Editor's Foreword

This is the first publication in the series of a study rather than a text or translation of source material. Little has been written on the pre-Christian culture and religion of Armenia, and for the most part years ago; so a new investigation of the subject is indeed significant. As usual, the text is the responsibility of the author, for the editor only makes suggestions which may or may not be accepted. Since the subject is of interest not only to those concerned with ancient Iran but especially to students of Armenian matters, the aid of the National Association for Armenian Studies and Research in the publication of this volume was not only most welcome but appropriate.
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**PREFACE**

From the time of the conquest of Assyria and Urartu by the Medes to the fall of the Sasanian Empire to the Muslim Arabs some thirteen centuries later, Armenian culture developed under the linguistic, political, and religious influence of successive Iranian empires. For most of this period the dominant religion of the Iranians was Zoroastrianism, and there exists abundant evidence that this religion was practised also by Armenians from the time of the Achaemenians. The religion waned in Armenia after the conversion of the Arm. Arsacid court to Christianity early in the fourth century, and most information on the old religion must be culled from hostile Christian texts of the fifth century and later. Classical writers such as Xenophon, Strabo, and Tacitus stress Armenia's ties to Iran, however, including common religious beliefs and practices. There is some evidence also in pre-Islamic Iranian texts.

Some features of Zoroastrian practice in Armenia can be reconstructed from archaeological remains, and the ethnographic material of recent times testifies to the survival of Zoroastrian beliefs.

Like their co-religionists in Iran, ancient Arm. Zoroastrians believed in a supreme God, Ahura Mazda (Aramazd), the Creator of all that is good, who is helped by the supernatural beings of His own creation, by righteous men, and by other good creations against the hostile, separate, uncreated Destructive Spirit, Angra Mainyu (Haranani), whose demonic hosts, destructive assaults, sins and diseases have polluted this world. Through an active, ethical life of piety, charity, truth, cultivation of the earth and veneration for the holy creations, particularly fire, whose light and warmth embody Divine righteousness, man struggles towards the great renovation of the world, Fra®.k®t (Fra®makert), when evil will be defeated and obliterated.

There was probably some local diversity in Armenian religion, though attempts by the Artaxiads to impose political unity involved religious centralisation as well. The Zoroastrian cult drew from the Armenian heritage of Indo-European, Asianic, and Semitic religion; Arm. Zoroastrianism was, perhaps, distinctive, but it was not a mere
The Armenians generally, though not universally, opposed the iconoclastic and other reforms of Ardešir I and his successors and the attempts by the latter, particularly Yazdagird II, to re-impose Zoroastrianism on the newly-Christianised nation. But remnants of the Good Religion survived down to recent times.

INTRODUCTION: THE LAND OF ARMENIA

The rugged volcanic highland called the Armenian plateau occupies an area of some 300,000 square kilometres, at a median elevation of 1500-1800 metres, on the same latitude as the Balkan peninsula; in its widest extent, Greater Armenia (Arm. Mecnayk) stretched from 37°-40°E. Long. and from 37°5'-41°5'N. Lat. The Plateau forms part of a mountain system including the Anatolian plateau to the west and the Iranian plateau to the east; both are lower than Armenia. The country's soils vary from desert and semi-desert to forest and mountain meadow. In sub-Alpine regions, the soil on the north side of a mountain may be rich chernozem, while the soil on the southern side is rocky and poor for lack of precipitation. Wind and water erosion and centuries of invasion, pillage and neglect have denuded many mountains once rich in forests. But Armenian orchards still provide the apricot, praised in Rome as the prunus Armeniacus, and the Armenian words for plum, apple and mulberry (salar, xajor, t'ut'c) are found in Assyrian, attesting to the cultivation and trade of Armenian agricultural produce in ancient times. Xenophon, who passed the winter in an Armenian village during the retreat of his mercenary army, described in the Anabasis the varied and abundant Armenian fare, much of it dried or pickled for the winter, as today; he and his men enjoyed Armenian beer. Armenia has a continental climate, being cut off by high mountains from large bodies of water, and winter is long and severe, with an average temperature of \(-15^\circ\)C in January; temperatures of \(-43.5^\circ\)C have been recorded in Kara. Summer is brief and hot, with temperatures of \(26-28^\circ\)C (but only \(20^\circ\)C on the high plateaux). Spring and autumn are the gentlest seasons of the year in Armenia.\(^1\)

Armenia may be viewed as the centre of a great cross defined by the Black Sea on the northwest,\(^2\) the Caspian on the northeast, the Mediterranean in the southwest, and the Persian Gulf in the southeast: at the strategic crossroads of the ancient world and lying athwart crucial trade routes, in proximity to important maritime centres. The
Euphrates, Tigris, Kura, Araxes, Chorokh and many lesser rivers rise in Armenia, and three great lakes form a triangle to the left of centre of the cross: Van, Sevan and Urmia, in the southwest, northeast and southeast of the country. Most of the centres of early Armenian civilization are clustered in the valleys of the great rivers, particularly the Araxes in the east and the Euphrates and its tributary the Aracani (Tk. Murat Su) in the west, and in the plains of Alashkert, Manzakert and Mug in the west and Ararat in the east, or on the shores of the great lakes, particularly Van. Where these valleys were particularly fertile or were traversed by major East-West routes, they became population centres with administrative offices in the Achaemenian period. The distribution of temples of the pre-Christian divinities follows the same pattern, so major centres of cult are found at Van and on the plains of Alashkert and Ararat, and along the courses of the Western and Eastern Euphrates, especially around Erzincan and Mug. Even when cities declined, sacred sites remained fixed, following Sir William Ramsay's 'law of the persistence of worship' and becoming Christian shrines.

Armenia is traversed by numerous mountain chains, most of which run in an east-west direction. On the north are the mountains of the lesser Caucasus; on the south are the mountains of Gordyene; on the northwest are the peaks of the Pontic and Antitaurus ranges; the Ararat-Haykakan Par-Ayeptunk-Anahkakan chains stretch across the interior. The highest mountain on the plateau is Greater Ararat (Arm. Asat Masik), 5165m. Most of the country is soft volcanic rock, mainly lava, so the valleys and mountains of Armenia are deeply cut and the topography of the land is super-human in scale and grandeur.

Armenia's fierce winters, high mountains, deep valleys and lofty elevation make it a land of isolated cantons marked by ferocious regionalism and cultural and religious conservatism. The archaism and conscientiously preserved integrity of Armenian language and custom are a boon to the student of Zoroastrianism, for forms and practices overcome and eradicated in other lands remain a living part of the Armenian heritage. Armenia was at different times a neighbour or province of one or several empires: in the west were the empires of Alexander, then the Romans, then the Byzantines; in the south, mighty Assyria once held sway; to the southeast were the Median, Achaemenian, Parthian, and then Sasanian kingdoms of Iran. It was the Iranians whose ties to the Armenians were closest and whose culture influenced the Armenian nation profoundly over the entire period when Zoroastrianism was the chief religion of Iran: from the Median conquest of Assyria in 612 B.C. to the fall of the Sasanians in A.D. 651. Throughout that entire span of twelve centuries, whose beginning coincides with the emergence of the Armenians as a nation in the annals of civilization, Armenia was ruled either directly by Iran or by kings and satraps of Iranian descent.

Yet Armenia never lost its sense of separateness; the Armenians were always a distinct people. The character of the country tended to foster the development of a social system based upon local dynastic units, each virtually self-sufficient in its own easily defended territory; while the local kinglets or dynasts, called in Armenian by the Mir. loan-word navarat, could only rarely be relied upon to come together and form an effective army, throughout most of history it has been as difficult to hold Armenia in complete subjugation as it would be to crush a sack of pebbles with a hammer. Thus one might explain the apparent contradiction of a country frequently subdivided by conquerors, its borders maddeningly fluid if defined at all, yet preserving throughout a definite sense of its own identity.

Until recent times, Armenian toponyms remained remarkably consistent for an area which has been subjected to waves of Arab, Byzantine, Seljuk, Nemanjic, Ottoman and Safavid invasion since the fall of the Sasanians. Names such as Erevan (Urartean Erbun), Van-Tosp (Urartean Blainea-Tusa), Aljnik (Urartean Alzini) et al. preserve the Hurrian-Urartean substratum; Semitic forms are attested in place-names such as Til (meaning 'hill', comp. the name of the Arm. city Duin, a Mir. loan-word with the same meaning); and Iranian forms are particularly abundant. Although the Zoroastrian vision of the world 'made wonderful' at the end of days with the destruction of evil specifies that the earth will be perfectly flat, the Armenians nonetheless named mountains after Zoroastrian divinities, and there is evidence to suggest that some mountains were considered sacred. For although mountains impede communication and agriculture, one recalls Herodotus' description of the religion of the Persians, who, he reports, worshipped in high places; besides, the grandeur and majesty of the brilliant white snow cap of
Ararat, seeming to float in Heaven, must have inspired religious awe in the ancient Armenians as it continues to do to this day.

Armenia has been the apple of contention of empires, but it has also been a refuge for many: the Assyrian kings complained of criminals and other riff-raff who escaped to the relative freedom of Arme-

supria in the Armenian highlands; Nushi immigrants from distant Thrace found their homes there; and Greek dissidents of pagan and Christian eras alike settled in Armenian towns to write poetry or expound philos-

ophy. A legend credits Hannibal, in flight after the defeat of Carth-

ga, with the foundation of the Armenian capital of Roman times,

Artaxata; the story is probably fiction, but it fairly reflects the Romans' irritation at a country which provided a safe haven for their enemies and which was impossible entirely to subdue. Tacitus wrote of

the Armenians, 'An inconstant nation this from old; from the genius of the people, as well as from the situation of their country, which bor-

ders with a large frontier on our provinces, and stretches thence quite to Media, and lying between the two empires, was often at variance with them; with the Romans from hatred, with the Parthians from jealousy.'

As N. G. Garsoian has noted, however, Armenian disputes with Iran in various periods are of a different quality from those with other conquerors, being more in the nature of violent family feuds than confronta-

tions between nations with different social systems and attitudes; until the late third century A.D., Armenia and Iran shared also a com-

mon religion.

That religion, Zoroastrianism, is the object of this investigation. It is worth noting that for some centuries, Armenia was entirely sur-

rounded by countries in which Zoroastrianism was practiced: to the west was Cappadocia, with its pyrathoi and its phylon of Magi. On the north, there is considerable evidence of Iranian religion in Georgia.

In the Sasanian period there were large Zoroastrian communities in northern Iraq (at Kirkuk, for example).

To the east and southeast was Media-Atropatene: Media was regarded as the homeland of Zoroaster himself, and Strabo declared that the religious practices of Armenians and Medes were identical. The very considerable enmity that erupted into open war between the Christian Armenian naxarars and Zoroastrian Iran in A.D. 451 has coloured subsequent perceptions of Armenia's ties to the outside world, leading many to view the people of the highland as embattled on all sides, resisting all foreign influence. The uniform anti-Zoroastrian tone of the fifth-century Armenian texts, and the seeming eradication by the Christians of Mazdean remains, have per-

haps discouraged scholars from attempting a systematic study of the Zoroastrian Armenian heritage, which has been, in the words of a recent writer, 'traitée peut-être un peu rapidement.'

Armenia's relation-

ship to Iran does not support such a view; rather, the Armenians seem to have been influenced at an early stage by Iran, whose social customs did not conflict with their own. Certain of these varied aspects of culture were retained long after their disappearance in Iran itself. In recognising institutions, art forms and the like as similar but of separate origin in Armenia and Iran, or as the common heritage of many different civilisations of the area, scholars such as Prof. B. N. Arakelyan have sought to minimise the impact of distinctly Iranian borrowings, as we shall see below. Armenian religion would then be seen as primarily a native development, for to admit otherwise would be to concede that Armenia was permeated by Iranian traditions which it adopted as its own. Authors of some studies have sought to isolate specifically Armenian phenomena, inspired perhaps by the legitimate wish to demonstrate that Armenian culture is neither an amalgam without a native core, nor indeed a provincial offshoot of Iran. There is the danger of seeing Iranian phenomena in Arm. where the material is more likely Asianic. Thus, next-of-kin marriage might well have come to Iran from Anatolia originally. In language, Arm. spend 'sacrifice' seems more likely to be related to the Asianic term, from which Gk. spoudē 'drink offering' is a loan-word, than to derive from Mlr. spenā, Av. spenta- 'incremental, bounteous, holy'. The basis of Armenian cul-

ture is a fusion of native and Iranian elements which has been retained faithfully over the ages, with comparatively slight accretions from other peoples. Armenia was neither the miraculous child of cultural parthenogenesis nor a mere stepson of the Persians.

When one examines the treasures of mediaeval Armenian painting, so profoundly influenced by the traditions of Byzantium and Syria, or reads the verses imbued with the imagery of Islamic poetry, or con-

siders the impact of Turkish syntactical forms upon the rich modern
Armenian spoken language, the image of an embattled, martyred, insular Armenia loses its validity. As in past ages, the Armenians merely adopted whatever they found pleasing in other cultures, turning their new acquisitions to their own use; the Persian rose and nightingale represent the Virgin Mary and Gabriel in the songs of Armenian minstrels. Armenian Christianity itself preserves much Zoroastrian vocabulary, ritual and imagery, while the rugged mountains and isolated cantons of the country allowed the Zoroastrian community of the Children of the Sun to flourish down to modern times.

Nonetheless, there is much truth in the remark of the late nineteenth-century traveller H. F. B. Lynch, that 'there is nothing needed but less perversity on the part of the human animal to convert Armenia into an almost ideal nursery of his race... one feels that for various reasons outside inherent qualities, this land has never enjoyed at any period of history the fullness of opportunity.'

Certain limitations of this study testify to the grim truth of Lynch's observation, at least as far as present-day Armenia is concerned. The modern Armenian republic, the smallest and southernmost of the constituent republics of the Soviet Union, occupies approximately one-tenth of the area of historical Armenia. The other nine-tenths, from earliest times to the mid-fifth century A.D., and the precise identity of the author is unknown, as is the date of composition;
scholars have proposed dates ranging from the fifth to the ninth centuries. Agathangelos, whose name is a Greek word meaning 'bringer of good tidings' and whose identity is likewise obscure, covers a much more limited period: the years of the conversion of the Armenians to Christianity (i.e., the late third-early fourth century). The text contains much valuable information on the shrines of various Zoroastrian divinities and acts of public worship and statements of belief by King Tiridates III, and versions exist in several languages. The text in Armenian probably belongs to the fifth century. The material on pre-Christian Armenian religion in both texts appears to be based upon both contemporary observation sources of great antiquity; Xorenaci includes numerous fragments of orally transmitted epic which he describes having heard with his own ears, and he claims to have consulted pagan temple records. (Often, too, Xorenaci appears to elaborate his remarks on Arm. antiquity with material borrowed from Classical literature, and it is sometimes perilous to accept his detailed assertions uncritically. At the same time, recent editors have tended to focus on scriptural and historiographical problems, understandably preferring to leave the Iranian material to Iranists.) The latter claim has been disputed, but not the former. Some of Xorenaci's statements, such as the erection of boundary markers by Artašēs, have been verified by archaeological discoveries of recent years.

Other important primary sources are the fifth-century text Eic alandoe'c 'The Refutation of Sects,' by Eznik Košac'ci, which contains much valuable material on Armenian pre-Christian religion as well as a polemic against Zoroastrianism, which is apparently regarded by the author as a sect of the Persians which did not affect the Armenians particularly; and another text, Veen Vardanac'ew Hayoc'c petaramin 'On Vardan and the Armenian War,' attributed to Elia'ë vardapet who was apparently an eyewitness to the Armeno-Sasanian war of A.D. 451. The text appears, however, to be a composition of the sixth century relying heavily upon the fifth-century work of Lazar P'arpeoci. The background of the war, the disposition of the Armenians toward Iran and the exchange of theological arguments between the Christians and Zurrani Sasanians are described in useful detail. The surviving portions of the Epic History (Pusançaran) or History of Armenia of P'awstos, a mysterious personage who probably wrote in the fifth century, deal with events of the fourth century and contain many legendary and epic elements.

Much of the information on ancient religion supplied by these early writers, most of whom lived within a century of the invention of the Armenian script by St. Mesrop Mashtoc (360-440), has been supplemented or corroborated by ethnographic studies conducted in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, beginning with the works of the clergyman and scholar Fr. Garegin Srunajtc'c (1840-1892). The latter first recorded recitations of the Armenian national epic of the heroes of Sasun, one of whom, Mher, is the yazata Mīhr, Av. Mitbrā; the deeds of the hero Mher, as sung by Armenians in some villages to this day, shed light upon our understanding of the Arm. cult of the yazata. Another example of the way in which recently recorded traditions can add to our knowledge of Armenian Zoroastrianism is the legend of the modern Mūš concerning a supernatural creature called the švod or švaz, whose name appears to be a modern form of that of the šahapat of Agathangelos. Modern Armenian folk rituals on the holidays of Ascension and the Presentation of the Lord to the Temple (Hambarjum and Yeain ţin arēj) reveal aspects of the cult of the Americas Spantas Haurvatat and Ameeteat and of the ancient celebration of the Zoroastrian feast of Athrakāna. In the former case is encountered a frequent problem of this study: definition of the specific Iranian origin of rites or customs which are widespread amongst Indo-European peoples generally. The custom of young girls gathering spring flowers and casting them into water is known, for instance, in Russia before Whit-sunday. In such cases we have tried to determine specific Iranian features in such Armenian customs, be they fire worship, reverence for trees, or, here, the springtime rite of waters and plants. Thus, an Iranian form of the rite is recorded for the Sasanian period in the eleventh-century Kitābu 'l-mahūsin wa 'l-adās: on each day of the vernal New Year festival of Hū Rūs, virgins stole water for the king, and he recited a short phrase, corrupt in the Arabic text, which mentions 'the two lucky ones' and 'the two blissful ones'—presumably Haurvatat and Ameeteat. In Armenia, the flowers cast into a vat of water bear the name of these two divinities: hōrōt-mōrōt.
Zoroastrian terms, or telling details of cult, are to be found in many Arm. customs one might otherwise assign to a common stock of Indo-European religious inheritances. 26

The first studies of pre-Christian Armenian religion were published in the late eighteenth century. 26aarmcan devoted a chapter to Armenian idolatry in his Hayoc patmutivn, 'History of the Armenians.' Half a century later, in 1835, Incic in his Hnaxsouitivn, Hayastanesyv, 'Armenian Antiquity', devoted separate chapters to sun worship, fire worship, pagan gods and other subjects. Gtcravan in his Tlezerakanc patmutivn, 'Universal History', included a chapter on ancient Armenian religion.

In the years preceding the first World War, numerous studies were published on Armenian ethnography and ancient religion. In 1871, M. Emkin published in Constantinople his Urmian Hayoc hetcamosakanc kroni, 'Profile of the heathen religion of the Armenians'; in 1879, K. Kostancan published a booklet entitled Hayoc hetcamosakanc kroni, 'The heathen religion of the Armenians'; in Venice, 1895, Fr. L. Alian published his Hin havatc karn hetcamosakanc kronik Hayoc, 'The ancient faith or heathen religion of the Armenians'; and in the same year, H. Geizer published his Zur armenischen GÖtterlehre; in 1899, Manuk Abelyan published in Leipzig a work establishing important connections between modern Armenian folk belief and ancient religion, Der armenische Volksglaube (repr. in M. Abelyan, Erker, VII, Erevan, 1975); the Armenian doctor and intellectual N. Tkaarean published a pamphlet, Hayoc hin kroney, 'The ancient religions of the Armenians', in Constantinople, 1909; and in 1913 the Armenian writer and public activist Avetis Aharonian presented to the University of Lausanne for the doctoral degree a thesis of remarkable brevity entitled Les anciennes croyances arméniennes (repr. Librairie Orientale H. Samuelian, Paris, 1980). 26b A work of equal brevity but greater substance is Hayoc c hin kroni karn hayakanc diccabanuvivn, by Echiss Duren, Armenian Patriarch of Jerusalem (Jerusalem, 1933). Articles on the subject of ancient Armenian religion and related modern folk beliefs were published in a number of Armenian and foreign journals, particularly the Armagnarakan Handes, 'Ethnographic Journal', which commenced publication in 1895 and appeared sporadically until the Russian Revolution. Research into the ancient Armenian past was encouraged by the linguistic researches of de Lagarde and HüBuchmann, and by the archaeological and ethnographic studies of the Caucasus sponsored by the Russian government and directed by N. Ya. Marr and others.

Much of this research was severely disrupted by the systematic massacre and deportation of the Christian populations of eastern Turkey by the Ottoman Government and its successors in 1895-1922. Some Armenian scholars resided in the safety of Tiflis, Moscow or St. Petersburg, but many others perished. Takaarean, for instance, whose work was noted above, was arrested with over two hundred fifty other Armenian intellectuals at Constantinople on the night of 24 April 1915, and was murdered by the Turkish authorities. 26a Some Armenian scholars survived the attempted genocide or escaped from Turkey before or during it. Martiros Y. Ananikean, born at Sebastia (tt. Sivas) in 1875, typifies the peregrinations of those Armenian scholars of this period who survived the 1915 genocide. Educated at the Central College of Turkey in Aintab, an institution run by American missionaries, Ananikean was sent after the massacres of 1895 to Springfield, Connecticut, where he earned an M.A. in theology and was appointed to teach Oriental languages at Hartford Seminary. In 1923 Prof. Ananikean died in Syria during a trip to acquire rare manuscripts for the Seminary library. 27 Ananikean perceived clearly that the Armenians had practised Zoroastrianism before their conversion to Christianity. An early article on the subject, 'Armenia (Zoroastrian)', in the Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, New York, 1913, I, 794, was later developed into an extensive study, Armenian Mythology (J. A. MacCulloch, ed. The Mythology of All Races, Vol. 7, N.Y., 1925, repr. Cooper Square Publishers, N.Y., 1964), which was published posthumously. Despite serious deficiencies, Ananikean's work contains much of value and is the only study of its kind in English.

At the time of Ananikean's writing, it was generally considered that the only 'pure' Zoroastrianism was that of the iconoclastic Sasanians (their depiction of Ahura Mazda as a human figure on bas-reliefs is conveniently forgotten), with their cult purged of foreign influences (the worship of Anahita notwithstanding) and their theology true to the teachings of Zarathustra (despite evidence to the effect
that the Zurvanite heresy was professed by the higher officials of the state. On the basis of this spurious understanding, fostered partly by the Sasanians themselves (who accorded credit, however, for the first compilation of the texts of the Avesta to a Parthian predecessor, Vahak) and partly also by Zoroastrians and Westerners of the nineteenth century who sought to purge the Good Religion of what they perceived as barbaric and polytheistic accretions, the religion of the Parthians was dismissed as a form of Hellenistic syncretism rather than authentic Zoroastrianism, and the religion of the Armenians, which shows close similarities to the Parthian type, was likewise denigrated.

The influence of such prevailing attitudes prevented Ananikean from considering the pre-Christian religion of Armenia as a form of Zoroastrianism whose assimilation of non-Zoroastrian aspects, both Iranian and non-Iranian, illuminate the character of the Faith as it was anciently practised, particularly by the Parthians, rather than obscure it. He is thus led to this awkward formulation: "It (the Hellenistic period) was a time of conciliations, identifications, one might say of vandalistic syncretism that was tending to make of Armenian religion an outlandish motley. Their only excuse was that all their neighbours were following a similar course. It is, therefore, no wonder that the Sasanians during their short possession of Armenia in the middle of the third century seriously undertook to convert the land to the purer worship of the sacred fire." According to this view, the Armenians practised a form of ancient Thracian-Phrygian paganism which had assimilated certain features of the religion of the Hurrian-Urartean autochthons. To this was added an admixture of Iranian beliefs over the centuries of Median, Persian and Parthian influence. These were inundated by a flood of Hellenic religious oddments as the hapless Armenians watched passively or built temples where—without system or conviction—they solemnised their 'conciliations' and 'vandalistic syncretism' until the Sasanians with their 'purer worship' arrived to save the day. Ananikean adds that the Armenians preserved a coherent group of traditions based upon a fusion of native and Iranian elements which endured through the periods of Hellenism, Sasanian proselytism and even seventeen centuries of Christianity.

Given his use of the term 'Zoroastrian Armenia' in the Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, it seems that Ananikian was himself convinced that the Armenians had incorporated various, disparate elements into their Zoroastrian cult—one can scarcely exclude the likelihood that the practice of the religion differed from place to place, or that many Armenians were never Zoroastrians at all. There were other foreigners besides Iranians—Persians and Medes, for the most part—in Armenia, such as Greeks, Syrians, and Jews, who brought their beliefs with them. The temple historian of Ani, Olympios, mentioned by Movsös Xorenac1, was probably a magus with a Greek name, like his colleagues in Lydia, rather than a Greek. One notes, however, the apparently Greek scribal tradition in Armenia (see the discussion of the Armenian inscription of Vakar in Ch. 1). But even where distinctly non-Iranian terms are used in the cult, this does not allow us to deny the Zoroastrian essence: the Aramaic word kuna, for example, gives us the pre-Christian Arm. word for a priest, kūrm, yet the Semitic word is found also in the trilingual inscription at Xanthos (see J. Teixidor, JNES 37, 2, 1978, 183), where elements of Iranian religion also are seen. The Arms. also seem to have used Iranian priestly titles (see Ch. 15), and the very term magus, one recalls, was adopted by the Good Religion from Median paganism. The Sasanians experimented with various sacerdotal offices, so innovation or variation in this area does not define the nature of Zoroastrian faith for the period under discussion. An example of a widespread rite, that of flowers and water in spring, has been adduced to show how one might prove Iranian origins as against Indo-European survivals. Fire worship is another case: it is important in Greek religion, but in Armenia the terms and beliefs associated with it are identifiablely Iranian. Greek temenoi had to have a tree and a spring, like Zoroastrian temples, and Arm. reverence for trees probably includes both Mazdean features and survivals from the Urartean substratum.

The expression 'vandalistic syncretism' is evidently emotive and betrays a prejudice towards the ever-elusive 'cultural purity' that no complex civilization has ever possessed. The terracotta mother-and-child figurines from Artašat and Armavor represent a modification of the scene of Isis lactans (see the monograph of that title by Tran Tam Tinh, Leiden, 1973), linked to the cults of Anahīt and Manē. Medallions of Isis were found at Artašat, and it is likely that her cult
influenced Zoroastrian thought in Anatolia. For example, an Aramaic inscription found at Arbeun in Cappadocia hails the marriage of the supreme Semitic god Bel to the 'wise' (mazā) Religion of Mazdā-worship. A shallow relief on the stone appears to depict a cosmogonic scene, and the Irano-Semitic text perhaps derives its inspiration from the teaching of the Isis cult that Theos and Sophia cohabited to produce the Cosmos. Such a myth accords well with the Zoroastrian conviction that the architect of the world acted with supreme wisdom; it affirms also the pre-existence of Religion. This is, if anything, considerably superior to the gloomy tale of Zurvan, the hermaphroditic doubter deceived by his own spawn--the old folktale type seen in the Biblical story of Jacob and Esau. Unless Zoroastrianism be defined baldly as that which Iranians think it to be, the Magi hellenises needed no instruction in their faith from the emissaries of Ctesiphon.

Armenia is a land which is well suited geographically to conserving archaisms, and which has done so. Yet even so, it could scarcely have sustained such a consistent and tenacious tradition had there not been an underlying thread of unifying belief, namely, that of Zoroastrianism. It is likely that the religion was introduced into the country by the Medes or Achaemenians, assimilating many non-Zoroastrian aspects, and that it was practised under the Artaxiads and Arsacids. In this study, we shall seek to describe the Good Religion in Armenia in the detail that examination of the wealth of linguistic, literary, archaeological, iconographic, theological and ethnographic evidence allows; to show, further, that the forms of Armenian worship were consistent and rooted in centuries of pietry, and to demonstrate that these forms are neither haphazard nor contrary to Zoroastrian practice elsewhere. Indeed Christian Armenian writers perceived the Parthian and Persian forms of the faith to differ in certain respects, and took care to distinguish the rites of their own ancestors' Aramaz from those of the Ormizd of their Zurvanite Persian opponents. Yet their traditional Zoroastrianism had evidently absorbed a number of local elements; this is seen, for instance, in the apparent survival of many beliefs concerning the Hurrian Tēšub in the cult of Vahagn. The Parsees of India, too have been strongly influenced by many of the usages of that land and have assimilated many Hindu practices

(including, for example, invocation of the goddess Lakṣāmi during the marriage ceremony) which distinguish them from their co-religionists in Iran. Instances of such national diversity are a commonplace in most of the great religions; the Jews, perceived by many to be one of the most ethnically distinct of peoples, recognise considerable differences in ritual, practice and custom between the Ashkenazic and Sephardic communities (these categories themselves conceal a bewildering variety of groups), not to mention the Karaites and Samaritans.

Recognition of Zoroastrian diversity, what R. C. Zaehner, perhaps somewhat tendentiously, called a 'catholic' Zoroastrianism embracing heterogeneous elements in a single edifice of faith, is fundamental to a study of the religion in Armenia, yet prejudice against such a concept remains strong; little doubt of the orthodoxy of the Parthians can remain, in view of the evidence assembled since the beginning of this century, yet statements such as the following are still made by serious writers: 'Once established the [Parthian] Arsacids never adopted full Zoroastrianism.' The same author goes on to list a number of Parthian practices which are clearly an indication, when taken together, of Zoroastrian pietry: respect for the Magi, worship of Ahura Mazā, observance of the cult of the fravahar, royal names beginning with Arta-or Mithra-, maintenance of an eternally burning sacred fire, and the compilation of the Avesta, referred to above. Much more evidence exists besides; one might mention here in brief also the transmission of the Kayanian epic, which enshrines the sacred history of Zoroaster's mission; the Iranian components of Mithraism; and the many Zoroastrian aspects in Arsacid works preserved in Zoroastrian Book Phil. and NP.

One recalls that the forefathers of the Parsis came from Parthia, not Parsa. What, then, is the proof of the above writer's claim? It is threefold: the names of Greek deities are found on Parthian coins, the Arsacids were buried in tombs, and they do not seem to have persecuted other religions. To cite the same author, 'The Sasanians would not recognise them as true believers.' But the Sasanians also practised imnization, as had the Achaemenids in Persis before them. They certainly continued to employ Hellenic art forms, although they did not style themselves 'philhellen' or use Greek translations of the names of their divinities. But the latter practice would prove nothing, in
any case, for peoples all over the Hellenistic Near East called their gods by Greek names such as Zeus Keraunios or Jupiter Dolichenus without abandoning their native Semitic or Asianic religions. One notes besides that the ostraca found at Nisa, and (as we shall see below) the religious names and vocabulary borrowed from Parthian and preserved in Armenian, are thoroughly Zoroastrian. The sole objection we are left with is that the Parthians did not persecute unbelievers, as the Sasanians did. But neither were the Parthians confronted by the powerful, aggressive Christian Byzantine state, which used religion as an important instrument of its foreign policy. It would seem that judgements concerning the religion of the Parthians have tended to rest upon conviction rather than evidence. Since the impact of Iranian culture upon Armenia was greatest in the Arsacid period, such prejudices have tended further to discourage investigation of Iranian religion in Armenia.

In the years following the Armenian genocide, research on ancient religion was resumed. In Paris, the journal Revue des Études Arméniennes was founded in 1920, and scholars such as Dansé, Benveniste, Bailey, Bolognesi, Henning, Junker, Meillet, and others made valuable contributions to Armenian studies from the Iranian field. In the Soviet Armenian Republic, scholarship was pursued, under extremely difficult conditions at first, for the fledgling state, only a few years before a forgotten backwater of the Russian Empire, had now become the refuge of hundreds of thousands of sick and starving refugees from the terror that had engulfed nine-tenths of the Armenian land. Before the establishment of Soviet power, Armenia had also to fight off invasion from three sides: Georgia, Azerbaijan and Turkey. Yet in 1926 the newly-founded Erevan State University began publication of the seven-volume HayerSn armatakan bajaran 'Armenian Etymological Dictionary' of H. Aksafyan, a pupil of A. Meillet. This work, with ca. 11,000 root entries, represents an important advance on the etymological researches of Heinrich Hübschmann, adding greatly to our knowledge of Iranism in Armenian. Aksafyan's entries are often, however, uncritical compendia of all previous opinions, of uneven value. More recently, R. Schmidt and others have re-examined the Iranian loan-words in Arm. The historical and mythological studies of M. Abekyan are also of great importance in this area, and we shall have occasion to refer to them often in this study. Despite this increasing volume of information, certain scholars in the Armenian republic have tended to regard many Iranian phenomena as either native Armenian (they indeed came to be regarded as such in time by the Armenians of the ancient period, but were not in origin) or of common origin. Other scholars, such as Anahit Perikhanian, have tended to study ancient Armenia within the framework of Iranian culture, but no major work has appeared in Armenia or abroad in recent years proposing to treat of the entire subject of Zoroastrian religion per se in Armenia.

The difficulties which attend such a study arise from both a wealth and a paucity of material. On the one hand, there exists a great mass of research on ancient Iran and the other Near Eastern civilizations under whose aegis Armenian culture grew. On the other, the inaccessibility of much of historical Armenia, the absence of archaeological material, and the destruction of the ancient Armenian communities and consequent scarcity of modern, scientifically presented ethnographic evidence creates gaps which cannot be filled. We have attempted to glean information from memorial volumes published by compatriotic unions of various towns and provinces in the Armenian Diaspora, and have received some oral testimony of value from Armenians born in the homeland; some ethnographic studies of great value have appeared in Soviet Armenia.

This study consists of three parts: the first is a historical survey of the development of Armenian religious beliefs and institutions, including the priesthood, temples, et al. until the conversion of the nation to Christianity, and a consideration of Arnao-Sasanian relations with regard to Zoroastrianism; the second part consists of an investigation of the cults of Zoroastrian yazatas whose worship is attested in Armenia; the third part deals with apocalyptic concepts, heroes, demons, and monsters, general questions of cult and ritual, and, finally, the survival of the Good Religion amongst the Children of the Sun in Christian times.
Notes - Introduction


2. The Greek name of this sea, Pontos Euxinos, 'the hospitable sea,' is a euphemism for an original Aesinos, taken by popular etymology to mean 'inhospitable,' but more likely the transcription of an OP form *asxiqinae-. Phl. asxiqen 'blue' (H. W. Bailey, Dictionary of Khotan Saka, Cambridge, 1979, 26, s.v. sggpelē) or xsaxen 'dark blue' (D. H. Mackenzie, A Concise Pahlavi Dictionary, London, 1977, 9a), with the Armenian loan-word and proper name Axsēn ( subsystem, Am. Gr., 20; a derivation of this name from Av. xōsēthinī was favoured, however, by E. Benveniste, Titres et noms propres en iranien ancien, Paris, 1966, 21). If the derivation of the name of the sea from Iranian is correct, it suggests that Iranians navigated it often, or lived on its shores.

3. On these routes, see H. Manandyan, 'O torgovle i gorodakh Armēnii v sviat's mirovoi torgovlei drevnii vremena,' Erevan, 1930 (2nd ed., Erevan, 1974; English trans. by N. G. Garsoian, The Trade and Cities of Armenia in Connection with Ancient World Trade, Lisbon, 1965). The importance of Armenian routes in the ancient world is underscored by the careful attention paid to the geography of the country by Strabo, Ptolemy and others; see H. Manandyan, Les anciens itineraires d'Arménie. Artaxata-Satala et Artaxata Tigrancortea, d'après la carte de Peutinger, ERA, 10, 1930. Ramsay is cited by E. Herzfeld, Archaeological History of Iran, London, 1935, 89.

3-a. The legendary homeland of the Iranians was alyxem vaCx 'the Iranian Expanse.' Armenia seems to have two loci of legendary origin in tradition: the regions of Van and Ararat. In the former in Hayoc C Jor, the Valley of the Armenians. For the latter, one might suggest a translation of Hayyakan Par as 'the Armenian Place,' the word par being here not 'row, line' but a Mr. loan-word, cf. OIr. pada-, Zor. Phl. pādāt/pāyav 'place' (see on the latter H. W. Bailey, AT 23, 44).

4. Arm. naxarxar is to be derived from a Mr. form *naxvarār attested in a Parthian inscription, probably of the mid-third century A.D., from Kāl-i Janjalu, the inscription mentions the naxvār w hārrār 'naxvarār and satrap' of Gar-Ardāsr. The word is also attested as Nandabar, the name of a Persian general under Šābuhr II mentioned by Ammianus Marcellinus, and as naxvar in Syriac, translated into Arabic as 'army chief' by Bar Bahlal (W. B. Henning, 'A new Parthian inscription,' JRAS, 1953, 132-6). The name of a Manichean presbyter, Naskhār, is attested in Sogdian, and various possible Greek forms of the name occur in the works of Agathias and other writers (see A. Christensen, l'Iran sous les Sassanides, 2nd ed., Copenhagen, 1944, 21 n. 3). On the use of the Iranian prefix naxa-, nahe-'first' in Armenian, see H. W. Bailey, op. cit. n. 2, 190 s.v. māhī-. The classical work on the development of the naxar system in Armenia is N. G. Garsoian/ N. Adonts, Armenia in the Period of Justinian: The Political Conditions Based on the Naxar System, Lisbon, 1970. In the course of this study, we shall have occasion to specific aspects of this social institution as it affected ancient religious practices.


6. On tuf'il, see our Ch. on Anahit and Nanē; on the derivation of Dūn, Ck. Davies (Procopius II:24), see V. Minorsky, 'Sur le nom de Drin,' in his Iranica, Tehran, 1964, 1.

7. The major work on Armenian toponyms is H. Hübtschmann, Die altarmenischen Ortswörter, Strassburg, 1920 (Indogermanische Forschungen, Bd. XVI, 1904, 197-490; repr. Oriental Press, Amsterdam, 1969; Arm. tr. by H. B. Pilikian, His Hayoc telvoy anumens, Vienna, 1907). Garsoian/Adonts, op. cit. n. 4, provide additional valuable information, including the modern Tk. names of many ancient sites.

8. See Ch. 5, the tomb at Ać in Ch. 9, and the discussion of Mt. Sabalan in Ch. 6.


10. See N. G. Garsoian, 'Prolegomena to a Study of the Iranian Aspects in Arsacid Armenia,' HA, 1976, 177-8. This article, together with 'The Locus of the Death of Kings: Irania Armeniain--the Inverted Image' and 'The Iranian Substratum of the Agat'angēlo' Cycle,' which deal with the courtly hunt, and other Iranian themes in the legend of the conversion of the Armenians to Christianity, is now reprinted in N. G. Garsoian, Armenia between Byzantium and the Sassanians, Var. Académie, Paris, London, 1985. The 'Prolegomena1' is an essential review of the sources for the study of ancient Armenian culture in its relations with Iran, particularly Greek and Latin writings not discussed in this Introduction though separately treated in the succeeding chapters.
10-a. See, most recently, M. M. Morony, Iraq after the Muslim Conquest, Princeton, 1984, Ch. 10, esp. pp. 282, 292. The tenth-century Arm. historian T'ovas T'orcu claims to have met Zoroastrian sages, noblemen of Arm. and Greco-Roman symbol of the evil eye, 3 which may compare the Arm. and Greco-Roman symbol of the evil eye, the symbol preserved any memory of pre-Christian shrines, for Arm.

11. See Ch. 9.

12. See Ch. 16.


13-a. A number of Arm. MSS. of the mediaeval period and later contain lists of abbreviated words mixed with hieroglyphic symbols (nanesagirk) and their Arm. meaning, called nanesagirk maoruc, of the wise', annunc 'of names', Hayoc agzi 'of the Armenian nation', or arabe c gir 'writing of the first (men)' or simply korkzeny (abbreviation); writers on the history of Arm. writing have compiled lists of these varying from 505 to 591 symbols, though some MSS. contain only a few scores. Most of the symbols do not seem to be found in use outside these lists, and although some are familiar lexical signs, or obviously invented, others may be very old. The symbol for hetcanos 'heathen', for example, recalls Hittite with the same meaning, a hieroglyph used down to Roman period in Asia Minor. The symbol for hetcanos 'heathen', as recorded in A. C. Abrahamyan, Haxarakocyan hay gir ekroyn, Erevan, 1982, 53, appears to depict the ground plan of a temple within a walled temenos, with two strokes added, perhaps to eradicate the structure in condemnation: 🏐

Without further evidence, however, it is impossible to tell whether that is, in fact, what the symbol represents, or whether it preserves any memory of pre-Christian shrines, for Arm. churches, too, are often built within walled yards. (For the stroke of cancellation of something evil, though, one might compare the Arm. and Greco-Roman symbol of the evil eye, 🎀, which is found in these lists and in some Arm. magical MSS.)


15. For the scope and importance of these discoveries in the linguistic field, see the survey by P. Considine, 'A Semantic Approach to the Identification of Iranian Loan-words in Armenian,' in B. Breguani, ed., Festschrift Oswald Eichrodt, Amsterdam, 1979, esp. 213-15. Some indication of the extent of the archaeological discoveries in the Iranian field is provided by T. N. Zedanovskaia, whose bibliography of recent Soviet research on the Parthians alone--the Iranian group most important to a study of Armenian Zoroastrianism, runs to nearly seventy closely-printed pages (Bibliotheque de travaux sovietiques sur les Parthes, Studia Iranica, Vol. 4, 1975, fasc. 2, Leiden, 263-60).


19. The critical edition was edited by L. Marlıs and Ch. Mercier, Ezmmik de Kolb 'Pe Deco' (Patrologia Orientalis, Tome XXVII, fasc. 3, 4, Paris, 1959); a translation with commentary in modern Armenian was published by A. Abrahamyan, Ezmmik kolbcd'ik Eke akhucoc (Abannc'der herx'um), Erevan, 1970. Passages in Arm. concerning Zurvanism are analyzed in R. C. Zabner, Zurvan, Oxford, 1957. The name Zurvan (pron. 'Zurnan\'), with customary reduction to zero of short \-i\ (as in ur\-), is used by Arm. writers as the equivalent of Gk. Kronos, without any indication, however, that Zurvan played a rôle in Arm. cult. He does not figure in descriptions of pre-Christian religion, and the Zurvanite cosmogonic myth is always distinguished as Persian rather than Armenian. It certainly cannot be employed, anachronistically and in disregard of its distinctly Sasanian Persian character, to explain the significance of episodes of the Artaxiad epic, pace Prof. Mazhe (Artaward, les F'arkoc, et le temps,' HArm., N.S. 16, 1982, in other respects a fascinating study; see Ch. 13 on Artaward). The Old Man Time, Zuk-jamanak, of later Arm. folklore, bears no resemblance to Ir. Zurvan.

21. There is as yet no critical edition. The Venice text of 1932 is used here; St. Vakhsašaren prepared an annotated modern Armenian translation, F'awetos Buzand, F'atam'yun Hayoc', Erevan, 1968; a Russian translation by M. A. Gevorgyan, with intro. by L. S. Khachikyan, ed. by S. T. Erevyan, Jecfery Armenian P'awstsa Buzanda, was published in Erevan, 1993; a critical study and translation by N. G. Garsofan, with notes by this writer on Persian features of the work, is to be published shortly.

22. On the etymology of Maštoc', see Ch. 5; on the origins of the Armenian script, see Ch. 9.

23. See Ch. 8.

24. See Ch. 10.

25. See Chs. 12 and 15. On the Sasanian custom at Nê Rûz, see E. Erlich, 'The Celebration and Gifts of the Persian New Year (Nowruz) according to an Arabic source,' Dr. J. J. Mord Memorial Volume, Bombay, 1930, 99. I am thankful to K. F. Mistree of Bombay for his spare copy of this important book.


26-a. On Tākawarān's life and scholarly studies, which embraced Arm. history, letters, and antiquities as well as the natural sciences, see Asatur F'asayan, 'Enaget, bûške, banasere ...' Soverakan Hayastan monthly 1985-9, Erevan, 26-7.

27. See T. A. Tz'cker, 'Martiros Yarūt'čyavan Ananikean, K'ansakaran,' in M. Y. Ananikean, K'损耗k anusamamir't'INNER, khetasak'yut'čyun Hay Krt'akan Himmarkut'čeun, K'o'nak tparan, New York, 1932, 7-11.

28. On the problems of Parthian and Sasanian Zoroastrianism with respect to Armenia, see Ch. 4. On the destruction of image-shrines in Armenia by Sasanian invaders and the establishment or endowment of fire-shrines (Arm. arusyan-k'i) alone, see Ch. 15. On the attribution to Valaz', see M. Boyce, Zoroastrians, London, 1973, 94, citing DkM, 412.5-11.

29. M. H. Ananikean, Armenian Mythology, 16.

30. See Ch. 2.

In the third millennium B.C., two racial types, the Mediterranean and the Caucasian, inhabited the lands of the Armenian plateau. The Caucasian Hurrians, whose language is said to have belonged to the same group as the speech of various modern peoples of the northeastern Caucasus, have left us cuneiform inscriptions dating from the second half of that millennium. They were in contact with the Semitic peoples to the south of the plateau, and assimilated certain Semitic art forms into their rich native culture. It is thought that the Hurrians were authochthonous inhabitants of the plateau, descendants of the people of the Kuro-Araxes culture, remains of which have been excavated at sites such as Sengavit, near Erevan.

Amongst the descendants of the early Hurrians are a people whose presence on the southeastern shore of Lake Van is attested from the end of the second millennium B.C. They called their land Biainili (whence Arm. Van), and their capital Tūspa (cf. Arm. Tosp, Vontosp, Gk. Theopio). Assyrian sources call the lands to the north Urwastri, Urartu or Na'iri. The archives of the palace at Assur record a war fought by Assyria against 43 'kings of Nairi'; Salmaneser I (1266-1243 B.C.) mentions the enemy state Urwastri in his inscriptions. N. Adontz connected this name with Gk. Eretreis and Arm. Ay'truank. The Assyrian Urartu, Babylonian Urastu (on which cf. infra) and Heb. Ararat (Dead Sea scrolls 'wrrt, 'Urarat) have been connected with Arm. Ay'tarat and the Alarodioi of Herodotus 3.94 and 7.79. It is worth noting that the 'mountains of Ararat' upon which Noah's ark rested were probably thought to be in Gordyene, to the south of the present-day Mt. Ararat (Tk. Ağrî dağ; Arm. Azat Masik, Masis), for the fifth-century Armenian historian P'awstos Buzand writes that the Syrian St. Jacob of Hisibis climbed Mt. Sararad in Gordyene to search for pieces of wood from the Ark. The tradition connecting the Biblical Mt. Ararat with Gordyene is attributed by Alexander Polyhistor (first cent. B.C.) to Barosus (third cent. B.C.), and it is likely that it was forgotten in Armenia only gradually, as
the Christian See of Vaharapat (Ejmiacin) eclipsed in importance and authority the first See of the Armenian Church, at Aštîat. Mt. Ararat (i.e., Azat Masik) was believed by the Armenians to be the abode of the legendary K'aj'k and the prison of King Artavazd, much as the Iranians regarded Mt. Demûvd as the place where Thrašûrûn had bound Aži Dahâka; it is also the highest mountain in Armenia, and must have been regarded as sacred. When Vaharapat in the province of Vayrap came to be the Mother See of the Church, the Biblical legend must have attached to the noble peak in whose shadow the great Cathedral of Ejmiacin stands, the mountain having been re-named after the province (the acc. pl. of the original name survives as Arm. Masis).

In the second millennium B.C. in the northwest and southeast of Anatolia we find two Indo-European peoples, the Hittites and the Luwians, who were probably invaders from the Balkans. Hurrian gods are found in the Hittite pantheon, along with Indo-European divinities such as Tarpuša, a weather-god whom the Armenians were to worship as Tork, two millennia later. The mining of precious metals had been a significant feature of the economy of the Armenian Plateau since the third millennium B.C. and early in the second millennium the Assyrians established trading colonies in the south and west of the plateau, mainly along the upper Euphrates, in order to obtain the copper and tin needed to make bronze weapons. In the eleventh-ninth centuries B.C., iron began to be mined as well.

The age of certain Semitic loan-words in Armenian is uncertain, and it has been proposed that Arm. K'urûm, '(pagan) priest', is to be derived from Assyrian kumru rather than later Aramaic kumru. A number of villages in Armenia bore the name 'Ull until recent times; the word derives from a Semitic form meaning 'hill' (compare Duin, Middle Persian 'hill', the capital of the last Armenian Arsacids). Armenia abounds in hills, of course, and a hill is both easily defended and economical, leaving the low-lying lands free for farming. Hills are also the high places at which Zoroastrian yazatas may be worshipped, and the temple of Manç was located at one town named T'Ull on the upper Euphrates. Certain names of trees and fruits in Armenian may be derived from Assyrian forms, however, so it is not impossible that the above terms of importance to the study of ancient Armenian religion may have entered the language at an early stage. A striking example of possible continuity of linguistic and cultural tradition from earliest times to the recent past may be illustrated here. N. Adontz proposed that Arm. kot 'obelisk' be derived from the ancient Mesopotamian kudurrû, an administrative stele or boundary marker. Such boundary markers with inscriptions in Aramaic were erected by king Artašēs (Artaxias) I of Armenia early in the second century B.C. and were described by Movâş Xorenac' in his History of Armenia, perhaps as much as a millennium later. In the eighth century B.C., the Urartean king Argisti I erected a similar stele with a cuneiform inscription; Christian Armenian villagers carved a Cross into the stone, transforming the ancient kudurrû into a mediaeval kot of the kind most common in Armenia: a xab'tar, 'Cross-stone'. Only one Semitic god, Baršāmin (Ba'al Samîn, 'Lord of Heaven'), seems to have been adopted in Armenia, however; this probably occurred late in the first millennium B.C.

In the thirteenth-twelfth centuries B.C., the Anatolian peninsula was invaded by warlike tribes called 'sea peoples' by contemporary Egyptian records. It has been hypothesised that they were the Achaeans and Danseans of Homeric epic literature. Thraico-Phrygian tribes from the Balkan peninsula may have invaded Asia Minor at the same time, while the Philistines conquered coastal lands of the eastern Mediterranean. The former destroyed the great Hittite Empire in central Anatolia early in the twelfth century B.C., and records of the Egyptian pharaoh Ramses III mention the settlement in northern Syria of Anatolian tribes displaced by them. Assyrian and Hurrian records continued to refer to the Anatolian peoples west of the Euphrates as Hittites, but called the Thraico-Phrygians Muški. Early in the twelfth century, Assyrian records mention the appearance of certain Muški tribes in the valleys of the upper Euphrates and its tributary, the Aracani (Tk. Murat Su); this area was called by the Assyrians and Urartians the country of Urumû, Urm or Arme, and this may be the Homeric 'Land of the Arimoi, where Typhoüs lies prostrate.' It is noteworthy that most of the temples of pre-Christian Armenia of Zoroastrian yazatas were located in the areas of the Aracani (E. Euphrates) and the W. Euphrates to the north, where Armenians might have settled in early times. The other centres of cult were in the Araxes valley—the eastern focus of Urartian power.
Markwart proposed that the ethnic name OP. armina- 'Armenian' (the Babylonian version of the text renders 'Armenia' as Uraštu) in the inscription of Darius I at Behistun was formed of arme- with the Hurrian adjectival ending -ini-, comp. muskin- 'Must, a Moschyan'; he analysed the name of Armavir (the Orontid capital of Armenia, built in the Araxes valley on the site of the Urartean city of Argistihinilli) as formed from the base arme-/arma- with toponymical suffix -vur, the latter found in the name of the Cappadocian city Galataurus23 (attested in Greek of the fourth century B.C. and explained as 'place of the treasury'24).

It has been noted that for most of the period under discussion, the Armenian highlands were ruled by a number of local dynasts, the kings of Haidri, and in the introduction it was proposed that the geographical division of the country into many cantons difficult of access has precluded the establishment of a strong, centralised power over all Armenia. Regional rulers retained considerable sovereignty, both as kings of Haidri and as naxarars in later centuries. In the ninth century B.C., a number of kingdoms of Haidri united into a single state with its capital at Tusa, on the southeastern shore of Lake Van (cf. supra), and in an inscription in the Assyrian language ca. 833 B.C. Sarduri I styled himself 'king of kings'. The united provinces of Urartu posed a serious threat to Salmaseser III of Assyria (859-24), and for over a century we find Assyrian records full of the news of victories and defeats in wars with Urartu, and the gods are questioned anxiously about the future of relations between the two states.

Urartean culture was rooted in the local tradition of the Hurrian population, yet many artistic forms appear to have been borrowed from Mesopotamia to the south and the Indo-European Anatolian peoples to the west.25 The Urartean kings Tispuri and Menusa have left us the names of some eighty Hurrian gods worshipped in Urartu, but the chief triad, equated in Urartean inscriptions with Assyrian Assur, Adad and Samas, included Haldi, the father of the gods; Teišeba, the god of storms; and Ardini, the sun god.26 In the ninth-eighth centuries, the Urarteaens built the temple city of Ardini (Assyr. Musamir) to Haldi, who as patron divinity of the royal house periodically received sacrifices of six horses, seventeen oxen, and thirty-four sheep.27 Urartean dedicatory inscriptions at temple sites always list the number and kind of sacrifices to be performed regularly in honour of a god.28 Large temple estates such as those founded in Asia Minor by the Hittites were established on the Armenian plateau; such estates were held in later centuries by Zoroastrian temples and later still by hierarchical families and monasteries of the mediaeval Armenian Church. The institution of regular sacrifices of animals in religious observances by the Urarteaens must have been important as occasions for social gatherings, and as a source of charity for the poor. In a country where the physical conditions of life changed little until recent times, these ancient practices may be regarded as providing a basis for Armenian observance of Zoroastrian gahabyars and for the meta sacrifices offered by Armenian Christians.

Other aspects of Urartean religion seem to have survived in later Armenian culture. The Zoroastrian yazata Verethraghna, called Vahagn by the Armenians, bears many of the attributes of the weather god Teišeba. Vahagn's consort, Astik, whose name means 'little star' and is apparently an Armenian calque of ancient Syrian Kaukabtē, Astarte, may be compared to the Hurrian goddess Hebat/Hepit.29 The cult of Nanē, who was worshipped in Uruk as Inanna, the Lady of Heaven, may have been introduced into Armenia in Urartean times, but this is by no means certain.30 The Urarteaens sacrificed before blind portals called 'gates of God', and one of these, carved on the rock-face at the fortress of Tusa (modern Van), is called by Armenians the 'gate of Mher', i.e., Mithra.31

The Urartean king Menusa (810-786) built fortresses in the area of Manaskert, Karin (Tk. Erzurum) and Banaz,32 and the Urartean expansion to the northeast continued under his successor, Argishi I (786-64), who conquered the provinces of Dsau (Arm. Tayk), Tariuni (Arm. Daroynk), Zabaza (Arm. Jawask) and other areas, including the plain of Ararat. In 782, Argishi conquered the lands around Lake Sevan, and built a fortress at Glaniuni (Arm. Gafni) on the river Azat to guard the route from Sevan to the plain of Ararat, where he founded two cities, Erebuni (Arm. Erevan) and Argishtihinilli (cf. supra). Both sites became later Armenian cities, and Gafni became a fortress of the Arm. Arsacids. Argishi colonised Erebuni with settlers from the upper Euphrates.
valley, and excavations have shown that the Babylonian god Marduk and the Persian god Ahura Mazda were worshipped there; this mixed population presumably included Muski as well.33

In the eighth century B.C. the Transcaucasus was invaded by the Cimmerians, a people of Thracian origin who lived on the northern shores of the Black Sea. Archaeological evidence indicates that they had maintained peaceful trading contacts with Urartu before the Scythians entered the region. The Scythians, who settled in the district later called Sakacene (Arm. Sakašen) after them,36 near Garnaz, the Scythians are referred to in the inscriptions of the early seventh century B.C. by the Scythian king Susama as Auguzi, hence Biblical Neb. Aškenaz (Arar. Ask' anaz, a name by which Armenians sometimes refer to themselves)37 Scythian artifacts have been found at Tisebaini, a city founded by the Urartean king Rusa II early in the seventh century near Erebuni (at Karmir Blur, on the outskirts of modern Yerevan), and classical Armenian historians trace the descent of the native Armenian kings, sons of the eponymous ancestor Hayk, numbering amongst them one Paroyr, son of Shayanird.38 Paroyr is to be identified with the Scythian chieftain known from cuneiform sources as Partatau and by Herodotus as Protohyres.39 The name Shayanir has been analysed as skay-ordi 'son (of) the Scythian'.40 The word skay alone in Armenian came to mean 'powerful, a strong man'; with the prefix h- from Iranian hu- 'good', it means 'giant'.41 This development may be compared to that of NP. pahlavān 'hero, strong man' from a word whose original meaning was 'Parthian'.

By the early seventh century B.C. there was already a large Iranian population in the countries to the south and east of Urartu and on the Armenian plateau itself,42 and from the genealogical tradition and lexical development cited above, it would seem that the contacts between the Scythians and the ancestors of the Armenians were close and friendly in many cases. Cimmerian and Scythian invasion weakened Urartu in its struggle with Assyria, and the state ultimately fell to the new power of the Medes, who despoiled Tušpa early in the sixth century.

The Muski on the Armenian plateau seem to have lived mainly in two districts: Molid-Kašmanu in the upper Euphrates valley (in the region of the later cities of Comana and Melitene, Tk. Malatya) and Arme-Šupriya (the mountainous region now known as Sazun).43 The latter province, then as now, was a refuge for fugitives of various nationalities, rebellious and difficult to conquer; Šalmaneser III failed to secure it in 854 B.C., nor were the Urartians able to subdue it for long, and it fell to Assyria only in 673 B.C., in the reign of Esarhaddon.44 There were Muski also in Suxmu, on the upper Euphrates, and it seems that they were variously referred to in neighbouring countries, according to the names of the provinces in which they lived and upon which those states bordered. When the Urartean kingdom fell to the Medes, the Muski country appears to have become an unbroken area comprising most of Cop'c and Taran, i.e., from the bend of the Huphrates near Melitene to the region north and northwest of Lake Van. In Taran was the district of Hark,45 where, according to Movses Karenac', the first Armenians lived.46 The Georgians to the north must have called the Muski by the name of Suxmu, hence Georgian sxmx [Armenian], while nations to the south and west would have called them, after the region of Arme-Šupriya (and cf. Gk. arimoi above), Armenians.

The name of the Muski survived down to the second century A.D., when Claudius Ptolemaeus described in his Geography (V.12) the Moschysen range of mountains in Kotarzene, north of the Euphrates; memory of them may survive also in the curious translation of a Greek passage by a fifth-century Armenian scholar.46 In their own literature, the Armenians refer to themselves mainly as hay-k', a word which has been interpreted as 'Hittite': intervocalic -k- becomes -γ- in common Armenian words of pure Indo-European origin, such as hayr, 'father' and mayr 'mother' (comp. Gk. pater, mētēr).47 It was proposed by P. Jensen in 1898 that Arm. hay is to be derived from *hata-yos 'Hittite';48 the Muski would have thereby adopted for themselves the name of the proud empire whose lands they had crossed in their eastward migration. Some Soviet scholars, most recently G. Jahanian, have suggested that hay comes from a toponym 'Hayasa', and links have been sought between Armenian and Luvian.49

Classical Greek writers perceived a genetic connection between Armenians and Phrygians: Herodotus called the Armenians 'Phrygian
Contacts between the various peoples of the plateau: Muski, Hurrian, Iranian and Semitic- are attested in personal names. We find the name of an Assyrian agent or vassal ruler on the Assyro-Urartean border, Bag-Tešup/b, containing the Iranian element baga- 'god' and the name of the Hurrian weather god; the name of the official is attested from the latter half of the eighth century. In the late sixth century, we find mention in the inscription of Darius at Behistun of an Armenian named Arxa, son of Haldita, who led a rebellion against Darius in Babylon. The name clearly contains the appellation of the supreme god of the Urartean pantheon, Haldi. The leader of such a rebellion was probably a nobleman who opposed what he considered the usurpation of power by Darius (a feeling which was widely shared, for provinces across the Achaemenian Empire revolted), and his father, a member of an Armenian noble family, might well have received a name containing the name of the god who had been the special protector of the Urartean royal house.

As seen above, Armenian preserves faithfully a number of Urartean place-names, and many sites have been inhabited continuously since Urartean times. We have noted also the continuity of the institution of periodic sacrifice of animals. Traditional Armenian reverence for the white poplar (Arm. saws-i, Urartean šurati) may well go back to Urartean practices: the Urartean king Rusa planted a grove of white poplars, and there is an Urartean bas-relief of a man standing in the attitude of a supplicant before a tree, with a vessel (probably for a libation) on the ground at his feet. The cult of the Tree of Life was a common feature of many of the religions of the ancient Near East, and we find traces of it in mediaeval Armenian folk songs. In the latter, the first stanzas describe the 'incomparable' branches and fruits of the Tree of Life (caín kene); while the final section compares the various parts of the Tree to the Holy Family, Saints and Patriarchs of Christianity. A mediaeval manuscript shows two men in festive dress holding a stylised Tree of Life between them; the free hand of each holds a taper. It is likely that the song and depiction of the Tree of Life are related to wedding customs, for another song of the same type mentions the 'king' (t̂əgawor), i.e., the bridegroom, and the festive dress of the two men in the miniature would be most appropriate at a wedding party.

This tradition would have been easily absorbed into Zoroastrianism, with its reverence for plants, the creations of Haurvatát, just as many of the attributes of Tešub or Tešuba were ascribed to Vaham and the ancient goddess Nanē was declared the daughter of Aramad. Such developments may be compared to the conscription of ancient local divinities of Western Europe into the ranks of the Saints of the Catholic Church, and to the survival of ceremonies of remote antiquity in other Christian cultures. Yet, as Prof. B. N. Arakelyan has justly observed, the formative stages of Armenian culture coincided with periods of Iranian rule.

In Xenophon's partly fictional Cyropaedia a servant named Cyrus of the Median king Cyrus has been sent to deal with a rebellious Armenian king. The Armenians are represented as chafing under foreign rule, yet the king's son already bears an Iranian name, Tigranes. Xenophon's use of this name may be anachronistic, but the case may be taken to illustrate the early impact of Iranian culture upon the Armenians. It was probably under the successors of the Medes, the Persians, that Zoroastrianism first came to Armenia.
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CHAPTER 2

ARMENIA FROM THE MEDIAN CONQUEST TO THE RISE OF
THE ARTAXIADS (585-190 B.C.)

By 585 B.C., the power of the Medes extended as far as the Halys River; they were thus in possession of the entire Ar. plateau and the former territories of Urartu. Median colonists probably settled in Armenia at that time, for the districts of Mardili and Mardastan attested in the A"zharhac'Oyo c 'Geography' of the seventh century A.D. bear their name. As we have seen, later Arm. writers considered Paroyr son of Skayordi 'son of the Scythian' one of their ancestors, and he is said to have received a crown from Varbakes of Media in return for his services in battle. The Armenians, as we have seen, appear to have settled in the area of Van and in the northeast, in the region of Ararat. Numerous other peoples also inhabited the plateau: Herodotus mentions the Suspyrians, Alarodians and Matieni; and Xenophon met on his march the Chaldaeans, Chalybians, Mardi, Hesperites, Phasians and Taochi. The Armenians appear to have been most favoured by the Medes, and later by the Persians, however, and Xenophon mentions two sons of the Armenian king, both of whom have Iranian names.

Little is known of the religion of the Armenians in the Median period, but it seems reasonable to suppose that it absorbed elements of the cults of the dominant Medes, as well as of the other peoples of the plateau. A small architectural model found in Soviet Armenia presents many problems, yet the paucity of material evidence in this period may nonetheless justify some discussion of it here. In 1966, excavations were carried out at the cyclopean fortress of Asiki-blur 'Hill of the Star' on the northeastern edge of the village of Enok'avan, about five km. northwest of Ijevan, a provincial town in the valley of the river Akstev (Joraget or Joroy get) northeast of Lake Sevan in the Armenian SSR. The region is mountainous and heavily wooded; the Caucasian brown bear and wild boar still roam its forests. The finds at the site have been dated to the ninth-eighth and sixth-fifth centuries B.C., and include twenty-five graves containing various objects of adornment and
everyday use, from both periods. A large number of ceramic cups with wide lips and narrow stems were found, also of both periods and showing little difference in type, and B. C. Piotrovskii suggested that these might have been intended to contain sacrificial offerings. Two small bronze statuettes of men were also discovered. Esayan dated to the sixth-fifth century B.C. an architectural model of black fired clay found at the site. The object is a round, slightly concave disk with a crenelated wall around the edge. The wall has the outline of a gate cut into it. Slightly off center and opposite the 'gate' inside the wall is a building of two stories with a pitched roof. The ground story is square (6 x 6 cm. and 4 cm. high), with two thick side walls. The front of the chamber thus formed is entirely open; the back is partly open, too, but the aperture is narrower. The second story is 3 x 6 cm., i.e., the dimensions of the chamber below, and has arched openings to the front and back. The diameter of the whole is 18 cm., there is a hole in the plate, and the outer walls overlap, as though the model were meant to fit securely over something else.

Esayan suggested that the model might have been put over a burner, whose light would have come through the hole in the disc and illuminated the building. Professor Theodore Gaster of Columbia University suggested that the object might have been carried on a pole, like the aediculum of the cult of Attis; this would explain the hole. It is noteworthy that Xorenac'i connects Arusawon son of Ara with the oracular cult of the plane trees (Arm. Armawir) of Armavir in this period. The legend of Ara in its essence is identical to that of Attis, and the mythical creatures called aralex which revived Ara were remembered and believed in by Christian Armenians of the fourth century; the cult of Ara/Attis was clearly of importance in Armenian belief, so there is thus a remote possibility that the model from Astkh-blur may have been an instrument of it.

The shape of the model suggests that it might have represented a temenos, or sacred enclosure, and a temple. The plan of the whole suggests that of Taxt-i Suleimân, a Zoroastrian site 160 km. southeast of Lake Urmia at which there burned continuously the sacred fire Adur Gušasp, one of the three great fires of ancient Iran. The site is a flat, round hill with a complex of temples and palaces within, and a lake. The buildings of Taxt-i Suleimân date from the Sasanian period, however. Mas'ûd wrote that idols had once stood there. The latter assertion, if it has any basis in reality, could mean either that a pagan temple once stood there, or else that there had been an image-shrine as well (probably adjacent to the sacred fire) before the iconoclastic reforms of the Sasanians. Classical writers of the Parthian period mention an eternally-burning fire in Atropatene, and refer to a city called Phraäsap or Prahast. In Armenian sources, the latter site is called Kretan or Kretan mec ('great'), where the fire of Vānasp burned. Although these terms are attested only in texts of the seventh century and later, the forms are obviously loans from pre-Sasanian Mir., indicating that the Armenians had been familiar with the temple before Sasanian additions or enlargements were made, and probably before the conversion of the Armenians to Christianity. The site of Taxt-i Suleimân is unique in plan and awesome in grandeur, and could have been the original of our model.

This suggestion seems unsatisfactory, however, in view of the late date of the buildings excavated at Taxt-i Suleimân, the uncertain date of the model and the location of its discovery, for it was found in an area which would have been at the extreme edge of Armenian settlement even at the period of the greatest expansion of Armenia under Tigran II in the first century B.C. A circular wall enclosing a square building could be found nearly anywhere, and one would have hoped for unmistakable details to draw a wholly convincing parallel. Although small architectural models held by princely donors are a common feature of the bas-relief decoration of mediaeval Armenian churches, we have no such models from the ancient period and can only speculate therefore about the function the mysterious object from Astkh-blur may have served.

In 550 B.C., the Persian vassal-king Cyrus rebelled successfully against his Median overlord, Astyages, son of Cyaxares, having married Astyages' daughter, Mandana. Despite their earlier friendly relations with the Medes, many Armenians appear subsequently to have joined Cyrus, for Xenophon notes that Armenian armies participated in the Persian attack on Babylon in 539 B.C., and Xorenac'i relates the increasing alarm of 'Arûshak' at the Armenian Tigran's friendship for Cyrus.
Ašdahak is the Mr. form of the name of the demon found in the Avesta as Aši Dahaka (Av. āśi- means 'serpent', Pahl. and NP. āš), a three-headed, three-mouthed, six-eyed monster made by Angra Mainyu for the destruction of the material world. The evil creature sacrifices to Amahïta in the land of Ewri, later identified with Babylon. In the Bundahišn, Dahāk ke Bēvarasp xwênpêd '(Aši) Dahāk whom they call "(he who has) ten thousand horses"' is imprisoned in Mt. Damāwand after being smitten by Frēōn (Av. Threšcāna-), but will rise again, becoming unfettered, and will be slain by Sēm. The basic elements of this epic narrative recur in the Armenian legend of the imprisonment of King Artauwēd.

In the Šah-nāme of Ferdousī, Aši Dahāk appears in the arabised form Zahhāk as a Babylonian tyrant who overthrows the Iranian king Jamšīd (Av. Yima-) with popular support and then is perverted by Tōlis (i.e., Satan), after which snakes spring from his shoulders. He is eventually vanquished and imprisoned in Mt. Damāwand by Ferdūn (i.e., Threšcāna). Xorenæci adds the latter tale in its essentials, in a form apparently of local origin, for the name Threšcāna appears in the northwestern Mr. form Hrudān; he attributes it to the Persians in an appendix to the first book of his History. Xorenæci adds a significant detail to the story, however. He proposes to describe the ānbari arajnōy ... bārerarutšen 'first bad beneficence' of Bīvraesp Ašdahāk, the details of which are as follows: ... ēw hasarakac şenêcāna kemēr čuc enel amēnat čen, ēw aṣēr; ōc inč īwr aršēn uruk č part linel, ēy hasarakac, ēw amēnas č inč yawtin ēw ban ēw gorer; ēw i cacu inc oč xorhēr, ēy zamēnaŋ yandēna artaŋ’s berēr lexnuv zacēnu šarin: ēw zel ēw smut barekacōn oprēs ē tuwēŋēn noympēs ēw giseri sahdēnēr. 'And he wished to show to all the common life, and said that no one must possess anything as his own, but it must be in common, and all things, both word and deed, be visible. And he considered nothing in secret, but brought out into the open with his tongue the secrets of the heart, and he ordained that his friends go out and come in by night even as by day.' The entire tale bears similar resemblance to the narrative concerning Tigran and Ašdahak which immediately precedes it at the end of Book I of the History, and indeed Stackelberg and Akinean argued that the demon-tyrant is identified in the tale recorded by MX in his Appendix with Mazdak, the Sasanian heresarch of the late fifth and early sixth century whose communistic teachings horrified pious Zoroastrians.

The suggestion can be made therefore that Aši Dahāk was regarded as the incarnation of the demonic par excellence; the tyrant or heretic of the day might be cast in the epic mold of the monster let loose on the world. In an anonymous Armenian chronicle dated to the eleventh-twelfth century, we are informed that Mahāmat ēw divahar ēw molengēr i dīvēn aw ūst avarē ēw andēmgeal i dīvē xērē i ūst xēnē ēw xkamān ērkatē'is ēw varēr ē dīvēn i yamāpats, ē lerins ē kārumjēw 'Mohammed was one possessed and was driven crazy by the demon day by day, and, emboldened by the demon, he broke out of his chains and bonds of iron and was led by the demon into deserts, mountains and caves.' We are also told that he was born near Ray (i kānakēn Ray) and that he was an idolater and magus (ēw Mahētn ēr krkapēt hawatōv ēw mōg). The Kārtīlis Cxovrebē 'Life of Georgia', a collection of tales and histories first compiled and edited by Leonti Mroveli in the eleventh century, and translated into Armenian shortly thereafter, records that Abriton ... Kapesā ascandōv niškēm avil c ērkatē'is, skcēcēl cāin Bīvraesp, yamnak lērinn Rayisēv, oprēs ēv gream ē i matēn son Persicē (Arm. trans.) 'Abriton [i.e., Threšcāna] ... bound the prince of snakes in iron, the one called Bīvraesp, by means of spells [ascandōv, read asandōv], in an uninhabited mountain of Rayis [i.e., Ray], as is written in the books of the Persians.' It would seem that Mohammed was regarded in the popular imagination of the Armenians as a latter-day incarnation of Aši Dahāk: born in the Median district of Ray, possessed by a demon, and bound in chains from which he broke loose to bring evil to the world. Mazdak had undoubtedly been regarded in a similar manner by the Zoroastrians whose version of the epic cliche Xorenæci recorded. Aši Dahāk/Ašdahāk/Zahhāk is always a foreign tyrant—either a Mede or a Mesopotamian—to Persian and Armenian writers, but never a Turanian. It is likely that the form of the myth was elaborated in western Iran, for the enemy lands are not those we should find in eastern Iranian traditions. The depiction of Zahhāk with snakes springing from his shoulders is an iconicographic detail whose origin should be sought in
the West, also, and we find Nergal, the lord of the underworld, shown as a bull-relief from Hatra. The Iranians must have appropriated this image of a chthonian deity, perhaps for the depiction of Yima, the ruler of the dead. A baleful little figurine from Sogdia, probably of post-Sasanian date, reproduces the image in detail, and it is unlikely that the object was a statue of an epic monster rather than of a supernatural figure. One would suggest therefore that the statuette was of a mythological monster may merely have served to strengthen a parallel

The influence of Mesopotamian epic is contaminated by the added features of the Artaxiad king Tigran II (95-56 B.C.), whose short-lived conquests included large areas of Media Atropatene. Tigran is called by Xorenac'i the son of Eruand sakawanac 'the short-lived'; we shall discuss shortly the origins of the Orontid or Eruandid dynasty, the first royal house of the Armenians.

In 521-520 the Armenians revolted against Darius I (522-486) together with nearly all the other provinces of the Achaemenian empire established by Cyrus. Struve suggested that the verb used in the Behistun inscription to describe the assembling of the 'rebels' against Darius, hagmatâ, refers normally to the scattered forces of a defeated army; he concludes that the fighting against Darius were Sakas. It seems more likely, however, that many Armenians would have regarded Darius as a usurper, as did the peoples of other provinces, and the revolt would not have been confined to one particular ethnic group. Armenia was divided into two satrapies, the 13th and 18th, by the Persians, and several sites mentioned in the inscriptions at Behistun have been identified in the south and west of the Armenian plateau, in the provinces of Akznik and Kordzïk. The latter region was the 13th satrapy, inhabited by a people Herodotus calls polypyrobatoi 'rich in flocks' who brought twenty thousand colts to the court of Achaemenian Great King every year for the feast of Mithra, saving others to sacrifice to the Sun. Horses were in Zoroastrianism associated with the Sun and Mithra. The 18th satrapy included the regions around Armazak; we shall discuss below the principal sites of the Achaemenian period from that region: Arin-berd (Urartean Erebuni) and Aramir (Urartean Argistihinili).

The Armenians of the 13th satrapy traded with Babylonia, sending their wares down the Euphrates in round boats made of hides. And they say Argawán made a feast in honour of Artašēs, and there was a plot against the latter in the palace of the dragons' (MX I.30).

The Armenians probably in the course of time cast the history of their struggle in alliance with Cyrus against the Medes in the form of the old Western Iranian epic of Thraêtaona and Aži Dähâka. The legend appears to have been elaborated at least five centuries after the events it describes, though, for the hero Tigran seems to have acquired the short-lived features of the Artaxiad king Tigran II (95-56 B.C.), whose short-lived conquests included large areas of Media Atropatene. Tigran is called by Xorenac'i the son of Eruand sakawanac 'the short-lived'; we shall discuss shortly the origins of the Orontid or Eruandid dynasty, the first royal house of the Armenians.

In 521-520 the Armenians revolted against Darius I (522-486) together with nearly all the other provinces of the Achaemenian empire established by Cyrus. Struve suggested that the verb used in the Behistun inscription to describe the assembling of the 'rebels' against Darius, hagmatâ, refers normally to the scattered forces of a defeated army; he concludes that the fighters against Darius were Sakas. It seems more likely, however, that many Armenians would have regarded Darius as a usurper, as did the peoples of other provinces, and the revolt would not have been confined to one particular ethnic group. Armenia was divided into two satrapies, the 13th and 18th, by the Persians, and several sites mentioned in the inscriptions at Behistun have been identified in the south and west of the Armenian plateau, in the provinces of Akznik and Kordzïk. The latter region was the 13th satrapy, inhabited by a people Herodotus calls polypyrobatoi 'rich in flocks' who brought twenty thousand colts to the court of Achaemenian Great King every year for the feast of Mithra, saving others to sacrifice to the Sun. Horses were in Zoroastrianism associated with the Sun and Mithra. The 18th satrapy included the regions around Armazak; we shall discuss below the principal sites of the Achaemenian period from that region: Arin-berd (Urartean Erebuni) and Armawir (Urartean Argistihinili).

The Armenians of the 13th satrapy traded with Babylonia, sending their wares down the Euphrates in round boats made of hides. Their
land was traversed by the royal Achaemenian road that linked Sardis with Susa; according to Herodotus, the road ran some 350 km. through Armenia, with fifteen stations along the way. In 480 B.C. the Armenians fought under Xerxes in Greece, armed, we are told by Herodotus, like the Phrygians, although in the bas-relief of subject peoples at Persepolis the Armenians are attired more in the style of the Medes.

In 401-400 B.C., Xenophon (430-355) and the ten thousand Greek mercenaries who had taken service with Cyrus the Younger against his brother Artaxerxes II Mnemon (404-358) retreated after their defeat at the battle of Cunaxa, north across Armenia to the Black Sea. Several itineraries have been suggested on the basis of Xenophon's description in the *Anabasis*. The Armenians spoke Persian; the Greeks conversed with village chiefs (Gk. kōnarkhōi) and lowly women alike through a Persian-speaking interpreter. One village headman refused to partake of food together with the Greeks, but ate only with his own countrymen, perhaps in adherence to the Zoroastrian injunction not to dine with infidels. At the time of Xenophon's journey, Armenia was ruled by a satrap, Orontes, Arm. Erund. According to Strabo, the Orontids traced their descent from Artaurēs, whose ancestor was Hydarnēs, one of the companions of Darius I and the head of one of the seven great noble clans of the Persians. This claim to Persian descent, presumably made by the Orontids themselves, is important evidence for Iranian influence in Armenia in the Achaemenian period, in a country where family and lineage are the foundation of all social relations. According to Xenophon and Plutarch, the Orontids had a blood-tie with the Achaemenids themselves through the marriage of the daughter of Artaxerxes II, Rhodogune, to Orontēs (=Orontes), the satrap of Armenia at the time of Xenophon's campaign. Xorenāc (II.37) mentions 'a certain Erund, son of an Arsacid woman' (Erund omni, ordi knô Arāsakūnwoy); the Arsacids by the time of his writing had supplanted the Achaemenids as the dynasty which conferred hereditary power and prestige; Arsacid descent was considered a sufficient claim to legitimacy in Armenia through Christian times, hence perhaps the anachronism. It is to be noted that the Iranian Arsacids themselves claimed Achaemenian descent, although it is apparent they did not press this claim as vigorously as did the Sasanians after them (who were Persians and could therefore justify it better). It is possible that the Orontids came in fact from the Orontes tribe east of Gaugamela, which Manndyan connects with Ardaunaon in Vaspurakan (Arvanthunikh, east of Van, on the Map in *AW*), the claim to Achaemenian descent being then a purely fictitious one of propaganda value. A Greek inscription found near Pergamon in western Asia Minor mentions that one Orontēs de Artasyrou / to genos baktiros, apostas apo Artaxerxous tou / perisōn basileōn ekratōsen tōn peregasiaon ... 'Orontes (son of) Artaxerxes, / a Bactrian, having revolted against Artaxerxes king of the Persians, ruled (the city of the people) of Pergamon...'. Tiranian proposed the following chronology of events: in 386-84, Orontes and Tiribazus, the hyparchs of western Armenia (who presumably administered other areas than Orontes but was subordinate to him in rank), fought king Euagoras of Cyprus; in 362, an Orontes became satrap of Mysia; and in 360 he became satrap of Armenia again; in 354, Demosthenes mentioned him in an oration.

The forces of the Armenians who fought Alexander under Darius III Codomannus (337-330) at Gaugamela were led, according to Arrian, by Orontēs and Mithraustēs, and it has been suggested that they led the armies of Greater and Lesser Armenia respectively. These areas would have corresponded to the 13th and 13th satrapies. With the collapse of the Achaemenian empire and its division amongst the generals of Alexander, Armenia seems to have remained largely free of Macedonian Greek rule, although the mediaeval Persian poet Niηsman, preserving a shadowy memory of Iranian religious resistance to Hellenism, wrote that Alexander abolished the worship of fire in Armenia. Alexander sent a satrap, Mithridētēs, apparently a Persian of Asia Minor, to Armenia (probably Lesser Armenia), but in historical lists of the regions of Alexander's realm Armenia is not mentioned, and Justin in his *Epitome* of Pompeius Trogus cites the boast of Mithridates Epator of Pontus that Armenia was not conquered either by Alexander or by any of his successors. A Greek general, Menon, was hanged by the local inhabitants of Sisyphus (Arm. Sper), in the northeast of Armenia, and in 317 Armenia was under the control of a 'satrap' Orontēs, according to Diodorus Siculus and Polyænus. It was this Orontēs or Arseotēs who placed his forces at the disposal of king Ariarathēs of Cappadocia when that land was conquered by the Macedonian general Eumenēs, and who sent Eumenēs a
letter 'written in Syrian characters' (Gr. syriœs gegrâmmenê grammâsin)--73 i.e., in the chancellery Aramaic of the Achaemenian administration. In 303-2, Seleucus pledged to respect the sovereignty of Ariarathes II of Cappadocia, and it is likely that Armenia under Orontes was 'soumise de plein gré', in the words of Markwart. 74 The country may have been regarded by the Seleucids as a vassal state, but there is no evidence that they made any further attempts to place Greeks in positions of power, nor were Hellenistic poleis founded in Armenia on the model of other provinces of the defeated Persian Empire. Outside Armenia, Orontes was called 'satrap', but in his own country he was Ebrontes( ) basile( ) 'Ebrontes the king'.75 The latter appellation is found in a Greek inscription from Armawir; the contents of the seven inscriptions found there will be discussed below. It is interesting to note here, however, that the form of the king's name, Ebrontes, is closer to the Armenian form of the name, Eruand, than any other spelling attested.

It is evident that a single Orontes did not reign over the entire period from the retreat of Xenophon to the reign of Seleucus; such a feat of longevity would be impossible, even in a region which produced such long-lived monarchs as Mithridates Eupator of Pontus (c. 131-63 B.C.) or the Sassanian Šāhuhr II (reigned A.D. 300-79). It is probable that we are dealing with a dynastic name applied to successive rulers of the Orontid house, much as various Arsacid kings were called Arsaces, after the eponymous founder of the royal clan, in later centuries. The tradition of the Achaemenian foundations of the Orontids characterises the Iranian orientation of the dynasty. In the first century B.C., Antiochus I of Commagene (69-34) traced his Orontid descent on the paternal line to the Achaemenians, and on the maternal side to the Macedonians, claiming a double prestige and legitimacy thereby. Various Armenian noble families also claimed Orontid descent, well into the Christian period. Although historical material for the Orontid period is scanty, Toumanoff proposed a king-list for Armenia from 401-95 B.C. of Orontid rulers in Greater Armenia and Sophene in his study (The Orontids of Armenia).76

The Orontids, claiming Achaemenian descent, seem to have followed also the religion of the Persian rulers, and it may be useful here to review some of the evidence we possess about the faith of the Persians in the fifth century B.C. It has been proposed that Zoroastrianism gradually came to the Medes from the east, where it was already an old and well-established faith among the eastern Iranian peoples.77 Although Zoroastrianism presumably encountered at first opposition from the Western Iranian Magi, the Persians adopted the religion and suppressed opposition to it. Darius worshipped Ahura Mazda and opposed dravgas, the Lie;78 Xerxes (486-465) invoked Arta (Av. Âsr-, 'cosmic order')79 and condemned the daivas (Av. daïva- 'evil god, demon'),80 again calling upon 'Ahuramazdâ with the gods' (OP. Auramazdâ hâd bâgibiñ). The ancient word bâga- 'god', used instead of the word yazata- 'a being worthy of worship' preferred in the Avesta, is found often in Armenian usage; the temple of Aramazd stood at Bagawan, which Agathangelos interpreted as Parthian for Arm. Bîcñawun, 'town of the gods'.82 In an inscription at Susa, Darius praised 'the great god Ahurâ Macha, who makes wonderful this earth' (OP. bâga vaçraka Auramazdâ bya fraesam ahýchâ bûnîya kûnautiy); in this case, the reference is clearly to the world at present, but fraesâ- is used also in Zoroastrian texts in connection with the concept of renewal or of making wonderful the world, an idea central to Zoroastrian eschatology, and a derivative of fraesâ- is found in this sense in Armenian usage.83 Herodotus describes Persian rituals, which included reverence for 'the elements, presumable a reference to the cult of the Ahma Spenta, the supernatural Bounteous Immortals who preside over the various good creations of Ahurâ Mazda.85 For the worship of fire, the pyraithoi founded by the later Achaemenians in Asia Minor are well attested from Classical sources.86

Zoroaster himself is not mentioned on Achaemenian monuments, nor indeed is his name to be found in the inscriptions of the Sasanians, who were undoubtedly Zoroastrians. The earliest reference in Western literature to Zoroaster is to be found in Plato, Alcibiades I, 122, 404.390 B.C., and other citations of still earlier writers mention the name of the Prophet.87 But these attestations of his name must have come to Greece from the Achaemenian Empire. A tradition preserved by Pseudo-Scylax, Eusebius and Arnobius presents Zoroaster as the king of Bactria fighting Semiramis,38 the accurate tradition of the eastern Iranian.
origin of Zarathustra has apparently been contaminated by an epic of Iranian struggle against Assyria, to which we may compare the Armenian legend of Ara and Samiria (Semiramis) preserved by Xorenac\textsuperscript{91}, or the tale of Vahagn and Barsam preserved by Anania of Sirak.\textsuperscript{89} Xorenac\textsuperscript{91}, quoting various sources,\textsuperscript{90} speaks of \textit{Zradat mog arkay Baktirac woc} or \textit{Zradst [i.e., Zarathustra]}\textsuperscript{92} the magus, king of the Bactrians, that is, of the Makk\textsuperscript{92} (MX I.6).

There exists also a tradition according to which Er, the Armenian in Plato, Republic, X, is to be identified with Zoroaster; this claim can be traced back to the third century B.C. and would indicate that Armenia was considered a Zoroastrian land, even as Media had come—mistakenly—to be regarded as the birthplace of the Prophet as the Zoroastrian religion took root there.\textsuperscript{93} According to Arnobius, this Armenian Zoroaster was the grandson of Hosthanas or Zostrianos, a Median magus. It is this Ostanes to whom Hellenistic and Roman writers attribute the spread of Persian 'magic' to the West.\textsuperscript{94} The equation could have been made because of the prophetic role of Er (or Ara, in MX\textsuperscript{95}) as a mortal who visits the next world and returns to tell of it; such a feat would be worthy indeed of a great spiritual leader. Both Ara and Zoroaster king of the Bactrians are represented as foes of Semiramis, and this coincidence may have led to the equation of the two. It is a coincidence because the conflict of Ara and Semiram is not merely the tale of a war between two nations, as seems to be the case with Zoroaster and Semiramis; it seems rather to present beneath Xorenac\textsuperscript{91}'s historical colouration the myth of the passion of Cybele and Attis.\textsuperscript{96}

Certain Armenian terms of religious significance aside from elements such as \textit{ara}- and \textit{bagh}-, discussed above, may derive from Old Iranian, probably Old Persian, rather than from northwestern Middle Iranian (Parthian and Atropatienian), the source of most Armenian loan-words from Iranian. The name of the first month of the Armenian calendar, Nawasard, may be traced to OP. Navasard;\textsuperscript{97} less likely is Akaien's derivation of the name of the eleventh month, Margac\textsuperscript{98}, from OP. *Markazana.\textsuperscript{98} His etymology of Mareri, the name of the tenth month, from a Mfr. form of Yav. Maldhy\textit{\text{"a}}rya, the fifth \textit{gah\text{"a}z\text{"a}r} of the Zoroastrian calendar of feasts, is more convincing, for that obligatory feast was celebrated in the tenth month of the Zoroastrian calendar,
Throughout most of the reign of the Orontids, the capital of Armenia was Armawir, a city lying on the road from Ganzaca through Naxijewan (Gk. Naxouana) to Colchis, on the river Araxes. The foundation of the city was attributed by Xorenac to Aramayis, one of the descendants of the eponymous ancestor of the Armenians, Hayk; it may be inferred from this legend that the Armenians traditionally regarded the city as very ancient. There was a grove of plane or poplar trees at Armawir (Arm. sawa) named after Armanak, the father of Armanays. Ara, who died fighting Semiramis, had a son, Anueswan, surnamed Saws or sawsawiwn, 'dedicated to the saws' (Kanzi javnal er çat pashtamanc i sawian Aramanekec, or yArmawiv xoroc zsaart och sawmawum, est handart ev ka satistik šncgaloy odoyen evetost cat Šarúum, soyroccen i hxays ñxartis haykaranac: ev ays bazum kamanak for he was dedicated to the (religious) services at the plane trees of Armaneak at Armawir; they studied the sough of the foliage according to the gentle or powerful blowing of the wind, and the movement of the branches, for divination for this country of the Armenians, and for a long time yet' (MX I.20).

Such divination was practised by the Urartians and various cults connected with trees and plants have survived in Armenia down to recent times. Xerxes made offerings to a plane tree in Lydia. The Eastern Plane tree, according to an Armenian writer, can live up to 2000-3000 years, and a few of the trees in the village of Melri, Arm. SSR, are 700-800 years old. The only grove of them in the country is in a nature preserve near Cav in the district of Eap'an. The tree was planted in churchyards, but the custom died out in the tenth-thirteenth centuries, at about the same time as Maxi Car Go composed a fable against the plane tree (sōsai) in which its opponent, the useful but humble cotton plant (bambakan) argues: 'You have no fruit, your wood is bad for building and even for burning, nor is your shade comfortable for men to rest in.' There exists an Armenian tradition according to which the sōsai is sacred because it sheltered Jesus when his enemies were pursuing him; this legend justifies the pre-Christian tradition of the sanctity of the tree.

Xorenac provides a great deal of information about the temples founded at Armawir, although his chronology is faulty; he attributes these to Valaršak (Pth. Valax; Latin Vologaesus), the Parthian Arsacid king of the first century A.D. whose brother was crowned Tiridates I of Armenia. Valaršak mehean jīneel yArmawiv, andris hastate aregakan ev jumal ev obeyac nameac built a temple at Armawir to the sun and moon and his ancestors' (MX II.8). The deification of kings was common in the Hellenistic age throughout the Near East; the Parthian kings called themselves theopatōr 'whose father is (a) god', and through the Sasanian period the King of Kings was regarded as Šahr i yazdān 'of the seed of the yazatas'. The cult of the royal ancestors (Av. fravaši, Arm. hro(r)) is well attested in both Iran and Armenia. Xorenac attributes to Artašēs (Artaxias I, early second century B.C.) the establishment in Armenia of images brought from the Greek cities of Asia Minor, of the gods Artemis, Herākles and Apollōn, which were used in the shrines of yazatas with whom the foreign divinities were equated. The use of images in Zoroastrian worship seems to have been established by Artaxerxes II Mennōn, and was suppressed by the Sasanians, both for theological reasons and perhaps in an effort to centralise the religious hierarchy. According to Xorenac, Eruand (probably Eruand IV, ca. 212-200 B.C.) moved the royal capital from Armawir to his newly-founded city of Erwanadāst, 'Joy of Eruand', which was named Bagaran. Xorenac explains that Eruand feared that Erwanadāst could not be securely guarded, were the images to be transferred there, what with i gain ev i zohel and ažxarri 'the whole country coming to sacrifice there' (MX II.40). Eruand appointed his brother Erus karmapet 'high priest' of the temples at Bagaran. (The word karmapet is formed of the Aramaic or Akkadian loan-word kum 'priest' (by metathesis from karmā or kumar), with Mir. suffix -pet (cf. OIr. -peti) 'lord, ruler'. The Semitic word may be derived from the triliteral root kmr 'to be sombre, to be prostrated in adoration'. In Hebrew, kōsmr means 'pagan priest', in opposition to the Jewish kōhen 'member of the Levite tribe, priest' (cf. Christian Arm. kahanāy 'priest'). The priests of the pagan Semites north of Israel—and south of Armenia—were called kōmarē; the Christian Acts of
Sharbil and Barsamyan mention the kmar 'rb' 'great priest' of Hatra; and Sharbil is called the r'w pqw' dkhun kwrw 'chief and leader of all the priests' of Edessa. When Artašēs took power, the images at Eruandašat and Bagaran were moved yet again, to the new city of Artaxēs (Artaxata), but the statue of 'Apollo' was set up on the road outside the city. Erwaz was murdered, and a new high-priest, a friend of Artašēs named Moggasta, was appointed; it was thought, perhaps, that Erwaz would have harmed the new dynasty that had just overthrown and killed his brother.

It appears that entombment of corpses was practised by the Oron-tids, even as it was by the Achaemenians and their successors, for reference is made by Korenač to a royal necropolis at Angh, and Artašēs is said to have buried the murdered Eruaw with funerary monuments (mohrjanak), showing the proper honour due one of 'Arsacid' blood (xamucc arskunvo, lit. 'mixture of the Arsacid', cf. Arm. diw'axavn 'mixed with the gods', i.e., of their nature, divine). The name 'Arsacid' is obviously anachronism; in the following chapter we shall see that Artašēs was to refer to himself in his inscriptions as an Oron-tid, and we shall see elsewhere that under successive Armenian dynasties the king, even if opposed, received the respect due his hereditary position, which was defined by the sacrosanct dynastic structure of Armenian society.

Although Armawir's statues were removed, one assumes the grave of plane trees there was left in place. Oracles would still have been sought and recorded there even after the foundation of Eruandašat and Bagaran. Seven Greek inscriptions were found at Armawir, whose contents and purpose remain uncertain, although attempts have been made somehow to link them with the oracular temple which presumably was located at the site. On the basis of palaeographic evidence, the inscriptions have been dated to the early second century B.C. or later. Three were found on one stone 1.5 x 2.9 m. in size, in 1911. The top of the stone has numerous cup-shaped depressions and little staircases cut into the rock; the contours suggest that the whole may have been a model of Armawir itself. The second stone, with four inscriptions, was found nearby in 1927.

The first inscription, possibly a quotation from Hesiod or an oracular prediction based on an event of the Greek poet's life, has been interpreted to read as follows: 'If you happened once, after he lost his land and paternal inheritance, himself encouraged Persēs as befits younger brothers.' The Greeks regarded the original Persēs, son of Perseus and Medea (after whom Hesiod's brother was named very much later), as the eponymous ancestor of the Persians, just as Medea was the mother of the Medes. But this is probably coincidence. Hesiod's writings might be engraved, as here; Pausanias saw Works and Days inscribed in lead, on Mt. Helicon. The second inscription appears to contain verses of Euripides, and has been compared to the inscriptions in Greek metric verse found at Susa from the first half of the first century B.C. The text refers to a warlike goddess, it seems, who threatens evil to unjust men. Boltunova identified the goddess as Anahītā, while Manandyan professed to see in the lines the goddess Artemis ruling that land be divided fairly. A number of identical gold pendants found at Armawir and elsewhere in Armenia may have been considered to depict Anahītā (Arm. Anahit) by the Armenians, but they are images of Isis, brought from abroad or made on foreign models. At the end of the inscription Trever reads the words phora thešalaton, which she interprets to mean '(an oracle) sent by the god through the blowing of the wind.' The third inscription, which, according to the excavators in 1911 had the words phore thešalaton near it, is five lines in length and seems to read: 'The four horses, the yoke of Euthychamīdēs, one (?) pinakion of Fēlamys.' A bronze plaque (Gk. pinakion) was found at Dodona which shows a chariot and four horses, and a slot-like niche was cut into the stone just below Armawir inscription 3 which is the right size for such a plaque. The Greeks believed that Apollo rode in a four-horsed chariot; he also dispensed oracles. Tir, with whom the Armenians identified Apollo, was a solar divinity, and the Armenians, according to Xenophon (see above), sacrificed horses to the Sun, yet the names in the inscription leave no doubt that it was made by a Greek. Armenians, unlike some Egyptians, Syrians, and Jews, do not seem to have used Greek names in pre-Christian times.

What is notable about the first three inscriptions is their belonging to an exclusively Hellenic cultural sphere: the first mentions Hesiod; the second seems to be a fragment of Greek verse, probably Euripides; and the third has two Greek names. Inscriptions 4–7, from
the stone found in 1927, differ significantly, in that nearly every one (with the possible exception of 6) has some obviously Oriental aspect: 4 contains the names Mithras and Ebrontē(s); 5 contains the name Pharmacē; and 7 mentions Armenia twice (a certain Noumēnios mentioned in 7 appears also in 6). If the first three inscriptions may be interpreted as having some oracular significance, then the last four appear more like copies of documents: 5 is a list of the months of the Seleucid calendar; 4 and 6 are in the style of the Greek formula valetudinis; and 7 seems to be a report on the violent death of a king of Armenia, although it is in verse and may therefore just as likely be a funerary inscription. There does not appear to be any necessary connection between inscriptions 1-3 and 4-7, unless one considers that the temple of Tr as described by Agathangelos was a place both of interpretation of dreams and of priestly instruction. One notes that Xorenacē makes reference to Ολίβρων κύρμ (Ha)νομος, orvα φαβανακαν πατμανενεκεν Ωλιμπεος, priest of Ani, writer of temple histories, a figure of doubtful historicity perhaps invented by Xorenacē to explain the presence of such inscriptions as those found at Armawir. The inscriptions of Armawir could be oracles (1-3) and significant documents of an archive (4-7) copied in stone to ensure their preservation.

Trever noted that the style of the writing has the appearance of rapid handwriting rather than of the formal epigraphic type of the time. If her supposition is correct, it would reinforce the suggestion that there are two original copies from a larger original store of documents.

Inscription 4 reads: ὉΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΛΛΑ/ ΜΑΔΟΧΙΡΩΝ/ ΜΙΘΡΑΣΕΒΡΟΝΤΗ/ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΚΙΑΗΜΕΝΟΥ/ ΕΒΡΟΝΤΗΧΝΑΙΝΗΚΟΥ/ΗΧΙΟΛΙΝΗΝ ΔΕΚΑ ΙΑΤΑ ΕΩ/ ΣΟΝΑΛΟΥΝΤΗ/ΟΥΚΙΑΙ/ΝΟΝ ΤΕΝ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΟΥ ΑΝ ΕΙΚΟΝΟΛΟΙΣ/ ΤΕ ΦΕΡΙΟΥ/ ΑΥ ΚΟΙΝΟΥ/ A which Bolotuova interprets as follows: 'King Ar( taxis) Madechiron Mithras to King Ebrontēs sends greetings. If you are well it would be good, that his descendants might be well. Being healthy you will complete the reign.' Trever suggested that ΛΛΑ in the first line might be connected directly to the second line, producing ΜΑΔΟΧΙΡΩΝ 'of the people of Armawir(?). Ebrontē(s) is probably Eruand, but it is not known whether Mithras is an epithet of the king (cf. ΗΕΛΙΟΣ ΤΙΡΙΔΑΤΟΣ in the Greek inscription of the mid-first century A.D. from Ga/me) or another king, but the use of the word ΒΑΣΙΛΕΟΣ 'king' twice, once in the nominative and once in the dative, indicates that there are two kings, and since Mithras is in the nominative, it probably refers to the king who is ΜΑΔΟΧΙΡΩΝ rather than to Eruand. The meaning of ΜΑΔΟΧΙΡΩΝ is not clear. One might suggest tentatively that the word comes from Μάδος 'Mead' and Ερευς 'I seize' and means 'conqueror of the Medes'; the use of such a title could be justified by the Armenian epic tradition of the battle of Tigran and Ardashir, as we have seen above, the heroic deeds of one member of a dynasty were the inheritance of his descendants.

Inscription 5 is a list of the Macedonian months used by the Seleucids and by native dynasties of the Near East in the Hellenistic period: ΒΙΟΣ/ΛΑ/ΑΠΕΙΛΟΥΣ ΑΥΑ/ΠΕΡΙΤΤΟΥΣ ΔΝΙ/ΣΟΣΥΤΡΟΣ ΦΘ/ ΧΑΝΤΙΓΩΣ/ΑΡΜΕΝΙΓΩΣ/ΔΑΙΣΤΟΣ/ΦΑΝΕΜΟΣ/ΛΑΙΟΣ/ΓΟΡΠΙΑΙΟΣ/ΗΦΑΙΣΤΙΑΙΟΣ/ ΦΑΡΜΑΧΟΣ ΗΥΞΙΒΡΟΛΩΒΕΙΚΟΥ. It is interesting to note that the name of the month of Xanthikos is written with a δέτα, as though at the time the list was compiled that letter had already come to be pronounced as a fricative, χ, as in Modern Greek. Trever, objecting to the suggestion that ΦΑΡΜΑΧΟΣ in the last line referred to King Pharmaces of Pontus (190-69 B.C.), pointed out sensibly that the formula '(to) Pharmakes, might he be healthy!' seems somehow inappropriate at the end of a list of months unless the name is to be read as Pharmakes, the Moon-god of Cappadocia and Mysia referred to by Strabo (hieron Μηνος Φαρμαχος 'temple of Mn Pharmakes'), who might be considered the guardian of the lunar months. Xorenacē mentions the name Pharnakes once, as a descendant of Ara (1.19). The 24th day of the month in the Armenian calendar is called ԽՍԱՐ ("little moon"), and the Zoroastrian religion enjoins its adherents to recite at least three a month during their night prayers the Mn ιվը (in honour of the moon). One recalls that statuses of the sun and moon (i.e., Helios or Mithra, and Mnē, whose Arian image was widely known in the Hellenistic world, as Mnē, the Moon-god) were placed in the temples of Armawir (ΜΧ ΙΙ.8). In medieval Armenian calendrical texts, the first phase of the moon is called mahik or naxa-mahik, from Mnē, 'moon', with Arm. diminutive -ik (see above); we have noted above the influence of Iranian upon Armenian astrological terminology.
The sixth inscription from Armawir is a short formula of greeting addressed to one 'Nouménios the Greek' (NOMÈNION HELÉNE),153 and the same Nouménios addresses to Philadelphia (inscription 7) what appears to be an epitaph on the violent death of the king of Armenia—Erum IV, according to Trever.154 The inscription mentions [KALON ARMENIA]155 Khoron 'the beautiful land of Armenia' and a city there called Kainapoli(s), i.e. the 'new city', which Trever explains as Artaxata,155 the capital built by Artaxias. If these suppositions are correct, the inscriptions may be dated to ca 190 B.C. or later. The presence of Greeks at Armawir during this period may be explained by the military successes of the Seleucid king Antiochus III against the Armenian Orontid Xerxes (after 228-ca. 212).156 Orontes IV (ca. 212-ca. 200) apparently regained control of the kingdom, but a Greek presence seems to have remained, for the two local dynasties who rebelled against him ca. 200 B.C., Artaxias (Arm. Artezhs) in north-eastern or Greater Armenia, and Zariadrés (Arm. Zareh)157 in the south-western regions of Sophene and Acilisene, are described by Strabo as stratêgoi 'generals' of Antiochus III.158 Greeks might well have remained in Armenia following the conquests of Antiochus III, and they would have been present also to report the murder of Erum IV. Sophene, it is remembered, had under Achaemenian administration been part of a separate satrapy of Armenia, and in the mid-third century B.C. Sophene and Commagene had taken their independence of Greater Armenia. Following the reign of Arsameus (after 228) Sophene separated from Commagene; the latter province continued to be ruled by its mixed Mediterranean-Orontid dynasty, and in the mid-first century B.C. Antiochus I of Commagene erected the great temple complex of Nemrut Dağ in honour of his ancestors and the Persian gods he worshipped. One supposes that the two stratêgoi administered areas corresponding to the Achaemenian satrapies, owing allegiance to the Armenian king (who would have re-established his sovereignty over both regions of the country), who was himself a vassal of the Seleucids.

After the defeat of the Seleucid power by Rome at Magnesia in 190 B.C., Artaxias and Zariadrés assumed full powers over their respective regions. The Roman Senate acknowledged the independent status of the two at the Peace of Apamae in 188, but, as we shall see, Artaxias was to reinforce his claim to legitimacy within Armenia by boasting of his Orontid forbears.

Notes - Chapter 2
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4. Herodotus, III.94; Xenophon, Anabasis, IV.3-5, 18.
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19. An example is the bas-relief on the drum of the church of the Holy Saviour (Arm. Sūrt Amsap'Prēk') at Sanahin, A.D. 961-2, which shows the Bagratid queen Kosrovanus and her consort Abót III Bagratuni holding a model of the church between them (O. X. Talpaxean, Sanahin (Documenti di Architettura Armenia, 31, Milano, 1970, 5 and pl. 13).

20. Astyaspēs, Babylon. Iššumēgu, is the Gk. form of *št̂išt̂iva' - ' Spear-caster' which might have sounded to Arm. ears like *št̂išt̂ahak (on the name, a parallel Av. form, and possible transcription in Elamite, see M. Mayrhofer, Onomastica Persopolitana, Vienna, 1973, 108, 171).

21. Herodotus, 1.96 et seq., see G. Tirac'yan, 'Erwanundiner Hayastanum,' Telekagir, 1958, 6, 56-7. The Classical account of the accession of Cyrus to the throne resembles the Sasanian romance of Ardāsir I Pāpakān, in which the future king, now a lowly servant, escapes from the royal court and marries the king's daughter. This is pure folklore; on the probable course of events, see I. M. Diakonoff (D'ykonov) in Chirān, 2, 142-8.
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24. Yt. 9.8, Yt. 15.19 etc.; see Airwb., 266.

25. (Indian or Lesser) Bdh., 29.9, trans. by West, SBE, Vol. 5, 119. On the motif of an epic figure who is imprisoned in a mountain until he rises anew at the end of time, see our discussion of Artavazd in the Ch. Captive Powers.

26. See Ch. 13.

27. B. Ç'ugarszyan, 'Bivraspi Ašdahakii araspešē ëst Movses Xorenac'cu,' Telekagir, 1958, 1, 70.
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I, I

I.

1. It is interesting to note that the Šah-nâme (see C.ugaszyan, op. cit., 70). NP. azdâhâ is the name given by the Kurds to the višâk ("dragon")-steles in Armenia (see our Ch. on Vahan). Curiously, the proper name Zohag is found in thirteenth-century Arm. (but Šahâk is a well-known name in Arabic), see G. M. Nalbandyan, "Histoire de l'histoire de l'Arménie" (M., 1983, 151). For a theological reconciliation of the two contradictory legends of Zima, see this writer's Government Fellowship Lectures of the K. R. Cama Oriental Institute, Bombay, 1983-4.


4. This would contradict the fifth-century date of Mx generally accepted by Soviet scholars. See also the Introduction to Thomson, Mx, and C. Tournanoff, "On the date of Pseudo-Moses of Chorene," HA, 1961, 467.

5. C.ugaszyan, op. cit., 71, suggested that the name of the father of Šahâk in the Šah-nâme, Mardûs, preserves a recollection of the tyrant's Median origin (cf. Gk. Mard-o-î), although he is born in Arabistan (i.e., Mesopotamia). It seems the Parthians equated Seleucus Nicator, rather than Astyages, with Aši Dakhâka as the great foreign tyrant. For the Macedonian may have enlarged the Parthian city of Hecatompylos (Kómîs), and the Šahristânîhâ-I Frân, 18 (tr. J. Markwart, ed. C. Messina, Analecta Orientalia 4, Rome, 1931, 55, with ref. to ZMON 49, 546 n. 2) attributes to Aši Dakhâ, the building of Kómîs. The image of Šahâk as a man with serpents springing from his shoulders was, as seen, widespread in Eastern Iran, though it probably came from the West originally (see, e.g., the fresco at Panjikant showing the tyrant, A. M. Belenititski, Kunst der Sogdien, Leipzig, 1980, 203).

6. See our Ch. on Tork-Angelaeus. The curious depiction of the Arm. king Pap by the fifth-century historian P. Asvatsos Buzand as having snakes springing from his breast is probably an adaptation of the image, for Pap was accused of demonolatry and may have been a Christian heretic—a follower of the Arminian teaching (see ibid. and our Ch. 4). He would thus share the stigma of the later Mardûs and of the still later Mohamed. Of the latter, one recalls that Christians of the medieval period frequently regarded Islam as a heresy of Christianity rather than a separate religion.

7. See our Ch. on Evil Spirits and Creatures.

8. See Boyce, Hist. Zon., I, 95 and n. 69.

9. It is interesting to note that the Šah-nâme contains the NP. generic form azdâhâ 'serpent, dragon' from NP. Šahâhâg, with various compounds (azdâhâeš 'dragon-formed', etc.), as well as the Arabicised name Šahâk (see C.ugaszyan, op. cit., 70). NP. azdâhâ is the name given by the Kurds to the višâk ("dragon")-steles in Armenia (see our Ch. on Vahan). Curiously, the proper name Zohag is found in thirteenth-century Arm. (but Šahâk is a well-known name in Arabic), see G. M. Nalbandyan, "Histoire de l'histoire de l'Arménie" (M., 1983, 151). For a theological reconciliation of the two contradictory legends of Zima, see this writer's Government Fellowship Lectures of the K. R. Cama Oriental Institute, Bombay, 1983-4, in publication.

10. Mx was familiar with the Chronicle of Eusebius, a Gk. text which was translated into Arm. in the fifth century. The history of Cyrus and Astyages, and a Median king-list containing the name of Astyages are found there (see Thomson, Mx, 110 n. 4 and 114 n. 11; Tournanoff, op. cit., 55-7).

11. The spellings Ašdâhâk and Ašdâhâk are used interchangeably. The former could be a scribal error or a rendering of the unvoiced -š- of the name Astyages.

12. On Mx, višâk 'dragon' see n. 39 above and our Ch. on Vahan. For the suggestion that the Arm. may have linked the Medes (Arm. mar-kâ), see above) with dragons through a popular etymology from Mx. mîr 'snake'), see MA 1, 128-3.

13. See MX II. 51.

14. Arm. tâcâr in this case must mean 'palace' (as OP. tâcara) or '(banqueting) hall' (cf. P.B. III. 9 tâcâr anâkhun 'royal hall, palace') and not 'temple', as Thomson renders it (MX, 121). The latter meaning probably developed from the former (cf. the Christian term basilica and ecclesia, both of which had original secular meanings); see Arm. Ge., 251. For the use of tâcâr as a non-Christian temple, see Ch. 4. Originally, tâcâr—may have meant any enclosure the size of a ring in which a horse ran (Ord. base tâk-), which was then roofed over. Cf. mediaeval Pers. compound midkân asfâr, thl. asfâr 'horse-track', Arm. 1-w. aspârê 'arena, field'. One recalls that ancient Iranian kings encamped more often than they resided; and even their palaces always had a parâdeison (Arm. 1-w. pardên 'garden') for hunting (see most recently M. Sandamamayev for the Achaemenian period, in Acta Iranica 23, Leiden, 1984, 117-7).

15. The description of Tigran in MX I. 24 can apply only to Tigran II the Artaxiad (95-56 B.C.); see G. M. Nalbandyan, Hellenistická darvâšlîjî Hayastanes ev Mvosûs Xorncen'in, Erevan, 1966, 53. On Tigran II, see the following Ch.
58. Justi, Fr., Nam., 235 and Hilbchmann, Arm. Gr., 39, derive Arm. Erwan from Av. *Aryan= 'mighty'; an etymology was proposed also from Olr. *Aryavarta- 'possessing riches' (HüP, 1, 437) on the basis of the form Aroandes.


60. See Toumanoff, op. cit., 279; Sargsyan, op. cit., 30; HüP, I, 504; Xenophon, Anab., III.14.13; Plutarch, Vita Artax., 33; on the legendary prestige of the Arsacids, see Ch. 4.


63. Xenophon, Anab., IV.4.4

64. Tirac'yan, op. cit., 62.

65. Arrian, III.8. On Mithraustês and the Arm. Vahê, see our Ch. on Vahagn.


68. Manandayan, op. cit. n. 66, 96.

69. Ibid., 97; Justin, 38.7.

70. Strabo, XI.14.9.

71. Manandayan, op. cit. n. 66, 100.

72. Ibid., 101.

73. Mod. Sic. XIX.23, cited by K. Trever, Ocherki po istorii kul'tury drevnei Armenii (II v. do n.e. - IV v.n.e.), Moscow-Leningrad, 1953, 104.

74. J. Markwart, 'Le berceau des Armeniens,' EDEA, 8, 1928, 229.

75. Trever, op. cit., 135.

76. See Toumanoff, op. cit., 277-354, esp. 293-4, and 108-9 n. 168; L. Jalabert, R. Mouterde, Inscriptions grecques et latines de la Syrie, I; Commagène et Cyréne, Paris, 1929, 15-16; see also Ch. 9.

77. See Boyce, Zoroastrism, 48-77, on the adoption of Zoroastrianism in Media and Persia in the Achaemenian period, and now Hist. Zor., II, Leiden, 1982. The latter is now the most thorough treatment of Achaemenian religion, which Boyce identifies as Zoroastrianism, despite problems and inconsistencies. Despite the weight of the
evidence adduced for Iran, her conclusions are debated (and reconstructions of the Jewish response to Iranian religion, resting largely on the work of M. Smith, have even been termed 'highly adventurous' by J. Barr, Journal of the American Academy of Religion 53.2, June 1985, 228 n. 47). Armenia in the Achaemenid period is far less well documented than Persia or Israel, yet the network of cultural contacts there was almost as complex, so the interpretation of much of the evidence (such as the temple-model (?) above) must be tentative.

78. Cf. of the Arm. loan-words džam 'I betray' and drunaš (with Ir. participial ending -an), from Mir. (Arm. Gr., 146).

79. Arm. names in Arta- such as Artavorz (see Ch. 13), Artašes (Gr. Artaxias, see Ch. 3), Artavazd (see Ch. 4) et al. are loans from Western Old and Middle Iranian, see Arm. Gr., 31-40 and Ir. Num., 31-40; on OP. arta- (Av. arta, Skt. itra), see Boyce, Zoroastrians, 55.

80. On the Arm. loan-word dew 'demon' from Mir., see Arm. Gr., 140; on Arm. demonology, witchcraft, dašvic terminology and xraštarna 'evil creatures', see Ch. 14.

81. See inscription XTB in Kent, op. cit.

82. Agath. 817; dićc gen. pl. of dićc 'gods'. On Bagawan, see our Ch. on Aramazd. The etymology from Pth. may be anachronistic, as references in Classical Arm. literature to the Arsacids frequently are. On Bagawan, see our Ch. on Mihr. On Bagân (AON, 345) see Ch. 15. Bagâ-, Vedic Skt. Bhaga-, means 'god' (Boyce suggests it may have stood for Dr. *Youruna). In the Sogdian documents from Mughi we find the priestly titles moqapt and vphapt, to be compared with Arm. moqapet and bampet, the latter from Arm. bagnip 'altar', apparently the Arm. loan-word with the element bagn- 'god' (see M. Boyce, 'Iconoclasm amongst the Zoroastrians,' Studies for Morton Smith at Sixty, IV, leiden, 1975, 99). On the Arm. priesthood, temples and image-cult, see our Chs. 3, 4 and 15. It is noted here that the foundation of Bagaran is attributed to an Orontid by Mir., implying that bagâ- came into Arm. before Pth. times. One recalls also the proper name Bag-Tesrub cited in Ch. 1, which testifies to contacts between ancient western Iranians and the Hurrians of the Ar widget. In Sogdian, baga- was a general word meaning 'god' amongst Christian missionaries (see W. B. Henning, 'A Sogdian God,' BSOAS, 1965, 623-5). In Manichaean MP. texts are to be found the names Ohrmizd Bag and Ohrmizd Bâl (the latter a variant of the former) (W. B. Henning, 'The Murder of the Magi,' JBRAS, 1944, 133-44).

83. Bailey notes the essential characteristic of frasa- as a quality which is physically visible, in keeping with the non-mystical attitude of Zoroastrian theology (Zor. Probs., 1971 ed., vii-xvi). The Arm. loan-word from Mir. hran-xa 'wonder', reflects this sense (see also Arm. Gr., 183). Arm. brašakert is a direct borrowing from the Zoroastrian theological term frašt-keršši-. which describes the final, purifying event in the life of the world, ending its present state of mixture of the forces of good and evil (loc. cit.; Boyce, Hist. Zor., 1, 232 n. 17). Gershevitch renders fraštšš in Y. 55.6 as 'extraordinary' (AHI, 224 n. 4).

84. Herodotus, I.132.

85. See Boyce, Hist. Zor., I, 202 et seq.

86. See A. Perikhanian, Khramovye obledineniya Maloi Azii i Armenii, Moscow, 1959.


89. On the latter, see our Ch. on Vahagn; on Ara and Šamiran, see the Chs. on Anahit and Nanē and Captive Powers.

90. See Thomson, Arm., 78 n. 4-6.

91. Another Arm. form of the name, Zraēš, is found in the fifth-century Arm. translation of Eusebius, see Jackson, op. cit., 12 n. 5 and Ir. Num., 380. See also this writer's 'The Name of Zoroaster in Armenian,' JSAS (in publication).

92. The index to the Venice, 1955 text of MX; S. Malaysia (mod. Arm. trans., MX, Erevan, 1961, 92); and Thomson (MX, 13) explain Makkē as the Medes. In MX 1-12 Zoroaster is called Zradast mag os nabapet Māremē 'Zradast, the magus and patriarch of the Medes'. H. W. Bailey, Dictionary of Khotoan Saka, Cambridge, 1979, 181 s.v. *mēna-, proposes an etymology of Arm. nabapet from Mir. mērī 'relatives' with suffix -pet 'ruler', see also HAB, III, 243; but it may also be analysed with Arm. mēvī 'before' (see ibid., 419).

93. On Er as Zoroaster, see Clement of Alexandria, Stromateis, V.14.103 and Proclus (citing Colose, 3rd cent. B.C.), cited by E. Duren, Hayoanhin hinn krošh, Jerusalem, 1933, 28 and n.

94. Armobius, Adv. ad Gentes, VII.2; on Hoshānaš, see Ir. Num., 58, s.n. Austenes and MX 1.30, where the region Ostan is mentioned, see AON, 460-1. Arm. ostan means 'capital', and is a loan-word from Mir. (Arm. Gr., 215). Yovhannaš Runkacā, writing in A.D. 1293, cited the division by the eighth-century writer Stephanos Sivison (of the Arm. language into eight dialects: ostanik 'court' or 'capital' Armenian (also called mjerkerxē 'mesogel'), for it was spoken in the 'central' province of Ayurat) and seven eserakan 'peripheral' dialects (Mekantīvan kertakanxēšan, cited by E. B. Akeyan, Hay lesvabanxan patmukxan, I, Erevan, 1998, 291).

95. See Ch. 13, and this writer's 'Er, Ara, and Anahita Wreiz,' NERAM N.S. 18, 1984, 477-85.
96. See Ch. 7.

97. HAB, III, 435-6; Arm. Gr., 202. Navasarda was probably originally an autumn feast (Boyce, Hist. Zor., I, 174) and in the Armenian calendar of the Christian era of the mid-sixth century the month of Navasard was fixed in August-September, perhaps preserving thereby traditional custom.

98. HAB, III, 278. It is more likely that the word is the gen. pl. of Arm. marag, 'meadow', and refers to agriculture; compare k'ad-oc, from k'ad-em 'I reap' (cf. Vahagn visapa-k'ak 'dragon-reaper'), i.e., 'the month of reaping'. For the use of the genitive, cf. Ar-sec, Hrot-ic (the month of the fravaisi; see our Ch. on Spandarwet-sandaramet) and Areg (the gen. of arew 'sun'; see our discussion of arew-ordik 'Children of the Sun' in Ch. 16). The names of the months and of the thirty days of the month are found in the works of Anania Straka'i, op. cit., 256-7.


102. See Ch. 10.


105. See Ch. 9. The coin is shown in X. A. Muselayan, 'Hin Hayastani dramayin srjanahut'yan patmut'yunici,' F-Bi, 1970, 3, 68. The figure holds what appears to be an arrow in his right hand and a dove in his left; he looks to the left. This detail, which is found elsewhere in Near Eastern art but not on depictions of the winged figure, may represent a preference for peace over war (cf. the American eagle, which holds a bunch of arrows and an olive branch, and faces the latter).

106. Araf'elyan, op. cit., pls. 53-60, 64.


108. Toumanoff, op. cit., 75 n. 83. On the etymology of the name of the city, see the preceding chapter.


110. MX I.12.

111. Bailey suggests that the word saw(i) means 'stately', citing gos erivar 'high-necked, prancing horse', and is a loan-word from Iranian (Dictionary of Khotan Saka, op. cit., 420, s.v. sulya).

112. The name Anusavan contains the Iranian loan-word aya 'immortal' (Arm. Gr., 19, 99-100); the ending -avan could be the Iranian suffix -yan 'possessing', or the name could be a form of Anusavan, a common MIR. name and epithet meaning 'of immortal soul'. Since Ara, the father of Anusavan, was believed to have gained immortality, the name of his son may be related to the myth. See J. R. Russell, art. 'Anusavan,' Encyclopaedia Iranica.
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saw their gods' images in Eastern temples, Plutarch wrote in his *On the Fortune of Alexander*, 328, 'through Alexander, Bactria and the Caucasus learned to revere the gods of the Greeks.' But this is a youthful, enthusiastic essay which goes on to claim that without Alexander the barbarians should not have had their great cities, either.
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CHAPTER 3
ARTAXIAD ARMENIA

In 190 B.C., Armenia was a patchwork of 120 dynastic states, referred to by Pliny as regna 'kingdoms'. These were the domains of the naxarars, and their 'barbaric names' are presumably the Arm. forms of toponyms dating back to Urartean times, and preserving the names of the ancient peoples of the plateau. Many of these peoples still spoke their various native tongues, such as Urartean, for it was only after the conquests of Artaxias, according to Strabo, that the Armenians (probably only gradually) became 'of one language'.

Certain of the regna may have had very large temple estates, for Pliny equates with Acilisene (Arm. Ekelese), an entire province in its own right, the Anaftica regio. Cassius Dio includes among the conquests of Pompey 'the country of Anaftis, belonging to Armenia and dedicated to a goddess of the same name.' Such temple estates existed throughout Asia Minor, and most of them were dedicated to the worship of the ancient Anatolian Great Mother goddess, in one or another guise. In certain areas the cult underwent Hellenisation, and the deity was equated with Artemis, but in other areas it would appear that temple estates became Zoroastrian foundations during the Achaemenian period, the goddess being equated with the yazata Anahtā whilst retaining the loyalty of the indigenous population: the Attalid kings of Pergamon made grants to the sanctuary of the 'Persian Goddess' at Hiera Komē (lit. 'Sacred Village') in Lydia, and a great temple estate at Zela in Pontus was dedicated to Anahtis and 'the Persian deities'. The temple of the Great Mother at Pessinus, on the border of Phrygia and Galatia, was regarded throughout the Hellenistic and Roman periods as an independent, theocratic principality, and in eastern Asia Minor, where hellenisation was slight, such ancient forms of administration must have survived to an equal or greater degree.

Zela, in the province of Zelitis, is a short distance to the west of Gaziura. We noted above in our discussion of the derivation of the toponym Armawir (Gk. Armaouira) that the ending -vir may be an old
toponymical suffix; the name of the Pontic city would therefore contain the Olr. element ga(n)k- 'treasure'. The site may have been a satrapal treasury of the Achaemenians, situated close to an important temple estate. The administrative divisions of Armenia at the close of the Orontid period would appear to be archaic: a loose-knit patchwork of small principalities with temple estates, following the ancient social patterns of Anatolia, yet bearing the cultural and religious stamp of Iran.

The influence of Greek culture and Seleucid power was also evident in Armenia, as seen in the preceding chapter, and Antiochus the Great (223-187) sought to expand his power in Armenia by instigating a revolt amongst the naxarars against the ruling Orontes (Arm. Erwand). Such a tactic probably could not have succeeded without the active connivance of some naxarars, who to the very last days of the sovereignty of Greater Armenia were to seek alliances with foreign powers against their own king: the dethroning of the last Armenian Arsacid, Artaxias IV, by Bahram V of Iran in 428 was urged upon the Sassanians by Armenian naxarars, who received privileges afterwards, and in neighboring Georgia the Iberian princes in 580 similarly urged upon Hormizd IV the overthrow of their royal Mihranid dynasty.

In Greater Armenia, a dynasty named Artaxias (Arm. Artatk̄) was installed as strategos; the Armenian king of Sophene, Xerxes, was besieged in his capital, Arsamazata, and subsequently assassinated. An Armenian Orontid, Zariadres, was named strategos of Sophene. In 191 B.C., Antiochus was defeated in battle by the Romans, who shattered his power at Magnesia and confirmed their control over Asia Minor by the peace treaty of Apamea, three years later. The two Armenian stratēgoi, rebelling in their turn against Antiochus, 'joined the Romans and were ranked as autonomous, with the title of king.' The Artaxiad dynasty of Greater Armenia was to last until the first decade of the Christian era; in 95 B.C., at the beginning of the brief period of the imperial expansion of Greater Armenia under Tigran II, Sophene was annexed and ceased to be a kingdom, the Orontid royal family continuing as a naxarārdom, however, into the Christian era.  

Movses Khorenac'i describes in accurate detail the stone boundary-steles that Artaxias caused to be erected on the lands belonging to towns and estates (Arm. agarak-k'). It has been suggested that the Hellenistic period was marked by perpetual boundary litigation motivated by an everpresent fear of crop failure and starvation, and that such litigation and arbitration in many cases replaced actual fighting. Boundary markers (Phl. sāmān-i wimand, cf. Arm. 1-w. Sahm) were, as it seems, equally important in Iran, for Ch. 50 of the Ardashir Namag describes the hideous punishment in hell of a man who in his life removed one with malice. A number of these steles have been found from the reign of Artaxias I (189-160 B.C.), and since to date none has been unearthed of earlier date, it is assumed that he instituted the practice of erecting such markers. The later Arsacid king Tiridates I erected an inscription at Aparan, apparently recording the grant of the town of Big to the Great xarmuni naxarar house. The inscription is in Greek, and the stone does not have the serrated top characteristic of the steles of Artaxias--as described by Xorenac'--which are inscribed in Aramaic. But the legal intent of the later monument is similar: to establish a property claim in the name of the king.

On the various steles of Artaxias, the name of the king is found in the forms *Petn̄s, *Khmēś, and *Pēntēš, corresponding to the Aramaic form of the name of the Achaemenian king Artaxerxes, *Pēnēš, in an inscription of the first half of the third century B.C. from Naqū-i Rustam. The Ars. king describes himself as an apportioner of land (Aram. MHLQ 'RQ, in Spitak 1-5), an Orontid king (MLK 'WNHDK, MLK 'WNHDKK) in Spitak 2 and Zangezur 4; MLK 'king' appears alone in Sevan B, 2), and son of Zariadres (Ars. Zarch, presumably not the same as the strategos and king of Sophene: BR ZRYTR, BR ZY ZRYTR, BR ZRYHR, in Spitak 3-4, Sevan B 2-3, and Zangezur 5-6). Although Artaxias had overthrown Orontes, his claim to legitimacy was based on his presumed Orontid lineage; such an attitude would accord at once with Iranian and Armenian conceptions, as we have seen above. The same patronymical formula was followed later by the Armenian Arsacids; an Aramaic inscription from Gāni, probably of the second century A.D., reads: (1) ... (2) MLK RH ŽY 'RMWN (3) BHR ŽK WOLS (4) MLK: '(1) ... (2) Great King of Armenia (3) Son of Vologases (4) the King'. In the inscriptions from Zangezur and Spitak, the king bears the epithet ŽÊ, ŽÊ'. The same Aramaic word was as an ideogram rendered by
which are found in bearer' lit. 'king', there seems little doubt that
tions accord admirably with Iranian religious beliefs.
ently a Hellenistic administrative practice, as were certain other re-
as a loaned form in Arm.
ought to consider. But the various attributes of the king in these inscrip-
for us to tell whether the language of the inscriptions is in fact
Mr. nēy 'brave', a common royal attribute of Iranian kings. In Arm.,
the word for brave is kōadj, which may be of Iranian origin, and is also
the name of a race of supernatural creatures who are said to dwell within
Mt. Ararat. In the Arm. epic fragments preserved by Movāēs
Xorenac", Artaxias curses his son Artawazd, who is taken captive by the k̠ašk̠-k̠. 17 P̸awstos Buzand refers to p̸a'ēx̹ t̸a'agaworac̹n ə
bax̹tn̸a ev k̠ašk̠-居住 'the glory of kings and their fortune and bravery' (IV, 2). Glory and fortune (p̸a'ēx̹-k̠ and bax̹t, both Ir. loan-words) are
constantly paired in Iranian and Armenian usage and are probably represent-
ated on the Armenian tiara depicted on the coins of the Artaxiad kings
as eagle(s) and star. 16 k̠ašk̠-居住 in the passage cited is likely to
correspond to Mr. nēy-asta' 'bravery', 19 as a Zoroastrian attribute of
the king, who is blessed with x̸arenac̹- so that he may be a brave fighter
for the Good Religion against evil in its various manifestations. In
an Aramaic boundary inscription from T̸ekut in Soviet Armenia, Artaxias,
who is called *R̸EHK̸H̸H̸K̸S̸E̸S̸-an apparently Hellenised form not found in the
other inscriptions—bears two additional epithets: Q̸IR̸R̸R̸ and H̸H̸H̸R̸R̸, which are found in the inscription from Zangezur. The first word is
read by Perikhanyan as an Aramaic heterogram of Mr. t̸a'ēx̹-bar 'crown-
bearer' lit. 'king', Q̸IR̸R̸R̸; the second is interpreted as 'Allied with X̸athra', i.e., with the Zoroastrian A̸sê Na̸Spênta X̸athra Vairya, 'the
Desirable Kingdom', who represents the spiritual archetype of righteous
government. 20 In the word W̸N̸Q̸P̸R̸ Perikhanyan proposes to see Mr.
v̸a'x̹anaq̸p̸êr̸, from O̸Ir. v̸a'x̹aneq̸.akap̸êra- 'who vanquishes all which Evil
engenders/encourages'. 21 The erection of boundary stelae was apparently a Hellenistic administrative practice, as were certain other reforms introduced by the Artaxiads which we shall have occasion shortly to consider. But the various attributes of the king in these inscriptions accord admirably with Iranian religious beliefs. Perikhanyan's suggested etymologies for H̸H̸H̸R̸R̸ and W̸N̸Q̸P̸R̸ are necessarily hypothetical, but even without them the epithet Q̸IR̸R̸R̸ is of great significance, and there seems little doubt that Q̸IR̸R̸R̸ is an Aramaic heterogram of the
Iranian word which we find as Arm. t̸a'agawor. The ending -K̸W̸ in *R̸E̸N̸N̸E̸K̸N̸ 'Orontid) is also an Iranian adjectival ending -ak̸an which is attested
as a loaned form in Arm. -ak̸an. The inscriptions are not long enough
for us to tell whether the language of the inscriptions is in fact
Armenian or a form of Middle Iranian or Armenian written with Aramaic ideograms.

It is beyond dispute, however, that several Iranian terms—or Armenian terms of Iranian derivation—are found in the boundary inscriptions. We have noted also a probable heterogram: T̸B̸ for Arm. k̠ašk̠. It is likely that the k̠ašk̠ of Mt. Ararat represented in fact the
royal ancestral spirits, who received reverence from Artaxias, as we
shall see, as the fraewaši of Zoroastranism. 22 A number of medieval and
modern Arm. tales exist about the k̠ašk̠-t̸un 'House of the Brave', and the family of the epic heroes of Sasun is also called by
the latter name or else Jošane-t̸un 'House of the Giants'. S. Kanayan
constructed family trees of the k̠ašk̠-t̸un of Arm. legend, and sought
to link the various characters with the Arsacid kings, queens
and noblemen of Armenia in the fourth century A.D., starting with
Xosrov II Kotak. In the legends, polygamy, next-of-kin marriage
and marriage of first cousins is frequent; such customs were praised by the
Zoroastrians and condemned by the Christians, as we shall see. In
addition to k̠ašk̠, the Arm., as it appears, used also a term common
amongst Zoroastrians for a similar complex of meanings, *K̸a̸w̸ (NW Mr.,
cf. Phil. k̸a̸y̸, O̸Ir. k̸a̸v̸), in the toponym K̸a̸w̸-a̸k̸ert̸ 'built by the hero';
Mr. K̸a̸w̸, Av. K̸a̸v̸ Usan, is found in Arm. as the K̸a̸w̸-akan line (A̸r̸m̸h̸to̸m̸) mentioned by P̸awstos. 23

The reign of Artaxias appears to have been a period in which ener-
ggetic measures were taken to regulate Armenia's economy and administra-
tion. Artaxias secured control over Caspiane, Pharnamis and Basoropeda
south of Media; he conquered Chorsene, Gogarene and the Parysed foot-
hills, which had been in the hands of the Iberians; Carenitis and
Dexene, with their populations of Chalybians and Mousynoei, were
placed firmly under the control of the king of Greater Armenia;
Acilisene was wrested from the Cataonians; and in the southwest
Taronitis was taken from the Syrians. 24 The expansion of the Arm.
state means that cities were to be built and coins were to be struck;
Armenia became a power to be reckoned with in international politics,
and we find frequent mention of various noblemen and warriors in the
works of Roman writers. The artefacts found in cities, the symbols on
coins, and onomastical and other evidence from literary sources provide
important information about the religious beliefs of the Armenians in the period.

Artaxata, Arm. Artasat, a city whose Iranian name means 'Joy of Artashes', was probably founded only a few years after Artaxias came to the throne, although according to some sources it was built only six years before the death of the king in 160 B.C. According to several Classical sources, the defeated Carthaginian general Hannibal had taken refuge with Antiochus III. After the battle of Magnesia, Hannibal apparently fled to Armenia and helped to build Artaxata, but one of the conditions of the peace of Apamea was that he be handed over to the Romans. Artaxias was pro-Roman, for the Romans, as we have seen, recognised his legitimacy, so Hannibal would have fled Armenia soon after the treaty which broke the Seleucid power in Asia Minor; according to Cornelius Nepos, he was at Crotyn on the island of Crete after the peace of Apamea. It is not impossible that Hannibal assisted Artaxias in the planning of Artaxata, but it would have to have been done ca. 189-188 B.C. Whatever the truth of events may have been, the story occupies a prominent place in Classical descriptions of Artaxata, all of which were written long after the days when Rome and Armenia were friendly. Plutarch called Artaxata 'the Armenian Carthage'; the capital of a powerful enemy whose way of life was neither Roman nor Greek.

Artaxata was built on nine hills along the river Araxes near the modern Soviet Armenian village of Pokr Vedi. The northeasternmost hill appears to have been the oldest quarter. Water was drawn from the Araxes, and channelled down from the Gekan mountains towards Lake Sevan; the approaches to Artaxata from the Sevan area were guarded by the ancient fortress of Gaimi, which had been founded by the Urartians (the Arm. name derives from Urartean Giarnian). Armawir, the Orontid capital, stood but a short distance away from Artaxata, the former itself a city built on Urartean foundations, and it is likely that Artaxias chose the site for his capital in the area because it was populous and its defences were already well developed; such conditions would have facilitated the rapid growth of the city. Artaxata was heavily fortified; its walls, which narrowed into passages between hills, had towers and armories. More than 3000 arrowheads of iron of the second-first century B.C. have been found at the site.

Buildings were made of local limestone, grey marble or pink tufa, and colonnades and bath-houses were constructed in Hellenistic style. Of the 12 colours of paint found, a brownish-red pigment is most common. This paint, called 'sandix', was exported to Rome, where it was used extensively at Pompeii and other cities, and the raised frame of the Aramaic inscription from Gaimi mentioned above also bears traces of the pigment. The buildings of the city were built very close together; every precious inch of space within the strong walls was utilised, and no remains of gardens have been found. The craftsmen of Artaxata produced fine glazed ceramic and glass wares, and it is likely therefore that the objects of cultic importance to be discussed presently were of local manufacture. Fine jewellery from Artaxata seems also to have been made in Armenia, for the gold mined at Zod, an area near the southeastern shores of Lake Van where pre-Christian cultic bas-reliefs have been found, contains tell-tale amounts of bismuth and tellurium. Life at Artaxata was rich: flagons, oinochoes and fish dishes have been excavated, and a gilded hippocampus of silver which once served as a vase handle has been unearthed. Another handle of silver was modelled in the form of a young Eros.

All of these objects display Hellenistic workmanship of exquisite quality, and may have been made locally or imported. They testify to a sophisticated and luxurious way of life, and indeed the 'Armenian Carthage' was a city whose loose morals are referred to by Juvenal as a matter of common knowledge: Sic praetextatos referunt Artaxata mores (Satires, 11, 170). It was a centre of Hellenistic culture with many foreign inhabitants; the poet Iamblichus, who composed his romance in 35 books, the Babylonica (now lost), is reputed to have lived there.

Artaxata was a centre also of industry and commerce, and according to Xorenac'i, Artaxias caused to settle there numerous Jews who had resided at nearby Armawir. Some of them may have formed the nucleus of the early Christian Church in Armenia— as Jews did in other countries— before it became a national institution closely linked to the ancient dynastic order, as we shall see in the following chapter. No material evidence of the Jewish presence at Artaxata has been uncovered, but much of the Armenian vocabulary for business activities is Semitic in origin, e.g., Arm. թախայ 'market', խանութ 'shop', հանուկ 'account') (cf. סעדה, בניה, בנק).
From the foregoing it would seem that the Armenians, like the Iranians of the same period, maintained control over cities as centres of trade, but did not live in them as a rule, preferring to leave the arts of commerce and fine craftsmanship to foreign residents. Most Armenians lived and worked in their widely scattered rural districts. Yet the royal household and members of the priesthood at the very least must also have resided at Artaxata, for Xorac{	extsuperscript{1}} relates that Artaxias kangn{	extsuperscript{E}} i nna mehean, ev p'oxi h Bagaran{	extsuperscript{E}} sportkem Artemiday ew zamenayn ku're hayenesis: bayc{	extsuperscript{C}} zAponcii patkern artak{	extsuperscript{C}'}oy k'akak{	extsuperscript{C}'}in kangaN hup i șenaparun 'raised in it a mehean [temple{	extsuperscript{3}}] and transferred from Bagaran{	extsuperscript{7}} the image{	extsuperscript{1}} of Artemis{	extsuperscript{29}} and all the statues of his fathers. But the image of Apollon he set up outside the city, by the roadside' (MX II.49). Many of these statues were captured from 'Greeks by Artaxias; one may compare to this the Achaemenian practice of removing to Persepolis temple images and other objects from Egypt, Babylonia, and Greece. Presumably Arm. Zoroastrians, like their Iranian co-religionists, had no indigenous iconographic tradition. No temple has been discovered to date at Artaxata; presumably, it was one of the first buildings to be converted to a church in the fourth century after the conversion of Tiridates. Reference is made by Agathanglcos to the 'Sun-gate' of the city (Arm. Areg duwn);{	extsuperscript{42} this probably faced south, for where the Arm. text of para. 206 reads ćand duwn harawoc 'by the south gate', the Gk. version has tēs hēliakēs pylēs (by) the Sun-gate'. The Sun is an important object of veneration for Zoroastrians as the greatest of the luminaries of heaven, and Armenian Zoroastrians of later centuries were to be identified as 'Children of the Sun,' perhaps because of their conspicuous worship of it, so it is likely that the name of the gate was intended to reflect the Zoroastrian piety of the king, as well as the radiance of his glory. The South (Phil. ńam rēz) is in Zoroastrianism the 'place of midday', where the Sun should, ideally, always stand.

Although no temples have been found, a number of artefacts of religious significance have come to light. Bronze figurines of eagles may represent ʃar-imah, and similar statuettes have been discovered in neighboring Cappadocia and in other regions of Armenia. A number of terra-cotta figurines depict a woman with a draped headress who is seated on a throne nursing at her breast a young, naked boy who stands with his back to the viewer. This scene, which is attested also in stone to the west in Armenia, near CnC w̃̄, is undoubtedly the ancient Asianic Great Mother, Cybele, with the infant Attis, probably equated by the Armenians with Nane or Anaht and Ara. A small bas-relief depicts a young woman resembling Aphrodite undressing beneath a rounded arch supported on either side by pillars. The manner of portrayal of the woman is Greek, although the architectural details are Oriental, and the Armenians tended to identify in texts their own goddess Astlik with Aphrodite. The composition of the scene and the style of the pillars, arch, and drapery—though to be certain, not the activity of the lady—are strikingly similar in a stone bas-relief of the Virgin Mary as Intercessor, a fragment of a fourteenth-century Deiosis from the Church of the Mother of God of the Monastery of Spitakawor.

Twenty-eight terra-cotta bas-reliefs have been found in Artaxata which depict a rider in Parthian dress on horseback, in side or three-quarter view. Nearly identical figurines have been found in large numbers in Iran from the Parthian period, and in parts of Syria and Mesopotamia which became part of the Arsacid empire late in the second century B.C. Staviski,, MaCatryan and others have suggested that these objects were of religious significance. The figure may represent the yazata Mithra, it is suggested, for this most prominent god represented the Sun, and there is abundant evidence to link horses to the cult of the Sun, either as sacrifices or as symbols, in both Iran and Armenia from Achaemenian times. Such an explanation would be supported also by the Armenian epic of Sasun, in which Mher sits on horseback in his cave at Van. The image of a rider god is not unusual for the period or area. A number of iconographic concepts, such as the eagles and star mentioned above, or the demonic figure with snakes at his shoulders discussed in the preceding chapter, seem to have come to Armenia and western Iran from Syria and northern Mesopotamia. In Palmyrene bas-reliefs, a number of gods are shown mounted on horses or camels, frequently carrying the paraphernalia of battle. Mithra (Clas. Arm. Mihr, Medieval Arm. Mher) was identified by Arm. writers with the Greek god of fire, Hephaistos, and had been associated since earliest times secondarily with the Sun, the greatest visible fire of all. The importance
of his cult in Armenia is eloquently attested in the very fact that the generic Armenian word for a non-Christian place of worship, mehean, contains his name. The cult of Mihr was apparently eclipsed in the Arsacid period by that of Vahagn, as we shall see subsequently, but it is plausible that the figure on horseback may represent him. One example from the period in which horses most likely represent the Sun may be cited here. The reverse of a silver tetradrachm of the Artaxiad king Artawazd II (56-34 B.C.) depicts a crowned charioteer driving a four-horse chariot left, and holding the reins with his left hand. One recalls the dedicatory inscription in Greek at Armawir discussed in the preceding chapter, which refers to a four-horse chariot and near which there was cut a slot in which a bronze pinakion was to be inserted. It was also noted that a plaque with such a chariot was found at Dodona. Although Mithra may not be the driver, the Sun in the Avesta is described as survat.appa - 'having swift horses', and Yt. 10 describes Mithra's own chariot.

Having mentioned above one coin of Artawazd, we may continue with a discussion of the coinage of the Artaxiad dynasty. The Orontid kings of Armenia minted very few coins, and the Armenian Arsacids appear not to have struck any issues at all; the latter used Roman and Parthian coins, and no convincing explanation has yet been presented for their failure to mint their own, for there were long periods during their nearly 1100-year reign when Armenia enjoyed such sovereignty as would have justified their doing so. The issue of coins is attested, however, for the entire period of the Artaxiad dynasty, and attests to the wealth, commercial development, and administrative organisation of the Armenian state. The coins of the Artaxiad kings are important for our purpose as a source of information on religion, for they depict various mountains, trees, animals, symbols and human figures (the latter presumably representations of gods) which are probably of religious significance. Unlike the later Kusanas in Bactria, the Armenians unfortunately did not provide on their coins the names of the gods shown, so explanations of the significance of a scene, or identifications of figures, cannot be offered with complete certainty.

A black published and dated to 183 B.C. a coin or medal with the inscription 'ARTAXI(S)A) TON M(?);TR(0);P(O);L(?);K(0) 'of the capital of

(people of) Artaxa, 

There is shown a winged Nike who holds a wreath in her upraised right hand. The figure appears on Armenian coins throughout the period. The depiction is Hellenistic in style; if it represents a female yasta, it is impossible to tell which is intended. A copper coin with a head of Zariadres (labelled in Gr. ZADRADA) has a thunderbolt on the reverse and the inscription 'BASILEUS BASILEON 'of the king of kings'. Neither Zariadres the father of Artaxias nor Zariadres the strategos of Sophene would have been likely to use such a title, so Bedoukian dismisses the coin as a forgery. The title was used only by Tigran II and his successors, a century later, so the forgery may have been done then. The symbol of the thunderbolt may have been associated with Arama, who is referred to by Xenophon 'of the thunder'; elsewhere in Asia Minor we find the cult of Zeus keraunios 'Zeus of the thunder'.

A copper coin of Artaxias I (189-63 B.C.) shows an eagle on the reverse turned left and perched on the summit of a mountain. A similar coin struck late in the first century B.C. has been found from Cappadocia; the mountain on the latter is undoubtedly Argeus, near Mazaca, which was worshipped as sacred. The eagle recalls the figurines from Arta and elsewhere, which show an eagle atop a cone or stepped pyramid. In this case, the mountain shown is probably Ararat, which towers magnificently over Arta. The eagle, which must represent either a divinity or the glory of the king, is also found alone on later coins; a small copper coin, attributed by Bedoukian to Tigran II although possibly a juge issue (two profiles are clearly visible on the obverse), shows on the reverse two mountain peaks, this time without an eagle, the mountain on the left the lower of the two. Above the peaks is the trace of a legend with the letters -ISAR visible. Bedoukian identified the mountain peaks as those of Argeus, but it is more likely that they are Great and Little Ararat. The fragmentary legend may contain the Armenian word sar 'head, mountain', probably a Gr. loan-word, often suffixed to the name of a mountain.

A copper coin of Tigran I (123-96 B.C.) shows a male figure on the reverse seated to left on a throne and resting his left hand on a sceptre. The figure in Hellenistic issues represents Zeus Nikephoros, and may have been identified by the Armenians with Aramazd. Modern
Armenian scholars have suggested that the Hellenistic figure of Tyche--the personification of Fortune--on the reverse of the coins of Tigran II (95-56 B.C.) represents the yazata Anahit, here depicted as the goddess of the river Araxes. But this identification, too, is pure conjecture, for the Tyche is found in Hellenistic iconography elsewhere.

On copper coins of Tigran II and Tigran IV (85-5 B.C.) the figure of the Greek god Heraklēs is clearly shown. The muscular, naked divinity leans on a club or spear, and holds a lion skin. There seems little reason to doubt that this is meant to represent Vahagn, the yazata of strength and victory, for the depiction of the god is the same in Commagene of the first century B.C., to the west, for Artagnes, and in Sasanian Iran, for Bahram, in the east, in the third century, and the cult of the yazata was of enormous importance to the Armenian royal family.

The cypress tree was and remains sacred to Zoroastrians, and such a tree appears to be depicted on a coin of Tigran IV. Tigran II and his successors issued coins with a picture of an elephant on the reverse. Hannibal had used these in fighting Rome, with well-known and disastrous results, and the Sasanians were to employ elephants at the battle of Avarayr against the Christian Armenian forces of Vardan Manikonean in A.D. 451. It is probably from the east rather than the Carthaginian west that the Armenians learned of the creatures, for Arm. pāl 'elephant' is a loan-word from Mir.

Although Artaxias himself erected boundary steles with inscriptions in the Aramaic alphabet, all the coins of the dynasty are in Greek only. The coins of the predecessors of Tigran II have the title BASILEUS MOGALOU 'of the great king', a title we shall see in Sasanian epigraphy as wuzurg šah, an office lower than that of the šahanshah 'king of kings', Gr. basileus basileōn, which title Tigran II and his successor Artawazd II (56-34 B.C.) used on their coins. Following a custom widespread in both the Hellenistic and Iranian worlds, the Artaxiad kings deified themselves: Artawazd II and Tigran III (20-8 B.C.) bear the epithets THIRI 'of the) divine' or THIRI 'of the) god'. A more modest, but equally widespread appellation, PHILHellenos, is found on the coins of Tigran I (123-96 B.C.) and his successors.

The need felt by an independent monarch of the east to declare himself a lover of Greek culture is an indication of the profound influence of Hellenism upon a country which, as we have seen, generally escaped conquest and colonisation by the successors of Alexander. The advance of commerce, the centralisation of government, and the evidence of Greek style in coinage all are part of the cosmopolitanism of the Hellenistic world. As the word implies, a man's polis was now the cosmos, the whole world. The direct democracy that had sufficed to govern the relatively intimate, compact community of the old Greek polis was replaced by vast bureaucracies; the local agora became a web of international trade routes, and the koine, the common language of this new world was Greek. It was only natural that the Artaxiad monarchs should declare themselves philhellenes, yet it must not be thought that their religious beliefs ceased to be what they had been of old: staunchly Zoroastrian. For religion was perhaps the most unsatisfactory facet of the otherwise shining jewel of Hellenic culture. We have seen how Plato had looked towards Armenia and Iran in his metaphysical quest, and Alexander himself had paid homage to the gods of the various ancient Oriental nations he conquered. The patrician Greek religion, if not the Orphism brought from abroad, offered no cosmological, eschatological or theological vision comparable to the faith of the Iranians. Its gods were petty, capricious and often local; the souls of good and bad men alike went down to a dreary world of shades; and no redemption or perfection might be hoped for. It is unlikely indeed that the Armenians, so zealous in other respects in defence of their national traditions, should have succumbed to such a dispiriting and primitive religion, even if they had been asked to. There is no evidence of Greek proselytism, and if anything the direction of religious influence was from east to west, culminating in the victory of an Oriental mystery cult, Christianity.

Thus, the presence of various aspects of Hellenistic culture in Armenia neither contradict nor challenge the assertion of Strabo, who lived in the last years of the Artaxiad dynasty, that the Armenians and Medes performed all the religious rituals of the Persians. And the political ties between Armenia and Iran that had been shattered at Gaugamela were soon to be restored.

Since the mid-third century B.C., the Arsacid dynasty of Parthia had been gradually advancing westwards across Iran, reconquering the
provinces which had been ruled since the time of Alexander by the descendants of Seleucus. Mithradates I (171-138 B.C.) extended his domains to Media, and Mithradates II (123-87) advanced to the Euphrates, taking hostage the young prince Tigran, who was to become king of Armenia in 96 B.C. To the northwest of Armenia was the kingdom of Pontus, a fertile strip of land between the Black Sea on the north and the rugged chain of the Paryadres on the south. This land early in the third century B.C. had become independent of Seleucid rule, and its kings, all of whom bore Iranian names, had embarked upon a policy of taking hostage the young prince Tigran, who was to become king of Armenia.

In the administration of Tigran II, there appear to have been four executive officials or sub-kings called bdeax-kas. The institution, it is suggested, was probably Seleucid, but the word is a loan from MIP, and it is recalled that Mithradates II of Parthia (d. 87 B.C.) is shown in a bas-relief at Behistun with his four principal officials, of whom the chief was called satrap of satrapies, and the other three simply satraps. This aspect of government may have been introduced by Tigran from Parthia. He inherited a rich, well-organised state, which, through astute political manoeuvres and audacious military campaigns he proceeded to transform into an empire.

Tigran's first acts as king were to annex Sophene, bringing to an end the Zariadrid dynasty. At the same time, presumably to avoid hostility from Pontus, he concluded an alliance with Mithradates VI (111-63) and married the latter's daughter, Cleopatra. Tigran went on to conquer north Syria and Cilicia; in 91, the Armenian generals Mithraas and Bagbaas attacked Cappadocia; by 83, Tigran had conquered the great Syrian city of Antioch; and in the 70's his forces advanced as far as Ptolemais in Phoenicia. Ca. 80-81 B.C. Tigran founded a new capital, Tigranocerta (Arm. Tigranakert), perhaps on the river Nikophorion (Tk. Parkin Su). The king deported people of the various conquered territories to the new city, and Plutarch in his Life of Lucullus notes that when the Romans conquered the city scarcely ten years after its foundation, the Greeks there revolted against the 'barbarians' who remnained.

Not all the inhabitants of Tigranocerta were so hostile; one Mistrodoros, surnamed miSfroaios 'the Roman-hater', wrote a history of Tigran's reign.

The Armenian empire was short-lived. Tigran's rapid military advances alarmed the Romans, and Pompey in 66 B.C. forced Tigran to cede most of the territories he had seized, but left him king of Armenia. Although three of Tigran's six children had been wedded to members of the Parthian royal family, Tigran had not hesitated to seize a large area of disputed territory in Atropatene and to assume the title 'king of kings' (which he was forced to relinquish by Pompey). His son, also named Tigran, who had married the daughter of the Parthian Arsacid king Phraates III, was persuaded by the Parthians to attempt to seize power from his father, and mounted an unsuccessful attack on Artaxata. Although Tigran's successor, Artawazd II (56-34 B.C.), was to mend and strengthen relations with Parthia, Rome had realised the strategic importance of Armenia and was to play an active role in the affairs of the country for centuries to come.

With the advent of Tigran, Armenia became a major bone of contention in international politics, and the names of a number of Armenian noblemen and generals were recorded by Classical historians and other writers. Certain of these names deserve our attention, as they bear testimony to aspects of Armenian religion in the period. The name Tigran itself is Iranian, and the epic exploits of an ancient Tigran were blended with the deeds of the Artaxiad king, as we have seen in the last chapter. The memory of Tigran as an epic hero survived long into the Christian period. An Armenian Christian philosopher, called David the Invincible or Thrice-Great (Gk. anikitos, trismegistos; Arm. anikztos, e'ramec), who was born in the late fifth century and belonged to the School of Alexandria, wrote a work in Greek called 'Definitions of Philosophy' which was translated into Clas. Arm. probably not long afterwards. In the Arm. text, there are explanatory interpolations, as well as substitutions for certain Greek proper names of Arm. ones more likely to be familiar to the reader. At one point, for instance, the translation mentions sAt'enay, the gl'oxyn Aramasday enwe 'Athena, who was born from the head of Aramaz'; Aramaz has been substituted for Zeus. At another point the text reads: Isk sarunak k'anak oc'
k̓al̓e m̓əŋ̓ətəb̓̓ abəz̓ən̓ zənəz̓ən̓ təsəks̓ end̓ən̓, vəsn̓ zə mən̓ , oł̓ s̓ sarum̓ K̓ an̓ək, ot̓ s̓ ok̓ s̓ stel̓ kən̓ən̓ sən̓ s̓ e t̓ əst̓ Tigran̓ ay̓ kər̓ kəpa̓ r̓ e̓ n̓ e̓ n̓, ot̓ s̓ k̓ e̓ k̓ ən̓ s̓ e̓ ay̓ kər̓ kə̓ r̓ p̓ ən̓ ən̓ e̓ n̓. 'But a continuous quantity cannot receive without confusion various shapes, for if one makes a wax candle, which is a continuous quantity, in the form of Tigran, it cannot take on another form unless the previous one is effaced. If it is not, confusion results. In the Greek original is found not Tigran, but the Homeric hero Hector, the doomed defender of Troy against the Achaeans. The learned Armenian translator would certainly have known at least that Hector was a great hero whose country went to its doom with his defeat; perhaps he had this in mind when he substituted Tigran, or else he merely replaced the Trojan warrior with a figure of comparable fame in the epic traditions of his own nation.

We find mentioned by Lucullus the name of Tigran's brother, Guraz. An Armenian prince of the Marzpetuni naxaran family named Got lived during the reign of the Bagratid king Adot III the Merciful in the tenth century, and both Justi and Aćavan connect the two names with Arm. goř,箔ox 'proud'. It is possible, however, that the name is Iranian, and to be connected with Mir. gərg 'onager, wild ass', cf. Bahram V, called Got, a Sasanian king of the fifth century. The hunt was central to the lives of Iranian and Armenian kings, and the wild boar (Arm. kini or Mir. loan-word varas, symbol of the yazata Vahagn and of the Armenian Arshacid house) and onager (Arm. jəsavər, lit. 'wild ass') are the two animals mentioned in a pre-Christian Armenian legend cited by Xorenac'y on Artawazd, who meets his perdition while hunting.

In 1913, the British Museum acquired three parchment documents found at Alvahan, in Persian Kurdistan. The first two are in Greek and the third is in Parthian; all three relate to a deed of sale of a plot of land with a vineyard, and apparently were written in the first century B.C. According to the first document, in Greek, Tigran had a daughter named Arayaṭa, who married Arsakès Epiphanès, i.e., probably the Parthian Mithradates II here called by the name of the eponymous founder of the dynasty with an epithet meaning 'manifest (divinity)', ca 88 B.C. The deification of kings is familiar from the inscriptions on Artaxiad coins, discussed above; we shall have occasion shortly to discuss the institution of next-of-kin marriage attested here. The name Arayaṭa is clearly composed of two Iranian elements, OIr. arya- 'Iranian' and the suffix -ətā 'born, i.e., son or daughter of': arya- here, and Arm. aric- 'Iranians', are both Arshacid rather than SWIR forms, cf. Pth. 伊朗人. A proper name of similar form from the same period is found in an inscription on a silver bowl found at a burial site in Sisian (in the southeastern Arm. SSR; called Siwanik or Sisakan in the period under discussion). The site is an enclosure made of blocks of stone, containing a sarcophagus of clay; the construction is of a type that would have prevented corpse matter from polluting the earth of Sẽnta Armea, and it is possible therefore that it is a Zoroastrian site. Coins of the second-first century B.C. were found, the latest of the Parthian king Orodes II (57-37 B.C.); this provides a terminus ante quem for the date of the inhumation. The inscription on the bowl, which is 6.3 cm. high, with an upper diameter of 16 cm., reads, rmbk znh 'r̃g̃zent z̃hl̃ kep ñt̃ l̃hh̃l̃ z̃m̃w̃ñl̃ This *bowl belongs to Arakhszet, silver weight 100 drachmas.' Inscriptions in Aramaic on other luxurious objects such as a glass, spoon, and lazurite tray have been found from the first century B.C. at Artaxata, so the practice of incising such inscriptions must have been fairly common in Armenia at the time. It is likely also that the owner of the bowl was an Armenian, for the first part of the name, r̃g̃z, appears, in this writer's opinion, to be a form of the name of the river Araxes, attested with metathesis of the last consonants in fifth-century Arm. as Arax. The name would mean 'Born of the Araxes'.

The name Arayaṭa would mean, similarly, 'Daughter of an Iranian'. Iranians--and Zoroastrians particularly--divided the world into seven kešvar or 'climes'. In the central kešvar of Xvanirah, the one inhabited by men, people could be either arya- or ar-arya- 'Iranian' or 'non-Iranian'. In the Sasanian period, the king of kings ruled subjects of both groups, and in the works of Xorenac'y, Eklès and other Classical Armenian historians, his was the court Areac'y or Aramaca ('of the Iranians and non-Iranians', nom. Aric'y or Aramik'y). The Armenian Christians clearly regarded themselves as non-Iranians, for to Ptolemaios Buzand the gund Areac'y 'army of the Iranians' was a troop of foreign
invaders, and for Eznik the azn ariakan 'Iranian nation' was an alien people. 100

But the distinction between Erān and Anērān is a complex matter. Akopov and Grantovskii have argued that in the works of Strabo and Pliny certain tribes of speakers of Iranian languages are called non-Iranian, whilst other peoples who were not speakers of Iranian languages are included as Iranians. D'yakonov suggested that the term may have means 'Zoroastrian', having a religious rather than an ethnic sense. 101 The Parthian Arsacid king Gotarzes II (ca. A.D. 40-51), who ruled an empire inhabited by the multifarious peoples who were later to be subjects of the Sasanians, refers to himself in a Greek inscription simply as Gotarzes basileus basileōn Areanan hyos Geo (ke)kaloumenos Artabanou 'Gotarzes king of kings of the Ormians, son of Geo called Artabanos'. 102 It seems doubtful that all the subjects of the Arsacid king were considered Areanoi, though, and it is not known who was, and who was not.

The Sasanians divided the known world into four parts: the land of the Turks; the area between Rome and the Copts and Berbers; the lands of the blacks, from the Berbers to India; and Persia—according to the Letter of Tarsar, a document attributed to the chief herald of Ardašir I (A.D. 226-41) which has come down to us, however, in a late translation in which many additions or changes were probably made. In the Letter, Persia is defined as stretching 'from the river of Balkh up to the furthest borders of the land of Alharbalīgān and of Persarmenia, and from the Euphrates and the land of the Arabs up to Ōmān and Mekrān and thence to Kābul and Toxorāstān. 103 Although Persian Armenia here is included in Iran, 104 the reference does not necessarily indicate that the Armenians were considered Iranian, for Arab territories, also, are part of the kingdom as described above.

Sasanian epigraphic material offers little help. The inscription of Šābuhr I on the Ka'aba-yi Zardūst records his conquest of Armenia, which became part of Erānšār; his sons Hormizd-Ardašir and Narseh both ruled Armenia subsequently with the title of 'great king' (familiar to us from the BASTILES MEGALOU of Artaxiad coinage, see above), each before his accession to the throne of the king of kings itself. 105 In his contemporary inscription at the same site, the high priest Kartīr declared that he had set in order the fire temples of Armenia, Georgia, Caucasian Albania and Balāsaṅgān. 106 We shall see that Arsacid Armenia was to be regarded as the second domain of the Arsacid house after Iran itself, a position of privilege which may indicate that Armenia was indeed regarded as an Iranian land. Kartīr's testimony shows that in the third century there were also Zoroastrians there. Yet in the inscription of Narseh at Paikuli, A.D. 293, reference is made twice to departing from Armenia to Erānšār; 107 the obvious inference is that Armenia was considered a separate country.

The Christian Armenians naturally wished to be considered amarik, for it seems that the Sasanian authorities treated non-Iranians who were not Zoroastrians, such as the Jews of Mesopotamia, with considerably more tolerance than they did Iranians who converted to Christianity. In the Syriac martyrologies of the Sasanian period, most cases involve converts to Christianity with Persian names. As Gray noted, 'Christianity has always been a proselytising religion, Zoroastrianism, in the Sasanian period, has not been; and although the Mazdeans were, on the whole, rather indifferent to other religions so long as these did not interfere with their own, they could scarcely remain unconcerned by proselytising directed against themselves.' 108 In the Armenian martyrologies of the naxarara Atom Omuni and Manaṣīhr Ṣutuni, who were executed during the reign of Yazdagird II (438-57), the two are not accused by reason of their own beliefs, but because they came from Armenia to Ctesiphon to convert others. 109 According to the Chronicle of Arbela (a work whose authenticity, however, is seriously disputed), the Jews and Manichaens stirred up agitation against the Christians by informing king Šābuhr II (309-79) that Catholicos Simon had converted prominent Magians to his faith, 110 undoubtedly well aware that this was a charge to which the Zoroastrians would react with particular sensitivity.

Although the Sasanians made repeated attempts to convert the Armenian Christians to Zoroastrianism, most notably in the proselytising campaign which culminated in the war of 451 chronicled by Ekišē, adherents of other faiths were also persecuted. Kartīr recorded with satisfaction that he had suppressed a number of different faiths, including Christianity and Buddhism, in Iran, and the Jews received with
trepidation the news of the overthrow of the Arsacids in 226.111 The fears of the latter were justified: Yazdagird II forbade observance of the Sabbath, and his successor Pērōz, according to Ḥumza Īsfahānī, massacred half the Jews of Spāhān on the pretext of a rumour that they had slain two hermits; their children were impressed into the service of the fire temple of Sro Šāhrūn in the nearby village of Nārūn.112 It is probably no coincidence that the above instances of persecution coincided with the period of the most virulent campaign in Armenia. In Ehlīš’s account, the stated purpose of the Sasanians is not so much to return Armenian backsliders to their old religion as to convert all the peoples of the Empire to the Mazdean faith; the Magi address Yazdagird II in the following speech: Arka y kara, astuakna etun kara stērūtāvmd ev zvstākutīvm: ev oc inc kara varu en marmavor muce’tcēn, baya‘c et‘ē i mi avēcē darju ‘anes zavemyn ase ev asina, or ev i tērūtēs cē tērēcē; yeznēm ev aēxarhēn Yunac c hrazandeal mte cē ēnd avrenewk c kovēc. ‘Brave king, the gods gave you your dominion and victory, nor have they any want of corporeal greatness, except that you turn to one law all the nations and races that are in your dominion; then the country of the Greeks also will submit to your law.’113 By ‘law’ (Arm. avēn-k) is meant here the Zoroastrian religion; Pā‘wstos uses the word to mean Christianity in another context.114 Although the campaign of the Sasanians against the Armenians is the most important and vigorously prosecuted episode of their policy, this is so most probably because Armenia was the most influential of the various countries in the Sasanian orbit, and because Christianity was the only minority religion of the Empire which was also the official cult of a militant and hostile power. It cannot be suggested with certainty, therefore, that the Sasanians perceived the Armenians as part of Šrān, or that they were particularly anxious to recover the Armenians because of this.

Let us return to the name Aryazatē. It is unlikely that Tigran was ignorant of the meaning of the name he bestowed upon his daughter. In neighboring Cappadocia, a country where Zoroastrianism survived at least down to the fourth century A.D.,115 and whose language bears the influence of Zoroastrian vocabulary,116 the Iranized kings bore names such as Ariaratha, Ari(ar)ames, and Ariobarsanes, which contain the element arva-. Diodorus Siculus mentions two Armenian kings named Ariannes.117 It is reasonable to suppose that the similarly Iranized Tigran, who was, one recalls, raised in Parthia, considered himself an arya- by faith and heritage, for his ancestor Artaxias, as we have seen, claimed to be an Orontid, and the Orontids of Commagene in the time of Tigran still boasted of their Achaemenian forbears. If this supposition is correct, then the name he gave to his daughter is the only evidence we have that the Armenians once regarded themselves as ari-k.118 Again, one must admit that this is not unimpeachable evidence, when Sasanian Jews could bear names like Spandārmāz and Ormizādād.

Outside the immediate family of Tigran, the names of several of his commanders are noteworthy. An Armenian cavalry commander named Našaēs or Namanēs fought under Mithradates VI of Pontus; the same man is also referred to as Mēnophanēs.119 Justi explained the name as Armenian, containing the elements nēw ‘brave’ and man ‘mind, spirit’. It is also possible that the name is a form of the Iranian name Narman, with the element naivra- ‘manly’. The names of Mithraas and Bagasae have already been mentioned; the name of the latter is found also in the form Magoas,120 and the name of the Armenian governor of Cilicia and northern Syria is variously attested as Magadēs and Bagadēs.121 The latter form is interesting in that it appears to predate the introduction into Armenian of the northwestern Mrg. form Bagarat with the change of original intervocalic -a- to -e- that is so abundantly common in Arm. loan-words from Mrg.122 It may be that this form of the name is a survival of OP.; other possible such survivals were noted in the preceding chapter.

In 56 B.C., Tigran died and was succeeded by his son, Artawazd II. Like his father, the new king was a philhellene, an accomplished Greek poet whose works were still read at the time of Plutarch, in the second century A.D.123 His Hellenistic culture notwithstanding, Artawazd’s policies were generally pro-Parthian and anti-Roman; we shall discuss in a later chapter the famous episode in which the head of the defeated Crassus was brought in to the marriage feast of Artawazd’s daughter and the Parthian crown prince Pacorus during a recitation of the Bacchae of Euripides.124 Parthian-Armenian relations suffered with the death of Pacorus I in 38 B.C. and the coronation of the other son of Orodes II,
Phraates IV (ca. 38-2 B.C.). The Armenians, alarmed by the murderous policies of the latter towards his own family and the Parthian nobility, were reluctantly forced to side with Rome, for the exiled Parthian leader of the nobles, Mmaeses, hoped to rid the kingdom of Phraates with the help of Mark Antony. When the Roman army met with failure, Artawazd renounced the alliance; he was subsequently seized by Mark Antony and taken to Alexandria in 34 B.C. There he was paraded in the Roman general's triumph, imprisoned, and finally murdered three years later. The Romans ravaged Armenia, sacking the temple of Anahit in Acilisene. Artawazd's son, Artaxias, who had fled to Parthia, was enabled to return to Armenia in 30 B.C.; he was murdered ten years later by his brother Tigran III, who had been raised in Rome and was supported by a pro-Roman faction in Armenia. In 6 B.C., the latter died and his son Tigran IV assumed the throne.127

From 2 B.C. to A.D. 1, Tigran IV reigned jointly with his sister and queen, Eratō, and jugate coins depicting the regnal couple were struck.128 One coin in the Hermitage at Leningrad bears the legend BASTILEUS BASTILEON TICRAMES on one side, with a portrait of the king; and ERATÒ BASTILEOS TICRANOU ADELPHI, with the likeness of his queen, on the other.129 The practice of next-of-kin marriage, called in Avestan XAVETVADATHA-, was important in the Zoroastrian faith in historical times, and is mentioned in the last section of the doxology, Yasa 12.9.130 This practice, which is first attested in Iran with the marriage of Cambyses in the sixth century B.C. to two of his full sisters, is mentioned as characteristically Zoroastrian by a Greek writer, Xanthos of Lydia, who was a contemporary of Herodotus. The practice therefore goes back at least to the early Achaemenian period, and would have featured in Zoroastrianism by the time the teachings of the faith reached Armenia. Perhaps the western Iranians adopted next-of-kin marriage from Elam or Anatolia; the practice of consanguineous marriages is well known in both places.131 But it seems possible also that the custom may have developed amongst eastern Iranians far removed from these foreign cultures, for, as we have seen, it has an Avestan name. The possibility exists, therefore, that the Armenians adopted the practice from their neighbours in Asia Minor, and not as part of Zoroastrianism, but by the time of Tigran IV the Armenians were so steeped in Iranian cultural and religious tradition that his marriage must have been regarded as a fulfillment of the pious obligation of xVETVADATHA-, and wholly Zoroastrian in character, regardless of its origin for the Armenians. The marriage is recorded in A.D. 2 of the Parthian king Phraataces to his mother Masa,132 and Tacitus wrote that neither Tigran nor his children reigned long, 'though, according to the custom of foreign nations, they took partners of the throne and marriage bed from among themselves.'133 The historian does not tell us which foreign nations are meant, but there was before him the example of the Parthians at nearly the same time.

The practice of xVETVADATHA- must have survived for a long time to come amongst the Armenians, if one is to judge from the frequency and vehemence of the condemnations of it that issue from the pens of historians and clerics. St. Nersès I the Great in A.D. 365 at the ecclesiastical council of Astištāt established for the Armenians canons governing marriage which forbade the practice of xVETVADATHA-. These canons are allotted detailed treatment by both Pswostos and Xorenac,134 and Garsoian has suggested that such attention indicates how seriously the issue was regarded.135 Although the council of Astištāt did not prescribe any penalty for those who persisted in the practice of xVETVADATHA-, perhaps because it was in no position to dictate to the powerful naxarars it implicated (they maintained the practice, it is explained, to preserve property within the family),136 later canons are more severe. One recommends, Or kin ariē zmavur kem zatar, i hur ayrećak znosa 'He who takes to wife his mother or daughter—burn ye them in a fire.'137 We shall have occasion to note that the very St Basil who consecrated St Nersès as bishop shortly before the council of Astištāt attacked the 'nation of the Magousoaloi' in Cappadocia for their 'illegal marriages'.138 It appears that the Church failed to eradicate consanguineous marriage in Armenia, for we find the practice condemned in the Datastangirk 'Law Book' of Mtct'ar Gos (d. A.D. 1213).139 Remarkably, xVETVADATHA- persisted down to the eve of the Russian Revolution amongst the Armenian melik of the Caucasus, dynasts who preserved something of the ancient naxarar system in their remote mountain domains. In the village of Alighamar of the district of Surmalu, the melik Vrtan's married two women. By the first
he had a daughter, Apcenik; by the second he had a son, Garegin. The boy and girl were later married. Marriages between first cousins were common in Surmali, and even in cosmopolitan Tiflis a case was recorded in which two brothers married their two sisters.

With the death of Sigrian IV, the royal line of the Artaxiads ended. Eratés was apparently allowed by Rome to remain on the throne for a time, perhaps to placate the Armenians, who rebelled against the various candidates the Romans placed on the throne, even though all were of local origin, coming from the royal stock of neighboring countries. From 97 A.D. 11-16 the Parthian prince Vonones held the Armenian throne. Although he was regarded by the Parthians as a Roman puppet, his Arsacid lineage seems to have induced the Armenians to accept him, for a time. In A.D. 16, they rebelled, and he was forced to flee.

In A.D. 18, Rome installed Zeno, son of Polemon, king of Pontus. It is recorded of the young man that he had "imitated the manners and customs of the Armenians, and by hunting and banquets and all else in which barbarians indulge had won the attachment of nobles and commoners alike." Zeno assumed the dynastic name Artaxias, and gained acceptance. At his death, the Parthian king Artabanus III declared his intention to expand the borders of the Arsacid Empire to rival the ancient states of Cyrus and Alexander. He was forestalled by the Romans, however, from making Armenia an appanage of the Iranian crown; the Romans had formed an alliance with the Iberians, the neighbours of Armenia to the north, and their king, Pharasmanes, sent his brother Mithradates to become king of Armenia. The Armenians rebelled against Mithradates; the uprising was led by one Demonax.

Although Rome was to pursue for centuries to come its policy of interference in Armenian affairs, the sympathies of the Armenians lay with Iran, a country whose religion and way of life were familiar to them. In A.D. 51, Vologases assumed the throne of the Arsacids. The younger of his two brothers, Tiridates, was made king of Armenia, although it was Nero, the Roman emperor, who was to give him the crown. The Arsacid house in Armenia, indeed, would outlast the dynasty in Iran itself by two centuries, but it was to face a challenge ultimately far more serious than the glittering cohorts of the Roman legions: the apostles of Jesus Christ.
also a possible derivation of the name from Arm. vaean 'shield', Arm. Gr., 509, but the common noun may have the same root as the name of the god, for Av. verethra-gan- means literally 'to smite an attack/resistance', which corresponds to the function of a shield; see HAB, IV, 296; the form Artanás would attest to such elision in another variant of the same name. For a complete king-
list of the Artaxiad dynasty, see Bedoukian, op. cit., 2, and
H. Manandyan, Eker, Erevan, 1977, 298; for a chronology of
the major political events of the period in Armenia, see HAB, I, 922-4. It is obvious
that the dynasty of Sophene claimed Achaemenid
descent: Arsames was the grandfather of the dynasty; the name Xerxes
needs no comment.

9. MX II.56; for photographs of these, see HAB, I, pl. opp. 532, and
the separate articles by Perikhanyan et al. cited below.

10. W. W. Tarn, Hellenistic Civilization, London, 1941, 72. In the
Sasanian period, minute changes in the size of a plot, or disputes
over tenure, could reduce to slavery the small farmer in Mesopo-
tamia, and, presumably, in other parts of Iran (see Yu. A.
Solodukho, 'On the Question of the Social Structure of Iraq in the

11. The Arm. word for a stele, kot-ka, was derived by Adonts from
Akkadian kudurru 'stele, boundary marker' (see G. B. Dahanyan,
'On akkadikih zaimatovaniyakh v armianskom yazike,' P-bh, 1980,
3, 119); this etymology is accepted by A. M. Danelyan, 'Artasas
I-i hastatvac sahananek'areri iravakan makanak'tyune,' P-bh, 1977.
3. Should the derivation be accurate, it is to indicate that the
institution of boundary markers in Armenia predated Artaxias by a
millennium. There is no material evidence for this, and the
institution of boundary markers in Armenia predates Artaxias by a
millennium. There is no material evidence for this, and the
institutions and administrative measures attached to it must be regarded as
Hellenistic. This etymology is poor; in Arm. koth-ka, in loan-words is represented as -k-, not as a dark r, whether the
original language from which the words are adopted be Iranian or
Semitic. For instance, the name of the north Syrian city of
Harrâm, LXX Gen. XI.32 Kharran, is found in the fifth-century
translation of the Bible in Arm. as Xiaan (see G. Bolognesi, Le
Punti dialettali degli imprestiti iranici in Armeno, Milan, 1960,
28); the word may be related to Arm. kot-ka 'handle, stem' in the
sense of something elongated and upraised, cf. Georxian loan-word
godol-i 'tower, godol-ka 'to rise' (see HAB, II, 614-5). If a
Semitic root is to be sought, a form of GHL, cf. Heb. migdal
'tower', is more likely than Akkadian kudurru.

12. See M. Rostovtsev, 'Aparanskaia grecheskaya nadpis' tsarya
Tritida,' Aiilikaya seriya No. 6, St. Petersburg, 1911. Mig was
a populous region on the river Xeis, and it has been suggested
that the early Arm. Christian basilica there was built on the site
of a former heathen temple (A. Sabinyan, Xeiski bazilikyi
cartareperpet'syun, Erevan, 1955). The later name of the place,

Aparan (cf. OP. apadana) 'palace' indicates that it must have
been an administrative centre as well, warranting a royal inscrip-
tion in view of its importance.

13. G. Tircay, 'Artases I-i evs mek noragut arameakahn
arjasagrut'yun,' P-bh, 1977, 4, 257 line 1 (Splitak); A. G.
Perikhanyan, 'The Inscription Armâneh du Boi Artâksa Trouvée À
Zanguezour (Sivanik'), NEArm, N. S. 3, 1966, 18 line 3 (Zangezour);
A. N. Danielyan, op. cit., 34 line 1 (Sevan B).

14. Perikhanyan, op. cit., 19, derives the name Zarâdres from Ir.
Zari-âthrâ 'golden fire'. Strabo refers to an Armenian named
Adôr who commanded the fortress of Artagasa and was killed by
Galus Caesar (the Arsacid queen Paredes would hold the same fort-
ress against the Sasanians after the imprisonment of her husband,
Artaxas II, in the fourth century); these events would have taken
place at the end of the Artaxiad period, ca. A.D. 2-3. The name of
the Armenian may be a form of Mr. Adôr 'fire', attested also in
Arm. atrasan 'fire alter', a loan-word from Pth. (see JRNum. 5;
Magic, op. cit., I, 485; and Ch. 15). The name Zarâdres is of
Iranian origin, for Atharneus, citing Chares of Mytilene, refers
to Zarâdres, the brother of Hystaspes of Media, in recounting the
epic romance of Zarâdres and Odatis, apparently a Median legend.
The tale reappears in a somewhat altered form in the Sêh-name,
where the hero is called Zare (see M. Boyce, 'Zarâdres and
Zareh,' BSOS, 17, 1955, 463-70). Both forms of the name are
attested in the inscriptions of Artasas, and the latter, with loss of
final -n, is found as Arm. Zarâ (cf. the toponym Zarâ-wan;
an earlier form survives in Zerarita-kert, Zarâ-kert. The
place-name Zarî-sat 'Joy of Zareh (?)' is parallel in form to
Art-sat 'Joy of Artasas' to be discussed below, see JRNum. 427-8).
A satisfactory derivation of the name in Ir. has not been found
(cf. Boyce, above; Arm. ân, 505; JRNum. 381-3; and
Toumanoff, op. cit., 293 n. 69).

15. A. G. Perikhanyan, 'Arameiskaya nadpis' iz Garni,' P-bh, 1964, 3,
123-4.

16. W. B. Henning, 'Manâ's Last Journey,' BSOS, 1962, 911 n. 2 and
BSOS, 9, 948 n. 3.

17. See Chs. 13 and 14 for discussions of Artavazd and the xēnâc.

18. See Ch. 9. This iconographical problem was discussed by us in a
paper entitled 'The Eagle of Tigran the Great,' delivered at a
Symposium on Arm. Art and Architecture held at Columbia University,
27 April 1961. Three points of interest to our discussion were
made which are worth mention here. The concept of xēnâc- as
represented by two eagles protectively flanking the king may be
reflected in the design of a Sasanian throne with an eagle sup-
porting either side (see A. S. Melikian-Chirvani, 'Studies in
Sassanid Metalwork, V: A Sassanian Eagle in the Round,' JHAE,
1969, 1, 2-9). NEwâ-zA is presumably seen to inhere in the king
himself; one notes the decoration on a Roman helmet found at Nawa, Syria, which shows a soldier confronted by two eagles, their bodies turned away from him, their heads facing him (as on Artaxiad tiaras in Armenia), above and behind him a winged youth, and above the latter a vastly larger youthful bust with rays about the head. The winged youth is probably the personification of Victory; the nimbus-crowned figure is Hélios (corresponding to the Arm. star, representing bakt 'fortune' and the yasata Tîr; on the pairing of hermA, the messenger—god like Tîr, with Hélios in Commagene, see our note on Nairysana below). The soldier is thus being awarded glory and fortune for his valour (in Arm., b'axal-yan; in Mr., navainp). Such an interpretation would be reasonable for a helmet dedicated to a deceased officer whom his comrades wished to honour, and the iconography is attested elsewhere in Syria, at Palmyra and Hatra (see Ch. 9). The helmet was published by S. Abdul-Hak, 'Les objets découverts à Nava,’ les annales archéologiques de Syrie, 4-5, 1954-55, 168-74 & pl. 4, cited by E. R. Goodenough, Jewish Symbols in the Greco-Roman Period, XI (= Bollingen Series, Vol. 37), New York, 1964, Fig. 141. The symbol of the bird and star is still used by the Armenians.

An embroidered fillet trimmed with a row of coins (worn by a woman on her forehead), from Zangezur, nineteenth-twentieth century, shows two birds in side view, to either side of a star, which they face (reproduced in S. Lisitlyan, Starinye plyaski i teatral'nye predstavleniya armianskogo naroda, I, Erevan, 1958, pl. 93). The symbol of birds confronting a sacred image is widespread; see Ch. 10. in the seventh book of the bênkard, two birds hold (and, apparently, protect) the hâm of the frawâdî of Zara-thastra on either side, before his birth.

19. This parallel is suggested by Bailey, Zor. Probs., 1971 ed., xvii.


21. Ibid., 173.

22. On the frawâdî-cult, see Ch. 10.


indeed, we have bas-reliefs of both gods and kings, but only one statue in the round of monumental size has come to light: a great stone image of Šabur II found in a cave above Bishapur (see T. Talbot Rice, Ancient Arts of Central Asia, New York, 1965, 85 & pl. 70). From the kingdom of the Kūšans to the east in the same period comes the well-known statue of the monarch Kaniška, found in a temple (B. Staviskii, Kushanskaia Baktarya, Moscow, 1977, 20 pl. 2). The latter, but probably not the former, may have received reverence as part of the cult of the royal ancestors. As we shall see, the Saesians were to destroy such images in Armenia. In the Parthian period, images in the round, both monumental, such as the statue of Sanastruk from Naxnit or the great representation of a Parthian prince unearthed at Shami, or in miniature, such as the crude figures from Susa, were probably used in the fravashi-cult (see Talbot Rice, op. cit., pl. 71 for the statue from Shami; see V. G. Lukonin, Persia II, New York, 1967, pl. 8, 9 for Sanastruk; and R. Ghirshman, Iran, Penguin Books, 1978, pl. 39 b for the figurines from Susa). In Armenia, a number of crudely executed heads of stone have been found at Artaxata and elsewhere which may likewise have represented ancestors whose spirits received honour and offerings (see Arak'elian, op. cit. n. 38, pls. 1-20, 31, 32). The Arm. word kuf-k' 'idol, image, statue' comes from the verb k'k'-'en 'I carve, sculpt' and is found in a fragment of epic preserved by Xorenacci on Vardges (for names with the Ir. loan-word vard 'rose', see Ch. 12; the name seems to mean 'rosy-haired', and the Ir. loan-word ges is found also in the name Gissnê, an epithet or cult name of the fiery red-haired Vahagn, see Ch. 5), who settled on the Kassê river (on this region, see the discussion of Xig/Aparan above); k'k'-'en zdurum Eruanday ank' 'to cut and burn the bate of Eruam and the king' (MX II.65). The basic meaning of the verb seems to be 'to make hard by striking' (HAE II, 669), so the original meaning of kufk' may have been an image of beaten metal. The word translates LXX Gk. eidoion, Gen. XXXI.19, and in Arm. Christian literature kfu-paftutun is a calque upon Gk. eidoio-latros 'idolatria'. Kufk' meant 'idol', while patker retained the meaning 'image' as a neutral word free of necessarily religious connotation. The variation in usage of the words by Xorenacci; thus seems to be a matter of differentiation for the sake of style rather than an intentional distinction between two kinds of images; if anything, the word kufk' by the time of his writing would have meant a statue in the round, while patker would be more appropriate for bas-relief, meaning basically any kind of picture.

39. Presumably Anahit is meant here; see below and Ch. 7.

40. This is a reference to the fravashi-cult; see n. 38 above and Ch. 10.

41. This was the temple of Tir, referred to also by Agathangelos as an archive or academy of priestly learning; see below and Ch. 9. On statues, see M. A. Dandamayev, Iran pri peryvkh Akhemenidakh, Moscow, 1963, 245 and n. 49.

42. Agath. 192.


44. See Ch. 16.

45. See Arak'elian, op. cit. n. 32, pls. 93-95; and Ch. 9.

46. Ibid., pls. 84-86; see also Ch. 7. It is recalled that a medallion of earlier date from Amrawir depicts the same scene, attesting to the continuity of religious observances. Xorenacci alludes to such preservation of tradition in describing how the images of the vasatas and royal ancestors were transferred from Bagaran to Artaxata by Artaxias.

47. The plaque from Artaxata is unpublished and was described orally by Arak'elian, with a slide (see Russell, op. cit.); the Christian relief is published in N. Stepanyan, ed., Dekorativnoe iskusstvo srednevekovoi Armenii, Leningrad, 1971, pl. 139.

48. See 2. Xa'antryan, 'Irana-haykakan dic'abansakan aersneri harci surj,' Ibrer, 1981, 2, 54-72, pls. 1, 2. For Pth. examples, see M. Colledge, The Parthians, New York, 1967, pl. 27 a, b. The most recent example unearthed at Artaxata was published by B. N. Arak'elian, 'Psammut Artasatun,' Hayenik'i Jayn, Erivan, 28 Nov. 1979, 4. See also n. 64 to Ch. 8.

49. See, e.g., Xenophon, cited in the preceding Ch.

50. This detail is not mentioned by the above writers; see Ch. 8. The remote Thracian kin of the Arms worshipped a rider-god strikingly similar in bas-reliefs of the Roman period to Mithra in Parthia (perhaps influenced by the developing iconography of Mithraism in the Pontic region), see Bulletin of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, Summer, 1977.


52. See Chs. 6 and 8.

53. Bedoukian, op. cit., 69 and pl. 129; see also Xa'antryan, op. cit. n. 48, 56.

54. See AHV, 38-40, where Gershevitch argues against the identification of Mithra as driver of the chariot of the Sun in Avestan texts.

55. It. 10.13. In the Xwarshed nityayes, the Litany to the Sun, which is recited daily together with the Litany to Mithra, the Sun is
continually addressed as 'swift-horsed' (in the NF. translation, tēx aṣp); see M. N. Dhalla, The Byaishes or Zoroastrian Litanies, New York, 1908, repr. 1965, 2-65, and Boyce, op. cit. n. 31, 45.

56. See Årak'elyan, op. cit. n. 32, pl. 107 and op. cit. n. 31, 45.


58. See Ch. 5.

59. Bedoukian, 7-8.

60. See Ch. 5 on Argaems and the religious importance of mountains in Armenia. Zoroastrians have traditionally regarded mountains as sacred. In Y. 1.2.2 are worshipped gairisca afstačinõ 'mountains flowing with water' (the waters flow down from high Harā, and from Cappadocia is found a dedication to Anāhītā with the Av. cult epithet rendered in Gr. letters barzokhara 'of high Harā'). In Sfrposición 2.28 reverence is offered to vissā geyravt Š 'all the mountains'. In Y. 1.1.4, 2.1.4 f. specific mountains are named for worship (pace Boyce, Hist. Zor., II, 141). A book of prayers and liturgies, Navnari MS T3, p. 67, contains a nameškar 'salute' based upon the Sfrposición passage, to be recited upon nūdjan koho wns [sic] 'seeing a great (?) mountain for the first time'. E. Herzfeld, Archaeological History of Iran, London, 1935, 55, compares the NP. name Khazed 'Born of the Mountain' to Pth.-in-Gk. ᾭπαθατάς at Behistun; the element kōp 'mountain' at least seems clear. According to the Menōg I Kred, Ch. 56, the mountains were made to check the force of the winds (an idea shared with, if not derived from, Aristotle). According to Bundahīsh, the mountains sprang up to stabilize the dish of the earth when it was shaken by the Šagad 'onslaught' of Ahriman; Qur'an 21.33 appears to echo this; suggesting that mountains were created to prevent earthquakes.

61. On coins of Tigran III (20-8 B.C.), an eagle or dove is shown with an olive branch in its beak; on coins of Tigran IV (8-5 B.C.), an eagle is shown facing a serpent; see Bedoukian, 71, 74.

62. Bedoukian, 24, 68.

63. Arm. Gr., 236, 189; for -sar as a suffix in toponyms, see AOM, 387. Both Hübchmann and Akačean, HAB, IV, 182-3, trace sar 'mountain' to *HIB and sar 'head, leader' to Phil., but such a semantic division seems unnecessary.

64. Bedoukian, 46.

65. Ibid., 14.

66. Ibid., 19, 35, 63, 74.

67. On Vahagn, see Ch. 6.

68. Bedoukian, 75; see Ch. 12 for a discussion of the cypress and other plants of religious significance.

69. Bedoukian, 67, 72, 73.

70. There were 3000 hoplites for every elephant in the Sasanian army at Avaruy according to Elke, Vosr Vardanawex NASAp a-armšš in Y. 1.14.16: the Arm. in later centuries whenever the battle was depicted in MS. paintings showed the Persians as seated upon elephants, e.g., in a Saracenic 'Hymnal' of A.D. 1482, Ervan Matenadar MS. 1620, in L. A. Durnovo and R. G. Dambayan, ed., Hyakin a-nahangarak 'Hymn', Ervan, 1969, pl. 71. The Sasanians also hunted with elephants; such a scene is shown in bas-relief at Tāq-i Bostān from the sixth century A.D. (see Lukomik, op. cit., p. 130).

71. See Arm. Gr., 255. In a Phil. work on the game of chess, Wshrišn i catragon, we learn that phẗ pustibkan sālār homnag 'the (piece called the) elephant is like the chief of the bodyguards' (cf. Arm. Ποστίτιαν and an earlier Loan, pastyan, Arm. Gr., 221, 255; the latter form, from Pth., with the generalised meaning 'defender', is the only one of the two which came into general use in Arm.), J. M. Jamasp-Asana, Pahlavi Texts, Bombay, 1913, 116.10. Both animal and game came to Iran from India. On the name of the animal, see P. Kretschmer, 'Der Name des Elefanten,' Anzeiger der Phil.-Hist. Klasse der Österreich Akd. Wiss., Jahrgang 1951, Nr. 21, Wien, 1952, 307 ff. The Armenians might have kept a few elephants as an exotic curiosity or symbol of royal power under the Artaxads, but the climate cannot support elephants; Armenia is horse country. The elephant was regarded by Iranians as a demonic creature (see G. Scarcia, 'Zambil or Zanbil?' in Narmāne-ye Jan Fynka, Prague, 1967, 44, on the monstrous Kēz-i phẗ-dandan, based perhaps on an elephant god; also A. Tafazzoli, 'Elephant: A Demonic Creature and a Symbol of Sovereignty,' Monumentum H. 8. Byberg, II, Acta Iranica 5, Leiden, 1975, 395-8).

72. Bedoukian, 46 et seq.


75. Hāg, I, 598; N. C. Debovoise, A Political History of Parthia, Chicago, 1936, 91-2; see also J. Wolski, 'L'Arménie dans la politique du Haut-Empire Romain (env. 175-67 av. n.ē.),' In Memoriam Roman Ghirshman, 1, Iranska Antiqua 15, Leiden, 1980.

76. Magie, op. cit. n. 4, I, 189-92.

77. Toumanoff, op. cit., 124, 156.
78. Hübschmann, Arm. Gr., 120, suggested that the word bdeax was Iranian, but did not offer an etymology. H. W. Bailey derived it from an Ir. base axe-, *observe, watch over*, cf. Av. aivâdâya, Old Indian ahyâskâ- 'superintendent' (*A Khârošṭrî inscription of Senavarma, King of Oud,' JRAI, 1980, 1, 27, n. 2 to line 9).

79. Debovoise, op. cit., xxxix.

80. The political history of Tigran's reign has been amply studied on the basis of Gk. and Latin documents, which naturally reflect a Roman viewpoint. Y. Manandian's study, Tigran II et Rome, norm lugabam' yawm est ekhosbenyvern (repr. in H. Manandian, Erker, 1, Erevan, 1977; 407-602, tr. by H. Thorossian, Tigrane, II et Rome, nouveauxclairissements à la lumière des sources originales, Lisbon, 1963), is a revisionist treatment of the sources from the Armenian point of view. In his study, the author seeks to demonstrate, among other things, that hostile attitudes towards Tigran II and Mithridates VI in the works of classical historians were accepted uncritically by later scholars as objective evidence.

81. Both these names are Iranian: on the first, a theophoric form with the name of Mithra, see Ch. 8; on the second, with Mr. bag-'god', see our discussion of Bagaran, Bagavan et al. in the preceding Ch.

82. See Appian, Syr. War, VIII, 48-9.

83. On the form with Mr. suffix -kert 'made', see AOH, 384, 474-5. It is now generally accepted that Tigranakert is to be identified with Gk. Turcopoleis, Arabic mayâ'ir, Gk. op'kert in the region of Aknîk (see J. Markwart, SdArm. und die Tigrisquellen, Vienna, 1930, 86 et seq. and N. Adonts/N. G. Garsoian, Armenia in the Period of Justinian, Louvain, 1970, 376 n. 10; a study of the history of the city was written by G. X. Sargsyan, Tigranakert, Moscow, 1960). R. H. Dawson, 'Ptolemy's Chapter on Armenia,' NEArM, N.S. 16, 1982, 135, identifies Tigranakert with modern Silvan; T. Sinclair has proposed instead Arzan, about 35 km. distant. A bas-relief of a horseman in Parthian style, of monumental size has been discovered at Besat, a few miles north of Silvan (see M. Nogaret in NEArM, N.S. 18, esp. pis. 4b, 65); presumably, it depicts either the god Mithra or else, more likely, an Arm. Artaxiad king.


87. Ibid., 130.32-32a. Arevšatyan translates Arm. et'5 oc'5 yaragayan i hac ekani as Rus. sii emu zayedoso byla pridana drugaya forma 'if another form was given it (the candle) deliberately', which does not correspond to the Arm., even if one accepts the Ms. variant ekani 'becomes' for ekani 'is refused, effaced', which Arevšatyan does not.


89. Plutarch, Lucullus, 31-4; see also Ir. Nam., 121.

90. RâN, 1, 488.

91. Ir. Nam., 362.

92. See Ch. 6 for names with zarag; as E. Makoudian notes in his introduction to Koriim, Varkö Mastoců, Class. Arm. Texts, Wilanow, 1985, ix, the ancient Arm. liked animal names, like Koriim 'cub, whelp', Enjak 'panther', etc.

93. See Ch. 13.


96. On the toponym Slunikö, see W. B. Henning, 'A farewell to the Khagan of the Aq-Aqštārān,' HSAI, 1952, 1, 512, and Ch. 9, where the form of this and similar Aramaic inscriptions found in Arm. is also discussed.

97. On burial customs, see Ch. 10; on the site and inscription, see A. A. V. Perikk'yan, 'Arameskaya nadpis' na serebryanom chache iz Sisiana,' P-Bl, 1972, 3, 78.

98. Perikk'yan, ibid., 80, derives rubk from an Ir. form *rebaka 'bowl', comparing NP. na'lbakî, nablakî, with the metathesis of n and 1/2 variation.

99. Z. D. Xar'şrayan, 'Sisiani arac'tya getarvestakan t'asern u skahaknere,' P-Bl, 1979, 1, 380-6; see also Arak'alyan, op. cit. n. 32, 31 & pl. 1.
The term Persarmenia must refer to the territories acquired by the Sasanian Empire after the partition of Greater Armenia between Iran and Byzantium in A.D. 307, or else to the smaller area that remained in Persian hands after the second partition, in 591. At the time of Ardashir, Armenia was an independent kingdom ruled by the Arsacids. It became the appanage of the candidate to the Sasanian throne in the last quarter of the third century (see below and Ch. 4), but even if this comparatively brief period of Persian rule is meant, the reference to Persarmenia still cannot be contemporary with Ardashir I and must be a later interpolation.

The word order of the title is 'Armenia basileus' (see Thomson, XIII, 6, 168). The element 'manly' is attested, with[--]...

The element 'manly' is attested, with...

In the following Ch. we shall have occasion to discuss the contents of a Gk. inscription found at the site presumed to be Tigranakert, which was probably carved there at the order of Smbath II, who besieged and captured the city, ca. A.D. 363. Movas's Xorenanc composed a short address of the Persian monarch to the besieged citizenry, probably on the model of pseudo-Callisthenes (see Thomson, MX, 282 n. 5), which may be cited for its interesting wording, for it begins: *Mazdeanc Kaj Sapuh ark* 'ayic ark 'ay, Tigranakert...
In Manichean Sogdian texts, the Friend of Light is called *nr(y)znx yazd* (the god Nairy6.sqha-I) (ABM, 40-1) & n. 1). Thus, it is seen that the Parthians and Sogdians identified the messenger-god also as a divinity of light, for Mithra was the yazata of fire and the Sun (see Ch. 8). The Commagenians also perceived a linkage of Helios and Hermes (see M. Boyce, 'On Mithra in the Manichaean pantheon,' in A Locust's Leg, Studies in honour of S. H. Taqizadeh, London, 1962, 47-8), and the Arms. regarded Tir, it seems, as both a messenger of the gods and a solar divinity (see Ch. 9). In Arm., the very frequent use of the name Nerses indicates the ancient popularity of a yazata whose cult is otherwise not attested in Arm., where it may have been overshadowed by that of Tir, even as in Persian Zoroastrianism the cult of Sraosa, MP. ~r6, appears to have eclipsed that of Nairy6.sqha-I.
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At the close of the Artaxiad monarchy, the Armenian nation found itself at the meeting point of the two great empires of Parthia and Rome. But the conflict between the two empires seems not to have affected Armenian religious affairs; Rome did not seek to turn the Armenians from their Iranised religion, and even acquiesced in the establishment of a branch of the Arsacid house in Armenia, provided candidates to the throne upheld Roman policies. Parthia, whilst regarding Armenia as the second kingdom of its empire, made no attempt to deprive the naxarars of their traditional domains and powers, nor did they apparently seek to impose upon the Armenians any religious belief or institution which the latter did not readily accept.

There emerged upon this scene, however, the powerful message of Christianity, which was to transform the Roman Empire and wrench Armenia from the religious orbit of Iran forever. For all the brilliant and unique power of the person of Christ himself, Christianity came to be an ingenious marriage of Roman organisational structure with an other-worldly teaching, of Platonic trans-national thought with the Jewish concept of a chosen people. Christianity offered more than initiation into a mystery; the Christian became a citizen of a nation chosen by God—in later centuries the Church would uphold the structure of Roman society when the Imperial administration faltered. The Christians offered not only the solace of an attainable wisdom which transcended history and released the adept from it, but introduced the idea—common to Judaism and Zoroastrianism alike—of God working in history, towards a desired end. There was a constant flow of converts to Judaism for several centuries before and after the birth of Christianity, mainly in Rome and Asia Minor, but conversion to Christianity became a flood as teachers of the new faith gradually stripped their cult of the concept of Hebrew exclusivism and of the requirements of Mosaic law governing diet, circumcision, and similar matters. This divorce from normative Judaism occurred over several centuries, and at first it
was in Jewish communities that Christianity took root and began to spread; the process was quickened by the growth of the Diaspora after the Persian revolts of A.D. 70 and 132. In Apostolic times, Christian communities seem to have been concentrated in the Roman provinces of Asia Minor and Syria, to the immediate west and south of Armenia, and the Apostles Thaddeus and Bartholomew are reputed to have preached the Gospel in Armenia itself, perhaps in the large Jewish communities of Tigranakert, Artaxet, and other trading cities. Rome, plagued by barbarian invasion and internal political upheaval, was naturally inclined to seek stability and order by embracing the very Church it had brutally persecuted, and Armenia, too, would become a Christian state at about the same time (and perhaps before the Edict of Milan, thus becoming the first Christian state).

In Iran, the Parthian Arsacid house was rent by internal conflict. Bloody battles over the succession to the throne in the first-third centuries weakened the country by dividing it into warring factions at the same time that Rome was pressing unrelentingly at its populous western territories and attempting to foment anti-Persian feeling amongst the Hellenised and other non-Iranian populations of the large cities of Mesopotamia, the administrative centre of the kingdom. In the second decade of the third century, one of the contestants for the throne, Vologases V, secured the support of the Roman emperor Caracalla against his brother, Artabanus V, who seems to have been aided in turn by the Armenian Arsacids and the bulk of the Iranian nobility. At this moment of civil discord, the local ruler of Fars (Gk. Persis), Ardešir I, rebelled and overthrew the Arsacid dynasty, which had reigned in Iran nearly five hundred years. Fars was a semi-independent domain of the Parthian Empire, enjoying the right to mint silver coins; the province was administered by several kings; numismatic evidence indicates that they were pious Zoroastrians. The new Sasanian dynasty embarked upon a campaign to subjugate the various peoples of the Parthian Empire, as well as those lands once ruled by their Achaemenian forebears, to a centralised monarchy. This policy went hand in hand with a policy of organizing the Zoroastrian religion under a parallel administration closely tied to that of the state. These acts were violently opposed by the Armenians, as well as others in the Parthian Empire, whose cherished image-shrines and fire-temples, staffed by priests of local noble families, were placed in immediate peril. In the mid-third century, Armenia was invaded by the Sasanians and made an appanage of the Empire, much as it had been under the Parthians, although it remains to be demonstrated conclusively whether the country was conquered during or after the reign of Ardešir I. Less than a century after the fall of the Iranian Arsacids, the Armenian Arsacids were converted to Christianity.

The new faith was to serve as a rallying point against the encroachments of the Sasanian state and church, from the restoration of the Arsacid house in the late third century after a brief period of Sasanian hegemony, until the end of the dynasty in 428. Thereafter, the Church remained as an important unifying factor in Armenian national life, against Byzantine Greek and Persian alike. The Battle of Avarayr in 451, in which the Christian forces of Vardan Mamikonian resisted unto death the superior armies of Yazdagird II and his Arm. mazār allies, who had sought unsuccessfully to turn the Armenians back to Zoroastrianism, became quickly enshrined in the Armenian imagination as a second Maccabean revolt, emblematic of zeal for the Good Religion as the guiding faith in that land, although isolated followers of the faith seem to have held out down to the early twentieth century.

We are informed by Tacitus that the Parthian Arsacid king Artabanus III (ca. A.D. 16) wished to re-establish the ancient borders of the Achaemenian Empire, and crowned his son Arsaces king of Armenia at the death of Artaxias, whose brief reign was discussed in the previous chapter. The Romans, anxious to forestall Parthian expansion, made allies of the Iberian king, Pharasmanes, whose brother, Mithradates, was installed on the Armenian throne during a struggle for the succession in Parthia between Artabanus and Tiridates III, the latter receiving Roman support. Ca. 52, Vologases (Ph. Va laxus) came to power in Parthia and determined to place his brother Tiridates on the throne of Armenia, 'which his ancestors had ruled' (Tacitus, Anales, XII.52). Rome, with her Iberian allies, repulsed the Parthians during several campaigns over a period of ten years, but in 66 the Emperor Nero finally crowned Tiridates king of Armenia in a notable ceremony at Rome.
Vologases I may have been the king who first portrayed fire-altars on Parthian coins and who ordered the compilation and redaction of the Avesta, but there were two other kings of the same name before A.D. 192. It is noteworthy that the Parthian monarch believed his house had a hereditary right to Armenia, however, and that he pursued his policy of conquest with singleness of purpose; perhaps the religious prestige and political success of Vologases combined to produce the Arm. historical anachronism whereby one Vakarāzak was held to be the first Arsacid king of Armenia, and younger brother of the eponymous king Arāz of Parthia himself, ca. 250 B.C. 8 In 72, the Caucasian tribes of the Alans invaded the new kingdom of Tiridates I, probably with the support of the Tiberian king Pharasmanes I, an ally of Rome. The Roman emperor Vespasian (69-79), who during his reign increased from four to seven the number of legions on his eastern frontiers, 9 annexed the Orontid kingdom of Commagene in the same year. 10

It seems that Tiridates was succeeded by Sanatruk, but the dates of his reign have been disputed. The Parthian royal name Sanatruk is attested several times in various lands which came under Arsacid rule around the time of Christ. 11 According to Armenian tradition, the Apostles Thaddaeus and Bartholomew arrived in Armenia during the reign of this king; 12 such a legend is of obvious value as evidence to support the claim of the Armenian Church to autocephalous status as an Apostolic foundation. The structure and custom of Arsacid society in Armenia required a second founder, however, from a native and princely house, in the person of St Gregory the Illuminator; in later literature, artificial links between the two traditions were to be forged. The Apostolic tradition itself bears suspicious resemblance to the mission of Thaddaeus to cure king Abgar Ukana of Edessa (cf. the cure attributed to St Bartholomew noted above, in an Arm. tradition of Abbāk); this Syriac tale is probably a fiction modelled upon the historical conversion ca. A.D. 36 of king乙sa of Adiabene to Judaism. 13 It seems, however, that Abgar IX of Edessa did embrace Christianity late in the second century; the legend attributing the conversion to his predecessor, Abgar V, would, like the Arm. tradition, endow the Church at Edessa with Apostolic foundations. It has been suggested that the fate of the third-century Arm. Sanatruk (mentioned in Classical sources) was interwoven with that of Abgar IX in reality; this facilitated the chronological shift to the time of Christ in the Arm. Apostolic tradition. 14 There is attested from the region of Sophene an Arm. bishop of the mid-third century named Merusana, apparently a native Arm. of the princely Arcruni family; this indicates that Christianity had come to Armenia around the time of Abgar IX, from the Syrian communities contiguous to Sophene. 15 The Arsacids suppressed this tradition of a pre-Gregorian church in the country. According to Pseudo-Recens (IV.24), Sanatruk was interred in a tomb of stone at Ani, the centre of the cult of Aramazd and royal necropoli of the Arm. Arsacids; 16 in the mid-fourth century, the traitor Merusana Arcruni led the Sasanian Šāhuhr II to the place. The latter ransacked the tombs and kidnapped and held for ransom the bones of the Arm. kings, but was unable to break into the strong sepulchre of Sanatruk. It is noteworthy that the Roman emperor Caracalla had behaved similarly ca. 216 when at Arbela he broke into the Parthian royal tombs there. 17 Like the Achaemenids before them, the Parthian and Arm. Arsacids are seen to have practiced entombment and burial, presumably with appropriate precautions to prevent the pollution of the sacred earth of the Zoroastrian yazata Spēnta Armaiti by corpse-matter.

The dethronement of one Tiridates, king of Arm., is recorded ca. 109-110. It is doubtful whether Tiridates I is meant; the coup was accomplished by the Pth. Pacorus II, who installed his son Axidares on the Arm. throne. It is possible that the deposed king was Sanatruk, but the chronology cannot be established with certainty. It has been suggested that this Axidares, Arm. Azadār, is to be connected with the wicked Šidar of Arm. legend, but this seems most unlikely. 18 Axidares reigned three years; in 113, the successor of Pacorus II, Osroes, depose the king of Armenia and enthroned the brother of the latter, Parthamasiris, without, however, consulting Trajan (98-117). In 114, Trajan advanced upon Armenia, and had Parthamasiris treacherously murdered at Elegeia, where he had been lured to an interview. 19 Axidares was restored by the Romans to the throne, and Trajan continued his campaign against the Pths. in Syria and Mesopotamia, but the native population revolted—Trajan was unable to capture Hatra—and the Romans were forced to withdraw.
Parthamaspates, crowned by Trajan at Ctesiphon ca. 116-7, ruled but a year, and at the same time Vologases (Arm. Vakar), son of Sanatruck, reconquered Armenia and ruled until 140-143, with the consent of Hadrian (117-38). The new king founded a city in the plain of Ararat, Vakarapat ('built by Vakar'), called in Gk. Kainopolis ('the New City'). The city became the administrative capital of Armenia, and was in close proximity to Artašat and to the holy city of Bagavan; there may have been temples at Vakarapat, for stone foundations in Hellenistic style of an earlier building have been found beneath the great church of St Hripsime in the city, and it is hypothesised that the shrine of a pagan goddess had stood on the site. The town is now called Ejmakin 'the Only-Begotten (of God) Descended', after a vision in which St Gregory is said to have beheld Christ descending and ordering him to found a church at the spot. Vakar resisted successfully a second Alan incursion into Armenia in 134, which was probably encouraged by the Iberian Pharasmanes II, an ally of Rome. It may be assumed that the Romans had consented to the coronation of the Arsacid simply because they could not do otherwise, but upon his death in 140-143 they installed Sohaemus, a member of the royal house of Reesa (modern Rusa), Syria related to the Orontid line of Commagene. Sohaemus, a member of the Roman Senate, was intolerable to the Parthians, and was deposed in 161.

The Parthian king Vologases III (148-92) installed his son Pacorus on the throne of Armenia, but the latter was deposed scarcely three years later by the invading Romans, who restored the crown to Sohaemus. Pacorus appears to have been taken as a hostage to Rome, for he dedicated there a funerary altar to his brother Mithradates, calling him himself Amelios Pakoros Basileus Megalis Armeniaca and invoking 'the gods beneath the earth'. This may be no more than a formal invocation of Greco-Roman divinities; it certainly does not sound Zoroastrian. (But see the discussion of šahapat gerezmanc 'ruler of the tombs' in Ch. 10.) Sohaemus died in 166, and the Romans took advantage of internal troubles at Rome to enthroned Vakar II (168-98).

At Garni, where Tiridates I had built a temple and left an inscription in Gk. (see Ch. 8), there has been found also an inscription in Aramaic. The text reads: (1) ... (2) MLK RS ZY 'HΜΥΝΩ (1) BΑH ZY WLGs (4) MLK; it is translated: '(2) Great King of Armenia (3) son of Vologases (4) the king.' A. Perikhanian, who published the inscription, ascribes it tentatively to the Arm. king Xosrov I, son of Vakar II; the former reigned to 216 and was succeeded by his son, Trdat II. The script resembles that of the Armazi bilingual inscription and of other Aramaic inscriptions from Georgia of the first-third centuries, or of inscriptions from northern Mesopotamia, but the style varies considerably from that of the Artaxiad boundary steles, which are closer to the chancellory Aramaic script of the Achaemenians. It is curious, too, that the spelling of the name of the king's royal father, WLGs, corresponds more closely to the Gk. rendering of the Pth. name than to the Ir. form preserved in the Arm. language, Vakar; the transcription of the name of Artaxias (Arm. Artašēs) in the Artaxiad Aramaic inscriptions is often similarly Hellenised to a form of Artaxerxes. This case may indicate the continuity of a Greek scribal tradition in Armenia parallel to an Iranian oral tradition reflected in the pronunciation of the same names in Armenian.

Vakar II steered a cautious policy of friendship with Septimius Severus (193-211), who invaded Armenia and northern Mesopotamia in 194-5 and was welcomed by the Arsacid monarch in the plain of Xarberd with gifts. Like his predecessors, however, Vakar II died at the hands of the northern barbarians, in 198. His son, we are told by Xorenaco, led a victorious campaign of retribution and arjan hastakē hēlēnmac 'created a monument in Greek script' (II.65) to commemorate his victory. The same Xosrov I appears to have accompanied Severus to Alexandria, ca. 202, and at Thebes left a Greek inscription: Khosroes Armenios χατα θεον την Αρμένθον, he beheld and was astonished.

In 211, Caracalla became emperor. The Parthian empire at this time was rent by internal conflict. Vologases V, virtually a puppet of Rome, was opposed by Artabanus V, his own brother, and the Arm. probably supported the latter. When Ardašir the Persian, son of Pāpak and grandson of Sēsān, came to the throne, Armenia was a kingdom faithful to the Arsacid line and implacably opposed to the upstart from Pārs: in the first-second century, two Arm. kings were Great Kings of Parthia, five were sons of Great Kings, one was a nephew and another a...
The naxarars, who enjoyed semi-autonomous rule in their domains, occupied hereditary posts in the service of the Arsacid king; respect for his position ensured the maintenance of their own, and rebellions by individual naxarars were crushed ruthlessly, with the slaughter of whole families and the re-apportionment of land amongst those who had loyally fought for the king. The terms 'king' and 'Arsacid' were to be regarded by Arm. writers of the fifth century and later as synonymous; none but an Arsacid could wear the crown, nor could the sins of an Arsacid deprive him of it. The Arsacid king was the bnak term ašxariš 'the natural lord of this country' (P²O III.11).

In religious affairs as in political matters, Armenia was completely integrated into Parthian Iran. The vast majority of the Iranian loan-words in Armenian, which comprise most of the vocabulary of the language, are from Northwest Middle Iranian dialects, that is, from the speech of the Parthians and Atropatensians of the Arsacid period. Nearly all the names of the gods of pre-Christian Armenia are Pth. forms, as are nearly all the terms associated with religious belief, ritual and institutions. In cases where both Parthian and Middle Persian (Sasanian) forms of the same word are attested in Armenian, it is the Parthian word, in almost all cases, which has become part of common Arm. usage. There is little discontinuity in the transition from Artaxiad to Parthian rule; instances of close ties between the two houses are seen in the first century B.C., and, indeed, Arm. historians ascribe to the 'Arsacids' the deeds of the Artaxiads and of the Orontids before them, in a telescoped narrative full of Iranian epic topos. The constant Roman incursions into Armenia, and their interference in political life in the country, never were intended to change the religious or cultural orientation of Armenia, nor did Armenian alliances with Rome ever touch such matters; as was seen, the Parnthan Arsacids themselves did not hesitate to form such alliances in the course of their internecine feuds. It does seem that Roman soldiers brought their own gods with them.

All the temples of the yazatas to be discussed in the following chapters existed throughout the Arsacid period, and most had been built before it. Yet, by contrast with the Artaxiads, there is a striking absence of material evidence, perhaps attributable more to the changing political fortunes of the land than to a paucity of cultural activity, for the Armenian writers of the fifth century drew upon a rich tradition of oral literature, including lyric poetry and music. Not a single coin minted by the Armenian Arsacids, from Tiridates I to the end of the dynasty in 428, has been found, in stark contrast to the abundant numismatic evidence of the Artaxiads discussed in the preceding chapter. It is likely that the Arsacids in Armenia did not rely upon a monetary economy throughout most of the country. In trading cities, the coinage of Parthian and the Roman Empire appears to have been adequate. Despite the severe conditions of foreign invasion and frequent political instability, the Arsacids became firmly established in a country which welcomed them as its own.

In the third century, Armenia became the scene of the confrontation of two philosophies and ways of life which threatened to change its very nature as neither Zoroastrian Parthia nor pagan Rome had ever done. In ca. 226, Ardashir defeated his Pth. overlords and set about a radical reformation of Iranian life. Throne and altar had never been entirely separate under Arsacid rule--Tiridates I of Armenia impressed the Romans as both monarch and Magus--but Ardashir transformed the Zoroastrian Church into a militant, highly centralised bureaucracy at the service of a similarly centralised state. In Armenia, the Vahunis were the hereditary priests of Vahagn, and the royal family presided, as it seems, over the cult of the father of the gods, Aramazd. The priesthood seems not to have been concentrated in a single caste or rigidly hierarchical structure, despite the kパーティュ 'high-priesthood' of the royal family. St Gregory immediately sought to enlist the sons of the kパーティュ as candidates for the Christian priesthood, and the provisions of the treaty of Nuarsak (see below), which prohibited training of Armenians as Magi, indicates that a kind of tug-of-war existed between the two faiths, in which the Zoroastrians were not without success. As well be seen, the Christians themselves adopted elements of Sasanian hierarchical structure, such as it had threatened the pre-Christian order. Local cults were subordinated to the state religious hierarchy, and non-Zoroastrian religious minorities were subjected to persecution.
Various teachings came to Armenia from the south and west also. Large communities of Jews had resided in the cities of the country since the time of Tigran II's conquests in the first century B.C., and some Jews must have been early converts to Christianity, as elsewhere in Asia Minor, assisting the spread of the new religion. For many Christians must also have fled eastwards under the pressure of increasingly severe persecution by Rome. As was seen, Christians also came to Armenia from Syria, to the south. In the first century, the pagan religious leader Apollonius of Tyana visited Armenia; early in the third century, the Edesian Christian heresiarch Bardaišan fled to Armenia to escape persecution under Caracalla, and wrote a History of Armenia during his stay. In the third century, Manichaeism spread to Armenia as well. Later, Mazakites and Huramīya fled to Armenia. Some of the various teachings noted above, Christianity alone would pursue a militant policy comparable to that of the Sasanians, and, indeed, force another wave of refugees to flee to the East: the Monophysites, branded as heretics, whose learning assisted the development of the Hellenophilic school in Arm. literature, and the pagan philosophers, who came to Iran when Justinian ordered their school at Athens closed in 529. The latter, unlike settlers in Armenia, returned West from alien, 'barbaric' Persia as soon as they could, although their knowledge and services were welcomed there (recalling perhaps the experience of some Greek doctors at the Achaemenian court).

The events preceding the establishment of Christianity by St Gregory the Illuminator are linked closely to the campaigns of the Sasanians and their militant Zoroastrian church. In 244, the Roman emperor Gordian was killed in battle by Sābuhr I (241-72); the former's successor, Philip the Arab (244-9), signed a peace treaty with the Sasanians in 245, ceding Armenia to them. It is unlikely that Iran had actually seized the country yet, for Sābuhr attacked the Arm. Arsacid king Trdat II, in 252-3; the defeat of Valerian by Iran in 260 strengthened the Persian position in Armenia further. In the Arm. sources, Trdat II is referred to as Xosrov, and the defeat of Armenia is ascribed to treachery: 'Xosrov' was murdered by one 'Anak', of the princely Surēn Pahlav family, acting as a Persian agent. Kāšē recalls a tradition that 'Xosrov' was murdered by his brothers, and it has been suggested that 'Anak' was one of them. Although Bailey (written communication) suggests that the name Anak may mean something like 'successful', with base nak- 'attain' and preverb *ā- in Iranian (we note that the name 'nādxwty 'daughter of *Anak' is found on a Sasanian seal), it is likely that the name was understood by the chronicler as Pth. anāk 'evil' (cf. Burdār and Sophia, and the possible explanation of Vardan also as an epithet). The implication of the legend is that Armenia could not have been defeated on the battlefield. The Armenian nobles, according to Agathangelos and later historians, caught 'Anak', murdered him, and then exterminated his family, except for one son, who was spirited off to Caesarea in Cappadocia by a noble Persian named 'Burdār' (i.e., burdār, 'carrier') and his wife 'Sophia' (i.e., Wāsera). The details concerning 'Burdār' and 'Sophia' are supplied by Movsēs Xorenac'ī, and probably represent a further development of the myth. The son of the murdered 'Xosrov' was saved similarly, we are told, and spirited off by his dawā'k 'nurse', the naxarār Artawazd Mandakuni, to Rome. The son of the murderer was to return to Armenia as Gregory, the Christian who would convert Tiridates, son of the murdered king, to the new faith. In both cases, a baby destined for greatness is shielded from violence by being rescued, taken away, and raised in obscurity until the day of destiny arrives; one recalls the account by Herodotus of the early childhood of the first Achaemenian king, Cyrus, or the derivative and late legend of the escape of Ardašīr, a young man of humble origins, from the court of Ardawān, in the Kārmānag I Ardašīr I Pāpakān. A version of this Wandsage is found appended to the beginning of the Armenian Agathangelos, and in earlier Armenian tradition, also, legends of escape from the massacre of a clan are often found: the escape of Artawazd from the general slaughter by Eruand of the sons of Sanatrak (MX II.37); or that of Xesā, son of the bēdēx Bakur, after the family of the latter are put to the sword for their insurrection against the Arsacid king of Armenia in the fourth century (PUB III.9).

There seems little doubt that the missionary activities in Armenia ascribed by Xorenac'ī to Ardašīr: the establishment of ormzadakan and viراماكن fires and the destruction of image-shrines were in fact undertaken by Sābuhr I, his son. In a letter ascribed to Gordian III...
(ca. 242), the Roman emperor addresses the Senate, declaring: 'We freed the necks of the Antiochians from the yoke of the [kings] of the Persians and the Persian laws.'\textsuperscript{49} Persian law at this period was inseparable from obedience to the customs of Zoroastrianism. In describing the campaign of Sābuhr I against the Romans in Syria and Asia Minor in 260, the high-priest Kirdēr mentions Armenia amongst the countries where Magi and sacred fires were found; he notes in the following passage that Magi who were ahlāmpāb 'heretics' were punished and set straight. The other countries mentioned in the list are Syria, Cilicia (with Tarsus), Cappadocia (with Cæsarea), Galatia, *Iberia (wlvć'n) and Balasagān as far as the Daryal Pass (Alānān der, Arm. dūr Alanac\textsuperscript{5}). Kirdēr devoted his attentions both to foreign religions, including Christians, whom he persecuted, and to Zoroastrians whose usages were not unacceptable to the Sasanian church. This probably brought him into conflict with most classes and confessions of third-century Arm. society.\textsuperscript{50}

The Persians were not content merely to impose their laws upon the Arm.; in ca. 252, Sābuhr I installed his son, Ormāz-Ārdešīr, on the throne as Great King of Armenia,\textsuperscript{51} undoubtedly hoping to establish a pattern of relationship and succession in the country similar to that which had existed under the Parthians. Ormāz-Ārdešīr succeeded to the throne of the King of Kings upon the death of his father, ca. 273, and in 279-80, his brother Narseh assumed the throne of Armenia. The latter ruled in Armenia until 293, when he himself became King of Kings. It is suggested by Toumanoff that Arsacid rule was restored to Roman-controlled areas of Armenia ca. 280 under Xosrov II, son of Trdat II. In ca. 287, he was murdered by his brothers; this event may have served as the basis for the anachronistic legend of Gregory discussed above. Then, Tiridates, son of Xosrov II, escaped to Rome, and returned to Armenia eleven years later, under Roman auspices. The murder of Xosrov occurred in the fourth year of the reign of Diocletian (284-305), according to the Arm. historian Sebōs (seventh century); Tiridates became king in the fifteenth year of Diocletian, and Constantine was crowned emperor in the ninth year of Tiridates.\textsuperscript{52} According to the chronology of Sebōs, Tiridates would have come to power in 298, and St Gregory the Illuminator would have been consecrated a bishop at Cæsarea in 314, i.e., in the seventeenth year of his reign. In his inscription at Paikuli, Narseh refers to one Trdat, king of Armenia. Since the inscription was made in 293-4, it cannot refer to a Tiridates who was not yet king. Toumanoff therefore suggests that Xosrov was killed by Tiridates III, his brother, the Anak of the legend, who was made king of Armenia by the Sasanians; Xosrov's son, Tiridates IV, escaped to Rome and returned to take the throne in 298.

The Iranians cannot have wanted Tiridates IV, but the balance of power had shifted by that time in favor of Rome: in 297, Galerius defeated Narseh and in the following year signed the Peace of Nisibis, according to which the Syrian and Arab marches of Armenia to the southwest were ceded to Rome.\textsuperscript{53} It is possible that Narseh was forced to accept the overthrow of Tiridates III in favor of the pro-Roman Tiridates IV because of the military reversals suffered by Iran; he may even have sought Roman support against his nephew, Varahrān III, whom he had deposed to become King of Kings, and towards this end had acquiesced in their demands concerning Armenia.

According to Agathangelos, Tiridates was proud of his Parthian ancestry, and offered sacrifices and prayer to the various yezatas of Zoroastrianism. He even claims to have visited Parthia itself, which he calls his ancestral homeland. (This was even then a fairly short journey, on major roads all the way.) Presumably he paid homage to the travails of Arsacid forebears at Nisa, and made a pilgrimage to Ādur Burzēn Mühr. Indeed, the earliest and most abundant literary evidence of the cults of the yezatas at the various shrines of the country comes from Agathangelos, and forms part of the account of the Conversion of Armenia. The date of the Conversion traditionally accepted by the Armenians is 301-3 A.D., i.e., six years before the edict of toleration of Christianity issued by Galerius and re-affirmed by the Edict of Milan of Constantine in 313; this would make Armenia the first Christian state in the world. In support of the early date, the testimony of Eusebius is cited that Maximianus in 311 fought the Armenians because they were Christian,\textsuperscript{54} but it is more likely that the Roman emperor fought the Christians in Armenia with the aid of the Arm. king himself. It would have been sheer folly for the latter to have accepted a religion severely condemned by the very empire that kept him in power.
According to Agathangelos, Tiridates (IV according to Toumanoff; III according to the chronologies proposed by others) imprisoned Gregory for fifteen years. If Gregory arrived in Armenia at about the same time as the Roman installation of Tiridates on the throne, he would have been released—and the king converted—ca. 314, after the Edict of Milan. 56

In Agathangelos, the very narrative of the conversion of the king is presented in Iranian epic terms: Tiridates, in punishment for his murder of Christian missionaries, is transformed by God into a boar (Arm. yares), the symbol of Verethraghna depicted on the Arsacid royal seal, and the animal of the royal hunt. His conversion at the hands of Gregory is the price of his cure. The general framework, and many of the details, of the Arm. legend of the Conversion, appear to be drawn in part from the Kuyanian epic narrative of the conversion of Vistasp and his court to Zoroastrianism. This epic was preserved by the Parthians, and elements are transmitted in various Zor. Phil. books. In Dēnkard 7, for example, the Iranian nobles were pēnanid 'Illuminated' in the Good Religion by Zarathustra. The Šah-nāme, also, speaks of the conversion of the nobles of the realm. In Armenia, St Gregory is the hūsanori 'Illuminator' of king and court; this seems to be a Zor. epithet. And we are told little about the common people, including Jewish-Christians, who must have played a major role in the Christianization of the country. Later, Xorenaçi gives his Bagratid patrons a Hebrew pedigree—but in the Davidic royal line. 57 But it may be assumed, myths aside, that official conversion to Christianity was an act of friendship towards Rome; Armenia had suffered greatly already from Sasanian invasion and persecution, and it may have been feared that the country would be absorbed entirely into Persia, were Zoroastrianism allowed to remain as a potential instrument of control by a foreign priestly hierarchy. Nor were the Sasanians in a position to counter effectively Gregory's coup d'etat. Šābuhr II (309-79) was still a boy, brought into power after a violent struggle within Iranian ruling circles, and there seems to have been no renewal of systematic persecution against the Christians of Iran itself until 339. 58

Not all the Armenian nobles and commoners accepted the new religion of Christianity with enthusiasm. The shrines of the yazatas were defended by main force, and armies fought over the temple complex of Aštišat. St. Gregory took immediate measures to assimilate the Church into the structure of naxarar and Arsacid society: patriarchs of the Church were buried at T'ordan, near the Arsacid necropolis of Ani, and the main centres of the faith were built on the sites of old holy places of the yazatas; major festivals of the Church were established to coincide with old Zoroastrian feasts, and particular saints seem to have corresponded closely in their character and functions to Zoroastrian yazatas. 59 Gregory was by tradition a naxarar, the son of Anak Suren Pahlav—and in Parthian society, the Suren family was second only to the Arsacid house itself.

The early hierarchy of the Armenian Church was drawn, not from the Judaeo-Christians, nor from the ranks of the humble and the outcast for whose sake Christ had come, but from the privileged class of the old order: Tywr hranar Trdat...bazmut év mena laykwyw acel yarwen dprut ēam, ev kargel i veray havatariq vardapets: afawel naxar pícagor k ymc-em ev znwmanus nón-ca i noyn zoxovel...ew znwa yerkus pašmael, somans yasori dprut ēam kargel, ev somans i Hellen 'Trdat commanded that a multitude of young boys be brought for education in the scribal art, and that trustworthy teachers be appointed over them particularly (he ordered) that the families of the k'urme of filthy deeds and their children be gathered, and that they be divided in two, some to study Syriac and some to study Greek' (Agath. 840). St. Gregory lived to see his son Aristakes attend the Council of Nicaea in 325, yet his other son and successor, Vrt'anes, was to face continued opposition from adherents of the old faith. It is noteworthy that the Arm. ecclesiastical hierarchy, being second to the monarchy, drew its centralised character from the Sasanian order as well as the Byzantine: an Arm. patriarch of the fourth century, St. Nersēs the Great, is described by P'awstos (IV.4) as jatagov amenyan arkoloc 'intercessor for all the deprived', a rough equivalent of the Sasanian MP. priestly epithet driyosan ğ ājagov 'intercessor for the poor'. 61-a

P'awstos reports (III.3) that the Queen of Kosrov Kotak (332-8), son of Tiridates IV, stirred up a mob to attack Vrt'anes as he was offering the Divine Liturgy at Aštišat, the centre of the fourth-century Church. Kosrov's successor, Tiram, murdered the righteous Patriarch Yusik, who had condemned his sinful and unjust way of life. P'awstos
says of the Armenians (III.13): Yeyn zmazanik zt'agworn iwranc
c'ar ari amzn' ev novin awrindav jewel skaan, ev novyns gorcel.
Zi i vahjyoc, yorme heti ari nok c'arnu k'ristonufc'ann, lok miss
ibrew zkrawns im marik'et'ean yanjins iwranc, ev oc' termund'inc
hawatcyoc' nkalan, ayl ibrew zmolorufc'imm im marik'et'ean i hurk.' Oc'
ev'c' ortp'as partu er, pituc'camb yusov kan hawatov, bacyc' missak
inc'c' changamsans sit'ins hellehn kan asori dprut'c'ec', orc's' sin hau
inc'ayn pok'v i sati. Iok orc' attak ov kan zejut'c'imm arwesin sin
ayl xuhakanc bazsuc'imm sarisk c'okovroc'c' naxaranac'c'me kaw
sinakanc'ec'a.m's'c' iwranc'ec' en apitans en anayguts evc' zbawseal
sin...degereal mu'c ensulls ay kruc't)c'imm en c'c'oti stec'v i hnut'v
het'c'anoac'c'ma coruac'c'ma, barbaros xmda'c' mta unelu. Ev
zirvrec'c' ergs araspelac'c' svipasanuc'c'ann sirec'c'alk v' p'oyt'c'
kructuc'c'ma, cv mnin hawatac'c'alk, cv i novy hanapagordealck...Ev
zic'v haut'c' cma pantasmu c naynut'c'imm pok'vuc'c'garoc'c' yzw
katarzin 'At that time [after the murder of Yusik] they made their king
the example of evil and by his example they began to appear, and to act
as well. For since earlier times, when they had taken the name of
Christianity, they only accepted it in their souls as some human reli-
gen but did not adopt it with fervent faith; (they accepted it) rather
as a confusion of humanity, and by compulsion. (They did not accept it)
as necessary, through knowledge, hope or faith, but only a few knew
the particulars of the Syrian and Greek writings; those competent in
the latter were few out of many. And those who were not privy to the
wisdom of art were the motley crowd of the peoples of the naxarars
of the peasantry...they occupied their minds only with useless and
profitless matters...they erred and spent (their powers) in mistaken
study and trivial thought of the antiquity of (their) heathen customs,
having barbarous and crude minds. They loved and studied with care the
songs of their legendary epics and believed in these and spent every
day with them...And they fulfilled the worship of the ancient gods in
the dark, as though performing the act of prostitution.62

Later in the fourth century, according to P'awatos, the naxarars
Meru'zhan Arcruni, whom he calls a kaxard 'witch' (V.43), and Vahan
Mamikonean, apetambealk c'c'iyutc' estucapastuc'tc'ec', en xanauctuc
Mazdezanc'c' alc'ec' al'ec' puc'tc'ec'; skaan aymu'hevet yerkyri Hayoc'.

awevel sekelc'ec, steva alawic'c' k'ristonulc' ec'amayn skoc'man
Hayoc', gawarac' gawarac' ew kokuc'ma kokuc'man. Ew nel'c'n zezum
sardik sor in buw arkan, t'oku zustucapastuc'tc'im ev i puc'tc'ec'm
dazm dalnc Mazdezanc'c' 'had rebelled against the covenant of the worship
of God and had accepted the godless cult of the Mazda-worshippers, which
they served. After that they began to destroy the churches in the land of
Armenia, the places of Christian worship in all the regions of Ar-
menia, province by province and region by region. And they persecuted
many men, whom they forced to renounce the worship of God and to turn
to the service of the Mazda-worshippers. ' This was done, of course, at
the direction of Sahur II, and represents the first of three major
campaigns by Iran to return the Arts. to Zoroastrianism, the other two
leading to the revolts of 451 and 571-2. On each occasion, the Sasanians
found supporters amongst the naxarars, who in 451 were almost
equally matched for and against Christianity. The Arm. sources present
the pro-Sasanian nobles as superstitious, wicked traitors; no one has
yet proposed a revisionist historical view of their motives.

P'awatos speaks of specific practices well known from the pre-
Christian period, as well. Meru'zhan consults magical dice: ijaner i
hmaws kaloc'tc'ec', sk'ec'c' hac'c'en'er; ev oc' gory nma yajoc'c'k
kaxardakanoc'c' yor yuysym 'he stooped to Chaldean spells and ques-
tioned dice, and there came not to him success in the witches' talisman
which he hoped in' (V. 43)—this practice recalls the talismans in the
story of Ara and Samiram. The Christian relatives of the dead Nu'zek
Mamikonean placed his body on a tower in the hope that he would be
resurrected by dog-like supernatural creatures which revive heroes
slain in battle; this belief, too, recalls the legend of Ara and
Samiram and is a survival of very ancient practices.63 Reverence for
dogs is noted by Yovhanns of Avujum, also. In the fifth century, many
Armenians returned to their pre-Christian ways during the campaign of
Yazdagird II; as we shall see presently, the Christian general Vardan
Mamikonean destroyed fire-temples in a score of Armenian cities, and at
least ten naxarars opposed him and fought alongside the Sasanian forces.
Their leader, Vaksh Sivni, encouraged Armenians to renounce Chris-
tianity by entertaining them with their epics, of which the fragment cited
by Movsés Xorenac'c' on the yazata Vahagn is presumably a part.64
Despite their nominal Christianity, the Arsacid kings of the fourth century are almost all condemned by the Church; Arzak II (345-68) and his son Pap (368-73) both seem to have been Arianising heretics, but not outright infidels. In Arm. literature, however, they are cast as villains or heroes in an Iranian context: Pap is described as having snakes which spring from his breast; the account of the death of Arzak II seems to have been cast as an epic using Iranian forms.

Arzak, who assisted Julian the Apostate (361-3) against Iran, was captured by Sabuhr II, Julian's successor Jovian (363-4) agreeing not to intervene in Armenia, provided Iran protected its neutrality. Arzak was invited to an interview in a tent with the King of Kings, who had had half the floor of the tent covered with soil brought from Armenia—the other half was Iranian soil. Sabuhr led Arzak around the tent as they talked, asking him whether Arzak would refrain from attacking Iran, if he were allowed to return home and regain the throne. When he stood on Iranian soil, P'awstos tells us (IV.54), Arzak agreed with deference to all the king's suggestions, but as soon as his feet touched the soil brought from his native land, he became haughty and angry and promised to raise a rebellion against Persia as soon as he arrived home. In various cultures, the earth is regarded as conferring strength or security. The giant Antaeus, whose mother is Gaea and whose father is Poseidon, is defeated only when his hands are in the air.68 The earth is permeated with Iranian names, vocabulary and themes, the Persian king Ahasuerus cannot revoke an order that the Jews be massacred—the king's order is law and irreversible as such—but issues a second order allowing the Jews to defend themselves. The visit of Drastamat and the encounter between Arzak and Sabuhr both are cast, it seems, in Iranian epic themes—of the various legends cited above about the power of the earth, the Iranian tale of the soil of Pars seems closest to the narrative of P'awstos. It is seen that the Armenians continued after the Conversion to weave73 epics of the kind that P'awstos condemns as survivals of the old religion.

During his campaigns in Armenia, Sabuhr desecrated the necropolis of the Arsacid kings and stole their bones; the Armenians ransomed them and re-interred them at Arzak. The episode is reminiscent of the behaviour of Caracalla at Arbela, described above.74 An inscription in Greek was found by C. F. Lehmann-Haupt in 1899 on the walls of the ruined town of Martyropolis/Ma'yarafqin which might have been made at the order of Sabuhr, or by Julian the Apostate, perhaps, for it refers to Tony thron basilea ton basileon 'the god, the King of Kings', a Persian title,75 and an invocation is made pronotal ton thron kai tēi tēi hēmeterai 'by the providence of the gods and by our Fortune'. It has been suggested that the Art. king Pap (368-73) was the author of the inscription, but it seems inconceivable that it could be the work of a monarch who was even nominally Christian.76

Arzak II's son, Pap, apparently pursued a pro-Iranian policy which disturbed Rome; he was murdered in a plot and an Arsacid named Varazdat was placed by Rome on the Arm. throne (374-8). A decade later, Rome and Iran re-established the balance of power in the region by
partitioning Greater Armenia between themselves. In the larger, eastern part, Persarmenia, the Arsacid kings continued to rule until 428. As was noted above, Christian teachings in Armenia were transmitted in Syriac and Greek, and were thus inaccessible to the bulk of the population, who continued to recite their epics and hymns of the old gods in Armenian. As we have seen, both Aramaic and Greek were used in pre-Christian Armenian inscriptions. Xorenac\textsuperscript{21} (II.48) mentions temple histories composed by Olympios, a priest at Ani, site of the shrine of Aramazd, and compares them to the books of the Persians and the epic songs (\textit{greek} \textit{vypasenac}--see n. 73, above) of the Armenians; according to Movsès, Bardašan consulted these histories and translated them into Syriac (II.66). Thomson demonstrated that Xorenac\textsuperscript{21} was citing in fact the works of various Greek and Syriac writers such as Josephus and Labuha whose works are known.\textsuperscript{77} It was seen that the legends of Gregory and Aršak follow Iranian modes of epic composition; however, in Ch. 2, Gk. inscriptions were cited from the Arm. Orontid cult centre of Armawir, so it is not improbable that a priest named Olympios, a Greek or an Arm. or Persian with a Gk. name, may have resided at another cult centre, Ani. Although Xorenac\textsuperscript{21}'s citations are sometimes forgeries designed to impress his patrons as examples of an ancestral literary tradition (to be contrasted with the illiteracy of the Arm. of his own time, which he scorns and laments), there is no reason to suppose that he did not hear of Olympios of Ani. It is recalled also that other antique historical works were composed in Armenia and are now lost: the \textit{Babylonica} of Iamblichus is one example. In Ch. 9, we shall examine the testimony of Agathangelos that there was a priestly scrip-torium at the temple of Tir, near Artašat. There is also preserved in the anonymous 'Primary History' at the beginning of the History of Sebšos a reference to inscriptions in Greek on a stele at the palace of Sanatrak in Mun on the Euphrates giving the dates of the Parthian and Armenian kings; the Syrian historian Mar Abas Katina is said to have consulted these.\textsuperscript{78}

In addition to the epigraphic evidence in Aramaic and Greek from Armenia which we actually possess, there is a brief but interesting notice of pre-Christian Armenian script in a Classical source. It was noted above that the charismatic pagan teacher Apollonius of Tyana came to Armenia. The biography of the philosopher, who died ca. A.D. 96-8, was completed by Philostratus ca. A.D. 220. According to Philostratus, Apollonius was accompanied on his journey to the East by an Assyrian of Nineveh named Dams, who boasted knowledge of the Armenian tongue, and of that of the Medes and the Persians (7.19). In Pamphylia, the travellers came upon a leopard with a golden collar on which there was written in Armenian letters 'King Arsaces to the Nysian God' (i.e., to Dionysos). Arsaces, Philostratus informs us, was king of Armenia at that time, and had dedicated the beast to Dionysos on account of its size. The leopard, a female, was tame, and had wandered down from the mountain in search of males.\textsuperscript{79} Presumably, Dams was able to distinguish between (spoken) Armenian and Persian, but it is likely that the engraving on the beast's torque was in the Aramaic language and script of the inscriptions discovered in this century.

During the reign of king Vramšapuh (388-414), a scribe of the royal court named Maštoc\textsuperscript{c} (361-410) was assigned the task of creating a script suitable for Armenian; the nature of the undertaking suggests that the Aramaic inscriptions, although they might contain individual Armenian names or common nouns, were still regarded as written in a foreign language. The need for Armenian Christian texts to counteract the influence of ancient orally recited epics is obvious, and must have impressed Maštoc\textsuperscript{c} with particular urgency, as he himself led a Christian mission to the Armenian province of Gökt. That region, according to the disciple and biographer of Maštoc\textsuperscript{c}, Korinn, had resisted Christianity, but Maštoc\textsuperscript{c} had learned that an Assyrian bishop named Daniel had discovered letters which had been \textit{vakc} \textit{sprut}\textsuperscript{c} \textit{sane}\textsuperscript{c} \textit{t} \textit{akalkc} \textit{ev} \textit{yavuc} \textit{calkc} \textit{dipeccan} \textit{awandeloc}, ev i satansyakan diyapai spasavorut\textsuperscript{c} enen i nhasandut\textsuperscript{c} ivn \textit{Kriostosi matuc}\textsuperscript{c} mn\textsuperscript{c} 'captured all from the traditions of their fathers, and from the demonolatrous service of Satan, and delivered them into submission to Christ.'\textsuperscript{80} Maštoc\textsuperscript{c} learned that an Assyrian bishop named Daniel had discovered letters which had been \textit{vakc} \textit{sprut}\textsuperscript{c} \textit{sane}\textsuperscript{c} \textit{t} \textit{akalkc} \textit{ev} \textit{yavuc} \textit{calkc} \textit{dipeccan} 'found buried and resurrected from other writing systems';\textsuperscript{81} Daniel's alphabet ('Arm. \textit{nisanagir cebetec} \textit{alphabetical symbols}') was found inadequate to express the sounds of the Armenian language, and Maštoc\textsuperscript{c} devised a new script, consulting scribes and scholars in the Syrian cities of Amida and Edessa; he then worked with a Greek calligrapher, Ruphanos, at Camosata.
The Armenian letters finally devised reflect the dual influence of the Northern Mesopotamian Aramaic and Greek scripts, the latter supplying the seven vowels and various diphthongs, the former service as a basis for the invention of letters to represent certain consonants, such as the affricates, for which no Greek equivalents existed. Many of the letters may have been borrowed also from the form of Aramaic used to write Middle Persian. Several mediaeval MSS. declare flatly that Mesrop invented only the seven vowels of the Arm. alphabet; Daniel invented all the 29 consonants. Mani had much earlier adapted the Estrangelo consonants to use in Iranian languages; and the Avestan script, with its sophisticated representation of vowels and semi-vowels, was probably conceived in the fourth century, at the same time the Northern Mesopotamian Aramaic and Greek scripts, the latter supplied a basis for the invention of letters to represent certain consonants, such as the affricates, for which no Greek equivalents existed. Many of the letters may have been borrowed also from the form of Aramaic used to write Middle Persian. Several mediaeval MSS. declare flatly that Mesrop invented only the seven vowels of the Arm. alphabet; Daniel invented all the 29 consonants. Mani had much earlier adapted the Estrangelo consonants to use in Iranian languages; and the Avestan script, with its sophisticated representation of vowels and semi-vowels, was probably conceived in the fourth century, at the same time the Sassanians were exerting pressure upon the Arm. to return to the Zor. fold. For all the hagiographical, nationalistic sentiments expressed by Koriwn himself in the Varkc MaStoci, the Arm. alphabet appears to be less a work of original genius than one element in a general pattern of the development of Near Eastern scripts in the Iranian world. The first work to be written in Arm. was a translation of the Biblical Book of Proverbs; the rest of the Bible was rendered into Arm. shortly thereafter, and Koriwn exulted: Yevnun zmavanske crameli ev c ankali aXoXeK Hayocc ampeymc skanceli linir: yorun yankarc urem avrômusoyo c Movas margarâkan dacevn, ev yafajacêm Pavion bovandak arik olakan gnovâm, handerj aXaxahacocoyc avetararnv Kriacoc, miangasym okeal haseal i jern ekuc c haXasarelccn hayabarbcKc hayeranaxawskc gtan 'At that time this country of Armenia became blessed and desirable, and infinitely wonderful, for suddenly then Moses, teacher of the Law with the ranks of the Prophets, and energetic Paul with all the army of the Apostles and the Gospel of Christ that gives life to the world, in an instant at the hands of the two colleagues became Armenian-speaking'. The vision of Koriwn is significant. Heretofore, the gods alone had spoken to the Armenians in their native tongue; now their message was drowned in the stridor of an army of foreign prophets who had stolen from the yazatas their language. Christianity had the crucial technical advantage of a written Awetaran over the spoken Avesta. The Zor. scriptures were systematically edited in writing in the Sasanian period, Pahlavi was widely used for commercial and administrative purposes in both Iran and Armenia, and late writers report that the long chants of the minstrels were recorded in carefully preserved manuscripts in Persia. Even so, the Zor. written tradition could not match Manischaean or Christian developments, and most Zoroastrian learning was, then as now, oral and conservative. The written Christian Bible was even more critical an advance over Armenian oral tradition than the Christian codex had been over the cumbersome pagan scroll in the Classical West scarcely two centuries earlier. The invention of the Arm. script, and the rapid labours of the Holy Translators of the fifth century, probably helped the Arm. to survive as a nation. Neighbouring Cappadocia had had its own dynasties, Zoroastrian faith, and Asianic language, much like Armenia, but it fell under Byzantine suzerainty. St. Basil of Caesarea is said to have remarked that he was glad Cappadocia was too crude a tongue to describe the more abstruse Greek heresies; he wrote in Greek. Cappadocian had no separate script, and it waned; the Cappadocians went the way of the Phrygians, whose language died in the Byzantine period. Had Armenia not been a part of the Iranian sphere, a factor which seems to have facilitated the development of a distinct script, it might well have been absorbed entirely into the Greek milieu.

Amongst the Biblical heroes who became suddenly Armenophones at the hands of MaStoci and his disciples were Mattathias and his sons. In the decisive battle against Sasanian Iran that was to erupt a decade after the death of MaStoci, the sparapet Vardan Mamikonian was to be shown to the nation through the powerful lens of Holy Writ as a latter-day Judas Maccabeus striking the impious attacker of the children of the New Covenant. In 428, Bahram V in one stroke dethroned both the Arm. king Artaâs V and the leader of the Church, Bishop Sahak PartcW ('the Parthian'). Ostenphon installed a marzpan 'governor' directly responsible to the King of Kings: Vasak, head of the marzerdom of Silnîc. A Nestorian Syrian named Bar Kišc took the place of Sahak—the Nestorian sect, which was to be anathematized at the Council of Ephesus in 431, was considered less of a potential threat than those Churches which maintained ties with the Orthodox hierarchy of the hostile Roman Empire. The Church in Armenia rejected Bar Kišc and his successor, Šmucl, and ratified the provisions of the Council of Ephesus,
but the naxars acquiesced in the overthrow of the Arsacid line, retaining their ancestral domains and military units.

The Sassanians under Yazdagird II (438-57) attempted again to impose Zoroastrianism on the Armenians, apparently as part of a general proselytising campaign which was undertaken once Yazdagird had defeated the nomadic Hephthalites on the northeastern frontier of the empire. This victory allowed the King of Kings to concentrate his attention on the western parts of the empire; the war had also provided an excuse to keep far from home the Armenian forces conscripted to serve, should military action be called for. The Prime Minister of the empire, Mihrnarseh, despatched to the Armenians a letter directing them to accept the deni maadon 'the religion of Mazda-worship', in which the basic tenets of the faith are outlined. Mihrnarseh's description is of the Zurvanite heresy, and in Ehlise's sixth-century text, some of its details derive from the description of Zurvanism refuted by Eznik of Koab in his Ehe Abandan ("Refutation of Sects", fifth century), and from tazar Peparpe. The letters and speeches in Ehlise's Veen Vardenay ev Hayoc Patresazmin ("On Varden and the Armenian War") are literary compositions in the manner of Maccabees and of Thucydides. Mihrnarseh's letter contains authentic Zoroastrian phrases, as does the decree of Yazdagird II (discussed in Ch. 15). Amongst these is the contention that those who do not accept Zoroastrianism are xul ev koyr 'deaf and blind' (presumably because its truth is intuitively obvious): this is a translation of Phl. kör ud karr 'blind and deaf', used in the Zend as a gloss of kav ud karr 'Kavi(s) and Karagan(s)'.

Ehlise reports also that the sperapet 'commander-in-chief' of the Armenians, Vardan Mamikonian, and the marpan Vasak Sivni were detained at Ctesiphon on their way home from the Hephthalite war and were forced to convert to Zoroastrianism. The king had accused them: skrak spananak ev aju rvech ev xmpersa i hot t'akelov zerks spananak, ev k'ripkar c'aKnelov oy' tayk sarabansay. You kill the fire, pollute the water, and kill the earth by burying the dead in the soil, and by not performing good deeds you give strength to Ahriman. The accusations are couched in Zoroastrian theological terms: to 'kill' a fire means to extinguish it; water is a sacred creation which must not be polluted, and corpses must be exposed or securely entombed.

Whilst the two leaders of the people were at Ctesiphon, Magi were sent to Armenia to enforce the observance of Zoroastrian rituals by the people. Vasak and Vardan returned to Armenia; the latter instantly repudi-ated his conversion, whilst the former took it seriously. The bishops of Armenia had roused the people to violent resistance against the Magi, and the latter, who had, apparently, expected to be welcomed, were ready to abandon their mission. Vasak, seeing that their Sassanian cult seemed foreign and undesirable to his countrymen, took the matter in hand: Sksaw ayyanetaw petrel zomans karsaw ev zomans ockakan banivk: xwamkin amenay ahek banivc sratc oxo aminr. Hanazaport afatac'oyc' zboqkas ta&cmin: ev yrkarer muqwo uraxute'can, mahelev zerkeynut'ivan gisernah yersg aarbcet'can ev i kak'avo ikct'can, k'icrc'rac'ac'amin oxanc omanoc skargs crusartakens ev yersg hot'anosakens. 'Then he began to deceive some with property and others with flattery. He disdained all the masses with frightful words. He daily made more bounteous the offerings to the temple, and lengthened the melodies of joy, whiling away the long nights in drunken songs and lewd dances, and for some he sweetened the musical scales and the heathen songs.

It is implicit from this passage that the ancient customs of the Arme. differed from those which the Magi now sought to impose upon them, but whether doctrinal differences between Arm. and Persian Zoroastrians still existed in 450, two centuries after the first iconoclastic campaigns of the Sassanians in Armenia, is not stated. There is an indication that regional zands 'interpretations' of the Avesta still existed, though; at a later point, Ehlise mentions that one Zoroastrian priest sent to Armenia was called Hasekden, i.e., '(Knower) of all the Religion' (Phl. baniw-kar), because he knew the Asparkeas, Bospayit, Pahlavik and Parskaden. These, Ehlise explains, are the five keok 'schools of Zoroastrianism, but there is also a sixth (he apparently includes haskaden in the first five) called Petmog. Benveniste explained Asparkeas as 'a treatise on penalties', from Olr. hemisphere and the Vasak Siwni were detained at Ctesiphon on their way home from the Hephthalite war and were forced to convert to Zoroastrianism. The king had accused them: skrak spananak ev aju rvech ev xmpersa i hot t'akelov zerks spananak, ev k'ripkar c'aKnelov oy' tayk sarabansay. You kill the fire, pollute the water, and kill the earth by burying the dead in the soil, and by not performing good deeds you give strength to Ahriman. The accusations are couched in Zoroastrian theological terms: to 'kill' a fire means to extinguish it; water is a sacred creation which must not be polluted, and corpses must be exposed or securely entombed.

Whilst the two leaders of the people were at Ctesiphon, Magi were sent to Armenia to enforce the observance of Zoroastrian rituals by the people. Vasak and Vardan returned to Armenia; the latter instantly repudi-ated his conversion, whilst the former took it seriously. The bishops of Armenia had roused the people to violent resistance against the Magi, and the latter, who had, apparently, expected to be welcomed, were ready to abandon their mission. Vasak, seeing that their Sassanian cult seemed foreign and undesirable to his countrymen, took the matter in hand: Sksaw ayyanetaw petrel zomans karsaw ev zomans ockakan banivk: xwamkin amenay ahek banivc sratc oxo aminr. Hanazaport afatac'oyc' zboqkas ta&cmin: ev yrkarer muqwo uraxute'can, mahelev zerkeynut'ivan gisernah yersg aarbcet'can ev i kak'avo ikct'can, k'icrc'rac'ac'amin oxanc omanoc skargs crusartakens ev yersg hot'anosakens. 'Then he began to deceive some with property and others with flattery. He disdained all the masses with frightful words. He daily made more bounteous the offerings to the temple, and lengthened the melodies of joy, whiling away the long nights in drunken songs and lewd dances, and for some he sweetened the musical scales and the heathen songs.

It is implicit from this passage that the ancient customs of the Arme. differed from those which the Magi now sought to impose upon them, but whether doctrinal differences between Arm. and Persian Zoroastrians still existed in 450, two centuries after the first iconoclastic campaigns of the Sassanians in Armenia, is not stated. There is an indication that regional zands 'interpretations' of the Avesta still existed, though; at a later point, Ehlise mentions that one Zoroastrian priest sent to Armenia was called Hasekden, i.e., '(Knower) of all the Religion' (Phl. baniw-kar), because he knew the Asparkeas, Bospayit, Pahlavik and Parskaden. These, Ehlise explains, are the five keok 'schools of Zoroastrianism, but there is also a sixth (he apparently includes haskaden in the first five) called Petmog. Benveniste explained Asparkeas as 'a treatise on penalties', from Olr. hemisphere and the Vasak Siwni were detained at Ctesiphon on their way home from the Hephthalite war and were forced to convert to Zoroastrianism. The king had accused them: skrak spananak ev aju rvech ev xmpersa i hot t'akelov zerks spananak, ev k'ripkar c'aKnelov oy' tayk sarabansay. You kill the fire, pollute the water, and kill the earth by burying the dead in the soil, and by not performing good deeds you give strength to Ahriman. The accusations are couched in Zoroastrian theological terms: to 'kill' a fire means to extinguish it; water is a sacred creation which must not be polluted, and corpses must be exposed or securely entombed.
Zaehner suggested that the Pahlavik and Parskaden were the 'Parthian and Persian religions', and notes that in the Manichaean texts from Turfan, the supreme deity is called Zurvan in Persian, but not in Parthian. We have noted the frequent use of bag- in Armenian toponyma, but the word, in the form bay, is used with frequency also in Sasanian Middle Persian. Zurvanism, however, is treated as distinctly Persian by Eranik, who distinguishes it from Arm. 'heathen' beliefs, so the distinction drawn by Zaehner may indeed be valid.

Soon after Vasak began his campaign of luring the Arm. back to their old cults, Vardan and other naxarars loyal to Christianity threatened to kill him. He made a show of repentance, and participated in a plan to mount a three-pronged attack on the Persians in Armenia. The Arm. forces surprised the Persians in a score of cities and fortresses, and in all of them avrēn kizu in stune pāstamin krēkē 'burned and incinerated the houses of the worship of fire'. This is obvious irony, like the burning of the Persian warshan in his own sacred fire at Duin in 571. Vasak, who commanded the central armies, suddenly turned to the Persian side, but Vardan quickly counter-attacked; Vasak and his allies amongst the naxarars fled to the safety of his domain of Siwnik at the end of the summer of 450. In May, 451, the Sasanian forces under general Mōkān Niwasalavur attacked Armenia in force. On 26 May, the two sides clashed on the plain of Avararr, on the banks of the river Tāzut, to the west of modern Mākā. The Armenian forces under Vardan were defeated, and Vardan himself was killed, but it was a Pyrrhic victory; rebellions erupted throughout Armenia against Persia, and Yazdagird II abandoned his plan to return Armenia to the faith.

Over the next few decades, the Sasanians renewed their campaign, but a successful guerrilla war led by the Mamikoneans naxarardom forced King Peroz to sign a treaty of religious tolerance with Vahan Mamikonean at Nuarsak, near Zoy, in 484. Armenia was recognized officially as a Christian land. According to the terms of the treaty signed by Vahan Mamikonean and Nīkōr Yānaspat (Duʾansp-īdār) (191-89): Ḭē mē yerēn nak ev araēn xindo ays karēvov ev pītani: etē e yazvēni ev sēnīk awēnēn mer i mez tōzukē, ev zey aym rōkē ni mog cē arēnēkē, ev umēkē yahēs mougēn cēn gah ev ūstīv cētāyēkē, ev akrēkarēn yaaşxēhēs Hayōcē i bacē tānīkē... 'And the first, foremost, most important and needful request of the three is this: that you leave with us the native law of our fatherland, that you make no Arm. man a magus, that you give no one throne or honor on account of being a magus, and that you remove the fire-temple from Armenia...’ It would seem, however, that practicing Zoroastrians remained in the country, and there was a fire-temple at Duin, recently excavated, which Vardan Mamikonean II destroyed (see Ch. 15).

The Armenians sought also to avoid Byzantine domination. The refusal of the Synkletes to grant aid to the beleaguered forces of Vardan in 451 had embittered Arm. opinion, and may have been one cause of the refusal of the Arm. Church to recognize the Christological definitions of the Council of Chalcedon convened in the same year—Arm. clerics had not been in attendance. In the summer of 451, Byzantine attention was probably focused upon events in the West, where the Huns were routed near Troyes; Armenia was not the priority of Byzantine foreign policy in that fateful year. Legislation in the Byzantine-held part of Armenia tended to break up the domains of the naxarars and to deprive them of their hereditary powers; such acts were regarded with profound suspicion by the nobility on the Iranian side of the border, and their support must have emboldened the Church further to dissociate itself from Byzantium. Eventually, the Arm. Church even accepted direction from the King of Kings. Such a policy was profitable also from the point of view of relations with the Sasanians, who wished to maintain good relations with the land they still regarded as the second kingdom of Iran, and, according to Stepānos Asōkē, Xusrō II Farvēz (591-628) ordered the Christians of the empire to follow the 'Armenian' faith. Christian Armenia still maintained close relations with Iran, down to the end of the Sasanian dynasty. It appears that some Armenians may have married Iranians, practiced Zoroastrianism, and resided in Iran in the Sasanian period. A fourth-century chalcedony seal, probably from Iran, is inscribed in Phl. 'Armēnty *Armēnt-xukt *daughter of (an) Armenia(n)—probably the name of the noblewoman who owned it. It depicts a woman, probably the goddess Anāhitā, who holds a trefoil. She dwarfs a turbaned man who faces her with one hand raised in salute; he may be a magus. As Christians often depicted Christian scenes or symbols on their seals in Sasanian Iran, it is likely the owner of this one was a
The Zoroastrian faith lived on in Armenia after the Battle of Avarayr and the Treaty of Nuarsak; instances of its survival will be seen in the following chapters. Even in the times of Justinian I (527-65), under whose intolerant rule Monophysites and philosophers fled the Byzantine Empire for the comparative safety of Iran, John of Ephesus still found 80,000 pagans to convert in Asia Minor, and Tabari claims that a treaty between Justinian and Xusro I stipulated that Zoroastrians in Byzantine dominions have fire-temples built by the Emperor for them. This would have included Byzantine-held Armenian lands, and one surmises that the restoration of confiscated or desecrated fire-temples is meant. When the Arabs entered Duin in the mid-seventh century, they were to find 'Magians' amongst the inhabitants; many, undoubtedly, were Persians, but others may have been Armenians, who, like the informants of Movsës Xorenac'i perhaps a century later still, whilst away the long nights with the songs of Vahan, Artašës, and Artavazd.

Notes - Chapter 4

1. S. T. Eremyan, ‘Hayastane’ ev vêrin Partc’ew Arşakunneri payk’arê Hroni dem,’ F-DH, 1977, 4, 59-72, suggests that the Arm. tradition found in Agathangelas of the raids carried out by the Arm. king Xosrov against Ardesir I in support of Ardashir Y refers more likely to campaigns by the Arm. Trdat II against Valaxs V and the Roman backers of the latter. According to Agathangelas 19-22, Xosrov raided Ctesiphon, massacred numerous Persians, and then made vows (uxt-avor line) to the seven basins of Armenia (i.e., the cult centres of Artašt, T’ordan, Âni, Erêz, T’il, Bagayaftic and Astisat—at some of these sites there were several basins; see Chs. 5-9). He honoured his Arsacid ancestors (see Ch. 10 on Arm. ancestor-worship) with offerings of oxen, rams, horses and males, all of them white (cf. the Av. stipulation that offerings be ‘of one colour’, Yt. 8.58; on the Ir. terminology of sacrifice in Arm., see Ch. 15), as well as offerings of gold, silver, and other costly stuff.


3. Opinions as to when the Sasanians first conquered Armenia vary. S. H. Taqizadeh, 'The Early Sasanians, Some Chronological Points which Possibly Call for Revision,' RSOSAK, 11, 1943-4, 6, 22 n. 1, notes that according to Tabari and the Nihayat al-arab, Ardesir was crowned after his conquest of Armenia and other countries; the 'Letter of Tamar', a document purported to have been written at the time of Ardesir, refers to 'Persarmenia' (see Ch. 3); and Movsës Xorenac'i reports that the Sasanian king Artašir established a fire-temple at Bagavan in Armenia after destroying the image-shrines there (see Ch. 5). According to C. Toumanoff, 'The third-century Armenian Arsacids: a chronological and genealogical commentary,' RSArm, N.S. 6, 1969, 251-2, Armenia became a vassal state of the Sasanians after the defeat of the Roman emperor Gordian by Iran in 244—the Arm. king Trdat II having sought the aid of the Romans in assisting the sons of Ardashir V (who were his first cousins) against Ardesir. Armenia was actually invaded by Sâbuhr I only in 252, and the sons of the latter, Ormizd-Ardesir and warshem, became Great Kings of Armenia before attaining in turn to the throne of the King of Kings.
5. Tacitus, Annales, VI, 31. The Parthians seem in Western Iran to have claimed legitimacy as heirs and descendants of the Achaemenids; see J. Neuser, 'Parthian political ideology,' Iranica Antiqua 3, 1963. As R. Rickman demonstrated subsequently in 'The Seleucids and the Achaemenids,' La Persie e il mondo greco-romano, Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, Quaderno No. 76, Rome, 1966, 87-117, the Eastern Iranians scarcely recognized Achaemenian rule, and their internal stability was nearly independent of it. The Parthians appear to have adopted Western Iranian ideology seen also in the political propaganda of Antiochus I of Commagene, who claimed Achaemenian ancestors.

6. N. C. Debevoise, A Political History of Parthia, Chicago, 1938, 158.

7. See Ch. 8 on the Zoroastrian aspects of the ceremony.

8. See MX I.8; Xorenac generally attributes the deeds of all kings after the remote eponymous ancestor Hagy himself to the Aršakunī 'Aršakūnī' house—a claim that the Armenians perceived the religious and administrative forms of the earlier, Artaxiad dynasty as unchanged and uninterrupted by Pth. rule; we shall return to this suggestion presently.

9. Two of the legions were stationed in Melitene and Satala, in the west of Armenia; on evidence from Satala, which is considered to have been the site of a temple of Anahīt, but is more likely to have been a Roman military shrine, see Ch. 7.


11. Ibid., 18 & n. 3; according to Greco-Roman sources, Sanātruk would have reigned from 215-7. The free-standing statue of one Sanātruk, king of Hatra, has been excavated (see H. Ingoldt, Parthian Sculptures from Hatra, New Haven, 1954, 6), and there was a king of Parthia, Sinatruces, who reigned ca. 78-68 B.C. The name may mean 'one who triumphs over enemies', from Or. *šāna-taruka- (see W. van Essbroek, 'Le roi Sanatruces et l'autre Thaude,' HEAR, N.S. 9, 1972, 242 & n. 8). According to Debevoise, op. cit., 237, Sanātruces was a king of Armenia who succeeded to the throne of Parthia, early in the third century A.D. Owing to the apparent popularity of the name in the Arsacid period, there may have been several kings bearing the name of Sanātruk in Armenia, but Arm. tradition is unanimous in placing the reign of Sanātruk at the time of the mission of the Apostle Thaddeus to Armenia, i.e., in the second half of the first century.

12. According to a local tradition, the Apostle Bartholomew cured 'King Sanātruk or the son of King Trdat' of leprosy at a spring of milk (Arm. κατ'ανάβιβρυ), and the church of St Bartholomew at Akab was built to commemorate the event; according to another tradition, a pagan temple had stood on the site (see M. Thierry, Monastères arméniens du Vanopurakan, III, HEAR, N.S. 6, 1969, 163). The popular tradition appears to support Manandyan's chronology, noted above.
who reports that the Persians leave a body to be torn by a bird or
dog, and then bury it). Despite the apparent practice of exposure
before interment, the Parthian practices are substantially differ-
cent from those enjoined by the Vdetya, a late Avestan text ap-
parently compiled in the Parthian period. If there were no sin-
ners, there would be no sermons; and one may suppose that the work,
most of which is a dreary treatise on purity and pollution, was
published because practice had diverged so widely from the canons
of the Good Religion.

24. A. G. Perikhanov, 'Armeiskaya nadpis' is Garni,' P-bh, 1964, 3,
123.

25. Ibid., 127.

26. Eresyan, op. cit., 44.

27. Corp. inscr. graec. 4821, cit. by ibid., n. 49.

28. Cf. the Arm. proper name Pap (Arm. Gr., 65; HanJb, IV, 222-4),
from the same Ir. base as Pasp-ak.

29. Toumanoff, op. cit. n. 4, 243.

30. See S. M. Krkysaryan, T'agavorakan ixanat<vne Arakunec v
Hayastanum,' P-bh, 1971, 1, 196-206 and Idem., 'T'agavorakan
ixanat'yun hin Hayastanum,' Baner Erevan Hamalsaran, 1969, 3,
158-67. An example is Saku, head of the Sakuni family, who was
induced to rebel against the Arm. king Tarsut by the Persian king
Skhuhr and took refuge in his fortress of Okakan. One Magon
tricked Saku by asking him to the hunt, where a heathen killed him.
The Arm. king gave Okakan and all the property of the Sakuni house
to Magon and his descendants, the Mumikoneans (MX II.84).


32. Poets recited historical and religious lays to the accompaniment
of musical instruments, see e.g. the song of Vasham, Ch. 6; the
minstrels were called gusans, after a Pth. word *gawan* (see
M. Boyce, 'The Parthian gawan and Iranian Minstrel Tradition,'
JAMS, 1957). For the strong connection of such literature to the
pre-Christian religion, see below.

33. See Ch. 8.

34. On the organisation of the state in the reign of Ardešir, see
R. N. Frye, 'Notes on the early Sasanian State and Church,' in
Studi orientalistici in omor di G. L. Della Vida, Vol. I, Rome,
1956.

35. The Sasanian persecution of the Jews was noted in the previous Ch.;
in his inscription on the Ka'aba-yi Zardust, the third-century
Sasanian high-priest Kirdar records that he harried Jews, Chris-
tians, Buddhists and followers of other faiths. The 'Letter of
Tansar', a mediaeval document based on a sixth-century re adaptation
of a letter attributed to a high-priest of the third century, de-
scribes the suppression of Zoroastrian cult centres within Iran
itself which lay outside the jurisdiction of the Sasanians (see
Ch. 15).

36. See MX III.35, P'B IV.55. To the north of Armenia, Jewish grave
stones of the fifth-sixth centuries have been found at the ancient
Georgian capital, Mc'xeti'a (O. V. Tsereteli, 'Epigraphisches
Material von Stelen des dienstlichen und religiösen Lebens in
Gruzie,' VDZ, 1948, 2, 50), attesting to the existence of a community there; it exists to
this day. The above-mentioned Arm. historians report that the Sasan-
i ans in the fourth century deported the Jews of Armenia en masse
to Iran. Most of them probably settled in the large, well-
established communities of Mesopotamia, such as the great Talmudic
centres of Suru and Pumbeditha; those who remained there must have been assimilated into the Christian majority; there is no record,
from the close of the Sasanian dynasty down to this day, of an in-
digenous, Armenian-speaking Jewish community.


38. Segal, op. cit. n. 13, 35-7.

39. Eznik attacked the Manichaens in his fifth-century 'Refutation of
Sects', on Mani's Epistle to the Armenians, see Ch. 5; on the
Mazdaikites and Hurasya, see R. Dodge, tr., The Fihrist of an-
Régne du Roi Kawd'î et le communisme Mazdakite, Copenhagen, 1925,
83.

40. S. T. Eresyan, ed., Kul'tura rannefeodal'noi Armenii (IV-VII vv.),

41. Manandyan, II, 86.

42. Ibid., II, 92.

43. A. A. Martirosyan, 'Hayastane ev ara'jin Sasanyannen,' P-bh, 1975,
3, 152; on Anakdust, see A. Bivar, Catalogue of the Western Asi-
atic Seals in the British Museum. Stamp Seals II: The Sasanian

44. This name seems as important symbolically as the two Iranian
epithet-names Anak and Burdar, for Wisdom was regarded with par-
ticular esteem by Christians and Zoroastrians alike (on Arm.
imast-utciwn 'wisdom', see Ch. 5).

45. Martirosyan, op. cit. n. 43, 153.

46. On the legend, see M. Adontz, 'Grégoire l' Illuminateur et Anak le
Farthe,' RBBA, 8, fasc. 1, 1928, 233-45.
47. Although the Iranian vocabulary of the myth of Gregory and the general proximity of Arm. legend to Iranian forms (cf. the story of Arsak II, below) seem to place the myth in Iranian tradition, the form is fairly widespread in the oral literature of various cultures, and is called a "Wandertage" (see J. Vansina, Oral Tradition, London, 1961, 73). In modern Greek folklore, the survivor of a holocaust is regarded as the "mavias" (Greek: 'mavias') yeast' which regenerates the Hellenes. According to Agathangelos, Anak was pursued and caught at the bridge called Tep'ercakan which spans the Araxes at Artazat. He was killed by being thrown from the bridge; this detail recalls the death of Sêdâr at the hands of the evil spirits called mywik in Arm. epic (see Ch. 13). The name Tep'ercakan apparently contains the element tep' 'flat'; Minorsky connected the toponym Dhîhâr-Tab to Arm. on the basis of the second part of the name; it is found in the works of the poet Xâqâni, a native of Shirvan in Azerbaijan (twelfth century) whose mother is called 'of Mêzâdian origin', i.e., a Zoroastrian. She seems to have been a Nestorian slave-girl converted to Islam, however (see V. Minorsky, 'Xâqâni and Andronicus Comnenus', BSOAS, 11, 1943-6, esp. 566 n. 1).

48. See Chs. 5 and 15.

49. Taqizadeh, op. cit. n. 4, 11.

50. KXZ, 12-14, in which Armenia is called 'imr tardh *Armen ŏahr. The non-conformist priests of the passage following are called 'lamech' in Arm. OBR 'Amis EVM agnaw awithâkh uâ Agarsâzîr mad ës andar maqastan 'heretics and destroyed (p. part.) men amongst the Magi'. The reference seems to be to the priesthood generally, including clergymen in Armenia and Asia Minor, the kûrmas and pyrahtâh whom the Sasanians considered nominally Zoroastrian, but unorthodox in their practices. The word gômâc, translated by I. Gershevitch as 'pernicious' ('Visâpa', in N. Ya. Gubaraev, ed., Voprosy iranskoi i obshchei filologii, Tbilisi, 1977 [M. Perekor for V. I. Abazov, 65]), was connected by Henning with the general Arm. kürads and with the word ūmar 'destroy' (BSOAS, 11, 1946, 73 n. 5 and BHR, 100), from the same base zarz-, cf. Phil. marz-Idan 'coire', NP. zalidan 'rub'; with preverb wi-, it means lit. 'to rub out, i.e., destroy' (cf. Arm. marz-'i exercise', Mod. Arm. marz-aran 'sports stadium').

51. On this title, see the preceding Ch.

52. Mananîyan, II, 107; Toumanoff, op. cit. n. 4, 256 et seq. The chronology of the period of the Sasanian Great Kings of Arm. and the Arsacid restoration is not certain, and the opinions of scholars differ widely (see I. Kn. Ter-Mkrtchyan, Armeanke istehchniki o Srednei Asii, V-VII v., Moscow, 1979, 14 n. 2, for a comparison of chronologies suggested by Soviet Armenian scholars).

53. Toumanoff, 264. The independent naxarars of these territories, which included the Arc ruin domain of Sophene, were thereafter outside the aegis of the rule of the Arsacid kings of greater Armenia, to the northeast, through the fourth century. It is suggested that naxarars from this region who made treaties with the Sasanian kings and returned to the Zoroastrian faith, such as Meruzan Areruni (see below), were exercising legitimate sovereign power from their own point of view; from the vantage point of the historians, who universally support the Arsacid position, they were apostates and traitors (see N. G. Garsofan, 'Armenia in the Fourth Century', in an effort to re-define the concepts "Armenia" and "loyalty", REArm, N. S. 8, 1971, 341-52).

54. A. A. Martirosyan, 'Sasanyanerê ev Hayastani K'âlak'akan Šixjadarî III darum', E-tIkh, 1979, 1, 47.

55. Ibid., 49.


57. On the varar; see Ch. 6; see also N. G. Garsofan, 'The Locus of the Death of Kings' and 'The Iranian Substratum of the "Agul'angez" Cycle', full ref. in the Intro., n. 10.

58. Garsofan, op. cit. n. 33, 347.

59. In the mid-fourth century, the Council of Laodicea forbade certain exaggerated cults of angels of Christianity, because these angels were invoked, it was argued, for magical purposes (see A. Monigliano, ed., The Conflict between Paganism and Christianity in the 4th Century, Oxford, 1963, 107).

60. Arm. vardapat, lit. 'teacher, doctor'; this and many other Mfr. terms became titles in the Arm. Church hierarchy, see Ch. 15.

61. The expression k'mordi 'son of a kûrm' is found in the Book of Lamentations of the tenth-century mystical poet St Gregory of Narek (583?): Aragumûn ev xadral yezrûg starâqûn arâvel aê is, k'ân erbem exlisin aq matas mankuns bet'elac is k'mor'dis 'They hasten against me to exact vengeance the One who receives it, la vengeance against her than that of Elisha from the young boys of Bethel, the sons of the priests.'

61-a. See N. G. Garsofan, 'Sur le titre de Protecteur des Pauvres', REArm N. S. 15, 1961; on the continuity of the term into Islamic society as vâyârû, see Perry, JNES 37, 1978, 205; Sasanian naxaray is said to be equivalent to Phl. hayyâr 'helper' in the Dânârâd, and one recalls the heroic k'âyâran of early Arm. literature, defenders of the poor.

62. On the concealment practiced in the performance of forbidden religious rites, compare the descriptions of Arwordi meetings, Ch. 36.
On the legend of Aru and Šamiram, see Chs. 7 and 13. This use of towers probably predates Zoroastrianism in Armenia; see D. Stroynach, 'Urartean and Achaemenian tower temples,' JNES, 1967.

See Ch. 6.

See Garsoyan, op. cit. n. 56, 311.

See Chs. 11, 14.

Eremyan, op. cit. n. 40, 10.


The name seems to be a MP. form meaning 'Welcome' (šurt àrmd).


Arm. վեր 'epic' is a loan, cf. Gir. շ(ա)էպե-; Av. vihara- 'habile, expert' (E. Benveniste, 'Studia Iranica', TFS, 1945, 74).

On the hypogaeum at Ake, see Ch. 10.

For photographs, transcription, translation and commentary on the inscription, see C. F. Lehmann-Haupt, 'Eine griechische Inschrift aus der Späzeit Tigranocerta,' Elno, 8, 1906, 497-501 (the Ir. title in G., 504). In an Arm. text describing the martyrdom of St Atom Anuni, his son, and Vars, Nersis and Varjavor at the hands of Yazdagird II in the fifth century, the Sasanian king is called dic'â-xähn 'mixed of the gods', i.e., of divine birth. In a scholion to the epithet fandman 'equal to a divinity' used of the Persian king by Aeschylus, The Persians, line 632, it is explained that tuous basileas theoum kaloum in ho ferei. 'The Persians call the kings gods' (T. H. Gray, 'Two Armenian Passions of Saints in the Sasanian Period,' Analexíta Hollandia, Vol. 67, Melanges Paul Peeters, I, Brussels, 1969, 369; the Arm. text of the martyrlogy is published in Sop'ezé Hayvakank, Vol. 19, Venice, 1854, 69-82). In MX III,65, the Armenian patriarch Sahak Part'ew (388-439) at the court of Bahram Ösr (Bahram V, 420-38; Arm. Vram) criticises the belief of the poets (k'ert'qah'n) that the princes are noyamqarnian șatuqac of the same seed as the gods'. According to Thomson, MX, 345 n. 15, the refutation is drawn from Philo, but it is as likely that the Arm. expression is a calque on MP. yaziq in chhr 'of the same seed as the gods'. In the History of Stepanos Amediq, Tiridates III calls himself divenq'xähn part'ew 'A Parthian, mixed of the gods' (trans. Eain, Moscow, 1864, 292).

L. A. El'întskii, 'K istorii antitserkovnykh i antikhristianskh tendentsii v Armenii v IV v.n.e.,' VDM, 92, 1965, 127, and 'O malozuzhennykh ili utrachennykh grecheskikh i latinskikh napisyakh Zakavkaz'ya,' VDM, 88, 1964, maintains that the inscription belongs to Pap, but this suggestion seems unacceptable, in view of the title of King of Kings, which Pap would not have used, and the invocation of many gods which Pap would not have made. The inscription seems to contain a warning to the citizens against rebellion; such a warning by Šahbūr is, indeed, preserved by MX (see our discussion of agra- and anara- in Ch. 3). G. X. Sargsyan, Hellenistakan daras'yan Hayastank ev Mowxes Xorenac'i, Erevan, 1966, 56, compares the formula of the Greek invocation in the inscription to a passage in the Gk. version of Agathangelos: pronoia genêlîn apó têes tôn theôn boîtheînas 'provocement comes from the help of the gods'. The crucial word in the inscription, though, is tykhe 'fortune', Mfr.cept or zwarran (see Ch. 9 on Arm. baxt and f'ânêc), which is not found in the passage from the Gk. Agath.

See Thomson, MX, 15-16 et seq.

See Ibid., 357; the Primary History apparently predates Xorenac'i, and the tradition of the discovery of the stele at Moun may be authentic. But Xorenac'i attributes to Mar Abas additional information, which, MX claims, come from the Parthian royal archives; much of it, however, comes from Gk. texts, and the attribution is spurious (Thomson, 53-6).


WV, 5.

WV, 6; the Arm. word dervûc'un, from dpir 'scribe' can mean a book, records, literature in general, or writing. The latter, in the sense of foreign scripts, seems to be meant here.

This is the development proposed by A. Perikhsyan, 'K voprosu o proiskhozhdenii armen'skoi pis'mennosti,' Perepisanstvaši Armenii, 2, Moscow, 1966, 103-133. A. B. Abrahamyan, Hayoc' giri ev grs'ut'yc'un patmc'yun, Erevan, 1969, and Hayoc' giri ev grs'ut'yc'un, Erevan, 1973, derives the title mainly from Greek. Like Greek, Arm. is written from left to right, and the early Arm. unicils, with their thick and thin lines, resemble the Greek book hand of the fifth century. On Korivn, see most recently K. H. Maksoudian,
83. On the significance of this choice, see Ch. 5.
84. I.e., Məstoc and Bishop Sahak Part'ew.
85. WM, 11.
86. The meaning of the word Avesta is not known with certainty; 'Authoritative Utterance' is a likely interpretation, suggested by Boyce, Zoroastrians, 3, 2; C. Andreas and P. F. Geldner, Grundriss der iranischen Philologie, hrs. von W. Geiger und E. Kahn, Strassburg, 1935-1936, II, 2, para. 1, traced the word to Av. apastā 'foundation'. A folk-etymology is provided in the Greater Bundahishn (177.7-8), cited by Dasturs K. M. Kutar and D. Pahlav, 'Pahlavi Folk-Etymology and Etymological Curiosities', in J. C. Cayagee et al., ed., Dinshah Irani Memorial Volume, Bombay, 1943, 173:

\[\text{'pot's Nāmā ye clām, 'pyck st' dān ZY yzd Abastāg kē-}\
\text{ān, khizārān abāzag sāyān I yzd 'Avesta', whose meaning is unblemished (abāzag) praise of God.}\]

Another derivation cited by Kutar and Pahlav is from Av. ā + vistā (pp. of vistāx 'to know'), but the suggestion of Andreas corresponds more closely to the Phl. form. Arm. avet-ān, with a base from Cbr. ā-ewēt- ('speak forth'), cf. Turfan Mgr. n禹rtidings (see H. W. Bailey, 'Iranica II', JRAS, July 1934, 508-9), on Arm. avet-k (good) tidings of. S. K. K. Sjoberg, 'Avicenna and his Companions', Zoroastrianism and Iranian Thought, 1976, 25, 514).
88. Ekišk, p. 9, refers anachronistically to the Hephthalites as Kusans, i.e., a central Asian kingdom defeated ca. 270 by the Sasanians. According to the Arm. tradition of Agath. and others, the Arm. Arsacids considered the Kusans their cousins and the only other branch of the Parthian royal house which actively resisted Ardešir after the death of Ardashīr V, ca. 226.
89. MP. Wurung tranṣād, transcribed by Ekišk, 24; as wārīk hramat and trans. as Arm. hazarāpet; on the latter title, see Ch. 16.
90. Ekišk, 24.
90-a. See B. M. Dhabbar, Translation of the Zand i Khurāt Avistāk, Bombay, 1963, 6 n. 2; H. W. Bailey in BRV 6, 1931, 391; and

91. Arm. kəripā, a transcription of Phl. Kirbakkari-'th' pious deeds'.
92. On Arm. Hamamani, see Ch. 14.
93. Ekišk, 46. The name Vardan, somewhat too appropriately, perhaps, to be an entire coincidence in this case, means 'hero' in Pth., cf. NP. vālān 'brave' (see Shaked in AT 25, 514).
94. See Ch. 15.
95. Tiridates I on his journey to Rome travelled overland to avoid polluting the sea (Ch. 8); on washing first with gēmēz and only afterwards with water, see Ch. 15.
96. On the particulars of these, which included the maintenance of sacred fires, the killing of noxious animals, washing with gēmēz (bull's urine), and wearing a face-mask while baking, see Ch. 15.
97. Promises of hell fire in retribution for apostasy from the Good Religion are probably meant here. In Zoroastrian communities to this day, simple believers find the fear of damnation in the world to come a powerful support of faith, as expressed in the Ardašir Mir-z Nāmag. The book describes in vivid detail the tortures of hell, and some copies are illustrated (see, e.g., Zoroastrians, 21).
98. Arm. tārcar can also mean 'palace'; on the Ir. loan-words Ṁaṭik and patrāk, see Ch. 15.
99. The voluptuous dancing girls and performers depicted in Sasanian and pre-Christian Arm. art (e.g., a player of pan-pipes on a silver rhyton of the Orontid period and a terracotta female Lutanist, bare-breasted, from Artaban, in B. M. Arakcyan, Akhtaranin hin Hayastani arvesti patmā'vān, Erevan, 1976, pl. 59, 87-b) were condemned as heathen and demonic by Yovhannes Mandakuni in the fifth century Mīhrārēsh condemned the Christians as haters of human generation by reason of their celibacy; Eznik countered by attacking Zoroastrians as kineolosh 'woman-crazy', perhaps with reference to upper-class polygamy.
100. The reference here is probably to the dastgāhe of Iranian music, attested from the Sasanian period. The system of modal scales corresponds to the Indian rāga or Arab maqām.
101. Ekišk, 64.
102. Ibid., 143-4.
103. Arm. kəst, has been derived from the same Ir. base as the loan-word kəst 'teaching, religion', cf. Av. ṭkaṣasa- (Arm. Gr., 258);
it is attested also in the fifth-century Arm. trans. of Ephrem Syrus (HA, IV, 376-7). It may be connected with Phl. ṣaṣṭag 'doctrine' (MacKenzie, 22). The initial k- in Arm. is to be explained as contamination by the better-known loan-word kēsār of closely similar meaning, rather than as dissimilation (cf. Arm. ściṣṭ 'true', cf. Phl. nām-ściṣṭ(-īk), cit. by Bailey, 'Iranica II,' op. cit., 51, who defines the Phl. word as 'known by name, particular, famous'). The base of Phl. ściṣṭ- is Av. kēsār- 'teach', from which both Av. tkaēsār- and Phl. ściṣṭ-ag are derived. J. P. Amussen, 'A Zoroastrian De-Demonization,' in S. Shaked, ed., Iranica Judaica, Jerusalem, 1982, 115 and n. 15, notes that in Manichaean MP. AVēS means 'false teaching'; it has the same pejorative sense in Enniki, and, subsequently, in Elisha.

104. HA, 1927, 763, cit. by R. C. Zaezner, Survan, A Zoroastrian Dilemma, Oxford, 1955, 29 n. 5; Christensen (loc. cit.), interpreting differently the first element hampart-, defined it as 'a complete collection of doctrines relating to the faith', and explained Paspaqtit as Phl. Baspatit 'a confession of crimes committed'. Petrow, Zaezner notes, is not clear; it looks like a reversal of the Arm. form meqret. Benveniste's explanation of part- as having to do with penalties accords with the meaning of the Arm. loan-word part-kē 'debt, duty'; in the Lord's Prayer, x-par-tēs (acc. pl.) renders Gk. ὀφειλήματα (on the etymology, see Arm. Gr., 228).


106. Elisha, 69.

107. Ibid., 74-6.


111. See Ch. 16 on the edict of toleration granted the various faiths in the city.

112. See C. Toumanoff, 'On the Date of Pseudo-Moses of Chorene,' HA 75, 1961, 467-76, who supports a date in the eighth century.

Having observed the historical development of Zoroastrianism in Armenia, we turn now to an examination of the cults of individual yazatai, in order of their apparent importance in Armenian sources. It is fitting that we begin with the discussion of Ahura Mazdā, the Lord of Wisdom, the supreme divinity of Zoroastrianism, invoked first in every act of worship, and the one whose name is most frequently attested. It is not proposed here to enter into an exhaustive treatment of his cult in Iran, but only to elucidate those aspects that have a particular bearing on the Armenian evidence.

The study of the cult of a supreme god in pre-Christian Armenia presents three major problems. The first concerns Ahura Mazdā himself. There are attested in Armenian two forms of his name, Aramazd and Ormazd, and two forms of the name of his worship, or worshipers, mazedēc-i-kē and (den i) mazedon. In both cases, the latter form is Sasanian Middle Persian and is treated generally as foreign by Armenian writers, while the former term derives from an older Iranian form (although attested only in Armenian texts of the Sasanian period and later) and is regarded as native. Were Aramazd and Ormazd worshipped in the same way in Armenia?

The second problem is that of the two Semitic supreme gods, Bel and Baʿalšamin. Both are mentioned in Armenian literature, and the god Barōšān (i.e., Baralšān) was worshiped in Armenia. Bel Marduk was the supreme god of the pagan Mesopotamians of the Hellenistic period, and Baʿalšān was the supreme god of Syro-Phoenicia; it appears that Achaemenian Zoroastrianism influenced strongly the development of their cults. By the second century A.D., the Palmyrenians regarded them as virtually identical: two names for the creator and lord of the Universe. The Semitic
deity worshiped in Armenia would have been seen to occupy a position of supreme dominion similar to that of Aramazd. Were the cults of the two divinities related?

The third problem is that of the name given in Armenia to the God of Christianity, Astuac. It appears to have been preferred to διός 'god', perhaps because the latter word occurs only in a plural form in texts; but by etymology Astuac may reflect ancient Armenian beliefs.

**IRANIAN AHURA MAZDÂN**

One of the most important aspects of Ahura Mazdân in Zoroastrian belief is that he is the Creator (Av. dadvâh-, dâtar-, Phl. dâv, dâdēr), the maker of all good things. Zoroastrians have used various images to describe the manner of his creation. Although essentially he willed the world into being through his mind (Av. manah-), he is called metaphorically the 'father' of the Amesâ Spêntas; the Armenians, too, called Aramazd the father of all. Although he is entirely good, Ahura Mazdân is not omnipotent, for he cannot prevent evil from invading his good creation. Consequently he is to be regarded as the commander-in-chief of the forces fighting the cosmic battle against evil, and images of him in Zoroastrian temples of the post-Alexandrine period presented him as a manly, warlike figure. St Acindynus destroyed in a fire temple the cîdion tou andrantos 'image of the statue (of Zeus [= Ahura Mazdân])'.

At Mcxēt in Georgia, St Nino beheld a great bronze image of 'Armag', which was dressed in a cape and helmet with ear-flaps, and held a sharpened, rotating sword.

We have noted in the preceding chapter the iconoclastic campaign of the Sasanians in Armenia, and shall have occasion to mention it again shortly. It may be noted here briefly that the Sasanians depicted Ahura Mazdân in bas-relief, and a Pahlavi text relates that Zarathustra was privileged to behold Ahura Mazdân in the form of a man. Sasanian Zoroastrians therefore also visualized the supreme god as a powerful, manly figure, but there is no suggestion that the bas-relief representation of the deity was an object of cult.

Fire, the most important symbol of the Zoroastrian faith, is referred to frequently in Zoroastrian texts as the son (Av. pûthra-) of Ahura Mazdân, and a Zoroastrian does penance pêy xwârstâd ud mîhr ud mîh ud âtâxât ō Hrmztâd 'before the Sun and Mithra and the Moon and the fire of Ahura Mazdân'. In Armenia, as we shall see later, the 'fire of Ahura Mazdân' was referred to as ormazdâkan hur.

Ahura Mazdân is closely associated in Zarathushtra's original revelation, and in all subsequent Zor. theology, with the seven Amesâ Spêntas, the Bounteous Immortals. Although these were not generally personified in the temple cult as were the lesser yazatas such as Mithra or Anâhítâ, perhaps because the Amesâ Spêntas were seen mainly as emanations of the abstract qualities of the Creator himself, Spênta Armaîti was worshipped in Armenia as an earth goddess (Ch. 10), Kauvatêt and Amêrêtêt survive as flowers (Ch. 12), and Ormuzos (perhaps Vohu Manah, the Good Mind) was an object of cult in Asia Minor (see Ch. 14).

There is recognition in the Arm. texts of a tier of Iranian gods above that of the lesser yazatas, for the Arm. bishops of the fifth century, in responding to the Persian polemicists in Ekhê, speak of Mihr (called by the Persians meq astuac '(the) great god') as but a hambhur kây ewt'êrordac astuacoc 'adjutant of the mighty heptad of gods', i.e., the seven Amesâ Spêntas (Phl. bart amahraspandân). The latter personified the principal creations, of which the inanimate ones were understood by Christians as the elements, so Arm. tarrapâstuc 'worship of the elements' was to Arm. Christians identical to Zoroastrianism and its 'fire-worship'.

The Sasanian kings were offended that such worship of the ordik Astuaco 'sons of God' was seen by the Christians as hetânos 'heathen', i.e., polytheism. To the Zoro. it manifestly was not, and Bahram V was outraged when told by the Christian Yakovik that such worship was of things 'deaf and blind' (êlic=c ew kwarâc, epithets the Sasanians themselves were wont to apply to those who rejected Zoroastrianism) and not of the Creator (arapirêc).
Behistun višnā Auramazdāha adan x̣āyaviya amēl 'by the will of Ahura Mazdā I am king'; and, according to Arrian, Darius III prayed for aid to Zeus, i.e., Ahura Mazdā, 'to whom it is given to order the affairs of kings in this world.'

Under the Sassanian king Ormizd I (A.D. 272-3), Kirōr received the title "Ahramazd mowed." This title is to be connected with the god, rather than the theophoric-named king; yet it is possible that this particular rank of mowed was to be connected with the royal family, reflecting the belief that the supreme god was the yazata most directly associated with it. We shall have occasion to return to this theme in connection with the Armenian cult of Aramaz at Ami and elsewhere.

It is noteworthy that Ahura Mazdā came to be identified with the chief divinities of both the Semitic and Greek pantheons. In an Aramaic inscription from Aresus, he seems to have been identified with Bel, the husband and brother of Dem Mazdayasnis and there is said to have been a votive inscription at Persepolis in which three divinities are mentioned: Zeus Megistas, Apollōn-Hēllos, and Artemis Athēna. Zeus Megistas, as we shall see, is also a Greek name for Baʿalšamin.

**Armenian Aramazd**

The fusion of the two words Ahura Mazdā into one, as seen in the inscription of Darius cited above, is attested in Old Persian from the fifth century B.C. The words continued to be separated in Avestan texts, however, and there is a possibility that in Armenia the two separate words were recognised. There are found in Assyrian cuneiform texts a number of proper names which appear to contain the Iranian element *masta*, identified with Mazdā.15 and on this basis a derivation of the Armenian proper Maštoc is proposed from Mazdā.16 The word is first found as the name of a bishop of Simik consecrated by Catholicos Nercēs the Great in the third quarter of the fourth century. At around the same time there was born in the village of Hac in Taranw the blessed Maštoc, later called also Mesrop Maštoc, who invented the Armenian script around the turn of the fifth century. His life and deeds are recorded in the Life written in the fifth century by one of his disciples, Kirōr. Variants of the name as Maštōc or Maštoc are found in early texts, but they are rare.17 In Greek, the forms Mastrobios, Masiţas and Mstoç are attested for the Armenian name. Mnočakanyan argued that Maštoc must be a word of some religious significance apart from its use as a proper name, for the service book of the Armenian Church is called the Maštoc. This suggestion seems farfetched, however, for the name of the prayerbook is that of Catholicos Maštoc (ninth century), not St. Mesrop Maštoc. Narek is the name given, similarly, to the Lamentations of St Gregory of Narek (tenth century), and it, too, has no special meaning.18 It is equally farfetched to propose an etymology of the name Maštoc based upon the hypothetical reading of names of a remote language and time, all the more so since no similar form of the name of Ahura Mazdā is found elsewhere in Armenian, or, indeed, in the Iranian languages from which loan-words are found in Armenian. Arm. mazd alone means 'thick, compact', and although it is probably an Iranian loan-word, it is not related to Mazd- 'Wisdom'. Maštoc may be related to the Av. proper name Māstār-, attested in the Fravardin Yasut (Yt. 13.116), or it may be a derivative of Arm. māšt-in 'I go bald'; G. Žahunyan derived the name from IE. *māzd- 'damp, wet' with the suffix *-to-.19

It is perhaps more interesting to seek a form related to Mazdā in the writings of Maštoc themselves. According to Kirōr, the first words translated into Armenian from Scripture—the Bible being the first text written in the newly-invented Armenian alphabet—were from the Book of Proverbs:22 čanac el zimustut'īm av sxrat, imanal zams hačaroy = LXX gnōai sophian kai paiselai, noēsai te logos phronēsēs (Prov. I.2). In the fifth century, few other languages possessed terms which conveyed the power and attraction of what was expressed by the Gr. word gnōsis (cf. gnōnai), used of the goal of innumerable religious sects and philosophical schools throughout the Mediterranean world, and Sophia, enthroned as divine in Byzantine Christianity. In Iran, Xrad 'Wisdom' (the Arm. loan-word above means wisdom, learning, and counsel)23 was similarly personified and exalted. Maštoc cannot have translated this particular passage first for any canonical reason other than to exalt Christianity as the only true source of wisdom, be it the Gnostic Sophia or the Zoroastrian Xrad. For the Book of Proverbs does not come at the beginning of either the New or Old Testament, it
is not prophecy, nor does it even bear particular witness to the actions of the divine in the world. But Maṭṭoṣ was schooled in both Greek and Persian. He had worked as a missionary in regions of Armenia where Christianity still had not taken hold, and it is likely that he translated Proverbs first because of its similarity to religious genres of the East, such as the Wisdom of Ḥīqar or the andarz literature of Iran, which would have been familiar and readily understandable to Armenians. The word used for Gk. sophia in the abstract noun iman-ut'īvīn, from iman- 'meaning', Arm. imanam 'I understand'. Lagarde connected the verb with Ind.-Ir. man- 'think' and Šāh connected iman with Mazdā. Such a suggestion is tenable only if iman- is the base, with ending -an.25 Although Ehlīsli (fifth century) uses a form iman-ak 'understanding',26 which would support such an analysis, the aorist iman-ay would indicate an inchoative in -anam with base ima-. If the base does contain -an- (the conjugation then being explained as assimilation of the form by Arm. grammar—an unprovable hypothesis), then the form iman- would be parallel to Arm. hrīṣār-em 'renounce' and hrīṣāt'em 'renunciation'.26 If -a- is taken as a preverb, we have an Ir. loan, i-mast, parallel with Av. Mazdā-; wisdom par excellence.

While the above examples are hypothetical, references to Aramaz in Classical Armenian texts are clear and abundant. Tiridates III in Agath. invokes aboovn ev xarin Aramazd, xararic' erkni ev erkri 'the great and manly Aramazd, Creator of Heaven and Earth' (Agath. 68), in full accord with Zoroastrian conceptions of the Deity. He requests liut'īvīn parart'īvīn y chóyn Aramazd 'fullness of abundance from manly Aramazd' (Agath. 127). Arm. parart 'fat, rich', apparently an Ir. loan-word,27 is used by a later Christian writer to describe the foods eaten by the Children of the Sun, whose enjoyment of earthly bounty he thought voluptuous. Although Christians are bidden to ask only for their daily bread and to live in poverty, the Zoroastrians do not regard wealth as a barrier to spiritual awareness, nor do they consider reasonable enjoyment of it as sinful; the invocation by the Armenian king may reflect this conspicuously Mazdean attitude which Agathangelos reproduces in scorn. In the Pahlavi sand of the Viḏvēšt (IX. 53-57), it is the ahlmog 'heretic' who is said to remove śīrēnīd ud ċarbnī 'sweetness and fatness' (cf. Arm. loan-word šarp 'fat') from the land by ignoring the laws of purity. Fatness (Av. Anītī-) is also praised in the Gāthas (Y. 49.4).28

Aramazd is hailed as creator not only of all physical substance, but of the lesser gods as well; at Ani, the Armenian Arsacid necropolis, St Gregory and his cohorts koronān in zabgiyīn Zevi dic'n Aramazd, hawrīn amunānān dic'6n amanānān 'destroyed the shrine of the god (dic'6n) Aramazd, named the father of all the gods (dic'6n)' (Agath. 785). The word di-k6 may be considered here the equivalent of either Ir. yazata or bage; Agathangelos explains 'Parthian' Bagawan as 'Armenian' Dić'awan (Agath. 817). Anūḥīt is called the annd...mecin arin Aramazd 'child of the great, manly Aramazd' (Agath. 23), and at Bagayač, St Gregory destroys the Hrakān meheann amunānān ordourin Aramazd 'temple of Mihr, who is named the son of Aramazd' (Agath. 790). At T̥s̥n, Gregory obliterations the Nančakan meheann destern Aramazd 'temple of Nanē, the daughter of Aramazd' (Agath. 786).

In the Mediaeval Armenian History of the Nīp'īsian Arm. Virgins is mentioned astik yōvu bāsmīt'īvīn divāc, zor asīn Tun Aramazd ox Astīk, mehean erku, yamu yazat pasamanc' ina kardayan or 5 Pašat: zor ox ayam murdīk aškarīn vič'al asen: t' wox i Paštay divāc' in gal, anlur ox anīmec 'a great crowd of demons which they called the House of Aramazd and Astīk, two temples. Because of the frequency of religious services they called the house30 Pašat, and even now when people of the country argue they say "You seem to come from the demons of Pašat, senseless and meaningless."31 It appears, then, that in each temple in Armenia devoted to a given yazata, the subservience of that yazata to the creator Acura Mazda was emphasised, as is only proper, for every major act of public and private Zoroastrian worship contains his invocation. As these prayers must be recited in Avestan, it is not surprising that local people remembered them as 'senseless and meaningless'. In Zoroastrian communities today, most worshipers have only a vague idea of the literal meaning of their prayers. The Muslims of non-Arab countries who memorise long passages from the Qur'ān often have no idea what they mean, and similar examples may be adduced for many other religions. The entrenchment of Christianity in Armenia was no doubt greatly aided, at least after Maṭṭoṣ, by the simple fact that the Bible and Divine Liturgy were read in Armenian. The pejorative attitude of
the Christians is paralleled by the Muslim description of Zoroastrian prayers as Arabic *raza man* 'mumbling'. It was suggested in a note that the explanation of Paštō sounds very much like that offered by Agathangelos for Aštīšat, the shrine of Vahagn and Aštīk. The description of Paštō may indeed be a corruption of the narrative in Agath., and the name of Aramazd mistakenly substituted for that of Vahagn, for, as we have seen, Aramazd was prominently invoked in all temples, and would have been remembered as the primary heathen god, while Aštīk was re-called as a female consort of the *aš* 'manly' deity.

According to Xorenac'i, Tigran II in the first century B.C. had *kangreš* to *zoolimpiakan paktarh Diosi yavum Ani* 'erected the Olympian image of Zeus in the fortress of Ani' (MX II.14)--presumably at the temple which St Gregory was later to destroy. (See Plate 1 at the end of this chapter. The photographer has asked to be identified by his initials only.) Tigran's ancestor, Artaxias (Artašaš) I had *Mašan kargē koy pastein i yani dič* a *Aramazday* 'appointed Mašan high priest of the god Aramazd at Ani' (MX II.53). Mašan was the brother of the king. Xorenac'i reports that the *naxarardom* of the Vahunis supplied the hereditary high priesthood of the cult centre of Vahagn, at Aštīšat, while exercising temporal power over their local domain. Similarly, the Artaxiad royal family supplied the high priests of Aramazd, the supreme Lord who ruled the other gods just as they ruled all the provinces of Armenia.

Mašan was entombed at Bagawan, and at that place, according to Xorenac'i, Vahagan təm ašxarhaxumb kargēš iskšan ami noroy, i mutn *nawasard* 'Vahagan' 35 instituted a celebration for the entire country at the start of the new year, at the beginning of Nawasard' (MX II.66). Gregory the Illuminator fixed the commemoration of the martyrs St John the Baptist and St Athenogenes at Bagawan on *dič* Ananoroy andmer nor *tsič* təmən, *hirvənsk* dič *vanari*, zor yavələgən isk i *min teks* pətšin yuraxu*ən* Nawasard avur 'the festival of the first fruits, of the god of the New Year, the bringer of all good things, of the hospitable and sheltering god, which in earlier times they celebrated joyfully in the same place on the day of Nawasard' (Agath. 836). These various epithets refer to Aramazd. In the Arm. version of the *Chronicle of Basæius*, translated in the fifth century, reference is made to *Aramazday awtarasirin* 'of of Aramazd *philoxenia*', and Arm. *hiwran* *gremzākan dič* *vanari* 'the hospitable god Omzd, the Shelterer' is used to translate LXX Gk. *Dios Xeniou* (II Macc. VI.2); in the Arm., a MP. form of the name is used which we shall examine presently. Grigor Armuni, writing in 690, stated that 1 Nawasard was the feast of Aramazd in Armenia. The first fruits are harvested in Armenia in mid-late August, so Nawasard must have been an autumn festival. Armenian writers regard Nawasard as a native word, and use it to translate a proper name, MP. *Nawrūz*, i.e., MP. *Hu Rūz*, the vernal New Year whose celebration anticipates the resurrection of the dead at Frawegir, even as nature in spring rises from the dead days of winter. There is a tradition amongst the Armenians of *Naxiʃeš* recorded by Zelinski that they won a great battle on Nawasard; perhaps the legend is a shadow recollection of the Zoroastrian belief that the cosmic battle of good and evil will end in final victory for Ahura Mazda.

Xorenac'i wrote, *de* Aramazd ok, ayl i kamec oksn linsl Aramazd, *zoroc* *ew yvoc* *anane* 'eloc Aramazd, yoroc mi s ew Kund ows *Aramazd* 'There is no such person as Aramazd, but for those desiring that there be an Aramazd, there are four others called Aramazd, of whom there is also a certain *kund* Aramazd' (MX I.31). Ananikian explained kund as 'brave', which would accord well with the epithet *aš* 'manly' discussed above; yet it is also possible that the word is the common Arm. adjective *kund* 'bald' and refers to the statue of Zeus *phalakros* 'the Bald' that is said to have existed at Argos. 41 There is a Zoroastrian demon called Kundag, but it is unlikely that the two have anything in common. Xorenac'i was perhaps attempting to impress his Bagratid patron with his recondite learning; a creator of the cosmos unable to preserve his own hair is a curiosity. For Zoroastrians, who regard baldness as a deformity caused by Ahriman, it is an impossibility. Certain MSS have instead of *kund ows* Aramazd the words *katarrum Aramazd* 'the perfection Aramazd', which seem to hint at an eschatological concept of completion and fulfillment. The four Aramazds may be the tetrad of Ahura Mazda, Infinite Time, Endless Light and Wisdom, a Zoroastrian adaptation of a quaternity originally conceived, it is suggested, by devotees of Zurvan, consisting of Infinite Time and three hypostases of his cult-epithets. Ephraim Syrus, whose works were translated into
Armenian in the fifth century, wrote that Manasses added the four-faced image in the temple of the Lord. The medieval Armenian writer Tiranav vardapet added, "Aramazd regularly renders Gk. Zeus. In the Arm. translation of pseudo-Callisthenes, Alexander before his death invokes Aramazd in the Arm. version of the life of Helikonis of Thessaloniki (second century A.D.), the saint destroys Zeus and Asclepius (other shrines of Aramazd and Asclepius). Obviously, Aramazd has been used here to translate Zeus, while no native equivalent of Asclepius was found. A misreading of Gk. diakosmos as diokosmos resulted in the Hellenophile Armenian calque aramazdaxar. An Arm. commentary on Chrysostom explains Dios, sor hayk. Araman asen...Zeus, sor ew Dion koc'en, ew hayrer Aramazd 'Dios, whom the Armenians call Aramazd...Zeus, whom they also call Dion, and in Armenian, Aramazd,' thereby covering most of the declensions of the Greek word. In the Arm. translation of Eusebius, the definition is widened to include Bel: Yorekmys asen or yunaren Dios t'argIsi ew hayrer Aramazd 'And of Bel they say that it is translated into Greek as Dios and into Armenian as Aramazd.'

The Gk. Agathangelos has ton bemon Kronou tou patros Dios pantodaimonos where the Arm. text cited above (Agath, 785) reads zagimun ew dia'n Araman hawm dia'n amenayni, and the Arm. Eusebius explains Kronos...sor hayy anusan Aramazday 'Kronos...whom they call the father of Aramazd (i.e., of Zeus). Xorenac' calls the Biblical Shem Zravan, i.e., Mr. Zrun, and makes Astik his sister. It appears that Zravan has taken the place of Aramazd (cf. the relation of the latter to Astik in the History of the Nhp asim Virgins cited above), although other references to Kronos are to be explained within the context of Greek mythology. There is in modern Arm. mythology an old man called Zok or Zamanak 'Time' who sits upon a mountain and rolls down alternately black and white balls of thread. But there is scant evidence to indicate that the teachings of Zurvanism were elaborated in Armenia to any great degree; as we shall see, Eznik in his attack on Zurvanism has in mind a cult prevalent amongst the Persians, not the Armenians.

Certain natural sites other than temples seem to have been dedicated to the cult of Aramazd: a medieval writer refers to mavrekan Aramazd 'Aramazd of the grove(s),' and there is abundant evidence that Armenians revered particular trees and groves and used them for divination. In a poem on the Cross-shaped Staff (Yalag xab'an...
Armenia, there are mountains which bear the names of the legendary hero Ara and the fiendish monster Ašdahak. The highest peak of the Bargūsat chain, in the Zangezur region of Soviet Armenia, is Mount Aramazd (3392 m). one may see in the name a parallel to the distant rock in Sogdia, likewise named after the supreme Lord.

ORMIZD

Anania of Širak wrote: Belos yunaren Dios, hayoren Aramazd, parakerenOrmizd 'Bel is Dios in Greek, Armazd in Armenian, and Ormizd in Persian.' In fact, the name Ormizd is used also in an Armenian context: Tīr is called by Agathangelos dīvan ʿor-mi-zēd 'the scribe of Ormizd,' and the Arm. version of II Maccabees 6.2, cited above, contains the form ʿormezdakan. The seventh-century writer Sebōs puts in the mouth of a Sasanian king the boast es yaštēcēcē erduač i mec astuacn Aramazd 'I shall triumph, having sworn by the great god Aramazd,' when he ought to be swearing by Ormizd. By the fifth century, the two forms, Armazd and Ormizd, appear to have been almost interchangeable in use, but the distinction between them was remembered. Armazd belonged to the pre-Sasanian, native cult. The use of the form Ormizd with reference to Tīr may indicate that the temple was connected with Persian traditions, or else that the foundation of a scriptorium for religious learning was an innovation of comparatively late date; in Iran, writing had been reserved traditionally for matters such as commerce, law and administration. The mather-, 'sacred Word' of the Religion had to be learnt orally.

According to Xorenac'i, the Sasanian Great King of Armenia, Artašir, shrub ormizdakan i veray bagmin or i Bagawan, anēz ʰramaysh łuca'anel 'ordered that the fire of Ormizd on the altar which is in Bagawan be kept burning continuously.' This king was Ormizd-Ardašir, the figure Ormizd I and wuzuršah ʿArmanān of the inscription of Šabūr at the Ka'āba-yi Zardūšt, the same king during whose reign Kirdēr became Ormizd knowbed. Anania vardapet (after tenth century), in a 'Paeon to the Cross', refers to the ʿormezdakan ov ʿowramakan hrapašt'examč fire-worship of Ormizd and Vṛsan using the MP. form of the name of the yazata Verethragna, who was worshipped in Armenia only under the NW. Mr. name Vahagn. The term ʿormezdakan hur may refer merely to the common Zoroastrian practice, noted above, of hailing fire as the son of
Ahura Mazda; *verakken hur* is an Arm. translation of MP. *takšē i wahram*, the highest of the three grades of holy fires, which must indeed be kept blazing continuously. It is not known whether the 'fire of Ormizd' represented a particular grade, such as a royal fire, for the term is obscure and did not survive the Sasanian period—nor, indeed, did the equally perplexing rank of *ormazda movbed*. The 'fire of Wahram', too, was apparently a Sasanian innovation. The Armenians had fire temples, called *atrušan*, from Pth. *atērōšan*, and there may have been various grades of the sacred fires before the Sasanian period: we have cited in a note the testimony of Isidore of Charax that the Parthian Arsacid sacred fire at Aṣaak burned continuously, yet there are in Armenian also references to the heathen ancestors of the nation as *moxrapāst* 'ash-worshipping'. This epithet indicates that some fires were buried for a time, the red embers carefully embedded in ash to keep them alive; infidels may have ignorantly or maliciously assumed that the sound of ash upon the altar was an object of cult. Since the fire was not actually extinguished, one could pray before the mound of ash, knowing it to contain living fire. This grade of fire would have corresponded to the *mavarēn* fire, a lesser grade than the kind kindled at Bagawan by Ormizd-Ardašir. But the word *atrušan* was used for all sacred fires, regardless of grade.

The two Armenian writers of the fifth century who use the form Ormizd exclusively are Eaišē and Emnik. By neither is the form used with reference to Armenian beliefs. To Eaišē, chronicler of the Battle of Avarayr, Ormizd is the god of the Sasanian Zarvanists who are seeking to impose upon the Armenians the *deni mazdean*, a cult so unlike their own form of Zoroastrianism that the movbeds must employ Armenians who follow native customs distinct from those of the invading Persians as intermediaries in their proselytising mission. To Emnik, the god Ormizd is son of Zruan, both part of the *kē šē* 'teaching' of the Persians, again distinct from the pre-Christian Armenian religion. Emnik attacks as a *kē šē* related to that of the Persians also the teachings of Manichaeism. Although his source on the doctrines of the 'Persian' faith was probably the Syriac translation of the Peri tēs en Persidi *magikēs* of Theodore of Mopsuestia, it is likely that there were Manichaean Armenia in the fifth century. The *Fihrist* of an-Nadim mentions an epistle of Mani to the Armenians, and a Sogdian Manichaean fragment mentions the same document: *...rty/ Ṛyn (r) ūtyyy nypt* 'And he writes in the epistle to Armenia'. A Parthian text on Mani's last journey tells us he was accompanied by a certain nobleman named Bat; there was an Armenian nobleman named Bat of the Saharuni family, but he lived a century after Mani's death. It is perhaps noteworthy that Mani's mother came from the Kamsarakan family, a branch of the great noble clan of the Kārēn, which became one of the prominent *naxarardsom* of Arsacid Armenia. The Arm. Manichaean seem to have used the names Zruan and Ormizd, and Emnik could have heard these terms first-hand.

In the fifth century, the Persian Denšapuh, according to Stepænos Ascalīk (II.2), established an *ormazdakan hur* in Hēšūnīk; Tovma Afruni (II.1) wrote that Šavasp Acruni during the reign of Yazdagird II (fifth century) founded an *ormazdakan mēkean* in Dūn, the Armenian capital, and established a sacred fire there. In both cases, these are foreign institutions imposed by invaders or traitors, rather than survivals of the old customs of Zoroastrian Armenia.

**Mazdean I-K**

The Arm. term *deni mazdean*, describing the Zoroastrian religion, is simply a transcription of MP. It appears that there was also a native Arm. form, although the sole attestation of it we possess is from a text of the seventeenth century. According to an Arm. MS., the late fifth-century philosopher Davit Anyalec 'the Invincible', arar girk mi, or koči 6000-sak, cv en yoyż xtīn en cv kzninc amansyn bani 'made a book called the Six Thousand, and it is very complex and scrutinises everything'. Armenian folk tradition ascribes the work to King Solomon. The term 'Book of Six Thousand' (Arm. Vēc Hazareak) appears to refer not to a single work, however, but to a wide variety of magical, angelological, astrological and mathematical texts of considerably varying length, composed or copied over nearly thirteen centuries. The earliest text of the name we possess is a table of division based on the number 6000 by Ananas of Širak. The table is arranged with the divisor in the left-hand column, the dividend in the right, and the quotient in the centre, viz.: 14 428 6000. The base of 6000 seems to be derived from ancient Mesopotamian mathematics; Arm. sōs '60 years' and ner
'600 years' are to be derived from Sumerian Ṛnu and Ṛnu, via Gr. āsōn and āsōn.\(^{92}\) Anania of Şirak was also an astrologer, and it is recalled that in the Roman Empire practitioners of that art were called also mathematici, because of their complex calculations, and Chaldei, because of their Eastern lore.\(^{93}\) It does not seem altogether unreasonable, therefore, that Anania should have been cited as one of the early transmitters of the occult wisdom of the Vec\(^{9}\) Hazarei, although his sole contribution to it was a simple arithmetical table. It is indisputable, however, that the number 6000 possessed further mystical significance, for many and marvellous properties are ascribed by Armenians to the book, to this day.\(^{94}\) From the days of the Talmud on, throughout virtually the entire Christian world, the belief was current that Christ had redeemed the world in its 6000th year, and that 6000 years later the world would come to an end.\(^{95}\) Pliny the Elder [d. A.D. 79] says that Eudoxus handed down a tradition that Zoroaster had lived 6000 years before the death of Plato (Nat. Hist., 30.1 (2). 3f., tr. by W. S. Fox and R. Pemberton, Passages in Greek and Latin Literature Relating to Zoroaster and Zoroastrarianism. K. R. Cama Or. Inst. Publication 4, 1929, 45 and 109). Sometimes, the period of 6000 years in which we live was divided into three parts: 2000 of emptiness, 2000 of the Law, and 2000 of the Messiah.\(^{96}\) What I am most striking about these conceptions is the manner in which they seem to have been adapted to the 12,000-year Zoroastrian cosmology, which seems to have been originally a period of 6000 years. In the developed cosmology of the Bundahišn, the assault of Ahriman upon the material world came at noon on the first day of Fravardin in the year 6000.\(^{97}\) In a poem by the fourteenth-century Arm. poet Yowatism T'irkuranc\(^{9}\), we find these lines: Sør\(\)m ašdām draxtēn\(\) eham/ Yerrik igec\(\) w arar šiwar/ Ew satani em mathemac\(\)/ Or c'ar c'areac\(\) am vec\(\) hazar. 'Love removed Adam from Paradise. Cast him into the world and made him giddy. And betrayed him to Satan, Who tortured him six thousand years.'\(^{98}\) The three periods mentioned above in the Christian scheme appear illogical and forced. Do they come before or after the advent of Christ? If they come before him, how is the present era to be divided? They make sense only in the Zoroastrian scheme, in which there are three ages: spiritual creation, material creation, and the mixture of good and evil in material creation (two periods of 3000 years' duration each in the age of Bundahišn 'creation', and one period of 6000 years called gumešian 'mixture', in which we live now). The Armenians, as is seen from the mediaeval lyrics cited above, also knew the 6000-year (or 12,000-year) cosmology. It appears that there may indeed have been a Zoroastrian source for the concept. A short version of the Vec\(^{9}\) Hazarei, a treatise on spells involving angelology and astrology, is bound in an Armenian miscellany of astrological and magical manuscripts, Brit. Mus. Or. Ms. 6471, fol. 233a-b. The text is on paper, in a mixed notzir and bologir hand, with 29 lines to a page. The text is very worn, and most of the title, as well as a number of words on the verso page, is illegible. The Ms. is dated A.D. 1611, and in his colophon on fol. 258, the scribe writes, 6000-ak marvan 'ti I acquired the Book of the Six Thousand at Marsovan.' Although the colophon is written in two columns, the handwriting is nearly identical to that of the text on fol. 233a-b. Even if the scribe did not copy the Vec\(^{9}\) Hazarei himself, the style of the script is late and probably contemporaneous with the author of the colophon. In the text there is a preamble tracing the transmission of the Vec\(^{9}\) Hazarei which mentions first that it came i mec inastansan\(\) c'w mazdÃŠac woc\(\) 'from the great philosophers and Mazdéac'i-k'. Dionysius the Areopagite, Abraham, Plato, Aristotle, Porphyry, Dawit\(^{9}\) Anyakt\(\), Anania of Şirak and Sâ Sahak and Mesrop come after. The word mazdÃŠac\(\) i, here attested as a hapax legomenon in the abl. pl., appears to be a native Arm. word meaning 'Mazdean', the only such word we possess for the pre-Christian faith.

\textbf{BA'ALSAMÔN}

Xorena\(\) c'ı mentions a Scythian tyrant named Baršam whom the Arm. hero Aرام fought and killed in Assyria, ox says Baršam van aruç\(\) c'ıan ivroy bazum goroc\(\) astuac\(\) oc'eal pasac\(\) i Amorik\(\) xamakh\(\) jor\(\) olov. 'And the Assyrians worshipped this Baršam for many years, having deified him on account of his many manly deeds!'\(^{100}\) One notes the epithet ari 'manly' in the abstract noun aru-t\(\) c'ım here; as we have seen above, it is one of the most frequent epithets of Arm. Armazd. The same historian records that Tigran II \in\(\) ijanê i Mimâget, ox steal and smârâsan vary spathern, zor i p'oksroy ox i bivrëesz kazmeal c'ı arc\(\) oy, hramayê tanel karamel yawanin T'ordan. 'himself descended into
Mesopotamia and found there the statue of Baršamin, which was of ivory and crystal set in silver, and he ordered that it be taken away and erected in the village of T'Ordorn (MX II.14). Several centuries later St Gregory the Illuminator, according to Agathangelos, "began to erect a temple in the little village of Daramai in order to destroy the altars of those falsely named gods, where in the village of T'Ordorn there was a temple of the god Baršamin, named 'of white glory'. First they destroyed it and shattered its image" (Agath. 78).

The god appears also in Armenian traditions on the origin of the Milky Way galaxy. Anania of Širak wrote, "Certain of the earliest men of the Armenians said that during a bitter winter, Vahagn, the ancestor of the Armenians, stole straw from Baršan, the ancestor of the Assyrians, which (straw) we have become wont in science to call the Trail of the Straw-Thief. This corresponds exactly to a Persian name of the Milky Way, kalEn, which was os ivory and crystal set in silver, and he ordered that it be taken away and erected in the village of T'Ordorn, mehem anunseal spatikap'ar die'n Baršamnay: naz ena korem, ev wakker norin p'ser'gen 'arrived in the province of Daramai in order to destroy the altars of those falsely named gods; where in the village of T'Ordorn there was a temple of the god Baršamin, named 'of white glory'. First they destroyed it and shattered its image' (Agath. 78).

It seems that the religious tolerance and political stability of the Achaemenian Empire, and the influence of the cult of a single, supreme god Ahura Mazda, encouraged the development in the northern Semitic world of a trans-national monotheism. The syncretistic philosophies of the Hellenistic period, in which the various gods of different nations were often regarded as the same divine personage possessing merely different names, can only have strengthened such a trend. In Phoenicia, the concept of a heaven inhabited by numerous gods in council, some of whom might be disobedient to the chief god, was replaced by the vision of a supreme Lord for whom the lesser gods were but angels and servants. Throughout most of the first millennium B.C., Ba'al Šamin was primarily a weather god, like the north Syrian Hadad and the Anatolian Tammuz. Even after he became a supreme god, he retained this function; a bilingual inscription of A.D. 134 from El-Tayyibe is dedicated by one Agathangelos of Abila to Ba'al Šamin, Master of the World,/ To Zeus, the Greatest, the Thunderer. The same epithet of 'Thunderer' was applied to Aramaic of Me'sak' by Movses Xorenac'i, who reports that St Nun (Geor. Nino, see above) korcanaec nampropay in patern Aramadvy or kayr mekusi i k'aas'etn getcoyn hawri ënd nêl anc'anelov: zor sovor ên erkrapagel ayun ayun i taneac' i urak'and'irv, zi hundêp noc'a ererw: iak et'd ok' zohel kamér, anc'ecal end geta raflji meneqin c zohr 'destroyed the image of Aramad the Thunderer that stood alone outside the city; a powerful river' flowed in between. They were accustomed to do obesiance to it, each on his own rooftop every morning, for it faced them. And if anyone wanted to perform a sacrifice, he crossed the river and sacrificed before the temple(s)' (MX II.86). One also notes an Armenian Artaxiad coin with the image of a thunderbolt on the reverse, identical to the thunderbolts held by Adad, the Babylonian god of tempests, in a bas-relief from a stele of ca. eighth century B.C. found at Arslan Taş. On another bas-relief from Komayganes of the first century B.C.,
Ahura Mazda is shown with a tiara and diadem decorated with winged thunderbolts. The epithet megtos 'greatest', applied to Baal Şamīn in the bilingual inscription cited above, is found applied, it seems, to Ahura Mazda in the Parthian Gk. inscription cited earlier, where he is called Zeus Megistos. 110

The epithet spitakap'ar may refer to the ivory of the statue at T'ordan, or to the brilliant lightning of the Thunderer, or to some other divine quality. The Zoroastrian faith itself is called al-din al-abjad 'the white religion' in a letter of Xaš, brother of Arși'n, cited by Tabari (ed. de Goeje, III, 131). White (Arm. spitak) dogs called 'gods' (Arm. astuac-k) by Movses Xorenac'i (II.7), probably the marvellous creatures called aralēz-k', save lost children and resurrect the dead; perhaps their whiteness bears some relation to the white glory of Bar güneş in Armenia. 112 The epithet spitakap'ar may be echoed in the description by P'arpi (fifth century) of the vision of St Sahak Partew (387-419): ...ew xovan bar krov spitakap'ayl gnov 'And there stood revealed to me on earth a four-sided tabernacle of cloud, whose height reached Heaven, and whose breadth extended to fill all the earth. And atop the tabernacle was a tetraskelē' of pure gold, vaulted, according to the worthy service of the Lord, covered with an exceeding fine linen of shining-white colour' (P'arpi I.1). The vision of St Gregory (Agath. 767) also contains the image of a four-sided vault, supported by pillars. The buildings described in both visions, it has been suggested, derive their shape from the temples of pre-Christian Armenia. 114 Much later Armenian church architecture contains elements of the sahār tāq and squinch, an architectural form common in the Sasanian period which may have evolved under the Parthians; it is that form which is apparently described in the above vision of St Sahak. The pillar-dome motif is a common decorative feature in Armenian, Syriac, and Byzantine illuminations of the canon-tables in manuscripts of the Gospel; in Armenian, the structure is called by an Iranian name, however, xoran, derived from Pth. xyrn. 115

In St Sahak's vision, the structure is called by a Gk. name by P'arpi's, yet it seems sound to suggest that pre-Christian imagery was used from the Zoroastrian past. The word spitakap'ayl 'shining-white' used in the narrative is very like spitakap'ar, and perhaps it echoes the ancient epithet of the pagan god. But the vision continues, and the true enlightenment of the saint comes only with the lifting of the shining white veil; it is tempting to imagine here a warning to the followers of the old dispensation that what once seemed radiance is now outshone by the fulfillment of Christ, and that the heathens hold not light but that which obscures it and will be torn away, even as the holy curtain of the Temple at Jerusalem was rent at the Crucifixion. 116 The image of radiance is of such general importance in Zoroastrianism that it cannot be a property ascribed exclusively to one divinity or another, but one notes that the Arm. translator of Philo calls the shining rainbow gawti Aramazd, 'the girdle of Aramazd', and the same expression is ascribed independently by T'ovma Arzruni (I.1) to the rarrapāt-k' worshipers of the elements—a likely designation of Zoroastrians (see the discussion of the Amsa Spentas above), whose careful reverence for the holy elements of the Mazda-created world is a conspicuous feature of the faith. 117 The epithet 'of shining glory' may well have been applied to the Supreme Lord, if he was regarded as girding himself in rainbows. 118 In the writings of Dawit Anyalt, the name of the planet Jupiter is translated as Aramazd, and of the planet is Ohrmazd in Pahlavi writings. 119

It is seen that both Aramazd and Barşandin shared a number of characteristics. In Palmyra, by the second century A.D., Bel and Ba'al Şamīn were both worshiped as identical deities, and their separate functions as creator and weather god respectively, had coalesced entirely. Ba'al Şamīn could be regarded as equal to Aramazd and perhaps even identical to him. It is unlikely that Tigran II (according to MX) established purely by coincidence the temple of the former at T'ordan, a village scarcely a few miles from Ani, where the shrine of the latter stood. In the Christian Arsacid kingdom of Armenia, the members of the royal family were buried at Ani as of old, whilst the Catholicos—descendants of the Tūr family, the second clan of the Arsacids themselves—the second clan of Parthia after the Arsacids themselves—were buried in T'ordan. 120 Such an arrangement, which served to express the balance and accord of throne and altar,
indicates that Aramazd and Baršāmin before the Conversion must have been associated. The Armenian legend of the origin of the Milky Way must go back to a time when Baršāmin, occasionally confused with the other Semitic divinity Bel, was regarded as a weather god merely. Such a confusion is not implausible, for both names contain the word Baʿal 'lord'. For Baršāmin is pitted against Vahagn, also a weather god; it will be seen in the following chapter that he had assumed the functions of the earlier Hurrian divinity Tvšû. It is interesting to note that Baʿal Šāmin is called Kronos in an inscription of the Hellenistic period from Byblos, but, as seems to be the case with the Gk. translation of Agathangelos cited above where Aramazd is called Kronos...Dios, this would be a manner of stressing the primeval supremacy of the god, and need not imply the influence of Zurvanist doctrines.

The cult of Baršāmin seems to have disappeared from Armenia after the Conversion. The Synaxarion of Tūr Israel records the martyrdom at Ctesiphon, probably in the fourth century, of one Barbašāmin 'Son of Baʿal Šāmin' at the hands of Šabuhr (II), and the Arm. version of the Wisdom of Abīgar mentions one Bēšām. Both references probably go back to Syriac sources.

ASTUAC

Aramazd, because of its obvious associations with the old religion, is besides a personal name, and could not therefore be used as a name for the Christian God. Arm. diḵ, a native word, was obviously unacceptable, also, for although it has been used with both singular and plural meaning, as we have seen, the base form attested is a plural, implying polytheism. By the fifth century, when Eznīk wrote, astuacapnaštukun 'worship of Astuac' implied Christian piety, while a diḵušapuš was a heathen. Astuac, used in the singular or plural, could refer, with or without the qualification of a proper name, to non-Christian gods also: Šabuhr II accused Sts Abdišoy, Sahak and Simeon, saying, os pašteḵ astuacu in 'you do not worship my gods', and swore to the Arm. Arsacid king Šīr ib Mīhr mec astuac 'by the great god Mīhr' (MX III.17).

Various etymologies of the word Astuac have been proposed since the mediaeval period. Aḵāsean and Marr both support a derivation from the name of the god Sabazios, who was apparently worshipped on the western border of Armenia, in Cappadocia, as a talisman of his has been found there. His worship was associated further to the west of Asia Minor, in Lydia, with the cult of the 'Persian' goddess, Artemis Anaeitis; one inscription found there reads: Ekopas dendra theon Dios Sabaziou kei Artemidos Anaeitis 'I cut down trees of the gods Zeus Sabazios and Artemis Anaeitis.' Sabazios appears originally to have been a chthonian deity. There may be a reference to Sabazios in a late mediaeval Armenian manuscript published by Makler which depicts crudely drawn demons and prescribes talismans against them. One devil 'demon' boasts, Mardo lyške tanem or šat xši or lini oc čak oc načat 'I take away a man's senses so he speaks so much that he is neither well nor ill.' The spell one recites reads: Mustakin šarian, azuni, sabazur all šay dil šati bi išn acoy ayay všay. The form sabazur may be a form of the name Sabazios; the verse as a whole seems to be gibberish, although several Arabic and Persian words and phrases may be distinguished. But the etymology of Astuac has yet to be explained with certainty.
8-c. Martyrdom of St. Yakovik, in the Arm.

8-d. A not in Cappadocia also a toponym Quadata, which seems to be OIr. *vātsa* †vātsa of wind, whose name is otherwise not found in the Arm. area. But this suggestion must remain tentative, for this form of the toponym is found only in Ptolemy and may represent a corruption (by Zoroastrians?) of an earlier name. See W. M. Ramsay, The Historical Geography of Asia Minor, 1890, repr. N.Y., 1972, 297.

8-b. Ekaš, text p. 35, lines 7-8.

8-a. One notes in Cappadocia also a toponym Quadata, which seems to be OIr. *vātsa* †vātsa of wind, whose name is otherwise not found in the Arm. area. But this suggestion must remain tentative, for this form of the toponym is found only in Ptolemy and may represent a corruption (by Zoroastrians?) of an earlier name. See W. M. Ramsay, The Historical Geography of Asia Minor, 1890, repr. N.Y., 1972, 297.

8-c. MK III.63, based on trC (see Thomson, tr. of MK, 339 n. 3).


11. KKE. 4: u-m kard nām Kirdēr I Ohrmazd movēd, Ohrmazd bāy pād nām 'and I was ordained with the title movēd of Ohrmazd, by the name of Ohrmazd the Lord.' It is probably the god referred to here, not the monarch. In Sasanian Pahlavi, the king is customarily referred to in this and other inscriptions as in bay †his present majesty', and when he is called bay, the word precedes his name; when reference is made to the divine origin of kings, either bay (from OP. bāga-) or yāzd (cf. Av. yāsata-) may be used. Although the office of Ohrmazd movēd is attested for later reigns of other kings, and in those cases definitely cannot have been a rank bearing the name of the reigning monarch, its origin is still uncertain.

12. Gray, op. cit., 24; Boyce, Hist. Zor., II, 274-5; M. Läuberski, Ephemeris für semitische Epigraphik, I, Giessen, 1902, 59-74, 319-26, and H. Donner, W. Röllig, Kanonische und aramäische Inschriften, 3rd ed., Wiesbaden, 1971, III, 311 n. 264. Den Mandaysēni is the Zoroastrian religion (MP. dēn Mandāsan, Arm. transcription deni mandēm, lit. 'religion of the worship of Mazda'), here personified as female (cf. Av. mādān, nom. f.). The next-of-kin marital tie alluded to in the inscription was common in Armenia; see Ch. 3, esp. on Tigran and Brutē. Photographs of the inscribed stones from Arebam were kindly supplied to this writer by the Türk Arkeoloji Müzesi, Istanbul, Env. Nos. 7753, 7754. They have shallow reliefs which may be interpreted to depict the creation of the world by Bel or Ahura Mazda. It is as Creator, indeed, that the Zoroastrian God is chiefly invoked. Env. No. 7753 shows two hands, perhaps those of the Creator, clenched over an inverted trapezoid covered with Aramaic, beneath which is an eight-spoked wheel very like the Buddhist Wheel of Dharma set in motion by Sakyamuni. From it water radiates in waves. At the bottom a duck is shown against a background of leaves, and fish with donkey-like faces (perhaps the Avestan karfish) swim in the water. The scene is one of striking motion and intricate beauty.
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CHAPTER 6

VAHAGN

The name of the yazata Verethraghna- is found in Arm. as Vahagn. This form derives from a pre-Sasanian Mr. word, cf. Sgd. Vaisaghn, Saka Varlaam, Kušana ORLAGN. The name of the last king of the Zaraiid dynasty of Sophene was Artanēs, and in an inscription at Nemrut Dağ, the contemporary Commagenian king Antiochus I equated the Gk. divinities Hēraklēs and Arēs with the Zoroastrian god, whose name appears as Artagnēs, very like the form from Sophene, which is probably Arm. The Arm. Vahagn has been derived by Toporov from a hypothetical Pth. *V(a)rhragn. As the equation with Hēraklēs and Arēs would imply, the Iranian god is the personification of Victory; his name means 'one who smites resistance'. Verethraghna is considered the 'standard-bearer' of the yazatas in the struggle against evil; and in historical times, he came to be regarded as a protector of travellers, the sick, and the demon-afflicted. It is perhaps because of his identification with victory and the Zoroastrian belief that fire is a warrior against the darkness of the assault of evil against the good creations of Ahura Mardīn, that temple fires of the highest grade were dedicated to him by the Sasanians. As an upholder of righteousness, Verethraghna is closely allied to Mithra and Rashnu, especially to the former. In the Mhr Yašt (Yt. 10), he appears as a powerful and raging boar (Av. varāz-), who destroys any man false to the sacred contract; this became by far the most important and popular of his numerous incarnations, as we shall see. It has been suggested that the Bahram Yašt (Yt. 14), which incorporates a number of archaic passages, was compiled in Arsacid times, when the prestige of the yazata enjoyed great popularity. In Hellenistic times, Iranian Verethraghna was equated by Classical writers with Hēraklēs.

Two important centres of the cult of the divinity in Arsacid times appear to have flourished in close proximity to Armenia—one is indeed cited by an Arm. writer—and therefore deserve brief
discussion here. Mount Sabalan, 4270 m. in height, rises at 36° N. Lat., 47°33' E. Long. According to Qazwini (ca. A.D. 1263), Zaratustra went to the mountain from Šīr and brought a book called Basta (the Avesta) from there. He adds that, according to the Prophet Muhammad, the mountain lies between Armenia and Azerbaijan. At its summit is a frozen pool and the grave of one of the prophets. On the mountainside are hot springs where the sick are cured—one recalls the curative powers ascribed to Verethraghna—and at its foot is a large tree at whose base there grows a plant fatal to animals. The Armenian writer Grigor Magistros (11th century) in one of his letters writes, Ovt mohac avc zSpandiar i Sabalan kalow lerin 'I will not forget Spandiar, who stands in Mount Sabalan,' comparing this tradition to the Arm. belief that king Artawazd languishes in Mt Ararat. Later, he speaks of savan part evic k'nak cac yostoc'n kertac'nal, isk savat ec m'Iko clora i vēm yekap'cocal, Spandiaray za kengenal arjan 'the cedar of Sabalan, about which the Parthians say that three cities were built of its branches, whilst its root and trunk were transformed into rock: Spandiar erected it as a monument.' Spandiar is probably an early form of NP. Isfandiyar, from OIr. špant5.ätā-. Moveš Kabankatuc'i (7th century) in his 'History of the Alans' refers to a great tree worshipped with sacrifices by the barbarian Hq-nk, which they call Tangrit'zān (i.e., the Turkic sky-god Tengri), and the Persians call Aspandiat. Although the Arm. revered certain trees, the reference here is most likely to Persian, and not Armenian, custom, for the common derivative of Av. špant5.āta— in Arm. is Spandarat, a NW Mbr. form, as distinguished from Spandiat; the shift of -ū to -ē in the latter is characterized SW Ir. According to the Farhang-i anjoman-i Arūf Nāsirī, s.v. Savalān, the mountain was an abode of religious hermits even in pre-Islamic times; the Magi considered it so sacred that they swore by it; and there is a frozen lake at the summit, in the depths of which there lies an enormous statue of human shape. In the Arm. legend, Artawazd is a sinister figure; in the tradition of Mt Sabalan to which the tale is compared, we find the epic figure Spandiat. In the Yēdgar i Zarārān, 'The Memorial of Zarārān', a Parthian epic preserved in Pahlavi, Spandidād is a hero, but in the Sāh-nāmeh he is an opponent of the hero Rustam. Perhaps because of this, Grigor Magistros regarded Spandiar as a villain; he cites a legend which is not found in the Sāh-nāmeh, in which it is said that erbeem na'jel k'nun Rustam, i versy basel patahama Spandirn amanael, sahpetk hahbawand i versy nora holovel. Zor zarruc'c'ol ōstasē'c'yn sot c'hem yi'mkēn šaraēl svarun ibru erbeem Kronos, yakerkēn zokompios ec i cayrs kawšun artakiteal i ver nahanīr. 'Once, while Rustam was sleeping, the one named Spandiar happened upon him and threatened to roll Mount Damawand over him. The āstagesē, that is, the shaggy-haired one, shook his locks, even as Kronos once leered at Olympus, and, shaking it with a tap of the tip of his boot, restrained himself.'

It is probable that Spandiar came to be associated with the holy mountain in popular legend as an apocalyptic figure imprisoned and doomed to rise and fight a hero, even as Azi Dahaka is to leave Damawand at the end of days, when Thraētaona shall awaken from millennial slumber to fight him. The various references to a statue indicate that in Parthian times the mountain may have been the site of an image-shrine. There is only one certain reference to it in pre-Islamic literature: in the Sāhristānīnī i Frān, a mountain is mentioned called 

\[\text{Sāhristānīnī i Frān, a mountain is mentioned called} \]

In his Annals (XII.13), Tacitus describes a campaign of the emperor Claudius (1st century A.D.) against the Parthians, during which the Parthian king Gotarnes went to Mount Sanbulos to offer sacrifices to the various gods of the place, 'and amongst these Hercules with especial solemnity, who, at stated times, warns the priests in a dream, "to prepare him horses equipped for hunting, and place them by the temple," the horses, when furnished with quivers full of arrows, scour the forests, and return at night with empty quivers, panting vehemently: again, the god, in another vision of the night, describes the course he took in traversing the woods; and beasts are found stretched upon the ground in all directions.' The god called Hercules, Gk. Heraklēs, is undoubtedly Verethraghna; the divine hunt perhaps reflects the hallowed Iranian institution of the royal hunt; the favoured quarry was the wild boar (symbol of Verethraghna and
heraldic animal of the Arm. Arsacids, as we shall see below) or the onager (cf. discussion of the name Guras in Ch. 3). It is likely that Sanbulos is the mountain now known as Sabalan, the site of an important temple of Verethraghna, probably an image-shrine, and a place of royal worship and pilgrimage.

Sir Mark Aurel Stein associated Sanbulos with another site, at a considerable distance to the south. This is a complex of over twenty caves, one of which is natural and of vast proportions, the others smaller and some of them man-made, in the cliff-face at Karafito, near Saqqiz, Iran. Although the caves are at some elevation, it would be unreasonable to call the site a mountain; the identification, which, we think, is not accurate, was prompted rather by a Greek inscription, dated tentatively to 330 B.C., over the lintel of the entrance to Room A. The inscription was read first by R. Ker-Porter, who published a fragmentary version of it in his Travels in Georgia, Persia, Armenia and Ancient Babylonia, II, London, 1822. The inscription, a shortened form of a common Hellenistic apotropaic formula, reads: Ἡρακλῆς enthade katoliki/moden eiseltboi kakon Ἡρακλῆς resides herein;/ might no evil enter.' This inscription may or may not be associated with the Iranian cult of Verethraghna; its general Hellenistic character makes this virtually impossible to determine. P. Bernard, who is inclined because of Pliny’s use of the name Cambalidus for the rock of Behistun to identify Sanbulos with the latter rather than with some other place, notes that the inscription at Karafito is of a form typical of houses, not of sanctuaries, and that it is entirely Greek in character.

Armenian sources concerning Vahagn are numerous. In Agath. 127, king Tiridates invokes in an edict addressed to the Arm. nation the aid of the triad of Aramazd, Anahit and Vahagn: ἐν Καθαντίγιον ἴω εἰς τὸν Βαχάγνῳ 'and may bravery come to you from brave Vahagn'. Such a characterisation would stress the martial aspect of Verethraghna noted above. After the conversion of the Arm. king to Christianity, St Gregory proceeded to demolish the temple of Vahagn: Ἐκ τῆς Βαχαγνίου, ἐκατον ἄρτος ἡμῶν, Grigorios, τὸν Βαχαγνίου μεσανήματα ἐκεῖνον ἵνα πάντες τὰς ὁρεινά ἔν τῷ Σάβλαι τῆς Πασανατίς ἐκεῖνον. Gregory then proceeded east to Bagawan, destroyed the images of the gods there, and ordered that the same two saints be honoured on
The location of the temple is corroborated by Xorenac'i, according to whom Tigran II zaptroditesay spatker, ibrew Herakleas term'awori, or norin patarin Herakleas hramyacag' kangei yaaxlac'tokisn 'commanded that the statue of Aphrodite, as the lover of Herakles, be erected next to the statue of the latter in the places of prayers' (MX II.14). Aššiśat became the first Mother See of the Armenian Church. According to P'awostos, Chorepiskopos Daniel was appointed at the monastery yavures yorum korenacac sbagins menhec'n Herakleas, ays ink'n Vahagni, orum teoxy Aššiśat kardaceral: ur nax ed zhimans ekolec'woy srboy... By yaaxar er yakn aebem in nerk'oy sarabarir menenatawy Herakleas, or kay den yandimn lerinn meci orum c'uln anuaneal karden, i bagarin tekwoj'i i bac'agyn ibrew k'arēngoc ci i nerk'oy kus'aw, i doyn corcorakin i sakaw anadakain i bac'ut purakin orum anun teoxy isk Hac'ac'ac draxt koc'en 'in the days when [St Gregory] destroyed the altars of the temples of Herakles, that is, of Vahagn, which place is called Aššiśat, where [St Gregory] first laid the foundations of the holy Church.... And often he [Daniel] was at the spring below the summit, the place of the temple of Herakles, which stands opposite a great mountain which they call the Ox [i.e., the Taurus], about a stone's throw away on the side below the place of the shrine, in a little, sparsely wooded valley, in a grove of ash trees which they call the Grove of the Ash Trees' (P'EB III.14).

The various passages cited above raise a number of questions. The name Vahēvaneac is found in MSS. also as Vahēvhean. The tenth-century historian T'ovma Arevunt mentions that a Vahēvhean mohean was located in the village of Ahevakanc on the eastern slopes of Mount Varaq, a few miles south of Van; the Christian Jeroy Vank' 'monastery' was later built on the site; T'ovma adds that king Artaxias (I) had commanded that moheans of Hēraklysas and Dionysos be built in Lesser Abak, to the southeast. Vahē vahē is the chorus of a wedding song of Vaspurakan, the region where the two temples were located; the song was recorded by the ethnographer E. Lalayan at the beginning of the twentieth century: E'g barew, ay E'g barew/ E'g arевum tank' barew/ Ta 'tagavorin šat arov/ Vahē Vahē 'Greetings, O greetings to the dawn./ Let us greet the dawn of the Sun/ That is give the king [i.e., the bridegroom] much Sun [i.e., a long life]/ Vahē, vahē.'²⁵ Benveniste suggested a connection between Vahēvahē and some ancient orgastic cry, citing the bakkebeakkhon a'sal of Aristophanes.²⁶ The word may come from a form of the name of the yazata, however, for the members of the naxardom of the Vahn(un) uni considered themselves descendants of the divinity, and supplied the priesthood of the cult. Xorenac'i writes that king Artaxias I found in Asia Minor gold-plated bronze statues of the Greek divinities Artemis, Hēraklys and Apollo; these were equated by the Armenians with Anahit, Vahagn and Tir.²⁷ Zor a'real k'rmepetac'n, or Šin yege Vahunac's, zanokonin er Artemisay kangeac'n Yarmawir: isk iderakleasain zaimapatker, zor a'real er i Dikweay er i Dipinose kretac'woy, zVahagn i'wreneac varkameyor nami, kangeac'in i Taraw yiwereyn sep'halen gevän yAššiśat, yet mahun Artaśisi 'The high priests, who were of the Vahun family, took them. They erected [the statues] of Apollo and Artemis at Armawir, but the manly image of Hēraklysas, which had been fashioned by Scyllos and by Dipinos the Cretan, they set up in Taraw in their own village of Aššiśat after the death of Artaśas, considering him their ancestor Vahagn' (MX II.12). One of the Vahunis, Vahē, is reputed to have died fighting on the Persian side against Alexander of Macedon.²⁸ In view of the close connection of the family with Aššiśat and the similarity of the names Vahun and Vahē to Vahēvahē, it seems most probable that the latter term is merely an adjectival form of the name of the yazata. We shall see presently why Vahē, i.e., Vahagn, was to be invoked in a wedding song praising the dawn, some seventeen centuries after the obliteration of his cult. The name of the site of the temple, Aššiśat, is explained by Agathangelos and Xorenac'id as composed of two MR. bases: yaš'/'prayer' and šat 'abundant'. The latter suffix is encountered often in Arm. toponyms, as we have seen in the cases of Artašat, Eruandasat et al.²⁹ In early Christian times, Aššiśat was called the teqal akawytic'n 'place of prayers'—a rendering of the old epithet of the place without the specifically Zoroastrian term yaš'.³⁰ Eznik uses the term yaš' aimal in describing the ritual performed by Zruman...
son(s) [i.e., of the Eruandid Tigran] (were) Bab, Tiran and Vahagn, about whom [i.e., Vahagn] the legends say: "Heaven was in labour, earth was in labour, the purple sea was in labour. The labour in the sea seized a red reed. Along the reed stalk smoke ascended; along the reed stalk fire ascended. And out of the fire leapt a golden-haired boy. He had fiery hair and a fiery beard, and his eyes were little suns." We have heard with our own ears how some sang this to the accompaniment of the *bambin*. After this in the song they spoke of his fighting with and vanquishing dragons, and they attributed to him in their songs much that was very like the exploits of Hēraklēs. They also said he was deified. And in the land of the Georgians yonder they honoured with sacrifices a full-scale statue of him. And the Vahunis are of his line' (MX I.31).

The Arm. song quoted by Xorenac³⁴ shows alliterative qualities, and may be divided into metric lines and hemistichs. The concepts of physics implied in the song of the birth of Vahagn are archaic and find a parallel in the Vedas, where plants, born of water, become sticks, which when rubbed together give birth to fire.³⁷ Survivals of this image may be perceived in mediaeval and modern Armenian poetry and folklore. In the nineteenth century, the Arms. of Bukovina, a Romanian district then part of the Russian Empire, told of a mythical creature, the *covac-ul* 'sea bull', which gives birth to a son by blowing fire through a reed. Out of the reed leaps a huge man with beard and hair of fire; two dogs accompany him.³⁸ The epithet 'Dragon Reaper' used of Vahagn by Agathangelos will be examined shortly; bulls and the sea will both be seen to play a significant part in the legend as we reconstruct it. The distant image of Vahagn may be perceived also in these lines describing the four holy creatures of the heavenly Chariot by the tenth-eleventh-century Arm. poet, Varden of Ami: *By box c p'orjanac / Vafeal i mē / eiegann ev akanc' / By axtiwc cerac'eloy amceranale hopyow / Manuk noroeal / By t'covak' aregaGenn gac'el i vor /And the flames of tribulation/ Flared up in the reed and in the springs:/ By the disease of age was renewed/ The child of ageless soul,/ And on wings of the Sun he soared aloft."³⁹

---

("Survûn") so that Ohrmazd might be born; the associated verb *yaz-om* 'I sacrifice' is also used in texts without reference to specifically Persian practices.³¹ J. Markwart connected with the Ir. base *yaz-* also the name of a place in Armenia attested in Greek in Strabo, *Geog.* XI.14.14, as *Isagoria.*³² An Arm. proper name from *Siwmik*, Yazd, is attested in the *History of Lazār Fārpeći* (late 5th century); this would be the sole attestation of a word for Av. *vasata*- in Arm., here a Mīr. borrowing.³³ The tradition of a temple complex in Tarawin with three idols survived down to the early years of this century amongst the Arms. of MaxiJewan. They related that when St Gregory heard of the temple, he hastened there and arrived on Nawasard. In order not to anger the crowd, he told them to proceed with their festivities, but he removed the three golden images of the gods and set up in their place the holy Cross. The feast was called *Surb Xoc* 'Holy Cross' thereafter.³⁴

In the fifth-century Arm. translation of the Bible, Vahagn is used to translate LXX Gk. Ἥρακλης (II Macc. IV.9), but he seems to have been regarded also as a sun god. In the fifth-century Arm. translation of Philo, we find the explanation *Xanx koc'en omanc* ... *zhur Hērpešten ew aregakn vzahagn 'for some call...fire Hephaistos and the sun Vahagn.'³⁵ In a Mediaeval *tawakan matean* 'Book of Festivals' we are told *Omanc³⁶ zaregakn pastec'in ev vzahagn koc'ec'in: ew ayłk³⁶ klusin, ew Artemis jawnc³⁶ in 'Some worshipped the Sun and called it Vahagn, whilst others worshipped the moon and called it Artemis.'³⁶

A source of such an identification may be sought in this citation by Xorenac³⁶ of an ancient epic: *Sora ordi Bab: Tiran: Vahagn, sornē asen aqaspelc³⁶: Erknēr erkin, erknēr erkir, erknēr ew covn cirani: erknēr i covn unēr skaranikan ciegnik: *ēnd eiegan p'ōc uxx elanēr, ēnd eiegan p'ōc bocc elanēr: ev i bocc'om vazer xarteag patane:ka: nax hur her unēr, bocc unēr mavrens ev ac'kun'ēn ēn aregaknec³⁶: Zaoz ergelov omanc³⁶ bahramb, loac³⁶ išk ajanjew³⁶ merovk³⁶. Yet orcy ev ēnd višac³⁶ ašiniz yerzg kwač nma ev yakt'eqel: ev kari imnmamagyns zherakleye nhatakac³⁶'eqac'n nma ergāsin. Ayl akāsn sia ew astuac'eqel: ew and yušarākhen Vras³⁶ zсорa t'eq³⁶ hasekis kungnae patuēsin zohīk³⁶. Ev sora en zarkn³⁶ Vahunik³⁶ 'His
The *bambin* was probably a stringed instrument similar to the lute. The tenth-century Catholicos Yovhannes of Drasmaktert wrote, Tigran neai ordi, *z*ab, *z*iran, *svahagn zor i kyrto* ĉahar asebana ēnd viqapac ĉambarvni kruil naa ev yaq'el, ev ēnd k'ajin Herakleay nahatakt*ĉe*ma n na hanevatal. *Ayi ban *svahagn* ĉ'elo pa *nhanagin Vrać ēt ĉ'ap ĉasi soa endrī kagmen pa*tu*maan zohivk*ĉ. Ev i *zarmic* ĉ *sora serin Vahunik* ĉ. Tigran bogat the sons *zab, *ziran and Vahagn. With strums of the plectrum, they celebrated his struggle against and victory over the dragons, and likened his [deeds] to the exploits of brave Heraklēs. The story about Vahagn says that in the province of Georgia they erected a full-scale statue of him and hono-red it with sacrifices. And the Vahunis are among his progeny.

It is seen that the above is virtually a literal citation of Xorenac*ĉi*, except for the explanation of the *bambin*. Fragments of terracotta bas-reliefs from Artešat depict long-necked stringed instruments similar to the lute, an instrument which is played with a plectrum.

Before recounting the Herculean deeds of Vahagn, we may examine several other references to his sunlike, fiery appearance and golden hair. The Arm. word *hret*, which means 'fiery', is also the name of the planet Mars, called after Verethraghna by the Iranians, and the word may thus be an epithet of Vahagn, for it was also paired (as a planetary name) by mediaeval Arm. astrologers with a star named *nox* 'Pig'; the boar, it is remembered, is the principal heraldic animal of Vahagn. The Arm. loan-word *varaz* 'boar' is found alone or in compounds as a proper name, and it was used often by the Arsacid kings on their seals.

According to Agath. 727, king Tiridates was transformed into a pig (nox) during his persecution of St Gregory, and the word may have been used with the meaning 'boar', for St Heraš Šnorhali (d. 1173) wrote in a poem that the king became varasakerp 'the shape of a boar'. It is likely that Christian polemists sought thus to turn the images and powers of the Zoroastrians against them; the king is brought low in the very form of the yazata whose symbol had represented his erstwhile glory. The word *hret*, according to Malkhasean*ĉ, was also used in the sense of a sacred fire; it is not certain whether in this case the word was used with reference to Vahagn, although in Sassanian times the name of the yazata came to be associated with the highest grade of sacred temple fire, as we shall see presently.

The image of the fiery Vahagn appears in two texts on the history of the province of Tarawn. The first is the Patmat*ĉh* Tarawnci 'History of Tarawn', whose author calls himself Zenob, and is given the surname Glak, after the monastery of St Karapet; John the Baptist (Arm. surb Karapet) and St Athenogenes were deposited. The events of the text take place in the time of St Gregory, and the local temples and their destruction are described in minute detail. The second narrative, ascribed to Yovhan Manikonean, purports to be a continuation of the first to the seventh century, but it is generally agreed that the two histories were compiled at the same time, perhaps as late as the eighth century.

The two texts contain much that is puzzling and perhaps spurious, but we may glean from them information no doubt derived from local tradition of great interest.

According to Zenob, St Gregory the Illuminator commanded him to teach Christianity at the monastery of Glak, in a place called Innakanean ('Nine Springs'), where the image-shrines of Gisane and Demetr stood. The place is almost certainly the same site where in Agathangelos we learn that the shrines of Vahagn, Anahit and Aštīk had been established, and where the relics of St John the Baptist (Arm. surb Karapet) and St Athenogenes were deposited. The Monastery of St Karapet founded there was a place of pilgrimage until the first World War. It stood at an elevation of about 6400 ft. over the Aracani river (Tk. Murat Su), a few miles from the town of Nuč (see Pls. IV, V), on Mt K'ark*ĉe* (cf. Agath. above), also called Innakanean. Zenob calls the Monastery of Glak kayean n*xara*ĉ *srbo* Karapat*ĉ, 'the station of the relics of St John the Baptist'.

When Gregory determines to destroy the shrines of Tarawn, the *k'urms* got wind of his plans and tell the priests of Aštīk to gather fighting men, *ni meq Gisanâte i pateraz ełanelot* ĉ ēnd uraz*ĉe*al isxaran 'for great Gisane will go to war against the apostate princes'. Presumably, this place is the shrine of Gisane and Demetr, but the identification is not stated. The *k'urms* make their battle plans at Kuaľ*ĉ—perhaps a form of K'ark*ĉe*—and the
high-priest Arjan goes out to lead the forces, with his son Demetr second in command. When the Christian naxarars attack, Arjan taunts them: Yara matik, ov denakoroyak, ew urac'awak shayreni astucen, ew t'snamik barop'afin Gisanèi: oc'gitèk zi aysav Gisanè i pateram cical è end jëz, ew matneloc è zëz i jës mer, ew harkaneloc è zëz kurtucamb ew mahuamb 'Come forward, you who have abandoned the dén and apostatised the gods of your fathers, who are enemies of Gisanè of fair glory! Do you not know that today Gisanè has arisen to battle against you, and will deliver you into our hands, and will strike you with blindness and death? It will be seen presently why the foes of Gisanè should be stricken specifically with blindness.

The battle is then joined. The armies of the K'urms are joined by the men of Visap k'asak, 'City of the Dragons', a city also referred to as Avj k'asak, 'City of the Serpents', an Arm. translation of the Mr. loan-word. The epithet of Vahagn in Agath, 879, Visap'el 'Dragon Reaper', is found in one MS. as visap'ak'asak'èn 'City of the Dragons'; such an error may indicate that the copyist associated the legends of Vahagn and of Gisanè. Others came from Makti, a nearby town which was still inhabited in the twentieth century, and from Tirakatarn k'asak, 'the City of the Summit of Tir', where the Arm. Monastery of the Holy Apostles (Arak'elo'c vank) was later to be built, also near Maš. One of the K'urms who fought was the K'rumpet of Astišat itself, Metakès or Meakès (MSS. differ, and both names are attested in Ir.). It is not implausible that Zoroastrian priests should have fought for their temples. At the consecration of a sacred fire, Zoroastrian priests carry swords, maces, shields and daggers, which are hung on the walls of the fire temple and may be used to defend it against infidel attackers; the sole recorded instance of this, however, was in India, in the eighteenth century.

The heathen priests and their armies are defeated, of course, and the great statue of Gisanè, fifteen cubits in height, shatters of its own accord into four pieces; the deus 'demons' of the place are seen to flee in the shapes of winged men, wasps and rain clouds. A Christian church is built on the site of the temple of Demetr—the tačar 'temple' of Gisanè stands but two cubits distant—and relics of St John the Baptist and Athenogenes are deposited there. The sons of the K'urms, 438 in all, are taken away to be trained as Christian priests, and their long hair (Arm. gës) is shorn.

Zenob then explains that Demetr and Gisanè were two Indian princes hounded out of their country by their king, Dinak'si(s). They fled to Armenia and were given the province of Tarawyn by Væarsik (Vologases, i.e., the earliest of the Arsacid line). They built a city, Viñap k'asak, and erected statues of their gods at Astišat. When they died, their own images were erected by their sons, Kuar, Mætæs and Horean, on Mount K'arkè. The spring of Gisanè on that mountain was reputed to cure the sick, and the name of the god (or deified man) is explained as gisavor 'long-haired'.

The Mr. loan-word gës has been encountered before; the shaggy hero Rustam in the legend cited by Grigor Magistros drives off Spandiar by flailing his dense locks. To this day, Mount K'arkè is called by the Arm. of Maš Mëso-cam 'the tresses of Maš', and Zenob notes that the local people kept their children long-haired even after the Conversion, in memory of Gisanè. 63 F'awtos (V.43) describes the young son of Vačèv Mamikonean, Artawazd: ...ër na i tioè thy: ew ëst manku'tës ëwreni, ëst kramiè Hayoc'c orpës érën èr, gzlux manktoyn, soynpës ë jëmmakin gëronal ër gzlux mankunu Artawazday, ew c'ëw ëste t'ëleal ëgës arjè: he was a boy in years, and according to the custom of childhood, according to the religion of the Armenians, as was fitting, so had the head of the child Artawazd been shaven at that time; one lock was left to grow long. Apparently, children had been left entirely gisavor in earlier days.

The tradition of the origin of the cult presents some problems. The mention of India may refer to eastern Iran, perhaps to the Kusano-Bactrian culture; it is recalled that the legend of Astlagès Rustam probably stems from the traditions of the Sakas, an eastern Iranian people. Demetr could be the yasata Spênta Ármatì, Arm. Spandaramet, the female divinity of the earth and of fecundity, here equated with Demèter and perhaps to be identified with Astaïk, the consort of Vahagn cited above. The names of the three sons sound suspiciously like the names of villages in the Maš area, and the
sons are probably fictional, eponymous figures from local tradition. It is not explained who the gods of Demetr and Gisanë enthroned at Aštīšat were; probably Demetr and Gisanë themselves were the gods. The derivation of the name Gisanë from an Ir. word, suggested by Zenob himself, reinforces our supposition that the name is Iranian; other Arm. names containing ǥe- are attested in fifth-century Arm. texts, such as Gisak or Vard-gns; 65 the latter, meaning 'rosy-haired', may indeed refer to the hue her 'fiery hair' of Zartosht's 'golden-haired' Vahagn. Long hair, one recalls, was a conspicuous feature of the pre-Islamic Iranian peoples of various epochs, which Classical writers often noted with contempt. Why did Gisanë blind his enemies? For an explanation, we must examine the narrative of Yovhan Mamikonean.

The scene of Yovhan's History is the early seventh century. By this time, the Monastery of St Karapet, Glakay yankc, is a well-established Christian shrine. Yet St Karapet seems to have assumed the aspects of Gisanë. When a noblewoman, Mariam of the Arzruni house, commits a sacrilege, she is set upon and slaughtered near the monastery by ayr mi gisavor end amps orrotecinal...ar na sur salel ev t'ceucceleal ev yarean nerkel 'a long-haired man thundering above the clouds...with a sharp sword drenched and bedaubed in blood.' 66 It is obvious that this is the image of warlike Verethraghna, shaggy-haired (gisavor, Gisanë) Vahagn, seen here also as a weather-god, thundering above the clouds. Later, the Sasanian Persians attack the monastery, but its entrance is miraculously hidden from them, 67 even as the door to the meheon of Aštīšat was concealed from the minions of St Gregory, centuries before (cf. Agath. above). Later, Smbat, son of gavil Vahan (Vahan the Wolf), of the Mamikonean house, advances on the Persians, loudly invoking St Karapet. Then, yankarcaki tesin ayr mi gisavor, or joyx p'aylir i herac c noral, ev nac's t'shamesc'n kurec'uo'aner. Zor terseal k'ajin Smbatay, ase c'tzawrsn: k'ajalerc'aruk, ordaesk, ev mi erkncilik: zl surb Karapetn mes i t'ikuns hasaen kay, ev end mer ink'n paterazmi.

'Suddenly they beheld a long-haired man, and light shone from his hair, and blinded the eyes of the enemy. When brave Smbat saw this, he said to the troops: "Take courage, little sons, and do not fear, for St Karapet has arrived to stand behind us, and he himself fights alongside us." 68 This supernatural figure cannot be other than Vahagn, whose eyes and hair are aflame, in whom Arjan must have hoped when he boasted to the Christian naxarars that blindness and death would be the recompense for their apostasy from the dēn. The two eyes, apparently of the Virgin Mary, in the Melody of the Nativity of the tenth century Arm. poet St Gregory of Narek, are described as being erku p'aylakajev aregahan nman 'like two fiery suns'. This may be a memory of the image of Vahagn. Sight was anciently believed to be the result of light emanating from the eyes. The ninth-century Pahlavi text Șkand-Gümānī vizār, I.56-7, calls a benevolent gaze čaen l xwaršēd 'the eye of the Sun', and Mary at the Holy Nativity is the very embodiment of love, of course, for the Lord.

Light of the eyes is associated by Zoroastrians with victory as well (as with Vahagn): Hvarešihtra ('the Sun-faced'), who is the son of Zarathustra by his second wife, is to lead the army of Vīštāpā's immortal son, Pēştānu, in the last days. 68-9 Christ, too, is come to vanquish Death.

Armenians continued to invoke St Karapet, the ancient Vahagn/Gisanë, down to recent days. Until the shrine was destroyed by the Turks in the Arm. Genocide of 1915, St Karapet of Muš was a place of pilgrimage for Arm., second in importance only to 3ēxenc. St Karapet was considered the patron of minstrelsy; the fourteenth-century bard Yovhannēs of 3ēxenc invokes the saint in his poems, 69 and in the eighteenth century the Arm. aṣīk 'minstrel' Sayat-Nova, court musician of king Īrakli at Tiflis, attributed his mastery of musical instruments to the power of Karapet. Until recent times, jugglers and other performers would gather outside the monastery gates on feast days of the Church, and poets would sing the praises of St Karapet for lovesick young men. 70 In one Armenian folk song, St Karapet-like Verethraghna—is referred to as the protector of wayfarers. 71

Natives of Muš still relate how St Gregory the Illuminator cast the heathen priests of Aštīšat, the k'arms, into a 'bottomless sea' (Arm. anv(y)atak covy) beneath a small domed chapel in the monastery called the deveri kavan 'station of the demons', dəoxk'i duh 'gates
of hell' or Dvšun 'House of the Demon'. One of the old pagan priests, called the kəq dew 'lame demon', still is said to slouch unseen through the monastery, taking dust from under it to build a hill beneath the F-rəbat man—the bridge over the Batəman Su (Aracani). This hopeless, Sisyphean labour is to end with the second coming of Christ. On the association of this demon with a bridge, one may note that some European bridges, such as the Pont de St Cloud of Paris, are in popular superstition considered to have been made by the Devil. The Arm. ayx, a demon, pushes people off bridges (see Ch. 13 on the adventure of Sidar).\(^72\) One asəצ song of Tarən relates: \(\text{Lusaworić}^{\circ}\text{ Zošec}^{\circ}\) diwan lcəxə czndan/\(\text{Kak} \text{ dew} \text{ ekaw asə}^{\circ}: \text{Eman,} / \text{Zis mi dner czndan.} / \text{Es k ešim sərb Karapetu} \text{Pəščenj...} \) 'The Illuminator collected the demons and filled a prison with them. \(\text{The lame demon came and said, "Alas!!! Do not put me in prison." I will become the dustman of Σt Karapet..."}^{73}

The Dvšun is a pit beneath the Chapel of the Holy Resurrection (Surb Yarut\(\text{c}^{\circ}\)m), a building of recent construction in a southwestern part of the Monastery in Kəx\(\text{c}^{\circ}\)pəak, the Yard of the Cross (cf. the festival of the Holy Cross in the legend from Naxil\(\text{c}^{\circ}\)van cited above).\(^74\) The chapel was opened for services only on Easter, hence perhaps its name. Smbat Sahnazarean, who was raised at St Karapet, wrote that the noise of mumbling, as of indistinct voices, could be heard emanating from beneath the place where the chapel stood. Once, on Easter Sunday, the children of the monastery school were leaving the chapel after the Divine Liturgy. The priest warned them to step carefully near the door, for there was a big, open hole there, with slits like handholds cut into its sides. When all the worshippers had left, young Smbat, who had remained behind, in hiding, took a lighted candle from the altar and climbed down. Up to this point, the details of the memoir are plausible. At Xor Virap, in Soviet Armenia, there is a chapel over the subterranean cavern where St Gregory is said to have languished in prison before the Conversion. There is an open hole, with handholds, to the right of the altar as one faces it, and there is indeed a cavern at the bottom, with another altar and yet more holes, in the sides of the cavern. From these, we were informed by an Arm. peasant woman, višaps had emerged to torment the saint.

After the description of the place, however, Sahnazarean's narrative assumes the character of fantasy. In the cave below, he found a heap of brick tablets inscribed with unintelligible characters. Then he beheld two huge bronze statues, which, he claimed, were images of Demtr and Ginane\(\text{c}^{\circ}\), like huge pillars supporting the roof of the cave.\(^75\)

The nineteenth-century Arm. ethnographer Fr. Garegin Sruan\(\text{c}^{\circ}\)ye\(\text{nc}^{\circ}\) described the site in an article, 'The Tradition of the Lame Demon of St. Karapet' (in Arm.) (first published in the journal Arcuik Tarənəy ("Little Eagle of Tarənəy"), 2/37, 1 March 1865, 49-50; reprinted in his Groc\(\text{u}^{\circ}\)ru Broc\(\text{c}^{\circ}\), Ch. 30, repr. in his Erker ['Works', with some deplorable abridgements, Erevan, 1982). He reports that the local people believed devoutly in the Lame Demon, Arm. Kəq Dew; those who doubted whether his heap of dust at F-rə Batəman was ash were denounced as anhawat 'unbeliever' or famason 'Freemason'. It is interesting that the Arm. insisted so vehemently that the dust was ash, for this belief presumably preserves the memory of the way the Zoroastrians of ancient days would have removed excess ash from the fire temple to the waters, as Bombay Parsis still do. Sruan\(\text{c}^{\circ}\)ye\(\text{nc}^{\circ}\) describes a round hole filled with earth and stones to one side of the altar in the portico (గռվի) of the chapel of the Resurrection—the place, that is, where Sahnazarean claims there was a gaping hole. Pilgrims hastened thither, demanding to be shown the Demon of the Dvšun, the house of the demon(s), but when the caretaker could not oblige them, they protested he was being kept from them on purpose. Sruan\(\text{c}^{\circ}\)ye\(\text{nc}^{\circ}\) laments that all wanted to see the Kak Dew, but nobody asked to see the graves of eminent Christians at the monastery.

We now approach the questions of Vahagn the višap\(\text{c}^{\circ}\)ak of višaps, and of Ast\(\text{c}^{\circ}\), of the sea and bulls, of the two festivals of St John the Baptist and St Athenogenes, and of iconographic portrayals of Vahagn. As for višaps, Arm. legends abound on the variety of forms they take, the places they inhabit, and the mischief they perform. The prayers of holy men are said to petrify them. Some live in mountain palaces; the thirteenth-century writer Vahram vardap\(\text{c}^{\circ}\) reported: Asen teše\(\text{c}^{\circ}\)al omanc\(\text{c}^{\circ}\) kər\(\text{c}^{\circ}\)as\(\text{c}^{\circ}\) cw višap\(\text{c}^{\circ}\) i lerins barjuns
between the two volcanic peaks which the hero is the theologian
him. His servant cried out in alarm. The theologian paused, made
the sign of the Cross, and the creatures were instantly petrified.
Their presence is explained in two tales, in both of
which the hero is the theologian Yovhannes of Awjun (eighth century).
In the first, Yovhannes was praying when two huge višaps attacked
him. His servant cried out in alarm. The theologian paused, made
the sign of the Cross, and the creatures were instantly petrified.
Out of the navel of one of them sprang a rivulet of water which to
this day is reputed to cure people of snakebite. In the second
tale, Yovhannes was celebrating the Divine Liturgy when he heard a
hissing sound. He sent one of his seven deacons outside to find out
what the matter was. The deacon did not return; a second was sent,
that the deacon did not return; a second was sent,
and had a prayer, and it was
turned to stone. South of
the village of Areni on the right bank of the Arpa river (V. Arpa
cay) there is another višap stele. A villager of Areni told the
Soviet Armenian scholar Sargsis Harut'yan in 1958 that a priest's
daughter was once walking along the river-bank collecting herbs. A
višap sprang out of the water and was about to devour her; happily,
his father saw the monster in time and said a prayer, and it was
turned to stone. Sat'co Ayvazyan of Garmi told the Soviet re-
searcher Grigor Karaxanyan in 1965 of the origin of four višap
steles near the fortress of Kaladip, in the foothills of the Gelam
Mts. of Soviet Armenia: according to the tales of aged wise men, a
višap came down out of the sky to destroy humanity, but God petrified
it. One nineteenth-century informant claimed that višaps
have been 'pulled up out of the mountains into the sky,' and
Vahram vardapet, cited above, wrote in a letter to the Armenian
Cilician king Het'um that 'many men have seen višaps ascend from
earth to heaven.' In an early Arm. translation of Origen, we find
this explanation: ev vasp dwasanv arwv visap awumak
et varamanis asenav. Bu basum kandanev i mecavanv višap, i
amak vamoc asenav pa'i, swji, ev marby cairin bhravoroi duclov
awumak'i ev shrutivn arjen. Visap asenav ev anerevoc i sar
zawrut'sen, or xndrelow zawrut'iv i Taranh, ebr zarand i
čaracar harucs oc'ció masab, ayl amemayn masambk, artak'nov
ev nerk'nak'. And about the mountains difficult to traverse
which we name višap and call xaramani. And we call višap many of
the largest animals; of those on land, the elephant and serpent,
and an evil and violent man, but when the names are once applied, they
do not change their nature. We call višap also the invisible evil
power, which, asking power of the Lord, struck the righteous man
with grievous blows, not in one part, but in all his parts, outer
and inner.

It would seem from the above citations that the term višap must
cover a fairly wide variety of monstrous or evil creatures. In the
Arm. version of Agath., the Arm. epithet višap'ak is translated as
drakontopniktoś; in the Arm. translation of the Bible, višap is used
to translate LXX Gk. κέτος, the big fish that swallowed Jonah on his
unsuccessful escape to Tarσis (i.e., Tarsus, in Cilicia, in the vi-
cinity of Armenia). As we have seen above, Classical Arm. writers
explain višap as ayl 'serpent', but because the višap is no mere
snake, we have preferred the English rendering 'dragon'. Two pro-
posed derivations of the word from Ir. warrant attention. Arm.
višap, like Syriac višap and Georgian vekaf, has been held by
Benveniste to come from a Pth. form of the Arm. adjective *višap-
'with poisonous slaver', which, he presumed, had formed part of the
name of a dragon, *Aši Višap. More recently, Bailey connected
Arm. višap with Khotanese Saka guşap 'large', from an elder
*višapa- in the sense of 'extended hugely', with the base vai-/-vi-
'to extend'. It is noted that Av. nasaŋ 'huge' is used of demons,
and that Arm. višap is used of anything monstrous. This second
eyymology is strongly corroborated by the translation of Origen
cited above, and appears to explain better the wide variety of
applications of the word than does the first. It is evident, how-
 ever, that in the Classical Arm. sources the višap is specifically a 
 monstrous serpent (awj) or dragon.

In a letter addressed to T'Ornîk Mamikonian, Grigor Magistros 
relates the tale of a fish called Ašahak (i.e., Aši Dahāka), which 
gave a concubine a huge pearl; she took it to the king, who had it 
set in the crown called Ezadovsen, a word which Magistros explains 
as meaning 'God-given'. It is probably a transcription of NP. 
hydration 'given by the yazata'. The king then ordered that the 
gods be honoured with rich offerings, and that the image of this 
fish be carved, together with the effigies of the other divinities, 
and that sacrifices be made on the banks of the river Phison, where 
it had appeared to the concubine. In another version of this tradition, the višap grows at 
the bottom of Lake Van. When they are a thousand years old and be-
come able to swallow all the water of the lake, angels descend and 
drag the fully-grown višap out of their lair; the water churns and 
a storm rages. When the višap are cast into the Sun, their ashes descend as a mist. This belief appears to go back at least to the 
seventh century, for Anania of Sirak explains the idiom višap hanel 'to extract a višap', used in fables, as a storm; in some modern 
Arm. dialects, the word višap or usap alone means 'storm'.

The presence of oxen is perhaps explained by the scenes por-
trayed on a Hurrian golden bowl found at Hasanlu, in Iranian Azer-
baijan. The Hurrian weather-god, Teshub, is shown crossing the sky 
in his chariot, which is drawn by a bull. Water pours out of the 
mouth of the bull onto a monstrous creature whose upper half is 
human, but whose lower half is a mountain with three dog-headed 
snakes sprouting from it. The creature appears to be submerged in 
water, for it is surrounded by bubbles. It is known from Hittite 
literary sources that Teshub was the progeny of another god named 
Kumarbi, and that Teshub had a consort, a goddess named Hebat or 
Hepit. Teşub was a prominent divinity also of the Urartians, and 
was called by them Tešeb; the cities of Taşebaini (Kamir Blur, 
near Erevan) and Tuşpa (Arm. Van; the Urartean name survives in the 
Arm. name of the surrounding district, Tosp) were named after the

Magistros was of local origin and recent date, despite the references 
to pre-Islamic polytheism; the river Phison, one of the four rivers 
of Paradise, is a specifically Christian feature that identifies the 
tradition as Armenian, rather than Iranian. In 1909, N. Marr and 
Y. Smirnov studied a number of steles at a place in the Gešam Mts. 
called Visapnec by the Arm. and Ašaha-yurt by the Kurds. Some of 
the steles have wavy lines carved into them to represent water; 
others are in the shape of a fish. A number have carvings in re-
lied of the hide of an ox. Some have rude Christian crosses cut 
into them, indicating that they had been sacred objects before the 
Conversion and remained so.
god. Teṣebā was one of the members of the supreme triad of the Urartean gods, Haldi, Teṣebā and Ardini (corresponding to the Assyrian triad of Aššur, Adad and Śamaš). Teṣub/Teṣebā was a weather-god, like Marṣunda, who was worshipped by the Luwians, an Indo-European people, and by other Asianic peoples of Anatolia; the Asianic god is attested in Ann. as Urartean god.

The same ancient legendry which seems thus to have informed the myth of serpents which had to be slain or neutralised, lest they devour or destroy the world. The heroic deed of the Arm. Zor. Vahagn appears in the Babylonian Talmud, inspired, as it seems, by the ancient Babylonian legendry heard by Jewish sages of the Sasanian period, but here it is an example of the farseeing wisdom of God himself: in Tractate Baba Batra 78b it is said that if God had not castrated the male and slain the female Leviathan, they would have mated and destroyed the world (presumably by the number and size of their offspring). Neither višaps nor Leviathan are wholly extirpated; their issue is periodically reduced, in the first case, or precluded, in the second. The reasons are probably correspondingly various: for the Zoroastrians, evil is always present and always to be combated, in this world of mixture. For Jews, the Leviathan, for all its monstrosity, is an example of God's majesty and economy.

Vahagn was the vanquisher of many višaps. He would pluck them selectively, as they reached deadly maturity, much as one might reap a crop when it is ripe, but leave the unripe plants to grow. These višaps were drawn up to heaven, presumably, on a chariot pulled by oxen, as on the Hurrian bowl. It has been suggested that the half-man, half-mountain on the bowl is Ullikunnā, about whom we shall speak in Ch. 8. But the three serpents may represent illuyankas and his progeny, which the weather-god Teṣub prepares to reap from the sea-bottom and drag heavenward on his ox-drawn chariot.

The silver Klimova Cup of the Hermitage, Leningrad, a piece in Sasanian style, shows a fully-clothed man carrying bow and arrow, who is standing in an archway which rests on a wheeled platform; two oxen at each side—four in all—pull at traces attached to the platform. Above each pair is a winged being who whips the animals. The being to the right seems to be pouring water onto the heads of the oxen (cf. the Hasanlu cup); the water is represented by two wavy, diverging lines. On the top of the arch of the wheeled platform (or chariot?) is a crescent moon. Within it is a beardless figure who sits cross-legged on a throne, with the two horns of another crescent moon emerging from behind his (or her) shoulders. To the right of the figure stands an ax. Perhaps this is the moon god (who is male in Iran), or else a goddess who is the consort of the warlike, masculine figure below with his full beard and typically Sasanian bunches of hair. The figure may be Verethraghna, but in the absence of a serpent in the scene one cannot suggest with certainty that this cup portrays the same legend we have sought above to link with Arm. Vahagn.

Zoroastrianism was not the only monotheistic religion to adopt the myth of serpents which had to be slain or neutralised, lest they devour or destroy the world. The heroic deed of the Arm. Zor. Vahagn appears in the Babylonian Talmud, inspired, as it seems, by the ancient Babylonian legendry heard by Jewish sages of the Sasanian period, but here it is an example of the farseeing wisdom of God himself: in Tractate Baba Batra 78b it is said that if God had not castrated the male and slain the female Leviathan, they would have mated and destroyed the world (presumably by the number and size of their offspring). Neither višaps nor Leviathan are wholly extirpated; their issue is periodically reduced, in the first case, or precluded, in the second. The reasons are probably correspondingly various: for the Zoroastrians, evil is always present and always to be combated, in this world of mixture. For Jews, the Leviathan, for all its monstrosity, is an example of God's majesty and economy.

Iconographic depictions of Verethraghna in Armenia may be found on the coins of Tigran II, where a bearded male nude is shown frontally, standing; a lion's skin is draped over his right arm, and with his left hand he leans on a club. This is the usual Greek rendering of Hēraklēs, and is reproduced also in a statuette from Hatra, from about the same period, and fairly close, both geographically and politically, to Arsacid Armenia.

Another piece, discovered recently, deserves discussion here. In 1979, a fragment of rose-colored tufa was found in the gold mines...
of Zod, ca. 12 km. east of Basargechar, near the SE shore of Lake Sevan and just south of the Şah-dağ range, in the Arm. SSR. 110 Two human figures are carven in high relief on two sides of the object. Suren Ayvazyan, who published a brief description of the find (without, however, providing dimensions and other archaeological details of importance), together with a small photograph, identified the two figures as Vahagn and Astlik. Mr Ayvazyan kindly sent us two good photographs of the stone (see pls. II and III, appended to this chapter), and his proposal seems justifiable, although the date he suggests, the first or second millennium B.C., seems to us too early.

The male figure holds what appears to be a giant snake, perhaps a všegp; this and the musculature of his body suggest Vahagn. The naturalistic depiction of the human figure would derive from Hellenistic forms, and the powerful torso recalls the Artaxiad Arm. coin cited above, the relief of Hēraklēs—Artagnēs from Commagene, or the naked male figures in bas-relief at the temple of Cašni in Armenia. 111 The snake, if such it is, blends into the folds of the drapery of the woman. Her figure is exaggeratedly and voluptuously feminine, and may be compared to the figure of Aphrodite in bas-relief on a terracotta piece from Artasat, in which the goddess is shown partially naked and in the act of undressing. 113 This figure bears little resemblance to the ceramic figurines of the heavily draped and sedate mother goddess Anahit or Nanē, also found at Artasat. It is, rather, of the Aphrodite anēnymēna type found commonly at Dura and elsewhere in the Greco-Roman world. For Anahit, although regarded as a goddess of fertility (Agath. 68), was also considered 'mother of all chastity' (Agath. 53), very different indeed from the bas-relief of Zod.

Zod, Classical Arm. Cawd, has gold mines which have been in use since the fifteenth century B.C.; settlements and graveyards of the second-first millennia have been unearthed; and various bronze weapons, items of personal adornment, talismans with depictions of the Tree of Life and other implements have been found dating from the twelfth century B.C. The place has been continuously settled throughout historical times, with the river Zod affording access from the east to Lake Sevan, and there is a seventeenth-century Arm. church there. 115 The area was known to Agathangelov, who refers to it as Cawdāk, a region between Siwnik and Utik (Agath. 597). The purpose of the tufa carving itself is impossible to determine. Because it is carven on two sides, it may have served as part of a larger structure, perhaps as the corner of a shrine or other building, or of an altar. In all recorded periods, Arm. reliefs are characterised by smooth, finely dressed stone and flat backgrounds; this piece is rough, and, it seems, unfinished.

The legend of Vahagn’s dragon-reaping appears to have its source in the ancient myths of the peoples who inhabited the Arm. Plateau in the second and early first millennia B.C. Similarly non-Iranian, it seems, are the details of his origin and the presence of a consort, Astlik. Tešub’s birth is mentioned in Hittite texts, as is his female consort, called Bebat or Hepit. The name Astlik is composed of Arm. astik ‘star’ with the diminutive suffix -ik, probably used here also in an honorific sense; the closest parallel is found in a Manichaean prayer cited in the Oskipōrik, a thirteenth-century miscellany: ‘The Manichaeans swear by the Sun and say “Little Light, sweet little Sun, you are full of the heavens (luwik arwik kānikōrik, li es tičerōk).”’ According to Yovhamēnē of Arjun, the ‘Paulicians’, also Sun-worshippers, addressed it thus: Arwik, liwik ‘Little sun, little light’. 116 As it will be argued in Ch. 16, the reference in both cases is probably to the Arewordik ‘Children of the Sun’, apparently a community of Arm. Zoroastrians who survived through the mediaeval period. Abelyan and others have identified Astlik ‘Little Star’ with the Syrian goddess Kaukabta, of which her name would be a translation. The ‘Little star’ is Venus, Gr. Aphrodite; in the Arm. translation of Philo, Astlik is identified with Aruseak ‘(the planet) Venus’. 117 A temple of the first century B.C.-A.D. 32 at Palmyra contains a bas-relief of Hēraklēs accompanied by a goddess with a radiant nimbus. In other reliefs, she is replaced by a star in a crescent (cf. the crescent on the Klimova cup, discussed above). The cult of Bebat/Hepit survived in Mal'onia, in Asia Minor, long after the fall of the Hittite empire; she is called Mešer Hipta in a Greek inscription found there. 118
According to the seventh-century writer Vrtanēs Kart'ok 'the poet', Astāk...xor mayr c赏nk'andc koc en amesayn hes'anosk'; ev baṣum en arbec'uṭ iynk'sora ev anarak't iynk' 'all the heathens call Astāk the mother of passions, and her drunken orgies and debaucheries are numerous. 119 In the nineteenth century, the Arm. priest and ethnographer Garegin Sruan'ektean' recorded this legend, told by the people of Maš: the place where the Euphrates enters the plain of Maš from the mountains of K'ni is called G(u)ğ(u)a, 120 and there is a pool there where Astāk bakes. Young men used to climb nearby Mt Dakan and light a fire in order to behold the beauty of the naked goddess, and that is why the waters send up a mist there—to shield her from their eyes. 121 It is perhaps noteworthy that K'ni is a native Arm. word for the wild boar, called also v'araž, the animal symbolic of Vahagn (cf. above). There is in the vicinity of Maš also an ancient fortress (Arm. berd) referred to by Zenob as well as other writers, ancient and modern, called Astākan berd 'Fortress of Astāk', Astān, Astaiberd, or Astānanek. 122 This may have been the structure described by T'covns Arcruni (I.8), according to whom Artaxes I i m'l erek'armatean gogajew hojtw p'ok'u...Sinā aštarak barjabre; p'orucowy mijoy c'ay, ev i veray k'amne zAšt'kan pakhem ev mast noru stan ganyu pastpanet'c'an kroc'h 'built in a three-cornered, concave little valley a lofty tower, at the centre of the cavity, and on it he erected the statue of Astāk, and nearby it the built1 a treasure-house for the protection of the idols. 123

We have noted the adjective vramakan 'of Verethraghna' applied to sacred fires, and the apparent identification of Verethraghna in Arm. also as Hrat 'fiery', the latter also an epithet applied to holy fires. In the preceding chapter, it was noted that there may have been varying grades of sacred fires in pre-Sasanian, Zoroastrian Arm., and in Zoroastrianism the 'fire of Verethraghna' is indeed the highest grade. The information we possess concerning the cult of fire in Arm. will be treated at greater length in Ch. 15; it is sufficient to remark here, however, that the forms Vram and Vahan, used as proper names alone or in compounds (e.g., Vramapuh, Anušvram 124) appear to be Sasanian, and are clearly distinct from forms such as Artagnēs, Artañēs, Vahagn and Vahan, discussed previously. As a yazata in Armenia, Verethraghna is called invariably by the name Vahagn, never by the later, Sasanian form, and the vramakan krak 'fire of Vram' is mentioned generally as a foundation of the Sasanians or their Arm. confederates. It is also important to note that Arm. Hrat Mecon in one case at least is a rendering of a toponym, Phraata, and need not refer to Verethraghna at all. We cannot therefore agree with Benveniste's suggestion that the vramakan krak was an Araratid institution. 125

It was observed that Verethraghna is a close companion of Mithra in the struggle against evil; in Yt. 14, the two appear together with Rašnu. In a Mithraic relief found at Mannheim, Mithra is accompanied by Hēraklēs, behind whom stands a wild boar rampant. 126 In the Acts of St Acephalas, the saint refuses the demand of the Magian high priest that he offer sacrifices to Helios and Arēs, i.e., in a Persian context, Mithra and Verethraghna. 127 In Iran, Mithra, a god of fire, came to be identified with the greatest of all physical fires, the Sun, but in Arm. he was equated rather with Gk. Hephaistos—the god of fire—alone, and not with Hēlēs (cf. MX II.14). Tiridates in Armenia invoked Arahmen, Anahit and Vahagn, in striking contrast to the common Iranian triad of Ahūra Mazda, Anahītē and Mithra attested since the time of Artaxerxes II. We shall see in Ch. 8 how the cult of Mithra may have been eclipsed in Arm. by the cult of Vahagn.

For the temple of the latter enjoyed vast prominence, to the extent that it became the first See of the Arm. Church, before the centre was shifted to Vakarsapat, in the northeast, at or near the royal capital of the country. Koremaci refers to the cult of Vahagn in Georgia, but Georgian sources do not refer to the yazata. To this day, however, the Georgians celebrate 'the great feast of summer', Atengenoba, in honour of Atengen, 128 i.e., St. Athēnogenēs, whose relics, it is recalled, were transferred to Atš'at by St Gregory when the cult of Vahagn had been eradicated there. The feast of the martyr Athēnogenēs is celebrated in the Syrian Orthodox church on 24th July, 129 while in Armenia it is celebrated on 17 July 130 (Arm. 11 Hrortc 131). All of these data affirm that it is indeed a summer feast. Why was Athēnogenēs, Arm. Atš'atēnēs, so
important? The Arm. Synaxarion relates that he lived in Sebastia (Th. Sivas), immediately contiguous to Armenia, Ev i mium aur e tec
patani mi enes'cal i dur' ayri mi yorus buncael yr višap: k' eni
bsakic'c' telcwyn vasa ni višapin matuc'andin nasa patani mi, vasa
ni Spa-cal er zamencyn nasums telcwyn 'And on one day he (St
At'angineł) beheld a youth who had been cast at the entrance to a
cave where a višap had its nest. For the inhabitants of the place
because of fear of the višap used to offer it a youth, as it had ex-
hausted all the animals of the region.' The saint freed the youth
and slew the dragon. In memory of this heroic act, the text con-
tinues, a hind comes down to the church once a year on this day and
is sacrificed to God.\textsuperscript{132} It is easy to see how this legend might
have been linked with the heroic, dragon-slaying exploits of Vahagn;
it is recalled that legends of propitiatory sacrifices to višaps
were still related until recent days. A relief from Bayazit pub-
lished by Ališan and reproduced by Ananikian depicts two robed,
priestly figures in soft, 'Phrygian' headdresses; between them is a
walled-in portal, above which stands an animal which resembles a
hind;\textsuperscript{133} perhaps the scene portrays an ancient sacrifice which sur-
vived as a ceremony of the Church.

St Gregory, according to Agath., ordained that the Feast of St
Athenogenes be celebrated on 7 Sahmi at Astišat, but on 1 Nawasard
at Bagawan. Neither 7 Sahmi nor Nawasard corresponded in the fourth
century, around the date of the Conversion when these events are
said to have taken place, to either of the two dates in July. Sahmi
is the name of the third month, probably to be derived from Georgian
sani 'three';\textsuperscript{134} the word has no apparent religious significance
which might enlighten us about why Gregory chose that month. The
popular Arm. tradition of Naxišewan cited above has Gregory arrive
at Astišat on Nawasard. Agathangelos states that king Tiridates
waited a month (Agath. 817) for Gregory to come to Bagawan from
Astišat, so Gregory was at the latter place in mid-late July, corre-
ponding to the twelfth month of the Arm. calendar, Hrotic\textsuperscript{c}, which
immediately precedes the New Year. This is in accord with the evi-
dence from the Synaxarion and Georgian and Syriac sources concerning
the date of the feast of St Athenogenes, but not with the date of
7th Sahmi.

It is probable that Gregory arrived at Bagawan on Nawasard, and
offered reverence to the same saints, at the royal centre of cult on
the specifically kingy holiday of Nawasard, as he had done at
Astišat a month before. It is recalled that the Artaxiad kings
struggled to subject the cult of Vahagn, dominated by the Vahunis,
to their own control—and their centre, like that of the newly-
Christian Tiridates, was the temple of Aramazd, at Bagawan. Greg-
ory's action, inexplicable otherwise—for why ought a saint to
receive two separate days in his honour—may be viewed as a gesture
of altar to throne of both fealty and equilibrium. The burial of
kings and catholicoi at the neighbouring necropolis of Ami and
Tçrdan, discussed in the previous chapter, reflects the same dele-
cate relationship.

Grigor Arşaruni, writing ca. 690, called 7th Sahmi the festival
of Vahêvahean, whom he calls 'the golden mother demon', confusing
Anahit with Vahagn.\textsuperscript{135} In the Arm. calendar, the 7th day of the
month is named after Astišak; the 19th, after Anahit; and the 27th,
after Vahagn.\textsuperscript{136} Perhaps the three dates we have, 11 Hrotic\textsuperscript{c},
1 Nawasard, and 7 Sahmi, all reflect Zoroastrian festivals replaced
by Christian observances. The first, which endured as the feast of
Athenogenes, must have been dedicated to Vahagn; the second was con-
secrated to Aramazd; and the third, 7 Sahmi, belonged to a goddess,
most likely Astišak rather than Anahit. It is not St Athenogenes,
however, whom we encounter as the successor to Vahagn, but St John
the Baptist, and the relics of both saints were deposited, as we
have seen, at Astišat. St Karapet, is, of course, a figure of in-
comparably greater importance in Christianity than Athenogenes; he
is no less than the forerunner of Christ, and better entitled thus
to assume the mantle of Vahagn, who was second only to Aramazd
in the pantheon of ancient Armenia.
5. Yt. 10.70; Ann, 62 & n.
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Pl. I. Chapel of the Monastery of Surb Karapet, Muş. Photo taken before 1913. The Arm. caption handwritten on back of the original reads, K'rmakan žen'k'j maac'ord, s. Karapeti ezap'cakin nüş 'Remnant of a building of the k'urns, in the yard of St Karapet.' From the collection of the late Harutiun Hazarian of New York. I am indebted to Ruth Thomason (Thomasian), director of Project SAVE (an Armenian photographic and documentary archive), for a copy of the photograph (SAVE ref.: Hazarian 18-78).

Pl. II, III. The bas-relief excavated at Zod, Armenian S.S.R. Photographs courtesy of Mr Suren Ayvazyan, Erevan.

Pl. IV. Map of the district of Muş, from Sargs and Misak Bdeean, Harazat pattut'cim Tarkcio, Cairo, 1962, 8-9. St Karapet and Astišt are in the upper left-hand corner.

Pl. V. The Monastery of St Karapet (the dome of the chapel of Pl. I is visible to the fore), from Bdeean, ibid.
The worship of the two goddesses Anāhitâ (Phl. Anāhīd, Arm. Anahit) and Nana (or Nanai, Arm. Nanē) is widely attested in Iran and in countries to the west and east in pre-Islamic times, although Anāhitâ alone of the two is recognised in existing, canonical texts as a yazata of Zoroastrianism. Both goddesses were worshiped in Armenia, and they shared so many aspects, in Armenia as elsewhere, that it seems fitting to consider them together. For both seem to have derived many of their characteristics from the Great Mother goddess of ancient Asia Minor, whose cult flourished in remote ages before the revelation of the Zoroastrian faith, and which may in part survive still in the reverence paid by Armenian Christians to the Virgin Mary. It is proposed to consider first this most ancient of cults and its connection with Nanē in Armenia and other countries, and then to discuss Iranian Anāhitâ and Arm. Anahit.

The name of the Great Mother goddess, known to the Romans as Magna Mater, is encountered most frequently in Asia Minor as Kubaba or Cybele. This and the name Nana are considered to be Lallwörter (e.g., English Papa, Mama) meaning 'mother'.\(^1\) The cult of the mother goddess has been dated as far back as the Palaeolithic Age. The goddess is usually shown enthroned, with lions (or, sometimes, leopards) to either side of her, as on a terracotta figurine from Catal Hüyük (ancient Phrygia), ca. 6000 B.C.\(^2\) Cybele was regarded as the Mother of all, the Queen married to the Sky-god, who was king. As the earth, she was both the source of life and the abode of all at its end. Another of her titles seems to have been 'the lady', as attested in the North Syrian theophoric name Alli-Kubaba, meaning 'Kubaba is the Lady' (seventeenth-sixteenth centuries B.C.).\(^3\) Cybele was the ruler, not only of the land, but of the life-giving waters, also: in a hymn of the second century A.D., probably from Pergamon on the western coast of Asia Minor, she is described as ruler of 'the rivers and the entire sea'.\(^4\)
The mother goddess is referred to often together with her young son and lover, the dying and rising god best known as Attis. The legend of the divine pair is often related thus: The Great Mother made herself into a rock called Agdus, with which Jupiter (i.e., the Sky-god, see above) desired to have sexual relations. He spilled his seed on the rock, and in the tenth month a bisexual being named Agdistis was born. The gods perceived the danger of such a being, for Agdistis could impregnate himself and give birth, and was not therefore subject to the natural order established by the divine powers. Bacchus stole up on the sleeping Agdistis and tied his virile parts to a tree. When Agdistis woke and tried to move, he was emasculated, and the blood that fell to the ground caused a tree to sprout (the pomegranate or almond, in most accounts). Nana, the daughter of the river Sangarius, took the fruit of the tree and put it in her lap as she sat (or, she sat beneath the tree and the fruit fell into her lap). The fruit vanished, and later a child was born, Attis. Sangarius, angered by the violation of his daughter's virginity, tried to kill her, but was unsuccessful. Attis was exposed to die, but the animals nourished him. The Great Mother then became the boy's lover, and numerous terra cotta figurines from Asia Minor and Syria show the Great Mother seated, with the young Attis on her lap.5 These figurines show Attis as a naked babe; in other scenes he appears as an adolescent youth of great beauty, attired as a Phrygian shepherd.

Then, according to the legend, Attis became enamoured of a nymph named Sagaritis, daughter of the river Sangarius (like Nana, above); The Mother Goddess learnt of this, and in her rage and jealousy drive Attis insane. The distracted youth mutilated his genitals with a stone under a pine or fir tree (and that is why they are evergreens: his blood made their leaves immortal).6 Attis, it was believed, rose from the dead, and the ceremonies of Roman devotees of his cult were held in March and divided into two parts: the tristis, commemorating his passion and death; and the subsequent festivities called hilaria, celebrating the awakening of the god after his long winter slumber.7

Nana was often identified directly with the Mother Goddess; such an equation is logically in keeping with the legend related above, in which it is clearly implied that the relationship of youth and goddess was an incestuous union of mother and son. Just as the Great Mother was called by various names, so also was Attis. In remote Sogdia, as we shall see, the goddess Nanai was imagined as grieving for the dead youth Silyavaxš, whilst in Armenia it was believed that the jealous Assyrian queen Semiramis had killed her young lover Arz the Beautiful, who rose from the dead with the help of supernatural dog-like beings; belief in such beings persisted into Christian times.7

The goddess Nana described above is probably to be identified with Nanā, patron goddess of the Sumerian city of Uruk, whose name in Sumerian, Ininn or Inanna, means 'Lady of Heaven'. Nanā was principally a goddess of fertility, and this role is in keeping with the various associations of earth, water, sex and motherhood referred to above in our discussion of the Great Mother. But she was also a figure of awesome and destructive might (as, indeed, was Anāhitā, as will be seen). In a Sumero-Akkadian hymn, Nanā is praised in one strophe as the embodiment of love, but in the next, she is the goddess who 'takes away the young man in his prime/ She removes the young girl from her bed-chamber...'.8a Her title, 'Lady', as we shall see, was applied later in Zoroastrian and Arm. texts to Anāhitā. In ca. 1700 B.C., the Elamite king Kuter-Nabhunte captured the statue of the goddess of Uruk and bore it off to Susa, where it remained until Aššurbanipal recovered it in 646 B.C.9 The cult of the goddess continued to flourish, of course, in Mesopotamia, and the Persians probably adopted it from the conquered Elamites; under the Achaemenians, army and administration must have spread the cult to eastern Iran, for in later centuries it is abundantly attested there.

According to II Maccabees 1.13, the Seleucid king Antiochus IV (mid-second century B.C.) sacked the temple of Nanaia in Persis (LXX Gk. Nanaias hierōn; Ass. tēkar Nanēy—Nanēy is the gen. sg. of Nanē): evidence that the cult of the goddess persisted there. Theophoric names such as Bathanama, Mekatanaia and Barhonnaia are attested from Hellenistic Mesopotamia.10 In the fourth century A.D., the Sasanian king Šābuhr II commanded a general named Mu'āsin or Mu'īn, a recent convert to Christianity, to worship the Sun, Moon, Fire, Zeus, Bel, Nebu and Nanē 'the great goddess of all the world'.11 The name of the general is probably Arab, so it is possible that Šābuhr was referring to the
gods of pagan Mesopotamia rather than to Ir. yazatas. The Sasanians were not, in general, concerned by the conversion of a non-Iranian from one alien religion to another, however, so perhaps it was the important rank of the convert in this case that troubled the king. In the same century, reference is made to a Mesopotamian settlement named 'Ninety' after ninety families of the southern district of Mesene who had emigrated with their idol Nanai; about a century later, in A.D. 484, a Nestorian Christian, Nanai of Prat, presided over the Nestorian Council of Beth Lapat; apparently, the fact that Nanai was a female divinity did not prevent men from bearing her name. In the Parthian period, Nana was widely venerated. An image of Artemis in Greek dress from Palmyra is labelled MNY *Nanai, and an inscription on an ostraco from Nisa, the heart of the Arsacid kingdom, reads: (1) ŠNP 159 (2) MNY *Nanai (3) MNYSTAN *'Year 159 (2) from the temple (3) *Nanaistānakān'. The last word of the inscription appears to mean 'of the place of Nanai'; the Pth. adjectival ending -akan borrowed by Arm. is used similarly with the name of a yazata and the word moshan 'temple' to denote a temple of that yazata, as we have seen in our discussions of Aramazd and Vahagn; the toponymic suffix -stan, also borrowed by Arm., is used in that language to describe mainly large districts or countries (e.g., Hayastan 'Armenia'), but it can be used also to describe far more limited aggregates (e.g., gerd-a-stan 'household'). In Ir., -stān may refer to a country or a single locus, e.g., OP *Bagastāna, modern Behistun. The Pth. adjective may refer, therefore, either to a temple estate or an entire province, cf. Anaztica in Armenia, below, or it may be the name of a temple alone. We are inclined to regard the word as descriptive of a temple estate at least, for the ostracon from Nisa are records mainly of the accounts of vineyards, some of which belonged to very large estates.

The cult of Nana was prominent farther east. A four-armed goddess seated on a lion or lion-shaped throne is found portrayed at Karšiana, and on a silver dish from Chorasmia. In Sogdian, the name of the goddess is found as nny *Nanai, and the theophoric names nny-*ākt 'Nanai-vandak 'servant of Nanai', and nny-*āt *Nanai-āt 'given by Nanai', and nny-*vār 'gift of Nanai' are attested in a group of documents called the 'Sogdian Ancient Letters', dated to ca A.D. 311; the authors of the letters seem to have been worshipers of Nanai and to have believed in their native Old Iranian religion. Nanai was the city goddess of Panjikant, and was called 'the Lady' (Sgd. N纳* nyy 'Nan(a) the Lady'). In a fresco from that city is shown a scene of mourning over a dead youth, probably Siyāvāx. The wall-painting, much restored, has been dated to the seventh-eighth centuries A.D. In a Manichaean text, preserved, unfortunately, only in very fragmentary form, a scene of terrible grief and mourning is described: '...purifying...without delay...he dismounts, and there take place spilling of blood, killing of horses, laceration of faces, and taking (= cutting off?) of ears (?). And the lady Nan(a), accompanied by her women, walks on to the bridge, the smash the vessels, loud they call out, they weep (their garments), pull out (their hairs), and throw themselves to the ground.' There seems little doubt that the fresco and the text refer to the same event: the mourning of Nana over her dead son-lover. Henning tentatively suggested that the latter be identified as a mysterious figure named Kūghūne who appears just before the scene in the Manichaean fragment, and is called also 'son of Ahriman'; the Manichaens would have frowned on the wild and destructive ceremonies described, and may have sought merely to calumniate Kūghūne. In contrast to this vivid tristia is a terracotta statuette of a woman holding a pomegranate, with a little boy standing to her left; the piece is dated to the second-fourth centuries A.D. and comes from the territory of ancient Sogdia. Terracotta figurines of a goddess standing alone are common in Sogdia, but this type is rare, and it is therefore suggested that it was produced from a Parthian model, but it is clear at least that it must represent Nana (cf. the pomegranate, above) and the young Attis, before his tragic self-mutilation and death.

A terracotta statuette of a mother suckling a child—presumably Nana and Attis—was found at Koy Krylgan Kala in Chorasmia; the same scene is shown on a medallion of greenish glass mounted in silver with a ring at the top for a neck-chain, from Balalyk Tepe, also in Chorasmia. 2h-a Nana is found also on coins of the Kusano-Bactrian kings Kaniška and Kuviška: she appears on the reverse, facing forward and seated on a lion which is standing or walking to the left. There is a crescent over her shoulders, with the horns pointing upwards to
either side. The inscription on the coin reads ΝΟΝΑ ΣΑΩ in Bactrian Greek script; it has been suggested that the letter Σ was written mistakenly in place of the Bactrian letter SAN (ג = ש). The second word would then be reconstructed as "šaω 'king' (or, in this case, 'queen', presumably). The crescent probably represents the planet Venus, with which the Mesopotamian goddesses Nana and Ishtar (Astarte) both were associated.26

According to MX II.14, Artaxias I established the statue of the goddess Athêna at Tîl, in the province of Ekeleac5 (Achillias)---within a short distance from the shrine of Anahit at Erêz (Eriza), as we shall see below.27 In his description of the campaign of Gregory to destroy the mehêans of Armenia, Agathangelos mentions the temples of Anahit and Nanê together: 

... where the goddess is addressed thus: pita t? (or, in this case, 'queen', presumably). The crescent probably represents the planet Venus, with which the Mesopotamian goddesses Nana and Ishtar (Astarte) both were associated.26

In the Greek text of Agath., Nanê is called Athêna, as in Xorenac5 above. Armed resistance to Gregory and his forces has been discussed in the previous chapter, and is seen to have been in keeping with Zoroastrian principle. We have seen also how Ani, Tòr'dan and Ašîšat became Christian holy places; the same transformation was effected at Tîl. Aristakes, the son of St Gregory, was buried there (MX II.91; P6B III.2), as was St Nersês the Great in the mid-fourth century (MX III.38). The reference to Nanê as 'daughter of Aramazd' need not be taken literally, and may be compared to Yt. 17.16, dedicated to the yazata Ašî (Phl. Ard), where the goddess is addressed thus: pita tê yô Ahurô Mazdâ 'thy father is Ahura Mazda'. Although the hymn is late, Ašî is mentioned in the Cēthô; as a goddess, Ašî represents fortune, prosperity and fecundity, like her Sanskrit counterpart (and cognate) Sîr, who was at times identified with the earth.29 The two deities, Ašî and Nanê, may share certain aspects, and perhaps also the appellations cited. In both cases, the words 'daughter' and 'father' would be allegorical in a Zoroastrian context. But in the legend of Cybele and Attis, the filial and maternal relationships are emphatically literal, and the Arm. worshippers of Nanê, like the other peoples who worshipped the Mother Goddess and her divine Child under various names, may have believed that Nanê was daughter indeed of the supreme God.

As we shall see presently, there were numerous shrines in Armenia to Anahit, but the temple of Nanê at Tîl is the only centre of the cult of the goddess which is attested with certainty. At the foot of Mt Arnos in Vaspurakan, however, is Nanénic5 for 'Valley of *Nane-ank5', and it has been suggested that the valley was named after a temple of Nanê which may once have stood there. A Christian church was built at the site,30 and, as we have seen, shrines of the new faith were commonly established in the holy places of the elder religion.

A large number of terracotta figurines have been discovered at Artaxata and Armawir which depict a lady enthroned. She is dressed in robes, and a veil suspended from the top of her high tiara falls evenly
on both sides to the base of the pedestal of the statuette. To her left, with his back to the viewer and his head at her left breast, stands a little naked boy.\textsuperscript{31} There is no doubt that these figurines served as cult statues of the Great Mother and the child Attis. It is known that the tragic legend of the pair was told in Armenia as the epic of Ara and Šamiram, referred to above, yet it is not known whether the Mother Goddess was called Šamiram; it is, indeed, unlikely that a lady portrayed in legend as the queen of a hostile foreign state would have been accorded reverence. It is more likely that the goddess was called by the name of Nanē. For although it appears that the cult of Nana was widespread throughout the Iranian lands, we shall see that Anahitā was the principal female divinity who absorbed such functions as Zoroastrian values would permit her to assimilate. The legend of the mutilated son and the wild rites of mourning performed at his death are, obviously, at variance with Zoroastrian ethical principles, which forbid self-mutilation and excessive grief; for a Zoroastrian, his body is part of the good creation of Ahura Māzda and must not be abused thus, and in bereavement one is bidden to be steadfast and calm, resolute as a good soldier in facing Ahriman-created death. Nana would therefore remain as the great Mother Goddess of the legend, worshipped in Armenia and Parthia, but ignored in Zoroastrian texts. Anahitā, officially acknowledged by throne and priesthood alike, could not be regarded as the Great Mother entirely, for the reasons we have enumerated, although certain aspects of the divinity were absorbed into her cult.

It was seen above that Nana was often accompanied by a lion or other animal or pair of animals. A coin tentatively ascribed by Babelon to a king of Sophene or Commagene of the second century B.C., shows on the reverse a goddess seated frontally above and between two winged, leonine creatures seated on their haunches and facing away from her.\textsuperscript{32} It is likely that the figure represented is Nanē. An inscription of one Julia Amnia, who claims she is the daughter of king Tigranes of Armenia, is found on an altar dedicated to the Magna Mater at Falcirii, north of Rome, and is dated to the first half of the first century A.D.;\textsuperscript{33} it is possible that the Tigranes referred to was one of the Roman candidates placed on the Arm. throne.\textsuperscript{34}

Nanē and her young son may be depicted also in bas-relief at Šnkûš, a village near the bend of the Euphrates south of Xarberd—at the other, southwestern edge of Armenia from Artaxata, where the mother-and-child figurines were unearthed. According to Gaulik Georgian, a native of the town, there is a little bridge over a valley to the east of Šnkûš Bridge. Near the little bridge is a carving in rock (Arm. karešēk kertuak,\textsuperscript{35}) depicting a woman with a babe in arms. The people of the Arm. villages of Šnkûš and Atīš explained that the child had defecated and its mother, wanting to wipe it clean and finding no rag, committed the unpardonable sin of using a piece of bread instead, whereupon she and the infant were turned to stone by God.\textsuperscript{36}

The goddess Nanē may be remembered in an Arm. tale recorded by the ethnographer G. Žerenc\textsuperscript{37} at Van in the nineteenth century. Love between Christian and Muslim is a common theme in the region, providing numerous opportunities for narrative complexity and often, also, a tragic dénouement. In the Arm. versions, the Christian boy is usually called Yovhannēs and the Muslim girl is Aysha. The love story is attested in verse as early as the Fourteenth century, attributed variously to Yovhannēs of Tlguran or Yovhannēs of Eranka (K. Erzinjän). In the prose version recorded at Van, Yovhannēs falls in love with a huri called Salcūm Paša who has disguised herself as a Turkish girl. The couple, bountied by their respective communities, take refuge with an obliging hermit who resembles somewhat the Friar Laurence of Shakespeare. The girl, who has been poisoned by her mother, appears to the hermit as a fiery being, whom he addresses as 'my Nanē'; when he asks her to take a seat, she falls down dead. Later, she rises from the dead; the boy arrives, they both die, light shines over them, and the angel Gabriel bids the monk dig them a holy grave. The word nanē in Armeno-Turkish dialect means the same as English 'mama' (as, indeed, did presumably the name Nana originally), so the hermit may not necessarily be calling the huri by the name of a divinity, although the supernatural nature of the huri and the circumstances of the story (love and death) might be seen to support such a contention.

We turn our attention now to Anahitā (Arm. Anahit), a divinity who, as will be seen, shared many of the attributes of the Great Mother, Nana. It has been suggested that the western Iranians early had learnt to
sacrifice to an alien goddess, presumably Assyro-Babylonian Ishtar, the Lady of the planet Venus, and of love and war, whose cult, as we remarked above, came to embrace that of various mother-goddesses. The Persians, according to Herodotus (1.131), sacrificed to the 'Heavenly Goddess', whom later Greek writers called Aphrodite Anaitis or simply Anaitis. The latter name was explained by Bartholomeas as OP. *an-hiti-Š 'undefiled', the name the Persians gave to the planet Venus. This form, with long -i-, might explain why the Phl. Anahid and NP. Nāhīt contain the long vowel where Av. Anāhīta does not. The latter is the fem. of an adjective meaning 'immaculate', an epithet used also for the yazatas Mithra and Naoma. *Anāhītiš was then apparently assimilated, through the epithet anāhītā, to the river-goddess *Harahvatī (Arēdvī Sūrā), the hypothetical OIr. form postulated in part from the Stk. name Sarasvatī, a goddess of the waters. The name is preserved in the Av. toponym Haravaiti, Gk. Arachosia, a region with many rivers and lakes in eastern Iran (where the original Sarasvatī probably was). The word arēdvī, attested only here, probably is an adjective meaning 'moist, humid', and sūrā is a common epithet meaning 'strong, mighty'. *Harahvatī was identified with *Anāhītiš, it seems, because the former, as a river-goddess, was worshipped also for fertility. The name *Harahvatī seems gradually to have been forgotten, and the goddess Arēdvī Sūrā Anāhītā came to be accorded the place of *Vouruna Apam Napēt 'Vouruna the Son of the Waters', the third Āhura 'Lord' of the Zoroastrian pantheon (the other two being Āhura Mazda and Mithra). Although Apam Napēt continues to be invoked in Zoroastrian prayers—the hypothetical proper name of the god, *Vouruna, cf. Stk. Varuṇa, having been lost—it is Anāhītā who was regarded among the people as the preeminent divinity of the waters and of fertility. The early Achaemenian kings invoked the supreme God, Āhura Mazda, alone in their inscriptions, but Artaxerxes II (405-369 B.C.) mentions the triad of Āhura Mazda, Anāhītā and Mithra.

Anāhītā is invoked for fertility, possessions, and victory. Although she is principally the goddess of waters—Yt. V, dedicated to her, is called either by a Mīr. form of her two epithets, Āravišūr, or Ābān 'of the waters'—she is also a hamkār 'fellow-worker' of the anēa spēnta Spēnta Ārmaiti, guardian of the earth. As we shall see, the Arm. Spandaramat was a deity of fertility, and the association of the two yazatas may reflect not only the natural alliance of earth and waters, but also the chthonian, fecundative aspects of the earth-goddess adopted by the early Western Iranians. It is recalled also that the Great Mother was queen of waters and lands alike.

Anāhītā's particular title in MP. was bēnuv 'lady'; the title is found in Sasanian inscriptions, in MP. portions of the Zoroastrian liturgy where Āravišūr is addressed; and in modern Persian usage, both Zoroastrian and Islamic, it has been demonstrated that the title bēnu used in the names of certain shrines represents Anāhītā, even where the name of the yazata proper has been forgotten. It was noted that the title 'lady' was applied to Nana, both in Mesopotamia and in eastern Iran. The particular sacrifice offered to Anāhītā, in ancient and modern times alike, is the cow or bull, perhaps because of the connection of the animal with fertility.

No single Greek goddess could be found as the exact equivalent of Anāhītā. Thus, according to Plutarch (Artaxerxes, IV), the Persian king Artaxerxes II visited at Pasargadae a temple to a warlike goddess likened to Athēna; while Clement of Alexandria quotes Berossus to the effect that the same king sponsored at Babylon and other cities the cult of Aphrodite-Anaitis. In the divine triad of the *Frāstādāra inscription in Greek from Persepolis (cited in Ch. 5, 6 above), the female deity is called Artemis-Athēna. In these various cases, it is most likely Anāhītā who is referred to; one recalls that Nana was identified mainly with Athēna. In Asia Minor, the shrine of Zela (Gk. Zēlitis; Strabo, Geog. XII.3) built on a hill named after Semiramis (cf. the legend of Arē and Šamiram noted above), was dedicated by the Achaemenians to the worship of Anāhītā, called by Tacitus (Annales III.63) the 'Persian Diana'. In Yt. 5.21, Anāhītā is worshipped at the foot of Mt Harā, which bears the constant epithet bekōvaiti 'the Lofty'. In an inscription from Ortaköy, Cappadocia, near Niğde, on an altar, three hierodoulai invoke in Greek Agathē Tykhē Theē Megistē Anaitidē Barzokharai 'Good Fortune, Great Goddess Anaitis Barzoxharē.' The latter cult epithet, from OIr., meaning 'of Lofty Harā', indicates the strongly Zor. character of her cult in Asia Minor, together with the tenacity of local beliefs and traditions.
There was a great and ornate temple presumably to Anahit in the Parthian period at Kangavar in Kurdistan, described by Isidore of Charax as a temple of Artemis; in the Sasanian period, the principal temple of the dynasty was Adur Anahid at Staxr, where the forebears of Ardashir I had served as priests. Both temples probably contained images of the goddess originally, but a fire was installed in the place of the idol at Staxr, according to Mas'udi, generations before Ardashir's rise to power. Unusual features of cult, appropriate, though, to a warlike goddess, are recorded for the Zor. temple in Sasanian times: the severed heads of enemies were hung from its walls. It is likely that the shrine at Kangavar retained its effigy of Anahit until the end of the Arsacid dynasty; the image was probably splendidly adorned, and it has been proposed that the description of the goddess in the Adab temple and in other Sasanian documents refers to the image of Anahit, since similar images were found in the temple at Shushtar.

Although the Sasanians vigorously suppressed the worship of the Zoroastrian gods, they were not averse to depicting images in bas-reliefs, as we have seen in the case of Ohrmazd, as a temple of the goddess usually, and in a woman, probably the goddess Anahit, is shown in the relief of Taq-i Bostan presenting a crown to Xusru II (late sixth–early seventh century). It has been suggested that these female figures on Sasanian silver plates and vases may represent Anahit.

References in Arm. texts to the goddess Anahit are plentiful, and the principal ones from the major classical sources will be cited forthwith; we shall then discuss the significance of the information, in relation both to Ir. Anahit and to the Christian Tiramay, 'Mother of the Lord', the Virgin Mary, who absorbed aspects of the goddess in the beliefs of Arm. Christians. Towards the beginning of the History of Agathangelos, the scene is set for the ensuing conflict between the old faith and Christianity: Yasrak in anin Trdatay arq'ayut'ecn Hayoc's mocac', xasac' in ekšin ykešucac' gawac', i geven Erisay, i meheann Anahitakan, zin and zohs natusc'en: ecw ibrew katarac'in zoroc anarjian'cevan ijin bavek'anc an at ecnpos getocn zor Hayoc'koc'en. Ibrew ecn ceat i xoroo and ecw yecac'ris bavec'ew, ec ibrew ecn ginis tmin hramen et t'agawor Grigor, zin psaks ec t'ecn ecec'ac ocac' mvres tarc' i begmin Anahitakan patkerin. Ayl na cc' arnyn yanin pastanacar linel dic'ecn erkrpaguc'ecn (Agath. 48–49). 'In the first year of the reign of Trdat of Greater Armenia, they set off, journeyed, and arrived in the province of Ekešac', at the village of Erac, at the temple of Anahit, in order to offer sacrifices there, and when they had completed the unworthy deed they descended and pitched camp on the banks of the river called the Lycus. When the king came into the tent for dinner, and when they had drunk their wine, he commanded that Grigor take wreaths and leafy branches of trees as gifts to the shrine of the statue of Anahit. But he (Gregory) did not undertake to participate in the worship of the god.' The medieval theologian Yovannès of Erzna may be recalling this scene in his Commentary on Matthew (Mknut'c'c'v 8, Astarazan, or Žet Mat'c'tesni, Constantinople, 1825, 444): Ec darjel yet moac' c moac'on ekec arg'c'iz ekean stunk' saqast'avors i pastoc'koc' divac' jocnac'. 'And again by their sins coming to forgetfulness of the Creator, they dedicated leafy boughs to the worship of the idols of demons.' The enraged king thereupon threatens Gregory with death, et c'c'ec'c' armuc'oc' yac'c'n pastac'n satuc'anec', manмышлa ayecn mecni Anahitay tiknol, or Ž gac'c' kagir'ec meroc ec koc'c'ec', sorr ec'c'ec'agowork'ec' amecn ecmany patcuen, manмышлa t'agowor Yucuc': or Ž may ecmany zacut'ec', barera amecn marack manu'tec', ec cund Ž mecni anin Aramazday 'if you do not undertake to offer worship to the gods, particularly to this great lady Anahit, who is the glory and giver of life of our people, whom all kings honour, particularly the king of the Greeks; who is the mother of all chastity, the benefactor of all mankind; and who is the child of the great, manly Aramazd' (Agath. 53). Grigor responds coolly that the one called Anahit tikin 'Anahit the Lady' (Agath. 59) may have been a historical personage defied in remote ages, but assuredly no divine being. The king again reproaches Gregory for scorning the gods, particularly Aramazd and zecuc Anahit, orv keay ec zkencuc ut'in krc c'çk akirci Hayoc'c'. 'The great Anahit, by whom this land of Armenia lives and thrives!' (Agath. 68).

In an address to his nation, Trdat proclaims Oc'jocn haseac' ev qiyut'ecn dic'c'n awmakanac'ecam, liuc'c'c' paratuc'n yarocn Aramazday, znamakaluc'c'w yucuc Anahit tiknol, ec k'c'c'ec'w nucoc' c ces i k'c'c'c'c' inxoc'c vayacu ecmany Hayoc'c' akirci. 'May health and prosperity come to you and to all this country of Armenia by the help of the gods, rich fullness from manly Aramazd, provision from Anahit the Lady, and bravery
from brave Vahagn' (Agath. 127). According to Lucian, De Dea Syria, Armis. and Medes travelled to Hierapolis in Syria to adorn with jewels the statue of "Hera", i.e., Astarte. It is possible that they regarded the goddess as their own Anahit, whose name is used to translate that of Hera in the Arm. version of the Alexander Romance of Pseudo-Callisthenes. At the triumph of Christianity, Grigor travels around Armenia, destroying the pagan temples. At Artaxata, he levels the temple at that Oskemayr was a cultic epithet of the dying ew bazum keans 'healing and much life'.

Anahit was the most popular of the Persian divinities worshipped by the Armenians, adds that the virgin daughters of Arm. noblemen (Gk. epiphaneastatoi) become temple prostitutes at Eriza. The practice of such ritual prostitution was widely attested in Asia Minor and elsewhere in the ancient world, and such a practice at Erëz may have provoked the seventh-century writer Vrt'anes Kerta'oi 'the Poet' to decry Anahit, ew pçut çivâk iwr ew patirêk 'Anahit and her lawlessness and falsehoods'. Such practices would be repugnant to orthodox Zoroastrians and are not mentioned in the Arm. texts, whose authors, one may be certain, would have derived the fullest possible polemical advantage, had they known of them. It is difficult also to reconcile temple prostitution with the cult of a goddess called by Agath. 'the mother of all chastity' and equated most frequently by Arm. writers (and exclusively, by Xorenacš) with Artemis, that most chaste of Greek divinities.

Several other temples of Anahit may have existed in Armenia. The remnants of the foundation of a monumental stone building in the style of the building at Gâni (on which see Ch. 8) have been unearthed beneath the great church of St Hripsime at Vaksarsapat (Kjmlacin). The saint, one of the most prominent of the Arm. Church, was a virgin nun and companion of St Gregory, and it has been suggested that the Church bearing her name was erected where the temple of a pagan goddess had stood earlier. During the excavations at Satala (Arm. Satal, Gk. Sadaç, Sadak) on the Kelkit river, north of Erzincan, late in the nineteenth century, a bronze head of the Gk. Aphrodite type was unearthed. The piece, dated to the second-first century B.C., is 36 cm high and 93 cm in circumference, of very fine workmanship, and was cast perhaps in western Asia Minor. Alfred Biliotti, who spent nine days at the site in 1874, reported rough stone walls 18 feet high, with traces of ashlar facing, and found a sculpture which he identified as a winged Victory. The excavations of Satala yielded also bronze legs which had belonged to a lifesize sculpture of a horse, and a brick was found stamped LEG XV I. This is undoubtedly an abbreviation of the name of the Roman Legion XV Apollinaris, which was stationed in Armenia during the campaign of Corbulo in A.D. 62. There was a large Christian community at Satala in the fourth century; the bishop of the town attended the ecumenical Council of Nicea in 325, and St Basil of Caesarea visited the community in 372. Armenian scholars have sought to identify the bronze head as having belonged to a cult statue of Anahit,
and the town appears to have been sufficiently important in ancient times to have been a religious centre, although there is nothing to suggest that the shrine was Arm. or Zor. It may have been frequented though, like the more distant shrine at Hierapolis mentioned above.

On the slopes of Mt Ararat there is a spring called Anahitäkan akbîwīr 'the spring of Anahit' to this day. The origin of the fountain is ascribed in popular tradition to St Jacob of Nisibis, who, as we have seen, climbed a Mt Ararat far to the south, in Gordyene. The attribution is doubly spurious, in that a spring bearing the name of a Zoroastrian yazâta cannot have had anything to do with a pious Syrian saint, and probably was named before his quest for the lost Ark of Noah. Arm. believe that the spring cures barrenness and prevents locusts from eating crops; both properties accord well with the characteristics of life-giving protection and fecundity ascribed to the goddess in texts.

In a mediaeval account of the apostolic mission of Sts Thaddeus and Bartholomew in Armenia, mention is made of a place in the district of Anéjavâc 'a mountain called Darâmâc Kazar 'Blacksmiths' Rock' where there was an incessant din, the sound of blacksmiths striking anvils. St Bartholomew halacâc zdârbinis zgorçnèays Sârin, ev zkwân pârâc or yamun Anahitay er 'drove out the blacksmiths, the ministers of evil, and shattered the idols, which were in the name of Anahit.66 Blacksmiths, as we shall see, struck their anvils to strengthen the bonds of the wicked Artawazd, imprisoned in Mt Ararat, and in Iran and Armenia blacksmiths and the iron they forged represented the struggle of good against evil.67 It is possible, therefore, that Darâmâc Kazar had been the site of a Zoroastrian shrine of Anahit; the Christian Hôgwoc Vânc 'Monastery of All Souls' was founded on the site.70 Pîawostos mentions a Greek hermit named Epip'ân (i.e., Epiphanius), who lived i meci lêrinn i teki dicn xor koc'en at Anahitay 'in the great mountain, in the place of the gods, which they call the Throne of *Nahat' (Pîawostos V.25). It is not known where this mountain was, although at the death of St Nersès the Great, we are told by Pîawostos that Epiphanius and a Syrian monk named Zâhita71 beheld a vision and hastened to T'îl in Ekéicân, where Nersès had just been buried. It is possible, therefore, that the mountain called At of Nahatay was not far from Erzê, the site of the temple of Anahit. The name *Nahat, gen. Nahatay, is attested only here, but from the reference of Pîawostos to the gods and the Arm. form Nâhîd we may assume it is a form of the name Anahit. One notes also the cult epithet 'barzoxârâ' of the goddess; it would have been appropriate to call a mountain after Anahit 'of Lofty Harâ'. As was noted earlier, the NP. form and its Phil. predecessor retain the long vowel -i- of the hypothetical form *Anâhiṭî. In the Arm. case, however, the replacement of -i- in (A)nahit by -a- probably indicates that the name of the goddess was subjected to internal development in Arm., as evidenced by the intrusive -a-, cf. loan-words zorâcset, Sandarmuet, Spandramet et al.72 Arm. -i- is a weak vowel in final syllables, cf. Anahit, gen. sg. Anahitay, and the form attested in Pîawostos may conceivably have evolved from the gen. sg. form or from the adj. anahita-kân, both of which are attested far more often, as we have seen, than the simple nom. sg., in references to the cult of the goddess and her temples.

In the ancient Arm. calendar recorded by Anania of Sirak, the 7th month and the 19th day of the month were named after Anahit; the same writer, in a list of the planets, equates Gk. Apôrodité (Aphrodité, i.e., Venus), Arm. Lusaber (lit. 'Light-bringer') and 'Persian' Anahit.73 As we have seen in the previous chapter, the Arm. tended to identify the planet with Astîk, but the crescent or half-moon on the heifers of the goddess in Armenia probably reflect the Ir. identification of the goddess with Venus, the only planet besides the moon whose phases are visible from Earth with the naked eye. We shall see that this symbol, the sacrifice of cows, the title 'Lady', and the characteristic of life-giving fecundity, were all transferred from Anahit to the Holy Mother of God, Mary, by Arm. Christians.

The mediaeval cleric Anania vardâpet wrote: Awrrneal es du lusankar afagazet, or 'êk ciâcxn nasaçwac zawrac ar er veray patkerac'n draweloc, ew harcal xortakcer zer mozi pâçwac diwanuçêr ev k'ajaperc pancenac Anâhiṭ taimoc 'Blessed are you, canopy etched in light, who have triumphed in magnificent dilaciv over graven images, and have stricken and destroyed the vain, demonolatrous pomp and overwhelming beasts of Anahit the Lady.74 The Arm. Feast of the Transfiguration, Vardâvâl, celebrated on the seventh Sunday after Pentecost, is a holiday of the waters, and, as such, retains aspects of the cult of Anahit, who,
as we have seen, is preeminently the yazata of the waters in later Zoroastrianism. In Dersim until recent times, calves born with a half-moon or star on their foreheads (both, presumably, were regarded as symbols of Venus) were sacrificed on Vardavak, and offerings of flowers and branches were made to the Holy Mother of God (cf. Agath. 48-9, above); it was also believed by the inhabitants of the region that Anahit bathed on Vardavak morning where two rivers met—a similar legend exists concerning Astlik, as was seen in the previous chapter. 75

In Christian times, the Virgin Mary has been regarded by the Arms. as the saint who cures those afflicted with venereal disease, who are called Tirman ör xekēro 'the poor ones of the Lord's mother'. The latter used to go for a cure to the Kajberunacak Xa'tun Tirmanöör Vank 'Monastery of the lady Mother of the Lord, of Kajberunik [province] at the village of Akmanc near Arceg (on the NE shore of L. Van). 76 It is seen that the title of Anahit, 'Lady' (Arm. tikin), is now found as Armeno-Turkish xatun, applied to the Virgin Mary. 77 St Barbara (Arm. Valvare), too, may have acquired these ancient characteristics of Anahit: there is a cave called Cvekevank (Monastery of Flowers) in the side of the mountain named after Ara in Soviet Armenia (on Ara, cf. above). Until not long ago, women who were barren used to go to the cave on Vardavak and pray for fertility as they stood beneath the drops of water that trickle down from the roof of the cave. If the drops touched them, they believed St Valvare had consented to grant them their desire.

Amongst the Kurdish tribesmen of Dersim are many who still mark their loaves with the sign of the Cross and remember how their Armenian forebears, harried by their Muslim persecutors, had abandoned their farms, adopted the creed of Islam, and fled to join the armed Kurdish clans of the mountains. Many of these Kurds recalled traditions still more ancient, for they spoke of a Spring of Anahit whose water they called 'mother's milk'. When two parties were in conflict, they would be brought to drink from the spring, whereupon they acknowledged that they were brothers of the same mother, and the dispute was settled. 78 The Mirag clan, who still remembered the Arm. tongue, offered reverence to a shrine of Ana-yi Fil, 79 the Kurds called Anahit either Anahid or Ana, and the word pil is a form of NP. pi 'old man, Islamic saint'. In Iran, various ancient Zoroastrian shrines were called those of Muslim

pīrs, in simple ignorance or perhaps as a camouflage against desecration. The Zor. shrines did not contain tombs, however, as many of the wholly Islamic pihr-shrines do. 80 The Mirag clansmen persisted also in calling the pihr their 'great mother', 81 preserving, as it seems, a usage even more ancient than the name or cult of Anahit herself, and one may justly marvel at the remarkable tenacity of this Zoroastrian cult in Armenia, informed in part by the ancient worship of the Mother Goddess of Anatolia, in surviving the successive depredations of the two great and militant faiths, Christianity and Islam. Anahit, the giver of life, herself lived on among her children, as the Great Mother and as the yazata of the curative and life-giving waters of the rivers and springs and of Vardavak.
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CHAPTER 8

MIHR

Of all the yazatas of Zoroastrianism, it is Mithra (Av. Mithra-, Phl. Mihr) who has attracted the greatest scholarly attention, for the religion of Mithraism was a cult of the first importance in the Roman Empire during the early centuries of Christianity; many of the spiritual values of the two religions are similar, and in the second and early third centuries it was still by no means clear which would prevail ultimately over moribund Greco-Roman paganism. Monuments of the Mithraic cult have been excavated from Syria to Britain, and references to the god Mithra in classical sources are also numerous.

As we shall see, it is possible that Roman legionaries stationed in Armenia and Pontus learned of the Zoroastrian yazata, were impressed by aspects of his cult, and spread it to the west, where it acquired numerous non-Zoroastrian accretions in Europe and developed into an independent religion. The impressive performance of the Arm. Arsacid Tiridates I at the court of Nero is widely noted by Classical historians, and the invocation by the Oriental potentate of Mithra may have provided additional impetus to the growth of the new cult at Rome.

Aspects of the Arm. cult of Mihr may go back to the prototypes which inspired the Roman armies: the hero Mher in Armenian epic was led to a cave at Van by a crow, and the western Mithra, who had a raven-familiar, was worshipped in temples called spelaeae 'caves'. The ubiquitous theme of Mithraic bas-reliefs, the tauroctony (i.e., slaughter of a bull), may have been inspired by the Zoroastrian tradition of the sacrifice of the bull Hadhayans that is to take place at Frasigird. Arm. worship of Mithra, however, including the aspects noted above, appears to have been solidly within the framework of Zoroastrianism, and evidence that the Mithraic cult existed at all amongst the native population of Anatolia is meagre.1

It is proposed, therefore, to consider Arm. Mihr as a Zor. yazata, and to examine his cult primarily in the light of the Iranian evidence. Artaxerxes II, as we have seen, was the first Achaemenian king to invoke
a triad of yazatas: Ahura Mazda, Anahit and Mithra—in inscriptions, rather than Ahura Mazda alone. As one of the three ahuras, Ahura Mazda and (Avorum-) Apaim Napāt being the other two, Mithra stands at the head of the Zoroastrian pantheon. As a judge of souls, a guardian of covenants and a fighter against evil, he epitomises the Zoroastrian ethic and worldview. Zoroastrian temples are called 'gates of Mithra' (NP. dar-i Mihfr), a term attested, however, only after the Islamic conquest of Iran; we shall have occasion to note its use in Arm., as well. It is recalled that in Achaemenian times the Arm. vassals of the Persian king brought 20,000 horses to him each year on the great festival of *Mithra-ka*; in Sasanian Iran, Mihrāgan was a festival second in importance only to NE Nōz, which was consecrated to Ormazd, and Zor. tradition holds that by presiding over the second half of the month through the 16th day which bears his name, Mithra is subordinate only to Ormazd, the Creator, of whose creations he is the Protector. Mithra appears to have been primordially a god whose function it was to be the overseer of contracts, and this function of seer was naturally associated with light. Mithra was identified with fire, too, at a very early stage, it appears, perhaps because the administration of justice was so closely linked to the ordeal by fire, perennially connected in Iranian tradition with oath-taking. As we shall see, it is mainly as a god of fire, equated with Greek Hephaistos, that the yazata was known in Armenia. The name Arameshki, apparently meaning 'fire of Mihr(āgan)' (discussed in n. 37), is interesting in this context. But in Iran at least by the Parthian period, Mithra had come to be ritually identified with the Sun, which is at once the greatest of all physical fires, and the source of the light by which the god oversees the conduct of men.

In Arm., the name of the god is attested in the Arm. form Mihr (in Arm. epic, the yazata appears as a hero called Mher). In proper names, Mihr is found alone, or in compounds with the forms mihr-, meher-, mehr- and mihr-. The Arm. form mithr- (rendered in Arm. as mitfr-) is found in Arm. texts, and in Classical and Arabic sources relating to Armenia. In MX III.17, the Sasanian king Artašir invokes Mihr aṣtuac 'the great god Mihr', and the Arm. bishops in their letter to the Sasanian Prime Minister, Mihrmuzsh, on A.D. 450, refer to Mihr astuac 'the god Mihr' (Mkiše, II). Parthian Manichaean missionaries identified their Tertius Legatus with the yazatas Mithra and Mairỵs-sanh; the two divine names are paired also in the case of Mihrmuzsh above, and a Christian monastery in Caucasian Albania was called Ners-Mihr. A seventh-century bishop of the Alans was named Mihr, and an Alan prince was called Zār-Mihr. The eighth day of the Arm. month was consecrated to Mihr, according to the list preserved by Anania of Shirak (seventh century), and an Arm. named Mihr-Abartšir was the lord of Siwīk in the mid-sixth century. The following names in Arm. contain mihr-: Mihran, Mihrdat, Mihrišir, Mihriban, Mihrāpuh and Mihr; with me(n)er: Mehreb, Mehri, Mehrizad, Mehrimiluk, Mehrīšat, Meher, Meher(ean), Mehrvan, Mehrūni(k), Meḥer and Mher; with the metathesised form mhr- are found Mhravan, a fourth-century Albanian version of the name attested above as Mihriban, and Mhragēt, perhaps originally a priestly title. The latter name is found only once, on an undated Māk (c)ar 'Cross-stone' from Arcāx. We shall discuss shortly also the form mhrakan meheran 'temple of Mihr' (Agath. 790). The form meh- is found in Mihandak, from OP. Mithra-bandaka- 'servant of Mithra', Mehevan (cf. Mhravan, Mihriban above) and Mehuni, the latter being the name of a naxarar family (cf. the Vahuni clan in Ch. 6). Mehekan, also attested as Mehek(1), the name of the 7th month of the Arm. calendar and a fem. proper name, from OP. Mithrakana- (see above) may be cited here, as well as the Arm. generic term for a (non-Christian) temple, meheran, which we shall discuss at greater length presently. With the form mhr- are attested the name of the Armeno-Kurdish Mirag clan in Derw (see Ch. 7), and the Arm. and Albanian names Mihrawa and Mirhewir. The Arm. mihr- (Arm. mitfr-) is found in Miṭ̄rēos, the name of a Chaldaean (!) king in a list provided by Koresac (MX I.19). The Arabic version of Agath. refers to Gordin in Daramaki (see Ch. 5) as Mitrodan, but this may be a scribal error.

An inscription at the monastery of Gelard (Arwank) states that Miṭ̄reục- Sin kūruma Parsi, 'The priests of the Persians were of the Mitrean.' The ending -can is commonly used in Arm. as a patronymic suffix in family names, and it is possible that this is a reference to the great Mihruin family of Arsacid Iran, whose residence was probably the Khur-mitrēn mentioned by Ptolemy (Geog., VI.26). The district was near Ganjak, the site from mid-Sasanian times of the sacred fire of
Guñasp (Arm. Vėnasp). In Grk. sources, the name of the family is attested as ...tou Mirranou oikarkhias...dēmou d' Arbakiū; the Arm. inscription may preserve an earlier form, and the Arms. could easily have regarded the great Mīhrān family as guardians of the sacred fire of neighbouring Atropatene. In the Arsacid period, the fire particularly exalted by the Parthians was Ādur Bursēn-Mīhr; the name Mīhrān in Arm. was cited above, and the element -pet (OIr. -pati) 'chief, ruler' is commonly found in religious titles in Arm. The above evidence would tend to support the supposition that the name of the yazata was associated with priestly titles, even as it will be seen to be an element of Arm. mehean 'temple'.

Greek sources preserve a number of names with mithra- associated with Armenia. An Orontid monarch named Mithra-ān is attested, ca. 331 B.C., and the Arms. fought Alexander at Gaugamela under two generals, Orontēs and Mithraustēs; it has been suggested that the name of the latter is to be derived from OIr. *Mithra.yaḥištā- 'Mithra (who is) the best'. An Arm. named Mithrobuzān was fought Artaxias for the throne of the country over a century later. Plutarch in his Life of Lucullus mentions an Arm. general of the first century B.C. named Mithrobuzānā who fought under Tigran II.

During his campaign of destruction of the old temples of Armenia, St Gregory Gayr hasanēr i Mihrakān mehean amaranā orboyn Aramasten, i gīvān zor Bagayahēn koç'en ēst part'ewarān lexuñ 'Come to the temple of Mīhr, who is named son of Aramazd in the village which they call Bagayaēc' in the Parthian tongue' (Agath. 790). (See Pl. IV at the end of this Ch. The photographer has asked to be identified by his initials only.) We have already encountered the word mehean as 'temple' in a variety of contexts. It was proposed by Gershvin that the Arm. word is to be derived from an OIr. form *mithra-dōna 'place of Mithra', with the Arm. ending -ēn from MP. -vān, the latter form resulting from the normal shift of intervocalic -v- to -w- in SW Mir. Earlier, Meillet had proposed that the word be derived from OIr. *mīhryāna-, also meaning 'place of Mithra'. The first part of the word, meh-, undoubtedly comes from the name of the yazata, but the ending is more of a problem. It was proposed above that Mīthra-ēn was a native form; the same might be true of meh-ēn. In all known cases, the OIr. suffix -dōna- is attested in Arm. as -(a)ran, via forms borrowed from NW Mir., not SW Mir. As we have seen, most borrowings from the latter are restricted to the Sasanian period, and in cases where both NW and SW Middle Iranian forms of the same word are attested in Arm. (e.g., NW petēnan and SW pūstīpan), the earlier, Arsacid 'Parthian' form generally is the one more frequently used. It is unlikely that the Arms. would have borrowed from their Sasanian adversaries a religious term of such central importance to the ancient Arm. cult, when they resisted other innovations of less moment. A derivation from Sasanian MP. *mīhryān is probably to be ruled out. There is another argument against the adoption of the loan-word at such a late date, although it is more hypothetical. Had the Arms. borrowed the word during the Sasanian period, i.e., at a time not remote from that of Agathangelos, they would have known its meaning, 'place of Mithra', as the foremost signification of the word. Why would Agathangelos, with his sensitivity to the 'Parthian' meanings of names, have produced a pointless tautology such as mīhakān mehean 'place of Mithra, of Mithra'? If the term had become general in Armenia before then, when was it introduced? It would have had to have been made a part of the religious terminology between A.D. 226, the date of the Sasanian accession to power and the earliest possible time of direct MP. influence in Arm., and the Conversion less than eighty years thereafter. This is not enough time for a specialised term to take on such broad meaning. But if the term had become a general one in Persis, instead, then why is it nowhere found there? Surely a word of such prominence could not have been lost merely in the great proliferation of religious grades and offices of the early Sasanian period.

It is probable that the word mehean is to be assigned to the Arsacid period or earlier. The ending -ēn could have come from the form proposed by Meillet, or else it is an Arm. suffix, ultimately of Ir. origin, like Mitēr-ēn. The importance of Mithra in Zor. in the Sasanian period has been noted already, and, as we shall see, the concept of the yazata in Arm. seems to have ceased to develop long before the Sasanian period.

By Pth. times at least, as we have seen, Mithra had come to be associated with the Sun. At Nērmrūt Dağ (first century B.C.), the god is called Mithras-Apollôn-Hēlois-Hērmēs. Christian Syriac writers of the
Sasanian period emphasise the Persian belief that Mihr and the Sun were identical; and to this day, the Zoroastrian litanies (NP niya\v{y}a\r{e}) to Mihr and Xvar\v{e}d, the Sun, are recited together daily during the first watch of the day, the H\v{a}van G\v{a}n, which is ruled by Mithra. In the fifth century A.D., Eznik of Ko\v{a}b describes a Persian myth in which the Sun is a mediator between Ahura Mazda and Angra Mainyu, and calls the Sun Arm. dat\wawar 'Judge'; these references seem to identify the Sun with Mithra, who is described by Plutarch as a mediator (Gk. mesitês), and who is referred to in the Phl. books as d\r{\i}h\r{\i}var 'Judge'. But the Arm. writer here is not describing a belief common amongst those of his own nation. In Armenian sources, Vahagn, not Mihr, is identified with the Sun. Mihr is called by Korenac\r{c}i Hep\r{e}stos (Gk. Hephaistos), and although T\w{O}vma Arcruni (I.3) identifies Hep\r{e}stos with the Sun, he adds that the god has hur vars 'fiery hair'. The latter description indicates that the Arm. writer had in mind Vahagn, who is often referred to thus, and not Mihr. The Arm. regarded Mihr as guardian of covenants as well, preserving faithfully the most ancient characteristic of the yazata in the adjective vat\w{m\i}rh 'perfidious', with the initial element vat 'bad' (Phl. wad).

In the ancient Arm. calendar, the 8th day of the month was called Mihr, and the 7th month was called Mehekan or Meheki, a name descended from G\v{e}h. Mihrag\v{n} (Phl. and NP. Mihrag\v{n}) In the Zor. calendar, the festival of Mihrag\v{n} was originally celebrated on Mihr R\v{e}z of Mihr M\v{a}n (the 16th day of the 7th month), but with the first calendar reforms of the Sasanians, the date of the festival was shifted to the 21st (R\v{e}z R\v{e}z), and since pious Zoroastrians, perplexed by the reform, were fearful lest they mark the feast at the wrong time, it came to be celebrated as a six-day festival, from 16-21 Mihr M\v{a}n, the last day being called 'Great Mihrag\v{n}'. The 21st day of the month of Mihr, one notes, would not have been connected to the cult of the god before the third century A.D. In the Arm. Church, 21 Mehekan is the date of the feast of St George the Soldier (Arm. G\v{e}org); if any connection is to be sought between yazata and saint on the basis of this circumstance, it is to be assumed that the Christian feast was established in the Sasanian period to coincide with Great Mihrag\v{n}, and without reference to the ancient Arm. calendar, in which the 8th day of the month is consecrated to Mihr.

There are two possible reasons for this. First, the Christians of Mesopotamia, with their profound influence on developments in Armenia, lived at the centre of the Sasanian state, and they may have equated their feast with the Zoroastrian observance; the Arm. would then have followed them. The second possibility is that the Arm. themselves set the date of the feast, for Great Mihrag\v{n} was second in importance only to N\v{e} R\v{e}z itself in the calendar of the Sasanian state—as the older date, the 16th, had been in bygone ages (cf. Strabo, above, on the Achaemenian Mithra\w{h\w{a}}na)—and would thus have been recognised in Armenia, at least, as yet another insidious innovation of the Persian enemy which invited Christian response.

In Georgia, aspects of the cult of St George bear comparison to the cult of Mithra. At the Monastery of Ilori in Mingrelia, it was customary to lock a bull in the church overnight, announce that Mithra had stolen it, and then appoint a youth to slay it. This rite has been linked to the Mithraic tauroctony, and in Zoroastrianism sacrifice plays an important role at Mihrag\v{n}. St George is also often shown mounted, like Mithra. In Armenia, such connections as may be perceived between saint and god are far less explicit. St George, unlike St At\r{c}angin\r{c}a or St Karapet, is a comparatively obscure figure, and the few legends told of him centre on the Monastery of St G\v{e}org of P\r{e}t\w{C}i. This sanctuary is called after Mt But\r{c} (like B\r{c}-\w{O}\r{c}i, see Ch. 14), a volcano whose fiery cone made it a place of pre-Christian worship, perhaps of Mihr, a lord of fire; according to the medieval author of a 'History of the Image of the Mother of the Lord', or te\w{C}in But\r{c} lai: k\r{c}\w{O}\r{c}i\r{c}i k\r{c}\w{C}amapetin But\r{c} kardayr 'the place is called But\r{c} because the [pagan] high priest was called by the name of But\r{c}'. Next to the church are the ruins of a vaulted hall; according to local popular tradition, this was a mehecan in ancient times. The monastery had cocks which were reputed to warn travellers in the mountains if a pass was to be snowed in. The cock is a bird sacred in Zoroastrianism to Mazda, a yazata whose function as guardian and overseer of men and their deeds linked him with Mithra. Another monastery of St G\v{e}org is Devoc\r{c}a or Devk\r{c}e Vank\r{c}, SB of Sebastia, which was said to have taken its name from the deus 'demons' that lived on the site before it was consecrated to Christian worship; that is, there had probably been a Zoroastrian shrine there before St Gregory.
The Parthian Arsacids who came to the throne of Armenia in the first century A.D. were pious Zoroastrians who invoked Mithra as the lord of covenants, as is proper. An episode which illustrates their observance of the cult is the famous Journey of Tiridates I to Rome in A.D. 65. Tiridates, the first Arsacid king of Armenia, travelled to Nero's capital to receive his crown, going by land as far as possible in order to avoid polluting the sacred creation of water.53 At the coronation ceremony, Tiridates declared, 'I am, my lord, a descendant of Arsaces and a brother of the kings Vologaesus and Pacorus, and your servant. And I have come before you, my god, to be obedient to you even as unto Mithra, and I shall be as you decree, for you are my fate and my fortune.' During his stay at Rome, the king initiated Nero into 'Magian' banquets. It is not certain what the latter were, for Zoroastrians are not supposed to sup with infidels at all; perhaps what is meant here is that Tiridates took the ḫūs, probably with bārsum (the Zoroastrian ritual bundle of twigs used in religious ceremonies, cf. Arm. bārorsmān). This routine act of prayer before meals, which are then eaten in silence, is at once so conspicuous and so common that in one Judaeo-Persian text the Zoroastrians are distinguished by it from adherents of other religions. Tiridates could not have neglected this essential ritual, regardless of the circumstances. Italian literature records a number of instances in which kings in dire distress and great haste still refused to take food until they had performed the necessary rituals.50 The oath taken by Tiridates is in keeping with orthodox Zoroastrianism, and Xenophon depicts the Persian king swearing by Mithra in both the Cyropaedia and the Anabasis.51

It has been suggested that soldiers of the Roman legion XV Apollinaris, which was transferred from Pannonia to Armenia to fight in Corbulo's ill-fated campaign of A.D. 62, may have acquired knowledge of the yazata as a sun god in Armenia (more likely Pontus) and carried his cult back with them.52 If so, Tiridates was swearing by Mithra and impressing by his ritual silence at banquets the patricians of Rome, at the same time that the legionaries were returning west with tales of the Sol Invictus 'the Invincible Sun', Mithra.

Before his departure to Rome, in about A.D. 64, the 11th year of his actual reign in Armenia, Tiridates left an inscription at the ancient fortress of Gahi (see plate I, appended to this Ch.).53 Mosaics have been found at the site which depict scenes from Greek mythology and bear the caption ἀγάν λαβότες ἐργασαμέθα 'we laboured, taking nothing [i.e., no wages]. The palace for which the mosaics were made is called by Xorenac a sun havane 'cooling-off house' (MX II.90), and it attributes it to Tiridates III (late third century) and says it was built by the latter for his queen, Xosroidux. Perhaps the building was so called because of its baths and pools; cf. the aquatic scenes in the mosaic floor. Gahi stands at the edge of a wedge-shaped promontory overlooking the deep ravine of the river Azat in the Gélâm mountains, and in the summer its cool breezes are a pleasant relief after the stifling heat of the plain of Ararat. As was seen in Ch. 3, the great cities of Artxaiid and Arsacid Armenia stood on this plain, and Gahi was a fortress of enormous strategic importance for the defence of the cities of the plain from barbarian marauders to the north and east, whose incursions were a perennial threat to both the Roman and Iranian empires, for whom Armenia served as a buffer.

Xorenac adds that Tiridates III greal i nna ziyānata iwr hellenac-grov 'wrote in it (i.e., the palace) his memorial in Hellenic script' (MX II.90). The inscription (see pl. 2) was found in the fortress-wall of Gahi, not in the ruins of the palace. It is also apparent, on paleographical grounds, that the inscription was made in the first century, and it has, accordingly, been assigned to Tiridates I. The inscription, in Greek, was discovered in 1945 on a block of basalt 165 cm long, 50 cm high and 79-80 cm thick; the letters are about 5 x 5.5 cm in size. The stone rests in the fortress-wall, which stood about 6.5 m high.

Owing to weathering and other damage, there are many lacunae in the inscription, and readings have varied considerably.56 The most reasonable rendering seems to be that of A. G. Abrahamyan, yet his reading, too, involves the restoration of many words where lacunae are too large to allow for a completely convincing reconstruction. Without attempting to restore the text and leaving most of the lacunae, a fragmentary translation may be attempted: 'The Sun Tiridates/ of Greater Armenia, lord as despot, built a temple for the queen; the invincible.../ in the eleventh year of his reign/... Under the protection of the.../ may the
The importance of Mithra in Zoroastrianism is amply attested in both Iran and Armenia; numerous terracotta figures of a horse and rider found at Artaxa and in the Parthian empire may represent Mithra on horseback; we shall see the Arm. Mher portrayed thus in the Epic of Samun. In two inscriptions of Artaxerxes II, the triad of Ahura Mazādā, Anāhit and Mithra is invoked. In Agath. 127, however, Tīrīdatēs invokes Aramazd, Anāhit and Vahagn, in that order. Mithra is conspicuously absent. It is recalled that Mithra and Verethrama are often represented together in Zoroastrian texts, in Christian hagiographies, and, apparently, on Mithraic bas-reliefs. In Armenia, it was Vahagn, not Mīr, who was equated with the Sun (cf. the Classical Arm. commentator on Genesis, who noted that omankā sargana purtēc in ēv Vahān Koçe in 'some worshipped the Sun and called it Vahān'); and the hero who fought Alexander and was known to the Greeks as Mithraustēs, seems to be the same person as the Vahē of Xorenacī. The name Vahē is probably a form of Vahagn. It seems that Vahagn excelled Mīr in importance, certainly by the time of the Conversion, when Astūlzāt became the first See of the Arm. Church; Bagvahātī, though much closer to Anī, Tīrōrdān, Tīl and Ērē, than Astūlzāt, which was also distant from Bagvahan, Artaštāt and Vahārīpaṭāt, became an obscure shrine of little importance. The cult of Vahagn absorbed the older reverence of the great weather-god, Tešub, and the cult of Anāhit absorbed, at least in part, that of the Great Mother.
Pseudo-Plutarchus as to t' on gynalkon genos misen 'hating the race of women', a detail not elsewhere attested in recorded versions of the myth, and a characteristic which would have been particularly repugnant to Zoroastrians. Mhermarden (whose name was discussed above) in his letter to the noblemen of Christian Armenia heaped scorn on their priests, who anargen anuny ev goyen zarordit'mun 'dishonour human birth and praise childlessness' through their revulsion which the Vahrunis could have used to their advantage. The cult of the Zoroastrian yanata was certainly not extirpated, but Vahagn seems to have taken his place in royal invocations of the third century. And even before that, Mithra is seen only in his ancient and primary aspects as a god of fire and of men. The epic Of Sasun. The main events of the epic commemorate the uprising of the Urartean blind portal) is called Agrawu'k'ar 'Raven's Rock', Vanay'k'ar 'Rock of Van' or Tospan blur 'Hill of Tosp'. The cave is called Mheri duin or Yamp-zemp Makara (from Tk. Mekara 'cave'). Here is a possible source for the western Mithraic speleuma. The blind portal has a cuneiform inscription on it, and black water can sometimes be seen trickling down from above; local people explained that this was the urine of Mher's horse.75 Twice a year, it was believed, the cave yawns open, on Ascension Day and the Feast of the Transfiguration, Arm. Hambapman tavn and Yvardavat.76 Mher then may be seen astride his steed, the xerk-i-falak 'wheel of fate' in his hands.77 According to one account, Mher emerges from his cave to test the earth, and, seeing that it is still not firm enough to support his weight, he returns to his place. Once, a shepherd in the tale asked Mher when he would come out for good, and the hero replied that he would return to the world only when a grain of corn grows bigger than a walnut.78 The re-emergence of Mher seems to be connected with an eschatological belief in a time of fullness and ripeness when all untruth shall have been defeated.

In other versions of the legend of Mher, it is told that he will destroy the world when the Wheel of Fate he holds ceases to turn.79 Or, it is related that God sent his six mounted angels to fight Mher. They defeated him, and he pleaded to God for mercy; the Lord confined him thereafter to Raven's Rock.80 The latter version resembles somewhat the legend of Kumari cited above, in which Morphos, the son of Mithra (rather than Mithra himself, as here), is defeated by the collective efforts of the other gods, Aris (i.e., Vahagn) in particular, and made

commands from her grave, K'o to Agrawu'k'arn S./ Jna Agrawu'k'arn
'Raven's Rock is your place. Go to Raven's Rock.' His father then speaks from his grave, adding K'o to Agrawu'k'arn S./ Agsk'k'averi, mek
'si注意到, Or getin K'o ji agjew dimanay./ Agsk'k'con S. 'Raven's
Rock is your place. The world will collapse and be rebuilt anew. When
the earth can bear your steed. Then the world will belong to you.'74
Mher turns around to return to Van and sees that mek agjaw k'er k'xos
'there was a crow and it spoke.' Mher wounds the bird, which flies into
a cave; Mher gallops after it, the hooves of his mount sink into the
ground, and the gates of the cave close. The rock of the cave (the latter
tought to be one of the caves in the Rock, or to lie behind an
Urartean blind portal) is called Agrawu'k'ar 'Raven's Rock', Vanay'k'ar
'Rock of Van' or Tospan blur 'Hill of Tosp'. The cave is called Mheri
duin or Yamp-zemp Makara (from Tk. Mekara 'cave'). Here is a possible
source for the western Mithraic speleuma. The blind portal has a cuneiform
inscription on it, and black water can sometimes be seen trickling
down from above; local people explained that this was the urine of
Mher's horse.75 Twice a year, it was believed, the cave yawns open, on
Ascension Day and the Feast of the Transfiguration, Arm. Hambapman tavn
and Yvardavat.76 Mher then may be seen astride his steed, the xerk-i-
falak 'wheel of fate' in his hands.77 According to one account, Mher
emerges from his cave to test the earth, and, seeing that it is still
not firm enough to support his weight, he returns to his place. Once, a
shepherd in the tale asked Mher when he would come out for good, and the
hero replied that he would return to the world only when a grain of corn
grows bigger than a walnut.78 The re-emergence of Mher seems to be
connected with an eschatological belief in a time of fullness and ripeness
when all untruth shall have been defeated.

In other versions of the legend of Mher, it is told that he will
destroy the world when the Wheel of Fate he holds ceases to turn.79 Or,
it is related that God sent his six mounted angels to fight Mher. They
defeated him, and he pleaded to God for mercy; the Lord confined him
thereafter to Raven's Rock.80 The latter version resembles somewhat the
legend of Kumari cited above, in which Morphos, the son of Mithra
(rather than Mithra himself, as here), is defeated by the collective ef-
forts of the other gods, Aris (i.e., Vahagn) in particular, and made
into stone (cf. confinement in a rock, here). Like other Armenian heroes associated with apocalyptic events, Mher is variously regarded as good or bad. In one Arm. legend, he appears as similar to Arshakan, who will rise and cause havoc, but will then be vanquished for good by Thraethona: Mher u ur jin ku gan eexar. Nor Mher kotorum koni, vesi ke martirosvi 'Mher and his horse will come into the world. Mher will slaughter men, and in the end he will be martyred.'

We have seen that Mher was guided to his cave by a talking raven (Arm. aglaw 'crow, raven'). Gershevitch suggested that the bird is to be identified with Av. Karshiptar, a name for which he proposes the meaning 'black-winged'. Karshiptar flew through the war of Yima spreading the evangel of Zarathustra. In Georgia, it is believed that the hero Amiran, whose name is a derivative of Mir, is fed by a crow, and is confined in Sa-Kome, 'Crow Mountain'. An Arm. xogxar 'Cross-stone' from Zangezur depicts a crow rescuing people from a serpent. In Lofik, there is a place called Aglawi perezaman, 'Raven's Tomb', so named because a raven, trying to warm some plowmen that a serpent had slithered into their t'an (a drink of yoghurt and water), drowned itself in the bowl where the beast lay hidden; this alerted the men, who made the bird a tomb to show their gratitude. Similar stories are told elsewhere of ravens saving people from snakes, or from eating food poisoned by snakes, and there is an Arm. incantation scroll which mentions an Aglawianates 'serpent seen by a raven'; one imagines that such a serpent is afforded scant opportunity to do evil.

Perhaps in Arm. tradition the war of Yima was remembered as the cave of Mher, the hero who upholds truth in a world polluted by sin, guided to his refuge by a raven, perhaps the bird Karshiptar. Although the cult of the yezata Mihr seems to have declined amongst some Zors. in Armenia, events in that country possibly contributed to the rise of Mithraism in the west; the original, specific meaning of the word nehezan may have been forgotten, yet the god is still called by name, by the old men who still recite from memory the epic of Sasun. But Mihr, brooding in his cave, might well have said, as his cult was degraded by some devotees of Vahagn, 'If indeed men were to worship me by mentioning my name in prayer, as other yezatas are worshipped with prayers that mention their names, I should go forth to righteous men.'

1. F. Cumont first proposed an Anatolian prototype for the Mithraic mysteries; this thesis has been challenged by several scholars. Most recently, it was criticised on the basis of insufficient archaeological evidence by F. Roll, 'The Mysteries of Mithras in the Roman Orient: the problem of origin,' Journal of Mithraic Studies, 2(1), 1977, 58-62. For Beskow, 'The Roots of Early Mithraism,' Studia Mithriaques, AI 17, 1978, 14, suggests that Mithraism spread from Pontus to Dacia and other Roman provinces.

2. See Boyce, Hist. Zor., I, 49, 52.


5. Ibid., 86 and 'On Mithra's Part in Zor.,' op. cit., 17 n. 35, 26 n. 82.


8. Ibid., 24.

9. See AHM, 31 et seq.


16. Ibid., 313-5, 415-6. On Mher, see further below. With the exception of the latter, most of the names in this group are attested only from ca. fourteenth century and later. For a list of names containing Mihr-, see also T. Avdalbegyan, 'Mihre Hayoc mej,' Hayagitakan betazotut'yrnner, Erevan, 1969, 14-5.

18. On the Mehnunis, see 20, 18; this may be an alternate form of the name Mehruun, cited above. See also Arm. Gr., 52-4 and Hnmb, III, 311-12. Mehendak is attested also in the forms Merewandak and Mehrenwank (cf. Arm. Gr.).

19. AHR, 154.

20. Avdalbegyan, op. cit., 14; Ktèakatukał, op. cit., 103. The name Mirag is perhaps to be compared to the Sg'd. inscription incised on a partially gilded Sasanian silver vase of the fifth-sixth century whose weight, however, is recorded in Pahlavi. The Sg'd. proper name is read by Lokunin as 'Mithrik' (V. G. Lokunin, Persia II, New York, 1967, 224 n. 183).

21. N. Marr, Kreshchenie aryan, gruzin, abkhazov i alanov, St Petersburg, 1905, 119.


24. M. Boyce, Zoroastrians, 88; the name of the founder meant 'Mihr the Lofty'.

25. Examples include Mer-pet, Krm-a-pet and bagna-pet in the pre-Christian period, Christian vardapet 'doctor of theology, priest' (cf. Phl. varbad, an office of the Sasanian Zor. Church, SKZ 32, cited by E. Benveniste, 'Etudes iraniennes,' TEC, 1945, 69), and hazrapet, the title of the religious leader or the Arm. Revordik (see Ch. 16). On questions of the Arm. priesthood and fire-cult, see Ch. 15.


28. Cf. Agath. Br., 17, where Tigrates gayr hasanir i kçak açagavan Bagawan, or anuaneal koç,ol i partievard enchain Dic'awan arrived at the Kòmpolis of Bagawan, which is named from the Partian language Dic'awan. In both cases, baga- 'god' is regarded as a Partian word. Bagayači is found on Lynch's Map of Armenia as Pekneri, west of Erzincan; shortly to the west of the village was an Arm. monastery of the same name, Pekneri, Vanç, see also AON, 112 and 379-380 on the topographic suffix -afti, -afti. On Arm. Bu'arli, anglicised Pat Aringe, see Ch. 14. In the same province as Baqayati, Derjan, was the fortress of Mharber 'the fortress of Mihr' (G. Halajyan, Dersim Bayeri, aspa kapat yu'man, Erevan, 1973, 19).


32. Ibid., 27; Stronghold, 50; 'Mihragan among the Irani Zoroastrians,' Mithraic Studies, I, 113.

33. R. C. Zahnor, Zarvan, a Zoroastrian Dilemma, Oxford, 1955, 103; see also S. Shaked, 'Mihr the Judge,' Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam 2, 1980, who identifies Mihr also as miyanči (mesitac) from a Phl. passage (see esp. p. 12).

34. MX III.17.

35. To'ova Maccuni describes a Nestorian who robbed a church at Ostán as vatmir (MC III.27). We may note here a ceremony of oath-taking attested in Armenia which may be related to ancient Zoroastrian custom. In the stanza of a love poem, the fourteenth-century Armenian bard Yovhannes T'ikuranči admonishes himself: Xwem Yovhannes T'ikuranči, 'Men mi hand rotok'd i eran:/ Atek surajem eby melan./ C'anči moy guun eresen 'Crazy Yovhannes T'ikuranči'./ Do not take sharply your foot out of line. / When the splendid voice dies, / Colour flees to dry earth from the face' (E. Pivazyan, Yovhannes T'ikuranči, Taker, Erevan, 1960, XI.17-20). T'ikuranči appears to have been a cleric, and a frequent theme in his poems is the renunciation of holy vows by a priest for the sake of a pretty girl.

The withdrawal of one's foot from a line is an idiom which seems to represent the breaking of a vow or an oath. The thirteenth-century writer Mīt'in Gōz in his Dastañagirç 'Law Book' warns Christians against the ways of other nations: Ew kem otris ayldasgik urac'tumאן dırankan tan erumun: kem yekkekoc tawmel oloes aytdumec, kem man beranom, i taw er i 16g t'isekem, kem xoč i getini nakerl ew xokel, kem mısıan gjetoy menel, kem osek i děsa ammon, kem i getini erkus oir amlin er i moy i miwan tawmel. Ew ayd armayan ew ayldasgik urac'tum dırankan zor ći part yon anuł k'ristonel t'ew ew mà hasanat, kem tan ka'kum. 'On the way of those other nations swear an oath of disavowal: by entering the church and extinguishing the light, by blowing with one's mouth on water or on oil, by tracing a Cross in the ground and then treading on it, by holding a dog by the tail, by holding a bone in one's hand, or by making two lines in the earth and stepping out of one into the other. For all these and their like are an example of disavowal which a Christian must not undertake even if death or the destruction of his house threaten!' Mīt'in Gōz, Dastañagirç.
A century later, the poet Yavanesian was warning himself not to step out of line (Arm. cim) for the love of a woman, so clearly the practices which Mithrār Gos condemns as foreign were widespread enough amongst the Armenians themselves.

What kind of disavowal was meant? It is immediately evident that at least certain of the practices mentioned by the Armenian lawgiver would be reprehensible to Zoroastrians, and, like the breaking of the kusti mentioned by Tikuranci in another poem, might even symbolize apostasy. Extinguishing a fire was a method favoured by Iranian Christians of the Sassanian period for renunciation of their ancestral faith (see Boyce, Zoroastrians, 139); here, the practice seems to have been conveyed to a church. Allowing the breath deliberately to pollute water, a sacred element, and oil, which was presumably the fuel for a flame, would be considered criminal by Zoroastrians in a religious context; during Zoroastrian rituals, the breath is kept away from sacred objects by the face-mask (Psh. pedem, Arm. p'animal, see Arm. wr., 254). It is known that Zoroastrians regard the dog as a particularly holy creature, and it has been suggested that for Zoroastrians who rejected their faith for Islam, 'maltreating a dog...was a distinctive outward sign of true conversion' Boyce, Zoroastrians, 188. It is likely that the specific gesture of apostasy in yanking the hapless creature's tail became a general formula of disavowal. The Armenians must have learned some practices from their Iranian Muslim neighbours, particularly the latter, primarily because the medievals lawgiver considers them foreign, but also because Christianity has no particular bias against dogs; mistreatment of them appears to have been a Muslim custom which was evolved as a deliberate offence to the Zoroastrians (loc. cit.).

Zoroastrians when taking an oath are required to step under a furrow (NP kaš) which is drawn about a fire with the knife used for cutting the barmo (NP kārd-i barmo-eq). The process is described in the Sogdian name 'Book of Oaths': En kas...ke sogand nakhudo...bar paš (emended by Dāshbār from pašt) istādan u rīy barištaš kurdan u az bīr-i kaš pavy dār kaš nihādan 'He...who is taking the oath (lit. their oaths)...(should) stand up and turn his face toward the furrow' (Sogand-Nāma, or the Book of Oaths), in B. N. Dāshbār, The Persian Rhytivats of Hormozgar Frasarts, Bombay, 1932, 43-8, text: M. R. Unvala, Dārdū Hormozgārī Rhytiv, 1, Bombay, 1922, 51, lines 17-19). The oath is taken, and then the advice concerning it is read yet a second time, and a second furrow is drawn (Dāshbār, 49). This seems to be why Mithrār Gos, with his attention to legal details, mentions two furrows. Tikuranci, who is using a popular idiom, has only one. But the meaning is nonetheless precisc: by stepping over the line, one enters a sacred precinct, the pērī or 'pure place' (Boyce, Hist. Zor. 1, 166) where, presumably, one's oath will be heard by Mithra himself. To step out meant to break one's oath, this much is clear from Tikuranci, and it is indeed probable that such a rite was employed by the Armenian Zoroastrians.

It is likely, however, that Modern Armenian usage reflects contamination by American idiom, as in an editorial in Hayrenik, Boston, 16 May 1975, 1: Me individual xem xwan ōxandānī, or to hāsetpadī Širvan arm.ārcān xman xamardanī, piti karevyon ŏstār-se-mā vēr mā 'Will the policy of relaxation pursued by the present State Department be able to step out of the line of non-interference?'


37. I. H. Grey, 'On Certain Persian and Armenian Month-Names as Influenced by the Avesta Calendar,' JAS, 28, 1907, 338; Boyce, Stronghold, 84 n. 40. In the Dictionary of Eremia vardapet, 1728, is found the Biblical name Aramatēlī corrupted to Armeniaeke (see M. Stone, Signs of the Judgement, Univ. of Penn. Arm. Texts and Stud. 3, 1961, 208). The form seems to be an Iranianized word meaning 'fire of Mithra' (on similar Iranianized Biblical names in Arm., see this writer's 'The Name of Zoraster in Armenian,' JNAS, 1959 [in publication]).


41. AY, 49, 50 & n. 1 on Bihār; on the site of the meheh, see A. A. Manuc-aryan, K'num-yun Hayastani 4-11 dazeri Sinaranakan k'yarageri, Erevan, 1977, 248-9.

42. Ibid., 54.

43. See Boyce, Stronghold, 257; Hist. Zor., 1, 60, 203. In Armenia, certain of the functions of Sraoša seem to have been acquired by Tir; see the following Ch.


46. Cassiodor Dio, 63.5. It has been suggested by A. Dieterich, 'Die Weisen aus dem Nordenland,' Zeitschrift für neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, 3, 1902, 3, that this journey served as the prototype of the Biblical voyage of the Magi to Bethlehem in Christian writings. The Arm. word for the Antichrist, Neft, gen. sg. Neft, has been derived from Gk. NF, i.e., Nero, whose name was numerically equivalent to 666, the number of the Antichrist (cf. Revelations...
The first interpretation to be published was that of [56.]

See [55.]

[54.]

The site of the colonnaded building at Satala, where there had been built yet. [53.]

C. M. Daniels, 'The Role of the Roman Army in the Spread and Practice of Mithraism,' Mithraic Studies, II, 251. Evidence was noted in the preceding chapter of the legionaries at Satala, where there seems to have been a temple of Anahit. [52.]

The site is attested in Urartean records as Giarniani, conquered by king Argisti I in 782 B.C.; see N. V. Harut'yunyan, Blainil (Urartu), Erevan, 1970, 211, 428. It is unlikely that the imposing colonnaded building at Gafni had been built yet. R. D. Wilkinson, 'The Ionic Building at Gafni,' BeAAM M.S. 16, 1982, 221-44, argues convincingly that it was a Roman tomb of the latter part of the second century A.D. [51.]

See B. M. Afr'eyyan, Akharkner hin Hayastani arvesti patmut'yan, Erevan, 1975, color pls. 23-27; the scenes portray aquatic gods and fish (1914, 92-5). [50.]


The first interpretation was published that of S. D. Lisc'yanyan in the daily newspaper Sovetakan Hayastan, 23 Sept. 1945; in 1946, H. Manukyan produced another reading (both are published in Afr'eyyan, op. cit. n. 59). K. V. Trever published a considerably different restoration of the text, with translation, in Nadpis o postroenii armayskoy kreposti Garni, Leningrad, 1949. [56.]

M. L. Chaumont, following P. Peydité, persisted in reading (AURELIOS TIRIDATIS at the head of the inscription (Recherches sur l'Histoire d’Arménie, Paris, 1969, 179), comparing the titula to another Gk. inscription, found on an altar at Rome, which reads AURELIOS PANCORVS BASTIUS MEGALÈS ARMENIUS 'Aurelius Pacorus, king of Greater Armenia' (cit. by S. C. Ercyanyan, Vakar 111, 1976, 3, 37, = Corpus inscriptionum graecorum, 6599). As is seen in our Pl. 2, there is an ample margin to the left of the inscribed part of the smooth surface of the stone, and no chance whatsoever of a lacuna; the reading AURELIUS is utterly impossible. [57.]

A. G. Abrahamian, Hay gri ev gr'Cyan patmut'yan, Erevan, 1959, 30. [58.]

Restoring Gk. anake or anaktôr from am... [59.]

Restoring naidion from nai... [60.]

Gk. litourgos; the word can also mean one who performs a public service, or a minister, of the statement in the later mosaic that the artist laboured without receiving wages; perhaps a similar service is referred to here. The correct spelling of the Gk. word is leitourgos; the form here indicates iotisation. [61.]

Restoring spôllaxion from sp... One thinks immediately of the Mithraic speleuxa, but the reading is wholly hypothetical. [62.]

Gk. metamezê. [63.]

A. Afr'eyyan, 'Mithras' work' is to be derived from Pth. wîgân. In Pth. Manichaean texts, Mithra is called dôbîr ud wîgân 'judge and witness', see Boyle, 'On Mithra in the Manichaean pantheon,' op. cit., 53, and Yt. X.92. [64.]

On the equestrian figures, see Ch. 3. It is apposite to note here the use of the equestrian figure in other cultures under Iranian influence to symbolize the defeat of evil powers, a theme appropriate to Mithra. In the Dura Mithraeum, Mithra is shown mounted, though as a hunter, not a soldier. The whole scene is drawn directly, as it seems, from Pth. Zor. iconography (on the fire altars and cypresses in the Mithraeum, see this writer's discussion of Bâvand in the art. 'Armeno-Iranica,' Boyle Postscript [in press]). The triumphant Mordechai is shown as a Pth. rider in the Purim fresco of the Dura Synagogue, whilst the vanquished Hassen is depicted as a slave-groom in Roman dress (see D. Tawil in JNES 30.2, Apr. 1979, 95-7 and figs. 1-3). In Christian art, St George is often shown on horseback, stabbing a dragon; this scene finds a Jewish parallel in the scene of a mounted Solomon smiting a demoness (Lilith?) on an antique gem (see F. M. and J. H. Schwartz in Museum Notes of the American Numismatic Society 24, New York, 1979, 184-5). Both scenes are most likely inspired by the Pth. Zor. image of Mithra.
66. See Sahinyan, op. cit. n. 26, 173.


70. Ezišé, p. 27 (II).


The name Mher, pronounced Mehîr, is to be traced to a Pth. form attested in the name Meherdotû (i.e., Mithraotû), the brother of Osroes and father of Sanatruces (Arm. Sanatru), early second century A.D. (see M. C. Debevoise, A Political History of Parthia, Chicago, 1938, 235).


73. Ibid., 317.

74. MA 1, 351.

75. On the shared Zoroastrian aspects of these two Christian feasts, see Ch. 12.

76. The phrase is a borrowing from NP. Compare to this image the tradition, preserved by Porphyrius and Dio Chrysostom, that Zoroaster dwelt in a cave adorned to represent the world and the various heavenly bodies; the cave was located in the side of a mountain (A. V. W. Jackson, Zoroaster, The Prophet of Ancient Iran, New York, 1899, repr. 1965, 34 n. 3). One recalls also the tradition of the cave in the Moni Victorialis where the Magi are said to have awaited the Holy Nativity, which is itself often referred to in Arm. books as having occurred in a cave (see Ch. 13).

77. H. Orbeli, Haykakan herosakan ṣpoc, Erevan, 1956, 52-3.

78. G. Sruanjteanc, Groc' u broc', Constantinople, 1874, 182-3.
Pl. 1: The building at Garni.

Pl. 3: Mheri dujn, Van (Avandapatum, pl. 2).
Nabû

In the Babylonian pantheon of the first millennium B.C., Nabû, a god of Sumerian origins whose Babylonian name appears to be derived from a Semitic base nāb- 'to call', was regarded as the first son of the god Marduk. During the autumnal ākitu-festival, the Babylonian king would proceed to the nearby cult centre of Nabû, Borsippa, where the image of the god was ceremonially removed from its place; it was Nabû's task to journey to the underworld and bring his father Marduk from there. The ākitu-festival was a celebration of the rebirth of nature, symbolised by the release of Marduk from his captivity beneath the earth; the imprisonment of Marduk and his release by Nabû are connected with the essential symbolism of the festival. Nabû might thus have been seen as an emissary and guide between this world and the next, a function which will be seen also in the Armenian Tir, and the Armenian Christian Ėrōk. In Susiana, Nabû's underworld journeys may perhaps be reflected in the attribution to him of chthonic powers, symbolised by the serpent. But this is not a clearly recorded function of Nabû. He seems to have been identified with the planet Mercury, the swiftest of the planets. He was also the sage and scribe of the gods, the divine inventor of script (Sumerian DIN Gir₆₃₄₅₆₅₃₄₅₆₇₈₉), and his temple generally had a library attached to it. Nabû fixed the destiny of man; as the swiftest luminary in the sky, he could be regarded as the messenger of the will of the gods, and as inventor of writing, he recorded past and future events. The art of writing was learned by the Iranians from Mesopotamia, and the first element in the word for scribe, OP dīpīravā-, MP dābîr, Arm. loan-word dēpī, came from Akkadian dīpī 'writing, record.' To a certain extent, the Iranians always regarded writing as foreign and even demonic: the Šēnu-nāme attributes its invention to the divine. This sense of the uncanny might, correspondingly, have applied to the god connected with the scribal art. It will be seen that the scribal god was disliked and feared as the Arm. Ėrōk. The Armenian god
Tir, who possessed many of the attributes of Nabû, was called the scribe of Ormuz; in later centuries, when the name Tir was suppressed or forgotten, the god was to be remembered simply as the sinister Greek 'the writer' of human destiny, who comes to men when they are to die.

As the planet Mercury, Nabû was equated with Hermēs in Hellenistic times, but his main Greek counterpart was Apollōn, the god of writing and the arts, who was identified astrally not with Mercury but with the Sun. In the Middle East and Cyprus, Apollōn was associated with death and the underworld; he is linked with Neēp, the shooter of plague arrows, and it appears that as a sun god associated with death he was associated also with the Iranian Mithra. In the temple of Nabû at Palmyra there is a bas-relief of a curly-haired, youthful god with a rayed nimbus around his head. He is flanked by two eagles in side view, their bodies turned towards him and their heads facing the nimbus crossing his head. The same scene is shown as the ornamentation of a temple pediment in a graffito found at Khirbet Abû Dūbih, northwest of Palmyra, dated A.D. 147. The god depicted is presumably Nabû-Apollōn. A similar scheme, of two eagles flanking an eight-rayed star, but without the face of the god, was the most common ornament on the tiaras of the Artaxiad kings of Armenia on their coins; we shall examine the symbolic significance of this scene below.

The cult of Nabû, or Nebo, survived in Sasanian Mesopotamia: a martyrology preserved in Syriac relates that Sābuhr II (A.D. 309-379) commanded a general named Muʾāzin to abandon Christianity and to worship Nebo and other gods. As his Semitic name indicates, Muʾāzin was most likely neither an Iranian nor a Zoroastrian, and the Sasanian king was therefore probably not referring to Tir, the Zoroastrian yazata he himself worshipped.

In the Christian literature of fifth-century Armenia, the name of Nabû in Deuteronomy 32.49 is simply transliterated as Nabōv, the diphthong aw probably pronounced ə, and is not translated into Tir. In an Armenian MS of the Book of Acts cited by Aramian and Avestan, a marginal gloss explains Hermēs as Tir dike, 'the god Tir,' Tir understood here as the bearer of divine decrees, but this addition was probably made several hundred years after the translation of the Bible by the school of Māstoc early in the fifth century. The translators rendered Dionysos as Spandaramet in Maccabees (see Ch. 10), so they did not always feel constrained to transliterate the names of pagan divinities from the Greek rather than translate them into terms more familiar to the Armenian reader. Movses Khoranian (II.27), following Labuna of Bâsēssa (Arm. Ləwun Bâssisk1), gives the names of the four Solar deities of Abgar of Bâsēssa (called the king of Armenia in the Arm. tr.) as Nabog, Bēl, Batēnik2a, and Tārāt2a, with MS. variant readings Nabag, Nabat, and Nabok, for Nabug (i.e., Nabû). The Arm. text of Labuna gives Nebo, Bēl, Batēnik2a, and Tārāt2. Nabog, etc., may be a Sasanian MP. form of the name with ṣ for final ə. The Armenians, it will be seen, tended to identify Tir more often with Apollōn than with Hermēs.

**Iranian Tir(i)**

The name Tir is nowhere to be found in the Avesta, yet this yazata is extremely prominent in Zoroastrianism. The fourth and the thirteenth day of each month bear his name, and theophoric names with Tir- are numerous in Iranian. These show that Tir was a divinity of importance in Achaemenian times: the names Teriyadada and Tiridad(a) are found on Elamite tablets, and a silver libation bowl found at Tel el-Maskhuta in Egypt, dated 309-379 B.C., bears the Iranian name THYPEN, Gk. Tiriphermēs, in Aramaic letters.

It seems that the cult of Nabû was adopted by the Western Iranians, who assimilated Nabû to their own, probably minor, stellar divinity Tir. Gershevitch has suggested that the name is to be derived from a root tr- meaning 'to move swiftly,' because of the swift movement of the planet Mercury. The aspect of the god Tir as scribe and master of destiny is preserved in modern Persian tradition, which assigns epithets to Mercury such as dabīr-i fālak 'scribe of fate' and āptar-i dānīš 'star of knowledge'; an Arabic name of Mercury, al-Kātib 'the writer' similarly preserves the memory of Nabû. From Sasanian Iran is found the MP. name *nabīrōst* 'saved by the Scribe (i.e., Tir)' on a seal.

In order for Tir(i) to be worshipped by Zoroastrians, it was necessary that he be somehow equated with an Avestan divinity, Tistrya. Tistrya is identified with the star Sirius and is pictured...
in the Avesta as bringing rain and fighting Aparsha, the demonic personification of drought; none of these functions are shared by TIR, but Nabû as the planet Mercury was associated with the coming of 'life-giving rain and flood' in Babylonia, and *Trikâna- was a rain-festival. This important function thus linked TIR-Nabû and Tîstirya.18

The elaboration of astrological ideas by the Zoroastrians, probably in Sasanian times but at any rate centuries after the adoption of TIR, presented a system in which the planets were essentially maleficent in their influence in opposition to the beneficent stars. Thus in the Greater Bundahish 57.7.12. we are told that TIR set Apôš ādev, 5 Tîstir med 'Mercury, which is the demon Apôš, came to (oppose) Siriuš.19 Several lines later, TIR is described as doing good to the good and bad to the bad, since his power is equal to that of Siriuš (Tîstir, i.e., Tîstirya). In another Pahlavi text, Æahristûnîhā 1 Ērân, which enumerates the provincial capitals of the Iranian empire, Babylon is mentioned as having been built by Bēbî during the reign of Yima, and Tîr ābâst ûy be bost 'and by him the planet TIR was bound.'20 Zoroastrians perhaps drew a distinction between TIR the planet and TIR the yazata in this case, but the association of TIR with Babylon suggests some recognition of his place of origin.

Armenian TIR, Tiwr

Agathangelos gives his name in the genitive singular, TIR dic2, from *TIR dic2 'the god TIR'. In the Venice 1835 and Tifsis 1883 editions of Arm. Agathangelos is found another form, Tiwr, which is not attested in MSE, however, according to Thomson.21 It seems that TIR is the more common form and the primary one, Tiwr being a variant. As a possible analogy one might adduce the names of the Arm. province of Siwrîk3 (P'awostos Buzand, Elia Confessor Panepcin2) and of the dynastic house that ruled it, Sisakan. The Pth. form of the name Siwrîk is Siwrîn (Sîn, line 2), and Lagarde suggested a base *Siwrîn with Tr. endings -k-ăn.22 But there is also a mountain, Siwr, near Artašat,23 which suggests the possibility of a base Siw-/Sis- in Arm. producing *Siwrîn- Siwrîc and Siw-a-kan. This suggestion is supported also by the existence of the Arm. proper names Siwr and Sis; the former being the name of a Bishop of the Namikonean dynastic house ordained by

St. Gregory the Illuminator,24 the latter found in the forms Sisâs, Sisak and Bahrâm-Sis. The latter was an eighth-century marzûnán of Xurûsân, while the first two are names of Armenians attested by Strabo and Movsès Xorenací respectively. It is likely that the form Siws is an expansion of an Iranian name, Sis, and the form Tiwr may have developed in a similar way. The meaning of sis seems to be 'noble' lineage, seed', from CP. sîs-, Av. Sîsî-va, e.g. Sišahār-mēnah, OIr. *Sîsî-farena-. Sišakan would then mean something like 'noble domain', cf. Arm. Waspûrakan. This would explain also the name of St Sišânnus as a Hellenisation of MF. *Sîs-In 'noble'; the saint was reputed by tradition to have been a Parthian knight. Even if, as has been suggested recently, the name as used in amulets was in fact derived from a different, Aramaic appellation, it could have served well as a generic name for any brave Iranian demon-slayer (a Parthian, one adds, from Western Iran). (The name Sišânnus is known, of course, as that of a princely Parthian disciple of Mani in the third century; the fame of this missionary perhaps influenced the development of the Christian figure.)25

The name of Tiwr is also attested in the name of the fourth month of the Armenian calendar—as in the Zoroastrian—Trê. The fourth month is called Teirei in the Cappadocian calendar (written in Greek letters).26 The form Teirei has been analysed as derived from Tištiryehe, the genitive of Tîstirya in Avestan,27 but this is unlikely to be true, as the Zoroastrian and Armenian names are both clearly derived from TIR, not from Tîstirya. The ending -ê in Trê may be Iranian, the oblique form of an old ending -êki, with the loss of -i- in TIR. It is also proposed that Arm. Trê derives from Achaemenian Triyā.28 Less likely is the Classical Arm. dative ending -ê, as in i tuê 'by day, in the daytime', or -ê as a shortening of gen. sing. -eav, as in the modern Arm. dialect of Melri, mnuōrê 'Day of death' (gen. sg.); the gen. of Trê is in fact attested as Treav.29 A folk etymology provided by Grigor Tâcawâlî (fourteenth century) in his Siwr îkîrasatê can, or kočî Siwrîcian hator, published at Constantinople in 1740, confuses the proper name TIR with Arm. têr 'Lord': Trê têr-şnakan xorhurtê can, yôrim tîrsacî Astuac i veray arracocî. Trê means the mystery of the Lord, as when God ruled over the creatures.30 Although the error of the
mediaeval Christian scholar is clear, it is often less apparent when one is dealing with proper names whether the theophoric element is Tir or Têr, i.e., Zoroastrian or Christian. In the case of Tirik, an Armenian priest of St. Gregory in Yerazak mentioned by Movses Xorenats'iti III.65, for instance, it is not clear whether his name contains Tir or not, although he lived fairly early, in the first half of the fifth century.

A case where no doubt exists is that of Tiribazos, one of the two satraps of Armenia to whom Xenophon refers in his Anabasis, ca. 401 B.C. The other satrap was Orontes, Father of the Orontid dynasty of Armenia and Commagene. Tiribazos, we are told, helped the Persian King of Kings Artaxerxes Mæson to mount his horse, and was later made commander of the royal forces. It was the same Tiribazos who caused to be minted a number of silver coins in Cilicia bearing the characteristic Assyrian/Achaemenian winged figure surmounted by the upper part of a man’s body, naked and Hellenic in appearance.

The Elamite form Tirdat(d) was cited above; the same name occurs as Tirdat in the Greek inscription of Gaimi of Trdat I, the first Arsacid king of Armenia, ca. A.D. 65-70. About two centuries later, Trdat III led the Armenian people to embrace the faith of Christ. His name is found in the Greek variants Tiridatês, Têrdatês, Têrâtatês, Têridatês, Têridatos, Syriac Tûradatis and Latin Tîridates. Tîrêt, son of Artashes, son of Tirman II, loved Peramaj, wife of Gndî, whom he accused falsely before King Aršak in a romantic legend preserved by P’awatos Bussand IV.5. The other theophoric names with Tir are Tir Bagratuni (fifth century); Tirak (comp. King Têrnânès of the Bosporus, A.D. 276-9), a royal name of the Artaxiads and Arsacids (MX I.31, II.54; P’b III.5,12); Tîrêc Gritun, tenth century and Tîrêc Acruni, a companion of St. Gregory the Illuminator (Têca I.9,10); Tîrikêt, son of a k’tirm (‘Zoroastrian priest’ taught by Gregory the Illuminator and made a Bishop (Agath. 845); Tirakan, a deacon, companion of Catholicos Nërsës the Great, fourth century (P’b IV.6); Tîrik, Bishop of Bassam, late fourth century; Tîrikam, mentioned by Step’anos of Simikc, eighth century, occurs also in a Georgian martyrlogy; Tiraxosrov, mentioned by Step’anos of Simikc; Tirot, Abbot of Basil, fifth century; Varaz-tîrêc and Varaz-trdat.

Several toponyms are known which probably contain the name Tir. The Milky Way is called the Tîrvâh or Tîrâkân gštî ‘Tir’s belt’; Alîsan and Hûbschmann mention a village called Tîrâsik in Bagrowand, with the common P’th. toponymical suffix -âTc (see AOH, Arm. ed., 274 and our Ch. on Mithra for Baga-(y)a Tîc); in the Ch. on Anahit in discussed the temple on the mountain of Tirinkatar at which she was worshipped, and it is likely that the word may be analyzed as Tirin ‘belonging to Tir’ (adj., also as a proper name in the Aramaic letter from Arvanon, Tîrvîn, and katar ‘pinnacle, summit’; there was a village of Trêtûc in Sëtûc, Siwînk, the name of which probably is formed of Trê- and a suffix from Arm. –tu ‘give’.

Agathangelos tells us of the decision of King Trdat III of Armenia to destroy the Zoroastrian temples of the city of Artaxata (Arm. Artasat): isk andên važužakî t’cagavom ink’niçan hramanap, ev amonec’um hawan’t’camb, goz in jen tav yaran lîw’y Grigori, gi gymz’laloyon shavransan hramac’n nagyzac’n ev shir karacel astuacan c’astuac anuaneal arml, t’kaî i miyoy. Apa ink’c ink’c t’cagavom xalayr gnyr amenyg cawrok’n handerj i Valersapat k’alak c ert’al yarâsak k’alak, awrel and tbaçan Anahatkan dîc’, ev or zîrazamoy telis anuaneal kýrav. Max dîpel in çasapari erazac’oyc’ erazamoy pattaman Tîc dîc, dprî gitt’unan k’ramac’ anuaneal Divan gzi’c’ Omrîsî, yanam çartur’t’cun mehean: max i na jen arkeal k’akeal eyreol awrel k’andec’c’n (Agath. 778). ‘At that the king, by his autocratic command and with the consent of all, placed the work in the hands of the blessed Gregory swiftly, that the latter might erase utterly and consign to oblivion (those whom) his native ancestors of ancient days and he himself had thought gods, calling them false gods. And he, the king himself, moved out with all his armies from Valersapat to go to the city of Artasat, in order to destroy there the begins (i.e., image shrines) of the god Anahit, and also that one which stood in the place called Erazamony. On the road they first came upon the temple (mehean, see Ch. on Mithra) of learning and eloquence, of the dream-displaying (erazac’oyc’), dream-interpreting (erazamoy) worship of the god Tîr, the scribe (dprî, gen of dprî) of the wisdom of the priests, called the Archive of the writer (grîc’c’) of Omrîsî. First they set to work, smashed it, burned it, ruined it and destroyed it. MSS of the text have variants erazamac’oyc’ and erazamoyan for erazac’oyc’ and erazamoyan, as was noted above, two printed editions have the variant tîw’ dîc’.
with the former word apparently in the nominative, but this form is not attested by MS.

This is the only explicit mention of the temple of Tir in Armenian literature, but Movsèn Xorenac’i (II.12,49) refers to a statue of Apollón transferred from the Eruandid (Crontid) capital, Armawir, to the newly-built city of Artaṣat. This is probably a reference to Tir, and suggests that the cult existed in the Eruandid period. Xorenac’i also mentions a certain magus in the time of Artaṣās who was a erazahan 'dream interpreter' and may therefore have had some connection to the cult of Tir: Artaṣās had Ernas, high priest and brother of Eruand, put to death, and in the place of Ernas in veray bagnac’c kac’c uc’c anē zentani Artaṣāsi, aṣakert mogi orum erazahan, or yyan saka av Mopgaštē anun kardayin 'over the image-shrines he appointed a relative of Artaṣās, the pupil of a certain magus who was an interpreter of dreams; they called the name (of that pupil) for that reason also Mopgaštē' (MX II.48). The word erazahan is attested in Gen. 41.8,24 and Deut. 13.1,3,5 in the Armenian translation of the Bible. The meaning of erazawyn has never been fully explained, however. In the Greek version of Agathangelos, where the temple of Trídis (sic, Tri dio’) is explained in an interpolation as bēmas Apollónos 'the altar of Apollón', erazawyn is rendered as onemoeusos, translating eras 'dream' and interpreting the second part of the word, -awyn, as having something to do with a Muse, perhaps because of the slight similarity of the sound of the two words -awyn and mouso. Eras is probably an Iranian loan-word, as suggested by Patkanean a century ago, from OIr. rasa-, which occurs in Biblical Aramaic with the meaning 'secret'. The word can be analyzed by analogy to Arm. eran 'blessed' from OIr. *rēna-:47 Arm. crak 'vein', Phl. rag;48 Arm. erex ‘guarantee’, from OIr. lexi-; comp. Skt. rakṣa ‘guarantee’;49 and the proper name Eraznak (F9 B. IV.15), from Phl. rama ‘war’.50 There is an Arm. toponym, Erazanawken - Širakawan,51 and an unexplained hapax legomenon, (y)rēzaγy(ie) (abl. pl.) which may contain the element eras ‘dream’, in the writings of the tenth-century mystic Gregory of Narek.52 Strabo mentions a city in Armenia called Anaṅka where prophecies were made for sleepers, presumably by interpretation of their dreams; Marquart connected the name of the city with Arm. anur ‘dream’. The city was apparently located near the country of the Mardoi, i.e., near the Median frontier. Its name almost certainly means 'non-Iranian'.

The suffix -awyn is found in Classical and Modern Armenian in the compound covamawyn 'drowned' with cov ‘sea’.53 In Classical Armenian is found hawramawyn 'eupator' (Agath. 13, 2v kaw vash hawramawyn kaj’c cenn Rtrat ’or also about the bravery of Rtrat like his father’s; I Macc. 6.17, II Macc. 10.10 hawramawyn Antiock’s). Mawyn alone is translated as 'beauty, floridity, grace',54 while tawyn with negating prefix i- and c’aranawyn with c’ar ‘evil’ mean 'discolored' and 'unhappy' respectively.55 The basic meaning appears to be 'like', the concepts of 'like' and 'color' being closely allied, comp. Arm. pēs 'like', connected to Av. pāṣa- 'leprosous',56 and Arm. pēs-pēs 'multicolored'. The toponym Erazawyn probably means something like 'Dream-like' or 'Belonging to Dream'. In numerous cultures, dreams are regarded as messages from God or as signs of one's destiny, and to this day many Armenians consult erazahan, books which interpret the symbols of dreams and assist the reader to interpret the intimations of his fate that he has been granted in his sleep. The interpretation of dreams would have been an activity appropriate to Tir, the scribe of destiny.

In Ch. 5 it was noted that most Armenian writers draw a careful distinction between the Pth. or Middle Atropateneian, NW Middle Iranian form of the name of the Creator, Ahura Mazda, Arevazd, and the Middle Persian form Oramzd (Phl. Ohramzd). The former is the name of the Zoroastrian God whom their ancestors worshipped; the latter is the God of the militant, iconoclastic Sasanian church. Agathangelos uses the name Oramzd once only, in the case of Tir; when writing of the other Zoroastrian shrines, he uses the name Arevazd. It is unlikely that he uses the form, then, because he lived in Sasanian times, or because he was unaware of the difference between the two forms. In both the Zoroastrian tradition stressed oral recitation and memorization rather than written records, particularly in the case of sacred texts,57 and mediaval records indicate that the Arewordik, a surviving remnant of the Armenian Zoroastrian community,58 did indeed transmit religious learning orally from father to son. But Movsèn Xorenac’i refers to temple records in various meheans across Armenia,59 and in matters concerning ancient tradition of this kind, the much maligned patmahawyn 'Father of
History may well be right, even as archaeological finds of the past two decades have proven the existence of the inscribed boundary-markers set up by Artašēs (in Aramaic with Iranian or Armenian names and words, as it happens) to which he refers. Thus we must probably eliminate another possible explanation for the use of Ormizd, namely, that the institution of a temple archive was an innovation introduced to Armenia by the Sasanians.

Yet it is well known that Zoroastrian shrines established by the Achaemenian Persians in Asia Minor continued to be maintained by the Iranian faithful long after Iranian power had receded from the area; in the Christian centuries, the rites of these Iranian presence in Armenia exists in political chronicles, and, what is perhaps more important to the subject of the present investigation, in religious vocabulary and in a toponym: the word sandaramet and proper name Spandaramet have long been recognized as loan-words from SW and NW Iranian respectively, and the geography of Claudius Ptolemaeus (second century A.D.) cites the name of an Armenian town called Magosanama. The introduction of the word sandaramet into Armenian cannot be dated with precision, and may go back to the Achaemenians. We have referred to the boundary-markers inscribed in Aramaic which were erected by Artašēs in the mid-second century B.C. On the boundary-stone found at Zangezur in Siwnik, the king's name is rendered as [Artašēy], a form corresponding to Lydian Artaksēsa, Gk. Artaxēsēs, Artaxias, Artaxɛas, Artaxēs, and, indeed, to the Armenian form itself. Another boundary stone found at Tézait on the river Āstev north of Erevan has the name of the king in the forms *trerkēs, *trerkēs, apparently a transliteration of the oldest Gk. form of OP. Artaxēstra-: Artaxērsēs. Whether this is a conscious archaism on the part of the scribe, or whether it is the survival of a Greco-Achaemenid form, cannot be determined on existing evidence. But it may indicate the persistence of such Achaemenian Persian tradition in the Armenia of the second century before Christ. This hypothesis may seem less farfetched if one considers the pride taken by the Orontids in their Persian ancestry. One recalls the boast of Mithridates Kallinikos, an Orontid king of Commagene, which was a small state to southwest of Greater Armenia. In his great inscription at Arsameia on the river Nymphaios, he calls upon paterēnous hapantas theou einai Persidos te kai Maketidos 'all (my) paternal gods, from Persia and from Macedon.'69 Artaxias, too, must have been proud of his Achaemenian heritage; it seems likely that the descendants of Persian colonists would have been welcome to reside in his kingdom and to follow the ways of their ancestors, even as he exalted his own.

Movšēs Xorenac'i refers to Moggāštē, a relative of Artašēs whom the king made high priest and who had been apprenticed to a certain movš 'Magus' who was an ezerahan 'interpreter of dreams'. The common Arm. word for a priest of the pre-Christian religion of the country was kūrm 'priest', kūrmēt 'high priest' (with Mr. suffix -et). The terms movš and movşet are used often with reference to the Persians and to the Sasanian movšwn 'priesthood of Magi'. Although recording a tradition attributed to Artašēs, Movšēs may be using the terminology of the Arsacid period, for the word movš is used by Elīšē to refer to the Sasanian clergy of the fifth century A.D., and erazahan in Agathangelos must also be the usage of that century, the earliest time at which the Arm. text of his history could have been written, for it was early in that century that Maštoc invented the Armenian script.

It is possible that the temple of Tīr at Artašēt, the place where dreams were interpreted by Magi, was a sanctuary of the Persians, referred to, therefore, with the name Ormizd instead of Aramazd, where Armenian k'unurance, however, were trained in the scribal art. It was a logical place for them to learn it; until the Christian Maštoc, Armenia had no script of its own save the Aramaic inherited from the chancellories of the Achaemenian empire. In the inscriptions cited above, Aram. ṣīn may render Mr. nēw, Arm. k'at as an ideogram,71 and ṣībā is probably an ideogram of Mr. *sī-bērā-; Arm. c'agavor 'king', lit. 'crown-bearer'. But the Armenian-Aramaic system is attested only to date in a number of boundary stelae, the texts of which are all short and fairly similar in content, an inscription in Aramaic from Gahni, and a brief inscription inscribed on the rim of a silver bowl giving the name of the owner, ṣīpsēt *Araxēsat, and ṣānuk, perhaps a Mr. word meaning 'bowl'.

There is no evidence to indicate that the use of this Aramaic developed further in Armenia; it seems to have been confined to brief
Inscriptions of a practical or administrative type. But the Armenians did use Pahlavi, according to Movses Xorenac'i, and it is reasonable to assume that their k'turn went to the academy attached to the temple of Tir at Artašat to learn dprac'iw, the scribal art. Movses Xorenac'i at the beginning of his history refutes the argument that the Armenians had few books because they had no writing and constant wars made literary activity impossible: 

Ayl oc'c ardarew syork'ik karec'cal linnen: k'anzi gt'mai ev ml'joc'c leal pateramace'c, ew gir Parsic'c ew Yunic', orovk'aym givik'c ew gawefac' eva ev iyrek'anc'iv tanc' asanjakavan'c anac'c, ev hanurc' haka'fakutan'c anac'c ew dasanc' ayin at mez gt'mai anbaw zruc'c mateank'c, manavand or i sep'hanan asatuc'cann 6 pazatsat'cvwn. But they do not think this with justification, because there were intervals between the wars, and (there are) the public controversies and treaties, and particularly the succession of the nobility. Later Movses relates that Maštoc in the early fifth century was unable to find a skilled secretary from amongst the scribes of the Armenian King Vratsagupuh, k'anzi parsakanavan varc'c grov 'because they used the Persian script' (MX III:52). Although Pahlavi and Greek were used extensively in Armenia, together with Syriac in the century or so between the conversion of the nation to Christianity and the invention by Maštoc of the Arm. alphabet, most of the letters devised by Maštoc seem to be based on forms of the Aramaic scripts used at Hatra, Palmyra and Armazi in Northern Mesopotamia and Georgia and at Gafni and Sevan in Armenia (Arm. A:b.g.d.xo:h.t.k.l.m.p.k'r,j.t), while a number for which Aramaic equivalents do not exist were derived from Pahlavi (Arm. c'c \_ \_ \_c from Phl. \_ \_ \_c; Arm. \_c from Phl. \_ \_ \_c and Arm. \_c from Phl. \_ \_ \_c \_ \_ \_c). The vowels probably derived from Greek. The Grok 'writer'.

In Classical Armenian, the word for writer is either the Ir. loan-word dpir or the native Armenian gric'c (as in Agath. 778, supra), which is formed from the native Armenian stem gir 'write' with the suffix -ic'c denoting an agent. The form grok, 'writer' formed with the agent suffix -sk (-ewk), is not found in Classical Armenian texts, and the suffix itself is rare in early texts; the earliest attestation of the word grok is in the early mediaeval Girk Vastakoc: S'vct p'cakes ew cep'c'ea, or 6c'c'mareg, zi iwr grok an omen 6 'quickly close and seal it lest the air enter, for its grok is in the air'. In modern Arm. -ok is the ending of the present participial active, and the word grok is the common noun 'writer'; the use of the (now) participial form in this way may be influenced by Turkish, in which the participial ending -er/-ar forms agent nouns: yez-ar 'writer', yez-ar-lar 'writers', comp. Arm. grok, nom. pl. groker.

In mediaeval and modern Arm. texts is encountered a supernatual being called the Grok. A mediaeval interpreter of Gregory the Theologian wrote, Borovyc'c'v ev axac'c'eloc'c or ambastacen znah, zhrastan or Grok asen; Aniraw c datastand, bini'c'amb tanik'c. It is customary for the sick to rebuke death, the angel they call Gröka, (saying): "Your judgement is unjust. You bear (me) away by force." And in the mediaeval Act\'ark, an astrological book, we receive this helpful advice: ov or xöfik c te\'n, ov sir hogin ahul lini, ev ink'c i hogevark'c lini i xerin, yevfik c ne\'yac c\' sel piti. 'He who sees in a dream that the Grok is come to take his soul away and he himself is about to expire, must say the "I have sinned" (prayer)'.

The region of Mùş it was believed that the Grok is blind, and that he puts a piece of bread on one's mouth to lure the soul away, hence the curse xöroki brë\'t\'c d\'in beryan I would put the Grok's crust on your mouth! In the Vaspurakan region, there were clairvoyants called Grok giz, who could predict their own deaths and those of others; the late nineteenth-century Armenian ethnographer E. Lalayan was told of Yoro of Narek, who was working in his field one day when the Grok arrived and told him his time was up. He said farewell to his friends, went home, and died an hour later. The Grok giz may have also incorporated some of the functions of the ancient erazahan, since the citation from the Akt\'ark above mentions the Grok in connection with dreams. A modern Armenian idiom, grok Cap'el, lit. 'to measure the grok', is explained as stretching...
out the palm of one's hand towards the face of another to curse him. Father Xažak Barsamean, who was born at Arapkir, Turkey (Western Armenia) in 1951, told this writer of a man of Arapkir named Nasan Tsecan who was a clairvoyant and who once caused faces to appear on the palm of the hand of Fr. Xažak's mother as though on a screen; he was reputed to be in possession of a manuscript of the esoteric Vec' hazarek ('Book') of Six Thousand, a magical text containing sections on angelology, astrology and other subjects.

In Armenian tradition, the role of the Grok has been assumed by the Angel Gabriel, who is called the Grok outright by the inhabitants of Xotorjur. As such, the Grok is regarded as a benevolent being; according to one tradition recorded by Armenian ethnographers late in the nineteenth century, the Grok is an angel who sits on one's right shoulder and inscribes one's good deeds; another angel seated on the left shoulder records transgressions. One of these protects the grave; the other conveys the soul to Heaven. Because the Grok is an angel, it is considered a sin to curse him.

The manuscript illuminator Cerum shows an angel labelled Gabriel removing the soul of the Holy Mother of God from her dead body and carrying it off to Heaven, in a Gospel from Ostan, Armenia dated A.D. 1391. Implicit in the prohibition against cursing the Grok, and in his identification with one of the most prominent archangels of Christianity (an equation made also, incidentally, with Vahagn), is the conviction that the Grok is not a personification of death, but rather the servant of God's judgement and the being who guides the souls of the newly deceased to Heaven.

The play between Gabriel of the Annunciation and Gabriel the Grok becomes the subject of discourse between the rose and nightingale of mediaeval Armenian minstrel poetry. In the poem Tał yaFak'el vardapet asc' el i vera nvard ev kivlyali 'Song said by the priest Afaq' el (of Bisk, modern Bitlis, fifteenth century) about the rose and nightingale', the nightingale is Gabriel come to proclaim the coming of Christ to Mary, who is the rose. But in the Tal vam nvard ev bibuli 'Song about the rose and nightingale' of Mertic' Makan (fifteenth century), where the roles are reversed, Bibuli i vamn asc' el; xist anoborm es/or zim arun k'ez halal ku dnes;/Or hanc' p'keumen du Gabriš el,/Na arek sa chogis, k'ani du tan'jas 'The nightingale said to the rose, "You are quite merciless; for you make my blood your own (halal, from Arabic halal 'permissible (i.e., to shed or to consume)', hence in mediaeval Arm. 'correct', hence 'one's own'); Undoubtedly you are Gabriel. Come on, take my soul then. How much longer will you torment me?"' The sixteenth-century minstrel Nahapet K'o uc' ak wrote a number of short poems called hayrane in which he complains of the Grok, who will separate him from his beloved: Aya astenoveris vera erku ban okora u lali:/Mek or siro ter lini, mek or ga grok u tani./Nafac gne z'ez lali, or uni cuy xoc' alani./Ekek', zobormus tesek', oc' mefaq ', oc' kendani. In this world two things are lamentable and to be pitied: One is when one is a lover (lit. 'master of love'); the other is that the Grok comes and takes one away. I do not bewail one dead, whose wound is readily seen. Come, behold me, the wretched one, neither dead nor quick.' Hocek, t'etoy test' uor, or sce'ikd i yet banayi:/sce'ikd palc'a aeni, test' urov i ners mtnel:/Er'dy, er'dum tayi, ayn test' uro'/ durs oc' gayi:/Ayn inc' anhayvet grok, zin i k'o co'o'ud ga tani. 'Little soul, if you let me open up your breast/I should make a garden of it, I should enter if you let me./I would swear not to depart from that liberty. Faithless is the Grok, who would come and from your breast remove me! K'o gunov zini piter, xmei u harbenevi./K'o co'o' Adama graxt./Mtnel x'or k'ael./K'o erku cma'li jin pafekei u k'um linel:/Ayn xam es hapi part'i groin, luk t'ol ga tani. 'Would there were wine of your color; I should drink and get drunk./Your breast is Adam's paradise; I would enter there and apples reap./Between your nipples I would lie and sleep,/And at that hour consign my soul to the Grok, he would be only come and take it away.'

The Grok, even if he interrupts our earthly pleasures, is essentially a protector of men; it is believed by Armenians that during the seven-day-long journey of the soul to Heaven, a good angel with a fiery sword, presumably the Grok, defends it from evil angels so that on the dawn of the seventh day it may be judged. In the Zoroastrian religion, death is an evil and is attributable to the Evil Spirit, Angra Mainyu, never to Ahura Mazda, so the yazata which removes the soul from the body and transports it to Heaven cannot be regarded as responsible for or connected to death itself. Christians regard death as dependent on the judgement of God, and again do not therefore rebuke the angel which executes judgement.
The Yazata Sraosa (Phl. Srōš, NP Szaraš), whose name seems to mean 'hearkening' or 'obedience', is praised in the Gāthās and is regarded by Zoroastrians as guardian of prayer, the regent of Ahura Mazda on earth and as protector of men.93 The meaning of his name and the character of the above functions indicate also that Sraosa records—presumably in memory—the deeds of men and reports them to Ahura Mazda. Sraosa is also the guardian of the hours between midnight and dawn,94 the time when demonic darkness is deepest and the forces of death are therefore strongest, requiring a powerful adversary to protect the creatures of Ahura Mazda from them. Sraosa is very prominent in Zoroastrian funerary rites. In the Zoroastrian communities near Yazd, the priest performs a service in the name of Sraosa upon a newly-deceased member of the community, and when the corpse bearers deposit the body at the dakhma, they commit it to the protection of the Yazatas with these words in archaic NP: 'O Mihr Ized, Srōš Ized, Rašn Ized, the pure and just! we have withdrawn our hands from him, do you take him by the hand...'.95 These rites indicate that Sraosa, who with Mithra and Rašnu is one of the three judges of the soul after death,96 has the particular responsibility of guarding the soul before its journey to Heaven, having also observed and recalled the acts and prayers of the believer in life. These roles are similar to some of those of the Grok in Armenia, who, as we have seen, is to be identified with Tir/Nabû.

We have noted above that Zoroastrianism has tended to assimilate new deities to the accepted Yazatas of the Good Religion, as appears to be the case with Tir and Tištrya. Perhaps certain functions of Tir which Tištrya did not assimilate were attributed to Sraosa. If this is so, it is not surprising that Sorūš is equated in Islamic Iran with Gabriel, even as the Grok is Gabriel to Christian Armenians. And even as Tir was pre-eminently the scribe of Ormizd, the Yazata of learning in the Religion, so we find Sorūš/Gabriel in the works of the twelfth-century Iranian Muslim mystic philosopher Sobravarādī as the Angel of initiation, who imparts gnosis to men.97

Before proceeding further, one may summarize the complex career of this divinity, the Scribe of Heaven and planetary deity Mercury whom we first meet in Babylonia as Nabû: the Achaemenians are probably the first Iranians to adopt his cult, during their campaigns in Mesopotamia. He is given an Iranian name, Tir, and is equated with Tištrya. In Armenia is found a temple of Tir where the original characteristics of Nabû are clearly discernible. The temple appears to be a Persian foundation: the scriptorium and academy attached to it, and the tradition of Achaemenian chancellery Aramaic as the lingua franca of the area, suggest that it may be an Achaemenian foundation. Armenian sources attest to the widespread use of Pahlavi in Armenia, and certain letters of the alphabet devised by Maštoc9 indeed seem to have been based on Pahlavi forms, as well as on letters adapted from Greek and Northern Mesopotamian Aramaic.98 When Armenia became Christian, the word dprē 'scribe' came to be used as a bureaucratic and ecclesiastical title, although echoes of Tir's book of destiny may be heard perhaps in the šarakan 'hymn' said by the dprē 'clerks' at the nawkatik 'Dedication'99 of a Church: I pattractei koc yēt evans srbo c koc c nkal ev zmes pərkic yrdegrutc ym i dprē can kena c 'Into thy resting-places prepared for thy Saints receive us also, O Redeemer, for adoption in the Book (dprēcan) of Life.'100 Tir came to be called the Grok, 'writer', a native term of mediaeval origin, and was identified with the angel Gabriel, who carries the soul protectively to Heaven after death. In Islamic Iran we find the Yazata Srōš identified with Gabriel, and an examination of the character of this Yazata, Avestan Sraosa, suggests that he may have absorbed many of the functions of Tir that the cult of Tištrya did not or could not absorb.

The Crown of the Artaxiads

It was noted above that the motif of two eagles in side view flanking a nimbus-crowned god may be seen in a relief from the temple of Nabû at Palmyra; a very similar image, of two eagles flanking a star or rayed sun, is the characteristic adornment of the tiaras of the Artaxiad kings on their coins.101 At Hatra, an Arabo-Parthian city immediately south of Armenia, there are shown on the lintel from the South Livān two eagles in side view, with rings about their heads, flanking the bust of a god with a rayed nimbus. At Dura Europos, a fresco shows a god with rayed nimbus; he stands on a pedestal, and to either side of his head are figures bearing rings: an eagle on his right, and a winged humanoid being on his left.102 We propose to
we have seen, Tir is equated also with Mithras-HElios-HennEs in accordance with the earliest Zoroastrian concepts of Mithra. This god, equated with Greek Apollon, represents the central figure, the god with rayed nimbus, the identity of the Sun, however; he is equated rather with Greek Hephaistos, as Agathangelos identifies Tir with Apollon-Mithras, and it is recalled that Apollon, as psychopompos and messenger. At Armenia, as psychopompos and messenger. At Armenia, as psychopompos and messenger. At Armenia, as psychopompos and messenger. Tir is probably does Korescai as well. In Armenia, as we have seen, Tir is equated also with Hervōs, probably because of the role of Tir as psychopompos and messenger. At Armenia, an inscription from Lycia informs us that 'Artim son of Artify (רנפ) made this ossuary (אַשּׁדַרָא).' Artim was probably the Artimias who was made Persian governor of Lycia in 401 B.C., and because he had his remains interred in an ossuary it is assumed that he was a Zoroastrian. In Armenian, the word arciv as a proper name is found only rarely, amongst the modern inhabitants of the Caucasus. In ancient times, however, the eagle appeared on the standard carried into battle by Armenian armies ('eagle-standard(s)*, and in a fragment of a pre-Christian epic preserved by Movses Korescai, he cast an eagle on his comely black (steed),'/ took out his red leather lasso adorned with golden rings/ and, crossing the river like a swift-winged eagle/ he cast the red leather lasso adorned with golden rings/ About the waist of the mistress [Satçenik] of the Alans' (MX II, 50). It is a royal and noble creature representing power and dominion. Bronze statuettes of eagles perched on pyramidal pedestals or on the heads of antelopes have been found at Artašat from the Armenian Arsacid period (A.D. 66-428) and on the slopes of nearby Mt. Aragac; a figure of an eagle perched on the head of an antelope was found also in Iran from the second-third century A.D.; a partially gilded Sasanian silver vase of the fifth-sixth century shows a large eagle with its wings partially spread, standing on a kneeling goat or deer; and numerous figurines similar to the Armenian examples have been found in Anatolia, particularly Cappadocia, and have been dated as early as the late second millennium B.C.111

Armenian arciv/arcui, gen. arcov 'eagle' may be a native word, but if so it is closely cognate to Av. ša-šana- in ša-šana-šarna- 'with eagle feathers', and recent studies suggest that arciv/arcui is a loan-word from Iranian, probably borrowed at a very early date. The word in Iranian was used as a proper name; an Aramaic inscription from Lycia informs us that 'Artim son of Artify (רנפ) made this ossuary (אַשּׁדַרָא).' Artim was probably the Artimias who was made Persian governor of Lycia in 401 B.C., and because he had his remains interred in an ossuary it is assumed that he was a Zoroastrian. In Armenian, the word arciv as a proper name is found only rarely, amongst the modern inhabitants of the Caucasus. In ancient times, however, the eagle appeared on the standard carried into battle by Armenian armies ('eagle-standard(s)*, and in a fragment of a pre-Christian epic preserved by Movses Korescai, he cast an eagle on his comely black (steed),'/ took out his red leather lasso adorned with golden rings/ and, crossing the river like a swift-winged eagle/ he cast the red leather lasso adorned with golden rings/ About the waist of the mistress [Satçenik] of the Alans' (MX II, 50). It is...
probably out of desire to flatter his Bagratid patron that Xorenac\(^3\)i describes the latter's (probably mythical) ancestor, Sabat Bagratumi, as defeating Eruand on behalf of Artasës at a battle in which the brave commander.large\(\text{yr}_{\text{aw}}\) was reared by an eagle.\(\text{Arcrunis}\) is the capital of the Arcruni, now called Bas-qal\(\text{ Bas-qal}\). It is shown with the bright and multi-colored plumage that one might associate with that of a peacock, not a eagle. In Arm. is found sirmarg 'peacock', with modern dialect forms containing also the element sir-, sim- and sometimes substituting Arm. haw 'bird' for Iranian marg-; these variants make the suggestion by Bailey of a base \(\text{sir-}\) with \(-\text{a} \) or \(-\text{a} \) suffixes\(\text{Greppin's repetition of the folk etymology of sir- from Arm. sir 'love' with Ir. marg- 'bird' (comp. lor-a-marg 'quail') The peacock-like image of the NP sirmarg may have resulted from the widespread attribution of magical powers or supernatural qualities to the peacock. Most notable is the reverence shown by the Yezidi Kurds to Malak T\(^\text{a}\)\(\text{us}, 'the Peacock Angel', and angels are described in NP as t\(^\text{a}\)\(\text{un} \) par\(\text{a} \) mit 'peacock-winged'.\(\text{In Fahlavi, the peacock is called fr\(\text{a} \)\(\text{a} \) \(\text{a} \)marg, possibly containing Av. \(\text{fra\(\text{a}\)a}r\)w 'wonderful', comp. Arm. h\(\text{a} \)\(\text{a} \)r-\(\text{a} \) 'wonder, miracle', which indicates that in Sasanian times marvellous properties may have been ascribed to it. The Armenian saint Nersès Klaye\(\text{c}\)i (called Snorhali 'the Graceful', died 1173) wrote, Siramarg onketip ankar hagi,\(\text{Tatrak ok\(\text{a}\)\(\text{j}\)axoh m\(\text{a} \)\(\text{c}\)ur an\(\text{a} \)wani 'The peacock, golden image (of the) soul,/'Turtle-dove, pigeon clean and whole in thought',\(\text{yet Emin repeats a legend which he attributes to the Zoroastrian Persians: that Ahraman created the peacock (siramarg) in order to show that he was unwilling to create other beautiful creatures, rather than unable to do so. The Armenians of mediaeval times often painted peacocks in MS illuminations, and a bas-relief of a peacock from the fifth-sixth century was found at Dvin.\(\text{It is likely that the form of the legend of the origin of the Arcruni preserved by Xorenac\(^3\)i is the original form of the Iranian tale we have in the \(\text{Arm.}\) and that the sirmarg was originally an eagle. The eagle thus appears in Iranian and Armenian tradition as a noble bird, the standard of royalty, which rescues children destined for lordship and greatness; it is possible to see in these functions the Av. \(\text{x}-\text{a} \)\(\text{zam\(\text{a} \)n},\(\text{Arm. p\(\text{a} \)\(\text{a} \)k\(\text{a} \)m\(\text{a} \)n}\) of Zoroastrianism. In Yt. XIX,34, the \(\text{x}-\text{a} \)\(\text{zam\(\text{a} \)n}\) flies from Yima after his sin, in the form (Av. \(\text{k\(\text{a} \)\(\text{r}\)a} \)\(\text{n} \)\(\text{a} \)m, Arm. loan-word k\(\text{e} \)\(\text{p} \)\(\text{a} \)r\(\text{o} \)\(\text{r} \) of a bird (Av. \(\text{w\(\text{a} \)\(\text{r}\)g\(\text{n}\)a} \)\(\text{a} \)m). In verses 35-8 of the same hymn, in the younger Avestan dialect devoted largely to \(\text{x}-\text{a} \)\(\text{zam\(\text{a} \)n}, the bird is identified as a w\(\text{a} \)\(\text{r}\)g\(\text{n}\)a\(\text{a} \)m, which was probably a falcon. A Mir. form of the latter (cf. NP w\(\text{a} \)\(\text{r}\)g\(\text{h} \)\(\text{a} \)m, 'crow') may be the origin of the Arm. toponym Varag; the mountain of that name was once the site of an important monastery, and towers to the south of Van. In the valley of Varag stand the ruins of Ast\(\text{t\(\text{a} \)k\(\text{a} \)k 'the fortress of Ast\(\text{t\(\text{a} \)k\(\text{a} \)k}, which, according to local tradition, was a temple of the goddess, consort of VaHagn, in the centuries before Christianity, it is conceivable that the lofty mountain nearby may have acquired its name in those remote ages, and that the name may have had religious significance, if the proposed derivation of Varag from a form of w\(\text{a} \)\(\text{r}\)g\(\text{h} \)\(\text{a} \)m- is
true, for the feathers of the latter bird are said to have magical powers in Is. XIV.35.

Eagles and falcons are birds of prey, similar in appearance, and both seem fit symbols of the royal x'arenah-. The falcon, called šāhin 'kingly' in NP. for its long association with the royal hunt, was indeed well suited to share with the eagle the honour of embodying x'arenah. In a Sogdian fresco from Panjikant, a bird is shown with a ring in its beak; it flies to the side of a king seated at a banquet under a canopy. This bird has been compared to the bās-e dovlat of Central Asian folklore, which alights on the head of a man destined to be king (on Arm. bāzē, see n. 130), and šāhš-e suxr 'a red eagle' in the Kārnāmag saves Ardešir from an attempt to poison him. In the same fresco, an animal with a similar ring in its mouth flies to the side of another king or hero.133 The latter may be the man whose form the x'arenah- takes in the Pahlavi romance Kārnāmag I Ardešir I Pērōkān when it leaves the doomed Parthian King Ardawān V. The x'arenah of Tigran II deserted him, too. The scornful Strabo remarked that Tigran tykhās d' ekhrēsto polikilai 'enjoyed chequered fortunes'; Gk. tykhō may be a translation of the Iranian term x'arenah.134

On the Artaxiad crowns we find not one eagle, but two, as indeed on the northern Mesopotamian and Syrian monuments. At the east Terrace of Nemrut Dağ, the row of colossal statues representing the Iranian divinities worshipped by the Dravidian kings was flanked at its northern and southern ends by a group of eagle and lion.135 Such symbolism was perhaps an attempt to represent the encircling, protective quality of x'arenah: in the Armenian case, the watchful and powerful glory (p'ārk) guarding the bright fortune (bāzē) of the king, represented by the luminary of Tir.

In our day, the Grok's name is a curse on the lips of Armenian Christians, and expressions of ill will often include his name: Grok u nāh 'The Grok and death (upon you)', Grok u c'aw 'The Grok and pain (upon you)', Groki bašé/p'ay dānaš/līnes 'May you come to the Groki', Groki coc nīnes 'May you enter the Grok's breast', Grok u teš 'May you eat the Grok', and Grokē k'ez/hrā het 'The Grok be with you/him'.136 One recalls the threat on an Assyrian tablet: 'Whoever steal this tablet, may the god Nabū pour out his soul like water.'137 In Armenia, even outbursts of temper may have archaic forebears.

The legend of the eagle and child survives in the Armenian folktales and in modern tradition, too, albeit in very different form. In a folktale, a youth slays a visān ('dragon') with his x'ur kekē 'sword of lightning', wielded by the heroes of the national epic of Sasun) and saves the young of an eagle. The eagle shelters the youth out of gratitude and returns him from the mut 'āsxār (world of darkness) to the lus 'āsxār (world of light).138 The modern Armenian writer Vaxt'ang Ananyan wrote down a tale told him by an aged schoolmaster who had lived before the first World War in a little Armenian village near Bin golu, Turkey. Most of the villagers were shepherds, and their yaylāq, the cool upland meadow where they pitched their summer tents, lay below a cliff called Arcuak'ar, 'Eagle's Rock'. A great eagle would swoop down from there sometimes to steal a sheep for her young (one recalls the statuettes mentioned above of an eagle perched on another animal). Once, the eagle took a child, but the mighty bird had no time to clarify its motive, for an intrepid shepherd, fearing the worst, ascended to the nest and slew the eagle after a fierce battle. He was about to kill the eagle's young, too, but the mother of the rescued child implored him to spare them. 'The poor chicks ... they are orphans.'139 Had the child been lost, and not merely left out to bask in the summer sun, perhaps this episode might have been cast in the terms of the ancient epic, preserved by Xorenac'ē and the Sānānē, and the child regarded as the object of divine intervention, protected from exposure to the elements by the winged embodiment of x'arenah/p'ārk. Aspects of the tale indicate deep layers of tradition: the name Arcuak'ar and the mother's protest on behalf of the eagle's young. They had dwelt there since time immemorial, and were not to be exterminated.

The various threads of the cult of Tir amongst the Armenians stretch far into antiquity, past the presence of the Armenians as a unified or even identifiable nation and far beyond the confines of their land. Both the cultic and iconographical features of Tir were adapted to Zoroastrian beliefs, although their origin lay elsewhere, and entered the Christian sphere in different garb still. Similar processes of assimilation, adaptation and transmission are seen to have taken place also in Iran.
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Avestan Spēnta Armaiti and Pahlavi Spandarmad

Spēnta Armaiti, whose name may be translated as 'Bounteous Devotion', is the Amēsa Spēnta who presides over the earth, and forms a pair with Xāsthra Vairya, 'Desirable Kingdom', who rules the sky. She, Haurvatāt 'Wholeness', and Amerētāt 'Immortality', are the only female Amēsa Spēntas, although by no means the only female yazatas, in the Avesta. In later times, Horād (Av. Haurvatāt) and Amurād (Av. Amerētāt) were regarded as male, but Spandarmad (Av. Spēnta Armaiti) remained female.2 Armaiti's hāmkārs, or supernatural collaborators, are yazatas connected with water,3 the creation with which the earth is fertilised, and which rains down from the sky of Xāsthra Vairya. Armaiti was since early times regarded as the guardian of virtuous women, perhaps because of a pre-Zoroastrian cult of Mother Earth, the bearer of all things; as we have noted, she was in later times the only female Amēsa Spēnta. Because of her association with the earth, her yearly feast celebrated on Rōz Spandarmad of Mīh Spandarmad (the fifth day of the twelfth month of the Zoroastrian calendar) was particularly popular amongst tillers of the soil and women, and was called Ḫaš-i barzīgaḏān 'the feast of husbandmen'.5 In the Av. and Phl. books, Armaiti is described as a bountiful divinity; in Yt. 17.16, she is called the mother of Ši, the yazata whose name means 'fortune', and in Khotan Saka Buddhist texts Šaṁdrāṣṭa 'Spēnta Armaiti' renders Sanskrit Śrī- 'prosperity and fortune'.6

Zoroastrians consider death an unqualified evil, and inhumation of a dead body in a grave must therefore defile Armaiti, who is both identical with and guardian over the earth; according to the Vidēvdāt, 3.8-9, graves and dāaras grieve the divinity. Zoroastrianism did not conceive of Armaiti as ruler of the underworld, for the proper place for the departed soul was either heaven in the sky, purgatory, or hell. Armaiti, being wholly good, cannot have had any association with hell, but we do find the grave referred to as 'the darkness of Spēnta...
Yet it seems that most classes of society in both Armenia and Iran practiced both burial and the theologically sanctioned method of exposure of a corpse until the end of the Sasanian period. It seems that there was connected with the practice of burial also the belief that Armenia was indeed the guardian and ruler of the dead; this idea may have originated as a fusion of Zoroastrian belief in Spenta Armaiti as guardian of the earth with ancient beliefs according to which earth was the entrance-way to the underworld.

Armenian Sandaramet

In the Armenian translation of the Bible is attested the word sandaramet-k, meaning 'Hades or the underworld (Gk. Hades, gē kato)', and a derivative adjective, sandarametakan. Agathangelos refers to the dead as sandarametakan nā'ec'elak 'those asleep in the underworld'. But sandaramet originally meant, presumably, the earth, in which men's remains lie, rather than the spaces below the earth in which their souls were believed to sleep or wander. The Arm. word also appears to render the neutral gē kato more often than Hades. Grigor Magistros wrote of a wind called Liparean which hur ing ẑ ė i Sandaramet ẑ 'is a sort of fire from the underworld.' St. Nersēs Xnorhali wrote: Sandaramet ẑ sarsecc'in/kapeal ogian arj'kacak ẑ 'the underworld trembled (and) released the spirits bound'; Jaync ẑ hacc'ec ẑ in Sandaramet ẑ andndoc ẑ 'Voices sounded: the underworld of the abysses.' These abysses can be also the depths of the sea: in a mediaeval commentary on Matthew 8.27, Jesus quieting the sea is said to have sandaramet-k ẑ c sandarametakan 'a sort of fire from the underworld'.

The use of sandaramet-k as a common noun meaning 'underworld indicates that the earth was regarded as the abode of the dead at the time when this form was introduced into Arm. Although such a belief was undoubtedly persistent in later ages, such an explicit statement of it argues an archaic date, and we note that the Arm. does not have the neutral meaning of 'earth' which is found in the Phil. literature, where, besides, a derivative of the Av. is used and not a SW Ir. form: spandarametakan 'the earth, the underworld'. Weillet long ago suggested that Sandaramet must be a NW Mbr. form of the name Spenta Armaiti, while sandaramet-k ẑ is a loanword from SW Ir., possibly Old Persian, Arm. ẑ reflecting an initial ẑw-. M. Schwartz now suggests that the Arm. form derives from an older ẑsantā-, while Cappadocian Sondara reflects an original ẑsvantā-. The use of sandaramet-k ẑ as a common noun meaning 'underworld indicates that the earth was regarded as the abode of the dead at the time when this form was introduced into Arm. Although such a belief was undoubtedly persistent in later ages, such an explicit statement of it argues an archaic date, and we note that the Arm. does not have the neutral meaning of 'earth' which is found in the Phil. literature, where, besides, a derivative of the Av. is used and not a SW Ir. form: spandarametakan 'the earth'. It is likely that Sandaramet was seen as a divinity of the underworld, ruler of the kingdom of the dead, through a fusion of Zoroastrian and archaic beliefs as suggested above, and that the name came later to mean 'the underworld' generally, without referring to a supernatural being.

According to T'ovma Arzruni, Artsakh II built in Lesser Abask, Vaspurakan, replaces Ĥerukleas eβ dioniseay ẑ 'temples of Herakleus and Dionysos'; 20 Herakleos is undoubtedly Vahagn here, and Dionysos is probably Spandaramet. M. Abayyan considered the temple of Gisane and Demeter at Innakf can also be a shrine of Vahagn and Sandaramet. 21 Gisane is to be derived from Phil. pēō 'curls, locks', hence 'the hairy
one', perhaps an epithet of Vahagn, who hur her unêr 'had flaming hair' in the epic song of his birth cited by Xorenaci. Mount K'arkê of the Innakmean range, upon whose southern slope the monastery of St. Karapet stood until its destruction by the Turks in 1915, is called by the Armenians Nkö-can, 'the long hair of Mus', and this popular toponym may preserve the memory of Gisanê.22 Demeter is identified as an earth-goddess in the martyrlogy of St. Ignatios: . . . or êrûk orn Demetr(ê) auvancôk sør Demetê(ê) auvancôk 'nor the earth whom you call (imp. pl.) Demeter',23 but this identification may not refer to practices in Armenia. One recalls that at Astisat, Vahagn shared his temple with a female consort, Astlik. In the case of Lesser Akbak, it seems from the text of Arcruni that he is referring to two different temples. As to the temple at Innakmê, Zenob Glak claims that Demeter and Gisanê were two brothers from India, not gods. This seems to be an euphemistic interpretation of the origins of their cult, for Yovhan Mamikonean, in his History of Turwûn (seventh century) refers to both as gods, Demeter being the son or brother of Gisanê. The historian refers to huge bronze statues of both divinities which were destroyed by St. Gregory the Illuminator.24 Even if Gisanê may be considered Vahagn, the identity of Demeter is uncertain.

The identification of Spandarmêt as Dionysos is also puzzling, for the former is female, the latter male. Armenian, like Pahlavi, does not have grammatical gender, and the change of gender in translation is no more unlikely than a similar alteration within the same body of tradition as with female Hearvatat and Amereetat to male Hurudat and Amurdad above. Dionysos was a god of fertility, and his cult was therefore connected with the earth. The particulars of his worship were well known to both Parthians and Armenians. Some of the forty rhytons found in the so-called 'square room' of Mhrudatkirt (Nisa, the early Arsacid capital of Parthia) depict scenes of bacchantic revelry; it is perhaps significant that this particular hall seems to have been devoted to the cult of the ancestors of the Arsacid kings,25 for the cult of Spandarmêt may have been associated with funerary observances. One recalls also the dramatic tale related by Flutarch in his life of Crassus. In 53 B.C., the latter's forces were slaughtered at Carrhae (Harrân) by the Parthians under the command of the young nobleman Sûrên. The Armenian Artaxiad king Artawatz had decided before this that the tide of power in the region favored the Parthians for the moment, and had arranged accordingly to wed his daughter to Pacorus, son of the Parthian king of kings, Orodes. The royal wedding party was enjoying a performance of the Bacchae of Euripides, we are told, when messengers burst in with the head and hand of Crassus, which were tossed on to the stage and unhesitatingly raised aloft as the head of Pentheus by a resourceful actor. Both the Parthian and Armenian kings would have been familiar with the appearance of Bacchus/Dionysus. A bronze fragment of a drooping panther skin resembling that seen in Greek depictions of Dionysus, was found in the ruins of the Parthian temple at Shamî. A bronze mask with a ring at the top was found in the mediaeval Armenian city of Ani, but it is probably very much older. It shows a rather pie-eyed, shaggy, bearded and moustached Bacchus with a wreath of grapes and vine-leaves on his head. The mask probably adorned the neck or handle of a metal drinking vessel, and a similar mask was found at Begram, Afghanistan.26

Our two Biblical references to Spandarmêt are from the Books of Maccabees. It has been observed that 'of all the Biblical writings, the books of Maccabees have left the greatest unacknowledged imprint on Moses (Korenaci's) History';24 and it was common for other historians as well to compare the Jewish war against the pagan Seleucids to the struggle waged by Armenian Christians against the Zoroastrian Sasanian Empire in the fifth century. Indeed, the Maccabees fought Hebrew hellenizers as well as foreign oppressors, and in fifth-century Armenia there were still numerous followers of the Zoroastrian faith, who sided with the Iranians against their own countrymen. The reference in II Maccabees to spandarmêtin kakôwvel is echoed by Ebisê in his description of the various ways Vasak Siwî employed to win Armenians back to their former faith: ev yerêkarêm an outrage urus cé, msê-vay yerkaynut-iw gisnéac n yergs arbec âuceêv cu ev i kêkôwvel lktuceêv, k'akêr pagy uc-met ermac êzergy erastakans, ev yerêg het ânosêksêns 'and he increased melodies of joy, spending all night long in drunken song and lewd dance (kêkôwvel, loc. pl.: lit. "partridge"); for some he sweetened the musical scales and the heathen songs'.28 It would seem, from the Biblical passage and the citation from Ebisê, that the
kakay-dance had some religious significance, perhaps as a celebration of the fecundity of the earth. To the Christians of that era, such earthy levity must have seemed lewd and unseemly, but to Zoroastrians it is proper to rejoice in the good creation of Ahura Mazda, and for them the abstemious and melancholy behavior of some Christian priests was demonic; Ekhë's Letter of Mihmenseh to the Armenian nobles (Ekhë, II) pours scorn upon Christian asceticism, poverty and celibacy.

The Christian Church seems to have succeeded in eradicating the cult of Spandaramet, but the kakay-dance was still performed, and depictions of Armenian dances in mediaeval manuscript illuminations depict the dancer barring his genitals, which would have seemed low indeed to Christians. Modern Armenians perform the kakay-dance with more modesty than their forebears. And an Armenian folk tradition of Naxi'Jewan recorded by a Dominican monk travelling through the area in the eleventh century may be a survival of beliefs concerning Spenta Armaiti. According to the tradition, the Armenians of old called the sky Noy, and his wife the earth they called Aretia. Noy impregnated Aretia, who gave birth to all creatures. This is the only mention of the name Aretia, but Noy is the Armenian form of Noah, who is a popular figure in Armenian folklore because of the Biblical story of the flood, which ends with the mooring of the Ark somewhere 'in the mountains of Ararat'. One recalls that the first plant Noah cultivated when he descended from the Ark was a grape vine, a potent symbol of the earth's bounty and of the cult of Dionysos depicted on the Parthian rhytons from Nisa mentioned above. Armenian tradition also mentions vineyards in connection with Dionysos. As for Aretia, it may be possible to see in her name a very debased form of Armaiti alone without the epithet Spenta-. The Armenians probably recognised Spenta-, Mr. spand, as a separate word. It has been suggested that Arm. spand 'rue', Np. sipand, ispand, Phl. spandân derives from Mr. It is possible that Arm. span-anum 'I kill' is related to Av. spenta-, but this derivation has been disputed. Arm. spand 'sacrifice', with span-anum 'sacrificial altar' and span-anoc 'slaughter-house' may be either a derivative of span- 'kill', in which case the etymology is uncertain, or a Mr. loan-word.) There are found in Armenian also two forms of the Iranian name *spanadâta- (Gk. Spendaradêa, Phl. Spandiyâa), which contains the element OIr. spênta-, Mr. spand-: Spandarat and Spandiat; the first is the name of a member of the Armenian Kamsarak Kaxisaradom and is a loan from NW Mr., with the change of intervocalic -â- to -a-, while the second is cited by Bebós as the name of a Persian hero and shows the SW Mr. change of intervocalic -â- to -ë-. The union of Khstrma Vairya and Spênta Armaiti is not sexual, so Noy may not represent Khstrma Vairya; on Ascension Day, when Armenian girls gather in silence bunches of the hawrot-mawrot flower, named after Saurvatät and Amërûtā, the sky is said to kiss the earth merely. The importance of Noy, who is not regarded generally in Armenia as either a supernatural figure or as one connected with the sky, may lie in the background of the Biblical tale: his vine-planting.

The earth, Armaiti, is fertilised with water, and Zoroastrians pour libations on the ground at their religious ceremonies as an offering to her. Arm. Christians do not offer such libations, but they refrain pointedly from pouring water on the ground at night, in the belief that the dews 'demons' are disturbed by it, the night being the time which belongs to the dead. For Zoroastrians, the watch of Awierzhra, the period between sunset and midnight, belongs to the fravâšis, the spirits of the departed, and water may not be drawn during this time. Both peoples thus preserve an archaic belief that the souls of the dead reside beneath the earth, in the darkness of Spenta Armaiti. The fravâšis may have been replaced by dews in Armenian tradition, perhaps because of fear of the soul of the dead (Mr. urvan 'soul' becomes Arm. ur 'ghost'). In Arm. tradition, it seems that there was a supernatural being regarded as the lord of graves and tombs who was probably Spandaramet. We shall consider below this divinity, the funerary practices of the ancient Armenians, and their beliefs concerning spirits and the afterlife.

Arm. Sahapet, ̀avod

A thirteenth-century Arm. miscellany, the Oskiberan, contains this note in a commentary on Isaiah: 'Of Dionysos they say that he is the sahapat of vineyards; and of Athena that she is the sahapat of olive trees; and Mairoknas is called by them the sahapat of all the trees.' In Trapezus, on the Pontic coast north of the Armenian provinces of Ekeleac and Memonak, Dionysos was worshipped as the protector of
HübSchmann derived šahapet from Av. *šāthrapātī - 'ruler of a homestead', a word which is unattested, while noting that it is used as an explanation of Arm. šahap 'strap' in the Armenian translation of St. Ephrem Syrus. HübSchmann derives šahap from OP. *šāthrapē. With the first element clearly Arm. šah-, OIr. xāthra- 'kingdom'. (A NW Mgr. form of xāthra- is found in Arm. ąxarh 'country, world', with metathesis of Mgr. ą- and -hr and addition of an initial a-. Added initial vowels are a regular feature in Arm. loan-words from Ir., e.g., Arm. ąxan 'prince', from Ir. xā(y)- 'to rule'; Pth. ąxeyd 'prince'; Arm. ąrani 'blessed' from Ir. ąranya 'happy'; Arm. ąmn 'race' and ąmn-tw 'noble' from Ir. ąn- 'to give birth', Mgr. ąnād 'free'). If indeed šahapet is a synonym of šahap, we should derive the former from OIr. *xāthrapātī - 'lord of a kingdom'.

The office of the satrap, Gk. satrapēs, was an important feature of Achaemenian administration. S. T. Frumkin noted the element šahap-in the toponym Šahapavan, the summer residence of the Armenian Orontids, and according to the late thirteenth-century historian Stepānus Orbelean, Ṣahapewic 2 herd i Šahapay pərškē šinēal 'the fortress of Šahapewe' (in Siwīn 3) 'was built by Šahap the Persian'. The form satrapēsin (dat. pl.) is found in a Gk. inscription of the two Persian satraps Ormanēs and Arioukēs from Agb'da-chka Kāle, 41 km. SW of Divriği (Rephrikē), on the Western extremity of Armenia. The institution of the satrap continued into Parthian times: the Arsacid King Mithridates II had a bas-relief and Greek inscription carved at Behistun shortly before his death in 87 B.C., which mentions 'Gōtarzē, Satrap of Satraps'. Another official mentioned in the inscription is called pokpistumēnōs 'entrusted', which may be the Greek translation of an Iranian title gāštḵān, found in Armenian as oštikan.

The office of the satrap commanded great respect, and the title was to be applied to divinity, much as Jews call their god Adonai 'Lord' and Armenian Christians call their God Gēr(Ašur)ā 'Lord(God)'. It is noteworthy that the Armenian Arwörđik 3 'Children of the Sun' called their religious leaders by the ancient secular title kharapet 'chiliarch', another office dating back to Achaemenian times. Thus, we find an inscription dedicated Satrapēi theši 'to the god Satrapēs' at Ma'ad, Phoenicia, in A.D. 8; similar steles devoted to the god have been found dating back to the fourth and fifth centuries B.C. A god called Hērōpte (Gk. Apollōn) is invoked in the Aramaic part of trilingual inscription dated 358 B.C. from Letoon at Xanthos in Lycia, a province of Asia Minor which was a part of the Achaemenian Empire. There is little doubt that the Aramaic name is a rendering of OIr. form *šāthrapēti. This word is a divine name in Manichaean Sogdian, where Xeyṣptē is used to translate the name of the Splendidemen; by is a generic word for 'god'. A Gnostic text in Coptic from before or during the latter part of the fourth century, found at Nag Hammadi, Egypt, called 'The Concept of Our Great Power' describes how Christ was seized by the Archons and delivered to Hell, after which Christ revealed His nature in glory and destroyed the dominion of the ruler of Hades: 'And they delivered him up to the ruler of Hades. And they handed him over to Sāsabed for nine bronze coins.' In this passage, the ruler of the underworld seems to be identified with Sāsabed, whose name has not been explained. But it could be a loan-word from a SW Ir. form of *šāthrapēti, cf. the change of -thr- in xāthra- to -ē- in Arm. Artsēs, etc.

Arm. šahapet denoted a class of supernatural beings: there were šahapets of various creations (olive trees, vineyards, and trees in general in the citation from the Oskiberan above). There were also šahapets of different loci: Eznik refers in his fifth-century Fāq Akandoo to Šahapetē: Hw eypēs Janay satanay zi samenay ok in barwok akkalute tye vripec usēcē, ev i snoti yova kapicē. Mecac uē eycē mardken vēyspe, zi yorān rahīgē erevescē in omancē amuēcē zmēs i pastayn. Karcec uē anā hē ev nhange inēcē icē en getocē, ev šahapetē vēyrapē. Hw yet karcec uē eney inkē kērparan i i vēysē kērparan kam i nhangi iwm ev i šahapeti, zi yuē zmērā yēyrapē ararēcē tēyrapēcē. 'And that way Satan tries to divert every man from concentrated attention through good (thoughts) and to bind him in false hope. In the eyes of men he makes serpents (Arm. vēyspe) great, so that when they appear awesome to some (men), those (men) will make them an object of worship. He causes (men) to think also that there are crocodiles of the rivers and šahapets of the (cultivated) lands. And after making (them) think (thus), he himself takes the form of a serpent, crocodile or šahapet, so that thereby he may cause man to go
astray from his Creator.56 A mediaeval MS lists Židarkc ev Žahapetkc ev visapk ev kajkc 'Usurares and Žahapets and serpents and titans', a veritable catalogue of monsters.57

During his interrogation of St. Gregory the Illuminator on the nature of the Christian faith, King Tiridates III asks: "Cas ev cyn Kartonn 1c: 8avo' ini, si gitac 1c: o cyn okc 1c ahatuq' aho markwâto" k oc, zor ko'c du araric: mitc n a okc 1c oc Žahapet gerezmauc", orum dun c'ankas hasanel, kas bandatal kepamec koc c na ic oc arjakoc? 'And who might this Christ be? Show me, that I may know, the one who may be the recompenser of your labours, whom you call Creator. Might he be a Žahapet of the tombs whom you desire to reach, or is he the releaser of your imprisoning bonds?'58 In the dramatic exchange presented by Agathangelos, the Illuminator replies to this sarcastic challenge by replying that Christ is indeed the Žahapet and pehapan 'guardian' of the tombs, to which He descended voluntarily.59

In the Gnostic narrative cited above, Christ was delivered into the hands of Sassaâbed, who can be identified with the ruler of Hades. The Žahapet of tombs, the ruler of the underworld, would be that divinity identified with and dwelling in the earth, with its darkness as well as its bounty, at once funereal and Dionysian: Spandaramet. This is not to suggest that the word Žahapet was used in Arm. exclusively to refer to Spandaramet, but only in the context of funerary rituals and beliefs.

In the passage of Movseś Xorenac60 cited above, the Sandarametapet 'ruler of the underworld' is placed in rhetorical apposition to Sarapis, a chthonic deity often shown on gravestones found along the northern coast of the Black Sea.60 The name of Sarapis sounds very similar indeed to the god whose name is attested in Gk. as Sarapêas, and we recall that Arm. Žahapet, possibly the equivalent of Coptic Sassaâbed, was used as a synonym of Arm. Žahapet 'strap', Gk. sarapêas. The worship of Sarapis was certainly known through the Iranian world as well as in Armenia in the Hellenistic period, for although the cult centre of the divinity was the famed Serapeum of Alexandria, his image and Bactrian name Sarapo appear on several Kushan coins, on the eastern edge of Iran.61 The Iranians and Armenians would have regarded the Žahapet of tombs, Spandaramet, as female, however. Pre-Christian funerary monuments have been found at Dün in Armenia, many of which depict women, and glazed ceramic sarcophagi, similar in design to those found in Armenia, have been excavated at Parthian cemeteries. These were often decorated with the figure of a native goddess in relief. Fragments of a round ceramic ossuary excavated at Munon Depe, in the southern Turkmen S.S.R. (ancient Margiana) show figures of women in bas-relief in various positions which have been interpreted as movements of a funerary dance of Dionysian character. Depictions of Pan and satyrs (the companions of Dionysus) are common from Central Asia in the Parthian period, and funerary dances of the type shown on the ossuary, which has been dated to the Parthian period, are still performed in Soviet Central Asia.62 R. Ghirshman's suggestion that the woman on the Parthian coffins is the Goddess Anahîtê cannot be supported, for the yazata, for all her connection with fertility and thus the earth in Armenian tradition, was not connected with death or the underworld. The images in both countries, if indeed they represent divinities, are more likely of Arm. Spandaramet, Mr. Spandarmad, than of Anahîtê.

In modern Armenian folklore, belief persists in a supernatural being called the Žvod (another, less common form is Žvag, perhaps a development analogous to the shift in pronunciation of NP. 8h to d) a shortened form of Žahapet. Ennik noted that the Žahapets mertc mard erewer ev mertc dw, orov ev zaqapatuc iyin kapersc ev yanârcn mucanel 'appeared sometimes as a man, sometimes as a serpent, because of which it was made possible for serpent-worship to be introduced into the country',63 and the modern Armenian belief in lucky snakes which come to dwell in houses may be a survival of the snake-worship Ennik described.64 The modern Žvod is an invisible being, however, who lives in the walls of houses during the winter. On the last day of February, Armenians strike the walls and shout Žvod durg, Adar ners 'Out with the Žvod and in which Adar [=March]!'. The evening before this, they leave a dish of water on the threshold, presumably to tempt the Žvod outdoors. The door is slammed, and the sign of the Cross is made. The Žvod dislikes having to leave its comfortable winter home, and has been heard to complain. Not all Žvods lived in houses, it seems, for a rock in the western Armenian province of Dersim near a grove of oak trees was called Žvodi kOf Žvod's rock'. One recalls the reference of the Oskiberan cited above to Žahapets of trees, and it is likely that the
continued to be considered in Dersim a being connected with vegetation and fertility therefore.\(^65\)

One recalls the custom cited above of refraining from spilling water on the earth during the night; perhaps the water which is set out to lure the švod and then spilt onto the ground may symbolise the švod’s return to a home beneath the earth. The winter months are those of death and cold, but with the coming of spring these forces must retreat to their own domain, vanquished by the light and warmth of the Sun, which is believed to be strengthened by the fires kindled by men, when it is at its lowest. The month of Adar is that of fire, corresponding to Arm. Ahekan, when Zoroastrians kindle light bonfires to banish winter from the world, and it is appropriate that the švod be driven from its winter quarters then. Originally Ątar/Adur was a winter month, corresponding to Armenian Ahekan (see Ch. 15).

Spandarmad and Hrōtic c.

The ancient Armenians accorded veneration to the spirits of their ancestors, for Agathangelos refers to uru-pašt c abrut c 'the soul', and two columns, each on its own stepped pedestal, that stand behind another pedestal at Bishapur; the latter ensemble has been interpreted as a votive monument.\(^79\)

Excavations of Parthian sites have uncovered numerous statues and figurines of men and women, of various sizes and of various materials (marble, metal and clay); these figures have been explained as connected with the fravəši- cult, and two rooms excavated at the old Arsacid capital, Nisa, appear to have contained numerous figurines of royal ancestors of the Arsacid house.\(^80\) Near these structures stood the buildings where Arsacid kings and noblemen were buried.\(^81\) It appears the Armenians, too, had images of their ancestors; Agathangelos wrote: Ed te ści anu urvan u urvan c i pšačx ał še an rir c ał qeši k c, an ran c un tūslov, an ran pšar c an u un an tūslov c e an, an an ašašin c e an, an an lāk c, an rir c an.\(^82\)

One notable example of such steles is the monument at Ējun of the sixth century: a double-arch on a stepped base enclosing two tall, narrow steles decorated with bas-reliefs depicting Biblical scenes.\(^77\) Although the monument is undoubtedly Christian, the dual columns call to mind the pair of Sasanian fire-altars that stand together on an outdoor pedestal at Naqš-i Rustam,\(^78\) or the two columns, each on its own stepped pedestal, that stand behind another pedestal at Bishapur; the latter ensemble has been interpreted as a votive monument.\(^79\)

The Armenians erected monuments to the souls of the dead, particularly if the deceased was related to a common royal ancestor. King Tiridates alludes clearly to the cult of the ancestors of the Arsacid house in his famous edict invoking Aramazd, Anshit and Vahagn (Agath. 127) at the end of which he asked that ev i mē dāwc ašxān Part c ašxān hāc c aš xā c elut 'i'v, i pšač aš xā c elut 'i'v i kari naxne 'visitation reach us from our Parthians of divine birth (Arm. dāwc ašxān, lit. "mingled of the gods"), from the glory (pšark) of kings and from our brave ancestors.' Artashes had sah-arljans 'death-statues' raised over the grave of Eruand, who was of 'Arsacid' blood, and Tiridates I built sah-arljans at Gəni.\(^75\) The tradition of erecting huge steles as monuments to the departed survived in Christian Armenia and continues to this day in the art of the elaborately-carven xac c kēar 'Cross-stone'.\(^76\)

To the east of Armenia, the twelfth month was called in Mr. Spandaram, as noted above, at the end of which falls the festival of Fravərdgān, Av. Namaspārmād, which is dedicated to the fravəšis, the spirits of the dead.\(^70\) To the west of Armenia, in Cappadocia, the name of the twelfth month was Sundara, a word which appears to derive from a SW Ir. form of the name of Spānta Ārmaiti, like Sandaramet.\(^71\) We have noted the close connection between Spandaramet and the underworld above, and in Armenia the festival of the fravəšis was of such importance that it gave its name to the entire twelfth month, Hrōtic c, the gen. pl. of hro(r)t(-i-) 'fravəši', a loan-word from Mr.\(^72\) In Chorsamian, the festival seems to have given its name to the month following it, Ew i, instead of to the month at the end of which it occurred.\(^73\)

The distinction between Ir. urvan- and fravəši- is a fine one drawn mainly in theological texts with which most members of the Armenian Zoroastrian community probably were not familiar, so both Arm. uru and hro(r)t(-i-) probably refer to the same concept.\(^74\)

The Armenians erected monuments to the souls of the dead, particularly if the deceased was related to a common royal ancestor. King Tiridates alludes clearly to the cult of the ancestors of the Arsacid house in his famous edict invoking Aramazd, Anshit and Vahagn (Agath. 127) at the end of which he asked that ev i mē dāwc ašxān Part c ašxān hāc c aš xā c elut 'i'v, i pšač aš xā c elut 'i'v i kari naxne 'visitation reach us from our Parthians of divine birth (Arm. dāwc ašxān, lit. "mingled of the gods"), from the glory (pšark) of kings and from our brave ancestors.' Artashes had sah-arljans 'death-statues' raised over the grave of Eruand, who was of 'Arsacid' blood, and Tiridates I built sah-arljans at Gəni.\(^75\) The tradition of erecting huge steles as monuments to the departed survived in Christian Armenia and continues to this day in the art of the elaborately-carven xac c kēar 'Cross-stone'.\(^76\)

One notable example of such steles is the monument at Ējun of the sixth century: a double-arch on a stepped base enclosing two tall, narrow steles decorated with bas-reliefs depicting Biblical scenes.\(^77\) Although the monument is undoubtedly Christian, the dual columns call to mind the pair of Sasanian fire-altars that stand together on an outdoor pedestal at Naqš-i Rustam,\(^78\) or the two columns, each on its own stepped pedestal, that stand behind another pedestal at Bishapur; the latter ensemble has been interpreted as a votive monument.\(^79\)

Excavations of Parthian sites have uncovered numbers of statues and figurines of men and women, of various sizes and of various materials (marble, metal and clay); these figures have been explained as connected with the fravəši- cult, and two rooms excavated at the old Arsacid capital, Nisa, appear to have contained numerous figurines of royal ancestors of the Arsacid house.\(^80\) Near these structures stood the buildings where Arsacid kings and noblemen were buried.\(^81\) It appears the Armenians, too, had images of their ancestors; Agathangelos wrote: Ed te ści anu urvan u urvan c i pšačx ał še an rir c ał qeši k c, an ran c un tūslov, an ran pšar c an u un an tūslov c e an, an an ašašin c e an, an an lāk c, an rir c an.\(^82\)
Isidore of Charax, writing in the last decade of the first century B.C., describes in his *Parthian Stations* the city of Asak, where the *pyr athamniston* 'immortal fire' of the Arsacids burned, and continues:

> ParthySne, skhoinoi 25, hē aulan: Parthaunisa hē polis apo skhoinoi 6: entha basilikai taphai 'thence to Parthyene it is 25 skhoinoi [50 parasangs], with its defile. After six skhoinoi is Parthaunisa, the city; in it are the royal graves.'

The third-century Latin writer Justin, citing Pompeius Trogus, a historian who flourished ca. A.D. 5, writes that the Persians (i.e., probably the Iranians generally) exposed their dead to be devoured by birds or dogs, the bare bones then being covered with earth.

Casualties of the late Parthian period have been found in Nisa and Sogdia, and glazed ceramic sarcophagi have been excavated; a form of burial in communal tombs were hypogeae rooms reached by staircases. Both Achaemenid and Sasanian monarchs were buried in tombs, although no archaeological evidence of such tombs for the latter period has yet come to light, and Sasanian laws of the fifth century prescribed severe penalties for interment of corpses in the earth.

In Armenia, there is archaeological evidence for the burial of the dead in sarcophagi, in hypogeae tombs and in funerary towers. Literary sources refer to several royal necropoli, and a mediaeval polemicist attacked the *Awyanti* 'Children of the Sun' for exposing their dead on rooftops.

The scant evidence for exposure, which is the pre-eminently Zoroastrian method of disposal of corpses, need not provoke scepticism as to the orthodoxy of the Armenians, Parthians, or, indeed, the Achaemenians. Exposure by its very nature is not intended to leave any traces, except where the remains are placed in *abgān*, as in Central Asia or Sasanian Fārs, and at a time when Zoroastrianism was the state religion there was no need to build enclosures to protect the creation of Ahura Mazda from defilement by infidels who might move or bury the corpses; the erection of *dakhamas*, and the exposure of corpses on Armenian rooftops rather than stony mountainsides, should be viewed as responses to persecution rather than as the recrudescence of a faith mysteriously absent in the pre-Sasanian centuries.

Coffins of glazed ceramic, shaped like an elongated tub, plates fitted side by side over the top, have been found at a graveyard of the...
Hellenistic period northeast of Vakaršapât (Ejmacin). Similar graves have been found at Șawan from the seventh-sixth centuries B.C.; one grave excavated at Äyešât, near Vakaršapât, of a cromlech type characteristic of the Bronze Age, was found to contain a Hellenistic belt-buckle. Various objects were buried with the dead, perhaps for their use in the next world. At one site near Dalîn cathedral dated to the latter half of the first century B.C., a body was found interred in a ceramic vessel with beads of glass, bronze, stone and gold, various ceramic pots and two seals, one showing a battle between a hoplite and a man on foot, the other depicting a fight between two hoplites. Mass sacrifices were carried out at the funerals of great men, presumably in accordance with a belief that dead slaves and animals continued to serve their master in the next world. Xorenan'i relates that at the funeral of Artašēs I bazum kotorack linein čat awrini het'anosac 'there were many killings, according to the custom of the heathens'.

The Armenians from Iran, for the Arm. word for a sarcophagus is tapan, a loan-word from Mfr., and a possible Chorasmian form meaning 'ossuary', tpsnwk, is found on an ossuary from Toq-Qal'a dated A.D. 616-711. The two common Arm. words for a grave or tomb, gerezman and širin, may also be loan-words of Mfr. origin. The former, from a Mfr. form of the term conceived by Zarathuštra himself for paradise, gãš-šdēdana 'House of Song', is found in the description provided by Agathanges of the Armenian Arsacid royal necropolis at Ani in Damsak, where there was a temple to Aramazd: t'agavoranak krayesman hangstoc 'Ac gerezman'c t'agavoran'c Hayoc 'St. Gregory went to the fortress of Ani, to the royally-inhabited abodes of the resting places, of the tombs of the kings of Armenia.' Although Gregory destroyed the temple of Aramazd, he dared not touch the tombs of the Arsacids, for they still stood when Meružan Aroruni led the Sasanian king Šabūhr II to despoil them after an unsuccessful raid on the Orontid necropolis at Ani. The tombs at Ani must have been strongly built and still accorded great reverence, for the Persians were able to pry open that of Sanatruk, and the Armenians hastened to ransom back those bones which the Persians had taken away, in the apparent belief that the p'akc 'glory' of the nation still inhered in them. The invocation of King Tigranes I cited above draws a clear connection between p'akc and the ancestors, and, according to P'awstos Buzand, it had been indeed the stated intention of the Persians to rob the Armenians of their x'arzaz-a- (Av. 'glory') by ascending with the bones of their kings.

Christianity, so often implacably hostile to the manifestations of Zoroastrian piety, cannot have objected on principle to the veneration of human relics, in view of its own cultic practices involving reliquaries, which were conveniently produced and installed by the Illuminator in various newly-consecrated sanctuaries; the most prominent example is the provision of relics of St. John the Baptist and St. Athenogenes to the Christian sanctuary established on the site of the temple of Vahagn and Astlik at Aštîzât. And indeed in Christian times the Arsacid kings continued to be buried at Ani, whilst St. Gregory and his descendants were buried at nearby T'ordan in Damash, the former site of the temple of Barumân; other were interred at T'll in Ekešac a short distance to the east, the former site of the temple of Manê. The bones of the kings from Ani recovered by the Arm. nakarars were re-interred in A.D. 364 at Ašk, on the slopes of Mount Aragac in the present-day Arm. S.S.R. It is recalled that a figurine of an eagle was found on this mountain, and this indicates that some form of worship may have been offered on the mountain in pre-Christian times. The Yazidi Kurds also have tombs there. Mountains such as Anaz Masik (modern Ararat, Tk. Ağri dağ), which faces Aragac over the plain of Ararat, were sacred to the Armenians, and one remembers also the assertion of Herodotus that the Persians of Achaemenian times worshipped Zeus (i.e., Ahura Mazda) on the tops of mountains. The highest peak of the Bargûsat chain in the district of Zangezur, Arm. S.S.R., still bears the name Aramazd.
had been worshipped on lofty Aragac as at Ani, and the memory of such cultic similarities influenced the 

naxarars in choosing a new site for a royal tomb.

The tomb at Aras is a hypogeum, similar in plan to another tomb 

of the fourth century A.D. at Mijileya, Syria, and to the Parthian tombs mentioned above. A crudely executed bas-relief in the tomb depicts a naked man spearing a boar. A crudely executed bas-relief in the tomb depicts a naked man spearing a boar. 112 A hunting scene is shown also on a pre-Christian funerary monument from Dura, and scenes of two animals fighting, or of an armed man, probably a hunter, on horseback, are shown with other scenes from everyday life on tombstones of the sixteenth century from the Sisian region in Armenia. The boar was a symbol of the yazata Petragnas, Arm. Vahagn, and was represented on the royal seal of the Arm. Arsacids, 115 the hunt was the chief joy of Ir. and Arm. kings, 116 and its depiction on the grave monuments of king and commoner down the long centuries probably expresses hope in the pleasures of the afterlife.

At Parak, a village on the road from Erivan to Ejmiacin, two funerary structures, called 'towers' by the archaeologist who excavated them, were found within 1.5 km of one another. They are of hard, un-mortared tufa blocks, and consist of two parts: a ten-sided, convex platform about 10.5 m in diameter, with the base of what seems to have been a tower, about 6.5 m in diameter, at its centre. One of the structures contained Parthian, Armenian and Roman coins of the first century B.C., and there is a fragmentary inscription in Aramaic. There is a grave in the earth itself, at the bottom of the 'tower', which appears to have been destroyed in ancient times and clumsily rebuilt. 117 The original purpose of the structure is not certain, although the building may be compared to the tower tombs of Palmyra, nor is it known when the Aramaic inscription was made. But the grave seems to be from the first century B.C., and it is unlikely that another grave was desecrated in the process, for as we have seen, the Armenians of that period would have been loath to incur the wrath of the fravasias.

Draxt and döoxk: The Next World

The Christian Arm. words for Heaven and Hell, draxt and döoxk, are both loan-words from Mr.: draxt comes from Mr. draxt 'tree' and means 'garden, Paradise', 118 while döoxk 'hell', with the plural

tantum -k, 119 comes from Mr. döox 'the worst existence, hell'. 120 In Arm. popular belief, hell is a pit of seven levels where the damned soul is whipped by Satan with a leaden scourge, worms crawl in and out of his mouth, and he is roasted on spits. He clamps about from one torture to the next in shoes of iron. 121

The Zoroastrian Arzay Wiraz Nāmag divides hell into four levels; Dante's Inferno has nine, and both offer a rich variety of torments, each of the latter corresponding to the sins for which the soul has been condemned. In Ch. 19 of the Arzay Wiraz Nāmag, a sodomite is shown with a snake plunging between his bowels and emerging from his mouth. In an Arm. MS illumination of A.D. 1601, Dives, the rich man, is shown with serpents entwined about his naked body in hell while Lazarus lies at Abraham's bosom in Paradise, 123 and in another MS of the sixteenth century the same proverbial rich man is shown with two snakes entwined about his legs, rising with their jaws wide open and their backs arched at his shoulders, to either side of his head. 124 The latter image is reminiscent of the depiction of Nergal at Hatra and of Żahhāk in mediaeval Persian MSS of the Sānāme, and may go back to early iconographic conceptions of the ruler of the underworld in Armenia. 125 In other Arm. MSS, hell is shown as a serpent encircling darkness, and the personification of hell is a serpent which an angel stabs with a spear on Judgement Day. 126 Demons were believed to take the form of serpents in Armenia; the Arsacid king Pap (mid-fourth century) is described by Fawwaz Buzand as having serpents sprouting from his shoulders, and this image of demons possession accords well with both the Nergal and Żahhāk figures described above and with the Zoroastrian condemnation and punishment in hell of sodomy, for Pap is referred to several times as a homosexual, first in his youth and later as king of Armenia: Sow evil aćać, evil spree can, społukliw, spćütłw amberagutlcwun ev zanamagutlcwun, ev zarrali garšütłwun; bavc kari saragutłwun ... Iak m̀w ev spćütłw am_ev aćać jwrovć awkcw spitakć, zì patealkć. Sin zgacyć ołamakć, ev čapatśin i verav pataşekn Papy, m̀nces tîf enšmancunc ev na 'Papy was suckled and weaned, and he committed sins, whoring and the filth of homosexuality, and bestiality, and repulsive obscenity, but especially homosexuality ... . His mother, Pčaranjem, entered his room once whilst he was
engaged in sodomy, and his mother beheld and saw with her own eyes that white snakes had entwined themselves about the feet of the chairs, and were crawling over the youth Pap as he lay in bed, 127 and the candle is called mehlok 'lamp of the deceased'.

For all the chilling forms of the demons on earth and the similar forms they assume in hell, the Armenian conception of Heaven, or at least of the afterlife, does not seem to have been very much brighter in many cases, and reflects the archaic belief in a dim, chthonian place of shades. Down to the end of the nineteenth century, Armenians put lighted candles in the hands of the newly departed, for the next world was dark; if one over the age of ten died, a candle would be left to burn at the spot of the washing of the corpse for eight days to light the soul’s path to the next world. 130 It was believed that the dead lived beneath the earth, and on the seventh and fortieth days after death, as well as on other mehlok (‘of the dead’, gen. pl.) days at regular intervals, cakes and drinks called hoghac ‘bread of the soul’ and hoghac ‘goblet of the soul’ would be distributed to various members of the community, particularly priests and the poor, and also placed on the grave. 131 These meals combined the fulfillment of religious obligations with charity towards needy members of the community and may be compared to the gahbâr festivals celebrated for the dead, and to the zoroastrians celebrated in Zoroastrian communities. 132 The six gahbâr (or seven, including New Year’s Day) are festivals celebrating the chief creations of Ahura Mazda, and Zoroastrians established pious foundations to celebrate at a gahbâr service rituals in memory of an ancestor, the offerings of food made during the religious ceremony to be distributed later to members of the community. 133 It was probably under the influence of the older Zoroastrian practice that Armenians developed the belief that the spirits of the dead return to earth five times yearly, on the eve of the nawakatik festivals of the Church, 134 and must be given offerings of candles and incense; 135 the candle is called yofli ğrag ‘lamp of the deceased’.

The souls of their ancestors, the Armenians believed, participated in the affairs of the living, and could take on visible form, like the serpent-demons of hell mentioned above. The soul was seen as a human form smaller than a living body but the same size regardless of the age at which a corporeal owner had died. The soul could also appear as a ball of light, or an inanimate object, or as the swaddling clothes of an infant. It could assume a variety of animal forms, appearing as a cat, wolf, bear, donkey, naked man or black dog. 137 Before entering the Crow’s Rock at Lake Van, the Armenian epic hero Mher offered a gatarag ‘Divine Liturgy’ 138 to his ancestors. 139 Ancestors warn the heroes of Sasun in their dreams of events to come. 140

Armenian concepts of the next world for all but royalty, who would, presumably, have been assured of good hunting, seem so bleak that it is little wonder the ancestors required the continuous attentions of the living and enjoyed interfering in the affairs of the world they had left. Offerings placed upon graves, restrictions against spilling water on the ground at night, and, of course, burial itself indicate that the belief in a subterranean kingdom of the dead persisted through
In Armenia and the Caucasus, oaths of denial involved the dog. The mediaeval Armenian writer Mšitšar Goš in his Datastanagirč noted various ways in which ayləxakc 'other peoples' made such oaths, including azən zətoj unel 'taking a dog by the tail'; the modern Ossetes swear by killing a cat or dog over the graves of the dead, and the Ingush swear over the bones of a dog brought to a sacred spot. The rituals of oath-taking described above seem to have in common the implied sense that the dog represents the powers of the next world and will take away the soul of the swearer if he tell a lie, or else that the dog is an intermediary through which the souls of the dead may be called as witnesses to the oath taken.

Torkc and Spandaranet.

In Armenia many of the funerary practices we have described are identical to those documented in Zoroastrian Iran, and post similar problems. Some seem to predate Zoroastrianism in both countries, and are to be viewed as originating from the distinct heritages of the two peoples rather than reflecting historical ties: the significance of the dog in both cultures is an example of such a case, traceable in Armenia apparently to a Mesopotamian cultural milieu before the Median conquest, and in Iran to the remote Indo-Iranian past. In other cases, practices which seem but uneasily reconcilable with Zoroastrian orthopraxy, such as burial, may nonetheless be part of a common culture, for we have noted the fact that the Armenians use an Iranian word, tapan 'sarcophagus', and the tomb at Ałcč bears resemblance to a type found in Parthian Iran. In other cases, the threads of a common Zoroastrian faith are more evident, as in Arm. hro(r)t-ic 'of the frevašés', and on the strength of such evidence we have sought to establish further details of the frevašči-cult in Armenia which could otherwise be dismissed as coincidental.

Problems found in interpretation of Greek equivalents of Iranian yazatas, and of the gender ascribed to the yazatas by Zoroastrians themselves, are encountered in similar form in both Iran and Armenia. Spandaranet was not, one thinks, considered male, although the name in the Arm. Bible renders Greek Dionysos in Maccabees. The Demeter of ancient Armenian temples was perhaps another yazata, yet the possibility of confusion or error on the part of an ancient writer must be kept in...
mind. After all, Herodotus identifies the male Mithra with the unquestionably feminine Aphrodite in a passage on Persian religion which is otherwise considered a reliable description of Achaemenian beliefs and practices. 151

Because of such problems, both of archaic survivals and of uncertainty in the precise identification of a given divinity, it is hard to tell whether the cult of Tork, Angekey as the divinity connected with death and the underworld was displaced or otherwise affected by the Zoroastrian yazata Spandaramet. There is no evidence of the expansion of the cult of Tork beyond its ancient centre at Angek Tun at the remote western edge of Armenia, although the Armenian translators of the Bible knew enough of Tork to equate Nergal with him. We have noted also the similarity of the image of King Pap in P*awston Ruzand, cited above, to the bas-relief of Nergal at Hatra, and P*awston remarks that Pap had been dedicated at birth to the 'demons' by his mother, P*afanjem. It is unlikely that this baleful, hateful image, connected besides to sodomy, an activity considered a serious sin in Zoroastrianism, 152 can have been assimilated into the Good Religion. It would appear that the concept of sandaramet-k, the personification of the underworld, was introduced into Armenia from southwestern Iranian usage in Achaemenian times, when the cult of Tork was prominent—for it was at this cult centre that the Orontid necropolis was founded—and that the yazata Spandaramet was arrived separately, the name coming from NW Mzr. or even Av. directly. No attempt was made to suppress the cult of Tork, though, as it seems, and it probably survived in Angek, whilst his temple itself would presumably have been dedicated to the cult of the fravashis of the Orontid kings, whom the Arsacids appropriated as their own ancestors. In Iran, too, cults varying from the heterodox to the demonic (from a Zoroastrian point of view) flourished through Sasanian times, despite the periodic persecution of their followers by Kartir and others. One recalls that the naxarar structure of Armenian and Parthian society, a flexible and often volatile alliance of local dynasts, was ill-suited to a centralised religious bureaucracy capable of such inquisitions, and greater accommodation of the heterodox was necessary.

The Winged Figure

The winged ring symbol encircling a human figure is shown on coins of the Persian satrap Tiribazos. 153 The torso is Greek in inspiration, naked and muscular, unlike the forms of the symbol found at Persepolis or Assyria. Opinions are divided as to the meaning of the winged figure in Iran, where scholars have argued variably that it may have represented x'arenah-, Ahura Mazda, or the fravashi-. The symbol is found in Armenia also on a fragmentary bronze throne-leg from Van, probably from the Achaemenian period; 154 in this case, the human head and torso are clothed and the posture is stiff, as in the examples from Persepolis and Assyria.

The coins of an Achaemenian satrap and the throne leg are the sole attestations of this puzzling symbol in the Armenian area. We have argued that the two eagles and star on the royal crown of the Artaxiads represent p*ark, 'glory, x'arenah-' and baxt, 'fortune', 155 and the portrait-like quality of the coin of Tiribazos would indicate that the figure is meant to represent either Zeus/Ahura Mazda or the fravashi- of Tiribazos himself. We have seen the centrality of the fravashi-cult in the references by the king of Armenia to his naxnik-k 'ancestors' and in the apparent continuation of the Zoroastrian gehaensburs through the Christian nawastik-k feasts and their rites and offerings to the departed. The daimon of the Persian king is referred to by Classical writers, 156 and by a Parthian king, Phraates (VII), in a Greek inscription at Susa in which he invokes his own daimon; 157 this may be a Greek translation of Ir. fravashi-. Kinship and patronage were crucial to concepts of social status and right in Iran and Armenia, and the establishment of genealogy, whether real or spurious, is a continuous theme in epigraphy and other sources from the Achaemenian era down to the early Christian Armenian historians, who were burdened with the task of establishing the antiquity and descent of the particular naxarar under whose patronage they worked.

It seems, therefore, logical to expect that such claims of lineage were to be reflected in iconography, for the temporal and social prestige of one's ancestors blended well with the supernatural power and religiously ceremonial significance of the fravashi. Depiction of one's fravashi or x'arenah on a coin or bas-relief would more directly
serve the interests of hereditary kingship than an image of Ahura Mazda. The latter is often invoked by Darius at Behistun, and the Armenian Arsacid necropolis was located at Ani, cult centre of Aramazd. Yet He is the creator of all things and god of all the world, perhaps too general in His influence and state to represent a ruler, albeit the King of Kings, whose primary claim to power was that he was an Achaemenian, or an Orontid, or an Arsacid. It was, rather, the family daimôn or personal fraṃsi that such a ruler might be expected to invoke in assertion of his right to rule.

The coin of Tiribazus, if indeed it represents his fraṃsi, presents us yet again with the curious blend of Hellenic and Iranian tradition which pervades our sources on ancient Armenian culture: Spandaramet and the Bacchae of Euripides, and the Hellenistic mask of Bacchus. The naked, muscular figure rises from the archaic symbol in an unexpected harmony of Greek art and Iranian religious iconography. As Hellenistic art forms went East, the Oriental god Dionysos, Spandaramet to the Armenians, went West with his kakçaw (kakçaw) dance:

From the fields of Lydia and Phrygia, fertile in gold, I travelled first to the sun-smitten Persian plains, The walled cities of Bactria, the harsh Median country, Wealthy Arabia, and the whole tract of the Asian coast Where mingled swarms of Greeks and Orientals live In vast magnificent cities; and before reaching this, The first city of Hellas I have visited, I had already, in all those regions of the east, Performed my dances ... --Euripides, Bacchae, 13-21
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CHAPTER 11

Nergal

The Babylonians worshipped a god named Ne-iri-gal (Sumerian 'Power of the great house'); his was the planet Mars, and he was the ruler of the underworld (Babyl. Arallii) together with his consort Nin-ki-gal (pronounced also Eresh-ki-gal), whose name means Lady of Kigallu ('the great earth'). Ne-iri-gal (Nergal) appears to have been at first a Sun-god; perhaps because the Sun was seen to enter the West and pass beneath the earth in the evening, or else because of the deadly power of the Sun's burning rays, Nergal came to be regarded as the ruler of Hell. He was also a figure of strength and power, hence his association with warlike Mars and his later equation with the Greek god Herakles.

Nergal was the patron-deity of the city of Cuthah, called in Babylonian magical texts 'the assembly-place of ghosts', presumably because of Nergal's association with the world of the dead. In the second book of Kings Ch. 17 is recorded the conquest of the Hebrew kingdom of Samaria by Shalmaneser, king of Assyria, who brought settlers from Mesopotamia and Syria to displace the Israelites from their cities; amongst them were the men of Cuth or Cuthah, who worshipped Nergal (2 Kings 17.30): Heb. נגאל; LXX Κουθ ἔποιεσαν τὸν Νεργαλ; Arm. Նէրգալ. In the early centuries of the Christian era, Nergal was worshipped at Palmyra, Dur Europos, and Hatra. A relief of Nergal and his consort Atargatis from Hatra of the mid-second century A.D. shows a fearsome and warlike bearded man in Parthian belted tunic and trousers. In his right hand he grasps a double-headed axe, and snakes spring from his shoulders. He has a beard and moustache, and there is a scorpion over his left shoulder. On an altar of a man named ENZYW from Hatra, possibly an Iranian, there is shown a figure who clutches several serpents in his left hand and a double-headed axe in his right. It has been suggested that this is a depiction of Nergal, lord of the
underworld, who is bidden to remember the soul of KNZYW. On a Sogdian ossuary from Biya-Naiman is depicted a figure of a moustached and bearded man holding a sword in his left hand and an axe in his right, corresponding closely to a similar figure in a graffito from Dura Europos. Both fit the description of the figure of a Harrānian idol identified as Saturn by the fourteenth-century Arab writer ad-Dimīqi.9

The double-headed axe wielded by the figures described above appears to have been a constant iconographic attribute of Nergal in all the various cultures where he was known, although Nergal is not the only divinity known to have been depicted holding an axe. The figure described as Saturn probably represents Nergal, although the axe in the representations from Sogdia and Dura has only one cutting edge. It may represent the destructive power of time and age (hence Saturn, the symbol of the two latter concepts) and the ultimate dominion of the kingdom of death over all that is mortal. In Harrān, indeed, Nergal, the god of the underworld, pestilence, plague and war, ruler of the utukki limmuṭī (the seven evil winds), was regarded as the twin and adversary of the good moon-god, Sin.11 Any figure thus regarded as associated with destruction and death would be considered demonic by Zoroastrians even more than by adherents of other faiths, for the cosmic dualism that is central to Zoroastrian thought rejects utterly all that is not good and life-giving as serving Aŋgra Mainyu rather than Aḥura Mazda. It is possible, therefore, that the image of Žahāčā (Av. Aži Dahāka) in mediaeval Persian MSS of the Šānāme and the terra cotta figurine from Sogdia we have discussed12 with snakes sprouting from their shoulders, was adopted from Mesopotamian images of Nergal.13

Angel

One of the chief divinities of the Urartians was the Hurrian god Tešub, whom the Urartians called Teišeba, and after whom were named the capital city of Tušpa (modern Van, after Biaina, the Urartians' name for their country; the district of Van is still called Tosp by the Armenians, however) and the eastern town of Teišebaini (Karmir Blur, near Erivan).

Teišeba was a weather god, mighty and heroic, like the North Syrian (H)adad or the Asianic storm god Tarḫunta to be discussed below. Zoroastrian Armenians equated Teišeba with their yazata Vahagn, symbolic of might and victory, and the exploits of Teišeba were attributed to Vahagn.14 By the late ninth century B.C., Urartu's cultic observances were under the strong influence of the country's chief political adversary, Assyria,15 and it is likely that the cult of Nergal was introduced into the Arm. highlands then, for a bronze statuette of Teišeba shows the god clutching a two-headed ax, symbol of the Mesopotamian god.16 In Hellenistic times, the two-headed axe is a constant feature in images of Jupiter Dolichenus, whose cult spread westwards from the city of Dolikhe in Commagene, a kingdom on Armenia's southwestern border.17

It was noted above that the Arm. translators of the Septuagint rendered Greek Eργελ, Heb. Nergal as Arm. Անգեղ. Heb. Nergal and Arm. Անգեղ may be connected, through the loss of initial N- as in the Greek, and the substitution of -r- by -n- in the Arm. form. But the development of Arm. Անգեղ is not certain. The latter name is found in the Arm. province of Arm. Tun, identified by Adone5 with the Mittite Ingalava. The name of the province means 'House of Angel', Angel being the gen. sing. (comp. astā 'star', gen. sing. asta, etc.18). Aside from the Biblical acc. sing. Անգեղ, which would imply a nom. sing. Angel, the name is attested in the nominative in the so-called 'Primary History' attributed to the seventh-century Arm. historian Sebōš: By ordinis Arm. Bagaratos yazafangoc'ın ziafangoc'ın wāns ivarenc' in kolsams arewmtic', syrinoc' և Angle tun: wāns ni koc'ec'aw Bagarat cw Angle, xor i žamanakin ysvamk asz barbarosac'ın astuc koc'ec' և 'And the sons of Bagarat inherited their inheritances in the regions of the West, that is, Angle Tun: for Bagarat was also called Angle, whom at that time the nation of the barbarians called a god (astuc).19 The author of the 'Primary History' claims to have got his information from a Syrian writer, Mar Abas of Mouvān.20 and we find in Syriac two names for the province, Ingilia and Beth Angela,21 the latter corresponding closely to the Arm. with Syr. bethArm. tun 'house'. The identification of Angel as a god is significant, for it links the Biblical reference to Angle Tun. The genealogy, through which the author seeks to connect the Bagratid house with the line of King Zariadres (Arm. Zarch) of Sophene (Arm. Cq'x), is probably as spurious as Movās Koresauci's attempt to trace the descent of his Bagratid patron to King David of Israel. But the Bagratids were a dynasty of enormous power and importance, and their
presumed association with Angel Tun indicates that a memory of great prestige and importance still lingered about the place.

The fortress of Angê, centre of the province of Angel Tun in Sophene, lies on the upper reaches of the Western Tigris, north of Amida and south of Arsamassata; it has been identified with Carcethiocerta (Arm. Arak’t’lakert), capital of the Orontids of Sophene. If indeed we may identify Angel with Nergal, the presence of whose cult on the Arm. plateau appears to be attested from Urartean times, as seen above, and if further Angel Tun was a centre of that cult, it seems logical to expect that the Orontid royal necropolis would have been located there, for Nergal was a god of power and also the ruler of the underworld.

Pavastos Buzand, writing probably in the mid-fifth century A.D., tells us that Angel Tun had been a ostan ar’kuni...vas va’a ‘royal capital...very long ago’ (P’b V.18), and relates how the Arm. traitor Meružan Arcrumi guided the Sassanian King Šăbaru II to the city: ...ev inkśank i Cop’s mec ar’sawec’in. Ev and śin berdk xor afín: ev šr xor oc karac’in aınul. Ev gayin pah arkanšin šurj Šangu samur ber’dawn, or Šangè tann gayarʃin: wi and śin buzum Hayoc t’agavorac’ n gersæmk širman’ n arânc Arsakuneac: basum gamj št’ereal manac’ seal kavin i nâmec’ n i huc’ Žamanakac’ hetè. Ĭcuan pah arkin ber’dawn: apa ibrew oc’ karâin aínul vasn amrut’ean tekwyn, t’ošun ev gayin. ‘And they [the Persians] invaded Greater Cop’k. And there were fortresses there which they took, and there was [one] which they were unable to take. And they came and laid siege about the strong fortress of Angê, which is in the province of Angel Tun, for there were the tombs of the graves of many Arm. kings, Arsacid men; there were many treasures stored up remaining there from the ancestors, since ancient times. They went and besieged the fortress. Then, when they were unable to take it because of the impregnability of the place, they left it and departed. The Persians continued, according to Pavastos, to the province of Daranaki north of Cop’k, where they sacked the Arsacid necropolis at Ani, site of the sanctuary of Aramazd; his reference to the Arsacids in the passage cited above is undoubtedly an anachronism, perhaps fostered by the Arsacids themselves. In Arsacid times, we find a high official with the Iranian name of Drastamat’ as prince of Angel Tun and treasurer of Cop’k; his seat at the royal banqueting table of King Aršak II was

above that of all the other nakarars: an indication that although Angel Tun was no longer a royal capital, it still enjoyed considerable prestige under the Orontids’ successors, the Arsacids.

The ruins of the Arm. monastery of Angêšav-Yan’k lie 2 km east of the present-day village of Engil (recently renamed Dünneş), Turkey, on the Engil or Hoqap Su (Tr. ‘River’). According to a legend recorded by Yovhann̄es Alțiparmazakan in 1814 and cited by M. Mirakorenian in a travelogue published in 1884-5, the apostle Thaddeus went to Angê during his mission to Hayoc’ Jor, and found a pagan temple there with 1000s in it. He tried to build a church on the spot, but the demons destroyed by night whatever the saint wroght by day. The Virgin Mary then appeared and advised him to set up a nakśk’ar (‘Cross-stone’). He did so, and the stone with its holy sign banished the demons. There is an old nakśk’ar in the ruins which is reputed by local tradition to be that of St Thaddeus. A MS of the Gospel from the fourteenth century bears a dedication to St Georg of Angê, so perhaps the church was dedicated to that saint.

A bas-relief found at the site shows Daniel amongst the lions, and is similar in style and theme to the fourth-century Christian Arsacid tomb at Ašc’181 on the slopes of Mt. Aragac, where the ransomed bones of the Arm. kings that Šăbaru II had taken from Ani in Daranaki were re-interred (cf. P’b IV.24 above, and MX III.27).

It seems likely, then, that the cult of Nergal had been adopted by the Urartians from their Mesopotamian neighbors, and had been assimilated into the cult of the prominent divinity, Nēbēša, whose worship was second only to that of the supreme god, Hald. The cult of the latter may have survived down to Achaemenian times; King Darius the Great in his inscription at Behistun mentions an Armenian with the theophoric name of Haldita, and the cult of Hald was probably absorbed gradually into that of Aramesh in Achaemenian times as the Persians and other Iranians colonised Armenia and the Armenians themselves adopted Iranian beliefs and ways. But the shrine of Angel stood through Orontid times, and it is probable that the tradition concerning St Thaddeus contains at least the grain of truth that the Christian church—apparently very ancient, to judge from the similarity of its decoration to that of Ašc’—was built on the site of an older pagan temple to Nergal, called in Arm. Angel. Our investigation does not end here, though, for the divinity worshipped at Angel Tun had another name, too: Tork’.
Tork

In the same chapter where Movses Xorenaci presents his spurious Israelite genealogy of the Bagratids referred to above, King Vakarsak, progenitor of the Armenian Arsacids, is depicted anachronistically as establishing the nanxaradsone of the various regions of Armenia. Movses was a scholar of the euhemerist school, and believed that the gods were in fact historical personages of the past whom later generations had deified. Thus, he refers to the 'sons' of Vahagn as being named Vahuni by Vakarsak after their father and entrusted with the care of the temples (Arm. zmahonic). Movses relates also: isk zavr xozarayc ev barjr ev tep sakic, xoroan ev dznahayac, i zawak Pask'amy, i Haykakay t'orn, Tork cav anu koc'ec'eal: or vam afawel zahadimut'een ann jayvin Angjeley, vit'xari hasakaw ev uvo, hastat' kusakal arowtic: ev yeresac' anpitanut'een koc'ec evan ev Angei tun. Bayo' et'ek kamis, stem ev es yalaec nor, anya ev p'ec'un, orp'ec Parsik' cavn fostomay Saceki, harewr ev k'ecan p'koc oyzi azen unel. K'ensi kari izm anyamar t'wein nna erg benic vam uzelus'een ev arseay lineoyun: orun oc' Erekley ev oc' Sacekiin ymar ev ayes groyc 'k's. K'ensi ergcin nna burh harkanel zorjzac'ar vimaec' jelauk' ur oc' goyr genuti'ivn, ev cea'cel st kanac' mec ev p'ec'or: ev k'ereukenagmb' ev kasel orpse taxak, ev grel nyanpe'sekangmb' ivrovk' arcwic us'ay apysicis. Ev yezer covm Pondois dipel nevac t'snameac', dima i versey: ev i nakal noc'a i jom ihwev saperzez ut'c, ev sa oc' t'sanwac noc'a: atnu, azen, vame brenalve, ev jge skni; ev i sastik patafinac' Jurc' enkimk maw'oc' sakawk', ev ambarjum aleac', or i patafarac' Jurc'c, var ez macac' eal nawan bazun makoan. Oh! kari i afavelsa, ayl ev afavelsac' afavelsa. Bayo' k'ez yi s'k. K'ensi Er ardarev sastik havor, ev apyseiac' truc'ac' arinci. 'And he [Vakarsak] appointed as ruler (kusakal) of the West a man of deformed appearance, tall, crusie and flat-nosed, with deep-set eyes and a fierce expression, of the offspring of Pask'am, grandson of Haykak MX I:23: Bayo' xangec tunn asf noyn patmacig i Pask'amy unemn i Haykakay t'orn' linei 'But the same historian (i.e., Mar Abas, see above) says that the house of Anga comes from a certain Pask'am, grandson of Haykak', called Tork by name, who on account of his extreme hideousness they called Angjeley, mighty in stature and strength, and by reason of the ugliness of his face (Valarisk) called the name of that people the house of Ange. But if you will, I too, lie concerning him, inappropriately and uselessly, as the Persians say about Rostom Sagicik that he had the strength of 120 elephants. For the songs of words to him seemed very awkward concerning his strength and courage, and these tales (groyc'oc's) to him are not comparable to (those) of Samson, Heracles or Sagic. For they sang of him that with his hands he grasped boulders of granite in which there was no fissure, and he would crack them into small and large pieces according to his desire. And he scraped them with his nails and formed them into tablets, and in the same way with his nails he wrote (i.e., sketched) eagles and similar things. And when enemy ships came to the shores of the sea of Pontus he turned on them, and when they had moved about eight stadia out to the depths he could not reach them. He took, they say, boulders shaped like hills and threw them after (the ships), and not a few ships sank because of the cleft of the waters, and the waves rising from the splash carried the other ships many miles. Oh, this is a fable indeed, but a fable of fables. But what is it to you, for in truth he was very powerful, and was worthy of such tales! (MX II:8).

Xorenaci resorts to a folk etymology, ange 'ugly' (privative an- and gei 'beauty'), in order to explain why Tork should be the progenitor of the people of Ange Tun; as we have seen, the etymology is certainly spurious, for Ange was a god in his own right, and probably Nergal. Tork is also linked to the eponymous ancestor of the Armenians, Hayk, through Haykak, and it is clear that Xorenaci is relating fragments of an epic narrative about Tork which mentions his ugliness, ferocity and strength. It is unlikely that Xorenaci has derived his story from the Homeric legend of Polyphemus, as Thomson suggests, for the historian speaks of his account as an afavels 'legend', a word he uses frequently elsewhere in citing native Arm. traditions and epic tales. Xorenaci also contrasts the song (Arm. erg) of Tork to the legends of the Hebrews, Greeks and Persians (Samson, Heracles and Rustam, the latter properly called by Xorenaci Sagic 'Gaka') as though to stress its Arm. origin. The ugliness of Tork would be apparent to any who beheld the horrid image of Nergal described above; Tork shares also Nergal's strength and bellicosity.
Añocó recognized Tork₆ as the Arm. form related to the name of the Asianic Tarhunda, weather god of the Luwians, whose name comes from a root tarh- meaning 'to be able (intrans.)' to conquer; to dominate.

The epithet derived from this base, tarhuili 'heroic', is found applied to the storm god of the north Syrians, (H)addad, in a hymn addressed to his sister, Istar. The name of a king of Melitene (modern Malatya, west of Angel Tun), Tarhunazi, contains the base tarh-, as does Tarhuna-/Tarhunabé- the name of a mountain in Hauri (i.e., the southern part of Urartu), so we find forms of the base tarh- used in the region of Armenia and in application to a non-Asianic civility as an epithet. The word survives into the Christian period in the form Trokondé, the name of a general of the Byzantine forces under the emperor Zenon.

In the chapter on the ethnogenesis of the Armenians was discussed the likelihood that the ancestors of the nation were a people of Thracian background who crossed the lands of the Hittites on their long migration to the Arm. plateau, perhaps adopting even their ethnic name, hay 'Armenian' from an older form *matiys- 'Hittite'. Contemporary records called the invaders Munu. The Chronicle of Scenebius Panphili (early fourth century) mentions a young wrestler named Moskhos Kolophônos; in the Armenian translation of the work, which was probably completed in the fifth century, the same passage has Tork₆ substituted for Moskhos: i muntkoy bimazaratik kirin Tork₆os Koherosonac in mays i muntkay i srjanak carin yalterac for the boys in the wrestling fight, only Tork₆os of Kolop in his boyhood was victorious in the battle with the belt (srjanak). Wrestling is one of the most ancient athletic arts in Armenia, and to this day in Armenia and Iran it is through wrestling that the pahlavân ('athlete', pahlav- 'Parthian') displays his strength. The Arm. translator may have seen in the archaic figure of the powerful athlete the image of Tork₆ Angeley, and his hideous and sinister appearance, as described in the tradition related by Xorenac and as depicted at Hatra, would have been considered by Zoroastrians as demonic and antithetical to the Good Religion. The temple at Anq, probably an oracular shrine, Achaeminid period must have hastened further the eclipse of the cult of Tork₆ Angeley, and his hideous and sinister appearance, as described in the tradition related by Xorenac and as depicted at Hatra, would have been considered by Zoroastrians as demonic and antithetical to the Good Religion. The temple at Anq, probably an oracular shrine, was burned by Šabran (see P. Asstmos Buzand above).

Orontid times. It is unsafe to suggest but nonetheless tempting to imagine that the fifth-century Arm. translator remembered in Gk. Moskhos a form of the name Munu by which his ancestors had been called, they who brought the cult of Tork₆ to Angel Tun. One recalls also that the name of the Munu is probably preserved in the Moschyan mountains of Ketarzene mentioned by Claudius Ptolemy, a writer of the second century A.D., in his Geography (V.12).

Aside from the folk legend of St Thaddeus mentioned above, there is no record of any temple at Angel Tun. In Agathangelos, the ruler of Angel Tun is twice referred to, as iškan 'prince' or mek iškan 'great prince', but there is no expedition by St Gregory or by King Tiri-dates III to the province to destroy temples and altars, although all the major cultic shrines of the country seem to have been visited and pillaged. Perhaps the reason for this otherwise inexplicable exception was that the cult of Tork₆ Angeley, unlike those of Baršamin and Aššak, had not been assimilated into Armenian Zoroastrianism. The funerary aspect of Nergal was probably appropriated at an early date, perhaps in the Achaeminid period, by Sandaranax, for the name of the latter divinity is SW Ir. in form and probably therefore antedates the NW Ir. influences which began in the Artašid period. Sandaranax was the vaneat of the earth and thus associated with burial.

As for the aspect of Tork₆ Angeley as a weather god and a symbol of power and victory, it appears that these various functions proper to Nergal, Tēšeba and Tarchuna were appropriated by the vaneat Vahāen, whose cult seems to have grown to overshadow even that of Mhr. The shift of the centre of power in Armenia to the northeast in the Artašid period must have hastened further the eclipse of the cult of Tork₆ Angeley, and his hideous and sinister appearance, as described in the tradition related by Xorenac and as depicted at Hatra, would have been considered by Zoroastrians as demonic and antithetical to the Good Religion. The temple at Anq, probably was allowed by the Arsacids to function, but it is likely that it was maintained out of Zoroastrian reverence for the souls of departed kings merely, Orontids who appear to have been claimed as ancestors by the Arsacids in Armenia, much as the Iranian Arsacids falsely claimed Achaeminan ancestry (see P. Asstmos Buzand above). It did not become a major centre of Zoroastrian worship, it
seems, and did not merit a visit from St Gregory on his mission of de-
struction described by Agathangelos.

Arm. popular tradition appears to have preserved the memory of
Tork⁴ Angelen, however. Step⁵ an Malxasanc⁶, in a note on Tork⁷ in his
tranlation into modern Armenian of Xorenac⁸, relates a legend of
Axaloc⁹ xa (Akhaltsikhe, an Armenian-Georgian town in the far northern pro-
vince of Gugark⁩, not far from the Pontic coast, now in the Georgian SSR)
told him by his father: there was a man who was a captive in the island
of Axaloc⁹ xa. The man saw the

Tork⁴ Angelen, as Thomson suggests, it is unlikely that the Armenians of
Axaloc⁹ xa were, and one notes the persistence in the tale of the epithet
'sunken-eyed'- an appropriate feature for a god who ruled the underworld
and may thus have had a corpse-like appearance. It is likely that the
fragment in Xorenac⁸ and the modernised tale told to Malxasanc⁶ by his
father (the epithet Tork⁴ Angelen with Tk. gën, the Jewish merchant, and
the Turkish kürus coins he has, are all modern features) are probably
parts of the same epic.

Xorenac⁸ relates how Tork⁴ flung boulders in the sea, and how he
scraped pictures of eagles on rock with his fingernails.⁴³ In the Arm.
national epic of Sasun which describes events of the ninth-tenth cen-
turies but contains elements of great antiquity, the hero Mher casts
huge boulders into the river Jaxire, while the mighty Dawit⁴⁴... chaung
aṣav k'arīn u krak ṭvec⁴⁵ 'scratched a stone with his (finger) nail and
made a fire'.⁴⁶ Soviet Arm. scholars have suggested that their ances-
tors saw the petroglyphs of the Stone Age and the scratches left on rock-
faces by the retreating glaciers of the Ice Age and believed that these
mysterious symbols and marks had been made by Tork⁴ Angelen's sharp
fingernails;⁴⁷ it seems fitting that such relics from the dawn of human
culture may have been attributed to a god worshipped at the dawn of Arm.
culture.

13. A. D. H. Bivar, 'Mithra and Mesopotamia,' Mithraic Studies, II (op. cit., n. 7), 286, suggests that the cult of Mergal was introduced to Iran by the Median king Astyages, and that Astyages practiced human sacrifice. If this is so, then the depiction of Zāhpān may reflect Zoroastrian revulsion at this evil heresy; the Sogdian figure is probably apotropaic.
14. See Ch. 6.
16. Ibid., Pl. 15.


22. *HZR*, I, 826 & n.15, 16. See also Ch. 3.

23. *P'BY IV.2h*.


25. *P'BY V.7*: *Isk Drastamat nerk'inin, ov yane Tiranyun Cageworin Hayoc* leal är isyan ten gewatin ov hawatarin ganinc* Angak berdin, ov amemyn berd'ac'nh ark'uni ov i kolmans yawnes: scynpes ov yerktri Cop'alac'c' in Bnabek berdin ganjk'ac' leal sin end novan, ov barj nori i ver o'an zamenyn naaxaraac'c'. 'And Drastamat (was) the eunuch, who in the years of Tiranyun king of Armenia had been the prince of the House of the province and trustee of the treasures of the fortress of Anga and of all the fortresses of the king which were in those parts: likewise the treasures of the land of Cop'H in the fortress of Bnabek were under him, and his pillow was higher than (those of) all the naaxaraac.'


27. Ibid., 226; on Ako* and on burial in pre-Christian Armenia see Ch. 10; on rites of exposure, see Ch. 16.

28. See Ch. 2; on the ending -ita, Arm. -it* in theophoric names, see the n. on Tirit* in our Ch. on Tir.

29. *MX II.8*.

30. Lit. 'holder of a side, religion'; on Arm. koya 'side', see our Ch. on the *K'ustik* and other vestments.

CHAPTER 12

HAWROT AND MAWROT

Amongst the Anēša Spēntas of Zoroastrianism (on these seven, see Ch. 5) there are two who are constantly paired: Haurvatāt 'Wholeness, Health', the guardian of the waters; and Amērtāt 'Life, Immortality', the guardian of plants. 1 Dumézil identified the names of the two in Armenian hawrot-mawrot, a flower used in popular rites on Ascension Day. 2 These rites involve the reading of quatrains called včaks, which are meant to foretell one's fortunes in love. Fr. Ep'r. vardepet Pēจอsoean of the Armenian Mxit'arist congregation of Vienna wrote a study of these in connection with the Ascension Day holiday. 3 We shall examine in this chapter both flower and ritual, drawing attention to those aspects which appear to retain Zoroastrian features.

The cults of certain trees and plants amongst the Armenians may be traced to pre-Christian times, and frequently again reflect Zoroastrian beliefs. We have noted above the practice of divination through the rustling of the leaves of the save-i 'Eastern plane tree', and have seen that reverence for this tree lasted well into the mediaeval period; 4 in Ch. 16 we shall have occasion to discuss the cults of various heliotropic plants and of the poplar tree (Arm. bari) amongst the Arewordik 5 'Children of the Sun', non-Christian Armenians who preserved a multitude of Zoroastrian beliefs and customs, down to recent times. 5 Here will be noted certain trees and plants of particular interest from the point of view of Zoroastrianism; a prodigious amount of material concerning Armenian folk beliefs and uses of plants has been collected by botanists, both in ethnographical studies of their native regions and by consultation of mediaeval medical texts, herbals and astrological or magical works, where numerous plants are described and recommended in the preparation of medicines or potions—indeed, these were often one and the same. 6

Many observers have recorded the rites of Ascension Day. According to M. Abejian, who observed the ritual in his native village of Astapet, the feast is called also caiamôr tôn 'holiday of the Mother of Flowers',
on which girls go out to gather bunches of the flower called hawrot-

calkahawak (see below). Other girls go to 'steal' water from seven springs.

This must be done in silence, and they must neither turn back nor let

their buckets touch the ground. The girls of the Ḫr̥l guk 'water thief'

and calkahawak (flower-gathering) parties meet at evening in a garden

and put the water in a vessel called a hawdir. They then throw in seven

stones, and petals of flowers. Over the top of the hawdir they place a

decorated cross called a vičak (see below). They guard this under the

stars, all night long. The village boys come and try to steal it, but

never succeed. (Mr Edward Tejirian of New York, whose father is from

Diyarbakir, told me that the t̥as 'bucket' was kept on a rooftop on the

eve of Ascension Day. Although in Xarberd the rites of

Arefian) were removed to the roof to protect the participants from Muslim molesta-

tion in recent years (see Ch. 151, here the intention may have been,

rather, to have the t̥as directly under the stars.) The girls sing this

song as they stand guard: ūxc̥ c̥k m̥uc varpet berḁx̥ / Ašorin xaban

jevac̥ x̥k̥ / Aregahn esre ar̥x̥ / Luskan ast̥ar jevac̥ x̥k̥ / Ampervol borol

nḁx̥ x̥k̥ / Cov̥en abrešum t̥el k̥ ašec̥ x̥k̥ / Ast̥er̥ c̥ kovk̥ x̥ar̥ x̥k̥ / Inc̥̥̥ c̥ x̥r̥

kay m̥æj̥̥̥̥ kært̥ x̥k̥ x̥. 'Come, bring a great craftsman,/ Design a beautiful

dress,/ Make its front the Sun/ And its lining of the Moon./ Decorate it

all in clouds,/ Draw thread of silk from the sea,/ Make its buttons of

stars./ And sew all the love there is inside it.' On the next, the

seventh, or the fourteenth day after this, men and women gather together,

a seven-year-old girl wearing a red mask holds the vičak-Cross, and

flowers are poured into the water. Various individuals before this

place personal amulets or other objects in the hawdir; these are now

removed, and a quatrain--also called a vičak--telling each person's for-
tune is read as the objects are extracted. A similar practice is found

amongst the Zoroastrians of Yazd, called moradula 'head-pot' or šokadula

'fate-pot'. In this game, girls gather water at sunset in a pot, put a

token in it, cover it with a Khordeh Avesta overnight, and then on the

morn draw out the objects and sing songs which foretell the 'fate' (pre-

sumably in love) of the owners. Because of the use of water, this prac-
tice was connected with the rain festival of Tīrāln. It seems that

the Arm. ritual is of great antiquity, with wide and ancient associa-
tions, but that it was in ancient times invested with certain Zor.

features. Modern Greeks in June celebrate the nearly identical rite of

klėdonas (from klėdon 'an omen contained in a word', cf. Arm. vičak),

with items dropped in water, flowers, covering of the bucket, which is

kept under the stars, a maiden, silence, and the removal of the objects

with recitation of fortunes in couplets.₁⁻⁸

In the calendar of the Armenian Church, the holiday of Ascension

(Arm. Hambarjman tûn) falls on the fortieth day of the Yinana (lit. 'of

the Fifty'), the fifty days which follow Easter, the Feast of the Resur-

rection of Christ. Ascension is mentioned twice in Scripture (Mark

xxvi.19, Luke xxiv.49-51), and in Acts I.15-26 it is recorded that after

the Ascension of Christ the eleven Apostles met to consider supplement-

ing their number with a twelfth. There were two candidates, Joseph and

Mattathias, so lots were drawn and Mattathias was chosen—the word used

for 'lot' in the Arm. translation of the Bible is vičak.₈ The holiday

of the Mother of Flowers mentioned above takes place on Holy Thursday,

which is Ascension Day, and it is customary to eat a pudding made with

milk, called katnapur, on that day. On the Wednesday before Holy Thurs-

day, flowers are collected by parties of girls; other girls bring water

from seven sources at eventide, in silence, and without turning around

or letting their buckets touch the ground. If they meet a man, they

must pour out the water and start all over again. Then in each bucket

of 'stolen' water is dropped a stone or some sand, and seven types of

grass found growing on a rooftop (Xarīn/Erzurum) or seven types of

flowers or twigs (Xarberd). Then some distinctive personal belonging is

put in, and the tub containing the water is placed in an open place un-

der the stars (the location is called ast̥un x̥k̥, 1 'stars') and guarded all

night long from the boys. Before noon the next day, the vičak-Cross,
adorned with flowers, is paraded about and vičaki erger 'vičak songs'

are sung. Then a little girl, called a hars 'bride' is appointed and

veiled: she removes the objects one by one from the tub and fortunes

are told, in the form of quatrains as above. These are sometimes called

Jaan-ǵhim (Tk. from NP., 'flower of my heart'), and are all about love

and marriage. On the night before Ascension Day, it is believed that

all the waters cease to move for an instant and receive great powers of

fertility. Many bathe then, and a bath in water to which seven flowers

or green plants have been added on that day is believed to cure illness
and banish sleep, and to make one’s desires come true. In the Armenian epic of Sangam, the lady Covinar becomes miraculously pregnant on Ascension Day.10 Easter is a movable feast and can occur on different Sundays from year to year, so the holiday of Ascension on the 40th day after Easter—Holy Thursday—is also movable, and can occur between 30 April and 3 June.11 In some parts of Armenia, the ritual described above is performed also on Vardavat, the Feast of the Transfiguration.12 This feast, which celebrates the appearance of Jesus as a shining figure before Peter, James and John (Matt. xvii, Mark ix; this is usually believed to have occurred on Mount Tabor), comes on 6 August in the calendars of the Catholic and Greek Orthodox churches, but according to Arm. tradition St Gregory the Illuminator established it on 11 August, corresponding to the first day of the month of Nawasard. In 551, Catholicos Nosats II Elivanadc13 reformed the Arm. calendar, changing also the date of the Feast of the Transfiguration in order to separate it from the Feast of the Assumption of the Holy Mother of God (Arm. Vardsvatar), which had begun to be celebrated in August. He fixed the Transfiguration on the 14th Sunday after Easter, which is the 7th after Pentecost.13 Both water and plants play an important role in the rituals of Ascension Day, and we have seen that the popular name of this day is Cukamor tön, ‘holiday of the Mother of Flowers’. Vardavat is a festival of the waters. People drench each other with water outdoors, and the ecclesiastical procession sprinkles the congregation with rose water in church. Al-Biruni noted that the Persians, too, splashed each other with water on Nö Rôz,14 and the sabze (fresh green shoots) grown for the Persian holiday are later cast into water, another aspect recalling the Armenian practice of putting plants in a tub of water.15 Three doves were released on Vardavat, according to Stepanos Aschik (late tenth century).16

Down to the end of the last century, Nawasard was still celebrated as their Christian New Year instead of 1 January by the Armenians of Sisian and Zangezur (mountainous, sparsely populated regions in the southern part of the present-day Armenian SSR),17 so it may be that certain customs of the New Year are connected with those of Nawasard. Nawasard itself was celebrated, as we have seen, as Vardavat during the first two centuries of Christian Armenia, and Vardavat and Ascension were celebrated in similar ways. It is important to note at this point that the Nö Rôz on which water was splashed was the Greater Nö Rôz, celebrated on Rôz Hordad; customs associated with water may have become blended with the rites of Nö RÔz, although they had originally been proper to the cult of Hordad. On New Year’s Day in Armenia, it is customary for newlyweds to go to a spring in silence and to say ʃri barin, ʃri morin/ Andndayin t’agaworin; / Jür kašender es? ‘Good one of the water, mother of the water,/ Of the king in the abyss./ Will you give a New Year’s gift of water?’18 We shall discuss the significance of silence in the ritual presently; it is sufficient at this point to note that it is important also in the Ascension Day ritual, which also involves a spring and at which the vičakanakan, the girl who takes out of the tub the various objects and reads fortunes, is called a hars ‘bride’. One recalls also that the fortunes all involve love and marriage.

Near the village of Kör in the region of Xnas, which lies south of Karin/Erzurum and a few miles east of Bingöl Dagh19 there was a spring which flowed only three months of the year, from May to July. Ascension Day falls within this time, and it was the custom of the Armenian inhabitants of the village to sacrifice a lamb at the spring on the holiday. Anquetil du Perron recorded in the eighteenth century the Zor. practice of sacrificing a sheep on Miragam; this ritual survives amongst the Zoroastrians, who thread pieces of six different organs of the slaughtered animal on a piece of the gut, which is tied with seven knots.20 The Armenians, too, tie seven knots in a string to ward off evil (there is a Zor. mfrang ['spell', in this instance] to be recited when tying seven threads, knotted eight times, around the body of a pregnant woman to protect her from black magic),21 and the Armenian terminology of sacrifice is rich in Mfr. loan-words (e.g., sôh ‘sacrifice’, patručak ‘sacrificial animal’).22 It is possible that the Armenian sacrifice is a survival of Zor. ritual. The Zoroastrian libation to the waters (Phl. Ay-zôhhr) is still practised in Iran: a priest pours into a stream milk mixed with rose petals and marjoram or oleaster. This rite, with the appropriate recitations of Avestan, is performed on various occasions, including weddings.23 In the Armenian case, water is drawn from seven springs (the number seven perhaps refers to the Amèsa
honoured by wilence.
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literature, for according to the male. In the so-called Younger menia, as we have seen, both flowers and water are spoken of as having plants, and these continued to he regarded as female in the Pahlavi mothers. We have also seen how silence is considered vital to the Ascension Day ritual, and have cited a popular invocation to the Ascension Day vičakahanūnīm, for in late May the pagan Romans celebrated a holiday called Rosalia.

The connections proposed above between the rituals of Ascension Day and Zoroastrianism exist, it seems because of Zor. influence on an ancient ritual practiced by Greeks, Armenians, and Iranians alike. One might doubt the Zor. content of the Arm. ritual, indeed, but for the flower haurvot-mavrot itself, which bears the names of two Zoroastrian divinities, the Bounteous Immortals Haurvatāt and Amrūtāt (Phl. Hordūd and Amurādūd). The two are female in Avestan, but with the loss of grammatical gender in Pahlavi they appear to have been thought of later as male. In the so-called Younger Avestan dialect their names are virtually synonymous with the creations over which they preside, waters and plants, and these continued to be regarded as female in the Pahlavi literature, for according to the Bundahīš the sky, metals, wind and fire are male, whilst water, earth, plants and fish are female. In Armenia, as we have seen, both flowers and water are spoken of as having mothers. We have also seen how silence is considered vital to the Ascension Day ritual; according to both the Dēnkard and the Menōg 1 Xrad, Hordūd and Amurādūd are offended by improper talk and by violation of the rule of silence during meals. Such silence is regarded as an expression of reverence for the two yavatas.27 It would seem that an ancient rite requiring silence was dedicated in Armenia to the two Zor. yavatas most honoured by wilence.

In Sogdian, the names of Hordūd and Amurādūd are found as hrvvot-mrvot in a glossary, where they are paired thus opposite MP. ḡ(mr) d`d hrwād.28 In Enochic writings, Arnoch and Maroch are considered the guardians of the earth; and in a fourteenth-century anti-Muslim treatise of John VI Cantacuzenus there is cited the legend of Arōt and Marōt, sent to earth by God hōste kalōs arōthein kal dikaiōs krinhein 'in order to rule well and judge justly'.29 The names are found in the form *hrv[t] *mrv[t], Hurwād ud Marwād, in the ninth-century Dēnkard (DMM. 607.6). In Islamic tradition, the devils are said to have revealed sorcery to two angels in Babylon, Hūrūt and Mūrūt (Qurʾān, Sūra 2.96); according to another tradition, the two are imprisoned and chained in a well in Mount Damavand.30 In the latter case, the two divinities, transformed by Islam into demons, are cast in the role of a sort of dual Ašī Dāhāka—so closely linked were they, it seems, that both could be substituted for a single fiend in the legend, as though they were one person.

Henning recognised in the text of Agathangélous the names of Hordūd and Amurādūd in 'the Armenian flower-names Haurvot Haurvot'.31 The two are found in a list of flowers in a passage about how the flowers of spring prefigure the resurrection of men at the end of days: Sospēs ew gung kugan ew erp c erp c cañacn : orşēs maragom ew vordn ev sañsim ev yasmim ev aniarn ev omakn ew sanplιntakn ew marakn, hōrōt ev mōrōt ev manikn: ew yxlun amepn haamaspān cañacn c ev carç c boys c bokboj c garmawvoy orevosen c in vet jernawvoy.32 R. W. Thomson translated the above as follows: 'Likewise the various kinds and colours of flowers, like the mandrake and rose, and lily and Soldan, and jasmine and lotus, and sumach and narcissus, and arum and tenguort, AND HYACINTH AND POPOY [emphasis ours] and violet. And of all the other fragrant flowers and trees, the budding shoots will appear in spring after the winter.'33 The Afjein bārān translates hōrōt as Ṭk. tutya qiqēti, and the NBM, translates it as Italian glaçinto tuberoso; Kouvoumajian translates mōrōt as 'rose campion', while Bedrossian has 'tuberose'. Thomson does not cite the source of his translation of mavroτ as 'poppy'. It would appear that originally these were two separate flowers, and one recalls that in Zoroastrianism each of the 33 yavatas has his own flower.34 Two MSS. of Agathangélou omit the word ev 'and' between the two names, and the earlier of the two texts dates from the beginning of the thirteenth century.
It appears that by that time the hawrot mawrot was therefore already considered a single flower.

In modern Armenian dialects, the name of the flower is pronounced horot-morot or xorot-morot, and is attested also in Kurdish as xorud-morud. The flower is a tuberous hyacinth, Latin amorum xanthorria, according to Karst and Malaxasanc. It is not the only flower that can be used in the Ascension Day ritual—in Arakpir, for instance, the Armenians used dandelions—but its connection with plants and waters through its name accords well with the ritual in which it is used. One notes also that this same flower, the sumbul ‘hyacinth’ is one of the haft sin ‘seven (objects whose names begin with the Arabic letter) sin’ which adorn every M6 sin table. In Armenian folklore, Hawrot and Mawrot are two lovers, and one recalls that the viêks read on Ascension Day all have to do with love and marriage. Poems have been written on the couple, and in Erzurum when two people fell in love the Armenians used to say xorotê morot z gerê hawrot has found his mawrot. A proper name probably to be read as hörûtik is attested from the twelfth century, and the word xorotik means ‘beautiful’ in fourteenth-century Armenian poetry (in modern Arm. dialects, xorotik-morotik), all with the affectionate diminutive ending -ik which we have encountered elsewhere.

Armenian mediaeval poets mention the flower hawrot-mawrot in poems where the various flowers of spring are allegorical representations of Christ and the Apostles; we have already seen how St Gregory the Illuminator compared the season to the coming resurrection of the dead. In a poem called by its first line Ayor elem psyacam garun ‘Today it was a glowing spring’ (attributed variously to the two fourteenth-century poets Yovhanêns Tîkuranci and Kostandin Emaânc; one M. of 1336 bears the epigraph Yovhanê T’zurgurançoy asac’el yvan yarutânan K’ristosi ‘Spoken by Yovanêns T’urgurançî (Tîkuranci) on the Resurrection of Christ’), the flowers go out in search of Christ, the Rose: Abay genen xendir hörût mawot u juncakên / u körken t’es ew jênên zûûnân or i mê / daertin ‘Now hyacinth and sunflower depart for the search/ And dispatch the fig and summon the lily in the meadow.’ In a mediaeval poem quoted by Gabikean, the flower is compared to the apostles: En xorawt mawrot caûkan/ Or gêcexik en ew sirun./ Mân ê surb Arak’elociçn/ Erkotasan noc’adazun ‘That flower hawrot mawrot/ which is beautiful and comely;’ Is like the holy Apostles/ In their rank of twelve.’

My teacher Miss Vartari Tarpianin was born in Karin/Erzurum at the time of the 1915 Genocide. Her family were sent by the Turks in the death marches to Bakkah, in Syria, and the survivors eventually found their way to a refugee camp in Aleppo. Miss Tarpianin’s mother and sisters settled in Istanbul, but she herself was sent to France, first to Marseilles and then to Paris, where she was educated at the Dproc’asèr boarding school, an institution founded for Armenian refugee children whose staff included many of the finest Armenian intellectuals who had managed to escape the general slaughter by the Turks. In addition to providing a liberal education, the teachers sought to instil in their charges a love of the joyful customs of their native land, of the childhood that had been so cruelly darkened for them. Thus, on the eve of Ascension Day, parties of girls scattered through the woods on the outskirts of the French capital, gathering water from seven streams and picking seven kinds of flowers in the school’s gardens. The youngest girl at the school served as the hars ‘bride’ in the assembly hall, and the viêks were read after church services the next day as the personal object cast in by every girl was removed from the tub. Miss Tarpianin recalls that fifty to a hundred of the quatrains might be read each Ascension Day. She recalled a few of them for me: Arveyê or sires ear/ Arveyê çat mi elli:/ Süh’id getin tynalun/ Im sirtes rê’i dimanar. ‘If you love your sun i.e., life, love;/ Do not go out often in the sun;/ My heart cannot bear/ Your shadow falling on the ground.’ Ot’êd kananc or rê ear./ Kananc arterên ekar:/ Sirta otk’id tak elli:/ Koxêr û kananc zer ‘Your feet have become green, love;/ You have come from the green meadows./ Were my heart beneath your feet/ You would trample it and it would become green i.e., young, joyful.’ Hewî têker ûertar ear./ rê’i koria, mec ê așxarin,/ Yetoy k’ez gtoncân ca/ Așxarinm al tam et rê’i tar. ‘Do not go to faraway places, love;/ Do not get lost. The world is wide./ Even if I gave the world to the one who found you then,/ He would not give you back.’ Ver p’arçoc àmperê ear;/ Arjex k’elîan ku gan var./ Dan al û zur mi p’axîr,/ Ku gas vân or hars ekar. ‘The upward fleeing clouds, love,/ Become rain and come down./ Flee not in vain;/ Tomorrow you will come and be a bride.’ Other viêks are given by ûazar ûarêg in his huge memoir of the martyred Armenian city.
likely, then, that the Zoroastrian tradition of Wiraz, with its similarity to their national legend of Ara, became known to the Armenians, and the two tales were blended together in the accounts of later Classical writers.\textsuperscript{48} The Armenians would have been aware, then, of the casting of the lots in the Iranian legend. The passage in which Wiraz is chosen for his momentous journey reads as follows: (Ch. I. 33-4)\textsuperscript{(43)}

(transcription) Wiraz, 'next' hpt GBR' BR' YTTMNWSt HMDq (34) W Nf hpt 3 W Nf TL'T'k 'lyvc wylc SM BR' wyc (35) W 'YT NwN nxz'lWl SM TMYMNd.

(36) W 'YL 'IN wylc cyge's 2K nxwHl 'Stw Mm 'Ld LGN YK'YMNWnt (37) W YDN FWN k5 krt w gtrp (38) YK Htp' Mm MmMnYt 'YTTN w'tkn 'k'k'wdrn mg 'L YmBnYt (39) 'B LKwM m'sdYn'n W L n'yyc LMYMnt (40) W HT n'yyc 'L YHMNTNwnt k'k'wdrnYh 'LmBn 'L 2K g'yk 'Yhvd'n 'wvdn'n (41) W zmY pytc'n drstwh 'YwlnM Y 'styh' YmYwNn. (42) W 'YL 'LqY'n m'sdYn'n W L n'yyc YmMnt (43) pltw b'l FWN huvt w styk b'l FWN huvt w styk b'l FWN nuwšt k5 TL'T'k 'L wyLc 'YTWNt.

(transliteration) Ud pas awšzn haft mard nišat hnd (34) ud az haft 3 ud az se šwag Wiraz nmn be wjdi (35) ud ast k5 newšdwrn nmn gnmn. (36) Ud pas šy Wiraz čyšn-is šn swnan mšd brb šp ďst (37) ud dast pas kš krt ud gpt (38) šy agar-tšn šhšd šg-em akšmagond mng mn dshd (39) tš šnmzdnm šn mn šyšgag abgmč (40) ud agaršyšgag šn rššd kmšgmndih šnšvm šn šyšg šhšvt šnhmsn (41) ud šn pššgm šrstwh šbrn rd rššmih švaršn. (42) ud pas awšzn mšdšzn šn mn šyšgag švrd (43) šrdon brd pas hvmnt ud šdšg brd brd pas hmd šr hšr šr šr wjšm-g Šr Wiraz šnm. (transcription) 'And afterwards the seven men sat down, (34) and from the seven, three were chosen, and from the three, one by the name of Wiraz was chosen, (35) and some call him by the name of Hiašpūr. (36) And afterwards, when he had heard those words, Wiraz rose to his feet (37) and placed his hands across his breast and said: (38) "If it seem proper to you, then do not give me mark" against (my) will, (39) until a lot is cast by you, O Mazdā-worshippers, and by me. (40) And if the lot comes to me I shall go willingly to that place of the righteous and the sinful, (41) and shall bear this message rightly and bring (it) truthfully." (42) And afterwards a lot was brought to them, the Mazdā-worshippers, and to me. (43) All three came to Wiraz—the first time for good thoughts, the second time for good words, and the third time for good deeds.'
As is seen from the above passage, the lot cast was a ʰāy̚, transliterated by Jamaspji Asa as nahčak and translated by Haug as 'lots'; Mackenzie renders it as nāvīzqk 'small reed, straw', comparing NP. nāvīzq, accepted by Neillit with emendation of the text (perhaps to ʰjēj vēčak; Aevarean does not specify this). ⁵² is accepted by K. Abrahamyan in his Pahlavi dictionary ⁵³ and in his Armenian translation of the Ardzīni Hrāxh Nāvac, where he translates the Pahlavi word in question as Arm. vēčak 'lot' without comment. ⁵⁴ Prof. Bailey explained Zor. Phil. nāvīčak 'lot' as containing the adjectival increment -ā-, with base vēč- 'throw'. ⁵⁵ Aevarean noted also the use of the verb abgādan 'throw' in the Pahlavi text, corresponding to Arm. vēčak arkančel 'to cast lots', an expression found several times in the Bible. The argument here is one of sense: lots are cast; straws, however, are not—they are drawn. It is unlikely that the Pahlavi writer used the verb 'to throw' meaning as the object 'lots' but using a word meaning 'straw', for nāvīzqk is not an obscure word, but a common diminutive (cf. NP. kān-īzqk 'girl') of the word for a reed, nāv, also one of the most popular musical instruments in Iran. ⁵⁶ In the Pahlavi Psalter, the term vēč(-th) ⁵⁷ is used in a sacerdotal sense parallel to Arm. vēčak, the latter term used to mean an area under one's control (mainly as a term of ecclesiastical jurisdiction ⁵⁸).

Various trees and plants were and are still venerated by Zoroastrians as creations of Amurđād, and in this chapter it may be appropriate to discuss certain Armenian practices which present interesting parallels. The veneration of trees in Armenia is attested in the writings of the fourth-century Syrian monk Mār Ābē, who found the people of a place called ʰwāč (‘Āsā) on the river Arsenios devoted to the cult of a tree. He converted the people to Christianity and built a church and monastery in the village. Mār Gürinqgu, the Metropolitan of Melitene, consecrated the church, and four priests were appointed to serve there. ⁵⁹

The cypress and other evergreens are respected in many countries because they do not shed their leaves as deciduous trees do. Because of this they are seen to represent immortality, and are often associated with the immortal spirits of the dead. Horace wrote in his Odes (Book II.14) that all is lost with death and the cypress alone attends; in Book X of the Metamorphoses of Ovid, the cypress is represented as the tree of mourning and the companion of those in distress. In China, the pine and cypress were seen to represent constancy, for they are always green, while other trees change with the seasons. A proverb quoted by Confucius says that only when the year grows cold do we see that the pine and cypress are the last to fade. ⁶⁰

In Iran, the cypress has since ancient times been the object of veneration. Yet it is not associated with death or mourning, as these are contrary to the spirit of Zoroastrianism. According to the , Zoroaster brought a cypress from Paradise to the land of Iran; Gušasp planted it at the gate of the fire-temple of Bursēn Mīr in Parthia. The great cypress which stood at the village of Kişmar was identified with this sacred tree, and one of the heroes of the Parthian epic Vī u Hāevān (which survives only in a NP. version) is named K.šmyr-why or K.šmyr, presumably after the village where the cypress of Zoroaster flourished still. It was cut down by the Abbasid Caliph Mutawakil in A.D. 861. ⁶¹ This was a deed of great wickedness, for Zoroastrians hold cypress and evergreens generally to be sacred as representative above other growing things of the immortality Amurđād represents; Plutarch in his Life of Artaxerxes mentions that the Persian satrap Teribazus ⁶² allowed his soldiers to cut down even the pine and cypress for fuel during a particularly cold winter. ⁶³ The nineteenth-century American writer Henry David Thoreau was moved to quote in Walden the Colestān of the Persian poet Sābd, who explained that the cypress bore the epithet ōsādā ('noble, free') because it was ever-blooming and not seasonally transitory, even as the religious recluses called ōšādā who lived in unchanging solitude, their hearts never led astray by the transitory aspects of life. ⁶⁴

In Armenian, the cypress is called noc-i or sargy, both Iranian loan-words. ⁶⁵ A copper coin of the Arm. Ardashir king Tirman IV, who is best known for the jugeate issues struck with his sister-queen Krato towards the end of his reign, ⁶⁶ depicts clearly a graceful, slender cypress, ⁶⁷ perhaps the holy cypress of Kişmar revered by the contemporary Parthians.

Another evergreen, the juniper (Arm. gihi) is revered by the Armenians. It was often planted near chapels, even as the Irani Zoroastrians still plant evergreens—cypress, myrtle and pine—around their
fire-temples. 68 There is a legend that St Gregory the Illuminator once slept in a hole in the trunk of a juniper, and it was believed that eating its needles would relieve those cured of demonic possession of the memory of their ordeal. Zors., according to Al-Biruṇī, fumigated their homes with juniper during Fravardīgān, in order to please the spirits of the righteous departed. 69 Christ is said to have blessed the juniper and savvät with eternal green (a puzzling legend in the case of the plane tree, which is deciduous) because they sheltered him and hid him when the Jews were pursuing him. 70 Not all Armenians regarded evergreens with such reverence; in one mediaeval MS. we are bidden to regard references to them in Scripture as metaphors of barrenness, for they bear no fruit. 71

Another tree accorded great reverence amongst the Armenians was the oak. There was a sacred grove of these near the village of Xacanēs in Vaspurakan before the first World War. A person who left some possession there was not allowed to touch it again for 24 hours, and no other person could ever touch it. 72 It is not explained why this particular prohibition was observed, but one recalls that personal belongings are left in the sacred grove for a time were used later for the divination of a particular person's fate. Other sacred groves (Arm. mayri 'grove, fir tree', antər 'forest') existed in ancient times. A mediaeval text refers to mairekan Aranzd 'Arnamazd of the grove(s)', 74 indicating that groves were sacred to him (cf. the oak of Dodona in Greece, which was sacred to Zeus and was used for divination). A forest of firs (Arm. mayri) called Cndocən antər (lit. 'forest of generations') was planted by the Orontid king Eruan near the newly-founded holy city of Bagaran; 75 firs are evergreens, and the grove may therefore have been planted in accord with the Zoroastrian custom discussed above. The Armenian Arsacid king Xosrov II Kotak (A.D. 330-8) over five centuries later planted a grove of oaks (Arm. kašin, kašni) called Tačar mayri 'Palace grove' and another of firs called Xosrovakert 'Made by Kosrov'. 76 Both kings used the forests they had planted as game preserves for the royal hunt. 77

Certain plants, creations of Amurdād, are revered by Armenians and Zoroastrians alike for their properties. Iranī Zoroastrians employ frequently as a ritual food sirū-sirətk 'garlic and rue', a pungent broth. Rue is also used separately, being scattered at shrines, 79 and is much revered also by Muslim Iranians, who call it sipand. 80 The Arm. word for rue, sspand, is a loan-word from Mkr., 81 and the Armenians use the plant as a talisman against evil spirits and the evil eye. 82 Garlic (Arm. xctor, xctor, from *IE. 83) is also used as a talisman against evil spirits by the Armenians; 84 it is also threaded with blue beads and an eggshell and left on the balcony of the house against the evil eye, 85 and is believed to protect newlyweds or those with new garments against malign powers. 86 Garlic was regarded as efficacious against demons in Sasanian Iran, too, where, according to Biruṇi, the Sir-sūr 'Garlic-feast' was celebrated yearly on the 14th day of the month Dāi. 87

Various other plants are believed by the Armenians to counteract the powers of evil. A medical MS. advises one to smoke the aru ward (lit. 'bear's rose', Latin Paeonia officinalis) or brew it as a tea against witches, demons and demonic possession. 88 The bri/biñi (dog elder or water elder) is believed to turn away the evil eye, 89 and the səw sənic (black rose campion) is sprinkled on bread eaten by a pregnant woman to keep Satan from her. 90 Xorenac ı citations of the ancient epic of Artašēs about the Alan princess Satʿīnīk which was thought by M. Abeyan to refer to a magical plant: 91 Ayl sw sənic aw, sen, Satʿiñik tikin təncəs, zartaxur xawart sw sticəxwarci j barlicn Argawar (MS I.30). "Also," they say, "the lady Satʿīnīk had a desire for a crown of greens and the rhubarb plant from the feast of Argawan." 92

The lọstāk 'mandrake (root)', called by Armenians the 'king of plants', 93 is held to be a cure for every illness, 94 and it is used also as a love potion. 95 But it is dangerous to tear the root out of the ground, for it will cry out, and its cry kills men. So the Armenians dig carefully around it while reciting a prayer against hearing its voice, 96 and then bring a chicken or the kid of a goat to pull it out. Most often, however, a dog is used. 97 The animals, it is said, often die, yet as we shall see in the next chapter, dogs are believed to possess supernatural powers most efficacious against death, and it is...
perhaps for that reason that men used them in order not to die when extracting the mandrake, the voluble creation of a yazata venerated by silence.
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CHAPTER 13
CAPTIVE POWERS: APOCALYPTIC AND ESCHATOLOGICAL LEGENDS

The legend exists in various cultures around the world of a king or hero confined to a cave or mountain until an apocalyptic event when he is released. In western Europe, for example, there is the legend of Frederick Barbarossa, the German king who was drowned in Cilician Armenia during the Third Crusade, late in the twelfth century, but who is believed to be waiting in a cave in the Kyffhäuser mountain in Thuringia for the reunification of Germany. There is a popular Greek superstition that Alexander the Great still 'lives and reigns' (see Ch. 14). We have already discussed the Iranian legend of the imprisonment of Aši Dahāka in Mount Damavand by the hero Thraśaona and its treatment in Armenian epic tradition, where the monster of the Avesta is variously identified as foreign tyrant or heresiarch. It was seen also how in Armenian folklore the Zoroastrian Yavāta Mithra is led by a crow to a cave at Van where he waits for the restoration of justice to the world: an apocalyptic vision in which Mithra (Arm. Mher) is an epic historical figure, the leader of the Armenians of Sasun in their rebellion against foreign oppressors. It is believed that on Ascension Day the cave of Mher yawns open and the hero (as the Epic regards him) may be seen astride his steed.

The various legends cited above seem to have a single common feature, in that at the centre of each stands a hero or villain whose powers are seen to be so great that they would effect a complete transformation of the world--either destruction or redemption--were they to run their full course. But the world is as it was before: the world conqueror's lands have fallen away; the evil demon has not succeeded in corrupting all of the creations; the liberating hero has not procured everlasting freedom for his nation. Yet the central figure retains the awe still of those who hoped in him or feared him, and he is granted immortality, the completion of his works postponed until the end of days. Neither wholly god nor wholly mortal, he is consigned for the
intervening ages to an earthly place of seclusion endowed with supernatural features: mighty Damavand, or the rocky heights of Van fortress with its blind portals and mysterious cuneiform inscriptions. We shall discuss in this chapter two epic figures of power made correspondingly captive in Mount Ararat, Artawazd and Šidar, and various legends connected with them.

Another general theme in the history of human religion and thought is the relationship of men to animals. Some of the latter were considered noxious, creatures of evil, and in both Iran and Armenia there is evidence that certain classes of beasts and insects were regarded thus. Animals such as cows and horses were useful, friendly to man, and often considered sacred; birds like the eagle were endowed with supernatural powers, and it seems that these miraculous properties caused the real eagle to be transmuted into a fantastic creature in Iranian legendary. In Iran, the dog was considered a creature of particular sensitivity to death and supernatural phenomena; in Armenia, both the dog and a dog-like supernatural creature called the aralez are associated with the captive powers mentioned above. The aralez probably is an invention of folklore which developed out of the dog--like the Persian siumyph from the eagle--and it figures prominently in the legend of Ars and Šemram, which we shall discuss below.

The name Artawazd is a western Mir. form of the name attested in Av. as Ašavazd-š, coming probably from an old western Iranian form represented in Elamite as Irdwasa. If Benveniste's interpretation of the Elamite form is correct, the name would be thus attested in Iran from the earliest times that the Armenians were in contact with Zoroastrians. The name is compared by Jackson to the Gāthic Av. phrase āhāya vəzdəng (Ya. 64.4), which he translates as 'furtherers of righteousness' and which Insler renders with the word ga following as 'the draft oxen of truth', which he explains as 'the earthly community of the faithful'. It is more likely that Ašavazdah means 'constant in righteousness', with Av. vəzdah- 'constant', as befits one who is to assist the Saviour at the Renovation of the world together with other heroes including one Gēw son of Gudars, who is obviously a Parthian (GBd. 29.7). The imprisonment in Mt. Damavand of Aši Dāhāk is described in the same chapter. One of Ašavazdah's seven companions at Frašegird is Fradaxšti, Phil. Fradaxšt I Xāmīgān, who is to withstand the demon of wrath, Ašama, then, but for fear of whom, according to the Phil. explanation of his name, he was raised in a jar (ke bim az Yeša rāy xandar xūb parvahr īst, Zep. 35.4). As will be seen, the Art. Artawazd was a contemporary of the Parthian Arasidae; he is depicted as an eschatological figure; he is imprisoned in a mountain and compared to or even equated with Aši Dāhāk; and other eschatological heroes confined in bottles are likened to him. The name is found in various Greek forms (Artacussadēs, Artatabadēs, Artabados, Artabazos, Artabanēs) in Iran and Asia Minor from the Parthian period. The name Artawazd is found with some frequency in Armenian history down to the twelfth century. Three kings by the name of Artawazd reigned over Armenia in the Artaxiad period: Artawazd I, son of Artaxias I; Artawazd II, son of Tigran II; and Artawazd III, son of Artawazd II. Artawazd II is well known as the Armenian king taken captive in 33 B.C. by Mark Antony and killed two years later by Cleopatra VII of Egypt after the battle of Actium; and it was at the wedding feast of the sister of Artawazd and Pacorus, son of the Parthian king Orodes, that the head of the defeated Crassus was brought in during a recitation from the Bacchae of Euripides, according to Plutarch. The actor Jason took up the head of Crassus and sang the lyric passage of the bacchante rejoicing at the murder of Pentheus.

Movers Xorenacći in his History writes that at the death of Artañs (Artaxias I) 'much slaughter took place according to the custom of the heathens' (bazun kotorack c linin èst avrini het'ansac). Movers adds that Artawazd was displeased and, according to the singers of Sokhān, said to his father (presumably before the death of the latter), Mîns du gacar, ev zerkir asmēnyv end kez tarar, es averakac's opes təgaworen 'Since you have departed and taken all the country with you, how shall I be king of these ruins?' Whereupon his father cursed him and said Eťs du vors heccis yazat i vet i Masis, zke'ez kalo in kēj kēj, tarecin yazat i vet i Masis, and kac c c, ev zlos ti tecs es 'If you ride to the hunt on Asat Māskik [i.e., Greater Ararat] the kēj kēj will take you and carry you up on Asat Māskik: you must remain there and not see the light!' (MK II.61). The kēj kēj, lit. 'brave ones', were regarded in medieval times as supernatural creatures who lived in the mountains; it has also been suggested that they were the spirits of the Artaxiad
According to Persian literary tradition, the Sassanian king Bahram V (called Gôr 'onager'), a famed hunter, died during the chase when he fell into a hole (NP. gôr); such a death seems to be a topos of Iranian epic. Xorenac'i continues: Zrauc' en amêrn ev pa'avunc', et'â argereal kuy yavri mim kapela erkat'ê 'at'sayök: ev erku 'unku hanapac kroevol sâst'evon, jayy elanel ev anel vazcan aôxhari: ayi a jayn' farsanq'êan darbanc'êawransan, asen, kapanc'n. Yevn orcy ev at merov isk 'aszunakaw basunk'ê i darbanc'ê, zhet ert'êalov afespeîn, yavur msa'asab'ê we'eric'ê kam 'oriol's baxen zaaln, zi zawrasc'ên, asen, 'at'sayk'n Artawazdy. 'The old women also tell this tale of him (i.e., Artawazd II): He is confined in a cave and bound with iron chains, and two dogs daily gnaw at the chains. He tries to go out and make an end of the country, but the bonds, they say, are strengthened by the sound of the striking of hammers of blacksmiths. Because of this even in our own time many smiths, following the fable, strike their anvils three or four times on the first day of the week, so that, they say, the bonds of Artawazd may be strengthened' (MX II.61).

Another version of the above legend is found in the Patmut'êwân, tiezerakan 'Universal History', a work of the thirteenth century attributed to Varden Barjberdëc.i.18 Molourot'îwân divac' xabac' skrapatânt Hayoc' i jor ërmac' ork' aseîn t'ê zartawaz om vișap' argereal en kendani i Masîs leam: ev na elanelc'ê ev sawrurc uneloc'ê ev om ayî mtaç' unêr sizhaxun'tîwân Hayoc': zarhureal hâc' aner zikays divac' ev xazarsan, t'ê erb lîni Artawazday elanel in kapac'ân. Ev nok'as sen c'ëne: t'ê oc' kanis zelonen nora i kapac'ac, hraman tur ênd amesayan aôxurc darbanc'n, or i Nawasardi orn amesayn darbin kop'êh kranwîn i very sali ivro: ev erkat'êk'ê Artawazday andêen hastati: ev kataren znov hraman ayim amesayn darbin, or i Nawasardi kranaw harkanen zelâin miç'ev c'ay'ôr 'At the hands of the K'urâns ['priests'] the idolaters of Armenia were led astray in the confusion of the deus. (The K'urâns) said that the vișap'ê ('dragons') had imprisoned a certain Artawazd alive in the mountain Masîk', and he will come out and will have the country. And someone else thought "(he will have) dominion over Armenia (also)." And frightened, he asked also the witches20 about the desires of the deus: "When will be the escape of Artawazd from his bonds?" They said to him, "If you do not desire his escape from his bonds, command all the smiths of the country that on the day of Nawasard (i.e., on New Year's Day21) every smith strike his anvil with his hammer; the irons of Artawazd will be strengthened by it." And every blacksmith fulfills the command now; they strike their anvils with a hammer on the day of Nawasard, to this day.' Eznik Kolbac'i compared the legend of Artawazd and the belief in his release to the messianic hopes of the Jews.22 Ev oc' zok' i t'agaworaztûc' ev i divoc'ânec' umin kapela ar irweans kendani: zi kendani'k' i marraworac'ekun eset'k' um, Enoe'c' ev zuîa. Ayi orpès zâsêk'sandrê xabein devk'ê t'ê kendani kây'ê, oroc'ê est egptakat hanaikut'êan arkeel akeal xâzardanav' zed i si, koroo'k'an ein'c' Alèk'k'andros kendani ic'ê ev maw xandric'ê: ev galusn K'rîstosî xaytafekac' szabênt'îwim, ev ebarî i miyo zayt' akût'îwim, nônqê ev molurat'îwuûn divac' xabac' zdiw'apstâ Hayoc', et'c' zom Artawaz anûm argereal ic'ê divac', or c'ayim kendani kuy, ev na elanelc'ê ev uneloc' c'axarhê: ev i sitî yyy kapel kan amhavât'; orpes' ev Hraevëk' or i zur akkâlîtu'ûn kapel kan, et'c' Davit' galoc'ê sînêl zîrusâlên ev zokovel zîhêays, ev et'agaworet mna noc'â. 'Nor have [the vișap'] taken to themselves alive and in bondage anyone of royal lineage or of the heroes;23 for of corporeal beings only two remain alive, Enoch and Elias. But just as the deus deceive concerning Alexander, that he is alive—according to the Egyptian art they bound and cast a deus by witchcraft into a bottle and caused one to think it was Alexander, alive and asking for death,24 but the advent of Christ disgraced deception and banished scandal—so also did the confusion of the deus deceive the worshippers of the gods of Armenia: that someone by the name of Artawazd is imprisoned by the deus, that he is alive until now and will come out and will have the country. And those without faith are bound by vanity hope, even as the Jews, who are bound by the vain expectation that David will come to Jerusalem and to gather the Jews and to be their king there.'

The two dogs that gnaw at the chains of Artawazd may represent day and night, for according to the mediaval writer Yansakan vardapêc,25 they are Seaw ev Spitak, or yar lesun akapans nora 'Black and White, which eternally lick (yar lesun) his bonds.' We shall find Arm. yar 'ternally' and lez- 'lick' presented often as a folk etymology of the name of the mythical creature called the (y)aralez; to the black
and white dogs may be compared the figure of Žamanak 'stone' in Armenian folklore, who sits on a high mountain and rolls alternately a white and a black ball of thread down the mountainside. 26 Vanakan wrote of the legend of Artawaz, Ayvə ə yaralıq araspən. 'This is the fable of the (y)araləc.' 27 It may be recalled that in the Şah-nəme Yəna, the man who raised the banner of revolt against the tyrant Zəhərək was a blacksmith, and in both Iran and Armenia objects of iron (particularly shears) were considered potent talismans against evil. 28 Blacksmiths seem to have played a role of religious significance in pre-Christian Armenia. According to a mediaeval Armenian letter (attributed to Xorenac'c'i, probably inaccurately) to the nobleman Saḥak Arcruni in which is described the mission of the Apostle Bartholomew to the province of Anjewac'k in Armenia, the Hoganac'c or Hogroc'c Vanək' ('Monastery of All Souls') 29 was originally sacred to Amaht. 30 And was called Darbnač'c K'ar 'Rock of the Smiths': 31 Dewk' basumk' bnaekal Sin in K'arn yunyn, ev pstrən zərdək tikəwəyn, təcəl yəwnən tikəwəyən dels astəkənəf i kətərel spəcut'əwn asic'c, kənəjynas dartenoc'c həwər hərašək'ə arəhəvən gorəən: yorəs merdik xəxərin sovəreałk', ven efərən degərən, afeal i əstəwəcał cərəs təxəxəcəs i patir asic', orpəs xərapən Kiprianọc'əf i patir Yustineu kusun: ev anuməin yanun tekwəyn anxorik Darbnač'c K'ar. Hanələvən Aftəc'əln halaṙac'c xəxərinən xərənovənə s'ərinə, ev skəren p'tərəc'c or yanun Amahtəy ər. Many deep lived in that Rock and seduced the men of that place, giving them those notions of passion for the fulfillment of the corruption of their passions. 32 They made blows of the hammer, tears by dread wonders. 33 The men of the country became learned in these and lingered by the crucible, taking from the non-gods talismans dripping with corruption for seduction to the passions, like the talismans of Cyprian for the seduction of Justine, and they named the place Rock of the Smiths. The Holy Apostle arrived, drove out the smiths—the ministers of evil—and smashed the idols, which were in the name of Amaht.'

The eleventh-century Armenian nobleman and scholar Grigor Magistros Pahlawuni wrote a letter on the occasion of the consecration of a priest named Grigor Nhjac'c'i at the monastery of Varəg, which stands on the slopes of a mountain of the same name near Varən. 35 Grigor Magistros begins his letter Astəwac bnaeəc'uc yəncən xəməkəəsən i tan ev xanək skəpəcən, kəjəc'əən 'God causes the faithful to dwell in a house and with valour removes those who are bound.' Later, he discusses mountains, because Varag is a mountain. Apparently in recollection of his first theme, that of dwelling within a house and of release from bondage, he adds (in the midst of various references to Scripture and to classical mythology): Citem ev zəBıvrəsp i leyn Dabawən, or zə Kəntofoon Privdeay. 36 mo racist ayəc'zəpənərən i Sebəlanən kalov leyn, kəm zmer Artawəz i cəya Ayraratey i Masik'ohn. 'I know also Bıvrəsp [Aždaheh] in the mountain Babylon, who is the Cəntəur Piwrəd. 36 I will not forget Spandir who is in the mountain of Sebalan, 37 or our Artawəz [sic] in the region of Ayrarat in Arazən. 38 It appears that in Armenian epic Artawəz was connected to Aždaheh, perhaps because of the similarity of the two tales. In the Georgian Vissramani, a version of the Parthian romance preserved in New Persian as Vis ə Kən, there is found the name Artawəz where the Persian has Zəhərək. Movəsə Xorenac'c'ə writes, Ayvə omənc'ə sen və i canənən zəa dipəl patahəəc'c'əm: zor hamecrec'ən xəxəreəl zəa kənaməc'c zərmic'ən Aždahehe: ven oroy nozo basum əc'c arəxəs'c Armənəs. Ev sayəs noyn ergic'c'c n yarəspənən asynəps: et əc'c xəkəsparumk' gəhəc'c an manənən Artawəz, ev dev p'oxəncən ecıd. Bayəc'c ənc ardəarc'c'əl təl lurn yuvə, cməc i cəndənən əwət əc məloruc'c'əməl, mənc'ənəvən ev xəncəncəc'əw.'

But some may that at his birth certain misfortunes befell him, which were considered to be the bewitching of him by women of the race of Zəhərək. For this reason Artawəz oppressed them greatly. And the same singers of Golc'ən say thus in fable: 'The spawn of the višen stole the child Artawəz, and put a dew in his place.' But the rumour seems justified to me, that he was insane from birth and finally died of it (XX II.61).

It is noteworthy that the Arscacid king Pepe, described by Paavstos Buniand as having snakes springing from his breasts similarly to Zəhərək in the Şah-nəme or Nergal at Hatra, was said to have been devoted to the dews at birth and driven insane by them. 39 The belief that a child may be kidnapped and a dew changeling put in his place survives in modern Armenian folklore. Patriarch Elieh Dureau of Jerusalem writes: 'A child who has not been christened with miwön [holy oil] is never separated from his mother; that is, he is never left alone. It is thought that the dew (would) change him. That is why they sometimes say to a
child Poxuar cz. inc cz. ("Are you a changeling—what is the matter with you?").  

If Artawazd was believed to have been a dew, the legend of his imprisonment in lofty, snow-capped Ararat may be regarded as parallel to Iranian legends about the imprisonment of Azi Dahaka in Damavand.

For many centuries, Armenians have regarded Ararat with awe. This attitude is illustrated by the reaction of the Armenian clergy to the first recorded ascent of the mountain, in which the pioneer modern Armenian novelist took part. Xezcatur Abovean, a native of Kzamaker (a village on the outskirts of Erevan) and one of the first graduates of the Nerusian School at Tiflis—the earliest Armenian European-style gymnasium—intended upon his graduation in 1826 to attend classes at the Armenian Catholic monastery of the Meitrists on the island of San Lazzaro, Venice. Detained by the Russo-Persian War, Abovean took employment as a clerk at Exmician monastery, the Mother See of the Armenian Church. After the Russian victory and the annexation of Erevan and its environs to the Russian Empire in 1828, Professor Friedrich Parrot of Dorpat University (now Tartu, in the Estonian SSR) led an expedition to Mount Ararat. Abovean, as the only Russian-speaking cleric at Exmician, was given the reluctant permission of the Catholics to accompany the Western scholar and his party. On 28 September 1829 Parrot and his associates, including Abovean, reached the summit of Greater Ararat. Abovean was added with deep hostility from then on by the Armenian clergy, who considered him guilty of desecration of the sacred mountain. When St James of Nisibis had attempted to scale Mt Sararad in Gordyene in the fourth century, an angel of the Lord had prevented him from reaching the top, but gave him a relic of the ark of Noah. This tradition, preserved by P跋sitos Bunand for the Armenians, had been transferred with the legend of the ark itself to Azat Masik as the Armenians sought to adorn the mountain—already sanctified in pre-Christian belief—with added Biblical prestige, to strengthen the legitimacy and holiness of Valasurespat—Exmician, which stands in the shadow of the massive peak. Abovean's ascent was a rejection of Armenian religious tradition which marked his decisive break with the clerical leadership; hounded and persecuted thereafter, he disappeared from his home in Kzamaker nineteen years later and was never heard from again. For the later Soviet Armenian poet Ekhzé Karenc, Abovean's journey, no less than his pioneering novel in the vernacular language Yerk Hayastani 'The Wounds of Armenia' (1848), marked the beginning of Armenian modernism. He called his poem to Abovean Depi lyarn Masin 'Towards Mount Ararat' (1933), yet even Carenc seems to have retained some of the traditional regard for the mountain, for he calls Masin Anhas pAawrci campa 'a road to unattainable glory' in a tak ('song', a medieval verse form) written in 1920.

Other Armenians held resolutely to their ancient beliefs. A British traveller in World War I expressed to Armenian friends at Igdir, at the foot of the northern slopes of Ararat, his desire to climb the mountain. Their reaction was to urge him to abandon his foolhardy plan. They cried, "The mountain is sacred. It is inhabited by evil spirits, so no one has ever reached the summit—we shall never see you again." This writer was assured by villagers of Ararat, Armenian SSR in August 1973 that Artawazd waits within Mount Ararat and will rise again to liberate western Armenia from the Turks. The legend of Artawazd was kept alive in popular memory, it seems, through dynamic presentations in medieval times which depicted his imprisonment; except for the epic fragments from GolcA preserved by Movses Xorenac and references in other literary sources, these have not survived. The villagers of Ararat, though, probably learnt the legend of Artawazd at school in their Armenian history classes.

It is possible that Artawazd was regarded by Zoroastrian Armenians as a hero of Fraiegird, and that Christians transformed him into a demon. Or, Artawazd may have been equated already with Adhalak in pre-Christian legend for various reasons: his disrespect towards his dying father could have cast him as a sinner in the popular imagination; perhaps he became demented at an early age and, like the later king Pap, came to be regarded as a demon. Certainly no recorded notice of the historical deeds of Artawazd I suggests that he was either a great national hero or a particularly vile tyrant, but one recalls the tendency of Armenian epic to telescope several historical figures with the same name into a single epic hero, as appears to have been the case in the legend of the struggle of Tigran with Adhalak, in which an Orontid Tigran fights the king of the Medes and is credited with the conquests of the much later
Artaxiad Tigran II. Artawazd II was a historical figure of some importance. His imprisonment and banishment to Egypt by Mark Anthony may have found an echo in Armenian folklore, but then the place of his captivity is not in distant Egypt—sharing perhaps pseudo-Alexander's unpleasant little amule—but in the very heart of Armenia. The scene of the performance of the Bacchae recorded by Plutarch is not implausible a priori, and its coincidence with the victory over Crassus would have etched the drama—both play and feast—indelibly upon the minds of all who heard of it at the time. One recalls that Dionysos, the god who takes human form, is imprisoned by Pentheus, who orders him to be left 'staring at darkness' (line 542); Dionysos warns him that 'Dionysos, who you say is dead, will come in swift pursuit to avenge this sacrilege' (548-9). Shortly thereafter the prison of the god crumbles away and Dionysos is liberated in earthquake, panic, fire and destruction. The scene is apocalyptic; for the worshippers of the god it is salvation, for Pentheus and the settled order he represents it is death. The parallel, even to the ambiguity of the central figure as saviour or destroyer, is there, but one might well ask whether the singers of Golt'N would have been likely to cast their king in an Iranian epic mold because of the events of a Greek play allegedly performed at the moment of a victory.

It is more likely that Artawazd was an apocalyptic hero of Zoroastrianism whom Christian writers sought to discredit by comparing him to Ashahak, even as they scorned the Jewish hope in a coming Messiah. Zor. elements remain in the legend which indicate that Artawazd was seen originally as a redeemer in whose liberation the Zoroastrian Armenians hoped. For the dog in Zoroastrianism is considered a holy creature, as we shall see, and unlikely to gnaw the chains of a demon in an attempt to free him. The Arm. word Șidar means 'crazy, possessed' as an adjective; as a substantive, it is a kind of evil spirit. Derivations have been suggested from a Semitic root štr 'to be crazy' attested in Arabic and Syriac, but it is not explained how Semitic šr became Armenian š-ג. Originally, the word was a proper name, Șidar, and it is attested as such in a Vaysmawurk[6] (Menologium) of Grigor Cerenc[6] XIat[6]ec[6] (A.D. 1441): 50 șagavo și khr Hayoc[6] Artawazd anum, ew mers ordi mi xelagar, oroy anum șr Șidar. șw sëew yorza mëfaw arm[6]ayn Artawazd, hayrn Șidaray, oč et šagavorut iwm ivr Șidaray, si xelagar șr. Vasn oroy ew șaxhara irar dibaw, ew averum lier oč sakaw. șw yavur mìum heceal Șidarn i ji șw et p'oz harkanel, t'ă kamin t'agavorel: șw el gmc șentir hecelawc i zhavans, ew eleal i veray kamrji getoy vasn anc'aneloy. șw eheu șinik mìmn ayaqin pëcey, ankaw i ștun ew korew. șw hecelawyc'ëh bëmawcc' in t'ë c'artseck'ëh Șidaray yap ștaked'ë in șna ew edin i șew leam, or ș avag Masis, ew ay kav șt'ayac. șw eku șinik mìmn ew șinik këxen banapas t'ë t'xay Șidaray; șw i tarelc'ëh i șaw gey, or t'ë ktrï, na elanë ew zaxxars anc'uc'anë. Vasn oroy kargoc'ëh kaxard'ëh arsapal dimawc'ëw t'ë satronëc t'ë i tarsutin i Navasardi mekn amenayn gorsaw zër zinëc ew ic'ë gërcn kop'ë erck'ë angurn, darbim ew ayin amenayn. și kapa Șidaray or i mekn magz ekal ș i ktrli, darjwil hastati șw aminayn, or oč elinë ew zaxxars anc'uc'anë. 'There was a king of Armenia named Artawazd, and he had a demented son whose name was Șidar. And when king Artawazd, the father of Șidar, died, he did not give his kingdom to Șidar, for the latter was insane. Therefore there was strife in the land, and no little destruction. One day Șidar mounted his horse and had the trumpets blown, (saying) "I will be king." He arose and went with picked horsemen to take diversion, and went up on a bridge over a river to cross it. A filthy wind-demon pushed him from there and he fell into the river and was lost. His horsemen spread the rumour that the nongods of Șidar had seized him and put him in the black mountain, which is Greater Ararat, and he stands there chained. Two dogs, one white and one black, daily lick the chains of Șidar, and at the fullness of a year these are thick as a hair; if they break, he will come out and cause the world to pass away. Therefore the witches ordained the [performance of] that which is now known among many peoples as the șyrs. "Tiridates the Great is cast from
his carriage by an aya for his punishment of St Gregory—he goes insane and becomes a boar until the holy man is released from the pit of Xor Wirap.53 There are evil spirits in Arm. folklore whose particular purpose is to drown people who fall from bridges.54

In Zoroastrian doctrine, the bridge is of particular importance. In Avestan it is the Činvatperêtu-, 'Bridge of the Separator', which a man's soul must cross after death. The soul of a sinner will find the bridge exceedingly narrow, and will fall from it to hell, in the company of his evil conscience (Av. dañna-), immediately after judgement by Mithra, Rañnu and Erawna. For a righteous man, the bridge is wide and the way to heaven easy in the company of the beautiful maiden who is his good conscience.55 To fall from a bridge—or to be pushed, as Anak was—may have the symbolic meaning of damnation. In Armenian Folk belief, Christ passes judgement on the soul of one newly dead, at dawn; the soul must then cross a bridge made out of one hair (Arm. manax karmur). If it is righteous, the crossing is easy; if it is evil, the hair breaks and it plunges into the river of fire which separates Heaven and hell.56 In Zoroastrian belief, the rays of the rising sun draw up the soul to Mithra's judgement seat at dawn. The Manicheans of Sogdia, who believed, it seems, in the dañna- which meets the soul after death,57 preserved also a scene of the goddess Nanaï mourning on a bridge with her ladies, probably over the slain Adonis/Attis.58 Perhaps here the bridge is an Iranian symbol of transition between life and death, or simply of death—for the mortal one crossing it has already died and it is the soul which crosses over from the world of the living. It is important to note also that, according to the Vidévdat, two dogs await the spirits of the dead at the Bridge of the Separator,59 and of course two dogs are found in the Arm. legend which struggle to free Šidar—'to restore him', that is, 'to life'.

In order to explain these aspects of the Armenian myth which have to do with hope in some sort of redemption, it is necessary to seek a connection with some eschatological figure. Manandyan identified Šidar with Ašxadar, son of the Parthian king Pacorus II (77-110 A.D.), who reigned over Armenia for three years, from 110 to 113, and was deposed by his father's successor, Xosrov, who installed Ašxadar's younger brother, Parthamasirias, on the Armenian throne; this was done without consulting Trajan, who reacted by invading Armenia in 113.60 There seems to be scant justification for such an equation. Ašxadar was not the son of Artawazd, or even of an Armenian; as a historical figure, he is unimportant; and the transformation of Ašxadar to Šidar is not easily explained in Armenian, which usually preserves the Iranian consonantal cluster -xa- as -xa-.

It is more likely that the name Šidar comes from Phi. Ušêdar (Av. Uxñyat.ērêta-), the first Sësyants (Phi., 'Saviour') of three, born of the seed of Zarathustra, who will battle evil in the final centuries before Fraâxegird.61 In the age of the second Sësyants, Ušêdarmañ (Av. Uxñyat.nëmah-), Až Dahâg (Av. Aži Dahâka) will burst free of his fetters and leave his mountain prison, to be defeated once and for all by the hero Karšâsap (Av. Kêrêšêspa-) and his comrades.62 It is possible that the Armenians, recognising a common element Ašidar in the names of the first and second Sësyants, proceeded to confuse the second with the arch-fiend whose terrible liberation is the most important event of his reign. Or, Christian writers might have sought to discredit Ušêdar, even as they had defamed Girmend. The myth then was explained by making Šidar the 'son' of Artawazd, while Artawazd (like Artaxias) was presented as displeased with his son, who is depicted as insane and accursed (he is thrust from the bridge, perhaps believed to stretch between the two peaks of Ararat—this is probably a symbol of damnation, as we have seen above). Šidar merely takes the place of Artawazd in the legend of Artawazd recorded by Movsês Xorenac'i; while Artawazd in the Šidar myth takes on the role of Artaxês. It has been seen that Mühr (Arm. Mher), confined to his cave at Van, represented for Armenians the hope of redemption at the end of the world.63 A similar belief must have attached to Mount Ararat with its majestic beauty, yet it was also the prison of a demented king of the kxšxš 'brave' dynasty of the Artaxiads, who was equated by the weavers of epic song with Ašdahak. The myth of redemption and the vision of the release of the dragon and the destruction of much of the world preceding its renovation were fused together in a single legend.

The association of apocalyptic events with both destruction and rebirth lends to other traditions as well as the Armenian an ambiguous apprehension that is felt, for instance, in the poem 'The Second Coming'
by William Butler Yeats, in which 'a shape with lion body and the head of a man'—more like the lcontocephalous Deus Arasmumius of the western Mithraists than the scion of the House of David—'isloches towards Bethlehem to be born'.64 Which is the Antichrist, and which the Christ?

It is a feature of Zoroastrianism that various place-names mentioned in the Avesta which may or may not have been actual places on earth originally, later came to be associated with various locations in Iran. We shall have occasion shortly to discuss, for instance, Av. Lake Kasalaya—(Phl. Kayōnsah), which was later identified by Zoroastrians with Lake Hāmūn in Seistan, on a hill near which called Kūh-ī Khwāja there stood an important Zoroastrian shrine built in the Arsacid period.65 According to the Pahlavi texts, the three yazatas Mihr, Bām and Srōs pass judgement on the soul on the 'Peak of Judgement'; the Bridge of the Separtor stretches from Harā Berānsaitī (cf. the cult epithet barzokhara, Ch. 7) to the Čagād-i Jāmāg 'Peak of Judgement' (Phl. Vd. 19.30, cf. ARM 53; compare Arim. loan-word from Iranian Žakāt 'brow, forehead'), which has been identified by some scholars with Damēvand on the evidence of Phl. tradition, which places the mountain in western Iran.66 The same mountain, if the above identification is correct, was also believed to be the place of confinement of Azī Dāhākka. Here, too, one may perceive a parallelism with Mount Ararat and the Arm. story of the bridge. It is not possible to say which cave on the mountain is the one may perceive a parallelism with Mount Ararat and the Arm. story of the bridge. It is not possible to say which cave on the mountain is the place of Artawazd's imprisonment. Caves were often regarded in the Iranian world as the abode of demons; in Vis 6 Bānān, king Nōbad locks up Vis in a place called Āskāft-i Dēvān, 'Grotto of Devils', identified by Minorsky with one or another of the artificial grottoes in the hills of the Murgbāb, which are still called dēv-kan, 'carved out by dēv'.67 Yet one of the striking features of Mount Ararat is its terrible chasm, the Ahora Gorge (Arm. Akočī), on the northeast face of the mountain. The bridge of a hair might well have been believed to stretch across this abyss, and the testimony of Movēš Xorenāči indicates that Artawazd fell into it, although passage over a bridge is mentioned separately: yet sakaw inc. avurc. t'agavorelym ivroy, anc'el zvamarin Artasat. Č K'asak'i orsal kinčs ev išavuyric sakambk' n Činav, ašnekal im i c'onorc xrlagarannc, Ėnd vayr yacelov erivaran, ankani i xor ēm xec, ev xorasonyc leal anheti (NX II.61) 'After but a few days of his reign, [Artawazd] passed over the bridge at Artašat to hunt wild boar and wild mar 68 at the springs of Čen. Startled by some phantom of insanity he whirled his horse round and fell into some great abyss; he plunged to the bottom and vanished.' Why does Xorenac'ī inform us that Artawazd crossed a bridge? It is self-evident that one must cross the Araxes to reach the slopes of Mount Ararat from Artašat, so it is at least a possibility that Xorenac'ī, in an effort to rationalise the narrative he had received, separated two incidents which were originally one: the passage over a bridge and the fall into an abyss (the c'onorc 'phantom' is to be equated with the eyes of the Židar legend). Xorenac'ī knew that there had never been any bridge over the chasm of Mount Ararat, so if such a bridge had been referred to, he would not have understood its symbolic meaning as the Armenian Bridge of the Separator, the nari kemury discussed above, and would have taken it to be a bridge such as the Tap' erakan from which the accursed murderer Anak was cast, at Artašat.

It seems likely, therefore, that an Armenian legend about Frašēgird (Arm. hrašakert) was connected with Mt Ararat as the place of the Bridge of the Separator, like Damēvand. But the mountain was also the prison of Ašānak (here equated with the mad king Artawazd), whose release from his captivity is one of the great events immediately preceding Frašēgird. The legend of Artawazd was re-worked for Židar, the first of the two Žōyants, probably the second, for it is in the time of the second that the dragon is released. The Žōyant was then equated with the fiend whose release would coincide with his reign. This could have been a mistake of ignorance—we have seen how eschatological events may be viewed as either good or evil, destructive or renewing—or an alteration by conscious design. In the latter case, one might attribute it to the Christians, for whom the old gods were demons and the old heroes, villains.

The third and final Žōyant, Astvatzat'a-, is referred to by Eznik, along with his two brothers before him, in the refutation of the 'sect of the Persians': 69 Darseal maww uaw mu iw asen, or amenevin c'ē hawatall, tē'ībrēw mezanēr or <di Or> nīzdī 70 sāzm n̄ iwr yāsvbîr mi arīk: ev maww i vaxām yasw sernân koy s mi aneloc ēti, ev i mānā ordi eel harkanē shazum s izwarac' n Črmenē: ev erku eww nōynpisik nōynγunak eelalc'
Again they say yet something else which is completely unbelievable: when the son of Ormizd was dying he cast his seed into a fountan, and close to the end a virgin will give birth by that seed, and a son arising from the same (will) strike many of the forces of Armun. And two more of the same type born the same way (will) strike his forces and exhaust (them). Ušēdār is the first of the three Saviours to come and is accorded the most attention by those now alive, the other two being merely thrown together as 'two more', when in Zoroastrian doctrine the last is the most important. Such emphasis would explain why Šīdar figures in the Armenian legend, rather than another with a name derived from Astvat."ētsa-.

The seed of the Sōşyants comes not from any son of Ahura Mazda, but from Zarathustra; one may compare the pseudo-Platonic Alcibiades 1.121, in which reference is made to 'the Magian lore of Zoroaster son of Horomazes' (i.e., Horomazes in the genitive). The tradition of the preservation of the seed is substantially the same as in the Pahlavi texts, according to which it is preserved in Lake Kāyānsh, identified with Hāmūn-ī Seistān.29 The fertilisation of a virgin by seed preserved in a lake is a theme found in the Armenian epic of Sasun. The daughter of king Gagik (Arcruni, of Yasprakan) is married to the 'idolatrous' (kīrpašt) Khalifa of Baghdad. On the eve of the holiday of the Ascension (Arm. Hambarjun)73 the daughter, Covinar,74 asks her husband for permission to go on an outing with some other women at the Milky Spring (Kāt'nov abīlwv). Later they come to the Blue Sea (Kapot cowv). Covinar is thirsty, but the water is too salty to drink.75 Covinar asks God to cause a fountain to well up so she can drink; then, Astu hrananov covn bac'cov.,/ Ma šat hamej jur durs škav./ Hayec,76 tesay mek Jol k'ar ka covu phuk./ Siptak (sic) ašbur mi eē k'aric kē t'all.

'By God's command the sea opened,/ And very delicious water came out./ She looked and saw a great stone at the shore of the sea,/ And a white spring flowed out of that rock.' Covinar strips off her clothes, goes into the sea to the place where the fountain flows, and drinks one and one half handfuls of water. Later, Covinar imac'cov., or Ėrelov Ė:/ Akhay, or Ėn coviচ is 'Covinar discovered she was with child;/ she figured out it was from that sea.' She gives birth to two heroes, Sanasar and Dādāsār. The latter is smaller than the former, for he was conceived with only half a handful of the liquid of the fountain. The two brothers, who are traditionally regarded as the progenitors of the Arcrunid house, go on to perform heroic deeds in driving the Arab infidels from Sasun.76

Although the basis of the historical events in the epic is the anti-Arab rebellion in Sasun and Xoyt77 which occurred in A.D. 851, the motifs and characters (e.g., Mher, who figures towards the end) are much more ancient: the saviours of Armenia from a foreign infidel are conceived by a virgin impregnated in a fountain by the will of God. One recalls Eznik's statement that the seed was of the son of Ormizd, and that the evil to be opposed by the Sōşyant is often seen as foreign tyranny (Pāhāk the Arab in the Šān-nāme; Aḏahak the Mede in Armenian tradition).

We shall now examine another legend of life, death and resurrection, in which a prominent part is played by the dog, a creature holy to Zoroastrians. This is the myth of Ara and Šāmiram, preserved by Movses Xorenac'či. According to Xorenac'či, Ara the Beautiful (Arm. galac'čik) was the king of Armenia, a descendant of Hayk—the eponymous ancestor of the nation—who was a descendant of Japheth.78 He was granted his kingdom, like Aram his father, by Ninos, the king of Assyria, whose queen was Šāmiram (Semiramis). At the death or flight of Ninos, Šāmiram desired Ara, but he refused her advances. She determined to seize him, and invaded dašt'n Arayi, or ev yanun nora anumyan Ayrarat 'the plain of Ara, which is called by his name Ayrarat.'79 The queen gave orders that Ara be captured alive and brought to her unharmed, but in the battle he was killed, so she sent despoilers to find his corpse and bring it to her. It was placed in an upper chamber (Arm. vennatun) of her palace. When the Armenians prepared to fight to avenge their fallen king, Šāmiram forestalled them: Hraznewči astuac'čn imac' člezul zvērs nora, ev kendamac'či im ī)'I commanded my gods to lick his wounds, and he will come to life!' (MX I.15). According to Xorenac'či, Ara did not come to life, but Šāmiram deceived the Armenians by dressing up one of her lovers to look like the Armenian king and announced that the gods had licked Ara and brought him back to life. She then caused to be erected a statue (Arm. patker) in their honour, and convinced the Armenians that it was all true.
It is unlikely that Ara died in the original version of the story; Xorenac probably introduced the pseudo-Ara to explain the tale in historically credible terms. Ara was known to Plato as Er the Paphianian, identified by Classical writers as Zoroaster and called an Armenian, a figure of supernatural power who visits the kingdom of the dead and returns to the world of the living. The legend is probably a variant of the passion of Cybele and the beautiful youth Attis, who is both her lover and son; this myth goes back to prehistoric Asia Minor, and is attested in Armenia also by mother-and-child figurines from Artashat and elsewhere which probably represent Nenê (Samiram, the Magna Mater) with the boy Ara (Attis). According to an account of the legend preserved by the so-called Anonymous Historian (whose brief account of ancient Armenia was incorrectly attributed to the seventh-century writer Sebêsos, of whom he appears to have been a contemporary), the 'gods' of Samiram were Aralez-k: sypspès hanê hambav aralezkc tikin Samiram 'thus did the lady Samiram acquire the fame of the aralezk'. It is not apparent that Xorenac's work was one of the sources used by the Anonymous Historian, so the identification is probably part of tradition rather than an embroidering of Xorenac's narrative. The aralez is described in any case by fifth-century writers, although they do not make specific reference to the legend of Ara. Eznik argues, oc ic sman inc elael, etc ew anderewyct zawrut'inc wac kec, ew yorzan viravor ok ankeal ipateramai dnic ic te lizic e ew olac uc anic e 'nothing has come from the dog which might live with invisible powers and lick and make healthy someone wounded when he falls in battle and is laid out,' and he ridicules those who think aralez in samen '(that) the aralez [is] from a dog'. The fifth-century historian Etkin, in a commentary on the book of Genesis, speaks of a creature which yar liyu sameralen 'continually licks the dead' and revives them, and is called a yearalez. The analysis of the word as yar 'continually' and less 'lick' is a folk etymology, yet none of the other explanations of the word which have been proposed are conclusive or convincing. The late fifth-century philosopher Davit is supposed to have written, xanzi yirokut samc omanc angoyc en, orpc es aljerk in evec aralez, ew orc ap inc mers verastelc mtcuc icw 'For certain circumstances are nonexistent, such as the chimaera and the aralez, and such other things as our cogitation synthesizes.' The structure of Davit's proposition seems to derive from a citation of Aristotle by Dionysios Thrax (whose works were translated into Armenian), but the aralez is Davit's own addition. The tenth-century historian Tovma Arsruni refers to the 'village of Lczk', where they recite the legend of the healing of the wounds of the dead Ara, i.e., where the Ara-lezk licked him back to health. Mention of belief in rescue or resuscitation by aralezkc is found in legends about other heroes, as well. Xorenac seeks rational explanation for the following Armenian tale concerning the infant prince Sanstruck, who was caught in a snowstorm in the mountains of Korduk with his nurse Sanot: Zormê arapkelabanen, etc kandani im norahra spituk yastuacocn araczal pahor sanmun. Bae0 orc ap elck verahas, sysspès ë: sun spituk ènd mdraka leyal, pataheac mankern dw eyekin. Ard kco caw Sanstrak, i dayekin sanmunakocc ut icn areal, orpc t'c tyczurc Sanotay. 'They make a fable about it: a miraculous white animal sent by the gods guarded the child. But as we have understood it, it is thus: a white dog was in search and came upon the child and (his) nurse. Now [the former] was called Sanstruk, taking the name from the nurse, as "gift of Sanot." It was apparently believed by Christians in the fourth century that the aralezk would descend to revive dead heroes. The sparapet of the Armenians, Mšeč Manikonean (died ca. 375), appears as the principal secular hero of P'awstos Buzand. At his death, Ítreb taren samarin sparapetin Mšeč tun iavr aé entsí asic ic, oc uvaratay entsí norc smun norc, t'c ëpt ew tesanëln aclcx norc sá i smrcoyn. Zi ašin: Dora vant'ic ëkzat metal ër, ew vër erbèk cër areal: oc net al dipacv erbèk, ew oc aclcx squic xockel s ëd. Isk kësk yamneloy akr uenin nac: mìn c aclcx aclen ënd kocen kåc cëcic, ew hanin edin i tanan ëstarak miy: ašin t'cëc vëm zi aêr kåj ër, aralez cifinen ew yarac,cen sëd. Pahapon kayin, ew akr uenin yamneloy, mìn c aclcx aclen samarin. Apc ñycic ëestarak miy, ew lac c Alicia c sma orpcsc avrcn ër (P'B V.36). 'When they took the body of the commander Mšeč to his house, to his household, the family did not believe in his death, although they saw the head separated from the body. For they said, "He has gone into battle innumerable times, and has never been
wounded: no arrow has ever touched him, nor has the weapon of others ever pierced him." And half of them expected him to rise; as they sawed the head to the trunk, took and placed it on the roof of a tower, they said, "Because he was a brave man, 90 the aralesk (will) descend and resurrect him." They stood guard and expected his resurrection, until the body decayed. Then they took it down from the tower, and cried, and buried it as was fitting. 71 It has been suggested that tower-type structures found in Armenia and Asia Minor may have been connected with belief in the aralesk, for one recalls that Ara, too, was placed in an upper room (vermatun) of the palace of Šamiran. 92 We have noted that the tower excavated at Parakar, near Ejmiacin, was also a burial site of the pre-Christian period, and perhaps Mæsil's body was first exposed, then buried. 93

An Armenian Christian polemicist attacked the 'Paulicians' for their practice of various pagan customs, amongst which was the exposure of the dead on rooftops. 94 The exposure of the dead is an important aspect of Zoroastrian ritual, and it may be assumed that corpses were placed in high and rocky places where they would not pollute the earth and their presence would not impede traffic, or in enclosed places of exposure, such as the stone daxman 'towers of silence' of the Parsi and Irani Zoroastrians. It is noteworthy, too, that the Zoroastrians attribute to certain dogs the power to banish the corpse-demon, 95 and a dog is brought to the side of the newly-deceased to determine whether a man is truly dead. The dog is of preference either yellow, with a spot over each eye, or white with yellow ears (it is recalled that the dog which saved Samatruk was white). In Armenia, too, dogs were believed to be able to sense the approach of death. Suanajcanc recorded in the mid-nineteenth century one villager's testimony: Nargiz xat'un hiwand är, grolök iker är och inor ārāv, ēnārēc ofnaluc īsamānc 'The lady Nargiz was ill and the grolik ('writer'), i.e., the Angel of Death, had come to (take away) her son [i.e., life], we learned it from the barking of the dogs.' 96 It may be that dogs on occasion found people asleep or comatose and saved them from interment or exposure; they would thus have been regarded as having rescued the body from death. It is also possible that the Armenian aralesk belong to a tradition which predated Zoroastrianism but survived with that tenacity which is seen to characterise archaic funerary beliefs and practices in various cultures.

It has been suggested that the Arm. tradition may be traced to Assyria, where the god Marduk, called 'resuscitator of the dead', is found still at Harrūn in the first centuries of the Christian era as mšy dkbw 'lord of the dogs'. 97 Thus, while it may be that the aralesk are not creatures of Zoroastrian belief, and the resuscitation of the dead by them certainly has no direct parallel in Zoroastrianism, the belief in the supernatural qualities of the dog and the exposure of a corpse are Zoroastrian practices. Indeed, it is interesting that while Ara was placed merely in an upper room, Mæsil was placed on a rooftop; an old Armenian practice may have undergone changes introduced by Zoroastrianism, such as the Achaemenian kings seem to have adapted the pagan rite of burial to conform with Zoroastrian laws of purity, by entombing the corpse in such a manner that it did not pollute by contact the earth of Špenta Ārmaiti.

We possess other evidence for the reverence of the dog by the Armenians. The fourteenth-century Byzantine ecclesiastical historian Nikēphoros Kallistos Xanthopoloulos wrote: "Now if one asks about the Artzibour, 98 fast, some say it is for Adam's disobedience or for the repentance of Nineveh. Some say it is because the Armenians fasted as they were about to be baptised by St Gregory. Sometimes they say also that it is for somebody named Sargis who died a martyr's death amongst them. There are yet others who tell the true story of its origin, which is the following: There was once a priest amongst them named Sargis who had a dog which, at Satan's instigation, he often made a herald of his arrival, and gave it the name Artzibour, which in Armenian means "herald" or "messenger". Thus whenever his students and disciples living in towns and villages saw his dog preceding him, they came up before their teacher and guided him. Now this dog was eaten by wolves. One day, Sargis sent his dog ahead of him and then went out himself, but was very angry when he found no one waiting to meet him on the road. When he discovered that his dog had been eaten by wolves, he commanded the Armenians to fast, mourn and lament every year at that time because of the dog's death, as they had lost such a great boon thereby. 99 The Armenian chronicler Mattēzos Upayec (Matthew of Edessa), who lived in the late eleventh-early twelfth century, recognised the existence of the cult of

characterise archaic funerary beliefs and practices in various cultures.
the dog of Sargis amongst the Armenians, so one cannot dismiss the testimony of Nikephoros as merely another example of Byzantine anti-Armenian calumny. Matt Eos wrote, 'As far as St Sargis the General, whose holiday we celebrate, is concerned, then we have in mind the true martyr, who in the days of the emperor Tzodos was martyred in the province of Hagreand at the hands of the sons of Hagar—the sons of Mehmed—and not the apostate asherd Sargis, who made people worship a dog.' In Armenia, where there is a large Armenian community, the Romanians speak of a dog named Artsivurtsi which belonged to an Armenian priest. The priest was once lost in a forest and the dog guided him out of it; the Armenians considered the dog holy and kept a fast on the day of St Sargis in its honour. The latter tale, of popular origin and therefore probably not filtered through the mind of a hostile theologian, is similar to the others above with one significant difference: the dog does not merely accompany the priest; it guides him when he is lost.

This detail recalls the legend of the rescue of Sanatruk and his nurse when they were lost in a snowstorm, and suggests that the popular observance may have been connected to the ancient cult of the aralezk. It was believed by Armenians in Nor Bayazit (modern Kamo, northeast of Erevan near the shore of Lake Sevan) around the beginning of this century that there was a race of dog-headed men who, of all God's creatures, were the only ones equal to human beings. Dog-headed men are regularly shown in mediaeval Armenian miniature paintings amongst the representatives of the various nations in whose languages the Apostles began to speak at Pentecost. In the Armenian Life of St Eustathius, the fleeing holy man pays one of the jamagluvek 'dog-headed ones', i.e., worshippers of the dog-headed god Anubis, to ferry him and his family across the sea to Egypt. In Christian art until recent times, a cynocphalic man seems to have been used to represent the Nile; it is likely therefore that in the Armenian MS illuminations the dog-headed figure represents the Egyptians.

There are a number of modern Armenian legends which preserve many essential details of the Samiram story. E. Lalaveane published a variant related to him by a centenarian from Erzurum, Mr Sahak Safarean: Many centuries ago in Nineveh, which is Mosul, there lived the aged king Aram. He became blind, and was advised to send one of his three sons to

Samiram for medicine. He declined to do this, fearing that she desired his youngest boy, Ara, but the latter persuaded his father to let him go. Ara, together with his two elder brothers, set off for Samiram's capital, Van. On the way, they conquered three fortresses of demons and freed maidens from each; Ara married the third maiden, Zwart, who knew that Samiram would not release him. But Ara forged ahead. He met an old man, who made him pluck forty leaves from a great tree. Ara ate one and beheld the whole world, his home, and his ailing father. He took another leaf, became invisible, and slipped past Samiram's four formidable guards. Once inside her chamber, Ara took the medicine needed by Aram, but he saw Samiram's beauty and slipped a ring with his name on it on her finger as she slept. Then he hastened home. When Samiram awoke the next morning, she saw Ara's ring, called her army and went after him, furious that he had escaped her. Meanwhile, Ara arrived home, cured Aram, and told him that Samiram would soon be upon them. He added that there was no time to prepare to fight her, and asked that he be allowed to go out with thirty men to meet her. Aram grudgingly agreed to this plan. Samiram seized Ara with little difficulty, and kept him by her for three years. At the end of that time, Ara escaped. The army was sent in hot pursuit, but killed him by accident. Lamenting, Samiram buried him. Although Ara and Samiram figure in this legend, it resembles more closely the Greek song of a young man held against his will away from his wife by a beautiful Armenian witch. The above legend has no mention of the resurrection of the dead, but a reference to that aspect of the tale is found in a Kurdish legend cited by X. Levoneanu: A king in PSL (Armen. Hayoc) Jor, the valley of the Hosap, southwest of Van) wished to marry the queen of Van. A widow, she was afraid to refuse his offer outright, but neither did she wish to lose her lands, so she promised to marry him if he would bring the water of the Spring of Samiram on the Hosap to her palace. He constructed a canal as far as Artame, seeing that he would succeed, the queen hurled herself from her tower and died. The king ordered his magicians to resurrect her with talismans, but they were unable to do so. The king of PSL thereupon seized her lands. One notes in this story the tower, the talismans mentioned by Xorena as belonging to Samiram, and the vain attempt to raise the dead.
In Artamet there is a pit with a boulder at the bottom, about which this legend is told: some boys found the beads which Samiram used to enthrall men. Samiram recognised the beads and took them away from the boys. An old man snatched them from her and ran off. She made a sling of her long hair and with it hurled a huge boulder at him. He escaped and cast the enchanted necklace into Lake Van; the boulder fell at Artamet.\textsuperscript{113}

According to another legend,\textsuperscript{114} there was an \textit{ašahr} (NP., 'dragon',\textsuperscript{115}) called Šahraman (NP. Šan-i māran 'king of the snakes', probably a folk etymology of the similar sounding name Šamiran) which threatened some villagers and was killed by a hero. Years later, a witch had a daughter who was ugly and unmarried but skilled in magic. This girl went into the fields to find betony root. The root was entwined about a bone and she could not extract it, so she smashed the bone. Sparks flew, and she fell asleep. In her dream, she saw a dragon (Arm. \textit{vişap}) with a shining gem on its head. Then she awoke and saw the gem lying before her. She began to polish it and was granted her wish: that she and her mother might have a palace on the spot where the dragon had died. The witch gave her daughter the name Šahraman. Now a lovely youth lived in Artamet, and Šahraman wished to marry him; she forced him to come to her with her dragon-gem, but he escaped. She ascended to the top of Mount Nemrut\textsuperscript{6} (a mountain of this name is found north-northeast of Deyvan, with a lake in the extinguished volcanic crater at its summit; Nemrut Dağ in Commagene is not meant here), made a sling of her hair, and cast a great boulder at Artamet out of spite. Then she built the aqueduct at Van, dropped her stone into it by accident, and died. Some boys later found the stone at Ostan (southwest of Artamet, on the shore of Lake Van), but a priest of their religion took it and threw it into Lake Van so that no man might take possession of it and misuse it. The old man is the cause of the disappearance of the stone (or beads) in several legends, and appears as 'a priest of their (the boys') religion' above. One recalls that in the narrative of Xorenaci Šamiran casts her beads--used as talismans--into the sea whilst fleeing Zradasht, i.e., Zarathustra, who was indeed a priest.\textsuperscript{116}

Finally, there is a legend of Xotjur\textsuperscript{117} which unites various themes of the legends of captive heroes: the hero captured and bound, dogs (in this case, they are undoubtedly aralezik\textsuperscript{7}) which gnaw at his bonds, his release, and his revenge. From the legend, it will become apparent that the myth of Artawazd, with its theme of apocalyptic renewal, and the myth of Ara, with its theme of renewal of a different kind--resurrection from the dead--share common details, particularly the aralezik\textsuperscript{7}. It is probable that a cult of Ara/Attis preceded by many centuries the introduction to Armenia of Zoroastrian eschatological conceptions; the goddess called the Great Mother, with her divine Son, is attested in Asia Minor from the Paleolithic Age.\textsuperscript{118} The images common to both groups of legends would have been borrowed from the legend of Ara. Here, then, is the tale from Xotjur. A king had three sons, and the youngest of them\textsuperscript{119} one day saw a crowd of gypsies outside the walls of the palace. Amongst them he espied a lovely girl, and asked his mother to have her brought to the palace. He decided to marry the girl, and asked for his inheritance then and there, that he might take her to a faraway country. His mother went to the treasury, which was guarded by a lion, and fetched lordly garments for the young couple, who set off and arrived at the seashore. The waters churned, and a huge creature with sunlike eyes, laughing like a man, swam towards them. It came on shore, and resembled a winged lion. It asked them to mount it, and bore them across the sea. On the far shore, it asked the youth to kill it, dismember it, bury the parts separately and exhume them a week later. Reluctantly, the boy performed the task. A week later, he exhumed the lion's trunk. A horse of fire leapt up, knealt before him, and, flapping great wings, took him for a flight through the air. Then he exhumed the head: four fire-eyed dogs jumped up and flew about on their wings. He then exhumed the intestines, which became weapons of fire. The youth built a palace in a leafy forest on the seashore and often went hunting. One day, while he was away, a pçeri\textsuperscript{120} in the form of a black man swam towards the shore. The gypsy girl, who had become bored during the continual absences of her husband, was persuaded to extend a stick to the evil pçeri and pull him ashore, despite her fright. Without very much trouble the pçeri convinced the girl that her husband intended to kill her, and that she should therefore slay him first. The girl feigned sickness and asked her husband upon his return to go to fetch her a lyre from an enchanted garden where musical instruments grew on trees. The
youth set off and arrived at a palace near the garden, where a girl asked him what he wanted. Shen he told her, she replied that his wife obviously intended to kill him, because the garden was surrounded by p'ēris, and a bear and a bull guarded the gates. She gave him meat for the bear and grass for the bull. He passed through the gates unharmed, seized the lyre, and was gone on his winged steed before the p'ēris could grab him. He played the lyre for his wife, and she pretended to get better. Then she feigned illness once more, and sent him off for a special black ram. Again, the girl at the distant palace advised the youth, telling him how to avoid the lions that guarded the ram, and he brought it back to his wife. She sent him on a final quest for some golden water. The p'ēri had nearly exhausted his tricks, and confessed to the wicked girl that if this one did not work, he would not know what to do next. Yet again the girl in the faraway palace counselled the tired youth, warning him of two mountains that closed on anyone who ventured out upon the lake, and imprisoned him. The young man escaped the clashing walls of rock, but his four dogs were trapped between them. Saddened but still faithful, he returned to his wife with the golden water. Amazed, she asked the youth what could bind him. Nothing, he replied, but the hairs of a pig. She bound him with these, and at that moment the foul p'ēri burst forth from his hiding place and cast the young man into a pit. The hairs cut into him, his life's blood trickled away, and he cried out. The fiery, winged dogs came, severed his bonds, and licked his wounds. He emerged from the pit, forced the p'ēri to kill his evil wife, and married the good princess.

The above tale bears some resemblance to the Georgian story of Šr'tisavari (the name means 'I am of God'), who is tricked and sent on dangerous errands. This hero, it is of interest to note, was born of an apple his mother found in the sea and ate (cf. Covinar above). He has eight dogs, who send a griffin (Geor. p'ask'undel) to save him when he is in mortal peril.121

In the land of Armenia, where the earth's crust is in continual travail, the ragged cliffs must have seemed to the ancients fully capable of giving birth to stony monsters,122 and the restless mountains, rent by earthquake and landslide, were likely gateways from which the world's end might someday emerge. Surely the stories about the Magi were meant to encourage the followers of ancient faiths in the East to embrace the Saviour born at Bethlehem; how much more impressive their journey would have seemed to the Armenians, when the latter were told that the three sages departed to follow the star from a cave, in the Mons Victoriais.123 Jesus did not go to the mountain, but its denizens went to him.
Notes - Chapter 13

1. See Ch. 2.
2. See Ch. 3.
3. On Ascension Day, see Ch. 12; on Mithra, see Ch. 8.
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32. The primary meaning of avt is 'disease' (cf. Av. avti-); in this case the reference is to sexual passion, the potions being aphrodisiacs. Cyprian, mentioned in the passage, was a sorcerer before his conversion to Christianity, and attempted to seduce the holy virgin Justine with a love potion (see Ch. 14).
33. On Arm. bra:zC and arhavirkC, see Ch. 14.
34. Arm. crar, lit. 'bundle', is also used in the sense of a talisman. The kCray 'crucible' was used presumably for melting metal, as the place was a smithy; the crars could have been either metal objects--perhaps statuettes of Anahit--or edible potions concocted in the crucibles. Crars could also have been, perhaps, bundles of herbs wrapped in a bag. A sermon of Vardan AygekaC (thirteenth
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38. The form Masik'oh may be analysed as Arm. Masik' 'Ararat' and NP. k'th 'mountain'.


39. See our Ch. on Tork' Angeles for Pap and Nergal; on other images with snakes, see Ch. 14.

40. E. Durean, Heyoc'hin krône, Jerusalem, 1933, 115.


42. P'B III.10.

43. See Ch. 1 on the name of Ararat and its etymology, also, A. Matikean, 'Sarakat t'k' Ararat,' Pusjarjan-Festschrift, Vienna, 1911, 432-5. Arm. Masik' may be a loan-word from Gif. masyah-'greater' (see this writer's art. 'Armeno-Iranica', in the Boyce Festschrift, in press).

44. Ekhe' òarenc', Erker, I, Erevan, 1962, 246-7 (Takaran XX); IV, Erevan, 1968, 214-22 (in Girv' canapari 'Book of the Journey').

The name appears to contain Arm. *sea*, but its derivation is uncertain. For the most recent discussion of the name see I. M. D'yakanov, "K drevnevostochnomu substratuv armianskom yazyke," P-BH, 1981, 1, 69.

The kapot cov (i.e., kapoyt cov 'blue sea') could be Lake Urma, called Kapotan cov by Arm. geographers and identified by the Zoroastrians with the Av. lake Cáasa-, or else Lake Van (Arm. Bûnumac' or Vany cov), which is directly to the east of Sasun—where the events of the epic take place—and whose water is very salty.

The text is corrupt. It reads: "Leznow geawin, or zawrach'gelec'ik afaspelabanca spianac verayn spanelc'en. The words or zawrach' were emended by Patkanean to ur sarawyn 'where Ara' (acc. sing.); spianac verayn spanelc'en was emended by Abekyan to spianal virac'n spanelc'y 'the healing of the wounds of the dead one' (see Matikean, op. cit. n. 83, 58 and V. Vardanyan, ed. & trans., "Tovuy Arrunw et Ananun, Patmat'tyan Arrcruynac' tan, Erevan, 1978, 225, 366 n. 431-432). A picture of the village of Lensk', with its fortress-crowned central rock, is reproduced in S. Liatsyan, Starinnye plyaski i teatral'nye predstavleniya armenianskogo naroda, Erevan, 1958, pl. 64. The connection of Lensk' with the Aralen was noted in the nineteenth century by G. Sruanjan'c'yan (Birk, I, Erevan, 1975, 32)."

"Leznow geawin, or zawrach'gelec'ik afaspelabanca spianac verayn spanelc'en. The words or zawrach' were emended by Patkanean to ur sarawyn 'where Ara' (acc. sing.); spianac verayn spanelc'en was emended by Abekyan to spianal virac'n spanelc'y 'the healing of the wounds of the dead one' (see Matikean, op. cit. n. 83, 58 and V. Vardanyan, ed. & trans., "Tovuy Arrunw et Ananun, Patmat'tyan Arrcruynac' tan, Erevan, 1978, 225, 366 n. 431-432). A picture of the village of Lensk', with its fortress-crowned central rock, is reproduced in S. Liatsyan, Starinnye plyaski i teatral'nye predstavleniya armenianskogo naroda, Erevan, 1958, pl. 64. The connection of Lensk' with the Aralen was noted in the nineteenth century by G. Sruanjan'c'yan (Birk, I, Erevan, 1975, 32)."
90. Arm. șvrm kcaj. Kcaj 'brave' was both the epithet of kings and the name of supernatural creatures who were believed to dwell on Ararat; see above and following Ch.

91. Arm. șvrm-ka k 'rule, custom' is a loan-word from Mr. ašvrm-ak 'manner, way' (HAG, IV, 617-8); the Arm., from an original meaning 'fitting, proper custom' came to mean 'law', and is used in the latter sense in the earliest Arm. literary monument, the fifth century translation of the Bible. Catholicos Yovannanes Mandakuni (fifth century) and later writers used an-șvrm 'lawless' in the sense of 'heathen'. But the phrase șvrm ēr is an expression of the pre-Christian epic; it is found in a fragment of the lyric lament of the dying Ayraci (I) cited by Grigor Magistros (op. cit., letter 33): 膘y instancetype șvrm Navaarsd./ șvrm Navaarsd./ șvrm-ka jecmew șvrm-kaawarac. 'Who would give me the smoke of the chimney? And the morning of Navaarsd./ The running of the bucks and the skipping of the stags?/ We blew the trumpet and struck the drum,/ As was the custom of kings.' The sense of custom, rather than law, is primary in the above passage. The Ayçagar i Zare'ran 'Memorial of Zare', probably a Pahlavi translation of a Parthian narrative poetical work, contains a similar description of a scene at the court of king Vistasp: . . . tumbag zed ud nāy pasandez gādum khārīn ' . . . they struck the drum and played the reed flute and made the trumpet call' (J. M. Jassap-Asana, Pahlavi Texts, Bombay, 1913, 3, lines 26-7). As we have remarked above, the manners and activities considered proper to the daily lives of Iranian and Armenian kings and noblemen corresponded in many particulars—the above is one example; feasting, hunting and going to war are others—and were described in the epics of both countries. The use of șvrm by Cawatos reflects a pre-Christian idiom, but the șvrm itself is in this case Christianity.


93. On șArak'ar and other sites, see Ch. 10.

94. See Ch. 16.

95. On this demon, which assumes the shape of a fly, see Ch. 14.


98. In Medieval Greek, ș is often used to transcribe the foreign sounds to, ò, ò or ò (e.g., the name of the Byzantine general John Tzimiskes, rendering Arm. Cwrmkn, or Mod. Ok. tsihi or tsaihi, rendering the șk. loan-word from Wp. Ljčk,river) with the neuter Gk. ending -i (for Classical Gk. -ôi); the latter beta was pronounced y in spoken Greek. It was therefore suggested by N. Akkinean, JA, 1904, 313, that the word Arzibour is a rendering of the Arm. αρξαμώρας fast celebrated since earliest times by the Armenian Church (see e.g., the Canons of St Epiphanius of Cyprus, in V. Hakoian, ed., Kanonagir' Hayocq', II, Erevan, 1971, 279). Arzavor means 'first fruits' or 'predecessor'; the fast celebrates early martyrs of the Christian faith.


100. St. Sargs, a Cappadocian general in the Roman forces, fled Julian the Apostate (ca. A.D. 361), took refuge briefly in Arm. under king Tiran, but was forced to leave there. He fled to Persia, where he, his son Martiros, and fourteen other Christians refused to offer sacrifices demanded by the Magi, whom they also insulted, whereupon king Šahubri II ordered that they be executed (Tw. Guinakean, Surb șw șw Garavankāvq Ebeke, Jerusalem, 1957, 143-4). Another St Sargs, considerably more obscure and too late to be considered an early martyr of Christianity or of the Arm. Church, is apparently the one referred to by Mattēsos, however. He was an Armenian general who died fighting the Arabs at Bagrawand, according to Mattēsos, during the reign of the Caesar Tēhodos (i.e., Theodosius III, 715-17; see S. Aucoman, Byzantine Civilization, Cleveland, Ohio, 1970, 242 and Hamb, IV, 425). The great and ill-fated revolt of the Armenian nakarar which culminated in the disastrous battle of Bagrawand did not occur, though, until at least a generation later (the battle occurred in 775, according to A. N. Ter-Gevondyan, Armenia i Arabshki Khalifat, Erevan, 1977, 106-9, or 25 April 772, according to C. Tomanoff, Studies in Christian Caucasian History, Georgetown University Press, 1963, 154).


102. Cited by HAG, 1, 252 s.v. șAr.

103. Matikean, op. cit., 169; AH, 1908, 93.

104. See the scenes of the Pentecost (Arm. HAp'gqat) in a thirteenth-century Gospel (L. A. Durnov, N. G. Dragmian, ed., Haykakan manrankaracutq'yun, Erevan, 1969, pl. 31), in the Queen Keran Gospel, painted for the Arm. Royal family of Cilicia at Sis, A.D. 1272, Jerusalem Arm. MS 2563, fol. 349 (B. Markiss, ed., Armenian Art Treasures of Jerusalem, New Rochelle, New York, 1979, fig. 76), and in a Gospel of A.D. 1575 from Van, Erevan MS 4831.
105. Ev i giseri edal stikr a ynov i maxai gnac in dimalk in Egiptos: ev aravealkc erkuw avwrc sanapar; merjacan i cov ev prutcvyin maxel. Ev gtes al navavar yazg'en sanaglxc en navarkal gnac in. 'And at night they put the children in a knapsack and went towards Egypt. And after two days' journey they arrived by the sea and hastened to set sail. Finding a skipper of the nation of the Dog-heads (Sanaglxc), they barged ship and departed.' (Wenckc ev kayabanac iwvikx arboe batendir kaalealk c i carentrecht, I. Venice, 1874, 427; for an abbreviated Life of the saint, see Guzakean, op. cit., 133).

106. A cynocephal man astride a flood, with his back to the viewer, represents the Nile in an eighteenth-century engraving by the English poet and artist William Blake after the painter Fuseli for Erasmus Darwin, Botanic Garden, 1791 (see Kathleen Haine, William Blake, London, 1970, 33 & fig. 16).


108. In MX, Šamiram herself is from Nineveh; the construction of Van after the death of Ara is attributed to her.


110. Vantosp, 1911, 2-4.

111. This is the Urartean aqueduct, whose construction is attributed by the Armenians to Šamiram (MX I.16).

112. On Arm. yurut c c, see Ch. 14.


114. Ibid., 73.

115. See our Ch. on Vahag for a discussion of the so-called vilen stales, which are called araha yurts by the Kurds.

116. On the expression ulunk Šamirasey i cov 'the beads of Šamiram into the sea', see Ch. 14.

117. Cited by Matikean, op. cit., 32. Kotjur is a region north of Karin/Erzurum and south of the river Ccorox.

118. See M. J. Vernasean, Cybele and Attis, the Myth and the Cult, London, 1977, 13, and our Ch. on Anahit and Nanè.

119. Presumably this is Ara; cf. the three sons in the tale recited by Mr SaFarean of Erzurum, above. It is perhaps noteworthy that there are also three Šosyants in the Zoroastrian eschatological tradition we have discussed, although three sons are indeed a commonplace in folk-tales.

120. Np. pert 'fairy'; on Arm. parik 'an evil spirit), a loan-word from Mr., see Ch. 14.

121. M. Wardrop, Georgian Folk Tales, London, 1894, 25, 32. Ossetic p'ak'unda 'griffin' appears to have been borrowed from another Iranian language via Georgian. Phl. bokc and older Ir. pkc 'griffin) are traced to Gfr. *pati-skuvazi 'swooping down upon' (R. W. Bailey, 'Excursus Iranocaucasian', Monumentum K. S. Meger, I. Acta Iranica, 1975, 34; on the Ossetic form, see also N. Ajello, op. cit., 315). Arm. paskuc is a loan from the older Ir. form cited by Bailey; according to AHH, 181, it and other birds of prey (including the k'ark'hag, an Ir. loan-word, cf. Av. kahraasa- 'vulture') were objects of cult. On eagles, which are listed in this category, see n. 5 above.

122. See our discussion of the myth of Kumarbi and Ulilkummi in the Ch. on Mitura.

123. Herzfeld identified the Kih-i Khwaja with the Mons Victorialis of the Magi; see K. Schippmann, op. cit., 58 & n. 126 (also n. 65 above). The oldest reference to the mountain, which contained a cave where the Magi kept the gifts that it had been prophesied would one day be presented to the Messiah, is to be found in the Syrac Book of the Cave of Treasures, where it is called Mir 'cave' 'mount Nûd' (probably to be emended to Mir 'Light', for in later, Western texts it is called the Mountain of Light) or tür neyân 'the Mountain of Victory'. The scene of the Nativity and the Adoration of the Magi in the earliest Armenian miniature painting, a sixth-century work bound with the Ejiacin Gospel of A.D. 989, is a sumptuous palace; in later Armenian art, as in other Christian painting, the scene is a grotto (clearly labelled syv 'the cave' in Erevan MS. 9423, A.D. 1332, from Van, in Durnovo & Dragyupa, op. cit., fig. 65; see ibid., fig. 1, for the Adoration from the Ejiacin Manuscript, Erevan MS. 274). It has been suggested that this depiction was influenced by the legend of the cave in the Mons Victorialis (see Ugo Monneret de Villard, Le leggende orientali sui Magi evangelici ('Studi e Testi', 163), Vatican, 1952, 6, 18, 62 & n. 1). An Armenian apocryphal text on the Nativity in a MS. copied in A.D. 1700 mentions the mawr 'manager' as within the syv 'cave' (Fr. Y. Tayecli, ed., Ankanon girk Nor Tkataranac, Venice, 1938, 267-77).
CHAPTER 14

EVIL SPIRITS AND CREATURES

Zoroastrianism differs from the other great monotheistic religions principally in its treatment of the presence of evil in our world. In any system which postulates an omnipotent God, evil cannot logically be explained except as a power either willed or permitted by divinity. Zoroastrians regard the lie (OP. drauga), the very spirit of all chaos and wickedness, as utterly alien from aša (OP. arta), the spirit of the right order of the cosmos. According to the Gāthās, Ahura Mazda, 'the Lord Wisdom' and Angra Mainyu 'the Destructive Spirit' were separate and distinct spiritual beings in the beginning, i.e., infinitely into the past. Ahura Mazda chose aša, while Angra Mainyu chose the lie. The two spirits are opposed in every way. Ahura Mazda created the universe, which was originally good and pure; Angra Mainyu, unable to create any material being, invaded it and corrupted certain parts of it. All death, disease, hatred and suffering is the result of that invasion, against which the ašavan 'possessor of aša', i.e., 'righteous man', is bidden to fight. In Zoroastrian theology, Ahura Mazda and the other yazatas he created receive reverence; neither Angra Mainyu nor his daēvas may be worshipped, nor can they be propitiated—they are to be opposed. It should be obvious from the above that Zoroastrian dualism is the opposition not of two gods, but of God and a demon. In that sense it is monotheistic, although Ahura Mazda is not omnipotent. The world is the scene of a cosmic struggle in which the forces of Ahura Mazda, the yazatas, ašavans and all good creation battle against the powers of darkness. The latter will be vanquished in the end, we are assured, but for now Ahura Mazda has not the power to prevent our death or always to stay other disasters that may befall us; we must be resolute and brave.

The origins of this ethical and cosmological foundation of Zoroastrian thought may perhaps be seen in the early distinction drawn in the Rg Veda between the supernatural beings called auras (cognate with Av. ahura- 'Lord'), who possessed māyā, a kind of mental power, and the
devas (cf. Av. ādeva-), who exerted their will, it is suggested, by pure strength.  

Zarathustra, who was himself a priest of an old religion which may have paid reverence to both abhuras and daevas, may have seen in the mental basis of the power of the abhuras the foundation of morality, whereas in the mere force of the daevas he perceived the amorality that is the basis of evil: the thoughtless exercise of power without regard for the rest of the cosmos as ordered by Ādī (Vedic rta). It is also possible that the religion Zarathustra professed before his revelation already condemned the daevas and that the Prophet refined this system. But those who have advanced this theory do not seem to have accounted adequately for the veneration of the Prophet's condemnation of the daevas and of his enemies who worshipped them.

From earliest times to the very end of the Sasanian dynasty and later, the worship of the daevas as gods by non-Zoroastrians, as in Sogdian, together with the propitiation of the deva as demons by nominally Zoroastrian practitioners of black magic, persisted throughout the Iranian world, despite the best efforts of kings and clerics to eradicate it. In the Achaemenian period, Xerxes boasted in an inscription that he had destroyed a salvadāna- 'place of the daeva' and had established the cult of Ahura Mazdā where previously men had worshipped the daevas. His own wife, Amestris, is said to have buried alive fourteen Persian boys of distinguished family in order to propitiate the god of the underworld; the Magi buried alive nine boys and nine girls during the Persian invasion of Greece. Although Angra Mainyu receives the epithet kthbōnios 'of the earth Cor, underworld!' in Hippolytus, it is unlikely that Amestris or the Magi were performing black magic in a Zoroastrian context; at this early period, it is probable that they were practising the rituals of the elder gods. Perhaps the Armenians adopted from Old Persian a term sandaramet meaning 'underworld' generally, without specific reference to the Zoroastrian yazata Spandārmaṇa (Av. Spēnta Ārmaiti). It seems that there still existed in Achaemenian times the pre-Zoroastrian conception of an underworld of shades, to be distinguished from the Zoroastrian after-life of rewards and punishments (the place of the righteous being called in Av. garō.ādāna- 'the house of song', cf. Arm. gerezman 'tomb'). The ruler of the pagan underworld was probably Yima (Skt. Yama), who may be the ādam-e ūw zvin 'person beneath the earth' to whom certain Zoroastrians of the community of Sarisbād, near Yazd, offer the propitiatory sacrifice of a black hen-black being the colour of evil. We have suggested that the image of Zahhāk in the Šah-nāme may come from an original conception of Yima based upon the Mesoopotamian Nergal; one recalls that in the Persian epic youths were sacrificed and their brains devoured by Zahhāk.

In the Parthian period, Plutarch states explicitly that the Persians (to be understood as Iranians generally) make apotropaic offerings to both Oromasēs and Areimandos (i.e., Ahura Mazdā and Angra Mainyu). For the rites of the latter they pound an herb called omēni, invoke Hades and darkness, mix the herb with the blood of a slaughtered wolf and throw it away in a sunless place. This ritual would seem to be an inversion of the haoma-pounding ceremony. Bonvéniste identified omēni as Gk. anōmon, according to Pliny, this plant grew in Media, in Pontus, and in Arminiae parte, quae vocatur Omen. According to Clement of Alexandria, the Magi boasted that they could bring demons under their power and compel evil spirits to serve them. This may be compared to the boasting of the youthful monster Snāvidhka in Yt. 19.4-4, who promises to harness both Angra Mainyu and Spēnta Mainyu to his chariot when he grows up. One ought to regard with caution Classical references to the Magi as practitioners of witchcraft, however, for by Parthian times the term often carried in the West much the same implications as 'magician' and 'magic' do today, and various kinds of sorcery were labelled as Magian which Zoroastrian priests would certainly have shunned. The writer Apuleius, a learned adept of Oriental cults and mysteries, sought to defend himself in A.D. 155-61 against accusations of magic by arguing a literal definition of the term. 'Magician', he insisted, was merely the Persian word for priest, and meant therefore one skilled in the performance of religious rites, an art acceptable to the immortal gods, full of all knowledge of worship and prayer, full of piety and wisdom in things divine, full of honour and glory since the day when Zoroaster and Oromazēs established it, high-priestess (i.e., magic) of the powers of heaven. Despite this clever piece of sophistry, he was forced to acquit himself of specific charges concerning acts of witchcraft.
The Dēnkgard describes rites of praise and propitiation of Ahriman and the demons which were conducted in darkness and secrecy. It would appear that in the Sasanian period and later, there existed both sorcery for the purpose of power or propitiation, based upon a perversion of Zoroastrian doctrine and ritual, and also a form of the older, non-Zoroastrian daēva-worship. Since an amoral desire for power or wealth from the gods would have been a common feature of both paganism and sorcery, and since the rites in honour of some underworld divinity would have involved revolting and dark practices in both cases also, it is difficult to define precisely one from the other, and indeed sorcerers and pagans may have been in contact. For their attitudes would have been simple and materialistic, without the desire for moral rectitude and the readiness to sacrifice oneself for it that characterise the Zoroastrian.

A heresy of Zoroastrianism which was very widespread in Persian from Achaemenian times, Zurvanism, deprived Ahura Mazda of his omniscience—a quality essential to the Zoroastrian belief that Ahura Mazda created the world with the fore-knowledge that Angra Mainyu would be trapped and defeated ultimately in it. This certainty is a great theological consolation, bearing the assurance that the tribulations of the righteous are not in vain; the loss of it seems to have provoked much fatalistic speculation. According to one Zurvanite myth, Ahura Mazda acquired the knowledge of how to create light from a demon named Mahi, who learned the secret from the Evil Spirit. Syrian and Armenian polemicists of the Sasanian period claimed that 'priests of this sect' (i.e., the Zurvanite Zoroastrians) offered sacrifices annually to Mahi, and chided Zoroastrians for persecuting worshippers of demons when they were no better themselves. The Manichaeans also ridiculed the Zurvanites for this practice. No reference to Mahi as a being is known in surviving Zoroastrian literature.

Evidence does exist of pagan or geotic practices in relics of material culture, mainly from eastern Iranian lands. A number of small ceramic heads of creatures of demonic appearance of the early post-Sasanian period have been found in Sogdia, i.e., from a time before Islam became firmly established as the principal faith of the region. There is in the Hermitage Museum at Leningrad a terracotta figurine, possibly of the same period and place of origin as these objects. It is 61 cm in height, and depicts a man on a semi-cylindrical throne which has a low, serrated back. There is a conical hat on his grotesquely oversized head; it is adorned with ridges of bumps, perhaps representing rows of pearls or precious stones. His muscular face has a prominent hooked nose, almond-shaped, narrow eyes, and his mouth is open to reveal clenched teeth. He has heavy brows, a moustache and beard. His left hand is clasped to his breast, while his right, also clenched and directly above, carries to his mouth the remnants of a staff (?). His robe is tied at the waist with a wide belt with round clasps, and he wears soft boots. Two snakes spring out of his shoulders at the base of the neck, curl up and around his ears, and descend down his cheeks, their heads with jaws open turned towards his grinning mouth. The base of the figurine appears to have been damaged by water. The figurine is similar to the bas-relief of Nergal at Hatra, and may be an apotropaic image of the demon Aši Dahīka, Pers. Ẓabībāk. It is interesting to note that in the Persian dialect of modern Tajikistan, the expression ʿAzi ūrakan means 'to ward off death', according to Ms. Isabella Ibragimova, a native of Dushanbe. A statue from the Mediterranean west, made in Roman times and apparently heavily restored in later centuries to resemble a winged, leontocephalous figure on a bas-relief from the same site, shows a man's naked trunk adorned with astrological symbols; a serpent coils around it. The object has been connected by some scholars with the western cult of Mithraism and is considered to represent Zūrūn or Ahriman. A similar figure appears on a medallion from Iran which may have been issued at the death of a Buṭid ruler. The figure would, accordingly, represent death or time as destroyer.

Gray wrote that, "... analogies from other religions would imply that in Iran as elsewhere malevolent beings received an excess, rather than a deficiency, of cult. The relative paucity of material concerning the powers of wickedness seems due to a determined and systematic endeavor to ignore evil as far as possible, and thus to doom it through oblivion to nothingness." The Avesta mentions "... thousands and thousands of those daēvas... their numberless myriads," yet Gray's suggestion seems to reflect the Zoroastrian point of view. In the Dēnkgard it is written that the dwelling of Ahriman is in the body of
men, and when he is chased out of the body of every man, he will be annihilated from the whole world. Thought of Abraham is to be banished from the mind, and by careful adherence to the laws of purity as defined in the Vīdēvdāt 'Law Against the Demons' all that is demonic may be purged from the physical body. We shall see that many aspects of Zoroastrian demonology, terminology concerning sorcerers, and phenomena and creatures perceived as demonic, are to be found in various periods attested also amongst the Armenians.

The most common Arm. word for a witch or warlock is kaxard, which translates Biblical Gk. ἐγείρω, pharmakeus. It is probably to be derived via a Mir. form from Av. kax arēdh- (fem. kax arē dhi-), found in Yasna 61.2. T'ovma Meopēc [fifteenth century] wrote of kaxardē or yarmats cafacē ew jaynas tēcē nocē dixtēcin 'witches who divined by the roots of trees and the voices of birds.' Another more recent clergyman attacked kaxardōn or anētincē cē ihot, kaps kam mom kam erkatē, ew pēspēs bāznēkē yarmarem (sic!) sarustēn 'the witch who buries some vessel in the earth, bonds, or wax, or iron; and with divers talismans practises (his) art.' In his sermon Yasan arbec olac cē cē cē or yarmats cafacē ew gusanacē 'On drunkards and minstrels' lists various techniques of witchcraft: Darjeai satanyay eyl ewa cēcēs tay gorcel, or š masakar hogey, jarnacu, zërenkē cē, Ew, akznēcē, eruzzhum, jur orhnel (or š na pike ey hukarav avazun), yragamahērmē, krakahan, azhagok, xoracā, cē eyl ey anhasar bāzūn divakan tay gorcel satanyay. Again Satan gives other evils to perform as (are) harmful to the soul: the witch, the diviner with hops, the page, the caster of the evil eye, the interpreter of dreams, the blessing of water (which is filthy and contrary to the baptismal rite), extinguishing a lamp, the interpreter of fire, the one who steals the reed of a loom, one who buries leaven—and Satan gives yet other, innumerable evils to do.' Another practitioner of the black arts is the yuht, whose name renders Biblical Gk. engrastrēgthos 'a diviner of entrails', and in the Book of Kings, theētiēs 'sorcerer, necromancer'. The word is probably to be derived from a Mir. form of OIr. *yithuka- from the base vašth- 'to ascertain for legal purposes (through divination)'. In Arm. we find also ḫab的商品; a loan-word from Mr. Arm. ∂ivtō 'witch or warlock, diviner' is a word of uncertain etymology (note v.t. dixtēcin from dixtecin 'I divine' above); Arm. gētē 'seer, witch' is probably to be derived from the native Arm. gētē 'know' (cf. dītē 'observe', dētē 'observer'), rather than from Av. kaētā, MF. kēdē.

The charms or spells cast by sorcerers were called homay-kēc, translating Biblical Gk. οἴονισμος; the word may be an Ir. loan-word, cf. NP. humāy. The word used for a talisman or magical instrument was yuhtē-kēc, a word of uncertain etymology. In MX I.18, the Assyrian queen Sharmak casts her 'talismans into the sea' (yuhtēcēn i cov), which Xorenacē considers the origin of the expression yuhtē Sharmakē i cov 'the beads of Sharmak into the sea.' The word is found with the suffix of agent as yuhtē isicēcē 'witch' in the works of Yovhanēs Mandakuni, a fifth-century Catholicos of the Armenian Church, and Emnēk Kaβacē (fifth century) writes: Ew ard etēn bātēn oicēcē or cēcē cē cē bnuētēmēk kērēcē, yandimanesēcē yikrōcē aruestakocēcē n yavrjasācēn: or yuhtē isicēcē zpanacēcē cēnēl yavēs ētēn, minēcē ew kocēl yuhtēcēkēcē tuns, ew kerakuros satacēnēl, opēn Babelācēkēn vissin por pastēnēn: ew span na Astuocē yiselin novin õntelakan kerakromē. And now if there be a heathen who may think a thing evil by nature, let him be opposed by the co-practitioners of his own art, the worshippers of serpents, for they know how to tame snakes to such a degree that they can call them into houses with talismans (yuhtēcēkēcē) and offer them food, as did the Babylonians with the dragon they worshipped, but the beloved of God killed it with the same accustomed food. Pēstwos Buzand (fifth century) describes the divination practised by the traitor and apostate from Christianity Meružān Armûn as he flies from the Armenian sparapet ('commander-in-chief') Manuēl Mamikonean: Ew insēcē an gócēl ẽst ḫakēn ūnâmēn i homay kēcēnēdēn, kēcē cē harkēnērē; ey cēcē gŏyr na va jō牙kē yuhtēcēkēšarakačēn yor yusyrēm.53 And he went on his way; he descended to Chaldaean spells, and questioned dice,54 but the talisman of witchcraft in which he hoped did not come up in his favour. Meružān, it is recalled, had accepted Zoroastrianism, but Phys makes him in colours as dark as possible, and it cannot be inferred that divination necessarily formed a part of his faith. Christian writers stigmatized their opponents as adepts of black magic and other foul practices; we shall see...
how they were to scour the Zoroastrian Armenian Children of the Sun for gathering at night, even as the Denkard condemns the worshippers of the Šēm—in the case of the Armenian Arevordik, such secrecy might indeed have been the result of fear of persecution by the Christians. The name Xaramani, meaning 'evil spirit', have found its way into Armenian through a Semitic contamination by Arm. pelce on, attested in Arm. MS. we find: H. Ov azgabon is clearly an armenised form of the Armenians believed that the devil (Satan, Arm. satanay, from Syriac) had two daughters, Slik and Elik. An Arm. translation of A.D. 1720 of a Uniate Catholic work of the fourteenth century says unšin t'agawor shreštak andandoc, aysink'nt+zatanay, or koši'+azgangon, or t'argani korunt 'they had as king the angel of the abysses, that is, Satan, who is called azgangon, which is translated as perdition'. The name azgangon is clearly an armenised form of Heb. abaddon 'perdition'. In an Arm. MS. we find: H. Ov 6 Bahādūn? F. Čandikun Akkaroki or Čandikun kam parašu δέων kam plux δίανσ, aye ēr Sodom paštān 1720 'question'. Who is Bahāt [i.e., Bellalā]? (answer). The fly of Akkaroni LIV Kings 1.21 who is the fly-swallower or the encompassing demon or the head of the demons; that was the worship (at) Sodom. In the folklore of the Arm. of Jawaxk there is an evil angel called Pešewon or Pešewon, obviously the Heb. Raq al-zebhib 'Lord of the Flies', armenised through contamination by Arm. pelc, pelc 'filthy'. There existed in Arm. folklore also the širak, širak 'Demon of širak', which took the shape of a fly and moved in darkness. The latter may be related to the Avestan Nasū, 'the most bold, continuously polluting, and fraudulent' of all the dēvs, the demon of the Corpse, or Decay, who appears as a fly.
The Armenian representations of Satan as a fly seem to owe more to Biblical tradition, however, than to Zoroastrian demonology, and the various names the arch-sfiend is given may be traced, as we have seen, to the Old Testament.

The element -mani (Av. mainyu- 'spirit') in the Arm. Xaramani can be found elsewhere; cf. Arm. c*man 'enemy', with the metathesis of -m- and -n-, Av. ḫa-mainyu-, Phil. ḫeš'en. The base OIr. maimyu- 'spirit' or monch 'mind' appears also in the proper names Manacirh, Manasia, Manak, Manen, Manit and Manec, and in the toponym Mana(z)-kert. The Azəra Spentə Vohu Manah 'the Good Mind' is not directly attested in Armenian, however. Strabo, writing at the time of the birth of Christ, referred to temples of Anaitis and of Omanos in Cappadocia, just to the west of Armenia; the temples belonged to the Magi, who served in fire-temples with the felt cheek-pieces of their tiaras covering their lips so that they might not pollute the sacred fire. They covered their lips also in the temples of Anaitis and Omanos (it is probable, therefore, that a fire burned there, too), and an image of the latter was carried in procession. It has been suggested that Omanos may be Vohu Manah.

One Biblical evil spirit of Iranian origin is Heb. ʾšmḏk, Ok. Arm. ʾšmḏkem, attested in the Arm. translation of Tobit III.8, 25 as ʾšmḏkem dewn or ʾšmḏkem down, 'the demon Arm. ʾšmḏkem'. This is Av. Ašima, Phl. Ašima, the only demon named in the Gathas, and thus perhaps one of the supernatural figures of pagan Iran, who was the personification of Wrath. Arm. ʾš̄m-ak probably is to be derived from the Iranian rather than the Biblical form of the word; it occurs in the texts only once, in the compound ʾš̄m-akpašt 'Wrath-worshipping': Šv sunqa c* of c* et ʾš̄m-akpašt Astuv zuqaxa arašc vəyəsitcen; Orpəs margaren at breut čəmn asər ibrev yeresac Astuocy t’c yemenayn tekis arkanen xuns ev matuc anen patarage” and in Ani. Z̄ c uc č t c t’c yemenayn dar astuacapašt gətanec, or xandmane in ʾš̄m-akpašt. And thus God never left the world without witness. As the prophet said to the Jews from the presence of God, "In all places they scatter incense and render offerings to My Name," (cf. Malachi I.11) to show that in all ages worshippers of God were found who opposed the worshippers of Wrath.

Numerous other evil spirits of various kinds are found in Armenian texts and folklore, from the fifth century to recent days. The demon ʿAl is believed to be the personification of a disease which strikes a woman at childbirth, the 'red (illness)'; the name of the demon appears to come from an Iranian word ʿAl 'red'. Belief in this demon is attested throughout the entire Iranian-speaking world and outside it, from Kurdistan, Armenia and Georgia in the west to the remote Pamir mountains in the east. The demon is called Alı in Kurdish and Alı in Georgian. Amongst the Wakhis and the Kirghis, Alı-masde is the demon of the whirlpool, taking the form of an old woman with streaming hair, living in gardens, canals and rivers. She seizes men's throats at night to produce snores and nightmares. Such manifestations of sleep are treated in both Iranian and Armenian demonology, and are found, of course, in many human cultures. The ʾŜuğni Alıamst is a demon with one eye and enormous breasts. In Afghanistan, Alıamst is a female demon with claws, spiky hair, and long breasts which she tosses over her shoulders; she lives in waste places. In the Kabul area, the ʿAl, ʾš̄l, hul or ʿudar-e ʿAl is described as a woman of about twenty with long teeth and nails, eyes curving down the sides of the nose, feet turned heel foremost; she feeds on corpses. The Zoroastrians of Yazd consider ʿAl a demon which attacks women with child and carries away children.

In Armenia, a pair of scissors is placed under a woman's pillow as a talisman against ʿAl, recalling the Zoroastrian belief that iron shears ward off evil. Grigor Tat’evac wrote that ork ʾjurs ev in cnuvnd kanač ʾu alk kəc ʾcan, ʾš̄l ʾntx ʾxmstv zhogis korusanen, ʾv in cnuvnd ʾxmstv zhogis, ʾv zhogis 'those who are in the waters and in the childbirth of women were called ʿAl, because through the wet disease they bring the soul to perdition, and in childbirth (they destroy) both body and soul.' Arm. ʾxt is a loan-word from Ir., cf. Av. ʾxiti- 'disease'; ʾxt is masturbation (cf. Arm. v.i. ʾxt-anac ʾ, a sin for which the Vīdya-khōrt (8.3) allows no explanation.

The aid of St Cyprian and St Sisianos was invoked in Armenian talismanic scrolls against ʿAl which contained illustrations of saints and demons, usually rather crude in execution. The amulets are also found as tiny books, the size of one's palm, and were obviously meant to be carried about. A great many are known, and several have been
published, in whole or in part. 95 Ališan recorded a fragment of such a talismanic scroll, with a picture of Al, a thin black imp holding the esophagus and bronchial tubes of his victim: Surbn Sisianos gayr i lemen w ey, ey tesaw pesct mi čar, ey urči ačči hrelčën, ey i joǩın erkiči ktrc, ey handipeči w i teki avayzoy; ašč S. Sisianos, Ut ertči, nzovec pesči? Patazxani xnt nma ey ašč: Ertč am zmanunka kananč' c čer anem, goǩi pakaceč us anem, zacčen xwäreč uc anem, zedem coem, ey bãrm amen, ey anem stakum anšamanik w yorovanči 'St Sisianos came down from the mountain and saw a filthy evil one who had fiery eyes and iron shears' in his hand, and who sat in a sandy spot. St Sisianos said, "Where are you going, accursed filthy one?" He answered him aud...
it was believed that any person with a physical deformity is dangerous, as evil has entered him; this belief is in accord with the Zoroastrian doctrine that all pain and injury comes from Ahriman or the demons, but never from God.

Various other demons are attested in Armenian literature, in more or less detail. Some are figures from pre-Christian epic or cult which were taken by Christians later to denote classes of evil beings. Șidar, an epic figure, becomes șidar-k (pl.), a kind of demon or an adjective used meaning 'demented'; he is one of a horde of demons extracted from the exploding womb of a vișeq 'dragon' by Simon Magus. The word sandarmoq-k is similarly found in mediaeval texts as a class of demons, in the plural, although in the old religion the word was a term in the singular meaning 'underworld'. Similarly, the pre-Christian term șahapat is found in the plural, as a kind of evil spirit, shortened also to švod in modern Armenian dialects. We have discussed Arm. šrâd-k, šrâs-kert as loan-words from Iranian, cf. Av. fraśīn-. Arm. hrâš or hrâs 'monster' (with hrâscin 'born with the shape of a hrâš') may also be derived from the Iranian form with the sense of something prodigious made manifest (compare the word nonstrum itself, with the literal meaning of 'something shown'); a term associated by Zoroastrians with sacred phenomena is thereby inverted by the adherents of a later, hostile faith.

There is a Zoroastrian yazata, Vâta-, who represents the good wind which brings rain and scatters clouds, but there is a more general and more powerful wind-god, Vayu, who is both good and evil; the evil Vayu- (Pah. Vâ) is identified with Astō.vidhotu-, the demon which brings death to men. In the Classical Arm. texts, there are evil wind-demons called ays-k; an ays struck Șidar from his horse and Ttrint from his chariot and made both mad. In the Arm. translation of the Bible, the ays appears frequently, usually with the epithet pišįk 'foul, filthy' or ečar 'evil'; the form aysahek linim 'I become broken by an ays', aysakir 'bearing an ays' and aysahar 'to be stricken by an ays' are also found in Scripture, rendering Gk. pneuma 'spirit' (with pōmen, 'evil', etc.), which also has the sense of 'wind'. The Mandaeans similarly use rûh 'spirit, wind' in the sense of an evil spirit (ziğ). Emnik writes, I mer lezu aysahar asemk, orpēs i xtranâc harec merc c etsı xorvot c em i mev kargoloy: ayl gitînek e t ē aysen hoam, opr, ... yorîm asemk t ē sik c ūnci, storneayk asem ays ūnci. In our language we say ays-stricken, observing the superstition of our fathers that has become established amongst us as well, according to custom. But we know that ays means "wind" (hoam) and "wind" means "spirit" (t ogl). When we say "a breeze is blowing," those below i.e., to the south, say "An ays is blowing." Ǻscean cites a proposed derivation from NP. ašya, 'spirit, demon', but one would expect to find in the fifth century a derivative of the Mlr. form ašyag ('shade, shadow'). One recalls nonetheless the inaccurate Phil. tr. of Av. dušak-šayana 'inhabited by hedgehogs' as 'having evil shades' (presumably of mountains) in the rand of the first book of the Vidârāt. In any case, the Iranian word does not mean 'wind', the primary meaning of the Arm. form, so the etymology must be discarded. Arm. ays may be cognate with Skt. asu 'spirit', the source of physical vitality for animals and men. The term ays is used in the Bible with a qualifying adjective meaning 'evil', and the word on its own possessed probably a neutral meaning, even as Av. Vayu-can be either vo- 'good' or aša- 'evil', depending on the adjective qualifying it.

Aysk were believed to exist of either sex, and to marry each other or men. They could become beasts to frighten dreamers, and they had a king. In the daytime, they could appear as men or serpents. They could also behave in a kindly manner, we are told by one eleventh-century writer: a woman died, leaving a husband and children. Another woman, an ays, appeared and took care of the family for a time, then disappeared. In order to catch an ays, we are told, one must stick a needle in her clothes (on the talismanic properties of iron, see above). The Arm. word kâ-ground means 'brave' and is used only in this sense in the Bible. It was apparently also an epithet applied to the Artaxiad kings of Armenia. The kâ-ground were also considered in ancient epic a race of supernatural creatures who captured and imprisoned the Artaxiad king Artavard in Mount Ararat, the place of their dwelling. The legend may have arisen from another belief: that the king at death joined his deified, kâ-ground ancestors of the royal clan.
The philosopher Davit called Anyak (‘the Invincible’) or Efamec (‘Trissmegistos’), who flourished in the late fifth century and was inclined towards a rationalistic explanation of supernatural phenomena, insisted that k'ajc ogi bacarjak i holtsen marnanyo, chist inkean golov bari ‘the k'ajc is a completely earthly and corporeal spirit which is good by nature’.140 Some Armenians believed that k'ajc held Alexander the Great captive in a mountain in ‘Rome’, but this would seem to be a mere extension of the myth of Artawazd to the numerous legends wrought in the East about Alexander.141 Grigor of Tat’ev (see above) wrote, Ork' ci vesx fixen k'ajc koc cesam ‘They who rule in the rocks were called k'ajc, also apparently in reference to the legend of Artawazd, in which the k'ajc are said to dwell in Ararat. The k'ajc were thought of as male peris ‘fairies’ (a low-word from NP. perî, cf. Phil. perig, Arm. parik above), and in mediaeval times the word k'ajunak having the k'ajc was used of luminics.142 One mediaeval writer linked the k'ajc to Biblical tradition: ‘Some say that they [the yawerzharsunk, ‘nymphs’] are k'ajc, and add that after the flood Noah had a son Maniton and a daughter Astikc.144 And when God asked Noah, “Do you have another son or daughter?” and he was ashamed and answered “No,” then both son and daughter turned into k'ajc and became invisible. Because of this, they say that they are mortal: they are born, and then they die. And he who sees them sees also that they have weddings and cymbals and pursans (‘minstrels’, see above) every day.’1 In another version of the tale,145 God commanded Noah and his sons to observe marital continence on the Ark, but Ham (Arm. K'âm) had a son and daughter. When the flood abated, these two remained in the Ark, ashamed, and became peri and zaric ‘evil one’.146.

K'ajc are reputed to live in t'aric ‘palaces’ in the mountains, or in deep, thickly forested valleys called k'ajcork'ic ‘valleys of the k'ajc’. They enjoy roast beef, xaric (hasty pudding), halvah and cakes at their feasts, at which they are entertained by human musicians. Once one of the latter, a sesandar (sax-player) stole a bone of the spitted cow in order to convince himself the morning after that he had not been dreaming. Towards daybreak, the k'ajc put skin over the bones of the cow. It came back to life and returned to its home. But one bone was missing, so it was lame; this is why cows can become lame overnight.147

In the Armenian epic of Sasun, the clan of Davit and the other heroes is called k'ajunak or jajunak ‘run (‘house’); jajc means ‘giant’. The fourteenth-century Armenian poet Yovhamannes of T'kuran sings to his beloved, K'ajunak tanan burac du inj xilyar as ‘You are a kingly robe brought to me from the k'ajunak run,’ and marvels ‘hreikan os, hosaen, t'c maradâm k'ajc [are you of fire, or earthly, or a k'ajc] with human face?’148

The k'ajc was defined by Saba Orbeliani, a Georgian lexicographer of the seventeenth century, as a diabolical creature ‘like the c'arec a (see Arm. c'akak, below), the All [Arm. Al, above] and others’.149 In the twelfth-century Georgian epic ‘The Man in the Panther’s Skin’ of Soct’c Rust’caveli, a k'ajc can raise storms, and one of the creatures holds captive the lady beloved of Tariel, Nest’an.150 The k'ajc is found apparently also to the west of Armenia; in Cappadocian Greek the word katsóra means ‘nightmare, evil spirit’.151 The name of the Modern Greek supernatural giant, kalkántsaros, kalkántaros, etc. (sg.), seems to contain katsóra with the euphemistic kalí (f.) ‘beautiful, good’, cf. the Armenian euphemism for supernatural evil beings, mewm akunere ‘those better (or, more beautiful than us)’. An etymology of k'ajc was proposed by Szemerényi, who cited Sgi. kri, kl ‘miracle’ and Ossetic karrz ‘strong’, comparing Arm. k'ajc and sk'anceli ‘wonderful’ (the latter to be analysed as s-k'anceli, with the Iranian preverb uz- and Arm. suffix -eli ‘able’).152 If the above suggestion is correct, the forms attested in Arm. as k'anc- and in Ossetic as karrz may be compared to the bases *gern- and *smn- with alternation of -n- and -r- in Arm. sirmanarg ‘peacock’ (cf. Phil. sinnur). In Armenian, the alternation of /n/ or /n/ and /s/ or /s/ is observed at an early stage in the pronunciation of the toponymic suffix -erich as /arich/ or /arich/,153 so -k'anc- and k'ajc may be variant forms of the same word.

There is a place in the region of Anjewac called But,154 which was, according to the historian of the mission of the Apostle Bartholomew, tun kruki, anyag hroy, andandar ayson astuacocn ‘a house of fire, of insatiable combustion, of unceasing burning for the gods’. The History of the Icon of the Mother of the Lord, another mediaeval Armenian text, explains that telin But c lsi, k'anzic amun k'armpetin But c kardavr ‘the place is known as But because the name of the high priest
was called But.157 There is another town to the north, Be'aric.158 14 km. northeast of Erzuka (Erzincan) in the province of Erzincan6 (Gk. Akilikds); the town had about 150 families at the beginning of this century, of whom about a third were Armenians.159 During the Turkish genocides of 1915 the little community was destroyed. One of the survivors was Leon Serabian Herald, who had left the town in 1912 to join his brother in Detroit, Michigan. Serabian enjoyed a period of considerable popularity as a poet in the late 1920's, and in the 1930's he was active in the Writers' Project of the W.P.A., an important artistic undertaking sponsored by the U.S. Government.160 Serabian spelled the name of his village Put-Aringe in the poem 'Memories From My Village': 'The name of our village was Put-Aringe, The name of a once mighty god./Put-Aringe has lost a lover./And somewhere there is a dreamer./ God Aringe has lost his power,/ And our village has been annihilated./ Some day I might be found, still dreaming somewhere; /But who will tell me, tell of your whereabouts?161 It is apparent that Be'aric was named after But and was still associated in the minds of its Armenian inhabitants on the eve of World War I with a divinity of pre-Christian times. Bailey has suggested that a form of the name of the Buddha, *Buddhi, was incorporated into the Viśvādāt ca. the second century B.C. as the demon Būtī, Phil. But.162 NP. but means 'idol', and perhaps the Armenian But and Be'aric were so named because temples containing images—as well as the fire referred to above—had stood there. In Phil., But is a demon, but it is not possible to determine whether the Arm. word bears any relationship to the Iranian. Arm. but means 'stupid,163 and perhaps this derogatory epithet was applied by the Christians to a Zoroastrian Šmēpet. In Armenian folklore there was another k'urm called 'Kai' Kudrut—Kurdut' the Lame—whom St Gregory forced to pour the sacred ash of the fire temple into the Tigris, at the place where the Christian Hogwoc Vatican (Monastery of Souls) was built, in the district of Anjewacik.164 Arm. Kudrut is probably a Syrian translation of Arm. kai 'lame', from the root KDR 'to become weak, to enfeeble'.165 The name may be a tautology; it is unlikely in any case that a historical k'urm bore it, as it is unlikely one was named But—demon, idol, or fool. The appellation must be of a later century, when Zoroastrian temples were regarded as the abodes of demons and idols, and those who had served in them were scorned as cripples and idiots.

Another demon whose name is found in the Viśvādāt is Žemaka— the personification of the evil power of winter, a spirit whose origin would have been in the demonic north, whence the cold wind and snow came. The primary meaning of Arm. cmać is 'north', and the word may be a loan from Iranian. Eznik wrote, agravunč e cmaćka vežagovn i jeron tēkic gmaľov 'it is the instinct) of crows to go early from the north to places of warmth.'167 Ališan also defines cmać as 'north',168 and AÇarean, proposing the etymology from Iranian, defines cmać further as 'a shaded place in a valley where the sun does not shine', citing the verb cmać-uč'amel 'to darken'.169 A village in the region of Dersim, south of the Arasaca river and southeast of Çapsajır (Tk. Cobil, Cevlik) is called Cmać by the Armenians.170

There is a demon called by the Armenians Šemōdić, which dwells in the dark corners of a house. If somebody is found sitting in a corner holding a candle, one asks him Šemōdiću i, cka mē vates dēm 'Are you burning the lamp against the Šemōdić?171 The word may be connected with Pth. šemōdyg 'semôduq 'world' (from Skt. jambudvipa), with the meaning of 'chthonic (spirit)', or it may be from Ir., cf. Lithuanian Žemėnikas, a chthonic spirit;172 both these suggestions are wholly speculative, however.

Large though Armenia's debt to Zoroastrianism in beliefs about evil beings seems to be, there are some which do not appear to have any link with Iran, for instance the Engēs, ċiwāt6 and xvilik. Arm. Engēs translates Gk. erīma 'Fury' in the Commentary of John Chrysostom on Matthew, II.15, and is explained by AÇarean as 'a mythical sea monster'.173 Ališan derived the name from Arm. ēngēmm 'I sink (v.t.)'.174 ćap and ćyan derived the word from Sumerian nin-gal 'great lady',175 but this suggestion is unlikely, for the Armenians worshipped the Sumerian goddess as Nanē and the two forms are not similar. More likely, the Arm. is a calque on a Semitic name for a demon of sinking or drowning. Armenia is not a maritime country, but for millennia it maintained economic and cultural contacts with the seafaring peoples of the north Syrian and Cilician coast, who believed that ships did not sink because a god of floating, ćashēn, supported them. This word became the Hebrew word for 'north', perhaps because the peoples who worshipped the god—and the waters they crossed—were north of the Land of Israel.176 It is
possible that the Armenians knew of a demon opposed to Șaphôn and called him by an Arm. name. In Arm. folklore there are found evil spirits called hmar-k' which lie in wait under bridges and pull helpless travellers into the water, while the river gurgles Anloq gay lokany, loborn in xorakna. 'May the one not swimming come and swim; may the swimmer go down in my depths.' 177 Brešmn nafikner 'girls of fire' and ğramartik 'watermen' are believed to dwell underwater, but the former are benevolent: they marry earthborn men and grant sound sleep. 178

Arm. ğivak-Z 'monster(s)' are found in the Bible, in Agathangelos and Korin (fifth century); T'owna Arcruni uses the p. part. ğivak-cal 'old, decrepit', 179 and in Arm. idiom a thin, weak man is called čevceveč. 180 ľap ano'yan derived the word ğivak from Hittite savall-š, minor demons who are hideous to behold and who bring evil to men. 181 The Arm. word was borrowed by the Gypsies, and Dowsett has proposed an etymology on the basis of IE. *gei- 'sing, call, shout', the ğivak being specifically a creature which makes loud noises. 182

We have referred above (in a note) to Marap, the demon of sleep. Various other demons may be mentioned which haunt the hours of night. In Muš, it was believed that there was a demon called the Cabos which strangled sleepers. 183 There was also a demon called xp(i)lik which caused nightmares. Amongst the Kurds of Iran there are believed to be evil spirits which assume at dusk the deceptive appearance of living people and are called xibilik (sg.). Safety pins are believed to ward them off; this is the familiar talisman of iron (cf. the AI). The Kurdish name may derive from Armenian; or they may have a common origin in Arabic or Iranian. 184 The name may come from Arm. xebel 'to deceive', for certain plants are called xpilik which are considered deceptively to resemble other plants, while presumably not having the beneficial properties of the latter; the Turkish term used in describing such plants is oynus, from the verb onemas 'to play'. Asirdovlat Amassic'i, the fifteenth-century author of a medicinal and herbal work entitled Angitac' czevpet ('Useless to the Ignorant'), explained xub matiteč ('false matiteč', a kind of rhizome) as matitelin xpilik, Svan x the șyana or xpilik of the matiteč. 185 A hat which made the man who wore it invisible was the x̌ekli k'olın of Muš. 186 A demon called the Druz—the principle of evil itself, the 'Lic'—is said to reproduce by tempting men in their dreams. 187 Such temptation was probably seen as the cause of nocturnal emission, which was believed to create female demons and was called satanaxbat'ıvm ('satanic deception'; cf. xab- 'deceive' and xplik above). 188 The arm arm-flower (helichrysum, lilt. 'unwilling') can protect one from this sin, however; it was believed to have been brought by the cimaris cag 'true lamp' from the Paradise of Elijah. 189

Certain Armenian beliefs concerning purity of the body and of creation may be cited here, as they seem to bear some resemblance to Zoroastrian practices, the latter founded on the belief that death is evil and dead matter is therefore contaminated by evil. The presence of a corpse is a source of contamination: one does not bathe while a corpse lies in the house unburied, lest one fall ill with a disease called hrešnakax, groš zarak or mešelı vaxos ( 'angel-trodden', 'groš-stricken', 190 'frightened by the dead'). 191 Fire is not allowed to burn where a corpse is lying, and water that is used to wash the dead must be heated with a fire kindled with flint, under the sun, but not fire taken from the hearth. The fire thus used is impure, and must be purified. 192 The custom appears to be a curious reversal of Zoroastrian practice, according to which a fire is kept burning near the corpse. The fire is believed by Zoroastrians to protect the soul, which lingers in the vicinity of its earthly home for three days after death. It is noteworthy that the fire must be placed three paces away from the corpse; were it any nearer, it would be polluted. 193 It would seem that amongst the Armenians the danger of pollution of the fire by the corpse outweighed considerations of comfort for the soul of the deceased. Such a calculation would have been influenced no doubt by the Christian belief that the soul does not remain, but leaves the body immediately after death.

Not only the corpse, but also dead matter from the living body such as hair-comings and fingernail-clippings is regarded by Zoroastrians as polluted by evil. Nail-pairings and hair-trimmings are disposed of with care in a special building or in the desert. 194 The Armenians collect pairings, trimmings, and teeth which have fallen out, and deposit them in holy spots, such as cracks in the wall of the church. Cracks in walls are remote from the creations sanctified by Zoroastrians (principally
earth and water in this case) and the sulllying matter would be thus safely disposed of. Other beliefs and practices do not seem to be connected with Zoroastrianism, however. It is considered, for instance, that on Judgement Day all parts of the body will come together, and nails and hairs, if not originally buried, must be sought the world over.

If one cannot bury nail-clippings, it is therefore best to cast them over one’s shoulder, repeating thrice after one’s shoulder, repeating thrice "Ur él gan, inj hét gan ‘Wherever I go, come with me.’ Sometimes parings, clippings and teeth are buried in the stove, with an invocation to an ancestor (epi): At k’ez, api šan atam, Tu inj Šaké atam ‘Api, take this dog’s tooth/and give me a golden tooth.’ For fingernails, one says hung, hung, ōd kac, ‘Adam, don’t take my nails, stay there; Adam, you be a witness.’

It is believed by the Zoroastrians that the world we live in is in a state of mixture (Phl. gśmyś) of good and evil. Such demons as afflict us represent supernatural evil; disease and menstruation are the onslaught of evil against the living body; corpses and other dead matter are wholly in the grip of evil. Evil thoughts, words and deeds represent the surrender by man of his free will to Ahriman. Those creatures which appear hideous or harmful to man are assigned a state of mixture (Phl. gśmyś); those in that state are wholly in the field of evil. Evil thoughts, words and deeds represent supernatural evil; disease and menstruation are the result of the perversion by Ahriman of the matter and life made by Ahura Mazda. Aspects of this Zoroastrian attitude towards such ‘noxious creatures’ (Av. xrafstra-, Phl. xrafostra) are found amongst the Armenians.

The frog is generally considered by Zoroastrians to be the most evil earthly creature, and in late Zoroastrian texts the Av. word xrafstrawas, it seems, ‘a narrow specialised term for one subdivision of fauna, the serpent and scorpion being the chief in the list.’198 In Armenia, the frog (gort) causes warts (gortnak) and makes one’s teeth fall out. It also steals them, so upon beholding the frog one must spit upon the hands and feet (to prevent warts) and then shut one’s mouth tightly (lest the frog steal a fallen tooth).199 A wedding song laments the fate of St Gregory, who was cast into the pit of Xor Virap at Artašat: Ayn ov ŋr or derin hore, Vran lec’ in čjn u gortie ‘Who is he whom they put in a pit, whom shall snakes and frogs pursue?’200 St Gregory of Narek wrote, taxtakatexak garšc izm gortos me čć awrinčc ŋi izmazac ucčanen ‘disgusting frogs, repellent to behold, the exemplars of sin, revolt me.’

The snake and scorpion are the chief representatives of the noxious creatures, reptilian and insect, which bite and sting. Both biting and stinging are expressed by the single Iranian base gazer-; from the adjective *gazāna- formed therewith may be derived the Arm. generic term for a wild beast, gazer.202 Arm. karič ‘scorpion’ is to be connected with Zoroastrian Phi. karaŋ ‘crab’ as a loan-word from Mir.203 Another form of the word is Arm. kor ‘scorpion’. A talismanic scroll (Arm. erdume-ucčīc) against 666 kinds of snakes, creeping and crawling things, wasps and bees, karič and kor, declares: Korn or elenč ši ķivnic satanayi, en inč t‘agawor ē emanyn pikč zeinoc or shen k veriy erkī en harkanen zemdirk ‘The scorpion is he who comes from the poison of Satan, and is himself the king of all the filthy crawlers that creep over the earth and strike men.’205 Enzik refuted the notion advanced by the Persians that certain gazan-k are evil, and attacked also the idea that one born under the sign Karič ‘Scorpion’ ċč ē ar ē melančakan lineol č ‘will become evil and sinful’.

It was believed in mediaeval Europe that Satan occasionally manifested himself as a great cat, and in 1507 the Knights Templars were accused, among other acts of sorcery, of cat-worship (most of them denied the charge).207 Yovhannes of Awjun accused the ‘Paulicians’ of kutupapat-‘im ‘cat-worship’,208 and there is evidence that the Armenians may have revered cats because they killed mice. Catholicos Hazar Jalkec’i (early eighteenth century) wrote, Anṣategyać ončiči tarin mi ‘ir kiraki pahen, ev marmakan gorı bsnov ċć katen, aselov: Aysür Montan č: et čće marmakan gorı inč ālmesč čan Munkė č ev ktraten shanderjı me.210 ‘Certain of the most mindless keep one Sunday a year and do no physical labour (then), saying: “Today is the Holiday of Mice. If we do any physical labour the Mice will come and cut up our clothes.” Such a holiday was probably kept for fear of mice, and Armenian farmers would indeed have prized the cat, called by Yovhannes of Awjun a mknorsak ‘mouse-hunter’ in his attack on the Paulicians (mknorsakč ĥe p’ohtamamatovč ‘for they make offerings to mouse-hunters’). In one Iranian land, too, the cat seems to have been prized for its usefulness against rodents, for it was called ‘mouse-killer’ in Sogdian (as, indeed, in Classical Greek and Sanskrit).211 According to one modern Armenian superstition, a person who kills a cat must build seven
churches with his little finger; otherwise his soul will go to hell. 212 The cats of the Van area do not exhibit the virtues that might make them the object of cult, however. A nineteenth-century English traveller wrote, "The best cats are Van cats, which are not really Persian; these, if well bred, are deaf, and also have eyes of different colours—a pink and a yellow eye, or a blue on one side and yellow on the other. They will not catch mice, show no affection whatever, their hair sticks to everything in spring, and they are in every way objectionable." 213 The twentieth-century Armenian poet Gurgen Mahari, a native of Van, addressed a poem to one of the ferocious creatures, a beloved family pet lost during the 1915 Genocide. 214

Zoroastrians regard the cat as a xrafstra-, however, perhaps because it is a nocturnal creature and had not been domesticated in the times when the Iranian nomads first formulated the concept of the pure and noxious creations. 215 Dislike of cats was a conspicuous feature of Zoroastrianism in Muslim Iran. The tenth-century Sasanid wasir Abu-Abdullah Muhammad ibn-Ahmad Jayhānī 'was suspected of dualism, and some peculiarities of his personal life were connected, in the minds of the people, with his religious opinions: he would not touch a man otherwise than through cloth or paper, and could not suffer the presence of cats.' 216 The Armenians of Vaspurakan told of a demonic spirit called the P'om'usik (from P'usik 'pussy cat') which grew to giant size and suffocated sleepers, or assumed the form of a cat and strangled them. It also caused nightmares. 217

The wolf, too, is regarded by Zoroastrians as a demonic creature. 218 The wolf is said to be a symbol of evil, and is associated with witchcraft and black magic. The wolf is also considered to be a symbol of the spirit world, and is often depicted in Zoroastrian art as a monstrous, multi-headed creature. 219

Armenians believe that the wolf (gayl) eats evil itself, which would otherwise overwhelm the world. 219 It walks on two legs, with its feet turned backwards. Prayers against it, called gaylakap ('wolf-binding') are repeated thrice. A talisman against wolves is made as follows: one hangs a ladle from a house-pillar, on black thread. Then one bends a knife or makes seven knots in a shoestring, and ties these between the teeth of a comb; an axe is placed on top of these things. It is believed that the gaylakap makes the wolf dumb, causes its teeth to fall out, blinds it and confuses it. The power of the spell lasts seven days. 220 One gaylakap reads, 'The Mother of God is in the mountains, the Son of God in her embrace, a column of light in his heart and three nails in his hands: one for the heart of Satan, one for the mouth of the wolf-beast, that wanders in the night, and one for the bēmin-memsīn, that twists over my head. I bound the wolf to the mountain; I bound Satan to the rock; I riveted the bonds with nails.' 223 God punishes evil women, it is believed, by making them werewolves (mandagayl). The ordeal lasts only seven years, but the woman retains her wolf's tail even after she becomes fully human again. 224

The snake is considered a xrafstra- by Zoroastrians, and the special stick used by Iranian Zoroastrians to smite noxious creatures of various kinds was called a mār-gan 'snake-killer.' 225 In the fifth-century History of P'awstos Buzand, serpents are associated with heresy, sodomy, and madness. The mother of king Fap, P'aranjen, once beheld white snakes entwining themselves about the legs of her son's couch as he engaged in unnatural intercourse. 226

It would appear, however, that ophiolatry was practised in Kūrdistan, Armenia and Iran. The Yazidis revere a carven snake the height of a man, painted black, on the wall to one side of the entrance to their holiest shrine, Sheikh Emāl, near Mosul in northern Iraq. 227 Ališan lists the following toponyms containing the element awj 'serpent': Awjet in Baberd, Awjabor in Gekar(r)ku, the river Awj near the latter, Awjun in Jorap-or, Awjin in Apahunik, Awjor in Marad, Awjini in Karin, and Awj-kalak or Višap-kalak in Taraw. 228 Ališan identifies the latter with the site of the temple of Vahagn višap kah ('dragon-reeper'), and it is possible that the other place names refer to the slaying of a serpent rather than to the worship of one; cf. Kirman in Iran, where Ardašiš I was reputed to have slain a dragon (Ph. Kirm). Yet in both Armenia and Iran, house-snakes are revered. Gurgen Mahari (see above) wrote that a snake with a golden spot on its head lived in a pile of brushwood at his family's home in Van. It was the guardian of their luck, and when his cousin killed it Mahari's sister went insane and other misfortunes as well beset the family. 230 C. J. Wills wrote in the last century, 'The Persians do not like to destroy house-snakes, for two reasons: first, because they say they do no harm, and secondly, because they suppose them to be tenanted by the spirit of the late master of the house.' 231

Zoroastrian beliefs concerning evil spirits and creatures exerted considerable influence on Armenia, as we have seen, though in the many
centuries that have elapsed since the conversion of the Armenian state to Christianity certain of these traditions were obscured, and others modified; Christ repels the dead, and the souls of the damned now go down to a Christian hell, although it still bears its Iranian name: dsox-k. Western influences, too, may be perceived in the development of Armenian demonism and witchcraft. It is interesting finally to note a reference to the black arts in Armenia as seen by foreigners.

A Greek folksong from Thrace called 'The Witch' was transcribed and translated by M. Bart'ikyan:

My black swallows of the desert
And white pigeons of my shores,
Who fly so high to my homeland,
I have an apple tree in my garden-nest there
And tell my good wife
To be a nun if she wishes, or to marry,
Or, if she wishes, to dye her clothes black.
Let her not persevere or wait for me.
Here in Armenia they have married me
To an Armenian girl, daughter of a witch.
She bewitches the stars and the sky;
She bewitches the birds and they cease to fly;
She bewitches the rivers and they flow no more;
She bewitches the sea and it is becalmed;
She bewitches the ships and they do not sail;
She bewitches me and I cannot return.
I set out on the road and snow comes down;
I turn back and the stars shine, the sun rises;
I saddle my horse and the saddle falls down;
I tie my sword and it breaks and falls from my side;
I sit, compose a letter, and the paper turns white.

Two more songs were found from the Greek island of Simi, north of Rhodes. Since Armenia is reached by sea in both, M. Bart'ikyan has suggested that they were composed in the fourteenth century, when the Armenian maritime kingdom of Cilicia had come to be known as Armenia generally to the Byzantine Greeks. Folk poetry need not observe the rules of physical geography, of course; there were few places in the Greek mind that could not be sailed to, and it may be thought that the place of the Odysseus's last journey, where the use of the oar was not known, lay indeed outside the lands of the living. The two variants from Simi read:

I.
The ship with silver rudder and keys
Is endangered in the deeps.
The gold in the hold lies in heaps.
The helmsman is a prince's son

Who cares nought for the ship or gold
And is stirred only by his little Glove-tree.
"Who wants to take my wife,
To marry her as his own,
To kiss her sweetly at sunrise,
And to embrace her at midnight?"
A voice called from another ship:
"I wish to take your wife,
To marry her as my own,
To kiss her sweetly at sunrise
And to embrace her at midnight."
He sends her no letter, no news,
A mere two words in his handkerchief:
"Take a man, my girl, if you wish,
Or dress in black and be a nun.
I have gone to Armenia, my lady,
And will take an Armenian girl, a witch-girl
Who bewitches ships and charms the seas,
Who enchants the skies that the stars not rise
And enchants the seas, and no waves vex them.
She hexed me, too, and I cannot come to you."
The girl heard, arose and put on black;
The lovely woman became a nun
And went to Armenia to find him.
"Greetings, Armenian woman. Where is your husband?"
"He has gone to feast with the nobles."
"Greetings, Armenian woman. Tell him
That the vine of his garden is dry and withered,
His arch has cracked and fallen in,
Another picks the apples of his tree,
And the two doves have flown away.
Greetings, Armenian woman. Tell him my words."
"A nun told me to tell you
(Christ God, may you see and not eat;
Christ God, may you see and not drink)
That the vine of your garden is dry and withered,
Your arch has cracked and fallen in,
Another picks the apples of your tree,
And the two doves have flown away."
The vine of my garden is my mother true,
The arch of my house is my own father
My apple-tree is my gentle wife,
And the two doves are my beloved sons.
Greetings, Armenian woman. I will not return."
Before she bewitched him he flew outside.
Before she charmed him he took horse and sped away.
"If you wish, girl, take a man.  
If you wish, put on black and become a nun.  
They married me off in Armenia 
To the daughter of a witch and warlock. 
She bewitches ships and seas 
And bewitched me; I'll not return."

She put on black, she went down to the shore, 
And a ship set sail for Armenia. 
She saw the Armenian girl, and said to her 
"Greetings, Armenian woman.  Where is your husband?"

"He has gone to the hunt with the nobles."

"Greetings, Armenian woman.  Tell him for sure 
What I now will say: 
*A good nun came from your land, 
From your parents, from your father's house, 
The vine of your garden has withered dry. 
Another plucks the apples of your tree 
And the two doves have flown away."

Greetings, Armenian woman. Relate it thus 
As I have said.  Farewell."

When the man came back with the nobles 
He went alone into his house; 
His wife came to him and told him 
All that the nun had said. 
"My father is the fallen pillar of my house. 
The apple-tree is my gentle wife, 
And the two doves are my beloved sons. 
You will see me no more.  Armenian woman, good-bye."

Before she bewitched him he fled far away. 
Before she hexed him, he entered his home. 
"Where shall I find a two-bladed scissor 
To cut out the tongue of the one who says it to me?"

When Odysseus languished on Circe's enchanted isle, Penelope could but sit and wait for his return. With the coming of Christianity redoubtable Greek nuns in black went to Armenia—to spread the new faith there, like Hipposimé and her companions, or to get back their men. It appears they learnt of the scissors that protected Armenians and Zoroastrian Iranians against evil, and found a practical use for them in silencing the spells of a witch.

Notes - Chapter 14
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In the Zoroastrian faith, reverence is shown to the Creator Ahura Mazda both directly and through veneration of his various creations and their supernatural guardians. Fire, the creation under the protection of the Amesā Spenta Āša Vahīsta, is held to pervade the other six principal creations, and is always present at Zoroastrian rites; the faithful turn during their prayers towards a fire, or else towards the Sun or Moon, which are regarded as heavenly fires, and Ahura Mazda himself dwells in amagra raçōah 'endless light'. In the early period of the religion, it seems that the hearth-fire of each family was used for worship; later, probably around the fourth century B.C., temples called baginas were instituted which contained images of the yazata; a temple-cult of consecrated fires developed in response. In Sasanian times, the cult of images was suppressed, and shrines where images had stood were converted into fire-temples, left empty, or destroyed. Representations of the yazatas continued to be carved and painted, but these, it seems, were not objects of worship, and it appears that at this time also a systematic terminology was developed for fires of varying grades of permanence and sanctity. Fire, a living source of light, warmth and energy, is called 'son of Ahura Mazda', and is the most potent of all the icons of the faith in its opposition to the cold, darkness and death of Angra Mainyu. Although Ferdowsi appealed to his fellow Muslims to call Zoroastrians worshippers of God, not of fire (NP. Aṭašpārest), fire temples were the most conspicuous centres of Zoroastrian worship, and the term 'fire worshipper' was frequently used. Fire is not regarded as a symbol, but as a holy being who comes to man's assistance in return for nourishment. Fire is a divinity deriving from the essence of the Creator, and is worshipped—following, as always, the primary invocation of Ahura Mazda.

The importance of the cult of fire warrants its careful examination in Armenia. As one might expect, the Iranian loan-words in Arm. relating to the cult are mostly pre-Sasanian, as are the institutions and
offices they describe. There are attested various other terms relating
to image-shrines, sacrifices and instruments used in ritual which will
also be discussed. The ancient Iranian feast of fire, *Athra-kâna*—
whose name is found in Arm. as Ahekan, continues to be celebrated as a
Christian holiday by the Armenians; their observance parallels in most
particulars the feast of Šâde amongst Irani Zoroastrians.

Zoroastrians probably did not have temples until the reign of
Artaxerxes II Maemen (404-359 B.C.), but performed their sacrifices and
other rituals as described by Herodotus (I.131): in high places and in the
open, or else by their own hearth-fires. The first Persian temples
were image-shrines dedicated to Anâhîtâ. In a famous passage, Strabo
describes the shrines of the Mâgi in Cappadocia in the first century
B.C.; these shrines were probably founded, however, under the earlier
Achaemenian rulers of the province. The Mâgi, he says, were also called
Pyraithoi; they performed their rites in temples of the Persian gods
(tûn persikôn theón hicra). In sacred enclosures (or buildings, Gk.
sekoi) called pyraithesia were altars (bômos) heaped with ash (spodos),
where the Mâgi guarded a fire which was never extinguished. They
bunched of sticks and wore tiaras with chin-pieces that covered
their mouths (paraghathidas) (Geog., XV.3.15). In connection with one
such Persian shrine, Strabo mentions also a wooden image. 6 There is no
doubt that a Zoroastrian temple is described; the bunch of sticks is the
barseon used in rituals (on Arm. barsæunic, see below), and the function
of the protective covering worn over the mouth is the same as that of the
pâdâm (cf. Arm. pâdânum below). 7 The bômos with its heap of ash is the
fire-altar.

In Arsacid times, it has been suggested, the Parthians called fire-
temples *staraðsân* 'place of burning fire'; shrines to vagitas, in which
the principal object of worship was an image, would have been called
*bâgin* '(a place) belonging to the gods'. It is noteworthy, though,
that Strabo in the passage discussed above stresses that all the rites
of the pyraithesia were performed also at the temples of Amaetis
(Anâhîtâ) and Osmanos (probably Vohu Manah). Armenian Zoroastrians
probably kept both images and sacred fires in the same buildings.
*Staraðsân* is attested only in Arm. atrûvan, to be discussed below;
*bâgin* is found in the title of the priest of such a shrine, MP bânbyd

*pešên, Sd. ònp, Arm. bâgin.* In the third century A.D., the Sasanian high priest Kirdâr at-
ttempted to suppress worship at image-shrines, called in Phl. uanâsârs,
but references to them are found still in the sixth century Nâdîyân ò
Hazir Dâdâstân 'Book of a Thousand Judgements', a digest of cases of law,
so it may be supposed that the reforms of the Sasanians encountered stub-
born resistance locally from the devotees of the old 'places of the
gods'; in Islamic times, the shrines, now empty of images, continued to
be revered as Pârs. 10

In Y. 37.11, five 'spiritual' fires are mentioned, whose particular
functions are elaborated in the Greater Bundahîn. They are Bêrêzisâvah,
which burns before Ahura Mandâr; Vohuhrâna, which burns in the bodies
of men and animals; Urvâvîsta, which burns in plants; Vâsîsta, which fights
the demon Spên[x]ahrâ in the clouds; and Spênîsta, 'that in the world is
used for work.' 11 The Phl. text continues by listing the Bahram-fire--
the most sacred grade of temple fire--and three particular fires of the
latter type: Ādur Guînâsp, Ādur Farnbâg, and Ādur Bûrânî Mîhr. The
latter, relegated by the Sasanian author to the position of least impor-
tance of the three in the list, was the great sacred fire of the Parthi-
ian kingdom. 12 Ādur Farnbâg, whose name may mean 'prospering through
xvarênah', was the fire particularly revered in Pârs; 13 and Ādur Guînâsp,
enthroned at the site called in Islamic times Tâx[t]-î Suleimân, was the
fire of Medî. 14 The latter is referred to as Vânasp in Arm. texts, 15
and Hûbshchmann proposed that Arm. Hurbak, the name of a bâgin of pre-
Christian Armenia mentioned by the tenth-century writer Ananîa, may be a
form of Farnbâg. Pagliaro repeated the suggestion, but it is also pos-
sible that hurbak seems to be a native Arm. word for a fire-temple. 16

The highest grade of sacred fire, requiring elaborate rituals of
purification of fires from 16 different sources, lasting 1001 days, is the
Etâ-î Bahram 'Fire of Verethragna', which must be kept blazing
night and day. This fire is invoked in the name of Ohrmazd, so it is
perhaps this grade of fire, probably a royal fire in addition, that is
referred to by Arm. writers when they mention the orzudakan krâk 'fire
of Ohrmazd' as well as the virmakan krâk 'fire of Vîram' (i.e., Bahram). 17
Such an equation is borne out by Xorenacêt, who describes how the
Sasanian king Arda-bîr invaded Armenia and amshefnê peșâmuns apavel
Ews yordor: ayl ev shurm oranzaban, i veray bagam or i Bagawan, man ez hramaye luce nel. Baye c’ sandran zor arar Vaharazak patker ivroc’ naxneagen handeri aregakab ew lusim yaravamar, ew p’oxec’ av i Bagawan ew darjcal yartam, sayyosuk p’inke’ ‘increased religious services in the temples, but ordered that the fire of Ormizd be kept perpetually burning on the altar at Bagawan. However, he smashed the statues that Vaharazak had made in the image of his ancestors with the Sun and Moon at Armavir, which had been transferred to Bagaran and then to Artašt (MX II.77). Bagawan was a site of royal devotions. A more common type of fire, requiring considerably less fuel and attention, is the ādarān fire, which is made to blaze up for religious services but allowed to smoulder for the rest of the time under its own bed of ashes. When rituals were not being performed, the altar would have appeared to hold merely a mound of ashes. It is perhaps for this reason that uninformed or malicious Arm. writers of the Christian period were to scorn their ancestors as mənoxپe’ ’ash-worshipping’, as we shall see presently.

The third and lowest grade of sacred fire is the dādgān type, which similarly is allowed to ‘sleep’ under its ashes and is re-kindled for prayer. Zoroastrians sometimes have fire altars of this type in their homes; in temples, a ‘throne’ (Parsi Gujarati maç) is made for the fire of four pieces of wood upon which two more pieces are placed crosswise. According to P’awatos Buzand, the naxarar Muṣaṣṭam Araruni after his apostasy from Christianity built an ṣtrākān in his house; this was probably an ātaš-i dādgān (see P’h IV.23, 59, below). Zoroastrian temple fires are installed by priests who carry weapons: swords, maces, shields and daggers. These are symbolic of the militant character of the faith and the victorious aspect of the fire itself, whose most sacred type, it is recalled, is called after the name of the yazata of victory, Verethraghna. The weapons have been used to defend temples from desecration in Armenia and amongst the Parsis of India, as we have seen.

In the pre-Zoroastrian religion of the ancient Iranians, offerings were made to fire and water, and in Zoroastrianism the Ah-hūr and ātaš-zohr (Arm. loan-word zoh) are still closely associated; the ancient offering of fat to the fire has been replaced by incense, whilst a mixture of milk and two different plants is ceremonially poured into streams of living water in performance of the Ah-hūr. In ancient times, fire was considered male by the Iranians, whilst water was female. The Arms. and Syrians associated water and fire closely, but regarded fire as the sister and water as the brother. St Mesrop Maṣtoc attacked ‘pagan’ Armenians for deifying fire and water together; he argued that neither is immortal, for water trickles away, and fire dies when its fuel is gone. In the Syriac Acts of Mar Abūdā, the Christian convert Hāsû declares to his Sasanian persecutors: ‘fire is no daughter of god, but a servant and a handmaid for kings and men of low estate, and calls fire ‘a goddess of the Magians’. According to a MS. of the mediaeval History of the Icon of the Mother of the Lord cited by Ališan, there was a place in Armenia called Seaw K’ar ‘Black Rock’ or Buto where there was a spring, ew zi ančin årma b’ovr ev zabibw incbak, yerik c’ aranšin moxim, ayl aramšuk’ ekbərn inšin and because they called fire sister and the spring brother, they did not cast the ash upon the earth, but smothered it with the tears of the brother.

According to an Arm. folk-tale, ‘once Brother Water came down from the mountain, Sister Fire said to him, “Come and warm yourself a bit.” Water answered, “Come and drink a bit, and take a breather.”’. The Arms. of Ama and Diarbekir used to give the sick water mixed with the ashes of an oak-fire to drink; the ashes were believed to possess curative properties. The belief that fire is the sister of water is attributed by Basar of P’arpi to the Persians; this testimony, together with that of the martyr Hāsû and the Arm. folk tradition cited above, indicates that the identification was not a confusion of Christian writers, but a Zoroastrian popular belief not attested in the written, orthodox teachings of the faith.

The altar on which the fire is enthroned varies according to the grade of fire, in size and shape. The earliest altars were of stone, or of mud brick coated with plaster. One Phl. term for a fire-altar is rāk, read 旻št (‘tyšt’) by MacKenzie; the type of fire-holder now in general use is a metal goblet called an ayrinšag, whose name appears to derive from the Zor. ceremony of praise. The vessel, probably used in ancient times, seems to have been adapted around the late fifteenth century by the Parsis as a portable receptacle of the sacred fire; Irani Zoroastrians both use this and retain also mud-brick
pillar-altars, called ąkhoğ or kalak, in the hall of the fire-temple. The chalices containing temple fires stand nearly the height of a man, and are filled with ash. Smaller ąrninezön, about a foot in height and width, are also to be found in Zoroastrian homes. The small goblet itself is sometimes kept empty, and a metal plate on top contains a shallow bed of ash on which fires can be kindled. There is depicted on a terra cotta ossuary of the fifth-seventh centuries from Biya-Naiman in Sogdia a bare-headed figure holding a small fire-altar about the size of his head. The altar has a large base and smaller top, both rectangular in shape. The top rests on a squat pillar, and flames rise from a pyramidal cone of fuel on the altar. On another Sogdian ossuary are shown two men in pedaz (Arm. 1-w. p'andem, the face-mask which protects the sacred fire from defilement by human breath) before a blazing fire on a stepped altar two-thirds their height.

The Arm. word for an altar (and, apparently, sanctuary of a particular yazata) in pre-Christian times was bám, which was used to translate Gk. hòmos. In the religious terminology of the Arm. Church, the pulpit is called bám and the altar is called seken; both of these are loan-words from Hebrew or Syriac. Several types of altar are attested in Armenia from the pre-Christian period. Two were unearthed during the archaeological excavations made at the sites of the Christian sanctuaries of Duin and Valvarsapat, where meheans are known to have stood; the third is depicted in a medieval manuscript of the Bible.

According to p'awtoss Buzand (III.8), Xosrov II Kotak ('the Little') 37 transferred the Arm. capital to Duin, whose name means 'hill' in MP., 38 from Artašat, which had become an unhealthy place in which to live because of the stagnant waters and swamps on the banks of the Araxes. During the reign of Catholicos Gít (461-78), the Mother See of the Church was transferred from Valvarsapat to Duin, to the church of St Gregory built by Vardan Mamikonean. According to Yovhanneos of Drasaznakert, omank' i meroc' naxararac' davaşaneal' i ç'arên urac' an zhavats' k'rîstosanu'c en hot'anosakan awrinec' hnaazandeal'. Isk awagegyn'c erkuc' i noc'and Ėwawsp Arcrumı ev Vndoy i Dvin k'alak'c, hranayan sinel zemhean Ormzdanen ev zuun hrapaştut'c ean. Ev k'napet kargd Vndoyın zordi iwr çerroy, ev daêr awrens i Parsik matenê bezum 'certain of our naxarars, led astray by evil, apostatised the faith of Christianity and submitted to heathen ways. And two of the most prominent of them, Ėwawsp Arcrumı and Vndoy from the city of Duin, commanded that the temple of Ormizd and the house of fire-worship be built. And Vndoy ordained as high priest his son ̃gory, and established many laws from the book of the Persians.' This occurred ca. A.D. 572. The 'book' (Arm. matean, from Mr., cf. Phil. midîyên) is, presumably, the Avesta, which had just been established in its final and largest redaction under Xusro I Anasat. Vardan Mamikonean the Second and his forces conquered the place, seized the miscreants, burned Vndoy varišsan krakin 'in the fire of the fire temple', hanged ̃gory over the bâgan 'altar', and on the site of the latter built a church. P'ovma Arcrumı identifies Vndoy as a Persian megepet 'high priest' and locates the episode in Artašat, before 451, i.e., in the time of the first Vardan Mamikonean, who fought at Avarayr. 39 Remains of two structures were found which have been identified as pagan temples. The first is a three-naved Christian basilica of dressed stone, which, Erazdaryan suggests, was a pagan temple converted to Christian use. There is no support for this supposition, though, in either the texts or in architectural tradition. More likely it was a church converted by the Persians to a fire temple, as in the case of Valvarsapat. To the side of the church foundations, however, the excavators discovered a pit full of clean wood-ashes. This find is of interest, because a similar pit was found also on the summit of the fortress-rock of the city, near the ruins of a smaller building of unmortared stone, and a strikingly similar method is employed by Zoroastrians of Yazd to deposit embers from their household fires at fire-temples. 'Elaš may allude to similar 'donations' of ashes (see below). The building faces east, at an angle of 45° to the rest of the fortress, indicating that it was deliberately positioned towards the place of the rising Sun. 40 Remains of weapons were found in the building, as well as other objects, including a number of clay tablets adorned with sinewy linear decorations incised with cuts. 41 A stone altar was found in Duin which may have been used for sacrifices in a bâgan. 42 The altar, of rectangular shape, consists of a base, pillar and top; each side of the middle pillar has a symbol in relief, and the whole is 55 cm. high. The pillar is 17.5 x 17.5 cm on the sides, and the base and top are 25 x 15 cm and 25 x 11 respectively. 43 The symbols
appear to represent a ring, a bird atop the summit of a hill, the head of a bull, and a scorpion (?) with a round object in its pincers. The altar is of a type very common in the Roman period, and it is impossible to determine whether it belonged to the temple on the fortress hill or to the meheen destroyed by Vardan. More likely it belonged to a private individual or to a beguin. The altar was made in Armenia, for a chemical analysis of the granite of which it is carved revealed that it comes from the same local quarry as the granite used in the temple of Gahni. In 1980, Soviet Arm. archaeologists discovered a fire-altar in the palace of Dvin. It appears to have been made by Sasanian Persians, but it is very likely that the Arm. apostates of the sixth century worshipped there. The relevant passages of the report of the discovery are here translated:

"The excavations of the lower level of the west wing of the palace hall provide very interesting material on the culture of early medieval Dvin. The building adjacent to the colonnaded hall is an organic part of the plan of the palace. But a second period of building is clearly observed here, of around A.D. 550-570. During the revolt of 572 this part of the building perished in a conflagration with the rest of the palace. A new floor of hardened clay was made, about 0.7 m above the level of the floor of the colonnaded hall; it differs in composition generally from the floors of the other rooms of the palace. In the central part, a square platform was made of three large pieces of tufa (1.5 x 1.5 x 0.3 m); this was covered with a layer of ash, and the outer surfaces of the stones were cracked by fire. To the side of the platform was placed a great jar full of ash. At the center is a square hollow. A base for a column was found here; it differs from those of the colonnaded hall. Three slabs were found at some distance to the south of it. It must be assumed that the structure was colonnaded, but other bases have been removed. Some may yet be found, since excavations of the structure continue. The study of materials and architectural details shows that the structure discovered is a Zor. temple, and that the platform is a fire altar. The central square hollow indicates that there was erected here a four-sided pillar, upon which the fire was kindled in a special vessel. Thus, the fire altar possessed all the basic elements found in similar Sasanian structures: a lower platform, pillar, and fire vessel. The fire altars depicted on the reverse of Sasanian coins, while remaining the same in their structure, differ in appearance from one period to another. This characteristic was noted by K. V. Trever in one of her articles on coins ("The artistic significance of Sasanian coins," Trudy otdeла Vostoka Ermitazha, 1, Leningrad, 1938, 274). The fire altar discovered at Dvin in its general outlines is similar in shape to the fire-altars shown on coins. This may be because the small space of a coin did not provide for preservation of scale, so there is therefore some distortion. Unfortunately, we do not at present possess the ground plans of late Sasanian fire temples and excavated fire altars, which might allow us to establish general correspondences. Apparently, the Dvin temple differs in its ground plan from classical Sasanian temples. One must say that a temple was not built here specifically for the worship of fire; rather, one of the areas of the palace was accommodated to the purpose. Further excavations will bring to light particular features specific to such cultic buildings....Stratigraphical study of the palace and careful examination of the sources have led us to the conclusion that the palace was built in the 470's, immediately after the transfer of the residence of the Catholicos to Dvin; it was probably his original residence. The conversion in the sixth century of one part of the palace to a temple, as shown by the stratigraphy, indicates that the palace was converted to the seat of a high Persian official. This could have happened only during the period of the politically and religiously intolerant policies of the marzaban Suren (564-72). As was shown, the palace and the temple with it were burnt and ruined during the revolt of 572. It is no coincidence that when the church of St Gregory was rebuilt in the early seventh century, the new palace of the Catholicos was founded north of it, and the defiled building was levelled, to become an open square near the church, until the beginning of the ninth century."

Another fire-altar was found some years earlier in a room with walls of smooth, dressed tufa directly beneath the main altar of Ejmiacin Cathedral, the very heart of the Armenian Church. The room was, it seems, the apse of an earlier Christian basilica on the site. The altar is a cone of cemented rubble. At the top is a circular hole which extends to the base of the altar, which stands about 3-1/2 feet high.
The hole is lined with smooth, grooved ceramic plates. Some ash was found at the site, and the altar could have accommodated a sacred fire. The location of the altar indicates that the cult practised there was of very considerable importance, and it is likely that the rude core of rubble was faced with plaster, dressed stone, or the same reddish ceramic shards that were used to line the central hole. The date of the altar has not been conclusively established. It was found with a large, table-like slab of stone on top of it which does not seem to have belonged there originally, and it was suggested that the altar had been constructed by the Persians and their Armenian naxarar allies during their brief occupation of Vâkârâpat in 451. The altar appears, indeed to have been built in some haste, unlike the more elaborate and solid temple of the Ñarthân at Drin, in a building converted from church to mehecan. When Vârdan reconquered the city, he would have caused the slab of stone to be placed on the altar so it could serve temporarily for Christian worship, before a new church was built and properly consecrated. The altar appears not to have been vandalized, perhaps out of fear of later Sasanian retribution. In this circumstance, and in the details of its construction, it bears remarkable resemblance to the fire altar erected---apparently in a niche which had previously held an image of the Buddha---in a vihâra at Kara Tepe, Bactrian Termez. One might date the Termez altar to the time of the eastern campaigns of Yazdagird II mentioned by Eliszâ, rather than to the earlier periods of Shabur II or Kartir. 45

The third type of altar found in Armenia is shown in a manuscript illumination of the scene of the sacrifice of Isaac from a Bible of A.D. 1305, from the province of Vaspurakan. The Armenian illustrator seems to have followed national traditions as well as canons of painting common to East Christian cultures, for the ram caught in the thicket is shown hanging there, following the Arm. translation, where the ram kaxeaw 'hung' (cf. LXX Gr. katekhomenos 'caught', Gen. XXII.13). Above the altar where Abraham is preparing to sacrifice his son there is shown a fire-goblet strikingly similar to the ahrinagan. 46 The tongues of flame shooting up out of the bowl leave no doubt as to the function of the object, but one cannot be certain of the source of the artist's inspiration; it is possible that the painter simply combined the images of goblet and altar-fire, for fire is shown in most Arm. portrayals of the sacrifice.

In his 'Paean to the Cross', the tenth-century writer Anania vardapet praises the korsan* khâxpât tawaracâ, moxrapat ev moxraic* atruâsacâ nororuc esanc* esanc* ainev usuradakâw ev zyramakan hrapastuc* esanc*, hogeâru stcc'omancâ xratizuc* esanc*, zor i merum Hayastaneac* asinc 'destroyer of the temples of the idolaters, of the customs of the ash-worshipping and ash-filled fire temples, causing to pass away the fire worship of Ormizd and Vram, the flaming holocausts of the perdition of the soul that are in the Armenian nation.' 47 St Gregory referred with scorn to the moxrapastuc* esanc navacac* meroc* 'ash-worship of our ancestors' (Agath. 89), indicating that the worship of fire in Arm., with its attendant careful reverence for the ashes of the fire, existed before the Sasanians introduced terms such as the 'Ormizd' and 'Vram' fires. The Arms. may have had various grades of sacred fire, as did the Parthians—for the Ādar Bursên Mîhr was presumably kept blazing continuously, whilst temple fires less illustrious were allowed to smoulder under a mound of ash. The various types of altar which may be adduced for Armenia (with the reservations noted above) would be suitable for different grades of fire. Different terms for these have not come down to us, however, only the word atruаn in Armenian, meaning, it seems, both 'fire temple' and 'fire altar'. The word continued to be used to refer to fire temples in the Sasanian period, although the Persians themselves did not have a word related to atruаn. The fire temple was called also moxnaoc* 'a place (or, receptacle) of ashes'. The naxarar Varazvakan of Siwink, according to Lazar Pârpec*1 apostatised the Christian faith thus: steal i tun moxraceoc* in zkrân asac* gpl azzauac 'entering into the house of moxraoc*, he declared the fire to be good.' Later, bazun tun moxraceoc* sinalc yaxanorh Siwaneac* 'he built many moxracoc* houses in the country of Siwink*. 48 The fire-temples were described as full of ash, although various methods of disposal were employed, as we have seen. Ash was also proof that a fire had been kindled, and a provision of the decree of Yazdagird II to the Arms. as reported by Eliszâ requires that every household produce a measure of ash to prove that the hearth-fire had been properly maintained: Minç*ew i nawasard* i newasard, (asâ,) yamexan teksî or iz*en ând
išxanuć'amb t'agaworn meci, barić'in kargć eklove, p'akesc'in ev
kn'esc in drunk cưr bačarac'n, prov havarav arc'n in nurual spask'n
yark'unis, ljescen jaynk saamascen ev dadarac'en ent'erc uack
(en'ut margarešic'in. K'ahayamy mi isxen en in tuns ivrexen' uusac anel
šučok useidac, ev havatse'ealk'n i K'rístos arck ev kanayć, or baukal en
vyrak anc' irv menancoć, p'oxesc'en shanderus iivrexc' est ašxanakan
kargć. Darjeal ev kanayć naxararac'n kalc'in zusum vartaputć'en
mogac'n. Usterk' ov deterk' azatać ev šinskanc kr'tesc'in in hrahans
noc'un mogac'. Karcesc 'in ev argeć'in urvńk suh amanuć'en, zor
udēni i nazameć' est kargć k'rístonuč'teann: ayl p'oxanak ūnd knoc
mio basun kanays arāsc'en: zl așeć'en atbasac'in așg' Hayoc. Deterk'
haranc' lińic'in, ev k'ork' ekharć: mark' mi eć'en yordovoc, ayl ov
t'orki uel' en yankolin havoc. Patrućć'ki ni melć'en anyay, etc'
yawdeac ić'ev ev et'ę yasicen ev et'ę yarjaroc ev ev et'ę i havuc ev
et'ę i xosac. Hayoc'ārane p'andami ni zangć'in: cīćk' ev k'akork' i
krajk mi ētscēc: ēiıc' ēranc' gūnsagī mi luasć'éin: ēn'līk' ev aulaść
ev ēpapastēk mi melć'in. ēgūk' ev molšeć, sortk' ev ērımūnc, ev or
syl' ev xarap ndor basacćić' en, mi kays-en, ayl vai t'ov havarav i
mēl berc'en est ark'uni c'ap'oyin. Ev or syl' ev inć spask' eć'en, kam
sahic' kam spandic', est tamakan karginc tarevor t'ukanin, ev ēst
kapat' ev moxrac c'ap' karginc. Zays ameayn zor asać'sk at šamanak mi
mić'ev i glux tarac'i ētscēc: ēmeneć'ean: ayl sayln ameayn at yana
patrastēsc'en. 'Between this New Year and the coming one, (it says,)
in all the places that are under the rule of the great king, let the
orders of the Church be removed. Let the gates of the holy temples be
shut and sealed, and the holy utensils be listed, numbered, and de-
livered to the church. Let the voices of the Psalms be still, and may
they cease the readings from the (un-)lyeing Prophets. May the be-
lievers in Christ, both men and women, who dwell in hermitages, change
into secular garments. Also, may the wives of the naxarars learn the
 teachings of the Magi, and may the sons and daughters of freedmen and
peasants be instructed in the learning of the same Magi. May the laws
of holy matrimony be severed and restricted, that they had according to
the orders of Christianity from their forebears. But instead of one
wife, may they take many wives, that the nation of Armenia may be fruitful
and multiply. May daughters come to their fathers, and sisters to
their brothers; may mothers depart not from sons, nor grandchildren from
the couches of grandparents. May sacrificial beasts [patrućć'kć', see
below] not be killed without prayer, whether it be a sheep, goat,
bullock, fowl or swine. May they not knead dough without a face-mask
(ć'andam). Let no rags or excrement approach the fire. Let them not wash
their hands without gumeć. Let them not kill otters, foxes or hares.
May snakes, lizards, frogs, ants and other swarms of maggots
not be allowed to live, but may they bring them in haste, numbered and
listed, according to the royal measure. And whatever other services
there be, either sacrifices or slaughters, let them be performed
according to the order of the number of kapīč and the measure of ash.
Let everyone fulfill what we have said, until the beginning of the year,
and let them prepare everything else for the future.
in many places, and made men subject to the laws of the Mazdeans; and many built atrušans in their own houses, and gave over their sons and relatives to the learning of the Mazdeans' (P8 IV.59). In addition to the consecration of new fires, many old fire-temples must have been renovated, some in places where churches had since been constructed. There is no reference made to the image-shrines of pre-Christian Armenia, where, as we have seen in preceding chapters, statues of the yazatae had stood.

Although the Sasanians justified their destruction of these shrines by arguing that demons infested graven images, we are not constrained to accept the cherished myths of that bureaucratic state, whose very centralised structure indicates what the actual motive of their campaign may have been. It has been noted above how the position of the Ādur Būrzan Mîhr, a much-beloved sacred fire of the Parthians, was degraded on pseudo-theological grounds in order to give first place to the Fires of Persia and Media, the western centres of Sasanian Iran. In the 'Letter of Tansar', a document preserved from the Islamic period in NP, but purporting to be the work of a Sasanian high priest of the third century, a local Iranian king named Gušnasp refuses to submit to Ardešir, accusing the King of Kings of having 'taken away fires from the fire-temples, extinguished them and blotted them out'. Tansar replies that the fires were not extinguished but removed from the temples 'to their place of origin', and adds that the temples had been built without the authority of the kings of old (by which the Achaemenians are meant). The kindest observation that can be made about this reply is that it is disingenuous. The same Achaemenians who established fire-temples also built image-shrines; their only claim to greater orthodoxy than the Parthians is their Persian origin, which is no claim at all. Combining in the highest grade of fire, noted above, strongly suggest that these new foundations were alien to Armenian tradition.

Two later notices of sites of fire-temples in Armenia may be cited here. The fourteenth-century Persian geographer and historian Ǧamāl-Allāh Mustâṣîf of Qazvîn, in his cosmography Nuzhat al-Qulâb reports: 'In Little Armenia there is a fire-temple, the roof of which is plastered over with cement, and below the gutter from the roof is a tank in which the water is collected that falls on the roof. The people are wont to drink of this, and if but little rain should fall, then with some of the water that is left they wash the roof of this fire-temple, and forthwith rain again falls, and so the tank is refilled.' By Little Armenia is meant the western part of the country; we have not found any reference to the temple in Armenian sources. The rain-fed well recalls that of Bahrucha agiard (The well there is called a laka in Parsi Guj.), from which the faithful draw drinking water (written communication of N. M. Desai and F. Dastoor of Bombay). In the southwest of Armenia, near the Khabur cay and south of Viran Sehir (between Diyarbakir and Urfa), there is a town called Tel Ateshan, i.e., 'Hill of Fires' (NP ʿāsān-ān). The same NP. form is found in the name of the town and district of Aṯā (NP. Āthā-ī) Bagawan, Caspiane (Arm. ְתארחא), in the Anəxarbac oc. But the modern form of the name gives no clue as to the age of the atrušan(s) that may have been there.

Before considering modern survivals of the Zoroastrian cult of fire in Christian Armenian ritual, we propose to discuss briefly aspects of the temple cult alluded to or described at length in earlier chapters: temples, priesthood, sacrifices, and ritual implements. Temples were called mehean or tašar generally, whilst the terms bagin and atrušan refer specifically to image-shrines and fire-temples. The most common term for a priest is a Semitic loan-word, kum (with Ir. suffix, kum-pet 'high-priest'), but other terms are attested: bagapet, moget and aranc n moguc (gen. pl.), and miteceran/mihrpet, the latter associated with the name of Mihr, from which the word mehean itself is to be derived. Moget is a NW Mir. loan, Olr. *magu-pati-ı*, MP. nogbed, aranc n moguc appears to be a calque on Sasanian MP. sōn mad(ān) 'Magi-men'. The priestly title hērbed, derived from Av. hērapereti-, is not found in Arm. 7.1

In the Arm. Church, the Sasanian title vardapet is found as the ecclesiastical rank of vardapet, whilst the parallel form from Pth.
varāpet, is retained only with the general meaning of 'teacher'. The NF. form indicates that the title was adopted on the model of a Sasanian office, rather than an earlier, pagan Arm. one; in the earliest period of Arm. Christianity, the Syriac loan-word k̄ahænay was the general word for 'priest'; the word varāpet seems to have been used only later. Now, the k̄ahænay may be a married priest, subordinate to the varāpet, who is celibate. The Ir. loan-word snir, which became an ecclesiastical title, has been discussed in connection with Tir, above. (The Arm. word for an Old Testament prophet is margar, a loan-word from pre-Sasanian MIr.73)

The names of a number of Arm. ecclesiastical vestments are to be derived from MIr.; some of them are Zoroastrian religious terms. The name of the Zor. sacred undershirt, Phl. šabīg, modern sudra, sedra, are found in Arm. šapik, rendering Gk. χήτων (Matt. V.40) and in sutra 'a kind of clothing' (Grigor Magistros Pahlavuni, eleventh century);74 the Arm. word for the Christian sacerdotal vestment, patmuzan, is derived from Pth. pāwnon 'garment'. The Zor. sudra has a small pouch at the throat, called in NF. giribzān, which symbolically receives one's good deeds; originally, the word meant 'neck-protector', and the term may be derived from Pth. giribzān, a loan from pre-Sasanian NW.

Other survivals of Zoroastrian terms in the Christian Arm. vocabulary have been noted in this work.

Benveniste observed that the tīargas, 'sacrament' and the paragnosta of the Magi of Cappadocia mentioned by Strabo are found in Arm. as xovr (also arta-xovr, artaxurak and psak79), barmsanuk and p'andam,80 cf. Phil. barres, padn.

The rite of offering was called pātarag, now the Arm. Christian Divine Liturgy,81 and the act of sacrifice was called zoh (cf. Phil. zōhr, Av. zaathra-); the ritual words accompanying the sacrifice formed the yast, cf. an-yaz in the passage from Eriše above, and the sacrificial offering was an animal, called patmuzak, a loan from Pth., cf. Phil. pādr̦zag; the general word for a temple-offering was fočik, cf. Phil. rōsīk. The Phl. words mean 'fasting' and 'daily bread' respectively, but the basic element of both words is r̦wcr̦r̦, 'day', which implies that the sacrificial offerings were made on a regular basis.82 As in Iran, different animals were sacrificed: rams, sheep, horses, pigs and oxen might be slaughtered.83 According to Strabo (Geog. XV.3.15), the Magi in Armenia stunned the animal with a log before killing it; this was done also by Zoroastrians in the Sasanian period, and in the Dēnkard it is explained that the procedure spares the animal pain at the moment of death, an attitude in keeping with the kindly and reverential attitude of the religion of Mandā towards gōspandān 'holy creatures'. To this day, Armenian Christians perform blood sacrifices, mainly of chickens, although the slaughter of sheep is not uncommon. The ritual, called matak 'young' after the young animal which is killed, is performed on major festivals of the Church, and when a member of a family is ill.85 Zoroastrians do not sacrifice immature creatures, so the matak rite probably comes from the Judæo-Christian tradition.

Reverence for fire is another aspect of the ancient religion which has become enshrined in Armenian Christianity. It is considered a sin to tell someone to extinguish a flame; the euphemism krak-an tarun 'Bless the fire!' is used. As in other societies, the hearth fire must not go out at all, however, and a woman who let the smouldering coals die out was regarded by Armenian villagers at the turn of this century as possessed by evil.87 The hearth is regarded as the centre and life of a household, and is called krak-an 'place of fire', t'umir 'furnace' or ṣāxan.88 Of a good son, the Arm. would say he was hör krakaran 'guardian of his father's fire-place', and of one dead it was said nra cukxē maraw 'his smoke was extinguished.' Curses often involved fire: n̄r̦ w̢ k̄ o krakaran (k̄ o ārț k̄ i) cukxē k̄ ț r̦ u 'let the smoke of your fire-place (your chimney) be cut off'; n̄r̦ w̢ k̄ o ār̦ k̄ gān ț g̦ m̦ ṇ 'may no fire be found in your house'; ār̦ k̄ gān ț r̦ k̄ r̦ i 'may water put out your lamp'.89 Sahak of K̄ ț unik80 boasted to a horrified Dēnkāpūh in the fifth century of his mistreatment of Sasanian Magi dispatched to Armenia, sakawak ū ț r̦ ā r̦ a r̦ e ā l̦ e g̦ a ni ṃ ṇ i a i ș i ț u z̦ k̄ r̦ a k̄ i ṣ̦ u r̦ ṃ ēn'ḳ e ṃ ṇ 'I tortured them for a while with a whip and made them cast the fire into the water.90 But for the countrymen of Sahak, over 1400 years later, such an act was the substance of a curse.
The ninth month of the Zoroastrian year bears the name of the yazata Aтар; the ninth month of the ancient Arm. year is called Ahekan, a Mir. derivative of OP. ’Ahtarakanā-, the feast of Fire. The ancient Iranian celebration survives, as we shall see, amongst Iranian Zoroastrians as the feast of Šade, ‘(the feast of) the Hundred Days’, and in Armenia as Τεσίν and ʔaɾaɽ, the Presentation of the Lord to the Temple, the Western Christian Candlemas. In Zoroastrianism, it is believed that Rapithwin is the lord or ratu of noonday heat and of the seven months of summer, which begins the first day after the vahshād of Hamaramāzdaya and ends on the last day of that of Ayāthrma, the beginning of the five months of winter. Of those months, the three middle ones, Aтар, Dadvah and Yohu Manah (Phl. Ādar, Dar and Bahman), are considered the coldest. The yazatas Aša Vahišta and Aтар—the Amesha Spenta who is the guardian of fire, and the yazata Fire personified—are both invoked with Rapithwin in the watch of the day (NP. gōh) ruled by him, and in the Yasna when the latter is mentioned. The connection of the ratu of summer with the warmth, heat and light of fire is a logical and natural one, and during the winter the Zoroastrians have since ancient times celebrated a festival of fire, the purpose of which is to drive away darkness and cold, and to assist Rapithwin in his task of warming the roots of plants and the springs of the waters. The Greater Bundahšn, it is mentioned that fires are lit everywhere on the day Ādar of the month Dair (XXV.14) and Hiršin mentioned two feasts of fire in winter, the Ādar Ṯaş regularly celebrated on the day and month named after the yazata (Ādar rōz of Ādar māh), and the Jēš-i Šade, ‘hundredth-(day) feast’, on Šaṃ mōz of Bahman māh. The latter, still celebrated in this century by the Zoroastrians of Kermān falls exactly 100 days after the beginning of the five-month Zor. winter; in the Zor. villages of Yazd, however, the Jēš-i Šade, called Hirpāba (a word whose meaning is no longer remembered), is celebrated instead on Astād rōz of Ādar māh, 100 days before the return of Rapithwin, i.e., Nū Rūz. It is proposed that this date was the original one of the feast.

Due to the recession of the Zoroastrian calendar, the feast of Šade was celebrated at Yazd in 1964 in late April, but the rituals themselves reflect the original significance of the holiday. On the eve of the holiday, a great bonfire of bone-dry brushwood is kindled in the court of the shrine of Mihr, with a torch (although fire from the fire-temple was probably used in ancient times) over an underground irrigation canal (NP. gūnā). As the fire flares up, the names of the great men of the faith—both the fravāhīs of ancient heroes and those of the community recently deceased—are recited, and after each name the boys of the community shout ‘Hirombō!’ and ‘Xoḏā be-Kāpūzādē!’ (‘May the Lord have mercy upon him!’—the first expression is the same incomprehensible name of the festival itself). In the morning, the women gather the dying embers of the fire, which are distributed among the households of the faithful, so that other fires may be kindled from them.

In Armenian communities around the world, the Feast of the Presentation of the Lord to the Temple is celebrated on the night of 13th February, and on the following day; the date is fixed as the fortieth day after Epiphany. On the eve of the feast, all the grooms married during the past year, or, in some communities, since the autumn, gather in the church and put on the ṣepeke (sacred shirts; see above) of the choir. Their mothers distribute candles, sugar, dates and almonds amongst the congregants. The grooms do not sing, but walk round together in a circle, lighted candles in their hands, during the andastan service, an Armenian Christian rite of invocation of blessing upon the fields. Then they go home and are entertained by relatives. Later, the people reassemble in the courtyard of the church. Branches from trees in the gardens of the families of the grooms, cane, straw and nettles are piled up and ignited with a candle brought from within the church. Of the fire, the Arm. manual of church Festivals Nmācyc says: By νοςον miaban k’ehensyka, ev eli en xeiciw ev ouetaranaw ev amensyν ναντυk i durs…ev luci’c’en zhurn…xoteli ʔērǐl lin shrōn or i tgitac Ө nemuceal ‘And the priests of the brotherhood shall vest themselves and go out with cross and Gospel and all adornments… and they shall kindle the fire…perambulation about the fire, which has been introduced by the ignorant, is to be deplored.’ No other fuel may be used, perhaps because dross stuff would be thought to pollute the fire, or might contain moisture. The bonfire is called mošet, mošet, or mereloc, the latter meaning ‘of the dead’ (gen. pl.) and the festival itself is sometimes called by the same name, although tērntak, dēdorin, tērntas and tērntas are also common; the latter four seem to be
The Arm. celebration provoked the hostility of Muslim neighbours. In 1808, Fr. Movses of K'ank'us wrote, Naew yart lini ent'ere'c'ac'ed, xi yavam ani 058 jep'ozut'ivniw ekn i veay asgis Hayoc'c; shi5ban tarwyo Teambndnaya1 avrn 0ru giwak'ak'aw 0 0taragik'c... oc'ct etum t'oyl vareh meletn shrayaut'ivniw yaxtni, vasn oroy elew nec'xrovut'ivniw... 'Also let it be known to you, 0 readers, that in this year tribulations thrice befell this Armenian people: at the beginning of the year, on Teambndnaya1 the foreigners of this town... did not permit the melet, the well-known conflagration, to be kindled, because of which there was a great disturbance...'

In the town of Arapkhir in the 1950's Armenians lit melet-fires on the flat rooftops of their houses; their church, with its yard, had been confiscated by the Turkish authorities, and on the roofs they were relatively safe from harrassment by gangs of troublemakers.

The Arm. feast is calibrated, as we have seen, forty days after Epiphany, i.e., roughly in mid-winter. The ninth month, Ahekan, corresponds to the ninth Iranian month, Atar, and a feast of fire celebrated in Ahekan—the month named after fire—would fall about 100 days before Nawasard, like the Yazdi Zoroastrian Jasni gade. But with Nawasard falling in late summer, Ahekan comes in April, and Adontz noted that Ahekan corresponds to Greek Xanthikos in the Arm. translation of II Maccabees XI.30, 33, and argues that the two would have coincided in the month of April in A.D. 468. But according to Ehiše, the Book of Maccabees was read to the Arm. troops on the eve of the Battle of Avarayr, 17 years earlier, and it is likely that the Biblical tale, of such immense symbolic importance to Arm. Christians in their struggle with the Sasanians, had been one of the first parts of Scripture to be translated into Arm. by the disciples of Mastroc. The date 468, therefore, seems to be of no relevance.

It is noteworthy that the translators rendered Xanthikos as Ahekan, whilst transliterating the names of other months (e.g., t'c'kai, k'kas'ew; Heb. ti66, kislaw); it is likely that the month was one of particular importance to Arms., and such a supposition is borne out by the remarkable survival of the feast of fire. That feast is celebrated in February, however, and the eleventh-century scholar Yovhamnês the Philosopher (Arm. Imastasêr) in his calendrical tables equated K'k'sant'c'ikos (Xanthikos) with the Roman February. It is possible that the mediaeval scholar preserved an equation used by...
the ancient translators in their reckonings. This equation is not the one that was used when the months were finally fixed, however, in relation to the solar year, for February corresponds to Mehekan, the month of Mihr; it would seem that the Armenians preferred to keep their feast in mid-winter, anchored to its proper season, than in Ahekan, its proper month; the common sense of enshrined popular tradition prevailed in Armenia, and only the hypothetical link between Ahekan, Xanthikos and February proposed above hints at the original correspondence of name to feast. In Iran, where the feast of fire was linked to Nū Rāz, and the scholastic tradition was never broken, the Zoroastrians followed their calendar faithfully, only to perform their ritual in April, when it is quite pointless—the world has been warmed by then without bonfires.

Why, however, was the ceremony of the old festival of fire transferred by the Armenians to the Christian holiday of the Presentation of the Lord to the Temple? An explanation is suggested by the depiction of the scene in Armenian manuscript paintings, which vary little in their basic elements: the Virgin is shown offering the forty-day-old Christ Child to Simeon, as Joseph and Anna look on. There is often an altar in the scene, and the figures stand to either side of it, seeming about to pass the Child over it, or carry him around it. In ancient Greece, it was the custom when a child was weaned for his parents to carry him around the hearth-fire a few times and then pass him over it. This ceremony of dedication and purification, called amphiadromia, corresponds in purpose, and, apparently, in the manner of its performance, to the Presentation as visualised by Armenian artists, as well as to the ceremony of the melet-fire, around which the women walked and over which the newly-wedded young men jumped. No Zoroastrian would jump over the Hiromba fire, though, and it is likely that this aspect of the ritual antedated the Zoroastrian features which are present in Armenia and so obviously parallel to Irani Zoroastrian practices.

In Christendom, the feast is seen first in fourth-century Jerusalem; Pope Sergius I (687-701), a Syriac, established a procession in its honor, and in the West, it was only in the eleventh century that the custom came into being of blessing all the candles to be used over the coming year. There was considerable opposition amongst the Fathers of the Church to aspects of the Candlemas rite which involved fire, for it seems that as the feast spread westwards, local aspects of pre-Christian fire-worship were incorporated into it by the various communities of Europe. It was in the eastern lands, under the aegis of the Sasanian Empire, that the feast first attained to prominence in the Church, however: a Syrian pope promoted it in the West, and the Arm. observance retains many aspects of the older Zoroastrian *Āthrakāna-, Arm. Ahekan. It was the prestige and importance of the Zoroastrian festival that would have given such impetus to its Christian reincarnation, and transformed a relatively unimportant way station in the great cycle of the Church calendar into a bright and joyous celebration of the Armenian people.

The temples, priesthood and fire-cult of pre-Christian Armenia were eradicated or absorbed by the Church, yet one small band of the faithful, the Arewordik* 'Children of the Sun' seem to have clung to the old religion still, their standard being the Sun, the greatest of all physical fires, and one which St Sahak and St Vardan could not reach to extinguish or defile.
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42. G. K'oççaryan, 'Antik današrîjanî zohasean Dvinîc,' P-BH, 1977, 2, 286-8, does not say where in the city the altar was found.
43. The altar and the symbols thereon (ibid., pls. 1-4, pp. 281-2); on the granite, see p. 284. These symbols, although found throughout the ancient world, would represent in Iran the ring of divinity; bird of X'arenak (on a hilltop?); and sun-and-moon or horned bull's head.
46. The painting, from Erevan Matenadaran MS. 2744, is reproduced in H. Hakobyan, Vaspurakanî manrankaç ãt'C'un, 1, Erevan, 1966, pp. 1. The altar looks like this:
47. Cit. by AMH, 51.
48. Lc Schs. 20, 46 (pp. 117, 270-1).
49. The Persian Môm Zîz is meant, but the Arm. name Navasard is used (see Ch. 5).
50. The title 'king of kings' (Phil. Hâkîn kôh) is replaced here by the title attested in MP. inscriptions as 'great king of Armenia' (see Ch. 3 on this office), a position generally reserved for the candidate second in line to the succession in Pth. and Sasanian Iran.
51. It appears that the Christian copyist could not bear to call the Prophets put 'lying', and in pious fear inserted the privative ar-
52. Arm. bhâhang is a loan-word from Mir., cf. MF. bhâhang 'education'; in the Sasanian period, the school was called frâhangestân (see Boyce, Zoroastrians, 137).
53. The Arm. style reflects this Biblical locution, an indication (should such be necessary) that Ekiš's own literary style informs, in part, the recounting of the decree. The details of the latter are probably factual nonetheless.
54. Arm. an-yaz; see Ch. 6 on Arm. (Yaštî-sât and Benveniste, op. cit. n. 7, 40-52 on Arm. yaz-el and mis yasacî 'meat of a ritually slaughtered animal'.
55. The reference here seems to be to the Arm. practice of fueling fire with cow manure; pats of this are dried against the walls of village houses in Armenia and stored in stacks.
56. Cf. Phil. gîmû, the urine of a cow, bull or calf, and Arm. loanword gîte 'urine' with derivative verb mîz-ez 'I urinate', from Av. maṣa- (E. Benveniste, 'Noms d'empreint iraniens en arménien,' BSLP, 53, 1957-6, 55-71). The word is attested in a specifically Zoroastrian sense in Arm. only here, in the gen. sg. (Arm. gr., 128), but cf. the modern Arm. dialect of Hamen, where the word gîmû means 'a room in the middle of a stable where the urine of animals is collected' (HAB I, 592; Acafan expressed doubt about the first element, connecting it with kôy 'animal
excrement', but it seems more likely that the runnel collected only liquids, the contents giving the name to the container. Zoroastrians wash with bull's urine, a mild antiseptic, to remove impurities before rinsing themselves with water, lest they defile the latter, which is a sacred creation of Ormazd (Stronghold, 95). Citirdates I of Arm. travelled overland to Rome for his coronation in order to avoid polluting the sea with waste matter (see Ch. 8). It is known that the Sasanians maintained a large fleet of merchant ships, but one recalls that ancient mariners, lacking precise instruments and techniques of navigation, tended to sail along the shore. Zoroastrians would have had ample opportunities to dispose of waste with the proper precautions on shore.

57. On the slaughter of xraštarān 'noxious creatures', see the preceding Ch. and Herodotus, Hist. 1, 142. The killing of the otter and other animals is expressly forbidden in Zoroastrianism, see Hist. Zor., I, 298-300; on the otter, or 'water-dog', considered the holiest of the dog species, see Vīdvēdat, XIV.

58. 'A measure of grain', loan-word from NW Mir., see Arm. Gr., 165 and S. Shaked, 'Mîhr the Judge,' Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam, II, 1980, 1, where is cited Phl. kapel from Ardāvī Wīrāz Nēmag, 67 on the punishment of one who cheats in weights and measures.

59. Eilēš, pp. 52-3.

60. On theophoric names with forms of Mithra-, see Ch. 8.

61. In Phl., āstuvānān is used as a technical term for confession of the Zor. Faith; the Arm. form, from Pth., is used in the translation of formulac of Christian confession from Syriac (in which the word used is bânūfīl); see J. F. Assussen, Xūastvanīr, Copenhagen, 1965, 46.

62. A loan-word from Mir., cf. Av. uxti- (Arm. Gr., 216), with the sense of a religious oath or pact; in later centuries, the Arm. word is used also to mean a pilgrimage to a Christian holy site. E. Benveniste and L. Renou, Virța et Vythrama, Paris, 1934, 8, define Av. uxtīnām as 'formule protectrice'.


64. See Stronghold, 6.

65. To imagine what the reaction may have been, one is invited to consider how the residents of Rome might react to the removal of the Basilica of St Peter on some similar pretext of illegitimacy to Salt Lake City, Utah, there to be grafted onto the Mormon Tabernacle.

66. The word bänč occurs in the toponym Bagnar in Shirk, the site of a monastery (AON, 411; A. A. Manacšaryan, K'Armēng Hayastani...
86. AH, 1897, 194. Similarly, Zoroastrians of our acquaintance never extinguish the fire in an abyran, nor do they say they would let it go out, but use a euphemism, 'to put the fire to sleep'.

87. A loan-word from Tk. ocak; in Turkey, this is also the name of the coldest month, January, when no farming can be done and families are gathered at the hearth to keep warm.


89. AH, 1912, 75.


92. Arm. Hrptic; see Ch. 10.


94. See M. Boyce, 'The two dates of the feast of Sade,' Yādgār namā-ye Fordūdī, Fargān-e Irān Zamin, 21, Tehran, 1976, 26-40. Also see Boyce, Pratidānum, op. cit., 214.

95. See Stronghold, 176 et seq., for a description of the Yazdī observance.

96. A number of descriptions of this popular ritual have been published. The earliest is provided by Garegin Srvantsyants (Arm., I, Eravan, 1978, 159), the mid-nineteenth-century Arm. cleric and ethnographer, followed by Manuk Ahebıyun (MA VII, 62), Y. K. Canekan (Hun)a l'Arm 21), Tiflis, 1895, 105) and Armund Lalayan (Vaspurakan, 1917, 202). Later, accounts were provided by Ananikian (p. 58) and Garin Gorgean (Čnkusapatum, Jerusalem, 1970, 371, 437). Different writers stress different aspects of the holiday, but it seems it was celebrated much the same way everywhere, except when adaptations had to be made because of Muslim oppression (see below). On the priestly condemnation see Tonaçov, I, Jerusalem, 1970, 25-7, and the present writer's 'On the Pre-Christian Religious Vocabulary of the Armenians,' in G. B. Jahnnyan, ed., Farhang-e Farsi: hayeren akhtakan gitačok: sekuč, Kimber, Eravan, 1984, 167-8.

97. Gorgean cites melet, 'campfire, bonfire'; Fr. Khajag Barsamian, a native of Arapkir, Turkey, born in 1951, reported to us that people chanted 'melet': around the bonfire; the variant melol, also from Arapkir, was noted for us by Dr. Krikor Maksoudian of Columbia University, New York.

98. It is suggested by some scholars that forms such as temtaz are closer to the original name, a Persian form tir-andāz 'arrow-shooting', and that Arm. temtaz merely a
rationalization of the foreign words. In an Iranian context, one is reminded naturally of the archer Zaxa (Phl. Aris), cf. Mt. VIII.6; but no such reference seems justified by the Ar.-

ritual.

98. See C. A. Mesanner, tr., H. Massé, Persian Beliefs and Customs, New Haven, 1954, 144.


100. Loc. cit.


CHAPTER 16

CHILDREN OF THE SUN

We have in the preceding chapters seen many instances of the survival of individual Zoroastrian customs and beliefs in Christian Armenia, and Zoroastrians lived in large numbers in Sasanian-ruled parts of Armenia down to the mid-seventh century, but in the light of instances from elsewhere of the stubborn survival of Zoroastrianism as a faith, even in adverse circumstances, one might reasonably look for something more. Indeed, the old religion did not disappear; in certain mountainous regions of Armenia Zoroastrianism seems to have held out until recent times.

In A.D. 377, St Basil of Caesarea, Cappadocia, wrote of the magousaión ethnos, 'nation of the Magosaei,' in a letter to Bishop Epiphanius of Salamis, Cyprus. As we have seen, it was not unusual to refer to Zoroastrians by the name of their priests, the Magi. This Greek term derives from an Aramaic form of the Sasanian period. There were many of them in Cappadocia, he wrote. They had come long ago from Babylonia, and kept to their own customs, disdaining to mingle with other people. They had neither books nor teachers of doctrine, but passed down their traditions from father to son by word of mouth. They would not perform sacrifices, and had others kill animals for their needs. They practiced 'unlawful' marriages (Gk. gamois epiinainontai paranomoi) and called fire God. 'They traced their descent not from Abraham, but from one called Zarnouas.' In this description we recognize certain distinctly Zoroastrian practices and beliefs such as the deification of fire, the practice of 'unlawful' marriages (most likely Av. xva'ctradatha- 'next-of-kin marriage'), and the oral transmission of doctrine. In Zarnouas one may discern the Iranian Survan, 'Time', who was held by some western Zoroastrians to be the origin of all things. Babylonia was at the time of St Basil's writing the administrative center of the Sasanian Empire, and had been so for hundreds of years under the Arsacids, so it is likely that the Magosaei were descendants of Persian settlers of Achaemenian times, whose temples in Asia Minor
Kartir rededicated during the campaigns of Šabuhr I a century before the
time of St Basil.

Zoroastrianism survived in Armenia after the Arab conquest of
Sasanian Iran in the mid-seventh century, for we find the conqueror of
Dvin (Arabic Marj Babli) in A.D. 654-5 issuing an edict of toleration to
the Christians, Magians (Arabic majusi) and Jews of the city.2

In the mid-eleventh century, the Armenian nobleman and scholar
Grigor Magistros Pahlavuni wrote a letter to the Syrian Catholics of
Armida. The letter is mainly concerned with Paulicians and Zondrahites,
heretical Christian sects. Grigor distinguishes carefully from these
'some others infected by the mage Zaradašt (i.e., Zarathustra), the Per-
sian Magi, and the sun-worshippers infected by them, who are called
Arewordik (Arm. 'children of the Sun'). In that region (Armida) there
are many of them, and they publicly call themselves Christians. But we
know that you are acquainted with their confused and dissipated way of
life.3 This passage contains the earliest mention of the Arewordik we
possess, and links them, even if indirectly, with Zarathustra. We shall
meet the term in various other writings, and in popular usage, although
it is not possible to establish when it was coined.

The term Arewordik is a compound of the Arm. words arew 'Sun' and
ordi 'son', with the nom. pl. ending -k. The form arewapašt 'Sun-
worshipper' (with reference to the Persians) is attested from the works
of the fifth-century writer Emnik of Koš and the fifth-century Armenian
translation of the Hexameron of St Basil of Caesarea, while St Nerses
the Graceful uses a form arewpašt in his Epistle to Samosata. A proper
name in Persian, Ārta-partyast 'Sun-worshipper' is known; it appears, for
instance, in the medieval epic Samak-e ʿAyyār. The forms aregwanapšt
and aregakanapast, with the same meaning, are attested only from the
eleventh century and later. In his commentary on Matthew, the
thirteenth-century writer Yovhanneš of Erzinka explains that God
xāvarec-e ʿoyc zeškan ʿoyr, zmi Astnak karcikši yaregakanapast another
word aregkan has been analysed as a compound of areg, an old genitive of arew, and akin 'eye', so one would expect a com-

pound meaning 'children of the Sun' to be aregordik or aregakanordik, the form which survives, Arewordik, is probably from ca. the eleventh
century, although it may be an older form based on an imprecise analogy
with arewapašt (for the latter word has no genitive sense).5 Another
possible argument for the early origin of the name is the assertion by
St Nerses that the name of the Arewordik was handed down to them by
their ancestors.

About a century after Grigor's letter, the Arewordik were men-
tioned again by St Nerses Klayec (called Nenphali, 'the Graceful'
d. A.D. 1173) in a letter to the people of Samosata on the treatment of
Arewordik who wished to become Christian.6 We learn from this document
(translated in the appendix to this chapter) that the Arewordik are Ar-
menians who were not converted to Christianity by St Gregory the Illumi-
nator in the fourth century. St Nerses speaks of their reverence for the
Sun and the poplar, and notes that their religion had been wide-
spread at one time: 'this confusion (i.e., the religion of the
Arewordik) was by the grace of God rooted out from amongst other
peoples living on the earth.' They are accused of ignoring Christian
fasts, and of enjoying rich food and intoxicating drink. Their indul-
gence in good food and drink, their abhorrence of fasting, and their
recognition of their own righteousness and piety are qualities frowned
upon by Christianity, but fundamental to Zoroastrianism. The Zoroas-
trian perceives himself as one of the good creations of Ahura Mazda,
a soldier in the cosmic battle against evil. His body deserves good treat-
ment, both as a holy creation and as a weapon in the struggle. Indeed,
the word used by St Nerses for rich food, Arm. parart 'fattening, nour-
ishing', corresponds exactly to the Ilušqvon parartušvun yareh
Aramazd 'fullness of richness from many Aramazd' that Tiridates III
asks for the nobles and kingdom of Armenia (Agath. 127), and parart may
correspond to the Pahlavi epithet of Ohrmazd, rāvōmand 'the rich', used
in the ubiquitous invocation pad nām i Dādār Ohrmazd i rāvōmand i
xwarrōmand 'in the name of the Creator Ohrmazd, the rich and the
glorious.' The total rejection by the Zoroastrians of asceticism and
renunciation of worldly pleasures is one of the most strikingly obvious
differences between the Good Religion and the ascetic trends which were
most pronounced in early medievel Eastern Christianity. Far from being
a creature crippled by original sin, man in the Zoroastrian view is in-
trinsically good, and recognition of this, through pious thoughts, words
and deeds, is his highest joy.
In the twelfth century, Dawit of Alawik termed the Paulicians and Massalians Arewordik. The eighth-century Armenian philosopher Yohannes of Awjun accused the Paulicians of consort ing with sun-worshippers, of worshipping the Sun and Moon, and of exposing the dead on rooftops. His contemporary, Pankos of Taron, wrote of the 'worshippers of the Sun'. These do not admit the resurrection of the dead, and are true worshippers of Satan. They believe not in the Holy Scriptures, nor do they accept them; and they say that He who died underwent corruption and perished. They liken this life to herbs and to trees, and say that it is as the herb, which when destroyed does not come to life again, whereas its root does so come to life. It would seem that orthodox Christian writers seem to have lumped Christian heretics and unbelievers loosely together, perhaps because the former may have adopted certain of the practices of the latter. As we shall see shortly, mediaeval Armenian poets were apt to regard even members of faiths as obviously distinct as Islam and Judaism as simply infidels; polemicians against far less defined teachings which were, furthermore, practised covertly, were unlikely to be fine in their distinctions.

In the fourteenth century, Mitar of Aparan wrote, 'There are some Armenians, who speak Armenian, worship the Sun, and are called Arewordik. They have no literature or writing, but fathers teach their children according to traditions their ancestors learned from the mage Zradar, the chief of the fire-temple. They worship the Sun, turning their faces to it, they revere the poplar tree, and of the flowers they worship the lily, the sunflower and others whose faces to it, they revere the poplar tree, and of the flowers they offer sacrifices for the dead and the maintenance of order generally in Armenian cities and villages. The Arewordi title of hazarpet is found as OP. hazara-pati, equivalent to Gk. chiliaros. In the fifth century Armenian translation of the Bible, Arm. hazarpet is used to translate LXX Gk. oikonomos, and in the usage of the Armenian historians the title hazarpet dran Arse, 'hazarpet of the Iranian court' corresponds to the Sassanian Pahlavi wusung-franbad 'Prime Minister'. The Armenian usage is a survival of Parthian, and although as late as A.D. 297 the Persian King of Kings Narseh negotiated with Diocletian in the company of Abarban, his arkapet, (it has been suggested that this is a Gk. rendering of hazarbad), by the time of Xusro I Anoshavann hazarbad was used only in its original, military sense and never as Prime Minister. The meliks of Eastern Armenia in about the mid-fifteenth century commanded their sepakan zavrc 'private forces' through their hazarpet 'centurion', hazarpetner (pl.1) and zornaw 'general'. (On OP. hazarpati- MP hazarpat- OP. *Aharapatii (Arm. hazarpet-hazarawust), see O. Szemerényi, 'Iranica V (nos. 59-70)', Acta Iranica, II serie, vol. II, 1975, 354-66.) The meliks preserved the sense of hazarpet as a military title (cf. Mark 6,21-2; Acts 21,31-2) rather than as civilian 'steward' (I Cor. 4, 1-2, Luke 8,3; Galat. 4,2). The OP. title of hazarpati was applied to the ten leaders of the 10,000 Immortals, but also to the leader of the melophoral or doryphoral regiment of the Achaemenian army. In later centuries, the hazarbad was recognised by Classical writers as second only to the King of Kings; Cornelius Nepos Onon wrote of the ...Chiliarochum qui seconsum gradum imperii tenebat, 'the chiliar which (i.e., the hazarbad) who held the second position of the (Persian) empire', and Hesychius, noting that the hazarbad reported daily to the King, describes azarapaties hoi eisangelies para Persais 'the azarapaties, the announcers-at-court of the Persians'.

In Armenia, the office of hazarpet existed during the period of the Sassanian sasanids following the end of the Armenian Arsacid dynasty in A.D. 428; the hazarpet collected taxes and was responsible for the maintenance of order generally in Armenian cities and villages. The Arewordi title RA TRS rabb tarsheu 'chief of the court', (comp. mediaeval Arm. darpan 'palace') in an Aramaic inscription at Mtskheta, the ancient capital of Georgia, has been equated with Arm. hazarpet, for the Georgian title ezyos noszvar, used to translate Arm. hazarpet in Christian texts (post-fifth century), means 'chief of the court'. The Arewordi title has also been compared to Gk. pitiaxos, Arm. bidex, and to Sasanian Pers. fremad. For the transformation of this civil term into a religious title, one may compare the development of another Iranian rank, ganzahara 'treasurer' to Biblical Aramaic gizbār 'priest', Mandaic gansibra 'idem'.

Chiliarchos in the fifth century Armenian translation of the Bible, Arm. hazarpet is used to translate LXX Gk. oikonomos, and in the usage of the Armenian historians the title hazarpet dran Arse, 'hazarpet of the Iranian court' corresponds to the Sassanian Pahlavi wusung-franbad 'Prime Minister'. The Armenian usage is a survival of Parthian, and although as late as A.D. 297 the Persian King of Kings Narseh negotiated with Diocletian in the company of Abarban, his arkapet, (it has been suggested that this is a Gk. rendering of hazarbad), by the time of Xusro I Anoshavann hazarbad was used only in its original, military sense and never as Prime Minister. The meliks of Eastern Armenia in about the mid-fifteenth century commanded their sepakan zavrc 'private forces' through their hazarpet 'centurion', hazarpetner (pl.1) and zornaw 'general'. (On OP. hazarpati- MP hazarpat- OP. *Aharapatii (Arm. hazarpet-hazarawust), see O. Szemerényi, 'Iranica V (nos. 59-70)', Acta Iranica, II serie, vol. II, 1975, 354-66.) The meliks preserved the sense of hazarpet as a military title (cf. Mark 6,21-2; Acts 21,31-2) rather than as civilian 'steward' (I Cor. 4, 1-2, Luke 8,3; Galat. 4,2). The OP. title of hazarpati was applied to the ten leaders of the 10,000 Immortals, but also to the leader of the melophoral or doryphoral regiment of the Achaemenian army. In later centuries, the hazarbad was recognised by Classical writers as second only to the King of Kings; Cornelius Nepos Onon wrote of the ...Chiliarochum qui seconsum gradum imperii tenebat, 'the chiliar which (i.e., the hazarbad) who held the second position of the (Persian) empire', and Hesychius, noting that the hazarbad reported daily to the King, describes azarapaties hoi eisangelies para Persais 'the azarapaties, the announcers-at-court of the Persians'.

In Armenia, the office of hazarpet existed during the period of the Sassanian sasanids following the end of the Armenian Arsacid dynasty in A.D. 428; the hazarpet collected taxes and was responsible for the maintenance of order generally in Armenian cities and villages. The Arewordi title RA TRS rabb tarsheu 'chief of the court', (comp. mediaeval Arm. darpan 'palace') in an Aramaic inscription at Mtskheta, the ancient capital of Georgia, has been equated with Arm. hazarpet, for the Georgian title ezyos noszvar, used to translate Arm. hazarpet in Christian texts (post-fifth century), means 'chief of the court'. The Arewordi title has also been compared to Gk. pitiaxos, Arm. bidex, and to Sasanian Pers. fremad. For the transformation of this civil term into a religious title, one may compare the development of another Iranian rank, ganzahara 'treasurer' to Biblical Aramaic gizbār 'priest', Mandaic gansibra 'idem'.
suggested that these were Arewordik\textsuperscript{c} who had fled persecution by the Armenian Church.\textsuperscript{24} This is unlikely, for the \textit{zamsiyya} were a recognised order of the \textit{Khwar\textsuperscript{i}t derv\textsuperscript{i}zs} of \textit{Siv\textcircled{a}s} since \textit{circa} 1600, and, therefore, considered Muslims; it is unlikely that the Arewordik\textsuperscript{c} would have been. It seems this is another instance of the confusion of heretics and unbelievers, as was noted above in the case of the Paulicians and Messalians.

It was noted above that Zoroastrians still resided at Dain in the seventh century, and it appears that many Armenians resisted conversion to Christianity. It may be recalled that many others returned in the fourth century to their older customs whenever the opportunity presented itself. We are told by the fifth-century historian P\textsuperscript{S}awatos Buzand that non-Christian Armenians performed their rites in secret, under cover of darkness,\textsuperscript{25} and this accords well with the description of the Arewordik\textsuperscript{c} provided by Mxit\textsuperscript{car} of Aparan above. Such secret gatherings are characteristic of the rites of any religion whose members fear persecution, and do not necessarily indicate that the members of the faith are partial to darkness, which Zoroastrians certainly are not. Sephardic Jews who practised their religion in secret during the Inquisition often held their rites in cellars or other dark places of concealment; and some of the Mexican descendants of these conversos, forced converts to Catholicism, continued until recent times to retire to their cellars every Friday evening at the beginning of the Sabbath, although they no longer understood or remembered why they did so.\textsuperscript{26} It is not unusual, either, for a polemicist of a persecuting religion to call scornful attention to the fortitude of those who practice forbidden faiths, even if the cause of their secrecy is the intolerance of his own creed. Thus, the Zoroastrian \textit{Denkard} scorns 'derv-worshippers' for their 'movement in darkness' (Phl. \textit{nih\textasciitilde{am}t\textasciitilde{g}om} \textit{d\textasciitilde{w}r\textasciitilde{s}\textasciitilde{n}m}), using the pejorative \textit{d\textasciitilde{w}r}, which perhaps is best translated as 'scuttle, creep'. By the mid-fourth century, some non-Christian Armenians felt it necessary that they practice in concealment their religious observances; the necessity of such precautions would have grown greater with time, as Christianity gained a firmer foothold in the country. Yet we are also told by Yovhannis of Avjun that a 'demon' commanded the 'Paulicians' to sacrifice (\textit{so\textasciitilde{h}el}, cf. Av. \textit{za\textasciitilde{h}thra}) on hilltops and mountaintops, indeed as
the Achaemenian worshippers of Ahura Mazda had proudly and openly done. 27

In our day, to be Armenian but not Christian is popularly regarded as a logical impossibility, yet our sources speak of followers of Zarathustra—who were Armenian and who spoke Armenian, and who transmitted the teaching of their prophet orally, like the Magus of St Basil and in accordance with Zoroastrian tradition. 28

Following the Zoroastrian injunction to expose corpses to the Sun and who transmitted the teaching of their prophet orally, like the pre-Christian Armenians had exposed the bodies of the xwarsZd just as the pre-Christian Armenians had exposed the bodies of the xwarsZd simen virgins (Agath. 201): ἐκ κ'[ἀρσει] ἐκ μεγάλης ἐκέκαθ' ἐν αὐτῷ κατά τὸν θεοὺς ἐν τῇ μεγαλῇ κατὰ τὸν θεοὺς κτίσμαν κατὰ τὸν θεοὺς "They dragged out their bodies and threw them away to be the food of the dogs of the city and the beasts of the country and the birds of the skies." But none of these, we are told, molested the virgins' bodies, nor did they decay until Gregory was brought to them on the ninth day after their death (Agath. 223). The veneration of trees was practised by the ancient Urartean inhabitants of the Armenian highland, and so may not be a specifically Zoroastrian custom, although certain trees were venerated in Iran, from Achaemenian times down to the present day. 30

The Arewordis' refusal to recognise the resurrection of Christ is in keeping with Zoroastrian doctrine, which allows for the restoration of the physical body (Phl. ταύτα τα πασάν) only at Judgement Day (Phl. πράσεγιρ τὸν καθαρόν). The Arewordi belief concerning the root which will eventually sprout anew may reflect this doctrine. In accordance with Zoroastrian custom, the Arewordi made regular offerings for the souls of the deceased.

Of all the beliefs and practices attributed to the Arewordi, the most prominent is reverence for the Sun, which is central to Zoroastrianism. Every orthodox Zoroastian should recite a hymn to the Sun, the xwarsZd niyaye, thrice daily, together with the Māh niyaye, the yazata Mithra being closely associated with the Sun, during the morning, noon, and afternoon watches of the day. 31 Several writers have noted how the Arewordi actually turned with the Sun when praying, and this too is an observable practice of the Zoroastrians, who turned east in the morning and west in the afternoon when tying the sacred girdle (Phl. κυστικ, Arm. կուսուտիկ). 32 St Nersēs Shorhali himself composed hymns to be recited before the rising Sun; it is the turning of the worshipper with the course of the Sun that marked the Zoroastrian and which is specifically anathematised by the Greek Orthodox Church. 33 It was said that the Arewordi worshipped the moon as well as the sun, and this statement is presumably to be linked with the Zoroastrian usage whereby the worshipper faces the moon when tying the sacred girdle at night if he has no lamp, and recites the Māh niyaye, a hymn to the moon, thrice monthly. 34 The cult of the Sun has always remained prominent in Zoroastrianism. 35

Reverence for the Sun was a prominent feature of the pre-Christian faith of the Armenians, who associated the greatest of heavenly fires with the yazates Māh and Vahagn at various times, and Tiridates I (first century A.D.) in his Greek inscription at Caiml identified himself with the epithet ἥλιος 'the Sun'. 36 The name of the eighth month of the Armenian year was Areg, 'of the Sun', and the great gate of the city of Artashat was called Areg ān, 'Gate of the Sun'. In Christian Armenian iconography, a sunburst is often found at the centre of the Cross, and in some early Christian Armenian ornamentation the Sun even replaces the Cross entirely. 37 The image of Christ as the sun of righteousness (Arm. aragbn ardarut'čan) is found frequently in Christian texts, and in one hymn (Arm. տառակե) the Christians fight fire, the substance of the sun, with fire in the most literal sense: Pancali surb zavakâr'č bovričn swart'wâk'č, hov hovocn ūjuc ն անահêt pašsc'nc 'The wakeful shepherds through their glorious, holy children extinguished with the fire of the soul the flame of the fire-worshipping Persians. 38 The tenth-century mystical poet St Gregory of Narek wrote, Էդ էկ արեւէն, Արդարատ'կմ արեկանն է թարկութ կարել ասում մեկ էկ։ 'At the sunrise, may that Sun of righteousness enter my straitened heart.'

Certain other practices and beliefs of the Arewordi beside those cited above seem to be part of Zoroastrian tradition. Grigor Magistros speaks darkly of an 'angel-like race of demons' revered by the 'Paulicians'. These 'demons' were perhaps the yazates, about whom the Armenian heresiarch Ebat T'ondrakeč learned from 'the Persian, Majusik'. 39 One of them may be the yazata Anahit, for Tovhamne of Awjun mentions
cakes which were offered to the Lady of Heaven (tikno zemc); the title Lady (Arm. tikin, Mr. loan-word bahis, Ph. henuj) is among the most common appellations of the yazata in both Armenia and Iran. It was noted above that the title Magus, from which was derived Arabic majusik, came to be applied to Zoroastrians generally, so that Grigor’s Majusik is more likely to mean ‘Zoroastrian’ than to be a personal name. The ending -ik is Armenian, however, a diminutive mainly denoting affection. It is often used with priests; in the early years of this century, Catholicon Mkrtiç Xrimean was called Xrimean hayrik ‘little father’. According to Yovhannes of Awjun, the Condakite heretics saregaun atac’el kamec’cal asen, arevik lusik ‘when they wish to beseech the Sun, say “Little sun, little light”, and the Oskeberman (a medieval miscellany containing texts of various periods) informs us that Manikc’ic’ik erdmun yaregakn, ew asen: lusik, arevik k’ac’lic’ik, li es tiezerik2 ‘the Manichaean swear by the sun and say “Little light, sweet little sun, you are full of the heavens.”40 The pre-Christian Armenians also worshipped a goddess Astik, ‘Little Star’.41 As we have seen, there were Zoroastrians, referred to as majusik by the Arabs, who resided at Dvin in the mid-seventh century. The seventeenth-century Ottoman traveller Hulya Efendi mentions in the narrative of his travels that he saw rich moghs in Genje (Arm. Ganjak) and Zindik (Manicheans, called Zandiki by Eznik) in Naxiţewan.42 There were Manichaean in Armenia, it seems, from the very earliest years of that faith, for according to the tenth-century Arab bibliophile and scholar An-Nadi, Mani addressed an Epistle to Armenia.43

Not far from Ganjak, on the Apşeron Peninsula, was the stāsghā ‘fire-temple’ of Baku, whose fires were fed by natural gases. The present building was built probably no earlier than the eighteenth century, and inscriptions in Indian scripts on its walls indicate it was a place of pilgrimage for Farsi travellers in recent times.44 The fires are now extinguished, but it is possible that the Baku temple was a centre of Zoroastrian worship in the Caucasus before the simple shrine now standing on the site was constructed. It may be stated with reasonable certainty, then, that both Zoroastrians and Manichaens continued to reside in Armenia and neighboring areas until recent times. Eznik’s remark that both were Sun-worshippers45 is borne out by later Armenian writers in their citations of invocations to the Sun. But the liking of the Arewordik4 for good food and drink is definitely contrary to the ascetic and world-denying teachings of Manichaeism, nor was any man called a Magus likely to be a Manichaean. We cannot tell for certain whether Majusik was a Persian or an Armenian, but it is possible that he was identified as the former because of his adherence to a religion which had once been practised by ‘many’ peoples (cf. the Epistle of St Nersēs) but was by the eleventh century considered Iranian, and certainly non-Armenian. Zoroastrians and Manichaens would not have intermingled, for however considerable the superficial and visible similarities between them that may have led Christian writers maliciously or ingeniously to confuse them, their philosophies are in diametric opposition to one another and wholly irreconcilable.

Armenian and Persian Zoroastrians living in the hostile Muslim and Christian environment of medieval Armenia may well have overcome the differences that had separated them in early Sasanian times, however,46 for there would have been no irreconcilable contradictions between their views. The man who was called Majusik could have been ‘Persian’ in nationality as well as religion.

In his enumeration of Arewordi customs, St Nersēs refers to the addition of substances repulsive to Christians to food and enjoins the Arewordik to cease this practice. The substance alluded to is possibly consecrated bulls’ urine (nīrang), the ritual consumption of which is crucial in Zoroastrian laws of purity.

Like the Magusaioi of Cappadocia and the Zoroastrians of other countries, the Arewordik appear to have shunned very much contact with the dangerous and unclean infidel, living, as T’ovma Mecopdī wrote, in villages of their own. The mountainous isolation of their homeland no doubt assisted greatly their chances of survival and the protection of their ancient faith, although it is this same isolation that makes any information concerning them so precious and scarce. (T’ovma Arcruni wrote of the Armenians of Xut4 that ‘half of them have lost the use of their mother tongue through the remoteness of their homes . . . they know and are forever repeating Psalms translated by the ancient Armenian translators.’)47
A certain survival of the ancient Zoroastrian faith of the Armenians of particular relevance to the Arewordi, the image of shadowless light, may be noted here, however. Students of religion have often remarked upon the uniquely Zoroastrian solution to the problem of evil, whose existence continues to perplex the followers of monist faiths such as Judaism, Christianity and Islam. For the Zoroastrian, Ahura Mazda is all light, all good and all warmth. Disease, death, darkness and the other scourges of our lives are a result of the invasion of the world by Angra Mainyu and are wholly separate from and inimical to Ahura Mazda. Evil is a quality apart from God, rather than a mysterious aspect of His omnipotence. To a Zoroastrian, there is no darkness in God, and all evil is to be fought. Zoroastrian philosophy must sacrifice the concept of an omnipotent divinity in order to achieve this solution, of course, for the wholly good Ahura Mazda would have destroyed evil long ago, had he been able to do so. Man is therefore an ally of Ahura Mazda in battle against Angra Mainyu, his minions, and the creations he has perverted; the Armenians preserve the names of many of these, as well as Zoroastrian concepts such as that of a class of Ahrimanic creatures.

Christian theologians have divided the unified Zoroastrian concept of evil into two parts, in an effort to solve the problem. External manifestations of evil, such as plagues or floods, are part of God's plan, and conceal some greater good, or are retribution for our sins, or are sent to test us. Inner manifestations of evil, such as violent or sinful thoughts, desires and impulses, are an absence of God (and therefore have nothing to do with Him or His will), a test sent by Him (either to strengthen us or for other reasons known to God but not immediately to us), or a result of original sin (itself an evil impulse coming either from an absence of God or as a test which our father Adam failed). In both cases, however, an all-powerful God would be competent to fill whatever was void of Him, to make us pass His tests, and to pursue His plans without the inexplicable and unbearable pain which is visited daily upon His creatures. For what is omnipotence if not this? God seems to be the source of both good and evil, of light and darkness (cf. Yovhannes of Ernak, cited above) in our world.

The fine poetical and polemical distinctions drawn between manifest and eternal light make such an image difficult to treat of with precision, particularly since the cosmological views of Christianity and Zoroastrianism are totally different: to the Zoroastrian, the getig 'earthly, material' state is a completion and fulfillment of the Menog 'spiritual' creation; to the Christian, the material world is to be seen as an image informed by an unchanging and superior spiritual reality. We have seen how Armenian Christians appropriated the images of the Sun and of Light and turned them to their own purposes. Yet it is still striking to observe the insistence with which various Armenian writers assert that God is all light and totally free of evil. St Nerses, Grigor Magistros and St Gregory of Narek and other writers compare God to a light that casts no shadow; this image is thoroughly Zoroastrian in character, for it was Angra Mainyu who was said to have added to fire its smoke and its shadow. Before the onslaught of evil, fire neither released smoke nor cast any shadow.

Although the Epistle of St Nerses was written to direct the mass conversion of Arewordi to Christianity, members of the sect are mentioned by writers of later centuries, and it seems that some of them may have survived down to the time of the 1915 Armenian Genocide. On 4 July 1979, Mrs. Marie a Metak'ean of Epinay-sur-Seine, France responded to a query by this writer which had been published by the American-Armenian writer Khachig Tololyan in the Mitckew Azest ('Thought and Art' supplement of the Armenian-language Parisian journal Haratch [i.e., yare'] 'forward') on 1 July 1979. Mrs. Metak'ean was born in Marsovan, Turkey of parents from Sebastia (Tk. Sivas). The ancestors of most of the Armenians of Marsovan, she wrote, came from Ani, the medieval Bagratid capital of Armenia on the Araxes, far to the east. The area of Marsovan around the hill which was the Armenian quarter, and particularly that part of the district at the foot of the hill where Armenians had settled, was called Arewordi, according to Mrs. Metak'ean, and a cemetery in the gardens outside town was called Arewordi grezman (i.e., grezman), 'Arewordi's tomb'. She recalled a song from Marsovan she had heard with the word arewordi in it, and the surname of the owner of one of the vineyards of the town was Arewordi. The fate of this man is unknown to us.
In 1898, Nathan Söderblom wrote, 'One of the proofs that Mazdeism in the beginning was not peculiar to one people, but had universal pretensions like those of Hellenism, is that Armenia remained entirely Mazdean until the time of the Sasanians, when the relations between the Armenian nobility and the Arsacid court broke down. Only then could Hellenism, thanks to Christianity, undermine Mazdeism in Armenia.'

Zoroastrianism, which was introduced into Armenia at least as early as Achaemenian times, survived Christian oppression and Muslim massacre; remnants of the early community of the faith seem to have survived as the Children of the Sun down to the final devastation of the western Armenian lands in our century. Armenian Christianity and folk custom retain many traces of the old religion too, and it may fairly be said that some Armenians retained with tenacity the religion of Ahura Mazda beyond the frontiers of Iran, as the world faith Zarathustra intended it to be, while others, although embracing Christianity, still retained certain Zoroastrian concepts and practices. Despite successive waves of obliteration, the filtering of Armenian Zoroastrian doctrine through hostile Christian polemics and the ruthless destruction by time and invasion of much of the ancient material culture, one can reconstruct the saga of a coherent faith, rich, dearly held, and a worthy chapter in the annals of the Good Religion.
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We, Nerses, servant of God and by His grace Catholicos of the Armenian, sending greeting to you, noble priests of the city of Samocata, Bishop T'oroos and your fellow priests, and to you, God fearing lay men, Bazan, and to all the householders of our spiritual children, a greeting full of love and blessing from my sacred, God-given office, from the right hand of the holy Illuminator and from this throne—may the Lord keep it whole in soul and body.

Let it be known to you that we received long ago your epistle concerning the conversion of the Arewordikts, who dwell in your city and are a hindrance to the federal church which is in your city, and let them collect at the gates of the church all those named Arewordikts, men, women and children. And first they will ask them: "Do you desire with all your heart, your mind and all your soul to cast off the first confusion of your fathers [garaNin deorur'tim harec] Jeroc] and to come to the truthful recognition of God of our Christian faith?" And when they undertake this and say (225) "voluntarily and with heartfelt eagerness we renounce the satanic deceits of our fathers and do appeal to Christ," then ask them anew thrice, as with children at their baptism, "Do you renounce Satan and all his designs, words and doings?" And when they undertake this and say "We renounce them," then turn their faces towards the West and say, "Spirit thrice in the face of Satan, revile him as one who is filthy, lying and unjust." When they have done this, teach them not to consider the Sun as anything other than a luminous body in the firmament, created by God the creator and set in heaven by him, like the moon and stars, as a lamp to the earth [a'sag a'sairN]l. Nor must they reverse the aspen [labaIt caM], also translated as "poplar," any more than the willow [en)populai] or other trees, nor should they think the wood of Christ's cross was aspen-wood; this is a lie and Satanic deceit, that has led them into confusion and has turned them from God.

For this tree called the aspen was for them an object of worship [paMW] in the times of idolatry ([kpea)topt'c]aen], and demons used to settle in it and accept the obeisance of men. And although this confusion was by the grace of God rooted out from amongst other peoples living on the earth, amongst you Satan hid and cherished it as a leaven of evil, and if you wish to come to the truth of Christ, then pull out the wicked custom from amongst you. Not only must you not revere the aspen over other trees, but you consider it less honourable than other trees, for thus will Satan be brought low. If some one of you knows of their other demonic talismans [diwakten insa bazanl], tell them of those too; tell them to renounce them and to get rid of them.

Then turn their faces to the East and ask "Do you believe in the Holy Trinity: the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, who are three persons [an)hawurt'c]i\n] one and indivisible, one nature and (226) one power, one dominion and one creative principle [araNrt'c]aen], from whom all persons, animate and inanimate, are created?" And if they say, "We believe in the Holy Trinity," then it is right and just to entrust them over to the care of the Church [artribc]ai, who will on the day of the final judgment receive them into the Kingdom of God [t$awalat $awalal][a]$awalal].

Appendix to Chapter 16

1. Translation of the 'Letter of Lord Nerses Catholicos to the city of Samocata' concerning the conversion of the Arewordikts', from Nerses Shnorhali, Endhunvakakan t'vut'c, Jerusalem, 1871, 223-9. A translation of the text into Russian forms the appendix to Bartikyan's article cited above; Biblical citations in it were identified by him. A French translation of his article, Les Arewordi (Fils du Soleil) en Armeé en Mesopotamie et l'epitre du Catholicos Nerses le Gracieux', was published in Barm, N.S. 5, 1968, 271-288.

* * *

command of Christ desire and strive to catch them, but if it will be possible for all peoples to be in the skin of His Evangel, to separate and collect the good in a good vessel and to throw away the bad, according to the words of the Evangelical parable [Matt. XIII, 48], this is the deed of the just Judge when He sits on the throne of His glory and dispenses to each according to his faith and his deeds.

So, by God's command we have found it fitting to deal with them this way. Let all priests together with our notable disciples come to the great church which is in your city, and let them collect at the gates of the church all those named Arewordikts, men, women and children.

If some one of you knows of their conversion to nonsense [Proverbs XXVI, 11; II Peter II, 22], then there will be no harm in it for us, as we according to the
accepted baptism in the Jordan from Satan, who was witnessed to by Father and Spirit, who was tempted by Satan and was victorious over the tempter; that He vanquished demons, and that He who asked of Him in faith was healed of psychic and bodily ills. Do you believe that He gave light to the blind, that He cured the lame, that He raised the dead and walked on the sea as on dry land, that like the Creator He reined in wind and sea and they were calm, that He sated a great crowd with a few loaves? Do you believe that after He had created a multitude of divine signs and wonders, He took willingly upon Himself the passions of salvation, which He suffered in our nature, that He was crucified on the cross and redeemed the sins of Adam and his progeny? Do you believe that he died in body and by his soul granted life to men, that he went down into the grave and saved souls in Hell, that He rose from the dead on the third day and gave men hope in resurrection by his appearance at the second coming, that in the presence of his disciples in our body he rose to Heaven and sat on the right of His Father in the highest, that He will come again for the righteous judgement over all men, granting good (227) to those who have done good and have abided in the true Christian faith, whilst preparing for infidels and unrepentant sinners eternal punishment in the hunds of Satan and his devils, (and) that he with His saints and righteous ones will reign eternally and unto ages of ages?

And after they accept this and begin to profess the true faith of Christianity which we have set forth, gather them into the church, and whosoever of them is unbaptised, teach him the mysteries of the faith, preach to adults and impose a penance upon them for a short time; then, after a while, baptise them. Baptise minors and infants at once. As for those who have been baptised before, merely command them and, laying a penance upon them, mark their brows and sense-organs with holy oil, saying "In the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit", and then join them to the Christian flock. And as Christ commanded His disciples "teach them to follow all that I have commanded you" (Matt. XXVIII: 20) and therefore--Christians. This is the name that the holy apostles, believers in Christ in great Antioch called themselves. And we shall pray to God to bind them to the rock of faith, so that the gates of Hell (drunk dzoosoc)"--Satan and his minions--cannot turn them from the true faith and law of our Lord Jesus Christ, to whom with Father and Holy Spirit glory and power unto ages of ages, Amen!

When by God's grace they are commingled with the Christian flock by those rules we noted above, let them be the wards of the wise, learned and Godfearing priests, that these might be able to teach and instruct them in Scripture. It is not necessary to sanitise them by insisting that they bring gifts to church for baptism, confession, last rites, burial or anything else. Be content with voluntary contributions. Teach them gently rather than harshly, that God may reward you for your kindness rather than punishing you as is meet for tempters, who are cast into the sea with a millstone on their necks (Matt. XVIII: 63).


(35) For there are some of them (the Heathens, het'anol) who were deceived by their eyes. Whatever of the elements of heaven and earth appeared once pleasant to behold, they called gods: stars, mountains,
hills, trees and rocks. And they, too, frightened and terrified by the power or ferocity of animals, turned to worship of them, as a serpent (Yisap) was honoured amongst the Babylonians, or crocodiles amongst the Egyptians.... Others chose and deified elements useful and necessary to the purposes of everyday life, as the Persians and Medes, (who deified) fire, water and earth, and worshipped Parsikis, or Mars, under the name of Merk; while it seemed more pleasant to them at death to give their bodies to be consumed by wild beasts and birds than to conceal them beneath the earth and by putrefaction to dishonour the one stupidly honoured.

(37) Now, since we have unveiled, denuded and made manifest the stupidity of the idolaters takpapasticcni, there is no point in calling those others, about whom the present discussion is concerned, by any other epithet (cco inci) on pèc~ daramun자는 zaynosik, yokag oroc cans ent'anyv, manaked, for they are identical in the master of their deeds and require no separate name. They bow to the Sun and cohabit with fellow worshippers of it. They make offerings to mouse-hunters (i.e., cats), and, thrust forward by them, they fall into the pit, they who chose the horse and dog as gods, or they drowned in the Egyptian river that fosters beasts. In the darkness they perform dark copulations: by their Persian copulation with their mothers they are thrust, imperilled, into depravity. (For the Arm. text of the preceding lines, see Ch. 16, n. 11.)

(38) Falling (upon their faces) they worship even the repulsive idols Churul of Omars and Astarte (Arm. zkar'mo'saym ov tasteroy, LXX Khambis, Astarte, cf. III Kings XI.71). As one who praises the leaptings of the fire of Gehenna of the lightning-producing demon they prostrate themselves with Jannes and Jambres (cf. II Tim. III.6) before the demon that on Mt. Olympus sprawls on the ground and foams at the mouth.

(38) They also conceal their own corpses in the eaves, on rooftops, looking upwards, facing heaven. They swear in their confusion "The one on high knows." And when they wish to beseech the Sun, they say "Little Sun, Little Light."

(38) They are perverser in every oath they utter, saying, "(I am) sworn by the sole-begotten Son', or again, 'I have as witness to you the glory (zpa'apa') of that one to whose hands the sole-begotten son consigned his spirit (nog'."

(41) The demon of passion for the (material) elements forces his subjects to bow down to pleasant forms or lovely images of the elements: thus they learned to make cakes for the Lady of Heaven and to give offerings to the Sun (corpses of men were thrown into the kitchens of their former

3. Grigor Magistros. Letter 57. 'Pataspaxi t'cocoyn kubakiakosin
Asorwoc i Zamanskin, yorzaem or duk'cs in Vaspurakan ov in Tarx, amki
bahnaloyv 'Manikceciyan yesxakher Yunac', ov in Tondrakac

mmac'sealn nocc's korgveaeux sazn: 'Ogoc af kat'ul'koosn Asorwoc i
kazak'c Anit', ov t'cereus xab'ebesamb rawanduc'sunc'en zna: zor noru
c'uctc in Grigor Magistros yarvakunik. Ev sys oc patasaXanin'

Answer to the letter of the Catholicos of the Assyrians at the time when he was Duke of Vaspurakan and Tarxan. After the expulsion of the Manichaean from the country of the Greeks, those remaining of the Tondrakites, their obliterated nation, went to the Catholicos of the Assyrians in the city of Amid that perhaps they might persuade him by trickery; he wrote a letter to Grigor Magistros, the Arsacid, and here is the reply to it, in K. Kontaneanc, ed.,

Grigor Magistros t'Cater, Aesk-sandrapaI, 1910, 146-164 (excerpts):

(153) But you, holy archpriest and all constant, many followers of Jesus, come and read that you may find in that province the writings of the holy and thrice blessed priest Anania by the request of Lord Anania, Catholicos of the Armenians, and Lord Yovhanné, overseer (Veraditoc) of the Armenians, whose names we have written in that letter on how that bloodthirsty evil beast, the homosexual (nahmolin) and lascivious maniac, the lover of slime (perborit), the filthy, accursed Sabaz appeared in the days of Lord Yovhanné and Sabaz Bagratuni, who i.e., the former Sabat, the herearch had studied his evil confusion from a certain Persian physician and stargazing magus whom you call Majusik (useal oc'ar molut'cim yummene parsakan bashë ov yacteakaksë
c'ac, zor Majusik ko'cek) (excerpts):

(161) For Grigor describes several sects who believe the universe was created by an evil spirit. He then adds: But there are certain others also, from Zrada, the magus, Magian Persians. And now the sun-worshippers have been poisoned by them. (the former) whom they call Arwordikc. And in that province there are many, and openly they call themselves Christians. But we know that you are not uninformed concerning the confusion and corruption of their behaviour. Ah, ev ayll omanc ic Zrada, mognparsakan'c. ev aylymoc nocc'unc de'ec
aragaksapatc, zor arwordins ananan, ev ahya ev yamyn gawari bazunc
ev ink'envank k'rstoneysyk sink'ecn yasynapae kokcenc. Baya etoc
orpsil mololoc'samb ev anafrak'tamb varin, gitenac, oc'oc oc antekan.)
ABBREVIATIONS

This list contains abbreviations of both terms and works used in the text and footnotes, including many primary sources; the full bibliographical references to the latter given below are not repeated in the select bibliography which follows.


AHM - Fr. Lewond Alișan, Hin havatk clic hetcanak kron'c Hayoc ('The Ancient Faith or Heathen Religion of the Armenians'), Venice, 1910 ed.


AMI - Archäologische Mitteilungen aus Iran.


Ar. - Arabic.

Arum. - Aramaic.

Aדרך - A través de la hazaña hagias ("Handy Dictionary of the Armenian Language"), 2nd ed., Venice, 1865; contains all the lexical items in the NEHL, but without citations from texts or Greek and Latin equivalents.

Arm. - Armenian.
Y. or Ys. - Yasna.

YM - Yovhannēs Mamikonean, Patmut'cim Tarōnoy ('History of Tarawn'), Venice, 1889. Cit. by page no.

ZDMG - Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft (Berlin).

ZG - Zenob Glak Asori, Patmut'cim Tarōnoy, Venice, 1889. Cit. by page no.


Zor. - Zoroastrian.


**TRANSLITERATIONS**

For Armenian, the system of transliteration used is a modified form of that used in NEArm, the so-called Hübßmann-Meillet system:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Armenian</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ա</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ը</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ի</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ե</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Օ</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ռ</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ս</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ծ</td>
<td>Š</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Զ</td>
<td>Z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Տ</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Պ</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Գ</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Դ</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Թ</td>
<td>TH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ւ</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Չ</td>
<td>CH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ց</td>
<td>CZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Փ</td>
<td>PH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ք</td>
<td>KW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ՌՀ</td>
<td>RH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Յ</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The original alphabet of St Mesrop Maštac consisted of 36 letters; Ժ renders Classical Armenian UL av, and was added in the twelfth century with Ժ. The diphthong NL AV, corresponding to Gk OU, is transliterated by some writers as ow or ou.

For the transliteration of Pahlavi and New Persian, one has conformed in most cases to MacKenzie's system (D. M. MacKenzie, A Concise Pahlavi Dictionary, London, 1971, x-xv), except in direct citations of scholars like H. W. Bailey, who use the older or 'Arsacid' transliteration; for Pth. and Manichaean MP., has been used most often Boyce's system (M. Boyce, A Reader in Manichaean Middle Persian and Parthian, Acta Iranica 9, Leiden, 1975, 12-19). For Av. and OP. is preferred the system of AirWh. The symbols gamma, delta, and theta are transcribed ph, dh, and th; shva is treated as in Arm. above. The transcription of other foreign languages requires no particular comment.

A discrepancy may be noted between the transliterations of Armenian words in certain cases. This is due to the orthographical reforms introduced in Soviet Armenia, which have not been generally adopted by Armenians abroad. The Soviet orthography is followed for materials printed in Soviet Armenia, using the Classical Arm.

*The symbol shva was not available to the typist.*
orthography only where clarity would otherwise be impaired. In Western Arm. dialects the voiceless consonants are voiced and the voiced consonants are pronounced as voiceless; the form of a Western Arm. word or name is transcribed according to the Hiibschmann-Meillet system above, and the word as it is actually pronounced is given in brackets where the sense of the argument requires it.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

Many Classical and Medieval Arm. texts and other works consulted in this study are noted in the list of abbreviations. Much of the primary material consists of epigraphy, ethnographical data and folk literature (some of the latter of very recent date), and no pre-Christian Armenian texts of great length and verifiable antiquity are known. Therefore, this section is not divided into primary and secondary sources. Instead, certain entries are annotated.


N. Adonts, N. G. Garsoian, Armenia in the Period of Justinian, Louvain, 1970 (a study of the development of the naxar system in the Arsacid period; see also our intro. to the section on Maps).

N. Adonc, "Tork astuac hin Hayoc" ('Tork, a god of the ancient Armenians'), YSUarian - Festschrift of the Mekhitarist Congregation (see HA), Vienna, 1911.


Yovkannes Avicinei, Matenagutclynk ('Works'), Venice, 1834 (a primary text on early mediavcal heresies; see Ch. 16).


H. W. Bailey, 'Iranica II,' JRAI, July 1934.


R. M. Bartikyan, 'Eretiki Arevordi ("syny solntsa") v Armenii i Neso-

K. V. Trever, Ocherki po istorii kul'tury drevnei Armenii (II v. do n.e.-IV v.n.e.), Moscow-Leningrad, 1953 (includes studies of the Gr. inscriptions from Armawir and Gašni).


MAPS

The two sketch-maps appended to this work are intended to provide a general orientation of Armenia with respect to its neighbours and to indicate principal sites of religious importance in Greater Armenia (Arm. Mec Hayk, Armenia Maior) ca. the first century A.D. A map showing the eight main meheans referred to by Agath. and MX is appended to Fr. Y. Taisean's Arm. trans. of A. Carrière, Les huit sanctuaires de l'Arménie païenne d'après Agathangé et Noës de Khoren, Paris, 1899 (= Het'anos Hayastani ut meheannem, Azgayin Matenadaran Vol. 32, Vienna, 1899, 44); but it is seen that the number of shrines attested is much larger, and reference must be made at least to detailed maps and works of historical geography which we have consulted.

Dulaurier published in JA., 1869, a translation of 'Topographie de la Grande Arménie,' by Fr. B. Ališan of Venice, a pioneer in this field as in the study of ancient Arm. religion (cf. AHR). In 1904, H. Hübenschmann published in Indogermanische Forschungen, Vol. 16, 197-490, his unsurpassed work Die Altarmenischen Ortsnamen (repr. Amsterdam, 1969; Arm. ed. trans. by K. B. Pilëzikčian, Híl Hayoc (Teiwoy Anunnor, Azgayin Matenadaran Vol. 53, Vienna, 1907), a gazetteer and historico-linguistic study to which is appended a detailed map of Armenia ca A.D. 600. The English traveller and scholar H. F. B. Lynch, together with F. Oswald, published at London in 1901 a Map of Armenia and Adjacent Countries, appended to his two-volume work Armenia: Travels and Studies (Arm. ed. trans. by Levon Larenç, Constantinople, 1913), enabling one to compare ancient and modern locations. Lynch's map also provides topographical information not found in Hübenschmann's work.

The advance of research and scientific method in subsequent decades made new studies necessary. S. T. Eremyan's Hayastan est 'Açxarakocyc, Erevan, 1963, is an analysis of Arm. historical geography based upon the 'Geography' attributed to Anania of Şirak (seventh century), but probably later. Prof. N. G. Garsoyan, in Appendix V ('Toponymy,' pp. *137-*246) to her translation of N. Adontz, Armenia in the Period of Justinian, Louvain, 1970, presents a table of toponyms and locations in
historical Armenia based upon Classical and Arm. sources, studies such as that of Eremyan, and coordinates based upon the Aeronautical Approach Chart of the United States Air Force; the table takes into account also the changes in the toponymy of Turkey since Lynch's time.

A great deal of research has been done in Soviet Armenia to bring geographical information up to date. A general work on Arm. historical geography is T. X. Hakobyan, Hayastani patmcakan әxәrхәrgүtсүм, Erevan, 1968; A. M. Oskenyan published a topographical study and detailed map of physical features of Greater Armenia, Haykakan lernәнүүхә yev harevan erkmen, Erevan, 1976. Haykakan SSA Atlas, Erevan-Moscow, 1961, is devoted mainly to the geography of Soviet Armenia, but there are also detailed maps of historical Greater Armenia from ancient times to the first World War. One notes also Z. Khanzadian, Atlas de cartographie historique d'Arménie, Paris, 1960.

Separate historical maps for different periods have also been published. W. Kleiss, H. Hauptmann et al. produced a Topographische Karte von Urartu in AMI, Ergänzungsband 3, Berlin, 1976 (see also S. T. Eremyan's map of Urartu, 870-590 B.C., in НАР, I). In НАР, I also is a reconstruction of Ptolemy's map of Armenia (second century A.D.) and a map of Armenia, 66 B.C.-A.D. 224, by Eremyan. For the geography of Asia Minor in the Roman period, we have referred to D. Magie, Roman Rule in Asia Minor, Princeton University Press, 1950, 2 vols., with a detailed map. A map of Artaxiad Armenia is published in the Haykakan Sovetakan Haragitaran, II, opp. p. 40. A convenient general map of Arm. in the Artaxiad and Arsacid periods is T. X. Hakobyan, Hayastan (II d.m.C.-a.-V d.m.C. sәhmәnnerov), Erevan, 1970. C. Toumanoff, 'An Introduction to Christian Caucasian History,' Traditio, 15, 1959, 105-6, published maps of the Armenian naxarar domains, and of the provinces of the country (see also R. H. Hewsen, 'An Introduction to Armenian Historical Geography,' NEArm, N.S. 13, 1979-80). A huge and exhaustively detailed map of Arsacid Armenia was published by S. T. Eremyan, Mec Hayk'i tагaworүүнүң IV darum (298-385), Erevan, 1979.

After the Arab conquest in the seventh century, the administrative unit of ArminIyya embraced historical Armenia and large regions of adjacent countries; a map is provided in S. T. Melik-Hakobyan, Hayastane VII-IX dәrerum, Erevan, 1968. Following the Seljuk conquest,
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Abdiqoy, St., 174
Abhayyan, N., 10, 16, 305
Abgar (of Edessa), 116, 117, 292
Abovean, Kadatur, 406
Abraham, 169, 515
Abrahamyan, A., 269
Ab-zöhr, 379, 380, 484, 485
Achaemenians, 2, 14, 15, 32, 45, 46, 48, 49, 51, 58, 81, 164, 237, 298, 339, 384, 419
religious tolerance, 171
See esp. Ch. 2.
Adad, 28, 362, 368
Adadnirvan (or Hadamakert), 308
Ahekm, month of, Arm. Ahekan, 334
Adonis/Attis, 410
Adontz (Adonis), N., 25, 26, 271, 338
Adur, 'fire (in a temple)', 40, 125. See also Atani, Fire.
Adur Anahit at Stavr, 246
Adur Bursan Mühr, 264, 491, 493, 494
Adur Gunasp, 483
Adur Parnbog, 48
Adurakan, 'fires', 166, 92
Aediculum, 40
Aesa, demon of wrath, Arm. Ahriman, 401
Akitu-festival, 289
Al, 447
Alakert, N., 42
Alaskert, 2
Alexander, 2, 47, 85, 163, 195, 264, 270, 452
Alexandria, 94
Ali, 453
Alighamar, 95
Alisan, h., 10, 49, 497, 56, 59, 161, 485
Akhnat, 45
Akiti, 39
Altar, 485, 490. See also Bagin. From Bible, 490
Ameratat, 9, 329, 375-381, 398, 402
See also Horot-Morot, Amurdad, as immortality, 323
Amag, 379
Amasias, 454, 154, 155, 323, 375, 479, 498
Amestris, 438
Amida, 364
Amir, 274
Amirдовецъ Amasias, 456
Ammon Xanthorhrus, Latin name for horot-morot, the tuberous hyacinth, 382
Amphitriton's, 'ceremony of dedication', 502
Ahlagh, 'heretic', 124
Ahrian, name of a village, 444
Ahura, 437
Ahura Mazda, 11, 15, 49, 156, 161, 244, 337, 339, 343, 414, 437, 517.
See also Aramae.
father of the Amaz̄ Spēntas, 154
figure of, 154
fire of, 155
guardian of kings, 155
spoke with the prophet, 164
tetrad, 161
winged thunderbolts of, 172
Akinean, N., 42
Akitu-festival, 289
Akopov, Erk and Anen, 90
Al, 141
Alagodians, 39
Alaskert, 2
Abibvir, 'spring', of Amahit, 250
Aleppo, 383
Alexander, 2, 47, 85, 163, 195, 264, 270, 452
Alexandria, 94
Ali, 453
Allghamar, 95
Alisan, h., 10, 49, 497, 56, 59, 161, 485
Akhnat, 45
Akiti, 39
Altar, 485, 490. See also Bagin. From Bible, 490
Amurdad, 9, 329, 375-381, 398, 402
See also Horot-Morot, Amurdad, as immortality, 323
Amag, 379
Amasias, 454, 154, 155, 323, 375, 479, 498
Amestris, 438
Amida, 364
Amir, 274
Amirдовецъ Amasias, 456
Ammon Xanthorhrus, Latin name for horot-morot, the tuberous hyacinth, 382
Amphitriton's, 'ceremony of dedication', 502
Anaetha, 175

Armenia, as Urartu, 28. See also Arsame.

Armenian central star crown, 306
diaspora, 17
legends, 420
script, 9

Armeno-Sassanid relations, 17

Armenos, 28
Armenos-Pryanian, 32

Arminian central star crown,
306
diaspora, 17

Armenos, 28

Artabanus, 421, 422

Arts, 175

Artaxerxes, 516, 517

Artaxerxes II, 46, 53, 244, 245, 270, 482

Artaxerxes III, 17, 73, 120, 305. See also Arsame.
monarchy, 113

Artaxias (Artsam), 74, 77, 78, 94, 115, 119, 194, 240, 264

Artemis, 73, 175, 195, 238, 248.

See also Artaxias.
temple of, 246

Arza, 32
Arzy, 62, 93
Arzrast, 92

Asa Vahita, 437, 481, 498

Asavan, 437

Asavazdah, 400. See also Artaxias.

Ascension Day, 273, 329, 377, 375, 378, 310, 383, 399
Asdabak, 208. See also Asdahak.

Ash-worshipping (mazrapast), 484

Askenaz, 30

Askenazic, 15

Asianic Tarhunda, weathor god of the Lowians, 366. See also Tork.

Aškaft-i Dēwān, 'cave of the demons', 412

Ašklepios, 163

Asshūr, 445. See also Assīra.

Assur, 25, 28

Assyria, 2

Assyrians, 32

Asz, 19, 26

Asztard, 190. See also Assur.

Asztard, 190. See also Assur.

Asztard, 190. See also Assur.

Asztard, 190. See also Assur.

Asztard, 190. See also Assur.

Astarat, 73, 78, 11, 118, 212, 248, 295, 296, 484, 487. See also Artaxas.

Astaras, 28, 112, 123, 401, 405.

See also Artaxas.

Astaras, 28, 112, 123, 401, 405.

See also Artaxas.

Astaras, 28, 112, 123, 401, 405.

See also Artaxas.

Astaras, 28, 112, 123, 401, 405.

See also Artaxas.
Bagavan, 7, 9, 160, 228, 484
Bagyarides, 5, 7
Bagis, sanctuary of a particular yazata, 482, 486, 494. See also Altar.
Bagos, 93
Bagratidis, 363
Bagrow, 420
Bag-Tag, 70
Bahrin, 58, 63, 402
Bar, 189, 214
Baqi', 268
Bako, 524
Balakhor, 239
Balbaskan, 124
Barboun (musical instrument), 197, 198
Barbara, St., 252
Barbarossa, Frederick, legend of, 399
Bardeh, 122, 123
Barqash, 228
Barsamian, Father Xunak, 302
Barsamian, 27, 172, 174, 339
temple, 339
Barsunkin, 'bundle of sacred twigs', 286
Barrom, 268, 482
Bart'ikyan, H., 462
Barcholoumae, C., 244
Barcholoumow, St., 114, 116, 250, 404
Basen, 59
Basil of Caesarea, St., 135, 515, 516
Basoropeda, 77
Bas-relief from southern Turramenestan, 333
Basi, 42. See also Babylon.
Bask 'fortuna', 305, 347
Beshistun, 28, 32, 150, 330
inscription, 45
bas-relief, 86
Del, 14, 171, 174
as Marduk, 153, 165, 210
Benveniste, E., 16, 195, 271, 400, 439, 496
Bemard, P., 192
Beresaus, 25
Bible, 134
Book of Proverbs, 157
Biblical heroes, 135
legends of, 26
Bilotti, 249
Bindigol Dag, 379
Biruni, 378, 388, 389, 498
Bitlis, 302
Bolognesi, G., 16
Bonca, 483
Book of Maccabees, 327
Book of Six Thousand (Yecce Hazarek), 167, 169
Borippa, cult center of Nabû, 289
Boundary steles, 27, 75, 84
Bounteous Devotion, 323. See also Spenta Armaiti.
Bread of the soul, 343
Bridge of the Separator (Cinvata Pervu), 413
Bronze mask, from Ami, 327
Bronze plaque, at Dodana, 55
Búcaric, 454
Buddha, 454
Bûti, 455
Bull Hadhayans, 261
Búdahšán, 168, 169, 380, 483, 498
Burdur, 123
Burnê Mîhr, 125, 164. See also Adur
Buti, 453
Čagād-i Dādiq, 412
Čahîr tâg, 172
Čalender, 142
Armenian, 50
Čakhahavâk, 'flower gathering', 376
Čaukandîr tûn (holiday of the mother of flowers), 378
Čaukandîr tûn (holiday of the mother of flowers), 378
Čambyges, marriage of, 94
Čepekur, 455
Çappadoecia, 4, 14, 28, 124
Çappadocean, 4, 14, 28, 30
Carraca, 114, 117, 122, 131
Carathocerta, 364
Carentis, 77. See also Erzurum, Karin.
Cassius, 73, 248
Cat, 460
Cathedral of Ezmiacin, 26
Caucasian brown bear, 39
Caucasus, 2
Cav, 52
Cave of Mher, 399. See also Mithra, Spolaea
Časaruk, 'wheel', 445
Čamčéan, 10
Činlieka, 453
Čaldæa, 168
Čaldæans, 39
Čalybrians, 39, 77
Chapel of the Holy Resurrection, 204
Children of the sun, 515. See also Arevordic
Chorasnia, 239
Chorokh, 2
Chorsen, 77
Christ, temple at Jerusalem, 173
Christian basilica, 487
naxaraks, 203
Christians, passim
Cicero, 7
Cilicia, 124
Cimmeri, 30
Chnito, 30
Civašk (monsters), 455, 466
Claudius, 31, 309, 389
Clement of Alexandria, 245, 439
Cleopatra VII, 401
Cumak, 455
Coin of Arta IX showing an eagle, 83
coins, 77
depicting mountain, 164
in the Hermitage, 94
of Orodes, 89
of Tigran I, 83
of Tigran II, also showing mountain peaks, 83
Čoksas, 376
Colchis, 52
Coman, 51
Congregation, 50. See also Near Ersu Dag.
Conversion, legends, 126
forced conversion to Catholicism, 521
Cults of Anahit, 270
Ara, Attis, 423
Aphrodite-Anatids, 245
dog of Bards, 420
Balb, 365
Bebat, 213
Images, 481
of Mhr, 82
Mother Earth, 323
sun horses, 81
Tork, 369
Vahagn, 215, 217, 270
Cunea, 86
Oubthah, 361. See also Tork
Cyaxares, 41
Cybele, 81, 235, 241, 416. See also Anatolian Mother Goddess.
Cypress tree, sacred to Zoroastrians, 84
Cyprian, St., 487
Cyrus, 33, 41, 44, 45, 46
Dabistân, 444
Dadvah, 51, 154, 498
Đa través, 410
Đaşvan, 49
dâr, 174, 267
dêwa, 329, 403, 404, 405, 412, 413-463
dês, 289
worship of, 440
Davitadnâ, 'place of the daivis', 438
Dakhs, 308, 233, 337, 418
Dasamand, Mt., 26, 42, 381, 399, 400, 406, 412
Danis, 133
Danseans, 27
Daniel, bishop, 133
Dante, 381
Darani, 170
Darânas* k'ar, 'rock of the smiths', 404
site of a Zoroastrian shrine of Anahit, 250
Dar-i Mîhr, 272
Darvus, 28, 32, 45. See also Achaemenians, 117, 47, 156
Datstambûk, law book of Mîtiwar Gos, 94
Datewar: judge, 466
Davît, 169, 173, 370, 452
Davît 'Anayač, 'the In-vincible', 167, 416
of Avelâk, 518
of Salmanor, 520
Dayek, 'nurse', 123
Demetr, 200, 202, 205, 325, 326
Demosthenes, 47
Dên, 'religion', 203. See also Dâna
Dên Madzer, 166
Dîncarad, 246, 380, 440, 441, 444, 497, 521
Dînepuç, 167
Dîrjan, 270
Dersim, 444
Dersênê, 77
Dervi kâvûr, 'station of the demons', 203
Dârgu, 29
Dmîrîq, 362
Dt-k, 'god(s)', 174
Diocletian, 519
Diôdoros Siculus, 47, 49, 93
Dionyusos, 160
Dionyseos, 408
Dîvî', 'enchancer', 442
Dîwîm, 'house of divs', 204
Dîybarakir, 376. See also Amlûn.
Dog, 344
Dog-headed man, 420. See also Amânias.
Dolkhâs, 363
Dîrmer, F. K., 6
Dowsett, C., 456
Dîrî, 'scribe', 300, 486
Dragon Illuyanka, 210. See also Vishap.
Dragon-Reaper (Vahagn), 197, 200
Drestamat, 364
Drouge, 49
Druyt, 'tree, paradise', 340
Druj, 437
demon, 456
Dûn, 37, 26, 309, 516, 521
Dûmêzîl, 6, 16, 375
Dura Europos, 306, 361
frescoes at, 305
Durân, E., 10
Dushane, 441
Dyakonov, I., 90
Dzox, 'hell', 340, 449, 462
Eagle, Arm. arciv/arcut, 307
Alb-l-Îr, 310
Rock, 311
Eastern plane tree, 52. See also Saws(i).
Ebront, 56
Eccles. 221
Edit of Milan, 114
Enâilân, 18, 406, 418. See also Cathedral of E.
Erîj, 403
Erûke, 8, 91, 92, 122, 136, 158, 166, 299, 416, 487, 490, 496, 501
Erîwarsâd, 378
Erûnik, M., 10
Endless light, Av. Angra maozâ, 149
Engay, 455
Enouch, 39, 403
Epiphanius, 161
Epic of Ara and Samiram, 242 of Artavas, 389
of Samx, 81, 370, 378, 414
Erkânah, 90, and Iran, passim
Eratô, 54
Erazahan, 'dream interpreter', 296, 299
Erêvuni, 30
Erêz, 6
Erlinys, 455
Erskin, 46. See also Orontes.
Erwanâhu, 53
Erwan, 52
Ertineka (Erânzân), 51, 249
Erzurum, 379. See also Karin.
Esharaddon, Assyrian king, 30, 31
Eryxan, 40
Ester, biblical romance of, 131
Estrangelo, 134
Eusebanos, 165
Eusèbion, 47
Euphrates, 2, 26, 45. See also Aracani.
Euripides, 55, 73, 401, 327, 348
Eusebius, 40, 160
Pamphili, 363
testimony, 125
Evil, 455. See also Angra Mainyu, spirit, 303
Exposure of corpses, 337
Eunik of Koeb, 8, 16, 163, 166, 174, 228, 266, 306, 309, 344, 403, 406, 443, 449, 459, 462, 524
Fable of the (Y)arâz, 404. See also Arâzâ.
Feast, of Argavan, 400. See also Hambardzam Töm, of Ascension of the Holy Mother of God, 378
of husbandmen, 323
of presentation of the Lord to the temple, 499
of Šade, 462
of Transfiguration, 251, 273, 370
Ferdowis, 481
Fire. See also Adu, Athâ, Atrûfan, altars, 404
cult, 409
sâdân type, 484
Feast of Ashrafkâ, 182
holder/Fârînânân, 485
of Mîhrân, 262
of Omid, 53
reverence for, 497
on Sassanian coins, 490
son of Ahura Mazda, 481
temple of Bursal Mîhr, 387
of Verahgâns, 483
Folklore of the Arm. of Jawâh, 445
Fradžâtâ, 401
Frâsa, 32
Fraçêgâr, Arm. hrašakart, 261, 401, 407, 413
Frâstârâ: Greek inscription, 172
arm. temple at Persepolis, 156
Fravardîgân festival, 334
Fravân (Arm. hrot-icê), 53, 125, 159, 329, 334, 347, 499, 500
cult of, 355, 345, 366, 520
Frederick Barroso, legend of, 399
frog, 458
funerary monuments, 340
towers, 340
Gabicen, 382
Gordyene, identified with Sраошая in Islam, 302,305
Gahambās, 29,343,498
Galatia, 123
Galerius, 125
Gaminī, 30. See also Cappadocia.
Ganjā, 263,524
Ganzaca, 30,52
Ganzabara, 'treasurer', 519
Garegin, 170,205
Garlic Feast, 389
Garth, 7,29,78,118,269,523
Garskan, N.G., 4,95
Gaster, T., 40
Gāt'ēram, 10
Gāthēs, 304,437,446
Gaugamelā, 47
Gayl, 'wolf', 460
Gaylagap (wolf-binding spell), 460
Gaza, 'beast', 459
Gasiaora, 28,73
George, of Antioch, 365
of Cappadocia, 271
Georgians, 4,16,31,243,274
Vissamani of, 405
Gerexman, 'tomb', 438
Gershevitch, I., 274
Gēs, 201
Gēš, 'earthly material', 527
Gēw, 400
Giarmani, 29. See also Gari
Gisnē and Demetr shrine of, 199,201,202,205
temple of, 325
Gisavor, 203
Givt, catholics, 486
Gizbār, priest, 519
Okl, monastery of, 199,200
Goblet of the soul, 343
God Sabazios, 174
Goddess Astāk: Little star, 524
Gocell, T., 6
Gogarēna, 47
Golestan, 387
Goltēn, 44,133
Good Religion, 13,14,17,76,126,340,346,369. See also Daēnā.
Gōr, 'haughty, onager', 88,402
Gordyene, 2,25,406
Gort, 'frog', 458. See also frog.
Gōspand, 'good creature', 497
Gorates II, Zoroastrian, 90,191
Gstrap of Gstre, 330
Gratovski, I.M., 90
Gray, L., 91,441
Great Mother, 235. See also Anatolian Mother Goddess and Attis
temple at Pessinus, 73
Greater Bundahisn, 392. See also Bundahisn.
Greater Nē Rās, 379. See also Navasard.
Greek inscription, 330
Greek, passim.
Gregory, St., the Illuminator, 116,260,172,196,199,264,
293,326,332,369,370,378,
382,388
Gregory, St., of Narek, 157,
203,527
Grigor Arranuni, 217
Grigor Cereno Čistčecči, 408
Grigor Hrjacči, 404
Grigor Magistros, 164,190,201,
208,304,527
Grigor Magistros Pahlavuni, 164,
516
Grigor of the Firm, 452
Grōl, 'writer', 289,290,300-305
shek-stricken, 457
Grōl-gaiz, 301
Gudara, 400
Guakār, 370
Gumē, 493
Gumeši, 458
Gurās, 38. See also Cor.
Gumnap, 40,158,494. See also Ādur Guumnap.
Gustāp, 387. See also Vištāspa.
Hačekac, 156
Hadad, 171
Hadakar, 308. See also Adamakar.
Haf, 221, 382
Haid, 382
Hald, 28,32
Halida, 32,365
Halys River, 39
Hambarman Tēn, 377. See also Feast.
Hambarman Tēn, 449
Hamdārā, 323
Hāman-i Seštān, 412,414
Hamza Iftahāni, 92
Hanībal, 4,178
Haona, 244,349
Harru, 44,245
Hara Berzažät, 412
Haravatāt, 244. See also Anahīt.
Harvrapet, 'centurion', 519.
See also Hazerpet.
Harvš, 31
Harraq, 362
Hars, 371,379,383
Hārūt, 381. See also Haurvatāt, Horvat-Morot.
Harvān, 32
Hatra, 44,306,361,369,405
Haurvatāt, 'wholeness', 9,33,
323,369,375-379
Havan Gūn, 266
Havirg, 376,388
Haurvatāt, 375
Hovat-Morot, 380
flower, 389
Hayakak, 367
Haykakan Par, 2
Hay-k, as Hittite, 30,31,367
Hayrēn, 303
Hazarād, 319
Hazerpet, 518
Hebat/Hepit, 29
Helicon, M., 55
Hekikonis of Thessalonikē, 163
Hēlos, 523
Herōtēs, 306
Henning, W.B., 16,239
Hepēstos/Hephaistos, 81,262,
266,306
Hēraklēs, 195,195,196,198,397.
See also Vaagah on coins of Tigran, 84
temples of, 194
Herald, Leon Scribanian, 444
Hermitage, Leningrad, 94,440
Hermot, 3,25,30,31,39,43,46,49,123,244,482
Hegida, 47
Hebat-Morot, 446. See also Aēmā.
Hesperites, 39
Hērychian, 32
Hiera Kome, sanctuary of the Persian Goddess, 73
Hierapolis, 248
Hrombā, 499
Hittites, 209,368. See also Hay-k, legend of Kumari, 271
Himār, 337
Himār-Peyten, 444
Himār, 43,443
Holiday. See also Feast.
Cakkazmar Tēn, Hambarman Tēn
of Ascension, 9,377,414
of mice, 459
of the mother of flowers, 477, 378
Holy
Apostles, 200
fire, 166
Thursday, 377
Homer, 370
Horād, 323,381. See also Haurvatāt.
Hormizd-Arasīd, 90
Hrobat-Morot, the tuberous
hyacinth, 9,360-363
Hrast, 198
Hraš, 450
Hrāp'ēime, St., 118
Hrāwt (Sogdian), 380. See also Haurvatāt.
Hūšbeian, H., 11,16,330,483
Hūramyā, 122
Hūrak, 483
Hūrī, 243
Hūrani weather-god, 11,174,209.
See also Tešub, Vaagah.
Hūviška, 239
Hydarnē, 46
Isogōna, 196
Ištvan, 39
Ilōri, monastery of, 267
Image of the gods/āsanas, 336
shrines, 123,182,194,495
undācārā, 483
Inanma, 29,237
Innākne, 199,325
Inquisition, 521
Inscription at Aparan, 521
Avarizj, 58
Beštātn, 365
on a bowl from Sisian, 89
funerary, 56
of Kartir, 90
Yaraz, Varaş, Varaz, varāza, 189, 198, 214
boar, symbol of Verethragna, 340
Varbakes, 39
Varōz, vož, Varōz, 380
Vard, 137, 400
Vardan, 137, 460
Varden Bzr̄bərd, 6, 402
Varden Manikonean, 115, 136, 487.
See also Manikoneans.
Vardapet, 491
Vardar, 251, 378, 380.
See also Peasts of the Transfiguration.
Vardad, 495
Varmag, 189.
See also Vahagn.
Vahagn (Bogdian), 189.
See also Vahagn.
Vasak, 137
Vasak Sīwani, 136
Vaspurakan, 6, 47, 194, 388, 490
Vēta, 190
Vestaz Havarsak, 168, 169
Vēvzn, the planet, 244
Verethragna, 29, 199, 190, 192, 214,
270, 340.
See also Vahagn, Varaz.
coll of, 25
dragon-rearing, 213
and Samaramet situated, 325
temple of, 219
yazota of strength, 84
Vahēvanean, 194
temple, 193
Vahran Vardapet, 205
Vahuni, 197, 263, 366
Vakhur II, 13, 118, 119.
See also Vologosean.
Vakarsak, 116, 366
temple of, 53
Vakarsag (Ejjincin), 7, 26, 118, 295
santuaries of, 416
Vakars, 12
Van, Lake, 2, 6, 28, 30, 272, 404
Vanahan Vardapet, 403
War of Yima, 274
Varast, monastery of, 404
Wills, C.J., 461
Winged circle, 51, 347
Wīrāz, 384
Wolf, 460.
See also pāk.
Wturk-Frăndxs, 519
Xax'mස̄r, 'Cross-stone', 27, 365
Xạcp'ak, ongometry of, 204
Xalavst deriving, of 81áveis, 521
Xanths, 13, 94
Xarberd, 376
Xartes, 202
Xavās, 172
Xenophon, 1, 33, 39, 41, 46, 48, 55,
139, 266, 294
Xrī, 379
Yekes, 46, 49, 438
Xem, 446.
See also Aēsma.
Xnus, 379
Xorān, 'canopy', 172
Xorāsān, 164
Xorastes, 'sun', 445
Xorenāt, Movses, 7, 8, 13, 27, 40,
41, 45, 50, 52, 54, 56, 57, 76, 79,
83, 89, 95, 123, 129, 140, 160,
161, 165, 194, 195, 197, 210, 241,
248, 166, 249, 299, 306, 307, 311,
327, 338, 344, 367-370, 389, 404,
406, 413, 417, 421, 422, 442, 483
Xyor Wirasp, 204
Xosrov II, 77, 125, 286, 388, 486
Xosrovanert, grove of oaks made
by Xosrov, 388
Xotuir, 302, 422, 423
Xoyr, 'tiara', 496
Xor, 'pig', 198
Xp(1)lik 'demons of nightmares',
435, 456
Xrafas, 'noxious Creature',
458
Xușhba Vairys, 76, 283
Xutl, 119, 122, 487, 519
X'yez̄viriş (Zoroastrian marriage
to the next-of-kind), 94,
95, 525
X'arenāt, 'glory', 80, 164, 306,
309, 310, 320, 339, 474, 483, 520
See also pāk.
Xadagir-i Zeravān, 190
Xanta, 169, 498
Xart, 199, 496
Yazata, 9, 17, 26, 27, 29, 43, 134, 195,
238, 241, 261, 303, 304, 323, 333
Yazata (continued)
380, 394, 437, 523
Aān Vahisti, 498
Asl, 241
Atar, 408
of baxt, 306
cult of, 125
Mithra, 522
Mithra, Nairyō Sāhba, 263
shrine of, 126
Spandarmad, 438
Spīnta Arzāt, 117
temple of, 120
Tb'Tus Legātas, 263
Verethragna, 340
Yagd, 449, 447.
See also Barīfāndād.
Yazdagird II, 91, 92, 115, 167, 470
Yazidi, 309, 461
Yeats, William Butler, 412
Yima, Jamīd, 42, 44, 292, 438, 39
Yīna, 377
Yōvanan Mānikonean, 202, 326
Yōvanan of Avjōn, 206, 213, 459,
518-524
Yōvanan of Drasmanakert, 198,
486
Yōvanan of Erkanra, 247, 516
Yōvanan Ismāltār (the Philoso-
phers), 301
Yōvananb Māvakuni, 443
Yōvananb Pūrārān, 168, 453, 520
Yūrūtēk, 'tailman(s)', 444
Yūnak-pahrik, 449
Zabaxa, 29
Zahner, C., 15
Zahnik, 34, 562, 404, 439, 441.
See also Azabaxk.
Zīl, son of Sīm, 308
Zammak, 'time', 404
Zandik, sindik, 524.
See also Mount.
Zanqir, 165, 274, 339
Zarathushtra, 11, 50, 154, 190, 328
Zariadres, 58, 83
Zarnoain, 515
Zelen, 6, 73, 485
temple at Pontus, 73
Zelīnta, 161
Zemmak, 455
Zeno, 96
Zenob Glak, 201, 326
Zeus, 87,162,163. See also
Aramaaz.
Keraunios, 16,83
Megistos, 172
Nikephoros, 83
Phalekros, 161
Zod, 7,212
Zoravar, 519
Zoroastrianism, 33,49,51,94,211,
235,261,267,304,309,323,
337,419,449,516,517
travas in, 77
Zoroastrians, 3,4,44,83,89,140,
154,161,211,217,237,261,
298,304,329,337,343,362,
416,449,484,515,525,528
calendar, 498
diversity, 15
divinities, 3,4
eschatology, 49
foundations, 6,11,14
law, religion, 92
seasonal festivals, 51
site, 89
temples, 262
use of images, 53,67
vision, 3
vocabulary, 6,92
x'varnah of, 76
Zradašt, 516,522. See also
Zarathushtra.
Zurvan, 14,161,163,515
Zurvanism, 8,12,45,136,163,440