

CHARACTERISTIC FEATURES AND PERIODIC CLASSIFICATION OF THE MEDIEVAL ARMENIAN HISTORIOGRAPHY

The ways the specific features of the Armenian historiography have developed, the problems of exploring the specific features of different centuries and their periodization has not attracted too much attention by the researchers. No works covering the whole path trodden by the Armenian historiography have yet been published and generally recognized. The problems of medieval Historiography, have usually been restricted to recounting or simply to presenting the Medieval culture¹. In general studies of this kind the main attention is focused on characterizing specific historians' works, rather than on historiographic features of historical periods². It is not surprising that in the Medieval Armenian spiritual Culture the issues of mutual impacts between historiography and literary works have not received special attention either. However, the problem of periodic classification of the Medieval Armenian history writing has become a starting point for putting forward some new issues of theoretical nature as well as for making generalizations.

However, prior to raising those questions one has to tackle the key issue of periodic divisions. It is to be noted in this connection that it is extremely difficult to offer a single crucial criterion of dividing the Medieval Armenian history writing into individual stages. It is to be pointed out at once that the efforts to directly link the course of writing history to the socio-economic rela-

¹ See e.g., Մ. Աբեղյան, Հայոց հին գրականության պատմություն, գիրք առաջին, «Երկեր», հատ. Գ, Երևան, 1968, *ibid.*, Հայոց հին գրականության պատմություն, գիրք երկրորդ, «Երկեր», հատ. Դ, Երևան, 1970, Կ. Քիպարեան, Պատմություն հայ հին գրականության, Վենետիկ, 1992:

² Thus, the monumental work «Հայապատումը» by Gh. Alishan is a research work and a reading book at the same time. In Volume 1, the author showed in different sketches the literary and scholarly legacy of the Armenian historians of the 5th to 18th centuries, as well as diverse problems with regard to the creative impacts. Volume 2 contains large fragments from the same authors (Ղ. Ալիշան, Հայապատում, հ. Ա-Բ, Վենետիկ, 1901): K. Mutafian's notes are concerned with the Armenian Historiography as a whole, see C. Mutafian, *Quelques specificites de l' historiographie arménienne*, «Հանդես ամսօրեայ, 2010, pp. 253-274: The only large study of the Medieval Armenian Historiography was a 3-volume work by L. Babayan (see Բաբայան, Դրվագներ Հայաստանի Վաղ Ֆեոդալիզմի դարաշրջանի պատմագրության (5-8-րդ դդ.), Երևան, 1977: Դրվագներ Հայաստանի զարգացած Ֆեոդալիզմի դարաշրջանի պատմագրության (IX-XIII դարեր), Երևան, 1981: Դրվագներ Հայաստանի XIV-XVIII դարերի պատմագրության, Երևան, 1984), retaining the seal of the Soviet mentality and has a descriptive character.

tions are below all criticism. E.g.: characterizations like “Historiography of the Early Period of Feudalism”, or “Historiography of the Period of Developed Feudalism” can lead to a blind alley, since for the subsequent centuries the Armenian reality does not provide opportunities to suggest relevant characteristics. Therefore, to logically describe the path of the Armenian Historiography, use can be made of a direct benchmark principle.

To do a further search, it is necessary to arrive at a general conclusion with regard to another important issue, as to which are the chronological indicators of the Medieval Historiography? In trying to answer this question, it may seem that the issue of the origin of the Medieval Armenian Historiography cannot be a subject of any serious discussion. The 5th century, as a period of inception, can be regarded as a natural borderline, although comprehending a given century will unavoidably require analytical approach to the antecedent periods of time. The final chronological borderline can incite discussion. With regard to the in-depth phenomena, the terminal period of the Medieval historiography can be pointed out as the 70-80s of the 18th century. The matter is that the historical works written in those years by Movses Baghramyan «Նոր տեսրակ» and Michael Chamchian “Armenian History” had substantially distanced themselves from the Medieval mentality and clearly absorbed the West-European socio-political and scholarly impact. In the subsequent decades, too, particularly in Armenia Proper and in the adjacent areas, the Armenian authors had written books impregnated with the Medieval traditions as well as historical works representing the same genres, being however unable to change the course of historical development. No matter how disputable can be the characterization of the “New Armenian Historiography”, the generally accepted truth is that in the late 18th century the Armenian spiritual activities surrendered their positions attained in the Middle Ages.

Now about other issues. The image of the initial stages of the Medieval Armenian Historiography, its typological features also determine the crucial ideological factors of shaping the spiritual culture. In different epochs, e.g., there were differences in the Armenian life, in the Eastern and Western perceptions of history, mythological and epic world outlook, as well as the traces left by Christianity.

Also of fundamental significance are the issues of mutual relationships between the written and oral cultures. It is beyond doubt that the oral tradition has had a great impact on history writing, while by no means diminishing the differences among the echoes and traces of the folk-created and popular compositions in the relics of the written culture. Another problem is that the oral tradition at different epochs had resulted from creative efforts of different public groups pursuing diverging ideological objectives, therefore historiography carries unmistakable seals of that ideological confrontation.

The issue of language and style of the works on history is also connected with the interrelations between the oral and written cultures. Not uncommonly, the folk and often poetically organized compositions have determined the basic structure of the historical books. Meanwhile, the folk pieces have also

been rewritten in prose leaving an indirect or mediated influence stipulating a choice of models for historical presentations. There have also been reverse phenomena. On occasions of relaxed positions of the official or elite culture the historical compositions were created in verse, thus expanding their capacity to be transferred to next generations. The same tendencies are attested by the facts of eliminating the verses in the past.

The historical compositions take their origin from the conservative strata, therefore the issue of their language is particularly significant. The quality of belle-lettres mostly belongs to the Early Medieval compositions, particularly those written in Classical Grabar of the 5th century. Meanwhile, as far back as the 10th c., the written works were compiled from the live word in a very distinctive language. Within the subsequent centuries, with the settlement of the Middle Armenian, linguistic differences became more conspicuous. Towards the end of the Medieval period, the linguistic differences had nearly made impossible mere recordings of the historical events by the immediate partakers. The language of history writing remained Grabar, although the vivacity of the lost language was controlled by the very few. Therefore, a new method became popular of dual authorship of a single historical composition. E.g., the Histories by David Bek and Abraham Yerevantsi (Abraham of Yerevan) were recounted in colloquial language, in the native dialect. The Mkhitaryan monks enriched those oral compositions with new facts rewriting them in Grabar, reinforcing the newly composed pieces with the ideological orientation typical for the traditional historiography.

When offering a periodic division of historiography, it is impossible to circumvent the widely spread problems of the types of creativity or belonging to a genre of historical compositions in the Middle Ages. In the Armenian Medieval historiography historical works were created following certain principles, possessing their own genre-type originality, however, more often than not the genres were not discretely delimited. As to the Medieval authors, they kept trying to determine the genre varieties of the preceding history writers and their compositions, however, the current characterizations being largely conventional, they can hardly be adopted without reservations. The genre differences had been stipulated not only by the authors' objectives, their level of preparedness, knowledge or breadth of coverage; they must have rather had deeper causes. Particularly great was the role of variations in the perceptions of time and space.

It is easy to notice that "History" as a separate genre had seized a commanding role at the initial stage of the Armenian History Writing. That is the title of the majority of compositions of historical type written in the Armenian Middle Ages. From the genre point of view, "history" is systemic presentation with prevailing chronological or thematic approaches. The exemplary pieces have been those that retained the strict chronological order. Chronological or thematic deviations were considered to be structural defects. Histories are also such compositions which give a chance to reveal the author's outlooks and scrutinize in detail the causes of events and phenomena, feedbacks and conse-

quences. In the structures of histories a special place belongs to Introductions declaring the authors' intentions and creative principles. Careful attention was dedicated to maintaining proportions: «**չնուազեցուցանել զեղեալսն և կարճակտուր պատմել բանիւք անփութութեամբ**»¹. As a rule, history writers compared themselves to a skilled captain who would assuredly bring to completion a difficult undertaking, i.e., would reach a quiet haven. The early Medieval historians had often quoted letters and documents. However, it was not by default that they should have been executed on the basis of authentic documents. E.g., the correspondence quoted by Movses Khorenatsi between the Roman Emperor Diocletian and Trdat III is a result of literary creation. Letters, as e.g. the letter by Emperor Morik to the Persian King Khosrov II, show the reality and the soul of a time period. However, they are not word-by-word reproductions. The same can be said about the speeches pronounced by significant historic personalities.

From the scope of geographic perception, the “histories” mostly present the Armenia’s past, including individual episodes in the history of neighboring countries. Therefore, the historical works created in the Armenian environment have predominantly been “Armenian Histories”.

As to the genre, the one having the closest connection with history is chronicle writing. The chroniclers focused their attention on events taking place within comparatively short periods of time. Their foremost problem was not explanation of events and phenomena, but rather a coherent registration of happenings. In chronicles, the coherence of the interior structure is quite simple. The chronicler, having finished his writing on the antecedent years, goes over to presenting his version of the events that follow. Chronicles mainly deal with military and political events. Considerably less attention was concentrated upon the country’s interior life or spiritual and cultural affairs. The chronicles have experienced heavy impacts from the antecedent historical traditions. A great number of chroniclers continued the compositions walking in the footsteps of their predecessors.

Chronicle writing has paved its way into the future since the 7th century. The first chronicle that has reached us was written in the late 7th century and in the new literature is ascribed to Philon Tirakatsi². It had a compilatory character and was based on “The Armenian History” by Movses Khorenatsi (Movses of Khoren) and on a number of translated works³. The Armenian materials occupy those two modest places which can be considered characteristic for the chronicles gradually adopting a national character. Particularly noteworthy is the fact that in the last sentence of the Chronicle the event is dated in the

¹ **Ղազար Փարպեցի**, Պատմություն Հայոց, «Մատենագիրք Հայոց», հատ. Բ, Անթիլիաս-Լիբանան, 2003, էջ 206:

² Տես **Փիլոն Տիրակացի**, Ժամանակագրություն, «Մատենագիրք Հայոց», հատ. Ե, Անթիլիաս-Լիբանան, 2005, էջ 899-902:

³ See **Բ. Սարգիսեան**, Անանուն ժամանակագրություն, խմբագիր յորինեալ յԷ դարու ի հնագոյն ժամանակագրաց, Վենետիկ, 1904, pp. 5-29: **Հ. Բարթիկյան**, Անանիա Շիրակացուն վերագրվող մի «ժամանակագրության» և նրա հեղինակի հարցի շուրջ,- «Բանբեր Մատենադարանի», 8, Երևան, 1967, էջ 57-77:

Armenian Era¹, and so we encounter the first case of dating the events with regard to years in the entire Armenian Historiography². Regretfully, through lack of material, we are deprived of a further development process of the chronicle genre. One can offer some remarks on a large work on the basis of a Chronicle by Mathew of Edessa. Here the registration is started with the events of 951–952³, while this date can by no means be regarded as having a special meaning or, even less so, as having a revolutionary significance. It remains to assume that Matthew of Edessa (Mathevos Urhayetsi) had at his disposal a chronicle starting with the events of the 10th century, whereby the events were sequentially dated in the Armenian era. It is beyond doubt that in the Armenian Historiography of the 8th to 10th centuries new attempts were undertaken to write chronicles⁴, with Matthew of Edessa continuing the tradition as a successor, rather than the founder of the genre. One of the characteristics of chronicles is that they have to continue with no end, those types of work can have no termination by definition, and have to be filled in nonstop, and Matthew of Edessa's work was fulfilled in 1136 with the help of Grikor of Kesun (Grikor Kesuntsi)⁵, and in the following century it was put in the basis of the Chronicle by Sempad the Constable⁶. The titles of this work show the place it occupied within similar works in the Medieval Historiography. In the first printing the publisher entitled it as The history of the Armenians and the Greeks of Constantinople in the chronological order or in the sequence of time⁷, i.e., to be considered history, whereas at a later date the same composition was characterized as a chronicle⁸, while at times it was called annals⁹. This can be explained by the fact that the composition by Sempad the Constable started as

¹ See **Փիլոն Տիրակացի**, Ժամանակագրություն, էջ 969:

² See **Ա. Տեր-Ղևոնդյան**, Թվականությամբ ժամանակագրությունը հայ պատմագրության մեջ, «Պատմա-քանասիրական հանդես», 1979, թ. 1, էջ 35: Following the tradition, the author ascribed the Chronicle to Anania Shirakatsi, writing: “The first historian who used the Armenian numerals was Anania Shirakatsi”.

³ **Մատթեոս Ուռհայեցի**, Ժամանակագրություն, Գրքարք բնագիրը Մ. Մելիք-Աղամանի և Ն. Տեր-Միքայելեանի, Երևան, 1991, էջ 6:

⁴ In the course of those centuries, in Byzantium, there was a formation of the genre of Chronicle as an individual genre in Historiography see **М. В. Бибиков**, Историческая литература Византии, Санкт-Петербург, 1998, с. 80–94, cf. Theophanos the Confessor (Byzantine sources, IV), Translation from the original, introduction and commentaries by H. Bartikyan, Yerevan, 1983, pp. V–XIX, (in Armenian). Theophanos' Successor (Byzantine sources, Ye.), Translation from the original, introduction and commentaries by H. Bartikyan, Yerevan, 1990, pp. VII–XXI.

⁵ **Մատթեոս Ուռհայեցի**, էջ 406–478:

⁶ **Սմբատ Սպարապետ**, Տարեգիրք, Վենետիկ, 1956 (Publisher Սերոբէ Ազըլեան):

⁷ **Սմբատ Սպարապետ**, Պատմություն Յունաց ի Կոստանդնուպոլիս և Հայոց Մեծաց ըստ կարգի ժամանակաց, Մոսկվա, 1856 (Publisher Voskan Hovhanniseants):

⁸ Տարեգիրք արարեալ Սմբատայ Սպարապետի հայոց որդւոյ Կոստանդէայ կոնսին Կոռիկոսոյ, ի լոյս ղնծայեաց հանդերձ ծանօթութեամբք Կարապետ Վ., Շահնազարեանց, Փարիզ, 1859; Extrait de la Chronique de Sempad, Seigneur de Babaron, connétable d'Arménie, traduite pour la première fois de l'arménien par V. Langlois, Saint-Petersbourg, 1862; Chronique du Royaume de la Petite-Arménie, par le connétable Sempad; Ed. Dulaurier, Recueil des historiens des Croisades; Documents arméniens, Paris, 1869; La Chronique Attribuéé au Connetable Smbat. Introduction, traduction et par Gérard Dédéyan, Paris, 1980:

⁹ Из летописи Конетабля Сембата, писателя XIII века. “История монголов по армянским источникам”. Перевод и объяснения К. П. Патканова, Выпуск I, СПб., 1873. Смбат Спарпет, Летопись. Перевод с древнеармянского предисловие и примечания А. Г. Галстяна, Ереван, 1974.

history (anyway, the author had openly declared his intention to that effect), but later it adopted the nature of annals.

If annals originate from histories, then the genre of annals is genetically linked with chronicles. The European annals and the similar pieces emerging in Russia as “letopis” are identified as a structural entity. In the compositions of this genre records are entered with regard to years, so that the events taking place within the same period can display no internal or logical link, for all differing events (combat, intruding armies, rebellion, earthquake, plague, natural disaster, extraordinary cosmic or planetary phenomena, pestilence or any unusual occasion) the common thing is their simultaneous occurrence¹. Chroniclers register time in its various manifestations. In the chronicles, dating mistakes are extremely rare, while concise presentation is a top priority. Chroniclers are often people who have not received historical training or those who have vague ideas about the surrounding areas. Therefore they as a rule do not make attempts to establish correlations between different events. Chronicles are also noted for the multiple significant data of the local character, which enables us to discover historical images of different cities or areas.

During the centuries following the inception of the Armenian historiography, there was a formation of certain historiographic traditions, the Medieval historians were following some creative patterns. Particularly, the dissemination of the genre of chronicles prompted the coverage of reality of the preceding centuries. Under these conditions, compilation was inevitable, the general picture emerged by means of quoting from the works by the previously existing authors. In this connection a certain role also belonged to Medieval ideas of the author’s self-awareness. Manifestations of author’s self-awareness and pride in the Armenian reality could be encountered in the early Middle Ages, while the antique traditions had been still there. Classical incorporations of this type of author’s feelings can be seen in the “Armenian History” by Movses of Khoren.

In the subsequent centuries under the influence of Christian ideology the author’s capabilities were habitually subjected under an emphatic underestimation. Medieval writers strove to display their modesty and their limited powers. As a rule, they described their creative capacities in much the same manner. In this sense a different approach is displayed perhaps only by Mkhitar of Ani (Mkhitar Anetsi), whose rating of his own work is rather high: «բանիւք կարևորաւք և զարմանազան իրաւք հարուստ և ընդանեգոյն նոր և ծանոթ զրուցաւք»². The prevailing custom was the outlook that the author’s objective was not to provide the fundamentally new ideas, but rather to give another account of the events and phenomena that have been regarded as common knowledge. Therefore, to address other authors borrowing extended quotations from them was by no means considered a fact diminishing the

¹ Т. В. Гимон, Ведение погодных записей в средневековой анналистике (Сравнительно-историческое исследование). Автореф. канд. дисс., М., 2001.

² Մխիթար Անեցի, Մատենան աշխարհավէպ հանդիսարանաց, Աշխատասիրությամբ Հ. Գ. Մարգարյանի, Երևան, 1983, էջ 73-74:

value of any composition.

Practicing compilation, the authors never followed the principle of precision. True, the Medieval history writers have usually pointed out the previous authors in the Introduction. However, attesting to some author, the writers did not consider it mandatory to make use of his work. The author made the mention to add more credibility to the content. Besides, in the opinion of Medieval historians, the multiplicity of references would testify to the high quality of their own works. In the Medieval History Writing a popular device was when an author compared his composition to a bunch of flowers picked up on a valley, while the work he has done was compared to the actions of an assiduous bee¹. The same logic was followed in *Asoghik* by Stepanos Taronetsi, which, after enumerating the writers of the preceding ages, addressed his indentor as follows: «Արդ յամենեցունց ի սոցանէ, իբր ի լայնալիր մարգաց և ի հովտային լերանց՝ հաւաքեալ ծաղիկս հեշտալի աչաց հայելոյ գեղեցկագոյն գունովքն և անուշահամ հոտովքն՝ բերեալ ընծայ մատուցանեն՝ աստուածասէր անձինդ»².

When making references, the history writers did not see much difference between bibliographic works of different times. In many cases, in order to mention a contemporary writer of an event, e.g. Moses of Khoren, the historians made references to some works by authors following the Patriarch of History. Thus, the authors of the 12th – 13th centuries, when mentioning the Histories by Movses of Khoren or Agathangelos, in actual fact made use of later writings for purposes of compilation. The works by the Medieval History Writers had an enormous significance in stipulating the rehabilitation of manuscripts of preceding centuries, however it should be kept in mind that every historian had pursued his own objectives. Some of them may have made not too much account of keeping intact another author's work while making references to it, as well as of interfering and amending the text and making voluntary abridgements³, besides, they more often than not updated the sociological, geographical or ethnic terminology used by their predecessors.

When doing compilation, the historians did not give a lot of thought to the comparison of their attested data, or to their authenticity with regard to the original sources. In some cases they noticed some apparent controversies between different authors, but they were never too zealous to make any conclusions about it. The first priority for the Medieval History Writers was adequate information, while its verification was left to their readers.

The Medieval historians in the course of their work often borrowed manuscripts from other monasterial libraries or from distinguished personalities. The manuscript's host, as a rule used to spurn them trying to get back his manuscript as soon as possible. Therefore, the copyist calligraphers were trying hard

¹ О. Л. Вайнштейн, Западноевропейская средневековая историография, М.-Л., 1964, с. 106.

² Ստեփանոս Տարունցի Ասողիկ, Պատմութիւն տիեզերական,- «Մատենագիրք Հայոց», հատ. ԺԵ, Երևան, 2011, էջ 640:

³ See details, e.g.: Ա. Սարգսյան, Հովհաննես Դրասխանակերտցու «Հայոց պատմությունը» և Մովսես Խորենացի, Երևան, 1991, էջ 67–91, Մխիթար Անեցի, էջ 15–25, Փ. Անթապյան, Վարդան Արևելցի, հատ. Ա, Երևան, 1987, էջ 248–270:

to make extended compilations to make a future use of them, thus they were becoming authors of new compositions unintentionally. It is a known fact, e.g., that a detailed description of “History of the Tartars” written in the Mongolian period was within a short time transformed into the composition titled “History of the Nation of Archers” that has lately been attributed to Grigor Aknertsi. The researchers sharing this view recognize the authorship of Grigor Vardapet with no regard for the ancient (copied in the Akner Monastery) records or multiple written data containing the work “History of the Nation of Archers”. In all those compositions Grigor looked like an ordinary copyist. Thus, when ending the copy of Mikhail Asori’s Chronicle he noted: **«գրեցաւ գիրքս ձեռամբ տառապեալ Գրիգորոյ»**, and then he did not hesitate to characterize himself using **«Մեղուցեալ գրչիս Գրիգորոյ»**, and similar expressions. Moreover, he pointed out directly that his copy had been copied from the manuscript brought from Avag Waste and he asked to remember **«զսէր Թաղէոս զհայր Աւագ անապատին, որ զարինակս շնորհեաց»**. From one of the records it is clear that Grigor was in a hurry to finish the work that had been undertaken. **«Կատարեցաւ Պատմութիւն տաթարի գործելոց ԸԳ (44) ամաց, բայց համառաւտ և ոչ ամէն»**: The reason for this haste was the writer’s health, whereby he asked Priest Hovhannes to continue his work and to bring it to an end. **«Յիշեցէք ի Քրիստոս և զպատուական քահանայն զՅոհաննէս, որ զվերջի տետրս գրեաց, զի մեր էար յոյժ տկար և անխել»**¹. Thereby, studies have shown that Grigor had at his disposal a vast historical material and made use of it for the purposes of compilation. Thus, he was an ordinary copyist, rather than an author in his own right².

The Medieval Armenian Historians started to do the description of their countries after a basic theoretical instruction. It was mandatory for an historian to know grammar and rhetoric in a given domain, i.e., to “write in verses”, since history had not yet attained a status of an individual science. The theoretical training had been accepted in the Armenian reality as far back as in the early Middle Ages, the theoretical legacy was created by the Hellenistic School (mid-5th to 8th c.); of great significance for the Armenian historians were the compositions **«Գիրք պիտոյից»** The Book of Chreia³, **«Արուեստ քերականութեան»** (*Art of Grammar*) by Dionysius Thrax⁴, and **«Յաղագս ճարտասանական կրթութեանց»** (*Progymnasmata*) by Theon of Alexandria (Theon Alexandratsi) *Art on Progymnasmata*⁵.

Evidence by the Medieval authors shows that there were two methods of writing history. The first one did not enjoy full respect by the recognized authors. The historical compositions that have been related under the direct

¹ Հայերեն ձեռագրերի հիշատակարաններ. ԺԳ դար, Կազմեց Ա. Մաթևոսյան, Երևան, 1984, էջ 427–731:

² Cf. **S. P. Cowe**, A Hitherto Unrecognized Chronicle to the Year A.D. 1272.– “Journal of the Society for Armenian Studies”, vol. 3 (1987), p. 15–34.

³ Գիրք պիտոյից, Աշխատասիրութեան Գ. Մուրադյանի, Երևան, 1993:

⁴ **Н. Адонц**, Дионисий Фракийский и армянские толкователи, Петроград, 1915.

⁵ Թէոփնէայ Յաղագս ճարտասանական կրթութեանց, Աշխատութեան Ը. Մանանդյանի, Երևան, 1938:

impression of the events in the colloquial language of the time or in a brute rural dialect merited only disdainful attitude. Thus, Hovhannes Draskhanakertsi, having adequately presented History by Shapuh Bagratuni, noted nonetheless that the historian had not done creative work according to the professional guidelines. From the point of view of the historian who was Catholicos, only those historical writings possessed excellency which were presented according to the grammatical art. The second method of history writing assumed a preliminary knowledge of the theoretical and methodological legacy of the past in compliance with the writing art and with the canonic genre of history writing, and eventually, skills in the classical literary language. Set before an historian were two problems simultaneously: he had to write in the Old Armenian acquired by learning, and to follow the rules of the art Art onProgymnasmata at the same time¹.

Since Grabar had gradually been turning into a language comprehensible for only a part of the public, the authors spared no effort in creating the language of classical Grabar, which from our current position could be considered an artificial language. It was extremely difficult for them to retain the standards of the classical Grabar, therefore in certain cases they addressed the contemporary colloquial language. In this way in “History of the Universe” by Vardan of Gandzak (Vardan Areveltsi) the description of the remote past was presented in Grabar, while the language of the more recent events was approaching Middle Armenian.

In the Medieval History Writing a widespread creative device was imitation. Thus, it was still Movses Khorenatsi who often addressed the novel “The Romance of Alexander” by Pseudo-Calusthenes regarding that composition as a ready-made repository of comparisons and derivatives of image-bearing expressions². Traces of imitation style can be noticed still in the 8th century, in History by Ghevond, but they show even more in the works of the 10th century by Thomas Artsruni and Hovanes Draskhanakertsi. When Movses of Khoren was at the top of his glory, his Masterpiece “Armenian History” became the model of imitation for most Armenian history writers. The imitation style assumed application of individual expressions borrowed from the compositions of preceding authors to imitate or even copy a composition that was considered a masterpiece³.

In this way, Hovanes Draskhanakertsi, when describing both the exterior and the activities of Bagratuni Kings, addressed the style of imitation using the images of the Armenian classical history writing of the 5th century. E.g., when describing Ashot I Bagratuni, he awarded the new dynast the characteristics referred to in the “Armenian History” by Movses of Khoren, even when outlining the two images of TigranYervandyan and Artashes I’s servant Smbat Bagratouni. Hence, Hovanes Draskhanakertsi had performed the previously pro-

¹ Մ. Աբեղյան, նշվ. աշխ., Գ, էջ 485–486, Ա. Սարգսյան, նշվ. աշխ., էջ 16–26:

² Գ. Սարգսյան, Աղբյուրների օգտագործման եղանակը Մովսես Խորենացու մոտ, «Բանբեր Մատենադարանի», 3, 1956, էջ 42:

³ Մ. Աբեղյան, նշվ. աշխ., հատ. Գ, էջ 485–486, 613–615, Ա. Սարգսյան, նշվ. աշխ., էջ 27–54:

grammed work, rather than having been inspired by the descriptions by the Patriarch of Historians. The imitation style has found multiple applications in works by the authors of subsequent centuries, so that the huge difference in time periods did not present any hindrance to the Medieval history writers.

This phenomenon had been widely spread in the Middle Ages also in other countries, being stipulated by the world outlook. In the Medieval thinking, the most valuable phenomena were those that were typically and generally encountered. The Medieval authors tended to provide the depicted characters with attributes that were considered exemplary. In this connection, alignment between the reality and the imaginary ideal was a thing that gave the least trouble to the Medieval authors. The creative mind was more interested in the image, rather than in a person.

To be particularly noted is the human environment of the historical pieces, the need to interpret the social order. In the course of centuries the social status of historians did not remain the same, very much like other social groups whose spiritual demands were met by the historical compositions. The commanding position in the domain of Historical Writing had nearly always been occupied by the Armenian Clergy. Participation by the secular strata went unnoticed up until the active manifestations of the cultural activities by the Armenian merchants in the late Middle Ages.

It is to be particularly noted that the Armenian History Writing, though developing in close association with saintly literature and particularly with compilations, nevertheless, all the way through it has trodden its own path. In this connection, a crucial role has been performed by the pre-Mashtots Armenian historiographic traditions. Therefore, the word «**վարք**», either, did not acquire the meaning of “History”, as it has done in the Georgian reality¹. Anyway, it remains unexplained, why in the early Middle Ages they did not start a special collection of Armenian History, particularly with regard to the fact that the issued works were very often continuations of the previous volumes. As seen from the Introduction to History by Ghazar Parpetsi, there have been certain prerequisites in Armenia for creating a selection of Armenian historical works. The historian notes that the first book of Armenian history was compiled by Agatangelos: «**այր բանիբուն գիտութեամբ և լի ամենայն հրահանգի, ստուգարան ի կարգադրութիւն ճառից և յարմարագիր ի պատմութիւնս ասացուածի իւրոյ**»². As noted by Faustus of Byzantium, Ghazar Parpetsi was disposed critically, «**վասն զի կարգելոցն առ ի նմանէ ի տեղիս ուրեք կարծեցին ոմանք բանք ինչ ոչ յարմարք և դիպողք, որպէս առաջնոյն ճշգրտարանութիւն**»³. So, though Pavstos in actual fact continued the work of Agatangelos, while Ghazar Parpetsi in the fashion of a chronicle, went on recounting the history almost to the end of the world, anyhow, there was a considerable obstacle on the way to creating a selection of

¹ In this connection a remarkable fact is that I. Javakhishvili dedicated his book on the Armenian Historiography entirely to the problems of evidences and behavior (see *օգ. չգաւառիւմիւոյ, Ժճուոյն սոմետրիոյ միւրոյն, Մոսկուոյն, 1935*):

² **Ղազար Փարպեցի**, Պատմութիւն Հայոց, էջ 202:

³ *Ibid.* p. 203.

Armenian history writings. The available pieces do not compose a uniform image either in historic reality or world outlook or linguistic style. For the sake of comparison let us again remember the neighboring Georgia, whose manual of selected Medieval works «**Քարթլի Յխարհագր**» (History of Georgia)» was compiled in the 12th century, the first one following the origin of the national Historiography. When compiling the Selection, the editors subjected the initial works to fundamental revision to rule out inconsistencies and recapitulations. Besides, to obtain a uniform text, they shortened the initial and the final sections of some compositions. Insofar as those works have retained the mental seal of their authors' world outlook, in the course of time they have merged into one posing today as a single unity. A realization of such a project in the Armenian reality has not taken place for one reason. It must be taken into account that «**ქართლის ცხოვრება**» (History of Georgia)» is an official relic of history writing, and with regard to all issues it will reflect the secular and spiritual viewpoint of the top authorities. Elimination of the Arshakounides Wealth ruled out the official recognition of Historiography in Armenia, while an essential controversy in the state-to-church interrelationships in the 4th century had already complicated the shaping of a joint outlook of the Armenian History.

Despite those obstacles, with regard to the Byzantine, Assyrian or the data preserved in Georgian bibliography, already in the early Middle Ages the Armenian historiographic tradition had been fully shaped, there was an original “General Resource of the Armenian History”, which was named “Armenian History” and «**Հարազրություն**» by Procopius of Caesarea¹, “A Brief Armenian History” by Michael the Syrian², and «**ცხოვრება სომხთისა**» (“Armenian Actions and History”)³. One of the Georgian works reads literally as follows: “as we are informed by the book on the Armenian customs, which is called «**ავანდაგირი**» (written traditions), i.e., «**პატმოთინი**» (History)⁴”. Thus, the

¹ See **G. Traina**, Faustus “of Byzantium”, Procopius, and the Armenian History (Jacoby, FGrHist 679, 3-4). – Novum millennium. Studies on Byzantine history and Culture dedicated to Paul Speck, 2001, p. 407-410, 7. Traina, **Փապստոս «Բյուզանդացին»**, Պրոկոպիոսը և Հայոց պատմությունը (Jacoby, FGrHist 679, 3-4), «**Աշտասակ**» (Journal of Armenian Studies), 3, Yerevan, 2000, pp. 136-138. In later times, the need for presenting a long-time true picture of the Armenian society and the Armenian History in the late 7th century in Byzantium resulted in a special book “Narratio de rebus Armeniae” see H. Bartikian “Narratio de rebus Armeniae”. It has reached our time as «**Բանբեր Մասենապարանի**», 6, 1962, pp. 457-470, **В. А. Арутюнова-Фиданян**, “Повествование о делах армянских” (VII в.): Источник и время. М., 2004, с. 103-139):

² See “Краткая история Армении”. Из “Хроники” Михаила Сирийца, “Кавказ и Византия”, вып. 1, Ереван, 1979, с. 184-199.

³ **ქართლის ცხოვრება**, **რ. მეტრეველის რედაქციით**, თბ., 2008, გვ. 83: The mentioned «**Հայոց պատմությունը**» Korneli Kekelidze compares with the composition by Movses Khorenatsi making many interesting comments, showing the impact by the views of the Armenian Patriarch of History upon the historical outlooks of Leonti Mroveli (see **კ. კეკელიძე**, **ლეონტი მროველის ლიტერატურული წყაროები**, «**ეტიუდები ძველი ქართული ლიტერატურის ისტორიიდან**», XII, თბ., 1973, გვ. 13-18):

⁴ **ი. აბულაძე**, **ძველი ქართული ენის ლექსიკონი**, თბ., 1973, გვ. 3, 338: By the opinion of L. Melikset-Bek, there were two versions of concise Armenian History that appeared in Georgia in the 9th century. The first one was based on the Armenian, while the second one – on the Armenian-Byzantine sources (**Л. Меликсет-Бек**, **Վրաց աղբյուրները Հայաստանի և հայերի մասին**, **հատ. Ա, Երևան, 1934, էջ 71-86**):

Georgian writer clearly suggested that there had been an original selection of Armenian historical writings in circulation in Georgian historiographic environment, and that that book had an unusual title “written traditions” («ավանդագիր»). Surprisingly, that name is not attested in Armenian, and has seemingly not been regarded as an accepted title in Georgian. That was the reason why the Georgian historian deemed it necessary to explicate it with the word “history”.

From the very beginning the Armenian history writing was distinctly characterized by an almost complete absence of official nature. In contrast with many adjacent countries whose descriptions of the past had primarily been the histories of their kings, the Armenian reality in all of the Middle Ages had been presented in the palatial historiographic tradition. This exclusive phenomenon will become even more conspicuous if we remember that in the pre-Mesropian Armenian Historiography the predominant tradition were books created at the palace¹.

One of the distinguishing features of the Medieval Armenian Historiography is the absence of individual historical books dedicated to the history of the Armenian Church. This situation looks strange, since in the array of the Armenian history writers, secular authors are quite scarcely encountered. All the more so that the mass of the books translated into Armenian from Greek in the early Middle Ages mostly consisted of the ecclesiastical history writers, regardless of the fact that some of them were not clerics. Suffice it to mention only Eusebius of Caesarea and Socrat Skolastikos, the authors that had played a crucial role in the whole Christian Historiography and its formation. Although in Byzantium the early 4th century ecclesiastical historiographic tradition had retained its tenacity up until the late 6th century², the secular elements in the ecclesiastical writing started to grow. From the very beginning, in the Armenian reality, the historical works’ purpose was to pass onto the generations of the history of the world and of the political history. In the course of centuries, the past history of the church was related within the framework of the general Armenian history³.

The emerging situation could have been mended by Hovhannes Draskhanakertsi, who dedicated one chapter of his composition “Armenian History” to the history of the Armenian Catholicoses, whereby he displaced the origins of the Armenian Church to the 1st century, embracing also the Apostolic Period⁴. He compiled a list of Catholicoses, that in the forthcoming centuries was put in the basis of similar lists by future historians. Attempts by the local spiritual centers to write history had also been made by Stephen Orbelian

¹ See **Գ. Սարգսյան**, Նախամետրոպոլիտան շրջանի պատմագրությունը, – «Պատմա-բանասիրական հանդէս», 1969, թ. 1, էջ 108–113:

² See **И. Кривушин**, Ранневизантийская церковная историография, Санкт-Петербург, 1998:

³ It can be seen that the merging of ecclesiastical and secular history had become a feature of the Armenian perception of history. In this connection a tell-tale fact is the universally known as the “Subtitle of Azgapatum” “Armenian Orthodox Church from the beginning to our days told in national attributes” by M. Ormanyan.

⁴ See **Ա. Սարգսյան**, *ibid.*, pp. 110–117.

and Zakaria Kanakertsi, while Ghazar Jahkytsi and Simeon Yerevantsi identified the position of the Holy See in Ejmiadzin and the history of its relationships with other Catholicosates.

Taking as a reference point the relevant principles and views, for the Medieval Armenian Historiography one can suggest the following periodization of the Medieval Armenian Historiography, underscoring at the same time the characteristic features of every stage:

In the whole chain of the Medieval Armenian historiographic development we can identify the period of 5–9th centuries as the first stage of organization. The basics of historiography were laid down in the 5th century, during the periods of a total uplift of culture and book writing. In the next centuries the Medieval Armenian Historiography became a progressive and original domain of the Armenian spiritual culture. Within the formation period of the Armenian Classical Historiography, Armenia was the location of an exclusive and fruitful cultural environment. It was shaped under the impact of three important factors: the first one was the antique traditions, which permeated the Armenian environment mostly via the Byzantine channels. The second heavyweight cultural impact was left by the Christian literary relics. The third important presupposition was the oral historical tradition, particularly the popular novel. In the Early Middle Ages the Armenian History Writing was leaning upon the acquisitions of the popular culture. The most significant source was the popular myths and stories¹. The Early Medieval authors were very well aware of the orally disseminated stories about individual princely tribes and their glorious past. In the Early Middle Ages in particular, the genre widespread in Armenia was Iranian story². The 5th-c. relics of the Armenian Historiography were written in classical Armenian, being at the same time outstanding specimen of fiction in prose.

An account was made of the history of the immediate past, with the principal focus on “super-occurrence” that had a crucial significance in the life of the country, the Conversion of Armenia to Christianity, the anti-Persian uprising headed by Vardan Mamikonian (450–451) and Vahan Mamikonian (482–484). In this connection, the only exception was Movses Khorenatsi in the array of history writers, who had meaningfully expanded the chronological limits of Armenian History to create the first ever Universal Armenian History. In the 7–8th centuries the achievements of the Armenian Historiography were made possible under the influence of the important regional historical events. They perceptibly ceded to the classical Armenian historiographic relics in their scope and the level of presentation. Generally speaking, the 5–9th cc. can be characterized as a separate stage in the row of the developing Armenian historiography. Particularly sizable was the role and significance of the 5th century. That century can be regarded as a period of formation for the Medieval Armenian

¹ See **Մ. Աբեղյան**, նշվ. աշխ., հատ. Գ, էջ 50–83, 187–189, 193–215, 441–472, **А. А. Степанян**, Развитие исторической мысли в древней Армении, Ереван, 1991, с. 7–60, 134–189:

² See **Բ. Զուգասոյան**, Հայ-իրանական գրական առնչություններ (V–XVIII դդ.), Երևան, 1963, էջ 62–111:

Historiography.

The Medieval Armenian Historiography was in full flourish in the 10–13th centuries. The Armenian history writing of that time is multi-genre, it is notable for the gigantic chronological and geographic scope, the published pieces are noticeable for their finalized shaping of the Christian historiography.

In the Armenian historiography of the late 10th to early 11th century there came a tradition of recounting the worldwide or universal history as a basically new phenomenon, connected with the universal values of Christian ideology. Of the Christian world outlook the destiny of all mankind was considered most important. In this way the universal scope became one of the characteristic features of the Christian Historic Writing.

The universal histories, as a rule, presented the events in an extremely brief way, with an expanded geographical scope. The earliest experience of this kind was performed by Eusebius of Caesarea in the first quarter of the 4th century; he was the first one to try a concise way of presenting history in the form of parallel chronological tables. This historical tradition was revived in the 60s of the 12th century by Samvel of Ani, whose axis of chronological structure was formed by four to six tables displayed simultaneously¹.

In the following centuries in different part of Armenia there came about several authors who continued to fill in the chronological tables compiled by Samvel Anetsi².

In the 80-s of the 10th century Ukhtanes, an Armenian historian, at the beginning of his History («Պատմութիւն հայրապետաց և թագաւորաց Հայոց») intended to recount in parallel the history of the rulers: Armenian, Persian, and Roman. In the second part of the History (History was divided into Georgian and Armenian) the author highlighted the history of the early 7th century Armenian-Georgian division of churches. The more valuable part of History by Ukhtanes, where he posed as a completely autonomous author, was the second part. In the part that has not reached our time, he recounted the story of the “tsat” or “tsad” Armenians covering their baptism and their populated area with the cities, villages, citadels and monasteries. The new historiographic trend to present the panorama of the Christian world, was not developed by Ukhtanes in the next two sections. The first “Universal History” was written by Stephen of Taron in the early 11th century. Another attempt at creating a Universal History was «Մատենան աշխարհավէպ հանդիսարանաց» in Ani in the late 12th century by Mkhitar of Ani. In the second half of the 13th century Vardan of Gandzak wrote the Universal History in the Armenian reality. Essentially, a Universal History is also the 1289 book by Mkhitar of Airivank which was in the form and genre of a chronicle. Here, too, the principal attention is centered upon the early history. In a small work a larger room is dedicated to the creation of the world prior to Adam, and then the two pe-

¹ Սամուէլ Անեցի, Հաւաքմունք ի գրոց պատմագրաց յաղագս գիտի ժամանակաց անցելոց մինչև ի ներկայս ծայրաքաղ արարեալ, Ofiginal by Ա. Հայրապետեան, Introduction by Կ. Մաթևոսեանի, Yerevan, 2011, pp. 5–17:

² Կ. Մաթևոսյան, Սամվել Անեցու ժամանակագրության ձեռագրերը և նորահայտ լրացումները, Երևան, 2009:

riods from Adam to Jesus Christ, and a smaller part described the events between the year 1 and the year 1289. The Armenian authors had larger opportunities to present the so-called “Sacred History” than Stepanos Asoghik, who could do the dating on the basis of only one reliable chronological axis: Armenian Era, trying to dump chronological indicators into the period of time embracing about four centuries. In the meantime, Samvel of Ani and his successors, by virtue of addressing the Year of Salvation, extended the exclusive chronological scale to the Year 1, then, using the Septuaginta year (5198) of creation, presented the history of about six millennia¹.

Supplementing and rewriting the Universal History was stipulated by the availability of the historical books having been translated into other languages. In the 12th century the Armenian translation was issued of the Medieval Georgian Historical manual **Քարթլիս Ցխովրեբա**, however, it showed a clear influence of the Armenian historiographic tradition². In the next century, Vardan of Gandzak edited the Armenian translation of a chronicle by the notable Assyrian historian Michael the Syrian. The Universal History writing was aided not only by translations of the foreign sources, a crucial role also belongs to the relevant environment. In the medieval cities, there came about favorable conditions for mutual cultural exchanges, there was a growth of interest with regard to the histories of the countries, both close by and far away. Remarkable in this respect is the example of Mkhitar of Ani, who considered it mandatory for historians to know the languages, he made use of **Քարթլիս Ցխովրեբա**, History of Georgia in the language of the original, he also made a translation from Persian, and was fully informed about the history of the Muslim and Arab countries.

During the following centuries with history writing on the decline, the attempts to write the Universal History nonetheless continued. Efforts had been exerted during the previous centuries to create the written brief variations of historical books. The dominating genre being the short chronicles, certain books in their chronological and geographic scopes enclosed original efforts to create Universal histories³.

During the 13–14th cc. the Armenian authors also started to show interest in the history of the West. Historiographic contacts were established with the Latin historiographers. Thus, the historian Hetum in the late 13th century wrote the history of the Crusaders states – Jerusalem, Antioch and Cyprus. An interesting fact is that the same author wrote the book **«Ծաղիկ պատմութեանց Արևելից Աշխարհի»**⁴ (La Flor des Estoires d’Orient). Besides, the Armenian

¹ Ա. Տեր-Ղևոնդյան, Թվականությանը ժամանակագրությունը հայ պատմագրության մեջ, էջ 43:

² The old Armenian translation of Քարթլիս Ցխովրեբա or Georgian History, The Georgian original and the Old Armenian translation with analysis and a vocabulary was published by I. Abuladze, Tbilisi, 1953, Rewriting Caucasian History. The Medieval Armenian Adaptation of the Georgian Chronicles, Translated with Introduction and Commentary by R. W. Thomson, Oxford University Press, 1996.

³ Մանր ժամանակագրություններ: Կազմեց Վ. Հակոբյան, հատ. I (XIII–XVIII դդ.), Երևան, 1951, հատ. II, Երևան, 1956:

⁴ Կ. Մաթևոսյան, Հեթում պատմիչ Կոռնիլուսին և նրա ժամանակագրությունը, Երևան, 2011:

writers continued their translation activities. E.g., Nerses Palianents in the mid-14th century translated into Armenian a chronicle written in Latin by Martinos Lehatsi who represented the history of the rulers of Rome and the Popes.

In a traditional manner, “Armenian History” was written in the early 10th century only by Hovanes Draskhanakertsi, who had actually elaborated a new type of presenting the national past. Surprisingly, his example, with certain deviations, was followed in the 60s of the 13th century only by Kirakos of Gandzak. As to Aristakes of Lastivert, he confined himself to writing on the history of events taking place during his lifetime.

In the Armenian history writing of the 10–13th cc. there was also room for histories of the local areas. Albania (towards the East of Armenia), Vaspurakan’s and Siunik’s early and recent past and the authors’ life-time experience in history writing was an exclusive achievement and was implemented using methods and devices substantially differing and can become a special subject of examination. From among the Medieval Armenian cities – Ani, the most notable one, was described individually, though at a later time, when the capital of the Bagratides had already long been lying in ruins.

At the same time the links with the oral culture remained, there were close mutual influences between the knightly songs and new popular stories¹. As in the previous centuries, historical discourse and the popular versified compositions served as fuel to the Medieval historians². In that period the living colloquial language was already the Middle Armenian, its elements can be encountered in the historical songs. Historiographic schools had been organized at some large cultural centers³. In particular, this phenomenon was noted in the City Ani, whose ethnic and devotional multi-element environments gave forth original relics carrying the influence of urban culture.

The 10–13th cc. authors had presented the early and the middle times on the basis of the previous historians’ books. For them it was essential that the events and phenomena of the long past and their own times be presented in association. In the works by the authors of that time there was a special internal division. The historians described with special care and attention those periods of time that had not been previously covered. At the dawn of the 11th century Stephen Asoghik characterized the third closing book of his work “Universal History” as a “Summary”. The same thing happened with the works by other authors in the subsequent two centuries.

The 14–16th cc. had been noted in the Medieval Historiography as the time of decline in the historiographic thought and creative sterility. For about 300 years the tradition of writing large historical works had been interrupted, small-sized historical pieces became popular. There had been a substantial growth in undersized booklets and small chronicles. Both reminiscences and

¹ **Հ. Մարգարյան**, Վիպական տարրերը X–XII դարերի հայ պատմագրության մեջ, – «Պատմա-բանասիրական հանդես», 1987, թ. 4, էջ 41–47:

² **Կիրակոս Գանձակեցի**, Հայոց պատմություն, Աշխատասիրությամբ Կ. Մելիք-Օհանջանյանի, Երևան, 1961, էջ ԽԹ–ԾԹ, ԶԷ–Ղ:

³ **Լ. Բաբայան**, Դրվագներ Հայաստանի զարգացած ֆեոդալիզմի դարաշրջանի պատմագրության (IX–XIII դարեր), էջ 11–16:

small chronicles are valuable original sources, since they provide the real concepts of the military and political situation at specific periods of time, the economic situation, as well as the religious and cultural atmosphere. The authors of memoirs had written their pieces for restricted circles of readers. They never had intentions to beautify history. The problems of the memoir writers were to save those events from oblivion, the events that had produced deep impressions upon the contemporaries. The authors of small works evaded making generalizations on the basis of the previous centuries' historiographic legacy. They mostly made vast compilations from the works under their disposal. In their books one can more often than not find some errors, related to the remote past. Usually, the territorial scope of small chronicles was vast, while the story went about the history of the past centuries. Gradually, small chronicles had become focused upon the region of their residence.

The authors of historical compositions stood before severe problems, for they had difficulties in selecting content and basic axis for their country. In the mid - 19th century, the last hearths of the Armenian statehood were extinguished. The majority of the Armenian princely houses had abandoned the scene, even the Holy See appeared in a difficult situation. Several leading Armenian ecclesiastical centers remained active. Under those conditions, the authors of historical works were deprived of any opportunity to make a competent coverage of life in the Armenian communities.

The only voluminous book written during the period of decline belonged to the pen of Tovma Metsopetsu. Interestingly, he had evaded the study of remote past and regarded as his main objective to produce a description of the present, covering about six decades of historical events. In the Armenian historiography of the decline period there appeared new trends, which was a specific response to the new deep changes in public life. There had been a gradual variation in public taste, under an insecure situation in Armenia the activities of educational centers had been severely hindered, the capabilities for the perception of oral discourse had gone down. It was characteristic for previous centuries that the historians wrote prosaic historical works on the basis of versified compositions. In the 14–16th centuries the situation was reversed. The authors tended to compose in verses which was more comprehensible to the simple people. Interestingly, it was characteristic for the popular culture to record the historical events in verse, passing them orally from generation to generation. Even some generally known historical compositions of the previous centuries and other works of historical nature had undergone a reprocessing. Rewritten to verses were also historical plots that were most spread out and thrilling to the public.

Many historical plaints were written, their characteristic nature being idealization of the past using references to the notable personalities of different periods of time to underscore the tragic circumstances of the current situation¹. The versified historical compositions do not possess high value as sourc-

¹ Լ. Բաբայան, Դրվագներ Հայաստանի զարգացած ֆեոդալիզմի դարաշրջանի պատմագրության (IX–XIII դարեր), էջ 11–16:

es; however those pieces are notable as expressions of public opinions of relevant times. Under the conditions of declining education and scholarly thought, the versified historical compositions help support public interest towards the past and have a great educational significance. The same function is carried out by sociological and factographic hagiographical relics which stipulate the deepening national self-awareness and strengthening the feeling of unity by appealing to the defense of Christian Faith.

During the final stage of the Armenian Medieval Historiography, the 17–18th centuries, which can be characterized as a period of a new upgrade, in the Armenian society the high places in economy and culture were tenaciously seized by the high-level enterprising, determined and intelligent trading community. This new public stratum with the center in New Jugha, had developed commercial operations of quasi-worldwide scale. Having seized all important positions, the Armenian trading community dictated its will to the clergy, and the newly arising Armenian intellectuals. The Armenian tradesmen started to acquire an ever-growing role and significance even in the intellectual domain.

Several authors emerged, writers, translators and patron tradesmen, their efforts resulting in the clergy losing their previously occupied exclusive position¹. The tradesmen come along with their new perception of literature. They often write notes of their own life, their personal thoughts and experiences in a clear and direct spoken language of their time. It is in the commercial environment that involves new vision of space and time. The writings of the commercial authors are noted for their chronological precision. The Armenian tradesmen, ahead of nearly all countries of the world, introduce revolutionary features into the traditional concepts of territorial distribution.

The Armenian settlements in adjacent and remote countries in their internal structure, surrounding population and specific interrelations with the home country again stipulated the dissemination of new outlooks and ideological patterns. The expansion and reinforcement of settlements resulted in boosting the interest in the past of the host countries of the multiple influential Armenian communities. It is not an accident that historical works were written on Iran and India, i.e., on the histories of the countries in whose economic life the Armenian population had acquired a conspicuous position. Along with the new settlements there were more and more religious conversions especially controversial being the trend of building up association of the Armenians with the Catholic Church. Certain authors, having excellent knowledge of Armenian, had written the Armenian history from the viewpoint of the Catholic Church. A subject that becomes popular in the Armenian Historiography is writing about the history of discussions on faith conversions. Consequently, there came about a requirement to write down the theological maxims of the Church, as well as the history of the interrelations inside the National Church.

The upsurge of the Armenian Historiography had been prepared by large-scale movements in the spiritual life. The century-long drowsiness of the Ar-

¹Տես Ան, Հայոց պատմություն, հատ. III, գիրք II – «Երկերի ժողովածու», հատ. 3, Երևան, 1973, էջ 523–549:

menian clergy and the reign of intellectual blackout had resulted in a powerful “movement of hermits” among the Armenian monks. Meanwhile, a growing tendency was noted to familiarize with the literary legacy of the past, to read the Armenian History and the spiritual legacy created in the previous centuries. Due to the careful attitude of notable teachers of that period copies were made of the popular collections, and an inventory was compiled of the Armenian history writers¹.

In the 17–18 cc. the intellectual progress accelerated, the intellectual horizons expanded, due to the successful Armenian printing. Printed in 1669 was “History” by Arakel of Tabriz, and in 1695 they printed “Armenian History” by Movses Khorenatsi. Throughout the 18th century a great attention was dedicated to publishing the historical books.

In the 17–18th centuries even traditional historiography showed controversial trends of development. Historical songs were composed, authored by priests or persons of spiritual education. So they had received certain theoretical and literary training, and made use of the previous historiographic achievements and experience. Arakel of Tabriz (1590s–1670) was the most significant author of the new historiographic upgrade, his History is remarkable for its extensive thematic and geographic scope. Although the axis of the book goes through the political events, mostly the history of the Ottoman – Iranian wars, and the deportation ordered by Shah Abbas, the author also described economic issues and praised those Armenian tradesmen who cooperated with progressive clergy. A new phenomenon was numerous facts about the Armenian settlements. The historian made acquaintance with the life of the communities during his multiple travelling experiences.

Zakaria Kanakertsi (1627–1699) initiated a tradition to record historical events based upon oral discourse and popular concepts. The author recorded conversations on Shah Abbas, whether untrue or mythological, or true. The author was quite aware that the substance communicated misrepresented the historic reality, and even advised his readers: to receive exact references on Shah Abbas one has to address History by Arakel Davrijetsi. In order to give preference to folklore, Zakaria Kanakertsi continued the traditions of Faust of Byzantium, Hovhan Mamikonyan, and Ananun Zrutsagir Anonymous Storyteller (alias Pseudo-Shapuh Bagratuni).

In the West-Armenian reality the initiator of the new upgrade in historiography was Grigor Daranaghtsi (1576–1643), who had written the first history of the early 17th century keeping in the center of attention the events going on in Ottoman Turkey and West Armenia. A chronicle of the 30–40s of the 17th c. by Daranaghtsi gives an account of the events that does not only abound in details, but also is remarkable for the author’s evaluations, or even biased opinions. Grigor Daranaghtsi belonged to the authors who, when describing the events was mostly stimulated by his private, very personal impressions and estimations. He merged the spiritual-cultural descriptions with the chronicle of his personal life.

¹Ը. Անասյան, Հայկական մատենագիտություն, հատ. Ա., Երևան, 1959, էջ XLIII–XLVIII, LII–LV:

The history and reality of West Armenia and the city of Constantinople had also been described in Eremia Chelepi Kiumurjan's (1637–1695) very large literary and scholarly chronicle. Being one of the most educated intellectuals of his time, he had communicated with foreign spiritual and secular influential circles, maintained personal ties with notable personalities. He was in command of multiple Eastern and Western languages, authored a number of works on history, geography and mapping. Eremia Kiumurjan was active in the cultural environment, including historiography, his contacts having been extremely favorable. He had produced many translations from Greek and Latin into Armenian and from Armenian into Turkish. It needs particularly to be noted that Kiumurjan translated into Turkish his own "Armenian History", of which the Armenian original has not been preserved. That translation was done by the request from the Turkish historians and covered the most glorious period of the Armenian history. Kiumurjan's work served as a source for a Turkey-based Arab historian Munajim Bashi (died in 1702) while writing "Jani ad-duval" (Universal History) of an enormous size¹.

In the initial decades of the 18th century, the Armenian authors mostly concentrated their attention on the events of the previous decades and the contemporary cases (Esai Hasan-Jalalyan, Stepanos Shahumian, Petros di Sargis Gilanents, Abraham Yerevantsi). However in the 18th century the Armenian surroundings revived the ideas that the narrator had to explore only the remote past. These new perceptions suggest that the whole Armenian history has so far been quite ambiguous, e.g., Hakob Nalian².

In the Armenian historiography of the 17–18th centuries the new world outlook is manifested in memorial, documentary, itinerary type of texts that have recorded the historical events in the form of personal impressions and emotions of the authors. Although the itinerary type of records had had a long history, however this genre attained popularity in the late Middle Ages. It was distinguished for its diversified contents, and very circumstantial descriptions of the visited countries. There came about in the form of general descriptions accounts of personal life, family affairs, diversified and abundant data on economic situations.

Very similar developments have occurred to the records of a documentary type. The Armenian tradesmen have usually kept ledgers of their commercial activities, where they recorded the executed deals, as well as happenings remarkable enough to be mentioned in the context of a family chronicle. The most conspicuous in this respect was the Diary by Zakaria Aguletsi (1630–1691). Besides describing the economic situations, he also recounted very different personal, ethnographic and everyday data, as well as many content-generating variations. To be especially noted are his reflections on *raison d'être*, the significance of wealth, and other issues. On the Diary by Zakharia Aguletsi one can form ideas not only on the commercial situation of a given time, but also on

¹ Տես Ա. Տեր-Ղևոնդյան, Երեմիա Չելեպին որպես Մունաջջիմ Բաշիի աղբյուրներից մեկը, ՀՀ ԳԱ, Տեղեկագիր (հաս. գիտ.), 1960, թ. 7–8, էջ 143–151:

² Տես Լևոն, նշվ. աշխ., էջ 456–457:

the world outlook and psychology. Large diaries were written by representatives of other social strata, particularly Eremia Chelepi Kiumurjan and a notable priest Minas Hamtetsi.

In the first decade of the 18th century, to deposit the events in detail, in figurative style, the trend to show even the every-day details, the direct way of communicating with the reader is taking place even in traditional historic writing. The Armenian Catholicos of the time recounted History, which however was, in the way of genre, rather a direct recording of impressions and reminiscences.

The prospective tendencies observed in historiography played a crucial role in the new times.

Translated into English by Hachatoor

ՀԱՅՐԱՊԵՏ ՄԱՐԳԱՐՅԱՆ

**ՄԻՋՆԱԳԱՐՅԱՆ ՀԱՅ ՊԱՏՄԱԳՐՈՒԹՅԱՆ
ԲՆՈՒԹԱԳՐԱԿԱՆ ԳԾԵՐԸ ԵՎ ՊԱՐԲԵՐԱՅՈՒՄԸ**

(ԱՄՓՈՓՈՒՄ)

Միջնադարյան հայ պատմագրության յուրահատկությունների, զարգացման ուղիների, տարբեր դարաշրջանների համար բնութագրական կողմերի խնդիրները, ավանդաբար, քիչ են գրավել հետազոտողների ուշադրությունը: Բաց է մնացել նաև հայ միջնադարյան պատմագրության պարբերացման հիմնահարցը: Այս կապակցությամբ անհրաժեշտ է նշել, որ հայ միջնադարյան պատմագրությունն առանձին փուլերի բաժանելիս չափազանց դժվար է միասնական կամ մեկ գլխավոր չափանիշ առաջարկելը: Հայ միջնադարյան պատմագրության առանձին փուլերի դեմքը, տիպաբանական յուրահատկությունները բնութագրելիս անհրաժեշտ է առանձնահատուկ ուշադրություն դարձնել աշխատայացքային գործոններին՝ հայ իրականության մեջ պատմության արևելյան ու արևմտյան ըմբռնումների, առասպելաբանական և վիպական աշխարհընկալումների, ինչպես նաև քրիստոնեական աշխարհայեցողության թողած դրոշմի հարցերին: Սկզբունքային նշանակություն ունի նաև գրավոր ու բանավոր մշակույթների փոխհարաբերության խնդիրը:

Բանավոր ու գրավոր (պաշտոնական և ժողովրդական) մշակույթների փոխազդեցության հետ է կապված պատմական երկերի լեզվի ու ոճի խնդիրը: Ժողովրդական և հաճախ չափածոյով շարադրված ստեղծագործությունները հիմնական առաղձներից մեկն են դարձել պատմական երկերի համար: Սակայն կարելի է արձանագրել նաև հակառակ երևույթը: Պաշտոնական կամ էլիտար մշակույթի դիրքերի թուլացման պայմաններում պատմական երկերը շարադրվել են չափածոյով և այդպիսով ընդլայնվել են հաջորդ սերունդներին բանավոր ձանապարհով դրանց

փոխանցման հնարավորությունները: Համանման միտումների մասին են վկայում նաև անցյալի պատմական ժառանգությունը չափաձոյի վերածելու մասին փաստերը:

Պատմական երկերը հոգևոր մշակույթի առավել պահպանողական շերտերից են, հետևաբար դրանց լեզվի հարցը առաձնահատուկ կարևորություն ունի: Գեղարվեստական խոսքի արժեք ունեն հիմնականում վաղ միջնադարյան, հատկապես V դարի՝ դասական գրաբարով շարադրված պատմական երկերը: Մինչդեռ՝ արդեն X դարում գրի առնված աշխատությունները շարադրվել են կենդանի խոսքից զգալի տարբերություններ ունեցող լեզվով: Հաջորդ դարերի ընթացքում, երբ տարածում է ձեռք բերել միջին հայերենը, առանձին դեպքերում շատ ավելի նկատելի են դարձել լեզվական տարբերությունները: Միջնադարյան պատմաշրջանի ավարտին լեզվական տարբերությունները գրեթե անհնարին են դարձրել հենց անմիջական մասնակիցների ձեռքով պատմական անցուդարձերի արձանագրումը: Ուստի բավականաչափ տարածում է ստացել երկու հեղինակների համատեղ ուժերով պատմական երկերի ստեղծումը:

Պատմագրության պարբերացում առաջարկելիս անհնար է շրջանցել պատմական երկերի ժանրային պատկանելության և միջնադարում տարածում գտած ստեղծագործական եղանակների խնդիրները: Միջնադարյան հայ մատենագրության մեջ պատմական երկերը ստեղծվել են որոշակի սկզբունքներով, ունեցել են իրենց ժանրային ինքնատիպությունները, սակայն ժանրերի հստակ սահմանազատում միշտ չէ, որ գոյություն է ունեցել: «Պատմութիւն»-ը, որպես առանձին ժանր, տիրապետող դիրք է ձեռք բերել հայ պատմագրության սկզբնավորման փուլում: Ժանրային առումով «պատմութիւն»-ը իրենից ներկայացնում է համակարգված շարադրանք, որտեղ գերիշխում են կան ժամանակագրական կան թեմատիկ մոտեցումները: Ժամանակագրական կան թեմատիկ շեղումները դիտվել են որպես կառուցվածքային թերություններ: Պատմությունները նաև այն տեսակի երկերն են, որոնք հնարավորություն են ընձեռում բացահայտել հեղինակի տեսակետները և հանգամանորեն անդրադառնալ դեպքերի ու երևույթների պատճառներին, փոխադարձ կապերին և հետևանքներին:

Աշխարհագրական ընդգրկման տեսանկյունից «պատմութիւն»-ները հիմնականում ներկայացնում են Հայաստանի անցյալը՝ հարևան երկրների պատմության առանձին դրվագների ներառումով: Հետևաբար՝ հայկական միջավայրում ստեղծված պատմական աշխատությունները գերազանցապես «Հայոց պատմութիւն»-ներ են:

Ժանրային առումով պատմության հետ առավել սերտ առնչություններ ունի ժամանակագրությունը: Ժամանակագիրները իրենց ուշադրությունը սևեռել են համեմատաբար փոքր ժամանակահատվածների անցուդարձերի վրա: Նրանց հիմնական խնդիրը ոչ թե դեպքերի և երևույթների բացատրությունն է, այլ իրադարձությունների կապակցված արձանագրումը:

Եթե ժամանակագրությունները սերում են պատմություններից, ապա

տարեգրությունների՝ աննախնի, ժանրը գենետիկ սերտ կապի մեջ է գտնվում ժամանակագրությունների հետ: Այս ժանրի ստեղծագործություններում գրառումները կատարվում են ըստ տարիների, ընդ որում միևնույն ժամանակահատվածում կատարված դեպքերը որևէ ներքին կամ տրամաբանական կապ չունեն, տարաբնույթ բոլոր իրադարձությունների համար ընդհանուրը միաժամանակ տեղի ունենալու փաստն է:

Միջնադարյան Հայաստանում պատմիչները հետևում էին ստեղծագործական որոշակի եղանակների: Մասնավորապես՝ ժամանակագրությունների ժանրի տարածում ստանալը թելադրում էր անդրադառնալ նաև նախընթաց դարերի իրականությանը: Նման պայմաններում անխուսափելի էր դառնում քաղաքությունը՝ նախորդ հեղինակների աշխատություններից մեջբերումներ կատարելու միջոցով ընդհանուր պատկերի ուրվագծումը: Միջնադարյան հայ պատմիչները ձեռնամուխ են եղել իրենց երկերի շարադրմանը տեսական հիմնավոր պատրաստություն ստանալուց հետո: Պատմիչի համար պարտադիր է համարվել պատրաստությունը քերականության և ճարտասանության ասպարեզում, այսինքն՝ «քերթողական արուեստ»-ին տիրապետելը, քանի որ պատմությունը առանձին գիտության կարգավիճակ դեռևս չուներ: Ստեղծագործական եղանակներից նմանողական ոճը ենթադրում էր նախորդ հեղինակների երկերից վերցված առանձին արտահայտությունների, բառերի, ոճերի կիրառում, կատարելատիպ համարվող աշխատությունների ընդօրինակում և նույնիսկ նմանակում:

Սկզբից ևեթ հայ պատմագրության հատկանշական կողմերից են դարձել պաշտոնական բնույթ ձեռք չբերելը, ինչպես նաև հայոց եկեղեցու պատմությանը նվիրված առանձին պատմական աշխատությունների բացակայությունը: Եկեղեցու անցյալը շարադրվել է հայոց ընդհանրական պատմության շրջանակներում:

Ելակետ ընդունելով առաջ քաշված սկզբունքները և տեսակետները՝ կարելի է առաջարկել հայ միջնադարյան պատմագրության հետևյալ պարբերացումը՝ միաժամանակ շեշտելով յուրաքանչյուր փուլի բնութագրական գծերը:

Միջնադարյան հայ պատմագրության զարգացման ընդհանուր շղթայում որպես առանձին՝ կազմավորման փուլ առանձնանում է V–IX դարերի ժամանակաշրջանը: Հայ պատմագրությունը ձևավորվում է երեք կարևոր գործոնների ազդեցությամբ: Առաջինն անտիկ ավանդույթներն էին, որոնք հայկական միջավայր էին ներթափանցում գերազանցապես բյուզանդական ճանապարհով: Մշակութային երկրորդ ծանրակշիռ ներգործությունը թողնում էին քրիստոնեական մատենագրության հուշարձանները: Պատմագրության զարգացման երրորդ կարևոր նախադրյալը բանավոր պատմության ավանդույթների, մասնավորապես ժողովրդական վեպի առկայությունն էր: V դարի հայ պատմագրության հուշարձանները շարադրված են դասական գրաբարով, դրանք միաժամանակ գեղարվեստական արձակի աչքի ընկնող նմուշներ են:

Միջնադարյան հայ պատմագրությունը զարթոնք է ապրում X–XIII դարերում: Այս ժամանակաշրջանի հայ պատմագրությունը բազմաժանր

է, աչքի է ընկնում հսկայական ժամանակագրական և աշխարհագրական ընդգրկմամբ: Միաժամանակ՝ պահպանվել է կապը ժողովրդական բանավոր մշակույթի հետ: Ինչպես և նախորդ դարերում, ժողովրդական չափածո ստեղծագործությունները դարձել են միջնադարյան պատմիչների երկերի ատաղձը: Այս ժամանակաշրջանում կենդանի խոսակցական լեզուն արդեն միջին հայերենն էր, որի տարրերը հանդիպում են նաև պատմական երկերում:

XIV–XVI դարերը միջնադարյան հայ պատմագրության մեջ հատկանշվում են որպես պատմագրական մտքի անկման ժամանակաշրջան: Շարադրվել է միայն մեկ պատմական նշանավոր աշխատություն, փորձեր են կատարվել յուրացնելու և պահպանելու նախորդ դարերի ձեռքբերումները: Այս ժամանակաշրջանում պատմագրական հիմնական ժանրեր են դարձել հիշատակարանները և մանր ժամանակագրությունները, ընդ որում՝ գրի են առնվել առավելապես իրենց հայրենի գավառում և քաղաքում տեղի ունեցած իրադարձությունները: Ուշագրավ երևույթ է, որ հասարակության հատուկ սերն են վայելել չափածո պատմական երկերը: Դասական գրաբարի փոխարեն դրանք շարադրվել են ժամանակի խոսակցական լեզվով:

Միջնադարյան հայ պատմագրության վերջին՝ XVII–XVIII դարերի փուլում, որը կարելի է բնութագրել որպես նոր վերելքի ժամանակաշրջան, հրապարակ են եկել մինչ այդ լայն տարածում չստացած ժանրերի՝ հուշագրական, օրագրական, ուղեգրական բնույթի երկերը: Դրանք արտացոլել են պատմական անցուդարձերը հեղինակների անձնական տպավորությունների և ապրումների միջոցով: Հայ պատմագիրները գրի են առել նաև Արևելքի այն երկրների պատմությունը, որտեղ կազմավորվել էին հայկական խոշոր գաղթօջախներ: Տպագրության միջոցով հասարակության լայն շերտերին մատչելի են դարձել նաև ժամանակակից պատմիչների աշխատությունները: Պատմագրության լեզուն շարունակել է մնալ գրաբարը, թեև գրաբարին տիրապետում էին միայն սակավաթիվ անձինք: Հենց այս ժամանակաշրջանի պատմագրության մեջ աչքի զարնող հեռանկարային միտումներին էր վիճակված վճռորոշ դեր կատարել նոր ժամանակներում:

**ОТЛИЧИТЕЛЬНЫЕ ЧЕРТЫ И ПЕРИОДИЗАЦИЯ
СРЕДНЕВЕКОВОЙ АРМЯНСКОЙ ИСТОРИОГРАФИИ****(РЕЗЮМЕ)**

Проблемы особенностей средневековой армянской историографии, путей ее развития, характерных черт разных эпох традиционно мало привлекали внимание исследователей. Оставался открытым и вопрос периодизации средневековой армянской историографии. В связи с этим нужно отметить, что предлагая периодизацию средневековой армянской историографии трудно руководствоваться единым критерием. Описывая типологические особенности отдельных периодов средневековой армянской историографии, необходимо обратить внимание на мировоззренческие факторы – восточное и западное восприятие истории в армянской действительности, мифологическое и эпическое миропонимание, влияние христианства. Принципиальным является также вопрос взаимоотношений между письменной и устной культурами.

С проблемой языка и стиля исторических сочинений тесно связан вопрос взаимовлияния устной и письменной (официальной и народной) культур. Основным источником для исторических трудов обычно служил фольклор. Хотя стоит отметить и противоположное явление. В условиях ослабления позиций официальной или элитарной культуры, исторические произведения слагались поэтическим языком и, таким образом, передавались из поколения в поколение в устной форме. О схожих тенденциях свидетельствуют также факты изложения исторического наследия в поэтической форме.

Исторические сочинения составляют наиболее консервативный пласт армянской духовной культуры и, следовательно, язык повествования имеет особое значение. Художественную ценность представляют исторические труды раннего средневековья (V век), изложенные на классическом древнеармянском языке. В последующие века, когда изложение в основном велось на живом армянском, в отдельных случаях еще больше обозначились языковые различия. В конце средневековой эпохи языковые различия практически не позволяли непосредственным участникам событий самим записывать свои воспоминания. Именно поэтому широкое распространение получило создание исторических сочинений двумя авторами.

При периодизации историографии невозможно обойти стороной жанровую принадлежность исторических произведений и творческие методы средневековья. В средневековой армянской книжности исторические труды имели жанровые особенности, но не всегда наблюдалось четкое разделение жанров. “История”, как отдельный жанр

занимала главенствующие позиции в самом начале формирования армянской историографии. “История” представляет собой систематизированное повествование. Хронологические и тематические отклонения считались структурными недостатками. В “Историях” также раскрывалась точка зрения автора, обстоятельно освещались причины событий и явлений, взаимосвязи и последствия.

“Истории” в основном излагали прошлое Армении, включая разделы, посвященные истории соседних стран. Таким образом, созданные в армянской среде исторические сочинения, в основном, являются “Историей Армении”.

В жанровом плане “история” тесно связана с “хроникой” (“хронографией”). Пристальное внимание хронографов было приковано, в основном, к событиям, занимающим небольшой отрезок времени. Их основная задача состояла не в объяснении событий и явлений, а в упорядоченном изложении фактов.

Если “хроники” берут начало от “историй”, то жанр “летописей” (анналов) генетически связан с “хрониками”. В произведениях данного жанра записи делаются строго следуя хронологии – события одного и того же года не имеют ни внутренней, ни логической связи. Основным критерием для отбора разного рода событий является их синхронность.

В средневековой Армении историографы следовали определенным литературным приемам. Жанр “хроники” требовал возврата к событиям предыдущих веков. В данных условиях для создания всеобъемлющей картины неизбежным приемом являлась компиляция. Армянские историографы средневековья имели возможность приступить к описанию исторических событий, только после получения теоретической подготовки. Историографы должны были в совершенстве владеть грамматикой и “пиитическим” то есть, ораторским искусством, поскольку история в средневековье еще не имела научного статуса. “Подражательный стиль” произведений подразумевал использование отдельных цитат, лексики, стиля авторов предыдущих эпох, следование и даже подражание трудам, считающимся эталоном.

С самого начала, отличительной чертой историографии являлось отсутствие официального статуса, а также отсутствие церковной историографии. Повествование о церкви велось в рамках общенациональной истории.

С учетом вышеизложенных основных подходов и позиций можно предложить следующую периодизацию средневековой армянской историографии, при этом подчеркивая характерные черты каждого периода.

В формировании средневековой армянской историографии, период с V по IX век выделяется особенно. Армянская историография формируется под влиянием трех главных факторов: 1. Античные традиции, проникшие в армянскую действительность из византийской культуры. 2. Христианские литературные памятники. 3. Устные народные предания. В V веке повествование велось на классическом грабаре, а памятники армянской

историографии одновременно являлись образцом художественной прозы.

Средневековая армянская историография переживает возрождение в X – XIII веках. В этот период армянская историография стала многожанровой, охватывала огромный географический ареал и отдаленные исторические эпохи. Одновременно сохраняется связь с устными народными преданиями. Как и в предыдущие века, устная традиция продолжала служить подспорьем средневековым историографам. Именно в этот период впервые в исторические труды начинают проникать элементы разговорного языка.

В XIV–XVI веках в средневековой армянской историографии наблюдается упадок. Появилось лишь одно выдающееся историческое произведение, предпринимались попытки освоить и сохранить приобретения прошлых эпох. Основным жанром данного периода стали памятные записи (колофоны) рукописей, где излагалась, как правило, локальная история. Стоит отметить, что особой популярностью пользовались исторические хроники, написанные в стихотворной форме. Вместо классического грабара, повествование велось на разговорном языке того времени.

XVII и XVIII века можно охарактеризовать как период подъема средневековой армянской историографии. Армянские историографы описывали также исторические события тех стран Востока, где находились армянские общины. Благодаря книгопечатанию, широким слоям населения стали доступны также и труды современных историографов. Грабар продолжал оставаться языком историографии, несмотря на то, что им владел лишь определенный узкий круг людей. Именно перспективным тенденциям этого периода и суждено было сыграть решающую роль в Новое время.