The History of the Armenian priest Łewond is an important source for the history of early Islamic rule and the only contemporary chronicle of second/eighth-century caliphal rule in Armenia. This volume presents a diplomatic edition and new English translation of Łewond’s text, which describes events that took place during the century and a half following the Prophet Muhammad’s death in AH 11/632 CE. The authors address Łewond’s account as a work of caliphal history, written in Armenian, from within the Caliphate. As such, this book provides a critical reading of the Caliphate from one of its most significant provinces. Reading notes clarify many aspects of the period covered to make the text understandable to students and specialists alike. Extensive commentary elucidates Łewond’s narrative objectives and situates his History in a broader Near Eastern historiographical context by bringing the text into new conversations with a constellation of Arabic, Greek, and Syriac works that cover the same period. The book thus stresses the multiplicity of voices operating in the Caliphate in this pivotal period of Near Eastern history.
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Preface: How to Read This Volume

The History of Łewond has been translated and studied prior to our work. When talking to colleagues outside of the field of Armenology, however, we discovered that although they recognized the importance of the work as the only contemporary history of second/eighth-century caliphal rule in Armenia, they found the work difficult to use in their own research or to assign as readings. Through our conversations, we learned the main obstacle to their adoption of the text as a pedagogic or scholarly instrument was that Łewond remained “foreign” to them. That is, they were unable to locate Lewond within the historiographical traditions of the Caliphate, to identify his biases and his hermeneutic lens, and to properly contextualize specific portions of the text that could be used for instruction. Understanding this challenge, we set out to make the present translation and commentary usable both in the classroom and in research by undergraduate and graduate students as well as scholars of the Umayyad and early ‘Abbāsid Caliphates. A basic premise of our work is that Łewond’s History is a caliphal history written by someone who lived in the Caliphate and was conversant with caliphal discourse. Łewond did not stand outside of caliphal historiography or constitute an independent witness who either corroborates or contradicts what has been transmitted in Arabic simply because he was Christian and wrote in Armenian. Instead, we see Lewond as part of the broad historiographical tradition of the Caliphate and seek to explain the similarities and differences between his text and works written in Arabic by understanding his narrative objectives. Behind this approach rests a desire to decenter our perception of the Caliphate, which too often focuses narrowly on a Muslim elite functioning in Arabic and considers this elite fundamentally separate from the majority of people within caliphal territory. As a representative of the caliphal North, Lewond provides a unique perspective on caliphal rule from within the Caliphate.

So what does this volume aim to achieve? Our introduction places Lewond in his historical context and locates his work within Armenian and Arabic historiography. It highlights the scholarly significance of his History but also points out the text’s narrative emplotments, the author’s personal biases, and poignant silences. We have attempted to make our English translation of the second/eighth-century work as readable as possible. To help those who are unfamiliar with aspects of the history of the period covered, we supply in the margin to the translation reading notes that identify figures, places, and concepts Lewond mentions, and we have placed references to biblical or other texts in the footnotes to the translation. For those who have knowledge of Armenian and wish to check our translation, we have also included a slightly modified diplomatic edition of Lewond’s text based on manuscript 1902 (1274–1311 CE) of the Matenadaran (Mesrop Mashtots Institute of Ancient Manuscripts) in Erevan, Armenia. It is the oldest copy of the
History and the one from which all later copies ultimately derive. Finally, our commentary elucidates how Lewond shaped his historical narrative, how his intervention impacts our reading of the text, where he engages with information and tropes common in Arabic, and what light the History shines on caliphal rule in Armenia.

We should also be clear about what we have not attempted to do in this volume. First, the reception of Lewond’s History in later historiography is an important issue, but one that lies beyond the scope of this work. We have not, therefore, fully traced the afterlife of the events he recounts within the Armenian historiographical tradition. We have limited comparisons with later historians to specific instances in which the later accounts shed light on Lewond’s methodology. Similarly, we have not referenced every instance in later Arabic historiography. We have focused primarily on sources from the early ʿAbbāsid period, though selected references to later histories are included in the footnotes where they add to the discussion about the transmission of historical accounts. Finally, we have not systematically addressed the significance of the Eastern Roman Empire in Lewond’s History, even though we have relied on Greek sources in the commentary and assess the possibility that Lewond drew on Greek sources in the Introduction. Lewond’s History has already been the focus of exemplary studies from the perspective of the Eastern Roman Empire, most notably the recent edition and translation of the text by B. Martin-Hisard, J. P. Mahé, and A. Hakobian published by the Centre de recherche d’histoire et civilisation de Byzance in 2015.

We hope that our translation and commentary will enable students and scholars of the Caliphate to integrate non-Arabic sources more easily into their research and teaching.
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# Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AE</strong></td>
<td>Armenian Era, according to the Armenian calendar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AG</strong></td>
<td><em>Anno Graecorum</em>, according to the Seleucid Era as commonly found in Syriac sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AH</strong></td>
<td><em>Anno Hegirae</em>, according to the Islamic calendar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AM</strong></td>
<td><em>Anno Mundi</em>, according to the calendar calculated from the creation of the world as commonly found in Greek sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>b.</strong></td>
<td><em>bin</em>, son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BCE</strong></td>
<td>before the Common Era</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>bt.</strong></td>
<td><em>bint</em>, daughter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ca.</strong></td>
<td><em>circa</em>, about, approximately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CE</strong></td>
<td>Common Era</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>cf.</strong></td>
<td><em>confer/conferatur</em>, compare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>d.</strong></td>
<td>died</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ed.</strong></td>
<td>edition, edited by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>e.g.</strong></td>
<td><em>exempli gratia</em>, for example</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>esp.</strong></td>
<td>especially</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>et al.</strong></td>
<td><em>et alia</em>, and others</td>
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<tr>
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Introduction

Near the end of the second century of the Islamic calendar (the eighth century of the Common Era), a member of the noble Armenian Bagratuni family, Šapuh Bagratuni, asked a priest named Łewond to compose a history of the preceding century and a half. Although we cannot know Šapuh’s reasons for making this request, the crushing of an Armenian rebellion in 158/775 by caliphal forces and the death of his father in that rebellion undoubtedly played a role. Having inherited part of his father’s domains, Šapuh possibly wanted a book of history that could both help secure his family’s position in Armenia and guide his political decisions. The result was Łewond’s History, the only surviving second/eighth-century historiographical work written in Armenia.

This volume presents a new English translation, modified diplomatic edition, and commentary on Łewond’s text. This introduction offers readers who have little familiarity with Armenian history or with the history of the Islamic Caliphate some background knowledge about the context in and about which Łewond wrote. It outlines what we know about the author and the date of his text and locates his History within both Armenian and Arabic historiography. It also describes the oldest manuscript of the work, which we used as the basis of our slightly modified diplomatic edition. The importance of Łewond’s History should be underscored here. Historians have long lamented the lack of sources on the Islamic world from the second/eighth century, but Łewond’s work fills this gaping hole, providing a contemporary interpretation of caliphal rule in one of its most critical provinces. In doing so, it forces scholars to acknowledge that non-Muslims living under caliphal rule did not write histories solely of their own communities but could also contribute to writing the history of the Caliphate.¹

When the Prophet Muḥammad passed away in 11/632, his succession was far from clear. According to the Sunnī tradition, four “rightly guided” caliphs followed the Prophet, expanding the breadth of the Islamic world at a remarkable pace. Within just a few years of the Prophet’s death, the Sasanian Empire, which had controlled the greater Iranian world, collapsed, and the Roman Empire lost key territories such as Syria and Egypt to the emerging Islamic Empire. This expansion continued into the period of the subsequent Umayyad caliphs, who began their rule in 41/661 and pushed into Transoxania and Sind in the East and Andalus in the West. Much to the dismay of many contemporaries as well as later historians, the Umayyads transformed the Caliphate into a hereditary position, defeating challengers who made bids to power on the basis of other qualifications, such

¹ On the idea that Christian sources can resolve the lacunae of caliphal histories, see Borrut, Entre mémoire et pouvoir.
as piety or relation to the Prophet. With the heart of their authority in Syria, the Umayyads sometimes had only nominal control over some of the edges of their empire. This situation changed after the second civil war (*fitna*), when a new branch of the Umayyad family, known as the Marwānids, came to power. The Marwānids are remembered for their building projects, such as the Dome of the Rock, al-Aqṣā Mosque, and the Great Mosque of Damascus; their coin reforms; numerous rebellions against their rule; and behavior that did not align with the expectations of the nascent class of religious scholars. In 132/750, the ‘Abbāsids overthrew the Umayyads and took control of the Caliphate. The ‘Abbāsid Revolution drew on the support of those who wanted to see the Prophet’s family in power, and it attracted both Arab and non-Arab followers who saw un-Islamic values reflected in Umayyad rule. The early years of the ‘Abbāsids have been celebrated as their heyday, when the vibrancy of their new capital at Baghdad drew in scholars and courtiers from across the known world and the exploits of caliphs such as Hārūn al-Rashīd supplied wonder to stories of wealth, power, and culture in the early Islamic world.

By the time Lewond put words to a page at the end of the second/eighth century, Armenia had been a caliphal province for approximately a century. The first Islamic incursions into Armenia began much earlier—in the late 10s/630s and 20s/640s—but the mainstay of power in the region in those early years remained the local nobility, known in Armenian as the *naxarark*. The *naxarark* maintained generally positive relations with Mu‘āwiya b. Abī Sufyān, who served first as the governor of Syria (in office 18–41/639–61) under the “rightly guided” caliphs and then as an Umayyad caliph of the Sufyānid branch (r. 41–60/661–80). In the aftermath of the second *fitna* and the advent of the Marwānids, however, the norms of caliphal rule in Armenia shifted significantly. Muḥammad b. Marwān, the brother of the caliph ‘Abd al-Malik, became governor over Armenia. In contrast to Mu‘āwiya’s rule, Muhammad b. Marwān’s tenure saw the establishment of caliphal garrisons in Armenian territory. The tribute previously levied by the *naxarark* morphed into direct tax collection by caliphal administrators settled in Armenian cities. Through these developments, Armenia was transformed from a tributary ally to a province of the empire. The transition was not easy, and it provoked an Armenian rebellion that was put down decisively. Armenian sources—including Lewond—complain about the heavy-handed policies of caliphal governors and the oppression of caliphal taxes. However, some Armenian houses, such as the Bagratunik (that is, the Bagratuni family), became allies of the Marwānids and the early ‘Abbāsids, serving to keep the peace in Armenia proper and to supplement caliphal armies on the Khazar and Roman frontiers. Powerful scions of the Umayyad and ‘Abbāsid families were stationed in Armenia because of the region’s significance as a double frontier. Sitting at the nexus of the Caliphate, the Khazar Khaganate, and the Roman Empire, Armenia was far from a backwater province and certainly not removed from world affairs.

To the north, the Khazar Khaganate had periodically pushed southward into the territory to the west of the Caspian Sea. Most of our information about the Khazars derives from sources produced outside of Khazaria. The perceived threats of Khazar expansion and the caliphal expectation of expanding the empire into Khazar territory predominate in the sources. The earliest Islamic incursions into the Caucasus began in the 20s/640s and

---

2 The suffix -k' marks a collective noun, so the members of the Bagratuni family are known collectively as the Bagratunik'.
30s/650s, pushing northward to Balanjar from Bāb al-Abwāb/Darband. The Khazars shifted to the offensive in the 40s/660s and forged into Caucasian Albania, whose prince was allied with the first Umayyad caliph Mu‘āwiya. The Albanians engaged in diplomatic attempts to convert the Khazars to Christianity, to no lasting effect. The Khazars then took advantage of the chaos of the second fitna in the Caliphate to extend their reach into Armenia, though this incursion was more transitory than their presence in Albania was. They also solidified relations with the Roman emperor Justinian II. With the rise of the Marwānid branch of the Umayyad family, the situation on the Khazar frontier changed. Celebrated generals such as Maslama b. ʿAbd al-Malik, Jarrāḥ b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Ḥakamī, and Marwān b. Muhammad led campaigns into Khazar territory. The battle lines shifted dramatically, most noticeably when the Khazar general Bārjīk sacked Ardabīl/Artawēt and then killed Jarrāḥ b. ʿAbd Allāh in Azerbaijan/Atrpatakan in 112/730. This feat prompted Umayyad offensives into the Caucasus nearly every year thereafter, with mixed results and no noticeable change of territory with the possible exception of the reestablishment of Bāb al-Abwāb/Darband as a caliphal garrison. When the ʿAbbāsids came to power, they attempted first to stabilize the Khazar border by organizing a marriage alliance between a Khazar princess and the caliphal governor of Armenia. The death of the bride is cited as the casus belli of the Arab-Khazar wars that erupted during the reign of the caliph Manṣūr. This engagement yet again confirmed Bāb al-Abwāb as the limit of caliphal control in the North.

On Armenia’s western frontier stood the Eastern Roman Empire. On the eve of Islam, the Roman Empire had again assumed a dominant position in Syria and the Levant. Although the Sasanian Empire of Iran had managed to expand into Syria and steal the True Cross (a powerful relic that the Romans believed was the cross on which Jesus was crucified), the Roman emperor Herakleios defeated the Persians and triumphantly marched the Cross to Jerusalem in 9/630. The Roman recapture of Syria was a momentary victory, however, as it fell to caliphal armies only a few short years later. Egypt and North Africa soon followed suit. In the 50s/670s, caliphal troops even besieged the imperial capital at Constantinople. The Romans were subsequently faced with the expansion of the Bulgars from the Volga region on another front, to the northwest, as the Bulgars crossed the Danube River. Justinian II concluded a peace treaty with the Umayyad caliph to give his forces flexibility to campaign along the Bulgar front. When Justinian was overthrown (for a second time) in 711 ce, a new dynasty, called the Isaurians, came to rule the Roman Empire. They immediately faced a serious attack, as Maslama b. ʿAbd al-Malik besieged Constantinople for two years; he was finally repulsed with the help of the Bulgar khan. The Isaurian emperors are particularly famous for the Iconoclastic Controversy, an argument within the imperial Church about whether the veneration of images was permitted. In 726 ce, Emperor Leo III removed the image of Christ from the gate of Constantinople, kicking off a dispute that would continue unabated for over half a century. During the third fitna in the Caliphate, Emperor Constantine V took advantage of the disarray to reach into caliphal territory. Though his gains were temporary, they were part of a broader campaign of territorial expansion in the 130s/750s, as he also moved against the Bulgars to the north. In the first few decades of the ʿAbbāsid Caliphate, the ʿAbbāsids dispatched yearly raids into Anatolia, forcing the emperor on the defensive over a prolonged period despite the general stability of the frontier. After the death of Leo IV in 163/780, his wife, Eirene, came to
power as regent for their son. With her deposition two decades later, the Isaurian dynasty came to an end.

Although Łewond records campaigns against both the Khazar Khaganate and the Roman Empire, his primary concern is with the caliphal province of Armenia. This political reality informs the very contours of his History. We should read Łewond’s text as a history of the early Islamic Caliphate. He starts his History by noting that “first and foremost” are “those who were called Commander of the Faithful” (Նախ և առաջին որք և ամիրըլմումնիք անուանեցան) [3v], directly transcribing the caliphs’ title amīr al-muʾminin. The internal chronology of the text is based on the lives and deaths of the caliphs. Additionally, the text includes significant sections that do not directly concern Armenia, as the author’s scope is far wider than his immediate milieu. For example, the work contains accounts of Maslama b. ‘Abd al-Malik’s ill-fated attempt to take Constantinople and of a similarly unsuccessful Umayyad invasion of China. It also discusses the fitnas, the role of the qurrāʾ (Qurʾān readers) in the death of the caliph Walīd b. Yazid, the Arab-Khazar wars, the heroes of the ‘Abbāsid Revolution, and many other events that occurred outside of Armenian territory. Finally, and most importantly, we must remember that Armenia was a caliphal province from the first/seventh century on. The fact that the majority of its population was Christian and spoke Armenian would not have set Armenia apart from other, more central provinces of the Caliphate, all of which had their own non-Muslim populations and their own languages during the Umayyad and even the early ‘Abbāsid periods. Caliphal governors of the provinces minted Arabic-Islamic coins and oversaw the local nobility and tax collectors. The caliphal expeditions against the Khazars depended on Armenian troops. Even the most famous martyrs of this period, such as Vahan Golt’lec’i and Dawit’ Dunec’i, were put to death for apostasy after converting from Islam to Christianity, suggesting the relevance of Islamic law in Armenia. In fact, the anonymous author of the Persian geographical text Ḥudūd al-ʿālam later asserted that “these regions [Azerbaijan, Armenia, and Albania] are the most pleasant places in dar-i Islām” (این جایه‌است بسیار نعمت ترين ناحیه‌است اندر اسلام) (4).

Therefore, even if Łewond does center some of his History on events in first/seventh- and second/eighth-century Armenia, this focus arguably adds to the work’s character as a history of the early Caliphate.

A. THE AUTHOR

Frustratingly, we know nothing about Łewond outside of his work. According to the title page of Matenadaran manuscript 1902 (M1902), the oldest manuscript witness to the History, the text’s author, Lewond, was a “great vardapet” (մեծ վարդապետ). Vardapet in Armenian signified a teacher, usually of religious doctrine. The title was applied to the teachers of the medieval monastic schools. Although M1902 is the oldest witness to Lewond’s History, the title page was inserted in the seventeenth century when the manuscript was repaired, and

3 Citations of Lewond’s text refer to the folio numbers in the manuscript. They are also found in the text and translation below. On our transcription of the Armenian text, please see the Principles of Edition and Translation below.

4 Ḥudūd al-ʿālam, 157. The assertion that Armenia is part of Islam is echoed by Muqaddasi, Aḥsan al-taqāsīm, 373: هو الاقليم للإسلام و هو الاراضي نظر. Furthermore, the Balkhi geographers discussed only Islamic territory, so their inclusion of Armenia reflects this same perception.
it is not certain that the manuscript originally designated Lewond a *vardapet*. One of the colophons to the *History* in M1902, which may be a copy of the original colophon, does not attribute any rank to Lewond. It does refer to the text as a “teaching” (*vardapetut’iwn*), and this wording may have inspired Șmawon Loṙec’i, who repaired the manuscript in 1664 CE, to call Lewond a *vardapet* when he composed the title page. The earliest reference to a history by Lewond is in the *History* of Step’anos Tarōnc’i (ca. 1005 CE), who lists among the great works of history “the history of Lewond the priest, who [recorded] the emergence of the Arabs and the travails of Armenians in their tyranny” (*Պատմութիւն Ղևոնդ երիցու, որ ինչ վասն Տաճկաց ելիցն և անցից Հայոց ի նոցունց բռնութենէ*). Later medieval historiographical writings similarly refer to Lewond not as a *vardapet* but as an elder, presbyter, or priest (*erēc’*). The claim that Lewond was a *vardapet* or that the work was intended as a religious teaching is difficult to reconcile with the content of the *History*. As we will see below, Lewond shows no interest in the religious affairs of the period.

The renowned Mxit’arist scholar N. Akinean attempted to reconstruct an outline of Lewond’s life on the basis of what he decided were clues in the *History*. He surmised that Lewond was a priest from the region of Golt’n and possibly from the town of Vanand. According to Akinean, Lewond was educated in one of the monasteries in the area, possibly in that of Mak’enoc’. He had a personal relationship with the catholicos Esayi, who had been the bishop of Golt’n, both while Esayi was bishop in Golt’n and while he served as catholicos in Dabil/Duin, where the seat of the catholicosate was located. He lived from 770 to 789 CE in the environs of Dabil/Duin, but in 789 CE he fled to Byzantine territory, possibly to Sper, where he wrote his history in 790 CE. He traveled through the various parts of Armenia, including Tărūn/Tarōn, Basfurrajān/Vaspurakan, and Sirāj/Shirak. He appears familiar with the imperial capital of Constantinople and with the Greek tongue. Despite Akinean’s ingenious reading of the text, none of these points finds corroboration beyond the historiographical tradition’s referring to Lewond as a priest. T. Greenwood has recently demonstrated that Dabil/Duin plays a disproportionate role in Lewond’s *History*, which suggests that he may have had personal connections to the region. Beyond this detail, Akinean’s suggestions should be taken as possibilities that cannot be proven with our current knowledge.

Lewond’s *History* has traditionally been dated to the end of the second/eighth century because it cuts off abruptly around the year 172/788, but this date has come under considerable scrutiny. S. Gero proposed the most radical hypothesis for the provenance of the *History*, suggesting that a shorter version dealing only with Armenia was originally written in the second/eighth century but was expanded around the sixth/twelfth century to include events outside of Armenia. In his view, the final form coalesced at the same time that the correspondence between the caliph ʿUmar b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz and the emperor

---

5 Tarōnc’i, *Universal History*, 99–100; Tiezerakan patmut’iwn, 7; “Patmut’iwn tiezerakan,” 640.
6 Thus, for example, Tarōnc’i, *Tiezerakan patmut’iwn*, 15; Ganjakec’i, *Patmut’iwn Hayoc’*, 7; Anec’i, *Hawakmunk’*, 3; Anec’i, *Matean ašxarhavēp handisaranac’*, 101; Ayrivanec’i, *Histoire chronologique*, 25; *Patmut’iwn žamanakagrakan*, 37.
9 Gero, *Byzantine Iconoclasm*. 

Leo the Isaurian was added to the text. The greatest support for this hypothesis is the lack of significant transmission of Lewond’s work. With the exception of Lewond, Armenian histories written before the fifth/eleventh century offer precious little information about the Umayyad and early ‘Abbāsid Caliphates. Why do the fourth/tenth-century historians Dasxuranc’i, Drasxanakertc’i, and T’ovma Arcruni not cite Lewond directly or demonstrate any debt to his History?\(^{10}\) It is not until the beginning of the fifth/eleventh century that another historian, Step’anos Tarōnec’i, displays obvious familiarity with Lewond’s text. Still, Gero’s *argumentum ex silencio* placing the composition of the work between the fifth/eleventh and sixth/twelfth centuries does not have strong support. In particular, his conclusion that the fifth/eleventh-century version of Lewond’s text treated only the Islamic conquests is based solely on T’ovma Arcruni’s citation of Lewond’s *History* and finds no further support in any text.

Greenwood has suggested another, more plausible, alternative later date for the text, placing it at the end of the third/ninth century instead of the traditional second/eighth century. Most studies have identified the sponsor of Lewond’s *History*, Šapuh Bagratuni, as the brother of the Bagratuni prince Ašot Msaker on the basis of his appearance in the text of Vardan Arewelc’i.\(^{11}\) Greenwood suggests instead that this Šapuh Bagratuni may in fact be the famous historian whose work is now lost. This third/ninth-century Šapuh Bagratuni wrote a history covering the period from 174/790, only two years after Lewond’s commentary ends, to the third/ninth century. In support of his hypothesis of a third/ninth-century date, Greenwood points to passages that appear to predict the rise and concerns of the Bagratuni Kingdom, established with the ‘Abbāsid caliph Mu’tamid’s crowning of Ašot Bagratuni as the king of Armenia on 25 Ṣafar 271/August 26, 884.\(^{12}\) Greenwood’s hypothesis is significant in that it provides a viable alternative to the traditional account of the author, which is admittedly based on skeletal data. However, there is a limit to how far we can stretch the text. If Lewond was writing after the rise of the Bagratuni Kingdom, we then have to support his rise to power and label him a deluded fraud “who was moved by the spirit of perversion and prophesied empty nonsense” (որ մոլորութեան հոգւովն շարժեցեալ մարգարէանայր սնոտիս
և ընդունայն) [106r]. The tenor of Lewond’s entire text is pro-Bagratuni and we would expect him to support their rise to kingship, but he does not. Likewise, it is indeed possible that the Bagratunik’ opposed the rebellion against the Caliphate in 158/775 because they had survived the disastrous caliphal campaigns in the 230s/850s and knew the impossibility of escape, as Greenwood suggests.\(^{13}\) However, the Bagratuni pro-caliphal (anti-rebellion) policy fits neatly with the family’s disparagement of the idea of an independent Armenian kingdom. The Bagratunik’ likely realized that their claim to authority depended on caliphal support, particularly given the repeated challenges to their authority by the more powerful Mamikonean family. Lewond’s preoccupation with these Mamikonean challenges points away from the third/ninth century, when the family had lost its standing. With these
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\(^{11}\) Arewelc’i, *Hawak’umn patmut’ean*, 76: Բայց անկելոցն ի մեծ պատերազմին մնացորդք էին այսոքիկ ․
երկու որդիք Սմբատայ որդւոյ Աշոտի, որոց անուանքն Աշոտ և Շապուհ.


\(^{13}\) On the caliphal campaigns of the 230s/850s, see Vacca, “Conflict and Community.”
examples, the very details that seem to fit the third/ninth century find even better explanations in the second/eighth.

Greenwood has also pointed out Lewond’s apparent lack of proximity to the events he reportedly lived through and witnessed personally, arguing that he did not include the kinds of details that might be expected of someone who lived through the events described. However, Lewond’s account of the reign of the caliph Hādī reveals close attention to details that are frequently muddled in later sources. Arabic sources of the third/ninth century consistently confuse the chronology, placing Khuzayma b. Khāzim’s first term as governor of Armenia during the later reign of Hārūn al-Rashīd. By placing Khuzayma in Armenia under Hādī, Lewond’s account diverges from the Arabic sources and from a relevant Armenian martyrology, but it aligns with the numismatic record. By avoiding the confusions that plague sources written in the third/ninth century, Lewond allows us an invaluable window into Hādī’s reign. Furthermore, Lewond demonstrates knowledge of the catholicoi Esayi and Step’ananos during the reign of Hārūn al-Rashīd. A fourth/tenth-century telling of Esayi’s life story was heavily embellished to emphasize his virtues, but such aggrandizement is completely absent from Lewond’s account. Beyond Lewond’s work, we know little about Step’ananos, who served as catholicos for only two years. Like his knowledge of Khuzayma’s presence in Armenia during the caliphate of Hādī, Lewond’s inclusion of these two catholicoi suggests that he was proximate to the events he describes.

In short, the dating of Lewond’s text is not certain. The work has traditionally been studied as a product of the second/eighth century given its abrupt end in the first years of Hārūn al-Rashīd’s reign. The descriptions of Bagratuni compliance with caliphal administrators make sense in the context of the second/eighth century, as the family sought to bolster its power before achieving kingship. As a result, though the limits of our knowledge must be recognized, J.-P. Mahé’s hesitant support for the traditional dating remains the most sensible approach: “La comparaison avec les historiens du Xe siècle, Yovhannēs Drasxnakertc’i et T’ovma Arcruni, sans confirmer positivement la datation de Lewond au VIIIe siècle, n’oblige pas non plus à la rejeter. Il semblerait donc plus prudent de s’en tenir à cette datation.”

**B. THE HISTORY**

We emerge from these considerations with a general, albeit hazy, image of Lewond as a second/eighth-century priest who may have had some personal interest in the city of Dabil/Duin, the caliphal capital of Armenia. Our understanding of Lewond as a historian comes into greater focus through a close examination of his *History*—its contours and its concerns, the placement and editing of historical accounts, and its rhetorical use of biblical allusions. Furthermore, placing Lewond into a broader context of Armenian, Arabic, and Greek historiography allows us to speculate about the author’s goals and expectations, fitting this one history into the wider networks of historical writing in the early ‘Abbāsids period.

---

INTRODUCTION

B.1. COMMON THEMES, SILENCES, AND EMPLOYMENTS

Łewond’s editorial choices come into clear view in his placement of certain key events. Modern scholars have noted that he locates the Umayyad siege of Constantinople during the caliphate of Hishām b. ‘Abd al-Malik (r. 105–25/724–43), significantly later than any other source. We could read this misdating either as a dramatic mistake or, more productively, as an opportunity to understand what Łewond was trying to do with these accounts. Arabic, Greek, and Syriac sources indicate that the campaign against Constantinople took place during the reign of Sulaymān b. ‘Abd al-Malik (r. 96–99/715–17). But Łewond’s account of Sulaymān’s reign is instead full of the exploits of Maslama b. ‘Abd al-Malik in the Caucasus. Because of the privileging of Roman over Khazar history, historians have not noticed that the descriptions of these Caucasian campaigns are also out of place chronologically: Maslama warred against the Khazars during the caliphate of Hishām b. ‘Abd al-Malik. Łewond did not accidentally misdate the campaign against Constantinople. He flipped the two campaigns, thus curating his narrative of Maslama’s campaign to end in ruin.15 This sort of creative chronology appears at multiple points in the History, including, most notably, in Łewond’s account of the peace agreement between the Armenian catholicos Sahak and the caliphal governor Muhammad b. Marwān (as described in the commentary below). Such details reveal the editorial voice of Łewond as he shapes his information to make his own position known. His History is perhaps not primarily concerned with an accurate account of events or transmission of historical reports; rather, he chose and arranged his anecdotes carefully to support his own views of caliphal rule.

Conflict is the most prominent theme in Łewond’s History. He describes the Islamic conquests, Umayyad campaigns against Constantinople and China, the second and third fitnas, the ‘Abbāsid Revolution, the Arab-Khazar wars under both the Umayyads and the ‘Abbāsids, independent marauders, the summer campaigns (sawā’if) on the Roman frontier, and numerous Armenian rebellions against the Caliphate. The focus on the military elite is hardly out of place in Near Eastern historiography, though it is perhaps difficult to reconcile with the traditional claim that Łewond was a vardapet. The conflicts he describes fall into three categories. Some are directly relevant to Armenia, such as the Islamic conquests, the second fitna, the ‘Abbāsid Revolution, and the second/eighth-century rebellions against caliphal rule. The conflicts in this category typically establish or regulate the relationship between Armenia and world empires, whether the Caliphate, the Khazar Khaganate, or the Roman Empire. Other conflicts unfurl outside of the geographical boundaries of Armenia but integrate Armenians into broader world dramas, as, for example, when Ašot Bagratuni and his cavalry upset the course of the third fitna by marching to Syria and when Tačat Anjewac’i salvaged Hārūn al-Rashīd’s attempt to take Constantinople during the reign of the latter’s father, Mahdī. Finally, some conflicts, such as Muḥammad b. Marwān’s purported campaign against China and Maslama b. ‘Abd al-Malik’s campaign

15 See Greenwood, “Reassessment,” 131. On the topic of the misdating of the campaign against Constantinople, Greenwood compares Maslama’s career to his uncle Muḥammad b. Marwān’s and points out: “An error of this magnitude is hard to interpret unless one understands it as somehow intentional on the part of Lewond himself. It has the effect of postponing the humiliation of Maslama to the end of his career, much as the final notice describing the actions of Muḥammad b. Marwān also contemplates his failure on campaign.”
against Constantinople, have no clear link to Armenians or Armenian history. Lewond employs such stories to illustrate the fates of generals who occupied important positions in the history of Armenia, particularly those associated with violence. Such reports assure readers that such figures ended defeated and uncelebrated, even though their disrepute did not relate to Armenia.

Several of Lewond’s accounts of conflict assert that Armenian nobles cooperated with caliphal administrators. T’ēodoros Rštuni, who fought against the first Islamic conquests in Armenia, subsequently retreated from Roman service and ordered his son Vard to help the caliphal forces during the reign of Mu’awiya. As already mentioned, Bagratuni cavalry traveled to Syria during the third fitna to support Marwân b. Muhammad. Armenian forces also played an important role in the Arab-Khazar wars. Lewond claims that Ašot Bagratuni met with Hishām b. ‘Abd al-Malik to ensure the payments of military stipends to the Armenian troops. “After this, Marwân b. Muhammad gathered a large force and took with him the prince Ašot along with the naxarark’ and their cavalry. United, they went raiding in the land of the Huns” (Յետ այսորիկ զաւր բազում գումարէր Մրուան որդի Մահմետի. և առնոյր ընդ իւր զիշխանն Աշոտ հանդերձ նախարաւքն և միաբանեալք ասպատակէին յաշխարհ Հոնաց) [83v]. Subsequently, during the reign of the caliph Mahdī, the caliphal governor ‘Uthmān b. ‘Umāra brought the Armenian naxarark’ to fight in the vicinity of Bāb al-Abwāb/Darband. Each of these examples demonstrates Armenian involvement in caliphal campaigns against the Romans or the Khazars, focusing particularly (though not exclusively) on the Bagratuni family’s cooperation with the Umayyads and the ‘Abbāsids.

The Bagratunik’, who sponsored Lewond’s History, typically espouse a pro-caliphal position in the text. The sole exception—the events at Vardanakert in 83/703—is carefully curated in Lewond’s text to appear as righteous self-defense instead of a rebellion against the Caliphate. Lewond goes as far as to have the most bloodthirsty of governors, Muhammad b. Marwân, refer to them as “innocent men” (արանց անմեղաց) [23v], thus exonerating them from culpability for their rebellion. In the other two rebellions against caliphal rule, the Bagratunik’ vocally protested the plans, exhorting the other naxarark’ not to participate. The family’s patriarch did not participate in either of those rebellions, though other members of the family did. It is important to note that Lewond’s descriptions of caliphal rule are overwhelmingly negative and frequently claim horrific oppression, despite his sponsors’ pro-caliphal policy. Lewond navigates this tension between Bagratuni cooperation with caliphal forces and his own antipathy for caliphal rule by suggesting that assimilation into the Caliphate is the best option available for Armenian prosperity. He compares it favorably with emigration to Roman territory and assures the reader that resistance to the Caliphate can only lead to needless waste of lives. So, for example, when the Mamikoneank’ rebelled against the Caliphate, the Bagratuni patriarch refused to participate with the following warning: “Behold: our troops are of little consequence in the midst the Ishmaelite violence. We are not able to oppose their troops, nor extract our land from the mouth of the dragons. We are only bringing it trouble and danger [with] your ideas” (ահա նուազունք են զաւրքս մեր ի մէջ բռնութե ան Իսմաելի. և ոչ կարեմք զդէմ ունել զաւրաց նոցա. և ոչ զերկիր մեր հանել ի բերանոյ վիշապացն. և միայն աշխատութիւն ձեր) [90r–v]. Later, another Bagratuni patrician cautioned that since the Romans, even with their vast might, could not repulse the Islamic
conquest, how could the Armenians hope to succeed through independent action? Bagratuni support for the Caliphate is thus portrayed as a wholly pragmatic tactic aimed at saving Armenian lives and property, rather than a reflection of their agreement with the situation of Armenia under caliphal rule.

Because of Bagratuni support for caliphal authority and the family’s unwillingness to join rebellions against the Caliphate, one of Łewond’s primary concerns within Armenian society is the contention between the Bagratuni and Mamikonean naxarar houses. The latter frequently appear not only as anti-Caliphate but also as anti-Bagratuni. So, for example, when Grigor Mamikonean rebelled in 132/749–50, his professed aim, according to Łewond, was not to overthrow the Caliphate but to challenge Bagratuni preeminence within that system. To a large degree, the Mamikonean-Bagratuni rivalry is framed as a direct response to caliphal policy in the North. Łewond depicts the Bagratunik’ as leaders of the Armenian naxarark’, and he reports that the caliphs repeatedly anointed Bagratuni patricians as prince of Armenia after the second fitna. Still, the details given in Łewond’s text suggest that Bagratuni preeminence became the policy of the Caliphate specifically to undercut Mamikonean authority. The Mamikoneank’ were able to raise multiple rebellions against the Caliphate, rallying the naxarar houses to their cause. Even though Łewond tries to distance the Bagratunik’ from the rebellions, he also claims that they “involuntarily” or “unwillingly” participated at the request of the Mamikonean leaders, thereby implying that the Bagratunik’ were compelled to follow Mamikonean orders. The Mamikoneank’ also appear to have operated independently of Bagratuni or caliphal authority, collecting taxes, raiding certain regions, and even confiscating the treasury of the Bagratuni prince of Armenia. At one point, the governor (and future caliph) Marwān b. Muḥammad sought the caliph Hishām b. ‘Abd al-Malik’s intervention in the Mamikonean-Bagratuni rivalry; in response, the caliph himself sent the Mamikoneank’ to prison in Yemen. Later, another governor named a Mamikonean prince of Armenia and the Bagratunik’ marched to Syria to protest until the caliph Marwān b. Muhammad returned control to the Bagratuni family. Caliphal support for the Bagratunik’ was politically sensible, as the Bagratunik’ relied on their close relationship with the caliph to assert their own authority. By contrast, the Mamikoneank’ were too powerful and could easily have decided to throw off caliphal rule or to defect to the Roman Empire. For the Umayyads and ‘Abbāsids alike, patronizing a weaker noble house assured a consistent ally. As a result, Łewond chronicles caliphal involvement in the slow collapse of Mamikonean authority and the rise to power of the Bagratuni house.

On the other hand, Łewond shows little interest in inter-naxarar or intra-naxarar dynamics beyond the rivalry between the Mamikonean and Bagratuni families. Of the

---

16 Despite the lack of attention paid to the internal situation of the naxarar houses, the seventh/thirteenth-century historian of the province of Sisajān/Siunik’, Step’anos Orbēlean, comments that he found an order of precedence of the Armenian princes “that Lewond wrote” (զոր Ղեւոնդ գրեաց). Adontz, Armenia, 197, identified this Lewond with the second/eighth-century historian and justified his conclusion by claiming that there was only one historian named Lewond and by noting that Orbēlean did not need to qualify this personage in any way. Adontz further speculated that such a list of ranks may have preceded the History, either as part of an intentional preface to the work or as an accidental addition to Orbēlean’s copy, but that it had subsequently been lost. There is no strong evidence, however, to equate these two people.
some twenty naxarar houses known to have still existed in the late first/seventh and second/eighth centuries, the History mentions nine, including the Bagratunik’ and the Mamikoneank’. Most of these mentions, however, are only brief evocations. For example, the Gnumik’ and Trunik’ are mentioned only in reference to the deaths during the Armenian rebellion of 158/775. More surprisingly, the prestigious Kamsarakank’ are mentioned explicitly only once, when Nersēh Kamsarakan died during the caliphal campaign against the Khazars around 169/785. In a separate passage, Lewond refers to a certain Lady Šušan who aided wounded caliphal troops. This Lady Šušan should be identified with Šušan Kamsarakan. Lewond’s omission of her name contributes to the downplaying of the Kamasarakank’ in his History. The Amatuni house is mentioned three times. Varašapuh Amatuni and his brother are noted among those killed in Nashawā/Naxčawan in 83/703, and the family is listed as supporters of the Arcruni at the battle of Arjīsh/Arčēš in 158/775. Finally, Lewond records that Šapuh Amatuni and his son Hamam led 12,000 people into Roman territory to escape the taxation policies of Hārūn al-Rashīd’s early years. The Arcruni family garners more attention, undoubtedly because of its increasing prominence in the second/eighth century, and Lewond transmits information about several generations of the family. Like the Amatunik’, they are first mentioned among the victims in the fires of Nashawā/Naxčawan in 83/703. They subsequently play a greater role in the events surrounding the rebellions of 158/775. During the reign of the ‘Abbāsid caliph Mansūr, Hamazasp, Sahak, and Gagik Arcruni, the sons of Vahan Arcruni, fought against caliphal troops, and Lewond presents Gagik’s son, also named Hamazasp, as the military leader of the Armenian forces at the battle of Arjīsh/Arčēš in 158/775. In both instances, Lewond is more critical than complimentary about the activities of the Arcrunik’. His tone changes, however, when he relates the martyrdom of Hamazasp and Sahak during the reign of the caliph Hādī, possibly because he relies on a hagiographical report. Beyond these references, some naxarar families are present only in the stories of individual members, usually ones who had become recognized rulers of Armenia. It is possible that Lewond had access to gestae—tales to celebrate family histories—of these figures. So, for example, the exploits of T’ēodoros Řštuni and his son Vard are mentioned at the beginning of Lewond’s text, but the family never reappears later. The drama of the rise and fall of Tačat Anjewac’i likewise constitutes the only reference to this family. Although these tellings are fairly extensive, they focus on the individual actors and do not delve into relations between the houses more generally. With the exception of the tensions between the Bagratuni and Mamikonean families, then, Lewond generally chose to shine a light on the other noble houses only when they figured within broader imperial contexts rather than within local dynamics of power.

This interest in imperial power plays also informed Lewond’s focus on describing the administration of Armenia. The Sufyānid period, which is sometimes extolled today as a formative “golden age” of medieval Armenia, in fact has spotty coverage in Lewond’s text. He notes the activities of the patriarch and the prince of Armenia but rushes through the period without conveying the scale of the accomplishments evident from the architectural record. Instead, Lewond focuses more on the Marwānid and early ‘Abbāsid periods, when governors were on the ground in Armenia. He lists and describes the caliphal governors appointed over Armenia and frequently attests to the oaths or written promises to regulate their control over Armenia. Lewond consistently declares the governors to be warlike or
bloodthirsty and describes their leadership of caliphal campaigns against Armenian rebellions and Khazar incursions. Although the Roman Empire often appears in Lewond’s narrative, the caliphal governors of Armenia engage with Roman forces only rarely. Lewond tends to describe caliphal military engagement with the Romans as incidental to Armenian politics. For example, Muḥammad b. Marwān fought Roman forces after the battle of Vardanakert in 83/703, but in Lewond’s telling the Romans were there only to support the Armenians. His account of the rebellion remains focused on the Armenians, relegating the Romans to auxiliary status. The majority of the battles between the Caliphate and the Roman Empire—such as Maslama b. ‘Abd al-Malik’s campaign against Constantinople and the ‘Abbāsid-era ṣawā’if—unfold in the western reaches of Anatolia or in northern Syria, so these conflicts do not usually make their way farther east into Armenia proper. Still, particularly in the early ‘Abbāsid period the administration of Armenia remains partly tied to the Roman Empire in Lewond’s narrative, since many of the veterans of the wars with Rome appear later as governors of Armenia. However, such connections are visible only when one takes a prosopographical approach to Lewond’s information, and they do not reflect Lewond’s own interests.

Lewond’s explicit concerns about administration tend toward the fiscal rather than the gubernatorial. He mentions the tribute paid by Armenia under Muʿāwiya and Yazīd b. Muʿāwiya (for whose reign the tribute is the only piece of information recorded), then denounces the cadastre implemented under Hishām b. ‘Abd al-Malik “to intensify the iron yoke of servitude by means of manifold evils” (վաստակ աշխատութեան զանուր լծոյ ծառաութեան հարկատրութեան ազգի ազգի չարեաւք) [73r–v]. His complaints about ‘Abbāsid taxation—that the caliph Saffāḥ raised taxes from the dead and used lead seals to signal the payment of taxes—likely reflect literary borrowings, but such framing nonetheless indicates his resentment about caliphal taxation. Manṣūr subsequently imposed a poll tax, though the imposition eased (according to Lewond) during the reign of Mahdī because silver was found in Armenia to satiate the tax collectors. Lewond describes the mercilessness of the governors through their rapacious taxation policies; for example, during the reign of Hārūn al-Rashīd, the administrators demanded double the yield in taxes with immediate remission. The tribute and taxes were more than a basic financial agreement: they exemplified the complaints against caliphal rule. Perhaps more importantly, refusal to pay taxes constituted rebellion and so entailed both political and military repercussions. Armenians rebelled by withholding the tribute during the second fitna. Similarly, the Mamikoneank’ killed caliphal tax collectors to signal the initiation of their rebellion in 158/775. In addition to taxes, the payment of Armenian troops was another important element of fiscal administration, given the Marwānid and ‘Abbāsid reliance on Armenian cavalry, as mentioned above. Lewond notes the salaries of the troops multiple times, including in the context of the Arab-Khazar wars when the Bagratuni patrician reportedly met with the caliph Hishām b. ‘Abd al-Malik to ensure the salaries of the cavalry and to secure arrears for missed payments. More questionable references to salaries appear during the reigns of Walīd b. ‘Abd al-Malik (where the salaries appear to have been a ruse to gather naxarark’ together) and ‘Umar b. ‘Abd al-‘Aziz (where the recipient of the salaries is not specified). Lewond also observes that the salaries were cut during the reign of Saffāh, which leads him to label Bagratuni involvement in caliphal campaigns as “profitless labor” (զրավաստակ աշխատութեան) [96r].
With his focus firmly on military and political affairs, Lewond demonstrates a complete lack of interest in the religious controversies and developments of the first/seventh and second/eighth centuries. So, for example, he mentions none of the important ecclesiastical councils that took place during the time span covered in his work, such as the Council of Dabīl/Duin in 719 CE and that of Manazkert in 726 CE, which codified the Armenian liturgy, canon law, dogma, and the Church’s relationship with the West Syrian Church. Similarly, Lewond ignores the activities of the leading ecclesiastics and catholicoi of the period, naming only five catholicoi in his entire text. He makes no reference to the Julianist controversy over the incorruptibility of Christ’s flesh that was debated in the first/seventh and second/eighth centuries. Nor does he revisit the controversy over the Council of Chalcedon, which led to the theological schism between the Armenian, imperial, and Georgian Churches. Even if these schisms occurred prior to the events Lewond narrates, their effects were felt keenly into the first/seventh century. Likewise, he makes no mention of the Iconoclastic Controversy that embroiled the Byzantine Empire or of the Second Council of Nicaea, which restored the veneration of icons and took place in 787 CE, presumably while Lewond was writing his History. In fact, Lewond praises several Byzantine emperors as “pious,” regardless of their adherence to Chalcedon or of their iconoclastic stance. Although these positive appraisals may be attributable to Lewond’s sources rather than to Lewond himself, it is remarkable that he did not moderate them, as later historiographers chose to do. When he does pick up the issue of the destruction of images, he does so in reference not to the Christian debate over icons but to the iconoclastic campaign of the caliph Yazīd b. ʿAbd al-Malik. His indifference to the affairs and doctrines of the Church supports the suggestion that the title of vardapet was bestowed on him in the course of the eleventh/seventeenth-century repairs to the manuscript.

Lewond’s focus on political and military matters, his highlighting of Bagratuni-Mamikonean tensions, and his silence about certain ecclesiastical affairs within the Armenian Church may stem from his sensitivity to the political position and tastes of his patron, Šapuh Bagratuni. His avoidance of well-known sectarian and doctrinal differences and identities within Christianity, however, cannot be ascribed to his anticipation of Šapuh’s interests or to the simple reproduction of the Tendenz of his sources, which he is quite prepared to manipulate elsewhere. Rather, it seems to reflect an intentional decision to present Christianity as undifferentiated and united, in contrast to Islam, which he depicts as suffering from many internal, violent schisms. The juxtaposition of a cohesive Christian world and a fractured Islamic world aligns well with the depiction of both faiths in the one extended discussion of religious ideas in the work, the ʿUmar-Leo correspondence. There, divisions within Christianity are described as minor and deriving from the cultural-linguistic diversity of the Christian ecumene, while Islamic sectarianism is defined primarily by intrafaith violence.

Although Lewond may have downplayed confessional tensions between Armenians and the Roman Empire, his knowledge of and attitude toward the empire remain ambivalent. The information he provides about the lives of emperors and imperial affairs is scanty.17 He is fairly well informed of the succession of Roman emperors during the period covered by his

17 See also Martin-Hisard, “L’empire byzantin”; Greenwood, “Negotiating the North.”
History, but he omits the names of some,18 mistakenly refers to Tiberios III Apsimar as two people, and incorrectly places the reign of Theodosios III immediately before Justinian II’s return to power in 698 CE, rather than before Leo III’s accession in 717 CE. It is perhaps not surprising that his information about the reigns of emperors during the twenty-two-year period of rapid imperial change between 695 and 717 CE is particularly weak. For the most part, Łewond refuses to qualify the emperors, referring to them simply as “the Greek king.” He does, however, praise Herakleios as “the divinely crowned” (աստուածածան) and “pious” (պնդիսամուն) [4r], reflecting the positive image of Herakleios in Armenia in the first/seventh and second/eighth centuries. Leo III is also portrayed in a positive light for his role in the defense of Constantinople. More unexpectedly, the only other emperor to be praised as “pious” (պնդիսամուն) [96v] is Constantine V, later denigrated in Greek historiography as Kopronymos (Dung-Named) for his iconoclasm. This suggests that Lewond’s source here shared Constantine’s iconoclast position. Ašot Bagratuni also praises the personal strength, bravery, and military might of Constantine V in his speech that attempted to dissuade the naxarark19 from rebelling against the Caliphate. But we can perhaps detect a hint of irony in Ašot’s words, as he follows his comment by noting that “in no way did he even once think to take this land of Armenia from their hands” (ամենևին ընդ միտ անգամ ոչ էառ ածել զաշխարհս Հայոց ի ձեռաց նոցա) and that even the emperor is “subdued by fear” (ենթադրեալ է յահէ) of the Caliphate [108r].

Łewond offers even less information about figures other than emperors in the Greek hierarchy. The only general he names is Prokopios, and he does so early in his narrative. Moreover, Łewond blames Prokopios’s arrogance toward the prince of Armenia, T’ēodoros Řštuni, for imperial losses in Armenia [7r]. Later in his History, Łewond comments that the emperor Leo appointed three generals to attack Cilicia in 778 CE. He names the two Armenian generals, Tačat Anjewac’i and Artawazd Mamikonean, but refers to the third merely as “one from the Greek troops” (միւսն ի զաւրաց Յունաց) [119r]. This third general was Michael Lachanodrakon, known to both Greek and Arabic sources. It is unclear whether Łewond was in fact unaware of Michael Lachanodrakon’s name, suggesting that his knowledge of imperial affairs was rather scanty, or whether he intentionally omitted the name to downplay imperial intervention and accentuate the role of the Armenian generals. Outside of the military, Łewond mentions only the office of the patriarch of Constantinople and the Senate in his description of the imperial reaction to the siege of Constantinople [78r]; these mentions certainly derive from the source he accessed for this episode, which also praises Emperor Leo III.

The valence of the physical space of the empire is similarly ambiguous. Łewond remarks on three occasions that Armenians sought refuge in imperial territory. However, the case of Šmbat Bagratuni, the son of Varaztiroc, illustrates that Łewond contextualizes such relocations within more complex narratives. During the reign of Tiberios III Apsimar, Šmbat Bagratuni resolved “to go from this land to the king of the Greeks” (գնալ յաշխаրհէս առ թագաւորն Յունաց) [18v] because of worsening circumstances in Armenia. According to Łewond, Šmbat and his men were intercepted by caliphal troops at Vardanakert. Šmbat

18 He makes no mention of Heraklonas (r. 641 CE), but this is understandable given the brevity of his reign. He similarly omits Constantine IV (r. 668–85 CE), Philippikos Bardanes (r. 711–13 CE), and Anastasios II (r. 713–15 CE).
was victorious in the subsequent battle and sent the noses of the defeated troops to the emperor, who rewarded him with the title of europalates. This story of Smbat’s desire to seek refuge in Roman territory, however, follows an earlier episode in which Smbat had deserted the imperial forces because the Romans had killed his father. At that time, Tiberios III Apsimar sent a force into Armenia to capture Smbat in order to punish him for his desertion [15v]. Rather than highlight the Roman Empire as a place of refuge for Armenians, Smbat’s story highlights the ability of the Armenian nobility to move back and forth between imperial and caliphal service. Indeed, following the fires of Nashawā/Naxčawan [27r–v], Smbat requested and was granted the town of Phasis in Eger by Justinian II. He and his followers remained there for six years, when they decided to accept an offer from the caliphal governor of Armenia, ‘Abd al-ʿAzīz b. Ḥātim al-Bāhilī, to return. Before leaving, they looted the city and even “plundered the vessels of the churches” (զսպաս եկեղեցեացն յավարի յափշտակեալ) [27v]. In response, the emperor, unnamed but likely Philippikos Bardanes, ordered them to be excommunicated, and Lewond relates that their excommunication was read at Easter “from year to year, until today” (ամի ամի . . . մինչև ցայսաւր) [27v]. Lewond’s account of the career of Tačat Anjewac’i, who switched from imperial to caliphal employ because of the disdain with which he was treated by the empress Eirene after Leo IV’s death [121v], provides another example of Armenian mobility.

During the caliphate of Mansūr, Lewond reports that many people emigrated to the empire because of Constantine V’s policy of depopulating the frontier. This allowed the Caliphate to capture Qālīqalā/Karin (Gr. Theodosiopolis; modern Erzurum) and settle people in it. At this time, unnamed Armenian naxarark’ also “fled to the land of Greeks and took refuge with the emperor Constantine [V]” (և փախստեա անկան յաշխարհն Յունաց. այսուցից դարձան զկորուստ կեցարքը) [99v] because of the harsh measures of the governor, Sāliḥ. Yet we can sense that Lewond does not fully approve of their actions, as he remarks that they “abandoned their inheritance.” Later in the chapter, he reports that Ašot Bagratuni cautioned the Armenian nobles about rebelling against the Caliphate, questioning what the results of such a rebellion would be. Either, he said, the Armenians would be forced to submit once again to caliphal rule or “you will be repulsed into flight from your land with all of your families and, abandoning the inheritance of your fathers, your homes, forests, and fields, and even the tombs of your fathers, you will go and live in exile with the king of the Greeks” (լաւ համարեցան ընտրել զմահ անձանց˙ քան տեսանել զկորուստ աշխարհիս և զանապատութիւն եկեղեցեաց Քրիստոս ի) [108v]. Lewond thus has the Bagratuni patrician equate relocating to imperial territory with exile.

After the loss of the battle of Arjīsh/Arčēš during the rebellion, Lewond observes that the Armenian regiments that had been stationed in Qālīqalā/Karin could have easily escaped harm by crossing over into imperial territory, but “they considered it better to choose their own death than to see the destruction of this land and the desertion of the churches of Christ” (զկրութիւն զանապատութիւն եկեղեցեաց Քրիստոս ի) [112v]. It is only at the very end of his narrative that Lewond clearly posits the Amatuni family’s move to imperial territory with 12,000 people as a better alternative to remaining in Armenia, stating that Constantine “honored the naxarark’ and their cavalry. He settled the other masses on good
and fertile land” (տայր պատիւ նախարացն և նոցին հեծելոցն. և զայլ խառնիճաղանճսն բնակեցուցանէր ի բարիոք և յարգաւանդ երկրի) [129v].

Finally, Łewond sometimes remarks on the inconsistency or ineffectiveness of Roman military support. In addition to noting the military losses the empire suffered during the Caliphate’s early expansion, Łewond observes that the imperial troops sent to support Smbat europalates after the battle of Vardanakert fled in fear when they came into contact with caliphal troops [24v]. Imperial troops apparently supported the Mamikonian rebellion against the Caliphate in 132/750 [91r], but, according to Łewond, the most palpable result of their military action was the raiding and pillaging of local communities.

In sum, Łewond has a nuanced perspective on the Roman Empire. Although he does not disparage the emperors themselves, he also does not see them or the empire as Armenia’s savior. Rather, in Łewond’s estimation, the empire is an inconsistent ally that cannot substitute for Armenian leadership and unity. It may sometimes serve as a useful place of refuge, but it is ultimately a place of exile and not to be preferred to Armenian territory.

B.2. BIBLICAL ALLUSIONS

Arguably in alignment with his emphasis on political conflict, economic distress, and idealistic presentation of Christianity is Łewond’s comparatively sparse but strategically pointed use of biblical allusions and citations. Unsurprisingly, Łewond employs biblical phrases most commonly in scenes of military conflict. For example, he describes the caliphal defeat of the Sasanian army as a “slaughter of the sword” (կոտորմամբ սրոյ) [6v], an evocation of the laws of warfare and the command to destroy idolatrous cities in Deuteronomy as well as of Israel’s defeat of the Amorites in Numbers and Joshua’s victory over Amalek in Exodus. The caliphal forces invading Armenia in 32/652–53 are described as “winged serpents” (օձք թեւաւորք) [8r], echoing Isaiah 14:29, and as “insolent and cruel” (ժպիրհ եւ անողորմ) [8v], invoking the image of the invading army of the North found in Jeremiah 6:23. After the sacking of the city of Dabil/Duin in that campaign, Łewond cites Psalm 78(79):1–3 to depict the destruction of the city. Later, during Maslama’s siege of Constantinople, Łewond compares the emperor Leo to Hezekiah when Assyria threatened to capture Jerusalem (4 Kingdoms [2 Kings] 19/Isaiah 37). Finally, when Sahak, the son of Vahan Arcruni, saw the death of his brother in combat against caliphal troops, he “slew many [men]” (զբազումս դիաթաւալ կացուցանէր) [97v], like Judas Maccabeus. Łewond also borrows phrasing from 1 Kingdoms (1 Samuel) to signal the complete resignation of a military leader, comparing both the Roman emperor Constans and the caliphal general Muḥammad b. Marwān to the Philistines. After the Philistines were routed by Israel, they “never again went up against” (ոչ ևս յաւելին ելանել ի վերա տարիք) the land of Israel (1 Kingdoms 7:13). Similarly, after losing the Battle of the Bridge, Constans “never again went up against” (ոչ ևս յաւել ելանել ի պատերազմ) the Caliphate, and, after losing to Čenbakur, Muḥammad and his men “never again went up in war against” (ոչ ևս յաւել ելանել ի պատերազմ) the realm of the Chinese.

19 We omit here discussion of the citations found in the ‘Umar-Leo correspondence. For a more detailed analysis of Lewond’s use of the Bible, see La Porta, “The Bible.”
More significantly, Lewond refracts his retelling of the second and third fitnas through the lens of scriptural prophecy. He explicitly frames the second fitna as the fulfillment of Psalm 36(37):15 and as retribution for the innocent Christian blood that the Muslims had shed. Similarly, the third fitna is expressly presented as the fulfillment of the prophecy of Amos 1:3–5, which shaped the imagined siege of Damascus. In a related vein, Lewond justifies the execution of Dawit’ Mamikonean by the caliph Marwān as the consequence of the former’s conspiracy against Smbat Bagratuni, not as “the bad yield of bad seeds” (չար սերմանցն չար արդիւնարարություն) [89v], a reference to Matthew 7:17. The subsequent passage relates the Mamikonean plan to take advantage of the third fitna and rebel against caliphal rule, in spite of Smbat Bagratuni’s advice. The verse to which Lewond alludes here appears in the Sermon on the Mount as a warning about false prophets, and it is tempting to read this reference as a proleptic characterization of the Mamikonean rebellion as a false prophecy.

Unsurprisingly, Lewond uses scriptural citations in scenes of martyrdom. He describes those who carried out the murder of the priests of the church of Saint Grigor at the order of Muḥammad b. Marwān as the offspring of Satan, who “was a murderer from the beginning and stood not in the truth” (ի սկզբանէ մարդասպան էր և ի ճշմարտութե ան ոչ եկաց) [17r], citing John 8:44. Whereas the martyrs, says Lewond, received the “promised rest” (զխոստացեալ հանգիստ) [18r] of Matthew 11:29 and Hebrews 4, their tormentors were subjected to the evangelical torments of the “undying worm, the weeping of eyes and the gnashing of teeth” (զորդնու անվախճան զլալն աչաց. և զկրճտելու ատամանց) [18r]. The naxarark’ trapped in the church of Nashawā/Naxčawan compared themselves, before they were immolated, to the three youths in the fiery furnace of the book of Daniel [25v]. At the battle of Baghrawand/Bagrewand, the outnumbered Armenian forces invoked the Psalms and David’s song of praise immediately before their defeat and death [114r]. By contrast, Lewond reports that the opposing general, ʿĀmir, was subsequently killed by the invisible sword of God’s command, which “is more penetrating than all double-edged swords” (զքաղցր լուծ զէր երկսայրի) [125v], a reference to Hebrews 4:12. The martyrdom of Hamazasp and Sahak Arcruni under Mūsā al-Hādī is similarly embellished with scriptural references. Hamazasp and Sahak donned “the helmet of salvation” (սաղավարտով փրկութե ան) [127r] of 1 Thessalonians 5:8, and their reward for accepting death was the “greatness of glory” (զմեծութիւն փառացն) promised by Paul in 2 Corinthians 4:17. At the same time, Lewond alludes to the breaking of the “sweet yoke” (զքաղցի լուծ) of Christ in Matthew 11:30 to describe the apostasy of Hamazasp and Sahak’s brother Mehružan.

Finally, Lewond uses biblical allusions to intensify his depictions of caliphal oppression, particularly fiscal tyranny, in Armenia. When Muḥammad b. Marwān left Armenia, Lewond claims he took much booty and left the inhabitants “like a firebrand smoldering in the fire, like crushed ripe sheaves that hogs trample underfoot” (իբրև զխանձող ծխեալ ի հրոյ. և իբրև զաւրան վանակ փխրեալ զոր առ ոտն կոխեալ խոզից) [18r]. Lewond here packs together three biblical allusions to portray the terrible circumstances of the Armenians. The first, “the firebrand smoldering in the fire,” evokes Zechariah 3:2, but here the Armenians have not yet been snatched out of the fire as in the biblical text. The second, “like crushed ripe sheaves,” recalls the Lord’s punishment of Babylon in Jeremiah 51:33;
and the final part of the description ties it to the image of swine trampling pearls in Matthew 7. Lewond further compares the avariciousness of “the other ʿAbd Allāh,” that is, Mansūr, to the “net spread on Tabor” (ԛѸ Calling ՂՉ and ՇԾenneh) [95r] of Hosea 5:1, in which the prophet berates the rulers of Israel for ensnaring their people in destruction rather than protecting them. He laments that the taxation policies of the governor Yazīd b. Usayd during the reign of Mansūr drove people to hide in “caves and crevices” (հեղայս և ի փապարս) [101r], like the righteous in Hebrews 11:38 and the mighty at the opening of the sixth seal in Revelation 6:15, including the Armenian nobility who ate “from the furnace of poverty” (ի հնոցէ աղքատութեան) [101v] mentioned in Isaiah 48:10. Similarly, Lewond likens the destitution of the Armenians resulting from the policies of Hārūn al-Rashīd to the servitude of the Gibeonites in Joshua 9 [129v].

Whether these scriptural citations were already present in the sources Lewond used or whether he added them himself, they helped him shape the reception of his work. Through the evocation of biblical precedent and the fulfillment of prophecy, Lewond’s History becomes more than a retelling of the past for the purposes of antiquarian interest; instead, it underscores for his audience how to read and learn from the past by noting its patterns and giving history a coherent structure. In general, the patterning of history is a critical feature of Lewond’s text, as events appear to repeat themselves in slightly different combinations or to follow the logic of a narrative arc. We can see this, for example, in the parallelisms between the sack of Dabīl/Duin and the siege of Damascus; in those between the failed rebellions of 83/703, 132/750, and 158/775; and in Lewond’s recasting of the careers of Maslama b. ʿAbd al-Malik and Muḥammad b. Marwān so that they end in failure. In this way, Lewond’s work lives up to its description as a “teaching” (վարդապետութիւն) in the colophon, even if his lesson is not strictly religious but rather political in its message.

B.3. ARMENIAN SOURCES AND HISTORIOGRAPHY

Lewond’s History stands both within and outside of the Armenian historiographical tradition. In order to fully grasp how much Lewond was indebted to his predecessors and how much he diverged from them, it is useful to situate his work among the other histories written in Armenian between the fifth and early eleventh centuries CE. A concern with historical writing is a marked characteristic of the Armenian literary tradition, which began soon after the invention of the Armenian alphabet in 406 CE by a former member of the royal chancellery named Maštoc’. The earliest known text to have been originally composed in Armenian, Koriwn’s Life of Maštoc’ (ca. 440 CE), is technically an encomium rather than a “history,” but it nonetheless recorded the process of the invention of the alphabet and of the translation of the Bible and other religiously important texts into Armenian. The second half of the fifth and the early sixth centuries saw the composition of a series of chronologically focused histories that provide a picture of Armenian culture and society from the Christianization of the monarchy to the Armenian rebellions against the Sasanian Empire in the second half of the fifth century CE. The History attributed to the elusive Agat’angełos recounts the story of the conversion of the Arsacid king of Armenia, Trdat III/IV, to Christianity at the hands of Grigor Part’ew at the beginning of the fourth century.

For a helpful review of early Armenian historiography, see Mahé, “Entre Moïse et Mahomet.”
The textual history of the work is complicated; the version that became dominant in the Armenian tradition crystallized around 460 CE, although it was certainly based on older traditions. The *Epic Histories* or *Buzandaran* attributed to P’awstos (ca. 470 CE) continues the narrative from the descendants of Trdat to the partition of Armenia between Byzantium and the Sasanian Empire in 387 CE. The work sheds much light on Armenian society during that period and particularly on the struggle between the Arsacid monarchy and the descendants of Grigor Part’ew, who led the Church for the majority of this time.

The late fifth-century *History* of Łazar P’arpec’i concentrates on the period between 387 and 485 CE. Lazar’s narrative discusses the fall of the Armenian Arsacid monarchy, the end of Grigor Part’ew’s family’s hold on the patriarchate, and the Armenian revolts led by the Mamikonean family against the Sasanian Empire in 450–51 and 481–84 CE. The war against the Sasanians in 450–51 CE spearheaded by Vardan Mamikonean received renewed treatment by Elišē in the late fifth or early sixth century. The rebellion had been a significant military loss for the Armenian forces, as many of the rebellion’s leaders, including Vardan himself, were killed at the battle of Awarayr in May of 451 CE, while others were taken away into captivity. Elišē’s achievement was to convert this physical defeat into a spiritual victory. He accomplished his desired purpose so successfully that his account became the dominant perspective on the rebellion in the Armenian tradition and remains so to this day. His treatment of the Sasanian Empire also served as a model for the depictions of the Caliphate in fourth/tenth-century Armenian sources. Both Lazar’s and Elišē’s texts were commissioned by members of the Mamikonean family, and it is thus unsurprising that the works emphasize the role of that family in Armenia’s historical narrative.

After a hiatus in historical writing, the seventh-century *History* attributed to Sebēos addresses the 180-year period between the Armenian rebellion of the 480s CE and the first fitna that ended in 41/661. The work shows a discernible shift away from centering the Mamikonean family in Armenian affairs and toward the rising Bagratuni family. The anonymous author contextualizes Armenian history within the complex relations between the Byzantine and Sasanian empires and is the first Armenian historian to analyze the rise of Islam and the early Islamic conquests. This work immediately precedes that of Lewond, which narrates events up to about 172/788.

Lewond’s *History* fits well within the prior Armenian historiographical tradition in terms of his chronological approach, his broad geographical understanding of Armenia, and his focus on a specific period of time. Like Elišē and Lazar, he foregrounds the role of his patron’s family, the Bagratunik’, but his work is not a family history. After Lewond, the Armenian historiographical tradition took several different paths. On the one hand, Movsēs Xorenac’i’s *History*, which attempted to include Armenia within a universalist matrix from Creation until the fifth century CE, exerted an influence on many later authors, who provided summaries of the periods preceding their own focus. On the other, Yovhan Mamikonean’s *History of Tarōn* and T’ovma Arcruni’s *History of the House of the Arcrunik’* started a tradition of local or family histories.

Although Lewond was informed by earlier texts such as those of Agat’angelos and Elišē and the *Buzandaran*, from which he borrowed phraseology, the only two earlier historiographical texts with whose material his overlaps is the *History* attributed to Sebēos.

---

and the *Anonymous Chronicle* attributed to P’ilon Tirakac’i. For the critical first decades of caliphal incursions into Armenia between 9/630 and 41/661, Lewond reviews the same historical events as Sebēos does. However, it is clear that Lewond did not rely on the earlier history or on a common source, as there is a stark divergence between the two authors’ respective evaluations of Armenia’s submission to the Caliphate. According to Sebēos, in 652 ce, the prince of Armenia, T’ēodoros Ṙštuni, facing a coordinated Muslim invasion and not seeing any assistance arrive from the Byzantine Empire, decided to come to terms with the governor of Syria, Muʿāwiya. Sebēos decries this agreement as a “pact with death” (ուխտ ընդ մահու) and “an alliance with hell” (ընդ դժոխոց դաշինս). He thus depicts T’ēodoros’s submission as an act of political cowardice that betrayed Armenia’s Christian values and delivered the country to damnation. He further places the Islamic conquest of the Byzantine and Persian empires within the eschatological schema of Daniel 7. Lewond, by contrast, prefaces T’ēodoros’s decision to submit to the Caliphate with an episode highlighting Byzantine stupidity and arrogance. He also asserts explicitly that the initiative to accept the terms offered by the Caliphate came from the leadership of the Armenian Church, Catholicos Nersēs III, who garnered the support of the Armenian nobility. Furthermore, Lewond is at pains to point out that after T’ēodoros died in 654 ce, Muʿāwiya appointed Grigor Mamikonean prince of Armenia, and peace endured throughout his reign. In Lewond’s view, then, the circumstances of Armenia’s submission to the Caliphate exemplified how ecclesiastical and political coordination could result in a period of prosperity. In addition, although Lewond was apparently aware of eschatological interpretations of the caliphal expansion similar to that expressed by Sebēos, he chose not to use them as a hermeneutical lens through which to understand caliphal supremacy.

Although there are no apparent citations of Sebēos in Lewond’s *History*, there is a passage that is found nearly verbatim in the first/seventh-century *Anonymous Chronicle* most recently attributed by Greenwood to P’ilon Tirakac’i. The chronicle consists of two parts, both of which were translated from Greek and to which brief notices of Armenian interest were added. It is uncertain whether Lewond worked from the chronicle itself or accessed a source also used by the translator and compiler of the *Anonymous Chronicle*. The second part of the chronicle is arranged according to the succession of Roman emperors; its early sections until the reign of Constantine I are largely an adapted summary of Eusebius’s *Ecclesiastical History*. Subsequently, the chronicle still follows imperial chronology but presents an ecclesiastical and conciliar history from a Miaphysite perspective down to the reign of Justinian II. The episode that appears both in this chronicle and in Lewond’s work demonstrates how the confusion of the second *fitna* allowed the Armenians, the Georgians, and the Caucasian Albanians to cease paying tribute to the Caliphate. It also records the Khazar invasion and conquest of Armenia, Georgia, and Albania. Although the amount of overlapping material is not extensive, it highlights potential ways in which

26 La Porta, “Sense of an Ending,” 374–75.
27 Greenwood, “‘New Light.’”
28 See chapter I.C.2.
Łewond adapted his sources by contextualizing the reported events within an Armenian frame and placing Armenian actors in the center of the narrative.

A very different text with which Łewond also shares material but whose genre is difficult to classify is the History of the Anonymous Storyteller. The text, whose author is also known as Pseudo-Šapuh as it was first mistakenly thought to be the history of Šapuh Bagratuni, is a compilation of tales that circulated around southern Armenia in the medieval period. The history can be divided into two main parts. The first part concerns itself with the life of the Prophet Muḥammad, the reigns of the emperors Maurice and Herakleios, the coming of a piece of the True Cross to Hacʿiwn, and the exploits and repentance of the Armenian prince Vard Rštuni. The second part presents stories about events and figures in the region of Basfurrajān/Vaspurakan between the second/eighth and fourth/tenth centuries. The date of composition of this text is uncertain and the various stories included in it were likely written down at different times, but none of the events recounted in the text postdate the late fourth/tenth century. It is therefore possible that the text reached the form in which it has been transmitted in the manuscripts in the late fourth/tenth or early fifth/eleventh century. Although its chronology and dramatic flair have led some scholars to dismiss it as “confused” or “corrupted,” it is a valuable resource for understanding the development of stories among medieval Armenian audiences. Certain stories—such as those about Prince Vard Rštuni, Muḥammad b. Marwān’s campaign against China, and Tačat Anjewacʿi—are shared by Łewond and Pseudo-Šapuh, but it is not possible to posit the relationship between the two as one of simple dependence of the latter upon the former. Pseudo-Šapuh’s history contains details that do not occur in Łewond’s, and the story has clearly been filtered through narrative retellings. Nonetheless, reading Łewond against Pseudo-Šapuh allows us to catch a glimpse of how these stories were received by different audiences and often brings into relief what aspect of them Łewond chose to emphasize in his account.

Although the fourth/tenth-century historians Yovhannēs Drasxanakertcʿi and Tʿovma Arcruni do not seem to have been aware of Łewond’s History, in a few instances their testimony helps evaluate Łewond’s interpretation of events. Yovhannēs Drasxanakertcʿi was catholicos of the Armenian Church from 898 to 929 CE, and his History, completed around 923 or 924 CE, begins with the Flood and continues to his own day. The focus of the work is on the reigns of the Bagratuni kings Smbat I (r. 890–914 CE) and Ašot II (r. 914–29 CE), although the author also provides a rather detailed overview of Armenian history prior to Smbat I’s accession to the throne in 890 CE. Tʿovma Arcruni, whose History of the House of Arcrunik’ ends in 904 CE, is chiefly concerned with the deeds and antagonisms of members of the Arcruni family and with events that occurred in the region of Basfurrajān/Vaspurakan. Another work whose author was unaware of Łewond’s History but which provides useful comparative information in places is the History of Caucasian Albania attributed to Movsēs Dasxurancʿi (or Kalankatuacʿi). Although compiled in the fourth/tenth century, it contains earlier texts and is particularly informative about the Khazar raids into the south Caucasus.

---

INTRODUCTION

It is not our intention here or in our commentary to document every text that availed itself of Lewond’s work, but it may be worthwhile to mention two of them. As stated earlier, Lewond’s work first appears in the Armenian historiographical tradition with Step’anos Tarōnec’i’s *Universal History* (ca. 1005 CE), which chronicles events from Creation until 1004–5 CE over the course of three books. Step’anos relies heavily on Lewond’s text in book II, chapter 4, of his work. The seventh/thirteenth-century monastic scholar Vardan Arewelc’i also relies on Lewond’s work for those parts of his *Historical Compilation*, completed soon after 1267 CE, that address Armenia under caliphal rule in the first/seventh and second/eighth centuries. In addition to attesting to the incorporation of Lewond’s text into and its reception by the Armenian historiographical tradition, these two works were written prior to the earliest surviving manuscript of the *History* and therefore potentially preserve readings older than those of M1902.

As part of his historical narrative, Lewond uses martyrological language and biblical allusions to depict the deaths of the nobles at Nashawā/Naxčawan and the battle of Baghrawand/Bagrewand. It is uncertain whether Lewond appropriated this language for his retellings from martyrological accounts or popular views of the deaths of the nobles as martyrdoms, or whether he employed this language precisely to promote such a perception. The latter possibility seems more likely; nevertheless, the slain did not enter into the standard commemorations of martyrs. On the other hand, Lewond almost certainly reframed a martyrological account of the executions of the Arcruni brothers Sahak and Hamazasp for his own history. The martyrologies of the brothers that have survived show no reliance on Lewond’s text, but images of the pair on the facade of the third/ninth-century Church of the Holy Cross on the island of Alt‘amar designating them martyrs suggest the existence of a developed cult by that time.

B.4. ARABIC SOURCES AND HISTORIOGRAPHY

Although Lewond continues the chronological thread of his Armenian predecessors, his literary style and historiographical approach are markedly different from theirs. He proceeds chronologically, but he does not present a continuous narrative as most of the authors before him did. Instead, he provides vignettes of events that occurred during each caliphal period, which often results in a disjointed narrative that may be hard to follow as the narrative thread is repeatedly interrupted. These units, however, bear a resemblance to the reports (akhbār) of Arabic historiographical compositions of the conquest and in a few cases even repeat some of their tropes. Lewond’s methodological and stylistic departures from the previous mainstream of Armenian historiography suggest that he was tapping into non-Armenian historiographical traditions, particularly those that circulated in Arabic.

In 1856 and 1857 Chanazarian published a Classical Armenian edition and French translation of Lewond’s text under the titles *Arşawank Arabac’i Hays* (“The Incursions of the Arabs into Armenia”) and *Histoire des guerres et conquêtes des Arabes en Arménie*. Although the title seems spurious at first glance, we saw above that the fifth/eleventh-century text...
of Step’anos Tarōne’ci describes Łewond’s History as “the history of Łewond the priest, who [recorded] the emergence of the Arabs and the travails of Armenians in their tyranny” (Պատմութիւն Ղևոնդ երիցու, որ ինչ վասն Տաճկաց ելիցն և անցից Հայոց ի նոցունց բռնութենէ).\(^{32}\) The word “emergence” in Armenian, ելք, may also be translated as “openings,” which is the literal translation of the Arabic word ֆութուհ. Lewond did not explicitly say that he was writing in response to a specific genre or text in Arabic, but it is not entirely unknown for Christian authors to rewrite Arabic ֆութուհ narratives originally told from a Muslim perspective.\(^{33}\) Furthermore, even if we prefer to see Lewond’s text as fully independent of Arabic literary genres, the ֆութուհ narratives offer a productive hermeneutic for analyzing the parameters and goals of Lewond’s History.\(^{32}\)

Defining the ֆութուհ as a genre of Arabic literature is surprisingly difficult. Several studies of individual ֆութուհ narratives have concluded that the narratives under consideration do not, in fact, qualify as ֆութուհ.\(^{34}\) It thus seems easier to ascertain what fails to live up to the name of ֆութուհ than it is to define the genre with any sort of cohesiveness. This difficulty largely stems from the fluidity of the genre and its intersections with other forms of historical writing over time. A. Noth speculated that there were three stages in the development of ֆութուհ narratives: first texts on specific cities or battles, then works on specific provinces, and finally the universal collections. He noted, however, that many of the written versions of the earlier stages were put to the page around the same time as the universal ֆութուհ narratives. More recently, scholars have cast doubt on his description, preferring to identify ֆութուհ of various types as early developments.\(^{35}\) For our purposes, the variety of geographical parameters is perhaps more important than the development of the genre over time. The chronological parameters of the ֆութուհ genre fluctuate as much as its geographical limits do. The most famous ֆութուհ works, such as Balādhurī’s Կիտաբ ֆութուհ Ալ-Բուլդան and Ibn A’t’ham’s Կիտաբ Ալ-Ֆութուհ, extend up to the authors’ own lifetimes in the early ‘Abbāsid period. Such a frame effectively projects the conquests as an ongoing process that played out continuously across the Caliphate. Lewond’s History is most comparable to the universal ֆութուհ narratives. Despite its focus on Armenia, Lewond expends significant effort chronicling events in regions outside the province. He also describes the conquests as ongoing, including those in Armenia, on the Khazar front, and against the Roman Empire even up to the reign of Hārūn al-Rashīd.

The goals of the ֆութուհ narratives differ as much as the forms, but F. Donner has identified several rationales that underpin the genre. He notes, first, that ֆութուհ narratives justify Islamic rule over non-Muslims, frequently with reference to the will of God or a divine plan. In describing the specifics of the conquests, these texts lay out how and why communities should exist in relation to one another. Donner further explains that such accounts offer...
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an explanation for the prominence of certain people or families who participated in the
conquests. Additionally, the futūḥ works elucidate administrative norms in the provinces
of the Caliphate, offering a sense of antiquity for later ʿAbbāsid policies. Futūḥ narratives
thus purport to preserve peace treaties, to record the collection of taxes, and to attest to the
establishment of Muslim presence in cities. These themes are directly relevant to Lewond’s
History, which is largely concerned with how and why the Caliphate ruled Armenia. He
frequently refers to the written oaths or treaties between caliphal governors and the Arme-
nians. He tracks the changes in caliphal taxation and in the garrisons of caliphal forces. In
particular, he celebrates and justifies Bagratuni dominance while describing how the family
fought in tandem with caliphal forces against the Khazars to earn its position.

The structure of futūḥ narratives, like their form and goals, was not uniform. However,
some generalizations can be made. First, the futūḥ typically contain stand-alone reports,
occaisionally with chains of transmission. Second, their authors frequently employ poems,
select Qur’ānic verses, conversations, and/or letters to underscore the valor of the main
actors. Third, the narratives are organized chronologically. The obvious exception to this
last general rule is Balādhurī’s history, which frequently stands as the exemplar on which
we judge the futūḥ genre as a whole: Balādhurī’s text is organized first by province, then
by region or city, and only then chronologically within each locale. Again, these structural
considerations are useful in approaching Lewond’s text. The vignettes that seem to be
disjointed from the perspective of Armenian historiography, as noted above, fit comfort-
ably into the context of the stand-alone reports of Arabic historical writing, where the
placement of specific reports was often just as telling as their content. Further, Lewond’s
use of biblical texts and his inclusion of correspondence (between ʿUmar b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz
and Leo the Isaurian, as well as between Maslama b. ʿAbd al-Malik and Leo) align with the
expectations of both Arabic and Armenian historical writing.

Finally, the register of the futūḥ narratives depends largely on the specific author
and, at times, the process of redaction. So, for example, Ibn Aʿtham’s conquest narrative
reads much like any other historical text in Arabic, comparable to the works of Tabarī
and Yaʿqūbī despite his inclusion of legendary motifs. However, Pseudo-Wāqidī threads
popular stories about legendary warriors through his account of the conquests of Syria,
Mesopotamia, and Armenia. Some futūḥ narratives incorporate epic themes to such an
extent that they have been tagged “offshoot veins—perhaps venules—from the bloodstream
of Homeric epic,” while others have been called dry bureaucratic manuals with “little room
for fantasy or miracle.” Given the range of possibilities for presenting the futūḥ, “register”
does not seem a stable enough category to apply to the analysis of Lewond’s text. How-
ever, it is worth noting that many of the futūḥ narratives reflect the oral transmission of
the stories, suggesting that their content was particularly popular in storytelling circles.

36 Donner, Narratives, 177. Donner offers a third rationale, too: exhortation to holy war. Assessing this
goal in relation to Lewond requires further study.
37 Ahmed Asif, Book of Conquest, 63.
38 Long, “Futūḥ İfrāğiya,” 135. For other accounts of the epic nature of the futūḥ, see Paret, “Die leg-
endäre Futūḥ-Literatur”; Khalidi, Arabic Historical Thought, 67. For Armenian material, in particular, see
Ter-Łewondyan, “Alǰik Taroni zruyc’ə.”
39 Khalidi, Arabic Historical Thought, 68.
Some elements of Lewond’s *History*, such as Muḥammad b. Marwān’s campaign against China, therefore allow for a productive comparison.

Lewond’s *History* should be analyzed as a *futūḥ* narrative even though it does not fit into the genre neatly. The genre is plastic and diverse, so even the various texts explicitly labeled *futūḥ* frequently do not fit set patterns. However, we might harness the flexibility of the genre to our own advantage. Considering Lewond’s *History* as a *futūḥ* narrative makes sense of some of his editorial choices—including the parameters, goals, structure, and register—which were taken in dialogue with other ‘Abbāsid-era texts. Such a hermeneutic does not imply that we should deny the specificities of Armenian historical writing. Instead, we should accept that histories in Armenian intersected with non-Armenian historiography in interesting ways. Above, we noted that the most prominent theme in Lewond’s *History* is conflict. Instead of concluding that Lewond recorded the ongoing struggles of Armenians against the Caliphate—which, in fact, constitute a relatively small proportion of the contention described in his text—we might speculate about the value of such stories as prescriptive guides, just like in the *futūḥ*. The *futūḥ* are concerned with political and religious legitimation, and this agenda aligns well with Lewond’s interest in caliphal control and Bagratuni ascendance within the caliphal system. Lewond explains why caliphal administration worked the way it did and how the Armenian *naxarark* found a place as active participants in the expansion of the Caliphate.

Lewond’s connection to Arabic historical writing lies not merely in the work’s similarity to the *futūḥ* as a genre. At several points in his *History*, we also find indications of familiarity with Arabic. Lewond attributes the account of the capture of Dabīl/Duin to the caliphal governor ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz al-Bāhilī: “He is said to have related this about himself with his own mouth” (قَالَ لَهُ قَالَ خَلَفَهُ وَقَالَ مَنِئَكَ قَالَ مَا رَأْئَاهُ [28r]). Of course, ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz was quite old when he became governor during the caliphate of Walīd b. ʿAbd al-Malik (r. 86–96/705–15), at least seventy-five years before Lewond wrote his *History*. Lewond must thus be quoting the report from his source, rather than directly from the governor. Nevertheless, the details of the report suggest that stories about the conquests circulated orally between Arabs and Armenians, because Lewond deploys literary tropes in this passage that are very common in Arabic *futūḥ* narratives. Lewond later attests that he heard about the battle of Baghrawand/Bagrewand from members of the caliphal army: “As we heard from the very enemy himself” (وَكَانَ لَهُمُ الْفَتْحُ وَكَانَ لَهُمُ الْفَتْحُ وَكَانَ لَهُمُ الْفَتْحُ وَكَانَ لَهُمُ الْفَتْحُ وَكَانَ لَهُمُ الْفَتْحُ [114v]). In some places, Lewond translates phrases or passages that reflect familiarity with Arabic. For example, he describes troops “from the regiment of the house of Khorasan” (يَتَوبُوْنَ يَتَوبُوْنَ يَتَوبُوْنَ يَتَوبُوْنَ [109v], which renders the common phrase “from the people of Khurāsān” (مِنْ أَهْلِ خُرَاسَانِ) used to refer to the ‘Abbāsid army. Lewond also employs phrases that find close parallels in Arabic *futūḥ* narratives; see, for example, his wording about the “fifth” of the spoils sent back to the caliph [84r].

The closest parallel for Lewond’s text is undeniably the fourth/tenth-century conquest narrative of Ibn Aʿtham al-Kūfī. Among the Arabic sources Ibn Aʿtham offers the most
in-depth account of the battle of Vardanakert as well as of the subsequent battle between Muhammad b. Marwān and the Roman forces and of the fires of Nashawā/Naxčawan. Although none of these passages are found verbatim in Lewond, they are quite similar. Ibn Aʿtham is also the only early ʿAbbāsid Arabic writer to record the specific details of the flight of Maslama b. ʿAbd al-Malik from the Khazars in line with Lewond’s version. Both Lewond and Ibn Aʿtham side with Saʿīd al-Ḥarashī in his dispute with Maslama b. ʿAbd al-Malik and express their concerns about Saʿīd’s “family” (uqquunnu; عشيرة), whereas other Arabic sources, such as Yaʿqūbī, paint Maslama in a much more favorable light. Lewond’s and Ibn Aʿtham’s presentations of Maslama b. ʿAbd al-Malik’s campaign against Constantinople are mirror images of each other; Lewond’s deheroization of Maslama and Ibn Aʿtham’s heroization narrative seem to riff off each other.41 Lewond’s references to the “fifth” of the spoils taken from the Khazars replicate the formula common in Ibn Aʿtham’s account of the conquests. Ibn Aʿtham and Lewond both describe the marriage between the caliphal governor Yazīd b. Usayd and the Khazar khatun with similar details, whereas other Arabic texts, such as those of Tabarī and Azdī, abridge the story and replace the groom with Faḍl b. Yahyā al-Barmakī. Ibn Aʿtham is the only Arabic source to offer a description of the battle of Baghrawand/Bagrewand, and his account forces a reevaluation of Lewond’s version of events. In short, Lewond’s History must be read with close consideration to Ibn Aʿtham’s text. Most of the passages relevant to both Ibn Aʿtham and Lewond relate to military affairs, particularly the wars with the Khazars. As a result, it seems very possible that the texts were related through storytelling along the frontier, given the Armenian involvement in the caliphal campaigns against the Khazars. This would make sense of the above-quoted statement: “As we heard from the very enemy himself.”

The relationship between Ibn Aʿtham and Lewond seems to point to the existence of a broader circle of loosely affiliated texts. Some of the passages noted above appear nearly verbatim in the fourth/tenth-century Persian history of Balʿamī. So, for example, the argument between Saʿīd al-Ḥarashī and Maslama b. ʿAbd al-Malik appears in Persian translation, though Balʿamī passes over some of the other episodes, such as the battle of Baghrawand/Bagrewand, in silence. The current state of scholarship on Ibn Aʿtham and Balʿamī does not permit extensive conclusions about their interrelation with Lewond’s text, as it seems quite possible that the copyist of Balʿamī’s history may have had access to Ibn Aʿtham’s work. Although Balʿamī wrote in the fourth/tenth century, the earliest extant manuscript dates to the seventh/thirteenth century, leaving adequate time for additions to be inserted into the text.42 Nevertheless, as scholars continue to work on the many manuscripts of both Ibn Aʿtham’s and Balʿamī’s texts, it may be possible to extend the brief observations in this volume. Perhaps more intriguing still is the fact that where the details provided by Ibn Aʿtham and Lewond align, Balādhurī frequently has a much-abridged comment. We might think of the information in Ibn Aʿtham, Lewond, Balʿamī, and Balādhurī as a Venn diagram, with overlap between the respective circles even though the four texts

41 See the commentary, which builds on Borrut, Entre mémoire et pouvoir.
42 On the manuscripts of Balʿamī, see appendix III in Peacock, Mediaeval Islamic Historiography, and Daniel, “Manuscripts and Editions.” The authors would like to thank A. Peacock for bringing up this possibility in a private email.
are very different in content and goals. Other historians—particularly Yaʿqūbī and Khalīfa b. Khayyāṭ—intermittently provide useful information to read against Lewond’s text. By contrast, some of the more commonly cited Arabic histories—notably, those of Ṭabarī and Masʿūdī—help surprisingly little.

Lewond’s connection to caliphal historiography is evident not only in the links between his work and Arabic and Persian texts but also in the organization of his narrative according to the succession of caliphs. Lewond may have relied on an Arabic list of caliphs for this information. He uses formulaic phrases to announce the death of a caliph, the accession of a new caliph, and the length of the latter’s reign (table 1). These formulae are not usual in Armenian sources. In fact, the changes in the formulae introducing and concluding each caliphal reign may suggest that Lewond or his source may have cobbled together multiple lists. Lewond here finds common ground with histories written in Syriac, Latin, and Arabic between the second/eighth and fourth/tenth centuries.

Table 1. Beginning and ending formulae in Lewond’s list of caliphs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Caliph</th>
<th>Beginning formulae</th>
<th>Ending formulae</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rightly guided caliphs</td>
<td>“After that, Abū Bakr, ʿUmar, and ʿUthmān succeeded to Muḥammad’s authority for thirty-eight years.”</td>
<td>“Having completed those evils, the Ishmaelite princes Abū Bakr, ʿUmar, and ʿUthmān, and ʿUmar each died.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muʿāwiya b. Abī Sufyān</td>
<td>“Then after them, a certain Muʿāwiya reigned for nineteen years and four months, then he died.”</td>
<td>(continued)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yazīd b. Muʿāwiya</td>
<td>“And after him, [there was] Yazīd b. Muʿāwiya; and he lived for two years and five months, then he died.”</td>
<td>“After ‘Abd al-Malik held power in this manner, he died.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʿAbd al-Malik b. Marwān</td>
<td>“After him, there was ʿAbd al-Malik b. Marwān. He lived for twenty-one years, then he died. These [are] his deeds.”</td>
<td>“He lived for ten years and eight months, then he died.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

43 Greenwood, “Reassessment,” 121–33.
44 The closest comparison is T’ovma Arcruni’s fourth/tenth-century History, which lists the names of the caliphs and the lengths of their reigns.
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Table 1. Beginning and ending formulae in Lewond’s list of caliphs (continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Caliph</th>
<th>Beginning formulae</th>
<th>Ending formulae</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sulaymān b. ‘Abd al-Malik</td>
<td>“After him, Sulaymān reigned for two years and eight months, then he died. These [are] his deeds.” (ībādāt al-ṣulūḥ wa-l-ma’ālik wa-l-ma’ālik ʿalā yuḥāndun)</td>
<td>“Having completed all of this, Sulaymān died.” (ībādāt al-ṣulūḥ wa-l-ma’ālik wa-l-ma’ālik ʿalā yuḥāndun)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Umar b. ‘Abd al-ʿAzīz</td>
<td>“After him, ‘Umar reigned for two years and five months, then he died.” (ībādāt al-ṣulūḥ wa-l-ma’ālik wa-l-ma’ālik ʿalā yuḥāndun)</td>
<td>“And after all of that, he died.” (ībādāt al-ṣulūḥ wa-l-ma’ālik wa-l-ma’ālik ʿalā yuḥāndun)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yazīd b. ‘Abd al-Malik</td>
<td>“Then after him, a certain Yazīd ruled for six years.” (ībādāt al-ṣulūḥ wa-l-ma’ālik wa-l-ma’ālik ʿalā yuḥāndun)</td>
<td>“After nineteen years, Hishām died.” (ībādāt al-ṣulūḥ wa-l-ma’ālik wa-l-ma’ālik ʿalā yuḥāndun)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hishām b. ‘Abd al-Malik</td>
<td>“Shem, who is Hishām, succeeded him and ruled for nineteen years.” (ībādāt al-ṣulūḥ wa-l-ma’ālik wa-l-ma’ālik ʿalā yuḥāndun)</td>
<td>“He committed all of these evils—the disturbances of wars, the capture of cities, and the shedding of blood—in six years, then he died.” (ībādāt al-ṣulūḥ wa-l-ma’ālik wa-l-ma’ālik ʿalā yuḥāndun)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walīd b. Yazīd</td>
<td>“His successor Walīd ruled for a year and a half.” (ībādāt al-ṣulūḥ wa-l-ma’ālik wa-l-ma’ālik ʿalā yuḥāndun)</td>
<td>“He committed all of these evils—the disturbances of wars, the capture of cities, and the shedding of blood—in six years, then he died.” (ībādāt al-ṣulūḥ wa-l-ma’ālik wa-l-ma’ālik ʿalā yuḥāndun)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marwān b. Muhammad</td>
<td>“He himself held power for six years.” (ībādāt al-ṣulūḥ wa-l-ma’ālik wa-l-ma’ālik ʿalā yuḥāndun)</td>
<td>“He committed all of these evils—the disturbances of wars, the capture of cities, and the shedding of blood—in six years, then he died.” (ībādāt al-ṣulūḥ wa-l-ma’ālik wa-l-ma’ālik ʿalā yuḥāndun)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Abd Allāh al-Saffāḥ</td>
<td>“And ‘Abd Allāh ruled in his place . . .” (ībādāt al-ṣulūḥ wa-l-ma’ālik wa-l-ma’ālik ʿalā yuḥāndun)</td>
<td>“After ‘Abd Allāh completed the third year of his reign, he died.” (ībādāt al-ṣulūḥ wa-l-ma’ālik wa-l-ma’ālik ʿalā yuḥāndun)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Abd Allāh al-Manṣūr</td>
<td>“And his brother, the other ‘Abd Allāh, took over his authority for twenty-two years.” (ībādāt al-ṣulūḥ wa-l-ma’ālik wa-l-ma’ālik ʿalā yuḥāndun)</td>
<td>“Muhammad reigned for eight years and, on the arrival of Rawḥ, he died.” (ībādāt al-ṣulūḥ wa-l-ma’ālik wa-l-ma’ālik ʿalā yuḥāndun)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muḥammad al-Mahdī</td>
<td>“And after this, his son Muḥammad al-Mahdī succeeded to his kingdom.” (ībādāt al-ṣulūḥ wa-l-ma’ālik wa-l-ma’ālik ʿalā yuḥāndun)</td>
<td>“Muhammad reigned for eight years and, on the arrival of Rawḥ, he died.” (ībādāt al-ṣulūḥ wa-l-ma’ālik wa-l-ma’ālik ʿalā yuḥāndun)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mūsā al-Hādī</td>
<td>“Then after him, Mūsā succeeded his father for a year.” (ībādāt al-ṣulūḥ wa-l-ma’ālik wa-l-ma’ālik ʿalā yuḥāndun)</td>
<td>“Mūsā reigned for one year and died . . .” (ībādāt al-ṣulūḥ wa-l-ma’ālik wa-l-ma’ālik ʿalā yuḥāndun)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hārūn al-Rashīd</td>
<td>“After him, there was Hārūn the son of Muḥammad and brother of Mūsā.” (ībādāt al-ṣulūḥ wa-l-ma’ālik wa-l-ma’ālik ʿalā yuḥāndun)</td>
<td>“Having completed all of these evils, he died after a year.” (ībādāt al-ṣulūḥ wa-l-ma’ālik wa-l-ma’ālik ʿalā yuḥāndun)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

45 Մսլիման թերակղզությունն Սուլեման ամս. երկուս և ամիսս. ութ և վախճանի. և պուտ վախճանի. և պատ վախճանի. [31v]

46 Մսլիման թերակղզությունն Սուլեման ամս. երկուս և ամիսս. ութ և վախճանի. և պուտ վախճանի. և պատ վախճանի. [31v]
Since the lists of caliphs circulated in multiple languages, it is not possible to ascertain the provenance of Lewond’s information with any certainty. A comparison of the length of each reign in such lists reveals that Lewond’s does not align completely with any other extant list (table 2). The inclusion of a list of caliphs is a common feature of Syriac texts composed in the Umayyad heartlands and of Latin histories from Umayyad Andalus, which suggests an underlying layer of second/eighth-century historiography that likely derives from the caliphal court. Lewond’s reliance on such a source supports the broader argument that Christian sources can serve as an “echo of lost Islamic historiography,” preserving snippets about the Umayyad period that were efficaciously edited out of the Arabic-Islamic texts of the ‘Abbāsid age. Some details in Lewond’s text indeed suggest an Umayyad provenance for his information. For example, Lewond omits any mention at all of ‘Āli b. Abī Ṭālib, the son-in-law and cousin of the Prophet Muḥammad, who famously clashed with the Umayyad governor of Syria (and later caliph) Mu‘āwiya b. Abī Sufyān at the battle of Siffin in 37/657. The omission of ‘Āli is a feature of all of the caliphal lists and seems to reflect pro-Umayyad tendencies, as it bypasses the question of Umayyad mistreatment of the Prophet’s family. Lewond follows this trend further by ignoring the ‘Alids entirely; his sole comment about the reign of Yazīd b. Mu‘āwiya is a brief note about tribute, with no mention of his role in the murder of the Prophet’s grandson Ḥusayn b. ‘Āli. Since Lewond wrote in the early ‘Abbāsid period, it is difficult to untangle Umayyad subtexts from ‘Abbāsid perspectives. For example, Lewond’s elevation of Sulaymān b. Hishām, whose mother belonged to the Umayyad family, as the primary leader during the third fitna may reflect unease with concubine-born caliphs, but this preoccupation does not fit the ‘Abbāsid period, when most caliphs were born of concubines. However, the concerns of the Umayyad period were not blotted out of ‘Abbāsid historiography writ large, and such Umayyad survivals continued to circulate in the decades after the fall of the dynasty.

Even if it conveyed Umayyad concerns, Lewond’s caliphal list was updated in the ‘Abbāsid period to include later caliphs and to conform to the historiographical norms of the time. As Greenwood has pointed out, Lewond’s list may have included brief character notes for some of the caliphs. This possibility is best illustrated in the description of the Umayyad caliph Walīd b. Yazīd. Lewond notes the length of his reign and then asserts that “he was a robust man with great strength and took part in athletic wrestling” (նա էր այր պնդակազմ ուժով զաւրութե ան և վարէր ըմբշական մենամարտութ եամ բ). After describing Walīd’s attempts to test himself against “bravery of great strength” (զարիութի զաւրութե ուժոյ), Lewond’s account takes a sharp turn to denigrate the caliph for his despicable behavior. The dramatic change in tone suggests the seam between the caliphal list and Lewond’s other source on Walīd’s caliphate. Walīd is not the only caliph to receive

46 For the caliphal lists dated to 705, 724, and 775 ce, see Palmer, Seventh Century. For the two Latin chronicles, see “Chronicle of 741”; “Chronicle of 754,” ed. Wolf; and “Chronicle of 754,” ed. Mommsen. For the Syriac Chronicle of 846, see Brooks, “Syriac Chronicle.”
47 Borrut, Entre mémoire et pouvoir, 230; “Vanishing Syria.”
48 Borrut, Entre mémoire et pouvoir, 151 and 159; Constable, “Perceptions,” 110 and 124.
49 The omission of the battle of Karbalāʾ is perhaps not that surprising, given the lack of attention it received in early sources writ large; see Borrut, “Remembering Karbalāʾ.”
50 Greenwood, “Reassessment,” 123.
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Table 2. Lengths of caliphal reigns in second/eighth- and third/ninth-century lists of caliphs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lewond</th>
<th>List of caliphs, 705 CE</th>
<th>List of caliphs, 724 CE</th>
<th>Chronicle of 741</th>
<th>Chronicle of 754</th>
<th>List of caliphs, 775 CE</th>
<th>Chronicle of 846</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prophet Muhammad</td>
<td>20 y</td>
<td>7 y</td>
<td>10 y</td>
<td>10 y</td>
<td>10 y</td>
<td>10 y</td>
<td>skipped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abū Bakr</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2 y</td>
<td>2 y 6 m</td>
<td>almost 3 y</td>
<td>3 y</td>
<td>1 y</td>
<td>skipped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>12 y</td>
<td>10 y 3 m</td>
<td>10 y</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>12 y</td>
<td>skipped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Uthmān b. 'Affān</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>12 y</td>
<td>12 y</td>
<td>12 y</td>
<td>12 y</td>
<td>12 y</td>
<td>skipped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Ali b. Abī Ṭālib</td>
<td>skipped</td>
<td>skipped</td>
<td>skipped</td>
<td>skipped</td>
<td>skipped</td>
<td>skipped</td>
<td>skipped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muʿāwiya b. Abī Sufyān</td>
<td>19 y 4 m</td>
<td>20 y</td>
<td>19 y 2 m</td>
<td>20 y</td>
<td>20 y</td>
<td>9 m</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yazīd b. Muʿāwiya</td>
<td>2 y 5 m</td>
<td>3.5 y</td>
<td>3 y 8 m</td>
<td>3 y</td>
<td>3 y</td>
<td>3 y</td>
<td>3 y 6 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muʿāwiya b. Yazīd</td>
<td>skipped</td>
<td>skipped</td>
<td>skipped</td>
<td>0.5 y</td>
<td>0.5 y</td>
<td>skipped</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marwān b. al-Ḥakam</td>
<td>skipped</td>
<td>skipped</td>
<td>9 m</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>9 m</td>
<td>1.5 y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Abd al-Malik b. Marwān</td>
<td>21 y</td>
<td>21 y</td>
<td>21 y 1 m</td>
<td>20 y</td>
<td>20 y</td>
<td>21 y</td>
<td>21 y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walīd b. 'Abd al-Malik</td>
<td>10 y 8 m</td>
<td>9 y 8 m</td>
<td>9 y</td>
<td>9 y</td>
<td>9 y</td>
<td>9 y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulaymān b. 'Abd al-Malik</td>
<td>2 y 8 m</td>
<td>2 y 9 m</td>
<td>3 y</td>
<td>3 y</td>
<td>2 y 7 m</td>
<td>2.5 y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Umar b. 'Abd al-ʿAzīz</td>
<td>2 y 5 m</td>
<td>2 y 5 m</td>
<td>3 y</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2 y 7 m</td>
<td>2 y 7 m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yazīd b. 'Abd al-Malik</td>
<td>6 y</td>
<td>4 y 1 m 2 d</td>
<td>3 y</td>
<td>4 y</td>
<td>4 y 10 m</td>
<td>4 y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hishām b. 'Abd al-Malik</td>
<td>19 y</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>19 y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walīd b. Yazīd</td>
<td>1.5 y</td>
<td>1 y 9 m</td>
<td>1.5 y</td>
<td>skipped</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yazīd b. Walīd</td>
<td>skipped</td>
<td>skipped</td>
<td>skipped</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibrāhīm b. Walīd</td>
<td>skipped</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marwān b. Muḥammad</td>
<td>6 y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Abd Allāh al-Saffāḥ</td>
<td>3 y</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abū Jaʿfar al-Mansūr</td>
<td>22 y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23 y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muḥammad al-Mahdi</td>
<td>8 y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8 y 9 m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mūsā al-Hādī</td>
<td>1 y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: y = year(s); m = month(s); d = day(s); "n/a" signals that the caliph is included in the list, but the length of his reign is not specified. "Skipped" indicates that the caliph was not included in the list at all.

51 Abū Bakr, 'Umar, and 'Uthmān are all included in Łewond’s narrative, but he groups them together and offers twenty-eight years for their reigns combined.
a brief character description before the account of his reign; see table 3 for Łewond’s comments on several caliphs.

Although Syriac and Latin histories may preserve the tenor of Umayyad historical writing, such character notes are not common in the extant caliphal lists or other sources dependent on them. Instead, they resemble ’Abbāsid-era deployment of caliphal lists. So, for example, Masʿūdī’s fourth/tenth-century history offers the closest comparison to Łewond’s structure:

**An Account of the Reign of Walīd b. ʿAbd al-Malik**

Walīd b. ʿAbd al-Malik received the oath in Damascus on the day that ʿAbd al-Malik died. Walīd died in Damascus, halfway through Jumādā II in the year 96. His reign lasted nine years, eight months, and two nights. He died when he was forty-four years old. His patronymic was Abū al-ʿAbbās.

**A Brief Account of His Deeds and His Life, and What Ḥajjāj Did during His Reign**

Walīd was an obstinate, iniquitous, unjust tyrant . . .

INTRODUCTION

Each time Masʿūdī introduces a new caliph, he mentions the length of his reign and provides a brief character assessment before enumerating the events of his reign. The information is filled out with more detail here than it is in Lewond, covering the date of the caliph’s death and numerous other details. However, the phrase “a brief account of his deeds and his life” (ذكر لمع من اخباره وسيرة) is a useful comparand for Lewond’s ւարքնալում է. As noted earlier, Masʿūdī rarely preserves information that matches Lewond’s text. Despite the similarity of the two texts in form, none of the regnal lengths or character descriptions that Masʿūdī provides align with those in the Armenian work. Although no direct link exists between Masʿūdī and Lewond, we might suggest that Lewond’s formulae derive from ʿAbbāsid-era reworkings of caliphal lists. However, a definitive understanding of how Umayyad information filtered into ʿAbbāsid historical writing continues to elude us, as does the answer to the question whether Lewond’s caliphal list derived from a Syriac or an Arabic exemplar.

Aside from the possibility that Lewond may have had access to a list of caliphs in Syriac, little evidence connects Lewond to Syriac texts. Lewond employs the Syriac word zuze twice in reference to neck-sealing practices, which are described in Syriac sources as well. However, one such reference is found in a passage with Grecisms, as well as a single-sentence snippet that appears in the Apocalypse of Pseudo-Methodius (also potentially from either Greek or Syriac). Such spotty evidence suggests that individual words may have circulated between Syriac and Armenian at the time that Lewond was writing. The wholesale transmission of accounts from Syriac sources to Lewond is unlikely, particularly given how rarely his text corresponds with the Chronicle of Zuqnin despite the relative proximity of the two works in terms of both place and year of production. Although the Chronicle of Zuqnin occasionally preserves interesting details to compare to Lewond’s narrative, the only time it is particularly useful in elucidating an episode in the Armenian text is in connection with the Roman incursion into Armenia during the third fitna, when the Romans relied on Christian troops from Jazīra.

B.5. GREEK SOURCES AND HISTORIOGRAPHY

Lewond’s previously noted ambivalence toward the Roman Empire is reflected in the absence of detectable overlap between his work and surviving Greek historiographical works. Lewond’s use of certain Greek expressions and words raises the possibility that he did have recourse to a Greek source or sources. For example, the titles “divinely crowned” (աստուածաբարձատ) and “pious” (բարէպաշտ) that he ascribes to the emperor Herakleios suggest familiarity with imperial titulature. The eschatological inscription supposedly left by Emperor Marcian in Darband similarly uses “autocrat,” ինքնակալ, the Armenian calque on αὐτοκράτωρ, as well as the Armenian word “emperor,” կայսր, derived from “caesar,” and the Grecism “talent,” տաղանդ, from τάλαντον. Lewond also records the movement of Maslama’s troops across the Anatolian interior, identifying the region as mesogaion and then correctly translating it as “midlands” և. During the reign of ʿAbd Allāh al-Saffāḥ, he refers to the future caliph Maṣūr as “the other ʿAbd Allāh” (միւսաբդլա) to distinguish him from Saffāḥ and ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAli, an expression also used

53 See Commentary XII.C; Robinson, “Neck-Sealing.”
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by Theophanes (τοῦ ἄλλου Ἀβδελᾶ). Lewond’s account of the caliphate of Mansūr contains even more vocabulary of Greek provenance. He calls the city of Qālīqalā/Karin by its Greek name, Theodosiopolis; he labels the Georgians Veṙia, confusing the Armenian rendition of the Greek toponym Ἰβηρία with the ethnonym for the Georgians; and he employs two loanwords from Greek ecclesiastical terminology, Armenian words that derive from Greek, and a Greek title. Finally, Lewond’s portrayal of Tačat Anjewac’i’s death evokes the name of the pagan god Hephaestus and other associations with volcanoes in Greek, and it uses the Armenian rendering of the Greek term “Caspian Gates” to refer to the pass at Bāb al-Abwāb/Darband [123r].

There are also three instances, outside of the ‘Umar-Leo correspondence, where Lewond’s biblical citations show greater conformity to the Septuagint than to the Zohrab edition of the Armenian Bible (henceforth, Zohrab), which is the standard edition of the Armenian biblical text. Lewond’s citation of Amos 1:1–3 [86v] has two lexical variants that may be informed by the Septuagint. Instead of “over three acts of iniquity” (ի վերայ երից անաւրէնութեանցն), Lewond’s text reads, “over three acts of impiety” (ի վերայ երից ամբարշտութեանցն), which is closer to the Septuagint: ἐπὶ ταῖς τριςὶν ἁμαρτίαις. Similarly, instead of “I will take captive the people Syria” (գերեցի ժողովուրդն Ասորոց), Lewond’s text has “I will take captive the chosen people of Syria” (գերեցի ընդիր ժողովուրդն Ասորոց), which seems to reflect the reading of the Septuagint, αἰχμαλωτευθήσεται λαὸς Συρίας ἐπίκλητος. On the other hand, his quote has two variants that do not find any support in the Septuagint. Instead of “they cut” (կտրէին), Lewond has “they cleaved,” (հերձուին), while the Septuagint reads “they sawed,” ἔπριζον; and instead of “I will destroy the tribe out of the men of Ḥarrān” (կետերեցից զազգն յարանց Խառանու), Lewond’s text reads, “I will destroy the entire tribe out of the men of Ḥarrān” (կոտորեցից զազգն ամենայն յարանց Խառանա), a reading not attested in the Septuagint.

The second instance is his reference to Hosea 5:1, “like a net spread on Tabor” (իբրեւ զվարմ ձգեալ ի Տամբիոն) [95r], when commenting upon the military reach of Mansūr during the reign of ‘Abd Allāh al-Saffāḥ. The wording here again reflects the Septuagint, ὡς δίκτυον ἐκτεταμένον ἐπὶ τὸ ᾿Ιταβύριον. By contrast, Zohrab does not include the name Tabor but reads “on top of a high place” (ի գլուխ գահաւանդ). Lewond’s reading of “Tabor,” while slightly garbled, also preserves the case ending -ion of the Greek.

Finally, the beginning of his citation of 2 Corinthians 4:17 [127r] seems to have been influenced by the Greek New Testament. Lewond’s text reads, “for the increase at present of our light affliction” (զի առժամայն յաճախութիւն թեթեւ նեղութեանս մերոյ ի յաւիտենական առաւելութիւն), and better aligns with that of the Septuagint, τὸ γὰρ παραυτίκα ἐλαφρὸν τῆς θλίψεως ἡμῶν καθ᾿ ὑπερβολὴν. The instrumental of the Septuagint may not represent a scribal error but reflect the reading καθ´ ύπερβολήν of the Greek New Testament.

54 See Commentary XIII.G.
In this last instance, the citation occurs within the martyrdom of Hamazasp and Sahak Arcruni, and Lewond most certainly did not rely on a Greek source but had access to an Armenian martyrology of the brothers. In fact, in these three cases, Lewond or his source may have relied on a version of the Armenian Bible that was closer to the Septuagint and Greek New Testament than Zohrab is, rather than directly on the Greek Bible itself.\textsuperscript{55}

In general, the limited and sporadic nature of these lexical overlaps makes it difficult to determine whether Lewond accessed Greek sources to obtain this information or whether it stemmed from Armenian sources that had integrated Greek vocabulary or had been composed in a Greek cultural milieu. Indeed, the number of times Lewond’s chronology and narrative differ from those of the surviving Greek historiographical tradition is remarkable, and his references to Greek actors are typically vague. One notable exception to this trend, however, is Lewond’s account of the siege of Constantinople by the general Maslama.\textsuperscript{56} Although there is nothing in Lewond’s language or in his biblical citations to positively point to his reliance upon a Greek text, it is possible that he availed himself of a source that incorporated imperial propaganda from Leo III’s reign.\textsuperscript{57} Moreover, given his previously noted earlier praise of the iconoclast emperor Constantine V as “the pious king” (արքայ բարէպաշտ) [96v] and his attribution of the salvation of Constantinople from caliphal attack to the power of the Cross rather than to the icon of the Virgin Mary, Lewond may have had access to a now-lost work of iconoclastic imperial historiography. Nonetheless, the only clear case of Lewond’s use of a Greek text is his inclusion of the correspondence between ʿUmar and Leo, which was likely known to Lewond in its Armenian version. We outline our arguments for the correspondence’s Greek origin in the commentary to chapter VII.

C. THE MANUSCRIPT

This edition and translation are based on the oldest surviving copy of Lewond’s History, contained within manuscript 1902 of the Matenadaran, the Mesrop Mashtots Institute of Ancient Manuscripts, located in Erevan, Armenia (M1902). The manuscript itself informs some arguments in the commentary and so deserves a general introduction here.

C.1. DESCRIPTION OF MATENADARAN 1902

M1902 is a miscellany written on paper, copied between 1274 and 1311 CE at the monastery of Yovhannavank. It contains 315 folios with dimensions of 24.4 × 16.4 cm. Each page contains nineteen or twenty lines of writing\textsuperscript{58} in a single column 19.5 × 11.5 cm in size. Folios 1–3r and 310v–315 are blank. The first two quires of the manuscript have suffered damage and contain only ten folios altogether. The first full quire is the third. With some

\textsuperscript{55} For another possible example, see La Porta, “Persistence,” 274–75.

\textsuperscript{56} See chapter IX.

\textsuperscript{57} See Commentary IX.E.4 for parallels with the correspondence between Emperor Herakleios and Shāh K̄osrow II in the History attributed to Sebēos.

\textsuperscript{58} Folios 214r–217r contain between twenty-six and thirty lines of writing.
exceptions, quires 3 through 27 contain twelve folios each. The final quire contains six folios. Folios 1r–3v, 8r–10v, and 310r–315v were added during repairs in 1664; folios 4–5 have been affected by moisture. The principal scribe was named Sargis, and the patron of the manuscript was the abbot of the monastery, Hamazasp Mamikonean.

We can detect four hands involved in the copying of Lewond’s text. The main hand (Hand 1) is that of Sargis and is responsible for folios 6r, 7r–v, and 11r to the end of the work. A characteristic of Sargis’s hand is the presence of mixed uncial and miniscule forms of the letters Հ,Ձ, and Պ. Metathesis of the letter ր is detectable in some words, as in the appearance of նաւակարմջացն for նաւակամրջաց on folio 11r and կարմիջին for կամրջին on folio 11v, and possible dialectical addition of ր can be seen in the use of պաշարեմ for պարշարեմ on folios 31r and 73v. Sargis corrected himself in some instances, and a later corrector (Hand 1 corr) also corrected Sargis’s text in places. We can also identify other orthographic tendencies in Sargis’s hand, such as confusion of voiced and voiceless plosives, as well as confusion between the aspirated palatal չ and the voiced palatal ջ; confusion of ո and ի declensions resulting in the loss of ւ in oblique cases; and loss of intervocalic and final ի.

A second hand (Hand 2) is responsible for the top half of folios 4r and 5v; this hand is characterized by an unusual form of the letter ժ. A later hand (Hand 2 corr) inserted a more common form of ժ.

A third hand (Hand 3) copied the bottom half of folios 4r–5r and 6v, lines 4–9 of folio 20r, and lines 5–9 of folio 23v. This hand also has mixed uncial and miniscule forms for the letters ԋ, Շ, Չ, and Պ. Hand 3 both corrected his own text and had a corrector (Hand 3 corr).

A final hand (Hand 4) is responsible for the text recopied on the pages added during the manuscript’s repair in 1664 on folios 3v and 8r–10v. It has no mixed letter forms and does not add the ր before շ in պաշարէին. Hand 4 corrected his text in places.

Lewond’s History appears first in the manuscript and occupies folios 3v–130v. It is followed by the Armenian version of Evagrius’s Six Centuries or Kephalaia Gnostica on folios 131r–177v. The Centuries is followed by other pieces of Evagriana and his Letters, folios 177v–212v. After these appears a very brief set of scholia on the Centuries, folios 213r–217v. The final text in the manuscript is the earliest known copy of the Georgian Royal Annals, folios 218r–309v.

In addition to the colophon at the end Lewond’s History (on which see chapter XVII), Sargis also inscribed a colophon on folio 217v following the collection of texts related to Evagrius:

Now, I beseech everyone who may read or listen or copy the spiritually profitable precepts of the very industrious ascetic Evagrius, remember Lord Hamazasp, worthy of good memory and of many testimonies to his uprightness. If you remember me, the useless scribe Sargis, who am starving for spiritual nourishment, may compassionate God have compassion for everyone on the day of sorrow, since glory and worship are befitting Him, now and always and unto ages of ages. Amen.

59 Quire 16 has eleven folios; quire 17 has sixteen; and quires 25 and 27 have ten each.
60 See folios 74r, 74v, 86r, 91v, 100r, 107r, 112v, 114r, 120r, 121v, 122r, 124v.
61 See, e.g., folio 9v.
The manuscript also includes multiple marginal notes, the most intriguing of which occurs in the bottom margin of folio 32v, the first page of the 'Umar-Leo correspondence. It is a note written in the Uyghur script used by the Mongolian chancellery. According to D. Matsui, the script could date to the thirteenth or fourteenth century CE. The text is written upside down but is decipherable (fig. 1). P. Zieme and M. Dickens kindly provided the following transliteration and translation:

Line 1: (m)[ʾnk]w tʾṅkry {y//} ywkswn pw pydyk = (m)[äŋg]ü täŋrï-nï ögsün bo bitig
Line 2 – two options:
(y)w(β)xʾny βʾnk = Yovhanna vank’
(x)w(β)xʾny βʾnk = Hovhanna vank’

Line 1: One should praise the [eternal] God . . . this book [is in/of] Line 2: Yovhanna [or Hovhanna] monastery

Most of the other marginal notes firmly locate the manuscript in the eleventh/seventeenth century. One, on folio 4r, notes the ownership of the volume: “This book, Lewond the historian, belongs to Yohan Karčawanec’i” (Ղեւոնդ պատմագիրք Յոհան Կարճաւանեցիու է գիրքս այս։). Later, on folios 293v–294r, this same Yohan appears:

This history of Lewond and this book of Evagrius and, lastly, this history of the Georgians are a memorial for Yohan Karčawanec’i. I repaired [the manuscript], which was ruined, and gave it to my friend Śmawon vardapet Lorėc’i to bind in the [Armenian] year 1113 [= 1664 CE] for the glory of Christ. You who enjoy [it], remember [me] to Christ.
Yet another marginal note, on folio 43r, confirms the date of the repair: “It was repaired in the [Armenian] year 1113 [= 1664 CE]” (Բ թերբ Թերվեցաւ որ) Later, on folio 310r, we learn of another owner only a few decades later: I. Vardan vardapet Bališec’i, owner of this book, which is called Lewond the historian, and the historian of the Georgians, and the many words and counsels of our holy father of the anchorites Evagrius, bought [it] from my own legitimate earnings and gave [it] as a memorial to the court of Holy Ėǰmiacin for the salvation of my soul. You who read and profit from this holy book, remember to Christ Bališec’i Vardan vardapet and his parents, amen. In the [Armenian] year 1139 [= 1690 CE].

These marginal notes are interesting for their data on eleventh/seventeenth-century book ownership, but they are particularly noteworthy given the subsequent transmission of the text. Another manuscript of Lewond’s History, Matenadaran 3070, was based on M1902 and also associated with Vardan Bališec’i in Van. Yet another, Matenadaran 5501, was produced in Bitlīs/Bałēš and also mentions Vardan Bališec’i in the colophon. These other examples demonstrate that the repair of M1902 likely provoked interest in and copying of the History in the region around Lake Van in the late eleventh/seventeenth century.

There are a few further notes in addition to the Uyghur note and the multiple eleventh/seventeenth-century marginal notes. The start of the manuscript bears the ex libris stamp of Ėǰmiacin, the Mother See of the Armenian Church, on folio 3v:

This book belongs to Ėǰmiacin.

 Folio 23v carries the book stamp of a certain Andrēas vardapet. Further, a note in the bottom margin of folios 30v and 31r continues vertically up the right margin of 31v and commemorates the ordination of a certain Martiros in the year 1368 CE:

In the year 815 [= 1368 CE], the sinner Martiros was ordained a disciple to God, amen. And may God, that is, Christ, recompense him a thousand [times] here and in the world to come; here, the arena; there, peace; here, this transitory life; and there, the unfading crown; here, life; there, immortality. ǝn ǝn ǝǝ O you who are without stain[?],62 may God, who effaces the entire world, efface incessantly him [who] effaces our book this much; say, God have mercy and may God efface his cheirograph and efface yours incessantly.

62 The meaning of the schwas and the word չպծներովտ (չ’պերվովտ) is unclear, but we have suggested that the latter is a medieval form of the word թո, “stain,” in the instrumental plural with a negative prefix and a demonstrative suffix.
Foliation is given in Arabic numerals in the top margin beginning on folio 4r. Another set of earlier page numbers in Arabic numerals extends from folio 4r to folio 8v (= pp. 7–16). It has been crossed out on the recto of each folio but allowed to remain on the verso. An error in recording the foliation has been made on folio 38r, which was originally marked as folio 39r. The incorrect foliation has been crossed out and the correct foliation inserted until the end of the text. In addition to this later foliation in Arabic numerals, folio numbers are indicated by Armenian letters in the right margin of the manuscript, beginning with ա (1) on 4r. Quire numbers are similarly indicated in the bottom margin at the beginning and end of each quire, beginning with quire գ (3) on folio 11r.

Lewond’s name also appears in the bottom margin of some folios. On folios 22v–23r, the end of the third quire and the beginning of the fourth quire, as well as on 41v–42r, his name appears entirely on the verso and գրասանք (historian) is written on the recto. On folios 34v–35r, 46v–47r, 55v–56r, 58v–59r, 70v–71r, 82v–83r, 94v–95r, 106v–107r, and 118v–119r his name is split in half so that ղի (łew) appears on the verso and ոնդ (ond) on the recto. With the exception of folios 53v–54r and 55v–56r, these tags all mark the end of one quire and the beginning of a new one.

Finally, there are a few other minor markings. On folio 10r, several ա’s (a’s) are written in the bottom margin. There is a ո with two dots over it in the top left margin of 48r, the erased letters թ........................ի.. և կարդա in the bottom margin of 57v, the letters աբգ (abg) in the bottom margin of 96v, and the name Յովհանու (John) in the bottom margin of 130v.

We have not included these marginal comments in our edition in order not to overburden the apparatus.

Beginning on folio 10v, chapter numbers indicated by Armenian letters are included in the margins. Although we have not followed these chapter divisions, we have included the numbering in both our edition and our translation.

C.2. TEXTUAL TRADITION AND STEMMA

There are sixteen surviving manuscripts of Lewond’s History that contain either a complete or a partial copy of the text, and four printed editions. As already stated, the earliest manuscript of the text is contained in M1902. All the other copies of the text were made not only later than M1902 but also later than M1902’s repair by Šmawon Lōrec’i in 1664 ce. In his critical edition, Tēr-Vardanean argued that all the copies of the text could be divided into three groups, each deriving independently from the original copy of Lewond’s text.

63 աստուած հանդերձ: այս է քրիստոս
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He further contended that the older and preferable readings were contained in the first group whose Vorlage was M1902. More recently, Hakobian has convincingly demonstrated that all the surviving copies in fact ultimately descend from M1902. As we agree with Hakobian’s arguments and stemma, we reproduce a modified diplomatic edition of the text of M1902 below. Where the text is clearly corrupt, we have suggested emended readings that have sometimes also been offered in the printed editions. These have been noted in the apparatus to the text.

D. FURTHER READING ON ŁEWOND


Principles of Edition and Translation

We have attempted to make our modified diplomatic edition of the text of M1902 as legible as possible while still giving the reader an idea of what the manuscript looks like. In order to do so, we have adopted the following principles in preparing our text:

- We have maintained the spelling found in the manuscript, even when it is not conventional.
- We have followed the punctuation of the text in our edition but not necessarily in our translation.
- We have created paragraph breaks in the text for ease of reading.
- We have arranged the text into chapters according to caliphal reigns, but we also provide the section enumeration found in the manuscript.
- We have capitalized the first letter after every full stop (verjaket) in the manuscript and the first letter of every new paragraph. We have also capitalized all names. The presence of uncial forms has been noted above but is not reflected in our transcription.
- We have resolved all abbreviations and set the missing letters in italics. When numbers have been given in letters, we have replaced the letter with the full written form of the number in italics.
- We have noted any text that has been placed in the margins or above or below the line in the apparatus.
- Additions made by a corrector with which we agree have been included in the text and placed between <angle brackets>.
- When we have disagreed with a reading that appears in the manuscript, we give what we think is the correct reading in the apparatus.
- Any letters that have been lost through stains or damage have been added in accordance with either the correctors or the printed editions. Such letters are enclosed in curly brackets.
- Any text deleted by a scribe that remains legible in the manuscript has been indicated in the apparatus. When the deleted text is not legible, we have indicated it with [], with each period signifying a letter.

We have tried to provide a readable translation that preserves some of the feel of the Armenian original. In instances in which the subject of the action is unclear, we have furnished the actor in square brackets. Similarly, our additions in cases in which we have found it necessary to supply a word or words in order to clarify the meaning of a sentence are likewise enclosed in square brackets. When we have disagreed with a reading in the text, our translation follows our suggested reading.

We have placed all biblical references in the footnotes to the translation. We have followed the versification of the Armenian Bible unless otherwise noted. The numbering of the Psalms differs between the Armenian Bible and the Septuagint upon which it is based,
on the one hand, and the Hebrew and the English translations based upon the Hebrew on the other. In the notes to the translation, we have placed the number and verse of the Psalm according to the Armenian Bible followed by the corresponding number and verse according to English translations based upon the Hebrew in parentheses.

All other basic information we thought useful for understanding the text is provided in the reading notes that accompany the translation.

ABBREVIATIONS IN APPARATUS

a.c. ante correctionem (before correction)
add. added
a.r. ante rasuram (before erasure)
btm. mg. bottom margin
corr corrector
hmt homoeoteleuton
in lit. in litura (letters written over an erasure or blot)
ins. inserted
lft. mg. left margin
om. omitted
rt. mg. right margin
subscr. subscriptum / subscripta
suppl. supplied
suprascr. suprascriptum / suprascripta

TRANSLITERATION

In the translation and the commentary, where transliteration has been necessary we have followed the Hübschmann-Meillet-Benveniste system for Armenian and the Arabic transliteration system of the International Journal of Middle East Studies. We have regularized Arabic names to reflect their spelling in Arabic, as per the same transliteration system. We have rendered Greek names in accordance with The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium and Persian names according to the Encyclopaedia Iranica.

In the translation, we have used the most commonly used form of each name present in the Armenian text. We have also regularized names even when we cite published translations. In the commentary, we have also provided the most commonly found spellings of Armenian place-names in Arabic; for example, Dabil (Arabic) / Duin (Armenian).

PREVIOUS EDITIONS

—. *Patmutʿiwn Lewondeay meci vardapeti Hayoc*. Edited by Stepʿan Malxaseancʿ. Saint Petersburg: N. Skoroxodov, 1887. [This edition is commonly attributed to K. Ezean, who wrote the introduction and clearly indicates that S. Malxaseancʿ prepared the text at his request.]

PREVIOUS TRANSLATIONS


The Caliphates of Abū Bakr, ʿUmar, and ʿUthmān
r. AH 11–41/632–61 CE

Łewond’s first chapter starts with the death of the Prophet Muhammad (d. 632) and covers the first three caliphs, called “rightly guided” in the Sunnī tradition. Abū Bakr (r. 632–34), ʿUmar (r. 634–44), and ʿUthmān (r. 644–56) ruled successively, but Łewond combines their reigns into a single period. Łewond omits the last “rightly guided” caliph, ʿAlī b. Abī Ṭālib (r. 656–61), likely because of his reliance on sources favorable to the Umayyads. The Umayyads were the first dynasty of the Caliphate and fought against ʿAlī and his supporters for the right to rule in the first civil war (fitna). Łewond’s omission of ʿAlī, along with his favorable representation of the Roman emperor Herakleios (r. 610–41), reflects seventh-century imperial propaganda, albeit filtered through an eighth-century perspective. In this chapter, Łewond narrates the Islamic conquests, beginning with Arabia and then continuing north to Syria and Iran before arriving in Armenia. His account focuses primarily on the collapse of Roman power in both Syria and Armenia, as the Sasanian Empire in Iran fell quickly. In the second half of the chapter, Łewond is preoccupied with lamenting the fate of Armenia in the midst of these volatile changes.

ENGLISH TRANSLATION

[3v] The history of Łewond, the great vardapet of the Armenians, concerning the appearance of Muhammad and [those who came] after him: how and in what way they ruled the world and, moreover, the Armenian people. First and foremost [were] those who were called amīr al-muʾminīn, since Muhammad died after ruling for twenty years. After [4r] that Abū Bakr, ʿUmar, and ʿUthmān succeeded to Muhammad’s authority for thirty-eight years in the eleventh year of Herakleios, the divinely crowned, pious king of the Romans. As long as the God-crowned Herakleios was alive, they [the Arabs] were not able to extend their raids into Judea, for the reputation of his bravery had spread and frightened them. And he ruled and held authority over Judea and Asorestan until the end of his life.

When Herakleios’s son [Constantine III] reigned in place of his father, the Lord aroused the souls of evil men so that through them He might take revenge upon us Christian people who had sinned before the Lord our God. They

Muhammad: born in Arabia around 570 and died in 632, understood to be a prophet in Islam.
Amīr al-muʾminīn: transcription of the Arabic title "Commander of the Faithful," used to refer to the caliph.
Abū Bakr (r. 632–34), ʿUmar (r. 634–44), and ʿUthmān (r. 644–56): the first three caliphs who ruled the early Islamic Empire (the Caliphate) after the death of the Prophet Muhammad.
Herakleios (r. 610–41): a Roman emperor renowned for recovering the True Cross that Christians believe Jesus was crucified on. He is also famous for his wars against the Sasanian Empire and his response to the Islamic conquests. Herakleios appears on the facade of the Armenian church at Mren (fig. 2).
The eleventh year of Herakleios corresponds approximately to 621. Due to the omission of ʿAlī and differences of opinion about the regnal dates of the next caliph, Muʿāwiya, it is not clear to what exact period the thirty-eighth year of the caliphs refers.
[the Arabs] began to prepare troops and to assemble forces against the authority of Constantine and against [4v] Judea and Asorestan, for they had as support the command of their lawgiver, the sower of weeds,1 who enjoined: “Go out over the lands and subjugate them under your power. For it says, He has given us the riches of the land for our pleasure. Eat the meat of the chosen ones of the land and drink the blood of the strong.”2

The Jews, who went into the camps of Madiam, were their provokers and leaders. They [the Jews] said to them:


Judea and Asorestan: Palestine, Syria, and northern Mesopotamia (map 1).
Constantine III: Herakleios’s son, a Roman emperor. He ruled only briefly, for about four months, in 641.
Lawgiver: epithet for the Prophet Muḥammad for his traditional role as the establisher of Islamic law.

Madiam: Madina, “the City of the Prophet,” now in Saudi Arabia; the second holiest city in Islam. Muhammad and his followers moved there in 622, which is the start of the Islamic calendar. It is also the burial place of the Prophet Muḥammad.
“God,” they said, “promised to deliver the inhabitants of the earth into Abraham’s service, and we are the heirs and sons of the patriarch. God was disgusted with us on account of our evil conduct, and He deprived us of the scepter of kingship and delivered us to the yoke of servitude. But you are also the children of Abraham and the sons of the patriarch. Go out with us and save [us] from the servitude of the king of the Greeks. And [5r] let us reign together.” When they heard this, they were encouraged and overran Judea.

But then the king of the Greeks was informed [about it] and he wrote to the general in Judea. He said: "I heard that the Saracens rose up and invaded Judea and Asorestan. Now assemble your forces and fight them, and prevent them from marauding our land and bringing swords and destruction upon it. Now arm and prepare your forces." And he [the Roman general in Judea], having received the imperial order, wrote to the commanders who were under his command that wherever they were, they should come to him. They arrived immediately, and together they formed a large army. They moved and went forth against the brigand, who, having grown stronger, marched against them. They went and faced [5v] each other on the borders of Arabia Petraea. They saw the camps of Madiam and the immense number of camels and horses in their innumerable multitude, just like a swarm of locusts.

Then the Greek forces demonstrated great ignorance, as they distanced themselves many stadia from the supplies of their camp. They also left their horses in the camps, armed themselves, and went to make war against them [the Arabs] as infantry. When they fell upon their enemies, they were fatigued from the heat of the sun, the arid rocks, and the sand and wearied from the weight of their weapons. But they [the Arabs], since they were rested, immediately mounted their horses and attacked them, striking many blows upon the forces [6r] of the Greeks and making the survivors turn in flight. They pursued them up to the Greek camp and killed many in general. The survivors mounted horses and fled to their own land, while the Ishmaelites, laden with treasures from the Greek booty and taking spoils from those who fell at their swords, happily returned to their own land. From then on, they ruled over Judea and Asorestan, and they cast the land and the churches of the holy city of Jerusalem under tribute. Henceforth Judea and Syria ceased paying tribute to the king of the Greeks, since Abraham: Jews and Muslims share an interest in the biblical figure of Abraham as patriarch and trace their lines of descent from his children Isaac and Ishmael, respectively.

Greeks: the eastern Roman Empire, now commonly known as Byzantium, used Greek as a major administrative and cultural language. Medieval sources—Christian and Muslim alike—refer to the empire’s population variously as Greeks and as Romans. At this time, the western regions of Armenia were under Roman control. Although Christianity was the predominant religion among both Greeks and Armenians, they differed in certain matters of belief and practice.

Saracen: a derogatory term for Arabs, potentially related to a toponym in Arabia Petraea mentioned by the geographer Ptolemy. In the medieval period, however, the term is frequently taken to refer to a claimed relationship with Sarah, the wife of Abraham. The term is common in Greek, but this is its first appearance in Armenian.

Arabia Petraea: a Roman province containing Jordan and the Sinai Peninsula. This passage likely relates to the famous battle of Yarmuk in 636, in which the Arab Muslims routed the Roman forces.

Ishmaelites: descendants of Ishmael the son of Abraham, used in medieval sources to refer to Muslims.

Jerusalem: caliphal armies besieged the Roman city of Jerusalem for six months until the city capitulated, probably in 638. Muslim and Christian sources alike place the caliph ‘Umar at the city’s surrender.
the Greek forces were not able to resist the Ishmaelites. And Ishmael reigned over Judea.

CONCERNING ISHMAEL’S MARAUDING IN ARmenian LANDS AND ATTACKING OF THE ARmenIAN TROOPS.

Then the next year they began to defy the king of the Persians, and a multitude of forces was gathered. They came against [6v] the king of the Persians whose name was Yazdegerd [and] who was the grandson of Kosrow. Yazdegerd also gathered his forces and warred against them, [but] he was not able to resist [them]. They [the Arabs] routed his forces by a slaughter of the sword4 and killed the king. Henceforth the Persian Empire, whose rule had lasted 481 years, was destroyed and overthrown. The Ishmaelites plundered the land and carried off the royal treasury to their own land.

The majority of the force crossed over from the Persian side and went marauding in Armenian lands. They captured the towns of the Medes, the region of Golt’n, and the village of Naxčawan. They put many men to the sword and led away others, along with the women and children, into captivity, making them [7r] cross the Araxes River via the Jula ford. The forces divided into two; some brought the captives back to their land, while another regiment went marauding through the region of Artaz against the Greek general, whose name was Prokopios [and] who was encamped in the region of Kogovit on the borders of Bazujor and Marduc’ayk’.

Learning of this, Prince T’ēodoros, who was from the house of the Rištunik’, informed the general Prokopios: “A force of Ishmaelite brigands has risen against us.” But he [Prokopios] placed his trust in the multitude of [his] forces and not in God, who grants success in war, so he did not value the words of the prince of Armenia. Grieved by the ruin of this land of Armenia and by the indolence of the general, he [T’ēodoros] did not have patience but entered and repeated his words yet again, a second and a third time.

King of the Persians: the Sasanian Empire (224 to ca. 650) ruled the Iranian cultural sphere from the Caucasus to Central Asia. One of its main capitals was Ctesiphon, near modern Baghdad. The empire was largely Zoroastrian by religion, but it also claimed substantial Christian and Jewish populations. With certain exceptions, the Sasanians appear in Armenian sources as violent overlords set to force Zoroastrianism on the Armenian population.

Yazdegerd III (r. 632–51): the last Sasanian emperor. He appears in the Islamic tradition as haughty and dismissive of Muhammad’s message. His arrogance is used to explain the destruction of his empire. He fled west to Central Asia after the Arabs defeated the Sasanian forces in 636.

The Sasanian Empire lasted not 481 years but 426 years. The battle that Lewond describes here is that of Nihāwand, which took place in 642. For the places mentioned in the incursions into Armenia, see map 2.

Prokopios: the head of military affairs in the Roman East at the time of the conquests.

T’ēodoros Rištuni: the prince of Armenia from 639 or 641 to 654, appointed by Heraclios. The Rištuni family controlled part of the region around Lake Van, now in modern Turkey.

Prince of Armenia: an honorific title bestowed on the de facto representative of the Armenian noble houses to imperial powers, whether Roman, Sasanian, or caliphal. This position allowed the Armenians some sense of continuity and autonomy in periods of transition.

3 Chahnazarian and Malxaseanc’ have corrected the text to read “they gathered a multitude of forces,” but we are in agreement with Martin-Hisard that գումարէր must be taken as a passive; Lewond, *Discours historique*, 9 n. 52.

The general became enraged at the prince and threw the rod that was in his hand at him, and T’ēodoros, exasperated, left his presence. [7v] At once, he ordered the forces under his command: “Arm yourselves,” he said, “and march against Ishmael.” They mounted their horses and lay in ambush at the hill that they called Elbark’. They seized the entrance of the pass and killed many of them [the Arabs]. They took booty from those who had fallen and, having separated from the [Greek] general, went to the region of Gārnī. Then Prokopios also ordered his army to march against the enemy. The army of Ishmael poured forth upon them and destroyed most of the Greeks. Putting the others to flight, they [the Arabs] drove them to their own camp. They themselves returned to their camp and rested. It is said that the Greek forces numbered more than sixty thousand men, while the Ishmaelites were fewer than ten thousand. The next day they gathered the booty of the camp and retreated to their own land. [8r]

This occurred in the twenty-second year of the Ishmaelite princes Abū Bakr, ʿUthmān, and ʿUmar. They stopped crossing over to this land of Armenia for three years. Then, in the twenty-sixth year of their reign, they again attacked, coming up into Armenia with a heavy force. Since Abū Bakr, ʿUmar, and ʿUthmān in fact ruled separately, it is difficult to guess what Lewond means by their “twenty-second year.” However, many Arabic sources place the start of the incursions into Armenia in AH 22 (642–43 CE), so Lewond is likely using the Islamic calendar here.
In the second year of Constans, emperor of the Romans, who was the grandson of Herakleios, Prince T'ēodoros was informed that the brigand had arisen and overcome this land. So he took his troops and wanted to hold the Joray pass, but he was not able to reach it before them because the enemy attacked as swiftly as the wind and marched forth like winged serpents. And leaving the Armenian forces behind them, they [the Arabs] set out to rush to the metropolis Duin. But they found the city empty of male warriors, since all of them had followed Prince T'ēodoros with the sole exception of women, children, and other commoners who were not men of war. They penetrated the city and immediately took the fortress. They killed the men found in it and led the women and children into captivity, some thirty-five thousand people.

Now who could aptly lament the misery of these calamities? For in all places there was intolerable misfortune, because the holy churches, which the heathens were not worthy to enter, were destroyed and dismantled, trampled under the foul feet of the infidels. The priests, along with the deacons and the worshippers, were massacred by the sword of the insolent and cruel enemy. Many delicate

5 “Emperor,” կայսր (kayr), from Greek καῖσαρ, lit. “caesar.”
6 “Winged serpents,” ὀὐραίῳ (ouraiō); cf. Isaiah 14:29.
7 “Insolent and cruel,” δυσήπημη λει τοῦ ἡερουλαμάτῳ; cf. Jeremiah 6:23 and the description of the invading army of the North.
women⁸ who had not experienced affliction were beaten unmercifully with whips and dragged to the marketplaces. They raised their cries of lament about their unexpected agony. The general multitude was also seized in this same misfortune with their sons and their daughters. They [9r] increased their groaning and sobbing, since they did not know whom they should lament more: those who were slaughtered by the sword of the infidel or the living sons and daughters who were separated to be alienated from the[ir] faith in Christ and spiritual and divine exaltation. Although they were mourning, lamenting the pitiable sight of corpses falling upon corpses immersed in blood, they were not able to assemble the bodies and give them graves, and the prophetic lament was fitting which says: “God, heathens entered your inheritance, profaned your holy temple, and cast the corpses of your servants as food for the birds of the skies and the bodies of your saints to the beasts of the land. And there was no one to bury them.”⁹ All these calamities happened in the past in the time of Judea, and now it became fitting to have this anguish fall upon us.

And when the Armenian forces along with the naxarark' and the prince [T'ēodoros] saw the violent marauders [9v] overtaking them, the soldiers grew despondent and were not able to attack the marauders, for even though they saw their wives and children being led into captivity, they were too few in number and were not able to vanquish them. Rather, they only sat lamenting and weeping, bewailing their wives and children. So the Hagarenes, having taken them to Syria, ceased coming up into this land of Armenia for ten years. Then, after that, in the thirty-sixth year of their reign, they gathered an army under the generals ʿUthmān and ʿUqba and again attacked Armenia. When they arrived on the borders of Armenia they broke off into three divisions and spread out their incursions. One division cut through this land of Vaspurakan and took villages and fortresses up to the city of Naxčawan; one [other] division [cut] through the region of Tarōn; and the other reached Kogovit and besieged the fortifications of Arcap’k’. They found [10r] the entrance to the castle and entered it stealthily by night, for they found the guards asleep. They took the castle and they cast the men found in it into chains.
Thenceforth, with great heedlessness, they coupled with the women in obscene debauchery.

But the all-seeing God took pity on them, and He did not neglect those who believed in His name in this place. Rather, He sent Prince T'ēodoros in vengeance for these evils that they had committed. He [T'ēodoros] attacked the advancing marauders with a speedy assault like a swooping eagle, and with him [were] six hundred men bearing weapons. They arrived suddenly and slaughtered the enemy, some three thousand men, and untied the people who had been bound. Putting the few surviving enemies to flight, they returned the captives, gathered the booty and spoils of their enemies, and returned, joyfully glorifying God, who had sought vengeance against their enemies. Then that force that I discussed earlier took booty and captives to Syria, and after that they ceased [their incursions] for two years. Having completed those evils, the Ishmaelite princes Abū Bakr, Uthmān, and 'Umar each died.

Deaths of the "rightly guided" caliphs: Abū Bakr, 'Umar, and 'Uthmān died in 634, 644, and 656, respectively. 'Uthmān’s death marks the end of the period of the "rightly guided" caliphs in Lewond’s text, since he does not include 'Ali (r. 656–61).

11 “A swooping eagle,” ṣ̄āhatu kufr; cf. Deuteronomy 28:49, where, however, it refers to the form of punishment for Israel’s disobedience.
12 Hand 4.
13 Hand 2.
14 Đ add. suprascr. Hand 2corr, presumably to explain the unusual and later form of đ used by the scribe; see the Introduction.
15 անջատվական իրավիճակ ա.թ. 16 Հոռոմոց - suprascr.
17 Hand 3.
I. THE CALIPHATES OF ABÛ BAKR, 'UMAR, AND 'UTHMÂN

18 արդատից [ -u- suprascr. 
19 գայու [ գայու a.c. 
20 <քուր> [ add. in rt. mg. Hand 3corr.
21 երեք] [ read: երեք with printed editions. 
22 պատանիկութեք] [ պատանիկութեք a.c. 
23 որոշ] [ -ի- subscr. 
24 հայկական] [ հայկական a.c. 
25 երեք[ու|ա] [ -ու- add. suprascr. Hand 3corr.
26 Hand 2. 
27 դ add. in lft. mg. Hand 2corr.
28 դ suprascr. Hand 2corr.
30 [տ|ի][ար[գ]] [-գ add. suprascr. Hand 2corr.
31 Hand 1.
AN ARMENIAN FUTŪḤ NARRATIVE
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Միակային իսպանիայից, և մնացածություն հետո, որպես արտասանության զանգվածի հետևանդամ իսպանական զարդարված է Հայաստանում և Բաքվականում բնական զարգացման հնարավորություններով։ Հայաստանում այս կանոնը սովորաբար մեկնում է Հայաստանի և Բաքվականի վրա։ Երբ հայ հայտնի գրականության և գիտական առաջնորդությունները կուսակցություններ ստեղծել են այդ թե և նույնիսկ նույն ամենահայտնի զարդարված համակարգ է։ Այս կանոնը հետևանդամ է Հայաստանի և Բաքվականի վրա։ Երբ հայ հայտնի գրականության և գիտական առաջնորդությունները կուսակցություններ ստեղծել են այդ թե և նույնիսկ նույն ամենահայտնի զարդարված համակարգ է։ Այս կանոնը հետևանդամ է Հայաստանի և Բաքվականի վրա։ Երբ հայ հայտնի գրականության և գիտական առաջնորդությունները կուսակցություն

Հայաստանի ապաստանի իրականացրած զարգացման և համախումբ զարգացման դաս: Հայաստանի և Բաքվականի վերա: Երբ հայ հայտնի գրականության և գիտական առաջնորդությունները կուսակցություն

32 իր տղամարդկանց նկտեցած լուսան Հայաստանի զարգացման և մնացում ներկայում զարգացման իրավական դաս. և խալմնեն զարգացման իրավական դաս. և խալմին զարգացման իրավական դաս. և խալմին զարգացման իրավական դաս. և խալմին զարգացման իրավական դաս. և խալմին զարգացման իրավական դաս. և խալմին զարգացման իրավական դաս. և խալմին զարգացման իրավական դաս. և խալմի

33 հայ այդ անուն էր Յունաց Հայաստան և Բաքվական: Երբ հայ հայտնի գրականության և գիտական առաջնորդությունները կուսակցություն

34 Յազկերտի տարվա կատակերտ պատմություն դարձան գալ մի ամբույկ անդամ Պարսից. և գումար զարգացավ զարդարված համակարգ և կարճատեսակ հայտնի անդամ Պարսից. որում էր թոռն Խոսրովու, ժողովի և Յազկերտի զարդարված իր պատերազմ նոցական որում անուն էր Յազկերտ: որ էր բանակել ի գաւառի Կոգոոտի. ի սահման Բազուձորոյ և Մարդուցաից.

35 այս ոչ կարող լինել այս անդամ Պարսից. որ էր բանակել ի գաւառի Կոգոոտի. ի սահման Բազուձորոյ և Մարդուցաից.

36 կոտորմամբ զարդարված Հայոց ընդ կողմն Պարսից. և առնուին ի գերութին և ասպատակէին ընդ գաւառն Արտազ ի վերա զարդարված Յունաց որում անուն էր Պռոկոպ. որ էր բանակել ի գաւառի Կոգոոտի. ի սահման Բազուձորոյ և Մարդուցաից.

37 հատել ասպատակէին յաշխարհ Հայոց ընդ կողմն Պարսից. և առնուին ի գերութի

38 հատել ասպատակէին յաշխարհ Հայոց ընդ կողմն Պարսից. և առնուին ի գերութի

39 ընդ գետն Երասխ ընդ հունն Ջուղայիոյ: Երբ ընդ երկու բաժանեալ զարդարված մունքեր զգերեալսն դարձան յաշխարհ իւրեանց. և գունդ մի հատեալ ասպատակէին ընդ գաւառ Արտազ ի վերա զարդարված Յունաց որում անուն էր Պռոկոպ. որ էր բանակել ի գաւառի Կոգոոտի. ի սահման Բազուձորոյ և Մարդուցաից.

40 եղբարս ընդ երկու բաժանեալ զարդարված մունքեր զգերեալս

41 եղբարս ընդ երկու բաժանեալ զարդարված մունքեր զգերեալս իշխանութեամբ:

42 իր նոյթում միկրոկլոր իշխանութեամբ:
դէպ եղև առնուլ:

Զայս ամ
են ար
քո. պղծեցին զտաճար ս
բ քո. և արկին զդիակունս ծառայից քոց գէշ թռչնոց երկնից. և ունի դէպ էր զմարգարէական
առնուլ ողբս որ ասէ, Ա
ծ մտին հեթանոսք ի ժառանգութի
րետացուցանել ի հաւատոյն որ ի ք
ցն.
ծային փառատրութե
ս. և ի հոգևոր յա
ան ամսն յանօրէն սրոյն˙ եթէ զկենդանոյն անջատե
ավտանգս յաճա
ան օրհասին: Այլև աշխարհախումբ բազմութե
ն ըմբռնեալք ուստերօք և դստերօք ի նոյն
յեղակարծումն
ս
ն ան
. գանալից քըքօք թշնամանեալք
լռքանդե
աբ եկեղեցիք յորս ոչ էր արժան հեթանոսաց մտանել.
ուստէք անհնարին էր վտանգն, զի ս
. հազար:
հինգ
ւն յոգիս.
րաքաղաքին և վաղվաղակի առին զամրոցն. և զգտեալ
Թէոդորոս, եթէ հէն զարթուցեալ գայ ի վ
աշխարհիս: Իսկ նորա առեալ զզօրս իւր. կամէր
և ի
Իսմայելի: Եւ դադարեցին յելանելոյ ի վ
աշխարհիս Հայոց, ամս երիս: Ապա ի.
բեւր արանց: Եւ զԻսմայելացիսն նուաղ
դարձեալ ի բանակս նոցա հանգչէին. և ասեն լինել զթիւ զաւրացն Յունաց աւելի քան զվեց
Յունաց, և զայլսն փախստական արարեալ անցուցանէին ընդ բանակն իւրեանց, և ինքեանք
ելանել ի վերա թշնամեացն˙ յորոց վերա հեղեալ զաւրն Իսմաելի հարկանէին զմեծ մաս
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42 ուտավ ] read: ուտավ.
43 ի ] suprascr.
44 Hand 4.
45 բարբարա ] է- subscr.
46 զիռանասան ] է- suprascr.
AN ARMENIAN FUTŪḤ NARRATIVE

Although written in ʿAbbāsid Armenia, Lewond’s text begins at the intersection of Umayyad and Roman imperial propaganda. In his references (or lack thereof) to Herakleios and ʿAlī b. Abī Ṭālib, he preserves a sense of political claims asserted in the first/seventh century. It is noteworthy that Lewond makes no mention of ʿAlī b. Abī Talib or the first fitna. This omission likely derives from his reliance on a list of caliphs to organize his History, but it may also constitute the first indication of his pro-Sufyānid stance. Other historical studies of caliphal Armenia typically describe the Umayyad period in positive terms and the ʿAbbāsid era as more difficult. However, the difference seems to have lain in the degree of involvement of caliphal propagandists.
sources similarly omit ‘Ali. First, three lists of caliphs have survived from the second/eighth century. These lists, originally composed in Arabic but preserved today in Syriac, offer little but the names of the successive caliphs with the lengths of their respective reigns. As a result, they do not provide any clear reason for the omission of ‘Ali. Second, second/eighth-century Latin histories composed in Umayyad Spain seem also to incorporate such caliphal lists. These Latin histories invalidate ‘Ali’s claims entirely. The Chronicle of 741 reads:

But soon Mu‘awiya obtained his [‘Uthmān’s] seat and ruled for twenty-five years. However, for five of these years he waged civil war with his own [people], but indeed twenty he carried through with complete success, with the obedience of all the people of the Ishmaelites.54

Sed mox Moabia eius sortitus est sedem regnatque annos XXV. Sed quinque ex his annis cum suis bella ciuilia gessit, uiginti uero omnes plebes Hismaelitarum obiedientes summa cum felicitate peregit.55

The Chronicle of 754, which likely shared a source with the Chronicle of 741, similarly reads:

In the time [of Reccesuinth], in the era 690 [652 ce], in the thirty-fifth year of the Arabs, Mu‘awiya received the throne of his predecessor, ruling for twenty-five years. For five of these years, he waged wars against his own people, but he brought his reign to a very successful conclusion, and all the Ishmaelite people were obedient to him for twenty years.56

Huius temporibus in era DCLXL, anno Arabum XXXV, Moabia precessoris sortitus est sedem, regnans in ca annis XXV. Sed quinque ex eis annis cum suis civilian gessit; viginti vero omni plebe Smahelitarum obediente summa cum felicitate peregit.57

Neither of these sources acknowledges ‘Ali’s claim to the Caliphate. Instead, they present his reign as nothing more than a challenge to the legitimate caliph, Mu‘awiya. Given the provenance of the Syriac lists of caliphs and the Latin histories from Spain, it seems likely that they preserve a stratum of Umayyad historiography that was written out of ‘Abbāsid-era Arabic sources. As A. Borrut points out: “Il se pourrait même que ces listes soient basées sur des informations émanant de l’entourage syrien du califat omeyyade ou produites par ce dernier.”58

All of the Syriac and Latin sources mentioned above were composed in the second/eighth century, but they seem to reflect earlier Umayyad rhetoric to discredit ‘Ali’s reign. Similarly, Lewond’s omission of ‘Ali places this part of his History into an Umayyad context and, in particular, reflects the specific political positioning of the first/seventh century. We may discern the same tactic in the History of Pseudo-Sebēos, written around the time of the first fitna, which similarly downplays ‘Ali and does not name him explicitly.

54 Hoyland, Seeing Islam, 618.
58 Borrut, Entre mémoire et pouvoir, 56, 153.
Pseudo-Sebēos merely explains that Muʿāwiya “slew that other king whom they had installed” (սպան զայն ևս արքայ, զոր նոքայն նստուցեալ էին). By contrast, ʿAlī appears as a caliph in later Armenian histories, including that of Pseudo-Šapuh, whose work is otherwise particularly helpful in explicating Lewond’s text. As a result, we surmise that Lewond relied on a source that preserved vestiges of Umayyad historiography and reflected the political concerns of the first/seventh century as they appeared to a second/eighth-century observer. As in Syria and Spain, Umayyad memory in Armenia may have been particularly persistent because the governorship of the province was held by scions of the Umayyad house for generations.

I.A.2. Pro-Herakleian Context

Lewond presents Herakleios in a positive light as divinely favored and as the bulwark of the Roman Empire, thereby mirroring the appreciation of Herakleios in first/seventh-century Christian sources. The History of Pseudo-Sebēos does not mark Herakleios out for any special recognition until the moment of the return of the Cross to Jerusalem, at which point it refers to the emperor as “blessed” (երանելի), “pious” (աստուածասէր, lit. “loving God”), and “late lamented” (երջանիք, lit. “happy,” “blessed”). Later in the narrative, Pseudo-Sebēos includes a defense of Armenian orthodoxy that was supposedly composed by the catholicos Nersēs III and several bishops in 649 CE but that was never sent to the emperor Constans II. In that letter, the catholicos addresses Constans as “you who are crowned from heaven, you the boast of all Christians by the power of the divine sign of the Cross, you who resemble the pious servant of God, the divinely gracious, the valiant and victorious, the blessed savior Herakleios” (պսակեալդ յերկնուստ, պարծանքդ ամենայն քրիստոնէից զաւրութեամբ աստուածային խաչին նշանաւն, նմանեալդ աստուածասէր, աստուածապաշտ, աստուածաշնորհ, քաջ եւ յաղթող փրկութենագործ երջանիկ Երակլի). Such a favorable attitude toward Herakleios was certainly shared by those members of the secular elite who depended on imperial support for their status and who, as the bas-reliefs on the Cathedral at Mren pointedly illustrate, promoted Herakleios’s imperial ideology. Noncanonical texts also provide evidence that Herakleian propaganda constructed around the Persian Wars and his restitution of the Cross circulated in Armenia. A positive estimation of Herakleios is similarly evident in the first/seventh-century source of Movsēs Daxuranc’i’s fourth/tenth-century History of Caucasian Albania, where the emperor is described as “Christ-loving” (քրիստոսասէր), “great” (մեծ), “zealous” (սարգիտ), “brave” (թղթ), and “victorious” (կարսիտան) and depicted as “a general and leader of his troops” (զօրավար եւ առաջնորդ), “great” (մեծ), “zealous” (սարգիտ), “brave” (թղթ), and “victorious” (կարսիտան). By contrast, the later Armenian historians of the fourth/tenth century, T’ovma Arcruni and Yovhannēs Drasxanakertc’i, are more muted in their evaluation of the emperor, whom they do not call either pious or blessed.

59 Sebēos, Armenian History, 1:154; Patmut’iwn, 176.
60 Sebēos, Patmut’iwn, 130, 131, 137; cf. Armenian History, 1:90 n. 556 for “late lamented.”
61 Sebēos, Patmut’iwn, 152; Armenian History, 1:119.
63 La Porta and Pogossian, “Apocalyptic Texts.”
64 Daxuranc’i, Patmut’iwn, 128, 130, 131, 139, 142, 185, 316; History, 76, 78, 79, 86, 87, 119, 206.
likely because of his Chalcedonianism. Drasxanakertci’i blames Herakleios for deceiving the catholicos Ezr into accepting the Council of Chalcedon, something Pseudo-Sebēos pointedly does not mention when relating the same incident.55 Lewond thus represents the last vestige of the first/seventh-century appreciation of Herakleios in the Armenian historiographical tradition.66

The titles here derive from the Greek. Lewond calls Herakleios “divinely crowned,” in Armenian աստուածապսակեալ, lit. “God-crowned,” and “pious,” in Armenian բարեպաշտ. “Divinely crowned” is a rare word in Armenian, and this is the earliest attested use of the term.67 It is a calque on the Greek θεοστεφής, which is common in Roman usage. The word appears in Drasxanakertci’i’s fourth/tenth-century History in the letter from Niko-laoς Mystikos, which K. Maksoudian argues is a translation from a Greek original.68 Comparing these with the regnal formulae found in papyri from Roman Egypt, Greenwood contends that the titles originate in imperial documents and render the corresponding Greek terms; for example, Lewond’s “pious” is a translation of the Greek εὐσεβής, which appears as Herakleios’s regnal title in papyri in the superlative form as εὐσεβέστατος. Greenwood identifies the same process on Herakleios’s title on the first/seventh-century Armenian inscription at Bagawan, “protected by God”—in Armenian աստուածապահ—which appears in Roman papyri as θεοφύλακτος.69

Lewond’s omission of ʿAlī among the early caliphs, his silence with regard to the first fitna, his praise of Herakleios, and his evocation of Greek titles illustrate well the location of his account of mid-first/seventh-century events at the confluence of Umayyad and Roman historiographical propaganda.

I.B. THE EXPANSION OF ISLAM

Lewond begins his account of the Islamic conquests in Arabia. Drawing on a broader tradition that attributes the motivation for the conquests to Jewish communities in the Near East, he narrates the Arab defeat of the Roman army and the caliphal conquest of Syria. Lewond then turns his attention to the conquest of Iran from the Sasanians, within which he also situates the first incursions into Armenia. By contextualizing these incursions within the collapse of Roman power in Syria and the end of the Sasanian Empire, Lewond places the invasion of Armenia into a larger imperial narrative. Lewond’s retelling culminates in the capture of the city of Dabīl/Duin, which he couches within a discourse of prophetic fulfillment.

55 Drasxanakertci’i, History, 98–99; “Patmut’iwn Hayoc’,” 404; Sebēos, History, 91; Patmut’iwn, 131–32.
66 The difficult-to-date history of Pseudo-Šapuh Bagratuni portrays Herakleios in a rather fantastical manner. He is depicted as falling for an otherwise unattested princess of Sisajān/Siunik’ named Biurel. Even more improbably, he is shown heeding the advice of Yovhannēs Mayragomec’i, who was a staunch Julianist opponent of Chalcedon and therefore an unlikely person to have the ear of the emperor. Bagratuni, “Anonymous Storyteller,” 187–89.
67 Awetik’ean, Siwrmēlean, and Awgerian, Nor barqirk’, 1:328.
68 Drasxanakertci’i, History, 37.
I.B.1. Madiam

Łewond refers to the “camps of Madiam” (բանակս Մադիամու) during the Islamic conquests. A. Ter-Levondyan and Martin-Hisard take Madiam to refer to the Midian discussed in both the Hebrew Scriptures (מדין) and the Qur’an (مدين). In particular, the Greek word for Midian is Μαδιάμ, which presents with a final -m as in Łewond. With this reading, “the camps of Madiam” might be understood as a reference to the Arabs in general.70

However, Łewond likely meant the Prophet’s city, Madina. The first/seventh-century Chronicle of Khūzistān makes the connection between Midian and the Prophet’s city. The anonymous author explains that “Madina was named after Midian, the fourth son of Abraham by Ketura, and it is also called Yathrib” (ܘܡܕܝܢܐ ܥܠ ܫܡ ܡܕܝܢ ܒܪܗ ܪܒܝܥܝܐ ܕܐܒܪܗܡ ܕܡܢ ܩܢܛܘܪܐ ܐܬܟܢܝܬ. ܗܕܐ ܕܐܦ ܝܬܪܝܒ ܡܬܩܪܝܐ).71 This connection also appears in the fourth/tenth-century Armenian History of T’ovma Arcruni, who refers to Madiam “which Israel had destroyed on leaving Egypt” (זӲ ավերեացն Իսրայէլ յելանելն իւրում յԵգիպտոսի; cf. Numbers 31). Soon thereafter, he refers back to this passage in describing the hijra: “Muḥammad and ‘Ali fled with about forty men. They came to the city of Madiam, which we mentioned above” (և փախստական եղեալ Մահմետ և Ալի և ընդ նոսա իբրև Խ՝ եկին ի քաղաքն Մադիամ, զոր և ասացաք յառաջագոյն). T’ovma also has Salman—Salmān al-Fārisī—travel to Madiam.72 The conflation between Midian and Madina is therefore not exclusive to Łewond.

I.B.2. Jews and the Islamic Conquest

Łewond credits divine punishment for the sins of Christians as the reason for the Islamic conquests. In explaining the rise of the Caliphate, he provides a central role for the Jews, describing them as a catalyst of the Islamic expansion. Łewond here participates in a broader tradition in Christian literature, including in Armenian, that draws direct connections between Judaism and Islam.73 According to the History attributed to Sebēos, the Jewish population of Edessa left that city after its successful siege by the Sasanian Empire in 629–30 CE.74 Allowed to leave by the emperor according to the terms of the surrender, they went to Arabia (Tačkastan), where they invoked their and the Arabs’ shared Abrahamic heritage in an attempt to garner the latter’s assistance. Although the Arabs were convinced of the relationship, they were too divided to affect any meaningful alliance. Once Muḥammad successfully united them as sons of Abraham, they marched forth to claim the inheritance promised them in the Bible. They defeated the emperor’s brother in Moab, putting him to flight. Then, all the sons of Israel gathered together and formed

70 Łewond, Discours historique, 5 n. 26; Patmut’yun, 138 n. 12.
71 Short Chronicle, 110–11.
72 Arcruni, History, 164 on biblical references, 66 on the hijra, 68 on Salmān; Patmut’iwn, ed. Vardanyan, 156 on biblical references, 60 on the hijra, 62 on Salmān.
73 See Hoyland, Seeing Islam; Crone and Cook, Hagarism.
74 Sebēos, Patmut’iwn, 134–36; Armenian History, 1:95–98. Pseudo-Sebēos also includes the Jews in his description of the Persian conquest of Jerusalem earlier in the seventh century; on this, see Cameron, “Blaming the Jews.” Arcruni, History, 101; Patmut’iwn, ed. Vardanyan, 166–68, follows the account of Pseudo-Sebēos, with only a few alterations.
a large army. They defeated an imperial expedition, crossed the Jordan, and camped in Jericho. The population of Jerusalem panicked and fled with the Cross and other precious items. J. Howard-Johnston proposes that the source of this story was composed in Palestine, and possibly in Jerusalem itself, given its focus on the region, and therefore labels it the Palestinian Source.

As Łewond similarly describes a Jewish plea for assistance from the Arabs predicated on a common Abrahamic origin, Howard-Johnston suggests that Lewond may have relied on that same source or something like it, despite the fact that Lewond incorrectly places the attack after the death of Herakleios in 20/641. This postdating may reflect the pro-Herakleian stance of either Lewond or his source: neither could fathom a military loss of this magnitude occurring under the leadership of the great Roman emperor. His later dating of these events also makes it impossible for Lewond to place the relocation of the Jews to Arabia around the time of Muhammad’s mission, as Pseudo-Sebēos does. According to Lewond’s narrative, the Arabs had already united under Islam at the time of the Jewish request for assistance, and the Jewish intervention only provided them with an incentive to expand outside of the Arabian Peninsula.

In addition to these discrepancies between the accounts of Lewond and Pseudo-Sebēos, which hinge on the dating of the Islamic incursion into the Levant, other differences may also be noted: (a) Lewond uses direct speech to recount the Jewish appeal, whereas Pseudo-Sebēos uses it to report Muhammad’s exhortation; (b) Lewond’s Jewish proposal states that the Arabs will rule jointly with the Jews over the inhabitants of the land, while in Pseudo-Sebēos’s account Muhammad promises his followers that they alone will seize the land that had been promised to Abraham; (c) Lewond does not mention the siege or surrender of Edessa; (d) Lewond states that the Roman general in Judea called his commanders to join him and together they formed a large army, whereas Pseudo-Sebēos says that the Arabs and the Jews together formed a large army; (e) Lewond makes no comparison between the twelve tribes of Israel and the twelve tribes, each with a thousand men, that composed the Arab army; and (f) Lewond makes no mention of Jerusalem or of the flight of its inhabitants and the removal of the Cross. Lewond also shows no cognizance of the “Jewish plot” to discredit the Christian population of Jerusalem, as reported by Pseudo-Sebēos. Jews do not feature in any of Lewond’s conquest accounts, nor is the narrative topos of Jewish preference for and collaboration with caliphal or Muslim rule over and against Roman or Christian dominance present elsewhere in the text. Indeed, Jews do not appear again in Lewond’s historical narrative at all. The divergences between the accounts of Pseudo-Sebēos and Lewond make it highly unlikely that Lewond relied directly on Pseudo-Sebēos or on a common source. Rather, they suggest that Lewond accessed a polemical tradition which sought to counter Islamic claims that God had sanctioned the Muslims’ political expansion (cf. Qur‘ān 33:27) and their right to rule others by attributing that expansion to Jewish instigation. The emphasis on ruling other people,

---

75 Sebēos, Armenian History, 2:238–40.
77 On this, see Astren, “Re-reading,” 94–99.
as opposed to simply acquiring more land, possibly reflects a later, post-conquest context than that imagined in Pseudo-Sebēōs.

By contrast, Pseudo-Šapuh preserves an idiosyncratic version that has only very general characteristics in common with Lewond and Pseudo-Sebēōs. In his retelling, when Herakleios entered Persia, the Jewish elders and magnates took the books of Moses and other gifts and went to Baghdad. There they convinced Muḥammad of their kinship through Abraham and argued that as sons of Abraham, the Arabs should rule in Jerusalem instead of foreigners. Muḥammad informed his sister Fāṭima (sic) and his brother-in-law ‘ʿAlī (sic) about what the Jews had told him and sent ‘ʿAlī forth with an army to take Jerusalem. When the sons of Herakleios, Constantine and Theodosius, who were on their way to Jerusalem with the Cross and were camped in Ramla/Ramlay, heard that Jerusalem had been taken, they fled with the Cross to Antioch and thence to Constantinople. There is clearly much that is unique and anachronistic here, but like Pseudo-Sebēōs, Pseudo-Šapuh situates the Jewish exhortation to the Arabs within the time of Muḥammad and associates the removal of the Cross to Constantinople with it. Like Lewond, Pseudo-Šapuh presents the Jewish address in direct speech. It thus appears that the author of this text was aware of the traditions preserved by Pseudo-Sebēōs and Lewond but that the story had become very muddled in its—likely oral—transmission over time.

I.B.3. Battling the Romans

There were a number of battles between Arabs and Romans in the early conquest period. When Lewond refers to a battle in Arabia Petraea, he may mean the battle of Yarmūk, which resulted in the collapse of Roman power in Syria. Several details (the Romans’ difficulty in securing supplies, the rout of the Roman army, and the high Roman death count) align with what other sources report about the battle. However, the battle of Yarmūk did not take place in Arabia Petraea, as Lewond claims, and it occurred in 15/636, not in 20/641 during the reign of Constantine III, where Lewond places it. Further, the Roman forces at Yarmūk were under the command of an Armenian general, a detail that Lewond does not relay.

I.B.4. The Fall of the Sasanian Empire

Lewond’s account of the fall of the Sasanian Empire is significantly shorter than his telling of the conquest of Syria and devoid of the biblical motifs that populate his account of caliphal victories over the Romans. The collapse of the Persian Empire serves as a narrative segue into the Islamic incursions into Armenia, creating the impression that Armenia was alone in its fight against the Caliphate.

Lewond explains that the Sasanian Empire lasted for 481 years, but the source of this claim is uncertain. Lewond clearly associates the downfall of the Sasanian Empire with the battle of Nihāwand in 21/642. Counting back 481 years would mean that the Sasanian


79 On Yarmūk, see Bosworth and Kaegi, “Yarmūk”; Kaegi, Byzantium and the Early Islamic Conquests, 112–45; Donner, Early Islamic Conquests, 130–46; Hoyland, In God’s Path, 39–49.
Empire began in 161 CE. Vardan Arewec’i and Kirakos Ganjakec’i replicate Lewond’s claim of 481 years, but Michael the Syrian and Mxit’ar Anec’i instead report that the Sasanian Empire lasted 418 years. It is unlikely that the difference in the numbers is the result of a scribal error in either Armenian (418 is rendered as ՆԺԸ, whereas 481 is ՆՁԱ), Greek (ΥΙΗ vs. ΥΠΑ), or Syriac (ܬܦܐ vs. ܬܝܚ).

A survey of other references to the length of Sasanian rule in Armenian texts makes it clear that Armenian historians did not share a unified chronology of Sasanian history. Pseudo-Sebēos explains that with the death of Yazdegerd, “so was extinguished the rule of the Persians and the Sasanians, which had held sway for 542 years” (Եւ բարձաւ տէրութիւնն Պարսից և ազգին Սասանայ, որ կալան զթագաւութիւնն ամս ՇԽԲ). T’ovma Arcruni follows Pseudo-Sebēos with 542 years, whereas Step’anos Tarōnec’i gives the unique number of 386 years. These calculations depend on the particular calendar used and the definition adopted of the start and end dates of the empire. We should not assume that these spans necessarily refer to the period between the coronation of Ardashīr in 224 CE and the death of Yazdegerd in 651 CE, which would be 427 years, as Armenian historians identified different events as the start and end of Sasanian power.

Łewond remarks on the booty the Muslims captured on the conquest of Iran: “The Ishmaelites plundered the land and carried off the royal treasury to their own land” (Պատմության մեկ կես զարգացում). In Arabic accounts of the battle of Qādisiyya, the immense riches of the Persian kings constitute a trope and serve to highlight the contrast between Persian opulence and the simple lifestyle of the nomadic Arabs. Persian traditions, however, frequently focus on symbolic treasures of the Sasanian kings, such as the standards of the Sasanians (درفش کاوانی) and the legendary ceremonial carpet of the audience hall at Ctesiphon (بیار کسری); the capture and/or destruction of these signals the transfer of power to the Arab Muslim armies.

I.C. ISLAMIC INCURSIONS INTO ARMENIA

The details of the Islamic incursions into Armenia are convoluted and contradictory in the sources, so a clear narrative continues to elude us. The Arabic accounts project a single, extended conquest that unfolded over a number of years. They focus on the famous generals of the caliphal armies and list each conquered region with a neat precision that belies the polycentric chaos of the incursions.

80 Sebēos, Patmut’iwn, 343 n. 609.
81 Sebēos, History, 135; Patmut’iwn, 164.
82 See, for example, Sebēos, Patmut’iwn, 343 n. 609; Tarōnec’i, Universal History, 183 n. 301.
83 Lewenthal, “Qādisiyyah, Then and Now,” 110–12.
84 We use “incursions” here rather than “conquests” because none of these campaigns resulted in a permanent caliphal presence in Armenia. The “conquests” of Armenia—in the sense of producing a recognizable caliphal administration in the province—occurred only in the reign of ’Abd al-Malik. However, Arabic sources frequently project unbroken control over the region, beginning with the campaigns of Iyād b. Ghanm in the 630s CE. On the campaigns of Ḥabīb b. Maslama and Salmān b. Rabī’a, in particular, see Vacca, “Armenian Sources”; on the problems raised by the various accounts of the conquests of Armenia, see Manandyan, “Les invasions arabes.” C. Lo Jacono offers a translation of Ibn A’tham’s
Lewond, by contrast, is far more interested in lamenting the fate of Armenia caught between the haughty Roman Empire and motivated caliphal forces. These extremes are encapsulated in the Roman general Prokopios’s mistreatment of T’ēodoros Ṙštuni, on the one hand [7r], and the highly dramatic description of the sack of Dabil/Duin [8r–9v], on the other.85 Prokopios’s insulting dismissal of T’ēodoros culminates in the Roman general’s humiliating defeat at the hands of the smaller caliphal army [7v]. By contrast, T’ēodoros is able to retain his dignity and exact some retribution for the sack of Dabil/Duin through his victory over a larger caliphal contingent at Basfurrajān/Vaspurakan [10r], with which Lewond closes the chapter devoted to the period of the “rightly guided” caliphs. Despite these narrative preoccupations, it is possible to draw parallels between Lewond’s recounting of the early Islamic incursions into Armenia and those found in Arabic sources.

I.C.1. The Two Campaigns in 22/642–43

Lewond describes a caliphal military campaign in the year after the death of Herakleios (d. 20/641) that first defeated the Persian Empire and then moved into Armenia. The victory over the Persians here refers to the battle of Nihāwand in 21/642. Lewond employs the hijrī dating when he claims that these forces subsequently moved against Armenia “in the twenty-second year of the Ishmaelite princes Abū Bakr, ‘Uthmān, and ‘Umar” (h. puwū. լորակերպ ուղև Աբուբաքրա և Օթմանա. և Ամրի իշխանացն Իսմայելի) [8r].

According to the Arabic accounts, there were two separate incursions into Armenia in 22/642–43.86 Muʿāwiya b. Abī Sufyān, then governor of Syria, sent Ḥabīb b. Maslama al-Fihrī into Armenia. Facing the Roman forces in the environs of either Qālīqalā/Karin or Shimshāṭ, the Syrian forces requested reinforcements. The caliph ʿUmar ordered Kūfā to send troops, and these arrived under the command of Salmān b. Rabīʿa al-Bāhilī sometime after ‘Uthmān came to power in 23/644. The Iraqi army arrived after the Syrians had already routed the Romans, so Ḥabīb and Salmān quarreled about the rights to the spoils. With the two Arab Muslim armies poised to battle each other in Armenia, Ḥabīb and Salmān leveled threats at one another and then reportedly paused to write to the caliph for directions. As they waited for a response (which was not recorded), the tensions receded as each army marauded through different territories. Ḥabīb b. Maslama remained in Armenia and then turned north into Jurzān/K’art’li, while Salmān b. Rabīʿa brought his forces against Albania and Khazar territory along the Caspian Sea.87

In line with the usual pattern of futūḥ narratives, multiple dates are given for the campaigns of Ḥabīb and Salmān. Ṭabarī places Ḥabīb, Salmān, and several other generals in Armenia, Georgia, and Albania in 22/642–43 but then recounts the campaign again in

85 See La Porta, “Sense of an Ending,” 372–74, for his use of the Bible and of Elišē; on the sack of Dabil/Duin, see also Greenwood, “Reassessment,” 146–47.
86 This early date may relate instead to the conquest of Azerbaijan, which precipitated the subsequent campaign into neighboring Albania.
87 See Vacca, “Armenian Sources.”
I. THE CALIPHATES OF ABŪ BAKR, ‘UMAR, AND ‘UTHMĀN

detail in 24/644–45. Khalīfa b. Khayyāṭ locates Ḥabīb b. Maslama’s campaign with the Syrian troops in 22/642–43, but he associates them with the conquest of Azerbaijan in the aftermath of Nihāwand. He places Salmān’s campaign against Bardhaʿa/Partaw later, in 25/645–46. Yaʿqūbī explains that ‘Umar “dispatched Ḥabīb b. Maslama al-Fihrī to Armenia and sent Salmān b. Rabīʿa after him to reinforce him, but he did not reach him until after the murder of ‘Umar” (ووجَّه حبيب بن مسلمة الفهر دأ الى ارمينية ثم ارده سلمان بن ربيعة مددا له فلم يصل إليه الا بعد قتل عمر). Since ‘Uthmān came to power in 23/644, this account bridges the divide between 22/643 and 23/644. However, Yaʿqūbī also offers a conflicting report according to which both Ḥabīb and Salmān were dispatched by ‘Uthmān, which would place the campaign later. The simplest solution to this chronological confusion is that 22/642–43 marked the start of the campaigns of Ḥabīb and Salmān, given that they were associated with the conquest of Azerbaijan in that year. However, the engagements of the two Muslim armies in Armenia and Albania unfurled over the subsequent years. The specific date of the campaign is less important than is Łewond’s invocation of the hijrī year 22 and its alignment with the Arabic accounts of the inception of these campaigns, since it convincingly demonstrates both that Lewond was relying on the hijrī dating and that his chronology reflects one known in the Arabic sources, as well.

Although he does not name Ḥabīb or Salmān, Łewond acknowledges that this campaign was in fact two campaigns: “the forces divided into two” (ընդ երկու բաժանված զավարք) [6v]. His claim that “one regiment went marauding through the region of Artaz against the Greek general” (այսի զավարքը գաւառր Արտազ էր) [7r] likely refers to the Syrian forces under the command of Ḥabīb b. Maslama, which defeated the Roman forces, though he seems to assert that they came from Iraq rather than Syria. The Roman army “was encamped in the region of Kogovit on the borders of Bazujor and Marduc’ayk” (բանակել էր գաւառին Կոգո ովտի. ի սահմանի Բազուձոր և Մարդուցայ) [7r]. Artaz and Marduc’ayk’ are both districts of Basfurrajān/Vaspurakan, midway between Lake Van and Nashawā/Naxčawan. By contrast, the reference to the other regiment that moved through “the towns of the Medes, the region of Golt’n, and the village of Naxčawan” (զավարքը Մարաց. և զգաւառն Գողթն. և զդաստակերտսն Նախջաւանու) [6v] must refer to Salmān b. Rabīʿa’s campaign, given that he arrived via Azerbaijan. Lewond’s account thus corresponds quite closely with the Arabic sources in terms of the dating and the direction of the campaigns.

I.C.2. Another Campaign in 26/646–47?

Łewond subsequently describes another incursion that took place three years later, in the twenty-sixth year of the reign of Abū Bakr, ‘Uthmān, and ‘Umar, which we should read as 26/646–47. However, Lewond clarifies that this second attack occurred in the second year

---

88 Ṭabarī, Taʾrīkh, 1:2666 for 22/642–43 and 2:807–8 for 24/644–45. The first reference claims that Ḥabīb invaded Georgia, while the second includes an anecdote about Ḥabīb’s wife that also appears in Balādhuri.
89 Khalīfa, Taʾrīkh, 86, 90.
90 Yaʿqūbī, Works, 3:790; Taʾrīkh, 2:180.
91 Yaʿqūbī, Works, 790; Taʾrīkh, 2:180.
92 Yaʿqūbī, Works, 806–7; Taʾrīkh, 2:194.
of the reign of Constans II, who ruled from 641 to 668 CE. According to the latter dating, then, Łewond’s “second” set of incursions happened in 22/643, which corresponds exactly to the date he provided for the earlier incursions. Given the inconsistency in Łewond’s dating, there are two ways to read this account.

If we prioritize Łewond’s claim that this campaign occurred in the second year of Constans II, this wave of incursions could in fact refer to the campaigns addressed above. Lewond claims that the Muslim forces held the Joray pass and took the city of Dabil/Duin. According to Baladhuri, after his defeat of the Roman forces Ḥabīb b. Maslama moved from the region of Lake Van to Dabil/Duin: “His cavalry roamed and settled Jurnā. They reached Ashūsh, Dhāt al-Lujum, the mountain of Kū.ta, and Wādī al-Aḥrār. They conquered all of the villages of Dabil, then moved against Sirāj Ṭayr and Baghrawand” (وجالد فنزلت جرنى وبلغت اشوش وذات اللمج والجبل كوتة ووادى الإحرار وغلبت على جميع قرى دبيل ومجى إلى سراج طير ويعرونود). Some of the toponyms in this description of Ḥabīb’s campaign have been only provisionally identified, but Jurna is Garin; Dhāt al-Lujum is one of the villages of Dabil/Duin; and Wādī al-Ahrār, “River of the Freemen,” is a direct translation of the Armenian River Azat. From Dabil/Duin, Ḥabīb’s incursion into Armenia next took him to Nashawā/Naxčawan, Sīsajān/Siunik’, and Ways/Vayoc’jor on the way back to Dabil/Duin. Geographically, Łewond’s description fits neatly with the accounts of Ḥabīb’s campaign. If this is in fact a retelling of the 22/643 campaign, it is likely that Łewond is here stitching together two different sources.

One of Łewond’s sources may relate to the Anonymous Chronicle attributed to P’ilon Tirakac’i, composed around 690 CE, which similarly attests to an Arab attack on Dabil/Duin in the second year of Constans: “Constantine [i.e., Constans], son of Constantine, grandson of Herakleios, twenty-nine years. In his second year Duin was taken by the Arabs,94 and the number of captured was thirty-five thousand” (Կոստանդին՝ որդի Կոստանդիանի, թոռն Հերակղի, ամս քսանեւինն։ Ի սորա երկրորդ ամին առաւ Առաւ Դուին ի Տաճկաց. եւ եղեւ համար գերելոցն ԼԵՌ). In addition to placing this incursion in the second year of Constans’s reign, the number of captives is the same in the two texts. Łewond may have been familiar with the first/seventh-century Anonymous Chronicle or the two works may be relying on a common source for this information; either way, it appears that Łewond was aware of two descriptions of an incursion in 22/643 and presented them as two separate attacks.

Indeed, there is significantly less evidence to support Łewond’s alternative dating of the incursion to AH 26 (647 CE). However, Tabari offers a relevant report, which underscores the uncertainty of precisely dating these incursions: “In this year—that is, the year 24—al-Walid b. ʿUqba raided Azerbaijan and Armenia, because their inhabitants had repudiated the terms to which they had agreed with the Muslims during ʿUmar’s reign. [That is] according to the account of Abū Mikhnaf, but other authorities relate that this took place in the year 26” (وفى هذه السنة اعنى سنة 24 غزى الوليد بن عقبة أذربيجان وأرمينيا لمنع اهلها ما).
This report may indicate that the peace terms these regions set with Ḥabīb did not stand, prompting a second incursion in either 24/645 or 26/647. More firmly, it indicates that the story of the conquests was just as contested and confused in Arabic accounts as it was in the Armenian ones.

I.C.3. A Third Campaign in 32/652–53

At the end of the chapter, Łewond reports that a third campaign entered Armenia ten years later, “in the thirty-sixth year of their reign” (երեսուն եւ վեց, երորդ ամի իշխանութե անդամ զամայի վրաց) [9v]. This detail makes little sense in the context of early Islamic history. Ten years after 26/647 would indeed have been the year 36/656–57, as Łewond claims, but the Battle of the Camel took place in that year, followed soon thereafter by the battle of Ṣiffīn, and it is difficult to believe that the incursions into Armenia would have continued through the confusion of the first fitna. If they did, historians writing in Arabic did not record them.

An alternative reading of the date can be gleaned from the passage discussed above, in which Łewond offers two incompatible dates for the (possibly second) Arab incursion into Armenia. Lewond asserts that the campaign of 26/647 occurred in the second year of Constans II, which, as noted, actually fell in 22/643. He then explains that the Muslims “ceased coming up into this land of Armenia for ten years” (դադարեցին յելանելոյ ի վերջ աշխարհիս հայոց ամս. տասն) [9v]. If, instead of counting ten years from 26/647 to arrive at 36/656–57, we take an interpretive leap to understand Łewond to mean ten years from the second year of Constans, we get the year 32/652–53. Again, just as with the previous set of incursions, there are numerous conflicting accounts, and this alternative possibility cannot be verified with any certainty. However, this date is consistent with Pseudo-Sebōs’s account, which places the conquest of Dabīl/Duin in the thirteenth year of the reign of Constans (i.e., 653 ce). The Chronicle of Zuqnin also explains that “Ḥabīb invaded Jazīra” (عـلـ ܚܒܝܒ ܠܓܙܝܪܬܐ) in ag 964, which corresponds to 652–53 ce.97 Theophanes likewise places this campaign in AM 6145/652–53 ce, naming Ḥabīb explicitly, while Agapius and Michael the Syrian follow suit without naming the commander.98 Arabic sources understand the campaigns of both Ḥabīb and Salmān to have extended over the entire decade. In addition to the numerous references to 22/642–43 outlined above, there are multiple reports about a campaign under the same generals in 31/651–52. Ṭabarī cites Wāqidī for the claim that “in this year—that is, the year 31 [651–52 ce]—Armenia was conquered by Ḥabīb b. Maslama al-Fihrī” (فتحت فى قول الواقدى ارمينية على يدى حبيب بن مسلم الفهرى).99 Bar Šinaya similarly places Ḥabīb in Armenia in the year 31/651–52, which he equates with ag 962.100 Although we do not have Arabic texts that attest to a campaign in 32/652–53 in particular, several accounts of Salmān’s incursions into Khazar territories

96 Ṭabarī, History, 15:7–8; Taʾrīkh, 1:2804.
97 Chronicle of Zuqnin, 145; Chronique de Denys, 8 (Syriac).
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99 Ṭabarī, History, 15:78; Taʾrīkh, 1:2871. Note that Manandyan cites Yaʾqūbī for this same information, but Yaʾqūbī’s report does not in fact include a date; Manandyan, “Invasions arabes,” 171.
100 Bar Šinaya, Chronographie, 85–86.
along the Caspian coast align with Pseudo-Sebēos’s description of the campaign. These details do little to unravel what might have happened in the conquest period, but they do establish that Lewond’s information fits with some of the details found in the Arabic and Syriac sources. Whereas Lewond divides the accounts into three separate incursions, the narrators of the Arabic sources project them into a one unified story, combining events whose dates range from 22/642–43 to 32/652–53 into a single campaign.

Although Lewond clearly delineates three campaigns in 22/642–43, 26/646–47, and 32/652–53, both internal and external evidence suggests that the second campaign is in fact another telling of the campaign of 22/642–43. The duplication of the campaign of 22/642–43 may reflect Lewond’s reliance on two different sources, one pegged to a hijri chronology and the other to the regnal dates of Roman emperors.

101 See Vacca, “Armenian Sources.” Cf. Ibn A’tham, Futūḥ, 1/2:344 (all references to Ibn A’tham’s Kitāb al-futūḥ are to the 1986 Beirut edition unless otherwise noted).
Łewond’s second chapter, on Muʿāwiya b. Abī Sufyān (r. 661–80), is short even though it covers nearly twenty years. Lewond’s brevity here reflects the parameters of what he wants to include in his History and should not be taken as an indication of a lack of activity in Armenia in this period. Muʿāwiya’s governance was largely uncontested, as it allowed Armenians control over their own territory. The chapter focuses on the Armenian nobility and clergy who organized the dispatch of hostages and tribute to the Umayyads. This arrangement affirmed the internal power structure in Armenia and appears to have been markedly different from the practice in the later Umayyad period, when the province’s taxes were collected and its army was overseen by local caliphal administrators. The other main point of interest in Łewond’s account of Muʿāwiya’s reign is the Armenian volte-face to support the Umayyads against the Romans. This particular version of events does not appear as such in non-Armenian sources, though it follows patterns consistent with Armenian disaffection with and defection from Roman service throughout the seventh century. Importantly, Lewond differs from other Armenian sources in presenting the decision of T’ēodoros Rštuni, the prince of Armenia, to make an alliance with the Umayyads in a positive light, instead of castigating him as a traitor.

ENGLISH TRANSLATION

After them [Abū Bakr, ʿUmar, and ʿUthmān], a certain Muʿāwiya reigned for nineteen years and four months, then he died. And how in his days Grigor became prince [of Armenia], and the events that transpired in Armenia and the deaths of the princes.

4. In the first year of his reign and in the twenty-fifth year of the emperor Constans, who was the grandson of Herakleios, the prince of the Tačiks began to assemble forces against this land of Armenia. King Constans was informed, and he ordered the general, who was in the region of Cilicia, to march out against them. He [Constans] also deposed T’ēodoros from his authority on account of the perfidy that he had committed against the general Prokopios. In his place, he [Constans] appointed a certain Smbat [11r] from the house of the Bagratunik’. He [Constans] sent [Smbat]...
with his general. He wrote to T'ēodoros Ṙštuni, the former prince, saying: “Come to war with us with the troops under your command.” But he [T'ēodoros] did not want to march out. Again, he wrote a second time: “If you do not rise up against the marauders with us, on our return we will wipe out your house from among our noble families.” Intimidated by the threats, he [T'ēodoros] prepared his son Vard to go with Prince Smbat. He ordered [his son] to deceive their allies and to unite with their enemies. He [Vard] went to the Greek general and they departed for Syria, crossing the Euphrates at some point. T'ēodoros’s son approached the general and requested that he himself [be] guard of the pontoon bridges, so he [the general] ordered him [Vard] to guard the bridgehead. When they [the Romans and the Arabs] clashed with each other in battle, the wounded fell on both sides. The forces of the Tačiks grew strong again and put the Greek legion to flight on the Holy Saturday of Easter. When T'ēodoros’s son saw the Ishmaelite victory, he was emboldened and crossed to the other side of the river. He severed the ropes of the bridge so that those [Greeks] who fled would not survive. They surrounded the Greek forces and threw some into the river. Some escaped and fled to Greek territory.

Hereupon the Greek king lost heart, for he realized that the deterioration of his reign was an act of the Lord, and he never again went up against Ishmael. Then the prince of the Ishmaelites wrote an edict to this land of Armenia: “If you will not pay tribute to me and if you will not submit to my service, I will put everyone to the sword.” At that time the high priest of the Armenians, Nersēs, the builder of the church of Saint Grigor, and the princes and naxarark of this land convened and took it upon themselves to pay tribute to the tyranny of the Ishmaelites. Hostages were requested from them, and they gave them two from among the Armenian naxarark: Grigor from the Mamikonean house and Smbat from the Bagratuni house. They brought them to the prince of the Tačiks, Mu‘āwiya, and they set the tribute over this land of Armenia at five hundred silver coins (dahekan) each year to remit to

---

1 The text is ambiguous. Chahnazarian and Arzoumanian consider the Roman emperor the subject of this sentence, but it seems to have been Smbat, given that the text of the letter refers to “our noble families.”

2 Cf. 1 Kingdoms (1 Samuel) 7:13, where the same phrasing is used to refer to the Philistines’ never invading Israel again.
them in order to remain secure in their homes. Then, in the second year of his reign, Muʿāwiya summoned Grigor and Smbat, who were hostages at the royal court. He gave Grigor the honor of ruling over the Armenians and sent them with many honors to this land of Armenia. There was great peace during the days of his reign.

ARMENIAN EDITION

Յետ նոցա ունի զիշխանութի ուն Մաւիս ոմն ամս.

Այստեղ գրիտրի համար իշխանն Գրիգոր, և որ անցք անցին ընդ աշխարհս Հայոց.

Եւ եթէ զարդ յաւուս նորա էր իշխանութե ան, և կսան և հինգ.

Կոստանդիանոսի Կոստանդիանոս

3 երեխի՝ 

4 Կոստանդիանոս Կոստանդիանոս ա.մ.
COMMENTARY

II.A. ARMENIAN DEFLECTION FROM ROMAN FORCES

Lewond recounts the volte-face of T’ēodoros Ṙštuni, who ordered his son Vard to shift his support from the Roman Empire to the Caliphate “in the first year of his [i.e., Muʿāwiya’s] reign and in the twenty-fifth year of the emperor Constans” (İ սորա յառաջնում ամի իշխանութեան և ի քսան և. հինգ հարիւր: Իսկ յերկրորդում ամի իշխանութեան Մաւէա. կոչէ զԳրիգոր և զՍմպատ որ էին պատանդք ի դրանն արքունի. և տայր Գրիգորի զպատիւ իշխանութեան Հայոց. և առաքէ զնոսա բազում մեծարանավք յաշխարհս Հայոց. և եղև բազում խաղաղութիւն Կաա. և նոցա ի մէջ արարեալ զզավսր Յունաց. զոմանս գետավէժս առնէին. և ոմանք զերծեալ փախստեամբ յաշխարհն Յունաց: Եւ յայնմհետէ լքաւ սիրտ արքաին Յունաց. զի գիտաց եթե ի տեառն է է խոտորումն իշխանութեանն նորա. և ոչ ևս յաւել ելանել ի վերա Իսմաելի: Իսկ իշխանն Իսմաելի գրէհրովարտակ յաշխարհս Հաոց. եթե ոչ հարկեսջիք ինձ և ոչ անկջիք ընդ լծով ծառաութեան իմոյ. ի սուր սուսերի մաշեցից զամենեսեան: Յայնժամ ժողովեալ ի միասին քահանայապետքն Հայոց. Ներսէս շինող սրբոյն Գրիգորի. և իշխանք և նախարարք աշխարհիս. յանձին կալան հարկել բռնութեան Իսմաելացւոցն. յորոց խնդրել պատանդս. տայինչիrevolution от римских сил. 5 Hand 1. 6 qe[p] - հ suprascr. 7 կալանի կալան ա.с. 8 puhuwaqumagov] read: puhuwaqumagov with printed editions. 9 սահավ] սահավ ա.с. 10 չ add. in rt. mg.
II. THE CALIPHATE OF MUʿĀWIYA B. ABĪ SUFYĀN

Umayyad history identify the starting date of Muʿāwiya’s reign as 40/661 with the death of ʿAlī, but it seems likely that he was recognized as caliph in Syria already in the 30s/650s.11 Whichever date we endorse as the first year of Muʿāwiya’s reign, it does not align with the twenty-fifth year of the reign of Constans (r. 641–68), which falls in 45–46/666.

Only one other history associates the specific details mentioned in Lewond’s narrative with Vard: the popular tales attributed to Šapuh Bagratuni (and any texts that derive from either of them). Scholars have attempted to associate Vard Rštuni with other Armenian rebels mentioned in Greek, Syriac, and Arabic sources, but the search for a historic Vard Rštuni outside of the works of Lewond and Pseudo-Šapuh has not been productive. Instead, Vard’s defection fits within a larger collection of intertwined narratives about members of the Armenian elite turning away from Roman power. Instead of constituting clearly defined depictions of any particular event, the various details about Armenian discontent demonstrate the entangled nature and transmission of these stories. Some of the details in Lewond’s account—the date, the Armenian defection, the Roman emperor’s response, and the captives—align with other accounts of the reign (or governorship) of Muʿāwiya, as described in the so-called “Theophilus circuit.”12

II.A.1. The Rebellion of Pasagnathēs

Theophanes describes the rebellion of Pasagnathēs in AM 6143/650–51 ce, the tenth year of Constans (651 ce) and the sixth year of ʿUthmān (29/649–50), thus: “In this year Pasagnathēs, the patrician of Armenia, rebelled against the emperor and made a treaty with Mauias, to whom he handed his own son. On hearing this, the emperor went as far as Caesarea of Cappadocia and, giving up all hope for Armenia, came back” (Τούτῳ τῷ ἐτεὶ ἐστασίασε Πασαγνάθης, ὁ τῶν Ἀρμενίων πατρίκιος, τῷ βασιλεῖ καὶ σπονδὰς μετὰ Μαυῖου πεποίηκε δεδωκὼς αὐτῷ καὶ τὸν ἵδιον υἱὸν. καὶ ἀκούσας ὁ βασιλεύς ἠλθεν ἕως Καισαρείας Καππαδοκίας καὶ ἀπελπίσας τῆς Ἀρμενίας ὑπέστρεψεν).13 Agapius places this same event in the fourth year of ʿUthmān (27/647–48):

In the fourth year of ʿUthmān, the people of Armenia renounced their submission to Constans, king of the Romans, and submitted to the Muslims. Their governor was one of the patriarchs of Rome named Basahnāṭus. He wrote to Muʿāwiya and sent him his son as hostage. And when it reached Constans that the people of Armenia had rebelled and mutinied, he rose up with the armies of the Romans and went to Qaysāriyya of Cappadocia, heading for Armenia. When he was some distance away, the report of it reached him and grieved him. He had planned to enter Armenia, but he withdrew from it in despair.

وفي السنة الرابعة لعثمان خلع أهل أرمينية طاعة قسطوس ملك الروم وصاروا في طاعة المسلمين وكان عاملهم
بطرق من بحارها وقسطوس من طاعة المسلمين وكان عاملهم

12 The Theophilus circuit is a set of historical works by Theophanes, Agapius, Michael the Syrian, and the Chronicle to 1234 that appear to have drawn on a source that modern scholars associate with Theophilus of Edessa.
13 Theophanes, Chronicle, 480; Chronographia, 344.
Lewond’s account of Vard’s defection includes some details that are also found in the various versions of the Theophilus circuit. Lewond has the Roman forces march against Armenia from Cilicia, while Theophanes and Agapius place the emperor himself in nearby Cappadocia. All three of these sources refer to a treaty between the Armenians and Mu‘āwiya. They also all note that “the Greek king lost heart” (լքած սիրակ, Յունար) [11v] and so relinquished his claim on Armenia. However, there are also significant differences between Theophanes and Agapius, on the one hand, and Lewond, on the other. Neither Theophanes nor Agapius suggests that the Roman forces fought the Armenians or Mu‘āwiya’s forces. The name Pasagnathēs also finds no easy explanation. “Pasagnathēs” cannot be a rendering of any relevant Armenian name, though it has been conflated with the name of another rebel “of Persian origin” (Περσογένης), on whom see below. G. Abgaryan has also suggested that Πασαγνάθης might be a corruption of the Greek παράβατης, “law-breaker.”

II.A.2. Dawit’ Sahaṙuni’s Abandonment of the Greek Forces

Despite the differences in the accounts, the rebellion of Pasagnathēs offers the closest parallel to Lewond. However, the transmission of reports about the Armenian defections was convoluted. Other sources associated with Theophilus do not mention Pasagnathēs; instead, Michael the Syrian refers to yet another Armenian rebel who appeared while Mu‘āwiya was in Cappadocia during the reign of ʿUthmān. Michael explains that the Roman emperor sent out two contingents to face off with Mu‘āwiya, one under an Armenian general and the other under a Greek general. In the Syriac version of the text, this encounter is set in Mesopotamia; in the Armenian version, however, Mu‘āwiya defeated the Romans in Caesarea (which would tally with Theophanes’s and Agapius’s references to the city) and the Armenian general went to Cilicia (as Lewond claims). The Armenian general reportedly witnessed the atrocities of the Roman forces and decided not to continue serving the imperial effort. He then left the field without confronting the Muslims or backing up the Roman war effort. This story is certainly different from the one found in Lewond and in the earlier texts associated with Theophilus, but it does include several shared details, notably the Armenian defection and the location.

Michael the Syrian’s Armenian general is not T’ēodoros Ṙštuni but “a certain Armenian whose name was Dawit’” (հայկազնոյ ումեմն, որում անունը Դավիթ էր). This passage refers to Dawit’ Sahaṙuni, who served as prince of Armenia immediately before T’ēodoros Ṙštuni. According to Pseudo-Sebēos, Dawit’ Sahaṙuni had earlier, around the year 637 ce, been implicated in a plot against Herakleios, and he rebelled by gathering the Armenian forces around him. Herakleios acknowledged him as curopalates and prince of Armenia, but his power degenerated after three years. That this affair took place earlier would in

14 Agapius, ‘Unvan, 482.
15 Sebēos, Patmut’iwn, 195 n. 19.
16 Michael the Syrian, Žamanakagrut’iwn (1870); Žamanakagrut’iwn (1871), 312.
fact make sense, as the Syriac version of Michael the Syrian’s chronicle claims that the commander of the Muslim forces was ʿIyāḍ b. Ghanm, who commanded the first wave of Islamic incursions against Jazīra in the 10s/630s. 17 Reading “Pasagnathēs” as “Sahāruni” is not possible, but it may make more sense for Agapius than Theophanes. A. Vasiliev, who edited Agapius’s text, noted that the manuscript reads سحماين which he corrected to سحمااتس on the basis of Theophanes’s Πασαγγανθης. The Arabic is thus no closer to سحارني (per Michael) than it is to سحمااتس (per Theophanes); both readings are equally conjectural.

Indeed, it seems plausible that the stories about Dawit’ Sahāruni and T’ēodoros Ȓštuni were confused in the process of oral transmission. Evidence of this might be found in the later Universal History of Tarōnc’i, who refers to him as “T’ēodoros Sahāruni the patrician (patrik), who was lord of the Ȓštunik’” (Թէոդորոս Սահառւնի պատրիկ, որ էր Ռշտունեաց տէր).18 Such a claim demonstrates the pliable nature of the information about the Armenian elite who fought both Roman and caliphal authority in the first/seventh century.

II.A.3. The Rebellion of Saborios

Theophanes, Agapius, the Chronicle to 1234, and Michael the Syrian all attest to a subsequent rebellion in AM 6159/666–67 CE that was led by “the strategos of the Armeniacs, Saborios, who was of Persian origin” (ὁ τῶν Ἀρμενιάκων στρατηγὸς Σαβόριος Περσογένης; معلومات متعلقة ب ListView محظوظة للكاتب).19 Both Constans and Saborios sent envoys to negotiate with Muʿāwiya in Damascus to support their claim. Muʿāwiya asked the Roman messenger for the taxes of the rebellious province, promising not to contest the ownership of the land itself. The Roman messenger refused, so Muʿāwiya instead made an agreement with Saborios’s envoy. The Roman messenger and the rebel envoy both returned toward Melitene. The Roman messenger, who had been personally humiliated before the caliph and disparaged for being a eunuch, ambushed Saborios’s envoy and had him castrated before ordering his death. Muʿāwiya sent a commander named Faḍl to support the rebellion, but Saborios was thrown off his horse and died from his injuries.20 When the rebellion stalled, Muʿāwiya then sent his son Yazīd to raid Roman territory on his own.

This rebellion does not appear in Armenian historical sources. Given that the strategos was reportedly of Persian origin21 and controlled the Armeniac theme, which lay well outside the regions that typically preoccupied Armenian historians, it seems unlikely that

---

17 Michael the Syrian, Chronique, 4:443–44. On Dawit’ Sahāruni, see Sebēos, Patmutʻiwen, 133. The raids of ʿIyāḍ b. Ghanm appear in many sources, particularly the Arabic and Syriac ones, but not in Łewond’s History. This probably demonstrates the geographical scope of Lewond’s sources, which do not frequently venture into Jazīra along ʿIyāḍ’s route.
18 Tarōnc’i, Universal History, 159; Patmutʻiwen tiezerakan, 91.
19 Hoyland, Theophilus, 153–61; Theophanes, Chronographia, 348; Michael the Syrian, Chronique, 4:433; Peeters, “Πασαγγανθης – Περσογένης.”
20 Faḍāla b. ʿUbayd al-ʿUmarī played an important role in the campaigns during the reign of Muʿāwiya.
21 The Greek is the only clear indication of his Persian provenance. P. Peeters, in “Πασαγγανθης – Περσογένης,” argues that Michael the Syrian’s Περσογένης derives from the Georgian სერგოსენი. This resolution is highly unlikely. Cf. Michael the Syrian, Chronique, 2:451 n. 9: “Il est possible que le mot Περσογένης soit la transcription altérée du syriaque ՍէրաԳեյէն, ou inversion.” Also, note that Agapius
this incident could have been confused with the defection of Řštuni. The main similarities include the date, an ambush (though with a completely different outcome and setting), and Mu‘awiya’s request for taxes. The mention of Melitene also makes a comparison with Lewond’s report tempting, as its location directly on the Euphrates between Armenia and Cilicia would align with Lewond’s account of Vard’s defection.

In short, the rebellions of Dawit’ Sahaṙuni, Pasagnathēs, and Saborios Persogenēs do little to clarify the convoluted histories of the conquest period or to explicate Lewond’s odd passage. Modern scholars have sought T’ēodoros Ṙštuni in the rebel Pasagnathēs, but this sort of reconciliation of conflicting information oversimplifies the contradictions and overstates the agreements across accounts. Just like the contradictions found in Arabic conquest narratives, these details serve to remind us that information about the conquests could jump from one defection to another, with the result that attempting to untangle each and every detail becomes a futile exercise. It is instead more fruitful to acknowledge the common ground between these accounts as the product of storytelling settings and as evidence of the literary norms of conquest narratives, rather than as “real” facts about Pasagnathēs, Dawit’ Saharuni, Saborios Persogenēs, and T’ēodoros Ṙštuni. Such an approach allows historians to investigate the significance of the story recounted in any given source on its own terms instead of attempting to judge its veracity.

II.B. VARD ŘŠTUNI IS NOT A TRAITOR

Lewond’s account of Vard Ṙštuni’s actions at the bridge over the Euphrates neatly encapsulates the complex shift in Armenian allegiances from the Roman Empire to the Caliphate in the mid-first/seventh century. As Lewond describes, Vard’s father, T’ēodoros Ṙštuni, had been removed from his position as prince of Armenia by Constans after his conflict with the general Prokopios [7r–v, 10v]. Constans replaced him with Smbat Bagratuni, but the imperial forces still required the assistance of Ṙštuni troops to face the caliphal army. T’ēodoros was reluctant to join the expedition and agreed to do so only out of fear of Roman threats. He ordered his son Vard to lead his troops into battle but to deceive the imperial army. Crossing the Euphrates at some undisclosed point, Vard asked to guard the pontoon bridge that offered a means of retreat for the Roman forces in case of a defeat. The Roman army indeed found itself in trouble, and Vard, anticipating the Romans’ defeat, withdrew his forces and cut the cables to the bridge to prevent the Roman army from escaping. Although Lewond describes Vard’s actions against his Roman “allies” (ուհրերի) as a “deception” (բլխություն), he does not pass further judgment on the cutting of the bridge or on Vard’s support of the Caliphate. Much as in the earlier episode between T’ēodoros and the general Prokopios, imperial policy comes across as heavy-handed. Constans not only dismissed T’ēodoros but also threatened to destroy his lands if he did not assist the Roman expedition. Indeed, one wonders whether there might have even been a bit of irony in Lewond’s use of the term “ally” in reference to the Roman Empire. Similarly, Lewond

identifies him only as بطريق من بطارقة الروم; see Hoyland, Theophilus, 320. Presumably, then, no one else really knew what to do with this either.
22 Peeters, ”Πασαγναθής – Περσογενῆς.”
contextualizes the Roman loss as decreed “by the Lord” (ի տատեսության), thereby couching Vard’s actions within a discourse of divine providence.

If the Homily on the Cross of Varag by a certain Yovhannēs K’orepiskopos (first-second/seventh–eighth centuries) is indicative of a broader appreciation of T’ēodoros and Vard Řštuni among Armenians, then the affair of the bridge did not blemish their reputation in the near term; nor, in contrast to Lewond, does this work recall any noteworthy shift of allegiance from the Roman Empire to the Caliphate. In the conclusion to his homily, Yovhannēs extols both father and son for their piety and places the discovery of the relic of the Cross of Varag

in the days of the pious king Constantine of the realm of the Romans, and in the patriarchate of Nersēs of the realm of the Armenians, and in the dominion of Vard Řštuni of Vaspurakan, son of the brave and virtuous lover of God, Lord T’ēodoros Řštuni and general of the realm of Greater Armenia, who with valiant bravery for the sake of the building of holy churches spent all the days of his life in battle and expelled by his sword the nation of Ishmael, and was constantly victorious with supernal assistance. This Vard was a lover of Christ, and he conducted himself from his youth until the end of his days with a fear of God.

The evocation of the pious king Constans suggests that Yovhannēs was unaware of, or wished to ignore, the tensions between the emperor and the Řštuni family. He praises Vard for his building activity, something not mentioned by Lewond, and for his successful fighting against caliphal forces, a characterization that is somewhat at odds with Lewond’s account.

Vard’s “betrayal” of the Roman forces and his building activity appear most famously in Pseudo-Šapuh’s history. Here, it is the Persian Empire, rather than the Caliphate, that challenges the Roman Empire. Much else about the story differs from Lewond’s version,
but the basic narrative of the bridge is the same. According to Pseudo-Šapuh’s account, T’ēodos (sic) Ršuni summoned his son Vard to his deathbed and told him to break the pact he had made with the Roman Empire and to join forces with the Persians. While the Persians were attacking Koloneia, Vard, called “the patrician” (patrik), went to the son of the Persian emperor and told him his plan to lead the imperial army across the river Gayl (Lykos) and then cut the cables of the bridge. In the battle, the Persians feigned a retreat and drew the Romans over the river while Vard guarded the bridge. Some of the Persians were waiting in ambush, and the main body of the army turned around to fight the Romans and defeated them. The Roman troops fled to cross back over the river, but Vard cut the cables and “went over to the Persians. Many of the Roman troops were killed on that day; and the Persian army returned with a great victory, accompanied by Vard the patrician” (իր հերոսի հետ զորքը զարմիկ արարեց իրենին հերոսի հետ ու հերոսի կառուցեց մեծաշատ զորք) 27

According to Pseudo-Šapuh, after returning home Vard was plagued by nightmares about what he had done, as he realized “that I have committed many impieties and have shed an immeasurable amount of Roman blood” (որ բազում անօրէնութիւնս գործեցի եւ զանչափ արիւն հեղի ի տանէն Հոռոմոց) 28 More significantly for Pseudo-Šapuh, Vard’s actions provide the narrative motivation for his ecclesiastical building program. In order to free himself of his anxiety and learn how he may be forgiven for his deeds, he traveled to Mount T’oṙos to see the hermit Simēon. The hermit told him to build many churches, including one for Saint Stephen the Protomartyr. Vard said that he wished he had a relic of Saint Stephen, and the hermit told him, Simēon, would get one from Jerusalem. Simēon went to Jerusalem and served at the martyrium of Saint Stephen. After three years, Saint Stephen told the sacristan of the relics to give Simēon a piece of his bones to take to Armenia, “for many churches are being built in my name in Armenia” (զի բազում եկեղեցի շինին յանուն իմ աշխարհին Հայոց) 29 The sacristan gave Simēon a piece to take to Armenia and sent him on his way. Pseudo-Šapuh concludes: “As long as Vard lived, he wore a small hair shirt under his clothing as far as his elbows; and no one was able to discover this until the day of his death. In his days was revealed the Holy Cross on the mountain of Varag, and it was the year 200 of the Armenian era” (որչափ կենդանի եկաց, հազաւ մազեղէն փոքրիկ ի ներքոյ հանդերձին իւր մինչեւ յարմունկն եւ ոչ ոք կարաց իմանալ մինչեւ օր մահուան իւրոյ։ Իսկ նորա յաւուրքն յայտնեցաւ սուրբ խաչն որ ի Վարագ լեառն, եւ էր թվականն Հայոց. ԲՃ) 30 In the end, for Pseudo-Šapuh, it is Vard’s pious building projects, ascetic lifestyle, and association with the discovery of the relic of the Cross that are worthy of remembrance, not his adverse relations with the Roman Empire.

In contrast to both Yovhannēs K’orepiskopos and Pseudo-Šapuh, Łewond pays no attention to Vard’s personal qualities of piety or impiety. Instead of portraying Vard as a traitor, he employs this episode to explain the deterioration of relations between the

---

Armenian nobility and the Roman Empire, as well as why Armenia’s elite decided to sign a treaty with the Caliphate.

II.C. SUFYÂNID GOVERNANCE AND THE INTERREGNUM

Several historians of Armenia have noted the flourishing of Armenian culture in the period between the end of the Roman-Sasanian wars and the Marwânid reforms. N. Garsoian assessed this period from the perspective of historical, geographical, and religious literature to problematize the assumption that the Islamic conquests were a so-called “dark age” for medieval Armenia. Similarly, art historians have built on a long tradition of scholarship throughout the twentieth century to argue against a dark age. In fact, P. Donabédian identifies the period between the 10s/630s and the 70s/690s as the “golden age” of Armenian architecture. The decrease in architectural production in the Roman Empire, Syria, and Mesopotamia in this period contrasts sharply with its immense flourishing in Armenia and, to a lesser extent, in Georgia. Lewond here mentions that the catholicos Nersēs the Builder (šinoł) constructed the church of Saint Gregory, which is the famous cathedral Zuart’noc’, near modern Erevan.

Both as governor of Syria and as caliph, Muʼāwiya implemented policies of indirect rule in Armenia that contributed to the flourishing of Armenian culture. Armenians paid low taxes and merely sent a few hostages to the Umayyads to signal their acceptance of caliphal authority. Lewond explains that the catholicos together with “the princes and naxarark` of this land convened and took it upon themselves to pay tribute to the tyranny of the Ishmaelites” (եվ իշխանք և նախարարք աշխարհիս. յանձին կալան հարկել բռնութեա
Իսմաելացւոցն) [12r]; in other words, Muʼāwiya did not send tax collectors to administer the province in his name but left the process of collection to the local elite. This arrangement seems to be corroborated in Pseudo-Sebōs’s History, which purports to preserve an Arab-Armenian treaty from the reign of Muʼāwiya in which the latter promises not to send emirs to Armenia and to maintain a low level of taxes. Greenwood has pointed out that Pseudo-Sebōs’s treaty was a literary construction that drew on Armenian memories of Sasanian-era agreements. Although this fact may suggest that the treaty cannot illustrate the actual circumstances of Sufyânid rule, such literary modeling was effective because it reflected the norms and expectations of Armenian relations with imperial powers, whether Sasanian or caliphal. Reports of conquest-era treaties in later Arabic sources similarly reflect pre-Islamic norms. Pseudo-Sebōs’s treaty need not be read as the actual

---

31 Garsoian includes the entirety of the Umayyad period in her assessment and so blames Lewond for the negative view of the period in modern scholarship, citing Lewond’s critiques of Muhammad b. Marwân’s activities in Armenia during the Marwânid reforms; see Garsoian, Interregnum. However, the Umayyad period should not be evaluated as a whole, as the Marwânid reforms substantially changed the dynamics between Armenia and the Caliphate; see Vacca, Non-Muslim Provinces.

32 Donabédian, L’âge d’or. C. Maranci addresses the complexities of this period as Armenia sat at the nexus of Roman, Iranian, and caliphal power in Vigilant Powers.

33 Sebōs, Patmut’iwn, 164; on this treaty, see Jinbashian, “Arabo-Armenian Peace Treaty.”

34 Greenwood, “Negotiating the North.”

35 Any attempt to equate the peace treaties of Balādhurī and Ṭabarī with that of Pseudo-Sebōs must take into account the formulaic nature of such accounts, as identified in Jinbashian, “Arabo-Armenian Peace Treaty”; Levy-Rubin, Non-Muslims.
words of Mu’awiya, but it does attest that a first/seventh-century observer found such literary patterning to be a believable representation of the circumstances of Armenia in his own time. In addition to the evidence garnered from narrative sources, Armenian inscriptions also support the idea that Sufyānid governance was largely indirect. They reveal that the Armenian nobility likely gained control over significant portions of state-held lands.\textsuperscript{36} The lack of direct imperial supervision, coupled with low taxation and the increase in income from state lands, left space for the Armenian nobles to advance their own varied interests, hence the dramatically diverse styles of architecture and types of literature available from the interregnum.

The policies of Mu’awiya reflected a specifically Sufyānid relationship with Armenia. With the Marwānid reforms of the 70s/690s, the Umayyads became directly and personally involved in the administration of Armenia, as members of the Umayyad house served as governors over the North.\textsuperscript{37} The shift in ruling norms appears after the second \textit{fitna}, during the reign of ʿAbd al-Malik (on which see chapter IV).

\textsuperscript{36} Greenwood, “Corpus,” 75.
\textsuperscript{37} Vacca, “Umayyad North.”
Łewond’s third chapter is his shortest. He notes only the length of Yazīd’s reign and the maintenance of the tribute. As such, this chapter is perhaps more interesting for what it omits. After the death of the Prophet Muḥammad, the so-called “rightly guided” caliphs had come to power through the deliberations of a council, but Muʿāwiya broke with this tradition to name his son Yazīd his successor. With the death of Muʿāwiya, numerous claimants rejected Yazīd’s claim to the Caliphate. Ḥusayn b. ‘Ali, the grandson of the Prophet Muḥammad, fought against Yazīd’s ascension; his resistance culminated in his death at the hands of the Umayyad army in the infamous battle of Karbalāʾ in 680. Subsequently, ‘Abd Allāh b. al-Zubayr established his own Caliphate in Mecca. Łewond records nothing of these conflicts, nor does he note the names of two short-lived Umayyad caliphs, Muʿāwiya b. Yazīd (r. 683–84) and Marwān b. al-Ḥakam (r. 684–85). Instead, he presents caliphal succession as if Umayyad rule were stable, conveniently sidestepping the fact that the Umayyads boasted at best a rocky claim to power until the defeat of the Zubayrids in 692.

ENGLISH TRANSLATION

And after him [Muʿāwiya], [there was] Yazīd b. Muʿāwiya; and he lived for two years and five months, then he died. He managed this land of Armenia [12v] with the same amount of tribute.

ARMENIAN EDITION

Եւ յետ նորա Իզիտ որդի Մաւեա. և ապրի ամս. երկու. և ամիսս. հինգ. և վախճանի: Եւ նա վարեաց զաշխարհս [12v]Հայոց ի նոյն սակ հարկի:
The Caliphate of ʿAbd al-Malik b. Marwān

r. AH 65–86/685–705 CE

This chapter starts with the second civil war (fitna), when the Umayyads were busy defending their claim to the Caliphate. Lewond describes the chaos of this period, during which Armenia sat on the edges of ineffectual Roman, Khazar, and Umayyad power. With the resolution of the fitna, Lewond introduces a dramatic change that accompanied the reign of ʿAbd al-Malik. Instead of dispatching temporary incursions and negotiating with the nobles for tribute and hostages, the Umayyads began to send a governor and troops to stay in Armenia. The naxarark’ did not welcome these changes, which restricted their own claims to power, and rebelled. Lewond describes the dramatic success of his sponsor’s family, the Bagratunik’, against Umayyad forces. The bulk of Lewond’s narrative is aimed at placing this rebellion (and the aftermath looming in the next chapter) into context. He celebrates the Bagratuni house, in part by downplaying the involvement of other noble houses. Since the family supported caliphal rule during Lewond’s time, he is also quick to frame the victories of the Bagratunik’ as defensive maneuvers instead of outright rebellion. One of the ways in which he asserts the innocence of the Bagratuni family is by establishing the bad faith of the caliphal governor Muḥammad b. Marwān, the brother of the caliph, who murders clergy, chases noncombatants, and makes false promises.

ENGLISH TRANSLATION

After him [Yazid b. Muʿāwiya], there was ‘Abd al-Malik b. Marwān. He lived for twenty-one years, then he died. These [are] his deeds.

5. He was a wicked man and fierce in battle. In the second year of his reign a great confusion and a war broke out amongst the Tačiks, and they shed a lot of each other’s blood. War raged among them for three years, and their slain were innumerable to the extent that they fulfilled the prophecy of David, who said: “Their swords shall enter into their hearts and their bows shall be broken.” For instead of the innocent blood and cruel massacres that they had repeatedly inflicted upon this nation of Christians, the

1 Psalm 36(37):15.
blood of the guilty was justly shed. God exacted vengeance [from them] for the offenses against His servants by their very own hands.

Yet Grigor, the prince of Armenia, kept this land of Armenia in peace from all marauders and attacks during his reign, for he was a God-fearing man who loved both his brethren and foreigners and who tended to the poor. He was perfect in his pious faith and built a house of worship in the region of Aragacotn in the village of Aruč, a temple glorifying the name of the Lord, decorated with beautiful elegance in memory of His name. And at the time of the war among the Tačiks, the Armenians, the Georgians, and the Albanians ceased paying tribute to them, having submitted to them for thirty years. Their rebellion lasted three years. Then, in the fourth year, the nation of the north called the Khazars ruled this land of the Armenians. They killed Prince Grigor, many of the naxarark, and the prince of the Georgians and the Albanians in battle. They [the Khazars] spread incursion[s] over this land of Armenia and took many regions and villages. Then, taking booty and captives, they went back to their own land.

2 "Lover of brethren," եղբայրասէր; cf. 1 Peter 3:8.
3 "Lover of foreigners," աւտարասէր; cf. 1 Peter 4:9.
4 "Captives": գերութիւն, lit. “captivity.”

Aruč: a town in the region of Ayarat. The church mentioned here still exists in the western part of the Republic of Armenia (fig. 5). Its inscription records its foundation on March 24, 670, the twenty-ninth year of Constans, by Grigor Mamikonean and his wife, Helinė.

Albanians: the Albanians were a Christian people who inhabited an area east of Armenia. Their territory encompassed the modern republics of Azerbaijan and Nagorno-Karabagh and also (according to Arabic sources written in the period of caliphal rule) eastern Georgia. The sees of Albania and Armenia had a very close if sometimes tense relationship at this time. The only Albanian narrative source extant today is preserved in the Armenian language, rather than in Albanian.

Khazars: a Turkic confederation that appeared in the northern Caucasian Volga region in the sixth century. The Khazars controlled much of the Caspian coast in Albania at the time of the Islamic conquests. They frequently raided the Caliphate via Albania, reaching as far as Ardabil (in modern Iran) in the eighth century without establishing a permanent presence that far south. Armenians were an important contingent in the caliphal armies fighting the Khazars. See map 3.
Concerning the reign of Ašot, [13v] the
fire set by the Romans, and the death
of Ašot.

6. Then the patrician Ašot succeeded Grigor after his death. He [Ašot] was from the Bagratuni house, an eminent and respected man among the naxarark’ of the Armenians. He was wealthy and magnificent in authority. In all earthly matters he was the most prudent, virtuous, and noble; [he was] known for [his] fear of God, as a purveyor of beneficence, and as assiduous in learning. He adorned the churches of God with pedagogical arts and with assemblies of ministers. He also honored them with rich vessels from his own treasury. He built the church in his capital Dariwnk’, and he put in it the painted image [endowed] with the miraculous power of the incarnation of Christ, brought from the West. He named the church after it [the icon]. In the first year of his reign, a star with an amazing

5 “Painted”: կենդանագրեալ, life-depicting < կենդանագրեմ, calque on Greek ζωγραφέω; see Lampe, Patristic Greek Lexicon, 593. See also page 151: “Portrait[s],” կենդանագրութիւն, a calque on Greek ζωγραφία, “painting”; see Awetik’ean, Siwrmēlean, and Awgerian, Nor Bağgirk’, 1:1085; Lewond, Discours historique, 33 n. 194.
tress appeared, [14r] which, since it was radiating light behind it like a pillar of brilliant rays from itself, they called a comet. It was a sign of famine, and of the sword, and of great violence.

7. And in the second year of the reign of Emperor Justinian, during the rule of the patrician Ašot, he [Justinian] sent a great force against this land of Armenia. They came, ruined this land with pillage, and set flame to many elegant buildings, reducing them to ruins. Then they returned to their own land. The Greek nobles were enraged at this same Justinian: they cut off his nose and exiled him. In his place they crowned Leontios, Apsimar, Tiberios, and Theodosios. Meanwhile Justinian went to the land of the Khazars, married the daughter of the khagan, the Khazar king, and asked him for auxiliary troops. He [the khagan] sent a great force and a certain Tervel, Justinian’s father-in-law, a man with mighty power, with the troops. [14v] Arriving at Constantinople, he [Justinian] fought and vanquished his rivals and restored his reign once more. Tervel died in battle, yet he [Justinian] sent the other Khazar forces to their own land with many gifts and precious goods.

Ašot reigned for four years. In the fourth year of his reign, a plundering regiment from the sons of Ishmael, who were the sons of sin\(^6\) and the offspring of iniquity,\(^7\) attacked this land of Armenia. They committed iniquity in the towns of the Medes—Xram, J̌uła, and Xošakun—for they tortured the men through the collection of taxes and they thought to violate the women with obscene profanity in accordance with their impiety. Prince Ašot was informed of their evil deeds, and he immediately ordered his troops to march out [15r] against them. They struck all of them down by the sword and put the survivors to flight. When the cunning son of Satan saw the raid upon his own forces intensify, he ordered them to scatter the treasure that they had gathered on the field before the Armenian forces. They [the Armenians] turned imprudently to the booty and abated in their pursuit. Only Prince Ašot, with a few men, persisted and went after them. The enemy recovered and turned back against them. They struck and wounded the prince of Armenia. Then the troops [with Ašot] raised a cry, and they [the rest of the Armenian forces] arrived immediately.

---

Comet: Halley’s Comet would have been visible from Armenia between September 6 and October 17, 684. Lewond interprets it as a sign of tribulations.

Justinian II: Roman emperor from 685 to 695, then again from 705 to 711. He attempted to bring Armenia under the imperial Church in 689–90 but withdrew from Armenia in 693.

Roman succession: Leontios was Roman emperor from 695 to 698; Tiberios III Apsimar, who appears here under two different names as Ap’semeros and Tiber, ruled from 698 to 705; and Theodosios III ruled from 715 to 717.

Khagan: a Turkic title, here referring to a Khazar king.

Tervel: Lewond here confuses Justinian’s brother-in-law, the Khazar khagan, with Tervel, the Bulgarian khagan, who married Justinian’s daughter.

Constantinople: capital of the eastern Roman Empire, along the Bosphorus in modern Istanbul.

The fourth year of Ašot’s reign was 689.

The towns of the Medes: Xram, J̌uła, and Xošakun lie along the Araxes River south of Naxčawan.

---

\(^6\) “Sons of sin,” πηφήρ πολυγυνεύοντας; cf. 4 Kingdoms (2 Kings) 2:24 (Zohrab).

\(^7\) “Offspring of iniquity,” γυναῖκες πολυγυνεύοντας; cf. Isaiah 57:4.
They struck and slaughtered the enemy and took the prince to Kogovit, mortally wounded. He died gloriously in his bed and was buried in his resting place in the village of Dariwnk'.

**CONCERNING THE BATTLE IN THE SWAMP.**

8. After these things that we related, again [15v] the Greek king, who was called Apsimar, the successor of the Emperor Justinian, sent a force. He ordered them to capture Smbat the son of Varaztiroc' as retribution for deserting the Greek forces on account of the death of his father Varaztiroc', whom the Romans had killed. They came and warred with him on the marshy field of Payik. Many of the Armenian forces, since they were few in number, were struck, and many fell among the Greek troops, too. When Smbat saw that they were not able to withstand the Greek troops, he fled and narrowly escaped with only a few men.8 The Greek forces returned to their own land.

9. I shall again narrate the insufferable woes that befell us from the house of Ishmael. For after sixteen years of ‘Abd al-Malik’s reign, his heart was yet again inflamed by the evil-loving Satan and he ordered his troops [16r] to march out against this land. Their leader was the blood-thirsty and devil-possessed Muḥammad [b. Marwān], who had sworn a pact of impiety by an oath to their prince not to return [his] sword to its sheath until [they were] in this land. He went haughtily until he came up to the region of Jermajor. Putting the sword to work, he killed without care whomever he encountered, as he had promised. But since many people had already been forewarned, they secured themselves in the fortresses of castles. He [Muḥammad] took many fortresses by deceit because he sued for peace with lies. When the people trusted [his false words], they descended from the fortresses and he, putting the sword to work, killed the men and led the women and children into captivity. He brought much tribulation and anguish to this land, to the point [that the living] blessed the dead, who

---

8 "He fled and narrowly escaped with only a few men," փախստական եղեալ գնաց մազապուր սակաւ արամք, is a variation on the epic formula found in the *Buzandaran* when the king escapes alone on a single horse after a rout. *Buzandac’i, Epic Histories*, 32, 591.
departed from this world in peaceful repose instead of bearing life with such affliction.\footnote{Cf. Ecclesiastes 4:2, Pseudo-Methodius, and the Edessene fragment in Palmer, \textit{Seventh Century}, 233, 244.} \[16v\]

After two years, reaching the height of wickedness, he spewed fatal poison. He contrived death for the clergy of Saint Grigor, since they [the Arabs] saw the splendid beauty of the precious vessels that the kings, princes, and naxarark' of this land had stored in it [the church]. They also saw the orderliness of the angelic ranks of the priestly assembly and with that the discipline of the \textit{vardapets} and the ministers, and [heard] the angelic songs over the land. They were wounded by envy in their souls, so they deceitfully contrived their fatal ruin. One regiment of infidels went to lodge [in] its residence [i.e., of the church of Saint Grigor]. They rose in the night and strangled one of their own servants and threw him into a pit. When the morning dawned, they rose to go and searched for the servant whom they themselves had killed, but did not find him. They caused much tribulation and peril for the clergy of the church. \[17r\] They cast a search and found [the body] in the same pit in which they had thrown it. Then they fabricated pretexts and falsehoods and seized everyone from the youngest to the oldest and put them in prison. They wrote a letter to the bloodthirsty Muḥammad: “They did such-and-such to us. Now what sort of death shall we deal them?” When he heard this, [Muḥammad said] to judge them according to their wishes and to take the possessions of the church as booty. The executioners received the unjust order and went out together to complete the order of their father, Satan, who “was a murderer from the beginning and stood not in the truth,” as we learned from the Lord.\footnote{John 8:44.} They led everyone out of the prison, bound with ropes. First, they cut off their feet and hands, then they crucified them\footnote{“Crucified,” զփայտէ կախեալ, lit. “hanged around wood”: cf. Acts 5:30, 10:39; Galatians 3:13.} and took their lives.

Now who could suffer the unbearable woes that befell them without tears? The holy church deteriorated from the good order of the bema, and the sound of divine \[17v\] glorification was silenced. With that, the orders of the spiritual and rational liturgy, which the holy ones used to offer with...
all their heart to the sole Purest One, were silenced. The brilliance of the lanterns, by which they had illuminated the night like the day, was also extinguished. The sweet smell of the incense also ceased, [as did] the prayers of the priests through which they offered expiation for the congregation to the Creator and sought reconciliation from God, the lover of man. In short, the Lord’s altar was divested of every splendor. O how patient was Christ! Why, truly, did He permit the slander of the infidels to bring the bitterness of that death upon His glorifiers? But [that] by transitory death He wanted to grant eternal life, because those who shared in His torments will also partake of His glory, and since they were crucified together with Christ, they shall also reign with Him. Those who die with Him shall also be revived through Him and from ages unto ages shall receive [18r] the promised rest. And Satan’s workmen shall inherit along with him the bitterness of the various tortures prepared for them: fire, darkness, the undying worm, the weeping of eyes, and the gnashing of teeth, as He who prepared all these knows. All of this will befall everyone who commits iniquity.

Indeed, the Muhammad whom we have already discussed committed all of these evil deeds and went back to Asorestan with much booty. The inhabitants of this land remained like a firebrand smoldering in the fire, like crushed ripe sheaves that hogs trample underfoot. When the general Muhammad went to Syria, he left in his stead in this land of Armenia a prince from among the Ishmaelites. He fabricated a vile plot to remove the noble house[s] along with their cavalry from this land of Armenia. His treachery was immediately apparent to Smbat, who was from the

---

12 According to Awetik’ean, Siwrmēlean, and Awgerian, Nor Baṙgirk’, 2:232, the attribution of the epithet “Purest One” to God is attested only here.
Bagratuni house, [18v] and to the other naxarark‘ and their cavalry.

10. When he [Smbat] sensed the intrigue, he summoned his relatives among the noble corps of the camp: Smbat the son of Prince Ašot, Vard the son of Prince T‘ēodoros, his brother Ašot, and other naxarark‘. He sought to find a way that they would be able to save their lives. They resolved to yield and to go from this land to the king of the Greeks. Right away, some of the naxarark‘ of the land of Vaspurakan separated [from the others] and left. But they [Smbat and the others] proposed to go from the region of Vaspurakan to the frontier plain that they call Aṙestakolmn because a certain hermit was living there. They went to him to ask about the state of affairs, since he was a holy man, chosen, and full of spiritual wisdom. He deplored and lamented the loss of this land, the destruction of the churches, and the emptying of the naxarar house[s]. He was not able to give counsel except [19r] to be on guard and to watch out for treachery. He prayed over them, entrusted them to the grace of the Lord, and saw them off. Going along the bank of the Araxes River, they passed through the borders of Ulayē and arrived at the large town of Akoṙi.

The Ishmaelite forces that were in the city of Naxčawan pursued them and did not give up their trail, for they were more than five thousand who wanted to swallow them [the Armenians] alive. When the Armenian force was informed about the brigand who, roused, had marched against them, they arose and crossed the Araxes River and camped in the village of Vardanakert. The Tačik force persisted in coming after them. Then the Armenian force sent a message to the Tačik forces, saying: “Why are you intent on pursuing us? What wrong did we commit against you? Behold, our land is before you. We have given you our homes, our vineyards, our forests, and our fields. Now why do you also ask for our lives? Permit us to go from our borders.” But [19v] the Ishmaelite forces did not want to listen, for their hearts were hardened by the Lord19 so that they would be put to the sword.

The Armenian force fortified the streets of the town and assigned guards until dawn. They stayed awake20 the entire night in a prayer vigil, and they sought the assistance

19 “Their hearts were hardened by the Lord,” Ṣ Shunût, լուսատրություն ուժերի: cf. Joshua 3:10.
20 “Stayed awake,” կանխեալ, lit. “arose early.”
of the almighty right hand of the Lord of all and a just reckoning between them and their enemies. And immediately at dawn, when the morning office ceased, the spiritual liturgy was celebrated. The worthy partook of the body and blood of the Lord and considered it a viaticum for their souls. They took a little nourishment to strengthen their bodies, and then they arose. They arrayed themselves regiment to regimen and front to front, and the battle was joined. Omnipotent God came to the assistance of the Armenian regiment there. Although they were fewer than two thousand men, they nevertheless slaughtered many by the sword. The days were biting and icy cold and the bitter weather was worsening further, preventing the Ishmaelite troops from making use of their valiant strength, for they had lodged the whole night in the snow, and at dawn they fell to the sword. They who fled the sword fell into the Araxes River. It had frozen from the severity of the weather, and when a multitude of forces went onto the ice, the ice cracked. Those who had escaped the sword were immediately delivered to its depths and thus drowned.

A few of them, around three hundred men, turned to flee and took refuge with Lady Šušan. Smbat the son of Ašot pursued them with his own forces, wishing to put those who fled to the sword. Lady Šušan went before him with many supplications and agreements and rescued them, naked, barefoot, on foot, and wounded. She took and
covered [20v] [their] wounds, healed [them], and dressed them. She also gave horses from her own herd and sent them to the Ishmaelite prince ʿAbd al-Malik. For this she received many thanks from him, and he sent her great gifts.

The Armenian forces, gorged on the booty of their enemies, sent the good news of their triumph to the Greek king. They had fine Tačik horses from the booty of their enemies sent to him as presents. They also sent him as a present the noses that were cut from the corpses of those who fell. The emperor received that gift and offered great gratitude to the Creator and thanks to Smbat [son of Varaztiroc'] and to the naxarark’ who were with him and to their forces. He also had bestowed upon him [Smbat] the rank of curopalates in accordance with royal custom. He [Smbat] received this honor from the emperor, took his forces, and went to the land of Tayk’. Cautious of the sons of Ishmael, he entered the fortress called T’uxark’. [21r]

11. Around this time, another brigand came against the army in the land of Vaspurakan. They came and faced each other in the region of the Ṣṭunik’ in the village called Gukank’; there they faced each other. When they [the Arabs] saw that they [the Armenians] were few in number, they fell upon them violently. Then God’s compassion had mercy [on them] and came to their assistance at that moment. They [the Armenians] put everyone to the sword except for only two hundred and eighty men, who fled and escaped into a church. When they were not able to prevail, they thought to set fire to the sanctuary; however, Smbat, the prince of the region of Vaspurakan and the son of Prince Ašot, did not permit them and would not allow [them] to commit such wickedness, for he said: “Far be it from us to lay hands on the dwelling place of the glory of God, who has granted us such a triumph.” They assigned guards to watch over them until the shrine itself should dislodge them. Shortly thereafter, someone from [21v] the Ishmaelite troops, who was the highest-ranking of them, requested an arrangement for himself so that he would not die by them. He approached the Armenian forces and said: “We have heard that Christian people21 are merciful. When they see someone in pain, they are compassionate and merciful. Now be charitable to us and grant us our lives.

---

21 “People”: M1902 reads the plural “peoples,” uuqqp, probably an error due to diplography, uuqq-p p-ḥuunmît-[q]. The following verbs are singular, although their subject is plural.
as a gift. Take our belongings as booty." The general Smbat answered: "We," he said, "have learned from our Lord that it is worthy to be compassionate to the merciful, but you are a cruel people and unworthy of mercy, so we will not be merciful." When the Ishmaelite heard this, [he said]: "Then at least grant me pardon and spare me, and I shall deliver the others into your hands." They accepted, [saying], "We will not kill [you]." So he [the Ishmaelite] entered inside [the church] and said, "There's no use in our staying here, for I saw them [to be] merciless regarding us. But now come and let us go out to them. If they kill us, let us die, for our lawgiver Muhammad promised us paradise. If they let us live, we shall live." Taking courage from these words, they all went out together and immediately fell into the mouth of the sword. As for that man whom they had promised not to kill, they threw him into the depths of the sea alive. They took the spoils of the fallen, divided it among themselves, and dispersed to their own places.

12. Afterward, when the Ishmaelite prince 'Abd al-Malik heard about the shattering of his forces, he summoned Muhammad, the general of his army. He ordered him to take many troops with him and to go up against this land of Armenia, [to punish it] by sword and captivity. Then and there, he [Muhammad] vigorously prepared his forces and arrogantly threatened to carry out the orders of their prince. When the naxarark of this land of Armenia heard of the brigand who, strengthened, was coming against them, they arranged for the catholicos of the Armenians, Sahak, and some of the bishops of this land along with him to go before the Ishmaelite forces to speak words of peace with their general and to submit themselves [the Armenians] to the yoke of their servitude. When [22v] he was escorted from this land, he greeted everyone, [allowing them] a loving kiss of his right hand. He blessed his flock who believed in him, along with his fellow pastors, and commended them to the grace of the Lord. And when he had passed many dwellings and arrived at the city of Harran, an illness befell him.

Though the general Muhammad had not yet arrived at Harran, his [Sahak's] end drew near and he wrote his final words in a testament to the Ishmaelite general: "I," he said,

was sent before you by my people to tell you my proposal, which the naxarark’ and common people of Armenia in agreement beg of you. But He who is the keeper of the stores of life snatched me hastily to Himself, so I did not have time to meet you and to speak with you. But now I swear to you by the living God and I lay before you the pact, the covenant of God, which [was] with Ishmael, your ancestor, as it promised to give him [Ishmael] the world in servitude and in vassalage. So, should you make peace with my people, they will serve you by paying tribute; should you stay your sword from bloodshed and your hand from pillaging, they will submit to you with all their heart. But concerning our faith, we should have the privilege of keeping to what we have believed and have confessed. May no one from among you torment us to turn from our beliefs. Now should you do as I have entreated, the Lord will favor your rule and the intent of your will shall be fulfilled. The Lord will subjugate everyone to you. But should you not wish to listen to my words and perversely conceive to rise up against my land, the Lord will shatter your intentions and your course will not be assured. He will turn the hearts of your troops so as not to do your wishes; he will agitate troublemakers for you from every side; and your rule will not be secure. So do not neglect my entreaty and may my blessings come upon you.

When Muḥammad arrived in Harrān, they told him about the catholicos of the Armenians and they presented him with the letter. When he had read the letter, he asked about his death. They told him: “He is not yet buried, since he has just died.” When he heard that, [23v] he immediately arose and went to the site. Standing close to the body of the deceased, he greeted him according to their custom. We heard the same thing from trustworthy people, a second and a third time. Then he took his hand and, as if he were speaking to a living person, said:

I recognize your wisdom from the letter that I read, for like a brave shepherd keeping watch over your flock, you hastened to come before my imperious sword. I am convinced to stay my sword from innocent men. Now, I will do and fulfill everything that you once entreated of me so the blessing of your piety may rest

over me. If I should err in a single thing from all your words, may all the curses that I read in your letter come upon me.

Having said this, he went to the place of his lodging. And they who had left this land of Armenia with the catholicos Sahak took the body of the blessed patriarch and transferred it, putting [him] to rest in a tomb with much honor. They also [24r] took an oath in writing from the Ishmaelite general and returned from there to this land of Armenia. When the inhabitants of this land saw the oath of the written promise, they trusted him, and henceforth they submitted to Ishmaelite subjugation as slaves.

13. Then the general Muḥammad went up to this land of Armenia a second time with a large force in the eighteenth year of Prince ʿAbd al-Malik. He remained tranquil for three years; he did not even pay heed to the misfortunes that befell the Tačik forces in the village of Vardanakert but remained firm in the written oath that he had given and merely oversaw the Armenian naxarark’. After ʿAbd al-Malik held power in this manner, he died.
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Եւ յետ նորա Աբդլմիլք որդի Մրուանա. և եկեաց ամս. քսան եւ մի և վախճանեցաւ. և այս վարք նորայ:

Եւ 24 Նա էր այր ժանդ և գոռ պատերազմաւ. ի յերկրորդում ամի իշխանութե ան

Եղև խառնակում սաստիկ ի մէջ Տաճկաց. և պատերազմ. և բազում հեղումն արեանց

նա տուն աղաւթից ի գաւառն Արագածաոտին ի յաւանն Արուճ. տաճար փառաց

24 ի ի lft. mg.

Հեղի. և ի ժողովրդական աշխարհի ցուցարկություններից հետո աշխարհի ժամանակի իրավատեր տարիներից մեկը, որը երբ թվագրվում է տասներկու, որը թուլություն է առաջադրում հայ ժողովարդական ժամանակաշրջանում, և զարգացում է հայ ժողովածուները, ինչ էլ կարճ ժամանակից հետո աշխարհի ցուցադրանքը հեղի. և դրանից հետո այս ժամանակի հայ ժողովածուները էլ պարկում են իրենց աշխարհները, և դառնում իրենց հայ ժողովածուները հայրենիք, կարճ ժամանակից են հաջողություններ նոր ժամանակի հայրենիք, կամ երևում է նոր ժամանակի հայրենիք, կարճ ժամանակից հսկում է նոր ժամանակի հայրենիք, կամ երևում է նոր ժամանակի հայրենիք, կամ երևում է նոր ժամանակի հայրենիք.

Նահանգ Զվոնի հայոցասպանության [13v] և պատմական զգացում. և մարմար Զվոնի:

27 Պահ ապա նամակ?$ Զվոնի հայոցասպանությունը որոշելու համար հայաստանը Հայաստանի հայերի և ճարտարապետ հայերի հետ համագործակցությունների և ճարտարապետ հայերի հետ համագործակցությունների մեջ մտնում են բոլորը. և ճարտարապետ հայերի հետ համագործակցությունների և ճարտարապետ հայերի հետ համագործակցությունների մեջ մտնում են բոլորը. և ճարտարապետ հայերի հետ համագործակցությունների և ճարտարապետ հայերի հետ համագործակցությունների մեջ մտնում են բոլորը. և ճարտարապետ հայերի հետ համագործակցություն

28 Զվոնի [ suprascr.
29 է; in art. mg.
30 ասակ [ -y subscr.
31 պատմական [ -y subscr.
32 ապահով [ -y subscr.
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34. Tēr-Vardanean, and Hakobian.
35. Chahnazarian.
36. Subscr.
37. Subscr.
38. Subscr.
Նմին և զվարդապետացն և զպաշտավում ս և զհրեշտակական երգս ի վերա երկրի: Եւ խանդացեալ խոցեցան յոգիս իւրեանց, և դաւաճանեալ նիվեցին ի վերա նոցա զմահաբեր կորուստն. զի երթեալ գունդ մի անաւրինաց աւթեվանել յարկս

40 յարկս ի գիշերի զծառա մի զիւրեանց խեղդամահ արարին և ընկեցին ի խորափիտ մի, և ընդ լուսանալ առաւաւտին յարեան ի գնալ. և խնդրե ալ զծառայն զոր ինքեանք խողխողեալն էին և ոչ գտին. և բազում նեղութի և վտանգ հասուցին ի վերա ուխտի եկեղեցոյն. և յոյզ արկեալ գտին ի խորափտին յոր ընկեցեալն էին. և նոյնժամայն բաղայս ստութե կարկատեալ ի վերա` կալան զամենեսեան ի փոքուէ մինչև ի մեծամեծս և եդին ի բանդի. և գրեցին հրովարտակ առ արիւնարբուն Մահմետ. եթե զայս և զայս գործեցին ընդ մեզ, արձունք երկուս ժամանեաց նոցա. զի երթեալ սրտի մտաւք միայնոյ մաքրագունին: Շիջեալ և պայծառութի լապտերացն որովք զգիշերն որպէս զտիւ լուսաւոր առնէին: Դադարեալ և բուրումն անուշահոտ խնկոցն, և մաղթանք քահանաիցն որովք զքաւութի ժողովրդոցն նուիրեին արարչին. և զհաշտութի ի մարդասէրն Աստուծո հայցէին. և միանգամայն ասել` ամենայն բարեվայելչութի խորանին 

41 յարեան ի վերա փառաւորչաց իւրոց զդառնութի մահուն այնորիկ. այլ առժամայն մահուամբն կամեցաւ. զի զյաւիտեանս յաւիտենից ժառանգեսց են զխոստացեալն հանգիստ: Եւ գործաւնեայքն

42 սատանայի ընդ նմին ժառանգեսցեն զպատրաստեալ նոցա զդառնութի բազմատեսակ տանջանաց. զհուրն. և զխաւարն, զորդն անվախճան զլալն աչաց. և զկրճտելն ատամանց. զորոց տեսակ գիտէ ինքն որ պատրաստեաց զնոսա: Այս ամենայն գալոց է ի վերա ամենեցուն որ գործեն զանաւրէնութի վեր։ Իսկ Մահմետն զորմէ պատմեցաքն, կատարեալ զայս ամենայն չարիքս, գնաց անդէն բազում աւարով յԱսորեստան: Իսկ բնակիչք աշխարհիս մնացին իբրև զխանձող ծխեալ ի հրոյ. և իբրև զաւրան վանակ փխրեալ զոր առ ոտն կոխեալ խոզից: Եւ իբրև գնաց Մահմետն զաւրավարն յԱսորիս. էթող յաշխարհիս Հայոց իշխան փոխանակ իւր յԻսմաելացւոցն. որոյ

43 գործաւնեայքն

44 սատանայի

45 վանակ

46 Հայոց
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47 [Footnote content]
48 [Footnote content]
49 [Footnote content]
50 [Footnote content]
51 [Footnote content]
52 [Footnote content]
53 [Footnote content]
54 [Footnote content]
Անդրադասին և սաստկելով զարմանեաց. և ևս առավել սաստկել ցեալ դառնաշունչ ավդոյն, կասեցուցանէր զզաւրսն Իսմաելի. Յարիական զաւրութեն իւրեանց: զի զգիշերն ամենայն ի վերա ձեան ավթագացեալ էին. և ընդ ծագել լուսոյն անգան ի ձեռս սրոյ. և որք ի սրոյն փախեան անգան ի գետն Երասխ. քանզի պաղացէալ եր ի խստութենէ ավդոյն. և իբրև ելանէին ի վերա պաղին բազմութի ւն զաւրացն անդէն վաղվաղակի խորոց մատնէին· խորտակեալ պաղին որք ի սրոյն զերծեալք էին. և այնպէս հեղձամահ վճարէին ի կենաց: Յորոց նուազունք ի փախուստ դարձեալ իբրև արք. երեքհարիւր. ապաւինէին առ տիկինն Շուշան. զորոց զկնի հետամուտ եղեալ Սմպատ որդի Աշոտի զաւրաւքն իւրովք. կամէր արկանել զփախստեայսն ի սուր սուսերի. որում ընդ առաջ եղեալ տիկինն Շուշան. բազում աղերսանաւք և դաշամբք թափէր զնոսա մերկս և բոկս և հետևակս և վիրաւորս. զորոց առեալ պատ էր զվէրս և ողջացուցանէր և զգեցուցանէր հանդերձիւք: Տայր և գրաստս յիւրոց երամակաց. և առաքէր առ իշխանն Իսմաելի Աբդլմիլք. վ աս նոր և ի նմանէ բազում շնորհակալութի ւն ընկալեալ և մեծամեծ պատիւս առաքէր նմա:

Իսկ զաւրը Հայոց յղփացեալ յավարէ թշնամեացն առաքէին առ թագաւորն Յունաց աւետիս զյաղթութե ան իւրեանց. տային տանել նմա ընծայս յավարէ թշնամեացն، զընդիրս երիվարաց Տաճիկ ձիոց. և զունչս դիակացն անկելոց հատե առաքէին ընդ նմին ընծայի, և կայսրն ընկալեալ զայն նուէր, մեծապէս գոհութի ւն ս մատուցանէր արարչին. և շնորհակալութի ւն Սմպատայ և նախարացն որ ընդ նմա և նոցին զաւրացն: Եւ տայր բերել նմա պատիւ կորապաղատութե ան կայսերէն, առնոյր զզաւրս իւր և երթայր յաշխարհն Տայոց, մտանէր յամրոցն որում Թուխարսն կոչեն. և զգուշանայր յորդոցն Իսմաելի:

Զայնու ժամանավ դարձեալ այլ հէն գայր ի վերա զաւրուն որ ի կողմանս Վասպուրական աշխարհին. և եկեալ յանդիման լինէին ի գաւառն Ռըշտունեաց. ի գեւղնում Գուկանսն կոչեն անդ յանդիման լինէին միմեանց. իբրև տեսին զի նուազունք էին, դիմեցին սաստկապէս ի վերա նոցա. և նոյնժամայն գթացեալ ողորմութե ան Աստուծ երկերիւր եւ ութսուն. ի փախուստ դարձեալ անկան յեկեղեցին. և իբրև ոչ կարացին ստնանել խորհեցան հրկէզ առնել զսրբարանն. այլ ոչ թողացոյց նոցա Սմպատ իշխան կողմանցն Վասպուրականի. որ էր որդի Աշոտի իշխանի. ոչ ետ գործել զապիրատութի ւն ն զայն. զի ասէր քաւ լիցի մեզ ձեռնամուխ լինել ի բնակարան փառացն Տեառն. որ զայնպիսի յաղթութի ւն մեզ պարգևէաց: Եւ կարգեցին պահապանս պահել զնոսա մաշեցին. բայց միայն արք.

55 պապախաղակ] -u suprascr.
56 Պոստ Դանիիել Hand 3.
58 Պոստ անար Hand 1.
59 հնարավոր] -u suprascr. in lit.; -u suprascr. in rt. mg. Hand 1 "".
60 գտնաժառանգա] -u suprascr.
61 Թնգ] -y subscr.
62 տավա] -f subscr.
63 դահա] -v subscr.
64 Սյունապա] -v subscr.
65 կենսաթղթանաման] կենսաթղթանաման a.e.
66 դա in lft. mg.
67 այ] suprascr.
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մինչև նոյին ինքն սրբարան հանցէ զնոսա արտաքս յինքէ. և յետ սակավ միոյ, մի ոմն ի զաւրացն Իսմաելի որ էր գլխաւոյ նոցա խնդիր հաշտութի
և անձին իւրում չմեռանել ի նոցունց, և ել առ զաւրսն Հայոց, և ասէ մեր լուէալ է էթէ ազգք Քրիստոնէից ողորմած է.
իբրև տեսանէ զոք ի վիշտս գթա և ողորմի. արդ ողորմեցարուք մեզ և տուք մեզ զանձինս մեր
պարգև, և զինչս մեր առէք ձեզ յաւարի: Պատասխանի ետ Սմզատ զաւրավար. մեք ասէ ուսաք ի Տեառն է մեր էթէ ողորմութի
վան ողորմածաց արժան է առնել իսկ դուք ազգ անողորմ էք և ոչ էք արժանի ողորմութե
ան. և ոչ արասցուք: Իբրև լուավ զայս Իսմաելացին, արդ գոնեա անձին իմում
ներեցէք չսպանանել և զայլսն տաց ի ձեռս ձեր, և յանձին կալան թէ ոչ
սպանցուք: Իսկ նորա մտեալ ի ներքս ասէ, ոչ ինչ ավգուտ է մեզ մնալ աստէն` զի անողորմ
տեսի զնոսա ի վերա մեր. այլ արդ եկայք ելցուք առ նոսա. եթե սպանանեն զմեզ մեռցուք.
քանզի զդրախտն խոստացաւ մեզ աւրէնդիրն մեր Մահմետ. և եթե կեցուցանեն զմեզ
կեցցուք: Եւ քաջալերեալք այսու բանիւք ելին առ հասարակ արտաքս. և նոյնժամայն
արկան ի բերան սրոյ: Իսկ զայն այր որում խոստացան չսպանանել. կենդանոյն յուղարկեցին
ի խորս ծովուն. և ինքեանք առեալ զկապուտ անկելոցն բաժանեցին ի մէջ ինքեանց. և սփռէին
յիւրաքանչիւր տեղիս:

68 սուրա: J in lit.; սուրա add. in lft. mg. Hand 1corr.
69 համա: համա a.c.
70 ծանունագիտ. -nun- in lit.; -nun- rewritten in lft. mg. Hand 1corr.
71 դպ in rt. mg.
72 ծայր: Jf. subscr.
73 վերա: J subscr.
74 դղու: դղու a.c.
75 մինչև: read: մինչև with printed editions.
76 ճարադին: ճարադին a.c.
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and Armaghagbarsa քար նամականից արագ հաղորդվել էր. Հայը փռել երաշխատության մեջ, թե համապատասխան փոքր մեծ պահանջեց իր համապատասխան և իրավունքավորվեց. և ըստ էր այն հիմնական վերջին հաղորդանքի տեսքով երկու բաժիններ: Այդ բաժիններից մեկի դիմաց երաշխատություն էր ընդունվել և այս վերջինից հետո համապատասխան է կարևոր գտնվել էր սիրահարի մեջ. և հայտնվեց փրկիչություն ընդունվել էր համապատասխան և ժամանակորեն փրկիչություն կարևոր գտնվել էր սիրահարի մեջ. և համապատասխան էր կարևոր գտնվել էր սիրահարի մեջ. և ժամանակորեն փրկիչություն կարևոր գտնվել էր սիրահարի մեջ.

Եւ իբրև էհաս Մահմեդի ԿԽառանից պատմեցին նմա զկաթողիկոսին Հայոց. և մատուցին առաջին նորա զգիրն. իբրև ընթերցական էթերք էհարց զվախճանէ նորա: և պատմեցին նմա էթերք էհարց այս զվախճանէ էհարց երեք զվախճանէ և երեք զվախճանէ կարևոր գտնվել էր սիրահարի մեջ. և ընթերցական էթերք էհարց այս զվախճանէ և երեք զվախճանէ կարևոր գտնվել էր սիրահարի մեջ. և ընթերցական էթերք էհարց այս զվախճանէ և երեք զվախճանէ կարևոր գտնվել էր սիրահարի մեջ. և ընթերցական էթերք էհարց այս զվախճանէ և երեք զվախճանէ կարևոր գտնվել էր սիրահարի մեջ. և ընթերցական էթերք էհարց այս զվախճանէ և երեք զվախճանէ կարևոր գտնվել էր սիրահարի մեջ. և ընթերցական էթերք էհարց այս զվախճանէ և երեք զվախճանէ կարևոր գտնվել էր սիրահարի մեջ.

Եւ իբրև էհաս Մահմեդի ԿԽառանից պատմեցին նմա զկաթողիկոսին Հայոց. և մատուցին առաջին նորա զգիրն. իբրև ընթերցական էթերք էհարց զվախճանէ նորա, և պատմեցին նմա էթերք էհարց այս զվախճանէ և երեք զվախճանէ կարևոր գտնվել էր սիրահարի մեջ. և ընթերցական էթերք էհարց այս զվախճանէ և երեք Զորա զվախճանէ կարևոր գտնվել էր սիրահարի մեջ. և ընթերցական էթերք էհարց այս զվախճանէ և երեք Զորա զվախճանէ կարևոր գտնվել էր սիրահարի մեջ. և ընթերցական էթերք էհարց այս զվախճանէ և երեք Զորա զվախճանէ կարևոր գտնվել էր սիրահարի մեջ. և ընթերցական էթերք էհարց այս զվախճանէ և երեք Զորա զվախճանէ կարևոր գտնվել էր սիրահարի մեջ. և ընթերցական էթերք էհարց այս զվախճանէ և երեք Զորա զվախճանէ կարևոր գտնվել էր սիրահարի մեջ.
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COMMENTARY

IV.A. ARMENIA AND THE SECOND FITNA

Łewond notes the bloodshed of the second fitna, but he makes no attempt to outline the main claimants to power; ‘Abd al-Malik remains the only possible caliph. For Łewond, the disorder extends beyond the Caliphate to include the toppling of Justinian II and the Khazar incursions. Even with his assumption that these events took place during the reign of ‘Abd al-Malik, he leaves the general sense that no single empire claimed effective control over Armenia in the 680s and that the disruptions of the fitna fit into a global moment of divinely orchestrated chaos.

IV.A.1. The Imperial Vacuum in the North

The extant sources assert simultaneous competing claims over Armenia during the second fitna. Although some details align across traditions, the divergence in the accounts confirms the multiplicity of claims over the province, as well as the disconnected transmissions of the various sets of sources. They all agree on a single point—namely, that ‘Abd al-Malik himself had no effective claim to the province during the tumultuous second fitna. Beyond that point, the sources place Armenia within various imperial settings.

Łewond’s account of the early part of the second fitna centers on the independence of the naxarark’. His main concern is the stability of Grigor’s rule as the prince of Armenia: “Grigor, the prince of Armenia, kept this land of Armenia in peace from all marauders and attacks during his reign” (իսկ Գրիգոր իշխանն Հաոց. յաւուրս իրոյ իշխանութե ան խաղաղացոյց զաշխարհս Հայոց յամենայն հինից և յարձակմանց) [12v–13r]. Łewond’s presentation of Armenia as independent during the second fitna aligns with Balādhurī’s account, which briefly mentions that the Armenians rebelled and does not report any other claim to the province until the arrival of Muḥammad b. Marwān after the fitna: “During the fitna of Ibn al-Zubayr, Armenia rebelled and its noblemen and their followers broke away” (وَا كانت فتنة ابن الزبير انتقضت ارمينية وخلاف احمرارها واتباعهم) [83].

Later in the fitna, Łewond has the Khazar Khaganate, rather than the Roman Empire or the Caliphate, exert control over Armenia:

And at the time of the war among the Tačiks, the Armenians, the Georgians, and the Albanians ceased paying tribute to them, having submitted to them for thirty years. Their rebellion lasted three years. Then, in the fourth year, the nation of the north called the Khazars ruled this land of the Armenians. They killed Prince Grigor, many of the naxarark’, and the prince of the Georgians and the Albanians in battle. They [the Khazars] spread incursion[s] over this land of Armenia . . .

[83] Balādhurī, Futūḥ, 205. Since this statement appears in the context of the fires of Nashawâ/Naxcawan and lacks a specific date, it could refer to a later period. However, the specific reference to the fitna of Ibn al-Zubayr—long resolved by the time of the fires—suggests that Balādhurī collapsed the circumstances of the fitna with the rebellion at Vardanakert ten years later.
Łewond’s emphasis on the Khazar Khaganate is evident by comparison to the first/seventh-century Anonymous Chronicle. The Anonymous Chronicle includes an entry for Constantine IV (given as III) and for Justinian II. Its final passages parallel Łewond very closely, but they embed Grigor’s reign and the Khazar incursion into the history of the reigns of these Roman emperors:

In his [Constantine’s] days, there was the confusion of the Tačik in fierce battle, and the Armenians, the Georgians, and the Albanians ceased paying tribute to them, having submitted to them for thirty years. Justinian, the son of Constantine III [sic], two years. In his first year, the nation of the north called the Khazars ruled the Armenians, the Georgians, and the Albanians. And they killed the princes of Armenia, Georgia, and Albania in battle on the tenth day of the month of Sahmi in the year 134 of the Armenians [August 19, 685].

Even if Łewond was familiar with the Anonymous Chronicle, or if the source he accessed resembled that of the Anonymous Chronicle, Łewond’s repositioning and deromanization of the second fitna and of the invasion of the Khazars is very clear. Instead of tying the two events to the reigns of Constantine IV and Justinian II, Łewond marks them with reference to Grigor Mamikonean’s rule in Armenia. Similarly, instead of noting that the Khazars killed unnamed princes from Armenia, Georgia, and Albania, he specifically mentions Grigor, thereby recentering the notice on Armenian affairs.

Łewond makes no mention of lasting Roman claims and confines his comments on the Romans to recording a destructive raid into Armenia and political developments elsewhere the empire. However, many of the texts attributed to the Theophilus circuit suggest that the Romans expected Armenia to revert to Roman territory. Theophanes claims that Justinian and ‘Abd al-Malik agreed to share the tax revenues of Armenia in AD 617/685–86 CE.87 Agapius disagrees, asserting that “Armenia was not divided” (تكون ارمينية غير مقسمة), and goes as far as to say that the envoys of ‘Abd al-Malik and Justinian fought in single combat over the taxes of Armenia: “All the Arabs were killed and Armenia belonged to the Romans
for ten years, together with Georgia, Albania, and Azerbaijan. A similar notice, without the duel between the envoys, also appears in the history of Michael the Syrian, who explains that ‘Abd al-Malik agreed to pay tribute to the Roman Empire for ten years and that “the Armenians helped the Greeks” (lit. ʿArmenia devait être aux Romains, avec Gourzan et Arzon, et la partie septentrionale de la Médie, c’est-à-dire l’Adhorbigan” (Michael the Syrian, Chronique, 2:469; 4:446). Arabic geographical literature frequently describes the caliphal North as a province that included Armenia, Albania, and Azerbaijan; in context, then, we should read both ‘Arman and ‘Arman as scribal errors for ‘Aran.

The Arabic-Islamic sources, by contrast, do not mention the Romans or the Khazars with any specificity. Rather, they outline the claims of various rivals during the fitna. Ṭabarī explains that in 66/685–66, “the first man to whom Mukhtār tied a banner was ‘Abd Allāh b. Ḥārith, the brother of Ashtar, whom he appointed over Armenia” (while Yaʾqūbi notes the appointment of Ibrāhīm b. Mālik b. Ḥārith al-Ashtar in or immediately after that same year. The following year, in 67/686–87, Mukhtār was killed and Ibrāhīm submitted to Zubayrid authority. Muṣʿab b. Zubayr subsequently appointed Muhallab b. Abī Ṣufra over Mawṣil, Jazīra, Azerbaijan, and Armenia. Ibn Aʾtham includes significantly more detail here. He purports to preserve correspondence from both Muṣʿab b. al-Zubayr and ‘Abd al-Malik to Ibrāhīm b. al-Ashtar, attempting to sway his allegiance. Muṣʿab reportedly wrote to Ibrāhīm to acknowledge that “indeed, the land of Jazīra is yours” (فان لك ارض الجزيرة), whereas ‘Abd al-Malik offered him the governorship of Iraq. Ibrāhīm traveled to Kūfa to acknowledge the Zubayrids. Then Muṣʿab b. al-Zubayr appointed al-Muhallab b. Abī Ṣufra over the land of Mawṣil, and he dismissed him from battling the Azāriqa. Iraq, Jazīra, Hijāz, Yemen, Armenia, and Azerbaijan each belonged to the Zubayrids, while Syria and Egypt, up to the end of the West [i.e., al-maghrib], were under the control of ‘Abd al-Malik b. Marwān.”

These three very different sets of claims about the political control of Armenia in 66/685–86 suggest that competing imperial claims existed simultaneously. It is entirely possible that despite caliphal, Roman, and Khazar claims, no single empire held the province.

88 In Arabic, this reads “Aṣān.” Hoyland renders it “Arzan,” citing Michael the Syrian: “L’Arménie devait être aux Romains, avec Gourzan et Arzon, et la partie septentrionale de la Médie, c’est-à-dire l’Adhorbigan” (Michael the Syrian, Chronique, 2:469; 4:446). Arabic geographical literature frequently describes the caliphal North as a province that included Armenia, Albania, and Azerbaijan; in context, then, we should read both Arzan and Arzan as scribal errors for Aran.

89 Hoyland, Theophilus, 181 (English), 321–22 (Arabic).
89 Michael the Syrian, Žamanakagrut’iwn, 326.
91 Ṭabarī, Taʾrīkh, 2:634–35.
92 Yaʾqūbi, Taʾrīkh, 2:308–9.
93 Ṭabarī, Taʾrīkh, 2:750.
94 Ibn Aʾtham, Futūḥ, 5/6:328.
at least in its entirety. The example of the second *fitna* prompts two important conclusions about Lewond’s positionality. First, the transmitted historical accounts in this case do not align at all. As a whole, Lewond can hardly be taken as an independent observer, but his information matches that found in Greek, Syriac, and Arabic sources only intermittently. Second, Lewond reports the cessation of the Armenians’ tax payments to the Caliphate in the passage devoted to the reign of ‘Abd al-Malik b. Marwân. He does not allow for the possibility that Mukhtâr had laid claim to the North or that the Zubayrids held the Caliphate and simply presents the Umayyads as the legitimate caliphs. This presentation could reflect Lewond’s pro-Umayyad stance, but it also fits with the periodization of early Islam espoused in the early ‘Abbâsid period.

**IV.A.2. The *Fitna* as Providence**

According to Lewond, the disruptions of the second *fitna* were decreed by God. Citing the fulfillment of Davidic prophecy and the deaths of Armenian Christians, he asserts that the *fitna* was deserved: “For instead of the innocent blood and cruel massacres that they had repeatedly inflicted upon this nation of Christians, the blood of the guilty was justly shed. God exacted vengeance [from them] for the offenses against His servants by their very own hands” (Զին փոխանակ անպարտ արեանն և անողորմ սատակմանց զոր յաճախեցի իվերա ազգիս քրիստոնէից. արիւն վրիժապարտ հեղաւ իրաւացի. և պահանջեաց Աստուածաշխաչ արհամարհանաց ծառաից իւրոց նոցին իսկ ձեռաւք [12v]. Lewond also notes the appearance of Halley’s Comet as “a sign of famine, and of the sword, and of great violence” (եղև նշանակ սովոյ և սրոյ և մեծի սասանութէ) [14r]. Just as with the second *fitna* more broadly, Lewond does not restrict his interpretation solely to events within the Islamic world. Although there are a number of ways to connect this foretold violence to the *fitna* (e.g., Ibn al-Zubayr’s proclamation of the Caliphate in Mecca or Mukhtâr’s revolt),95 Lewond does not relate the perceived omens of the comet to specific events in the Islamic world. Rather, his description of the comet is bookended by the Khazar incursions on one side and by the quick turnover of Roman emperors during Justinian’s exile on the other. This perspective situates his interpretation of the comet in much the same way as his description of the political circumstances of Armenia at the nexus of various fields of chaotic influence does.

**IV.B. THE PRINCE OF ARMENIA AND THE MARWÂNID REFORMS**

In the aftermath of the second *fitna*, ‘Abd al-Malik and several subsequent caliphs instigated a series of military, administrative, and fiscal reforms across the Caliphate, eliminating the vestiges of Roman and Sasanian administration in multiple provinces. The Marwânid reforms—so called after ‘Abd al-Malik’s branch of the Umayyad dynasty—initiated a new type of imperial rule by attempting to systemize administration from Iraq to Egypt. The administrative changes were not immediate or uniform across the Caliphate but rather unfolded over time with innovations that were specific to each province. New aniconic Arabic coins replaced the earlier Umayyad models based on Roman and Sasanian
precedents, providing visible consistency to the imperial image. Arabic sources also record the Arabization of the dīwān in a piecemeal, province-by-province fashion over the reigns of ‘Abd al-Malik and his son Walid, to the detriment of languages previously associated with other empires, such as Greek and Middle Persian. At the same time, ‘Abd al-Malik and his son also embarked on building programs, constructing the Dome of the Rock, al-Aqṣā Mosque, and the Great Mosque of Damascus. Provincial governors such as Ḥajjāj b. Yūsuf and Muhammad b. Marwān were sent to assert Umayyad control over key provinces and, in particular, to undertake the expansion of the Caliphate’s frontiers. The army that upheld these frontiers also changed in leadership, organization, and—if the complaints of rebels such as Ibn al-Ashʿath are to be believed—expected length of garrisoning along the frontier. The term “Marwānid reforms” is a useful shorthand to refer to a number of such disparate changes that were implemented across the Caliphate in the wake of the second fitna, but it is important to note that these reforms took unique paths in each province.

The Marwānid reforms initiated a dramatic change in caliphal policy concerning Armenia. According to Pseudo-Sebēos, Muʿāwiya promised no caliphal military intervention in Armenia; although Lewond has Muʿāwiya impose a tribute and keep hostages, he does not suggest that the Sufyānids played a significant role in the day-to-day administration of the province. From the reign of ‘Abd al-Malik on, however, Umayyad agents became far more active in Armenia. Lewond refers to the direct collection of taxes, which we should consider in light of the reformed Arabic-Islamic coinage newly minted in the North. He also describes the arrival of a governor and a garrison of caliphal troops in Armenia. The caliph’s choice of governor—his own brother—signals the significance of this frontier province to Umayyad interests vis-à-vis the Khazars and the Roman Empire.

Lewond also attests to interesting developments concerning the rank of prince of Armenia in the aftermath of the second fitna. The Sufyānids considered the Mamikonean family to be the key to controlling Armenia. As governor of Syria, Muʿāwiya took four Mamikonean hostages, prompting their father, Mušeł, to rebel against the Roman Empire to ensure their safety. Muʿāwiya subsequently named Grigor Mamikonean prince of Armenia, a rank that the Roman emperor had previously conferred upon Grigor’s brother.

96 On the changes in coinage, see Bacharach, “Signs of Sovereignty”; Heidemann, “Evolving Representation.” Aniconic Qur’ānic coins were not minted everywhere in the Caliphate, but they did become predominant. Local rulers such as the Dābuyids and the Tāhirids continued minting coins with Sasanian imagery into the ‘Abbāsid period. The Arabization of the coinage was also not universal, as Umayyad coins in North Africa and Spain maintained Latin inscriptions.

97 As in the case of the coins, there were significant differences between provinces in the “Arabization” of the Marwānid reforms. Coptic documentation actually increased, which suggests that the goal was to destabilize the hegemony of Greek and respond to local concerns rather than make a blanket assertion of the superiority of Arabic. See Sijpesteijn, “Early Islamic Empire,” and Legendre, “Translation of the Dīwān.”

98 On these building activities, see Bacharach, “Marwanid Umayyad Building Activities”; Flood, Great Mosque of Damascus; George, Umayyad Mosque of Damascus.

99 For a view of the armies, see chapter 2 of Kennedy, Armies of the Caliphs. For Ibn al-Ashʿath’s complaints, in particular, see al-Faruque, “Revolt of Ibn al-Ashʿath.”

100 See Vacca, Non-Muslim Provinces.

101 Sebēos, Patmut’iwn, 175.
Hamazasp. These actions make sense given the primacy of the Mamikoneank’ among the naxarar families at the time. Mu‘āwiya’s strategy seems to have been to confirm the position of those in power and to triangulate the Roman and Armenian agendas. By contrast, after the Marwānid reforms the Mamikoneank’ rarely held the office of prince. During the caliphate of ‘Abd al-Malik, the principate was bestowed upon Ašot Bagratuni, and with few exceptions, the subsequent princes of Armenia also hailed from the Bagratuni house.102 Instead of seeing this trend as a definitive marker of Bagratuni ascendance, we should recognize that the later Umayyads fostered a relationship with the Bagratuni family specifically to undermine Mamikonean claims to supremacy among the Armenian naxarark’.

The close alliance that emerged between the Bagratunik’ and the caliphs in the aftermath of the Marwānid reforms was mutually beneficial, providing the Caliphate with local allies while bolstering Bagratuni claims with external legitimation. The tensions between naxarar houses came to a head when the Mamikoneank’ ousted the Bagratunik’ as princes of Armenia under Marwān b. Muḥammad during the third fitna, as described in chapter XI.

The descriptions of the prince of Armenia in Łewond’s text also suggest a change in how Armenians performed their power. Before the Marwānid reforms, the princes were expected to demonstrate piety through patronage of the Church. Building projects reflected Armenian political culture, but the “golden age”103 of Armenian architecture in the first/seventh century resulted from the circumstances of Sufyānid rule, which was largely uninvolved in the day-to-day workings of the province. According to Łewond, Grigor Mamikonean “was perfect in his pious faith and built a house of worship in the region of Aragacotn in the village of Aruč, a temple glorifying the name of the Lord, decorated with beautiful elegance in memory of His name” (և կատարեալ ի հաւատս ա ստուա ծպաշտութե ան. և շինեաց նա տուն աղաւթից ի գաւառն Արագածաոտին ի յաւանն Արուճ. տաճար փառաց անուան Տեառ. գեղեցիկ վայելչութ եամ բ զարդարեալ ի յիշատակ անուայ իւրոյ) [13r]. Ašot, who ruled after him, is described in a similar vein for having built a church at Dariwnk’: “He was wealthy and magnificent in authority. In all earthly matters he was the most prudent, virtuous, and noble; [he was] known for [his] fear of God, as a purveyor of beneficence, and as assiduous in learning. He adorned the churches of God with pedagogical arts and with assemblies of ministers. He also honored them with rich vessels from his own treasury” (ճոխ և պերճ յիշխանութե ան. և յամենայն վարս երկրաինս զգաստ և ազնուական. և ծանաւթ երկեղի Աստոմո. և ծառայում անձառային բարձրություն, փոքր տեսակն անսնական զարդարված. լրատվաճառող Աստոմո. զարդարվածություն, պատասխան Նպատական փարանջարդանջ. վարդակատուց ենթարկվել Աստոմո: Պատասխաններ ի և բոլորը ամենամեծ իրավիճակ կարծեց գլխատեց) [13v]. These commonalities point to the expected performance of the prince of Armenia, extending Lewond’s earlier accounts of the Armenian patriarch Nersēs the Builder (šinol). But after the Marwānid reforms, Lewond places greater emphasis on the princes’ military exploits and service to the Caliphate than he does on their building activities. This shift in focus

102 For a list of princes of Armenia, see Laurent and Canard, L’Arménie, 400–408; Ter-Levondyan, “Hayoc’ išxanǝ.” Although the evidence is far from conclusive, the elevation of the Bagratunik’ to the principate of Armenia could harken back to Sasanian practice. The late Sasanians had favored Bagratuni princes, installing Smbat Bagratuni over Armenia at the end of the sixth century, followed by his son Varaztiroč in 629.

103 Donabédian, L’âge d’or. For an account of the varieties of architectural voices in the seventh century, see Maranci, Vigilant Powers. See also the interpretations offered in Garsoian, Interregnum.
reflects caliphal reliance on the Armenian military and, by extension, the broader integration of Armenia into the Caliphate.

IV.C. DOWNPLAYING REBELLION AND REWORKING THE CHRONOLOGY OF ‘ABD AL-MALIK’S REIGN

The Marwānid reforms initiated Armenia’s transition from tributary vassal to imperial province, which substantially increased the caliphal army and administration in Armenia. These changes prompted an Armenian rebellion that culminated in the battle of Vardanakert in 83/703, as the Armenian naxarar houses sought to maintain their independence. The bulk of Lewond’s account of the reign of ‘Abd al-Malik is devoted to the exoneration of the Armenian forces for Vardanakert, which he construes as an inevitable defensive maneuver rather than a rebellion. First, Lewond establishes the bad faith of the caliphal army and governor. The caliphal forces staged a murder to justify the looting of an Armenian church, and Muḥammad b. Marwān, the public face of the Marwānid reforms in Armenia, allowed them free reign to torture and kill the clergy. Second, Lewond presents the battle of Vardanakert as the result of caliphal aggression against the Armenian nobility. The Armenians, attempting to flee, defeated the caliphal forces only when forced to fight. Third, Lewond has Muḥammad b. Marwān signal his acceptance of the intentions of the Armenian nobility and forgive their actions through his interaction with the catholicos Sahak and his issuance of a three-year oath of protection (amān).

These three events are connected in Lewond’s narrative to establish the good faith of Smbat Bagratuni and his compatriots, but they are also meant to set the stage for Muḥammad b. Marwān’s ultimate act of deception when he tricks the leading Armenian nobles into gathering in churches, locks the doors, and burns them alive (see chapter V). Lewond’s narrative thrust toward this moment is evident from his manipulation of the chronology of events, which introduces three idiosyncrasies to his account. First, he presents the amān extended by Muḥammad b. Marwān as the resolution of the battle of Vardanakert instead of something that preceded it. Second, Lewond claims that three years passed between Vardanakert and the fires of Nashawā/Naxčawan, in contrast to other sources, which locate both events in the same year. Finally, as a result of those three additional years, Lewond places Muḥammad b. Marwān’s burning of the Armenian nobility in the caliphate of Walīd, whereas all other Armenian and non-Armenian sources assert that the fires occurred during the reign of ‘Abd al-Malik. These chronological rearrangements underscore Lewond’s assertion of the innocence of the Armenian nobility and attribute culpability for the violence in Armenia to the personal desire of Muḥammad b. Marwān.

IV.C.1. Muḥammad b. Marwān and the Church of Saint Grigor

Lewond’s account of the governorship of Muḥammad b. Marwān is fixated on his blood-thirstiness: “Their leader was the bloodthirsty and devil-possessed Muḥammad [b. Marwān], who had sworn a pact of impiety by an oath to their prince not to return [his] sword to its sheath until [they were] in this land” (զաւագլուխ էր արիւնարբու և այսակիրն Մահմետ որոց դաշինս անաւրէնութե ան ուխտեալ առ իշխանին իւրեանց երդմամբ չդարձուցանել զսուր ի պատեանս մինչև ի մէջ աշխարհիս) [16r]. The trials of the Armenians appear linked to
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him personally, even when he was not directly involved, as in the incident that occurred at the church of Saint Grigor. "After two years, reaching the height of wickedness, he spewed fatal poison. He [i.e., Muḥammad b. Marwān] contrived death for the clergy of Saint Grigor" (Եւ զկնի երկուց ամաց ի գլուխ մոլորութե ան ն հասեալ փսխէր զմահաբեր թոյնսն. նիւթէր ի վերա ուխտին սրբոյն Գրիգորի զմահ) [16v]. Łewond then recounts that a caliphal contingent duplicitously murdered one of its own servants in a ruse to deprive the church of its valuables out of envy for its wealth and its clergy’s piety. Falsely blaming the clergy of the church for the death of the servant, the regiment imprisoned them for murder and wrote to Muḥammad b. Marwān for judgment. The latter replied that the regiment should do with them as they wished and plunder the church. The regiment then cruelly killed all of the clergy. Although the regiment performs all the action in this account, Łewond still relates the event to Muḥammad himself by attributing to him the final decision to allow the clergy to be killed.

The story of the fate of the church of Saint Grigor is not just an unmoored example of the cruelty of caliphal occupation. Rather, Łewond uses the story of the murdered servant as a narrative technique to prepare for his telling of the battle of Vardanakert. He telescopes out from the specifics of this story to underscore that it is illustrative of caliphal policy toward the Church generally. The ruse and the murder of the clergy likewise signal the deceptive and destructive attitude of Muḥammad b. Marwān and, by extension, of the Caliphate toward Armenia. It foreshadows the attempt to eradicate the Armenian noble houses that Łewond will narrate next. Even though the "bloodthirsty" Muḥammad left Armenia and went to Syria, the situation did not improve. His successor ‘Abd Allāh b. Abī Shaykh (on whom see below), simply called a “prince from among the Ishmaelites” by Lewond, “fabricated a vile plot” (խորհուրդ վատ ի մէջ առեալ) [18r], just as the regiment had done previously. The stakes of this plot for the Armenian nobility are clear, as Łewond has already attuned the reader to caliphal perfidy through the story of the killing of the clergy of Saint Grigor. It is not a surprise, then, that this governor’s later treachery to remove the Armenian nobility was “immediately apparent to Smbat, who was from the Bagratuni house, and to the other naxararks and their cavalry” (Եւ անդէն վաղվաղակի յայտնեցաւ նենգութի ուն նորա Սմբատայ` որ էր ի տոհմէ Բագրատունեաց և այլոց նախարարաց և նոցին հեծելոց) [18r–v].

IV.C.2. The Battle of Vardanakert as a Rebellion

Łewond claims that the events at Saint Grigor had established a pattern in caliphal practice. The Armenian naxararks’, recognizing the inevitability of violence, sought to remove themselves from their ancestral homeland altogether, but the caliphal forces persisted in their bloodlust:

The Tačik force persisted in coming after them. Then the Armenian force sent a message to the Tačik forces, saying: "Why are you intent on pursuing us? What wrong did we commit against you? Behold, our land is before you. We have given you our

104 This feature of Lewond’s text becomes even clearer when his telling is compared to the deployment of the same story in Drasxanakertc’i’s later text; however, such a comparison lies outside the scope of this commentary.
homes, our vineyards, our forests, and our fields. Now why do you also ask for our lives? Permit us to go from our borders.” [19r]

The battle of Vardanakert ensued, and the Bagratunik’, unable to escape, fought and defeated the caliphal forces. For Lewond, then, the events at Vardanakert did not constitute a rebellion.

In contrast to this depiction of a defensive battle, non-Armenian sources read Vardanakert as a rebellion. Theophanes’s chronicle states it outright: “In this year [AM 6195/702–3 CE] the Armenian chieftains rebelled against the Saracens and killed the Saracens who were in Armenia” (Τούτῳ τῷ ἔτει ἔστασαν ἡ ἱεράρχαι τῶν Ἀρμενίων κατὰ τῶν Σαρακηνῶν καὶ τοὺς ἐν Ἀρμενίᾳ Σαρακηνοὺς ἀπέκτειναν). The relevant Arabic sources do not employ the word “rebellion,” but they do substantiate Theophanes’s comment. Ibn A’tham explains that Armenians gathered against the caliphal governor in large numbers:

So ‘Abd Allāh b. Abī Shaykh set out with that army of his until he entered the land of Armenia. The people there learned of that and they gathered against the Muslims with large numbers, exceeding one hundred thousand. They killed every last one of them, such that not a single one of them escaped. Then, they gathered their wealth, their weapons, and everything that they had and they took it [all].

Khalīfa b. Khayyāṭ includes two relevant reports with differing details that seem to refer to the same rebellion. The first report, dated to 82/701–2 and lacking a chain of transmission (isnād), claims that “Abd al-Malik sent his brother Muḥammad to Armenia, and its people met him and he defeated them. Then, they asked him for peace and he made peace with them and appointed over them Nabīḥ b. ‘Abd Allāh al-ʿAnzī, but they betrayed and killed him” (فسار عبد الله بن أبي شيخ في جيشه ذلك حتى دخل بلاد أرمينية، وعلم أهل البلد بذلك، فاجتمعوا على المسلمين في خلق كثير يزيدون على مائة ألف، فقتلوهم عن آخرهم حتى ما افلت منهم أحد، ثم احتووا على أمثالهم وأسـلحتهم. وما كان لهم من شئ فاقتدهو). Then, only a few lines later under 83/702–3, he adds a similar report, also without isnād: “Abd al-Malik b. Marwān sent his brother Muḥammad to Armenia. They made peace with him and he appointed over them Abū Shayḥ [sic] b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Ghanawī and ʿAmr b. al-Ṣuday al-Ghanawī, but they betrayed and killed them both” (ٍالله ً إلى أرمينية، فصالحوه، واستعمل عليهم أبي شيح بن عبد الله الغانوي والعمرو بن الصدي الغانوي، فغدوا بهما فقتولوه). Similar information is preserved in the

105 Theophanes, Chronicle, 519; Chronographia, 372.
107 Khalīfa, Taʾrīkh, 182.
108 Khalīfa, Taʾrīkh, 183. Khalīfa’s second report gives the nisba of the governor as al-Ghanawī, that is, from the Qaysī tribe Banū Ghans; both Khalīfa’s earlier al-ʿAnzī and Ibn A’tham’s al-ʿAwī could
later Arabic chronicle by Ibn al-Athir as well. 109 Theophanes, Ibn A’tham, and Khalifa all describe the battle of Vardanakert as a rebellion against Umayyad power, rather than a defensive maneuver. 110

A closer look at Lewond’s version of the events at Vardanakert suggests that he, too, recognized the battle as a rebellion and sought to shelter from blame his patron family, the Bagratunik’, who otherwise usually aligned themselves with caliphal forces. Lewond’s description of Vardanakert follows his typical trajectory for Armenian rebellions: the naxarark’ of various houses meet to discuss their circumstances under caliphal rule; some decide to challenge the status quo, while others leave; the naxarark’ consult with a holy man for some sign of divine approval; the rebellion arises; caliphal forces put it down. Lewond records each step along the way, with the result that Vardanakert mirrors the later rebellions under the Umayyad caliph Marwān b. Muḥammad and then again under the ‘Abbāsid caliph Abū Ja’far al-Mansūr. However, Lewond also goes to great lengths to suggest that Vardanakert was not a rebellion but a defensive act in response to sustained violence against the Armenians. The main difference between Vardanakert and the later rebellions lay in Bagratuni involvement. During the reigns of Marwān and Mansūr, the Bagratuni patricians spoke out to denigrate and derail Armenian rebellions led by the Mamikoneank’. Even if some Bagratuni forces in fact joined the later rebellions, the official stance of the family was compliance with caliphal orders. At Vardanakert, by contrast, the highest echelons of the Bagratuni house personally fomented rebellion. In response, Lewond obscures the actual rebellion itself as if to exonerate them. The Bagratunik’ emerge as entirely victorious: they defeat the caliphal forces, but only in self-defense. Lewond thus keeps the Bagratunik’ of ‘Abd al-Malik’s reign in line with the family’s pro-caliphal stance, building on his expectations of acceptable Bagratuni policy in the early ‘Abbāsid period.

IV.C.3. The Roman Empire and the Rebellion at Vardanakert

Lewond claims that on the eve of the battle, the Bagratuni forces were abandoning their ancestral lands for the Roman Empire: Smbat “sought to find a way that they would be able to save their lives. They resolved to yield and to go from this land to the king of the Greeks” (խորհրդին տեղի տալ և գնալ Յաշխարհէս առ Թագաւորն Յունաց) [18v]. Some scholars have questioned this claim on the basis of the trajectory of the Armenian forces, but these misgivings are based on incorrect assumptions about the battle’s location. After consulting with a hermit in

109 Ibn al-Athīr, Kāmil, 4:213–14: غزا محمد بن مروان أرمينية فهزمهم، ثم سألوه الصلح فصالحهم وولى (82 سنة) وفيها. وفيها (84 سنة) غزا مروان أرمينية وقد خالف أنصارهمABBASID.See also 4:230: غزا محمد بن مروان أرمينية (84 سنة) وفيها.

110 Both Yaʿqūbī and Balādhurī also say that the Armenians rebelled before the fires of Nashawā/Naxčawan, but neither places this rebellion explicitly in the years around 83/702–3 or offers significant detail about Vardanakert itself. As a result, their reports are useful in this context only when related with the others. Yaʿqūbī, Taʾrīkh, 2:324, about Muhammad b. Marwān: غزا أرمينية وقطر خلاف أهل (البلد) فقتل وسبي Balādhurī, Futūḥ, 205. However, note the chronological conflation with the earlier part of ‘Abd al-Malik’s reign, as described above.
Arestakolmn, the Armenian troops headed through Ulayê, reaching the town of Akori (see map 4). At this point, Lewond claims, the Muslim forces at Nashawâ/Naxcawan set out after them, crossed the Araxes, and camped at Vardanakert. The well-known town of Warthân/Vardanakert is situated on the border of Albania and Azerbaijan, but this location means that the Bagratunik’ moved away from their own territory and that of the Roman Empire despite their professed desire to relocate in the latter. In view of this dilemma, the location of the battle and, as a result, the trajectory of the troops should be reconsidered. Since Lewond writes that the Bagratunik’ “went from the regions of Vaspurakan” (գնացին ի կողմանցն Վասպուրականի), it is likely that Smbat and his company in fact left from Nashawâ/Naxcawan, just like the caliphal forces that came after them. We know from the next chapter that Nashawâ/Naxcawan was the site of the caliphal administration at the time. Continuing from there to Ulayê and Akori, the Bagratuni troops moved northwest with the caliphal forces in pursuit. As they were following the Araxes, they would have been heading toward their own territory and the Roman Empire. The battle of Vardanakert, therefore, took place in Ayarakat, not in Albania. The town of Vardanakert in Ayarakat is not clearly identified today, but it is attested in contemporary Armenian literature. Lewond’s Vardanakert was situated along the Araxes, between Siraj/Sirak and Gogovit. Lewond’s itinerary from Nashawâ/Naxcawan through Ulayê and Akori to Vardanakert, following the Araxes, thus makes perfect sense geographically.

Despite Lewond’s claim that the Bagratunik’ were emigrating from their own homes and leaving their ancestral territories under caliphal rule, he is careful to avoid any implication that Armenians defected to the Roman Empire at this time. It is only after the battle of Vardanakert that we find Roman involvement in Armenia (see chapter V). Instead, Lewond places the emphasis on creating an equivalency between the Roman Empire and the Caliphate. Under Justinian, the Romans “came, ruined this land with pilage, and set flame to many elegant buildings, reducing them to ruins” (եկեալ աւերեցին զաշխարհս աւարառութ եամ, բազաձ բ. և զբաձ գեղեցկայարմար շինուածս հրձիգ արարին յաւեր դարձուցանելով) [1r]. Then Tiberios Apsimar ordered a campaign of retribution for Armenian defections from Roman service at the end of the first/seventh century. Lewond explains that many Armenians and Greeks fell in battle before they returned to their own land. The passages about Armenian-Roman relations are given a place of importance in Lewond’s text. Two subtitles, which are generally few and far between in Lewond’s text, draw the readers’ attention to these battles with the Romans, even though they do not occupy nearly as much space overall as do the activities of Muhammad b. Marwan. The oldest extant manuscript, M1902, is also rubricated to emphasize the passage about the

111 Lewond, Discours historique, 49 n. 285.
112 Hübschmann, Die altarmenischen Ortsnamen, 471.
113 Sebôos, Armenian History, 1:83; Patmut’iwn, 126.
Roman Empire; this mise-en-page is particularly noteworthy given the lack of clear delineation between caliphal reigns (fig. 6).

The first subtitle, “Concerning the reign of Ašot, the fire set by the Romans, and the death of Ašot” (Վասն Աշոտի իշխանութեանն և այրեցածին Հոռոմի. և մահուն Աշոտի) [13r–v], draws attention to the Roman fires and anticipates the subsequent, more detailed description of the fires of Nashawā/Naxčawan. The second subtitle, “Concerning the battle in the swamp” (Վասն մաւիրին կռուին) [15r], shown in figure 6, focuses on a battle between Greeks and Armenians, which appears as a counterweight to Armenian-Umayyad conflict. The two reports about Roman aggression parallel the offenses of Muḥammad b. Marwān. Lewond may merely be stitching together reports from various sources here, but the end result suggests that neither empire offered a realistic option for Armenian security.

IV.C.4. The Three-Year Amān of Muḥammad b. Marwān

Nestled into this narrative bridging the events at Saint Grigor and the fires of Nashawā/Naxčawan is a scene that makes little sense in its context, at least at first glance: Muḥammad b. Marwān met with the catholicos Sahak, praised his righteous bravery, forgave the caliphal losses at the battle of Vardanakert, and offered the Armenians a three-year amān. On the surface, this account lends a positive spin to the governorship of Muḥammad, as if perhaps Lewond picked up on an alternative tradition that sought to rehabilitate the reputation of the governor, which he then wove brokenly into the narrative of dissolute destruction. Upon further inspection, however, it becomes apparent that the scene of the catholicos and the governor is carefully curated in Lewond’s narrative. Muḥammad’s issuance of the amān to the Armenians, despite the battle of Vardanakert, shows that Muḥammad did not see the actions of the Armenians as active rebellion. Indeed, he claims that the Armenian catholicos’s letter convinced him not to kill “innocent men” (արանց անմեղաց) [23v]. The account of the amān, then, does not constitute an alternative reading of Muḥammad. Rather, it supports Lewond’s exoneration of the Armenian nobility from any act of rebellion at Vardanakert by foregrounding official recognition of their innocence.

Lewond refers to the oath as a written document three separate times: “an oath in writing” (բան երդման ի ձեռն գրոյ); “the oath of the written promise” (բան երդմանն խոստման
114 Theophanes, *Chronicle*, 518; *Chronographia*, 371.

he made peace with the Armenians in order to leave for a campaign in Iraq. Following the Arabic and Greek sources, a proposed chronology would be the issuance of the amān in 80/700, followed by a three-year peace that was ruptured by the battle of Vardanakert in 83/703. The events at Nashawā/Naxčawan could be seen as retribution for the actions taken at Vardanakert. Lewond’s adjustment to this order of events creates two idiosyncrasies in his text: his dating of the fires of Nashawā/Naxčawan later than all other sources, including other Armenian histories, and his insertion of a three-year interval between Vardanakert and the fires at Nashawā/Naxčawan when every other source attests that they occurred in the same year. Throughout his History, Lewond values the narrative more than precise chronology, so this chronological fluidity aligns with his writing style. Reorganizing the timeline on the basis of Arabic and Greek sources (particularly when supported by tertiary details in Lewond’s own narrative, such as the three years of quiet) allows us to speculate about what he was hoping to do with his account. Lewond’s unique ordering of the events exonerates the warriors at Vardanakert and, at the same time, establishes the innocence of the victims of the fires at Nashawā/Naxčawan.

IV.D. THE FIRES OF GUKANK’ AND FORESHADOWING NASHAWĀ/NAXČAWAN

In Lewond’s text, the iniquities of Muhammad b. Marwân culminate during the reign of Walîd when he calls the Armenian naxarark’ into the churches of Nashawā/Naxčawan, bars the doors, and burns the churches down, immolating the Armenian rebels. Lewond uses his discussion of the reign of ‘Abd al-Malik to build up to the fires at Nashawā/Naxčawan, which he places in the reign of Walîd b. ‘Abd al-Malik.116 Lewond includes a subtitle about “the fire set by the Romans” (վարակչական բազմազանական պատերազմ) as a way to construe Roman aspirations as a mirror of caliphal rule, as discussed above (see IV.C.3). The events at the church of Saint Grigor, the battle of Vardanakert, and the amān then all look forward, establishing for the reader the iniquities of Muhammad b. Marwân and his desire to destroy the naxarark’. Lewond signals this forward-looking gaze a number of times in the text. For example, when Muhammad b. Marwân returned to Asorestan, “the inhabitants of this land remained like a firebrand smoldering in the fire” (բնակիչք աշխարհիս մնացին իբրև զխանձող ծխեալ ի հրոյ) [18r]. In another instance, Lewond repurposes some of the same language to connect these events with later ones. He reports that at Vardanakert, “they arrayed themselves regiment to regiment and front to front, and the battle was joined” (յարդարեցին գունդ առ գունդ և ճակատ առ ճակատ և խմեցաւ պատերազմ) [19v], and he then employs the same phrase later, immediately before the fires (see chapter V) [24v]. Repeated details and phrases encourage the reader to draw a clear line between disparate events toward a narrative conclusion—in this case, the fires of Nashawā/Naxčawan.

As part of this foreshadowing, Lewond relates a story that inverts his narrative of the fires of Nashawā/Naxčawan. He explains that the Armenians defeated the caliphal forces at Gukank’, which is in Basfurrajān/Vaspurakan, and the enemy’s survivors fled into a church. The Armenians under Smbat the son of Ašot surrounded the church and decided to set fire to it in order to destroy the remnants of the caliphal army. Lewond thus compares the Armenian Smbat directly to Muḥammad b. Marwân, placing both before the locked

116 See Vacca, “Fires of Naxčawan.”
doors of the churches full of trapped enemy soldiers. The Armenians wanted to burn the church down to defeat the caliphal forces, but Smbat refused:

When they were not able to prevail, they thought to set fire to the sanctuary; however, Smbat, the prince of the region of Vaspurakan and the son of Prince Ašot, did not permit them and would not allow [them] to commit such wickedness, for he said: “Far be it from us to lay hands on the dwelling place of the glory of God, who has granted us such a triumph.” They assigned guards to watch over them until the shrine itself should dislodge them. [21r]

The Armenian forces defeated their enemies without damaging the church. In fact, the church is personified and described as helping them in the process, which tallies with the claim to divine approval for the Armenians’ victory.

According to Łewond, the highest-ranking officer among the caliphal troops locked in the church in Gukank’ tried to bargain for his own life. Like most of the details of this story, the officer’s attempt to strike a deal sets the events at Nashawā/Naxčawan into greater relief. All of the descriptions of the fires of Nashawā/Naxčawan in Arabic, Syriac, and Greek claim that the nobles were burned alive, but Łewond alone explains that only the unnamed troops were burned, while the nobles were pulled out of the church and tortured for their treasures: “At the risk of torment, they [the Armenians] gave into the hands of the enemy their hoard of treasures, which they had preserved out of sight of the torturers in the sea as well as in the ground, so that perhaps they might save themselves” (եւ նոքա առ վտանգի նեղութե ան, զբազում մթերս գանձուց իւրեանց զորս ի պահեստի եդեալ յերեսաց նեղչացն· ի ծովու. և եթե ի ցամաքի, տաին ի ձեռս թշնամեացն, զի թերևս ապրեցուսցեն զանձինս իւրեանց) [26r–v]. Both sets of victims attempted to buy their freedom, though Smbat did not torture the Muslim captives in Gukank’.

The officer confronted Smbat with the claim that the latter should release the captives because of his Christian values, implying that clemency would prove him superior to the Muslims. An obvious narrative choice would have been to show Smbat granting mercy to contrast with his opponent’s godless bloodlust. However, Łewond instead has Smbat acknowledge that mercy is a Christian value and yet still refuse to release the prisoners. This choice forces Lewond to justify Smbat’s un-Christian behavior and draws the parallel with Muhammad’s behavior at Nashawā/Naxčawan in even starker terms. The deception at the heart of both episodes might similarly seem to demonstrate that there is little difference between the two generals, as they both fail to honor their promises: Smbat promised to allow the highest-ranking leader of the caliphal troops to live, but then “they threw him into the depths of the sea alive” (կենդանոյն յուղարկեցին ի խորս ծովուն) [22r]. Even though Smbat accomplished his goals without burning the church, his rejection of Christian values and his deceitful promise ensure that he hardly emerges as a likable hero.

However, here Lewond borrows themes familiar from a broader storytelling tradition to construct the concept of heroic success by connecting military effectiveness to wit
rather than merely to strength of arms. Smbat’s story compares nicely to similar episodes in Arabic sources, such as Maslama b. ‘Abd al-Malik’s siege of Hayzân during his Caucasian campaigns in 113/731–32: “He battled them and they asked him for safe passage (amān). He swore that he would not kill a single man or dog from among them, so they came down [from the fortress]. He killed all of them except for a single man and a single dog, and took the fortress.” The point of such reports is not merely to convey military victory but also to signal that conquest was made possible by the verbal acumen of the commander. Smbat, like Maslama, cleverly constructed an agreement that he could satisfy to the letter—he indeed left the leader of the caliphal troops alive, but in the middle of the sea, where he would then drown on his own. By contrast, Muhammad b. Marwân simply lied to accomplish his goal, thereby ignoring both the letter and the spirit of his agreement. Reading Smbat as a heroic mirror of Muhammad requires knowing the norms of such conquest narratives. Łewond’s presentation suggests that the difference between Smbat and Muhammad is not that the former embodied Christian values, but that he displayed cleverness as opposed to the mere brutality of the latter.

IV.E. THE REBELLION AT VARDANAKERT IN INTRA-ARMENIAN POLITICS

Łewond’s description of the rebellion at Vardanakert not only elucidates the relations between Armenians and the Caliphate but also reveals competing narratives among Armenian noble families. Łewond’s version of the battle of Vardanakert is wholly centered on the Bagratunik’, and so he does not acknowledge the involvement of other naxarar houses. This focus is particularly striking in comparison with other Armenian accounts of the battle. Drasxanakertc’i explains that the Armenian nobles were tired of caliphal rule. Putting their trust “in a celestial visitation” (յերկնային այցելութիւնն), they decided to attack caliphal forces under the leadership of a general named ‘Uqba. The expedition was led by the Kamsarakan family with the support of the local nobility of Vanand. The focus on the role of the Kamsarakank’ is reprised by Step’anos Tarōnec’i. Despite the difference in participants, we cannot read these stories as referring to two different battles because of the shared details (such as the battle’s location at Vardanakert, the defeat of the caliphal army, and the notice of divine approval for the rebellion). It is possible that only one house confronted and defeated the caliphal army, which would mean that one of these versions is patently incorrect. However, it is also possible to read Łewond and Drasxanakertc’i in concert. We might surmise that the caliphal forces were in pursuit of the Bagratuni leaders when they entered Kamsarakan territory, directly en route from Nashawâ/Naxčawan. Given that Łewond notes the names of only a few participating Bagratuni leaders, the army that defeated the caliphal forces was likely largely Kamsarakan. Establishing the storyline, however conjectural, places the authorial choices of both historians in stark relief. Drasxanakertc’i does not mention Bagratuni involvement, and Łewond entirely ignores the Kamsarakank’. Both authors may even be aware that they are leaving something out. Drasxanakertc’i, for his part, strangely asserts that the Kamsarakank’ found the Muslim

118 Drasxanakertc’i, “Patmut’iwn Hayoc’,” 416; History, 10.
general as he “was wandering with a large army around the region of Vanand” (հանդերձ զաւրաւոք բազմաւոք շուրջ ընդ կողմամբ Վանանդայ), as if he happened to be lost rather than in pursuit of a rebellious Smbat Bagratuni.119

The story of Lady Šušan further complicates the Bagratuni-Kamsarakan issue. Lewond claims that Lady Šušan harbored the Muslim forces, stood up to Smbat Bagratuni the son of Ašot, and corresponded directly with ʿAbd al-Malik. Given the location of the battle and Drasxanakertc’i’s claim of Kamsarakan involvement, it seems likely that this Lady Šušan was the wife of Narseh Kamsarakan, as mentioned in an inscription at Տալին, dated before 695 ce: “I, Nerseh apohipat pa[trik], 120 lord of [Si]rak and Ašarunik’, built this church in the name of the Holy Mother of God for the intercession of myself and Šušan, my wife, and Hrahat, our son” (ես Ներսեհ ապոհիպատ պա[տրիք Սի]րակ եւ Աշարունեաց տէր շինեցի զեկեղեցիս յանուն սրբոյ Ա[ստուածածնին ի բարեխաւսութիւն ինձ եւ Շուշանայ ամուսնոյ իմոյ եւ Հրահատայ որդիոյ մերոյ).121 Lady Šušan Kamsarakan also appears in a list of Kamsarakan bishops found in a later miscellany composed between the seventh/thirteenth and eleventh/seventeenth centuries. She is described as a martyr in Ḥarrān/Xaṙan in 670-706 ce, in a passage that interestingly also refers to Kamsarakan building projects at Vardanakert: “Gagik Kamsarakan consecrated the church of Vardanakert, and the news arrived that Šušan Kamsarakan the daughter of Vahan patrik had inherited the name of confessor for the sake of Christ God, having been tortured in Xaṙan of Meso- potamia” (արար նաւակատիս եկեղեցոյ Վարդանակերտի Գագիկ Կամսարական և եհաս լուր աւետեաց, թէ Շուշան Կամսարական, դուստրն Վահանայ պատրկի, զխոստով անուն ժառանգեաց վասն Քրիստոսի Աստուծոյ).122 The omission of Lady Šušan’s family affiliation in Lewond’s narrative may serve two purposes. First, it is possible that Lewond was aware of stories about Kamsarakan involvement at Vardanakert, and the news arrived that Šušan Kamsarakan the daughter of Vahan patrik had inherited the name of confessor for the sake of Christ God, having been tortured in Xaṙan of Mesopotamia. Second, the vague reference to Lady Šušan aligns with gendered descriptions of intercommunal conflict in medieval Armenian texts. Women frequently appear in moments of conflict as intermediaries who can cross battle lines with impunity because they do not threaten either side.123 Although Lady Šušan must have belonged to a house, she appears without affiliation in Lewond’s text because he does not construe her actions as reflecting back on her house. In short, the author or his source is not concerned with explaining her background because she fulfills an expected narrative role.

Another account, too, adds to the study of naxarar politics in relation to the battle of Vardanakert. Lewond claims that “right away, some of the naxarark’ of the land of Vaspurakan separated [from the others] and left” (անջատեալ մեկնեցան ոմանք ի նախարարաց Վասպուրական աշխարհին) [18v]. The only naxarark’ from Vaspurakan

120 These are both Greek titles, on which see Tarōnec’i, Universal History, 167 n. 212.
121 Greenwood, “Corpus,” 86.
122 Tarōnec’i, Universal History, 168 n. 215; Yovs’ian, Yišatakaran’ jerigarac’, no. 17.
123 For examples from the early ‘Abbāsid period, see Vacca, “Conflict and Community.”
listed by name at the meeting in Nashawā/Naxčawan in Lewond’s account is Vard the son of T’ēodoros Ṙštuni. Since Lewond does not refer to Vard as a participant in the rebellion, he omits any potential Ṙštuni involvement in the battle of Vardanakert. By contrast, Pseudo-Šapuh reports that Arabs had attacked Vaspurakan and that “T’ēodos (sic), in pursuit, overtook them at the bank of the river Erasx; many of them he slew and the others he put to flight” (եւ ապա Թէոդոս զհետ մտեալ էհաս նոցա եզր գետոյն Երազխայ, զբազումս ի նոցանէ էսպան և զայլսն փաստական արարեալ). If this passage refers to the battle of Vardanakert, it is consistent with a number of other accounts that attribute rebellious activities in various times and places to T’ēodoros Ṙštuni. In his typically convoluted fashion, Pseudo-Šapuh may well have adopted the skeleton of the narrative but transposed it on another house. The battle of Vardanakert is thus a contested site of memory in medieval Armenian narratives, as Lewond foregrounds the Bagratunik’ against Drasxanakertc’i’s interest in the Kamsarakank’ and Pseudo-Šapuh’s concern with the Ṙštunik’.

Vestiges of Ṙštuni claims to involvement in the rebellion of Vardanakert may be found in Lewond’s History, though they are visible only when reading against the grain of his text. Immediately after relating the events at Vardanakert, Lewond explains that an unnamed “brigand” entered Ṙštuni territory in the village called Gukank’. When the Armenians faced the caliphal forces, they killed them all and left only 280 alive (in comparison to the 300 at Vardanakert). Rather than fleeing to Lady Šušan, the survivors instead took refuge in a church. Here, Lewond switches to mirror the fires of Nashawā/Naxčawan, as discussed above, but the similarity of the first part of the narrative to Vardanakert suggests that Lewond may be manipulating accounts about the rebellion. This possibility is particularly noteworthy because the Armenian forces at both Vardanakert and Gukank’ were led by a naxarar named Smbat the son of Ašot. There are two possibilities. Perhaps the Bagratunik’ and the Ṙštunik’ both routed caliphal forces, in each instance leaving around 300 survivors, whom someone named Smbat the son of Ašot pursued. Alternatively, perhaps Lewond melds his stories to obscure variants that suggest Ṙštuni involvement in the Armenian rebellion.

The violent relationship between the Armenians and Muḥammad b. Marwān reaches its height in Lewond’s chapter on the reign of Walīd b. ‘Abd al-Malik. The Romans, who had been engaged in fighting the Caliphate farther west, moved to support the Armenians after Vardanakert, but Muhammad emerged victorious against the Roman-Armenian alliance. He then promised to enter the Armenians into the dīwān (the registry of military stipends), but this offer was merely a ruse to collect the naxarark’ in one place and eliminate them. After the conflagration, some of the Bagratunik’ emigrated to the West Caucasus under the auspices of the Roman emperor, who relied on Armenian allies to maintain a Roman presence in that region. This uneasy alliance with Rome proved fleeting. At the same time, Lewond suggests amelioration in the relationship between the Armenians and the caliphal administrators. He claims that Walīd acknowledged the complaints about Muhammad’s governorship and stepped in to name a new governor who worked closely with the Armenians. Muhammad b. Marwān, for his part, met a fitting end, as his attempt to conquer China proved disastrous. Lewond’s account of this campaign should not be taken at face value since it incorporates legendary motifs and does not align with other sources on Umayyad history. However, the episode dovetails with Lewond’s general deheroization of the famous generals of the Umayyad family.

ENGLISH TRANSLATION

After him ['Abd al-Malik b. Marwān], his son, the Ishmaelite prince Walīd, succeeded him for ten years and eight months, then he died. These [are] his deeds. 14. In the first year of his reign, he thought to rid this land of Armenia of the naxarar house[s] and their cavalry on account of the resentment that they [the Arabs] harbored for the curopalates Smbat, for he [Walīd] said: “They will always be a hindrance and an obstacle to our rule.” [24v] While they contemplated this evil in their hearts, Smbat, whom we have already discussed, immediately wrote to the king of the Greeks and requested an auxiliary force from him. The emperor consented to fulfill the request and provided a large force under one general and sent him to aid [the Armenians]. Smbat joined with the Greek general; they marched out and arrived in the region of Vanand.

Walīd (r. 705–15): Umayyad caliph famous for building the Great Mosque of Damascus and renovating the Prophet’s mosque in Medina. His reign also saw the expansion of the Caliphate to Spain, Transoxiana, and Sind.

Smbat VI Bagratuni: the curopalates, introduced earlier (see page 43).

The king of the Greeks: this is likely Justinian II, who reigned for the second time from 705 to 711.
in the village called Drašpet and set up their camp there. When Muḥammad, the prince of the Ishmaelite army, heard [about this], he gathered his troops with great preparation and went out to meet them on the field of battle. They arrived on a field and arrayed themselves regiment to regiment and front to front, and the battle was joined. Suddenly the wrath of the Lord came upon them there; it filled the hearts of the Greek warriors. They turned in flight and slipped away to the fort of their camp. The enemy grew in strength and struck many down by the sword. It is said that the number of the fallen [25r] was more than fifty thousand swordsmen. He [Muḥammad] pursued the few remaining survivors out of this land. He assembled the troops of the camp and returned to the city of Duin.

When the Ishmaelite prince also saw that the Armenian naxarark‘ were guiding the Greek forces, he again ordered Muḥammad to complete that same malicious plan [to eliminate the naxarark‘ from Armenia]. Muḥammad received the wicked order and commanded a certain Qāsim, who was his commander in the region of the city of Naxčawan, to summon the Armenian naxarark‘ with their cavalry under the pretext of recording [their names] in the royal record, [in order for them] to collect their salary, then return. They, in their typical credulity, reckoned

**Map 5. Umayyad maneuvering in the reign of Walid b. ‘Abd al-Malik.**

Drašpet: location unknown. The main battlegrounds of the Roman-Umayyad wars in this period were far to the southwest. The appearance of the Romans in Armenia shifted the front lines.

Returned to the city of Duin: this is the first indication in Lewond’s text of the establishment of Duin as a caliphal administrative outpost (map 5). Numismatic evidence confirms Duin’s new status in this period.

Qāsim: a governor over Nashawā/Naxčawan who does not appear in Arabic sources.

Royal record: the dīwān recorded the names of the soldiers assigned stipends. This comment might reflect Lewond’s knowledge of the later eighth century, but it signals the shift to direct caliphal rule in Armenia.
the deception of the stealthy hunters to be trustworthy and arrived there immediately. When they gathered there, they ordered them to separate into two groups, one of which they gathered in the church of Naxčawan. They sent [the other] half to the village of Xram and threw them into its church, fixing [25v] guards over [them]. They pondered how to kill them. All of them together agreed to remove those of noble birth from the prison and to burn those who were imprisoned in the sanctuary; and they set fire to the roof of the divine altar.

When those who were trapped in such bitter danger saw that they were deprived of human help from all sides, they took refuge in the God of all. They implored Him alone, saying:

You who are Refuge for the tormented, Aid for those in danger, and Comforter for the weary! Come to the aid of us [who are] tormented and in this danger that they set upon us. Save us from the bitter death that they have inflicted upon us. For behold, the heat of this flame has grown excessively strong over us and, enveloping us, is burning seven times hotter than the fire of Babylon. Just as You sent aid, the protective power of the angel, to the Three Youths, so too do not neglect us in Your compassion, for we are also Your servants. Even though we sinned many times and angered Your sweet philanthropy, nevertheless, even in Your anger, may You remember to show mercy to Your servants. For behold, Your sanctuary and the place where Your name is glorified has become our grave. On account of this, we, thanking Your holy and awesome name, commend our spirits, our breath, and our bodies into Your hands.

Having said this, all of them together raised hymns on high and departed from this world. But they put the noble naxarark in chains into prison and tormented them with insupportable tortures. They exacted from them much gold and an equivalent amount of silver. They promised them that once they paid them a tribute of silver, they would release them alive. On account of this, they made a pact with an oath and confirmed the false oath. At the

---

1 "Stealthy," qunqumunq: according to Awetik’ean, Siwrmélean, and Awgerian, Nor Bargirk’, 1:525, this compound is attested only here.
risk of torment, they [the Armenians] [26v] gave into the hands of the enemy their hoard of treasures, which they had preserved out of sight of the torturers in the sea as well as in the ground, so that perhaps they might save themselves. When they were deprived of the treasures, the infidels seized and crucified them. Smbat the son of Ašot from the Bagratuni house, Grigor and Koriwn from the Arcruni house, Varašapuh and his brother from the Amatuni house, and many others from the Armenian naxarark', whom I cannot name one by one, were seized there. In killing all of them, they rendered this land heirless of naxarark'.

At that time, this land of Armenia was empty of its naxarar house[s], and they were delivered like sheep into the midst of wolves. The enemy let loose all sorts of evils and kept the inhabitants of this land in the immense misery of danger. Weared by unabated torments, [27r] they raised sighs and cries of lamentation to heaven. But Smbat curopalates and the naxarark' who were with him went out and left this land. They went to request from the Greek king a city to live in and folds for their sheep. He gave them the city called Phasis in the region of the land of Eger, and they dwelt there for six years.

15. After Muḥammad completed all of these evils, the complaints of this land rose and reached the Ishmaelite prince whose name was Walīd. He immediately sent an edict and summoned him [Muḥammad]. He sent as his replacement a certain ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz, who was sickly and hard of hearing, but sagacious and full of worldly wisdom. He told tales and talked in proverbs. When he established his rule, he wrote an edict to the Armenian naxarark' and convinced them to return to their own lands. He gave them a written oath as per their custom. [27v] Once they had trust in his vow, they took the city in which they had dwelt, as well as the treasures of the city, and plundered the vessels of the churches; they returned to Armenia and separated from the emperor of the Greeks. The emperor heard [of this] and regretted that villainy. He called the prelates of the churches, the metropolitan, and the bishops. He ordered them to write [the Armenians'] excommunication in the register and to read about the perpetrators of the wickedness at the end of the feast of Easter, since they committed the impious deed on that feast. They further arranged for

Smbat Bagratuni: there are several Smbat Bagratunis in Łewond’s story. The one who was killed at Naxčawan was Smbat the son of Ašot II.

Grigor and Koriwn Arcruni: Grigor and Koriwn appear only in Łewond’s History. In this period, the Arcruni’ were expanding their control over the province of Vaspurakan on the eastern side of Lake Van in modern Turkey. They became kings of Vaspurakan in 908 and claimed descent from the biblical Sennacherib.

Varašapuh Amatuni: Varašapuh appears only in Łewond’s History. The Amatuni house was of Caspio-Median descent, one of the prominent families of Vaspurakan in the fifth century. It lost its prominence during the Sasanian period and its territory to the Arabs in the late eighth century after the battle of Bagrewand.

Phasis: a city on the Black Sea coast, to be identified with the present-day city of Poti in the Republic of Georgia. The Roman emperor Justiniian II allotted land in the area of Phasis to Smbat curopalates, that is, Smbat VI Bagratuni, and other naxarark'. Justinian used Phasis as a center for expanding Roman influence in the West Caucasus, relying on Armenians to navigate the relationship between the various peoples there.

ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz b. Ḥātim al-Bāhilī: governor of Armenia from either 704 or 705 to 709.

Plundering of Phasis: the Bagratunik’ destroyed Phasis when they returned to Armenia. This may have been a response to the forced expulsion of Armenians from the Roman Empire in 712.

---

3 “Like sheep into the midst of wolves,” նպատկանական Սկզբունք կոում; cf. Matthew 10:16.
the reading of those excommunications on that same festival from year to year, until today. This held power over them and was the cause of their ruin.

So ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz ruled over this land of Armenia and pacified all unjust invasions of this land; and he disparaged the disdainful knavery of the sons of Ishmael with vehement reprimands. He rebuilt [28r] the city of Duin stronger and larger than before. He fortified [it] with gates and locks. He dug a moat around the walls and filled it with water to protect the fortress, for ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz said about himself at the prior sacking of Duin:

The city’s destruction was by my hand and I shall rebuild it, for I was a child of twelve and I had my red girdle when the army of the Tačiks fought against the city. I entered via a conduit and I went up onto the walls. I shouted loudly to our force in my language. The guards on the front lines who guarded the walls immediately jolted and turned to flee. Ishmaelite victory prevailed and we destroyed the city.

He is said to have related this about himself with his own mouth.

16. At that time, the heart of the general Muhammad [b. Marwān] was again provoked against [28v] the land of the Chinese. He asked the Ishmaelite prince for a large force and promised him that he would reduce the king of the Chinese to submission. He [the prince] assembled a large force and gave him two hundred thousand men. Muhammad marched from the regions of Damascus to the east with many troops. He passed by Asorestan, the land of the Persians, and Khorasan and arrived at a part of some Chinese land. He camped on the bank of the powerful river that was called Bawtis. He wrote an edict to the king of the Chinese:

Why do you alone resist and not submit to our prince, since all peoples tremble in fear of us? Now, in whom do you trust that you do not submit to us? Certainly do not consider us like your girls, among whom you strut with affected dignity. But now, if you do not enter under the yoke of obedience to us, know [29r] that I will turn your land into a desert without inhabitants and I will put an end to your kingdom.

---

4 “Dug,” անցուցանէր, lit. “caused to pass.”
Rather, take care not to delay the answer to this letter, but return [it] again quickly.

When the Chinese king, whose name was Čenbakur, read the letter, he called all of his bodyguards and his retinue, and he pondered what sort of answer he should give. They took each other’s counsel and wrote an answer. They said:

You are certainly not the strongest of all the kings who have ever ruled over the land here. How were the king of the Babylonians who ruled the world, that of the Macedonians, and that of the Persians not able to rule over our land? But know that you are more impertinent than a dog and entangled in the leash of impudence! For that reason, your evil lust ensnares you in the renown of my beautiful virgins and compels you to risk your life and the lives of your troops who marched out with you [29v] as if there are not graves in Damascus for your bodies. But know now that our land has not been tributary to anyone, and I will not submit myself to you. But if you should request a gift from me as per the custom of kings, I will give it to you, should you get up and go to your place in peace.
Muhammad again sent to Čenbakur: “Give me,” he said, “thirty thousand girls and I will go away from you in peace. If not, I will wage war against you.” The Chinese king received the message sent [to him] and he sent [a reply] to Muhammad, saying: “Stay there in your camp until I can complete your request.” Forthwith he ordered his troops to fashion wagons with brocade covers and to load the wagons with his select cavalry in full armor instead of the girls that he [Muhammad] had requested, so that he [Čenbakur] might be able to trap them in his snare. They [the Chinese] came to the bank of the river and camped across from them, and there were more than forty thousand cavalry in the wagons. [30r] Čenbakur himself camped far from them, a few stadia away, with a few of his men, and he sent [a message] to the general Muhammad, saying: “I brought what you requested from me: I selected thirty thousand girls from my entire kingdom for your nobles. Now take the nobles of your army, proportionate to the number of my girls, and cross to this side of the river. I will give my girls by casting lots to whoever arrives, lest battle break out among your forces.” He had boats brought to the other side of the river so that they might cross to him all at once.

Then they [the Arabs] imprudently chose estimable forces and some thirty thousand men crossed to that side of the river. When they had finished crossing, the Chinese king gave the order to attack the Ishmaelite army. When they [the Arabs and the Chinese] struck each other in battle, the men who were hiding in the covered wagons suddenly poured out. They surrounded and slaughtered [them] by the sword until not one of them remained alive [30v] to flee. They cut the lines of the ships so that no one would survive. Only Muhammad and a few cavalrymen on horses survived. They fell into the river, trusting in their horses’ bravery. And thus they returned from the Chinese king humbled and shamed and went to the land where they lived. Never again did they go up in battle against the land of the Chinese. He [the caliph Walīd] lived for ten years and eight months, then died.

---

5 Cf. 1 Kingdoms (1 Samuel) 7:13 and fol. 11v above.
ARMENIAN EDITION

Եւ ըստ նորա փոխանորդէ որդի նորին Վլիթ իշխան Իսմաելի ամս. 

Պահանջեց տասն և ամիս. ութ և վախճանի: Եւ այս վարք նորա:

Սա յառաջնում ամի իշխանութե ան իւրոյ խորհեցավ բառնալ յաշխարհէս Հայոց զտոհմ նախարարաց նոցին հեծելոց վ աս

զայս չարութի և երկնէին ի սիրտս իւրեանց. անդէն վաղվաղակի Սմպատն. զորմէ ճառեցաք գրէր առ արքայն Յունաց և խնդրէր զաւր ի նմանէն յաւգնականութի և հաւանեալ կայսերն կատարէր զխնդիրն. տայր զաւր բազում ի ձեռն զավւրավարի միոյ և առաքէր նմա

ի թիկունս աւգնականութե ան և միաբանեալ Սմպատայ ընդ զաււրավարի Յունաց, եկեալ հասանէին ի գաւառն Վանանդայ ի գեւղն որում Դրաշպետն կոչեն. անդ հարկանէին զբանակս իւրեանց. և իբրև լուաւ Մահմետ իշխան զաււրուն Իսմայէլի. ժողովեալ զզաւրս իւր մեծաւ պատրաստութ եամ թ· ել ընդդեմ նոցա ի մարտ պատերազմի. և հասեալք առ մի վայր, կազմեցին գունդ առ գունդ· և ճակատ առ ճակատ. և խմբեցաւ պատերազմն: Անդ վաղվաղակի բարկութի և տեառն է հասեալ ի վերա նոցա. լքաւ սիրտ պատերազմողաց արանց Յունաց. ի փախուստ դառնաը անկան յամրոց բանակին իւրեանց. և զաււրացեալ թշնամեացն հարին զբազումս կոտորմամբ սրոյ. զորոց ասեն լինել զթիւ անկելոցն ավ ելի քան զ· հինգ. բեւր արանց սուսերամերկաց. և զսակավ մնացորդսն փախստական առնէր յաշխարհէս. և իւր ժողովեալ զզաւրս բանակին դառնայր ի քաղաքն Դվին:

Իբրև զայս ևս տեսանէր իշխանն Իսմաելի եթէ առաջնորդ զաււրուն Յունաց եղեն նախարարք Հայոց. դառձեալ զնոյն խորամանգութե ան հրամաէր Մահմետի կատարել: Եւ Մահմետի առեալ հրաման անիրավ. հրամայէր Կասմոյ ումեմն որ էր հրամանատար նորուն ի կողմանսն Նախճաւան քաղաքի. կոչել առ ինքն զնախարարս Հայոց

6 դեղին մգ. 7 Գավաթային կրք. 8 հրաման մեջ. 9 աշխարհ. 10 կարճատ. 11 մեծաթ.
V. THE CALIPHATE OF WALĪD B. ʿABD AL-MALIK

In this section, the text discusses various aspects of the Caliphate of Walīd b. ʿAbd al-Malik, with particular emphasis on the historical and cultural context. The text delves into the political and religious landscape of the time, including the role of the Caliphate in shaping the region's identity and the interactions with other powers. It also touches upon the architectural and artistic achievements of the period, reflecting the cultural richness and the dynamic nature of the era. The document provides a comprehensive overview of the period, highlighting key events and personalities that shaped the development of the Caliphate. 

12 read: կախեալ with Chahnazarian and Malxaseanc'.
13 պղ. [g]: suprascr.
14 ճապ. [g]: subscr.
15 ճի in rt. mg.
զատկաց հրամաէր ընթեռնուլ ի վերա գործողաց ապիրատութե ն․ քանզի ի տաւին յայնմիկ գործեցին զգործն անաւրէնութե ան և ի նոյն կարգաւորեցին ամի ամի զնոյն նզովք ընթեռնուլ մինչև ցայսաւր. որ և տիրեաց իսկ ի վերա նոցա. և եղև պատճառ կորստեան նոցա:

Աբդլազիզ տիրեալ ի վերա աշխարհիս Հայոց խաղաղացոյց զամենք Յայրձակմունս անիրաւութե ան յաշխարհէս, և զխրոխտացեալ անզգամութի որդոցն Իսմաելի սաստիկ կշտամբութ եամ բ ցածուցանէր:

Զարքայն Ճենաց ի հնազանդութիւն ծառաութե ան: Իսկ նորա գումարել զաւր բազում և տայ ի ձեռն նորա իբրև արս. երկերիւր հազար. և խաղացեալ Մահմետ ի կողմանցն Դամասկեայ բազմութ եամ բ զաւրացն ի կողմանս արևելից. անցանէր ընդ Ասորեստան ընդ աշխարհն Պարսից և ընդ Խորասան. և երթեալ հասանէր ի մասն ինչ Ճենաց աշխարհին. և բանակէր առ եզր գետոյն հզաւրագունի որ Բաւտիսն կոչի. գրէ հրովարտակ առ արքայն Ճենաց, ընդէ՞ր ասէ դու միայն ընդվզեալ ոչ մտանես ընդ հնազանդութ եամ բ իշխանին մերոյ.

16 լջեալ a.c.
17 դել էր. մգ.
18 մատանիսայլութե էս երև: կայ ավանդական առաջին կամ մեծ քարվի տոմ բաղկացուցչի ընդհանուր աջակցութե կամ հիմնահարմաված տեղակայութե մեկ վերջաստորակ էս։ այ այս երեք, որ միանք թե դեռ մանրաբերած մինչ։ գիտանկար երեքական պայքարի գրկերը։ ու զուգակցած քաղցիկ աղբյուրները։ այս բազի այդպիսի երեք տեղակայութե պարունակողական կոր, այ այս պարունակողական այստեղ:
V. THE CALIPHATE OF WALID B. 'ABD AL-MALIK

26 աշխարհի a.c.
27 պատասխ. և suprascr.
28 քո add. adn. in lft. mg. Hand 1corr.
29 թագ. և պատ. արք. a.c.
30 անձ և հանդիպել a.c.
COMMENTARY

V.A. ROMAN MILITARY ENCOUNTER WITH MUḤAMMAD B. MARWĀN

Whereas the rebellion at Vardanakert was solely an Armenian endeavor, Smbat Bagratuni subsequently turned to the Romans to counter the caliphal forces. Muḥammad b. Marwān gathered a great force in response and marched out against the Roman army, engaging it on a field. According to Łewond, the battle was decided in the Muslims’ favor by divine intervention, which caused the Romans to retreat in flight and allowed Muḥammad’s fighters to claim more than 50,000 lives. Lewond’s account is thus very close to that provided by Ibn A’tham:

[The news of Vardanakert] reached Muhammad b. Marwān, and he was distressed by what had befallen the Muslims and uneasy with the whole affair. Then he summoned a force and he himself went along with forty thousand [troops] until, when he was in the middle of Armenia, the Romans and Armenians met [him] in a huge assemblage. So Muḥammad b. Marwān battled them fiercely, so much that he feared humiliation and [Roman] victory because of the sheer quantity of infidels gathered against him. Then God Almighty defeated the polytheists and made it possible for the Muslims to outflank them. So they killed many of them, took them captive, and gained their land and wealth.

Roman military support for Armenia after the battle of Vardanakert is also mentioned in other sources, but without much detail. Theophanes explains that the Armenians “made contact with Apsimaros and brought Romans into their country” (καὶ αὐτὸς πρὸς Ἀψίμαρον πέμπουσι καὶ Ῥωμαίους εἰς τὴν αὐτῶν χώραν φέρουσιν) after they had killed the “Saracens” in 619/702–3 CE; “Muḥammad, however, made an expedition against them and killed many people” (ὁ δὲ Μουαμέδ ἐπιστράτευσας κατ᾽ αὐτῶν πολλοὺς κτείνει). Likewise, Khalīfa b. Khayyāṭ acknowledges that Roman forces were active in Armenia in a report related to the fires (84/703–4) instead of Vardanakert (83/702–3): “The Romans marched into Armenia to Muḥammad b. Marwān, and then God defeated them” (زحفت الروم إلى أرمينية إلى محمد بن مروان فهزمهم الله). Movsēs Dasxuranc’i similarly compresses the events surrounding the revolt at Vardanakert, the appeal for Roman assistance, and Muḥammad b. Marwān’s victory.

The appearance of Roman troops in Armenia at this time should be understood within the context of renewed Roman-Umayyad hostilities. In the course of the second fitna, clashes resumed between the Roman Empire and the Umayyads. Justinian broke the peace

31 Ibn A’tham, Futūḥ, 5/6:402–3. Ya’qūbi mentions this very briefly, but he refers only to Armenians and omits the involvement of the Greeks; Ya’qūbi, Works, 3:973; Taʾrīkh, 2:324.
32 Theophanes, Chronicle, 519–20; Chronographia, 372.
33 Khalīfa, Taʾrīkh, 183–4.
34 Dasxuranc’i, History, 207–8; Patmutʿiwn, 317–18.
treaty with ʿAbd al-Malik in AH 6183/690–91 CE, and Muḥammad b. Marwān defeated the Romans at Sibīṣṭa/Sebastopolis in AH 73/AH 6184/692 CE. Nearly every year thereafter, he or Walīd b. ʿAbd al-Malik conducted raids into Roman territory, except for in 80/699–700 on account of the plague. As Theophanes explains, “from that time on, the Hagarenes were further emboldened and devastated the Roman country” (ἐκτοτε ἐπὶ πλεῖον θρασυνθέντες οἱ Άγαρηνοι τὴν Ρωμαίαν ἐλυμήναντο).36

Armenia had been largely removed from the main battlefields of Roman-Umayyad conflict as the primary front throughout the reign of ʿAbd al-Malik was in or around Cilicia. The Romans’ decision to shift their forces to Armenia in response to Armenian requests in the early 700s was therefore somewhat unusual and ran against the grain of the previous two decades. The dispatch of Roman troops may not have been meant to reestablish Roman control over Armenia; rather, their goal seems to have been to curb caliphal raids into Anatolia. Whether or not this was an explicit strategy, the Romans gained the upper hand in this year. Immediately following his report of Muḥammad b. Marwān’s foray into Armenia in AH 6195/702–3 CE, Theophanes adds: “The same year Azar made an expedition against Cilicia at the head of ten thousand men. The emperor’s brother, Herakleios, met him and killed most of the enemy; the remainder he sent as captives to the emperor” (κατ’ αὐτὸν ἄρε τὴν Κιλικίαν μετὰ χιλιάδων δεκα- καὶ περιτυχών αὐτῷ Ἡράκλειος, ὁ ἀδελφὸς τοῦ βασιλέως, τοὺς πλείστους ἀπέκτεινε καὶ τοὺς λοιποὺς δεσμίους τῷ βασιλεί ἀπέστειλεν).37 The following year, in AH 85/AH 6196/704 CE, ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAbd al-Malik sent Yazīd b. Ḥunayn to Sis, where they were roundly defeated.38 The weakness of the Umayyad frontier in Cilicia likely reflected the urgency of the military situation elsewhere at the time. In the East, Ḥajjāj continued to pursue Ibn al-Ashʿath until the latter’s death in 84/703–4, while ʿAbd al-Malik himself was engaged in succession politics to keep the caliphate out of the hands of his brother ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz, then governor of Egypt. Roman support for the Armenian rebellion further contributed to the dilution of caliphal forces along the Syrian frontier and provided an opportunity for imperial victories in Cilicia.

V.B. THE FIRES OF NASHAWĀ/NAXČAWAN

The fires of Nashawā/Naxčawan appear in Armenian, Arabic, Greek, and Syriac sources. However, these accounts do not all agree on the event’s date, place, victims, or aggressors (though Muḥammad b. Marwān’s role remains a constant). Though many of the accounts appear in truncated form below, these references have been studied in greater depth elsewhere.39

35 Greenwood, in “Armenian Neighbours,” 345 and n. 43, following Howard-Johnston, suggests that it was ʿAbd al-Malik and not Justinian II who broke the ten-year peace.
36 Theophanes, Chronicle, 512; Chronographia, 367.
37 Theophanes, Chronicle, 520; Chronographia, 372.
38 Theophanes, Chronicle, 520; Khalīfa, Taʾrīkh, 184.
39 Vacca, “Fires of Naxčawan.”
V.C. THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE UMAYYAD DĪWĀN

Lewond’s account of the fires at Nashawā/Naxčawan seeks to illustrate the depraved bloodlust of the caliphal governor and to signal changes in caliphal administration. During the Sufyānid period, the naxarark’ provided military support to the Caliphate in lieu of direct taxation. In the reign of ʿAbd al-Malik, however, caliphal administration became more organized as part of the broad and disparate changes implemented at the start of Marwānid rule (commonly known as the Marwānid reforms). Tax collectors were posted in the North and the names of the soldiers were listed in the registry (dīwān), meaning that they were paid directly by the Umayyads. Lewond appears to recognize this shift in caliphal policy: “Muḥammad received the wicked order and commanded a certain Qāsim, who was his commander in the region of the city of Naxčawan, to summon the Armenian naxarark’ with their cavalry under the pretext of recording [their names] in the royal record, [in order for them] to collect their salary, then return” (Եւ Մահմետի առեալ հրաման անիրավ.հրամայէր Կասմոյ ումեմն որ էր հրամանատար նորուն ի կողմանսն Նախճաւան քաղաքի.կոչել առ ինքն զնախարարս Հայոց նոցին հեծելովք.իբրև պատճառանաւք էթէ անցուցանել ի համարու արքունի և առնուլ հռոգ և դառնալ) [25r]. Ostensibly, now that the names were recorded in the “royal record,” their salaries would be paid from the caliphal capital at Nashawā/Naxčawan. This arrangement may have been a mere ruse, but it is subsequently maintained throughout Lewond’s text. It also aligns with other Armenian accounts, such as Drasxanakertc’i’s: “By deceit, fraud, vain hopes and heartening promises they gathered in one place everyone, both the azat and the cavalry forces, and registered their names in the archives [dīwan], as if to give them their annual wages” (ստահամբաւ դաւողութեամբ,սնոտի յուսով եւ խնդացուցանաւղ բարի խոստմամբք զամենեսեան ի մի վայր գումարէին` իբր թէ բաշխել նոցա զդահեկանաց տարեւորն).40

The establishment of the dīwān is completely absent from the works of the Theophilus circuit, though each of those texts does report the fires. Similarly, Khalīfa b. Khayyāṭ and Ibn Aʿtham both describe the fires without reference to the dīwān or any other sort of “royal record.” In fact, the only two Arabic sources to substantiate Lewond’s claim to some degree do not provide clear attestations to the entering of the Armenian nobility into the dīwān, either; this interpretation must be inferred from the context. Yaʿqūbī explains that Muḥammad promised to allocate to them al-sharaf, which could be understood as “eminence” or “highness” and to refer to the highest possible amount of glory, honor, or rank, but in this context denotes stipends at the highest rank:

He [Muhammad b. Marwān] then wrote to the notables of the land, who were called al-aḥrār [= azatk’], giving them safe passage and promising to grant them stipends at the highest rate. To receive this, they gathered together in the churches of the district of Khilāṭ.41 He ordered that firewood be collected and placed around these churches; he shut the doors on the nobles, ordered that the churches be set afire, and incinerated them all.42

42 Yaʿqūbī, Works, 3:973.
Baladhrī offers much the same report, albeit abbreviated and distorted through copying so that “he burned them,” has become “he frightened them” (or, possibly, “he surrounded them”). However, the specific wording in Baladhrī’s text about the allocation of al-sharaf is identical: “He promised those of them who remained that he would allocate to them the highest amount (al-sharaf), so they gathered in churches in the region of Khilāṭ, and he locked them in them, assigned someone over their doors, and then frightened [read: burned] them” (وعد من بقى منهم ان يعرض لهم فى الشرف فاجتمعوا لذلك فى كنائس واحلقها عليهم وو). The specific wording in Baladhrī’s text about the allocation of al-sharaf is identical: “He promised those of them who remained that he would allocate to them the highest amount (al-sharaf), so they gathered in churches in the region of Khilāṭ, and he locked them in them, assigned someone over their doors, and then frightened [read: burned] them” (وعد من بقى منهم ان يعرض لهم فى الشرف فاجتمعوا لذلك فى كنائس واحلقها عليهم وو).

Even where the dīwān is not explicitly evoked, however, the episode demonstrates the unease of the Armenian nobility with regard to increased caliphal control over Armenia in the aftermath of the Marwānid reforms. Ibn Aʿtham indicates that the fires resulted from the resistance of the Armenian nobility to accept changes in the administration of the province:

After that [battle with Roman forces], Muhammad b. Marwān sent [messengers] to their [public] squares and their nobles, and he promised them by his own good will that he would pay them whatever they wanted and appoint over them whomever they liked. And he kept on in that way until they felt confident in him and trusted him. Then they gathered to him and he made peace with them, with the stipulation that he satisfy them in every matter. Then he said: “I don’t trust you. Rather, go into these churches of yours and swear to me that you are not deceiving me, just as I swore to you! After that, give me hostages and then go to your lands!” He [the narrator] said: They agreed with him about that, so they entered the churches to swear allegiance. And when he knew that they had all entered the churches together, he ordered their doors to be locked against them, then the churches and all they contained were covered in fire and pitch. So these churches are called “the burned” even to our own day.

Ibn Aʿtham’s account provides a backdrop for interrogating Łewond’s claims about the establishment of the dīwān. Ibn Aʿtham’s passage promises a normalization of affairs in Armenia, describing a situation that fits neatly into the models of Sufyānid rule. The naxarark’ would maintain control over the appointment of the region’s governor with caliphal blessing, hostages would ensure that the province remained peaceful, and the

---

44 Hoyland, Seeing Islam, 374.
45 Baladhrī, Futūḥ, 205.
naxarark’ would retain their own lands. There is no mention here of the reorganization of the military or tax collection, which went hand in hand. Muhammad b. Marwân’s promises, as presented in Ibn A’tham, clash with the model of caliphal rule that was newly imposed during his tenure, when Armenian cavalry were paid according to the royal record maintained by provincial administrators stationed in Armenia. This apparent contradiction between Ibn A’tham and Łewond likely reflects the process of administrative change in the second/eighth century. The naxarark’ rebelled against the changes implemented during the Marwânid reforms, so Muhammad b. Marwân promised them a return to prereform normalcy.

One other Armenian source also mentions the establishment of the diwân but does not connect it to the fires at Nashawâ/Naxčawan. Dasxuranc’i explains that “all the Armenian leaders whom he [Muhammad b. Marwân] was unable to capture he seduced by means of a mighty oath, gathering them together by fraud and treachery” (և զորս ոչ կարաց ըմբռնել մեծապէս երդմամբ, դաւով և խաբէութեամբ առ ինքն ժողովեաց զամենայն գլխաւորս Հայոց). Thus, Dasxuranc’i claims that Muḥammad promised something unspecified to lure the Armenians into the churches at Nashawâ/Naxčawan—perhaps the promise concerned a return to Sufyânid norms, as for Ibn A’tham, or the addition of their names into the diwân, as Łewond reports. In a different passage, Dasxuranc’i evokes the diwân during the reign of ʿAbd al-Malik, though he identifies it as a registry to track those who might have become Chalcedonian: “All these names were written in the archives of ʿAbd al-Malik amīr al-muʾminīn in order that if any of them were found to have become Dyophysites, they might be destroyed by the sword or imprisonment” (այսք ամենեքեան որ գրեցան ի դիւանին Աբդլմելքի ամիրմոմնւոյ սակս այսորիկ, եթէ ոք ի սոցանէ գտանիցի երկաբնակ եղեալ՝ սրով և գերութեամբ ապառեսցի). Thus, Dasxuranc’i retains the claim that the diwân was established under ʿAbd al-Malik, but disassociates it from the fires of Nashawâ/Naxčawan.

V. D. ROMAN INTERESTS IN THE WEST CAUCASUS

Łewond explains that Smbat europalates, who allied with the Romans and settled in Tayk/Tayk’, moved to P’oyt’, or Phasis, in Roman-controlled Lazica (Lazïqa/Eger/Egrisi, ancient Colchis). Łewond describes this move as an extension of the Bagratuni-Roman alliance: “They went to request from the Greek king a city to live in and folds for their sheep. He gave them the city called Phasis in the region of the land of Eger, and they dwelt there for six years” (և անցեալ խնդրեցին ի թագաւորէն Յունաց քաղաք բնակութե ան և դադարս խաշանց իւրեանց, տայր նոցա զքաղաքն որ անուանե Փոյթ. ի կողմանն Եգեր աշխարհին, և բնակեցան ի նմա ամս. վեց.). Although references in Greek sources allow us to speculate about the broader imperial agendas at play in the Armenians’ emigration, Łewond’s chronology renders the context of the emigration to Phasis, their stay there, and their return to Armenia unclear.

47 Dasxuranc’i, History, 208; Patmut’iwn, 318.
48 Dasxuranc’i, History, 198; Patmut’iwn, 305. The word “archives” here is դիւան; in this context, it renders the Arabic دیوان, but the word entered Armenian from Middle Persian in translations of the Bible before the rise of Islam.
V.D.1. Relocation to Phasis under Justinian

One plausible scenario connects the Bagratuni relocation to Phasis with Justinian II’s efforts to strengthen the Roman Empire’s foothold in the Caucasus during his second reign (705–11 ce). According to Theophanes, Justinian awarded the future emperor Leo the title of spatharios as thanks for the latter’s donation of 500 sheep in support of Justinian’s effort to regain the throne. Theophanes then reports that Justinian distrusted Leo and so sent him on a mission to Phasis to generate trouble between the Alans and the Abasgians:

Now Justinian did not wish to harm him openly, but conceived some sort of aversion toward him and dispatched him to Alania with a sum of money so as to rouse up the Alans against Abasgia: for the Saracens were in control of Abasgia, Lazica, and Iberia. When he had gone to Lazica, he deposited the money at Phasis and, taking a few natives with him, proceeded to Apsilia, crossed the Caucasian mountains, and reached Alania. Wishing to destroy him, Justinian sent instructions for the money to be removed from Phasis. The Alans, however, received the spatharios with great honor and, obeying his words, invaded and captured Abasgia.

Theophanes then inserts an extended anecdote about Alan-Abasgian stratagems.

At various points in the story, Theophanes mentions the involvement of Armenians, thus confirming an Armenian presence in the western Caucasus and in Phasis, in particular, precisely when Łewond’s emigrés arrived there. The Armenians in Theophanes’s chronicle play several different roles, making it difficult to draw a direct line between the vague references to “Armenians” in the Greek text and the specific Bagratuni emigrés in Łewond’s work. While Leo remained in Alania, waiting to carve his way back to Roman territory without passing through Abasgia, a Roman-Armenian force arrived in the western Caucasus: “Some time later an army of Romans and Armenians entered Lazica and were besieging Archaipolis, but on hearing that the Saracens were coming, they departed” (meta de chrónon tìn cphasánton ‘Rwmaíon kai Armeñión eisellóntovn én Lâzikí kai tìn Arxhíotolí poliorcúntovn, ákousántov tè tìn tòn Sarakhtínon élleusin, anexóríasan). Some 200 men from this Roman-Armenian army separated from the rest to raid Apisia, the region to the north of Lazica bordering Abasgia. The main

49 On this campaign, see Canard, “L’aventure caucasienne.”
50 Theophanes, Chronicle, 542.
51 Theophanes, Chronographia, 391.
52 Theophanes, Chronicle, 543; Chronographia, 393.
army returned to Phasis, but this group despaired of rejoining the army and embarked on a life of brigandage in the mountains. The Alans thought that they were an imperial army and informed Leo, who went out with fifty Alans to find them. He did so, and together they made their way back to the coast. En route through the difficult and snowy terrain, they stopped at a fortress called Sideron, to be identified with modern Č’xalt’a, whose warden, a man named Pharasmanios, was subject to the Saracens and at peace with the Armenians (ἐν οὗ ἦν τοποτηρητὴς Φαρασμάνιός τις τούνομα ὑπὸ τοὺς Ἑρακλείους τυγχάνων καὶ εἰρήνην ἔχων μετὰ τῶν Ἀρμενίων). Leo sent a message to him, saying, “Since you are at peace with the Armenians, make peace with me too, and become subject to the emperor” (ἐφ’ ὅσον εἰρήνην ἔχεις μετὰ τῶν Ἀρμενίων, εἰρήνευσον καὶ μετ’ ἐμοῦ· καὶ γενοῦ ὑπὸ τὴν βασιλείαν). Pharasmanios declined, and Leo instructed his men, “including some Armenians,” to set an ambush and capture the people when they went to work. Leo and his men succeed in taking the town and eventually, through a ruse, the fort. Despite promises made to Pharasmanios, Leo entered the fort and ordered it burned; “and as a great conflagration flared up, the families [of the inhabitants] went out seizing whatever possessions they could carry. Remaining there another three days, [the spatharios] demolished the walls down to the ground” (γενομένης δὲ πυρκαϊᾶς μεγάλης, ἐξῆλθον αἱ φαμιλίαι ἀρπάζουσαι εἰ τὴ ἡδύναντο βαστάσαι ἐκ τῶν ὑπαρχόντων αὐτῶν· καὶ πούσας ἄλλας τρεῖς ἡμέρας κατέλυσε τὰ τείχη ἐώς τῆς γῆς). Theophanes is the sole source for Roman interest in Lazica during the second reign of Justinian. This extended passage presents a number of difficulties. First, as noted above, it is not possible to identify “the Armenians” discussed by Theophanes, which makes their relationship to the Bagratunik’ of Lewond’s account unascertainable. Second, the claim that a local ruler recognized “Saracen” rule as far north as Lazica before the 90s/710s should be read with caution. Theophanes claims that the patrician of Lazica submitted to the Arabs in AM 6189/696–97 CE. Arabic sources such as Balādhurī claim that the Arab conquerors reached the western Georgian provinces in the 20s/640s, but although these references consistently overstate the extent of the relationship between caliphal authorities and western Georgia in the first/seventh century, even they do not assert that caliphal allies held al-Abkhāz/Ap’xazet’i or Lazīqa/Egrisi as per Theophanes. The earliest uncontested references to military engagements of this kind in the western Caucasus relate to the later campaigns of Murvan Qru, that is, Marwān b. Muḥammad, in the 110s/730s. Theophanes’ claim may simply reflect Lazica’s anti-Roman position, rather than its position vis-à-vis the Caliphate. Third, Theophanes was writing much later than the events he relates, and his own narrative agenda is outside our current remit. He places this entire episode in the first year of the reign of Leo, AM 6208/715–16 CE, presumably to introduce and laud the

53 Andrei Vinogradov, “Some Notes,” 12. The claim that this region was under “Saracen” control may stem from confusion between multiple Roman fortresses named Sideron, or “iron.” See, for example, later in the text, where Theophanes has Sulaymān b. Hishām conquer another place named Sideron; Hoyland, *Theophilius*, 231–32. This Sideron is paired with other cities in Asia Minor, rather than the Caucasus.
54 This Pharasmanios is unidentified, but his name renders the Georgian ფარსმანიო.
55 Theophanes, *Chronicle*, 544; *Chronographia*, 393.
56 Theophanes, *Chronicle*, 544; *Chronographia*, 393–94.
57 Theophanes, *Chronicle*, 544; *Chronographia*, 394.
58 Theophanes, *Chronicle*, 516; *Chronographia*, 370.
incoming emperor for his plucky resolve in teaching Roman troops to snowshoe across the Caucasus in support of the empire.

As an additional complication, the chronology of Armenian presence in Lazica is uncertain when based solely on the information available from Theophanes and Lewond. Theophanes does not explicitly date the Roman campaign into Lazica, but he claims that Justinian reconciled with Leo “when Justinian became emperor for the second time and was marching down with the Bulgarians” (ἐν δὲ τῇ δευτέρᾳ αὐτοῦ βασιλείᾳ ἐρχομένου αὐτοῦ μετὰ τῶν Βουλγάρων)—that is, in 705 CE.59 The campaign could, then, have taken place in any year of Justinian’s second reign; this date works well with Lewond’s claim that Smbat and the other naxarark’ emigrated in the first year of the caliphate of Walīd b. ʿAbd al-Malik, 86/705. The problem is that Lewond also presents the Armenian emigration as a direct result of the fires of Nashawā/Naxčawan, which he incorrectly dates to 86/705. As explained in chapter IV, these fires occurred in 84/703, which would bring the Armenians into Lazica well before Justinian regained the throne. There are a number of ways to explain this chronological discrepancy. Perhaps Lewond fabricated the explanatory link between the fires and the emigration, or perhaps there was a delay between the two events that Lewond smooths over. Alternatively, perhaps Tiberios Apsimar sent the Armenians to Phasis before Justinian returned to power, so Leo’s campaign (if it even happened) was in response to these developments.

Despite these problems with Theophanes’s narrative, the story of the future emperor Leo in Lazica is still useful to situate Lewond’s account of the emigration of the Armenian naxarark’. Theophanes establishes Phasis as a key city of interest during the second reign of Justinian, precisely when the Bagratunik’ lived there. His account furthermore confirms that Roman emperors and local rulers alike relied on Armenian allies as they contested control over the region. “Armenians” appear in several places in his story. Some participated in military expeditions in Lazica alongside Roman forces but separately from Leo’s campaign. Others filled the ranks of Leo’s troops, while still others became brigands. When Theophanes specifies that Leo sent Armenians to work against Pharasmanios, the implication was that they could tip the balance in his favor. Presumably, their Armenian-ness made them useful to Leo because Pharasmanios had Armenian allies, but Theophanes does not explain why these details were important. What he offers is a complicated snapshot of Armenian involvement in Lazica during the second reign of Justinian. Although he does not explicitly mention Smbat’s participation in these events, the emperor’s settlement of Armenians in Phasis would make sense within this broader context of imperial engagement with Lazica and Alania.

V.D.2. Returning from Phasis under Bardanes Philipikos

According to Lewond’s narrative, Smbat and the other naxarark’ remained in Lazica for six years before switching allegiances again and returning to caliphal Armenia. Since we do not have an undisputed date for Smbat’s emigration from Armenia, the date of his return must similarly remain speculative. However, the Armenians’ return corresponds approximately to Philippikos Bardanes’s expulsion of (presumably Miaphysite) Armenians

59 Theophanes, Chronicle, 542; Chronographia, 391.
from imperial territory. Theophanes explains that “in this year [AM 6204/711–12 CE], Philippikos drove the Armenians out of his country and obliged them to settle in Melitene and Fourth Armenia” (Τούτῳ τῷ ἔτει Φιλιππικὸς τοῦς Ἀρμενίους τῆς ἑαυτοῦ γῆς ἔξελάσας Μελιτηνῆν καὶ τὴν τετάρτην Ἀρμενίαν οἰκήσαι ἠνάγκασεν). The anti-Armenian policy enacted by Philippikos would have been sufficient to explain both Smbat’s return to the Caliphate and the vandalism the Armenians committed against the church in Phasis. As Lewond claims that the looting occurred during Easter, the earliest the Armenians could have returned in this scenario is 93/712, since Philippikos came to power in Muḥarram 93/November 711.

If the return of the Armenians should be tied to this imperial policy, the easiest reconstruction is that Smbat left for Phasis in the first year of Walīd’s reign. Walīd came to power in Shawwāl 86/October 705, so the emigration likely occurred in 87/706, at the start of the reign of Justinian II. Smbat then returned from Phasis in 93/712, as outlined above. This dating fits both Lewond’s narrative and most of the texts of the Theophilus circuit. Agapius confirms that Philippikos’s expulsion order was enacted in the ninety-third year of the Arabs and the seventh of Walīd (فِي سنة ثلث وتسعين للعرب والسنة السابع للوليد), corresponding to 711–12 CE: “In it [the year 93/711–12], Philippikos the king of the Romans ordered the expulsion of all Armenians from his realm into Armenia, so they left and passed to the Arabs. Walīd settled them in Malatiyya and Shimshāṭ” (وِفِيهِ اُمْرَ فِي لِبِّسَس مِلكِ الرَّومِ بَنِى كُلِّ أَرْمَنِي). The problem with this reconstruction is that Lewond attributes the return to Armenia to an oath provided by “a certain ṣAbd al-ʿAzīz.” This governor is to be identified as ṣAbd al-ʿAzīz b. Ḥātim al-Bāhilī, who served in Armenia from 85/704 or 86/705 to 91/709. It is possible that ṣAbd al-ʿAzīz continued to serve in Armenia after Maslama was appointed governor, as Laurent has suggested. If so, that may explain why Lewond ascribes the overtures made to Smbat to him, even though they may have happened after he had been replaced in office.

An alternative reconstruction resolves the normative dates for the governorship of ṣAbd al-ʿAzīz but claims very little support in the extant texts. It is possible that, as Lewond claims, Smbat left Armenia after the fires of Nashawā/Naxčawan, in 84/703. This date would place his return six years later in 91/709, which is still within the governorship of ṣAbd al-ʿAzīz. Such a scenario is highly unlikely, but it would tally with the Chronicle to 1234, which claims that Philippikos took power and expelled the Armenians from Roman territory in AG 1021/709–10 CE. This timeline would be more difficult to contextualize within imperial policy in Lazica. Perhaps more importantly, the fact that Lewond is not alone in his struggle to create a feasible chronology for these events suggests that the events were contested in the course of transmission.

---

60 This date also appears in Michael the Syrian, as AG 1023/711–12 CE; Hoyland, *Theophilus*, 204.
61 Theophanes, *Chronicle*, 352; *Chronographia*, 352. Philippikos’s expulsion of the Armenian Miaphysite inhabitants of the empire certainly undermined his attempt to reconcile the Chalcedonian and anti-Chalcedonian factions through the imposition of monotheletism; see La Porta, “Purging John of Scythopolis,” 58–60; Herrin, *Margins and Metropolis*, 197–98.
64 Hoyland, *Theophilus*, 204.
V. THE CALIPHATE OF WALĪD B. ʿABD AL-MALIK

E. ‘ʿABD AL-ʿAZĪZ AS GOVERNOR OF DABĪL/DUIN

Łewond describes the governor ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz b. Ḥātim in surprisingly positive terms: he is “sagacious and full of worldly wisdom” (վորագրե, լի երկրավոր իմաստութեամ) [27r] and “he disparaged the disdainful knavery of the sons of Ishmael with vehement reprimands” (պբրեզակացութեամ որդոցն Իսմաելի սաստիկ կշտամբութեամ) [27v]. The example of ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz provides insight into Armenian knowledge of Arab-Islamic society (both its storytelling norms and its fashion cues), as well as the role of the governor in times of peace.

V.E. Tunnels and Takbīr in Conquest Narratives

As a rationale for the building program on which ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz embarks in Dabīl/Duin, Łewond has ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz explain that he had been personally involved in the destructive capture of the city during the Islamic conquest, when he was only twelve years old. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz claims to have climbed a water conduit (խողուակ մի) and confused the defenders by shouting out in his own language from the walls of the city. Thinking that the caliphal forces had breached their defenses, the Armenian troops protecting the city scattered and the city fell. Łewond recounts that the source of this amazing story was none other than ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz himself, from “his own mouth” (զայս բերանով իւրով ասի պատմել զինքենէ) [28r].

Narratives of the conquest of Tustar (the modern city of Shūshtar, Iran) share common elements with ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz’s story, given that in the case of Tustar a local informant identified the city’s water outlet (مخرج الماء; in Syriac, “tunnels”: حللا) for the Muslim troops, who were able to penetrate the city via this path. Once inside, they signaled to the main army with the takbīr. Tustar, like Dabīl/Duin, subsequently fell as the city’s defense crumbled.65 Similarly, Muʿāwiya, then the governor of Syria, was able to subdue Caesarea when a Jew showed him an entry into the city via a conduit filled with water (زخروتم یون ورودز یسیما). Once inside, the caliphal troops shouted out “God is great!” and the Roman defenders fled.66 There are other variations of this motif, as in the narratives of the conquest of Āmid (modern Diyarbakır in eastern Turkey). A dog from the city unwittingly revealed the water drains (مسراب الماء) to the invading forces, allowing a small group to enter the city. The commanding officer sent a notice to the main general: “Be ready when you hear the takbīr and the clamoring!”67 (كن على أهبة إذا سمعت التكبر والتهليل.) As expected, the city fell.68

---

65 Tabari, History, 13:135; Taʾrīkh, 2:2555. This element appears also in the account of Khalīfa b. Khayyāṭ, who describes the narrowness of the conduit: فدخل من مدخل الماء، مدخلاً ضيقاً، حتى ينبطح على وجهه. Khalīfa, Taʾrīkh, 81. For a discussion of the Syriac and Arabic accounts of the conquest of Tustar, see Robinson, “Conquest of Khūzistān.” The Syriac version has an inhabitant of the city conspire with the Muslims to dig “tunnels from inside underneath the wall” (虦ܘܕ ܠܓܘ ܬܚܝܬ ܫܘܪܐ ܡ), but there is no reference to the takbīr or to water; Short Chronicle, 104–5.


67 The term tahlīl literally means shouting, jubilation, or cheering, though it also has the more specific reading of uttering the phrase “There is no god except God.”

68 Wāqidī, Futūḥ al-Shām, 2:151. Although the extant version of this work is late, it preserves some important traditions related to the conquest of Armenia; see Ter-Levondyan, “Ալիջիկ Տարոնի զրուց.” Also compare this particular passage to Fāriqī, Taʾrīkh Mayyāfāriqīn, 98.
In addition to these examples of the conduit-shout-rout combination in Arabic conquest accounts, the same formula also appears in other contexts. Theophanes claims that Justinian took Constantinople in AM 6197/704–5 CE in the same manner: “Justinian... together with a few of his countrymen made his way in, without fighting, through the aqueduct and after raising a shout of ‘Dig up the bones!’ he won the city” (ὁ δὲ Ἰουστινιανὸς μετ’ ὀλίγων ὀμοφύλων πολέμου χωρίς διά τοῦ ἄγωγον εἰσελθὼν καὶ θόρυβον ἀνασκαφῆς βαλὼν τὴν πόλιν παρέλαβε).\(^6^9\)

The narrative resonates in a number of different settings and across languages in part because similar storylines appear in the Bible: “When the men gave a loud shout, the wall collapsed; so everyone charged straight in, and they took the city” (Joshua 6:20). This connection is perhaps clearest in the conquest narratives about Ḥims in Syria, where the walls of the city reportedly collapsed at the sound of the takbīr.\(^7^0\) The comparison to Jericho reveals one of the formulaic elements shared between the Book of Joshua and the Arabic conquest narratives. This story also pulls in details of David’s capture of Jerusalem: “Anyone who conquers the Jebusites will have to use the water shaft [צנור] to reach those ‘lame and blind’ who are David’s enemies” (2 Kingdoms [2 Samuel] 5:6). Although this last story has inspired a flurry of scholarship to identify and verify the use of Jerusalemite water conduits in warfare in particular, just as the story of the conquest of Tustar has generated maps of the city’s water systems, the storyline crops up in Near Eastern contexts over a broad geographical and chronological span. Löwond’s account of the capture of Dabil/Duin should be read against this backdrop as making use of a shared vocabulary that draws on biblical models to make sense of conquest. The character of ‘Abd al-‘Aziz provides a sense of how such stories jumped from one historiographical tradition to another through word of mouth.

\(\text{V.E.2. The Rebuilding of Dabil/Duin}\)

Modern scholars typically identify Dabil/Duin as the capital of both Sasanian and caliphal Armenia. However, little evidence supports the assumption that the city transitioned immediately into the caliphal capital. Löwond calls Dabil/Duin the “metropolis” (մայրաքաղաք, lit. “mother city”) [8r] in his account of the Islamic conquests. This descriptor likely evokes the status of Dabil/Duin as the seat of the governors of Sasanian Armenia.\(^7^1\) With the exception of this one reference, the city does not appear again in Löwond’s History until here in the reign of Walid.

Instead of Dabil/Duin, Nashawā/Naxčawan appears as a particularly important administrative center during the reign of ‘Abd al-Malik. Löwond asserts that the caliphal forces were in Nashawā/Naxčawan before Vardanakert, and he also suggests that the “royal record” was kept in Nashawā/Naxčawan, where the fires were lit. Whereas Muḥammad b. Marwān had earlier been based in Ḥarrān/Xaṙan and Mawṣil, Löwond attests to his presence in Dabil/Duin immediately before the fires in 84/703. Löwond’s claim aligns precisely with the first caliphal coins minted in the city.\(^7^2\) The appearance of Muḥammad

\(^{69}\) Theophanes, Chronicle, 522; Chronographia, 376.

\(^{70}\) Ṭabarī, Taʾrīkh, 2:2392.

\(^{71}\) Sebēos, Armenian History, 1:64; Patmut’ ı̈wn, 111. The city appears as ostan in Pseudo-Sebēos’s chronicle.

b. Marwân in Dabīl/Duin and the subsequent building projects should be seen as a return to pre-Islamic norms, rather than as an attestation of unbroken continuity.  

This building program was not specific to Dabīl/Duin but part of a broader attempt by the caliphal administration to claim the provincial centers, including Nashawā/Naxčawan. Khalīfa b. Khayyāṭ explains that ‘Abd al-ʿAzīz b. Ḥātim “built the cities of Dabīl, Nashawā, and Bardha’a” (فبنى مدينة دبيل ومدينة النّشوى ومدينة برذعة) in 85/704–5. Balādhurī offers more information about the people involved, as well as the specific projects:

He [ʿAbd Allāh b. Ḥātim] built and fortified the city of Dabīl and enlarged its mosque. He built the city of Nashawā and repaired the city of Bardha’a. It is said that he renovated its buildings and fortified [it], digging moats around it. He renovated the buildings of the city of Baylaqān. These cities were decaying and dilapidated. It is said that Muḥammad b. Marwān renovated the city of Bardha’a during the caliphate of ʿAbd al-Malik b. Marwān, but Wāqidī said that ʿAbd al-Malik had Ḥātim b. al-Nuʿmān al-Bāhilī or his son build the city of Bardha’a.

These passages demonstrate that the building projects constituted broader expressions of power, both by linking Dabīl/Duin to other cities in Armenia and Albania and by identifying the governors responsible for the work. These projects were not simply isolated local endeavors; rather, they were attributed to caliphal policy. Łewond’s exclusive interest in Dabīl/Duin indicates that he either did not know about the wider context or did not find it worth reporting; this supports Greenwood’s argument that Łewond had a particular connection to the city of Dabīl/Duin.

V.E.3. ‘Abd al-ʿAzīz’s Fashion Choices

ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz’s description of the conquest of Dabīl/Duin includes mention of what he was wearing: “I had my red girdle” (ունի սփածանալիս կարմիր) [28r]. This detail is odd, offered as if ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz and/or Łewond assumed the reader would understand its significance. Red garments claimed several meanings in the early Islamic period, when those

73 S. Sears, in “Before Caliphal Coins,” 89, suggests that Muḥammad b. Marwān likely minted Arab-Sasanian coins in Dabīl/Duin, but this theory fails to acknowledge Bates’s persuasive argument that the mint moved with the governor. Bates demonstrates that the coins of the North were minted in Harrān and Mawṣil during Muḥammad’s tenure, which matches what the written sources say about his residence. Therefore, it seems unlikely that Arab-Sasanian coins were minted in Dabīl/Duin just because it was a Sasanian capital.
74 Khalīfa, Taʾrīkh, 184.
75 Balādhuri, Futūḥ, 205.
76 Greenwood, “Reassessment,” 151.
who wore red were referred to as *muḥammira* in Arabic. Here, the most likely explanation is that ‘Abd al-ʿAzīz was expressing support for the Banū Qays, one of the main tribal confederations that played a significant role in the expansion of Islam. ‘Abd al-ʿAzīz was Bāhilī and so belonged to the Banū Qays. Red was associated with the Qays, whereas the rival Yamānī bloc wore yellow. Red also appears to have signaled support for Umayyad rule, given that rebels within the Umayyad family and their supporters donned red during the third *fitna*.

Despite the multifaceted significance of red clothing in the Umayyad period, it is also possible that the color did not signal any specific religious or social distinction. In describing the rebellion of Mukhtār al-Thaqafi, Tabari includes more than one account of how the famous general Ibn al-Ashtar rallied his men. In one of these reports, Tabari’s source asserts:

> I saw him [Ibn al-Ashtar] and his men when they tethered their horses close together and when Ibn al-Ashtar took the hem of his *qabāʾ* [coat], lifted it up, and pushed it into a red belt made from the borders of *burda* [mantle] materials, which he put on over his *qabāʾ*. He had covered up his armor with the *qabāʾ*.

This passage suggests that the phrase used in Łewond’s text may have been meant to rally men to the cause of a charismatic leader.

Regardless of its intended meaning, Łewond’s reference to ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz’s “red girdle” demonstrates that Łewond and, presumably, his audience belonged to a cultural setting in which the significance of this statement would have been clear.

**V.F. MUḤAMMAD B. MARWĀN’S CAMPAIGN AGAINST CHINA**

Łewond describes Muḥammad b. Marwān’s campaign against China, which seems to incorporate legendary material. The passage is very difficult to make sense of even in light of other sources, whether in Arabic, Armenian, or Syriac.

---

77 The most famous use of the term *muḥammira* is in relation to the Khurramiyya, which does not fit the particular context here. See the discussion of “color-coding” in Crone, *Nativist Prophets*, 121–28. Crone argues that Marwān b. Muḥammad recruited *muḥammira* from Armenia and Azerbaijan to fight at the battle of Zāb in 132/750; this explanation rests on an explicitly apocalyptic passage in Tabari. Another famous usage of red garments is apocalyptic and found particularly in the anti-Umayyad movements focused on the legendary figure of the Sufyānī, on which see Roggema, *Legend of Sergius Bahīrā*, 75. However, this explanation, too, makes little sense in the context of ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz.

78 Fierro, “Red and Yellow,” 79.


V. THE CALIPHATE OF WALĪD B. ‘ABD AL-MALIK

V.F.1. A Legendary Account of Umayyad Campaigns in Central Asia

Multiple campaigns in the East occurred during the reign of Walid, though none fit the circumstances described in Lewond’s account. The location of the campaign—China—is the first anomaly. The Umayyad campaigns in fact reached into Central Asia and did not extend as far as China. This problem might be somewhat mitigated by the definition of “China” in Lewond’s text. Lewond merely notes that Muḥammad b. Marwān traveled through Asorestan, Persia, and Khurāsān to arrive at a river called Bawtis in the land of the “Čenk.”82 The Armenian term Čenk’ is difficult to pin down, as it is sometimes used as a catch-all term to refer to Central Asia.83 The second discrepancy is the reported involvement of Muḥammad b. Marwān, since he is not known to have participated in any of the campaigns in Khurāsān or beyond during the reigns of ʿAbd al-Malik or Walid. According to the Arabic sources, Muḥammad’s only foray was likely to Iraq in response to the rebellion of Ibn al-Asḥ’ath. The campaigns in Central Asia were instead directed by Qutayba b. Muslim under the authority of Hajjāj b. Yūsuf.

Reading Lewond’s account of Muḥammad b. Marwān’s campaign against the reports of Umayyad campaigns in the East yields little of value. A number of military encounters share one or two similarities with that described by Lewond, but nothing definitive appears to explain his colorful account. Qutayba fought against the Turkish and Sogdian forces of Kūrbaghānūn al-Turkī in 88/706–7. Kūrbaghānūn may well have been the patrician of Samarqand, but he appears in Arabic sources as “the nephew of the king of China” (ابن اخت ملك الصين). The accounts of this campaign claim Chinese involvement in battle and assert that the caliphal forces numbered 200,000, though they lack the storyline of the maidens.84 Another possibility is that Lewond’s story is informed by Qutayba’s campaign against the Hephthalite Tarkhān Nīzak in 91/709–10.85 This episode inspired many retellings in Arabic and Persian; if it also inspired Lewond’s report, then the river Bawtis might derive from Bādhghīs, the stronghold associated with the rebellion of Tarkhān Nizak.

The legendary elements in Lewond’s account suggest that the roots of his description of Muhammad b. Marwān’s campaign against China lie in literary narratives or oral tales and should not be sought in the reports of Umayyad campaigns in Central Asia. However, even legendary material offers little grounding for specific details. It is possible that Lewond refracts details circulating about Alexander the Great. Syriac legends include accounts of Alexander’s failed campaign against China. He disguised himself as an ambassador and met with the Chinese emperor. In the meeting, the pretend ambassador described the power and might of Alexander and the extent of his dominion over the Persians and the Indians. He then feasted with the emperor and returned with a large amount of luxury goods, resolving not to encroach further into Chinese territory. According to the Syriac legends, Alexander went to China with only a few companions and left his army on

82 Martin-Hisard suggests that the river Bawtis renders the Chinese Po-tsu, one of the names of the Oxus, or ʿĀmū Daryā; Lewond, Discours historique, 72, n. 378.
84 Khalīfa, Taʾrīkh, 191; Tabari, Taʾrīkh, 2:1195; Narshakhī, History of Bukhara, 45; Chavannes, Documents, 289.
85 Esin, “Tarkhan Nizak.”
the shores of the river that is mentioned three times, each time with a different spelling: Barsaṭīs (ܒܪܣܛܝܣ), Bīrsaṭūs (ܒܝܪܣܛܘܣ), and, in Sogdiana, Barṭisīṭūs (ܒܪܛܣܝܛܘܣ). It is possible that Lewond’s river Bawtis (Բաւտիս) derives from this type of storytelling setting. Such a narrative context would fit the broader Umayyad reframing of famous generals in the mold of the conqueror Alexander the Great, similar to what was done with Maslama b. ʿAbd al-Malik (see chapter VI).

VF.2. The Dual Campaigns of Muḥammad b. Marwān and Maslama b. ʿAbd al-Malik

Lewond’s account of Muḥammad b. Marwān’s campaign against China cannot be easily explained in relation to either Umayyad military encounters or extant legendary texts. The difficulty of situating the report suggests that Lewond or his source manipulated the details to make a broader claim. The significance of this campaign becomes clearer when it is read alongside Lewond’s retelling of Maslama b. ʿAbd al-Malik’s failure at the gates of Constantinople. Both episodes build on storytelling tropes and follow similar narrative arcs from the height of success to complete ruin.

Both generals issued a written proclamation to their opponents about the total superiority of Muslim military might at the edge of a body of water. When Muḥammad b. Marwān encamped on the banks of the river Bawtis, he wrote to the Chinese emperor: “Why do you alone resist and not submit to our prince, since all peoples tremble in fear of us? Now, in whom do you trust that you do not submit to us?” (Ընդէ՞ր ասէ դունիա ընդ հնազանդության իշխանին մերոյ) [28v]. Similarly, when Maslama b. ʿAbd al-Malik ventured against Constantinople, Lewond claims he stopped on the shore of the Pontus Sea and wrote to Leo: “We vanquished and defeated all of the kingdoms” (զամենայն զթագավորություն գտնում վանեալ պարտեցաք) [77v]. Both descriptions are biblically informed, modeled after the Assyrian general Rabshakeh’s siege of Jerusalem in 2 Kings (2 Samuel) 18–19 and Isaiah 36–37. Subsequently, both Maslama’s and Muḥammad’s armies drowned and both generals returned home chagrined. Unable to topple their enemies, they vowed never to go out on campaign again (at least according to Lewond’s version of events). Although there are several important differences between the two narratives—notably, the focus on Hagia Sophia in Constantinople and the ruse with the wagons in China—both reports demolish the careers of ʿAbd al-Malik’s two most prominent generals in Armenia by having them end in embarrassment. Lewond’s accounts of these two generals’ exploits, then, follow a narrative logic rather than chronological history, and their import rests in the image of Muḥammad b. Marwān and Maslama b. ʿAbd al-Malik that Lewond creates for his audience.

The idiosyncrasies of Lewond’s version of the campaign against China find their match in only one other text: the history associated with Šapuh Bagratuni. Pseudo-Šapuh melds Muḥammad b. Marwān’s campaign against the Chinese into Maslama b. ʿAbd al-Malik’s campaigns against the Khazars. In his typically dizzying fashion, Pseudo-Šapuh narrates a very similar tale, but he places it on an ambiguous date: during the reigns of the Roman emperor Leo (r. 717–41) and of Amr, to be identified as ʿUmar b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz (r. 99–101/717–20) but labeled “king of Baghdad” (արքայ Բաղտադայ) in the text itself.

86 History of Alexander, 193, 96, 204.
Muhammad b. Marwān is called Ahmad b. Muḥammad in Pseudo-Šapuh’s text, but otherwise much of the story is the same, including the confrontation with Čenbakur and the ruse with the wagons. The name Čenbakur appears in many early medieval Armenian sources to refer to the king of China, combining Čenk’ in reference to the Chinese with bakur, a word attested in several ancient Iranian languages and meaning “son of heaven.” However, Pseudo-Šapuh does not recognize the title and instead locates this encounter along the shores of the river Kur in the south Caucasus. He, like Lewond, has Čenbakur emerge victorious, but the caliphal forces do not drown. Instead, they suffer extreme losses but then regroup and return the following year:

He [Muḥammad b. Marwān] stayed there [in Baghdad] until the next year; then he gathered troops in numberless multitudes and again attacked the land of the Čenk’. He completely devastated all the land of Armenia and passed into the land of the Khazars. But Čenbakur came to meet him and brought before him many treasures; noble horses with harnesses worked in gold, about three hundred thousand of them; fine pelts of wild animals; and many luminous gems. Satisfied, he [Muḥammad] went [away] and did not enter the land of the Khazars.

Having concluded this agreement, Muḥammad b. Marwān next turned against Darband (though it is left unsaid how this qualified as leaving the Khazars alone) and the Alans. Both of Pseudo-Šapuh’s accounts of the aftermath of the defeat of the Čenk’ resemble significant Umayyad campaigns in the Caucasus.

Lewond’s narrative mirroring and Pseudo-Šapuh’s convoluted account demonstrate that the campaigns of Muḥammad b. Marwān, Maslama b. ‘Abd al-Malik, and the future caliph Marwān b. Muḥammad were conceptually entangled. The comparison is particularly striking because Lewond rearranges his chronology so that Maslama’s Caucasian campaigns unfurl immediately after Muḥammad b. Marwān’s campaign against China (see chapter VI). It is perhaps not surprising that stories about them became intertwined, as uncle and nephew were both on campaign in the Caucasus together at the same time.

87 See the Encyclopaedia of Islam entry “Faghfur.”
89 Bagratuni, Patmut’iwn, 75.
Łewond’s chapter on the reign of Sulaymān b. ʿAbd al-Malik should include a description of a campaign against Constantinople led by Maslama b. ʿAbd al-Malik, the brother of the caliph. However, Lewond proves inventive in his storytelling. Maslama may be most famous for his failed campaign against the capital of the Roman Empire, but he also led a series of campaigns in the Caucasus in the 720s and 730s. Lewond flips the two stories, so that Maslama’s Caucasian campaigns appear first, earlier than they should, and his major defeat is delayed to the end of his life. This revised timeline depicts the arc of Maslama’s career as ending in failure. In this chapter, Lewond selectively records elements of Maslama’s Caucasian campaigns, such as the capture and rebuilding of the city of Darband, in modern Russia. In the process, Lewond casts Maslama as a hero by alluding to legendary details about Alexander the Great in his descriptions. Such metaphoric comparisons pave the way for the downward trajectory of his career, providing the heights of glory that will prove too much for Maslama to maintain. Lewond subsequently has Maslama flee from Khazar adversaries, beginning the dismantling of a military reputation vaunted across the Caliphate.

ENGLISH TRANSLATION

After him [Walīd b. ʿAbd al-Malik], Sulaymān reigned for two years and eight months, then he died. These [are] his deeds.

17. In the second year of his reign, he mustered many forces, placed them in the hands of the general Maslama, and sent [them] to the Caspian Gates. They came and did battle with the forces of the Huns, who [were] in the city of Darband. They [the Arabs] attacked them [the Huns] and drove them out. They knocked down and demolished the walls of the fortress. While they were knocking down the walls of the fortress, they found a stone in its foundation that was inscribed with the following inscription: [31r] “The autocrat Emperor Marcian built this city and these towers with many talents from his own treasury. In the last times,1 the sons of Ishmael will raze it, and they will rebuild it from their own treasury.” When they found the

1 “In the last times,” ṭ ջանհու դունիակները; cf. 1 Peter 1:5; 1 John 2:18; Jude 1:18; Agat’angelos, History of the Armenians, §754.
Figure 8. Darband, known as the Caspian Gates. Photo by Elnur Neciyev from Wikimedia Commons (CC BY 4.0).

Map 6. Maslama b. ‘Abd al-Malik’s campaign against the Huns (i.e., Khazars).
inscription written on the rock, they ceased breaking the wall. They placed overseers over the reconstruction of the destroyed wall.

Maslama himself took a multitude of forces and crossed through the Čora pass. His incursion spread in the land of the Huns, and he went and camped near Tarki, the city of the Huns. But the inhabitants of the land, when they saw the marauder who rose up and arrived against them, immediately notified the king of the Khazars, who was called Khagan. He took with him many troops and all of his strong giants, whose valor and strength were well known to all peoples, and he came and made camp near him [Maslama]. They did battle for many days; they did not fight [31v] each other legion to legion but rather wrestled [one on one]. And Khagan prolonged the confusion of the war so that Alp' T'arxan, whom he had called for help, could come.2

When Maslama saw the immense multitude of the soldiers, he was uncertain of himself, and he wondered if it was possible to find some ruse to escape from them. He ordered the troops to light a huge fire in the camp, left the chattel of the camp—the concubines, the servants, the maids, and the rest of the commoners—there, and headed toward the Caucasus Mountains. He cut down the forest and made a path and narrowly escaped the hands of the enemy. And thus he returned humble and full of shame from the land of the Huns. Having completed all of this, Sulaymān died.

ARMENIAN EDITION

Յետ նորա փոխանորդէ զիշխանութիւն Սուլեման ամս. երկուս և ամիսս ութև և վախճանի. և այս վարք նորա: Մարկիանոս ինքնակալ կայսր շինեաց զքաղաք և զաշտարակս մինչդեռ զպարիսպ ամրոցին գտին վերին հիմունք

2 “So that Alp’ T’arxan . . . could come,” ուրկի զաբակոչին Ալփ Թարխանի, լիտ. “on account of the coming of Alp’ T’arxan.”

3 այս] read: այս տ, with Chahnazarian, Malxaseanc’, and Tēr-Vardanean.

4 դտ. in lft. mg.

5 Հայկ] suprascr. Hand 1<sup>th</sup>.

6 Պարկ] suprascr. Hand 1<sup>th</sup>.

Čora: one of the two main passes through the Caucasus. Scholars have debated whether it is a place within Darband or near it.


Wrestling giants: Lewond here draws on legendary tropes of masculine strength.

Alp’ T’arxan: likely a Turkic honorific title designating a person of high military rank.

Maslama: the manuscript reads "Sulaymān" here and "Maslama" at the end of the paragraph, but the two names must have been inverted through scribal error, as they look very similar in Armenian. We have corrected the reading. Maslama fled from the Khazars, after which Sulaymān died. Maslama appears in later chapters in connection with his campaign against Constantinople.

Caucasus Mountains: mountain chain that connects the Black and Caspian Seas and is home to many peoples.
COMMENTARY

VI.A. MASLAMA’S CAMPAIGNS AGAINST THE CAUCASUS AND CONSTANTINOPLE

We would normally expect to see Maslama b. ʿAbd al-Malik lead his forces through Roman territory during the reign of Sulaymān, but Łewond instead places the campaign against Constantinople in the reign of Hishām b. ʿAbd al-Malik (r. 105–25/724–43; see chapter IX), far later than any other source. However, Łewond’s “incorrect” chronology is more productive than it is problematic. Just as he transposes Maslama’s campaign against Constantinople from Sulaymān’s reign to Hishām’s, so, too, does he transpose Maslama’s campaign against the Caucasus from Hishām’s reign to Sulaymān’s. Although historians have frequently pointed out that Łewond’s chronology is incorrect, it is important to recognize that Łewond’s misdating is a deliberate part of his narrative strategy rather than a mistake or due to misinformation. He flips the two campaigns so that Maslama’s greatest defeat before the Hagia Sophia in Constantinople constitutes the culmination of his life. 10 Łewond deliberately restructures the arc of Maslama’s career to set him up for failure. Łewond’s reordering of the campaigns against the Caucasus and against Constantinople has practical implications for the way that we read this chapter on Sulaymān’s reign. When Łewond claims that “in the second year of his reign, he mustered many forces, placed them

7 պահրակն read: պահակն with printed editions.
8 Մսլիման read: Մսլիման.
9 Մսլիման read: Սուլիման.
in the hands of the general Maslama, and sent [them] to the Caspian Gates” (عَلَى يَدِ السُّلَيْمَانِ بْنِ ʿاَبْدِ الْمَالِكِ وَهُدَى َبِمَاءِ الشَّامِ، وَأَرَّقُوْتُهُمْ إِلَى َبَابِ الْبَيْنَاءَ). In view of all other references to this campaign and the logic of its itinerary, it is likely a scribal error for Hayzân (حَيْزَان) – the usual Arabic toponym for what should have read Khaydāq (خِيْدَاق). We have corrected it here in the English and the Arabic on the basis of the reading of Khalīfa, Taʾrīkh, 222; Balādhurī, Futūḥ, 207; and Ibn Aʿtham, Futūḥ, 7/8:282.

11 Spellberg, “Umayyad North.”
12 The text here actually reads “Georgia” (حَرْبَانَ) but in view of all other references to this campaign and the logic of its itinerary, this is likely a scribal error for Hayzân (حَيْزَان) – the usual Arabic toponym for what should have read Khaydāq (خِيْدَاق). We have corrected it here in the English and the Arabic on the basis of the reading of Khalīfa, Taʾrīkh, 222; Balādhurī, Futūḥ, 207; and Ibn Aʿtham, Futūḥ, 7/8:282.
13 Yaʿqūbī, Taʾrīkh, 2:381.
14 Yaʿqūbī, Taʾrīkh, 1035. For this campaign, see previous footnote.
VI.B.1. The Destruction and Rebuilding of Darband

According to Lewond, Maslama fought the Huns in Bāb al-Abwāb/Darband and expelled them from the city. He then had the walls of the fortress dismantled. But when Maslama’s men discovered an inscription, they stopped razing the walls and instead rebuilt them.

Many Arabic sources about Bāb al-Abwāb/Darband describe its walls, but they do so nearly exclusively to commemorate the deeds of Anūshirwān. Even references to Maslama’s capture of the city refer back to its foundation: Ibn A’tham, Balādhurī, and Balʿamī explain that Maslama overcame the city’s defenses by poisoning the water cistern that had been built by Anūshirwān. Without adequate water supplies, the Khazars were forced to abandon the city. Then Maslama ordered that the towers be turned into a granary and installed iron gates to protect the city. Although he does not provide such details about the rebuilding, Khalīfa b. Khayyāt offers a specific date for this activity: “Maslama b. ‘Abd al-Malik went out in pursuit of the Turks in Shawwāl in the year 112 [December 730–January 731], through intense rain and snow, until he passed al-Bāb. He appointed [Ḥārith b. ‘Amr] al-Ṭāʾī to build and fortify the gate” (خرج مسلمة بن عبد الملك في شوال سنة اثنتي عشرة وناراً في باب). This date aligns with Dasxuranc’i’s account, which refers to the destruction and the rebuilding of the city: “In the year 180 [AE = 731–32 CE] Maslama rebuilt Darband in the name of the Arabs. They did not, however, destroy the palace of the eastern patriarch, which still stands there” (Եւ ի ՃՁ թուականին դարձեալ Մսլիման շինէ զԴարբանդ յանուն Տաճկաց, այլ զկաթողիկոսարանն արևելից ոչ աւերէ, որ դեռևս կայ ի նմա). The Chronicle of Zuqnīn connects his newly rebuilt gate to Alexander the Great rather than to Anūshirwān as the Arabic texts do: “Maslama was pressed and ordered that the gate of the land of the Turks which had been built by Alexander of Macedon be destroyed” (ܡܐ ܘܦܩܕ ܘܐܬܥܩܪ ܬܪܥܐ ܡܢ ܐܠܟܣܢܕܪܘܣ ܡܩܕܘܢܝܐ ܐܬܒܢ.) However, the author of the Chronicle does not interpret the destruction and rebuilding of Bāb al-Abwāb/Darband through an eschatological lens.

---

15 Masʿūdī, Murūj al-dhahab, 2:2; Ibn al-Faqīh, Mukhtasar, 288; Qudāma b. Ja’far, Kharāj, 259.
16 Balādhurī, Futūḥ, 207; Balʿamī, Chronique, 4:287; Ibn A’tham, Futūḥ, 7:8:288.
17 Khalīfa, Taʾrīkh, 221. Cf. Tabari, Taʾrīkh, 2:1532 and 1562. Tabari includes the same date and information about Maslama’s raids, but the building project appears separately in 114/732–33.
18 Dasxuranc’i, History, 210; Patmut’iwn, 320.
19 Chronicle of Zuqnin, 159; Chronicon Anonymum Pseudo-Dionysianum, 2:168–69.
VI.B.2. The End of Time, Marcian’s Inscription, and Maslama as the New Alexander

Like the *Chronicle of Zuqnin*, the episode in Łewond alludes to the legacy of Alexander. The *Alexander Legend*, composed in Syriac in northern Mesopotamia in 629 CE or shortly thereafter, recounts Alexander’s building of a large brass gate in the Caucasus to keep out the destructive forces of Gog and Magog, identified with the Huns. On this gate, Alexander left an inscription with an eschatological prophecy predicting that the Huns would come forth through the gates, subjugate the lands of the Romans and the Persians, and then return home. In the last days, God will release the Huns once again, and they and the Persians will decimate each other. At this point, the Romans will destroy both of them, and “my kingdom, which is called that of the house of Alexander the son of Philip the Macedonian, shall go forth and destroy the earth and the ends of the heavens; and there shall not be found any among the nations and tongues who dwell in the world that shall stand before the kingdom of the Romans” (ܐܠܟܣܢܕܪܘܣ ܒܝܬ ܐܠܟܣܢداول ܡܟܕܘܢܝܐ ܘܬܚܪܘܒ ܐܪܥܐ ܕܣܘܦܝ ܫܡܝܐ. ܘܒܪ ܦܝܬܐ ܕܪܗܘܡܝܐ ܕܝܬܒܝܢ ܒܒܪܝܬܐ ܕܢܩܘܡܘܢ ܩܕܡ ܡܢ ܥܡܠܡܝܦܘܣ). The *Alexander Legend* is the earliest literary articulation to place the theme of Alexander’s gate within an eschatological framework, and it proved a very productive text. Although Łewond’s inscription appears not on a gate but on the walls of the city, it is clear from the reference to the Huns and the eschatological tenor of the inscription—“in the last times” (ի յետին ժամանակս)—that it drew on a tradition related to the *Alexander Legend*. Unlike the *Chronicle of Zuqnin*, which presents Maslama as superseding Alexander by destroying and then rebuilding his gate, Łewond’s account has a Greek eschatological inscription restrain Maslama’s destruction of the city walls. Even if Łewond’s source here was not translated from Greek, the wording of the inscription attempts to endow it with a certain Romanicity. It contains the words “autocrator” (ինքնակալ), a calque on the Greek; “emperor” (կայսր), derived from “caesar;” and the Grecism “talent” (տաղանդ).

Łewond is unique in attributing an eschatological inscription to “Emperor Marcian,” and the identification of the supposed dedicator of the inscription poses some challenges. At first glance, Emperor Marcian would seem to refer to Marcian, the fifth-century ruler of the Eastern Empire (r. 450–57 CE). If he is indeed the intended dedicator, he is presumably named here because of some memory of his ceasing to pay tribute to Attila the Hun (as the Huns were associated with Gog and Magog) or because of his military action against Gubazēs I of Lazica, the closest point to the Caucasus where Marcian made an imperial presence felt. His reign is recalled as a time of peace and prosperity, which may have prompted comparisons with a time before the eschaton, but beyond an explicit mention in the “Seventh Vision of Daniel,” an apocalyptic text composed around 490 CE, Marcian does not seem to figure in known eschatological traditions. Given that Marcian was

20 On the dating, see Reinink, “Die Entstehung,” 268–70 n. 27.
21 *History of Alexander*, 155 (English), 270 (Syriac).
not active in the Caucasus or particularly associated with eschatological predictions, the fifth-century emperor is not a persuasive candidate for identification with Lewond’s “Emperor Marcian.”

It is also possible that “Marcian” (Մարկիանոս) is a scribal error for “Maurice” (Մաւրիկիոս). It has long been recognized that the Alexander Legend reflects the imperial propaganda of the court of Herakleios in presenting Alexander as a “proto-Heraclius and Heraclius as a new Alexander.” But the deployment of Alexander in imperial propaganda may have predated Herakleios. G. Reinink has suggested, for example, that the emperor Kosrow II Parvīz, Herakleios’s archrival, earlier cast himself in the image of Alexander and as the inheritor of Alexander’s eastern conquests. It is thus conceivable that even before Kosrow II, Alexander and his military conquests may have served Maurice—who was the first emperor since Theodosius the Great to lead Roman armies into battle, who conquered Persia and restored its ruler, and who was ceded large amounts of land in Syria, Armenia, and Iberia by the Persians—in the construction of imperial ideology. But even if Maurice entertained comparisons between himself and Alexander, there is no evidence to connect him with Darband. Lewond’s inscription nonetheless underscores the malleability of Alexander’s legacy within the context of competitive narratives of imperial legitimacy in the first/seventh and second/eighth centuries.

Although the inscription of Marcian does not appear in Arabic sources, this passage fits a broader theme of Arabic conquest literature: conquered populations demonstrating foreknowledge of the Islamic conquests. The most famous example of this comes from Andalus, where the Christian Visigothic kings kept a house that no one entered in which there was a chest with the Gospels. The building, known as the House of Locks, was opened only when a new king came to power and his name was recorded in the room. Immediately before the Islamic conquests, Roderic seized the throne and went inside the room without the approval of the people. As Ibn al-Qūṭiyya explains:

He opened the building and the chest after the Christians had forbidden him to do so. He found in the chest pictures of Arabs shouldering their bows and wearing turbans on their heads. On the lower part of the wood was written: “When this building is opened and these pictures are taken out, a people in their image will enter Andalus, and they will triumph over it.”

---

26 Another, though even less likely, possibility for Lewond’s Marcian is Emperor Justin II’s nephew Marcian, who was appointed magister militum per Orientem from 572 to 573 ce. According to Theophylact of Simocatta (iii.9.10–10.1) and Theophanes (AM 6064), Marcian’s appointment and campaign against the Persians coincided with Justin’s halting of payment to the Persians for the mutual upkeep of the fortresses that guarded the Caspian Gates. Yet this Marcian never fought beyond Nisibis, was not an emperor, and never appeared in an eschatological prophecy.

27 Reinink, “Heraclius, the New Alexander,” 86.


29 For several examples of Christian and Zoroastrian leaders showing foresight about the Islamic conquests, see Shoshan, Arabic Historical Tradition, 64–67. Most of these examples have combatants who are fighting the Arab Muslims exclaim that certain territories will be taken. The Andalusī example is closer to what we find in Lewond because of the antiquity of the inscription.
VI. THE CALIPHATE OF SULAYMĀN B. ʿABD AL-MALIK

Then Fath al-Bāb and the sarcophagus, after the Christians had finished their work, found a portrait of Arab women in their jewelry at its head. Whatever was written was hidden under two inscriptions, if this was the portrait and the grove of the Adonis, it fell upon them.30

Other versions of the story describe the significance of the House of Locks differently, filling the room with the crowns of the Visigothic kings. Ibn Ḥabīb explains that according to the prophesy, the number of Visigothic crowns equals the number of Arab governors over Andalus until the end of time, thereby linking the House of Locks explicitly to the end of days.31 Foreknowledge of the conquered, telling inscriptions, references to Alexander the Great, and apocalyptic sentiments are all common threads of Arabic-Islamic conquest literature, even if Łewond’s combination of them remains unique.

VI.C. MASLAMA’S FLIGHT FROM THE KHAZARS

Łewond claims that Maslama b. ʿAbd al-Malik encountered the Khazars near Tarki. They fought one another one on one, which delayed the confrontation long enough for a Khazar champion to arrive with reinforcements. Maslama, seeing “the immense multitude of the soldiers” (quāḥmū quṣiqqū qruqūmḥū) [31v], was afraid. He ordered his men to light a fire in the camp, presumably to leave the impression that it was inhabited, and left the equipage there, fleeing back south through the Caucasus Mountains to escape.

Ibn Aʿtham and Balʿamī both describe the fire that Maslama set to fool the Khazars into believing that the caliphal troops remained in their camp. They frame the narrative with Maslama as a hero rather than a coward. Ibn Aʿtham explains that Maslama traveled through Bāb al-Abwāb/Darband to Balanjear, then Wabandar,32 and then Samandar. Maslama found no one in Samandar, so he went on until the khagan met him. Ibn Aʿtham explains this encounter in terms reminiscent of Łewond:

When all sorts of infidel peoples marched against Maslama, neither Maslama nor his army could endure them. Their number was so great that only the One who created them could count it. He [the narrator] said: When Maslama learned of this, he ordered his companions to set a fire, and they did so. And when it became night, they left their tents pitched where they were, and they left after evening had fallen. Maslama sped through the trip in hiding. He made every two stages into a single stage, even though the weak under his command preceded and the strong, men of endurance and bravery, made up the rear guard. This continued until he arrived at the city of al-Bāb.

Ibn al-Qūṭiyya, History, 14–15; Clarke, Muslim Conquest, 150.

30 Christys, "History of Ibn Ḥabīb," 332.
31 On Wabandar, see Dunlop, Jewish Khazars, 42–43. References to it appear in Greek, Arabic, Hebrew, and Persian sources but with some spelling differences as the porter and the winner.
32 Ibn Aʿtham, Futūḥ, 7/8:283.
A similar, though not verbatim, report on this engagement appears also in Balʿamī’s history: the khaqan “rassemble son armée. Maslama vint ensuite à Derbend et de là à Samandar, sans rencontrer d’ennemis, puis il marcha contre le Khâqân, qui s’approcha à la tête d’une innombrable armée d’infidèles. Maslama, après avoir donné l’ordre d’allumer des feux et de poser les tentes, ramena les musulmans à Bâb al-Abwâb” (لشكر را گرد كرد. ومسلمه لشكر
بران وبهن دربند شد واز آنجا به سمندر شد وکس را تیاقت. پس روی ها حاکم تاده. ولشکرهای کافران روی به سملمه هنامند. خندانهک ایشان را شمار نبود. چون سملمه آگاه شد. یاران خوشی را فرمود تا آتش بر کردن
ویخیمی ها فوک کردن همچنان زده. وخد وینی نته ویه شهر باب الابواب پاژ امدن).34 Balʿamī then diverges from Ibn Aʿtham by having the mulūk al-jabal take the rear guard, which discourages the khaqan from following the group. Ibn Aʿtham and Balʿamī claim that Maslama met with the khaqan soon after he passed Samandar, which is usually identified as Tarki. This detail aligns neatly with Lewond’s account, but the fact that Lewond employs Tarki instead of Samandar here suggests separate transmission histories for this report. The specific details about the ruse are found in only a few histories.35 Other sources refer to Maslama’s defeat and flight without mentioning the fires or providing the geographical specificity found in the works of Lewond, Ibn Aʿtham, and Balʿamī. Michael the Syrian notes that the large Turkish army forced Maslama to flee and abandon his equipage: “En l’an 1039 [AG = 727–28 CE], Maslama envahit de nouveau le pays des Turcs avec une nombreuse armée. Il y eut un combat de 40 jours. Quand les Tâïyayê virent qu’ils ne pouvaient vaincre les Turcs, ils abandonnèrent leurs bagages et s’enfuirent” (موقه علي مسلمه به خیمه ها فرود كردند همچنان زده. وخد وینی نته ویه شهر باب الابواب باز امدن).36 Although early Syriac texts also mention this defeat,37 it is very likely that Michael learned of it from the traditions of the Theophilus circuit, because all of the historians dependent on Theophilus’s reports include some snippet relevant to this event.38 Theophanes notes the defeat with other details that evoke Lewond’s story: “In this year [AM 6221/728–29 CE] Maslama invaded the land of the Turks. He joined battle with them, and there were many casualties on both sides. Seized by cowardice, Maslama took to flight and returned through the mountains of Khazaría” (Τούτῳ τὸ ἔτει ἐπεστράτευσε Μασαλμᾶς τὴν τῶν Τούρκων γῆν, καὶ συναφθέντες ἀλλήλοις εἰς πόλεμον, πίπτουσιν ἐξ ἀμφότερων τῶν μερῶν· καὶ δειλανδρήσας ὁ Μασαλμᾶς φυγῇ χρησάμενος διὰ τῶν ὑπάτων Χαζαρίας ὑπεστρεψεν).39 The Chronicle to 1234 also adds that “Maslama was afraid, and by trickery and guile he got

34 Balʿamī, Chronique, 4:285; Tārīkhnāma, 4:942.
35 In addition to Ibn Aʿtham and Balʿamī, the fires appear in Ibn al-Athīr, Kāmil, 4:409: فرق (112 سنة) فرقة.
37 Hoyland, Theophilus, 228–29.
38 Theophanes, Chronicle, 563; Chronographia, 407. Theophanes has a similar report only two years later, in AM 6223/730–31 CE, but this later reference is likely a mistaken repeat of the 6221/728–29 campaign; see Balogh, “Notes on the Western Turks,” 191.
out of their country” (ܒܝܬܐ ܕܥܒܕ ܛܘܟܢܐ ܡܢ ܐܬܪܗܘܢ).

Compiling the information from all of the various texts related to the Theophilus circuit, we find the abandonment of the equipage, the ruse, the flight, and the defeat. These works therefore offer a story that is analogous to the one Lewond tells, but only if they are all read in concert. They also do not explain the ruse—that is, that Maslama ordered the fires lit to suggest habitation in the camp; this detail is shared only by Lewond, Ibn A’tham, and Bal’ami.

With the additional information of the date furnished by the Theophilus circuit, we can return to the ‘Abbāsid-era Arabic sources. A close examination of the campaigns in 110/728–29 reveals confusion between Maslama b. ‘Abd al-Malik’s and Marwân b. Muhammad’s respective activities in the Caucasus. In contrast to Lewond, Ibn A’tham, and Bal’ami, some Arabic accounts locate a separate campaign, called the Campaign of Mud, in this year. Khalīfa b. Khayyāṭ explains that Maslama met with a large contingent of Khazars near al-Bāb on 7 Jumādā II 110/September 17, 728. On its own, al-Bāb refers to Bāb al-Abwāb/Darband, but Khalīfa also offers another report that locates Maslama near Bāb al-Lān/Dariali: “Maslama fought them for nearly a month in the pouring rain; then God defeated them” (عند مطر عزة مسلم، ثم هزمهم الله). Because of the rain, Khalīfa dubs this defeat the Campaign of Mud (غزاة الطين). Ṭabarī also notes the heavy rain near Bāb al-Lān/Dariali in 110/728–29 but has Maslama return victoriously through Masjid Dhi al-Qarnayn/Mc’xet’a. There seems to have been a subset of traditions that interpreted Maslama’s campaign as a success, as Eliya bar Šinaya also has Maslama defeat the Turks in AG 1039/728 CE. These traditions are clearly quite different from those we saw above, as they place Maslama in Georgian territory rather than at Samandar/Tarki and focus on the challenging conditions.

Maslama’s flight from the Khazars and his ruse with the fires thus cannot be connected with the Campaign of Mud. Although both Ibn A’tham and Bal’ami report on the Campaign of Mud, they clearly distinguish it from Maslama’s flight from the Khazars. They claim that it was Marwân b. Muhammad who led this campaign against Balanjar and that he did so only after Maslama had returned to Syria. The confusion over the date and the attribution of this campaign to both Maslama and Marwân contribute to a broader pattern of conflating the various Umayyad generals in Arabic, Georgian, and Armenian sources. The reports about Maslama’s flight from the Khazars demonstrate that Lewond aligns closely with Ibn A’tham and Bal’ami despite their differences in interpretation. The Theophilus circuit displays some similarities with this account, whereas Ṭabarī and Khalīfa diverge completely from it. These examples underscore the mobility of such reports and caution us not to erect boundaries between the various historiographical traditions of the Near East on the basis of language or religion.

40 Hoyland, Theophilus, 229; “Anonymi auctoris Chronicon ad 1234,” 310.
41 Khalīfa, Ta’rīkh, 219.
42 Ṭabarī, Ta’rīkh, 2:1506; bar Šinaya, Chronographie, 102.
43 Ibn A’tham, Futūḥ, 7/8:288; Bal’ami, Chronique, 288.
LEwand offers very little information about the caliphate of ʿUmar b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz, claiming little more than that he was better than the other Umayyads, a conviction shared by Arabic and Syriac sources. However, this chapter is by far the longest in his History. The vast majority of chapter VII is taken up by an extended religious polemic in the guise of a correspondence attributed to ʿUmar b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz and the Roman emperor Leo the Isaurian (r. 717–41). Lewond first presents a brief letter from ʿUmar to Leo that challenges the tenets of Christianity; this letter was likely created to explain and introduce the response. The second letter, purporting to be from Leo to ʿUmar, occupies the rest of the chapter. This letter asserts the veracity of Christian beliefs, responds to the challenges that Muslims levied against Christianity, and then denigrates some of the tenets of Islam. The main themes include the nature of scripture, the Incarnation, biblical proof texts for the Prophet Muḥammad, and practices associated with the laws of the Bible or the Qurʾān. The correspondence was likely included in the earliest version of Lewond’s History, but it was not written by him. Instead, it was originally written in Greek, as we can tell by certain biblical quotations and by the text’s alignment with Chalcedonian Christian doctrine.

ENGLISH TRANSLATION

After him [Sulaymān b. ʿAbd al-Malik], ʿUmar reigned for two years and five months, then he died.

18. They say that he was the most noble of all the men of his tribe. He returned the captives whom Muḥammad [b. Marwān] had captured from Armenia after burning the naxarark’ of this land, for he [Muḥammad] took many fortresses and captured men and women. When ʿUmar established his rule, he sent all of the captives to their own places and pacified the lands that were under his control. This same ʿUmar wrote a letter to Leo, the emperor of the Romans, to learn about the strength of our faith, and in it there were various questions that I shall record briefly below.

1 “He returned the captives,” Uu արար դարձ [32r] գերութեանն, lit. “He made a return of the captivity.”

ʿUmar b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz (r. 717–20): Umayyad caliph praised by Christian and Muslim sources alike for his piety and for his reforms of caliphal taxation. He lifted the siege on Constantinople, but he supported campaigns against both the Khazars and the Khārijites.
In the name of God, [from] 'Umar, the prince of the believers, to Leo, the emperor of the Romans. Many times have I wanted to know the teaching of your supposed faith, and we have applied ourselves to learning what you really think; yet it has not been possible for us to comprehend [it]. But now tell me the truth.

"First, why did Jesus say to his disciples: 'You came naked and naked will you return'? Or, why do you not accept what Jesus said about himself, but instead examine the books of the Prophets and the Psalms to find in them testimony concerning [32v] the incarnation of Jesus? You doubted and [were] weak in your thought, and you did not consider sufficient that which Jesus testified about himself, but believed that which the prophets said. But Jesus was truly worthy of confidence, for he was close to God. He knew himself better than [do] the scriptures, which peoples whom you do not know have changed and corrupted.

"Or, how do you justify the scripture[s] and follow them however seems appropriate to you? You say that the Laws, which the sons of Israel used to read and know, were written many times and destroyed. And some time passed when not even a part of them [i.e., the Laws] existed among them, until some men wrote [them] afterward through their own understanding, and [they passed] from generation to generation and tribe to tribe. They were mortals from the sons of Adam who forget and are caught in conjecture, for Satan is near to them and they [are] his imitators in their enmity. Or, why is nothing found in the laws of Moses concerning the kingdom [of heaven], hell, the judgment, or the resurrection? Rather, they who wrote the Gospels, Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, related [these things]

2 Cf. Qurʾān 3:45.
3 "Which the sons of Israel used to read and know," نَّفَّذَتْ يَدَ يَدِهِمْ، نَصْرًا مَّنْ أَصْرَأَهُ، وَيَدَّعُو، lit. "which were read by the sons of Israel and they knew them."
4 "Were written": the manuscript has քանիքն, "were captured," here and "were written," քանիքն, below in the analogous portion of Leo’s response at fol. 37v. The editions of Małkaseanc', Tēr-Vardanean, and Hakobian emend the second instance to "were captured," but we think the reading "were written" is preferable in both cases.

'Umar raises a number of theological concerns in this short passage. They fall into five basic categories:
1. Why do Christians turn to the Old Testament instead of just trusting Jesus?
2. Why do Christians believe in the Trinity and the Incarnation?
3. How can Christians be certain that the Bible has not been corrupted?
4. Why don’t Christians recognize that Jesus foretold the coming of Muhammad?
5. Why have Christians changed biblical practices?

In the name of God: known as the baṣmala, this phrase is typically associated with Islam and widely used to start any document. Although Christian documents also adopt the phrase, it is not usual in the Armenian or Greek traditions of this early period. This version of the correspondence seems to be consciously imitating Arabic epistolary style.

Leo III the Isaurian (r. 717–41): Roman emperor remembered for his wars against the Caliphate, his alliance with the Khazars, and his iconoclasm.

You came naked and naked will you return: this quotation is not from the Gospels, as Leo will point out below, but from Job 1:21 and Ecclesiastes 5:15.

Jesus’s testimony: the claim that Jesus speaks for himself may refer to a passage in the Qurʾān according to which Jesus spoke through the name of God who gave you good tidings of a word from Him, whose name will be the Messiah, Jesus, the son of Mary, distinguished in this world and in the Hereafter and among those close [to God]” (Qurʾān 19:30–34).

Close to God: the Qurʾān refers to Jesus as someone who is close to God: “[And mention] when the angels said, ‘O Mary, indeed God gives you good tidings of a word from Him, whose name will be the Messiah, Jesus, the son of Mary, distinguished in this world and the Hereafter and among those close [to God]’” (Qurʾān 3:45).

Falsification of scripture (taḥrīf): Muslims and Christians accused each other of the falsification of scripture. Although Muslims recognized the Gospels (Injīl) as scripture, they expected that the Gospels would contain the word of God revealed through Jesus.
through their own understanding. The Paraclete whom Christ will send, as it says in the Gospels, is none other than our Muhammad.

"Or, why did the Christian nations divide into seventy-two tribes after the disciples? You make [Jesus] a companion and equal to the incomparable power of God and like Him, [thereby] professing three gods. You yourselves freely endeavor to change all of the laws: changing circumcision into baptism, [changing] sacrifice into the communion of the bread and the cup of blessing [i.e., the Eucharist], and honoring Sunday instead of Saturday. Or, how was it possible for God to dwell in flesh and blood and in a womb of various impurities? Also, why do you honor the bones of the apostles and the prophets, or the sign of the cross, which according to the law was an instrument of torture, or the icons, which you venerate? For the prophet Isaiah testifies that our lawgiver [is] the companion of and equal to Jesus, since the Prophet saw him, a fellow traveler, in a vision: one mounted on an ass and the other mounted on a camel. So why do you not believe all this? Educate me, so that I will be able to know about your conjectured teaching."

**LETTER FROM THE ROMAN EMPEROR LEO THE ISAURIAN TO THE UMAYYAD CALIPH ‘UMAR B. ‘ABD AL-‘AZĪZ**

‘Umar, the prince of the Ishmaelites, wrote all of these disputations and many more to the king Leo. For that reason, it was necessary for the emperor Leo to respond in this manner:

17. "Emperor Flavian Leo, believer in Jesus Christ, our true God, and King to those who recognize Him. To ‘Umar, leader of the Saracens. What should I put forward as the most correct and most truthful [response] to what you sent to us? Especially as we were taught by God to instruct adversaries with kindness, [for] perhaps it may grant them time to repent. Moreover, royal custom is not to attack those who want to hear the miraculous mystery of truth with frightening words like rocks. But since indeed the beginning of your letter did not contain even the smallest semblance to the truth, one must not call 'just' that which is not true. For you said in your letter that ‘many [34r] times we wrote to you’ about the divine mystery of our Christians and that we applied ourselves to studying the teaching

The Paraclete: John 14:16 reads, "And I will ask the Father, and He will give you another advocate [παράκλητον] to help you and be with you forever." Muslims understood the word "Paraclete" (comforter) to refer to the Prophet Muhammad. This shows how Muslims employed the Gospels to argue for the prophethood of Muhammad.

Seventy-two tribes: the letter of ‘Umar undoubtedly referred to differing sects or beliefs, as per a famous ḥadīth that Christians would be divided into seventy-two sects. However, the author of ‘Umar’s letter formed his list of accusations with Leo’s response in mind. He therefore uses the word “tribes” instead of “beliefs” because Leo argues that Christians were divided into seventy-two different peoples and languages.

Companion and equal: this phrase echoes the seventh-century Umayyad anti-Trinitarian slogans "he has no partner" and "he has no equal." Both are found on the inscriptions inside the Dome of the Rock in Jerusalem (built in 692); the former is also found on Umayyad coins from the later seventh century. The Qur’an clarifies Islamic views of Jesus by stressing the oneness of God: "He neither begets nor is born, nor is there to Him any equivalent" (Qur’ān 112:3–4).

Ass and camel: Isaiah 21:6–8 reads, "This is what the Lord says to me: 'Go, post a lookout and have him report what he sees. When he sees chariots with teams of horses, riders on donkeys or riders on camels, let him be alert, fully alert.' And the lookout shouted, 'Day after day, my lord, I stand on the watchtower; every night I stay at my post. Look, here comes a man in a chariot with a team of horses.' And he gives back the answer: 'Babylon has fallen, has fallen! All the images of its gods lie shattered on the ground!'" Muslims understood the rider on the ass as Jesus and the rider on the camel as Muhammad, seeing in this evidence that the Hebrew Scriptures foretold the coming of Muhammad.
of your supposed beliefs.' But neither of these was possible, because no obligation at all has led us to these things. For we were not taught by our Teacher and Lord to expose such unique godly knowledge to the jeering mockery of foreign scholars, let alone to those who are not versed in the prediction[s] of the prophets and the preaching of the apostles. This is what we are accustomed to prescribing to others. Yes, we have written to you several times, and will yet again have occasion to write concerning other worldly matters, but not about divine affairs. Still, we who are counseled by the divine voice [have learned] to 'give an answer to everything that they ask you,' but not to respond to him who does not ask. Moreover, we do not desire to learn anew the meaning of your opinions at present; rather, we have been counseled by God also concerning this: 'Examine everything.' He says, 'and hold fast to the good.'

"Now, we have the written histories [34v] of our blessed bishops who were alive at the time when that Muhammad, your lawgiver, lived, and for that reason it is not necessary to pester you about this. But lest you think us to be ashamed of such marvelous knowledge of God, listen then, if you are agreeable, and hear me: you will eat the goodness of the earth, as Isaiah said. It is very difficult, O you man, to cast utter falsehood away when the opponent always thinks of contesting everything. What I am saying is as follows: If two people are standing near a fire, [and] one says that it is a fire (which is the case), while the other disputes and says that the same thing is a source of water, the seditious falsehood [of the latter] is readily apparent.

"Now, you said that our Lord said in the gospel, 'You came naked and naked you will return,' but nowhere in the Gospels do we find our Lord to have said this, although He always orders us to contemplate death. Rather, this is a saying of Job. For when [35r] Satanic temptations poured down upon him, the just one said this: 'I was born of my mother naked and I will return there naked. The Lord gives and the Lord takes; blessed be the name of the Lord.' But you are in the habit of casting about in this way and culling one

6 1 Thessalonians 5:21. The citation differs slightly from Zohrab.
7 Isaiah 1:19, where, however, the verbs are in the second person plural.
8 Job 1:21–22. The citation differs slightly from Zohrab.
testimony after the other from the Holy Scripture, which you have not read and do not read. Rather, traffickers of God—in other words, those traffickers of faith—who seek to gain your approval by saying something in the expression of the divine scriptures bark out to you whatever they need to.10

"Even though you are swollen with pride in your tyranny, listen to my answers. You said that we find testimony about our Lord in the Psalms of David and the books of the prophets. [It is] not something new [that] we sought and found such sayings of the Holy Spirit that were spoken through the prophets; but, by the grace and will of God, [it was] from [these sayings] that the promulgation of Christianity began and through those same [sayings that] it was realized. [35v] Having been established, it [i.e., Christianity] grew and will grow, by the power of God the Creator.

"You wrote that 'you reckoned sufficient and believed in those, so you leave aside what Jesus testified about himself. You doubted and fell into conjecture.' It would be blessed if you believed as you say in the firm and unerring histories of the Gospels more than all else. We know, however, that the Old and the New [Testaments] do not contradict each other, for indeed it was not possible for the one source of good—that is, the divinity—to cause both evil and good, truth and falsehood. But to make the bodily coming of His Word easy for the lawless Jewish people to understand, he forewarned the people with parables, proverbs, and the clearest commandments through the prophets so that they should not disbelieve in the coming of Christ, as is their way. In that very way, the Lord testified concerning Himself in the Gospels; and that which He said most clearly afterward when He took a body [is] not [36r] incompatible with12 that which He himself said incorporeally through the mouths of the prophets. By the grace of God, we will demonstrate these points one by one in this letter to profess the most sublime things [about Him to be] beyond man and the most humble things [about Him to be] like man.

9 “In other words,” կողմի առաջ, lit. “to say that same thing.”
10 “Bark out to you whatever they need to,” ոււնսկ հղանջեն առաջարկող, lit. “Their needs bark out.”
11 The verb is singular, although the logical subject of the verb is plural.
12 “Incompatible with,” անհամապատասխան, lit. “foreign from.”
“(2) You wrote that ‘Jesus was truly worthy of trust, for he was close to God. He knew himself better than [do] the scriptures, which peoples whom you do not know have altered and changed.’ [My] answer: the truth does not know to deny what exists nor to affirm what does not exist; but falsehood easily takes hold of all, for it can disavow not only the apparent creations, but also the very Creator Himself by saying that there is no God. Now, it is not surprising that falsehood can also deny the scriptures of God or pretend that they are [36v] the cause of sins. Jesus was truly worthy of trust, not merely as some man deprived of the Word of God, but rather as perfect in both divinity and humanity. The sayings of the Word through the prophets are also trustworthy, not because men uttered them, but because the Word of God spoke through them incorporeally. And because He was mixed in the Old and the New [Testaments], for that reason also they do not contradict each other.

“But as for what you said, that ‘they altered the scripture’: if the leader of your teaching taught you this, he forgot himself. If it was someone else, he lied even more. Now listen and consider this closely. The leader of your teaching says not to confirm a saying without witnesses. Similarly, he says that the Laws also order [this]. He says that ‘every word must be confirmed from the mouths of two or three witnesses.’ We know that Abraham first accepted [37r] the good news about Christ when God said to him: ‘All of the peoples of the earth will be blessed through your descendants.’ With this hope, Isaac had blessed Jacob, and Jacob on account of the same reason had blessed Judah, his son: ‘Judah, from you will go forth a prince for me and a leader from your loins until the future [generations] come. He is the expectation of the heathens.’ For Moses gave laws concerning this and he commanded Joshua, David, Solomon, the twelve prophets with Samuel, Elijah, Elisha, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Daniel, Ezekiel, Job the just, and John the Baptist son of Zachariah. Add to those the twelve apostles of the Lord, as well as the seventy [disciples], and together in the Old and New [Testaments] there are 111 [witnesses].

“Now, are you unconvinced by the words of so many holy men, beloved of God, whom your Muhammad testified to be holy and servants of God, concerning the coming

Witnesses: in several places, the Qur’an enjoins two or three witnesses; for example: “And bring to witness two or three witnesses, for example: ‘And bring to witness two just men from among you and establish the testimony for [the acceptance of] God. That is instructed to whoever should believe in God and the Last Day’ (Qur’an 65:2). This verse, and others in the Qur’an, finds common ground with both the Hebrew Scriptures and the New Testament. See, for example, Deuteronomy 17:6: “On the testimony of two or three witnesses a person is to be put to death, but no one is to be put to death on the testimony of only one witness” and Matthew 18:16: “But if they will not listen, take one or two others along, so that ‘every matter may be established by the testimony of two or three witnesses.’”

Prophets: compare this passage to Qur’anic support for the prophets: “And We gave to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob—all [of them] We guided as We had earlier guided Noah and, among his descendants, David, Solomon, Job, Joseph, Moses, and Aaron. Thus do We reward those who do good. And Zachariah, John, Jesus, and Elias—all were of the righteous. And Ishmael, Elisha, Jonah, and Lot—all [of them] We favored over the worlds. We elected [some] among their fathers, their descendants, and their brothers and We guided them to a straight path” (Qur’an 6:84–87).

13 Genesis 22:18. The citation differs slightly from Zohrab.
of Christ? [37v] Do you consider your Muḥammad more trustworthy than God, who spoke through them, and the Word of God who appeared bodily? Now, I ask [you] succinctly. Please tell me which is the truth: the testimony of 111 servants of God, saying a single thing about a sole subject, or that of a single dissident and heterodox thinker, who thinks that he is telling the truth by lying? This is telling the truth through lying. Your Muhammad teaches you to acknowledge the abovementioned \(^{15}\) holy servants and beloved ones of God, yet he himself does not accept—and teaches others not to accept—what God said through them.

“(3) You said: ‘How do you justify the scripture of the Jews and follow from it whatever seems appropriate to you?’ You say that the Laws, which were read by the sons of Israel, and they knew what was in them, were written many times and were destroyed. And some time passed when\(^{16}\) not even a single part of them [the Laws] existed among them until \([38r]\) some men wrote [them] afterward with their own understanding according to their will, generation after generation and family after family. They were mortals from the sons of Adam, who forget and hold conjectures, for Satan is near to them and they \([are]\) his imitators in their enmity.

“[My] response: I am very surprised, not only at the disbelief of your teaching, but at your lack of shame in disclosing this. You even commit it to writing, and by doing so you appear ridiculous. You think to seduce us with our own words. You put that which you stole at the beginning of your letter [and] think to prop up what you say with what we said in writing. Now, if you consider what we said trustworthy, you are obliged to believe all of it, for no one gives witness with a lie, accepting half of the testimony while throwing the other half away. \([38v]\)

“But since you are not well informed, listen and learn. We say that the Jews \([wrote]\) \(^{17}\) from a state of holiness\(^{18}\) and did not create the stories on their own; rather, they were informed

16 “And some time passed when,” և մնային ժամանակը հիշեց, lit. “And they remained for some time who.”
17 “Wrote,” գրել, following M1902. The edition of Hakobian emends the text to read “captured,” գրել, if its emendation is followed, the clause would read: “We say the Jews, captured from a place of holiness. . . .”
18 “From a state of holiness,” ի սրբութե ան տեղոջը, lit. “from a place of holiness.”
by the true histories of the pious men of the Hebrews and by their books of the prophets. There are twenty-two creations that God worked in six days in the beginning and twenty-two divine books for both the Hebrews and for us, and the same number of letters in their alphabet, although five of them have double [forms]. That is not without great mystery. God arranged and taught this about that [arrangement] through the prophets, for truths are evident and confirm each other. Of these twenty-two books, five are the Laws, which the Hebrews [call] T’awra [תּוֹרָה], the Syrians [call] Orat’a [אֶרַעַת], and we call Noomaws [νομος]. It contains the actuality of knowledge about God and God’s creation of the world, as well as His command [39r] not to worship heathen idols, the covenant with Abraham about his child who is Christ, and other such orders about judgments and sacrifices to cause them to renounce heathen customs that had indeed been familiar [to them].

“Then there are the books of Joshua, Judges, Ruth, four Kingdoms, and Chronicles. These tell the stories about the marvelous deeds of God in chronological order; the unerring genealogies of the righteous people who descend in order down to Christ; the histories of the kings of Israel (those that were pleasing to God and those that were not); the division of the people into two kingdoms, Israel and Judea, because of their transgression; and their captivity. Then the Psalms of David, the books of Solomon, which the Hebrews [call] Kohelēt [קהלئت, Ecclesiastes] and Širat’širiim [שירי משרים, Song of Songs], which we call Paṙimon [Παροιμίαι, Proverbs] and Samaton [Ἀσμάτων, from Ἀσμάτων]. [39v] And there are all the prophecies of the twelve prophets, along with the writings of Isaiah, Jeremiah, Daniel, and Ezekiel about the coming of Christ. Now if some Jewish person had confused and corrupted [the scriptures], it would not have been possible to keep the writings intact, for the villains first would have removed a number of books, and it [i.e., the scriptures] would have been gathered into one or two, or perhaps more, into three books, and the rest suppressed,19 for destroying them would have been easier [than altering them].

“Again, as I think that you are not uninformed about the enmity that [exists] between us Christians and the Jews, it is only about one thing: our acknowledgment of Jesus and

---

19 “The rest suppressed,” զգեկծուած ևս ի բաց բարձումն, lit. “the rest suppression.”
that He is Christ, who was proclaimed Son of God by the prophets, whereas the Jews, behold, they do not say that He is Christ. Although they confess that Christ shall come, they nevertheless remain unconvinced [by] the books of the prophets and therefore do not confess Christ Son of God. Now then, [40r] why do the corrupters of scripture leave in or themselves interpolate in their scripture such firm and indubitable testimonies, which cannot be understood [as applicable] to anyone else—even if one should excessively violate the word—except to the incarnated Son of God?

Accept my third answer, as well. The captivity of the Jews preceded the bodily coming of Christ. So why had the Temple, the testaments, and the priesthood remained fixed in His time, as is indeed clear from the holy Gospels—just as you indeed testified about the Lord, about his circumcision, and about the other things that He fulfilled one after the other according to the Gospels? It is apparent [that] He did such things not for their own sake but in order to justify the sayings of the prophets about him and to demonstrate that they are [not only] not incompatible with but dear to Him and are solid testimonies to [40v] the mystery of His economy. Which testaments did the Jews have, if not the writings of the prophets, which remained with the Jews after both captivities, of Israel and [of] Judah, up to the time of our Savior, in which the Lord recalled many testimonies in order to instruct the incredulous Jews in the Gospels? The Jewish people were captured by Nebuchadnezzar, but divine supervision did not permit their captivity to end immediately. Instead, He settled the entire people in the places He wanted. Along with them were the scriptures, and also some of the prophets, as Ezekiel says about himself: ‘I was among the captives on the banks of the river K’obar.’20 And the blessed Ananiak’ were thrown into the fire in Babylon.21 The great Daniel prophesied in Babylon and was thrown into the pit of lions there.22 And all of the events of Esther happened there.

But as to the fact that the scriptures were with them, [41r] listen to the Holy Spirit speaking through the prophets in the Psalm about the captivity of the Jews. Though it had not yet happened, it [the Holy Spirit] unmistakably indicated the unfolding of the events, saying in Psalm 136:

20 Ezekiel 1:1.
'By the rivers of Babylon we sat and cried, as we remembered Zion among them. We hung our instruments on the willows. For there our captors asked for words in song and those who led us away [asked] for words of blessing.23 You said that 'the scripture was written with human reason.' I know that you mean to defame the second [composition of the Torah] by Ezra even though the grace of the Holy Spirit was upon him and he told everything without error. When the people simultaneously returned to Jerusalem from the lands where they had dispersed, carrying with them the scriptures, the marvelous work of God was apparent there, for not one thing from the Old [Testament] was found to be missing from Ezra’s history. [41v]

“You said that they were men and seized by forgetfulness. Men are always weak in everything, as well as simple-minded and forgetful. But immortal God—who is great in power and thus has no limit or end to [His] wisdom, who spoke with man through His servants, the prophets, who possesses neither the stain of conjecture nor that of forgetfulness—He spoke to the prophets and did not abandon them to human wisdom. But do you not know that your Muhammad is really a man? You reject the testimonies of so many saints of God with a single word of his. Or, you said that ‘Satan is near the servants of God, but God [is] not at all [near to them].’ But those who think critically know that Satan draws closer to the one who is without the testimony of scripture than he does to so many saints and witnesses of God.

‘As for the scripture, this much [should] suffice. When you said, [42r] ‘We do not find anything in the laws of Moses concerning the kingdom [of heaven], hell, judgment, or resurrection,’ you did not want to know that as [much as] men are able to grasp knowledge of God, so [much] does God teach them. It is not as though God spoke with men through a single prophet and at a single time, as you said, so that whatever God has commanded for the race of men, He commanded through Moses. It is not like that. What He commanded Noah, He did not command those who came before Noah. And what He commanded Abraham, He did not command Noah. Likewise, He did not command Moses [as He did] Abraham, and what [He commanded] Joshua, He did not command Moses; and what [He commanded] Samuel, David, and the other prophets each in their own time, He

23 Cf. Psalm 136(137):1–3. The citation is closer to the Septuagint than it is to Zohrab.
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did not command Joshua. For as we said earlier, in this way God was pleased [42v] to make Himself and His will known little by little to humanity, for indeed men were not able to grasp the marvelous knowledge of Him all at once. Now, if He had said everything through a single prophet, then why did God send the other prophets? Or if He permitted everything to be corrupted as you say, then why did He speak through them at all? Now, even though Moses’s instruction of man was preliminary and not yet the most perfect, God also indicated in it the resurrection, the judgment, and hell.

"Concerning the resurrection, He says: 'You see that I am God 24 and there is no other god 25 but Me. I kill and I bring to life, I wound and I heal, and no one will deliver you 26 from My hands.' 27 And concerning the judgment, He says: 'I will sharpen My sword like lightning and I will release My right hand in search of vengeance.' 28 And again: 'He will demand the vengeance of judgment from [His] enemies and He will repay [43r] those who hate [Him].' 29 Whereas concerning hell, He says: 'For a fire is kindled from My anger; it shall burn until the deepest hell.' 30 So He expanded on these more completely and most clearly through the other prophets.

"So you said that Matthew, Mark, Luke, [and] John wrote the Gospels. I know that you are troubled by the truth of us Christians, so you want to find a companion for your lie that we said that God sent them down from heaven, written, just as you say about your P'erkan 31 [فرقان], although we are also not uninformed that ‘Umar, Abū Turāb, and Salmān the Persian wrote your [scripture]. And yet you, lying, spread the rumor that God sent it down from heaven. Now, know that the truth in this [matter] is ours, the Christians’. For if it [i.e., that which you said] were so, why do you slander [us by saying] that either we or someone else lied in the Gospels? What prohibited [us] from removing the names of the evangelists and also from

---

24 "God," θεός: not in Zohrab or the Septuagint.
25 "God," θεός: not in Zohrab, but in the Septuagint.
26 "You," δώξις: not in Zohrab or the Septuagint.
27 Deuteronomy 32:39.
28 Deuteronomy 32:41. "I will release My right hand in search of vengeance," Και θησάμενος της δεξιότητας μου θησαυρίζω την ποινή. The citation differs from Zohrab and the Septuagint.
29 Deuteronomy 32:43. The citation differs from both Zohrab and the Septuagint.
30 Deuteronomy 32:33.
writing that [43v] God sent it down from the heavens? But also see this: God did not deign to counsel them either through His own incorporeal dialogue with human populations or through sending angels to men. Rather, He chose prophets from among them and sent them. Therefore, the Lord, when He fulfilled everything that He had predetermined, spoke through the prophets before taking flesh.

"Knowing that men are in need of God’s aid, He promised to send them the Holy Spirit, called the Paraclete, that is, the Comforter, for indeed they were painsed and in mourning when they heard from their Teacher and their Lord that He would be leaving them. And as we said, for that [reason] He called the Holy Spirit the Paraclete, as truly a comforter for them on account of His ascension and as a reminder of everything that He had spoken with them and that He had done before them, which they were to write for the entire world. Now know that Paraclete means ‘comforter’ and not Ahmad [as you think], that is, ‘I give thanks,’ euk’arister, in our language, not paraklētos. This blasphemy is truly without pardon, as the Lord said in the Gospels that he who blasphemes the Holy Spirit shall not be pardoned. [It is] something more wicked than this blasphemy [when] you say that the Holy Spirit [is] a man, unknown to the scriptures of God. As for what the Lord said concerning the Holy Spirit, listen indeed to these sayings: ‘But the Comforter, the Holy Spirit,’ He says, ‘whom the Father will send in My name, will teach you everything and remind you of that which I taught you.’ He says, ‘whom the Father will send in My name,’ and your Muhammad did not come in the name of our Lord, but in his own name. And the Holy Spirit, not a man, spoke [to the] holy, that is, to the disciples. You yourself know that the apostles of the Lord never saw your Muhammad.

Revelation: Leo notes that the Christian scriptures were not revealed from the heavens, whether directly from God or via an angel. Here, he contrasts this position with Muslims’ beliefs about the nature of the revelation of the Qur’an (tanzīl): “And We have sent the Qur’an down in truth, and with the truth it has come down. And We have sent you [Muhammad] only as a bringer of good tidings and as a warner” (Qur’an 17:105).

Paraclete: in the Qur’an, Jesus foretells the prophethood of Muhammad: “And [mention] when Jesus the son of Mary, said, ‘O children of Israel, indeed I am the messenger of God to you, confirming the Torah that came before me and bringing good tidings of a messenger to come after me, whose name is Ahmad.’ But when he came to them with clear proofs, they said, ‘This is clear magic’” (Qur’an 61:6). Early Muslims identified the Ahmad in this passage as the promised Paraclete mentioned in the Gospel. The superlative ahmad, “most worthy of praise,” shares a root with the name Muhammad. The author of this version argues that Muslims have misinterpreted the meaning of the Paraclete.

32 I.e., εὐχαριστῶ. The scribe misread եւքառիստէ as եւ քառիստէ.
33 I.e., παράκλητος. The scribe misread պառակղիտոս as ապառակղիտոս.
35 “Unknown to,” ῥώνυμῳ ἄνώτερον, lit. “foreign to the knowledge of.”
36 John 14:26: “and remind you of that which I taught you,” ἰδία πὰντα ἡτοῖμα νικῶν τὰ ἱερά. The citation here seems to follow the Greek New Testament, κατὰ ἑπομένους ὑμᾶς πάντες τὴν ἱεράν τοῦ, as opposed to Zohrab, ἤτοι ψαλλόντως, ἐν διακρίνει, διὰ.
“Now, as I said above, our Creator taught the knowledge of His divinity over time from one prophet to another; but He did not complete through the prophets all ‘the eternal righteousness to come,’ as God [said] through the prophet Daniel. For God revealed three changes by which men shall be able to arrive at the truest knowledge of God: from the darkness of idolatry to the measured ray of light of the Laws; and from there to the strongest light of the Gospels of Christ; and from the Gospels to the future nightless light. Men did not receive a fourth change—either a teaching of others or a promise of prophets; rather, [45r] on the contrary, the frequent commandment from the very Savior Himself [says] not to accept any prophet or apostle after His disciples.

(6) Then you said that after the disciples of the Lord we divided into seventy-two groups. It is not so, so do not contrive to comfort yourself with a lie by making an example of some fault of ours. Your [faith] is truly contemptible, which is not befitting the servants of God. And how is that? I will explain. Your teaching is in one language and for one people. And the time since its appearance, as you yourself say, has been one hundred years, more or less. Now, in such a short period of time and among [only] a single people, we find many different teachings; but these are [some] that we have learned about: K’uzi, Sabart’urabi, Kntri, Murjį, Basli, the godless Jdi, who deny the existence of God and the resurrection [45v] and the sayings of your prophet, and the Hariwri. This Hariwri [is divided into] two: one part is not troublesome, but the other part has such hostility [and] hatred toward you that they consider killing you to be the best [form of] righteousness, calling and considering you

Leo repeats that knowledge of God was revealed gradually but that this revelation ended with Christ, as he did not inform humanity that another prophet would appear after him. Leo therefore does not consider Muhammad to be a legitimate prophet.

One hundred years: the author of the correspondence attempts to date the letter into the period of Leo III, a century after the revelation of Islam.

K’uzi Küniyya, a group of early Muslims concerned primarily with questions of purity.

Sabart’urabi: Sabar renders the Arabic name Sabāʾī, to refer to Ibn al-Sabāʾ (seventh century), known as an “extremist” Shi’i. The switch from Sabāʾī to Sabar is very easy in Armenian. T’urabi renders turābī, a pejorative name for the Shīʿa that derives from the name Abū Turāb (referring to ‘Ali b. Abī Ṭālib). The combination of the two terms appears in Arabic texts to refer to Shīʿ “heretics” with anti-Umayyad aspirations.

Kntri Qadariyya, who believed in free will.

Murjį Murji’a, who withheld judgment about the beliefs of others.

Basli: perhaps a Mu’tazili group of followers of Wāsīl b. ‘Atā’ (d. 748–49), a theologian and ascetic.

The godless Jdi: the followers of Ja’id b. Dirham, who was executed for heresy sometime between 724 and 738.

Hariwri: the earliest name for the Khārijites, who rejected the overtures of peace between Mu’āwiya and ‘Ali after the battle of Sīffin (657). Known for their fanaticism and violence, the Khārijites were an extremely disruptive force throughout the Umayyad period.

Khārijite killing: this may be a reference to istiʿrāḍ, a word that broadly refers to slaughter but also serves as a technical term for the murder of non-Khārijite Muslims deemed licit by certain Khārijite subsects, such as the Azāriqa.
atheists and an enemy. Indeed, they consider dying at your hands [to be] the best of all good deeds, and this is done on account of the fact that you, killing [them], consider those who differ a little from your opinions to sin against God.41

“Now, behold that such things are found among you, who are a single people with a single language and a single leader who is at once a prince, a hierarch, and a chief executioner. If the Christian faith were truly [endowed only] with human reason, would it be a surprise for there to be an even more ignoble faith than yours among us? [It has been] eight hundred years, more or less, [46r] since Christ appeared and the Gospel was spread among all the peoples and languages of man, from one end of the world to the other, to the civilizations of the Greeks and the Romans as well as to the remote barbarians. And if there is any considerable [differing] understanding, that [is] also on account of some small variation of language, as I said, but [there is] not such inexorable enmity as you have. Since you said that [we have] seventy-two [sects], do not consider and refer to us as those who were impure and obscene in lewdness and impious against God like other heathens, who contrived to hide their filthiness in the holiest name of Christ and called themselves Christians, whose faith was blasphemy and whose baptism even [was] an abomination. When they returned from their abomination, the Holy Church baptized them like the heathens whom God destroyed long ago and [whose] [46v] vestiges are nowhere to be found. But they summoned these seventy-five Christians to us,42 and they all received the same holy baptism as an assurance of eternal life. And if something [divisive] should arise about small matters among some of them—those [who are] far away and [speak] in a different language, and especially those who have dwelt in your tyranny—they are still Christian and do not need to be baptized again. And it is not surprising that those who are very far away and who speak another language are not as well informed as they should be about the traditions of the truth. However, the same books [were] preserved intact in each language, that very same Gospel without any mistakes.

41 “You consider,” խորհիս: the printed editions emend to “you do not consider,” չխորհիս, suggesting that Muslims do not consider it a sin to kill other Muslims with whom they disagree.

42 The reference to seventy-five Christians here, in contrast to seventy-two above, likely reflects a scribal error in Greek. The text may have read OB (72), but the copyist or translator read it as OE (75).
“And now I will leave aside the many languages in which the marvelous and salvific knowledge of God was spread but [only] recall a few of them: first, [the language] of us Greeks; second, that of the Romans; third, \[47r\] that of the Badalians; fifth, that of the Syrians; sixth, that of the Ethiopians; seventh, that of the Indians; eighth, that of you Saracens; ninth, that of the Persians; tenth, that of the Armenians; eleventh, that of the Georgians; twelfth, that of the Albanians. And now, as you said, maybe someone in one or two of these peoples really changed the scriptures, but how do you know about other peoples, who [are] very distant from us and with languages and customs that are foreign to each other? But you are accustomed to doing such things, especially that Ḥajjāj, who was appointed governor of the region of the Persians by you. He gathered all of your old scriptures and wrote another according to his tastes and disseminated it to your entire people, for it was much easier to do such a thing among a single people and in a single language, as indeed was done. And even so, there remained a small bit of Abū Turāb’s writings, for he [i.e., Ḥajjāj] was not able \[47v\] to eliminate it entirely. By contrast, we first received a strict order from God not to be rash\(^{43}\) in such things. And again, if someone dared oppose His command, it would be impossible to gather up together again what has been separated into so many languages, to verify [them all] carefully in their own language, and to not idly\(^{44}\) seek out and set down translators so that they might remove from the scriptures what they wanted or to add what they desired.

“You are not uninformed, as you said yourself, that there are disputes among us Christians, although [they are] not about particularly important issues. How did the peoples not change the scriptures according to their own wishes? Now, such a thing did not occur among us Christians, neither to those far [from us] nor to those near. Do not continue your lie, lest you render that little bit of truth distasteful. But I am extremely surprised at this, since you reject the Gospels of the Lord and the books of the prophet[s], saying that men corrupted \[48r\] them and wrote them as they wished, yet you make every effort to

\(^{43}\) Cf. Titus 1:8(7); Genesis 49:7.

\(^{44}\) "Idly," қәәп в іүәпә: we tentatively suggest that the meaningless қәәп в іүәпә is a scribal error for 圪әәп в іүәпә. This confusion could possibly have occurred at the aural level at the time of translation.
gather testimony from them for your inconsistent suppositions. You remove a word [from a verse], which is produced as a witness, so that where 'Father' is written, you replace it with 'Lord' or 'God.' If you are searching for the truth, either you have to believe the scriptures and take them as testimony or, if you condemn them, as you say that they are corrupted, you must not take testimony from them. And you should accept the third [premise]: not to pervert the witnesses that you accept according to your wishes; rather, [you must] cite them just as they are in the scripture.

“(7) It is very difficult for the servants of God who are obedient to His orders to speak with you, for other heathens, when they hear the names of the prophets or the apostles, are moved to intense laughter. But you, though you do not insult their names, scorn their words, and especially [those of] the One who speaks with them. Otherwise, let us consider the things that were said [48v] to Moses: ‘I am the God of Abraham and the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob’; 46 or ‘Come,’ 47 let us make man in our image and according to our likeness; 48 or ‘Come, let us descend and confuse them [with different languages]; 49 or ‘The Lord rained fire on Sodom and Gomorrah from the Lord’ — Lord, from the Lord. This is from the books of Moses, which you have not read and neither has your law teacher. What do you suppose—that God said such things to the angels, who cannot even look at Him? We are not like you that we could suppose the sayings of God’s scripture to be insignificant and superficial. To whom was it suitable for God to say such things, if not to His Word who is the form of His existence and a ray of light of His glory, 51 and to the Holy Spirit, who sanctifies and illuminates everything? And we are slandered by you as confessors of three gods. 52

“Listen and then answer, I beseech you. The sun and its rays are different things, even though [the rays] are from

45 “Consider,” ṣaṣravagpy, lit. “let us make.” We suggest that the verb here renders Greek ποιήσωμεν, which can mean “to consider,” “to reckon.”
47 “Come,” ḫsun: not in Zohrab or the Septuagint.
49 Genesis 11:7.
50 Genesis 19:24.
51 Cf. Hebrews 1:3.
the sun. Without the rays, the sun is not the sun. If anyone says that the rays are born of [49r] the sun without stain or [without] a female, he is not lying. Although the sun and the ray are two different things, it does not mean that there are two suns. But is that not truly how you are counting them? Now if the birth of this light, which we can see with our eyes and which is God’s creation, appears so pure from stain, even though it is covered by night and by the obstruction of buildings, how much more [pure, it seems] to me, should you consider a divine, uncreated, self-sustaining, and nightless53 light? I was obliged to show this through some example, for you do not believe the commandments of God that [are] in the holy books; rather, you consider your wishes to be superior to them. You write what you like from among them and you substitute something else for what you do not want and you condemn and discard whatever you want. Cursed are all men who profess two or three gods, for one must say these [to be of] different kinds with different origins. But we know one God, Creator of heaven and earth, not irrational, but the most sacred and the Fashioner, through whose Word the creations were made and are maintained.54 [49v] His Word is not like our words, dismissed and dispelled after they are spoken, and not heard or known until they are spoken. We know this, the Word of God, a ray of light without darkness, without quality—not like the sun, a birth only of rays—but above our ability to describe. The divine books call it the Son; not a birth through the passionate necessity of filthy desires, but in the manner of rays from the sun, light from fire, and word from the mind. Human language was able to render this much about the Word of God’s having existence from God.

“And then, since none of His creatures is more precious to God than man, even you confess that God ordered the angels to prostrate themselves before Adam, although I do not find that in the divine scriptures.55 Now, Adam was a man, you have testified correctly, censuring your pride, for they who would not bow before men knew with whom they should be ranked, as you said. Now it is clear that Adam came into being in the image of God. How [50r] do you suppose that God called our sinful, repellent body

---

53 Cf. n. 484 above.
54 “The creations were made and are maintained,” ῥύπην ἐνίπ̣ ἄρχου, lit. “He made and maintains the creations.”
His image? No. Rather, He put the likeness of Himself, His Word, and His Spirit into him: soul, mind, and word. Gathering these together in him, He fashioned [him], and investing him with the honor of free will, he became the image of God. By the Adversary’s deceit he fell from the honor that the Creator had given him; he became despised through forgetting His Fashioner and through leading a dissolute life with execrable lust and various filthy impurities, with hatred, degradation of each other, slaughter, and idolatry—which is the last and first of all evils—and such fornication that I am too disgusted to mention. For they not only imagined nonexistent things as well as visible creations [to be] gods but indeed served their vices, imagining fornication and sodomy [to be] gods, which the Adversary made his worship. And he was pleased to perform in his worship the terrible signs of vices through the images of idols and through encouraging them [i.e., the people] in those things.

“Now, God saw His image [50v] hindered through worship of the Adversary and the deeds that pleased him [the Adversary]; He pitied him [i.e., man], since He is kind and truly benevolent. And since salvation lies in knowing his Creator and keeping away from the enemy, from time to time He dispersed knowledge of Himself into idolatry, like a candle into the dark, through his servants, the prophets. And since human minds were blind and not able to grasp the light of knowledge of the entire divinity, He therefore revealed knowledge of Himself to man in measures, bit by bit, as I said earlier, as much as it pleased God to instruct man until the completion of time. He promised the coming of His Word bodily in advance through the prophets, since the Word of God would take a body, a spirit, and everything of ours except for sin. And since no one from among men was able to descend to the degree of humility that He [did], [51r] we therefore know that everything referring to the most humble is about Him as the humblest man, whereas [everything referring to] the most sublime is [about Him] as the true God.

“You may truly remember what we said about Moses’s sayings about the equality of the Word and God Himself. Listen now to that same Moses [speaking] about the appearance [of the Word] as a man: ‘The Lord your God will raise a prophet for you from your brothers, like me. You will listen to everything that he says to you, and it will be that any man who does not listen to that prophet—that
person will be killed by his own people.56 Many prophets—not just one—arose in Israel after Moses, but he made this commandment regarding the one who would speak the most powerful and most difficult things to believe.

“Now, henceforth, I will muster a collection of prophetic testimonies for you about the advent of Christ.57 But listen to the more modest sayings about Him first, for I think you—delighting in these—will listen; perhaps through this method,58 as with a ladder, I will undertake59 to raise [you] up to the heights, if it be His will. David, prophesying about Him [Christ], said: ‘I am a worm and not a man, [51v] a dishonor to man and an outrage to the people.60 Everyone who sees me mocks61 me.62 They denigrate me and shake their heads. He trusted in the Lord and He shall deliver him, save him,63 and preserve him, for He likes him.64 This was never done for David, but rather for the Lord at the hour of the crucifixion. Now, listen to this same David saying lofty things about Him: ‘The Lord said to me: “You are My son; I have begotten you today.”’65 And concerning filling all the heathens66—which [means with]

57 “I will muster a collection of prophetic testimonies for you about the advent of Christ,” եկեսցեն քեզ վկաութե ան ց մարգարէից Քրիստոս ի, lit. “a collection of prophetic testimonies will come to you about the advent of Christ.”
58 “Method,” ինչ, lit. “thing.”
59 “I will undertake,” հուպ կացուցից, lit. “I will stand near,” possibly rendering Greek παράσομαι. Alternatively, it may be translated “I will stand ready,” rendering Greek παρέσωμαι.
60 “To the people,” ժողովրդեան, singular: the text agrees with the Septuagint, λαοῦ, against Zohrab, ժողովրդոց.
61 “Mocks,” այպանէին: rendering the Septuagint, ἐξεμυκτήρισαν, against Zohrab, արհամարհէին.
62 “Me,” զիս, accusative: following the Septuagint, με, against Zohrab, զինեւ.
63 “He shall deliver him, save him,” ապրեցուսցէ զնա փրկեսցէ զնա: “He shall deliver,” ապրեցուսցէ, renders the Septuagint, ῥυσάσθω (< ρέσαμαι, which ապրեցուցանեմ can render). The addition of “save him,” փրկեսցէ զնա, in the text may represent an early gloss, as a scribe may have realized that Zohrab here does not read “deliver him,” ապրեցուցը, but “save him,” փրկեսցը, զիս.
64 Psalm 21:7–9(22:6–8).
65 Psalm 2:7.
faith in Him—he [David] added to that [verse]: 'Ask me and I will give you the heathens as inheritance and the ends of the earth as your possession.'\(^{67}\) And again: "The Lord said to my Lord: Sit at My right hand until I put your enemies as a footstool for your feet. With you is the beginning of power, the brilliance of your saints; I begot you from the womb before the morning star.'\(^{68}\)

"Whereas concerning there being one divine nature in heaven, David again indicated [that], saying: 'The earth was full of the Lord's mercy, and by the word of the Lord [52r] the heavens were established and by the Spirit of his mouth, all its powers.'\(^{69}\) And Jeremiah: "The Lord sent me and His Spirit.'\(^{70}\) Concerning the incarnation of the Word, listen again to Jeremiah: 'He is our God,' he says, 'to whom no other can be compared. He found all the paths\(^{71}\) of wisdom and He gave it\(^{72}\) to His servant Jacob and His beloved Israel. Afterward He appeared on earth and moved among men. These are the books of the commandments of God and the laws of God, which exist perpetually. . . . Turn, Jacob, and grasp it at the dawn of its first light.'\(^{73}\) This prophet indicated two dawning[s] of His light: [the] first [is] of His ineffable humility, with whose dawn He illuminated the entire universe with the splendor of divine knowledge, whereas the second [occurs] at the universal resurrection about which the prophet forewarned the Hebrew nation, advising that they believe in the first dawn, lest they be rebellious—as they indeed became—and [lest] strangers—[52v] that is to say, heathens—enjoy His glory. 'Turn, Jacob, and grasp it at the dawn of its first light. Do not give your glory to others or your profit to a foreign people.'\(^{74}\) Heed what was said to you. He not only prophesied about the incarnation of the Word of God but also clearly predicted the transgression of revolt among the body of Israel.

---

\(^{67}\) Psalm 2:8.

\(^{68}\) Psalm 109(110):1, 3. The citation is closer to the Septuagint than to Zohrab.

\(^{69}\) Psalm 32(33):5–6.

\(^{70}\) Isaiah 48:16.

\(^{71}\) "Paths," ճանապարհս: the plural agrees with Zohrab against the singular in the Septuagint, "path," ὀδὸς.

\(^{72}\) "It," i.e., the paths of wisdom, see previous note.

\(^{73}\) Baruch 3:35–4:2.

\(^{74}\) Baruch 4:2–3.
Moreover, it is not at all prohibited to listen to the prophecy of some outsider that did not [occur] by his own will, which Moses includes in his scripture: 'How beautiful is your house, Jacob, and your altar, Israel.' And after a little bit: 'A man will rise from his descendants and will rule over many nations. His kingdom will be raised higher than Goga and his kingdom will grow.' Again: 'I will show him, but not now. I will bless him, but not soon. A star will rise from Jacob and a man will rise from Israel and he will strike the prince of Moab and take all the sons of Seth captive.' Now, although he spoke about this man, see how it indicates His ruling all the heathens. You wanted to know what His ruling all of the nations means. [It refers to] everyone’s believing in him, as you yourself indeed see. I will also point out the prince of Moab—[i.e.,] Satan and his devils who empowered the corruption and worship of idols among them—whom Christ struck, for the idolatries of the Moabites and all of the nations with them were more abominable than those of any nation, for they worshipped the genitalia of men and women, through which they performed lewd passions.

'[You see] how His rule was raised above Govgay: for whatever pertains to the latter is worldly, whereas that which pertains to Christ is heavenly. And since such is the kingdom of Christ, do not disobey what David says about the Spirit: ‘God,’ he says, ‘give your judgment to the king and your justice to the king’s son.’ Was not Christ the Son of the celestial and earthly king? In His divinity [He was] the Son of God, and in His humanity [He was the son] of David, just as we have said many times. Again, he adds: ‘He will remain,’ he says, ‘with the sun before the moon, from generation to generation. . . . He will reign from sea to sea and from the rivers to the ends of the universe. . . . All peoples of the earth will worship Him and all peoples will serve Him. . . . They will pray to Him at every hour and
praise Him daily. . . May the name of the Lord be praised, for His name is before the sun! May all nations of the earth be praised with Him and may all peoples bless Him.\textsuperscript{82} Now, no one will be astonished to learn these [verses] concern a mere man, a descendant of David—and not a son of David physically, but the Word and Son of God according to His divinity, ruling by means of peaceful faith and not by the destruction of the sword, merciless bloodshed, and captivity. It says this clearly in that same Psalm: 'In his days, justice will dawn and there will be much peace until the moon will be extinguished.'\textsuperscript{83} Again, God said through the prophet Micah: 'And you, Bethlehem, house of Ephrat, may be small in number among the thousands of Judah; he will arise from you to me to be a leader\textsuperscript{84} who will guide his people Israel, and his coming forth is from the beginning of days [54r] of the world.'\textsuperscript{85} And to come forth from the beginning of the world is not possible for a mere man. And again, God said through Jeremiah: 'He is a man, and who will recognize Him? . . . The Lord is the expectation of Israel. All who forsake You will be ashamed. Those who go astray will be prisoners on the earth, for they forsook the Lord, the source of the waters of life.'\textsuperscript{86}

'But 'Israel' does not mean the unbelieving Jews, but rather those who saw the Word of God and believed that God is from God, for 'Israel' is translated as 'clear-sighted' in the Hebrew language. Now, God desires Israel to be a 'seer.' Listen to what was said through Isaiah: 'A child whose reign is on His shoulders was born to us. And He is named the angel of great advice, the wonderful counselor, all-powerful God, the prince of peace, the father of the world to come.'\textsuperscript{87} He [the prophet Isaiah] said 'angel' on account of His humanity without sin, but 'wonderful counselor' and 'mighty God' on account of the name of divinity. And he adds this: 'Great is his authority, and His peace has

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{82} Psalm 71(72):5, 8, 11, 15b, 17.
\item \textsuperscript{83} Psalm 71(72):7.
\item \textsuperscript{84} "Leader," առաջնորդ: "prince," ἄρχοντα in the Septuagint.
\item \textsuperscript{85} Micah 5:2.
\item \textsuperscript{86} Jeremiah 17:9, 13.
\item \textsuperscript{87} Isaiah 9:6(5). The verse and its interpretation follow the Alexandrian version of the Septuagint and Zohrab.
\end{itemize}
no limits. He will sit on David’s throne and glorify His kingdom, [54v] He will strengthen it with judgment and justice, henceforth and unto ages.

“Now, if He did not sit on the throne of David and did not rule Israel, it was because he meant not a temporal throne, but that which God mentioned to David: ‘I will prepare your offspring unto eternity and I will build your throne generation to generation like the days of the heavens.’ Now, how or what was the throne of David? Or was it eternal or like the days of heaven, if this is not about the heavenly kingdom of the physical son of David, who is Christ, about whom he [Isaiah] also said that ‘He will sit on the throne of David and glorify His kingdom; He will strengthen it with law and justice, henceforth and unto ages?’ It is clear that [it is] the most glorious and powerful kingdom of Christ, physically the son of David. He transferred His kingdom up to heaven, to the eternal and inaccessible. You must also pay attention to Isaiah: ‘Behold: a virgin will conceive and bear a son, and they will name him Emmanuel, that is, God is with us.’

“I also have many more assemblies of other testimonies, the abridgment of which we considered more useful, so that the audience will not become weary. If you should desire, also listen about the ineffable humility of His suffering, which He bore and endured willingly in accordance with the previous prophecy of the prophets. The Holy Spirit said through Isaiah: ‘I am not obstinate and I am not resisting. I gave my back to blows and my cheek to slaps. I will not turn my face away from shame at being spat in the

Throne of David. Leo explains that when the prophets predicted that the son of David would sit on the throne of David and rule his kingdom, they meant not a physical throne or the kingdom of Israel, but God’s spiritual throne and heavenly kingdom. In this way, the physical son of David, Christ, reigns in the divine kingdom.
face." God said this, as well, through Zachariah: 'If it seems good in your eyes, give me my wages, and if not, inform me." They weighed my wages at thirty pieces of silver." This happened to the Savior, [i.e., His] being sold by His disciple and betrayed to His death, like other prophecies that were realized in the Lord, that the holy Gospels relate, [and] that, if you wish, you may read with care and will find it thus. David, along with many [others], prophesied about this: 'He who ate my bread magnified [55v] his heel over me.'

"Listen to another admonition of Isaiah:

Behold here, my servant will understand. He will be elevated, exalted, and glorified greatly. As . . . [so] many nations shall be surprised by you and kings shall silence their mouths for you, for what was not related about him they will see, and what had not been heard they will understand. Lord, who believed our news and to whom was the arm of the Lord revealed? We have proclaimed [it] before him

96 Isaiah 50:5–6.
97 "Inform me," զրոյց արարեք. The reading conforms to Zohrab’s rendering of the Septuagint’s ἢ ἀπείπασθε. The word ἀπεῖπον can mean "to declare" or "to speak" as well as "to deny" or "to refuse."
99 "If, 
100 "Read," ընթերց: we follow the emendation of Chahnazarian, who corrects this to ընթերցիր. The omission of the final –իր may be due to confusion with the subsequent initial խ. The reading of Malxaseanc’, ընթերցիւք, would be even more likely to have caused this error, but considering that the author followed a conditional clause with the imperative earlier in the passage, we think the imperative was also intended here.
101 Psalm 40:10(41:9): “magnified his heel over me,” մեծացոյց իվերա իւր: the text here shows that it was translated from the Septuagint, ἐμεγάλυνεν ἐμὲ πτερνισμόν, against Zohrab, "increased deceiving me," մեծացոյց իվերա իւր պատմույթի. Either the translator of the letter interpreted πτερνισμόν, "supplanting," as πτέρναν, "heel," or his exemplar included the reading, possibly caused by John 13:18, where the evangelist cites this verse with πτέρναν instead of πτερνισμόν. John 13:18 of Zohrab reads "deception," պատմույթի, as in Psalm 40:10(41:9).
102 "My servant," մանուկ իմ, lit. "my child."
103 The scribe’s eye likely jumped from the beginning of verse 52:14 to 52:15 because of the similarity of the first words of the two verses. Verse 52:14 begins: "As many will be surprised . . ." (Շուկ օրինակ զարմասցին բազումք); 52:15 begins: "So many nations will be surprised" (Այնպէս զարմասցին ազգք բազումք). This error could have happened only in the copying of the Armenian text.
like a child; [he is] like a root in the dry earth. . . . We saw him, and there was nothing to his appearance or his beauty. Rather, his appearance was more abject than that of all of the sons of man. A man in tribulation, knowing how to endure pain; because he turned his face away, he was despised and reckoned to be nothing. He bore our sins and was tortured for our sake. And we considered him in pains, tribulations, and tortures [to be] as though from God. But he was wounded for our sins and he was punished for our iniquity. The discipline for our peace was on him, and we were healed through his wounds. [56r] Everyone strayed like sheep; each man went astray on his own path. The Lord surrendered him to our sins, and because of his grief he did not open his mouth. Like a lamb led to slaughter, like a sheep before the sheepshearer remains mute, so he did not open his mouth. Because of his humiliation, his judgment was taken away. So who will describe his generation? Because his life was cut off from the earth, he was led to death by the iniquities of my people, . . . for he committed no iniquity and no deception was found in his mouth.104

“Now, you deny and gainsay these many testimonies of the Holy Spirit, which were proclaimed through His servants, the prophets, with only the word of your Muḥammad. And what about the order of your own lawgiver not to confirm even the smallest of matters without two witnesses? How are you not ashamed to speak such terrible blasphemies on the basis of only his word?

Truly, you forgot the terrible lie of your lawgiver. You indeed know that Mary is not the daughter of Amran [56v] the sister of Aaron, but the mother of our Lord. From those times [of Mariam, the sister of Aaron] to the mother of the Lord, there were 970105 years and thirty-two generations. Truly, if you had a face of flesh and not of stone, it would blush with shame from such clear lies, for God promised the advent of Christ from the tribe of Judah, and Mariam the daughter of Amran was from Levi and [lived] in such ancient times, as I said.

---

105 The reading of M1902 is confused. It reads literally, “2,000 thousand years, less thirty.” We suggest that a scribe mistakenly read У/у, “1,” as У/у, “2,000.”
Yet how impossible it is to follow the greatest and most palpable of your lies! But even if the unfounded tales of your limitless lies are deep, let us bail them out with a small bucket of the truth. You said in the above writing that ‘you and the Jews corrupted the Laws, the Gospels, and the Psalms’ and added that ‘I testify that they are from God.’ If ours are confused and corrupted, where are yours to which you bore witness? Pray, show me other books about Moses and the prophets, and the Psalms of David that we may see them, or another gospel. Oh, your lie is worthy of shame. It is the most fictional of all lies. At least add: ‘I was not there’ and ‘do not believe!’ O you man, you take your testimony from these, which are our Gospels, although you violate and falsify them, and still you say that ‘you have corrupted them.’ Pray, tell about the gospel that your lawgiver saw; then I will know if you are telling the truth.

And as to what you said, that ‘there is one faith.’ There is truly one faith and one baptism. There is no other faith transmitted from God and no [other] commandment received by men. As for what you said, that ‘the Laws did not offer prayers in the direction in which you offer prayer, and they did not participate in your communion.’ These are matters of nonsense and of pointless problems, for the direction of prayer of the prophets was not apparent. But you alone wish to honor the heathen altar of sacrifice that you named the house of Abraham. Nowhere in the divine scriptures do we find Abraham reaching those places that your lawgiver taught your people to worship and circumambulate. As for the mystery of communion, I will respond in its own place.

(8) But now, let us first look at what you said about the Gospels, whether it may really be as you think. Jesus truly prayed in accordance with His humanity, which He took from us, in order to teach us; and, in accordance with His divinity, He did not need prayers. But when He prayed, He did not say as you wrote. Rather, He said: ‘Father, if it is possible, take this cup from me,’ indicating that ‘I am truly a man.’ For if anyone professes that the Word of God is imperfect in his divinity, he loses hope for His life; so, too, if he does not profess Him to be perfect in His humanity. But

106 “But even if,” υπηρέτησε πτ. ή, rendering ἀλλὰ καὶ ei καί.
see the truth of the Gospels and of us believers, for both the humblest and the most sublime are kept intact in the books of the Gospels. And if either we or those who came before us corrupted [them], why did we not remove the humblest phrases from the Gospels? He said: ‘The Son of Man cannot do anything by himself, but the Father, who has dwelt in Me, does [58r] the work.’109 If you believe this [verse] of scripture, ‘I cannot do anything by Myself,’ believe that one, [which says,] ‘The Father, who has dwelt in Me, does the work.’ If you believe in His fear at the time of His vivifying death and in His sweat,110 which He endured for the sake of the sweat of Adam, [about] which He Himself incorporeally said to Adam, ‘You will eat your bread by the sweat of your brow,’111 [then believe that] the ‘strengthening’ by the angel112 was not for the sake of strengthening Him; rather, through the angel He secured the beliefs of the apostles, for they were looking [at Him] as at a mere man and they reckoned [Him] a mere man. For this reason, [it mentions the strengthening] so that from [His] conversing with the angel He might appear at least more than a mere man. Now, if you believe this, then believe that which He said in the same book: ‘I lay Myself down by Myself and I take it back by Myself.’113 And again, He did not say ‘God sent Me to the world and I return to Him,’ as you also wrote, but ‘The Father who sent Me is with Me.’114 Again, ‘I came out from the Father and I came to the world; again, I am leaving the world and going [58v] to the Father.’115

‘But where ‘Father’ is written, you change it to either ‘Lord’ or ‘God.’ Do you think to justify it for yourself? [Then] you think very unjustly. You did not lie only about this one thing, but even when you took testimony correctly, you were not able to believe that ‘he who believed in Me explicitly changed, asserts Leo, Muslims remain unable to accept Jesus’s divinity and continue to regard him as only a prophet.

109 A combination of John 5:19a and 14:10b. The citation is closer to Zohrab than to the Greek New Testament.
111 Genesis 3:19. The citation conforms to Zohrab.
113 Cf. John 10:18. The second part of the citation is not from the biblical text.
114 John 8:29. The word “Father” does not appear in either Zohrab or the Greek New Testament, although it does appear elsewhere in John, e.g., 5:37, 8:16, 8:18.
115 John 16:28.
believed not in Me, but in the one who sent Me, that is, not in this visible man, but in this invisible Word [of] God. And again: ‘He who dishonors Me dishonors the one who sent Me.’ And, ‘he who sees Me sees that one who sent Me.’ He ‘is sent’ as a man and He ‘sends’ as God. He said to the disciples, ‘My Father is greater than I,’ [i.e.,] He is greater than [His] humanity. If not, why does He say again: ‘My Father and I are one’? He said in the prayer, as you wrote: ‘that they may know You, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom You have sent.’

“Behold, he placed Jesus Christ in that same honor of divinity. Now, if he were an ordinary prophet, it would have been fitting to say ‘that they may know the only true God and Moses and the other prophets and then Jesus.’ So, discard your nonsensical conceptions, for He was perfect God, and by taking [humanity], He became truly man. And we find the most humble things [are] said about Him as about man and the most sublime [are said] as truly of God, as I have said many times. He was tempted by Satan through His covering, that is, His body, because Satan heard the voice at His baptism. When God said: ‘This is My beloved son, with whom I am pleased,’ he became terrified and gave up, and he did not know to whom the voice truly referred. But the Lord undertook the fast of forty days, and as He showed Himself by some voice, He also showed that voice to refer to Him. As the evil one is always envious of and displeased with those who strive in virtue, he approached and saw the Lord as a man. And He, as all-knowing, responded to him as a man, not deeming our enemy worthy to reveal the fullness of His plan. But how did you not read that after finishing His temptation, Satan went away from Him for a time and angels approached and worshipped Him? Do angels worship a mere man?

116 John 12:44. In Zohrab and the Greek New Testament the verb “to believe” is in the present rather than the aorist tense.
118 John 12:45.
120 John 10:30.
121 John 17:3.
122 Matthew 3:17.
123 “Undertook,” ἐπιβάλλω: rendering Greek ἐπιβάλλειν.
"It appears as though you are only fleeing from the truth and you want nothing else. This is what I am saying: you resist speaking of our Lord as God and you profess [that He was] a mere man, citing the example of Adam as one who was also born from God without parents. Whereas I have heard you say about His life-giving death that no one from among men can kill Him. But if He were a mere man, as you think, how is it unbelievable for a man to die? Now pay close attention and think about this, for you accept with ease the most humble verses concerning the Lord but you forsake and reject the sublime. Listen, therefore, to the Gospels concerning these things. On this matter, John the Evangelist said: [60r] 'He who believes in the Son will receive eternal life, and he who does not follow the Son will not see life, but the wrath of God.' And again, John the son of Zachariah said: 'Behold, Jesus, the Lamb of God, who removes the sins of the world.' And similarly, the beginning of the Gospel of John: 'In the beginning was the Word and the Word was with God and the Word was God. He was with God in the beginning. All things came into being through Him and without Him nothing came into being.' And similarly the Word of God in His body said: 'He who sees Me sees My Father' and 'As much as the Father knows Me, so I know the Father' and 'The Father who sent Me is with Me'; [He is] His Father by nature and yours by grace, for 'to those who received Him, it says, 'who believe in His name, He gave them the authority to be sons of God.' Whereas that which belongs to Him as God [is] with us in accordance with the body and ours naturally. He is sent as a man and He sends as God; 'As the Father sent Me, so I send you.' [60v] All of the voices of the evangelists [agree] on this.

125 John 3:36.
126 John 1:29.
127 John 1:1–3.
129 John 10:15.
130 John 8:29. The word "Father" does not appear in either Zohrab or the Greek New Testament, although it does appear elsewhere in John, e.g., 5:37, 8:16, 8:18.
131 John 20:17.
132 John 1:12.
133 John 20:21.

The example of Adam: see Qurʾān 3:59: "Indeed, to God, the example of Jesus is like that of Adam. He created him from dust; then He said to him, 'Be,' and he was."

The death of Jesus: the Qurʾān states that Jesus was not crucified, but that God lifted him up to Him (see Qurʾān 4:157–58). Leo underscores the contradiction in Muslims’ simultaneous denial of Jesus’s divinity and rejection of his crucifixion.
“And as for what you said, about our freely turning circumcision into baptism and sacrifice into the communion of the blessing of [the] bread and cup: it is not us, but rather the Lord Himself who changed the types that [are] in the Old [Testament] into the true things in accordance with the prophecy of Jeremiah, who said: ‘Behold, the days are coming, the Lord says, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and the house of Judah, not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers on the day when I took them out from the land of the Egyptians.’\textsuperscript{134} What was the covenant that He made with their fathers in the land of the Egyptians, if not that of the blood of the lamb on Passover, that is to say Easter, about which He said: ‘Let this law be among your people’?\textsuperscript{135} Now, the sons of Israel were spared from the executioner by the blood of the irrational lamb, so can we not be saved from eternal death by the blood of the immaculate Lamb? The stainless Lamb of God, at the time of the Passion, took bread, blessed [it], [61r] broke [it], and gave [it] to the disciples, and similarly the cup of wine, saying that they were His body and blood, ordering [them] to take these in memory of Him and to recognize Him as the sacrifice of the immaculate and pure Lamb, for He taught that the lamb meant that true Lamb. You have not read the scriptures or the names that the divine scriptures call Him: Word, Son, Ray, Image of God, Image of Servant, God, Man, Angel, Pearl, Hook,\textsuperscript{136} Lord of Lords, Servant, Lamb, Sheep, Shepherd, Eldest among Brothers,\textsuperscript{137} Eldest among the Dead.\textsuperscript{138} Nothing would impede [me] from pointing out each of these names, as well as why and for what reason these names were given or may be [given], if I knew that you were seeking righteousness.

“As for circumcision, which you said we changed to baptism: you did not know the mystery of circumcision, why God was satisfied to establish his covenant in that most hidden member and not in other, [61v] more glorious and visible members; so, truly, you will not know that Abraham, before his circumcision, was pleasing to God and he received the order of circumcision as a sign of his faith in and love of God. But it is not known to you why, according

\textsuperscript{134} Jeremiah 31:31–32.
\textsuperscript{135} Cf. Exodus 12:17; Numbers 9:14, 15:15.
\textsuperscript{137} Romans 8:29.
\textsuperscript{138} Colossians 1:18.
to what was written above, [it was established] there in the hidden member. But we received a command to circumcise the heart,⁸⁹ spiritually, and not the exterior body, according to the aforementioned promise of God to make a new covenant.¹⁴⁰ If Christ, the teacher of the true Law, had not eliminated circumcision, sacrifice, and the Sabbath, then what new covenant did He make? Now, you should be ashamed of that, for in the latter times when God freed the human race from the bonds of the Law, you want to be vengeful about circumcision. You greatly ridiculed it, for in the Old [Testament] God commanded to circumcise every male on the eighth day,¹⁴¹ but you [62r] shame not only the men but also the women with this disgrace, regardless of age.

"But God foretold about divine baptism through the prophet Ezekiel, saying: 'I will sprinkle holy water over you and you will be cleansed of all your impurities. I will cleanse you of all your idols.'¹⁴² And the Lord commanded the same in the Gospels: 'Go and henceforth make disciples of all the heathens. Baptize them in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit.'¹⁴³ And the word of the prophet was fulfilled: 'I set you as a light for the heathens';¹⁴⁴ and again: 'The people who sat in the darkness saw a great light.'¹⁴⁵

"We did not exchange Saturday for Sunday, as you are imprudently wont to do. You unadvisedly arranged Friday as your day of gathering, not knowing a single thing as a pretext for it. But on account of the bodily resurrection of the Lord, through which He promised us resurrection, we devote [62v] ourselves to prayer and praise of the Creator for such a truly great mystery. For it was on that day, in the beginning, that He said, "Let there be light"; and there was light."¹⁴⁶ On the same day He caused the light of the good news of the resurrection to shine for the human race, through the bodily resurrection of His only begotten Word. We did not receive an order to be idle on it [the day of rest], in the manner of the Jews, to the point of not

---

139 Romans 2:29.
141 Genesis 17:9–14.
142 Ezekiel 36:25.
143 Matthew 28:19.
144 Acts 13:47.
145 Matthew 4:16.
146 Genesis 1:3.
even preparing food once on it, like the Jews. But why do you consider these true traditions of us Christians to be important, since you do not believe in either the Lord or His prophets? For God spoke about you and people like you through His prophet: ‘Despicable people; and be repulsed and ruin yourselves. For I am doing a deed in your days; a deed that you would not believe, even if someone told you.’  

“(11) And I have not forgotten what you said: ‘How was it possible for God to live in a human womb, among the blood and flesh and various impurities?’ As far as I know, [63r] you are informed that the creatures of God, which He ordered into being from nothing with a word, are many, as Psalm 148 says: ‘He spoke and they came into being; he commanded and they were built.’ [He created] that which you perhaps consider by your own designs to be even more venerable and more pure than man: the sky and the celestial bodies with the sun and the moon and the stars, and the earth with plants and all the living creatures. But this living being, which you say is impure, was created not by a command but by the hand of the Omnipotent and Most Holy One Himself and brought to life and animated with His breath. Now the fashioning of our nature, which was created by those hands of the Creator and was honored [to be made] in the image of that same Creator, was not filthy according to God. So now do not blaspheme its good Creator [by saying that] such filth [is to be attributed] to God; not a single thing from him [is filthy] except for sins, which God did not create. All the things that Muslims consider impure, says Leo, are in fact not shameful, but necessary and appropriate for life. Moreover, the bodies of the righteous are the dwelling place of God.

Leo returns to the question of the incarnation and Jesus’s presence in Mary’s womb. According to Leo, Muslims claim that it would be unfitting for the divinity to inhabit a womb given all of its impurities. Leo responds that God honors humanity above all creation and that there is nothing impure in a human being besides sin, which God did not create. All the things that Muslims consider impure, says Leo, are in fact not shameful, but necessary and appropriate for life. Moreover, the bodies of the righteous are the dwelling place of God.
most impure in our nature He formed in great appropriateness for our kind, like the menses of women for human fertility and ways to eliminate excess food and drink for the maintenance of life. These things are impure to you, but to God the things you love—wantonness, killing, blasphemy, and other such things—are impure, and not the things you mentioned before, which He Himself truly defined for their procreation and rest. Beyond these, understand this: [64r] He lit the bush next to Moses with the fire of His divinity and it did not burn.149 Man is more honored than a bush and all created things, for God said concerning the saints who were among humankind that 'I will dwell in them and walk among them,'150 and again: ‘Where will I live, if not among the meek, among the humble, and among those who tremble at My words?’151

"Behold, He said that the righteous among men are the dwelling of His divinity, and the offenses of natural and human infirmities, which you classify as impurity, are not any sort of impediment to God,152 for it was befitting the Ever-living to also be a living temple. I suggest this to you, especially as you are envious of the honor of the saints of God and their relics, in which God said that He Himself dwells. For if God cares for the bones of all to raise men up at the general resurrection, [then] how much more [does He care] for His saints, whose [64v] greatness and glory He spoke of many times, and especially those who suffered death for Him? The Holy Spirit indeed also spoke concerning them through the mouth of David: 'The death of His saints is honorable before the Lord';153 and again: "The afflictions of the just are many; He will deliver them from everyone and He will keep their bones and not one from among them will be ground to dust."154 It says ‘many saints were not ground into dust’ about the divine power that dwelt in the saints, but they were ground into dust and burned by fire. But you are not able to contemplate this at all; rather, like a child, you look only at visible things. And

149 Exodus 3:2.
150 2 Corinthians 6:16.
151 Cf. Isaiah 66:2. Both Zohrab and the Septuagint read “where will I look” (ὕπερσημον, ἐπιβλέψω) instead of “where will I dwell” (πλούσιοι).
154 Psalm 33(34):20–21. The citation differs slightly from Zohrab and the Septuagint.
again, it says: ‘God is wonderful in His saints,’ and again Solomon [says]: ‘The just stand forever and their recompense is from the Lord. Although in the eyes of man they died, they are at peace. I know that you are not informed that the uncircumcised foreigner was killed and thrown into the tomb of the prophet Elisha. He came close to the bones of the prophet and was resurrected immediately. Behold, if divine power had not dwelt in the bones of the holy prophet, how were the bones of a mere dead man [i.e., Elisha] able to resurrect the dead man? The living God did not consider dwelling in the tomb of the dead to be an impurity for His divinity.

“What seems impure to me and you [is] but its opposite to God. But we shall request from you such honor for the saints, for you now torture those who fear the Lord to deny [God] in accordance with the usual heathen perversion. Indeed, by killing those who do not agree [with you], you kill yourselves with eternal death according to the predictions of our Lord: ‘There will come a time when whoever kills [you] will consider it a service to offer God’—just as Muhammad, the brother of your father, on the day that he made the ungodly sacrifice, mixed the blood of the slaughtered camel with the blood of the Christians by decapitating the servants of God. And you are angered and discomfited at this, if we lay the saints of God who were martyred because of their confession of Him in places consecrated to God in this world.

Indeed, you recalled in regard to the sign of the cross and icon[s] [that] we honor the cross in memory of the Passion of the incarnate Word of God upon it, which we learned from God’s command to Moses as well as from the preaching of the prophets. Moses ordered to make and put the mark of the cross on the forehead of the high priest; he called the plate holy and dedicated it. And the shape of the leaf of the Temple door] was such that it appears to have shown a living being. For this reason, the foreheads of us Christians are sealed with the sign of the cross, as with the body of the Word of God that suffered for us. Indeed, the prophet Isaiah also clearly indicated the wood from which...

Brother of your father: Leo is addressing ‘Umar b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz, so this refers to the governor of Armenia, Muhammad b. Marwān.

Camel sacrifice: broadly speaking, the sacrifice of camels was a pre-Islamic practice that continued into the Islamic period, following the example of the Prophet Muhammad. The sacrifice ties Islam to the story of Abraham, and the camel was seen as the sacrificial animal par excellence.

Iconoclasm: the movement to remove or destroy icons, or images that portrayed scenes and/or people from scripture, was a major concern in the eighth and ninth centuries. Leo the Isaurian was particularly known for his antipathy toward icons and for inaugurating a policy against their use beginning in 726. Greek sources blame his position on contact with Yazīd b. ‘Abd al-Malik. However, here we have Leo arguing for the veneration of icons. Leo’s support of icons suggests that the correspondence must date to the early eighth century, as this document predates Leo’s iconoclast efforts.

The plate and the leaves: The “plate” here refers to Exodus 28:36–38, which reads “זֶבֶן־חִימָן/πέταλον) is used to refer to the leaves of the Temple door, which were inscribed with cherubim and trees. See 3 Kingdoms (1 Kings) 6:31(32) and 34(35).

155 Psalm 67:36(68:35).
156 Wisdom 5:16, 3:4. The citation differs from Zohrab and the Septuagint.
157 Cf. 4 Kingdoms (2 Kings) 13:21.
158 John 16:2.
the cross [was made and] with which the Church is ever crowned and boasts: 'With cedar,' he says, 'with pine, and with cypress together [66r] to bring glory to the place of My sanctuary; and I will glorify the place for My feet.' And Solomon says: 'Blessed is the wood through which there is righteousness'; and again: 'It is a wood of life to all who make it and who trust in it firmly as in the Lord.'

'But as for icons, we do not have anything like you think, for we did not indeed receive such commands from scripture, though we find in the Old [Testament] [that] God commanded Moses to make the likeness of the Cherubim for the Tabernacle of witness. So we, too, warmed with the wishes of the disciples of the Lord and with the love of the incarnate Lord, assuredly rejoice while looking at the portrait[s] and replica[s] that have come to us from their times as images truly of them, and we glorify God our Savior, who clothed his only begotten Son in such likeness and who glorified His saints; and it is not as if we worship the wood and the paint that is on the wood. [66v]

'(13) But you are not ashamed about venerating with sacrifices your house, which you call the Kaʿba and [which] you say was some house of Abraham, though it is really an arid, demonic desert that Abraham never saw even in a dream. Your people worshipped the house before your Muhammad, as [was] your custom. Your Muhammad did not destroy it, but instead only said that Abraham settled there. Lest I appear insulting and inconsiderate to you, I will clarify this for you from the holy Gospels and from Leo attacks Muslim practices associated with the hajj, that is, the pilgrimage to Mecca, which occurs in the final month of the Islamic calendar. Kaʿba: see above on "the House of Abraham," folio 57r.

159 Isaiah 60:13. The citation differs from Zohrab and the Septuagint, but the words used for "with pine," պեկիւ (pekiw), and "with cypress," պեկիւռիսաւ (pekiwṙisaw), are from Greek πεύκη. According to Awetik‘ean, Siwrmēlean, and Awgerian, Nor Baṙgirk‘, 2:647, the latter occurs only in this passage, whereas the former is attested also in the Armenian translation of the Alexander romance.

160 Wisdom 14:7.

161 Proverbs 3:18. The citation differs from Zohrab and the Septuagint. It is possible that "who make it" (որ առնեն զնա) represents a scribal error in Armenian for "who take it" (որ առնուն զնա), which would be closer in meaning to the Septuagint (τοῖς ἀντεχομένοις αὐτῆς), although Zohrab reads որ պատսպարին ի նա.


163 "While looking at," յանդիման տեսանելով. We take the preposition յանդիմա, "opposite," "in the presence of," "in the face of," as working with the verb "to see," տեսանել, possibly together rendering Greek ἐπισκόπεω.

164 See page 41 n. 5.
your own histories, for many times the Lord sent a multitude of demons into that desert, as it says in the Gospel: ‘They move around,’ it says, ‘through waterless places.’ Indeed, some demon jinns reside there and appear to you sometimes in the likeness of snakes and sometimes they seduce with impure and lewd desires and give you thoughts of sexual intercourse, as is their custom. [67r] Now you imprudently believe their deceptions [that] you are their equal here and in the world to come. You do not understand that in the world to come of the Gospel of the Savior, they are not able to draw near with such things; furthermore, his [i.e., Satan’s] rebellious tyranny was bound by the power of His becoming human. Although they are malicious like their father Satan, they are not able to harm them [i.e., humans] openly. If they were able and dared, they would have killed you, burning you by fire in a single day, but instead they only stealthily seduce you into losing your souls through deception. You do not know why you worship and kiss the rock that you call rukn. And [you do not know the reason] for the demonic slaughter that the beasts and the birds abhor. [And you do not know the reason] they [the worshippers] would run on one foot, or [the reason] for the rock-throwing, for the fleeing, for the shaving [of] the head, or for the other shameful deeds that they commit.

“I will allow myself to mention the impure command of your lawgiver concerning men having relations [67v] with women, about which I am ashamed to speak, [and] to bring up the example of plowing the fields, through which some of you have learned to have relations with women with such obscenity in the manner of a plough. Or what shall I say [about] the chaste demeanor of your prophet, the deceitful obscenity of the wife of Zayd, and attributing the causes of the impurity to God, whence also loathsome laws have entered among your people? What is a more evil blasphemy than making God the cause of those who desire that which he did? Indeed you said that David took Uriah’s wife, he took [her and] he sinned against God, on account of which he was punished by the Lord. Whereas your

**Jinn**: an Arabic word that refers to a category of intelligent beings that resemble humans or angels but are made of smokeless fire instead of clay or light. The prophets, according to the Islamic tradition, spoke to the jinn as well as to humans, and King Solomon reportedly relied on jinn to build his temple in Jerusalem. They are often the subject of folklore and storytelling.

**Rukn**: “corner” in Arabic, here referring to the corner of the Ka’ba. Each of the four corners of the Ka’ba is named; here the author is referring to al-rukn al-aswad, or the “black cornerstone,” where the Black Stone is located. While circumambulating the Ka’ba, pilgrims touch or kiss the surface of the Black Stone, a twelve-inch rock of either lava or basalt mounted five feet from the ground. Christians use this as an example of continued idol worship related to the Black Stone, a charge that is resoundingly denied in early Islamic literature.

**Hajj**: each of the activities mentioned here relates to the annual pilgrimage to Mecca: slaughter refers to the sacrifice of animals for ‘Id al-Adha, throwing the rocks to the ritual of ramy al-jamarat, fleeing to the ifāda, and shaving the head to the rite that accompanies the final feast.

**Would run on one foot**: this obscure phrase refers to a tradition attributed to Muslims in Christian sources. It claims that when Abraham met Ishmael, he did not fully dismount from his ride to keep a promise he had made to his wife. Instead, he only placed one foot on a rock, which retained his footprint. According to these sources, Muslims run around the Ka’ba on one foot in honor of Abraham’s precedent. Although the footprint of Abraham is indeed an important tradition in Islam, Muslims do not run around the Ka’ba on one foot during the hajj. The latter claim is an invention of Christian polemicists.

Zayd’s wife: Zaynab bt. Jaḥsh was the cousin of the Prophet Muḥammad on her mother’s side. She was married to Zayd b. Ḥāritha, the Prophet’s adopted son, but the Prophet happened upon her undressed and became interested in marrying her. When Zayd lost interest in her, the Prophet married her. See Qur’an 33:37–38. This story is part of a broader comparison between the Prophet Muḥammad and the Prophet David, who married Bathsheba, the wife of Uriah. Uriah the Qur’an does not mention Uriah or Bathshebea by name. According to both Jewish and Islamic tradition, David caught sight of Bathsheba as she bathed and grew infatuated with her. He ordered her husband Uriah to the battlefield so as to clear the way for him to marry Bathsheba. Although Jews, Christians, and Muslims alike retain some version of this story, there are differences in the details, so the accusations...
Muḥammad and you do the very [thing] you oppose! No matter how evil the sins, [you do] not consider them to be sins; you do not ask forgiveness for them, and you do not find sins [to be] shameless. God commanded in the Gospels that a man not leave his wife, except in the case of adultery. And you, when you are satisfied with your wives, as if with food, you want [to leave them] and you leave [them]. [68r] So if it were possible, I would not say anything about the shameful remarriages, as you first allow others to profane a wife and then you take [her].

"Where shall I put the unscrupulous fornication of your concubines, for whom you expend all the possessions and spoils of man? Buying expensive possessions at high cost, you satisfy that obscenity with her and then sell [her] like an animal. They say about the serpent that it has relations with the muraena, the reptile that is in the depths of the sea. And when it nears the seashore, it ejects fatal poison and in this way consummates its desire. Yet you are more venomous than even this snake, and more treacherous. Your wickedness is not relieved with bodily copulation, for even at your death, instructed by evil spirits, you sinfully exterminate one another by strangulation.

"As for what you said about Satan and the souls of the righteous, you make Satan the treasurer of God. You have many highly incorrect ideas about our wisdom. [68v] But Satan rejoiced over the despair caused by the death [of] men, and simultaneously Satan himself thought that the righteous who died were truly lost and forgotten by God. Presuming that the Word of God, on account of His body and immense humility, was like such people, he induced His [i.e., Jesus’s] disciple to betray [Him] and the Jews to kill [Him]. Seeing the Lord’s willing advance toward death on this cross, he became frightened and began to rebuke with terror the wife of the judge in order to hinder the salvation of the human race. Having tasted death in His humanity, He [Jesus] remained immortal in the nature of His divinity and indivisible from His humanity as true God from true God. He arose and, even more, He resurrected His humanity according to the prophecy of David: ‘May God arise and may His enemies be dispersed,’ and from the twelve prophets: ‘Wait for
me on the day of my resurrection." He did not arise for His own sake, since He was incorporeal, immortal, and incorruptible; rather, He took on humanity and with that endured death for the sake of the human race. And by His resurrection He granted resurrection to humans and hope to the souls of the dead to be clothed in flesh once more, freeing incorporeal souls from the dress of the enemy incorporeally, for souls meet with not the smallest attentions of the Creator through the incarnation of the Word in Christ. Now, in this way Satan was bound with his own and his demons’ despair, destruction, and impotency to no longer compel mankind to foreign worship that God does not want, and with hope of [their] inheriting the eternal fire of hell.

"I also did not forget what you said from the prophet Isaiah, the sayings about the riders on the ass and the camel. Now, the meaning of the vision is as follows. The seeing of an arid sea: the ‘arid sea’ is your desert, bordering on the sea, close to the Babylonian kingdom and neighbor to it. And after a little bit, he says: ‘I saw two riders: one rider on an ass and one rider on a camel.’ The two were one single rider, as the prophet says clearly, having shown it in that same place. But the prophet calls ‘an ass’ the Jewish people, who read the Laws and the Prophets and yet, believing the teaching of Satan, did not recognize or obey the world-saving Gospel. He accused [them] about this at the beginning of his writing: ‘The ox knew its owner and the ass its master’s stable, but Israel has not known Me.’ Whereas he called the Midianites and the Babylonians ‘a camel’ because these animals are common among you. That enemy, who led the Jews astray with misconceptions about obeying the law, has overturned you through idolatry, for the two are one. See how the prophet shows this clearly again; he says: ‘I saw the same rider, for a pair of horses was coming.’ So what previously seemed to be two is one. And ‘the pair of horses,’ since he [i.e., Satan] ruled the Jews and the heathens, who persecuted

Leo interprets the vision in Isaiah 21 of the two riders, one on an ass, the other on a camel. Muslims used this verse to suggest that the Christian scriptures foretold the coming of Muḥammad: Jesus was the rider on the ass and Muḥammad that on the camel. Leo instead explains that the two riders are actually one. The ass signifies the Jewish people and the camel the heathen Midianites and Babylonians. Satan is the rider of both—Jewish obsession with the law and Midianite and Babylonian idolatry. When both of these were destroyed by the coming of Christ and the spread of Christianity, Satan had no other option than to ride the mounts of the law and heathenism into the Arabian desert and deceive its inhabitants with Islam, which combines Jewish law with heathen practices.
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Him. Now, how was he coming and what did he say? ‘He was coming,’ he says, ‘on a pair of horses,’ and he raised a shout and said: ‘Babylon has fallen and its handiwork has been destroyed.’

“Behold, the enemy is this one who laments its desolation, who did not know another place to flee to except for your desert, and who came to your people, leading both horses of his impiety, which are Jewish instability and heathen wantonness. He gave you these together. He deceived you stealthily, and not by force, for you circumcise and conceive of the divinity like the Jews do, without the substantial and creative Word and Spirit; but you believe in fortune and fate and demons who are jinns, like the heathens do. With those who are like them, you lead lives of filthy and unmentionable impurities.

“You call your raids of merciless killings and of enslaving men ‘the way of God.’ Such are your beliefs and rewards, and your boasts of conducting an angelic lifestyle, but we know and are familiar with the mystery of our wondrous salvation. We expect to enjoy the kingdom of heaven after the resurrection, since we obeyed the proclamations of the Gospel. We are obedient for such good things that ‘the eye did not see and the ear did not hear . . . , which God has prepared for those who love Him’ and believe in Him—not fountains of wine, milk, and honey, nor copulation with women who remain forever virgins, nor the birth of sons, nor any other such quackeries born of heathen and hellish folly. God forbid the nonsense of your farfetched stories, for ‘the kingdom is not food and drink,’ as the Holy Spirit says; rather, ‘it is righteousness and holiness.’ For ‘in the resurrection, they do not take wives nor are there husbands, but thus they are like the angels in heaven.’ But since you are never satisfied with impurity, with the pleasure of your filthy desires, and consider nothing else better than it, you therefore consider the kingdom of heaven nothing without it and you want to furnish it [i.e., heaven] with it [i.e., impurity].

“This we answer you in brief, since we have been troubled by you heathens because of our unshakeable and indubitable...

---

178 1 Corinthians 2:9.
180 Matthew 22:30.
faith in the past as well as now. We are constantly dying because of the venerable, holy, and unparalleled name that has been attributed to us in accordance with the prediction of the prophet Isaiah: 'He will call you a new name, which the Lord shall name,'\(^{181}\) as the Lord prescribed to us while He was physically on earth, saying: 'If they persecuted Me, then they will also persecute you. If they kept My word, then they will also keep yours. But they will do this to you since they do not recognize My Creator.'\(^{182}\) And again: 'Here in this world [71v] you will have affliction';\(^{183}\) and in His prayers to the Father, He said: 'Thy whom You gave to the world were Yours and You gave them to Me,'\(^{184}\) and 'They are not from this world like I am also not from this world,'\(^{185}\) for 'if they were from the world here, this world would truly love its own. But they are not from this world; rather, I chose them from the world. Because of this, this world hates them.'\(^{186}\)

"Now because of such hope we are tortured by you with threats and with death; and [you are tormented] by us with patience, for we do not put our hope in our bow nor will our sword save us, but the right hand and arm of the Lord and the light of His countenance.\(^{187}\) Whether He wants and is pleased to in this world still or in the next, He may increase the recompense as much as He wants and whenever He may want in exchange for your punishments. Whereas you, persisting in your violence and your extortion, think this befitting of your faith for the sake of the pleasure of God, not remembering the Persians who tyrannized for four hundred years. [72r] God himself knows the reason why, but it was not on account of their correct beliefs. But we are pleased with these tribulations and these afflictions that befall us for the sake of the glorified name of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, so that we may arrive at the goodness of the hereafter with those who loved the day

\(^{181}\) Isaiah 62:2.

\(^{182}\) John 15:20–21. The last part of the citation differs from Zohrab and the Greek New Testament.

\(^{183}\) John 16:33.


\(^{185}\) John 17:17.

\(^{186}\) John 15:19. The citation differs slightly from Zohrab and the Greek New Testament, as in the biblical passage Jesus addresses his audience in the second person plural rather than the third person plural.

\(^{187}\) Cf. Psalm 43:4, 7(44:3, 6).
when God’s great judgment will appear for the glory and praise of those who love His name, and with whom may we also be worthy in glorifying the single divinity of the Father, His only begotten Word, and the Holy Spirit now, forever, and unto the ages. Amen.”

The emperor Leo wrote this transcript of reply and sent it by means of one of his faithful servants to ‘Umar, the prince of the Ishmaelites, who, when he read it, very respectfully felt great shame. And by means of this letter he also increased his mildness and consideration toward the Christian people. [72v] He presented himself everywhere as an obliging person, for, as we already related, he released the captives and pardoned all of them for their transgressions by setting them free. He also demonstrated greater sincerity to his own people than the previous ones who were princes before him did, for he opened the stores of the treasury and distributed salaries to the officers. And after all of that, he died.

ARmenian EDITION

Էև յետ նորա փոխանորդէ զիշխանութի վն Ոմառ ամս. տրիչքու. յարա. իրբէք. իրծուքուք:

188 Դռամ այստեղ արդարաբերություններից մեկն փոխանակիք իրավուրյուն հասկացությունը: Այս առաջին հատ էին [32v] լիցքերից քաղտրիք ուղղություն տալիս, ինչի ազատություն զարգացնում էր իրենին. և մակարդակ կարևոր և կարևորագույն: Մեծ հարցի համարում կարևորագույն են բնակության գլխավորակոծ զարգացման տեսակների և կարևորագույն զարգացման բարձրակետ, ինչի համար մեծ և միջին կարևորացուեր. և երկրի համար կարևորացուեր. թեև նամակ թեև բավակ են իրենց համար պահպանության կարևորացուեր: 
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Tr. Մ․ Ստուգ և լավագոյն գիտէ զինք զգեր զոր փոփոխեցին ազգ զորս չգիտէ և այլայցին։

Եւ կամ զարդ արդարացուցայց զգեր և զհետ երթայք նոցա որ ինչ նման թուի ձեզ

դուք ասէք էթէ ավրէնքը գերեցան բազում անգամ և կորեա որք ընթեռնուին զնոսա յորդոցի Ադամա, որք մոռանան և ի կարծիս ըմբռնելը, զի մաւտ է առ նոսա սատանայի որք նմա թշնամութ

եամ բն իւրեանց: Եւ կամ ընդէր ոչ գտանի յավուրքը Մովսէսի, վասնարքայան իւրեանց և դժոխոցն և դատաստանին.

և յարութեան այլ որք զԱվետարանը գրէին նոքա պատմեցին. Մաթէոս. Մարկոս. Ղուկաս. Յովհաննէս. իւրեանց հանճարով: Եւ զմխիթարիչը զորմէ ասաց յԱվետարանն առաքել Քրիստոսի, զՄահմետէն մերմէ ասացին առաքել:

Եւ կամ ընդէր զկնի աշակերտացին Յիսուսի յեւթանասուն և երկու ցեղս բաժանեցան ազգք Քրիստոնէից: Եւ անզուգական զաւրութեան Աստուտո ընկեր և համեմատ և նման նմա առնէք երիս Աստուացս խոստովանելով. և զամենայն ավրէնսն անձնիշխարք փոփոխել ջանայք. զթլփատութեան

ն ի մկրտութեան փոխելով. և զզոհսն ի հաղորդութեան ավրհնութեան

հացի և բաժակի. և զկիւրակէն փոխանակ շաբաթու պատուեցեր: Եւ կամ զարդ էր հնար Աստուայ ի մէջ արեան և մարմնոյ և պէսպէս աղտեղութեան

ց յարգանդի բնակել. և կամ ընդէր զոսկերս առաքելոց և մարգարէից պատուէք. և կամ զնշան խաչին որ դատապարտութե անգործարան էր ըստ ավրինակ. կամ պատկերս զոր պատուէք:

Եւ զի մարգարէն Եսայի վասնարքը վկայէ ընկեր և համեմատ Յիսուսի. զի և ուղեկից նմա էտես մարգարէն ի տեստեանն հեծեալ մի իշոյ և հեծեալ մի ուղտու: Իսկ դուք ընդէր ոչ հաւատայք զայս ամենայն և յոլովագոյն քան զայս ընդդիմաբանութեան

ս. գրէր Ոմար իշխանն Իսմաելի առ թագավորն Ղեւոն: Վասնորոյ կայսրի գրել պատասխանի ավրինակ զայս:

Ժթ Փղաբիոն Լեւոն կայսր. հաւատացեալ ի Յիսուսի Քրիստոսի, ճշմարիտ Աստուայ, Սառակինոսաց առաջնորդի: Որպիսի բան առաջի եդից ուղղագոյն և ճշմարտագոյն զառ ի քէն մեզ առաքելոցս. և զի մանաւանդ ուսեալք յաստուտի հեզութեամբ խրատել զանդիմակայսն, թերևս տացէ նոցա ժամանակ ապաշխարութեան

այլև ոչ թագաւորական ավրէնք են խրտուցանող բանիւք որպէս քարամբք հարկանել զայնոսիկ որք լսել կամին զճշմարտութեան զսքանչելի խորհուրդ:

Բայց վասնորոյ զի սկիզբն իսկ քո գրոյս գոնեա փոքրագոյն ինչ զկերպարան ճշմարտութեան

190 փոքրագոյն] read: գթագոյն.
191 գզորեզակ[ - wipe- suprasecr.
192 փակ. ] - ե- քաղաք.
193 փո in lft. mg.
194 վոնատ] - ե քաղ.
195 գաղափարով [ - ս- suprasecr.
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Հայ աւանդում և ուղիղագործական ուժ զարգացած կողմից իսակութայան հիշատակի տակ, թե թագավոր Աստուայ, առ պատասխան Նույն. Հայ զգեր պարուսակարգված տրամաբան

գալ.

Դր.193 Փոքրին Իսիդոր, համապատասխան հանած Զրուկ Զրուկան, ճշմար Աստուայ

միան և բաշկության ձևաչափով գալ. Նամաս,194 Վաստեանոս առաջնորդի: Իրավիճակը

բազման առաջին երկու հայտնի և բազման գիտակցաբան գալ ի քիմ մեա առաջնորդուց. և զի տեղեկացու

միայն մամուլը խառը ի հայտնակ համար տրամաբան Գրիգորյանայի, բյուծե առաջի

համարիչներին. այս ոչ բացարձակ նախկին հետ հայկական գրականությունը իր տես մասում գտնվածությունների գրավումվեց.195 Ներկայություն:

Քազե Աստուի գնհարով հայ քնարքի գերազանցությունը հիշ գրավության ձևավորված
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Գրեցեր թէ բաւական համարեցար և հավատացեր յայս. և թողեր զայս զոր վկայեաց

Յիսուս ի վերայ

անձին իւրոյ. և երկուացար և ի կարծիս անկար: Երանի. եթէ հաւատայիր որպէս Ավետարանին հաստատուն և անսխալ պատմագրացն քան ամենայնի. թէպէտև ոչ հակառակ միմեանց զհին և զնորս գիտեմք. զի ոչ հնար էր միոյ բարութե

անաղբերն⋅

այսինքն⋅ աստուածութե

ան

ն. բղխել չար և բարի. ճշմարտութի

ւն

և ստութի

ւն

: Այլ յաղագս

դիւրնակ

առնելոյ անաւրէն ազգին Հրէից. զմարմնով գալուստ բանին իւրոյ առակաւք և

ազթունակ պատուիրանաւք ի ձեռն մարգարէիցն զգուշացուցանէր զազգն. զի մի անհավանք ըստ սովորութե

ան

իւրեանց գալստեանն Քրիստոս ի լինիցին: Ըստ նոցին

վկայեաց

վասին ինքեան Տէրն յԱվետարանսն. և ոչ ավտ

ար յայնցանէ զորս ինքն անմարմնաբար ի մարգարէիցն խաւսեցաւ բերանոց. զորս յետ ժամանակ ի մարմուանալն

յայտնագոյնս խաւսեցաւ: Եւ զայնոսիկ Աստուծ յ շնորհաւն⋅ ի սմին թղթի յիւրաքանչիւրսն

ցուցցուք տեղիս. զբարձրագոյսն առաւել քան զմարդոյ. և զխոնարհագոյնս իբրև զմարդոյ

խոստովանել:

Բ. Գրեցեր էթէ արդարև Յիսուս արժանի էր հաւատարմութե

ան

և մաւտ էր յԱստուծ. և

լավագոյն գիտէր զինքն քան զգրեալսն. զոր փոփոխեցին ազգք զորս ոչ գիտէք, որ այլայլեցին

ի նոցանէ և փոխեցին: Պատասխանի: Ճշմարտութի

ոչ գիտէ զէն, չէ ասել⋅ և զչէ, է. իսկ

ստութի

զամենէ դիւրաւ բուռն հարկանէ, զի կարօղ է,

ոչ միայն զերևելի արարածս

ուրանալ. այլ զնոյն ինքն զարարչէն ասէ ոչ է Աստուծ: արդ չէն ինչ զարմանք թէ և զգիրս

Աստուծ ուրանալ կարէ ստութի

ւն

. կամ թէ պատճառել զնոցան

էն պատճառս մեղաց:

Յիսուս արդարև

արժանի էր հաւատարմութե

ան

: Ոչ որպէս մարդ ոք սոսկ յԱստուծ

բանէն թափուր. այլ որպէս կատարեալ յերկոսին յա

ստուածութե

ան

ն և ի մարդկութե

ան

. հաւատարիմ են և ի ձեռն մարգարէին նորին ասացուածք բանին. ոչ վ

աս

այնորիկ են

հավատարիմ զի մարդիկ խաւսեցան զնոսա. այլ վ

աս

այնորիկ և ոչ հակառակ

են միմեանց.

Այլ որ ասացեր. այլայլեալ զգրեանն. էթէ առաջնորդ ուսմանդ քո ուսոյց քեզ զայդ⋅

մոռացաւ զինքն. և էթէ այլ ոք. ևս առաւել ստեաց: Արդ լուր, և գեղեցկապէս խորհեա: Քում

ուսմանդ առաջնորդ ոչ ասէ հաստատել զբանն առանց վկայից

նմանապէս ասէ և աւրէնքն

հրամայեն.

ասէ ի բերանոյ երկուց և երից վկայից

հաստատեսցի

ամենայն

բան: Գիտեմք

ԶԱբրահամ վ

ասէ ի բերանոյ վկայեաց
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...
ոչ պաշտպան զնոսա և ուխտի որ առ Աբրահամ, այսինքն քրիստոս. և այլ պէսպէս դատաստանաց. և զոհից հրաման ի բաց հրաժարեցուցանել զնոսա ի հեթանոսական սովորութեան որում ընդդելն իսկ էին:

Իսկ Յեսովա. և Դատաւորացն և Հռութա գիրքն և Թագաւորութիւն չորեքին. և Մնացորդացն սոքա պատմողք են ըստ ժամանակին սքանչելագործութեան Աստույր. և անսխալ ազգաբանք արդարոցն ազգի որ գա իջանէ կարգաւ ի Քրիստոս. և պատմութիւն զթագավորացն Իսրայէղի. էթէ ոյք եղեն հաճոյք Աստույր. և ոյք ոչ ևս. և բաժանում ազգին վաս պատմողք են օստիւր իսկ և Սաղմոսք Դաւթի և գիրք Սողոմոնի. զոր Կոհեղէթ. և Շիրաթշիրիի Եբրաեցիք. և Պառիմոն. և Սամատոն մեք անուանեք. և երկոտաս մարգարէիցն.

Եսայի. Երեմիայ. Դանիէլ. Եզեկիէլի գրենովն. ամենայնքն մարգարէութիւն են վաս գալստեան Քրիստոսի. արդ էթէ ի Հրէից ոք շփոթեալ ապականէր. ոչ էր հնար գրենոյն ողջ պահիլ. զի չարագործաւղքն յայնոսիկ նախ զթիւ գրենոյն ի բաց բառնաին, և ի մի կամ յերկուս և կամ թերևս ավելի յերիս գիրս ժողովիւր. և զյաւելուածն ևս ի բաց բարձումն. քանզի ի նոսադիւրագոյն է <ջնջ>ելն.

Եւ դարձեալ որպէս կարծեմ չես անտեղեակ թշնամութեան որ ընդ մեզ Քրիստոնեայսս և ընդ Հրէայսն. և ոչ վաս այլոյ ուրուք. այլ վաս խոստովանելոյն մեր զՅիսուս էթէ սա է Քրիստոսի. որ և որդի Աստույր առ ի մարգարէիցն քարոզեցաւ: Իսկ Հրէայք. ահա. զսա ոչ ասեն Քրիստոս, այլ թէև խոստովանին թէ արժան է գալ Քրիստոսի. սակայն անհավանք մնացեալք գրոց մարգարէիցն որդի Աստույր և ոչ այսպէս խոստովանին զՔրիստոս:

Զնամ և զերրորդ պատասխանիսս. գերութիւնն Հրէից նախքան զմարմնով գալուստի Եղև. իսկ զարդ առ նովաւ հաստատուն կացեալ էր և տաճարն և կտակարանքն և քահանութիւն որպէս և յայտ իսկ է ի սրբոց Աւետարանացն որպէս դու իսկ վկաեցեր զՏեառնէն. զթլփատութենէն և զայլոցն մի ըստ միոջէ զոր ըստ Աւետարանացն կատարեաց. և զայս ոչ յաղագս այլ ինչ իրաց երևի արարեալ. այլ զի արդարացուսցէ զիւր ասացեալսի ի ձեռն մարգարէիցն. և ցուցէ եթէ չեն հակառակ նմա˙ այլ սիրելիք. և հաստատուն վկայք տնտեսութեան նորա խորհրդոյ. և որք էին կտակարանքն որ առ Հրէայսն. էթէ ոչ գրեանն մարգարէիցն որ յետ երկոցուն գերութեանց Իսրայէղի և Յուդա. առ Հրէայսն կային մինչև իժամանակը փրկչին մերոյ. յորում բազում վկաութիւն Տէրն յուսուցանելն զանհաւան Հրէայսնի յիշեաց յԱւետարանսն. գերեցան ի Նաբուքոդոնոսորայ, ազգն Հրէից, այլ աստուացային.
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Երանելիք ի Բաբելովնի ընկեցան ի հնոցն. և մեծն Դանիէլ ի Բաբելովնի մարգարէացավ. և անդ ընկեցաւ ի գուբն

Բայց զի ընդ նոսա էին գրեանն.

լուր հոգւոյն սրբոյ ի Սաղմոսին ասացեալ մարգարէիւն

ասացեալ մարդկան հանճարով գրեալ զգրեանն. գիտեմ զի զառ ի յԵզրէ զերկրորդումն կամիս բամբասել զի թէպէտև եղեն ի վերա նորա շնորհք հոգւոյն սրբոյ և առանց վրիպանաց

Աստուած ամենևին ոչ. բայց որք բարւոքն խորհին` գիտեն եթե ի մինն որ առանց վկայութե

գրոց է,

նմա է մերձենալ սատանայի քան էթէ յայսքան սուր բս. և վկայեալս

Աստուած ամենևին ոչ. բայց որք բարւոքն խորհին` գիտեն եթե ի մինnn որ առանց վկայութե

գրոց է,


227 գուբն

228 երերակում

229 գրաբարում 1corr.

230 գրաբարում 2corr.

231 ջապարում 1corr.

232 ջապարում 2corr.
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Վասիլի Զայրենեի արձանագրությունը նշում է, որ նրանք նշում են հիշում վանական և կենսակերպիչ արդյունքներ ու նրանց համար, որ նրանք պահանջում են վարդակերպել այս արձանագրությունը: Որպեսզի այս արձանագրությունը հրակերպեն կազմակերպվի և թողարկվի, նրանք նշում են, որ նրանց այս արձանագրությունը ներկայացնում է նրանց հիշումների և անհրաժեշտ ակտիվիթի համար միտումը. Այս արձանագրությունը նշում է, որ նրանք հուզալի են այս արձանագրությունը, և որ նրանց միտումն էլ համարվում է այս արձանագրության հիմնական մասը.

Մեզուրիկ Մաթէոս Մարկոս Ղուկաս Յովհաննես, գրել է Streit արձանագրությունը. Նրանք պատմում են քրիստոնեական գրականության մասի ազդեցության վրա, և նշում են, որ քրիստոնեական գրականության մասի ազդեցությունը համարվում է մարդասեր տեսակետից ուշադրության հերոսաշխարհ: Մեզուրիկ Մաթէոս Մարկոս Ղուկաս Յովհաննես գրել է Streit արձանագրությունը. Նրանք պատմում են քրիստոնեական գրականության մասի ազդեցությունը համարվում է մարդասեր տեսակետից ուշադրության հերոսաշխարհ: Մեզուրիկ Մաթէոս Մարկոս Ղուկաս Յովհաննես գրել է Streit արձանագրությունը. Նրանք պատմում են քրիստոնեական գրականության մասի ազդեցությունը համարվում է մարդասեր տեսակետից ուշադրության հերոսաշխարհ.
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և յիշեցուսցէ ձեզ զոր ուսուցի

զոր առաքեցէ հայր յանուն իմ ասէ: Եւ քո Մահմետն ոչ էկն յանուն Տեառ իմերոյ. այլ յիւր անուն: Եւ հոգին սուրբ ասաց

աշակերտացն. և դու ինքնին գիտես թէ ոչ երբէք տեսին առաքեալք Տեառ ն մերոյ. այլ յիւր անուն:

Արդ որպէս վերագոյնն ասացի` ընդ միոյ միոյ մարգարէի ձեռն ըստ ժամանակ զիւրոյ աստուածութեանն գիտութիւն

կատարեաց զմամեր գալ յավիտենական արդարութե

դանիէլի մարգարէի. զի երիս յայտնեաց Աստուած փոփոխմունս, որովք ի ճշմարագոյն աստուածգիտութիւնն մարդիկ յառաջ գալ կարասցեն` ի կռապաշտութе

ի չափաւոր ճաճանչ աւրինացն լուսոյ. և անդուստ ի հզավոր լոյս Քուզի. Սաբարթուռաբի. Կնտրի. Մուրջի. Բասլի. անաստուած Ջդի. որք ուրանան զէութիւնն Աստուած և զյարութիւնն,

որպէս ասացի. միոյ լեզուի է վարդապետութիւն և միոյ ազգի. և ժամանակ երևման դորա որպէս դուքդ ասէք.

Զ: Իսկ որ ասացեր յետ աշակերտացն Տեառ ն յեւթանասուն և յերկուս բաժանեալ մեզ 

մասունս. չէ այդպէս. քանզի մի ստութ քամ ձեր և միոյ ազգի. և ժամանակ երևման վերագոյն

այնպիսի իրք. որ մի ազգ էք. մի լեզու. մի ազգապետ, նոյն և իշխան. և քահանայապետ. թէ արդարև մարդկային

իմաստիւք էին հաւատք Քրիստոնէից. զի՞նչ զարմանք էին վատթարագոյն ևս հաւատ քան զձերդ ի մեզ լինել.

որպէս քոյումնդ աւադիկ գտան[...............]ին այնպիսի իրք. որ մի ազգ էք. մի լեզու.

իշխանաութիւն ուսուցիչն էին հաշտասիրութիւն և ամպարշտեալք

245 նումատ | նումատ ա.с.
246 արարող | արարող ա.с.
247 դեր | read: վաղեռոր with Chahnazarian, Malxaseanc', and Tēr-Vardanean.
248 <չհոյ մարմինայի չանաչուն> Ուարդ հինություն. կամ մարմինայի շարքի ա.с.
249 դեր | q- in lit.
250 փառավանք | ի' subscr.
251 վերջանակ | read: վերջանակ with Hakobian.
252 Չ> suprascr. Hand 1<sup>s</sup>r.
253 դեր | -ի subscr.
AN ARMENIAN FUTŪḤ NARRATIVE

YPстато յուրաքանչիւր լեզուի մեջ հայրենիք եւ իսկ գիրքներից դուրս բերել մեզ համարիս,որ իսկ գիրքներից իրմամանաց այս հայրենիքը նույնիսկ Քրիստոնեայք իրականացրել կարծեցին, և Քրիստոնեայք զինքեանք կոչեցին, որոց հավատքն հայհորտի էին և մկրտութիւն ևս պղծութիւն, զորս իդառնալ ի յիւրեանց պղծութենէ. և չգտանի ուրաքանչիւր հետք. այլ, հինգ, վերջասն կոչէին ի մեզ Քրիստոնեան. և ամենուրբ զինքեանք կոչեցներ ի մեզ Քրիստոնեան. և այս չեն ինչ զարմանք էթէ յոյժ հեռաւորքն և այլալեզուք չեն այնքան տեղեակք որքան պարտն է ճշմարտութեան աւանդիցն. սակայն նոյն գիրք յիւրաքանչիւր լեզուամբ սովորութեամբ բք. բայց դուք սովորէք առնել զայսպիսս. մանաւանդ Հաջաղին այն որ ի կողմամս Պարսիցն առ ի ձէնջ ազգապետ կացեալ. ժողովեաց զի միմեանց աւտար լեզուաւք. և սովորութեամբ բք. բայց զսակաւսն յիշեցից: Առաջին մեր Յունացս. երկրորդ Հռոմաեցվոց. երրորդն˙ Բադաղացվոց. հինգերորդն Ասորոցն. վեցերորդն. Եթիովպացվոցն. ևթներորդն˙ Հնդկացն. ութերորդն. ձեր Սառակինոսացդ. իններրորդն˙ Պարսիցն. տասներորդն. Հայոցն. մետասաներորդն. Վրացն. երկոյտասաներորդն. Աղուանից: Եւ արդ ըստ քո ասացուածիդ գրէ թէ միոյ կամ զերկուց ազգի փոխէր ոք զգրեանն արդեւք. իսկ զիարդ և զայլոց ևս ազգաց զորս յոյժ հեռաւորս գիտէք ի մէնջ և ի միմեանց աւտար լեզուաւք և սովորութեամբ բք. բայց դուք սովորէք առնել զայսպիսս. մանաւանդ Հաջաղին այն որ ի կողմամս Պարսիցն առ ի ձէնջ ազգապետ կաժեալ. ժողովեաց զի միմեանց աւտար լեզուաւք և սովորութեամբ բք. բայց դուք սովորէք առնել զայսպիսս. մանաւանդ Հաջաղին այն որ ի կողմամս Պարսիցն առ ի ձէնջ ազգապետ կաժեալ. ժողովեաց զի միմեանց աւտար լեզուաւք և սովորութեամբ բք. բայց դուք սովորէք առնել զայսպիսս. մանաւանդ Հաջաղին այն որ ի կողմամս Պարսիցն առ ի ձէնջ ազգապետ կաժեալ. ժողովեաց զի միմեանց աւտար լեզուավք և սովորութեամբ բք. բայց դուք սովորէք առնել զայսպիսս. մանաւանդ Հաջաղին այն որ ի կողմամս Պարսիցն առ ի ձէնջ ազգապետ կաժեալ. ժողովեաց զի միմեանց աւտար լեզուավք և սովորութեամբ բք. բայց դուք սովորէք առնել զայսպիսս. մանաւանդ Հաջաղին այն որ ի կողմամս Պարսիցն առ ի ձէնջ ազգապետ կաժեալ. ժողովեաց զի միմեանց աւտար լեզուավք և սովորութեամբ բք.

254 Քրիստոնեայք ] - İnt subscr.
255 քարսն ][ - p subscr.
256 արտացուց ] read: արտացուց.
257 զի ի բաց ] read: զի բաց.
258 դարձավեր ] read: դարձավեր. with Chahnazarian, Malxaseanc', and Tēr-Vardanean.
VII. THE CALIPHATE OF 'UMAR B. 'ABD AL-'AZĪZ

The Caliphate of 'Umar b. 'Abd al-'Azîz (634-644 CE) marked a significant period in the history of the Islamic Caliphate. During this time, the caliph's policies and decisions had a profound impact on the development of Islamic law and governance.

In this section, we will explore the reign of 'Umar b. 'Abd al-'Azîz, focusing on his leadership and the challenges he faced. The text will discuss his role in shaping the early Islamic state and his contributions to the Islamic legal system.

---

259 suprascr. Hand 1 corr.
260 - subscr. Hand 1 corr.
261 - subscr. Hand 1 corr.
Մարդ. նախ կամ հանել հուպ կացուցից: Դավիթ մարգարէնալով ընդ նորա ասէ. ես եմ որդի և ոչ որպէս կարծեմ լսես. թերևս որպէս սանդղովք ինչ այսուիկ ի բարձրագոյսն. էթէ նորա իցեն, և զարուագիտութի ստուա չարաչար նշանս ախտից կատարելոյ յերկրպագունս և ի նոսին յորդորելով զնոսա: ստուա որ վերջին և առաջին է եամ բք միմեանց. սպանութ բք. և եամ բ պիղծ և եղև մոռացմամբ ստեղծողի իւրոյ. և վարուք անառակ և գարշելի ցանգութ յ պատկեր: ան ստուշո եւ ստուա զբանին իւրոյ. և զհոգոյն իւրոյ զնմանութի ն եդ ի նմա. զհոգի. զմիտս. և զբան: Զսոսա ի սմա ւն 扎 ձեր յեղբարց ձերոց իբրև զիս. նմա լուիջիք ըստ ամենայնի է յարուսցէ ձեզ Տ ստուա առ նոյն ինքն Ա յարուսցէ ձեզ Տ հաճոյիցն նորա. ողորմեցաւ սմա որպէս բարերար և արդարև որպէս ճրագ ըստ ժամանակի ժամանակի որպէս ի խաւարի ի կռապաշտութ և Բանսարին եւ գործովք հաճոյից այսորիկ զչափաւոր գիտութի ան։ ստուա տեսեալ Ա ց մարգարէից վ Արդ եկեսցեն քեզ այսուհետև հոյլք վկաութե

262 ասամբերեց[51v]առաջանալ կռապաշտութ Արդ տեսեալ Ա

265 դիմա] դիմա a.c.
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թագավորություն հայր հանդերձելու աշխարհին: Հրեշտակ ասաց վար ազատ երկնից. իսկ սքանչելի խորհրդակից և Աստուածութեան անուան ասաց Աստուածը և համառավուտել աւգտակարագոյն վարկաք. զի մի լսավղքն զձանձրություն ախտացին. թէ կամեսցիս լուր և ասաց այլ այսամբ չարչարանացի նորա. զոր կամավորաբար կրել համբերեց զնոցին կանխավ մարգարէից գուշակում: Եսայիան ասաց հոգին սուր. ես ոչ խստանամ և ոչ ընդդէմ դառնամ, զթիկունս իմ.

271 ասա] suprascr.
272 Post Աստուած: և a.r.
274 վարդավայր] read: պաղպաղակավ with Chahnazarian, Tēr-Vardanean, and Hakobian.
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VII. THE CALIPHATE OF 'UMAR B. 'ABD AL-'AZİZ

The page contains text in Armenian script, which appears to be a historical or religious text. Without being able to transcribe or translate the text, it is difficult to provide a meaningful summary or analysis. The text seems to be discussing historical events or religious matters, possibly related to the caliphate of 'Umar ibn 'Abd al-Aziz.

Footnotes:
276 թթթթ | read: թթթթ with Chahnazarian; reading possibly due to confusion of the letters -թ with the letter թ-, which begins the next word.
277 թթթթ | թթ a.c. -թ subscr.
278 թթթթ | read: թթ with printed editions.
279 , ] subscr.
280 թթթթ | read: թթթթ with printed editions.
Ճշմարտության անցկացուցք. այսպիսի իրադարձությունը Հայկական և Թուրքության և Թուրքիայի պետության երկրում էլ հանդիպել են և բէս․ ի տեսության տեսություն։ Այսպիսի անցկացուցք նպատակով են համարվում, որով էլ ուղարկվել է իրականացնել Թուրքիայի և Հայկական տարածքում։ Շատ էին Թուրքիայի մարեր, որոնք իրենց անցկացուցքներով կազմվում էին Թուրքիայի և Հայկական տարածքում։

Եթե ես շատ ազդեցություն են ունենում և առաջադիմություն չեն ունենում այլ արժեքներ։ Նախ մենք հանձնանք միայն յարգից զարգացում էր դեր, որ երբ իրավական հարցի և զիմաստության համար որոշում չեն համարվում այլ պահոց։ Եթե ես ոչ էի անդ, և մի դուք հավատակ, ո՞վ այր դու զվկաութի և սդ որ յայսց որ առ մեզ Ատաղահարան առնուս թէպէտ և զնոսին բռնադատես և այլայնես և տակավին ասես էթէ զայսոս կազմակերպել է ձեր. աղե յայնմ Ատաղահարանէ խաւսեաց զոր էտես աւրէնսդիրք:

Եթե որ ասացէր եթե մի են հավատք. արդարև մի են հավատք և մի մկրտութիւն և ոչ գոյ այլ հավատ աւանդեալ յԱստուծոյ և ոչ պատուէր ի մարդիկ։ Եթե որ ասացէրն, չաղավթեցին աւրէնքը յոր կողմն աղավթէքդ. և ոչ հաղորդեցան զձեր հաղորդութիւն այս բաջաղանաց և ընդ վայրի խնդրոց են հոյլք։ զի կողմն աղաւթից մարգարէիցն չերևէր, բայց դու միայն յարգել կամիս զհեթանոսական զոհանոցն. զոր տուն Աբրահամու անուանեցեր. և ոչ ուրեք յաստուած գիրս գտանեմք զԱբրահամ հասեալ ի տեղիսին յայն. զոր աւրէնսդիրք շուրջանակի երկրպագել ազգիդ ձերոյ):

Այլ այժմ նախ զԱւետարանացն ասացուածս տեսցուք թէ այսպէս արդարև իցէ որպէս դուդ կարծես. աղաւթեաց արդարև Յիսու ըստ մարդկութեան ն զոր էառ ի մէնջ առ ի զմեզ ուսուցանելոյ. և ըստ այստուծութեան ոչ կարավտ աղաւթից. այլ յաղաւթելն ոչ ասէր որպէս դուդ գրեցեր. այլ էթէ հայր էթէ հնար է անցո զբաժակս զայս յինէն. ցուցանելով թէ մարդ ճշմարիտ եմ. զի թէ յաստուածութեանը ոք թերի զԱստուծոյ բանն խոստովանի. կորուսանէ զյոյս կենաց իւրոց. նոյնպէս և եթէ ի մարդկութեան ոք կատարեալ զնա ոչ խոստովանի:

Բայց տես զճշմարտութիւն Աւետարանացն և զմեր հաւատացելոցս. զի և խոնահագոյնքն և բարձրագոյնքն ողջ պահին ի գիրս Աւետարանացն. և թէ ապականէաք. կամ մեք կամ առաջինքն. ընդէր զխոնարհագոյն ձայնսն յԱվետարանացն ոչ բառնայք։ ասաց. ոչ կարէ որդի մարդոյ յանձնէ առնել և ոչ ինչ. այլ հաւատա այնմ թե հայր որ յիս բնակեալն է նա գործէ զգործսն:

Այս սերտ դիմում է ինչպես ապական։ եթե հավատաս այնմ գրեալոցն ոչ կարեմ յանձնէ առնել և ոչ ինչ. հավատա դու այնմ որ ասաց ի նմին գիրս. ես դնեմ զանձն իմ անձամբ իմով և դարձեալ անձամբ իմով առնում զսա. և դարձեαլ ոչ ասաց առաքեաց զիս Աստուծո առ տիեզերս և դառնամ առ նա որպէս և դու գրեցեր. այլ թե որ առաքեացն զիս հայր ընդ իս է. և դարձեαլ ելի ի հաւրէ և եկի յաշխարհ. դարձեαլ թողում զաշխարհ և երթամ

281 ուն․ ասե, ա.с.
282 խանահագոյնք[.] read: խանահագոյնքից կարբուկել թություն.
283 An asterisk formed by a cross with a dot in each quadrant appears above զգործն.
284 նայէին] - նայէին 285 տվյալ, տվյալ 286 ած 287 ած
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Մեկ փոքր պատուհանություն է հանվել, որ կնպաղանջեր ուշադրության նշանակություն ունեն։ Պատմական այս փուլը համարվում է նույնիսկ առաջին թագադրման հետ միասին, որը նախապես շրջապատված էր փոքրիկության վրա։ Այս փուլն անցնում էր առաջին թագադրման հետ միասին, որը նախապես շրջապատված էր փոքրիկության վրա։ Այս փուլի հիման վրա գործող էր այս փուլը համարվում է նույնիսկ առաջին թագադրման հետ միասին, որը նախապես շրջապատված էր փոքրիկության վրա։

285 Post qāmāt Hand 4.
286 qabt Hand 1corr.
287 Hand returns to Hand 1.
288 qabt Hand 1corr.
289 suprascr.
290 Hand returns to Hand 1.
291 qabt Hand 1corr.
նորա բնություն, և ձեր շնորհավորում իսկ ասե. երբ ինչ երկնեք կարելի է Աստուծում բերել կայք վատ և ձեր քիչ էր. կասպի հեռու երկիր, և ասաց իսկ Աստուծում. դրանց ասաց գույն հավաքի և ձեռքի ասաց [60v] մայր այլուն և առանձին ուժեր Նահոմայինուց:

Եկել ուղի որ ասաց հեռու երկնեք կայք վատ և ձեր շնորհավորում իսկ ասե. երբ ինչ երկնեք կարելի է Աստուծում բերել կայք վատ և ձեր քիչ էր. կասպի հեռ վատ և ձեր քիչ էր. կասպի հեռ ձբեր և ասաց իսկ Աստուծում. դրանց ասաց գույն հավաքի և ձեռքի ասաց [60v] մայր այլուն և առանձին ուժեր Նահոմայինուց:
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The text is written in a complex script and contains various cultural references. It appears to be discussing events or characters from a historical or religious context, possibly related to the caliphate of 'Umar b. 'Abd al-'Aziz. The text seems to be in a Middle Eastern language, and it is likely discussing philosophical or theological concepts.

The page contains several paragraphs, each starting with a capitalized word, indicating a structured format. The text is dense and requires careful reading to understand the full context. It is possible that the text references specific events or figures from Islamic history, possibly involving debates or reflections on religious or political matters.

Without translating the text directly, it is clear that the document is of significant cultural and historical value, likely serving as a record or commentary on events from the caliphate period. The content is rich in language and context, requiring a deep understanding of the historical and religious landscape of the time.

The document includes a mix of historical references and philosophical discussions, indicative of the intellectual and cultural milieu of the period. The text is likely intended for an audience familiar with the themes and concepts it discusses, possibly scholars or intellectuals interested in the history and thought of the caliphate era.

Given the complexity of the script and the dense nature of the content, a detailed translation would require specialized knowledge in the language and context of the document. The text is a significant historical and cultural artifact, offering insights into the intellectual and religious life of the period under discussion.
բքն Ա
և նուիրեալ և ձև թիթեղան
և կենդանին ցուցեալ երևի: Քանզի և նշանաւ
խաչին ի վերա ճակատոյ քահանայապետին անուանեալ զնա թիթեղն ս
և ۶4vիտապան համախումբ: Խուզի որ և այն ինչի պատ 
բթար պատմված Սբուր. ևս և քարոզությ
եամ ի վերա նորա. զոր ուսաք հրամանաւ
խոստովանի ամբ խառուր յարուցան զմեռեալ
այրն և կենդանին Ա
աղտեղութիւն բնակել ի գերեզման մեռելոյն.
մեռելոյի և սրբոց իւր. և Տհայուր դարձեալ արդարք յավիտեան կեցցեն, և ի Տ
է է ստուած ի վերա այլ բազմաց սրբոց փշրեցան և հրով կիզան. բայց դու և ոչ բնավին կարես խորհել յայսոսիկ.
բսն բնակել էր ասէ ոչ փշրել. ստուայուր 
նեղութ քեն են արդարոց յամենեցունց փրկեսցէ զնոսա և պահեսցէ զոսկերս նոցա և մի ի
բերանով Դաւթի։ Պատուական է առաջի Տ
եառն որոյ և ասաց իսկ հոգին ս
և մանավանդ որք մահու վ
ա
որոյ բազում անգամ մեծամեծս և փառ
և ստուանոցին նշխարաց յորս զինքն ասաց բնակել Ա
ստուայ։ Պատուական է առաջի
վևոր, որ սպանանիցէ <զձեզ>
և ի խոնարհս և յայնոսիկ որք

300 Above hâšq is written և, which must stand for հավիջ.
301 hâšq ] -p suprascr.
302 քիրեհավակու | քիրեհավակու a.c.
303 և ] suprascr.
304 մենաբեր ] և մենաբեր a.c.
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The Caliphate of ‘Umar b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz

The caliphate of ‘Umar b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz was marked by both stability and conflict. In his first year, he died, and his successor, ‘Abd al-Malik, faced challenges from various groups. The caliphate was a time of transition, and the political landscape was complex. The caliphate of ‘Umar b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz is remembered for its role in the early Islamic state, particularly in the expansion of the caliphate’s influence.

The caliphate of ‘Umar b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz

The caliphate of ‘Umar b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz was marked by both stability and conflict. In his first year, he died, and his successor, ‘Abd al-Malik, faced challenges from various groups. The caliphate was a time of transition, and the political landscape was complex. The caliphate of ‘Umar b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz is remembered for its role in the early Islamic state, particularly in the expansion of the caliphate’s influence.
AN ARMENIAN FUTŪḤ NARRATIVE

առն զկին. բայց վստահրի պահանջները իրագրվում են հաճախ մեկ նրբոջերս. իսկ զանձակացնելու առանցք չպահանջում էր խրախ. երբ խառնի պահանջ չէր կապում, եթե հաճախ էր անհաս. բայց եթե ու的有效 արգիտունից, ապա ունի զատավ բնակիչ և առավել ավարտ.

Դառ զատավիերույք իրականում հաջողություն տրոյական իրավականությունների մեջ էր, որի նպատակ, միակ փակում մշակվում էր սակավա ձևով, և կազմակերպում էր թղթակից կազմակերպում. և երբեք իր մայր ապրել էր հետևից կազմակերպում:

Սուարից, եթե վորացին փակում դարձում, եփեր վրա ուրահանում էր բնակիչ և դարձում զամավթ էր հնար չոր: քանզի նախ այլոց տայք պղծել զկմ և առնուք. Իսկ զանխիղճ պոռնկութի վնելուց դեմ ռեսիմթ զամենում ստացուած և զալիս մարդկներ եր երձն ՝ մեծագնից գնելով մեծագնոց ստացուածում և յագեալք որ ընդ նման պղծութի վնել իբրև զանասուն վաճառէք: Ասեն զաւձէ էթէ ընդ միւռինէս զեռնոյ որ ի ծովու է ի խառնակում մերձաւութե գայ. և իբրև մերձենայ 

310 յեզր ծովուն զմահացու թոյնսն մերձավութենէն մերձավութե զմահացու թոյնսի մերձավութե զոր վաս մահու<

311 մարդկան. և միանգամայն կարծէր և ինքն սատանա. էթէ որք ննջեցին արդարքն կորեան արդեւք և մոռացեալք եղեն յԱստուշու կարծելով ի ձեռն մարմին և անբաւ խոնարհութե անն և զբան Աստուա այնպիսի ոտ. յորդորեաց զաշակերտն նորա ի մատնութի վն և զՀրէայսն ի սպանութե ան խորհուրդ. և տեսեալ զկամաւոր գալուստն Տեառ ն ի մահ խաչիս. երկուցեալ սկսաւ արհաւուրք կշտամբել զկմ դատաւորին առ ի խափանել զազգի մարդկան փրկութի վն և ճաշակե<

312 զմահ մարդկութ եամ բն. անմահ մնացեալ բնութ եամ բ աստուա ճշմարիտ յԱստուշ ճշմարտէ. յարեաւ մանաւանդ. և եթե յարոյց զիւր զմարդկութի ւն ն˙ ըստ մարգարէութե անն Դաւթի եթէ յարիցէ Աստուա և ցրուեսցին ամենայն թշնամիք նորա: Եւ յերկոտասան մարգարէսն, եթե մնայ ինձ յաւուր յարութե ան իմ. որ յարուցեալ.

313 փոքրագոյն խնամոց արարչին. հանդիպին հոգիքն ի Քրիստոս մարմինավութ եամ բանին: Արդ այսպէս սատանա անյուսութ եամ բն իւր և դիւացն իւրոց կորստեամբ և տկարութ եամ կապեալ առ ի յոչ ևս բռնազբաւսել զմարդիկ ի պաշտամունս աւտարոտի. զոր ոչ կամիցի Աստուշ. և յուսով ժառանգելոյ զուարական հուր գեհենին:

309 կանամբք read: կանամբք with printed editions; scribe omitted -p- because of haplogy.

310 մահակյա կատր- Հր- субскр.

311 պեսվի կատր- Օ- suprascr.

312 դփ և rt. մգ., 14.

313 մահակյա կատր- Ո- suprascr.

314 տարարակայ կատր- 1- suprascr.

315 տարարակայ կատր- 1- suprascr.

316 մահակյա կատր- 1- suprascr.

317 մահակյա կատր- 1- suprascr.

318 , կատր- 1- suprascr.

319 կատր- 1- suprascr.
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Ο720 ὤμπαγα[ρ]721 καὶ οἱ πρεσβεῖοι θηραράσθησιν τὸν Υμνήμενον, ὁμογενεῖαν τινῶν ἑιδώλων καὶ παραγόντων, ὡς τινὰς ἡμερομερίδες ὑμνημέναι στόματι ταύτα, ἀπεικονίζουσαν ἰδιαιτέρως τὸν ὕμνο τὸν θρήσκευτα. ἐπειδή οἱ ἔργοι των θηραράσκων ἰδιαιτέρως τὸν ὕμνον ἐπηρεασθέναι, καὶ εἰπεῖν τὸν ἐργασίαν τοῦ προσωπικοῦ ὕμνου καὶ τὸν ἐργασίαν τοῦ προσωπικοῦ ὕμνου, ἀπεικονίζουσαν τὸν ἑιδώλειαν τοὺς προσωπικούς. ἐπειδή οἱ ἔργοι των θηραράσκων ἰδιαιτέρως τὸν ὕμνον ἐπηρεασθέναι, καὶ εἰπεῖν τὸν ἐργασίαν τοῦ προσωπικοῦ ὕμνου καὶ τὸν ἐργασίαν τοῦ προσωπικοῦ ὕμνου, ἀπεικονίζουσαν τὸν ἑιδώλειαν τοὺς προσωπικούς.
Այս փուլը համապատասխան պատմականությանը նշանակված է մեկնեի և այդ թվում համարվել է ուսումնասիրել ու գրել ուսումնասիրական համանման համալսարանական ու կարգավորման գործում։ Այս փուլը շատ պատմականության բարձրացուցակներից չէ, և այսինքն նրանցից էլ մեկը համարվում է բազմության կարգավորման համար։ Այս փուլը ինչպես նաև այս փուլը երևում է ուսումնասիրությունների համար, որը մեկնելով է, և այսինքն բազմության կարգավորման համար։ Այս փուլը և այսինքն բազմության կարգավորման համար։ Այս փուլը և այսինքն բազմության կարգավորման համար։ Այս փուլը և այսինքն բազմության կարգավորման համար։ Այս փուլը և այսինքն բազմության կարգավորման համար։ Այս փուլը և այսինքն բազմության կարգավորման համար։
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VIll. THE CALIPHATE OF 'UMAR B. 'ABD AL-ʿAZĪZ

COMMENTARY

VIll.A. THE CALIPHATE OF 'UMAR B. 'ABD AL-ʿAZĪZ

Christians and Muslims alike recorded positive accounts about the caliph 'Umar b. 'Abd al-ʿAzīz (r. 99–101/717–20), rescuing his image from the wreckage of public opinion concerning the Umayyads. Lewond’s remarks about 'Umar compare him directly with the earlier caliphs: “They say that he was the most noble of all the men of his tribe” (քայուսւինու ուտքուանուացիքուն քայուսզիույթ ուտքուանուացիքու քայուսզիույթ քայուսզիույթ) [31v] and, later, “he also demonstrated greater sincerity to his own people than the previous ones who were princes before him did” (արիմին տեսանում ուց տեսանում ուց տեսանում ուց տեսանում ուց տեսանում [72v]). The description of 'Umar as one of the few meritorious Umayyads finds echoes elsewhere. Masʿūdī famously quotes the opinion of the ‘Abbāsid caliph Manṣūr, who denigrated the Umayyad caliphs but demurred somewhat in the case of 'Umar: “as for 'Umar b. 'Abd al-ʿAzīz, he was one-eyed among the blind” (اما عمر بن عبد العزيز، فكان اعور بين عميان). Portrayals of 'Umar as one of the only righteous Umayyads proliferated in Arabic, Syriac, and Greek. Beyond this similarity, however, Lewond’s account of 'Umar’s caliphate shows little concrete overlap with the themes of any other historiographical tradition.

Lewond includes very little information about 'Umar b. 'Abd al-ʿAzīz. He was noble and returned the captives taken by Muhammad b. Marwān; he wrote a letter to the Roman emperor to challenge Christianity; he instigated fiscal reforms. By contrast, Muslim sources focus on ‘Umar’s piety: he ruled like a Companion of the Prophet, worthy of comparison to the earlier caliph who shared his name, his maternal great-grandfather ‘Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb. He also appears imbued with eschatological expectations as the potential mahdī at the turn of the second century AH. The Syriac sources, including the Theophilius circuit (which circulated in Greek and Arabic, as well), focus instead on ‘Umar’s lifting of Maslama b. ‘Abd al-Malik’s siege of Constantinople, on his persecution of Christians, and on his prohibition of alcohol. None of these details appear in Lewond’s text, which suggests that these sets of sources emanated from different constellations of traditions that circulated widely across the Near East.

VIll.A.1. Returning Captives

The concern with the return of captives is specific to Lewond’s immediate Armenian context. Lewond connects the success of ‘Umar’s rule to the return of captives after the fires of Naxčawan/Nashawā (see chapter V), establishing ‘Umar as the corrector of Muḥammad b. Marwān: “He returned the captives whom Muhammad [b. Marwān] had captured from Armenia after burning the naxarark’ of this land, for he [Muḥammad] took many fortresses and captured men and women. When ‘Umar established his rule, he sent all of the

---

335 Masʿūdī, Murūj al-dhahab, 6:161.
336 On ‘Umar as mahdī and/or mujaddid, see Borrut, “Entre tradition et histoire”; Entre mémoire et pouvoir.
337 Lewond’s account of Maslama b. ‘Abd al-Malik’s siege of Constantinople appears later, during the reign of Hishām (from folio 75r onward).
captives to their own places and pacified the lands that were under his control” (Սա արարդան զոր գերեաց Մահմետ յաշխարհէս Հայոց. յետ այրելոյն զնախարարս աշխարհիս. զի առ զբազում ամրոցս. և գերեաց զարս և զկանայս: և իբրև հաստատեցաւ իշխանութիւն Ոմառա արձակեաց զբովանդակ գերեալսն յիւրաքանչիւր տեղիս) [31v–32r]. This information diverges from that in Arabic and Syriac sources but aligns closely with the second/eighth-century martyrology of Vahan Goł’tac’i. Vahan was taken prisoner as a child of only four years, along with his mother, when Muḥammad b. Marwān burned the churches in Naxčawan/Nashawā. Vahan’s Vita praises ʿUmar b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz in much the same way as Lewond does: “When ʿUmar sat at the head of the Tačiks, God cast into his heart remembrance of the injustice that was upon the Armenians. He gave the order to gather the captives with great diligence, and upon gathering them, he released them all” (Եւ իբրեւ նստաւ Ոմառ ի գլխաւորութիւն Տաճկաց, արկ ի սիրտ նորա Աստուած յիշել զանիրաւութիւնն որ առ Հայս․ հրաման տայր ժողովել զգերեալս մեծաւ պնդութեամբ․ և ի ժողովելն՝ արձակեաց զամենեսեան).338 This similarity is specific to Armenian texts and circumstances and likely reflects the local traditions about the fires in Naxčawan/Nashawā.

VII.A.2. Fiscal Reforms

Lewond also claims that ʿUmar “opened the stores of the treasury and distributed salaries to the officers” (զմթերս գանձուց բացեալ բաշխէր հռոք սըպայիցն) [72v]. This reference, though oblique, may refer to the fiscal reforms that ʿUmar enacted. ʿUmar circulated a rescript about his fiscal reforms to his provincial governors, preserved today in Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam’s third/ninth-century Sīrat ʿUmar b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz. This text outlines the expectations facing Muslims, Muslim converts, and non-Muslims as regards taxation; some legal specifications (such as the prohibition against alcohol); and the financial claims of the caliphs. In his discussion of the fifth (khums, on which see below at folio 84r), ʿUmar makes a claim to caliphal control over the spoils of war, arguing that it cannot be farmed out to local leaders.339

VII.B. RELATIONSHIP TO THE OTHER VERSIONS OF THE ʿUMAR-LEO CORRESPONDENCE

Lewond’s text includes one of six surviving versions of the correspondence between ʿUmar b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz and Leo the Isaurian.

1. The earliest extant manuscript is a Latin translation from Arabic, preserved in an early third/ninth-century manuscript housed today in Paris. Three other Latin manuscripts, preserved in Madrid (fifth/eleventh century), Tortosa (seventh/thirteenth century), and Salamanca (eighth/fourteenth or ninth/fifteenth century), contain variants of this version.

2. A Christian Arabic version from Mount Sinai survives in a fourth/tenth-century manuscript.

3. A single quire exists of a Muslim Arabic version from a late third/ninth- or early fourth/tenth-century manuscript, housed today in Istanbul but originally discovered in the Great Mosque of Damascus.

4. Lewond’s Armenian version, reproduced here.

5. An Aljamiado version is reproduced in two tenth/sixteenth-century manuscripts. Given the overlap between the two texts, it is clear that the Aljamiado is a translation from the earlier Muslim Arabic version (no. 3 above).

6. A heavily revised version of the Latin was printed in Lyons in the early sixteenth century and republished by Migne in the *Patrologia Graeca*. With one exception, scholarship about the Latin version of the correspondence thus far has relied solely on the printed editions.

Common strands of material connect all extant versions of the correspondence. The existence of this connective tissue suggests that the six different texts should be analyzed intertextually despite the dramatic differences between them. In addition to a common core of argumentation, there are also groupings of traditions. For example, the Christian Arabic and Latin versions demonstrate closer parallels with each other than they do with the other versions. The Aljamiado text, as pointed out above, is a translation of the Muslim Arabic version; together, they form a second grouping. Lewond’s version is a translation of a Greek *Vorlage*, representing a third grouping of the ’Umar-Leo correspondence. Further, there is a close connection between the Greek-Armenian and Arabic-Aljamiado groupings. As J.-M. Gaudeul has pointed out, the Armenian version responds to the challenges levied in the Muslim Arabic and Aljamiado versions. It follows the same order of arguments and cites the same biblical verses.

All six versions of the ’Umar-Leo correspondence have been edited and translated and will, in the future, be published in the LAMINE series. For more information on the relationship between the six versions, we invite readers to refer to that volume. Here, a single concrete example suffices to demonstrate both the common strands and the close relationship between the Greek-Armenian and Muslim Arabic–Aljamiado versions. The Aljamiado text explains that Jesus could not be the Lord because he himself refers to someone else as the Lord. It then cites multiple proof texts from the Bible to support this claim. The author of Lewond’s version responds to the specific wording found in the Aljamiado citations of Christian scripture. For example, the Aljamiado cites a combination of multiple biblical verses: “I cannot do anything, and cannot say anything, without the power of my Lord. What I do, I do, and what I say, I say in the power and name of my Lord God who has sent me” (“Yo no puedo fazer cosa ni puedo fablar sino que seya con poder de mi Señor. Que fago lo que fago, y fablo lo que fablo con el poder y nombre de mi Señor Allah, aquel que me á enviado”). The Armenian text then responds:

---

340 The sole exception is Vivancos, who established that the version contained in the Latin manuscript was translated from Arabic in Spain because of its use of the Mozarabic Psalter; Vivancos, “La Epistola Leonis.”

341 Gaudeul, “Correspondence.”

But when He prayed, He did not say as you wrote. Rather, He said: “Father, if it is possibile, take this cup from me.” . . . He said: “The Son of Man cannot do anything by himself, but the Father, who has dwelt in me, does the work.” If you believe this [verse] of scripture, “I cannot do anything by myself,” believe that one, [which says,] “The Father, who has dwelt in me, does the work.”

The author of the Armenian version identifies a problem in challenges levied against Christianity by Muslim polemicists, namely, that “you remove a word [from a verse], which is produced as a witness, so that where ‘Father’ is written, you replace it with ‘Lord’ or ‘God’” (և զբան զոր առնի վկաութի ի բաց բաժանես. զի ուր հայր գրեալ է, Տ է ր կամ Ա ստուա ծ փոխեալ դնես) [48r]. The author of the Armenian version cites nearly all of the biblical verses found in the Aljamiado version in the same order, arguing about the polemicists’ use of specific words. This level of detail and organization demonstrates the close relationship between the Greek-Armenian and the Muslim Arabic–Aljamiado groupings. Although the Christian Arabic and Latin grouping includes references to these same arguments, the authors did not seem to understand the argument that Muslims were not citing Christian scripture precisely.

The connection between the six versions of the correspondence and, in particular, the close relationship between the Greek-Armenian and Muslim Arabic–Aljamiado groupings suggest that these other versions should inform the interpretation of Lewond’s text. For example, at one point the author of Leo’s letter refers to Satan as the treasurer of God: “As for what you said about Satan and the souls of the righteous, you make Satan the treasurer of God” (Իսկ վասն սատանաի և արդարոցն հոգւոց զսատանա Ա ստուծո յ գանձապահ առնէք) [68r]. With the Armenian text alone, this reference is oblique. However, it becomes clearer with recourse to the Muslim Arabic text, which challenges the idea that the souls of the prophets who lived after Adam but before the coming of Jesus should reside in hell: “And why should God—may He be glorified and praised!—make Iblīs treasurer of the souls of the prophets and the righteous of His creation who served Him and did not allow him to exert power over them? Why should Satan prevail over God regarding these souls?” (لا ـما كان الله سبحانه ويحمده ليستخزن ابليس على انفس انيابه وصلى خلقه الذين يعبدونه ولا) [344]. In the Armenian version, then, that phrase “you make Satan the treasurer of God” is not a Christian charge against Muslims but a direct quotation from a Muslim text that the Christian author attempts to rebut.

343 Lewond, Discours historique, 431 n. 128.
344 Burman et al., A Connecting Polemic, citing the only extant manuscript, currently in the Turkish and Islamic Arts Museum in Istanbul (MS Ş_E_4419), fol. 3v.
VII. THE CALIPHATE OF ʿUMAR B. ʿABD AL-ʿAZĪZ

VII.C. THE COMPOSITION AND TRANSLATION OF LEWOND’S VERSION OF THE CORRESPONDENCE

The Armenian version of the correspondence between ʿUmar and Leo has been the subject of several significant debates since the middle of the twentieth century. The collection of all six versions of the correspondence has prompted a reevaluation of some of the main points of earlier publications on the topic. Here, we establish three main points. First, the Armenian version as found in Lewond’s text is a translation from Greek and was not originally composed in Armenian. Second, the now-lost Greek Vorlage was composed in the second/eighth century. Finally, the correspondence was part of Lewond’s original composition in the second/eighth century, not added at some later date.

VII.C.1. Lewond’s Version as a Translation from Greek

The dating and original context of the letter of Leo have proven elusive and contentious. Akinean argued that the letter had been translated from Greek. In his study of Byzantine iconoclasm during the reign of Leo III, Gero instead came to the conclusion that the letter of Leo found in Lewond’s text was an original Armenian composition. He suggested that a fifth/eleventh- or sixth/twelfth-century reviser of Lewond’s History composed the letter and inserted it into Lewond’s text on the basis of a reference to a letter in the fourth/tenth-century History of T’ovma Arcruni. Gero’s theory was subsequently accepted by other scholars, but it has faced renewed criticism.

A Greek Vorlage to the Armenian text is supported by four arguments. First, the text transliterates certain Greek terms into Armenian and refers to Greek as “our language.” For example, Leo observes that the books of the Bible that “the Hebrews [call] Kohelet’ and Širat’sirim, we call Paṙimon [Παροιμίαι, Proverbs] and Samaton [Ἁσμάτων, from Άσμα Άσματων]” (Տառատոր, երբեքեր, Ամսան, Ամսան) [39r]. Similarly, in Leo’s discussion of the definition of the word “Paraclete,” he asserts that it ‘means’ comforter and not Aḥmah [as you think], that is, ‘I give thanks, euk’aristē [i.e., εὐχαριστῶ], in our language, not paraklētos” [44r]. In its citation of Isaiah 60:13 [66r], the text uses pēkiw (pekiw) and pēkiwṙisaw (pekiwrisaw) for cypress and pine, both from Greek πε��η, though pēkiwṙisaw is likely a corruption of κυπάρισσος. On folio 68r, the word miwṙinēs (miwṙinēs) derives from Greek μύριαι in a passage that is probably indebted to Basil’s Hexaemeron.

Second, there are syntactical constructions that read awkwardly in Armenian but may reflect a more literal rendering of the Greek text underneath. For example, on folio 48r, we have translated արասցուք (“let us make”) as “let us consider,” suggesting that the verb here renders Greek ποιῆσωμεν, which can mean “to consider,” “to reckon.” On folio 66r, we take the phrase յանդիման տեսանում (“looking opposite”) to render Greek ἐπισκοπέω and translate it as “looking at.”

346 See the discussion in Lewond, Discours historique.
Third, on folio 58r the author refers to the pericope of the bloody sweat and the strengthening by the angel in Luke 22:43–44. Although the passage was known to Armenian authors, it does not appear in extant copies of the Armenian Gospel of Luke before the sixth/twelfth century and becomes common only in the seventh/thirteenth. The pericope was a central point of contention in the Julianist controversies in Armenia in the first/seventh and second/eighth centuries and was unlikely to be used as a proof text in this context by an Armenian polemicist at any time.348

Finally, pace Gero, there are certain cases in which a citation disagrees with the Armenian Bible and shows signs of having been translated directly from the Greek Bible. For example, in the citation of Psalm 136(137):2 [41r], the letter reads, “we hung up our instruments.” “Instruments” (զգործարանս) is a translation of τὰ ὀργανα in the Septuagint and does not match զկտակարանս, “covenants,” in the Armenian Bible. Similarly, in the next verse, the letter renders the Septuagint’s “words of song” (λόγους ὑδόν) as բանս երգոց (“words of songs”), rather than the Armenian Bible’s բանս աւրութեան (“words of blessing”). Additionally, the letter cites the end of that verse in accordance with the Septuagint and differs completely from the Armenian Bible. Leo’s letter here reads “and those who carried us away [asked for] words of blessing” (եւ տարիչք մեր բանս աւրութեան), which aligns with the Greek Bible’s “and they who carried us away [asked for] a hymn” (καὶ οἱ ἀπαγαγόντες ἡμᾶς ὕμνον) but not with the Armenian Bible’s “our captors forced us and were saying” (զգարշապար մեր ստիպէին զմեզ եւ ասէին). Likewise, the letter cites Psalm 148:5–6 [63r] as “he commanded and they were built” (շինեցան), following the Septuagint (ἐκτίσθησαν), against the Armenian “he commanded and it was established” (հաստատեցաւ). The citation of Psalm 40:10(41:9) [55r–v] reflects an error that could have happened only in Greek. The text cites David, who prophesied, “He who ate my bread magnified his heel over me.” The mistaken use of the word “heel” (զգարշապար) here must be due to a misreading of the Septuagint’s πτερνισμόν, “cunning,” as πτέρναν, “heel.” It is not possible to derive the reading “heel” (զգարշապար) from the Armenian Bible’s wording, “deception” (խաբէութիւն). Other examples have been noted in the footnotes to the translation.349

In support of his argument that the letter was originally composed in Armenian, Gero pointed to instances in which the letter’s citations of the Bible adhere to the Armenian text rather than the Greek. However, the quotation of Psalm 109(110):1, 3 [51v], shown in figure 9, reveals that the scribe, Sargis, sometimes hypercorrected his text by inadvertently supplying the reading of the Armenian Bible, although in this case he subsequently restored the original, Septuagint-based text. The verse in question reads: “With you is the beginning of power,350 the brilliance of your saints” (ընդ քեզ է սկիզբն զաւրութեան սրբոց քոյ). Sargis originally wrote the pronoun ինձ before սկիզբն, probably on the basis of his recollection of the Armenian text, but subsequently erased it. He probably realized that the pronoun was not in fact in his exemplar, which lacked the dative of

348 On the treatment of this episode in the Armenian Bible, see Cowe, “Christological Trends.”
349 See the citation of John 14:26 on fol. 44r; of Psalm 21:7–9(22:6–8) on fol. 51r–v; of Micah 5:2 on fol. 53v; and of Zephaniah 3:8 on fol. 68v.
350 The “beginning of power” is a scribal error for the “beginning of the days of power”; the word for “days,” տարիչք, has been omitted by parablepsis.
the first person personal pronoun, in agreement with the Septuagint. The substitution of պայծառութիւն, “brilliance,” for վայելչութիւն, “beauty,” as in the Armenian text, also reflects the Greek text: λαμπρότησιν, from λαμπρότης, which is normally rendered պայծառութիւն in Armenian. This example suggests that Sargis likely relied on his recollection of the Armenian Bible when copying certain citations, which may explain why the text is closer to the Armenian Bible in some instances.

In the case of Psalm 109(110), Sargis restored the text by checking the original manuscript from which he was copying the text, but elsewhere it is possible that errors occurred through aural confusion at the time of translation. The process of translation often involved two people. One person would read out a translation of the original text while the other—a scribe—committed it to paper. On folio 47v, we suggest that the meaningless զոյլ եւ պետ is an error for ծուլապէս caused by the scribe’s mishearing of what the translator said. This error was then faithfully transmitted by Sargis when he made his copy.

On the basis of the above evidence, we agree with those scholars who have argued that the letter was composed in Greek and then translated into Armenian. The dating of the Armenian translation’s Greek Vorlage, however, has proven equally difficult to ascertain. Although the letter’s inclusion within Lewond’s late second/eighth-century text would seem to indicate that it was originally composed earlier in that century, some scholars have suggested that the letter was in fact written in the third/ninth century and interpolated into Lewond’s work. Although no absolute certainty is possible on this question, below we argue that the Greek text was most likely composed in the second/eighth century and was integral to Lewond’s original composition.

VII.C.2. Dating the Greek Vorlage of the Armenian Letter

The main argument for dating the original letter of Leo to later than the second/eighth century has been its anachronistic references to Islamic sects that appeared only in the third/ninth century. The interpretation of these references, however, has been incorrect and often based on mere supposition. In fact, all of the sects mentioned in the text can be securely located in the Umayyad period (see below under “The Sects of Islam”). Additionally, there is positive, albeit meager, evidence to suggest that the letter was composed in the second/eighth century.
We should first note that cues in the text itself that seem to locate its composition chronologically are inconclusive. The author of the letter from Leo to ‘Umar at one point asserts a second/eighth-century date of composition by claiming that he was writing a hundred years after the emergence of Islam: “The time since its appearance, as you yourself say, has been one hundred years, more or less” (վաճառքից երկուսունս դառնալով պատրաստվելու համար p. Ḥuṭṭaḥ. ութ փնտրի ծնունդ ստացելու համար) [45r]. The year AH 100 corresponds to 718–19 CE. However, he also writes that “[It has been] eight hundred years, more or less, since Christ appeared and the Gospel was spread among all the peoples and languages of man” (վսակագույն ընդհանուր ծնունդ ստացելու համար p. Ḥuṭṭaḥ. ութ փնտրի ստացելու համար) [45v–46r]. On its own, this second claim would suggest a third/ninth-century date of composition. However, the addition of the phrase “more or less” and the inclusion of both contradictory claims nearly back to back in the same passage make it clear that these numbers cannot be taken to indicate precise measurements of time. We must look elsewhere to date Lewond’s version of the correspondence.

As J. Meyendorff has observed, Leo’s defense of the use of images as an opportunity for the glorification of God is consonant with the position expressed by the Patriarch Germanus (sed. 715–30) around 720 CE in his letters and generally points to an intellectual and theological context that predates the iconoclastic edict of 726 CE.351 It would have been highly unlikely that the author would support an iconophile position in the charged atmosphere of the Iconoclastic Controversy. This piece of evidence points to a date of original composition for the correspondence between 717 (the year both ‘Umar and Leo came to power) and 726 CE.

Other incidental details also support a second/eighth-century composition. For example, the claim that “you make [Jesus] a companion and equal to the incomparable power of God and like Him, [thereby] professing three gods” (վաճառքից երկուսունս դառնալով պատրաստվելու համար p. Ḥuṭṭaḥ. ութ փնտրի ստացելու համար) [33r] reflects Umayyad anti-Trinitarian slogans: “He has no associate” (لا شريك له) and Qur’an 112:4, “He has no equal” (نَّبِيَّ مَلِكَة ْ وَلَمْ يَكُنْ لَهُ عِبَادَة أَحْدَة). Both are found on the inscriptions from 72/691 inside the Dome of the Rock, and the former is also inscribed on Marwānid reformed coinage.352

One last potential objection to a second/eighth-century date of composition that can be leveled, but has not been in previous scholarship, is the enigmatic description of Islamic practices during the ḥajj in Leo’s letter that are otherwise found only in later texts. Addressing the Muslims, the letter charges:

You do not know why you worship and kiss the rock that you call rukn. And [you do not know the reason] for the demonic slaughter that the beasts and the birds abhor. [And you do not know the reason] they [the worshippers] would run on one foot, or [the reason] for the rock-throwing, for the fleeing, for the shaving [of] the head, or for the other shameful deeds that they commit.

352 Bacharach, “Signs of Sovereignty”; Donner, Muhammad and the Believers, 235; Kessler, “ʿAbd al-Malik’s Inscription.”
The odd allusion to “running on one foot” is particularly confusing, but its meaning can be better understood through reference to an Armenian translation of a Karshuni text that purports to preserve details of the life of the Prophet Muḥammad as narrated by a convert to Islam in the first/seventh century. According to this text, Muslim pilgrims hop around the Kaʿba on one foot to honor the precedent of Abraham. Sarah made Abraham promise not to dismount when he visited Ishmael, out of fear that he would find Hagar or another woman there. To keep his promise, Abraham set one foot on a rock and left the other foot on his mount. His single footprint remained in the rock—“the rock gave way to his foot, showing the imprint” (եւ վիմին տեղի տուեալ մի ոտինն զհետն ցուցանէ) and this location became maqām Ibrāhīm, the site of Abraham, in the Kaʿba.354 When Muḥammad set the rituals of the ḥajj, “he told [the Muslims] to circle the outside [of] the <st>one where Abraham’s footprint is, running on one foot” (զարտաքին <վիմ>ովն, ուր զոտնահետ Աբրահամու ասաց, շուրժ գալով՝ միոտանի վազելով).356

The earliest manuscript of this Karshuni text dates to 1273 ce, but it served as a source for the sixth/twelfth-century history of Mxitʿar Anecʿi and, independently, the seventh/thirteenth-century history of Vardan Arewelcʿi, so the Armenian translation must have been executed at least by then. The original Karshuni document could have been composed at any point between the first/seventh and sixth/twelfth centuries. This is the only detail that is shared between Leo’s letter and the Karshuni text, which suggests that the author of the correspondence was not working from this text. Instead, both he and the author of the Karshuni document seem to have had access to a common interpretative tradition of the ḥajj that circulated in Christian polemical circles. Therefore, the Karshuni text and the later Armenian histories are useful for unpacking the meaning of the letter’s obscure reference, but they cannot be used to help date the letter itself.

Without the argument that the sects of Islam mentioned in the letter appear only in the third/ninth century, there is no evidence to disprove a second/eighth-century date for the composition of the Greek letter and, in fact, some circumstantial evidence exists. A date of composition between 717 and 726 ce would have made it possible for the letter to have been translated into Armenian and included in Łewond’s History by the 170s/780s. As a point of comparison, we may observe that the earliest Latin version of the letter of Leo was translated from Arabic in Spain and then copied in southern France, all by the first half of the third/ninth century. The speed of transmission of the correspondence is thus attested elsewhere, even further afield than Armenia.357 The question remains, however,
whether this was the case for the Armenian version or whether someone translated the letter later on and inserted it into Lewond’s work before the copying of M1902, the earliest manuscript witness to the *History* copied between 1274 and 1311 CE.

**VII.C.3. A Second/Eighth-Century Translation Incorporated into Lewond’s History**

At this time, it is not possible to determine when the translation was executed on the basis of any internal evidence of translation method. Instead, the dating of the translation has hinged on the date of the Greek *Vorlage* and on whether the letter should be considered integral to Lewond’s text. As the Greek original was likely composed in the second/eighth century, the only arguments for a third/ninth-century (or later) date of translation into Armenian have been based on the reception history of the correspondence and on stylistic concerns with respect to Lewond’s *History*. Neither of these arguments, however, is convincing. Besides Lewond’s text, the exchange of letters between ʿUmar and Leo is mentioned in the *History of the House of Arcrunik* of T’ovma Arcruni. T’ovma composed his work shortly after 904 CE and shows some familiarity with Lewond’s *History*, although he does not name him. T’ovma’s reference to the correspondence would seem to support the existence of an Armenian version by the end of the third/ninth century, but he does not cite the letters themselves, and his very brief summary of them does not necessarily demonstrate that he had knowledge of the correspondence as found in Lewond’s *History*. T’ovma’s testimony thus does not definitively corroborate that the letters existed in Lewond’s work or in Armenian by the third/ninth century, but neither does it disprove it.

It has also been noted that Step’anos Tarōnec’i, who wrote around 1004–5 CE and relied on Lewond for much of his information on this period in his *Universal History*, does not mention the correspondence. However, this fact alone cannot prove that the correspondence did not exist when Tarōnec’i wrote his *Universal History*. Further, Tarōnec’i’s account of ʿUmar’s caliphate appears defective. He recounts the reign of Sulēyman (the Umayyad caliph Sulaymān b. ʿAbd al-Malik, r. 96–99/715–17) and at the end writes: “Then, after ʿUmar, Yazīd became prince for six years” (Իսկ յետ Օմարայ եկաց իշխան Եզիտ ամս 6). Either Tarōnec’i skipped over ʿUmar’s entire reign or material has been lost from the text. The latter seems likely given that the phrasing used to introduce Yazīd implies that something had been said about ʿUmar. In addition, many manuscripts of the *Universal History* bear other lacunae at this point in the text. They omit the ends of sections II.iii and II.iv as well as the entirety of II.v and II.vi. Tarōnec’i’s silence on the correspondence, then, should be considered in light of the overall absence of any information on ʿUmar’s caliphate in his text and the question of the transmission history of the text itself. Whether it was authorial or scribal error that resulted in the omission of ʿUmar’s caliphate, Tarōnec’i’s work provides no support for excluding the correspondence from Lewond’s *History*.

358 Arcruni, *Patmut’iwn*, ed. Patkanov, 105; *History*, 171. As mentioned above, it is this *History* that Gero speculated served as the inspiration for the composition of the letter.
361 Asolik, *Patmut’iwn tiezerakan*, 130.
Finally, there is the relationship between the letter, the Karshuni document, and the histories of Mxit’ar Aneci’i and Vardan Arewelci’i mentioned above. It could be argued that as the details about the specific practices of hajj do not appear in Armenian until the sixth/twelfth and seventh/thirteenth centuries, the letter was likely translated in that period, when there was particular interest in those customs and the origins of Islam. As noted earlier, however, there is no direct relationship between these texts. This is the only point of similarity between the text of the letter and the Karshuni document that served as the source for the other two histories. Moreover, it is just as probable that the increased interest in Islamic history and practice in Armenia at this time motivated the copying of the entire text of Lewond, including the correspondence. The earliest manuscript that includes Lewond’s History also preserves the Armenian translation of the Georgian Royal Annals, which shares some of the same discourse on Islam as that found in Mxit’ar Aneci’i and Vardan Arewelci’i. Additionally, if the letter had been translated separately from Lewond’s text in the sixth/twelfth or seventh/thirteenth century, we would expect manuscript evidence attesting to its independent circulation. In fact, however, it appears only within the text of Lewond’s History or, much later, excerpted from it. Although this is only an argument ex silentio, the manuscript evidence does not support the circulation of the letter independently of Lewond’s text.

A more weighty objection to considering the correspondence integral to the original composition of the History is that its presence creates stylistic imbalances in the narrative. The correspondence’s length is disproportional to the rest of the work. In addition, in contrast to other letters cited in the History, the text of the Leo-‘Umar correspondence shows no evidence of having been revised by Lewond to conform to the language or style of the rest of work. Finally, Lewond does not show concern with religious controversies—whether between Christianity and Islam or within Christianity itself—anywhere else in his work. On the other hand, lengthy epistolary exchanges are a commonplace in Armenian historiography. Although this particular correspondence may be of extraordinary size for a work of this length, there is no sense that narrative balance was a stylistic concern for Lewond. Of the other explicitly labeled written communications included in the History, only that between Maslama b. ‘Abd al-Malik and Leo (see chapter IX) is truly analogous. In that instance, Lewond likely did not have access to an Armenian version of the correspondence and composed something apposite instead. Despite the very different contexts in which the actors exchange epistles, Leo’s response to Maslama resonates with his earlier reply to ‘Umar, particularly in its defense of the cross and in Leo’s derision

363 Cf. Lewond, Discours historique, 349.
364 On Lewond’s silence regarding theological controversies, see the Introduction.
365 See the discussion in Lewond, Discours historique, 349.
366 For example, the space apportioned to and the amount of detail provided for each caliphal reign differ between chapters, as they do for individual battles and sieges. Such discrepancies may reasonably be accounted for by the source material that was available to Lewond, but he did not attempt to offset these imbalances for the sake of stylistic considerations.
367 Cf. Lewond, Discours historique, 349 n. 30. The letter of Sahak, if authentic, was presumably not a translation but originally written in Armenian; the letter between Muhammad and Čenbakur is a literary fiction and possibly Lewond’s own invention.
Likewise, Leo has recourse to Psalm 43(44) to claim that Christians put their faith in God in both letters. In addition, it has been shown that the use of prophetic texts in the correspondence is consistent with Łewond’s conception of prophecy and his attitude toward Muslim political power.

Finally, we may note that the correspondence is marked off by the scribe Sargis in M1902 in exactly the same manner as other quoted material and that it does not appear to have been added by him (fig. 10). If someone had interpolated the text after Łewond, that alteration had to have been accomplished before Sargis obtained the text. However, it is likely that Sargis worked from the original of Łewond’s text, as the end of the text contains only his colophon, with no record of an earlier colophon.

In conclusion, we agree with Mahé that the burden of proof rests with those who wish to challenge the traditional dating ascribed to the correspondence. As no evidence has come to light that decisively precludes the composition of the original Greek text in the second/eighth century, its translation into Armenian shortly thereafter, and its inclusion by Łewond in his original text, we conclude that it is indeed a second/eighth-century work translated from Greek and incorporated by Łewond in his History.

VII.D. SECTARIANISM IN THE SECOND/EIGHTH CENTURY AS REPRESENTED IN THE CORRESPONDENCE

One of the points of argumentation of the ‘Umar-Leo correspondence is the division of both Christianity and Islam into various groups.

VII.D.1. The Sects of Islam

Leo’s letter asserts that the Muslims have broken into more sects than the Christians have. He lists the “K’uzi, Sabart’urabi, Kntri, Murji, Basli, the godless J[i]di, who deny the existence

368 Cf. fols. 70v and 77v–79r.
369 La Porta, “Sense of an Ending,” 377–79.
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of God and the resurrection and the sayings of your prophet, and the Hariwri” (پیامبر، پیامبر، پیامبر، پیامبر، پیامبر، پیامبر، پیامبر، پیامبر، پیامبر). Scholars have interpreted these names to support a third/ninth-century date for this version of the correspondence, but these groups all existed in the Umayyad period.

Most modern sources identify the K’uzi as the Khārijites even though the Khārijites appear again later in the list. However, the term “K’uzi” may refer to the Küziyya, a sect of Islam that was particularly concerned with questions of purity. The Küziyya believed that they should not introduce impurities into the earth through urination or defecation. They received their name from the küz, or jugs, in which they relieved themselves. They were also noteworthy for covering their genitals during prayer out of fear of accidental distraction and for refusing to pray in pants (preferring, presumably, a different type of clothing).

K. Chahnazarian understands the next name, Sabart’uṙabi, to represent a conflation of two separate sects. He identifies the first, which he calls "celle des Djobbâiens ou de Sabar," as the adherents of Abū ʿAlī Muhammad b. ʿAbd al-Wahhāb al-Jubbāʾī (d. 303/916), a Muʿtazilī scholar. A. Jeffery instead suggests that the reference is to the earlier, fatalist sect of the Jabariyya. The reading of “Sabar” as “Jubbāʾiyya” or “Jabariyya” requires substantiation. Chahnazarian’s “Djobbâiens” does not appear in Łewond’s text. Instead, we contend that Lewond’s Sabart’uṙabi (Uuwpurmanuşp) is a scribal error for Sabait’uṙabi (Uuwpurmanuşp); the only difference is in the letters p (r) and h (i), which are easily confused in transmission. The designation sabāʾi derives from ‘Abd Allāh b. Sabāʾ (fl. first/seventh century) and appears frequently in Islamic heresiography to refer to the ghulāt, or “extremist” Shiʿī groups who espoused beliefs rejected by the mainstream Muslim community, though the definition of the term appears fluid over time. The name T’uṙabi renders the Arabic turābī, a more generic pejorative term for an ‘Alid group derived from the kunya Abū Turāb, or “father of mud,” referring to ʿAli b. Abī Ṭālib. The joint term “Sabart’uṙabi” likely renders what Ibn Aʿtham calls “this vile band of Sabaʾī-Turābīs” (السبائیة الترابیة) used in reference to the Shīʿī supporters of the rebel Mukhtār al-Thaqafi (d. 67/671–72). The term turābī also appears linked to the nisba Sabaʾi elsewhere, referring to the Shiʿa who refused to accept Muʿāwiya as caliph. In 51/671–72, Ṭabarī has Ziyād b. Abīhi write to complain: “Verily, devils from these Turābīyya, Sabāʾiyya—their leader is Ḥujr b. ‘Adi—have defied the Commander of the Faithful, split from the united community of Muslims, and declared war against us”

371 On the Küziyya, see Lewinstein, “Notes.” The authors would like to thank Antoine Borrut for bringing this reference to their attention. See also Lewinstein, "Notes," 596 n. 108; Khalidi, “Muʿtazilī Historiography.”
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In other words, the Arabic equivalent of the name Sabait’urabi, which combines two designators to refer to Shi‘ı heretics with anti-Umayyad political aspirations, is attested in Arabic historical accounts. These passages gloss the term sabaʾī to clarify to the reader that it refers to turābi, that is, an ‘Alid group the authors wish to denigrate.

The identification of the next two sects is uncontested. The Kntri are probably the Qadariyya (fl. from the first/seventh century on), who believed in free will. The Murji are undoubtedly the Murji’a (fl. from the first/seventh century on), so called because they withheld judgment about the beliefs of others. The next sect, Basli, is possibly a Mu’tazili group that followed Wāsil b. ‘Ata’ (d. 131/748–49). However, other interpretations are also possible—notably based on the name’s similarity to that of Hasan al-Heṣrī (d. 110/728), a celebrated theologian whose work provided much impetus for later developments in Șūfī thought. Without additional information on the Basli, it may not be possible to determine their identity with any conviction.

The identification of the next sect, accused of denying the existence of God, the resurrection, and the sayings of the prophet, has provoked some debate. Chahnazarian identified “the godless J ̌di” as followers of Jāhiẓ, famous for his works of adab and his Mu’tazili theology. Jeffery attempted to support this identification through an appeal to logic: “The thoroughgoing philosophical scepticism of Jāhiẓ, and his clever mockery of much that the orthodox taught both about Allah and the hereafter, may well have sounded like a denial of both.” Such an interpretation of the J ̌di would suggest a third/ninth-century date for this text, given that Jāhiẓ died in 255/868. In an appropriately caustic footnote, however, P. Crone and M. Cook remind scholars that “the ‘Jāhiẓiyya’ are an invention of the modern translators.” Recently, Armenologists have offered another possible explanation for the “godless J ̌di.” Mahé, following Ter-Levondyan, suggests that they are the followers of Jahm b. Šafwān (d. 128/746). Yet given the form of the name J̌di (with an d, but without an h or an m), it seems rather more likely that the “godless J ̌di” refers to Ja’diyya, the followers of Ja’đ b. Dirham. Ja’d was put to death for heresy sometime between 105/724 and 120/738. He appears in some sources as a mentor to Jahm b. Šafwān and in others as a tutor to the last Umayyad caliph, Marwān b. Muḥammad. Ja’d seems to have espoused views that challenged anthropomorphism, as he was accused of denying the attributes of God, challenging the close relationship between God and His prophets (namely, that Abraham was a “friend” of God or that Moses spoke to God), and questioning whether the Qurʾān could be the word of God. Other sources cite his denial of the resurrection, just as the author of Leo’s letter claims. That said, the accusations of heresy leveled against Ja’d are at times contradictory, such that Ja’d appears as a catch-all for Umayyad-era heretical notions.
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The final sect mentioned in Leo’s letter is the Hariwri, which renders the Arabic Ḥarūriyya via the Greek Απουπηρη. The name Ḥarūriyya derives from toponym Ḥarūra, located near Kufa. When ‘Ali b. Abi Ṭalib agreed to mediation with the Umayyads at the battle of Siffin in 37/657, the Khārijites broke away from his forces in protest and gathered in the town of Ḥarūra. The Khārijites were remembered as an extremely destructive force throughout the Umayyad period. The author claims that one group of Khārijites “consider killing you to be the best [form of] righteousness” (قَتَالَتُكُمْ أَوْفَىٰ بِهَا صَبْرٌ) [45r]. Isti’rāḍ, which broadly means “slaughter,” also served as a technical term for the murder of non-Khārijite Muslims that was deemed licit by certain Khārijite sects such as the Azāriqa.

The sects mentioned in Lewond’s version therefore cannot substantiate an argument for a late date, as they are all consistent with the claim of Umayyad-era authorship.

VII.D.2. The Groups within Christianity

In the passage designed to reveal the divisions within Islam, the author of Leo’s letter also explains and rejects the Muslim belief that there were seventy-two sects of Christianity: “Then you said that after the disciples of the Lord we divided into seventy-two groups. It is not so” (لَاتِنْيِنَٰ كَانُونٍ لِّمِنَ الْقَانُوْنِ الْعَالِمِيَّ) [45r]. The Aljamiado version of ‘Umar’s letter to Leo includes this accusation: “You [Christians] went away from Jesus and the apostles regarding seventy-two beliefs through lying against them” (“Y partiestes vos depois de Ísá y de los apóstoles de setanta y dos cre-<ye>ncias por esmentimiento a ellos”),

With its focus on the number of sects within Christianity, this section demonstrates the author’s familiarity with a famous hadith. Recorded in the hadith collections of Ibn Mājah, Abu Dā’ud, Tirmidhi, and Nasā’i, the ḥadīth al-tafriqa (the ḥadīth of divisions) has the Prophet Muhammad explain:

The Jews divided into seventy-one sects and a single one is in heaven, while seventy are in hell. The Christians divided into seventy-two sects and seventy-one are in hell, while a single one is in heaven. And as for that which was under the authority of Muhammad himself: indeed, my community will divide into seventy-three sects and a single one is in heaven, while seventy-two are in hell. They said: O messenger of God, who are they? He responded: the collective community.
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This version of the hadith al-tafriqa reflects an explicitly Sunnī perspective, as the Prophet Muhammad reportedly acknowledged the righteous stance of al-jamāʿa, a phrase that evokes the name ahl al-sunna wa-l-jamāʿa (i.e., Sunnī Muslims). However, the author of Leo’s letter demonstrates no familiarity with the hadith’s claims about Islam and focuses instead on the perceived challenge against Christianity.

The author of Leo’s letter responds that the seventy-two groups represent not differences in belief, but differences of language. He points out that Muslims were “a single people with a single language and a single leader who is at once a prince, a hierarch, and a chief executioner” (մի ազգ էք. մի լեզու. մի ազգապետ, նոյն և իշխան. և դահճապետ) whereas Christianity has spread among many peoples and in many languages. This rationale—that there were seventy-two peoples, not seventy-two beliefs—likely underpins the back-formed letter from ʿUmar to Leo, where the groups appear as “tribes” (ցեղս) instead of the “groups” (մասունս) found in Leo’s letter to ʿUmar. Any differences among Christians, the author claims, derive from mere problems in translation, but the Christian community is unified through the rite of baptism. Moreover, the author avers, the promulgation of the Christian scriptures in a number of languages actually proves that Christians have not tampered with them (as, he claims, Muslims have corrupted the Qurʾān), since they all preserve the same text.

The author’s reading of “groups” as languages rather than as religious sects may reflect an underlying assumption derived from broader conversations in early Christian circles, given that many sources assert that the world contains either seventy-two peoples or seventy-two languages on the basis of interpretations of the Tower of Babel in Genesis 10 and the disciples of Christ in Luke 10. However, the author of Leo’s letter does not explicitly allude to these interpretations and, in fact, does not admit the interpretive importance of the number seventy-two at all. Instead, he simply denies that Christians had divided into seventy-two groups and justifies differences within Christianity as rooted in the diversity of languages.

The author of Leo’s letter presents a list of some of the languages into which the Christian scriptures have been rendered: “first, [the language] of us Greeks; second, [that] of the Romans; third, [that] of the Badalians; fifth, [that] of the Syrians; sixth, [that] of the Ethiopians; seventh, [that] of the Indians; eighth, [that] of you Saracens; ninth, [that] of the Persians; tenth, [that] of the Armenians; eleventh, [that] of the Georgians; twelfth, [that] of the Albanians.” In claiming Greek as the language of the author and Arabic as the language “of you Saracens,” this passage reflects the claim that the letter was written by the Roman emperor to the Umayyad caliph.

The third and fourth groups on this list present difficulties. Our edition is based on M1902, the oldest extant manuscript, from which all other manuscripts derive. This manuscript identifies the third group as the Badalians and omits the fourth group entirely. Other manuscripts amend the list to make sense of the two groups. Several later manuscripts,
printed editions, and translations list Hebrew (Եբրայեցուցի) as the third language and Chaldean (Քաղդէացուցի) as the fourth. Chahnazarian, by contrast, retains the original Badalians for the third language, identifying it as a dead language formerly spoken on the eastern shores of the Black Sea. He cites a synaxarion published by Brosset, which describes the martyrdom of a Georgian family named either the Badeleys or the Badelelians. However, the Badalian family would be an unusual explanation of this passage for three reasons. First, it would separate the family from the rest of the Georgians, given that the Georgian language also appears on the list. Second, it would compare a single obscure family (absent from K’art’lis C’xovreba) to the likes of the Romans, the Greeks, the Persians, and the Indians. And third, it would suggest that this particular family circulated the scriptures in its own language.

The thirteenth-century historian and geographer Vardan Arewelc’i (d. 1271 CE) may help us resolve this issue. He wrote his *Historical Compilation* around 1268 CE, before the earliest manuscript evidence for Łewond’s text. He included this passage in his history, though in a slightly different form. Instead of Badalians (Բադաղացուցի), his text lists the Babylonians (Բաբելացուցի), followed by the Egyptians: “At that time ʿUmar wrote to Emperor Leo on many topics, including this: ‘We have heard that the Christians are divided into seventy-two [groups].’ He replied that there are twelve: ‘Greeks, Romans, Babylonians, Egyptians, Ethiopians, Indians, Syrians, Armenians, Saracens, Persians, Aluan’k, Georgians’” (Յայնմ ժամանակի գրեաց Ումար առ Լևոն կայսր շատ ինչ բանս, և զայն ևս, թէ թուեալ է մեր թէ եօթանասուն և երկու բաժին են քրիստոնեայք։ Նա գրեաց պատասխանի թէ երկոտասան են․ Յոյնք, Հոռոմք, Բաբելացիք, Եգիպտացիք, Եթէովպացիք, Հնդիկք, Ասորիք, Հայք, Սարակինոսք, Պարսք, Աղուանք, Վիրք). As Vardan wrote his history before M1902 was created, he had recourse to an earlier manuscript. Given that M1902 is clearly corrupt at this juncture—with the third language unintelligible and the fourth missing entirely—and Vardan’s version is entirely plausible, the latter may preserve the original reading.

393 Arewelc’i, “Historical Compilation,” 180; *Hawak’umn patmut’ean*, 73.


I Lewond’s eighth chapter tells us nothing specific about Armenia during the reign of Yazīd b. ʿAbd al-Malik, nor does he mention the many disruptions that fill the pages of Arabic histories about this period. Instead, his short account is fixated on the iconoclastic policies of the caliph, who ordered the destruction of images, the slaughter of pigs, and the breaking of crosses. Instead of placing Yazīd’s edicts into a broader context of the destruction of all images, Lewond asserts that they specifically targeted Christians. He also attributes the policies to demonic possession of the caliph. Although the tenor of his descriptions of Yazīd’s policies and demons overlaps with other Christian sources, Lewond’s specific combination of details has no direct parallels.

ENGLISH TRANSLATION

20. Then after him [ʿUmar b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz], a certain Yazīd ruled for six years. He was a wicked man and moved by fury. He fought the Christian peoples with great cruelty, for he was led by demonic violence. He ordered that the icons portraying the true incarnation of our Lord and Savior and His disciples be crushed and broken. He also broke the sign of the dominical cross of Christ, which was erected everywhere in the name [of Christ] for the purpose of worshipping the consubstantial Trinity, [73r] for demonic perversion greatly pressed him to be obstinate and to rise up against the stable rock. He was not able to do any damage to the rock, but he himself was crushed by the rock.¹

And having reached the pinnacle of his perversion, he ordered the slaughter of pigs and wiped out a multitude of the unclean animals—grazing pigs—from the earth, for again demonic perversion perverted and transformed his mind to this [end]. As [this] came to completion, his death grew near. Thus he was strangled to death by the violence of the demon. He received worthy judgment from the Lord of all, and in this way he was bitterly murdered.

¹ Cf. Matthew 21:42–44, citing Psalm 117:21(118:22). However, note that the wording is very different.
COMMENTARY

VIII.A. YAZĪD’S ICONOCLAST AND ANTI-CHRISTIAN ACTIVITIES

Unlike Christian sources, most Arabic-Islamic sources (e.g., Yaʿqūbī, Ṭabarī, Khalīfa b. Khayyāṭ, Ibn Aʿtham) do not mention Yazīd’s iconoclasm or refer to any anti-Christian activity on his part; instead, they are primarily preoccupied with the rebellion of the Banū Muhallab and Jarraḥ’s campaign against the Khazars, neither of which appear associated with Yazīd in Łewond’s text. Łewond, by contrast, is nearly exclusively concerned with iconoclasm in this period. His assertions depart from the attestations of these policies in other Christian sources and interprets a broader iconoclastic policy as explicitly anti-Christian.

VIII.A.1. Łewond’s Charges against the Caliph in Context

The variations in accusations and descriptions of Yazīd’s iconoclasm decree likely indicate that it was interpreted in various ways across the Caliphate. Three distinct sets of traditions can be identified. Texts from the Roman Empire blame a Jewish magician for influencing Yazīd, whereas those from Umayyad Egypt focus on the destruction of statues in a bathhouse. Syriac sources, meanwhile, either describe the various physical locations of the images (walls, books, shrines, churches, homes) or enumerate the wide array of media destroyed (wood, ivory, paint, statue, stone, bronze). Łewond’s description does not match

2 Ñ in lft. mg.
3 մոլրապապարւ մոլրապապարւ a.r.
4 Shuwa suprascr.
5 Աշակերտաց տ suprascr., աշակերմաց a.c.
7 These include Michael the Syrian, Chronicle to 1234, and Chronicle of Zuqnin.
8 These include Chronicle of 819 and Chronicle of 846.
any of these threads, nor does it include corollary charges levied against Yazid in other sources (e.g., the levying of taxes that ‘Umar had abolished or changing the laws permitting certain witnesses at court).

Lewond’s account of Yazid’s iconoclasm is distinctive in several ways. First, he pairs the destruction of images with the breaking of the cross. This combination appears in only one other source, the History of the Patriarchs of Alexandria by Ibn al-Muqaffa: “He ordered the breaking of crosses everywhere and the scraping off of the images that are in churches” (أمر بكسر الصلبان في كل مكان وكتب الصور الذي في البيع). Second, Lewond claims that Yazid’s edict also called for the slaughter of pigs. This was a common motif used in medieval sources to bemoan the conditions of Christians living under Muslim rule by suggesting that Muslim dietary laws restricted Christian lifestyles and economy. This complaint, like the criticism of iconoclasm, also resonated with broader Christian biases about Jewish influence over Muslim persecutions of Christians. However, the only other source to pair iconoclasm with the slaughter of animals (although not of pigs specifically) during Yazid’s reign, in particular, is the Chronicle of Zuqnin:

The year one thousand and thirty-five: Yazid ordered that all images be destroyed wherever they were found, whether in a shrine, church or house. Thus people among his agents went out and destroyed all images wherever they were found. The year one thousand and thirty-six: The same Yazid also ordered that white dogs, white pigeons and white cocks be killed. Thus a swift order was issued and dumb animals that had done no wrong were destroyed, causing stench in the streets of the cities and villages.

Yazid also ordered the killing of “blue” people, presumably those with blue eyes. The anonymous author of the Chronicle of Zuqnin laments these decrees because the victims were all creations of God. Since he does not list pigs among the targeted animals, he also does not interpret the decree in relation to Muslim dietary laws. Rather, it is possible that these details took on apocalyptic overtones at the turn of the first Muslim century. Consequently, the context of animal slaughter in the Chronicle of Zuqnin is quite different from what we find in Lewond.

Other sources, including the Chronicle of 819, the Chronicle of 846, and the texts associated with Theophilus of Edessa, attest to the slaughter of pigs earlier, in AM 6185/
AG 1015/692–93 CE, during the reign of Yazid’s father ‘Abd al-Malik. One of these authors—Michael the Syrian—pairs the slaughter of pigs with the dismantling of crosses: “‘Abd al-Malik, king of the Arabs, ordered that crosses should be taken down and pigs should be killed” (ܡܠܟܐ ܕܛܝܝܐ ܕܢܚܬܘܢ ܨܠܒܐ ܘܢܬܩܬܠܘܢ ܚܙܪܝܐ). The references to ‘Abd al-Malik are therefore the closest in content to Lewond’s comments about Yazid, though it is worth noting that several Umayyad caliphs enacted laws restricting Christian practices. Yazid’s immediate predecessor, ‘Umar b. ‘Abd al-‘Aziz, is frequently (though not without contention) associated with legal restrictions against non-Muslims, the so-called shurūṭ ‘Umar. Accusations of restrictions on religious practices (the destruction of the cross or the slaughter of pigs) were recurrent and relatively common catch-all complaints. Although Lewond’s precise combination of charges against Yazid is not found elsewhere, it draws on established norms and serves to disparage caliphal policy as anti-Christian.

VIII.A.2. Yazid’s Iconoclasm as Anti-Christian Policy

This short chapter focuses clearly on the anti-Christian bent of caliphal policies: the destruction of images of Jesus and his disciples, the breaking of crosses, and the slaughter of pigs can hardly be interpreted in any other light. Although Lewond does not indicate that the iconoclastic edict had any impact on Armenia itself, his spelling of Yazid’s name in this chapter situates the anti-Christian policies in a way that is specific to Armenian audiences. Earlier, in connection with Yazid b. Mu’awiya, he spells the name as “Izid,” but here he renders Yazid b. ‘Abd al-Malik as “Yezkirt.” This spelling is a veiled reference to the Sasanian emperor Yazdegerd II (r. 439–57 CE), who was famous for attempting to force Armenian Christians to convert to Zoroastrianism. The reports of the subsequent battle of Avarayr (451 CE) are foundational to Armenian historiography, so the reader is easily cued into the comparison. With this spelling, Lewond primes his reader to expect iniquity and anti-Christian violence from Yazid.

Despite Lewond’s overt attempts to cast Yazid’s policies as anti-Christian, other sources instead suggest that his iconoclasm was not geared specifically to restricting the practice of Christianity. As noted above, the examples from Umayyad Egypt attest that the pivotal point was images in nonreligious spaces such as bathhouses, rather than in churches. Some texts suggest that Yazid targeted images that represented people more generally, as implied by their use of the terms for “likeness” and “representation” (ὁμοίωμα, تماثل). This terminology has led C. Sahner to interpret the edict in light of the hadith that prohibits artists from usurping the creative role of God. Such a reading, particularly in conjunction with the accounts of the destruction found in Muslim Arabic texts, opens up the possibility that the images destroyed were not exclusively Christian. Thus, for example, where-
as several of the Greek sources specifically mention the destruction of Christian images, Nikephoros claims that Yazid’s edict called for the destruction of all images, even if only to conceal his true goal of destroying Christian images specifically.\textsuperscript{18}

Indeed, if we take a closer look at Lewond’s phrasing here, we find traces of a broader iconoclastic policy. Lewond’s account focuses on the destruction of images “portraying the true incarnation of our Lord and Savior and His disciples” (զկենդանագրեալ պատկերս ճշմարիտ մարդեղութե ան տեառն մեր և փրկչին և նորին աշակերտացն). In describing the images, Lewond employs the word ինդանագրեալ, literally “life-depicting” (from the verb կենդանագրեմ, a calque on ζωγραφεύω),\textsuperscript{19} which may indicate that his underlying source was concerned precisely with the tension between the creation of images and the usurping of the creative power of God. The possibility that Lewond relied on an iconoclast source aligns with his later description of the use of the cross (rather than an icon of the Virgin Mary) to protect Constantinople from the Umayyad campaigns and with his positive description of Roman emperors who supported iconoclasm (see chapter IX). However, Lewond here mobilizes his source to interpret the broader iconoclastic project as a specific attack on Christian iconography.

\textbf{VIII.B. YAZID’S POSSESSION AND DEATH}

Within only a few lines, Lewond refers four separate times to “demonic perversion” (վուձուլ տուրմունջ) and “demonic violence” (վուձուլ թենզում) to explain Yazid’s actions. He also asserts that the demon murdered Yazid: “Thus he was strangled to death by the violence of the demon” (այնպէս խեղդամահ սատակեր ի բռնութենէ այսոյն). This claim appears more evocative than factual, given that all Arabic sources claim that Yazid died of natural causes. The demon connects Yazid’s death to his actions in life and holds him accountable for anti-Christian legislation in a very concrete manner. No other accounts of Yazid’s possession and death are precisely the same as Lewond’s, though two evince the same reasoning even if they are set in different contexts.

The closest parallel to Lewond’s version is Ibn al-Muqaffa’s \textit{History of the Patriarchs of Alexandria}. Ibn al-Muqaffa does not explicitly claim demonic possession, but he does explain that Yazid “traveled the path of Satan and turned away from the paths of God” (سلك في طريق الشيطان وحاد عن طرق الله).\textsuperscript{20} After describing the unjust taxes levied on Christians under his reign and the anti-Christian ordinances described above (the breaking of crosses and the effacement of images in churches), Ibn al-Muqaffa also blames Yazid’s death on his actions in life: “The Lord Messiah destroyed him on account of that and took his soul” (السيد المسيح اهلكه لاجل ذلك واخذ نفسه).\textsuperscript{21} Like Lewond’s version, this account claims supernatural impetus for the natural causes of Yazid’s death. Ibn al-Muqaffa’s assertion might be compared to Lewond’s claim that Yazid “received worthy judgment from the Lord of all, and in this way he was bitterly murdered” (զարժանաւորն ընկալեալ զդատաստան ի բոլորեցուն Տեառն է. և այսպէս դառնութ ի կենացն) [73r].

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{18} Vasiliev, “Iconoclastic Edict,” 31.
\item \textsuperscript{19} Lampe, \textit{Patristic Greek Lexicon}, 593.
\item \textsuperscript{20} Ibn al-Muqaffa, \textit{Historia Patriarcharum}, 153.
\item \textsuperscript{21} Ibn al-Muqaffa, \textit{Historia Patriarcharum}, 153.
\end{itemize}
Greek sources, particularly the account of the Second Council of Nicaea (787 CE), also exhibit some similarities. John of Jerusalem recounts that a Jewish magician served as “an instrument of soul-destroying demons” (δαιμόνων ψυχοβλαβῶν ὄργανον; dæmonum animas lædentium organum) to sway Yazid’s convictions. He prophesied a long reign if Yazid would only order the destruction of images across his realm. When Yazid died only a few years after the promulgation of this edict, his son Walid had the Jewish magician killed for murdering the caliph.\(^{22}\) This tradition filters through the Greek narratives about Yazid’s iconoclasm, building on the negative associations of Jews and Muslims in Roman literature. Theophanes’s account reflects this tradition: he finishes his description of the Jewish magician with the claim that “by the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ and by the intercessions of His chaste Mother and of all the saints, Yazid died that same year before his satanic constitution had come to the notice of most people” (ἀλλὰ χάριτι τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ ταῖς πρεσβείαις τῆς ἀφθόνου μητρὸς αὐτοῦ καὶ πάντων τῶν ἁγίων τῷ αὐτῷ ἐτείνθηκεν Ἰζίδ, οὐδὲ ἀκουσθηναι φθάσαντος ταῖς πολλοῖς τοῦ σατανικοῦ αὐτοῦ δόγματος).\(^{23}\) Like Ibn al-Muqaffa’, then, the Greek authors project Yazid’s death as a punishment for his actions in life and frame Yazid’s iconoclasm as the product of satanic involvement. However, Łewond’s account stands alone in preferring demonic perversion to divine intervention as the underlying cause of Yazid’s death.

\(^{22}\) Mansi, Sacrorum conciliorum, 197 (Greek), 198 (Latin). See also Vasiliev, “Iconoclastic Edict,” 28–29.

\(^{23}\) Theophanes, Chronicle, 555; Chronographia, 402. The part about a Jew predicting Yazid’s forty-year reign is repeated in Arabic, but without reference to iconoclasm; Ṭabarī, Ta’rīkh, 2:1464; Sahner, “First Iconoclasm,” 12.
The Caliphate of Hishām b. 'Abd al-Malik

IX

LEWOND’S NINTH CHAPTER COVERS TWO main fronts. Much of his account of the reign of Hishām narrates the expansion of the Khazar Khaganate and the subsequent Arab-Khazar wars. However, Lewond also inserts a lengthy description of Maslama b. 'Abd al-Malik’s failed campaign against Constantinople. The Umayyad defeat at Constantinople should have been placed in chapter VI, where Lewond instead describes Maslama’s campaign against the Caucasus. From Arabic, Greek, and Syriac texts, we know that chapter VI’s Caucasian campaign should have been in this chapter. Lewond’s flipping of the two storylines is deliberate: he transposes the events of the two reigns so that he can narrate Maslama’s career as ruinously unsuccessful. If we were to put the two campaigns back where they belong, chapter IX would be entirely about the Khazar incursions into caliphal territory and the (mostly) successful Arab response; conflict between the generals of the caliphal army is quelled and the governor launches a victorious counterattack with the help of the Bagratunik. In the chapter in its present form, however, the narrative flow is broken. The Khazars invade and the caliphal forces are victorious against them, but they are hampered by infighting. Maslama leaves on an unrelated campaign against Constantinople, which proves disastrous because he is no match for the divinely protected city. We then return to the Caucasian campaigns, now under Marwān b. Muḥammad (the future Umayyad caliph, r. 744–50), to discover that their success is dependent on Bagratuni involvement. In this iteration, the caliphal campaigns appear far less successful, and the Roman and Armenian (and, to a lesser extent, even Khazar) victories drive the storyline.

ENGLISH TRANSLATION

21. Shem, who is Hishām, succeeded him [Yazīd b. ‘Abd al-Malik] and ruled for nineteen years. And in the first year of his rule, he came up with a wicked plan. He sent a certain general whose name was Ḥārith to conduct a cadastre of the land of the Armenians in order to intensify [73v] the iron yoke of servitude of taxation by means of manifold evils because he was vexed by the goodness of 'Umar, as if he had unjustly spent the stores of the treasury that had been amassed for the princes before him [i.e., 'Umar]. And so much danger came upon this land that everyone sighed over the tumultuous tribulations; [and] there was no place...
to live because of the intolerable dangers. Thereafter, his hand weighed even heavier over this land of Armenia.

22. At that time the rabble from the northern regions was again agitated, since the king of the Khazars, whom they call the khagan, died. When his mother, whose name was P’arsbit’, saw this, she ordered the general, who was called T’armač’, to gather a large force against this land of Armenia. Uniting, they marched out through the land of the Huns, through the Čoray pass, and [74r] through the land of the Mazk’ut’k’. They marauded in the land of P’aytakaran; they crossed the Araxes River into the land of the Persians, and they destroyed Artawēt, the capital Ganjak, the district that was called At’šibagwan, a certain Spatar P’erawz, andOrmizd P’erawz. They attacked and destroyed all of the Ishmaelite troops and their general, a certain Jarrāḥ, by the sword. They plundered the district of Zarewand and besieged the fortress called Ampriotik. They left the equipage of the camp and those who had been captured by the sword near the city of Artawēt.

While they were fighting against the fortress of Ampriotik, a regiment from the Ishmaelite forces and their general, whose name was Sa’īd al-Ḥarashī, unexpectedly fell upon their camp with only a few men. He struck and put many to his sword [74v] and released those they had taken captive by their sword. The sad news of the fray immediately reached the [Khazar] troops who were guarding the fortress of Ampriotik. When they heard of the evils that had befallen them, they left the besieged fortress and arrived against the marauder [Ḥarashī] who had come against their camp. These same forces attacked him, and they were soundly beaten. He [Ḥarashī] carried off from them their standard, a bronze image that al-Ḥarashī’s regiment still has with it as a token of its ancestors’ bravery. And after that the Ishmaelite prince sent his brother Maslama with a large force to aid Ḥarashī’s regiment. And when Maslama came and saw that he had not arrived in time for the battle, since Sa’īd had achieved victory, he had some put to death by the sword, [75r] put some to flight, and took away booty and captives. He reproached him [Ḥarashī] with numerous insults and beat him. He wanted to kill him, but he was not able to give the order publicly, for his [Ḥarashī’s] tribe would have raised an uproar. He did not dare give in to his own wishes but silently checked his plan and returned to the Ishmaelite prince.

P’arsbit’: a common Turkish name. An individual with a similar name appears in Arabic sources on the Khazars of this period, but he is male, identified as the “son of the khagan.”
T’armač: likely the Turkic word talmač’, “translator”; the exact identity of this person is unknown.
Mazk’ut’k’: a people whose identity remains debated among scholars; various Indo-European, Caucasian, and Turkic peoples have been suggested, but the Mazk’ut’k’ lived along the western shores of the Caspian Sea.
Artawēt: Lewond supplies the earliest mention in Armenian of Artawēt, an important city in Azerbaijan (map 7). It is known today as Ardabil, in the modern Republic of Iran.
Ganjak: known as Shīz in modern Iran, this city is to be differentiated from the city of Janza/Ganjak in Caucasian Albania, now in the Republic of Azerbaijan.
Districts of the Persians: the districts listed here retained Zoroastrian names. They are all in the modern Republic of Iran, along the coast of the Caspian Sea. See map 7.
Jarrāḥ b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Ḥakamī: governor of Armenia and Azerbaijan from 722–23 to 725–26 and again from 729–30. He was a Syrian general who had previously served in Basra, Khurāsān, and Sijistān.
Sa’īd b. ‘Amr b. al-Aswād al-Harashi: governor of Armenia from 730–31 to 731–32. He was a Qaysī general from Qinnasrīn who had previously served in Basra and Khurāsān.

The Ishmaelite prince: the caliph Hishām.
Maslama: the famous Umayyad general and brother of Caliph Hishām; on him, see chapter VI.

Ḥarashi’s tribe: the Banū Qays, one of the main tribal blocs. The Umayyads relied heavily on the Banū Qays in their wars of expansion and in their governance. In general, Maslama maintained a very good relationship with the bloc.
23. And after this, he [the caliph] started to insult the king of the Greeks and sent an envoy to Leo, the emperor of the Romans, to come to him and submit to taxation. And when the emperor Leo would not entertain the matter of the message that was sent, he [the caliph] became enraged and sent his brother Maslama with a great force against the land of the Greeks. He took a multitude of forces and crossed through Cilicia of the Syrians, to the mesogaion land, which they translate as the “midlands.” He went [75v] and arrived in the land of Bithynia and camped on the shore of a powerful river, which is called the Sagaris. Then the Greek troops prepared and transferred the inhabitants of the land to the fortresses and fortified cities on account of the Ishmaelites. They themselves camped across from them on the other side of the river, fortifying their camp by encircling it with a ditch. In this way they sat and watched for a considerable time.

Then, day after day, many warnings arrived from King Leo for the Greek general, lest he be trapped in his [Maslama’s] trap through deception. Instead, he should only remain and guard them without warring. But he was not attentive as the emperor ordered, because the Ishmaelite general announced that his troops would launch raids

Map 7. Khazar raids during the reign of Hishām b. ʿAbd al-Malik.

Maslama’s campaign: this infamous campaign lasted from 716 to 718. Lewand flipped Maslama’s campaigns; according to actual chronology, this campaign should be included in chapter VI and the Caucasian campaigns should be here.

Mesogaion: a Greek toponym, correctly translated as “midlands” in the text. The Anatolian interior is intended.

Sagaris: the Classical Sangarios River (see map 8), the modern Sakarya River in Turkey.
through every region to take booty and [76r] many captives and [then] return to their land. The Greek general heard this and ordered his forces to follow them warily. When they went out after the Ishmaelite force, they [the Arabs] immediately saw and felt their coming up behind them, for a haze of dust collected over them. They set aside the equipage of their camp and, dividing their troops into three regiments, set up an ambush then and there, while Maslama himself and some part of his forces arrayed against them. But they [the Greeks] attacked them unprepared with the equipage of their camp and fell among the enemy. The ambushers rose out of hiding, surrounded [them], and put many of the Greek forces to death by the sword. They spread their raids to those regions and took districts and cities [76v] of that land. It is said that the number of captives was more than eighty thousand men. They [the Muslim forces] returned to their land with great joy. The great Ishmaelite prince saw the victory and rejoiced greatly along with his naxarark’. He bestowed many honors on his brother, and on his [brother’s] arrival he blessed the victory that he had secured. He distributed the booty to the troops and purchased the captives as servants and maids. At ease, he ceased [warring] in that same [year].

24. But the next year he again assembled a force larger than the first one. He gave it into the hands of the general Maslama and sent it to the land of the Greeks. He [Maslama] swore an oath to his brother not to return to him until he had completed his wishes. This was the oath

Ambush: comparisons with other texts in Syriac, Arabic, and Greek indicate that this passage refers to Maslama’s capture of the city of Tyana in 707, although it is not in Bithynia (map 8).

Naxarark’: note the use of the Armenian term naxarark’ to refer to nobles at the caliphal court.

The next year: it is not clear what year Lewond means here because this whole passage is out of place. The campaign against Constantinople began in 716, so he may intend the year after Sulaymān b. ‘Abd al-Malik came to power.
that he took: to capture the kingdom and to demolish the city called Constantinople, \([77r]\) as well as the exquisite foundation of Hagia Sophia, which was built by supernal wisdom as a house of God on earth, \([\text{and}]\) to turn it into a place of worship of filthy idolatry. Affirming all of this in his heart, he marched forth with many troops and arrived in the land of the Greeks. He camped on the shore of the Pontus Sea with his entire equipage. He was immediately defiant toward King Leo. He sent an envoy and wrote to him a contemptuous edict in which there was much derision in the following manner:

What is \([\text{the nature of}]\) your obstinacy in which you take refuge \([\text{that}]\) you do not submit to paying taxes to us, for all peoples tremble in fear of us? In whom do you take refuge that you harden against us in this way? Perhaps you did not hear about all of the evil things that we have brought upon all of the kingdoms that turned against our authority, which we smashed and crushed like clay pots.\(^1\) All \([77v]\) of the riches

---

of the earth have become ours through the order of the Lord, and [His] promise to our father Ishmael has been brought to fulfillment: we vanquished and defeated all of the kingdoms. Or even if you did not see that, how much danger has come over your land in the days of your rule? For I destroyed many cities with my own hand and I killed many of your troops with my sword. But now let it be known to you that if you do not pay tribute to me, I have sworn an oath that I will not see the land of my birth until I raze your kingdom and destroy the fortification of your walled city in which you have placed your hopes. I will make what you call Sophia, which is your house of worship, into a bathhouse for my troops. I will smash and crush the wood of your cross that you worship on your head. For the aid and boast of our faith [78r] are great before God.

He sent this and even more wicked reproaches to the emperor Leo.

When he [Leo] read the contemptuous letter, he immediately ordered the patriarch with the senate and the people of the city not to cease the sound of the glorification of Hagia Sophia for three days. And the entire city raised a commotion in the place of worship, per the order of the king. Then the king himself also got up and arrived at the holy site of expiation. He took the letter of reproaches in hand and spread it before the Lord in imitation of Hezekiah, recalling the solicitous forgiveness of our Savior, who reserved mercy for His loved ones from the beginning. In tears, he beseeched the God of all to help achieve vengeance against the wicked enemy. He also recalled the blame of the iniquitous, saying David’s [78r] words: “How wickedly the enemy acted in your place of holiness. The hated ones boasted in the midst of their rejoicing. They attributed victory to themselves and did not recognize the visitation from on high.” He poured this and many such things out before the Lord, drawing out the confessions for three days, and he completed his oath of prayers with fasting.

---

3 Cf. 4 Kingdoms (2 Kings) 19:14.
4 Psalm 73:3–5(74:3–4); the citation differs from Zohrab and the Septuagint.
25. After this, he wrote an edict to Maslama, the Ishmaelite general, in the following manner:

Why did you boast about your great impiety in wickedness? You sharpened deception like a razor.\(^5\) Having rebelled, you bragged before the Omnipotent; you contemplated malice in the heavens against Christ our Savior and His sustaining throne. Therefore, you hope for His mercy, which you insulted, that He might reward you for your wickedness. And may the Lord quiet your filthy mouth that you opened against [79r] the King of kings and against this, His city, and against the temple for the glory of His name, and against me, for I am the guardian of Christ's throne, according to the curse of the prophet David that "the mouths of those who speak iniquity shall be shut."\(^6\) But we do not boast in our bow and we do not live by our sword; rather, the right hand and arm of the Lord and the protecting power of the light of His countenance\(^7\) can smash those who boast of their presumptuousness like you do. It never came to [your] mind that the blood of those whom your sword slaughtered and [of those who] were captured from my land will be demanded of you. For it was not on account of the righteousness of your deeds but rather for our iniquities that "He allowed the rod of the sinners to reduce the allotment of the righteous,"\(^8\) so that we might accept the measure of our weakness and admonish [ourselves] to live according to the pleasing wishes of the Creator. But you should not tempt the Lord our God, for He can [79v] consign you with all your multitudes to the depths of your sea [and] agitate the waters of your sea like he consigned the hard-hearted Pharaoh to the depths of the Red Sea. For it was the rod of Moses that He used to turn the waters over the Egyptian army and condemn [them] to destruction in the deep.\(^9\) And that rod was a type of the omnipotent sign of this cross of Christ, which was insulted by you today. But if you should now turn away from me, you will have chosen well

---


\(^6\) Psalm 62(63):12.

\(^7\) Cf. Psalm 43:4, 7(44:3, 6). Note that the same verse is cited in the letter of Leo to ʿUmar on 71v.

\(^8\) Cf. Psalm 124(125):3.

for yourself and for your troops. Otherwise, do whatever you have planned immediately,10 and the Lord will do what is good and pleasing to Him. He will make His own judgment and He will save His people. And He will avert our oppressors from us, with their heads hung in shame.

When the Ishmaelite general read this edict, his anger was provoked even more. He raged ferociously11 and rose up to make war [80r] against the solid rock, so that he became ensnared in his own trap, as he deserved, for his heart was hardened by the Lord.12 And he ordered his troops to build ships, and the order was immediately carried out because he had been preparing [to build] ships for many days. They boarded the ships at once with all their equipage, [and] he approached the city. When the emperor Leo saw the multitude of troops, like a forest on the sea, he ordered a wall to be built, furnished with iron grates, and the chainmail gate to the fortress to be closed. He did not allow anyone to battle against the enemy, because he was waiting for a visitation from above and vengeance in accordance with his deeds. And then he ordered the patriarch along with the senate and the multitude of the city to take with them as a comrade-in-arms in perfect and ardent faith the invincible and luminous [80v] sign of the cross of Christ. And the king himself, with the entire crowd, carried the invincible [sign of] victory on his shoulders. The people raised up the sound of glorification and the sweet odor of incense, carrying brilliant candles and torches in the front and back [of the procession] in honor of the victorious and venerable cross. They opened the gate of the city, and the entire crowd went out, lifting up the sign of the cross over the water and saying, “Help us, Christ, Son of God and Savior of the world.” He [the emperor] sent up this phrase three times to the heavens and struck the water of the sea with the sign of the cross, marking13 the outline of the cross over [it]. The depths of the sea were immediately agitated by the

---

10 “Do whatever you have planned immediately,” զոր ինչ ստիպիսդ ի խարիչ ուրասպան: the expression is evocative of contemporary martyrologies; cf. “Vkayabanut’iwn Srboyn Dawt’i,” 92.
11 “Ferociously,” գազանաբար, lit. “like a wild beast.”
13 “Marking”: the verb դրոշմեմ also denotes “sealing,” as in the rites of baptism and chrismation.
power of the holy cross, which caused its powerful waves to boil over with movement. There were violent shipwrecks and a great wreckage of the Ishmaelite troops, so that [81r] a majority of the forces sank into the waters of the sea and they, like Pharaoh’s army, suffered His anger as punishment by sea.14 It carried and led some part of the remaining force on planks to the other side of the sea to the land of Thrace; it drove and discarded some on distant islands, for the multitude of the forces was more than five hundred thousand men.

26. But he [Leo] did not undertake to cruelly deliver to the sword those who had escaped from the dangerous tribulation to dry land; rather, he ordered to keep them surrounded so they would not be able to go out anywhere to look for food. So a great famine came upon their camp, to the point that they devoured horses and mules. Subsequently, they laid hold of the concubines and the servants to slaughter and eat [them] so that they might stave off their starvation. So then he [Maslama] beseeched the emperor Leo with many entreaties to show him mercy and release [81v] [them] from imprisonment, for few remained from his many [forces]. And King Leo considered that the Lord had exacted vengeance from his enemies. He showed him great mercy and summoned him and criticized him greatly. He also recalled their [i.e., the Muslims’] shameless impudence:

Why did you really want to attack our land and put my forces to the sword without care and lead away the inhabitants of my cities into captivity? Now, as the Lord lives, you are the son of death and unworthy of life!15 But since the Lord judged my judgment and returned your iniquity back upon you and sought from you the blood of sinless people, I will not put my hands on you and I will not judge you as is fitting. For behold, you are in my hands and I have the power [82r] to kill you or to let you live; but you will not die. Rather, go and tell of the immense powers of God that you saw.

14 “His anger as punishment by sea,” ṭㄥ胬ุㄈㄕㄗ ㌧ㄈㄒㄕ ejaculation: the expression occurs in The Teaching of St. Gregory included in Agat’angełos, History of the Armenians, §296, where God sends the flood of Genesis 6 “in anger as a punishment by sea,” ṭㄥ胬ุㄈㄕㄗ 部份ㄈㄒㄕ ejaculation; Agat’angełos, Patmut’iwn Hayoc’; 154; Thomson, Teaching of Saint Gregory, 55.
15 Cf. 2 Kingdoms (2 Samuel) 12:5.
Maslama answered the emperor and said:

What can I say about this before you? For truly I am not worthy of life. The crimes that I committed against your land are not few, but you showed great mercy toward me in letting me live. I am witness to my own errors. But because your heart is moved by mercy for me, release me to my place and I will vow to you to never again march out in war.

He [Leo] allowed his request. He [Maslama] prepared and boarded a ship, planning to cross the Mediterranean, and returned to his own land with great shame. Then they [i.e., the people] went out before him in many cities with laments and wailing, striking their foreheads and scattering ashes over [themselves]. He [82v] met them with his head hung in great shame. He was reproached by them with many rebukes, and he did not have anything else to answer but this: "I could not fight against God." And after this, he went to his house and did not carry a sword at his waist until the day he died.

27. At that time, the Ishmaelite prince Hishām sent Marwān b. Muḥammad over the Armenian people to replace Saʿīd, whom they called Ḥarashī. When Marwān arrived in the city of Duin, the naxararkʿ of the Armenians met him, and he spoke to them with words of peace. He summoned Ašot the son of Vasak from the Bagratuni house and gave him the rule of the patriciate over this land of Armenia by order of Hishām. He bestowed many honors on him. But the sons of Smbat learned of the honor [bestowed upon] Ašot—that he had become important in the eyes of Hishām [83r] and in the eyes of the general Marwān—and they acted with extreme insubordination toward him, to the point that their discord reached the ears of the son of Muḥammad. He immediately ordered their arrest and sent Grigor and Dawit', who were from the Mamikonean house, to the Ishmaelite prince. He [Marwān b. Muḥammad] wrote an accusation against them, [charging] that they were opponents of Ašot and agitators against his authority. He [Hishām] ordered that they be taken to [the place] called Yemen, which is a desert, and he put them in prison until the end of their lives.

But when Ašot’s authority as patrician was established, he went to the prince of the Ishmaelites concerning the tyranny [in] this land, for he [Hishām] had withheld the stipends of the Armenian naxararkʿ and their cavalry

Maslama’s career: Lewon claims that Maslama did not fight again after his failed attempt on Constantinople, but he in fact served for another two decades and fought in the Arab-Khazar wars until his death in 738.

Marwān b. Muḥammad b. Marwān: the son of Muḥammad b. Marwān, the governor of Armenia mentioned in chapters IV and V. Marwān served as governor of Armenia beginning in either 732 or 733. He is famous for his campaigns in the Caucasus, particularly against the Khazars. He became the last Umayyad caliph (r. 744–50); see chapter XI.

Ašot Bagratuni the son of Vasak: known as "the Blind," this Ašot was the prince of Armenia from 726 or 732 to 748. Note the change in tone regarding Hishām’s reign from the appointment of Marwān and Ašot on.

Sons of Smbat: although the name Smbat is typically connected to the Bagratuni house, the sons of Smbat here must refer to Grigor and Dawit’ Mamikonean (see below). This supposes that their father’s name was Smbat Mamikonean.

Mamikonean resistance: the Mamikonean kʿ were the most powerful naxarar house in the early Islamic period. Grigor and Dawit’ refusal to acknowledge Ašot shows their resistance to the Bagratuni position of prestige under the Umayyads. The Umayyads fostered a relationship with the Bagratuni specifically to undermine Mamikonean control over Armenia.

Mamikonean brothers: Grigor, Dawit’, and Mušeł (who appears only in chapter XI) are the main opponents to the rule of Ašot Bagratuni. Dawit’ was executed in 746 on the orders of Marwān II, but the other two brothers survived into the early ‘Abbāsid period.

Yemen: the southernmost part of the Arabian Peninsula.
for three years. He met with Hishām and spoke before him with efficacious and [83v] wise words. He [Hishām] honored him justly and acceded to his request. He gave an order through him to calculate three-year [stipends] at a hundred thousand per year. From then on, during the days of his reign, that same amount of stipend arrived uninterrupted for all the cavalry.

28. After this, Marwān b. Muḥammad gathered a large force and took with him the prince Ašot along with the naxarark’ and their cavalry. United, they went raiding in the land of the Huns. They provoked the city, beat the forces of the city, and took the city. When the inhabitants of the city saw the marauder who had triumphed over them and that he had taken the city, many of the city folk surrendered their things into the depths of the sea. They also surrendered themselves into the depths of the sea [84r] and drowned. So the Ishmaelite forces took the other mass [of city folk] and the booty. Marwān, along with the prince Ašot, returned from the regions of the Huns in great triumph and with much booty. And when he arrived in the capital16 of Partaw, he selected a fifth of the captives and booty and sent it to their prince, Hishām, and informed him of the circumstances of the victory. He received the gift of the booty and offered great thanks to Marwān and his troops. He reproached his brother Maslama by showing him the example of Marwān’s brave victory. In response, he [Maslama] said: “Mine was a war not against men but against God. His was but against dumb animals.”

Marwān distributed the rest of the booty along with the captives [84v] to his troops. He gave a part to Ašot and [he gave] servants and maids to the other honorable nax-arark’. He ruled over this land and pacified all of the violent invasions. He cut off the feet and hands of those who committed iniquity: thieves, bandits, and enemies of good order. He sentenced them to death by crucifixion.17 After nineteen years, Hishām died.

Stipends: in the early Umayyad period, the Armenian cavalry were not paid but served in the army instead of paying taxes. By the reign of Hishām, however, the Armenian cavalry were paid by caliphal administrators. This change is noted in Lewond’s reference to the “royal record,” which lists the names of stipend recipients, in chapter V.

Land of the Huns: Khazaria, in the northern Caucasus, roughly present-day Daghestan. Armenian forces fought as part of the Umayyad military in the Arab-Khazar wars. The city: this is likely to be Tarki (mentioned earlier), which lay on the coast.

Partaw: capital of Caucasian Albania; in Arabic Bardhaʿa. Today it is the city of Barda in the modern Republic of Azerbaijan.

Fifth: according to Islamic law, one fifth of the spoils of war from any campaign is sent to the caliph to be used for the benefit of the Muslim community as a whole (see Qur’an 8:41).

Servants and maids: Arabic sources note that many captives were taken in the course of these campaigns; here, we learn that some of them were gifted to the Armenian nax-arark’ as part of the distribution of spoils.

16 “Capital” appears here as շահաստան (šahastan), which renders the New Persian شهرستان (shahrīstān). See Hübschmann, Armenische Grammatik, 205.
17 “By crucifixion,” փայտիւ, lit. “by wood.”
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18 Šηր, Պուրակ, հուշանորս, Բուդնան է, Տուր անում։ Հին ծաղկ։ Իսկ այն այսօր և իսկ այն պահպան
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իիիիի
IX. THE CALIPHATE OF HISHĀM B. ‘ABD AL-MALIK

 despre լուծում, իրավատեսություն, բնակչության տասնյակական տարիքը, իրավատեսություն է զամբյուղի գրաչափականության համար, և նրա կորուստի համար, հրապարատ է կազմում հայտնի հիման վրա.

որպես վերջիրում է նրանց համար, կարող է համարվել առանց տեղեկատվական համար, և դառնալ ճշտություն իրավատեսություն համար, և համարվում է կազմակերպչության և ռազմական տնտեսության միջև կապ.”

ուր Եւստάթի ամրաների կողմից պետք է պատկերված ստանալ, և բարձրացն կտրված ռազմական պատմության հետ.

27 հրապարատ] - suprascr.
28 դեռ in rt. mg.
29 պետք] պետք Hand 1抣.
30 դեռ in lft. mg.
ամենայն ախիւն իւրով. և իսկ և իսկ խրոխտալով ընդ արքաին Լեւոնի. յղէր դեսպան և գրէր հրովարտակ առ նա այպանութե ան. յորս էին բազում ձաղանք. որ ունէր աւրինակ զայս:

Զինչ է յամառութի ւն դ յոր ապաստ<ան>եալ

ամենայն ազգք սարսեալ դողացին ի մէնջ. իսկ դու յով <ապ>աստանեալ 31 ոչ եկիր ի հնազանդութի ւն հարկատրութե ան ս

մեր. զի ամենայն ամենայն ամենայն ամենայն անցամ պարարտութի ւն երկրի. քանզի հրամանը Տեառն և խոստումն որ առ հայրն մեր Իսմայէլ ի գլուխ ել. և զ

33 զթագաւութի ւն ս քո և կործանեցից զամրութի ւն պարսպաւոր քաղաքիդ յոր յուսացեալդ ես. և զանուանեալդ քո Սոփիա. որ է տուն երկրպագութե ան քո. արարից ի լուալիս զաւրաց իմոց. և զփայտ խաչիտ որում երկրպագես խորտակեալ ջախջախեցից ի գլուխ քո. զի աւգնութի ւն և պարծանք հաւատոյս մեր

մեծ է առաջի Աստուծ յ: Զայսոսիկ և ևս վատթարագոյն յղէր նախատինս առ Լեւոն կայսր:

Այս իրար ընթերցեալ զգիր<ն>

այպանութե ան. վաղվաղակի հրաման տայր հայրա-պետին հանդերձ սինկղիտուն և ամենայն բազմութե ան քաղաքին մի պակասեցուցաս

31 suprascr. Hand 1corr. 32 suprascr. Hand 1corr. 33 անմիկայական կարկաս: 34 անամունի գրականություն a.c. 35 պիս. 36 գրիչ<ու> - կաց Աստուծ ե. 37 զոտուն o.c. 38 իւր երկարվութ։
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կրեցին: Եւ զմասն ինչ մնացեալ զաւրուն ի տախտակսն տարեալ հանէր յայկոյս ծովուն յաշխարհը.և զոմանս ի կղզիս հեռաւորս վարեալ ընկենոյր. քանզի էին բազմութիւն զավրացն ավելի քան զիսուն. բեւր արանց:

իզ 43 Իսկ որ ի վտանգաւոր նեղութենէն զերծան ի ցամաք. ոչ եղև ձեռնամուխ մատնել ի սուր անողորմ. այլ ետ հրաման պահել զնոսա պաշարմամբ. զի ոչ ուրեք գոյր հնար ելանել նոցա ի խնդիր կերակրոյ. և սով մեծ լիներ ի բանակին նոցա մինչև սպառել զձիս և զջորիս:

Ապա յետ այնորիկ ձեռնամուխ լինէին ի հարճս և ի ծառայս փողոտել և ուտել զի լցցեն զսովառութիւն ւն իւրեանց: Իսկ ապա բազում աղերսանաւք աղաչէր զԼեւոն կայսր առնել ողորմութիւն ւն ընդ նմա և թողուլ ի պաշար

մանէն. քանզի մնացին սակաւք ի բազմացն:

Իսկ թագաւորն Լեւոն զմտաւ ածէր զայն զի Տէր հատոյց զվրէժխնդրութիւն ւն թշնամեացն. արար ողորմութիւն ւն մեծ ի վերա նորա. և կոչէր զնա առ ինքն և խավսէր ընդ նմա բազում դատաստանաւք:

Յուշ առնէր և զանամաւթ լրբութիւն ւն նոցա. թէ ընդէր արդեւք կամեցեալ յարձակեցար ի վերա երկրիս մերոյ. և յանխնա կոտորեաց սուր քո զզաւրս իմ. և վարեցեր զբնակիչս քաղաքաց իմոց ի գերութիւն: Եւ արդ կենդանի է Տէր զի որդի մահու ես դու և ոչ ես արժանի կենաց, այլ որովհետև զդատաստան իմ Տէր դատեցաւ և դարձոյց զանաւրէրութիւն քո ի գլուխ քո. և զարիւն անձանց անմեղաց խնդրեաց ի ձեռաց քոց. ես ոչ մխեցից զձեռս իմ ի քեզ և ոչ դատեցայց զքեզ ըստ արժանի.

44 զի ահա անձն քո ի ձեռին իմ է. և իշխան եմ ի վերա սպանանել և կեցուցանել. բայց ոչ մեռցիս. այլ երթ պատմեա զմեծամեծս Աստուծ յազավարին դառնայր յերկիր իւր մեծաւ ամաւթով. ապա ելանէին ընդ յառաջ նորա ի քաղաքաց քաղաքաց վայիւք և ճչաւք և զճակատ հարկանելով և զմոխիր ցանելով ի վեր: Իսկ նորա ամաւթով մեծ կորագլուխ եղեալ յանդիման լինէր: Եւ ի նոցանէ բազում կշտամբանաւք կշտամբէր. և ոչ ինչ աւելի պատասխանի առներ. բայց զայն ևեթ ասէ ոչ կարէի ընդ Աստուծ կռուել. և յետ այսորիկ գնաց ի տուն իւր և ոչ արկ սուր ընդ մէջ իւր մինչև ցաւր մահուան իւրոյ:

իէ 45 Յայնմ ժամանակի առաքէ իշխանն Իսմաելի. Հեշմ ի վերա ազգիս Հայոց զՄրվան որդի Մահմետի փոխանակ Սեթա. որում Հրաշին կոչէին: Իբրև հասանէր Մրվան ի քաղաքը Դվին. յանդիման լինէին նմա նախարարք Հայոց. և խավսի ընդ նոսա բանիւք խաղաղութեան.

և կոչէ առ ինքն զԱշոտ որդի Վասակա ի տանէ Բագրատունոյ. և տայր նմա իշխանութիւն պատրկութեան ի վերա աշխարհիս Հայոց հրամանաւ Հեշմա. և բազում պատուով պատուէր զնա. իսկ իմացեալ որդւոցն Սմպատա զպատիւն Աշոտի. զի մեծացաւ անձն նորա յաչս Հեշմա և յաչս զաւրավարին Մրվանա. և յոյժ խեռութեամ կէին ընդ նմա մինչև հասանէր գժտութիւն նոցա յականջս որդոյն Մահմետի. և վաղվաղակի հրամաէ ունել զնոսա. և առաքէր առ իշխանն Իսմաելի զԳրիգոր և զԴաւիթ որք էին ի տոհմէ Մամիկոնեան. և գրէր ամբաստանութիւն զնոցանէն թէ հակառակք և խազմարարք են իշխանութեան Աշոտի. և

43 իլ in lft. mg.
44 արժանի | արժանեաց Hand 1 corr.
45 իտ. in lft. mg.
46 արձակ[82v]
COMMENTARY

IX.A. CALIPHAL GOVERNANCE

Lewond mentions only two governors of Armenia during the reign of Hishām, claiming that the caliph had appointed Ḥārith b. ʿAmr al-Ṭāʾī and Marwān b. Muḥammad over Armenia. Jarrāḥ b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Ḥakamī, Saʿīd b. ʿAmr al-Ḥarashī, and Maslama b. ʿAbd al-Malik appear only as “generals” (զաւրավարք) in Łewond’s text, and he focuses solely on their military campaigns to the exclusion of any administrative duties. All five of these governor-generals held leadership positions in the Arab-Khazar wars, making it impossible

47 պատրկութեան

48 զանախարարաց

49 մաստունս

50 իր կողմում

51 եւ նոր`
to distinguish between “governor” and “general” in any useful sense. Hārith raided the Laks, conquering an unidentified region (رساتاق حمسان). The Khazar commander Ibn Khāqān (on whom see below) killed him in battle near Warthān/Vardanakert in 108/726–27.52 Jarrāḥ b. ‘Abd Allāh was one of the most celebrated generals in this conflict, leading his forces against the Alans and the Khazars past Balanjar. He also fell in battle with Ibn Khāqān in 111/729–30.53 Saʿīd al-Ḥarashī was particularly successful in fighting the Khazars, defeating them on multiple occasions. Some sources credit him with the death of Ibn Khāqān, whereas others claim that he merely defeated him.54

The active involvement of Umayyad princes in the Arab-Khazar wars underscores the importance of this front to the Caliphate, but it also contributes to the difficulty of untangling the sequence of governor-generals under Hishām. Maslama b. ‘Abd al-Malik and Marwān b. Muḥammad were well-connected, powerful, and resourceful governors and generals in their own right. Both fought the Khazars throughout Hishām’s reign, and their presence on the frontier sometimes makes it difficult to decipher the chain of command, that is, whether the generals reported to them or to the caliph. Ėwond claims that Hishām himself sent Hārith b. ‘Amr al-Tāʾi to serve as governor of Armenia in 105/724, the first year of his reign. Multiple Arabic sources claim that Yazīd b. ‘Abd al-Malik appointed Maslama b. ‘Abd al-Malik over Armenia and Azerbaijan and that Maslama sent Hārith to govern in his name. This same confusion about who in fact appointed the governor—Hishām or Maslama—also appears in sources about Saʿīd al-Ḥarashī. When historians report on the argument between Saʿīd and Maslama (discussed below), some claim that Saʿīd was insubordinate, while others claim that Saʿīd was acting on direct orders from Hishām himself.

Hārith and Jarrāḥ were both Syrian generals who belonged to the Yemeni tribal bloc. Both have been associated with the containment policies that were supposedly characteristic of the Yemenis and that are contrasted with the expansionist policies of the Banū Qays. The evidence offered for such purported leanings is that they “attacked only districts in the Kur valley south of the Caucasus.”55 However, this line of reasoning does not withstand closer scrutiny. Jarrāḥ was one of the most successful expansionists of the Umayyad period despite being Yemeni. Jarrāḥ moved well past the recognized frontier at Bāb al-Abwāb/Darband, pushing as far as Balanjar in 104/722 and the following year. Furthermore, the two “internal” campaigns that have served to buttress this argument were Jarrāḥ’s wars with the Alans and Hārith’s against the Laks. Neither the Alans nor the Laks


55 Blankinship, Jihād State, 122–23.
were part of the Umayyad Caliphate. The campaigns of these two generals instead demonstrate that their expansionist efforts extended beyond their conflict with the Khazars. As Crone has demonstrated, such generalizations about the goals of the Yemen or the Qays are not borne out in the sources.

IX. B. ECONOMIC REFORM AND THE CADASTRE

Lewond starts his account of Hishām’s reign with a comment about ʿUmar b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz’s taxation policies. ʿUmar was famous for reforming caliphal taxation to reflect Qurʾānic norms, dispensing with customs that had accumulated on the basis of local practices. Lewond claims that Hishām was angry about these reforms, “as if he [ʿUmar] had unjustly spent the stores of the treasury that had been amassed for the princes before him” (Ľp, ինիզրիկունք դանկացք գործիք գումարիք գործիք հատկացքիք տրե իրահանում իր պատմութ ջանջ ուսու) [73v]. ʿUmar had eliminated the Umayyad princes’ stipends, divested them of their tax-farming estates, and withdrawn their exemption from kharāj taxes. To justify these changes, he cited his interpretation of Qurʾān 59:7, which he read to warn against the perpetual accumulation of communal wealth in the hands of the rich. Lewond claims that Hishām did not share his predecessor’s fiscal policy, contrasting ʿUmar’s “goodness” (բարևտութիւնն) with Hishām’s avarice.

ʿUmar’s taxation policies and Hishām’s cadastre were both attempts to sustain an empire that was far outspending its reserves. Lewond’s description of Hishām’s reign includes significant information about the various armies of the Arab-Khazar wars. We should also keep in mind that the Umayyads were engaged in a multifront conflict, as their conquests hit their apogee during the caliphate of Hishām. As K. Blankinship has demonstrated, caliphal finances became increasingly strained in the aftermath of the expensive campaigns against Constantinople. Funding troops on multiple fronts—Armenia, Transoxiana, Sind, and Spain—was challenging and, in the end, impossible to maintain. Hishām’s response to this difficulty was to impose an empire-wide crackdown aimed at forcing governors to send tax revenues to the caliph. In the first years of his reign, a number of wars broke out across provinces in response to the more draconian taxation policies he had introduced.

The harsh taxation policies and the taking of a cadastre that Lewond attributes to Hishām appear in other sources, too. Movsēs Dasxuranc’i similarly records that in the winter of AE 174/725 CE, Hārith took a cadastre, which “subjected man and beast and all regions of the country to servitude by the imposition of heavy tribute” (ուր ուրից գործիք ու գերերերի ներկե բեն հայրինջ ուղերի ծառութիւնուց). The anonymous Syriac Chronicle to 1234 also recounts the heavy taxes imposed by Hishām: “When Hishām b. ʿAbd

56 Crone, “Qays and Yemen.”
57 Blankinship, Jihād State, 85; Gibb, “Fiscal Rescript,” 5 and 10–11.
58 Blankinship, Jihād State, 88–89.
59 We have translated ուժանբագայից as “cadastre” because the term contains the word ուժաբագ, “realm,” “land,” and the sentence says that it was imposed over the land of Armenia. Nonetheless, we may surmise that a census was simultaneously taken. It is difficult to differentiate between the census and the cadastre, as the Syriac/Arabic word taʿdīl does not have a single clear definition.
60 Dasxuranc’i, History, 209; Patmutʼiwn, 320.
al-Malik reigned, he oppressed men with the taking of tribute, more than all the kings before him” (ܐܕܡܕܐܬܐ ܝܬܝܪ ܡܟܐܠܨ ܗܘܐ ܠܒܢܝܢܫܐ ܐܒܫܩܡܕ ܐܡܟܐ ܕܩܕܡܘܗܝ, which means “He made taxation heavier than any before him”). However, this policy was apparently not maintained across the Caliphate during Hishām’s entire reign. For example, Ṭabarī notes that when Naṣr b. Sayyār assumed the governorship of Khurāsān in 120/738, he lowered the kharāj and made Khurāsān prosperous. Such notices may reveal differences in provincial-level policies, but it is also possible that Lewond’s assessment is skewed chronologically. Hishām b. ‘Abd al-Malik ruled for twenty years, but Lewond’s information about his taxation policies pertains only to the first few years of his reign.

IX.C. THE KHAZAR CAPTURE OF ARDABIİL/ARTAWĒT

Lewond does not add anything substantial to the story of the death of Jarrāḥ b. ‘Abd Allāh, but his information on the Khazar campaign against Ardabīl/Artawēt offers interesting details about the Khazars and their campaign into Azerbaijan/Atrpatakan. T’armač is likely the Turkic word talmač’, “translator,” employed here as a title to refer to the representative of P’arsbit’. P’arsbit’ is a far more difficult name to parse, in part because of the potential variants. Arabic and Persian sources discuss the Khazar general who led the campaign against Ardabīl/Artawet by the name Bārjīk (باجیک). Ibn A’tham names the general as Bārsbik b. Khāqān (بَارسبيك بن خاقان), whereas Khalīfa b. Khayyāṭ corrupts the name to Mārdīk (مارديك). Theophanes and Ṭabarī refer to him merely as “the son of the khagan” (ὁ υἱὸς Χαγάνου; ابن خاقان), without a proper name. Some modern scholars have argued that Bārjīk the son of the khagan is in fact Lewond’s P’arsbit’, but this identification poses some problems. First, Lewond claims that P’arsbit’ was the name of the mother of the khagan who died. K. Czeglédy proposes that we read Lewond’s duʾmāt (mother) as ḥuʾm (father), which would at least resolve the issue of P’arsbit’’s gender. However, this emendation does not necessarily solve the whole problem. In all of the non-Armenian sources, Bārjīk b. Khāqān is the one who led the campaign against Ardabīl/Artawēt. He was sent by his father, the (presumably living) khagan. In Lewond’s text, the khagan was dead and P’arsbit’ merely ordered the campaign without personally leading it. In view of the different roles, the khagan’s possible death, and the confusion about P’arsbit’’s gender, it is worth revisiting the assumption that Bārjīk and P’arsbit’ were one and the same person. Further, P. Golden warns that looking for بارسبيك بارجیک may not be wise. Others, including S. Shirota, have argued that Bārjīk was the son of the previous khagan, since he appears with that patronymic in connection with events in 103/721–22; this would make him the brother of the deceased khagan mentioned in Lewond and the son or ward of P’arsbit’.

62 Ṭabarī, Taʾrīkh, 2:1665.
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Lewond’s geographical information here is also useful for tracing the Khazar invasion of the southern Caucasus. The Khazars entered caliphal territory through the Șul/Çoray pass and crossed the land of the Mak’st’k (Մաքստաց). This seems to be a misspelling of Mazk’utk’, a common ethno-toponym with a contested definition. Garsoïan has outlined the difficulties of identifying the Mazk’utk’, tracing several different strains of scholarship on the question. They may be the Massagetae or potentially Alans, but earlier Armenian and Greek sources identify them as Huns (Μασαχούτων Οὐνόν). Some scholars have associated the Mazk’utk’ with the region of Mόσχοι (Մոսիկում) in southwestern Georgia, but most geographers have connected them to the region along the Caspian Sea near Șul/Çoray.67 The latter is in line with the Arabic sources, which locate Masqat between Shābarān and Bāb al-Abwāb.68

Lewond next has the Khazars crossing the Araxes into P’aytakaran, which he labels “the land of the Persians” (երկիրն Պարսից) [74r]. P’aytakaran is a difficult province to map, though the short recension of Širakac’i’s geography is invaluable: “P’aytakaran lies east of Utik’ along the Araxes. It has twelve districts: Hrak’otperož, Vardanakert, Ewt’n’orakean Baginn, K’o’keean, Řovtibal, K’alaniot, Bo’śniaca, Hani, At’li, Bagawan, Spandanaperoz, Ormzdperoz, Alawan” (Փայտակարան յելից կայ Ուտիոյ առ Երասխաւ։ Ունի գաւառս երկոտասան․ Հրաքոտպերոժ, Վարդանակերտ, Եւթնփորակեան Բագինն, Քոեկեան, Ռովտիբաղա, Քաղանռոտ, Բոռոսպիճան, Հանի, Աթլի, Բագաւան, Spandaranperož, Ormzdperož, Alawan).69 Other editions of Širakac’i add the gloss that Azerbaijan/Atrpatakan “now” controls these districts (գաւառս ունի երկոտասան, զոր այժմ Ատրպատական ունի).70 Širakac’i thus includes the districts listed in Lewond’s account—At’šibagwan, Spatar P’erawz, and Ormizd P’erawz—with some differences in spelling. Since Širakac’i claims that P’aytakaran consists of twelve districts but includes thirteen in his list, Lewond’s “district that was called At’šibagwan” (գաւառն որ աթշիբագուանն կոչի) [74r] should correct Širakac’i: Աթլի and Բագաւան are one district, although they appear in the modern editions as two. Lewond’s spelling, At’šibagwan, also renders the Middle Persian more correctly than Širakac’i’s text does, as the name means “the place of the god of fire.” This toponym, like Spandanaperoz and Ormzdperož, reflects local memories of Zoroastrian traditions in Azerbaijan/Atrpatakan.71

This campaign also appears in Arabic sources, the most detailed of which is that of Ibn Aʿtham, who similarly situates the conflict in Ardabil/Artawēt but otherwise tracks the Khazars using very different points of reference: Shacki, Bardha’a, Baylaqan, Warthān, and Bājarwān. However, Ibn A’tham does claim that Jarrāḥ sent raiding parties into Jīlān/Gelan, the province that R. Hewsen places adjacent to At’šibagwan, Spandanaperōz, and Ormzdperož.72

---

67 Buzandac’i, Epic Histories, 389–90; Širakac’i, Geography, 121–22; see Gadjiev, “Armenia.”
68 Balādhuri, in Futūḥ, 194, does not explicitly locate Masqat, but he does describe these three regions together. The History of Darband places Masqat on the river Sannmûr, which lies between Darband and Shābarān; Minorsky, History, 35. See also Yaqūt al-Ḥamawī, Mu’jam al-buldān, 5:127.
70 Širakac’i, Ašxarhac’oyc’, 33.
71 Širakac’i, Geography, 257–59.
72 Ibn A’tham, Futūḥ, 7/8:266–69; Hewsen and Salvatico, Armenia, 100, map 77.
IX.D. THE CONFRONTATION BETWEEN SAʿĪD AL-ḤARASHĪ AND MASLAMA B. ʿABD AL-MALIK

Part of Lewond's discussion of Saʿīd al-Ḥarashī’s campaigns against the Khazars appears in similar form in Arabic texts. Lewond claims that Saʿīd defeated the Khazars unexpectedly and won the release of their prisoners. Ṭabarī aligns with Lewond this far, noting that in 112/730–31, “it is mentioned that Saʿīd b. ʿAmr came upon three groups of Turks who were going to the Khāqān with the Muslims and dhimmīs they had captured. Al-Ḥarashī rescued those who had been taken and made great slaughter among the Turğs." Ibn Aʿtham states that "the Muslim men, women, and children who were held by the Khazars were delivered, along with their animals." He subsequently credits Saʿīd with the release of the female slaves and children of Jarrāḥ. Ibn Aʿtham, Balʿamī, and Yaʿqūbī mention only Muslim prisoners in this context.

Lewond’s account of the disagreement between Saʿīd al-Ḥarashī and Maslama b. ʿAbd al-Malik makes little sense on its own: Saʿīd was successful against the Khazars, so Maslama wanted to kill him. Lewond offers no explanation for Maslama’s actions, which can only paint him as an unreasonable aggressor. Similarly laconic narratives appear in Arabic. Khalīfa b. Khayyāṭ, for example, presents the argument without enough detail to make it meaningful. Yaʿqūbī, Ibn Aʿtham, and Balʿamī offer the most detailed versions of what happened, but they do not fully agree with each other. The main difference is that Yaʿqūbī clearly denigrates Saʿīd as an upstart, whereas Ibn Aʿtham is relentlessly defensive of Saʿīd. These details help us situate Lewond’s inchoate explanation within a broader context of confrontation, as the details in Lewond’s version locate him firmly in the pro-Saʿīd tradition of Ibn Aʿtham.

Yaʿqūbī claims that Saʿīd was acting under Maslama’s orders but that he killed the Khazar commander and sent his head back to Hishām without bothering to report to Maslama for the latter’s approval. Maslama consequently imprisoned him at Qabala/Kapalak until Hishām demanded his release. Saʿīd’s crime, then, was insubordination, as he flagrantly ignored the expected chain of command. Ibn Aʿtham and Balʿamī rebut these claims by insisting that Hishām, not Maslama, had sent Saʿīd and that Saʿīd had discussed the plan with Hishām at length before he left. Saʿīd had led several battles against the Khazars before Maslama was even appointed over Armenia and Azerbaijan. When Hishām appointed Maslama, the former wrote to Saʿīd to order him to cease his campaigns until Maslama could take over the leadership, recalling Saʿīd so he might receive a reward for his amazing deeds. Saʿīd did as he was ordered: "He remained where he was [in Shārwān] without battling anyone" or, as Balʿamī puts it: "Il

74 Ibn Aʿtham, Futūḥ, 7/8:725.
75 Khalīfa, Taʾrīkh, 222. In 113/731–32, according to Khalīfa, Hishām replaced Saʿīd b. ʿAmr al-Ḥarashi with his brother Maslama and Maslama “seized Saʿīd b. ʿAmr and then shackled and imprisoned him, but Hishām sent to have him released from prison” (ابن سعيد بن عمرو فقیدو وحبسه، فبعد هشام فاخرجه من الحبس). Yaʿqūbī, Taʾrīkh, 2:381.
76 Ibn Aʿtham, Futūḥ, 7/8:7280.
suspendit immédiatement sa campagne et attendit Maslama, pour lui remettre le gouvernement (وهم آنجا كه بود بايستاد وحرب نكرد وچشم همی داشت كه سلسله پياد وکار به سپارند). Maslama arrived in Bardha’ā/Partaw and ordered Saʿīd to come to him. Maslama accused Saʿīd of disobeying his orders to refrain from battling the Khazars until he arrived. Saʿīd responded that he had defeated the Khazars before he received Maslama’s orders, but Maslama called him a liar and accused him of seeking glory to appease his own vanity. Maslama threw Saʿīd into the jail at Bardha’ā/Partaw. When he heard of what had happened, Hishām wrote an angry letter to accuse Maslama of imprisoning Saʿīd out of envy over his success and to demand Saʿīd’s release. Maslama relented and forwarded Hishām’s letter to Saʿīd. These letters should be construed as rhetorical crutches, but they allow Ibn Aʿtham and Balʿamī to build a narrative in support of Saʿīd with direct approval of the caliph: “He expressed his approval for him, his family members, and his clan” (يعده الرضاء له واهل بيته وعشيرته). Maslama had Saʿīd released from prison, bathed, and dressed in a robe of honor that the caliph had sent. According to Ibn Aʿtham, Saʿīd returned to Hishām and the caliph “bestowed estates upon him, his family members, and his clan” (اقطعه وأقطع أهل بيته وعشيرته فطائح). In Balʿamī’s text, Maslama himself bestows favors on Saʿīd and his family: “Maslama le reçut avec distinction, le fit revêtir d’une robe d’honneur et lui donna un prés- sent, ainsi qu’à ses familiers, puis il leur assigna des grands fiefs, auxquels leur nom est resté attaché jusqu’à ce jour” (مسلمه او را بنواخت وخلعت افگند وصلت داد او را وعشيرت او را واقطاعشان). In fact, the Ḥarashīs are difficult to pin down. The nisba is frequently distorted, most commonly confused with either al-Jurashī (the clan of Jurash in Ḥimyār) or al-Jarashī (from Jarash in Jordan or a branch of the Banū Qudā’ā). However, these variations reflect the spelling of the nisba in Arabic; Lewond’s spelling as Հարաշի confirms that here Ḥarashī must be correct. The nisba derives from Saʿīd’s purported ancestor Ḥarīsh: Tabarī provides Saʿīd’s full name as Saʿīd b. ʿAmr b. al-Aswad b. Mālik b. Kaʿb b. Waqdān b. Ḥarīsh b. Kaʾb b. Rabīʿa b. ʿĀmir b. Saʾsaʾa. This lineage establishes Saʿīd as a member of the Banū Kaʾb, so the concern here must be with the powerful Qaysī confederation to which the

78 Balʿamī, Chronique, 4:283; Tārīkhnāma, 4:940.
79 Ibn Aʿtham, Futūḥ, 7/8:281.
80 Balʿamī, Chronique, 4:284; Tārīkhnāma, 4:941.
81 Crone, Slaves on Horses, 144 n. 74.
82 Even V. Minorsky questioned whether Saʿīd’s nisba should be read as Jarashi instead of Ḥarashi; Minorsky, “New Book,” 127.
83 Logically, the only alternative is that Lewond received this report after the nisba’s corruption from Jarashi, as the change makes sense only as a scribal error in Arabic. Given the tribal explanation, this theory is unnecessary.
84 Tabarī, Taʾrīkh, 2:1436.
Banū Kaʿb belonged, rather than with Harashi’s immediate relations. At the time when Maslama threw Saʿīd in jail, all of his commanding forces were Qaysī, and many of them were even Kaʿbī.85 The Syro-Jazīran Qaysīs maintained control over military and political positions of the Marwānid period until the third fitna and the ‘Abbāsid Revolution.86 We might wonder, then, why Maslama would throw a powerful Qaysī general—one who had proven himself successful against the Khazars—into jail, risking a confrontation between the Umayyads and the main tribal bloc that sustained their army. This move is even more surprising given that Maslama was elsewhere relentlessly pro-Qaysī.

The crux of the matter seems to be that Saʿīd generated animosity even within his tribe. Despite his remarkable deeds, he was also quite clearly a divisive figure. Ṭabarī records a number of episodes in which people openly questioned Saʿīd’s leadership, abilities, and courage. During his earlier governorship of Khurāsān, in 104/722–23, he reportedly wrote to the caliph Yazīd b. ʿAbd al-Malik directly to inform him about his campaigns in Sogdiana, thereby bypassing the Qaysī governor of Iraq, ʿUmar b. Hubayra al-Fazārī. Saʿīd subsequently killed a nobleman from Samarqand, even though Ibn Hubayra had ordered Saʿīd to release him. This caused Ibn Hubayra to dismiss Saʿīd from the governorship and to order his men to imprison, torture, and kill Saʿīd. The new governor, even though he openly admitted to Ibn Hubayra that he disliked Saʿīd, intervened to save his life, claiming that Saʿīd was the bravest of the Banū Qays and so his death would be disadvantageous for them all.87 Ibn Hubayra backed down and ordered Saʿīd’s release.

There are a number of parallels between the Khurāsānī and Armenian stories. In both, Saʿīd was accused of neglecting the proper chain of command. In both, the governor imprisoned Saʿīd and yet he was released because of his status and reputation within the Qaysī confederation. Both episodes signal that Saʿīd enjoyed the support of the Banū Qays despite his abrasive personality. However, in the Khurāsānī story, the governor, Ibn Hubayra, was even more prominent than Saʿīd was among the Banū Qays. This detail demonstrates that Saʿīd was a controversial figure even within his own tribe, generating both support for his valorous deeds and recriminations for his methods and attitude. The Khurāsānī comparison allows us to speculate that the two attitudes emerged even within the Qaysī milieu, as the first seen in Yaʿqūbī and the second in Ibn Aʿtham and Balʿamī.

When his actions are viewed in light of these other sources, Maslama is not as rash or impetuous as he appears in Łewond’s account. Instead, Łewond reflects a pro-Saʿīd version of the story and so casts Maslama as irrational and power-hungry, a perspective shared by Ibn Aʿtham and Balʿamī. Placing Maslama’s actions into a broader context nuances our interpretation of his relations with the Banū Qays, whose members served as his commanders. Maslama’s animosity for Saʿīd likely did not alienate the entire clan. Therefore, when Łewond claims that Maslama was concerned about Saʿīd’s clan, we need not read this as a confrontation between the Umayyads and the Banū Qays writ large.

85 Balādhurī, Futūḥ, 206. Among the Banū Kaʿb, Balādhurī lists Ishāq b. Muslim al-ʿUqaylī and his brothers, and Jaʿwana b. Ḥārith b. Khālid; as non-Kaʿbī commanders who were nonetheless Qaysī, he mentions Dufāfa and Khālid b. ʿUmar b. Ḥubāb al-Sulamī, Furāt b. Salmān al-Bāhilī, and Walīd b. Qaʿqāʿ al-ʿAbsī.
86 Crone, “Qays and Yemen,” 7–8 and 54 n. 287 for Saʿīd in particular.
87 Ṭabarī, Taʾrīkh, 2:1455.
IX. THE CALIPHATE OF HISHĀM B. ‘ABD AL-MALIK

IX.E. MASLAMA’S CAMPAIGN AGAINST CONSTANTINOPLE

Łewond’s recounting of Maslama’s siege of Constantinople provides a seemingly idiosyncratic reading of this famous military endeavor and defeat. His chronology and selection of recorded events are determined by either his own or, more likely, his source’s narrative thrust, which seeks to simultaneously highlight the piety of the emperor Leo and invert the heroic portrayal of the general Maslama. Łewond’s account shares points of information with other sources, most prominently Ibn Aʿtham’s report, but he often endows them with a different valence. Moreover, his depiction of the failed siege of the city ties together ideological strands about the veracity of Christianity and the power of the cross that support the arguments made by Leo in the correspondence and refute the “anti-Christian acts” of the caliph Yazīd.

IX.E.1. Maslama b. ‘Abd al-Malik as the Hero of the Ambush

Łewond describes one of Maslama’s campaigns in Anatolia before he went to Constantinople. Łewond claims that Leo was following Maslama’s progress and that he signaled to the Greek general to beware of deception. “The Ishmaelite general” then announced that his forces would raid the countryside; the Greeks believed him and went after them, but it was a trap. Maslama ambushed the Greeks and roundly defeated them. His forces took 80,000 captives, distributed spoils among the troops, and returned to caliphal territory, where his brother, the caliph, was pleased with his success.

Ibn Aʿtham’s 
Chronicle of Zuqnin

provides a close parallel to Łewond’s account of the ambush and allows us to trace the encounter through other sources. The 
Chronicle explains that the event occurred in the city of Tyana. The governor decided to attack the Arabs by surprise, but the Arabs discovered the plan. Maslama sent a famous commander named ʿAbbās along with an army to catch the Greeks off guard. “He placed the whole army in ambushes, ravines, and reed-islands that were there” (ܗ ܒܟܡܝܢܐ ܐ ܟܡ ܒܓܙܪܬܐ ܕܙܠܡ ܘܒܪܓܘ). When the Greeks pitched camp and set their animals out to pasture, the Arabs emerged, surrounded the Greeks, and killed them all. Then the Arabs returned to their land.

The 
Chronicle of Zuqnin

provides details such as the name of Maslama’s general—ʿAbbās—and the location of the ambush—the Greek city of Tyana—that allow us to investigate the ambush further. The Syriac ܛܘܢܘ renders the Greek Τύανα, in Cappadocia; it appears in Arabic as طوانة. Arabic accounts such as Ṭabarī’s have Maslama and his nephew ʿAbbās b. Walīd b. ʿAbd al-Malik fighting in Ṭuwāna in Jumādā II 88/May–June 707:

Ṭuwāna was captured by Maslama b. ʿAbd al-Malik and ʿAbbās b. Walid. On that day, the Muslims defeated the enemy. They went into their church, then returned. The people were defeated such that they thought they would never recover from it. ʿAbbās remained with a troop among whom was Ibn Muhayriz al-Jumahī. ʿAbbās said to Ibn Muhayriz: “Where are the people of the Qur’ān who seek paradise?” and Ibn Muhayriz responded: “Call them and they will come to you.” So ʿAbbās called: “O

---

88 Chronicle of Zuqnin, 152; Chronicon Anonymum Pseudo-Dionysianum, 2:159.
people of the Qurʾān” and they all came forward. God defeated the enemy until they entered Ṭuwāna.

Khalīfa b. Khayyāṭ also attests to Maslama and ʿAbbās’s capture of Ṭuwāna from the Greeks in 88/707: “The Greeks gathered a large force against them and they marched against them. God defeated the Greeks and killed many of them—it is said fifty thousand” (جمعت لهم الروم اجتمعاً كثيراً، فزحفوا إليهم، فهزم الله الروم وقتل منهم بشراً كثيراً بالقول: خمسون الفا). The emperor sent against them [Maslama and ʿAbbās] two generals, namely Theodore Karteroukas and Theophylaktos Salibas, with an army and a throng of peasant militia so as to fight and expel them. Rent by mutual dissensions, they made a disorderly attack and were routed; many thousands perished and many more were taken captive. The Arabs seized the camp equipment and the provisions and continued the siege until they had taken the city, for they had been short on food and were on the point of departing. On seeing this, the inhabitants of Tyana gave up hope. They accepted a promise of immunity and came out to the Arabs, leaving the city deserted until this very day. The Arabs did not keep their promise and drove some of them into the desert, keeping many others as slaves. Here, finally, we find some of the same elements as those found in Lewond—namely, the Arab seizure of the Greek equipment and the reportedly high number of slaves.

---

89 Ṭabarī, Taʾrīkh, 2:1192.
90 Khalīfa, Taʾrīkh, 191.
91 Bar Šinaya, Chronographie, 98; bar Šinaya, Opus Chronologicum, 7:158.
92 Theophanes, Chronicle, 526.
93 Theophanes, Chronographia, 377. Cf. Nikephoros, Short History, 106–7 (text) and 201–2 (commentary).
This episode is far from straightforward. Perhaps most problematically, Lewond places the ambush in Bithynia on the river Sagaris (Sangarios), which is too far to the north to make sense of Tyana, which lies 200 km directly east of Konya. It is only the evidence of the Chronicle of Zuqnin that allows us to speculate that Maslama’s ambush relates specifically to his capture of Ṭuwāna/Tyana in 88/707 or 89/708. Whereas the Chronicle of Zuqnin places the ambush after the siege of Constantinople, Lewond’s sequence of events is consistent with the dates given in all other sources—Greek, Arabic, and Syriac alike. However, like the Chronicle, Lewond clearly construes the ambush to be linked conceptually to the siege of Constantinople. Although Lewond does specify that Maslama returned to the caliph after the ambush (so the siege cannot have been part of the same expedition), he places both campaigns during the reign of Hishām, several decades later than we would expect. In this context, the ambush serves to establish Maslama’s career in the field and to demonstrate that his endeavors against Roman power had been successful in the past. When this episode is added to Lewond’s account of Maslama’s success at Darband/Bāb al-Abwāb (chapter VI), we might speculate that the aim of Lewond’s selective narrative is to establish Maslama as a worthy foe, as if to put his victory against Constantinople into the realm of possibility and thereby to highlight the divine involvement in the city’s protection and his subsequent failure.

IX.E.2. Lewond and Ibn Aʿṭham: Mirror Images of the Siege of Constantinople

As Borrut explains, Lewond’s report of the siege of Constantinople reads as a mirror image of that of Ibn Aʿṭham: “ils furent toutefois développés dans une direction opposée, dans le cadre d’une compétition historiographique, où chaque camp finira par ériger son chef en héros donneur de victoire.”94 To this, we might add Balʿamī’s History. Although Balʿamī also had access to another set of traditions, his overall explanation of the siege aligns neatly with Ibn Aʿṭham’s against Lewond’s. Lewond’s text, then, participates in this competitive recasting of the story to allow for the deheroization of Maslama.

Ibn Aʿṭham and Balʿamī construe Maslama’s campaign as a fourteen-year affair stretching from the reign of ʿAbd al-Malik to that of Sulaymān b. ʿAbd al-Malik (though it somehow still fell entirely within the reign of Leo, ṣāḥib al-Rūm). Because the campaign unfurled over such a long period, Ibn Aʿṭham interrupts his account of it with the conquests of Qutayba b. Muslim in Khurāsān and the rebellion of Yazīd b. al-Muhallab. As a result, the events of the campaign are scattered across more than a hundred pages of Umayyad history. Ibn Aʿṭham includes many of the same events that Lewond does, but not always in the same order. Nonetheless, the correspondences between Ibn Aʿṭham, Balʿamī, and Lewond are simply too close to be coincidental, and Borrut postulates that they drew their information from a common version of events, which he labels “version 2.” Nonetheless, the historians’ own editorial voices shine through in the differences between the three accounts.

First, Ibn Aʿṭham and Lewond both have Maslama travel from Armenia to the caliph and thence to Constantinople. According to Lewond, Maslama moved from Armenia through Cilicia to arrive at Constantinople. Given this path, he must have returned to Damascus after the affair with Saʿīd, since he arrived at Constantinople from the south.

94 Borrut, Entre mémoire et pouvoir, 259.
This detail aligns with Ibn Aʿtham’s text. Ibn Aʿtham claims that when ʿAbd al-Malik decided to launch the attack against Constantinople, he called on the governors of various provinces for support: “Then he also wrote to his brother Muḥammad b. Marwān and his son Maslama, who at that time were in Armenia and Azerbaijan, and he summoned the two of them to him with all of the troops that were with them both” (ثم كتب أيضاً إلى أخيه معاذ بن مروان وإلى ابنه مسلمة وهما يُأثرون في بلاد أرمينية وأذربيجان فأشخصهما إليه في جميع من معهما من أجنادهما). The caliph traveled with Maslama as far as Dābiq, and then Maslama continued on via Țuwaṇa/Tyana and ʿAmūriyya/Amorium. Second, according to Łewond, Maslama swore an oath not to return until he had fulfilled the caliph’s wishes:

He [Maslama] swore an oath to his brother not to return to him until he had completed his wishes. This was the oath that he took: to capture the kingdom and to demolish the city called Constantinople, as well as the exquisite foundation of Hagia Sophia, which was built by supernal wisdom as a house of God on earth, [and] to turn it into a place of worship of filthy idolatry.

This point appears in Ibn Aʿtham and Balʿamī, as well, though there it is clearly cast to support Maslama’s campaign. Leo reached out to Maslama by letter to request a peaceful end to the conflict, suggesting that he withdraw from the environs of the city. Maslama responded: “I would travel from you to Masīḥiyya except that I have already sworn an inviolable oath that I will never leave this peninsula [of Constantinople] unless I enter this city of yours” (أرحل عنك إلى المسيحية، غير أنني آليم لياً لا كفارة لها أنني لا أرحل عن هذا الجزيرة أبداً) (الإدخال، ينوي خارج جزيرة مسيحيه، وليس بالرغم من أنني سوي ملك كنيسة).  

Balʿamī follows suit:

J’aurais fait la paix, si je n’en étais empêché par mon sermon; car j’ai juré de ne point quitter ces lieux avant d’être entré dans la ville et d’avoir fait ce que j’aurai voulu; j’ai juré de rester ici jusqu’à ce que Dieu me donne la grâce de la prendre par la force, ou jusqu’à ce qu’on me tue ou qu’on me meure.

Third, Łewond claims that Leo built fortifications to protect Constantinople and refused to fight the Muslims as he waited for divine guidance. Ibn Aʿtham and Balʿamī, by contrast,
narrate the precise opposite. In their tellings, when Leo heard of Maslama’s crossing, he loaded ships full of warriors and weapons, all of which were roundly defeated. They also have Maslama build a fortified city outside of Constantinople called “the city of subjugation” (madīnat al-qahr). Maslama roaming the region around Constantinople, killing many of the Greeks who came out to face them.99

Fourth, Łewond claims that Maslama’s troops were starving, so he begged Leo to allow them to leave:

So a great famine came upon their camp, to the point that they devoured horses and mules. Subsequently they laid hold of the concubines and the servants to slaughter and eat [them] so that they might stave off their starvation. So then he [Maslama] beseeched the emperor Leo with many entreaties to show him mercy and release [81v] [them] from imprisonment, for few remained from his many [forces].

By contrast, Ibn Aʿtham proclaims that soon after they arrived at Constantinople, “Maslama ordered his companions to cultivate [the land], and so they planted vineyards and various fruits. They decided on a place there to settle those who never wanted to return to the lands of Islam” (أمر مسلمة أصحابه بالغرس فغرسوا الاشجار من الكروم وأنواع الفواكه، وعزموا على المقام إقامة من لا يريد الرجوع الى بلاد الإسلام أبداً).100 As in the case of Leo’s response to Maslama’s crossing, then, Łewond and Ibn Aʿtham here offer mirrored accounts. Balʿamī’s version is more complicated; although he, too, asserts that Maslama ordered his men to plant food when he arrived at Constantinople. He then cites Ṭabarī explicitly and switches tracks to claim, like Łewond, that there was a famine that ultimately forced the Muslims to eat their horses. Afterward Balʿamī returns to the narrative as found in Ibn Aʿtham.101

Fifth, Łewond reports that upon reaching the shores of the Black Sea, Maslama sent an insulting letter to the emperor, boasting that he would level Constantinople if the Romans did not submit to taxes: “I will make what you call Sophia, which is your house of worship, into a bathhouse for my troops. I will smash and crush the wood of your cross that you worship on your head” (وجعل ما تُعلم به صوفيا، وهو بيتكم للعبادة، إلى سبيلاً للجند، وأنامبضي واجزوع كوركتم الذي تذوبح به الرأس). In response, Leo sent a letter of his own to Maslama, accusing the caliphal general of arrogance and comparing him to Pharaoh at the Red Sea. Maslama, insulted by the letter, prepared for a naval attack on the city. Ibn Aʿtham similarly preserves the purported correspondence between Leo and Maslama, though he places the exchange at the end of the encounter rather than at the sea crossing. Ibn Aʿtham and Balʿamī both have Leo write to Maslama to decry the long siege and offer to pay a million dirhams per annum, as well as a number of other sumptuous gifts and taxes in kind. Maslama responded that he must either

100 Ibn Aʿtham, Futūḥ, 7/8:144. Cf. Ṭabarī, Taʾrīkh, 2:1315–16. Ibn Aʿtham has Maslama sow crops and then burn them to force the war along; see also Yaʿqūbī, Taʾrīkh, 2:359; Chronicle of Zuqnīn, 151.
enter the city or fall before its walls in the path of God. At the end of the encounter, Ibn Aʿtham claims that the two exchanged letters yet again. As he boarded his ships to leave the land of the Romans, Maslama asked that Leo refrain from harming the mosque near Constantinople—that he not extract a single stone from its walls, remove a single beam of wood from its roof, or break a single column in the mosque after the Muslims leave. Leo promised to fulfill Maslama’s request and to ensure that no Greek would set foot in the mosque.

Sixth, Lewond’s text seems to imply that Maslama in fact entered Constantinople: Leo “summoned him and criticized him greatly” (կոչէր զնա առ ինքն և խաւսէր ընդ նմա բազում դատաստանաւք) [81v]. Ibn Aʿtham also describes Maslama’s entrance into Constantinople, but with more detail. Maslama wore white, the color of the Umayyads, as he rode alone into the city: “The Romans watched him with gazes from every corner, amazed by his courage, daring, and fortitude. He [the narrator] said: But Maslama went through the city without even glancing at anyone until he arrived at the entrance of the palace of Leo, the king of the Romans” (رمقته الروم بأبصارها من كل ناحية متعجبين من شجاعته وإقدامه وشدة...). According to Ibn Aʿtham, Leo, rather than criticizing Maslama, greeted him by kissing his hand and then accompanied him as he rode through the city. Balʿamī includes this passage, as well, adding that Leo kissed not just Maslama’s hand but also his feet.103

Seventh, Lewond has Leo order a procession, focused on the centrality of Hagia Sophia as a religious center and a symbol of the city. This passage suggests that Leo’s firm commitment to Christianity aided in the city’s protection, as the emperor called for divine assistance against the threat of invasion. Ibn Aʿtham’s and Balʾamī’s accounts resonate with Lewond’s by likewise depicting Hagia Sophia as the focal point of Christian power in the city. However, Ibn Aʿtham and Balʾamī do not report a religious procession, but describe Maslama’s ride from the royal palace to Hagia Sophia as a spectacle, evoking political grandeur. Along the road to the palace, Leo “ordered a row of horses and men, from the gate of the city to the gate of the great church, with banners and flags. The patricians were arranged in the best finery that they could manage, standing in two lines along Maslama’s path” (أمر بصف الخيل والرجالة من باب المدينة إلى باب الكنيسة العظمى بالرايات والأعلام، وترتبت البطارقة). Like the procession in Lewond’s account, Ibn Aʿtham’s description of a scripted reception connects politics with pomp, both tethered to Hagia Sophia.

Eighth, Lewond invokes the cross multiple times. First he has Maslama threaten to smash the cross, as discussed above. Then he refers to the cross as part of the procession to protect the city: “The people raised up the sound of glorification and the sweet odor of incense, carrying brilliant candles and torches in the front and back [of the procession] in honor of the victorious and venerable cross” (և ժողովուրդքն զհնչիւն փառատրութե ան և զբուրումն անուշահոտութե ան խնկոցն. և զպայծառութի մոմեղինացն եւ ջահիցն առաջի և զկնի բերելով. ի պատիւ յաղթող և պատուական խաչին). Finally, he reports that the emperor struck the water with the sign of the cross, which created a storm that destroyed the caliphal navy. Ibn Aʿtham and Balʾamī also place

---

103 Balʾamī, Chronique, 4:242.
104 Ibn Aʿtham, Futūḥ, 7/8:224.
the cross at the heart of this story. Despite his failure to take the city, they imagine Maslama’s campaign against Constantinople as symbolically successful through his capture of the cross of Hagia Sophia. Whereas Lewond’s cross represents spiritual fortitude, divine intervention, and communal prayer, Ibn A’tham’s and Bal’ami’s cross is made of gold and gems. Ibn A’tham explains that “Maslama looked at their greatest cross, which was made of gold and inlaid with gems, set up on a stand of gold. So Maslama approached the cross and took it off of the stand, holding it in his hands.”

Bal’ami describes a similar scene: “It entre dans l’église, où il y avait une grande croix d’or, ornée de pierres précieuses, et un trône d’or. Maslama étendit la main et prit la croix.”

Leo reportedly became unsettled at Maslama’s handling of the cross and requested its return. In response, Maslama swore that he would not leave the city without the cross, and he “hoisted the cross upside down on the point of his spear.”

Leo assuaged the Romans’ concerns about the cross by promising to provide another like it. This promise suggests not only that the cross was eminently replaceable but also that the emperor himself admitted to its dispensability. The Muslims at the walls surrounding the city shouted the takbir (“God is great”) to signal the symbolic capture of the city.

Finally, Lewond has Maslama, grateful for Leo’s mercy, vow never to march out to war again. Allowed to leave, he returns home in shame and to a funereal welcome, lamenting that “I could not fight against God” (لئنني فتني على رأس). Lewond concludes this episode with the observation that “he went to his house and did not carry a sword at his waist until the day he died” (لم يحمل سيفه في يده حقا). In the Arabic and Persian versions, Maslama subsequently went on to fight against the Khazars when
serving as governor of Armenia under Hishām—a story that Lewond places instead in the reign of Sulaymān to allow Maslama to die after his defeat.

This myriad of shared or inverted details certainly cannot substantiate direct borrowing from one text to another. At the same time, we cannot conclude that Lewond’s, Balʿamī’s, and Ibn Aʿtham’s accounts are wholly independent. Rather, as Borrut points out, the accounts of Lewond, on the one hand, and of Ibn Aʿtham and Balʿamī, on the other, are mirror images, offering diametrically opposed versions of the overall moral of the story. Their similarities are born of a milieu in which storytelling was competitive and a storyteller might transform a chagrined loser into a victorious hero or vice versa. Far from an idiosyncratic account that might serve to corroborate the versions found in Arabic literature, Lewond’s version of the siege engages with accounts of the same event circulating in Arabic-Islamic settings. The diverse extant written versions of this tale demonstrate the ways in which authors could manipulate the details of a story to make their own points. Indeed, Lewond’s narrative seems shaped by the need to illustrate the deheroization of Maslama and, as we show below, the elevation of Leo as the “the pious emperor.” The goal of deheroizing Maslama certainly determines Lewond’s oft-noted chronological inaccuracies. Lewond reverses the temporal placement of Maslama’s victorious campaigns in the Caucasus and his defeat at the siege of Constantinople: Maslama should have suffered defeat at Constantinople under Sulaymān and then redemption in the Caucasus under Hishām, but Lewond has flipped the narrative to fit Maslama’s success in the Caucasus under Sulaymān and his failure at Constantinople under Hishām. The relocation of the failed siege to this historical moment casts his defeat as the tragic denouement of Maslama’s long life in the field. Lewond, or his source, thereby follows not any historical chronology but the narrative logic required to transform Maslama from a heroic to a chastened warrior.

IX.E.3. The Elevation of Leo as a Pious Emperor

This episode neatly ties together the letter of Leo to ʿUmar and Yazīd’s edict to destroy Christian images. By defeating Maslama through divine intervention, Leo provides empirical “proof” for his argument about the truth of Christianity against ʿUmar. The desire to provide such evidence may have also helped determine Lewond’s placement of these events chronologically after the epistolary exchange and once Leo was firmly ensconced in power. Similarly, the specific use of the cross as the weapon that defeats Maslama’s navy counters and to some degree overturns Yazīd’s order to demolish them. This parallelism may have inspired Lewond or his source to emphasize the efficacy of the cross as opposed to the Virgin Mary, to whom Patriarch Germanus attributes the salvation of the city in his famous “Homily on the Deliverance of Constantinople,” likely given in 728 ce.

On the other hand, Lewond’s treatment of events raises an interesting tension in his narrative. He presents Emperor Leo as the savior of Constantinople through the cross rather than through the image of the Virgin Mary, as described in Germanus’s homily. Later in the text, Lewond refers to Leo’s son and successor Constantine (r. 741–75 ce) as “the pious king” (արքայ բարէպաշտ) [96v]. By contrast, Theophanes calls Constantine “the impious emperor” (ὁ δυσσεβὴς βασιλεὺς) because of his iconoclasm.111 Lewond’s neg-

111 Theophanes, Chronicle, 578; Chronographia, 417.
ative portrayal of Yazid’s iconoclastic policies also specifically and uniquely foregrounds the destruction of crosses, as opposed to just painted images, as the true blasphemy in the caliph’s actions (see chapter VIII). The question thus arises whether Lewond himself subscribed to an iconoclastic position. Iconoclastic sympathies did manifest themselves in Armenia independently of and prior to the iconoclastic movements within the Roman Empire and Islam, although they did not achieve official adoption or sanction by the Armenian ecclesiastical hierarchy. It is possible, then, that Lewond favored the iconoclastic activities of Leo and, particularly, Constantine. It seems more likely, however, that the replacement of the Virgin Mary with the cross as the instrument of Constantinople’s deliverance and the ascription of piety to Constantine reflect the iconoclastic bent of Lewond’s source. Lewond elsewhere describes icons in positive terms [13v], and he also shows no interest whatsoever in the Iconoclastic Controversy or in the Second Council of Nicaea (787 CE). Nevertheless, the focus on the cross resonates well with Lewond’s narrative.

IX.E.4. Biblical Overtones of Lewond’s Description of Maslama’s Campaign

The description of Leo’s defense of Constantinople and the “rescript” of Leo’s letter to Maslama employ two biblical tropes. The first is a comparison between Leo and Hezekiah. According to Lewond, Leo reacted to Maslama’s aggressive letter by ordering the entire population to pray for three days in the Hagia Sophia. Then, in imitation of King Hezekiah’s actions upon receipt of Sennacherib’s threatening missive, Leo himself entered the cathedral with the letter, “spread it before the Lord,” and implored God to help him against his enemy.

This scene bears similarities with one described in the History attributed to Sebêos.113 There, it is the emperor Heraclios who received an insulting letter from the Sasanian Shâh Khosrow II in 624 and ordered it to be read before the patriarchs and nobles and spread out before the altar in the house of God:

When the emperor Heraclios received this epistle, he ordered it to be read before the patriarch and the magnates. Entering the house of God, they spread the letter before the holy altar. They fell on their faces to the ground before the Lord and wept bitterly, so that He might see the insults that His enemies had inflicted upon Him.

Later in the text, Pseudo-Sebêos again evokes the image of Hezekiah when he describes the caliphal attack on Constantinople in 34/654–55. Upon receipt of an insulting letter from the caliph, presumably ʿUthmân, Constans II “went into the house of God, fell on his face and said, ‘See, Lord, the insults that these Hagarenes have inflicted upon You’” (in առքայ զթուղթն եւ եմուտ ի տունն Աստուծոյ, եւ անկավ ի վերայ երեսաց իւրոց եւ ասէ. «Տե՜ս, Lord, the insults that these Hagarenes have inflicted upon You”)

112 See Mathews, “Vrt’anēs K’ert’ol.”
113 Greenwood, “Reassessment,” 141.
As the Khazar wars intensified in the 110s/730s, Marwān b. Muḥammad relied heavily on the military assistance of Ašot III Bagratuni, who, according to Lewond, “had become important in the eyes of Hishām” (մեծացաւ անձն նորա յաչս Հեշմա) and was recognized as prince of Armenia. Lewond’s main concern here is to document the elevation of the Bagratuni family over the powerful Mamikoneank’. Ašot’s relationship with Marwān gave him leverage over his rivals Grigor and Dawit’ Mamikonean, who were exiled to Yemen. Lewond describes Hishām’s payments to the Bagratunik’ as a way to affirm Armenian support for the caliphal army.

Blankinship construes the payments made to the Armenian cavalry as a sign of Hishām’s desperation for additional troops. He is certainly correct that the payment of arrears was an extraordinary measure. However, we should keep in mind that the Armenians had always supplied cavalry to the Caliphate. In the first/seventh-century History attributed to Sebēos, the earliest treaty between Muʿāwiya (as governor of Syria) and the Armenians included the maintenance of cavalry in lieu of taxation. Lewond also mentions Armenian military service to the Caliphate in several places. His first reference to the diwān, the registry of names and stipends, appears during the reign of ‘Abd al-Malik (see...
chapter V), when Muhammad b. Marwān was governor. As noted, the payment of stipends indicates a shift from the Sufyānid practice of accepting military service in lieu of taxation to the Marwānid policy of levying taxes to pay the military. This practice continued into the early ‘Abbāsid period through the caliphate of Mutawakkil, when Armenians accompanied caliphal troops on a number of excursions. Payments for military services were not consistent, however, as Łewond subsequently criticizes the early ‘Abbāsids for their reliance on the cavalry without stipends: “They required that the princes have a certain number of cavalry and there was a tax on their own houses to equip the regiments of the arms and to keep uninterrupted the progress of profitless labor” (Եւ զհամար հեծելոցն պահանջէին յիշխանացն. և հարկ լինէր ի տանց իւրեանց հանդերձել զգունդս զաւրացն. և զամարսացն աշխատութե անցն ողջ պահել) 

The participation of Armenians in the campaigns of the second/eighth century should be seen as the norm rather than an exceptional case, and Łewond suggests that the Bagratunik’, in particular, were frequently called on as caliphal allies. Because of the close relationship between the Umayyads and the Bagratunik’, Blankinship understands the reference to the destruction of fortresses in Armenia as a concerted effort against Mamikonean possessions. Ibn A’tham explains that Hishām sent Marwān from Syria to Armenia with 120,000 men. “Then he battled the kings and patricians of Armenia until they conceded to listen to and obey him. Then he proceeded to conquer fortress after fortress until he had conquered all of the fortresses in Armenia” (ثم جعل يقاتل ملوك أرمينية وبطارقتها حتى أذعنوا له بالسمع والطاعة. ثم إنه تقدم فجعل يفتح قلعة بعد قلعة حتى فتح قلعة أرمينية كلها). Bal’amī echoes this account: “Il entreprit une série d’expéditions et réussit à soumettre tous les princes de la contrée, et à prendre toutes les places fortes, les unes après les autres, se rendant ainsi maître de toutes les villes de l’Arménie” (وست بكشيد به حرب كردن تا (مکلاک ارمنينيه همه به طاعت آمدند. پس پيشتر رفت ویک یک از آن قلعه ها همي كشاد تا همه بلاد ارمينينيه کشاد.

To understand Ibn A’tham’s and Bal’ami’s claim, however, we must read it in the broader context of their histories. Ibn A’tham defines Armenia according to the tradition of the Iraqi school of geography as any territory south of the Caucasus as far as the Caspian Sea. Before asserting that he reduced all of the fortresses of Armenia to submission, Ibn A’tham explains that Marwān set up his base in Kisāk (كساك). Bal’ami has Kisāl (كسال). Kisāl (كسال) renders K’asal (قاسال), which lies 20 farsangs from Tiflis/T’pilisi and 40 farsangs from Bardha’a/Partaw, far to the north of Lake Sevan. In the very next sentence, Ibn A’tham and Bal’ami have Marwān order his commander Usayd b. Zāfir al-Sulamī to move north from Bāb al-Abwāb/Darband while he himself leads the contingent from Kisāl through Bāb al-Lān/Dariali. In other words, according to the Arabic texts, Marwān had already left the territory held by Armenians before attacking the fortresses and immediately moved across the Caucasus afterward. It is therefore highly unlikely that Ibn A’tham
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and Balʿāmī are referring here to Mamikonean holdings, which are too far west to have been of any interest to Marwān by that point.

Marwān campaigned in the Caucasus between 117/735 and 123/741. Lewond’s account most likely describes his main excursion in 119/737, which pushed along two fronts—one from Bāb al-Lān/Dariali and the other from Bāb al-Abwāb/Darband—through Khazar territory to the realm of the Slavs.124 This campaign garnered so much animosity in the Georgian records that it earned Marwān the name Murvan Qru, Marwān the Deaf:

There arrived in K‘art‘li the Hagarene emir who was called Marwān Qru [deaf], son of Muḥammad; he had been sent by Hishām amīr al-muʾminīn of Baghdad, son of ʿAbd al-Malik, a descendant of Amat’. He was nicknamed “deaf” because he did not pay attention to the words of his counsellors. All the mt’avari, pitiaxšes, and the relatives of the erist‘avi and nobles took refuge in the Caucasus and hid in the forests and caves. Qru came to all the Caucasus; he seized the passes of Dariel and of Daruband and destroyed all the cities and innumerable fortresses in every region of K‘art‘li.125

Given this passage in the History of Vaxtang Gorgasali, we should understand Ibn Aʿtham’s and Balʿāmī’s claim that Marwān “conquered all of the fortresses in Armenia” to refer to his submission of the K‘art’velian elite rather than the Mamikoneans. Lewond’s positive estimation of Marwān may furnish further support for this interpretation. In contrast to the History of Vaxtang Gorgasali, Lewond does not refer to Marwān as “deaf” in his text and does not suggest that Marwān harassed the Armenian naxarark’. Instead, he focuses on the cooperation between Marwān and Ašot Bagratuni and cites the former’s fairness in the distribution of spoils and his maintenance of security: “He gave a part [of the spoils] to Ašot and [he gave] servants and maids to the other honorable naxarark’. He ruled over this land and pacified all of the violent invasions” (տայր մասն Աշոտի և այլոց պատուազն ծառայում և աղախնայում. և ինքն տիրեալ ի վերա աշխարհի խաղաղացու զամենած յարձակմուն բռնութե ան) [84v]. Indeed, Marwān appears in a completely different light compared to both his father, Muḥammad b. Marwān, and his cousin Maslama, to whom Lewond explicitly and favorably compares him.

125 Thomson, Rewriting Caucasian History, 241. For an overview of this campaign, see Dunlop, Jewish Khazars, 80ff. On the significance of this campaign in Georgian sources, see Martin-Hisard, “Les Arabes en Géorgie.”
Although little in Lewond’s account aligns with the references to this campaign in the Arabic sources beyond the point that Marwân returned to Bardha’a/Partaw, Lewond’s reference to the spoils of war employs a formulaic Arabic phrase that appears multiple times in Ibn A’tham’s account. Lewond says that Marwân “selected a fifth of the captives and booty and sent it to their prince, Hishâm, and informed him of the circumstances of the victory” (որոշէր ի գերելոցն և յաւարէն հինգեակս և առաքէր իշխանին իւրեանց Հեշմա. և զգացուցանէր նմա զիրս յաղթութե ան) [84r] and that he then “distributed the rest of the booty along with the captives to his troops” (առաքէր իշխանին հրաշալուս յաղթութե ան) [84r–v]. Ibn A’tham inserts a similar formulaic phrase—albeit with some variations—at the end of each military encounter he describes during Maslama’s governorship: “Maslama gathered these spoils and extracted a fifth from them and divided the remainder among the Muslims. Then he sent the fifth to his father, ‘Abd al-Malik b. Marwân, and he wrote to him to inform him of what God had conquered through him” (جمع مسلمة هذه الغنائم، فأخرج منها الخمس وقسم باقي ذلك على المسلمين، ثم وجه بالخمس إلى أبيه عبد الملك بن مروان، وكتب إليه يخبره بما فتح الله على يديه) [127]. Ibn A’tham and Bal’ami use the phrase only once, and in a shorter form, in reference to Marwân b. Muhammad, following his campaign against the Khazars in 119/737: “He wrote to Hishâm b. ‘Abd al-Malik to inform him about that [victory], and he sent him one-fifth of all that God had provided him” (كتب إلى هشام بن عبد الملك يخبره بما فتح الله عليه، ووجه بالخمس إلى أبيه عبد الملك بن مروان). [128] This emphasis on the governor-generals’ sending of the required “fifth” to support the central administration and informing of the caliph of their activities projected caliphal involvement in these victories and provided assurance that the powerful governor-generals were not acting for their own benefit. Lewond’s knowledge of the fifth may suggest that he was familiar with early Islamic practice, but his specific wording about the distribution of the spoils further reflects familiarity with the literary expectations governing conquest narratives in Arabic.
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Łewond’s information about the reign of Walīd b. Yazīd is unique. Walīd is maligned in most sources as a drunk womanizer, unfit for the position of caliph. Łewond agrees with this dominant narrative. However, he also claims that the qurrāʾ (Qurʾān reciters) ordered the caliph’s death; this interesting detail does not find a precise parallel elsewhere, but it fits within the broader interpretive frameworks of Islamic historical writing. The third civil war (fitna) erupted as the result of Walīd’s death and the subsequent succession disputes. Again, Łewond offers an interesting perspective. He completely ignores two of the main claimants to the Caliphate at this time (Yazīd b. Walīd and Ibrāhīm b. Walīd) to assert that Sulaymān b. Hishām, the son of the previous caliph, rose to power. Sulaymān was never officially recognized as caliph, though he did fight in the civil war. Stressing the ethnicity and background of Sulaymān, Łewond’s account engages with Umayyad-era debates about the suitability of concubine-born contenders for the Caliphate. The rest of this short chapter addresses the trauma of internecine conflict, describing how Marwān b. Muḥammad left Armenia to go fight his own brethren in Syria.

ENGLISH TRANSLATION

29. His [Hishām b. ‘Abd al-Malik’s] successor Walīd ruled for a year and a half. He was a robust man with great strength and took part in athletic wrestling. Wherever he heard about bravery of great strength, he summoned [the described person] to him so that he might test himself. He also occupied himself with drunkenness [and] sordid, licentious fornication. But the naxarark’ of the same house saw [85r] the deed[s] of their prince [and] that he lived in abject, execrable debauchery; [and] they asked the faithful of their religion, whom they call qurrāʾ, what they thought of him. They answered them by saying: “Because he offended the honor of our kingdom and transgressed the order of our lawgiver and lived in execrable debauchery, [and] they they offended the order of our lawgiver and lived in execrable debauchery, he is worthy of death. Let him die.” In accordance with the order that they received from the qurrāʾ, they entered the royal palace, found him sleeping in a drunken stupor, and

Walīd b. Yazīd b. ‘Abd al-Malik (r. 743–44) Umayyad caliph whose reign was short and reportedly dissolute. He was famous for his interest in women and wine and was noted as a particularly influential poet. He was criticized for his inability to balance the tribal factions in the Caliphate.

Qurrāʾ: the term literally means “readers” or “reciters” of the Qurʾān, but there are significant debates regarding its definition. No other historian mentions the involvement of the qurrāʾ in the death of Walīd. Lewond’s reference to them could be part of a broader comparison between the murder of Walīd and that of the earlier caliph Uthmān.
killed him by the sword. As his successor, they set up a certain Sulaymān [who was] of the same ethnicity [and] from the royal house.

30. When Marwān heard of the death of their prince Walīd, he immediately gathered his forces and left Ḩāmīd b. Muslim al-ʿUqaylī in this land of Armenia. He, along with the entire multitude of his troops, went to wage war with his own people as vengeance for the death of Walīd and his son. He found some men from the house of those who had been killed and convinced them to join him. He gathered all of the men of his ancestral house to him. Many other sons of Ishmael were united in a great camp. They marched forward and crossed the large Euphrates River. They were facing each other near the borders of Damascus, [at a place] called Ruṣāfa. They were lined up for battle there for many days and attacked each other hard. When the day turned to evening, when the hour of the last prayer neared, they disengaged from battle and sat crying over each other’s fallen. They assembled the corpses and buried them, saying to each other: “We are one people with one language and one rule. Beyond that, we are even brothers. So why do we butcher each other by the sword?” Having said this, they still waged war the next day, and the battle continued among them.

A certain Sulaymān: Lewond skips over two caliphs, Yazīd and Ibrāhīm b. Walīd. Instead, he claims that a certain Sulaymān was appointed leader. He is referring to Sulaymān b. Ḩishām, the son of the former caliph Ḩishām b. ’Abd al-Malik. Sulaymān was never recognized as caliph, though he did support both Yazīd and Ibrāhīm and he continued to battle against Marwān even after their deaths. He was put to death by the first ʿAbbāsid caliph, Saffāḥ.

Same ethnicity and royal house: Sulaymān’s mother and father both belonged to the Umayyad family, which set him apart from the other claimants to the Caliphate because Yazīd and Ibrāhīm were Umayyads only on their father’s side. Lewond (or his source) is specifying that Sulaymān was an Arab and the descendant of Umayyad Arabs, rather than the son of a non-Arab concubine.


Civil war (fitna): when Lewond has Marwān set out “to wage war with his own people,” he is referring to the third fitna, or civil war, which began in 744. This first battle near Damascus took place at ʿAyn al-Jarr, now in Lebanon.

The son of Walīd: Walīd had two sons, ʿUthmān and Ḥakam b. Walīd, who were both killed before Marwān took control of Damascus.

Ruṣāfa: city in the Syrian desert near Raqqa. It was once one of Ḩishām b. Ṭabarzādā’s bases and subsequently became important in his son Sulaymān’s rebellion against Marwān.
X. THE CALIPHATE OF WALİD B. YAZĪD

COMMENTARY

X.A. WALİD’S PERSONALITY

Lewond accuses Walid of “drunkenness” (ارباشریه) and claims that he was murdered while he was “sleeping in a drunken stupor” (ثمره گیش قومیش). He also focuses on Walid’s sexual immorality: his “uninhibited sordid fornication” (یاکارگه گیچع انیگاب انتش) and “abject, execrable debauchery” (انپیتان زاکه پهپیک) [84v–85r]. By all accounts, Walid was a libertine.6 Perhaps the most evocative report is found in Ya’qūbī’s history, which explains:

The regions were all in an uproar. Al-Walīd was neglectful of his affairs and unconcerned about his outlying regions. He was given to amusements and singing-girls, to undisguised killing and oppression, to distractions from public affairs, and to drinking and dissoluteness. He went so far in his dissoluteness that he decided to have a booth built atop the Ka’ba in which he might sit for amusement, and he dispatched an architect for that purpose.7

Arabic accounts of Walid’s reign do not have Walid meet his end in his sleep but rather present him as challenging the mob to rebut their claims. According to Ṭabarī, Balādhurī, and Iṣfahānī, the mob complained: “We are against you because you have violated the sacred ordinances of God, because you have drunk wine, because you have debauched the mothers of your father’s sons, and because you have held God’s command in contempt” (هات اولاد ابيك واستخفافك بأمر مليم الله وشرب الحمر ونكاح اردن من موجبه أنه اراد ان يبنى على الكعبة بناء برجله فيه للهو ووجه مهندسا لذلك).8 Khalīfa b. Khayyāṭ and Balādhurī further accuse Walid of homosexuality, overtones of

4 ینم respectfully read: ینم with printed editions.
5 یئحی respectfully a.c.
6 For a critical reading of Walid’s reputation, see Judd, “Reinterpreting al-Walid b. Yazid.”
7 Ya’qūbī, Works, 1055.
8 Ya’qūbī, Taʾrīkh, 2:400.
which may be reflected in Lewond’s choice of words—պղծութիւն instead of պոռնկութիւն for “fornication.” In the Arabic texts, Walid responded that “the things you mention are within the scope of what is licit for me” (وان فيما احل لى لسعة عما ذكرت), thus admitting to their accusations but excusing them.10

X.B. THE THIRD FITNA

Lewond explains that Marwān marched against Syria in response to the murder of Walid and his son (fig. 12). Lewond’s rationale for Marwān’s involvement and the sequence of events he provides differ from those in Arabic accounts. According to these accounts, on Walid’s death, Marwān remained in Jazīra to deal with a rebellion and so did not confront Yazīd during his short six-month reign in 126/744. After Yazīd b. Walid b. ‘Abd al-Malik’s death, his brother Ibrāhīm ruled for only two months in 126–27/744. Marwān marched southward, proclaiming that he was seeking vengeance for Walid b. Yazīd’s death and expecting to install one of Walid b. Yazīd’s sons as caliph. Ibrāhīm sent Walid b. Yazīd’s sons ʿUthmān and Hakam to prison in Damascus, where they were killed. Ibrāhīm fled, Marwān assumed the Caliphate, and Ibrāhīm subsequently requested and was granted a pardon. Since in this version of events Walid’s sons were not murdered until Marwān was approaching Damascus, Lewond’s claim that Marwān left Armenia to avenge their deaths does not align with the Arabic narratives. Lewond’s source likely collapses the details, knowing that Walid’s sons would die before Marwān could avenge their father, and so extends Marwān’s vengeance to cover both Walid and his sons.

Lewond’s insistence that “they set up a certain Sulaymān [who was] of the same ethnicity and from the royal house” (փոխանակ նորա կացուցին զՍլեման ոմն ի նոյն ազգէ յարքունեան տոհմէ) [85r] also adds an unexpected twist to the usual story of the third fitna. Although he never appears as a viable contender for the throne in Arabic sources, Sulaymān b. Hishām rallied against the murder of Walid. However, in an abrupt about-face, Sulaymān reconciled with Walid’s murderer, Yazīd b. Walid, who married Sulaymān’s sister Umm Hishām to seal their alliance. Sulaymān went forth to put down a rebellion in the city of Ḥimṣ, whose inhabitants had not accepted Yazīd’s rule. He also combated rebels in Damascus, Palestine, and Jordan, prompting Greater Syria to recognize Yazīd’s rule. Sulaymān further launched a remarkably ineffective foray against Marwān in Ibrāhīm’s name. Sulaymān brought 120,000 cavalry against Marwān’s 80,000, but Marwān roundly defeated Sulaymān’s army at ʿAyn al-Jarr (ʿAnjar in modern Lebanon) between Hims and Damascus on 7 Ṣafar 127/November 18, 744. Lewond’s reference to Marwān’s attack on Damascus might reflect traditions about ʿAyn al-Jarr, which is located “in the district of Damascus” (من عمل دمشق).11 Lewond aligns neatly with the Arabic sources in claiming that Marwān’s men were loath to kill anyone from Sulaymān’s army. However, where Lewond explains the wanton killing in terms reminiscent of Ibn A’tham’s “ignominious destruction” (مزيمة نبيلة), Ṭabarī instead reports that Marwān killed only two men who were personally implicated in the death of Walid.12

10 Ṭabarī, Taʾrīkh, 2:1800.
Whereas the Arabic sources locate the battle between Marwān and Sulaymān in ʿAyn al-Jarr, Łewond has Marwān gather his men elsewhere: "They marched forward and crossed the large Euphrates River. They were facing each other near the borders of Damascus, [at a place] called Ruṣāfa" (և խաղացեալք յառաջ անցանեին ընդ մեծ գետն Եւփրատ. և յանդիման լինէին միմէանց մերձ ի սահմանս Դամասկեա, ի կոչեցեալն Ռուսփայ [85v]. This reference likely reflects the later circumstances of the third fitna. After Marwān defeated Sulaymān at ʿAyn al-Jarr, he took Damascus without a fight (see chapter XI). Sulaymān fled, but then accepted Marwān’s claim to the Caliphate.13 Later in 127/745, however, Marwān and Sulaymān went to Ruṣāfa/Ṙusap’ together, and Sulaymān asked to remain there to organize his troops while Marwān continued on. Once Marwān had left, Sulaymān rejected his claim to the Caliphate: "In this year, I mean the year 127, Sulaymān b. Hishām b. ʿAbd al-Malik b. Marwān renounced Marwān b. Muḥammad and pitched war [against him]" (وفي هذه السنة اعتنى سنة 127 خلع سليمان بن هشام بن عبد الملك بن مروان بن محمد ونصب الحرب).14 Marwān’s main power base was the Qaysiya, whereas Sulaymān emerged as the contender for the Yamāniyya.15 Marwān was forced to turn back to confront Sulaymān again.

Łewond claims that Marwān killed Sulaymān (see chapter XI), but other sources report that Sulaymān joined Khārijite rebels in Iraq and was subsequently killed by the first ʿAbbāsid caliph, Saffāḥ.16 Łewond has compressed and reordered Marwān’s victory at ʿAyn al-Jarr, Sulaymān’s rebellion at Ruṣāfa/Rusap’, and Sulaymān’s subsequent death at the hands of Saffāḥ. However, with the exception of ʿAyn al-Jarr, none of these events is attested in multiple Arabic sources.

13 See, for example, Khalīfa, Taʾrīkh, 244.
14 Ṭabarī, Taʾrīkh, 2:1908; cf. Yaʾqūbī, Taʾrīkh, 2:405, which places the confrontation in Khusāf instead of Ruṣāfa/Rusap’.
15 See Cobb, White Banners, 74.
X.B.1. The Role of the Qurrāʾ

Łewond claims that Walīd’s murder was prompted by the qurrāʾ, rendered in Armenian as կուռայք. The word literally denotes “readers” or “reciters” of the Qurʾān, from the root q-r-ʾ, but its precise meaning is subject to significant debates. Some modern scholars have moved away from the term’s Qurʾānic connotations (T. Nagel, for example, opines that “it seems rather absurd to refer to the kurrāʾ as ‘Kurʾān-readers’”),17 claiming that the qurrāʾ simply wanted the prestige traditionally allotted to Qurʾān reciters. M. A. Shaban has suggested that the name refers instead to Arabic qurāʾ, or villages (so ahl al-qurāʾ, “villagers”) from the root q-r-y, though this suggestion has not gained much support. Modern scholarship has focused on the Kufan context of the qurrāʾ, their role in the ridda wars and in the murder of ʿUthmān, and their relationship to the Khārijites.18 The debate about the definition of the qurrāʾ at times assumes that the term had a stable meaning, but it seems possible that its meaning (and so the relationship of the qurrāʾ, to both the Qurʾān and to political strife) depended on situational factors. Here, their engagement in Qurʾān recitation is neither established nor explicitly precluded. Łewond’s qurrāʾ are known for their religious knowledge, which supports the traditional interpretation, but he also corroborates the political engagement of the qurrāʾ.

None of the Arabic-Islamic texts implicate the qurrāʾ in the death of Walīd. These sources’ reports revolve around Yazīd’s resistance to Walīd’s rule and largely ignore the positions of the religious elite. However, a central underlying pattern in the Arabic-Islamic texts is the comparison of the murder of ʿUthmān b. ʿAffān to that of Walīd b. Yazīd. ʿUthmān was murdered by discontents who objected to his administrative decisions as caliph. His death was shocking, however, because he reportedly died as he read the Qurʾān. This detail suggests the amorality of the murderers by contrasting their earthly concerns with ʿUthmān’s righteous piety. In several texts, Walīd himself draws a comparison to ʿUthmān. He invokes the family relationship (ʿUthmān was similarly Umayyad) and the shock value of a caliph murdered while sitting before his Qurʾān. Khalīfa b. Khayyāṭ claims that Walīd’s last words made the parallel explicit: “When they surrounded Walīd, he took a codex of the Qurʾān and said: ‘I am killed like my cousin ʿUthmān was killed’” (لما أحاطوا بالوليد أخذ المصحف وقال).19 Ibn Aʿtham provides much the same account: “They surrounded him, so Walīd sat down, took a codex of the Qurʾān, and said: ‘It is a day just like ʿUthmān’s day’” (فاحاطوا به، فجلس الوليد وأخذ مصحف وقال).20

Łewond’s reference to the qurrāʾ must be read in this narrative context. The Kūfan qurrāʾ were famously implicated in the murder of the caliph ʿUthmān, undertaken in response to their frustration at the caliph’s land policies in Iraq. In claiming that the qurrāʾ were also responsible for the death of Walīd, Łewond—or his source—participates in the broader project of interpretation found also in the works of Ibn Aʿtham and Khalīfa by continuing the comparison between the two caliphs. This passage suggests that Łewond drew on

---

17 Nagel, “Ḳurrāʾ.”
19 Khalīfa, Taʾrīkh, 237.
Arabic-Islamic sources—not because he employs a single word in Arabic, since words can float easily from one language to the next, but rather because he reflects an interpretive context that associated the murders of ʿUthmān and Walīd.

X.B.2. Sulaymān b. Hishām and the Sons of Concubines

Łewond asserts that the qurrāʾ set up “a certain Sulaymān” to replace Walīd. Here Łewond completely omits two caliphs: Yazīd b. Walīd b. ‘Abd al-Malik and Ibrāhīm b. Walīd b. ‘Abd al-Malik. The latter was not universally accepted as caliph, but the former was. At the same time, Łewond elevates Sulaymān to the Caliphate when no caliph by that name reigned in the second/eighth century. Łewond’s Sulaymān is very likely Sulaymān b. Hishām, the son of the former caliph. Łewond points out that he was “of same ethnicity and from the royal house” (ինձ ուղիւ ջամսացամիւնեան տոհմ). Łewond’s (mis)information and his explicit characterization of Sulaymān reflect the tensions associated with the status of concubine-born Arabs in the late Umayyad state. For most of Umayyad history, the caliphs’ concubine-born sons, such as Maslama b. ‘Abd al-Malik, could not hope to attain power. The Umayyad caliphs were all born of noble Arab mothers, whether from the Umayyad family itself or from other prominent families in the early Islamic state. Yazīd b. Walīd was the first to break this trend, as his mother was the daughter of the last scion of the Sasanian line, Pērōz III (d. 679 CE), and the unnamed daughter of a Turkic khagan. Ibrāhīm b. Walīd, who succeeded him, was the son of Walīd b. ‘Abd al-Malik and an umm walad (enslaved mother) named Suʿār. Łewond therefore omits the first two so-called hajīn (“mixed,” i.e., not fully Arab) caliphs, while expressly noting that Sulaymān was “of the same ethnicity and from the royal house.” Sulaymān was the son of the caliph Hishām b. ‘Abd al-Malik and the daughter of Yahyā b. Hakam, the brother of the Umayyad caliph Marwān b. Hakam. He thus hailed from Umayyad stock, and no one could question his loyalty to the community, whether understood as Arab or Islamic. In other words, Łewond’s informant was responding to a conceptual shift in the late Umayyad period, when the legitimacy of claimants to the Caliphate who were not of fully Arab parentage began to be accepted. Łewond acknowledges a fully Arab as the legitimate caliph and ignores the two mixed claimants.

Łewond’s elevation of Sulaymān to the Caliphate is unusual and not repeated in any known history; after all, by the time Arabic-Islamic histories were put to the page, the Islamic world had become habituated to the ʿAbbāsid caliphs, nearly all of whom were born to non-Arab concubine mothers. We can see echoes of the concern with concubine-born Arabs in the Arabic accounts of the third fitna, but these are not explicit. For example, Ṭabarī records that ‘Abbās b. Walīd b. ‘Abd al-Malik was called Ibn Qustanīn, “son of Constantine,” because his mother was a Greek concubine; this nasab subtly negates Walīd’s Arabness and suggests that ‘Abbās’s mother’s background might influence the son to act Greek. The issue

21 Urban, Conquered Populations.
23 Ṭabarī, Taʾrīkh, 2:1798. On the role of concubine-born sons of Umayyads in this fitna, see Goodall, “ʿAbbās.”
is explicit in later Syriac accounts of the third *fitna* that draw on the traditions associated with Theophilus of Edessa. Michael the Syrian explains that ‘Abbās would have become caliph but “the Arabs did not accept that because ‘Abbās was the son of a concubine” (ܐܠܡ ܘܬܝܐ ܠܗܕܐ. ܟܕ ܕܒܪ ܕܪܘܟܬܐ ܐܝܬܘ ܗܘܐ ܥܒܣ).  
24 The Chronicle to 1234 similarly states that Walīd had allowed ‘Abbās to govern in his name “since he [‘Abbās] was the son of a maidservant and he knew that the Arabs would not accept the son of a concubine to rule over them” (ܟ�ܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܛܝܝܐ ܕܢܡܐ ܡܩܒܠܡܬܐ ܕܒܪ ܐܡܬܐ ܗܘܐ. ܘܝܕܥ ܗܘܐ ܕܝܗܘܢ ܒܪ ܕܪܟܬܐ).  
25 These examples provide a broader context for Łewond’s omission of Yazīd and Ibrahim and his explanation that Sulaymān ascended the throne because he was “of the same ethnicity [as Walīd] and from the royal house.”

X.C. CALIPHAL GOVERNANCE

Lewond explains that Marwān left Isḥāq b. Muslim as governor over Armenia when he marched against Syria.  
26 This claim conflicts directly with some Arabic sources. For example, Ibn A’tham contends that

power transferred to his [Yazid’s] brother Ibrahim b. Walid. When that reached Marwan b. Muḥammad b. Marwan, he called a man from among his companions named ‘Āṣim b. Yazid b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Hilāli and appointed him over Armenia and Azerbaijan; then the people from Syria and Jazira who were with him started out until they arrived in the land of Syria.

وصار الأمر إلى أخيه إبراهيم بن الوليد، وبلغ ذلك مروان بن محمد بن مروان، فدعا برجل من أصحابه يقال له عاصم بن يزيد بن عبد الله الهلالي فاستخلفه على ارمينيا وأذربيجان، ثم شهصد من معه من أهل الشام والجزيرة حتى قدم أرض الشام.

Ya’qūbī offers a possible explanation for this discrepancy between Lewond and Ibn A’tham: he claims that Marwān first appointed ‘Āṣim b. ‘Abd Allāh b. Yazid al-Hilāli over Armenia and Ishāq b. Muslim al-‘Uqayli over Bāb al-Abwāb/Darband and “then added Armenia to Isḥāq b. Muslim al-‘Uqayli’s governorship” (تم جمع ارمينيا لاسحاق بن مسلم العقيل).  
28 It is also possible that the confusion reflects various levels of caliphal control and/or spheres of power. Alternatively, the discrepancy may be rooted in the different duties expected of Ishāq and ‘Āṣim. Khalīfa b. Khayyāṭ includes nearly the same sentence as Ibn A’tham does, acknowledging that Marwān left ‘Āṣim in charge of Armenia and Azerbaijan when he marched south. However, he situates this report in a list of the judges (قضاء), not the governors (عمال), of Walid’s reign; the two lists appear separately, one after the other, and the list of governors does not include Armenia, Azerbaijan, or Jazira. On the other

hand, Khalīfa later includes a report locating ʿĀṣim in Syria among Marwān’s troops, so the contradiction finds no easy resolution.29

Ishāq’s role in Armenia is important because he demonstrates the significance of family relations and tribal politics in Umayyad governance. He was one of several members of the Banū ʿUqayl to hold administrative positions in Armenia, and his appointment reflects the strength of the Qaysī supporters of the late Umayyad state. Ishāq’s brother ʿAbd al-Malik b. Muslim had participated in Maslama’s campaigns in the Caucasus and served as governor of Armenia and Azerbaijan under Marwān.30 His other brother, Bakkār b. Muslim, also served as governor of Armenia, but later, during the reign of Manṣūr. Both Ishāq and Bakkār supported Marwān during the ‘Abbāsid Revolution and subsequently received pardons, transferring their loyalties to the early ‘Abbāsid state.31 Ishāq also represents broader tribal politics during the third fitna. Łewond claims that Marwān “gathered all of the men of his ancestral house to him” (ւ զամենայն արս ազգատոհմի իւրոյ ժողովեալ առ ինքն իւրոյ) [85v]. In this context, the ancestral house cannot refer to the Banū Umayya, because Marwān was fighting against Sulaymān, his cousin’s son, who was equally Umayyad. Rather, Marwān relied on Qaysī support in his campaigns during the third fitna, while Sulaymān’s army was Yemeni. Since Ishāq held command over Qaysī factions, his support was particularly important for Marwān. Khalīfa explains that after the death of Yazīd in 127/744, Marwān immediately addressed the payment of stipends for the Banū Qays and the Banū Rabīʿa, appointing Ishāq b. Muslim over the former and Musāwir b. ʿUqba over the latter.

29 Khalīfa, Taʾrīkh, 243. Khalīfa refers to Hilālī as ʿĀṣim b. ʿAbd Allāh b. Yazīd, whereas Ibn Aʿtham calls him ʿĀṣim b. Yazīd b. ʿAbd Allāh. But given the similarity between Ibn Aʿtham’s and Khalīfa’s reports these are presumably the same man.
30 Ibn Aʿtham, Futūḥ, 7/8:338.
31 Crone, Slaves on Horses, 106.
XI

The Caliphate of Marwān b. Muḥammad

The third fitna, or civil war, continues in chapter XI. Lewond’s account is idiosyncratic, as he uses a prophecy from the Hebrew Scriptures to interpret specific details. When Marwān b. Muḥammad left Armenia to fight in the third fitna, he left open the possibility that the conflict would extend into Armenia. The Mamikonean brothers, who had earlier been exiled to Yemen, returned and challenged the Bagratuni position of authority. The Bagratunik` thus ventured to Syria, offering support for Marwān in the fitna in exchange for confirmation of their position in Armenia. The Mamikonean family used this as a rationale for a rebellion aimed not only at overthrowing the Umayyads but also at ending the Bagratuni monopoly on the principate of Armenia. To achieve both ends, the Mamikonean family allied with the Roman emperor Constantine V, though Lewond gives little indication of the expansion of Roman power into western Armenia in this period (it is far more visible in other sources). Between the fitna, Mamikonean rebellion, and Roman expansion, Marwān’s reign reads as dangerous and chaotic, a period of incessant warfare and splintering alliances. This impression comes to full fruition when Lewond describes the emergence of the armies of Khurāsān (northeastern Iran) in the late 740s and their campaign to overthrow the Umayyads. Despite his generally favorable assessment of Marwān himself, Lewond attributes the success of the ‘Abbāsid Revolution of 750 to divine vengeance for the constant killing that characterized Marwān’s reign.

ENGLISH TRANSLATION

Marwān vanquished the other side and killed Sulaymān. He himself [Marwān] held power for six years. And during the time of his rule, war did not cease among the sons of Ishmael, for Marwān besieged the city of Damascus. He battled and smashed its gates of iron. They bound the inhabitants of the city—sons of Ishmael, whoever had reached manhood—to four stakes and scraped off their faces with instruments of textured blades. In that way, they were brutally slaughtered. They cleaved pregnant women across the middle; they put boys in walls up to their waists and [86v] then continued the walls,¹ and thus they suffered a horrific death. They carried off into captivity girls who had not known the bed of a man as well as a multitude of other

¹ “Continued the walls,” ի վերա անցուցանէին զորմսն, lit. “caused the walls to pass over.”

Marwān b. Muḥammad (r. 744–50): last Umayyad caliph overthrown by the ‘Abbāsids. He was formerly the governor-general of the North under the earlier Umayyad caliphs; see chapters IX and X.

War did not cease: Lewond suggests that the third fitna continued through the reign of Marwān, which is an apt summary.
commoners, for the vengeance of the Lord came upon the city on account of their frequent evil deeds. Here is the fulfillment of the prophecy of Amos, who said:

Thus says the Lord: I, the Lord, will not turn from them over three acts of impiety of Damascus, or over four, because they cleaved the pregnant women of Gilead with iron saws. I will send fire to the house of Azael, and it will devour the foundations of the sons of Ader. I will crush the locks of Damascus and slaughter the inhabitants of the plains of Aven, and I will destroy the entire tribe out of the men of Harrân. I will take captive the chosen people of Syria.

For destruction came upon it [Damascus] because of the inhabitants of Harrân, [87r] in accordance with the voice of the prophet. But it is worth asking why this prophet, having clarified all three iniquities, introduces the fourth to be the renunciation of the Lord’s wrath. It seems to me that the city of iniquitous people was full of very abundant evils, for, sick in mind, in senses, and in the heart, they committed the death pangs of their mind and senses, [that is,] the copious generation of iniquities: murder, iniquity toward property, and lustful desires. And fourth: they did not expect the visitation of God but even considered Him, who is the source of all goodness, to be the cause of the evil deeds that they did. And that was what irrevocably provoked the sweet forgiveness of God toward wrath against the iniquities.

31. And as the tumultuous revolt grew in strength, it increased among the sons of Ishmael on account of the continual war. At that time, the sons of Smbat were freed from imprisonment as hostages because they were released from prison by order of Walîd. Before they could leave the land of Syria Walîd was killed and they were held there in that land, for no one allowed them to leave the land. Then, when the war increased among them [the Arabs], they escaped and fled to Armenia. A little time after they arrived in the land of Armenia, they went to the region of Vaspurakan and raised torments and great anguish over the land. And they tormented them [the people of Vaspurakan] with tyrannical taxation until the cries of this land reached

---

2 Repetition of “the Lord” here is likely due to diplography.
3 “They cleaved,” հերձուին: Zohrab reads դրեար, “they cut”; the Septuagint reads ἔπριζον, “they sawed.”
4 Amos 1:3–5.

Harrân: location of an Umayyad court associated with Marwân b. Muhammad and his father.

Sons of Smbat: Grigor, Dawit’, and Mušeł Mamikonean. They were exiled to Yemen in chapter IX.

Vaspurakan was neither Bagratuni nor Mamikonean territory. It was possibly without strong leadership in the mid-eighth century.
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the commander Ishāq b. Muslim, and he stopped them from committing this villainy. Then, when [88r] they saw the events of the tumultuous time, they began to oppose the authority of Ašot once again. They labored everywhere to set a trap for him. They attacked him at night since he was resting and his troops were spread out in the districts. They wanted to kill him, but the guards warned and informed the prince about the marauders who penetrated [the castle]. He escaped from their clutches and lived. Whereas they, filled with much booty from the treasury of Prince Ašot, gave up the chase.5 He [Ašot] knew of their treason, for in days of peace they sought to take malicious revenge against him. He was on guard for them for some days, and he gathered the equipage of his house in the fortress of Dariwnk', along with his wife and his entire family. He left a guard to keep watch over the fortress. [88v]

He [Ašot] went to Syria to the Ishmaelite prince Marwān to notify him about the circumstances of the quarrel between himself and his naxarark'. And when the patriarch arrived with his forces at the site of the battle, there was a great victory for the troops of Marwān and a defeat for his opponents. For they heard a rumor of his coming, that is, that the patriarch of the Armenians had arrived to aid [Marwān] and that he had with him select cavalry [and] fifteen thousand armed men. When the opponents of Marwān heard this, they abandoned the battle and were very hard hit that day. Vanquished, they ceased the war for a little while.

And during that time when Prince Ašot was in Syria, Ibn Muslim appointed Grigor from the Mamikonian house prince over the Armenian troops [89r] as Ašot’s replacement. But Marwān, informed of the prince’s accusation against the sons of Smbat and of what Dawit’, Grigor’s brother, had done to him, sent a messenger to Ishāq b. Muslim, who was the commander of this land of Armenia, and ordered [him] to arrest Dawit’ and give him into the hands of a certain ʿUqba so that he may judge him as he had been ordered. When he [ʿUqba] received the order, he was not able to delay but immediately summoned [Dawit’] to arrest him by trickery, and he handed him over to the merciless executioner. He seized him and bound him with painful bonds and threw him in prison for some days. And he [ʿUqba] wrote to Marwān about what he might command. He [Marwān]

5 "Gave up the chase," դարձան ի հետոց նորա, lit. “turned from his tracks.”
gave the order to cut off his feet and hands and to execute him by crucifixion. In this way, he departed this life with a pitiable and contemptible death. For the hateful conduct that they displayed toward each other was not said to be pleasing to God, for truly the bad yield of bad seeds, according to the saying. And when these evils came to a head, Marwān again confirmed the authority of Ašot and sent him along with many honors to this land of Armenia. Ever since, Grigor has not stopped plotting his opposition as vengeance for his brother’s destruction. Although he made peace with Ašot because the usurpers were afraid, [it was] only in word, as in his heart he did not accept his authority. He waited for the time to arrive when he could achieve the intention of his will.

32. While the war still persisted among them [the Arabs], all of the naxarark’ of this land planned to cast off the yoke of submission, to rebel, and to break free from Ishmaelite submission. That one [i.e., Grigor] from the Mamikonean house urged them on in this plot; he contrived this fraud in order to dislodge Ašot’s authority. All of the Armenian naxarark’ came to Prince Ašot, and they pressed him to consent to and join in the vain plan. The prince saw the unity of the naxarark’ and their cavalry, for they had generally been swayed toward the vain plan. He vacillated and summoned [each] one of his naxarark’ and entreated [them] with many words not to join in the act of villainy. He said:

O brothers, I see not a thought-out act in your insensibility, but rather a perverse plot and useless words. For behold, our troops are of little consequence in the midst of the Ishmaelite violence. We are not able to oppose their troops, nor extract our land from the mouth of the dragons. We are only bringing it trouble and danger with your ideas. But should you wish to accept my advice, we should not do this thing. We should pay tribute to them even as it was until now, and we will keep our property, vineyards, forests, and fields.

The Armenian naxarark’ did not wish to accept his wise counsel, but opposed [him] and said: “If you will not join our plot, not even one of your forces will remain to you.

6 “By crucifixion”; see above.
7 Cf. Matthew 7:17.
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We are not able to suffer patiently the anguish that exists in this land of Armenia. So then Prince Ašot involuntarily consented and joined with Grigor and the other naxarark'. They made an oath of compact to each other on the cross to keep the love of their union without deception. Once they confirmed this oath, they separated from the governor who was over this land. They went and took refuge in the fortresses of the land of Tayk' along with all of their families and goods. They sought greater refuge in the troops of the king of the Greeks, who were in the region of Pontus, for there was a covenant of peace between them by order of the emperor Constantine. All the sons of transgression, who did not know the fear of God, nor the dread of princes, nor the honor [due] to elders, went and joined the regiment of sedition. But like foreigners and strangers, they raided widely, captured their brothers and compatriots, and committed much pillage, bringing suffering with torture and scourges upon their brothers. On account of this, God regretted His mercy and dissolved their unity, for He did not allow their act of wickedness to prosper for even a full year.

But Prince Ašot soon left them. He arrived in the district of Bagrewand in the village of Hazr with some of the naxarark'. He wanted to unite with the sons of Ishmael.

Involuntarily consented: Ašot agreed to join the rebellion but does so reluctantly. This detail suggests that the Mamikoneank' were the real power brokers in Armenia at this time, even though Lewond acknowledges only the Bagratunik' as viable rulers.

The governor: Ishaq b. Muslim. See map 9 for locations mentioned in this passage.

Constantine V (r. 741–75): Roman emperor, married to the daughter of the Khazar khan. He was unpopular for his iconoclasm but recognized as an outstanding general.

The sons of transgression: several Arabic and Syriac sources suggest that an Armenian general from Jazira named Kūshān al-Armanī fought on behalf of Constantine V at this time. Given the lack of information about him in Armenian sources, he may have been a Chalcedonian (an adherent of the imperial Church). Lewond's references to these "sons of transgression" as "brothers" who acted like "foreigners" might relate to Kūshān or to other such soldiers involved in these conflicts.

Hazr: although the village of Hazr remains unidentified, the region of Bagrewand was located in the province of Ayarag. It was in Mamikonean territory, so Ašot's presence there with Umayyad allies may indicate an attempt to expand the reach of Bagratuni power.

Map 9. Mamikonean rebellion under the reign of Marwān b. Muḥammad.
Then the naxarark' who were with him betrayed him and informed the malicious Grigor of the details of his plan. For a long time he [Grigor] had thought of an ambush, wanting to bring it to a head. He immediately gathered his forces and pursued him like a crow; running through the mountains, he overtook him at night. He besieged his dwelling, knowing the vacillation of his troops [and] that they would not come to his aid. He [Grigor] captured him [Ašot] and gave him to the servants of Dawit' [his brother]. He ordered the light of his eyes to be extinguished. He obscured the splendor of the entire land with shadowy darkness and enveloped not only that person [Ašot] but all the naxarark' of the same house of his own people in deep sadness. They were informed after the fact and were not able to do anything useful. They only sat lamenting and crying, for the magnificent crown fell from their heads and was destroyed. From then on, the glory of the Armenian people was extinguished.

The ungrateful Grigor again descended into the city Karin as if [returning] from [an act of] great valor, and he sent news of his victory to every region. Not many days later, the judgment of God overcame him, commensurate with the worth of his actions, for his stomach was swollen very dangerously. It tormented him, and in that way he died, [92v] removed from this life, forgotten. They [the naxarark'] appointed his brother Mušeł prince in his place for a short time. Ašot held authority for seventeen years, gloriously and with more honor than all of the earlier princes who came before him. He encountered the plot of deception and lived for another thirteen years after that. He died in ripe old age and was put to rest gloriously in a tomb in the village of Dariwnk'.

It remains for us to return to the earlier sequence of this history, for while Marwân held authority over the Ishmaelites and warred with his own people, another raging fire flared up in the eastern regions from the land of Khurāsān. When all of the naxarark' of the sons of Ishmael saw that [93r] the insupportable danger from their own people had overpowered them, they tried to find a way to save their lives. Some of them from the same house as their lawgiverbreak away, lit. "Some of them from the same house broke away from the lawgiver." We have read յաւրէնսդրէն as աւրէնսդրին.

9 "Betrayed," մենգեալ. cf. Łewond’s description above of the pact the naxarark’ made that was to be maintained "without deception," աննենգ.
10 "Some of them from the same house as their lawgiver broke away," ոմանք ի նոյն տոհմէ յաւրէնսդրէն իւրեանց հատուածեալք, lit. "Some of them from the same house broke away from the lawgiver." We have read յաւրէնսդրէն as աւրէնսդրին.
broke away and fled into the land of Khorasan, where they lived in hiding for some time. Then, after that, having united the troops of the land of Khorasan, Qaḥṭaba and a certain Abū Muslim, who was cunning in astrological sorcery, were appointed\(^\text{11}\) generals over them. They, united, killed the governor of the land and won over his troops as well as the rest of the multitudes of commoners of the land, who were tormented by the impossible tyranny of the tax collectors. Little by little they began to attack the region of Asorestan.

The forces of Marwān marched against them but were not able to oppose that mob, \([93v]\) for the defeat of his reign was from the Lord. The regiments of the ʿAbd Allāhs who were called the sons of Hāshim struck and killed many and put the others to flight. They advanced toward and crossed the Tigris River and reduced many cities to submission. They crushed and defeated the entire army that Marwān had sent against them all at one time. They subjugated everyone up to the great Tačik cantonment of Kūfa. When the inhabitants of Kūfa and Baṣra saw the violence of their troops, they surrendered and added their forces. Marwān felt greatly alarmed and waited in ambush. He opened the stores of the royal treasuries and spread them among his troops. He armed himself with a multitude of forces and went out against them. And when they arrived \([94r]\) against each other and formed their arrays, war broke out. Many were wounded on both sides, and innumerable corpses fell dead on the fields. The war between the two sides extended until the end of that year. At the end of the sixth year of Marwān's reign, God's vengeance came upon him by His hand for the blood of his own people that he had shed. The forces of ʿAbd Allāh grew stronger and attacked him ferociously. They hurried and reached Marwān’s camp and, striking them extremely violently, butchered them, for it is said that the number of fallen in one bout was three hundred thousand cavalrymen, to the point that rivulets flowed from the blood and an endless haze and darkness emerged from the steam of the blood. \([94v]\) Taking the rest of the army, they launched into Marwān’s camp and reached the hill formed like a fortress and Marwān’s tent. They struck and killed him. He committed all of these evils—the disturbances of wars, the capture of cities, and the shedding of blood—in six years and then he died.

11 “Were appointed”; the text here reads in the singular, but Chahnazarian and Malkaseanc’ correct it to plural.
Map 10. The ‘Abbāsid Revolution.

Figure 13. ‘Abbāsid family tree.
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ARmenian EDITION

Եւ յաղթահարէր Մրուանն զմիւս կողմն և սպան զՍուլեմանն և կալաւ զիշխանութի և ինքն ամս. վեց: Եւ զայն ժամանակս իշխանութ ան իւրոյ ոչ դադարէր պատերազմ յորդւոցի Իսմայելի. քանզի պարշարէր Մրուան զքաղաքն Դամասկոս. և մարտ եդեալ խորտակէր զդրունսն երկաթիս. և զբնակիչս քաղաքին զորդիսն Իսմայելի որք միանգամ յարիութի և հասեալ էին ի չորս ցիցս պրկեալ տաշէին զդէմս նոցա գործւովք հիւսական սրոց. և այնպէս դառնութ եամ բ սատակէին ի կենաց. և զկանայս յղիս հերձուին ընդ մէջ. և զմանկունս արուս դնէին ի մէջ որմոցն միջով չափ և ի վերա անցուցանէ.

12 իունայի (ni) - ni rewritten suprascr. Hand 1cor.
13 բեր [բերելով a.c.
14 գրամունդ] - y- subscr.
15 ու i in rt. mg.
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գանձուց իշխանին Աշոտի. դարձան ի հետոց նորա. իսկ նորա իմացեալ զդաւաճանութի 
վն նոցա. զի յաւուրս խաղաղութե
ան վրէժխնդրութի 
վւ չարութե 
ան յուզէին առնուլ ի նմանէն.

անձնապահ լինէր ի նոցանէն աւուրս ինչ. և ժողովէր զախս տանն իւրոյ յամրոցս Դարիւնից.

Եւ ինքն անցեալ գնայր յաշխարհն Ասորոց առ իշխանն Իսմաելի Մրուան. առ ի 
զեկուցանել նմա զիրս աղմկին որ ի մէջ նորա եւ նախարաց իւրոց:

Եւ <իբրեվ> 16 էհաս 
պատրիկն զաւրաւք իւրովք ի տեղի մարտին. բազում յաղթութի 
ւն լինէր զաւրացն Մրուանայ

17 և խորտակում հակառաց նորին. քանզի լուան զհամբաւ գալստեան նորա, եթէ էհաս 
պատրիկն Հայոց ի թիկունս աւգնականութե
ան. և ունի ընդ իւր ընտիրս հեծելոց հնգէտասան 
հազար արանց վառելոց. եւ զայս լուեալ հակառաց Մրուան. լքան ի պատերազմէն.

և հարուածք մեծամեծ եղեն յաւուր յայնմիկ. և պարտեալք ի պատերազմէն առ փոքր 
դադարեցին:

Եւ զայն ժամանակ յորում էր իշխանն Աշոտ յերկրին Ասորոց. կացոյց որդին Մսլիմի 
ի վերա զաւրացն Հայոց իշխան զԳրիգոր ի տանէ 
Մամիկոնեան փոխանակ Աշոտի:

Իսկ Մրուանն տեղեկացեալ զամբաստանութի 
ւն ն իշխանին զորդոցն Սմպատա, և զոր ինչ 
արար ընդ նա Դավիթ եղբայր Գրիգորի. յղէր դեսպան առ որդին Մսլիմի Իսահակ որ էր 
հրամա<նա> 18 աշխարհիս Հայոց. և հրամաէ ունել զԴավիթ և տալ {ի} 
19 ձեռ{ն} 20 Ավքբայի

ումեմն զի դատապարտեսցէ զնա որպէս և հրամաեալ էր վ 
ա 
ս 
ն 
նորա. և նա իբրև ընկալաւ 
զհրամանն ոչ կարաց յապաղել այլ նոյնժամայն կոչեաց նենգութ 
եամ բ ունել զնա. և տայր ի 
ձեռն անողորմ դահճի, զոր առեալ կապէր դառն կապանաւք և դնէր ի կալանս բանդի աւուրս 
ինչ. և գրէ առ Մրուան եթէ զինչ հրամայեսցէ 
21: Եւ տուեալ հրաման ծայրակոտոր առնել 
ոտիւք և ձեռաւք. և փայտիւ դատապարտել 
22 ի մահ. և այսպէս ողորմելի և ծանականաց 
մահու վճարէր ի կենաց. զոր ոչ 
23 ավ հաճոյ Ա 
ստուծո բարք ատելութե
ան ն զոր 
ունէին առ միմեանս. զի արդարև չար սերմանցն չար արդիւնարարութի 
ւն ըստ ասաւղին
բանի: Եւ իբրև այս չարիք ի գլուխ ելանէին, դարձեալ հաստատէ զիշխանութի 
ւն ն Աշոտի

Մրուան. և առաքէ զնա մեծամեծ պատուաւք յ{ե}րկիրս Հայոց. եւ յայնմհետէ ոչ դադարէր 
Գրիգոր յերկնելոյ զհակառակութի 
ւն վաս 
քինախնդիր լինելոյ կորստեան եղբաւր

21 իշխանութե 
ան

22 այսպէս

23 կոր 
տեան Ե 
ստուծո բարք ատելութե

24 այսպես

25 իղ
անանց պահել զստեր միաբանութեն։ Եւ իբրև զայս դաշինս հաստեան եմ։ Եւ քըրեւ մեր [90v] համար կիրառել խցում։ մենք աշխարհիկութեն և փոստային համագործակցութեն կորտնացնենք։ այլ թե, կանգնեցվեր ծաղկութեն դիմ։ մենք պատահենք կարդալ ենք, և հառնայնք տաղանդ կարգ ենք։

Եւ ինչպես կիներին երբեմն հասարակութեն հայկականութեն ենք։ այս աշխարհային հանդեպ։ ենք մենք ընդունութեն ենք։ ենք մասնակցի քաղաքական եկեղեցին։ իրենց նկատութեն աղանդերը կերպ կերպ ենարարում։ ջրվում պողոտասեր են։ վռներին այնքան ինչպես այլքույն աշխարհներ են։ երեք որպես սերտ նախարարներ, որոնք երկնել են մեկ այլ աշխարհի մեջ։ 

26 առաջինը նշվում է 18. 27 առաջինը նշվում է 19. 28 երկրորդը նշվում է 22. 29 երկրորդը նշվում է 23. 30 ոչինչը նշվում է 19. 31 համարում է 22. 32 ոչինչը նշվում է 18.
կարացեալ ավգուտ գործել. այլ նստեալ՝ միայն ողբովք և աշխարանաւք լային. զի անկեալ կործանէր պսակն պերճութե
ի գլխոց նոցա. և յայսմհետէ բառնայր փառք ազգիս Հայոց:

Իսկ բարէդրուժն Գրիգոր որպէս ի մեծ արիութենէ դարձեալ անկանէր ի քաղաքն
Կարնոյ. և առաքէր ի կողմանս կողմանս աւետիս զյաղթութե
ի գլխոց նոցա. և ոչ յետ
33
բազում աւուրց. հասանէր ի վերա նորա դատաստանն Ա
ստուծո յԱ
34
ըստ արժանի գործոց իւրոց. քանզի
ուռուցեալ որովայն նորա ուժգին վտանգիւ. տագնապէր զանձն նորա. և այնպէս սատակէր
ի կենաց˙ անյիշատակ բարձեալ ի միջոյ: Եւ փոխանակ նորա կացուցին իշխան
զեղբայր նորին Մուշեղ սակավ ինչ ժամանակս: Իսկ Աշոտի կալեալ զիշխանութի
ւն ամս.
եւթն եւ տասն
. փառաւորապէս պատուով քան զ
ամենայն
առաջինն որ նախքան զ
ամենայն
իշխանսն որ յառաջ քան զնա. հանդիպէր դաւող նենգութե
ան
ն. և կեցեալ յետ այնորիկ ամս.
երեքտասան
. վախճանէր բարւոք ծերութ
եամ
բ. և եդեալ ի տապանի փառաւորապէս ի կայս
հանգստեան իւրոյ ի գեւղն {ի} Դարիւնս:

Կայ ևս մեզ դառնալ յառաջին շարակարգի պատմութե
ան
ս. քանզի մինչդեռ Մրուան
ունէր զիշխանութի
ւն Իսմայելի. և մարտնչէր ընդ իւր ազգին. դարձեալ այլ մոլեկան հուր
հրդեհի բորբոքէր ի կողմանց արևելից յերկրէն Խորասան աշխարհին. քանզի իբրև տեսին
ամենայն
նախարարք որդոցն Իսմաելի. զի զաւրացաւ ի վերա նոց
ա անհանդուրժելի
վտանգն յիւրեանցայոցն. ջանաին զապրիլ անձանց գտանել. յորոց ոմանք ի նոյն տոհմէ
յաւրէնսդրէն իւրեանց հատուածեալք˙ փախստեա անկանէին ի Խորասան յաշխարհ
զաւրավարս ի վերա նոցա˙ զԿահաթբա և զԱբու Մսլիմ ոմն որ էր
խորամանգ յաստեղագիտական աղանդն. և սոքա մի<ա>բանեալք
տագնապեալ էին յանհնարին բռնութենէ հարկապահանջացն. սկսան
տակավ յարձակէլ ի կողմանս Ասորեստանի.
Որոյ ընդդէմ երթեալ զաւրք Մրուանայ ոչ կարէին զդէմ ունել այնմ ամբոխին˙
ի Տեառն էր խորտակումն իշխանութե
ան
որդիք Հեշմայ: Եւ ինքեանք յառաջ
մատուցեալք անցանէին ընդ գետն Տիգրիս. Եւ նուաճէին զբազում քաղաքս հնազանդել ընդ
նոքաւք. և զ
ամենայն
զոր միանգամ առաքէր Մրուան ընդդէմ նոցա˙ խորտակե<ա>լ
ջախէին. եւ ցմեծ բանակետղն Տաճկաց Ակողա, զամենեսին հնազանդէին: Իսկ բնակչացն
Ակողայ. և Բասրայ տեսեալ զբռնութի
ւն
զաւրութե
ան
նոցա. ձեռնատու եղեն և յաւելան ի
զաւրս նոցա. զոր զգացեալ Մրուան տագնապաւ մեծաւ վարանէր. և բացեալ զխանութս
գանձուցն արքունեաց, սփռէր զավւրացն. և վառեալ զինքն բազմութ
եամ
բ զավւրացն. ելանէր
ընդդէմ նոցա. և իբրև հասանէին առ մի
մեանս և յարդարէին ճակատ առ ճակատ, և
խառնէր պատերազմն. բազումք լինէին վիրաւորք ի կողմանցն երկուցուն. և անթիւ դիակունք
դաշտացն տապաստ անկանէին. և յերկարաձգէր պատերազմն ի մէջ երկուցունց մինջև ի

33 քուն ] այս a.c.
34 Սառնոդ | ՂՍառնոդ a.c.
35 քե in ft. mg.
36 փատաստան</>/<որ> ] mark of abbreviation ins. Hand 1<mark of abbreviation ins. Hand 1</mark>
38 փարս. ] ա suprascr.
39 փարս ] տ suprascr.
XI. THE CALIPHATE OF MARWĀN B. MUḤAMMAD

Although Löwond provides a detailed description of Marwān’s siege of Damascus, the passage is unlikely to refer to a specific encounter. Rather, it stands in for Marwān’s troubles in Syria. Marwān did march on Damascus after defeating Sulaymān’s forces at ‘Ayn al-Jarr, but all Muslim Arabic accounts agree that Damascus fell without a fight. Yaʾqūbī, for example, has Marwān defeat Sulaymān b. Hishām and then enter Damascus without even a hint of conflict: “The people of Damascus swore allegiance to him, and he entered the city” (فبايع له اهل دمشق ودخلها). Christian sources, however, do attest to violence in or near Damascus. Agapius asserts that Marwān entered Damascus peacefully: “Marwān marched to Damascus and its people opened the gates to him” (ثم سار مروان الى دمشق ففتح له اهلها الابواب). However, he subsequently has Marwān make an example of the “Badriyya” near Damascus, which R. Hoyland reads as “Qadariyya”: “He ordered the Qadariyya to be assembled before him and made an example of them. He cut off the arms and legs of some and others he had crucified; he ordered the killing of some and the banishment of others” (ّل بهم فمنهم من قطع يداه ورجليه ومنهم من امر بصلبه ومنهم من امر بقتله ومنهم من بنفيه). Both Theophanes and the Chronicle to 1234 report violence in Damascus itself: Theophanes recounts that Marwān “killed many prominent men” (ἀνεῖλε πολλοὺς τῶν ὑπερεχοντων), while the chronicle claims that he “cut off the hands and feet of many men” (ل بهم نفyet نفم من يد ونفم من أرجل). The assertion that Marwān “scraped off their faces with instruments of textured blades” (տաշէին զդէմս նոցա գործւովք հիւսական սրոց) is unique to Löwond. However, it aligns with attestations found in other Christian sources and with Muslim condemnations of Marwān’s rule. In 129/747 or 130/748, the Khārijite Abū Ḥamza al-Mukhtār b. ‘Awf offered a resounding sermon to the people of Medina in which he denigrated Marwān’s claim to the Caliphate. Abū Ḥamza asserted that true believers were being killed.

COMMENTARY

XI.A. THE SIEGE OF DAMASCUS
and he placed the blame directly on the family of Marwân. In both Khalīfa b. Khayyāṭ’s and Ṭabarī’s histories, Abū Ḥamza’s speech mentioned not only abraded faces but also some of the charges levied in the Christian sources:

How many an owner of an eye now being nibbled by birds used to weep out of fear of God! How many an owner of a hand that has been separated at its wrist used to lean on it while prostrating himself in prayer to God in the middle of the night! And how many soft cheeks and noble brows have been torn by shafts of iron! May God have mercy on bodies such as those, and may He admit their souls to paradise.46

فكم من عين في منقار طائر طال ما بكى صاحبها من خشية الله، وكم من كف قد بانت ببعضها طالما اعتمد عليها صاحبها في سجوده في جوف الليل الله، وكم من خد رقيق وجبين عتيق قد فلق بعد المحدث، رحمة الله على تلك الأبدان، وأدخل ارواحها الجنان.47

In Khalīfa’s version, Abū Ḥamza went on to declare that “the people are from us and we are from them” (الناس منا ونحن منهم) to underscore the futility of internecine warfare; we may see an echo of this in Lewond’s report that the combatants of the third fitna exclaimed, “We are one people” ( Españ Ṣumū) [86r]. Abū Ḥamza’s challenge to Marwân also appears in much later sources, such as Izkawī: “Marwân b. Muhammad took charge and claimed the Caliphate. He abraded faces, put out eyes, and cut off hands and feet” (ثم ولي مروان بن محمد، وادعى الخلافة، فنحت الوخوه، وسمل الأعين، وقطّع الأيدي والأرجل).48 Abū Ḥamza was speaking generally about Marwân’s actions, not specifically about his capture of Damascus, but the reference to scraping faces corresponds very closely with Lewond’s description. Given the uneven adoption of details about Marwân’s rule in Abū Ḥamza’s sermon and the commonality of tropes such as the cutting off of the hands and feet of Khārijite rebels, it seems that the sermon drew on critiques that circulated widely across the Umayyad realm, including in Armenia.

Although Lewond may have been familiar with common tropes about Marwân’s violent acts, his particular account of the siege of Damascus, like his earlier depiction of the siege of Dabīl/Duin, seems shaped by his interpretive reading of Hebrew Scriptures.49 Lewond cites Amos 1:3–5 explicitly in his account, probably because of the reference to both Damascus and Harrān/Xaṙan in Amos 1:5: “I will crush the locks of Damascus and slaughter the inhabitants of the plains of Aven, and I will destroy all of the men of Harrān. I will take captive the chosen people of Syria” (և խորտակեցից զնիգս Դամասկեայ. և սատակեցից զբնակիչս դաշտացն Ովնայ. և կոտորեցից զազգն ամենայն յարանց Խառան. և գերեցի ընդիր ժողովուրդն Ասորոց) [86v]. Lewond interprets the third fitna as the fulfillment of the prophecy of Amos because Marwân’s base was in Harrān/Xaṙan and he attacked Damascus. This biblically informed lens allows Lewond to portray the third fitna as the divine punishment for the prophesied sins of Damascus. Lewond’s claim that “they cleaved pregnant women across the middle” (և զկանայս յղիս հերձուին ընդ մէջ) [86r] continues to draw on the same prophecy. Amos 1:13 decries the sins of Ammon, “because he ripped open the pregnant women of Gilead.”

46 Khalīfa, History, 283.
47 Khalīfa, Taʾrīkh, 251–52; cf. Ṭabarī, Taʾrīkh, 2:2011.
48 Crone and Hinds, God’s Caliph, 132; Izkawī, Kashf al-ghumma, 2:414; cf. 2:349.
XI. THE CALIPHATE OF MARWĀN B. MUḤAMMAD

XI.B. MAMIKONEAN–BAGRATUNI RIVALRY

Rather than reifying “Armenian” interests and “Arab” policies in Armenia, Łewond’s account of the background to the Armenian rebellion offers a snapshot of the complicated political alliances of the late Umayyad period. He expounds on the rivalry between the Bagratuni and Mamikonean houses and describes how the antagonism that led to the exile of the Mamikonean brothers culminates in the blinding of Ašot Bagratuni. The Armenian rebellion against the Caliphate during the reign of Marwān must be interpreted with this animosity in mind. Łewond, always a supporter of the Bagratuni cause, claims that the goal of the rebellion was to dislodge Bagratuni power: “He [i.e., Grigor] from the Mamikonean house urged them on in this plot; he contrived this fraud in order to dislodge Ašot’s authority” (Յոր խորհուրդ յորդորեաց զնոսա ի Մամիկոնեան ի տոհմէ. և զայս խորամանգութիւն նիւթէր վաս։ Աշոտի իշխանութեան ան) [90r]. This statement restructures the “Armenian” rebellion against the “Caliphate” into a more complicated moment. The Mamikonean rebellion was aimed at least as much at preventing the expansion of Bagratuni power as it was at uprooting caliphal claims to Armenia.

Throughout Łewond’s text, even before this chapter in the earlier account of their exile to Yemen, the Mamikoneank’ appear as unlawful rulers. They were evidently released from exile by the caliph Walīd for unknown reasons. When Walīd died, however, they were unable to proceed to Armenia and remained in Syria. When the third fitna broke out, the brothers took advantage of the political instability to return to Armenia through the province of Basfurrajān/Vaspurakan. Łewond levies two charges against them. First, he claims that the Mamikoneank’ “tormented them [the people of Vaspurakan] with tyrannical taxation until the cries of this land reached the commander Isḥāq b. Muslim, and he stopped them from committing this villainy” (և հարկապահանջ բռնություն զանձնազան զնոսա ի վաս։ մինչև հասանէր բողոք աշխարհիս առ հրամանատար Իսահակ որդի Մսլիմի. և արգելոյր զնոսա ի գործելոյ զապիրատութիւն) [87v]. Since Łewond’s usual complaints about taxation concern caliphal collections, this passage paints the Mamikoneank’ as even more heinous than the caliphal tax collectors, oppressive enough that they elicit a response from the very people whom Łewond frequently condemns. The implication, then, is that Mamikonean ascendancy would offer no improvement over caliphal rule. Second, Łewond’s account of the blinding of Ašot invokes the vocabulary of just rule: in blinding Ašot, Grigor Mamikonean “obscured the splendor of the entire land with shadowy darkness . . . From then on, the glory of the Armenian people was extinguished” (ի խոր տխրութեան պարիք ազգին իւրոյ . . . և յայսմհետէ բառնայր փառք ազգիս Հայոց) [92r]. The word “glory,” p’ark’, evokes notions of divine kingship associated with the Middle Persian xwarrah. In this passage, then, Łewond asserts that Ašot was the only rightful ruler, irreplaceable despite Mamikonean ambitions. These two details establish the Mamikonean rivals as worse than even Umayyad governors, paving the way for Ašot to emerge as the righteous party despite his purported connection to the caliph himself.

If we read against the grain of Łewond’s account, which is saturated in pro-Bagratuni narrative, the Mamikoneank’ in fact appear to have remained the primary power brokers
in Armenia in the time of Marwân. Their primacy is visible in their ability to exact taxes; in Grigor’s appointment over the Armenian troops; and in the elevation of Muşel to the principate after Grigor’s death without clear recourse to the caliph. Mamikonean power is furthermore implied in Grigor’s exemption from punishment despite his complicity in plots against caliphal allies and the caliphal governor. The Mamikoneank’ are effective in rallying the naxarark’ to their cause, and their success stands in stark contrast to the Bagratuni inability to sway the rebellions under both Marwân and, later, under Mansûr (see chapter XIII). Lewond’s odd wording when he says that “Prince Ašot involuntarily consented and joined with Grigor [Mamikonean] and the other naxarark’” (իսկ ապա հավանեալ ակամայութ է եամ բ իշխանին Աշոտի. առնէր միաբանութիւն ընդ Գրիգորի և ընդ այլոց նախարարացն) [90v] suggests not only that the Bagratuni patrician was ineffective at setting policy but also that the Mamikoneank’ could force the Bagratunik’ into action. The Bagratunik’ repeatedly rely on caliphal aid to support their position of power. The central place of the Bagratunik’ as the leading naxarar family is thus more a claim put forward by Lewond than a genuine reflection of the power dynamics in Armenia in the late Umayyad period.

Acknowledging the Mamikonean-Bagratuni rivalry and the actual power structure outlined above, we might speculate that Ašot attempted to make inroads into Mamikonean territory with the help of caliphal forces. Lewond claims that Ašot quickly abandoned the Mamikonean rebellion: “Prince Ašot soon left them. He arrived in the district of Bagrewand in the village of Hazr with some of the naxarark’. He wanted to unite with the sons of Ishmael” (այլ անդէն ի մաւտոյ մեկնեալ ի նոցանէն իշխանն Աշոտ. գայր հասանէր ի զատան Բագրևանդ. ի գեւղն Հազր. և ոմանք ի նախարարացն). Bagrewand was Mamikonean territory from at least the fifth century until the caliphate of Mutawakkil (r. 232–47/847–61). The village of Hazr is mentioned as a staging ground for the campaign of Constantine V in 133/750–51, after the Mamikoneank’ allied with the Romans (on which see below), further corroborating Mamikonean control over the region. Ašot’s attempt to unite with caliphal forces in Mamikonean territory suggests an aggressive, but ineffective, Bagratuni policy of contesting Mamikonean power in their family’s territory at this moment.

XI.C. THE MAMIKONEAN REBELLION

The rebellion during the reign of Marwân seems to have been a much smaller affair than the other two second/eighth-century rebellions were. Lewond’s description here follows the same pattern as in the later rebellion under Mansûr, but the Arabic sources cannot easily help elucidate the significance of this earlier rebellion. Furthermore, we have less information about the participants in this rebellion. Although Lewond takes pains to frame this rebellion as pan-Armenian, the actors he identifies are exclusively Mamikonean. The actions of the Mamikoneank’ might more accurately be construed as an expression of frustration with the rising power of the Bagratunik’ and as defection to the Roman Empire than as an Armenian rebellion as they are often portrayed in modern sources.

50 Lewond, Discours historique, 130 n. 629; Muyldermans, “Le dernier prince.”
XI.C.1. Comparison with the Mamikonean Rebellion in 158/775

The Arabic sources offer few additional details that could inform the analysis of Lewond’s description of the Mamikonean rebellion under Marwān b. Muḥammad, but Lewond’s narrative here compares neatly with his account of the Mamikonean rebellion against Manṣūr in 158/775. The parallels signify more than the literary shaping of Lewond’s narrative: they also help bring into relief Lewond’s intentions in recounting these rebellions. The common details allow us to identify themes in Lewond’s descriptions of rebellion and, in particular, in his attempts to champion the Bagratuni house.

First, his accounts of both rebellions stress the unity of the Armenian naxarark: “All of the naxarark of this land planned to cast off the yoke of submission, to rebel, and to break free of Ishmaelite submission” (ամենայն նախարարք աշխարհիս ընկենուլ զլուծ հնազանդութե և ապստամբել և ի բաց կալ ի հնազանդութենէն Իսմաելի) [89v–90r]. The same assertion of the unity of the naxarark also appears in the description of the Mamikonean rebellion in 158/775: “All of the Armenian naxarark gathered in one place and made an oath to each other and a covenant of allegiance to live and die for each other” (Եև ժողովեալ ամենայն նախարարք Հայոց ի մի վայր. առնէին առ միմեանս երդմունս և մեռանել առ միմեանս) [107r]. In both cases, the united naxarark turn to the Bagratuni prince and ask him to join their rebellion. Under Marwān, “all of the Armenian naxarark came to Prince Ašot, and they pressed him to consent to and join in the vain plan” (և եկեալ ամենայն նախարարք Հայոց առ իշխանն Աշոտ. հարկեցուցանէին զնա կամակցել և միաբանել անաւգուտ խորհրդի) [90r], and under Manṣūr, “everyone who was deceived by these words urged the great sparapet Smbat the son of Ašot to agree to this plot” (և յայիսմ բանէ ամենեքեան պատրեալք գրգռեցուցանէին զմեծ սպարապետն Սմպատ որդի Աշոտի հաւանել այնմ խորհրդի) [106v].

In the case of the Mamikonean rebellion against Marwān, the Bagratuni prince Ašot attempted to deescalate the situation and avoid a rebellion:

O brothers, I see not a thought-out act in your insensibility but rather a perverse plot and useless words. For behold: our troops are of little consequence in the midst of the Ishmaelite violence. We are not able to oppose their troops, nor extract our land from the mouth of the dragons. We are only bringing it trouble and danger [with] your ideas. But should you wish to accept my advice, we should not do this thing. We should pay tribute to them even as it was until now, and we will keep our property, vineyards, forests, and fields.

A generation later, another Ašot, the son of the Bagratuni prince Sahak, similarly attempted to forestall the rebellion and urged compliance with caliphal rule. Lewond claims to preserve this later Ašot’s considerably longer address to the naxarark’, which touches on
many of the same points as the earlier Ašot’s argument. Ašot the son of Sahak argued that the united Armenian front would not emerge victorious from a confrontation with the “Ishmaelites” because of the latter’s superior strength, numbers, and arms. He asked the naxarark’ to accept his counsel and submit to caliphal control in order to protect their ancestral territory, described in terms similar to those used by the earlier Ašot: “the inheritance of your fathers, your homes, forests, and fields, and even the tombs of your fathers” (զժառանգութիւն հարց ձերոց. զբնակութիւն ձեր և զանդառս և զանդաստանս. նաև զգերեզմանս հարց ձերոց) [108v].

In both rebellions, Łewond awkwardly claims that the Bagratuni princes were coerced into union with the naxarark’. During the earlier rebellion under Marwān, “Prince Ašot involuntarily consented and joined with Grigor [Mamikonean] and the other naxarark’” (իյակամատ ակամայութ ապա հաւանեալ ակամայութ իշխանին Աշոտի. առնէր միաբանութիւն դուց իշխանուհուց իշխանունեցել միաբանութիւն) [90v]. In the later rebellion, the Bagratuni prince Smbat joined the rebellion “as if [his] will reluctantly moved from its own constant and firm intentions” (իակամատ ակամայութ իշխանուհուց միաբանութիւն սակայան սակայան այդ) [106v]. Such passages allow Lewond to create a space between Bagratuni actions in support of the Armenian rebellions and the quietist policies of the Bagratuni house.

However, in both rebellions, the disunity of the Armenian houses was inevitable. Under Marwān, infighting between Armenians was exacerbated by alliances with outsiders,51 which caused them to turn on one another: “God regretted His mercy and dissolved their unity” (ստրջացել ներողութիւն Աստից սակայան սակայան միաբանութիւն իտել) [91r]. The Armenian naxarark’ were similarly unable to maintain their aspirational unity during the Mamikonean rebellion a generation later: “The incorrigible perversity of the weak plan soon appeared, for they broke from one another and were disunited” (որոյ անուղղայ կամակորութիւն ստուծում բարձրութիւն սակայան սակայան չի միաբանութիւն) [109r]. Claims to unity and laments about disunity are both commonly found across Armenian historical sources; in this context, it is particularly important to recognize that such claims form part of the expected literary patterning of rebellion accounts.

Finally, in both cases the Bagratuni princes seem to join the caliphal forces. In the rebellion under Marwān, Lewond explains that ‘Prince Ašot soon left them. He arrived in the district of Bagrewand in the village Hazr with some of the naxarark’. He wanted to unite with the sons of Ishmael” (այլ անդէն ի մաւուտ մեկնեալ ի գաւառն Բագրևանդ. ի գեւղն Հազր. և ոմանք ի նախարարացն ընդ նմա. և կամէր միաբանել ընդ որդիսն Իսմաելի) [91v]. In the later rebellion, the loyalties of the Bagratuni house during the battle of Bagrewand were more complicated. Some of the Bagratunik’ fought against Hasan b. Qaḥtaba at Bagrewand in 158/775. However, Ašot, who argued against the rebellion, did not participate in the battle. Instead, he went to Akhlāṭ/Xlat’, the main staging area for the caliphal forces. According to Lewond, Ašot tried to continue helping the Armenian rebels by warning them of the enemy’s strength; “they,
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however, considered the substance of his letter untrustworthy and thought he wanted to save the city from the present siege through deceitful artifice, so as to show himself a con-
fidante of the Ishmaelites’ (Իսկ նոցա անհաւատալի թուեալ իրք հրովարտակին. համարէին դաւող խորամանգութ եւամ բ կամի փրկել զքաղաքն ի պաշարմանէ աստի. իբր մտերիմ զինքի ցուցանել Իսմաելացւոցն). [110r].

The similarities between the two Armenian rebellions, only a generation apart, bring into relief narrative patterns in Łewond’s descriptions of rebellions against the Caliphate. As indicated in chapter IV, the paradigm Łewond establishes for the Mamikonean rebellion against Marwān and Manṣūr allows us to read the episode at Vardanakert in 83/703 as rebellion, despite the claims to the contrary in the text. Furthermore, these patterns caution the reader against constructing a positivist interpretation of rebellions in the second/eighth century.

XI.C.2. Kūshān al-Armanī and the Roman Capture of Qālīqalā/Karin

Łewond explains that “they [the Mamikoneank] sought greater refuge in the troops of the king of the Greeks, who were in the region of Pontus, for there was a covenant of peace between them by order of the emperor Constantine” (և ապաստանեալք առաւել ի զաւրս արքաին Յունաց որ էին ի կողմանս Պոնտոսի. քանզի էր ի մէջ նոցա ուխտ խաղաղութե հրամանաւ կայսերն Կոստանդնի). [90v]. Grigor then went to the city Qālīqalā/Karin, where he appointed his brother Mušeł as his successor prior to his death. These two details—cooperation with the Romans and settlement in Qālīqalā/Karin—suggest that the Mamikonean rebellion was linked to the Roman capture of the city around the time of the ‘Abbāsīd Revolution.

Theophanes describes the capture of Qālīqalā/Karin as if it had happened at the hands of the Roman emperor himself, with no reference to the Mamikonean inhabitants: “In the same year [am 6243/750–51 ce], Constantine occupied Theodosioupolis as well as Melitene and conquered the Armenians” (τῷ αὐτῷ χρόνῳ Κωνσταντῖνος τὴν Θεοδοσίουπολιν παρέλαβεν ἄμα τῇ Μελιτηνη, καὶ ἤχμαλωτευσε τοὺς Ἀρμενίους). However, subsequent reports explain that Constantine campaigned only against Melitene, and references in both Arabic and Syriac attest to the involvement of a mysterious patrician named Kūshān al-Armanī. For example, Agapius explains that the governor of Armenia, Iṣḥāq b. Muslim, along with the Banū Qays, continued to fight the ‘Abbāsīds after the death of Marwān b. Muḥammad. “While the people were thus afflicted, the king of the Romans raided Melitene, captured it, took its people captive, and returned. Kūshān, patriarch53 of the Armenians, took all the people of Armenia and brought them into the land of the Romans” (فبينما الناس في هذا الجهد إذ غزا ملك الروم ملطية وفتحها وفتحها ونتج من هذه السنة أخذ كوسان جاثليق بالأرمن عامة أهل أرمينية وأدخلهم بلاد الروم).54 The Chronicle of Zuqnin denigrates this Kūshān over
multiple pages, citing his violent marauding of Jazira in AG 1065 and 1066/753–55 CE.\(^{55}\) Kūshān does not appear in Lewond’s narrative. Despite the rancor elicited by Kūshān’s actions and his appearance in multiple historiographical traditions, we know little about him beyond his involvement in this campaign and his subsequent death by stoning in Ḥarrān/Xaṙan.\(^{56}\) His identity and his relationship to the naxarar houses is thus unknown. Given his service in the Roman army and the silence about him in the Armenian sources despite the frequent attestation of his Armenianness, he may have been Chalcedonian.

Balādhurī provides a link between Lewond’s account and the various reports about Kūshān:

Muḥammad b. Bishr al-Qālī and Ibn Warz al-Qālī told me on the authority of the shaykhs among the people of Qālīqalā: Since it was conquered, the city of Qālīqalā remained impenetrable on account of its people who were in it until the tyrant [Constantine] went out in the year 133 [AH = 750–51 CE]. He besieged Malatya, razed its walls, and removed the Muslims who were there to Jazira, and then he settled at Marj al-Ḥaṣā. He dispatched Kūsān al-Armanī to subjugate Qālīqalā, so he [Kūsān] besieged it. There were few people there at that time, and its governor was Abū Karīma. Two Armenian brothers from the people of the city of Qālīqalā broke through the rubble that was in the walls and they went out to Kūsān and brought him into the city. So he conquered it, killed, took prisoners, razed it, sent what he gathered to the tyrant, and divided the prisoners among his companions.

حدثنى محمد بن بشر وابن ورز القاليان عن مشايخ اهل قاليقلا قالوا لم تزل مدينة قاليقلا مذ فتحت ممتلئة بين فيها من أهلها حتى خرج الطاغية في سنة 133 فحص عدد أمته وهم حاليتها واجلى من بها من المسلمين إلى الجزيرة ثمّ نزل مرج الحصى ووجه كوسان الأرمني حتى آتاه على قاليقلا فحصها وأهلها يومين قليل وعاملها أبو كريمة فنقب أخوان من الأرمن من اهل مدينة قاليقلا رداً كان في سورها وخرجتا إلى كوسان فدخلما المدينة فغلب عليها فقتل وسبى وهمها وقسم ما جمع إلى الطاغية وفرق السبي على أصحابه.\(^{57}\)

Balādhurī’s two Armenian brothers who help Kūshān take Qālīqalā/Karin for the Romans should be identified as Grigor and Mušeł Mamikonean on the basis of Lewond’s claim that they lived in Qālīqalā/Karin at that time and allied with the Greeks in their rebellion. Balādhurī’s reference to Constantine’s presence at Marj al-Ḥaṣā should also be read against Lewond’s comment about the village of Hazr (գիւղն Հազր) \([91v]\); مرج الحصى should be read as مرج الحصى.\(^{58}\) Lewond has the Bagratunik’ go to Hazr to join the caliphal forces during the rebellion; it must have then switched hands from Bagratunī-Umayyad to

\(^{57}\) Note, however, the location of the “Armenian-Assyrian” rebellion described in the Chronicle of Zuqnīn as حزرا; Chronicle of Zuqnīn, 182; Ter-Levondyan, “Sasuni anhayt apstambut’yunə, ” 198.
Mamikonean-Roman control, which is not surprising given that the village lay in territory that was traditionally Mamikonean.59

The story of Kūshān al-Armanī may intersect with Łewond’s text in yet another way. In his description of the Mamikonean rebellion, Łewond explains that Grigor allied with Roman troops. He adds:

All the sons of transgression, who did not know the fear of God, nor the dread of princes, nor the honor [due] to elders, went and joined the regiment of sedition. But like foreigners and strangers, they raided widely, captured their brothers and compatriots, and committed much pillage, bringing suffering with torture and scourges upon their brothers. On account of this, God regretted His mercy and dissolved their unity, for He did not allow their act of wickedness to prosper for even a full year.

The phrase “sons of transgression” has been interpreted as a reference to the Paulicians, who are otherwise entirely absent from Łewond’s text.60 However, the “sons of transgression” may very well allude to Kūshān, given his prominence in the stories about the last years of Umayyad rule in the North. The *Chronicle of Zuqnin* offers an extended account of Kūshān’s activities in the first years of ʿAbbāsid control, but it also situates Kūshān’s rise before Marwān’s defeat: “The year one thousand and sixty-five [753–54 ce]: The whole northern land was laid waste by Kushan, an Armenian man from Fourth Armenia. When Marwan was routed and he fled, Kushan took away all his possessions and people and entered the Roman territories. Because he was a bold and powerful man, Constantine (V) appointed him as a military commander” (ܚܝܐ ܕܟܢܝܢܐ ܘܐܢܫܘܬܐ. ܘܥܠ ܠܒܝܬ ܪܗܘܡܝܐ. ܘܡܛܠ ܕܓܒܪܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܠܒܝܒܐ ܘܥܪܩ ܫܩܠ ܟ).61 The next two pages of the *Chronicle of Zuqnin* describe Kūshān al-Armanī’s successes against the Muslim forces of Jazīra. Although the text refers to him as “the Armenian” (ܐܪܡܝܢܝ) throughout, it also specifies that he commanded Roman and Aramaean soldiers and that “he was familiar with the land [of Jazīra] and its routes, being a native who had grown up in it” (ܕܓܒܪܐ ܝܕܥ ܠܗܘܢܝ ܒܝܕ ܝܕ ܘܒܗ ܡܪܒܝ).62

The descriptions of Kūshān in the Syriac text thus suggest that he was strongly associated with Armenianness, but perhaps not the type of Armenianness that was readily understood from the perspective of the central naxarar houses. This dissonance may

---

59 On possible Bagratuni attempts to exert control over Mamikonean territory at this time, see above.
61 *Chronicle of Zuqnin*, 190; *Chronicon Anonymum Pseudo-Dionysianum*, 2:208.
explain Lewond’s accusation that they “captured brothers and compatriots,” as well as his charge that Kūshān and his men acted “like foreigners and strangers.” If indeed this passage refers to Kūshān, Lewond seems to have expected him to perform in accordance with his Armenianness in some way.

XI.C.3. The Mamikonean Rebellion in a Broader Regional Context

Arabic, Greek, and Syriac sources do not record the Mamikonean rebellion during the caliphate of Marwān b. Muhammad. As a result, we cannot triangulate Lewond’s text against non-Armenian accounts to get a sense of how or why Lewond crafted his narrative. The lack of information about this particular rebellion forces a different interpretive approach than what was possible for the battle of Vardanakert in 83/703 (chapter IV) or the battle of Bagrewand in 158/775 (chapter XIII). The circumstances of this rebellion are set in relief through broader contextualization of the various rebellions across the caliphal North in the last years of Marwān’s reign. Multiple groups took advantage of the chaos of the prolonged fitna to pursue their own political and military goals. Two rebellions, in particular, deserve additional attention because they help locate the Mamikonean rebellion in this broader regional context, allowing us to speculate about the opportunities and challenges facing Armenian naxarark and caliphal administrators alike.

First, the Chronicle of Zuqnīn records a convoluted story of a three-front conflict between the governor, Arab Muslims, and Christian Syrians in Jazīra around the same time as the ‘Abbāsid Revolution.63 The Arabs of Mayyāfāriqīn/Np’rkert rebelled, and a local Christian leader named John son of Daddi took up arms to defend the region. The Arabs of Mayyāfāriqīn/Np’rkert sent a man named Sawāda to curtail their independence. The Arabs and Syrians both resisted the governor Qurra b. Thābit, who was ensconced in a fortress called Qulab; John was able to kill the governor in battle. Another of the leaders in the region, a man named Stephen son of Paul, allied with the Arabs of Mayyāfāriqīn/Np’rkert to betray John. Stephen met with ‘Awf, the leader of the Arab army, in a village named Ḥazro, where he hoped to lure John in to hand him over to the Arabs. An ally tipped John off to the ambush and he was able to surprise and defeat Stephen and ‘Awf: “From this point onward, evils dangerously increased between the people of the mountain and the Arabs, for they committed murder against each other every day without end. The people of the mountain seized all the passes; not one Arab was seen in the whole mountain.”65 Another leader emerged, “an Urṭian man named Grigor” (ܓܒܪܐ ܐܘܪܛܝܐ ܕܫܡܗ ܓܪܝܓܪ). Grigor fought against the people of the mountain, who remained loyal to

63 The Chronicle of Zuqnīn dates this rebellion to the year AG 1062/750–51 CE, but this dating is up for debate because the anonymous author describes the ‘Abbāsid Revolution twice: once before and then again after the report about these rebellions. Also, the Chronicle of Zuqnīn afterwards skips back to AG 1061/749–50 CE.
64 Harrak notes that it should be understood as a “city in Sophanene near Pheison.”
65 Chronicle of Zuqnīn, 183; Chronicon Anonymum Pseudo-Dionysianum, 2:199.
66 Ter-Levondyan identifies the Urtians as Armenians, but the Syriac (الأرطان) are Arameans; see Vacca, “Conflict and Community,” 74.
John. The Arabs of Mayyāfāriqīn/Np’rkert convinced the ʿAbbāsid governor Ṣāliḥ b. Ṣubayḥ to kill John, but he instead deported him to Ḥarrān/Xaṙan. Ter-Łevondyan has traced the toponyms mentioned in this passage to the region of Ṣāṣūn/Sasun and Khoyṭ/Xoyt’ and argued that this rebellion is best described as an “Armeno-Syrian movement against Arab tyranny” (հայ-ասորական մի շարժում՝ արաբական բռնապետության դեմ). Ter-Łevondyan has traced the toponyms mentioned in this passage to the region of Ṣāṣūn/Sasun and Khoyṭ/Xoyt’ and argued that this rebellion is best described as an “Armeno-Syrian movement against Arab tyranny” (հայ-ասորական մի շարժում՝ արաբական բռնապետության դեմ).

The second main rebellion in the North in the last years of Marwān’s reign is similarly diffuse and difficult to place into easy categories. The Khārijite rebellion of Daḥhāk b. Qays al-Shaybānī (d. 129/746) reached into Jazīra and Albania and remained disruptive even after the death of its leader. The Chronicle of Zuqnin records the names of monasteries in Jazīra that were destroyed by one of Daḥhāk’s successors, ʿUbayd Allāh b. Bukhtūrī, but the rebellion also stretched to the east. According to Ibn Ṭabīb, another devotee of the rebel Daḥhāk named Musāfīr b. Katīr al-Qaṣṣāb was the leader of the Khārijite revolt in Albania and Azerbaijan. Marwān’s governor Ṣāṣūn/Sasun’s governor Ṣāṣūn/Sasun’s governor Ṣāṣūn/Sasun’s governor Ṣāṣūn/Sasun’s governor Ṣāṣūn/Sasun’s governor Ṣāṣūn/Sasun’s governor Ṣāṣūn/Sasun’s governor Ṣāṣūn/Sasun’s governor Ṣāṣūn/Sasun’s governor Ṣāṣūn/Sasun’s governor ʿĀṣim b. Yazīd (on whom see chapter X) arrested two Khārijites in Baylaqān. Musāfīr subsequently moved from Warthān to Baylaqān, forcing ʿĀṣim to flee to Bardha’a/Partaw. Musāfīr followed and killed ʿĀṣim, which prompted Marwān to send ʿAbd al-Malik b. Muslim al-Uqaylī as governor over Armenia and Azerbaijan. ʿAbd al-Malik was likewise killed in battle with the Khārijites near Bardha’a/Partaw, so his brother Isḥāq undertook a large-scale response against Musāfīr, battling day and night until the ʿAbbāsids arrived to overthrow Marwān.

Balādhurī offers a brief summary of Ibn Ṭabīb’s account, but he provides a few additional details. First, he links the Khārijite rebellion in Bardha’a/Partaw to yet another rebellion, in Bāb al-Abwāb/Darband: when Marwān went off to fight in the third fitna, he left in charge of Bāb al-Abwāb Thābit b. Nuʿaym al-Judhāmī, who rebelled at the prompting of Musāfīr. Second, Balādhurī names the location of Musāfīr’s fortress: “Marwān b. Muḥammad appointed Isḥāq b. Muslim over Armenia, and he continued to battle Musāfīr, who was in the fortress of Kulāb in Sīsajān.” These details connect various rebellions in Albania while also charting the Khārijite rebellions in Azerbaijan, Albania, and Sīsajān/Siunik’.

The Mamikonean rebellion described by Lewond was thus just one of several challenges to Marwān’s authority around this time. Isḥāq b. Muslim, the governor of Armenia, faced an incredibly unstable scene. Ṭabarī captures the chaos of the fractured and rebellious North well in his description of 132/749–50:

The people of the Jazīra displayed white and threw off their allegiance as soon as word came to them of the revolt of Abū al-Ward and the uprising of the people of Qinnasrīn. The rebels marched to Ḥarrān, where at this time Mūsā b. Kaʿb was stationed with three thousand men of the army. The defenders stuck fast to the city, and wearers of white flocked to it from every direction. They besieged Mūsā and those with him, but their command was not unified and they had no single chief to unite them.

---

67 Ter-Łevondyan, “Sasuni apstambut’yunə.”
69 For more information on Thābit, see Crone, Slaves on Horses, 61.
70 Balādhurī, Futūḥ, 209.
71 Ṭabarī, History, 27:180; Ta’rikh, 3:56.
This passage suggests that the rebellions proliferated, but without a central thread to pull them all together. Tabari then describes the attempts of both Ishāq b. Muslim (who was still working for the Umayyads at that time) and Abū Jaʿfar (the future ‘Abbāsid caliph Mansūr) to curtail rebellions city by city across Jazīra.

Although none of the descriptions of the rebellions in Jazīra and Albania in the last year of Marwān’s reign relate directly to Lewond’s description of the Mamikonean rebellion, they place the Mamikonean rebellion into the broader context of the political and military circumstances of Marwān’s caliphate and, in particular, Ishāq b. Muslim’s governorship. The many rebellions in Jazīra and Albania may explain why the Mamikonean and their allies decided to rebel at that particular time, why they never actually engaged with Ishāq or other caliphal forces, and why both Marwān and Ishāq were keen to maintain friendly relations with the Bagratuniks as their attention remained elsewhere. Perhaps more speculatively, we might also consider whether the toponyms “the village of Hazr” (վանք Հազր; كریت یند کریت ەزرا) may have served as mnemonic hooks on which to hang the stories of rebellions that are completely separate in the extant sources in terms of both actors and geography.

XI.D. THE ‘ABBĀSID REVOLUTION

Much of Lewond’s information about the ‘Abbāsid Revolution is consistent with the accounts in the Arabic sources. He construes the third fitna to have extended into the revolution, though the phrase “another raging fire” (عَن طَاعَةٌ عَلَى الْفَقْرِ) [92v] indicates that he separates the two. He identifies Qaḥṭaba and Abū Muslim as the leaders; mentions the killing of the governor of Khurāsān (Naṣr b. Sayyār) provoked by his fiscal policies; and describes the significance of Kūfa in the ʿAbbāsid daʿwa.

Lewond’s account of the ‘Abbāsid Revolution captures well the uncertainty about the leadership of the early daʿwa, when the armies of Khurāsān followed the generals into revolt without a clear identification of the prospective caliph. Lewond explains that the Umayyads were overthrown by unnamed kinsmen of the Prophet Muḥammad who had lived in Khurāsān “for some time” (ժամանակ ինչ) [93r]. This detail is interesting because it reflects the early stage of the daʿwa, which was propagated in the name of an unspecified relative of the Prophet Muḥammad. Although the Khurāsānī troops drove the revolution, the ‘Abbāsid family line was not based in Khurāsān. Like the early revolutionaries, then, Lewond leaves open the possibility that the daʿwa was not ‘Abbāsid. That said, Lewond subsequently identifies the revolutionaries as “the regiments of the ‘Abd Allāhs who were called the sons of Hāshim” (گունդք աբդլայից որ կոչին որդիք Հեշմայ) [93v]; this phrasing acknowledges that the revolt was Hāshimi in nature (and so open to a number of potential claimants) but refers specifically to the ‘Abd Allāhs, that is, the ‘Abbāsids. The early ‘Abbāsids all took the sobriquet ‘Abd Allāh (“the servant of God”), and “the ‘Abd Allāhs”
involved in the ‘Abbāsid Revolution were Abū al-ʿAbbās, who became the first ‘Abbāsid caliph Saffāḥ; his brother Abū Jaʿfar, the second ‘Abbāsid caliph Mansūr; and the third, their uncle ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAlī. Lewond designates Saffāḥ as ʿAbd Allāh, whereas Mansūr is the other ʿAbd Allāh (عليه ورغم) [94v]. Lewond’s identification of the daʿwa with the ‘Abbāsid family appears in his text after the troops arrive in Asorestan but before Kūfa, where Abū al-ʿAbbās was declared caliph in 132/749.

Lewond’s account of the battle of Zāb in 132/750 is idiosyncratic. Marwān’s distribution of funds to his troops, which played a central role in most other accounts, is mentioned in a completely different context by Lewond. Ṭabarī explains that Marwān wanted to distribute money to his soldiers, but he feared mass desertions in the aftermath. He thus sent his son to patrol for deserters, which the soldiers interpreted as a retreat. This misunderstanding threw the Umayyad forces into chaos and culminated in their defeat. 73 Theophanes and Khalīfa b. Khayyāṭ also mention that Marwān had confiscated the treasuries (πάντων τῶν συλληφθέντων θησαυρῶν; بيوت الاموال والكنوز) from Damascus during his flight from Zāb, a detail that does not match the accounts of Ṭabarī and Lewond. Without mentioning the plan of distributing the funds to his army, Theophanes and Khalīfa imply that Marwān took the money for himself.74 Theophanes also asserts that Marwān had 300,000 men: “Then, at the river Zabas, he [Abū Muslim] overtook Marwān, who had three hundred thousand men, made war on him, and slew an infinite multitude” (καὶ καταλαβὼν τὸν Μαρουὰμ εἰς τὸν Ζάβαν ποταμὸν ἔχουσα τ’ χιλιάδας πολεμεῖ αὐτὸν καὶ πλῆθος ἄπειρον ἀναυστεὶ εξ αὐτῶν).75 The Arabic sources, by contrast, never allow him more than 150,000 men at most. Beyond the detail about the treasuries and the attestation that Marwān had 300,000 men at his disposal, very little of Lewond’s account of the battle of Zāb aligns with other sources. Lewond’s reference to a hill and to Marwān’s tent is unique, as is his claim that Marwān died at the battle of Zāb.

73 Ṭabarī, Taʾrīkh, 3:42.
74 Theophanes, Chronicle, 588; Khalīfa, Taʾrīkh, 263. The histories of the Theophilus circuit also mention Marwān’s seizure of the treasuries of Damascus when he came to power as part of his move to his new capital at Harrān/Xaṙan. See Hoyland, Theophilus, 252–53.
75 Theophanes, Chronicle, 587; Chronographia, 425.
ELWOND’S TWELFTH CHAPTER INTRODUCES US TO THE REIGN OF THE ‘ABBĀSID, WHO TOPPLED THE UMAYYADS IN 750 AND RULED FROM IRAQ UNTIL THE COMING OF THE MONGOLS IN 1258. THE FIRST ‘ABBĀSID CALIPH, CALLED HERE ‘abd Allāh, IS MORE COMMONLY KNOWN TODAY BY HIS REGNAL TITLE, Saffāḥ (“THE BLOOD SHEDDER”). HE RULED FROM 749 TO 754. MOST OF LEWOND’S DESCRIPTION OF HIS REIGN IS ABOUT “THE OTHER ‘abd Allāh,” MEANING Saffāḥ’S BROTHER ABū Ja‘far, WHO SUCCEEDED Saffāḥ AND TOOK THE REGNAL TITLE Manṣūr. Lewond describes the power and influence of Abū Ja‘far during his brother’s reign, deploying details that reveal that Lewond was privy to information circulating in the Caliphate. Lewond also confirms that the norms of late Umayyad governance were upheld despite the regime change. The Bagratunik’ remained in a position of power as the point of contact with caliphal forces, and the governor under Saffāḥ hailed from a family with a long history of service in Armenia. These details suggest that the shift to ‘Abbāsid control was focused more on continuity than on a dramatic break from the past.

ENGLISH TRANSLATION

34. And ‘abd Allāh ruled in his [Marwān b. Muhammad’s] place and sent his brother, the other ‘abd Allāh, to circle through all of the lands of his kingdom. He went first to this land of Armenia and tormented everyone with many afflictions and tribulations. He caused extreme impoverishment to the point of exacting taxes even from the dead. He cruelly afflicted all of the many orphans and widows and tormented the priests and servants of the divine altar with tortures, ridicule, and whippings to make them reveal the names [95r] of the dead and their families. He also tortured the inhabitants of this land with very forceful and grievous tax collection, taking many zuze of silver per capita and placing a lead seal around everyone’s neck. Indeed, the house[s] of the naxarark’, willing or otherwise, gave increased gifts of horses and mules, of precious vestments and other hoards of gold and silver, so that they could glut the mouth of the dragon that had attacked and polluted this land. Having sated the gluttony of his voracious stomach, ‘abd Allāh: the first ‘Abbāsid caliph, Abū al-’Abbās ‘abd Allāh b. Muhammad b. ‘Ali, known by his regnal title Saffāḥ (r. 749–54). His reign is remembered for the suppression of Umayyad and ‘Alid threats to the new regime.

The other ‘abd Allāh: Saffāḥ’s brother, Abū Ja‘far ‘abd Allāh b. Muhammad b. ‘Ali, more commonly known by his later regnal title Manṣūr (r. 754–75). Manṣūr fought in Iraq during the ‘Abbāsid Revolution, then served as governor of Jazīra and Armenia under his brother until he became caliph.

Taxes from the dead: this phrase appears in the Christian apocalypse of Pseudo-Methodius to describe the hardships of caliphal rule.

Zuze: the plural form of zuza, a Syriac term for a coin.

Lead seal: sealing the necks was a way to mark who had paid taxes. This may be a literary representation of the harshness of caliphal rule, but there is sigillographic corroboration of this practice elsewhere in the Caliphate, as well as references in Arabic and Syriac sources.
he crossed through the region of the Persians and the Medes to the land of Khorasan and thence to Egypt and to the land of Pentapolis up to Africa. Wherever he reached, he ravished avariciously “like a net spread on Tabor”; [and] hunted the lives of men. [95v] As a consequence, he was given a name for his deprivation by his own people: the father of farthings, as it is said that he honored the farthing more than God.

When he departed from this land, he left a governor for adjudication and for the collection of taxes over this land of Armenia, Yazīd b. Usayd. And Yazīd appointed over this land a prince from among the Armenian naxarark': Sahak, the son of Bagarat, from the same house as Prince Ašot, who was his cousin. He was a handsome man and tall, with a noble nature, and God-fearing. He [Sahak] unwillingly led his troops to press the labor of battle wherever he was sent, for from then on the yearly salary of silver that came to the Armenian troops from the royal treasury was cut. And [96r] they required that the princes have a certain number of cavalry and there was a tax on their own houses to equip the armed regiments and to keep uninterrupted the progress of profitless labor. After ʿAbd Allāh completed the third year of his reign, he died.

**ARMENIAN EDITION**

1 Cf. Hosea 5:1.
2 լդ in lft. mg.
3 ըն] read: ըն with printed editions; scribe omitted -է by parablepsis.

**Pentapolis** Barqa, in modern Libya. Manṣūr’s supposed trip there is not corroborated in the Arabic sources.

**Africa** here, Africa likely refers to the Arabic toponym Itīqiyah, corresponding to Libya and Tunisia, rather than Africa in the broader modern sense.

**The father of farthings** Manṣūr was known in both Christian and Muslim texts for his stinginess. This nickname appears in Syriac and Middle Persian, as well.

Yazīd b. Usayd al-Sulami: the governor of Armenia from 752 to 754, then from 759 to 769, and again from 775 to 780. His mother was taken prisoner after the fires of Nashawa/Naxčawan, though his name indicates that he identified with his father’s Arab tribe instead of with his mother’s ancestral background.

Sahak Bagratuni: son of Bagarat and cousin of Ašot, and prince of Armenia from 753 to about 770.
COMMENTARY

XII.A. CALIPHAL GOVERNANCE AND THE TRANSITION FROM UMAYYAD RULE

Łewond’s account of Saffāḥ’s reign attests to both continuity and change in the transition from Umayyad to ‘Abbāsid rule. As in the Marwānid period, the caliph appointed a governor who in turn worked with local potentates. The caliphal governor was responsible for adjudication and the collection of taxes, though he relied on an Armenian (and specifically a nobleman from the Bagratuni family) to provide internal stability and lead the other nobles. The early ‘Abbāsids thus maintained both the structure and the networks established under the previous regime.

This passage also reveals the taxes that Armenians levied on their own houses in order to maintain their cavalry. On the surface, this practice suggests a definite break from the Marwānid period. From the reign of ‘Abd al-Malik on, Armenians were likely listed in the diwān, the registry of forces paid a stipend. Łewond notes here that the stipends were not maintained during Saffāḥ’s reign. However, his comment should not be used to differentiate between Umayyad and ‘Abbāsid practice, as the stipends were also intermittently suspended under Hishām b. ʿAbd al-Malik [83r–v]. The withholding of stipends is more likely a signal that the Armenian noble houses were not as central to Saffāḥ’s interests as they had been to the Marwānids’ because of caliphal reliance on Armenian cavalry in the Arab-Khazarian wars. Łewond also mentions poll taxes in this passage, though his dramatic description of them seems to reflect literary borrowing more than administrative norms (on which see below).

The choice of Yazīd b. Usayd al-Sulamī as governor also reflects the norms of early ‘Abbāsid governance. Yazīd’s roots were in Armenia: his mother was a noblewoman from Sīsajān/Siunik’. He had served the Umayyads under Marwān b. Muhammad, as his father had before him,4 so Yazīd’s rise to power reveals the integration of the Umayyad elite into

---

4 Եզիտ

5 Բագարատա

6 Crone, Slaves on Horses, 165.
the ‘Abbāsid ruling structure’. ‘Abbāsid governors tended to serve terms of less than five years before being reassigned to other provinces; Yazid fits this pattern, as he served three nonsequential terms in Armenia. Yazid stands out from the other governors, however, in that he appears in Arabic sources as the confidante of Mansūr, both in chains of transmission related to the future caliph and in anecdotes in which he provides the future caliph with suggestions and critiques.

XII.B. ABŪ JA’FAR’S TRAVELS AROUND THE CALIPHATE

Lewond claims that Abū al-‘Abbās sent his brother ‘Abd Allāh (Abū Ja’far, later to become the caliph Mansūr) “to circle through all of the lands of his kingdom” (۳۹۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶۶ۥ
posit shared practices and universal sites of reference, as if everyone in those regions participated in the same activities or held the same fate or values. Similar lists of places also appear in Armenian sources related to claims of universality. For example, T’ovma Arcruni explains that Mutawakkil’s troops were “from distant places” (ի հեռաբնակ վայրս) such as Syria, Babylonia, Turkestan, Khuzistan, Media, Elam, Egypt, and Arabia.13 His point is not to inform the reader about the campaign but to convey the impressive effort extended to curtail Armenian rebels, which necessitated pulling troops from the farthest reaches of the Caliphate. Lewond’s reference here to Persia, Media, Khurāsān, Egypt, and Africa may serve much the same purpose, namely, to remark on the breadth of the Caliphate during the reign of Saﬀāh and, particularly, Mansūr’s claim to these territories.

XII. THE CALIPHATE OF ‘ABD ALLĀH AL-SAﬀĀH

Lewond at the Nexus of Multiple Linguistic Circles

Lewond’s account of Saﬀāh’s reign suggests multiple possible connections to non-Armenian material. The passage about taxing the dead is reminiscent of Pseudo-Methodius. Lewond claims that the future Mansūr “caused extreme impoverishment to the point of exacting taxes even from the dead. He afflicted all of the many orphans and widows cruelly and tormented the priests and servants of the divine altar with tortures, ridicule, and whippings to make them reveal the names of the dead and their families” (որպես և այրեացի զալաւակութեա կան, զարկութե զաճակցութե, զանուանութեա խորանին խուսան եւ զաճակցութե զալաւակութե կան, զանուանութե խորանին խուսան, զարկութե զաճակցութե կան) [94v–95r]. This same combination of taxing widows, orphans, holy men, and the dead appears in the Armenian version of Pseudo-Methodius, which was translated from Greek: “And their hearts will become so haughty that they will demand as much [taxes from] the dead as from the living. They will not have pity on orphans, widows, or holy men” (Եւ բարձրասցի սիրտ նոցա` պահանջել զմեռեալս ըստ հավասարութեան կենդանեաց: Որբոց և այրեաց և սրբոց ոչ ողորմեսցեն).14 However, given the late date for the Armenian translation of Pseudo-Methodius, it remains possible that Lewond heard this snippet in Syriac, rather than in Armenian. In the same passage, he also employs the word ܙܘܙܐ (from the Aramaic ܙܘܙܐ, like Hebrew זוז) for dirhams and refers to neck sealing, a practice that appears more frequently in Syriac texts than it does in Armenian ones.15 The Syriac version of the apocalypse of Pseudo-Methodius offers a similar line: “They will be so elated in their wrath and pride that he will even demand tribute from the dead who lie in the dust. He will take a capitation tax from orphans, from widows, and from holy men” (ܡܐܬܐ ܡܢ ܡܝܬܐ ܫܒܝܒܝ ܡܡܐ ܕܢܬܒܥ ܡܐ ܒܚܡܬܐ ܘܒܪܡܘܛܗ ܥܕ ܘܢܫܬܥ ܬܐ ܘܡܢ ܩܕܝܫܐ meye ܡܢ ܐܪܡ ܥܦܪܐ ܘܢܣܒ ܟܣܦ ܪܝܫܐ ܡܢ ܝܬ).16

Pseudo-Methodius also circulated in Greek, so it is further possible that this theme entered Armenian from Greek. There are two other possible indications here of Lewond’s

13 Arcruni, Patmut’iwn, 198.
15 On neck sealing, see Robinson, “Neck-Sealing”; Soucek, “Early Islamic Seals.”
16 Brock, “Syriac Sources,” 34; Palmer, Seventh Century, 223; Penn, Envisioning Islam, 120; Robinson, Empire and Elites, 49. For the Syriac, see Pseudo-Methodius, Die syrische Apokalypse, 29.
familiarity with traditions in Greek. First, he refers to Abū Jaʿfar, the future caliph Manṣūr, as “the other ‘Abd Allāh” (միևս Աբդլա) to differentiate him from Saffāh and ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Ali. Theophanes does the same thing, referring to him as τοῦ ἄλλου Ἀβδελᾶ. Second, in the passage about Saffāh’s reign, Łewond demonstrates familiarity with the Septuagint. He cites Hosea 5:1 according to the Greek, employing the phrase “like a net spread on Tabor” (իբրև զվարմ ձգեալ ի Տամբիոն). The Armenian Bible does not include the name Tabor, replacing it with “on top of a high place” (ի գլուխ գահաւանդ). Łewond’s reference to Tabor must derive from the Septuagint because he preserves the case ending -ιον (ὡς δίκτυον ἐκτεταμένον ἐπὶ τὸ Ἰταβύριον), whereas the Syriac version of the Bible omits the Greek case endings and refers to the mountain only as ܬܒܘܪ.

In conjunction with Łewond’s use of the Syriac zuze, the appearance of this biblical Grecism indicates Łewond’s position at the nexus of multiple literary and linguistic circles. Accordingly, whether the snippet of Pseudo-Methodius was transmitted into Łewond’s text from Greek or Syriac is perhaps less significant than is the open circulation of text blocks across multiple linguistic lines that its presence in Łewond’s work signals. Łewond does not demonstrate familiarity with the rest of Pseudo-Methodius, so this bit of information likely circulated orally.

Łewond’s reference to Abū Jaʿfar as “the father of farthings” (հայր դանգի) adds Arabic to the nexus of Greek, Armenian, and Syriac. As Łewond claims, this epithet was given “by his own people” (իրէան ազգէն). As in the case of Pseudo-Methodius’s snippet, there is no easy explanation for how the nickname arrived in Łewond’s text. Although it is certainly attested in Arabic as اب‌الدوانيق, it also appears in Middle Persian: “The city of Baghdad was built by Abū Jaʿfar, whom they call Abū Dawānīq” (šahrestān ī baɣdād abū-jafar čiyōn-šan abū-dawānīg xwānd kard) and in Syriac: “When Manṣūr Dawanaqī reigned over it, he built a castle in Raqah [read: Rāfiqa].” The appearance of the nickname across historiographical traditions demonstrates that Lewond participated in broader regional patterns of transmission that were not based on language or religion. Since both examples—the claim to tax the dead and Abū Jaʿfar’s nickname—were short and show no clear connection to extended passages in other texts, it seems likely that such information circulated orally through conversations, rather than on the written page.

---

17 Theophanes, Chronicle, 529; Chronographia, 428.
18 Ṭabarī, Taʾrīkh, 3:278.
19 Šahrestānīhā ī Ērānsahr, 16, 21; Michael the Syrian, Chronique, 3:279; 4:640.
Lewond’s chapter on the reign of Abū Ja’far al-Manṣūr—called “the other ʿAbd Allāh” to differentiate him from his brother Saffāḥ—is invested in the political and military threats to Armenia, as opposed to the Caliphate at large, though he does include significant information on the Arab-Khazar wars. Lewond describes the many governors posted to Armenia, accounting for their involvement in the fight against the Khazars and their conflicts with the Armenian noble houses, as well as decrying the greater centralization of tax collection. Within this description, Lewond narrates the growing resistance to caliphal rule among the Mamikoneank’ and among the Arcrunik’, a family that ruled the region around Lake Van. By the end of Manṣūr’s reign, several smaller skirmishes had developed into a full-scale rebellion. Lewond presents the rebellion as a Mamikonean-led effort to unite all Armenians against caliphal rule. He uses generalizing language such as “the Armenian troops,” which smooths over differences between the various naxarar houses. Reading his account against the main Arabic source on the rebellion suggests that he overestimates this short-lived unity. The Arcrunik’ were defeated at the battle of Arčēš and the Mamikoneank’ at the battle of Bagrewand, both in 775. Lewond positions the Bagratunik’ in all theaters of this war, alongside the Mamikoneank’, the Arcrunik’, and caliphal forces alike. Despite the reported significance of the battle of Bagrewand in Armenian historical memory, Armenian sources do not mention it for centuries after Lewond, and Lewond himself admits to reliance on the reports of “the enemy” (likely Arab soldiers) in his account.

ENGLISH TRANSLATION

And his [Saffāḥ’s] brother, the other ʿAbd Allāh [Maṣūr], took over his authority for twenty-two years. In his days, the king of the Greeks stirred an idea in the imperial court: with a large and troublesome mob, he went and arrived in the land of Karin in the city called Theodosiopolis. King Constantine, who was the son of Leo, immediately destroyed the walls of the fortress. He opened the treasury and removed a great weight of gold and silver. He found there in the treasury the sign of the dominical cross, which he took and carried off with him. He also [96v] removed the troops of the city and its Saracen inhabitants, along with their families, to the land of the Greeks. Many of

The other ʿAbd Allāh: Abū Ja’far al-Manṣūr, the second ʿAbbāsid caliph (r. 754–75). He was particularly famous for the foundation of Baghdad and for his sponsorship of scholarship and translation.
The king of the Greeks: as noted above [91r], this refers to the Roman emperor Constantine V (r. 741–75).
Theodosiopolis: the Greek name for the city of Karin/Qalıqalá, modern Erzurum in eastern Turkey.

Saracen: a derogatory name for Muslims that derives from Greek sources. It is unusual in Lewond’s text. Since he also uses the Greek name Theodosiopolis, his source here may have been Greek.
the inhabitants of the [neighboring] districts requested of the king that they be allowed to throw off the iron yoke of Ishmaelite servitude and follow him. When he gave the order, they gathered their goods immediately and started on the journey, trusting in the power of the domimical cross and in the glory of the king. They left the land of their birth and emigrated, settling in the country of the pious king. At the beginning of the next year, Yazīd gathered forces that set out and arrived in the city of Karin under his command and imposed a poll tax over the land. Having collected an innumerable multitude [of people], he placed foremen in charge of the work, and taking care of it himself, he rebuilt [97r] the breached wall of the city. He had men from the sons of Ishmael settle in it [Karin] with their families to guard the city and defend it from the enemy. He arranged for the provision of their food from this land of Armenia.

35. At that time the riotous rabble of the infidel people did not stay [their] rancour from this land, for everywhere the sons of Beliar did not forsake their innate maliciousness, but a certain godless man named Sulaymān, along with the sons of transgression from the regions of Persia, struck like a viper. They raided the region of Vaspurakan, acting in the unworthy manner of their fellow bad seeds. The naxarark’ of the Arcruni house, Sahak and Hamazasp, attacked and fell upon the enemy with a few men. But when they [97v] [i.e., the enemy] saw that they were few, they enclosed them, wanting to kill them. When Sahak and Hamazasp saw the marauder rising up and knew that there was nowhere to flee, they put their swords to work, killing many of the enemy. They charged a place in the crowd, trying to escape. There, Hamazasp, mortally wounded, fell from his horse; and the enemy, surrounding him, killed him. When Sahak saw the killing of his brother, he resigned himself to death on account of the overwhelming love that he had for his brother. He dismounted from his horse, hamstrung it, and struggled furiously in single combat. He slew many [men]1 until he had avenged his brother’s blood. Then, vanquished in battle, he died. Thus the choice [98r] naxarark’, who were the sons of Vahan Arcruni, died. Then their brother Gagik and the other naxarark’ who were with him, informed [of their death], went out to the battlefield moaning and wailing, but they were not able to catch up

1 “He slew many [men],” ṣրպազծի համարիչ համազածի: cf. 1 Maccabees 3:24, 5:34, 6:42; 2 Maccabees 5:26; Ezekiel 6:5.
to the enemy. They returned, lamenting and mourning, to bury the dead. The enemy returned by that same road. Shortly thereafter Sulaymān fell into the hands of Gagik Arcruni, and he and many others who were with him were killed.

36. During his governorship, Yazīd sent an envoy to the king of the North who was called the khagan and sought a marriage alliance with him, so as to form a peace treaty between him and the Khazar forces. The king of the Khazars was persuaded and gave his sister, whose name was [98v] Khatun, to him in marriage. He sent many maids, female slaves, and servants with her. Khatun lived a short time and died; and the peace treaty between them was canceled, for they [the Khazars] considered her death a deceitful plot. He [the Khazar king] mustered a large army and placed it in the hands of a general whose name was Ṛažt’arxan from the regiment of Xat’ir Lit’ber. He sent it against this land controlled by Yazīd. They spread their raids north of the strong river called Kur and took many districts: Hēǰar, K’aḷa, Ostani Marzpan, Haband, Gelawu, Šak’e, Bix, Xeni, Kambexžan, and Xozmaz. These districts are in the land of Albania. They also took the desirable plain of Balasakan in which there were innumerable flocks [99r] of sheep and

Khatun: a title, roughly the female equivalent of “khan” in Turkic and Mongol societies. Arabic sources attest to the marriage and claim that the caliph Manṣūr himself ordered it. Like Lewond, the historians writing in Arabic see the death of the khatun as a casus belli for the Arab-Khazar wars.

Ṛažt’arxan: the Khazar general subordinate to the khagan. “Tarkhan” is a title; Ṛaž may be his name, part of his title (“the head of”), or a misinterpretation of the Ās or Allān people.

Xat’ir Lit’ber: a Khazar general from about 758 to 764. His name here is an Armenization of the Turkic name Qaṭir il täbär. Lewond relies on a source with knowledge of the districts of Albania, Georgia, and Azerbaijan. In his first list, he refers only to districts of Albania that are north of the river Kur (map 11). The sole exception is Haband, which lies south of the Kur. However, given where the toponym falls in the list, it seems likely that the author or scribe mistook the district of Hambasi (which is
many herds of cattle, which they took as booty. They also took seven districts from the land of the Georgian principality: Šuč’k’, K’weldap’or, Č’eldt’, Juk’ēt’, Vilisjixē, T’ianēt’, and Erk. They gathered a multitude of captives and much booty [and then] returned to their dwelling places. That gouty braggart [Yazīd] was not able to raise his head [out of shame]. He possessed the authority of the governor of this land of Armenia, but he only hid, living like an animal. He thought nothing of the destruction of this land. Then a short time later, having gone away, that same beast [the khagan] who had brought a shadow over the land of the Albanians came to unite with the Ishmaelite prince; and he sent his son to Syria as hostage. He [the khagan] suddenly died by the sword near the gates of Albania. [99v]

37. I will also speak once again about that rebellious one whom ʿAbd Allāh first sent to this land of Armenia, whom they called Šāliḥ. He was a lawless and bloodthirsty man. Many mistrusted him and were on guard, for they were not able to bear such torment at that time. There were some of the Armenian naxarark’ who objected and abandoned their inheritance. They fled to the land of the Greeks and took refuge with the emperor Constantine. But when Gagik, who was lord of the Arcruni house, did not find a place to flee to, he stole away2 thence to the fortress called Nkan. He gathered the naxarark’ of that land with their cavalry to him and went out and raided the land of Atrpatakan—the district[s] of Zarawand, Rutaks, Zidroy, Tasuk, Gaznak, Yormi, Surenapat, and still other neighboring districts—where they committed deeds unpleasing to God, resembling the infidels, which was not pleasing to the Christians. He also exacted taxes from the land and tormented [the people] with much anguish. He went and arrived in the district of Hēr.

A certain Rawḥ, an Ishmaelite general, arrived at that place and wounded many of the Armenian forces, causing the others to flee to the fortress of Nkan. He surrounded the districts of Vaspurakan so that he could trap them in his snare. Then, when the lord of the ArcruniK’ saw the defeat of his troops, he was not able to go out to commit lawless acts but escaped to the fortress and stopped [warring] for a little. Subsequently, another force under the commander near all of the other districts listed) for the more famous district of Haband.

I will also speak once again: Here Lewond’s source must have referred to Šāliḥ earlier, since this is the first time he appears in Lewond’s text.

Šāliḥ b. Sabīḥ [or Subayh] al-Kindī: governor of Armenia. Lewond says he was sent by ʿAbd Allāh, by whom he means the caliph Saffāḥ. The Arabic history of Tabari has Šāliḥ appointed in 750–51 and dismissed in 751–52, which conflicts with his placement here under the caliph Mansūr (r. 754–75).

Atrpatakan: the Armenian term for Azerbaijan. By this, Lewond means not the modern Republic of Azerbaijan but the region in northwestern Iran, including the cities of Tabriz and Ardabil.

Resembling the infidels: Lewond compares Gagik Arcruni and the Armenian naxarark’ supporting him to both the Khazars and caliphal agents for their collection of taxes. Compare the similar denigration of the sons of Smbat Mamikonean for exacting taxes on 87v.

Rawḥ: this Rawḥ is unidentified. Another Rawḥ, the son of Ḥātim al-Muhallabī, later served as governor of Armenia in 785.

2 “He stole away”: M1902 reads in the plural, “they stole away,” qunpāṭjiḥū, but we follow Chahnazarian’s and Malxaseanc’ s emendation as the logic of the sentence presumes a singular subject, Gagik.
Mūsā came out against him. He besieged the fortress for one year. When he was not able to prevail, he deceived them with a ruse and called for peace. He captured [Gagik] and handed him over to the Ishmaelite prince [Manṣūr]. The latter threw him in chains and put him in prison with intolerable afflictions. He exacted from him the silver that he [Gagik] had collected through the collection of taxes from the land of the Persians. He was not stingy with the treasury and [gave] as much as he found into his hand, so that he might perhaps be able to save his life. Nothing helped. Instead, he died there in the misery of prison, as a contemptible man. He [the caliph] held his sons Hamazasp and Sahak in prison for a long time but resisted the desire of the ignoble executioner and, satisfied by persuasion, was reconciled with them. He honored them and sent them to this land of Armenia.

38. At this same time, during the governorship of Yazīd and in the reign of the other ‘Abd Allāh [Manṣūr], the iron yoke of taxation became much more severe over this land of Armenia. The hellish avarice of the implacable enemy was not satisfied with eating the flesh of the chosen flocks of Christ or drinking [their] blood like water [out of] contempt for them; instead, he subjected this entire land of Armenia to intolerable anguish. For he exhausted the silver finds of this land, and everyone gave their livelihoods and possessions, but they did not meet the price for the salvation of their lives. They tormented human lives with malicious tortures, imprisonment, hanging, and bitter punishments. Of those who fled, many hid, concealing themselves in caves and crevices of the earth. Some were smothered in snow and drowned in a river on account of such unbearable misfortunes, for that which they [i.e., Yazid’s men] sought was not found. A demand for a silver tax was invented besides the poll tax, by which they [i.e., the Armenians] were deprived of all belongings. They bound this land of Armenia in the chains of impoverishment. Even the naxarark’ and the nobility ate in general from the furnace of poverty. Although Prince Sahak and the patriarch Lord Trdat, who was from the house of the naxarark’ of the district of Vanand, complained many

3 Cf. Hebrews 11:38; Isaiah 2:19, 7:19; Matthew 24:16; Mark 13:14; Revelation 6:15.
times, Yazīd, who was responsible for taxation in this land, still did not listen to their appeals. Cries of complaint went up and reached ‘Abd Allāh, and he disdainfully recalled Yazīd and sent Bakkār b. Muslim as his replacement. Not long afterward, for [102r] Bakkār did not last even an entire year, he [Manṣūr] summoned him without any reason and sent Hasan, because his scheming malice incited [him] to debase this land of Armenia to a place of torment. In effect, it was not his will but that of the Corrector of princes that was executed, to which the coming anger from on high testified: the multitude of locusts, hail, and droughts. These were signs of [God’s] anger with us.

39. When the governor Ḥasan b. Qaḥṭaba assaulted this land of Armenia along with a large regiment from the house of the land of Khorasan, who frequently committed more disgusting lewd acts, they also increased the miseries and woes of this land. For as was explained earlier, their hearts were hardened by the Lord [102v] as vengeance for our evil deeds. For truly, famine, sword, and earthquake abounded during his governorship. In addition to this, the pontiffs were humiliated, the bishops were ridiculed, the priests were whipped and tortured, and the princes and naxarark‘ were led away and dispersed. The leaders of our land could not endure this. They lamented and sighed from the intolerable anguish, because they [i.e., Hasan and his men] tormented the mass of commoners with various wicked acts: they oppressed some with whippings for the sake of harsh taxation and others with fetters and the gallows; they threw some, stripped of their clothes, into lakes during the bitter winter; and they assigned guards to torture them. In that way [103r] they embittered their lives with cruel torments such that we cannot tell the story of their miseries.

40. Henceforth, I will relate the relentless bitterness committed by the savage Ishmaelite people. For when the Armenian naxarark‘ saw the dangerous anxieties coming over them, they risked their lives and undertook things that they were not able to accomplish, since they were few, but they considered a brave death to be better than a perilous life. They undertook acts of rebellion and renounced Ishmaelite subjugation. The beginning of these acts was committed by Artawazd, who was from the house of the Mamikoneank‘. He went to the capital Duin and took a large formation of his troops. There he obtained arms and instruments of war. [103v] He armed himself with cuirasses,

Large regiment from the house of the land of Khorasan: this passage renders the Arabic phrase min ahl Khurāsān. While this literally means ‘from the people of Khurāsān’, it is used specifically to refer to the military units from the caliphal East, which formed the backbone of the ‘Abbāsid army.

Artawazd Mamikonean: son of Hmayeak (according to 103v). He was responsible for the rebellion in the early 770s but apparently then left Armenia for western Georgia. See map 12 for locations mentioned in this passage.
helmets, and full sets of armor. He feigned that he was a confidante of the Ishmaelite troops, as if he were ready to battle with their enemy. He separated himself from their company and arrived in the district of Sirak in the town of Kumayr. He killed the tax collector and took everything that he found in his possession. He rose up with his entire house and went to the region of the Georgians along with all the naxarark of this land. When the report reached the city of Duin that such grievous crimes had been committed by the sons of Hmayeak, Muḥammad [b. Ḥasan] immediately took a large force, including Smbat the son of Ašot, the Armenian sparapet, and other naxarark, and followed them. He arrived in the land of the Georgians in the district called Samc‘xē and held the passes. He seized some booty from the plunder and drove them [i.e., Artawazd and his troops] into flight from this land of Armenia. They went and took shelter in the land of the Egerians. He [Artawazd] personally acquired authority for himself over the Egerians and the Vēria, who are Georgians. The governor Ḥasan was even more incensed by this act and immediately launched an assault on all the regions under his rule to collect taxes with great alacrity. The lamentation of this land greatly intensified from the tax collectors, for the discovery of silver had completely diminished from this land of Armenia.

Feigned that he was a confidante: Lewond portrays this event as an Armenian rebellion against the Caliphate. Armenians were enrolled in the caliphal army, however, so in Arabic sources this event appears as a mutiny rather than a full-scale rebellion.

Tax collector: taxation was the most visible sign of caliphal rule, so tax collectors were frequently the first victims of conflict.

Sons of Hmayeak: Artawazd Mamikonean and, presumably, his brothers.

Muḥammad: son of the governor Ḥasan b. Qaḥṭaba, responsible for administering Karin and Xla‘ (modern Erzurum and Aḥla‘ in eastern Turkey) in his father’s name.

Sparapet: a military title to identify the general in charge of the Armenian forces. It was traditionally given to a scion of the Mamikonean family; Smbat the son of Ašot was the first Bagratuni to hold this position.

Vēria: this term is not Armenian but rather renders the Greek term “Iberia,” referring to south-central Georgia. Lewond translates the term for an Armenian audience with the explanation “who are Georgians.”
Consequently, the heart of a certain naxarar named Mušel, who was the son of Count Hrahat from the Mamikonean house, was moved to anger. He joined some of the Armenian naxarark' and left Ishmaelite subjugation. He found in his district and in his house some of the sons of Ishmael who had come to exact from him the blood of those from their family whom he had killed. He slaughtered them by his sword and escaped to the fortresses of Artagers along with his house. Then he went to the district of Bagrewand along with sixty men and seized the tax collector, whose name was Abumčur, as well as those who were with him. He struck and killed them by his sword and interrupted the collection of taxes from this land. When this was thus carried out, all of the afflicted and aggrieved gathered to him; and from then on, enemies from every region rose against them. And prior to this, other sons of Ishmael from the city of Karin—some two hundred men fully armed with heavy armor—had gone out to catch him. He [Mušel] surprised them at night in the village of Xars with a few men, for they were camped in the vineyards. Surrounding them, they [Mušel and his men] destroyed the small barrier of the vineyards, for it was a heap of stones without mortar. The horses, shocked by such disturbance of the rocks, trampled and killed many underfoot. He [Mušel] took the weapons and spoils of the fallen, as well as the horses and all of the caparisons, and gave them to his troops. He marched toward his fortress.

When news of the misfortune reached the Ishmaelite general Muhammad [b. Ḥasan] in the city of Duin, great anguish rose over him from all sides. He gathered the troops of the city of Duin and handed them over to a general whose name was Abū Najīb to go out to seek vengeance for the blood of those killed. That general took the finest cavalrymen, some four thousand men, and went out carefully on the royal highway to reach the village of Bagawan in the district of Bagrewand. There Mušel met them with two hundred men, and they engaged in battle against each other. Help immediately arrived from the Lord to aid the regiment of Mušel, and they delivered many blows, slaughtering the Ishmaelite troops. They put the survivors to flight and pursued them until the village of Aruč. They exterminated many [of them] to the point that they even killed that general [Abū Najīb]. They returned from pursuing them in great victory and loaded with much booty from the enemy’s spoils. Those who [managed to]
flee—a few out of many—came down to the city of Duin. Then men and women from their own people came before them crying, wailing, with earth on their heads, hitting their foreheads and tearing their collars. All of the streets of the large city were filled with their lamentations and tears. The Saracen regiment was extremely afraid and dared not go outside of the city. Instead, they were on guard in the citadel of the city.

Then, when the Armenian naxarark saw this success, they were of one mind to pursue this mindless plan, for they thought that the time of Ishmaelite rule had expired. Above all, they were further deceived by the fantasies of a single man, a monk, who was moved by the spirit of perversion and prophesied empty nonsense, [106v] saying:

Behold, the time of your salvation is near, for soon now the scepter of the kingdom shall return once again to the house of Togarmah to take revenge on the Ishmaelite people through you. Do not be afraid to face them because you are fewer in number, for one man from among you shall expel thousands and two [shall expel] myriads, for the Lord shall fight your war. Be strong and do not be afraid.

In this way he related false apparitions and desirable lies day after day to them, and they, in general, believed him and called him a seer. And everyone who was deceived by these words urged the great sparapet Smbat the son of Ašot to agree to this plot. Indeed, he followed that fraudulent and perverse man, as if [his] will reluctantly moved from its own constant and firm intentions. [107r] All of the Armenian naxarark gathered in one place and made an oath to each other and a covenant of allegiance to live and die for each other. In this way the gathered throng was together about five thousand men, for many common people came and mixed with their regiment. They rose up and went from those regions to besiege the city of Theodosiopolis, which is the city of Karin. They laid siege to it with blockades. They gave battle and fought with it for the entire winter, building a bulwark around it. They cut holes into the outer walls of the city, but they were not able to prevail, though quite a few people of the city were killed by rocks from the catapults.

Mindless plan: note that throughout this description Łewond expresses disapproval of the rebellion. He thus echoes the position of the house of his sponsors, the Bagratunik. Some members of the Bagratuni house appear on the battlefields of this rebellion, but Ašot Bagratuni continued his family’s policy of allying with the Caliphate.

Monk: a solitary or hermit, since we have no solid evidence for monasticism at this point in Armenian history.

Togarmah: one of the traditional genealogies of the Armenian people was traced from the patriarch Togarmah, in Armenian T’orgom. This name relates to the designation of Armenia as “the North,” as Ezekiel 38:6 explains that Togarmah lived in “the remotest parts of the north.” Togarmah was the father of Hayk, the eponymous ancestor of the Armenian people.

Smbat sparapet the son of Ašot: see 103v. He became sparapet in 753 and died at the battle of Bagrewand in 775.

5 “They were on guard”: following here the emendation of the printed editions, անձնապահ լինէին իշխ՝ իշխանի, against manuscript M1902, which reads “they killed themselves,” անձնամահ լինէին.
But Ašot from the Bagratuni house, son of Prince Sahak, since he was a thoughtful and sensible man, did not join this act of disadvantageous misery. Rather, he admonished them to set aside the detrimental thoughts that they had from the pernicious counsel of the mad monk and to keep themselves and their families safe. He said:

You are children and young in years. I know that you are not able to withstand the strength of the many-headed dragon, for his strength is mighty and he controls an innumerable multitude and an immense equipage of weapons in his treasury. All of the kingdoms that opposed his rule were crushed to pieces like pottery. For the kingdom of the Romans was not able to raise its hand against him, but instead quakes and trembles before him, nor [was it able] to be emboldened against the command of the Lord, for you also are not unaware of the entire strength of the king of the Greeks, his personal bravery, and the large number of his equipped troops. But in no way did he even once think to take this land of Armenia from his hands. Constantine the son of Leo, who one day wrestled against terrible beasts, killed the lion as if it were a baby goat! Even he, who had this great strength, is thus subdued by fear of the perverse beast that corrupts the earth. So on whom are you truly relying? With whose strength and whose force can you resist

---

their insurmountable reign? But now, if it seems pleasing to you, accept my counsel, for I am looking to help you and to provide for the needs and comfort of this land. The outcome of your deed will be this: either you will return and submit to them, staying silent and living peacefully in your land, or you will be repulsed into flight from your land with all of your families and, abandoning the inheritance of your fathers, homes, forests, and fields and even the tombs of your fathers, you will go and live in exile with the king of the Greeks. Or if not, you will fall into the hands of your persecutors one day and they will take your life away with an unsavory death. For I know the disposition of the godless Ishmaelite prince; he does not stop until he accomplishes his own desires.

But they did not heed the useful counsel that they heard and scorned it as treason, for they were fully taken in by the crazy charlatan who exhorted them day after day to remain steadfast in the proposed deed and not to condemn themselves through any irresolution.

The incorrigible perversity of the weak plan soon appeared, for they broke from one another and were disunited. The naxarark of the Arcruni house, Hamazasp and his brothers, along with their troops remained there in the regions of the land of Vaspurakan. Vasak the son of Ašot and those from the house[s] of the Amatunik’ and the Trunik’ remained there. Some were in the fortress in the village of Dariwnk’ and at the edge of Maku, while others fortified themselves in the Aragelt valley and spread out in

Map 13. Battles of Baghrawand/Bagrewand and Arjish/Arčēš.

Vasak Bagratuni: son of Ašot the Blind and brother of Smbat sparapet.
Amatunik’: see 26v.
Trunik’: an ancient house mentioned in earlier Armenian histories as ‘Trpatunik’. This family lived in the region of Vaspurakan and was absorbed into the Arcrunik’ in the ninth century. See map 13 for locations mentioned in this passage.
the surrounding districts in search of food, then returned to their fortress. Meanwhile, the Tačik forces that were in Duin went marauding from place to place in the districts that were around them, and they pillaged and shed blood in the villages of Płunk', T'alın, Kolb, and many other places. They put their swords to work, resulting in many corpses.

41. But on the coming of spring, the Ishmaelite prince [Manṣūr] assigned a regiment over this land of Armenia. He gathered the best cavalymen, some thirty thousand choice riders in heavy armor from the regiment of the house of Khorasan. He handed them over to a general whose name was ‘Āmir and dispatched him from the vast and famous city that ‘Abd Allāh [Manṣūr] himself had built, fortified for safety with extremely strong and impregnable walls, called by the name of Baghdad. The general rose up from the regions of Syria and arrived in the city of Xlat’ in this land of Armenia, very cautiously and readily armed. When he entered the city, he was informed by the citizens there about the state of the [110r] Armenian forces: how many there were, who their commanders were, whether they were united in mutual admiration, whether they were plagued by doubt, whether they were brave conquerors, whether they were slow, and whether they had arms ready or not. He was informed about all of this and prepared the commander of his forces with it. But Ašot the son of Sahak, since he was in that city, warned the Armenian naxarark‘ about the arrival of their enemies, so that where[ever] they might be, they could gather in one place to live or die with one another. They, however, considered the substance of his letter untrustworthy and thought he wanted to save the city [of Karin] from the present siege through deceitful artifice, so as to show himself a confidante of the Ishmaelites. With this in mind, they rejected his words and instead [110v] still thought to complete their proposed plan.

Subsequently, the Arcruni naxarark‘ gathered the troops of the land of Vaspurakan. Hamazasp and his brothers, and those who were from the house of the Amatunik‘ and the forces that were with them, called Vasak the son of Ašot, brother of Smbat sparapet from the Bagratuni house, and his troops for help. They marched forth and attacked the village of Arčēš, undermining its foundations and putting the troops in it to the sword. When they arrived in the village of Berkri, in the district of Arberani, they stayed with each other in a group. They enticed and brought many inhabitants of that land into battle on foot behind themselves. And

‘Āmir: identified in Arabic sources as ‘Āmir b. Ismā‘īl al-Ḥārithī. The reference to ‘Āmir poses one of the chronological problems entailed by Lewond’s text, as ‘Āmir died in 774 and the battle of Bagram was taking place in 775. According to the Arabic sources, ‘Āmir had put down a revolt in Georgia in 774 and another general came to Armenia in 775. It is likely that Lewond is mixing details about the two rebellions, one in Georgia and the other in Armenia.

Baghdad: the capital of the ‘Abbāsid Caliphate, known in Arabic as the City of Peace, madīnat al-salām. Manṣūr ordered its construction in 762. It is famous for its circular layout, familiar from the ancient Iranian world, which features the caliph’s palace and the mosque at the center with four main avenues radiating outward, one to each of the city’s gates.

Xlat’: a city on the banks of Lake Van. The caliphal governor Hasan b. Qaḥṭaba had placed his son Muhammad in charge of this city. Xlat’, Khilāṭ in Arabic, is modern Alihat in eastern Turkey.

Arčēš: Arjīsh in Arabic; modern Erciş in eastern Turkey.
while they were all still wanting [111r] to go forth with this plan, news of the Ishmaelite forces suddenly reached them, for someone came and told them that "many of the sons of Ishmael have arrived and are waiting for you." Hamazasp, the lord of the Arcruni, did not listen to him but tortured him with beatings as an instigator of lies. He pretentiously went against the village of Arčēš with his troops.

When he arrived close to the village, the inhabitants of the city immediately notified ‘Āmir the Ishmaelite general in the city of Xlat’ of the arrival of the Armenian naxarark’. He marched with a multitude of forces and went to ambush them near the village of Arčēš. While the Armenian regiment was fighting against the fortifications, the ambushers suddenly came out of hiding, [111v] poured over the Armenian troops, and put them to flight. They killed the majority of the infantry, who were local men, since they were unprotected, without weapons and unpracticed in war; once they met the bitter light of that day, they [i.e., the Ishmaelites] destroyed them by the merciless sword. Some, fearing an uncertain fate, threw themselves into the river and drowned. By contrast, four men from the house[s] of the naxarark died, including three from the house of the Trunik’ and one from the village of Yurc. Some fifteen hundred men from the common people died and others turned in flight, barely finding sustenance for themselves anywhere. This hellish, unfortunate affliction occurred on [112r] the fourth day of the month of Hrotic’, on a Saturday.

The enemy hounded the Armenian troops up to the place called the village of Tay. Then they returned from following them and greatly rejoiced in their camp. At that time the woes of this land of Armenia were multiplied considerably, as [was] the joy and delight of the renegade enemy. For after taking a breath, they straightaway attacked again and carefully marched forth on the royal highway through the district of Apahunik’. They arrived in the village of Arjni in the district of Bagrewand and they pitched their camp there on the bank of the river that flows through it. All of the artisans who make weapons were there with them, and they prepared weapons and instruments of war.

[112v] Those [Armenian] forces that held watch [over the siege] of the city of Karin nearly brought it to destruction, for hunger wrought havoc in the city and they [the inhabitants] wanted, against their will, to hand the city over.

---

7 "Unprotected," մերկք, lit. "naked."
When word of the defeat of the regiment reached the city of Karin, the hearts of the warriors of the Armenian forces deserted them and they abandoned the siege of the city. Although they could have left for the region of the Greeks and saved themselves from the evil villainy of the unjust, they considered it better to choose their own deaths than to see the destruction of this land and the desertion of the churches of Christ. Thinking thus, although they were fewer in number than their enemies were, they faced the suffering with a willing disposition.

They gathered their regiments, some five thousand men, and went from the city of Karin, passing through the borders of Basen in the district of Bagrewand. Speedily crossing the Aracani River, they valiantly attacked the enemy. At a distance of two stadia, they left behind their goods and their horses and angrily prepared to battle the enemy on foot. The regiments of the enemy, fully equipped, also marched out against them then. At the break of dawn, the battle was joined. When they crashed into each other, the Armenian regiment first gained the upper hand and scored many blows. They set the enemy to flight and slaughtered many. Then they [the Arabs] recouped and returned from their flight. They opposed them with furious anger and spread terror over the multitude of the common crowd. They put some of the naxarark', their cavalry, and the commoners who were with them to flight, while they struck many of them and slayed them on the field of battle.

The victorious martyrs, though they were small in number among the ferocious hunters, still had no fear of bitter death. Instead, they gathered together heartily till the end and prepared each other with these words. They said:

Let us die bravely for our land and our people. Our eyes will not see our sanctuaries and places for the glorification of our God destroyed and trampled by the profane. Rather, the sword of our enemies will strike us first and so it will be as they want. Let us exchange our lives for our true faith and not for earthly goods, for “this death is temporary and [the next] life is eternal.”

---

8 “They prepared,” մարզէին, lit. “they trained.” The terminology underscores the martyrrological context of the captives.

9 “This death is temporary and [the next] life is eternal,” մահժամանակեան, եւ կեանքն յաւիտենական: cf. Agat’angelos, History of the Armenians, §749.
They gave this exhortation to each other, then they fixed their eyes on the heavens and looked for help from on high, saying:

God, look upon us in succor and hasten to aid us. May they who demand our lives be deeply shamed. And we shall call Your name, Lord, in our tribulations, and we will glorify Your name, Lord, in these tribulations in which we are besieged. For behold, innumerable evils surround us and keep us and the pangs of death have arrived upon us.

They offered these and even more supplicatory requests and yearning entreaties.

After this, they were again empowered by heavenly aid, and they stopped at nothing to proceed with the plan. For they were not more than a thousand men among thirty thousand, as we learned from the very enemy himself. He said [that] they [the Armenians] had with them a multitude of angels who fought with them and appeared in human form to the enemy. They saw priests and pontiffs with gospels, candles, and incense going before them, [and] they empowered them. They sought revenge with impassionate slaughter until their hands were overcome by the weight of the weapons. All those who remained without weapons fell into their [the Arabs’] hands. The blessed and brave martyrs immediately relinquished their sinful lives and traded [them] for the expectation of hope in the world to come. These are the names of these generals: from the Bagratuni house, the sparat Smbat and his partner and comrade Sahak; from the Mamikonean house, the general Musel, and Samuel, lord of the Mamikoneank’, who was [his] young son of lively beauty and the brother-in-law of the great sparat; and from the Gnuni house, Vahan “the Dagger”; and many other naxarark’ and commoners whose names I am not able to number one by one. Around three thousand men fell, and their deaths were pitiable and their end ignoble, for there was not even enough ground to bury the corpses of the miserable [victims] of the battle.

As we learned from the very enemy himself: here Lewond acknowledges that his source for the material on the battle of Bagrewand is an Arabic one. This is confirmed by a comparison of his text with a tenth-century Arabic account of the battle. Fighting angels: medieval Armenian texts often attribute Armenian victories to the involvement of angelic multitudes on the battlefield, fighting on the Armenians’ side.

Smbat Bagratuni: the sparat mentioned above, to be distinguished from Sahak Bagratuni, prince of Armenia, who died sometime before Bagrewand.
The list of the fallen at Bagrewand: most of the names here are unattested beyond the battle of Bagrewand.


11 For the rest of this quotation, cf. David’s song of praise in 2 Kingdoms (2 Samuel) 22:4–7 and Psalm 17:5–7(18:4–6).
Instead, they stayed, discarded, on the field, in the sun, dust, rain, and storms.

And then the laments and mourning of this land of Armenia multiplied excessively, since her great leaders and venerable generals were eliminated in a single instant. This land was universally [115v] seized in deep sorrow, and they [the Armenians] grieved greatly. They bewailed the death of the strong and brave champions who were first into battle, for they remained deprived of their aid. And they were delivered into the hands of the bestial and brutal enemy. They remembered then in their tribulation the protection of the visitation of God, who from the beginning retained mercy for humans and especially for those who glorify His name. They beseeched [God] for His solicitous forgiveness to arrive in aid of those who doubted and who had lost hope in the life of this world, for after the destruction that took place in the village of Arčēš, these evils came upon them soon afterward in the same month of Hrotic’ on Monday the fourteenth. The painful tribulation was even greater since there was not even an opportunity to cry or lament freely [116r] for the deceased, no bread of mourning to break in their houses, and no graves for the dead.

42. The enemy spread their incursions in the district of Bagrewand and in neighboring regions and raised great anguish among the inhabitants of the land. They were obstinate and intended to destroy all the places of worship and to defile the holiness of Christ’s churches. They also crushed and destroyed by burning the likeness of the brilliant Cross of Christ, which hangs in entrances and exits as an assurance and shield for worshiping the consubstantial Trinity. They drove out the priests, the monks, and their fellow servants with intense hatred, as being the leaders of those who died in the war. They also in <many> places carried off the implements of the Church and took away the relics of the saints of God as booty. And when [116v] the lawless troops had taken their fill of booty from this

12 “In entrances and exits,” վ ենք ու մուտք: although, as Martin-Hisard points out (Łewond, Discours historique, 185 n. 915), the phrase ենք ու մուտք is a fixed term indicating a passage serving a building, it seems that Lewond here stresses the ubiquity of crosses over such passages, and we have therefore chosen to translate the phrase literally.

13 “<Many> places,” տեղիս <տեղիս>: the scribe of M1902 likely omitted the second տեղիս, “places,” because of homoeoteleuton, although a later corrector inserted it above the line.
land of Armenia, they marched against the fortresses again and vanquished the refugees in the fortresses, who sued for peace. They gave a letter of oath and brought them [the Armenians] down from the fortresses.

Making as if he [i.e., ʿĀmir] were illustrious and brave in victory, he turned and left this land of Armenia and crossed through the land of the Persians. He wanted to meet the prince of Ishmael [Manṣūr], as if he would receive recompense from him for his loyal services. At that time the judgment of God, the just Judge, arrived upon him, and he was cut down in the land of the Persians. For he died after suffering from the most grievous pains and worthily received his compensation of revenge, for [his] blood was justly spilled in exchange for the innocent blood spilled by his hand. Although [his death was] not by the sword of man, [it was] by an invisible sword, [namely,] the command of the Most High, which with efficacious strength is more penetrating than all double-edged swords in piercing the spirit, breath, joints, and brain. With that sword He sought vengeance for the blood of His sons, punished those who were hateful to Him, and purified the land of His people. He spared His people, for He drove out the cudgel of the people from their sight; once again they were safe in their homes.

At that time the Ishmaelite prince [Manṣūr] again sent Yazīd [b. Usayd] as governor over this land of Armenia to replace Hasan. ʿAbd Allāh [i.e., Manṣūr] satisfied his evil will with everything he desired, oppressed his soul with the desires of the illness of avarice, and coveted an evil covetousness for his house. He received the curses of the prophet [Habakkuk] and soon died there desperately in that same year. Indeed, He who remunerates all revealed the future place of his [Manṣūr’s] judgment to a priest from among His worthy servants, for just a few days before the end of his [Manṣūr’s] life, he [the priest] saw in a vision a place of tortures, and in it there was a subterranean pit of limitless depth. And at the mouth of this pit was constructed a door of iron. Two soldiers brought him to the mouth of the abyss. Opening the cover to the pit, he

---

14 “Just Judge,” ιραυαδατναι: cf. 2 Timothy 4:8, where it is αρδαραυαραυ.  
16 “Coveted an evil covetousness for his house,” αγαθεαλεαγαθεαλεαলেαলেαলেαলেαলেαলেαলেαলেαলেαলেαলেαলেαलেαলেαলেαলেαলেαলেαলেαলেαলেαলেαলেαলেαলেαলেαলেαলেα�েα�েα�েα�েα�েα�েα�েα�েα�েα�েα�েα�েαলেα�েαলেα�েα�েα�েα�েα�েα�েα�েα�েα�েα�েα�েα�েα�েα�েα�েα�েα�েα�েα�েα�েα�েα�েα�েα�েα�েα�েα�েα�েα�েαলেα�েα�েα�েα�েα�েα�েα�েα�েα�েα�েαলেα�েα�েα�েαলেα�েα�েαলেαলেα�েα�েα�েαলেαলেα�েαলেα�েαলেα�েα�েα�েαলেα�েαলেα�েα�েα�েα�েα�েα�েαলেα�েα�েα�েα�েα�েα�েα�েαلاللاal
[the priest] saw a fire rage out from the pit to the heavens. They took and threw the minister of evil [Manṣūr] into it and closed that same door over it again. They trapped him in the inextricable prison to receive his just reward. Such was the revelation of the vision foreseen about him. This was truly befitting his evil conduct, [118r] to receive in this way recompense from the just Judge.
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Երկնածին, կարպատում տեղա. և յինտա հարզամության նշանակության տեսակներ. և բացակայության դեպքում կարգավորեց իճի հատուկ որոշում՝ տարեկան ամեամսակ. և պատերազմի կարգավորում ինչին նախորդ ավելի որոշակի: կամ պատերազմի կարգավորում ինչին նախորդ ավելի որոշակի: որ կես պատերազմի կարգավորում ինչին նախորդ ավելի որոշակի: իսկ զետամեն առավոտյան ազատագրելու համար պատերազմի կարգավորում ինչին նախորդ ավելի որոշակի:

21 լայն տեսակ հարազանության խաղաղության զարդի տեսակ. պատերազմի կարգավորում ինչին նախորդ ավելի որոշակի: Կամ պատերազմի կարգավորում ինչին նախորդ ավելի որոշակի: որ կես պատերազմի կարգավորում ինչին նախորդ ավելի որոշակի: իսկ զետամեն առավոտյան ազատագրելու համար պատերազմի կարգավորում ինչին նախորդ ավելի որոշակի:

22 դիում թույլ բարձրացնելու դեմիր եկամություն: և այլ անհուսակ պատերազմի կարգավորում ինչին նախորդ ավելի որոշակի:

23 այս անհուսակ պատերազմի կարգավորում ինչին նախորդ ավելի որոշակի: որ կես պատերազմի կարգավորում ինչին նախորդ ավելի որոշակի: իսկ զետամեն առավոտյան ազատագրելու համար պատերազմի կարգավորում ինչին նախորդ ավելի որոշակի:

AN ARMENIAN FUTŪḤ NARRATIVE

In the midst of a war between the Armenian and Chosroean empires, the king of Armenia, Gagik, was captured by the Chosroean forces. The king's son, Vardan, attempted to rescue him but was also captured. The king's daughter, Queen Tamar, then took command of the Armenian forces and led a successful campaign against the Chosroean forces, eventually liberating her father.

The story depicts the bravery and strategic thinking of the Armenian forces, particularly in the Battle of Zvartnots. Tamar's leadership played a crucial role in the victory, demonstrating the strength and resilience of the Armenian people.

Translation:

In the land of Chosroean Armenia, King Gagik was captured by the Chosroean forces. The king's son, Vardan, attempted to rescue him but was also captured. The king's daughter, Queen Tamar, then took command of the Armenian forces and led a successful campaign against the Chosroean forces, eventually liberating her father.
ուղղակի ապացույց տրվում է Աբդլայնի համար և խրողուց կոչվում ինքն ու ԶԻԶԱՏ, որը նորա առաքել է Բաքար որդի Մսլիմայում։ Եւ յետ ոչ բազմ ժամանակ է՝ և ոչ զամ մի ողջույն տեւի Բաքարի կոչել զնա առ ինքն առանց իրիք պատճառի, և առաքել Հասան։ Քանի մեքենայող խորամանկությունը յորդորէր խոնարհեցուց զերկիրս Հայոց եւ տեղիս չարչարանացվի մանավանդ թէ ոչ նա այլ կամք ուղղչի իշխանաց կատարի, որում ի վերուստ վկաէր բարկութի գոլ բազմություն, և կարկուտք, և երաշտություն անձրև։ Այսոքիկ ցոյցք բարկութե ան ի վերա մեր։

39 եր իբրև եկն Հասան որդի Կահադբա հրամահատակին և վերա երկրիս Հայոց, և ընդունում գունդ բազմ տոհմէ Խորասան աշխարհին։ Որք առաւել դառնեամ բյաճախ գործէին զաղէտս և զհեծության աշխարհիս։ Զի որպէս նախքան զայս պատմեցաւ ի Տեառից է կարծրանային սիրտք նոցա առ ի վրայի էժխնդութիւն չարեաց մերոց։ Զի արդարև սով և սուր և սասանություն յաճախէր յազգապետութե ան նորա։ և ևս առ այսոքիւք արհամարհութիւն հայրապետաց. այպանութիւն քահանայից, 40 իշխանաց և նախարարաց քարշանք և քայքայութիւն ք հայրապետաց. այպանութիւն ք եպիսκոպութիւն գան և խոշոտանգանք քահանայից.

41 այսոքիկ լինէր ի ձեռս Արտաւազդա։ որ էր ի տանէ Մամիկոնէից, որոյ երթեալ ի մայրաքաղաքն Դվին։ կազմություն մեծ առնէր զավեռ իւրոց. և ստանայր անձամբ զէնս և անաւթս պատերազմի և վառէր զինքն զրահիվք և սաղավարտիւք և ամենայն սպառազինություն և մտերիմ զինքն երևեցուց զավեռ Իսմաելի։ իբրև թէ մարտնչել ընդ թշնամիսն նոցա կազմիցի։ Եւ որոշեալ զինքն ի միաբանութենէ նոցա հասանէր ի գաւառն Շիրակ ի գեւղն Կումայրի։ և սպանայր զհրամատար հարկին։ և որ ինչ գտանէր ի ձեռին նորա առեալ, համբառնայր ամենայն տամբ իւրով։ գնայր ի կողմանս Վրաց աշխարհին։ և ընդ նման ամենայն նախարարք աշխարհիս։ Եւ հասել համբաւն ի քաղաքն Դվին։ էթէ այս ավճիրք դառն գործեցան յորդուց Հմայեկի, վաղվաղակի առնոյր զավեռ բազում Մահմետն։ և ԶՍՄՊԻ որդի Աշոտի զսպարապետն Հայոց և զայլ նախարար։ և հետամուտ լինէր զկիրճսն. թափէր ապուռ ինչ յաւարէն։ և զնոսա վարեալ փախստական առնէր յաշխարհէս Հայոց։ Իսկ նոքա երթեալ պատսպարէին յաշխարհին Եգերացւոց։ և ստանայր անձամբ զիշխանութիւն.
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Անձին իւրոյ ի վերա Եգերացւոց և ի վերա Վէռիայ
որ են Վիրք: Եւ ի ձեռն այսր գործոյ առաւել զայրագնեալ հրամանատար Հասան։ Եւ վաղվաղակի առաքէր յամենան կողմանս իւրոյ իշխանութե ան ն զբռութի ւն հարկին ժողովել մեծաւ ստիպով։ Եւ յոյժ սաստկանայր հեծութի ւն աշխարհի ու պահանջողակ հարկուհ։ քաշե սանդի տայացին ի դրի առաջախաղ ի շագանկան լայնադիմ։

Անդ ուրեմն շարժէր սիրտ նախարարի ուրումն ցասմամբ։ որ էր որդի Հրահատա կոմսի, որ էր ի տանէ Մամիկոնեան, որոյ անուն էր Մուշեղ։ Սա միաբան եալ ընդ իւր զոմանս ի նախարացն Հայոց, ի բաց էկաց ի հնազանդութենէ Իսմայելի։ Եւ գտեալ զոմանս յորդոց Իսմայելի. ի գաւառի իւրում և ի տան իւր։ որք եկեալ պահանջէին ի նմանէ զարիւնս ոմանց սպանելոց ի տոհմէ իւրեանց խողխողէր զնոսա ի սուր սուսերի իւր։ և ինքն գաղթէր յամրոցսն Արտագերոյ հանդերձ տամբ իւրով։ Եւ ելեալ նոյնժամայն ի գաւառն Բագրևանդ և ընդ նմա արք։ վաթսուն և ըմբռնեալ զպահանջողսն հարկին որում անուն էր Աբումճուր։ և զորս ընդ նմա, հարեալ սատակէր ի սուր սուսերի իւր։ և լռեցուցանէր զպահանջում յերկրէս։ Եւ իբրև այս այսպէս վճարէր։ ժողովէին առ նա ամենայն վշտատեսք և վտանգեալք հոգով։ և յայնմհետէ զարթեան յամենակ կողմանց թշնամի ք ի վերա նոցա։ Եւ նախքան զայս այլք յորդոցն Իսմայելի ի քաղաքէն Կարնոյ։ հասանէին ի վերա նորա։ որք էին իբրև արք։ երկերիւր վառեալք կուռ սպառազինութ եամ բ։ Յորոց վերա հասեալ ի գիշերի ի գեւղն Խարս սակաւ արամք։ զի էին բանակեալ ի մեջ այգեստանեացն։ Շուրջ կացեալ զնոքաւք։ Փլուզին զդուզնաքեա պատուար այգեստանեացն։ զի էր կարկառակոյտ քարանց առանց հողոյ։ և յանչափ դղրդմանէ քարանցն, բախեալ երիվարացն, զբազումս առաթուր հարեալ սատակէին և առեալ զէնս և զկապուտ անկելոցն տայր զաւրաց իւր։ և զերիվարս և ամենայն կազմած զինուց։ և ինքն խաղացեալ գնայր ի կողմն ամրոցի իւրոյ։

Եւ իբրև այս լուր աղիտի հասանէր ի քաղաքն Դուին առ զաւրավարն Իսմայելի Մահմետ յամենակ տագնապ մեծ յառնէր ի վերա նորա։ և գումարեալ զզաւրս քաղաքին Դուվնա։ տայր ի ձեռս զաւրա գլխի միում որում անուն էր Ապունճիպ ելանել ի խնդիր վրիժու արեան սպանելոցն և առեալ զաւրավարին այնմիկ զընդիրսն հեծելոց իբրև արս։ չորս հազար հազարս ուշ եդեալ ընդ պողոտայն արքունի հասանէր ի գաւառն Բագրևանդ ի գեւղն Բագաւան։ Անդ ի վերա հասանէր նոցա Մուշեղ ընդ նմա իբրև արք։ և մարտուցեալք ընդ միմեանս աւգնութի ւն ի Տեառն է վաղվաղակի հասանէր ի թիկունս գնդին Մուշեղի։ և բազում հարուածս հաরեալ սատակէին ի զաւրաց Իսմաելի։ Եւ զմնացորդսն ի փախոստ դարձուցեալ հետամուտ լինէին մինչև յաւանն Արուճ։ և զբազումս ճռաքաղ առնէին մինչև զնոյն ինքն զզաւրագլուխն հարեալ սատակէին և մեծաւ յաղթութ եամ բ դարձեալ ի հետոց նոցա։ լնուին բազում աւար յաւարէ թշնամեացն։ Եւ փախստեայքն անկան ի քաղաքն Դուին սակավք ի բազմաց ապա ընդ առաջ լինէին նոցա համազգիքն արք և կանայք վայիւք և ճչաւք հող ի գլուխ լինելով զճակատ հարկանէին և զաւձիս պատառէին և ողբովք և աշխարանօք լնոյր ամենայն փողոցք լայնանիստ քաղաքին։ և ահ մեծ անկան ի վերա Սառակինոս գնդին։ և ոչ լինէր նոցա համարձակ ելանել քան զքաղաքն այլ անձնամահ լինէին յամրութե ան քաղաքին։

44 Քերակ [Քերակ a.c.
45 : ] subscr.
46 ասպար [ ]- suprascr.
47 զարդապաշար [ ]- suprascr.
48 այբնահարոր [ ]-o suprascr.
49 սահասահ ] read: սահասահ with printed editions.
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...
ձեզ և մտանել ընդ հնազ
անդութ
եամ
բ նոցա. և հանդարտել և կեալ խաղաղութ
եամ
բ
յերկրիս ձեր. և կամ մերժել փախստեամբ համաւրէն ընդանեաւք յերկրէս ձերմէ. և լքանել
թողուլ զժառանգութի
ւն
հարց ձերոց. զբնակութի
ւն
ս ձեր և զանդառս և զանդաստանս. նաև
զգերեզմանս հարց ձերոց. և երթալ բնակել նշդեհութ
եամ
բ ընդ արքաին Յունաց. և կամ թէ
ոչ` անկանիցիք ի ձեռս նեղչաց ձերոց ի միում աւուր. և անախորժելի մահուամբ բառնայցեն
զձեզ ի կենաց:
Զի գիտեմ ես զբարս անա
ստուա
ծութе
ան
ն իշխանին Իսմաելի. զի ոչ դադարէ
մինչև կատարէ զկամս անձին իւրոյ: Իսկ նոքա ոչ ընկալան զոր լուան զբանս խրատու
աւգնականութե
ան
ն. յընչաց քերէին իբրև զխրատ նենգութե
ան
. քանզի յոյժ հավանեալ էին
ստապատում
55
առնն մոլորելոյ որ աւր ըստ աւրէ յորդորէր զնոսա կալ պնդակազմ ի
56
արքում մայր զավարներսկայում` մուտքագրելոյ երբ զգայում ժամանքին և ամրայցելոյ զավարի
57
խա
in lft. mg.
58
<էր>
59
յինքենէ
59
ի- suprascr.
60
կալ
60
կեալ
with Malxaseanc’ and Tēr-Vardanean.
գետավէժ <և>

61 հանդիպում կողքավր. 62 <ցվ> ի մեկնել Յունաց և ապրեցուցանել զանձինս ի չարասէր ապիրատութենէ. 63 արուեստականք յարդարիչք ամենայն. 64 չորք հարիւր. 65 փախուստ դարձեալք հազար հինգ հարիւր.
Եվ յետ այսորիկ դարձեալ զաւրացեալք, յաւգնականութենէ վերնոյն, ոչ ինչ կասեցին և ժողովեալ զգունդս իւրեանց ինքն ի թշնամեացում. զի այս մահ ժամանակեան, և կեանքն յաւիտենական:

66 [ harga ] suprascr.

67 ժամեկու թագ, թագ, թանգ թանգ
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Կարկառեալ զաչս աւգնութիւն ստուայի հավատոյս և ան

"66 համար իշխանություն և երիտասարդ կառավարություն

67 որոշ կարճ կարճ կարճ կարճ կարճ կարճ կարճ կարճ երկր աշխարհի և զանապատութիւն և նուազունք էին քան զթիւ թշնամեացն ինքնակամ յաւժարութ

Կարնա. անցանէին ընդ սահմանսն Բասենոյ ի գաւառն Բագրևանդ. իսկ և իսկ անցեալ

բազում հարուածս. և ի փախուստ դարձուցեալ զոմանս ի

նախարացն և ի վերա աշխարհիս ոգուվք չափ մարզէին զմիմեանկայից բանիւք. ասելով. քաջութ

վերնոյն. մկանային և ի 

զախն իւրեացն. և զերիվարս. և ի հետիոտս զայրագնեալ եամ

ընդ գետն Արածանի. յարձակէին արիութ

Կարնա. անցանէին ընդ սահմանսն Բասենոյ ի գաւառ

բզաւրավար. և Սամուել տէր Մամիկոնէից որ էր որդի մատաղ և առոյգ գեղեցկութ
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այս հաղթակուտում եուրք ու աշխարհական աշխարհագրություն զարգացավ. զարգացրած զարգացման պատճառների մեջ եուրք ու միջնադարյան համակարգերի շարունակ և վարձանման ի կարճ ժամանակ սպասարկեց. այս մշակույթային նախագծի հետագա էություն պարունակում էր. զարգացման պատճառների մեջ եուրք ու միջնադարյան համակարգերի շարունակ և սպասարկում ի կարճ ժամանակ սպասարկեց. այս մշակույթային նախագծի շարունակ և սպասարկում ի կարճ ժամանակ սպասարկեց.

երկու սպասարկում ի կարճ ժամանակ սպասարկեց. այս մշակույթային նախագծի շարունակ և սպասարկում ի կարճ ժամանակ սպասարկեց.

Երկու սպասարկում ի կարճ ժամանակ սպասարկեց. այս մշակույթային նախագծի շարունակ և սպասարկում ի կարճ ժամանակ սպասարկեց.

Երկու սպասարկում ի կարճ ժամանակ սպասարկեց. այս մշակույթային նախագծի շարունակ և սպասարկում ի կարճ ժամանակ սպասարկեց.

Երկու սպասարկում ի կարճ ժամանակ սպասարկեց. այս մշակույթային նախագծի շարունակ և սպասարկում ի կարճ ժամանակ սպասարկեց.

Երկու սպասարկում ի կարճ ժամանակ սպասարկեց. այս մշակույթային նախագծի շարունակ և սպասարկում ի կարճ ժամանակ սպասարկեց.

Երկու սպասարկում ի կարճ ժամանակ սպասարկեց. այս մշակույթային նախագծի շարունակ և սպասարկում ի կարճ ժամանակ սպասարկեց.
AN ARMENIAN _FUTŪḤ_ NARRATIVE

COMMENTARY

XIII.A. CALIPHAL GOVERNANCE

The settlement of frontier cities and the payment of soldiers are both primary concerns of caliphal governors in Lewond’s text, and these preoccupations reveal the strategic policy the Caliphate employed in order to stabilize the region and integrate it into the broader empire. The section on Manṣūr’s caliphate helps elucidate the connections between Armenia and other provinces in the early ʿAbbāsid period, the duties of the provincial governors, the relationship between the province and the imperial center, and taxation.

The governors and generals listed here under Manṣūr demonstrate family ties to Jazīra and/or Khurāsān. Ṣāliḥ b. Ṣubayḥ, a _mawlā_ of Banū Kinda, was Khurāsānī. The few references to him beyond Lewond’s text place him in Jazīra, attempting to put down a rebellion on Manṣūr’s orders in 137/754–55. Yazīd b. Usayd al-Sulamī, as discussed in chapter XII, was half Siunec’ī; his father was from Jazīra and served in the Umayyad army under Marwān. His brother Khālid served as governor of Armenia, his son Ahmad served over both Jazīra and Armenia, and his great-grandson Yaqẓān was later governor of Armenia. Bakḵār b. Muslim al-ʿUqaylī’s family was also from Jazīra. His brothers ʿAbd al-Malik and Isḥāq had campaigned in Armenia and served as governors over Armenia under Umayyad rule. Like his brothers, Bakḵār b. Muslim served the Umayyads, then defected to campaign in Khurāsān, and eventually governed Armenia for the ʿAbbāsids. Hasan b. Qaḥṭaba al-Ṭāʾī is yet another example of the connection to the East, as his family was Khurāsānī. Over the course of his career, Hasan governed Jazīra, Egypt, and Khurāsān. As discussed below, Ibn Aṭham confirms the involvement of Hasan’s sons ʿIbrāhīm, Muḥammad, and Qaḥṭaba in governing the North. Muhammad b. Hasan served as governor of Khurāsān like his father and grandfather, as did Hasan’s other son ʿAli. ʿAli b. Hasan does not appear in histories.

---
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about the North, but he was governor of Khurāsān, Sīstān, and Damascus in turn.77 Finally, Łewond mentions a certain Rawḥ as a general, rather than a governor. His identity is uncertain. Rawḥ b. Ḥātim al-Muhallabī was governor of Armenia under Hārūn al-Rashīd, but there is no evidence of his service in Armenia under Manṣūr. If Łewond’s Rawḥ is indeed Rawḥ b. Ḥātim, he diverges from the pattern set by the others in that he demonstrates no ties to Jazīra at all. Although his family was indeed Khurāsānī, they served across the Caliphate. The Muhallabis, including Rawḥ, were famous for serving in Sind (Pakistan) and Ifrīqiyya (Tunisia). These examples reveal the significance of particular families that produced governors for the ‘Abbāsids. The increase in governors with close ties to Khurāsān is not surprising, given that this was the heartland of the ‘Abbāsid military.78

It is frequently difficult to untangle the relationship between Armenia and Jazīra, as they were sometimes combined under a single governor and some governors claimed family ties to Jazīra or served first in one province and then in the other. During the caliphate of Manṣūr, Armenia and Jazīra appear to have been governed separately, but they were very much intertwined, given the familial ties of both Yazīd and Bakkār. The connection between Armenia and Jazīra allows us to speculate about unclear details in Łewond’s text. When Gagik Arcruni threatened caliphal control over Basfurrajān/Vaspurakan, a commander (վարդապետ) named Mūsā stepped in to support the governor. No such general has been identified in Arabic sources, though it is possible that the name refers to Mūsā b. Muṣʿab, who replaced Yazīd as the military governor over Jazīra in either 154/770–71 or 155/771–72.79 The purview of his authority “over matters of war and taxation” in Jazīra (على حرب الجزيرة وخراجها)—that is, without the responsibility of appointing qāḍīs and leading prayer—seems to correspond to the responsibilities of the governors over Armenia.

The governors’ duties were largely military in nature—understandably, given the position of Armenia along the frontier with Rome and Khazaria. The Arabic descriptions of the campaigns against the Roman Empire usually revolve around the military, particularly its commanders, the movements of troops, and the cities sacked in any given campaign. Łewond helps us move from the military to the social side of the Arab-Roman encounter. When Constantine took Qālīqalā/Karin, he “removed the troops of the city and its Saracen inhabitants, along with their families, to the land of the Greeks” (Նաև զաւրսն քաղաքին և զբնակեալսն ի նմա Սառակինոսս բառնայր նոցին ընդանեաւք յաշխարհն Յունաց) [96r–v]. A number of others followed, apparently including Armenian Christians who “left the land of their birth and emigrated, settling in the country of the pious king” (թողին զերկիր ծնընդեան իւրեանց և հատուածեալք անկան ի կողմն արքաին բարէպաշտի) [96v]. When Yazīd recaptured Qāliqalā/Karin, he responded by rebuilding the city and resettling it with Arab Muslims: “He had men from the sons of Ishmael settle in it [Karin] with their families to guard the city and defend it from the enemy. He arranged for the provision of their food from this land of Armenia” (և ածեալ արս յորդոցն Իսմաելի բնակեցոյց ի նմա նոցին ընդանեաւք. պահել զքաղաքն և զգուշանալ ի թշնամեացն. և կարգեաց նոցա պատրաստութիւն կերակրոց յաշխարհէս Հայոց) [97r]. This is not specific to the Arab-Roman
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frontier, as Lewond records that Armenian naxarark' also moved north into the Caucasus, including to Lâz/Egrisi (Colchis, outside of caliphal territory) and to Phasis (see chapter V). Building both the walls and the populations of such cities was as much if not more an imperial assertion over territory as the transitory annual campaigns (sawā'if) were.

The governors also ensured the payment of taxes, which provoked the most persistent complaints about caliphal rule in Armenia. Much of such writing is emotive, decrying and lamenting the poverty caused by the demands of the caliphal governors. Yet these sections yield data points about the fiscal regime in the North. Lewond reports, for example, that Yazid b. Usayd imposed a poll tax (=logginguhun) over Qâliqalâ/Karin [96v]. This suggests a localized policy, specific to particular cities or subregions, as described by Balâdhurî. Lewond also attests to changes in normative taxation, perhaps an attempt at changing the fragmented policies of the earlier period: “a demand for a silver tax was invented besides the poll tax’ (quṣuṭtər yeqwāhmûnūn únîlî ʿarḍqawrîn. ʿunîr qisqûm ʿunûlûn) [101v]. Both the prince of Armenia and, interestingly, the patriarch of the Armenian Church first interceded with the caliphal governor Yazid. When this effort failed, they appealed to the caliph himself. According to Lewond, Mansûr replaced Yazid because of the complaints about his overtaxation of Armenia.

Taxation was likely one of the most overt symbols of caliphal claims over Armenia, which explains its centrality to Lewond’s overall narrative. When Artawazd Mamikonean rebelled, his first move was to kill the tax collector: “He killed the tax collector and took everything that he found in his possession” (yeqwâhûnûn qisqûmûnûn hûlîhûn. li ʿunûr qisqûmûn qisqûmûn únîlî ʿunûlûn) [103v]. Lewond understands Artawazd’s actions as rebellion. However, from the perspective of Baghdad, they were likely perceived as mutiny. The Armenians served as troops in the caliphal army and received stipends from the treasury. This is why Artawazd was able to feign “that he was a confidante of the Ishmaelite troops, as if he were ready to battle with their enemy” (li ʿunûlûn qisqûmûn qisqûmûn únîlî ʿunûlûn. ḫûnîl ﷺ; yeqwâhûnûn qisqûmûn únîlî ʿunûlûn) [103v]. It also explains a somewhat oblique comment by Ṭabarî that in 158/774–75, “the governor of Armenia wrote to Mansûr that the army had mutinied against him and broken the locks of the treasury and taken what was in it, and Mansûr said in his letter, ‘Leave our office in disgrace, for if you were intelligent they would not have mutinied, and if you were strong they would not have plundered’” (kāb cāhāb Araqmînî a tīnsur an al-jund qad ʿishbûna ʿalîhī wâksa rāqûmûn ak Freud bêt al-mal wâxnûn) (ma fîhī fî wâqûlî fî ḫwāṣûmî bûna mādumîmî fîl ʿishbûna wîl fâqiîtîn lî bînhûna) [80]. As the Mamikonean rebellion continued, the tax collectors remained a primary symbol. Mušel Mamikonean also killed a tax collector, named Abumçur: “He struck and killed them [Abumçur and those who were with him] by his sword and interrupted the collection of taxes from this land” (hûlîhûn únîlûnûn qisqûmûn únîlî ʿunûlûn. li ʿunûlûnûn únîlî ʿunûlûn hûlîhûn únîlûn) [104v].

80 Ṭabarî, History, 29:142; Taʾrīkh, 3:436. Note that the verb used here—shaghaba—means “to cause a disturbance” or “to riot.” The subject al-jund (the army) informs its reading as mutiny.
XIII. THE CALIPHATE OF Ṭabd Allāh al-Manṣūr

XIII.B. IMPERIAL POLICY ON THE FRONTIER

Łewond notes the emigration of several naxarar and Muslim families to Roman territory in the early 130s/750s. Caliphal policy was to populate the cities of the frontier. By contrast, the Roman emperor actively worked to create breathing room along the frontier by moving families westward.Łewond’s account suggests that the emperor supported such emigration himself, either by force or by incentive. We see this first in the recognition that “the king of the Greeks stirred an idea in the imperial court” (շարժեալ թագաւոր Յունաց կայսերական արքունեան մտին) [96r]. Later, Łewond explains that the Armenian naxarark ‘abandoned their inheritance. They fled to the land of the Greeks and took refuge with the emperor Constantine’ (լքին զժառանգութիւն ս իւրեանց և փախստեա անկան յաշխարհ Յունաց. ապաւինեալք առ կայսր Կոստանդին) [99v]. The insertion of Constantine’s name associates the movement of Armenians directly with the emperor. Although Roman emperors had supported Armenian migration from caliphal territory in the past [cf. 27r], this migration of naxarark ‘seems to have constituted part of Constantine’s broader imperial policy for the border.

XIII.C. THE ARAB-KHAZAR WARS

The caliph Manṣūr engaged with the Khazars through diplomacy in an attempt to curtail the Arab-Khazar wars that had earlier [74r] threatened caliphal territory as far as Ardabīl/Artawēt. Łewond includes names and details that align with Arabic sources relating to the Khazars during the caliphate of Manṣūr, though he also includes snippets of information that either do not appear elsewhere or disagree with the non-Armenian sources.

Łewond claims that Yazīd b. Usayd wrote to the khagan to arrange a marriage alliance. Arabic sources attest to Manṣūr’s role in this arrangement, suggesting that this diplomatic marriage was caliphal policy rather than Yazīd’s personal decision. Balādhuri mentions it briefly, explaining that Manṣūr had placed Yazīd as governor over Armenia. “Manṣūr wrote to him [Yazīd] to order him to make a marriage alliance with the king of the Khazars, so he did so. She gave birth to his children, one of whom was a son who died, and she died herself” (فكتب اليه المنصور يامره بمصاهرة ملك الخزر ففعل وولدت له ابنته منه ابن فمات وماتت فى نفسها). Ibn A’tham offers significantly more information that helps us read Łewond’s text. Ibn A’tham confirms Balādhuri’s statement that the caliph himself ordered the marriage alliance. Manṣūr sent Yazīd b. Usayd to rule from Bardha’a/Partaw and ordered him to make a marriage alliance with the Khazars. Yazid followed up by approaching the Khazar khan, named Taʻāṭr (تعاطر), which could be corrected to [Baghāṭur], meaning “hero,” or,

81 On population movements orchestrated by the Romans, see Charanis, “Transfer of Population.” On Sasanian and caliphal settlement, see Vacca, Non-Muslim Provinces. On Roman versus caliphal policies toward the frontier, see Haldon and Kennedy, “Arab-Byzantine Frontier,” 83: “Constantine V’s policy of population transfer away from this area can be viewed not only as a means of strengthening the population of Thrace, but of deliberately depopulating the south-eastern border zones, tending to create a no-man’s land behind which Roman Asia Minor was relatively safe.” This compares neatly to ‘Abbasid policy, which Haldon and Kennedy describe on page 109: “It was in the half century from 132/750 onwards, the first half-century of Abbasid rule, that the frontier was organized and the scorched earth policy of the early days replaced by one of advancing settlement.”

alternatively, it could render “Theodoros”),83 who betrothed his daughter Khāṭūn to Yazīd for 100,000 dirhams. Two details in Ibn Aʿtham’s history echo Łewond’s: (1) the reference to her solely as Khāṭūn/Xat’un (وكان يقال لها خاطون and անուն էր Խաթուն [98v]), a title that acts as her name; and (2) the description of the retinue that accompanied her (though this is far more expansive in Ibn Aʿtham’s account, attesting to the social and economic power of Khāṭūn). Ibn Aʿtham has her settle in Bardhaʿa/Partaw, where she learned about Islam and the Qurʾān from Muslim women before she agreed to consummate the marriage with Yazīd. Khāṭūn lived with Yazīd in Bardhaʿa/Partaw for two years and four months, giving birth to two children in that time. She died in childbirth, and the child along with her, and "Yazīd grieved for her intensely” (فاغتم عليها يزيد غما شديدا).84 His grief was compounded by the subsequent Khazar raid to avenge her death. Ibn Aʿtham reports that when the Khazars heard of the death of Khāṭūn, the daughter of their king, they gathered and poured outward from Bāb al-Abwāb/Darband. Czeglédy reviews the sources on this marriage to suggest that Balādhurī and Ibn Aʿtham likely draw on the same source;85 Łewond should also be included in this cluster, given the close connections between the three accounts of this marriage and the battle of Baghrwand/Bagrewand (discussed below). By comparison, the narratives of Ṭabarī and Azdī differ in significant details from these three. The fourth/tenth-century historians identify the groom as Faḍl b. Yaḥyā al-Barmakī, push the marriage later to the reign of Hārūn al-Rashīd, and omit reference to the couple’s children.86

The amount of geographical and prosopographical detail preserved in Łewond’s History and in the corresponding passages in Ibn Aʿtham demonstrates the perceived importance of Khāṭūn/Xat’un in early medieval narratives.87 The story contains information specific to the early ‘Abbāsid period but also reinvents tropes commonly deployed to inscribe difference between Iran and the Huns/Khazars at their borders. Lewond’s explanation that the Khazars “considered her death a deceitful plot” (جيبتي نومي یکوننپیبی یکوننپیبی یکوننپیبی یکوننپیبی [98v]) may refer to a similar story in which the Sasanian emperor Anūshirwān plays a trick on the king of the Huns through a royal marriage alliance that turns out to be a ruse. Either both stories echo a typical literary form to imagine the frontier or such marriages were commonly expressions of both hope and distrust between empires.88

Arabic and Greek sources confirm the Khazars’ retaliatory raid into caliphal territory in 147/764–65 after the death of Khāṭūn. The name of the Khazar general responsible for this raid has provoked considerable debate. Łewond’s Ražt’arxan appears in Ṭabarī as Āstarkhān al-Khwārizmī.89 This reference has led scholars to suggest that he was the leader of the Ās, or Alans, which in turn may explain the claim that he was Khwārizmī, since Masʿūdī identifies the Lārsiyya (meaning the Alans) as originally Khwārizmī: “The
majority in this region are Muslims because they are the regiment of the king. They are known in this region as Lārsiyya. They emigrated from the environs of the land of Khwārizm. A long time ago, before the appearance of Islam, there was war and disease in their land, so they moved to the king of the Khazars.

However, Lewond’s Rażt’arxan also appears in Ya’qūbi with the spelling Rās Ṭarkhān; Ya’qūbi may have derived the title from an Armenian source. There are similarly multiple explanations for the term “Xat’ir Lit’ber,” which appears only in Lewond’s narrative. First, Xat’ir Lit’ber might render *Qaðır il tābār (Xat’irlit’bēr = Xat’ir il t’bēr = Qaðır il tābār), the personal name of a commander rather than the name of the regiment itself. Second, and less likely, Xat’ir may be a muddled reference to the Khazars as Xazirk’, such that the title “the tābār of the Khazars” would refer to Rażt’arxan’s title as the leader of the Khazars within a broader Western Turkic Khanate.

Lewond’s references to the geographical reach of Rażt’arxan’s campaign are more specific than those we find in the Arabic and Greek sources, which typically identify the raids vaguely as occurring in “Armenia.” By contrast, Lewond offers a list of places in Albania and Georgia that were captured by the Khazars. Most of these toponyms are not attested in Arabic. Exceptions include Քաղա (K’ała; قلعة), Շաքէ (Šak’ē; شكي), Կամբեխճան (Kambexžan; قمیبران), and Ուրմի (Urmia; ارمية), respectively. Tabari claims that the raids took place in the region of Armenia but names only Tiflis/Tp’ilisi explicitly; Ya’qūbi similarly merely identifies their site as “in the region of Armenia.”

Lewond’s information here is geographically oriented, as he outlines districts in Albania and Georgia with explicit statements about the provincial delineation. Perhaps more interestingly, the placement of this geographical information sheds light on Lewond’s active editing. At first, it seems that sections 36 and 37 are separate. Section 36 recounts the marriage of Xat’un, her death, and the subsequent Khazar raids. Section 37 is thematically different and set off by a narrative marker used to introduce new material: “I will also speak once again” (ասացից դարձեալ և [99v]). Section 37 describes caliphal governance, Arcruni raids into Azerbaijan/Atropatakan, and the burdensome taxation imposed by the Arcrunik’. However, Lewond’s listing of the districts in Albania and then in Georgia in section 36 is markedly paralleled by his listing of the districts in Azerbaijan/Atropatakan in section 37. Lewond has interwoven material from different sources into these two accounts, but the structural parallelism between the Khazar and Arcruni raids cannot be fortuitous. Although a surface reading might suggest that Lewond is comparing the Arcrunik’ to caliphal governors when he decries Arcruni deeds as “unpleasing to God, resembling the
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infidels” (անհաճոյ Առնունդ, անհաճոյ անաւորին) [100r], the structure and placement of the account suggest that the “infidels” here are not in fact caliphal troops but the Khazars. Gagik’s raids into Azerbaijan/Atapatakan become an extension of the Khazar raids and are described as their continuation. Through his comparison of the Arcrunik’ to infidels, Lewond doubly condemns them in relation to both the Khazar raids and to the rapacious taxation of the Caliphate.

The subsequent caliphal response is studiously ignored by Lewond, who dismisses Yazīd by claiming that “he only hid, living like an animal” (միայն ղաւղեալ իբրև զանբան կալով) [99r]. By contrast, the Arabic histories describe his response to the Khazar incursions in greater or lesser detail. Yazīd reportedly gathered troops and moved against Sharpān before retreating to Bardha’a/Partaw. He then either went or, more believably, wrote to Baghdad to request more troops. He subsequently returned and took Bāb al-Abwāb, settling it with soldiers on a stipend.95

XIII.D. ENTER THE ARCRUNIK’

Although the Bagratunik’ remain dominant in Lewond’s History, we can observe the emerging centrality of the Arcruni house in medieval Armenian politics, a process that started before the battle of Bagrawand/Bagrewand. Lewond’s treatment of the Arcrunik’ hinges on his ideal of Armenian solidarity, which results in a highly contextualized assessment of the members of the family. He provides epic overtones to laud Arcruni heroes while comparing other members of the family to Khazars and/or Muslims (on which see above) and criticizing them for their lack of commitment to a unified Armenian front. The first reference to the Arcruni family during Manṣūr’s caliphate relates the resistance and death of Hamazasp and Sahak Arcruni as they fought some unidentified Sulaymān. Hamazasp was killed and so Sahak, overcome by grief, “dismounted from his horse, hamstrung it, and struggled furiously in single combat” (և ի խոնարհ անգեալ յերիվարէն, կարթակոտոր առնէր. և ինքն զայրագին անձամբ մենամարտէր) [97v]. Lewond may have relied on a hagiographical source for this material, but even such a confessionally bounded genre as hagiography reveals resonances to the broader cultural contexts of the medieval Near East. This formula, familiar already in an Iranian context, also appears to celebrate the heroes of early Islamic history despite the prohibition against killing horses under Islamic law.96

Lewond also relates the story of Gagik Arcruni—the brother of the Hamazasp and Sahak discussed above and the father of the Hamazasp who fought at Arjīsh/Arčēš discussed below—and criticizes him for raiding neighboring territories and oppressing people through excessive taxation. “They [the Arcrunik’] committed deeds displeasing to God, resembling the infidels, which was not pleasing to the Christians. He [Gagik Arcruni] also exacted taxes from the land and tormented [the people] with much anguish” (գործէին գործ անհաճոյ Առնունդ, անհաճոյ անաւորին. որ ոչ վաել էր Քրիստոնէից: Պահանջէր և հարկ յաշխարհէն բազում տագնապաւ խոշոտանգեալ) [100r]. Two caliphal generals, Rawḥ and then Mūsā, were sent to put a stop to Gagik’s marauding. Mūsā finally captured him through deception, and Gagik died in prison. As discussed above, Lewond’s description
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of Gagik’s activities may have been intended to draw a comparison with the raids of the Khazars. However, the focus on taxation simultaneously establishes the “lawless acts” (գործ անաւրէնութե ան) of the Arcrunik’ as mirrors of caliphal administration.

XIII. REBELLIONS

Lewond catalogs a number of rebellions that occurred during the reign of Manṣūr, primarily in reaction to the taxation policy of the Caliphate. The rebellions were first led by members of the Mamikonean family, but they subsequently attracted the support of other naxarar families. The senior branch of the Bagratunik’, represented by Ašot Bagratuni, strongly cautioned against rebelling, even though his kinsmen Smbat Bagratuni, who was allied with the Mamikoneank’ through marriage, and Vasak Bagratuni apparently supported the uprisings. From Lewond’s account, it is clear that the earlier rebellions of Artawazd Mamikonean and then of Mušeł Mamikonean should be considered individual acts of revolt and were not associated with a broader movement. Mušeł’s initial successes, however, prompted other houses—most notably the Arcrunik’—to undertake similar actions. The extent of coordination between the various houses is difficult to ascertain, particularly because of Lewond’s rhetorical concern with the unity of the Armenian naxarark’.

XIII.E.1. A Two-Pronged Rebellion or Two Separate Rebellions?

The main participants in the rebellion(s) of 158/775 were the Mamikonean and Arcruni houses. The Arcrunik’ were defeated at the battle of Arjīsh/Arčēš, and the Mamikoneank’ fell only nine days later at the battle of Baghrawand/Bagrewand. The Armenian leaders and naxarar houses involved in these two battles were different, and Ibn Aʿtham’s account shows that the caliphal commanders and the provenance of the caliphal forces involved in the battles also differed (table 4). Although the Mamikoneank’ and the Arcrunik’ clearly knew about each other’s rebellions, the extent of coordination between the two fronts is unclear. The evidence from Lewond and Ibn A’tham could be marshaled either to claim that the Mamikoneank’ and the Arcrunik’ worked together or, conversely, to suggest that the two separate rebellions unfurled simultaneously.

The first possibility is that the Mamikoneank’ and the Arcrunik’ formed two prongs of a loosely affiliated rebellion. Lewond explicitly describes a meeting of the naxarar houses in which they all decided to rebel against caliphal governance against the advice of Ašot Bagratuni: “All of the Armenian naxarark’ gathered in one place” (ձայնամակի Արցախից ամբողջությունը մի տեղ) [107r]. Lewond also repeatedly refers to a plan involving multiple naxarar houses (on which see below). The meeting and these references to a plan suggest that a coordinated military offensive was agreed upon, and there is some evidence to support such an interpretation. The primary objective of both the Mamikonean and Arcruni rebellions seems to have been to attack the two garrisons of Muḥammad b. Ḩasan. Ibn A’tham explains that the caliphal governor Ḩasan b. Ḥaṭṭaba had appointed his sons to govern various cities of the North. Muḥammad b. Ḩasan was responsible for Qālīqalā/Karin and Akhlāṭ/Xlat’. The heart of the Mamikonean rebellion was the siege of Qālīqalā/Karin, one of his main garrisons, whereas both Lewond and Ibn A’tham assert that Manṣūr’s reinforcements gathered at Muḥammad’s other garrison in Akhlāṭ/Xlat’.
Arcrunik’ and their allies mustered at Barkrī/Berkri before attacking Arjīsh/Arčēš. This trajectory places them directly en route from their home territory in Basfurrajān/Vaspurakan to Akhlāṭ/Xlat’ (see map 5). The “plan” that Łewond mentions multiple times may have been for Mamikonean forces to attack Muḥammad’s garrison at Qālīqalā/Karin while the Arcruni assailed his base at Akhlāṭ/Xlat’. The two prongs would have forced Muḥammad b. Ḥasan into a two-front war and decreased the possibility that one of his garrisons could send reinforcements to the other. Such a strategy might explain why the Mamikoneank’ lifted the siege of Qālīqalā/Karin when they heard that the Arcrunik’ were in trouble and hurried back across the Aracani River to face a caliphal army at Arjni in the direction of the Arcruni forces. Had there been no coordination between the Mamikoneank’ and the Arcrunik’ at all, it would be difficult to explain the Mamikonean course of action.

On the other hand, it is just as possible to read Łewond’s and Ibn Aʿtham’s accounts and conclude that these were separate rebellions that unfolded simultaneously. Even though Łewond claims that all of the naxarark’ gathered to discuss the plan, he also notes that the plan did not hold together. Furthermore, he admits that the naxarark’ did not come together to create a single army; rather, each house remained in its own territory: “The naxarark’ of the Arcruni house, Hamazasp and his brothers, along with their troops remained there in the regions of the land of Vaspurakan” (արծրունեաց Համազասպ և եղբարք ին արծրունեաց աշխարհի նախարարք) [109r]. Łewond’s acknowledgment that the Arcrunik’ did not join the rest of the naxarark’ aligns with Ibn A’tham’s description of the rebellions. Ibn A’tham claims that the Mamikoneank’ rebelled with only the naxarark’ who were in their own orbit, and that this provided an opportunity for the Arcrunik’ to rebel in turn:

[Mušel] immediately wrote to his patricians who were near him and asked them to help him fight Muḥammad b. Ḥasan b. Qaḥṭaba, and they agreed to that. Čušābīdh gathered the patricians and set them to war against him [Muḥammad]. Ḥamza b. Jāiq.
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Ibn A’tham’s account makes sense of the separate leadership, theaters of action, and objectives of the different participants in these rebellions. The rebellions were mutually responsive—the Arcruni leadership knew of the Mamikonean rebellion, and the Mamikoneank’ were aware of what happened to the Arcrunik’—but they did not share a centralized plan. Even though both Qālīqalā/Karin and Akhlāṭ/Xlat’ were controlled by the same commander, we cannot be certain that the Mamikoneank’ and the Arcrunik’ planned their offensives together. It is possible that the Arcrunik’ moved toward Akhlāṭ/Xlat’ for their own benefit, thinking to take advantage of Muḥammad b. Hasan’s preoccupation with the siege of Qālīqalā/Karin, rather than as part of a strategy coordinated with the Mamikoneank’. Similarly, the Mamikonean decision to abandon the siege of Qālīqalā/Karin and head toward Bagrewand may not have been an attempt to assist the Arcrunik’.

Lewond claims that the Mamikoneank’ traveled toward the Arcrunik’ only after they heard of the defeat at Arjīsh/Arčēš: “When word of the defeat of the regiment reached the city of Karin, the hearts of the warriors of the Armenian forces deserted them and they abandoned the siege of the city” (իբրև էհաս զրոյց պարտութե ան գնդին ի քածաքն Կարնոյ. յայնժամ լքաւ սիրտ արանց պատերազմողաց զաւրացն Հայոց). This passage merely claims that the Mamikoneank’ knew of the fate of the Arcrunik’, not that they worked together or that the Mamikoneank’ sought to relieve the Arcrunik’. Hearing of the caliphal victory at Arjīsh/Arčēš, the Mamikoneank’ may have feared that they would have been trapped outside the walls of Qālīqalā/Karin, squeezed between Muḥammad b. Hasan’s garrison in the city and Mansūr’s reinforcements from Akhlāṭ/Xlat’. In order to avoid this predicament, they may have preferred to attack Mansūr’s troops head on.

In sum, the information available on the events of 158/775 is ambiguous and supports differing possible interpretations. The Mamikoneank’ and the Arcrunik’ may have been working together, as two prongs of a single rebellion, united by a single plan. Alternatively, they may have taken advantage of the chaos of the moment to rebel, each with their own strategy and objective. Although both Lewond and Ibn A’tham indicate that the leaders knew of each other’s revolts, the level of coordination between the Mamikoneank’ and the Arcrunik’ remains uncertain.

97 Vacca, “Al-Basfurrağān”: The name is mispointed and the title corrupted such that “Hamra b. Jurjīq, the patrician of the land of Jurzān” (حمرا بن جرجيق بطريق بلاد جرزان) should read as “Ḥamza b. Jājīq, the patrician of al-Basfurrajān” (حمزة بن جاجيق بطريق البسفرجان), referring to Hamazasp the son of Gagik Arcruni, the patrician of Vaspurakan.

98 Ibn A’tham, Futūḥ, 7/8:396.
XIII.E.2. The Bagratunik' and the Rhetoric of Unity

Levond contextualizes all of the rebellions—including the first, under Artawazd—with unifying language: "For when the Armenian naxarark' saw the dangerous anxieties coming over them, they risked their lives and undertook things that they were not able to accomplish, since they were few, but they considered a brave death to be better than a perilous life. They undertook acts of rebellion and renounced Ishmaelite subjugation" (Քանզի իբրև տեսին նախարարք Հայոց զվտանգ տարակուսանացն հասեալ ի վերա ինքեանց. ենդու զողի էին: Այլ սակայն այն համարե լավ զմահ քաջութե եեամ. և ի բաց կացին ի հնազանդութենէն Իսմաելի) [103r]. Once Muşel had rebelled, Levond repeatedly refers to a plan shared by the Armenian naxarark': "Then, when the Armenian naxarark' saw this success, they were of one mind to pursue this mindless plan, for they thought that the time of Ishmaelite rule had expired" (Ապա իբրև զայս յաջողուած գործոյ տեսանէին նախարարք Հայոց. ամենեքեան միամտեալ ընթանաին զհետ անմիտ խորհրդին. զի կարծէին լցեալ զժամանակ իշխանութե ան Իսմաելի) [106r]. When Ašot Bagratuni warned them of the folly of their actions, they chose "to remain steadfast in the proposed deed and not to condemn themselves through any irresolution" (կալ պնդակազմ ի գործն առաջարկեալ. և մի ինչ երկմտութ էամ ըստգտանել զանձինս) [108v–109r]. When Ašot Bagratuni subsequently advised the Mamikonean' and the Arcruni' to work together, they rejected his counsel and "still thought to complete their proposed plan" (տակավին զառաջի արկեալն իւրեանց խոկաին կատարել) [110r–v]. The Arcruni', hearing of the presence of caliphal reinforcements at Arjīsh/Arčēš, "were all still wanting to go forth with this plan" (մինչդեռ զայս խորհուրդ առհասարակ կամէին կատարել) [110v–111r]. Outnumbered at the battle of Baghrawand/Bagrewand, the Mamikonean forces prayed and "stopped at nothing to proceed with the plan" (ոչ ինչ կասեցին յառաջի արկեալ խորհրդէն) [111r]. Although he omits numerous houses, Levond’s association of each of these houses with a singular plan projects a sense of Armenian unity. His assertion that the rebellions involved all the Armenian naxarark' may be rhetorical hyperbole, but in combination with his repeated references to a plan and his indiscriminate use of the phrase “Armenian forces,” he produces a sense of unified Armenian action.

However, even as he maintains that the Armenian naxarark' adhered to a plan until the bitter end, Levond disparages their lack of unity: "The incorrigible perversity of the weak plan soon appeared, for they broke from one another and were disunited" (Որոյ անուղղայ կամակորութի և միմեանց անմիաբանք լինէին) [109r]. Ascribing military failure to disunity among the naxarar houses is a historiographical trope in Armenian, so Levond’s complaint may stand in for criticism of a strategy that included a two-pronged attack by design instead of fighting as a single force. Levond has Ašot Bagratuni make this point immediately prior to the Arcruni attack on Arjīsh/Arčēš. Ašot alerted the other naxarark' that caliphal reinforcements had arrived in Akhlāṭ/Xlat', so that they "could gather in one place to live or die with one another" (զի ուր ուրեք և իցեն ի մի վայր գումարեսցին, կալ և մեռանէլ ի վերա) [110r]. But distrusting Ašot, the other naxarark' once again refused to follow his advice.
Lewond’s ideological support of the Bagratunik’ further complicates our reading of his account. He emphasizes the sagacity of the advice provided by Ašot, who first counsels against rebellion and then advocates fighting as a single force, over the fact that the other naxarark’ mistrusted him because of his relationship with caliphal power. At the same time, he explicitly identifies other Bagratunik’ who joined the rebellions: Vasak Bagratuni helped the Arcrunik’ at Arjish/Arčēš, and the sparapet Smbat Bagratuni and Sahak Bagratuni died on the field at Baghrawand/Bagrewand. In his version of events, Lewond presents the Bagratunik’ as omnipresent actors, rather than as a family whose loyalties were divided.

Lewond’s ideological commitment to the Bagratunik’ is brought into greater relief by Ibn A’tham, who does not mention Bagratuni involvement at any point. Instead, he focuses solely on Mušel Mamikonean and Hamazasp Arcruni as the main agitators of the rebellions. Unlike Lewond, he does not suggest that all of the naxarark’ conferred from the start or that they shared a single plan. Rather, he explains that Mušel Mamikonean engaged in a personal argument with Muhammad b. Hasan. Mušel “immediately wrote to his patricians who were near him” (كتب من ساعته الى بطارقته الذين حوله), not to all of the Armenian naxarark’. Hamazasp Arcruni then took this opportunity to rebel. Ibn A’tham thus grants no role to the Bagratunik’ and makes no argument for the unity of the naxarark’. After asserting that Hamazasp rebelled, Ibn A’tham admittedly ignores the Arcrunik’ entirely and refers to the rebels in generalizing terms reminiscent of Lewond: “The infidels from every region gathered against him [Ibrāhīm b. Ḥasan] to defend Mūshābidh from them” (اجتمع إليه الكفار من كل ناحية غضب). However, with this passage Ibn A’tham is not asserting the unity of the Armenian houses, to which he seems largely indifferent. Rather, by referring to an extensive gathering of infidels from all regions, he emphasizes the extent of the dangers facing the children of Ḥasan b. Qaḥtaba.

XIII.F. AN ARABIC SOURCE ON THE BATTLE OF BAGHRAWAND/BAGREWAND

Despite the status of Baghrawand/Bagrewand as a “watershed” in medieval Armenian history,100 the Armenian historical tradition is surprisingly sparse on the battle’s details. It is not described in the fourth/tenth-century Armenian sources ascribed to Dasxuranc’i, Draxanakert’i, or T’ovma Arcruni. It also does not appear in the fifth/eleventh-century History of Step’anos Tarōnc’i, who in other places follows Lewond’s narrative quite closely. This silence regarding the battle in Armenian sources of the fourth/tenth and fifth/eleventh centuries lends indirect support to Lewond’s claim that he gained his information on it from conversations with members of the caliphal army: “As we learned from the very enemy himself” (نپات هین هر لى رض لا) [114v]. His reliance on Arabic sources, despite the fact that the battle occurred in Lewond’s own lifetime, reinforces the impression that the battle did not loom large in contemporary Armenian imagination.

Lewond refers to “a large regiment from the house of the land of Khorasan” (گوند بحوری اشخراوی) [102r] and, later, to troops “from the regiment of the house of Khorasan” (هین هر، سیادت هوئری) [109v]. Martin-Hisard has pointed out

99 Ibn A’tham, Futūḥ, 7/8:396.
100 Some of the ideas developed below first appeared in Vacca, “Khurāsānī and Transoxanian Ostikans.” The interpretations have been extended here.
that the word “army” or “regiment” in Armenian—գունդ (gund)—is analogous to the Arabic گند (jund). The use of the word for “house” here—տոհմ (tohm)—is equally interesting; it is unusual to see it applied to a province as a whole, as it normally refers to an extended family unit. The Armenian tohm renders the Arabic اهل (ahl), which can also refer to a noble house in the sense of "among the people of Khurasan" but which appears in early ‘Abbāsid texts to refer to the army with its large number of Khurāsānī soldiers. This opens the possibility that Lewond or his source were aware of commonly used vocabulary in Arabic, whether in writing or conversationally.

Lewond’s reliance on Arabic sources is confirmed by a chronological discrepancy. Lewond claims that the caliph Manṣūr sent a general named Amr to reinforce Ḥasan b. Qaḥṭaba when the Mamikoneank’ rebelled. Balādhurī identifies this general as ‘Āmir b. Ismā‘īl (فبعث اليه المنصور الامداد وعليهم عامر بن اسماعيل), a famous Ḥārithī general in the service of the ‘Abbāsids. The problem is that ‘Āmir b. Ismā‘īl died in Baghdad in 157/774. The caliph himself prayed over his body, and he was buried in the ‘Abbāsid family cemetery. Therefore, if we follow Lewond’s dating, ‘Āmir b. Ismā‘īl was already dead by the time of the battle of Baghrawand/Bagrewand. Lewond claims that the battle of Arjīsh/Arčēš occurred on a Saturday, the fourth day of the Armenian month of Hrotic’, whereas the battle of Baghrawand/Bagrewand fell on a Monday, the fourteenth day of Hrotic’. Modern scholars have identified these dates as April 15 and 24, 775 CE, respectively, which correspond to 9 and 18 Jumādā II 158. Lewond further clarifies that al-Manṣūr “received the curses of the prophet [Habakkuk] and soon died there desperately in that same year” (ընդունէր զմարգարէին նզովսն և յուսակորոյս սատակէր անդէն ընդ հուպ ի նմին ամի [117r]). This confirms the year he means, as Manṣūr died on 6 Dhū al-Ḥijja 158, or October 7, 775.

This chronological discrepancy can be reconciled through analysis of narratives provided by Ibn Aʿtham. Ibn Aʿtham reports two different rebellions in the caliphal North during the caliphate of Manṣūr: one by the Ṣanāriyya/Canark’ and the other by the Armenians. Hasan b. Qaḥṭaba first arrived in Armenia with an army of soldiers from Khurāsān, Syria, and Iraq. He faced a rebellion of the Ṣanāriyya/Canark’, so he wrote to Manṣūr, who dispatched ‘Āmir b. Ismā‘īl al-Jurjānī al-Ḥārithī, ʿĪsā b. Mūsā al-Khurāsānī, Faḍl b. Dīnār, and Muqātil b. Śāliḥ, along with 30,000 cavalry, to Jurzān/K’art’li. ʿĀmir and Hasan were victorious and defeated the Ṣanāriyya/Canark’ in a single battle. ʿĀmir returned to Baghdad, where he then died. After describing the defeat of the Ṣanāriyya/Canark’, Ibn Aʿtham

101 Lewond, Discours historique, 158 n. 781.
103 Tabari, Taʾrīkh, 3:380; Azdī, Taʾrīkh al-Mawsil, 226.
104 The Ṣanāriyya/Canark’ are more typically placed in Khākhīṭ/Kaxet’i, as Ibn Aʿtham attests by calling them اهل خاخيط. Both Khākhīṭ/Kaxet’i and Ṣanāriyya/Canark’ are pointed incorrectly in the Hyderabad edition of the text, as حاحيط and الضياربة, respectively. It appears, then, that ‘Āmir used Jurzān/K’art’li as his base to move against them. This makes sense, since the caliphal presence in the region was at Tiflis/Ţp’ilisi under Ibrāhīm b. Hasan.
106 Yaʿqūbī, Works, 3:1106, also mentions ‘Āmir b. Ismā‘īl al-Ḥārithī’s campaign against the Ṣanāriyya/Canark’, but he then shifts to an account of governors in Armenia, Azerbaijan, and Tabaristān at the end of Manṣūr’s reign and does not mention any Armenian uprising.
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Table 5. The rebellions of 157/774 and 158/775 according to Łewond and Ibn Aʿtham.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Łewond on Bagrewand</th>
<th>Ibn Aʿtham on the Ṣanāriyya</th>
<th>Ibn Aʿtham on Bagrewand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>158/775</td>
<td>157/774</td>
<td>158/775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>Amr</td>
<td>ʿĀmir b. Ismāʿīl</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of troops</td>
<td>30,000 cavalry</td>
<td>30,000 cavalry</td>
<td>10,000 cavalry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provenance of troops</td>
<td>Khurāsānī army</td>
<td>Khurāsānī, Syrian, and Iraqi army</td>
<td>Iraqi army</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base of caliphal forces</td>
<td>Akhlāṭ/Xlatʾ</td>
<td>Tiflis/T'pilisi</td>
<td>Akhlāṭ/Xlatʾ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

turns to the Armenian rebellion, led by Mūshābīdīdh (موشابذ، a clear scribal error for موشائل, or Mušeł Mamikonean). Ibn Aʿtham constructs an argument between Muḥammad b. Ḥasan, the son of the governor of Armenia, and Mūshābīdīdh that began when Muḥammad demanded that Mūshābīdīdh gift him a signet ring. Mūshābīdīdh refused, claiming that the ring was his father’s and could not be passed on to others. Mūshābīdīdh then rallied the Armenian noble houses against Muḥammad. Ḥasan again wrote to Manṣūr for reinforcements, and the latter sent 10,000 Iraqi troops. They gathered in Akhlāṭ/Xlatʾ, Ḥasan joined them from Bardhaʿa/Partaw, and they engaged with the Armenian forces “on the shores of Lake Van” (على شاطئ بحيرة أخلاط). 107 The caliphal forces emerged victorious, looted a church, and then took the heads of Mūshābīdīdh and his companions back to Manṣūr.

If we compare Ibn Aʿtham’s two adjacent reports with Łewond’s text, certain similarities emerge (table 5). This comparison shows that Łewond’s account merges details from the two different rebellions. The name of the commanding officer, the number of troops, and the provenance of the troops are actually from the report on the rebellion of the Ṣanāriyya/Canark’, not from that on Baghrawand/Bagrewand. This is a common phenomenon in Arabic accounts of the conquests, as stories with similar content often include wandering details that jump from one story to the next. L. Conrad has demonstrated how details about the conquests of Mediterranean islands migrated from one island to the next as the stories of the conquests were transmitted by word of mouth. 108 Something similar happened here in reports about rebellions in the North.

Details about the Ṣanāriyya/Canark’ were already intertwined with the report about the rebellion of the Armenians before Łewond heard the story. We can surmise this because Baladhuri also places the deceased general ʿĀmir b. Ismāʿīl on the field against Mūshāʾīl al-Armanī:

Muḥammad b. Ismāʿīl informed me on the authority of some shaykhs that the people of Armenia rebelled during the governorship of Ḥasan b. Qaḥṭaba al-Ṭāʾī after [Yazīd] Ibn Usayd and Bakkār b. Muslim al-ʿUqaylī were dismissed. Their leader was Mūshāʾīl al-Armanī. So Manṣūr sent reinforcements to him under the command of

---

107 Ibn Aʿtham, Futūḥ, 7/8:396.
‘Amīr b. Ismā‘īl. Hasan fought Mūshā’il, who was killed, and his forces were scattered. So things fell into line for him [Hasan].

Balādhurī does not offer much to inform the general narrative, but he does confirm that the placement of ‘Amīr against the Armenians (instead of against the Ṣanāriyya/Canark’) is not exclusive to Lewond. Given the problematic chronology—notably, the death of ‘Amīr in 157/774—Ibn A’tham’s account is to be preferred. However, the fact that both Lewond and Balādhurī place ‘Amīr b. Ismā‘īl at the battle of Baghrwand/Bagrewand implies that the alternative narrative circulated early and that the omission of the Ṣanāriyya/Canark’ is unlikely to have been Lewond’s own editorial decision.

Given that Lewond’s version of the battle of Baghrwand/Bagrewand relies in part on Arabic stories, we can look to Ibn A’tham to fill in some of the lacunae in his text. The most obvious example is Lewond’s reference to an unidentified Muhammad, who, Arzoumanian and Martin-Hisard suggest, may be the caliphal governor of Dabil/Duin. However, Ibn A’tham explains that Hasan b. Qaḥṭaba placed his sons over various cities in the North:

Hasan b. Qaḥṭaba remained in Armenia. He drew near until he settled in Bardha’a [Partaw]. He summoned his son named Qaḥṭaba and invested him over Bāb al-Abwāb [Darband]. He summoned his son Ibrāhīm and invested him [to rule] over Jurzān [K’art’li] from Tiflis and its environs. He summoned his son Muḥammad and invested him over Fourth Armenia from the land of Akhlāṭ [Xlat’], Qālīqalā [Karin], and its environs.

As we saw above, Ibn A’tham explains the battle of Baghrwand/Bagrewand as the result of demands that Muḥammad b. Hasan made of Mušeł Mamikonean. In this passage, Ibn A’tham refers to Mūshābidh—Mušeł Mamikonean—as a patrician of Fourth Armenia: “In Fourth Armenia, there was a patrician whose name was Mūshābidh, who was one of the princes and lords of Rome” (وكان بارمينية الرابع بطريق يقال له موشابذ وكان من أبناء ملوك الروم). This confirms that Mušeł was within the territory controlled by Muḥammad b. Hasan. Interestingly, Muḥammad used Akhlāṭ/Xlat’ as his base instead of Dabil/Duin, which explains why the caliphal forces rallied there. Given this evidence, it is clear that Lewond’s previously unidentified Muḥammad is in fact the son of the caliphal governor Hasan b. Qaḥṭaba. It also seems that the choice of Akhlāṭ/Xlat’ as the headquarters of the caliphal army was prompted solely by Hasan’s investment of his son Muḥammad there; no other evidence suggests that the city was particularly important as a garrison.

---

110 Ibn A’tham, Futūḥ, 7/8:396.
111 Ibn A’tham, Futūḥ, 7/8:396.
Unfortunately, Ibn Aʾtham’s text does not help us identify the general working under Muhammad, Apunčip (Ապունճիպ) [105v], which apparently renders a name such as Abū Najīb.

XIII.G. LEWOND’S INTEGRATION OF GREEK VOCABULARY

Lewond’s description of Mansūr’s caliphate includes several words that demonstrate Greek influence, though these are isolated cases that likely evince the integration of Greek words into Armenian rather than an underlying Greek source.

The most likely passage to derive directly from Greek is Lewond’s reference to the “Saracen” inhabitants of Theodosiopolis [96r]. Both the ethnonym and the toponym are Greek and uncommon in early medieval Armenian texts, which points to the possibility of a Greek source for this material. Lewond employs the word “Saracen” also earlier, but most of these references occur in the correspondence attributed to ʿUmar and Leo, which was translated from Greek. The name Թէոդուոյպաւլիս renders the Greek version of the toponym Theodosiopolis (Θεοδοσιούπολις), which usually appears as Karin (Քարին) in Armenian. When paired with the word “city” as Karnoy K’alak’, the Armenian serves as the basis for the Syriac Qalinqqalā (Քալինգքալա), the Arabic Qāliqalā (قاليقلا), and the Georgian Karnu K’alak’i (ქარნუ ქალაქი). Lewond noticeably switches back to the Armenian Karin in the same paragraph. He also repeats the toponym Theodosiopolis later in this chapter [107r], though he explains to the reader that he means Karin.

Another toponym in this section is also Greek, although it probably constitutes evidence of the convoluted transmission of geographical material between Armenian and Greek and does not attest to an underlying Greek source. Lewond refers to control “over the Egerians and the Vēṙia, who are Georgians” (ի վերա Եգերացւոց և ի վերա Վէռիայ որ են Վիրք) [104r]. Vēṙia here renders the Greek Ἰβηρία, which Lewond then translates for an Armenian audience with the comment “who are Georgians.” This likely does not come directly from a Greek text, as a similar snippet also appears in the short recension of Širakac’i’s first/seventh-century Ašxarhac’oyc’: “Veria, that is Virk’” (Վեռիա է, այսինքն Վիրք)113. Širakac’i rightly understands Veria as a toponym, though Lewond apparently takes it to be an ethnonym. This suggests that Lewond did not recognize the underlying Greek Ἰβηρία.

Finally, Lewond employs words for priest (եռիէս) and pontiff (պապաս) that are both loanwords from Greek (ἱερές and πάππας, respectively) and uncommon in Armenian [114v]. Martin-Hisard claims that this is evidence of his Arabic source: “Les Arabes, dont le témoignage est cité, ne connaissent pas les équivalents arméniens de ces termes: erēc’ et k’ahanay; c’est là une eloquent témoinage de l’authenticité des sources de Lewond.”114 But this claim is untenable for three reasons. First, πάππας could not yield պապաս if it were transmitted via Arabic because Arabic does not have a “p” sound. Had Lewond’s text rendered the Greek as *բաբաս, an Arabic intermediary would be feasible. Second, neither բաբաս (rendering ἱερές) nor բաբաս (πάππας) is attested this early. And third, puḥwūwā is

112 On the name Qāliqalā, see Vacca, Non-Muslim Provinces.
113 Širakac’i, “Ašxarhac’oyc’,” 348.
114 Lewond, Discours historique, 180–81 n. 897.
a cognate of the Semitic ܟ哈登 / כהן / כוה; as such, the Armenian word for “priest” would have been comprehensible in Arabic—certainly far more than ἴερεύς. Accordingly, these unusual terms are evidence of the integration of Greek terminology into Armenian vocabulary, rather than of the transmission of historical accounts from Arabic into Armenian.

Although these examples cannot show that Łewond heard material in Greek and integrated it into his History, they do attest to a linguistically fluid environment in which specific vocabulary and short phrases could pass from one language to the next. In addition to the Greek words already mentioned, the word for “royal highway” appears as պողոտայ, from πλατεῖα (a word that was internalized into Syriac, too, as ܛܝܐ [105v, 112r]). We also find a Greek title in this passage, as Hrahat Mamikonean is referred to as the “count” (կոմս) [104r], from the Greek κόμης (κόμης).
If Łewond’s extended discussion of Manṣūr’s reign largely focused on Armenian territory, his account of Manṣūr’s successor, Mahdī, looks elsewhere. The majority of chapter XIV focuses on the ʿAbbāsid caliphal governor whose reign was famous for the entrenchment in power of a famous family of viziers called the “Barmakids” and for his persecution of zindīq, or heretics. As Łewond’s text certainly attests, the ʿAbbāsids were particularly focused on Roman power in this period. The reference to border gates suggests that there were checkpoints for collecting customs taxes from merchants.

The Caliphate of Muḥammad al-Mahdī
r. AH 158–69/775–85 CE

Discovery of silver: modern scholars have appealed to Łewond’s passage here to explain the pattern of coins being minted at Bājunays/Apahunik’, the area to the west of Lake Van in eastern Turkey (fig. 15).

Summer campaigns: the ʿAbbāsids launched annual summer raids (ṣawāʿif) into Roman territory in the late 770s and early 780s.

And he, Muḥammad, began to assault the kingdom of the Greeks. He gathered forces and handed them to a

ENGLISH TRANSLATION

43. And after this, his [Manṣūr’s] son Muḥammad al-Mahdī succeeded to his kingdom. He was more noble than his father and better in conduct. He opened all of his treasuries that the impious ‘Abd Allāh had kept locked and distributed pensions to his troops. He also allowed merchants to forgo border gates for their merchandise and to fulfill the needs of those in want. The land was abundant, and the discovery of silver spread. The inhabitants of the land experienced a reprieve from the violent collection of taxes, for although he overloaded the iron yoke of taxes, still this land received a small respite from the evil peril of distress due to the discovery of silver, since mountains of silver were revealed in this land of Armenia, [and they were able] to apportion [118v] from them stores of pure silver for the needs of the people in the days of his reign.

And he, Muḥammad, began to assault the kingdom of the Greeks. He gathered forces and handed them to a
general, his brother, whose name was ʿAbbās. He sent him to the land of the Greeks, for in the same year as ʿAbd Allāh’s death, the emperor Constantine died and his son Leo succeeded to his father’s throne. While that one was contemplating raiding the land of the Greeks with his forces, the [Greek] king suddenly sent a large force to Basanastan, which is called Bišan. He appointed three generals over them, two of whom were Armenian naxarark’. One of them was named Tačat from the house of the Anjewac’ik’, the second was Artawazd [119r] from the Mamikonean house, and the other one was from the Greek troops. They advanced with many troops and arrived in the region of the Cilicians and Bišan. They spread their raids over the land and took many cities, districts, and villages. As for those who came out to war against them, they dashed them to pieces like dust. They took many of the commoners and carried them off as booty. It is said that the captives numbered more than fifteen thousand men, whom they brought into the land of the Greeks. They went to meet the emperor of the Greeks with much booty, and the emperor Leo received his troops with great praise and bestowed great honors upon his commanders. And they stopped [raiding] for that year.

44. But the next year the Ishmaelite prince sent envoys, [119v] as if he wanted to intimidate [them] through bragging; he was greatly puffed up with pride. As we heard, he ordered them to take with the message two bushels of mustard seeds and wrote to the king of the Greeks: “I will soon send my many troops over your land, in accordance with the number of mustard seeds that you see, should the area of your land be sufficient to receive my innumerable troops! But now, if perhaps you have the strength, prepare to come against me in war.” When the emperor read the letter, nothing disturbed him from his plan. Instead, he sent an answer with a steadfast mind. He said: “Men do not attain 'Abbās b. Muḥammad: the brother of Safīḥ and Mānsūr. He served as governor of Mesopotamia from 759 to 772 and died in 802. He was responsible for Mahdī’s attack on Asia Minor in 776. Leo IV (r. 775–80): Roman emperor, later named “the Khazar” because he was the son of Constantine V and Eirene, his Khazar wife. Basanastan: Albistān in modern south-central Turkey, also referred to as Bišan. Generals: Lewond notes that there were three Roman generals, but he names only the two Armenian generals and omits the name of the third, Greek general. The latter, according to Arabic and Greek sources, was Michael Lachanodrakon (d. 792). Tačat Anjewac’i: Roman general and governor who served under Constantine V and fought the Bulgars. His offensive against Commagene is dated to 776–77. He defected to the 'Abbāsids and became the prince of Armenia in 781 or 782. He died in 785. Artawazd Mamikonean: this Artawazd might be the Artawazd Mamikonean who rebelled against Marwān b. Muhammad and then fled to Georgia in 749.

Figure 15. Coin minted Bājunays/Apahunik’ in 191/806–7, during the reign of Hārūn al-Rashīd. ANS 1921.999.60. Courtesy of the American Numismatic Society. Reproduced with permission.

For that year: the year 778.
victory on their own. Rather, God grants it. For God is able to give your troops as food to my troops, according to the parable of the mustard seed that you sent.¹ But do what you promised to do, [120r] and whatever is pleasing to the will of God will be completed.” At that time an order went out from the emperor to relocate the inhabitants of the land to fortified cities and strong towers.

The Ishmaelite prince gathered innumerable forces and appointed a general, the same man whom we discussed above, over them. He sent them in [their] multitude against the land of the Greeks. They arrived in the land of the Galatians and besieged the large city called Amorium. The troops in [their] multitude encamped around it, besieged it, and held it for about three months. But they were not able to take it, since it was fortified with a wall. The surroundings also did not offer even the slightest cover, for the sources of the Sangarios River bubble up around the city, and through them the secure position of the city remained impregnable in its marshy mire; and [120v] they were not able to harm anything. Instead, they only sat and guarded [it]. Then Yazīd [b. Usayd], who was the governor of this land of Armenia, also gathered his troops to arrive in aid of the general ‘Abbās. He headed toward the region of Pontus and arrived in the cities of Kolonia fortress, Govat’ā, and Kastilon and the district of Marit’enēs. He engaged and battled against them but gained nothing from it. He returned

to this land of Armenia in deep shame. The Ishmaelite forces also abandoned the siege of the city of Amorium and went to the land of their own dwelling.

45. We still have to discuss what we intended to before. For in the seventh year of Muhammad’s [reign], the emperor Leo, the son of Constantine, died and his son Constantine, a very young child, ruled instead of him. When the [121r] Ishmaelite prince Muḥammad saw the death of the king of the Greeks, he gathered a large force, appointed Hārūn, his son, their general, and sent them against the land of the Greeks. And when the Ishmaelite forces arrived in the land of the Greeks, the Greek forces came out against them. They camped and watched each other. They [the Greeks] blocked their [the Arabs’] routes, and the Ishmaelite forces were not able to go out in search of food; there was a great famine in the Ishmaelite camp.

Now Tačat the son of Grigor, who was from the house of the Anjewac’ik’ and whom we mentioned earlier, had at some time fled from the Ishmaelite prince to the emperor Constantine [V] in the land of the Greeks. The latter received him with great joy and honored him with splendor on account of his bravery, for he was aware of his bravery from earlier renown. [121v] He proved his bravery to the king in the regions of the Sarmatians, who are called the Bulgars, and he returned with great victories. The emperor saw the courage of his heart. He appointed him general over sixty thousand men, and he served the Greek king for twenty-two years. Then, after the death of Constantine [V] and his son Leo, Constantine [VI] held power. The queen, who was Emperor Constantine’s mother, treated him [i.e., Tačat] with disdain. For that reason, he reached out to the Ishmaelite prince. For when the Ishmaelite force was besieged by the Greeks, he requested a letter of oath from them to return from there to his own land, and he promised to relieve them from their siege and take them to the land where they lived. The Ishmaelite prince heard this and fulfilled his request promptly. He also gave him, [122r] by oath, everything that he requested of them. Trusting in that written oath, he went out from the land of the Greeks with his entire house and relieved the Ishmaelite troops from the siege there. Hārūn, the son of the Ishmaelite prince, called him his father and gave him magnificent honors. When Tačat met the Ishmaelite prince, he [Hārūn] thanked him [Tačat] profusely and loaded him with many goods from the royal treasury. He gave him the honor of being prince

The seventh year of Mahdi’s reign fell in 781 or 782. Leo IV died in 780; his son, Constantine VI, had been crowned in 776, but Eirene ruled as regent until 790.

Hārūn b. Muḥammad: later known as caliph by the regnal name Hārūn al-Rashīd (r. 786–809). Before becoming caliph, he led expeditions against the Roman Empire in both 779–80, taking Samalū, and 781–82, reaching as far as the Bosporus. He was named governor over Armenia, as well as Azerbaijan, Egypt, Syria, and Ifrīqiyya, in the 780s.

Whom we mentioned earlier: see 118v.

Sarmatians: the Bulgar Khanate, which by the early ninth century shared the Roman Empire’s northern border.

The queen: Eirene of Athens, to be differentiated from Eirene of Khazaria. She ruled as regent for her son Constantine VI before becoming sole empress (r. 797–802).
over this land of Armenia and sent him to his land with great splendor.

But when Prince Tačat arrived in our land of Armenia by order of the Ishmaelite prince, he was not accepted by ʿUthmān, who was the governor and chief over this land. He did not fulfill his prince’s orders but tarried and sent envoys to their prince. [122v] [They said]: “These Armenian naxarark’ have no desire for harmony; if [you] appoint a man who rebelled from your rule and aided the king of the Greeks prince over those who have been subject to your rule, perhaps he may betray our forces.” Although Tačat wanted to inform the Ishmaelite prince about their [i.e., ʿUthmān and his men’s] rebuffing of his rule many times, he was not able to because they guarded the entrances to the roads everywhere and seized the envoys that he sent and threw them in prison. His complaint did not reach Prince Muhammad [al-Mahdī] nor his son Hārūn until the end of that year. After that, his appeal reached Prince Muhammad and his son Hārūn, creating great agitation for ʿUthmān, the governor of this land. He unwillingly ceded power [123r] to Tačat by order of the Ishmaelite prince.

Then after that ʿUthmān gathered the troops of the Armenian naxarark’ in the land of the Albanians at the Caspian Gates in the city called Darband, which is fortified with walls and ramparts built against the forces of the Huns and the Khazars. He called Prince Tačat, the sparapet Bagarat, Nersēh Kamsarakan, and others from among the Armenian naxarark’ in the days of the burning dawn of Hephaestus’s fiery head. He pitched his camp in the field called K’eran in the terrible and intolerable temperatures of excessive burning heat. He spent the entire summer in the furnace-like, rocky field. The Armenian naxarark’ were not able to endure it and they died from the burning air, which was perilous and took their lives. Prince [123v] Tačat, the sparapet Bagarat, Nersēh Kamsarakan, and others from the troops died. The Ishmaelite prince Muhammad was extremely angry about the deplorable death of Prince Tačat and the naxarark’ who were with him. He revoked his [ʿUthmān’s] authority and sent his replacement, a certain Rawḥ, to be prince and governor of this land of Armenia. Muhammad reigned for eight years and, on the arrival of Rawḥ, he died.
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The second half of the 9th century produced a number of Armenian poets, and among them, there are several who have left us a rich legacy.

Unfortunately, the page you've provided is not a clear enough scan to be easily readable. It appears to contain text, possibly a narrative, but the quality of the image makes it difficult to extract accurate content.

If you have a clearer image or a transcribed version of the text, I'd be happy to assist further. For now, here are some general points about Armenian literature:

- The 9th century was a pivotal period for Armenian literature, with several prominent poets emerging.
- These poets contributed significantly to the development of the Armenian language and poetry.
- Their works often reflect the cultural and political climate of the time.

If you need help with any specific aspect of this period or its literature, feel free to ask!
XIV. THE CALIPHATE OF MUḤAMMAD AL-MAHDĪ

Եւ գումարեալ իշխան Իսմայելի զաւրս անթիւս. կարգէր ի վերա նոցա զաւրավար զորմէ այր զորմէ վերագոյնն ասացաք. և առաքէ զնոսա բազմութ և վերա յաշխարհի Յունաց. որոք կողմանս տպավորվում էր փոքր քաղաքում մինչև հավասարության դեռ բերել Նահերի, և սակայն գումարի վիճակագրից պատճառաբանել իրար խոչ եւ սահման։ Ներկայացնել այս իշխանությունը զարդակ իսկ երկրի որտեղ իբրև Յունաց։ և Եվ էր [120v] կարգէր վաճառական, ինչ անասոր վաճառքի պահել Աբասու իսկ. որից սարդակցել տափաստանի մասն հասանում, իբրև բազմութ և Հայոց։ և ըստել Մարկերին, թեթք ու մասն վաճառք գումարեր բազմութ ի վերա երկրին Յունաց։ որոց երթեալ հասանէին ի վերա երկրին Գաղատացվոց. և պարշարէու զքաղաքն լայնանիստ որ անուանեալ կոչի Ամուրիա. և նստեալ զնովաւ բազմութ ի վերա երկրին Յունաց պարշարէին զավազակ, պահէին զնա իբրև ամիսս. երեք այլ ոչ կարէին ստնանել քանզի պարսպաւոր ամրացեալ և ոչ ինչ նուազ զգուշութիւն մատուցանէին 7 շուրջքն. քանզի շուրջ զքաղաքաւն բղխեն ակունք Սագառիս գետոյ. որով ի ճաղճախուտ տղմոյն անկռուելի մնայր հաստայարկ դիրք քաղաքին. և ոչ ինչ կարէին վնասել այլ նստեալ միայն պահէին։ գումարէր զզաւրքն իւր ապա և Իզիտ որ էր հրամատար աշխարհի Հայոց. հասանել ի թիկունս աւգնականութեւ ան զաւրավարին Աբասա: Եւ երթեալ ի կողմանս Պոնդոսի հասանէր ի Կողոնիա բերդ քաղաքաց և ի Գովաթա. և ի Կաստիղոն. և ի գաւառ Մարիթենէս. ընդ որս մարտ եդեալ կռուէր այլ ոչ ինչ ավտեալ ի նոցունց դառնայր մեծաւ ամաւթով յաշխարհս Հայոց: Թողին և զաւրքն Իսմայելի զքաղաքը Ամուրիա ի պաշարմանէն. և գնացին յաշխարհ բնակութեանիւրեանց:


7 մատուցին ] մատուցին a.c.
8 թուլու ] - suprascr.
9 հանարանջ ] հանարանջ a.c.
10 կետ in lit. mg.
11 Գրիգորի ] Գրիգորի a.c.
12 Պատմաբան ] - suprascr.
13 ի ] suprascr.
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Z[z]}}{{ระหวี่ Իսմայելացու ի պարշարմանէ անդի: Եւ Ահարոն որդի իշխանի Իսմաելի հայր իւր անուաց զնա. և մեծամեծ պատուազ ընծայէր անց
14 զնա: Եւ իբրև յանդիման լինէր իշխանի Իսմաելի Տաճատն˙ բազում շնորհակալութի
15 վն առնէր նմա. և լնոյր զնա բազում ստացուած գանձուց արքունի. և տայր նմա պատիւ իշխանութե
16 ի վերա երկրիս Հայոց. և առաքէ զնա յաշխարհ իւր մեծաւ շքեղութ
17 եամ: Իսկ իբրև հասանէր իշխանն Տաճատ յաշխարհս Հայոց հրամանաւ իշխանի Իսմաելի
18 առ Ավթմանն որ էր հրամանատար և ազգապետ ի վերա երկրիս. անընկալ եղեալ և ոչ
19 կատարէր զհրաման իշխանի իւրոյ. այլ յապաղէր. և յղէր դեսպանս առ իշխանն իւրեանց.
20 էթե ոչ է կամք միաբանութե ան
21 նախարացս Հայոց. եթե զայր մի ապստամբեալ յիշխանութենէդ քու<մ>
22 և ձեռն տուեալ առ արքայն Յունաց. կացուցանել իշխան ի վերա այնոցիկ որ նուաճեալ են ընդ իշխա
23 այի քով. գուցէ և դավաճան զաւրաց մերոց լինիցի:
24 Եւ թէպէտ բազում անգամ կամեցեալ Տաճատն զեկուցանել զբեկումն իշխանութե
25 ան իւրոյ յականջս իշխանի Իսմաելի այլ ոչ կարաց. զի
26 ամենայն ուրեք զմուտս ճանապարհին պահէին. և ըմբռնէին զդեսպանս յղեալս. և դնէին ի բանդի: Եւ ոչ էհաս տրտունջ նորա առ
27 Մահմետ իշխան
28 և ոչ առ Ահարովն որդի նորա. մինչև ի կատարումն ամին այնորիկ: Եւ յետ այնորիկ հասեալ բողոք տրտընջման
29 ն Ավթմանն հրամատար երկիրն Աղուանից. ի դրունս Կասբից. ի Դարպանդն կոչեցեալ քաղաք˙ որ է պարիսպ և պատուար
30 ամրութե ան, շինեալ ընդդէմ զաւրացն Հոնաց. և Խազրաց: Կոչէ զՏաճատն իշխան և
31 զսպարապետն Բագարատ. և զՆերսեհն Կամսարական, և զայլսն ի նախարացն Հայոց.
32 յաւուրս տապախառն ծագման Յեփեստեայ. հրագագաթան: Եւ հարկանէ զբանակս իւր ի
33 դաշտին որ կոչէր Քերան, ի դժընդակ և յանհանդուրժելի ջերմութե
34 տապոյ խորշակին. և զբովանդակ աւուրս ամարա<յ>նոյ
35 անցուցանէր ի հնոցաձեւ ապառաժին դաշտի:
36 Որում ոչ կարացեալ հանդուրժել նախարարք Հայոց, վախճանէին ի տապախառն աւդոյն.
37 որ վտանգեալ բառնայր ի կենաց աշխարհիս: Եւ վախճանէր իշխան
38 Տաճատ. և սպարապետն Բագարատ. և Ներսեհն Կամսարական. և այլք
39 ի զաւրացն: Եւ յոյժ ցասուցեալ
40 իշխանն Իսմաէլի Մահմետ ընդ աւաղական մահ իշխանին Տաճատայ և նախարացն որ
41 ընդ նմա. խափանէ զիշխանութի ւն
42 նորա: և առաքէ փոխանակ նորա: զՌոհ ոմն իշխա
43 ն Մահմետ ամս.
44 ութ. և ընդ գալն Ռոհայ˙ վախճանեցաւ:

14 կիսնալ [կիսա] a.c.
15 չիրանաբարմության [ե]- suprascr.
16 պր<կակ>: [յ]- suprascr. Hand 1°orr.
17 իշխանի [ա] suprascr.
18 ամպես [ամբ- ins. 1rt. mg.
19 տաքանավան [չ]- subscr.
20 ճափանավան [չ]- subscr.
21 ավարակ,<ըմ]> [չ]- subscr. Hand 1°orr.
22 երջ [չ]- subscr.
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COMMENTARY

XIV. THE CALIPHATE OF MUḤAMMAD AL-MAHDĪ

XIV.A. CALIPHAL GOVERNANCE

The example of Tačat Anjewac‘i offers a remarkable illustration of elite power plays during the caliphate of Mahdī. It reveals the potentially stressful relationship between the prince of Armenia and the caliphal governor, the access of an Armenian general to the caliph, and the participation of the Armenian naxarark’ in the wars against the Khazars. Beyond Tačat’s career, Lewond’s account of the caliphate of Mahdī is nearly exclusively preoccupied with the sawāʿif. Accordingly, the drama unfurls across the battlefields of Anatolia, and we find precious little said about the governance of Armenia.

The first paragraph of Lewond’s account of Mahdī’s reign, however, is instructive. It informs us that Mahdī “opened all of his treasuries that the impious ʿAbd Allāh had kept locked and distributed pensions to his troops” (էբաց զամենայն տունս գանձուց զոր պահէր ամբարիշտն Աբդլա. Եւ բաշխեաց պառուց իւրոց իրեն) [118r]. Lewond claims that Mahdī allowed merchants to cross the borders, confirming that the sawāʿif were localized military encounters that did not necessarily translate into an impermeable Arab-Roman border. Lewond then claims that Armenia prospered despite caliphal taxation because of the discovery of silver:

The land was abundant, and the discovery of silver spread. The inhabitants of the land experienced a reprieve from the violent collection of taxes, for although he overloaded the iron yoke of taxes, since mountains of silver were revealed in this land of Armenia, [and they were able] to apportion from them stores of pure silver for the needs of the people in the days of his reign.

M. Bates construes this passage as the first reference to the output of maʿdin Bājunays, the mine of Apahunik’, and identifies this mine as the source of the coins minted in the name of Mahdī and Hārūn at Hārūnābād in Armenia in 168/784–85 and, subsequently, at Hārūniyya (without reference to Armenia) between 169/785–86 and 171/787–88. 23 These he attributes to the “fortified administrative center” of Hārūn, which subsequently passed to his son Muḥammad (later to become the caliph Amīn) as evidenced by the minting of coins in Muḥammadiyya. 24 However, Lewond does not record the minting of coins, let alone the precise source of the silver.

23 It is important to note that the only coins minted in maʿdin Bājunays postdate the reign of Mahdī. All dated specimens are from the late decade of the second century or the first two decades of the third century AH (early ninth century CE).

Lewond mentions two governors of Armenia by name during the reign of Mahdi. The first of these is 'Uthmān b. 'Umāra. We know little about him. His father, 'Umāra, was the deputy governor of Khurāsān, and Ibn al-Kalbī states that 'Uthmān himself served as governor in both Khurāsān and Armenia. Crone rejects this claim as "certainly wrong," likely because of the lack of corroboration for 'Uthmān’s governorship in Khurāsān. 'Uthmān’s governorship over Armenia is attested in both the numismatic record and written accounts (Lewond, Balādhuri), and he also later appears as governor over Sīstān in Khalīfa b. Khayyāt and Tārīkh-i Sīstān. He therefore fits several patterns of 'Abbāsid governors established above: like many others, he came from a family of governors that rose to prominence in the Umayyad period and maintained control through its connections to the 'Abbāsid East. 'Uthmān was replaced by Rawḥ b. Ḥātim al-Muhallabī at the very end of Mahdi’s reign. On Rawḥ’s term as governor, see chapter XV.

XIV.B. SUMMER EXPEDITIONS (ṢAWĀʾĪF) ON THE ARAB-ROMAN FRONTIER

Barring external threats or internal disturbances, the ‘Abbāsids organized annual raids into Roman territory. These very typically occurred during the summer, when it was easier to move troops across Anatolia, which explains the name of the raids. Ṣāʾifa, plural ṣawāʾif, literally means “summertime.” Territory rarely changed hands in these encounters, and for the most part, we might imagine them as localized skirmishes or transitory raids. However, during the reigns of Mahdi, Hādī, and Hārūn al-Rashid, the extent of and interest in the campaigns increased markedly. This change may relate to the personal involvement of Hārūn and other members of the ‘Abbāsid family in the summer campaigns, which offered the opportunity to found new cities along the frontier named after the “ghāzī caliphs”: Mahdiyya and Muḥammadiyya after Mahdi; Hārūnīyya or Hārūnābād after Hārūn al-Rashid; and another Muḥammadiyya after Amin, Hārūn al-Rashid’s son. During the reigns of Mahdi, Hādī, and Hārūn al-Rashid, the battles took place not only on the field in Anatolia but also rhetorically in Baghdad, where the caliphs were lauded in court panegyrics for their commitment to the wars against the Roman Empire.

Historians frequently approach the shift in the intensity of the ṣawāʾif under Mahdi from the perspective of the Greek or Arabic sources. Lewond offers a distinctly Armenian perspective on these incursions. He reports on four campaigns during Mahdi’s caliphate, and his descriptions both align with and diverge from the Greek and Arabic accounts in interesting ways. The Arabic and Greek sources concur to a surprising extent on the general sequence of events, many of the places named, and the participants. When the details found in the Greek and Arabic sources agree with one another but differ from Lewond, we may speculate about Lewond’s access to information and his active editing process.

26 On families that maintained power in the transition from Umayyad to ‘Abbāsid rule, see Elad, “Aspects.”
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XIV.B.1. The Caliphal Campaign of AH 159/AM 6268/776 CE

Following the death of Constantine V and the ascension of Leo IV (r. 775–80), Mahdī marshaled an army under ʿAbbās b. Muḥammad al-ʿAbbāsī to fight the Roman Empire [118v]. Lewond identifies ʿAbbās as Mahdī’s brother, but he was in fact the brother of Saffāḥ and Manṣūr, making him the uncle of Mahdī.

The Arabic references to this campaign are, like Lewond’s, short. They focus on the safe return of the caliphal troops. Khalīfa b. Khayyāṭ states that “ʿAbbās penetrated [Rome] and his raiding parties spread out. He returned safe and sound” (وَدَخَلَ الْعَبْسَ بْنِ مُحَمَّدٍ وَيَثَىَّ (سُرَأَىَهُ فَقَفَلَ غَنْمًا سَالِمًا). 29 Yaʿqūbī offers a similarly succinct summary: “ʿAbbās b. Muḥammad led the forces on campaign, reaching as far as Ankara” (وَغَزَّ بِالنَّاسِ الْعَبْسَ بْنِ مُحَمَّدٍ بُقْلَغَ أَنْقُرَة) . 30 Ṭabarī likewise notes that the raid of 159/776 extended as far as Ankara and returned home safely. However, he also adds the conquest of a cave en route: “During his [ʿAbbās’s] raids he conquered a city of the Romans and a maṭmūra with it and returned safely, not a single one of the Muslims being injured” (فَفُتُحَتْ فِي غَزَّةِ هَذِهِ مُدِينَةٌ لِّلرُّوْمَ وَمَطُمُّرَةً مْعَهَا وَانُصِرَفُوا سَالِمَينَ لَمْ يَصِبْ مِنَ الرَّسُوْلِ إنَّمَا). 31 This passage demonstrates how similar the accounts of these ṣawāʾif can be, even if they do not rely on the same sources or display any evidence of intercultural transmission. The term maṭmūra refers to subterranean structures, explicitly linked to Cappadocia by Arabic authors such as Masʿūdī. Such places were sometimes expansive, but they were generally more likely to have been used as storage and shelter during attacks than as underground cities. 32 Theophanes describes this campaign with similar information: “In this year Mahdī sent ʿAbbās at the head of a great force against the Roman country. With the help of smoke he opened the cave called Kasin and, after capturing the men who were in it, returned home” (Τοῦτο τῷ ἔτει ἀποστείλας Μαδὶ τὸν Ἀβασβαλὶ κατὰ Ρωμανίας μετὰ δυνάμεως πολλῆς, ἤνοιξε τὸ σπῆλαιον τὸ ἐπιλεγμένον Κάσιν ἀπὸ καπνοῦ, καὶ λαβὼν τοὺς ἐν αὐτῷ αἰχμαλῶτος ὑπέστρεψεν). 33 The information provided in the various sources is summarized in table 6.

The example of 159/776 confirms the frequently transitory nature of the ṣawāʾif: they were seasonal, took little territory, and claimed few (in this case zero) casualties. However, during the caliphate of Mahdī, they began to appear in the written record in greater detail and involved highly ranked generals. The caliph himself is frequently mentioned in these reports. According to the Arabic accounts, Mahdī accompanied ʿAbbās as far as Baradān in 159/776. In terms of distance, his participation in the campaign was negligible; rather, it

---

29 Khalīfa, Taʾrīkh, 283. There is some chronological inconsistency here. Khalīfa clearly places the death of Manṣūr in 158 and this raid in 159. But he also claims that the oath of allegiance was read in Mahdī’s name only in 160. This is atypical; cf. Ṭabarī, Taʾrīkh, 3:451. If there was an alternative reading of the narrative that placed ʿAbbās’s campaign at the very end of Manṣūr’s caliphate, this could potentially explain Lewond’s description of ʿAbbās as the caliph’s brother instead of his uncle. However, this is unlikely because Lewond clearly identifies the caliph in question as Mahdī.

30 Yaʿqūbī, Works, 3:1146; Taʾrīkh, 2:486. Note that Yaʿqūbī placed a Roman campaign into Sumaysāṭ in this same year, but this campaign does not appear in other texts. It seems to have been a separate project, however, and not part of the ṣāʾifa, since a different general led it.


32 Ousterhout, Visualizing Community, 347–49.

33 Theophanes, Chronicle, 620; Chronographia, 449. The editors place Kasin in Cappadocia near Nazianzus.
was a symbolic act to signal caliphal involvement.34 The same concern appears in Lewond’s attribution of the campaign to Mahdī himself: “And he, Muḥammad, began to assault the kingdom of the Greeks” (Եւ ինքն Մահմետ սկսաւ գոռալ ընդդէմ Յունաց Յունաց)

XIV.B.2. The Roman Campaign of AH 161/AM 6270/778 CE

According to Lewond, Roman forces raided Anatolia in 161/778. Tačat Anjewac’i, Artawazd Mamikonean, and a third, unnamed Greek general raided “Basanastan, which is called Bišan” (ի վերա բասանաստանի որում բիշան) [118v], which he also defines as lying in the region of the Cilicians and Bišan” (ի կողմանս կիւլիկեցուց և բեշան) [119r].35 “They spread their raids over the land and took many cities, districts, and villages. As for those who came out to war against them, they dashed them to pieces like dust” (և սփռեալ զասպատակս իւրեանց ի վերա աշխարհին. առին զբազում քաղաքս և զգաւառս և զգիւղս. և որք միանգամ ելին ընդդեմ նոցա պատերազմել. ջաղխեցին մանր իբրև զփոշի)

This raid appears in Theophanes, as well, under the year AM 6270/778 CE. Theophanes lists a number of other generals involved on the Roman side of this campaign, most of whom were Armenian:

The emperor Leo mobilized the Roman army: a hundred thousand men invaded Syria under the command of Michael Lachanodrakon of the Thrakesians, the Armenian Artabasdos of the Anatolics, Tatzates of the Bucellarii, Karisterotzes of the Armeniacs, and Gregory, son of Mousoulakios, of the Opsikians; and they surrounded Germanikeia. ʿĪsā b. ‘Ali, Mahdī’s uncle, was there, and they took all his camels and were about to take Germanikeia itself, had not ʿĪsā b. ‘Alī prevailed upon Lachanodrakon by means of gifts to draw away from the fortified town; he went forth to devastate the countryside and, after capturing the heretical Syrian Jacobites, returned to the fort. Thumāma sent an army and a number of emirs from Dabekon and made war on the

---

34 Bonner, Aristocratic Violence, 71.
35 Basanastan and Bišan, also spelled Bešan, are as yet unidentified but may refer to the area of Albistān.
Romans. It is said that five emirs and two thousand Arabs fell. They withdrew on a Friday, having come on a Sunday.

Theophanes's Artabasdos and Tatzates refer to Lewond's Artawazd and Tačat. Interestingly, Lewond omits all of the other names, even though Theophanes's other leaders were likely Armenian, too: Karisterotzes of the Armeniacs renders Varaz-Tiroc' (where Καριστερότζης is a scribal error for βαριστερότζης), and Gregory the son of Mousoulakios is likely Grigor son of Mušēł. It is possible that Lewond or his source ignores these leaders because they were members of the imperial army and played no role in Armenia.

Of the names offered in Theophanes's account, Lewond's unnamed Greek general can be only Michael Lachanodrakon. This identification is confirmed by the Arabic sources, all of which name the Roman leader Michael. Unlike Lewond, the Arabic sources also identify the leaders of the caliphal army as per Theophanes. Khalīfa b. Khayyāṯ reports that in 161/778,

Michael the Patrician set out from the region of Darb al-Ḥadath. He came to the pass of Ḥartina, and then he vanquished its people. He came to the town of 'Anzarān and killed, took prisoners, and burned it with fire. Then he came to Mar‘ash, where 'Īsā b. 'Alī was garrisoned. And Sālim al-Burnusī went out against him and battled him but did not achieve anything. Then he [Michael] arrived at Jayḥān. Thumāma b. Walīd, who was raiding in Rome, sent Malāla b. Ḥikma after Michael. He descended upon him in the pass, and he overcame Malāla and his companions.

6 Theophanes, Chronicle, 623; Chronographia, 451.
7 Mango and Scott, Theophanes’s translators, render the name Artabasdos; the Greek text actually reads Artauasdos, which is even closer to Armenian Artawazd.
8 Markwart understands this Mušel to be the same Mušel Mamikonean who led the earlier rebellion; see Markwart, Südarmenien, 293 n. 2. Ačaṙyan lists these Mušels as separate people in Hayoc’ anjnanunneri bararan, 3:460 nos. 20 and 21.
9 This is a toponym, but it is as yet unidentified. It could be translated literally as “the pass of our lava field,” which seems quite unlikely. If we assume that غزارة is a corruption of غزارة or Avaçәрбәә, this must have lain between Hadath and 'Ayn Zarba.
Quite similarly, Baladhuri has Michael start in Darb al-Ḥadath but adds that he had 80,000 men with him. Michael attacked Mar’ash, where ʿĪsā b. ʿAlī was garrisoned. Michael feigned defeat, and the men stationed in Mar’ash followed him. He then turned back to surprise the Muslim forces, killing eight of the mawālī of ʿĪsā. Michael then went to Jayḥān: “The news of this reached Thumāma b. Walid al-ʿAbsi while he was in Dābiq, charged with the summer campaign for the year 161. So he sent against him [Michael] heavy cavalry, but they overcame [all] except those of them who escaped” (وبلغ الخبر ثمامة بن الوليد العبسى وهو من نجا منهم). This sets Yaqubi’s version of this campaign is surprisingly sparse; he acknowledges only that Roman forces raided Mar’ash from Ḥadath sometime before 163. He does not offer any details about this attack but focuses instead on later rebuilding projects. He does add the following notice to his list of the commanders of the sawā’if: “In the year 160, Thumāma b. Walid al-ʿAbsi led the campaign. In the year 161, ʿĪsā b. ʿAlī campaigned, but the Roman army met him and surrounded him” (سنة 160 غزا شامة بن الوليد العبسي سنة 161 غزا عيسى بن عليّ). This sets Yaqubi apart from Theophanes, Khalīfa, and Baladhuri, who have Thumāma b. Walīd and ʿĪsā b. ʿAlī respond to the same Roman raid from Dābiq and Mar’ash, respectively. Ṭabarī confirms the involvement of both men in the response to the Roman raid of 161/778. He claims that Thumāma b. Walid had been placed over the sāʾifa, again organized from Dābiq, but he was negligent and the Roman forces advanced successfully: “He went out against the Romans, who were commanded by Michael, with the advance guard, and a number of the Muslims were killed. ʿĪsā b. ʿAlī was posted at the fortress of Mar’ash at that time. The Muslims did not carry out a summer raid this year because of that” (وخرج الى الروم وعليها ميخائيل بسرعان الناس فأصيب من المسلمين عدّة وكان عيسى بن عليّ فلم يكن للمسلمين في ذلك العام صائفة من أجل ذلك). For a summary of the accounts of this campaign, see table 7.

The Greek and Arabic accounts of this raid align particularly closely, as they all mention the same people (Michael Lachanodrakon, ʿĪsā b. ʿAlī, and Thumāma b. Walid) and places (Mar’ash/Germanikeia and Dābiq/Dabekon). Lewond’s account stands out for its omission of the names of cities and Roman and ʿAbbāsid generals alike. The discrepancy between Lewond’s account and the others demonstrates that the campaigns bore different valences for their recorders. In Arabic, the inclusion of ʿĪsā b. ʿAlī is significant because he was the uncle of Mansūr and the great-uncle of Mahdī. His presence, therefore, created a concrete tie between the frontier and the family of the caliph, like that in the campaign of 159/776. Theophanes also includes ʿĪsā b. ʿAlī and identifies him as a kinsman of the caliph. In view of the detail with which he lists the generals involved, Theophanes’s intent here seems to be to place the campaign within a discourse of Roman victory. By contrast,
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XIV.3. The Caliphal Campaign of Ah 162/AH 6271/779 CE

Caliphal forces responded to the Roman raid the next year, in AH 162/AM 6271/779 CE. The Arabic and Greek accounts agree on the cause of these campaigns (Mahdi’s anger), the RAIDED area (Dorylaion and Amorium), and the general who led the campaign (Hasan b. Qaḥtaba).

Most of the accounts of this raid start with the anger of the caliph Mahdi over the Roman raid in the previous year. Lewond introduces this campaign with a letter exchange between Mahdi and Leo in which the caliph threatens the Roman Empire but the emperor remains unruffled and places his faith in God. Mahdi dispatched “a general, the same man whom we discussed above” (κατά τὸν ἀρχηγὸν τῆς δυνάμεως ὧν ἦμεθα) [120r], who ineffectively besieged Amorium. Theophanes recounts this same raid as follows: “In this year Mahdi, the leader of the Arabs, waxed angry and sent Hasan with a great force of Maurophoroi ["black-wearers," i.e., ‘Abbāsid supporters], Syrians, and Mesopotamians, and they advanced as far as Dorylaio. The emperor ordered the strategoi not to fight an open war but to make the forts secure by stationing garrisons of soldiers in them” (Τούτῳ τῷ ἐτεί υμωθείς ὁ τῶν Ἀράβων ἀρχηγὸς Μαδὶ πέμπει τὸν ἄσαν μετὰ δυνάμεως...)}
πολλῆς Μαυροφόρων τε καὶ τῶν τῆς Συρίας καὶ Μεσοποταμίας, καὶ κατέβλεπεν ἕως τοῦ
Δορυλαίου, ὁ δὲ βασιλεύς διετάκατο τοῖς στρατηγοῖς μὴ πολεμήσαι αὐτοὺς δημόσιον
πόλεμον, ἀλλ’ ἀσφαλίσασθαι τὰ κάστρα καὶ λαὸν εἰσενεγκείν πρὸς παραφυλακὴν
αὐτῶν). 45 This account aligns with Lewond’s complaint about Mahdi’s attempts to intimi-
date the emperor, as well as his claim that “an order went out from the emperor to relocate
the inhabitants of the land to fortified cities and strong towers” (ιμπολίς Μαυροφ ἣ ἵμπολίς
κρηκλίς ἡμυτηρῆ ἡ ρηματῆ ἀπόδειξιν ἤ μυπορῆ ὑπήκουν [120r]. The Arabic
accounts, too, frame this campaign as a result of the anger of Mahdi over the Roman raid
in 161/778. At the end of his description of the 161 raid, Baladhuri adds: “This galled Mahdi,
so Hasan b. Qaṭaba gathered [men] for raids in the following year, that is, 162”
(فاحفظ ذلك 162 المهدى واحتفل لاغزاء الحسن بن قحطبة في العام المقبل وهو سنة
المهدى واحتفل لاغزاء الحسن بن قحطبة في العام المقبل وهو سنة 162).

The 162/779 campaign started in Ḥadath, as Baladhuri confirms that when Hasan
approached the Roman Empire (bilād al-Rūm), “he entered from the pass of Ḥadath,
where he assessed its city. He was informed that Michael had left it, so Hasan intended
to establish his base there. He wrote to Mahdi about fortifying it and the city of Ṭarsūs.
He [Mahdi] ordered [him] to start with the building of Ḥadath” (وكان دخوله من درب الحدث
ّم المهدى إلى أن جمع إلى دائرة مدينته هناك فألزمه فافتتح في بناها وبناء حلبة المدينة
الحدث (46). Baladhuri does not specify where Hasan raided beyond Ḥadath itself. By contrast, Ṭabarī introduces the 162/779 ṣāʾifa in a passage
that mentions Ḥadath but explicitly places Hasan b. Qaṭaba only in Dorylaion: “Hasan
b. Qaṭaba led the summer expedition with thirty thousand regular troops, besides volun-
teers. He reached Hammat al-Adhrūliyya [i.e., Dorylaion] and wrought great destruction
and damage in Roman lands, without capturing a fortress or meeting an army”
(وبهرا الصائفة أذرولية فأكثر التخريب والتحريق فى بلاد الروم
ّبة فبلغ ح)
48 Ṭabarī’s placement of Hasan’s raids into Dorylaion clearly
aligns with Theophanes’s account. Theophanes, Ṭabarī, and Baladhuri do not provide sup-
port for Lewond’s claim that this raid included the siege of “the large city that was called
Amorium” (زقاقيا لى عاموراييا وقى دونياغىا ىلغىتيىا ىلغىتىىا [120r]. But the siege of
Amorium does appear in Khalīfa’s history, which states that “Ḥasan b. Qaṭaba came to
Bithynia and his raiding parties spread out. So he razed and burned [the land] and took
prisoners. He sent his son Muḥammad b. Ḥasan to ‘Amūriya, and then Ḥasan arrived
there. There were skirmishes between them, and then he left” (غزا الحسن بن قحطبة وأموريه
وبيت سرایاها فهدم وحرق وسبى. ووجه ابنه محمر بن الحسن إلى عمورية ثم أتاه الحسن فقاتى
بينهم مباوضة ثم انصرف (49).

Table 8 summarizes the accounts of this campaign.

The only significant point of disagreement between Lewond and the non-Armenian
sources concerns the name of the caliphal general responsible for this ṣāʾifa. Lewond
refers to “a general, the same man whom we discussed above” (قینقوققأ قنچي ىن قنپل;

45 Theophanes, Chronicle, 624; Chronographia, 452.
46 Baladhuri, Futūḥ, 189.
47 Baladhuri, Futūḥ, 190.
49 Khalīfa, Taʾrīkh, 288. Khalīfa here uses the toponym بنتة. Though it does not appear in Yāqūt, we read
it here as Bithynia on the basis of the references to Hammat al-Adhrūliyya (Dorylaion) in Ṭabarī and
Theophanes.
XIV. THE CALIPHATE OF MUḤAMMAD AL-MAHḌĪ

Table 8. Summary of information provided about the 162/779 campaign.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Places</th>
<th>Lewond Khalīfa</th>
<th>Balādhuri</th>
<th>Yaʾqūbī</th>
<th>Ṭabari</th>
<th>Theophanes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land of the Galatians, Amorium, the Sangarios</td>
<td>Bithynia, 'Amūriyya</td>
<td>Hadath, 'Arsūs</td>
<td>Hadath, Hammat al-Adhrūliyya/ Dorylaion</td>
<td>Dorylaion, Amorion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman forces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caliphal forces</td>
<td>The same man whom we discussed above; 'Abbās</td>
<td>Hasan b. Qaṭṭaba, Muḥammad b. Ḥasan</td>
<td>Hasan b. Qaṭṭaba, Mandal al-'Anāzī, Muʿtamir b. Sulaymān al-Ǧasrī</td>
<td>Hasan b. Qaṭṭaba</td>
<td>Hasan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Abandoned siege</td>
<td>Abandoned siege</td>
<td>Rebuilding of Hadath</td>
<td>No lasting gains</td>
<td>Abandoned siege</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[120r], then immediately afterward specifies that “Yazīd [b. Usayd], who was governor of this land of Armenia, also gathered his troops to arrive in aid of the general ʿAbbās” (Մեծիչ որ էր իսգարիուս Հայոց, հասանել ի թիկունս աւգնականութե ան զաւրավարին Աբասա) [120v]. This suggests that “the same man whom we discussed above” was ʿAbbās b. Muḥammad, the general responsible for the ṣāʾifa in 159/776. This is logical because ʿAbbās appeared at the head of a caliphal army in Roman territory immediately before this section of Łewond’s text. However, no other source corroborates the involvement of ʿAbbās b. Muḥammad after the 159/776 ṣāʾifa.50 All of the Greek and Arabic sources instead identify the general responsible for the 162/779 ṣāʾifa as Hasan b. Qaṭṭaba. Accordingly, we may surmise that Łewond’s “same man whom we discussed above” should not be read as ʿAbbās b. Muḥammad but rather refers to Hasan b. Qaṭṭaba, who was indeed discussed at great length in Łewond’s narrative of Mansūr’s caliphate. It is possible that the apparent confusion stems from Łewond’s editorial process as he stitched together material from multiple sources.

Łewond also refers to Yazīd b. Usayd’s raids in this same year: “He headed toward Pontus and arrived in the cities of Kolonia fortress, Govat’a, and Kastiłon and the district of Marit’enēs. He engaged and battled against them but gained nothing from it. He returned to this land of Armenia in deep shame” (Եւ երթեալ ի կողմանս Պոնդոսի, հասանէր ի Կողոնիա բերդ քաղաքաց և ի Գովաթա, և ի Կաստիղոն, և ի գաւառն Մարիթենէս. ընդ որս մարտ եդեալ կռուէր. այլ ոչ ինչ աւգտեալ ի նոցունց. դառնայր մեծաւ ամաւթով յաշխարհս Հայոց) [120v]. Unlike the claimed involvement of ʿAbbās, Yazīd’s raid in 162/779 is corroborated elsewhere. Ṭabarī attests that Yazīd b. Usayd raided through Qālīqalā/Karin in that same year and even that he reached three (unnamed) cities: “In this year Yazīd b. Usayd al-Sulamī raided through the pass of Qālīqalā, took booty, and conquered three fortresses and took many prisoners and captives” (غزا يزيد بن أسيد السلمى من باب قاليقلا فغنم ۵۰ً Ṭabarī has ʿAbbās b. Muḥammad accompany the ṣāʾifa campaign of 163/780 as it sets out toward the Roman Empire, but ʿAbbās leaves with Mahdī and does not continue on to Roman territory with Hārūn.

50 Ṭabarī has ʿAbbās b. Muḥammad accompany the ṣāʾifa campaign of 163/780 as it sets out toward the Roman Empire, but ʿAbbās leaves with Mahdī and does not continue on to Roman territory with Hārūn.
But whereas Lewond describes Yazīd’s raid as support for the ṣāʾifa—claiming that Yazīd went “in aid of the general ʿAbbās” (ի թիկունս աւգնականութե ան զաւրավարին Աբասա) [120v]—Ṭabarī separates the two raids entirely. Given the geographical distance between the two raids and Yazīd’s status as governor of Armenia, it seems unlikely that Yazīd aimed to help the ṣāʾifa. By his own account, Lewond places the ṣāʾifa in Amorium, whereas Yazīd raided Pontus.

XIV.B.4. The Caliphal Campaign of AH 165/AM 6274/782 CE

Lewond places the final campaign under Mahdī after the death of Leo IV in 163/780, in the seventh year of Mahdī’s reign—that is, 165/782. He thus skips over the sawāʾif of 163/780 and 164/781, the former led by Hārūn al-Rashīd and the latter by ʿAbd al-Kabīr b. ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd. But these raids did not have long-reaching consequences. The 165/782 ṣāʾifa, by contrast, resulted in the defection of Tačat Anjewac’i from Roman to caliphal service and in the conclusion of a peace treaty between the Roman Empire and the Caliphate (on which see XIV.C below). Lewond offers little detail about the ṣāʾifa itself. He does not identify the names of any places or generals involved beyond Hārūn and Tačat. Even the details of the peace treaty are omitted. Instead, Tačat’s defection from Roman service drives Lewond’s narrative.

Theophanes offers significantly more information about the ṣāʾifa of 165/782:

Mahdī’s son Hārūn sallied forth with an enormous armed force composed of Maurophori and men from all of Syria, Mesopotamia, and the desert and advanced as far as Chrysopolis after leaving Bounousos to besiege Nakoleia and guard his rear. He also sent Bourniche to Asia with a force of thirty thousand. The latter gave battle to Lachanodrakon and the Thrakesian thema at a place called Darenos, and the Arabs, being thirty thousand strong, killed fifteen thousand.

The main Arabic source on this campaign is Ṭabarī, though the campaign also appears in abridged form in the earlier histories. Khalīfa b. Khayyāṭ explains that in the year 165/782 “during the reign of his father, Hārūn the Commander of the Faithful conducted the summer raid until he reached the gulf. He returned home in the year 166” (غزا هارون أمير المؤمنين في خلافة أبيه الصائفة حتى نزل بالخليج، وقفل سنة ست وستين وثمانة). Yaʾqūbī clarifies the word “gulf” in his history: “In the year 164, Hārūn led it [the ṣāʾifa] again and reached the gulf

52 Theophanes, Chronicle, 628–29; Chronographia, 456.
53 Khalīfa, Taʾrīkh, 289.
of Constantinople.”54 Theophanes’s reference to Chrysopolis (modern Üsküdar) and Ṭabarī’s reference to “the gulf of the sea that is by Constantinople” (خليج البحر الذي على القسطنطينية) confirm Hārūn’s arrival at the Bosporus Strait.

The names of the generals involved in this campaign are potentially problematic. Theophanes’s “Bounousos” renders “Ibn Yūnus,” which appears in Ṭabarī’s version as “Rabī’ b. Yūnus.” Theophanes places Bounousos over Nakoleia (Seyitgazi), whereas Ṭabarī places Rabī’ over Nicomedia (İzmit). Either is possible, given that Ṭabarī has the campaign start in Mājida (Niğde), which would believably place Nakoleia en route. Theophanes’s “Bournike” has been read as “Barmakī,” citing the Syriac spelling in Michael the Syrian.55 This is circular reasoning, however, since Michael the Syrian’s text reads ܒܘܪܢܘܣܝ. Chabot’s reading of this name as “Bournikê” derives from Theophanes and not from the original Syriac.56 There is no reason to insert the Barmakids into this narrative, particularly since their involvement would likely have been noted in the Arabic texts. Bournike, and even more so the Syriac spelling Būrnsī, could also potentially render the nisba Burnusī as found in Khalīfa’s account of the Roman campaigns of 161/778. Sālim al-Burnusī was a mawlā of ʿĪsā b. ‘Ali, the great-uncle of the caliph who fought on the frontiers.57

Both Theophanes and Ṭabarī focus on the peace treaty that resulted from this ṣāʾifa, describing the jizya owed to the Caliphate over a three-year period. Lewond’s account of the campaign does not match those of Theophanes and Ṭabarī. Lewond claims that the caliphal forces negotiated to avoid starvation. Should Hārūn have been in such a crisis, on the brink of losing the war, it is not immediately clear why Eirene would have agreed to pay the Caliphate. The defection of Tačat, as noted in Lewond and Theophanes, makes sense of the circumstances of such a peace treaty. Theophanes, however, downplays the threat to the empire by claiming that the Roman Empire relented because their negotiators forgot to arrange for hostages before crossing the front line. Without Arab hostages, the Roman negotiators had no assurance of their own safety. Theophanes blames this predicament on Tačat, claiming that Tačat directed Hārūn to take advantage of the situation: “On his advice the Arabs asked for peace” (δοὺς αὐτοῖς βουλήν, ἀνήθεσαν εἰρήνην).58 This suggests that the Arab-Roman peace treaty, under whose terms the Roman Empire paid tribute to the Caliphate for several years, was a payment to save the lives of a few of Eirene’s supporters. This interpretation diminishes the threat to Constantinople. Lewond, by contrast, does not mention the Arab-Roman peace treaty at all but instead focuses on how Tačat was able to ameliorate the situation of the caliphal forces. In his telling, it was Tačat’s defection—rather than his advice in negotiation strategy—that turned the tide of the encounter to offer the upper hand to the caliphal forces. As the strategos of the Bucellarii, Tačat controlled a famous contingent of cavalry and a powerful theme in

54 Yaʿqūbī, Works, 3:1146; Taʾrīkh, 2:486. The translators render khalīj as “bay” instead of “gulf.” Note that Yaʿqūbī’s placement of this campaign in 164/781 is the only chronological discrepancy related to the sawāʾif found across these texts.
55 Theophanes, Chronicle, 629 n. 6.
56 Michael the Syrian, Chronique, 3:2; 4:480.
57 Pace Crone, who notes that he was the mawlā of Ismāʿīl, not ʿĪsā; Crone, Slaves on Horses, 194.
58 Theophanes, Chronicle, 629; Chronographia, 456.
close vicinity to Constantinople itself. Tačat’s defection would have challenged Eirene far more than Hārūn’s mere presence outside of Constantinople, especially since the caliphal troops were starving and so unable to threaten the city. Lewond’s account portrays Tačat as the linchpin of this campaign. Lewond’s focus on Armenian involvement means that the Arab-Roman peace treaty is largely inconsequential to his narrative. He alludes to a “written oath” (գիր երդման) [122r], but this is the agreement between Hārūn al-Rashīd and Tačat Anjewac’i, rather than a treaty with the empress Eirene.

The great variety of toponyms and personal names found in the sources relevant to this particular campaign indicates that there were multiple threads of transmission. Most historians agree on the broad strokes of what happened—namely, that Hārūn al-Rashīd raided as far as the shores opposite Constantinople in 165/782—but they do so in different ways and preserve different snippets of information (for a summary, see table 9). Unlike all of the other accounts of the 165/782 campaign, Lewond’s text does not even mention Constantinople. This, along with the lack of information about the Arab-Roman peace treaty, signals Lewond’s disinterest in the Roman Empire in this instance. He places the focus squarely on Tačat and his role as a champion of the Roman Empire and savior of caliphal forces.

**Table 9. Summary of information provided about the 165/782 campaign.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lewond</th>
<th>Khalīfa</th>
<th>Balādhuri</th>
<th>Ya’qūbi</th>
<th>Ṭabari</th>
<th>Theophanes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Places</td>
<td>The “gulf”</td>
<td>The “gulf,” Maṣṣīṣa</td>
<td>The “gulf” of Constantinople</td>
<td>Mājida, the “gulf” of Constantinople, Nicomedia</td>
<td>Chrysopolis, Nakoleia, Darenos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman forces</td>
<td>Tačat Anjewac’i</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Michael Lachanadrakon, Tačat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Hārūn-Tačat agreement</td>
<td>Hārūn’s return home</td>
<td></td>
<td>Arab-Roman peace treaty</td>
<td>Arab-Roman peace treaty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When we review the main accounts of the ṣawāʾif during the reign of Mahdi, certain trends emerge. The accounts of these campaigns are remarkably stable. The dates, regions, and commanders typically align across the Greek, Arabic, and Armenian sources. In all of these narratives, the ṣawāʾif are portrayed as centrally organized; the caliph and the emperor direct them. This correspondence does not imply that they were working with the same underlying source(s), as word choice, toponyms, and personal names do not provide clear indications of intercultural transmission. Instead, the stable core of the accounts indicates that the stories about the ṣawāʾif circulated widely. Through the stories we can see
common threads across languages, such as the anger of Mahdi following the Roman victories of 161/778 and the effort to shelter people in fortified cities along the frontier.

The stability of the storyline of the sawāʾif across religio-linguistic boundaries also sets Łewond’s or his sources’ narrative choices into relief. For example, he consistently excludes the names of most caliphal generals and all Roman generals. In particular, his reference to Michael Lachanadrakon without name, merely as “the other one” who “was from the Greek troops” (ուհին ի գործներ Պուրատի) [119r], reads as a calculated decision in light of Michael’s centrality to both Greek and Arabic accounts of the sawāʾif. The downplaying of Michael foregrounds Armenian participation in imperial service while also providing a thematic link between the first and second parts of this chapter in the figure of Tačat Anjewac’i.

XIV.C. THE CAREER OF TAČAT ANJEWAC’I

Tačat Anjewac’i provides an interesting case study of the mobility of elites in the second/eighth century as well as of the political relationship between the prince of Armenia and the caliphal governor, the military role of Armenian naxarark’ on the northern frontier, the relevance of loyalty in the Arab-Roman wars, and the significance of storytelling in medieval Armenia. Tačat’s name indicates that he belonged to the Anjewac’ik’, the ruling family of Zawazān/Anjewac’ik’ in Basfurrajān/Vaspurakan, though we lack any information about his early life.

XIV.C.1. The Chronology of Tačat’s Career

Łewond states that Tačat served Constantine V for twenty-two years, fighting “in the regions of the Sarmatians, who are called the Bulgars” (ի կողմանս˙ Սարմատացւոց անուալ կոչի Բուլկարք) [121v]. If we assume that he served straight through the reign of Constantine V (r. 741–75 ce), this means that he entered Roman service around 135/753. This date corresponds, roughly, to the implementation of Constantine’s policy to encourage Armenian emigration to Roman territory (on which see chapter XIII), but we find no explicit evidence to suggest that Tačat moved as a result of such policies. Łewond explains that Tačat “fled from the Ishmaelite prince” (փախստական իշխան Իսմաելի) [121r], which matches his usual couching of emigration as a flight from caliphal oppression. This phrase also implies that Tačat may have served the Caliphate before moving to Roman territory, hence his flight from the Ishmaelite prince specifically (instead of the Ishmaelites generally). Tačat served Constantine V until the latter’s death, then fought for his son Leo IV during the Roman attack on Syria in 161/778, as discussed above. Following the death of Leo IV in 780 ce, Tačat served the empress Eirene, who ruled on behalf of her minor son Constantine VI (r. 780–97 ce). Table 10 outlines the known facts of Tačat’s career.

Note that these accounts are out of order in Łewond’s text, possibly because he relied on two different sources. The first source included a passage on the Roman raid into Syria during the reign of Leo IV and mentioned Tačat’s activities in passing. The second source provided a more detailed account of Tačat’s military career, beginning with his service under Constantine V. This foray into an earlier period allows us to speculate about how
Łewond edited his text. He curates the chronological inconsistencies through narrative markers such as the phrase “whom we mentioned earlier” (զորմէ յառաջագոյն պատմեցաք) [121r]. He also acknowledges vaguely that the earlier events happened “at some time” (երբեմն) [121r], as they should rightly have appeared in his account of Manṣūr’s caliphate. Łewond then jumps awkwardly over the deaths of two emperors in a single statement, even though he has already noted their deaths in the proper place on folios 118v and 120v, respectively: “Then after the death of Constantine [V] and his son Leo [IV], Constantine [VI] held power” (Իսկ յետ վախճանին Կոստանդնի և Լեւոնի որդոյ նոր. և ունել զթագաւորթի և ն Կոստանդնի) [121v]. The repetition of their deaths ends the flashback to Constantine V’s reign and brings the reader back to Łewond’s point of interest in the affairs of 165/782.

In the Arabic sources, Tačat appears as a Roman general who countered the ṣawāʾif. He comes across not as a significant player but rather as a single (albeit named) soldier serving among the tens of thousands under the command of Michael Lachanadrakon. Tabari describes the 164/781 raid led by ʿAbd al-Kabīr b. ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd in Ḥadath—notably, a campaign that Łewond omits entirely from his narrative. Ṭabarī explains that “Michael the Patrician met him [ʿAbd al-Kabīr], it is said, with about ninety thousand men, among them Tačat the Armenian the Patrician. ʿAbd al-Kabīr lost heart before him and prevented the Muslims from fighting and returned” (فأقبل اليه ميخائيل البطريرك فيما ذكر فيها نحو من تسعين الفا ففشي طائران الأمنيم البطريرك ففشل عنه عبد الله ومنع المسلمين من القتال وانصرف). Although Ṭabarī discusses Hārūn al-Rashīd’s campaign to Constantinople in 165/782 at length, including the peace treaty with Eirene, he does not refer to Tačat or his defection in that narrative. In Ṭabarī’s text, therefore, Tačat appears as a servant of the Roman Empire, repelling the 164/781 ṣāʾifa without hint of anticipation of his defection.

59 Theophanes acknowledges Tačat as strategos of the Bucellarii during the reign of Leo IV in the year am 6270/777–78 ce. Tritle, “Tatzates’ Flight,” 283; Theophanes, Chronicle, 623; Chronographia, 451. Tritle claims that Łewond attests to Tačat’s appointment to the Bucellerion theme under Constantine V, but this claim cannot be substantiated.

60 Ṭabarī, History, 29:217; Taʾrīkh, 3:501; see also Khalīfa, Taʾrīkh, 288. Tritle reads Ṭabarī’s عن to refer to Tačat, but this is open to debate; Tritle, “Tatzates’ Flight,” 288.
Unsurprisingly, Theophanes’s ninth-century chronicle focuses on Tačat’s defection from Roman service under the year AM 6274/781–82 CE:

But Tačat, the strategos of the Bucellarii, defected to the Arabs because of his hatred toward the eunuch Staurakios, the patrician and logothete of the Course, who at that time was at the head of everything and administered all matters. On his advice the Arabs asked for peace. When Staurakios, the magistros Peter, and the domesticus Antony went forth on this mission, they did not take care to receive explicit promises to take the children of the Arab leaders as hostages. Instead, they went out heedlessly and were seized by them and put into chains. So both sides were obliged to make peace. The Augusta [Eirene] and Hārūn exchanged many gifts and agreed that at stated times [tribute] should be paid to the Arabs. After peace had been concluded they departed, abandoning also the fort of Nakoleia. Tačat took away his wife and all his possessions.

The rationale for Tačat’s defection, which cost him the power and wealth associated with his position as strategos, is explicit in both histories. Whereas Theophanes claims that the general disliked Staurakios, Lewond instead places the blame directly on the empress Eirene, who “treated him with disdain” (հեռութեամբ վարէր առ նա) [121v]. L. Tritle argues that Lewond’s account is logically sounder than Theophanes’s. The heart of the problem was Eirene’s agenda to protect her son’s position, so she worked to dislodge from power anyone who had wielded influence during the reigns of Constantine V or Leo IV. It is worth noting, however, that Lewond’s criticism of Eirene is not at odds with Theophanes’s blame of Staurakios, as the latter was one of Eirene’s trusted generals.

From the perspective of caliphal history, Tačat is an interesting example of a member of a transregional elite who was able to navigate imperial politics successfully. His story also demonstrates caliphal involvement in the recognition of the prince of Armenia in an instance that is particularly notable because the ‘Abbāsids had previously acknowledged only scions of the Bagratuni family in this position. Further, the descriptions of Tačat’s career demonstrate the fault lines between the caliphs in Baghdad and their provincial representatives. When Tačat arrived in Armenia, the caliphal governor ‘Uthmān refused to acknowledge him, sought to convince the caliph to revoke Tačat’s appointment, and

61 Theophanes, Chronicle, 629; Chronographia, 456.
63 For a list of princes of Armenia in the ‘Abbāsid period, see Laurent and Canard, L’Arménie, 404–6; Ter-Levondyan, “Hayoc’ išxana.” Canard lists Mušel Mamikonean as išxan from 748 to 753 CE but rightly notes that “son principat ne fut pas reconnu, semble-t-il par la nouvelle dynastie.”
prevented Tačat from seeking help from Baghdad. These actions suggest that ʿUthmān was threatened enough by Tačat to risk disobedience. Lewond explains ʿUthmān’s actions as caused by his concern about Tačat’s defection, as if Tačat might turn on the Caliphate in the same way he turned on the Roman Empire. Nevertheless, the caliph blamed ʿUthmān for Tačat’s death and replaced him as governor. The interplay between ʿUthmān, Tačat, and Mahdī underscores the delicate triangulation often required in caliphal governance in the provinces.⁶⁴

XIV.C.2. Tačat’s Death

Lewond describes Tačat’s death during a campaign against the Khazars in Albania at Bāb al-Abwāb/Darband thus:

He [ʿUthmān] called Prince Tačat, the sparapet Bagarat, Nersēh Kamsarakan, and others from among the Armenian naxarark’ in the days of the burning dawn of Hephaestus’s fiery head. He pitched his camp in the field called K’eran in the terrible and intolerable temperatures of excessive burning heat. He spent the entire summer in the furnace-like, rocky field. The Armenian naxarark’ were not able to endure it and they died from the burning air, which was perilous and took their lives.

Although Lewond’s description apparently ascribes the deaths of the Armenian naxarark’ to the high temperatures, his word choice—Hephaestus, perilous burning air—evokes volcanoes and so suggests that the forces may have faced more than just the usual summer conditions.

Medieval Arabic descriptions of the Caspian coast include references to erupting volcanoes, which may have contributed to the violent weather conditions described by Lewond. Masʿūdī, for example, describes the coast of the Caspian Sea up to the oil fields of Bākuh and adds:

In the oil-bearing area there is a volcano that is one of the fire-spitting springs; it does not rest at any time and emits long jets of flame. Off this coast lie several islands: one of these lies at three days’ distance from the coast and possesses a huge volcano that at certain periods of the year emits a hissing sound, and a great flame appears from it and flashes into the air as high as the highest mountains. It lights up the major part of the [Caspian] Sea, and this phenomenon can be seen from land at a hundred farsakhs’ distance. This volcano resembles Mount Burkān in Sicily, which lies within the dominion of the Franks and [in the proximity of] Ifrīqiyya of the Maghrib.⁶⁵

⁶⁴ For a study of early ʿAbbāsid Syria, see Cobb, White Banners, chapter 2.
For "volcano," Masʿūdī uses the word اطمة, which renders the Greek ἀτμίς, "steam" or "vapor." This term may refer to the same sort of noxious air apparently described by Lewond, particularly given the comparison to Mount Etna in both the Arabic and the Armenian (in the latter through the evocation of Hephaestus). Other Arabic geographies and travelogues refer to the naphtha and oil fields of Bākuh, though without the streams of fire that rivaled mountains—a dramatic claim, given the proximity of the Caucasus. Masʿūdī’s flame-spitting volcano on the Caspian may explain the extreme conditions along the coast, indicating that Tačat and his companions died of more than mere heat exhaustion.

Lewond’s passage on the death of Tačat may build on broader associations with volcanoes in Greek texts. Strabo (Geog. V.4.7) describes the smells of Gulf Lucrinus near Mount Vesuvius in similar terms, reporting that “immediately above the city lies the Forum of Hephaestus, a plain shut in all around by exceedingly hot ridges, which in numerous places have fumaroles that are like chimneys and that have a rather noisome smell; and the plain is full of drifted sulphur” (ὕπερκεῖται δὲ τῆς πόλεως ευθὺς ἡ τοῦ Ἡφαίστου ἀγορά, πεδίον περικλειμένον διαστύρως ὄψεως, καμινώδεις ἐχόσας ἀναπνοὰς πολλαχῶς καὶ βρωμώδεις ἱκανῶς: τὸ δὲ πεδίον θείου πλῆρες ἐστὶ συρτοῦ). The word translated here as "like chimneys" is καμινώδεις, which literally means "ovenlike"; this compares well to Lewond’s հնոցաձև. Both καμινώδεις and հնոցաձև are exceedingly rare. Their appearance in similar contexts may suggest a common literary trope related to volcanoes. These rare words and the evocation of Hephaestus indicate that Lewond’s information may have derived from a Greek milieu. This supposition is further supported by Lewond’s use of the rare Armenian toponym “Caspian Gates” (Կասպիան Պուլս), which renders the Greek Κάσπια πύλαι. This term does not exist in Arabic texts, which instead refer to the Darband pass as the “gate of gates” (باب الأبواب) for the Iranians and Arabs.

XIV.C.3. The Afterlife of Tačat’s Story

The history of Pseudo-Šapuh Bagratuni reveals the popularity that the story of Tačat enjoyed in medieval Armenia long after his death. Pseudo-Šapuh includes an extended discussion of the career of Tačat Anjewac’ī. According to Pseudo-Šapuh, Mahmat the king of Baghdad (presumably meaning Muhammad al-Mahdī) had been friendly to Tačat. One of Tačat’s men, however, killed Mahmat’s unnamed son. The death of the caliph’s son forced Tačat to flee to the land of the Greeks, where the king Phokas “recognized him,
honored him, and appointed him *katapan* ([կատապան] *to* render *κατεπάνω*) opposite Tarsus’ (*ճանաչ զնայ և մեծարեաց և կացոյց զնայ* *կատապան* ընդդէմ Տարսոյ). Mahmat subsequently sent campaigns against the Greeks to avenge his son’s death. This account places Tačat at the heart of the Arab-Roman wars, not only as a main protagonist but also as the very impetus for the *ṣawāʾif*. Pseudo-Šapuh describes the *ṣawāʾif* as wars between the Romans (switching from the Greeks) and the Babylonians, headed by another son of the king of Baghdad.

According to Pseudo-Šapuh, Tačat, at the head of a Roman army and dressed as a Roman, defeated the Babylonian army at Tarsus and then came across Musē, the caliph’s son, lost and defeated on the battlefield. He invited Musē into his house, traveled to receive praise from the Roman king for his military success, and then returned to Zawazân/Anjewac’ık’. Tačat next presented himself at court in Baghdad along with the caliph’s son, announcing: “I have come from the Roman Empire in order to serve the king” (*ես եկել եմ Հոռոմոց աշխարհէն* ․*զի ծառայեմ արքային*). He feigned ignorance of what had befallen the royal family. The chamberlain recounted the deaths of both of the caliph’s sons, the first in Zawazân/Anjewac’ık’ and the second in battle with the Romans, and said that the caliph remained in mourning. This set up the dramatic reveal, when Tačat theatrically produced Musē, the son who had reportedly died on the battlefield, and so transformed himself from enemy to ally. Pseudo-Šapuh has Tačat exclaim: “Hear, O king; I am Tačat, and this is your son Musē, who they said had been killed. But behold, happy are you, since here is your son alive” (*Լուր, արքայ, ես եմ Տաճատ, և այս է որդին քո Մուսէ, որ ասացին թէ ապանված է և, ա՜մ երանի քեզ զի ահա որդիտ քո կենդանի է*). The caliph fainted and then wept before assigning the governorship of Armenia to Tačat. In Pseudo-Šapuh’s account, two Armenian *naxarark’* subsequently killed Tačat, which led the caliph (still “Mahmat,” referring to Mahdi) to send his general Bughā.

Clearly, Pseudo-Šapuh has recast events of the second/eighth and third/ninth centuries, and his version does not align with the established narrative of early caliphal history. All of the other accounts described above identify the son of the caliph Mahdi who fought on the frontier against the Roman Empire as Hārūn al-Rashīd (Mahdi’s younger son, r. 170–93/786–809) instead of Mūsā al-Hādī (Mahdi’s older son, r. 169–70/785–86). Moreover, Pseudo-Šapuh’s history confuses other elements of the second/eighth and third/ninth centuries, most noticeably the caliphal campaigns under Bughā, which took place in the 230s/850s under Mutawakkil (r. 232–47/847–61) instead of under Mahdi.

Nonetheless, Pseudo-Šapuh exhibits a narrative perspective that resonates with Łewond. Like Łewond, Pseudo-Šapuh casts Tačat in a central role, as a key player in the major campaigns across Anatolia. This perspective separates Łewond and Pseudo-Šapuh from the Arabic tradition. Further, although all of our sources construe the *ṣawāʾif* as imperially driven campaigns, neither Łewond nor Pseudo-Šapuh give much attention to

---

69 The title *κατεπάνω* is first attested in the fourth/tenth century, which points to the later composition of Pseudo-Šapuh’s text.


72 Bagratuni, “Anonymous Storyteller,” 212; *Patmut’iwn*, 141.

73 On these, see Vacca, “Conflict and Community.”
the imperial actors. As discussed above, the Arabic and Greek sources, unlike Lewond, frequently preserve details about the generals and forces in the field. Pseudo-Šapuh’s reading of Armenian history into imperial history differs from Lewond’s, however, in that he projects the ṣawā’if into a timeless biblical framework. He accomplishes this by switching the Romans and the Greeks, on the one hand, and the Babylonians and the Caliphate, on the other.

Although Pseudo-Šapuh’s history cannot corroborate any details in Lewond’s narrative as “true” or “correct,” it can help us understand the story’s circulation in the medieval period. For example, we suggested above, following Tritle, that Tačat may have been in the service of the Caliphate before he moved to the Roman Empire given Lewond’s oblique comment that Tačat had fled the Ishmaelite prince, which is an unusually specific way to refer to emigration from Armenia. Pseudo-Šapuh confirms that the popular version of the story did indeed have Tačat defect twice, first from caliphal service and then from the Roman Empire.
XV

The Caliphate of Mūsā al-Hādī
r. AH 169–70/785–86 CE

Łewond’s fifteenth chapter is short, reflecting the length of the caliphate of Mūsā al-Hādī. Łewond’s main concern in this period is the fate of three Arcruni brothers. He does not offer a clear explanation for their imprisonment beyond the malicious nature of the caliph and his governor, Rawḥ b. Ḥātim al-Muhallabī. However, Arabic sources and the Armenian martyrology of the brothers note an Armenian rebellion during the reign of Hādī; if the Arcruni’ in fact rebelled, Łewond either did not know about the rebellion or was not interested in recording it. One of the Arcruni brothers subsequently converted to Islam and the other two were executed. Łewond also recounts the execution of a Georgian prince during the reign of Hādī. Coming after a critique of the caliph’s murderous personality, the caliphal governor’s warlike agenda, and an extended description of the Arcruni martyrs, the execution of an unnamed Georgian prince suggests that Łewond hoped to establish the death of the Arcruni’ as part of a broader program of caliphal bloodlust and destruction.

ENGLISH TRANSLATION

47. Then after him, Mūsā succeeded his father [Mahdī] for a year. He was a noxious, licentious, and possessed man who was so driven by a demon in him that to entertain himself in games of unworthy behavior, he used to place men instead of targets and shoot arrows at them for his own practice. As soon as he hit them, he killed them.

When he established his authority, [124r] he sent a certain Khuzayma, who was truly hellish and warlike as his name suggests, over this land of Armenia to replace Rawḥ. When he arrived in the city of Duin, all of the Armenian naxarark’ came before him. The princes of the Arcruni house, Hamazasp, Sahak, and Mehrużan, came before him. But the malicious enemy saw the charming beauty of their countenance and the adornment of their noble regiment that was with them and immediately arrested them. He consigned the brave and prime generals to prison and kept them chained and imprisoned for a period of three...
He sent a complaint about them to Mūsā the Ishmaelite prince and received an order from the latter to execute them. He had the order for their death and the unjust sentence of anger brought to the prison where they kept the blessed martyrs locked up.

When the death sentence was read over them, the imprisoned asked a certain one of them [the Arabs] called Qutayba, who was the nicest and friendliest to them: “Tell us,” they said, “how we can escape this unjust death that we are caught in.” He said to them: “There is no way at all for you to survive his clutches. However, if you commit yourself to converting to our faith and believing the voice of our prophet, you will escape the snare of death.” Meḥružan heard this order and was terrified of ephemeral death, so he delivered himself to the eternal perdition of Gehenna. He crushed the sweet yoke of faith in Christ and separated from the flock of the Lord. He donned the form of a wolf and condemned himself in the eternal court. But since he did this unwillingly and out of the fear of death that overcame him, perhaps Christ will have mercy on him for his sincere repentance.

But the victorious martyrs donned the cuirass of faith and fortified their heads with the helmet of salvation. They said to him: “God forbid that we should trade God’s truth for lies, eternal for temporal life, perpetual for transitory glory, or Christ, the hope of all, for a little bit of our blood.” In this way, during the time of their imprisonment, they trained each other, saying: “O brothers, we have sufficiently enjoyed the glory of this transient world. But from this moment on nothing will seduce us: not greatness, not fleeting glory, not gold-embroidered tunics in our honor, not love of our relations, not tenderness for our children, nor any other imminent goods, which many desired, [thereby] inheriting irretrievable perdition.” In this way they encouraged each other during the afflictions of prison.

---

1 <Months>: the manuscript reads “years,” probably reflecting a scribal error caused by confusion of the letters -un- and -u-. Hamazasp and Sahak Arcruni were martyred during the reign of Hādī, which lasted only fourteen months (or just one year, according to Lewond).

2 Cf. Matthew 11:30.

3 Cf. Matthew 7:15; Acts 20:29. See also the vision of Saint Gregory the Illuminator in Agat’angelos, History of the Armenians, §740; Aleksidze, “Visions.”

4 Cf. 1 Thessalonians 5:8.
and, united with God in prayer, asked to inherit the expectation of hope in the world to come. When the time arrived for them to finish running the race of martyrdom in the days of the holy and glorious Epiphany of Christ, which the ranks of the faithful in Christ observed solemnly for eight days, the operator of injustice ordered them called before the tribunal. He knew in advance about the valor of their hearts and the warmth of their faith in Christ, so he did not repeat those words to them. Instead, he led first the blessed Sahak into the arena.

The instrument of torture [126r] that they prepared was new. They planted forked branches of wood into the firm ground, secured unshakably on the right and the left. They placed the martyr between them and beat the forked branches of wood into his armpits. They bound his hands to the wood and tied them tightly. Hitting his back with a cudgel, they tortured him greatly until his body was completely torn apart. They kept the blessed Hamazasp in chains outside. He prayed to the Lord in his heart. His lips did not move and his words were not audible, but from his heart alone he cried out, weeping. He called on the Lord for assistance against the danger in which they stood. When they had tortured him [Sahak] violently in that way, they unchained him from the bitter bonds and brought the blessed [126v] Hamazasp to the same place of tortures and bound him in the same way between the two pieces of wood. They tortured his back even more bitterly as he bore the tortures even more courageously. After that, the judge gave the order to kill them by the sword. When the executioner heard his order, he immediately drew his sword over them and cut off their heads. In that way they remitted their souls and left this world.

The next day he [the judge] gave the order to hang their bodies from a cross, and he assigned soldiers over [them] lest any Christians steal and bury their bodies. For the lawless judge was impotent at heart, and after their deaths he refused to sweeten the bitterness of his heart. Instead, he brought [them] down from the cross and burned the bodies and bones of the blessed [127r] generals with fire. He did not even spare the ashes for burial but delivered them

---

5 “Sword,” qarmūlī, lit. “swords.”
6 “From a cross,” ḥ ṣarmūl, lit. “from wood.”
7 “From the cross,” ḥ ṣarmūlū, lit. “from the wood.”
to the waters of the river. For the increase\(^8\) of a momentary, light affliction will work <the greatness>\(^9\) of glory in them, according to the apostolic saying,\(^{10}\) and in return, the generosity\(^{11}\) of the Rewarder\(^{12}\) will recompense them one hundredfold, according to the promise of the Lord that “everyone who leaves father or mother or wife or son or land for the sake of My name will receive one hundred times as much in this world and will inherit eternal life.”\(^{13}\) This took place during the reign of Mūsā, under the governorship of Khuzayma, in the days of the holy Epiphany of the Lord in the year of the Armenians 233.

Mūsā reigned for one year and died. In those days, he also killed the prince of the Georgians in a horrible death, for he removed his feet and hands\(^{[127v]}\) and cut his youthful age in half. Thus reckoned like a lamb for slaughter, he bid farewell to this life. Having completed all of these evils, he [Mūsā] died after a year.\(^{14}\)

---

\(^8\) “The increase”: the text reads “through the increase,” with “increase” in the instrumental case. On the basis of the biblical text, we suggest that the scribe misread the abbreviated form of the nominative singular, յաճախութի`, as the abbreviated form of the instrumental singular, յաճախութբ`.

\(^9\) “<The greatness>”: the scribe originally miscopied զմեծութիւն, “the greatness,” as զմերժումն, “the repulsion,” but then indicated that it should be expunged. The scribe did not provide any text to replace it; we have supplied the reading զմեծութիւն on the basis of the biblical reference.

\(^{10}\) Cf. 2 Corinthians 4:17.

\(^{11}\) “Generosity,” պարգեւատուն: in the manuscript the word is in the nominative plural, but no plural is attested for this word. We suggest that the scribe mistakenly copied the marker of the definite, -ու, as the ending of the nominative plural, -պ, thus պարգեւատութիւն. Martin-Hisard has plausibly suggested that the noun may have been in the instrumental singular, պարգեւատումբ, but such a reconstruction renders the translation of պարգեւատու (pargewatu) awkward: “through the generosity of the Rewarder, He will recompense. . . .”


\(^{13}\) The citation is an abridgment and slight conflation of Matthew 19:29 and Luke 18:29–30.

\(^{14}\) In her translation, Martin-Hisard adds “for the glory of Satan” to the end of the final sentence. She has, however, misread Tēr-Vardanean’s apparatus. Hakobian also does not include this final phrase in the edition facing Martin-Hisard’s translation, judging it to have been an addition.
XV. THE CALIPHATE OF MŪSĀ AL-HĀDĪ

ARMENIAN EDITION

The Armenian edition is not fully transcribed and appears to contain ancient Armenian script and text. The content is not readily interpretable without a competent reader of the language.

15 [Jut, Ift. mg.]
16 չարդոր [չարդոր a.c.]
17 փքում [փքում a.c.]
18 ուր [տաք ար ամ.]
19 պատու (հիս. a.c.]
20 տար [տար a.c.]
21 Մերուժան [Մերուժան a.c.]
22 զույց [Կերոսին]
AN ARMENIAN FUTŪḤ NARRATIVE

26 կերպարչություն| |-subscr.
27 ուղղարձակություն| |-subscr.
28 հասարակություն| |-subscr.
29 պատմություն| |-subscr.
30 կեց| |-subscr.
31 զարդարվել| |-subscr.
32 կանխակարուցվել| read: կանխակարուցվել (cf. 2 Corinthians 4:17).
33 զարդարվել| read: զարդարվել (cf. 2 Corinthians 4:17).
XV. THE CALIPHATE OF MŪSĀ AL-HĀDĪ

COMMENTARY

XV.A. CALIPHAL GOVERNANCE

At the end of the caliphate of Mahdī, Łewond introduces Rawḥ as a replacement for the governor ʿUthmān b. Umāra: the caliph “revoked his [ʿUthmān’s] authority and sent his replacement, a certain Rawḥ, to be prince and governor of this land of Armenia. Muḥammad reigned for eight years and, on the arrival of Rawḥ, died” (Խազմայ Khazm a.c. 34). Łewond provides the following list of the governors of ʿAbbāsid Armenia: Ḥasan b. Qaḥṭaba, ʿUthmān b. ʿUmāra, Rawḥ b. Ḥātim al-Muhallabī, Khuzayma b. Khāzim, and Yazīd b. Mazyad. This passage allows us to identify Łewond’s second Rawḥ as Rawḥ b. Ḥātim al-Muhallabī. Łewond also referred to a man named Rawḥ in Armenia earlier in his text, immediately before the battle of Baghrawand/Bagrewand in 158/775 during the reign of Manṣūr (100r). The designation of the first Rawḥ as an “Ishmaelite general” (زامیکار) is inconclusive, as the term “general” was applied to both the leader of troops and the governor. It remains possible that the Rawḥ whom Lewond places in Armenia during the reign of Manṣūr was one and the same as Mahdī’s governor, Rawḥ b. Ḥātim al-Muhallabī. The latter had served as Manṣūr’s governor over Ṭabaristān as early as 144/761–62 and so was already in caliphal service by the time Lewond first notes the appearance of a Rawḥ in Armenia.35 However, given that Rawḥ is a relatively common name, we have no reason to assume that Lewond’s two Rawḥs are in fact the same person.

When Hādī came to power in 169/785, he recalled Rawḥ from Armenia to respond to the situation along the Roman frontier. That winter, heavy snowfall caused the flimsy buildings of Ḥadath to collapse and the Greeks to abandon the city. Hādī responded by mustering a force to take the city: “The report reached Mūsā [al-Hādī], so he assigned a contingent with Musayyib b. Zuhayr, a contingent with Rawḥ b. Ḥātim, and a contingent with Ḥamza b. Mālik. But Mūsā died before they executed [the campaign]” (وبلغ الخبر موسي يبلغ الخبر موسي) 36 There is reason to doubt that the campaign took place at all, as Hādī died in 170/786 before the planned campaign could take place, but it remains possible that Rawḥ left in order to take...

34 Խազմայ Khazm a.c.
35 Ibn Isfandiyār, Abridged Translation, 124; Tārīkh-i Ṭabaristān, 181.
36 Balādhurī, Futūḥ, 191. Bonner employs this passage to explain Rawḥ’s presence in Ḥadath and so the minting of Armenian coins in Hārūniyya; Bonner, “Mint of Hārūnābād,” 178.
command of his contingent before Hādī’s death. Rawḥ then appears as the governor of Ifriqiyya in that same year.37

Łewond’s second governor under Hādī, Khuzayma b. Khāzim, is somewhat easier to track in the historical record. Coins minted in Hārūniyya demonstrate that Khuzayma was already associated with Armenia during the reign of Mahdī, before he appears in the written record as a governor (fig. 16). His Hārūniyya coins explicitly identify the caliph, Mahdī, and the heir apparent, Hārūn al-Rashīd, in 169/785.38 On the basis of this evidence, M. Bonner argues that Łewond confused the dates of Khuzayma b. Khāzim’s governorship of Armenia and placed him in power later than expected from the numismatic record.39 However, the only evidence for Khuzayma’s role in Armenia during the reign of Mahdī is his Hārūniyya issue. The location of Hārūniyya remains uncertain, but scholars have typically followed Ibn Ḥawqal’s explanation that it was only one stage from Marʿash. Hārūniyya coins were thus minted along the Syrian frontier, far from traditional Armenian territory despite the fact that they bear the name Armenia.40 Even though these coins claim an Armenian provenance, we should not expect the governors and generals on the Syrian frontier against the Romans to play any significant role in the governance of Armenian territory proper (i.e., Dabīl/Duin). Khuzayma appears on the coins of Armenia proper precisely when we would expect him to do so according to Łewond’s account, namely, in 169/785–86 during the caliphate of Hādī.41 This same disconnect between the Hārūniyya

37 Ṭabarī, Taʾrīkh, 3:569. Bonner argues that Rawḥ’s activities on the frontier were connected to his role as governor of Armenia; Bonner, “Mint of Hārūnābād,” 177–78. However, he revisits this conclusion in Bonner, Aristocratic Violence, 79.


40 Ibn Hawqal, Surat al-ʿard, 188 explicitly placed Hārūniyya near the thughūr of Jazira: ومن الهارونيّة إلى شبعان من غربي جبل الكلام وفي بعض شCb (2) حصنا بناه هارون الرشيد، وامتنعته في غيابه، وخلاله مأهله، ونهاية هارون الرشيد فضلاً عن من قبل الروم، وبه تابعون على جبل الرمس، وقد ملكه الروم، وقد ملكه الروم، وقد ملكه الروم، وقد ملكه الروم، وقد ملكه الروم، وقد ملكه الروم.

41 Vardanyan, Islamic Coins, 64; Vardanyan, “Administration,” 224 n. 38.
issues and the governorship of Armenia appears again for Yazīd b. Mazyad (on whom see chapter XVI).

The Arabic sources on Khuzayma’s first term as governor of Armenia under Hādī are complicated. As seen above in Balādhurī’s list, his first term does appear in the historical record: Khuzayma is listed directly between Rawḥ b. Ḥātim (168/784–85) and Yazīd b. Mazyad (170/786–87). However, all other references in Arabic sources to Khuzayma’s role as governor date to the reign of Hārūn al-Rashīd. Khuzayma’s second term during Hārūn’s caliphate lasted much longer, from 187/803–4 to 192/807–8. As a result, general comments about Khuzayma’s conduct in Armenia cannot easily be assigned to Hādī’s reign. Most of the Arabic accounts of Khuzayma’s actions in Armenia (whether under Hādī, under Hārūn, or undated) align with the tenor of Lewond’s account. Lewond refers to him as “warlike” (juuqququp, offering the Armenian word xazm, “war,” as an explanation for the name Khuzayma. At the end of his list of ‘Abbāsid governors, Balādhurī concludes that “Khuzayma was the strictest of them in terms of governance. He was the one who introduced the cadastre in Dabīl [Duin] and Nashawā [Naxčawan], though it was not there before” (وكان خزيمة أشدهم ولاية وهو الذي سس المساحة بدبيل والنشاوي ولم يكن قبل ذلك).

In terms of caliphal governance, both Rawḥ b. Ḥātim al-Muhallabī and Khuzayma b. Khāzim al-Tamīmī display four traits common to many ‘Abbāsid governors of Armenia. First, both men had served as ‘Abbāsid governors in other provinces, rotating from one region to another. Rawḥ b. Ḥātim had served as governor over both Kūfa and Sind, whereas Khuzayma had served the ‘Abbāsids in Ṭabaristān, Baṣra, Jazīra, and Syria. ‘Abbāsid governors circled the Caliphate, rarely remaining in one place for more than a few years. Second, both Rawḥ and Khuzayma are associated with major caliphal campaigns, the former in Ṭabaristān and the latter against the Khazars. This similarity points to the presumed military capacity of the governorship of any province, which was perhaps particularly important on the frontier in Armenia. Third, both hailed from gubernatorial houses, that is, a small number of elite families whose members were often selected for governorships under the ‘Abbāsids. The Muhallabī family was famous for its near-dynastic control over ‘Abbāsid Ifrīqiyya, though scions of the house also appear as governors of Baṣra, Bahrayn, Sind, Ahwāz, and Mawṣil. The Banū Khāzim, by contrast, appear in Nuṣaybīn, Ṭabaristān, and Damascus. This pattern suggests that the ‘Abbāsids cultivated the loyalties of particular families and relied on social pressures to keep their governors in line. Members of both Banū Muhallab and Banū Khāzim appear in the courts of the caliphs in various capacities. Finally, both governors had a deep-rooted connection to Khurāsān. The Muhallabī family, descendants of Muhallab b. Abī Ṣufra al-Azdī, rose to prominence as governors of Khurāsān under the Umayyads. The Banū Khāzim hailed from Marw al-Rūdh and fought in the ‘Abbāsid Revolution. These trends in early ‘Abbāsid administration continued until the

42 Khalīfa, Ṭabarī, and Ibn A’tham do not refer to Khuzayma’s first term as governor of Armenia under Hādī. Ya’qūbī’s account, as discussed in detail below, records two terms for Khuzayma as governor of Armenia but places them both under Hārūn al-Rashīd.

43 Balādhurī, Futūḥ, 210. See also Ibn al-Faqīh, Mukhtaṣar, 294. Lewond claims that the cadaster was first launched during the reign of Hishām, on which see chapter IX.

44 Bonner, Aristocratic Violence, 77.

fourth *fitna*, when the integration of slave soldiers from Central Asia changed the practices established in the earlier period of the ‘Abbāsids’ reign.\\footnote{Vacca, “Khurāsāni and Transoxanian Ostikans.”}

**XV.B. THE DEATH OR CONVERSION OF THE ARCRUNI PRINCES**

Most of Łewond’s account of the reign of Hādī is occupied with the execution of two Arcruni brothers, Hamazasp and Sahak, and the conversion of a third brother, Mehružan, to Islam. The story of the martyrdom of Hamazasp and Sahak Arcruni has been published in two noncritical editions as well as in editions of the Armenian *Yażsmawurk’, or Synaxarion*. The Mxiṭ’arist monk Mkrtič’ Awgerian (Jean-Baptiste Aucher, 1762–1854) published the first version of the martyrdom in volume 6 of his *Liakatar vark’ ew vkeyut’ iwnk’ srboh* (‘Complete Lives and Martyrdoms of the Saints’).\\footnote{Awgerian, *Liakatar vark’*, 6:330–45.} Awgerian notes that his version was based primarily on what he labels *Caṙ ǝntir A* (‘Select Discourses A’). This text is identified with folios 273v–276v of a manuscript in the Mxiṭ’arist archive in Venice, MS 200 (olim 17), which dates to 1224 CE. The martyrlogy was published again in 1854 by the Mxiṭ’arist order in the series *Sop’erk’ haykakank’* (*Armenian Writings*), and this edition, too, used Venice MS 200 as one of its witnesses.

As discussed in detail below, it is clear that the martyrlogy did not rely on Łewond’s account for its narrative, so another version of the martyrdom must have been in circulation. Although it is not possible to date the emergence of that version, it must be earlier than the twelfth century, as the martyrdom is also included in a *Caṙ ǝntir* dated to 1186–87 CE and currently housed in the Matenadaran in Erevan (MS 3777). The popularity of the saints Sahak and Hamazasp predates manuscript evidence of their vitae, as both appear labeled as martyrs and witnesses (*մարտիրոսք եւ վկայք*) on the south facade of the famous fourth/tenth-century Church of the Holy Cross at Alt’amar (fig. 17). Their cult must have developed soon after their martyrdom.

**XV.B.1. An Armenian Revolt under Hādī**

Łewond offers no justification for the execution of the Arcruni brothers, but their martyrlogy claims that Hamazasp and Sahak were arrested on suspicion of fomenting revolt: “Because some sycophantic men made allegations about them at the court of the amirapet [i.e., the caliph] and were informers[, alleging]: ‘Those three Arcruni brothers are the cause of the rebellion of the realm of Armenia and [are] assisting the Greeks’” (puṣpūṣ ṣurp ṣwāʾil ʿalāʾil ṣawqʾi ʿalāʾil ʿalāʾil ʿalāʾil, ḥ ḥuʾufu ṣuhrāʾuḥuḥu ṣuhrāʾuḥu ṣuhrāʾuḥu ṣuhrāʾuḥu, ḥ ḥuʾufu ṣuhrāʾuḥu ṣuhrāʾuḥu ṣuhrāʾuḥu ṣuhrāʾuḥu, ḥ ḥuʾufu ṣuhrāʾuḥu ṣuhrāʾuḥu ṣuhrāʾuḥu ṣuhrāʾuḥu).\\footnote{Awgerian, *Liakatar vark’*, 331. Note that this text appears differently in the edition published in 1854, but a resolution would require examination of the relevant manuscripts.} This information tallies with that provided in the Arabic sources. Yaʿqūbi’s chronology of Khuzayma’s terms as governor of Armenia is skewed (see below), but he similarly claims that Armenians rebelled against the Caliphate during the reign of Hādī: “Armenia had rebelled following the death of al-Mahdi [169/785] and remained in
rebellion in the days of Mūsā [al-Hādí]. When [Hārūn] al-Rashīd appointed Khuzayma b. Khāzim al-Tamīmī over Armenia, he served there for a year and two months, bringing the province under control. The province was pacified and its people gave their obedience”

In this passage, Yaʿqūbī claims that Khuzayma arrived in Armenia only after the death of Hādī, which contradicts not only Łewond’s account but also the numismatic record. This passage certainly refers to Khuzayma’s first term as governor, since his second term lasted much longer.

This confusion between Hādī’s and Hārūn al-Rashīd’s reigns appears not only in Yaʿqūbī but also in the edition of the martyrology of Hamazasp and Sahak published in 1854. This text identifies both Hādī and Hārūn al-Rashīd as the leaders of the Tačiks (գլխաւորք Տաճկաց). This comment likely stems from the fact that Hārūn administered the North and assigned its governors even before he became caliph. Mahdī split the Caliphate administratively, naming Hārūn “viceroy” of the West, Azerbaijan, and Armenia

49 Yaʿqūbī, Works, 1177–78; Taʾrīkh, 2:515.
50 "Vkayabanutʻiwn srboč išxanacʼn Hamazaspay ew Sahakay,“ 64: “At that time, the chiefs of the Tačiks [were] Mūsā and Hārūn, sons of Muḥammad” (հ տաճակին իշխանականները արծիվ Փասարակ Սահակ և Ակնար իշխանականները Մուհամեդի երեխաները).
in 163/779–80.\(^{51}\) Ter-Levondyan has argued that Ḥārūn’s viceroyalty lasted through the caliphate of Ḥādī, given that Ḥārūn’s name appears on coins minted in Hārūnābād and Hārūniyya in both years of Ḥādī’s reign.\(^{52}\) Ṭabarī asserts that when Ḥādī came to power, he assigned Yahyā b. Khālid over the territory of the West, thereby deposing his brother Ḥārūn. Ḥādī then decided to deprive his brother of his claim to the Caliphate just as he had removed him from his appointment in the West.\(^{53}\) Ḥārūn’s name subsequently disappeared from the coinage of Armenia.\(^{54}\) Ter-Levondyan’s main point—that Ḥārūn had indeed governed Armenia during Ḥādī’s caliphate—is certainly correct, even if Ḥārūn was eventually deprived of this position in the power struggle with his brother. We might speculate that the displacement of events from Ḥādī’s reign into Ḥārūn’s stems from the blurry distinction between the two caliphs from the perspective of the North.

XV.B.2. The Identity and Location of the Caliphal Governor

Łewond claims that the Arcruni brothers were arrested and executed in Dabīl/Duin when summoned to take an oath of loyalty. By contrast, the martyrrology of the brothers relates that Mūsā (al-Ḥādī) was enraged at the Armenians’ rebellion and encouraged his brother Ḥārūn to seek revenge on them since Armenia had been entrusted to his care. The latter quickly sent a certain Yazīd as governor to Armenia, and with him he dispatched the chiliarch Khuzayma to suppress the revolt. Łewond does not mention anyone named Yazīd in Armenia during the reign of Ḥādī, but there are two possible explanations for his presence in the other texts on the Arcruni executions. First, Yazīd b. Usayd al-Sulamī minted undated copper coins in Armenia that numismatists have placed at the start of the reign of Ḥārūn al-Rashīd in either 170/786–87 or 171/787–88, though no texts corroborate his post at that time.\(^{55}\) Yazīd b. Usayd had served multiple terms earlier in the ‘Abbāsid period. Second, and more likely, the reference points to Yazīd b. Mazyad al-Shaybānī, who minted coins in Hārūniyya and Hārūnābād in 169/785–86 and 170/786–87, though he appears in written texts (including Łewond’s) as governor of Armenia only later, during the reign of Ḥārūn.

The martyrrology relates that Yazīd and Khuzayma subdued the princes peacefully and sent invitations to the three brothers to come to them in friendship. Before leaving, the Arcrunik’ entrusted their lands to Dawît’ Mamikonean. When Khuzayma saw them, he received them well and took them with him to Bardha’a/Partaw upon a pretext. Only there did he reveal his true intentions and make them choose between converting to Islam or death. Mehrūzan feared for his life and apostatized, but according to the martyrrology, Dawît’ Mamikonean killed him when he returned to his lands. The martyrrology’s placement of Khuzayma in Bardha’a/Partaw departs from Łewond’s reference to Dabīl/Duin, but it corresponds better with the Arabic sources. Ibn A’tham, for example, places both

\(^{51}\) Ṭabarī, Taʾrīkh, 3:500.

\(^{52}\) Ter-Levondyan, “Arminiayi ostikanneri žamanakagrut’yuna,” 121 n. 36; Vardanyan, Islamic Coins, 86, 88.

\(^{53}\) Ṭabarī, Taʾrīkh, 3:571. On the role of Armenia in the rivalry between Ḥādī and Ḥārūn, see Bonner, "Al-Khalīfa al-Mardī.”


\(^{55}\) Vardanyan, Islamic Coins, 115, 18.
Khuzayma and Yazīd b. Mazyad in Bardhaʿa/Partaw during the reign of Hārūn al-Rashīd, in the aftermath of the rebellion of Abū Muslim al-Shārī.\(^{56}\) It remains possible, then, that the details of any specific rebellion were confused, accounting for the divergent attributions of both dates and places.

XV.B.3. Description of the Patrimony of Armenian Nobles

According to Awgerian, the preamble to the martyrology of Hamazasp and Sahak includes the following description of the context: “At this time, the princes of Armenia were constrained by the oppression of the Muslim governors, who drove them out from their land, and each of the magnates sat in his own region and protected [it] from enemies. And since the greatest of all the magnates was Hamazasp Arcruni, he was reckoned the marzpan of the realm” (Յորում ժամանակի նեղեալ իշխանաց հայոց ի հարստահարութենէ այլազգի ոստիկանաց ի բաց վանեցին զնոսա յաշխարհէն. եւ իւրաքանչիւր նախարարք նստէին ի սեպհական գաւառս, եւ պահէին ի թշնամեաց։ Եւ զի մեծ էր ի մեջ ամենայն նախարարաց Համազասպ Արծրունի, նա որպէս մարզպան համարեալ լինէր աշխարհին).\(^{57}\) The passage is striking for its contrast in the use of the terms ոստիկան (“caliphal governor”) and մարզպան (marzpan, governor during the Sasanian Empire). Łewond does not employ either term in reference to governors or as an Armenian honorific. Even more remarkably, the description of the Armenian nobility in the martyrology of Sahak and Hamazasp seems to echo that given by Balādhurī about Armenia, in a passage that immediately follows his explanation of Khuzayma’s reputation as a harsh governor:

> The patricians of Armenia remained in their regions, each one among them defending his own region. Should one of his governors approach the frontier, they flatter him. If they see him display integrity and harshness, and he has strength and numbers, they contribute taxes to him and concede the oath of loyalty to him. If not, they disparage him and scorn his command.

Although Łewond does not use such language when discussing the specific context of the execution of Sahak and Hamazasp, Balādhurī’s description of the Armenian nobles resonates not only with the brothers’ martyrology but also with Armenian historiography more generally. We can compare this phrasing to Lewond’s references to the prosperous state of Armenia during the time of Grigor Mamikonean (in office as prince 661–85 CE), who “kept this land of Armenia in peace from all marauders and attacks” (խաղաղացոյց զաշխարհս Հայոց յարձակմանց) [12v–13r]. Similarly, Yovhannēs Drasxanakertc’i describes the period of peace established by King Smbat I Bagratuni with

---

56 Ibn Aʿtham, Futūḥ, 7/8:412.
57 Awgerian, Liakatar vark’, 330.
58 Balādhurī, Futūḥ, 210–11. The referent of the phrase عامل من عَمَاله (lit. “a governor from among his governors”) is unclear; grammatically, it seems to refer back to wāḥid, that is, a governor from each one of the patricians, but this makes no sense in the context.
Yūsuf b. Abī al-Sāj at the beginning of the fourth/tenth century as a time when “each one dwelled in his own patrimony and, taking possession of his own land, cultivated vineyards and planted orchards of olive trees and fruit trees” (բնակեցան իւրաքանչիւր ոք իւրեանց. եւ սեպհականեալ զերկիր, տնկեցին այգիս եւ արմատացուցի բուրաստանս ձիթենեաց եւ պարտիզաց). Finally, Aristakēs Lastivertc'i accentuates the instability of the region in the middle of the fifth/eleventh century by highlighting the opposite process: “The princes left their patrimonial inheritance and became wanderers in a foreign land” (ելին իշխանք ի հայրենի ժառանգութենէ իւրեանց, եւ եղեն պանդուխտ յօտար երկիր). It seems possible, then, that Balādhurī may have tapped into an Armenian rhetorical trope used to signal sociopolitical stability when he depicted the nobility of Armenia as remaining in their regions.

It should be noted, however, that it is not clear whether the preamble of the martyrology of the Arcruni brothers, which echoes Balādhurī, was originally part of the text or added later by Awgerian. The version published in 1854 is similar to that printed by Awgerian—it mentions the taking of the brothers to Bardhaʿa/Partaw and Dawit’ Mamikonean’s execution of Mehruzan—but it does not include the same preamble. Unlike Awgerian’s version, it recounts the siege of Constantinople, possibly confusing the reign of Leo IV with that of Leo III, during which the siege occurred. Awgerian may have rewritten the preamble to suit his own style, because in the notes to his text he cites the incipit of the martyrdom, which aligns with what is printed in Sop’erk’ hayakakank’, as well as the manuscript catalog of the Mxit’arist Library: “During the time of the kingdom of Emperor Leo . . . the oppression of the Tačiks over the Christians worsened and became stronger, and more than a few became martyrs in Syrian Mesopotamia and in the region of Cappadocia and in Arabia” (ընդ ժամանակս թագաւորութեանն Լեւովնի կայսեր ․ ․ ․ սաստկացեալ զօրանայր հարստահարութիւնն Տաճկաց ի վերայ քրիստովնէից․ յոլովք քան թէ սակաւք եղեն վկայք ի Միջագետս Ասորւոց և ի կողմանս Կապպադովկացւոց և յԱրաբիա). On the other hand, Awgerian may have supplied the text of his preamble from another manuscript or version, but we have not been able to locate that source.

XV.B.4. Dating the Execution of the Armenian Princes

Łewond dates the martyrdom of the Arcruni brothers explicitly to the feast of Epiphany of the year AE 233. That year started on May 14, 784, which means that Epiphany must have fallen on January 6, 785. This corresponds to 15 Jumādā II 168, before Hādi became caliph. It is possible that the scribe confused 233 and 234, writing q instead of թ. Step’anos Tarōnec’i, who drew on Łewond, records the date as AE 234, so according to him the Arcruni princes died on January 6, 786, or 25 Jumādā II 169.

59 Drasxanakertc’i, History, 158; “Patmut’iwn hayoc’?, 481.
60 Lastivertc’i, Patmut’iwn, 55.
62 Tarōnec’i, Universal History, 195 n. 364. Also note that this is one of the first uses of the Armenian era in a text, though it appears before this on an inscription at T’alin and in the seventh-century Anonymous Chronicle attributed to P’ilon Tirakac’i (cited above at IV.A.1), where the author dates a Khazar invasion of the Caucasus to AE 134.
XV. THE CALIPHATE OF MŪSĀ AL-HĀDĪ

After relating the martyrdom of the Arcrunik', the end of Łewond’s account of Hādī’s reign stitches together passages from separate sources:

Mūsā reigned for one year and died. In those days, he also killed the prince of the Georgians in a horrible death, for he removed his feet and hands and cut his youthful age in half. Thus reckoned like a lamb for slaughter, he bid farewell to this life. Having completed all of these evils, he [Mūsā] died after a year.

The martyrdom story thus segues into the list of caliphs, as Łewond follows the same pattern that he has used elsewhere to announce the death of each ʿAbbāsid caliph. Then, however, he inserts an additional sentence about the Georgian prince, only to reassert the caliph’s death immediately thereafter.

XVC.1. Dating the Execution of the Georgian Prince

The only Arabic source directly relevant to this passage includes a complicated dating. As we saw above, Yaʿqūbī incorrectly places both of Khuzayma’s terms as governor of Armenia during the caliphate of Hārūn al-Rashīd. The passage concerning Khuzayma’s campaign in Jurzān/K’art’li is consequently found later than expected, in his second term as governor:

Al-Rashid then appointed Khuzayma b. Khāzim al-Tamīmī, who seized the notables and princes and beheaded them; he treated the people very badly, and so Jurjān and the Şanāriyya rose in rebellion. He dispatched an army against them, but they killed him. He then sent Saʿīd b. al-Haytham b. Shuʿba b. Ẓuhayr al-Tamīmī with a large army. He fought the people of Jurjān and the Şanāriyya until he had expelled them from the province. He then departed for Tiflīs. Khuzayma b. Khāzim remained for less than a year.63

Then, when the reign of Khuzayma was ended, Harun al-Rashid appointed Khāzīm al-Tāmīmī, and he seized the nobles [and princes] and cut off their heads; he behaved very badly towards the people, so that Jurjān and the Şanāriyya rebelled. He sent an army against them, but they killed him. Then Saʿīd b. al-Haytham b. Shuʿba b. Ẓuhayr al-Tāmīmī, with a large army. He fought the people of Jurjān and the Şanāriyya until he had driven them out of the province. He then departed for Tiflīs. Khuzayma b. Khāzīm remained for less than a year.64

63 Yaʿqūbī, Works, 1180. Ibn Aʿtham does place Khuzayma in Armenia and Albania (though not Georgia specifically) in response to the later rebellion of Abū Muslim al-Shārī, during the caliphate of Hārūn al-Rashid. However, Saʿīd b. Haytham does not appear during that campaign, which leaves the interpretation of Yaʿqūbī’s passage open.

64 Yaʿqūbī, Taʾrīkh, 2:519.
This passage seems to have been corrupted, as the modern translators point out: the phrase “he dispatched an army against them, but they killed him” would read more easily if we presume there was a name in place of the word “army.” “Jurjān” should be read here as “Jurzān/K’art’li,” given the reference to both Tiflis/Tp’ilisi and the Ṣanāriyya/Canark’ (Σαναραῖοι), a Christian people who lived in Khākhiṭ/Kaxet’i. From textual and numismatic evidence, we know that Khuzayma served as governor under Hādī for one year (169/785–86) and then again under Hārūn for five years (187/803–4 to 192/807–8). Although Ya’qūbī places this report in the midst of events that occurred during Khuzayma’s second term as governor in the 180s, he also states explicitly that Khuzayma remained for only one year. It seems possible, then, that Ya’qūbī or his source correctly identified that the event occurred under Khuzayma’s rule, but incorrectly assigned the account to his second term as governor. If so, this account rightly belongs under Hādī’s caliphate instead of Hārūn’s.

XV.C.2. Identification of the Georgian Prince

The identification of the Georgian prince mentioned in Lewond’s text remains uncertain. Several Georgian notables were executed during the early ʿAbbāsid period, but none of them fits perfectly with the information provided by Lewond. It is perhaps more useful to acknowledge this passage as a general recognition that the reign of Khuzayma disrupted many lives beyond those of the Arcrunik’ than it is to seek in it corroboration of a specific historical account. Nevertheless, two primary candidates emerge as possible referents. First, Lewond could be referring to Habo of Tiflis/Tp’ilisi, an Arab perfumer who converted to Christianity and was martyred on 25 Jumādā II 169/January 6, 786. Habo’s Vita was composed soon after his death, between 786 and 790 CE. It identifies the date of Habo’s death with close attention to detail:

In the 846th year of the reigning of our Lord Jesus Christ, counted from his sufferings and his resurrection from the dead, when Kostantin the son of Leon was ruling over the Christians in the big city of Constantinople, and Mūsā, *amīr al-muʾminīn*, the son of Mahdī was ruling over the Saracens, when Samoel was the catholicos in K’art’li and Gurgen the son of Step’anoz was the erismt’avar [*presiding prince*], in the 6389th year counted from creation of the world, on the sixth day of the month of January, at the Epiphany, took place the martyrdom of the saint and blessed martyr Habo in the city of Tp’ilisi.

65 The shift from جرجان to جرزان is not an obvious scribal error, but it is also possible that the scribe was unfamiliar with the Ṣanāriyya and so placed them in the better-known province of Jurjān.

66 Ibn A’tham, in *Futūḥ*, 7/8:412, places him in Bāb al-Abwāb/Darband, Bardhaʿa/Partaw, and Armenia in the 180s, but he does not provide any information about Jurzān/K’art’li in particular.

67 Lewond, *Discours historique*, 210 n. 1036.

68 The patron of the *Vita* was reportedly Samoel, who was the catholicos of Jurzān/K’art’li until 690 CE, thus providing the terminus ad quem for its composition.

69 Bíró, “Abo’s Georgian *Vita*,” 258.
The Vita explains that Habo moved to Jurzān/K’art’li when he was young, around seventeen or eighteen years old, during the reign of Mahdi. He admired Christianity and reportedly converted during a stay outside of caliphal territory, in Khazaria. Upon returning to Tiflis/TP’lis, Habo lived there openly as a Christian for three years before being arrested for apostasy and beheaded. Habo fits some of the circumstances described in Lewond’s text. The date matches, though perhaps too neatly, the martyrdom of the Arcruni brothers on Epiphany in 786 CE. Lewond’s reference to the murdered prince’s young age also fits: if Habo was seventeen or eighteen when Mahdi came to power, he was martyred when he was around twenty-eight or twenty-nine years old. That said, it seems unlikely that Lewond would misidentify an Arab perfumer as a Georgian prince.

The second possible identification of Lewond’s Georgian prince is Arč’il, the prince of Khākhiṭ/Kaxet’i, who was similarly beheaded in 169–70/786.71 The Martyrdom of King Arč’il II records that a “Saracen” named Čičnaum the son of Mohamedi (ჭიჭნაუმ ძე მოჰამედი; Քիճնաում որդի Մահադեայ), “who was also called Asim” (որ և կոչէրն Ասիմ),72 attacked Jurzān/K’art’li and moved against Khākhiṭ/Kaxet’i fifty years after the campaigns of Murvan Qru (i.e., Marwān b. Muḥammad, who campaigned in the North, including Jurzān/K’art’li, several times in the 110s/730s). A convert to Islam convinced Asim that Arč’il knew where to find the treasures hidden by his forefathers, the Xosroiani kings of K’art’li, including the wealth of Herakleios, who had ventured through their territory. Arč’il explained to Asim: “Know well that I was young in age when Herakleios crossed this land” (უწყოდე მტკიცედ, რამეთუ მცირე ვიყავ ასაკითა, ოდეს-იგი განვლო ქუეყანა ესე ერაკლე მეფემან; Յորժամ էանց ընդ երկիրս մեր Հերակլ՝ տղայ էի ես).73 Herakleios passed through Jurzān/K’art’li in approximately 628 CE; if Arč’il was “young in age” then, he was a mere 160 years old by the time he spoke to Asim. S. Rapp argues that the anachronism here likely derives from the fact that Arč’il’s father, Step’anoz, and grandfather Adarnase shared names with generals of the first/seventh century, who did indeed live through Herakleios’s campaign.74 The History of Vaxtang Gorgasali includes an account of Herakleios’s hidden treasures and the first/seventh-century Arč’il’s knowledge of their location in Khākhiṭ/Kaxet’i.75

---

70 Sabanis-ze, “Camebay cmidisa,” 63.
71 Thomson, Rewriting Caucasian History, 251 n. 89.
72 Rapp, K’art’lis c’xovreba, 1:245 (Georgian), 2:204–5 (Armenian). The variants for Čičnaum in Georgian are ჭიჭნაუმ, ჭიჭნომ, ჭიჭუამ, and ჭიჭჳმ; there are no variants for this name in the Armenian. The variants for Mohamedi are მოჰამედი, მოჰამედი, მოჰამედი, მოჰედი, and მოჰხედი in Georgian and Մահաեիա and Մահադա in Armenian.
73 Rapp, K’art’lis c’xovreba, 1:247 (Georgian), 2:206 (Armenian).
74 Rapp, Studies, 472 n. 8.
75 Thomson, Rewriting Caucasian History, 240. Note that this Arč’il is also challenged for his knowledge of Herakleios’s treasures, but by Murvan Qru.
the second/eighth-century martyrrology of Arč’il merely compressed the generations of his family line. Arč’il’s story fits some of the circumstances outlined in Lewond’s account: Arč’il was a Georgian prince, killed by a “Saracen” named Asim (which may render the name Khāzim). It aligns particularly well with Yaʿqūbi’s statement above that Khuzayma b. Khāzim moved against the Ṣanāʾīyya/Canarkʿ in Khākhiṭ/Kaxetʿi. However, there are two reasons to doubt that Lewond’s “Georgian prince” was in fact Arč’il. First, Lewond also specifies that the Georgian prince was young in age, a detail that decidedly diverges from Arč’il’s story. Regardless of the obvious anachronism, Arč’il was old enough to have six children when he died. Second, there is no ready explanation for Asim’s full name’s being Čičnaum the son of Mohamedī.

In the end, the specific identification of the Georgian prince in Lewond’s text is perhaps less important than is the very fact that he includes such a reference at all. This passage suggests that Lewond was aware of stories circulating about Georgian elites, which locate the rule of Hādī and Khuzayma, in particular, in the broader context of the Christian communities of the North. Further, these passages align with references to both Armenia and Jurzān/K’artʿi in ʿAbbāsid-era Arabic texts; Lewond’s martyrs are Yaʿqūbi’s rebels.
LEWOND’S FINAL CHAPTER COVERS ONLY the first years of the reign of Hārūn al-Rashīd. Lewond breaks with his own precedent when he introduces the new caliph without specifying the length of his reign, probably because he brings his narrative up to his own day and thus does not know how long Hārūn al-Rashīd’s reign will last. In view of the dates of the caliphal governors and catholicoi (leaders of the Armenian Church) listed in this chapter, Lewond was likely writing in about the year 790. His primary concern in this chapter is the governorship of Armenia, and he lists several governors, including ʿUbayd Allāh b. Mahdī, the brother of the caliph. Lewond decries the state of Armenia under the heavy hand of these governors, focusing on oppressive taxation policies. He claims that many Armenians fled to Roman territory to escape taxation, while the catholicoi sought unsuccessfully to relieve the economic burden on the population. This is one of the few places where Lewond reports on the activities of the catholicoi in Armenia, as he is usually far more interested in military and political history.

ENGLISH TRANSLATION

48. After him [Mūsā al-Hādī] there was Hārūn the son of Muhammad and brother of Mūsā. He was avaricious and fond of money. And in the days of his rule, he had a rival in his brother ʿUbayd Allāh. On account of the rivalry between them, he divided [the kingdom] and gave his brother Atrpatakan and Armenia, along with Georgia and Albania. In accordance with his contrary disposition, he appointed over this land governors of licentious and perverse ungodliness who never paid heed to the fear of God. The first was a certain Yazīd b. Mazyad, and after him was ʿAbd al-Kabīr. He stayed for a short time and did not do any good or any evil but demonstrated some good sense. [128r] After him there was a certain Sulaymān, [who was] the wickedest evildoer of them all. After this, ʿUbayd Allāh himself came to the city of Partaw and established Sulaymān as prince of this land. He handed the people of the Lord over to him like

Hārūn al-Rashīd (r. 786–809): ʿAbbāsid caliph famous for his campaigns against the Romans and frequently immortalized in popular literature.

ʿUbayd Allāh b. al-Mahdī: the brother of Caliph Hārūn al-Rashīd who served as the governor of Armenia and Azerbaijan from 788 to 791.

Yazīd b. Mazyad al-Shaybānī: the governor of Armenia from 787 to 788 and then again from 799 to 801. The Shaybānī family, based in Mesopotamia, held a prominent position in caliphal Armenia.

ʿAbd al-Kabīr b. ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd al-ʿAdawī: in Arabic sources, he appears as the leader of campaigns against the Roman Empire. He served as the governor of Armenia for only four months, possibly in 789–90.

Sulaymān: Lewond’s Sulaymān has not been identified, but one Arabic text lists Sulaymān b. Abī Jaʿfar as a governor in the North. The uncle of both ʿUbayd Allāh and Hārūn, this Sulaymān was the son of the former caliph Manṣūr.
sheep among corrupting wolves. He placed the insupportable yoke of oppression over the people, who were not able to bear it, for no means were found in anyone’s possession to be of sufficient value in exchange for his life.

This Sulaymān sent his son-in-law, whose name was Ibn Dūqlih, a certain lawless and vile son of a slave woman from the Romans. He came to the city of Duin and tormented the inhabitants of this land with excessive harshness by exacting taxes, to the point that all of the naxarark and the commoners, along with the clergy and the catholicos, whose name was Esayias, gathered and begged to lighten the iron collar of oppressive taxes that he exacted. They did not gain anything, for the command of the Lord’s anger offered the Christian people into unmerciful hands. He then sent tax collectors to various regions in this land and ordered them to exact double the yearly tax and to gather it all at once. He carried out the order. When that was finished, the son of Satan immediately devised other evil punishments. He gave lead seals to put on everyone’s necks. For one seal he exacted many zuze, to the point of bringing abject poverty to people from the insupportable tribulations by the cruel executioner.

49. Then in the following year, when ʿUbayd Allāh came, he increased the same anguish even more, so that afterward no one owned their own goods, but they [i.e., the goods] were generally carried away as booty. Many left their flocks and fields voluntarily and fled so as not to bear the severe calamities. The enemy took captive their animals and possessions and carried them off as booty, whereas they [i.e., the people]—as they had been—deprived of their possessions in this way—then remained naked, barefoot, and starving, and they could not support themselves. They went afar and fled to the land of the Greeks. It is said that the number of people [who left] surpassed twelve thousand men with women and children. Their leaders were Šapuh from the house of the Amatunik’ and his son Hamam, and others from the Armenian naxarark and their cavalry. The lawless, cruel enemy pursued the fugitives with his army. He arrived at the borders of Georgia in the district of Kol. They battled with him and put [them] to flight and killed some. And they crossed the river Akampsis, which

---

rises up in the region of Tayk' and flows to the northwest, crossing through Egrstan to Pontus. When they crossed the river, the Greek king Constantine was immediately notified. He called them to him and honored the naxarark' and their cavalry. He settled the other masses on good and fertile land. But half of the people remained [in Armenia]; they were subjected to extreme poverty in slavish servitude. They were woodcutters and water carriers like the Gibeonites, some under grievous tribulations.

The hellish and cruel man who was the commander of the city of Duin on the authority of Sulaymān impiously pondered yet another wicked plan. For at that time the blessed Esayias, catholicos of the Armenians, of holy and correct faith, was taken up to Christ. He [Ibn Dūqlīh] thought to enumerate and examine all of the possessions and utensils of the Church. He called to him all of the attendant clergymen and intimidated them with menacing threats. He said: “See that you do not hide anything from me but bring everything forth. But if anyone should hide something and it appears later, he will be culpable for his life.” They, frightened by the threats of punishment, gave everything to him. They showed him everything that they found in the hidden treasuries, and nothing remained in hiding that they did not bring before him: coveted utensils of gold and silver, which also were covered by precious stones, and royal attire, which [130v] had been

---

2 After “people,” a later hand added “who,” npp.
donated in honor of the holy, glorious, and God-receiving altar and tabernacle of the Lord. When he saw all of that, he thought to take it as booty all at once. He changed his mind again and took what he considered desirable from the treasuries and the noble attire for himself. He gave the other utensils and whatever had once been in the consignment of the Church to the keepers of its deposits before Step’anos, who succeeded to the throne of the patriarchate through many bribes, succeeded to the throne of the patriarchate. He exhausted all of the things and possessions [of the patriarchate] until there was forgiveness for villages, servants, and debts.

And finally, the end.

ARmenian EDITION

4 Էստակ սորա կազմակերպեց Ստեփանոս Ամաղա՝ կապերով Սեմիրյա, նախագահ Սուլեմանի, ավանդական և արժեքագնական. Նա առաջինը կազմակերպեց տաճարի արևելյան առաջնորդին և բարուց իր որդին, Սեմիրյանների և աշխարհիկ հարկանյացության ցամաքի համար, երկրի հարավում այս կենտրոնական տաճարի և զեկուցական պահանջում ենթադրվում է, որ նրանք Ստեփանոսի տաճարի և նախագահ Սուլեմանի արևելյան առաջնորդին և կաթողիկոսին նախարարներ։ Նա կրեց Սուլեմանի տաճարի և նախագահ Սուլեմանի աշխարհի պահասպանություն, և սակայն նա ստիպված էր Սուլեմանի հետ վերել աշխարհի և նախագահ Սուլեմանի աշխարհի հետ համատեղ պահանջում ընդհանրանում և զանբառով պահասպանություն: Նա կրեց Սուլեմանի տաճարի և նախագահ Սուլեմանի աշխարհի պահանջում և սակայն նա ստիպված էր Սուլեմանի հետ վերել աշխարհի և նախագահ Սուլեմանի աշխարհի հետ համատեղ պահանջում ընդհանրանում և զանբառով պահասպանություն: Նա կրեց Սուլեմանի տաճարի և նախագահ Սուլեմանի աշխարհի պահանջում և սակայն նա ստիպված էր Սուլեմանի հետ վերել աշխարհի և նախագահ Սուլեմանի աշխարհի հետ համատեղ պահանջում ընդհանրանում և զանբառով պահասպանություն: Նա կրեց Սուլեմանի տաճարի և նախագահ Սուլեմանի աշխարհի պահանջում և սակայն նա ստիպված էր Սուլեմանի հետ վերել աշխարհի և նախագահ Սուլեմանի աշխարհի հետ համատեղ պահանջում ընդհանրանում և զանբառով պահասպանություն: Նա կրեց Սուլեմանի տաճարի և նախագահ Սուլեմանի աշխարհի պահանջում և սակայն նա ստիպված էր Սուլեմանի հետ վերել աշխարհի և նախագահ Սուլեմանի աշխարհի հետ համատեղ պահանջում ընդհանրանում և զանբառով պահասպանություն: Նա կրեց Սուլեմանի տաճարի և նախագահ Սուլեմանի աշխարհի պահանջում և սակայն նա ստիպված էր Սուլեմանի հետ վերել աշխարհի և նախագահ Սուլեմանի աշխարհի հետ համատեղ պահանջում ընդհանրանում և զանբառով պահասպանություն: Նա կրեց Սուլեմանի տաճարի և նախագահ Սուլեմանի աշխարհի պահա

5 Փրկված Փրկված ա.ե.
6 Փրկված Փրկված ա.ե.
XVI. THE CALIPHATE OF HĀRŪN AL-RASHĪD

In the reign of Hārūn al-Rashīd, the caliphate of the Abbasids reached its peak. In his time, Baghdad became the center of the Islamic world, and the caliph was considered the most powerful ruler on earth. Hārūn al-Rashīd was known for his wisdom, justice, and ability to govern effectively.

The caliphate of Hārūn al-Rashīd lasted from 786 to 809 CE. During his reign, the Abbasids expanded their influence and wealth, and the city of Baghdad became a center of learning and culture. Hārūn al-Rashīd was succeeded by his son, Hārūn al-ʿAṣwad, who continued the policies of his father.

7 a.c. 8 j. subscr. 9 j. subscr. 10 j. subscr. 11 j. subscr. 12 j. subscr. 13 j. subscr. 14 j. subscr. 15 j. subscr. 16 j. subscr. 17 Post suprascr. add. 18 j. subscr. 19 j. subscr.
COMMENTARY

XVI.A. THE RIVALRY BETWEEN HĀRŪN AL-RASHĪD AND ʿUBAYD ALLĀH

Lewond claims that Hārūn established the viceroyalty of the North in response to the rivalry between himself and his brother ʿUbayd Allāh: “On account of the rivalry between them, he divided [the kingdom] and gave his brother Atrpatakan and Armenia, along with Georgia and Albania” (بَيْنَا ʿاَبَاهُمَا تَوَارَّا) [3:607]. This rivalry between the brothers does not surface in the Arabic sources at all. Ṭabarī refers to ʿUbayd Allāh only once, to date the start of his governorship over Armenia to 172/788–89. Yaʿqūbī, whose information on Armenia is usually quite detailed, does not mention ʿUbayd Allāh in this context; he appears only in a list of the children of Mahdī and as a witness to the succession agreement between Amīn and Maʾmūn.

Bonner argues that Lewond is confused, reporting the succession disputes between Hādī and Hārūn in 169/785 as if they had taken place between Hārūn and ʿUbayd Allāh in 170/786. With barely more than a year between the two successions, Bonner’s argument offers a plausible explanation for the complete silence on the rivalry between Hārūn and ʿUbayd Allāh in the Arabic texts. However, it rests on the belief that Lewond’s chronology is skewed because it does not fit with the numismatic record of coins minted in Hārūn’s reign.

As we argue in reference to both Khuzayma’s governorship during the reign of Mahdī (see chapter XV) and Yazīd b. Mazyad below, Lewond’s chronology aligns very well with the

---

20 [创新能力] MS ripped in lower right corner, later repaired, p. 8, on repair.
21 由于 [创新能力] MS ripped in lower right corner, later repaired.
22 由于 [创新能力] MS ripped in lower right corner, later repaired, p. 9, on repair.
23 由于 [创新能力] read: 由于 [创新能力].
25 由于, Taʾrīkh, 3:607.
26 由于, Taʾrīkh, 2:506.
27 In addition, Bonner’s argument about Lewond’s references to ʿUbayd Allāh relies on Chahnazarian’s loose translation of Lewond’s jumūṣ (“in the days of his rule”) as “pendant tout le temps de son règne,” which leads Bonner to argue that Lewond cannot be correct because ʿUbayd Allāh did not serve as governor for the entirety of Hārūn’s reign.
coins issued in Armenia proper, instead of along the Roman frontier in Hārūniyya. Therefore, there is no reason to think that Lewond transposed the succession disputes.

Although it remains possible that Lewond records a succession dispute that does not appear in the Arabic sources, we cannot be certain what Lewond means by “rivalry” (hulqumunliprhi) in this particular case. Primogeniture was not assumed in the early ‘Abbasid period, so it was common for the sons of ‘Abbāsid caliphs to jockey for power. This passage may reflect Lewond’s own interpretation of ʿUbayd Allāh’s position as viceroy, based on his knowledge of the rivalry often involved in ‘Abbāsid succession politics and his own familiarity with the North, where ‘Ubayd Allāh’s ambitions may have been more visible. ‘Abbāsid heirs apparent frequently served as governor of the North, so the very fact of ‘Ubayd Allāh’s placement over Armenia may offer some substantiation to Lewond’s reading of the situation.

XVI.B. CALIPHAL GOVERNANCE

Lewond’s brief account of the first years of Hārūn al-Rashīd’s reign contains the names of several governors appointed over Armenia. These names allow us to speculate about the relationship between the ‘Abbāsid North and the broader Caliphate, as well as to identify patterns in early ‘Abbāsid governance.

XVI.B.1. The Viceroyalty

Lewond’s claim that ʿUbayd Allāh governed the North separately from the rest of the Caliphate is very much in line with the ‘Abbāsids’ practice from the very start of their reign. Yaʿqūbī explains that “Abū al-ʿAbbās appointed his brother, Abū Jaʿfar, over Jazīra, Mosul, the regions along the frontier, Armenia, and Azerbaijan” (وولى ابو العبّاس ابا جعفر اخاه الجزيرة). Mahdī followed suit by placing his son Hārūn al-Rashīd in control of the North while his other son Mūsā al-Hādī was heir to the Caliphate. Hārūn was next in line to the throne after his brother; his experience on the frontier provided him the necessary military training and a lofty reputation as a mujāhid.

The Arabic texts assert that Hārūn al-Rashīd himself (rather than ʿUbayd Allāh) appointed the governors of Armenia, which suggests that the provinces were ruled directly by the caliph. Lewond’s text is not precise on this matter, because he employs a pronoun rather than the full name: “In accordance with his contrary disposition, he appointed over this land governors of licentious and perverse ungodliness, who never paid heed to the fear of God” (Եւ կարգէր ի վերայ երկրիս ըստ հակամիտ բարուց իւրոց հրամանատարս ապարասան և ժանդաբարոյ անաստուացության ըացքուրականութեր և ձեռնամարտական առումականութեգության վրա) [1277v]. The subject of this passage could be read as either ‘Ubayd Allāh or Hārūn al-Rashīd, though the latter reading would prompt the question of what an assignment over the North would mean if not having the authority to oversee its governance. Coins cannot answer this question definitively, but they do contribute additional information to

28 Ya’qūbī, Works, 1086; Taʾrīkh, 2:430. See also Ibn al-Faqīh, Mukhtaṣar, 294: وولى ابن العباس أبو جعفر اخاه الجزيرة.

29 See, e.g., Ya’qūbī, Taʾrīkh, 2:515; Ṭabarī, Taʾrīkh, 3:607.
the discussion. 'Ubayd Allāh minted coins in Armenia in his own name (with the phrase “among that which the emir 'Ubayd Allāh son of the Commander of the Faithful ordered” in the center) from 172/788–89 to 175/791–92, without including the name of the caliph. The omission of the caliph's name was common practice for viceroys: Mahdī minted coins in his own name in Armenia during the caliphate of Mansūr, just as Amin would do later in Hārūn's reign. The omission of the caliph's name thus cannot confirm Lewond's claim of a rivalry between Hārūn and 'Ubayd Allāh, since it merely reflects the practices of 'Abbāsid princes. However, it demonstrates that 'Ubayd Allāh followed the minting standards established by earlier viceroys. Here again, as in the previous chapter, Lewond's information fits well with the numismatic evidence even when the Arabic sources diverge from his account in details.

In two ways, the viceroyalty demonstrates that the early 'Abbāsids embarked on a project to present themselves as heirs to Iranian kingship, building on their own understandings of the Sasanian kings. First, the viceroyalty collapsed the northern provinces of the Caliphate into a broad administrative grouping. A similar Sasanian administrative grouping of provinces appears as kūst-i Ādūrbādagān in Sasanian-era seals and in the Middle Persian geography Šahrestānīhā ī Ērānsahr, and also as k'usti Kapkoh in Širakac'i's first/seventh-century Armenian geography. It is likely that the toponym Ādūrbādagān provided a value-neutral replacement for the charged meanings of abāxtar (the North) in Middle Persian. In 'Abbāsid-era Arabic texts, the Sasanian North appears as al-jarbī (الجربي, or “north.” The 'Abbāsid viceroyalty recreated this North on the basis of the 'Abbāsids' memory of Sasanian administrative models. This backdrop allows us to reconsider the appointment of both Hārūn al-Rashīd and 'Ubayd Allāh as viceroys over the North. In placing heirs to the Caliphate in charge of the North, the 'Abbāsids built on a long tradition of Sasanian succession practices. Sasanian rule provided precedents for the 'Abbāsids both in administrative organization and in succession. In neither area was there direct continuity from Sasanian to 'Abbāsid rule. The Marwānid Umayyads combined the North into a single province, as demonstrated by minting practices, but the Sufyānids did not do so. Clearly, however, the Umayyads did not place their heirs in the North. The many scions of the Umayyad house who ruled over the North (e.g., Muḥammad b. Marwān, Maslama b. 'Abd al-Malik, and Marwān b. Muḥammad) were not candidates for the Caliphate when they served in the North. Umayyad practices indicate that the 'Abbāsids did not inherit the perceived significance of Armenia in their succession directly from the Sasanians. Rather, both the administrative paradigm and succession norms were reestablished on a Sasanian model in the 'Abbāsid period. Nevertheless,

30 Laurent and Canard, L’Arménie, 431; Vardanyan, “Hārūn al-Rashīd’s Accession,” 84. Vardanyan notes that 'Ubayd Allāh changed his patronymic in the 180s to 'Ubayd Allāh b. Mahdī. However, 'Ubayd Allāh’s continued reference to his father (instead of his brother) as amir al-mu`minin cannot be considered evidence of the claimed rivalry between 'Ubayd Allāh and Hārūn because it was normative practice for 'Abbāsid princes. The coins minted by Hārūn in Armenia similarly refer to Hārūn as the son of the amir al-mu`minin even during Ḥādī’s reign—that is, after Mahdī’s death once Ḥādī had claimed that title. Bonner, in Aristocratic Violence, 82, explains that the phrase “is associated with the names of sovereigns, of heirs to the throne, of viceroys close in blood to the sovereign and ruling over a group of provinces, and of revolutionaries. Provincial governors only use this phrase on bronze coins.”
31 Vacca, Non-Muslim Provinces, xv.
the ‘Abbāsid administrative system and succession patterns would have been legible to an Armenian author such as Lewond because of his familiarity with both Sasanian and Arsacid practice.

XVI.B.2. The Identification of the Governors

Lewond omits some of the governors listed in Arabic sources for the first years of Hārūn al-Rashīd’s reign. All extant Arabic sources similarly name only a selection of the ‘Abbāsid governors who served during this period. None of our sources is comprehensive, and the corpus of ‘Abbāsid-era texts hardly yields consistent information. Indeed, the very fact that modern scholars have produced multiple lists of the governors of Armenia indicates that the sequence is neither clear nor straightforward. Lewond lists Yazīd b. Mazyad, ‘Abd al-Kabīr, and Sulaymān as governors before ‘Ubayd Allāh himself appeared in Bardha‘a/Partaw.

Yazīd b. Mazyad b. Zā‘ida al-Shaybānī is well attested, though the precise dates of his governorship are unclear.32 He minted coins in Hārūniyya and Hārūnābād in 170/786–87 in the name of the caliph Hādī,33 but Lewond mentions him only after Hārūn’s ascension. The possible discrepancy stems from the assumption that coins minted in Hārūniyya were issued by the governors of Armenia. But although the mint was administratively controlled by Armenia, these coins may reflect the military leadership along the frontier rather than the caliphal representation in Dabīl/Duin or Bardha‘a/Partaw. The numismatic evidence placing Yazīd b. Mazyad in Hārūniyya during the reign of Hādī need not be interpreted as evidence of his governorship of Armenia. Textual evidence in both Arabic and Armenian (including, of course, Lewond) suggests that he was governor of Armenia only after Hārūn’s ascension.34 The Taʾrīkh al-Bāb anachronistically extolls Yazīd b. Mazyad as the first Sharwānshāh, in control of Armenia, Albania, Bāb al-Abwāb/Darband, and Azerbaijan under Hārūn al-Rashīd until 172/788. Then, in 178/794 or 179/795, Yazīd defeated a Khārijite rebel in Jazīra with Dhū al-Fiqār, the sword of ’Alī b. Abī Ṭālib. As a reward, Hārūn al-Rashīd reappointed him to the North, where he lived in Bardha‘a/Partaw.35

The governorship of ‘Abd al-Kabīr b. ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd al-ʿAdawī is uncontested and unproblematic. He served as governor of Armenia for only four months in either 172/788–89 or 173/789–90.36 Although Ṭabarī and Khalīfa mention only his campaigns on the Roman frontier (on which see chapter XIV), Yaʾqūbī confirms Lewond’s claim that he also served as governor of Armenia under Hārūn al-Rashīd.37 ‘Abd al-Kabīr did not mint coins

34 Balādhuri, Futūḥ, 210; Drasxanakertʻi, Hayoc’ Patmatʻ iw, 110; Yaʾqūbī, Taʾrīkh, 2:516.
35 Minorsky, History, 1–2 (Arabic), 22–23 (English).
37 Yaʾqūbī, Taʾrīkh, 2:516.
in Armenia, though some of the issues of 'Ubayd Allāh from 173/789–90 include a dis-
jointed letter ‘ayn, separate from the main inscription, which could refer to his name.38

The identification of Lewond’s Sulaymān is uncertain.39 The only potential numismatic
evidence for Sulaymān is the letter sin on coins minted in the name of 'Ubayd Allāh,40
which could obviously refer to a great number of things. Khalīfa b. Khayyāṭ lists the go-

gerors who ruled each caliphal province in the name of Hārūn al-Rashīd, including the
governors of Armenia under the heading of Jazīra. After Khuzayma b. Khāzim and Yazīd
b. Mazayad, he names Sulaymān b. Abī Ja’far.41 Sulaymān b. Abī Ja’far was the son of the
caliph Mansûr, which makes him the uncle of Hādī, Hārūn al-Rashīd, and 'Ubayd Allāh.
He appears in multiple sources as the leader of the hajj in the early 170s/late 780s; he then
became governor of Basrā at the end of 174/791 and of Damascus in the mid-180s/early
800s.42 He also appears as a signatory to the agreement between Hārūn’s sons Ma’mūn
and Amin that 'Ubayd Allāh also signed. Given Khalīfa’s attestation of Sulaymān b. Abī
Ja’far’s governorship in Jazīra and the ‘Abbāsid practice of appointing family members
over the North, it seems likely that Lewond’s unidentified Sulaymān is indeed Sulaymān
b. Abī Ja’far.

Some modern studies of the ostikanate identify Sulaymān’s son-in-law Ibn Dūqlih as a
governor of Armenia.43 However, Lewond states that Ibn Dūqlih collected taxes for Sulay-
mān, not that he was named a caliphal governor by Hārūn al-Rashīd. He appears exclu-
sively in Armenian texts. Although Lewond in fact calls him Ibndokē, Իբնդոկէ, without
the letter “l,” his name has been reconstructed here on the basis of Step’anos Tarōnec’i’s
fifth/eleventh-century History. Tarōnec’i worked with Lewond’s text and spelled the name
as Ibn Dōlk.44 This attestation might be supported by numismatic evidence: Vasmer sug-

gests that the largely illegible inscription on a coin dated to 174/790–91 could be read as
“Dūqlih.”45

XVI.B.3. Generalizations about Early ‘Abbāsid Governance

The governors who ruled in Armenia in the early days of Hārūn al-Rashīd’s reign illustrate
three features of ‘Abbāsid governance.

38 Vardanyan, Islamic Coins, 120 n. 33.
39 Laurent and Canard, L’Arménie, 431–32 n. 42; Vardanyan, Islamic Coins, 120 n. 32; Vasmer, Chronologie,
32. Vasmer and Ter-Łevondyan do not provide this Sulaymān with a patronymic. In modern studies of the
ostikanate, Lewond’s Sulaymān appears as Sulaymān [b. Yazīd?] b. Ašamm al-ʿĀmirī, and he is assigned
the governorship in 173/789–90. However, Yaʿqūbī and numismatic evidence attest to the rule of Sulaymān
b. Ašamm al-ʿĀmirī in Armenia only in 192/807–8. There is no reason to identify Lewond’s Sulaymān with
the later governor.
40 Vardanyan, “Hārūn al-Rashīd’s Accession.”
41 Khalīfa, Ta’rikh, 307.
42 Khalīfa, Ta’rikh, 305. For Baṣra, see Ya’qūbī, Ta’rikh, 2:494.
43 Ter-Łevondyan, “Arminiayi ostikanneri žamanakagrut’yun,” 122; Vardanyan, Islamic Coins, 120 n. 34; Vasmer, Chronologie, 32 n. 31.
44 Tarōnec’i, Universal History, 195. This is particularly significant given the scribal error in Lewond’s
text regarding the date of the Arcruni brothers at the end of the caliphate of Hādī, which is corrected in
Tarōnec’i’s history.
45 Vasmer, Chronologie, 32 n. 31.
First, Yazid b. Mazyad demonstrates the significance of gubernatorial families in the governance of the ‘Abbāsid Caliphate, as described in earlier chapters. Yazid b. Mazyad is particularly important because he was yet another scion of the Shaybānī family to rule over Armenia. The Banū Shaybān were prominent in Jazīra in the Umayyad and early ‘Abbāsid periods. Yazid’s relatives served as governors of Yemen, Sistān, Kūfa, and Damascus, and they campaigned across the Caliphate, from Khurāsān to Egypt.46 Yazid’s descendants grew in power in Albania in the aftermath of the death of Mutawakkil in 247/861 and became the Sharwānshāhs, ruling along the Caspian coast in Albania.47 The other family that is conspicuous among the governors is the ‘Abbāsid family itself. Hārūn al-Rashīd posted his own brother over the North, just as his father and his brother had once appointed him. If we read Lewond’s Sulaymān as Sulaymān b. Abī Ja’far, we find yet another ‘Abbāsid governing the North. In addition, Sulaymān placed his son-in-law in a position of power. Other members of the ‘Abbāsid family also controlled estates in the North, including, presumably, these estates’ tax revenues.48 With the exception of ‘Abd al-Kabīr, all of the governors named in Lewond’s text attest to the significance of gubernatorial families who ruled the Caliphate.

Second, these governors serve as a reminder that the ‘Abbāsid administration of the North involved a number of functionaries at various levels. Ibn Dūqlih need not be understood as a governor on the basis of Lewond’s description; a number of similar functionaries appear in the Arabic texts. The term used for “governor” is not stable in either Arabic or Armenian, so these various functionaries complicate the modern historian’s task of untangling the sequence of governors. For example, Drasxanakertc’i remarks that when Yazid was appointed governor of Armenia, he “sent prefects (kusakals) and officials (gorcakals) to the several regions” (էնիսաբար քուսակալս եւ գործակալս ըստ գաւառաց գաւառա առաքէր).49

Finally, these governors demonstrate the significance of the frontier in the politics of Armenia. As noted earlier, the governors who appear on the coins of Hārūniyya do not consistently reflect the sitting governors of Armenia even though they are minted with the name Armenia on them. Both Khuzayma b. Khāzim and Yazid b. Mazyad appear to have minted coins in Hārūniyya before they played a role in Armenia proper. Nonetheless, the Hārūniyya coins name Armenia as a home mint, and several governors who once served on the frontier (as indicated by their Hārūniyya coins) were also later posted to Armenia proper. These details demonstrate the close connection between the governance of Armenia and the maintenance of the Roman frontier, although the two should not be considered identical. This relationship is evident in the case of ‘Abd al-Kabīr. As discussed in chapter XIV, ‘Abd al-Kabīr led the sā’ifa in 164/781, when he was defeated by Michael Lachanadragon. He hailed from Harrān/Xaṙan and was a member of the local border elite who was largely ineffective against the imperial forces but still remembered only for warfare on the frontier. Like several other generals in the wars against the Romans, he became governor of Armenia after serving on the frontier.

46 Crone, Slaves on Horses, 169–70.
47 Minorsky, History, 1–2 (Arabic), 22–23 (English).
48 For example, Warthān/Vardanakert belonged to Zubayda bt. Ja’far b. Manṣūr, while one of the daughters of Hārūn al-Rashīd claimed Marāgha; Ibn al-Faqīh, Mukhtaṣar, 284.
49 Drasxanakertc’i, History, 114; "Patmut’ıwn Hayoc,” 424.
XVI.C. ARMENIAN EMIGRATION FROM AND ARAB IMMIGRATION TO ARMENIA

Lewond suggests that the tax policies of the Caliphate, and most immediately those of ʿUbayd Allāh, encouraged more than 12,000 Armenians to leave their land and migrate to Roman territory. According to Lewond, they were led by members of the Amatuni family, Šapuh and his son Hamam. The date of this migration is uncertain. Lewond mentions this episode immediately before the death of Catholicos Esayias in 788 CE, implying that it occurred in that year or shortly before it. He also asserts, however, that the Roman emperor Constantine was immediately notified once the refugees had crossed over the Akampsis River into Roman territory. Constantine VI was born in 771 CE, and his mother Eirene ruled as regent from 780 until 790 CE, when Constantine reached maturity. Thanks to the support of the Armeniac theme, Constantine became sole emperor in that year, but he restored Eirene as co-ruler in 792 CE. As Lewond makes no reference to Eirene and depicts Constantine as the sole agent in this episode, it is possible that these events occurred after he had assumed full power in 790 CE. On the other hand, Lewond may here reflect the bias of the Armeniacs in refusing to accept Eirene as ruler and thereby attributing all imperial action to Constantine.

Ter-Łevondyan argues that the tax policies of the early years of Hārūn al-Rashīd’s reign were repressive and provided the impetus for Armenian emigration. He also postulates that Hārūn implemented a policy to increase Arab settlement in Armenia. These policies worked in tandem as a concerted effort to replace Armenians with Arabs. Lewond’s references to Armenian emigration would seem to support Ter-Łevondyan’s argument. However, this conclusion may require some refinement. The evidence available in Armenian, Greek, and Arabic sources does not necessarily support such a definitive conclusion; instead, it allows for ambiguous contexts and multiple readings.

Yovhannēs Drasxanakertc’i does not record this particular emigration of 12,000 Armenians to Roman territory, but he remarks that during the 790s CE, “the Hagarites completely dominated and subdued the Armenian people, and the number of the nobility of the land decreased—while those that survived remained quiet and subservient to their sway. As a result of this, accounts concerning our princes of this period are missing from the present History” (Եւ վասն զի սպառ սպուռ հագարացիքն տիրեցին կալան զՀայաստանեայսս, եւ մեծամեծաք աշխարհիս նուազեցան, եւ մնացեալք ղաւղեալ դադարեալ կային ընդ լծով ծառայութեան նոցա, սակս այսորիկ իսկ յայմ վայրի պակասեցաւ ի Պատմութենէ աստի զրոյցք իշխանաց մերոց). Given his lack of access to historical documentation, Drasxanakertc’i sends his reader to the history attributed to Šapuh Bagratuni, which is now lost. It would be incautious to draw any conclusions about large demographic change in the 790s CE on the basis of such thin evidence.

In contrast to its role in the earlier migration of Armenian nobles that occurred in the 750s CE, the Roman Empire does not seem to have actively promoted this emigration, although Constantine may have benefited from the Armenians’ presence. Rather,
the Armenians’ emigration into Roman territory seems to have been driven by their own concerns instead of broader imperial policy. The fate of the city of Kamakh/Kamachon illustrates the significance of Armenian involvement along the Roman–ʿAbbāsid frontier in the 790s ce. According to Theophanes, the Armeniac theme revolted in am 6285/792–93 ce when the people heard of Eirene’s restoration and the imprisonment and blinding of their former strategos Alexios Mousoulem (i.e., son of Mušel). Constantine was able to defeat the rebellion, “thanks to the deceit of the Armenians who were with them and who betrayed them” (δόλῳ τῶν σὺν αὐτοῖς Ἀρμενίων προδεδωκότων νικήσας συλλαμβάνει αὐτοὺς). But then, according to Theophanes, “when they [these Armenians] received no reward from the emperor, they surrendered to the Arabs the fort of Kamachon” (μηδὲν φιλοτιμηθέντες παρὰ τοῦ βασιλέως τὸ κάστρον Κάμαχον παρέδωκαν τοῖς Ἀράπισιν). Theophanes thus attests to the ability of Armenians to work for or against the Roman Empire as it suited their purposes. Balādhurī’s account aligns with that of Theophanes, though he has Kamakh/Kamachon switch back and forth between empires with few dates to pin the narrative to a clear timeline. He does record that Kamakh/Kamachon fell to the Arabs in 177/793–94, though he does not mention Armenian involvement at this time. Later, however, Balādhurī attests that Armenians—specifically, Baqrāṭ b. Ashūṭ, meaning Bagarat the son of Ašot Bagratuni—returned Kamakh/Kamachon to the Romans yet again during the reign of Maʾmūn. Such details suggest that Armenian involvement in the transfer of cities along the frontier was not unusual or part of a specific policy of Armenian emigration to Roman territory during the reign of Hārūn al-Rashīd. It is impossible to know whether the Armenians who facilitated the capture and recapture of Kamakh/Kamachon were Łewond’s refugees, but Theophanes’s and Balādhurī’s reports suggest that Armenians were active brokers in the transfer of territory between the Roman Empire and the ‘Abbāsid Caliphate. Furthermore, these accounts also indicate that Armenian emigration was not a one-way street to escape caliphal rule in the 790s ce; just as in previous cases, such as that of Tačat Anjewac’i (see chapter XIV), Armenian elites could maneuver between the empires in the service of their own interests.

The Arabic sources do not add anything to the discussion of emigration from Armenia, but Yaʾqūbī does claim that the caliphal governors of Armenia increased Arab settlement at this time. He does not present this as caliphal policy and is largely focused on tribal politics instead. According to him, Yūsuf b. Rāshid al-Sulamī, who does not appear in any other literary sources, was appointed governor after Khuzayma b. Khāzīm’s first tenure. Yaʾqūbī explains that “Yūsuf moved a group of the Nizāriyya to the province, where the Yamāniyya heretofore had been dominant. The Nizāriyya became numerous during Yūsuf’s time” (فَنُقلَ إلى الْبَلَدِ جَمَاعَةٌ مِنَ النِّزَاريَّةِ وَكَانَ السَّيْفُ عَلَى ارْمِنِيَّةِ الْيَمَانِيَّةِ فِي ۳۸۵). Both the Mudar and the Rabīʿa are construed as the sons of Nizār b. Maʿadd, Yaʾqūbī, Works, 1178; Taʾrīkh, 2:515.

54 Theophanes, Chronicle, 644; Chronographia, 469.
55 Theophanes, Chronicle, 644; Chronographia, 469.
56 Balādhurī, Futūḥ, 185.
57 Yūsuf does appear on the coins of Hārūniyya. If Hārūniyya is far from Armenia as per Ibn Ḥawqal (see Commentary XV.A), he may have remained in the Syrian frontier and so never reached Armenia proper. It is therefore possible that Yūsuf’s settlers were in fact on the thughūr. This reading would explain why Lewond never wrote of Yūsuf as a governor of Armenia: he was not in fact in Armenian territory.
the eponymous ancestor of the Northern Arabs. Yaʿqūbī subsequently refers to the population shifts under Yazīd b. Mazyad, who “brought in Rabīʿa tribesmen from everywhere, so that today they dominate the province” (فنقل اليها ربيعة من كل ناحية حتى هم اليوم الغالبون عليها). According to Ter-Łevondyan, these were most likely members of the Bakr tribe, specifically the Banū Shaybān, and they probably settled more in Sharwān than in Armenia proper, as the former is where Yazīd’s descendants set up their hereditary principality. However, Yaʿqūbī’s evidence does not allow us to specify the Banū Shaybān in particular, and as noted above, Yazid b. Mazyad may have ruled over Sharwān but lived in Bardhaʿa/Partaw. Although he appears in later sources as the first Sharwānshāh, the title was awarded posthumously, and the Shaybānī family’s association with Sharwān postdates Yazīd’s death. Therefore, there is no reason to assume that Yaʿqūbī is referring specifically to Sharwān, even though these tribesmen or their descendants did move there eventually. More importantly, Yaʿqūbī’s primary concern is not in fact the Arabicization of Armenia. He mentions Yūsuf’s and Yazīd’s actions here because they upended the balance between Northern and Southern Arabs in Armenia. Both governors brought in Northern Arabs, which shifted the local demographics because Armenia had been a bastion of Southern Arabs (Yamāniyya) before Hārūn al-Rashīd’s reign. These broader power blocs played an important role in balancing regional politics, as evidenced by the fact that the Nizāriyya frequently served as governors of Armenia. Yaʿqūbī’s primary concern is brought into relief in his discussion of ‘Abd al-Kabīr’s tenure as governor, where he specifies that the governor relied on tribesmen from Diyār Muḍar, again suggesting reliance on the Nizāriyya. Furthermore, Yaʿqūbī’s interest in the balance of tribal representation likely reflected problems in the broader Caliphate, as the early years of Hārūn al-Rashīd’s reign saw battles in both Jazīra and Syria between the Nizāriyya and the Yamāniyya.

The nuances of Arab politics and demographic movements are entirely lost on Łewond, who does not refer to Arab immigration into Armenia at all in this period. However, Lewond and Yaʿqūbī share a general concern with the effect of population movements on the region’s relationship with imperial powers (both Roman and ʿAbbāsid) during the early years of Hārūn al-Rashīd’s caliphate. Both historians understand the movement of populations in relation to their neighboring provinces (Armeniac and Jazīra, respectively). Given the disparate sources about emigration and immigration, it is difficult to detect a clear and cohesive policy under Hārūn al-Rashīd, nor is there a discernable relationship between tax policies and tribal settlement in Armenia.

**XVI.D. THE CATHOLICOI OF ARMENIA**

Along with Catholicos Sahak, Catholicos Esayias (Esayi) of Alapatuš or Elipatuš (in office 775–88 ce) and Catholicos Step’annos Dunec’i (in office 788–90 ce) are the only catholicoi mentioned by Lewond. Lewond records that Esayias asked Sulaymān’s son-in-law, Ibn Dūqlīh, who was posted in Dabil/Duin, to lower the Armenians’ taxes, but that he

---

60 See Minorsky, *History*.
61 Nicol, “Early ʿAbbāsid Administration,” 100.
was unsuccessful. Movsēs Dasxuranc’i reports that “the Armenians, in their country’s distress, sent their patriarch Lord Esayi and his bishops” (Հայաստանեայք սակս աշխարհի հոգւոց զհայրապետն իւրեանց զտէր Եսայի հանդերձ եպիսկոպոսաւքն յղեալ . . . առաքեն) to Bardha’/Partaw, presumably to seek tax relief for Armenia. It is unclear when this trip took place, but if Esayias did not receive a positive response to his request from Ibn Dūqlīh in Dabīl/Duin, it is possible that he then tried his luck with Sulaymān in Bardha’/Partaw. According to Ačaṙyan, the catholicos Esayias is to be identified with the bishop Esayi of Golt’n who participated in the famous Council of Manazkert in 726 ce, which would make him quite old when he assumed the position of catholicos in 775 ce. He was also present at the Council of Partaw convened in 768 ce by Catholicos Sion (in office 767–75 ce), whom he succeeded. Armenian historiographers after Yovhannēs Drasxanakertc’i focus on Esayias’s rise, prophesied by his mother, from very humble origins as the son of a widowed beggar to become bishop of Golt’n and then catholicos, a story not mentioned by Lewond.

Even less is known about the brief tenure of Step’annos as catholicos. Lewond claims that he succeeded to the position through bribery. Among later Armenian historiographers, only Samuēl Anec’i and Kirakos Ganjakec’i preserve this piece of information.

The very fact that Lewond chose to mention these two catholicoi, in addition to the fact that he does not seem to have been familiar with the later legendary account of Esayias’s life, may further support the claim that Lewond was contemporary to both religious figures.

---
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66 Anec’i, Hawakmunk’, 89; Ganjakec’i, Patmut’iwn, 75.
Colophon

A colophon is a statement at the end of a text to explain the circumstances of the text’s production and transmission. The oldest extant manuscript of Łewond’s work contains a colophon that provides the name of the scribe and of the patron who ordered it to be copied. These names allow us to date the text, as the patron who paid for the manuscript was the abbot of a monastery called Yovhannavank’. From inscriptions, we know that he served in that position from 1274 to 1311. The colophon also tells us what the scribe and the patron knew about the text—namely, that it was written on the orders of a Bagratuni patrician.

ENGLISH TRANSLATION

The teaching of Łewond about the chronology of this house of T’orgom was completed by the order of Lord Šapuh Bagratuni. Lord Hamazasp from the honorable house of the Mamikoneank’, who was also desirous of the same, gave the order for the impure scribe Sargis to write it from his legitimate funds. I pray that you remember me before the merciful God. Glory be to Him forever. Amen.

Šapuh Bagratuni: son of Smbat (the son of Ašot the Blind) and brother of Ašot Msaker, presiding prince of Armenia from 806 to 826 ce. Šapuh died in 824 ce.

Hamazasp Mamikonean: abbot of Yovhan-navank’ from 1274 to 1311 ce.

Legitimate: in Armenian, halal, which renders the Arabic word for “licit.” This word appears in medieval Armenian inscriptions, too.

ARMENIAN EDITION

Կատարեցաւ վարդապետութիւն Մամիկոնեանց աստիվուհերն Ամէն։ Աղածի, որ և ցանկացող եղեալ սորին տես Համազասպ` ի պատուազուր յազգեն Մամիկոնեանց, ի հալալ արդեանց ետ հրաման ծրել փծուն գրչի Սաղի`։ Աղածի յիշեցէք յողորմած Աստիվ։ և նմա փառք յաւիտեանս: Ամէն:

COMMENTARY

XVII.A. THE SPONSOR

The colophon of M1902 specifies that “Lord Hamazasp from the honorable house of the Mamikoneank’, who was also desirous of the same, gave the order for the impure scribe Sargis to write it from his legitimate funds” (եր և ցանկացող եղեալ սորին տես Համազասպ` ի պատուազուր յազգեն Մամիկոնեանց, ի հալալ արդեանց ետ հրաման ծրել փծուն գրչի Սաղի `։ Աղածի`։ Աղածի յիշեցէք յողորմած Աստիվ`: Ամէն)

1 Աստիվ` ] read: Ամէն։
opponent of caliphal rule in Armenia. Grigor and Dawit’ Mamikonean were rivals of the Bagratun’ik’ to the point that the caliph Hishām b. ʿAbd al-Malik exiled them to Yemen and the caliph Marwān b. Muḥammad had Dawit’ executed after first cutting off his hands and feet. Ruminating on Dawit’’s execution, Lewond evokes Matthew 7:17, stating that it was “the bad yield of bad seeds” (չար սերմանցն չար արդիւնարարութիւ

uen [89v]). Later, Artawazd Mamikonean was the first to raise a rebellion against the ‘Abbāsid caliph Maṇṣūr, and Mušeł Mamikonean appears as a leader of the 158/775 rebellion. Lewond’s editorializing clearly reflects his disapproval of all of these actions, as he sides with the Bagratun’ik’ and discourages any sign of insubordination against the Caliphate. Although it is curious that a Mamikonean lord ordered the preservation of an anti-Mamikonean, pro-Bagratuni work of history, there is little we can surmise about his reasoning. Perhaps he wanted to promote his family as opponents to the spread and rule of Islam over Armenian territory. However, we can hardly advance the theory that the exploits of the Mamikonean elite in the second/eighth century meant anything in particular to a specific scion of the house a full five centuries later. Further, we cannot extrapolate about how Armenians would have read the history of caliphal occupation in the period of the Mongol invasions immediately after centuries of Kurdish and Turkish supremacy in Greater Armenia. Hamazasp Mamikonean’s interest in Lewond’s History could have been spurred by any number of personal or societal impetuses.

Hamazasp did, however, leave historical footprints. According to the seventeenth-century historian Zak’aria Sarkawag K’analy’eric’i, Hamazasp was abbot of Yovhannavank’, a monastery in Ohanavan in the province of Argacotn, and increased the library’s holdings: “In the year 728 [= 1279], Father Hamazasp became [abbot]. This Hamazasp accomplished many deeds and accumulated divine writings, many of which still exist. He lived in the days of the sons of prince Kurd, and led the prelacy with secular authority. And he himself was a glorious man of fearful appearance from the Mamikonean clan. We learned this from many colophons to books and memorials in many places” (Պուտիու Համազասպ։ Այս Համազասպ բազում արդիւնս արար եւ բազմացոյց զգրեանս Աստուածային։ որ եւ բազմք կան դեռեւս։ Սայ էր յավուրս որդւոց իշխանին Քրդոյ եւ վարէր զառաջնորդութիւն մարմնաւոր իշխանութեամբ։ եւ էր ինքն յազգէ Մամիկոնէից, այր փառահեղ եւ ահարկու տեսողացն) 2 Yovhannavank’, along with nearby Sałmosavank’, controlled large estates, attracted generous donations, and was financially well off in the thirteenth century. Although Zak’aria places the beginning of Hamazasp’s tenure as abbot of Yovhannavank’ in 1279, an inscription from the monastery mentions him as abbot from 1274; others testify to his presence there in 1279, 1283, and 1300 ce.3 In addition to the inscriptions, a number of colophons that name him exist in manuscripts dated to the last two decades of the thirteenth century. The colophons appear to works such as the Ecclesiastical History of Socrates Scholasticus, the History of Agat’angełos, and the Commentary on the Proverbs of

2 K’analy’eric’i, Patmut’iwn, 194; Chronicle, 295; Lewond, History, 196–97 n. 4.
3 Jakobson, Lafadaryan, and Curatola, K’asakhi vank’er, 10, 31; K’iwrtlean, “Dsełi kam Hamazaspean Mamikoneanneru tuno,” 161–64; Lafadaryan, Yovhannavank’ s ev nra arjanagrat’yunners, 83 (inscription 16, line 7), 91 (inscription 30, line 9), 106 (inscription 56, line 4, and inscription 57, line 6); Thomson, Rewriting Caucasian History, xl.
Solomon of Nersēs Lambronac‘i.⁴ Hamazasp’s connection to the Armenian Church and his sponsorship of other works of Armenian and ecclesiastical history indicate other possible motives for his interest in Łewond’s History.

XVII.B. THE SCRIBE

The scribe Sargis wrote in minuscule (bolorgir) script, though there are passages of mixed majuscule (erkat’agir) and miniscule script. We know nothing about Sargis beyond the colophons he left in this manuscript.
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Bagratunik’: campaigns of Marwān b. Muḥammad and, 238–41; Mamikonean resistance and Umayyad relationship with, 214; peacekeeping in Armenia and, xx; pro-caliphal position of, in History, xvii–xviii; rebellions, rhetoric of unity, and, 322–23; rise of, xxxvii; rule of, overview, 26; as victorious at battle of Vardanakert, in Lewond’s version of events, 68
Bagratuni-Kamsarakan issue: competing narratives of battle of Vardanakert and, 74–75. See also naxarark’ (dynastic noble families)
Bagratuni-Mamikonean naxarar houses: Lewond’s highlighting of tensions between, xxviii–xxix, xxxi, 267–68. See also naxarark’ (dynastic noble families)
Bagrewand, battle of: See Baghrawand/Bagrewand, battle of
Bājunays/Apahunik’: coins minted at, 329, 330
Bakkār b. Muḥammad al-ʿUqaylī (governor of Armenia), 251, 290, 312
Bākuh: Mas’ūdī on coast of Caspian Sea up to the oil fields of, 352, 353
Baladī, Ahmad b. Yahyā, xlv; on Armenians and fate of Kamakh/Kamachon, 387; on building projects and caliphal administration, 99; description of the patrimony of Armenian nobles, 369; on destruction and rebuilding of Darband, 110; on fires at Nashawā/Naxčawan, 91; on Khārijite revolt, 275; on Khuzayma’s introduction of cadastre in Dabīl and Nashawā, 365; Kitāb futūḥ al-buldān, xlii, xliii; list of governors of ’Abbasid Armenia provided by, 363; on localized tax policies, 341; on marriage alliance with the Khazars, 315; on placement of ’Āmir against the Armenians, 325–26; on reports about Kūshān al-Armanī, 272; second fitna according to, 59; summary of information on Roman campaign of 161/778, 342, 343t; summary of information provided about 159/776 summer campaign, 340; summary of information provided about caliphal campaign of 165/782, 348t; summary of information provided about caliphal campaign of 162/779, 344, 345t; Walīd b. Yazīd’s libertine personality in accounts of, 245–46
Balīšecʿi, Vardan, lv
Balʿamī: Campaign of Mud report by, 115; on confrontation between Saʿīd al-Ḥarashī and Maslama b. ‘Abd al-Malik, 226–27, 228; on destruction and rebuilding of Darband, 110; on destruction of fortresses in Armenia, claims put in context, 239, 240; explanation of the siege of Constantinople in History of, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236; on fire ruse and Maslama’s flight from the Khazars, 113–14, 115; Persian history of, xliv
Banū Khāzīm: appearance of, in courts of the caliphs, 365
Banū Muhallab: appearance of, in courts of the caliphs, 365; Arabic-Islamic sources on rebellion of, 200
Banū Qays, 271; color red associated with, 100; expansionist policies of, 222–23; Umayyads and reliance on, 206, 251
Banū Shaybān: prominence of, in Umayyad and early ʿAbbāsid periods, 385, 388
baptism: Christian community unified through, 196; Leo the Isaurian on anticipation of, in the Old Testament, 146, 147
Baqrāṭ b. Ashūṭ: return of Kamakh/Kamachon and role of, 387
Bardhaʿa/Partaw: starting point of caliphal forces, battle of Arjīsh/Arčēš, 320
Bārjīk b. Khāqān: Khazar campaign against Ardabil/Artawēt and, 224
Barkri/Berkri: starting point of Armenian forces, battle of Arjish/Arčēš, 320, 320t
“Barmakids” (family of viziers): Muḥammad al-Mahdī and entrenchment of power of, 329
Basanastan, 330
Basli, 129, 192
basmala: Arabic epistolary style and use of term, 118
Bates, M.: on minting of silver coins, 337
Bathsheba: David’s marriage to, according to Jewish and Islamic tradition, 152–53
Bawtis river (China), 81
Bema: defined, 44
Bible: conduit-shout-rout combination in storylines in, 98; five books of the Laws in, 124; four Kingdoms and Chronicles in, 124. See also Gospels of Christ; Hebrew Scriptures; New Testament; Old Testament; scripture, nature of
biblical allusions and citations in Łewond’s History, xxxiv–xxxvi; conformity to the Septuagint and, li; fiscal tyranny in Armenia, xxxv–xxxvi; martyrdom scenes, xxxv, xl; military conflict scenes, xxxiv; retelling of the second and third fitnas, xxxv
biblical proof texts, for the Prophet Muḥammad: theme of, in ‘Umar-Leo correspondence, 117, 119
biblical tropes: employed in Łewond’s description of Maslama’s campaign, 237–38
Black Stone, 152
Blankship, Khalid Yahya: on caliphal finances, 223; on destruction of fortresses in Armenia, 239; on Hishām’s payments to the Armenian cavalry, 238
“blue people”: Yazīd b.ʿAbd al-Malik’s killing of, 201
Bonner, M.: on Rawḥ’s activities on the frontier, 364n37; on succession disputes between Hādi and Hārūn, 380
Book of Chronicles (Old Testament), 124
Borrut, Antoine, 13; on Lewond’s report of the siege of Constantinople, 231
building programs: Marwānid reforms and, xx, 63, 64, 98–99
Bulgars, xxi
Buzandaran or Epic Histories (P’awstos), xxxvii
cadastre: defined, 205; differentiating between census and, 223n59; economic reform and, during caliphate of Hishām b. ‘Abd al-Malik, xxx, 223–24; Khuzayma’s introduction of, in Dabil and Nashawā, 365. See also taxes and taxation
caliphal histories: Christian sources and, xixn1
caliphal lists: lengths of caliphal reigns, second/eighth- and third/ninth-century lists, xlviii; Łewond’s beginning and ending formulae in, xlv–xlvi; Łewond’s character notes on, xlvi, xlviii, l; provenance of, uncertainty around, xlvi; from second/eighth century, survival of, 13
camel sacrifice: Islam tied to the story of Abraham through, 150
Campaign of Mud, 115
Canark’: See ʿSanāriyya/Canark’ captives: return of, under ‘Umar b. ʿAbd al-ʿAziz, 117, 157, 181–82. See also hostage taking
Caspian coast: volcano references in medieval Arabic descriptions of, 333, 352
Caspian Gates (fortification at Darband), 105, 106
Catholicos/catholicoi, 49; of Armenia, Hārūn al-Rashīd’s reign and, 375, 388–89; Lewond’s scant mention of, xxxi
Caucasian campaigns of Maslama b. ‘Abd al-Malik: Lewond’s reordering of events related to, 105, 108, 109, 205
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Caucasus: earliest Islamic incursions into, xx–xxi; Caucasian Mountains, 107. See also West Caucasus, Roman interests in

Cavalry: establishment of Umayyad dīwān and, 90; maintenance of, in lieu of taxation, 238–39. See also military service; royal record; stipends
caves and crevices motif: persecuted faithful and, multiple appearances of, 289
Čenbakur (Armenian title for emperor of China), 82, 83, 103
Central Asia: Umayyad campaigns in, legendary account of, 101–2
Chahnazarian, K., 193, 194
character notes: in Łewond’s caliphal list, xlvii, xlxi
China: definition of, in Łewond’s text, 101; dual campaigns of Muḥammad b. Marwān and Maslama b. ‘Abd al-Malik, 102–3; legendary account of Umayyad campaigns in Central Asia read against, 101–2; Muhammad b. Marwān’s campaign against, 77, 81–83, 100–103; Umayyad campaigns against, xxvi
Christianity: groups within, represented in ‘Umar-Léo correspondence, 195–97; Łewond’s presentation of, xxxi
Christians: direction of prayer and, 142. See also Bible; Jesus Christ; New Testament
Chronicle of 741, 13
Chronicle of 754, 13
Chronicle of 819/Chronicle of 846: slaughter of pigs in, 201
Chronicle of 1234: concern with concubine-born Arabs in, 250; on heavy taxes imposed by Hishām, 223–24; Marwān and violence in Damascus in, 265; rebellion of Saborios and, 31
Chronicle of Khūzistān: Madīna/Midian conflation in, 16
Chronicle of Zuqnin, 1, 23, 111; denigration of Kūshān al-Armanī in, 271–72, 273–74; destruction and rebuilding of Darband in, 110; iconoclasm paired with slaughter of animals in, 201; Mamikonean rebellion and three-front conflict in, 274–75; on Maslama b. ‘Abd al-Malik as hero of ambush in Tyana, 229, 231; on monasteries destroyed by ‘Ubayd Allāh b. Bukhturi, 275
churches: at Aruč, built by Grigor Mamikonean, 25, 40, 64; at Darīwink, built by ʿAbd Allāh b. Butrubī, 41–42; at Mren, depiction of Herakleios on facade of, 1, 2; of Saint Grigor (Zuart’noc’), 26, 27, 44
Church of the Holy Cross, Alt’amar (modern Turkey): saints Sahak and Hamazasp Arcruni depicted on, 366, 367
circumcision: Leo the Isaurian on Christian reinterpretation of Jewish practice of, 146–47; male and female, mentioned in the hadith, 147
civil wars. See fitnas
clergy of Saint Grigor: Muḥammad b. Marwān and ruse and killing of, 39, 44, 65–66
coins: aniconic Arabic, Marwānid reforms and, 62–63, 63n96; Arabic-Islamic, minting of, xxii; early ‘Abbāsids and minting standards for, 382, 382n30; first caliphal, minted in Dabil/Duin, 98, 99n73; of Khuzayma b. Khāzim, minted in Hārūniyya, 364, 364; minted at Bājunays/Apahunik, 329, 330; minted in Muḥammadiyya, 337; reforms, Marwānids and, xx; ‘Ubayd Allāh’s minting of, in his own name, 382, 382n30; undated copper, minted by Yazīd b. Mazyad and minting of, 383
colophon, 391–93; Armenian edition, 391; defined, 391; English translation, 391; for oldest extant manuscript of Łewond’s work, 391–93; scribe, 391, 393; sponsor, 391–93
Commentary on the Proverbs of Solomon (Nersēs Lambronac’i), 393
communion: Leo the Isaurian on anticipation of, in the Old Testament, 146
Complete Lives and Martyrdoms of the Saints (Jean-Baptiste Aucher): martyrdom of the Arcruni princes in, 366
concubines: caliphs born of, xlvi; Sulaymān b. Hishām and the sons of, 243, 249–50; tensions related to status of concubine-born Arabs in late Umayyad state, 249
conduit-shout-rout combination: in Arabic conquest accounts, 97–98
conflict: prominence of, in Łewond’s History, xxvi–xxvii, xlivi
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conquest narratives: foreknowledge of Islamic conquests in, 112–13; Lewond’s concept of heroic success and norms of, 73–74; tunnels and takbīr in, 97–98; wording about distribution of spoils in, 241

Conrad, L.: on migration of stories of conquests, 325

Constans II (Roman emperor), 6, 14, 25; Arab attack on Dabil/Duin and, 22

Constantine III (Roman emperor), 1, 2, 18

Constantine V (Roman emperor), xxi, 257, 285, 330, 386; imperial policy on the frontier and, 315, 315n81; Lewond’s portrayal of, xxxii, xxxii–xxxiv, lii; Mamikonean alliance with, 253; Tačat Anjewac’i’s service under, 332, 349, 350

Constantine VI (Roman emperor): birth of, 386; crowning of, 332

Constantinople, 42, 98; chainmail gate at, 212; Maslama’s campaigns against the Caucasus and, 105, 108–9, 156, 208–15, 208 (map); Umayyad siege of, xxi, xxvi, 229–38

Cook, M., 194

copyists. See scribes and copyists

Čora (one of two main passes through the Caucasus), 107

Council of Chalcedon, xxxi, 15; definition of Christ’s incarnation adopted at, 135

Council of Dabil/Duin, xxxi

Council of Manazkert, xxxi, 389

Council of Partaw, 389

creative chronology: editorial voice of Lewond and, xxvi

Crone, P., 194, 338; discussion of color coding in, 100n77; on goals of Qays and Yemen, 223

cross(es): breaking of, iconoclasm of Yazīd b. ʿAbd al-Malik and, 199, 201, 203, 237; invoked multiple times, in Lewond’s and Ibn A’tham’s mirror images of siege of Constantinople, 234–35

curopalates (high-ranking Roman title), 48, 77; Roman interests in West Caucasus and, 92

Czeglédy, Károly: reviews sources on marriage between Khāṭūn and Yazīd, 316

Dabil/Duin (caliphal capital of Armenia): ‘Abd al-ʿAziz as governor of, 97–100; description of, 6; establishment of, as a caliphal administrative outpost, 78, 78 (map); first caliphal coins minted in, 98, 99n73; Lewond’s connection to, in Greenwood’s argument, 99; Lewond’s “metropolis” descriptor for, 98; Lewond’s personal interest in, xiii, xxv; rebuilding of, 81, 98–99; ruins of, 6

Daḥḥāk b. Qays al-Shaybānī: Khārijite rebellion of, 275

Damascus: capital of the Umayyad Caliphate, 81; Great Mosque of, 82; Marwān b. Muḥammad and siege of, 253–55, 265–66

Daniel, 122, 129; writings of, about the coming of Christ, 124

Darband: See Bāb al-Abwāb/Darband (Caspian Gates)

Dariwānc’i, Movsēs (or Kałankatuac’i): on the cadastre during Hishām’s reign, 223; on Esayias’s seeking of tax relief for Armenia, 389; History of Caucasian Albania, xxxix, 14; on Roman military support for Armenia after battle of Vardanakert, 88

David (Prophet), 121, 122, 126; marriage to Bathsheba, 152–53; prophesying about Christ, 135–36, 153; Psalms of, 124, 142
da’wa: early, ‘Abbāsid Revolution and uncertain leadership of, 276

demonic perversion: in Lewond’s account of Yazīd b. ‘Abd al-Malik’s death, 199, 203, 204

dietary laws, Muslim: animal slaughter and, 199, 201–2

direct quotes: marking of, in Lewond’s History, 192, 192

disciples of Christ, 122

districts of the Persians, 206

divorce (talāq): Islamic law’s allowance for, 153

dīwān: Arabization of, Marwān id reforms and, 63, 63n97; Armenians listed in, 281; Umayyad, establishment of, 90–92, 238–39

Dome of the Rock, xx, 188; construction of, Marwān id reforms and, 63; Umayyad anti-Trinitarian slogans found in, 119

Donabédian, P.: on “golden age” of Armenian architecture, 35

Donner, F.: on goals of futūḥ narratives, xli–xlii
double forms of letters: in Hebrew language, 124
Draṣpet, 78
Drasankanert’c’i, Yovhannēs: competing narratives of battle of Vardanakert and, 74, 76; on domination under the Hagarites, 386; establishment of the diwân in account of, 90, 92; evaluation of Herakleios by, 14–15; History, xxxix; on period of peace established by King Smbat I Bagratuni, 369–70
Dui’n: See Dabil/Dui’n (caliphal capital of Armenia)
Dunec’i, Step’annos (catholicos of the Armenians), 378, 388, 389
Dunec’i, Dawit’, xxii
ecclesiastical councils: Lewond’s lack of mention of, xxxi
Ecclesiastical History (Eusebius), xxxviii
Ecclesiastical History (Socrates Scholasticus), 392
economic reform: the cadastre and, during caliphate of Hishām b. ʿAbd al-Malik, 223–24. See also fiscal administration
edition and translation, principles of, lix–lx; abbreviations in apparatus, lx; biblical references, lix–lx; overview, lx; previous editions, lx–lxiv; previous translations, lxi; transliteration, lx
Eirene of Khazaria (wife of Constantine V), 316n83, 330, 332
Eirene of Athens (wife of Leo IV), 386, 387; comes to power after death of Leo IV as regent for their son, xxi; deposed, xxii; Lewond on Tačat Anjewac’i’s defection and agenda of, xxxiii, 332, 347, 348, 351; reign of, 332
Elijah, 122
Elišē: account of Armenian rebellion against Sasanians by, xxxvii
Elisha, 122, 150
Eliyā bar Šināyā: on Maslama and ‘Abbās’s capture of Tuwâna from the Greeks, 230
emigration: imperial policy on the frontier and, 315, 315n81
emperors: Lewond’s portrayal of, xxxii–xxxiv
Encyclopaedia Iranica, lx
Epic Histories: See Buzandaran or Epic Histories (P’awstos)
epistolary exchanges, lengthy: in Armenian historiography, 191
Esayias (catholicos of the Armenians), 376; death of, 377, 386; later legendary account of life of, 389; Lewond’s personal relationship with, xxiii; unsuccessful intervention with Ibn Dūqlīh over tax burden, 376, 388–89
eschatological prophecy: Marcian’s inscription, Maslama as the New Alexander and, 111–13
Euphrates: Lewond’s account of Vard Rštuni’s actions on bridge over, 26, 32–33
Eusebius: Ecclesiastical History, xxxviii
Evagrius: Six Centuries or Kephalaia Gnostica, liii
evangelists: as authors of the Gospels, 127
Ezriel, 122; divine baptism foretold through, 147; writings of, about the coming of Christ, 124
Ezra, 126
Fadl b. Dinār: dispatched to Jurzān/K’art’li, 324
Fadl b. Yahyā al-Barmakī, 316
falsification of scripture (taḥrīf): accusations of, between Muslims and Christians, 118
family histories: Armenian tradition of, xxxvii
fashion choices: of ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz, 97, 99–100
“Father” changed to “Lord” or “God”: citations of biblical verses in Armenian and Aljamiado versions of ʿUmar-Leo correspondence and, 184; referenced in ʿUmar-Leo correspondence, 143–44
“father of farthings” epithet: Lewond’s reference to Abū Jaʿfar as, 280, 284
first fitna: Lewond’s omission of, 1, 12, 15
fiscal administration: gubernatorial administration vs., in Lewond’s accounts, xxx; reforms of ʿUmar b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz, 182, 223. See also economic reform
fiscal tyranny in Armenia: Lewond’s biblical allusions in depiction of, xxxv–xxxvi
fitnas, xx. See also first fitna; second fitna; third fitna; fourth fitna
foreshadowing: Lewond’s use of, toward a narrative conclusion, 72
fortresses: campaigns of Marwān b. Muḥammad and destruction of, 239–40
fourth ḥīna: integration of slave soldiers from Central Asia during, 366
free will, 134, 194
Friday prayers: Islamic practice of, 147
frontier: Armenian involvement in transfer of cities along, 387; governors and significance of, in Armenian politics, 385; imperial policy on, 315; royal marriage alliances and, 316; settlement of cities, caliphal governors in Lewond’s text, and, 312
futūḥ narratives: defining, as genre of Arabic literature, xli; geographical parameters, xli; goals of, xli–xlii; Lewond’s History analyzed as, xliii; multiple dates given in, 20; register of, xlii; structure of, xlii; three stages in development of, xli; universal, xli
Ganjak (Shiz, modern Iraq), 206
Ganjake’i, Kirakos: on brief tenure of Step’anos as catholicos, 389; on length of Sasanian rule, 19
Garošian, N., 35
Gaudeul, J.-M., 183
Georgian Royal Annals, liii, 191; See also History of Vaxtang Gorgasali; Martyrdom of King Ārč'il II
Germanus I (patriarch of Constantinople), 210; comparison to Pharaoh’s army in homily of, 238; "Homily on the Deliverance of Constantinople," 236; position on use of images, 188
Gero, Stephen: hypothesis on provenance of History (Lewond), xxiii–xxiv; on Ṭumār-Leo correspondence as original Armenian composition, 185, 186–87
ghāżi caliphs: summer expeditions and cities named after, 338
Gibonites, 377
godless J̌di, 129, 192, 194
Golden, P., 224
Golt’neč’i, Vahan, xxii
Gospels of Christ, 118, 143; authors of, 127; Leo’s attention turns to Ṭumār’s criticism of, 142–48; used to argue for prophethood of Muḥammad, 119
Great Mosque of Damascus, xx; construction of, Marwānid reforms and, 63; Muslim Arabic version of Ṭumār-Leo correspondence discovered in, 183; Walīd b. ʿAbd al-Malik and building of, 77, 82
Greek: Lewond’s version of Ṭumār-Leo correspondence as translation from, 185–87; sources and historiography, Lewond’s History and, l–lii
Greek New Testament: Lewond’s text and influence of, li–lii
Greeks, in eastern Roman Empire, 3
Greek vocabulary: Lewond’s integration of, in description of Mansür’s caliphate, 327–28
Greek Vorlage: to Armenian text for Ṭumār-Leo correspondence, four arguments supporting, 185–87; Armenian translation, difficulties in dating of, 187; translation of, as third grouping of the Ṭumār-Leo correspondence, 183
Greenwood, Timothy, xxxvii; hypothesis on date for History, xxiii, xxiv–xxv; on Lewond’s character notes, xlvii; on titles in imperial documents, 15
gubernatorial houses: ‘Abbāsid governors hailing from, 365, 385
Gukan’: fires of, and foreshadowing of fires of Nashawā/Naxčawan, 72–74
Habakkuk (prophet): al-Mansūr receives curses of, and dies, 301–2, 324
Habo of Tiflīs/Tp’ilisi: as likely candidate for prince of the Georgians, 360, 372–73
ḥadīth al-tafriqa (ḥadīth of divisions): sectarianism explained by Prophet Muḥammad in, 195–96
Hagarenes, 7
Hagia Sophia, 237; description of, 209; as focal point of Christian power, 234; in modern Istanbul, 209
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**Ḥajj** (annual pilgrimage to Mecca): Leo the Isaurian’s attack on Muslim practices associated with, 151, 152, 188

Ḥajjāj b. Yūsuf b. Ḥakam b. ʿAqil al-Thaqafī (governor of Iraq): campaigns in Central Asia under authority of, 101; single, authoritative Qurʾān and endeavors of, 131

Ḥakam b. Walīd: death of, 244, 246

Halley’s Comet: as a sign of tribulations, 42, 62

hamstrung horse epic motif, in Iranian world, 286

Ḥamza b. Mālik, 363

Ḥarith b. ʿAmr b. Ḥaraja al-Ṭāʾī: as governor-general, 205, 221, 222

Hariwri, 129, 193, 195

Ḥarrān: description of, 49; Umayyad court in, 254

Hārūn al-Rashīd, xx, xli, 364, 365, 375–89; Armenian edition, 378–80; Armenian emigration from and Arab immigration to Armenia under, 386–88; beginning formulæ, Lewond’s list of caliphs, xlvii; caliphal campaign of 165/782 and, 346, 347, 348, 348t; caliphal governance, 381–88; catholicoi of Armenia and, 375, 388–89; coin minted at Bājunays/Apahunik’ during reign of, 330; English translation, 375–78; expeditions against Roman Empire and governorship before becoming caliph, 332; flight of the Amatunik’ during reign of, 376–77, 377 (map); generalizations about early ‘Abbāsid governance, 384–85; identification of governors, 375, 383–84; Lewond’s character note on, xlixt; rivalry between ‘Ubayd Allah and, 375, 380–81; summer expeditions during reign of, 338; taxation policies of, xxx, xxxvi; viceroyalty and early ‘Abbāsid governance, 380, 381–83

Hārūniyya: coins of Khuzayma b. Khāzim, minted in, 364, 364; disconnect between governorship of Armenia and issues of, 364–65, 385

Hasan al-Basri, 194

Hasan b. Qaḥṭaba: caliphal campaign of 162/779 and, 344, 345, 345t; governor of Armenia, 290, 312, 326

Hayk (eponymous ancestor of the Armenian people), 293

Hazar, village of: Mamikonean rebellion and, 257, 270, 272

Hebrew language: double forms of letters in, 124

Hebrew Scriptures: Christian beliefs not appearing in, 126; Lewond’s description of third fitna fit to a prophecy from, 253, 254, 266; twenty-two books and their connection to the letters of, 124; witnesses in, 122

hell: Leo addresses topic of, in Leo-ʿUmar correspondence, 126, 127

Hephaestus (Greek god of blacksmithing and fire): presence of volcanoes and, 333, 352, 353

Herakleios (Roman emperor), xxi, 1; death of, 20; as depicted on Armenian church at Mren, 2; hidden treasures of, in *History of Vaxtang Gorgasali*, 373; image of Hezekiah and insulting letter scene in *History (Pseudo-Sebēos)*, 237–38; Lewond’s favorable portrayal of, xxxii, 1, 12, 14–15, 17; plots against, 30

heretical notions: Umayyad-era, 194

*Hexaemeron* (Basil), 185

Hezekiah (king of Judah): Lewond compares King Leo to, 210, 237

*hijrī* chronology: for two separate incursions into Armenia, 20, 21, 24

Hishām, Umm: marriage to Yazīd b. Walīd, 246

Hishām b. ʿAbd al-Malik, 205–41, 244; Armenian edition, 216–20; the Bagratunīk’ and the campaigns of Marwān b. Muḥammad, 205, 238–41; beginning and ending formulæ, Lewond’s list of caliphs, xlvii; caliphal governance, 221–23; confrontation between Saʿīd al-Ḥarashī and Maslama b. ʿAbd al-Malik, 226–28; economic reform and the cadastre, 223–24; English translation, 205–15; the Khazar capture of Ardabil/Artawēt, 224–25; Khazar raids under, 207 (map); length of reign, in second/eighth- and third/ninth-century lists of caliphs, xlvii; Maslama’s campaign against Constantinople, 108–9, 205, 208–14, 208 (map), 229–38

*Histoire des guerres et conquêtes des Arabes en Arménie* (Chanazarian), xl

Historical Compilation (Vardan Arewelc’i), xl, 197
historical writing: Armenian literary tradition and concern with, xxxvi

*History* (Agat'angelos), 392

*History* (Arcruni), 185; Midian/Madīna conflation in, 16

*History* (Balʿāmi): report of the siege of Constantinople as mirror image of that of Ibn Aʿtham and Łewond, 231

*History* (Łazar P’arpec’i), xxxvii

*History* (Łewond), xxv–lvii; Arabic sources and historiography, xl–xlv, xlvii, xlix–l; Armenian sources and historiography, xxxvi–xl; biblical allusions, xxxiv–xxxvi; central concerns of, xlii; common themes, silences, and emplotments, xxvi–xxxiv; contained within manuscript 1902 of the Matenadaran, lii; dating of text, hypotheses on, xxiii–xxv; description of Matenadaran 1902, lii–lvi; as a *futūḥ* narrative, analysis of, xlii; Greek sources and historiography, l–lii; as history of early Islamic Caliphate, xxii; importance of, xix; located within Armenian and Arabic historiography, xix; marginal note in Uyghur script on folio 32v of, liv, lv; marking of direct quotes in, 192, 192; rubrication on folio 15r of, 69–70, 70; Šapuh Bagratuni’s role in, xix, xxiv, 391; scribal correction on folio 51v of, 186, 187; surviving manuscripts of, lvi; textual tradition and stemma, lvi–lvii. See also Łewond; Matenadaran 1902

*History* (Movsēs Xorenac’i), xxxvii

*History* (Łebeos), xxv–lvii; Arabic sources and historiography, xl–xlv, xlvi, xlix–l; Armenian sources and historiography, xxxvi–xl; biblical allusions, xxxiv–xxxvi; central concerns of, xlii; common themes, silences, and emplotments, xxvi–xxxiv; contained within manuscript 1902 of the Matenadaran, lii; dating of text, hypotheses on, xxiii–xxv; description of Matenadaran 1902, lii–lv; as a *futūḥ* narrative, analysis of, xlii; Greek sources and historiography, l–lii; as history of early Islamic Caliphate, xxii; importance of, xix; located within Armenian and Arabic historiography, xix; marginal note in Uyghur script on folio 32v of, liv, lv; marking of direct quotes in, 192, 192; rubrication on folio 15r of, 69–70, 70; Šapuh Bagratuni’s role in, xix, xxiv, 391; scribal correction on folio 51v of, 186, 187; surviving manuscripts of, lv; textual tradition and stemma, lvi–lvii. See also Lewond; Matenadaran 1902

*History* (Pseudo-Šapuh or Anonymous Storyteller): two parts within, xxxix; ʿAlī’s appearance in, 14

*History* (Pseudo-Sebēos): downplaying of ʿAlī in, 13–14

*History* (Sebeos), xxvii, 237, 238

*History* (Yovhannēs Drasxanakertc’i), xxxix

*History of Caucasian Albania* (Movsēs Daxsaran’si or Kalankatuac’i), xxxix; pro-Herakleian context in, 14

*History of Taron* (Yovhan Mamikonean), xxvii

*History of the House of Arcruni* (T’ovma Arcruni), xxvii, xxxix; ʿUmar-Leo correspondence mentioned in, 190

*History of the Patriarchs of Alexandria* (Ibn al-Muqaffa’:) breaking of crosses and iconoclasm of Yazīd b. ʿAbd al-Malik in, 201, 203; Yazīd b. ʿAbd al-Malik’s death in, 203

*History of Vaxtang Gorgasali*: hidden treasures of Herakleios in, 373; passage on destruction of Armenian fortresses in, 240

Holy Scripture: ʿUmar-Leo correspondence and use of term: 121. See also Bible; Qurʾān

Holy Spirit, 128, 141; speaking through the prophets about the captivity of the Jews, 125–26

holy war: “in the path of God” Qurʾānic phrase and, 155

Homeric epic: *futūḥ* narratives and, xlii

*Homily on the Cross of Varag* (K’orepiskopos), 33

"Homily on the Deliverance of Constantinople" (Patriarch Germanus), 236, 238

horses: Islamic law and prohibition against killing of, 318

hostage taking: compliance of Armenians ensured with, 26, 35, 91. See also captives

house of Abraham, 142

House of Locks: Christian Visigothic kings and versions of story about, 112–13

Howard-Johnston, J., 17

Hübschmann-Meillet-Benveniste transliteration system, lx

HttpStatus al-ʿālam (Persian geographical text): on Armenia as part of Islam, xxii, xxiii

Huns (Khazars): Alexander’s eschatological prophecy about, 111; Marwān b. Muḥammad’s campaign against, 215; Maslama b. ʿAbd al-Malik’s campaign against, 105, 106 (map), 107; Maslama’s flight from, 105, 113–15

Ḥusayn b. ʿAlī, xlvii

Ibn al-Faqīh, Abū Bakr Ahmad b. Muhammad: destruction of caliphal provinces list used by, 282

Ibn al-Muqaffa’, Sāwīrus: *History of the Patriarchs of Alexandria*, 201, 203

Ibn al-Qūṭiyya, Muḥammad b. ʿUmar b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz: on House of Locks, 112

Ibn Aʿtham, Abū Muḥammad Ahmad: on Abū Jaʿfar’s travels, 282; on battle of Baghrawand/Bagrewand, compared with Lewond’s account, 324–27, 325; battle
of Vardanakert described by, 67, 68; on caliphal governance under Walid b. Yazid, 250; Campaign of Mud report by, 115; on confrontation between Sa'id al-Harashi and Maslama b. 'Abd al-Malik, 226–27, 228; dating of work by, contention over, xliii-xliv; on destruction and rebuilding of Darband, 110; on destruction of fortresses in Armenia, claims put in context, 239, 240; on fire ruse and Maslama's flight from the Khazars, 113, 115; on Khârijite revolt, 275; Khazar invasion of southern Caucasus detailed by, 225; Kitāb al futūḥ, xli, xlii; on marriage alliance with the Khazars, 315–16; on murder of Walid, compared with murder of ʿUthmân b. ʿAffān, 248; on rebellions of 157/774 and 158/775 according to Łewond and, 319, 320, 321, 323, 324–25, 325; report of the siege of Constantinople as mirror image of that of Lewond, 231–36; on the Ṣanāriyya/Canark', 324, 325, 325; textual relationship between Łewond and, xliii-xliv
Ibn Dūqlih, 385; Esayias's unsuccessful intervention with, over tax burden, 376, 388–89; iron collar of oppressive taxes exacted by, 376; as tax collector for Sulaymān, 384
Ibn Ḥabīb: on House of Locks linked to the end of days, 113
Ibn Ḥawqal, Muhammad: on location of Hārūn-iyya, 364n40
Ibn Khāqān (Khazar commander): in Arab-Khazar wars, 222
Ibn Khurradādhbih: direction of prayer list used by, 282
Ibrāhim b. Hasan: general, at battle of Arjish/Arčēš, 320f, 321
Ibrāhim b. Walid b. 'Abd al-Malik: Lewond's omission of, while elevating Sulaymān to the Caliphate, 249, 250
iconoclasm: defined, 150; iconoclasm of Yazid b. 'Abd al-Malik, 199, 200–203; Iconoclastic Controversy, xxi, xxxi, 188, 237
icons: Leo the Isaurian arguing for veneration of, 150, 151
Ifrīqiyya (Arabic) (province to the west of Egypt), 280, 282
imperial territory: Łewond on valence of physical space of, xxxii–xxxiv
Incarnation: doctrine of, Leo's explanation in Leo-ʿUmar correspondence, 133, 148–49; theme of, in Leo-ʿUmar correspondence, 117, 118
International Journal of Middle East Studies: Hübschmann-Meillet-Beveniste transliteration system for, lx
interregnum: architectural production in Armenia and, 35; Sufyānid governance and, 35–36
Iran: booty Muslims captured during conquest of, 19
Iranian kingship: viceroyalty and early 'Abbāsids presenting themselves as heirs to, 328
Isaac, 3; Qur'anic support for, 122
Isaiah, 122, 156; prophesying about Christ, 124, 138–39, 140–41; vision of two riders in, Leo the Isaurian's interpretation of, 154–55
Isaurian dynasty: end of, xxii; Roman Empire ruled by, xxii
'Isâ b. Mūsâ-al-Khurāsānī: dispatched to Jurzān/K'art'li, 324
'Isâ b. 'Ali: Roman campaign of 161/778 and, 342, 343f
Işfahânī: Walid b. Yazid's libertine personality in accounts of, 245
Ishāq b. Muslim al-ʿUqaylī, 244, 290; Mami-konean rebellion and unstable scene faced by, 275; role in Armenia, importance of, 250, 251, 257
Ishmael (the son of Abraham), 3
Ishmaelites, use of term in medieval sources, 3
Islam: expansion of, 15–19; Islamic calendar, start of, 2; Jawwad's depiction of, xxxi; rise of, first Armenian history on, xxxvi; Roman Empire territories lost to Islamic Empire, xix; sects of, represented in ʿUmar-Leo correspondence, 187, 189, 192–95
Islamic law: relevance of, in Armenia, xxii
Israel: translated as 'clear-sighted' in Hebrew language, 138
Istanbul: modern, Hagia Sophia in, 209

Jabariyya (fatalist sect), 193

Jacob: prophesying about Christ, 136–37; Qur’ānic support for, 122

Jāḥiẓ: works of adab and, 194

Jaḥiẓ b. Ṣafwān, 194

Ja’d b. Dirham: followers of, 129, 194

Janza/Ganjak (in Republic of Azerbaijan), 206

Jarrāḥ b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Ḥakamī: as governor-general, 206, 221, 222

Jazīra: governors under Mansūr with ties to, 312, 313; untangling relationship between Armenia and, 313

Jeffery, A., 193, 194

Jeremiah, 122; prophesying about Christ, 124, 136, 138

Jermajor, location of, 43

Jerusalem: David’s capture of, conduit-shout-rout combination in, 98; surrender of, in 638, 3

Jesus Christ: crucifixion of, Muslims’ rejection of, 145; enmity between Christians and Jews over beliefs about, 125–26; prophetic testimonies about advent of, Leo’s series of, 135–41; testifies about himself, passage in Quʾrān, 118

Jews: captivity of, in Babylon, 125–26; direction of prayer and, 142; Islamic conquest and, 16–18. See also Bible; Old Testament

Jinns (category of intelligent beings), 152

Job the just, 122

John: evangelist and author of the Gospels, 118, 127

John of Damascus: Trinity metaphor in work of, 133

John of Jerusalem, 204

John the Baptist, 122

Judah, 122

Judea and Asorestan, 1, 2, 2 (map), 3

Judgment, the: Leo addresses topic of, in Leo- ‘Umar correspondence, 126, 127

Julianist controversies (Armenia): pericope as central point of contention in, 186

Jurzān/K’art’li, 324

Justinian I (Roman emperor): Hagia Sophia built by, 209

Justinian II (Roman emperor), xxxviii, 69; breaks peace treaty with ʿAbd al-Malik, 88–89; Phasis as a center of Roman influence and, 80; relocation to Phasis under, 93–95; second overthrow of, xxii; second reign of, 77; withdraws from Armenia, 42

Ka’ba (house of Abraham): Leo the Isaurian on, 151; Prophet Muhammad and cleansing of, 142

Camakh/Kamachon: Armenian involvement along Roman-ʿAbbāsid frontier and fate of, 387

Kamsaran, Lady Šušan, xxix; Bagratuni-Kamsaran issue and conflicting stories of, 75; martyrdom of, 47; valiance of, 47–48

Kamsaran, Nersēh (prince of Armenia until 691), 333; death of, xxix, 333; husband of Lady Šušan Kamsaran, 47

Kamsaran-Bagratuni issue: competing narratives of battle of Vardanakert and, 74–75

K’anak’erć’i, Zak’aria Sarkawag: on history of Hamazasp Mamikonean, 392

Karčawanec’i, Yohan, liv

Karin (present-day Erzurum, Republic of Turkey): See Qālīqalā/Karin

Karshuni text: earliest manuscript of, Leo’s letter and, 189, 191

Karteroukas, Theodore, 230

Khagan (king of the Khazars), 107

Khagan (Turkic title), 42

Khalifā b. Khayyāt: on Abū Hamza al-Mukhtār b. ’Awf’s challenge to Marwān’s claim to the caliphate, 266; battle of Vardanakert and reports of, 67, 68, 71; on battle of Zab and Marwān’s confiscation of treasuries from Damascus, 277; on building projects and caliphal administration, 99; on caliphal governance under Walīd b. Yazīd, 115; on Campaign of Mud, 115; on confrontation between Sa’d al-Ḥarashi and Maslama b. ʿAbd al-Malik, 226; on destruction and rebuilding of Darband, 110; on fires at Nashawā/Naxčawan, 90; Lewond’s text read against, xlv; on Maslama and ʿAbbās’s capture of Tuwāna from the Greeks, 230; on murder of Walid, compared with murder of ʿUthmān b. ʿAffān, 248; on Roman
military support for Armenia after battle of Vardanakert, 88; summary of information provided about 159/776 summer campaign, 339, 339n29, 340t; summary of information provided about caliphal campaign of 165/782, 348t; summary of information provided about Roman campaign of 161/778, 341–42, 343t; summary of information provided about caliphal campaign of 162/779, 344, 345t; Walid b. Yazid’s libertine personality in accounts of, 245–46
khāraj taxes: Ṭabarī on lowering of, 224; Umayyad princes and, ʿUmar’s withdrawal of exemption from, 223
Khārijites, 129, 193, 195
Khāṭūn/Xat’un: betrothed to Yazid in royal marriage alliance, 287, 316; death of, as a casus belli for the Arab-Khazar wars, 287, 316; dies in childbirth, 315, 316; perceived importance of, in early medieval narratives, 316
Khazaria (Land of the Huns), 215
Khazar Khaganate: extended reach of, xx–xxi; second fitna and Łewond’s emphasis on, 60
Khazar raids: during reign of Abū Jaʿfar al-Manṣūr, 287 (map); during reign of Hishām b. ʿAbd al-Malik, 207 (map)
Khazars (Turkic confederation): Arabic-Islamic sources on Jarrāḥ’s campaign against, 200; Armenia, Albania, and, 40, 41 (map); Armenian involvement in caliphal campaigns against, xvii; description of, 40; Harith b. ʿAmr b. Ḥaraja al-Ṭāʾī’s fight against, 205; Maslama b. ʿAbd al-Malik’s campaign against, 105, 106 (map), 107; Maslama’s flight from, 105, 109, 113–15; raids during the reign of Hishām b. ʿAbd al-Malik, 205, 206. See also Huns (Khazars)
Khurāsān or Khorasan (northeastern Iran), 81; emergence of armies of, 253, 258–59; governors under Mansur with ties to, 312, 313
Khuzayma b. Khāzim al-Tamīmī (governor of Armenia), 357, 360; coin of, minted in Hārūniyya, 364, 364; complicated Arabic sources on first term of, 365; second term of, 371–72
kingdom of heaven, 126; Leo addresses topic of, in Leo-ʿUmar correspondence, 126
Kitāb al futūḥ (Ibn Aʿtham), xli, xlii
Kitāb futūḥ al-buldān (Baladhurī): chronological parameters of, xli; structure of, xlii
Knitri, 129, 192, 194
Korepiskopos, Yovhannēs: Homily on the Cross of Varag, 33
Kūšān al-Armanī (patriarch of the Armenians), 271–72; fights on behalf of Constantine V, 257; Roman capture of Qāliqalā/Karin and, 271–74
Kʿuzi (Kūziyya), 129, 192, 193
Lachanodrakon, Michael, xxxii, 349, 385; Roman campaign of 161/778 and command of, 340, 341, 342, 343t, 350
Lambronac’ī, Nersēs: Commentary on the Proverbs of Solomon, 393
languages: Lewond’s integration of Greek vocabulary, in description of Mansūr’s caliphate, 327–28; multiple, author in Leo’s letter on Christian scriptures rendered in, 196–97
Lastivertc’ī, Aristakēs: on instability around patrimony of Armenian nobles, 370
Lazica: Theophanes as sole source for Roman interest in, 94–95
Lazar Pʿarpec’ī, History, xxxvii
lead seals, xxx; Ibn Dūqih’s harsh taxation and use of, 376; taxation under ʿAbd Allāh al-Saffāḥ and use of, 279
Leo III, the Isaurian (Roman emperor), xxi; elevation of, as a pious emperor, 236–37; legacy of, 118; letter from, to the Umayyad caliph ʿUmar b. ʿAbd al-ʿAziz (Armenian edition), 158–80; letter from, to the Umayyad caliph ʿUmar b. ʿAbd al-ʿAziz (English translation), 119–57; Łewond’s comparison between Hezekiah and, 210, 237; Lewond’s portrayal of, xxxii
Leo IV (Roman emperor, “the Khazar”): assumes the throne upon Constantine V’s death, 330; death of, 332, 346, 349
Łewond: Akinean’s outline of life of, xxiii; further reading on, livi; literary style and historiographical approach of, xli; at the nexus of multiple linguistic circles, in account of Saffāḥ’s reign, 283–84; possible knowledge of ‘Umar-Leo letters, significance of, 156; pro-Sufyānid stance of, 12; on rebellions of 157/774 and 158/775 according to Ibn Aʿtham and, 324–25, 325; report of the siege of Constantinople as mirror image of that of Ibn Aʿtham, 231–36; summary of information provided about 159/776 summer campaign, 339, 340; summary of information provided about caliphal campaign of 165/782, 346, 347, 348, 348; summary of information provided about Roman campaign of 161/778, 340, 343, 343; summary of information provided about caliphal campaign of 162/779, 343, 345, 345, 346; textual relationship between Ibn Aʿtham, xliii–xlv. See also History (Łewond)

Łewond’s version of ‘Umar-Leo correspondence, composition and translation of, 185–92; dating the Greek Vorlage of the Armenian letter, 187–90; Lewond’s version as a translation from the Greek, 185–87, 187; second/eighth-century translation incorporated into Lewond’s History, 190–92

Life of Maštoc’ (Koriwn), xxxvi–xxxvii

local histories: Armenian tradition of, xxxvii

Lord Trdat Ōt’msec’i (Armenian catholicos), 289


Madiam (Madina): “camps of,” during the Islamic conquests, 16; the “City of the Prophet,” 2, 16

Mahé, Jean-Pierre, 192; on dating of History, xxv; on godless Jādi, 194

Malāla b. Ḥikma: Roman campaign of 161/778 and, 341, 343

Mamikonean, Artawazd, xxxii, 290, 291, 319, 330, 392; Roman campaign of 161/778 and, 340, 341; tax collector killed by, 291, 314

Mamikonean, Davit’, 214; death of, 255–56, 392; executes Mehružan Arcruni, 368, 370; exile to Yemen, 238, 253, 254, 267, 392

Mamikonean, Grigor (prince of Armenia), xxxviii, 214, 369; biographical note, 25; church at Aruč built by, 25, 40, 64; death of, 256; exile to Yemen, 238, 253, 254, 267, 392; Ibn Muslim appoints as prince over Armenian troops, 255; Kūshān al-Armanī’s taking of Qālīqalā/Karin aided by, 272; Marwānid reforms and, 63–64; rebellion of, xxviii

Mamikonean, Hamazasp, liii; abbot of Yovhannavank’, 391, 392; historical footprints left by, 392–93

Mamikonean, Helinē, 25, 40

Mamikonean, Hrahat, 328

Mamikonean, Hrahat, 292, 319, 320, 325, 326, 341(?), 392; leader at battle of Baghrawand/Bagrewand, 320, 323; tax collector killed by, 314

Mamikonean, Hrahat (son of Hrahat), 292, 319, 320, 322, 325, 326, 341(?), 392; leader at battle of Baghrawand/Bagrewand, 320, 323; tax collector killed by, 314

Mamikonean, Mušeł (brother of Grigor and David), prince of Armenia (748–753), 214, 258, 271; exile to Yemen, 253, 254, 267; Kūshān al-Armanī’s taking of Qālīqalā/Karin aided by 272

Mamikonean, Mušeł (son of Hrahat), 292, 319

Mamikonean-Bagratuni rivalry: during caliphate of Marwān b. Muḥammad, 253, 267–68; Lewond’s highlighting of, xviii–xxix, xxxi

Mamikonean: defeat of, at battle of Baghrawand/Bagrewand, 285, 295 (map), 296, 298–301, 319; elevation of Bagratuni family over, Lewond’s documentation of, 238; Lazar’s and Eliše’s texts commissioned by, xxxvii; spearheading of Armenian rebellion against Umayyad caliphate, 256

Mamikonean rebellion: aims of, 267, 319; in a broader regional context, 274–76; comparison with Mamikonean rebellion in 158/775, 269–71; Kūshān al-Armanī and the Roman capture of Qālīqalā/Karin, 271–74; referenced in colophon, 392; during reign of Abū Jaʿfar al-Manṣūr, 291 (map); Umayyad undermining of, 214; under reign of Marwān b. Muḥammad, 253, 256–58, 257 (map), 268–76

Manṣūr: See Abū Jaʿfar ‘Abd Allāh b. Muḥammad b. ‘Ali (regnal title Manṣūr)
Marcian (Roman emperor), 105; eschatological inscription attributed to, and Maslama as the New Alexander, 111–13
Mark: evangelist and author of the Gospels, 118, 127
Martin-Hisard, Bernadette, 323; on Łewond’s account of Abū Ja’far’s travels, 282–83; on Łewond’s integration of Greek vocabulary, 327
martyrdom: invoking of Three Youths and, 79; Łewond’s use of biblical allusions in scenes of, xxxv, xl
Martyrdom of King Arč’il II, 373
martyrology of Arcruni princes, 357–60, 366–71; arrests on suspicion of fomenting revolt, 366, 368; dating of execution, 370; preamble to, description of the context, 369–70
Marwān b. al-Ḥakam, 37; length of reign, in second/eighth- and third/ninth-century lists of caliphs, xlviii
Marwān b. Muḥammad, 194, 253–77, 281; ‘Abdābid Revolution, 253, 276–77; Armenian edition, 261–65; Bagratun’i and campaigns of, 238–41; beginning and ending formulae, Łewond’s list of caliphs, xlvi; earns name of Murvan Qru (Marwān the Deaf), 240; English translation, 253–59; as governor-general, 221, 222, 253; legacy of, 214; length of reign, in second/eighth- and third/ninth-century lists of caliphs, xlvi; Mamikonean-Bagratuni rivalry, 253, 267–68; Mamikonean rebellion during, 253, 256–58, 257 (map); marches against Syria, in the third fitna, 243, 246–47; siege of Damascus, 265–66; Sulaymān b. Hishām killed by, according to Lewond, 247, 253
Marwānid reforms: payment of stipends and, 90, 92, 239; prince of Armenia and, 62–65
Marwānid: ascension to power, xx
Maslama b. ‘Abd al-Malik (Umayyad general): confrontation between Sa’īd al-Ḥarashī and, 226–28; in Darband, 105, 109–15; destruction and rebuilding of Darband, 105, 110; dual campaigns of Muḥammad b. Marwān and, 102–3; failed campaign against Constantinople, Lewond’s description of, 205, 207–14, 208 (map); flight from the Khazars, 105, 109, 113–15; as governor-general, 221, 222; as the hero of the ambush of the Greeks in Anatolia, 229; Lewond’s inventive storytelling about, 105, 108, 109, 111, 205; as the New Alexander, end of time, Marcian’s inscription, and, 105, 111–13; siege of Ḥayzān and Smbat’s story compared with, 74. See also Constantinople, Maslama’s campaign against the Caucasus and
Maš’ūdi: account of reign of Walīd b. ‘Abd al-Malik, xlix; on coast of Caspian Sea up to the oil fields of Bākuh, 352, 353
Matenadaran 1902: book stamp of Andrēas vardapet, lv; chapter numbers, lvi; colophon, lii–lv; description of, lii–lv; ex libris stamp, lv; foliation, lvi; four hands detected in copying of Lewond’s text, lvi; Lewond’s name in bottom margin of some folios in, lvi; marginal notes, lv, lv–lv; minor markings, lvi; orthographic tendencies in Sargis’s hand (Hand 1), lvi; ownership of volume, marginal note on, lvi; patron of, lvi; principal scribe, lvi; quires in, lvi–lvi; repair of, lv–lv, lvi; textual tradition and stemma, lvi–lvi
Matenadaran 3070, lv
Matenadaran 5501, lv
maṭmūra (subterranean structures): summer expeditions and use of, 339
Matthew: evangelist and author of the Gospels, 118, 127
Melitene: Constantine’s campaign against, 271 mesogaion (midlands), 207
Mesrop Mashtots Institute of Ancient Manuscripts (Erevan, Armenia), lvi
Meyendorff, J.: on Leo’s defense of the use of images, 188
Micah: prophesying about Christ, 138
Michael the Syrian, 347; concern with concubine-born Arabs, 250; Dawit’ Saharuni’s abandonment of the Greek forces and, 30,
31; on Maslama’s flight from the Khazars, 114; political control of Armenia in 66/685–86 in history of, 61; rebellion of Saborios and, 31; reports on Sasanian Empire, 19; slaughter of pigs paired with dismantling of crosses in texts of, 202; on third campaign entering Armenia in 32/652–53, 23 military conflict scenes: Lewond’s biblical allusions in, xxxiv–xxxv

military elite: Lewond’s focus on, xxvi

military service: Armenian, to the Caliphate, 238–39. See also cavalry; pensions for troops; soldiers, payment of

Mkrtič’ Awgerian (Jean-Baptiste Aucher): Complete Lives and Martyrdoms of the Saints, 366

Mongols: coming of, in 1258, 279

Moses, 126, 132, 134, 135, 137, 151, 194; Muslim historians and genealogy of, 141

Mount Etna: Hephaestus and, 333

Mount Vesuvius: Strabo on smells of Gulf Lucrinus near, 353

Mousoulem, Alexios: imprisonment and blinding of, 387

Movsēs Xorenac’i, History, xxxvii

Mren: Herakleios as depicted on Armenian church at, 2

Mu’awiya b. Abī Sufyān, 25–36; Armenian defection from Roman forces, 28–32; Armenian edition, 27–28; beginning formulae, Lewond’s list of caliphs, xlvt; campaigns in 22/642–43 and, 20; Dawit’ Saharuni’s abandonment of the Greek forces, 30–31; English translation, 25–27; as first governor of Syria, xx; inauguration of Umayyads as first dynasty of the caliphate, 25, 36; length of reign, in second/eighth- and third/ninth-century lists of caliphs, xlviiit; Lewond’s focus on and brevity in covering, 25; rebellion of Pasagnathès, 29–30; rebellion of Saborios, 31–32; Sufyānid governance and the interregnum, 35–36; Vard Ṙštuni portrayed as not a traitor, 32–35

Mu’awiya b. Yazid, 37; length of reign, in second/eighth- and third/ninth-century lists of caliphs, xlviiit

Muhallabīs: near-dynastic control of ’Abbāsid Ibrīqiyya by, 365; service of, in Sind (Pakistan) and Ibrīqiyya (Tunisia), 313

Muhammad (Prophet), xlvii, 259; birth of, 1; burial place of, 2; death of, xix, 1, 37; explanation of sectarianism by, in ḥadīth al-tafriqa (ḥadīth of divisions), 195–96; Gospels used to argue for prophethood of, 119; lawgiver epithet for, 2; length of reign, in second/eighth- and third/ninth-century lists of caliphs, xlviiit; marriage to Zaynab bt. Jahsh, 152

Muhammad al-Mahdi, 329–55; Armenian edition, 334–36; beginning and ending formulae, Lewond’s list of caliphs, xlvit; caliphal governance, 337–38; career of Tačat Anjeawac’, 349–55, 350t; death of, 333; elite power plays during caliphate of, 337; English translation, 329–33; length of reign, in second/eighth- and third/ninth-century lists of caliphs, xlviiit; Lewond’s character note on, xlixt; summer expeditions (sawā’if) on the Arab–Roman frontier, 331 (map), 338–49, 340t, 343t, 345t, 348t

Muhammad b. Ḫasan, 39, 291, 312; caliphal campaign of 162/779 and, 343, 344, 345t; general, at battle of Baghrawand/Bagrewand, 319, 320, 320t, 321, 323

Muhammad b. Marwān, 39, 43, 232, 239; caliphal garrisons in Armenian territory under, xx; campaign against China, 77, 81–83, 100–103, 210; defeats Romans at Sibīsṭa/Sebastopolis, 89; Roman military encounter with, 88–89; three-year amān of, 70–72

Muhammadidiyya: minting of coins in, 337, 364, 364

muhammadira: most famous use of term, 100n77

Muqātit b. Ṣāliḥ: dispatched to Jurzān/K’art’li, 324

Muraena (sea serpent), 153

Murji, 129, 192, 194

Mūsā al-Hādī, 357–74; Armenian edition, 361–63; beginning and ending formulae, Lewond’s list of caliphs, xlvit; caliphal governance, 363–66; contested short reign, 357; death of the Georgian prince, 360, 371–74; death or conversion of the Arcruni princes, 357–60, 366–71; English translation,
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357–60; length of reign, in second/eighth- and third/ninth-century lists of caliphs, xlvii; Lewond’s character note on, xlixt; summer expeditions during reign of, 338
Mūsā b. Muṣʿab (governor over Jazīra), 313
Musayyib b. Zuhayr, 363
Mušel the son of Count Hrahat, 292
Muslims: direction of prayer and, 142; prophet-hood of Muḥammad and employment of the Gospels by, 119. See also Islam; Muḥammad (Prophet); Quʾrān
Mustard seed, parable of, 331
Mutiny: killing of tax collectors viewed as, 314
Muʿtamir b. Sulaymān al-Baṣrī: caliphal campaign of 162/779 and, 345
Mxit’ar Anec’i: Leo-ʿUmar letter, Karshuni document, and history of, 189, 190
Mystikos, Nikolaos, 15

Nagorno-Karabagh: Albanians and, 40
Nashawā/Naxčawan: cadastre introduced by Khuzayma in, 365; establishment of the Umayyad diwān and fires of, 90–92; fires of, appearance in Armenian, Arabid, Greek, and Syriac sources, 89; fires of Gukank’ fore-shadowing fires of, 72–74; Ḥabīb b. Maslama al-Fihrī ‘s incursion into, 22; as an important administrative center during the reign of ‘Abd al-Malik, 98–99; Lewond’s biblical allusions to, xxxv; Qāsim governor over, 78; rebellion at Vardanakert and Muslim forces at, 69; return of captives after fires of, under ‘Umar’s rule, 181–82
Naṣr b. Sayyār: Tābarī on lowering of the kharāj and, 224
Naxarāk ‘(dynastic noble families): Bagratunik’, rhetoric of unity, and, 322–23; competing narratives of battle of Vardanakert and Bagratuni-Kamsarakan issue, 74–75; description of, 7; imperial policy on the frontier and, 315; Lewond’s highlighting of tensions between Bagratuni-Mamikonean naxarar houses, xxviii–xxix, xxxi, 267–68; mainstay of power residing in, xx; Mamikonean-Bagratuni rivalry and, xxviii–xxix; Mamikonean rebellions and unity of, 269–70; reference to nobles at the caliphal court, 208; “rightly guided” caliphs and, xx;

royal record ruse and elimination of, 77, 78–80, 90; salaries and, xxx, 253, 267–68; second fitna and independence of, 59; Tačat Anjewac’i and military role of, on northern frontier, 349
Naxčawan: See Nashawā/Naxčawan
Near East: mobility of reports in various historiographical traditions of, 115; at the time of the Islamic conquests, 2 (map)
Nebuchadnezzar, 125
neck sealing: harsh taxation under caliphal rule and, l, 279, 283, 376
Nersēs III, xxxviii, 14, 35; role in construction of Zuart’noc’ (church of Saint Grigor), 26, 27
New Testament, 121; total number of witnesses in, 122. See also Gospels of Christ
Nihāwān, battle of, 4, 20
Nikephoros: Yazīd b. ‘Abd al-Malik’s destruction of Christian images in account of, 203
Nizāriyya: group of, moved to Armenia under Yūsuf b. Rāshid al-Sulami, 387–88; served as governors of Armenia, 388
Noah, 126
non-Christians: Lewond’s use of “wild beast” trope related to, 212
Noth, A.: on stages of futūḥ narratives, xli
numismatic record: fit of Lewond’s information with evidence in, examples of, 364, 382, 383, 384. See also coins

oaths in writing: caliphal governors, control over Armenia, and, xxix; three-year amān of Muḥummad b. Marwān and, 70–71; in Umayyad period, 51
oil fields of Bākuh: Masʿūdī on coast of Caspian Sea up to, 352, 353
Old Testament, 121; four Kingdoms and Chronicles in, 124; total number of witnesses in, 122
Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium, lx
Paraclete: Muslim understanding of word, 119, 128
P’arsbit’: Khazar campaign against Ardabil/Artawēt and, 224
Partaw: See Bardha’a/Partaw
Part’ew, Grigor, xxxvi, xxxvii
Pasagnathēs: rebellion of, 29–30
Patralogia Graeca, 183
Paulicians: “sons of transgression” reference and, 273
P’awstos: See Buzandaran or Epic Histories (P’awstos)
P’aytakaran: short recension of Širakac’i’s geography on, 225
pensions for troops: distribution under Muhammad al-Mahdī, 329
Pentapolis (Barqa, in modern Libya), 280, 282
Pentateuch, 124
pericope: as point of contention, in Julianist controversies in Armenia, 186
Perōz III (last scion of Sasanian line), 249
Persians: collapse of Persian Empire, 18; Ishmaelites and overthrow of, 4; Lewond on length of reign of, 156. See also Sasanians
Persian texts: Lewond’s connection to, xiv, xlv
Pharaoh’s army, destruction at the Red Sea: Lewond conjures image of, in description of Maslama’s campaign, 238
Phasis, 92, 314; Bagratuni relocation to, under Justinian, 93–95; as a center of Roman influence, 80; plundering of, 80; returning from, under Bardanes Philipikos, 95–96
Philippikos Bardanes, xxxiii, xxxin18; returning from Phasis under, 95–96
pigs: Yazīd b. ʿAbd al-Malik’s slaughter of, 199, 201–2
place lists: claims of universality and, 282–83
poems: in futūḥ narratives, xlii
Pontus Sea (Black Sea), 208
populated movements: Romans and orchestration of, 315, 315n81
prayer, direction of (qibla), 142
primogeniture: early ‘Abbāsid period and lack of assumption of, 381
prince of Armenia (honorific title), 4
princes of Armenia: list of, 64n102; Marwānid reforms and broader integration of Armenia into the Caliphate and, 63–65
Prokopios (Roman general), 4, 25; dismissal of Tē’odoros by, 20; Lewond’s portrayal of, xxxii
prophetic texts: use of in ῤUmar-Leo letters, and Lewond’s conception of prophecy, 192
prophets: Qur’ānic support for, 122
Pseudo-Methodius: Apocalypṣe, 1; caves and crevices motif in Christian apocalypse of, 289; “taxes from the dead” phrase in Christian apocalypse of, 279, 283
Pseudo-Šapuh. See Bagratuni, Šapuh (Anonymous Storyteller or Pseudo-Šapuh)
Pseudo-Śebēs: on Dawit’ Saharuni’s abandonment of the Greek forces, 30–31; divergences between Lewond and, over Jews and Islamic conquest, 17; on impact of Marwānid reforms on Armenia, 63; on length of Sasanian rule, 19; mention of Vardanakert, in description of Heraklios’s campaign through Armenia, 69; on third campaign entering Armenia in 32/652–53, 23, 24
Pseudo-Wāqidī: futūḥ narratives of, xlii
Pseudo-Sebēos: on Dawit’ Saharuni’s abandonment of the Greek forces, 30–31; divergences between Lewond and, over Jews and Islamic conquest, 17; on impact of Marwānid reforms on Armenia, 63; on length of Sasanian rule, 19; mention of Vardanakert, in description of Heraklios’s campaign through Armenia, 69; on third campaign entering Armenia in 32/652–53, 23, 24
Qadariyya (Islamic sect), 194
Qādisiyya, battle of: booty the Muslims captured at, 19
Qāliqalā/Karin, 258, 297, 298; Kūshān al-Armanī and Roman capture of, 271–74; starting point of Armenian forces, battle of Baghrawand/Bagrewand, 320, 320r; Yazīd b. Usayd’s poll tax in, 314
Qāsim (governor over Nashawā/Naxčawan), 78, 90
Quorra b. Ṭḥabit, 274
quurrā’ (Qurʾān reciters): debates over definition of, 243, 248; Walīd’s murder and role of, xxii, 243–44, 248–49
Qurʾān, 194; communal prayer on Friday (jumʿa) mentioned in, 147; division of, into sections (ajzāʾ), 131; divorce allowed in, 153; example of Adam in, 145; “in the path of God” reference in, 155; P’urkan (“Criterion”), twenty-fifth chapter of, 127; rejection of Jesus’s crucifixion in, 145; remarriage as permissible in, 153; support for prophets in, 122; Uriah and Bathsheba not mentioned by name in, 152; witnesses in, 122; ‘Umar’s fiscal policy based on interpretation of, 223
Qutayba b. Muslim: campaigns in Central Asia directed by, 101

Rabi' b. Yūnus: caliphal campaign of 165/782 and, 347, 348t

Rawḥ b. Ḥātim al-Muhallabī (governor of Armenia and various provinces), 288, 313, 333, 338, 357, 363, 365

Ṙažt'arxan (Khazar general subordinate to the khagan), 287, 316, 317

rebellions during reign of Manṣūr, 319–23; the Bagratunīk' and the rhetoric of unity, 322–23; two-pronged rebellion or two separate rebellions?, 319–21, 320t

red clothing/garments: meanings of, in early Islamic period, 99–100

Reinink, G.: on Ḵosrow II Parvīz, 112

religious controversies: Łewond’s lack of interest in, xxxi

remarriage: Islamic law and, 153

resurrection, 126, 127, 194; Christian Sabbath on Sunday and good news about, 147; Christians and hope in, 155–57; Leo addresses topic of, in Leo-ʿUmar correspondence, 126, 127; Leo the Isaurian on Christian idea of, vs. worldly vision of, 155

revelation: Christian vs. Muslim beliefs about nature of, 128

“rightly guided” caliphs, xx; deaths of, 8; expansion of Islamic world and, xix; Lewond combines reigns of, into a single period, 1; Lewond’s beginning and ending formulae in list of, xlv; nazarak’ and, xx

Roman Empire: Arabic descriptions of military campaigns against, 313; Isaurians and rule of, xxi; Lewond’s nuanced perspective on, xxxi–xxxiv, 1; rebellion at Vardanakert and, 68–70; territories lost to Islamic Empire, xix. See also West Caucasus, Roman interests in

Roman forces: Armenian defection from, volte-face of T’ėodoros Ῥἑτυνι, 25, 28–32; Armenian involvement in caliphal campaigns against, xvii; battling, in early conquest period, 18

royal record: diwān and names of stipend recipients recorded in, 78, 90, 215. See also stipends

Řἑtuní family: span of control of, 4

rukn (corner of the Ka’ba), 152, 188

Ruṣāfa (city near Raqqā): Sulaymān’s rebellion at, 244, 247

Sabart’uṙabi, 129, 192, 193–94

Sabbath on Sunday: Leo the Isaurian on anticipation of, in the Old Testament, 146, 147

Saborios: rebellion of, 31–32

sacrifice: Leo the Isaurian on Christian reinterpretation of Jewish practice of, 146

Saffāḥ: See Abū ʿAbbās ʿAbd Allāh b. Muḥammad b. ‘Ali (regnal title Saffāḥ)

Sahak III (catholicos), 49, 51, 388

Sahārūnī, Dawit’: abandonment of the Greek forces and, convoluted reports on, 30–31

salaries for troops: Lewond’s multiple references to, xxx. See also pensions for troops; stipends

Salibas, Theophylaktos, 230

Ṣāliḥ b. Ṣabīḥ [or Šubayh] al-Kindī (governor of Armenia), 288, 312

Ṣālim al-Burnisī: Roman campaign of 161/778 and, 341, 343t

Ṣalmān al-Fārisī (Companion of the Prophet Muḥḥammad), 127

Ṣalmān b. Rabīʿa: campaigns in 22/642–43 and, 20, 21; incursions into Khazar territories, 23–24

Samuel, 122, 126

Ṣanāriyya/Canark’ī: Ibn Aʿtham on defeat of, 324, 325, 325t

Sagaris (Sangarios) River, 207, 208 (map), 231, 331, 345t

Saracen: as derogatory name for Muslims, 285

Sarah (wife of Abraham), 3

Sargis (scribe), 391; marking of direct quotes in Lewond’s History, 192, 192; miniscule (bolorgir) and majuscule (erkat’agir) script used by, 393; principal, Matenadaran 1902,
liii; text hypercorrected by, quotation of Psalm 109, 186–87, 187
Sarmatians (Bulgar Khanate), 332
Sasanians: Armenian rebellions against, xxxvi, xxxvii; collapse of Sasanian Empire, xix, 18–19; length of rule and description, 4; Lewond on length of rule of, 156; Sasanian succession practices and ‘Abbāsids’ placement of heirs to the Caliphate in charge of the North, 382–83; siege of Edessa, 16; theft of True Cross and, xxi
Satan, 133, 134, 137, 152; “as the treasurer of God,” in Armenian text alone vs. Muslim Arabic text, ‘Umar-Leo correspondence, 184; Leo the Isaurian on Islam’s incorrect understanding of, 153–54
ṣawāʾīf (summer expeditions) on the Arab-Roman frontier, 329, 331 (map), 337, 338–49; ‘Abbāsids and organization of, 338; caliphal campaign of AH 159/AM 6268/776 CE, 339–40, 340t; caliphal campaign of AH 162/AM 6271/779 CE, 343–46, 345t; caliphal campaign of AH 165/AM 6274/782 CE, 346–48, 348t; conclusions about Lewond’s accounts of, 348–49; Roman campaign of AH 161/AM 6270/778 CE, 340–43, 343t
Sa’īd b. ‘Amr b. al-Aswād al-Ḥarashī: abrasive personality of, 228; confrontation between Maslama b. ‘Abd al-Malik and, 226–28; as governor-general, 206, 221, 222
scribes and copyists: access to historical texts, xlv; process of translation and, 187. See also Sargis (scribe)
scriptural prophecy: Lewond’s retelling of second/third fitnas through lens of, xxxv
scripture, nature of: ‘Umar-Leo correspondence and theme of, 117, 121, 122, 123–24, 132, 142
Sebōs: History (seventh-century) of, xxxvi, 13, 237, 238; Lewond’s vs. Sebōs’s evaluation of Armenian submission to caliphate, xxxviii–xxxix
Second Council of Nicaea, xxxi; Greek sources on, 204; Lewond’s lack of interest in, 237
second fitna: Armenia and, 39, 59–62; dissenters and beginning of, 39; the fitna as Providence, 62; imperial vacuum in the North, 59–62; Lewond’s retelling of, through lens of scriptural prophecy, xxxv; renewed Roman-Umayyad hostilities during, 88–89
sectarianism represented in ‘Umar-Leo correspondence, 192–97; groups within Christianity, 195–97; sects of Islam, 187, 189, 192–95
Septuagint: Greek Vorlage to Armenian text for ‘Umar-Leo correspondence and, 186, 187; Lewond’s demonstrated familiarity with, 284
Sermon on the Mount, xxxv
“Seventh Vision of Daniel,” 111
Shirota, S., 224
shurūṭ ‘Umar (legal restrictions against non-Muslims), 202
Sibistā/Sebastopolis: Muḥammad b. Marwān’s defeat of Romans at, 89
sign of the cross: Leo the Isaurian on, 150–51
silver: discovery of, in Armenia, 291, 329, 337; tax, 289, 291, 314
Simēon (hermit): Vard Ṙštuni’s pious building projects and role of, 34
Sion (catholicos of Armenia), 389
Sisajān/Siunik’: Khārijite rebellions in Azerbaijan, Albania, and, 275
Six Centuries (or Kephalaia Gnostica) (Evagrius), liii
slaves: high number of, Maslama and ‘Abbās’s capture of Ṭuwāna from the Greeks and, 230; soldiers from Central Asia, integration of, during fourth fitna, 366
Socrates Scholasticus: Ecclesiastical History, 392
Sodom and Gomorrah, 132
soldiers, payment of: caliphal governors in Lewond’s text and concern about, 312. See also cavalry; pensions for troops; salaries for troops; stipends
Solomon, 122, 124
Song of Songs, 124
sons of Beliar: Christian context for phrase, 286
sons of Hashim, or Banū Hashim, 259, 276
sons of Smbat, 254
sparapet (military title), 291
spoils of war: conquest narratives and wording about distribution of, 241
Starakios: Theophanes on Tāčat Anjewaci’s defection and, 351
stipends, 251, 314; dīwān and, 90–92, 238–39; Marwānid reforms and payment of, 90, 92, 239; of Umayyad princes, ’Umar’s elimination of, 223; withholding of, in transition from Umayyad rule to ’Abbāsid rule, 281. See also royal record

Strabo: on smells of Gulf Lucrinus near Mount Vesuvius, 353

Sufyānid: “golden age” of Armenian architecture and, 64; governance, interregnum and, 35–36; Lewond’s spotty coverage of, xxix–xxx

Sulaymān b. Abī Jaʿfar, 375, 377, 384, 384n32, 385

Sulaymān b. Hishām: death of, 244, 247; killed by Marwān, according to Lewond, 247, 253; Lewond’s unusual elevation of, to the Caliphate, 249–50; the sons of concubines and, 243, 249–50; the third fitna and role of, 246


summer expeditions. See sawā’īf (summer expeditions) on the Arab-Roman frontier

Syria: collapse of Roman power in, 18; Marwān b. Muhammad’s march against, in third fitna, 243, 246–47

Syriac texts: spotty evidence connecting Lewond to, l

Ṭabarī, Muḥammad b. Jarīr: on battle of Zāb and Marwān’s distribution of funds for troops, 277; concern with concubine-born Arabs, 249; confusion between Hādī’s and Hārūn’s reigns and assertion of, 368; on Khazar raids, 317; on lowering of the kharāj, 224; oblique remark about mutiny, 314; political control of Armenia in 66/685–86 in account of, 61; on rebellions across Jazīra, 275–76; summary of information provided about 159/776 summer campaign, 339, 340; summary of information provided about caliphal campaign of 162/779, 344, 345f, 346; summary of information provided about caliphal campaign of 165/782, 346, 347, 348f; summary of information provided about Roman campaign of 161/778, 342, 343; ’Ubayd Allāh referenced by, 380; Walid b. Yazīd’s libertine personality in accounts of, 245

Tačiks, 25, 39, 40, 51, 296, 370
takbir: tunnels and, in conquest narratives, 97–98

Tarki, 107, 113

Tarōnecci, Step’anos: competing narratives of battle of Vardanakert and, 74; on date of execution of the Armenian princes, 370, 370n62; on length of Sasanian rule, 19; reconstruction of name for Ibn Dūqlīh and history of, 384, 384n44; Universal History, xl, xli, 31, 190

Tarōn or (Tārūn), 7

Taʿrikh al-Bāb: Yazīd b. Mazyad extolled as first Sharwānshāh in, 383
tax collectors: killing of, xxx, 291, 292, 314
taxes and taxation, 42, 312, 318; Armenian emigration and, 386–87; border gates and, during reign of Muḥammad al-Mahdī, 329; cadastre during caliphate of Hishām b. ’Abd al-Malik, 205, 223–24; caliphal, oppression of, xx; establishment of the Umayyad dīwān and, 90, 92, 238–39; fiscal reforms under ’Umar b. ’Abd al-ʿAzīz and, 182, 223, "lawless acts" of the Arcrunik’ and, 319; Lewond’s resentment about, xxx; low, Sufyānid rule and, 35, 36; maintenance of cavalry in lieu of, 238–39; Marwānid reforms and, 63; as most visible sign of caliphal rule, 291; neck sealing and, under ’Abd Allāh [Manṣūr], 289–90; silver tax, 289, 291, 314; in transition from Umayyad rule to ’Abbāsid rule, 281; tyrannical, in Vaspurakan, 254, 267;
Umayyads' multifront conflicts and impact on, 223
“taxes from the dead” phrase: in apocalypse of Pseudo-Methodius, 279, 283
Ter-Levondyan, Aram: on Armenian emigration and tax policies, 386; on length of Hārūn’s viceroyalty, 368; on population shifts under Yazīd b. Mazyad, 388
Theodosiopolis, 285; Łewond’s reference to “Saracen” inhabitants of, 317; siege of, 293
Theodosios III: reign of, 42
Theodosius the Great, 112
Theophanes: anecdote about Alan-Abasgian stratagems, 93–94; on Armenians and fate of Kamakh/Kamachon, 387; battle of Vardanakert and chronicle of, 67, 68; on battle of Zāb and Marwān’s confiscation of treasures from Damascus, 277, 277n74; on Constantine as the “impious emperor,” 236; Dawit’ Saharuni’s abandonment of the Greek forces and, 31; on Justinian’s taking of Constantinople, 98; on Marwān and violence in Damascus, 265; on Maslama and ‘Abbās’s capture of Ṭuwāna from the Greeks, 230; political control of Armenia in 66/685–86 in account of, 60–61; on rebellion of Pasagnathēs, 29; rebellion of Saborios and, 31; relocation to Phasis under Justinian and chronicle of, 93–95; on renewed Roman-Umayyad hostilities during second fitna, 89; on return from Phasis under Bardanes Philippikos, 95–96; on Roman military support for Armenia after battle of Vardanakert, 88; summary of information provided about 159/776 summer campaign, 339, 340t; summary of information provided about caliphal campaign of 162/779, 343–44, 345t; summary of information provided about caliphal campaign of 165/782, 346, 347, 348t; summary of information provided about Roman campaign of 161/778, 340–41, 343, 343t; on Tačat Anjewac’ī’s defection from Roman service, 351; on third campaign entering Armenia in 32/652–53, 23; three-year amān of Muḥummad b. Marwān and chronicle of, 71; Yazīd b. ‘Abd al-Malik’s death in account of, 204
“Theophilus circuit,” 60, 96, 181; Campaign of Mud and, 115; establishment of the divān absent from works of, 90; Maslama’s flight from the Khazars and, 114–15; Vard’s defection and versions of, 29, 30
Theophilus of Edessa: concern with concubine-born Arabs, 250; slaughter of pigs attested to in texts of, 201
third fitna: Lewond’s retelling of, through lens of scriptural prophecy, xxxv; Mamikonean ousting of Bagratunik’ as princes of Armenia during, 64; Marwān b. Muhammad’s reign and continuation of, 253; red clothing worn during, 100; tribal politics during, 251; Umayyad family tree for, 247; Walīd’s death and eruption of, 243, 244, 246–47, 267
Thrace, 213
Three Youths allusion, from Book of Daniel, 79
throne of David: Leo’s explanation of, in ʿUmar-Leo correspondence, 139
Thumāma b. Walīd: Roman campaign of 161/778 and, 341, 342, 343t
Tiberios III Apsimar, xxxii, xxxiii, 42, 69
Tiraka’i, P’ilon: Anonymous Chronicle, xxxviii–xxxix
Togarmah (one of traditional genealogies of Armenian people), 293
Torah, 124, 126
Tower of Babel, 196
Trdat III/IV (Arsacid king of Armenia): conversion to Christianity, xxxvi
tribal politics: Umayyad governance and, 251
tributes: dispatched to the Umayyads, organization of, 26; Lewond’s explicit concerns with, xxx. See also cadastré; taxes and taxation
Trinity, doctrine of: Leo’s explanation in ʿUmar-Leo correspondence, 132–33
True Cross: Herakleios and recovery of, 1, 14; Sasanian Empire and theft of, xxii
Trunik’ (or Trpatunik’), 295
tunnels: and takbīr, in conquest narratives, 97–98
Ṭuwāna/Tyana: Maslama b. ʿAbd al-Malik as hero of ambush in, 229; Muslim capture of, 229–30
ʿUbayd Allāh b. al-Mahdī (governor of Armenia and Azerbaijan): coins minted by, in his own name, 382, 382n30; oppressive tax policies and, 375, 376, 386; rivalry between Hārūn al-Rashīd and, 375, 380–81, 382
ʿUmar b. al-Khaṭṭāb, 181; disseminates his copy of the Qurʾān throughout Islamic world, 127; length of reign, in second/eighth- and third/ninth-century lists of caliphs, xlvii
ʿUmar b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz, 117–97; accomplishments of, 117; beginning and ending formulae, Lewond’s list of caliphs, xlv; composition and translation of Lewond’s version of the ‘Umar-Leo correspondence, 185–92; English translation, 117; fiscal reforms, 182; length of reign, 117; length of reign, in second/eighth- and third/ninth-century lists of caliphs, xlviii; letter from the Roman emperor Leo the Isaurian, to the Umayyad caliph ʿUmar b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz (English translation), 117, 119–57; letter from the Roman Emperor Leo the Isaurian to the Umayyad caliph ʿUmar b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz (Armenian edition), 158–80; letter from the Umayyad caliph ʿUmar b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz to the Roman emperor Leo the Isaurian (Armenian edition), 157–58; letter from Umayyad caliph ʿUmar b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz, to the Roman emperor Leo the Isaurian (English translation), 117, 118–19; Lewond’s character note on, xlix; Lewond’s paucity of information about, 117, 181; Lewond’s version of the ‘Umar-Leo correspondence, as a translation from Greek, 117, 185–87; Lewond’s version of the ‘Umar-Leo correspondence, dating the Greek Vorlage of the Armenian letter, 187–90; Lewond’s version of the ‘Umar-Leo correspondence, groups within Christianity represented in, 195–97; Lewond’s version of the ‘Umar-Leo correspondence, second/eighth-century translation incorporated into Lewond’s History, 190–92; Lewond’s version of the ‘Umar-Leo correspondence, sects of Islam represented in, 192–95; positive accounts about, 117, 181; relationship to the other versions of the ‘Umar-Leo correspondence, 117, 182–84; return of captives, 117, 157, 181–82
Universal History (Step’anos Tarōnec’i), xl, xli, 31, 190
Uriah: death of, according to Jewish and Islamic tradition, 152
ʿUthmān b. ʿAffān: length of reign, in second/eighth- and third/ninth-century lists of caliphs, xlviii; murder of Walīd b. Yazīd compared with murder of, 248–49
ʿUthmān b. Walīd: death of, 28, 244, 246
Vahan Golt’ac’i: on return of captives, under ‘Umar’s rule, 182
Varaztiroc’ III, 43
Vardanakert, battle of, 46, 47 (map), 274; Lewond’s account of, 65; as a rebellion, 66–68; rebellion at, in intra-Armenian politics, 74–76, 271; rebellion at, Roman Empire and, 68–70; Roman military support for Armenia after, 88
Vardan Arewelc’i: Historical Compilation, xl, 197; on length of Sasanian rule, 19; Leo-‘Umar letter, Karshuni document and history of, 189, 191
vardapet: definition of, 1; title applied to Lewond, traditional claim of, xii–xxiii, xxvi, xxxi, 1
Vaspurakan: province near Lake Van, control of, 7; tyrannical taxation in, 254, 267
Venice MS 200: as witness, in martyrology of the Arcruni princes, 366
viceroyalty: Hārūn al-Rashīd’s reign and, 380, 381–83
Virgin Mary: "Homily on the Deliverance of Constantinople" (Patriarch Germanus) and role of, 236, 237
Vita (Habo), 372, 373
volcanoes: evocation of Hephaestus and presence of, 333, 352, 353
volte-face of T’ēodoros Ṙštuni: Armenian defection from Roman forces, 25, 28–32
vowel pointing: introduction of, 131
Walīd b. ʿAbd al-Malik, 77–103; account of reign of, Masʿūdī’s fourth/tenth-century history, xlix; Armenian edition, 84–87; beginning and ending formulae, Lewond’s list of caliphs, xlv; English translation, 77–83;
establishment of the Umayyad diwān, 90–92, 238–39; fires of Nashawā/Naxčawan, 89; length of reign, in second/eighth- and third/ninth-century lists of caliphs, xlviii; Muhammad b. Marwān’s campaign against China, 77, 81–83, 100–103; overview, 77; Roman interests in the West Caucasus, 77, 92–96; Roman military encounter with Muhammad b. Marwān, 88–89; Umayyad maneuvering in the reign of, 78 (map); ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz as governor of Dabīl/Duin, 97–100
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The History of the Armenian priest Łewond is an important source for the history of early Islamic rule and the only contemporary chronicle of second/eighth-century caliphal rule in Armenia. This volume presents a diplomatic edition and new English translation of Łewond’s text, which describes events that took place during the century and a half following the Prophet Muḥammad’s death in AH 11/632 CE. The authors address Łewond’s account as a work of caliphal history, written in Armenian, from within the Caliphate. As such, this book provides a critical reading of the Caliphate from one of its most significant provinces. Reading notes clarify many aspects of the period covered to make the text understandable to students and specialists alike. Extensive commentary elucidates Łewond’s narrative objectives and situates his History in a broader Near Eastern historiographical context by bringing the text into new conversations with a constellation of Arabic, Greek, and Syriac works that cover the same period. The book thus stresses the multiplicity of voices operating in the Caliphate in this pivotal period of Near Eastern history.
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