e-ISSN 2974-6051

Armeniaca
Vol. 4 — October 2025

The Educational-Ecclesiastic Missions and Networking Between the Roman Osroene and Sasanian Armenia in the First Half of the Fifth Century

Anna Usacheva
Universität Bern, Switzerland

Abstract This article reexamines Maštocʻ's first and second journeys to Roman Territory through the lens of frontier networking, utilizing prosopographic analysis of Roman hosts and encounters. I propose that Maštocʻ's first journey occurred between 406 and 407 during the episcopacy of Pqida of Edessa, countering the identification of Babilas with Rabbula of Edessa. For the second journey, I suggest it likely took place between 422 and 423, with 425 as a *terminus ante quem*. While Koriwn and Movsēs mention Anatolius as Maštocʻ's assistant, I argue that the evidence does not support his active military role during the 421-22 conflict.

Keywords Maštocʻ. Armenian Church. Frontier networking. Prosopographic analysis. Roman Empire. Sasanian Empire. Rabbula of Edessa. Anatolius.

This article resulted from the work in the EX-PATRIA project (University of Lille, HALMA – UMR 8164).

Edizioni Ca'Foscari

Peer review

Submitted 2025-04-28
Accepted 2025-08-28
Published 2025-12-12

Open access

© 2025 Usacheva | CC BY 4.0

Citation Usacheva, A. (2025). "The Educational-Ecclesiastic Missions and Networking Between the Roman Osroene and Sasanian Armenia in the First Half of the Fifth Century". *Armeniaca*, 4, 69-96.

DOI 10.30687/arm/2974-6051/2025/01/004

1 Introduction

This article examines the missionary travels of the famous founder of the Armenian alphabet, Maštoc‘ and his disciples, focusing on the networking, logistics, and mobility between Persian Armenia and Roman Osroene. The study of the prosopographic traces of Armenian connections with the East Syriac ecclesiastical and intellectual tradition presents several challenges due to the relative scarcity of historical sources. Thus, some scholars have expressed scepticism towards the Armenian sources. For instance, Gabriele Winkler, in her “Obscure Chapter in Armenian Church History (428-439)”, discussed a “legitimate suspicion whether the Armenians had good reasons for misinterpreting some of the events or destroying many sources” (Winkler 1997, 85). Similarly, Nina Garsoïan questioned certain prosopographic accounts provided by Armenian historiographers and hagiographers in her reconstruction of early Armenian church history.[1]

While biased master narratives can dominate historical accounts, adapting a prosopographic research approach could help mitigate this tendency. Prosopography facilitates crafting a historical narrative about ecclesiastical networking – not through the “master narrative” of historical events and political strategies, but through individual stories and their interactions. This study employs a bottom-up methodological approach, involving the prosopographic verification of names, dates, and circumstances related to Maštoc‘’s journeys into Roman territory. Prosopographic approach enables a nuanced revision of chronology and networks, potentially shedding further light on the still obscure interactions between Persian Armenia and Roman Osroene.

2 Persian Armenia and Roman Osroene: Setting the Stage

Armenian historians have identified the region of Roman Osroene as a primary educational destination for Armenians. Before the time of Maštoc‘ and Theodore of Mopsuestia, Christian literature in the territory of Persian Armenia was under the influence of Hellenic and Syriac linguistic traditions. The Syriac tradition was particularly prevalent due to the requirements of the Persian administration. As Movsēs Xorenac‘i noted, “the Persian governors did not allow anyone to learn Greek in their part but only Syriac” (cf. Movsēs, *Hist*. 3.54,

1 Thus, Garsoïan challenged the account of Maštoc‘’s second journey to Roman territory as presented by Movsēs Xorenac‘i (Garsoïan 2004, 190).

e-ISSN 2974-6051

translation from Thomson 1978, 323). Łazar P'arpec'i mentioned that during the late fourth century, in the time of Maštoc', "the worship of the church and the readings of scripture were conducted in Syriac in the monasteries and churches of the Armenian people" (cf. Łazar, *Hist.* 1.10, translation from Thomson 1991, 47). He observed that Syriac liturgies were incomprehensible to the Armenian people. Łazar also lamented the great expenses associated with educational journeys to Roman Syria, which Armenian students were obliged to undertake (cf. Łazar, *Hist.* 1.10, translation from Thomson 1991, 47).

The adoption of Syriac as an official language for Christian liturgy and mission was characteristic of the region of Mesopotamia, where the spread of Christianity was not achieved exclusively through the use of the Greek language.[2] In her study of the historical transformation of the Armenian liturgical tradition, Gabriele Winkler demonstrated that its earliest layer shows a close affinity to the East Syriac rite and terminology (Winkler 1997, 26, 80, 95). Françoise Briquel-Chatonnet has highlighted the importance of the Syriac language in shaping Syriac Christian identity and its subsequent dissemination through religious missions (Briquel-Chatonnet 1991, 257-74).

Another significant phenomenon that shaped East Syrian orthodoxy was the widespread circulation of Syriac translations of treatises by Theodore of Mopsuestia, who had become renowned as a preeminent exegete.[3] His works, along with those of Diodore of Tarsus, were considered part of the curriculum at the so-called School of the Persians in Edessa.[4]

Sources also mention a certain school of Armenians in Edessa. Thus, the Syriac acts of the 'robber' council (Ephesus 449) mention a certain petition submitted against Iba of Edessa, which was signed by "all the clergy and heads of monasteries, monks and members of orders, worthies and citizens and Romans and the Schools of the

2 Thus, Philip Wood (2010, 6) argued that since "major proponents of Nicaea had written in Syriac, the language escaped the fate of the languages of Anatolia, where Christianisation accelerated Hellenisation". For an examination of the intricate relationship between Greek and Syriac, see Sebastian Brock *From Antagonism to Assimilation: Syriac Attitudes to Greek Learning* (Brock 1982, 17-34).

3 For an examination of the role and impact of Theodore's heritage on the teaching practices and reputation of the School of the Persians, see Adam H. Becker, *Sources for the History of the School of Nisibis* (Becker 2008, 6). For testimony of Theodore's prominent position in the School of Nisibis, a successor to Edessa in theological tradition, see Gerrit J. Reinink, *Edessa Grew Dim and Nisibis Shone Forth* (1995, 77-89).

4 In the early sixth century, Jacob of Sarug, in his *Letter 14*, mentioned a certain school of the Persians in Edessa, from which "the whole East was harmed", because in this school the books of Diodore of Tarsus were translated and appreciated (Becker 2006, 52).

Armenians, of the Persians, and of the Syrians (ܒܝܬ ܣܦܪܐ ܕܐܪܡܝܐ ܒܝܬ ܣܦܪܐ ܕܦܪܣܝܐ ܒܝܬ ܣܦܪܐ ܕܣܘܪܝܝܐ)". [5]

Whether such an establishment as an Armenian school in Edessa truly existed is difficult to ascertain, but this testimony implies at least the existence of educational connections between Armenian and Roman Syriac territories.[6]

The earliest explicit accounts of the dissemination of Theodore's teachings across the Roman border via the School of Edessa are preserved in Ibas of Edessa's *Letter to Mari the Persian* (433)[7] and in sixth-century Miaphysite sources, including the *Letter from Simeon of Beth Arsham* and *Letter XIV* of Jacob of Sarug.[8]

In his *Letter to Mari the Persian*, Ibas attested that Theodore not only enlightened his own city but also "educated the distant churches with his teaching".[9] The letter indicates that after the Council of Edessa (431), where the teachings of Nestorius were condemned, Rabbula, the bishop of Edessa, initiated a search and burning of Theodore's books.[10] The identity of Ibas' correspondent, Mari, is debated.[11] However, the text implies that he was a high-ranking church official, either a bishop or an abbot, who had recently stayed in Edessa and was familiar with its current prelate. Mari's identifier 'the Persian' suggests that he belonged to the Church of the East. If this identity marker is genuine, it would explain Ibas' intention to inform his friend about recent events in the neighbouring Christian church.

5 The Syriac text of the *Acts* and its German translation were published by Flemming 1970, 25-6. English translation from Becker 2006, 64.

6 About other mentions of the School of the Armenians in Edessa and its likely connections with the School of the Persians, see Garsoïan 1999, 69, fn. 97.

7 Ibas of Edessa became known as the manager of the translation project of Theodore's oeuvre conducted at the School of Edessa. For details, cf. Rammelt 2008, 50-3.

8 Adam Becker provided a critical reading of the Miaphysite sources, highlighting their biased misrepresentation of the dissemination of the writings of Diodore and Theodore. Nevertheless, Becker's analysis did not undermine the strong connection between the so-called School of the Persians in Edessa and Antiochene theology (Becker 2006, 53).

9 The Syriac text of the letter of Ibas and its German translation was published by Flemming 1970, 48-9. The Greek version of the text is found in *Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum* (Schwartz 1935, 32-5).

10 About Rabbula's book burning activities, see Doran 2006, 172.

11 Arthur Vööbus suggested that Mari was the bishop of Rev-Ardashir (Vööbus 1965, 25, 356). Georg Günter Blum identified Mari as the metropolitan of Seleucia (Blum 1969, 211). Michael van Esbroeck proposed that Mari was an archimandrite of the convent of the Akoimetoi near Constantinople (van Esbroeck 1986 145-59). Claudia Rammelt disputed van Esbroeck's hypothesis and argued that Mari held a prominent ecclesiastical position in the Church of the East and that he met Ibas during his prolonged educational visit to Edessa (Rammelt 2008, 51-3).

e-ISSN 2974-6051

Apparently, Ibas' remark about the transborder spread of Theodore's teachings was accurate, as following Rabbula's lead, Acacius of Melitene also initiated a search for Theodore's writings. Evidence of these actions is preserved in the correspondence between Acacius and Catholicos Sahak Part'ew,[12] dated around 432-33.[13] Acacius informed the Armenian prelate and his people about the outcome of the Council of Ephesus and warned them of the hidden dangers posed by the works of the Mopsuestian teacher, whom Acacius, like Rabbula, associated with Nestorius: "But we are afraid lest someone be found imbued with the discipline of Theodore of Mopsuestia and the evil poison of Nestorius, inciting simple souls".[14]

Aware of the spread of Theodore's works to Armenia and relying on his established connection with Catholicos Sahak, Acacius sought to engage the neighbouring church to remain united in the face of religious conflict.[15]

While this epistolary exchange clearly confirms the transborder spread of Theodore's oeuvre, it is uncertain when this dissemination began. There is a scholarly discussion regarding the earlier (late fourth to early fifth century) *versus* later (beginning with Ibas' episcopate in 435 onward) dating of the translations of Theodore's works.[16] Although the exact timing of the earliest translation projects is debatable, it is likely that while Armenian students from the Osroene schools occasionally brought home the teachings of Theodore, the more formal introduction of his works into Armenia was facilitated by the famous missionary Maštoc'.

12 Cf. *Ep. Ad sanctum Sahak, Armenorum Patriarcham, Responsum Domni Sahak epistulae Akak*, and *Ep. Ab Akak episcopo ad Armenios*. French translation and the commentary of these works was published by Maurice Tallon (1955, 21-39).

13 For the dating of the correspondence between Acacius and Sahak, see Tallon 1955, 22-3; Winkler 1997, 101-4.

14 Cf. Acacius, *Ep. ad sanctum Sahak*: "*Sed nobis timor est ne forte quis inveniatur imbutus disciplina Theodori Mopsuestiae maloque veneno Nestorii, instiguat animas simplices*". Latin translation of Acacius' correspondence was published by Marcel Richard (1977, 394).

15 Around 435, Acacius' admonitions were reflected in the *Letter from the Armenians to Proclus*. For the dating of the *Letter from the Armenians*, see Inglisian 1957, 42.

16 For an account of the scholarly debate regarding the translation of Theodore's works, see Rammelt 2008, 43-6.

e-ISSN 2974-6051

3 Maštoc‘ and Theodore

Nerses Akinean and Nicholas Adontz suggested that Maštoc‘ met Theodore of Mopsuestia during his first journey to Roman Syria.[17] Both scholars linked their hypotheses to the testimony of Patriarch Photius (810-895). In his work *Myriobiblion*, Photius claimed that he had read a treatise in three books against the Persian religion written by a certain “Theodore” and addressed to “Mastoubios of Armenian origin”.[18] Photius identified this Theodore as the renowned Bishop of Mopsuestia. [19]

Ervand Ter-Minasean, in an article, presented a thorough and persuasive criticism of the renowned scholars’ position (Ter-Minasean 1964, 25-48). I fully endorse Ter-Minasean’s opinion and will further review the scholarly discussion, suggesting some nuances regarding the prosopographic interpretation of a hypothetical meeting between Theodore of Mopsuestia and Maštoc‘.

Thus, Ter-Minasean doubted Adontz’ and Akinean’s identification of a certain “Mastoubios of Armenian origin” with Mashtots, referring to the lack of historical evidence that Maštoc‘ ever held the position of *chorepiscopos* mentioned by Photius (Ter-Minasean 1964, 39-40). Nina Garsoïan also expressed reservations about the opinion of Adontz and Akinean (Garsoïan 1999, 68-9).

Another reasonable doubt about linking Mastoubios with Maštoc‘ lies in the questionable identification of the author of *Contra Magos* with Theodore. Victoria Jugeli, in her article, has pointed out that Photius’s description of the treatise’s content does not correspond to Theodore’s known teachings (Jugeli 2008, 66-72). According to Jugeli, Theodore never endorsed the restoration of all things to their original, perfect state (ἀποκατάστασις) (Jugeli 2008, 69).

In Jugeli’s opinion, another famous Antiochene teacher, Theodoret of Cyrus, supported *apokatastasis* and mentioned in his own writings that he authored a work, *Ad Quaesita Magorum Persarum* (Jugeli 2008, 70). Although Jugeli acknowledged the mentions of a certain treatise against Persian magicians attributed to Theodore of Mopsuestia in the work of Leontius of Byzantium and in the *Seert Chronicle*, she still argued that Photius’s description in the *Bibliotheca* referred to the work of Theodoret of Cyrus.

17 Cf. Akinean 1949, 95-173, cf. also: Adontz 1925, 435-6. Nina Garsoïan suggested that possibly Maštoc‘ met Ibas during his stay in Edessa (Garsoïan 1999, 69).

18 Cf. Phot. *Bibl.* 81.63b.33-5: “Ἀνεγνώσθη βιβλιδάριον Θεοδώρου περὶ τῆς ἐν Περσίδι μαγικῆς, καὶ τίς ἡ τῆς εὐσεβείας διαφορά, ἐν λόγοις τρισί. Προσφωνεῖ δὲ αὐτοὺς πρὸς Μαστούβιον ἐξ Ἀρμενίας ὁρμώμενον, χωρεπίσκοπον δὲ τυγχάνοντα” (Henry 1959, 187).

19 Cf. Phot. *Bibl.* 81.63a: “Οὗτος ὁ Θεόδωρος ὁ Μοψουεστίας εἶναι δοκεῖ·” (Henry 1959, 187).

e-ISSN 2974-6051

However, Ilaria Ramelli has persuasively demonstrated that both Theodore of Mopsuestia and Theodoret of Cyrus supported the theory of *apokatastasis* (Ramelli 2013, 539-48, 572-4). Therefore, the argument about Photius's content misrepresentation does not stand. Scholars who have studied the fragments of the treatise against Persian magicians mentioned by Photius attribute the work to Theodore (Reinink 1997, 63-71; Tamrazov 2024, 15-35).

As far as my current argument is concerned, I would like to revise the hypothesis about the dedication of Theodore's *Contra Magos* to Maštoc'. If such a dedication did indeed take place, it would suggest a personal acquaintance between Theodore and his addressee. Hence, the questions arise: When could Theodore have met Maštoc'? Did it happen prior or after Theodore's episcopal consecration?

Photius could not have known whether Theodore wrote the treatise against Persian magicians while he was still a presbyter or after 392, when he became a bishop. Supposedly, Maštoc' travelled to the Roman territory after he left his court duties and began his missionary career. As a missionary, he would have been well within his rights to request a treatise from a renowned exegete, which could assist him in his efforts by providing arguments against the Persian magi. This supposition rests on two assumptions: that Maštoc' was already engaged in missionary work and that Theodore had already established his reputation as an exegete par excellence.

The *Syriac Chronicle of Edessa* indicates that Theodore of Mopsuestia published his famous biblical commentaries after 397 (Guidi 1903, 1-13). Consequently, the earliest possible date for the meeting between the two scholars falls within the first decade of the fifth century. This estimation aligns with the period of Maštoc' first documented missionary journey to Roman Syria. His biographer, Koriwn, places this journey in the fifth year of Vṙamšapuh, extending into the sixth year, specifically 405-06 (cf. Koriwn, *Life* 7.1 [47], translation Terian 2022, 73). However, some scholars have challenged Koriwn's testimony based on the names of the bishops whose sees Maštoc' visited.[20] A thorough critical analysis of the scholarly doubts concerning Koriwn's dating was offered by Ervand Ter-Minasean in his 1964 article, "*On the Date of the Invention of Armenian Writing and Other Related Problems*" (Ter-Minasean 1964, 25-48). Ter-Minasean persuasively demonstrated the reliability of the information provided by Maštoc''s chronicler – namely, that Maštoc'

20 Nicholas Adontz placed the journey in 406-07 (Adontz 1925, 435-6). Nina Garsoïan also dated the journey to "les premières années du V^e^ siècle" (Garsoïan 1999, 68). However, Paul Peeters suggested the date 414 (1951, 171-207). Gabriele Winkler also argued that Maštoc' went to Edessa around 414, where he was hosted by Bishop Rabbula (Winkler 1997, 90). Winkler contends that Maštoc' might have met Ibas and become acquainted with the theology of Theodore.

invented the Armenian alphabet thirty-five years before his death, a timeframe that corresponds precisely to the year 405/406. I fully concur with Ter-Minasean's argumentation, and in what follows I revisit the discussion surrounding the date of Maštoc''s journey from a prosopographic perspective.

4 Maštoc' and Babilas

Koriwn recounted that Maštoc' "came to the region of Aram, to two Syrian cities, the first of which was called Edessa and the second Amid. He presented himself to the holy bishops, the first of whom was named Babilas and the second Akakios" (cf. Koriwn, *Life* 7.2 [46], translation from Terian 2022, 73.).

One of the mentioned bishops is easily identifiable as Acacius of Amida (400-25). An active traveller himself, Acacius became renowned for his interactions with the Church of the East and the Persian court.[21] The first mention of Acacius' name in connection with the Church of the East appears in the *Acts of the Synod of Isaac*, which took place in Seleucia-Ctesiphon in 410 (Melloni, Ishac 2023, 602-5). Marutha of Maypherqat, an ambassador of Emperor Arcadius delivered a letter from the Roman bishops to their Eastern counterparts. The letter was read out loud at the Synod of Isaac and subsequently approved.[22] Acacius of Amida and Pqida/Pqidha (ܦܩܝܕܐ), bishop of Edessa (398-409),[23] were among the signatories of the letter (Melloni, Ishac 2023, 565).

If Koriwn's date for Maštoc''s journey is accurate, the name Babilas (in Armenian: Բաբիլաս), mentioned in the *Life*, referred to Pqida. This discrepancy in names could be attributed to a misspelling or a scribal error. Ervand Ter-Minasean in his already mentioned article, explained the paleographic features that could have caused the change of Pakidas to Babilas in Armenian manuscripts (Ter-Minasean 1964, 30). Levon Xač'ikyan in his article published in the same 1964 also identified Babilas as Pqida (Xač'ikyan 1964, 15).

21 Acacius was on an official mission in Seleucia-Ctesiphon in 419 and participated in the Council of Yabalaha, which began that same year. Additionally, Socrates Scholasticus testified that Acacius ransomed 7,000 Persian prisoners captured during the Roman-Persian War of 421-422. Following this act of mercy, he was invited for a personal audience with the Shahanshah (Socrates *Hist. eccl.* 7.21). Jerome Labourt analyzed Acacius's role in the Council of Yabalaha (Labourt 1904, 90-102). For a concise outline of the council and its acts, see *Conciliorum Oecumenicorum Generaliumque Decreta* (Melloni, Ishac 2023, 611-12).

22 For an analysis of Maštoc''s activity, see Honarchiansaky 2018, 59-90.

23 The dates for Pqida's bishopric are indicated in the *Chronicle of Edessa* (Guidi 1903, 1-13).

However, Paul Peeters and Gabriele Winkler believed that Koriwn referred to Rabbula of Edessa, who occupied the seat from 411 until 435. This identification entailed postponing the possible date of Maštoc''s journey to 414. In other words, if Koriwn was correct in dating Maštoc''s journey, he could not have referred to Rabbula as his host. Conversely, if Koriwn's dating of Maštoc''s journey is incorrect, the name "Babilas" might indeed have referred to Rabbula. Paul Peeters and Robert W. Thomson argued that "Babilas" is a misspelt rendering of "Rabbula" (Peeters 1951, 177; Thomson 1978, 323).

Whether or not Rabbula acted as Maštoc' host, he demonstrated a keen interest in Armenian ecclesiastical affairs soon after the Council of Ephesus (431). To understand this seemingly sudden focus of the Edessan bishop, it is essential to examine Rabbula's background and activities prior to 431.

From the outset of his career, Rabbula was recognized for his distinctly ascetic-monastic profile and his fervent opposition to what he considered as heretical teachings.[24] The correspondence between Rabbula and Andrew of Samosata reveals that shortly before the Council of Ephesus, Rabbula publicly supported the *Twelve Chapters* of Cyril of Alexandria and criticized those who spoke against this treatise.[25] The Edessan bishop also openly condemned the works of Theodore of Mopsuestia and initiated the burning of his writings.[26]

Soon after the council, in his letter to Cyril, Rabbula informed his Alexandrian colleague that the root of Nestorian heresy could be traced back to the teachings of Theodore of Mopsuestia: "a certain Bishop Theodore from the province of Cilicia [...] sets into [his] writings other [things that are] snares of destruction".[27]

This information was both new and welcome to Cyril. In his response, the Bishop of Alexandria acknowledged Rabbula's keen insight and righteous zeal in his extensive campaign against the

24 For analysis of Rabbula's early career, see Blum 1969, 81-106.

25 There is a scholarly discussion regarding Rabbula's political allegiance prior to the Council of Ephesus. Winkler argued that initially, Rabbula sided with John of Antioch in his opposition to Cyril. However, after the council, Rabbula openly aligned himself with the Bishop of Alexandria (Winkler 1997, 88). Conversely, Blum and Phoenix and Horn demonstrated that Rabbula was already aligned with Cyril prior to 431 (Blum 1969, 153-5; cf. also Phoenix, Horn 2017, 170).

26 In his *letter to Rabbula*, preserved in Syriac in *Rabbula's Corpus*, Andrew complained that Rabbula "is behaving against us with many abuses, and not only before a small [group] but also openly before the people", that he "banned (in the church) those who do not agree with the opinion of Cyril of Alexandria and those who read what has been written by us, [namely,] the denunciation of the chapters that were set down by him". Syriac text and English translation published by Phoenix, Horn 2017, 148-9.

27 Cf. Rab. *Ep. ad Cyr.* (= Cyr. *Ep.* 73): *episcopus enim quidam prouinciae Cilicium Theodorus...alios autem laqueos perditionis in scriptis ponebat*. Latin text and English translation from Phoenix, Horn 2017, 128-9.

e-ISSN 2974-6051

legacy of Theodore. Among other things, Cyril praised Rabbula for his efforts to eliminate the teachings of Theodore not only from his own diocese but also from the neighbouring regions across the border:

> Because you have become so illustrious and have reassured through your wise teaching both those who are under your authority and those who dwell in other cities and places; and you have illuminated also not only those who are near to Your Holiness but those far off.[28]

Cyril's hint at Rabbula's transborder book hunting was confirmed by a letter from the Armenian clergy to Patriarch Proclus, written around 434.[29] In his paraphrase of this letter, Liberatus of Carthage reported that Acacius of Melitene and Rabbula of Edessa, "wrote to the bishops of Armenia that they should not receive the books of Theodore of Mopsuestia as they were heretical [...] Therefore, the venerable bishops of Armenia gathered together and sent two priests, Leontius and Abelius, to Proclus, the bishop of Constantinople, [...] wishing to know whether the doctrine of Theodore or that of Rabbula and Acacius should be considered true".[30]

This evidence indicates that, prior to the Council of Ephesus and especially thereafter, Rabbula became increasingly hostile toward the legacy of Theodore, hunting after it also in Armenian territory. If this account of Rabbula's longstanding aversion to Theodore's doctrine is accurate, it raises questions about the inconsistency of Rabbula hosting Maštocʻ at the beginning of his episcopacy and facilitating his acquaintance with Theodore's legacy, while roughly 20 years later, he actively sought to eradicate this legacy from Armenian territory. Although several plausible explanations for this inconsistency may exist, I contend that none is needed because Rabbula never hosted Maštocʻ and his disciples. I believe that the Armenian embassy occurred under Pqida, whose name was either incorrectly recorded

28 Cf. Cyr. *Ep.* 74: "ܠܐܝܠܝܢ ܐܦ ܐܬܢܗܪܬ ܒܬܘܠܡܕܘܬܟ ܚܟܝܡܬܐ ܘܫܪܪܬ ܗܘܝܬ :. ܚܕܬܐ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܠܗܠ "ܠܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܫܠܝܛ ܗܘܐ ܐܠܐ. ܕܢܗܪܬ ܘܐܬܪ̈ܘܬܐ ܐܚܪ̈ܢܝܬܐ ܕܡܕܝܢ̈ܬܐ ܠܐܝܠܝܢ. ܘܐܦ ܗܘܬܐ ܕܒܟܠ ܬܘܣܦܬ ܐܬܐ ܗܟܢܐ ܕܡܕܝܢ̈ܬܐ ܠܐܝܠܝܢ ܐܦ ܐܠܐ :. ܒܬܘܩܦܐ ܕܡܕܝܢ̈ܬܐ". Syriac text and English translation from Phoenix, Horn 2017, 136-7.

29 The letter is preserved in Syriac (Bedjan 1910, 594-6) and its translation in Greek (*ACO* 4.2:27-8). It was also quoted in the *Breviarium causae Nestorianorum et Eutychianorum* of Liberatus of Carthage and in the *Letter of Innocent, bishop of Maron* (*ACO* 4.2:68-73).

30 Cf. Liberatus, *Brev.* 10.15-29: *Acacius Melitinensis et Rabula Edessenae ciuitatis episcopus* [...] *scripserunt Armeniae episcopis ne Theodori Mopsuesteni libros susciperent tamquam haeretici… Congregati sunt ergo in unum uenerabiles Armeniae episcopi et miserunt duos presbyteros Leontium et Abelium ad Proclum Constantinopolitanum episcopum* [...] *scire uolentes utrum doctrina Theodori an Rabulae et Acacii uera esse probaretur.* Cf. Latin text of Liberatus published by Blaudeau 2019, 190-2.

as "Babilas" or there was a later scribal confusion between a more obscure name of Pqida and that of the well-known Rabbula.

Another argument for identifying 'Babilas' as Pqida relates to the correspondence between Acacius of Melitene and Catholicos Sahak. During Maštoc''s second journey to Roman territory, his host was Acacius of Melitene, who later warned Sahak about the hidden dangers of Theodore's legacy. Scholars have suggested that it was Rabbula who encouraged Acacius to initiate this correspondence (Blum 1969, 184; Sarkissian 1965, 230-1; Rammelt 2008, 140-1; Phoenix, Horn 2017, 191). Acacius's action demonstrates that an official connection was established through the diplomatic mediation of Maštoc' between the bishop of Melitene and the Armenian Catholicos. If Rabbula had a personal relationship with Maštoc' and through him had a mediated contact with Sahak, he would have reached out to the Catholicos himself without needing to appeal to Acacius for assistance.

Regardless of the identity of Maštoc''s host in Edessa and the timing of his journey, one of the significant outcomes of the mission was the establishment of a strong connection with the Antiochian branch of theology and the school of Edessa. Another trace of ties between Armenian and Syriac educational networks is associated with a prosopographic 'mystery' involving a certain Syriac bishop named Daniel.

5 Maštoc' and 'The Syriac Bishop Daniel'

An enigmatic story, recounted by Koriwn, concerns a certain Syriac bishop named Daniel. King Vŕamšapuh informed Catholicos Sahak that this Bishop had come into possession of certain characters for the Armenian alphabet.[31] In the logic of Koriwn's narrative, the purported discovery of a mysterious Armenian writing by Bishop Daniel served as an additional motivation for Maštoc''s journey. The characters were delivered to Vŕamšapuh and Sahak by a relative of Daniel named Habel. Upon examining this script, Sahak and Maštoc' deemed it inadequate for properly conveying Armenian sounds.[32]

31 Cf. Koriwn, *Life* 6.1-11 [42-4]: "ժամ պատմէր նոցա արքայն վասն առն ուրու ասորւոյ եպիսկոպոսի ազնուականի Դանիէլ անուն կոչեցելոյ, որոյ յանկարծ ուրե գտեալ նշանագիրս աղիաբետաց հայերէն լեզուի" (Thereupon the king told them of a certain nobleman, a Syrian bishop named Daniel, who recently happened to possess alphabetic characters for the Armenian language). Translation Terian 2022, 71.

32 The purely linguistic characteristics of the discovered script were not the only factors leading to its rejection. Ani Honarchian emphasized the social motivations behind the creation of the Armenian alphabet, such as the desire to maintain a distance from Greek (Roman) and Syriac (Persian) influences. For further details, see Honarchian 2018, 45-55.

Consequently, they initiated a mission to Osroene with the aim of creating a new and original Armenian alphabet.

Movsēs Xorenac'i, in his *History*, noted that Maštoc' visited bishop Daniel (cf. Movsēs, *Hist.* 3.52, translation Thomson 1978, 319). Unfortunately, we have little additional information about this bishop, aside from his name, the approximate dates of his office, and his location, making identification a challenge. Nevertheless, some conjectures can be made. The acts of the Synod of Isaac, held in 410, mention several Syriac bishops named Daniel, including Daniel of Erbil, Daniel of Beth-Moksaye, and Daniel of Arzon (Melloni, Ishac 2023, 602-3).

If we accept Movsēs Xorenac'i's account of Maštoc' visiting Daniel during his journey, we should consider the possible routes he might have taken. There were two primary roads leading into the Roman Empire from the Ayrarat district in Persian Armenia. The northern route passed through the city of Satala, while the southern route went through the cities of Martyropolis and Amida.[33] Since Maštoc' entered Roman territory via Amida and subsequently travelled to Edessa, it is likely that he took the southern route. Both Beth-Moksaye and Arzon were located along this southern road, whereas Erbil was significantly farther to the south. Furthermore, Beth-Moksaye and Arzon were relatively close to Edessa, which served as a hub for many Syriac and Armenian scholars, intellectuals, and students seeking Hellenic and Syriac education.[34]

Naturally, students from Armenia who sought education in Roman Osroene not only acquired linguistic proficiency but also absorbed the theological inclinations of their alma mater.[35] The limited evidence available suggests that Armenian students were regular attendees at the Osroene schools, particularly the renowned ones in Edessa. It is plausible to imagine that, while residing in the multilingual and intellectually vibrant environment of the Roman Syriac schools, Armenian students attempted to use the alphabetic characters of the languages they were studying to represent the sounds of their

33 For the maps and description of the routes from Persian Armenia to Rome, see Hewsen 2000, 70; Dillemann 1962, 147.

34 The so-called School of the Persians in Edessa provided an education grounded in classical Hellenistic standards, covering subjects such as geography, philosophy, history, astronomy, literature, and exegesis. This educational tradition was later carried on at the School in Nisibis. The association of the school with the Persians suggests it maintained close ties with Christians of various ethnic backgrounds living outside the Roman Empire. For further reading, see Drijvers 1994, 49-59; and Vööbus 1965, 1-32.

35 Paul Peeters traced the influence of the Syriac theological school on the Armenian ecclesiastical tradition (Peeters 1951, 179-85). Louis Mariès specifically examined the impact of Theodore's teachings on *De Deo*, written by one of Maštoc''s students, Eznik of Kolb (Mariès 1924, 197-202).

e-ISSN 2974-6051

own language.[36] Instances of bilingualism, multilingualism, code-switching, and diglossia have been documented in the Osroene region both before and after the fifth century (Taylor 2002, 298-313).

It stands to reason that certain linguistic experiments to render Armenian in writing, possibly using existing letters from other alphabets, might hypothetically have been attempted within the multilingual scholarly environment of the Osroene schools. It is likely that even if such experiments took place, they did not extend beyond a mere scholastic exercise, deemed unsuitable for serious literary endeavours. In any case, to my knowledge, there is no evidence of any administrative support for hypothetical linguistic experiments with Armenian writing before the initiative of Vŕamšhapuh, Sahak, and Mashtots, as narrated by Koriwn.

Therefore, if the mysterious writing in allegedly proto-Armenian script found by Daniel really existed, it is plausible to assume that it could have been crafted within the milieu of the Syriac schools. Arguments supporting this hypothesis are that this writing was allegedly discovered by a Syriac bishop, and there appeared to be no prior efforts to introduce it to Persian Armenia. Nevertheless, this hypothetical writing may have been preserved and known at a local level.

According to Abraham Terian, the Armenian text of the *Life of Maštoc'* suggests that Daniel did not merely find a certain writing with proto-Armenian letters but that he was their creator (Terian 2022, 133, fn. 6). Regardless, I believe that the creation of such characters was a private initiative that clearly required remarkable philological expertise in Armenian, as well as Syriac and other forms of Aramaic.[37] This level of linguistic proficiency points to the scholarly environment of the Roman Syriac schools as a likely *alma mater* of their creator. This hypothetical connection may be indirectly supported by the fact that, in their efforts to invent the Armenian alphabet, Maštoc' and Sahak sought assistance from the scholarly milieu of Amida and Edessa.

36 For cases of linguistic influences in multilingual environments, see Pawel Nowakowski 2023, 50-78. Recently, Briquel-Chatonnet published an intriguing study on the reappearance of Western-style Aramaic inscriptions in North Syria after a long absence from local epigraphic sources. Briquel-Chatonnet argued that, as local Aramaic speakers lost their writing skills, they borrowed a form of written Aramaic from a neighbouring region, where it had acquired the prestige of a church language by the fourth century, thanks to the translation of the Bible, Christian liturgy, and the writings of Bardaisan and Ephrem of Nisibis. For more details, see Briquel-Chatonnet 2024, 44.

37 Koriwn informs us that "the letters were insufficient to fully convey the syllabic sounds of the Armenian language, especially since these letters were found to have been gleaned and recovered from other literatures" (Koriwn, *Life* 6.12 [46], translation Terian 2022, 73). Anahit G. Perixanyan mentioned the adapted Aramaic square script found in ancient inscriptions in Armenia and Northern Mesopotamia and argued that, similarly, Daniel's letters most likely utilized Semitic alphabets (Perixanyan 1966, 103-33).

Whoever the inventor of Daniel's letters may have been, it is likely that this individual lacked the administrative resources necessary to develop the project to a level that would garner approval from ecclesiastical and state officials. Without such authorization, any attempted translation of the Bible and liturgy into a newly created written language would have been unimaginable.

Administrative episcopal resources were necessary for the dissemination of translations among Christian communities of different dioceses. Thus, for example, Jerome, in the prefaces to his translations, always tried to emphasize the authority of prominent ecclesiastic figures who commissioned his work. In the preface to his corrected version of the *Vetus Latina*, he pointed to the precarious position of an author who dared to revise the translation of the New Testament. Jerome claimed that without the urgent request and support of Pope Damasus, who commissioned his work, he would not have undertaken it.[38]

Maštoc' acted on behalf of King Vṙamšapuh and Catholicos Sahak, but even he required the approval of the Roman Emperor and the Patriarch of Constantinople to teach the Armenian language within the territory of Roman Armenia. However, it took Maštoc' more than ten years to return to Roman territory in search of political and ecclesiastical support from the highest Roman authorities.

6 Maštoc''s Second Journey to the Roman Territory: Historical Circumstances

Scholars generally agree on the timing of Maštoc''s second journey to Roman territory between 422 and 425. The motivation for this trip arose from preceding religious and political tensions. Since the Council of Isaac in 410, Shahanshah Yazdgerd I had begun to assert his authority over the Church of the East by employing a strategy of religious tolerance and patronage. As Scott McDonough argued in his recent article, this approach effectively increased the authority and power of Christian hierarchs at the Persian court, consequently posing a challenge to the Magian priests (McDonough 2023, 100-22). The Synod of Yabalaha, held in 419-20, reinforced the decisions made

38 Cf. *Incipit praefatio Sancti Hieronymi presbyteri in Evangelio*, 10-12: *"Adversum quam invidiam duplex causa me consolatur: quod et tu qui summus sacerdos es fieri iubes, et verum non esse quod variat etiam maledicorum testimonio conprobatur"* (Against such envy, I am consoled by two reasons: both because you, who are the highest priest, command it to be done, and because it is proven to be untrue by the testimony of even those who speak ill; cf. Weber, Gryson 1983, 1515). In this passage, Jerome spoke about the envy of the critics of his translation, who nevertheless acknowledged some inconsistencies of the old translation.

e-ISSN 2974-6051

in 410. However, inter-religious tensions and mutual provocations continued to build, ultimately leading to persecution at the end of 420.[39]

Upon the death of Yazdgerd I and the beginning of Wahrām V's reign, Theodosius II sent his troops to the Persian Arzanene via Armenia. Meanwhile, the Armenian king Šābuhr was assassinated in Ctesiphon. Thus, in 421-22, Armenia became a corridor for Roman military troops, while simultaneously experiencing its own succession crisis and political turbulence. Due to its socio-political context, the Armenian church was closely intertwined with royal and aristocratic power, offering both benefits and challenges, such as political interference in the selection of church leaders.[40]

The peace between Rome and Persia coincided with the end of Armenia's succession crisis. Wahrām V facilitated the enthronement of king Artašēs. However, while neither the peace treaty nor the accession of a king from the Arsacid dynasty substantially altered the existing political landscape, the attitudes and dynamics of state and ecclesiastical politics in Armenia were significantly affected. Discussing the political 'side effects' of the peace between the Romans and Persians and the enthronement of Artašēs, Giusto Traina highlighted the demise of the Armenian royal line, marking the end of the last Armenian king's unsuccessful reign (Traina 2023, 29-39; also Traina 2009, 3-6).

In ecclesiastical politics, instability persisted due to several disruptive factors. These included strained relationships with the Roman state and church, overshadowed by the war, and tensions with the Church of the East, which increasingly sought independence from Rome and aimed to extend its influence over the Armenian church.[41] Both issues were delicate and required careful management. This responsibility was entrusted to Maštoc'.

39 For an analysis of the events leading up to the war of 421-22 and a meticulous study of the conflict's details, see Greatrex and Amanatidis-Saadé 2023, 5-29.

40 In his recent article, McDonough compared the dynamics between church and state powers in the Church of the East and the Armenian church. He demonstrated that, unlike its southern counterpart, the episcopal sees in Armenia aligned closely with aristocratic landholdings. As a result, Armenian bishops were effectively subordinated to the noble clans (McDonough 2023, 126).

41 Thus, the first paragraph of the *Acts of the Synod of Yabalaha* lists Armenia among the dioceses subordinate to the Catholicos of the Church of the East (Melloni, Ishac 2023, 621). The Acts do not specify whether a representative from Armenia was among the signatories; however, the absence of Sahak's name – who would have participated had he accepted the authority of Yabalaha – from the list is notable.

7 The Date of Maštoc‘ Second Journey

Most likely, the mission set in late 422, early 423[42] via the northern road from Armenia to Melitene.[43]

Vardazaryan in her article about Maštoc‘’s journey to Byzantium presented her hypothesis concerning the probable route.[44] She suggested: Dvin/Vagarshapat-Bagavan-Tigranakert-Amid-Melitene-Arabissos-Caesarea-Ancyra-Nicomedia-Constantinople (Vardazaryan 2019, 158-9). Vardazaryan also argued that Maštoc‘ and his team secured a permission to use *cursus publicus* and travelled by *angaria* – a covered four-wheeled heavy cart drawn by oxen. Their journey lasted approximately 10-12 months (Vardazaryan 2019, 162-3).

Terminus post quem of the journey corresponds to the end of the Roman-Persian conflict. Koriwn mentioned that, during his royal audience, Maštoc‘ was received by the *Augusti* – the Emperor and his wife (cf. Koriwn, *Life* 17/16 [66.7-11], translation Terian 2022, 89-91). While Theodosius II married in 421, Athenais-Eudokia received the official title of Augusta in 423 (Terian 2022, 162). Naturally, one should not expect the Armenian historian to provide meticulous accuracy regarding the formal acquisition of official titles. However, the journey could not have occurred during the war or prior to the resolution of the succession crisis, as the mission would have made little sense before the establishment of a new *status quo*. Therefore, I disagree with those scholars who propose earlier starting dates for the journey, such as 419-21.[45]

Koriwn noted that when Maštoc‘ returned from his mission, he “presented himself to the holy bishop, Sahak, and to the king of Armenia, whose name was Artashēs” (cf. Koriwn, *Life* 17/16 [70.24], translation Terian 2022, 89-91). Since the journey likely took no more than a year, it could not have started so early that, by its conclusion,

42 Peeters, Tallon and Arevshatyan indicated 422 as the start date of the journey (Peeters 1951, 212; Tallon 1955, 13-14; Arevshatyan 1997, 309-24.) Winkler argued for 423 and I also stand by this date (Winkler 1997, 92).

43 The choice of the northern route may be explained by the official pretext for the journey – namely, to seek the Roman Emperor’s consent to teach the newly invented Armenian written language to the Roman Armenians. Additionally, the region of Amida, through which the southern route passed, was still a site of post-war negotiations. Socrates Scholasticus reported that Acacius of Amida ransomed 7,000 Persian captives and also negotiated the liberation of the deposed Catholicos Dadisho, who had been imprisoned by the Persian authorities (cf. Socrates, *Hist. eccl.* 7.21.1-6; also Baum, Winkler 2003, 19-21).

44 Cf. Vardazaryan 2019, 156-65. In her earlier article, also devoted to the second journey of Maštoc‘ to the Roman territory, Vardazaryan argued that Maštoc‘ likely reached Constantinople by Easter and participated in the court Easter ceremonies (Vardazaryan 2016, 219-30).

45 419-20 as the starting dates for the mission were suggested by Akinean (Akinean 1949, 95-173) and Sarkissian (Sarkissian 1965, 103, fn.1).

Armenia still lacked a king. *The terminus ante quem* for the mission's end is 425, as this is the last year of Atticus of Constantinople, who also welcomed Maštoc' at court.

The evidence suggesting an earlier date for the mission centres around the figure of the Roman general Anatolius.

8 Maštoc' and Anatolius

Koriwn mentioned that Maštoc' was hosted by the bishop Acacius of Melitene and Anatolius, "commander of the land" (*սպայապետէն աշխարհին*).[46] Koriwn also relayed that Anatolius facilitated Maštoc''s mission by announcing the Armenian embassy in a letter to the Emperor and securing his approval. Koriwn briefly described the royal audience, mentioning that Maštoc' obtained an imperial decree authorizing the teaching of the Armenian language to the inhabitants of Lesser Armenia and subjugation of the sect of the Borborites. On his way back, Maštoc' passed the decree to Anatolius, who arranged for the teaching of the Armenian alphabet and the subjugation of the Borborites (cf. Koriwn, *Life* 17/16 [66-8], translation Terian 2022, 89-91).

Movsēs Xorenac'i did not provide a step-by-step account of the mission. Instead, he simply announced Sahak's decision to send Maštoc' "to the western regions" of Armenia and then included the texts of Sahak's letters to Theodosius II, Atticus, and Anatolius, along with their respective responses (cf. Movsēs, *Hist*. 3.57, translation Thomson 1978, 326-30). These letters are most likely fictional,[47] invented to mask Movsēs' lack of an access to accurate historical account of the journey. Furthermore, they convey the general idea of Sahak's humble petition for authorization of Armenian teaching and the much more elaborate replies he received. Unlike Koriwn, Movsēs claimed that Theodosius not only granted permission for Armenian teaching but also ordered General Anatolius to build a city in Armenia "to serve as a refuge for yourselves and our armies" (cf. Movsēs, *Hist*. 3.57, translation Thomson 1978, 329). Additionally, Movsēs provided a detailed and rhetorically elaborate description of the construction of the city of Theodosiopolis, which was administered by Anatolius.

46 Cf. Koriwn, *Life* 17/16 [65.4]: "he was sincerely and amicably honoured by the bishops and rulers and provincials of the land, especially by the commander in chief of the land whose name was Anatolios. The latter presented the matters in writing to the emperor, whose name was Theodos[ios], the son of the emperor Arkadios".; [66.5]: "And he took a great many of the disciples to the city of Melitene and entrusted them to the holy bishop of the city whose name was Akakios". Translation from Terian 2022, 87-9.

47 Garsoïan expressed her doubts about the authenticity of these letters based on their absence from the *Book of Letters* (Garsoïan 2007, 188).

Movsēs conveyed that while Maštoc‘ was busy teaching the Armenian language, Sahak negotiated a treaty with Wahrām V, which resulted in the enthronement of King Artašēs (cf. Movsēs., *Hist.* 3.58, translation Thomson 1978, 331). Giusto Traina argued that Artašēs's accession was the outcome of "a compromise between Theodosius II and the Great King Bahrām V" (Traina 2009, 3). He also emphasized the role of general Anatolius in the conflict of 421-22. Traina professed that while *magister militiae per Orientem* Ardabur ravaged the border region of Arzazene, Anatolius joined the rebels in Armenia and by the time of Maštoc''s return from Theodosius, Anantolius came up close to the Armenian borders (cf. Movsēs, *Hist.* 3.58, translation Thomson 1978, 331). In other words, according to Traina's analysis, Anatolius was active in Armenian territory in 421, and by early 422, he and his troops approached the Armenian border from the Roman side. The scholar also asserted that when Anatolius threatened the Armenian border, the naxarars sought Sahak's assistance, and the Catholicos used his authority to negotiate with Wahrām.

Traina's argument, which primarily relies on Movsēs's testimony, suggests that Maštoc''s journey was completed by 422. This account contradicts my assertion that Maštoc''s journey began at the end of 422 or the beginning of 423. My dating is based mainly on Koriwn, who indicated that Anatolius assisted Maštoc‘ on his way to and from Theodosius. Koriwn's narrative is more plausible, as it does not imply that Anatolius provided administrative support to Maštoc‘ while actively participating in military actions far from Melitene, where the Armenian delegation was hosted. In contrast, Movsēs's account is less coherent, as it assumes that Anatolius could simultaneously assist Maštoc‘ with his teaching mission, and with the subjugation of the Borborites, oversee the construction of Theodosiopolis, and march his troops to the Armenian border.

I believe that this logical contradiction undermines Traina's interpretation of Anatolius' involvement in the military actions of 421-22. Additionally, it seems highly unlikely that Maštoc‘ could have set out on a journey amidst the ongoing military conflict. On his way to Melitene, Maštoc‘ would have had to traverse a region that, according to Socrates, was devastated by the troops of Ardabur.[48] It is more plausible that the Armenian mission took place after the war.

Furthermore, I find it unclear what evidence supports the theory that Anatolius joined the Armenian rebels in 421. This thesis was first proposed by Holum and subsequently supported by Blockley

48 Cf. Socrates *Hist. eccl.* 7.18 (363.9): "The Roman emperor acted first, despatching a special army under the command of the general Ardaburius. He invaded Persia through Armenia and laid waste one of the Persian districts called Azazene". Translation from Greatrex, Lieu 2002, 38.

and Traina, yet none of these scholars provided specific references to substantiate this assertion (Holum 1982, 101, fn. 102; Blockley 1992, 200, fn. 31; Traina 2023, 34).

Another related question that has sparked scholarly discussion concerns the timing of Anatolius' service as *magister militum per Orientem*. Both Koriwn and Movsēs claimed that Anatolius already held this high military position at the time of Maštoc''s journey. It is important to note that if Anatolius had occupied this role during the war, he would have been engaged in active military actions and, therefore, could not have acted as a mediator between Maštoc' and Theodosius or as a curator of the Armenian teaching and heretic-hunting projects.

A number of Roman and Armenian sources assert that Anatolius served as commander of the East from 433 to 446. The Roman sources include the writings of Paul of Edessa, John of Antioch, Theodoret of Cyrus, Evagrius Scholasticus, along with *Codex Justinianus*, *Chronicle of Edessa*, and others (Martindale 1992, 84-5).

However, Cyril of Scythopolis indicated that Anatolius' term as *magister militum per Orientem* occurred during the reign of Yazdgerd I. Interestingly, Cyril placed Anatolius' service in the province of Arabia, rather than in Armenia.[49] Procopius also noted that "The Emperor Theodosius happened to have sent Anatolius, the *magister militum per Orientem*, as an ambassador to the Persians on his own" (cf. Procop., *Bel. Pers.* 1.2.12, translation from Graetrex, Lieu 2002, 42).

Kenneth Holum, Roger Blockley, and Geoffrey Greatrex referenced these testimonies to argue that Anatolius held the high military post during the conflict of 421-22 (Holum 1982, 101; Blockley 1992, 200; Geoffrey Greatrex 1993, 6-8). Greatrex also linked Procopius's account of Anatolius's embassy to the Persians with the aftermath of the conflict of 421-22, rather than that of 440. Blockley regarded Procopius' narrative as anachronistic, attributing it to confusion with the aftermath of the war of 440 (Blockley 1992, 200, fn. 36). Additionally, Holum and Blockley proposed that the Anatolius mentioned in Roman sources as *magister militum* during the war of 421 was a different individual from the Anatolius who held the position from 433 to 446.

Nina Garsoïan dismissed the notion of Anatolius' participation in the 421-22 conflict as commander of the East and expressed general doubt about his presence in the area of Roman Armenia during that time (Garsoïan 2010, 186). She also rejected the idea that Anatolius

49 Cf. Cyr. Scyth. *Vit. Euthym.* 10.5-10: "Διαβληθεὶς οὖν τῶι βασιλεῖ Ἰσδιγέρδηι λαβὼν τὸν υἱὸν αὐτου ἡμίξηρου, τὸν Τερέβωνα λέγω, καὶ πᾶσαν αὐτοῦ τὴν συγγένειαν καὶ τὴν οὐσίαν Ῥωμαίοις προσφεύγει. Οὐστινας Ἀνατόλιος ὁ τότε τῆς Ἀνατολῆς στρατηλάτης δεξάμενος Ῥωμαίοις ὑποσπόδους ποιεῖται καὶ τὴν φυλαρχίαν τῶν ἐν Ἀραβίαι ὑποσπόνδον Ῥωμαίοις Σαρακηνῶν Ἀσπεβέτωι ἐνεχείρισεν" (Greek text from Schwartz 1939, 19).

e-ISSN 2974-6051

oversaw the construction of Theodosiopolis (192). This hypothesis was developed by Greatrex, who argued that the military fortress was built around 420 (Greatrex 1993, 5-8).

I question the hypothesis put forward by Holum and Blockley regarding the existence of two generals named Anatolius, who supposedly occupied the high military post with a ten-year gap between their tenures. It seems more plausible that both Armenian and Roman sources anachronistically ascribed to Anatolius the position he held later. For instance, Ełišē referred to the commander of the East, Anatolius, in his account of the war of 440, while Łazar P'arpec'i mentioned him in relation to the events of the Armenian revolt of 450.[50] Koriwn finished writing his history in 443,[51] at a time when Anatolius was indeed a well-known commander, and thus the hagiographer could have easily referred to him by this title.

At any rate, it seems doubtful that Anatolius could have served as *magister militum per Orientem* for 26 years. It is possible, however, that he held this position twice for shorter terms. Given that the period of 433-46 for Anatolius' term in military office is much better attested in the sources, I think that either the mention of the earlier term is anachronistic or he received the honour twice.

Aside from Movsēs Xorenac'i, we do not have any other Roman or Armenian sources explicitly discussing Anatolius' active participation in military actions during the conflict of 421-22. Garsoïan cast doubt on Movsēs's account.[52] The very style of narration regarding Maštoc''s second journey suggests that, in the absence of more reliable sources, Xorenac'i resorted to composing fictional correspondence and an *ekphrastic* portrayal of the foundation of Theodosiopolis.

Regarding the possible interaction between Anatolius and Maštoc', I believe that if it is not entirely fictional, it must have taken place after the war of 421-22. This would imply that, following the war, Anatolius was stationed around Melitene, where he assisted the Armenians in their mission.

A distinctive solution to the 'Anatolius' problem' was offered by Olga Vardazaryan (Vardazaryan 2019, 156-65). She provided a detailed analysis of the circumstances surrounding Maštoc''s second journey

50 Ełišē, *Hist*. 7.61-2, translation Thomson 1982, 123. Łazar P'arpec'i in his account of the events in Armenia when Marcian became Roman emperor (450) conveyed that at that time Anatolius was "a sparapet of Antioch" (Łazar, *Hist*. 41.74, translation Thomson 1991, 118).

51 For Abraham Terian's commentary upon the date of Koriwn's composition, see Terian 2022, 8.

52 Garsoïan expressed doubts about Movsēs's testimonies regarding Vardan Mamikonean, the grandson of Sahak, accompanying Maštoc' on his mission, as well as Sahak's journey to Roman territory prior to Maštoc''s second mission and the role of Anatolius in the foundation of Theodosiopolis (Garsoïan 2010, 181-96).

e-ISSN 2974-6051

to Roman territory. She expressed doubts regarding the accuracy of references to the renowned general Flavius Anatolius in the works of Koriwn and Movsēs (Vardazaryan 2019, 159). Vardazaryan suggested that these references are merely distant and confused recollections of different historical figures. She highlighted the uncertainty surrounding Anatolius's title in the manuscripts of Koriwn, which, in her view, suggests possible interference by an unknown editor and corruption of the original text. Additionally, Vardazaryan pointed out that, within the Roman Empire, the affairs of foreigners were typically managed not by the military but by the *magister officiorum* (magister of embassies or offices) of the provincial capital (Vardazaryan 2019, 160).

Although Vardazaryan's doubts are reasonable, I disagree with her opinion. Given Flavius Anatolius's involvement in the war of 440, as described by Ełišē, and the fact that Koriwn published his work by 443, we can confidently assert that the general was well-known among the Armenian nobility (cf. fns 83 and 84). The later mention of Anatolius by Łazar P'arpec'i further confirms this fact. In these circumstances, I do not believe that Koriwn could have deliberately misled his readers regarding the involvement of the famous general in the reception of Maštoc''s delegation. On the other hand, since Anatolius was the *magister militum per Orientem* at the time when Koriwn wrote his work, the biographer could have easily made a mistake by referring to him by his contemporary title, which he had not yet acquired during Maštoc''s mission. In other words, I can accept Koriwn's lapse in dating Anatolius's title, but I am reluctant to believe that his involvement in Maštoc''s mission was entirely fictional. Regarding the duties of the *magister militum versus* the *magister officiorum*, I would like to point out that there is ample evidence from the correspondence between Theodoret of Cyrus and Anatolius showing that the general actively participated in ecclesiastic politics while holding his military post.[53]

Koriwn also mentioned Acacius, the bishop of Melitene, as the host for the Armenians. The identity of the bishop Acacius referenced by Koriwn has been questioned by some scholars, who doubt that he is the same Acacius who later sent warning letters to Sahak and the Armenian clergy, and who, along with Rabbula, marshalled the campaign against Theodore of Mopsuestia (Baudrillart 1953, col. 242). The reason for this scholarly debate lies in the uncertainty surrounding the starting date of Acacius' episcopacy. Acacius, known as a supporter of Cyril of Alexandria and a fellow combatant of Rabbula, was active from shortly before the Council of Ephesus onwards. Since the *terminus ante quem* for Maštoc''s mission is 425

53 Cf. Theodoret of Cyrus, *Letters* 45, 79, 92, 111, 119, 121, 139. On Anatolius's involvement in the ecclesiastic politics see Garsoïan 1999, 73.

(the last year of Atticus of Constantinople's episcopacy), there is a gap of at least five years between the possible date of the Armenian mission and the confirmed start of Acacius' episcopacy. This discrepancy led Winkler to suggest that Maštoc' may not have been received by the famous supporter of Cyril, but rather by his predecessor, who also bore the same name. However, I find this hypothesis unconvincing. Instead, I align with Sarkissian's argument, which points out that Acacius not only hosted Maštoc' but also, according to Koriwn and Movsēs, cared for his students left in Melitene.[54] If my interpretation of the dates of Maštoc''s journey and the identification of Acacius is correct, we can tentatively place the start of his episcopacy between 422 and 425.

9 Conclusion

I have revised the history of Maštoc''s first and second journeys to Roman territory from the perspective of frontier networking, using a prosopographic analysis of the Roman hosts and encounters involving the Armenian missionary and his fellow travellers.

In my analysis of the scholarly discussion regarding the dates of Maštoc''s first journey, I propose that it took place in 406-07. This journey occurred during the episcopacy of Pqida of Edessa, whose name was misspelt by Koriwn and Movsēs as Babilas. I reject the identification of Babilas with Rabbula of Edessa, who later sought to influence the theological direction of the Armenian church.

Importantly, during his first visit to Roman territory, Maštoc' not only created the Armenian alphabet but also established significant theological and educational connections with Theodore of Mopsuestia and the schools in Edessa. One of the staff members at the so-called School of the Persians in Edessa was Ibas, who oversaw the project to translate Theodore's works into Syriac. Thus, Maštoc''s stay in Edessa reinforced pre-existing ties with the Syriac and Hellenic educational centres in Osroene, a long-established destination for Armenian scholars. These educational connections likely provided fertile ground for the initial attempts to develop a script for the Armenian language, which was associated with a certain Syriac bishop named Daniel. Although there is insufficient evidence to definitively identify this individual, I suggest that he may have been an alumnus of one of the Osroene schools who possessed considerable philological expertise in Armenian and Syriac. By comparing Maštoc''s journey with the list of names of the Syriac bishops who were signatories of

54 Cf. Koriwn, Life 17/16 [66.5-6], translation Terian 2022, 88-9; also Movsēs, *Hist*. 3.57, translation Thomson 1978, 328; also Sarkissian 1965, 135.

the Council of Isaac (410), I speculate that Daniel of Beth-Moksaye or Daniel of Arzon could be the enigmatic philologist mentioned.

Regarding the second journey of Maštoc‘, I reviewed the scholarly discussion concerning its starting date and proposed 422-23 as the most likely period for the mission, with 425 serving as a clear *terminus ante quem*. Since Koriwn and Movsēs mentioned Anatolius, the commander of the East, as an assistant and host to Maštoc‘, I engaged in an extensive scholarly discussion about this notable figure’s eventful life. Given the dubious nature of the existing evidence, I suggest that Anatolius did not take an active role in military actions during the conflict of 421-22. Regarding the references to Anatolius’ position as *magister militum per Orientem* during this conflict, I suppose that they are either instances of anachronistic usage or that he held this position twice. If the mention of Anatolius in connection with Maštoc‘’s journey has any basis in reality, their meeting likely occurred after the war in 422-23 (possibly extending to 425), when Anatolius was located around Melitene. Maštoc‘’s other host was Acacius of Melitene, who later became known for his support of Cyril of Alexandria and his correspondence with Sahak. Therefore, I contend that the starting date of Acacius’s episcopacy, a point of contention in scholarship, could be situated between 422 and 425.

Bibliography

Primary sources

Acacius Melitiensis
Richard, M. (1977). *Acace de Mélitène, Proclus de Constantinople et la Grande Arménie*. *Opera Minora II*. Leuven: Brepols.
Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum
Schwartz, E. (ed.) (1935). *Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum. Concilium Universale Chalcedonensis.* Tome 2, volume 1, part 3. Leipzig: De Gruyter.
Price, R.; Gaddis, M. (transl.) (2005). *The Acts of the Council of Chalcedon*. Vol 1. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press. Translated Texts for Historians 45.
Biblia Sacra Vulgata
Weber, R.; Gryson, R. (eds) (1983). *Biblia sacra iuxta Vulgatam versionem*. Editio quinta. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.
Conciliorum Oecumenicorum Generaliumque Decreta
Melloni, A.; Ishac, E.A. (eds). (2023). *Conciliorum Oecumenicorum Generaliumque Decreta*. Volume V/2. Turnhout: Brepols. Scientific editors of the Volume’s chapters: “Council of Isaac (410)”, M.-J. Pierre & C. Nakano (eds), “Council of Yabalaha (419/420)”, L. Van Rompay (ed.), “Council of Dadisho (424)”, K. Smith (ed.).
Chronicon Edessenum
Guidi, I. (ed.) (1903). *Chronica Minora. Pars prior*. (CSCO Syr. III.4). Paris: Typographeo Reipublicae.
Cyrillus Scythopolitanus
Schwartz, E. (Hrsg.) (1939). *Kyrillos von Skythopolis*. TU 49/2. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs Verlag.

Greatrex, G.; Lieu, S.N.C. (eds). (2002). *The Roman Eastern Frontier and the Persian Wars. Part II. AD 363-630. A Narrative Sourcebook*. London; New York: Routledge.

Ełišē

Ter-Minasyan (ed.) (1957). "*Ełishē vasn Vardanay ew Hayocʻ paterazmin*" (On Vardan and the Armenian War)". Erevan: Armenian SSR Academy of Science Press.

Thomson, R.W. (transl.) (1982). *History of Vardan and the Armenian War*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Koriwn

Terian, A. (2022). *The Life of Maštocʻ By His Disciple Koriwn*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Łazar

Tēr-Mkrtchʻean, G.; Malxasean, S. (eds) [1904] (1986). *Łazar Pʻarapecʻi, Patmutʻiwn Hayocʻ*. Yerevan University Press.

Thomson, R.W. (transl.) (1991). *The History of Łazar Pʻarpecʻi*. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholar's Press.

Liberatus Carthaginensis Diaconus

Blaudeau, P. (éd.) (2019). *Libératus de Carthage. Abrégé de l'histoire des nestoriens et des eutychiens*. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf. Sources Chrétiennes 607.

Movsēs Xorenacʻi

Abełean, M.; Yarutʻiwnean, S. (eds) [1913] (1981). *Movsēs, Xorenacʻi, Patmutʻiwn Hayocʻ*. Yerevan University Press.

Thomson, R.W. (1978). *Movsēs Khorenatsʻi, History of the Armenians*. Cambridge (MA); London: Harvard University Press.

Photius

Henry, R. (éd.) (1959). *Photius. Bibliothèque*, vol. 1. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

Rabula Edessenae

Phoenix, R.R.; Jr.; Horn, C.B. (2017). *The Rabbula Corpus Comprising the Life of Rabbula, His Correspondance, a Homily Delivered in Constantinople, Canons and Hymns*. Atlanta: SBL Press.

Letter from the Armenians to Photius of Constantinople

Bedjan, P. (éd.) (1910). *Nestorius: Le livre d'Héraclide de Damas*. Paris: Letouzey et Ané.

Syriac Actis of the Council of Ephesus

Flemming, J. (Hrsg.) (1970). *Die Akten der ephesinischen Synode vom Jahre 449*, vol. 15. Berlin: Weidmann.

Secondary sources

Adontz, N. (1925). "Ancanōtʻ ēǰer Maštocʻi ew nra ašakertneri keankʻicʻ əst ōtar ałbiwrneri" (Unknown Pages from the Life of Maštocʻ and His Students according to Foreign Sources). *Handes Amsorya*, 39, 435-41.

Akinean, N. (1949). *S. Maštocʻ vardapet* (St. Maštocʻ Vardapet). Vienna: Mxitʻarean tparan. Azgayin Matenadaran 158.

Arevshatyan, S. (1997). "Maštocʻ et les débuts de la patristique arménienne". Mahé, J.P.; Thomson, R.W. (eds), *From Byzantium to Iran: Armenian Studies in Honour of Nina G. Garsoïan*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 309-24.

Baum, W.; Winkler, D.W. (2003). *The Church of the East: A Concise History.* London; New York: Routledge.

Baudrillart, A. (éd.) (1953). *Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastiques*, tome 1. Paris: Librairie Letouzey.

Becker, A.H. (2006). *Fear of God and the Beginning of Wisdom: The School of Nisibis and Christian Scholastic Culture in Late Antique Mesopotamia*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Becker, A.H. (2008). *Sources for the History of the School of Nisibis*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.

Blockley, R.C. (1992). *East Roman Foreign Policy, Formation and Conduct from Diocletian to Anastasius*. Leeds: The University of Leeds Press.

Blum, G.G. (1969). *Rabbula of Edessa: Der Christ, der Bischof, der Theologe*. Leuven: Secrétariat du CorpusSCO.

Briquel-Chatonnet, F. (1991). "Rôle de la langue et de l'écriture syriaques dans l'affirmation de l'identité chrétienne au Proche-Orient". *Phoinikeia Grammata. Lire et écrire en Méditerranée = Actes du IXe Congrès du groupe de contact interuniversitaire d'études phéniciennes et puniques* (Liège, 15-18 novembre 1989). Namur, 257-74.

Briquel-Chatonnet, F. (2024). "To Write in Greek or to Write in Syriac: Dynamics of Languages in North Syria in Late Antiquity". Minets, Y.; Nowakowski, P. (eds), *Shaping Letters, Shaping Communities: Multilingualism and Linguistic Change in Byzantine and Early Islamic Times*. Leiden: Brill, 25-49.

Brock, S. (1982). "From Antagonism to Assimilation: Syriac Attitudes to Greek Learning". Garsoïan, N.G.; Mathews, T.F.; Thomson, R.W. (eds), *East of Byzantium: Syria and Armenia in the Formative Period*. Washington, D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks, 17-34.

Dillemann, L. (1962). *Haute Mesopotamie Orientale et Pays Adjacents*. Paris: Librairie Orientale Paul Geuthiner.

Doran, R. (2006). *Stewards Of The Poor: The Man of God, Rabbula, and Hiba in Fifth-Century Edessa.* Kalamazoo (MI): Cistercian Publications, Liturgical Press. (Cistercian Studies Series, Vol. 208).

Drijvers, J.W. (1994). "The School of Edessa: Greek Learning and Local Culture". Drijvers, J.W.; MacDonald, A.A. (eds), *Centres of Learning: Learning and Location in Pre-Modern Europe and the Near Eas.* Leiden: Brill, 49-59.

Van Esbroeck, M. (1986). "Une lettre de Dorothee comte de Palestine aux Archimandrites Marcel et Mari". *Analecta Bollandiana*, 104, 145-59.

Garsoïan, N. (1999). *L'Église arménienne et le grand schisme d'Orient*. Louvain-la-Neuve: Peeters.

Garsoïan, N. (2004). "La date de la fondation de Théodosioupolis-Karin". *Revue des Etudes Byzantines*, 62, 181-96.

Garsoïan, N. (2010). *Studies on the Formation of Christian Armenia*. Farnham: Ashgate Variorum.

Greatrex, G.; Amanatidis-Saadé, G. (2023). "Les relations Romano-Perses sous Yazdgird Ier et Wahrām V". Jullien, C. (ed.), *Discourse, Power Issues, and Images: Transversal Studies on the Reigns of Yazdgird I and Wahrām V*. Leuven: Peeters, 5-29.

Greatrex, G. (1993). "The Two Fifth-Century Wars Between Rome and Persia". *Florilegium*, 12, 1-14.

Hewsen, R.H. (2000). *Armenia: A Historical Atlas*. University of Chicago Press.

Holum, K.G. (1982). *Theodosian Princesses. Women and Imperial Dominion in Late Antiquit.* Berkeley, Los Angeles; London: University of California Press.

Honarchiansaky, A. (2018). *Connected Histories in Late Antiquity: A Study of a Peace between the Roman and Sasanian Empires and Its Diverging Impacts on Christianity in Greater Armenia and Iran* [PhD Dissertation]. Los Angeles: University of California. https://escholarship.org/uc/item/1r46d0h3.

Honarchian, A. (2018). "Of God and Letters: A Sociolinguistic Study on the Invention of the Armenian Alphabet in Late Antiquity". Berberian, H.; Daryaee, T. (eds), *Reflections of Armenian Identity in History and Historiography*. Jordan Center for Persian Studies, 45-55.

Inglisian, V. (1957). "Die Beziehungen des Patriarchen Proklos von Konstantinopel und des Bischofs Akakios von Melitene zu Armenien". *Oriens Christianus*, 41, 35-50.

Jugeli, V. (2008). "The Lost Work of Theodoret of Cyrus Ad Quaesita Magorum Persarum". *Phasis: Greek and Roman Studies*, 11, 66-72.

Labourt, J. (1904). *Le Christianisme dans l'Empire Perse sous la dynastie Sassanide (224-632)*. Paris: Librarie Victor Lecoffre.

Mariès, L. (1924). "Le *De Deo* d'Eznik de Kolb connu sous le nom de 'Contre les sectes': études de critique littéraire et textuelle". *Revue des études arméniennes,* 4.2. Paris: Geuthner.

Martindale, J.R. (1992). *The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire*, vol. 3. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McDonough, S. (2023). "A Tale of Two Isaacs: Christians and the Crown in Fifth Century Ērānšahr". Jullien, C. (ed.), *Discourse, Power Issues, and Images, Transversal Studies on the Reigns of Yazdgird I and Wahram V.* Leuven: Peeters, 99-127.

Nowakowski, P. (2023). "Of Presbyters and Stonemasons, or Switching Codes in a Syrian Village". Minets, Y.; Nowakowski, P. (eds), *Shaping Letters, Shaping Communities: Multilingualism and Linguistic Practice in the Late Antique Near East and Egypt*. Leiden: Brill, 50-79.

Peeters, P. (1951). "Pour l'histoire des origines de l'alphabet arménien". *Recherches d'Histoire et de Philologie Orientales*. Brussels: Société des Bollandistes, 171-207.

Perixanyan, A.G. (1966). "K voprosu o proisxoždenii armjanskoj pis'mennosti" (On the Question of the Origin of the Armenian Script). *Peredneaziatskij sbornik, II: Deshifrovka i interpretatsiya pis'mennosti Drevnego Vostoka*. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo "Nauka, 103-33.

Ramelli, I. (2013). *The Christian Doctrine of Apokatastasis: A Critical Assessment From the New Testament to Eriugena*. Leiden: Brill.

Rammelt, C. (2008). *Ibas von Edessa: Rekonstruktion einer Biographie und dogmatischen Position zwischen den Fronten* Berlin: De Gruyter.

Reinink, G.J. (1997). "A New Fragment of Theodore of Mopsuestia's Contra Magos". *Le Muséon*, 110(1-2), 63-71.

Reinink, G. (1995). "Edessa Grew Dim and Nisibis Shone Forth". Drijvers, J.W.; MacDonald, A.A. (eds), *Centres of Learning: Learning and Location in Pre-Modern Europe and the Near East*. Leiden: Brill, 77-89.

Sarkissian, K. (1965). *The Council of Chalcedon and the Armenian Church*. New York: The Armenian Church Prelacy.

Tallon, M. (1955). *Le Livre des Lettres*, *Documents arméniens du Ve siècle*. Beirut: Impr. catholique.

Tamrazov, A.V. (2024). "Novonajdennye fragmenty iz *Contra Magos* i ranee neizddannye sirijskie citaty iz drugix tvorenij Feodora Mopsuestijskogo" (Newly Found Fragments from 'Contra magos' and Previously Unpublished Syriac Quotations from Other Works of Theodore of Mopsuestia). *Bible and Christian Antiquity* 2(22), 15-35.

Taylor, D.G.K. (2002). "Bilingualism and Diglossia in Late Antique Syria and Mesopotamia". Adams, J.N.; Janse, M.; Swain, S. (eds), *Bilingualism in Ancient Society: Language Contact and the Written Word*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 298-331.

Ter-Minasean, E. (1964). "Hayoc' greri gyuti t'vakani ev ayl harakic' xndirneri masin" (On the Date of the Invention of Armenian Writing and Other Related Problems). *Bulletin of Matenadaran*, 7, 25-48.

Traina, G. (2009). *428. An Ordinary Year at the End of the Roman Empire*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Traina, G. (2023). "Yazdgird I, Wahrām V and the End of Greater Armenia: A Note on the Armenian Sources". Jullien, C. (ed.), *Discourse, Power Issues, and Images, Transversal Studies on the Reigns of Yazdgird I and Wahram V*. Leuven: Peeters, 29-39.

Vardazaryan, Ō. (2016). "Inč'pes Maštoc'ə darjaw *akimit* " (How Mashtots Became *Acoimetos*), *Banber Matenadarani*, 23, 219-30.

Vardazaryan, Ō. (2019). "Maštoc'i ułevorut'yunə Byuzandia. Koryuni bnagirə ev patmakan hangamank'nerə" (Maštoc' Trip to Byzantium: Koriwn's Text and the Historical Circumstances). *Banber Matenadarani*, 28, 156-65.

Vööbus, A. (1965). *History of the School of Nisibis*. Leuven: Secrétariat du CorpusSCO.

Winkler, G. (1997). *Studies in Early Christian Liturgy and Its Context*. Aldershot, Brookfield: Ashgate Publishing Company.

Wood, P. (2010). *'We Have No King But Christ' Christian Political Thought in Greater Syria on the Eve of the Arab Conquest (c. 400-585).* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Xač'ikyan, L. (1964). "Mesrop Maštoc'i cnndyan 1600-amyakə" (The 1600th Anniversary of the Birth of Mesrop Mashtots). *Banber Matenadarani*, 7, 11-24.