

ALESSANDRO ORENGO

University of Pisa

FORMS OF MARRIAGE AND MOURNING AMONG CAUCASIAN ALBANIANS IN THE MIDDLE AGES

Keyword: Albanian (society, 5th century); Armenian (society, 5th century); Ałowēn (council); Šahapivan (council); marriage; levirate; funeral rituals; funeral lamentations.

At the time of Vač‘agan, king of the Albanians, due to the continuous quarrels arising among all Albanians – clergymen and laymen, noblemen and commoners alike – a great meeting was convened by the king in Ałowēn, on the 13th day of the month of Mareri, in an unspecified year. The council is traditionally dated to 488, or at least between 484 and 488, although different dates have been also proposed.¹

¹ The time interval between 484 and 488 has been proposed by Dowsett (*The History of the Caucasian Albanians by Movsēs Dasxuranc‘i*. Translated by **C. J. F. Dowsett**, London 1961, p. 50); the year 488 by Angiarakian (in **A. Mai**, *Scriptorum veterum nova collectio e Vaticanis codicibus edita ab A. M.*, tom. X/2, Romae 1838, p. 314) and Talatinian (**B. Talatinian**, *De contractu matrimoniali iuxta Armenos (Disquisitio historico-iuridica)*, Hierosolymis 1947, p. 10) among others. Akinean (**Ն. Ակինեան**, *Մովսէս Դասխուրանցի (Կոչուած Կաղանկատուացի) եւ իր Պատմութիւն Աղուանից, Վիեննա 1970, էջ 139*) proposes a date slightly later than 444 (the year of the council of Šahapivan). According to *K‘ristonya Hayastan (Քրիստոնչա Հայաստան. Հանրագիտարան, Երևան 2002, էջ 44)*, the council took place in the late 5th or early 6th century; the latter date was also proposed by Yakobean (**Ս. Յակոբեան**, “Վաչագանի վեպ”-ը եւ Առշակունեաց թագաւորութեան խնդիրը Գ-Ձ դարերի Աղուանիում, *Հանդէս Ամսօրեայ*, 117, 2003, pp. 45-142; and Idem, *ՄՀ III*, 2004, pp. 127-131). A less probable date – between 372 and 387 – has been suggested by Hovhannisyann (**Ս. Հ. Հովհաննիսյան**, «Աղվենի սահմանադիր ժողովի կանոնները եվ նրանց աղերսը Աշտիշատի կանոնների հետ», *ՊԲՀ № 4* (39), 1967, էջ 265-274). Comparisons between the canons of Ałowēn and Šahapivan can be found in Talatinian (**B. Talatinian**, op. cit., pp. 10-12), Akinean (**Ն. Ակինեան**, op. cit., p. 139) and Hovhannisyann (**Ս. Հ. Հովհաննիսյան**, op. cit., pp. 271-274). The latter argues that any similarities between the two sets of canons are due to their imitating the canons of Aštišat, a council convened by Patriarch Nersēs in the second half of the 4th century.

The purpose of this communication is to discuss some of the canons established during that meeting, particularly those dealing with marriage and funeral rituals, and compare them with those fixed by the Armenian church at the council of Šahapivan, held in 444.

As is well known, both canon collections have reached us in versions that do not reflect their original form. The canons of Šahapivan have been transmitted in a later collection, ultimately revised in the 8th century and published by Yovhannēs Awjnec‘i, with evident additions and/or interpolations.² The canons of Ałowēn are contained both in the collection of Armenian canon laws – in a version subsequent to the one curated by Yovhannēs Awjnec‘i – and in an historical work, the *Patmowt‘iwn Ałowanic‘ ašxarhi* (I,26) by Movsēs Kałankatowac‘i. The latter details events up to the 10th century, which suggests that its final version was possibly redacted at the end of that century.³

Nevertheless, we think a comparison between the two sets of texts is possible and profitable, inasmuch as it will give us an idea about the similarities and differences of the local customs, and consequently the legislation, of Albanians and Armenians around the same time.

During the council of Ałowēn decisions were made about several issues, some of them concerning marriage.⁴ First of all, it was decided that no one could marry a relative up to the third degree (երրորդ սոզ), nor the wife of a brother (canon 10). Secondly, if a man had repudiated his wife without just cause and then married another woman (obviously without the nuptial crown, that is

² For the Armenian text see *Կանոնագիրք Հայոց, աշխատասիրությամբ Վ. Հակոբյանի*, vol. I, Erevan, 1964, pp. 422-466 and UՀ VII, 2007, pp. 594-638. For an English translation see **V. S. Hovhannessian**, “The Canons of the Council of Šahapivan,” *REArm*, n.s. 37, 2016-2017, pp. 73-95, and for an Italian one see **A. Orengo**, “Canoni conciliari armeni: Šahapivan e Dowin”, *Augustinianum* 58, 2018, pp. 533-595.

³ For the Armenian text see *Կանոնագիրք Հայոց, աշխատասիրությամբ Վ. Հակոբյանի*, vol. II, Erevan, 1971, pp. 91-100, UՀ III, 2004, pp. 133-139; Aṛak‘elyan (**Մովսես Կաղանկատուացի, Պատմութիւն Աղուանից աշխարհի**, Բնական բնագիրը եվ ներածությունը Վ. Առաքելյանի, Երևան, 1983, էջ 89-94), UՀ XV, 2011, pp. 129-135. For a French translation see **A. Mardirossian**, “De l’Albanétie à l’Arménie: la destinée des Canons du roi Vač‘agan,” in: **A. Mardirossian - A. Ouzounian - C. Zuckerman** (éd. par), *Mélanges Jean-Pierre Mahé (Travaux et Mémoires 18)*, Paris 2014, pp. 439-451.

⁴ In the text of the *Patmowt‘iwn Ałowanic‘* (II,32) «race-polluting (սոզաշարախ) marriages» are also mentioned: this probably refers to unions with non-Christians rather than to incestuous ones (although the latter cannot be entirely ruled out) → this probably refers to unions with non-Christians rather than to marriages between relatives (although the latter cannot be entirely ruled out).

without a solemn ceremony),⁵ he should be brought to court and condemned to death – the same penalty established for a murderer, a criminal, or whoever had consulted a wizard (canon 11).

If we compare the latter canon with those established by the Armenian clergy and noblemen gathered in Šahapivan⁶ some forty years earlier, the severity of the Albanians' decision becomes immediately apparent.

The Armenians also considered different scenarios in which a man could repudiate his wife, clearly distinguishing between justified repudiations – for instance when the wife was an adulteress, severely ill (probably a leper), or barren – from unjustified ones, possibly followed by remarriage (canons 4 and 5). In this last case – the only one comparable to the Albanian one – all shared properties should be divided in half, and one half given to the former wife, who was also free to remarry, if she so wished. As for the former husband, he was condemned to do penance for seven years, and either pay a fine to the church, if a nobleman, or be beaten and pay a reduced fine, if a commoner. It is worth noting that the different treatment of nobles and commoners is perfectly coherent with the contemporary worldview reflected by the decisions taken at Šahapivan, and reoccurs in canons dealing with different questions. Finally, should the man marry again within a year of the divorce, the new wife should also be punished, as the real cause of the divorce itself: she should work at a leper hospital for a year, or just pay a fine, if a noblewoman.

To summarise, the Armenians gathered in Šahapivan decided that in case of unjustified divorce the man should give half his goods to his former wife, do

⁵ We quote this passage from Aṙak'elyan's critical edition (**Մովսէս Կաղանկատուացի**, op. cit., p. 92 = ՄՀ XV, 2011, p. 132): *որ զկին թողու առանց պատճառանաց եւ առանց պատկի կին առնէ*. Both the text preserved in the *Patmowt' iwn Ałowanik'* and that attested in the *Kanongirk' Hayoc'* present a *varia lectio*: *որ զկին թողու առանց պատճառանաց եւ որ առանց պատկի կին առնէ*: if the variant is to be accepted, the text could refer here both to a man who repudiates his wife without a cause, and to one who lives with a woman without being married to her. We will discuss this passage in a future article.

⁶ On marriage and divorce among the Armenians see **A. Orenco**, *Forme di matrimonio fra gli Armeni del IV-V secolo: il conflitto fra usi pagani e norme cristiane*, in: *Il matrimonio dei cristiani. Egesi biblica e diritto romano. XXXVII Incontro di Studiosi dell'Antichità Cristiana*, Roma, 8-10 maggio 2008 (*Studia Ephemeridis Augustinianum*, vol. 114), Roma 2009, pp. 639-649; **A. Orenco**, *Legge e religione nell'Armenia del IV e V secolo*, in: *Lex et religio. XL Incontro di Studiosi dell'Antichità Cristiana*, Roma, 10-12 maggio 2012 (*Studia Ephemeridis Augustinianum*, vol. 135), Roma 2013, pp. 717-728, and **D. Zakarian**, *The Representation of Women in Early Christian Literature. Armenian Texts of the Fifth Century*, D. Phil. Thesis, Oxford, 2014, pp. 125-158.

penance and pay a fine, or be beaten, or both: doubtless severe punishments, but still more lenient than the death penalty established by the Albanians.

As a side note, the penalty for consulting a wizard also seems to have been more severe among the Albanians: they opted once again for the death penalty, while their Armenian colleagues merely envisioned a fine (canon 9).

Actually, the Armenians opted for the death penalty in only one case, namely when one practised witchcraft (կախարդութիւն) or became an apostate (ուրացութիւն), that is, probably, repudiated Christianity to become a Mazdean (canon 8). Indeed, there is a link between rejecting Christianity and practising witchcraft (which is quite different from merely consulting a wizard). If someone repudiated his own religion in any way and did not subsequently repent, they could be sentenced to death by stoning, in accordance with the Bible (e.g. *Leviticus 20.27*).

Why did the Albanians envision the death penalty for so many different crimes? One could argue that that was somehow connected to their having their own royal court – unlike the Armenians – where such cases could be discussed and the guilty parties sentenced.

As for marriage between relatives, the 13th canon of Šahapivan clearly stated that it is forbidden to marry a relative up to the fourth degree of kinship (ի չորրորդ ծնունդն), be they one's sister, nephew or aunt (զքոյր կամ զքեռորդի կամ զեղբարորդի կամ զհարաքոյր), and so on. The forbidden degree of kinship could actually prove to be the same for Armenians and Albanians,⁷ depending on whether the individual wishing to get married is counted, as the Armenians did, or not, as may have been the case among the Albanians. In that case, as an example, a cousin would be a relative in the 4th degree (the individual–his/her mother–her sister–the latter's child) according to the Armenian system, but in the 3rd degree according to the Albanians. The notion that Albanians calculated kinship that way can be reinforced by an excommunication imposed by Kat'olikos Mik'ayēl (first half of the 8th century) to a couple who were first cousins (see *Patmowt' iwn Ałowanik' III*, 13-14), as well as members of the royal family.

We could argue that the marriage rules established at the council of Šahapivan represent yet another way of opposing traditional marriage forms, widespread among the Armenians and supported by the Mazdean clergy. So, at

⁷ See **B. Talatinian**, op. cit., pp. 143-147.

the time of the council, resisting such practices was a way of resisting the Zoroastrian religion the Sasanian rulers were trying to impose in Armenia. However, this struggle predates the Council. In the second half of the 4th century, probably immediately after his own appointment, Patriarch Nersēs the Great was already doing everything in his power to extirpate these customs, as witnessed by the *Bowzandaran* (IV,4,42) and Movsēs Xorenac‘i (III,20,12) as well as by other later sources. Significantly, when king Pap set out to restore the old traditions after having the Patriarch killed, one of the most important fields of his activity was reinstating previous marriage customs (*Bowzandaran*, V,31,10,12). It should be noted that these were strongly rooted in the Armenian Weltanschauung, even among people strictly connected to the Church. According to the *Bowzandaran*,⁸ two great-grandchildren of Grigor the Illuminator, Pap and At‘anaginēs (the latter being the father of Patriarch Nersēs himself), had married their maternal great-aunts.

It is possible that marriage between relatives had a similar value among the Albanians, as a custom favoured both by local tradition and by the Mazdean religion.

The case of a man marrying his brother’s wife – which was also condemned in canon 10 of Ałowēn – is probably different. Evidently, in this instance we are not dealing with consanguinity, but rather with affinity. Such a form of levirate, according to which the brother of a deceased man is allowed – or even obliged – to marry the latter’s widow, is attested among different peoples and is a way of protecting the widow, and often giving an heir to the deceased man. This custom is usually found in societies that favour patrilinear descent, and is also prescribed in the Bible (e.g. in *Deuteronomy* 25,5-10). As for the Albanians, it is possible that this was a local, traditional custom that the Church opposed as non-Christian practice, but which was especially difficult to eradicate due to the resistance of people attached to the old ways as well as to the Biblical precedent.

Other issues were discussed and deliberated upon at Ałowēn, including those connected with death, funeral and mourning, which we will consider next.⁹

⁸ *Bowzandaran* III, 15 and also III, 5. On the same topic see also *The Epic Histories Attributed to P‘awstos Buzand (Buzandaran Patmut‘iwnk‘)*. Translation and Commentary by **N. G. Garsoïan**, Cambridge, Mass. 1989, pp. 247-248, 364.

⁹ On funeral rituals among the Armenians see **A. Orengo**, “Funeral Rites and Ritual Laments of the Ancient Armenians”, in: **U. Bläsing - J. Dum-Tragut** (eds.), *Cultural, Linguistic and Ethnological Interrelations In and Around Armenia*, Cambridge 2011, pp. 127-144; **A. Orengo**, “On Armenian Funeral Rituals (4th-13th Centuries)”, in: **V. S. Tomelleri - M. Topadze - A.**

Some canons, e.g. numbers 3 and 5, talk about donations given by or in the name of dead people, or about masses celebrated for them. However, the most interesting canon is arguably number 12, in which the custom of funeral laments is strongly condemned. The canon states that, should a similar celebration (Լըժ դիւնի) take place, both the householder (սոսնուտըր) and the minstrels (գոլասոս) performing the laments should be bound and brought to the royal court to be punished. The relatives of the dead should not perform any funeral lamentation for him, either.

As is well known, the ideal Christian funeral should be a moment – if not of joy – at least of hope, because the dead are in fact reborn into the true life, so there is no reason for lamentations. This sort of ideal ritual was imposed among the Armenians by Patriarch Nersēs, according to whom people should simply accompany the dead with tears, fitting psalms and benedictions, carrying lighted lamps and candles (*Bowzandaran* V,31,11). The same ritual is attested in the description of the funerals of some prominent Christians, such as Patriarchs Vrt’anēs and Nersēs (*Bowzandaran*, III,11,23 and V,24,23-24), which can be profitably compared with the funerals of Sahak and Maštoc’ described by Koriwn (Ch. 25 and 27). The body was taken from the place where the person had died to the village where they were to be buried, followed by masses of people reciting psalms and benedictions by lamp light.

This was not exclusively an Armenian custom: in Gregory of Nyssa’s account of the funeral of his sister Macrina (*de Vita Macrinae*, Ch. 34), her body was likewise taken to the church by many ecclesiastics singing psalms by candle light, in the presence of crowds. Similarly, according to the Syriac *Chronicle* of Pseudo-Joshua the Stylite, in 500-501 A. D. in the famine-ravaged town of Edessa the dead were accompanied to the burial place «with psalms, praises, hymns, and songs full of the hope of resurrection»; however, it is worth noting that «women also (took part in the ceremony) with mournful lamentation and emotional cries»¹⁰.

Lukianowicz – O. Rumjacev (eds.), *Languages and Cultures in Caucasus. Papers from the International Conference "Current Advances in Caucasian Studies" Macerata, January 21-23, 2010*, München – Berlin 2011, pp. 481-492.

¹⁰ Cf. *The Chronicle of Pseudo-Joshua the Stylite*. Translated with Notes and Introduction by **F. R. Trombley** and **J. W. Watt** (*Translated Texts for Historians*, vol. 32), Liverpool 2000, p. 4. This anonymous Syriac chronicle, probably composed shortly after 506 A. D., is a section of a larger work known as the *Chronicle of Pseudo-Dionysius* or the *Chronicle of Zuqnin*, probably composed just after 775 A. D.

Both Albanians and Armenians knew of different traditional forms of mourning, usually opposed by the church. For instance, the entire canon 11 of Šahapivan is devoted to the topic, establishing punishment for everyone indulging in excessive lamentations (լըճ ղխլի), making a distinction between rituals enacted by the dead person's family against their will, or in consequence of a decision made by them during their lifetime. The canon does not give any details as to the form of the ritual or the performers involved therein, but we have some information from other sources, including the following:

a. the *Bowzandaran*, where at least two funerals are described, namely those of Gnēl Aršakowni (IV,15,47-59), of which we will speak later, and Manowēl Mamikonean (V,44,7-28);

b. the *Patmowt'iwēn Hayoc'* by Movsēs Xorenac'i, which provides some information on funeral rituals from the 2nd and 4th centuries;

c. canonical texts such as the reforms of Patriarch Nersēs, transmitted in the *Bowzandaran*;

d. a long text entitled «Letter of Consolation concerning Those Who Passed Away from this World» (*T'owlt' mxit'arowt'ean vaxčaneloc' yašxarhēs*). This is number 23 in the collection attributed to 5th-century Patriarch Yovhannēs Mandakowni, but was possibly written by 7th-century theologian Yovhannēs Mayragomec'i. The letter, criticising funeral customs from a Christian standpoint, seems to suggest that perhaps these rituals were still being performed several centuries after the official Christianisation of Armenia. However, it should be noted that the text, although written in Armenian, does not contain any specific references to Armenia, and could therefore be a translation describing a non-Armenian situation. Consequently, (Pseudo-)Mandakowni's letter may be regarded either as a rare folkloric document, or as a purely rhetorical exercise based on biblical passages.

These texts suggest that, from the 4th to the 7th centuries, the Armenians practised pagan funeral rituals condemned by the Church – or at least by its leaders – but deeply rooted among people of all social classes.

The ritual was performed by men and women alike, and it may be assumed that the mourners could occasionally be hired for the purpose. Apparently, there was no difference in the roles performed by men and women, with the possible exception of ritual denudation, which was presumably restricted to women. As mentioned above, the ritual could be requested either by the deceased in their

lifetime or by their relatives. Setting aside ritual denudation, the other pertinent acts can be classified as follows:

- a. weeping, wailing, and crying in general;
- b. self-harm or self-mutilation, such as beating certain body parts, tearing one's hair, injuring one's limbs, cheeks or bosom; shaving one's head and casting ashes upon it;
- c. tearing one's clothes, or possibly wearing special garments such as a sackcloth, an apron or a sash;
- d. performing funeral dances;
- e. engaging in lamentations and narrating significant episodes of the deceased's life.

What is arguably the oldest reference to these narrative lamentations among the Armenians can be found in the description of Gnēl Aršakowni's funeral in the *Bowzandaran* (IV,15,47-59), detailing events taking place at the time of the aforementioned Patriarch Nersēs. According to this description, after Gnēl's death his wife P'aranjem at first merely mourns him in the usual manner, i.e. by tearing her garments, loosening her hair, engaging in bare-chested laments, wailing, and weeping. However, later on she becomes the «mother of laments» (մայր նղբոց), and the mourners begin to sing different episodes from Gnēl's life. Clearly, this is a funeral lament performed by a group of mourners specialising in this activity. Furthermore, it may be argued that the title «mother of laments» means that P'aranjem did not merely weep and wail, but that she actually became the leader of a group of mourners.

Another possible reference to this kind of lamentation is contained in Movsēs Kałankatowac'i's *Patmowt'iw n Ałowanac'* (III,22): at the burial of Ašot, prince of Siwnik', in the year 897, female lamenters or «lamenting women» (նղբերգուկան կանայք) also participated, and expressed the hope that no similar year would reoccur in the future.

Movsēs Kałankatowac'i also provides a very good example of a funeral lamentation performed among the Albanians, namely a eulogy by Dawt'ak in memory of prince owanšir (or Ĵowanšēr). The prince lived in the 7th century and, through a policy of alliances with the great powers of his time, sought to obtain advantages for his country. He probably died in 680, wounded to death by a courtier. This episode is narrated in the *Patmowt'iw n Ałowanac'* (II,34-35), which likely draws on a first-hand account by an eyewitness. The source relates that when the news of Ĵowanšir's assassination spread throughout the country, a

certain Dawt'ak, a man skilled in rhetoric, began singing a lament for the dead prince in the form of an alphabetical acrostic poem. The composition is quoted in its entirety, although only stanzas I-XIX are transmitted by all manuscripts, with the remaining ones surviving only in a few. This is the oldest surviving Armenian funeral lamentation¹¹. It was certainly composed in Armenian, because it is the Armenian alphabet that provides a frame for it, and some biblical references are almost certainly taken from the Armenian version of the Bible. Furthermore, Dawt'ak was certainly imitating a similar alphabetic acrostic written a few decades earlier by Armenian Kat'olikos Komitas Ałc'ec'i (d. 628), namely a hymn dedicated to St. Hrip'simē and her companions¹². From a metrical standpoint, the earlier poem seems far more regular than Dawt'ak's work, at least judging from the form in which the latter survives.

As for the contents of the poem, it is worth focusing on a few points. After an opening sentence addressed to the «master spirit of the divine word» (Աստուածային բանին արուեստաւոր հոգի), namely, the Holy Spirit, several stanzas describe the Albanians' grief upon Ĵowanšir's death. This ushers in reflections on the prince's greatness, followed by renewed attention to his murder. Its cause is the sinfulness of the Albanian people. A curse on the killer is then uttered: he will wander the earth like Cain, his body will be eaten by fire and worms as happened to Herod, his murderous hand and his foot will wither because of pustules and fever, and so forth. There follow several stanzas that compare the past greatness with the present grief, dwelling on a description of the sorrow, shared not only by the Albanians but also by other peoples. Finally, Dawt'ak concludes his poem with the lines: «It would be sweet to speak of other things and restlessly weep, // but even sweeter to die with you» (Բաղոր էր զայս ասել եւս եւ միշտ հեծել, // Բայց քաղցրագոյն եւս ընդ քեզ մեռանել).

Unfortunately, almost nothing is known about ancient Armenian poetry and its composition technique. A few relics are almost all that remains, and as to the technique, we are totally in the dark. All we know is that Armenian poems were often transmitted orally by singers or minstrels.

¹¹ On Dawt'ak's lamentation, see **A. Orenco**, "Sulla più antica poesia armena. Elementi precristiani e cristiani nell'Elegia in morte di Ĵowanšir composta da Dawt'ak (VII secolo)", in: *Motivi e forme della poesia cristiana antica tra Scrittura e tradizione classica. XXXVI incontro di studiosi dell'antichità cristiana, 3-5 maggio 2007 (Studia Ephemeridis Augustinianum, vol. 108)*. Roma 2008, pp. 783-794.

¹² For the Armenian text of the hymn see **ՄՀ VIII**, 2007, pp. 283-287.

As for Dawt‘ak’s eulogy, nothing is known about how it was composed, not even whether it originated as an oral poem and was later put in writing, or whether it was originally composed in writing and just happened to be performed orally by the author on the occasion of Ĵowanšir’s memorial ceremony.

In this context, the use of the alphabet as a frame for the poem could suggest that the author was working within a certain literary culture. On the other hand, the alphabet could simply have been a mnemonic tool, particularly in a poem where – if one is to trust the manuscript tradition – only the first letter distinguishes each stanza from the others and thus shapes the rhythm of the composition.

Indeed, the actual metre of the poem is quite irregular. Of the thirty-six stanzas, twenty-one contain four lines; seven, two lines; four, three lines; two, two lines; one, six lines, and one contains only one line. This is striking, particularly if one compares Dawt‘ak’s poem with Komitas’s above-mentioned hymn, where all thirty-six stanzas are quatrains. Furthermore, of the twenty-one quatrains of the eulogy to Ĵowanšir, eighteen are in stanzas I-XIX, i.e. those that are contained in all manuscripts. The author also made use, albeit in a very irregular manner, of other poetic devices such as rhyme and alliteration, the latter being well attested in the relics of old Armenian poetry.

Be that as it may, Dawt‘ak’s eulogy contains some typical features of narrative lamentation, such as the comparison of the lamented hero with strong animals or with those parts of a building that render it almost indestructible and impregnable: Ĵowanšir is a rock, a wall, a tower, a bulwark (stanza III), he is compared with a lion (stanzas VII and XX), and so forth. Such devices are frequent in the funeral lamentations of other peoples living in the Mediterranean basin¹³; furthermore, this sort of lamentation, well known among the Greeks, was probably also customary among the Persians¹⁴.

¹³ See **M. Alexiou**, *The Ritual Lament in Greek Tradition*. Second Edition Revised by **D. Yatromanolakis** and **P. Roilos**, Lanham-Boulder-New York-Oxford 2002, pp. 193-205, and **A. Di Nola**, *La morte trionfata. Antropologia del lutto*, Roma 1995, pp. 83-136.

¹⁴ The Middle Persian work *Ayādgār ī Zarērān* («Zarēr’s Memoirs»), which continues a Parthian text composed in verse, includes a funeral lamentation performed by Bastwar before the body of his father, who had been killed in battle. See **A. Pagliaro**, “Il testo pahlavico Ayātkār-ī-Zarērān edito in trascrizione, con introduzione, note e glossario”, *Rendiconti della R. Accademia dei Lincei. Classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche*, serie VI/1, 1925 (pp. 550-604), pp. 585-587, and **É. Benveniste**, “Le Mémorial de Zarēr, poème pehlevi mazdéen”, *Journal Asiatique* 220, 1932 (pp. 245-293), pp. 280-282.

ԱԼԵՍՍԱՆԴՐՈ ՕՐԵՆԳՈ

Պիզալի համալսարան

**ԱՍՈՒՄՆՈՒԹՅԱՆ ԵՎ ՍԳՈ ՁԵՎԵՐԸ
ՍԻՋՆԱԴԱՐՅԱՆ ԱՂՎԱՆՔՈՒՄ**

Բանալի բառեր՝ Աղվանքի հասարակություն (V դար), Հայաստանի հասարակություն (V դար), Աղվենի ժողով, Շահապիվանի ժողով, ամուսնություն, լեվիրատ (մահացած եղբոր այրու հետ ամուսնությունը), թաղման ծեսեր, թաղման ողբեր:

Աղվանից արքա Վաչագանի օրոք, ամենայն հավանականությամբ 484 և 488 թվականների միջև, Աղվենում գումարվել է մեծ եկեղեցական ժողով (ավանդական թվականը 488-ն է): Հողվածի նպատակն է այդ առիթով ընդունված որոշ կանոնների քննարկումը, մասնավորապես՝ ամուսնության և թաղման ծեսերին վերաբերող կանոնների, և դրանց համեմատությունը Շահապիվանի ժողովում 444 թ. Հայոց եկեղեցու ընդունածների հետ:

Հայտնի է, որ երկու կանոնախումբն էլ մեզ են հասել իրենց նախնական վիճակը չարտացոլող վիճակով: Շահապիվանի կանոններն ընդգրկած են ավելի ուշ ժողովածուի մեջ, որն ի վերջո խմբագրվել է VIII դարում՝ ակնհայտ հավելումներով և/կամ ընդմիջարկություններով: Աղվենի կանոնները պահպանվել են Մովսես Կաղանկատվացու «Պատմութիւն Աղուանից աշխարհի» երկի մեջ, որը մանրամասն պատմում է ընդհուպ մինչև X դար հասնող իրադարձությունների մասին և հավանաբար խմբագրվել է այդ նույն դարավերջին:

Այնուամենայնիվ, այդ կանոնախմբերի համեմատությունը հնարավոր է և իմաստ ունի, քանի որ թույլ կտա հայացք նետել Հայաստանի ու Աղվանքի սովորույթների միջև եղած նմանությունների ու տարբերությունների և դրանց վերաբերող օրենսդրության վրա, մոտավորապես նույն ժամանակաշրջանում:

Հողվածում քննարկվում են հետևյալ հարցերը.

1. մերձավոր ազգականների միջև ամուսնության արգելքը
2. լեվրատի արգելքը
3. սգո սաստիկ արտահայտության արգելքը
4. մահացածների պատվին պատմողական ողբին դիմելը՝ Մովսես Կաղանկատվացու պատմական երկում Ջվանշիրի հիշատակին Դավթակի ողբի հանդեպ հատուկ ուշադրությամբ:

АЛЕССАНДРО ОРЕНГО

**ФОРМЫ БРАКА И ПЛАЧА В КАВКАЗСКОЙ
АЛБАНИИ В СРЕДНИЕ ВЕКА**

Ключевые слова: Кавказская Албания (5-й век), Армения (5-й век), Алуэнский собор, Шаапиванский собор, брак, левират (брак с женой умершего брата), погребальные обряды, погребальный плач.

Во время царствования Вачагана, царя Албании, по всей вероятности, между 484 и 488 годами (традиционная дата – 488 г.) в Алуэне был созван великий собор. Целью статьи является обсуждение канонов, относящихся к браку и погребальным обрядам, и сопоставление их с принятыми Армянской церковью на Шаапиванском соборе в 444 году.

Известно, что оба свода канонов дошли до нас в редакциях, не отражающих их первоначальные формы. Каноны Шаапивана вошли в поздний сборник, принявший окончательную форму в 8-ом веке, с явными дополнениями и/или интерполяциями. Каноны Алуэна включены в «Историю страны Алуанк» Мовсеса Каланкатуаци, в которой подробно рассказаны события до 10-го века, и которая, по-видимому, была отредактирована в конце этого века.

Тем не менее, сравнение между двумя группами канонов, возможно, имеет смысл: оно даст возможность взглянуть на сходные черты и различия между местными обычаями армян и албанцев и, следовательно, на касающиеся их законы примерно в одно и то же время.

В статье рассмотрены следующие пункты:

1. запрет на близкородственные браки,
2. запрет на левиратный брак,
3. запрет на непомерное выражение скорби,
4. обращение к повествовательным плачам в честь умерших, с особым вниманием к плачу Давтака о князе Джуаншере в «Истории» Мовсеса Каланкатуаци.