



НАЦИОНАЛЬНАЯ АКАДЕМИЯ НАУК РЕСПУБЛИКИ АРМЕНИЯ
ИНСТИТУТ АРХЕОЛОГИИ И ЭТНОГРАФИИ

КАМЕННЫЕ СТЕЛЫ ВИШАПЫ

Редакторы
Армен Петросян, Арсен Бобохян

NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES OF THE REPUBLIC OF ARMENIA
INSTITUTE OF ARCHAEOLOGY AND ETHNOGRAPHY

THE VISHAP STONE STELAE

Editors
Armen Petrosyan, Arsen Bobokhyan

ИЗДАТЕЛЬСТВО
«ГИТУТЮН»
ЕРЕВАН 2015
«GITUTYUN»
PUBLISHING HOUSE
YEREVAN 2015

ՀԱՅԱՍՏԱՆԻ ՀԱՆՐԱՊԵՏՈՒԹՅԱՆ ԳԻՏՈՒԹՅՈՒՆՆԵՐԻ ԱԶԳԱՅԻՆ ԱԿԱԴԵՄԻԱ
ՀՆԱԳԻՏՈՒԹՅԱՆ ԵՎ ԱԶԳԱԳՐՈՒԹՅԱՆ ԻՆՍՏԻՏՈՒՏ

ՎԻՇԱՊ ՔԱՐԱԿՈԹՈՂՆԵՐԸ

Խմբագիրներ՝
Արմեն Պետրոսյան
Արսեն Բորոխյան



«ԳԻՏՈՒԹՅՈՒՆ»
ՀՐԱՏԱՐԱԿՉՈՒԹՅՈՒՆ
ԵՐԵՎԱՆ 2015

Տպագրվում է ՀՀ ԳԱԱ Հնագիտության և ազգագրության
ինստիտուտի գիտական խորհրդի որոշմամբ

ՀՏԴ 902/904
ԳՄԴ 63.4 + 63.3
Վ.630

Վ.630 Վիշապ քարակոթողները / ՀՀ ԳԱԱ: Հնագիտության և ազգագրության ինստիտուտ:
Խմբ.՝ Ա. Պետրոսյան, Ա. Բորոխյան. – Եր.: Գիտություն, 2015. – 420 էջ:

Հայաստանի բարձր լեռներում մինչ օրս պահպանվել են հնագույն կոթողային հուշարձաններ, որոնց ժողովուրդն ավանդաբար կոչում է «վիշապ»: Խաչքարերի նման, վիշապ քարակոթողները հանդիպում են միայն Հայկական լեռնաշխարհում: Չնայած այս հուշարձաններն ավելի քան մեկ դար է, ինչ հայտնի են գիտությանը, սակայն բազմաթիվ խնդիրներ, կապված դրանց նշանակության, գործառույթի և թվագրության հետ, մնում են դեռևս չլուծված: Սույն ժողովածուն նվիրված է վիշապ քարակոթողների բազմակողմանի հետազոտությանը՝ առասպելաբանական, ազգագրական, լեզվաբանական և հնագիտական նոր տվյալների հիման վրա: Գիրքը նախատեսված է ինչպես մասնագետների, այնպես էլ Հայաստանի հնագույն շրջանի պատմությամբ և մշակույթով հետաքրքրվող ընթերցողների համար:

Կազմին պատկերված է հատված Իմիրզեկ 17 վիշապաքարից:

ՀՏԴ 902/904
ԳՄԴ 63.4 + 63.3

Բովանդակություն

Նախաբան	7
Предисловие	8
Preface	9
Գեղամա լեռների վիշապաքարերի գծանկարները / Рисунки вишапов Гегамских гор / Drawings of Geghama Mountain vishaps	10
Երեսուն տարի անց. վիշապ քարակոթողները և վիշապամարտի առասպելը <i>Արմեն Պեպրոսյան</i>	13
«Վիշապներ» կոչված քարակոթողների պատկերագրության իմաստաբանության շուրջ <i>Սարգիս Հարությունյան</i>	53
Зооморфная опора земли и вишапы – противники громовержца <i>Юрий Березкин</i>	59
Մի քանի դիտողություն վիշապ կոթողների վերաբերյալ <i>Հանյեղ Պեպրոսյան</i>	81
Վիշապաքարերի պաշտամունքային-կիրառական գործառույթները <i>Գարեգին Թումանյան</i>	99
Архетип вертикали и каменные вишапы <i>Левон Абрамян</i>	121
Լեռնային ակունքի ֆառնը, Արշալույսի դիցուհին և գլխի ու մորթու զոհածեղ վիշապակոթողների իմաստաբանական հենքում <i>Հրաչ Սարգիսյան</i>	136
The vishapakars of the Geghama Mountains: a synopsis <i>Alessandra Gilibert, Marina Storaci</i>	171
Новые данные о менгирах Южной Грузии <i>Годердзи Нариманишвили, Нино Шанишвили, Дмитрий Нариманишвили</i>	176
Ձկնակերպ արձանիկ Սևանի ավազանից <i>Նորա Ենգիբարյան</i>	190

Рапира – бык – вишاپ <i>Արամ Դեւորկյան, Արսեն Բոբոխյան</i>	193
The Armenian dragon stones and a seal impression from Acemhöyük <i>Alessandra Gilibert</i>	205
Deer stones, not dragon stones: "vishapoids" of North Caucasus and Mongolia reconsidered <i>Pavol Hnila</i>	211
Սարուխանի «Վիշապը» <i>Մինն Հնայակյան, Հայկ Հակոբյան, Նորայր Հազեյան, Մարինե Մելքոնյան</i>	219
The location of cult stelae in the light of the Hittite cult-inventories <i>Michele Cammarosano</i>	224
Ոսկե գեղմի առասպելը և վիշապ քարակոթողները <i>Արմեն Պետրոսյան</i>	233
Ոսկե գեղմ – վիշապաքար. առասպելից դեպի հնագիտություն <i>Արսեն Բորոխյան, Արամ Գևորգյան</i>	241
Վիշապաքար հուշարձաններն արխիվներում <i>Լևոն Մկրտչյան</i>	258
Վիշապաքարերի հնագիտություն <i>Արսեն Բորոխյան, Ալեասնդրա Ջիլիբերտ, Պավոլ Հնիլա</i>	269
Ամփոփումներ	397
Резюме	405
Summaries	413

The vishapakars of the Geghama Mountains: a synopsis¹

Alessandra Gilibert¹, Marina Storaci²

¹Institut für Altorientalistik, Freie Universität Berlin

²Cà Foscari University, Venice

Scientific research on the Armenian *vishapakar* (lit. “dragon stones”) begins with Nikolai Jakovlevich Marr and Jakov Ivanovich Smirnov, who in 1909 saw at least 19 vishapakar in the Geghama Mountains and recorded what still is the most comprehensive collection of dragon stones to date.

Nikolai Marr was born in Georgia in 1865 and died in Leningrad in 1934. A linguist specialized in Armenian and Georgian Studies, Marr became famous above all for his controversial “New Linguistic Doctrine,” which postulated a common origin of Caucasian, Semitic-Hamitic, and Basque languages. By 1920, Marr devoted all his scientific attention to comparative linguistics. In the earlier part of his academic career, however, he led three important archaeological excavations in the Armenian Highland, each a cornerstone in the history of Armenian archaeology: the excavations at Ani (1892-1893; 1904-1917), at Toprakkale (1916), and at the Hellenistic temple of Garni (1909-1910). At Garni, Marr was joined by Jakov Smirnov. Smirnov, who was born in 1869 and died in 1918 in St. Petersburg, lived his scientific life as an acclaimed art collector and medievalist art historian. In 1898, he became senior curator at the Hermitage. In 1909 he published the influential work *Vostochnoe serebro*, an “Atlas” of Central Asian silverwork from the Sassanian to the early medieval period, and left St. Petersburg to join Marr’s excavation at Garni.

At Garni, Marr and Smirnov were told of the existence on the mountains above the site of “certaines pierres énormes aux images sculptée: des serpents ou des dragons ou quelquefois simplement des drag-

ons en pierre” (Smirnov 1931, 61). On Sunday, July the 19th, they hired a local guide and embarked on a one-day survey on horseback of the high-altitude pastures above Garni, taking off at 2am and coming back at 12pm (Smirnov 1931, 61-62). They took the route along the river valley, passed by the monastery of Geghard, and rode up the mountain until they reached the pastures of Gaspar-Kend. From there, they marched further for over an hour towards northeast, until they reached an encampment of herdsmen called “Azhdaha-Yurt,” literally “the encampment of the giants.” There, at last, Marr and Smirnov saw the first examples of the “dragons” they were looking for. What they saw were basalt megaliths shaped, to the astonishment of the scholars, as “énormes poissons en pierre” (Smirnov 1931, 62).

Marr and Smirnov came back to Azhdaha-Yurt in 1910 and surveyed also the “families of vishapakar” at the nearby sites of Tokhmagan-Göl, Göli-Yurt and Imirzek². Along their routes, Marr and

1 I would like to thank Pavol Hnila and Giorgio Gilibert for the time they devoted to the close reading of *Les Vichaps* and for sharing the important results of their studies with me.

2 Neither Marr nor Smirnov report exactly how many excursions in the Geghama Mountains they undertook in total. Marr speaks of „recherches répétées“ (Marr 1931b, 94). At least two times, on July 19, 1909 and later in Summer 1910, Marr and Smirnov went together (as implied by Marr 1931b, 91 describing a vishapakar at the site of Göli-Yurt: “Nous y avons déblayé aussi une autre pierre, don’t nous n’avons vu à notre première visite que la partie supérieure”). During the first common trip, Marr and Smirnov apparently visited only the site of Azhdaha-Yurt. In the second common trip, the scholars visited Tokhmagan-Göl, Göli-Yurt, and probably also Imirzek. Between these two trips, Smirnov undertook at least one trip alone (“sa 2-e expedition:” Marr 1931b, 91, n.1). This trip is nowhere described by Smirnov himself (hence we infer that the conference published by Marr after his death was held before this second trip). Marr reports that Smirnov visited the site of Tokhmagan-Göl and quotes a passage from an unknown document where Smirnov apparently declares that upon this occasion he saw “un vishap et une stèle” (Marr 1931b, 91, n. 1). As we learn from Marr, that vishap is to be identified with Tokhmagan-Göl 1

Smirnov recorded 19 vishapakar³ of three different typologies: vishapakar in the shape of a fish (which we may call “*piscis*”), vishapakar carved as if one or more bovid hides had been draped on them (the *vellus* class), and vishapakar combining a fish shape with the carving of bovid hides (the *hybrida* class).

Between 1910 and 1911, Marr and Smirnov divulged the results of their expedition in the Geghama Mountains in Russia: Marr with a talk at the Russian Archaeological Society at St. Petersburg and Smirnov at the Archaeological Society of Moscow (Marr 1931a, 11). Both presentations remained unpublished. Then, in 1918, the year of Smirnov's death, a “great misfortune” occurred: the papers, the photographs, the drawings and the notes from Marr's archaeological expeditions in Armenia went lost while being transported by railway from Armavir to Tiflis via Baku (Choisnel 2005, 66). Marr writes: “Le destin leur avait réservé un sort pareil à la mort” (Marr 1931a, 10). A period of quiescence descends upon the discovery of the vishapakars by Marr and Smirnov. Two decades later, in 1930, Marr hears in Tiflis a report on a vishapakar seen in Georgia by L.M. Melikset-Bekov (Melikset-Bekov 1947). Recognizing in the stone of Melikset-Bekov the same kind of megalith that he saw above Garni, Marr finally published in 1931 the drafts of the talks given in Russia by Smirnov and himself between 1910 and 1911 (Marr, Smirnov 1931). In *Les Vichaps*, which is so far the only existing monograph interely dedicated to the dragon's stones, the text by Smirnov is published after the death of its author and the text by Marr is published without further editing, “comme si c'était une outre oeuvre posthume” (Marr 1931b, 11). Although *Les Vichaps* is a thoroughly captivating book, the texts it contains were nonetheless original-

ly conceived to be read out aloud, are interspersed with contradictions and lack a general systematic frame. Above all, *Les Vichaps* does not contain a precise list of the megaliths recorded by the authors, although Marr and Smirnov actually made such a list in the field and numbered the vishapakar according to their findspot (e.g., “Imirzek no. 1” etc). One such list, together with drawings to scale, has been published by L.A. Barseghian in 1967/1968, who in 1963 followed the tracks of Marr and Smirnov in the Geghama mountains and found two further vishapakar (Barseghian 1968, no. 19-20; here, *Dava-Gözi* 1-2). Barseghian himself, however, points out that his list is more a “description sommaire” than a scientific catalogue (Barseghian 1968, 290). Furthermore, since Barseghian introduces his own numbering system, it is often difficult to compare his list to the data collected by Marr and Smirnov. In short, even if the vishapakar of the Geghama Mountains are so far the most significant group of vishapakar ever observed, a compilation of the scientific information available about them is still lacking. Thus, as a propedeutic tools and as a scientific compass for interested scholars, we publish here a synoptical overview of the different data from Marr, Smirnov, and Barseghian.

Bibliography

- Barseghian L. A. 1968. Les višaps des monts Guegham. *Revue des études arméniennes* n.s. 5, 289-293.
- Choisnel E. 2005. Le parcours de N. Marr de l'archéologie arménienne à la linguistique “japhétique”. *Cahiers de l'ILSL* 20, 57-76.
- Kalantar A. 2003. Mount Aragats in History. In: *Materials on Armenian and Urartian History*, by A. Kalantar. Neuchâtel, 5-19.
- Marr N. J. 1931a. *Les Vichaps: Préface*. In: Marr, Smirnov 1931, 9-57.
- Marr N. J. 1931b. *Les Vichaps: Extrait d'un rapport fait à la Société Archéologique Russe*. In: Marr, Smirnov 1931, 81-107.
- Marr N. J., Smirnov Y. I. 1931. *Les Vichaps. Mémoires de l'Académie de l'histoire de la culture matérielle* 1. Leningrad.
- Melikset-Bekov L. M. 1947. Vishapy i vishapoidy Gruzii. *Kratkie soobščeniya o dokladach i polevych issledovanijach Instituta istorii material'noj kul'tury* 15, 27-37.
- Piotrovskiy B. B. 1939. *Vishapy. Kamennye statui v gorakh Armenii*. Leningrad.
- Smirnov Y. I. 1931. *Les Vichaps: Extrait d'un rapport fait à la Société Archéologique de Moscou*. In: Marr, Smirnov 1931, 61-76.

(Marr 1931b, 91, n. 2) and the “stele” with Tokhmagan-Göl 2 (Marr 1931b, 91: “Smirnov l'avait vu auparavant...”). The photographic documentation and perhaps also the drawing have probably been recorded during the second common trip in 1910.

3 Marr declares having seen 23 dragon stones (Marr 1931b, 94) but in the text the stones recorded are 19. In at least two cases (*Azhdaha-Yurt* 1 and *Tokhmagan-Göl* 1), Marr mistook the same stone photographed from two different angles for two different stones, thus counting each stone twice. Marr may have also counted as *vishapakar* unidentified fragments not recorded in detail, for example “une pierre de petites dimensions à tête de boef abimée” seen next to *Göli-Yurt* 3 (Marr 1931b, 91), or further fragments reused in Medieval waterworks (Marr 1931b, 93).

	Catalogue		Documentation				Typology	Current Location	Notes
	Marr, Smirnov	Barseghian	Foto	Drawing	Measurements	Description			
Azhdaha-Yurt 1	1	3	Marr, Smirnov, pl. 2,7, pl. 7 is incorrectly labeled as “vishap no. 5”	Smirnov, 63; Barseghian, № 3	Height 480 cm, Length 55 cm (Smirnov, 62); Height 475 cm (Marr, 89); 510×73–55×35 cm (Barseghian, 290)	“pierre noire, dure et poreuse...” (Smirnov, 62-63); Marr, 89; Barseghian, 290	<i>piscis</i>	In situ	A fragment of the “tail” was found broken next to the vishap (Smirnov, 62). The “belly” of the fish bears secondary inscriptions and incised crosses dated by Smirnov to the XIII century AD (Smirnov, 63). Barseghian apparently does not see the belly of the fish.
Azhdaha-Yurt 2	2	4	Marr, Smirnov, pl. 3-4; Kalantar 2003,7 (erroneously labeled as “found on the slope of Mount Aragats”)	Barseghian, № 4	Height 375 cm, Length of relief 253 cm (Marr, 89); Height 340 cm; Length of vellus relief 250 cm (Barseghian, 290-291)	Marr, 89; Barseghian, 290-291	<i>hybrida</i>	Yerevan, Poplavok Gardens	According to Marr (90) and Smirnov (66-67), Azhdaha-Yurt 1 and Azhdaha-Yurt 2 were found each at one side of a water stream coming from a nearby source; “dans le rocher de la pente voisine est taillé une sorte de mortier en pierre” (Smirnov, 66-67).
Azhdaha-Yurt 3	—	5	Marr, Smirnov, pl. 5b	Smirnov, 65; Barseghian, № 5	250×170×47 cm, “parallépipédique” (Barseghian, 291)	Barseghian, 291	<i>vellus</i>	in situ	Fragment (“stele”) of a blackish and porous stone.
Azhdaha-Yurt 4	5	2	Marr, Smirnov, pl. 6	Barseghian, № 2	260×80–40×45cm (Barseghian, 290)	Marr, 90; Barseghian, 290	<i>piscis</i>	in situ	Seen “together with some others” not far away from Azhdaha-Yurt 1-2. According to Marr, the head of the fish reminds of that of a catfish, or silurus glanis (Marr, 90).
Azhdaha-Yurt 5	6	1	Marr, Smirnov, pls. 8-9; Piotrovskiy 1939, pl. 5	Smirnov, 64; Barseghian, № 1	Length 340 cm, Length of relief 240 cm, (Smirnov, 63-64) 360×60–43 cm (Barseghian, 290)	Smirnov, 63-64; Barseghian, 290	<i>hybrida</i>	Outside Sardarapat Museum	This is the second vishap seen by Marr and Smirnov (seen immediately after Azhdaha-Yurt 1 and near Azhdaha-Yurt 3). Not to be confused with Marr and Smirnov’s vishap no. 2 (Azhdaha-Yurt 2).
Azhdaha-Yurt 6	—	—	Marr, Smirnov, pl. 5a	—	—	Smirnov, 65	<i>vellus</i>	in situ	Fragment (“stele”) of black basalt, elongated and polished, incised with the head of a ram with spiraled horns. Recorded at a distance of 30mins by foot from Azhdaha-Yurt 4, in a place “with many dispersed stones” (Smirnov, 65).

	Catalogue		Documentation				Typology	Current Location	Notes
	Marr, Smirnov	Barseghian	Foto	Drawing	Measurements	Description			
Tokhmagan-Göl 1	—	9	Marr, Smirnov, pls. 11(?), 12 and 14a	Marr, 92; Barseghian, № 8 [incorrect: should be № 9]	400×150 cm (Barseghian, 292)	Marr, 91; Barseghian, 292	vellus	Vishapilich	“vishap aux grues”.
Tokhmagan-Göl 2	2	8	Marr, Smirnov, pl. 13 and 14b	Marr, 90 (right); Barseghian, № 8	350×85–70×70-25 cm (Barseghian, 291)	Marr, 91; Barseghian, 291-292	vellus	Yerevan, Neighborhood Park “II Massif”	Found 2-3mins NE by foot away from Tokhmagan-Göl 1; Marr calls it “no. 3” in the text (91).
Tokhmagan-Göl 3	4	10	Marr, Smirnov, pl. 15a		200×50–15×30 cm (Barseghian, 292)	Barseghian, 292	hybrida	Outside Matenadaran in Yerevan	Barghesian did not publish drawing no. 10.
Tokhmagan-Göl 4	—	6	—	Barseghian, № 6	205×80 cm (Barseghian, 291 [incorrectly identified with no. 11, which is actually a drawing of Tokhmagan-Göl 5])	Barseghian, 291 [incorrectly identified with no. 11]	vellus	Vishapilich	To be probably identified with the vishap depicted in Piotrovskiy, pl. XI; it is possible that this vishap was first recorded by Piotrovskiy 1939.
Tokhmagan-Göl 5	—	7	—	Barseghian, № 7	340×70–25 cm (Barseghian, 291)		piscis	Yerevan, Neighborhood Park “II Massif”	First recorded by Barseghian.
Tokhmagan-Göl 6	—	—	Marr, Smirnov, pl. 15b	Marr, 93; Barseghian, № 11	150×50 cm (Marr, 92)	Marr, 93	vellus	in loco	Fragment reused in barrage, with hole for water (20×20 cm).
Tokhmagan-Göl 7	—	—	—	—	72 cm (Marr, 93)	—	vellus	in loco	Fragment (broken in two), found at a distance of c. 20m from Tokhmagan-Göl 6.
Göli -Yurt 1	1	14	Marr, Smirnov, pl. 16; Piotrovskiy, 1939, pl. VI	Barseghian, № 14	—	—	piscis	in situ	Barseghian declares not to have seen it (Barseghian, 292).
Göli -Yurt 2	—	15	Marr, Smirnov, pl. 17	Marr, 90 (left); Barseghian, № 15	Cf. scale in Barseghian's drawing	Marr, 90-91	hybrida	in situ	Vishap “à filets d'eau”; Barseghian did not see it. Pl. 17 of Marr, Smirnov labels it as found “near Azhdaha-Yurt”, but in the text it is written that this vishap comes “de Göl-Yurt” (Marr, 91).
Göli-Yurt 3	—	—	—	—	—	Marr, 91	piscis	in situ	Half buried, only upper part visible. Next to it, Marr mentions “une pierre de petites dimensions à tête de beuf abimée” (Marr, 91).

	Catalogue		Documentation				Typology	Current Location	Notes
	Marr, Smirnov	Barseghian	Foto	Drawing	Measurements	Description			
Imirzek 1	1 [5 in text]	17	Marr, Smirnov, pl. 18	Marr, 95 (left), Barseghian, № 17	500×90–35×64 cm	Marr, 94	<i>vellus</i>	in situ	Barseghian did not see it (Barseghian, 293). It is unclear where Barseghian's drawing with scale (quite different from the drawing without scale published by Marr and Smirnov) is derived from.
Imirzek 2	2	16	Marr, Smirnov, pl. 19-20	Marr, 94; Barseghian, № 16	400×70–40×40 cm (Barseghian, 292-293)	Marr, 94	<i>hybrida</i>	in situ	
Imirzek 3	3	18	Marr, Smirnov, pl. 21-22	Marr, 95; Barseghian, № 18	Length 390 cm (Marr, 93)	Marr, 93	<i>hybrida(?)</i>	in situ	Barseghian did not see it.
Imirzek 4	4	20(?)	Marr, Smirnov, pl. 23	Perhaps Barseghian, № 20	410×75–60 cm (Barseghian, 293)	Barseghian, 293	<i>piscis</i>	in situ	Found at Bzovani-Yurt, Baba-Pari, together with Imirzek 5.
Imirzek 5	5	19(?)	Marr, Smirnov, pl. 24	Perhaps Barseghian, № 19	520x90-50cm (Barseghian, 293)	Barseghian, 293	<i>piscis</i>	in situ	Found at Bzovani-Yurt, Baba-Pari, together with Imirzek 4.
Dava-Gözi 1	—	12	—	Barseghian, № 12	390×90(?)×50 cm (Barseghian, 292)	Barseghian, 292	<i>vellus</i>	in situ	Recorded only by Barseghian. Bovid head in altorilievo, mutilated. Found 4 km away from Azhdaha-Yurt at a locality called Dava-Gözi (Barseghian, 292).
Dava-Gözi 2	—	13	—	Barseghian, № 13	235×70–60×30 cm (Barseghian, 292)	Barseghian, 292	<i>vellus</i>	in situ	Recorded only by Barseghian, who writes that it was found “10 km away from Göli-Yurt 3” (Barseghian, 292).