

Greeks accused of following the Jacobite errors, retorted upon members of the Greek Church with the reproach of the opposite heresy of Nestorianism. And the attribution of Nestorianism to a Georgian Prince is, like the expression "*extreme East*," an indication of the Armenian channel through which the story came.

The intention to march to the aid of the Christians in Palestine is more like the act of a Georgian General than that of a Karacathayan Khan; and there are in the history of the Kingdom of Jerusalem several indications of the proposal at least of Georgian assistance.

The personage in question is said to have come from the country of the Magi, from whom he was descended. But these have frequently been supposed to come from Great Armenia. *E.g.* Friar Jordanus says they came from Moghán.*

The name *Ecbatana* has been so variously applied that it was likely to lead to ambiguities. But it so happens that, in a previous passage of his History, Bishop Otto of Freisingen, in rehearsing some Oriental information gathered apparently from the same Bishop of Gabala, has shown what was the place that he had been taught to identify with Ecbatana, viz. the old Armenian city of ANI.† Now this city was captured from the Turks, on behalf of the King of Georgia, David the Restorer, by his great *sbasalar*,‡ John Orbelian, in 1123-24.

Professor Bruun also lays stress upon a passage in a German chronicle of date some years later than Otho's work :

"1141. Liupoldus dux Bawariorum obiit, Henrico fratre ejus succedente in ducatu. Iohannes Presbyter Rex Armeniæ et Indiæ cum duobus regibus fratribus Persarum et Medorum pugnavit et vicit." §

He asks how the Gur-Khan of Karakhitai could be styled King of *Armenia* and of *India*? It may be asked, *per contra*, how either the King of Georgia or his *Peshwa* (to use the Mahratta analogy of John Orbelian's position) could be styled King of *Armenia* and of *India*? In reply to this, Professor Bruun adduces a variety of quotations which he considers as showing that the term *India* was applied to some Caucasian region.

My own conviction is that the report of Otto of Freisingen is not merely the *first mention* of a great Asiatic potentate called Prester John, but that his statement is the whole and sole basis of good faith on which the story of such a potentate rested; and I am quite as willing to believe, on due evidence, that the nucleus of fact to which his statement referred, and on which such a pile of long-enduring fiction was erected, occurred in Armenia as that it occurred in Turan. Indeed in many respects the story would thus be more comprehensible. One cannot attach any value to the quotation from the Annalist in Pertz, because there seems no reason to doubt that the passage is a mere adaptation of the report by Bishop Otto, of whose work the Annalist makes other use, as is indeed admitted by

* The Great Plain on the Lower Araxes and Cyrus. The word Moghán = *Magi*: and Abulfeda quotes this as the etymology of the name. (*Reinaud's Abulf.* I. 300.)—Y. [*Cordier, Odoric*, 36.]

† Here is the passage, which is worth giving for more reasons than one:

"That portion of ancient Babylon which is still occupied is (as we have heard from persons of character from beyond sea) styled BALDACH, whilst the part that lies, according to the prophecy, deserted and pathless extends some ten miles to the Tower of Babel. The inhabited portion called Baldach is very large and populous; and though it should belong to the Persian monarchy it has been conceded by the Kings of the Persians to their High Priest, whom they call the *Caliph*; in order that in this also a certain analogy [*quaedam habitudo*], such as has been often remarked before, should be exhibited between Babylon and Rome. For the same (privilege) that here in the city of Rome has been made over to our chief Pontiff by the Christian Emperor, has there been conceded to their High Priest by the Pagan Kings of Persia, to whom Babylonia has for a long time been subject. But the Kings of the Persians (just as our Kings have their royal city, like Aachen) have themselves established the seat of their kingdom at Egbatana, which, in the Book of Judith, Arphaxat is said to have founded, and which in their tongue is called HANI, containing as they allege 100,000 or more fighting men, and have reserved to themselves nothing of Babylon except the nominal dominion. Finally, the place which is now vulgarly called Babylonia, as I have mentioned, is not upon the Euphrates (at all) as people suppose, but on the Nile, about 6 days' journey from Alexandria, and is the same as Memphis, to which Cambyses, the son of Cyrus, anciently gave the name of Babylon."—*Otonis Frising. Lib. VII. cap. 3, in Germanic Hist. Illust. etc. Christiani Urstisii Basiliensis, Francof. 1585.*—Y.

‡ *Sbasalar*, or "General-in-chief," = Pers. *Sipâhsâldr.*—Y.

§ *Continuatio Ann. Admutensium*, in Pertz, *Scriptores*, IX. 580