

REVD. DR. NERSES VREJ NERSESSIAN

## REVIEW ARTICLE: THE ARMENIAN APOSTOLIC ORTHODOX CHURCH AND THE VISION OF THE FRATRE UNITORES OR UNIFYING FRIARS AMONG ARMENIANS.

This is a review article on Father John Whooley's, 'The Armenian Catholic Church: A general overview', *One in Christ*, vol.52, No2 (2018), pp.318- 338.

This is an extended review on Father John Whooley's above mentioned article. The whole work is tainted by a priori conviction which leads to disconcerting conclusions. The author has inevitably put too much reliance on a limited number of Catholic Mkhitarist authors, which are replete with factual errors, and biased approach to theological and historical matters. There is little or no searching critique of his sources and takes no account of more recent works on the most complex issues.

Contrary to what Catholic Mkhitarist scholars suggest (Amaduni, Akinian, Kogian, Hats'uni, Inglizian, Zekyan) the initial condemnation of the decisions of the Council of Chalcedon was made at the First Council of Dvin in 506, convened by Catholicos Babgen I Ut'metsi (490-516), with the participation of the Georgian and the Caucasian Albanian (Aghvank') Churches.<sup>1</sup> The Second Council of Dvin was convened on Palm Sunday 29<sup>th</sup> of March 554 during the Catholicate of Nerses II Bagrevandtsi (548-557), on the 24<sup>th</sup> year of the reign of King Khosrov and the 14<sup>th</sup> year of the reign of Emperor Justinian. Catholicos Babgen in his 'Letter from the Armenians to the Orthodox in Persia' states very clearly that the Nestorians who had gained ground and were disturbing the peace of the Christians in Persia for they were emboldened by the Council of Chalcedon:

*"We flee from and deny the false Teaching (lit. "the lies" (stoutut'iwn') of Nestorius and of others like him [whose teaching was confirmed] in Chalcedon; we know these people as having departed [only] feignedly from both the Gentile and Jewish errors, for they confess the same Gentile and Jewish doctrines and seduce into error the minds of the innocents".*

The reasons for rejecting the Council of Chalcedon were several. Firstly, in 506 as relations between Byzantium and Persia were improving, the Armenian Catholicos Babgen, summoned the First Council of Dvin after Armenians had accepted Emperor Zeno's (471-491) *Henetikon* (482). Catholicos Babgen in his Letter refers to the *Henetikon* in no uncertain terms:

<sup>1</sup> E.Ter Minasyan, 'Babgen kat'oghikosi zhoghvi t'vakane ev teghe' (The date and place when Catholicos Babgen convened his council), *Patma-banasirakan hetazotutyunner* (Erevan, 1971), pp.31-44. Artashes Ghazaryan, 'Dvini ekeghetsakan zhoghovner' (The Church Councils convened in Dvin', *Kristonya Hayastan Hanragitaran* (Erevan, 2002), pp.275-278; Nerses V.Melik Tangian, *Hayots ekeghetsakan irawunke* (Armenian church canon laws) (2<sup>nd</sup> printing, Tehran, 2004), see pp.312-371 for the canons of the 5 councils held in Dvin.

<sup>2</sup> *Girk Tghotots* (Book of Letters) (2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Jerusalem, 1994, p.158); Leif Frivold, *The Incarnation. A study of the Doctrine of the Incarnation in the Armenian Church in the 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> Centuries according to the Book of Letters* (Oslo, 1981), pp.175-176; M.Tallon, S. J., *Livre Des Lettres* (Girk Thghotots) (Beyrouth, 1955).

‘The synod of Armenians, Georgians, and Albanians consider the Henetikon as a document of faith’. Secondly, between 480 and 484 the *Refutation of the Articles of the Council of Chalcedon* by Timothy Aelurus (called Cat, Weasel) (d.477) was available to the Armenian theologians in its Armenian translation.<sup>3</sup> Thirdly, Catholicos Hovhannes Mandakuni (478- 490) before Catholicos Babgen had rejected the Council of Chalcedon in his ‘*Treatise against the Council of Chalcedon called Demonstration*’ [*Apats’oyts’*].<sup>4</sup> Finally, in a short treatise attributed to Moses Khorenatsi, the author defends the ‘*one nature of the incarnate Word of God*’.<sup>5</sup> The historian sets out his understanding of the ecclesial impact of Nestorianism on the whole church in these confessional terms: ‘In those times the impious Nestorius unworthily sat on the episcopal throne of Byzantium. And following the Jewish interpretation he blasphemed the all-holy virgin as being the mother of a man and not the mother of God. For the one born from her had a beginning [he claimed] but was called Son by grace from Mary and another was Son from the Father before ages; so that there was two Sons, whereby the Trinity became a Quaternity. Therefore, the holy fathers gathered in Asia at Ephesus, which faces the sea. In a written statement Celestine of Rome, Cyril of Alexandria, Juvenal of Jerusalem, John of Antioch, Memnon of Ephesus, Paul of Emesa, Theodotius of Ancyra, and many others, altogether two hundred fathers, anathematized Nestorius and confessed our Lord Jesus Christ as one Son of God and the all-holy Virgin Mary as the mother of God’<sup>6</sup>. The Mkhitarist Fathers in their longstanding practice either regard these authors as adhering to Chalcedon or question the authenticity of the texts or as last resort relocate them to later centuries, whichever one comes to their fancy. Father Whooley fails to re-appraise their arguments in the light of current scholarship including perhaps the most distinguished theologian and member of the Mkhitarist Congregation Father Poghos Ananian, who defines the criticism of the above listed colleagues as: ‘artificial, contrived and pure suppositions’.<sup>7</sup> In his analysis of the facts Gareth Fowden reaches this conclusion: ‘The chronology of the gradual process by which in the course of the sixth century Armenia officially rejected Chalcedon is murky; but the “Pancaucasian” First Council of Dvin set the tone in 506 by proclaiming the allegiance of the Armenian, Iberian and Albanian hierarchies to the councils of Nicaea and Constantinople and condemning Nestorianism along, less directly, with Chalcedon, deemed Nestorian’<sup>8</sup>. The Armenian church along with the other Oriental Churches ‘rejected the council of Chalcedon for the same reason as most of the east: because they judged the Chalcedonian definition to be incompatible with the doctrine ‘*One incarnate nature of God*

<sup>3</sup> Karapet vrd.Ter Mkrtchian and Ervand vrd. Ter Minasian, *Timot’eosi episkoposapeti Hakacharutiwn ar sahmanealsn i zhoghovotsn Kaghkedoni* (Holy Ejmiadsin, 1908); T. E. Gregory, ‘Timotheos Ailouros’ *ODB*. vol 3, pp.2086-87; Syriac version (ed.), Y. Ebied in *After Chalcedon* (Louvain,1985); David Johnson, ‘Pope Timothy II Aelurus. His life and his importance for the development of Christianity in Egypt’, *Coptica*, vol. 1 (2002), pp.77-89.

<sup>4</sup> Catholicos Komitas, *Knik Hawatoy endhanur surb ekeghetswoy (Le Sceau de la Foi)*, published by Karapet episkopos [Ter Mkrtchian] (Holy Ejmiadsin, 1914), pp.130-133 ; M.Tallon, *ibid.*, pp.78- 138.

<sup>5</sup> Girk Tghtots, *ibid.*, pp.163-171 (Jerusalem 1994 ed.)

<sup>6</sup> Movses Khorenatsi, *History of the Armenians*, translation and Commentary by Robert W. Thomson ( Harvard University Press,1978), Book III,\$ 61.p.335; L.R. Karimyan, Dvini 506 t’zhoghovi hakanestorakan voroshumnere ( The Council of Dvin of 506 and its ant-Nestorian decisions), *Hay Astvadsabanakan: gitakan hodvadsneri zhoghovadsu* (Erevan, 2008),157-165; E.G.Ter-Minasyan, ‘Nestorakanut’yune Hayastanum’ (Nestorianism in Armenia) in *Patma-Banasirakan Hetazotut’yunner* (Historical-Philological investigations) (Erevan, 1971), pp.330-393.

<sup>7</sup> Fr. Poghos Ananian, *K’nnut’iwn Hay ekeghetswoy patmutean E ew Z dareru shrjanin (Recherches sur l’histoire de l’eglise Armenienne du V et VI siècle)* (Venice,1991), p.12,note 4.

<sup>8</sup> Gareth Fowden, *Empire to Commonwealth. Consequences of monotheism in late antiquity* (PUP,1993), pp. 104-109; John Meyendorff, *Imperial Unity and Christian Divisions* (St Vladimir’s Seminary Press, New York, 1989), p.282.

*the Word*’ and felt therefore that Cyril had been betrayed by the Council’.<sup>9</sup> The plain truth is that Mkhitarists by placing the rejection of the Council of Chalcedon to a date as late as possible, is an attempt at legitimising in a haze of legend the schism created by the Armenian Uniate and Roman Catholic hierarchies.

The term ‘Uniate’ (*Lat. Unio, Unia*) was first used at Brest-Litovsk (1595). Roman controversialists like to allow it to be thought – they are generally too wise to state it openly - that any given body of Uniates is an original, faithful remnant, which has remained true to Rome and refused to go into schism. It is inspired by their general assumption that the Armenians remained in communion with the ‘Catholic Faith’, implying the faith of the church before the Council of Chalcedon. In order to strengthen their argument that the Armenian Uniate Church is the true descendent of the ‘Ancient Orthodox and Catholic’ Armenian church, they try to show that even after the mother church rejected Chalcedon, there remained a ‘Catholic’ remnant in the Armenian church. There is no evidence to bear the weight of such a claim.

The chief evil of the Crusades was the belief that military aggression can serve the spread of Christianity, and that the sword can sometimes be more efficient than the word in the presentation of the Gospel. ‘For the Son of God did not come into the world and suffer the cross to acquire land but to redeem captives and to recall sinners to repentance’<sup>10</sup>. It was during the 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> crusades that a document called *Lettera dell’ amicitia e dell’ unione di Constantino gran Cesare e di san Silvestro Sommo Pontifice, e di Tridate re dell’ Armenia, e di S. Gregorio Illuminatore della Nazione Armena scritta nell’anno del signore 316* ( Venice, 1695) known in Armenian as “*Dashants T’ught*” surfaced in Cilicia. This forgery formed the bases for Clemens Galanus’s *Consiliationis ecclesiae Armenae cum Romans ex ipsis Armenorum ecclesia, et Doctorum testimoniis, in duas partes, Historialem & Controuersialem diuisa* (*SCPF, Romae, 1690*). Such a forgery could have been conceived at no period other than when the Armenians ruled Cilicia. This forgery was composed broadly between the years 1141 and 1238. In 1141, Catholicos Grigor III P’ahlavouni (1113-1166) after participated in the Latin Council of Antioch, visited Jerusalem in the company of the papal legate, Cardinal Alberic. This event is described by the historian Kirakos Gandzaketsi in these terms: “...the ancient treaty between Trdat and Saint Gregory [the Illuminator], and the Emperor Constantine and the Patriarch Sylvester, was renewed’.<sup>11</sup> The methods used were often unworthy of the high ideals. The deception was an attempt on the part of Rome to bring the Armenian Orthodox church into her fold. During the Cilician period alone attempts to subject the Armenian church to papal jurisdiction were undertaken by the following popes; Innocent II (1130-1143), Eugenius III (1145-1153), Lucius III (1181-1185), Clement III (1187-1191), Innocent IV (1243-1254) and Urban IV (1261-1264).<sup>12</sup>

<sup>9</sup> Andrew Louth, ‘Why did the Syrians reject the Council of Chalcedon?’ (eds), Richard Price and Mary Whitby, *Chalcedon in Context Church Councils 400-700* (Liverpool University Press, 2009), p.115.

<sup>10</sup> Henry of Susa (Hostiensis), *Summa aure*, 3, 19 (Venice, 1574) quoted by Giles Constable in ‘The Historiography of the Crusades’ (eds.), Angeliki E. Laiou and Roy Parviz Mottahedeh (Washington, D.C., 2001), p.15.

<sup>11</sup> Kirakos Gandzaketsi, *Patmutiun Hayots* (History of the Armenians) (ed.), by K. A. Melik’-Ohanjanyan (Erevan, 1961), pp.117-118. «...զիմն դաշինսն Տրդատայ եւ սրբոյն Գրիգորի եւ Կոստանդիանոսի կայսեր եւ Սեղբեստրոսի Հայրապետին վերստին նորոգեցին»;

Vrej (Nerses) Nersessian, *Catalogue of early Armenian Books (1512-1850)* ( The British Library, 1980), pp.10-11; Vrej Nersessian, ‘Did Trdat meet Constantine I the Great’, *HHH* (1999 vol.19), pp.65-70.

<sup>12</sup> Tirayr vrd Panosian [*Anapatakan*], *Hamarot patmutiun Hay – Latinakan yaraberuteants skizben mintchew 1382* (Brief account of the history of Armenian -Latin relations from the beginning to 1382) (Antilias, 1973); H. M. Bartikian, ‘*Dashants’ Tught*’. Kazme, steghdsman zhamanake, heghinaken u npatake (*Lettera dell’ amicitia...* Contents, time of composition, author and purpose), *Studia Armeno-Byzantina* (Erevan, 2006), vol.III, pp.179-230; reprinted from *PBH* 2 (2004), pp.65-116; Robert W. Thomson, ‘The Crusaders through Armenian eyes’ in

The author's contention that the Armenian Catholic Church finds the term 'Uniate' applied 'to itself as doubly unacceptable, pejorative, and historical inaccurate' is rather perplexing. The term Uniate was coined in the west and used by them for Christians of any Eastern rite who were in union with the Pope. A 'uniate' is a person who is a Roman Catholic but belongs not to the Latin but to an Eastern rite. The 'Uniates' are product of the Latinising activities of the Catholic missionaries who called their organisation '*Fratres Unitores*', their sole mission being to make every effort to unite the Armenian Church to the Church of Rome. In the Armenian Apostolic Orthodox Church the term used for Armenian Uniates is 'Franks' and the pejorative term is '*Akht'arma* or *Aght'arma* from the Turkish *aqtarma* used for the first time in 1287 by the historian Samvel of Ani meaning 'tail-cut, vulgar, confused'<sup>13</sup>. This term was coined for those Latinophile Armenians who spoke a version of Armenian that had been corrupted with Latin words and phrases defined by the term *aght'armayut'iwn* similar to the term *dzat'* used for Chalcedonian Armenians. The Orthodox Church, as the 'One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church' in her profound ecclesiastical self-consciousness believes unflinchingly that the past method of 'uniatism' is not the way to re-establish unity<sup>14</sup>. The Orthodox Church considers all efforts to break the unity of the Church, undertaken by individuals or groups under the pretext of maintaining or allegedly defending true Orthodoxy, as being worthy of condemnation. It is worth to remember that for the East *koinonia* (communion, fellowship) has primarily remained the goal of believers in local churches. Reciprocity does not imply equilibrium.

The largest non-Greek unit in the Byzantine Empire were Armenians. From the time of the official break between the Imperial and the Armenian Churches (506), the early seventh century, was marked with endless deafening polemics, recriminations and stereotypical ethnic insults. The Armenian community was divided on the confessional line one opposing the Armenian "Monophysites" (non-Chalcedonians), who maintained their allegiance to their national autocephalous Church in schism with Constantinople and the "Chalcedonians", who had accepted communion with Imperial Orthodoxy. Like the Armenian Catholics, the Chalcedonian Armenians in the Byzantium in c. 700 composed a treatise called *Narratio de Rebus Armeniae*, which purports to show that the Armenians had always been united to the Byzantine Church. This text has survived only in Greek. It describes from a pro-Chalcedonian viewpoint the relation between the Armenian and Greek churches.<sup>15</sup> Among Chalcedonian Armenians there were some who had the ability to ascend to the throne of an empire which signifies integration into the highest echelons of society. But there were also those who failed to integrate fully and were contemptuously called *Dsayt'/Tzatoi*. Armenian Orthodox sources, view them as renegades and apostates, make it amply clear that the *Dsayt'* (Ծայթ) belonged to neither Greek or Armenian society, both of which rejected them. As late as 1410 Mkhitar Aparants'i characterises the *Dsayt'* as 'Armenians only in language and script, but in everything else altogether in agreement with the Greeks and all their writings'.

The Crusades from the perspective of Byzantium and the Muslim World, (eds.), Angeliki E. Laiou and Roy Parviz Mottahedeh (Washington. D.C., 2001), pp.76-77.

<sup>13</sup> *Aght'armay* was the name given to the *Fratres Unitores* which means 'witch' or 'apostate' derived from the word *aghtark'*. See Hratchy Acharyan, *Hayeren armatakan bararan* (Armenian Etymological Dictionary), (Erevan, 1971), vol. I, p.128.

<sup>14</sup> Serge Keleher, 'Reflections on 'Uniatism as a method of Union', *Sobornost* 13:2 (1992), pp.55-64; Uniatism as a method of union in the past and the present search for full communion, 'ibid, pp. 49-54.

<sup>15</sup> Gerard Garitte, *La Narratio de rebus Armeniae, edition critique et commentaire CSCO* (Louvain, 1952), vol. 132; subsidia 4; Armenian translation from the Greek by H. M. Bartikian in *BM* 6 (1962), 457-470; Levon Avdoyan. 'Narratio de Rebus Armeniae' in (ed), *ODLA* (Oxford, 2018), vol. 2, p.1058; J. P. Mahe, 'La Narratio de Rebus Armeniae (traduction française)', *REA* NS.25 (1994-95), pp. 429- 38.



The *Dsayt*’ failed to integrate into Byzantine society in a fashion similar to that of their aristocratic compatriots, despite the fact that they too unquestionably adhered to the Chalcedonian confession, although they continued to use Armenian as a liturgical language. Pghos Taronatsi (1050-1123) in his *Letter Against Theopistos the Roman philosopher* writes ‘This is now the case with the Dsayt’... who have a perverted faith among the Armenians that is to say, they call themselves Greeks although with an Armenian tongue’.<sup>16</sup>

To excavate a stratum of thinking that is of archaeological interest in order to imply that there was an organised ‘Roman Catholic’ church ‘prior to Chalcedon’ cannot be allowed to pass without challenge. The author forgets that there was no concept of Roman Catholicism and a Roman Catholic church at the time of St. Gregory the Illuminator. The idea of a “Roman Catholic [Universal] church” as a separate ecclesiastical hierarchical entity came into being as a result of the schism between Rome and the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople in 1054 as a result of the introduction of the *‘Filioque’* clause (doctrine of the Holy Spirit proceeds not from the Father alone, but also from the Son) into the Nicene Creed and over the issue of the canonical authority of the Pope in the Ecumenical Church. Until then there was but One Universal Church with many local autonomous and autocephalous sees. ‘Holy, Apostolic, Catholic’ (*Universal*= arm. = *Endhanrakan*) are the four marks of the church. The word ‘Catholic’ [= *Endhanrakan*] applies to the faith of the whole church, i.e. doctrine believed everywhere, always, and by all. ‘Orthodox’ is not such a mark, but it is important in as much as it declares that its beliefs and doctrines are true. Strictly speaking ancient churches do not have ‘names’ of their own, because they are parts of the self-same universal church. They are designated by the name of the land where they operate or have their headquarters. So, we have the self-same church in Armenia (Hayastaneayts), Rome, Greece, Russia. The Church, as Christ’s body, is not supposed to make distinctions based on ethnicity ‘for you are all one in Jesus’ (Gal.3:28). The one Church was always a federation of churches, united in faith and distinguished in order and administration. In the words of Prof. Hans Kung ‘it had taken around six hundred years for the papacy, after countless setbacks and defeats, to shape a Roman Catholic Church. The aim of this program was sole rule by the pope in the church and the world, allegedly established by the Apostle Peter. Obedience to God, must be obedience to the church, the obedience to the church is obedience to the pope’.<sup>17</sup> Never did the East know and accept a monarchical episcopal jurisdiction upon the whole church. A condition of the participation of the Armenian church in inter-confessional dialogues, since the time of Nerses IV Klayetsi (1166-1173), Grigor IV Tgha (117-1193) and Nerses Lambronatsi (1153-1198), including in the recent theological dialogues between the Orthodox Churches and the Oriental Orthodox and in the Five Pro-Oriente Consultations with Oriental Orthodoxy and in the WCC, the emphasis has always been the exclusion of religious syncretism. Orthodox Christians insist on their right to freely confess their faith in the Orthodox Church as the One, Holy, Universal and Apostolic Church without conceding to the so-called ‘branch theory’ (uniate) and definitively reject any attempts to dilute Orthodox

<sup>16</sup> Nina G. Garsoian, ‘The problem of Armenian integration into the Byzantine Empire’, in *Studies on the internal diaspora of the Byzantine Empire*, (eds), Helene Ahrweiler and Angeliki E. Laiou (Harvard University Press, 1998), pp. 106-110; Hratch Bartikyan, ‘Grigor Bakuryani “Kanonadrutyan” mej hishatakvozh “Ankayun zhoghovrdi” masin (The “unstable people” mentioned by Georg Pakourinos in his typicon)’, *Studia Armeno-Byzantina*, ibid., pp. 409-416; Vrej (Nerses) Nersessian, *The Tondrakian Movement. Religious movements in the Armenian church from the fourth to the tenth centuries* (London, 1987). For further literature on the Dsayt’ see V. A. Arutyunova-Fidanjan, ‘Les Armeniens Chalcedoniens en tant que phenomene culturel de L’Orient Chretien’, *Atti-V Simposio* (1991), pp. 463-477; *REA*, n.s., 21 (1988-89), pp.351-353.

<sup>17</sup> Hans Kung, *The Catholic Church* (New York, 2003), p. 84.

ecclesiology.<sup>18</sup> Bertrand Bareilles in his introduction to Maghakia Ormanian's French translation of the latter's *The Church of Armenia* provides this careful reflection 'She believes that no church, however great in herself, represents the whole of Christendom; that each one, taken singly, can be mistaken, and to the Universal Church alone belongs the privilege of infallibility in her dogmatic decisions'.<sup>19</sup>

Canon four and six of the Council of Nicaea gave official recognition to metropolitan structures corresponding to the civil provinces in the empire. It also stipulated that the metropolitan of a province was not allowed to interfere with the affairs of a church in a neighbouring province. In the 2nd Ecumenical Council (381) when the patriarchal sees were established several metropolitans were brought under the jurisdiction of a Patriarch. As the position of Caesarea waned and Great Armenia ceased to be a Roman protectorate as a result of the partition of Armenia between Rome and Persia in 387, the ties with the Exarchate of Caesarea lapsed. In the meantime the Armenian Church, having developed and matured, became autonomous and pursued an independent course. It is also important to note that the hierarchical links that existed until 373 between Armenian Christianity and the church of Caesarea are explained by the origin of the evangelisation and not by the eparchial position of the see of Caesarea. Although it is true that St Gregory the Illuminator was consecrated in Caesarea, it is not the case that all the subsequent catholicoses were also consecrated in Caesarea. Catholicos Aristakes I Part'ev (325-333) was consecrated by St Gregory the Illuminator; St. Vrt'anes I Partev (333-341) and S.Housik I Partev received ordination in Armenia. The evidence of the historian P'awstos Buzand that St Nerses I Part'ev (353-373) was ordained in Caesarea by Eusebius in 353 is impossible for we know that Eusebius became metropolitan of Caesarea in 362. Catholicos Sahak I Partev acceded to the See without reference to Caesarea in 389. Following the Council of Chalcedon in 451, Caesarea ceased to have any jurisdictional claim over Armenia<sup>20</sup>.

The real missionary vocation, as sanctioned by Christ (Matt 28:19-20) has been exploited by narrow proselytism. The Roman Catholic Church founded the '*Fratres Unitores*' in order to enforce the doctrine that '*Extra ecclesiam nulla salus*' (there is no salvation outside the Roman Catholic Church). Its special mission was the union of the Armenian church with the Papacy, through total surrender and complete subjugation of the former to the latter. In 1341 a papist Armenian priest Nerses Palents'i prepared in Avignon a list of 117 '*errores*' in the Armenian church which he presented to Pope Benedict XII (d.1342) known as *Responsio fratris Danielis [De Thaurisio] ad errores impositos Hermenis*'.<sup>21</sup> The violent conflict of the Crusades and at-

<sup>18</sup> Vrej Nerses Nersessian, 'The legacy of Ecumenism in the Armenian Orthodox Church', *One in Christ*, vol. 49, no. 1 (2015), pp.41-59; and 'The Armenian tradition' in *The Orthodox Christian World*, ed. Augustine Casiday (Routledge, 2012), pp. 50-54.

<sup>19</sup> Malachia [Maghakia] Ormanian, *The Church of Armenia*, translated from the French edition by G. Marcar Gregory, edited by the Right Rev. Terenig Poladian (London, 1955), p. xiv.

<sup>20</sup> Peter L'Huillier, *The Church of the ancient councils. The disciplinary work of the first four ecumenical councils* (New York, 1996), p.234; Tiran Abp. Nersoyan, 'Summary topics of Armenian Church history', in *Armenian Church Historical Studies. Matters of Doctrine and Administration*, ed. Rev Nerses Vrej Nersessian (New York, 1996), pp.65-66; Eznik Abp. Petrosian, *Hay Ekeghetsu Patmutyun* (History of the Armenian church) (Erevan, 2016), Chapter VIII, pp. 70-76; *The Epic Histories attributed to P'awstos Buzand (Buzandaran Patmutiwnk)* Translation and Commentary by Nina G. Garsoian (Harvard University Press, 1989), p. 322 n.7 & p.371, n. *Eusebios bishop of Caesarea*.

<sup>21</sup> Y.S.Ananian, 'Hayots molorakan hamarvads grkern est Latinakan mi hin tsutsaki' (The Armenian books regarded heretical according to an old Latin list), *Manr erker*, (ed.), by A. Sanjian (Los Angeles, 1988), pp.303-318; *RHDC, Documents Armeniens* (Paris, 1906), t. II, pp.559-650.

A virulently anti Latin contingent in Constantinople in the twelfth century had composed a list of Latin "errors" which Hugo Eteriano an Italian living in Constantinople and the emperor's champion had translated into Latin from the Greek sometimes before 1178. See Tia M.Kolbaba 'Byzantine perceptions of Latin religious "Errors":

tempts to force papal primacy on the Greeks after 1204 meant that few Byzantine church-men could negotiate for union with any measure of trust and goodwill. So, too, it comes as no surprise that the most scurrilous, least sophisticated kinds of anti-Latin literature increased over time. When Constantine Stilbes attaches his seventy-five items of Latin errors to a list of the atrocities committed in the sack of Constantinople in 1204, the association seems natural.<sup>22</sup> Father Joseph Gill is refreshingly impartial when he says ‘Innocent III saw union too much as a jurist. Fulfilment of the canons- the external adherence to set forms- was made to be the essence of unity, seemingly without regard to the inner spirit’.<sup>23</sup> The other problem was explained to Pope Benedict XII by a Byzantine envoy in this way: ‘It is not so much difference of doctrine that divides... the Greeks from you as the hatred... that has entered their souls from the many great evils that... the Greeks have suffered from the Latins and still suffer every day’<sup>24</sup>. The Armenian theologian Vardan Aygektsi in his invaluable *catena* called *Armat Hawatoy [Root of Faith]* as an active apologist argued pragmatically that rather than insisting on uniformity in belief and practice, affairs be governed by confessional tolerance and interethnic entente with their neighbours, the Byzantines, Syrians and Latins, it was characteristic of the Armenians not to instigate acrimonious exchanges with proponents of other religious views and Vardan Aygektsi advocates that all the participants in the inter-faith debate should show tolerance-

*‘Oh you mindless and ignorant Armenian who thinks he alone is Christian and inheritor of the kingdom, and other nations are not, then let God take none amongst you into his kingdom; all you haughty and blindly holy Syrians, who thinks you alone are Christian and sharer of God, and there is no other nation, then let God not take a single one amongst you to his rest. Oh deaf and gloomy Roman who thinks he alone is Christian and God’s chosen and worthy of entry into the heavenly Jerusalem, who is the mother of Peter and Paul and there are no other worthy nation, then let God not admit any one of you into his chamber and temple. Why do you not look at the home of the Muslims, as to how many nations there are, separated by tongues, and live with one another in love and peace, under one faith and order; which their leader Muhammad ordained and established. And you who claim to have been called to be One in Christ, and were baptised in the ONE font, enlightened in the name of the One Father and the One Holy Spirit, but you still revile and insult each other’.*<sup>25</sup>

### The Man in the Iron Mask and the Armenian Roman Catholic Church

Father Whooley implies that the creation of the Armenian Catholic Church made an important contribution for it delivered fellow Christians ‘into the safe arms of Rome’. This is an anti-intellectualist swipe for it repeats the catch-cry of the Catholic Propagandists who were bent on severance. This is an evaluation totally patronising to the views of those thousands of Armenians in Poland, Romania, Hungary and Transylvania, who did not survive the unscrupulous

---

themes and changes from 850-to 1359; in ( eds.), *The Crusades from the perspective of Byzantine and the Muslim World* (Washington D.C/, 2001), p.139, n.104; Tia M.Kolbaba, *The Byzantine Lists. Errors of the Latins* (University of Illinois Press, 2000) reviewed in *Sobornost* vol. 24:2 (2002), pp.82-86.

<sup>22</sup> J. Darrouzes, ‘Le memoire de Constantin Stilbes contre les Latins’, *REB* 21(1963), pp.50-100.

<sup>23</sup> Joseph Gill, *Byzantium and the Papacy* (New Jersey, 1979), p. 45.

<sup>24</sup> Joseph Gill, *ibid.*, p. 147.

<sup>25</sup> Y. S. Anasian, ‘Vardan Aygektsi in ir norahayt erkeri loysi tak (Vardan Aygektsi in the light of his newly discovered works), *ibid.*, pp. 177-220 in particular pp. 210-212; Rafik T’adeosyan, ‘Miararakan banaktsutyunner Kilikian shrjanum (11-14-rd darer) (Unitary negotiations during the Cilician period 11-14<sup>th</sup> centuries) (Ejmiadsin 8 (1987), pp.43-50; Azat Bozoyan, *Hay Byuzandakan ekeghetsakan banaktsutyunneri vaveragire (1165-1178)* (A document of Armenian – Byzantian negotiations, 1165-1178) (Erevan, 1995).

pulous tactics to accept Catholicism.<sup>26</sup> By the eighteenth century the prosperous communities of these countries became assimilated under the protracted campaigns of the Roman Church.<sup>27</sup>

Moliere was not the only Iron Mask to be incarcerated by religious bigots. The Armenian Patriarch of Constantinople Awetik' Ewdokiatsi (or Tokatetsi (now Sivas) (1704-1706) was also hounded into exile by Jesuit missionaries supported by the high-handed antics of the French Ambassador to the Sublime Porte, Charles de Ferriol (1700-10). Soon after his arrival in Istanbul, Ferriol deemed it politically expedient to become an active enthusiastic supporter of the Jesuit campaign to proselytise Armenians into allegiance to the Pope of Rome. Together they had organised a small network of pro-Catholic Armenians in the capital. Ferriol and his agents not only attempted to protect the converts, but they actively gave them shelter and interceded for them with the Sublime Porte. Patriarch Awetik' was resented for his ardent adherence to the traditional tenets of the Armenian Church.

Ferriol succeeded in convincing the Grand Vizier to exile Awetik' to a deserted island named Ardas or Ruad on the Mediterranean coast of Syria, after having been imprisoned from 20 July to 11 September, 1703.

During his second tenure as Patriarch of Constantinople, Awetik' tried to pursue a policy of coexistence with his pro-Catholic enemies, particularly Ambassador Ferriol who in his memoirs has written that Awetik was 'a very evil and cunning adversary and a deceitful man'. I will never let him have peace until somehow I topple him'. With Ferriol's active and underhanded encouragement Awetik's enemies secretly plotted to remove him from office. They concocted a number of accusations including, ironically, that Awetik was harbouring pro-Catholics, since in effect they were not part of the Armenian *millet*. Joining forces with Ambassador Ferriol, Awetik's enemies bribed the Grand Vizier to remove Awetik from office and replace him with his vicar Martiros vardapet Erzenkats'i. On 2 February, 1706 two agents of the Vizier arrested Awetik and escorted him in chains to the island of Tenedos (now Bozcha Ada) located on the western coast of Turkey.

Awetik's friends and staunch supporters in the capital even in exile they considered him patriarch. They succeeded in convincing the Grand Vizier through hefty bribes to release Awetik. Since he still held the title of Patriarch of Jerusalem, they requested that he be allowed to travel to the Holy City and re-assume his office while renouncing all rights over the Patriarchate of Constantinople. On 7<sup>th</sup> April, 1706, a special courier arrived from Istanbul with order for Awetik's release. The plan was to sail to the island of Khios where they would embark on a ship sailing to the islands of Rhodes and Cyprus with final destination to the port of Jaffa. Through his network of spies Ferriol learned of the plan.

While Awetik, his novice aid and the government escort were waiting for a ship to Khios, Ferriol arranged through the French vice-council on the island, to waylay Awetik. After bribing the government courier, and as Awetik and his aid were not conversant in the French language they were made to believe they were boarding a Venetian ship bound for the Holy Land. Instead, at midnight they were put on ship sailing west toward Messina on the island of Sicily, which at the time was under Spanish sovereignty.

<sup>26</sup> 'The dislike of Roman Catholicism was most bitterly illustrated in Serbia, where the people in the 15<sup>th</sup> century accepted Turkish rule rather than submit to the Pope' quoted by J. W. C. Wand, A history of the modern church. From 1500 to the present day (London, 1971), p. 149.

<sup>27</sup> Karapet Ezeants, Brni miut'iwn Hayots Lehastani end ekeghetswoyn Hromay (The forceful union of the Armenians of Poland to the Church of Rome) (St. Petersburg, 1884); The Travel Accounts of Simeon of Poland, Annotated translation and Introduction by George A. Bournoutian (Mazda Publishers, Inc. 2007)



After passing the island of Santorini, Awetik's aid was forcefully dropped off on a nearby island and Awetik was placed under custody and deprived of his personal belongings including a leather pouch containing 180 gold pieces, his personal vestments and jewelled cross, episcopal ring. Reaching Messina, the ship captain handed his captive to the waiting council French named Jouffroy Soulier who unceremoniously took him to the Inquisition Prison on the island where he remained for about five months.

While in prison Awetik somehow succeeded in handing a Greek merchant named Spatali a note dated 7 May, 1706 in which he informed his supporters that he was kidnapped by 'foreigners'. The merchant delivered the letter to his supporters in June 1706 creating great consternation among his compatriots who protested to the Grand Vizier who in turn summoned the French ambassador Ferriol. The latter assured the Grand Vizier that he did not know what had happened to Awetik and in truth no one in Istanbul knew the whereabouts of Awetik.

At the urging of Pope Clement XI (1700-1721), the French King Louis XIV (1643-1715) ordered the transfer of Awetik to Marseille under guard. Upon arrival in Marseille his handlers subjected him to abject humiliation for a faithful Armenian clergyman. They shaved his beard, removed his priestly garb and dressed him in typical Frenchman's clothes. He was then transported in secret to the island prison on Mont Saint Michel in Normandy. He was kept in a dark dungeon under inhospitable conditions until 8 September, 1709, when he was secretly transported to the Bastille in Paris.

After forty day in the dungeon in Bastille he was moved to a habitable room in the prison and through an Armenian interpreter name La Croix [arm. Khatchatur] the cardinal of Paris, Louis Antoine Noyal, assigned a French priest Monsieur L'Abbe Reynuad to tutor Awetik in the tenets and rites of the Catholic Church as a condition of his repentance and release. On 22 September, 1710 when his indoctrination was complete, he was asked to kneel in the presence of the Cardinal, renounce his faith in the Armenian Church, relinquish his position as Patriarch of Constantinople and Jerusalem and become a simple monk in the Catholic Church. A subdued and beaten man, he was ordained a priest of the Latin Church and performed barefoot his first mass at the Carmelite Chapel in the cathedral of Notre Dame.

Fortunately, he was allowed to pursue his literary endeavours in Armenian. He authored several books including his diary which described in detail the aforementioned events. He copied and illustrated manuscripts of the New Testament and published several religious studies. Awetik died on 11 July, 1711 at age 54. He was buried in the cemetery of the Church of Saint Sulpice in Paris.<sup>28</sup> This is just one of the many deplorable and worst acts of a Christian Church against a member of the most ancient Christian community. It was not the Islamic conquest of the Middle East that fatally weakened Christianity in the lands where celebration of Christian faith under Islam flourished for centuries with an unbroken tradition until the 'Great Schism' of 1054 (the first being the Council of Chalcedon in 451) brought upon by the Papacy in Rome

<sup>28</sup> H. Acharyan, Hayots Andznanneri Bararan (Dictionary of Armenian personal names) (Erevan, 1942), vol. I, pp.341-342; Mikayel Tchamchian, Hayots Patmutyun (History of Armenia) (reprint Erevan, 1984), vol. III, pp.732-749; Topin Marius, L'Homme au Masque de fer (Paris, 1870), translated from the French into Armenian by K. S. Iwtiwchian (Constantinople, 1870); M. Ormanian, Azgapatum (National History) (Beyrouth, 1960), Vol. II, pt.2, pp.2679-2744 & pt.3, pp.2778-2788; John Noone, The Man behind the iron mask (New York, 1994), pp.109-103; Haig Aram Krikorian, Lives and times of the Armenian Patriarchs of Jerusalem. Chronological succession of tenures (U.S.A., 2009), pp.271-276; Hrant Asatur, Kostandnupolsoy hayere ev irents Patriarknere (The Armenians of Constantinople and their Patriarchs) (Istanbul, 2011), pp.93-95; Leon Arpee, A history of Armenian Christianity from the beginning to our time (New York, 1946), pp. 231-34. Her conclusion differs from the authors listed above: 'Such in outline is the story of a man who has figured in both Armenian and French literature, and has even been identified, though wrongly, with "the Man of the Iron Mask" '.

- when the organisation of the so called ‘Fratres Unitores’ in the twelfth century had the task of ‘delivering the faithful of the Eastern Orthodox Churches into the ‘save arms of Rome’ by promoting religious intolerance.

### The case of Father Komitas K’comiwrchian

The annals of Armenian history have preserved the name of a martyr called Father Komitas K’comiwrchian (1656-1707) an educated clergyman and poet who was the younger brother of the renowned Armenian writer and poet Eremia Celebi K’comiwrchian. He was a contemporary of Patriarch Awetik’ and an archpriest serving in the Church of St Gevorg in Samatia. As a pilgrim he visited St James’ Monastery in Jerusalem. Father Komitas returns to Constantinople. Patriarch Yovhannes and his cohorts accuse him of being a ‘frank’ or ‘supporter of Frankism’ and an enemy of Patriarch Awetik’. In 1707 Father Komitas with two other friends Yarut’iwn Khatchaturian and Grigor Eghizarian were arrested. While in Constantinople, in the course of the sultan’s inquest on the kidnapping of Patriarch Awetik’, Father Komitas was implicated in the plot. The Catholic Church has canonised him implying that he died for defending the Roman Catholic faith but the truth is it was for his refusal to convert to Islam. Father Komitas in his letters to his friends explicitly states that he is not a ‘convert to Frankism’ [«փրանկացեալ մը չի»]. The reason for his execution was for refusing to convert to Islam a request to which he had replied ‘I will not exchange my gold for copper’. In an elegy he composed in the final days of his life he laments the sorry state of his people, but makes no mention of Rome or Catholicism instead he praises the ‘mission of the Illuminator’ and the ‘oath of the Illuminator’ [«Լուսաւորչի աշխատանաց» եւ «Լուսաւորչի ուխտին»]. It is suggested that his funeral service was conducted by Greek priests, but the fact that he was buried in the Armenian Patriarchal cemetery and this could not have happened without the consent of Armenian Patriarch. He was buried in the cemetery in the Palek’li quarter of Constantinople [«Պալլեքլի»] next to the grave of Catholicos T’oros II of Sebastia. The story of his remains having been purchased from the Greeks by Feriol and sent to France is a total and complete fabrication.<sup>29</sup>

On June 23, 1929, the Vatican placed Father Komitas in ‘the rank of the beatified’; the reason for this becomes clear when one discovers that his descendants had subsequently converted to Catholicism.<sup>30</sup>

After the collapse of the Soviet Union Roman Catholic relations with Orthodox Churches worsened because of the so-called Uniate churches, the single obstacle to the desire to restore visible unity between the Latin and Eastern Churches. In place of definite programme of real evangelism, seeking the conversion of those who do not know Christ and the deepening of the commitment of those who are already members of the Church, it initiated a programme of proselytism under the cover of financial assistance, luring the faithful from one Church to the other with the promise of education or material benefits. This author participated in an ecumenical gathering organised by the WCC called ‘*Salvation What for*’ in which one of the main sub-topics was the issue of Proselytism. The targeting of Christians in Eastern Europe and allocation of vast sums of money for proselytising campaigns was the subject of a colloquy held in Belgium

<sup>29</sup> Father Komitas’s pilgrimage to the Armenian convent of St James’ is recorded by Mkrtitch Bps. Aghavnuni in *Miabank’ ew aytseluk Hay Erusaghemi* (Brothers and visitors to Armenian Jerusalem) (Jerusalem, 1929), pp. 212-213; *Azgapatum*, vol. II, Pt 3 pp. 2755-59;

<sup>30</sup> Charles A. Frazee, ‘The formation of the Armenian Catholic community in the Ottoman Empire’, *ECR VII, 2* (1975), pp.49-163. Father Komitas was beheaded on 4 November 1707 for refusing to convert to Islam and not because he had become a ‘treasonous Frank’ (p.155).

in Belgium (2-6 September 1991).<sup>31</sup> The programme of re-evangelisation in the former communist countries became the aggrandisement of one Church at the expense of another and for this very reason the present contributor preferred if the title of the conference was ‘Salvation what from’. In an exchange of views a Romanian delegate expressed explicitly without any delicacy his conviction that the price of extending financial assistance to the victims of the Armenian earthquake and the Sumgait massacre was ‘to bring them back’ to the Catholic Church.<sup>32</sup>

Pope Leo XIII (1810-1903), who became Pope in 1878, dedicated to the idea of strengthening the authority of the Catholic Church circulated in the form of a letter dated July 13/25, 1888, recommending the Armenian catholic Patriarch to resort to various measures in order to lure the faithful of the Armenian Apostolic Church out of the ‘bosom of their mother church’- and in the words of Father Whooley into the ‘safe arms of Rome’. Catholicos Azaria distributed the Circular, first in Constantinople and then in the provinces where, numerous Jesuit missionaries appeared in Armenian communities and began their work. With false evidence they tried to lead astray the simple-minded, deceiving the poor with financial help, and enticing others with dreams and promises’. Makar I Ter Petrosian, Catholicos of All Armenians (1885-1891) gave a critical reply to the circular letter in an *Encyclical* addressed to all the classes of Armenian clergy and people published as separate offprint of the *Ararat* monthly on December 8, 1888.<sup>33</sup> Catholicos Makar advised his flock not to be deceived by the vain promises of Pope Leo XIII. Such promises misled the inexperienced and led them astray from the correct path shown by Jesus Christ. Citing the words of the Lord ‘do not call anyone teacher, for you have only one Master... Nor are you to be called teacher, for your teacher is Christ’ (Matthew 23:8-10); he added the following very pointed advice: ‘do not be deceived by the cunning subtleties of the scavengers, whose intention is to rob you of the grace of the Holy Spirit, and who with a calm conscience make you believe that all of the man-made traditions derive from the Holy scriptures. Always remember that ‘we have not received the spirit of the world but the spirit Who is from God, that we may understand what God has given us’ (I Cor. 2:12). The Catholic Church has no privilege over the Armenian Church, nor does it have any exclusive right ordained from above: ‘For no one can lay a foundation other than the one already laid, which is Jesus Christ’ (I Cor. 3:11). Catholicos Makar’s reply was an authentic echo of an Armenian representative’s message at the Council of Acre in 1261 who reminded a startled papal legate:

*Whence does the Church of Rome derive the power to pass judgment on the other apostolic sees while she herself is not subject to their judgment? We ourselves have the authority to bring you to trial, following the example of the apostles, and you have no right to deny our competence’.*<sup>34</sup> It was in the wake of these unedifying superiority, loftiness and divine perfection stance of the proselytisers ‘God-botherers’ that Armenians opposed to any compromise by the pro-Roman faction in the Armenian Church (1307-1322) that attracted the wrath of Bishop Stepanos Orbelian, Primate of the diocese of Siwnik’ and a very serious historian, known for his accuracy and veracity, with this unthinkable condemnation ‘we are prepared to descend into

<sup>31</sup> Hugh Wybrew, ‘Reports: A colloquy held at the Monastery of the Holy Cross, Chevetogne, Belgium, 2-6 September 1991’, *Sobornost*, *ibid.*, pp.46-48.

<sup>32</sup> Serge Keleher, ‘Uniatism as a method of Union in the past and the present search for full communion’, and ‘Reflections on ‘Uniatism as a method of Union’, *Sobornost* 13:2 (1991), pp.49-64.;

<sup>33</sup> Makar I, Catholicos of All Armenians, ‘Tught Endhanrakan T. T. *Makaray srbaznagoyn katoghikosi amenayn hayots ar hamoren dass ekeghetsakanats ew zhoghovrdakanats Hayots* ( General Epistle of His Holiness Makar I, Catholicos of All Armenians to his clergy and Armenian nation), *Ararat* (1888), pp.65-85.

<sup>34</sup> RHDC, Documents Armeniens 2 vols.1 p.697; Aristideides Papadakis in coll. with John Meyendorff, *The Christian East and the Rise of the Papacy* (Crestwood, 1994), p. 118.

*hell with our fore-fathers than go up to heaven with the Romans*'.<sup>35</sup> Before the demise of the kingdom of Cilicia in 1375, papalist policy had been steering in the direction of open proselytism.<sup>36</sup>

To mark the 1500<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Council of Chalcedon Pope Pius XII (1876-1958) issued an Encyclical in 1951 named *Sempiternus Rex* addressed to the none-Chalcedonian Churches urging their faithful to '*return to the bosom of Catholic Church*'. Therefore, it did not come as a surprise that the Catholicos-Patriarch of the Roman Catholic Armenians Cardinal Grigor Petros XV Aghachanian (1895-1971), a year earlier had issued a 'Pastoral Epistle' inviting the Armenian nation to return to the '*enlightened faith of their ancestors, in Catholic Church*', which the Armenian Bishop Derenik Poladian in his '*Refutation*'<sup>37</sup> describes as being 'written by order from above to defame the Holy Armenian Church and its clergy by historical distortions and to sow dissention and perplexity in the minds of the faithful Armenian people by beating the drums of falsehood and error and thereby glorify Papacy alone'. Unsurprisingly, Father Whooley as a nimble propagandist of the Armenian Roman Catholic church, does not find it relevant to mention this in his assessment of the carrier of the 'future figure of no small importance' who in his bullying leaflet in an attitude that is in reality contemptuous and paternalistic, condemns Armenian faithful to eternal damnation unless they repent and '*turn to Rome*'.

One of the visible result of this unrelenting unfair and even inaccurate attempt at discrediting the faithful of the Armenian apostolic Church was what the author ungraciously calls the return of the 72 uniate Armenian clergy to the 'fold of the mother church' an embarrassing loss'. The defection was led by archbishop Maghakia Ormanian (1841-1918) who on 11<sup>th</sup> February, 1877, accompanied by the priest Yovhannes Mkrian presented themselves to Patriarch Nerses II Varzhapetian (1874-88) confessing allegiance to the Armenian Apostolic Church. The latter responded 'we know you very well, where ever you may be, you are ours, stay where you are and leaven' [*khmore*]<sup>38</sup>. Two years later on October 28<sup>th</sup>, 1879, on Sunday Feast day of the Discovery of the Holy Cross with 72 other colleagues he was accepted into the Armenian Apostolic Church in Kumkapi Church, where the Patriarch in his reception speech says 'I have no doubt that you lived in much more splendid house, but it was not yours, while this modest house is yours'<sup>39</sup>. Ormanian the most famous Armenian church leader occupied the throne of the Armenian Patriarchate of Constantinople from 1896-1908.

The reasons for his disillusion of the Roman Catholic Church are best illustrated in the following list of publications:

Gli Armeni cattolici orientali, rivista storico-polemica, Contantinopoli, 1870.

<sup>35</sup> Stepannos Orbelian, *Patmutiwn nahangin Sisakan* (History of the province of Siwnik) (Tiflis, 1910), chapter 69. P. 459 «հաւան եմք մեզ ընդ մեր հարսն ի դրժոխս իջանել եւ ոչ ընդ Հռոմոնց յերկինս ելանել».

<sup>36</sup> Vladimir Ivanov, 'Unitorakanutean entsatske 14-15 dd hasarakakan kaghakakan gordsentatsneri hamatekstum' (The proselytising process i in the Armenian social-political context of the 14-15<sup>th</sup> centuries), *HHH* vol. 27 (2007), pp.89-102.

<sup>37</sup> Terenig Bps.Poladian, *Refutation of the Encyclical of Gregory Peter Cardinal Aghagianian*, translated by Matthew A. Callender (Ant'elias, 1953).

<sup>38</sup> Maghakia Ormanian, *Azgapatum*, *ibid.*, vol. 3, part 2, p. 4355.

<sup>39</sup> Maghakia Ormanian, *Azgapatum*, *ibid.*, vol. 3, part 2, p. 4360 [«թէ իրաւ անկի զարդարուն տուն կը բնակէիք, բայց ձերը չէր, այս համեստ տունը ձերն է»]; In 1856 three clergy belonging to the Mkhitarist Congregation- Sargis vard. T'eodorian, Gabriel avrd, Ayvazovski and Ambrosios vard.Galfaian-returned to the fold of the Armenian Church. See their account in «Պատմութիւն եւ պատճառք վերադարձի երկից վարդապետացու հայոց Սարգսի, Գաբրիէլի եւ Ամբրոսիէայ ընդ հովանեաւ Լուսաւորչական Սուրբ Աթոռոյ Հայաստանեայց եկեղեցոյ» in Gabriel Archbishop Ayvazian (Ayvazovski), *Ընտրանի* [Selection], Erevan, 2012, pp. 38-65.



Il Reservurus ovvero la Turchia ed il papato, studi giuridici, Roma, 1872.

Les droits civils et la liberte religieuse des catholiques d'Orient, Rome, 1872.

La question armenienne articles historiques publies dans l'Esperance de Rome, Rome, 1892

Lettere sulla questione armena, pubblicate nel Rinnovamento catholico, Bologna, 1872-73

Le Vatican et les Armeniens, Rome, 1873.<sup>40</sup>

## The Armenian Catholic (Uniate) Church in Independent Armenia.

Following the demise of the Soviet Union and the emergence of Independent Armenia, in his planning church-related programs under the new circumstance, the Catholicos of All Armenians, wished to pave a way for Priests from the Mkhitarist Congregation of St. Lazzaro, Venice to become the pastors of the Armenian Catholic communities in Armenia. In his Letter of December 4, 1990 addressed, Fr. Nerses Ter Nersessian, the head of the Mkhitarist Congregation the Catholicos Vazgen I writes:

*In this way, your dream of having a 'Mkhitarist corner' on the soil of Armenia will come true...*

*...It is our sincere wish that the Armenian Catholic communities in Armenia might always be jurisdictionally connected with the Congregation of St. Lazzaro, and that their pastors hereafter come from the ranks of your brotherhood. We emphasize this point, since the monks of St Lazzaro in particular are favoured by our intellectuals and the Holy see'.*

On March 5, 1991, Fr. Nerses Ter Nersessian responded to His Holiness:

*.... It is our intention to bring spiritual service, ministry and consolation to our brothers in the Catholic regions of Armenia, as they have been for a long time deprived of good spiritual shepherds and administrators of the sacraments. And [ we wish to carry out] all of this in harmony and close, brotherly relations with the Mother See of Holy Ejmiadsin and Your Holiness, as is the tradition of the Mkhitarists of Venice'.*

In August 28, 1991, in a letter by Fr. Nerses Ter Nersessian to His Holiness Vazgen I confirms:

*We again are deeply appreciative of the cordial and paternal disposition which you have always shown toward the Mkhitarist Congregation, especially in the present situation, as you expressed in your wish to see the responsibility for the Armenian Catholic mission that is coming to life in Armenia entrusted to us, the Mkhitarists.*

This correspondence marks the beginning of the spiritual mission of the Mkhitarist Brothers in the newly independent Armenia. Father Komitas of the Mkhitarist order was appointed as the first pastor of the Catholic Armenian community in Armenia, to the joy of the Mother See of Holy Ejmiadsin.

The plans of the Mother See and the Mkhitarist Congregation of St. Lazzaro were dealt an unexpected blow, however, when His Beatitude Hovhannes Petros Gasparian, the Patriarch of the Catholic Armenians, issued an official circular dated June 7, 1992, entitled 'Return to Armenia'.<sup>41</sup> A substantial part of the encyclical was devoted to an argument against the legitimacy

<sup>40</sup> Maghakia Ormanian, 'Kensagrakan zhamanakagrutian' [Biographical chronicle] [Appendix compiled by Babgen Bp. Kiwleserian] *Azgapatum*, vol. 3, part 3, [p7]. 'Ormanian' [Biography] in *Kristonya Hayastan Hanragitaran* [Christian Armenia. Encyclopedia] (Erevan, 2002) pp.1068-1070.

<sup>41</sup> *The Mother Church and Roman Catholic Missionary Activity in a Reborn Armenia. Documents pertaining to*

of the Armenian Apostolic Church, in one particularly distasteful passage. Patriarch Hovhannes denied the ‘legal presence’ of the Armenian Apostolic Church and her canonical authority in Armenia, because the Armenians did not accept the Chalcedonian formulation adopted in Byzantium in 451. The anti-ecumenical un-historical, anachronistic sentiments throughout in the document echo the same ancient arguments found in the Encyclical of Cardinal Aghachanian issued thirty-nine years before.

The circular Letter inferred that the Armenian Apostolic Church was a heretical institution which had persecuted the true believers. It went on to clearly spell out the resolution of the Uniate Patriarch and his bishops to advance missionary activities in Armenia itself – described as “a boundless field – in order to extend the jurisdiction of the Uniate Patriarch over the Armenian Uniates living in Armenia, Georgia and the Crimea; to establish new parishes and seminaries in Armenia; and to become the spiritual head of all the Armenian Uniates. Father Whooley by evaluating this most un-ecumenical episode ‘as evidence of the continuing trust and reciprocity between Mekhitar’s spiritual sons and the Apostolic Church of Armenia’ studiously ignores the implications of this unhappy episode as worthy of mere footnote<sup>42</sup>.

Under the guise of providing humanitarian aid to the victim of the 1988 earthquake, to refugees from Azerbaijan and Nagorno-Karabagh it rapidly became evident that, hidden behind the offer of material relief was missionary activity, directed at the entire Armenian population and supported by affluent centres in the West. Confronted with the untenable situation Catholicos Vazgen I, of All Armenians and Garegin II, Catholicos of the See of Cilicia, issued a joint encyclical dated 30<sup>th</sup> August, 1992 in which they declared that “**Armenia is not a mission-field for Christian evangelization**’. In September 1992, the synod of Armenian Apostolic bishops convened at Holy Ejmiadsin and decided to send a delegation to the Vatican to discuss the issues raised by the Patriarch of the Uniate Catholics. With the consent of the two Armenian Catholicoses and the Armenian Patriarchs of Jerusalem and Constantinople, four Primates made arrangements with the Vatican to meet His Holiness Pope John-Paul II and Cardinal Cassidy and Silvestrini. The meeting took place on Tuesday, 27 October 1992. The issue of proselytizing to Armenian Apostolic communities was also discussed in a personal meeting with Pope John-Paul II and with His Holiness Archbishop Bartholomaios, the Ecumenical Patriarch of the Orthodox Church. On August 1992, His Holiness Vazgen I Catholicos of All Armenians and Garegin II, Catholicos of the See of Cilicia, issued a joint statement directed to the Armenian people against the proselytising attempts of various denominations and sects. From the Encyclical comprising of 20 points I like to share only the following two points:

*8. Before taking any position or establishing any norm of reaction, one has to state and adopt as an essentially important and general principle the following historically valid and irrefutable truth, namely, that **Armenia is not a mission-field for Christian evangelization**. ...*

the Armenian Uniate Patriarchate’s design to proselytize in Armenia (New York, 1993) and A critical examination of Armenian Catholic Communities in Transcaucasia. Their late origins, historical development, and Contemporary status (New York, 1994). The latter contains two essays: Fr. Eznik vard. Petrosian, ‘On the Circular-Letter entitled “Return to Armenia” of the Armenian Catholic Patriarch Hovhannes Petros’ (pp. 1- 12) and Prof. Pion Hakobian, ‘Armenian Catholicism in the light of historical criticism’ (pp. 13- 98) .

Appendix I -II: ‘Statistical and demographical information on the Armenian Catholic communities of Gugark-Tashirk (1831-1931).;

Appendix III: ‘Migration data on the origins of present-day Armenian Catholic communities in Georgia.

Appendix IV : ‘The Armenian Catholic communities in Georgia that have disappeared or assimilated during the course of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

<sup>42</sup> John Whooley, ‘The Mekhitarists: Religion, culture and ecumenism in Armenian-Catholic relations’ (ed.), Anthony O’Mahony, Eastern Christianity. Studies in modern history, religion and politics (Melisende, London, 2004), p.486.

*Armenia is a Christian country, with a heritage of almost two thousand years of Christianly life moulded by the Christian principles of the Gospel.*

9. *In this connection, it is highly important to emphasize the fact that the Christian faith is not a matter of only heritage from the past. It is not strictly history. It is a living and continuing witness today. Christianity for the Armenian nation is the “colour of their skin yesterday, today and forever”<sup>43</sup>.*

10. *Therefore to consider Armenia as an open and barren field for Christian evangelization means, above all, transgression against history and the given reality. Moreover, it means also a lack of love, recognition, and respect towards the Armenian Church founded by the Apostles Thaddeus and Bartholomew and nurtured by St Gregory the Illuminator.<sup>44</sup>*

The Armenian position is not very different from that of the Orthodox Churches. In 2005 when formal theological dialogue between Rome and the Orthodox churches on the issue of Uniatism were reopened after it was stalled in 2000, the ecumenical patriarch Bartholomew I has referred to the primacy and infallibility of the Roman Pontiff as ‘theologically erroneous claims’ and the greatest and most scandalous stumbling block’ for Catholic-Orthodox dialogue.<sup>45</sup>

### **The origins of the Roman Catholic Patriarchate**

The Armenian Roman Catholic Patriarchate [not catholicate] was established on August 14<sup>th</sup> 1742 by the priest Abraham Ardsivian (1679-1749). Ardsivian had conceived the idea of creating for himself a distinct Armenian Catholic position, but it was not possible to put into effect such a plan in Constantinople, when Archbishop Hovhannes Kolot (1678-1741) was Patriarch and Hakob Nalean was the vicar, both very able and energetic churchmen; so the thought of organising a separate Catholicate in Cilicia. But that too was impossible because he lacked support in the See of Cilicia. Contrary to ecclesiastical law *‘It is preferable that a bishop be established by all the bishops of a province; but if this appears difficult because of a pressing necessity or because of the distance to be travelled, at least three bishop should come together; and, having the written consent of the absent bishops, they may proceed with the consecration. The confirmation of what takes place falls to the metropolitan bishop of each province’*.<sup>46</sup> Abraham Ardsivian proceeded to consecrate three Bishops – Hakob Hovsepiyan, Isahak Barseghian and Melkon Tukhmanian- on 3<sup>rd</sup> May, 1740 and then these three bishops consecrated him Catholicos on 26<sup>th</sup> November, 1740. On August 13<sup>th</sup>, 1742. He reached Rome and presented himself to Pope Benedict XIV Lambertini (1750-1800) where he declared his allegiance and his faith to Pope in Arabic and received from the Pope a pallium in return. According to M. Ormanian *‘Ardsivian is someone who makes here bishops as in a children’s game and from the three bishops he has made he receives the rank and consecration of a catholicos and thereby*

<sup>43</sup> This is a description first used by the historian Eghishe in his account of the Battle of Avarayr in 451 against the Persians in his *History of Vardan and the Armenian War*, fought ‘for the preservation of the glory and liberty of the Church’. See Boghos L. Zekiyan, ‘Eghshe’s witness of the ecclesiology of the early Armenian Church’, (eds.), *East of Byzantium: Syria and Armenia in the formative period* (eds.), Nina G. Garsoian and others (Dumbarton Oaks, Washington, 1982), p.187-195.

<sup>44</sup> *The Mother Church and the Roman Catholic missionary activity in a Reborn Armenia. Documents pertaining to the Armenian Uniate Patriarchate’s design to proselytize in Armenia* (New York, 1993), pp.99 and *A critical examination of Armenian catholic Communities in Transcaucasia: Their late origins, historical development and contemporary status* (New York, 1994), pp. 224.

<sup>45</sup> Petros Vassiliadis, ‘Mission and proselytism. An Orthodox Understanding’ *International Review of Mission* 337 (1996), pp. 257- 75.

<sup>46</sup> Peter Aps L’Huillier, *ibid.*, Section 2: ‘The Canons of the Council’, p.36.

becomes a person who derives satisfaction by self-deception. In order to complete the game he has also falsified the vacancy of the See of Cilicia'.<sup>47</sup> Not only the Catholicate of Ardsivian was uncanonical, invalid and illegal, his episcopate was too. Mkhitar Sebastatsi the founder of the Armenian Catholic Mkhitarist Congregation in his confession declares 'I believe in and accept everything that the Holy, Catholic and Roman church believes and accepts and deny everything that it denies. Just as it has been my duty to obey the Holy Father of Rome as the vicar of Jesus Christ'. Similarly, Abraham Ardsivian declares to the Pope that his aim is 'the glorification and expansion of the sacred faith of Rome'. Therefore, it is hypocritical to maintain that Mkhitar Sebastatsi and Abraham Ardsivian were actively engaged in promoting the tenets of the Armenian Apostolic Orthodox Church, when they actively and systematically did not shy away from appropriating and corrupting Armenian theological texts [[Nerses IV Shnorhali, Grigor Narekatsi, the Nicene Creed, Breviaries and the Hymnal's<sup>48</sup> by introducing dishonestly the doctrines of the Primacy of the Pope, the infallibility of the Pope, Peter as the rock on which the church stands, the doctrine of the double procession of the Holy Spirit, and belief in a Purgatory distinct from Hell. For Father Whooley to suggest as does Father L. B. Zekiyan that Mkhitar Sebastatsi and Nerses Shnorhali 'shared the same ecumenical attitude... for the former affirmed without any shadow of doubt the full orthodoxy of the Armenian Church and the full legitimacy of her liturgical and canonical traditions' reveals the incredulity of both authors.<sup>49</sup> Father Ghewond Alishan, the greatest representative of the Mkhitarist Congregation confesses 'I cannot separate religion and patriotism. I do not know how a person who hates his nation can enter the kingdom of heaven'.<sup>50</sup> According to the theologian Bishop Karapet Ter Mkrtchian, 'the Mkhitarist were worthy continuators of the work of the Fratres Unitors, whose works on the Armenian church have been for Western readers their main authoritative sources.... But that they have also greatly contributed to the dissemination of false theories concerning the history of our church cannot be denied'<sup>51</sup> [*մեր Սեկեղեցու մասին այս տեսակ մոլորութիւն տարածելուն շատ են նպաստել միարարները եւ դրնաց արժանի ժողանդ Մխիթարեանները, որոնք երոպացոց համար հեղինակաւոր անձինք են Հայոց վերաբերեալ խնդիրներում: Բայց որ նոքա այնու ամենայնիւ մեծապէս նպաստել են մեր եկեղեցոյ, մեր ամբողջ պատմութեան մասին սխալ գաղափարներ տարածելուն՝ այդ է, որ անուրանալի է ըստ մեզ*». 'The Roman Catholic establishments, supported by Roman Propaganda and actively patronized by the French government, were potent instruments for the extension of Catholicism among the Armenians during the eighteenth century. However, it may be mentioned that the results which accrued were in no way commensurate either with the effort made or with the means employed.<sup>52</sup> The methods employed publishing special editions of the Armenian Service books, with the texts interpolated or altered though retaining the semblance of the model, or foist on to the original text arbitrary and farfetched interpretations always insisting on the title pages of their publications that 'it is in accordance with the true and accurate translation of our ancestors' or 'in accordance with rituals of the Armenian Church', or 'Order of daily prayers of the Armenian church arranged by St Sahak' Partev ....<sup>53</sup> The re-

<sup>47</sup> M. Ormanian, *Azgapatum*, ibid., vol. II, p.2945.

<sup>48</sup> Vrej N. Nersessian, 'Grigor Narekatsi, Mystic and poet: The soul's search for immediacy with God', *One in Christ* vol. 5, no.1(2017), pp.81-117.

<sup>49</sup> Boghos L.Zkiyan, 'Modern Armenian culture: Some basic trends between continuity and change, specificity and universality', (ed.), Nicholas Awde, *Armenian Perspectives* (London, 1997), p. 336.

<sup>50</sup> S. Eremian, *Kensagrutiwn Hayr Alishani* (Biography of Father [Ghewond] Alishan) (Venice, 1902) p.191.

<sup>51</sup> Karapet Tr Mkrtchian, *Erkeri zhoghovadsu* (Collected Works) (Holy Ejmiadsin, 2008) pp. 129-130 & 'Misconceptions regarding the past history of the Armenian Orthodox Church', *Ararat* (1902), pp. 809-830.

<sup>52</sup> M. Ormanian, *The Church of Armenia*, ibid., p.69.

<sup>53</sup> «Աստուածաշունչ ...ըստ հզորիս բարգմանութեան նախնեաց մերոց», «Խորհրդատեւոր ....ըստ արարո-



peated claim that ‘the motive behind the formation of the order was the enlightenment of the Armenian nation spiritually and intellectually’<sup>54</sup> ignores the fact that the activities of the Mkhitarists injured the religious consciousness of Armenia people and for that reason it was met with strong opposition from the divines of the Armenian church on theological grounds. The Catholics began their hostility towards the Armenian Church by publishing works such as *Praecipuae obiectiones quae vulgo solent fieri per modum interrogationis a Mahumeticae legis sectatoribus, Iudaeis et haereticis orientalibus adversus Catholicos, earumque solutiones* by Michel Febvre of which the Armenian translation was published in Rome in 1681.<sup>55</sup> While in Venice, Yovhannes Kostandnupolsetsi printed an Answer to the Letter by certain Armenian Brothers.<sup>56</sup> Further, when the Latin missionaries intended their missionary work in the city of New Julfa (Isfahan), the most prominent theologian of the New Julfa school Aleksandr Jughayetsi wrote in 1682 a Book of controversies or Discussions printed in 1687 addressed ‘to the Armenian people, who are friends of Christ and who profess the true faith.’<sup>57</sup> The book was intended ‘as a reply to the Frankish Nation’. The same author in 1709 who had by this time become Catholics of All Armenians in 1706, wrote a letter to Pope Clement XI: Letter...concerning the regrettable conduct of the missionaries who, in blatant injustice, create problems amongst the innocent sheep of the saintly Church of Armenia’. Books defending the position of the Armenian Church by two theologians of the New Julfa school were published in 1688. The first by Yovhannes Jughayetsi called *Mrkuz* (1642-1716) called A brief discourse regarding the authentic and true faith<sup>58</sup> and the second by Bishop Stepannos called Collection of texts against the Dyophysites.<sup>59</sup> These were books printed in the newly established printing press set up in the Monastery of the Holy Saviour in 1638 specifically to combat the proselytising mission of the Fratres Unitors. The literary and missionary work of the theologians of New Julfa against the Fratres Unitors gained them the nickname ‘Armenian Geneva’ the Lutherans and Calvinists of Armenian enlightenment. The staunchest critic of Yovhannes Jughayetsi, the Catholic convert Armenian scholar and poet Stepannos Dashtetsi write’s of the former: ‘Vardapet (master) I confess the indubitable and do not lie, that among all the Christian nations among whom I have lived and the Calvinists and Lutherans whom I have met among the English, Swedes and Danish; in particular the Dutch among whom I have lived, who are all outside the domain of the Catholic Church and anti-papists and the Orthodox, I found no one that unrestrained and resolute even beyond the ability of your state’.<sup>60</sup> Harutyun Ter Hovhaneants the leading historian of the Community of New Julfa shares this view with his readers ‘I wish to put it as plainly as possible the enlightenment provided by Venice is indebted to the divines of New Julfa. Alas, a pity, their most famous historian [i.e. Mikayel Tchamtschian [v.n]] from every crack in the wall

---

ղոսեան Հայաստանեայց եկեղեցոյ», «Կարգաւորութիւն հասարակաց աղօթից Հայաստանեայց եկեղեցոյ: Արարեալ սրբոյն Սահակայ հայրապետին...»». These are all titles (Bible, 1805, Divine Liturgy, 1803 and Breviary, 1793) printed for the use of Armenian Uniate Rite by the Mkhitarists in Venice.

<sup>54</sup> Kevork Bardakjian, The Mekhitarist contributions to Armenian culture and scholarship (Harvard College Library?), p.2

<sup>55</sup> Hay Girke 1512-1800 tvakannerin (Armenian printing between 1512-1800. Union bibliography), (eds.), N. A. Voskanyan and R. A. Ishkanyan (Erevan, 1988), no. 116, P.86.

<sup>56</sup> Hay Girke 1512-1800, *ibid.*, no.135, p.102-03.

<sup>57</sup> Hay Girke 1512-1800, *ibid.*, no.138, p. 106.

<sup>58</sup> Hay Girke 1512-1800, *ibid.*, no.142, p. 108-109.

<sup>59</sup> Hay Girke, 1512-1800, *ibid.*, no.141, pp.107-108. See Vrej Nersessian, Catalogue of early Armenian books 1512-1850 (The British Library, 1980) [This is a Catalogue of the collections Armenian in the British Library and the Bodleian library, Oxford].

<sup>60</sup> Stepanos Dashtetsi, Kotchnak chshmartutean (Bell of truth), quoted by H. Gh. Mirzoyan, Hovhannes Mrkuz Jughayetsi (Hovhannes Mrkuz of New Julfa) (Erevan, 2001), 24-25..Mat. Ms. N. 8111, fols.156b-157b

has managed to pull out a document, to knot together a history in which he totally dismisses the miraculous achievement of the New Julfa school.<sup>61</sup> As is often the case in times of national crisis, strength and inspiration was drawn from the Theological Seminaries in Armash (1889) whose first abbot was archbishop Maghakia Ormanian and Patriarch Eghishe Durian and the Gevorgian Academy in Holy Ejmiadsin founded by Catholicos Gevorg IV Sureneants (1869). Unfortunately, the activities of both these illustrious institutions were cut short – the former by the Turks in the 1915 Genocide and the latter was closed by the Bolsheviks in 1919.

Through the initiative of Vardan Baghishetsi (d.1704) the abbot of the monastery of Amrtolu and his disciples Yovhannes Kostandnupolsetsi, called Kolot (1678-1741), Hakob Nalian (1706-1764), patriarchs of Constantinople, and Grigor Shirvantsi, the Chain-bearer of Jerusalem (1670-1749)<sup>62</sup> ‘were able to render conspicuous services without departing from their loyalty to the Church. It was due to their efforts that the eighteenth century gave tokens of a visible progress both in national life and in matters connected with the Church’.<sup>63</sup> The theologians of the above mentioned institutions made sure that the activities of the missionaries fail in their aspirations not only in New Julfa<sup>64</sup> but also in Armenia.

## Conclusion

Archbishop Tiran Nersoyan in his ‘Problems of consensus in Christology’ asks us to put aside the kind of contentions and division which we inherited from the past and:

‘Given the exigency of our time to leave the councils and their definitions where they are, stop making them shibboleths for the determination of the orthodoxy or otherwise of one side or the other, and try to arrive at a new consensus on problems that the world is trusting at us’<sup>65</sup>.

### Abbreviations

BM – *Banber Matenadarani*

CSCO – *Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium*

ECR – *Eastern Churches Review*

HHH – *Haykzean Hayagitakan Handes = Haigazian Armenological Review*

Mat – *Matenadaran (Institute of Ancient Manuscripts, Erevan)*

<sup>61</sup> Harutyun Ter Hovhaneants, *Patmut'iwn Nor Jughayu vor yAspahan* (History of New Julfa which is Ispahan) (New Julfa, 1881), vol. II, p.38.

<sup>62</sup> Shght'ayakir- zinjirli = chain-bearer was the epithet given to the patriarch who wore a chain necklace secured by a lock around his neck from 1718 to 1726 soliciting alms for the Jerusalem Patriarchate whose coffers were so depleted that it could not pay its tribute to the sultan and its creditors, which he vowed not to release until the Holy See of Jerusalem was free of all indebtedness, which he removed only after receiving instruction from Catholicos Karapet II Ulnetsi (1726-1729).

<sup>63</sup> G. Bampukchian, *Hovhannes Patriark' Kolot (1678-1741) ew ir ashakertnere* (Patriarch Hovhannes Kolot (1678-1741) and his pupils) (Istanbul, 1984); and *Hakob Patriark Nalean (1706-1764), keanke, gordsere ew ashakertnere* (Patriarch Yakob Nalean (1706-1764), his life, works and pupils) (Istanbul, 1981); Norayr Poghosian, *Grigor Shghtayakir Patriark* (Patriarch Grigor the Chain-bearer) (Jerusalem, 2017). M. Ormanian, *The Church of Armenia*, ibid., p.69 To combat the Latinisation efforts of the missionaries Hovhannes Kolot printed over 100 books among them translations of several Latin works chief among them the entire works of the Calvinist biblical commentator Thomas Scott (1747-1821), the commentaries of the Flemish exegete Cornelius a Lapide (1567-1637) and the works of St.Thomas Aquinas (c.1125-74).

<sup>64</sup> John M.Flannery, *The Mission of the Portuguese Augustinians to Persia and Beyond (1602-1747)* (Brill, 2013), in particular ‘The missionaries flee Isfahan’ pp.143-147

<sup>65</sup> *Christ in East and West* (eds.), Paul R. Fries and Tiran Nersoyan, ibid., p. 64

*ODB - The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium, ed. Alexander P.Kazhdan*

*ODLA – The Oxford Dictionary of Later Antiquity , ed. Oliver Nicholson*

*PBH – Patma- Banasirakan Handes*

*REA – Revue des Etudes Armeniennes*

*REB – Revue des Etudes Byzantines*

*RHDC -Recueil des historeins des Croisades .Documents Armeniens*

## ԽՈՐՀՈՒՐԴ ԵՒ ԽՕՍՔ

*Ամէն ճշմարտութիւն չըսուիր, սակայն միշտ լաւ է լսել:*

*Սէրն է տիեզերքի ճարտարապետը:*

*Չկայ մէկը, որ իրաւունք ունենայ արհամարհելու ուրիշը:*

*Անկասկած, հզօր է այն անձը, որ գիտէ յաղթել ինքզինքին:*

*Մեզմէ իւրաքանչիւրին աղօթքը պէտք է ըլլայ. «Տէր Աստուած, աշխարհին ուղղախոհ միտք տո՛ւր, սկսելով ինձմէ»:*

*Դաստիարակութիւնը միայն մտքի կամ ուղեղի զարգացում չէ, այլ աւելի հաստատուն նկարագրի տէր ըլլալն է դաստիարակութեան էական մասը:*

*Մտքի զարգացումը նման է լուսնին, որ կը լուսաւորէ բայց չի տաքցներ, մինչ սրտի կրթութիւնը նման է արեւին, որ թէ՛ կը լուսաւորէ եւ թէ՛ կը ջերմացնէ:*

*Վարդին տեսքէն աւելի բոյրն է կարեւորը, ինչպէս նաեւ մարդը միայն խելքով չեն դատեր, այլ նաեւ սիրտով:*

*Երբ գիրք կարդալը մի քանի ամիսէն կը սորվինք, անդին՝ մարդ կարդալը քառասուն տարիէն չենք սորվիր:*

*Սովորաբար թշնամիին տուած հարուածը մեզ չի ցնցեր, սակայն բարեկամին հարուածը անպայման կը ցնցէ մեզ:*