ՊԱՏՄՈՒԹՅՈՒՆ
HISTORY

CHALCEDONIAN ORTHODOXY IN THE KINGDOM OF ARMENIA

The Church Hierarchy, Aristocracy and Communities of the Byzantines and the Chalcedonian Armenians in the 12th–14th Century Cilicia

BRUN S.

The article is dedicated to the role of the Chalcedonian Orthodox in the social, political and ecclesiastic life of the Cilician Kingdom of Armenia. For a scholar, engaged in the Middle Ages and the Christian East, it is easy to notice, that a major part of research papers, books and other written works, dedicated to Cilician Armenia, deal either with the culture and history of the Armenians (almost exclusively – the Miaphysite Armenians), or with the Latin Crusader influence and presence in the region. The role of Eastern Orthodox Christians – Byzantines and the Chalcedonian Armenians – remains largely underestimated and unstudied. Meanwhile, barons (or the *ishkhani*), belonging to the "Greek" Church, formed a highly influential faction of the Armenian Kingdom's aristocracy, no less than the Franks. The "Greek" townspeople and feudal lords proved to be the dominant force in such major centers as Tarsus and Anazarb; this was especially evident during the civil wars, which ravaged the Kingdom in the 13th century. The Kings of Armenia, despite their devotion to the Armenian Apostolic Church and their political allegiance to Rome – played a crucial role in the restoration of the Orthodox Patriarchate of Antioch in the Levant; they allowed for the Orthodox Patriarchs to reside or even be elected in their realm, patronizing the monasteries and diocese of the Chalcedonians. The history of the Eastern Orthodox Christians in Cilician Armenia – which can only be traced through Miaphysite (Armenian, Syriac) and Latin narrative sources – significantly expands our timeline of the

Byzantine secular and ecclesiastic dominance in the northern part of the Levant, bringing the terminus ante quem from the 11th–12th centuries to the first part of the 14th century.

Among the various Christian States, which sprang up within the Middle Eastern provinces of the former Byzantine Empire in the 11th–12th centuries, a very special place is occupied by the Kingdom of Armenia (Regnum Armeniae), also known as Cilician or Lesser Armenia. For almost two centuries (since the late 12th and until the later part of the 14th) this state – recognized by the Pope of Rome and the Holy Roman Emperor as a Western "kingdom" (*regnum)* – united the Armenian, Byzantine, Syriac, Frankish, Italian, Turcoman and Jewish peoples who inhabited the Cilician Plain, Eastern Isauria, the Taurus, Anti-Taurus and the Amanus Mountains, significant parts of northern Syria. The Armenian Kingdom also sustained the closest possible ties with the Crusader States, and is even sometimes listed as one of them. The influence of the Franks of Outremer was evident in the state and court organization, as well as in the military, economic, cultural and artistic life of Armenian Cilicia[1]. Today, the presence of the Franks, their military orders, the Latin Church and Italian colonies in Cilician Armenia is well described in a wide array of studies and publications. Meanwhile, Byzantine influence and the role of the Eastern Orthodox Christians – the Byzantines and Chalcedonian Armenians – in the history and cultural landscape of the Kingdom of Armenia remains largely underestimated and unstudied. Neither the Empire of the Angeloi Dynasty, nor its successors – the Empires of Nicaea and Trebizond – could exert any dominant form of influence over Cilician Armenia. Nevertheless, Armenian monarchs (both the Roupenids, and their successors – the Hethumids and the Lusignans) provided significant patronage to the Eastern Orthodox Church, while various Armenian, Syriac and Latin authors provide numerous accounts of influential "Greeks" among the aristocracy, military and cities of the Kingdom.

To provide the necessary historic context, let us remind the reader that since the 960's Cilicia, after three centuries of Arab domination, was retaken by the

[1] It is noteworthy that the rulers of the Cilician Kingdom preferred to be known exclusively by the Western European title of rex. Even in Byzantine sources, namely in the History of Gregory Pachymeres, the King of Armenia – Levon II – is referenced to by the title of ρηγος (the Greek transliteration of the Latin title rex), not as a βασιλέας. See: **Georgius Pachymeres.** *De Michaele et Andronico Paleologis.* – Bonn, 1835. – Lib. VI, P. 429.

Byzantine Empire – a crucial point in the Byzantine *Reconquista*, led by the Emperor Nikephoros II Phocas. The Muslim population was faced either with forced conversion to the Christian Faith, enslavement, exile or death. During the following century, the regions and cities of Cilicia were re-populated with Christians – either Byzantine Greek settlers, hailing from the Balkans and western Asia Minor, or the Armenian migrants, who came in greater numbers after the Empire's annexation of Vaspurakan (under Basil II in 985) and the Kingdom of Ani (under Constantine IX Monomachos in 1045). By the end of the 11th century, Cilicia turned into an almost exclusively Christian region, inhabited by Greeks and Armenians. With the fall of the Byzantine rule in the Levant and the destruction of the de facto independent state of Philaretos Brachamios (in the 1070's–1080's) the Seljuk Turks occupied the Cilician Plain, while the mountainous regions remained under the rule of the Armenian Princes, namely the Roupenid Dynasty, with their stronghold of Vakha in the eastern part of the Taurus, and the Hethumids, whose capital was the fortified town of Lampron. The Seljuk rule on the Cilician Plain did not prove to be a long one. By the fall of 1097, the forces of the First Crusade liberated Cilicia from the Saracens[2]. The liberation from the Seljuks did not bring peace to this part of the Christian world. During the entire 12th century three Christian states – the Byzantine Empire, the Crusader Principality of Antioch and the Armenian Roupenid "Lordship of the Mountains" – fought for the control of the rich vales, plains and cities of Cilician Armenia. In this paper, there is no need to give a full (or even a brief) report on the series of Frankish, Armenian or Byzantine campaigns in the Cilician Plain. To give at least some idea as to the intensity of the wars between the three Christian states for Cilicia, one might simply note that within the span of 85 years Tarsus passed from one party to another 12 times[3], Adana – 16 times[4], Mamistra – 15[5]. By 1183–1185

[2] Of course, one cannot help mentioning the fact that it was in Cilicia that the Crusaders first came to infighting. The forces of Baldwin of Boulogne (later to become the founder of the County of Edessa and the first King of Jerusalem) came to blows with Italo-Norman Crusaders let by Tancred (who would soon become the founder of the Principality of Galilee and Prince of Antioch) for the control of Tarsus and Mamistra.

[3] The Byzantine Empire was forced to reclaim the city over five times (in 1100, 1104, 1137, 1173), the Franks of Antioch took control of it three times (1101, 1109, 1178/1180) and the Armenians – four times (1131, 1152, 1171, 1183).

the hegemony in both the mountain regions and the Cilician Plain – was in the hands of the Armenian Roupenid Dynasty[6]. The last male ruler of the Roupenid dynasty – Levon I/II the Magnificent – renounced the traditional titles of "baron" and "Lord of the Mountains", borne by his predecessors, in favor of a new and far grander title; on January 6th, 1198 he was proclaimed King of Armenia, receiving the golden crown and scepter from Pope Innocent III and the Holy Roman Emperor Henry VI.

From the moment of his coronation and anointment as Levon I the Magnificent, performed in Tarsus by the joint papal/imperial legate Conrad, the Archbishop of Mainz, and Armenian Catholicos Gregory VI, the state ruled by the Armenian monarchs of the Roupenid and Hethumid dynasties, as well as by the Franco-Armenian line of the Lusignan family was known as *Regnum Armeniae*, the Kingdom of Armenia. Yet this Kingdom, which indeed became the prime center of the Armenian culture, art, Church and state, cannot be exclusively tied to one ethnos. The mountain regions of the Taurus and Anti-Taurus, the fertile lands of the Cilician Plain, the vales of northern Syria were inhabited by a multitude of peoples and religious groups, each one playing its own and distinct role in the life and cultural landscape of the Armenian Kingdom. Despite the Byzantine genocide of the 10th century, one could still find a Muslim presence in Cilicia; Turcoman herdsmen came down from Anatolia, while Arabs came from Syria and Egypt either for trade or for their pilgrimage to Tarsus, to the tomb of the Caliph Al-Mamun and to the burial places of Forefather Seth and Prophet Daniel. The larger cities housed Jewish communities. But the major part of the population remained Christian. Syriac Miaphysites sustained several dioceses and monasteries, situated mostly in the Eastern Part of the Cilician Plain. The Latin

[4] The Byzantines took the city six times (1100, 1104, 1137, 1138, 1144, 1158), the Antiochian Franks – five times (1101, 1109, 1136, 1143, 1185), the Armenians – four times (1131, 1151-1152, 1157, 1186) and the Rum Turks briefly conquered and ravaged the city once (1138).

[5] Six times to the Byzantine Empire (1100, 1104, 1137, 1144, 1158), five times – to the Principality of Antioch (1101, 1109, 1136, 1143, 1185), four times to the Armenians (1131, 1151-1152, 1167, 1186).

[6] In 1183 Prince Bohemond III of Antioch sold Tarsus and the surrounding region (which he received from his brother-in-law, the Byzantine Emperor Manuel I Komnenos) to Roupen III, the Armenian Lord of the Mountains. By 1186, after an unsuccessful attempt at occupied cities and vales of the eastern Cilician Plain, the Prince of Antioch was finally forced to completely cede the region to the Roupenids.

Christians, even after the fall of Frankish domination in Cilicia, retained an influential presence within the region. Frankish knights, sergeants, burgesses and pilgrims flocked to the rich lands, held by the Lords of the Mountains and Kings of Armenia, receiving both estates and money fiefs. Some of the kingdom's castles and fiefs were held by the Military Orders – Templars, Hospitallers and Teutonic Knights[7]. The Italian Merchant Republics (especially Genoa) established their colonies in the major trading towns – Tarsus, Mamistra, Ayas. Yet a major part of the population was comprised of the Eastern Orthodox (Chacledonian) Christians – Byzantine Greeks, Chalcedonian Armenians and Syrian Melchites.

Unfortunately, in an effort to make an accurate description of Eastern Orthodox presence in Cilician Armenia, a scholar is faced with a nearly complete absence of material sources – architecture, painting, written works, decorative art. This can be explained by the sad and evident fact that the cities and monasteries of Cilicia were viciously ravaged and later – completely destroyed during the Mameluke raids and conquests of the 13th–14th centuries[8]. Despite this devastating loss, the surviving narrative sources shed light on the life and status of the Eastern Orthodox Christians in *Regnum Armeniae*. The credibility and value of these surviving texts is doubled by the fact that they were written not by Byzantine apologists, but by Miaphysite or Latin authors, who were more than critical of the "Greeks" and had no reason to overemphasize their prominence. Scraping up and analyzing these – often brief and scattered – fragments, one quickly comes to the realization that the Armenian adherents of the Chalcedonian Faith, along with their Byzantine Greek compatriots, formed a significant force within Cilicia; a force that either enjoyed the patronage or provoked fear and wrath of the Kings of Armenia.

Judging by the surviving chronicles and other, sometimes quite fragmentary sources, it seems that the majority of Cilicia's "Greek" population was concentrated in the cities of Tarsus, Pompeiopolis (today known by its Turkish name of Soli), in and around Seleucia Isaurica, or farther east – in the fertile

[7] For example, the Knights of St. John held the Lordship of Seleucia – a rich coastal town, situated to the west of Tarsus and populated predominantly by the Greeks.

[8] These catastrophes obviously led to the desolation of all Christian communities, not only the Eastern Orthodox (Greek, Chalcedonian Armenian, Melchite, Georgian), but also the vast majority of the monasteries and churches, which belonged to the Armenian Apostolic, Syriac and Latin Churches.

plains between the rivers Sarus and the Pyramus (Jeihan) and within the cities of Adana and Mamistra. A strong presence of the Byzantine Greeks and Chalcedonian Armenians was also sustained in the northeastern part of the Cilician Plain – in Anazarb[9], and even further north, in the Kingdom's capital – Sis[10]. The presence of the Eastern Orthodox in Cilician Armenia was not limited to the lower classes – merchants, artisans, townspeople and farmers.

Byzantine Greeks and Chalcedonian Armenians comprised a significant part within the realm's feudal aristocracy and military. Armenian and Syrian chronicles hold numerous mentions of Cilicia's princes or barons, who adhered to the "Greek" Church. Among the 30 barons (or *ishkhans*), who paid homage to Levon I the Magnificent at his coronation in January, 1198, seven belonged to the Byzantine or Chalcedonian Armenian aristocracy. According to the list of barons, contained in the Chronicle of Pseudo-Sempad, those were Adam, the Lord of Baghras; Azaros, the Lord of Mavolon; Romanos, the Lord of Amida (Amuday); Nikephoros, the Lord of Vergis and Vetine; Christophore, the Lord of Lavzat; the brothers Constantine and Nikephoros, the Lords of Lakraven[11]. Four of the mentioned lordships (those held by Nikephoros of Vergis, Christophore of Lavzat, and the brothers Constantine and Nikephoros of Lakraven) were located in the western part of the Cilician Plain. Romanos held the Lordship of Amida (or

[9] The dominant presence of Byzantine Greeks and Chalcedonian Armenians in Anazarb is attested to by the fact that the city remained the seat of an influential Eastern Orthodox Metropolitan Diocese (in 1278 the Metropolitan of Anazarb was one of the two main contestants to the Patriarchal Throne of Antioch), and more importantly – by the fact that the city became the center of the uprising of the Chalcedonian Armenian barons and the Greek population, that took control of the city and rebelled against King Levon II in 1272.

[10] The Latin pilgrim and future Bishop of Paderborn and Utrecht – Wilbrand of Oldenburg, while visiting Sis in 1211, saw the Orthodox Patriarch Simeon II there and noted that he oversaw the local churches and communities of the Greeks, located in the realm's capital city. See: **Wilbrandus de Oldenborg.** *Peregrinatio* // Peregrinatores Medii Aevi Quatuor. – Leipzig, 1864. P. 177–178. Thus, by the 1210's the Kingdom's capital city had a well-off Byzantine community, along with Eastern Orthodox churches and one of the residences of the Patriarch of Antioch.

[11] **Sempad le Connetable.** *Chronique de Royaume de la Petite Arménie* // RHC Arm. I. – Paris, 1869. P. 636–637.G. Dédéyan – in his fundamental study of Pseudo-Sempad's list of barons – clearly emphasized the affiliation of those seven lords with the Greek Orthodox faction of Cilicia's aristocracy. See: **Dédéyan G.** *Les listes «féodales» du pseudo-Smbat* // Cahiers de civilisation médiévale. 1989. Vol. 32 (№ 125). P. 40–41.

Amuday), on the river Pyramus, to the north of Mamistra. Azaros held the northern Lordship of Mavolon in the Anti-Taurus – quite far from the other Byzantine and Chalcedonian Armenian lords. Last but not least, Adam held Baghras, the Syrian Gates (the Mountain Pass of Al-Balan) and a significant part of the Amanus Mountain Range, guarding the southeastern provinces of the realm, which adjoined the Principality of Antioch. Besides this critically important lordship, Adam also held other fiefs; according to the *Chronography* of the Syriac author Bar Hebraeus, he owned several castles and rich lands of the coasts of the Cilician Plain[12].

Adam of Baghras deserved to be mentioned with greater detail, since no other Armenian, Byzantine or Frankish baron of Levon I the Magnificent wielded more influence, nor achieved a higher status at the Royal Court. The fact that Adam belonged to the Eastern Orthodox (Chalcedonian) Church is clearly stated in the Armenian chronicles, most notably in the Armenian version of Michael the Syrian and in the Chronicle of Kiriak of Gandzag[13]. King Levon I entrusted Adam with the defense of the regions, bordering the Principality of Antioch; it was Adam, the Lord of Baghras, who bore the brunt of the War for the Antiochian Succession (1198–1216), organizing both the offensive campaigns and defending the Kingdom from Frankish and Saracen invasions, led by Prince Bohemond IV of Antioch and Az-Zahir of Aleppo. In the early 13th century, Levon I the Great made Adam of Baghras the Seneschal of Armenia, and in 1219 the dying monarch entrusted his faithful Chalcedonian Armenian friend with the entire kingdom and his young daughter – the 8-year-old Queen Isabel (Zabel). Thus, the Eastern Orthodox baron became the regent and de facto ruler of all the Christian lands from Anti-Taurus in the north to the Mediterranean Coast in the south, from the borders of Isauria in the west to the Euphrates in the east. Adam of Baghras – the seneschal and bailli of the Kingdom of Armenia – was in fact one of the three great Chalcedonian Armenians, who ruled significant parts of the Near East, along with Philaretos Brachamios († 1087) and Ivane I Zakarid († 1227). He also became the last Byzantine Christian, who truly dominated the Levant. Yet his rule was

[12] "Sir Adam, the Bailli, Lord of the Fortresses on the coast" – that is how Bar Hebraeus calls the Chalcedonian Armenian Baron and Seneschal of the Kingdom in his *Chronography*. See: **Bar Hebraeus.** *Chronography* // ed. & trans. E.A. Wallis Budge. London, 1932. P. 437.

[13] For the multiple references and mentions of the fact that Adam "professed the Greek faith" see: **Dédéyan G.** Op cit. – P. 31.

short-lived. In 1221, Adam was killed by the Assassins, possibly acting under the orders of the Hospitallers, since the Order of St. John supported the claims of Queen Isabel's rival – Raymond-Roupen, the former Prince of Antioch and junior King of Armenia[14]. The assassination took place in Sis, near the Syriac Church of St. Bar Sauma[15].

Seneschal Adam's death did not put an end to the active participation of the "Greeks" in the war for the throne of Armenia. While the regency and guardianship of the young Queen passed to the fervent Miaphysite Armenian – Constantine Hethumid, the Lord of Barbaron – many representatives of the Chalcedonian Orthodox aristocracy, along with the Byzantine Greek population of Seleucia and Tarsus, shifted their allegiance to the Franco-Armenian contender – Raymond-Roupen. Leaving the Fifth Crusade to claim Armenia's throne, Raymond-Roupen sailed north from the Egyptian Delta and landed at Seleucia. The western part of the Cilician Plain became the gathering place of Raymond's supporters, with numerous nobles flocking to his camp; the most important of those was Vahram, the Lord of Korikos and Marshal of Armenia[16]. It is not entirely clear, whether Vahram belonged to the Chalcedonian or Miaphysite factions; one way or another, the "Greeks" played a leading role among Raymond-Roupen's supporters, a role no less inferior than that of the Franks. According to the Chronicle of Pseudo-Sempad, Tarsus peacefully passed to Raymond-Roupen, where he gathered "the princes who were in Cilicia, Armenians and Greeks,

[14] Between 1211 and 1230 the Assassins – whose domain was interlocked between the Hospitaller fortresses from the West and the South (between Marqab and Krak de Chevalier) – became the tributaries of the Order. This period of the Assassins dependence on the Hospitallers coincided with a series of assassinations of various Christian lords in Outremer, who stood in the way of the Order's interests. Raymond de Poitiers, the Bailli of Antioch and the elder son of Prince Bohemond IV (a fierce enemy of the Hospitallers) became the first such victim. The Assassins struck him down at a Mass in the Cathedral of Our Lady in Tartous in 1213. The same fate was suffered by the Latin Patriarch of Jerusalem – St. Albert Avogadro – a stern opponent of the Order's ex jurisdictional status in the Holy Land. Adam of Baghras, the Seneschal and Bailli of Armenia, who blocked the Hospitaller's ally Raymond-Roupen from occupying the throne, became the third major victim in this series.

[15] **Bar Hebraeus.** *Op. cit.* p. 442.

[16] Being desperately in need of Vahram's support, Raymond-Roupen agreed to let his own mother – Alice Roupenid – be wed with the Marshal.

paron Vahram and others (…) some 5,000 men"[17]. Constantine Hethumid went out to meet the enemy, even though his forces were numerically inferior to Raymond-Roupen's army. The battle took place at the crossings of the Pyramus. Raymond-Roupen's forces were completely routed; the survivors and those that kept at least some form of order retreated with the King and the Marshal – taking refuge within the walls of Tarsus. Soon the city was besieged by Constantine Hethumid's army[18]. When the gates of Tarsus were opened by a secret supporter of the Royal Bailli – a man by the name of Basil – Hethumid's Armenian warriors unleashed their wrath on the houses and property of the Byzantine Greek aristocracy and population[19]. Raymond-Roupen – with the last supporters he could gather – fled to the city's citadel. After a few days, he was forced to capitulate. Neither King Raymond-Roupen, nor Marshal Vahram were destined to ever leave the walls of the citadel; both were imprisoned and – by 1222 – killed under the orders of Constantine Hethumid, now the all-powerful Bailli of Armenia.

The Hethumid Dynasty, which gained power and reigned over the Kingdom of Armenia in 1221–1222/1226–1343, was forced to deal with open rebellions and challenges on behalf of the Chalcedonian Orthodox baronage and population. Once – in 1221, when the uncrowned founder of the Hethumid Dynasty and Bailli of Armenia – Constantine, had to take Tarsus by force and to fight King Raymond-Roupen, a claimant supported by Chalcedonian barons and the Greeks of the western Cilician Plain. For the second time – in 1272, when the Chalcedonian Armenian nobility, led by Baron Vahram, rebelled against the newly-crowned King Levon II Hethumid (third ruler and second king of the dynasty), taking the city of Anazarb. According to Bar Hebraeus's *Chronography*, "the nobles of the Greeks of Cilicia acted treacherously against the new king Leo, and when the [people] perceived their treachery, they seized the Baron, their chief. And his companions heard [of it], and they fled to one of the fortresses, and they sent for the Rum

[17] **Bedrosian R.,** ed. *The Armenian Chronicle of Sempad, or of the "Royal Historian*". New Jersey, 2005. p. 104.

[18] A description of the Battle on the Pyramus and the following siege of Tarsus is given in the Chronicle of Pseudo-Smbat. See: ***Ibid.*** p. 104. According to the chronicle, Constantine Hethumid only had 300 knights and men-at-arms, while the army of King Raymond-Roupen had 5,000 men. Although, it is quite likely that the Chronicler – loyal to the Hethumid Dynasty – exaggerated the disproportion, emphasizing the military skill and Divine favor of Constantine.

[19] In the words of Pseudo-Smbat "the bailli and his troops entered the city, looting the Greeks' property". See: ***Ibid.*** p. 104.

Turks for them to come to their help and receive the fortress. Then the king made haste and encamped against the fortress, and the Armenians who were therein seized the Greek nobles and handed them over to the king, and he destroyed them all. And he also destroyed Vahram in the fortress of the city of Anazarb"[20]. It is noteworthy that King Levon II asked the Orthodox Patriarch of Antioch Euphymius I to negotiate with the rebels. Only when Levon II realized that the Patriarch is part of the conspiracy, he forced him to flee to Constantinople[21]. In comparison with the War for the Throne of Armenia (1221–1222), the Anazarb Rebellion of 1272 is less studied and for our particular subject is far more important, since in 1272 the Chalcedonian Orthodox of Cilicia began an uprising not in support of a Franco-Armenian claimant, but tried to take over at least a part of the kingdom on their own behalf. Despite the ruthless suppression of the rebellion and exile of the Patriarch, the Orthodox retained their status in the Kingdom, and their Church still enjoyed the patronage of the Armenian monarchs (which we will examine below).

It is more than evident that the well-being of the Byzantine and Chalcedonian Armenian nobility (not to mention the armed uprisings, which led to the captures of Tarsus in 1221 and Anazarb in 1272) would not be possible, if the Eastern Orthodox Christians had not comprised a notable part of the Kingdom's fighting force. Judging by the list of barons in Pseudo-Sempad's Chronicle, we can deduce that around a quarter of Cilician Armenia's feudal aristocracy belonged to the Chalcedonian Orthodox Church. It is more than likely that this proportion was at least partially sustained during the following decades (if not for the entire history of the kingdom), not only with regard to the higher baronage, but also to the smaller landowners and men-at-arms. For example, Wilbrand of Oldenburg, touring the Cilician cities in 1211–1212, notes that the Citadel of Mamistra was held by the "Greeks"[22]. This eyewitness account clearly indicates that the defense of the city was entrusted by King Levon I to Byzantine troops. This might seem strange, but only to someone who is only superficially acquainted with the history of the Crusades and the Middle East; after all, the stereotype of Byzantines being "effeminate Greeks" who depended exclusively on foreign mercenaries is quite far from the 12th–13th century realities. If one takes into account that at that very

[20] **Bar Hebraeus.** *Op. cit.* p. 527–528.

[21] ***Ibid.*** p. 528. **Georgius Pachymeres.** *Op. cit.* Lib. VI, p. 429.

[22] **Wilbrandus de Oldenborg.** *Op. cit.* p. 176.

period, in another part of Asia Minor, the Byzantine Greeks formed the bulk of a highly efficient army of the Laskarid Empire of Nicaea, it is not surprising that the Kingdom of Armenia could sustain similar troops. Among other fragmentary mentions of the Eastern Orthodox (Byzantine and Chalcedonian Armenian) warriors in the armies of Cilician Kings, one can turn to the war between Hethum I and the Turks (1262), described in the Chronicle of Pseudo-Sempad. The Armenian Chronicler praises a certain "Sempad, Bakuran's and Constantine's brother, who was of Byzantine nationality, who (…) covered the ground with the infidels' corpses"[23]. Judging by the fact that Smbat was an exclusively Armenian name (plus the young warrior was said to be related to King Hethum I), and that he is nevertheless characterized as being "Byzantine" can only mean that Smbat and his brothers belonged to an aristocratic family of the Chalcedonian Armenians.

The prominent role of Eastern Orthodox nobles and warriors in the armed forces of the Cilician Kingdom of Armenia radically expands our understanding and timeline of "Byzantine" domination and intervention in the Middle East, shifting the *terminus ante quem* from the 11th – 12th to the 13th – 14th centuries. The last Chacledonian Armenian ruler to dominate the northern part of the Levant was Adam of Baghras († 1221), not Philaretos Brachamios († 1087). The last appearance of Eastern Orthodox (Byzantine Greek, Chalcedonian Armenian, Georgian) cavalrymen and foot soldiers in the vales of Syria would take place during the wars of the Armenian Kings in the 13th and early 14th centuries, not the campaigns of the Komnenid Emperors – which ended in the 12th century[24]. Greek and Chalcedonian Armenian nobles and men-at-arms, under King Levon I the Magnificent and his Seneschal Adam of Baghras fought in the endless raids and sieges of the War of the Antiochian Succession (1198–1216); under King Hethum I they sacked Aleppo, Baalbek and Damascus (1260) and saved Antioch from the First Mameluke Siege (1262). During the Mongol Invasion of Syria under Khan Munke, the Eastern Orthodox were present in two of the vassal armies of the

[23] **Bedrosian R.,** ed. *Op. cit.* p. 113.

[24] The last appearance of Byzantine warriors in Syria was traditionally linked with the Great Eastern Campaign of Emperor John II Komnenos (1138); in more accurate sources – with the campaign of his son and successor Manuel I Komnenos (1158–1159) or with the intervention of Byzantine forces under the *Doukas* Constantine Coloman during Nur-ad-Din's invasion of Frankish territories in 1163–1164.

Ilkhanate, led by King Demetrios II of Georgia and King Levon II of Cilician Armenia. It was in that campaign, during the First Battle of Homs (1281) that the Christian vassals of the Ilkhanate (which included not only the Frankish and Armenian Apostolic, but also the Georgian, Byzantine, and Chalcedonian Armenian warriors) formed the most trustworthy part of the allied army, which held its own even after the rout of the Mongols. The last battles, fought by the Cilician Greeks and Chalcedonian Armenians (along with other Armenians, Franks, Georgians, Mongols, Turks) during the Syrian Campaigns of 1299 and 1301–1302, were led by the Ilkhanate and its principal vassal – King Hethum II of Armenia.

The history of the Chalcedonian Orthodox Christians in the Cilician Kingdom of Armenia is perhaps best reflected in the status of the Eastern Orthodox Church within the realm. In the 12th–14th, centuries Cilicia was one of the main centers of the Orthodox Patriarchate of Antioch. The Orthodox Church began to once more strengthen its position in the region during the Byzantine Reconquista at the end of the 10th century. The reinforcement of Orthodox dioceses – through the influx of Byzantine settlers and the conversion of Syriac and Armenian Miaphysites – was among the main factors of the Empire's new Byzantinization policy in the reclaimed regions of northern Syria and Cilicia. During the time period of interest (the 12th–14th centuries) the majority of the Patriarchate of Antioch's Metropolitan Archdioceses in Cilicia managed to retain their hierarchy, churches and flock. These included the Metropolitan Archdioceses of Tarsus, Anazarb, Seleucia, as well as other diocesan centers, such as Mopsuestia (Mamistra).

Moreover, during the Second Byzantine Period in Cilicia (10th–11th centuries) some dioceses were elevated to a new and higher status. Thus, in the late 10th century the Diocese of Pompeiopolis was promoted to the rank of Autocephalous Metropolis. The Diocese of Adana received the same honor by the 11th century. Previously, both Sees were suffragans under the Metropolitan of Tarsus. The elevation of the Dioceses of Adana and Pompeiopolis is a clear indication of a significant increase in the numbers and status of the Eastern Orthodox population within the region; if that had not been the case, there would not have been any reason for the remodeling of the traditional structure and honorary titles of the ecclesiastic hierarchy.

The presence of functioning and thriving dioceses obviously indicates that the Eastern Orthodox cathedrals and parish churches could be found in all of Cilicia's

major cities: Tarsus, Seleucia, Anazarb, Mamistra, Adana, Pompeiopolis. Unfortunately, in order to gather at least some ideas as to the number and status of the Eastern Orthodox monasteries and churches in Cilicia, one has to turn almost exclusively to narrative sources; history – mercilessly acting through Mameluke persecutions and Turkish negligence – left us practically no surviving monuments. Nevertheless, in medieval texts Cilician Armenia stands out as a region, filled with monasteries and other Christian shrines. The author of the Armenian Continuation of Michael the Syrian notes that King Levon I the Magnificent, with his numerous and lavish donations, "enriched the monasteries not only of his own subjects (meaning the Armenians – *S.B.*), but the monasteries of foreign Christians – Syrians, Franks and even the Greeks and Georgians, forgetting the evil that they had committed against him personally, the Armenian people and all of the Orthodox" (by the "Orthodox" the Armenian author obviously means the Non-Chalcedonian Orthodox – *S.B.*)[25]. Of course by the "Georgians" the Armenian chronicler can mean both – Georgian, as well as Chalcedonian Armenian monasteries[26].

[25] *Chronique de Michel le Grand, Patriarche des Syriens Jacobite*. Venise, 1868. P. 359.

[26] It is well known that the Miaphysite Armenians preferred to call their Diaphysite (Chacledonian) compatriots either "Greeks" or "Georgians" – excluding them from the ranks of "true" Armenians and emphasizing their submission to one of the three Eastern Orthodox Patriarchates (Antioch, Constantinople or Mtskheta).

In the 11th–13th centuries Georgian clerics, monks, scholars, architects and pilgrims flocked not only to the Holy Land, but to northern Syria – the jurisdiction of their Mother Church (Antioch). During the period of the Second Byzantine and Crusader rule, the vales around Antioch and the slopes of Black Mountain sustained several Georgian monasteries: the Kastana Monastery (near the Kastalia Springs in the Daphne Valley), the Monastery of the Mother of God Kalipos on Wondrous Mountain, the monasteries of Tzharota, Tvali, St. Romanos and the Wood of Cross. Georgian monks were among the brethren of the great Lavra of St. Simeon on Wondrous Mountain, occupying one of the three altars of its Cathedral and filling the monastery's library with a grand collection of Georgian manuscripts. The same period saw the rise in Chalcedonian Armenian monasticism in Cilicia, Northern Syria, Eastern Anatolia, the Balkans and Transcaucasia. At the moment of the Seljuk Conquest of Antioch the renowned Byzantine author and monk Nikon of the Black Mountain took refuge in the Chalcedonian-Armenian Monastery of Our Lady of the Pomegranate (Panagia tou Roidiou), located in the Amanus Mountains. In 1238 Pope Gregory IX wrote to all "Greek, Armenian and Georgian abbots and clerics in the city of Antioch and its Diocese", calling them to return to the canonical obedience of the Latin Patriarch and to renounce their allegiance to the Orthodox Primate Simeon II. See: **Auvray L.,** ed. *Les Registres de Grégoire IX*. Paris, 1896. Vol. II, № 4467, c.

Among the Eastern Orthodox monasteries, which survived in Cilicia during the Second Byzantine and Armenian rule, only a handful can either be localized or identified by name. It is known that a large monastery, dedicated to the Holy Virgin, was located in Seleucia. In Tarsus one could visit the Monastery of St. George and the Monastery of St. Eleutherios, which held the martyr's myrrh bearing relics and attracted numerous pilgrims. The Monastery of St. Simeon the Stylite near Anazarb, also known as Simanakala, was renowned for its extensive library, which held numerous Greek books and manuscripts[27]. The ruins of several churches, with Greek inscriptions and fragments of mosaic decoration, were uncovered by Victor Langlois in and around Seleucia in 1851–1852[28]. The Orthodox Cathedral of St. Paul in Tarsus – the historic center of the Archdiocese, rebuilt by the Antiochian Franks – remained (along with other churches and ecclesiastic property) the subject of fierce contention between the Latin and Orthodox hierarchies throughout the entire reign of Levon I. The Latin-Orthodox struggle for the churches of Tarsus occupies an important place in the Armenian King's correspondence with Pope Innocent III[29].

1098. It is clear that these Armenian abbots, in communion with the Orthodox Patriarch Simeon II, were Chalcedonian Armenians. The 13th century Papal address proves that the Monastery of Our Lady of the Pomegranate, mentioned by Nikon of Black Mountain in the 11th century, was not by far the only Chalcedonian Armenian monastery in the region. Taking into account that the Chalcedonian Armenians held entire fiefs and estates in Cilicia, there is no reason to believe that they – for some unknown reason – would refrain from setting up their monasteries within the Kingdom. For more on the Chacledonian Armenians and Georgians in the Latin East, see: **Brun S.P.** *Romei i franki v Antiohii, Sirii i Kilikii XI–XIII vv. K istorii soprikosnoveniya latinskih i vizantijskih hristian na rubezhah Vostoka (The Byzantines and the Franks in Antioch, Syria and Cilicia. 11th–13th centuries. An Outline of Latin-Byzantine Interaction in the East).* Vol. I–II. M.: Maska, 2015. Vol. II, c. 2, p. 136–143.

[27] The Monastery of the Holy Virgin, located in Seleucia, the ruins of which were still known and venerated by the local population in the 19th century as "the place of Mariam", is described by Victor Langlois. See: **Langlois V.** *Voyage dans la Cilicie et les Montagnes du Taurus.* Paris, 1862, p. 184–185. On the Monastery of St. Eleutherios and the pilgrimage to his shrine in Tarsus, see: **Foss C.** 'Pilgrimage in Medieval Asia Minor' in *Dumbarton Oaks Papers.* 2002. Vol. 56. p. 133, 143–144. On the Monastery of St. Simeon (Simanakala), see: **Weitenberg J.J.S.** 'The Armenian Monasteries in the Black Mountain' in *East and West in the Medieval Eastern Mediterranean. Antioch from the Byzantine Reconquest until the End of the Crusader Principality. Vol I.* Leuven, 2006. p. 90.

[28] **Langlois V.** *Op. cit.* p. 184.

[29] **Innocentius III Pontifex Romanus.** *Epistolae* // PL. Vol. 216. Paris, 1855.

The thriving state of Eastern Orthodox communities in Cilicia is evidenced by the status of their ecclesiastic hierarchy in the Armenian Kingdom. In 1198, the Orthodox Metropolitan of Tarsus – along with the Armenian Catholicos Gregory V Apirat, the Latin Archbishop Conrad of Mainz and the Syriac Patriarch Michael I the Great – took part in the coronation of King Levon I the Magnificent[30]. Orthodox patriarchs and metropolitans – along with the Armenian, Syriac and Latin bishops – took part in the following coronations of other Cilician monarchs as well[31]. The traditional patronage and the close, rather friendly relations between the Cilician Kings and the Orthodox Patriarchs of Antioch was established by the first King of Armenia Levon I.

In 1210 Simeon II ibn Abu Saib, the Orthodox Patriarch of Antioch, was exiled from his Cathedral city by Prince Bohemond IV, and forced to flee to Cilician Armenia. King Levon I offered the Orthodox First-Hierarch a more than generous welcome. Simeon II was allowed not only to exercise his pastoral authority and to set up his residences in the royal capitals of Tarsus and Sis; he received numerous lands, rents and churches, which were previously under the control of the Latin Archdiocese of Tarsus. In 1212 the King's forces, acting directly under Levon's orders, expelled the Latin chapters from the Cathedral of St. Paul and other churches in Tarsus, transferring them, along with other Catholic property, to the Orthodox Patriarch of Antioch[32].

---

[30] The Armenian Chronicler Kiriak of Gandzag mistakenly calls him "the Greek Patriarch of Tarsus". See: **Guiragos de Kantzag.** *Extrait de l'Histoire d'Arménie* // RHC Arm. I. Paris, 1869, p. 423.

[31] Describing the joint coronation of Hethum I and Isabel, which took place on Pentecost 1226, Bar Hebraeus tells us that the Royal Bailli – Constantine Hethumid – gathered at Tarsus "the Patriarchs, and bishops, and priests; and they crowned her (Isabel – *S.B.*), along with (…) Hethum, and Hethum was proclaimed King". See: **Bar Hebraeus.** *Op. cit.*, p. 428. It is noteworthy that the Syriac Maphrian – a man that would likely neglect the intricacies of ecclesiastic hierarchy – speaks of the "Patriarchs" in plural. This gives us reason to believe that the coronation was attended not only by the Armenian Catholicos Constantine I, but also by one or two other Patriarchs: the Syriac Patriarch Ignatius III David (who was in Cilicia between 1224 and 1226) and the Orthodox Patriarch of Antioch Simeon II ibn Abu Saib. One way or another, the Eastern Orthodox hierarchs must have been present, as representatives of one of the four major religious groups of the Kingdom.

[32] In a letter, sent to King Levon I in 1213, Pope Innocent III gives the following account of the crisis, "I would like to tell you about Tarsus (…); obviously, you decided to give in to an ungodly plan, dividing the lands of the Diocese and providing them to the abovementioned

Being at war with the Antiochian Franks, the King of Armenia was ready to temporarily break his ties with the Papacy in order to win the support of the Eastern Orthodox population of Cilicia and Northern Syria[33]. It is noteworthy that in 1206–1210 precisely the same position and reasoning was upheld by Prince Bohemond IV, who sanctioned the election of Patriarch Simeon II and allowed for the restoration of an Orthodox Patriarchate at Antioch in the first place[34]. The Orthodox Patriarch was, in turn, willing to engage in the closest possible contacts with Levon. On January 6th, 1211 Simeon II, along with King Levon I and the newly-crowned Junior King Raymond-Roupen (the titular Prince of Antioch), the Master of the Teutonic Knights Herman von Salza, the Armenian and Latin clergy, took part in the celebrations of the Theophany at Sis. According to the description of Wilbrand of Oldenburg, who witnessed and took part in the celebrations "the Greeks and their Patriarch went in processions, having prepared a multitude of relics, which they carried with them"[35]. From Wilbrand's description it seems that the Patriarch of Antioch and his clergy preceded the Armenian Archbishop, and went right before the King and his Latin retinue.

Since the early 13th century Cilician Armenia, along with northern Syria and the Lebanese coast (which, until 1289-1291, was under the control of the Franks), became one of the two main centers of the Orthodox Patriarchate of Antioch[36]. As

---

Patriarch (Simeon II – *S.B.*). Your warriors expelled the Latin clergy, whose place was taken by some Greeks". See: **Innocentius III Pontifex Romanus.** *Op. cit.*, № 2, p. 785.

[33] It is also important to note that by 1210 Levon I was already excommunicated by the Roman Pontiff. This was done after the forces of the Armenian King killed several Templars and wounded the Grand Master in an ambush near Baghras. It must be noted that Baghras – one of the two principal points of contention in the Antioch-Armenia Wars – was at that time the fief of the Eastern Orthodox Seneschal of Armenia – Adam.

[34] For this, the Prince of Antioch-Tripoli was, in turn, excommunicated not only by the Latin Patriarchs of Outremer, but also by Pope Innocent III himself.

[35] **Wilbrandus de Oldenborg.** *Op. cit.*, p. 178.

[36] In the centuries of Arab Rule, there were several cultural and political centers, which sought to dominate the Patriarchate of Antioch. These included Antioch itself, Tyre and the Phoenician coast, Aleppo, Damascus and its suffragans, and Edessa (along with other diocese on the Euphrates, such as Raqqa and Harran). During the Mameluke and Ottoman eras, the life of the Orthodox Church of Antioch was dominated exclusively by the power struggle between Aleppo and Damascus, with a lesser input from the coastal dioceses (such as Beirut, Tripoli, Tyre and Sidon). For a more detailed study of the regional power centers of the Church of Antioch, see: **Panchenko K.A.** *Blijnevostochnoe Pravoslavie pod osmanskim vladyichestvom.*

mentioned above, in 1210–1212 the residences of the Patriarch of Antioch and all the East were set up in Tarsus and Sis; a fact that is strongly emphasized in the texts of Pope Innocent III and Wilbrand of Oldenburg. Practically every Patriarch of Antioch, elected in the 13th and the first half of the 14th centuries, had strong ties with Cilician Armenia. Simeon II ibn Abu Saib made Cilicia his main residence in 1210–1217, and during the following years of his tenure (after the transfer of his residence to Nicaea), continued to visit his Cilician diocese and undertake diplomatic missions to the court of the King of Armenia (1218–1242). Patriarch Simeon II played a central role in the negotiations between Emperor John III Doukas Vatzates and King Hethum I of Armenia, as well as in the dialogue on the possibility of restoring communion between the Eastern Orthodox and Armenian Apostolic Churches in 1239[37]. Patriarch Euphymius I of Antioch, after his exile from Frankish territory, came to Cilicia and spent several years there (1264–1272). As was said before, Euphymius I was called on by King Levon II to negotiate with the rebelling Chalcedonian Armenian barons, but after his ties with the rebels were revealed he was forced to flee to Constantinople.

Euphymius's successor – Patriarch Theodosius V Villehardouin – was installed by Emperor Michael VIII Palaiologos and consecrated in Constantinople. Nevertheless, when the news of Euphymius's death reached the Levant, the bishops of the Antiochian Church elected their own candidate for the See of St. Peter; this was one of the Cilician bishops – Theodoritos, the Metropolitan of Anazarb. Yet, on hearing about the enthronement of Theodosius V in Constantinople, Theodoritos of Anazarb withdrew his candidacy in order not to create a schism in the Patriarchate of Antioch[38]. The fact that a Synod of the Church of Antioch was held in Cilicia and that the chosen candidate for the Patriarchal Throne was the Metropolitan of Anazarb – a city that just six years prior was the epicenter of the Byzantine and Chalcedonian Armenian rebellion – clearly indicates that after the execution of the rebels and the exile of the former

Pervyie tri stoletiya. 1516–1831. [Arab Orthodox Christians under the Ottomans. 1516–1831]. Moscow, 2012, p. 190–206.

[37] For more on Simeon II's later missions to Cilicia, see: **Laurent V.** *Les regestes des actes du Patriarcat de Constantinople. Les actes des patriarches III. Les regestes de 1208 à 1309.* – Paris, 1947. № 1278, 1282, 1290; **Hamilton B.** *The Latin Church in the Crusader States. The Secular Church.* London, 1980. c. 12, p. 321.

[38] **Georgius Pachymeres.** *Op. cit.* Vol. I., Lib. VI, p. 436–437.

Patriarch (1272), King Levon II did not continue his persecutions and that the status of the Eastern Orthodox within the Kingdom remained stable. After the death of Michael VIII Palaiologos, Patriarch Theodosius V suffered the persecution of the opponents of the Council of Lyon; he was forced to abdicate and leave Constantinople for Outremer. It was in Outremer that a new Synod of the Church of Antioch elected his successor – Arsenius, Bishop of Tripoli (1282). It is not entirely clear whether the Synod took place in the County of Tripoli or in Cilicia; nevertheless, the new Patriarch of Antioch spent a major part of his five-year tenure in the Kingdom of Armenia. It was his closeness to the Armenians that cost Arsenius his Patriarchal Throne. Despite the fact that Patriarch Arsenius "was a pious and venerated man", whose reputation was upheld throughout the East[39], his close ties with King Levon II of Armenia and Catholicos James I made him an unacceptable figure to Emperor Andronikos II Palaiologos and the Church of Constantinople. Being accused not only of sharing the church revenues with the King of Armenia, but also facing the severe charge of concelebrating with the Miaphysite Armenians, Arsenius was forced to renounce the Patriarchal Throne and his name was removed from the diptychs (1287)[40].

The election of the new Patriarch divided the Church of Antioch. The bishops of Cilician Armenia chose Dionysius I, the Metropolitan of Pompeiopolis, while the bishops of Syria and the Lebanese coast, gathered at Tripoli, elected their candidate – Cyril III, Metropolitan of Tyre, to the Throne of St. Peter. For a long time it was thought that from the moment of the parallel election of Dionysius I in Cilicia and Cyril III in Tripoli (1287), the Church of Antioch remained in a state of schism. Yet K.A. Panchenko proved that Dionysius I and the Cilician bishops renounced their claim in favor of Cyril III, and that the latter was able to achieve recognition in Constantinople, in many ways because of the support of Maria (Rita) of Armenia, the daughter of King Levon II and the wife of Emperor Michael IX. Moreover, for several years Cyril III was unable to receive the formal acknowledgement from the Ecumenical Patriarch Athanasius III, who refused to recognize him as Patriarch of Antioch on the charges of his supposed communion with the Armenians. This clearly indicates that the former Metropolitan of Tyre, installed as Patriarch by the Syrian-Lebanese party, sustained the closest ties and

[39] ***Ibid.*** Vol. II, p. 56.

[40] **Laurent V.** *Op. cit.*, № 1498, 1511, 1568.

more than friendly relations with Cilician Armenia. After the death of Cyril III in 1308 the Eastern See of St. Peter passed once more to Dionysius I (most likely – as part of the previous arrangement between the rival Patriarchs). Dionysius's second election and enthronement took place in the Kingdom of Armenia; only in 1310 would he come to Constantinople, to receive the formal recognition of the Byzantine Emperor and the Ecumenical Patriarch[41]. Dionysius I was succeeded by another Cilician bishop – Dionysius II, the Metropolitan of Mamistra ("the renowned Dionysius" as he is called by the Byzantine courtier and Church History author Nikephoros Kallistos Ksanophoul)[42]. One should note that Dionysius II spent his entire tenure in Cilician Armenia, never leaving either for Constantinople or the Syrian dioceses.

After his death (circa 1322) the Church of Antioch was once more separated by a schism. When the bishops of Cilician Armenia and the Phoenician coast elected Patriarch Sophronius, the former Metropolitan of Tyre, the Orthodox of Damascene Archdiocese, the Hauran and inner Syria refused to recognize him and proclaimed Abu an-Najm al-Arshi, the Metropolitan of Damascus, as their Patriarch[43]. The last Patriarch of Antioch, who had direct and close ties to the Kingdom of Armenia and the Cilician dioceses, was Ignatius II, who assumed the Eastern See of St. Peter in 1344. Patriarch Ignatius II was not only elected by the bishops of Cilician Armenia, but was himself – by birth – an Armenian, which seems to be an exceptionally rare phenomenon among the Patriarchs of Antioch. His election marked the last high point of Byzantine-Armenian interaction; after all, the Armenian Patriarch of Antioch was elected at a time when Cilician Armenia had a former Byzantine general – Guy of Lusignan (who took the throne name of Constantine II) – for its King. Yet his tenure had a tragic end. In 1358–1359 a major part of the Cilician Plain was overrun by the Mamelukes; the weak King Constantine III, unable to stop the devastating campaigns, surrendered Tarsus and Adana to their Sultanate. The Armenian Kingdom of Cilicia began its rapid decline, and among the first to be sacrificed were the predominantly Eastern

[41] For more on Patriarch Dionysius I, see: **Panchenko K.A.** *The Arab Orthodox…* p. 84–85; **Panchenko K.A.** "Dionysius I" in *The Orthodox Encyclopedia*. Tome XV. Moscow, 2007, p. 308.

[42] **Nicephorus Callistus.** *Nicephori Callisti Ecclesiasticae Historiae* // PG 146. Paris, 1865. Lib. XIV, c. 1197–1198.

[43] **Panchenko K.A.** *The Arab Orthodox…* p. 85

Orthodox regions of the plains, with their great cities and Sees. Moreover, the Church of Antioch led the opposition to St. Gregory Palamas and the Hesychast teachings. When the Hesychasts won the upper hand – with the help of the new Byzantine Emperor John VI Kantakouzenos – they began a fierce persecution of their opponents. Patriarch Ignatius II and the Church of Antioch could no longer count on the support of the Empire or the Ecumenical Throne; Cilicia – which had been the main center of the Patriarchate of Antioch for over a century – was on the brink of complete collapse. At that very period, the Orthodox of Damascus finally saw their chance in gaining full control of the Patriarchate. Although the Damascene Melkites had not exhibited any Hesychast sympathies, they "embraced" Palamas and in 1359, at a Synod in Damascus, a significant faction of the hierarchs and clergy of the Antiochian Church deposed Patriarch Ignatius II. Metropolitan Pachomius of Damascus was proclaimed the new Patriarch; the Patriarchate would never be transferred from that Syrian city. Ignatius II fled to the Kingdom of Cyprus, where he was welcomed by King Hugh IV de Lusignan. He spent the rest of his days in Cyprus, enjoying the patronage of the royal family, exercising his pastoral authority over the island's Byzantine and Melchite communities, and retaining the Patriarchal title[44].

Even before the final formation of the Kingdom of Armenia, Cilicia became one of the major centers of interaction and dialogue between the Byzantine and the Armenian Orthodox. This interaction affected not only the socio-political, but also the ecclesiastic and cultural life of the region. For example, services in the Armenian Apostolic Cathedral of Tarsus – the Cathedral of Hagia Sophia and St. Peter – were celebrated in two languages – Armenian and Greek[45]. The double consecration of the Armenian Cathedral in Tarsus – in honor of both Hagia Sophia and the Apostle Peter – naturally and symbolically reflected the two main fronts of cultural and socio-political interaction of the Cilician Kingdom and the Armenian Church in the region; with the Latin world, represented by both – Western Europe (with Rome and its great See of St. Peter), and Outremer (with

[44] ***Ibid.*** p. 85–86.

[45] These practices were instituted by or installed shortly before St. Nerses of Lampron became the Armenian Archbishop of Tarsus. See: **Nersès de Lampron.** *Extraits* // RHC. Arm. I. Paris, 1869, p. 596.

Antioch's central shrine also being dedicated to the Prince of the Apostles)[46]. St. Nerses of Lampron, an outstanding theologian of the Armenian Apostolic Church, received the blessing and permission to work in the scriptoria and libraries of the Eastern Orthodox monasteries in Cilicia and northern Syria[47]. When faced with criticism for introducing a variety of Latin or Byzantine elements into the Armenian Rite – from Latin miters for the bishops to the use of Greek at the services – he replied the following, "We take from the Byzantines and from the Franks whatever we consider good and right"[48]. What was taken from the Franks is still remembered; what was taken from the Byzantines is now practically forgotten and overlooked. Yet Byzantine influence remained significant. Even when it came to the main symbols of power, such as the depictions of the Armenian Kings on their coinage, Byzantine presence could be felt. Throughout the entire numismatic history of Cilician Armenia, since the coronation of Levon I the Magnificent, and up until the reign of Levon V of Lusignan, all the kings were depicted wearing Byzantine crowns with their hanging *perpendula* pearl threads.

Aside from the cultural interaction, the Chalcedonians of Cilicia were at the forefront of the theological dialogue between the Eastern Orthodox and the Armenian Apostolic Churches. During a new round of negotiations, initiated by Emperor Manuel I Komnenos, a principal role was played by the Chalcedonian Armenian abbot John Outman, who was appointed to head the imperial embassy sent to Cilicia, to the court of Catholicos Nerses IV Shnorali in 1170[49]. When this dialogue resumed in the 13th century, it was Patriarch Simeon II of Antioch who became the main intermediary in the negotiations between the Ecumenical Patriarch Hermanos II and the Armenian Catholicos Constantine I on the possibility of restoring communion between the Chalcedonians and Armenian Miaphysites (1239).

It should be stated once more that interaction between Patriarch Simeon II and the Orthodox clergy in Cilicia with the Armenians were not limited to

---

[46] For more on Antioch's Cathedral of St. Peter, see: **Brun S.P.** *The Byzantines and the Franks…* Vol. II, p. 41–55.

[47] These included the monasteries of St. Simeon (Simanakala) near Anazarb and the Greek Monastery of St. Gregory the Theologian in Betias, on Black Mountain.

[48] **Nersès de Lampron.** *Op. cit.*, p. 595.

[49] For more details on the embassy, see: **MacEvitt C.** *The Crusades and the Christian World of the East. Rough Tolerance.* Philadelphia, 2008, p. 165.

negotiations between the Ecumenical Throne and the Miaphysites. Both before and after such negotiations the clergy and laity of the Antiochian Orthodox Church – including the Patriarchs – were engaged in an incredibly friendly and close relationship with the Armenians; this was a condemnable crime in the eyes of the Antiochians' powerful Sister-Church – the Patriarchate of Constantinople. The participation of Patriarch Simeon II and the Antiochian Orthodox clergy in the Armenian celebrations and processions on the Feast of the Theophany in 1211 was an act unthinkable for a Byzantine cleric of the Great Church of Constantinople. The presence of the Eastern Orthodox hierarchs at the coronations of Armenian monarchs at Tarsus is another example of such "ecumenical" prayer services, akin to the Theophany Procession of 1211, described by Wilbrandus of Oldenburg. As said before, not only Patriarch Simeon II ibn Abu Saib, but also **three of his successors** on the Patriarchal Throne – Euphymius I, Arsenius and Cyril III – faced fierce condemnation from the Church of Constantinople for their close ties and interaction with the Armenian Miaphysites. Patriarch Euphymius I, during his stay in Constantinople, was condemned by a significant part of the Byzantine episcopate, led by the Ecumenical Patriarch Arsenius, for his theological compromises with the Armenian Church. Patriarch Arsenius was condemned for allowing communion and sharing the tithe with the King of Armenia; for this, his name was removed from the Constantinople diptychs by the Ecumenical Patriarch Gregory II the Cypriot (who himself was a former monk from Antioch). Patriarch Cyril III could not receive formal recognition in Constantinople for several years, since the Ecumenical Patriarch Athanasius III also accused him of being in communion with the Armenians.

Summing up the history of the interaction of the Antiochian Orthodox Church with the Kingdom of Armenia, let us once more remind that three Cilician bishops – Theodore, the Metropolitan of Anazarb, Dionysius, the Metropolitan of Pompeiopolis, and Dionysius, the Metropolitan of Mopsuestia (Mamistra) – were the main candidates for the Patriarchal Throne, with the latter two successfully claiming the Eastern See of St. Peter and winning the recognition of Constantinople. Three more Patriarchs of Antioch of this period – Arsenius, Cyril III and Sophronius – despite being the representatives of the Syrian-Lebanese party, won the support of the Cilician dioceses and the Armenian Kings (which cost Arsenius his Patriarchate, yet played strangely in favor of Cyril's and

Sophronius's recognition)[50]. The last in this line of Patriarchs – Ignatius II – was an Armenian himself. Overall, at least three Orthodox Patriarchs of Antioch were elected and enthroned in Cilicia[51], and no less than seven spent a significant part of their tenure in the Armenian Kingdom, among the Cilician dioceses, churches, clerics and flock[52].

There is a widespread opinion, which prevails even in the official historiography of the Antiochian Orthodox and Melchite Greek Catholic Churches, that after the destruction of Antioch by the Mamelukes in 1268, the Orthodox Patriarchs – after a brief period of "wandering" – set up their residence in Damascus. This approach lacks both accuracy and historic memory, since it completely ignores the era of Cilician dominance in the history of the Antiochian Church. It would be far more accurate to say that since the destruction of Antioch (1268), the Orthodox Patriarchs set up their main residence in Tarsus, leaving this city for prolonged visits (of either several months or even years) for their imperial metochia – the Hodegon Monastery of Constantinople, or for the cities of the Phoenician coast (Tyre and Tripoli). Since the War for the Antiochian Succession and the restoration of the Patriarchate of Antioch in the Levant under Prince Bohemond IV, Patriarch Simeon II ibn Abu Shaib set up his residences in Tarsus and Sis. Patriarch Euphymius I spent several years in Cilician Armenia, between his exile from Antioch and his flight to Constantinople. Patriarch Arsenius, being elected in Frankish territory – moved to Cilicia; his proximity to the Armenian King, as was said before, cost him his throne. Patriarchs Dionysius I and Dionysius II, who occupied the Cilician Sees of Pompeiopolis and Mamistra prior to their ascension to the Throne of St. Peter, spent practically their entire tenure in the Kingdom of Armenia. The same was true for the Armenian-blooded Patriarch Ignatius II. The Byzantine author Nikephoros Gregoras, writing in the first half of the 14th century, names Tarsus the city "where the Patriarch of

[50] Arsenius, prior to his election to the Patriarchal Throne, was the Bishop of Tripoli; Cyril III and Sophronius were Metropolitans of Tyre.

[51] Dionysius I (1287/1308) and Dionysius II (circa 1316) were most definitely elected in Cilicia. It is most likely that the election and enthronement of Arsenius (1282), Sophronius (circa 1322) and Ignatius II (1344) also took place in the Armenian Kingdom. With the latter it is more than likely. With Arsenius and Sophronius the question remains open; they might have been enthroned on the Phoenician coast, either in Tripoli or Tyre.

[52] Simeon II ibn Abu Saib, Euphymius I, Arsenius, Cyril III, Dionysius I, Dionysius II, Ignatius II.

Antioch resides for the most part"[53]. Thus, by the times of Gregoras and Ignatius II the fact that the Patriarch of Antioch resided in Tarsus was seen as tradition, not merely a precedent. Only the sack of Tarsus and the conquest of the Cilician dioceses by the Mamelukes forced Ignatius II to flee to Syria, where he was deposed and his successors made the decision to transfer the Patriarchal See to Damascus.

The patronage, which the Armenian monarchs bestowed on the Eastern Orthodox ecclesiastic hierarchy, and the status of Cilicia as the main residence of the Antiochian Patriarchs in the 13th and the first half of the 14th centuries, is perhaps the best possible testimony to the importance of Byzantines and Chalcedonian Armenians in the Kingdom of Armenia. It is noteworthy that the tradition of such patronage was established by the first King of Armenia – Levon I the Magnificent – even though this man had little reason to love Byzantium and its heritage in Cilicia. The treacherous and savagely cruel murder of Levon's own father – Stephen Roupenid, committed by the Byzantine warriors of Andronikos Komnenos on February 7th, 1169[54], did not stop the King from bestowing incredibly generous gifts on the Orthodox Church (the generosity that sparked the outrage and condemnation of both – Latin and Miaphysite authors); neither did it stop Levon I from welcoming Patriarch Simeon II at his court, allowing for the strengthening of the Eastern Orthodox aristocracy and Church in his realm, and entrusting the entire kingdom, along with his daughter and heir, to a Chacledonian Armenian – Adam of Baghras[55]. Since unification of all Cilician lands under the Roupenid Dynasty and until the 1350's the Kingdom of Armenia was the state which served as the dwelling place of numerous enclaves of the Byzantine Greeks and Chalcedonian Armenians, their city quarters, villages, fiefs,

[53] **Nicephori Gregorae.** *Byzantinae Historiae* // PG 148. Paris, 1865. Lib. XXV.

[54] The Armenian chronicler Samuel of Ani tells us that Stephen, being treacherously captured by Andronikos, was not only murdered, but boiled alive and that his mutilated body was left on the road, leading to Tarsus. See: **Samuel d'Ani.** *Extrait de la Chronographie de Samuel Ani* // RHC Arm. I. Paris, 1869. p. 454.

[55] The most notable in such texts are the letters of Pope Innocent III and the Armenian Continuation of Michael the Syrian. The author of the letter seems especially indignant at Armenian King's generosity to the Byzantines, Chalcedonian Armenians and Georgians, emphasizing the fact that not only the Armenian Apostolic Church and the Armenian people, but also Levon's family suffered greatly from their oppression; after all, the Byzantines were responsible for the deaths of the grandfather, father and uncle of the first King of Armenia.

aristocracy, monasteries, their Church, led the Patriarchs of Antioch and all the East.

The Mameluke Conquest of the Kingdom of Armenia brought unimaginable loss to the region, drastically changing its population and eradicating a major part of its cultural landscape. Waves of mass murders and destruction affected all ethnic and religious groups – Armenians, Byzantine Greeks, Franks, Syrians. Under the Ottomans, Cilicia sustained several small Orthodox enclaves, predominantly Greek. Their main centers were still in Adana, Tarsus and Seleucia[56]. Practically all of the Orthodox episcopal sees in Cilicia disappeared with the Mameluke conquest. Under the Ottomans, all of the Orthodox communities in Cilicia were united under one diocese – the joint Metropolitan Archdiocese of Tarsus and Adana[57]. Communities of Chalcedonian Armenians survived only in Anatolia and on the Euphrates river. A major part of them was united under the Metropolitan Archdiocese of Theodosiopolis (Erzerum), the northernmost diocese of the Antiochian Church. Enclaves of Greeks in Cilicia and Chalcedonian Armenians in Anatolia survived up to the early 20th century, and were eradicated during the Ottoman genocide and the Lausanne Population Exchange between Greece and the Turkish Republic in 1923.

[56] Paul of Aleppo left a brief description of his father's – Patriarch Macarius III az-Zaim's – journey through Cilicia in 1652. Archdeacon Paul noted the thriving state of the Greek community in Adana and the richness of the city's gardens, belonging to the Orthodox. He also notes that the Patriarch traveled to the parishes of Tarsus, Trimor and Jafer Pasha, as well as settlements, which he calls "the towns of the Cypriotes", which is a clear indication that the Cypriot Greeks established new colonies in the 17th century Cilicia. See: **Paul of Aleppo.** *The Travels of Macarius Patriarch of Antioch*. London, 1886, p. 5. Seleucia, at the start of the 20th century, had a population of 3,000 people, half of which were Orthodox Greeks. See: **Vailhé S.** "Seleucia Trachea" in *The Catholic Encyclopedia*. Vol. 13. New York, 1912.

[57] During the Ottoman era, at least by the 19th and early 20th centuries, the Orthodox in Cilicia were comprised almost exclusively of Greek communities, who were far more friendly to their Hellenic counterparts from the Patriarchate of Constantinople, than to the Arab-speaking hierarchs of Antiochian Church, to whose jurisdiction they belonged. It is a well-known fact that when the Arab Orthodox hierarch – Alexander Tahan, the future Patriarch of Antioch, assumed his See as Metropolitan of Tarsus and Adana (in 1903–1908), he was greeted with widespread contempt and even open aggression from his Greek flock.

ՔԱՂԿԵԴՈՆԱԿԱՆ ԵԿԵՂԵՑԻՆ ՀԱՅՈՑ ԹԱԳԱՎՈՐՈՒԹՅՈՒՆՈՒՄ

ԲՐՅՈՒՆ Ս.

Ամփոփում

Կիլիկյան Հայաստանի մասին գիտական ուսումնասիրությունները հիմնականում կենտրոնանում են Հայ առաքելական եկեղեցու հետևորդների կամ խաչակրաց արշավանքների վրա՝ անտեսելով քաղկեդոնական եկեղեցու ներկայացուցիչներին և նրանց դերը Կիլիկյան Հայաստանում: Մինչդեռ, այն իշխանները, որոնք հունական ուղղափառ եկեղեցու հետևորդներ էին, Կիլիկյան հայաստանի ֆեոդալական համակարգում ազդեցիկ տեղ էին զբաղեցնում: Ուղղափառ իշխանների ազդեցության չափը բավական տեսանելի էր XIII դարում բռնկված քաղաքացիական պատերազմների ընթացքում: Այս առումով հետաքրքրական է հայ թագավորների դիրքորոշումը ազգային եկեղեցուն հետևող իրենց հպատակների նկատմամբ, քանի որ նրանք նաև որոշակի պարտավորվածություն ունեին Հռոմեական կայսրության առաջ: Այնուամենայնիվ հայ թագավորների վարած քաղաքականությունն ուղղափառների նկատմամբ ավելի քան բարենպաստ էր, քանի որ նրանք ոչ միայն թույլ էին տալիս ուղղափառ պատրիարքների բնակությունը իրենց թագավորությունում, այլև նրանց հնարավորություն էին ընձեռում ընտրել պատրիարք և ունենալ կրոնական ազատություն: Հենց նրանց ջանքերով է, որ վերականգնվել է Անտիոքի ուղղափառ պատրիարքությունը: Նրանք նաև հովանավորում էին ուղղափառ եկեղեցու հովանու ներքո գործող մենաստանները, թեմերը և այլն:

ХАЛКЕДОНИТСКАЯ ЦЕРКОВЬ В АРМЯНСКОМ ЦАРСТВЕ

БРЮН С.

Резюме

Научные исследования о Киликийской Армении в основном посвящены последователям Армянской апостольской церкви либо крестовым походам, в то время как представители халкедонитской церкви и их роль в

Киликийской Армении так и не стали предметом научных изысканий. Между тем князья, являвшиеся последователями православной греческой церкви, были влиятельными представителями феодальной прослойки Киликийской Армении. Степень влиятельности православных князей со всей очевидностью проявилась в ходе гражданских войн в XIII в. В этой связи интересна позиция армянских царей в отношении своих подданных, являвшихся последователями Армянской апостольской церкви, поскольку они имели определенные обязательства перед Римской империей. Тем не менее политика армянских царей, проводимая по отношению к православным, была более чем благосклонной, т.к. они не только разрешали православным патриархам обосноваться в армянских царствах, но и давали им возможность избрания патриархов и свободы вероисповедания. Именно благодаря их усилиям было восстановлено православное патриаршество Антиоха, помимо этого они оказывали финансовую поддержку действующим православным монастырям и епархиям и т.д.