

THE EVOLUTION OF THE ARMENIAN PROTESTANT CHURCHES IN MUSA DAGH, 1840-1914

VAHRAM L. SHEMMASSIAN

1.

Armenians inhabited Musa Dagh, a mountain situated some 20 kilometers to the west of the biblical town of Antioch, from time immemorial. They lived in six main villages: Bitias, Haji Habibli, Yoghun Oluk, Kheder Beg, Vakef, and Kabusiye. Until the 1840s all Armenians of Musa Dagh adhered to their distinct church, variably known as the Apostolic, Orthodox, Gregorian, or National Church. But beginning with the mid-nineteenth century the uncontested supremacy of this denomination was challenged first by Protestant and then by Catholic inroads. The following paper traces the evolution of Protestant churches in Musa Dagh, excluding their role in educational matters.

The Armenian Protestant or Evangelical Church was the outgrowth of two concomitant developments that took place during the first half of the nineteenth century. On the one hand, there occurred within a small segment of Armenians, especially in Constantinople, a spiritual awakening which was at once a protest against the lethargic state of the Apostolic Church. As the latter reacted with anathemas and expulsions, in 1846 the reform group, encouraged by the propitious arrival of American missionaries, proclaimed the creation of the Armenian Protestant church. The Ottoman government recognized the new denomination as a separate *millet*¹ four years later.²

The other factor in the emergence and strengthening of the Protestant community was the proselytizing efforts of missionaries dispatched to the Levant by the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions (Board). These activities, begun in 1810, initially aimed at the pagan peoples of the Far East. Pressure exerted by the British government in India, however, occasioned a shift of focus to Persia, thence to the Holy Land, and finally to other parts in the Ottoman Empire. As Christians, the indigenous Armenians soon began to be perceived as a most convenient vehicle to convert the non-

Christians. But having witnessed 'the spiritual and moral degeneration of the Armenian Apostolic Church,' the missionaries saw a great opportunity to propagate Protestantism among the Armenians themselves, as a legitimate field.³ Thus commenced a vigorous religious, educational, medical, and relief activity that span a century. The vast area of operations was divided into the Eastern, Western, and Central Turkey Missions, with various stations and outstations. The Protestant Church of Musa Dagħ was attached first to the Antioch Station and then to the Aintab Station within the Central Turkey Mission.⁴

The first contacts between the Protestant missionaries and Musa Dagħ took place in the spring of 1840, when William M. Thomson and E. R. Beadle visited John Barker at Bitias.⁵ Thomson wrote in his diary: "The present inhabitants are all Armenians, and appear to be a peaceable and industrious class of people. As they were altogether under papal influence, and are accommodated with a watchful sentinel to defend the flock from English wolves, we found but small opportunity to distribute even the word of God."⁶ The second part of Thomson's statement reveals two things: first, he mistook the religious affiliation of the Armenians who belonged not to the Catholic ("papal") faith but to the independent national church, and second, his first attempt at proselytism failed. Be that as it may, he stayed on in the region as an itinerant evangelist during the 1840s and worked among the Armenians of Antioch, Kesab, and Musa Dagħ, urging them to read the New Testament.⁷

Toward the end of the same decade two Protestant "helpers" from Cilicia, Mister M. and Mister N., witnessed a changing trend in Bitias, where people congregated around them several hours "every night to hear the reading of the Bible and spiritual conversation." The helpers likewise met with the local parish priest, gave him a Turkish Bible upon his request, and discussed "religious subjects." Before leaving, they promised their audiences that another person would visit them soon "to explain [the Scripture] this way to them more fully."⁸

The nascent Protestant community of Kesab played an indirect role in grafting Musa Dagħ with this brand of Christianity. As one missionary recounted, in about 1853, "a young man from the village of Bitias, named Carabed [Gayegjian?], was visiting at Kesab, when Mr. Schneider happened to be spending a few days there, preaching to the small Protestant community gathered at that time. Carabed attended some of the services, and became very much interested in the truth. He afterwards went to Aintab; and there...experienced a change of heart. He returned to Bitias, and told his family and neighbors what he had seen and heard, and they became interested in the gospel."⁹ Another source referred to the connection between Kesab and Musa Dagħ in less specific terms, maintaining that the example of Protestants in the former place "was followed by other Armenian villages on the other side of the valley

of the Orontes, in Mount Pieria; first Bitias, then Habablee-yay, and then Yeghon-olok, and Kabousee-yay."¹⁰

The making of Antioch a missionary station served as further impetus to the spread of Protestantism in the region. The choice of that city was based on two considerations: its healthy climate and accessibility to the Armenian and Greek peasantry.¹¹ Therefore, "now, as in primitive times, it ought to be a missionary centre for Kessab, Bitias and other villages, not easily looked after from Aintab, Aleppo and Homs."¹² And indeed, on February 4, 1856, the missionary H. B. Morgan and his wife arrived in Antioch to take charge of the new Board station.¹³

Once established, Morgan and others visited Bitias on different occasions and came back with mixed impressions. For instance, in a letter dated April 18, 1856, Morgan reported that "there are between thirty and forty declared Protestants! As many as four or five give hopeful evidence of piety....There is a good deal of inquiry among the Armenians: and there are constant accessions to the Protestants....[These are] rude yet earnest men, who seemed really to drink in the words of evangelical instruction....They wanted light, and evidently leaned to what was scriptural and reasonable."¹⁴ In less than four months, however, Morgan painted a totally different picture with utter disappointment: "I have hoped that, on examination, we should find enough suitable persons to form a small church. But I am obliged to say that there is not a person in the community who seems to give evidence of a change of heart. Their ignorance about spiritual things is really astonishing....They have not emerged from the darkness of their old superstitions."¹⁵

Things must have changed within a year, for, on Sunday, August 30, 1857, the Protestant church of Bitias "was publicly recognized."¹⁶ Morgan, who officiated at the consecration with a colleague, described the event: "Our chapel was full in every part. Many Armenians, from the village and villages near, came to satisfy themselves on a point which has long been a subject of controversy among them, viz. whether the Protestants really celebrate the Lord's Supper. In the afternoon several children were presented for baptism."¹⁷ Before the decade was over, "there was a decided improvement" particularly among the women adherents, whose number had increased from an initial few to about forty.¹⁸

During the 1860s, the Bitias congregation multiplied by about three-folds, virtually the entire community attended Sunday school, a more spacious house of worship was constructed, and the local worker was ordained pastor.¹⁹ Nevertheless, the steady progress witnessed during the previous thirty years came to a halt in the early 1870s because of family feuds. Difficulties of socio-economic nature posed a serious problem for the missionaries, one of whom

involved in the Bitias affairs explained:

The experience of that chh. [*sic!*] is perhaps not peculiar, and therein we have another illustration of the difficulty of bringing these chhs. [*sic!*] up to a high standard of holy living and bringing them there. The defects of their early education; the frequent failure of their crops and other sources of livelihood; the huddled together state of their families when parents and it may be several sons with their wives and children all live together; the heavy taxes of the government, these and other like circumstances present great obstacles in the way of a Christian life, and till a new generation comes upon the stage, and comes too under more favorable auspices, we must expect trials in the training of these churches.²⁰

As the prevalent tensions somewhat eased by 1876, the work in Bitias became "very hopeful." Missionary Corinna Shattuck "found real activity on the part of the women and girls, and...the work among the young men was such as I have not seen in many villages of our mission."²¹ This rejuvenation led to the erection of a new church in which every member of the congregation participated irrespective of age, sex or social status.²² But the undertaking was a mixed blessing. It is true that the house "is the best proportioned and will make the most beautiful church edifice in our Mission field,"²³ nevertheless, the high construction cost exhausted the congregation's financial resources, making it impossible to complete the roof, windows, and doors.²⁴ What was more, "overstrained and their attention absorbed by such an enterprise, interest in purely spiritual things has evidently declined."²⁵ Despite the setback, however, the community's potential was considered so great that, "with even moderate care on the part of Protestantism, Armenianism will disappear from Bitias, at no distant day."²⁶ But the over-optimistic prediction did not materialize. On the contrary, not only could the Protestants not bring their Apostolic brethren within their fold, but actually the two denominations separated officially in 1881, which "was accomplished with difficulty."²⁷

During most of the 1880s and the first half of the 1890s the Bitias church was beset by external and internal troubles. Externally, two inauspicious events not only threatened a permanent division within the congregation, but also challenged seriously the Board's monopoly over it. A certain Harutium Filian caused the first tribulation. A native of Bitias studying at the Oberlin, Union and Chicago theological seminaries, Filian was ordained minister and dispatched by an American Armenian society to establish independent Protestant churches in the Antioch district.²⁸ The American missionaries already in the field were unsure as to how to treat him: "Shall he be allowed to

take possession of our churches, provided he can buy up the people? Shall I recognize his church or churches, as Evangelical and orderly? There are many more questions I could ask."²⁹ Filian's perceived "evil" influence generated by "promises and threats" answered these questions.³⁰

Perhaps more serious in its short-range repercussions was a second intrusion, in 1887, which was termed as Episcopal-Campbellite-Baptist doctrines. This movement --which "is strongly Anti-normianism crowned by baptismal regeneration through immersion, and seems to be a legitimate outcome of Calvinistic Baptist doctrine, distorted and strained through ferocious bigotry, and narrowness of conception and perception that is simply inexplicable"--began when four families from the Bitias church joined a separate Episcopal congregation run by someone who was converted allegedly for money.³¹ The Board missionaries believed, perceivably out of wishful thinking rather than conviction, that even at its initial stage this movement "seems to have spent its force" and therefore had "become wholly a matter of history."³² But it took the same missionaries more than seven years to proclaim finally, with a sigh of relief, that "we need have no special anxiety."³³ By the winter of 1894 mainstream Protestantism in Bitias had prevailed following "fiery discussions" that had led most church members to see the "spiritual truth" better.³⁴

All along these years of external meddling the internal picture was similarly bleak. In 1886, "the spiritual condition...is unspeakably sad" owing to the lack of a capable preacher.³⁵ To the regret of one missionary, what the Apostolic Armenians "have seen of Protestantism for the past few years has not affected them very favorably toward it. The Bitias church must set a better example before those around will be greatly affected."³⁶ The situation did not ameliorate through the late 1880s, as Bitias "is probably as low as any of our [Central Turkey Mission] churches, if not the very lowest."³⁷ The reasons for this bad rating were fierce disputes between the two leading families and the arbitrary appointment or dismissal of pastors by an influential elder and his sons.³⁸

After the mid-1890s, the Protestant church of Bitias yo-yoed between the satisfactory and the unsatisfactory. Status reports reveal that while "all is going well" in 1898, 1899, and the first two-thirds of 1902,³⁹ "there is more than usual of trouble between those of Church, outside of church relations" from September 1902 until March 1903.⁴⁰ But beginning that month things looked "much better than last summer,"⁴¹ and the church "has taken a great step forward."⁴² During 1904-1905, on the other hand, "there is...among a large section of the men a tendency to stay away from church and to ignore all claims of religion, which is alarming. With the women of the congregation it is

very different and they preponderate forming perhaps nearly three-fourth of the people."⁴³ And during 1905-1906, "while there have been encouraging features in the work here, the year as a whole has been a disappointment."⁴⁴

2.

Evangelical work in Haji Habibli can be traced back to the year 1860, when a native helper labored among a "considerably increased" number of sympathizers.⁴⁵ In 1872, they submitted to the general conference of the Cilicia Armenian Evangelical Union, held at Kesab, September 8-13, a petition requesting an ordained pastor and "to be formed into a church."⁴⁶ The demands were not met, for two years later the Haji Habibli people still insisted on a preacher other than that of Bitias, otherwise they would stop paying their share of his salary.⁴⁷

During the early 1880s, the number of Haji Habibli Protestants varied between twenty-two and forty persons out of a total of 1,280 inhabitants.⁴⁸ Since Apostolic "young men are constantly asking for a [Protestant] preacher while still more openly avow their dissatisfaction with the Armenian church,"⁴⁹ it was hoped that others would join the Protestant camp. But because Haji Habibli was not far from Bitias, and because of the scarcity of trained men and/or funds, it was questionable whether a pastor or a missionary could be stationed in the former place to spur such an increase. Therefore, the people of Haji Habibli were asked to unite with Bitias; they acceded only when they were told that the Board was opening new missions in Japan, China, and Africa, and contemplating to pull out of Turkey.⁵⁰ Wrote a missionary: "I entirely believe the Spirit intends that the Board shall quit these churches [like the one in Haji Habibli], as the sole remedy for arousing them to a sense of duty."⁵¹ But despite the warning, the idea of sharing a pastor with Bitias was not adopted wholeheartedly, and a bewildered evangelist remarked that Haji Habibli "has never been noted for any religious interests, strictly as such. I never knew what to do with the place, nor has the Mission."⁵²

At the turn of the century, "there was quite a movement looking toward coming over to the Protestants simply to escape the exactions of the [Apostolic] Armenians," and this change of camps "will do no harm certainly for everyone understands that they make no religious profession whatever--that it is only a case of being registered in one place rather than another."⁵³ In any case, Haji Habibli was "a very hard place" where people indulged in "worldliness," and unless they reformed themselves, "it is not worth working" there.⁵⁴ When, in 1903, a native Protestant, then living in New Jersey, asked permission to raise fund in America for a parsonage in his village, a missionary regret-

ted that "the golden opportunity for Hadji-Habebli seems to have passed and hereafter we shall have uphill work."⁵⁵ A very strong anti-Protestant feeling rendered the obstacles even more unsurmountable with the approach of World War I.⁵⁶

3.

Protestantism secured a foothold in Yoghun Oluk beginning with 1869, when a man from Bitias by the name of Movses Filian arrived to preach the gospel. After a frustrating year, four people joined him and together they succeeded in making approximately one third of the village "friends" of the Bible. The actual number of Protestant sympathizers, however, was about thirty, who were in the process of forming a religious society.⁵⁷ An American missionary followed these developments with mixed feelings, because "what I saw and learned [in Yoghun Oluk] would have given me very great satisfaction and rejoicing, if my hopes in so many Protestants elsewhere have not been disappointed."⁵⁸ Soon optimism replaced caution, however, as a larger number of people openly professed their new beliefs. So that, by April 1872 "the way seems fast preparing for the organization of a church" that would serve the people of Kheder Beg as well, and a small graveyard was purchased through native contributions.⁵⁹ Within a year a house in the village center was transformed into a chapel, and two additional buildings were secured for missionary work.⁶⁰ These preparations culminated in the establishment of the Protestant church of Yoghun Oluk sometime between 1876 and 1877.⁶¹

From the outset the missionaries demanded that the church be self-sufficient. Intimated an evangelist: "I distinctly told them I preferred they should remain [Apostolic] Armenian, than become such Protestants as they were in Kesab, for a Christianity that would not pay its expenses, when able to do, had no salvation in it, and it might as well be called one wave as another."⁶² In fact, the missionaries were so adamant in this issue that any church member who failed to pay an equitable share of his income could be expelled. Although the poorest congregation in the Central Turkey Mission, in the early years the Yoghun Oluk Protestants surprised the missionaries by their behavior in financial matters. For example, while the value of their aggregate property was a meager 35,000 Ottoman piasters, they were still able to pay 3,000 piasters for church, educational, and related needs.⁶³ Reported an amazed missionary: "So prompt are they, that at the annual settlement they had overpaid all claims and actually received back that excess, an instance of its kind that is curiously rare, I imagine, even in America" and the entire Ottoman Empire.⁶⁴

Not only were the missionaries strict in money matters with their Armenian proteges, but also in the process of admitting new adherents. Each

and every prospective member had to sign a prepared statement before witnesses to the effect that should the signatory violate any rules set by the church he or she could be expelled and the government would recognize such disciplinary action as legally binding. This "promise of obedience" stipulated: "1. 'I will attend worship every Sabbath.' 2. 'I will in business and conversation obey all Bible rules relating to the same.' 3. 'I will submit to 3 mos [*sic!*] probation before reception.' 4. 'I will pay according to my ability, as fixed by the community, all necessary taxes.' 5. 'If the community, after full investigation consider that I am deporting myself in the above and other respects so as to disgrace Protestantism, I promise a ready acquiescence in my expulsion from the Community.'"⁶⁵

After being "the most hopeful place in the C[entral] T[urkey] M[ission]" for a decade,⁶⁶ the Yoghun Oluk church gradually declined. One of the principal causes of this ebbing was things related to preachers, such as disputes over salary, misconduct, moral degeneration, and lack of aggressiveness. During the early 1880s, for instance, religious retrogression was attributed to the "folly" of "an evil intentioned man" whose departure brought calm to the disturbed congregation.⁶⁷ A worse scandal in 1887-1888 involving the preacher, the Bible woman, and the female school teacher not only outraged the community but also left it divided through the early 1890s.⁶⁸ Fortunately, the preacher was replaced by a capable pastor named Stepan Yarpuzlian (or Asaturian) who brought "great harmony" to his flock. As a result, after some soul searching, the Yoghun Oluk church cleansed itself by suspending fourteen members for periods ranging from thirteen to eighteen months and expelling outright four others. At this critical junction of revitalization, Yarpuzlian, like his predecessor, was caught in licentious conduct which did "great harm" to the church. It is true that his strained relations with his wife, sex affair with the school teacher, and erratic behavior were ultimately ascribed to a developing brain disease, nevertheless, the damage was done, "and the church could not be in a worse condition than it is now."⁶⁹

Another reason for stagnation hence weakening was the church building itself. Even before Yarpuzlian's ministry the congregation had outgrown the original, dilapidated chapel, and therefore a new prayer house was imperative. But two obstacles hindered its construction. First, the poor natives could not raise the necessary funds. Besides, American subsidy was not forthcoming; despite repeated requests for money by the missionaries, and for some reason the Board deferred "practical action." Second, it was a real hassle to go through Ottoman bureaucracy and obtain a building license. As a missionary summed up, "the inevitable in everything pertaining to Yoghonolook is the church building. The quandary now is its probable collapse, sometime in the future, and the present temper of the government: if the building is demolished, it can

not be rebuilt without a firman, and if anything fatal should occur the government could complicate matters very much for us."⁷⁰

The church building and the behavior of ministers were not the only factors in the church's downhill. After 1896 the Protestant congregation of Yoghun Oluk was "very much demoralized" as a result of the Henschakian revolutionary episode.⁷¹ What is noteworthy here, however, is the fact that the consequences of that troubled period were manifested in various forms, particularly among the males. According to a missionary, "this congregation is one that gives us more than average trouble. There are a number in the church, who glory in being free lances and their activity seems to be expanded almost without fan when there is an opportunity to do harm, and seems to move with difficulty when there is an opportunity to really help. I am urged by some members of the church to take the rod and use it unsparingly, but my observation goes to show that such courses result in harm more than good."⁷² Furthermore, whereas two decades earlier the church had manifested great enthusiasm in meeting its financial obligations, now it "has rather of an unusual trouble in getting its subscription for church expenses. A large percent refuse to give anything. A large additional number give very little and contributions of the entire church come practically from a few who are very faithful."⁷³ There was no question in the missionaries' mind that "the problem of Yoghonolook is the young men," whose conduct was influenced by the revolution and alcohol.⁷⁴ And thanks to the lack of necessary funds to introduce changes, the churches of Behesne, Antioch, and Yoghun Oluk "make us most sorry" among those in the Central Turkey Mission.⁷⁵

The women kept the Yoghun Oluk Protestant church alive. According to the 1906-1907 Aintab Station report, "there are several good women here [in Yoghun Oluk] who are real workers, though there is no one who is paid. Women's meetings are held twice a week and the church is sometimes full. Fifty to eighty Gregorian women come and are ready to listen."⁷⁶ Within two years "a real spiritual awakening...spread to the whole village," one attributed to the labors of a new, energetic pastor.⁷⁷ During his eight month tenure in 1908, "not only Yoghoon Olook church and Musa Dagh Protestants, but all the region with 6,000 inhabitants, Gregorian and Catholics, too, were led into light. Drunkards, gamblers, rascals, all sorts of people were moved. There was widespread awakening."⁷⁸ But this turnabout was short-lived, for by 1910-1911 "a little band of earnest Christian women are doing much to keep up the spiritual tone of the village. They are in fact the leaven as the men are a turbulent set."⁷⁹

Evangelical proselytism in Kheder Beg commenced and ended during the 1880s, although a small Protestant community continued to exist under the aegis of Yoghun Oluk. Despite "a most striking eagerness...manifested [in 1881 and 1882] for Protestant instruction [in Kheder Beg] religious and otherwise,"⁸⁰ the Board "uniformly declined" to "open sickly centers of work hereafter, that we are sure never to become selfsupporting...." Instead, the Board advised unpromising communities to join hands with stronger neighboring churches. Should that fail, "the Board would, at least, be clear of the reproach of feeble communities to die out."⁸¹

Kheder Beg did not have many Protestant adherents, although at various times the entire village seemed ready to listen. During 1885-1887, for example, the Yoghun Oluk pastor visited Kheder Beg on Sundays and several weekdays to preach. Significantly, the village headman and the priest's son were among "his most constant pupils." What was more, on New Year's Day, 1887, an attendance of over a thousand people from the three contiguous villages of Kheder Beg, Vakef, and (Vire) Ezzeir congregated to hear the gospel.⁸² These manifestations indicated that, had the missionaries not pursued a "policy of curtailment," Kheder Beg might become a strong Protestant center.⁸³ As things stood in 1889, however, "Hudr Bey is a sad case of a golden opportunity neglected until nearly lost."⁸⁴

Kabusiye proved the least receptive to Protestant instruction. During the 1860s, while "several individuals seem to have cordially espoused the cause of truth," no tangible success was achieved in winning over larger numbers.⁸⁵ The reason for this failure was fierce opposition on the part of Apostolic Armenians, who repeatedly annoyed and clashed with the new converts.⁸⁶ When, in 1863, "nearly all the so-called Protestants" left their church following a slander leveled at their minister, the missionaries had no choice but "to leave them for a time, hoping that there may be a better state of things ere long."⁸⁷

Whether because of this strategy, adopted out of desperation, or some other cause, things looked more promising during the following decade. In 1871, the village headman invited the visiting missionary to his house, where a large audience "listened to the various exercises of the evening with the most fixed attention." The missionary found additional gestures of good will by the headman "particularly gratifying in a village where the [Apostolic] Armenians

have hitherto manifested no friendly spirit towards the Protestants."⁸⁸ Encouraged by what he thought was a changing mood, the missionary returned to Kabusiye several times during the following year, examined a few persons, and concluded that he could soon form a church with "the hopeful cases."⁸⁹ His optimism lingered on to 1876: "There are but a few Protestants, but they and with them many [Apostolic] Armenians seem to be hungering and thirsting for the truth more than any little group I have ever seen."⁹⁰ This promising outlook notwithstanding, no Protestant church was ever organized in Kabusiye; all there had remained there by 1907 were two Protestant families.⁹¹

6.

The attitude of the Armenian Apostolic community vis-a-vis the Protestants changed from initial anger to resignation. In the early years, the Apostolic clergy and laity alike, instead of reforming their ailing institutions and thus curbing the alien religious inroads, manifested their despondency through occasional violence against their Protestant and Catholic compatriots. This reaction took the form of threats to life, beatings, stone throwing, and desecration of tombs. In Kabusiye, for instance, "the Protestants and the [Apostolic] Armenians have repeatedly come into collision,"⁹² and "the enemies of the truth have annoyed the Protestants in various ways."⁹³ Similarly, the Yoghun Oluk Protestant "brethren have encountered a good deal of opposition and persecution. Night after night stones were thrown upon the roof of the house occupied by the preacher, breaking the tiles and endangering the safety of the inmates. The storm which had been gathered for some time finally burst upon the brethren on Sabbath, the 12th [of February, 1871], when a mob, under great excitement, rushed into the place occupied as a chapel by our brethren, while they were engaged in prayer, beat them and drove them from the place. The preacher was so severely beaten that he has been nearly confined to bed ever since."⁹⁴ Four years later, a *vardapet*⁹⁵ from Malatia "collected a mob, which he first sent to demolish the grave-stones of the Protestant graveyard [in Bitias]...; and afterwards to assault the house and family of the preacher."⁹⁶ Intolerance and hatred ran even deeper in Haji Habibli, where, during the early 1900s, that is, more than sixty years, after the Protestant missionaries had set foot in Musa Dagh, "there...has been considerable petty persecution suffered at the hands of the Gregorians and this may very easily come to be very serious."⁹⁷

The victims obtained redress very painstakingly. The trial following the Yoghun Oluk incident, for example, "went on [in Antioch] for several days in a farcical manner, the culprits bribing the court with oranges and rum, and

denying all knowledge of the affair. And so, for what that appears, the thing might have gone for as many days more, or till oranges and rum were all exhausted, had not the governor come into court, taken the thing into his own hands, condemned and fined the culprits, and taken a guarantee for the future peace of the village."⁹⁸ Serving justice to the Bitias case proved another frustrating experience. It elaborated the missionary involved in the trial proceedings: "I was obliged to leave all my work at Aintab last March [1875], and made through the most terrible mud and rain to Antioch near Bitias, via Aleppo twice, to prosecute the [Apostolic] Armenians at Bitias. After 20 days of tribulation the Armenians were beaten, [illegible], and put in prison, only to be let out in 36 hrs, and my 250 miles of mud and water with a month of time, resulted in little or nothing."⁹⁹

The persecutions subsided in time, as the Apostolic Armenians, unable to put up an effective fight against the accomplished fact, learned to live alongside the other denominations, at the same time benefiting from their religious, educational, and health facilities. Thus, in 1876, the people of Kabusiye, reversing field, invited the Protestant pastor from Bitias to preach in their church. Although the local priest "was not thoroughly cordial, his congregation, as a body, were so eager for service in an open tongue he could only give place to this preacher who twice...preached to the congregation and was asked to go there the third time...."¹⁰⁰ In Yoghun Oluk, too, a missionary "was practically gratified [in 1872] to find that the storm of persecution which burst...with such violence one year ago...has passed away, that in general kindly intercourse prevails between the Protestants and the Armenians of the old Chh. [sic!], and that very considerable numbers of the latter acknowledge the truth of Protestantism."¹⁰¹ Four decades later, the priest Ter Galustian paid "a touching homage" on behalf of his Yoghun Oluk congregation to Ignace of Lyon, one of the resident Latin padres at Kheder Beg, for his indefatigable efforts at tending the sick in his dispensary without distinction to creed.¹⁰² And in Bitias in 1913, not only did the Protestants allow the Apostolics to use their chapel, but also contributed to the construction of a new Apostolic church.¹⁰³

The size of the Protestant community of Musa Dagħ varied according to time and definition. Detailed statistics pertaining to the 1890s and 1900s categorize the denomination into members or communicants, adherents, and congregation or church attendants. Communicant membership varied between a low of 146 in 1893 and a high of 200 in 1903, averaging 173 persons. Membership in Bitias (including Haji Habibli) was slightly higher than in Yoghun Oluk (including Kheder Beg and Kabusiye). Overall, males exceeded females by a ratio of about two to one, although at times females constituted a majority. Adherents to Protestantism, averaging 577 persons between a low of 310 in 1890 and a high of 660 in 1906, preponderated over church membership

by a margin of more than three to one and formed about 8-10 percent of the entire population of Musa Dagh. Finally, the congregation attending church on any given Sunday averaged 401, slightly trailed by 382 Sabbath School goers.¹⁰⁴ These figures shrank during the years of World War I due to the deportation and subsequent decimation of several Protestant families from Bitias and the emigration of other households from the refugee camp at Port Said to the United States. As a result, when the survivors repatriated to Musa Dagh in 1919, the Protestant community functioned in a weaker state.

NOTES

1. Civil religious community.
2. For the emergence and evolution of the Armenian Evangelical Church, consult Leon Arpee, *A Century of Armenian Protestantism, 1846-1946*, New York, 1947; Yeghya S. Kassouny, *Lusashavigh: Patmutiun Hay Avetaranakan Sharjman, 1846-1946*, Beirut, 1947; Tigran J. Kherlobian, *Voskematyan: Patmutioun Merdz[avor] Arevelki Hay Avet[aranakan] Mioutyan*, 2 vols., Beirut, 1950; Vahan H. Tootikian, *The Armenian Evangelical Church*, Detroit, Michigan, 1982; idem, "The Genesis of Armenian Evangelism," *Haigazian Armenological Review*, vol. 14, 1994, pp. 169-194.
3. Thomas Otakar Kutvirt "The Emergence and Acceptance of Armenia as a Legitimate Missionary Field," *The Armenian Review*, vol. 37, no. 3, Autumn, 1984, pp. 7-32; idem, "The Development of the Mission to the Armenians at Constantinople through 1846," *The Armenian Review*, vol. 37, no. 4, Winter, 1984, pp. 31-62.
4. The Central Turkey Mission encompassed Cilicia, north Syria, and adjacent districts.
5. *The Missionary Herald*, vol. XXXVII, no. 5, May, 1841, p. 207, no. 6, June, 1841, p. 236. John Barker was a retired British diplomat who possessed a summer resort at Bitias and a cottage and orchards at Kheder Beg.
6. *The Missionary Herald*, vol. XXXVII, no. 6, June, 1841, p. 236.
7. H. Petermann, *Reisen im Orient*, vol. II, Leipzig, 1861, pp. 366-367; William M. Thomson, "Travels in Northern Syria: Description of Seleucia, Antioch, Aleppo, etc." *Bibliotheca Sacra and Theological Review*, vol. 5, New York, 1848, pp. 451-452.
8. *The Missionary Herald*, vol. XXXIV, no. 1, January, 1848, pp. 18, 20-22.
9. *Ibid.*, vol. LII, no. 8, August, 1856, p. 229. For a different version of this story, see Kherlobian, *Voskematyan*, I, p. 338.
10. John Barker, *Syria and Egypt under the Last Five Sultans of Turkey: Being Experiences, during Fifty Years, of Mr. Consul-General Barker*, Edward B. B. Barker, ed., vol. II, London, 1876, pp. 279-282. See also the archives of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, Harvard University, Houghton Library, Cambridge, Massachusetts: 16.9.5, vol. 6, Hovsep Apelian to Aintab Station Conference, received January 10, 1889. Hereafter cited as ABCFM, ABC.
11. *The Missionary Herald*, vol. XXXVIII, no. 2, February 18, 1852, p. 38; vol. LII, no. 10, October, 1856, p. 317.
12. *Ibid.*, vol. LII, no. 2, February, 1856, p. 36.

13. *Ibid.*, vol. LII, no. 4, April, 1856, p. 123; no. 5, May, 1856, p. 156. The Antioch Station was responsible for the following three districts: the northern district, including Adana and Tarsus; the middle district, including Antioch and Musa Dag; and the southern district, including Kesab. *Idem*, vol. LIV, no. 9, September, 1858, p. 267.
14. *Ibid.*, vol. LII, no. 8, August, 1856, p. 229. See also *idem*, vol. LI, no. 8, August, 1855, pp. 239-240; vol. LII, no. 7, July, 1856, p. 209; no. 9, September, 1856, p. 271.
15. *Ibid.*, vol. LII, no. 10, October, 1856, pp. 316-317.
16. *Ibid.*, vol. LIII, no. 12, December, 1857, p. 405.
17. *Ibid.*
18. *Ibid.*, vol. LIV, no. 9, September, 1858, p. 268; vol. LV, no. 2, February, 1859, p. 59.
19. *Ibid.*, vol. LVI, no. 9, September, 1860, p. 266; vol. LVII, no. 9, September, 1861, p. 279; vol. LIX, no. 7, July, 1863, p. 217; no. 9, September, 1863, p. 275.
20. ABCFM, ABC: 16.9.5, vol. 4, P.O. Powers to N. G. Clark, March 19, 1872. On this period see also *idem*, vol. 3, P. O. Powers, Report of the Antioch Station, April, 1872; *idem*, L. Adams to N. G. Clark, December 25, 1872, July 4, 1873, and October 22, 1874.
21. *Ibid.*, vol. 4, Corinna Shattuck to N. G. Clark, October 17, 1876.
22. *The Missionary Herald*, vol. LXXIV, no. 7, August, 1878, p. 258.
23. ABCFM, ABC: 16.9.5, vol. 3, Lucien Adams to N. G. Clark, February 27, 1880.
24. *Ibid.*; *idem*, Lucien Adams, Report of the Antioch Portion of the Aintab Station, April, 1880; *idem*, vol. 6, Lucien Adams, Report of the Antioch Field, April 22, 1881; *idem*, Lucien Adams to N. G. Clark, September 6, 1880; *idem*, Lucien Adams, Report Antioch Field, 1881-1882, prepared April 20, 1882; *idem*, Lucien Adams to N. G. Clark, February 11, 1882.
25. *Ibid.*, vol. 3, Lucien Adams, Report of the Antioch Portion of the Aintab Station, April, 1880.
26. *Ibid.*
27. *Ibid.*, vol. 6, Lucien Adams, Report of the Antioch Field, April 22, 1881.
28. *Ibid.*, L. Adams to N. G. Clark, July 13, 1883, and October 31, 1883.
29. *Ibid.*, July 13, 1883.
30. *Ibid.*, October 31, 1883.
31. *Ibid.*, vol. 10, L. H. Adams, Report of the Antioch Field, 12 mos [sic], June, 1893; *idem*, vol. 6, C. S. Sanders, Report of Aintab Station, C. T. M. for Ten and One Half Months Ending April 16, 1888.
32. *Ibid.*, vol. 6, C. S. Sanders, Report of Aintab Station, C. T. M. [Central Turkey Mission], for Thirteen Months Ending May 16, 1889.
33. *Ibid.*, vol. 10, L.H. Adams, Report of Antioch Field, 12 mos, June, 1893.
34. *Ibid.*, L. H. Adams, Antioch Field Report, July 1893-June 1894. For additional details relating to the Baptist movement in Bitias, see *idem*, vol. 11, L. H. Adams to Judson Smith, May 24, 1890, December 29, 1890, and August 27, 1891; *idem*, vol. 10, Report of Antioch Field, 1891-92, June 30, 1892; Near East School of Theology (NEST) Archives, "Giligya Ittihad ve Merkezi Türkiye Muhtelit Meclislerinin Muzakerat ve Mukarreratinin Kuyudat Defteri Dir [1892-1905]," p. 83. Hereafter cited as NEST archive. The leader of the movement in Bitias was Movses Filian. Locally the Baptists were known as *Vaftisakan* or *Taknakan*, *takna* or *tekne* mean-

ing trough.

35. ABCFM, ABC: 16.9.5, vol. 6, C. S. Sanders, Report of Aintab Station for 11 Months Ending May 31, 1886.
36. *Ibid.*
37. *Ibid.*, C. S. Sanders, Report of Aintab Station for Year Ending May 25, 1887.
38. *Ibid.*; idem, C. S. Sanders, Report of Aintab Station, C. T. M., for Thirteen Months Ending May 16, 1889.
39. *Ibid.*, vol. 14, C. S. Sanders to Judson Smith, September 20, 1898, and April 17, 1899; idem, vol. 16, Annual Report Aintab Station, July 1901-June 1902; idem, vol. 20, C. S. Sanders to Judson Smith, April 18, 1902. In 1898, the echoes of a strong spiritual awakening in Aintab reverberated in Bitias, too. Sedrak K. Matosian, *Ayntapi Kristosiasirats Enkerutyoun*, 1896-1935, Aleppo, 1935, p. 18.
40. ABCFM, ABC: 16.9.5, vol. 20, C. S. Sanders to Judson Smith, September 23, 1902.
41. *Ibid.*, March 11, 1903.
42. *Ibid.*, vol. 16, C. S. Sanders, Report of Aintab Station, July 1903-June 1904.
43. *Ibid.*, C. S. Sanders, Report of Aintab Station, July 1904-June 1905.
44. *Ibid.*, C. S. Sanders, Report of Aintab Station, July 1905-April 15, 1906. For Bitias church activities in 1906-1907, consult idem, John Merrill, Report of Aintab Station for the Year 1906-July 1907; idem, Isabel J. Merrill, Report of Woman's Work in Aintab Station (Oorfa and Kessab Not Being Included), 1906-7.
45. *The Missionary Herald*, vol. LVI, no. 9, September, 1860, p. 266. A year later the number of the Protestants was put at twenty-six, and by the summer of 1863 "the Sabbath congregation is 28." See, respectively, idem, vol. LVII, no. 9, September, 1861, p. 279. and vol. LIX, no. 7, July, 1863, p. 217.
46. *Ibid.*, vol. LXX, no. 1, January, 1874, p. 22.
47. ABCFM, ABC: 16.9.5, vol. 3, L. Adams to N. G. Clark, January 30, 1874.
48. *Ibid.*, vol. 6, Lucien Adams, Report of the Antioch Field, April 22, 1881; idem, Lucien H. Adams, Report Antioch Field, 1881-82, April 20, 1882.
49. *Ibid.*, Lucien Adams, Report of the Antioch Field, April 22, 1881.
50. *Ibid.*
51. *Ibid.*, Lucien Adams to N. G. Clark, November 5, 1884.
52. *Ibid.*, vol. 11, L. H. Adams to Judson Smith, May 24, 1890. Although in 1887 and 1888 the Haji Habibli people were "beginning to show a better spirit" and "great improvement," in 1889 they "withdrew [their cooperation with Bitias], their reasons however being trivial." Idem, vol. 6, C. S. Sanders, Report of Aintab Station for Year Ending May 25, 1887; idem, C. S. Sanders, Report of Aintab Station, C. T. M., for Ten and One Half Months Ending April 16, 1888; idem, C. S. Sanders, Report of Aintab Station, C. T. M., for Thirteen Months Ending May 16, 1889.
53. *Ibid.*, vol. 20, C. S. Sanders to Judson Smith, April 18, 1902.
54. *Ibid.*; idem, September 23, 1902.
55. *Ibid.*, March 11, 1903.
56. *Ibid.*, vol. 16, C. S. Sanders, General Report of Aintab Station, July 1902-June 1903; idem, C. S. Sanders, Report of Aintab Station, July 1903-June 1904.
57. Movses Filian, "Yoghun Oluk," *Avetaber*, March 8, 1871, pp. 39-40. According to Karapet Guntagjian, "Yogun Oluk Kilisenin Tarihi," *Nor Avetaber*, vol. 2, no. 16, August 17, 1929, pp. 459-460, Protestantism in Yoghun Oluk commenced in 1868, worship services took place at the home of a certain Ateshian, and the first minister

- was Hovsep Gayegjian from Bitias. On the other hand, Karapet Tilkian, "Yoghun-Oluk," *Nor Avetaber*, vol. 3, no. 3, February 21, 1930, p. 62, maintains that the Evangelical movement in Yoghun Oluk began in 1870.
58. ABCFM, ABC: 16.9.5, vol. 4, P. O. Powers to N. G. Clark, March 1, 1872; *The Missionary Herald*, vol. LXVIII, no. 7, July, 1872, p. 215.
 59. ABCFM, ABC: 16.9.5, vol. 3, P. O. Powers, Report of the Antioch Station, April, 1872.
 60. *Ibid.*, Lucien Adams to N. G. Clark, July 4, 1873.
 61. S. Terzian, "Kilikio Avetaranakan yekeghetsinerun hisnamya hamarot patmutiun," *Avetaber*, January 7, 1905, p. 15.
 62. ABCFM, ABC: 16.9.5, vol. 3, Lucien Adams to N. G. Clark, December 25, 1872.
 63. *Ibid.*, February 27, 1880. On a different occasion Adams estimated the aggregate property of the Yoghun Oluk congregation at 48,000 piasters. *Idem*, Lucien Adams, Report of the Antioch Portion of the Aintab Station, April, 1880.
 64. *Ibid.* Not only in Yoghun Oluk, but also in other localities in Musa Dagħ did the missionaries insist that the local churches participate in the defrayment of their expenses. It is true that most of the money came from the United States; nevertheless, the natives did contribute to the upkeep of their churches.
 65. ABCFM, ABC: 16.9.5, vol. 6, Lucien Adams to N. G. Clark, September 6, 1880. Elsewhere Adams indicates seven rules instead of five, but he fails to mention the additional two. *Idem*, Lucien Adams, Report of the Antioch Field, April 22, 1881.
 66. *Ibid.*, vol. 3, Lucien Adams to N. G. Clark, April 6, 1880.
 67. *Ibid.*, vol. 6, Lucien Adams to N. G. Clark, February 11, 1882, January 5, 1883, and October 31, 1883.
 68. *Ibid.*, C. S. Sanders. Report of Aintab Station for Year Ending May 25, 1887; *idem*, Report of Aintab Station, C. T. M., for Ten and One Half Months Ending April 16, 1888; *idem*, vol. 11, L. H. Adams to Judson Smith, May 24, 1890; *idem*, vol. 10, L. H. Adams, Report of the Antioch Field, 1890-91, May 25, 1891; *idem*, Report of Antioch Field, 1891-92, June 30, 1892. It was probably this minister whose scandalous conduct became the subject of ridicule: "*Vara, vara, vardik kuru kastala/ Benden selam sōyle, Hoca Yestera/Yester bir yana, Anna bir yana/ Topal mey-dana.*" Translation: "We gradually approached the dry fountain and saw the Lame (pastor) in between the two female teachers, Yester and Anna. Send our regards to Yester." Interview with Marta Sherpetjian Shemmasian, August 1, 1977, Ainjar, Lebanon.
 69. ABCFM, ABC: 16.9.5, vol. 10, L. H. Adams, Report of Antioch Field, 1891-92, June 30, 1892; *idem*, L. H. Adams, Report of the Antioch Field, 12 Mos [*sic*!], June, 1893; *idem*, vol. 14, C. S. Sanders to Judson Smith, September 20, 1898; *idem*, C. S. Sanders to Bro[ther] Barton, April 27, 1898; NEST Archives, "Giligya Ittihad Defteri," pp. 17-18, 34-35, 71, 73, 80, 121.
 70. ABCFM, ABC: 16.9.5, vol. 6, C. S. Sanders, Report of Aintab Station for Year Ending May 25, 1887; *idem*, L. H. Adams, Report of Aintab Station, C. T. M., for Ten and One Half Months Ending April 16, 1888; *idem*, vol. 11, L. H. Adams to Judson Smith, May 24, 1890; *idem* vol. 10, L. H. Adams, Report of the Antioch Field, 1890-91, May 25, 1891; *idem*, L. H. Adams, Report of Antioch Field, 1891-92.
 71. *Ibid.*, vol. 14, C. S. Sanders to Judson Smith, September 20, 1898. On the

Henchakian revolutionary episode in Musa Dagh, consult Vahram Leon Shemmassian, "The Armenian Villagers of Musa Dagh: A Historical-Ethnographic Study, 1840-1915" (Ph. D. Dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1996), pp. 132-159. Hereafter cited as Shemmassian, "The Armenian villagers of Musa Dagh."

72. *Ibid.*, Vol. 14, C. S. Sanders to Judson Smith, August 30, 1899.
73. *Ibid.*, vol. 20, C. S. Sanders to Judson Smith, March 11, 1903.
74. *Ibid.*, vol. 16, C. S. Sanders, Report of Aintab Station, C. T. M., July 1905-April 15, 1906.
75. *Ibid.*, vol. 19, John Merrill to Enoch F. Bell, August 9, 1907; *idem.* [John Merrill?] to James L. Barton, February 28, 1908.
76. *Ibid.*, vol. 16, Isabel J. Merrill, Report of Woman's Work in Aintab Station (Oorfa and Kessab Not Being Included), 1906-7, July 5, 1907.; *idem.*, vol. 19, John Merrill to Enoch F. Bell, May 21, 1907.
77. *Ibid.*, 16.9.6, vol. 1, Isabel M. Blake, Report of Educational Work in Aintab Station, 1908-1909.
78. *Ibid.*, 3.3, vol. 9, Rev. Koundakjian to James L. Barton, April 29, 1913.
79. *Ibid.*, 16.9.6, vol. 1, Lucile Foreman, Report of Woman's Work in Aintab Station, 1910-11. This "little band" was actually a women's society that included Protestant and Apostolic members alike. The society's constitution and by-laws were posted on the parsonage wall. Adherence to the guidelines was strictly pursued. For example, a woman was expelled because of her unbecoming Christian conduct during a minor dispute concerning taking turns at a fountain. The society held parties and staged dramas; money saved from such activities and membership dues was donated to the church and school. The following were some of the members: Nuritza Gppurian (president), Nektar Guyumjian (treasurer), Elmast Gppurian, Zaruhi Gapaian, Elmast Pursalian, Sima Pursalian, Rosa Guyumjian, Haykanush Guyumjian, Nuritza Apajian, Nevard Apajian, Zaruhi Pezkelian, Yeranuhi Gazanjian, and Marta Sherpetjian-Shemmassian. *Interview with Shemmassian.*
80. ABCFM, ABC: 16.9.5, vol. 6, Lucien H. Adams, Report of Antioch Field, 1881-1882 April.
81. *Ibid.*, Lucien H. Adams to N. G. Clark, October 31, 1883.
82. *Ibid.*, Report of Aintab Station for 11 Months Ending May 31, 1886; *idem.* C. S. Sanders, Report of Aintab Station for Year Ending May 25, 1887.
83. *Ibid.*, C. S. Sanders, Report of Aintab Station, C. T. M., for Ten and One Half Months Ending April 16, 1888.
84. *Ibid.*, C. S. Sanders, Report of Aintab Station, C. T. M., for Thirteen Months Ending May 16, 1889.
85. *The Missionary Herald*, vol. LVI, no. 9, September, 1860, p. 279; vol. LVII, no. 9, September, 1861, p. 279.
86. *Ibid.*, vol. LVI, no. 9, September, 1860, p. 279; vol. LVIII, no. 8, August, 1862, p. 248.
87. *Ibid.*, vol. LIX, no. 7, July, 1863, p. 217.
88. *Ibid.*, vol. LXVII, no. 5, May, 1871, p. 144.
89. *Ibid.*, vol. LXVIII, no. 7, July, 1872, pp. 215-216; ABCFM, ABC: 16.9.5, vol. 4, P. O. Powers to N.G. Clark, March 1, 1872.
90. ABCFM, ABC: 16.9.5, vol. 4, Corinna Shattuck to N. G. Clark, October 17, 1876.

91. *Ibid.*, vol. 16, Isabel J. Merrill, Report of Woman's Work in Aintab Station (Oorfa and Kessab Not Being Included), 1906-1907.
92. *The Missionary Herald*, vol. LVI, no. 9, September, 1860, p. 266.
93. *Ibid.*, vol. LVIII, no. 8, August, 1862, p. 248.
94. *Ibid.*, vol. LXVII, no. 6, June, 1871, p. 173. See also "Yoghun Oluk," *Avetaber*, vol. 24, no. 30, July 26, 1871, p. 119.
95. A celibate priest of the Armenian Apostolic Church.
96. *The Missionary Herald*, vol. LXXI, no. 6, June, 1875, p. 172.
97. ABCFM, ABC: 16.9.5, vol. 16, C. S. Sanders, General Report of Aintab Station, July 1902-June 30, 1903. See also *idem*, C. S. Sanders, Report of Aintab Station, July 1903-June 1904; *idem*, vol. 20, C. S. Sanders to Judson Smith, March 11, 1903.
98. *The Missionary Herald*, vol. LXVII, no. 6, June, 1871, p. 173.
99. ABCFM, ABC: 16.9.5, vol. 3, L. Adams to N. G. Clark, August 5, 1875. According to a Bitias church report submitted to the Cilicia Evangelical Union conference held at Aintab in June 1894, the Apostolic Armenians continued to annoy the Protestants to some extent, but the latter were advised to ignore such disturbances. Nest Archives, "Giligya Ittihad Defteri," p. 116.
100. ABCFM, ABC, 16.9.5, vol. 4, Corinna Shattuck to N. G. Clark, October 17, 1876.
101. *Ibid.*, P. O. Powers to N. G. Clark, March 1, 1872; *The Missionary Herald*, vol. LXVIII, no. 7, July, 1872, p. 215. For more on improved Apostolic-Protestant relationships in Yoghun Oluk two decades later, see NEST Archives, "Giligya Ittihad Defteri," pp. 35, 80.
102. R. P. Jérôme, "Touchant hommage à un missionnaire," *Les Missions Catholiques*, vol. 44, no. 2270, Decembre 6, 1912, pp. 577-578.
103. "Bitiyastan Mektup," *Rahnuma*, vol. 3, no. 10, March 7, 1913, pp. 235-236.
104. For details, see Shemmassian, "The Armenian Villagers of Musa Dag," pp. 94-97, Table IV.

V. L. SH.

ՄՈՒՍԱ ԼԵՐԱՆ ՀԱՅ ԲՈՂՈՔԱԿԱՆ
ԵԿԵՂԵՑԻՆԵՐՈՒՆ ՀՈԼՈՎՈՅԹԸ
1840–1914

(ԱՄՓՈՓՈՒՄ)

ՎԱՀՐԱՄ Լ. ՇԵՍՏԱՍԵԱՆ

Մուսա լերան վրայ հայերը կը բնակէին հիմնական վեց գիւղերու՝ Պիթիասի, Հաճի Հապիպլիի, Եողուն Օլուգի, Խըտըր Պէկի, Վազըֆի եւ Քեպուսիէի մէջ, ուր անտարանական շարժումն սկսաւ միայն 1840ական թուականներուն, որպէս հետեւանք մախ Պոլսոյ մէջ սկսած հոգեւոր արթնութեան, որ ձեւով մը կը հակադրուէր Մայր Եկեղեցիի լծացումին, եւ ապա Ամերիկեան Պորտ Ընկերակցութեան արեւելք դրկած միսիոնարներու ճիգերուն։ Սկզբնական օրերուն Անտիոքի մէջ առկայութեան կոշտող թոյլ կազմակերպութենէ մըն էր, որ յետագային անհիկա պիտի փորձէր արմատ մետել մախ Պիթիասի եւ Հաճի Հապիպլիի մէջ 1860ական թուականներուն, ուրկէ շարժումը պիտի տարածուէր Եողուն Օլուգ (1869), Խըտըր Պէկ եւ Վազըֆ (1880ականներուն) եւ Քեպուսիէ՝ քչիկ մը անելի ուշ՝ 1871ին։ Այսուհանդերձ՝ դիւրին չեղաւ հաստատումը Անտարանականութեան, որ ապրեցաւ բաւական վերիվայրումներ։ Այս էր պատճառը, որ տեղուոյն վրայ հաստատուած միսիոնարներ մէկէ անելի անգամներ ստիպուած ըլլային յետս կոչելու առջի խանդավառութիւնը իրենց սկզբնական տեղեկագիրներուն, որոնք միշտ ալ առաքուեցան Այնթապի Կեղրոնական Թուրքիոյ առաքելութիւնը՝ անկէ փոխանցուելու համար կեղրոն՝ Պոսթոն։

Դժուար սկսուած եւ դժուար ալ արմատաւորուող այս շարժումն ըստ տուեալներու 1906ին կը հաշուէր մօտ 675, այսինքն Մուսա Լերան հայ բնակչութեան գրեթէ 8–10 տոկոսը, իսկ Սր. Գիրքի շաբաթօրեայ սերտողութեան կը հետեւէին 382 եւ Կիրակնօրեայ Դպրոցին 401 հայեր եւ հայուհիներ։ «Այս թիւերը սակայն, – կ'եզրակացնէ հեղինակը, – կծկուեցան Համաշխարհային Առաջին Պատերազմի տարիներուն գաղթականութեան պատճառով եւ անոր յաջորդող Պիթիասի կարգ մը բողոքական ընտանիքներուն տասանորդումով, եւ Փոքր Սայիտ հաստատուած գաղթական այլ ընտանիքներու Միացեալ Նահանգներ գաղթով։ Առ այդ՝ երբ 1919ին վերապրողներ վերադարձան Մուսա լեռ՝ բողոքական համայնքը գործի անցաւ տկարացած վիճակով»։

