ROBERT DULGARIAN

CONCILIATIO AUT DISTINCTIO: PRELIMINARY OBSERVATIONS ON HISTORY AND THEOLOGICAL METHOD IN CLEMENS GALANUS' CONCILIATIO ECCLESIÆ ARMENÆ CUM ROMANA (ROME, 1650-1661)

This article offers a preliminary assessment of the relation between the historical and controversial parts of the *Conciliatio ecclesiæ armenæ cum romana, ex ipsis armenorum patrum et doctorum testimoniis, in duas Partes, Historialem, & Controversialem divisæ* of Clemens Galanus Surrentinus (Clemente Galano da Sorrento, in the vernacular), published bilingually (in Latin and Armenian) at Rome in three volumes between 1650 and 1661. While the *Conciliatio* has figured tangentially in a number of studies of Armenian-Western relations in the period between the Council of Florence in 1438 and the notional posing of the 'Eastern Question' in conjunction with the Russian defeat of the Ottomans in 1774, no systematic evaluation of Galanus's work has been undertaken to date. Quite obviously, such an evaluation would necessarily attempt to trace the Armenian sources that Galanus uses for the historical part of his work: identifying these sources is a necessary step in evaluating the somewhat tendentious interconfessional history that Galanus narrates. But equally important would be a thorough evaluation of the arguments and analyses that comprise the *Pars controversialis* of Galanus's *Conciliatio*. I shall suggest that Galanus's philosophical analysis of apparent points at issue between the Armenian and Roman churches reveals a methodological fissure at the heart of his project. On the one hand, the goal of a rapprochement between the churches, even if a rapprochement achieved by evangelization, would seem to demand a reassessment of the contemporary positions, in discipline no less than in doctrine, of the two churches. Practically speaking, the linguistic and logical resources which Galanus by 1650 had shown himself committed to developing would seem an important initial step in such a process; but further steps would seem to imply the creative application of the considerable intellectual

resources of the Roman Catholic church, as demonstrated in the range of scholarship demonstrated by its adherents in the earlier seventeenth century. But on the other hand, the intellectual demands put upon the Roman Church by its confrontation with Protestantism, and the commitments (intellectual as well as doctrinal) to which this confrontation had more or less unshakeably committed Rome by the 1640s and 1650s would prove an almost insurmountable barrier to the sort of rapprochement with the East which the *Conciliatio* by its very title announces itself interested. I shall attempt to outline *infra* how the *Conciliatio* bears the traces of this unfortunate paradox.

The *Conciliatio* can aptly be described in two related but different ways: as one of a series of publications documenting the engagement of Galanus (and by extension the Roman Catholic Church) with the Armenian East, an engagement marked by but perhaps not entirely subordinated to the demands of evangelization; and as a discrete official publication of the Sacra Congregatio de Propaganda Fidei, the branch of the Roman Church to which Galanus was attached as a 'regular'. Galanus's publication history dates from 1645, with the *Grammaticæ, & Logicæ Institutiones Linguæ Literalis Armenicæ Armenis Traditæ*, a combined text in Armenian grammar and Aristotelian logic. The three volumes of the *Conciliatio* itself follow in 1650, 1658, and 1662; while the *Grammatica* saw at least one more edition (Dublin, 1660). Finally, 1686 saw the publication of *Clementis Galani, Surretini, clerici regularis theologi, et S. Sedis Apostolicae ad Armenos missionarij, Historia Armena, ecclesiastica & politica* in Cologne. With the addition of his own testimony of more than ten years' travels as a missionary in the East, the traces of Galanus's Armenian experience argue no mean commitment[1].

Yet the *Conciliatio* is also very much an official publication of the Sacra Congregatio de Propaganda Fidei, the department of the Roman Catholic Church charged with responsibility over regions in which the Church lacked primary ecclesiastical jurisdiction: its very name announces evangelization as its primary directive. The title page of each volume of the *Conciliatio* (as indeed of the 1645 *Logica*) names Galanus as 'clericus regularis theologicus et Sanctæ Sedis Apostolicæ ad Arme-

---

[1] Virgil Strohmeyer's work on Teodoro Ambrogio offers a number of assessments of Galanus's debt to Ambrogio's Armenian grammar but has little to say about the relation of the logic portion of Galanus's treatise to the state of the discipline in Galanus's day: see **Strohmeyer** *Influence*, 79-91.

nos missionarius', i.e. as theologian attached, as to a religious order, to the Sacra Congregatio itself, and missionary to the Armenians under the authority of the Holy See. Each volume bears a series of *approbationes* of the Congregatio and of other officials of the Apostolic See itself (including, in both Latin and Armenian, the Armenian Dominican 'Gregorius Zuorzorensis', *armenicè* Գրիգոր Մնձնրէցի: *Conciliatio* I.[b3v-b4r]. Galanus, too, is at some pains to stress his dual qualification as missionary eyewitness and official of the Sacra Congregatio: in an illuminating passage in the Preface of the *Pars historialis*, Galanus describes his twelve years' travel as a missionary and scholar, consulting manuscripts (as he writes) among the Arabs in Syria; in Lesser and Greater Armenia; in Iberia amongst the Georgians; in Pontus amongst the Colchians; then having passed twice over the black Sea, in Scythia amongst the Getæ; in Ionia amongst the Smyrnæans; in Constantinopolitan Thrace; and at last here in Rome, where, at the order of the Sacra Congregatio de Propaganda Fidei, I busy myself with teaching sacred Theology to Armenian students in their own language[2].

The last item in Galanus's curriculum, his teaching duties, may go some way to explaining the intervals separating the publication of the several volumes of the *Conciliatio*, particularly the eight years' hiatus between the appearance of the *Pars historialis* and that of the first volume of the *Pars controversialis*. The official character of the work, with its weight of *approbationes*, also suggests a possible burden of scrutiny upon the writer. Moreover, as shall appear *infra*, the composition of the *Pars controversialis* clearly proceeded along a radically different plan than that of the *Pars historialis*, possibly one less congenial to Galanus's particular talents. Yet the two *partes*, however different in approach, turn out to be not only structurally, but logically complementary. While the *Pars controversialis* seems the more obviously 'wrongheaded' given the project's stated aim of 'conciliation', the *Pars historialis* holds a key to certain of the peculiarities of its successor volumes.

---

[2] '[…] duodecim iugiter annos diversatus sum, eorumque libros evolvis in Syria apud Arabes; in Minori & Majori Armenia; in Iberia apud Georgianos; in Ponto apud Colchos; tum nigro bis trajecte Gurgite; in Scythia apud Getas; in Ionia apud Smyrnensis; in Thracia Constantinopoli; atque demum hic Romæ, ubi, Sacra Congregatione de Fide Propagatione mandante, in sacram Theologiam Armenis discipulis proprio ipsorum idiomate explicandam incumbo': *Conciliatio* I.2; cf. I sig. b2.

The *Conciliationis Pars historialis* merits a separate study on a number of grounds. Most obviously, it is a striking example of bilingual (Armenian-Roman) printing. Apart from the Latin *approbationes*, the volume is printed bilingually in Latin and Armenian. After sequential indices near the front of the volume (the Latin at sigs. c[1r]-e2v, the Armenian from [e3v] to [h4v]), printing is bicolumnar throughout. Pagination runs from 1 to 531 with a single unpaginated list of errata on the last verso. The *Pars historialis* is also a potential treasure trove of documentary sources. The text is organized in brief historical narrations ('*Historia*') interspersed with much longer annotations ('Annotatio'). Galanus's 'Preface' ('Præfatio') claims to have drawn the historical narrations from 'other Armenian and Latin historians' (or 'from other historians of the Armenians and Latins' ('ex alijs Armeniorum, & Latinorum historiis depromptis': I.2) and to have supplied his own annotations. Notably, Robert Thomson's *Bibliography of Classical Armenian Literature* cites Galanus as a primary source for two historical documents: Grigor Anawarze'ci's 'Letter to King Het'um II' (Galanus I.435-451) and a forgery purporting to be diplomatic letter between the Armenians and Romans at the time of Trdat (Galanus I.35-39) (Thomson 125, 149). A full analysis of Galanus's sources would presumably reveal valuable information about the Armenian MS resources of the earlier seventeenth century.

Yet the narrative of the *Pars historialis* is strikingly curtailed: beginning with the first-century evangelization of Armenia by Thaddeus and Bartholomew, Galanus annotates twenty-eight chapters' worth of brief historical narratives and documentary quotations up the Council of Adana of 1316 (*Conciliatio* 1.471-508); the remaining three hundred forty-odd years until the publication of the *Conciliatio* occupy a mere twenty-three pages, and concentrate on the aftermath of the Council of Adana. Given Galanus's experience in Armenian lands, one might well have expected the *Pars historialis* to culminate in an account of Western missionary activity in historic Armenia: not least, perhaps, to account for the presence of the Armenian (or at least Armenophone) students whose education, in his own testimony, seems to occupy Galanus's time. Moreover, Galanus overtly couches his vehemence in the cause of Armenian evangelization in historical terms: to choose one nicely rhetorical example, Galanus's dedicatory epistle (addressed to Cardinal Aloysius Capponius) refers to the Armenians as a Nation of which the stinking sore of heresy

has putrefied for twelve centuries, since the Council of Chalcedon, without timely medicine: nor has any Samaritan been found, who, moved by mercy, should dress it, in Armenian letters, with the balm of wisdom and gentle confutation, to cleanse it with the wine of sound doctrine, and to bind it up charitably with some bonds of agreement ('conciliationis')[3].

Perhaps initially more surprising from an historiographic point of view is the omission from the *Pars historialis* of the Armenian-Latin sessions of the Council of Florence (1439-1447): in effect, Galanus would seem to construct a 'history' of relations between the Armenian and Roman Churches that ceases before the most recent conciliar contact. Alternatively, Galanus writing in the 1640s and 1650s, might be read as treating the Council of Florence as a matter of current rather than historical significance. Yet judging from the *Pars controversialis*, this seems to be precisely the reasoning of the *Conciliatio*: the 'point of last conciliar contact' effectively sets out, by definition, the issues that divide the churches; the resolution of these issues is the precondition of '(re)conciliation'. It is the outlining of these issues that occupies the *Pars controversialis*; but both its focus and its format are arguably strikingly anomalous in the context of seventeenth-century theological and philosophical writing.

The *Pars controversialis*, at 1258 numbered pages plus some 92 unnumbered pages of prefatory material, is more than double the length of the *Pars historialis*[4]. Published in two volumes, the first in 1658, the second in 1661, both its size and the length of time between the completion of the two parts suggest an attempt at an exhaustive definition of the doctrinal relations between the two churches. The ambitions of the *Pars controversialis* are signalled by the dedication of the first volume to the Pope of the day, Alexander VII (*Conciliatio* II.1.[†3r-†4v]. Following the dedication, an address 'To the reader' ('Auctore lectori', ††[1r]-††2v)

---

[3] '[…] Nationem […] cuius virosum hæresis ulcus, duodecim ad hinc seculis, tam inde à Chelcedonensi Quarto Concilio natum, sine opportuno medicamino computrescat: nec ullum hactenus reperiri Samaritanum, qui, misericoruia motus, oleo sapientiæ, lenisque contuationis, Armenis characteris cusæ, illud liniat; extergat vino sanæ doctrinæ; *Conciliationis* vinculo amabiliter alliget': *Conciliatio* I [sig. a3v].

[4] Pagination of *Conciliationis Pars altera Tomus primus* (1658) (hereafter *Conciliatio* II.1) is: sigs. [†1r-†††††4v, ††††††1r-††††††2v] and 1-487. Printing after the Approbationes, Imprimatur, and Ad Lectorem is bicolumnar Armenian and Latin. Pagination of *Conciliationis Pars altera Tomus secundus* (hereafter *Conciliatio* II.2) follows the same scheme (sigs. [††3r]-[†††††4v] and 1-771, with an unpaginated list of errata on the verso of 771).

states the aims of the *Pars controversialis* in threefold terms. First, the 'End' of the work is to lay out as precisely as possible the sources in which 'all heresies are knowledgeably and expertly examined and confuted, so that there should seem to be no need further to distinguish amongst and discuss the errors of the Armenians, nor any hope of new advantage from such a discussion'[5]. Next, the 'Author' assigns all deficiencies in the work to himself. Finally, concerning the 'Matter' ('Materia'), Galanus notes that 'the condition of the Armenian religion has not yet been able to become known to the Latins, nor indeed even to the Greeks'; that 'of many of the errors that both Greek and Latin Writers have ascribed to the Armenians they are wholly innocent; and that the rest they have generally ascribed to them without reflection'; and that this ignorance is due largely to ignorance of the Armenian language. As Galanus puts it,

If it be an empty and indeed dangerous cure to apply a medicine to expel a disease when the force of the disease barely exists, or is misunderstood; how much more superfluous, and indeed damaging, a Work, so to seek to overcome the heresies of the Armenians and to reconcile their souls to our own; by which we shall the more sharply irritate those, ascribing a false crime to them [so that] a worse shall triumph; or if a crime be real, but not clearly explained, that it should be treated with an antidote of unsuitable explanations[6].

This formula calls for two initial observations. First, Galanus defines the project of the *Conciliatio*, or at least of the *Conciliationis Pars controversialis*, as working, by recourse to sources and arguments in Armenian, toward a reconciliation of the Armenian and Roman churches by

---

[5] Primùm enim de Fine […] exploratissimum est, Christiana in Ecclesia quamplures numerare libros, inquibus hæreses omnies ita scienter, peritèque tractantur, ac refelluntur; ut nulla denuò de Armenis erroribus seorsim differendi, diisceptandique necessitas apparere, nec ulla novi emolumenti ab ista disceptatione percipiendi spes concipi posse, videatur: ††[1r].

[6] Postremò de Materia: non status Armenæ religionis nondùm Latinis potuit, immò ne Græcis quidem, tantùm innoscere; […] Multos errores tum Græci, tum Latini Scriptores Armenis attribuunt, quorum hi expertes omninò sunt: reliquos etiuam adeò inexploratè, summamque retulerunt [….] Quod si ad morbum depellendum, ubi morbi vis vel not extat, vel ignoretur, inanis, atque adeò periculosa adhiberetur curatio; eò certè magis in Armeniorum hæresibus eliminandis, conciliandisque nobiscum eorum animis, supervacaneum, quin etiman noxiam hoc esset Opusl quò acerbiùs irritarentur hi, si falsum in eos crimen obijeceret; perversiùs trimpharent; si crimen certum, explicatè tamen non cognitum, importunarum ratuionum antidotis emendaret: ††[1r-v]

distinguishing the errors falsely ascribed to the former from the fewer, but nonetheless real errors into which the Armenians have fallen; which recourse Galanus imagines will facilitate the desired return of the Armenians to orthodoxy as defined by Rome. The preliminary apparatus that follows the Author's address To the Reader in *Conciliatio* II.1 instantiates this strategy. After two signatures of official *imprimatur*, Galanus offers a twofold 'Catalogus' of 'false doctors of the Armenians, who opposed the Catholic Faith' ('Armeniorum Pseudomagistri, qui Fidem Catholicam oppugnarunt': *Conciliatio* II.1 sigs. [††4r]-[†††3r]) and of 'Armenian Fathers and Doctors, who propounded the Catholic Faith' ('Armeni Patres ac Magistri, qui Fidem Catholicam propugnarunt': *Conciliatio* II.1 sigs. [†††3v-††††3r]). Each name in the Catalogus is followed by a brief outline of the life and work of the cleric or council in question. Notably, while the 'Pseudomagistri' comprise only seventeen names (including John of Odzun, Ananias of Shirak, and the last councils of Dvin and Adana), the list of 'legitimate' (i.e. pro-Roman) authorities runs to forty-four items, including such stalwarts of the Armenian Church as Gregory the Illuminator, Gregory of Narek, and Nerses of Lambron, as well as an impressive list of more recent Armenian patriarchs and more ancient Armenian general councils. Moreover, the Catalogus is followed by an unannotated 'Index of Ancient Holy Fathers and other Writings upon which the arguments in this Work are based', comprising fifty-one items, and by a list of textual 'Instrumenta' accepted by the Armenian church and cited in the *Conciliatio*. The strategy of the Catalogus and Index is clear: to suggest that the vast majority of Armenian authorities conformed to and supported a version of Christianity concordant to that of Rome[7].

Galanus's explanation of the *Pars controversialis* in terms of 'End', 'Author', and 'Matter', however, also signals to the knowledgeable reader the procedure by which the work of 'conciliation' will proceed. 'End' (*fines*) and 'Matter' (*materia*) are of course two of the four causes

---

[7] The 1661 volume, the *Pars controversialis Tomus secundus pars altera* follows much the same format, omitting the biographies of the Armenian authorities: the headings are 'the false doctors of the Armenians, who are refuted in this work' (Armeniorum Pseudomagistri, quorum in hoc opus refutantur': eleven names); of 'the Armenian fathers, upon whose testimony we build in this work' ('Patres Armeni, quorum testimoniis in hoc Opere nitimur': 23 names); and 'Greek and Latin Fathers accepted by the Armenians and cited in this work' (Patres Græci et Latini, ab Armenis suscepti, & in hoc opere citati' (*Contiliatio* II.2 sigs.[††3r-††4r]).

of substance according to the Aristotelian analysis that Western scholasticism inherited and adapted. As is the case with ensouled substances and their derivatives, 'end' and 'form' (*forma, ratio*) coincide; the 'Author' supplies the 'Efficient' (*efficiens*) cause, the instrument whereby form informs matter to a particular end. The analysis of any and all substances in terms of this fourfold causality is not only one of the cornerstones of scholastic analysis generally; it turns out to underpin the analysis of the relation between the Armenian and Roman churches that the *Pars controversialis* takes as its 'End' to define and analyse. But herein lies a difficulty. As Galanus himself observes, incomprehension of language and terminology lie behind many, although not all, of the accusations of heresy that the Greek and Latin churches have levelled at the Armenians. But Neo-scholastic or Neo-aristotelian analysis is not necessarily obviously adapted to mutual comprehension between Armenia and Rome, despite an older tradition of Armenian Aristotelian controversy. Moreover, the *Pars controversialis* is not simply Aristotelian in its mode of analysis. Galanus employs a particular analytical format, the *quæstio* format, that arguably raises serious difficulties for the project of ecclesiastical understanding and reconciliation that Galanus outlines.

The *quæstio* format is in one way a legacy of the Western mediæval unversity, above all the University of Paris: the vocabulary of 'quæstio', 'responsus' divided into distinctiones' and 'objectiones', and 'solutio' reflects the oral practice of the university before the age of print. But the *quæstio* format also dominates written exegesis from the eleventh-century *Sententiæ Libri quattuor* of Peter Lombard. In Galanus's day, the works of Thomas Aquinas, above all the *Summa Theologiæ*, remained a touchstone of both theological authority and methodological felicity. Its four books divided into concise *quæstiones* and even more concise *articuli*, couched in objections and responses, the *Summa Theologiæ* is a triumph of organization: seemingly the whole field of theology is on the one hand divided and analysed, and on the other grouped and ordered, in an interlocking set of distinct yet logically and theologically connected positions. Hence the *quæstio* format could prove a powerful tool for the enforcement of orthodoxy.

Yet one of the great analytic advantages of the *quæstio* format is its capacity to preclude predetermination among alternatives. This capacity turns out to have been important for a great deal of pre-Tridentine Catholic theology, in which decisions concerning more abstruse technical ques-

tions could be deferred, sometimes for generations or indeed indefinitely, as for example in the competing Thomist and Scotist accounts of the relation between form and individuation in ensouled matter. Unsurprisingly, for similar reasons the *quæstio* format continued to thrive in philosophical commentaries well into the seventeenth century: the major Early Modern commentaries on Aristotle, for example, almost exclusively use the *quæstio* format to weigh conflicting interpretations of such fraught issues as the rôle of substantial form in the individuation of substances. Indeed, metaphysics commentaries espousing mutually exclusive 'Thomist' and 'Scotist' interpretations of form continue to be published, and indeed used in the same university courses. The *quæstio* format, moreover, proved a useful tool for incorporating new scientific insights into traditional curricula without causing undue disruption to underlying assumptions. For example, one widely circulated Aristotelian commentary, that of the Jesuit theologian Franciscus Tolletus, (quite uncontroversially) uses an objection and response structure to acknowledge the error of Aristotle's identification of the heart, rather than the brain, as the physiological seat of the human intellegence (*intellectus*), in a way that leaves intact the authority of a basically Aristotelian mode of analysis.

This openness might suggest the suitability of the *quæstio* format for Galanus's project. Two considerations argue against this view. First, the *quæstio* format is designed above all to clarify distinctions, a procedure that does not necessarily conduce to agreement, as the merits of any given argument are apt to appear in clearer focus. Second, and by extension, argument by *quæstio* depends upon a shared set of assumptions about signification, grammar, vocabulary, definitions, the use of terms, and logical procedures in general: just the sorts of issues which too often pose the greatest obstacles to theological understanding between churches that employed different languages in their theological traditions.

Yet the *quæstio* format remained the default for serious intellectual and theological inquiry in seventeenth-century Roman Catholicism; and as the apparatus to both volumes of the *Conciliationis Pars controversialis* make clear, the *quæstio* format provides the basic structure of Galanus's work. Following the Indices of Church Fathers and authories and the single-page of 'Instrumenta' (textual authorities followed) and errata at sig. [††††4v], the first volume of the *Pars controversialis* presents a pair of Indices, a general and specific, outlining the *quastionies* to be

treated. The more specific 'Index paragraphorum primi tomi' (i.e. covering only *Conciliatio* II.1) most clearly indicates Galanus's adherence to the format: for example, the first *quæstio*, covering the 'Errors in this material [sc. the relations attaining amongst Christ, God, and man] proceeds by way of a question, 'whether the Greek writers are correct in ascribing to the Armenians the errors of Arius, Apollinaris, Nestorius, Eutyches, the Manichæans, and the Acephali concerning the mystery of the Incarnation'; a series of distinctions (that the Armenian fathers reject the charges of the Greeks'; 'that the Armenian church can be shown to have no part in the errors in question'; a series of disproofs of specific doctrinal accusations; and a 'solutio' concerning the current state of the Armenian church (II.1.sig. [†††††3v]).

Clarity of format alone, however, does not define either the mode or the efficacy of argument; and the specifics of Galanus's argumentative mode, at first puzzling, arguably show the trap which the combination of the *quæstio* format and a particular set of historical and doctrinal constraints pose, if not for the possibility of Armenian-Roman reconciliation considered in the abstract, then at least for Galanus's attempt. A particularly clear example is provided by *Quæstio inter Armenos* IV.§1 under the heading *De Militantis Ecclesiæ Capite ac Nova Lege* (II.2489-497). The first 'Sectio', 'De materia, & forma Baptismi', nicely illustrates the pitfalls facing Galanus in his project. Galanus opens his analysis with a question of definition: 'Let us ask first: What, then, are the matter, and form, of Baptism?' ('Quæritur Primò: Quænam sit materia, & forma Baptismi?'). Galanus gives the response of the Council of Florence, from the session addressed to the Armenians: that the material is water in its natural state, and that the form is just words: *Ego te baptizo in nomine Patris, & Fili, & Spiritus sancti*: or, as he writes, other [words] similar in substance, such as those which are used by the Armenians: N[ame] servant of Jesus Christ, coming willingly to Baptism, is baptized now through me in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit: for that these words do not differ at all in substance from the preceding ones is declared in the same council, loc. cit[8].

---

[8] 'vel alia similia secundùm substantiam, qualia sunt ea, quibus utuntur Armeni: *N[o-men] servus Iesu Christi, sponte veniens ad Baptismam, baptizatur nunc per mè in nomine Patris, & Fili, et Spiritus sancti*: quæ quidem verba non differe quantùm ad sub-

This response corresponds (unsurprisingly) to the discussion of baptism in Aquinas *Summa Theologiæ* III.q.66.: at much greater length, Aquinas specifies water as the matter (III.q.66.a.3), the Latin verbal formula as the form (a.5) and the logical equivalency of the Greek (and by extension Armenian) formula (a.5 ad 1). To this discussion Galanus adjects two 'objections' of Armenian 'pseudomagistri', by far the more serious of which is that of the 'pseudomagister' 'Vartanus', whom Galanus characterizes as the author of two 'Opuscula', an *Admonition to the Armenians* (*Monita ad Armenios*) and a *Refutation of the latter of the Roman Pontiff to Hetum, King of Armenia* (*Refutatio epistolæ Rom. Pontificis, ad Haytonem Armeniæ Regem*) 'Vartanus'argues that the formula 'I baptize thee' violates the injunction of Paul in 1. Corinthians 1 not to baptize in one's own name, but in the name of Christ[9]. (Interestingly, Galanus also records the characterization of the 'pseudomagister' Grigor Datevac'i ('Gregorius Dattevensis') to the objection of Vartanus as just the sort of 'triviality' ('nugis') that wounds one's own cause: *Conciliatio* II.2.492). Galanus's 'response' is to divide the 'efficient cause' of baptism yet further into a 'principal cause', which is the Holy Trinity, and an 'instrumental cause, which is delivered from outside the Sacrament; and that is the Minister/Agent, to whom indeed God himself attributes the act of baptizing, saying: *Baptizing them* &c. For indeed Baptism according to the form of his words has efficacy, as shown in Ephesians 5, 'washing them with the washing of water in the Word of Life': for in this form both causes are shown together; the Minister, who carrying out the act of Baptism, saying, *Ego te baptizo*: such that that pronoun 'Ego' is not applied by necesssity, but as a greater expression of 'intention'; and the Holy Trinity, as in whose name or virtue the Minister acts, as he says '*In nomine Patris, & Filij, & Spiritus sancti.* {…]*[10]

---

stantiam à præcedentibus, declaratum est in eodem Concilio, loc. cit.': *Conciliatio* II.498. Cf. Concilium Florentinum, 'Decretum pro Armenis', in **Denzinger** §696 (255).

[9] Objicit secundò Vartanus contra formam Bapismi, à Latinis usurpatum, sic scribens in Monitis ad Armenios, cap. 2, De minus præcipit Apostolis, ut in nomine Patris, & Filij, & Spiritus sancti baptizarent, & non etiam in nomine proprio. qui autem dicit: Ego te baptizo, &c., indicat se in suo etiam nomine baptizare. & ideo Paulus 1.Cor.1 inquit: Gratias ago Deo, quòd neminem vestrùm baptizavi, ne quis dicat, quòd in nomine meo baptizati estis.': *Conciliatio* II.2.492.

[10] 'Respondetur ergo ad principale argumentum: quòd causa Baptismi efficiens duplex est: altera principalis, à qua virtutem habet Baptismus; & hæc est sancta Trinitas, ac pro-

Theologically, Galanus's division is canonical, consisting of a re-statement of Aquinas at *Summa* III.q.66.a.5 ad 2. What is more in question is the logical appropriateness of the response to the 'objection' of Vartanus. This objection may or may not be serious: Grigor Datevac'i thinks that it is not. But Galanus's response, to cite in the act of baptism a double efficient causality, divided among the Holy Spirit as 'principle' and the words of the minister as 'instrument', is at the least confusing in context. Galanus's invocation of 'intention' (*intentio*) is, again, Aquinian; but Galanus cites it not from the paragraph on causality in baptism. but the immediately preceding *Summa* III.q.66.a.5 ad 1., on the Greek formu-la, in which Aquinas in effect momentarily reads the Latin formula as logically consequent upon the Greek. But Aquinas's argument concerns the propriety of the *Greek* formula, whereas for Vartanus it is the Latin formula, specifically the Latin words of the minister themselves that are at issue: whether they allow or invoke the operation of the Holy Spirit, or arrogate to the human agent a divine function. In the context, Galanus's recourse to 'intentio', traditionally defined as 'something in the mind that corresponds to something in the world', is question-begging. For Galanus the theologican, the 'intentio' is the *recognition* on the minister's part of the presence of the Holy Spirit; but for Galanus the logician, the invo-cation of 'intentio' could conceal any sort of content, for example, a *hope* that the Holy Spirit would be present in the act of baptism, or worse, a demand that the Spirit so be there: the burden of proof is upon Galanus. Worst of all, for the hypothetical objector, the 'intentio' could well be precisely *the minister himself as agent*: the very charge that Vartanus rightly or wrongly lays against the Latin formula of baptism.

Galanus's analysis of baptism nicely illustrates the argumentative and methodological quandary that characterizes the *Pars controversialis.*

---

indè etiam Christus secunda Trinitatis persona, iuxtà illud Ioanes 1. *Super quem videris Spiritum sanctum descendentem, & manentem, his est, qui baptizat*. altera verò instru-mentalis, quæ tradit exteriùs Sacramentum; & hæc est Minister, cui etiam ipse Dominus baptizandi actum attribuit, dicens: *Baptizantes eos* &c. Cùm ergo Baptismus per for-mam verborum suam habeat efficaciam, iuxta illud Ephes. 5. *mundans eam lavacro aquæ in Verbo Vitæ*; ideò in eius forma hæc utraque causa convenienter expriitur, Mi-nister quidem, ut exercens actum Baptismi, cùm dicitur: *Ego te baptizo*: quamvis pari-cula illa, *Ego*, non ponatur ex necessitate, sed ad maiorem expressionem intentionis: Sancta verò Trinitas, ut in cuius nomine, seu virtute Minister operatur, cùm dicitur: *In nomine Patris, & Filij, & Spiritus sancti*. [….]': *Conciliatio* II.2.493.

Theologically Galanus's citation of Aquinas on baptism is orthodox. In the common philosophical terms of the seventeenth century, however, Galanus's invocation of Aquinas's definition of baptism as a *substance* is deeply problematic. Substance is a composite of 'matter' and 'form'. But matter, 'materia' in a substance, is very nearly nothing at all: pure potentiality that forms the material substrate of the substance, to which 'form' supplies *all* qualities (quality, quantity, relation, habit, time, space, etc.). Such analysis is relatively straightforward applied to persons, animals, material objects, and even inexplicable miracles such as the transubstantiated Host beyond time and space; its application to baptism is a great deal less so. Hence it is little surprise that Roman Catholic analyses of baptism in Galanus's day generally move considerably beyond Aquinas's formula. As early as 1518, responding to Martin Luther's nascent Protestant challenge to traditional accounts of the sacraments, Thomas Cajetan distinguishes among classes of *intentiones* of the baptizer with respect to baptism. For Cajetan, if the baptizer baptizes for the sake of a joke, or out of avarice, but nonetheless has in his mind the *intentio* of baptism *qua* baptism, then the baptism is valid; whereas, if the *intentio* is, as it were, a parody, the baptism is null and void. In effect, Cajetan distinguishes between the formula *qua* formula and *qua* effect of an *intentio*; it is the latter that proves probative. This view, moreover, turns out to have a long history. Already in *De Trinitate*, Augustine (5th century) analyses words as logically posterior to and dependent upon acts of the mind; both Aquinas (briefly) and Ioannes Duns Scotus (at greater length) take up this analysis, with Scotus offering the particularly striking formula of words as *proles* (offspring); by the late sixteenth century, this treatment of the relation of words to *intentiones* becomes a standard item in the commentary tradition. And Cajetan's analysis is in effect merely an inaugural response in an increasingly sophisticated multipronged debate among Roman Catholic theologians and a variety of Reformed positions on the efficacy of baptism in relation to issues of grace, salvation, reprobation, election, and so forth[11].

---

[11] See **Cajetan**, *Opuscula* q. 10 ('De fide ad fructuosam absolutionem sacramentalem necessaria') a.17 (I.330); cf. **Augustine**, *De trinitate* IX.xii,18; **Aquinas**, *De veritate* q.4 a.1; **Scotus**, *Ordinatio* I. d. 27. q. 1 ('utrum verbum creatum sit actualis intellectio'); *Commentarii Collegii Conimbrensis in De anima*, in lib.III. cap. viii. q. 3. art. 2 (487);

Hence Galanus's analysis of the issue of baptism seems doubly limiting, neither bringing to bear the most recently formulated resources of the Roman Catholic tradition nor engaging creatively and productively with the sorts of questions that these resources were capable of answering. The explanation for this curious limitation, if it survives, must lie in the archives of the Sacra Congregatio de Propaganda Fidei (now the Congregatio pro Gentium Evangelizatione). In the absence of archival research, however, two explanations present themselves. First, practically speaking, whatever the state of written Armenian theology since the Council of Florence, the state of such putative later theological treatises remains technically uncertain in the absence of either a council or an Armenian mission to give such work official imprimatur; hence Galanus is limited by historical circumstance to addressing ancient and mediæval Armenian theological positions. Yet the range of issues laid out in the *Pars controversialis* seem amenable to reconceptualization and reorganization: for example, the analyses of baptism developed by the successors of Thomas Cajetan would seem to have implications for issues of reprobation and salvation discussed under other *quæstiones* of the *Pars controversials*; such a reconceptualization of issues arguably would constitute a more powerful and flexible instrument of 'conciliation' with the living Armenians of Galanus's day. I suspect (and this is the second explanation) that whatever Galanus's evangelical ambitions may have been, permission to construct such a wide-ranging and innovative work of theology was not forthcoming from the Sacra Congregatio itself. Perhaps the textual, financial, or intellectual resources for such a work were either wholly unavailable, or deemed more needed elsewhere; perhaps the possibility that theological innovations or reinterpretations vis-à-vis the Armenians might complicate the seemingly more pressing mission of confuting and combatting Protestantism was too strong; or perhaps, indeed, the *Pars controversialis* represents the limit of Galanus's own capacities. Clearly, then, explanation for the form and scope of the *Conciliationis Pars controversialis* and its ultimate relation to the *Pars historialis* must await further research; but such eventual research promises to

---

Fonseca, *Commentarii in Metaphysica* lib.vii.cap.viii. q. 3. sec. 2 (vol. 2: III.298); **Eustachius a Sancto Paulo**, *Summa philosophiæ*, Tertia pars, tract. iv., q. ix.ii (340).

open an extensive and fascinating chapter in the histories of Armenian and Roman Catholic relations in the Early Modern period.

Bibliography

Aquinas, Thomas. *Sant Thomas d'Aquin De veritate. Questions disputées de la verité.* Ed. R. P. Roberto Busa, S.J., and Enrique Alarcón. Trans. André Aniorté. Le Barroux: Éditions Sainte-Madeleine, 2011. Vol. 1.

Aquinas, Thomas. *Sancti Thomæ Aquinatis Doctoris Angelici Ordinis Prædicatorum Summa Theologica.* 3rd ed. 5 vols. Madrid: Bibliotheca de autores cristianos, 1961.

[Aurelius Augustinus. *De trinitate*.] Agostino. *La trinità*. Ed. & trans. Beatrice Cillerai. Milan: Bompani, 2012.

Balgy, Alexander. *Historia Doctrinæ Catholicæ Inter Armenos.* Vienna: Typis Congregationis Mechitaristæ, 1878.

[Cajetan, Thomas de Vio. *Opuscula*.] *Cajetan et Luther en 1518. Édition, traduction, et commentaire des opuscules d'Augsbourg de Cajetan*. Volume 1. Ed. Charles Morerod, O.P. Fribourg: Éditions universitaires Fribourg, Suisse, 1994.

Commentariii Collegii Conimbricenses Societatis Jesu in tres libros De anima Aristotelis Stagiritæ. Cologne, 1604.

Denzinger, Heinrich. *Enchiridion Symbolorum Definitionum et Declarationum de rebus fidei et morum*. Freiburg: Herder, 1937.

[Fonseca, Petrus.] *Petri Fonsecæ commentariorum in libros Metaphysicorum Aristotelis Tomus I-IV*. 1615. Repr. ed. 2 vols. Hildesheim: Olms, 1964.

Eustachius a Sancto Paulo. *Summa Philosophica Quadripartita, de rebus dialecticis, ethicis, physicis, & metaphysicis*. Cambridge, 1649.

Galanus, Clemens. *Conciliationis Ecclesiæ Armenæ cum Romana ex ipsis Armenorum patrum et doctorum testimoniis in duas Partes, Historialem, & Controversialem divisæ Pars prima.* Rome, 1650

Galanus, Clemens. *Conciliationis Ecclesiæ Armenæ cum Romana ex ipsis Armenorum patrum et doctorum testimoniis in duas Partes, Historialem, & Controversialem divisæ Pars prima.* Rome, 1658.

Galanus, Clemens. *Conciliationis Ecclesiæ Armenæ cum Romana ex ipsis Armenorum patrum et doctorum testimoniis in duas Partes, Historialem, & Controversialem divisæ Pars altera.* Rome, 1662.

Strohmeyer Virgil, *The Influence of the Armenian Language and Alphabet upon the Development of the Renaissance's Perennial Philosophy, Biblical Hermeneutics, and Christian Kabbalism.* Erevan: Armenian Philosophical Academy, 1998.

Thomson Robert W., *A Bibliography of Classical Armenian Literature to 1500 A.D.* Corpus Christianorum. Turnhout: Brepols, 1995.

Ռոբերտ Դուգարյան

Միաբանությո՞ւն թե տարանջատում. նախնական դիտողություններ Կղե-մես Գալանոսի «Միաբանութիւն Հայոց սուրբ եկեղեցւոյն ընդ մեծի սուրբ եկեղեցւոյն Հռոմայ» (Հռոմ, 1650-1661) գրքի պատմության և աստվա-ծաբանական մեթոդի մասին

Սույն հոդվածում նախնական գնահատական է տրվում Կղեմես Գալանոսի գրքում ամփոփված նյութերի և վիճաբանության մեթոդների, մի գրքի, որը որպես իր նպատակն է ազդարարում Հռոմի կաթոլիկ և Հայոց եկեղեցիների մերձեցմանը նպաստելը՝ նրանց հարաբերությունների պատմությունն ուրվա-գծելու և համաձայնության եզրեր պարունակող ու չպարունակող աստվա-ծաբանական խնդիրների վերլուծություն ձեռնարկելու միջոցով։ Ես փորձում եմ ապացուցել, որ ինչպես գրքի պատմական շարադրանքը, այնպես էլ աստ-վածաբանական վերլուծությունն այնքան հնաբույր են, որ խոչընդոտում են ազդարարված նպատակի իրագործմանը, սակայն նաև այն, որ Եվրոպայում Հռոմի կաթոլիկ եկեղեցու վրա պայքարող բողոքականության ընշումը անհաղ-թահարելի աստվածաբանական սահմանափակումներ էր ստեղծում հայ քրիս-տոնյաների հետ ավելի սերտ և ժամանակին ավելի համահունչ կապեր հաս-տատելու համար։