

ԿՐՕՆԱԿԱՆ**THE JURIDICIZATION OF DOCTRINE AT THE EXPENSE OF
THEOLOGICAL SCHOLARSHIP. THE CASE OF MIKAYEL CHAMCHIAN'S
‘SHIELD OF FAITH’****Summary:**

The rift between the Armenian Apostolic and Roman Catholic communities in Constantinople at the end of the 18th and first half of the 19th century- Formation of the Armenian *millet* system – Բան հրաւեր սիրոյ ('An invitation to love') - The failure to implement the acts of union with Rome in the 13th century - *Fratres Unitores and the role of the Inquisition* – Վահագն Հաւատոյ ('Shield of Faith') – First abridged printed edition in comparison with a manuscript of the same in UCLA (Ms.Arm.14)- The theology of the 'Shield of Faith'.

The rift between the Armenian Orthodox and Catholic communities in Constantinople at the end of the 18th and first half of the 19th century.

The nineteenth and twentieth centuries as seen in the context of Armenian Church history has a crucial importance for the understanding of the present- day situation of the Armenian Church spread all over the world. When one appreciates that the Armenian Church, has continually been, but particularly in the first half of the nineteenth century, most intimately, and almost inseparably, associated with the Armenian Nation, then a brief look at the political events of this period is justified. Arnold Toynbee is quite judicial when referring to the Eastern Churches in the Ottoman Empire: 'In the Near East a church is merely the foremost aspect of a nationality'¹. At the beginning of the nineteenth century, the Armenian people lived under three major political allegiances: the Persian, Russian and Ottoman rules.

In the first decade of the nineteenth century after a series of wars the Persians persuade for peace and signed the Treaty of Turkmenchai (1828) while Eastern Armenia became part of Tsarist Russia. The most important imperial decision concerning the Armenians was the decree issued in 1836 called *Polozheniye* (Satute) by which the church became the policing agent of the state enforcing its decisions among the Armenian people². The entrance of the mighty Russia presenting itself as the liberator of all Orthodox Christian among the Balkan peoples to cast off the heavy yoke of Turkish domination coincided with the spread of nationalism. The successful struggles of the Serbs (1804-1830) and the Greeks were not lost upon the Armenians. The Armenian historian Pastermadjian gives a concise description of the state of the Christian populations in the Ottoman Empire: 'As to the position of Christian peoples under the Turkish

¹ Arnold Toynbee, *The Treatment of Armenians in the Ottoman Empire*, London, 1916, pp. 617-618.

² Vrej Nerses Nersessian, 'The Armenian church under the sceptre of the tsars, 1828-1905', *Living Stones Yearbook* 2020, pp. 255-276. For text of the *Polozheniye* translated from the Russian by M. Kartashian see A. Eretseants «Ամենայն Հայոց կաթողիկոսութիւնը եւ Կովկասի Հայք: Բ. Կաթողիկոսութիւն Ս. Յովհաննէս Ը. Կարբեցոյ եւ «Պօլօժէնիէ» (1831-1842) [The Catholic ate of All Armenians in the Caucasus], Tiflis, 1895, p. 259; Krikor Vardapet Maksoudian, *Chosen of God. The election of the Catholics of All Armenians. From the Fourth century to the Present*, New York, 1995, pp. 102-108; Appendix I and II, 'The text of the *Polozheniye* in Classical and Modern Armenian, pp. 164-169.

yoke, these were a people reduced to servitude, stripped of their elementary human rights, their property and lives constantly exposed to the arbitrary will of the government and the attacks of Muslim subjects of the Empire'.³ Under pressure from the European powers number of reforms were administered between 1839-1878 in the Ottoman Empire to improve the treatment of the Christian peoples collectively called the *Noble Rescript of the Rose Chamber – Hatt-i Sherif Gulhane* – November 3, 1839 inaugurated the *Tanzimat* period. This reform adopted the concept of Ottomanism – that is the idea of regarding as Ottoman subjects all individuals living in the Ottoman territories regardless of their faith and languages.⁴ This was followed in quick succession by number of other reforms sponsored by Western Powers aimed at achieving equality among the subjects of the empire. In order to forestall more drastic intervention, the government issued a second edict called *Khatt-i Humayun [Imperial Rescript]* in 1856, which proclaimed the equality of all Muslim and non-Muslim alike and paved the path for a democratic government of the communal life, granting say to the ordinary people. The final result was the compilation of statutes called '*Sahmanadrutian*' [Սահմանադրություն] in Turkish '*Ermeni patrikligi nizamati*'.⁵

All the reforms and promises made by the Ottoman rulers under pressure from the European Powers brought no real change in the situation of the Christians, particularly of the Armenians, who lived in the heart of Asia Minor and were more fully integrated in the structure of the Ottoman Empire than the peoples of the Balkan countries. The case of the Armenians was on the agenda of the negotiations in the San Stefano Congress (3rd March, 1878) and again in the Berlin Congress (13th June, 1878). Among the delegation attending the Berlin Congress was former Patriarch of Constantinople (1869-1873) and later Catholicos of All Armenians Mkrtych I Vanetsi called *Khrimyan Hayrik [Father]* (1892-1907), who returned to Constantinople despondent and summed his experience with this famous parable: 'The Europeans placed a cauldron of liberty filled with *harissa* (meat and oat dish), the Bulgarians, Serbs and Montenegrins took their portions of the tasty *harisa* with their iron ladles; but the Armenians had only a paper ladle, which collapsed when they dipped it into the cauldron to take their share'.⁶ The father of German liberalism Friedrich Naumann who supported the suppression of the Armenians by the Young Turks leading to the Genocide wrote '*The Turks did well, when they beat the Armenians to death or otherwise the Turks could not have defended themselves against the Armenians... the Armenian is the worst man in the world*'.⁷

The Armenian Millet

Originally the Arabic term "*millet*" applied to community of Muslims in contradistinction

³ H. Pasdermajian, *Histoire de l'Arménie*, ch. XI, English translation in the *Armenian Review*, vol. xv, no. 4 1962, pp. 72-73.

⁴ H. Karpap Kemal, *An Inquiry into the Social Foundations of Nationalism in the Ottoman State*, Princeton, 1973.

⁵ H. Karpap Kemal, '*Millets and Nationality: The roots of incongruity of Nation and State in the Post-Ottoman Era*' in *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire*, Benjamin Braude and Bernard Lewis (eds.), London, 1982, vol. I, pp. 141-169. For an English translation of the 'Armenian National Constitution' see H. F. B. Lynch, *Armenia: Travels and Studies*, London, 1901, vol. II, Appendix I, pp. 449-67.

⁶ Louise Nalbandian, *The Armenian Revolutionary Movement: the development of Armenian Political Parties in the Nineteenth Century*, Los Angeles, 1963, pp. 28-29.

⁷ W. Gust, *Der Volkermord an den Armenien*, 1993, p. 61 quoted by Burchard Brentjes, *The Armenians, Assyrians and Kurds. Three Nations One Fate?*, Varanasi, 1999, p. 40; Vrej Nersessian, 'The impact of the genocide of 1915 on the Armenian Orthodox Apostolic Church', *Sion*, July-November (2016), pp. 63-74.

to the non-Muslims but in the Ottoman context it came to designate the non-Muslim communities. The *millet* system emerged gradually as an answer to the efforts of the Ottoman administration to recognise the cultures of the various religious-ethnic groups it ruled. The system provided, on the one hand, a degree of religious, cultural and ethnic continuity within communities and on the other permitted their incorporation into the Ottoman administrative, economic and political system. So, ethnic-religious groups preserved their culture and religion while remaining subject to continuous ‘Ottomanization’ in other spheres of life⁸. At the turn of the nineteenth century there were three major *millets* in the Ottoman state: the Greek Orthodox, Armenian Orthodox (*Ermeni*) and the Jewish. The Patriarchates as an institution were a manifestation of the *millet* system, that gave each of the religious communities a degree of legal autonomy and authority with the acquiescence of the Ottoman rulers.

Mikayel Chamchian’s remarkable *History of Armenia* assigns the founding of the Armenian Patriarchate to the reign of Sultan Mehemmet [II] in 1461, but on the bases of sources not available to Chamchian, Hayk Berberian dismissed the traditional accounts and concluded that the rank, with ‘certain rights’ was conferred on the Armenian religious leaders of Constantinople in the first half of the sixteenth century; more precisely, between 1526 and 1543.⁹

The patriarch was both the spiritual and civic leader of the entire Armenian population (*milletbashi*) in rank equal to a pasha. It was incumbent upon him to defend the national church against the encroachments of Catholic and Protestant missionaries, who began to gain converts in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

In 1780 Chamchian began to write his magisterial *History of Armenia* in three volumes which he completed in 1784 and was published in 1784-1786.¹⁰ Unlike Movses Khorenatsi who begins the history of the Armenians with a brief account of the earliest Armenian heroes from Hayk to Ara and his descendants, Chamchian acknowledging that while the origins of many nations are shrouded in legends the Armenians have the Bible as the only source of their history. His poses and seeks new insights for the advancement of historiography: ‘*If historical research is consumed to merely quench interest, it is unacceptable; if it is to only increase the stock of memory, this overburdens memory, does not bear fruit, becomes tiresome instead of bringing joy. But if a historical work is to be read to attain wisdom to correct human behaviour, then it is product for the good*’.¹¹

⁸ H. Karpat Kemal, ‘*Millets and Nationality: The Roots of the Incongruity of Nation and State in the Post-Ottoman Era*’, *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire*, op. cit., p. 141-142; Alexander Humphries, ‘Political Patriarchs: A study of the political significance of Patriarch Thomas of the Chaldean Catholic church during the creation of Iraq’, *Living Stones Yearbook*, 2022, pp. 179-180.

⁹ Mikayel Chamchian, Պատմութիւն Հայոց (History of the Armenians), Venice, 1786, vol. III, p. 500; Hayk Berberian, ‘Կ. Պօլսոյ հայ պատրիարքութեան հիմնադրութիւնը’ [The founding of the Armenian Patriarchate of Constantinople], *HA*, 78(1964), cols. 338-339; Kevork B. Bardakjian, ‘The rise of the Armenian Patriarchate of Constantinople’, *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire*, op. cit., pp. 89-100; Hrant Asatur Կոստանդնուպոլսոյ հայերը եւ իրենց պատրիարքները [The Armenians of Constantinople and their Patriarchs], Stanpul, 2011, lists Yovakim Bps. of Brusa as the first patriarch (1461-1478) and not Grigor Bps. (1526-1537).

¹⁰ Mikayel Chamchian, Պատմութիւն Հայոց ի սկզբանէ աշխարհի մինչեւ ցամ տեառն 1784 [History of Armenia from the beginning to the year of the Lord 1784], Venice, 1784, vols. I-III; facs. Erevan, 1985; abridged version in one volume Խրախնան Պատմութեան [Joy of history], Constantinople, 1811, the same in Turkish in Armenian letters (1812); Johannes Avdall, *History of Armenia by Father Michael Chamich in two volumes*, Calcutta, 1827.

¹¹ Mikayel Chamchian, *History of Armenia*, op. cit., ‘Introduction’, p. 42 «Քանզի ընթերցանութիւն և տեղեկութիւն

Pre-dating the Soviet period of Armenian historiography, in Leo's view Chamchian's magisterial analysis over a wide terrain with great skill matches his contemporary Edward Gibbon.¹² He uses 23 Armenian and over 70 foreign authors, hundreds of documents, colophons, letters, church canons, and lives of saints. He was a staunch catholic and member of the Mkhitarist Congregation and his primary source is the '*Letter of love and Concord*', in the Armenian called *Dashants Tught* (Դաշանց Թուղթ) composed between the years 1141 and 1238, coinciding with the third and fourth Crusades, being one of the documents among the forgeries called *Donation of Constantine*. In the eighteenth-century catholic missionaries revived this document as an instrument to achieve reunification of the Armenian Church with Holy See of Rome¹³. Chamchian accepts the authenticity of this document and in the first volume of his work, among the primary sources he lists the *History* by Agathangelos's for whom he says '*he wrote a book concerning Trdat... but as to in what language he wrote his book in Greek or Armenian, we are not certain*'. He mentions that the 1709 printed edition of the *History* by Agathangelos contains the text of the *Dashants Tught* with many additions.¹⁴ From this we may conclude that he considers Agathangelos as the author of *Dahsants Tught*. In his notes to his sources, he reaffirms the story of the visit of Saint Grigor to Rome and in his conclusion asserts that *Dashants Tught* is not 'a fabrication but true for we always find allusions to it in Armenian literature stretching as far back as to the time of Khorenatsi'.¹⁵ This is a significant departure since the Mkhitarists do not consider *Dashants Tught* an authentic and reliable document. In the introduction of the 1835 edition of the *History* by Agathangelos printed by the Mkhitarists they maintain that the text is 'contaminated (խամբարում)

The text of the *Dashants Tught* was first published with an accompanying study by its most unforgiving critic Karapet vardapet Shahnazarian, which he considered a forgery and fabrication of the middle ages invented by the Latinophile *Fratre Unitores* or Unifying Friars, affiliated with *Propaganda Fide* which he describes as containing 'litany of fabrications and

պատմութեանց եթէ սոսկ առ հետաքրքրութեան իցէ. ընդունայն է. և եթէ առ գանձելոյ ի յիշողութեան և եթէ ծանրաբեռն գիտաշինն ոչ պտղաբերէ իսկ երկրորդն յաւետ վաստակեցուցանէ՝ քան բերկրեցուցանէ: Այլ եթէ վասն ստանալոյ զհամեմատ առ ի ուղղելոյ զգնացս անձին, արդիւնաւոր է ի բարին»:

¹² Leo (Mikayel Babakhanian), Հայոց Պատմութիւն [Armenian History, Erevan, 1973, vol. 3, bk. II, p. 517.

¹³ *Dashants Tught* [Letter of Concord] a forgery of the 12th or 13th century based on an Appendix found in Agathangelos's *History* entitled «Թուղթ սիրոյ և միաբանութեան մեծի կայսերն Կոստանդիանոսի, և սուրբ պապին Սեղբեստորոսի. և Տրդատայ թագաւորին, և սրբոյն Գրիգորի», Constantinople', 1824, pp. 331-363; Clemens Galanus, *Conciliatio ecclesiae Armenae cum Romana, Pars I*, Rome, 1690, pp. 31-35; Armenian text and Italian translations see Venice, 1695; E. V. Gulbekian, 'The conversion of King Trdat and Khorenatsis *History of the Armenians*', *Le Museon* tome 90-Fasc. 1-2 (1977), pp. 49-62; Vrej Nersessian' Review article: 'The Armenian Apostolic Orthodox Church and the vision of the *Fratre Unitores* or Unifying Friars among Armenians', *Sion* 8-12 (2019), pp. 197-198; and 'The See of Holy Etchmiadsin and the Vatican: A chronicle of the contacts between Armenian Catholicos and Popes', *Sion*, 1-2-3 (2021), pp. 78-87 & 4-7, pp. 183-195; Hratch Bartikyan, «Դաշանց Թուղթ» կազմը, ստեղծման ժամանակը, հեղինակն ու նպատակը, [*'Letter of Concord'. Its composition, time of creation, author and purpose*], *Studia Armeno-Byzantina*, volume III, Erevan, 2006, pp. 179-116; The title of the Italian translation is "*Lettera dell' Amicitia e dell' Unione di Constantino gran Cesare e di San Siluestro Sommo Pontifice, e di Tradate Re dell' Armenia, e di S. Gregorio Illuminatore della Nazione Armena. Anno del Signore 316, Venetia, 1683.*

¹⁴ Mikayel Chamchian, *History of Armenia*, op. cit., vol. I, p. 10.

¹⁵ Mikayel Chamchian, *History of Armenia*, op. cit., «Սա գրեաց մատեան մի վասն Տրդատայ և վասն Լուսաւորչին մերոյ... Իսկ թէ յոր լեզու շարագրեալ իցէ սորա զգիրս իւր, արդեօք յունարէն՝ թէ հայերէն, տարակոյս է» and «Նախ՝ թէ այս Թուղթ Դաշանց ոչ է կեղծիք, այլ ճշմարիտ. քանզի օրինակ նորա միշտ գտանիւր յազգէ մերում, նաև յաւուրս հորենացոյն», *See Vol. I, pp. 10, 642.*

mistruths’ (ստապանդյն), ‘extravagant’ (աղնատարան) and ‘ignominious’ (խայտառակ).¹⁶

Mkhitar Sebastatsi (1676-1749) entered communion with Rome and established the Mkhitarist Benedictine Order on the small island of St Lazarus in August, 1717, which split in 1773 when a number of extreme papists left the island and met in Trieste and failing to remove the causes of disagreement declared themselves a separate order in 1803, and re-established in Vienna in 1811. In 1740, with the election of a patriarch and his confirmation by Pope Benedict XIV the Armenian Catholic Church was formally founded as separate ecclesial entity in the monastery of Bzommar-Lebanon. In 1830 through the intervention of the French ambassador in Constantinople, the Armenian Catholic community was legally recognised by the Ottoman authorities as a *millet*. Pope Pius IX (1846-1878) united the Patriarchate with the Armenian Catholic diocese of Constantinople and the Patriarchate was moved to Constantinople. In 1925, after the genocide, the Patriarchate returned to Bzommar.¹⁷

‘An Invitation to Love’ [Բան Հրաւիր Սիրոյ]¹⁸

Under the rules and regulations of the *millet* system the Armenian Patriarch of Constantinople was the sole leader of the Armenian community and it was incumbent upon him to defend the national church against the encroachments of the Catholic and Protestant missionaries engaged in proselytism. Conversion was a political issue within the Ottoman Empire: the French, and to a lesser degree the Austrian ambassadors supported the Catholic cause; the British diplomats protected Protestants, while the Armenian national church had no foreign power to support it. The Ottoman rulers did not welcome the emergence of a Catholic *millet*, which would provide easy reasons to European powers to interfere in the internal affairs of the Ottoman Empire for that reason the Pope had to be content by appointing in 1758 an Armenian bishop with authority corresponding to that of a *nuncio*. Despite the efforts of the patriarchs, Catholicism was spreading, which an observant scribe in his memorial describes in these terms: ‘*gradually some were attracted and went and mixed with the startled sheep of the Mkhitarist brotherhood and others to the alienated herd of Triestian goats [reference to the Vienna Mkhitarist] and another half to the pack of foxes in Lebanon [reference to the Antonian brotherhood] and others to the estranged group of Collegians and many from the separated faction of our people sent their sons to Rome to the schools called College, where they studied Latin and Armenian and then after being ordained priests, returned to their homeland and in deceitful (եւ խորամանկ) and well trained (արուեստակեալ բանիւ) convinced many among the simple minded to convert to their faith*’.¹⁹

¹⁶ Karapet vrd. Shahnazareants, «Դաշանց Թղթոյ քննութիւնն ու հերքումը» [An investigation and rejection of the *Dashants Tught*], Paris, 1862. He numerates 13 ‘errors’ (ստոյքիւնները on pp. 99-111); Archbishop M. Ormanian [peud. K’nner] in his substantial study «Հերքում Ս. Գրիգոր Լուսաւորիչի Հոռոմ երթալու առասպելին» [Rejecting the legend of S. Gregory the Illuminator’s visit to Rome], *HHT*, 2nd year (1949-1950), pp. 235-246. The confusion in the sources arises from the use by Armenian authors of the term ‘Rome’, ‘New Rome’, ‘world of the Romans’ (Հոռով, Հոռոմոց աշխարհ) in place of Byzantium and the people Franks (Փռանգ) in place of Greeks (Յունաց).

¹⁷ Soon after, with the intervention of the British ambassador in Constantinople, the Ottoman government created a Protestant *millet* in 1847, which included the Armenian Protestants.

¹⁸ [Grigor Gaparachian] Բան հրաւիր սիրոյ: Որ առաջի առնէ զպատասխանի խնդրոյ ինչ-ինչ մասանց հաւատոյ ըստ Լուսաւորչաւանդ վարդապետութեան Հայաստանեայց առաքելական սուրբ եկեղեցոյ [Invitation to love containing answers to the many tenants of faith according to the Illuminator’s teaching of the Armenian Apostolic Holy Church], Constantinople, Poghos Arapian, 17th May, 1820, pp. 43.

¹⁹ H. Topchean [=Topdjian], «Կաթոլիկ գրականութիւնը Արմաշի ձեռագիրներուն մէջ» [Catholic literature among

Countless internal disputes remained to plague the Armenian community throughout the nineteenth century. For most of the period Armenian passions were directed more within the community than without. However, the Ottoman policy was to stabilize the *millet* system by supporting the patriarchate, and the *amiras* were the cutting edge of this policy. Their own values and interests within the *millet* were in perfect accord with Ottoman policy, and this coincidence made the *amiras* formidable opponents. Even the French ambassador in Istanbul feared their enmity, as reported in his letter to the foreign minister concerning his efforts to advance the cause of Catholicism:

... *eviter...le double inconvenient d'attirer gratuitement sur moi suel; 'inimite fort redoutable des sarafs armeniens et de tous les influens qu'ils ont su gagner a leur cause'*.²⁰

At this period an unseemly dissention surfaced between the followers of Mkhitar Sebastatsi 'the Abbotians' and the Collegians (named after the College for the *Propaganda de Fide*), who abandoned Venice and settled in Vienna. The former favoured putting aside all doctrinal-religious disputes through *rapprochement* to prevent split in the brotherhood. Mkhitar Sebastatsi as far back as 12th of January 1719 and again in 14th April 1733 had presented a comprehensive memorandum to the 'Roman Board of Inquisition seeking permission for catholic Armenians to frequent Armenian Apostolic Orthodox churches to receive the sacraments of Baptism, Marriage and Burial. This suggests that Mkhitar Sebastatsi was against the proselytising activities of the missionaries, wishing to remain faithful to the traditions of the Mother Church. He and his affiliates were submitted to creating an Armenian Catholicism (կաթոլիկոսիւն) and refrain from promoting Latinism (լատինացնէլ). While the Collegians supported by their staunchest allies the Catholic magnates the Duzian family demanded the following modifications in the doctrines rituals and practices to achieve union-

1. The two natures and wills;
2. The *Filioque* clause;
3. The doctrine of purgatory;
4. The supremacy of the Pope of Rome;
5. The sacrament of Extreme unction;
6. The abandoning of the anathema against the Council of Chalcedon and the Tome of Pope Leo,
7. Exclude from the 'Litany of General Intercessions' in the Divine Liturgy the names of

the manuscript collection in the Monastery of Armash], *HHT*, 2nd Year (1949-1950), pp. 294-309 «...Ապաքն բազումք ի մերոց հատուածեալ ժողովրդոց ի մանկական տիս առաքեալ ի Հռովմ, ի դպրոցն որ անուանեալ գոլէջ, մնան ժամանակս ինչ յօսումն լատինական եւ հայկական դպրութեան, ապա ընկալեալ զկարգ քահանայութեան և զհրաման քահանայութեան դարձ առնեն իւրաքանչիւր ի հայրենիս իւրեանց եւ խորամանկ եւ արուեստակեալ բանիւք պարտեալ զբազումս ի պարզամտաց յիմեանս յանկուցանեն, p. 304»); See H. Topchian, Յուցակ ձեռագրաց Արմաշի վանքին [Catalogue of manuscripts in the Monastery of Armash], Venice, 1962. The Theological Academy of Armash was founded in 1889 in the Monastery of the Holy Virgin called *Tcharkhapan*, under the patronage of the Armenian Patriarchate preparing priests and had a scriptorium dating back to 1786. The entire valuable manuscript collection was destroyed during the Genocide of 1915.

²⁰ Gabriel Ayvazovski, Պատմութիւն Օսմանեան Պետութեան [History of the Ottoman State], Venice, 1841, vol. 2, p. 519; 'AE Correspondence Diplomatique', Turquie, vol. 232 (July 1819-December 1820), p. 108; Hagop Barsoumian, 'The dual role of the Armenian *Amira* class within the Ottoman Government and the Armenian *Millet* (1750-1850), Benjamin Braude & Bernard Lewis (eds.), *op. cit.*, pp. 171-184.

Grigor Tatevatsi, Movses Tatevatsi, Hovhannes Odznetsi and Hovhannes Vorotnetsi.²¹ Grigor Tatevatsi in his *Book of Questions* in a chapter entitled ‘*The unity and the separation of the church*’, lists the differences and similarities between the Armenian, Roman Catholic, Greek Orthodox and Syrian churches and explains that the elements that separate do not have *legal status* but are all a question of ‘*communication in sacrist*’. According to him the Latins have these practices [աւանդութիւնս] which are alien to the Eastern Orthodox Churches.

1. They do not offer the sacrament out of the cup;
2. The same priest can celebrate liturgy three times on the same day;
3. And that in the same church without discrimination;
4. They do not celebrate liturgy of the ‘*Lucermarium*’ on the Eve of Nativity and Easter;
5. They have purgatory;
6. Acknowledge the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father and the Son [*Filioque*];
7. They mark saints of other nations outside the Lectionary;
8. They celebrate the liturgy on all fast days;
9. They do not ordain priests from women
10. They baptise women “*in necessitate*” and make secular persons confess and re-baptise again;²²

Because the catholic Armenians could only receive the Holy Sacraments in the Armenian Apostolic Orthodox Church and attend Divine Liturgy celebrated in the Armenian language, the followers of Mkhitar were against those intransigent Collegians who advised their flock: ‘*Do not even pass by the front of an Armenian church, and if you are obliged to do so because you have left your hat there, do not go into the church to retrieve it but leave it there and flee*’.²³ The slogan advanced by the Collegians ‘I am not an Armenian, I am a Catholic’ [“*pen Ermeni teyil im, pen {place - above the e-s} kat’olik im*” = ես հայ չեմ, ես կաթոլիկ եմ] In respond the Turks rejected this claim by drawing clear distinction between religious affiliation and ethnic origin.

A slim volume called ‘*History of the events which happened in Constantinople concerning the famous discussions proving the truth of the Armenian faith for those who were ignorant of it and were sinning against it*’²⁴ gives a succinct account of efforts of Patriarch Poghos Grigorian

²¹ According to the pro-Chalcedonian treatise known as the *Narratio de rebus Armeniae*, Emperor Heraclius summoned Catholicos Ezr (630-641) to Karin and coerced him into accepting union with the Imperial Church of Constantinople by accepting the doctrinal tenets formulated at the Council of Chalcedon and the Tome of Leo and the Seven Ecumenical Councils. This was part of the constant pressure on the Armenian church first within the borders of the Imperial Church and later by the Roman Catholic church. But no permanent success was achieved. cf. *The Armenian History attributed to Sebeos*, translated, with notes, by R. W. Thomson, Liverpool University Press, 1999, Part I [Chapter 41], pp. 90-94 and Part II, pp. 228-231. This action of Catholicos Ezr taking ‘communion’ with the Emperor was considered a treachery against the Armenian tradition and a rebuke was coined around his name ‘Truly your name is EZR (brink, precipice, edge) since you took the Armenian church to the brink of dishonor’ [Յիրախ կոչեցաւ անունդ եջր, վասնզի յեջր տառեալ հաներ զՀայաստանեայս], see M. Ormanian, *Azgapatum*, op. cit., vol. I, Bk. 2, p. 69.

²² Grigor Tatevatsi Գիրք Հարցմանց [Book of Questions], Constantinople, 1729, pp. 553.

²³ Gabriel Ayvazovski, op. cit., p. 41. «Հայոց ժամուն առջեւն անգամ մի անցնիր, իսկ եթէ անցնել պէտք եղաւ ու գրակը գլխէդ հոն ձգեցիր, ներս մի մտնէր առնելու, ձգէ փախիր»:

²⁴ «Պատմութիւն անցից որ եղել ի Կոստանդնուպոլիս վասն յայտնի կացուցանելոյ զհշմատութիւն հաւատոյ Հայաստանեայց Ս. Եկեղեցոյ՝ այնոցիկ, որոց չէին տեղեակ մեղանշին», Constantinople, Andreas vard. Aknetsi, 15th February, 1818, pp. 35; See also H. Kurdian, «Հայ-Հայ Կաթոլիկ բաժանման մասին վաւերաթուղթ մը» [A

Andrianapolsetsi (1815-1823) between 1816-1823, who called five meetings composed of a committee of eight members representing each of the factions to discuss doctrinal differences.²⁵ In 1820 an agreement was reached in which it was agreed that in the ‘Order of Ordination’ the anathemas pronounced by the ordination candidates against the Council of Chalcedon and the Tome of Leo will not be required, and the names of Grigor Tatevatsi, Movses Tatevatsi and Hovhannes Orotnetsi will be excluded from the ‘Litany of General Intercession’ and for those who require ‘Extreme Unction’ blessed oil will be provided. Patriarch Poghos ordained two celibate priests and during the ordination ceremony the anathemas on the Council of Chalcedon and the Tome of Pope Leo were not pronounced. In the same meeting the Patriarch asked every papist to sign the following brief confession: ‘Whatsoever the Holy Orthodox Armenian Church from the time of St. Gregory the Illuminator accepts until the present I also accept, and whatsoever she rejects, I too reject. In witness to this my true confession, I hereby voluntarily have affixed my signature and seal’. As many were unwilling to sign this confession, later, to make matters easier, the Nicene Creed was substituted.²⁶ On 17th May the declaration called «Բան Հրաւիր Սիրոյ» [An Invitation to Love] was printed and communicated in the community. Mikayel *vardapet* Chamchian who represented the Mkhitarist Congregation of Venice and was a member of the committee and had by this time completed his *Վահան Հաւատոյ* [*Shield of Faith*] in defence of the Orthodoxy of the Armenian Church.

Things, however, assumed a grave aspect when Patriarch Poghos, in carrying out one of the conditions of the plan of union consecrated holy oil for use in the administration of ‘Extreme unction’. The common people, only puzzled by the subtleties of doctrine found the innovations in the rites of the Church alarming. The faction of the papists who were opposed to the union on any terms, kept exasperating the nationals with their sarcasms: ‘If now you will only mention the Pope in your Liturgy, you will be perfect Catholics!’ On the 19th of August, members from *Collegio Urbano*, hostile to the unity, thwarted and disrupted the reconciliation. From among them a Collegian in disguise as a member of the Armenian Apostolic Church, holding in his hand a copy of the *Invitation to Love*, from which he had cut out the portrait St. Gregory the Illuminator and replaced it with a portrait of the Pope, run through the streets of the Armenian quarter shouting ‘*Our patriarch has become a Frank he has denounced our Father the Illuminator and has accepted the Pope of the Franks*’ [պատրիարհն մեր ֆրանկացեալ՝ ուրացաւ զԼուսաւորիչ հայրն մեր, և զպապան Ֆրանկաց ընկալաւ է]²⁷. The Patriarch was instructed to discover the instigators. Scores were thrown into prison and many sent into exile, some were executed for refusing to convert to Islam, while five were hanged. Among them beheaded was Father Komitas Keomirchian, who despite having openly confessed that he had not become a ‘*Frank*’ [միաբանեալ են ընդ Ֆրանկս]²⁸. On the 18th of September, 1820 a hapless

document concerning the separation of the Armenian-Armenian Catholics], *Hask 1-2* (1975), pp. 31-38. This is a short unpublished document copied by the scribe Tadeos Mihrdat attached to a manuscript entitled «Պատմութիւն անցից. յաւելած 1818-ի» [Additional information on the History of events of 1818] written by Patriarch Karapet Palattsi (1823-1831), which in several details differs from the account of Ormanian.

²⁵ For a full list of the participants See: Hrant Asatur, *op. cit.*, pp. 152-153.

²⁶ Leon Arpee, *A history of Armenian Christianity*, *op. cit.*, p. 258.

²⁷ See note 13.

²⁸ John Whooley, ‘*The Mekhitarists: Religion, culture and ecumenism in Armenian-Catholic relations*’, in *Eastern Christianity* (Anthony O’Mahony, ed.), London, 2004, p. 462, accuses Patriarch Awetik Ewdokiatsi (1704-1706)

octogenarian, Gregory Sahakian was brought to vespers to the door of the Patriarchal Church and beheaded.²⁹ The papal family of the Duzians *amiras*, in charge of the Royal mint were charged with dissent for supporting the Collegians (altars for celebration of mass were discovered in their homes) and were replaced by Palian dynasty at the Imperial mint.³⁰ The Armenian poet, playwright, and activist, Mkrtych Peshiktashlian (1828-1868), in turmoil because of confessional disputes and schism, became closely involved in community affairs, supporting the unity of the nation, expressed his frustration in a poem called ‘*We are brothers*’ [Եղբայր եմք մենք]. All the eight verses end with the same refrain “*We are all brothers*” -

“Clasp hands, for we are brothers dear

Of old by tempest rent apart

The dark designs of cruel Fate

Shall fail, when heart is joined to heart

What sound, beneath the stars aflame,

So lovely as a brother’s name”.³¹

In a recent study Sebouh David Aslanian, regards the splinter in the Mkhitarist Congregation, which he calls ‘Great Schism’ an exaggeration- a term first employed to describe the break up between the Eastern Orthodox and Roman Catholic churches in 1054, firstly as a consequence of ‘disputes over constitutionalism and representative governance in a monastic setting’ and secondly that the Habsburg authorities welcomed the expelled monks from Venice to Trieste ‘to topple Venice from its pedestal of prestige as the leading port and emporium in the Eastern Mediterranean’. He argues that the split in the Mkhitarist Congregation cannot be attributed ‘to theological or doctrinal differences among the parties’ but was motivated by ‘mercantile factors’.³² All the above arguments of his are plainly absurd and contrary to the efforts of the two communities in Constantinople to achieve reconciliation as evidenced in the publication called ‘*Invitation to Love*’, which failed as a result of the overzealous Catholicism advocated by the seditious monks of the Trieste faction. While on the one hand Aslanian

‘of particular notoriety’ was incarcerated in Bastille, where he died in 1711 and Father Komitas Keomirchian who was beheaded for refusing to convert to Islam. He was not a Catholic. Chamchian states that Father Komitas protested against his accusers ‘*Everything that they say is a lie*’ [բէ ստու է այն ամենայն, զոր խօսին դոքա]; See Vrej Nersessian, ‘Review article’ *op. cit.*, *Sion* (2019), pp. 195-219; M. Ormanian, *Azgapatum*, vol. II, Bk. 3, pp. 2756-2759; M. Chamchian, *History of Armenia*, *op. cit.*, Vol. III, p. 755; Hrant Asatur, *The Armenians of Constantinople and their patriarchs*, *op. cit.*, pp. 96-98.

²⁹ For a full list of those sent to exile or executed: See M. Ormanian, *Azgapatum*, *op. cit.*, vol. III, Bk. I, pp. 3470-3471.

³⁰ The most comprehensive account of the events from 1817-1823 is provided by Perperian *varzapet* Awetis, Պատմություն Հայոց սկսեալ ի 1772 ամէ մինչեւ ցամն 1860 հանդերձ կարեւոր տեղեկութեամբ եւ ժամանակագրութիւն երեւելի իրաց [Armenian history from the year 1772 until the year of the Lord 1860], Constantinople, 1871, Chapters 17-31, pp. 81-171. Pp. 435-621 Contains *Chronicle* of events from 1769-1860. This is a continuation of the *History* by M. Chamchian who covers the period up to 1772.; Tigran H. T. Sawaleants, Պատմություն Երուսաղեմի [History of Jerusalem], translated into modern Armenian by Mesrop Bsp. Nshanian], Jerusalem, 1931, vol. II, pp. 935 – 941.

³¹ Agop Hacikyan, *J et all, The heritage of Armenian literature. Volume III. From the eighteenth century to modern times*, Detroit, 2005, pp. 286-287 and 289-290.

³² Sebouh Aslanian, ‘The “Great Schism” of 1773: Venice and the founding of the Armenian community in Trieste’; *in Reflection of Armenian identity in history and historiography*, H. Berberian & T. Daryae (eds.), UCI Jordan Centre for Persian Studies, 2018, pp. 84-85.

dismisses Archbishop Ormanian's arguments on the causes of the split in the same breath states 'these had to do with rival and irreconcilable theological positions between the exponents of the two parties'.³³

The failure to implement the many acts of union with Rome in the thirteenth century

The ecclesiology of the Christian Church underwent substantial changes by the decisions of the Council of Constantinople of 381 recognising that the centre of gravity of the Empire had shifted eastward ever since the third century, when Constantinople was declared the 'the second Rome' which very rapidly became a 'New Rome' and its bishop 'Bishop of New Rome'. The contacts of the Armenian church with Rome only extends to the pre-Christian period. This is the supposed visit of the Armenian king Trdat I to Rome to receive his crown from Emperor Nero which in the medieval period is transported and enshrined in the *Letter of Concord* [*Dashants Tught*] cited in a military context to recall earlier Roman assistance to Armenia, or in an ecclesiastical context to demonstrate the Orthodoxy of Armenian faith and practice, mutually confirmed by monarchs Constantine and Trdat.³⁴ In the early Christian period Armenia did not cultivate political or ecclesiastical ties with Rome until the 12th century during the Crusades. In 1054 the negotiations between Byzantium and the Papacy failed disastrously resulting in the final breach between Rome and the Eastern Churches, the latter publishing a pamphlet in Constantinople entitled '*Against the Franks*', in which twenty-eight Latin malpractices were cited some authentic, but others were obviously untrue.³⁵ The decline and fall of the Macedonian [Armenian-Greek] dynasty in the disastrous defeat of the Byzantines by the Seljuk Turks at the battle of Manzikert in 1071 in the Emperor Diogenes Romanos was captured; and Asia Minor was left open to the invaders.³⁶

The aftermath of the Seljuk conquest of Armenia, a New Armenia (Little Armenia or the Armenian Kingdom of Cilicia) was founded in exile, in the south-eastern corner of Asia Minor and northern Syria in 1199. This was the first period in the long history that Armenia became involved with Rome. Armenian historians like Matthew of Edessa regard the arrival of the *Khachenkalk* (խաչընկալ), which means 'those who had taken up the cross' as the fulfilment of the prophecy of the Armenian patriarch Nerses the Great at the time of his death on Daniel's vision of the beast which predicts that the recapture of Jerusalem from the infidels will be by the Franks [«ի յազգէն ֆռանկաց լիցի փրկութիւնն երուսաղէմի»] (Daniel 7:7).³⁷ It is not clear whether in the mind of the historian Daniel's fourth beast represents the Crusaders, who will devour and trample the enemies of Christ, or whether it stands for Muslim rule, now to be destroyed. Sebeos writing sometime soon after 660 identifies the Muslims with Daniel's

³³ Sebouh Aslanian, *op. cit.*, p. 122. Aslanian forgets that Archbishop Ormanian was a founder member of Sacred Propagation of the Faith, before his return to the fold of the Armenian Orthodox Church on August 28-29, 1879 with 45 other Armenian Catholic males and 30 females.

³⁴ See note 16.

³⁵ Steven Runciman, *The Eastern Schism*, Oxford, 1956, pp. 55-77; Marcus Ward, *The Byzantine Church*, India, 1953, p. 66.

³⁶ Hrach Stepanyan, Հայ ժողովրդի պայքարը Թաթար-Մոնղոլական լծի դէմ [The struggle of Armenia under Tatar-Mongol occupation], Erevan, 1990, pp. 144.

³⁷ Matteos Urahayetsi [of Edessa], Պատմութիւն Մատթէոսի Ուրայէցոյ [History of Mathew of Edessa], Jerusalem, 1869, pp. 306-307 and 324. Covers the years 952-953 down to 1136 continuation by Grigor the Priest down to 1162.

fourth beast as he tried to come to terms with the new power in the East.³⁸ Armenian church's rapprochement with Rome began at this period in the context of seeking military aid from the west to protect the new state from the threat posed by the Turks and Mongols, which consistently required papal approval.

Several Armeno-Latin conclaves were summoned for unity in Sis (1243 and 1307) and Adana 1316 largely attended by bishops of the Cilician diocesan and princes of Cilicia, with no representation from Greater Armenia.³⁹ Esayi Nchetsi abbot of the Monastery of Gladzor describes these councils summoned as 'erroneous councils' [սխալ ժողով], in particular the Council of Adana.⁴⁰ The famous abbot of the university at Gladzor and his supporters are unanimous that the unity of the church is a God pleasing act and it is the devil 'that by his provocative deceit keeps us apart, to achieve victory easily'. Being realistic he confides that in the absence of all the necessary requirement for the unity of the churches, 'every church should remain loyal to the traditions it has inherited from the past and at the same time being respectful towards the laws and practices of the national Churches'.⁴¹

After the death of Grigor VII Anavarzetsi (1293-1307) in Sis, King Levon summons a council in Sis in 1307 and presents to the delegates a letter of the former Catholicos proposing the following doctrinal and sacramental changes:

- a. To mix water in the Eucharistic cup.
- b. Accept the authority of the seven Ecumenical Councils.
- c. Confess two natures, two wills and two actions in Christ.
- d. Celebrate the Dominical feast days with the Greeks and Latins-Birth of Christ on December 25th; Annunciation on 25th March; visit to the Temple on February 2nd etc.
- e. End the lent of the Nativity and Easter with olive oil and fish.
- f. Recite the Trisagion with the addition of the word 'Christ' as in 'Christ who was Crucified'.⁴²

In 1198 Cilicia became a kingdom; in 1375 the last king was carried away a captive into Egypt. Armenian 'Messianism' a salvation that was to come from the west never materialised. After so many unhappy experiences, the Catholicos became an instrument of pressure in the hands of foreign powers and hence the Eastern clergy held a National Council in Etchmiadzin in 1441

³⁸ Sebeos, *The Armenian History attributed to Sebeos*, op. cit., p. 177.

³⁹ Vrej Nersessian, 'The See of Holy Etchmiadzin and the Vatican: A chronicle of the contacts between Armenian Catholicos and Popes', *Sion*, 1-2-3 (2021), pp. 78-87 and 4-7, pp. 183-195. For a contextualization of these developments according to the Papal correspondences with the Cilician court, see W. H. Rudt de Collenberg, 'Les Bullae et Litterae adressees par les Vaticano', in *Armenian Studies in Memoriam Haig Berberian* (Dickran Kouymjian (ed.), Lisbon, 1986, pp. 697-726. For the English renderings of the First-Second Letters of Pope John XXII to Archbishop Zakaria of Artaz and Letter of Pope John XXII to the heads of state and theologians of Southern Caucasia see S. Peter Cowe, 'The role of correspondence in elucidating the intensification of Latin-Armenian ecclesiastical interchanges in the first quarter of the fourteenth century', *JSAS*, 13 (2003, 2004), pp. 61-68.

⁴⁰ Nicolas Coureas, 'The Papacy's relations with the kings and the nobility of Armenia in the period 1300-1350' *Actes du Colloque 'Les Lusignans et L'Outre Mer* (C. Mutaian (ed.), Poitiers, 1993, pp. 99-107.

⁴¹ Matenadaran Ms. 9622, fls. 734-753 'Letter of Esayi vardapet in response to the letter of Catholicos of Sis (Hovhannes VI Ssetsi, 1203-1221) and the king' (Leo). The precise date of the letter is not known, but it must have been written during the final decade of the 14th.

⁴² Abp. Eznik Petrosyan, Հայ եկեղեցու պատմություն (Ա. մաս) [History of the Armenian Church (Part 1), Erevan, 2016, pp. 203-204.

and decided to ‘return’ [վոխադրել] the Holy See of the Catholicoi back to Holy Etchmiadzin.

Fratres Unitores and the role of the ‘Inquisitor haerelicae pravitatis’ – (Congregation for the Doctrine of Faith).

In 1341 Avignon, city and archdiocese in France became the seat of the papacy from 1309 to 1377 (a period known as the ‘Babylonian Captivity’) a number of Latinophile Armenian clergy supporting the union of the Armenian church with Rome acted as a catalyst in the formation of an Armenian Catholic brotherhood affiliated with the Dominican Order, called the *Fratres Unitores* (Միաբաճող) in the archbishopric of Sultaniyyah (Sultanieh) in Nakhijevan.⁴³

The most significant among them was Hovhannes Krnetsi who composed a list of 19 errors in the Armenian Church and provided it to *Unitores* clergy. His followers were Nerses Palients (Paghon Taronatsi) and Simeon Pek. In 1336 Palients is mentioned as bishop in Urmiay. There he meets with the bishop of Karin named Simeon Pek, travel to Cilicia and devote themselves to *Unitores* cause. Chamchian writes ‘United with other same minded they travelled here and there, preached and if necessary they re-baptised, re-confirmed all Armenians with according to Latin rites, and re-ordained their priests and instructed them to celebrate liturgy in Latin and according to Catholic rites, alter all the orders of the Fasts and other practices, so that there after they can join the church of Rome and would confess with Catholicos Mkhitar [1st Grnetsi, 1341-1355] that the Armenian rite of Baptism was dubious and their liturgy is not a true sacrifice’.⁴⁴ Nerses Palients for his adversarial activities was persecuted by the Armenian political and ecclesiastical authorities and in 1341 ‘imbittered’ he fled to Avignon and presented himself to Pope Benedict spreading malicious untruth concerning Armenian church’s faith and practices, the most extreme case of which was the compilation of 117 Armenian errors, the 110th being a list of ‘heretical’ (մոլորական) books of the Armenian Church which in 1341 he presented to Pope Benedict XII.⁴⁵ Here we need to point out that the accusations were refuted by

⁴³ Oudenrijn M. A. van den, ‘Bishops and Archbishops of Naxivan’ in *Archivum Fratrum Praedictorum* vol. VI (1936), pp. 161-216; Jean Richard, *La papauté et les missions d’orient au moyen age (XIII-XV siècles)*, 2nd ed. Rome: Ecole Française, 1988. Sultaniyyah was established by the Mongols in the 13th c. and was significantly expanded into a capital in 1305; See *The Encyclopaedia of Islam* (C. E. Bosworth, et al. eds.), vol. IX, Brill, 1997.

⁴⁴ M. Chamchian, *op. cit.* pp. 330-331. Catholicos Mkhitar calls a meeting at Sis in 1342, and point by point discuss the 117 errors. Pope Clement VI (1342-1352) and Pope Innocent VIth (1352-1362) send Nerses Palients to negotiate the submission to the Roman Catholic Church in return for military aid. See J. Gray. *Le Pape Clement VI et les affaires d’Orient*, 342-1352, Paris, 1904, pp. 133-146.

⁴⁵ I shall list the 18 titles with minor notes: 1. *Tonapachar* – *Tonapachar*, *Tonapachaz*, *Tonaphacen*, *Tenophacer* {confusion between the vowels o-e; a-o; a-er-z r-n; p-ph} (**Տօնապաշտճառ**- A book against the feasts of the Roman and Greek churches); 2. *Hanadoarmat*, *Anadoarmat* – **Արճառ Հաաառայ** (“Seal of Faith” composed by Vardan Aygektsi in 1205); 3. *Johannes Mandagonensis*- **Յովհաննէս Մանդակունի** (Armenian theologian opposed to the Greek Church (478-490), *Treatise against the Council of Chalcedon*); 4. *Johannes Ossinensis* – **Յովհաննէս Օճնէցի** ((Catholicos from 717-728 anti-Chalcedonian tract); 5. *Liber Miascosurus*, *Myascosurum*, *Myascosutum*, *Myastosuru* Nerses Lambronatsi’s (1153-1198) [*Liber*] unius locutionis = **Գիրք Միաբանութեան**; 6. *Liber Michael*, *Liber Michaelis patriarchae Antiocheni* – **Գիրք Միխայէլի** (*Chronicle of Patriarch Michael of Antioch translated into Armenian in 1248*); 7. *Paulus Taronensis* - **Պօղոս Տարօնէցի** (11-12 century theologian ‘*Epistle against Theopistus*’); 8. *Octavensis*, *Tochanensis*, *Occenensis* {confusion in the letters t-t-c, a-e, n-v} - **Ովստանէս Եպիսկոպոս** (*Historian of the 10th century on ‘The history of the separation of the Georgian and Armenian churches’*); 9. *Liber Matthaeus* - **Մատթէոս գիրք** (12th century historian Matthew of Edessa ‘*Chronicle*’); 10. *Canones apostolorum*, *Liber Canonum apostolorum* - **Կանոնք առաքելական** (*Contains all the ‘errors of the Armenian church’*); 11. *Liber Sergniz*, *Sergium* - **Սարգիս Շնորհալի** (12th century author ‘*Commentary on the Seven Catholic Epistles*’); 12. *Liber Marucha*. *Marocha* - **Մայրազոմէցի** (7th century anti-Chalcedonian theologian); 13. *Liber Nanam*, *Ranam*, *Vanam* - **Նանան գիրք** (9th

fellow Armenian Franciscan Daniel of Tabriz,⁴⁶ the Synod of Sis 1341-1342 and later by Catholic authors (Galanus, Villote, Mansi). According to Ormanian Nerses Palients was from Taron and not Sis who had gone to Krna and there joined the *Unitores*. In a colophon written by him in 1332 he writes ‘I Nerses by calling a *vardapet* but by labour a useless soil and dust among the *vardapets*, son of Vahram from the land of Taron in the province of Sis, from the monastery of Lazar, in the village called Kor’.⁴⁷ It is worth reminding the reader the Nerses Palients action had its antecedent in the Byzantine circles in the shape of ‘*Narratio de rebus Armenie*’ written in Greek by an Armenian-Chalcedonian in the beginning of the VIII century. The author of this document was Chalcedonian Armenian ‘who had renounced his faith, accepted the doctrine of the Greeks and composed his book of errors which the Armenians believed in those times’.⁴⁸

In the twelfth century the infiltration of the Roman Catholic Church into Cilicia, the Chalcedonian issue from the Byzantine era re-surfaced in Cilicia. This was the result of the political changes that took place in Cilicia. Prince Leo II in 1198 restores Armenian independence by receiving his crown from the Pope and the German Emperor. Thereafter during the entire 13-14th centuries just as the Byzantine rulers had tried to enforce Orthodoxy on the Armenians, so also the Papacy wished to bring their submission to the Roman Catholic Church under the guise of Latinisation. The demands of the Papacy caused a rift between Cilician Kingdom and the mother country where the theologians of the monasteries of Artaz and Tatew were the staunch defenders of the national traditions. Religion was a powerful stimulant of national consciousness. The sense of a common religious heritage uniting the Armenians of the both realms, enabled them to express their national self-determination by forcing the return of the See of the Catholicate of All Armenians back to its original location in Etchmiadzin in 1441.⁴⁹

REVD. DR. NERSESS NERSESSIAN

(Part 1)

century monophysite Jacobite Nana's ‘Commentary on the Gospel of St. John’); 14. *Liber Ignadius* - Իգնատիոս զիր (12th century monk Ignatios's ‘Commentary on the Gospel of St. Luke’); 15. *Liber Ganazan*, *Guanazan*, *Guanazam* latin title ‘*Liber virgarum*’ i. e. - Գիր Գաազանաց (Chronicle of Catholicoi); 16. *Pataraquin Mehging*, *Pataraquin Mehging*, *Neginua Pataraquin*, *Naguig Patracum* - Մեկնիչ Պատարազին (Commentators on the Divine Liturgy); 17. *Textorquire*, *Teytorgunt* translated title given as ‘*Liber epistolarum*’ - Գիր Թղթոց (‘Book of Letters’ compiled in 1298. Collected Letters on the doctrinal position of the Armenian church towards Chalcedonianism and Nestorianism); 18. *Aismanorc*, *Aismanore*, *Aismavort*, *Aysyjanot* translated title given as - *Martyrologium* i. e. Յայսմաւորք). For a complete annotated list See H. Anasyan, «Հայոց մոլորական համարուած գրքերն ըստ Լատինական մի ցուցակի» [Armenian heretical books according to an ancient Latin list], Մանր երկեր [Minor Works], Los Angeles, 1987, pp. 303-317; reprinted from Etchmiadzin, 10 (1957), pp. 27-89. The entire corpus of anti-Chalcedonian theological works was deemed heretical.

⁴⁶ For a complete published text See “*Responsio fratris Danielis [De Thaurisio] ad errores impositos Hermenis*” in *RHC Documents Armeniens*, t. II, Paris, 1906, p. 559-650; J. D. Mansi, “*Concilium Armenorum, in que objecti Armenis in libello errores condemnatur, eorumque fides amplius, anno 1342 celebratum; ex ms. codice Bibliothecae Regiae*, t. XXV, Graz, 1961, p. 1185-1270.

⁴⁷ Abp. M. Ormanian, *Azgapatum*, op. cit., vol. II, p. 1279; Lewond Alishan, *Հայապատմութիւն* [Armenian History], Venice, 1893, p. 375.

⁴⁸ G. Garritte, *La Narratio de rebus Armeniae in CSCO*, vol. 132, subsidia t. 4, Louvain 1967; Armenian translation of the text from the Greek by H. Bartikian, *BM*, No. 6 (1962), pp. 457-470.

⁴⁹ Arshak Alpoyachian, «Աթոռին Էջմիածին վերահաստատութեան շարժառիթները եւ անոր գլխաւոր գործիչները» [The motives for returning the See of Holy Etchmiadzin and its principal motivators], *HHT* 2nd Year (1949-1950), pp. 1-15.

Abbreviations

BM - Banber Matenadarani

CSCO - Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum

EBA - Etudes Byzantines et Armeniennes

Etchmiadzin - Official monthly of the Holy See of Etchmiadzin

Gandzasar - Theological Journal of the Diocese of Artsakh

HHT - Hask Hayagitakan Taregirk'

JSAS - Journal for the Society of Armenian Studies

ODB - Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium

ODLA - The Oxford Dictionary of Late Antiquity

RHC - Recueil des historiens des croisades - Document armeniens

Sion - Official monthly of the Armenian Patriarchate of Jerusalem

ZDPV - Zeitschrift des deutschen Palastina -vereins

