

ԿՐՕՆԱԿԱՆ

**THE JURIDICIZATION OF DOCTRINE AT THE EXPENSE OF  
THEOLOGICAL SCHOLARSHIP. THE CASE OF MIKAYEL CHAMCHIAN'S  
‘SHEILD OF FAITH’**

**«Վահան Հաւատոյ» [‘Shield of Faith’]. The Orthodoxy of the Armenian Church]<sup>1</sup>**

On 12<sup>th</sup> January, 1719 and on the 14<sup>th</sup> of April, 1733, the founder of the Mkhitarist Congregation Mkhitar Sebastatsi presents to the ‘College of Propaganda Fide’ a comprehensive communication in which he gives dispensation to Catholic Armenians in Constantinople to attend Armenian Orthodox Churches and participate in their rites. This is evidence that Mkhitar Sebastatsi was against the presence of Catholic missionaries engaged in proselytising, emphasizing his mission to protect the national, cultural, religious and social coherence of the Armenian nation. A group of Mkhitarist among them, Chamchian was ‘a devoted catholic but not a latinophile’, were developing the notion that the two churches could co-operate by dialogue without compromising their identities. They vigorously defended the autocephalous character of the Armenian church by drawing attention to the fact that the Armenian church had not removed itself from the Roman Catholic Church and the doctrinal position of the Armenian church had not been officially condemned by the Papacy. The adoption of this view by the Mkhitarists is the principal theme of Chamchian’s three volume *History of Armenia*. In his history Chamchian is critical of those Catholic historians, who by distorting the above fact have tried to proof that the Armenian Church has deviated from orthodoxy. Chamchian cannot even hide his disdain for Catholic apologist Clemens Galanus (+1666), whom papal circles named ‘God’s scourge against the eastern heretics’, while he himself boasted that with bribery he could with the participation of corrupt and arrogant Catholic Armenian clergy could secure ‘*Abundant harvest*’ for Rome.<sup>2</sup> Clemens Galanus from the Order of Theatins published in Rome in two parts his *Conciliationis Ecclesiae Armenae cum Romana ex ipsis Armenorum Patrum et Doctorum testimoniis, in dua partes, historialem et controversialum, diuinae Pars prime* produced two ‘*Conciliationis Ecclesia Armenae cum Romana* = Միաբանութիւն Հայոց եկեղեցւոյն ընդ Մեծի եկեղեցւոյն Հռովմայ’.<sup>3</sup> The work is based on the writings of the famous Franciscan Luc Wadding and the

<sup>1</sup> Վահան Հաւատոյ Ուղղափառութեան Հայաստանեայց եկեղեցւոյ Յօրինեալ ի Հ. Միքայէլ Վարդապետէ Զամչեան: Ի համառօտութենէ անտի զաղափարեալ ի Պետրոսեան Պօղոս Սարկաւագէ Կ. Պոլսեցւոյ դասասաց անուանելոյ: «Ի Կիպրոս նաւահանգիստ Թուղլայ ի Փետրուար) 1823: Տպագրեալ արդեամբ և վերատեսչութեամբ Տ. Յովնանու Խաչիկեան Խաչակիր Քահանայի՝ յիւրով տպարանի յամի Տեառն 1873 ի Կալկաթա, էջ. 115+26. [vii] Փայտփորագիր պատկեր Թարգմանչաց վարդապետների - ձախից լուսանցից: Եղիշէ - Գրիգոր Նարեկացի - Ներսէս Շնորհալի - Ներսէս Լամբրոնացի - Մովսէս Խորենացի - Սար(գի՛ս) մէկն(ի՛շ). Engraved by Madhub Chander Mullink: Տ. Յ. Խ: Երկրորդ մասը սկսում է դիմապատկերով Տէր Յովնաննէս Խաչիկեան Աւագ Քահանայ ասպետ = Revd. Johanness Chachiek.

<sup>2</sup> K. Ezian, Բռնի միութիւն Հայոց Լեհաստանի ընդ եկեղեցւոյն Հռովմայ [The forced union of the Armenians of Poland with the church of Rome], St. Petersburg, 1884, p. 121.

<sup>3</sup> «Միաբանութիւն Հայոց Սուրբ եկեղեցւոյն ընդ մեծի Սուրբ եկեղեցւոյն Հռովմայ» (Latin and Armenian texts), 2 vols., Rome, 1650-1658; See Vrej Nersessian, Catalogue of Early Armenian Books 1512-1850, The British Library, 1980, nos. 17 & 18, p. 50.

Armenian Dominican *Unitores* priest Grigor Dsodsoresetsi [Գրիգոր Ծոճճօրէցի], *The Letter of Hovhannes Krnetsi to Fratres unitors* shortly before their establishment, which includes the 19 errors of the Armenian church, extracts from *Letter of Concord* [Dashants Tught, and finally *Letter to King Hetum (1226-1270) in which Galanus calls* Hovhan Odznetsi, Anania Shirakatsi, Poghos Taronatsi, Vardan Areveltsi and Mkithar Gosh ‘false vardapets’ (սուս վարդապետներ).<sup>4</sup> Galanus also includes in his “*Conciliationis*” the tract ‘On the seven sacraments’ the translation of which into Armenian Galanus attributes to Hovhannes Krnetsi but whose translator is in fact Hovhannes Erznkatsi (also known as Dsordoretsi) who participated in the Council of Adana.<sup>5</sup> Chamchian draws a different conclusion by convincingly establishing the orthodoxy of these patristic fathers. With extended explanations he refutes the ‘false accusations’ («սուս մեղադրանքներ»). At the same time does not neglect to numerate the many points on which the ‘two sister’ churches have in common in contrast to the catholic missionaries, who in exasperation continued demanding the return of the Armenian church into the ‘fold of the Catholic Church’. While Chamchian a brilliant and prophetic theologian while remaining impenitently and loyally a Mkhitarist is convinced that there is no need for that, for he gives reassurance in his *The Shield of Faith* authored between 1738-1823, which fell into the hands of the Roman *magisterium* who maintained their conviction for spiritual absolutism and intransigence, added the book to their list of heretical books and had it destroyed. The Mkhitarists in Venice did not dare defend Chamchian in front of the Propaganda inquisition and to protect the Catholic Armenians in the Ottoman Empire from fear of persecution. An Armenian Catholic in Venice called by his Italian name Marchese Giovanni de Serpos [Hovhannes *aspet* Seghbosian] published his ‘*Dissertatione Polemico-Critica...concernenti gli armeni catholici studdti dell impero ottoman, presantati all sacra Congregazione di Propaganda* (Venice 1783), in which he denounces the accusations of Galanus and utilising freely the *History of the Armenians*, the *Shield of Faith* by Mikayel Chamchian, Papal Bulls and the decisions of the Councils of the Propaganda Fidei to defend Chamchian from being denounced at heretic. Most interesting is the quotations of the decisions of the Encyclicals issued on 31<sup>st</sup> January, 1702 and 13<sup>th</sup> March, 1755 on the rituals and practices of the Eastern Churches based on the evidence of which Pope Benedict XIII (1640-1730) declared ‘Let every church observe its own rituals’ [«Պահեսցեն իւրաքանչիւր (եկեղեցի) զիւրհանց ծէս»].<sup>6</sup> Clement Galanus ‘God’s scourge’ had secured great authority among Catholics through his missionary and historical works. For that very reason many scholars blindly follow him, repeating everything found in his writings. Thus, western scholars unable to access Armenian sources predominantly shaped their views of Armenian Christianity on the writings of Galanus.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>4</sup> Oudenrijn M. A. Van Den O. P., Յովհաննէս Քոնցեցիի Ընդհանրական Թուղթը Կալանոսի “Conciliatio”-ին մէջ [The inclusion of Hovhannes Krnetsi’s Encyclical addressed to the Fratres Unitorum in the “Conciliation”] translated into Armenian by Gnel Ds. Vardapet, HHT, 2<sup>nd</sup> year (1949-1950), pp. 109-208.

<sup>5</sup> The tract “On the seven sacraments” is the Armenian version of Saint Thomas Aquinas’s (c. 1225-1274) [‘...et transtulerunt pro tune quantum librum Sententiarum sancti Thome propter sacraments.

<sup>6</sup> M. Ormanian, Ազգապատում, op. cit Vol. II, Bk. 3, pp. 3163-3166. Sepeos defends the Orthodoxy of the Armenian church, all its rituals and practices in six books covering 1608 pages. He is also the author of a History of Armenia (Venice 1786), which is modelled on Chamchian’s work.

<sup>7</sup> Mikayel Chamchian, Armenian History, op. cit., vol. III, chapter XXVII, pp. 622-629; Leo, Երկերի Ժողովածոյ [Collected Works], Vol. V, Erevan, 1986, p. 225; Sadly several modern Mkhitarist historians- Balgy Alexander (Palcian), Historia doctrinae Catholicae inter Armenos unionisque eorum cum Ecclesia Romana in Concilio Florentino (Vienna, 1878), Vardan vardapet Hatsuni, Կարեւոր խնդիրներ Հայ եկեղեցւոյ պատմութեան [Important questions in the history of the Armenian Church] (Venice, 1927); L. S. Kogian, Հայոց եկեղեցին մինչև Ֆրոնտենան

His reputation suffered when he came under severe criticism from the theologians of the ‘New Julfa’ School, when a printing press was founded in New Julfa in 1687 predating the founding of the Mkhitarist Congregation and Press.<sup>8</sup>

**Description of the only printed edition in comparison with a manuscript copy (Arm. MS. 14) in the University of California**

According to Patriarch Ormanian the original manuscript of *Shield of Faith* a copy of which he had seen in the Armenian Atonian Catholic monastery in Constantinople, consisted of 924 handwritten pages<sup>9</sup> was completed in 1776. Chamchian, a member of the reconciliation delegation representing the Mkhitarists of Venice [see above] asserts the ‘Orthodoxy’ of the Armenian Church against Catholic papist accusations that the Armenian church had deviated from the truth.

For setting out the facts of this extraordinary case I am dependent on the printed edition of the ‘*Sheild of Faith*’ and the manuscript copy formerly in the collection of the late Dr. Caro Minassian of New Julfa and now part of the University of California’s collection (Arm. MS. Nr. 14).

Members of the schismatic Collegian faction of the Catholic community in Constantinople, who opposed the faction to which Mikayel Chamchian belonged, managed to steal the manuscript from the safe in which it had been kept. Their leader, Poghos *vardapet* Papasian, made a copy of it, travelled to Rome and, submitted the manuscript to the *magisterium*, the Church’s ‘teaching office’ in the Vatican. The inquisition appointed by the Holy See, meeting at the monastery of St. Mary at Minerva on May 5, 1819 concluded that Chamchian could not be considered the author of the manuscript submitted to them and hence was to be found innocent of the accusations. The verdict was confirmed by Pope Pius VII on June 30<sup>th</sup>, 1819. Although the Inquisition resolved that Chamchian’s *Shield of Faith* was censored and listed among the heretical books.

From the inscription in the manuscript (fls. 60-60v) and the printed version (pp. 116-118) we learn that in August of 1817 a notable named Harutiwn *agha* Pezian purchased a copy of the abridged version from the Collegian clerics in Constantinople. Deacon Poghos Petrosian employed at the time as a tutor to Harutiwn *agha*’s nephews made a copy for his own use. In 1823 the deacon left Constantinople for Cyprus, and while waiting for a ship to journey Jerusalem, he completed the title page, subtitles, and other divisions of his codex that had been only sketchily laid out by the abridger of Chamchian’s original manuscript. The deacon states that after arriving in Jerusalem, he offered his codex to Archbishop Mkrtich vrd. Ghrimetsi (i.e. from Crimea, d. 1828) then chief sacristan of the Armenian Patriarchate. It is to be noted that the manuscript collection in Jerusalem contain two manuscripts written by deacon Poghos Petrosian: MS 409, written in 1821 at Tuzla, Cyprus [«Ի Կիպրոս նաւահանգիստն Թուղլայ, Ի

ժողովը [The Armenian Church up to the Council of Florence] (Beyrout, 1961); B. L. Zekian’, ‘Les disputes religieuses di XIV siècle, preludes des divisions et du statut ecclesiologique posterior de l’eglise Armeniennes’, Actes du Colloque (C. Mutaftian ed.), op. cit., pp. 305-315; John Whooley continue upholding Galanus’s reputation See Vrej Nersessian, ‘Review article: The Armenian Apostolic Orthodox Church and the vision of the Fratre Unitores or Unifying Friars among Armenians’, Sion, August- December (2019), pp. 195-219.

<sup>8</sup> Vrej Nersessian, ‘The impact of the New Julfa – ‘New Geneva’ school of theologians against the crisis of proselytization and apostasy in Safavid Iran’, Living Stones Yearbook 2020, pp. 240-310.

<sup>9</sup> M. Ormanian, Ազգասպառուժ, vol. II, Bk. 3, pp. 2162-2163.

փետր(ւա)ր 1825» printed on the title page of the printed edition]; and MS. 2692, written in 1821 at Pera in Constantinople.<sup>10</sup>

The abridged version was published in Calcutta in 1873 by the priest Hovhannes Khachikian. The publication is based on the short version copied in Tuzla, Cyprus in 1828, as stated on the title page. In the preface of the book the publisher states that in 1844 he had seen a manuscript copy of the text with Ter Isahak vardapet Grigorian [d. 1831], who had arrived in India as *nuncio* of the Armenian Patriarchate of Jerusalem. A while later, the priest Martiros Ter Hovakimian [1846-1849]<sup>11</sup> who had been sent from New Julfa as a diocesan priest, borrowed the manuscript from Isahak vardapet to make a copy for himself, and it was this manuscript that formed the basis of the printed edition.<sup>12</sup>

The chapter headings are as follows:

i. Title page

ii-iii. Dedication to Ter Grigoris prelate of the Diocese of All-Saviours Convent of [New] Julfa

iv. Printer's introduction

v. Icon of a cross with 6-line eulogy.

vi-vii. Eleven verses inserted by the printer entitled 'On the glory of the Church' [«Յաւելուած Տապաքչի ի Փառս եկեղեցոյ»] topped by a quotation from Hovhannes Erznkatsi's also called Dsordsoretsi «Ի գովեստ Լուսա(ւորչի) յամի Տեառն 1288» [‘In Praise of St. Gregory the Illuminator’].<sup>13</sup>

viii. Frontispiece portrait of the ‘Translators’ representing – Eghishe - Grigor Narekatsi - Nerses Shnorhali - Nerses Lambronatsi - Movses Khorenatsi - Sargis Mek(nitch?) accompanied by the legend «Հանդէս բարունեաց տանս աստանազեան Արգոյ հեռորաց չինաղ տեսարան»

Portrait of the priest Khatchikian inscribed ‘Engraved by Madhub Chander Mulliek’. T. H. Kh [ initials of Ter Hovhannes Khatchikian]

ix. Blank. pp. 1-5 (fols. 3-4v) Հաստատութիւն Ուղղափառութեան Հայաստանեայց եկեղեցոյ [Confirmation of the Orthodoxy of the Armenian Church.

<sup>10</sup> In the margin of the copy in UCLA MS. 14, fls. 61-6av, the owner of the manuscript Dr. Caro Minassian attests that his manuscript is a copy made by Martiros Ter Hovakimian in Calcutta from the exemplar belonging to Isahak vrd. Ter Grigorian; for other manuscript copies: Vrej Nersessian, A Catalogue of the Armenian manuscripts in the British Library acquired since the year 1913 and of collections in other libraries in the United Kingdom, The British Library, 2012, vol. II, Or. MS. 14177, pp. 874-877; Apb. Norayr Pogharian, Մայր Ցուցակ ձեռագրաց Սրբոց Յակոբեանց [Grand catalogue of St. James' manuscripts], Jerusalem 1966-1991, 11 vols. 2: 345-346 and 8: 311-312. For copies of the manuscript in All Saviour's Monastery in New Julfa [Isfahan] see Smbat Ter Awetisian, Vienna, 1970, Vol. I, MS. 504 (p. 776); O. Eganyan, Ցուցակ Մատենադարանի [Catalogue of Manuscripts in the Matenadaran], Erevan, 1965-1970, Vol. 2, MS 9030 and 9842, cols. 856-57 & 1002.

<sup>11</sup> Deacon Tigran Baghramyan, Արեւմտեան Բենգալիայում թաղուած հայ հոգեւորականները [Armenian clergy buried in West Bengal], Yerevan-Kolkata, 2007, pp. 144-145.

<sup>12</sup> In the margin of the copy in UCLA MS. 14, fol. 61-61v, the owner of the manuscript Dr. Caro Minassian attests his manuscript is the copy made by Martiros Ter Hovakimian in Calcutta from the exemplar belonging to Isahak vardapet Ter Grigorian.

<sup>13</sup> Hovhannes vrd. Dsordsoretsi (or Erznkatsi), 1260?-1335?. A graduate of the University of Gladzor and pupil of Esayi Ntchetsi (1255?-1338).

1<sup>st</sup> Task. pp. 5-10 (fols. 4v-7) 1<sup>st</sup> task. Խնդիր առաջին Յաղագս ժողովոյն Քաղկեդոնի ‘Concerning the Council of Chalcedon’. *Sub sections* pp. 10-16 (fols. 7-9v)

2<sup>nd</sup> Task. ‘What do Armenians think on the one or two natures in Christ’ [[Զի՞նչ միտս ասեն հայք մի բնութիւն կամ երկու բնութիւն ի Քրիստոս]. { \*167 }

3<sup>rd</sup> Task. pp. 16-21 (fols. 9v-11v) ‘Concerning the procession of the Holy Spirit’ [Յաղագս բղխման Հոգւոյն սրբոյ];

4<sup>th</sup> Task. pp. 21-27 (fols. 54-57v), ‘What view do Armenians hold on the deceased and what meaning does the word purgatory hold for them’ [Թէ զի՞նչ կարծիս իցեն հայք վասն ննջեցելոց, և յի՞նչ միտս առեալ լինի ի նոցանէ բառս Քաւարան];

5<sup>th</sup> Task. pp. 27-31 (fols. 11v-13v), ‘On the inclusion of the phrase ‘Who was crucified for us’ in the Trisagion ‘Holy God’ [Յաղագս խաչեցարիւ երգելոյ սուրբ աստուածն]<sup>14</sup> {pp. 309-310}

6<sup>th</sup> Task. pp. 32-36 (fols. 52-54v) ‘Concerning the feast day of Christ’s birth’ [Յաղագս տօնի Ծննդեան Քրիստոսի] { \*pp. 577 }

7<sup>th</sup> Task. pp. 37-53 (fols. 37-45v) ‘Concerning the sacred cup as to whether it should be undiluted or mixed with water’ [Յաղագս սրբոյ բաժակին ընդ բանի անապակ կամ ջրախառն մատուցանելոյ]

8<sup>th</sup> Task. pp. 53-64 (fols. 45v-52), ‘On how the rules and commandments of the church should be observed’ [Թէ զի՞նչ պիտի եղանակաւ պահելի են օրէնք և պատուիրանք եկեղեցւոյ]<sup>15</sup>;

9<sup>th</sup> Task, pp. 65-77 (fols. 31-37) ‘Extreme unction’ [Յաղագս վերջին օծման] { \*pp. 743 }

10<sup>th</sup> Task. pp. 77-103 (fols. 13v-31) ‘Concerning the Primacy of the See of Rome’ [Յաղագս նախագահութեան Առաքելական Աթոռոյն] { \*pp. 824 }

pp. 103-115 ‘The Armenian church is free of heresy and schismatism [Յաղագս ազատ գոյլ եկեղեցւոյ հայոց ի հերետիկոսութենէ և ի հերձուածողութենէ]<sup>16</sup>

pp. 116-118. Contain the various colophons and inscriptions signed by Gamillius Spartsian notary of the Holy Roman Inquisition (Seal); Petrosian deacon Poghos (Patriarchate of Jerusalem 1824); Ter Grigor Isahak *nuncio* of the Apostolic See of Jerusalem to India (30 June, 1846, Calcutta); Ter Martiros Ter Hovakimian (New Julfa 6<sup>th</sup> March, 1852). The scribe of the manuscript is named as Andreas Ter Eghiazarian.

Unpaginated page carrying the portrait of the publisher and owner of the printing press Ter Hovhannes Khachikian archpriest and *Aspet* = Revd. Johanness Catchik [reverse side blank].

<sup>14</sup> The publisher has made the following annotation. First, he explains the origin of the hymn ‘Holy God’ and proves that all peoples, including Latins recite the hymn addressed to the Son, as evidenced in the singing of the hymn on Good Friday, when in place of the ‘Word ‘who was crucified’ a real cross is held aloft. Therefore, it is the right of the Armenian church to continue to sing as before and not to change.

<sup>15</sup> The scribe of the manuscript has erred in designating this as Task 4<sup>th</sup>.

<sup>16</sup> The numbers with \* in { } brackets inserted by the publisher with notes are those of the un-abridged manuscript. The complete manuscript ends on page 880. The end section expands his concerted opposition to Clemens Galanus’, by re-stating the view of the Armenian theologians Hovhannes Imastaser Odznetsi, Parsam, Vorotnetsi [Hovhannes] and Tatevatsi [Grigor] vardapet on the Orthodoxy of the Armenian Church.



Appended to the printed version of the ‘*Shield of Faith*’ with new pagination is a 23-page response entitled «Աղաղակ սրտի ընդդէմ վատասիրտ արանց որք խոռվին ի բարի գործս ալոյց» [‘*Anguish from the hearth against those timid individuals who are disturbed by the good works of others*’]. Revd. Khatchikian is responding to those who hearing of the news of the publication of ‘*Shield of Faith*’ were criticising him for having printed the work of a dedicated Papist and a Catholic vardapet [i.e. Mikayel Chamchian], who stood accused of not being a worthy Armenian and cunningly pretending to defend the Armenian Church, while allegedly promoting the conversion of the Armenians to Roman Catholicism [չէր օրէն մեզ տպագրել զայն գործ Պապական Վարդապետի, և ոչ իսկ նորին յազգս արժան ծագումն]. His accusants doubted Chamchian’s sincerity and circulated rumours that his motives were a cynical facade. One of the major criticisms against Chamchian was that he had been too reliant on the contents of *Dashants Tught*. The publisher declines to give the name of his accuser confessing ‘I do not wish to give his name for two reasons; first for the respect I have towards him and secondly from my fear that I am not certain of his identity’. The publisher narrates his defence in the form of Questions and Answers. And his justification for publishing the work is ‘Yes he was a papist and a brave one too for according to some co-religionists, he was not against his national church but was faithful and defended it according to his best ability’.

[Հ. Զի՞նչ կամիս ասել թէ չէր նա պապական և պաշտպան Հ. եկեղեցւոյ:

Պ. «Այո՛, նա պապական էր և կարի քաջ, սակայն ըստ ոմանց կրօնակցաց՝ չէր հակառակ իւրոյ ազգային եկեղեցւոյ, այլ հաւատարիմ և պաշտպան ըստ կարի»] ending with the words of the Apostle ‘*Let every man abide in the same calling wherein he was called*’ and ‘*Brethren, let every man, wherein he is called, therein abide with God*’ (I Cor. 7, vv. 20 & 24).<sup>17</sup>

I would hazard a guess suggesting that the person questioning his wisdom for printing the ‘*Shield of Faith*’ was his long-time friend and colleague the priest Hovhannes Mkrian (1831-1909) with whom he did not wish to begin a long acrimonious theological argument. Khatchikian bequeathed his outstanding library to Father Mkrian which was bought for the library of the Catholicate of Cilicia in Antelias.

### **The Theology of ‘Shield of Faith’**

The work begins with a broad history of the Armenian church. During its entire history in times of prosperity and many tragic instances, but never has She deviated from its true beliefs and reform, which she inherited from St. Gregory the Illuminator, but kept unchanged and still preserves the same until now.

Then he lists the contents of his thesis in ten chapter the errors and accusation levelled against the Armenian church. I will list these and provide, with in due brevity the arguments he advances proving the contrary.

#### **1. Concerning the Council of Chalcedon.**

The Armenian Church not having participated in the Council of Chalcedon preserved the Christological traditions of the first three Ecumenical Councils, and came to side with those who rejected Chalcedon. Its adherence to non-Chalcedonian Christology remained a potential problem in its relations with Byzantium and Rome.

<sup>17</sup> *Shield of Faith*, Calcutta, 1873, Appendix, pp. 1-2.

Could the Armenian church be defined as schismatic because it rejects the Council of Chalcedon? If the Armenian church was convinced that the decisions of the Council of Chalcedon were faithful to the decisions reached at the Council of Ephesus, without Nestorius's claim that Christ had two natures, they would never have rejected it. After a prolonged discussion he makes this observation. The French and German churches anathematised the Seventh Council, but were never declared heretics, similarly the Armenians anathemised the Fourth Council and that should not make them heretics or schismatic. In the seventh ecumenical Council on the use of images in worship the term '*veneration*' [Երկրպագութիւն] was one of the many sore points, which ignited the mutual distrust of East and West and eventually contributed to the final schism.<sup>18</sup> In the same manner the tortuous doctrinal debate on the term 'two nature' [Բնութիւն] employed by Nestorius undermined the unity and stability of the church and became the principal cause of rift between the Christian east and west. Chamchian reiterates 'If you travel through Europe ask its citizens how many natures are there in Christ only the learned will have an answer but the ordinary people and some among the clergy will be scandalized [«յապուշ մնան»] and will not understand as to what the question is in reference to'. In the same way that theologians justify the stance of the French towards the Seventh Council, they should accept the stance of the Armenian church. Ecumenical councils do not possess inherent, automatic infallibility. He concludes the Armenian church should not concede to the demand of the Catholics to lift the anathema regarding the Council of Chalcedon in their sacrament of ordination. The ecumenicity of a council is not a *priori* certain. The acceptance of the First Ecumenical Council of Nicea in 325 is of fundamental importance. There were councils that were not convoked or conducted as ecumenical but have come to be accepted as ecumenical. The canons of smaller synods, such as those of Ancyra in 314, Neocaesaria in 320, Antioch in 329, Gangra in 324 have acquired ecumenical status. But the converse is also true. Councils that were convoked as ecumenical failed acceptance; such were the Council of Sardica, the Second Council of Ephesus in 449. The historian H. Jedin rightly observes that 'for the first thousand year and beyond, the intention and will of the convokers of a council were not sufficient to establish its ecumenicity; nor did the acknowledgment of its decisions'.<sup>19</sup>

### Concerning the Procession of the Holy Spirit (pp. 16-21)

In 1014, at the coronation of the German emperor Henry II, the singing of the Nicene Creed included the *Filioque*, Latin word meaning 'and from the Son' added to the Niceno-Constantinople creed at the Spanish Council in Toledo in 594, which became a major theological

<sup>18</sup> Vrej Nersessian, 'Vrtanes Kertogh' in ODLA (Oliver Nicholson, ed.), Oxford, 2018, vol. II. p. 1575; S. Der Nersessian 'Une apologie des images du septieme Siecle' EBA, vol. I, pp. 379-403; supra 'Image worship in Armenian and its opponents', EBA, op. cit., pp. 405-415; Abp. E. Durean, 'Haghags Patkeramartits' [Concerning the Iconoclasts], Sion 17 (1927), pp. 23-25, 61-63. Armenia did not participate in the Second Council of Nicaea in 787 but persecuted the two Armenian iconoclastic sects the Paulicians and the Tondrakians whom Grigor Magistros referred to them as 'bandits', 'brigands', 'outlaws'.

<sup>19</sup> Abbay Vladimir Gaite, Հերձուածող Պապութիւն կամ Հոռվմ ի յարաբերութեան ընդ Արեւելեան եկեղեցիս. Գործ Աբբայ Կէրէի: Թարգմանութիւն Միաբանից Չարխապիան Ս. Աստուածածնի Վանաց [Schismatic Papacy or Rome. Its relations with Eastern Churches. Translated into Armenian [from the French] by a member of the Church of the Holy Virgin], Armash, 1869, vol. I, pp. 119 {reprints in 1867, 1871, 1873} & Վարդապետութիւն Ընդհանրական ուղղափառ եկեղեցւոյ հանդերձ տարբերութեամբ որ ընդ այլ եկեղեցիս փրխտոնից [The teaching of the Universal church, and the differences in the other Christian churches], translated from the French by Khoren Vrd. Ashegeants, Armash, 1871, pp. 343. Kung Hans, Infallible? An Enquiry. Collins, 1971, p. 167.

issue between East and West. Patriarch Photius, in an *Encyclical* addressed to the other patriarchs (866) attacked both the interpolation and the doctrine of the ‘double procession’. The Fifth Ecumenical Council [Constantinople II, 553] had stated that ‘the Creed cannot be subtracted from, added to, altered or distorted in any way’ (Mansi 17:516C). The interpolated creed was accepted in Rome in 1014 (reaffirmed in 1274, 1438-1439) and was rejected in the East.

The Armenian church did not distort, or interpolate the Nicene Faith.

They accuse the Armenian church of reciting ‘processing from the Father’ or ‘emanating from the Father’ [Ելող ի հորէ or բխեալ ի հորէ] but not ‘and from the Son’.

Mkhitarist theologians were worthy continuators of the work of the *Fratres Unitors*, by printing the works of Armenian Church Fathers with texts interpolated or altered with far-fetched interpretations supporting the dissemination of fabricated theories concerning the doctrines of the Armenian church. They even do not shy away from distorting the works of such authoritative famous Church Fathers like Grigor Narekatsi [declared Doctor of the Universal Church] and Nerses *Shnorhali* to support their subversive fabrications. For instance Grigor Narekatsi’s ‘Holy Spirit which is of the same essence’ is corrupted to ‘*Father and Son*’ (Narek. 34:VII) or ‘We praise with the Father and the Son the Lord Holy Spirit which springs [բխումն] forth from them sharing their glory’ [Narek, 75:VI]. Nerses *Shnorhali* in his seminal epic poem ‘*Jesus the Son*’ and Letters to Emperor Alexius III and Emmanuel repeats on fifteen occasions the doctrine of the Armenian church in these words ‘*The Father being unbegotten, and the Son being unbegotten and the Holy Spirit proceeding from the Father, they are not thereby separated according to nature*’.<sup>20</sup> In his ‘*General Encyclical*’ [Թուղթ Ընդհանրական] in the section ‘Who is God’ says ‘*The Holy Spirit is called the one who proceeds from the Father and is equal in glory to the Son*’.<sup>21</sup> In the ‘Confession of Faith’ Armenians confess ‘*We confess Holy Spirit God, unbegotten, eternal, not born but proceeding from the Father, in the image of His essence and shares the glory of the Son*’ [«Հաւատամք զՍուրբ Հոգին Աստուած՝ անեղ, անժամանակ, չծնեալ, այլ բղեալ ի Հորէ. էակից Հոր եւ փառակից Որդւոյ»] [Breviary] and in the hymn sung at the ‘Morning office’ ‘*Proceeding from the Father, emanate from my soul words pleasing to You*’ [Բխումն ի Հորէ, բխեալ ի հոգւոյս, բան բեղ ի հաճոյս] [Breviary]. This is precisely what St. John declares (XV:26).

Pope Pius IX (1846-1878) called the First Vatican Council in which he validated papal primacy and infallibility. Such claims were resisted, not only by the Byzantines but also by the non-Chalcedonian churches. For Orthodoxy the pope is certainly the first bishop within an undivided Christendom, but he is *primus inter pares*, the first among equals. He is the elder brother within the Christian church, not a supreme ruler, and in particular he has no right to claim direct jurisdiction over the Christian East. The Russian theologian Alexei Khomiakov, commenting on exchanges at the time, wrote: ‘The Pope is greatly mistaken in supposing that we consider the ecclesiastical hierarchy to be the guardian of dogma. The case is quite different.

<sup>20</sup> Nerses IV Klayetsi, called Shnorhali, Epistle for the Unity of the church addressed to the Greeks’, Holy Etchmiadzin, 1865, pp. 163-176; See Vrej Nersessian ‘Das Beispiel eines Heiligen: Leben und Werk des Hl. Nerses Clajensis, mit dem Beinamen Schnorhali’ (Friedrich Heyer von, ed.) Stuttgart, 1978, pp. 59-69 (Die Kirchen Der Welt Band XVIII, Die Kirch Armeniens).

<sup>21</sup> Nerses IV Klayetsi, called Shnorhali, General Encyclical translation and introduction by Fr. Arakel Aljalian, New York, 1996, p. 20.



The varying constancy and the unerring truth of Christian dogma does not depend on any hierarchical order; it is guarded by the totality, by the whole people of the church, which is the Body of Christ'.<sup>22</sup> The basic contention was that the Third Ecumenical Council (Ephesus 431) had categorically prohibited an addition to the creed, however true or worthy. No matter how great the Roman Church is, its authority is less than an Ecumenical Council.

### **The concept of Purgatory**

The Catholic doctrine of purgatory is an outcome of the granting of papal indulgences in 1095 by Pope Urban II to the participants in the Crusade which would be recognised as a substitute for all penances-or, in popular language, would ensure the immediate entry into Heaven of a Crusader who died in the state of repentance and confession.<sup>23</sup> This was from the beginning a peculiarly personal expression of papal plenitude of power and infallibility, and there were no limits to the use of the popes made of this privilege. Roman Catholics believed that outside the visible church there was no salvation and that to be a member of the visible church it was necessary to be subject to the Pope of Rome. A man cannot be saved without the true and complete faith; and he cannot believe the true and complete faith unless he believes the word of the infallible Church.<sup>24</sup>

According to Catholic doctrine purgatory is the state of purification between death and heaven takes leading to eventual intimate union with the triune God. Pope XXII (1244-1334) preached that the saints will not enjoy the Beatific vision until after final judgement, a view condemned by his successor. They accuse the Armenian church for employing the term 'expiation' [փաւարան] and not the Latin term 'purgatory'. The Armenian church remaining faithful to the words of St. John 'I am the door of the sheep (John X:7; cf. Phil. I:23; 2 Cor. V:8) and in that spirit sings of the church as 'Christ our door of life, allow us to come before God the Father and the Holy Spirit, singing always your glory'.

In the Armenian liturgy the priest in his litany recited in secret seeks mercy and remission of sins for those present in the church and 'for the souls of those who are at rest. 'Give them rest and enlighten them and reckon them among thy saints in the kingdom of heaven and make them worthy of thy mercy [Divine Liturgy, p. 86]. It is evil to say that Armenians do not accept purgatory the 'place for expiation of men [kawaran] because of which they are heretics [Հայֆո ոչ ընդունին զփաւարան, վասն որոյ են հերետիկոսս]. According to Chamchian in Christian literature the term 'place of expiation' [փաւարան] is much more suited than 'purgatory' [բոսկաթոխ] to the biblical term 'heavenly kingdom' or 'abode of the triumphant or of the saints'. When reciting the 'litany of 'General intercessions' the names of the Triumphant Church or saints is recited on the right side of the altar while those of the Militant church are recited on the left side of the altar is not a definition of location but signifies that those mentioned on the right side enjoy blessed sight of the Lord and those on the left the bitter sight of the Lord. But according to Tatevatsi all the souls are in the same place but there is a difference in their works

<sup>22</sup> Abbay Vladimir Gaite, *The schismatic papacy*, op. cit., pp. 58-63; Ware Timothy, *The Orthodox Church*, Penguin Books, 1972, p. 255.

<sup>23</sup> R. W., 'Indulgences' in *Western society and the church in the Middle Ages*, Penguin Books, 1970, p. 136-143. [The Pelican History of the Church: 2]

<sup>24</sup> Chadwick Owen, *The Reformation*, Penguin Books, 1964, p. 367 (The Pelican History of the Church:3).

and image, some are full of immortality and joy and others bitterness and despair.<sup>25</sup>

The church is the *kawaran* from the verb *Kawich* or *kawchakan* [meaning to atone, absolve, expiate] (cf. ‘: Thou answered them, O Lord, our God: thou wast the God that forgives them’ (Psalm 99:8). The prayer for remission of sins recited by the priest is significant:

*‘O Christ, Son of God, forbearing and compassionate, have compassion, in they love as our creator, upon the souls of thy servants who are at rest, especially upon the soul(s) of thy servants (N or NN) name] for whom we are offering these prayers. Be mindful of them in the great day of the coming of thy kingdom. Make them worthy of mercy, of expiation and forgiveness of sins. Glorify them and reckon them with the company of thy saints at thy right hand, for thou art Lord and creator of all, judge of the living and of the dead’.*

In the prayer of ‘*Exhortation for Communion*’ the celebrant recites: ‘*In holiness let us taste of the holy, holy, and precious body and Blood of our Lord ... This is life, hope of resurrection, expiation and remission of sins.* In ‘*The Prayer in the Sanctuary*’, the celebrant in loud voice the says ‘*In this dwelling of holiness and place of praise, in this habitation of angels and the place of expiation of men...*’. Catholicos Nerses in his *General Encyclical* reiterates the Biblical view ‘He came [i.e. Christ] willingly to suffer, and the one who could not suffer suffered on the cross, having taken upon himself our suffering nature. He died an innocent death in His mortal body in order to give life to the natures which died by sin. He descended into the tomb and destroyed Hell twice ... He gave the hope of resurrection to mortal nature freed from the corruption of death by the resurrection of His divine body’.<sup>26</sup>

‘The Memorial Office’ one of the hymns sung defines the Armenian view in these terms:

*‘In the supernal Jerusalem in the dwellings of the angels*

*Where Enoch and Elijah live old in age like doves,*

*Worthily glorified in the garden of Eden,*

*Merciful Lord, have mercy on the souls of those of us who have fallen sleep’*

On the Armenian elaborate mosaic floor dated sometime not later than the sixth century excavated in the Musrara Quarter near the Damascus gate has this inscription ‘*To the memory and salvation of all Armenians whose name the Lord knows*’. The funerary mosaic is decorated with a massive stem of a grape vine framing in circular scrolls forty-one birds-doves, partridges, peacocks, eagles, a basket of grapes, basket of bread and a chalice. One of the central themes to which Agatangelos frequently returns in his *The Teaching of St. Gregory is* ‘The Redemption of Mankind’ in which he ‘the birds become the just, the resurrected, and those who are to attain heaven’. The imagery in the mosaic-grapevine related to Christ, the passion, the Church, the eucharist, and the Tree of Life all point to the concept of *Kawaran* as being the place for the expiation of sins.<sup>27</sup>

<sup>25</sup> M. Ormanian, Տեղիք Աստուածաբանութեան: Տեսական Աստուածաբանութիւն [The sources of Theology. Systematic Theology], Jerusalem, 1985, pp. 183-196.

<sup>26</sup> Nerses Klayetsi, op., cit., p. 20.

<sup>27</sup> Garegin Hovsepian (Owesejian), ‘Mosiak mit armenischer Inscript in Norden Jerusalem, ZDPF 18 (1895), pp. 88-90; B. N. Arakelian, ‘Armenian mosaic of the early middle ages’, in Primo Simposio Internazionale di Arte Armena. Atti, Venezia, 1978, pp. 1-9, figs. 1-10; Bezalel Narkiss, ‘The Musrara Mosaic’ in Armenian Art Treasures of Jerusalem, Jerusalem, 1980, pp. 26-27, figs. 39-40; Agatangelos, The Teaching of St. Gregory, op. cit., § 605, 658-659, pp. 163-164; 211-212.

Amongst the miniatures illustrating the life of Christ there is an image called ‘*Harrowing of Hell*’ or ‘*Descent into Hades*’ (*Deesis*), which depicts Christ, treading the broken gates of Hades after his death and before his Resurrection freeing those whom Hades had held captive. Christ lifts up Adam and takes him to paradise with all the other patriarchs, prophets, martyrs and ‘forefathers’, where they are greeted by Enoch and Elijah at the gate, blessing them with sign of the cross. In the Divine Liturgy the ‘Responsory of the Great Entrance’ echoes this theme through Psalm 24: 7-10. The visualisation of this act, is enacted in the Armenian Church on Palm Sunday in the ceremony of ‘Opening of the Doors’, rubrics of which states that this is ‘the mystery of the Second coming and the Day of Judgment’. Finally, in the Divine Liturgy, the *Anamnesis* ends with this prayer ‘And descending into the nether regions of death in the body which he took of our kinship and mightily breaking asunder the bolts of hell, he made thee known to us the only true God, the God of the living and of the dead’.<sup>28</sup>

The church is the new paradise, the spiritual Eden, the sanctuary of God, an earthly heaven. In the Armenian position the concept of purgatory and indulgences are alien as it is in Eastern Christianity. St. Gregory in his Sermons [*Hachakhapatum*] ‘As some mindless say, let no one be deceived, that there is a place another abode in between kingdom of heaven and hell called limbo [*lat. Limbus*].<sup>29</sup> This was supposed to have been the abode of the unbaptised infants [Երախայից or անդրանկաց] who had not been personally guilty in any way, but because they had not been baptised were excluded of ever from heavenly bliss. The Armenian church practices infant baptism and any one not baptised is barred from taking part in any of the seven sacraments.

### The inclusion of ‘who was Crucified’ in the Trisagion

The accusation of the missionaries against the Armenian Church was that it’s abhorrent for a Christian to say ‘God crucified’ [Աստուած խաչեցաւ] or ‘God died’ [«Աստուած մեռաւ»]. Chamchian writes ‘some among the ignorant missionaries beginning with Clement Galanus for the use of ‘was crucified’ in hymn of the *Trisagion*, the Armenians were accused of being adherents of the ancient heretical concept of ‘theopaschism’ meaning ‘God the Father suffered as the Son’. To say that the ‘human being was crucified is to suggest the human nature was crucified which is the heresy of Nestorius. But to say ‘God crucified’ is to maintain that the divine nature suffered in his human body, which is the doctrine of the Catholic Church.

The contentious clause is replaced by other appropriate phrases such as ‘*who didst rise from the dead*’ (at Easter) or ‘*who was born and manifested to us*’ (Epiphany)’, or ‘*who didst come and art to come*’. From this it is clear that the Trisagion is sung in honour of Christ, not of

<sup>28</sup> S. Der Nersessian, ‘An Armenian version of the homilies on the Harrowing of Hell’, *Byzantine and Armenian studies*, Louvain, 1973, pp. 437-455, and ‘A homily on the Raising of Lazarus and Harrowing of Hell’, *op. cit.*, pp. 457-467; Vrej Nerses Nersessian ‘Sources of Armenian iconography’, in *A Catalogue of the Armenian manuscripts in the British Library acquired since the year 1913 and of collections in other libraries in the United Kingdom*, The British Library, 2012, vol. I, p. 35-36; for a sample of an illuminated folio of the Harrowing of Hell from an Armenian Lectionary in the British Library, Ms. No. Or. 15, 291, fols. 211v-212r illustrating the Feast of Easter see *Treasures from the Ark*, *op. cit.*, pp. 218-219.

<sup>29</sup> Quotation from Ter Mikelian, *Catechism of the Holy Armenian church* [Հայաստանեայց Սուրբ Եկեղեցու Քրիստոնեականը], Tehran, 2003, p. 505, note 3; *Hachakhapatum* [Գիրք որ կոչի Յանախապատում]. This is a collection of everyday sermons attributed to St. Gregory (or St. Mesrop). Has had several publications: Constantinople (1737, 1824), Calcutta (1813), Venice (1826, 1838, rep. 1954), Holy Etchmiadzin (1894); translation into modern Eastern Armenian, Tehran, 2003.

the Trinity. Stepanos Siwnetsi (680-735 in his Commentary on the Office, relates the Trisagion to the elevation of the Gospel. Stepanos is convinced that if the Godhead was present in Christ incarnate, it “was legitimate to say that ‘God was crucified for us’ has risen from the dead’ and ‘was born and revealed to us’. The tenor of the Armenian theology is daring in accepting that God does suffer and die on the cross. The Armenian poet St. Grigor Narekatsi (951-1003) likens the relationship between the human and the divine in Christ “You gave oil, and in this oil, you placed a wick, which exemplified your union, without imperfection, with our condition, formed and wove with your love of mankind’ (Lamentations, chapter 20).

David the Invincible (590-660) defines the Cross with the predicate Astuadsenkal (Աստուածընկալ = God-receiving), since, for the Armenian theologian, “the tree of life” in the book of Revelation (2:7, 22:2; 22:19) becomes the “wood of life” in the shape of the cross.” For Abraham saw in the Sabek tree the Cross of Christ”. Stone Crosses as symbols of life and are known are called ‘Amenaprkich (Ամենափրկիչ = All Saviour’s). David the Invincible states “...where the cross, there is also the crucified, and where the cross and the crucified there is the crucifixion’. One of the chants composed by Grigor Narekatsi, sung on Easter Sunday, invokes the powerful image of Christ as a lion on the cross:

I tell of the voice of the lion  
Who roared on the four -winged cross  
On the four- winged cross he roared,  
His voice resounding in Hades’.<sup>30</sup>

Finally, the doxology that follows the hymn is ‘Glorified and blessed ever holy Virgin Mary, Mother of God, Mother of Christ, offer our supplication to your Son and our God’ makes it absolutely explicit that the hymn is addressed to the Son.

## 6. The Feast of Nativity and Epiphany

The missionaries continued their subversive outworn accusation that the Armenian church does not celebrate the birth of Christ on the 25<sup>th</sup> of December and continues celebrating the ‘manifestation’ or ‘revelation’ of Christ as ‘Son of God’ on the 6<sup>th</sup> of January, the Day of His Baptism originating in the 3<sup>rd</sup> century. Not adhering to changes in the western church calendar is deemed as heretical deviation from faith and doctrine. The actual date of Christ’s birth is not known, the date for its celebration was designated as December 25<sup>th</sup> by the early fourth century in Rome. The designation of December 25<sup>th</sup> was adopted to replace the birthday of the invincible or unconquered sun god (Lat. *dies natalis Solis Invicti*), which Emperor Aurelian established in 274 in honour of the Syrian sun God, to counter worship of the pagan god in favour of Christ, the true ‘sun of justice’.

The Armenian Church remaining loyal to the practice of the ancient church marks the feast of His Birth and Baptism on the 6<sup>th</sup> of January. This was the practice in the Universal church from the 4<sup>th</sup> century. The 6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> canon in the Apostolic Canons states ‘*It is written on*

<sup>30</sup> Vrej Nersessian, ‘The Armenian Tradition’ in *The Orthodox Christian Word* (Augustine Casidy, ed.) Routledge, 2012, pp. 46-47 (pp. 41-57); One of the letters of Patriarch Photius addressed to the Armenian Prince Ashot Bagratuni is on the subject of theopaschism see Igor Dorfmann-Lazarev, ‘Armeniens et Byzantins à l’époque de Photius: Deux débats théologiques après le triomphe de l’orthodoxie’, CSCO 609, Subsidia 117m Louvain, 2004.



the 6<sup>th</sup> section of the constitution thus: that the Apostles ordered and established that let there be a feast day for the Birth and Revelation of our Lord and Saviour, first among the feasts of the church on 21<sup>st</sup> of the month of Tibet, which corresponds to the 6<sup>th</sup> of January of the Romans'.<sup>31</sup> Through the Incarnation God reveals himself to mankind but at His baptism God the Father bears witness: This is my beloved Son, in whom I am pleased' (Matt. III:17; Mark I:11, Lk. III:22). Thus, Christ by His Birth and Baptism established His 'Epiphany' and 'Theophany'. For this reason, the two events were celebrated on the same day. More important St. Basil the Great (c. 330-379) also subscribed to celebrating the 'Birth' and 'Revelation' of Christ as God on the 6<sup>th</sup> of January. In the western church Liberius, Pope (352-366) was the first to celebrate the Feast of Epiphany on the 6<sup>th</sup> of January but in 354 according to the information of contemporaries the two feast were split and 25<sup>th</sup> December became the date for marking the Nativity only.<sup>32</sup> But the Armenian church following the ancient tradition displays not only its faithfulness to the old practices not only protecting the mystery that exists between Christ's birth and Baptism, as double expression of the Saviour's incarnation than the adoption of a pagan feast.<sup>33</sup> Nerses IV Klayetsi in his 'Definition of Faith' addressed to Emperor Manuel writes: 'This is the practice of the Armenian church passed down to us from our forefathers, to mark the birth and baptism of our Lord on the same day, and we say this not just for the sake of being difficult but in immense reverence since all churches from the beginning did the same, which is also known to you in your wisdom. But although as time passed this single feast was divided into two, but we kept the tradition passed to us by saint Grigor...'.<sup>34</sup>

#### **7. Concerning the preference of using unleavened bread and chalice of un-mixed wine [անապական = 'zeon'. lit. "hot"],<sup>35</sup>**

Chamchian asks in a rhetorical way 'This seditious and unacceptable accusation is always made against the Armenian Orthodox Holy Church, but she does not despair so much on this

<sup>31</sup> Vazgen Hakobyan, Կանոնագիրք Հայոց [Armenian Liber Canonum], Erevan, 1964, vol. I p. 32 and notes on pp. 543-544.

<sup>32</sup> The observance in the West spread to the East: Rome 336, Constantinople 379; Antioch 386, Alexandria 433, Jerusalem 549, etc. see Eznik Ter Petrosyan, «Քրիստոսի Ծննդեան տօնը Յունուարի 6-ին տօնելու Հայ եկեղեցու աւանդութիւնը» [The tradition in the Armenian church of marking Christ's Nativity on the 6<sup>th</sup> of January', Etchmiadzin, 6 (1986), Lists the names of all those Armenian theologians who bear evidence to the Armenian church's position: «Վասն տօնի Ծննդեանն Քրիստոսի» ('Concerning the feast of Christ's birth', Anania Sanahentsi (Mat. MS. no. 6453, fols. 66a-72b), Setpannos Siwnetsi, Poghos Taronatsi, Kirakos Erznkatsi, Grigor Tatevatsi, pp. 23-30. John of Damascus in his 'Letter of Reply to the Armenians' accuses the Armenian church of Adoptionism. See 'Louys' monthly, 1905, 1112-1113; 1906, pp. 957-960, & 75-79.

<sup>33</sup> Karapet Ter Mkrtchian, «Աստուածայայտնութեան տօնի ճիշդ օրը՝ ըստ պատմութեան» [The correct date of God's revelation according to historical sources], Երկերի ժողովածոյ [Collected works], Holy Etchmiadzin, 2008, Part I, p. 237-243. The Patristic sources he quotes in support of the Feast of Epiphany being celebrated on the 6<sup>th</sup> of January are: The Apostolic Canons, Clement of Alexandria; John Patriarch of Jerusalem, Gregory the Theologian, Saint Basil, Saint Hippolytus of Rome, St. Cyprian, St. Marutta Bishop of Maiperkat, the canons of the Council of Karin held during the reign of Emperor Justinian, followed by Armenian sources.

<sup>34</sup> Nerses Iv Klayetsi, called Shnorhali, 'Definition of Faith', op. cit. p. 243; «Է եւ այս աւանդութիւն Հայոց ի նախնեացն սկսեալ՝ զտաւն ծննդեանն եւ մկրտութեանն ի միում ատուրն տաւնել»; Cf. St. Nerses Shnorhali, Նամականի ժԲ դար [Epistle's 12<sup>th</sup> century. Armenian-Byzantine church relations], translated into modern Armenian by Seda Stambultsyan, Holy Etchmiadzin, 2011, pp. 85-86.

<sup>35</sup> «Հայք ըստ որում ոչ խմորում առնեն զհացն սրբաբար խորհրդոյն, եւ ջուր ոչ խառնեն ի գինի բաժակին, վասն որոյ են հերքուիկոս». Taft R., 'Zeon (lit. "hot")', the custom, unique to the Byzantine rite, of adding hot water to the chalice at Eucharist, first alluded in the 6<sup>th</sup> century see ODB, Oxford University Press, 1991, vol. 3, pp. 2223-2224 and 'Water into Wine', Le Museon 100 (1987), pp. 323-342.



falsification, but it pains, as to why those who are so knowledgeable on the ancient validity of the mysteries and rites of the early church, display such a degree of ignorance, perverse hatred and enmity, that permits them to define the Armenian church as heretical and schismatic'. The Roman Catholic Church bears witness that the use of un-mixed wine in the chalice is an old authentic practice, for it was Pope Alexander I (ca. 109-ca. 116) who decreed to mix water in the cup in the Roman Church, imitating the flow of blood and water from the side of Jesus Christ (cf. John IX:34). According to Nerses *Shnorhali*, the water that flowed out of Christ's side represented his Holy Baptism, and the blood the life-giving sacrament of the communion.

The disputes around the use of mixing water with the wine and the use of un-leavened bread arose after the Armenian church had split after the Council of Chalcedon. When the Armenian Catholicos Movses II Eghivardetsi (574-604) was summoned to Constantinople by Emperor Maurice (582-602), he is reported to have answered 'I will not cross the Azat river [which is the Persian border]. Neither will I eat the oven-baked bread [leavened bread], nor will I drink [their] hot water'.<sup>36</sup> These words obviously allude to leavened bread and wine mixed with Zeon. The Armenians employed unleavened bread in the eucharist as an expression of one divine nature in Christ.<sup>37</sup> The decisive text attached to the use of unleavened bread is St. Paul's words in 1 Corinthians 5:6-8. Since the Armenians rejected any addition of water, they evidently did not practice the custom of the Zeon. The twelfth canon of the Trullan synod which condemned the use of unmixed wine in the eucharist (*Mansi XI, 956-957*), reads: 'It has come to our attention that when the unbloody sacrifice is offered in Armenia, pure wine unmixed with water is brought to the altar. In their defence the Armenians appeal to what Chrysostom, says in his commentary of the Gospel of Matthew: 'Why did the risen Lord drink no water'?<sup>38</sup> The Armenian position is that drinking of wine alone was appropriate for the risen Jesus in his immortal state, and not mixing water, which is itself corruptible will corrupt the purity of the wine. The testimonies in the many commentaries on the Divine Liturgy justify the use of unmixed wine in order to remove from the eucharistic cup of immortality any hint of corruption and death. The objection that the death of the Lord must be proclaimed in the eucharistic celebration could not persuade them to change, since his resurrection too must be proclaimed, and the living, not the dead, body of the Lord be received there. This is in tune with their theology of the cross as being the

<sup>36</sup> J. M. Hanseens, *Institutionis liturgicae de ritibus orientalibus. II-III. De missa rituum orientalium*, Rome, 1930-1932, nn. 262-282; *Narratio de rebus Armeniae*, which dates from the eleventh century, and for the various attributions of it see H. Bartikyan and Karine Melikyan.

<sup>37</sup> John H. Erickson, 'Leavened and unleavened: Some theological implications of the Schism of 1054' in *The Challenge of our past*. Crestwood, 1991, p. 137.

<sup>38</sup> PG 58:740A. The passage in Chrysostom is as follows: 'Why did the risen Lord drink no water but only wine? Since there are some who are accustomed to use water in the mysteries, he wanted to show that he established the mysteries using wine, and therefore when he rose from the dead, he set the customary table with wine'. Chrysostom is here opposing certain heretics who attempted to celebrate the Eucharist with water. See Khosrov Anjewatsi (+972), *Մեկնութիւն աղօթից պատարագին* [Commentary on the prayers of the Divine Liturgy], Venice, 1869, translated with an Introduction by S. Peter Cowe, *Commentary on the Divine Liturgy by Khosrov Anjewatsi*, St. Vartan Press, 1991; Nerses Lambronatsi, *Մեկնութիւն խորհրդոյ Պատարագին* [Commentary on the Divine Liturgy], Venice, 1847; Translated into French by Isaac Kechichian, 'Nerses de Lambron (1153-1192), Explication de la Divine Liturgies', Beyrouth, 2000; H. Gatrjian, *Սրբազան պատարագամատոյց հայոց* [The Sacred Missals of the Armenians. Translations of the Greek, Syriac, and Latin Liturgies, with introduction and commentary, Vienna, 1897, 747pp, see Review by F. C. Conybeare, *The Armenian Church: Heritage and identity*, Compiled, with Introduction, by the Revd. Nerses Vrej Nersessian, New York, 2001, pp. 757-758.

symbol “that hold God up to us” [«աստուածընկալ»] and the phrase “*was Crucified*” sung in the Trisagion.

### Concerning extreme unction

All the Orthodox churches accept seven sacraments: i.e., Baptism, Confirmation, Communion, Penance, Matrimony, Burial and Blessing for the sick. In the Armenian church the ‘Order for the sick’ [Կարգ Հիւանդաց] which is the completion the Extreme unction. It needs to be said that two are one and the same sacrament differing only in their practical execution and effect. For instance, in the case of veneration of images there are two options. One is doctrinal by which we accept that it is worthy to venerate the images of Christ and saints and the second we acknowledge that images are source of piety. If in the first instance someone denies the veneration of images or implies it is not worth adoring images is against the doctrine of the church but is not a heretic. But from the perspective of the second option if one has no use of images as source of meditation (not adoring icons) is not misguided nor is he a heretic. It is the same in the case of Extreme unction. The Calvinists and Lutheranism also denounced this sacrament as being Simoniac heresy but are not labelled heretics.

In the Armenian church the practice is in place of the oil the priest lays his hands over the sick and says ‘dispel my illness and heal my sickness’ [Փարատեա զցաւս եւ բժշկեա զհիւանդութիւնս [ cf. “shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover” (Mark XVI:18); ‘If any sick among you let him call for the elders of the church; and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord’ (James V:14). And this sacrament in the early church did not have the name ‘extreme’ unction. Its term was introduced in the Councils of Florence (1438-1445) and Trent (1543-1563).

Therefore, the Armenian church by not employing the term Extreme [վերջին (final) and not using oil but only by laying of hands, with a cross and the holy Gospel the sacrament of healing is performed according to the command of Christ and Apostolic tradition. The Extreme unction in the Armenian church is performed as part of Baptism. The neophyte is first washed in the font, which is sanctified by the sign of the holy Cross and the holy Gospel and by the pouring of holy oil (*Myron*) from the mouth of a dove (representing the Holy Spirit). The immersion into the font symbolises his death (John 19:30), the resurrection is symbolised when the neophyte is raised from the water. The Chrismation (*droshm-դրոշմ*) is when all the parts of body beginning with the forehead {in the following order eyes, ears, nostrils, mouth, hands, heart, back, feet} reciting the prayer [“*Sweet ointment in the name of Jesus Christ is poured upon thee as a seal of incorruptible heavenly gift*”] by the conclusion of which the child becomes a full member of the church, His original or adamic sin forgiven (I Peter II:9). Finally, as a full member of the Church of Christ he is offered Holy Communion. The child receives all the three great mysteries necessary for salvation one after the other and becomes a full Christian through one continuous sacred act.<sup>39</sup> The Order of Communion of Sick persons or Laying of Hand on the sick Persons should be considered as Extreme unction without the word unction, while the sacrament which the Roman church calls Extreme unction is the Confirmation (*droshm*) which is performed as part of Baptism.

<sup>39</sup> Grigor Tatevatsi, Գիրք Հարցմանց [Book of Questions], Constantinople, 1729, facs. reprint Jerusalem, 1993, Vol. IX, pp. 604-605; F. C. Conybeare, *Rituale Armenorum*, Oxford, 1905; facs. reprint, 2005, pp. 86-108.

### Concerning the Primacy of the See of Rome

To protect and defend the ‘autocephalous’ character of the Armenian church in the 13<sup>th</sup> century precocious writing of treatises appeared in spiritual literature defending the unique character of the orthodoxy of the church’s theology, purity of rituals and traditions. One such theologian was Mkhitar Tashratsi or Skewratsi, who is the author of a treaty called ‘Concerning the equality among the twelve apostles’ [Յադագս համապատուութեան երկոտասանից առաքելոց]. This was a writing which he produced on the order of King Hetum I (1226-1270) on his diplomatic mission to Acca. As a representative of the Armenian king Hetum I and Catholico Kostandin Barjaberdtzi (1221-1267) he has a meeting with the legate of Pope Urbanus IV (1261-1264). This was the time when the Roman Catholic Church demanded from the Armenian Catholicate established in Hromklay to unreservedly submit to the jurisdiction of the papacy. In this treatise he argues that the Armenian church was autocephalous, they did not *become* autocephalous nor were they *granted* autocephaly by some higher authority. The most famous of the canons issued by Nicea was the official recognition *sui iuris* the independence of the patriarchates of Alexandria, Antioch, Constantinople, Jerusalem and the Armenian patriarchate on the basis of the ‘ancient customs’ is a custodian of the same ecclesiological arrangement. He defends the independence of the Armenian church against the illegitimate encroachment from the Roman church.<sup>40</sup> He makes it obvious that Christ’s commission to St. Peter in Matthew 16:18 ‘Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build the church’ means that the church was built first ‘on one man’, as a lesson about its unity but Christ gave ‘equal power to all the Apostles (John 20:22). St. Paul who is speaking on behalf of Christ confirms this in his Letter to the Ephesians ‘Now therefore you are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow citizens with the saints, and of the household of God. And are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner *stone*. In whom all the building fitly framed together growth unto a holy temple in the Lord’. This was the response of Mkhitar to the legate of Pope Urbanus IV on the saying of St. Matthew on St. Peter being the ‘rock’ on which the church was founded.

Chamchian states that from among all the nations the Armenian people among all others very explicitly agree to St. Peter being the leader among the apostles and was ‘made the rock on which the church was founded’ but there is no elaboration on the primacy of Peter, but more on the whole college of apostles and their universal missionary work’.<sup>41</sup> Pope Gregory VII (1073-1085), with demonic personal drive committed to his belief in the primacy and papal infallibility in 1073. Every church accepted the papal primacy, but without the jurisdictional teeth which Gregory VII gave it. For Orthodoxy the pope is certainly the first bishop within

<sup>40</sup> Azat Bzoyan, Մխիթար Բախանայ Սկեռացու հակաճառութիւնները տասներկու առաքելայնի համապատուութեան մասին [The dispute of Mkhitar Skewratsi on the equality of the twelve apostles], Gandzasar, V (1994), pp. 137-157, A similar debate was ignited in 1951, when Cardinal Petros Grigor Aghagianian newly elevated to the rank of Cardinal by Pope Pius XII published his Encyclical calling upon the Armenian church to return to the ‘fold of Roman Catholicism’, See Bps. Derenik Poladian, ‘Refutation of the Encyclical of Gregory Peter Cardinal Aghagianian, Translated by Matthew A. Callender, Lebanon, 1953, pp. 67. A manuscript copy of the Mkhitar Skewratsi text is available in MS. No. 42 in the Armenian section of Bibliotheque Nationale de Paris dated 1274. A French translation by E. Dulaurier (1869). The text has had three printings, Jerusalem, 1857, 1860, 1865.

<sup>41</sup> Agatangelos, The Teaching of St. Gregory, translated by Robert W. Thomson, New York, 2001 (Revised ed.), p. 35.

the undivided Christendom, but he is *primus inter pares*, the first among equals. He is the elder brother within the Christian family, not a supreme ruler, and in particular he has no right to claim direct jurisdiction over the Christian east. In the words of Archbishop Bessarion present at the Council of Ferrara-Florence, ‘Indeed, we are not ignorant of the rights and privileged of the Roman Church; but we know also the limits set to those privileged... No matter how great the Roman Church is, it is notwithstanding less than an Ecumenical council and the universal Church.’<sup>42</sup>

Until the arrival of the Crusades in the Near East, Armenians had shown no concern with the Roman Church or the claims of the Pope to the primacy over the entire Church Universal. The fact of the pre-eminence of St. Peter among the Apostles, the words of Jesus addressed to him, the knowledge that Peter had preached in Rome, and had been martyred there, and that the Pope was his vicar do not lead the Armenian theologians to conclude that the ‘Patriarch of Rome’ had primatial authority outside the limits of his jurisdiction in the West.<sup>43</sup> The first formal contact with the Latin Church occurred 1141,<sup>44</sup> St. Nerses Shnorhali, in his *Elegy on the Fall of Edessa*, written after 1144, apostrophized the Roman See

*And you, Rome, Mother of Cities  
Brilliant above all and honourable  
You throne of the great Peter.,  
first among the apostles  
You immovable church  
built on the rock of Cephas,  
Invincible at the doors of hell,  
and breaker of the seal of heavens,  
Becoming vine of many branches,  
and Paul’s firmly-rooted tree,  
Besprinkled with his blood  
Like paradise, which is in Eden.*<sup>45</sup>

The ‘Latinization’ efforts of the missionary preachers, the consequences of the activities of the organisation ‘*Fratres Unitores*’ changed profoundly the relationship between the two churches. During the Cilician period alone to trade unity for military assistance, to subject the

<sup>42</sup> Joseph Gill, *Personalities of the Council of Florence and other Essays*, Oxford, 1964, p. 267. cf. Vrej Nersessian «Ուղղափառ եկեղեցիների դասանանքը «Առաջնություն» եւ «Գահաւերէցութեան» խնդրի շուրջ» [Orthodox understanding of Primacy and Catholicity], *Sion* 2015, pp. 6-14.

<sup>43</sup> Bps. Tiran Nersoyan, ‘Problems and exercise of Primacy in the Armenian Church’ in *Armenian Church Historical Studies. Matters of Doctrine and Administration*, edited with introduction by Revd. Vrej Nersessian, New York, 1996, p. 225.

<sup>44</sup> Vrej Nersessian, ‘The See of Holy Etchmiadzin and the Vatican: A Chronicle of the contacts between Armenian Catholicos and Popes’, *Sion* 2-3 (2021) pp. 78-87. cont. 4-7 (2021), pp. 183-195. The ‘Lettera dell’ amicitia e dell’ unione...’ [Dashants Tught] recounting a meeting between the two churches during the time of St. Gregory the Illuminator of Armenia and St. Sylvester of Rome was a forgery created during the Crusades, which formed the bases of Clemens Galanus’s *Conciliatōnis ecclesiae Armenae cum Romanis*.

<sup>45</sup> Nerses Klayetsi, called Shnorhali, *Lament on the fall of Edessa*, trans. and annotated by T. M. van Lint, in K. Ciggar and F. Teule (eds.), *East and West in the Crusade States*, OLA, 92 (1999), p. 20.

Armenian church to papal jurisdiction were undertaken by the following popes: Innocent II (1130-1143), eugenius Iii (1145-1153), Lucius III (1181-1185), Clement III (1187-1191), Innocent IV (1243-1254) and Urban IV (1261-1312)<sup>46</sup>

Chamchian concludes his commentary on the subject of primacy with this passage ‘We Armenians have our own Catholicos. As for accepting the primacy of the pope we have no antagonism or opposition. The Universal Church was made up of independent regional churches bound together by a common faith and reverencing the pope as successor of St. Peter, the senior bishop and elder brother of the Universal Episcopate’.

In conclusion, I will present in translation the opening statement of the author’s title to his final chapter ‘*The Armenian church is free from heresy and schismatism* [Յաղազս ազատ գոլոյ եկեղեցին հայոց ի հերետիկոսութենէ եւ ի հերձուածողութենէ]:

“The Orthodoxy of the Armenian church will not be falsified by the utterances of slanderous evil-speakers. What we have outlined in this book from the beginning until now, as light illuminates the judicious orthodoxy and reforming path of the Armenian church, not from my perspective, but in accordance to the result of my study of the sources, not as if adding new light, but only by bringing it to full view by placing it on mantel piece to dispel the shadows of darkness created by the fabrications of the enemy. And I hope from now on there will be no darkness, but everything will shine explicitly as when a light by its ray’s enlightens’

«Թէ ուղղափառքին հայոց ոչ արատաւորի ի բանից վայրախոսաց և չարախօսաց: Զոր ինչ միանգամ խօսեցաք ի սկզբանէ մատենիս մինչև ցարդ, իբրև զոյս պայծառացուցեալ ցուցանեն զողջմտութիւն և զուղղափառութիւն և բարեկարգութիւն եկեղեցւոյ Հայաստանեայց, ոչ եթէ մերովս ասութեամբ, այլ իրացն իսկութեամբ, քանզի մեք սովին մատենագրութեամբ ոչ իբր նոր ինչ պայծառութիւն յաւելաք այդն լուսոյ, այլ միայն ի հանդէս ատենի իբրև ի վերայ աշտանակի եղաք առ ի փարատել զստուերս խաւարացուցիչս՝ զառ ի թշնամեաց չարախօսութենէ նիւթեալն: Եւ յուսամ թէ այսունհետև ոչ մնաց մթագնութենէ տեղի, այլ ամենայն ինչ բացայայտ փայլմամբ ի վեր երևեցաւ, որպէս յորժամ նրազն նշողիւք լուսաւրեպէ»<sup>47</sup>:

### Conclusion Summary.

The Ottoman state regarded the Roman Catholics in the east as a dissenting minority and discourage them. It was safer for Latin communities to allow it to be assumed by the Turkish governors that they were Eastern Orthodox. It was in the Turks’ interest to protector the Orthodox and as of 1728 had decreed Latin proselytism illegal. The Ottoman Sultans’ law courts

<sup>46</sup> Vrej Nersessian, ‘Review article: The Armenian Apostolic Orthodox Church...’. Op. cit., p. 197.

<sup>47</sup> In 1948 a group of Mkhitarist monks lead by Revd. Arsen Komitasian (Antimosian) and Bishop Georg Hiwrmizian published a pamphlet in Armenian and Italian called ‘The Armenian nation and church are schismatics and heretics’, accusing their brethren in Venice for pretending to be Roman Catholics but are in reality apologist for a heretical church. ‘The Congregation for the Doctrine of Faith’ did not summon a meeting to discuss the content of the pamphlet but ordered both the Armenian and Italian texts to be destroyed. See Awetis Perperian, Պատմութիւն Հայոց սկսեալ ի ամէ Փրկին մինչև ցամն հանդերձ կարեւոր տեղեկութեամբ եւ ժամանակագրութեամբ երևելի իրաց [History of Armenia beginning from the year of the Lord 1772 until 1860], Constantinople, 1871, Chapter 64, pp. 867-370; In response to the same event Matteos Choukhachian, Patriarch of Constantinople, 1844-1848 later Catholicos of All Armenians, 1858-1865 wrote his Հանդիսարան Ուղղափառութեան Հայոց եկեղեցւոյ [Panorama on the Orthodoxy of the Armenian Church], Constantinople, 1848, pp. 495. Chapters 12 -16 contain the author’s observations on the conflict between the Armenian Orthodox and Catholic communities in Constantinople.



strengthened the ecclesiastical authority of the Orthodox Patriarch's over their communities and regarded the Patriarchs of the Eastern Churches as its representatives.

The inter-confessional conflicts between Catholic Armenians and Orthodox became troublesome in the eighteenth century in Constantinople.

The two most outstanding clergy of the time were Catholicos Simeon I Erevantsi (1763-1780) [b.1710 - d.1780] and the Mkhitarist scholar Mikayel Chamchian [1738-1823] who responded to the crises in very contrasting ways.

In 1774 Catholicos Simeon founded the first printing press on the Armenian soil. One of the first books he printed was his *Tonatsoyts* [Տոնացոյց] (4<sup>th</sup> printing 1906) in response to the publication in 1758 by Hakopos Chamchian's *Oratsoyts* [Օրացոյց] introducing Latin rites and feasts, which Erevantsi defines as 'poison's guide' [թունացոյց], which must be discarded into the corners of streets as garbage to be trampled underfoot, reduced to feed for moths and mice' [անկանի ի յանկիւնս, ի փողոցս և յաղբիւսս և լինի կոխան ոտից, և կեր ցեցից և մկանց]. He calls the Mkhitarists and the Collegians 'newly budding Lutherans' [նորաբոյս լութերականաց]. In contrast Mikayel Chamchian since 1784 in a calculated effort is endeavouring to raise the national consciousness of his nation, which for him has religious dimension. 'The Armenian speaking Yahweh, the Armenian speaking and Armenian citizen Adam, Armenian speaking, God worshipping Hayk, the holy rivers Euphrates and Tigris, the holy Mount Ararat are gracing that God has gifted to the Armenian nation. He would not consider the Armenian nation worthy of any one of these graces, if it had not been faithful to the Catholic faith from the beginning'. He has some reservations on the primacy claim of the Pope and addressing his opponents he writes 'I am an Armenian, I do not accept the Frankish Patriarch of the Franks, I do not accept the Pope as I have my Catholicos, I have a Patriarch and Catholicos of my nation... for the Pope is not the catholicos of my people but that of the Franks' [«Ես հայ եմ, ոչ ընդունիմ, այսինքն ոչ համանշեմ ինձ յատուկ պատրիարհ զպատրիարհն Ֆրանկաց, ոչ ընդունիմ, ինձ կաթողիկոս զպապն ձեր, ես իմումս ազգի պատրիարհ և կաթողիկոս ունիմ... քանզի պապն ոչ է կաթողիկոս ազգին մերոյ, այլ Ֆրանկաց կաթողիկոս»] (*Shield of Faith*). It is significant that Chamchian has reservation on the concept of the primacy of the pope, he advocates: 'It is not essential for every faithful, particularly demand from the simple minded to know that the pope is the supreme head of the church, or he is above all patriarchs' [Ոչ է հարկ իւրաքանչիւր հաւատացելոց, մանաւանդ պարզամտաց գիտել որոշակի, թէ պապն է զլուս եկեղեցոյ, կամ ի վեր քան զամենայն պատրիարհումս]. His view was shared by a member monk of the Mkhitarist order, the famous geographer and defender of *The Shield of Faith*, Lucas Inchichian (1758-1833).<sup>48</sup> He publishes a pamphlet, in which he advances the concept, that above religion and everything else stands first and foremost the nations interests and the inspiration of unity. Inchichian's primary aim was to expand his teacher's Chamchian's view that it is the duty of every Armenian 'place the love his nation and motherland above everything else... The nation is the greatest society, and the most natural, and whoever belongs to that nation is obliged to

<sup>48</sup> Charles Dowsett, *Decoding the mysteries of medieval Armenia. The collected studies of Charles J. F. Dowsett*, First Calouste Gulbenkian Professor of Armenian studies, Oxford, 1965-1991. Compiled, with preface and introduction by Dr. Vrej Nersessian, Erevan, 2022, 296-339. see 'The Madman has come back again'. In commemoration of the 200<sup>th</sup> anniversary of Lord Byron's birth, pp. 320-333.

love his nation above everything else'. Inchichian's stand is directed against the latinophiles: 'an Armenian, who does not confess the religion of the majority could not have also its nationhood'.<sup>49</sup> His stance failed to reconcile the feuding Mkhitarists and Collegians, who regarded him an apostate to their confession. They were also many in the Armenian Orthodox Church who never ceased to be sceptical towards his motives. While Archpriest Ter Hovhannes Khatchikian in his appendix informs that some 'individuals [whom he is reluctant to name] behind my back were gossiping, that it was not proper of me to have printed the work of a Papist *vardapet*, who is not even worthy to have been of our nation, but recalling the words of Aristotle I say to them "where I am not let my enemies beat me there' [*«Ուր չեմ ես՝ թող անդ գանիցէ և զիս թշնամին»*] (*Shield of Faith*, Calcutta in 1873, p. 2). Former Patriarch of Constantinople Matteos Tchuhachian and later Catholicos of All Armenians {Matteos I, 1858-1865} calls Mikayel Chamchian 'blessed' 'for from the depth of his heart, putting aside all fear of human violence, taking upon himself every personal punishment and dishonour, wrote his three volume *Shield of Faith* defending the orthodoxy of the Armenian church and when he came to know that his work had been stolen by papal agents and destroyed, he did not despair, did not cease preaching the truth, on the contrary he grew stronger" (*see «Հանդիսարան Ուղղափառութեան Հայոց Եկեղեցւոյ», Constantinople, 1854, p. 267*).

In the ill-conceived Latinizing activities of Western missionaries, whose origins stretched back to the Cilician period in their presumed attempt to save the Kingdom by bringing about the union of the Armenian Church with the Church of Rome failed. The extremist who accused the Armenian church of 'heresy' and proceeded to make 'corrections' of their 'errors' ended by creating splits in the ethnic and national solidarity of the Armenian people. Thanks to the theologians who emerged from the famous monasteries of Gladzor, Tatew, Sanahin in the homeland and New Julfa and Constantinople in the diaspora resisted the tide of Latinization remaining steadfast to the guidelines of the ecumenical spirit: 'Do not mix muddled teaching with the clear and limpid teaching of our Holy and Apostle like patriarch Saint Gregory' [*«Մի խառնեցի պղտոր ուսումն ընդ յստակ և ականակիտ վարդապետութիւն ս. և առաքելանման հայրապետին Գրիգորի»*] (Arshak Ter Mikelian).

REVD. DR. NERSESS NERSESSIAN

(Last Part)

### **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

<sup>49</sup> Ghukas Inchichian, «Ազգասէր. ճառ ասացեալ ի փոյր յորդորանաց յնտէլութիւն սիրոյ ազգի և ի զգուշութիւն նորին ընդիմակաց ակտիցն հակառակաց» [Lecture on the love of the nation warning to those who oppose it], Venice, 1815.

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

### ՄԵԾԵՐԸ ԱՍՏՈՒԾՈՅ ԵՒ ԱՍՏՈՒԱԾԱՇՈՒՆՉԻ ՄԱՍԻՆ

Չնայած ոչ տեղը, ուր Աստուած է, ոչ ալ արտաքին տեսքը, որ Ան ունի, չենք գիտեր եւ չենք տեսներ, սակայն Անոր կը ճանչնանք Իր գործերով: Նոյնը կարելի է ըսել եւ Աստուածային Հոգիի, եւ մարդկային հոգիի մասին, որու ոչ տեղը, թէ ուր կը բնակի, ոչ ուրուագիծը, որ ան ունի, չենք գիտեր եւ չենք տեսներ, սակայն անոր գործերակերպով կ’եզրակացնենք, որ ան կայ՝ առանց որեւէ շփոթի, պարզ, մասերու չբաժնուող, չանհետացող եւ մշտապէս ապրող՝ որպէս Աստուծոյ պարզեւ:

### ԴԸՄԻՏՐԻ ՍԵՐԿԷՏԻԻՉ ԱՆԻՉԿՈՎ

Եթէ ջանասիրութեամբ քննենք մեզ հետ կատարուած երբեմնի եւ այսօրուայ դիպածները, ապա պարզ կը տեսնենք, որ ողջ մեր կեանքը՝ իր մանրամասներով, կախեալ է Աստուծմէ: Կը տեսնենք, թէ Աստուած Իր գոյութեան անքնին պատմութեամբ ինչպէս կը զարմացնէ մեզի, կը ճանաչենք Անոր իմաստութիւնը, կը փառաբանենք Անոր բարեգթութիւնը, եւ, վերջապէս, կը յանգենք այն եզրակացութեան, որ առանց Աստուծոյ կամքի ոչինչ չի կրնար ըլլալ, եւ ոչ մէկ ուժ չի կրնար դէմ կենալ Աստուծոյ նախախնամութեան:

### ԴԸՄԻՏՐԻ ՍԵՐԿԷՏԻԻՉ ԱՆԻՉԿՈՎ

Դժբախտութիւններու զգալի մասը վրայ կը հասնէ արիութեան պակասէն. արիութիւն, որ կը ձգէ խօսիլ եւ լսել ճշմարտութիւնը խաղաղութեամբ եւ սիրոյ հոգիի մէջ:

### ՀԱՐԻԷԹ ՊԻՉԵՐ-ՍԹՈՈՒ

Երբ ամէն բան շատ ծանր է ձեզի, երբ ամէն ինչ շրջուած է ձեր դէմ, եւ կը թուի՝ այլեւս մէկ վայրկեան անգամ չէք կրնար համբերել, չնահանջէք, չընկրկէք, որովհետեւ հէնց այդ պահուն պայքարը կը դառնայ բեկումնային, եւ հէնց այդ պահուն կ’իջնէ հաւատքի սպասուած ճեղքումը:

### ՀԱՐԻԷԹ ՊԻՉԵՐ-ՍԹՈՈՒ