

**VARDAN ALEXANYAN\***

*PhD in History*

*Ijevan branch of YSU, Institute of Armenian studies YSU,*

*Vardanalexanyan406@gmail.com*

*ORCID: 0009-0005-3615-4778*

*DOI: 10.54503/1829-4073-2024.1.19-41*

## **RELATIONS BETWEEN THE ECCLESIASTICAL AND POLITICAL AUTHORITIES OF ARMENIA ON THE EVE OF THE FALL OF THE BAGRATID KINGDOM OF ANI-SHIRAK**

### **KEYWORDS**

Ani-Shirak  
Armenian Catholicosate  
Petros I Gethadardz  
Hovhannes-Smbat  
Expansion of church estates  
Constantine IX Monomachus  
Treaty of Trebizond

### **ABSTRACT**

The article investigates the relationship between the Armenian ecclesiastical and political authorities, which led to the fall of Ani-Shirak's Bagratid kingdom. At the beginning of the 1020s, Armenian king Hovhannes-Smbat (1018–1041) bequeaths the kingdom of Ani to Byzantium with the consent of Catholicos Petros Gethadardz (1019–1059). In 1022, Petros signs a treaty with Basil II (976–1025) in Trebizond, preventing the Byzantine invasion of Armenia. In that period, the economic potential of the Armenian church reaches great proportions, thanks to which the influence of the Catholicos on the internal and external affairs of the country increases. On this ground, in the 1030s, the relations between secular and spiritual sovereigns are strained. Petros is exiled and dethroned. However, he is soon restored to his throne. After the death of Ashot IV and Hovhannes-Smbat, Petros I cooperates with the national forces and in 1042 anoints Gagik II as the Armenian king. This was an attempt to renounce the Treaty of Trebizond. After taking Gagik II into custody in Byzantium, Petros, under the pressure of the pro-Greek forces, hands over Ani to the empire.

### ***Introduction***

After the death of king Gagik Bagratid I (990–1018) the country finds itself in a socio-political crisis. Secular and spiritual feudal lords intensified the oppression of

---

\* Հոդվածը ներկայացվել է 28.12.23, գրախոսվել է 12.01.24, ընդունվել է տպագրության 30.04.24:

### **Relations Between the Ecclesiastical and Political Authorities of Armenia...**

---

the Armenian peasantry, as the main class producing material goods, as a result of which the polarization of the society of the Armenian principalities deepened. The thirst for enrichment destroyed the system of moral values that regulated social relations, because "the love of silver became more honored than the love of God, and Mammon ["more esteemed] than Christ",- writes the famous Armenian cleric and historian of the 11<sup>th</sup> century Aristakes Lastiverts'i<sup>1</sup>. The resulting spiritual vacuum was filled with greed, which was also characteristic of the church class, designed to inculcate spiritual and moral values in society. "The piety and holy selection of priests also came to an end. They pushed and crowded toward the altar and officiated at the ineffable mystery [of the mass] which is awesome to the angels, let alone to man, and [they got there] through silver and not through God"<sup>2</sup>.

During the period under study, the process of disintegration of statehood began in the Bagratid kingdom with the support of external and internal forces. In order to achieve this goal, the Byzantine authorities targeted those institutions that were identified with the statehood. They understood the role of the Armenian Church in preserving the national identity of the state-forming ethnic group – the Armenians, and also saw the active participation of the Armenian clergy in the state-public relations. That is why they planned to put an end to the independence of the Armenian Church, to abolish the Catholicosate, which was the head of the patriarchal system.

After the death of Gagik I, the title of Shahinshah (king of kings) inherited "physically unsteady and weak, cowardly in battle and unschooled [in military matters]" Hovhannes-Smbat, against whom the junior brother "brave courageous and powerful, triumphant and unbeatable in battle" Ashot IV was ready to fight. Fierce battles for the throne between the brothers consumed the last charges of statehood and exhausted its resistance potential. As a result of the throne confrontation, the country was divided into two warring factions. Eventually, destructive passions gave way to common sense, and with the mediation of the Armenian Elders and Catholicos Petros, the bloodshed was stopped at the cost of another division of the country. "And then the blessed patriarch Petros and all the

---

<sup>1</sup> Aristakes Lastiverts'i 2021, 145. Արիստակես Լաստիվերտցի 1844, 53:

<sup>2</sup> Aristakes Lastiverts'i 2021, 147. Արիստակես Լաստիվերտցի 1844, 54: "A spiritually unfavorable environment,- writes A. Toynbee,- can be defined in the words of Plato as a "the City of Swine", in which the aspirations of the soul are replaced by the care of material well-being", (Toynbee 1954, 566–567).

princes arose and went to Ashot and, with a solemn vow, seated Ashot as king of all the House of the Armenians outside the gates (of Ani), while Yovhannes would sit as king in the city of Ani”<sup>3</sup>. Dual power was established in Armenia, it was agreed that after the death of Hovhannes-Smbat, Ashot will become the sole ruler of the entire country. The main external beneficiary of the generation of internal divisions in Armenia was Byzantium, which encouraged Ashot's destructive actions, praising him as the “exusiarch of Great Armenia”<sup>4</sup>.

In the period rich in such dramatic political events for Armenia, Petros I, nicknamed “Gethadardz” (turning back the river) (1019–1059) stood at the head of the Armenian church hierarchy. He was the most influential figure of the prominent Grecophile “triad” (Grigor Magistros, West Sargis, Petros Gethadardz) of the Bagratid kingdom, because, along with science, he also possessed great power, like a Catholicos. Petros, who received the title of spiritual ruler, at the behest of Armenian King Hovhannes-Smbat (1018–1041), supported the political leadership of the country. By this, he became an accomplice in the catastrophic events of the surrender of the Ani-Shirak kingdom to Byzantium. He was unable to maintain the unity of the church and the people, and was carried away by political issues, in the end himself became a victim of these ways of acting<sup>5</sup>.

### ***Treaty of Trebizond***

After defeating rebellious Georgian and Abkhazian king George I (1014–1027) and wreaking havoc in Tayk province, Emperor Basil II (976–1025), known as the “Bulgar-slayer”, (Bulgaroctonus), entered Trebizond in late 1021 to spend the winter<sup>6</sup>. He planned an attack on the Bagratid kingdom, but before that, as the chronicler of the 11<sup>th</sup> century Hakob Sanahnetsi testifies, through ambassadors, “demanded Ani and Kars from the Armenian king” and a kingdom “Shirak”<sup>7</sup>. The Byzantine chronicler of 11<sup>th</sup> century John Skylitzes tells why and how it came about that the emperor Constantine declared war on the ruler of Ani, who was living in peace and had done nothing wrong: “When George, and chieftain of the Iberians,

---

<sup>3</sup> **Matthew of Edessa** 2021, 17. **Մատթեոս Ուռհայեցի** 1898, 10: **Smbat Sparapet** 2005, 14. **Սմբատ սպարապետ** 1859, 28:

<sup>4</sup> **Բարթիկյան** 2002, 671–672:

<sup>5</sup> See **Մաթևոսյան** 1997, 33.

<sup>6</sup> See **Մելիքսեթ-բեկ** 1934, 137–138, 204–205:

<sup>7</sup> **Խաչիկյան** 2012, 189: **Matthew of Edessa** 2021, 89. **Մատթեոս Ուռհայեցի** 1898, 49: **Smbat Sparapet** 2005, 18. **Սմբատ սպարապետ** 1859, 46:

### **Relations Between the Ecclesiastical and Political Authorities of Armenia...**

---

raised arms against the Romans, Iovanesikes, [Hovhannes-Smbat – V.A.] ruler of the country of Ani, fought alongside him. Then when (as we said above) the emperor Basil went into Iberia and fought against George in battle order, defeating and overthrowing him, Iovanesikes was afraid that the emperor, enraged by his alliance with George, would do him some severe damage”<sup>8</sup>. Considering it impossible to stop the offensive of Byzantium, which was at the peak of its power, by force of arms, Hovhannes-Smbat tries to prevent the attack of Emperor Basil II by tactical steps and “save” himself. He did not want to become like “neighboring petty kings”<sup>9</sup> and sent the pro-Byzantine Catholicos Petros, on a diplomatic mission to Emperor Basil II. The head of the spiritual authority had to deliver to the emperor the Armenian monarch’s letter, regarding the fate of Ani kingdom.

The head of the Armenian church, who went to Trebizond with large gifts and offerings, arrived there at the end of December in 1021. He was expected to meet the emperor on January 6, 1022 “on the great feast-day of the Revelation of God”. Petros appeared at the festive ceremony with a respectable retinue of followers, among whom were 12 bishops, 70 abbots and priests “and two skillful *vardapets* [academic priest], the omniscient Hovsep Hntsuts, and the brave and invincible Kozern Hovhannes”. He was also accompanied by three hundred mounted bodyguards “of the glorified”<sup>10</sup>.

The emperor “gave them an honorable reception”<sup>11</sup> and, putting aside his “strict religious requirements” and bypassing ritualistic and religious differences, presented the honor to the Armenian Catholicos to perform the ceremony of consecrating the water: “The emperor commanded patriarch Petros to bless the waters in accordance with our [Armenian] canons, while the Byzantine bishops who happened to be there [were to celebrate] in accordance with their canons”<sup>12</sup>. The ritual ceremony was planned on the Chorrok River. By order of Emperor Basil, the Armenian clergy led by the Catholicos were seated “above the Byzantine prelates”<sup>13</sup>, that is, in the upper part of the river, and the place of the Greeks was at the mouth of the river. Granting such an honor to the Monophysites was a sign

---

<sup>8</sup> John Skylitzes 2010, 409. Հովհաննես Սկիլիցես 1979, 146, compare Греч 1893, 120:

<sup>9</sup> Ալիշան 1869, 107:

<sup>10</sup> Ալիշան 1869, 109, compare Խաչիկյան 2012, 190:

<sup>11</sup> Matthew of Edessa 2021, 91. Մատթեոս Ուռհայեցի 1898, 50:

<sup>12</sup> Aristakes Lastivertc’i 2021, 27. Արիստակես Լաստիվերտցի 1844, 12:

<sup>13</sup> Smbat Sparapet 2005, 20. Սմբատ սպարապետ 1859, 47: Matthew of Edessa 2021, 91. Մատթեոս Ուռհայեցի 1898, 50:

of special attention and tolerance of the empire towards representatives of other religious directions. A special honor given to the Armenian Church was not only the personal presence of the emperor at the ceremony of “heretical” Armenians, and also the fact that Catholicos Petros was given upstream the river, and the Greeks performed their rites in the down the river. These manifestations of attention had their explanation, because of the conditions of severe religious intolerance between Armenians and Greeks, every detail mattered. The religious tolerance<sup>14</sup> of the emperor was a diplomatic gesture by which he expressed his satisfaction with the Armenian pontiff, and the Greek clergy chose the lower reaches of the river because “they did this with the thought that since the blessing of the Armenians was considered defective by them and since they were downstream, [the Greeks] would bless again that which had been blessed by the Armenians”-comments Gandzaketsi<sup>15</sup>. M. Ormanyany explains that the title of the person who performed the ritual mattered in this matter, according to which, the rite was performed by the Armenian Catholicos, and the main official of the Greeks was the Metropolitan<sup>16</sup>.

A kind of “competitive” arena opened up between the two age-old conflicting confessions, and, naturally, each side had to miraculously prove its superiority in the field of holiness and Orthodoxy. Lastivertsi, a contemporary of the events he describes, but who was not present at the “played scene” in Trebizond, heard that “when the patriarch sprinkled the holy chrism on the water, suddenly rays of light streamed forth from the waters. Everyone saw this and glorified God, and the horn of our faith was raised up”<sup>17</sup>. Here is how Vardan Areveltsi describes the miracle that happened: “And there occurred an amazing miracle: a light shone out from the patriarch's right hand and from the anointing of the holy oil, to the astonishment of the onlookers. And the Armenian faith was greatly praised”<sup>18</sup>. Armenian historian and chronicler of the 12<sup>th</sup> century Mattheo's Urhaetsi colors what happened and increases the power of the miracle: “When [Petros] had cast the chrism of holy oil on the water and then struck the water with the blessed

---

<sup>14</sup> See **Bartikian** 2002, 919:

<sup>15</sup> **Kirakos Gandzakets'i** 1986, 31–32. **Կիրակոս Գանձակեցի** 1961, 94:

<sup>16</sup> See **Օրմանյան** 2001, 1404:

<sup>17</sup> **Aristakes Lastivertc'i** 2021, 27. **Արիստակես Լաստիվերտցի** 1844, 12:

<sup>18</sup> **Vardan Arewelc'i'** 1989, 191. **Վարդան վարդապետ** 1862, 93: Գիրք որ կոչի Յայսմաւորք, մեռելի ԻԳ, մարտի 2, 1730:

### **Relations Between the Ecclesiastical and Political Authorities of Armenia...**

---

cross, an intense fire appeared blazing over the water and the river froze up a moment, motionless. When the emperor and troops saw this, they were terrified. The emperor, bowing down, had Lord Petros sprinkle the holy water on his head”<sup>19</sup>.

Miracle-working raised the authority of the Armenian faith<sup>20</sup>. The crown of the wonderworker was woven on the forehead of Patriarch Petros just at the moment when the auctions and sales of Ani were going on in parallel. For this miraculous holiness, the Catholicos was awarded the title “Gethadardz” (turning back the river) by history<sup>21</sup>. This name was given to him by the authors of a relatively late period, because author Lastivertsi, who lived at the same time, did not mention such a name.

The sanctification crowned by the miracle of the “Turning of the river” reached a dramatic conclusion, when, in exactly the same place, the “holy ambassador” handed over the letter of Hovhannes-Smbat to Basil II, where it was bequeathed: “so that after my death he shall inherit my city and country”<sup>22</sup>. Mattheos Urhayetsi writes: “This was because Yovhanne’s, during his lifetime, had given a document to the Byzantines [stating that] “after my death Ani shall be [the property] of the Byzantines”<sup>23</sup>.

Byzantine sources present the prelude to the fall of the kingdom of Ani somewhat differently. John Skylitzes reports that Hovhannes-Smbat personally “took the keys of the city, deserted to the emperor, surrendered himself voluntarily into his hands and gave him the keys”<sup>24</sup>. The emperor accepted him for his sagacity, honoured him with the title of magister and appointed him ruler for life of Ani and of the so-called Great Armenia. In return he demanded (and got) a written guarantee that, after his death, all that dominion would pass under the

---

<sup>19</sup> **Matthew of Edessa** 2021, 91. **Մատթեոս Ուռհայեցի** 1898, 50: **Սամուէլ Անեցի** 2014, 184: **Kirakos Gandzaketsi**, 1986, 31–32. **Կիրակոս Գանձակեցի** 1961, 94: **Smbat Sparapet** 2005, 19–20. **Սմբատ սպարապետ** 1859, 47:

<sup>20</sup> See **Լեո** 1967, 653:

<sup>21</sup> **Կոստանեանց** 1897, 13–15: In the 18<sup>th</sup> century chronicler Baghdasar Dpir, he is called “Petros Getargel” (stop the flow of the river). (See **Մանր ժամանակագրություններ**, XIII–XVIII դդ. 1951, 342):

<sup>22</sup> **Aristakes Lastivertc’i** 2021, 29: **Արիստակես Լաստիվերտցի** 1844, 12:

<sup>23</sup> **Matthew of Edessa** 2021, 155–157. **Մատթեոս Ուռհայեցի** 1898, 84:

<sup>24</sup> **John Skylitzes** 2010, 409.

emperors sway and become a part of the Roman empire<sup>25</sup>. This story by a Byzantine author was the legal justification for Ani's bequest<sup>26</sup>. "The demand of the emperor had to be satisfied, because "at that time no neighboring state could resist Byzantium. Thus, Hovhannes-Smbat tried to prolong the independence of his country, hoping that the successor of Basil II would pursue a different policy towards Armenia", - writes H. Bartikyan<sup>27</sup>.

Since then, the Trebizond Treaty became a Damocles sword hanging over the head of the Armenian statehood. The vardapet [academic priest] Aristakes explains the signing of the Treaty of Trebizond by the childlessness of the Armenian king: "For he had no royal heir for his kingdom"<sup>28</sup>. His only son died, so the king "of his own free will" made the emperor his heir. Vardan Areveltsi considers the motive of the testament to be that Hovhannes-Smbat was strongly oppressed by Georgian king Georgi. By handing over Ani to the emperor, he received security guarantees, the emperor "would protect him from his oppressors"<sup>29</sup>. According to Byzantine chronicler John Skylitzes, the real reason for the testament was Hovhannes-Smbat's fear of the revenge of Basil II<sup>30</sup>. H. Manandyan studied various pieces of information about the ill-fated testament of Hovhannes-Smbat and came to the conclusion that what Skilica reported was reliable<sup>31</sup>.

In exchange for the rejection of Ani, the emperor ensured the material well-being of Hovhannes-Smbat and appointed a "lifetime" monetary allowance from the royal treasury: "In return for this [promise, Yovhann's] had received gifts and authority from the Byzantines for 15 years"<sup>32</sup>. For successful usurpation of Ani-Shirak kingdom the emperor also duly appreciated the role of Catholicos Petros, who "yet more honored by the emperor. Because Petros "had been a

---

<sup>25</sup> John Skylitzes 2010, 409. Հովհաննես Սկիլիցես 1979, 146–147: Historian K. Yuzbashyan is convinced that there was a testament that legitimized the actions of Constantine IX Monomachus. The Byzantine Empire attached great importance to the existence of legal grounds for seizing a territory. They were even willing to wait years for that legal basis to take effect, (See Юзбашян 1988, 159, 173).

<sup>26</sup> See Մաթևոսյան 2008, 18:

<sup>27</sup> Բարթիկյան 2002, 671:

<sup>28</sup> Aristakes Lastivertc'i 2021, 29. Արիստակես Լաստիվերտցի 1844, 12:

<sup>29</sup> Vardan Arewelc'i 1989, 191. Վարդան վարդապետ 1862, 93:

<sup>30</sup> John Skylitzes 2010, 409. Հովհաննես Սկիլիցես 1979, 146:

<sup>31</sup> See Մանանդյան 1977, 22–24: Юзбашян 1979, 76–91:

<sup>32</sup> Matthew of Edessa 2021, 157. Մատթեոս Եդեսացի 1898, 84:

### **Relations Between the Ecclesiastical and Political Authorities of Armenia...**

---

great lover of treasure" the emperor later assigned him annual or lump sum cash allowance<sup>33</sup>. It is notable that contemporaries correctly understood the essence of the events, as evidenced by the words of the tragical author's at the end of the narrative about the Trebizond events: "It was there that the destruction of Armenia occurred [through] a written letter"<sup>34</sup>.

After those events, the Armenian Pontiff did not return to Ani, sources are silent about his motives. Obviously, he was aware of the significance of his actions and understood that he could not return to the place whose verdict he had signed. So instead of returning to Ani, he reported his "miracle", which was a hopeless attempt to save face. By the order of the emperor in the spring, Petros moves from Trebizond to Sebastia, to Sennekerim, the last king of Vaspurakan. According to Gandzaketsi's remarkable report: "The emperor ordered the *kat'oghikos* to place his throne in Sebastia and to direct his flock from there"<sup>35</sup>. This report is the unequivocal evidence of the intention of Byzantium to remove and liquidate the Armenian Catholicosate from the land of Armenia.

### ***The Reasons for Contradictions Between the Armenian King and the Patriarch***

In 1026, after the death of Senekerim Artsruni and Basil II, Petros returned from Sebastia to Ani. By that time, the emotions caused by the Treaty of Trebizond had already subsided, and not everyone remembered it. However, after the events of Trebizond, the relationship between the king and the Catholicos became strained. According to Leo, the reason for the strained relationship was that Petros Ge-thadardz had exceeded the authority given to him by king Hovhannes-Smbat<sup>36</sup>.

Historical sources are silent about the period (1022–1026) that Catholicos Petros spent in Sebastia. However, it would be naive to think that the reason for the anger between the king and the Catholicos was the latter's long absence. The real cause of the conflict was the uncompromising struggle of the secular and spiritual rulers for their role in the country. Taking advantage of the patronage of

---

<sup>33</sup> See **Matthew of Edessa** 2021, 197. **Մատթէոս Ուռհայեցի** 1898, 106, compare **Օրմանյան** 2001, 1403:

<sup>34</sup> **Aristakes Lastivertc'i** 2021, 27. **Արիստակես Լաստիվերտցի** 1844, 12:

<sup>35</sup> **Kirakos Gandzaketsi** 1986, 32. **Կիրակոս Գանձակեցի** 1961, 95:

<sup>36</sup> See **Լեո** 1967, 654, compare **Զամինեան** 1908, 176: According to K. Yuzbashyan, their relationship was strained over the testament, as Hovhannes-Smbat bequeathed Ani Byzantium under Petros's influence, (See **Юзбашян** 1988, 162).



the political and spiritual elite of Byzantium<sup>37</sup> and playing a significant role in the spiritual and political life of the country, Catholicos Petros faced opposition from King and the princes. Church ruler's spiritual-political weight was directly proportional to the enormous economic and material wealth of the ecclesiastical state, which included extensive estates, revenues from churches and monasteries, various donations and countless treasures. Descended from a noble family, Petros inherited many estates in Arsharunyats province. Urhayetsi reports that: "For, [by contrast] when Lord Petros sat on the throne of the patriarchate and when it was [located] in the land of Armenians, it had the patriarchal properties given to it by the Armenian kings: 500 renowned large villages with very profitable revenues, 500 glorious bishops and district heads (*gawar'apets*), who administrated 700 dioceses without interruption"<sup>38</sup>. The spiritual landowner Petros owned the village of Ashnak, whose garden "with a wall and trees, fruits, meadow lands, irrigated plots" he gave to Ablgharib Pahlavuni<sup>39</sup>. And he dedicated this garden to the Church of Ani St. Savior, which he built himself. Grigor Magistros from the same dynasty, who owned Bjni with its fortresses, donated vast lands to the church of Bjni and the monastery of Havuts Tar<sup>40</sup>. Mkhitar Ayrivanetsi mentions that in 1011 Petros "built the monasteries of Surmari and Tsarakar"<sup>41</sup>.

Information has been preserved about the splendor and crowdedness of the patriarchate headed by Petros, which is an example of an unprecedented growth in the number of spiritual bureaucracy. "At that time there were 12 bishops in the House of the patriarch who were traditionally "advisers and associates of the patriarchs"<sup>42</sup>, as well as four *vardapets*, 60 priests and 500 members of the laity"<sup>43</sup>. Urhayetsi tells about the countless treasures of the patriarchate and various churches: "Furthermore, the churches and the House of the patriarch were filled with countless adornments, which the first kings had permanently

---

<sup>37</sup> See Ջամյան 1984, 945:

<sup>38</sup> Matthew of Edessa 2017, 73. Մատթէոս Ուռհայեցի 1898, 153–154:

<sup>39</sup> See Դիվան հայ վիմագրության 1965, 48:

<sup>40</sup> See Դիվան հայ վիմագրության 1965, 17, compare Ալիշան 1881, 84:

<sup>41</sup> Մխիթար Այրիվանեցի 1860, 58: It should be noted that the phenomenon of unprecedented enrichment of monastic estates was also characteristic of the Byzantine Church, (See Скабаланович 1884, 442–448, compare Շառլ Դիլ 2005, 65–66).

<sup>42</sup> Փավստոս Բուզանդ 1987, 403–405:

<sup>43</sup> Lay priests were married, and were called "white clergy".

### **Relations Between the Ecclesiastical and Political Authorities of Armenia...**

---

given to the first patriarchs, and which had been handed down to Lord Petros"<sup>44</sup>. Hundreds of clerics, some of whom were incompetent and untalented individuals who caused public displeasure, lived in luxury supported by huge incomes from their estates. This was a favorable environment for abuses, that's why Petros was blamed that "his royal patriarchate was subject to palace falsifications"<sup>45</sup>. His wealth was so visible that even the Byzantine court had an undisguised desire to take possession of it. In the latest period of the Bagratid's reign, Petros brought so much brilliance and glory to the patriarchate that "the throne of the patriarchate was not inferior to the throne of the Kingdom of the Armenians"<sup>46</sup>.

Petros's crowded Patriarchate and hundreds of diocesan-leaders under his supervision were not worthy of their title, because they were obsessed with greed, love for silver, and the desire to accumulate wealth was to the point of obsession. Talking about the destruction and robbery of the city of Artsn in 1049, Urhayetsi tells that he: "did hear that many times from many people concerning [the great wealth of] chorepiscopus [rural bishop] Dawt'uk, when Ibrahim seized his treasury: that it took 40 camels". Rural bishop's estates were so large that "800 oxen [yoked] in groups of six to bear the treasure away from his home"<sup>47</sup>. Riches and treasures were derived both from his extensive estates and from the dues of the eight hundred churches which paid a tax to the episcopal see<sup>48</sup>. It can be concluded that among the diocesan leaders there were many greedy clerics as Dawtuk.

The moral image of the luxurious patriarchate of Ani and the customs that prevailed among the clergy are fully reflected in the legend about the eclipse of the sun, which is associated with the name of the famous academic priest [vardapet] of that time, Hovhannes Kozern<sup>49</sup>. On August 10, 1033, on the 1000<sup>th</sup> anniversary of Christ's crucifixion, there was an eclipse of the sun, and at the same time "the whole earth trembled with a great movement". The element of nature has a great influence on the contemporaries. Considering this phenomenon as an ominous sign, Hovhannes-Smbat and Catholicos Petros sent

---

<sup>44</sup> Matthew of Edessa 2017, 73. **Մատթէոս Ուռհայեցի** 1898, 154:

<sup>45</sup> **Օրմանյան** 2001, 1412:

<sup>46</sup> Matthew of Edessa 2017, 73: **Մատթէոս Ուռհայեցի** 1898, 154:

<sup>47</sup> Matthew of Edessa 2021, 191–193. **Մատթէոս Ուռհայեցի** 1898, 103:

<sup>48</sup> See Հայ ժողովրդի պատմություն 1976, 178, compare **Առաքելյան** 1964, 123:

<sup>49</sup> According to N. Mar, the legend-vision of a solar eclipse is apocryphal, refers to the history of Ani. It was created in the 12<sup>th</sup> century, but its content dates back to the 11<sup>th</sup> century, (See **Հակոբյան** 1988, 73, compare **Մար** 1895, 9–19).

Grigor Magistros, West Sargis and “princes Armenians and others from the priest” to Sevanavank to get explanations from Hovhannes Kozern, “[He was] a man clothed in divinity, with an angelic faith, full of knowledge of apostolic and prophetic literature”. Kozern commented the element as divine punishment for departing from the Christian precepts. The scientist predicted many future disasters, which were the result of a general decline in morals and godlessness. Kozern accused the church class, particularly its leaders, of materialism, predicting the disruption of church order, disdain for true preaching, and the proliferation of sects<sup>50</sup>.

The predictions of Hovhannes Kozern and the news about the royal patriarchate and fabulous riches of the leader of the church discredited Petros Gethadardz. All this made it difficult for him to stay in Ani and he had to leave. According to Gandzaketsi's interpretation, “King Yohannes, was filled with resentment for patriarch Petros”<sup>51</sup>. Therefore, “Lord Petros the Catholicos was angry with King of Ani Yohannes and the princes”<sup>52</sup> and because of the commotion “arose from his throne and secretly went to Vaspurakan”<sup>53</sup>.

The sources do not indicate a convincing motive for his departure. His supporters believed that the reason for Petros's departure was that the king, princes “and *azatagund* troops of the Armenians did not heed the divine commandments”<sup>54</sup>. However, many facts, especially Kozern's words, testify that Catholicos himself was not even an ardent follower of divine commandments and was more engaged in worldly and political affairs. If, in fact, the violation of the divine commandments was the motive for his departure, he would not have left in a secret way, but with open rebuke and protest (*démarche*) he could have left his flock and secluded himself in a nearby monastery. Meanwhile, Gethadardz left the borders of the kingdom and went to Dzoroy monastery, which was under the spiritual influence of the Greek Empire and relied on the patronage of the Greek governor of Vaspurakan. The fact that Petros, being dissatisfied with Hovhannes-

---

<sup>50</sup> **Matthew of Edessa** 2021, 95–99. **Մատթեոս Ուռհայեցի** 1898, 52–54: **Smbat Sparapet** 2005, 19–20. **Սմբատ սպարապետ** 1859, 53:

<sup>51</sup> **Kirakos Gandzaketsi** 1986, 31–32. **Կիրակոս Գանձակեցի** 1961, 89–90:

<sup>52</sup> **Սամուէլ Անեցի** 2014, 185:

<sup>53</sup> **Matthew of Edessa** 2021, 141. **Մատթեոս Ուռհայեցի** 1898, 75: **Vardan Arewelc'i** 1989, 193. **Վարդան վարդապետ** 1862, 98:

<sup>54</sup> **Matthew of Edessa** 2021, 141. **Մատթեոս Ուռհայեցի** 1898, 75, compare **Грен** 1893, 121.

### **Relations Between the Ecclesiastical and Political Authorities of Armenia...**

---

Smbat, does not go to Ashot IV or other rulers, but relies on the imperial governor, indicates the serious causes of the conflict<sup>55</sup>. He stayed in Vaspurakan for four years “staying at Dzoroy monastery in Salnapat, which had been built by the blessed patriarch Nerses”<sup>56</sup>.

Petros I was certainly aware of the events that happened more than half a century before him, when Catholicos Vahan I Syunetsi (965–970) also took that path and had an inglorious end. However, it is difficult to suspect him of inclination towards the Greek religion, “because his course never fell under the suspicion of Chalcedonism, but, shining with promises of political gain and dominance in the eyes of the Greeks, he refrained from making religious demands”, - writes M. Ormanyan<sup>57</sup>. His cooperation with the Byzantine authorities was not done at the expense of limiting the autonomy of the Armenian Church. The logic of the actions suggests that the patriarch's departure from Ani had a political motive.

#### ***The Deepening of Contradictions Between the King and the Catholicos***

By leaving the patriarchal throne, Petros caused “immeasurable sorrow” to his congregation. Hovhannes-Smbat and the princes tried in various ways to bring him back to Ani: “Then King Yovhannes's and all the *naxarars* of the Armenians wrote a deceitful letter to Lord Petros saying that they would be obedient to his commands and heedful of all his radiant teachings” – tells Urhayetsi<sup>58</sup>. The Armenian court was probably wary of the growing influence and actions of Byzantium, so they also turned to the Byzantine governors of Vaspurakan, asking them to mediate and convince Petros to return to Ani. Catholicos, of course, guessed what awaited him from his opponents if he returned, so “Despite entreaties he did not return”<sup>59</sup>. As M. Ormanyan assumed, their goal was not only to return Petros home, but also to deprive him of the throne<sup>60</sup>. They would not dare to do this while he was at large, because then there would be a real danger of a split in the patriarchal throne. Petros was under the patronage of the Greeks, and most of Armenia was under the rule of the empire at that time.

---

<sup>55</sup> See Մաթևոսյան 2015, 43.

<sup>56</sup> Սամուէլ Անեցի 2014, 185:

<sup>57</sup> Օրմանյան 2001, 1416:

<sup>58</sup> Matthew of Edessa 2021, 141. Մատթէոս Ուռհայեցի 1898, 75–76:

<sup>59</sup> Vardan Arewelc'i 1989, 193. Վարդան վարդապետ 1862, 98:

<sup>60</sup> See Օրմանյան 2001, 1416:

Finally, four years later, in 1037 Petros Gethadardz returns from Vaspurakan to Ani, where he was arrested by order of the king and imprisoned in the fortress of Bjni. According to the 12<sup>th</sup> century chronicler Samvel Anetsi, the Armenian princes “deceived him [Petros Gethadardz – V.A.] and took him to Ani”<sup>61</sup>. Historian Vardan Areveltsi says that the Greek “duke” – governor of Vaspurakan “helped the detention” of the Catholicos and returned him to Ani by force<sup>62</sup>. At the end of the same year, a church council was convened in the capital, in which Petros was deposed<sup>63</sup>, and the abbot of Sanahin monastery Deoskoros was declared the new Catholicos. Overthrowing of Petros was illegal and contrary to church rules, since such a decision could be made by a representative of an episcopal council, meanwhile it should be noted that “at his ordination bishops, priests and patriarchs did not assemble”<sup>64</sup>. Only the clergy who agreed with the king participated in the council. For such a decision to be made against Petros, there would have to be strong accusatory arguments, but this is not mentioned<sup>65</sup>. Instead of all that, the anti-Petros position of Hovhannes Smbat was crucial.

Abbot of Sanahin Deoskoros described in Vardan’s book as “a holy and virtuous man”<sup>66</sup>, was a suitable candidate for silencing the opposition, which the king valued. The chroniclers consider Deo’scoros’s consent to be elected Catholicos the result of naivete: “Behold the great rhetorician Deo’scoros was greatly tricked”<sup>67</sup>. His tenure lasts “for one year and two months”. As historian of Edessa says, his reign and deposition were “not in accordance with God’s commands”, that is, not according to church rules. Deo’scoros “lost the great respect which he had [commanded]. Nor did anyone accept as valid his ordination to the blessed throne. Nor did they mention his name with other patriarchs during the church service since they considered him unworthy of that honor. And great

---

<sup>61</sup> Սամուէլ Անեցի 2014, 185:

<sup>62</sup> Vardan Arewelc’i’ 1989, 193. Վարդան վարդապետ 1862, 98:

<sup>63</sup> A close precedent for these events was the overthrow of Vahan I Syunetsi in 970 in the council of Ani. Hovhannes-Smbat, who is presented as a weak and timid character, repeatedly violated the church tradition. His first successful attempt was in 1019. It was the abdication of Sargis Sevantsi and the election of Petros Getadardz, (See Մաթևոսյան 2008, 15).

<sup>64</sup> Matthew of Edessa 2021, 143. Մատթէոս Ուռհայեցի 1898, 76:

<sup>65</sup> According to A. Gren, the Catholicos was accused of collaborating with the enemy, (See Դրեն 1893, 121).

<sup>66</sup> Vardan Arewelc’i’ 1989, 193. Վարդան վարդապետ 1862, 98:

<sup>67</sup> Matthew of Edessa 2021, 141. Մատթէոս Ուռհայեցի 1898, 76:

### **Relations Between the Ecclesiastical and Political Authorities of Armenia...**

---

mourning descended on the House of the Armenians”<sup>68</sup>. During the short reign of Deoscoros, there was a noticeable decline in church morals, a split in the episcopal class. In order to increase the number of his followers, he ordained many unworthy bishops who had been anathematized by the previous patriarchs for their “obvious transgressions”<sup>69</sup>.

The mentioned actions of the Armenian royal court caused new unrest among the clergy. The bishops and *vardapets* of the Land of the Armenians excommunicated the king and all the Armenian *naxarars* for the contention which had developed in the Church. Having overthrown Petros from his throne, Hovhannes-Smbat and his like-minded princes didn’t achieve the expected result. On the contrary, the internal contradictions deepened and an alarming situation was created in the country, the only solution of which was the restoration of Petros to the patriarchal throne. The king and the princes “terrified by the fear of the anathemas” in order to prevent upcoming uprisings “wanted to return Lord Petros to his throne”<sup>70</sup>. Grigor Magistros, who was one of the main figures of the court, had a significant role in his return.

It can be seen from the correspondence that during his imprisonment Petros studied and read the works of the Church Fathers. Grigor Magistros handed him over to prison “Book of Faiths” of St. Ephraim Sirin, saying that it will be “your [Petros Gethadardz – V.A.] friend in loneliness”<sup>71</sup>. Petros was a man with stable views, stubborn and consistent, despite the persecution, overthrow and deprivation of honors, he remained unshakable in his convictions.

#### ***Re-Establishment of Petros I Gethadardz on the Patriarchal Throne***

In the difficult situation that had developed in the country, the majority of the clergy demanded the reinstatement of Petros Gethadardz, who had a large circle of followers in the church and, due to his authority, could influence public moods. With his return, it would be possible to restore internal peace and social solidarity in the country. Then the king and all princes wrote letter to Aghuania, and called upon the *Catholicos* of the land of the Aghuans, Lord Yovse’p’, so that he come and intercede and [re] establish Lord Petros on the patriarchal throne in the city of

---

<sup>68</sup> Matthew of Edessa 2021, 143. Մատթեոս Ուռհայեցի 1898, 76:

<sup>69</sup> Հայ ժողովրդի պատմություն 1976, 148-149:

<sup>70</sup> Matthew of Edessa 2021, 143. Մատթեոս Ուռհայեցի 1898, 77:

<sup>71</sup> Գրիգոր Մագիստրոսի թղթերը, 1910, 4:

Ani. Catholicos Yovse'p' arrived in Ani with his episcopal class in 1038. In the same year, a great national-ecclesiastical council was convened under his chairmanship, in which patriarchs, clerics, and *vardapets*, *azats* and princes in the city of Ani participated the number of which reached four thousand. The members of the council "rejected him [Deoskoros] from the honor [of the position of Catholicos] and deposed him from the throne of the patriarchate"<sup>72</sup>. They qualified the Petros's deprivation of the throne as a violation of church tradition and restored him to the patriarchal throne. After being imprisoned for one year and five months, Petros "triumphantly" returned to the position of Catholicos and "there was peace in the blessed Church of the land of Armenia." On this occasion, Garsoyan writes: "By the end of the period of Armenian independence, the position of the kat'olikos was so firmly entrenched that not even the equivocal policy of Petros Gethadardz could undermine it, and the bishops assembled in Ani in 1038 forced his return against the claims of the royal candidate imposed by Yovhannēs-Smbat"<sup>73</sup>.

In 1042, the Ruler of the Armenian Church went to Byzantium. Petros I Gethadardz's mission to Constantinople was a diplomatic move to prevent the continuation of the unsuccessful but costly military operations of Michael Calafates (December 10, 1041 – April 21, 1042) against Armenia by Constantine Monomachus (1042–1055)<sup>74</sup>.

### ***The Surrender of Ani to Byzantium***

After the death of the crown-bearing brothers (1041), certain disagreements arose in the trio leading Ani's pro-Greek party. Taking advantage of a favorable circumstance, one of the principal *azats* West Sargis, who "since upon [Yovhannes'] death [Sargis] was his executor", stole and hid the royal treasures in his native fortresses. He intended to "rule over Shirak and the districts surrounding it"<sup>75</sup>.

In order to save the country from a split and resolve the issue of the heir to the throne, Catholicos Petros, Vahram Pahlavuni and other princes enthrone 18-

---

<sup>72</sup> According to Turnbiz, most of the council members were Armenian clerics of the Chalcedonian denomination, (See **Tournebize** 1910, 372):

<sup>73</sup> **Garsoyan** 1997, 173: Garsoyan characterizes Petros Gethadardz as an "enigmatic figure" (See **Garsoyan** 1997, 172).

<sup>74</sup> See **Բաղդիկյան** 2002, 599: Հայոց պատմություն 2014, 159:

<sup>75</sup> **Aristakes Lastivertc'i** 2021, 99. **Արիստակես Լաստիվերտցի** 1844, 37:

### **Relations Between the Ecclesiastical and Political Authorities of Armenia...**

year-old Gagik, the son of Ashot IV. They suppress the ambitions of all illegitimate claimants to the throne and according to the traditional order of succession, at the end of 1042 Catholicos Petros anoints Gagik, as king in the Cathedral of Ani. Cooperation with the national forces and the fact of the anointing of Gagik II prove that Petros I at that time was against the plan of bequeathing Ani to Byzantium and was trying to prolong the existence of the kingdom.

Byzantium, which does not recognize the rule of Gagik II, increased pressure on the Bagratid kingdom of Ani. In 1044, under the pretext of concluding peace and establishing friendship, Emperor Constantine IX Monomachus, "summoned Gagik to Constantinople with love"<sup>76</sup>. Handing over the keys of Ani to Catholicos Petros and appointing him the head of the city, he goes to Constantinople with a "one-way journey". Gagik received a royal reception with "great glory", and appears there in a situation "like a fish caught on the line, or a bird ensnared in a trap". With vile machinations, Gagik was blocked and demanded to hand over Ani, they offer him instead: "[the city of] Melitene (Malatya) and the surrounding districts". But [Gagik] did not consent<sup>77</sup>.

Convinced that the return of Gagik is impossible and the appointment of a new ruler of Ani is inevitable, Catholicos Petros sent a message to the Greek ruler of Samusat: "Inform the emperor [about what is going on and find out] what he will give us in return if I give up the city and other strongholds in this land". As a result of negotiations and bargaining, Catholicos, tempted by the promised "treasures and authority", agreed to the demand to hand over Ani to Byzantium<sup>78</sup>. They sent forty keys of the city of Ani to Emperor Monomachus, with a letter that said: "The city of Ani and the entire East belongs to you"<sup>79</sup>. Gagik stubbornly opposed the claims of the Emperor "For thirty days Gagik persistently resisted"<sup>80</sup>.

<sup>76</sup> Smbat Sparapet 2005, 23–24. **Սմբատ սպարապետ** 1859, 61: **Matthew of Edessa** 2021, 173–175. **Մատթեոս Եդեսացի** 1898, 93:

<sup>77</sup> Aristakes Lastivertc'i 2021, 111. **Արիստակես Լաստիվերտցի** 1844, 41:

<sup>78</sup> Aristakes Lastivertc'i 2021, 113. **Արիստակես Լաստիվերտցի** 1844, 42:

<sup>79</sup> Smbat Sparapet 2005, 23–24. **Սմբատ սպարապետ** 1859, 62: **Matthew of Edessa** 2021, 175. **Մատթեոս Եդեսացի** 1898, 95: M. Chamchyan writes that the keys of Ani, hidden from the Catholicos, were sent to the emperor by Sargis and several other princes, (See **Չամչյան** 1984, 933).

<sup>80</sup> Smbat Sparapet 2005, 23–24. **Սմբատ սպարապետ** 1859, 62: Byzantine chronicler 11<sup>th</sup>–12<sup>th</sup> centuries Skylitzes also testifies to Gagik's stubbornness in not handing over Ani voluntarily, saying that Gagik "did not want to give up his father's inheritance, the emperor decided to go to war", (**John Skylitzes** 2010, 410. **Հովհաննես Սկլիցես** 1979, 147).



As a legal justification for his demand, the emperor summoned Gagik, placed the keys and the letters before him, and cynically said: "Your princes have given Ani and the entire East to me".<sup>81</sup> Under the conditions of imprisonment and isolation, the last crowned Bagratid was forced to make concessions and give Ani to the Byzantines. As John Skylitzes narrated, "He [Aplesphares] stormed and captured many of Kakikios' fortresses and villages. As for Kakikios, assaulted by Roman forces and ravaged by the ruler of Tivion, he abandoned all hope. He made contact with the parakoimomenos and gave his allegiance to the emperor through him, [437] to whom he surrendered the city"<sup>82</sup>. Historian K. Matevosyan noted that the transfer of Ani to the Byzantines was not the individual decision of Petros, there was a strong group of Grecophiles in the city, who fulfilled the desire of the empire<sup>83</sup>. The chronicler Samvel Anetsi clearly announced the names of accomplices in this case: "Lord Petros, *azat* Sargis and Grigor Bjnetsi betrayed Gagik and gave Ani to the emperor of the Greeks [Constantine IX Monomachus]"<sup>84</sup>.

On March 10, 1044, Emperor Monomachus sends a Greek vestarches named lassites to Armenia to conquer and rule Ani. The people of Ani again put up armed resistance under the leadership of Vahram Pahlavuni, but when they hear about the surrender of Armenian king Gagik, they fell into despair, they realized that they are surrounded by enemies on all sides and there was no hope for help. They lay down their arms because they considered further resistance to be a senseless massacre of the people. "With this the kingdom of the Armenians was eliminated. And the lordship of the Bagratids fell",- Smbat Sparapet, the chronicler of the 13<sup>th</sup> century, sums up the tragic period of Armenian history with these painful words<sup>85</sup>.

---

<sup>81</sup> Smbat Sparapet 2005, 23–24. Սմբատ սպարապետ 1859, 62: Matthew of Edessa 2021, 175. Մատթեոս Եդեսացի 1898, 95:

<sup>82</sup> John Skylitzes 2010, 410.

<sup>83</sup> See Մաթևոսյան 2008, 24:

<sup>84</sup> Սամուէլ Անեցի 2014, 187:

<sup>85</sup> Smbat Sparapet 2005, 23–24. Սմբատ սպարապետ 1859, 63: Matthew of Edessa 2017, 90. Մատթեոս Եդեսացի 1898, 220: Examining the Armenian-Byzantine relations in the field of civilization, Harutyunova-Fidanyan concludes that before the physical conquest of Armenia, the Byzantines had long ruled over the Armenians in the ideological field, (See Арутюнова-Фиданян 2021, 16): "Byzantium needed Ani not so much because it was a rich city, which had in its possession a large area with numerous towns, which stretched to the border with Syria, but because of its strategic importance" (Арутюнова-Фиданян 1967 98).

### **Relations Between the Ecclesiastical and Political Authorities of Armenia...**

---

King Hovhannes-Smbat, who bequeathed the country to Byzantium, is the main person responsible for the destruction of the Bagratid kingdom of Ani. Undoubtedly, his main partner in that matter was Catholicos Petros Gethadardz, who, whatever role he played, cannot be equal to the king. They preferred Byzantine rule to Turkish-Seljuk or Georgian-Abkhazian rule<sup>86</sup>. This is the reason why they were called "traitor" not by contemporaries, but by historians of the subsequent centuries.

#### ***Conclusion***

On the eve of the fall of Ani's Bagratid kingdom, Armenia was experiencing a socio-political crisis. The external challenges that came from the Byzantine Empire and Turkish nomadic tribes intensified. In 1019, the ruling Bagratids handed over the ecclesiastical authority of the country to Petros I, a follower of the Greek civilizational value system, with the aim of solving the mentioned problems, preventing impending threats, as well as strengthening their own support within the country. Cooperating with Petros the Catholicos Hovhannes-Smbat prevents the Byzantine invasion of Armenia and prolongs the existence of the kingdom. By order of the king, His Highness went on a diplomatic mission to Trebizond and in 1022 signed the treaty proposed by Basil II, according to which, after the death of King Hovhannes-Smbat, Ani would pass to the Byzantine emperor.

During the reign of Petros, nicknamed Gethadardz (turning back the river), the economic power of the Armenian church reached great proportions, which was directly proportional to the role of the Catholicos in the internal and external affairs of the country. As a result of Petros's independent pro-Byzantine actions in the 1030s, relations between the political and ecclesiastical authorities became strained. He is exiled and deposed. However, Petros's reputation was so high that in order to restore public peace, the government had to soon reinstate him. After the death of Ashot IV and Hovhannes-Smbat, Petros I cooperated with the national forces and in 1042 anointed Gagik II as the Armenian king. This was an attempt to renounce the Treaty of Trebizond. After taking Gagik II into custody in Byzantium, Petros, under the pressure of the pro-Greek forces, handed over Ani to the empire. Historians of his time characterized Petros as a "Saint of the Armenian Church", a "Miracle-worker" and a "Skilled diplomat", while later authors, paying

---

<sup>86</sup> See ՊԵՏԱԿԵՐԵԱՆ 1967, 148.

tribute to emotional approaches, described him as a “Traitor” and “Byzantine agent”.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

**Ալիշան Ղ.** 1881, Շիրակ, Վենետիկ, Սուրբ Ղազարի տպ., 192 էջ:

**Ալիշան Ղ.** 1869, Յուշիկք հայրենեաց, Յունուարի 6 ի հայս, հ. Ա, Վենետիկ, Սուրբ Ղազար, Մխիթարեան տպ., 537 էջ:

**Բարթիկյան Հ.** 2002, Պետրոս Ա Գետադարձ և Կոստանդին IX Մոնոմախ, Հայ-բյուզանդական հետազոտություններ, հ. Ա, Աճեմյան մատենաշար, Երևան, ԵՊՀ հրատ., 822 էջ:

**Գրիգոր Մագիստրոսի** թղթերը 1910, բնագիրն յառաջաբանով և ծանոթագրություններով առաջին անգամ ի լոյս ընծայեց Կ. Կոստանեանց, Աղեքսանդրապոլ, տպարան Գէորգ Մաճոյեանցի, 352 էջ:

Դիվան հայ վիմագրության, 1965, պրակ I, Անի քաղաք, կազմեց՝ Հ. Օրբելի, Երևան, ՀՍՍՌ ԳԱ հրատ., 137 էջ:

**Լեո** 1967, Երկերի ժողովածու, հ. II, Երևան, «Հայաստան» հրատ., 786 էջ:

**Կիրակոս Գանձակեցի.** 1961, Պատմություն հայոց, աշխատասիր. Կ. Մելիք-Օհանջանյանի, ՀՍՍՀ ԳԱ հրատ., Երևան, 426 էջ:

**Կոստանեանց Կ.** 1897, Տէր Պետրոս Ա Գետադարձ, Վաղարշապատ, տպ. Մայր աթոռոյ սրբոյ էջմիածնի, 53 էջ:

**Հակոբյան Թ.** 1988, Անի մայրաքաղաք, Երևան, ԵՊՀ հրատ., 327 էջ:

Հայ ժողովրդի պատմություն. 1976, հ. Գ, Հայաստանը զարգացած ֆեոդալիզմի դարաշրջանում (IX դ. կեսերից մինչև XIV դ. կեսերը), Երևան, ՀՍՍՀ ԳԱ հրատ., 1023 էջ:

Հայոց պատմություն. 2014, հ. Բ, Միջին դարեր (IV–XVII դարի առաջին կես), Գիրք II, (IX դարի կես – XVII դարի առաջին կես), Երևան, Զանգակ-97 հրատ., 800 էջ:

Հաւաքումն պատմութեան **Վարդանայ վարդապետի.** 1862, Վենետիկ, Սբ. Ղազարի տպ., 184 էջ:

**Հովհաննես Սկիլիցես.** 1979, Օտար աղբյուրները Հայաստանի և հայերի մասին, 10, Բյուզանդական աղբյուրներ, Գ, թարգմ., առաջ., ծանոթագր. Հ. Բարթիկյանի, Երևան, ՀՍՍՀ ԳԱ հրատ., 437 էջ:

**Մաթևոսյան Կ.** 2015, Անիի ազնվականության պատմությունից կամ երեք Գրիգոր Մագիստրոս, Մուղնի հրատ., Երևան, 143 էջ:

**Մաթևոսյան Կ.** 2008, Անին մայրաքաղաք և կաթողիկոսանիստ, Պատմաբանասիրական հանդես, № 3, Երևան, ՀՀ ԳԱԱ հրատ., էջ 3–30:

**Մանանդյան Հ.** 1977, Երկեր, հ. Գ, Երևան, ՀՍՍՀ ԳԱ հրատ., 504 էջ:

**Մատթէոս Ուռհայեցի.** 1898, Ժամանակագրութիւն, Վաղարշապատ, տպ. Ս. էջմիածնի, 448 էջ:

Մանր ժամանակագրություններ, XIII–XVIII դդ. 1956, կազմեց՝ Վ. Հակոբյան, հ. Բ, Երևան, ՀՍՍՀ ԳԱ հրատ., 684 էջ:

**Մխիթարայ Այրիվանեցոյ** Պատմութիւն Հայոց. 1860, Մոսկվա, Մ. Էմին, տպ. Լազարյան ճեմարանի, 69 էջ:

## **Relations Between the Ecclesiastical and Political Authorities of Armenia...**

- Շառլ Դիլ.** 2005, Բյուզանդիայի պատմության հիմնախնդիրները, առաջ. Հ. Բարթիկյանի, Երևան, տպ. Սարգիս Խաչենց փրինթինգ, 400 էջ:
- Չամչյան, Մ.** 1984, Հայոց պատմություն, հ. Բ, Երևան, ԵՊՀ հրատ., 1060 էջ:  
Պատմություն Արիստակեսայ վարդապետի Լաստիվերտցոյ. 1844, Վենետիկ, տպ. Ս. Ղազար, 124 էջ:
- Պերպերեան Ա.** 1967, Հայոց կաթողիկոսական աթոռին բարձումը 11-րդ դարուն երկրորդ կեսին, Հանդես ամսօրեայ, № 4–6, Վիեննա, Մխիթարեան տպ., էջ 327–346:
- Սամուէլ Անեցի եւ շարունակողներ.** 2014, աշխատասիր. Կ. Մաթևոսյանի, Երևան, Նաիրի հրատ., 502 էջ:
- Սմբատ Սպարապետ.** 1859, Տարեգիրք, տպ. Է. Թունյի, Փարիզ, 180 էջ:  
Տեառն Ներսէսի Շնորհալոյ Չափաբերականք. 1830, Վենետիկ, տպ. Սր. Ղազարոյ, 620 էջ:
- Փաւստոս Բուզանդ.** 1987, Հայոց պատմություն, թարգմ. և ծանոթ. Ստ. Մալխասյանի, Երևան, ԵՊՀ հրատ., 455 էջ:
- Օրմանեան Մ.** 2001, Ազգապատում, հ. Ա, Մայր Աթոռ Սուրբ Էջմիածին, 1870 էջ:
- Арутюнова-Фиданян В.** 1967, К истории падения Ани (о личности «царского раба» в «истории» Михаила Атталиата) // Вестн. обществ. наук АН Армянской ССР, № 9, с. 90–101.
- Арутюнова-Фиданян В.** 2021, Роль «образа другого» во взаимодействии цивилизаций. Армяно-византийская контактная зона (X–XI вв.), Вестник ПСТГУ, сер. III, филология, вып. 69, с. 11–22.
- Грен А.** 1893, Династия Багратидов в Армении, Журнал министерства народного просвещения, ССХС, Типография В. Балашева, С.-Петербург, № 11, с. 52–139.
- Скабаланович Н.** 1884, Византийское государство и церковь, тип. Еленского, Санкт-Петербург, 449 с.
- Юзбашян К.** 1988, Армянские государства эпохи Багратидов и Византия IX–XI вв., Москва, «Наука», 300 с.
- Юзбашян К.** 1979, Скилица о захвате Анийского царства в 1045 г., Византийский временник, Москва, «Наука», т. 40, с. 76–91.
- Aristakes Lastivertc'i's** History. 2021, Translated by Robert Bedrosian, New York, Published by Sophe, 345 pages.
- Bartikian H.** 2002, The Religious Diplomacy of Byzantium in Armenia during the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries, Հայ-բյուզանդական հետազոտություններ, հ. Բ, Երևան, Աճեմյան մատենաշար, էջ 915–922:
- Garsoyan N.** 1997, The Armenian People from Ancient to Modern Times, vol. I, 7, The Independent Kingdoms of Medieval Armenia, Publisher Palgrave Macmillan, New-York, 384 pages.
- John Skylitzes.** 2010, A Synopsis of Byzantine History 811–1057, Translated by John Wortley, Cambridge University press, Published USA by Cambridge University press, New York, 490 p.
- Kirakos Gandzakets'i's** History of the Armenians. 1986, Translated from Classical Armenian by Robert Bedrosian, New York, <https://archive.org/details/KirakosGanjaketsisHistoryOfTheArmenians/mode/2up?view=theater>.

**Matthew of Edessa's**, Cronicle. 2021, Volume I, Translated by Robert Bedrosian, New York, Published by Sophehne, 212 pages.

**Matthew of Edessa's**, Cronicle. 2017, Translated from Classical Armenian by Robert Bedrosian, Sources of the Armenian Tradition (Long Branch, N.J.), [https://ia800804.us.archive.org/34/items/ChronicleMatthewEdessa/Chronicle\\_Matthew\\_Edessa.pdf](https://ia800804.us.archive.org/34/items/ChronicleMatthewEdessa/Chronicle_Matthew_Edessa.pdf).

The Cronicle of **Smbat Sparapet**. 2005, Translated from Classical Armenian by Robert Bedrosian, Sources of the Armenian Tradition (Long Branch, New Jersey) <https://archive.org/details/SmbatSparapetsChronicle/page/n27/mode/2up?view=theater>.

The Historical Compilation of **Vardan Arewelc'i** (1989), Ed. and Trans. R. Thomson, Washington, DC: Dumbarton Oaks, Trustees for Harvard University, 226 pages.

**Toynbee A.** 1954, A Study of History, The Challenge of Militancy on Earth, Volume VII, Oxford University Press, London, New York, Toronto, 772 pages.

**Tournebize Fr.** 1910, Histoires politique et religieuse de l'Arménie. T. I, Typographie Firmin-Didot Et C 56 Rue Jacob, Paris, 897 pdf pages.

## ՀԱՅԱՍՏԱՆԻ ԵԿԵՂԵՑԱԿԱՆ ԵՎ ՔԱՂԱՔԱԿԱՆ ԻՇԽԱՆՈՒԹՅՈՒՆՆԵՐԻ ՀԱՐԱՔԵՐՈՒԹՅՈՒՆՆԵՐԸ ԱՆԻ- ՇԻՐԱԿԻ ԲԱԳՐԱՏՈՒՆՅԱՑ ԹԱԳԱՎՈՐՈՒԹՅԱՆ ԱՆԿՄԱՆ ՆԱԽԱՇԵՄԻՆ

ԱԼԵՔՍԱՆՅԱՆ Վ.

Ամփոփում

**Բանալի բառեր**՝ Անի-Շիրակ, Կաթողիկոսություն Հայոց, Պետրոս Ա Գետադարձ, Հովհաննես-Սմբատ, եկեղեցական կալվածքների ընդարձակում, Կոստանդին Թ Մոնոմախ, Տրապիզոնի դաշնագիր:

Հոդվածում ուսումնասիրվում են հայոց եկեղեցական և քաղաքական իշխանությունների հարաբերությունները, որոնք հանգեցրին Անի-Շիրակի Բագրատունյաց թագավորության անկմանը: 1020-ական թթ. սկզբին հայոց արքա Հովհաննես Սմբատը (1018–1041) կաթողիկոս Պետրոս Գետադարձի (1019–1059) համաձայնությամբ Անին կտակում է Բյուզանդիային: 1022 թ. Պետրոս կաթողիկոսը Տրապիզոնում պայմանագիր է կնքում կայսր Վասիլ Բ-ի (976–1025) հետ՝ կանխելով բյուզանդական ներխուժումը Հայաստան: Այդ շրջանում Հայ եկեղեցու տնտեսական ներուժը հասնում է աննախադեպ մեծության, որի շնորհիվ աճում է հոգևոր վեհապետի դերակատարությունը երկրի ներքին և արտաքին գործերում: Այս հոդվածում վրա 1030-ական թթ. լարվում են

աշխարհիկ և հոգևոր ինքնակալների հարաբերությունները: Պետրոսն արտաքսվում է և աթոռանկ արվում: Սակայն շուտով եկեղեցականների և հանրության ճնշման տակ նա վերահաստատվում է կաթողիկոսական գահին: Հայոց թագակիր եղբայրներ Աշոտ Դ-ի և Հովհաննես-Սմբատի մահից հետո երբեմնի բյուզանդամետ կաթողիկոս Պետրոս Ա-ն համագործակցում է ազգային ուժերի հետ և 1042-ին Գագիկ Բ-ին օժում Հայոց թագավոր: Դրանով փորձ էր արվում հրաժարվել Տրապիզոնի դաշնագրից և պահպանել Անիի թագավորությունը: Սակայն Բյուզանդիայում Գագիկ Բ-ի արգելափակումից հետո հայոց եկեղեցապետը հունամետ ուժերի ճնշման տակ ստիպված է լինում Անին հանձնել կայսրությանը:

## ОТНОШЕНИЯ МЕЖДУ ЦЕРКОВНОЙ И ПОЛИТИЧЕСКОЙ ВЛАСТЬЮ АРМЕНИИ В ПРЕДДВЕРИИ ПАДЕНИЯ БАГРАТИДСКОГО ЦАРСТВА АНИ-ШИРАК

АЛЕКСАНИЯН В.

### Резюме

**Ключевые слова:** Ани-Ширак, Армянский католикосат, Петрос I Гетадардз, Ованес-Смбат, расширение церковных имений, Константин IX Мономах, Трапезундский договор.

В статье исследуются взаимоотношения армянской духовной и политической власти, приведшие к падению Багратидского царства Ани-Ширак. В начале 1020-х годов армянский царь Ованес-Смбат (1018–1041) завещал Анийское царство Византии с согласия католикоса Петроса Гетадардза (1019–1059). Армянский католикос Петрос I подписал договор с византийским императором Василием II (976–1025) в Трапезунде в 1022 году, тем самым предотвратив вторжение византийской армии в Армению. В этот период экономический потенциал Армянской церкви достиг огромных размеров, благодаря чему возросло влияние католикоса на внутренние и внешние процессы страны. На этой почве в 1030-е годы обострились отношения между светскими и духовными лидерами. Петрос был свергнут и изгнан. Однако вскоре он был реабилитирован в своих правах. После

смерти армянских царей Ашота IV и Ованеса-Смбата некогда провизантийский католикос Петрос Гетадардз сотрудничал с национальными силами и в 1042 году помазал Гагика II армянским царем. Это была попытка отказа от Трапезундского договора и сохранения Анийского царства. Однако после заключения Гагика II под стражу в Византии глава Армянской церкви под давлением прогреческих сил вынужден был передать Ани Византийской империи.