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EDITOR'S NOTE

I welcome all of our readers to the first issue of the review. We are extremely excited that this project has finally come to fruition.

The St. Nersess Theological Review embodies and reflects the concern of St. Nersess Armenian Seminary not only to study the writings of Armenian scholars, Church fathers, and historians, but to make these educational and important works easily accessible to scholars and members of the community, both Armenian and non-Armenian alike.

The St. Nersess Theological Review can be said to have been born over thirty-five years ago in the vision of the founder of St. Nersess Armenian Seminary. The mission of St. Nersess Armenian Seminary is to support, educate, and train faithful men and women dedicated to service and ministry in the Armenian Church, and, in general, for the propagation of Christian piety, theological learning, and Armenian studies among the clergy and members of the Armenian Church and the greater community. This was the inspiration which led Archbishop Tiran Nersoyan, in 1961, to found St. Nersess Armenian Seminary. His fervent desire was to establish a forum in English for critical discussion of issues of central concern to the Armenian Church, and it is my earnest wish that his aspiration will be fulfilled through the publication of this journal. Inspired by Abp. Nersoyan's vision, the publication of the St. Nersess Theological Review was enthusiastically undertaken to respond to and fulfill this most important and essential calling and responsibility. The St. Nersess Theological Review serves as an excellent resource through which the theological works of our Church Fathers can be brought to the forefront and made accessible to the clergy, members of the Armenian Church, and the international theological community.

It is imperative to note that the publication of the St. Nersess Theological Review is made possible by the vision and forethought demonstrated by Archbishop Nersoyan through his generous financial contributions to St. Nersess Armenian Seminary. As such, the St. Nersess Theological Review is primarily being funded by the Archbishop Tiran Nersoyan publication fund.

The St. Nersess Theological Review has as one of its aims the publication of the theses of St. Nersess seminarians, past and present. Throughout the past thirty-five years, seminarians have written excellent discourses which are representative of an expansive scope of the Armenian church. Unfortunately, until now, many of these theses have not had the opportunity to be published and, in turn, to enlighten and enrich the general community.

We pray that God will guide us with wisdom, courage, and perseverance in bringing His Word to His people.

Rev. Fr. Arakel Aljalian
Editor
Dedicated in loving memory of

Archbishop Tiran Nersoyan
(1904-1989)

Founder

St. Nersess Armenian Seminary
New Rochelle, New York
REFLECTIONS ON THE LIFE AND MINISTRY OF ARCHBISHOP TIRAN NERSOYAN

Arshen Aivazian

A few years before his death, during one of my occasional visits to him, Archbishop Tirian Nersoyan evaluated his own legacy in his service of the Gospel and the Church. He compared his life of ministry with that of his classmate Archbishop Norayr Bogharian. "He dedicated his life to scholarship and consequently he will leave behind a great legacy of study and literature. I, on the other hand, spent my life in administrative service within the Church and my legacy is scattered and tucked away in the annals of various churches and dioceses." The two had so much in common and yet were so different in so many ways. Both were born in 1904, in Aintab, Cilician Armenia (Modern Turkey), both were sons of priests who were forced to leave their hometowns during the deportations of Armenians from the Ottoman Empire, and both families settled in Aleppo, Syria. The fathers personally took their sons Nerses and Adam to the Monastery of St. James in Jerusalem where they were to be educated in the newly reorganized seminary under the tutelage of the saintly Patriarch Yeghishe Tourian on June 22, 1928 at the Cathedral of St. James with their fathers acting as their sponsors at the ordination. Following their ordination they both left for England to further their studies. After their return to Jerusalem they began life-long ministries in the Armenian Church. And here end all the parallels between Archbishop Nersoyan and Archbishop Bogharian.

The latter, who at the age of 91 continues his work, with his quiet and introverted personality, and methodically organized and strictly regulated self-imposed discipline has devoted his entire life primarily to teaching and to scholarly studies, producing the multivolume Grand Catalogue of St. James Manuscripts, Armenian [Patristic] Writers, and A Course of Liturgics, to name just three, and thousands of scholarly articles. Archbishop Nersoyan, on the other hand, was the extrovert, the bold and courageous activist, who, by his own admission, lacked academic self-discipline ("I should have taken notes of everything that I read through the years" he once said), yet with his warm and communicative personality could motivate people around him to share his vision and to pursue it. Upon his return from England he was assigned to the position of Dean of the Seminary of St. James which he held for a few years. He returned to London, England, as pastor of the then quite small Armenian Community. He was in London during the Second World War, where he met and ministered to many of the American-Armenian GIs. After the war, he was elected Primate of the Eastern Diocese of the Armenian Church of America, a position which he held for more than two terms before he resigned under political pressure, concluding what one might call the first and the more productive and focused half of his ministry.

He returned to Jerusalem in 1955 with the greatest desire and urgency to put the affairs of the patriarchate in order, which had suffered greatly and was on the verge of col-
lapse after the Arab-Israeli War of 1947 and the partition of Palestine into Arab and Jewish States, including the City of Jerusalem. His election and tenure as Patriarch of Jerusalem in 1956 lasted less than three years and, with the denial of formal recognition by the Jordanian Government, he was exiled and returned to the United States where he spent the rest of his life until his death in 1989.

My first impression of Archbishop Tiran came in 1956 when I entered the seminary of Jerusalem. He was the patriarch who had returned from many years of service overseas to put his spiritual house in order. Despite the fact that much of his time was taken by the ongoing legal battle to keep the office to which he was elected, he was able to pay attention to the reorganization of the seminary and other institutions of the patriarchate. One could not help but be impressed by his deep voice, his tall and erect stature, and by his personal presence at the many liturgical celebrations, which added so much to the seriousness and the solemnity of the occasion. My impression of Tiran Srbazan from those childhood years was indeed of a man of legend: unapproachable and awesome because of his position, yet inspiring and warm because of his genuineness and sincerity. That impression remained with me for many years. It grew rather than faded with the passage of years. It was, therefore, with some awe that I first walked into his residence in the rectory of Holy Cross Church in Manhattan after my assignment to part-time pastoral duty in 1970. For approximately three years I shared with him the joy of worshipping together, hearing his inspiring homilies, discussing history, debating current ecclesiastical issues, and even national and international political affairs. It is in and through these exchanges that I came to know Archbishop Tiran not so much as the hierarchical giant who had inspired in me the impression of awe in my early years in the seminary, but as the humble priest, the devoted messenger of the gospel, and the dedicated servant of the Church. It was his devotion to the Gospel and his dedication to proclaim it in his life as a servant of the church that provided him with the inspiration, the inner strength, and the courage to share his vision of the church regardless of his rank within the hierarchy of the Church, from the diaconate to the episcopate.

The mission of the Armenian Church has been an issue of debate for over a century. Since the middle of the nineteenth century, when the debate was brought into open in the public arena, secular nationalists have insisted that the Armenian Church is the product of purely nationalistic aspirations with the single mission of maintaining and preserving the ethnic identity and the national secular culture of the Armenian people. For these secular nationalists not only is the Gospel inconsequential to the life of the Armenian people and the Church, but it is irrelevant. The hierarchy of the Church, on the other hand, has always maintained that proclaiming the Gospel is the only mission of the Church and whatever other roles were assigned and assumed by the Church were temporary and added responsibilities, imposed by circumstances of history but never at the expense of the proclamation of the Gospel. In the years following the First World War, in the aftermath of the Armenian massacres, when Armenian nationalism was on the rise and people’s faith was shaken in consequence of the devastating sufferings that they had endured, the effort by secular nationalists had intensified to the point of emptying the Church of any religious and spiritual mission (“We want a church where God does not exist”, as one has put it), there was a need to assert the Church’s apostolate clearly and courageously. In an article
published in the August-September, 1928 issue of Sion, the official monthly magazine of
the Armenian Patriarchate of Jerusalem, Archbishop Tiran Nersoyan, then a young dea-
con, wrote:

This widespread and deeply rooted idea, namely that the Armenian church jus-
tifies its existence only because of its national character, at first seems a plausi-
ble keystone both to some Armenian Christians, and even to Armenian non-
Christians.

And indeed there is some truth in this viewpoint, and there is some value in
ascribing it to the Church and the Church’s acceptance of it. However, that is neither the
whole truth nor does the value of our Church rest entirely on it. If our Church identified
with our nation, if the Armenian Church is the only protector and sponsor of our national
identity, that has never been the purpose of the Church’s being nor should it be. On the
contrary, our Church’s national character is only a partial quality, a consequence of the cir-
cumstances, and often an additional function which the Church has assumed due to the
absence of a viable national institution, which we have been unable to nurture due to unfor-
tunate political circumstances, i.e., we never had a strong government, a dominant
culture, or a nation with a concentrated population. Going a step further, the accented
nationalism of our Church is the result of her failure, for various reasons, to embark on
foreign missionary activities, which is her topmost Christian duty.

And now, as I already noted above, because of the ignorance of some, the inten-
tional distortion of facts by others, and the indifference of still others who should be most
watchful, a secondary benefit which derived from our Church, i.e., the preservation of our
ethnicity, is presented as her only purpose and calling. As this misunderstanding spreads
further and becomes rooted in people’s minds, it obviously harms both the cause of
Armenian nationhood and nationalism, and does even more harm to the true and real call-
ing of the Armenian Church, which, alas truthfully, she is still far from understanding and
accomplishing.

The distortion of the mission of the Church has, in the last few decades, opened
the debate on some other side issues ranging from the official name of the Armenian
Church ("Orthodox" or "Apostolic"?) to the legacy of Sts. Sahak and Mesrop, the inven-
tion of the Armenian alphabet and the translation of the Bible into Armenian in the fifth
century. Secular nationalists have advanced the notion that the work of the Holy
Translators and their students was intended purely for the creation of an Armenian nation-
al identity. This has led many, including some among the ranks of clergy, to idolize the
Armenian alphabet and promote the church as the fortress of its maintenance and preser-
vation. At a time when the use of the Armenian language is in decline in many commu-
nities in the Diaspora, the idea that the Church is the guardian of the Armenian language
is appealing and injects new hope among secular nationalists that the Church can preserve
what people have already lost, namely the use of Classical Armenian as a living language.
It is exactly this myth that has led the secular nationalists in our midst to redefine the lega-
cy of our Holy Translators from its pure and simple intent to bring the gospel message to
the people in the language they understand to a purely secular purpose of strengthening
Armenian national identity by giving it a unique linguistic expression of its own. In an article in the November, 1935 issue of Sion, Tiran Vardapet Nersoyan signed an article entitled “The Eternal Discipleship” in which he writes:

The teachers and the students of the fifth century, who built up Armenian culture, did not [invent the Armenian alphabet and translate the Holy Scriptures] with the intent of building up an Armenian culture, or to create an Armenian literature, or to secure a unique [Armenian] national identity. They were much wiser than some of our contemporary mindless people who confuse the means with the end. No. Our translators were much wiser to know that culture, literature, language, alphabet, and the church, and other similar factors represent any value in and of themselves to be offered to the people. These factors serve only as the vehicles that give form, shape, and image to those values.

Anyone who knew Archbishop Nersoyan as a priest can testify that he lived his life boldly proclaiming what he believed in, never compromising on the principles of the Gospel. Many of his students and colleagues will bear witness to the fact that his greatest attribute as a leader was his talent to build consensus, to form a team around his vision and to pursue it. He was always open to new ideas and suggestions that would clarify his vision and expedite its realization. He would compromise on the form but never on the substance. His strength of character as a priest was evident throughout his life in his uncompromising defense of the true mission of the Armenian Church and in his rejection of any suggestions that might distort the truth as it is defined by our Lord himself, by the Church, by our forebears in faith, and by history. He himself recognized that much of the pain that he endured throughout his ministry in the Armenian Church was exactly because he would hold his ground on the principles of the Church. And this he did not only in defining and debating issues relating to the internal affairs of the Armenian Church, but in representing the Armenian Church in ecumenical circles. He presented many scholarly papers on the theological positions of the Armenian church and historical themes in various ecumenical discussions, some of which have been published separately. He also represented the Armenian Church in some official dialogues with other churches. A quick glance at the transcripts of these meetings reveals in Archbishop Tiran the fiercely committed advocate of the Orthodox theology of the Armenian Church, open and willing to accommodate understanding and clarification but never ready to compromise on the fundamental issues of dogma.

Archbishop Tiran has left behind a wealth of articles, study papers, and commentaries ranging on topics from theology to history, from liturgy to canons, from spirituality to moral issues. It would greatly benefit the Church if some day all were brought together and published in one volume. But the greatest literary legacy that he left behind will remain his monumental translation into English of the full and unabridged text of the Armenian missal. This is not the time nor the place to discuss the style or the linguistic merits of his translation. The value of his work will always be in the high quality of scholarship in staying loyal to the Armenian original, and as such in its great appeal to scholars and students of the Armenian liturgy. Along with this, however, one can meet and appreciate the theologian in Archbishop Tiran, who added his own commentary to the
text, and the liturgist who included the rubrics with meticulous attention to every detail. The same can be said also of his translations of portions of the breviary and ritual. One can appreciate why Archbishop Tiran felt somewhat unfulfilled concerning his literary legacy, despite the fact that he was most proud of it. He accomplished all of what I have discussed so far in addition to his administrative responsibilities, which he considered his primary field of ministry.

The accomplishments of Archbishop Tiran Nersoyan in the administrative field of church ministry are as great as his literary legacy, and I believe their impact and value for the future will grow rather than diminish with the passage of time.

His tenure as Dean of St. James Seminary in Jerusalem was groundbreaking not only because the seminary had been reorganized only a few years prior, but also because he set up a curriculum that served as a model for the seminary of the Catholicate of Cilicia. His pastorate in London coincided with the Second World War, years that he spent on the translation of the missal, and to ministering to the needs of the Armenian-American GIs, with whom he bonded strongly and permanently.

From 1944, the year he was elected Primate of the Eastern Diocese of the Armenian Church of America, to 1959, the end of his tenure as Patriarch of Jerusalem, are the most productive years of Archbishop Nersoyan. He is to be credited with giving the Diocesan by-laws its legal shape and form. While a set of by-laws existed before he assumed his post and many changes and amendments have been introduced over the years, yet the organization of the by-laws as a document to govern the affairs of a church body is the result of his foresight.

It was Archbishop Tiran who formed the first committee to explore the possibility of building a cathedral in New York City. The Cathedral of St. Vartan was consecrated in 1968, but the dream and the vision were born in 1946.

It was Archbishop Tiran who led the transition of the Diocese from a group of "immigrant" churches into a church with roots in the soil and culture of the land. His first effort to that end was to bring into the Diocese candidates to the priesthood and the pastorate who were ready to bond and identify with the American born generation of Armenians. Many of those he invited were his former students from Jerusalem, whose education in American seminaries he encouraged and supported.

It was Archbishop Tiran who took personal interest in the youth, whose admiration he had already won, and in 1946 founded the Armenian Church Youth Organization of America. Many of the veterans of the ACYOA became the future lay leaders of the church. It was among these youth that Archbishop Tiran sowed and nurtured the seeds of the Gospel and of service in the Armenian Church. A few in the beginning, and more and more in later years, have dedicated themselves to the service of the Church, both in clerical and lay vocations.

It was Archbishop Tiran who encouraged the choirs of the diocese to come together and organize as a body. In 1946, the Association of Armenian Church Choirs of America was born.

Archbishop Tiran’s tenure came to an abrupt end in 1954 when political pressure forced him to resign only a few months after his re-election to a third term. In 1955, he returned to Jerusalem, his spiritual home, and spearheaded the movement to put affairs of
the patriarchate in order. He was elected patriarch in 1956 and remained in office until 1959. Once again, local and international politics played a decisive role in forcing him from office. He returned to the United States in 1960.

It must be admitted sadly that the second half of Archbishop Tiran's life could have been his most fruitful and productive years. Unfortunately those years ended as the least productive, with the exception of what I and many others consider the crowning accomplishment of his life, the founding of St. Nersess Armenian Seminary in 1961. I consider the founding of the Seminary the single most important event in the ministry of Archbishop Tiran not because it is the most important one, which it is, but because in the seminary I see the embodiment of all that he was as a person, as a priest, and as a servant of the Gospel. The seminary embodies Tiran Srbazan's vision of a crucible for the education, training, and nurturing of church leaders, both lay and clergy, for the entire Armenian Church but especially for the American-Armenian Church. The seminary embodies the community in which a person of faith is to grow and flourish. It is ironic that Tiran Srbazan, the community builder all his life, was in a way rejected by the community of the institutional church at least during the last three decades of his life. Finally, the seminary brings together the past, the present, and the future of the Church. Tiran Srbazan was a man deeply rooted in the past, ever in touch with the present, and always with a vision for the future.

I have often wondered how Archbishop Tiran was able to accomplish all he did with the odds often stacked so highly against him. The answer to that question came to me near the end of his earthly life. During a visit to his residence with my wife only two weeks before his death, as we got up to take leave, sad and heavy hearted, he bowed his head and asked me to offer a prayer of healing. At that moment I experienced not Tiran, the archbishop, not the intellectual giant that he was, not the man of legend, but the faithful servant of Christ, the humble priest.

It is that image of Archbishop Tiran Nersoyan that will stay with me.
THE THEOLOGICAL MISSION OF THE HOLY TRANSLATORS

S. Peter Cowe

In a culture marked by pluralism, mobility and ethnic diversity and in an era which has undergone a revolution in communications technology, it is easy for us to appreciate the necessity of translation. It is an activity all of us are involved in at various levels on a day to day basis, interpreting other's speech, ideas, and images in terms of our own perceptions and outlook. By its nature, then, the process is universal and multifaceted. It allows us to share in the benefits of accumulated human experience and in so doing to discover ourselves and redefine our identity in the light of the data we absorb. And if this is true of us as individuals, the same also applies to the collective entities to which we belong, most obviously our linguistic communities.

Granted the ubiquitous nature of the enterprise, it is already clear that there were many Armenian translators before those honored by the term "Holy Translators," but none of them were accorded the same respect or subsequently recognized as saints. What then was special about Sahak Par'tew and the vardapet Maštöc and their activities almost sixteen hundred years ago that we continue to gather in their annual commemoration?

In the classical world of the eastern Mediterranean Judaism was regarded as the religion of the book.1 Ancestral tradition recorded there referred to God speaking directly to Moses and bestowing on him instruction on the divinely pleasing life entrusted on tablets of stone.2 This revelation then inaugurated a corpus of writings also considered as imbued with the holy, as in some sense "written by the finger of God."3 Consequently, one aspect of their sanctity was precisely the form in which the message had been transmitted, and therefore its very linguistic idiom. In such a case it was unthinkable to tamper with that formulation in rendering it into another language and still accord it equal veneration.4 Under a similar set of circumstances Islam was to declare the text of the Qur'an inviolable as God's discourse to Muhammad.5 Only Christianity celebrated the diversity of human expression in the Holy Spirit's descent on the disciples of the risen Lord "in tongues of fire" as the writer of Acts observes,6 and their preaching to all the peoples of

1 This development is seen particularly in post-exilic times with the decline in prophecy and rise of the scribes as interpreters of the divine revelation contained in the Pentateuch.
3 Ibid., 32:16.
4 As a result the Old Greek version of the Pentateuch effected in the third century B.C. and generally referred to as the Septuagint was not considered on a par with the Hebrew text by authorities in Palestine. Similarly, the Aramaic targums were transmitted orally for a long time to indicate their secondary status as a reader's aid.
6 Acts 2:3.
the *oikoumenē*, or inhabited world of the time.

This was possible because their unity was assured as members of Christ's body, the Church. Moreover, whereas Judaism and Islam perceived the word of God as communicated to humanity through a written record, Christians affirmed that God the Word, the divine Logos, had revealed Himself to mankind by being born and sharing our very existence. The Master had taken the form of a servant and the divine had become human without undergoing any change in His divinity. Now the Gospel Book represents Christ in various ways. In the liturgy it is held on high at the little entrance, re-enacting Christ's coming into the world. On the battlefield it embodied His presence, leading Armenian forces into the fray. Consequently, the message it bore witness to could be rendered into different languages without compromising its salvific efficacy.

As a result, commentators viewed the creation of the Armenian alphabet and the process of crafting the Bible into that form not only as a human act, but one with a profoundly divine dimension. Quite simply it was part of salvation history and increasingly interpreted in language relating to the incarnation, rather than the laws of the old covenant given on Mt. Sinai. The first account we have of the episode is preserved by Maštoc's pupil Koriwn, writing in the 440's, who likens his teacher's return journey from Mesopotamia at the turn of the century to Moses' descent of the mountain. However, whereas the latter's descent was tinged with anger and frustration at the Israelites' backsliding in venerating the golden statue of a calf, the former "was filled with spiritual consolation...confident of the eagerness of those who were to be the recipients." Whereas our earliest sources, Koriwn and the historian Łazar Parpeči, composing at the end of the fifth century, focus primarily on the activities of the protagonists Maštoc and Catholicos Sahak respectively, later reflection on the course of events underlines more deeply their divine underpinning which led to the saints' canonization. Nevertheless, the nucleus is already to be found in Koriwn who sought to defend his scriptural comparison in the following terms:

Let no one consider us bold for what we have said. We may be subject to censure for our analogy between a very modest man and Moses the Magnificent, who had spoken with God. But we feel justified in that there is no reason to dis-

---

7 Ephes. 1:23.
8 John 1:1-14.
9 Phil. 2:7-8.
10 This represents the Antiochene approach to which Armenians were more attuned in the early centuries. For a brief overview of the issue see GERMANUS, 1984, pp. 23-41.
12 KORIWN, 1981, p. 100 (Armenian) and p. 280 (English).
14 See KORIWN 1981, pp. 94-98 (Armenian) and pp. 278-279 (English) and ŁAZAR PARPEČI, 1985, pp. 14-16 and 1991, pp. 48-49. For a recent assessment of these two sources' handling of the invention of the Armenian alphabet see COWE, 1992, pp. 231-235.
parage overtly or covertly that which is from God; for it is from omnipotent God alone that all graces come to earth-born men.\textsuperscript{15}

This was subsequently developed by the well-known historian Movses Xorenaci\textsuperscript{16}. His much more circumstantial account of the complex transactions which preceded the invention of the alphabet is clearly intended to demonstrate the task was above the powers of even the most skilled human experts. Thus, we find Maštoc calling on the Syrian bishop Daniel who had tried unsuccessfully to adapt an alphabet, presumably Syriac, to Armenian use.\textsuperscript{17} Thereafter, the saint proceeded to the Syrian city of Edessa just inside the Byzantine border where he conversed with the city's archivist and rhetorician, a pagan significantly named Plato.\textsuperscript{18} After applying himself to the problem, he too confessed his ignorance and inability to provide a solution.

On his suggestion Maštoc continued his journey to the metropolis of Samosata in search of Plato's mentor Epiphanius who had since embraced Christianity, but this too proved ineffectual because of the latter's death.\textsuperscript{19} He in turn had left a pupil Rufinus, already familiar from Koriwn.\textsuperscript{20} However, disappointed in him also, the saint took refuge in prayer. The historian describes that scene in precise detail:

He saw not a dream in sleep, not a vision while awake, but in the depths of his heart there appeared to the eyes of his soul a right hand writing.\textsuperscript{21}

Retaining the images he had observed during his intense prayer, he traced the shapes which Rufinus' calligraphic skill then brought to perfection.\textsuperscript{22}

The significance of Xorenaci's image of the hand writing in the depth of Maštoc's heart is in turn illumined by the great thirteenth century scholar Vardan Arewelci who composed the šarakan appointed for his commemoration.\textsuperscript{23} In another writing\textsuperscript{24} he interprets this in the light of the prophet Jeremiah's vision of a new covenant between God and men, by which God would set His law within them and write it on their hearts (31:33). The Apostle Paul further elaborates the idea of this being written "not with ink but with the Spirit of the living God, written not on stone tablets but on the pages of the human heart" (2 Cor 3:3). Similarly, whereas Koriwn employs the metaphor of Maštoc fathering the Armenian letters,\textsuperscript{25} Vardan imaginatively associates this embodiment of invisible

\textsuperscript{15} KORIWN, 1981, p. 100.
\textsuperscript{18} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{19} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{20} KORIWN, 1981, p. 96 (Armenian) and p. 279 (English).
\textsuperscript{22} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{23} ŠARAKAN, 1853, pp. 692-697.
\textsuperscript{24} VARDAN AREWELČI, 1964
\textsuperscript{25} KORIWN, 1981, p. 96 (Armenian) and p. 279 (English). For the same metaphor employed of St. Gregory's fathering the Armenian people through baptism see AGATHANGELOS, 1976.
speech with the nativity of the Logos and the synergy of the Virgin Mary. Attuned to the powerful trends toward a more mystical theology being generated at this period, in his hymn he celebrates the formation of the "living letter in great Mesrop's pure womb through the design of the true Light of uncreated glory." Recognizing the utility of the newly invented script for the upbuilding of the church, Vardan goes so far as to describe its impact as "establishing St. Gregory's throne." That the latter was indeed in need of support is clear from fourth century history. The probable timing of Armenia's official conversion in 314, a year after Christianity's tolerance in the Roman Empire by the Edict of Milan, suggests a certain political undercurrent behind the move, granted imperial suzerainty over Armenia in that era. The vicissitudes of a disaffected king like Pap, a pro-Persian faction among the aristocracy and a strong central force in Iran during the long reign of Shahpuhr II (309-379) undoubtedly led to an attrition of Christian institutions and confidence. Indeed, as Maštoč discovered in the course of his missions, the church seemed concentrated in the south and west of the country, while in the north and east Parthian Zoroastrianism continued to flourish.

Moreover, as Lazar Parpeči and others inform us, even where there were church buildings and clergy, their effectiveness was naturally circumscribed by the necessity of conducting services in Greek and Syriac, with only the possibility of an instantaneous oral Armenian translation of scriptural readings. The ability to commit to paper not only the Bible and the various liturgical books, but also theological treatises, apologies defending Christianity as well as polemics on heresies and other religious systems afforded Maštoč's disciples an unparalleled tool, or hi-tech means, to propagate their faith. Nor were they inept in applying it. Hence it comes as no surprise that perhaps the first indigenous work of Armenian literature is neither a national epic nor a comprehensive law-code, but Eznik Kołbací's De Deo or refutation of the sects. There he seeks to expose

26 VARDAN AREWELÇI, 1964, p. 379.
27 For further details see COWE, "Armenological Paradigms."
28 ŠARAKAN, 1853, p. 694.
29 ŠARAKAN, 1853, p. 692.
30 On this see ANANIAN, 1961, and AGATHANGELOS, 1976, pp. lxiv-lxvi.
31 For the king's Arian opposition to Catholicsos Nerses' orthodoxy see PS. PAWSTOS, 1989, pp. 395-396, 398.
34 PS. PAWSTOS, 1989, pp 46-47.
36 Although the works of Agathangelos and Ps. Pawstos in particular are founded on an important stratum of oral tradition, it was only Movses Xorenacı who preserved a few portions of early Armenian epic.
37 Apart from collections of ecclesiastical canons, Armenians had no written compendium of civil law until Mšištar Gos' judicial manual of 1184.
38 EZNIK KOŁBACI, 1959. For a re-telling in English see SAMUELIAN, 1986. A full English translation is currently being undertaken by M. Blanchard and R. Darling Young.
the fallacy of Zoroastrian cosmology and ancient philosophy as well as followers of the second century heretic Marcion still proselytizing in the Near East.

The success of this ecclesiastical literature is evident in the aftermath of one of the most severe tests early Armenian Christianity was to endure, the campaigns of the Persian Shah Yazdgard II, which culminated in the battle of Avarayr. Significantly, all we know about these events is preserved only in Armenian sources and these present the data with an obvious didactic purpose, celebrating the heroic dead as martyrs to the faith and portraying the renegades' demise in lurid colours to dissuade others from pursuing such ends. 

Moreover, in order to promote assurance and quench doubts concerning the well-foundedness of their belief in this period of instability, Agathangelos records that already over a century previously St. Gregory had envisioned that this disaster was going to occur and predicted the heavenly rewards the stalwart would attain:

From lambs they will become wolves who will slaughter the holy lambs—that is, those who depart from the truth and priestly covenant will become wolves and will cause the shedding of blood...and confusion for the people. But those lambs which endure faithfully will receive wings and rise to the kingdom of Christ.

Indeed the most patent endorsement of the success of Maštoc's program was the same writer's retrojection of certain of its traits back into St. Gregory's epoch, such as the missionary journeys and more widespread founding of schools to foster trust in what Elišē calls "our ancestral religion."

In this regard it is instructive to compare the situation in Iran where Zoroastrianism had become the official religion of the empire under the Sasanian dynasty. Because of complications in script, most of its traditions and lore were transmitted orally as in Armenia. Consequently, in a relatively short space of time after the Arab conquest Islam gained adherence there and literary figures generally adopted Arabic and its literary conventions over their native tongue for about the next two centuries. One can only speculate as to what the course of events in seventh and eighth century Armenia would have been without the benefit of the script in the hands of its Christian clergy.

Granted the pressing needs of the religious situation and the means taken to address them in the incipient indigenous literature, we could hardly expect the rendition of scripture to be value-free or neutral. As a discipline translation demands more than mere technical bilingualism. One cannot compare it, for example, to the transportation of a consignment of beef from one country to another. Many of the texts translated are undoubtedly meaty, and yet the process by which they are rendered primarily involves not

---

39 ELIŠĒ, 1982, p. 3.
41 AGATHANGELOS, 1976, p. 292 (Armenian) and p. 293 (English).
42 AGATHANGELOS, 1976, pp. lxxxviii-xc.
43 ELIŠĒ, 1982, pp. 10.
44 BOYCE, 1957, p. 36.
discrete lexical items, but thought patterns and modes of perception which are much less quantifiable. Moreover, through their associations with Edessa the Armenian translators belonged to the tradition of Antiochene exegesis of the Bible. This drew a fundamental distinction between a literal reading of the text and its underlying meaning which might then be stated by way of paraphrase. Comparison of different earlier renderings in Greek and Syriac was an integral part of the enterprise in which preference would be given to the most semantically apt expression.

It is against this background that we should view the greater freedom the translators permit themselves in representing Greek morphology and syntax to elucidate scripture for their readers. Moreover, the comparison of versions was extended to parallel passages relating the same events and there too the clearest would be employed in order to clarify the others. In addition, the exegetes' rhetorical training disposed them to elucidate the figures of speech encountered in the text. Similarly, as Lucian, the founder of the Antiochian school, was exercised to maintain his biblical recension at a high linguistic register with due emphasis on Greek idiom, the Armenian translators also strove for symmetry and balance in their phraseology, often restructuring whole sentences to convey the sense more directly. Consequently, although Koriwn characterizes the first Armenian version as "hasty", it emerges as a responsible, carefully supervised undertaking, incorporating a lucid methodological framework which had been elaborated over several generations.

Designed as a manual for preachers engaged in Maštoč's mission, one could imagine the Armenian Bible incorporated something of their anti-Zoroastrian ideology. While Koriwn discreetly omits comment on the nature of the ancestral religion, other sources permit us to reconstruct its main features. Although St. Gregory is reported to have destroyed the seven major cult centres, a number of others would have continued to function as image-shrines of the yazatas, the lesser divinities venerated alongside the supreme god Ahuramazda. As a result, the striking terminological affinities between early Armenian writers referring to this pagan cult and the treatment of heathen practices of the Old Testament as recorded in the Armenian Bible can hardly be coincidental. Thus, the translators deliberately contemporized the issue, introducing a clear distinction between licit and illicit worship which is not generally articulated in the Greek and Syriac Bibles. Hence, although ecclesiastical authors refer to pagan gods as astuack (lit. 'gods'), in scripture there is a more marked tendency to utilize the more pejorative dig. Likewise, pagan priests are designated not as kahanay but kirm and the locus of the pagan cult was

47 COWE, "Chronicles," pp. 74-75.
52 Rather he restricts himself to broad, disparaging comments about its level of culture.
54 RUSSELL, 1987, passim.
differentiated from the Christian tačar by the term mehean, which appropriately derives its etymology from a Parthian form denoting a Mithraic temple.\textsuperscript{55}

Naturally, the worst aspect of the traditional cult for Christian commentators was the veneration of images. Nevertheless, despite St. Gregory's zeal, such worship continued throughout the fourth century. Accordingly, when the topic of idolatry appears in the Bible, the Armenian version renders the criticism several times more trenchant and contemptuous. The gods' inability to respond to human needs is intensified, as is their gross physicality, demonstrating their apparent senses and faculties were an illusion. At one point, the translator subtly alters the drift of the Greek to suggest that the pagan priests organize processions of their idols with the intention of striking fear into the hearts of the populace. Nevertheless, they are constantly anxious themselves about maintaining the images: not only must they keep them clean, they have to secure them firmly to the floor in case they should topple and smash. Moreover, although one might assume this solicitude arose from the priests' piety, a heavy tone of skepticism pervades the Armenian translation which hints that their prime concern was rather to preserve their livelihood.\textsuperscript{56}

Another facet of the translation process I touched on at the beginning was its impact on redefining our identity. In establishing St. Gregory's throne, the invention of a new Armenian script and ferment of activity rendering into that idiom primarily works of the Greek patristic heritage\textsuperscript{57} largely maintained the Gregorid line's pro-Byzantine orientation over against Syriac Nestorian and Persian factions.\textsuperscript{58} This encouraged the creation of a Hellenophile school of translations providing Armenian readers with the basic texts of Greek education in grammar, rhetoric and logic as well as a system still in use for coining neologisms in the various intellectual disciplines.\textsuperscript{59} Indeed, one can argue that most subsequent periods of Armenian history which were culturally vibrant and progressive were marked by a similar avidity in acquiring access to foreign works through translation.\textsuperscript{60} An impression of the variety that encompassed is offered by the early twelfth century writer Pōlos Taróneči:

We translate the books of the holy fathers and homilies of the holy martyrs from the Syrians, Egyptians, Romans and Greeks, as well as many books of schismatics which are consonant with the orthodox.\textsuperscript{61}

Translation should not, then, necessarily be regarded as a sign of passivity or lack of initiative. As we have seen in connection with scripture, the procedure implied appropriation of the data and harmonization with the translator's perception of his community's

\textsuperscript{56} COWE, 1990-1991, pp. 105-111.
\textsuperscript{57} Although now out of date in many respects, the most comprehensive bibliography of these still remains ZARBHANALEAN, 1889. See also TƏR PETROSEAN, 1992.
\textsuperscript{58} For the background to this see WINKLER, 1985.
\textsuperscript{59} In contrast Syriac and Coptic frequently tended to borrow Greek terms directly as loanwords.
\textsuperscript{60} Translators are plentiful in the early period to the Abbasid revolt of 750, during the Cilician period and from the seventeenth century onwards.
\textsuperscript{61} PŌLOS TARŌNEČI, 1752, p. 342.
needs. Indeed, some later renditions of historical material involved quite a lot of editorial creativity, inserting accounts of Armenian events not present in the original source.62 Whereas before the invention of the alphabet Armenian rhetoricians like Prohaeresius, the teacher of Sts. Basil and Gregory of Nazianzus, had no option but to pursue their careers at foreign centers like Athens, now Armenian developed a prose aesthetic of its own alongside its ageold bardic verse tradition.63

This became the staple medium in the schools Maštoc established to train a clergy capable of conducting the various services and sacraments in Armenian and offering basic instruction to the populace at large. Usually this took the form of recitation from the psalms and there are several later illuminations depicting a priest displaying a board with the opening of Ps.1 to a group of expectant pupils. In his sarakan Vardan recalls the saints rejected the greatness of earthly glory as darkness.64 Indeed few gained a higher secular education over many centuries: the legacy of Sahak and Maštōc in the translation of scripture remained the center of scholarly attention in the academies of Glajor and Tat‘ew,65 the vardapets constantly trying to plumb its depths through the commentaries they wrote.66 Hence, over the centuries the disjunction between the conservative written language (grabar) and the developed vernacular (ašarhabar) led to the creation of a new literary language in East and West which continues to utilize Maštōc’s letters and orthography with minor variations.67

Thus to celebrate the translators’ achievement is also to appreciate their aspirations toward literacy and their successors’ efforts in cultivating Armenian literature in all ages, producing the rich diversity of genre and style we now enjoy. However, we are reminded by the representatives of the younger generation of translators like Łazar Parpeči that their efforts did not meet with universal approval.68 Vardan puts it in the following way:

They were not honored by us according to their due, they were not glorified as was fitting, nor accorded customary respect...therefore they were elevated and crowned by God.69

If their own generation, struggling to come to terms with this major religious and cultural transition, failed to do them justice, how can this generation show it values the accomplishments of the creators of the alphabet and their literary heirs down to our own-time? Surely the highest form of recognition any writer craves is for his or her works to be read and thereby draw us into dialogue as to who we are individually and corporately

62 This is particularly true of the Armenian version of the chronicle of a Jacobite patriarch. See MICHAEL the SYRIAN, 1871.
63 BOYCE, 1957, pp. 35-36.
64 ŞARAKAN, 1853, p. 692.
66 Ibid.
67 On the background to these developments see COWE, 1991.
69 VARDAN AREWELČI, 1964, p. 390.
and what we mean.

The sincerest tribute we can pay their labors is emulation, enabling Armenian works to reach the widest possible readership in the multilingual media of our era and perhaps in so doing to enthuse new generations to acquaint themselves with the original as well. The re-emergence of Armenia as a nation among nations provides an opportune moment as old identities are re-evaluated and new possibilities explored. May the vision which guided Sts. Sahak and Maštoč in their endeavors during the fifth century inspire their spiritual descendants on their own journey into the new millennium.
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"The purpose of music is to connect the soul and the heart, to express the intellectual activity and ability united with the feelings of the heart, in such a way that our hearts become purified." Father Komitas*

PART ONE

The role of music as a means of relating with what is beyond the intellectually perceptible is a generally admitted reality. Music has had a ritual function in every so-called primitive culture as well as in highly sophisticated ones, and that function has remained for all religions of our times. Despite the intrinsic concepts and rules of each religious music, emphasized by the diversity of forms and styles of each people, the function of religious music is still the same for all of them: to free humans to communicate with the Creator.

The nature of music is immaterial, yet it is the perceptible expression of the cosmic order. Hence, singing is an ideal religious act. This was especially true for humans who performed many of their daily acts religiously. They have almost disappeared in the Western world, but have left a deep mark of their perception about the major questions of existence on what is today called tradition.

A considerable corpus of traditions and artistic expressions are compiled in the Armenian liturgy. It is completely intertwined with music, and incorporates the most antique and original characteristics of worshipping with music. Thus, it is impossible to speak about Armenian liturgical music by abstracting it from the liturgy itself. Two fundamental concepts, common to any ritual system, must be considered in order to understand different aspects of Armenian liturgical music:

1) The nature of religious music is hieratic. The concept of sacred art must therefore be admitted in studying any aspect of Armenian liturgical music;

2) Many musical aspects of Armenian ritual have developed within the concept of liturgical time, which is a cyclical concept of time, contrary to the linear secular time.* Therefore, liturgical time is a fundamental constant of Armenian liturgical music. The repetition phenomena that I will investigate further on is closely related to this subject. These concepts will often be evoked in the following pages as they allow us to understand some of the less rational aspects of Armenian liturgical music.

The most substantial components of the structure of Armenian liturgical music are:

1) the use of classical Armenian as a ritual language;
2) monophony developed within a modal system;
3) use of natural intervals;
4) variation of melodic patterns; and,
5) repetition.

These basic elements will be considered in the following short surveys. Together with the sacred art and liturgical time concepts, they also constitute the background of current problems in this field which I will expose briefly in the second part.

1. The Armenian liturgical chant repertoire. During the first centuries of Christianity, the musical aspect of worshipping in Armenia was naturally not very different from other early Christian regions. Psalmody, probably adapted to local melodies, was the essential vehicle of recitative singing. A few universally sung hymns, like the trisagion (surb Astuac), phos hilaron (loys z uart), and gloria in excelsis (pär̈ki barjuns), had their Armenian variants during these centuries. Parallel to the evolution of the liturgy, the number of songs increased and new song forms appeared. A complete repertoire was constituted over the centuries. This repertoire is composed of songs of diverse types, forms and tempi. A simplified classification would be the following: a) the songs of the Holy Liturgy; b) the songs of the book of hours (žamagirl); c) šaranak songs; d) diverse hymns and melismatic songs.

2. Šaranak. An outstanding and voluminous unit of this repertoire, the šaranak songs form the substance of the musical system of the Church of Armenia. An elementary approach to šar-akan songs starts with enigma and controversy. Although no longer a subject of debate, the etymology of the word still holds its mystery; the explanation accepted for centuries as šaranak (row of jewels) remains appealing, although it has been categorically rejected by linguists. The earliest surviving manuscript mentioning the word šaranak is from the twelfth century,* yet tradition puts the creation of the first šaranak songs to the fifth century.

The šaranak repertoire constitutes a vast field of research about: a) theology; b) the eight-mode system; c) the melodic patterns of Armenian liturgical music; d) the prosody of classical Armenian; e) the history and the analysis of literary creation by Armenian church Fathers; and, f) the system of musical teaching of the Church of Armenia.

The šaranak book is organized as a cyclical repertoire, starting with the birth of the Virgin Mary and ending with her Dormition. It includes songs in a specific series and in canonical order for each feast or commemoration day of the liturgical calendar. More than 1,800 songs of diverse lengths are compiled in the current šaranak book. The majority of these songs have three verses, some have four or more, and a few have thirty-six verses, each beginning with a letter of the Armenian alphabet. Of the latter, the most famous and the oldest (seventh century) is the song dedicated to the Hripsimeanké virgins.

* The lyrics of šaranak songs are not taken directly from Scripture; they are individual poetic creations, in which faith is solemnly proclaimed and the Bible subtly commented. Every aspect of the Christian faith is treated in šaranak songs which are widely used in offices and other rituals besides their initial canonical places.

In the earliest periods šaranak songs were sung during offices alternately with psalms. Later, they were substituted for many psalms, the first verses of which remained
as introductions, also giving the intonation.

The substitution of Đarakan songs for psalms was a significant event. Original, contemporary creations would take the place of Scripture. This was a decisive step towards an original ritual. A hieratic musical art was henceforth established in the bosom of the Church of Armenia, developing specific regional schools. Musical creation enjoyed a freedom which is difficult to understand in modern societies, for it was conditioned by its ritual function.

The details of the circumstances which led to the Đarakan genre being integrated into the liturgy and substituted for psalms are unknown to us. New findings on this subject would be more instructive in many ways than the chronological questions about the history of Armenian liturgical music, which have remained a main subject of controversy.

3. The question of authorship of the Đarakan songs. The authorship of Đarakan songs, especially the earliest names, constitute a much debated question. The earliest lists of Đarakan authors that we have are from the thirteenth century.* At the head of these lists are found two inseparable names: St. Mesrop Maştoč, inventor of the Armenian alphabet, and St. Sahak Parfew, the catholicos at that time (387-436). The lists next mention St. Movses Kercol and the names of many famous Armenians follow. The highly symbolic aspect of these lists of authors has been a major reason for the controversies going on since the nineteenth century about their historicity. However, the composition of these lists, which include saints, pious church fathers, catholicoi, and respected personalities, corresponds totally to the hieratic character of the Đarakan repertoire, in which so many symbols, values, ideas and traditions are coalesced. Such attributions are attested in many cultures: they are a part of the culture-making process.

4. The question of originality of melodies. Đarakan songs share a typical trend of folk music: the periodical change of their melodies. In this process, probably very early, the melodies started to lose their original form and adapt to their time. Moreover, they have never been fixed by musical notation, since the Armenian neumatic notation system, although highly developed, consisted of indications, valid only in the framework of an orally transmitted living tradition. There have always been regional variations of the same song, as can also be observed at present.* This is the common trend of all living music. Therefore, the problem of authorship of the poetry (although many Đarakan authors are explicitly known to us), which is related to a given moment in history, cannot be directly related to a long process as is the case for melodies. Nor can it be used to reject the actual melodies of Đarakan songs.

On the other hand, there is no reason why St. Mesrop Maştoč should not have been the first author to create new songs for the Armenian liturgy. This may be true not only for lyrics, as is supported by historical evidence, but also for melodies, since the poet and musician were the same person in pre-modern times; the person who wrote the poetry naturally composed the music at the same time. Nevertheless, it would be erroneous to accept the melodies of Đarakan songs attributed to St. Mesrop Maştoč, or to any other author old or new, as original since, as I have mentioned, they have changed periodically, making a constant adaptation to historical periods.

In this respect, arguing the originality of melodies in relation to their supposed or attributed authors is, in my opinion, useless speculation which has little chance of arriv-
ing at a satisfactory conclusion either for those who defend traditional attributions or for those who dispute their historicity unless new, explicit documents are discovered.

5. The language-music combination. Classical Armenian is an excellent ritual language. The power of its intonations and rhythms are profoundly felt when it is well recited. As most of Armenian ritual is sung, the intonations of the language are externalized in the framework of musical modes. The power of the word is increased by its synthesis with music, as Nersēs Lambronači stated:

Because Satan has a practice of mingling his thoughts with the souls of men, thus taking our minds into slavery as if tied with a rope, in response, the Prophet [Moses] mixed the songs, that is, the melodies ans sounds of instruments, to the souls of men as reinforcement, so that the power of words and the charm of sounds would seize our will away from Satan and make us rejoice. For, hearing the loveliness of the melody, our mind is compelled to examine the power of the word, wondering what was the word that charmed us through this melody, and finds it.

In prayers the language is simple and comprehensible, but this quality is revealed only with an intense concentration which becomes possible by the cognition of liturgical time. Thus negative stress is removed and a ritual environment, created by the sounds and other sensorial elements of the church, penetrates the self.

6. Repetition in singing. Repetition is one of the common characteristics of rituals and is inherent to the Armenian ritual. It is helpful to establish another parallel with Armenian folk music which has exactly the same repetition phenomena, common to all ancient peoples. Many daily acts, especially work, had a religious meaning for peasants, so that most folk songs had a ritual function. Long repetitious dance songs which were sung by groups during dance sessions were nothing other than ritual songs. Similarly, in Armenian liturgical music many songs have several verses, sung on the same melody. Only slight modifications occur for accentuation. Repetitive singing is practised during certain offices with the well-known formula of “Lord have mercy” which enables the participant to transcend the self, suspending secular time. Repeating the melody has the function of: a) keeping the concentration on the text; b) invigorating the harmony of the ritual environment; c) imbuing the participants with certain melodies that will therefore be recognized as specific melodies for specific moments. If most Armenian liturgical songs have many verses sung on a same melody, the reason is functional and closely related to the liturgical time concept, and does not indicate a level of evolution compared to a secular classical music.

7. The musical structure of the Armenian liturgy. A classification of “human sounds” by St. Grigor Tafewači (fourteenth century) explains in a simple way the difference among diverse song forms:

a) silent: like thoughts; b) intonation alone, without word: like a call; c) more word than melody: like șarakan songs; d) more melody than word: like melismatic songs; e) word and intonation are equally balanced on the tongue, like-speaking.
Only prayers and collects are spoken in the Armenian liturgy. The rest, in the form of recitative or song, is interpolated in the ritual according to a special structure.

Three main song forms are used in offices, the Holy Liturgy and other rituals: a) recitative singing; b) simple songs based on traditional melodic patterns; c) songs with particular melodies and melismatic songs. Recitative singing is practised within a limited basic interval. Few melodic patterns are used in this form and their variations depend on the accentuation. This is the form which best shows how a text can be recited while singing. The deacon's litanies and biddings, simple psalmody, and prayers said aloud by the priest during the Holy Liturgy are in this form. The second is the main form of šarakan songs. It can be considered an evolved form of recitative singing. Melodic patterns have a developed structure, yet they are used in such a way that the text remains as important as in recitative singing, for the melodic patterns are differentiated according to the prosody of the poem.

Melismatic songs are believed to have developed around the tenth and eleventh centuries.* The songs called tašt and melešči are of this type. They seem to have influenced some slow šarakan songs. In this form, the relationship of melodic development and text are very different. With rich ornamentation and lengthened phrases, it is more difficult to perceive the words. Such melismatic songs add a peaceful effect to the sounding environment. In fact, the combination of these three different musical forms and reading produce the external aspect of the ritual.

8. The eight-mode system. Every major liturgical branch of early Christianity has an organizational system of its music. It is called octoechos (ui jayın) or the eight-mode system. However, the Armenian variant does not correspond to its Latin or Byzantine counterparts. Around twenty modes, some of which may have folk origins, are combined in the Armenian system. It has conventionally kept the name of ut jayın, the number eight also having symbolic connotations.* The octoechos has an important role in the fulfillment of the liturgical calendar. Each day of the year has a mode of the day (orua jayın). On the first Sunday of Lent, the mode becomes the fourth “side” (örrod kohn), which is the eighth mode, regardless of the mode of the day before, in order to start the liturgical year on Easter day with the first mode. The mode of the day has a role in defining the readings of the New Testament, psalmody, šarakan songs, some hymns of offices, some litanies, prayers and collects, and so on.

9. The melodic patterns. The melodic patterns constitute the melodic patrimony of Armenian liturgical music. The major part of the šarakan repertoire is based on traditional melodic patterns, which show subtle variations from one song to the other, according to the poetry and the length of phrases. There are a number of these melodic patterns in each mode. They also vary in tempo: the same šarakan can be sung for different occasions at a rapid, medium or slow tempo, for which the melodic pattern is adapted and sometimes extended. The archetypes of patterns seem to be in the rapid songs, which are simpler and more condensed than medium or slow variants.

There are different traditions of melodic patterns in Armenian church music. For example, those used in Constantinople differ from those used by the Venice Mkhitarists or by the Jerusalem Armenian congregation. But careful study reveals that they all have the same origin. This is like the folk song phenomenon (%4): variants are found in differ-
ent regions, and each of them undergoes changes in time. This is why šarakan melodies and other songs transcribed during the nineteenth century are like a reflection of that time and do not necessarily represent the melodies used during former periods.

10. Reliability of Armenian melodies. This subject was questioned in the nineteenth century and in the first decades of the twentieth when Armenian culture was being debated and new forms of expression inspired by Western civilization were being introduced. On the one hand, as Armenian music did not fit Western criteria and, on the other hand, as there was little discussion on a musicological level, intellectuals commonly began to feel that their music had been totally altered by foreign influences. This subject continues to be a source of preoccupation for Armenians. This is, in fact, a very complicated subject that should not be treated on the basis of personal taste (although that does have a certain role), or by simplistic deductions from historical premises.

When studied as a group, šarakan songs reveal an essential quality which is their extraordinary melodic coherence. I have said that šarakan songs are based on variations of melodic patterns; by this we would suppose that external influences would affect the entire repertoire. However, it is difficult to imagine that such a “coherent alteration” could occur to a repertoire of around 1,800 songs of different lengths, and this in every Armenian musical center. Undoubtedly, foreign influences have affected šarakan songs, but they have been well assimilated. In well-known šarakan transcriptions, only a few passages of certain songs openly show a foreign melodic formula or ornamentation. They are mostly found in songs of important feasts. In fact, many well-known liturgical songs of other types have undergone foreign influence, and some of them have melodies that are difficult to compare to the majority of Armenian liturgical melodies. Among the best-known examples, we find: the second part of loys zvart, which is probably adapted to a Greek version of the same song, by Zenne Pūlos* (1746-1826, father of Patriarch Nerses Varzapatian); the song of frōrhe, Aysor jayw hayrakan; the song in the middle of the ganj (sort of litany) of the Washing of the Feet on Holy Thursday, Ays xorhurd tēw, except the solo part. The most striking of these songs are those with the Byzantine krami. They repeat one syllable of a word for several minutes for the sake of melodic development. Other obviously Ottoman or Byzantine examples can be found in transcriptions made or copied by ordained choristers for their personal use.

Melodic patterns of the šarakan can well be taken as a reference for Armenian liturgical music. This repertoire can serve to establish many criteria for the theory of Armenian church music, but it is a task requiring time and labor, which must be carried out in parallel with a continuous practise of the repertoire. Another aspect must be taken into account: šarakan melodies have often been edited by master-singers or clergymen, especially in order to suppress long ornamental formulae. The repertoire seems to have suffered more from these editings than from foreign influences.

11. Natural intervals. Proportion has always been at the base of religious principles. It can be observed in the architecture of not only early churches of Europe and the Near East including Armenia, but also in any traditional temple, for they are cosmic centers, and harmony is the inherent element of any place dedicated to God.

Music, being above all an art of harmony, fulfills its function in a church only if the sounds emitted are related to each other by precise and simple proportions. The preser-
vation of this principle permits the music to act positively upon the human psyche and creates a harmony within and among humans. Disturbance of this harmony creates confusion and singing in church becomes a decoration. “Music therapy” is nothing more than the establishment of inner harmony with the help of well proportioned sounds. It had been practised for centuries in the East and in the Americas.* Church music has the role of maintaining a suitable environment for this harmonization process, avoiding the need for the term “therapy”.

These precise proportions are found in natural intervals, known to humans since the most remote times and formulated in ratios during the antique period. Humans have found these intervals intuitively; they have combined them brilliantly over the centuries and established numerous musical modes.

12. Intervals used in Armenian liturgical chant. They find their origins in three major interval genres: pythagorean diatonic, natural diatonic and chromatic. Each genre refers to a specific way of dividing the interval of the natural fourth. Ten different kinds of intervals that can be discerned in the Armenian octoechos are thus derived.* One of them belongs to the specific genre, used in the Armenian seventh mode (ewtherord jayn) but rarely found elsewhere. When joined or superimposed, these intervals form the scales of modes.

A series of inner intervals, like whole tones, semitones, major thirds and minor thirds, created by the division of the natural fourth, currently appear in Armenian modes. These intervals, although clearly discernible, need to be learned by special training and with emphasized attention, for there is no opportunity to hear them frequently in our daily lives.

13. Monophony and modes. Monophony is the original singing manner of Armenian liturgical chant, as for all of humanity. Its basic principle is the successive production of proportionally related sounds, which are also perceived successively. In monophony, a melodic line with subtle ornamentation is developed in diverse song forms. Here, ornamentation means more than the term: it is an inseparable and natural part of the melody.

Melodic development, hence including ornamentation, is always understood within the concept of mode or tone, the terminology still being a subject of debate. The Armenian jayn, which designates the eight modes, is suitable for this concept.

A mode is a sounding environment, defined by two simultaneously considered parameters: the scale and the development, both defined in their turn by proportion. The scale of a mode is constituted by successive degrees which are obtained by the division of different intervals, generally fourths, but also fifths and sometimes thirds. The combination of these intervals may be both successive or superimposed.

There are endless possibilities for dividing and combining intervals, but the modes universally employed are those which contain the greatest number of simple harmonic ratios. As a consequence of the structure and development rules of each mode, each degree assumes a specific value and must be interpreted accordingly. This may require singing one degree with the full voice, another with vibrato (within a very small interval, not wide as in operatic singing), yet another degree with very small pitch changes, according to the upward or downward movement of the melody.
The use of only simple ratios in each mode is a patent trait of the Armenian octoechos. This is due in part to the relatively small number of modes, which limits complex combinations of intervals, but also to their function, which is religious and intended to contribute in creating and maintaining a state of concentration. From each mode of the Armenian octoechos emanates a specific color, even if their scales are not always radically different. This spectrum is created by distinct manners of developing melodies proper to each mode. Movements within the natural fourth, direct passages between intervals of thirds, and slow upward and rapid downward (rather ornamental) movement are some of the main characteristics of melodic development in Armenian liturgical music.

Like melodic patterns, Armenian modes have undergone periodic changes through outside influences or changes in the language, as during the Cilician period. Nevertheless, the principle of using natural intervals as the structural basis for modes has remained intact, as is commonly the case in modal music.

Numerous characteristics of modal systems make them difficult to learn unless one has a traditional training, hearing these modes regularly. Indeed, Armenian liturgical music has been passed on for fifteen centuries without interruption in the most efficacious way: through oral transmission.* Modes, especially those used in church, that is for religious purposes, need to be heard not only regularly but also with a correct interpretation, in order to let the song fulfill its function. Armenian modes have their specific characteristics and rules of development, which are closely related to the intonational traits of the language. The Armenian language finds its full expression when sung on correctly established modes and with appropriate melodic development.

14. Drone. In modal music, each degree of the scale is defined in relation to its fundamental degree, which is either the degree the melody is set on or the first degree of the basic interval, these being very often the same. The drone is the emission of the fundamental degree parallel to the melody. To fully obtain the expression of a mode, the relativity of each emitted sound must be clearly set. Therefore, the drone must be sufficiently present, as is the case in Armenian traditional music. The reader will recall the Armenian diduk* which, while playing the melody, is always accompanied by another diduk playing the drone. The importance of the drone explains the fastidiousness of the main player in his choice of the drone player.

In church, the drone is frequently used to accompany solo singing and slow group songs like processional songs. In fact, most Armenian liturgical songs should be interpreted with a drone.

PART TWO

15. A fundamental change preceding our days. At the beginning of the twentieth century, in Constantinople, western-style polyphonic choirs and the organ were definitively introduced into the church. Despite the reticence of a few, the modern, westernized Armenian intelligentsia of Constantinople accepted this transformation with joy. But the fundamental change was ignored: it was not a mere change of style but a change of system. The new system was completely incompatible with the Armenian modal system for two reasons: 1) the means of expression of modern polyphony was the simultaneous emis-
sion of sounds instead of the linear development of melody-ornamentation; 2) equal temperament was necessary to build the scales, suppressing the diversity of intervals and dividing the octave into twelve equal parts. Thus, Armenian modes became pseudo-modes in the new system, and proportions were no longer natural or simple (equal temperament being based on the ratio of the square root of two).

When the importance of proportion in rituals is taken into consideration, it becomes obvious that Armenian liturgical songs, if interpreted with the above mentioned Western concept, have a radically different effect. These two opposing musical mentalities have been cohabiting for a century to the detriment of the traditional music.

In the following sections, I will investigate the consequences of the present complex situation.

16. The present situation. Many aspects of liturgical music explained in the previous sections are not easily perceptible by attending offices or the Holy Liturgy. The Armenian ritual is in a state of crisis, and resultantly, the Armenian liturgical chant tradition is seriously endangered. Such a statement may seem exaggerated, since most Armenian churches all over the world have fervent choirs which ensure the singing of the Holy Liturgy and many of them are very good indeed. Nevertheless, this unusual alarm is sustained by evidence that I will point out progressively.

At present, in most Armenian churches of the Western Diaspora and Armenia only the Holy Liturgy is celebrated. Offices are rarely performed, and it is not surprising anymore to hear, for example, a polyphonic arrangement of a Maundy Thursday office, defeating the power of its modal structure. There are also frequent ungrounded abbreviation or compression formulae which turn the office into an unconsciously repeated relic of a long-forgotten ritual.

It is true that these offices are complicated and require a number of ordained choristers and deacons to ensure their correct practise. In many places it has become difficult to find and regularly assemble people with a minimum knowledge of Armenian liturgical music. The situation would improve if clergymen, especially the young, realized the importance of preserving the offices and the beneficent effects of traditional music in worship.

The structure of offices is sophisticated, but less solemn than the Holy Liturgy. As the Holy Eucharist is not celebrated during offices, they become, without the mystical act, moments of intimate common prayer. With their absence, the congregation misses the occasion for such a collective experience, which is at the same time an excellent preparation process for the Holy Liturgy. Even if few people attend offices, and even if they are not always correctly performed, it is of prime importance to keep these moments available. It would be, of course, illusory to think that the problems of Armenian liturgical music would find their solution by performing offices. The musical situation has many complex aspects and cannot, in any case, be separated from the problems concerning the Church of Armenia or Armenians in general.* The reader may easily establish parallels between cultural problems and the musical problems evoked in this part.

17. Prejudices about Armenian liturgical music. “Soul-stirring”, but also “altered” and “spoiled” are the most commonly encountered stereotypical qualifications about Armenian church music, but the main controversy has remained the presumed influ-
ence of Ottoman classical music. Such ideas are generally proffered by Armenian intellectuals and not by musicologists. The origin of these assertions is worth consideration: the existence of outside influences on Armenian church music is undeniable, but it is also almost impossible to find an educated Armenian who has not undergone a strong influence in Western taste. This can be verified by comparing the reactions to the operatic style and the “à la turque” style in Armenian singing. The following points may help to clear up the question of influences.

There is no music which has not undergone influences. The question is to find out how well they have been assimilated. To do this, one must distinguish the right criteria, necessitating among many things, a knowledge of different kinds of music, from a wide spectrum of styles, interpretations and schools.

A living music cannot remain static; it undergoes changes over a long period of time. The music we sing today in church is not the same as that sung in Cilicia, which was different from the one sung a few centuries earlier, or even at the same period but a few hundred miles north. Here again, we find the problem of the right assimilation.

Ottoman classical music is easily taken as a reference not only for Armenian music, but also for those kinds of music which have developed for several centuries within the Ottoman Empire. We must take into account that there are many unresolved questions of influence between Byzantine church music and Ottoman classical music and also many other questions about the formation and history of the latter.* Ottoman classical music is not an absolute reference.

We should find out if our reaction to “oriental” music is not closely related to our social situation and also, and especially, to our political situation since the Genocide. Let us point out that most of the debate about the Near Eastern origin of Armenian music is based upon its westernized representations supported by praise of Western civilization.

18. The “time problem”. Constraints of modern society have strongly influenced our perception of time. Thus, it is very difficult to oscillate between liturgical time and secular time because our daily acts are not only conditioned by a “rapidly flowing time”, but also deprived of religiosity.* Consequently, we live in a continuous confusion of cyclical time and linear time. The following example, which was reported from a community of the Western Diaspora, is significant, although an extreme case.

A sufficient number of ordained choristers who know the repertoire were gathered for the office of Maundy Thursday night which is known as xawarum (in fact, the night and morning offices of Good Friday). Performed once a year, xawarum is very popular among Armenians and is one of those “soul-stirring” offices. It lasts almost five hours, including more than one hour of New Testament reading, interwoven with psalmody and hymns. According to the report, it was possible to perform this office in one hour, including the readings.

Justifications set forth in such cases reveal the confusion between the concepts of liturgical time and secular time, for they are generally based upon “practical” issues, like constraints of distance, the tendency of the congregation towards “time-saving”, the lack of ordained choristers, or “contemporary” observations like the unnecessary length of offices which might cause boredom, their “out-dated” structure, inaccessibility to the congregation, etc. It also reveals a tacit reality: we have brought the offices to a precari-
ous state by neglecting their significance.

During rituals one must be disconnected from secular time. In fact, rituals require the suspension of secular time. Otherwise, our experience stays at the level of daily activities and the ritual loses its quality of being the culminating moment of spiritual concentration. The need for “understanding”, which is often evoked, is compatible with liturgical time, since nothing prevents mental concentration. For this, an active religious education is necessary. If this is the case, removing parts of offices would disturb the mental process, in addition to provoking negative psychic effects.

A very palpable uneasiness towards repetition is observed in cases like that mentioned above. An abbreviation which “saves” twenty seconds can only be explained by the secular time concept. A psalm which should be repeated thrice (the third one on a higher pitch) evidently has no justification for a pragmatic mind which, in addition, cannot acknowledge liturgical time because it has not been steeped in it.

The act of repetition works on the nervous system: therefore, the reactions of the congregation, of ordained choristers and of clergymen depend on how well they can admit liturgical time. Once the congregation, especially the youth, become accustomed to the “soul-stirring” office of zawarum lasting just one hour, it is consequently extremely difficult to return to its correct practise. Thus the ritual, mutilated, will not work the physiological effect for which it was intended, but will only give a sentimental satisfaction caused by the accumulation of traditional elements. I will focus upon a few other precise subjects in order to demonstrate the damage caused by innocent efforts of modernism.

19. Alienation from traditional melodic patterns. Because of its particular status and solemn structure, the Holy Liturgy has fixed musical components, except a few songs. This means that a congregation that hears only the Holy Liturgy throughout the year is familiar with only ten percent of the liturgical chant repertoire.* The rest of the repertoire belongs to offices, during which many of the particular elements of Armenian liturgy, as well as of its musical system, are functional. This is why the absence of offices results in a lamentable impoverishment with regard to the living culture.

Alienation from traditional melodic patterns concerns all participants. Armenians before 1915 centered around the church both figuratively and physically. This world was broken apart by the Genocide which eradicated the monastic network, source of the living church tradition. Except for their preliminary training period, most Armenian clergymen today cannot live long enough in the remaining monasteries to assimilate the monastic discipline or to receive an adequate knowledge of the complex musical system. With a multitude of administrative tasks, they seldom hear or sing the traditional melodic patterns which are concentrated in the offices. This alienation is further aggravated by the lack of ordained choristers.

The congregation is directly influenced by this situation. Further, it actively increases the alienation by its impulse towards adapting religious needs to secular life. Distracted by modern living conditions, the congregation becomes less attentive to its own church music. In time, indifference sets in. Armenians lose their link with the living tradition of liturgical chant; Armenian melodic patterns disappear progressively from the collective memory.

20. The language and the “problem”. As I emphasized in the beginning, we can-
not abstract liturgical music from the liturgy itself. We have also discussed the combination of language and music and its importance (§5). Problems related to the use of classical Armenian in rituals fit perfectly into the framework of the subjects treated here. I will point out some aspects which are rarely included in current debates.

The language used in liturgical songs often has poetic turns of phrase which make the simultaneous literary comprehension difficult even for those who know Armenian well. Although classical Armenian has never been accessible to all classes of society, this has never prevented an active participation in rituals. Living examples of this situation are found most frequently among the older generation and in the Armenian communities of the Near East. Instead of questioning the structure of rituals with the pretext of the inaccessibility of the language, it would be more prudent, and certainly more beneficial to consider the social factors leading to this predicament, such as the ideology elaborated to minimize the role of the language between the cultural identity and the spiritual well-being of the individual.

An important factor which is often overlooked is the close relationship of the ritual language to the singing style. A beautiful voice is not enough to make the music carry the word. This is particularly important in religious music. Neglecting the intonations of the language spoils the liturgical time, and the beneficent effects of the repetition phenomena are inverted. Thus, ritual language loses its main function, which includes not only the understanding of the word but also its psychic effects, for a ritual language, just as ritual music, has effects which are beyond the intellect. The peasant who put Narek under the pillow of the ill did not understand a word of it, but had faith in the power of its words.

21. The problem of proportion. Many people who sing at church do not know the modal system or the proportions of intervals. Consequently, they are unaware that musical expression, the colour, changes with the different intervals and their ratios. With the use of the equally tempered system, not only the substance and the texture of colours are changed and the possibilities for variation reduced, but also an acoustic complication is created since the equally tempered system divides the octave into twelve equal parts and the only pure interval it contains is the octave, an interval rarely used in Armenian music. The equally tempered and therefore unnatural intervals create a conflictual acoustic environment in the church and the profound effects of ritual music are obstructed. The same phenomenon is observed with traditional ordained choristers when they are unaware of the musical system of Armenian liturgical chant. Although the music produced either way may well be of great quality, sensitivity is forced to move onto another level, more appropriate for appreciation than contemplation.

22. Foreign styles. Armenian liturgical chant has to deal with two very different foreign styles: Western operatic style and the “à la turque” style. The operatic style, as a consequence of classic Western musical education, is very often interpreted with a large, voluminous voice which overcomes the acoustic setting of Armenian churches. In this style, almost all long notes are vibrated, which contradicts the requirements of the Armenian modal system. Moreover, the wide vibrato inhibits a peaceful assimilation of sounds and encourages the congregation to become mere “listeners” appreciating the beauty of the voices. In the “à la turque” style, the voice, although emitted differently than
in operatic singing, produces the same result. The nasal voice emission deforms most of the vowels in the Armenian language, but favors ornamentation and glissandos. Here too, most of the long notes are vibrated, although within the limits of the requirements of the mode. An excessive use of grace notes, especially that of *acciaccatura* has a distracting effect. Moreover, the singers who know the Ottoman modal system fully use their aptitudes of improvisation, which results in sometimes beautiful, but unnecessarily extended melodies. Both styles are inadequate for singing in Armenian. They may offer pleasant, well-sung melodies, but the power of the word is lost.

During the last decades, another problem has appeared: the complete lack of style, which escapes notice because of the beauty of young voices. There are also many sensitive singers who use the intonations of the language with aptitude but still have no musical training, which is an unfortunate waste of potential.

23. The use of organ. The use of the organ or harmonium in church music has, in spite of the generally accepted opinion, a negative effect on the human nervous system. Like many other contemporary novelties, its effect is not perceived on the spot but undermines the human psyche in the long run. The origin of this negative effect is far from abstract and can be concretely explained by the harmonics emitted by equally tempered fixed musical instruments. The hardly audible differences between natural and equally tempered intervals take enormous proportions in their harmonics. The slightest difference of a few vibrations brings about a difference of a semi-tone in the upper octaves and the upper partials become completely dissonant. These vibrations, although not as immediately perceived as the melody itself, are present in the environment, thus acting on the human nervous system. We should note that Father Komitas did not compose an organ accompaniment for his arrangement of the Mass although he did write piano arrangements for songs which were not intended to be sung during rituals.

Another concrete example of the organ's role in transforming the nature of Armenian church music concerns the importance of the drone in modal music. As mentioned earlier (§14), it establishes the basis of the mode, and defines the meaning of each sound emitted in the environment. In Armenian modes, the second most important degree is very often the fourth degree beginning from the fundamental degree, and the melody is led towards it. Constantly present, the drone forms with that degree an interval of a pure fourth. This harmony is the most common one in Armenian church music. However, when the organ is played, this characteristic disappears. The organist, who normally has an education in Western music, a) finds it nonsensical to keep his fingers on one note to play the drone; b) has learned that the beauty of a melody depends on the underlying harmonies; and, c) knows how to embellish a melody with harmony. The organist, therefore, will put to use Western harmony, in which we constantly hear harmonies built on thirds, but rarely the harmony of the drone. As a result, the melody loses its basis, the modal structure is disguised, and almost disappears. Properties of acoustic effect are further reduced by the unnatural intervals of the equally tempered scale. The song is deprived of its original effect, the effect for which it was first conceived.

A liturgical chant should not be confused with a concert piece, which has a different function, nor should Armenian liturgical chant be compared to other liturgical music traditions in order to justify the use of Western polyphony. Traditions have differ-
ences, and each of them has a different history which should be respected, unless they are given up consciously. The Western musical influence has also been felt in other Eastern and Orthodox churches, but in spite of this, the monophonic, traditional practice of liturgical music is flourishing in the Greek Orthodox Church and has become increasingly more popular in recent years. A similar movement can be observed in the Russian Orthodox Church at present. Both movements are guided by an awareness of the role of original musical traditions.

24. Conclusion. At the origin of many current problems we find the lack of a rigorous musical education system: a system which would embody ordained choristers, deacons and young clergymen. Problems about style are also closely related to musical training: when a particular singing manner for Armenian church music is not taught, the young singer will inevitably have recourse to the manner most familiar to him. This is why Armenian singing is often interpreted with an operatic singing or "à la turque" style. The latter, originating in a modal system, easily becomes a reference for singing Armenian songs in a so-called traditional way.

It is necessary to reestablish an educational system for the traditional practice of Armenian liturgical music. The firm foundation of such a system requires an essential tool, that being the modal theory of Armenian liturgical music. Elaborating a written theory will certainly take time, for an imposed theory cannot succeed, and the confrontation of different views will be necessary. But above all, a valid theory must be coherent with the traditional but contemporary practice of music. This aspect brings about the second important point, which is the heritage of traditional master-singers and the vital necessity of its perpetuation in ordained chorister groups.

As the perpetuation of musical tradition depends on the maintenance of all rituals and not only that of the Holy Liturgy, the final issue converges on the fundamental problem already mentioned in previous sections: the precarious state of offices and their significance. Investigating this problem is beyond the limits of this article; nevertheless, an earnest analysis would be of great benefit for Armenian culture.

Regarding the future of Armenian liturgical music, these central questions remain: 1) is it necessary to join the current movement of desecration in the Christian West, which consists primarily of the depreciation of traditions and symbolism, and the devaluation of the liturgy? 2) is it wise to force a metamorphosis of inherited sensitivities, which are still active in the subconscious of Armenians, although they have seemingly undergone some changes?

It becomes clear through this brief survey that an apparently positive initiative, or sometimes the lack of initiative, but also efforts at modernism in the field of traditional liturgical music may have irreversible consequences. Merely because they have been erroneously judged as out-dated, a number of musical traditions, part of our living cultural heritage, are becoming obsolete. Our relationship with traditions naturally changes from generation to generation. This inevitable change turns into a positive evolution if traditions are acknowledged as a part of the culture with which we identify ourselves. Thus, they are regenerated by a smooth adaptation in form and in content, and we remain in permanent communication with their immutable essence. This constancy greatly contributes to our spiritual well-being and in this respect, musical traditions have a prominent role.
We have reason to hope that the creativity of the Armenian synthesis will persevere, perpetuating musical traditions to which Armenians have always been attached during the best and the worst periods of their history.

ADDENDUM

This article was written in 1992 and was intended to be published without footnotes. The following addendum has been prepared for the present publication, in order to preserve the article's original structure.

Introduction.
Father Komitas' words are taken from the Komitas archives of the Museum of Arts and Literature in Erevan, cited in XAČIKYAN, 1964, pp. 53-54.

For the concepts of sacred and secular time, see ELIADE, 1959.

Section 2.
For the oldest known use of the word šarakan see AĞARÉAN, 1971, pp. 501-502.
For the history of the Hrîpsimeanç šarakan see KIRAKOS GANJAKEČI, 1961, p. 53.

Section 3.
Several lists of šarakan authors can be found in ANASYAN, 1959, pp. xviii-xix, lxv-lxxiv.

Section 4.
The most substantial melodic variations can be heard in Constantinople, Jerusalem and Venice. Original variations have also been preserved in Cairo. One can find several melodic variations within Constantinople, apart from the issue of style. The transcriptions made at the end of the nineteenth and beginning of the twentieth centuries in some other places also contain original melodic variations. Many other regional church music traditions disappeared when Armenian monasteries were destroyed during the Genocide. The melodic variations sung in these monasteries were never transcribed entirely during the period 1873-1915, when Armenian liturgical songs were being written down, especially in Constantinople and Ejiacis. This has been a great loss for Armenian church music, caused in part by the lack of interest of musicians and intelligentsia.

Section 5.
The statement by Nersős Lambronaçi is taken from his Commentary on the Psalter in MS 878, folio 4r of the Mkhitarist Library in San Lazzaro, Venice.

Section 6.
On Maundy Thursday night, “Lord, have mercy” is repeated forty times on a simple melody by all participants as they stand in the dark. During the processional andstan (blessing of the fields) ceremony adjoined to the evening office of the feast of the Exaltation of the Cross, the bishop says four times forty “Lord, have mercy”, in the four cardinal directions. During the ritual of the Washing of the Feet the bishop says “Lord, have mercy” fifty times.

Section 7.
For a medieval scholar's classification of human sounds, see GRIGOR TÂTEWAČI,
1729, p. 639.
For a historical survey of the development of Armenian liturgical songs, see TAH-MIZYAN, 1970-1971. For a study of one major medieval author see also id., 1985.

Section 8.
For a brief survey of Armenian church music modes, see KEROVPYAN, 1991.

Section 10.
The adaptation of loys zuar' to a Greek melody is mentioned by HISARLEAN, 1914, p. 21.

For further reading on kratima see HANNICK, 1992.

Section 11.
For a medieval treatment of music therapy see YOVHANNES ERZNKAČI, 1983, pp. 131-135 and for a more recent article on the same text KOMITAS, 1915. See also a description of a village music therapy session found in a short story entitled Xallačaw in BAKUNČ, 1986, pp. 88-91.

Section 12.
The intervals used in Armenian church music are listed in KEROVPYAN, 1991.

Section 13.
For the relation between oral and written transmissions in Armenian church music, see KEROVPYAN, 1995.

Section 14.
The duduk is a mellow sounding reed instrument made of apricot wood, which is very popular in Armenia.

Indian sūfī teacher Hazrat Inayat Khan mentions the practise of the drone in the Armenian church for its properties in creating a religious atmosphere. See KHAN, 1960.

Section 16.
An excellent analysis of the current problems of the Church of Armenia from the theological point of view can be found in GUROIAN, 1995.

Section 17.
The formation period of Ottoman classical music lasted until the late seventeenth century; only then does an original music start to appear. Apart from the historically attested process of synthesis in which musicians from diverse regions and countries participated, the Byzantine heritage of the Ottoman classical music, as well as the reflective influence of the latter on the former are little discussed, these subjects still being considered sensitive. For a history of Ottoman classical music see REINHARD, 1969.

Section 18.
Section 19.
The proportion of ten percent is true for a singer who knows the solo pieces of the Mass. For a choir singer this proportion is five percent. I make this evaluation on the basis of the entire repertoire which is transcribed, including very short recitative entities as well as unusually long songs.

Section 22.
Acciacatura (Armenian: անդհարում) is an ornament performed by singing the normal note preceded by a neighboring one, almost always the upper second. It has an important role in Armenian church music, being used for syllables which need to be emphasized. This is why its excessive use is detrimental to the text and the melody.
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YOVHANNES ERZNKAČI
THE MEANING OF THE FOUR CHALCEDONIAN ADVERBS IN RECENT ECUMENICAL AGREEMENTS

J. Robert Wright

The definition of faith of the fourth ecumenical council of Chalcedon in the year 451 affirmed that Jesus the Christ, Son, Lord, Only-begotten, is to be “recognized in two natures, without confusion (asynkhrytos), without change (atreptos), without division (adiaretos), without separation (akhoristos), the distinction of natures being in no way annulled by the union, but rather the characteristics of each nature being preserved and coming together to form one person and substance”.

The meaning of Chalcedon and its four famous adverbs each beginning with the alpha-privative was not clear even in its own day, but one may hope that the scholars and leaders of those churches who still claim to formally reject it understand its meaning a bit better. This essay will focus upon the meaning of Chalcedon, and in particular of its four adverbs (asynkhrytos, areptos, adiaretos, and ahoristos), not as they may have been intended originally but as they have been understood and interpreted by patristic scholars advising church leaders of the present in a series of five recent ecumenical statements. These are thought to have overcome much of the classical disagreements surrounding the meaning of Chalcedon, and they have been published by the leaders of the Oriental Orthodox, Roman Catholic, Eastern or Chalcedonian Orthodox, and Anglican churches. Thanks to these statements, drawing upon scholarly insight into the patristic period as well as contemporary goodwill, the questions I shall explore are the following: Are the churches that have differed over Chalcedon, their scholars and their leaders, closer now to a common understanding about the meaning of the Chalcedonian adverbs? How have these adverbs actually been used in the agreements that have been reached? Is there now a consensus about their meaning?

Since the churches that have classically rejected Chalcedon—the Armenian, Syrian, Coptic, and more recently Indian and Ethiopian Orthodox churches, all collectively called Oriental Orthodox, pre-Chalcedonian, non-Chalcedonian, or sometimes monophysite—are variously the partners from one side of all the modern bilateral agreements on Christology that use the Chalcedonian adverbs, it will be helpful first to summarize the so-called “monophysite” doctrinal position in the way that they now seem to hold it.

Generally following the teaching of the great theological school and Episcopal See of Alexandria, these churches now seem to agree in rejecting the monophysite heresy that was condemned at the fourth ecumenical council (Chalcedon, 451), namely the teaching of Eutyches that Jesus Christ is of only one nature and that divine. But they all do affirm that Jesus is of only one nature (mono-physis, hence “monophysite”) which, after

---

"This essay was delivered at the Twelfth International Conference on Patristic Studies at Oxford University, 21-26 August 1995."
the incarnation, was both fully human and fully divine. Thus, they also agree in rejecting the major doctrinal decision of the Chalcedonian council, that Jesus is of two natures, one fully human and the other fully divine ("the distinction of natures being in no way annulled by the union"). Instead, they hold to the teaching of St. Cyril of Alexandria, the principal theologian at the third ecumenical council of Ephesus (431), that there is "only one incarnate nature of the Word of God" (in Greek: mia physis tou theou logou sesarkomene). They use the term physis, it should be noted, as synonymous with hypostasis. They also accept the decision of the third council that because Jesus is a complete union (henosis) of humanity and divinity and thus only one person and not two, Mary can therefore be called the "Mother of God" by the doctrine of communicatio idiomatum or "interchange of properties". To separate the human and the divine, even to describe this relationship as a "conjunction", they believe would be to accept the heresy of Nestorius that the third council condemned. It should be added that the fourth council, in condemning the monophysitism of Eutyches and his followers, was not condemning the position of Cyril of Alexandria, who had asserted one physis but was clearly using the term in its earlier sense of "independent existence" that later came to be implied in the term hypostasis as it was used at the fourth council.

And so we turn to the modern Christological agreements that utilize and incorporate the Chalcedonian adverbs. No less than three of these five have been signed on behalf of the Coptic Orthodox church by its leader His Holiness Pope Shenouda III.

To take these three in chronological order, the first came in May of 1973 when Pope Shenouda signed an agreement of common Christological profession with Pope Paul VI of the Roman Catholic Church, stating in its official English text:

[Jesu Christ] is perfect God with respect to his divinity, perfect man with respect to his humanity, in him his divinity is united with his humanity in a real, perfect union without mingling, without commixtion, without confusion, without alteration, without division, without separation.²

Here we have, in effect, six adverbial formulations that, at first, sound similar to the four adverbs of Chalcedon, but when they are analyzed they do leave us puzzled because there are two extra ones. Three of the six, in the official English translation, are indeed the same as three of the Chalcedonian adverbs in their common English translation: without confusion (asynkhytos), without division (adiairetos), without separation (akhoristos), and a fourth one in the English text published by Popes Shenouda and Paul, "without alteration", sounds like the atreptos of Chalcedon that is commonly translated as "without change". But then, what are the other two, "without mingling, without commixtion", doing in the text issued by the two popes after the presumably careful preparation of their scholarly advisors? These words in the agreed text do distance it somewhat from Chalcedon, and so we may logically ask whether these extra two adverbial phrases are intended merely to emphasize or underline or duplicate the meaning of the original four

Chalcedonian adverbs, or are they intended to alter the original Chalcedonian meaning because on its own it was not acceptable to one or both of the signatories of the agreement in 1973? We are not told why these extra adverbial phrases are here, and at first thought it seems best not to read too much into this divergence from Chalcedon.

The problem is compounded, though, when we come to the next recent agreed statement of Christological faith, this time signed by the Coptic Pope Shenouda in January of 1987 with Archbishop Robert Runcie as Archbishop of Canterbury and President of the Anglican Consultative Council, and thus, as the leader of the worldwide Anglican Communion. The key clause of this Christological agreement concerning the union of the human and divine in Jesus affirms "a real perfect union without mingling or commixture, without confusion or change, without division or separation." Here again we find the four original Chalcedonian adverbs: "without confusion (asynkhytos), without change (atreptos), without division (adaiaretos), without separation (akhoristos)"; and, two extras that have been added: "without mingling or commixture", which sound very much like the two, "without mingling, without commixtion", that were added to the Chalcedonian four in the statement signed by Popes Shenouda and Paul back in 1973. And so the same question may be asked about the intention of this addition also. Was it merely the case that Pope Shenouda had, both in 1973 and in 1987, within his Coptic theological or liturgical reservoir two adverbial phrases like this, and that the assistants to Pope Paul and those to Archbishop Runcie felt that these phrases did not harm, or perhaps even helped, the meaning of the four Chalcedonian adverbs to which their churches, as churches that do accept the two-natures formula of Chalcedon, were already committed? Or was there some other meaning intended? We are not told. The names of the scholars who advised their leaders on the meaning that should be attached to the Chalcedonian adverbs are not given, but they surely cannot have been ignorant of the four adverbs that Chalcedon used, nor of the questions that would be raised when two more adverbs were added.

It seems appropriate to wonder at this point if the theological and historical scholars whom Archbishop Runcie must have consulted from the Anglican side were at all tempted at first to draw upon the different four Chalcedonian adverbs cited in the classical Anglican statement of Christology that came from the pen of Richard Hooker in the late sixteenth century:

In four words, *alethos, teleios, adaiaretos, asynkhytos*, truly, perfectly, indivisibly, distinctly; the first applied to his being God, and the second to his being man, the third to his being of both one, and the fourth to his still continuing in that one both: we may fully by way of abridgment comprise whatsoever antiquity hath at large handled either in declaration of Christian belief, or in refutation of the foresaid heresies.  

---

3 See HILL, 1988, p. 42.

4 For example, an alternative that could have been used but was not is the adverb found in Cyril of Alexandria's first letter to Succensus (c. 434-438): *ametabletos*, "without alteration".

5 *Ecclesiastical Polity* V, liv. pp. 10.
This from Hooker would have been a classically Anglican Christological formula. It employs four adverbs taken from the Chalcedonian definition, and it is hard to see why it would have been opposed by the formally monophysite tradition of the Oriental Orthodox since it does not use the two-natures phrase and because the adverb Hooker draws from Chalcedon to refute the Eutychians, *asynkhýtos*, is used in the Shenouda-Runcie statement of 1987 anyway.

Hooker’s comments at this point in his *Polity* are often thought to be his interpretation of the meaning of the four classical Chalcedonian adverbs, but it is noteworthy that he also had tampered with them, selecting two of the classical four, *adiairetós* ("without division", or as he translates it "indivisibly") and *asynkhýtos* ("without confusion", or as he translates it "distinctly"), but drawing his other two adverbs from earlier lines in the same Chalcedonian definition—*aleithos*, "truly" and *teleios*, "perfectly", as the definition speaks of Jesus Christ being "truly God and truly man", "complete (*teleion*) in Godhead and complete in manhood". Hooker too, that is, has been selective in his choice of Chalcedonian adverbs, and in doing so he also gave a somewhat different meaning for, as he explains in his *Polity* just before he introduces his four adverbs, he is really speaking of four principal heresies refuted by the first four councils: Arians by Nicaea, for Christ is truly God; Apollinarians by Constantinople, for Christ is perfectly man; Nestorians by Ephesus, for Christ is indivisibly of both one; and Eutychians by Chalcedon, for Christ still continues in one to be distinctly both. For Hooker, obviously, these are the four Chalcedonian adverbs that mattered, and this is the meaning that he gave to them. But Hooker was not cited in the statement signed by the Archbishop of Canterbury in 1987, and instead the six adverbs (four from Chalcedon and two extras) already used by Shenouda with Paul VI were used again in 1987, almost word for word.

The third modern ecumenical agreement on Christology that raises questions about the meaning of the Chalcedonian adverbs was signed again by Pope Shenouda, this time with the official representative of Pope John Paul II, in February of 1988. In this statement, only three adverbs are used, only one of which is from the classical four of Chalcedon. The 1988 statement affirms that Jesus Christ is "perfect in his divinity and perfect in his humanity. He made his humanity one with his divinity without mixture, nor mingling, nor confusion." Thus, for some unexplained reason, between the two churches that had already signed a Christological agreement in 1973 that used the four adverbs from Chalcedon and two others, now in 1988 an agreement is reached using only one of the four Chalcedonian adverbs, *asynkhýtos*, without confusion, but also using the same two others that were not from Chalcedon, "without mixture, nor mingling". In this statement we have a total of three adverbs now, only one from Chalcedon, instead of the six that were incorporated in the two earlier agreements. Surely, if words mean anything, the meanings of these agreements of the same parties in 1973 and 1988 cannot be intended to be the same, for the adverb *asynkhýtos* cannot carry also the meaning of the other three adverbs in the original Chalcedonian definition of 451. The advisors of the two popes in

---

1988 must have had before them the text of 1973, but we are not told why they changed it.

Having now considered the three statements to which the Coptic Pope Shenouda has been signatory from one side, we turn slightly backward in time to consider another formula, that employed by Pope John Paul II, in June of 1984, with the Syrian Orthodox Patriarch of Antioch, Ignatius Zakka I Iwas. Together, they solemnly stated that Jesus Christ is “perfect God as to his divinity and perfect man as to his humanity. This union is real, perfect, without blending or mingling, without confusion, without alteration, without division, without the least separation.” Here we find another formula of the same basic content as the first two statements that were signed by the Coptic Pope, utilizing all four of the Chalcedonian adverbs as well as the same additional other two, the same that is, if “without blending” here in 1984 be taken as equivalent in meaning to “without commixture” or “without commixtion”. So far, therefore, of the four contemporary statements we have considered, all of them attach something extra to the meaning of the four Chalcedonian adverbs by adding two more, but three of them are at least consistent in utilizing all four Chalcedonian adverbs whereas one statement contains only one of them.

Finally, we turn to the fifth and latest statement in the series to be considered in the present essay. This latest statement is, so far, only proposed and not yet accepted at the highest level, but in many ways it is the most important of them all because in it all the Oriental Orthodox representatives have reached an agreement on Christology with all the representatives of the Chalcedonian Orthodox churches. Most, if not all, of the ancient churches of the Christian east are therefore involved; the proposed agreement is multilateral and not just bilateral. Its text bears the signatures of 34 representative scholars and leaders from these churches. This statement, which dates from June of 1989 and is now under consideration by all the various churches concerned, both Chalcedonian and non-Chalcedonian, employs a rather different phraseology from the others that we have previously reviewed, one that incorporates all four classical adverbs of Chalcedon but not the other two that were added to each of the four earlier statements.8

The text of this fifth and latest statement reads:

“the four adverbs used to qualify the mystery of the hypostatic union belong to our common tradition—without commingling (or confusion, asynkhynos), without change (atareptos), without separation (ækhoristos), and without division (adíairetos). Those among us who speak of two natures in Christ, do not there-

---

1 Full text in L'Osservatore Romano for 2 July 1984, and in Information Service (Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity), no. 55 (1984/2-3) pp. 61-63; further see ROBERSON, 1985, p. 242.
2 I have not included in this paper the recent agreed statement on Christology signed on 11 November 1994 by Pope John Paul II and Mar Dinkha IV, Catholicos-Patriarch of the Assyrian Church of the East, because the latter church is not regarded by itself or others as having had the same classical position on Christology or attitude toward Chalcedon as the Oriental Orthodox Churches. If I were to include it I would note that it is an agreement using the same four original Chalcedonian adverbs and only those four. The entire issue of Latina vol. 40 (1995), 2, is devoted to this agreement, and see also The Tablet (London) for 3 December 1994, as well as (for background) COAKLEY, 1992.
by deny their inseparable, indivisible union; those among us who speak of one united divine-human nature in Christ do not thereby deny the continuing dynamic presence in Christ of the divine and human, without change, without confusion."

This formula was confirmed in September of 1990 in the (more extensive) second agreed statement of the same representative commission of all the Chalcedonian and non-Chalcedonian Orthodox, the range of agreement extending with it to far more than only the council of Chalcedon.\textsuperscript{10} On the basis of both these statements an impressive common text of proposed steps toward the restoration of full communion among all of them was proposed unanimously by the same commission in December of 1993 for submission to all the churches concerned.\textsuperscript{11}

To me, the first four of the recent agreements that have been reviewed in this paper (well intentioned and ground-breaking though they were) seem to complicate rather than to clarify the meaning of the four Chalcedonian adverbs because they add to them, or in one case subtract from them, without explaining why. Probably their signatories as well as their advisors thought they were reaching basic agreements in Christology that clarified the centuries-old disputes over the meaning of Chalcedon, but they leave us wondering whether the churches that have rejected Chalcedon are really now accepting at least its four classical adverbs, or whether those churches that have held to Chalcedon are now backing off from it by altering its wording and adding other adverbs. In contrast, the fifth statement, the last one, does seem to reach some understandable consensus about the four adverbs themselves without adding to their meaning. It will be quite significant if all the Oriental Orthodox churches, which in the past have formally rejected Chalcedon, and all the Eastern or Chalcedonian Orthodox churches, which have condemned the others for not adhering to it, can now sign this common Christological agreement on the basis of a consensus about the meaning of Chalcedon and its adverbs.

\textsuperscript{9} The text and comments thereupon appear in many places. See for example \textit{The Tablet} (London), 22 July 1989, p. 852, and \textit{Ecumenical Trends}, March 1990, pp. 43-47.


\textsuperscript{11} Useful report and text in \textit{Outreach} (publication of the Armenian Prelacy, New York City), vol. 16, (November 1993), 5, pp. 1 and 8.
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EASTERN ORTHODOX–ORIENTAL ORTHODOX DIALOGUE: AN HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

John H. Erickson

Of Christian divisions, few have been more long-lasting or painful than that between the Eastern, or Chalcedonian, Orthodox Churches and the Oriental, or non-Chalcedonian, Orthodox Churches. All the more remarkable, therefore, have been developments over the last half century which have brought these two families of churches close to reunion. Some noteworthy dates in this period of rapprochement include:

1951 - On the occasion of the 1500th anniversary of the Council of Chalcedon, Patriarch Athenagoras of Constantinople calls for theological dialogue with the non-Chalcedonian churches.

1961 - The first of the Pan-Orthodox Rhodes Conference calls for dialogue.

1964 - The First Unofficial Consultation, in Aarhus, produces an Agreed Statement stressing the authority of St. Cyril of Alexandria.

1967 - The Second Unofficial Consultation, in Bristol, produces an Agreed Statement indicating basic Christological agreement not only on the question of "nature" but also of "will" and "energy".

1970 - The Third Unofficial Consultation, in Geneva, reaffirms Christological agreement and notes three important ecclesiological issues: (a) the meaning of councils in the life of the Church; (b) the anathematization or canonization of controversial teachers; (c) jurisdictional questions relating to manifestation of the Church’s unity.


1973 - A joint planning commission begins preparation for establishment of an official Joint Commission for Theological Dialogue between the Orthodox Church and the Oriental Orthodox Churches.

1985 - The first plenary meeting of the Joint Commission, in Geneva, prepares the agenda for the Commission’s future work.
1989 - The second plenary meeting of the Joint Commission, at Anba Bishoy Monastery, Egypt, produces an Agreed Statement on Christology¹.

1990 - The third plenary meeting of the Joint Commission, at Chambésy, produces a Second Agreed Statement and Recommendations to the Churches on pastoral issues².

Other presentations in this symposium will examine the nature and contents of these agreed statements and discuss their implications for the life of our Churches. My own task is to place these statements and the theological dialogue which led to them in a broader historical perspective. This calls for some selectivity; the estrangement of our churches began at the time of the Council of Chalcedon in 451 A.D. and has now lasted over 1500 years. What I wish to highlight are the factors which have impinged one way or another on efforts to achieve reunion of our Churches, to restore full communion between them.

Let us begin with the first of the dates just listed: 1951, the 1500th anniversary of the Council of Chalcedon. It may be instructive to consider how the Council of Chalcedon was presented at that time. Certainly for the Eastern Orthodox, Chalcedon then, as now, was numbered as the fourth of the seven ecumenical councils; and just as the other ecumenical councils, as late as the 1950s, it was remembered above all in terms of the heresy condemned. Just as Nicaea I had condemned the Arian heresy, Constantinople I the Macedonian heresy, and Ephesus the Nestorian heresy, so also Chalcedon had condemned the monophysite heresy. Those whom the Eastern Orthodox (or for that matter, Western Christians) today refer to as Oriental Orthodox or non-Chalcedonian were most often called monophysites in popular books of the period. The genesis of this heresy and its condemnation at Chalcedon were presented more or less like this: the Council of Ephesus quite rightly condemned Nestorius for emphasizing the humanity of Christ to the point of separating Christ into two persons; by contrast Nestorius’ chief opponent, Cyril of Alexandria, emphasized Christ’s divine nature, and his followers quickly enough carried this to an extreme, to the point of denying Christ’s human nature. So Chalcedon, basing itself on the carefully balanced Christology of the Tome of Pope Leo of Rome, quite rightly condemned this monophysite heresy which held that Christ had but one nature, viz., the divine.

Here, of course, I am presenting the stereotype that was widespread on the Eastern Orthodox side circa 1951; no doubt comparable stereotypes existed on the Oriental Orthodox side. For centuries we had regarded each other as heretics, and often enough during those centuries we had denied any churchly character whatever to the other side. Thus, in the eighteenth century, when the Patriarchate of Constantinople began to practice rebaptism of Latins, it also insisted on the same for Armenians; in the later nineteenth century Constantinople decided that henceforth “economy” should be applied to Latins and Armenians; even so, certain circles even to this day would argue that in principle we should rebaptized, even if for reasons of expediency we do not do so in most

¹ Joint Commission, 1989.
² Joint Commission, 1990.
cases. For most Orthodox, however, whether Eastern or Oriental, the climate of opinion has changed considerably since 1951, not to mention since the eighteenth century. Why? I can think of at least two reasons:

(1) We must acknowledge, first of all, the contribution of modern historical scholarship. On the one hand, specialists demonstrated conclusively that mainstream "monophysites" like Severus of Antioch simply were continuing the terminology and Christological emphases of St. Cyril of Alexandria. Like Cyril, they spoke of "one incarnate nature of God the Word", and hence were "monophysite", but this did not mean that they denied Christ's full humanity. In fact, much of their energy was spent in combating those who denied Christ's humanity or who argued that it was essentially different from our own. In short, it is misleading and indeed inaccurate to call these mainstream non-Chalcedonians "monophysite heretics". If the word monophysite is used at all, they should rather be called "monophysite orthodox". At the same time that non-Chalcedonian "monophysitism" was being reassessed, Chalcedonian diophysitism was also being reassessed. Reacting against the older and characteristically Western approach which saw ancient church history and dogmatic development as culminating and indeed ending with Chalcedon, scholars like the late Fr. John Meyendorff called attention to developments after Chalcedon and indeed to neglected aspects of Chalcedon itself. As Fr. Meyendorff often emphasized, at Chalcedon it was not just the Tome of Leo that was the touchstone of Orthodoxy: whenever a difficult moment arose, the witness of St. Cyril, and not just of St. Leo, was invoked. In addition, as Meyendorff and other scholars pointed out, Chalcedon itself left a number of issues unresolved, both in Christology and in the inseparable area of soteriology. Many people rejected Chalcedon on the grounds that it could be interpreted in a Nestorian way and indeed that it had rehabilitated certain Nestorian sympathizers. This possibility was eliminated only after yet another ecumenical council, the fifth by our Eastern Orthodox reckoning, in Constantinople in 553 during the reign of Emperor Justinian. This council once again emphasized the authority of St. Cyril of Alexandria and condemned the suspect Nestorian sympathizers. Henceforth, in the Byzantine imperial Church there would be no thought of rejecting or simply ignoring Chalcedon, but it was also clear that Chalcedon could be interpreted only in the light of the Christology of St. Cyril of Alexandria and, behind that, the soteriology of St. Cyril. In short, Chalcedon, the fourth ecumenical council, does not stand alone. It must be read in light of the fifth and subsequent councils.

(2) In addition to the contribution of modern scholarship, we must acknowledge the contribution of the modern ecumenical movement. Both the Eastern and the Oriental Orthodox Churches have criticized certain developments in the ecumenical movement, and quite rightly. At the same time, both have benefited from the ecumenical movement in diverse ways. The very dialogue which has brought our churches so close to full communion and unity is in a very real way a product of the ecumenical movement and, more specifically, of the close contacts and resulting friendships which this movement has made possible. Back in the 1960s, two then young staff members of the World Council of Churches, Nikos Nissiotis of the Patriarchate of Constantinople and Paul Vergheze—later Mar Paulos Gregorios—of the Malankara Syrian Orthodox Church, sensed the fundamental unity of our churches. They succeeded in winning over their respective church author-
ities, and in turn—at first in conjunction with meetings of the Faith and Order Commission of the World Council of Churches—a series of informal dialogues involving leading theologians from both sides began. To the amazement of the nay-sayers who had not expected much openness on the part of the “other side”, the first of these informal dialogues, Aarhus 1962, was a great success. “We recognize in each other the one orthodox faith of the Church”, declared the final statement. The success of the second informal dialogue—Bristol 1967—came as an even greater surprise. Aarhus had been devoted to the Council of Chalcedon and to the issue of one nature or two—an issue on which agreement had been anticipated by the historical research. Bristol, on the other hand, was devoted to Constantinople III, the sixth ecumenical council by the reckoning of the Eastern Orthodox, and to the issue of one will or two—an area largely uncharted by the professional historians of doctrine. But here again, full agreement was reached:

The position of those who wish to speak of one divine-human will and energy united without confusion or separation does not appear...to be incompatible with the decision of the Council of Constantinople (680-681) which affirms two natural wills and two natural energies in Him existing indissolubly, incontrovertibly, inseparably, unconfusedly.

Subsequent informal and formal dialogues have only served to deepen this conviction. Notwithstanding differences in terminology, both “sides” are fully Orthodox.

While we should not forget the role of modern scholarship and the modern ecumenical movement in bringing our churches together, we should not conclude from this that the present rapprochement is simply the result of the modern relativism or the “pan-heresy of ecumenism”, as some self-styled traditionalists might charge. I have called attention to our many centuries of estrangement. Yet during those centuries there were many on both sides who recognized that the differences between us were essentially verbal. Already in 1951 in his letter commemorating the 1500th anniversary of Chalcedon, Patriarch Athenagoras of Constantinople quoted with approval St. John of Damascus, who in the eighth century observed that those who do not accept the terminology of Chalcedon were “nevertheless Orthodox in all things”. And during those centuries there also were efforts to reach agreement and to restore communion. At this time I would like to call attention to some of these early efforts, for I believe they are instructive. They illustrate what both sides—at the time at least—regarded as the proper basis for reunion. While for various reasons these early efforts were not successful, they may nonetheless provide some guidance not only for our present Eastern-Oriental Orthodox dialogue but for other dialogues and ecumenical activities as well.

I already have called attention to Emperor Justinian’s efforts in the sixth century to address the legitimate concerns of those who did not accept Chalcedon. The fifth ecumenical council which he summoned, in fact, did not end the divisions; by that point both sides had begun to erect parallel, competing hierarchies. Ethnic, national, and political issues were further aggravating what had begun a theological dispute. Yet efforts at reunion continued, and indeed intensified, under Justinian’s successor, Justin II, who issued what has been called “a manifesto of Neo-Chalcedonian theology.” Addressing all his Christian subjects, he affirmed that Orthodox Christology can be expressed both in
Cyrillian terms ("one incarnate nature of God the Word") or in Chalcedonian terms ("the difference of natures is not annulled by the union"); and he called on all to unite on the basis of orthodoxy, avoiding "unnecessary disputes about persons or words [used on either side] to lead to one true belief and understanding."

One problem, of course, is that emperors tend to become impatient when their initiatives are not immediately crowned with success. In antiquity imperially sponsored dialogue too often alternated with imperially sponsored persecution of dissidents. No doubt some churchmen were happy to go along with the persecutions just as they went along with the dialogues. But there were also those who rejected force. One such was John the Faster, Patriarch of Constantinople: "What did the dissidents do or say that deserves persecutions?" he asked. "If pagans have been justified and amnestied, how can I persecute Christians who are blameless in their Christianity and, so it seems to me, have more faith than we?" Another noteworthy figure is John the Merciful, Chalcedonian Patriarch of Alexandria, who is honored as a saint by both sides because of his even-handed charity. On lower levels too we find some interesting examples of good will. In the imperial capital there was even a joint monastery, where daily life and church services were in common; the only thing absent was common reception of the Eucharist.

During this period there were also important developments in how each side viewed the ecclesial status of the other. In the wake of Chalcedon there were self-proclaimed champions of akribeia or "strictness" on both sides who would ransack the archives of the churches to expunge the names of long-dead "heretics" and insist on the rechristianization and reordination of those "repenting" of their former adherence. This approach, however, was vigorously resisted and ultimately defeated by moderate churchmen on both sides, who explored the proper limits of oikonomia or "prudent pastoral management". Severus of Antioch, for example, a leading non-Chalcedonian theologian of his age, rallied against what he called "the heresy of the self-appointed reanointers", i.e., those of his fellow non-Chalcedonians who advocated rechristianisation of Chalcedonians. On the Chalcedonian side too we can see an analogous development in canon 95 of the Synod in Trullo, a synod which for the Chalcedonian Orthodox has ecumenical authority: those coming over from among the non-Chalcedonians are to be received simply by profession of faith, not by anointing with chrism or, a fortiori, by rebaptism. While much of this discussion of oikonomia and its limits proceeded case by case, there was at least one attempt at systematic presentation, a special treatise on the subject by the seventh century Chalcedonian patriarch of Alexandria Eulogius. His work expresses what I take to be the accepted position of Chalcedonians and non-Chalcedonians alike: (a) by oikonomia a temporary concession can be made in matters of practice to avoid irremediably damaging the peace of the Church (e.g., Paul's circumcision of Timothy); (b) by oikonomia differences of theological terminology can be tolerated indefinitely; (c) by oikonomia technical barriers to communion—an occasional heretic's name in the diptychs and other vestiges of past error can simply be ignored. But in no case may present purity of faith be compromised.

3 Quoted in MEYENDORFF, 1989, p. 262.
4 Ibid., pp. 264-265.
Efforts at rapprochement continued into the Middle Ages, mainly between the Byzantine Church and the Syrian Jacobites and the Byzantine Church and the Armenians. There were frequent contacts especially during the twelfth century. As an historian, I often am disappointed by the attitude of my fellow Chalcedonians in this period. All too often it was the Byzantines who were unaccommodating. Just as agreement seemed near on Chistology, they would insist on uniformity in various ritual matters (e.g., the use of leavened bread in the Eucharist and the mingling of warm water, the zeon, in the eucharistic chalice). As an historian, I also am impressed by the relative openness of “the other side”. The Catholicos St. Nersès the Graceful, for example, expressed his conviction that Chalcedon was not heretical: “I find nothing in the horos [of Chalcedon] against the orthodox faith, and I am astonished that those before us opposed it so strenuously”.

Unfortunately, initiatives toward reunion in his day were not carried through. Representatives from Eastern Armenia wanted further clarification first, and by the time this came, the mood and political climate in Byzantium had changed. The right moment had come—and gone. During the later Middle Ages, with the collapse of Byzantium in the face of Latin Crusaders and then the Turks, the churches on both sides became more isolated, more defensive, and in the process less willing to recognize anything of value on the “other side.”

As we turn from these centuries long past to our own day, we should be thankful, first of all, that we have been given another chance, that an opportunity for reunion has come again. Modern historical scholarship and the ecumenical movement have given us new resources. Some might fear that they offer new possibilities for betrayal of the faith. Yet if one carefully examines the results of the unofficial and then the official dialogue between our church families, I think he will find them quite consistent with the principles laid down in the past by men like Eulogius of Alexandria and Severus of Antioch. First of all, there is full agreement on the substance of the faith, notwithstanding differences in terminology.

In the light of our four unofficial consultations...and our three official meetings which followed..., we have understood that both families have loyally maintained the authentic orthodox Christological doctrine, and the unbroken continuity of the apostolic tradition, though they may have used Christological terms in different ways.

Indeed, as the documents of the dialogue point out, “Our mutual agreement is not limited to Christology, but encompasses the whole faith of the one undivided church of the early centuries,” including, for example, the veneration of icons.

But if there is full unity of faith, what more is needed? We now face a moment of truth. In our official statements on ecumenism, both Eastern Orthodox and Oriental Orthodox have insisted vigorously, often in the face of Protestant hostility, on the necessity of unity of faith, that unity of faith is the essential precondition for communion; and

7 Joint Commission, 1989, reprinted here on p. 100.
in so doing we have at least implied that, when unity of faith is indeed present, full communion is not only the logical but even the necessary consequence. Will we now follow through to full communion and concelebration? Or, as so often has happened in the past, will we "raise the hurdles", finding new reasons to remain divided? In fact, as the agreed statements also indicate, a number of issues still have not been addressed—issues relating more to practical ecclesiology and canon law than to Christological dogma. Even within the Eastern Orthodox family of churches, we know how difficult it is to maintain structures for communion. While internally we have not disagreed about Chalcedonian dogma, we have disagreed about the application of some of the Chalcedonian canons, especially those relating to the role of the Patriarch of Constantinople, "first among equals", within this family of churches. The Oriental Orthodox Churches thus far have had very different mechanisms for inter-church relations. In the future, in a reunited Church, how will we address pressing practical problems like disunity in the so-called "diaspora"? Such problems need to be addressed not only at the highest inter-church level but also on regional and local levels, for in fact the real unity of our churches at this point may depend less on the agreement of professional theologians than on the presence of a common mind and ethos in the faithful of our congregations. As both our church families have always insisted, *homologia*—confession of the faith in the form of creeds and agreed statements—is inseparable from *martyria*—the lived-out witness to the faith in daily life. Certainly our hope and prayer must be that, when unity between our churches is finally restored, our faithful will experience this as a living reality and not simply as a matter for specialists.
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PAPADAKIS, A.
EASTERN ORTHODOX–ORIENTAL ORTHODOX RELATIONS: PRACTICAL STEPS TOWARD UNITY

Theodore Pulcini

Professor Erickson has just given us an overview of some of the more auspicious episodes in the history of relations between the Chalcedonian and pre-Chalcedonian Churches, and in a few minutes Archbishop Krikorian and Father Malaty will examine how the theological controversies which for centuries divided these two families of churches were resolved in recent years through theological dialogue and other efforts. I will therefore prescind from historical and theological discussion in this presentation. Rather, I wish to concentrate on what practical measures must be taken before Chalcedonians and non-Chalcedonians can achieve the unity for which they have been striving for so many years.

It is my conviction that no matter how much good will the participants of this dialogue have shown and no matter how successfully they have bridged the theological breach between them, unity will remain only a theoretical construct, a spirit without a body, unless it is experienced on a practical, experimental level. Without commitment to unity on a practical level, the final steps toward rapprochement may well never be taken.

A Recognized Need

The need for a practical experience of unity has consistently been recognized throughout the dialogues between the Oriental and Eastern Orthodox. At the Bristol consultation (July 1967), for example, participants affirmed that Christology (obviously the primary concern of the theological discussions) must not be viewed in speculative isolation from, but rather in relation to soteriology, and that both Christology and soteriology must be related to the doctrine of God, the doctrine of man, ecclesiology, liturgy, and spirituality. The participants thus called for an integrative and holistic approach—not simply a theoretical one.

At the Geneva consultation (August 1970), participants addressed some of the practical, canonical problems that militated against reunion between Chalcedonians and non-Chalcedonians. While noting the ideal of one bishop, one presbyterium, and one Eucharist in a local church, they stressed that the ideal could be reshaped according to specific circumstances, as indeed it would have to be in this case. The legitimacy of a plurality of expressions in terminological, liturgical, canonical, and administrative matters, within the bounds of a common faith, was affirmed.2

1 Agreed Statement, 1968, p. 133 (para. 3).
2 Summary of Conclusions, 1971, pp. 5-6 (paras. 6-7).
To further the cause of reunion, the participants in the Geneva consultation also suggested the establishment of a joint commission to study remaining obstacles to full communion. They called for, among other things, a statement of reconciliation, academic cooperation between the two sides, and common catechesis of young people.\(^3\)

Furthermore, the Joint Commission of the Theological Dialogue between the Orthodox Church and Oriental Orthodox Churches, meeting in September 1990 in Chambéry, recommended a number of practical steps toward union: reciprocal visits (by bishops, priests, and lay people) among the various churches, exchange of students and professors among theological institutions, joint worship, joint publications designed to explain the histories of the various churches and their common faith (including joint commission documents), mutual recognition of baptism, bilateral agreements regarding interchurch marriage and child-rearing, revision of instructional materials to reflect the unity between the two traditions, and programs of education for clergy and lay people on questions relating to union.\(^4\)

Despite these calls for practical measures, I know of only one case in which extensive practical guidelines have actually been promulgated and implemented: in the Patriarchate of Antioch.

**The Antiochian Situation**

The Chalcedonian dispute was particularly disruptive in the church of Antioch, where long-standing tensions had existed between Christians of Greek bent and those of more Semitic, specifically Syriac, orientation. Chalcedon confirmed their mutual alienation, pitting the Greek Orthodox against the "Jacobites", as the Syrian Orthodox came to be called, after their leader Jacob Baradaeus. As the years passed, the former became ever more influenced by Constantinople, gradually adopting its liturgical rite, with only minor variations, in its entirety; indeed they came to be derided as "Melkites" or "emperor's men" by the Jacobites who, in turn, were branded as "monophysites" by their opponents. During the period of Byzantine ascendancy the Jacobite community became ever more marginalized.

Despite undeniable animosity between the two churches over the centuries, the Greek and Syrian Orthodox of the see of Antioch never completely lost sight of their primordial unity. Events of the past few years, in particular, have spawned hopes that their reunion is imminent.

The Eastern Orthodox Patriarchate of that historic city has jurisdiction over some million souls worldwide; the Syrian Orthodox Patriarchate over some 243,000.\(^5\) (In Syria, they number some 200,000 and 81,000, respectively\(^6\)). Their numbers are, therefore, quite comparable; and in their Middle Eastern homelands, members of the two

---

\(^3\) Ibid., pp. 7-8 (para. 9).
\(^6\) Ibid., p. 659.
churches interact frequently in day-to-day life. Could not Chalcedonians and non-Chalcedonians of this patriarchate be reunited by means of a regional union?

The late Father John Meyendorff recognized this sort of regional union as a means to a broader union between the Eastern and Oriental Orthodox. He clearly considered formal proclamation at a Great Council to be the most proper means of achieving union. He admitted that "the history of the Church has also known precedents for initiatives taken regionally". Even while recognizing the dangerous obstacles that such regional efforts could present to a general union, he provided a description of a regional union properly conceived and executed:

No issues concerning doctrine, ecclesiology and discipline should be overlooked. Substitute "ideologies" such as regional nationalism, or anti-Western animosity, or political considerations involving the influence of foreign interests, should be regarded as poison. A union, solemnly proclaimed on a regional basis, would be communicated officially to all churches on the Chalcedonian and non-Chalcedonian sides, and their approval would be formally asked. A positive reaction should logically lead to further union steps. A negative reply would place before the church involved a clear option: it would have to decide which communion it considers to be the communion of the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church.\footnote{Ibid.}

Indeed in 1988, intimations of an effort aimed at a regional union in the Patriarchate of Antioch were reported. In August of that year, a meeting was convened in Geneva at which, under the direction of the Greek Orthodox Patriarch of Antioch, Ignatius IV, a number of clergy and laity discussed issues of concern to the patriarchate in particular and world Orthodox in general. The primate of the Antiochian Orthodox Archdiocese of North America, Metropolitan Philip Saliba attended and, upon his return, granted an interview to the editor of the official Archdiocesan periodical, The Word, in which he discussed, among other things, the desirability of a regional union between Chalcedonians and non-Chalcedonians. In the course of the interview he stated:

The question arose whether issues should be resolved in an ecumenical council or can be resolved by an autocephalous church alone. We felt that since the problem was an Antiochian problem in origin, a clear theological position should be articulated by Antiochian theologians after this unity is restored and presented to all sister autocephalous Orthodox churches.\footnote{Ibid.}

The metropolitan recognized that certain practical problems would have to be addressed: "the existence of two patriarchates, two synods, the difference in liturgical rites, the calendar, etc.", but felt that none of these were "monumental" enough to preclude reunion.\footnote{Ibid.}

\footnote{MEYENDORFF, 1989, p. 328.}
\footnote{Ibid.}
\footnote{See SALIBA, 1988, p. 6 and compare Patriarchates, 1989.}
I, too, fail to see why any of these problems should prove insurmountable. It is true that the ideal of Orthodox ecclesiology is to have one bishop in a particular territory. If the Greek and Syrian Orthodox of Antioch united, there would be two patriarchs in full communion with each other occupying the same see, each with his own synod. Their bishops would be presiding over overlapping dioceses. Even though such a situation would be anomalous, it would certainly not be intolerable. I believe the traditional Orthodox ecclesiology was articulated to avoid the establishment of parallel or overlapping jurisdictions. From an Orthodox perspective it would be irregular for different Orthodox groups to go into a territory, establish the church there, and then set up competing bishops in the same locale—or for one Orthodox church to "invade" the territory of another and set up a parallel hierarchy. This would clearly not be the situation in a "reunited Antioch". Because of centuries of separation, it is simply a fact that where there was once one united church there are now two distinct, highly developed, legitimate churches. The vicissitudes of history led not only to mutual alienation but also to a sort of "mitosis" within the primordial united community which produced two well-defined, parallel bodies. Having a parallel hierarchy in Orthodox Antioch, therefore, would not be the result of the deliberate establishment of competing canonical jurisdictions but of the simple recognition of an historical reality that cannot be denied or forcibly changed. Besides, although the Greek and Syrian Orthodox would have their own patriarchs and synods for matters of administration, would it not be possible to have a "united synod" as well, which met on a regular basis and over which the two patriarchs would preside in alternation? This group would consider issues of mutual concern to the sister-churches and would serve as a highly visible sign of their unity in a common faith.

The fact is that the traditions of the Greek and Syrian churches have, over the centuries, become immiscible; both are equally valid expressions of the same Gospel, and it would be wrong to attempt to reduce one to the other. The main manifestation of this immiscibility and irreducibility is the distinctive liturgical rites that have crystallized in the two churches. A number of lessons, both positive and negative, can be learned from the multiritual structure presently obtaining in the Roman Church. As a concession to pastoral necessity, Rome has accepted the existence of parallel Catholic hierarchies in the same territory for the purpose of better serving the needs of the various "rites", or "particular churches" that co-exist there. In a reunited Orthodox Antioch, the pastoral welfare of the church would necessitate the same sort of multiritual co-existence between the Greek and Syrian churches. There should be no attempt to "homogenize" the two traditions. By maintaining the fullness of the particularity, they would be mutually enriching.

Indeed, it seems that such an attitude of mutuality prevailed at a meeting between the leadership of the Eastern and Oriental Orthodox Churches of Antioch held in Damascus in July 1991. A policy statement drafted at this meeting defines, in practical terms, future relations between the two churches. It calls for "complete and mutual respect" in all matters of liturgy, spirituality, and heritage. The patristic legacy of both traditions is to be respected and included in catechetical materials and theological school curricula. Neither church will convert members from the other. The administrative independence of each is to be maintained in all matters pertaining to marriage, divorce, adoption, etc. The synods of the two churches will meet in conjunction whenever necessary.
Perhaps most significant is that the document foresees full *communicatio in sacris* in that it provides guidelines for liturgical concelebration of the clergy of both churches, most notably at the Eucharistic liturgy and marriage services. Godparents and marriage witnesses can now be chosen from either church without discrimination. Organizations from both churches are to cooperate fully in educational, cultural, and social matters. The bishops close the document with a promise "to continue strengthening our relationship with the sister church."

From the foregoing discussion it becomes evident that both in general terms (at Bristol, Geneva, and Chambésy) and in specific terms (in the Patriarchate of Antioch), those engaged in the process of fostering the reunion of the Chalcedonian and non-Chalcedonian churches recognized the need for practical guidelines in the following areas: sacramental intercommunion, liturgy, spirituality, administration, catechesis, theological education, marriage and child-rearing, publications, and social and cultural undertakings.

To what extent have we accomplished this task? To what extent have we enabled our theological convergence to find expression on the practical level? My fear is that if our unity remains only on the level of theology, our rapprochement on the level of doctrinal formulae, it will be no unity at all. Furthermore, there will always be the nay-sayers among us who, because they do not really know "the other", will continue to use theology as a means of perpetuating division.

Practical Implementation in the American Setting

Let me therefore conclude by offering a few suggestions of what can be done in our own American setting to keep our theological convergence from becoming merely a dead letter, with no effect on our communities. I would suggest that the following three projects be undertaken:

1. *Encounter Weekends*, in which a non-Chalcedonian parish would invite a neighboring Chalcedonian parish, or vice versa, to spend the weekend. On Saturday, several talks and worships would familiarize the visitors with the liturgical prayers, practices, and customs of the host parish. Participants from the two parishes would have the opportunity to socialize and get to know one another on a personal level. The weekend would conclude after the visitors attended the Sunday Liturgy at the host parish.

I firmly believe that once the sense of "liturgical strangeness" is overcome through such interactive weekends, much of the resistance to formal union will be overcome. It should also be noted that such encounter weekends would not only benefit the members of the visiting parish; in having to respond to the inquiries of their visitors, members of the host parish will certainly come to a more nuanced appreciation of their own tradition.

2. *Episcopal Collaboration in such areas as parish visitation, publishing, and social service programs*. As soon as Chalcedonians see their bishops alongside non-Chalcedonian bishops, and vice versa, working for a common cause, bonds of fraternity
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Unity, 1992, pp. 5-6.
will be quick to form. Bishops of the two communities could make plans for joint visitation of certain parishes, especially in cities where both Chalcedonian and non-Chalcedonian parishes are found (e.g., Boston, New York, Los Angeles). Publication projects, especially those relevant to the common roots and shared faith of the Chalcedonian and non-Chalcedonian traditions, could be undertaken jointly. When responding to the human needs created by natural disasters and political strife, why could our churches not pool their resources, thereby manifesting a united Orthodox witness in the secular world? Why, for example, should the non-Chalcedonian churches not be asked to join with their Chalcedonian counterparts in the work of the International Orthodox Christian Charities (IOCC)? Such common effort produces common vision.

3. Catechesis and Theological Education through which mutual appreciation of the richness of our respective tradition is fostered. There is undoubtedly a need for popular literature in this subject area, which can be distributed to the people in our parishes and used as the basis for parish study groups. But perhaps more importantly, there is a need for us to make each other known in our seminaries and houses of theological study.

Here I would especially like to challenge the non-Chalcedonian traditions to make courses in their spirituality, liturgy, and patristic traditions available to the Chalcedonian theological seminaries. Because the Chalcedonian communities in this country are larger, they have developed the more established centers of theological learning. It makes good sense for the smaller non-Chalcedonian communities to maintain houses of studies in association with the established Chalcedonian seminary—much like St. Nersess does with St. Vladimir's. But the non-Chalcedonian house of studies should make courses in its tradition available to the students of the Chalcedonian seminary as well. Thus, while it is easy enough for a St. Nersess student to avail himself of courses at St. Vladimir's that can give him an appreciation of the Byzantine liturgical tradition and of the Greek patristic tradition, I would like to see St. Vladimir's students have the opportunity to take a course in the Armenian liturgical tradition or in the thought of the Armenian Church Fathers. In other words, while in our seminaries we Chalcedonians have felt ourselves enormously enriched by the presence of non-Chalcedonian students, we have not always been able to familiarize ourselves with their heritage as extensively as we might like. The association between seminary and house of studies should provide opportunities for "theological cross-fertilization". If our future theologians and pastors, while in seminary, come to a healthy and substantial respect and appreciation for our joint traditions, we can be certain that some of that mutuality will filter down to a popular level, where it can bear much fruit.

Conclusion

It seems to me that it is of little consequence to speak of unity on a theological level if there is no experience of unity in the day-to-day encounters between our churches. On the one hand, theological conviction forms experience; yet, it must always be remembered that theological positions are forged as a result of, and in interpretation of, experience. It is always easier to remain separated from someone with whom one has never experienced unity. It is therefore imperative that, on a practical, everyday level, we
work to forge an experience of solidarity, mutual respect, and reciprocal familiarity. Then the unity for which we have labored so strenuously over these past three decades will become a living reality among us, a reality in which our common witness to the Gospel is strengthened.
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Unity
REVIEW OF THE AGREED STATEMENTS AND DOCUMENTS OF THE JOINT COMMISSION

Mesrob Krikorian

Introduction

The official dialogue of unity between the Eastern Orthodox Church and the Oriental Orthodox Churches started in December 1985 at the Orthodox Centre of Chambésy near Geneva and on the initiative of the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople or of the Inter-Orthodox Commission for Dialogue (with the Oriental Orthodox Churches). The discussions were concluded at the beginning of November 1993 when the representatives of the two families of the Orthodox Church published a communiqué and announced the good news of the agreement on unity. This agreement "in principle" was achieved by theologians of the two sides with suggestions and proposals for the concrete realization of the restoration of full communion.

As a participant and secretary (for the English language) of the official dialogue, I have the honor to present to this illustrious assembly of theologians the main points of the agreements and the practical steps which could be taken for the complete and final unity of the Orthodox Church(es).

The Christological Consensus

It is clear that the most important theological agreement was the Christological consensus. Naturally, the results of the unofficial consultations (Aarhus, Denmark, August 1964, Bristol, Great Britain, July 1967, Geneva, Switzerland, August 1970, and Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, January 1971) had already leveled and prepared the pathway for mutual understanding and agreement. The wonderful Christological consensus was effected after hot-tempered disputes and a tragic schism of 1500 years, not because the theologians of the Eastern and Oriental Churches were more intelligent or wiser than their forefathers, but simply because the time was ripe and urging for a reunion.

The draft for the Christological consensus was drawn up at the meeting of the Joint Commission in June 1989 at the Monastery of St. Bishoy in Egypt. In September of 1990, at the Orthodox Centre of the Ecumenical Patriarchate in Chambésy, the final text of the agreement was then completed under the title "Second Agreed Statement" and comprised of ten points. The first seven points or paragraphs are related to the Christological consensus which, of course, presents the core of all other agreements. At the beginning of this formula of union we read the following:

1. Both families agree in condemning the Eutychian heresy. Both families confess that the Logos, the Second Person of the Holy Trinity, only begotten of the
Father before the ages and consubstantial with Him, was incarnate and was born from the Virgin Mary Theotokos; fully consubstantial with us, perfect man with soul, body, and mind (nous); he was crucified, died, was buried, and rose from the dead on the third day, ascended to the Heavenly Father, where He sits on the right hand of the Father as Lord of all Creation. At Pentecost, by the coming of the Holy Spirit He manifested the Church as His Body. We look forward to His coming again in the fullness of His glory, according to the Scriptures.

2. Both families condemn the Nestorian heresy and the crypto-Nestorianism of Theodoret of Cyrhhus. They agree that it is not sufficient merely to say that Christ is consubstantial both with His Father and with us, by nature God and by nature man; it is necessary to affirm also that the Logos, who is by nature God, became by nature man, by His Incarnation in the fullness of time.

In this statement we find a common Cyrillian definition on the incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ acceptable to both Orthodox families, as well as boundary marks which limit and secure the authentic Christological teaching of the Church. Already in the "Agreed Statement" of Aarhus (August 14, 1964), the rejection of the teachings of Nestorius and Eutyches was registered with importance:

On the essence of the Christological dogma we found ourselves in full agreement. Through the different terminologies used by each side, we saw the same truth expressed. Since we agree in rejecting without reservation the teaching of Eutyches as well as of Nestorius, the acceptance or non-acceptance of the Council of Chalcedon does not entail the acceptance of either heresy. Both sides found themselves fundamentally following the Christological teaching of the one undivided Church as expressed by St. Cyril.¹

The sentence which states "the acceptance or non-acceptance of the Council of Chalcedon does not entail acceptance of either heresy" is the expression of a new diplomatic language, and the rejection of Nestorius and Eutyches ensures the Christology of the Church against erroneous teachings and all sorts of suspicions. In fact, from the very beginning of the disputes and for many centuries both sides blamed, insulted, and condemned each other as being monophysite or dyophysite, Nestorian or Euchian. Consequently, the disapproval of heresies became a touchstone or criterion for testing reciprocally the authenticity of their Christological faith. In this sense, the representatives of all Orthodox Churches could in a diplomatic approach and language further declare their loyalty to the faith of the early Church Fathers as follows:

In the light of our Agreed Statement on Christology as well as of the above common affirmations, we have now clearly understood that both families have always loyally maintained the same authentic Orthodox Christological faith, and the unbroken continuity of the Apostolic Tradition, though they may have used Christological terms in different ways. It is this common faith and con-

tinuous loyalty to the Apostolic Tradition that should be the basis of our unity and communion.\textsuperscript{2}

The theologians of both Eastern Orthodox as well as of Oriental Orthodox churches pronounce here explicitly their conviction that the basic difference of two traditions lies not in the essence of their Christian faith, but in different terms or terminologies. This view was repeatedly expressed during the unofficial discussions. For instance, in the conclusion of the Geneva Consultation (August 16-21, 1970, at the Cenacle) we read as follows:

On the essence of the Christological dogma our two traditions, despite fifteen centuries of separation, still find themselves in full and deep agreement with the universal tradition of the one undivided Church. It is the teaching of the blessed Cyril on the hypostatic union of the two natures in Christ that we both affirm, though we may use differing terminology to explain this teaching.\textsuperscript{3}

In order to scrutinize thoroughly the problem of Christological terms and terminologies, a small group of theologians from both sides met at the end of September of 1987 in Corinth, Greece. The group discussed the main problems of Christological terminology and was convinced that though using some terms in different nuances of senses, both sides express the same Orthodox theology. The dialogue was focused on the terms \textit{physis}, \textit{ousia}, \textit{hypostasis}, \textit{prosopon}, and it became clear that they have not been used with uniformity in different traditions and by different theologians of the same tradition. Following St. Cyril, who in his key-phrase sometimes used \textit{mia physis} (\textit{tou Theou Logou sesarkomene}) and sometimes \textit{mia hypostasis}, the non-Chalcedonians pay special attention to the formula \textit{mia physis}, and at the same time they confess the \textit{mia hypostasis} of Jesus Christ, whereas the Chalcedonians stress especially the term \textit{hypostasis} to express the unity of both divine and human natures in Christ. Yet, all agree and confirm that the unique and wonderful union of the two natures of Christ is a hypostatic, natural, and real unity.\textsuperscript{4}

The question of terms and terminologies is only one side of the coin. The other side is the reality of different formulations. Perhaps the most important phenomenon which was neglected by our forefathers was and is the possibility of expressing the same truth in various formulae. The principle of plurality or diversity could spare great and grave disputation and solve the controversies. In this spirit of understanding and tolerance the representatives of two Orthodox traditions accepted mutually the authenticity of the Christological formula of either side and declared their consent in the official agreement:

The Orthodox agree that the Oriental Orthodox will continue to maintain their traditional cyprian terminology of one nature of the incarnate Logos, since they acknowledge the double consubstantiality of the Logos which Eutyches denied. The Orthodox also use this terminology. The Oriental Orthodox agree that the

\textsuperscript{2} Second Agreed Statement, 1990, point 9.
\textsuperscript{3} Agreed Statement, 1971, p.3, cf. The Documentation of Aarhus Consultation (see note 1 above).
\textsuperscript{4} Wort und Wahrheit, p. 82.
Orthodox are justified in their use of the two-natures formula, since they acknowledge that the distinction is in thought alone. Cyril interpreted correctly this use in his letter to John of Antioch and his letters to Acacius of Melitene (p. 77, 184-201), to Eulogius (p. 77, 224-228), and to Succensus (p. 77, 228-245).

In the Formula of Reunion concerning the incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ and the terms used about the Lord we read as follows:

By virtue of this understanding of the union which involves no merging, we acknowledge the holy Virgin to be "Mother of God" because God the Word was "made flesh" and "became man" and united to himself the temple he took from her as a result of her conception. As for the terms used about the Lord in the Gospels and apostolic writings, we recognize that theologians treat some as shared because they refer to one person, some refer separately to the natures, traditionally teaching the application of the divine terms to Christ's Godhead, the lowly to his manhood.

Likewise, in his letter to Acacius of Melitene, Cyril of Alexandria writes the following on the union of two natures:

In this way, when we have the idea of the elements of the one and unique Son and Lord Jesus Christ, we speak of two natures being united; but after the union, the duality has been abolished and we believe the Son's nature to be one, since he is one Son, yet became man and incarnate.

Further, in the letter of Cyril to Eulogius the wonderful unity of two natures and the use of the phrase one incarnate nature of the Son are clearly defended:

We unite these [two natures], acknowledging one Christ, one Son, the same one Lord, and, further, one incarnate nature of the Son in the same way that the phrase can be used of ordinary man. The point is that man results from two natures—body and soul, I mean—and intellectual reception recognizes the difference; but we unite them and then get one nature of man. So recognizing the difference of nature is not dividing the one Christ into two.

In general, the Christological consensus of the Eastern Orthodox and Oriental Orthodox Churches is based on the writings and phraseology of St. Cyril of Alexandria who is a praised common Father for both traditions. Also, the four adverbs attributed to the manner of union of two natures which were inserted and solemnly pronounced in the Christological formula of Chalcedon, in fact derive from the theology of Cyril. In almost all his writings, this champion of the Christian faith repeatedly declared that the two

6 Cyril of Alexandria, pp. 222-223.
7 Ibid., pp. 48-49 (section 12).
8 Ibid., pp. 62-65.
natures of Christ were united without mingling and merger, without diminution and division. For instance, in the letter addressed to Acacius of Melitene we read:

Accordingly when the mode of the incarnation is the object of curiosity, the human mind is bound to observe two things joined together in union with each other mysteriously and without merger, yet it in no way divides what are united but believes and firmly accepts that the product of both elements is one God, Son, Christ and Lord.⁹

The fourth point of the Agreed Statement includes the four attributes of the union of two natures in the Christological consensus as follows:

Both families agree that the natures with their proper energies and wills are united hypostatically and naturally without confusion, without change, without division, and without separation, and that they are distinguished in thought alone.

The paragraph which precedes this agreement asserts that the hypostasis of the Logos became composite:

3. Both families agree that the hypostasis of the Logos became composite by uniting to His divine uncreated nature with its natural will and energy, which He has in common with the Father and the Holy Spirit, created human nature, which He assumed at the incarnation and made His own, with its natural will and energy.

This expression, "the hypostasis of the Logos became composite" also comes from the heritage of St. Cyril. The second letter to Succensus explains this conception in detail:

If we call the Only-Begotten Son of God become incarnate and made man "one", that does not mean he has been "mingled", as they suppose; the Word's nature has not transferred to the nature of the flesh or that of the flesh to that of the Word - no, while each element was seen to persist in its particular natural character for the reason just given, mysteriously and inexpressibly unified, he displayed to us one nature (but as I said, incarnate nature) of the Son. "One" is a term applied properly not only to basic single elements but to such composite entities as man compounded of soul and body. Soul and body are different kinds of things and are not mutually consubstantial; yet united they constitute man's single nature despite the fact that the difference in nature of the elements brought into unity is present in the composite condition.¹⁰

Of course, in a short treatise it is impossible to analyze the content and all aspects of the Christological consensus, but I hoped I could explore and explain the background, the ⁹

⁹ Ibid., pp. 50-51 (section 14).
¹⁰ Ibid., pp. 88-89.
basic points and the skillful treatment of the subject which has become a historical agreement.

Ecumenical Councils

Next to the Christological question, the problem of ecumenical councils was a major obstacle in the way of reunion of the Eastern Orthodox and Oriental Orthodox churches. Although both families were in agreement that the first three ecumenical councils enjoy a larger acceptance and form their common heritage, the theologians of the Eastern Orthodox Church insisted that the four later councils present an integral continuation of the earlier synods. In Aarhus (August 1964) the participants of the Consultation stated that, "All Councils, we have recognized, have to be seen as stages in an integral development and no council or document should be studied in isolation."\textsuperscript{11}

In August (16-21) 1970, at the Cenacle, Geneva, the difference concerning some ecumenical councils was registered very clearly. The Eastern Orthodox theologians argued about the inner coherence and continuity of the synods:

Theologians from the Eastern Orthodox Church have drawn attention to the fact that for them the Church teaches that the seven Ecumenical Councils which they acknowledge have an inner coherence and continuity that make them a single, indivisible complex, to be viewed in its entirety of dogmatic definition.\textsuperscript{12}

The counter argument of the Oriental Orthodox theologians was that without recognizing the four later councils, they could maintain the authentic Christological doctrine of the Church:

Theologians from the Oriental Orthodox Church feel, however, that the authentic Christological tradition has so far been held by them on the basis of the three Ecumenical Councils, supplemented by the liturgical and patristic tradition of the Church. It is our hope that further study will lead to the solution of this problem by the decision of our Churches.\textsuperscript{13}

How then, could the difficulty be surmounted? Surely only a diplomatic approach could solve the problem; and that is what happened, the two Orthodox families mutually recognized the authenticity of their mutual traditions:

Both families accept the first three Ecumenical Councils, which form our common heritage. In relation to the four later Councils of the Orthodox Church, the Orthodox state that for them the above points 1-7 are the teachings also of the four later Councils of the Orthodox Church, while the Oriental Orthodox con-

\textsuperscript{12} Agreed Statement, 1971, p. 5.
\textsuperscript{13} Ibid., p. 5.
sider this statement of the Orthodox as their interpretation. With this understanding, the Oriental Orthodox respond to it positively.\textsuperscript{14}

Special attention was given to the seventh ecumenical council (Second Council of Nicaea, September-October 787), since the Oriental Orthodox Churches too venerate icons. In the second part of point 8 of the Agreement we read as follows:

In relation to the teaching of the seventh ecumenical council of the Orthodox Church, the Oriental Orthodox agree that the theology and practice of the veneration of icons taught by that Council are in basic agreement with the teaching and practice of the Oriental Orthodox from ancient times, long before the convening of the Council, and that we have no disagreements in this regard.\textsuperscript{15}

In connection with the veneration of icons, the Armenian Apostolic Church has a special practice. She allows the use of icons in a limited number and manner, perhaps under the influence of Islamic powers which dominated Armenia for many centuries, or perhaps it is a question of taste. In two other domains, the Armenians have achieved marvelous results, namely in the miniatures of manuscripts and in cross carving on stone, or (xvačkar).

**The Question of Anathemas**

The question of anathemas was largely investigated and discussed at the meetings of unofficial consultations, especially in Bristol, Geneva, and Addis Ababa. In the conclusions of Geneva (1970) we read:

The reuniting of the two traditions which have their own separate continuity poses certain problems in relation to certain revered teachers of one family being condemned or anathematized by the other. It may not be necessary formally to lift these anathemas, nor for these teachers to be recognized as Saints by the condemning side. But the restoration of Communion obviously implies, among other things, that formal anathemas and condemnation of revered teachers of the other side should be discontinued, as in the case of Leo, Dioscorus, Severus, and others.\textsuperscript{16}

The meeting of Addis Ababa (1971) was mainly dedicated to the problem of anathemata. The communique of the Consultation sums up the conclusions as follows:

1. We agree that the lifting of the anathemas pronounced by one side against those regarded as saints and teachers by the other side seems to be an indispensable step on the way to unity of our two traditions.

\textsuperscript{14} *Second Agreed Statement*, 1990, point 8A.

\textsuperscript{15} *Ibid.*, point 8, paragraph b.

\textsuperscript{16} *Agreed Statement*, 1971, p. 5.
3. We agree further that once the anathemas against certain persons cease to be effective, there is no need to require their recognition as saints by those who previously anathematized them. Different autocephalous churches have differing liturgical calendars and lists of saints. There is no need to impose uniformity in this matter. The place of these persons in the future united church can be discussed and decided after the union.

4. Should there be a formal declaration or ceremony in which the anathemas are lifted? Many of us felt that it is much simpler gradually to drop these anathemas in a quiet way as some churches have already begun to do. Each church should choose the way most suited to its situation. The fact that these anathemas have been lifted can then be formally announced at the time of union.17

At the official meeting of Geneva in 1990 in the Orthodox Centre of Chambésy, the representatives of all Orthodox Churches agreed that the anathemata and condemnations on both sides against councils and fathers should be lifted:

Both families agree that all the anathemas and condemnations of the past which now divide us should be lifted by the Churches in order that the last obstacle to the full unity and communion of our two families can be removed by the grace and power of God. Both families agree that the lifting of anathemas and condemnations will be consummated on the basis that the Council and Fathers previously anathematized or condemned are not heretical.18

During the final official meeting at the beginning of November 1993, likewise in Chambésy, the participants after long discussions in plenary session, unanimously agreed upon the following proposals:

1. In the light of our Agreed Statement on Christology at St. Bishoy Monastery 1989 and of our Second Agreed Statement at Chambésy 1990, the representatives of both Church families agree that the lifting of anathemas and condemnations of the past can be consummated on the basis of their common acknowledgment of the fact that the Councils and Fathers previously anathematized or condemned are orthodox in their teachings. In the light of our four unofficial consultations (1964, 1967, 1970, 1971) and our three official meetings which followed on (1985, 1989, 1990), we have understood that both families have loyally maintained the authentic orthodox Christological doctrine, and the unbroken continuity of the Apostolic Tradition, though they may have used Christological terms in different ways.

2. The lifting of the anathemas should be unanimously and simultaneously by the Heads of all the Churches of both sides, through the signing of an appropriate ecclesiastical Act, the content of which will include acknowledgment from each side that the other one is orthodox in all respects.19

17 Ibid., p. 211.
19 "Communiqué, 1993."
Further Steps

As mentioned above, at the official meetings of the Dialogue the most important questions were duly discussed and solved in the form of Agreed Statements. Practical steps, however, should be taken so that the efforts may bear fruit and in a short period of time the desired reunion of the separated Orthodox Churches may become a reality. Here, I sum up the main essential measures for the restoration of full communion among the two branches of the Orthodox Churches.

1. Endorsement of the Agreements. The first step towards reunion would be the endorsement of the Agreed Statements of the official meetings—Geneva 1985, Anba Bishoy 1989, and Geneva 1990 and 1993. I presume the heads of all Orthodox Churches should endorse these Agreements within the framework of their holy synods in order to offer an official character to the undertaking.

2. Unity in Diversity. The holy synods of the respective churches should agree on the principle of plurality. Only the acceptance of such a norm can lead the churches into a sound and definitive unity. I personally plead for the widest possible diversity not only in languages, rites, customs, and canonical or disciplinary norms, but also in theological and doctrinal interpretations and traditions. The agreements on Christology and ecumenical councils as well as on removing of anathemas should form the foundation of this unity. For all Oriental Orthodox Churches, but especially for the Armenian Apostolic Church, it is extremely important to preserve jurisdictional self-government and independence. This independence is a guarantee for the maintenance of the national identity of the respective churches.

3. Lifting of anathemata. The removal of anathemata from liturgical or ritual texts is the first practical step which will open and level the way for further measures. After lifting the anathemas no past condemnation, synodical or personal, against each other is applicable anymore.²⁰

4. Clarification of misunderstandings. One of the main tasks of theologians who believe and are engaged in ecumenical dialogue should be to shed light on false information and misunderstandings which have emerged from conflicts and controversies in past history. Let me cite some of the items concerning which the Byzantine Church repeatedly blamed the Armenian Church in the Middle Ages: the expression “who wast crucified for us” in the Trisagion, the use of the unmixed chalice and unleavened bread, the dates of the conception of Elisabeth (October 9), of the Annunciation of Mary (April 7) and of Nativity and Epiphany (January 6), and the last, but not the least, the fast of anjawork, ten weeks before Easter.²¹ Perhaps such secondary controversial points exist among other Churches; it is the obligation of theologians to clear away misunderstandings and differences.

5. Catalogue of diptychs. In November of 1993, at the final meeting in Geneva, it was recommended to set up a catalogue of diptychs of the heads of the churches to be

²⁰ Ibid.
²¹ Those who are interested in these questions can consult KRIKORIAN, 1987.
used in liturgy. No doubt it is important to attain agreement on this and other liturgical and pastoral questions.

I hope that I was able at least partially to fulfill your expectations and provide you some information and interpretations concerning the Dialogue between the Eastern Orthodox Church and the Oriental Orthodox Churches and this for the improvement of unity of the churches and for the glory of our triune God.

22 *Communiqué*, 1993, Point 3B.
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CYRIL OF ALEXANDRIA

KRIKORIAN, M.

Wort und Wahrheit
A NON-CHALCEDONIAN RESPONSE: ON THE INITIATIVES OF UNITY

Tadros Malaty

I feel happy that after participating in the Joint Commission of the Theological Dialogue between the Orthodox Church and the Oriental Orthodox Churches and in the Theological Sub-Committee, I now have the honor to share in discussing the practical steps towards the unity of the two Orthodox families. Sincerely, it feels difficult to say two families, for we are one family, and have the same faith.

Unity and the Coptic Orthodox Church

After the non-official and official conferences between the two Orthodox families, unity between them almost became a reality. There is now no theological problem concerning Christology.

The problem of unity in Egypt is not of the same magnitude as other areas, for the following reasons:

1. The Copts sincerely adopt the words of St. Athanasius and believe that when there is one thought, words and theological terms must not separate us.

2. The Copts, after being isolated because of the Arab conquest in the seventh century, now long for the unity of the Church on the basis of oneness of faith and love. Therefore, with the exception of the synaxarium which mentions historical realities, there are no instances of any attacks against any Church. Our liturgies strongly reveal the desire for unity.

3. Another factor that helps the Coptic Church take practical steps towards this unity is the situation of the Orthodox Church in Egypt. The members of the Eastern (Chalcedonian) Orthodox Church in Egypt are less than 5,000 persons. The majority are in other countries like South Africa. Therefore, there is no competition among us, but sincere love.

4. There is a personal relationship between H.H. Pope Shenouda III, and H.H. Patriarch Parthenios as well as between H.H. Pope Shenouda III and the present Antiochian leaders in Lebanon and Syria.

The visits between H.H. Pope Shenouda III and the leaders of the Orthodox Churches have increased over the past years. In the presence of H.H. Patriarch Parthenios, the Coptic deacons sang the same hymns that are sung for the Coptic Patriarch, mentioning both names together.

5. In Egypt, there is a mutual problem concerning mixed marriage. All of the Orthodox churches in Egypt stress the need that one of the couple be admitted to the other’s church, even if the two are attributed to one family (Eastern or Oriental), otherwise the marriage would be subjected to Islamic law, and the husband would be able to divorce his wife by uttering the word of divorce.

I will now give some examples of the practical steps taken towards unity.
Educational Affairs

1. At least every month, H.H. Pope Shenouda III himself publishes the good news about our unity in El-Keraza, the official church magazine, where the sincere desire for unity in the near future is expressed. More than 20,000 copies of the magazine are distributed among the Copts in Egypt and overseas. I think the Coptic mentality is very well prepared for this unity.

Other Coptic magazines published in Egypt and overseas have the same attitude and are spreading the good news, even the local ones and those produced by Sunday Schools.

2. Arabic Chalcedonian books and publications are widespread in Egypt among the Copts, especially among the priests and Sunday School teachers, perhaps more than among the Antiochians themselves. Personally, I pursue many references, especially those produced by St. Vladimir's Seminary.

3. In Egypt, there is a movement to translate many stories of Chalcedonian saints and martyrs in Arabic for all levels, even for children.

4. The Coptic Church sends scholars to the Universities of Athens and Thessalonica each year. For the first time some Coptic leaders have participated in the discussion and evaluation of doctorate research work in Greece.

5. In Athens, we have some deacons who have had their Coptic hymns revised as they have a Greek origin.

Pastoral Affairs

1. From 1970 to 1972 while I was serving our communities on the West Coast and the Southern United States, the Greek Churches opened their hearts and buildings before us. For example, I used to celebrate a Coptic liturgy once a month in San Francisco. The Antiochian priest was serving us and taking care of all of our spiritual needs.

2. At the beginning of the movement of Coptic immigration to North America, the first conference of the Coptic priests and deacons was held in a Russian monastery (The Holy Trinity). At that time we had only four priests, two from Canada and two from the United States.

3. In Athens the Holy Synod offered a Greek church to the Copts to use until a church could be built.

4. At a Coptic Orthodox wedding held in St. Nicholas' Greek Orthodox Church in Cincinnati, Ohio, the pastor Fr. John Mitsos invited the Coptic Orthodox Bishop, Anba Wissa of El-Balyana, Egypt, to sit on the Episcopal throne. Fr. Mitsos insisted, saying that Bishop Wissa was his bishop also.

5. At a Coptic Orthodox baptism in the same church, the Greek priest and the Coptic priest joined together to celebrate the Sacrament of Baptism. (The father of the girl was Greek and the mother was a Copt). The priests shared in the prayers according to the Coptic Rite of Baptism. Both the priests held the child and said aloud, "We baptize...in the name of the Father..."
6. There is also a warm friendship between St. Mark's Coptic Orthodox Church of Cleveland, and the monks and abbot of St. Gregory Palamas' Greek Orthodox Monastery (Hayesville, Ohio), His Grace Bishop Maximos of Pittsburgh.

On March 26, 1994, a priest of the Coptic Church, Fr. Mikhail E. Mikhail and over 60 members of his congregation attended the feast day of St. Gregory Palamas at the Monastery. Following the Divine Liturgy and the reception, Fr. Mikhail presented His Grace Bishop Maximos with relics of the holy martyrs of Afayoum, Egypt. His Grace Bishop Maximos presented Fr. Mikhail with a portion of the monastery's relics of St. Athanasius the Apostolic, Patriarch of Alexandria, and the Great Martyr St. Menas. Both Egyptian Saints are venerated by both sides. All in attendance felt the atmosphere of mutual love and looked forward to full unity between the families of Orthodoxy.

In November of 1994 over 100 members of St. Mark's Coptic Orthodox Church in Cleveland, Ohio spent a day of retreat at St. Gregory Palamas' Greek Orthodox Monastery. The monks celebrated a liturgy earlier that morning on a table serving as an altar, saving the main altar for the Coptic group. This sign of love and brotherhood was deeply appreciated by Fr. Mikhail and the Coptic Congregation.

The Greek monks participated in the Liturgy of the Word, and Fr. Nicholas, the priest of the monastery, read the Holy Gospel. Fr. Mikhail mentioned the name of H.G. Bishop Maximos in the Prayer for the Fathers after the name of H.H. Pope Shenouda III. The Liturgy was a beautiful celebration, which all hoped would one day be shared by both families of Orthodoxy.

The October/November 1994 issue of El-Keraza magazine reports:

The recent journey of H.H. Pope Shenouda III to Europe and America was a tour of pastoral care, visitation, and teaching. It was also a journey for ecumenical work and Christian unity, in which His Holiness established a relationship of love with the Romanian Orthodox Church, having been received and gladly welcomed by her patriarch, metropolitans, priests, monks, and nuns; for the first time the name of the Patriarch of Alexandria was mentioned in their liturgies and hymns. The visit of His Holiness to Romania took place on October 13, 1994.

Last November, it was decided that some theologians from the two families sit together to write a book in the Greek language to answer questions concerning Christology, lift the anathemas, and underline the importance of the dialogue about unity.

Finally, due to mutual love, respect, and sanctity, the Greeks in Egypt refuse to deliver their church buildings which have no congregation, except to the Coptic Orthodox, who are in need of them, as they consider them to be one family in Christ.

A Fellowship of Orthodox Churches

Fr. Marcos Guirguis stated that there is a Rhode Island Fellowship of Orthodox Churches which includes all the Orthodox Churches in Rhode Island, among them are Copts and Armenians, as well as Antiochians, Russians, Romanians, Ukrainians, and Greeks.
Among the activities of this organization are the following:

1. There are two enrichment programs presented during Great Lent and in the fall. Every course is covered in five weeks. Every week, the people from all the Orthodox Churches gather together to hear guest speakers or some priests. They deal with spiritual, sacramental, or marital (interfaith marriage) topics, besides those of the unity of Orthodox Churches. An agape feast follows the speech.

2. On the first Thursday of every month eight priests from the Orthodox Churches gather in one of the homes to share an agape feast and a study.

3. There is a special weekly broadcasted program for the Orthodox congregation of this state.

4. The Orthodox Churches who are members of the National Council of Rhode Island work together. As an example, they succeeded in protesting against issuing a document from the council which accepts a homosexual lifestyle.

5. They are concerned with family affairs and strongly oppose any trends that might divide the oneness of the church.

6. The Orthodox Churches collect donations for promoting Orthodoxy, such as helping Orthodox seminaries and broadcasts.
THE STATUS OF INTER-ORTHODOX COMMUNION IN THE ARMENIAN CHURCH IN LIGHT OF THE JOINT COMMUNIQUÉS

Arshen Aivazian

In one of his classes here at St. Vladimir’s Seminary in the early 1970’s, when the theological discourse between the Oriental and Eastern Orthodox Churches was in its beginning stages, the late Fr. Alexander Schmemann made a prediction that we are going to see, in our lifetime, the establishment of full communion between the Chalcedonian and Non-Chalcedonian Orthodox confessions. More than twenty years have passed and we are still not in full communion despite the fact that the most fundamental obstacles that caused the division in the first place, i.e. the theological content and substance of the Christological doctrines of both positions, have been resolved. The communiqué of the Joint Commission of the Theological Dialogue between the Orthodox Church and the Oriental Orthodox Churches,1 following the meeting of June 20-24, 1989, at the Anba Bishoi Monastery in Egypt, testifies that Fr. Schmemann’s prophesy has been fulfilled at least partially, yet full unity still seems to evade us. One might wonder, as I often do, as to what obstacles still remain in the path to full communion. In a commentary,2 the late Fr. John Meyendorff offers some observations on the very causes that are preventing the achievement of full communion. He identifies and discusses the “reasons of human, political, and institutional nature” that are preventing the achievement of full communion. Today, I would like to offer my thoughts on the reasons that are obstructing our path to full eucharistic communion.

Fr. Meyendorff identifies “ignorance (beyond the circle of informed theologians)” and “institutional passivity” among the obstacles to full communion. Speaking only from my perspective as an Armenian priest, the truthfulness of this is confirmed in the fact that to my knowledge nowhere in the Armenian ecclesiastical or secular press was the communiqué published. No commentaries or explanations were offered to the general public in an effort to inform and educate. It is sad indeed to note that even a great number of clergy are totally unaware of the dialogue between the two families of Orthodox Churches and the subsequent agreement on the theological issues that have separated us since the fifth century. What is sad in this reality is not so much the fact that the average person in our churches is ignorant of theology and church history, but the fact that the hierarchy of the church, consciously or unconsciously, perpetuates the existing ignorance. It seems that an enlightened and educated church population is perceived by the hierarchy as a threat to “established traditions”. This might explain why, at least in the Armenian Church, both the dialogue and the communiqué have been treated as good ecclesial pub-

1 Joint Commission, 1990.
2 MEYENDORFF, 1989.
lic relations but of no real impact on the life of the Church. I believe that this is probably one of the primary reasons why the various Orthodox hierarchies remain passive and feel no urgency to act upon the recommendation of the joint commission. Obviously there are other political realities that may contribute to the present inaction, but these are temporary in nature and even in our present circumstances are not insurmountable.

In the Orthodox societies of the Middle East fear and suspicion prevails in inter-Orthodox relations. There are historical reasons to explain the fear of “ethnic domination” of one Orthodox society over the other. At various times in the last few years we have heard rumors that heads of some Oriental and Eastern Orthodox Churches have discussed the possibility of entering into full communion without waiting for an official simultaneous reaction because of the prevailing fear and suspicion. The question that arises in this situation is whether having overcome the theological differences that have kept us separate for centuries we can now overcome the human fear and suspicion that has dominated our relationships for all these centuries.

Ironically, the very benefits of full communion to the cause of Orthodox witness in the world in general, and in the United States in particular, are perceived by the hierarchy as detrimentally damaging to the mission of the so-called “national” churches. Various Orthodox jurisdictions in the Western World, and especially in North America, have redefined their mission if not totally then at least partially to be the cause of ethnic survival. The Church has been “converted” into a vehicle to provide ethnic identity to those who walk through its doors. And, wherever that is indeed the case, survival of ethnicity rather than saving the soul has become the mission of the Church. I believe this is the case to a greater or lesser extent in many Orthodox jurisdictions. This sad reality is the root cause, I believe, why there is so little inter-church activity within Orthodox churches in the United States despite involvement in “ecumenical affairs”. Very often we see little threat in cultivating an ecumenical relationship with a local Roman Catholic jurisdiction or a Protestant congregation, but entering into a serious relationship with another Orthodox jurisdiction is very often treated as “anathema”. This is the case not only between Orthodox jurisdictions that are still not in full communion, but also between those that are in full communion. Other than formal and official, and I must say public relations motivated, contact between the local bishops or the patriarchs, there is little contact between local parishes of the non-Chalcedonian Orthodox Churches. As in the case of the Armenian and Syrian Orthodox Churches, very often the cause of this is ethnic rivalry. There are also cultural “estrangement” and geographic distances that keep us separate. The result of all this is that many Orthodox Churches are “strangers” to each other and at some point we have to start creating opportunities to get to know each other better if we are serious about entering into full communion and becoming once again “one church” and “one communion”.

Here in the United States we are in a most unique situation. We have opportunities that may not be present in other parts of the world. Many Orthodox parishes are neighbors and our people in this country have the common ground of the American civil heritage. The possibilities are great to start cultivating relations with a view of the future of Orthodoxy in America. Once again, however, the unfortunate reality is that concerns of ethnic survival have overtaken the concern of the survival and witness of Orthodoxy in
America. I am afraid this situation will not change unless all Orthodox Churches embark on a journey to rediscover their common heritage in the faith and their common calling to bear witness to that faith. As tumultuous as our common history was in the fifth century that separated us, at least our fathers then, despite all their theological differences affirmed their common faith in the "one, holy, catholic, and apostolic church". At least in theory that remains unchanged. But, if in the fifth century the christological disputes posed a threat to the integrity of Orthodox Christological dogma, in our times the threat is to the integrity of Orthodox Ecclesiology. The "oneness" is neither seen nor lived in the unity of faith but rather in the unity of ethnic identity. The joint commission and the communiqué have answered positively the question whether we can resolve the first and greatest theological dispute. The question that remains to be answered is whether we can overcome the human limitations that we have created and, instead of defining the mission of the church in terms of ethnic survival venture once again into our own common heritage of faith and rediscover the true nature of the Church.
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MEYENDORFF, J.
RESTORING UNITY AMONG THE ORTHODOX CHURCHES

Nicholas Apostola

Worcester is a unique place in America. It is where the Orthodox/Roman Catholic dialogue started. It has the longest standing Eastern Orthodox cooperation in America, and is probably the place where it works best.

The Eastern Orthodox just finished the building of a nursing home, and one of the concerns was how we would draw in the Oriental Orthodox, primarily the Armenians who have a large population there. It was to involve them in a more intrinsic way. I would raise this as an issue which we need to discuss today. The Eastern Orthodox Council has discussed over the years, in a variety of different ways, formally incorporating the Oriental Orthodox within the structure of the council. This is the problem. The Eastern Orthodox council is set up as a quasi-liturgical ecclesiastical institution, and they are not in communion. So part of the requirement is that everyone who is a member of the council be in communion. We wanted to bring the Oriental Orthodox into this structure, but then we would violate the first principle of the organization. And we wait anxiously for the communion question to be settled in order to expand this. Part of the way, to begin is to work together–by the way the IOCC already has as its members Oriental Orthodox–on issues of charity and other sorts of things that do not require liturgical communion as a premise, and begin to work together in that way. The disadvantage that we have as Orthodox, and this is in the larger sense in America, is that we are by and large isolated from one another, so that what takes place in Worcester among the Orthodox churches is regrettably unique or not replicated in as many places as could happen. And so even among the Eastern Orthodox as well as Oriental Orthodox, those that are separated either ethnically or historically for whichever reasons, do not commune one with another. don’t interact one with another. And the pluralism of American society, tends to encourage the division, so that we tend to remain segregated unless there is a larger institutional pressure of sorts to encourage cooperation. So there has to be some pressure from the top. I don’t think it should be entirely from the top, but permission is needed from the top to begin to allow things to occur on the local level.

I think in terms of an existential crisis, and this is the merging of theology and practice, that unless (now that we have had theological dialogue and agreement for 30 years) we have effective restoration, our theology is called into question. It isn’t simply letting this go by, because those sorts of things infect us.

One of the problems that we [Eastern Orthodox] are facing in America in terms of the continued fragmentation of Orthodoxy in America, is that unless that question is resolved in some way so that we begin to act more like one church rather than ethnic ghettos or parallel jurisdictions, then–and this comes not internally but externally–people, Roman Catholics, Protestants, and just secular people, begin to look at us and say, “Well excuse me. You say this, well then how are you divided in so many different ways?”; “The Greeks are a separate church from the Romanians, the Albanians and the Russians.”
And you respond, “No, we are all one church.” As you begin to try to explain the thenate, and the hypocrisy of the situation begins to come home, it infects then the fabric, so that once you understand it you never go back to thinking the way you were before. The same is true with us in terms of the Oriental and Eastern Orthodox, that the dialogue that ended in 1967 has been sitting there, I would even say as a cancer infecting the relationships between us. Some say it has been a positive thing, some say its been a negative thing, the reason being that once you come to the agreement, and then you do not act on it—it is the way sin acts, you begin sinning and the sin eats away at you internally. And there is a sin here against what we believe and our faith in Jesus Christ.

There are many positive things which we should emphasize, but I think that really we are at a crisis in terms of our relationship. I think that of all places in the world if we restore communion, the place that it will be felt perhaps most is in America, because here we will have to do something to bring everybody together. And when I say "if" it is because I think there is at least a 50/50 chance that we will miss this opportunity. Here we will have to put to the test what it means to express one faith, to live one life, to be one church. The unity of the church is not an incidental thing.

When we look historically, as we should look historically, to the undivided church, we also have to remember that by and large most of these people have never had daily interaction. While different liturgical traditions and different spiritual traditions could co-exist, they never interacted. So, practically speaking, it didn’t have the type of depth that is required of us today. More than that, people’s expectation is for a deeper or a different level of interaction in the community. The factors of modern society that have speeded up communication one with another, so that we experience one another much more closely, much more frequently than ever thought possible, and also our own heightened expectation of what it means to be one, will place different sorts of demands on us. I think that is good, because I think we take too lightly the admonitions in the Gospel that we be one, that we live together and love one another in a very particular way. We should take those things seriously. We should also understand, however, that it will be much more difficult to restore the unity of the church today than it was to do so at some historical point in time.
ECUMENICAL PERSPECTIVES
WITH REGARD TO THE DISCUSSION OF UNITY
WITHIN OUR ORTHODOX FAMILY OF CHURCHES

Milton Efthimiou

I am going to try and limit my remarks to some of the homework I did for today, as well as learning from a lot of the material of the speakers who in a very intriguing way spoke to us today. I am very happy to see here Abp. Krikorian, because I am going to his country for a conference where he will also be.

First of all, I want to congratulate you for putting together this symposium. It is something which has been long overdue. Nowadays we are talking about things that we didn’t dare to talk about or touch upon a few years ago; and we are living in exciting times because we are doing these things today.

From what we heard today from these very fine speakers, canon law experts, theologians, experts, we see that one thing is common to everybody—that is, we all, now that we are speaking out about these things, are trying to find procedures for the restoration of full communion between our two churches, the Oriental and Eastern Orthodox. That at least we have in common, even if we disagree on everything else. Of course, and this is part of the exciting times in which we live, we have to get our own house in order, and we had better do it fast. Preparing for today gave me an opportunity to do my homework. I went back to the documents, things that have gone on in the past, and I went back to 1964, August 11-15 in Denmark. To my knowledge, that was the first official modern-day conversation. The most remarkable thing that happened at the first gathering is agreement on the faith itself concerning the person of our Lord and Savior. In 1964, great personages such as Fr. Meyendorff who spoke on “Chalcedonians and Monophysites after Chalcedon,” Fr. John Romanides who spoke on the one physis and the hypostasis issue, and the then Archbishop Karekin Sarkissian who spoke on the doctrine of Christ in the Armenian Church. All of these respected leaders did one thing which set the pace for everybody else—they found that no difficulties exist on the key issues of Christology, as found in the writings of St. Cyril of Alexandria. Yet even those theologians at the conference had difficulties with some of the things we heard today, the tome of Leo, for example, in the Council of Chalcedon, where non-Chalcedonian theologians and Orthodox Chalcedonians were pitted against each other in light of St. Cyril, in light of the third council of 431, and in the light of the fifth council in 553. Even in light of those difficulties, each side was satisfied with the Orthodoxy of their counterparts, especially on Christological doctrine.

Now, why am I going back to 1964, and not concentrating on the more recent full commissions? Because I think that in the United States, we need not concentrate mainly on the issues presented at that first conference and subsequent conferences, and elaborated upon in so many other dialogues pretty much as we are doing here today. They already
took care of this in their historic statements; if you read those statements carefully, there is no doctrinal issue dividing the Eastern Orthodox and Oriental Orthodox churches. We need, on these shores at least, as our speakers suggested today so many times, to discuss the manner in which the reconciliation will be manifested in the actual organization of the church—where we are not only Greeks, or Russians, or Antiochians, or Romanians, etc. Probably for the first time in history, we are many jurisdictions in one given area, which includes Armenians, Copts, Ethiopians, etc. This has never really happened before.

I must admit to you that the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of North and South America has been guilty in not really doing much in this area. Fr. Tadros mentioned the Cincinnati incident—I was in a neighboring town at the time, and was asked to look into that situation, the Greek priest concelebrating with a Coptic priest in a baptism. And it was frowned upon at that time. Times have changed since then, of course. That is why I say we live in exciting times. But somebody touched on the thing that bothers me (I think Fr. Nicholas), that although our relationships have been very cordial, especially among Protestants and the NCCC with thirty-two Orthodox/Protestant denominations, and Roman Catholics, with our Orthodox-Catholic dialogues, in which we are very cordial. Yet we have not been very pastorally sensitive to our sister Oriental Orthodox churches. It is a statement that we painfully have to confess one to another. A prerequisite, in my view, to any discussion whatsoever, for example, is lifting the anathemas that we heard today in the light of the affirmation of a common faith expressed so adequately in the joint commissions and, equally important, in the brilliant essay, one of the finest I have ever read, of Metropolitan John Zizioulas in 1971, entitled “Ecclesiastical Issues Inherent in the Relations between Eastern Chalcedonians and Oriental non-Chalcedonians.”

What I suggest here is that we must leave the question of anathemas, the Oriental Orthodox anathemas upon those who accepted Chalcedon and Leo of Rome, for example, to the Chambéry theologians and their statements, past and future. And perhaps, by economy, devise a process recognizing the distinctive liturgical customs. Fr. Pulcini mentioned this very adequately this morning. He gave us some very good guidelines which made a lot of sense—the iconographic traditions, the various ecclesial traditions along with their invariable and historical background—and to use these as a symbol of unity, forgetting the anathemas. You and I, on this side of the Atlantic, need to be looking at other things as symbols of unity. Perhaps, if I read history correctly as a prologue to doctrine of accord between both churches, looking at our traditions we have in our history; that comes first.

These are prologues to doctrine, of course, for both our churches. Why can we not have in the United States a symbolic process of reconciliation prior to theological accord, which is what I think Fr. Pulcini was suggesting. Why not? That was the entire philosophy of the Patriarch of blessed memory Athenagoras when he met with the six others. That was his whole philosophy on the many times that I met with him: a reconciliation prior to theological accord, which is inevitable if not in our generation certainly in the next with an Orthodox Church and an Oriental Orthodox Church in the same given area simply manifesting full communion through liturgical concelebration and sharing in the eucharistic table. Why not? Does this mean that I am suggesting a lack of faith, or am not optimistic in the outcome of the work of the Joint Commission for the theological dia-
logue to the two churches? The answer, frankly, is partly yes and partly no. But I, your children, my children, your grandchildren, and my grandchildren don’t have time to waste, or to wait.

What I am not suggesting is indifference to doctrine and to dogma. Those of you who know me and have worked with me on the Orthodox dialogues know that on the basis of doctrine and ecclesiology I initiated, on behalf of SCOBA and its chairman, a suspension in the Orthodox/Anglican dialogue, and in one of our three Orthodox/Roman Catholic dialogues. I will not go into the reasons for this at this time, but what I am suggesting is to follow a strategy, for lack of a better word, of the Orthodox concerns that we have at the annual Board of Governors meeting at the NCCC, where both Eastern Orthodox and Oriental Orthodox delegates sit and act together, in our respective delegations, and present a united voice based on and expressive of a common understanding of the apostolic faith. We do this together, we don’t wait for an agreement in Orthodox theology. We somehow, perhaps by virtue of workings of the Holy Spirit, sit together and act together as one voice. What I heard today is very encouraging. It is reflective, really, of what happened in 1964—a crying out to do something, especially for our young generation and the generations to come. What I heard is that we will not become complacent. We are not going to wait for some Pan-Orthodox Great Council which may or may not happen soon, and we will not acclimate ourselves to an imposed schism. We are ready, willing, and able to pray together and to deliberate together as we recognize the tragic consequence of Christian division—beginning with our own house, beginning with our own Orthodox family—and recognize that this division is an inflictive wound to our witness to the world. It was mentioned about our Lord’s prayer to be one. If our Lord’s prayer that all may be one (John 17) is to be meaningful, it has to begin with us, in the here and in the now.

I suppose the question before us, as presented by our speakers, as Fr. Pulcini mentioned on a practical level, and Archbishop Mesrob gave us some things to really think about in summarizing for us the different goings on in the fourth and fifth centuries, as well as from those who oppose what I am suggesting, for example theologians in Greece, Mt. Athos, Serbia, and Russia, is whether a true Christian union is a dogmatic enosis or an enosis by economy. Does one exclude the other? There is a strong voice that insistence on purity of doctrine is wrong. Yet others argue we chose to submit to the Islamic Turkish yoke rather than compromise our faith by submission to the Pope. Many say that if we had compromised there would now be nothing much left of Orthodoxy as a witness to the apostolic faith which alone can unite Christendom.

What we say and do here today and tomorrow, and hopefully in future sessions, I hope will continue on these shores. Eastern Orthodoxy and Oriental Orthodoxy have a responsibility to be witness to the true faith regardless of the consequences, while demonstrating at the same time, especially to the young people, that reconciliation is paramount on our agenda, as you and I together witness to that faith.
RECONCILIATION AND THE HONORING OF MEMORY

Susan Ashbrook Harvey

I am honored to be here in such a distinguished gathering. I also, as so often in an Orthodox setting, feel myself somewhat of an outsider, not only as a lay person on a panel otherwise consisting of ordained, but also as a convert to Orthodoxy. I would like to raise two questions in my comments to you: one as a historian out of my academic study of this situation, and one as a parishioner. So in both, the position of being a scholar and the position of being a convert, I feel as an outsider. I do not have an ethnic background that ties me to this question, but the story that I always tell is that it was as a graduate student that my interest in this subject was kindled during my doctoral work, which specifically dealt with the separation of the Syrian Orthodox from the Chalcedonian church during the sixth century through the ordination of the separate hierarchy for the Syrian Orthodox. And I began that study as an academic problem. How did this happen? Why did this happen? It was a sort of tragedy, and it remains a tragedy, that I was attempting as an historian to understand. I would debate to myself the different sides of the Chalcedonian problem as it stood in the sixth century. A result of my trying to understand that situation as an historian was that I converted to Orthodoxy. The problem of my conversion was that I then had to understand into which Orthodox church I could come, especially because I was convinced, as an historian, that this is not a case of either/or but of both/and, which the Archbishop expressed so eloquently this morning in terms of the theological agreements that have been come to.

As an historian as I have looked at this problem and as I teach this problem, I am aware that the theological issues in question here are very real and remain real and that is why the question of the agreements in theological discussions continue to be so important in resolving the differences between the Orthodox traditions. At the same time, as a historian, I am very aware it was not only a theological problem that set this up. Prof. Erickson gave this morning a fine history of the complexity of the issues that went on. You know, in some respects, we in Syriac studies see the dialogue sponsored by the Emperor Justinian in the years 531 and 532 as the point at which a theological agreement was reached. On the other hand, those theological conversations sponsored by the Emperor Justinian took place under conditions of persecution. It is clear that it was political issues which prevented reaching an agreement.

I always remember being so moved by the letters of Severus in which he was so opposed to the ordination of the separate hierarchy because he knew, as did the other bishops, that once you had two hierarchies in place you had a very practical problem to resolve, regardless of whatever the theological discussions might come to. So as an historian I have always been aware that there are these different levels of problems to be dealt with. On the other hand, as I have been involved in ecumenical work, one thing that I have
observed is that there are different dynamics at work when we discuss theology and when we discuss history. When we discuss theology, we tend to be very polite, very cordial, and perfect in the best sense because we do care about theology. When it comes to the matter of history, a very different level of dynamic is at play. I was very struck to my heart one day when a Syrian Orthodox said to me, “You know the history of our people, you know what we have suffered, you know the blood we have shed, and you go to the Church of the Chalcedonians? You go to the church where they did this to us? How can you do that?” I do not go to the church that did this to these people, anymore than anyone here is responsible for anything that took place then.

It seems to me as an historian, and the question I would put forward is “How do we honor memory?” I think this is a big question to the Orthodox. It is because we honor memory that the divisions remain real and large between us. We remember who died, we remember the blood that has been shed, we remember what was suffered. A legacy is left, a triumphalism on both sides. I feel the same kind of pain when I read letters of the Orthodox church of how can we now be told that the people we have always anathematized as heretics are people with whom we are now in communion. I think it is important for us to be able to honor in our memories what it is that has been preserved. People died for a true faith, the true faith that we have in Orthodoxy. We honor that memory. We can also be enslaved to that memory, and we can use that memory to prevent us from coming together. I keep wishing that we could have some type of ritual in which we would remember and honor those who suffered, those who died, and honor the treasure which they died to bequeath to us, by moving forward into a different kind of future.

The irony I see as an historian is that people hang onto the divisions of the past as if to move forward into something else would somehow dishonor that. But nobody wants to return to that past, nobody wants to return to a time when people were killing each other over this. That is not what we want. As long as memory prevents us from moving towards unity, that division will remain. On the one hand, a number of speakers today have echoed a common sentiment among the Orthodox now which is a certain decrying of the ethnic issue in Orthodoxy, as that which divides Orthodox and keeps many converts outside. But there is another side to the ethnic issues, and that is that it is because of ethnic identity and memory within groups of people that Christianity has survived, that Orthodoxy has survived, in parts of the world and through histories that would otherwise have destroyed us. So in addition to not being enslaved to an ethnic set of differences, affirm it as that which has protected and preserved for us a true faith. So my historical question for you is, “How can we honor memory?”

On a personal level, as a parishioner and as a lay person the question before us today is “to whom does this matter?” I care about this reunion because this is also what I study. I remember seeing a pirated photocopy of faxes of the 1989 agreement and running into my classroom at Brown saying, “Look, before your very eyes history is changing!” Six years later most people still do not know that anything happened. The question to whom does it matter is a very real one, and for large parts of the Orthodox world it does not matter at all. For large parts of the Orthodox world there are not Oriental Orthodox and Eastern Orthodox in the same place. Syria, as Fr. Pulcini was talking about, is a place where it matters because every street corner has one of each, and, as a place
where Christianity is so threatened it is a place where it matters how Christians will come together. North America, in large areas, is a place where it does not matter because you do not have a mixture of these people, but in many places throughout America there are places where it does matter. I live in Rhode Island, and it is a place where we have eleven Orthodox churches of different jurisdictions, and in the Rhode Island Fellowship of Orthodox Churches, in addition to the Greeks, Russians, and Ukrainians, we have Armenians, Copts, and Syrian Orthodox. And, it is a great exemplar of how the Orthodox work together at the level of parish activity. We all give talks in each other's churches. We celebrate together. It is a happy family, with all of our differences. On the other hand, my parish, an Antiochian parish, is within a mile of a Maronite parish and a Syrian Orthodox parish. We have a clustered group of Arab and Syrian Christians together, different traditions, all intermarried, and at the parish level, the question of divisions remains very great. Oceans of tears are shed every time a baby is born, because into which parish will the child be baptized? Where can the child receive communion? Will the wife's or the husband's family win out in this particular battle? So the question of to whom does it matter—it matters to us, here, because we do live together; it is a place, therefore, where something can be done about it. For many Orthodox it will remain an academic question, but in North America we have the opportunity to do something about it. I think the stress today of the practical issues of what can be done is really a very important one. I hope that the people in this room will continue to work towards that and see what can be done at a practical level.

Everywhere I have gone, people have been affirmative about learning the riches of a tradition with which not everyone is familiar. With regard to this emphasis today on cross-fertilization, on learning one another's traditions, I feel very keenly that when Orthodox learn about one another's saints, read one another's theologians, and hear one another's mystics, there is always a sense of common treasure, in which the differences of memory somehow disappear. I hope that there will continue to be the kind of cooperation that we have seen here today, and which St. Nersess and St. Vladimir's certainly have done a great deal to engender.
ANTIOCH AND BYZANTIUM: APOSTOLIC WITNESSES TO CHRIST AND HIS CHURCH

John Meno

The mere fact that we have gathered together today from so many different traditions speaks to me volumes. There has been no hatred in this room, and I have not sensed a difference in faith. The thing that has always amazed me, and I am not, thank God, a professional theologian, is the fact that the faith has never changed. It has always been there. We are the ones who have changed.

The late Ecumenical Patriarch Athenagoras in a wonderful statement made a number of years ago said, and how true it is, "Will the blood of the martyrs of the early church, scream at the scandal of church disunity?" God did not divide the church. We did, and we did a real good job with it. It has been a wonderful experience to observe over the years how representatives of our church in real dedication and prayer have come together, both informally and formally, and have come rather quickly, I believe, to the understanding that the faith we share is one. That came, I think, relatively soon. But as has been mentioned today, and I especially want to underline what Dr. Susan Harvey said, there is a hurt today, and as Fr. Milton underlined, there is a real hurt today among our people, among the faithful. They feel deeply, more deeply I think than any of us realized, and sense the scandal of this division. And what appears seems, at times, to be indifference. We have spent an awful lot of time, unnecessarily so I believe, on the academic aspect. That is important. I do not want to minimize that. I do not want to minimize doctrine. But, one thing that has come out of our dialogue with the Roman Catholics is the fact that there is a real need out there among our faithful. Very often the answers to some of the questions, or at least the right directions to some of these answers, can come if we simply listen to our faithful. Sometimes I think they are closer to the truth than the clergy.

We have been very thankful to God in the Patriarchate of Antioch that brothers and sisters have come together. Things that people thought could never happen, are happening. But the interesting thing is that none of this has been really new. Our brothers and sisters in the Patriarchate of Antioch for many many centuries have witnessed together the oneness of God and the oneness of the faith. I think it was a very natural progression that this should happen. We have shared a common history, we have shared a common tradition, and most importantly, we have shared a common faith, from day one. A number of the points mentioned today are ones that we should consider very carefully: some of the obstacles that face us now, because I think the real crunch comes now. We have perhaps discussed, *ad nauseam*, the faith and what we share in common and what we understand, and what we believe concerning Christology and other aspects of the church.

The late Archbishop Tiran Nersoyan once told me, "We have practiced a sys-
tematic program of overkill on many of these issues.” So much so that when you read one article and you start to read others, they are basically saying the same thing. So then you have a situation, like the one of my parishioners who came to me and said, “Father, if this is all true, why in the world aren’t we together?” “What are you waiting for, divine intervention?”

This is going to be a very simplistic answer. Please forgive me, but maybe there is something profound about it as well. We have made the faith the expression of the faith. The faith has always been there. I think that in America, especially here in the United States, we have a wonderful opportunity that I hope and pray is not going to slip through our fingers. Fr. Milton mentioned the possibility that this could happen, and that is a reality for a variety of reasons. We could sit back from now to eternity, and nothing will be done. We can write wonderful articles, we can give marvelous addresses, and it will only serve theory. We will pat one another on the back. We will say, “Isn’t it nice that we are sitting together today?” And it will stop there, and we all know in our hearts that is not nearly enough.

I think that each one of us, and that is where the beauty of our tradition comes in, each of us comes from our own heritage and tradition witnessing to the oneness of the faith, and those traditions shouldn’t get in the way; they complement one another, they do not contradict one another. It is like a mosaic. If any of our traditions is missing, something is missing from the picture—the beautiful picture of the oneness of the faith, witnessed by our traditions and our fathers and our heritage over the years.

I think we have in this country opportunities that do not exist overseas in many areas. We have a wonderful experience of two years ago of bringing our youth from the cathedral to spend some time with youth from the Antiochian Archdiocese and the Antiochian village over in Pennsylvania. If you want to talk about faith in action, and the oneness of the faith, you saw it there, and it brought home to me the fact that we don’t pay enough attention to the faithful, to the people. You may be shocked to hear that we have been giving communion within the Patriarchate of Antioch to one another for an awfully long time. And, believe me, lightning didn’t come out of the sky and burn down any of our churches, nor was it a scandal—the scandal would have been to say no.

Thanks be to the mercy and the grace of God that the expressions are as beautiful as they are. I want to emphasize how important it is, as Fr. Theodore mentioned today, that one of the valuable areas that we really have to work hard at is to appreciate especially each other’s patristic heritages. I do not mean just in seminary, I mean getting it out to our people. Its been a beautiful experience going to these meetings. The opportunity of meeting with you, and for example in our dialogue with the Roman Catholics, has also brought us Oriental Orthodox closer together. There was so much about one another that we didn’t know. The tragedy is that we have churches next door to one another and we do not even visit one another. We lose so many opportunities in this country that it is incredible. I think the time has now come to start being what the Lord has called us to be: one. As I started the conversation with, and would like to end with, the faith has never changed. It is one faith. And I hope God will give us the wisdom to take the opportunities that our fathers have brought us to this point and not let them down. Again, I thank all of you for your patience in listening to me. God bless you.
APPENDIX

JOINT COMMISSION OF THE THEOLOGICAL DIALOGUE BETWEEN THE ORTHODOX CHURCH AND THE ORIENTAL ORTHODOX CHURCHES

ANBA BISHOY MONASTERY, EGYPT, JUNE 20-24, 1989

AGREED STATEMENT

We have inherited from our fathers in Christ the one Apostolic faith and tradition, though as churches we have been separated from each other for centuries. As two families of Orthodox Churches long out of communion with each other we now pray and trust in God to restore that communion on the basis of the common Apostolic faith of the undivided Church of the first centuries which we confess in our common Creed. What follows is a simple reverent statement of what we do believe, on our way to restore communion between our two families of Orthodox Churches.

Throughout our discussions we have found our common ground in the formula of our common Father, Saint Cyril of Alexandria: mia physis (hypostasis) tou Theou Logou sesarkomene, and in his dictum that “it is sufficient for the confession of our true and irreproachable faith to say and to confess that the Holy Virgin is Theotokos” [Hom 15, cf. Ep. 39].

Great indeed is the wonderful mystery of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, One True God, one ousia in three hypostases or three prosopa. Blessed be the Name of the Lord our God, forever and ever.

Great indeed is also the ineffable mystery of the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ, for us and for our salvation.

The Logos, eternally consubstantial with the Father and the Holy Spirit in his Divinity, has in these last days become incarnate of the Holy Spirit and Blessed Virgin Mary Theotokos, and thus became man, consubstantial with us in his humanity but without sin. He is true God and true Man at the same time, perfect in his Divinity, perfect in his humanity. Because the One she bore in her womb was at the same time fully God as well as fully human, we call the Blessed Virgin Theotokos.

When we speak of the one composite (synthetes) hypostasis of our Lord Jesus Christ, we do not say that in Him a divine hypostasis and a human hypostasis came together. It is that the one eternal hypostasis of the Second Person of the Trinity has assumed our created human nature, in that act uniting it with his own uncreated divine nature, to form an inseparably and unconfusedly united real divine-human being, the natures being
distinguished from each other in contemplation (theoria) only.

The hypostasis of the Logos before the Incarnation, even with His divine nature, is of course not composite. The same hypostasis, as distinct from nature, of the Incarnate Logos, is not composite either. The unique theandric person (prosopon) of Jesus Christ is one eternal hypostasis who has assumed human nature by the Incarnation. So we call that hypostasis composite, on account of the natures which are united to form one composite unity. It is not the case that our Fathers used physis and hypostasis always interchangeably and confused the one with the other. The term hypostasis can be used to denote both the person as distinct from nature, and also the person with the nature, for a hypostasis never in fact exists without a nature.

It is the same hypostasis of the Second Person of the Trinity, eternally begotten from the Father who in these last days became a human being and was born of the Blessed Virgin. This is the mystery of the hypostatic union we confess in humble adoration—the real union of the divine with the human with all the properties and functions of the uncreated divine nature, including natural will and natural energy, inseparably and unconfusedly united with the created human nature with all its properties and functions, including natural will and natural energy. It is the Logos Incarnate who is the subject of all the willing and acting of Jesus Christ.

We agree in condemning the Nestorian and the Eutychian heresies. We neither separate nor divide the human nature in Christ from His divine nature, nor do we think that the former was absorbed in the latter and thus ceased to exist.

The four adverbs used to qualify the mystery of the hypostatic union belong to our common tradition—without commingling or confusion (asynkhytос), without change (atreptos), without separation (akhoristos), and without division (adiairetос). Those among us who speak of two natures in Christ do not thereby deny their inseparable, indivisible union; those among us who speak of one united divine-human nature in Christ do not thereby deny the continuing dynamic presence in Christ of the divine and the human, without change, without confusion.

Our mutual agreement is not limited to Christology, but encompasses the whole faith of the one undivided Church of the early centuries. We are agreed also in our understanding of the Person and Work of God the Holy Spirit, who proceeds from the Father alone, and is always adored with the Father and the Son.
The Joint Commission of the Theological Dialogue between the Orthodox Church and the Oriental Orthodox Churches, at its meeting at the Orthodox Centre of the Ecumenical Patriarchate, in Chambéry, Geneva from September 23 to 28, 1990, received a report from its Joint Pastoral Sub-committee which had met at the Anba Bishoy Monastery in Egypt from 31st January to 4th February 1990. The report was the starting point for an extended discussion of four types of pastoral issues:

I. Relations among our two families of Churches, and our preparation for unity.

II. Relations of our Churches with other Christian Churches and our common participation in the Ecumenical Movement.

III. Our common service to the world of suffering, need, injustice, and conflicts.

IV. Our cooperation in the propagation of our common faith and tradition.

I. Relations among our two families of Churches

1. We feel as a Joint Theological Commission that a period of intense preparation of our people to participate in the implementation of our recommendations and in the restoration of communion of our Churches is needed. To this end we propose the following practical procedure.

2. It is important to plan an exchange of visits by our heads of Churches and prelates, priests and lay people of each one of our two families of Churches to the other.

3. It is important to give further encouragement to exchange of theological professors and students among theological institutions of two families for periods varying from one week to several years.

4. In localities where Churches of the two families co-exist, the congregations should organize participation of one group of people—men, women, youth, and children, including priests, where possible from one congregation of one family to a congregation
of the other to attend in the latter’s eucharistic worship on Sundays and feast days.

5. Publications
   (a) We need to publish, in the various languages of our Churches, the key documents of this Joint Commission with explanatory notes, in small pamphlets to be sold at a reasonable price in all congregations.
   (b) It will be useful also to have brief pamphlets explaining in simple terms the meaning of the Christological terminology and interpreting the variety of terminology taken by various persons and groups in the course of history in the light of our agreed statement on Christology.
   (c) We need a book which gives some brief account, both historical and descriptive, of all the Churches of our two families. This should also be produced in the various languages of our peoples, with pictures and photographs as much as possible.
   (d) We need to promote brief books of Church History by specialist authors giving a more positive understanding of the divergencies of the fifth, sixth, and seventh centuries.

6. Churches of both families should agree that they will not rebaptize members of each other, for recognition of the baptism of the Churches of our two families, if they have not already done so.

7. Churches should initiate bilateral negotiations for facilitating each other in using each other’s church premises in special cases where any of them is deprived of such means.

8. Where conflicts arise between Churches of our two families, e.g. (a) marriages consecrated in one Church being annulled by a bishop of another Church; (b) marriages between members of our two families, being celebrated in one church over against the other; (c) or children from such marriages being forced to join the one church against the other, the Churches involved should come to bilateral agreements on the procedure to be adopted until such problems are finally solved by our union.

9. The Churches of both families should be encouraged to look into the theological curriculum and books used in their institutions and make necessary additions and changes in them with the view to promoting better understanding of the other family of Churches. They may also profitably devise programs for instructing the pastors and people in our congregations on the issues related to the union of the two families.

II. Relations of our Churches with other Christian Churches in the World

10. Our common participation in the Ecumenical Movement and our involvement in the World Council of Churches needs better co-ordination to make it more effective and fruitful for the promotion of the faith which was once delivered to the saints in the context of the Ecumenical Movement. We could have a preliminary discussion of this question at the Seventh Assembly of the WCC at Canberra, Australia, in February 1991 as well as in regional and national councils of Churches and work out an appropriate scheme for more effective co-ordination of our efforts.

11. There are critical issues in which our families agree fundamentally and have disagreements with the Roman Catholic and Protestant Churches. We could all organize small joint consultations on issues like
(a) the position and role of the woman in the life of the Church and our common Orthodox response to the contemporary problem of other Christian communities concerning the ordination of women to the priesthood,
(b) pastoral care for mixed marriages between Orthodox and heterodox Christians,
(c) marriages between Orthodox Christians and members of other religions,
(d) the Orthodox position on dissolution or annulment of marriage, divorce and separation of married couples, and
(e) abortion.

12. A joint consultation should be held on the burning problem of proselytism vis a vis religious freedom to draw up the framework of an agreement with other Churches, for the procedure to be followed when an Orthodox or Oriental Orthodox person or family wants to join another (Catholic or Protestant) Church or vice-versa.

13. A special joint consultation should be held on the theology and practice of Uniatism in the Roman Catholic Church, as a prelude to a discussion with the Roman Catholic Church on this subject.

14. We need to have another joint consultation to coordinate the results of the several bilateral conversations now going on or held in the past by Churches of our two families with other Catholic and Protestant Churches.

III. Our common service to the world of suffering, need, injustice, and conflicts

15. We need to think together how best we could coordinate our existing schemes for promoting our humanitarian and philanthropic projects in the socio-ethnic context of our peoples and of the world at large. This would entail our common approach to such problems as,
(a) hunger and poverty,
(b) sickness and suffering,
(c) political, religious, and social discrimination,
(d) refugees and victims of war,
(e) youth, drugs, and unemployment,
(f) the mentally and physically handicapped,
(g) the old and the aged.

IV. Our cooperation in the propagation of the Christian Faith

16. We need to encourage and promote mutual cooperation as far as possible in the work of our inner mission to our people, i.e. in instructing them in the faith, and how to cope with modern dangers arising from contemporary secularism, including cults, ideologies, materialism, AIDS, homosexuality, the permissive society, consumerism, etc.

17. We also need to find a proper way for collaborating with each other and with other Christians in the Christian mission to the world without undermining the authority and integrity of the local Orthodox Churches.
JOINT COMMISSION OF THE THEOLOGICAL DIALOGUE 
BETWEEN THE ORTHODOX CHURCH AND THE ORIENTAL 
ORTHODOX CHURCHES

ORTHODOX CENTRE OF THE ECUMENICAL PATRIARCHATE, 
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SECOND AGREED STATEMENT AND 
RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE CHURCHES

The first Agreed Statement on Christology (Appendix 1) adopted by the Joint 
Commission of the Theological Dialogue between the Orthodox and Oriental Orthodox 
Churches, at our historic meeting at the Anba Bishoy Monastery, Egypt, from 20th to the 
24th of June, 1989, forms the basis of this Second Agreed Statement on the following 
affirmations of our common faith and understanding, and recommendations on steps to be 
taken for the communion of our two families of Churches in Jesus Christ our Lord, who 
prayed "that they all may be one".

1. Both families agree in condemning the Eutychian heresy. Both families con-
fess that the Logos, the Second Person of the Holy Trinity, only begotten of the Father 
before the ages and consubstantial with Him, was incarnate and was born from the Virgin 
Mary Theotokos; fully consubstantial with us, perfect man with soul, body and mind 
(νοῦς); he was crucified, died, was buried, and rose from the dead on the third day, 
ascented to the Heavenly Father, where He sits on the right hand of the Father as Lord of 
all Creation. At Pentecost, by the coming of the Holy Spirit He manifested the Church as 
His Body. We look forward to His coming again in the fullness of His glory, according to 
the Scriptures.

2. Both families condemn the Nestorian heresy and the crypto-Nestorianism of 
Theodoret of Cyrus. They agree that it is not sufficient merely to say that Christ is cons-
substantial both with His Father and with us, by nature God and by nature man; it is nec-
essary to affirm also that the Logos, Who is by nature God, became by nature Man, by His 
Incarnation in the fullness of time.

3. Both families agree that the Hypostasis of the Logos became composite 
(σύνθετος) by uniting to His divine uncreated nature with its natural will and energy, 
which He has in common with the Father and the Holy Spirit, created human nature, 
which He assumed at the Incarnation and made His own, with its natural will and energy.

4. Both families agree that the natures with their proper energies and wills are 
united hypostatically and naturally without confusion, without change, without division, 
and without separation, and that they are distinguished in thought alone (τῇ θεωρίᾳ
μόνη).

5. Both families agree that He who wills and acts is always the one *Hypostasis* of the Logos incarnate.

6. Both families agree in rejecting interpretations of Councils which do not fully agree with the *Horos* of the Third Ecumenical Council and the letter (433) of Cyril of Alexandria to John of Antioch.

7. The Orthodox agree that the Oriental Orthodox will continue to maintain their traditional Cyrillian terminology of "one nature of the incarnate Logos" (μία φύσις του Θεου Δόγμα συσχετικό έννη), since they acknowledge the double consubstantiality of the Logos which Eutyches denied. The Orthodox also use this terminology. The Oriental Orthodox agree that the Orthodox are justified in their use of the two-natures formula, since they acknowledge that the distinction is "in thought alone" (τη θεωρία μόνη). Cyril correctly interpreted this use in his letter to John of Antioch and his letters to Acacius of Melitene (pp. 77, 184-201), to Eulogius (pp. 77, 224-228) and to Succensus (pp. 77, 228-245).

8. Both families accept the first three Ecumenical Councils, which form our common heritage. In relation to the four later Councils of the Orthodox Church, the Orthodox state that for them the above points 1-7 are the teachings also of the four later Councils of the Orthodox Church, while the Oriental Orthodox consider this statement of the Orthodox as their interpretation. With this understanding, the Oriental Orthodox respond to it positively.

In relation to the teaching of the Seventh Ecumenical Council of the Orthodox Church, the Oriental Orthodox agree that the theology and practice of the veneration of icons taught by that Council are in basic agreement with the teaching and practice of the Oriental Orthodox from ancient times, long before the convening of the Council, and that we have no disagreements in this regard.

9. In the light of our Agreed Statement on Christology as well as of the above common affirmations, we have now clearly understood that both families have always loyally maintained the same authentic Orthodox Christological faith, and the unbroken continuity of the apostolic tradition, though they may have used Christological terms in different ways. It is this common faith and continuous loyalty to the Apostolic Tradition that should be the basis of our unity and communion.

10. Both families agree that all the anathemas and condemnations of the past which now divide us should be lifted by the Churches in order that the last obstacle to the full unity and communion of our two families can be removed by the grace and power of God. Both families agree that the lifting of anathemas and condemnations will be consummated on the basis that the Councils and fathers previously anathematized or condemned are not heretical.

We therefore recommend to our Churches the following practical steps:

A. The Orthodox should lift all anathemas and condemnations against all Oriental Orthodox Councils and fathers whom they have anathematized or condemned in the past.

B. The Oriental Orthodox should at the same time lift all anathemas and condemnations against all Orthodox Councils and fathers, whom they have anathematized or
condemned in the past.

C. The manner in which the anathemas are to be lifted should be decided by the Churches individually.

Trusting in the power of the Holy Spirit, the Spirit of Truth, Unity and Love, we submit this Agreed Statement and Recommendations to our venerable Churches for their consideration and action, praying that the same Spirit will lead us to that unity for which our Lord prayed and prays.
1. In the light of our Agreed Statement on Christology at St. Bishoy Monastery, 1989, and of our Second Agreed Statement at Chambésy, 1990, the representatives of both Church families agree that the lifting of anathemas and condemnations of the past can be consummated on the basis of their common acknowledgment of the fact that the Councils and their Fathers previously anathematized or condemned are Orthodox in their teachings. In the light of our four unofficial consultations (1964, 1967, 1970, 1971) and our three official meetings which followed (1985, 1989, 1990), we have understood that both families have loyally maintained the authentic Orthodox Christological doctrine, and the unbroken continuity of the apostolic tradition, though they may have used Christological terms in different ways.

2. The lifting of the anathemas should be made unanimously and simultaneously by the Heads of all Churches of both sides, through the signing of an appropriate ecclesiastical Act, the content of which will include acknowledgment from each side that the other one is Orthodox in all respects.

3. The lifting of the anathemas should imply
   (a) that restoration of full communion for both sides is to be immediately implemented,
   (b) that no past condemnation, synodical or personal, against each other is applicable anymore,
   (c) that a catalogue of Diptychs of the Heads of the Churches should be agreed upon to be used liturgically.

4. At the same time the following practical steps should be taken:
   (a) The Joint Sub-Committee for Pastoral Issues should continue its very important task according to what had been agreed at the 1990 meeting of the Joint Commission.
   (b) The Co-Chairmen of the Joint Committee should visit the Heads of the Churches with the view to offering fuller information on the outcome of the Dialogue.
   (c) A Liturgical Sub-Committee should be appointed by both sides to examine the liturgical implications arising from the restoration of communion and to pro-
pose appropriate forms of concelebration.

(d) Matters relating to ecclesiastical jurisdiction should be left to be arranged by the respective authorities of the local churches according to common canonical and synodical principles.

(e) The two Co-Chairmen of the Joint Commission with the two Secretaries of the Dialogue should make provisions for the production of appropriate literature explaining our common understanding of the Orthodox faith which has led us to overcome the divisions of the past, and also coordinating the work of the other Sub-Committees.
BOOK REVIEWS


Reviewed by David Bundy

Professor Cowe has provided the scholarly world with a carefully executed editio princeps and English translation of an important Armenian collection of texts. The seventeen discourses of Mxiṭar Sasneči (1260-1337), completed in 1334 C.E., are essential for understanding the historical and theological developments of fourteenth century Cilician Armenia. Mxiṭar was a key player in the debates of that turbulent period which focused on Armenian theological identity and social unity as well as the sacramental and liturgical innovations which figured in political and theological negotiations between the Armenian Kings and the Roman Catholic Church.

Mxiṭar, widely known and cited in his own century, has seldom been mentioned in modern scholarly literature. The earliest reference in the biographies places him in the region of K'ajberuniłk although he may have been originally from the region of Sasun. Educated at the Monastery of Glajor under the tutelage of Nersēs Mšeči, he achieved national status as an orator, theologian, teacher, calligrapher and spiritual guide. Sometime after 1291, "He took up residence in the spectacularly beautiful and God-indwelt skete called Mecoņay vanč and there passed the days of his life [Biography by Mkrtič, ed. p. 180; trans. p. 207]." Among his students at the Monastery of Mecoņ was the famed and erudite Yovhannēs Mecoņči. Manuscripts from the hand of Mxiṭar include a manuscript, dated 1305 C.E., containing works of Evagrius [British Library Or. 4787], and a Gospels manuscript dated 1313 C.E. [Avedis K. Sanjian, Colophons of Armenian Manuscripts 1301-1480 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1969), 57/1313, 2].

The immediate context of Mxiṭar's Theological Discourses was the discussion provoked by the changes to Armenian theological and liturgical norms at the behest of the King Heľum II and the Catholicos Grigor Anawarzeči at the Council of Sis (1307) and reaffirmed at the Council of Adana (1316) by Catholicos Kostandin III. These innovations were undertaken at the behest of the Papacy as a condition for eventual military support for the Kingdom of Cilician Armenia. Mxiṭar provided in these Discourses a carefully reasoned defense of traditional Armenian values based on a close reading of biblical
texts and a wide awareness of Armenian history and theology. After his death, his doctrinal formulations would be criticized [1341] by the Roman/Armenian theologian Nersês Palianenç who, as Cowe demonstrated [trans. pp. ix-x], misread Mclusar's Discourse IV, "Concerning the Divinity of Jesus."

As might be expected given the contents of the period, the Discourses focus on the issues of Christology [I, Incarnation; II, "Union of Nature and the Principle of Activity;" III, Divinity; IV, "Voluntary Passions of our Lord;" XIII, Christ's Resurrection; XIV, "Economy of Christ God;" XV and XVI, "Lowly passions of the Lord Christ;" and XVII, the Virgin birth], liturgy [VI, "the Holy Liturgy and Atoning Sacrifice;" VII, "To those who mix leaven and water with the sacrament"], vestments of priests [No. VIII], eschatology [IX, the Second Coming of Christ], confession of sin [No. X]; "Compassion and Love of the Poor" [No. XI], and an exegesis of John 3:13 [No. XII]. They vary significantly in length and depth of analysis.

The edition of Cowe is a diplomatic edition based on the manuscript Jerusalem 414 (dated 1334 C.E.) against which the other nine extant manuscripts were collated. A second manuscript, Erevan Matenadaran, 952, dated 1330 C.E., was also copied during the lifetime of Mclusar Sasneçî. The Jerusalem manuscript was chosen as the base text because it was copied for and corrected by Mclusar himself at Mecop'. This provides an unusual warrant for the textual readings of the manuscript, as well as the order and titles of the texts. It also contains the biography of Mclusar edited by Cowe [edition pp. 177-182; trans. 205-209]. The other manuscripts were copied significantly later. These include five incomplete copies dating from the mid-nineteenth century. The manuscript history, described in detail by Cowe in the introduction to the textual volume, makes the diplomatic method of text edition, in the tradition of the CSCO, the most responsible editorial choice.

The translation is remarkable. Cowe has taken particular care to be precise and consistent in the translation of technical terms. While one could quibble perhaps over the rendition of particular clauses, there appear to be no particular gaffs. The resultant work is a model of scholarly translation; it was translated so as to be faithful both to the Armenian and English languages. To produce such a readable English text was no mean feat. The only lament is that while most (but not all) of the biblical texts cited are identified in the notes, the references to earlier Armenian texts cited by Mclusar are not identified in the notes to the translation. While this would have been a daunting task, many of these are available in editions or accessible manuscripts. Likewise the bibliography cited in the otherwise excellent introductions does not lead the uninitiated into the scholarly literature concerning fourteenth century Armenia or its controversies.

These comments should not detract from the appreciation of these volumes. Cowe's text and translation have made available a crucial text for the history of Cilician Armenia and for the development of Armenian theology. The judicious appraisals and analyses provided in the introductions to the volumes are significant contributions to the historiography of Armenian religious culture. The author, series and publisher are to be congratulated on the publication of this collection by Mclusar Sasneçî.

Reviewed by Barbara Merguerian

The women’s movement has stimulated a sweeping re-evaluation of gender roles in all aspects of societal and communal life, including religion. For the Armenian Church, however, preoccupied for the most part with survival and the preservation of nationhood, the question of women’s true role in the spiritual life of the church remains for the most part peripheral. In common with most of the Oriental Orthodox Churches, the Armenian Church has not been engaged in the dialogue designed to create a more active and meaningful role for women in the church, a dialogue that has aroused such heated debate and controversy in the Roman Catholic, Episcopalian, and other Christian denominations. Yet the challenges to the Armenian Church arising from the secular societies of the Diaspora, coupled with the spiritual needs of the homeland, cry out for a dynamic response that can hardly be effective without the full participation of women.

Father Abel Oghlukian, who until recently was the Vicar General of the Diocese of the Armenian Church of Canada, is therefore to be commended for turning his scholarly attention to one little known but significant aspect of women’s service in the Armenian Church, the diaconate. In this brief study designed for the general reader, the author has gathered all available information about the deaconess in the Armenian Church in order “to direct the attention of our religious authorities and church-loving community to a very ancient national-ecclesiastical tradition currently completely overlooked.”

This book begins with a survey of New Testament references to the female diaconate and summarizes the scanty information available about the deaconess in the early church in general and in the Armenian Church in particular. The reader can conclude from this presentation that women played an instructional and ritual role, though a circumscribed one, in the early church. Turning next to the medieval period, the height of monasticism in the West, members of the Armenian clergy are found inveighing against the participation of women in religious services. It was not until the seventeenth century that the Armenian Church experienced “a revival of the female diaconate” which was reflected in the convents of St. Catherine’s in New Julfa, St. Stephen’s in Tiflis, and, later, the Galafayan in Istanbul. The evidence suggests that the goal of the nuns in these convents was to live a life of study and good works that would enable them to reach the office of diaconate. The existence of the office of female diaconate in the Armenian Church is well documented, although many questions remain about the role of the deaconess both within the convent and particularly outside its walls.

By the nineteenth century, the contradictory situation had arisen in which some Armenian ecclesiastics, such as Archbishop Tadéos Peknazarëan, ordained deaconesses; while others, such as the Patriarch of Jerusalem Yovhannës, refused in 1864 to ordain a nun named Katerinë on the grounds that such an act was contrary to the traditions and canons of the Armenian Church. This situation has continued into the present time, when
the ordination in 1982 of Sister Hrįpsimê Sasunean by the Patriarch in Istanbul Shnorhîk Galusteán was an exceptional event in the life of the Armenian Church.

The most striking evidence in the book concerning the role of deaconesses in the Armenian Church is found in the illustrations at the end. Here are reproduced photographs of protodeaconess Sister Hr štoimê Aĥk-Tahireanê in her liturgical vestments, an Armenian nun from the convent in New Julfa wearing a headcovering resembling the velar, two gold-and-silver embroidered stoles dedicated to the Deaconess Sisters of the Armenian Church in Astrakhan, and finally the carved doors to the main entrance to the Cathedral of Holy Efymiacín given "in memory of protodeaconess Aĥk-Tahireanê."

The larger issue of the general attitude toward women manifested by the Armenian Church in its various prohibitions against women (e.g. being barred from the altar), lie outside the scope of this book. Nor does the author make reference to the considerable work written and published in recent decades in the West dealing specifically with the female diaconate and with the historic and current roles of women in the church. His focus is a more narrow one, on the potential benefits of reviving the female diaconate. "Vocations to be deaconesses exist in Armenia, and especially in the Armenian Church in the United States, yet they are not encouraged by the church authorities," Fr. Abel writes. "How many sincere devotions which show promise are allowed to die, knocked against the deaf wall of the ecclesiastical hierarchy?"

Those who are awaiting a serious and thoughtful re-evaluation of the role of women in the Armenian Church as a result of recent changes in Armenia will not find encouragement in the statement on the subject by the newly installed Catholicos, Karekin I, on the occasion of the United Nations Women's Conference in Beijing. "Women in the Armenian Church are fully satisfied with their active engagement in all aspects and areas of service of the Church," the Catholicos asserts, adding that "the question of the ordination of women has never emanated from the life of the Armenian Church; but rather is a "foreign question." As to what level of participation in the church women may aspire to attain, short of full ordination, the statement is silent.¹ Hopefully, Father Abel's small but eloquent plea for a revival of the female diaconate in the Armenian Church will stimulate dialogue and discussion of this vital question, which affects not only the fifty percent or more of the Armenian faithful who are women, but the life of the entire church.
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