ST. NERSESS THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

The St. Nersess Theological Review (SNTR) is published annually by St. Nersess Armenian Seminary. The SNTR considers articles, short notes, review articles, and book reviews in all fields related to Christianity in the Armenian Church: e.g., theology, liturgy, philosophy, ethics, biblical studies, canon law, church history, ecumenics, literature, fine arts, archaeology, and interdisciplinary studies, as well as editions and translations of Armenian patristic texts.

Articles submitted should be addressed to, SNTR, St. Nersess Armenian Seminary, 150 Stratton Road, New Rochelle, New York 10804. Books to be considered for review should also be addressed to the same.

Ideas and opinions expressed in articles and reviews appearing in the SNTR are those of the authors, and do not necessarily represent the views of the Armenian Church, the editors of the SNTR, the SNTR Editorial Board, St. Nersess Armenian Seminary, or the St. Nersess Armenian Seminary Board of Directors or faculty.

EDITOR
Abraham Terian

ASSOCIATE EDITOR
Roberta R. Ervine

BOOK REVIEW EDITOR
Edward G. Mathews, Jr.

EDITORIAL BOARD

The subscription rate is $25.00 per year for subscriptions in the United States, $30.00 per year for subscriptions outside of the United States. Requests for subscriptions should be addressed to the Subscription Coordinator, SNTR, 150 Stratton Road, New Rochelle, New York 10804.

Printed in the United States of America
© Copyright 2005 by St. Nersess Armenian Seminary
150 Stratton Road, New Rochelle, New York 10804 USA

ISSN 1086-2080
The publication of this volume
was made possible by a generous grant from the
Dolores Zohrab Liebmann Fund
ARTICLES

Du service du pape au service du Christ.
Michel van Esbroeck (1934-2003)
Maxime Yévadian

On the Historical Background of the Early Sources
Regarding the Churches in the Caucasus
Michel van Esbroeck

The next three articles were delivered as papers at the
Symposium Holy Etchmiadzin Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow:
Heritage – Mission – Hopes, at the Mother See of Holy

Worship in Holy Etchmiadzin: The Development of the Armenian
Surb Patarag as Mirrored in the Postcommunion and Final Rites
Robert F. Taft, S.J.

Etch Miadzin: Describing the Ineffable in the Teaching
of St. Gregory the Illuminator and in the Syriac Tradition
Sebastian Brock

Èjmiacin: Some Remarks on its Most Famous Scholars and Some
Reflections on the Term Èjmiacin and Related Terminology
Gabriele Winkler

Armenian Pilgrimage to the Mountain of the Transfiguration
and the Galilee
Michael E. Stone
BOOK REVIEWS

Ed. by Robert F. Taft, S.J.
Roberta R. Ervine 91

St. Gregory of Nazianzus: Select Orations.
Trans. by Martha Vinson
Edward G. Mathews, Jr. 95

Theodore of Mopsuestia: Commentary on the Twelve Prophets.
Trans. by Robert Charles Hill
Edward G. Mathews, Jr. 99

The Spirit of Early Christian Thought: Seeking the Face of God.
By Robert Louis Wilken
Edward G. Mathews, Jr. 103

By Hans-Jürgen Feulner
Michael Daniel Findikyan 109

NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS 115
Du Service du pape au service du Christ.

MICHEL VAN ESBROECK

(1934-2003)

Maxime Yévadjan

Nous avions tous deux travaillé au Matenadaran de Erevan ce jour-là. Michel voulait terminer la collation du dernier manuscrit complet du Girk’ Erkac’, ou Livre des Etants, ce traité qu’il voulait attribuer à Hovannes Mayrogometsi (dèb. VIIe s.). La fin du texte annonçait 351 Questions-Réponses et la dizaine de manuscrits qu’il avait étudiés n’en contenaient que 305 ou 315. Il cherchait donc les questions perdues. Soudain, la salle silencieuse s’anima. Tous les érudits courbés sur leurs propres manuscrits, plongés dans leurs recherches, se retournèrent de concert, Michel avait trouvé ses questions...

Au terme de cette après-midi aussi laborieuse que fructueuse, nous décidâmes de faire une balade jusqu’à la nouvelle cathédrale Saint-Grégoire l’Illuminateur pour la découvrir ensemble. Là, durant plus de deux heures, je reçus en cheminant de par les rues de Erevan, les confidences de mon ami: ses joies, ses peines et bien sûr ses projets, il en avait tant! Nous échangeâmes sur tous les plans, théologie, patristique, histoire de l’Arménie bien sûr, mais surtout du Christianisme dans son entier. Car au fil du temps, il s’était affranchi des limites, des restrictions et des chapelles. Il ne percevait plus l’Eglise du pape, de tel Patriarche ou du Catholicoù, mais regardait vers celle du Christ. Sa connaissance encyclopédique, ses recherches passionnées l’avaient mené à s’ouvrir aux chrétiens de toutes traditions pour retourner au christianisme des origines.

Et pourtant, qui était moins préparé que lui pour cela? Entré il y a un demi-siècle exactement dans la Compagnie de Jésus, il espérait partir convertir la Chine maoïste au catholicisme! L’Ordre ayant bien assez de missionnaires, il se rabattit, presque à contre-cœur, sur le christianisme ancien. Il avait changé ses horizons mais pas ses convictions. Il se tournait vers l’Église arménienne, mais à la suite de Clément Galanus et François Tournebize pour l’encourager à reconnaître ses erreurs et à revenir dans le giron du pape. Ses premiers
travaux sont pétris de ces convictions. Et bien qu’il ne cédât jamais rien de sa foi sincère et profonde dans cette Eglise qui se veut catholique, mais déçu par ses frères, bien souvent jaloussé par les siens, et confronté à la réalité du Communisme en Arménie comme en Géorgie, il s’ouvrit au fil du temps à des cheminements différents vers Dieu. Son œuvre immense (plus de 250 titres) l’y aida d’ailleurs et l’amena à penser que les deux voies qui partent du concile de Chalcédoine (451) sont également légitimes et également faites de mains d’homme. _Ne partent elles pas du Christ pour aller à Dieu?_ Ces réflexions ont introduit une inflexion sensible dans ses travaux. En effet, il se concentra dès lors sur l’étude de la littérature post-chalcédonienne (jusqu’à la fin de l’âge iconocaste, Ve-IIXe s.). Il découvrit et publia de nombreux textes pour éclairer le développement des pensées tant monophysites que chalcédoniennes. C’est vraisemblablement pour cette raison qu’il s’intéressait tant ces dernières années à Hovannes Mayragonetsi qui a tant œuvré pour façonner la pensée religieuse arménienne.

L’iconoclasme retint également son attention. Il voyait dans le mouvement une réponse à des milieux arménophones au problème byzantin des images. Aussi était-il convaincu que Leon l’Isaurien (714-740) était lui-même arménophone. Arménie, Byzance, Perse ou Caucase ; toutes ces contrées formaient à ses yeux les membres d’un corps, peut-être celui de la parabole de saint Paul....

Ce travailleur infatigable voyageait trop pour ses 70 ans en Europe, notamment de congrès en congrès pour défendre ses idées ou dans le Caucase à la recherche d’un texte inconnu ou prétendument perdu.

Nombre de domaines ont considérablement été renouvelés par ses travaux. L’étude des différentes versions de la vie de Grégoire a été enrichie par van Esbroeck de deux textes anciens et originaux en syriaque et karshuni. De même sa contribution à l’étude du culte marial et plus précisément la dormition, est essentielle. Sur ce point, son œuvre servira longtemps de référence. Les nombreuses éditions de textes patristiques et liturgiques géorgiens ont ouvert la voix à l’étude de cette langue trop peu connue du christianisme ancien. Pour finir ce rapide aperçu, il faut souligner qu’il s’était fait une spécialité de retrouver dans l’une ou l’autre des littératures chrétiennes des textes perdus dans leur langue originale: le grec.

Ses connaissances étaient encyclopédiques, sa capacité de travail importante et ses intuitions étonnantes. Pourtant son puissant intellect s’acharnait parfois à ne pas voir certaines évidences. Dans ses derniers
articles, Michel voulait avec tant d’empressé sermonner le lecteur à accepter ses véus qu’il en oubliait quelques étapes du raisonnement. De ce fait, toute son érudition et sa passion ne parvenaient pas à produire la conviction. En histoire, malheureusement, vrai et vraisemblable n’ont pas la même valeur...

Pour ne citer qu’un exemple, lorsque nous arrivâmes à la cathédrale de Saint-Grégoire l’Illuminateur, il développa une fois de plus sa fameuse thèse sur Tiridate et Grégoire. Il pensait en effet que la seule conversion historique d’un roi d’Arménie était celle de Tiridate II (216-238), mais non au christianisme: au mithraïsme!... Grégoire, quant à lui, n’était qu’un prédicateur parmi d’autres, et l’Arménie ne se serait convertie qu’à l’imitation de Constantin, vers 315! Tout est faux dans ce théorème bizarre, pourtant le génie de van Esbroeck était de lui donner corps et vraisemblance.

Durant près d’un mois, tous nos petits-déjeuners furent largement consacrés à la réfutation de ce qui me semblait presque une hérésie! Mais rien n’y fit. Une discussion animée se poursuivit jusqu’à notre hôtel, sans succès, non plus: poli, il souriait, mais écoutait sans entendre. Certains esprits, trop brillants, en viennent aussi à s’éblouir au point de ne plus discerner le vrai du faux.

Mais ne le condamnons pas. Il a tant œuvré que sa mémoire doit être honorée par les schismatiques qu’il apprit à connaître, à comprendre, et même à aimer, et plus largement par tous ceux que l’histoire du christianisme ancien ne laissent pas indifférents. D’ailleurs qui peut prétendre ne jamais avoir cédé à l’élan de l’exaltation de ses idées?

«Que celui de vous qui est sans péché lui jette la première pierre.»
Jn. VIII, 7.

Pâques 2004
New Rochelle, New York
On the Historical Background of the Early Sources Regarding the Churches in the Caucasus*

Michel van Esbroeck

The analysis of old legends about the founding of various early churches is always complicated. Two approaches have to be avoided: on the one hand, one should not consider everything in the tales as a journalistic description. Were all Armenians really present at the river Arsanias where Gregory the Illuminator baptized 150,000 (Aa § 833) of them? After all, had he survived so many tortures at the hand of King Tiridates, would he then really have lived for 13 or 15 years in a pit? Did King Mirian in Georgia have a vision ordering him to convert the Georgian people to Christianity while he was hunting in a mountainous forest? And did both conversions to Christianity happen during the reign of Constantine or even before?

On the other hand, complete rejection of the words of the legends would be even less suitable. It would lead to a blank spot on the map of history, despite the existence of abundant source-material. People who wrote the legends knew very well why they spoke in a way that sometimes seems to us somewhat esoteric. Why did they speak through so many images? Their sense has to be understood not only with reference to the Old and the New Testaments but also with reference to old apocryphal histories that can be traced to the second century BC. Other texts, which at first glance seem to have no connection whatsoever to history, have to been seen within the context of rivalry between pro- or anti-Chalcedonian interests. The sequence of those tales may allow the establishment of a relative chronology, where some

*EDITOR'S NOTE: The late Prof. Dr. Michel van Esbroeck died in Louvain-la-Neuve on 21 November 2003. The article here published posthumously was his last paper, presented in Yerevan that Fall. It sums up his life-long study of the subject (see the bibliography cited in n. 3) and serves as a reminder of his prolific work. Publication of this article was facilitated by Mr. Maxime Yévadian, a mutual friend of both the author and the editor.
elements irreversibly precede other ones. If an absolute date could then be attached to one of those tales, the whole sequence might be approximately dated. For instance, the literary report on finding the relics of John the Baptist was made under the patronage of emperor Marcian (450-457). Its relationship with several legends of Longinus gives the clue to the introduction of Elio, companion of Longinos, in the Life of Nino. Another example may be given concerning the tortures endured by Gregory the Illuminator: it is impossible to comprehend the pompous style of reporting his twelve vexations without looking at the new political cult of Gregory the Wonderworker (Thaumaturgus), inaugurated around 484 by Peter the Fuller, in the light of the Henotic politics of emperor Zeno in Neocaesarea. The extant Georgian Passion of the Wonderworker was published only in 1999. The text is relevant for the understanding of the Armenian legend of Gregory the Illuminator and is equally important for the comprehension of the Georgian Henotic period. Several other texts, which at first seem to be independent of the basic Conversion Legend, must be taken into consideration so as to grasp the intent of various passages in the main tradition.

This methodological remark covers a still more important issue: searching for the original significance of images, which were valuable in antiquity, does not imply that the legend lacks any historical relevance. On the contrary, the right grasping of an image in its own context brings exactly the true message to justify the legitimate claim to authentic affiliation with the universal Christian Church. And in this perspective, both the Armenian and the Georgian Church have good reason to rely on the very old elements included in the somewhat mythical context. In fact, there are two different sources, one for the Armenian Church and the other for the Georgian. For the former, the History of the Armenians attributed to Agathangelos, and for the latter, the Life of Georgia and the related texts about Saint Nino in the Conversion of Georgia. Both books have given birth to a very large bibliography, still growing every year. It is highly interesting to observe how opinions have changed in the last century. Only later will it be possible to identify the historical context of sensational scenery and to

---

trace the original source of some early Christian stories regarding conversions of peoples.

A strong reason for creating the fresco of the conversion is to be found in the political adjustments made under the power of the Sassanian dynasty. The conflicts between Iranians and Byzantines led Caucasian Christianity and Byzantium to be suspected of cooperation with the enemy. The political weight of Iran cannot be overstressed. During the reign of Yezdegerd II (442-457), strong anti-Christian politics developed. Two hundred years earlier, Shapur I (241-272) had found another solution to avoid the religious implications in the political struggle between Rome and Ctesiphon: He gave Mani a free hand to establish a new universal religion based on a syncretism in which several elements from the Iranian culture were embedded alongside many others from Christian and Greek philosophic currents of thought, including the schools of Marcion and Bardesanes. Today, all experts accept the existence of traces of that missionary campaign in both Armenia and Georgia.

While working on this paper I came to realize that for the last 32 years, since I published the Karshuni version of the Agathangelos, no less than thirty of my publications have been directly related to our present subject. Looking at the large volume of recent studies on the


conversion of the Caucasus, it seems that there are at least five reports of outstanding importance that bear on the viewpoint of the present study. Those of (1) Bernard Outtier, given at Spoleto in April 1995; (2) the very dense paper I delivered in Rome in January 1999 concerning Georgia, published in 2000; (3) the still unpublished paper I read in Halle in 2000 regarding Armenia; (4) the panoramic view given by Jean-Pierre Mahé in Vienna and published in Vienna in 2002; and (5) the detailed report on the conversion of Armenia by Erich von Kettenhofen, will be published in Handes Amsoreay in 2003. A student eager to verify all the materials included surely should be able to write


4 (1) B. Outtier. "La Christianisation du Caucase", in n°(20) above, 553-568. (2) n°(27) above. (3) "Was wissen wir über Grigor Lousaworitsch?" (4) "Die Bekehrung Transkaukasiens: eine Historiographie mit doppeltm Boden", in n°(28) above, 107-124. (5) "Die Anfänge des Christentums in Armenien".
a personal report on the present perception of the available sources. He should be able to describe the first steps of the three churches of Armenia, Georgia and Aghuania. I regret not having been able to find some original recent studies written in Armenian and in Georgian: I know some of them only through other publications.

The critical study of the Armenian Book of Agathangelos, for a long time the Bible of the Conversion of Armenia, started with the awareness that the Armenian text is not the oldest among the various versions of that legend⁵. (1) In 1906 [sic] Nicolas Marr published an Arabic version, where Gregory the Illuminator baptizes Armenians, Georgians, Abkhazians and Albanians at the same time.⁶ N. Marr however was inclined to place this new redaction in the province of Tao-Klardjethi during the eighth century, where Georgians and Armenians met one another. I think that most scholars nowadays agree that this relation is a product of the closest collaboration between the three nations during the period of the Council convened by Babgen in Dwin in 506. (2) More decisive was the discovery of a Greek Life of Gregory by my teacher Gérard Garitte. His edition was published in 1946. His commentary clearly shows that the present official Armenian text is not at all the most ancient form of the legend. Let us for instance remember that only there, in the Greek, is Gregory’s wife Julitta mentioned, and that no connection appears between Gregory and the Arsacid dynasty. Gregory is a Cappadocian believer, who becomes the Christian teacher of the Armenian people. At the same time, Garitte proved that his Greek short text is a translation from an older Armenian Legend, which was lost. Moreover, the close affinities between the classical Armenian Agathangelos and Koriwn were pointed out by Basil Sarkisean in 1890; these must be interpreted as based on Koriwn. Such interdependence was impossible before the end of the fifth century. The kinship of Tiridates with Gregory himself in the Armenian Agathangelos appears to be a late speculation; it seems to show, at least to the satisfaction of the Sassanians, that Christianity in Armenia did not grow on the basis of a religion of Byzantine origin. (3) In 1971 a

⁵ R. W. THOMSON, A Bibliography of Classical Armenian Literature to 1500 AD, Turnhout 1995, 90-92, cites all the editions and translations of the Agathangelos.

⁶ N. Ia. MARR, Kreschenie arman, gruzin, abkhazov i alanov sviatym Grigoriem: arabskaia versiia, S.-Peterburg, 1905 (Codex Sinaiticus ar. 460 [ninth century]).
Syriac and also a Karshuni résumé of the Agathangelos appeared for the first time. However, it ends with mentioning emperor Heraclius renewing the church of Thordan where Gregory, according to the history of Faustus (the Buzandaran), had been buried. Unlike the primitive Greek Agathangelos, the Syriac résumé possesses a Teaching (Didascalia) which is much shorter than that in the received Armenian text. That long Armenian text has been well translated and commented upon by Robert Thomson. G. Garitte observed that the treatise *De Fide* of Hippolytus of Bostra, which is preserved in Georgian, had 80% of its contents quoted, in a quite different order, in the great Armenian Didascalia. A comparison of both *didascaliai* shows that the Armenian Didascalia is a construction based on the shorter Didascalia, to which the Georgian *De fide* was added from a lost Armenian version. Just 18% of the treatise, which was not used in the Didascalia, is quoted in the *Root of the Faith*, which is attributed to Komitas, and in the Creed at the end of the Armenian Agathangelos. Thanks to this analysis, it can be asserted that it was Komitas who wrote the great Didascalia. In 618 the same Komitas founded the three churches located at Etchmiadzin.

To the location of the baptism of the Armenians, new places are added in the Syriac résumé, according to the flight of Chalcedonian Catholicos John of Bagaran near Erzerum, from 604 to 610, before being exiled to Hamadan. Finally, one of the first reports by the same Syriac Agathangelos is quoted in the History of Movsès Khorenac’i: Gregory the Illuminator was conceived on the very place of the battle of Avarayr at Artaz, where Thaddaeus had previously been executed. The rarity of that mystic coincidence in the Syriac résumé gives the clue to how Movsès Khorenac’i was able to attribute that legend to “Agathangelos”. This short survey of the Agathangelos cycle is but a small contribution to the intricate historical implications of that great Legend.

Owing to the lack of time, I shall try to condense the logical sequence of several inquiries into the problem of the identity of King

---

9 M. van ESBRÖECK, footnote 3, n° (7) and (13).
Tiridates and that of Gregory the Illuminator. Father Paul Ananian published an excellent study on the date of the consecration of Gregory in the year 314\textsuperscript{10}. However, this date is based on the mention of a council of twenty bishops who gathered in Caesarea according to the oldest extant Greek version of the Life of Gregory. J. Lebon recognized that this council had taken place according to one Armenian manuscript of the Kanonagirk' Hayoc'. The critical edition of Hakobyan does not change this fact. Later, Hubert Kaufhold remarked that Edward Schwartz had already noted in 1936 that that Council of Caesarea depends on a very old mistake, a homoiooteleton in a Greek uncial codex with short columns\textsuperscript{11}. The six letters "KAI NEO" disappeared by jumping from KAI to [NEO]KAI... But the original six letters must be introduced in front of the name of Caesarea. As a result, the council of twenty bishops did not take place in Caesarea, but in the habitual Neocaesarea (according to most canonical collections). Nonetheless, the old Syriac and the Latin translations depend on the perpetuated error. Moreover, there are several elements in the Life of Gregory that stress the importance of Neocaesarea: It was there that the Cappadocian Gregory married Julitta; later he called his two sons to the same city to appoint them as his successors, as bishops; and it was there too that the King searched for Gregory, who refused to go himself to take part in the Council of Nicaea in 325. The council of Neocaesarea cannot be dated exactly. All that is known is that it took place between 314 and 319. The presence of Leontios of Caesarea at that Council is normal, for Neocaesarea depends on Caesarea, and the consecration of Gregory could very well have occurred under such circumstances. The subsequent introduction of Caesarea helped the official interpreters of the Armenian Church to unify the tradition from the South – Ashtishat and the Baptism – with those of the North – Thordan as the place for burying Gregory, according to the Buzandaran. Nevertheless, a strong tradition places the finding of the relics of Gregory by Garnik under emperor Zeno (474-491)\textsuperscript{12}. Most probably this unexpected relic discovery is to be seen in relation to the new cult of the Wonderworker.

\textsuperscript{10} P. ANANIAN, «La data e le circonstanze della consecrazione di S. Gregorio Illuminatore», Le Muséon 74 (1961) 43-73 and 317-360.


\textsuperscript{12} M. van ESBROECK, footnote 3, n°(1).
introduced by Peter the Fuller in Neoacaesarea around 482. The historical Gregory has nothing in common with the parent of an Arsacid king of Persia, as one may read in the official Armenian Agathangelos.

No less difficulty appears when searching out the identity of Tiridates. The majority of historians consider him to be the converted king Tiridates III 287-298. The Tiridates IV who has been postulated by R. Hewsen from 298-330 is attested by none of the historical sources. The theory was that a reign from 287 to 330 was too long. But even Tiridates III cannot be attested without the legendary sources and Movses Khorenac'i. The Trdad of the Paikuli inscription cannot have had that aim. The only Tiridates who surely is historical is Tiridates II, from 216/7 to 252. That was the reason for Nerses Akinian’s proposing of the year 219 for the consecration of Gregory the Illuminator. King Tiridates II must have admitted Manichaean missionaries in the time of Shapur I. And if he converted to Manichaeism, the claim of the first converted king with the name of Tiridates had to be renewed in the Agathangelos, giving evidence that he really was a Christian king of Armenia. Let me also refer to the essential studies by H. Drijvers and E. Kettenhofen concerning the legend of Thaddeus, who is still regarded as the first apostle of Armenia. There is no doubt that Eusebius of Caesarea bases his transmission of the Act of Addai on a Syriac source. This one is but a Christian response to Manichaean missionary activity, the name of Addai being very well attested in the presently recovered sources of Manichaeism. The equation of Addai with Thaddeus is really a hint to accept that Christianity already existed in Armenia. As Kettenhofen observes, the Manichaean missionaries used to work where Christian communities had settled.

As stated earlier, in the various versions of the Agathangelos Armenia has a source to illuminate the intricate problem of the conversion. I have already mentioned the curious detail in the

16 See footnote 4, n°(5).
Armenian version of 150,000 people who converted and were baptized in the river Arsanias or Euphrates\(^\text{17}\). Another source offers the same figure in the legend of the baptism of a pagan group, and that legend is related to the role of Tirdates in the story of the Feast of the Roses, Vardavar\(^\text{18}\). It is the story of the conversion of the city of Illyrikon, with all its population, by the apostle Paul. This legend occurs in three redactions: the Ethiopian version was published by Wallis Budge, in Chapters XV and XVI of the *Acts of Paul*\(^\text{19}\). There, when Paul baptizes the first group of the pagans, they are 150,000. And in the Arabic version of the same legend in two quite different redactions of the eighth book of the Octateuch of Clement, this figure becomes 180,000 or even 185,000\(^\text{20}\). Now that legend leaves the King of the Illyrikon nameless. The main pagan Deity, which is obliterated there, becomes Aphrodites or Anahit in the Armenian tradition of Vardavar. Similarly, in the old Ethiopian legend that name is not given. In any case, the complex of the Feast of the Roses has been strongly utilized just in the middle of the fifth century in the context of the *Henotic* version of the *Transitus Mariæ*, exactly at the time when Peter the Fuller made several liturgical reforms that could be traced in all oriental traditions\(^\text{21}\). The episode of Peter and Paul in the Illyrikon is directly connected with the tomb of Clement in Chersonese, but comes primarily from the lost *Acts of Paul*, dating from the end of the second century. This is made clear by the mention of some archaic names like Apollonius of Tyana, Simon the Magician, and Hermes Trismegistes. These names seem to evoke the challenge of the lost *Life of Apollonius of Tyana* by Moiragenses. The next biographer of Apollonius, Philostratus, avoided the inclination of Moiragenses to multiply the miracles\(^\text{22}\). On the other hand, the primitive

\(^{17}\) See the Armenian Agathangelos, § 833.


\(^{20}\) In the Karshuni ms. Mingana 70, fol. 177\(^\text{r}\) and in the Vat.arab. 165, fol. 94\(^\text{r}\). Similar figures also occur in the variants in the Agathangelos.

\(^{21}\) On this topic, I have to announce my forthcoming „Bemerkungen zur syrischen Transitusliteratur“ given in Bamberg in 2002, and “The Three Marian Feasts according to the Syriac Church and How it Came that the Apostles Founded Them”, given in Kottayam in 2002.
Clementine Roman fabrications are clearly embedded in the eighth book of the Octateuch, without Arian interpolation as in the Greek and Latin extant Homilies and Recognitiones. To develop here the Vardavar tradition in old Armenian literature would take too much time in this paper, where I am asked to speak about two other Caucasian Churches, whose traditions are rather autonomous in comparison with all that we have evoked until now.

So far we have discussed the conversion of Armenia to Christianity. It has to be remembered that the conversion of Georgia as a concurrent event is included in the Arabic version of Agathangelos (Va) published by N. Marr in 1905. In this publication, the Georgians and the other peoples of the Caucasus, all mentioned in the title of the edition by N. Marr, were baptized along with the Armenians. The Arabic text is very close to the old Greek version, but without many of the archaisms. There is no doubt that this strong claim to have fulfilled the baptism of every Caucasian nation was prior to the redaction of the extant Armenian Agathangelos; indeed, much earlier. Old Christian Abkhazia must have accepted Christianity before the Council of Nicaea (325); an Abkhazian bishop is mentioned among the fathers at that council. The period during which such claim to universality as in the Arabic version was possible is that of the Henoticum, from 482 to 512. During that period, it was imperative that the council of Chalcedon should not be mentioned. On this point, all the Caucasian churches did agree with Constantinople. We will soon see that this general understanding did not last for very long. Yet Georgia has its own literary tradition about its conversion to Christianity, and this has nothing to do with the Armenian Church’s concord of 506. Even though the young virgin Nino became one of the Rhipsimian nuns in the latest layers of the Agathangelos, and although she is associated

22 M. VIELBERG, Klemens in den Pseudoklementinischen Rekognitionen. Studien zur literarischen Form des späantiken Romans, Berlin 2000 (= Texte und Untersuchungen 145), especially 153-156. Of course the whole complex needs an edition of some hundred unpublished Arabic pages. We hope to achieve the work as soon as possible.

23 See above, note 6. G. GARITTE, Documents pour l’étude du livre d’Agathange, Vatican 1946, 221, observes that Abkhaz is the Arabic translation for Lazoi in the Greek parallel. In any case, the text must be anterior to the conversion of Tzathes, king of Lazica, to the Justinianian orthodoxy.

24 The Arabic text has Gregory appoint bishops for all the peoples of the region.
with Rhipsime before her travel from Ephesus to Jerusalem in the *Conversion of Georgia*\(^{25}\), the remarks of Rufinus of Aquileia around 402 know nothing about these later developments.

The relationship between Rufinus and his friend Bacurius is fundamental to an understanding of the most celebrated report on the conversion of the Georgians through the renowned anonymous *captiva*\(^{26}\). V. Poggi has sketched the best portrait of Bacurius. Bacurius was a local king\(^{27}\). He started as *tribunus sagittariorum* and was already present at the battle of Andrianopolis in 385. Rufinus was born in Concordia, today Sagittaria, one of the two places in the West where the arrows were made from the mines in the Noricum. The place is close to the river Vipacco, not far from Gorizia, on the present border between Italy and Slovenia. The name of the river was the Frigidus, where in September 394 a huge battle took place between Theodosius I and Eugenius, the intellectual, pagan, would-be emperor. The latter was sustained by the general Arbogastes. Theodosius won the battle after he prayed to God during a critical moment of the struggle. A storm blowing dust came from the mountain in the North, and Christianity was saved from the aggression. The pagan minded historian Zosimus wrote that Bacurius died in the battle, and this was repeated in the well-documented history of Ernst Stein. But this is not quite true. Bacurius lived as *dux Palestinæ* and *magister militum* almost till 397, and there is little doubt that Rufinus met him there after the battle of the Frigidus\(^{28}\). These circumstances are important; for they exclude any possibility that Gelasius of Caesarea, the nephew of Cyril of Jerusalem, had already published a report on the *captiva*\(^{29}\). A glance over the Greek rendering of Gelasius of Cyzicos one hundred years later shows how he transformed the role of Bacurius to avoid political claims from

---


\(^{26}\) Its text has been very frequently reproduced. The standard edition is that of E. SCHWARTZ, in EUSEBIUS, *Werke, II. Kirchengeschichte*. Leipzig 1908, 973-976, where the Latin of Rufinus has been prepared by Th. Mommsen.

\(^{27}\) V. POGGI, “L’esorcismo del cilicio in Rufino,” in G. Shurgaia, cf. note 4, n° (27), 38-41.

\(^{28}\) E. STEIN, *Histoire du bas-empire*, 1 (1959), 217, following Zosimus, IV.57. I regret to have accepted the opinion of Stein in my report of Rome, note 4, n° (27), 119.

\(^{29}\) That question was the object of many discussions in the thirties.
a region which at that time did not follow the religious politics of Byzantium. As a consequence, the efforts that were made to put the report of Rufinus even earlier than the death of Gelasios in 395 are still unsuccessful. In his description of the battle, Rufinus says that Bacurius should have been entitled to Comes and Dux. In his supplement to the Ecclesiastical History concerning the captiva, Rufinus refers to both titles which Bacurius should have received before Theodosius died on 17th January 395. Rufinus, who was in Jerusalem from 381, probably met Bacurius between 395 and 397 and heard from him the story about the captiva.

There is no doubt that the captiva ought to be taken as the position of Peter the Iberian, who was made hostage in Constantinople at the age of 12, in 429. The captiva supposedly should help create a relationship between Georgia and Constantinople. Françoise Thélamon wrote in 1981 a study on Rufinus, where she described in forty pages the conversion of Georgia. She summed up perfectly the common opinion. On the one hand, the paragraph of Rufinus was really written in 402, while on the other hand, the very intricate Georgian report in the Kartlis Mokcevai and in the Kartlis Cxovreba goes back to the same story coming from the West to Georgia with several new facts which were issued only in the eighth or the ninth century. Nino is first mentioned by name in the History of the Armenians by Movses Khorenac’ti.

Contrary to this view, F. Thélamon omitted two elements: The first one is to name Nino in the Vision of Vakhtang Gorgasali, whose oldest draft could not have been much later than 502. The second is the Coptic tradition, where again the name Nino does not appear. Instead she is called Theognosta. That method of speech is quite characteristic of several legends in the Henotic period. According to the Coptic tradition the emperor who sends the first bishop into Georgia is

33 On all the extant Coptic and Arabic fragments of that life, I have a forthcoming article: «Nino, Théognosta et Eustathe» to appear in Christijskij Vostok.
Honorio, who became Aquileia’s emperor in 395. The Coptic story of the conversion of Iberia does not mention Mirian as the King who converted. But it relates clearly to a battle where the army of the enemies is blinded by obscurity; and this report is very close to that of the battle of the Frigidus four months before Theodosius died. Not surprisingly, the Coptic story put the record in the reign of Honorio, the Byzantine emperor of Aquileia.

The *Vision* of Vakhtang Gorgasali is embedded in a quite complicated compilation of stories. The chronology therein is so incoherent that there is a strong temptation to think that nothing could be certain in such a redaction. However, the Vision of Vakhtang Gorgasali in its context has a strong connection with a special cult of Gregory the Wonderworker of Neocaesarea, and that cult might be dated from the years 476 onwards (surely to the years 482-485), when Peter the Fuller, refugee in Amasea, promoted that curious cult. Two very different saints are simply combined; i.e., Saint Gregory the Wonderworker, the patron of Neocaesarea, and saint Gregory of Nazianz, contemporary of Julian the apostate. The extant Georgian report of those Gregorys’ martyrdom makes this paradoxical fact absolutely clear. Still in another source, the *Life of Vakhtang*, the Georgian king conquers three cities from Georgia into Byzantine land: Steri, Ekeletsı and Andziandzor. In Greek they are named Satala, Ekeghets and Neokaisarea, whose name Andziandzor is the Armenian wording for Nazianz. That confusion of Neokaisarea and Nazianz cannot be explained in the *Life of Vakhtang* without reading the large Georgian Passion where both Gregorys are made one person. Vakhtang had a heavenly vision of an event unknown to him and which he did not understand. The explanation can be found in the so-called Romance of Julian, which is extant in Syriac and Arabic, from the end of the fourth century. These events of that vision took place when the pious emperor Jovian made penance for the apostasy of the empire under the impious Julian. There, Jovian asks to receive his crown from heaven itself, feeling unworthy to take it himself after the apostate. This event occurs also for Vakhtang in a dream, which will be confirmed by Peter

---

34 I made an accurate analysis of the four main parts of that text in «Lazique, Mingrélie, Svanéthie» (Cf. note 3, n° (20), 196-211.

35 See note 1.
and Samuel who witnessed the same scene. The wording of the vision is as follows:

Lo a woman who was holy Nino herself appeared and said: Stay up, for both kings of heaven and earth are coming to you! He (Vakhtang) looked and firstly saw the shape of a city similar to that of Constantine. He drew nearer and saw two thrones. In the first one sat a young person with weapons and crown; in the second one he saw an old man sitting, in a white garment, and on his head there was a crown not made of gold but of light, and at his feet sat Nino. Peter the priest held the right hand of Vakhtang, and Samuel his left. And Samuel said to him: Prostrate yourself before the great prince of the heaven Gregory! He went and prostrated himself. And Gregory said to him: What a bad thing you did, you man, for you devastated my camp and the wild beasts ate my flock. If there were not those people who stand on your side, and owing to this woman who suffers for you in the presence of Mary, I would have revenge on you and your forefathers who worshipped a fire which burns and not the glitter that illuminates everything! He gave him his hand and embraced him, stretched his hand to the crown of light and immediately extended another, similar [crown] to Vakhtang and said: Give this to Peter! And Peter extracted another from the same crown and gave it to Samuel. And Nino said to Vakhtang: Now go to the emperor and accept your reward! He (Vakhtang) went to the emperor, they embraced one another and he gave him a place on the throne and sat with him. And he gave him the seal of his hand, which was a glittering precious stone. And the emperor said to him: If you like that I should give you the crown, you have to promise to him who stands over us that you will fight against his enemies, and you will receive the crown. Vakhtang looked up and saw a cross and a crown lying on its arms. Looking at the cross, he became fearful, for it had a huge proportion and he said nothing. However Nino stood up, looked at Peter and Samuel, and they said with one tongue: We warrant that he will win more than anyone, o invincible cross! And the emperor stretched his hand, took the crown from the cross and put it on the head of Vakhtang.\footnote{Karlis Cxovreba, ed. S. Qaukhtshivili, t.1, Tbilissi 1955. 167-168 and note 3, n° (11).}
This vision of Vakhtang reproduces the penance of Jovian, who put
the crown on the cross waiting to receive it by another power than his. The
structure of three persons is that of the Vision of Gregory the
Wonderworker receiving the right creed from the hands of John the
Evangelist and Mary at the end of the third century. That scenery is
described in the Panegyric on the Thaumaturgus by Gregory of Nyssa
which was pronounced around 380. Here Nino takes the role of Mary
and Gregory himself that of John. The whole scenery cannot have been
invented to long a time after the conversion of Vakhtang to the Henotic
politics of Zeno. Indeed Vakhtang first accepted the mazdean bishop
Binkaran, and thereafter removed the bishop Mikael into the convent
of the Acoimetoi and placed Peter and Samuel on his see. The emperor
in Vakhtang’s vision must be Constantine whose city appeared. If king
Mirian had already got some role in the legend of the conversion, he
surely should have been mentioned here. Only Nino here served as
warrant. The captiva of Rufinus has here a name, but the king remains
anonymous. Finally, there is an independent testimony from the Sicilian
monk Nilos Doxopatres around 1142 AD. His work is somewhat like the
synekedemos, the ecclesiastical geography of Hierocles written under
Justinian in 535. In his description of the churches, Nilos states that the
Georgian church depended on the see of Amasea. Peter the Fuller
took refuge in this city when Zeno pushed him from the see of Antioch
in 476. He settled himself under the protection of the great saint
Theodoros. Now both in the Georgian and in the Armenian Passion of
Theodoros, there is an explicit mention that bishop Phaidimos of
Amasea sent Gregory the Wonderworker to found the church of
Neocaisarea. Of course, Gregory of Nyssa already told us this event.

39 See note 3, n° (26).
40 F. N. FINCK, Des Nilos Doxopatres Taxis tón Patriarchikón thronón, Vagharshapat 1902, 30: Amasea of the Hellespontos has five Episcopal sees including that of Iberia itself.
But there was no special reason to record it in a Caucasian redaction of the *Life of Theodorus*. Both versions surely existed in Greek, as did many other Greek documents about the *Henotic* movement, which were destroyed during the time of Justinian. One of those documents must have given Nilos Doxopatres the otherwise hardly known opinion that the Georgian church depended on the metropolis of Amasea. The claims of the Vision of Vakhtang Gorgasali are unmistakably written according to the remnant remark of Nilos. Their source is clearly embedded in a symbolic manner to justify the political legitimacy in the Syriac and Arabic so-called romance of Julian the Apostate, and to ask for the dogmatic rectitude according to the Vision of Gregory the Wonderworker in the panegyrical written down by Gregory of Nyssa around 380.

There are still two more topics about which I would like to say something in more detail. Since I have related this in three articles already, I can simply point out the most important facts43. It is essential not to forget that the extant Georgian texts about mixing the Armenian tradition of the Rhipimian virgins with that of Nino started in the period around the council of Dwin in 506, when the *Henotic* politics yielded a common origin for the two churches. The Kartlis Mokcevay is clearly written after the restoration of Heraclius. In the time of Justinian, the strong Chalcedonian politics provoked new changes in the legend about the conversion. The most visible is the delegation of Nino by Juvenal of Jerusalem, who presided at the Chalcedonian Council. The Kartlis Mokcevay, where King Mirian is one of the exponents of the legacy of Nino, includes several topics that could have started only after the Council of Chalcedon, even many years later. This is especially true for the legend of Elio.

On the other hand, the theoretical calculation for the date of the conversion, which has been given as 337 both by I. Dzhavakhishvili and C. Toumanoff, is unsustainable. The Coptic legend says quite clearly that the first bishop was sent, not by Constantine, but by Honorius. There is a parallel in the Kartlis Cxovreba itself: Mirian is given as a grand child to Tiridates and as the great father of Vakhtang. It was slightly difficult to stress more clearly that the emergence of Mirian’s personality occurred following the traces of Tiridates, whose historical identity is so difficult to establish. On the basis of the

43 Cf. note 3, no (24), (27) and (28).
different chronologies used in the six narrations about Nino, one could even suppose 370 for the official conversion of Georgia. The presence of King Mirian was introduced in the Kartlis Cxovreba in a time when Tiridates was already identified as converted king of Armenia in 287. The succession of the kings of Georgia is somewhat complicated to explain. Much difficulty arises from the fact that two contemporary dynasties are mixed. And here, just as for Tiridates in Armenia and Abgar in Edessa, we have to think about a Manichaean conversion. The very recently deciphered Manichaean sources speak of a Habaza of Georgia who received an apostle from Mani\textsuperscript{44}. B. Outtier has already observed that Habaz could be Hamazasp. His place in the list of kings is referred to as the father of Rev Marthali. The title Marthali, “the just one”, perfectly matches Manichaean creed\textsuperscript{45}. Manana Sanadze made a basic study on the successions of the old kings from Kartlos to Mirian\textsuperscript{46}. I follow her conclusions concerning four sovereigns: Amazasp from 230 to 265 fits perfectly the Manichaean mission under Shapur I (241-272): his son Rev Marthali 265-280; Miriani/Vache 260-335; and Bakur 335-355. As Bernard Outtier remarks, according to the tradition in the Syriac Life of Peter the Iberian, Bakur should have ruled from 234-249: here he thinks that the first Christian king mentioned as an ancestor of Peter the Iberian could have been the first Manichaean king. Even in the opinion of Dzhavakhishvili, the real time of Nino is surely closer to Bakur (335-355) rather than to Mirian (260-335), who plays a role parallel to that of Tiridates and/or Constantine.

Having now registered the main sources which have to be considered for an objective approach to the history of the conversion of Armenia and Georgia to Christianity, we still have to approach the third church of the Caucasus, whose alphabet has been recovered in some late Armenian manuscripts\textsuperscript{47}, in rare stone inscriptions\textsuperscript{48} and only some

\textsuperscript{44} W. Sundermann, Mitteliranische manichäische Texte kirchengeschichtlichen Inhalts, Berlin 1981, 24-25.,
\textsuperscript{45} B. Outtier, cf. Note 4, n° (1).
\textsuperscript{46} M. Sanadze, „K’art’is Cxovreba“ da Sak’art’velos istoriiis ujvelesi periodi, Tbilissi 2001.
\textsuperscript{47} A. Shanidze, „Novootkrytyj alfabet kavkazskih Albancev i ego zna_enije dlja nauki“, in Eniumnikis Moambe 4 (1938) 1-68.
\textsuperscript{48} For an effort at deciphering, see W. Schultze, Die Sprache der Uden in Nord-Azerbajdan, Wiesbaden 1982, 282-293. See also note 3, n° (10).
years ago in a palimpsest from Mount Sinai⁴⁹. Of course, the Arabic Agathangelos included them in the great Baptism by Gregor the Illuminator. Jean-Pierre Mahé gave a short introduction in Vienna. Perhaps no report has better underlined how in every Caucasian Christianity two different levels exist, one in the apostolic age - Andrew in Georgia and Abgar and Thaddaeus in Armenia – and the other in the time of Constantine – Tirdates and Mirian⁵⁰. This rule appears still stronger in the case of Caucasian Aghouania. Only there the problem is also divided into two geographical areas. The oldest level, with its northeast Caucasian alphabet, concerns Tchogha or Derbent, and all the extant traces lie north of the river Kura. The southern Aghouania received another capital, Partav, and became completely Armenianized in the sixth century. Thus, our present historical documentation is completely Armenian.

As a consequence, it is almost impossible to know very much about the primitive church and the language of the north. A certain bishop Jeremia is attested both by Koriwn and by a Latin notice on the bishops at the time of the Council of Ephesus⁵¹. Nevertheless, it is not too much to say that, according to the Armenian sources, there are also two levels for the conversion of Aghouania. The oldest one is the story of Eghishay, who was first a companion of Thaddaeus but was then sent by him to Jerusalem, where he met James, the brother of the Lord and was ordained by him⁵². The reason to let him make that travel is almost surely the claim of the Armenian Church to depend liturgically upon Jerusalem⁵³. He returned to Gis in the province of Uti south of the Kura. He founded there a church and was martyred in Zergoun, and his relics were buried in Homenk⁵⁴. There, according to Movses Kaghankatuaci, Stephanos of Urekan discovered them at an earlier but imprecise time⁵⁵. The second level is in the time just after Gregory the

⁵¹ P. PEETERS, «Jérémie, évêque des Iberes», Analecta Bollandiana 51 (1933) 1-33.
⁵³ B. OUTTIER, cf. note 4, n° (1), 556.
⁵⁴ KAGHANKATUAC‘I, cf. note 52, 11-12, chapt. 7.
Illuminator. The sovereign, who made the change, is Urnayr, brother-in-law of Shapur, who received baptism from Gregory the Illuminator. The Aghuans claim Grigoris, the grandchild of the Illuminator, as their bishop. He installed Christianity in all the main towns of northern Aghuania, from Tchogay south of Derbent till modern Mingetchaur. There some capitals of columns have been found with inscriptions. Grigoris too soon was martyred in Amaras\(^{55}\). However, all those reports depend on Armenian sources. As B. Outtier notes, the sister language of Aghuanian, the Udian language, contains religious words of Syriac and Georgian origin\(^{56}\). However, already in the time of the \textit{Henotikon}, king Vatchagan II renewed the church with canonical prescriptions where all the towns mentioned in those canons, with the exception of Kapaghay, are settled south from the Kura\(^{57}\). In the time of Ter Abas in the middle of the sixth century, the capital was removed from Tchoghay to Partav, south of the Kura, owing to the invasions of the Khazars\(^{58}\).

There is something systematic in the presentation of Eghishay. According to Kirakos of Gandzak, who wrote not very far from Uti around 1240, the relics of Eghishay remained in a pit with other victims till Vatchagan II, that is the time of the \textit{Henoticon}\(^{59}\). And nobody knew at whose hands Eghishay had suffered his martyrdom. This report contradicts that of Movses Kaghankatuac'ı, though it seems much more logical. An echo of that claim is to be seen in a remark of Catholikos Abraham in the first decade of the seventh century: he says that the Albanians were Christianized earlier than the Georgians\(^{60}\). Eghishay is symbolically referred to as the companion of Thaddaeus, who is explicitly connected with the martyrdom under Sanatrouk. Just as Thaddaeus sent Aggaeus farther away, here Eghishay is sent for further missions. The whole complex supposes that the legend of Artaz is already firmly fixed in Armenia. As we have seen, this could not have happened before the last form of the Agathangelos at the end of the sixth century. Movses Kaghankatuac'ı filled in the blank spot between

\(^{55}\) Ibid., 31-40, chapt. 14.

\(^{56}\) B. OUTTIER, cf. note 4, n° (1), 557-560.


\(^{58}\) Ibid., 122-126, chapt. 7.


\(^{60}\) Girk' \textit{T'ght'oc'}, ed. Y. Izmirenec', Tiflis 1901, 162.
the earlier mission of Eghbashoy and the findings of the relics at the time of Vatchagan II. He uses it as the criterion for a legitimate autocephaly of the Aghvanit of his time in the tenth century. But this is an internal Armenian presentation, and has little significance for the fifth century.

At the end of this paper, I must apologize for pouring together so much condensed information on so many important features of early Christianity in the Caucasus. I was asked to provide an overview of the several traditions on the conversion of the three ancient nations that inhabit the region. I beg your pardon for having condensed the matter into so little space.
WORSHIP IN HOLY ETCHMIADZIN:
The Development of the Armenian Surb Patarag as Mirrored in the Postcommunion and Final Rites

Robert F. Taft, S.J.

These holy days we friends of Armenia and its Holy See of Etchmiadzin have gathered here to commemorate the 1700 anniversary and the achievements of the Etchmiadzin cathedral, consecrated in the year of Our Lord 303. Surely one of the greatest achievements of this Holy See and its venerable cathedral church is its Holy Liturgy, about which I shall offer some reflections today.

Liturgies have both an inner and an outer history that interact in dialectical tension, reciprocally molding and informing each other. This is especially true in the traditions of the Christian East, where the spiritual understanding of ritual has contributed vitally to the development of its symbolic form. In this context, later liturgical changes, though perhaps structurally insignificant, are not necessarily without import for the history of liturgical spirituality. As Gerhard Delling has said,

Worship is the self-portrayal of religion. In worship the sources by which religion lives are made visible, its expectations and hopes are expressed, and the forces which sustain it are made known. In many respects the essence of a religion is more directly intelligible in its worship than in statements of its basic principles or even in descriptions of its sentiments.

What Delling says here of the phenomenological/epistemological

---


level is even more true of the existential level: not only in worship is religion known; it is through worship that it is fed and lives.

The inner history of the Armenian liturgical tradition is intimately linked to the Holy See of Etchmiadzin. As we know, թուջ անում մուտք էին, which means in Armenian "the Only-Begotten descended," recalls the vision of St. Gregory the Illuminator (ca. 240 † ca. 332), proto-apostle and first bishop of Armenia, to whom the Only-Begotten One appeared, inspiring him to found here the Holy Catholicosate of Armenia and its historic cathedral. From that time on the Armenian Apostolic tradition has been strongly marked by a high Christology and a strong emphasis on the Incarnation of the Only-Begotten One, the eternal Word of God. As I pointed out in an earlier paper, one might call the Armenian tradition incarnational, with a Christology strongly rooted in the mystery of Christmas. That the Armenian Church is the only one in Christendom never to have accepted the new December 25 feast of Christmas, preserving instead the old hagiopolite January 6 feast of the Incarnation, is but one sign of this phenomenon which, in my view, strongly marks the Armenian rite. The very name of its primatial cathedral and see, թուջ անում մուտք էին, is an obvious allusion to the Incarnation of the Only-Begotten Son of God.


But today in Holy Etchmiadzin I wish to talk about the outer history of the Armenian liturgy. In a previous study in honor of His Holiness Vehapar Ter Karekin I of Blessed Memory, I described the various influences that entered into the formation of the Armenian liturgical tradition, using the Surb Patarag as a living mirror of those influences at the origins of the Armenian rite. In the earliest phase of this evolution one sees a certain struggle for dominance between the Greek and Syriac strains of Early Christian culture, with the Greek ultimately gaining the upper hand. Later, in the formative period when the Armenian tradition came into its own during the Armenian literary and linguistic Golden Age, Jerusalem influence was especially strong, transmitted to the Mother Church via Armenian monks present in the Holy City. Greek influence came in again through contact with the Byzantines toward the end of the first millennium. Byzantium and its Church exerted enormous cultural influence throughout the East, and the Armenians and their liturgy were affected too. This remained strong especially in the borderlands, where the Greek and Armenian cultures met and mingled, and the Chalcedonian wing of the Armenian church remained active right up until the catholicsate of John Ojinec’i (ca. 650-728). But the Churches of Persian Mesopotamia, Greek Cappadocia, Jerusalem, and Byzantium were not the only cultural influences on the Armenian rite. Armenian Christians came into contact with the Latin Crusaders as they passed through Anatolia on their way to the Holy Land, and from the eleventh to the fourteenth century we have Latin influence and even Armenian translations from the Dominican rite.

---

6 Taft, "Holy Sacrifice." See also the paper cited in note 3 above.
7 On the heavy Greek influence on the Armenian Church—and hence on its liturgy—see Winkler, "Geschichte" eadem, "Obscure Chapter," with the relevant literature she cites. Despite Persian dominance and the imposition of Syrian patriarchs to rule the Armenian Church in Persarmenia from 429 until 437, important groups in the Armenian Church continued to favor Byzantine Orthodoxy: Winkler, "Obscure Chapter," passim, esp. 89-109, 170.
In summary, then, the Armenian Church underwent the following waves of liturgical influence.\(^\text{10}\)

1. In the foundational period, the period of origins, there was Mesopotamian Syriac and Cappadocian Greek influence.\(^\text{11}\)

2. In the period of Late Antiquity, beginning with the fifth century, we observe a massive hagiopolite influence on the Armenian liturgy, especially in the lectionary and calendar of feasts and commemorations, as Renoux has abundantly demonstrated in his seminal publications on the topic.\(^\text{12}\)

3. Later, from around the beginning of the second millennium, there was very strong Byzantine influence.\(^\text{13}\)
   
   a. during the Crusades, contact with the Latin rite, passing through Asia Minor resulted in a substantial influx of elements from the Latin liturgies, especially the Dominican rite.

   b. Most instructive from all this is the liturgical tradition we know as the rite of the Armenian Apostolic Church, a national Church, limited geographically and ethnically. That situation often spells involution, cultural xenophobia, a tradition distrustful of and closed to others. Surprisingly, this was not true of the Armenian Church, and that is the first characteristic of its rite. What is most remarkable about Armenian religious culture in contrast to its

by which Latin influence on Eastern liturgies is always decried as baneful Latinization, whereas the far more preponderant Byzantine influence—one can far more readily speak of the Byzantinization of eastern liturgy than of its Latinization—seems, for some reason, to be taken for granted. Furthermore, Byzantine influence was just as heavy-handed as that of the Latins: see Winkler, “Decline,” 329 ff.


\(^{11}\) See Winkler, “Obscure Chapter” ; eadem, “Formation.”


\(^{13}\) Taft, “Holy Sacrifice.”
main competitor, Byzantium, is its receptivity to outside influences. Since the Council of Chalcedon (451), Byzantium had had doctrinal differences with the Armenians, and since the Quinisext Council in Trullo, held at Constantinople just over 1300 years ago (691/2), the Byzantine Orthodox Church had consolidated its own rite while turning its face against the different usages of its principal neighbors, the Armenians to the East and the Latins to the West. Though busy holding off the Persians and those who succeeded them, and coping with their powerful Christian neighbor Byzantium on their doorstep, the Armenians, by contrast, were remarkably open to the uses of other nations, absorbing Latin and Byzantine customs with relative ease. Bishop Xosrov Anjewac’i’s (ca. 900–†ca. 963) openness and receptivity often led him to be considered a Chalcedonian, as were numerous Armenian ecclesiastics, including Nerses Lambranac’i (ca. 1153/4-1198), centuries after that dolorous misunderstanding.

The Surb Patarag

To illustrate this history of the Armenian rite, I would like now to take one example, the postcommunion and final rites of the Armenian Surb Patarag or “Holy Sacrifice” of the eucharist.14 Unfortunately, apart from the anaphora or eucharistic prayer, for which we now have the excellent recent study of Prof. Dr. Hans-Jürgen Feulner of Vienna,15 prepared under the direction of eminent armenologist and oriental liturgiologist Prof. Dr. Gabriele Winkler of Tübingen, our investigation of the ordo communis of the Patarag—those chants, prayers, and

---


15 Feulner, Athanasius-Anaphora.
diakonika common to the structure of the Divine Liturgy apart from the eucharistic prayer—has little modern scholarship to rely on. As with any tradition, the sources for the history of the Armenian Patarag comprise not only liturgical references in literature not properly liturgical—histories, chronicles, canons, the acts of synods and councils—but first and foremost the liturgical commentaries, especially since the manuscript liturgical texts before the advent of printing, which for the Armenian service books began in the sixteenth century, are all medieval. The earliest manuscript dates from the thirteenth century, thereby postdating the earliest commentary by three centuries or more. Furthermore, many of the available eucharistic manuscript texts contain only the anaphoral section of the Patarag. For the complete ordo we must often turn to the liturgical commentaries.

Liturgical commentaries are explanations of the liturgical services by church writers, usually monks or bishops. Of the extant classic commentaries on the Armenian liturgy, only three of the nine that deal with the eucharist have been published. The earliest is that of Xosrov Anjewac’i (ca. 900–†ca. 963), bishop of Anjewac’ik from around 950, who wrote his commentary, Meknut’iwn Srboy Pataragi,

16 The best overview of scholarship to date on the Armenian rite, including the eucharist, with relevant bibliography, is G. Winkler, “Der armenische Ritus: Bestandsaufnahme und neue Erkenntnisse sowie einige Notizen zur Liturgie der Georgier,” in The Christian East 265–298—on the Patarag: section 2, Die Anaphora. See now, however, Feulner, Athanasius-Anaphora; also Winkler, “Formation.”

17 For the printed books, see A. Baumstark, Comparative Liturgy (Westminster, MD 1958) 232–234; LEW xcvi–xcviii.


19 On the Armenian liturgical commentaries see Feulner, Athanasius-Anaphora 84–89; and Renoux, “Commentaires”; also LEW xcix–c.

20 Feulner, Athanasius-Anaphora 85–87 and passim throughout; Cowe 87–92.

21 Feulner, Athanasius-Anaphora 88–89 and passim throughout; Renoux, “Commentaires.” 299–303. Until recently this was the only Patarag commentary for which a complete translation, in Latin, had been available; P. Vetter, Chosroae magni episcopi monophysitici Explicatio precum missae (Freiburg im B. 1880). But we now have Cowe’s new and excellent re-edition of the Armenian text of the Venice edition of
as a sort of liturgical catechism for the faithful of his diocese. The long and critically important twelfth-century Commentary on the Holy Sacrifice (Meknut’iwn Xorhrday Pataragin) of the young (in 1192 at the time of writing he was only twenty-four) Nerses Lambronac’i (ca. 1153/4-1198)—i.e., of Lambron—bishop of Tarsus in Cilicia from 1180/81-1198, was published in Armenian in 1847, and, most recently, in French translation. Nerses of Lambron was the nephew of Catholicos Nerses Shnorhali (†1173), whose liturgical reforms were inspired by Byzantine and Latin models, and his nephew’s commentary describes a highly Byzantinized form of the Armenian Patarag. The third published commentary, by Yovhannes (Ospnaker) Archishec’i


(ca. 1260-ca. 1330), though sometimes dismissed as little more than a compilation of the two earlier commentaries, is now considered more original than was previously thought.

The *Surb Patarag* a Mirror of the History of the Armenian Rite

A comparison between the *Patarag* ordo in the oldest sources and its present structure provides a perfect mirror of the influences I have briefly described. The commentary of Xosrov illustrates the truism that liturgies grow at their soft points — places where originally there was ritual activity unaccompanied by chants or prayers — and also at the beginning and end. The reasons are obvious. Like nature, medieval liturgy abhorred a vacuum, and besides, it is easier to insert new things into the empty cracks of a service, or to extend its beginning and end, than to mess with elements already a fixed part of the existing text.

So the Armenian *Patarag*, like other rituals of the Armenian rite — and, indeed, of any — rite, is like an archeological dig. Slice through the tell and one finds a layer-cake of strata mirroring the phases of Armenian cultural and religious history. The first or lowest level is the Armenian *Urgut* derived from East-Syrian Mesopotamia and not Greek Cappadocia, as Prof. Gabriele Winkler has shown in numerous publications. Then, from the fifth century, we observe a steady stream of hagiopolite borrowings, especially in the calendar and lectionary. The second millennium is characterized by heavy Byzantine and Latin influence.

The Postcommunion and Final Rites

All this can be clearly illustrated in any one of the three "soft points" of the present structure of the *Surb Patarag*, [1] the Enarxis or opening rites, [2] the Preanaphoral Rites, and [3] the Communion and Postcommunion or final rites. I have already shown in other studies

---

26 Cowe (91 notes 9, 12) lists four editions.
how this is verified in the Erarxis of the Patarag ordo. Since I have
time here for only one example, I would like to illustrate the same from
the postcommunion and concluding rites. I choose the postcommunion
because it remains completely unstudied. The complete ordo communis
of the Surb Patarag postcommunion and final rites, comprising fully
fourteen distinct units representing an enormously overburdened ritual,
is structured as follows in Table 1.

TABLE I

Elements in boldface are mentioned by Xosrov, in whose
commentary the liturgy ends with §6. Those elements in both boldface
and italics are found in both Xosrov and Nerses. References to X in
parentheses indicate the paragraphs in Xosrov, references to N in
parentheses indicate the chapters in Nerses. Those elements after the
line marked by italics are later additions already mentioned by Nerses.
Those marked with an asterisk (*) are Byzantine borrowings; those
with a cross (†) are Latin.

1. *Postcommunion Blessing with the Gifts: Ps 27/28:9: “Save,
   O God, your people and bless your inheritance! Feed them
   and lift them up from henceforth and forevermore.”
2. Refrain “We have been filled”
3. Distribution of Antidoron (∞dun∞).
4. Thanksgiving Litany and Prayer (X §§163-172; N 76-77).
5. Peace to all + Concluding Doxology (X §§173-175).

Here Xosrov concludes his commentary: By God’s grace we have
brought to completion our explanation of the ecclesiastical rites for
each hour (Afterword).
8. *Ps 112/113:1b: “Blessed be the name of the Lord from now and forever!” 3x (N 78-80).
9. *Prayer “You are the fullness” (Skeuophylakion Prayer of Chrysostom Liturgy) (N 81).
10. †Last Gospel: Jn 1:1-14a.
12. Ps 33/34:1: “I will bless the Lord at all times, his praise ever in my mouth!” (N 82).
13. Blessing and Dismissal.
### Table II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Xosrov (post 950)</th>
<th>Lambronaci (ca. 1190)</th>
<th>The Patarag Today</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X §§163-172</td>
<td>N 76-77</td>
<td>1. &quot;Postcommunion Blessing + Ps 27/28:9&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X §§173-175</td>
<td>N 78-79</td>
<td>2. Refrain &quot;We have been filled&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N 80</td>
<td>3. Antidoron <em>(sjuv)</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N 81</td>
<td><strong>4. Litany and Prayer</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N 82</td>
<td><strong>5. Peace to all + Doxology</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N 82-83</td>
<td>6. Odes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7. <em>Opisthambonos</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8. <em>Ps 112/113:1b 3x</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                   |                      | 9. *Prayer "You are the fullness."
|                   |                      | 10. †Last Gospel |
|                   |                      | 11. Litany and Prayer of the Cross |
|                   |                      | **12. Ps 33/34:1** |
|                   |                      | 13. Blessing and Dismissal |
|                   |                      | **14. Ps 33/34:2-22 + Doxology + Antidoron (hwr wmp)** |

The progressive growth of these rites illustrates phenomena observable across the entire spectrum of Christian liturgy: the illusion that more is better, and the reluctance to bring things to a close. As in the Byzantine Divine Liturgy, we are presented here with multiple conclusions (§§4-5, 7, 11-14), two of them early native Armenian (§§2, 4), two others traceable to the hagiopolite stratum (§§12, 14); three clearly Byzantine borrowings (§§1, 7-9); and one completely extraneous element, the Latin Last Gospel from John 1 (§9).

Where these elements come from and when they arose is no mystery to the historian of eastern liturgy. The Latin Last Gospel is a foreign importation into both the Roman Mass and the Armenian Patarag. It comes from the Dominican rite, which was fixed in 1256. It
doubtless entered the *Patarag* in the fourteenth century, when the Dominicans were operating in Medieval Armenia in the wake of the Crusades.\(^{33}\) The Byzantinisms probably all date from the second millennium, as I have shown in lengthy research that, for lack of time, I can only summarize here.\(^{34}\) The attribution to St. John Chrysostom of the Opisthambonos Prayer or “Prayer in the Midst of the Church”\(^{35}\) betrays that, for it was only at the end of the first millennium that the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom overtook that of St. Basil to become the principal liturgy of the Byzantine Orthodox Church.\(^{36}\) The Opisthambonos, introduced first into the Liturgy of St. Basil, then of St. John Chrysostom sometime after the first half of the eighth century, is common to both those Byzantine eucharistic formularies.\(^{37}\) That alone betrays it as not original to both. Furthermore, had it been introduced into Armenia earlier than the victory of the Chrysostom Liturgy over Basil, the Armenians would have called it a “Prayer of St. Basil.” The same is true also of the Prothesis Prayer at the beginning of today’s *Patarag*.\(^{38}\)

The Byzantine origin of the Opisthambonos Prayer also underlies Nerses of Lambron’s explanation in chapter 78 of his commentary:

---


\(^{35}\) Nersoyan 99.


\(^{38}\) Nersoyan 31.
Why does the bishop, having put on again his omophorion of honor, descend to the middle of the church to pray again? If we have truly retained in the memory of our spirit the previous explanations of this subject, then we shall now understand better the mystery before us. We have shown how the bishop, when standing at the door of the church, images forth of Christ according to the Incarnation... And why does he pray aloud? Because here it is a question of distributing the blessing received from God... 39

The fact that the bishop goes to the middle of the church for the prayer is something totally extraneous to the Armenian tradition, and reflects the fact that—as I have shown elsewhere 40—the Byzantine Opsthambonos Prayer was proclaimed over the people from the west end ambo in the middle of the nave as the clergy exited in procession to the skeuophylakion or outside sacristy at the end of the liturgy. 41

The Original Shape of the Armenian Postcommunion and Final Rites

What did the Armenian postcommunion and final rites look like before undergoing this outside influence? To determine all of its details would require many months of research in the manuscript tradition. But on the basis of comparative liturgy it is most probable that the Patarag originally ended as in the time of Xosrov, with the Litany and Prayer of Thanksgiving, plus the "Peace to all" and doxology (§§4-5), and, possibly, the Blessing and Dismissal (§13). Table III shows how this would look with the Latin Last Gospel and all the later Byzantinisms removed, and indicating, hypothetically, Jerusalem or hagiopolite influences. Elements in brackets in column one, though native Armenian are later additions.

39 Nerses 336.
### TABLE III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patarag</th>
<th>Hagiopolite Elements</th>
<th>Byzantinisms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Refrain</td>
<td>&quot;We have been filled.&quot;</td>
<td>1. Postcommunion Blessing + Ps 27/28:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Litany and Prayer</td>
<td></td>
<td>7. (Opisthambonos)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Peace to all + Doxology</td>
<td></td>
<td>8. Ps 112/113:1b 3x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[11. Litany and Prayer of the Cross]</td>
<td>&quot;You are the fullness.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12/14. Ps 33/34:2-22 + Doxology\textsuperscript{42}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Blessing and Dismissal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Antidoron</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{42}I am hypothesizing here that the use of Ps 33 may be the result of its common use as the communion psalm in hagiopolite sources: see Taft, \textit{Precommunion} (note 31 above) 284-88.
If we compare this to the reconstructed final rites of the Byzantine Divine Liturgy in their original shape, we can see the commonality of the conclusions of both rites, as in Table IV:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Patarag Final Rites</th>
<th>Original Byzantine Final Rites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Refrain “We have been filled.”</td>
<td>Plerotheto refrain\textsuperscript{43}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Litany and Prayer</td>
<td>Litany and Prayer\textsuperscript{44}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Peace to all + Doxology</td>
<td>Dismissal\textsuperscript{45}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Blessing and Dismissal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Liturgia Semper Reformanda?**

But why, one might ask, need we bother today with all this past history? For one very simple reason: I presume that the organizers of a symposium on the achievements of the Holy See of Etchmiadzin do not wish to imply that all those achievements are in the past, that the Catholicosate of Etchmiadzin is not a living organism of the Mystical Body of Christ’s Church but just a museum, a past with no future. No, there will be a future. And in that future, liturgies—unless they are dead—will change just as they did in the past. I presume I have said enough to prove that.

Everyone knows that a Liturgical Movement swept the Christian West in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. What fewer know is that a similar ferment began in the Orthodox Churches at the beginning of the twentieth century, only to be cut off at birth by Communism.\textsuperscript{46}

\textsuperscript{43} Text LEW 342.6-9. On this chant, see note 31 above.

\textsuperscript{44} LEW 342.13-343.8.

\textsuperscript{45} LEW 343.11-14.

\textsuperscript{46} In the period 1905-1917, Church reform was in the air and intensive preparations were underway for the famous 1917 Council of Moscow of the Russian Orthodox Church. The Bolshevik Revolution ultimately aborted these reform projects. For details see M. Mojzež, Analisi metodologica di alcune tendenze e tentativi per una riforma liturgica nelle Chiese di tradizione bizantina nel XX° secolo (Pontificio Istituto Orientale, Rome, unpublished doctoral dissertation defended June 17, 2003) Part I; and, more fully, Nikolaj Balašov, На пути к литургическому возрождению Дискуссии в
There was a time when western romantics like Dom Olivier Rousseau OSB of Amay-Chevotegne, one of the first historians of the western Liturgical Movement, could write:

Among Catholics it is a truism that the Orthodox Church has preserved the liturgical spirit of the Early Church, and that it continues to live this spirit, to drink from it as from its purest source... So there can be no question of a liturgical movement in the Orthodox Church. This Church has never departed in its piety and its offices from the liturgical spirit of the Early Church, to which it has always remained faithful.47

47 "C'est un truisme dans le monde catholique que l'Eglise orthodoxe a conservé l'esprit liturgique de l'ancienne Eglise, et qu'elle continue d'en vivre, de s'y aboucher comme à sa source la plus pure... Il ne saurait question de "mouvement liturgique" dans l'Eglise orthodoxe. Cette Eglise ne s'est jamais écartée, dans sa piété, de celle de ses offices, et elle y est toujours restée également fidèle...": O. Rousseau, OSB, Histoire du mouvement liturgique. Esquisse historique depuis le début du XIXe siècle jusqu'au pontificat du Pie X (Lex orandi 3, Paris 1945) 188.
Rousseau, writing in the 1940’s, towards the end of World War II, when the Liturgical Movement among francophone Catholics drew inspiration from contacts with the Russian Orthodox emigration that had found refuge in France in the aftermath of the Bolshevik Revolution, was living in a dream world. The innumerable calls for liturgical renewal within Byzantine Orthodoxy today attest to that.\textsuperscript{48} This need for renewal is clear to anyone who lives in the real world, and is no longer mesmerized by the idea that eastern liturgies go back to apostolic times and have remained unchanged ever since. Modern liturgical history has long exploded that myth.

So the historico-critical comparative study of liturgy is an approach of proven results not just historically but also pastorally, an approach that is at the basis of much of the real progress made in understanding and revitalizing liturgy in modern times. This does not mean that it is the task of the historical scholar to find pastoral solutions to the concrete problems of worshipping communities. In liturgical renewal the work of the historian is to remove obstacles to understanding produced by a misreading of the past. Historical scholarship cannot tell the Church what it must do. It can only help the Church to see what it could do if those in the pastoral ministry deemed it feasible.

But that is no modest claim, for the liturgical sciences have made possible the liturgical renewal we enjoy today. This is true even in the realm of ecumenism. Does any serious thinker wish to continue fighting over whether the Words of Institution or the consecratory Spirit-Epiclesis is the form of consecration when some of the earliest eucharistic prayers had neither?\textsuperscript{49} I see no way of moving beyond the puerilities of past controversial theology except by serious attention to text and history.

This does not mean that history provides us models for imitation. The Church and its reformers can never be guided by a retrospective ideology. The past is always instructive but never normative. What its study, like all study, should provide is understanding, an understanding

\textsuperscript{48} See the references in note 46 above.

that challenges myths and frees us from the tyranny not just of any one frozen slice of the past, but also from the tyranny of the latest cliche or of the blind conservatism that is the refuge of the ignorant, so that we can move ahead to solutions suitable for today in faithful freedom, faithful to living tradition that is always indebted to but free of the past.

So the ultimate purpose of any study of liturgy is to achieve understanding based on knowledge. Only then can one move to application. For understanding what any aspect of Christian liturgy—indeed Christian anything—means, and hence means for today; and therefore how it must be understood, celebrated, preached on the pastoral level; proceeds from the premise that Christian liturgy is an objective reality whose meaning is located not in what we think or feel or imagine or would like it to be, but in the data of Christian tradition.

Amid the contemporary search for relevance in liturgy, therefore, I continue to maintain, obstinately and against all comers, that there is nothing so relevant as knowledge, nothing so irrelevant as ignorance. The only reliable way to understand and critique—and therefore, if necessary, reform—the present manifestation of any cultural phenomenon is to see what it once was and how it got to be the way it is. I maintain one can do this only by studying its origins and evolution—in a word, its history, which of course includes its shape and uses today.

As Thomas J. Talley said,

Our current discussions of pastoral praxis, theological meaning, and of much more rest finally in the assumption that we know what we are talking about; and to know what we are talking about demands knowing much more than can be generated by a mere creativity operating upon data drawn only from the experience of itself.50

English or French literature is not what we imagine it to be or what we'd like it to be. It is what it is. And we find that out not by asking ourselves how we feel about it, or by imagining what we would like it to be, but by reading it. The same is true of liturgy. It is an objective, existing reality. To know what it is one must study it, and that can only mean studying it in its historical manifestations, past and present. Of course one is free to dislike what it is, and to hope to invent something

50 Introduction to Taft, *Beyond East and West* vii.
else to take its place. That, however, is not studying Christian liturgy, but imagining it.

This is not to suggest that liturgy cannot change, or that when it does, people are not the ones who change it. It does suggest that when one changes something, it might be helpful to understand first what it is one is changing. For beyond the desire for change lies the twofold presumption [1] that something is wrong with things as they are, and [2] that the proposed change will be an improvement. If so, it might be useful to provide for these value judgments a basis more substantial than the personal velleities of the uninformed or the latest cliché of the semi-educated. And if at least part of such a substantial basis is not to be found in Christian tradition, then I do not know what Christian liturgy is all about. That means the hard work of scholarship using the tools of history and philology and text-criticism and the rest. If someone has found another way to recover the tradition, I beg to be informed immediately.

Am I proposing to change or reform the Armenian liturgy? Not at all. What I am saying is that anyone living in the real world and without his or her head in the sand, knows that Armenian liturgy will change in the future just as it did in the past, and when it does—and liturgies change only because someone changes them—those introducing the changes might best know something about what it is they are doing. That is where scholarship comes in play. So please continue to send your best Armenian Church students to do higher studies in the tradition, or run the risk of becoming a stagnant backwater on the fringes of the modern world.
Abbreviations:

AB = Analecta Bollandiana.
BELS = Bibliotheca Ephemerides Liturgicae, Subsidia.
EO = Échos d’Orient.
LEW = F.E. Brightman, Liturgies Eastern and Western (Oxford 1896).
OCA = Orientalia Christiana Analecta.
POC = Proche-orient chrétien.


ETCH MIADZIN: DESCRIBING THE INEFFABLE IN THE TEACHING OF ST. GREGORY THE ILLUMINATOR AND IN THE SYRIAC TRADITION

Sebastian Brock

How does one describe the central mystery of Christianity, the entry of God the Word into the created world? The term “Incarnation”, standard in English, is not to be found in the New Testament, although of course it is based on St. John’s Gospel, “The Word became flesh” (John 1:14). During the early centuries of Christianity a variety of different terms were devised. In order, however, to counter various unsatisfactory terms and phrases, the different local Churches produced credal statements that expressed their orthodox faith, and in due course the entire Church came to adopt as a universal Creed, the statement formulated first at the Council of Nicaea (325) and then expanded at the Council of Constantinople (381). The following century, however, witnessed the disastrous three-way split in Eastern Christianity, whose effects we still have with us today, with the separation between the Oriental Orthodox Churches, the Chalcedonian Orthodox Church and the Church of the East.

In the epilogue his major contribution to the history of the Church in the fifth and sixth centuries, entitled “The Council of Chalcedon and the Armenian Church”, the late Catholicos of the Armenian Apostolic Church, His Holiness Karekin I, wrote as follows:

History tells us most eloquently how disastrous have been the consequences of the division of Eastern Churches because of the Council of Chalcedon and other related factors of a non-theological nature... Generally speaking, in the past polemics have dominated the relationship between the two groups of Churches. The self-defensive, self-justifying tendency and method, with the natural implication of mutual condemnation, have prevailed in the conversations that have taken place. Fresh attempts at a deeper understanding of each other’s positions as expressed in the post-Chalcedonian theological tradition may
greatly help us in our search for the recovery of the unity of the Eastern Churches. [2nd ed., 1975, p.218].

Archbishop Karekin Sarkissian, as he then was, wrote these perceptive words in November 1964. A few months earlier, in August of the same year, the First Non-Official Meeting of the Oriental Orthodox and the Chalcedonian Orthodox Churches had convened in Aarhus (Denmark). Since it was the Definition of Faith issued at the Council of Chalcedon that had led to the split between the Oriental Orthodox and the Chalcedonian Orthodox Churches, it was sensible to take the technical terminology used in this document as the starting point for discussion, since it was this that had caused the problems. Thanks to their ability to view the christological controversies of the fifth and sixth centuries with a dispassion and greater objectivity than had been the case on both sides in the past, the theologians at this first Non-Official meeting of 1964 had been able to state in their communique that

on the essence of the Christological doctrine we found ourselves in full agreement. Through the different terminologies used by each side, we saw the same truth expressed. (Chaillot and Belopopsky (eds), Towards Unity: the Theological Dialogue between the Orthodox Church and the Oriental Orthodox Churches, Geneva 1998, p.48).

This initial finding of the Non-Official Dialogue was subsequently endorsed by the Official Dialogue. Thus in the Agreed Statement of the Joint Commission, of June 1989, we find:

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. (Chaillot and Belopopsky, p.61).

So great was the extent of agreement in doctrinal matters found by the early meetings of the Official Dialogue, that at the Fourth Official Meeting, in 1993, the specific proposal was made that the anathemas against each other’s saints should be lifted
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 acknowledgement from each side that the other one is Orthodox in all respects. Furthermore, this recommended lifting of the anathemas should imply that restoration of full communion for both sides is to be immediately implemented. (Chaillot & Belopopsky, p.68).

So far, however, the proposal made by the Official Dialogue in 1993 still remains to be put into effect.

For obvious and necessary reasons the theological dialogue has focused on the Definition of Faith issued at the Council of Chalcedon, and its terminology. It needs to be recalled, however, that one of the Oriental Orthodox Churches' fundamental objections to the Council's Definition of Faith was that the Creed of the Councils of Nicaea and Constantinople was sufficient in itself. Furthermore, the Creed is - in the words of Dionysius the Areopagite (Eccl.Hier. III.2) a "song of praise" (awrhbanutfïwn in the Armenian translation of Dionysius), whereas the Council of Chalcedon's Definition of Faith was intended to have a quite different function, serving as a norm, or canon, which encapsulated orthodoxy. The very etymology of the term Horos in Greek and Definitio in Latin, both with the basic meaning of "boundary", points to the limitations of such an approach, since it seeks to put a "boundary" on a mystery that cannot be contained by any boundary. In other words, the Oriental Orthodox Churches rightly sensed that the analytic terminology of the Chalcedonian Definition was not only a limited, but also a limiting, approach to describing in words the mystery of the Incarnation. As any extensive reading of early Christian writings - whether in Greek, Latin, Armenian or Syriac - will indicate, there are many other ways of describing the mystery of the Incarnation, by employing metaphorical language, analogy, pictorial imagery, and paradox.

Examples of all of these are to be found in the long catechetical address of St. Gregory the Enlightener to the Armenian royal court, known as the Teaching of St. Gregory, incorporated into the History of Agathangelos. The fact that the Teaching of St. Gregory employs a great variety of different terms for the Incarnation is no doubt deliberate, in order to indicate that no single term is going to be adequate in itself. Thus, for example, we find the divine Word is
described in just a single section (377) as having “put on a body, descended to our likeness, been contained in a body, been restricted to a body, taken human form, come down in bounded form, come down to dishonour, come down to raise us up”. It is interesting to note that “descended”, as found in the name of the Holy See of Etchmiadzin, is particularly common throughout the Teaching. A study of all the phraseology used in the Teaching in connection with the Incarnation indicates that the background is in part Greek, and in part Syriac.

Since the Syriac tradition was a formative element in the early development of the Armenian Church (as has been well illustrated in recent years by our colleague Professor Gabriele Winkler), and since Syrian Orthodox Church is a sister Church of the Armenian Orthodox Church, I should like to illustrate briefly two other approaches to theological language, one from St. Ephrem (+ 373), who of course is a saint common to all the Churches, and the other from the great Syrian Orthodox theologian Philoxenus of Mabbug (+ 523).

In a number of places the Teaching of St. Gregory makes use of paradoxical statements, such as “the Ungraspable took flesh and was touched and grasped in the flesh” (379), “He joined the invisible to the visible” (387), or “the Ancient of Days became a child for us” (381, 680). The use of paradox as a means of theological expression is already found in St. Paul, when he speaks of Christ “being rich, He became poor for your sake” (2 Cor. 8:9), but it is above all St. Ephrem who makes especial use of the language of paradox.

A single example must suffice to illustrate this: in one of his poems on the Nativity Ephrem has three entire stanzas describing the Incarnation by means of a whole series of paradoxes; here I cite just one stanza:

The Mighty One entered [Mary], and put on insecurity from her womb; the Provisioner of all entered - and experienced hunger; He who gives drink to all entered - and experienced thirst: naked and stripped there came forth from her He who clothes all. (Hymns on the Nativity 11:8).

The contrast between Ephrem’s approach and that used in the christological controversies of the fifth century can be illustrated in a simple way by imagining a circle with a point in the centre. This central
point represents the mystery of the Incarnation: whereas the analytic approach seeks to define the central point using the tools of precise terminology, Ephrem's approach is to leave the central point undefined, and instead provide a whole series of paradoxes, as it were, all around the circumference. The central point, representing the mystery of the Incarnation, is itself left undefined, but it is can be located by observing where all these diagonal lines that connect the paradoxes, located at opposite points of the circumference, cross one another at the centre of the circle.

A century and a half after St. Ephrem, and writing in the heat of the christological controversies of his time, Philoxenus specifically points out the merits of using the language of paradox in connection with the Incarnation:

Every utterance of God is given for the increase of faith, and every action on His part in which some difficulty is found took place in order that we might thereby acquire instruction for the mind, so that it grows in faith in matters that are considered difficult. For there is no increase in faith if we argue over providing an explanation to all the actions and utterances performed and uttered on God’s part, whereas faith does increase and make good progress through hearing something that is challenging and difficult, or wording that appears to be contradictory. Examples of such things are the following paradoxes:

The Uncontainable has been contained,
the Limitless One has been limited,
He who is known to be everywhere,
has been confined in a womb,
He who is, became (flesh),
the Fashioner was fashioned,
the Maker was conceived, etc.

(Tres tractatus, ed. A. Vaschalde, CSCO 9, repr. 1961, pp.102-3)

Philoxenus continues with a further twenty two paradoxes, all describing the Incarnation; some of these, incidentally, are similar to those found in the Teaching of St. Gregory. For Philoxenus, the paradox deliberately defies logic, indicating that what is being hinted at is not something that can be described in a logical manner, using analytical terms. Furthermore, the paradox prompts a sense of wonder, and it is essentially this that encourages the growth of faith. This is a
point emphasized not only by Philoxenus, but also by Ephrem before him, and by his contemporary, Jacob of Serugh, another Syriac poet who, like St. Ephrem, was translated into Armenian. Jacob states the whole matter succinctly as follows: “Wonder dispels disputed but increases worship”. (Ed. Bedjan, III, p.583).

Elsewhere in the same treatise (pp.39-40) Philoxenus discusses another means of describing the Incarnation, namely analogy. No single analogy is going to be entirely appropriate, he explains; for if it were, it would no longer be just an analogy, but the reality itself. But analogies are helpful “in order to illustrate how the (divine) Word is mingled with his flesh, that is, united without confusion taking place or destruction occurring”. (In parentheses, one may note that Philoxenus’ use of the term “mingle” in this context is also a characteristic feature of the Teaching of St. Gregory). Philoxenus continues immediately with a whole series of analogies for what happened at the Incarnation: it was like light in the eye, like utterance in the voice, like thoughts in the soul, like learning in the mind, like fire in gold, like (the sun’s) rays in the air”, and so on. Each different analogy illustrates some different aspect, and no single one is adequate on its own.

Later on (p.152) Philoxenus points out that the same applies to the various verbs used to describe “how our Lord’s dispensation in the flesh is revealed”. Philoxenus here directly confronts the range of terminology current in the heated polemic of his day, right across the christological spectrum, from the Eutychians to the Nestorians, each of which confine themselves to only one set of terms, whereas an orthodox position, such as that “of the ancient Fathers” and of Philoxenus himself, will accept them all as appropriate. Here is how Philoxenus puts the matter:

In the first place, there is the phrase “the Word became flesh” (John 1:14); then there are the terms ‘God became corporeal’, ‘was embodied’, ‘was enfleshed’, ‘was inhominated’. Again, there are the other terms: ‘He took’, ‘was united’, ‘dwelt’, ‘put on’, was joined’. In the case of the two (heretical) doctrines that are still in the Church, I mean that of the Eutychianists and that of the Nestorians, each is in agreement with just one part of these terms: with the Eutychians, the (only acceptable) terms are ‘He became, became corporeal, was embodied, was enfleshed, was inhominated’; whereas the Nestorians accept (only) ‘He took, was united, dwelt, put on, was joined’. But the ancient Fathers and Teachers who are recognized as such and who are
without reproach, will be found to be using all the phrases and terms together, understanding each one of them in its appropriate sense.

At the conclusion of this chapter (p.155) Philoxenus points out that, whereas "the heretics" (i.e. Eutychians and Nestorians) employ only one set of terms, to the exclusion of the other,

we (the orthodox), however, ought to consent to all the phrases and terms used by the two sides, and to their true and correct understanding: not just as it pleases us to think, but as the Fathers and Teachers have understood them.

Philoxenus is making a very important point which is just as relevant today as it was in his own days: in attempting to describe the mystery of what took place at the Incarnation there can be no one term, or single set of technical terms, which is adequate - let alone capable of acting as the norm or canon of orthodox faith. The inadequacy of this approach was pointed out by the late Archbishop Tiran Nersoyan 25 years ago in the course of a sermon preached in Vienna:

...there was the idea abroad... that the orthodoxy or purity of the faith could be safeguarded and the unity of the Church maintained by making people to subscribe or adhere to abstruse dogmatic statements... This formal, legalistic way of trying to protect the integrity of the faith and the unity of the Church proved to be most of the time ineffective. It gave rise, on the contrary, to interminable disputes and bitter conflicts. (PRO ORIENTE, Five Vienna Consultations, Vienna 1993, p.279).

One of the important lessons of modern dialogue on christology has been the realization that it is not a question of orthodox faith residing in either one formula of faith, or another; It is not a matter of either/or, but rather, of both/and. As Philoxenus pointed out, orthodox faith lies in the acceptance of a whole range of different terms and analogies. This is exactly the point that St. Ephrem also makes, but in a different context: discussing the interpretation of the Bible from the standpoint of faith, he emphasizes that the biblical text is multivalent and so is capable of many different - and equally valid - interpretations; this means that it is actually misguided to suppose that there is only one correct interpretation to a particular passage. Here is how St. Ephrem puts it:
Anyone who encounters Scripture should not suppose that the single one of its riches that he has found is the only one to exist; rather, he should realize that he himself is only capable of discovering just one out of the many riches which exist in it. Nor, because Scripture has enriched him, should the reader impoverish it. Rather, if the reader is incapable of finding more, let him acknowledge Scripture’s magnitude. (Commentary on the Diatessaron 1:19).

By emphasizing the sufficiency of the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed, and by rejecting the imposition of the Council of Chalcedon’s Definition of Faith as a norm of orthodoxy, the Armenian Orthodox Church, along with the other Oriental Orthodox Churches can - paradoxically - be seen to have done a great service to all the Churches, Chalcedonian as well as non-Chalcedonian, by indicating that faith in Christ cannot satisfactorily be encapsulated in a single doctrinal formula. As with the paradoxes used in the Teaching of St. Gregory and by St. Ephrem, and as with the analogies and the verbs used to describe the Incarnation in the passage by Philoxenus, it is in the acceptance of a whole range of paradoxes, analogies, incarnational terms and doctrinal formulations that an orthodox faith is best identified. This insight, provided by the Armenian Orthodox Church, is one that would appear to be of especial significance for the whole of Christendom at the present time, and it is one for which all Christians should be grateful. Let me end, however, with a further brief, but essential, comment by the poet Jacob of Serugh: “The Son of God came to save, and not in order to be investigated by disputing parties”. (Ed. Bedjan III, 584).
The Sept 12-14, 2003 gathering in Šjmiačin, organized by Archbishop Khajag Barsamian, Primate of the Eastern Diocese of the Armenian Church of America (New York) and ably assisted by the Deans of the Sevan Seminary of Armenia, Fr. Garegin Yarut’iwnian, and St. Nersess Seminary (New Rochelle, New York), Vardapet Daniel Findikyan, was a major event: for the first time scholars from the West were invited as guests of His Holiness, Garegin (Karekin) II, to meet major representatives of the Armenian hierarchy gathered at Šjmiačin, such as the Archbishops Nersês Bozabalean of the Catholicosate Šjmiačin, Zawên Č’inečinean from Egypt, and Šahê Aće’eamean from Jerusalem, as well as the clergy and students, to reflect on what has been achieved at this venerable place of study and prayer, a place that has had to live through terrifying ordeals and agony unparalleled by any other Christian institution.

It seems as if some of Šjmiačin’s most famous men of the past, who held eminent positions at the turn to the 20th century, were sometimes well-ahead of their times and their peers, and as a consequence, perhaps not always as much appreciated and cherished as they actually deserved. It is exceedingly rare that the results of scholarship hold for a hundred years, as is the case of several editions and studies published by the erudite sons of Šjmiačin. Names like Malak’ía Örmamean, Karapat Tër-Mkrte’ean, Ervand Tër-Minaseanč, and several others, come immediately to mind: their publications have to be consulted to the present day.

Yet not only the learned men of the past deserve to be commended today. For the Armenian Church has also at present outstanding personalities, well-known and highly esteemed not only in Armenia but throughout the world. It is indeed a great pleasure to know some of these noble men and to have had the privilege to accompany some of them on their path of higher learning. Esteem expressed through
scholarship is an apt way of honoring the thoughtfulness, wisdom, and dignity of especially two outstanding Primates of the Armenian Church to whom I wish to dedicate this overview the late Primate of Egypt, Zawên Ç'ineçinean, and Khajag Barsamian of the United States.

And there are also young Armenians who, although burdened by many pastoral and other duties, are eminently equipped to imitate the scholarly work of their illustrious predecessors. It is to be hoped that the Armenian Church will recognize the potential of these young scholars by freeing them insofar as possible from pastoral duties in order to gain an even greater harvest through the future work of these fine men as scholars and teachers.

* 

The present paper consists of two parts. The first deals with some Armenian scholars of singular importance, trained initially at Ėjmiaçin and then moving on to German universities for further studies.¹

The second part is dedicated to some reflections on the term “Ėjmiaçin” and cognate terminology occurring in sources such as early credal statements and creeds in the Buzandaran Patmut’iwnk’ and the Šaraknoč.²

¹ A good deal of this information I owe to two publications which are extremely helpful for anyone who wishes to learn about Ėjmiaçin, its scholars, and the reforms attempted during the late 19th and early 20th centuries: cf. Sabine Step, Karapet Episkopos Ter-Mkritschjian (1866-1915). Materialien zu einem Kapitel armenisch-deutscher wissenschaftlicher Zusammenarbeit (Halle 1983); I want to thank the editor of this publication, H. Goltz, for sending me this important study in 1983 while Germany was still divided. See in addition R.H. Gazer, Die Reformbestrebungen in der Armenisch Apostolischen Kirche im ausgehenden 19. und im ersten Drittel des 20. Jahrhunderts (Doct. Diss., written under the supervision of the late Prof. Dr. J. Mehlhausen, Tübingen 1991, published in Göttingen 1996). I am grateful to R.H. Gazer for sending me not only his interesting publication concerning previous attempts at reforms in the Armenian Church but also his other pertinent study: Die Armenische Kirche in Sowjetarmenien zwischen den Weltkriegen: Anatomie einer Vernichtung (Studien zur orientalischen Kirchengeschichte 14, Hamburg 2001). His doctoral dissertation was translated into Eastern Armenian, appearing under: X.R. Lazaryan, Barenorga’akakan naxaçetnut’yunnero Hay Arak’elakan Ekeleç’um 19-rd dari verjin k’afordin ev 20-rd dari ațaçin kesin (Ėjmiaçin 1999).

² I want to express my thanks to Father Armaş Nalbandian, who helped me by preparing the excerpts from the Šaraknoč’ due to the enormous time pressure I felt at that time. Fr. Armaş Nalbandian is studying at Tübingen University and is a “wissenschaftliche Hilfskraft” of the Chair of Liturgical Studies.
I. Some Notes on Ėjmiacín’s Most Famous Scholars

The Mayr At’oř of Ėjmiacín constitutes the heart of the Armenian Apostolic Orthodox Church. Its initial official and most influential organ “Ararat” founded in 1868 and forced to cease publication in 1918/19, includes numerous scholarly contributions written by brilliant scholars such as Karapet Tër-Mkrt’č’eën, to name just one of the foremost among the learned men of that period whose contributions have still to be studied by anyone dealing with Armenian Church History and related areas.

Shortly after the foundation of the periodical “Ararat”, the “Georgian Theological Seminary” was established. One of its most outstanding teachers was undoubtedly Malak’ia Ôrmaneane (1841-1918) who, despite his short engagement of just one year at the Theological Seminary because of the oppression of Zsarist Russia³, had considerable influence on this institution. He also has to be considered as one of the towering scholarly figures among Armenia’s many erudite men. The three huge volumes of his famous monumental Annals of the Armenian Church, Azgapatum⁴, holds to the present day centerstage in our knowledge of Armenia’s ecclesiastical history.⁵ Two of Ôrmaneane’s

³ Cf. Gazer, Reformbestrebungen, 13-14, 71-74; idem, Die Armenische Kirche in Sowjetarmenien, 21-25.
foremost disciples, Karapet Tēr-Mkrt'čean and Garegin Yovsēp'ean, had studied for several years at German universities. As a matter of fact, at the turn of the twentieth century several Armenians were sent to the universities of Leipzig, Halle, Berlin, and other German universities to finish their studies in places which at that time were among Europe’s foremost institutions of higher learning. For example, the exceptionally endowed Karapet Tēr-Mkrt'čean (1866-1915) studied, in addition to Philosophy and Theology, also several languages (Latin, Greek, Hebrew, and Syriac, as well as German and English), remaining several years in Germany for the sole purpose of studies: he stayed in Leipzig from 1889-1990, Halle in 1891, Berlin in 1892, and Tübingen in 1893. At Tübingen he sought deeper acquaintance with the Catholic “Tübinger Schule,” while preparing for publication at the same time his study on the Paulicians in order to obtain his doctoral degree in Philosophy, after having obtained rigorous formation at several Protestant Faculties under the supervision of the then leading experts such as A. Harnack, F. Loofs, and many others. He also went to Paris to study the Armenian manuscript collection at the Bibliotheque Nationale (1893), moving then on to London (1894) in order to refine his knowledge of English. In 1894 he was back in Germany at Marburg University, for the completion of his Licentiate in Theology. Little


6 Cf. Gazer, Reformbestrebungen, 15-17, 43, 52; Stephan, Karapet Episkopos, 6-11.

7 His correspondence with F. Loofs after returning to Armenia (published in Stephan, 68-76) reveals his impeccable German.

8 Cf. Stephan, Karapet Episkopos, 8; Gazer, Reformbestrebungen, 15-17.

9 Cf. K. Tēr-Mkrt'čean. Die griechischen Quellen über die Paulikianer (Leipzig 1893); idem, Die Paulikianer im byzantinischen Kaiserreich und verwandte ketzerische Erscheinungen in Armenien (Leipzig 1893).
known is the fact that for this most industrious and able student the rigid German regulations of the Cultural Ministry (Kultusministerium) were waivered in order to make it possible for him to obtain also the Licentiate in Theology from the Marburg Protestant Faculty. It was (and still is) exceedingly rare in the highly-regulated German degree-procedures to obtain an exemption: only his outstanding scholarly achievements already amply demonstrated as a student led his teachers to act on his behalf.\(^{10}\)

As a cosmopolitan and highly learned young man of just twenty-eight years, he returned in 1894 to Ėjmiaci in via Venice and Constantinople, ready to shoulder heavy responsibilities\(^{11}\) not only as a teacher at Ėjmiacin from 1894-1899, but also as a scholar widely known in scholarly circles. Among his many publications the following have to be singled out as ones that must be consulted to the present day for anyone studying Armenian affairs in the context of the Christian East:

- 1897-1908: the discovery and publication of Timot'ēos Kuz, published in collaboration with E. Tēr-Minaseanc' (Ėjmiacin 1908); this important work appeared simultaneously in Germany, dedicated in gratitude to the Theological Faculties of the Universities of Marburg and Giessen;\(^{12}\)
- 1911-1914: the discovery and publication of the manuscript of Knik' Hawatoy əndhanu r s. Ekeleé'woy (Ėjmiacin 1914), republished because of its significance in Louvain 1974;
- 1904-1910: the discovery of the manuscript of singularly important writings of Irenaeus, considered

\(^{10}\) Cf. Stephan, Karapet Episkopos, 8; Gazer, Reformbestrebungen, 15-17.

\(^{11}\) His moving vows at the tomb of the founder of the Theological Seminary of Ėjmiacin, Catholicos Gēorg IV Mecagore (1866-1887), addressed to the then Catholicos Mkrtič (1892-1907), the Brotherhood of Ėjmiacin, and the Armenian people, give ample testimony of his profound sense of responsibility. Cf. Stephan, Karapet Episkopos, 9-11; Tēr-Minaseanc', Karapet Episkopos Tēr-Mkrtič'ean. Kēñk'n u Gorcunēut'ıw'na (Moscow 1911), 15-17.

of such significance that it was published in the famous series *Texte und Untersuchungen* with an Epilogue and Notes by A. von Harnack.\(^{13}\) Given the importance of this discovery, it was translated\(^ {14}\) into English and French, appearing in the equally famous series of *Patrologia Orientalis* (1919),\(^ {15}\) as well as in addition in Russian in the well-known *ХРИСТИАНСКОЕ ЧТЕНИЕ* 87 (St. Petersburg 1907), in Italian (1923), and even in Dutch (1920).\(^ {16}\)

As editor of "Ararat" he published numerous brilliant studies, voicing also his concerns in connection with the envisioned reforms within the Armenian Church.\(^ {17}\) At that time any real chance for lasting transformation of the theological training at Ėjmiacin and the realization of the lofty plans espoused by Armenian scholars and the ecclesiastical leadership was already doomed: internal strife, compounded by mounting political pressure forshadowing the revolution,\(^ {18}\) the ensuing massacres of the Armenians from 1894-1896


\(^{14}\) Cf. overview in Stephan, *Karapet Episkopos*, 81-82.


\(^{16}\) Cf. Stephan, *Karapet Episkopos*, 81-82.

\(^{17}\) It was above all Tér-MkrTē’ean who clearly foresaw the need to rigorously train the young Armenian clergy in all theological disciplines, publishing his concerns in numerous articles of "Ararat." Cf. Gazer, *Reformbestrebungen*, 18-27.

by the Turks under Sultan Abdul Hamid, buried all hopes of harvesting the fruits sown by such able men as Karapet Tër-Mkrtč'ean and Garegin Yovsěp'ean, who succeeded Tër-Mkrtč'ean as editor of “Ararat” and as rector of the Theological Seminary of Ėjmiačin, shut down in April 1917 on the eve of the revolution and remaining closed until 1945. Garegin Yovsěp'ean had also studied Philosophy, Theology, and History at the German universities of Leipzig (1892-1894), Halle (1894-1895), and Berlin (1895-1896) before assuming responsibilities in Ėjmiačin from 1897 to 1917, then subsequently as Catholicos of the Holy See of Antelias until his death in 1952.\textsuperscript{19}

One of the most urgent tasks felt by these highly erudite Armenians was the fundamental necessity of organizing on a larger scale the education of the Armenian clergy at Ėjmiačin.\textsuperscript{20} This — alas — came to naught at the beginning of the 20th century because of internal disunity and the horrendous political circumstances the Armenians were faced with at that crucial time for Ėjmiačin.

In the “\textit{Official Monthly of Holy Ėjmiačin}” Xačik Badikyan has most recently drawn attention to other prominent students of the Gēorgean Seminary such as the famous philologist Manuk Abelean (1855-1944)\textsuperscript{21} who, after having completed his education at the Gēorgean Seminary (1876-1885), moved on to Europe for further studies in Germany and France. His outstanding contributions, to be used and studied to the present day, include among many important scholarly investigations the critical editions of Koriwn and Movsēs Xorenac'i\textsuperscript{22} next to his important two-volume study on the History of the Armenian Literature.\textsuperscript{23}

Kostandyan, “Petut'yan ew ekelec'u p'oxharaberut'yan mi k'ani har'er, 19-rd dari erkrd kes, Ṣusastan, T'urk'ia”, \textit{ibid.}, 184-188; English summaries in \textit{Armenica 2000}, 131.

\textsuperscript{19} Cf. Gazer, \textit{Reformbestrebungen}, 52-62.

\textsuperscript{20} \textit{Ibid.}, 17-27, 38-42, 54-61. Gazer (Lazaryan) has collected and studied all the pertinent contributions of Tër-Mkrtč'ean published in the various issues of “Ararat.”


\textsuperscript{23} Cf. M. Abelean, \textit{Hayoc' hin grakanut'c'an patmut'iwn} 1-II (Erevan 1944-1946).
Other highly educated Armenian clergy had also received their formation first at Éjmiacin, then at German universities, among them Ervand Těr-Minasean(c') (1879-1964), who, after completing his studies at Éjmiacin (1892-1900), had studied Theology, Philology and "Orientalistik" (i.e. "the Study of the Christian Orient") in Leipzig (1901-1903) and Berlin (1903-1904), returning thereafter to Leipzig where he finished his doctoral dissertation on the relations between the Armenian and Syrian Churches.24 Given its importance, A. von Harnack accepted this study for publication in the prestigious series "Texte und Untersuchungen."25 The German professors of another university were so impressed by this publication that Těr-Minasean obtained an honorary doctorate from the university of Giessen in 1904.26 This was by no means the only honor bestowed on him. In 1943 he obtained an honorary doctorate in Philology from the University of Erevan.27 E. Těr-Minasean surely belongs, with K. Těr-Mktrte'ean and others, to the foremost Armenian scholars of his time, demonstrating his vast erudition in numerous publications.28 It is sad, indeed, that his own compatriots seemingly were unable to make better use of this admittedly somewhat "radical personality" than burning his article and removing him from office.29 This also elucidates the point Khajag Srpazan once made in my office while still a student: "You cannot move a table before not having established friendship," an insight that duly impressed me.

The subtlety of this profound principle paves the way for us to reflect on the spiritual significance of the name of this century-old

24 Cf. Gazer, Reformbestrebungen, 90.
26 Cf. Gazer, Reformbestrebungen, 90.
28 See above the important editions and publications together with Těr-Mktrte'ean listed in notes 12-13.
29 Cf. Gazer, Reformbestrebungen, 95-96.
location of the *Mayr At’or* where several of Armenia’s foremost scholars served the Armenian people.

II. The Term Ėjmiacin and Related Terminology

(*Եհովա, Եհովահ, Հայոց Զարի, Հայ, Հայազգ*) in the *Saraknoc* and Other Armenian Sources

I do not know of any other Christian Church named after the “*Only-Begotten who descended*” from heaven to redeem mankind.”

The term “Ėjmiacin” (“the Only-Begotten descended”): the more interesting translation seems to be: “he descended as Only-Begotten”) must be associated with the beginnings of the Armenian Church, for the verb ἐζηλήσασθαι has to be compared with the Greek κατελθόντα already attested in the creeds I-III at the second Synod of Antioch in 341. In Antioch it seemingly formed part of the baptismal creed, and it is also attested in the Syriac *Doctrina Addai* and several other Syriac sources. The oldest Armenian witness is a creed in the *Buzandaran Patmutiwnk*’ [110 (34) and 225 (9)], and credal statements in the

---


32 The *first number* refers to the page of the edition used, in the case of the *Buzandaran Patmutiwnk*’ it is the third Venice edition of 1914; the *second number* indicates the line.
Teaching of Saint Gregory [§377 (4) and §381 (11)]. The text of the Buzandaran Patmut‘iwnk (p. 110) and the earliest Armenian translations of the Nicene Creed can serve as samples:

Buzandaran Patmut‘iwnk

3rd Venice Edition of 1914, p. 110 (Winkler, 70 [31-34]):

(31) հույս պրեսչ բայեր ուջի ասոսայրութիւն քարսեր կերստի}

(32) բուրքույ

(33) կյուն

(34) կեղ ըճեսnaissance ամերգ…

(31) When he saw that the Father remained ignored by humanity,
(32) he leaped,
(33) came,
(34) descended from the right of the throne...

Here are the differing versions of the earliest Armenian witnesses to the Nicene Creed:

Nicene Creed (Winkler, 128 [13-14]):

Ps.-Evagrius, p. 135 (13-14):

(13) ուր ըճես ասոսայրութիւն կեղ
(14) բեք ըճեսայրութիւն գրքույ 34

(13) Who descended for the sake of humankind
(14) and put on a body.

Letter of Sahak:

(13) ուր ըճես ետփ
(14) բեք ըճեսայրութիւն կեղ 35

(13) Who descended for the sake of humanity
(14) and was “embodied”.

of the textual presentation in my study on the Armenian creeds: Entwicklungsgeschichte, 70 (34), 377.

Moreover we encounter կեղ in many šarakan, see for example Šarakan, 34 (col. 2), 48 (col. 2), 78 (col. 1), 81 (col. 2), 96 (col. 1), 101 (col. 2), 109 (col. 1), 136 (col. 2), 138 (col. 2), 153 (col. 2), 163 (col. 1), etc., etc. In addition կեղ is present in one of the most intriguing Armenian creeds, found at the beginning of the Žamagirk‘, which reflects the original Armenian baptismal creed, subsequently replaced by the so-called “Armeniacum” probably some time during the 6th century. For the Armenian evidence cf. Winkler, Entwicklungsgeschichte, 377-381.

34 For the analysis of this expression cf. Winkler, Entwicklungsgeschichte, 385-399.

35 For this neologism cf. Winkler, Entwicklungsgeschichte, 428-460.
Given the intriguing fact that the background of ՔՔ seemingly goes back to the beginnings of Armenian Christianity it does seem eminently worthwhile to look more closely into the terminology of “Եջմիացիա” and related vocabulary. In this context the following nouns and verbs are of considerable interest:

1. the terminology expressing the relationship between the Father and the Son such as:

- ԳԵՐԵՎԵՐԵ ("Only-Begotten");
- ՀԵՆԵՐԵՆ ("Offspring");
- ԵՆԵՐԵ ("the one who brings forth", as a term for the Father);
- ԵՎՆԵՐԵ ("dawn" which seemingly corresponds with syr.: ՔԱՆԹ);

2. the verbs concerning the Incarnation like:

- ՔՔ ("he descended") as we have seen already;
- ԵՐԵՆԱՐԵ ("he humbled himself");
- ԵՐԵՆԱՐԵ / ԵՐԵՆԱՐԵ ("he sent"/"was sent");
- and several other verbs like ՔՔ ("he came"), ՔՔ ("he put on a body") etc.

All these terms are, of course, part of credal statements and some also derive from official creeds of the Armenian Church, about which I have published a more extensive study and several articles.36

In this presentation I do not want to repeat the detailed discussions of several terms, including "q̣qṭẉṇḷ "ḍẉp̣ḍ/p̣ḅ" ("he put on a body") and how, why, and when this expression was substituted by the neologism "ḍẉp̣ḍβ̣ẉγ̣ẉḷ" ("he was ‘embodied’"). All this is readily available in previous publications. And for the Syriac evidence the ground-breaking studies of scholars like A. de Halleux, S. Brock and others have to be consulted. In this paper, which does not pretend to be a systematic investigation, I want to extend my previous analysis of the Armenian sources to include now the pertinent vocabulary in the Šarəknoc’ limiting, however, the analysis to several feasts. In my book on the formation I discussed the šarâkans only in connection with the formation of the neologism "ḍẉp̣ḍβ̣ẉγ̣ẉḷ" ("he was ‘embodied’").

1. Some Remarks on the Terminology Concerning the Relationship between the Son and the Father:

In the Šarəknoc’ and other Armenian sources we find numerous references to the "ḍẉḍβ̣p̣ḅ" ("Only-Begotten"), as one might expect.


38 Cf. Winkler, Entwicklungsgeschichte, 158-166.

39 Cf. Šarakan (from Jerusalem 1914, reprinted in New York 1992), 11 (col.2), 17 (col. 1), 19 (col. 1), 21 (col. 1), 22 (col. 1), 23 (col. 1), 24 (col. 1), 34 (col. 1), 39 (col. 2), 44 (col. 2), 45 (col. 1), 65 (col. 2), 67 (col. 2), etc. etc.
We are perhaps less aware of the background of related terms such as δυνητης (σωκερ) with the meaning of “Offspring (of the Father),” sometimes used also in connection with the Father being depicted as δυνης (“the one who brings forth”). Like the verbs εληφης (“he came”) and εληφης (“he descended”) so also the reference to the Son as δυνητης ("Offspring [of the Father]") and the Father as δυνης (“the one who brings forth”) occurs more readily in the earliest Armenian sources than in later documents.

a. The Allusion to the Son’s Birth Before All Time:
   The Son as δυνητης (of the Father)
   and the Father as δυνης (of the Son)\(^{41}\)

Already in the Teaching of Saint Gregory the term δυνητης (1. “birth” / 2. “offspring”) is no longer used in the sense of the Son being the “Offspring” of the Father. In this source it just has the meaning of “birth” in the broadest sense: “the birth from the Father”, “from the holy Virgin”, etc.\(^{42}\) However in the creeds of the Buzandaran Patmut’iwnk’, which are of highest antiquity, the term δυνητης is used as a technical term for the Son being the “Offspring” of the Father. Here the term δυνητης is closely related with δυνητης (“Only-Begotten”), while reflecting at the same time the older vocabulary: the term δυνητης has to be compared with the Nicene γεννηθαις οτι του πατρος μονογενη, whereas δυνητης seems rather to reflect γεννηθαι of the Synod of Antioch in 324/325, thus being prior to the Nicene Council of 325.\(^{43}\) The pre-nicene Synod of Antioch has come down to us only in Syriac, and the Syriac term in

---

\(^{40}\) This translation is preferable to “begetter” (which surely is possible), for δυνητης means both “to give birth” and “to beget”; likewise the first meaning of δυνητης is “birth”. Hence it is preferable to render δυνης with a neutral and open-ended translation, like the German translation of δυνης as “der Hervorbringer” (which – alas – is not possible in English).

\(^{41}\) Cf. the discussion of the evidence in the Buzandaran Patmut’iwnk’ in Winkler, “Anhang zur Untersuchung” (as in note 36).

\(^{42}\) Cf. Winkler, Entwicklungsgeschichte, 316.

\(^{43}\) Ibid., 316-320. See in addition the extensive further clarifications in Winkler, “Anhang zur Untersuchung” (as in note 36).
question is տղամարդ, with which the Armenian expression ծնայուն ("Offspring" [of the Father]) has seemingly to be compared.

The Syriac term τάλα is also attested in the Syriac “Anaphora of Addai and Mari” (here “Offspring of the Most High”), and it is known to Ephrem, as I have shown elsewhere.

It is quite interesting to note that the term ծնայուն (“Offspring”) is still present in several Ժականքs. I quote as an example the interesting Օրհնութիւն from the Canon of Ėragoloc’ of Epiphany:

Ընթացել զոր

Քհբ Համլեյ աղեղերի ճանապարհը
Ընթացել իր դիտահայկը
Քհբ Զոր ի դիտահայկ... 

The Offspring of the Father
and the Old One of days of timeless eternity,
in time he dwelled in your womb
yet was not separated from the Father...

The vocabulary is taken from the creed in the Buzandaran Patmut’iwnk [Creed 1 (2.5.10.13) and other credal statements in this document], and the reference to the Քհբ Համլեյ occurs as Քհեթաաղելու in the credal formulae of the Teaching of Saint Gregory §381 (1): Քհեթաաղելու գնութ ընտանիք աղելու (“The Old One of days has made himself a child for our sake”).

This close connection with the oldest credal statements shows how interesting the Ժականքs are: many a times they reflect expressions

45 Cf. Winkler, “Anhang zur Untersuchung.”
46 Cf. Šarakans, 21 (col. 1), also the Ōrhnut’iwn of Great Monday (p. 168 [col. 2]), of Good Friday (p. 181 [col. 2]) and Tuesday after Easter (p. 199 [col. 1]), furthermore 228 (col. 2), 230 (col. 1), 237 (col. 1).
47 Cf. Winkler, Entwicklungsgeschichte, 318-320, 323-328.
48 The Armenian term մանականվ  (= a hapax) is untranslatable in English, unlike in German, where one can translate it: “er verkündete sich.”
49 Cf. Winkler, Entwicklungsgeschichte, 24.
which once were more widely disseminated and pertained to the earliest Armenian credal traditions.

The closeness of Հոնդ ("Offspring") with Օհոդ ("Only-Begotten") and their usage as synonyms is clearly seen in the Որհնութիւն of the fourth Sunday of Lent.⁵₀

Որհոդ... դու Հոնդեր զոր Օհոդի... համարումից...

Today the Word ... and Offspring of the Father, the Only-Begotten ... appeared ...

This passage can also be rendered as: " ... the Word and only-begotten Offspring ...". The combination of the two terms suggests that the later common term Օհոդ ("Only-Begotten") was simply added to the older terminology of Հոնդ ("Offspring").

The Որհնութիւն of the Canon of the sixth Sunday of Lent⁵¹ speaks of the hiddenness of the "Offspring" in the Father’s bosom, an allusion to Jn 1:18:

Ալ Օհոդերն են Հոնդ զոր
Օհոդի ուղերջիր Հոնդեր են դու.
եւ Զորիմարում երկրաբանային զանազանություն...

[You] who art the inscrutable Offspring and Word, concealed in the ineffable Father’s bosom, you were also glorified by worshipping angels ...

Of particular interest are coined compounds concerning the Son, such as Օհոդեր (literally: "the bosom-born") and Օհոդեր (lit.: "the father-born"), terms notoriously difficult to render into Western languages, but which are quite common in Armenian. Here are two examples, beginning with the Որհնութիւն of the Canon of Thursday of Easter:⁵²

---
⁵⁰ Cf. Սարական, 126 (col. 2), also the Որհնութիւն of the feast of all the Apostles (p. 73 [col. 2]).
⁵¹ Ibid., 153 (col. 2).
⁵² Ibid., 202 (col. 2).
The Spirit of truth
who instead of the “bosom-born” Word
— who ascended to heaven —
was sent as good news of the Father from the heights
to comfort those afflicted since Adam...

Here is the Ṣhrnut’iwn of the third day after Epiphany.⁵³

Planting the holy Virgin as Tree of Life in Eden,
you, who didst bring forth the blossom, born from the Father
(lit.: the “father-born” blossom),
and didst give [him] in time as fruit for mankind...

The term ḏūnqa, used as an expression for the Father who brings
forth the Son before all time, occurs only in the oldest Armenian credal
statements and creeds such as Creed 1 and 3 of the Buzandaran
Patmut’iwnk’, as well as in a further credal fragment of this particular
source.⁵⁴ Interestingly enough, this terminology is preserved in the
Hare’ of Easter⁵⁵ and in several other šarakans such as the Mecac’usc’e
of the Canon of the feast of (Mary’s birth from) Joachim and Anna and
the Mecac’usc’e of the Canon of the imprisonment of Saint Gregory.⁵⁶

---

⁵³ Ibid., 30 (col. 1).
⁵⁴ Cf. Winkler, Entwicklungsgeschichte, 317-319; eadem, “Anhang zur Untersuchung.”
⁵⁵ Cf. Šarakan, 231 (col. 2).
⁵⁶ Ibid., 11 (col. 2), 149 (col. 2).
Harc of Easter.\textsuperscript{57}

\textit{Πρ ἡμὴ πη τι \ποπ ἡμὴ ἠρνη...}

Who is sitting at the right of the Father, his Begetter ...

\textit{Μεε'υεστ'ε' of Mary's birth (and the imprisonment of Saint Gregory).\textsuperscript{58}}

\textit{ῃηςηηηη ηή σειηεγ \πηηηη \ποπ \ποποοηηηη...}

Maid and mother of life
of the Only-Begotten at the right of [his] Begetter-Father ...

The vocabulary of \textit{ἡμή} ("the one who brings forth" / "begetter") seems to stem from the early credal tradition of the \textit{Buzandaran Patmut'iwnk'} to which sometimes \textit{ςοπ} ("of the Father") was added later on, as is the case in these \textit{sarakans}.

The early credal tradition of the \textit{Buzandaran Patmut'iwnk'} is also traceable in other \textit{sarakans}, for example in connection with the term \textit{ὐηηληηηη} (\textit{ἀπαύγασμα}, "dawn", "rise") to express the Son's birth before all time.

\textbf{b. The Son as \textit{ὐηηληηηη} ("ἀπαύγασμα")}

The term \textit{ὐηηληηηη} has to be analysed in the context of Heb 1:3, which according to Zohraean reads as follows: \textit{πρ έ λαγ ἤηηηη} (δς έν ἄπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης). The creeds in the \textit{Buzandaran Patmut'iwnk'} are important witnesses to significant variants of Heb 1:3, also present in several \textit{sarakans}. I shall refer first to the creeds in the \textit{Buzandaran Patmut'iwnk'}, followed by the evidence in the \textit{sarakans}.

\textsuperscript{57} Ibid., 231 (col. 2).
\textsuperscript{58} Ibid., 11 (col. 2), 149 (col. 2); furthermore 257 (col. 2).
The Testimony of the Buzandaran Patmut’iwnk

Credal Fragment: 

δωρησαθη
ην ου φωνησαν
...  
dawn,  
light of glory of the Father ...

Creed 1:

δωρησαθη ζωπ 
ην ου φωνησαν ξωπησαν
... 
dawn of the Father,  
light of glory of the Divine ...

Both terms, δωρησαθη like ην ου, correspond to ἀπαύγασμα of Heb 1:3. Since δωρησαθη seems to be an addition to ην ου, the question arises (1) whether δωρησαθη and ην ου reflect the fusion of different traditions and (2) whether δωρησαθη has to be compared with the Syriac term ḫaur (denha), as I suggested elsewhere.

Variations of Heb 1:3 are also attested in the šarakans, for example in the Ōrhnut’iwn of Maundy Thursday.

1 ὕψωτας δηνωρ 
2 η πρ ηΖ ως βουλωμένη φωνησαν ζωπησαν
3 δωρησαθη η φωνησαν 
4 ἐν δωρησαθη η φωνησαν ξωπησαν...

1 Today you engendered  
2 [the one] who [is] the Son from the Father before eternity  
3 as splendor of glory  
4 and dawn of the ineffable light ...

The vocabulary of lines 2-4 is taken form the creeds of the Buzandaran Patmut’iwnk. The Antiochene expression of line 2 is also present in Creed 2 of the Buzandaran Patmut’iwnk and in several other Armenian creeds; lines 3-4 can be compared with a credal fragment and Creed 1 of the same document.

---

59 Cf. Winkler, Entwicklungs geschichte, 321.  
60 Ibid., 80 (6-7).  
61 Ibid., 70 (6-7).  
62 Ibid., 321-322.  
63 Cf. Šarakan, 177 (col. 2).  
64 Cf. Winkler, Entwicklungs geschichte, 321-328.  
65 Ibid., 326-327.  
66 Ibid., 321.
But there are also other šarakans with variants to Heb 1:3 and the peculiar reference to the Son as ḏwrlnәbh (ἀπαυγασμα) of the Father, for example the Ōrhnut'iwn of the Canon of the third Sunday of Lent\textsuperscript{67} and the Feast of the Commemoration of the Forty Martyred Youths of Sebaste:\textsuperscript{68}

\textit{Ōrhnut'iwn} of the third Sunday of Lent:\textsuperscript{69}

\textit{L}ān\textsubscript{y}  b\textsubscript{y}  n\\bun\textsubscript{y}
\textit{d}μ\textsubscript{n}n\textsubscript{y}  b\textsubscript{y}  d\textsubscript{w}n\textsubscript{l}n\textsubscript{b}n
\textit{n}p  t\textsubscript{h}p\textsubscript{r}p...

Light from Light
offspring and \textit{dawn}
[you] who came ...

\textit{Ōrhnut'iwn} of the Forty Martyred Youths:\textsuperscript{70}

\textit{y}m\textsubscript{n}p\textsubscript{r}z\textsubscript{r}w\textsubscript{f}w\textsubscript{m}n
\textit{d}w\textsubscript{r}l\textsubscript{d}p
\textit{n}p\textsubscript{r}p\textsubscript{b}n  \textit{d}\textsubscript{w}d\textsubscript{b}\textsubscript{v}n
\textit{q}w\textsubscript{w}w\textsubscript{n}w\textsubscript{y}w\textsubscript{w}n\textsubscript{b}n
\textit{w}m\textsubscript{w}m\textsubscript{w}d\textsubscript{n}w\textsubscript{b}w\textsubscript{w}n
\textit{k}p\textsubscript{b}l\textsubscript{b}y\textsubscript{y}b\textsubscript{g}w\textsubscript{l} p \textsubscript{b}k\textsubscript{z}
\textit{h}\textsubscript{h}n\textsubscript{b}n...

Today when, in [his] majestic \textit{dawn},
the Son [and] Only-Begotten
made the splendor of the Godhead
appear in the midst of the lake ...

It is time to draw attention to the fact that nearly all quoted šarakans\textsuperscript{71} surprisingly belong to the category of the Ōrhnut'iwn\textsuperscript{c} that form, together with Hare\textsuperscript{c} (and Gore), the oldest šarakans.\textsuperscript{72} This corresponds with the fact that the discussed terminology occurs only in

---

\textsuperscript{67} Cf. Šarakan, 113 (col. 2).
\textsuperscript{68} Ibid., 137 (col. 1); see in addition 235 (col. 1), 259 (col. 1:3x).
\textsuperscript{69} Ibid., 113 (col. 2).
\textsuperscript{70} Ibid., 137 (col. 1).
\textsuperscript{71} The Meccae'usc\textsuperscript{c} of the birth of Mary has preserved the old terminology. The category of the Meccae'usc\textsuperscript{c} did not develop before the 8th century in contrast to the šarakans belonging to the canticles of Exodus (= Ōrhnut'iwn), of the Three Youths of Dan 3 (= Hare\textsuperscript{c}) and the prayer of Azarias of Dan 3 (= Gore); likewise the šarakans to Ps 50 [51] (= Olormea), and to Pss 148-150 (= Tèr yerknie'), all of which are of considerable antiquity. Cf. Winkler, "The Armenian Night Office II: The Unit of Psalmody, Canticles, and Hymns", Revue des Études Arménienes 17 (1983), 471-551, here: 519-523.

\textsuperscript{72} Cf. Winkler, "The Armenian Night Office II", 519-523.
the oldest creeds and credal statements of the *Bazandaran Patmut’iwnk’.

2. The Verbs Introducing the Statements of the Incarnation: 

\textit{b}l\textit{b}l, \textit{b}l\textit{r}, \textit{fun\text{"a}wp\text{"a}k\text{"a}g\text{"a}n\text{"a}}, \textit{wn\text{"a}wp\text{"a}k\text{"a}w\text{"a}/wn\text{"a}wp\text{"a}k\text{"a}w\text{"a}}.

We commented on the verb \textit{b}l\textit{r} ("he descended") and its background and context already at the beginning of this paper.\(^{73}\) I want to add here a few remarks on the other verbs which introduce the statements concerning the Incarnation, for a detailed discussion I refer to my publication on the evolution of Armenia’s creeds.\(^{74}\) One of the oldest verbs is undoubtedly \textit{b}l\textit{b}l ("he came") with its Syriac parallels in the *Acts of Thomas* and other early Syriac sources.\(^{75}\) Moreover it is attested in the Armenian fragments attributed to Irenaeus, in the following combination: \textit{b}l\textit{b}l \textit{npq\text{"a}h\text{"a}n\text{"a} wn\text{"a}np\text{"a}n\text{"a}n\text{"a} \text{"a} \text{"a} òp\text{"a}q\text{"a}k\text{"a}w\text{"a}n\text{"a}} ("the Son of God came and put on a body").\(^{76}\) The verb "he came" forms also part of the earliest Antiochene baptismal creed ("\textit{qui propter nos venit}"),\(^{77}\) which shows once more that the Armenian evidence has sometimes to be compared with the oldest Antiochene and Syriac sources.

The verb \textit{wn\text{"a}wp\text{"a}k\text{"a}w\text{"a}/wn\text{"a}wp\text{"a}k\text{"a}w\text{"a}} ("he sent", "was sent") occurs in several \textit{\text{"a}rak\text{"a}n},\(^{78}\) also in the *Teaching of Saint Gregory* §§ 364, 380,\(^{79}\) in the Creed attributed to Gregory,\(^{80}\) and in Creed 3 of the *Buzandaran Patmut’iwnk’*.\(^{81}\) This shows again that this particular verb is predominantly present in the oldest Armenian credal statements.

The same has to be said about the verbs \textit{fun\text{"a}wp\text{"a}k\text{"a}g\text{"a}n\text{"a}} ("he humbled himself"), which occurs in the *Teaching of Saint Gregory*

\(^{73}\) See also Winkler, *Entwicklungsgeschichte*, 375-384.

\(^{74}\) For \textit{wn\text{"a}wp\text{"a}k\text{"a}w\text{"a}/wn\text{"a}wp\text{"a}k\text{"a}w\text{"a}} see Winkler, *Entwicklungsgeschichte*, 375-376, for \textit{fun\text{"a}wp\text{"a}k\text{"a}g\text{"a}n\text{"a}}, 382-383, for related verbs, 383-384.


\(^{79}\) *Ibid.*, 16 (1), 23 (3), 375.


\(^{81}\) *Ibid.*, 77 (66), 376.
§385 and several šarakans, reflecting at the same time an affinity with Syriac sources of the 4th century.

3. Traces of Expressions from the Armenian Anaphora of Basil in Several Šarakans

It is well known that the Armenians initially used the Anaphora of Basil, not the Liturgy of Athanasius, as a fragment of the prayer following the Sanctus in the Buzandaran Patmut’iwnk’ V:28 demonstrates. Also well known is the fact that the Armenian manuscript tradition attributes this anaphora to Grigor Lusaworič’, not Basil. This does not concern us at the moment so much as the traces of particular expressions of this anaphora in several šarakans. In this context we can only allude to this observation. A systematic investigation of the šarakanoc’ not only with regard to parallels with the Anaphora of Basil, but concerning also the “Formelgut” of the creeds, has to wait for future scholarly projects.

---

82 Ibid., 25 (2), 382.
83 Ibid., 382.
84 Ibid., 382-383.
86 Cf. Winkler, Entwicklungsgeschichte, 83.
a. The Son Sitting on the Throne of Glory

(ܡܒܕܢܐ ܡܘܢܝܓ)

The reference to the Son sitting on the ܡܒܕܢܐ ܡܘܢܝܓ ("throne of glory") figures prominently in all recensions of the Anaphora of Basil, where it forms the transition to the Sanctus. The expression ܡܒܕܢܐ ܡܘܢܝܓ ("throne of glory") occurs quite frequently also in the ܫܪﺎՔܢܐ. Here are two examples:

Ԏրհութիւն օ Ԃրագաղթու օ Էփիփանի: 🌁️

...ետառեց եւ ϻարեա մունաւ դին երեք...

...ascending also to the throne of glory with the Father ... 常委

Ԡրհութիւն օ օ Սաղար օ էփիփանի: 🌁️

Մուժ եւ երեք եւ ձեռք եւ երեք եւ երեք եւ երեք երեք եւ երեք երեք երեք երեք երեք երեք երեք երեք երեք երեք երեք երեք երեք երեք երեք երեք երեք երեք երեք երեք երեք երեք երեք երեք երեք երեք երեք երեք երեք երեք երեք երեք երեք երեք երեք երեք երեք երեք երեք երեք երեք երեք երեք երեք երեք երեք երեք երեք երեք երեք երեք երեք երեք երեք երեք երեք երեք երեք երեք երեք երեք երեք երեք երեք երեք երեք երեք երեք երեք երեք երեք երեք երեք երեք երեք երեք երեք երեք երեք երեք երեք երեք երեք երեք երեք երեք երեք երեք երեք երեք երեք երեք երեք երեք երեք երեք երեք երեք երեք երեք երեք երեք երեք երեք  sứh

Today the Word, who is with the Father on the throne of glory, is born, having been 'embodied' by the holy Virgin.

Other borrowings from the "ante Sanctus" of the anaphoras can also be traced in the ܫܪﺎՔܢܐ.

---

88 For an extensive exploration of its background and presence in all recensions of the Anaphora of Basil see my study: Die Basiliius-Anaphora (Anaphorae Orientales II. Anaphorae Armeniacae 2, Rome 2005), 357-384.

89 Cf. Սաղարան, 21 (col. 1), also present in the Օրհութիւնք of Monday of the Holy Week, Good-Friday, and Tuesday after Easter; cf. ibid., 168 (col. 2), 181 (col. 2), 199 (col. 1).

90 Cf. Սաղարան, 32 (col. 1), also in the Օրհութիւն of the fifth day after Epiphany, 35 (col. 2); see in addition 232 (col. 2), 237 (col. 1), 244 (col. 1), 252 (col. 2), 253 (col. 1).

91 For a detailed discussion of the evolution and the context of this neologism cf. Winkler, Entwicklungsgeschichte, 428-466.

92 See previous note.
b. The Son Sitting on the Chariot of the Cherubim

God “sitting on the Cherubim” or “upon the chariot of the Cherubim” is mentioned in Is 37:16 (ὁ...καθήμενος ἐπὶ τῶν χερουβίν), Dan 3:55 (ὁ...καθήμενος ἐπὶ χερουβίν), and 1 Chron 28:18 (τοῦ ἄρματος τῶν χερουβίν). This expression was taken over in the “ante Sanctus” of several Eastern anaphoras, as in a Greek fragment, in the coptic Euchologion of the White Monastery, in the Bohairic version of the Anaphora of Gregory, in the Syriac version of Basil (here in the “Oratio super velamine”), in the Armenian version of the Anaphora of Cyrill, and some Ethiopian anaphoras, besides being also attested in Armenian and Georgian troparia sung at the Great Entrance of the Liturgy, so for example the Srbasačutiwn of Maundy Thursday:

You who are sitting on the ‘four-shaped’ fiery chariot ...

The allusion to the Son sitting “upon the chariot of the Cherubim” is also attested in the Šaraknoc‘, as for example in the Hambarji, Ōrhnut’iwn, and Tēr yerńic’:

Hambarji of the second week of Lent:

93 Not present in the Armenian version; cf. Zohraean, 267; Winkler, Die Basilius-Anaphora, 377 n. 73.
94 For these anaphoras cf. Winkler, Die Basilius-Anaphora, 376-379.
97 Ibid., 225.
98 Cf. Šarakan, 110 (col. 1).
Son [and] Only-Begotten
you who are upon the chariot of the Cherubim ...

Örhnut‘iwn of Palm-Sunday
and Tēr yerknio‘ of Pentecost: 99

You who are resting upon the chariot of the Cherubim ...

This small collection of examples suffices to show how intriguing the evidence of the šarakans is! The study of the broader context of the term Ėjmiahin has invited us, moreover, to ponder the depth and beauty of the rich theological tradition of Armenia’s hymnography.

Sometimes it is quite appropriate to remember the broader ramifications and the fine web of subtle underpinnings when we use terms like Ėjmiahin: they can lead us from a philological and historical context to its inner core, inviting us to contemplate the profundity and beauty of these terms, while admiring also those who once shaped these concepts, and this more often than not in times of excruciating hardship.

99 Ibid., 164 (col. 1), 272 (col. 1).
ARMENIAN PILGRIMAGE TO THE MOUNTAIN OF THE TRANSFIGURATION AND THE GALILEE

Michael E. Stone

The Mountain of the Transfiguration

Tabor or Hermon

My good friend Professor George Nickelsburg of the University of Iowa has long had a particular interest in Mount Hermon. The role played by this high mountain in the Book of Enoch first aroused his curiosity. He once observed, and he is far from the first person to do so, that the mountain of the Transfiguration must have been Hermon.¹ This position is taken by many biblical scholars on the grounds that: (a) the preceding incident in the Gospel narrative, Peter’s declaration of Jesus as Christ, took place at Caesarea Philippi, and the Hermon rises north of that site (Mat. 16:13-20 and parallels); (b) Mat. 17:1 and Mark 9:2-10 both refer to a ὑψηλὸς “a high mountain”. This fits Mount Hermon (nearly 3000 m.) far better than the traditional Mount Tabor (588 m.); (c) following the Transfiguration, Jesus and his disciples continued through the Galilee, which again fits better with Mount Hermon (Mark 9:30).

This conclusion of modern biblical scholarship, however, does not conform to the traditional site of the Transfiguration. Since the fourth century, Christian tradition has virtually unanimously set it on Mount Tabor, in the valley of Jezreel, considerably south of Mount Hermon. It is true that the Bordeaux Pilgrim (ca. 333) identified the Mount of Olives as the place of the Transfiguration, but the traditional site at Tabor seems to have become fixed soon after. The Christian (and Moslem) pilgrim tradition attests this from the time of Queen Helena

on. We shall be chiefly concerned with this traditional site, which has attracted pilgrims and monks since the fourth century.

The verse of Psalms 89(88):13 “Tabor and Hermon joyously praise your name” was early understood to refer to the Transfiguration. Eusebius, in his commentary on Ps 88:13, §1092 says: “I think that in these mountains (i.e., Tabor and Hermon) the glorious transfigurations of our Savior took place, and that he often spent time there when he was doing his work with human beings.”

As a result of the association of these two mountains in Psalm, in the Armenian Hymnal, the Ծաղկելք, in hymns for the Feast of the Transfiguration (Vardavər), expressions such as the following occur: Գման բարձր է Բարերեն այսբանք, մաքուր բարձր գտնած այսամ, է Բերեն: “Moses and Elias serve him, Tabor and Hermon rejoice in his name” (p. 602: Ծաղկելք for the first day of Vardavər, i.e., Feast of the Transfiguration): Գման ապրում է Բերեն, գտնած է Բերեն այսամ, է Բերեն: (p. 606 Տար բարձրհոր for the second day) “Today Mount Tabor of the Only Begotten rejoices in glory together with Hermon, most revered Sinai is exalted and the descent of God, the gate of heaven is upon it”; այսամ, է Բերեն: (p. 612 Տար բարձրհոր for the third day by N. Shnorhali) “Tabor and Hermon will rejoice in your name.”

In spite of these turns of phrase, there does not seem to be any Armenian tradition that identified Hermon as the mountain of the Transfiguration. This was uniquely Tabor, and Hermon only entered the picture because of Ps. 89(88):13 or because a series of holy mountains was being enumerated.

Pilgrims to Mount Tabor

Around the year 570 the Piacenza Pilgrim says the following about Mount Tabor: “From Nazareth we went to Mount Tabor, a mountain rising out of a plain. … When you arrive at the top there is a level place

---

3 Ծաղկելք (Hymnal), (reprint New York: 1968 of edn. Jerusalem: 1853). All references are to this printing.
a mile in length, with three basilicas, in the place where one of the disciples said, ‘Let us make three tabernacles’.

Adomnan (in the late seventh century) reports that the "top is beautiful, a large level place surrounded by a huge wood\(^5\) in the middle of which a large monastery of monks and many smaller cells. ... On the level summit there are large and renowned church buildings, three in number, like the tabernacles of which Peter spoke on this very mountain. ... All these buildings, the monastery, the three churches, and the little cells of the monks, are enclosed in a stone wall."\(^6\)

ca. 780 Hugeburch in the Life of St. Willibald says: "they went on and came to Mount Tabor, where the Lord was transfigured. There is now a monastery there for monks, and a church dedicated to the Lord, and to Moses and Elijah. People who live there all the place, 'Age Mons.' They prayed there."\(^7\)

In the Commemoratorium (ca. 808) we read: "On the holy Mount Tabor the bishop Theophan<es and> four <churches> one in honor of the Holy Savior, where he spoke with Moses and Elijah, another of Holy Moses, a third of St. Elijah, and a fourth <......>. There are 18 monks."\(^8\) The fourth, on the basis of some later sources, is ascribed to the place of meeting of Melchizedek and Abraham.\(^9\) The title "Holy Mountain" for Tabor is mentioned in a number of Greek and Latin sources.\(^10\)

The chief difference between these accounts is the number of churches. In 570 the Piacenza Pilgrim saw three basilicas. The same three basilicas are to be found in sources through the ninth century, but in addition certain sources refer to a fourth church and others to a monastery. Excavations have uncovered fourth-fifth century Byzantine church buildings, though the number of churches that existed remains unclear.

---

\(^4\) The translation is by Wilkinson, *Jerusalem Pilgrims*, p. 81; the Gospel citation is from Matthew 17:4.

\(^5\) Compare the stress on the forest and fruit trees in Pseudo-Elīšē, cited below.

\(^6\) The translation is by Wilkinson, *Jerusalem Pilgrims*, p. 109. The stone wall is mentioned only in this source, and does not figure in the more detailed description in Pseudo-Elīšē. It has not figured so far in any archeological reports on the area.

\(^7\) The translation is by Wilkinson, *Jerusalem Pilgrims*, p. 128.

\(^8\) The translation is by Wilkinson, *Jerusalem Pilgrims*, p. 138.


Pseudo-Elise “On the Transfiguration”

Among the writings attributed to Elise vardapet, one of the Holy Translators, is a Homily “On the Transfiguration.” Robert Thomson published a translation and study of the relevant portions in 1967. This homily preserves the record of an ascent of Mount Tabor and notes the existence of three churches and a monastery on the mountain’s peak.

The question of the authenticity and the date of this homily have been raised. The homily is entitled Πρὸς Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν Θεόν και ἱλαρόν Σιαντικὸν ἤσοου “On Mount Tabor: The Revelation of the Lord to Peter and his Companions.” Thomson observes that it cites the Armenian version of Philo of Alexandria, and so it is most unlikely that it was truly written by Elise in the fifth century. Even those who would set the translation of Philo to the late fifth century must concede that the homily is later than that. Based on the Philonic citation, Thomson set the date of this homily to about 630 at the earliest. Perhaps, in view of the date now entertained for the Armenian version of Philo, we can say no more than that the Homily is sixth century or somewhat later.

The document describes Mount Tabor and mentions that there were three churches and a monastery on its peak. The churches as they were described by Pseudo-Elise seem to correspond to those reported by the Piacenza Pilgrim. The Armenian account is much more detailed, however, and can only have come from an eyewitness. Thus, the author of this account must have been a pilgrim from Armenia who ascended Mount Tabor. The description is of great interest. The author describes both the site and its inhabitants’ way of life in great detail, and may well have remained there for some time. In the present paper we shall only deal with those aspects of his description bearing on Armenian pilgrimage.

---

11 This is printed in the Venice edition of Elise's works, 1859, on pp. 212-239
12 In Journal of Theological Studies 18 (1967), pp. 27-33
13 Thomson would concede now that Philo was translated earlier than he had thought in 1967, when he had set the translation of Philo to the end of the sixth century (personal communication).
14 Pseudo-Elise's Homily also contains interesting details about the life of the Taborite monks. We intend to present them in some detail, in a future study.
Elišē on p. 236 says the following:

Concerning the beauty of the mountain and the delightfulness of the spot, if you wish to lend a willing ear I shall briefly describe for you the appearance of the charming place. After listening to the gospel you all know the place, but we indeed went there in person and saw it with our own eyes, not alone but with many companions some of whom remained on the mountain—nor from a desire of pleasures of the body but for the love of Christ, because wonderfully many brethren dwell there, who live a more spiritual than physical life.\(^{15}\)

From this passage we may infer that the author had visited the site. That is confirmed by the colophon of the sermon which reads: ści to uanwpamenvi wuq quqeaivy uamk, np aqwaνqii aqwaνqii


\(^{16}\) Ibid, p. 33.
Armenian Pilgrimage

The evidence for Armenian pilgrimage to the Holy Land is rather ancient. It goes back as far as the time of Constantius, about 360. However, in the texts relating to the period down to the Moslem conquest, there is no mention of Armenian pilgrimage to the Galilee. The most striking evidence for Armenian pilgrimage to the North of Israel are the pilgrim graffiti which have been discovered there. There are two significant groups of graffiti in Nazareth, spanning a period of 1,200 years. From under the Basilica of the Annunciation came stones upon which is the oldest Armenian writing surviving, from the first half of the fifth century C.E. These graffiti are names, and two of the persons who inscribed their names in Nazareth can also be shown to have travelled to the Sinai. This is additional evidence, should such be needed, for the fact that these persons, called Anania and Papgen, were pilgrims.

Another pilgrim visit to the North of Israel is witnessed by a group of inscribed stones, which have been assembled in a storeroom below the Basilica of the Annunciation in Nazareth. The exact provenance of these graffiti is unclear, but from names and dates in them we may conclude that they were made by a group of Armenian pilgrims from Turkey in the seventeenth century. To this data we may add that a thirteenth-century report mentions (ca. A.D. 1231) an Armenian chapel at Saltus Domini not far from Nazareth.

Thus the information drawn from Pseudo-Elisée supplements this direct evidence of Armenian reverence of the Holy Places in the Galilee from a date, the sixth century or a little later, which lies between the dates of the two oldest existing pieces of evidence.

---

A second point of interest in this text is the expression ἀναφερόμενος ἀναφερόμενον, ἀναφερόμενον παραμετρόν, “not alone but with many companions”. In other words, the writer was one of a group of Armenian pilgrims who came to Tabor, and not just an isolated individual. This pattern seems to have been typical of Armenian pilgrimage. The Life of St. Euthymius by Cyril of Scythopolis relates that a group of four hundred Armenian pilgrims visited the founder of Palestinian monasticism in the fifth century. They were on their way to Jericho and, we may assume, to the site of the Baptism. The anecdotal account of Anastasius of Sinai mentions a second group of Armenian pilgrims, 800 in number. This enormous group of pilgrims traversed the Sinai desert to St. Catherine’s Monastery about the year 610. The group mentioned by Pseudo-Elīšē provides, therefore, further evidence that Armenians traveled to the Holy Land in groups.

Sebēos preserves correspondence between Komitas, Catholicos of All the Armenians and Modestus, who was in charge of the holy places of Jerusalem in the period of the Sasanian rule. It confirms the regular and organized character of Armenian pilgrimage to the Holy Land. It was a well-organized, annual event and usually took place in groups. This pattern was disrupted by the Persian invasion and the Armenians eagerly renewed it.

The first pilgrims came to the Holy Land to pray in the places where the wondrous events of the Historia Sacra had taken place. With the development of Christian monasticism from the fifth century on, a visit to the virtuosos of the religious life, the great spiritual figures of the church in the East also became part of the pilgrims’ route. This is abundantly clear to anyone reading the Apophthegmata Patrum, the stories and sayings of the Egyptian Desert Fathers who were beset, often against their wishes, by streams of visitors. For the Armenians,

22 So Thomson, p. 30: we might observe that the addition of two adverbs before the adjective strengthens it greatly.


pilgrimage to holy men is already the object of the visit paid by 400 pilgrims to their illustrious countryman, St. Euthymius, soon after AD 428. Indeed, the earliest Armenian pilgrim, Eutaktos of Satala, had also come to visit a holy man around AD 360. 26 Pseudo-Elishe describes his sojourn with the holy brethren of the monastery on Mount Tabor which rings true to this early pilgrimage tradition.

Two more observations should be made about Pseudo-Elishe’s description. He remarks that some of his group remained and became monks in the Monastery of Mount Tabor. If Thomson is right, and the description is of the seventh century, then this is significant evidence for Armenians joining a (presumably predominantly Greek) monastery at that time. Some years ago we discussed Dassuranci’s evidence for pilgrimage. Then we remarked that one story he transmits must be dated to the late 630’s. It apparently hints at close relations between Chalcedonian and non-Chalcedonian Armenian Christians in Jerusalem. 27 These were relationships between a visiting pilgrim and a local Armenian, a Roman citizen.

As for the monastic context, there is much evidence for Armenians in the monasteries of the Holy Land. Most of it comes, of course, from the writings of Cyril of Scythopolis. Not only was St. Euthymius himself Armenian, but the successor of St. Theodosius as head of his monastery in 529 was also Armenian, from Zomeri near Sebastia in Cappadocia-Pontica. 28 Monophysite tensions are evident in an incident

28 Vita Sancti Theodosii 240.1ff. (Festugière, Moines, 3/2, p. 44). He was presumably a Greek-speaking Armenian and his family had a great career in the imperial service, *ibid.* There is further evidence for Greek-speaking Armenian pilgrims from a later period, see M.E. Stone, “The Greek Background of Some Sinai Armenian Pilgrims and Some Other Observations,” *Mediaeval Armenian Culture*, eds. M.E. Stone and T.J. Samuelian (Chico: Scholars Press, 1983), pp. 194-202. A further piece of evidence for Greek-Armenian linguistic contacts in the Middle East is the well-known Armenian papyrus. This document is a Greek vocabulary list transliterated into Armenian. It is most probably older than the eighth century, as a consideration of the use of papyrus shows, and it presumably came from Egypt. The recto of the papyrus has been known for some time, but the verso was only recently observed by D.K. Kouymjian. On the papyrus, see the remarks of D.K. Kouymjian in Michael E. Stone, Dickran Kouymjian and Henning Lehmann, *Album of Armenian Paleography* (Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 2002), pp. 59-63. Earlier bibliography includes the following: J. Dashian (Taşian), Մէջեր Տասին (A Cursory View of Armenian Palaeography; Vienna: Mechitarist Press, 1898), p. 197; G. Cuendet, “Un papyrus grec en caractères arméniens,” *Mélanges Emile Boisacq* (Annuaire de l’Institut de philologie et d’histoire
related in the *Life of St. Sabas*. In the Great Lavra of St. Sabas there were so many Armenians that they had their own chapel. In 501, however, they were forbidden to say the Mass or the Trishagion in their chapel, because they introduced some Monophysite formulations into them.\(^{29}\) There was another Armenian-language chapel in the monastery of St. Theodosius at Deir Dossi.\(^{30}\)

This evidence relates to the great monasteries in the Judean Desert. We also know something about Armenians in the Monastery of St. Catherine in the Sinai, mostly in the seventh century.\(^{31}\) We can now add new data about Armenians and Greeks living in the same monastic complexes in sixth-seventh century Jerusalem. In excavations carried out north of the Damascus Gate of the Old City of Jerusalem, a most important discovery was made. In a monastic complex including a church and a number of other reception and dwelling rooms, an Armenian mosaic inscription, two inscribed tombstones and a graffito scratched on a bowl were discovered.\(^{32}\) On archeological grounds the tombstones must be of sixth-century vintage, while a coin embedded in the mortar of the mosaic shows it to have been laid in the latter part of the seventh century.\(^{33}\) The mosaic, known as the Eustathius Mosaic after its sponsor, is the floor of a room off to the side of a church, the apse of which bears a Greek inscription. Thus, not only was this complex of buildings used jointly by Greeks and Armenians, but new Armenian dedications were made as late as the second half of the seventh century.

---

\(^{29}\) *Vita Sancti Sabae* 117.20-118.10 (Festugière, 3.2, p. 44).


\(^{33}\) The graffito cannot be dated.
Just across the modern road, at about 100 meters' distance from the site of the Eustathius Mosaic, is Jerusalem’s most famous Armenian mosaic, the renowned “Bird Mosaic.” This, perhaps the finest Byzantine mosaic in the country, formed the floor of a funerary chapel and it bears an ancient Armenian inscription. If it were possible to excavate the area over which the modern road runs, archeologists might clarify the relationship between the Bird Mosaic and the Eustathius Mosaic. This is not possible, however, at present.

The Bird Mosaic was uncovered in 1894 and the Ottoman authorities removed all the associated finds to Istanbul. Their present location is unknown. In his “Chronique Palestinienne,” written in 1894, P.-M. Séjourné observed that in the burial ground adjoining the Bird Mosaic, some tombstones with Greek inscriptions were found. This is further evidence for Armenian-Greek cohabitation, but this time of a cemetery.34 The Bird Mosaic cannot be dated securely, but a sixth-century date seems most likely.

We are thus able to speak of a joint Armenian-Greek habitation of this area north of the Damascus Gate in the sixth and seventh centuries at least. The evidence from Jerusalem is corroborated as we have shown, for the monasteries of the Judean desert and for St. Catherine’s Monastery in the Sinai. Into this picture, the Armenian pilgrims of the seventh century who decided to join a monastery on Mount Tabor fit very admirably.

There is one further very new piece of evidence bearing on Armenian pilgrimage in the seventh century. In an excavation carried out in 1997, archeologists uncovered a pilgrim hostel outside the Jaffa Gate. Among the finds from this site is a four-line Armenian pilgrim graffito that is, at the latest, of the seventh century, and perhaps of the sixth. (The dates are reached on archeological grounds.) This graffito includes at least three names and evidences a number of Armenians traveling together. The road that begins at this hostel leads to Bethlehem.35

Thus, we may conclude that Armenian pilgrimage was a well-established and lively activity by the time Pseudo-Ehišê wrote his homily “On the Transfiguration”. Various pieces of evidence make explicit the tradition of pilgrimage to the holy sites in the Galilee, and

---

34 Revue Biblique 3 (1894), p. 628.
35 The writer will publish this graffito soon.
Mt. Tabor was among them. Such travelers came from earliest, documentable time to Nazareth, and presumably to Mt. Tabor. Often they traveled in groups, up to several hundred in number.

Pseudo-Elišē says that some members of his group remained on Mt. Tabor and joined the monastic brethren there. This demonstrates explicitly what we have assumed, that besides those Armenians who came to the Holy Land specifically to join the monastic movement, some Armenian pilgrims decided to remain in the Palestinian monasteries. The prominent Armenian presence is well documented, on Mt. Tabor, in the monasteries of the Judean Desert and in St. Catherine’s Monastery in the Sinai. The particularly active presence of Armenian monks in the Palestinian monasteries in the sixth and seventh centuries is notable. It must be considered in determining the time and the extent of the Chalcedonian and anti-Chalcedonian split in the Holy Land. This question, like that of the split of the Armenian and Byzantine Churches, has been re-opened for scholarly discussion.  

---

36 K. Hintlian remarks that an Armenian named Thaddeus copied a manuscript in the Monastery of Mar Sabas in 1455 and that in the graveyard of the Monastery of St. George of Choziba many Armenian names are to be found: History of the Armenians in the Holy Land (Jerusalem: St. James Press, 1976), p. 9.

37 Nina G. Garsoïan, L’Eglise arménienne et le grand schisme d’orient (Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium vol. 574 Subsidia t. 100 (Leuven: Peeters, 1999).
BOOK REVIEWS


Reviewed by Roberta R. Ervine

Published in honor of the historic visit of His Holiness Karekin II, Supreme Patriarch and Catholicos of All Armenians, to Rome in November, 2000, this volume brings together papers presented at a symposium held on that occasion.

The volume begins with appropriate acknowledgements of the importance of His Holiness’ visit to Rome, particularly in conjunction with the 1700th anniversary of Christianity in Armenia. In her opening words, which conclude the introductory section of the volume, world renowned liturgiologist Prof. Dr. Gabriele Winkler recaps recent Armenian history, emphasizing the Church’s will to survive in adverse circumstances, and outlining the role of the Catholicoses Karekin I and Karekin II in the development of ecumenical relations at the turn of the 21st century.

The papers which comprise the body of the volume are six in number. The first, by Hans-Jürgen Feulner of the University of Vienna, is devoted to a consideration of external influences on the Armenian “Athanasius anaphora.” To begin the article, Feulner offers a brief overview of the foreign influences on Armenian liturgy, followed by a description of the various anaphoras in Armenian, and the historical contexts in which they appeared and a listing of the Armenian commentaries on the liturgy. He then returns to a point by point comparative analysis of the Syriac and Byzantine influences on the Athanasius anaphora. His conclusion is that the strong evidence for preponderant Syriac influence on the anaphora calls for a more careful and nuanced approach to the study of Armenian eucharistic liturgy in general than has previously been the case.
Fr. M.D. Findikyan's article expands on a point made in the work of Fr. Robert Taft on precommunion rites. Findikyan considers the presence of the ancient Inclination (before the priestly dismissal prayer) in the Armenian rite to be a sign of that tradition's respect for Jerusalem tradition. Not only has that original, simple act developed into a liturgical complex in its own right, but it has proliferated and made itself a part of numerous sacraments and occasional offices. The bulk of the article focuses on the multiple inclinations of the Divine Liturgy, offering a comparative analysis of three of them (that in the Enarxis, the pre-Anaphoral and the pre-Communion). While hesitating to draw any firm conclusions from the comparison, Findikyan points out, in conclusion, evidence indicating that the pre-communion inclination may have entered the Armenian and Byzantine liturgies at around the same time in the fifth century.

A significant adjustment to traditional views of the development of the Armenian church in the period between the 4th and 7th centuries is proposed in Prof. Nina Garsoian's article, the third in the collection. Entitled "Janus," the article explores the way in which Armenia's state church faced both east and west, towards the Byzantine and Persian churches. The article begins by defining "Armenia" as a geographical entity in the time period under consideration, and by describing the duality in Armenia's Christianity, arising from its early christianization by currents from both the south and the west. Garsoian goes on to outline the theological implications of Armenia's relationships with its neighbors to the east, and the church-political repercussions of Armenia's relationship with Persia, reflected in the exile of the Catholicos St. Sahak and subsequent events. She points out the insignificance for the Armenians of the Council of Chalcedon in the first century after its meeting, compared with the minute attention paid to councils which set the doctrine of the Church of Persia in the same time period. In other words, the greater involvement of the Armenians with their neighbors to the east, an involvement which in turn affected their relationship with the Imperial church in the west.

Bishop Yeznik Petrossian devotes his article to an enumeration of Latin saints—defined as saints who lived, worked or died in the Latin world—found in the synaxaries of the Armenian church. The synaxaries are listed and described at the outset. The rest of the article considers the various routes by which these martyrs and their
celebrations have entered the Armenian synaxaries, some via Greek and others directly from the Latin, while still others seem to have neither Greek nor Latin parallels. Certain of the saints are pre-Chalcedonian, while others, such as Gregory and Agapitos, Popes of Rome, derive from a later period. The article concludes with a call for further study of the structure and contents of the Armenian synaxaries.

Prof. Dr. Gabriele Winkler contributes a lengthy and detailed addition to her work on the evolution of the Armenian creed. **Über die Entwicklungsgeschichte des armenischen Symbolums**, which appeared in the same year that the symposium took place. In it she describes the process of selecting and studying important fragments of Armenian, Ethiopian and Georgian texts of significance for the understanding of the relationship between liturgy and creed. She examines the affinities between Armenian and Syriac formulas, analyzes the Armenian form of the Nicene creed as revealed in quotations from it, particularly in the Letter of Sahak, and then examines the credal formulas in the light of the Synods of Antioch in 324/5 and 341-345, giving particular consideration to important terms such as zōrutyun and cnund. The article concludes with a brief look at the creed in the Armenian Žamagirk.

As those who enjoy his work have come to expect, Fr. Boghos Levon Zekiyan has presented, as the last article in the collection, a panoramic essay which delves into the relationship between Armenian ethnicity and Armenian faith. After elucidating the concept of nationality/ethnicity as it relates to the Armenian experience in particular and to the concept of “Christian inculturization” in general, Fr. Zekiyan turns to the dialectic between the universal and the local as it forms the specific manifestations of Christianity as a universal religion. The invention of the Armenian alphabet as a specifically religious and specifically ethnic endeavor, and the intentions of St. Mesrop in this undertaking which ensured the ethnic cohesion of the Armenians as people and Church, testifies to the self-understanding of the Armenians and offers a model for the integration of ethnos and faith.

As an afterword to the volume, Prof. Dr. Gabriele Winkler concludes the volume with an overview of research on the Armenian Rite, undertaken between 1992 and 2003. This valuable bringing together of research references includes descriptions of works by
younger scholars (Fr. M.D. Findikyan, Armenuhi Drost-Abgarjan, H.-J Feulner and C. Gugerotti among others) and established ones, like Ch. Renoux, herself and Robert F. Taft as well. Works not directly related to liturgy are also included, among them K. Avetisyan’s article on embroidered altar curtains and H.R. Gazer’s overview of the history of Armenian church reform.

Reviewed by Edward G. Mathews, Jr.

St. Gregory of Nazianzus was one of three extraordinary Greek Christian writers known as the Cappadocian fathers. These contemporaries all lived in the mid to late fourth century. St. Gregory himself is known simply as “The Theologian” (Arm., Astuacaban) by later writers, and his friend, St. Basil is commonly known by his epithet “The Great”. The third of this remarkable group of early Christian thinkers is St. Basil’s younger brother St. Gregory of Nyssa, who is generally regarded as one of the great mystics of the early church and was dubbed, at the Second Council of Nicea in 787, “the Father of the Fathers.” Each of these three had his own particular gifts, but together this trio formed the most formidable group of thinkers in the early Church.

St. Gregory of Nazianzus was born, sometime around 330, of a wealthy and aristocratic family in Arianzum, a village in southwestern Cappadocia. With his friend, St. Basil, whom he whom he befriended while a student in Athens, he studied with some of the greatest teachers of his time, including Prohaeresius, who was also teacher to a number of Armenian students. So great did St. Gregory’s rhetorical skills become that, in addition to “The Theologian”, he was known as the “Christian Demosthenes” by Byzantine writers. Nonetheless, Gregory always yearned for a life of solitude which he only found at the very end of his life. Until then, he was the victim of various political and theological schemes, even at the hand of his friend Basil. The inability to live that solitary life for which he so yearned and betrayal from even his closest friends seem to have left their mark on St. Gregory, as he seems to have been an extremely sensitive soul.

St. Gregory was not a prolific writer like Origen or St. John Chrysostom, and he wrote no biblical commentaries or dogmatic treatises like his contemporaries; rather, the bulk of his literary output
consisted of letters and a large number of theological and autobiographical poems written in a classicizing style. But he was most widely renowned for his homilies, usually referred to as Orations, which were highly stylized compositions. Forty-five of these were collected after his death (forty-one of which were soon translated into Armenian). These forty-five Orations probably constitute only a selection of all those which he delivered, but they are ample witnesses to his great genius and skill. It is for his Orations 27-31, known as the Theological Orations, that he gained the title “The Theologian”, not so much for their doctrinal content - although they were indeed the clearest articulation of Trinitarian doctrine to that point - but rather, as the Greek term theologia meant for the fathers, for his profound contemplation of the Blessed Trinity. In addition to these, St. Gregory also composed a number of Funeral Orations, or Encomia, some of which have also survived. The Funeral Oration delivered on the occasion of his friend Basil is generally considered to be one of the finest examples of rhetoric that exists in all of Christian literature. His second Oration, “In Defense of His Flight to Pontus”, written after he fled upon his ordination, is a veritable treatise on the character and responsibilities of a priest and is such a profound reflection that it became the primary source for St. John Chrysostom’s more famous treatise On the Priesthood.

Despite his reputation, it is only recently that St. Gregory has received the attention of modern critical scholars. In 1978 appeared the first volume of the Sources Chrétiennes editions of his Orations; a total of nine volumes have appeared but Orations 13-19 and 44-45 remain unedited. (Readers of this journal will note that critical editions of the Armenian versions have also begun to appear, though only a few so far). Nor has St. Gregory been very well served in English until very recently. Some of his orations and his letters were translated at the end of the last century, but it is only in the past decade or so that English translations of his other works have begun to appear. Translations of a number of his poems have appeared, particularly his autobiographical poems which rank him with St. Augustine as the most “self-revealed” of the fathers. In addition to these, his so-called Poemata Arcana have also been edited and translated; translations of a number of his trinitarian and christological
poems have also recently appeared as well as those letters known as the theological epistles.

Of the forty-five known Orations of St. Gregory, twenty-four, including those mentioned above, were translated by Browne and Swallow at the end of the nineteenth century; they have been reprinted in the *Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*. The volume under review here is intended to be a translation of the rest of the Orations that are not already included there. In addition, Dr. Vinson has decided not to include in her volume Orations 4-5, the venomous invectives “Against Julian”, as they too have been translated elsewhere, but these 1888 translations are perhaps not so “easily accessible (p. xiii)” to everyone as she intimates. One wishes that she had indeed translated these two famous Orations as well. The nineteen Orations that are translated in this volume have never before been translated into English, with the exception of Orations 14 and 15 which exist in very old translations.

The Orations translated in this volume include the three Orations *On Peace* (Orations 6, 22-23), and another four *encomia*: In Praise of the Maccabees (Or. 15); of Cyprian (Or. 24); of the philosopher Hero (aka, Maximus the Cynic) (Or. 25); and on the Holy Martyrs (Or. 35). There are also two orations on Theology (Orations 20, 32). In both of these, though more so in Or. 20 than in Or. 32, he reprises a most important topic which he also discusses in Oration 27, the first of the Theological Orations, and that is the nature and disposition of a theologian. One is not a theologian by reason of any amount of academic learning but rather by long and profound contemplation of the divine—a notion only beginning to be recovered in contemporary theological discourse. Also found here is his long and famous Oration on Love for the Poor, delivered on the occasion of the construction of a new hospital complex in Caesarea, as well as a few other orations that give us a further glimpse into St. Gregory’s character—particularly Orations 9, 10, 13, and 36—and even more so into that extremely sensitive nature noted above. In each of these four orations he complains about his having been treated with some degree of injustice and how much he was hurt by this action, sometimes in an off-handed sort of way, as when he hopes that his fellow bishops “will not be offended by my observation that you showed more kindness
when . . . we fed together on pagan learning than you do now (Or. 9; p. 23).

While this reviewer would have preferred to see the two *Orationes Against Julian* included here, this volume is nonetheless one of great usefulness. Works of the "Theologian" were quickly translated into nearly all the main early Christian languages, not only because of his formidable rhetorical skills, but because of the depth of his thought and his profound theological acumen. To translate St. Gregory's prose is no simple task; his writing is not only replete with every rhetorical device in an age known for its rhetoric, and is also filled with allusions not only to the Christian Bible but to classical literature in which St. Gregory was eminently at home. While rhetoric is largely a lost art, now one can see in these orations St. Gregory in all his rhetorical glory. While one does find the occasional awkward English phrasing, Dr. Vinson has done an admirable job in translating these orations which are, heretofore, almost unknown to the English-speaking world. It is also very encouraging to see good translations of works never before translated, rather than re-translations of works—even classics—that have already been translated several times. These translations now make available to the English-speaking reader the rest of a collection of *Orationes* of one of the most gifted of all the early church fathers, and thus this rather slim volume of translations should fill a very regrettable gap in English-speaking patristic studies.

Reviewed by Edward G. Mathews, Jr.

Robert Charles Hill, retired Professor of Divinity from both the University of Sydney and the Australian Catholic University, seems to have dedicated his retirement to translating all the works of the great IV-V century Antiochian theologians. Prior to the volume reviewed here, Hill has translated over a dozen volumes of the works of these fathers, including: John Chrysostom, *Homilies on Genesis* (3 vols.; FOTC 74, 82, 87; 1986, 1990, 1992); John Chrysostom, *Homilies on the Psalms* (2 vols.; Holy Cross, 1998); Theodoret of Cyr, *Commentary on the Psalms* (2 vols.; FOTC 101-102; 2000-2001); Theodoret of Cyr, *Commentary on the Song of Songs* (Brisbane, 2001); Theodoret of Cyr, *Commentary on the Letters of St. Paul* (2 vols.; Holy Cross, 2002); and St. John Chrysostom, *Old Testament Homilies* (3 vols. Holy Cross, 2003). In addition to these volumes, Hill has already announced forthcoming translations of Diodore of Tarsus’, *Commentary on the Psalms* (Scholars Press), and Theodore of Mopsuestia’s, *Commentary on the Psalms*.

Theodore was born in Antioch in the mid fourth century, was a friend of John Chrysostom and with him studied under Libanius and Diodore of Tarsus, two of the greatest teachers at that time. At a young age, he became bishop of Mopsuestia in which capacity he served for over forty years, until his death in 428. Theodore had begun commenting on the bible before he reached his twentieth birthday and his works became so influential in Nestorian circles that he became known simply as “the Interpreter”, much as Gregory of Nazianzus was known as “the Theologian”, or Paul as “the Apostle.” In his own Byzantine realm, however, his works were so controversial that they were eventually condemned at the council of Constantinople in 553, and were held by many to be the work of one who “subjected the Scriptures to drunken abuse” and who “never ceased mocking and jeering at the efforts of the holy teachers who have worked on them.”
This volume of commentaries by Theodore, who may have been a correspondent of Maštoc (this connection is currently debated by scholars), is of great importance as it is the only complete work of Theodore to have survived in its original Greek. Due to their condemnation, the Greek works of Theodore have been almost completely destroyed; what remains has survived mostly in Syriac translations, but some also in Latin translations. The text of these particular commentaries was first published by A. Mai in 1854, and reprinted in Migne PG 66.124-632. It has since received a critical edition by Hans Sprenger in 1977; it is on the basis of this edition that Hill has made his translation.

In these commentaries Theodore follows very closely the Antiochian version of the Septuagint, also known as the Lucianic recension. Like many of his contemporaries, it was the Septuagint text that was the established sacred text (see Theodore’s own defense of this position on pp. 288-289) so, in these commentaries at least, Theodore makes no appeal to other Greek translations such as Symmachus or Theodotion. Theodore’s few attempts at appealing to the Hebrew or Syriac texts are feeble and clearly second-hand. Curiously, the Septuagint text that Theodore used seems to have placed these twelve prophets in the order of the Hebrew bible and not in the normal order of the Greek bible.

Theodore shows himself to be quite sensitive, as one might expect from a student of Libanius, to the various literary genres as well as to the imagery and the figurative language of the prophets, but he is not seldom forced to sacrifice this appreciation to his insistence on the historical interpretation of the text, inherited from his other teacher Diodore. Consistent with these rigid historical principles, Theodore betrays here many of the characteristics for which he had been condemned by his fellow Byzantines. Very little of prophecy is allowed, even in those places where verses are cited or alluded to in the New Testament. Even Zechariah 9:9-10, quoted by Matthew and John in the context of Jesus’ entry into Jerusalem before the Passover, Theodore explicitly denies having any Christological meaning, calling such an interpretation “the height of folly” (p. 367). Only grudgingly does he allow the possibility of such an interpretation for Micah 5:2, and for Joel 2:28-32 (quoted by Peter in Acts 2:17-21), presumably
because of its prominence in the Liturgy of Pentecost. Hill notes that
even the characteristic *theoria* of Antiochian exegesis is entirely
lacking in these works.

These commentaries are clearly the work of Theodore’s youth,
and they follow such a rigid historical agenda that they can not in any
real sense be called exegesis. They also reveal someone who has
clearly yet to engage in any pastoral work, who is ignorant of the
biblical languages, and one who is certainly guilty of arrogantly
“mocking” his predecessors, yet these commentaries remain the only
ones where we can hear directly the voice of Theodore and not that of
his Syriac or Latin translator. They are also one of the few examples
that we have of an Antiochian commentary on a prophetic text; while
a few pieces have survived from the pen of John Chrysostom, only
Theodoret of Cyr systematically commented on the prophetic books,
but these commentaries remain unedited and untranslated. As such,
the availability of these Greek commentaries from the pen of one who
today is often considered to be the “foremost proponent of the
Antiochian historical method” and the “forerunner of modern biblical
scholarship”, in such a fine English translation is a great boon for
students of early Christian biblical commentary, of Antiochian
thought, and of Theodore in particular. Catholic University of
America Press merits heartiest congratulations for having made
available to English speaking readers a fine translation of such an
important collection of commentaries.

Reviewed by Edward G. Mathews, Jr.

Robert Louis Wilken, the William R. Kenan Professor of the History of Christianity at the University of Virginia, is already well known as one of the premier patrologists in the country. He has written extensively, in books and hundreds of articles, on almost every facet of early Christian thought and history. His previous books have often focused on the centers of the early Christian church, especially, Alexandria and Antioch. These works include monographs on Cyril of Alexandria and John Chrysostom, as well as one on Jews and Christians in Antioch. His book, *The Christians as the Romans saw Them*, on the primary pagan opponents of Christianity, is still the standard treatment of the subject. His most recent monograph prior to the one here under review is a study of the Holy Land in the thought of the early Christians: *The Land Called Holy* (Yale, 1993).

In *The Spirit of Early Christian Thought* Wilken now attempts a general synthesis of the thought of the giants of those giants of the early church. This is his first book since his own conversion to Roman Catholicism, and his own new convictions are evident on nearly every page. While some might toss the book aside for that reason alone, they should not. Wilken is just following the example of his subjects who claim that ultimately one learns best by placing “confidence in men and women whose examples invite us to love what they love (p.174).” As Wilken himself further notes “the first task of a serious interpreter is to give oneself to the author . . . without sympathy and enthusiasm, without giving of ourselves, without a debt of love, there can be no knowledge of things that matter (p.173).” And Wilken has written a book that ought to be read by every one who is looking for an introduction to that group of early Christian writers known as the Fathers, for he sets out in an eminently readable volume what was of the greatest importance to them.
As the subtitle indicates, Wilken takes as his starting point the verse from Psalm 105:4: *Seek always the face of the Lord.* So, when he states in his introduction that his intention is "to depict the pattern of Christian thinking as it took shape in the formative years of the church’s history," it is that which he means — his purpose is not to write another introduction to the historical background of the fathers, not a history of the christological controversies, not an introduction to the world in which they lived, nor even a monograph on the development of their thought, such things as these can be found elsewhere. Wilken rather intends to write an introduction to the one thing that really and ultimately mattered to the fathers: *to see the face of the living God.* Wilken has thus constructed an introduction to the theology of the early Church that the fathers themselves might have written.

Rather than the more traditional chronological or author-by-author approach, Wilken opts for a more thematic approach. He divides twelve chapters into five primary divisions. The first, the foundational, comprises three chapters on knowing God, Christian Worship, and the Bible. The second division, chapters 4-6, is doctrinal, each dealing with a person of the Holy Trinity. The third, chapters 7-8, deals with belief and believing. Chapters 9-10 deal with poetry and icons, and the last two chapters set out the essential matters of Christian life. The titles of these twelve chapters are:

1. Founded on the Cross of Christ
2. An Awesome and Unbloody Sacrifice
3. The Face of God for Now
4. Seek His Face Always
5. Not My Will But Thine
6. The End Given in the Beginning
7. The Reasonableness of the Faith
8. Happy the People Whose God is the Lord
9. The Glorious Deeds of Christ
10. Making This Thing Other
11. Likeness to God
12. The Knowledge of Sensible Things
In each chapter, Wilken concentrates his exposition on the thought of one or two Fathers who, perhaps, thought most deeply on the subject. For example, in chapter 4, on the Father, his discussion is largely largely derived from the Trinitarian thought of Hilary of Poitiers and of Tertullian. In chapter 9, on Christian poetry, he draws primarily from the writings of Ambrose and of his contemporary Prudentius, two of the great Latin poets (though the former is known for much more than just his poetry). Other early writers to whom Wilken makes more than just passing reference include Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, Lactantius, Athanasius, Basil, John Chrysostom, and Cyril of Alexandria. But, Wilken himself admits to being partial to four in particular: Origen, Gregory of Nyssa, Augustine, and Maximus the Confessor (p. xix). Few would argue about the stature of these four as the pillars of the early church.

Woven through these chapter headings, Wilken also highlights several important and fundamental aspects of patristic thought that are often absent in more historical evaluations. Namely, he shows how the fathers’ entire theology was based not simply on their very careful reading of the Bible, nor even on an intimate reading, but on the conviction that the entire Bible, Old and New Testaments, is basically a book about Christ. The Scriptures and the Christ are each known as “The Word of God”, and the fathers all maintained, with Jerome, that “ignorance of the Scriptures is ignorance of Christ” (On Isaiah, prol.). In the course of his discussion of the Bible, Wilken offers the observations that the Fathers “approached, formulated, and debated in large measure on the interpretation of specific words and texts from the Scriptures,” and that “[the Bible] gave them a vocabulary that subtly shaped their patterns of thought” (p. 76). Wilken does little in this context to distinguish the Greek and Latin worlds, much less oriental Christian traditions. Words resonate very differently in different languages, and this is as much the root of the Trinitarian controversy as anything else: ousia, substantia, ithúthá, and ēufiwn, each had their own overtones. So too, different translations of the Bible very often led to different “interpretations” and “patterns of thought”.

Wilken’s exposition also highlights the fact that the great task of the fathers was to claim unabashedly and unashamedly that faith and
love were not only legitimate but necessary ways of knowing reality as created by God. They were not trying to fit Theology into the categories established by philosophy; rather, theology "did philosophy" according to the "new reality" disclosed by God through the resurrection of His Son. He also brings to the fore the intensely spiritual goal, or end, of the thought of the fathers. Their thought was entirely devoted to their own experience of salvation or, more accurately, a defense of the transformation of the human person through a life with God. To live that transformation and to bring that transformation to others was their consuming desire. Their entire enterprise was, again to cite Wilken's subtitle, "to seek the face of God." The early fathers did, of course, draw on the philosophical and rhetorical traditions of the ancient world, but it was the Christ of the Bible that set them on fire to construct the world anew, intellectually and spiritually.

For the readers of this journal, as it is for this reviewer, it will be a great disappointment to find that, apart from a single unnamed instance, there is not one non Greek or Latin writer even referred to, much less cited. On the one hand, the Greek fathers in particular, were indeed fundamental in the formation of the theology of the Syriac and Armenian churches, but each quickly developed its own way of thinking and some of their authors deserve to have their voices heard. Perhaps this bias — however unintentional — is at the root of a very silly faux pas that Wilken commits. On p. 213, in his chapter on Christian poetry, he claims that "the first Christian poet was Prudentius" (p. 213). Even Ausonius is earlier in the Latin tradition, and Gregory of Nazianzus is earlier in the Greek tradition, not to mention Melito of Sardis. But Ephrem the Syrian is an even earlier Christian poet, whose works were highly praised by both Greek and Latin authors, and is generally considered to be the greatest of the Christian poets. This omission is even more startling as Wilken had already cited Ephrem's *Hymns on Paradise*, earlier in his book, though he identifies the author only as "a Syriac Christian" (p. 53). But this relatively "minor infraction" is brought up simply to highlight the dearth of Oriental authors.

As already noted Wilkens has not written a systematic monograph on the history of the early Church, or a detailed discussion
of the various theological controversies, but he has written a book that ought to put patristic study back where it belongs — not in historical or academic theological categories, but in the love of God and in the salvation of the human race. It is thus a truly inspirational book that ought to be read by any one either entering the field or who is looking for a true introduction to the fathers. Wilken carries out this task not only with the great learning that one has come to expect from him, but with a deep appreciation gained from many years of patient and affectionate reading, which has been renewed and even illuminated, one might say, by his own recent conversion. Evagrius of Pontus once said, "To pray is to do theology; to do theology is to pray"; one can say that this is a core theme of this book. Wilken concludes his book by saying that "each period in Christian history makes its own unique contribution to Christian life. The Church Fathers, however, set in place a foundation that has proven to be irreplaceable. Their writings are more than a stage in the development of Christian thought or an interesting chapter in the history of the interpretation of the Bible. Like an inexhaustible spring, faithful and true, they irrigate the Christian imagination with life-giving water flowing from the biblical and spiritual sources of the faith. They are still our teachers today."

*He who has ears to hear, let him hear!*

Reviewed by Michael Daniel Findikyan

The various liturgical traditions of the Christian East possess a remarkably rich array of anaphoras or Eucharistic Prayers, the central prayers of the Divine Liturgy, which most fully express its themes and purpose. Many of these texts are little known to those outside the traditions that use them because they have yet to appear in critical editions, much less in modern translations. Hans-Jürgen Feulner’s study of the Armenian Anaphora of Athanasius is the inaugural volume in a most welcome, new monograph series, *Anaphorae Orientales*, published by the Pontifical Oriental Institute in Rome, under the direction of Robert F. Taft, S.J. In a short introduction Fr. Taft states the objective of the series as publishing Armenian, Coptic, Ethiopian and Greek anaphoras in critical editions with facing translations in modern scholarly languages accompanied by historical, textual and liturgical analysis and commentary. The series editor’s introduction is followed by a valuable ten-page foreword, again by Fr. Taft, in which he contextualizes Feulner’s work within the field of liturgical studies, assaying as well its potential ecumenical and pastoral significance.

For students and practitioners of the Armenian liturgical rite, Feulner’s study is of utmost importance. The Anaphora attributed (in some manuscripts from the 13th century) to St. Athanasius of Alexandria has been the only Eucharistic Prayer used by the Armenians for over a millennium. Over 600 manuscripts survive containing this text. None of these witnesses dates earlier than the 13th century except for the text used and liberally quoted by Xosrov Anjewac’i (†963) in his catechetical commentary on the Divine Liturgy. Feulner has examined about 200 of the surviving manuscripts, compiling the critical edition from the 38 oldest, all from the 13-15th centuries. The oldest manuscript containing the anaphora is *Erevan 142* from the year 1269, which serves as the base text of the edition. One assumes that the
author ruled out the possibility that older recensions of the anaphora might reside in later manuscripts, as is sometimes the case. Feulner's new edition thus supersedes the earlier edition by Catergian and Dashian (Vienna, 1897), which was based on a smaller sampling of manuscripts from the 15-17th centuries, and which Feulner describes as "fehlerhaft" (filled with errors). All of this is exhaustively presented in Feulner's two introductory chapters.

They are followed by the critical text and apparatus with complete German translation on facing pages. The author's complete German translation follows the Armenian syntax very closely and is quite accurate. The text of the anaphora is remarkably stable in the manuscripts. Nevertheless, those who hear and pray this text week after week will discover a number of variations between the ancient texts and the one known to them today. While not theologically significant, some of these are interesting. The command to "eat" in the words of institution is not «\(\lambda \rho \rho \lambda \varphi\)» (kerja), as one is accustomed to hear today, but «\(\lambda \rho \rho \pi \nu \lambda \varphi\)» (kerayk), which is not only grammatically correct, but unanimously attested in the manuscripts. (Once again we are reminded that liturgical reform growing out of critical study is hardly a threat to the integrity of the tradition, but its most effective guardian).

Feulner's critical apparatus confirms that the Trinitarian hymns Hayr erknawor, Vordi Asducoy and Hogi Asducoy first appear in a Jerusalem manuscript of 1328 and do not become universal until centuries later.

Today the epiclesis is invoked by the celebrant first over the bread alone, then over the wine alone, and finally over the bread and wine together. Yet in many manuscripts, including several of the latest examined by Feulner, there is no invocation over the bread and wine together. This is obviously a later embellishment of the ritual.

The greatest variation among the manuscripts occurs in the intercessions and diptychs. The earliest manuscripts commemorate the Egyptian hermits Paul ("the Hermit" †c.347), Anthony, Paul ("the Simple," disciple of St. Anthony) and Macarius. The monks Onophrius, Mark the Abbot, Nilus, Arsenius, Evagrius, and Barsumas, as well as the Armenian hermits Oski and Sukías and their companions, first appear in some 14th-century manuscripts. “Serapion,” presumably the fourth-century Serapion of Thmuis in Egypt, is mentioned in this list in the textus receptus, though there seems to be no reference to him in Feulner's critical apparatus. The historical and cultural factors
motivating the addition of these names into the diptychs would surely be worth investigating further.

Even more interesting than the textual variants discernable from the critical apparatus are differences in the rubrics. As one would expect, the number and detail of the rubrics are very limited in the earliest manuscripts, increasing noticeably in manuscripts of subsequent centuries. While the evolution of the ritual underlying the anaphora lay beyond the scope of Feulner’s study, the data meticulously documented by him in the critical apparatus constitute the raw materials for such a future inquiry. It is interesting to observe, for example, that at the Kiss of Peace, several ancient manuscripts instruct the deacons to kiss the table and one another, as opposed to the current practice, in many places, whereby the deacons do not actually greet one another, but kiss the table in turn. The ancient liturgical roles of the deacon and faithful are highlighted in three manuscripts, Vatican arm 3 (1286), Venice 1411 (13th century) and Munich Bayer. Staatsbibl. Cod. arm. 6 (1427), in which a rubric instructs the deacon to lead the people in singing the Sanctus (Ανέππ ανέππ) and other hymns: «δοξάσας τὸν θεὸν ἐκ πάντων σωτῆρα ὁμολογήσωμεν» (the people sing by order of the deacon). The ritual of moving the chalice cross-wise upon the altar during the anamnesis, which might be dismissed as a late, ritual embellishment, is actually attested in one of the earliest surviving manuscripts, Erevan 179 (1292).

The real center of gravity of Feulner’s work is no doubt the detailed comparative liturgical commentary of over 200 pages. Here the author analyzes in turn each of conventional literary-thematic foci of West Syrian-type anaphoras, of which Armenian Athanasius is one: the Introduction, the “Oratio ante Sanctus,” the Sanctus, the “Post-Sanctus,” the Words of Institution, the Anamnesis, the Epiclesis, and the Intercessions and Diptychs. For each of these the author reproduces the entire passage under investigation (with the critical apparatus) and reviews all of the relevant previous studies before comparing phrases and themes from the Athanasius anaphora with material from other Armenian and non-Armenian anaphoras. As such, this chapter becomes a veritable textbook on the structure and origins of eastern anaphoras.

Remarkable is the author’s facility in comparing liturgical texts from a number of traditions and languages. In his analysis of the anamnesis, for example, Feulner compares the formula «Αριστή τῇ ἀριστῇ Αδελφα ἡμῶν ἐν Μαρκανθόρῳ»
"And thine of thine own unto thee we offer from all and for all") with variants in eleven other eucharistic prayers in Bohairic, Greek, Syriac, Georgian and Latin.

Feulner's indebtedness to the work of his mentor, Prof. Gabriele Winkler, is evident in the footnotes on most every page. Indeed, one unfamiliar with Winkler's many studies on eucharistic prayer structure will follow portions of Feulner's analysis with difficulty.

As a result of his rigorous analysis, Feulner traces multiple genetic strands in the Armenian anaphora of Athanasius. Alongside a good deal of indigenous material, the anaphora has clear connections with the earliest Armenian eucharistic prayer attributed in the Armenian tradition to St. Gregory the Illuminator, but actually an early version of the anaphora of St. Basil. Similarities can be found in the Post-Sanctus, Anamnesis and Intercessions. There is also material common to Athanasius and three other Armenian anaphoras, attributed to Sts. Sahak, Gregory of Nazianzus, and Cyril of Alexandria. Yet prominent differences lead Feulner to disagree with Catergian's earlier assessment that all of the Armenian anaphoras hailed from the 5th century and were translated from Greek. Feulner prefers a slightly later date for all of them, including Athanasius, in the 6th or 7th centuries.

The author, a Roman Catholic who now holds the chair in Liturgical Studies at the University of Vienna, concludes his analysis by reflecting on the ecumenical significance of his work. Quoting the 1996 common declaration of His Holiness Pope John Paul II and His Holiness Catholicos Karekin I, which touched on the historically controversial issue of the doctrine of Christ's humanity and divinity, Feulner draws attention to the christological affirmations that surround the Sanctus in the Athanasius anaphora, emphasizing their complete and indisputable orthodoxy. "Here it also becomes clear," Feulner writes, "how a central liturgical text that has belonged for centuries to the living faith of a church, can have wide-ranging significance not only from a dogmatic, but also from an ecumenical perspective" (461-462). In another sign of ecumenical openness, the author has dedicated his book to the memory of His Holiness Catholicos Karekin I.

The volume concludes with an exhaustive "Index verborum" (465-525), registers of subjects (527-528), liturgical sources (529-530), names and persons (531-532), authors (532), places (533-535) and Biblical references (536).
This work represents a remarkable achievement, a highly significant contribution to the ongoing effort to elucidate the roots and evolution of the Armenian liturgical tradition, and thereby the authentic heart and mind of Armenian Christianity. If Hans-Jürgen Feulner’s inaugural volume is in any way indicative of the scholarly caliber of the Anaphorae Orientales series, then students of liturgy, early Christian studies, and patristics have much to look forward to.
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