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THE ECUMENICAL MINISTRY OF CATHOLICOS KAREKIN I (†1999)

J. Robert Wright

It is a distinct pleasure and a signal honor for me as an Episcopalian to offer this ecumenical tribute and personal reflection from outside the Armenian Church to His Holiness Karekin I Sarkissian, the 131st Supreme Patriarch and Catholicos of All Armenians, who died on the evening of June 29 one year ago. I bring you the personal greetings and salutations of my own Bishop Richard Grein, the XIV Episcopal Bishop of New York, whose honorary canon theologian I am. I offer this testimony in thanksgiving for Catholicos Karekin, a person who was a great Armenian Orthodox churchman, an exemplary Christian, a spiritual giant, a leader among leaders, and a tireless worker in the cause of Christian unity, as well as to me a personal friend. The words spoken by a late twelfth century English chronicler in tribute of Saint Thomas Becket, one of the greatest Archbishops of Canterbury, shortly after his death in 1170, can also be predicated of Catholicos Karekin: “Great he was, in truth, always and in all places... Great in the palace, great at the altar, great both at court and in the church; great when going forth on his pilgrimage, great when returning, and singularly great at his journey’s end.” Thus Saint Thomas Becket, thus Catholicos Karekin. And so I ask today: 1) Who was this man Karekin Sarkissian to those of us who were his friends from other churches? 2) What was his contribution to Christian unity? 3) And what lesson, what challenge, does his life and witness offer to us all who follow after him? These are the three questions I shall address and blend together in these brief remarks.

Who was this man? Here I recount some personal remembrances substantiated, in their turn, by the obvious facts. I first met this future Supreme Patriarch and Catholicos back in 1974 at a meeting of the Faith and Order Commission of the World Council of Churches at Accra in Ghana in west Africa. He already an archbishop sought me out, a simple priest, he came and introduced himself to me, to ask my assistance and collaboration in one of the innumerable proposals that were coming up for discussion and debate in that worldwide assembly.
Already, as this incident attests, he was an indefatigable worker for the sake of the unity of the churches. "My priestly life has coincided with my ecumenical engagement," he was later to say.¹ That was my first meeting with him, there were of course other encounters, and the last time that his life crossed mine was for the same purpose only a couple of years ago when I received an urgent request that His Holiness from his hospital bed here in New York wanted to borrow my copy of the Dictionary of the Ecumenical Movement. Even in his illness, even with his earthly end in sight, he would not give up his prayerful study and writing for the sake of Christian unity. Who was this remarkable person, who had such a facility with words that to deliver an address of substance he did not even need a written text? One other personal attestation must suffice, this time the many letters of his that survive in the archives of the Anglican diocese in Jerusalem to our successive bishops and archbishops there and written from him as Dean of the Seminary in Lebanon in the 1950s and 1960s which, once again, show the energy and passion of this great servant of Christ. I discovered these letters around five or ten years ago while I was doing some research in Jerusalem, and they remain there in the archives for some future scholar to study and assess and evaluate.

Who was this person? He was obviously a scholar, but not just a scholar in the abstract but one with a purpose. His monumental study on The Council of Chalcedon and the Armenian Church, originally published in 1965, remains the definitive study, from the perspective of the Oriental Orthodox churches, of that council and its doctrine of Christ defined in the year 451. It was this book that established the then-newly-consecrated bishop and future pontiff as a scholar of worldwide significance in patristic studies. I own my copy of the first edition, later personally autographed to me from Vehapar "with love, appreciation, and prayers." In his epilogue at the end of that book he made the prophetic observation that "At present [1965], thanks to the spirit of open-mindedness, sincere and fresh scholarly enquiries, and common studies aiming at a mutual understanding as fostered by the Ecumenical Movement, the prospect of a rapprochement between the Chalcedonian and non-Chalcedonian Churches is returning to the

minds of theologians and Church leaders.” ² He concluded: “That vision constitutes one of the major factors in this study, and that same vision must be, I believe, a driving force in all studies which may follow along the same lines.” ³ Also, at about the same time, he was in agreement with Archbishop Tiran Nersoyan, also of blessed memory, on the need for common language and better terminology to promote mutual understanding in treating the age-old questions about Christ raised at Chalcedon.⁴ Shortly before his death, he was able to write in 1998, no doubt with personal satisfaction at the part he had played, that “a consensus has been reached among theologians that there is no fundamental, substantial difference between the two families of churches” [Eastern Orthodox and Oriental Orthodox]. Here then was scholarship with a purpose. Of course, as you and I both well know, it is one thing for scholars finally to agree—that is half the battle won—but the struggle remains for the rest of the people to understand and appropriate that agreement!

Already I am introducing the challenge that His Holiness has bequeathed to us! But let me return briefly to the course of his life to survey a few other facts and accomplishments. Never before in history had a Catholicos of Cilicia made the transition to the Mother See of Holy Etchmiadzin, and whatever inner dynamics and politics there may have been among the various Armenian peoples themselves, surely here to us looking on from the outside, here in 1995 was a sign, in his person, in this transition, of the coming greater unity of churches for which we all work and pray. If the Armenians can do something like this, we all reflected, maybe there is also hope for the rest of us to put aside our past quarrels and to work more closely together! No wonder that it was this same person who was an observer at the Second Vatican Council, at the Lambeth Conference of Anglican Bishops in 1968, and at the pivotal Addis Ababa conference of the heads of the Oriental Orthodox churches in 1965. No wonder that, still later, in 1989, having completed his term of office as one of the three presidents of the Middle East Council of Churches, he was summarily elected honorary president of that organization. No wonder that his presence was so

³ Ibid., p. 218.
⁴ Zakian, op. cit., pp. 73-74.
often sought in meetings with church leaders and political leaders throughout the world. No wonder that my Presiding Bishop was eager to host a luncheon in his honor. No wonder that the Pope had hoped to pray with him at his deathbed. No wonder that his visits to this very country in 1996, at his Pontifical Liturgy at our Cathedral of St. John the Divine where I too was present, and again in 1998 to celebrate the 100th anniversary of the establishment of an Armenian Church diocese in America, were events of such inspirational significance. You, Armenians, who are today the heirs and descendants of the first Christian nation, have so much to be proud of, such an example to follow, in the service and achievements of this great Catholicos.

What more did this Vehapar offer to the cause of Christian unity? He also offered two definitions of “ecumenism,” complementary and not contradictory even though twenty years apart. In 1978 he wrote: “Ecumenism,” as I understand it, refers to a spirit, a way of looking at Christian life, where we recognize that all Christians are bound in brotherhood through the unique figure of Christ and the unique nature of His Gospel. It is a common effort to grow in our understanding of the Truth, to act under the imperative of love, and to share our gifts in the service of those whose lives are improved through such sharing.”

And in 1998 he added: “The word itself, in its original Christian sense, refers to the desire and the search for Christian unity. The gist of what we mean by ‘ecumenism’ comes from our Lord Jesus Christ, who in His Incarnate Person no less than His spoken words united us, people of different colors, languages, senses, ethnicities and social standings. Therefore, ecumenism may be seen as an intrinsic part of the Gospel and the Church.” Together, these two definitions guided the late Catholicos, they formed the principle that he incarnated in his own life, the principle that made his life an “ecumenical movement” in itself, and I must record that for me this principle was nowhere more apparent than in his relations with my own church.

Others may have equally impressive stories to tell from their own church perspectives, but for me the ecumenical principle that animated this Catholicos (who had, after all, studied at Oxford University, that “cradle of Anglicanism,” for three years in the late 1950s) was nowhere better expressed than in the address he gave in the chapel of the

---

5 Ibid., p. 14.
6 Ibid., p. 157.
General Theological Seminary of the Episcopal Church, New York City, where I teach, when he was honored with the degree of Doctor of Divinity *honoris causa* in May of 1998, the same chapel where your own Primate as well as his predecessor had also been honored. Perhaps in a way speaking for them all, Catholicos Karekin said in his address there on the sixth of May, and I quote: "It is difficult for me to draw a line of distinction between what is Armenian in me and what is Anglican in me, and this is not an honor to a person alien to the Episcopalian or the Anglican tradition. In my life that tradition has been part and parcel of my ministerial and ecumenical service."

Recalling that he had known personally no less than five Archbishops of Canterbury as well as three Presiding Bishops of the Episcopal Church, that the dean of his former seminary in Lebanon Bishop Terenig Poladian was a graduate of the General Seminary, that so many other students of his own—your own—church had also studied at General, that Anglicans/Episcopalians do not proselytize in Armenia or for that matter anywhere else, and that Armenians always feel welcome and at home in an Anglican church when one of theirs is not near at hand, the Catholicos then remarked: "Indeed I will never forget that the Anglican Church, the Anglican Communion, and the Armenian Church have been together for so many centuries. Wherever we have looked for a church outside of the Armenian tradition to worship and to be associated with spiritually there has been the Anglican Church. How many of my Armenian people who first came to this country more than a hundred years ago, when they had no church of their own, they found the church in the Episcopalian churches. And one of our students one day has to write a thesis about the close and inseparable togetherness of a Western church and an Eastern church being an example of true ecumenicity." Here, I submit, was a genuine expression of lived ecumenism, not of church merger or absorption or proselytism or a watering down of the one for the sake of the other, but of churches that are friends and can support one another. Let me now say, as a professor of the General Seminary, an honorary canon of the Cathedral of St. John the Divine, and as the newly elected Historiographer of the Episcopal Church, that this same welcome from us is always open to all of you, just as I myself, created an honorary *vardapet* of your church by Patriarch Torkom Manoogian in 1992, have always felt a warm welcome and friendship in yours.
We are already moving from the past through the present towards the future, and so I ask in conclusion: what is the challenge that our late and beloved Catholicos offers us, even as you yourselves prepare for the upcoming jubilee year of 2001, also the celebration of the one-thousand seven-hundredth anniversary of the conversion of Armenia as the first Christian nation back in the year 301? Vehapar calls all Armenian Orthodox, calls the church in Armenia, now that it has regained the freedom to preach and serve in its native land, “to offer its irreplaceable leadership in the process of rebuilding a nation after seventy years of Communist domination and ecclesiastical stagnation,” “to revive ‘the essential and permanent’ dimension of the faith of Christ, as it was taught by our church fathers, and as it was lived by generations of our ancestors who responded to trial and tribulation with saintliness and faith.”¹⁷ That is his challenge to Armenians as you prepare to mark, in his words, that “supreme moment in Armenian history: the adoption of Christianity as the national religion of Armenia.”¹⁸ But there is also a wider challenge that I think he addresses to all of us, whether Armenian or not: “Our record of Christian witness should not be presented as something belonging solely to the past: a dead heritage of archaic values and lovely-but-irrelevant items in a museum. Rather, it needs to be presented as a dynamic alternative to the prevailing world-view, and as a rebuke to the nihilism of post-modern culture.”¹⁹

I conclude: The brilliance and charisma of His Holiness Karekin I, his writings, his tireless and responsible advocacy of Christian unity, his entire life and witness, all combine to make his challenges an imperative for us today. We can be proud of him, but we must also seek to emulate his teaching.

¹⁷ Ibid., pp. 171, 197.
¹⁸ Ibid., p. 187.
¹⁹ Ibid., p. 194
PETER, PAUL AND RELATED ACCOUNTS IN THE EARLIEST EDITION OF THE ARMENIAN SYNAXARION

Abraham Terian

Introductory Note

The selected accounts are from the Haysmawurk’ (Synaxarion) of Grigor Vardapet Khlat'ets'i, also known as Tserents’ (d. 1425), published anonymously by Grigor Marzvanets'i and with the hierarchical imprimatur of the day (Constantinople, 1706; reprinted 1730). These accounts current by the end of the fourteenth century stand in need of comparison with those in two near-contemporary and hitherto unpublished collections: the Haysmawurk’ of Tër Israël (d. 1249), of which six manuscripts survive (especially Venice no. 631, dated 1427, and Erevan no. 6283, dated 1437), and the Haysmawurk’ of Kirakos Vardapet Arewelts’i (d. 1272), of which many more manuscripts survive (especially Vienna no. 219, Antelias no. 1, Paris no. 180, and Jerusalem no. 1822, all from the early fourteenth century). The latter collection, like that of Khlat'ets'i, begins with Nawasard 1, the beginning of the ancient and movable Armenian fall-to-fall calendar (August); that of Tër Israël begins with January 1. A fourth collection is the much reworked Haysmawurk’ of another contemporary, Catholicos Grigor VII Anawarzets’i (in office 1293-1307), who because of his Chalcedonian persuasion harmonized it thoroughly with Latin and Greek versions (Constantinople, 1834). The latter publication, wrongly introduced as that of Tër Israël, has become—by default—the textus receptus in the Armenian Church. G. Bayan’s edition in Patrologia Orientalis, vols. V 3 (1909), VI 2 (1910), XV 3 (1920), XVI 1 (1922), XVIII 1 (1924), XIX 1 (1925), XXI 1-6 (1930), is a re-edition of this 1834 edition and thus perpetuates the wrong attribution: *Le synaxaire arménien de Ter Israel*. The Haysmawurk’ was unaffected by the liturgical and calendrical reforms undertaken between 1770-1775 by Catholicos Simeon Erewanets’i (in office 1763-
1780). While much remains to be done in this area of Armenian studies, our reliance on the published editions continues.

The selected accounts are here translated without annotation, assuming that these stories require little or no explanation—not even the blunderously conflated list of provinces, cities and towns visited by St. Paul on his various journeys (see the last page)—until the needed comparative study is undertaken.

Translation

[p. 358] K'aghots 19 (Dec. 27)

Feast day of the foremost of the holy Apostles of Christ, Peter and Paul

The foremost and great Apostles of Christ, Peter along with Paul, preached the Gospel of Christ in many places. They appointed priests, built churches, and established rules and canons for the believers in Christ the Lord. They also forewarned their disciples of the evil heretics who would come later as satellites of Satan, whom they foresaw in their biblical epistles, which the churches of Christ now possess and by which they are now enlightened.

Paul himself pointed to his preaching and said: "From Jerusalem to Illyricum, which is the edge of the world, I spread the Gospel of Christ" [Romans 15:19]. For Paul, along with his disciples, preached in sixty-five cities, apart from those provinces and districts allotted to other Apostles, where he entered and preached Christ.

So also the great Peter, the rock of faith, went about from east to west. They made many disciples in the faith of Christ; and they named

1 On his reforms, see Maghak’tia Ormanian, Azgapatum [National History], 3 vols. (Beirut: Sevan, 1959-61) 2:3065-66, 3101-09 (§§ 2101, 2124-28).
the believers "Christians." Later they came and met in the great Rome, and they rejoiced greatly and were together. And from day to day the believers in Christ the Lord increased through their preaching.

There, in Rome, was also Simon the sorcerer, who confronted the holy Apostles and said, "I am the Christ." For he was a magician and used to amaze people. And many believed the spirit of deception. Wherefore the holy Apostles, Peter and Paul, rebuked him. And when Simon the sorcerer was rising in the air, they made him fall down to earth with disgrace; and he was cut into four pieces, [scattered] over the four sections of the crossroads. Thereupon the wicked Emperor Nero ordered that the holy Apostles be killed. And thus they were perfected in the city of Rome.

Peter was crucified in the likeness of Christ, who had told him "Follow me." But Peter said to those who were to crucify him, "I am not worthy to resemble my Lord in death." And Paul was beheaded with the sword. And their holy bodies were interred in the great city of Rome for the world to take pride in and for intercession on behalf of all believers. Now, let it be known, that they were perfected on June 29.

But the setting [of the date] here is by way of a mystery, to establish the faith of the orthodox churches, so as to shun the most wicked sect of Artemisios and the accursed Council of Chalcedon. We are saved by being cautious of their deceptions, with the help of the prayers of the rock of faith, the holy Apostle Peter, who confessed that the Son is of the nature of the Father. This Peter, who was pronounced blessed by Christ and became a guarantor of the grace of blessedness; Peter, who was named Rock and was set for the foundation of the Church; Peter, who received power from Christ not to be overcome by the gates of hell; [p. 359] Peter, who was a fisherman and the key of the gates of heaven; Peter, who was the ignorant and the wise; Peter, who was the stupid and the deep philosopher; Peter, who was the slow to understand and the genius; Peter, who was the poor and the rich man; Peter, who was the homeless one, yet exalted many; Peter, who had nothing and yet had everything; Peter, the miracle-working man who had neither silver nor gold, yet made the man lame from birth to walk; Peter, who had no roof [over him], yet raised Tabitha; Peter, who was without a city, yet welcomed everyone to the heavenly city; Peter, who saw that wondrous miracle: the container made of cloth; Peter, who made the Holy Spirit descend upon the house of Cornelius; Peter, who was pitied and stumbled on Friday night, yet raises up those who
stumble in sin and makes them stand upon the Living Rock; Peter, who through tears of repentance did not lose the Spirit of apostleship and did not fall out of the foundation of the Church; Peter, who confessed the Lord by the lake and denied [Him] by the fire; Peter, who for his love for the Teacher was entrusted with pasturing His flock; Peter, who with the single net of the Gospel caught the 3,000 for Christ, with one cast; Peter, who caused the fall of Simon [the Sorcerer] yet elevated many by his fall.

Peter and Paul, who were more brilliant than the sun and as filled lamps [brighter] than the moon; Peter and Paul, who in their radiance were more than the sun and shed more light than the stars; Peter and Paul, who were purer than gold and more honored than silver; Peter and Paul, who were dutiful and are in God’s house, [honored] more than the topaz in kings’ treasures and all prized gems; Peter and Paul, who were more unassuming and gentle than doves; Peter and Paul, who were insightful and cast fear upon the demons—more than serpents upon men; Peter and Paul, who were compassionate and merciful toward the poor and the homeless, as Peter had said, “Christ, He heals you,” and Paul, made the lame man at Lystra to walk; Peter and Paul, who were vigilant and pious, who were observers of the fast and patient; Peter and Paul, who were bound and thrown into prison and torture; Peter and Paul, who loved Christ and put on God, who chased evil spirits and cast fear upon demons; Peter and Paul, who wrote admonitory letters and inscribed canonical books; Peter and Paul, who exemplified every good deed; Peter the wise architect and builder without material, whose hands laid a foundation in the eye of the universe, Antioch of the Syrians, and in the great Rome of the Latins.

Paul, the preacher to lands and the teacher to Gentiles; Paul, a vessel for the Spirit of God and the trainer of the children of the Church; Paul, the trumpet of Tarsus, the mouth of Jesus and the tongue of Christ; Paul, whose hands were on the task, mouth on the word, and mind on heaven; Paul, who held up the name of Christ and gave up his soul for Christians; Paul, the winner of the Gentile throngs, who was of the Hebrew race; Paul, the sun of the mind and the light of the teachers’ eyes; Paul, the torch of the Church and the foundation of faith; Paul, who laid the foundation of the churches of Christ in Damascus, in Arabia, in Asia, in Galatia, in Phrygia, in Sparta, in Spain, in Dalmatia, in Pamphylia, in Libya, in Mauritania, in Cilicia, in Assyria, and in distant isles [p. 360], as far as Illyricum.
Peter and Paul began preaching the good news of Christ in Judea, and with their preaching reached the ends of the earth. They built churches and appointed priests and officers. Peter and Paul enlightened the whole earth and converted people from one religion to another, and invited them from earth to heaven, and made them to be ranked equal with angels. Peter and Paul were made higher than the angels and all the heavenly ranks.

Peter and Paul, whom we honor and celebrate today, we have them as intercessors with the One proclaimed by them: Jesus Christ our God. Peter and Paul, I say, associates in the faith and planters of the Word of Life in the souls of rational beings. Peter, I say, an abode of God, and Paul the goal of blessedness. Peter, I say, is the true evangelist, and Paul the tiller of the earthlings. Peter and Paul, who were of corruptible human nature, were made superior to the Cherubim. For one confessed the Man born of the Virgin to be God, Son of God, of the nature of God. Wherefore he was pronounced blessed by Christ, was set as the foundation of the Church and received the keys of the Kingdom. He was established as the head of the holy Apostles, to be their commander in lieu of Christ. The other, Paul, was raptured, was lifted up, was elevated to the third heaven. He saw wondrous visions and heard unutterable words that have never crossed the human heart. Wherefore they both were made a marvel; they were staged and martyred together; they were honored and venerated together; they were crowned and were made kings together; they were offered incense and celebrated together; they were enriched and made happy together; they were magnified and made splendid together; they ascended the throne of Rome together and sat on the Seat of the Dalmatians. Their remains were made to rest together in the Church of Rome. They were elevated and glorified together, they are blessed and celebrated in one accord, they are praised and magnified in one accord. They were witnessed to by angels; they were honored and venerated together. We who lag behind and are sinners agree as regards the worthy ones.

We bless Peter and praise Paul, we celebrate their feast day. We offer them incense and magnify them. We fill up our lamps, light up the torches, compose hymns, worship them with our voices. We stand up and conduct service. We say Psalms, rejoice in our celebration and are happy. We read homilies, recount their lives and wonder and are much amazed. We bow down, weep tearfully and pour out our souls. We say "Woe to us," repeat our regrets and are sorrowful. For we do not
resemble those whom we celebrate, never practice asceticism. We have not been disciples of those who instructed us, from whom we learned the faith. Again we are refreshed in spirit, we have been restored and established. For we have heard this, that we become participants with those whom we celebrate. For we have toiled, have come together to celebrate, and are deemed worthy to do so. We rose up at night, stood in vigil, and prayed. We repented in our hearts, we hoped against hope, we resorted to the Lord. We lit candles and burned incense, said “I have sinned,” and confessed. Our sins were shed, we were justified, and were ranked with the saints. We resorted to the Lord, trusted in His help, and were joined to God.

Through the intercession of your chosen Apostles, and the preachers of your word of life, O Christ God, have mercy upon the recipient of this book (in handwriting: the pilgrim [to the Holy Land] Ghumrē and his wife, the pilgrim [to the Holy Land] Khēnzadē, and his parents Pēnklu and Mariam, and his sons Peter and Astuatsatur, and all his kin).

[p. 377] K’aghots’ 27 (Jan. 2)

The life and memory of St. Sylvester, the Patriarch of Rome

The holy patriarch Sylvester was from the city of Rome, the first deacon of Timothy, the patriarch of Rome, who was martyred by the eparch Tarquinius who apprehended Sylvester and demanded [p. 378] from him the possessions of Timothy. But he prophesied that he [the eparch] would die on the next day and rebuked his godless errors. And while Tarquinius was eating a fish the next day, the bone of the fish was stuck in his throat, and he died in pain. When Sylvester became thirty years old, he was ordained as priest by Mentiatos [read Miltiades], the archbishop of Rome. Sylvester lived a God-pleasing life, was knowledgeable of the divine law, a counselor to the senseless and a teacher of truth, a rebuker of the undisciplined and of all evil Jews and Gentiles. He was beloved in the eyes of all, because of his upright life. After the death of the Patriarch Mentiaton [read Miltiades], St. Sylvester was ordained upon his throne as Pope of Rome. And he established the nine ecclesiastical ranks, after the order of the heavenly
ranks. And he [re]named the days of the week: The Sun, he named Sunday, Kiraki, which means Dominical; the Moon, Monday; Aries, Tuesday; Hermes, Wednesday; Jove, Thursday; Venus, Friday; Chronos, Saturday.

He commanded, and all the Christians changed the Great Pascha; that they should call the Sunday after the 14th day of the moon "Dominical." He ordered to observe the five days [and] the Sabbath as great Sundays leading to the Grand Sunday. He wrote into canon law that on Maundy Thursday all prisons should be opened and all those bound should be let free; and this order is carried out to this day in all Christian jurisdictions.

There was a dragon that lived in a palace called Capitolis; and women of a certain sect used to descend 365 steps to the dragon, to offer sacrifices to him. And much harm was inflicted by the dragon upon the city of Rome. And St. Sylvester never ceased from teaching the divine Books to Jews and to Gentiles. And they said to him: "If you can stop the sacrifices to the dragon and save the city from its harm, we will believe in the God whom you preach." And St. Sylvester and all the Christians with him prayed for three days. And the holy Apostle Peter appeared to him in a dream and said: "Take with you three priests and two deacons and descend the 365 steps and set the sign of the holy cross at the door of the dragon. And the innermost cave, where the dragon dwells, has bronze gates. These you shall shut as you invoke the name of our Lord Jesus Christ upon them, and shall say: Thus says Peter, the Apostle of Christ: "These gates shall not be opened, but shall remain shut to the day of the end of the world."" The holy patriarch Sylvester did according to the command of the holy Apostle. And when the ministers of the dragon saw the wonderful work that was done, they believed in Christ and were baptized in the name of the Father, the son, and the Holy Spirit, who is blessed forever. Amen.

[Addendum:]
How King Constantine came to believe in Christ

Constantine, the King of Rome, was pagan. He was infatuated with Maximindia [read Minervina], his wife. She was the daughter of King Maximianus and the grand-daughter of Diocletianus the sovereign [Emperor], who instigated persecutions against the Christians and
massacred 1,000 souls from among his troops who believed in Christ and His cross. Following the vision of the King, they defeated the enemy [p. 379] on the day of battle across the River Danube. For countless troops gathered there, to wage war against Constantine. And he was new in his kingship and a youth in years, and seeing the great many troops of the enemy, he was afraid. He was thinking of a solution, as to how to wage the war. And while he was in his thoughts, he saw up in heaven the form of the cross in light, and a script in starry light around the cross that said: “By this sign you shall prevail over your enemies.” When he saw this, he called his wise men and counselors and told them his vision, and inquired about the sign of the cross—as to from which gods it is. And they said: “This sign is of the Galilean, Jesus of Nazareth, whom the Christians worship as God.” And the King commanded all his troops to form the same. And they all did; some of cloth, some of wood, some of grass, and some of flowers. Having done so, they hastened into battle. Some they destroyed and some they put to flight. And with the same sign they returned joyfully to the city of Rome and knocked down every demonic pagan altar.

And all the pagan priests and officers of the pagan shrines cried out loudly and protested at the King’s gate; for all the false gods fell and crumbled because of the sign of the Nazarene, which the troops brought into the city. Thereupon the Queen commanded all the troops to dishonor the sign of the cross of Christ and to trample upon it on the ground, under foot. Many of the soldiers opposed this and said: “How could we dare to dishonor and trample upon our Life-giver who gave us the power to triumph over our overwhelming enemies.” Thereupon the Queen became angry and said: “Cut them down with the sword.”

And 1,000 persons were killed on that day. And they died in such good faith in Christ. And there was a great persecution of the Christians. For this reason St. Sylvester took his disciples and fled to the mountain, and was in hiding. And Constantine became leprous like a [spotted] carpet, and none of the many physicians whom they gathered from every country could heal him. Even some experts and sectarians from Persia came and said: “It is impossible for you to be healed, O King. However, if you were to gather 1,000 suckling infants and to sit in a pool and have all the infants slaughtered over your naked body, and bathe yourself in the warm blood of the children, you may be healed thereby.” A decree was issued by the King, and they gathered countless children.
And the King went to the Capitolis, to the pagan temple. Then came the mothers of the children with the infants in their arms, and the mouths of the infants on the mothers' breasts. And the mothers of the children tore their hair and scratched their faces and fell before the King in tearful mourning. When he saw the extent of the mothers' grief and lamentations and the cries of the children, he pitied them and showed mercy to them, to the point that tears flowed from the King's eyes. And he considered saving them better than his personal health. And he released them with joy to their homes and gave them payments of charity. And in that very night the Apostles of Christ, Peter and Paul, appeared to the King and said to him: "Since you showed mercy to the children more than to yourself, we have come to help you. Now, send [men] to this particular mountain and call unto you the Archbishop Sylvester, and he will wash you with the waters of baptism, and you shall thereby be healed from your incurable pains." [p. 380]

In the morning he sent [men] to the mountain and they brought Sylvester. He thought he was being taken for martyrdom, and went joyfully. He entered into the presence of the King, greeted and stood. And the King said to him: "Do you have gods named Peter and Paul?" And he said: "They are not gods, but servants of God and my fellow servants." The King said: "Whom do they resemble or how tall are they?" And the Saint took out of his bosom a small picture of the holy Apostles and showed them to the King. When the King saw it, he recognized them and said: "Truly they are the ones whom I saw in my dream, and they told me to bring you from the mountain to baptize me." The Saint said: "If you believe in Christ the Lord, let it be as you wish." The King said: "I believe in Christ God and obey your injunctions." Thereupon he commanded to prepare the pool with water, and undressing the King brought him down into the water, and performed the sacrament of baptism upon him. A bright light shone upon the water, and a hand from heaven drew near to the king's body. There was sizzling as from a frying pan, and things like peels dropped off the King's person and floated upon the surface of the water. And his body became immaculate as that of a young child, with shining face. And on that day 120,000 men were baptized by St. Sylvester. The King dressed them all in white garments and each held a candle in his hand.

And a decree was issued by the King that if anyone blasphemes Christ, their homes and belongings would be confiscated by the palace. And if anyone wishes to honor Him, they ought to be baptized, without
fail, and should not be afraid to destroy the pagan images. And the King built a church in the name of the holy Savior. He himself leveled the ground, moved the earth, dug, and laid the stones. And the King commanded to preach in the middle of the public square, with a loud voice, forty times, that Christ is true God; and that churches should be built in the name of Christ, ten times; and that the One who gave life to the King is God, thirty times; and that those who do not worship Christ are enemies of the King, ten times; and that those who worship Christ are the King’s friends, twenty times; and that those who do not believe in Christ should be driven out of home and country, so cried the herald forty times.

Helen was the King’s mother from Bithynia, and her two grandsons were Constans [I] and Constantine [II]. The leaders of the Jews came to her and said: “Lady, your son, our King, did well that he abandoned the idols; however, he did not embrace the true faith. Write to him to be circumcised and become a Jew, like us, who are children of Abraham and disciples of Moses.” But she dishonored them and sent them away with insults, and wrote to her son to be firm in the Christian faith. She commanded that he should call a meeting of the Christian bishops and the Jewish teachers to discuss the prophetic books. And there assembled, by a decree of the Empress, twelve Jewish scribes and lawyers and twenty-four Christian bishops headed by the blessed Sylvester. And the King sat in the middle of the bishops and the scribes. And the scribe Abiathar began to downplay the predictive testimonies of the prophets concerning Christ. Whereas St. Sylvester, filled with the Holy Spirit, pointed out clearly the prophets’ testimonies concerning Christ; His divinity without beginning and eternal, from the Father; and of late His humanity through the holy Virgin Mary: the Word becoming flesh and the bearer, the Begetter of God. And from among the Jews a magician, Zimri, arose and said to the King: “Command that a bull be brought and I shall speak into the ear of the bull, and [p. 381] it shall instantly die.” And when they brought it, he spoke into the ear of the bull and it succumbed in their midst. And he said to the King: “If Sylvester can resurrect it by a word, then know, O King, that his words are true.” Thereupon the Saint prayed to God, and the bull was revived by the word of St. Sylvester. The King said: “It is fair to believe the one who revives rather than in the one who kills.”

When the Jews saw what Sylvester did, they believed in Christ and were baptized by the Saint. The King rejoiced greatly over this and
honored St. Sylvester. Thus did the holy Patriarch shine in the world through his magnificent deeds. For he used to heal the sick through prayer, and to cast out demons from people in the name of Christ. And he brought many Jews and Gentiles to faith in Christ. And by his council and confession the First Council convened in Nicaea, where 318 bishops gathered. And he reached a ripe old age and rested in peace in Christ on the 2nd of January, to the glory of Christ our God.

This reading is through the testimony of St. Gregory the Persian who [labored] in Armenia, and St. Basiliskos, the martyr who suffered much for Christ’s name and suffered martyrdom in Caesarea at the hands of Julianus. Through the prayers of our holy patriarchs and the memorial of our pious King, benevolent Christ, give life to the soul of the printer of this book, the sinful scribe Grigor and my spiritual brother Pali. Also to the recipient of this book, (in handwriting: the pilgrim [to the Holy Land] Ghumrē, and his wife, the pilgrim [to the Holy Land] Khēnzadē, and his parents Pēnklu and Mariam, and his sons Peter and Astuatsatur and Gaspar, and all his kin).

[p. 768] Mareri 17 (May 24)

Memorial of the finger of the Apostle Peter

There was a worthy priest, learned in every virtue, of Armenian origin, from the province of Kokojvit, from the village called Bletsayr, that is “stables.” In the same village there was a landlord who was at odds with that priest, and used to pierce the ears and the heart of the priest with wearisome words. The priest was poor and without a helper. After much suffering, the priest went to the door of the church, uncovered his head, anathematized the landlord and said: “Lord Jesus, just Judge: By your order and by the authority of my rank may that man be bound according to the canons of the apostolic constitution and be shut up eternally by their anathemas all the days of his life. And may in your name, Lord, that man be bound who vaunts himself against me unjustly.”

Thereupon the curses were activated and poured from heaven upon him, like the brimstone of Sodom. And without being seen, the curses amassed and circled the person of the landlord round about. And the
landlord was bound with bonds that cannot be loosened, without iron or rope. Nothing could loose him except the word of the priest’s mouth. And the priest with his household moved from that village to another village. And having reached his last day he died.

Then the landlord became sorrowful, and coming to his senses he said: “Woe is me, pitiful that I am, what have I done and what have I gained in this life?” He then began to beat his chest, to weep and sob and to pity himself with laments over the loss that could not be retrieved. And leaving his home and sons and everything that he owned [p. 769], he went roaming through the provinces and to the knowledgeable Armenian priests, asking a remedy for his incurable pains. Answering him the wise leaders of the day said: “There is no treatment for your health, for your unbearable wounds, but to go to Rome, where those who open and shut the Kingdom of Heaven are, the holy Apostles Peter and Paul and those who open and shut in heaven and on earth. They are able to find a remedy for your wounds.” And he, without hesitation, hastened to go, deeming the distance as nothing.

And succeeding with God’s help, he reached great Rome. And meeting the holy patriarch he fell weeping before him and recounted his transgressions and the reason for his coming there. And the holy patriarch summoned all the clergy together and said to them: “This man has come to us from the East, from the Armenian people, with much entreaties and firm faith. Come let us ask the Lord our God and the holy Apostles, that they may open to him the door of God’s mercy and deliver him from the bonds of his priest.” And they all took to heart and mind what the patriarch said. They began their worship service and with ceaseless prayers, day and night, ardently pleaded with God to grant him mercy. And it was declared by God, in the mind of the patriarch, to put iron chains on the feet of that man, on his hands and neck, and bound like that, to have him stand before the Apostles. This sign was placed in their minds: if these bonds be removed from him without anyone [involved], they would know that God had heard their pleadings, and the man would be spiritually released from his bonds. They did this in the evening, and they stood in vigil. They prayed together, without ceasing, that the man might be released from his bonds. And they saw the man released and standing in prayer before the holy Apostles and giving thanks to God.

They asked him and said: “O man, how were you released from your bonds?” And he said: “I was worried while standing, for I was
spiritually bound, and now I was bound again physically; how would I be released from this bond and that? At that moment, a sudden numbness fell upon me. And I saw face to face that priest who bound me. He was in awe-inspiring glory and in clothes of light, seated on a golden, most glorious throne. And the holy Apostles Peter and Paul with their hands bound were standing before him. And they were pleading with the priest on my behalf, saying: 'Release this man from the bonds you have placed on him, for he has appealed to us from such a long distance.' The priest answered and said: 'I was poor and without friends, and he used to come with blasts of anger against me constantly, and used to revile me daily. And I had no other recourse but Christ, and by His word I bound him till He comes to judge between me and him.' The Apostles said: 'Now, listen to our pleadings and do not turn his hope in us to embarrassment.' The priest said: 'There is no way for this to happen, for the damage caused by him was great and he does not deserve to be released.' And I saw on the other side, in the likeness of the priest's adornment, a youthful King seated on the throne of glory, awe-inspiring and mystifying. Before him were myriads and myriads of beings. I asked who He was and heard the response that He is the Creator of all. When the holy Apostles gathered that the priest was not listening to them, they went to Christ and told Him: 'The priest is not listening to us.' [p. 770] Thereupon, the compassionate and benevolent Jesus sent the angel Raphael to the priest and said: 'Listen to the Apostles and release the bound man, for they have entreated Me much on his behalf.' And the priest knelt twice before the uplifted One and said: 'Immortal King, he reviled me much, and I continue to be angry, till you, Lord, who judge justly, come in glory and judge justly between me and him.' The holy Apostles then fell on their knees at the priest's feet and beseeched him with entreaties. And while the holy Apostles were thus begging and the priest was not listening to them, at that moment Jesus, the Creator, came to the priest. As the holy Apostles saw this, they said to the priest: 'See, the Lord of heaven and earth is coming to plead with you.' Thereupon the priest arose quickly and fell upon his face before the Lord and said: 'I have sinned, Lord, I have sinned.' He then turned to me and said: 'You are released from your bonds because of the Lord's command and the wishes of the holy Apostles. May your sins, which you have committed against me, be forgiven.' When I heard this from him, the bonds fell off me. And I arose and fell at the feet of the priest and was blessed by him. And
being filled with joy, I woke up and saw myself released from these iron bonds.”

As the patriarch and the multitude of the congregation heard this and saw the man released, they blessed God with joy and glorified the holy Apostles who did not overlook their entreaties. After the wonders had taken place, the man asked the holy patriarch to grant him permission to serve the church. They gave him the key and he served the holy Apostles for seven years, and he never departed from that sanctuary from dawn to dusk, working endlessly and praying without ceasing. It then occurred to the man to return to the East to his home and family. And the Pope gave him permission to return. But a certain thought emerged in his heart after he was rewarded for life, and had a share of being healed by the holy Apostles, and was allowed to serve the saints regularly. One night with his teeth he pulled off the little finger of the holy Apostle. Instantly the church began to shake and scream thunderously. The patriarch and the priests were awakened, and they entered the sanctuary and found the man bleeding and lying breathless like dead. They sprinkled water on the man’s face and speaking to him said: “Tell us, brother, what happened to you.” And he arose and told them what he had done. And they were inclined to kill him. But at that moment the saints spoke: “Permit him because of his faith and for having served us for a long while, and do not take away the relic from him. Allow him to take it to the land of the Armenians.” Then they let him go, and with great gifts and love they escorted him on his way to the East, to the borders of Armenia. And he arrived joyously in Kokovit, in his province of Sasunk, bringing with him the agent that opens the Kingdom of Heaven. And it was placed in the church which is called the Cave of Gomtis. And through it many miracles take place and healing of all ailments to the glory of Christ and the holy Apostle Peter.

Through his prayers, Christ God, have mercy on the printer of this book, the sinful scribe Grigor and to my spiritual father, the pilgrim [to the Holy Land] Lukas; and also on the recipient of this book (in handwriting: the pilgrim [to the Holy Land] Ghumrē and his wife, the pilgrim [to the Holy Land] Khēnzdē, and his parents Pēnktlu and Mari-am, and his son Astuatsatur and daughter Elizabeth, and all his kin).
The death of the foremost of the holy Apostles Peter and Paul

The great Apostle of Christ, St. Peter, the rock of faith and the foundation of the church, came from Jerusalem to preach on earth. He went to Cappadocia, Galatia, Phrygia, Bithynia, Pontus, and Asia, and then to Rome with Paul. There they found Simon the sorcerer who was a magician and was stupefying the Roman people and saying of himself, “I am the Christ.” The Romans used to say that he was a great person. He used to perform great wonders and make the people believe firmly. Peter confronted Simon and said: “Are you not the one who asked of the Apostles of Christ in Jerusalem to buy the grace of the Spirit and we anathematized you? And now you have come here and are disrupting us willfully.” Simon said: “I am the Christ, and you are not recognizing me? See now what great wonders I perform.”

At that instant Simon, through sorcery, caused the death of the son of a widow and through sorcery killed the son of Pereuteicos. He then spoke into the ear of a bull and it was split in two. But as for the Apostle Peter, whomever Simon killed through sorcery, he brought to life through prayer. And the large crowd was divided into two, not knowing whom to believe. Then they said in unison: “Peter’s God who brings to life is greater than that of Simon who kills but cannot bring to life.” King Nero heard of it and summoned before him Simon and Peter and Paul and Pilate and asked [the latter]: “Do you recognize them?” Pilate said of Peter: “This one was a disciple of Jesus the Galilean, whom I delivered into the hands of the Jews to crucify Him.” But as for this man Simon, he is not that Jesus, for his head is very hairy and he is a fat person. That Jesus was more handsome in looks and as a person, in countenance and height, than any human being.”

The multitude of the city was there. Simon began performing illusionary miracles and Peter the opposite, true [miracles]. Simon said to Peter: “You say regarding me that I am not the Christ who ascended to heaven.” Peter said: “You are the messenger of Ner, and the son of perdition, and an heir to hell, and a disciple of lawlessness.” Simon said: “Look now and see how I will ascend to heaven.” At that moment he took off and flew and was ascending on high. Paul said to Peter: “Lord Peter, Simon went to heaven.” Peter said: “Let us kneel and
pray.” And the holy Apostles bowed down and began pleading with God to make him fall from that height. And behold, they saw Simon plunging head-down; and he fell in the middle of the street on a cart and he was cut into four parts, each part [thrown] on each road of the crossroads. His satellites came and gathered his filthy corpse and placed it on a bronze pillar in the middle of the street. And the cart, hardened in the shape of the cross, exists to this day. And King Nero became very sad over the loss of Simon and commanded that Peter be killed. When Peter heard this he fled the city, since he had led four of the king’s concubines and many other people to faith in Christ. For this reason Nero was all the more bent on doing evil and was threatening Peter. For this reason Peter fled. And when Peter left the city he met Christ the Lord and he bowed down [p. 833] and said: “Where are you going Lord?” The Lord said: “To Rome.” Peter said: “What do you need to enter Rome for?” The Lord said: “To be crucified.” Peter said: “Will you be crucified a second time?” The Lord said: “Yes, Peter, I’ll be crucified again, for you are running away.”

Having said this, the Lord ascended to heaven. Then Peter knew that it was concerning him that the Lord had spoken of crucifixion. And he returned joyfully to Rome, glorifying God. When they seized him, he gave Rome’s episcopal robe, which was made of the burial clothes of Christ, to his disciple Zeno, for he alone accompanied Peter. When they reached the execution place and wanted to lift him on the cross, Peter pleaded with the executioner not to crucify him in an upright position, as was the Lord Jesus, but contrariwise, head down. And they crucified him like that. While being stretched on the cross, he was teaching the word of life. He then prayed to God as follows: “You, Lord, our Father; you, Lord, our Brother; you, Lord, our Beloved: You take care of us; you are everything to everyone. We do not hearken to any other except you, Lord, our God. I thank you and confess you. I plead with you and glorify you Lord, for you alone are God; now and always, forever and ever.” Those around him said “Amen.” And he yielded up his spirit to God. A certain man named Markelos, a believer in the Lord, lowered Peter from the cross and anointed his body with fragrant oils and incense, wrapped it in clean clothes and placed in a sarcophagus the Rock of faith.

St. Peter was a stout man, of medium size, the hair of his head curly, and his body white. He had a long nose, thick eyebrows, broad
forehead, and a brave heart. He was quick at conciliation, kind, and
doer of great wonders to the glory of Christ, our God.

Meanwhile Paul stood before Nero and, as befitting, responded to
the Ner [i.e., the Antichrist] within him. And Nero became mad like a
wild dog. He [Paul] stood also before Agrippina, his [Nero’s] mother,
and Octavia his wife, and his paternal aunt, Espan[ia], and many others
of his relatives.

He then persecuted the Christians throughout the world and wished
to kill the Apostles speedily. So he commanded that Peter be crucified
and Paul beheaded. A believing woman, Perpetua by name, cried much
when she saw Paul being taken in shackles, to be beheaded. And Paul
said to her: “Do not cry my sister, just give me your scarf to tie my
eyes; and when I return, I will bring it back to you.” And the woman
gave him her scarf. The executioners who were taking Paul, three
brothers, laughed and said to the woman: “You fool: he is going to be
beheaded, and why will you loose your scarf?” The woman said to the
soldiers: “I ask you to swear by the head of the Emperor: tie his eyes
with this scarf and then behead him.” And they went about three miles
from the city, and beneath a certain tree they beheaded Paul. And as
soon as the blood began to drip from Paul’s neck, and before the
executioners could turn around, angels delivered the scarf to that
woman. She had one eye. When she tied the scarf over her forehead, at
that moment her eye was opened and enlightened. And upon their
return the soldiers saw the woman in the same place, an arrow’s throw
away from the city, with her eyes enlightened. And they believed in
Christ.

The Apostle Paul, personally, was short and fat; he had a large
nose, hazel eyes, thick eyebrows, and a happy face; he was semi-bald,
long-bearded, dignified, awe-inspiring, full of divine grace, and healer
of every pain. [p. 834] The holy Apostle Paul was from the city of
Tarsus of Cilicia, nurtured and raised at the feet of Gamaliel, the law
teacher of the Jews. He was zealous in the ancestral, Mosaic law; and
he was from the tribe of Benjamin. Obtaining warrants from the priests,
he used to persecute the church of Christ. He was a collaborator in the
death of Stephen the martyr by holding the clothes of those who were
stoning him. Receiving authority from the chief priests, he went to
Damascus to persecute the Christians there. And when he drew near to
the city, he was raptured into heaven and became blind in both eyes, as
and the glory of God, the light of the sun was like the darkness of the night; it appeared pitch-dark to him and he was unable to see anything through his senses, until he was baptized by Ananias and believed in Christ. He returned to Jerusalem and introduced himself to the Apostles. It was three months after the ascension of Christ. And the holy Apostles appointed Paul as a minister to the orphans and the widows, and he ministered to all and preached Christ openly to Jews and Gentiles. He was then called to apostleship, and the Holy Spirit proclaimed in Antioch: "Set apart for me Paul and Barnabas for the work of apostleship" [Acts 13:2]. And they, being sent by the Holy Spirit, went down to Seleucia. Saul was called Paul by the Holy Spirit as Simon was called Peter by Christ.

These are the cities to which Paul came preaching the Word of God: From Damascus to Jerusalem three times; to Tarsus and Syrian Antioch, four times; to Seleucia, Perga, and Pisidian Antioch, three times; to Lystra, Iconia, Derbe, two times; to Lycaonia, Pamphylia, Attalia, two times; to Galatia and Phrygia, two times; likewise to Macedonia and Greece; to Assos and Melita; then to Judea, to Sparta [read Patara], Tyre, and Ptolemais; also Philippi, Crete, and then, in chains, to Rome. And again, from Rome to Sidon, Smyrna in Lycia, Cnidus, Nico[polis], Syracuse, Ar[g]e[nnum], Patilulos [read Puteoli], Taber [read Tralles], and Apameia. And back to Rome a second time. Thus, throughout his days, Paul journeyed around, to sixty-five cities. He preached the Word of God in the provinces and endured much heartache and difficulty for the sake of Christ’s love and the faith. He had with him Aristarchus of Macedonia and Luke, who wrote the Acts of the Apostles.

They kept Paul in chains for two years in Rome. And before his death, Luke visited Rome. For this reason he does not account for the death of Paul as a martyr in the treatise on the Apostles.

Through the intercession of the holy Apostles Peter and Paul, have mercy O Christ, [our] God, on the printer of this book, the sinful scribe Grigor, and on my spiritual brother Alexanos, and also on the recipient of this book (in handwriting: the pilgrim [to the Holy Land] Ghumrē and his wife, the pilgrim [to the Holy Land] Khēnzdē, and on his parents Pēnklu and Mariam, and his sons Gaspar and Astuatsatur, and all his kin).
THE ARMENIAN VERSION OF THE  
"LIFE OF EVAGRIUS OF PONTUS"

Monica J. Blanchard, Carl Griffin, Cornelia B. Horn, Janet A. Timbie

Introduction

Evagrius of Pontus (c. 345-399) is one of the most interesting and important early monastic figures. His writings are at once profoundly mystical in their contemplation of the various stages of the spiritual life, yet eminently practical in their explication of the psychology of sin. Widely read and personally influential, Evagrius made a deep impression on later monasticism in East and West, both directly and indirectly through such disciples as John Cassian, John Climacus, and Maximus the Confessor. However, with his condemnation for Origenism in 553 (Second Council of Constantinople), many of his writings were lost, and few facts about him have survived to our day.


2 His works were translated from Greek into the languages of the Christian Near East. Much of the Syriac and Armenian is extant today. Although the Syriac texts have been studied extensively, relatively little attention has been paid to the Armenian corpus apart from the works of I. Hausherr and J. MuylxERMERS: Irénée Hausherr, Les versions syriaque et arménienne d’Évagre le Pontique: leur valeur, leur relation, leur utilisation (Orientalia Christiana vol. XXII/2; Roma: Pont. Institutum Orientalium. Studiorum, 1931); J. MuylxERMERS, “A propos d’un feuillette de manuscrit arménien (Brit. Mus. Cod. arm. 118),” Le Muséon 65 (1952) 11-16; idem, A travers la tradition manuscrite d’Évagre le Pontique: essai sur les manuscrits grecs conservés à la Bibliothèque nationale de Paris (Bibliothèque du Muséon, 3; Louvain: Bureaux du Muséon, 1932); idem, “Les citations bibliques dans la version arménienne de l’Antirrheticus d’Évagre le Pontique,” Handles Amsorv 75 (1961) 442-447; idem, “Le discours de Xystus dans la version arménienne d’Évagrius le Pontique,” Revue des études arméniennes 9 (1929) 183-201; idem, “Évagre le Pontique: les ‘Capita cognoscitiva’ dans les versions syriaque et arménienne,” Le Muséon 47 (1934) 73-106; idem, “Evagriana,” Le Muséon 44 (1931) 37-68, 369-383; idem, “Fragment arménien du Ad Virgines d’Évagre,” Le Muséon 53 (1940) 77-87; idem, “Miscellanea Armentica,” Le Muséon 47 (1934) 293-296; idem, “Répertoire de pièces patristiques d’après le catalogue arménien de
Our most important, and almost exclusive, source of information on Evagrius’ life is a short vita found in Palladius’ *Historia Lausiaca* (ch. 38). In the Oriental churches where Evagrius’ works were openly read, this chapter was excerpted and circulated independently, at times prefixed to collections of his works. Thus the vita in the Oriental versions often has a textual history separate from that of the *Historia Lausiaca*, usually remaining quite close to the Greek but at times exhibiting some interesting differences. This is especially true of the Coptic version, which is substantially longer and may represent, if not the original text, at least a “lateral tradition” or separate work also coming from the pen of Palladius.\(^3\) That the Coptic agrees substantially with one fragmentary Greek text of the *vita* is suggestive of the unique and possibly authentic readings which may survive in the versions alone.

The Greek text of Palladius itself has a rather complex textual history. Butler discerns among the Greek manuscripts three basic texttypes. The predominant texttype (B) might be called the *textus receptus* and is that found in all printed editions before Butler. A second texttype (G) seems to be simpler, less rhetorical, and shorter than B in Butler’s judgment. He regards G as nearest to the autograph and bases his edition upon it. A third texttype (A) is quite heterogeneous but is typified by the conflation of B and G, with frequent interpolations of the *Historia monachorum*.\(^4\)

The Armenian text of the *vita* presented here is the 1907 edition of the Mechitarist Barsegh V. Sargisian.\(^5\) Sargisian’s base text A (A) is

---


\(^5\) Barsegh V. Sargisian, *Srboy Horn Ewagri Pontats’woy, Vark’ ew matenagrut’iwnk’; t’argmanealk’ i yunê i hay barbar i hingerord daru, Ashkhotasirut’eamb ew tsanB’ut’eamb’i yois entsayeats’* (Venetik: S. Ghazar, 1907). The editor’s name also appears as Basile or Parsegh Sarghissian, Sarkisian, or Sargisian. Modern Armenian
Venice San Lazzaro MS 716, a copy of a manuscript dated A.D. 1305 from the Monastery of Medzoph. Manuscripts which appear in the critical apparatus include: \( \mathbf{A} \) (B) Venice San Lazzaro MS 427, undated; \( \mathbf{B} \) (D) Venice San Lazzaro MS 966, dated to the fourteenth century by Sargisian; \( \mathbf{C} \) (E) Venice San Lazzaro MS 1552, undated.\(^6\) The work is difficult to obtain in the United States. We have, therefore, included a copy of Sargisian's text along with our English translation.\(^7\)

This is not a text-critical study and we will not speculate on the precise relationship of the Armenian version to any particular Greek Vorlage. However, in Butler's opinion the Armenian version represents a G text.\(^8\) If this is so, it nevertheless contains a number of notable variants from his reconstruction of G. Whether these variants represent a divergent Vorlage, redactional embellishment, or interpolations, what emerges is a unique portrait of Evagrius as seen through the eyes of the Armenian Church.\(^9\)

\(^6\) Also indicated in the apparatus on pp. 2 (n.2) and 4 (n.10) is \( \mathbf{B} \) (G) Venice San Lazzaro MS 1071. The description of MS 1071 on p. 184 does not make clear its relevance. In correspondence with the Mechitarist Fathers in Venice, J. Muyldermans learned that MS 966 is designated both \( \mathbf{G} \) (G) and \( \mathbf{E} \) (E) in the San Lazzaro Library. As one of the Library's nine Evagrian MSS it is classed \( \mathbf{G} \), the third of nine. MS 966 also contains the Lives of the Fathers, and it is classed \( \mathbf{E} \), the seventh of that group of MSS. In order to avoid confusion in the edition Sargisian used \( \mathbf{G} \) for MS 966, keeping \( \mathbf{E} \) for MS 1071 and \( \mathbf{E} \) for MS 1552. However, in several places he seems to have reverted to the Library designations \( \mathbf{G} \) and \( \mathbf{E} \) for MS 966. See J. Muyldermans, "Le discours de Xystus dans la version arménienne d'Évagrius le Pontique," Revue des études arméniennes 9 (1929) 186-187. A descriptive list of the Armenian manuscripts at San Lazzaro and elsewhere, which were consulted by Sargisian, can be found on pp. 175 - 192 of the Vark' ew matenagrat'iwnek.

\(^7\) The text is reproduced in Barz, a freeware Armenian font.

\(^8\) C. Butler, The Lausiac History of Palladius II.1xxi and note 7, p. 217.

Արմենական երգ

Երասպ հարուստ դարձավ, երբ կիրառեց, հարց կարծիք, ինչպես պատկերն է, որը վառ սլավը պահել է շատ կարևոր պատմություն։ Դարձավ իրավատարություն ուրրում, այլը զարգացելու ուրիշների և սկզբնական տեսանկյունից են։ Նույնիսկ այսպիսի պատմություն և պատասխանություն պարույր։

Արարատուն զարգացած են հայկական մթնոլոգիան։ Այս պատմությունները սկզբնական տեսանկյունում են նույնիսկ արատունց պատմությունները և զարգացման տեսակները։ Այս պատմությունները սկզբնական տեսանկյունում են նույնիսկ արատունց պատմությունները և զարգացման տեսակները։
Բարձրական ապահույսն է երաշխատական ազդեցության փուլ
ի գործընթացի հիման վրա, որին են ունենում առկա են երաշխատական
գործընթացի իրադարձություններն ու նոր տերություն,
որ երբ սակայն գրավում է գործընթացի ձգում։ Այս
էակրում հանդիպում է երաշխատական առկա
գործընթացի իրադարձություններից, որոնք հաճախ են ներկայացվում
երաշխատական այլ արգելներում, երբ իրենց
համար ուղղակի գործընթացի դիմականունների
ցանկության կարգավիճակներում, երբ իրենց
համար պայքար է կազմում այլ գործընթացի
կազմակերպման, երբ իրենց համար
Դասաբանական գործընթացի կազմակերպման
կազմակերպման, երբ իրենց համար
"բնական սիմվուլներ" են կազմակերպման
կազմակերպման, երբ իրենց համար
Այս դիմապարան ուղղված է այն
Այս դիմապարան ուղղված է այն
Այս դիմապարան ուղղված է այն
"բնական սիմվուլներ" են կազմակերպման
"բնական սիմվուլներ" են կազմակերպման
"բնական սիմվուլներ" են կազմակերպման
գիշերերի երիտասարդ կենսաբանության հետ երազում են երեխայի զարգացման աղբյուրներում, որպեսզի զարգացման համար պատասխանի կան հնարավորություն և Պատրիարքության բնագավառների տեսություններով և կարևոր էին զարգացման բնագավառի համար հնարավորությունները և Պատրիարքության բնագավառների տեսությունների հասկացությունները։ Պատմական կերպով, երեխաների զարգացման համար պատասխանի կան հնարավորություն և Պատրիարքության բնագավառների տեսությունների հույն ուկրաինական լեզու Պատմական կերպով, երեխաների զարգացման համար պատասխանի կան հնարավորություն և Պատրիարքության բնագավառների տեսությունների հույն ուկրաինական լեզու Պատմական կերպով, երեխաների զարգացման համար պատասխանի կան հնարավորություն և Պատրիարքության բնագավառների տեսությունների հույն ուկրաինական լեզու Պատմական կերպով, երեխաների զարգացման համար պատասխանի կան հնարավորություն և Պատրիարքության բնագավառների տեսությունների հույն ուկրաինական լեզու

30 ST. NERSESS THEOLOGICAL REVIEW
Life of the Blessed Evagrius

In many ways, 0 beloved ones, Evagrius, the faithful servant of God, appeared very wonderful and celebrated in his way of life. A man trained in everything, like the apostles and the prophets, he blossomed and bore fruit in all parts through his virtuous conduct, to the glory of the most holy Trinity. Unable to speak worthily about him, I am obliged to speak briefly, for the edification of those who will read and for the profit of the eager hearers. Having been summoned once more by the Holy Spirit, he came to a remote place, Rebon,\(^\text{10}\) and by great

---

\(^{10}\) Rebon is unintelligible as it stands in Armenian; the Greek text here refers to the *monoē bion* of Evagrius, while later it places him at Nitria. In both instances the Armenian text has Rebon, Hrebon. Armitage Robinson wrote about the Armenian *vita* of Evagrius in chapter 11 of Cuthbert Butler’s, *The Lausiac History of Palladius*. Robinson suggested a confusion in the Armenian text based on the word division *monē*
asceticism he was found worthy of the good things of heaven. He died at the age of fifty-four as a monk in the desert, having killed the earthly members (cf. Col 3:5) in entire accord with Scripture. In fervent faith, he took up the cross of Christ many times in pure thought.

He was of Pontic origin, from the city of Iberia, the son of a priest, a pious man, a reader for Saint Basil, the bishop of Neocaesarea, who is celebrated among all because of his brilliant understanding. When the blessed Basil died, the holy bishop Gregory Nazianzus, wise and dispassionate, saw Evagrius’ very gracious ability and ordained him archdeacon. At that time an assembly took place, a great synod of the city of Constantinople, and when the blessed ones came there, Gregory left Evagrius with the holy bishop Nectarius. While still in earliest youth, Evagrius strove against the entire heresy of the Arians; the God-inspired one flourished and his entreaty bore fruit in the great city. By his words he defeated the heretics. They did not know how to oppose the wisdom and the spirit with which he spoke (Acts 6:10), and for his brilliance he was honored by the citizens.

The evil and jealous Satan cast him into desire for a certain woman, as he himself told us. And after a few days, when he found a little peace of mind, again a meeting would take place with the same woman, who was of high rank and very attractive. From fear of God and shame before men, keeping shame and endless torments continually before his eyes, Evagrius prayed to God in supplication that he might be able to suppress the terrible temptation of the woman, but he was unable. Since the woman disturbed him very much with the stirrings of desire, and in manifold ways with love and devotion, he was bound as if by fetters and was not able to move. But the beneficent


1 Iberia, for Ibora in Helenopontus, one of two Pontic provinces created by Diocletian; see “Pontos,” ODB 3.1697; Gabriel Bunge, Evagrios Ponikos, Briefe aus der Wüste: Eingeleitet, übersetzt und kommentiert (Trier: Paulinus-Verlag, 1986) 21, 95 n.8.

12 Council of Constantinople, AD 381.

13 Nectarius, bishop of Constantinople 381-399, was the choice of the emperor Theodosius to succeed Gregory Nazianzus at the time of the council (381). Works of Nectarius survive in Armenian. See Matenadaran Haykakan T'argmanut'eants' nakhneats' (Dar D-DzG) [Catalogue des anciennes traductions arménienes (Siècles IV-XIII)] (Venetik: Mkhit'arean Tparan, 1889) 632-633.
God heard his prayers and did not leave him in temptation. Suddenly a vision appeared before him of an army of angels, and they carried him off as to judgment, with an iron collar on his neck and chains on his feet and hands, and they threw him in prison without revealing his crime. But he felt guilt over the woman, suspecting that her husband was his accuser. While he suffered this torment, he saw certain criminals whom they tortured in front of him because of some other matter, and being still more frightened, he was confused. After all this, the angel who had shown the vision to him appeared in another form, in the likeness of a beloved and familiar friend, saying to him, “Bound with such awful chains, in the midst of many dangers, why are you imprisoned, lord deacon?” Evagrius said to him, “Truly, I swear to Christ that I do not know.” The angel said to him, “Don’t you have any thoughts on the matter yourself?” Evagrius said, “I believe that someone with the title of eparch has slandered me, wounding with jealous words, and I am afraid that, God forbid!, he may have bribed the prince and he shall order me to be tortured.” He said to him, “Listen to me, your friend, it is not good for you to dwell in this city.” Evagrius said to him, “God alone will save me from this temptation. So if you see me again in this city, know that I am in these torments justly.” The angel said to him, “If that is the case, I am bringing the Gospel; swear on it that you will leave the city. You will save yourself and I will carry you away from this torment.” And taking the Gospel, he swore and said, “After today, when I have taken my clothes to the ship, I will not delay here one hour.” At that moment he woke up in the night from his dream and got up, thinking about the oath that was in his dream. Immediately he threw his belongings on the ship and left

---

14 This is the title of various imperial functionaries, the most important of which was the “eparch of the city,” who served as the head of the police in Constantinople. See the entry “Eparch,” with additional bibliography in ODB 1.704. The word appears in Armenian dictionaries as քարգուր քարգուր meaning “prefect” or “viceroy” (M. Bedrossian, New Dictionary Armenian-English (Beirut: Librairie du Liban, 1985) 157. It is a standard loan-word in Armenian.

15 This usage suggests that the gospels are bound in a separate book and it is on this that Evagrius swears his oath. In Byzantine Greek usage, evangelion refers to the gospel lectionary, a single volume, containing only those gospel passages read in liturgies. The ἱεραπεράγελον contained the complete text of the four gospels with the readings marked by notes in the margins. Consult the ODB entries “Evangelion,” 2.761 and “Gospel Book,” 2.861. Helpful bibliography is provided in both.
for Jerusalem, visiting the holy places there and the blessed Melania, a Roman matron.

Later, his heart, like Pharaoh’s, was hardened by Satan, for he was still a young man. He did not want to confide in anyone, for his thoughts were mixed up. He began to change his style of dress, and he became proud and full of vainglory. But God, the creator of all beings, who does not desire for anyone to transgress, cast him into the pains of a fever for six months. His whole body withered, and physicians were not able to find a cure. The blessed Roman lady came to see him and said, “This prolonged illness of yours is not pleasing to me, child, because it does not happen without God.” And he confessed to her his innermost thoughts. The noblewoman said to him, “Swear before the Lord that you will undertake a great work in the desert of Rebon. Though I am a sinner, I will pray that He will give you time for repentance.” Now Evagrius repented at her words, immediately came to his senses, and was well again. And getting up, he left and set out toward Mt. Rebon in Egypt. He settled there for two years and then he entered the innermost desert. He stayed in the Cells for fourteen years, eating a pound of bread every five months and a measure of olive oil. Then he totally abstained from the delicacies and pleasures of this world. He lay stretched out on the ground all night reciting psalms, offered one hundred prayers daily, and throughout the year he wrote the books for every monastery in which he was dwelling, since he was skilled in the Oxyrhynchus hand. After fifteen years, his way of life

---

16 This passage is difficult to understand in Armenian. Perhaps Evagrius had adopted the dress of the Christian ascetic, the tribon, when he arrived in Jerusalem, and later changed his style of dress. Michael Wallace O’Laughlin makes this point in his unpublished dissertation, “Origenism in the Desert: Anthropology and Integration in Evagrius Ponticus” (Harvard University, 1987) 31, n.102.

17 Armenian ՊԵՐԵՐԸ, meaning “the huts”. Just as the Greek plural κελλία, “cells,” came to refer to a loosely organized monastic settlement at the western edge of the Nile Delta, so too in Armenian, a descriptive term is also a place name. See A. Guillaumont, “Histoire des moines aux Kelâia,” Orientalia Lovaniensia Periodica 8 (1977) 187-203. The same can be found in the Syriac version of the Life of Evagrius. See René Draguet, Les formes syriaques de la matière de l’Histoire lausique (CSCO vols. 389-390, 398-399. Scriptores Syri t. 169170, 173-174; Louvain: Secrétariat du CSCO, 1978) vol.399.184, n.5. The term is consistently used in the Armenian apophthegmata when the Greek has kellia; see for example Vark’ srbots’ harants’ 2.98.

18 Earlier editions and translations of the Historia Lausiaca state that this refers to a “sharp-pointed” style of writing and has no connection to the city; see Robert Meyer, The Lausiac History (New York: Newman Press, 1964), p. 113, n. 350, citing V. Gardthausen, Griechische Palaeographie 2 (Leipzig, 1913), p. 113ff. For a more recent
became pure and sober and, perfected in mind, he became worthy of grace from the Holy Spirit. With much knowledge, with surpassing discretion, he conducted studies with the help of the Spirit. He composed three divinely-inspired books for solitaries, both against myth-makers, and against the cleverness of demons.

After this, again the demon of fornication tormented him, as he reported to us, and digging a deep hole, he stood in it every night during the winter days, until his whole body froze. Then the spirit of blasphemy tormented him and he did not go under a roof for forty days until his whole body became as tough as the hide of an animal. Later, three demons appeared to him in daytime in the likeness of clerics and disputed with him concerning the faith. One of them claimed to be an Arian, another an Eunomian, and another an Apollinarian, and he defeated them by means of his intelligence. Upon his recognizing the temptations and lifting his hands to heaven toward God, the demons vanished from him immediately. Then one day he lost the keys to the church, and signing the front of the locks in the name of Christ and thrusting forth his hand, they opened by themselves for him. He was tested by every trial from various demons and in countless ways. When his father died, someone came and told him and he said, “Cease from blasphemy, for my Father is immortal.” One of his disciples, who studied with him for eighteen years, related everything from his

discussion, see E. G. Turner, Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World, 2nd ed. (London: Institute of Classical Studies, 1980), pp. 20-23, on styles of handwriting. Oxyrhynchus was an important center for the copying of manuscripts; see E. G. Turner, “Roman Oxyrhynchus,” Journal of Egyptian Archaeology 38 (1952), pp. 78-93.


20 The passage is very confused in Armenian, as it is in Greek. It may be a garbled reference to Evagrius’s Antiirhetikos, an eight-book treatise giving advice to ascetics, since the word antiirhetikos appears at this point in the Greek text of the Historia Lausiaca. The title of the Antiirhetikos appears in Armenian manuscripts as օրինինքերի երգերը և օրինինքերի մեկերը, which can be translated into English as A Reply from Holy Scripture to the Demons Who Tempt Us.

21 The spelling of Greek names in classical and medieval Armenian is not uniform. Variant spellings can involve confusions between proper and descriptive names. It is possible to read this line as “One of them claimed to be Arius, another Eunomius, and another Apollinarius.” The preferred reading above follows the Greek version of the vita.

22 G. Bunge, Evagrios Pontikos, Briefe aus der Wiiste, p. 76 mentions that Evagrius cites this story in reference to someone else in the Praktikos 95.
previous observations. Speaking like a prophet, Evagrius said to him, "Since I came to dwell in the desert, I have not eaten vegetables or green herbs or grapes or fruit or meat, nor washed the body, not even tasting bread and wine at all." But when his body became very weak from a hard way of life, he mixed a little barley with date palm water and warmed this on the fire because of the great pain in his stomach. But from bread and wine and from much that is necessary for sickness he abstained. He ate only a few green vegetables, legumes, and barley water up to the end. It happened then, after partaking of Communion in the church on the feast of Epiphany, that he said to the brothers at that time, while he was near his own end, "It is three years since I have been tormented by the desires of the flesh." After such suffering and troubles, and difficult temptations from the demons, and after such austerities and perpetual prayer in monastic life with good conduct, guarding the faith and completing the race (cf. Acts 13:25; 20:24; 2 Tim 4:7), he rested in the same desert in Christ Jesus, our Lord, to whom be glory forever. This Evagrius lived in the desert for fifty-four years by the power of the Holy Spirit and Jesus Christ, our Savior; greatly the light shone on me, the unworthy one.

I wrote and arranged to the best of my ability three books with ordered and easy-to-understand and appropriate discourses: first, concerning the monks' true faith; second, against debaters and myth-makers; and third, concerning evil spirits, a reply from Holy Scripture to demons who tempt us. Thus, when you read and profit, Christ may make you victorious over these evil ones.

---

23 An error in the Armenian version, since the opening paragraph clearly states that he "died at the age of fifty-four."

24 The last paragraph of the Vita, which purports to introduce the reader to the same works of Evagrius mentioned earlier (see pp. 33-34 above), is written in the first person. Modern scholars have speculated on the content and function of this paragraph. See Robinson in C. Butler's *The Lausiac History of Palladius* 1.103-106.
KIRAKOS ERZNKAĆI’S
On the Eight Thoughts of Evagrius

Tigran Karapetyan

Kirakos of Erznka lived at the end of the 13th and the beginning of the 14th century. His contemporaries and followers called him “the great and famous teacher,” “worthy of all prizes and remembrance,” eminent and thrice-great arch-teacher,” “blessed and thrice-praised arch-teacher.” As a representative of the intellectual tradition of Erznka, he followed in the footsteps of his famous predecessor Yovhannēs Pluz of Erznka (ca. 1240-1293) and of his near-contemporary Mvšēs of Erznka (ca. 1250-1323).

We know little about Kirakos’ life. According to some, he was born in around 1270. His parents’ names were Yovhannēs and Hipa. Like others of his time, he received his education at the monastic school of Glajor under the tutelage of the noted teacher Esayi Nēcēi. Kirakos became a teacher in his turn, in the monasteries around Erznka. According to the colophon of J 1236, he died on November 15, 1356, leaving the writer Stephanos the Elder and others “orphans in

---


3 Ibid., p. 225.


5 Երևանցի Հայաստանի Հայկական Սոցիալական Տեղեկություններ [Encyclopedia of Soviet Armenia], vol. V, p. 450. According to H. Kurtean, Երևանի քաղաքի մասնաճյուղերը [The Province of Eriza or Ekeghia...], (Venice, 1953), vol. I, p. 225, he is mentioned for the first time by name in a manuscript dated 1317.


7 Another Erznkaći who received the same education was Yovhannēs Erznkaći of Corcor who, nonetheless, went on to become an adherent of the movement espousing the union of the Armenian Church with the Church of Rome. Ibid., 360.

this life.” The 17th century geographer Yakob Karneči says that Kirakos was buried in Erznka’s St. Sargs Church.

In addition to the work on Evagrius’ Eight Thoughts which will be the main topic of discussion here, Kirakos authored a commentary on Evagrius’ Centuries, as well as numerous sermons and homilies, hortatory works and hymns.

Before proceeding to an overview of Kirakos’ On the Eight Thoughts, it would be well to look at the origins of the teaching about the Eight Thoughts in the church at large.

The teaching on the Eight Thoughts has its roots in eastern monastic asceticism. The desert fathers’ and mothers’ uncompromising battle against sin involved them in extensive contemplation of its nature: its origins, the process of its influences, its strange characteristics and the varieties of its consequences. Although a human being cannot totally understand sin, yet through endurance and constant meditation desert monastics attained the divine gift of a profound understanding and knowledge of it. By a mystic synergy between the activity of man and of God, their inner vision was sharpened, and they became more capable of recognizing the invisible thoughts which came to them, fixing those thoughts and finding a proper approach to each. Their hard-won understanding was transmitted by them to the church at large, and became an important resource in the struggle for Christian self-knowledge.

To attain their understanding, the desert dwellers had to strip away things which were not conducive to it. They entered into a state of peace and relaxation which cannot be measured by today’s standards. According to current concepts, an individual is relaxed and undisturbed if he or she has no external problems, discomforts, or material insecurities. Even completely busy people know how to relax from time to time and to stand apart from daily anxieties and problems. Yet Christian calm, the calm lived by the desert fathers, is different. For them, calm did not consist in avoiding external problems and obtaining physical rest, but in avoiding the internal problems of sinful thoughts and evil perceptions and finding rest for

---

their spirit in God. For the hermit, a modern person's state of calm would be a moment of battle and vigilance.

The monks' relaxation and calm were not achieved by thinking about something pleasant (as is done today in some branches of meditation) but by struggling to be free from the world of ideas and imaginations, from all the accidental thoughts and remembrances that could make them forget their Creator. In order to achieve this freedom, much had to be rejected. As one of the Apophthegmata records, 'The brother said, 'Father, I want to curb my thoughts, but I fail.' The old man replied, 'How can we curb our ideas and thoughts if we give freedom to our mouth and ears'?'

To overcome one's thoughts was a sign of maturity. When the great hermit Selovman was asked how he had received the knowledge of God, he answered, "I never let thoughts that were not pleasing to God enter my mind." The distinction of thoughts pleasing to God from thoughts unpleasing to Him was a matter of intense importance. Although the human consciousness should verify what is good and what is not, it might be asleep or damaged and thus confuse evil thoughts with good ones. The knowledge of the Eight Thoughts helped one to see more clearly the essence of each thought visiting the soul, assisted one in differentiating them from each other in their perplexing multitude, and aided one in grouping them.

The Eight Thoughts are the following: (1) gluttony (2) impurity (3) avarice (4) sadness (5) anger (6) acedia (7) vainglory and (8) pride. They embody the totality of sinful states, beginning with sins associated with the body and ending with sins concerning the spirit.

That totality is the first and most important aspect of this teaching. Every totality can be divided into parts. But the question is, how, and in what manner? Here, both intelligence and revelation are needed; in their light, the Eight Thoughts divide the totality of sinful thoughts into eight categories, ranged in a physiological sequence, encompassing the entire existence of man. The first thought, gluttony, corresponds to the human dietetic function; the second, impurity, to sexual function; the third, avarice, to material need; the fourth, sadness, to the emotional circuit connected with desire; the fifth, anger, to the performance of the will; the sixth, acedia, to the proper

---

disposition of time; the seventh, vainglory, to the social feelings, the relationship of the spirit with near and far friends. Finally, the eighth, pride, corresponds to the highest circuit of the spirit of man, to one's own knowledge and understanding of oneself, as well as one's relationship with God and fellow human beings.

The progression in the Eight Thoughts is from below to above, from body to psyche and spirit. In addition to its role in helping one to recognize and understand sin, this order is practical. According to the desert fathers, the battle against the first thought, gluttony, is primary, because without some victory in the realm of physical intake, there cannot be any stable spiritual progress. However, the order of the Eight Thoughts does not imply that one must perfectly master the first before moving on to the second. The value of their teaching lies, as we mentioned already, in its integrality and all-inclusiveness, and in the provision of a means for overcoming each and every thought.

The most ancient author to write on the Eight Thoughts was Evagrius Ponticus, and it is to him that the teaching on the Eight Thoughts is consistently attributed in the Armenian tradition. Despite the fact that representatives of ancient Christian mysticism were well-acquainted with this teaching, its foundation was unanimously attributed to Evagrius only in the Armenian and Syrian churches. In the Chalcedonian churches, on the other hand, there is no such authoritative loyalty. This may be due to some uncertainty in the ancient sources, for although the Antirrhetikos did not survive in either its original Greek or its Latin translation, work with a similar theme and also now generally acknowledged to be the work of Evagrius was copied under the name of Nilus of Sinai.\(^\text{12}\)

There was probably also an intentional reticence concerning the name of Evagrius, causing his works to be purposely ascribed to others. Together with Origen and Didymus the Blind, Evagrius was condemned at the Fifth Ecumenical Council in 553, a condemnation which was renewed by later councils as well.\(^\text{13}\) Among the

\(^{12}\) According to Johannes Quasten, *Patrology* (Westminster, Maryland, 1994), vol. III, 169-175 Evagrius’ *De Malignis Cognitionibus, Ad Eulogium Monachum* and *On Prayer* were attributed to Nilus. Quasten also mentions that Evagrius’ works are to be found attributed to Basil the Great. See too A.I. Sidorova, *Tvorenia Avii Evagriia. Asketicheskie i Bogoslovskie Traktiati* [Creation of Abba Evagrius: The Ascetic and Theological Treatises] (Izdatelstvo Marts, 1994), pp. 20-23.

\(^{13}\) *Evagrius Ponticus: The Praktikos, Chapters on Prayer*, tr. John Eudes Barnberger (Spencer, Massachusetts, 1970), p. xxv.
Chalcedonian churches, Evagrius’ condemnation resulted in a deep silence about his name, despite the fact that his works were used by many teachers and theologians of the Church. The Armenian and other non-Chalcedonian churches, however, were not affected by the council’s decisions, and the orthodoxy of Evagrius’ work was not questioned by them. Indeed, he is included in the list of saints celebrated during the Armenian liturgical year.

The continuing respect and admiration that the Armenian Church had towards Evagrius played an important role in preserving the teaching on the Eight Thoughts in its primitive, Evagrian version. Fr. Barsel Sargisian, in the course of his comparative studies, realized that in the manuscript attributed to Nilus the sequence of the thoughts is different: sadness follows anger, rather than preceding it. Fr. Sargisian goes so far as to say that the work attributed to Nilus constitutes a later edition, if not a separate work altogether.¹⁴

This change in the sequence of the Eight Thoughts, as we shall see later, was not an accidental one. Although we do not know what tradition caused redactors of a later period to make such a change, it certainly became the standard order, except in the Armenian.¹⁵

Indeed, through the centuries the teaching on the Eight Thoughts in the writings of the holy fathers underwent a certain metamorphosis. In his first work on the Eight Thoughts (his Letter to Anatolius)¹⁶ Evagrius presents in a brief manner the visitation of thoughts and the consequences brought by them.¹⁷ The Antirrhetikos, on which Kirakos focused his attentions, includes Scripture texts for the countering of

---

¹⁴ Զ. Բարսել Սարգիսյան. Եվագրիոս Նիլոսի տասներկրորդ գործեր. Եվագրիոսի Պոնիկիս. [Fr. Barsel Sargisian, Life and Works of the Holy Father Evagrius Ponticus] (Venice, 1907), pp. xii-xiii. Sargisian considers the work generally attributed to Nilus to be a condensation and simplification of Evagrius, leaving out the Scriptural quotations and making other changes, such as referring to the Thoughts as Spirits. There seems to be an emphasis on examination of the faults within a person, rather than on recognition and refutation of visitant thoughts. (Ibid., pp. lxix-lxx) Despite Fr. Sargisian’s learned work, much more remains to be done in the assessment of Evagrius’ Armenian texts. The relationship between the works of Evagrius and those of Nilus would also repay further study.

¹⁵ S.M. Zarin, Asketizm po Pravoslavno-Xristianskomu Ucheniyu [Asceticism according to Orthodox Christian Teaching], (n.d./n.p.), p. 321.


¹⁷ This writing is preserved only in the Armenian and Syriac translations. See Sargisian, pp. 317-323.
each Thought, providing the “active” monk with an arsenal of retaliatory weapons.  

The Eight Thoughts are also known to us from the work of John Cassian. After four books dedicated to monastic law, Cassian composed eight more dedicated to the battle against the Eight Thoughts. Cassian follows the revised order of the Thoughts which, as we have already mentioned, became characteristic of the Chalcedonian tradition. He also changes the word “Thought” to “Fault”, or sometimes, “Lust,” and refers to the battle against them as a battle against “Spirits.” The combat is against the sinfulness present in man, rather than against external influences. In other words, the battle is against the bad habits and faults that Evagrius would have seen as consequences of the Thoughts once they have built their nest, so to speak, within the person.

Within Cassian’s work is to be found a smaller one dedicated to the Eight Thoughts. This is the interpretation of Abba Sarapion, who is the speaker in Conference Five which Cassian entitles, “On the Eight Principle Faults.” In this, the relevance of the Eight Faults is defended by analysis, as Abba Sarapion compares and contrasts them with one another.

One of the greatest followers and developers of the teaching on the Eight Thoughts is John Climacus. In his famous ascetic work describing the thirty steps of spiritual growth, he refers to each of the Eight Thoughts, giving specific recipes for conquering them at the end of each chapter. In Climacus’ book, the Eight Thoughts are presented along with virtues and other spiritual principles so that, for example, the chapter on Avarice (step 16) falls between chapters on Chastity (step 15) and Poverty (step 17). The overall composition of Climacus’ book is as a practical enterprise for overcoming sinful faults and receiving their opposite virtues. It does not adhere to the already known order of the Thoughts, in either the Chalcedonian or the Armenian tradition. The emphasis is on turning Climacus’ readers against the faults, and then offering them virtuous alternatives.

---


In this stream of its development, the teaching on the Eight Thoughts developed from Evagrius' provision of ways to recognize and counter the Thoughts to Climacus' practical system of replacing human sin with virtue.

The development of the teaching in the Armenian Church had quite a different character. When we reach the work of Kirakos, we find first of all that the Eight Thoughts are still referred to as "Thoughts," and the primitive sequence of the Eight Thoughts has been retained. However, Kirakos effectively shows the origin and interconnection of the Thoughts and instills in the reader a healthy antipathy towards sin in general.

Before we enter on a detailed consideration of Erznkači's work, we must make a digression. It will not have escaped the reader that there is a marked resemblance between the Eight Thoughts and the Seven Deadly Sins. The Seven Deadly Sins were a familiar concept in the Armenia of Kirakos' day, as they were elsewhere. In fact, Kirakos alludes to them in the introduction to his work, saying that the writing on which he is about to embark would be better done by one who had been "found victorious against the Seven Deadly Thoughts." Why, while writing about the Eight Thoughts, does Kirakos refer to perfection in conquering the "Seven Deadly Thoughts?" And why, since he mentions them, does he refer to them as "Thoughts," when the common terminology for the seven is "Sins'? The present writer is going to maintain that the choice of terms is deliberate, and that Erznkači's work represents a synthesis of the two traditions.

---

21 In the present context, we can only discuss the middle section of this development, as Kirakos' work falls chronologically between two (possibly three) others which have not yet been adequately examined. The twelfth century Scholia on Evagrius by Grigor Skewracı (1150?-1230?) has unfortunately not been studied extensively and remains unpublished. Mattėos Julayecı's (1352?-1412?) Summary of the Eight Thoughts of Evagrius likewise remains in manuscript form only. There exists also a thirteenth century manuscript (MM 4150) which contains a Preliminary Explanation of the Writings of Evagrius attributed to Yovhannēs Sarkawag Vardapet, the great eleventh century doctor of the Armenian church (ca. 1050-1129). This has yet to be examined.

22 According to some scholarly studies the teaching on the Seven Deadly Sins is a later adaptation of the teaching on the Eight Thoughts, and its author was Gregory the Great (end 6th century). About this, see Zarin, p. 349. However, as we will see below, this teaching may have its own separate origin, representing a completely distinct tradition.
The Seven Deadly Sins are presented in the following sequence: (1) pride (2) envy (3) anger (4) sloth (5) greed (6) gluttony (7) lust. It is readily apparent that there are many similarities between the Seven Deadly Sins and the Eight Thoughts. It is also obvious that the Sins are presented in approximately reverse sequence to the Thoughts.

However, the main difference between them is not to be found in such details. It is deeper. As we have already stated, the teaching on the Eight Thoughts originated in the ascetic life, whose struggle against sin fostered a strengthening of spiritual sensitivity in the detection and understanding of sin. The Thoughts are not yet sins, but rather facilitators of sin. They may give birth to it.

The Seven Deadly Sins, on the other hand, are fully actualized sins: they are the principal sins from which all other types of sin derive. As they have already been committed, they are named “Deadly.” The thought by itself is not deadly if it has not grown into sin. So the knowledge of the Eight Thoughts helps one to detect, from the beginning, the potential for sin, and to anticipate and forestall its development. The knowledge of the Seven Deadly Sins, on the other hand, does not force one to this sensitivity towards incipient sin, but rather forces one to self-examination with a view to seeing how far a particular sin has already developed.

Perhaps we might speak of the teaching on the Seven Deadly Sins as theoretical in origin. That the sins are listed in sequence from above to below, that is, from spiritual to bodily, indicates the more intellectual character of this approach. Starting with pride and considering it as the origin and root of all other sins and faults, the teaching on the Seven Deadly Sins generally gives priority to the ontological bases of sin. It forces one to think about the essence of sin, and then to undertake practical means to overcome individual sins.

The most ancient expression of the teaching on the Seven Deadly Sins may be a confessional text attributed to St. Athanasius or St. Ephrem.²³ Naming the Seven Deadly Sins one by one, the author first

²³ Ὑπαρχον Ὑθμονος ὡς Ὑπαρχον Ὑθμονος Ἐφραμος Ἐφραμος Ἐφραμος Ἐφραμος Ἐφραμος Ἐφραμος [Confession Ascribed to St. Athanasius and the Holy Father Ephrem]. See Φηράμ [Book of Prayers Ascribed to St. Ephrem Khouri the Syrian] (Jerusalem, 1933), pp. 11-28. The question of whether or not this work is authentic lies outside the scope of this study; because of its attribution to either of these two authors, we consider it to be ancient.
divides them according to the parts of the body and then according to the movements of the spirit. Then, referring to the "Seven sins equal to death," the author enters on a detailed description of each sin’s various manifestations.

This text is similar to the texts entitled "Confession" or "Penitence" that were composed to be read in front of the father confessor as an examination of conscience. As such, these texts do not have the practical purpose of fighting against evil thoughts, counteracting and conquering them. Rather, they refer to sins that have already been committed, or to sinful habits that are present in one’s heart. Thus, the purpose of such texts is to pay more attention to the consequences of a sin, its roots in the human being, its ugly essence and dangerous results, so that the sinner may have a greater sense of repentance, and through meditation may grow in antipathy towards each sin.

The fact that these texts have as their practical purpose repentance, rather than a long-term process of building resistance to evil thoughts, explains why they have developed in a totally different way. Two different purposes have created two different ways of approaching the same idea: sin.

In other words, the combat against sin is divided into two dynamic principles: one, to develop the will not to sin, to be able to stand firm against all kinds of sinful movements or thoughts. The other, to rethink already committed or realized sins, to repent, and to rebuke oneself for them. It is important to have the sense and will not to sin, inculcated by works embodying the first principle. But it is no less important to consider oneself as a being in a sinful state, and take steps to remedy this.

In this sense the two traditions, although beginning from different principles and moving in a different order, complement one another. Both of them are great gifts given to humanity through the holy fathers, and the appropriation of both is essential to the journey of all Christians toward perfection.

24 Sargisian finds that these texts were used in the Armenian Church from the fifth century. (Their present, edited version is to be found in any current Book of Hours, for example that published in Jerusalem, 1985, pp. 8-11). See especially his comparative study of the probably pseudo-Evagrian text entitled “Collective Confession,” pp. xlviii-li and 377-384. Although he refutes the text’s attribution to Evagrius, he proves its ancient origin.
In the Armenian Church’s traditional understanding of sin and penitence, the teaching on the Eight Thoughts was not so prevalent as in the other Orthodox churches. The theological mind of the Armenian Church soon concentrated its attention more on the teaching of the Seven Deadly Sins, for historical reasons which are beyond the boundaries of this study.

However, the Armenian Church did not forget the teaching on the Eight Thoughts, nor did it leave aside the practical implications of that teaching. Rather, in the Armenian Church the two teachings were intertwined and presented together as a uniquely integrated approach to the conquering of sin. We will now look at the two teachings briefly as they occur in the *Book of Questions* by St. Grigor Taťevaci (+1410), who represented the culmination of the Armenian Church’s thought on this matter, and then we will move backwards in time to the work of Kirakos.

Chapter 32 of Taťevaci’s *Book of Questions* is dedicated to sin.25 The first question in the chapter describes the distinctions between three Armenian words for sin.26 The second question in it is intended to show that the difference between thought and sin is not such that one can draw a clear line between them. He cites the words of Christ concerning adultery of the heart, in Matthew 5:28, and pays special attention to pride and envy, sins committed only in the heart.

Developing his ideas on the relationship of thought and sin, Taťevaci refers to the Eight Thoughts of Evagrius, and quotes Evagrius as saying: “Until the age of thirty, passion motivates the thoughts to desire; thereafter, the thoughts motivate passion.” Pursuing this, Taťevaci presents two kinds of sinful thoughts: “The first is only the minor transgression of viewing, according to the mind’s natural property, visitant thoughts, which the Prophet laments are countless (“Who can discern his errors?” Ps. 19:12). And the second is when viewing them they delight in their mind and wallow in them, and by ruminating on them approve them. And in this way it comes to fruition, as natural thinking secretly blends with alien. About this the Prophet prayed, “Cleanse me from my secret sins, and preserve your servants from what is alien.” (Ps. 19:12-13)

26 Թաթևացի, Գրիգոր, Թաթևացի, Գրիգոր.
It is no accident that in this chapter of the *Book of Questions* Tatevaci responds to a certain Father Sahak, who was "ascetic and monk." His subtle analysis of the "fault of the mind" corresponds well with the general ascetic teaching about the progression of thoughts. In the *Philokalia*, the first two steps in the development of evil thoughts are called "Provocation" (prosvoli) and "Communion" (syndyasmos). In Tatevaci's terms, the former would be a "minor transgression" and the latter, "viewing with delight." Having established that his analysis is in line with ascetic thinking, Tatevaci goes on to ask the important, synthesizing question, "Why does Evagrius refer to the 'Eight Thoughts' of sin, and other teachers refer to the 'Seven Deadly Sins'?" The answer has to be given in two parts. First: one can make the Eight Thoughts into seven by telescoping sadness and acedia together. Tatevaci explains that they are really different aspects of the same Thought—sadness turns backwards towards lost good, and finds it difficult to work towards the new, while acedia seeks to prolong spiritual pleasure into the future. Together, both can be connected with the single Deadly Sin, sloth. By this artifice, it is possible to arrive at Seven Thoughts and Seven Deadly Sins.

---

27 Compare, for example, John Climacus, *The Ladder of Divine Ascent* step 15, pp. 181-182. Here, Climacus considers that "Provocation" is sinless, but "Communion" is not. And the next two steps, "Assent" (synkathathesis) and "Communion" (syndyasmos) are condemnable sins. He goes on to say that "Communion" is judged differently, depending on whether it happens at the time of prayer or at some other time, and whether it happens in regard to something unimportant, or in the context of evil thoughts.

28 In the glossary of the *Philokalia*, under the entry for "Temptation," these terms are explained thus: "Provocation": the initial incitement to evil. Mark the Ascetic defines this as an 'image-free stimulation in the heart'; so long as the provocation is not accompanied by images, it does not involve a person in any guilt. Such provocations, originating as they do from the devil, assail a person from the outside, independently of his free will, and so he is not morally responsible for them. If one rejects the provocation, the sequence of development is cut off and the process of temptation is terminated. "Communion": without as yet entirely assenting to the provocation, a person may begin to entertain it, while still hesitating whether to act upon it or no. At this stage, the provocation is no longer 'image-free,' but has become a logismos or thought, and the person is morally responsible for having allowed it to become such. "Assent" signifies a step beyond "communion," as, no longer merely toying with the evil suggestion, a person now resolves to act upon it. Even if circumstances prevent him from sinning outwardly, he is judged by God according to the intention of his heart. *The Philokalia*, tr. and ed. G.E.H. Palmer, Philip Sherrard, Kallistos Ware (London, 1981), vol. II, p. 388.
However, even when there are Seven Thoughts and Seven Sins, there remains a discrepancy between the two lists. The Thought of “Vainglory” must be made to correspond to the Deadly Sin of “Envy.” This correspondence Taefwaci does not hesitate to make, saying “And again, what [the Thoughts] refer to as ‘vainglory,’ [the Deadly Sins] refer to as ‘envy.’ That is, [they are both] lovers of glory. For any glory loving person loves his own glory and his own good while he detests and hates the glory and good of others.”

Now that the number of the Thoughts and Sins has been reconciled and the difference between “vainglory” and “envy” resolved, there remains a third difficulty, which Taefwaci deals with next: the sequence of the Thoughts is the opposite from that of the Deadly Sins. “The first Deadly Sin is “Pride,” while the first Thought is “Gluttony.” Taefwaci proposes that the respective orders derive from differences in their authors’ starting point rather than in their goal. “The first Sin is pride, which Satan committed in heaven and fell therefrom. Whereas Evagrius places gluttony first for three reasons: first because the first man, in Paradise, fell because of his gluttony, and hence it was the first sin of human nature.” In other words, according to Taefwaci, the compilers of the Seven Deadly Sins chose to begin with the first sin of all the universe, while Evagrius and those on whose experience he drew for the teaching of the Eight Thoughts, confined themselves to the sins of mankind alone.

After his synthesis of the two systems, Taefwaci concludes with a clear definition of each of the Seven Deadly Sins, perhaps considering that the distinction between Thought and Sin is not great enough to maintain.

Kirakos Erznkaçi, who lived and wrote more than one hundred years before Taefwaci, had already achieved a unique synthesis of the Eight Thoughts and the Seven Deadly Sins. And unlike his famous successor, he did not conclude by finding the Seven Deadly Sins the

---

29 Book of Questions, p. 559.
30 He makes other points as well: for instance, the reason that the Deadly Sins are seven is because there are four natural elements plus three divisions of the soul. Each Deadly Sin or Thought is connected with one of the elements: gluttony with the air, impurity with water, avarice with fire, and sadness with earth. They also correspond with the seven possible motions of any body.
more practical approach. What was the difference between his synthesis and that of Tatevaci?

First of all, let it be said that the synthesis of the Eight Thoughts and the Seven Deadly Sins is not merely a semantic exercise. It is, on the contrary, a great moral undertaking resulting from increased development in the worship of God. As this worship develops, the theoretical understanding of sin is deepened, leading the worshiper to prudence. This prudence forces one to exercise caution towards each and every thought and action; it demands a precise inner attentiveness.

One person who appears to have been concerned with this inner attentiveness was John, the Arch-teacher, at whose request Kirakos undertook to write about Evagrius’ Eight Thoughts.32 As John is about to set out on the next stage of his journey of self-discovery, Kirakos cautions him that there are two basic roads from which one can choose: the one leads to destruction, and the other to immortality. If one has chosen the road to immortality, there are still three paths or lanes along which one may travel: the high, the middle, and the low. The high, he says, is the way of a free son; the middle is the way of a paid mercenary, and the low is the way of a slave.

Knowing that his interlocutor has chosen the highest way, making his inward journey an expression of filial love, Erznkaçi takes upon himself the fulfillment of John’s request. And he begins it in a straightforward manner: “Thus, all the thoughts of evil are eight, by which the father of evil, satan, battles against man.” The Eight Thoughts are listed in their original order; that is, with anger following sadness. As we shall see, there is more reason for this than simply the maintaining of a tradition. Erznkaçi’s analysis will give us the chance to understand the deep, constructive basis of this sequence.

Kirakos begins his general analysis with the establishment of a logical and constructive standard. The basis for comparison is the Temptation of Christ in the wilderness. Erznkaçi presents the Temptation as having to do with the Thoughts of gluttony, avarice and vainglory. Satan’s proposal that Jesus make bread from stones he equates with gluttony, the proposal that he inherit the kingdoms of the world he equates with avarice, and the proposal that he throw himself down from the pinnacle of the temple he equates with vainglory.

---

32 The following discussion is based on the text presented in MM 2542, dated 1476, pp. 133b-161a. A full translation of the text into English accompanies this article.
There is a rising sequence here from the true necessities of human existence (bread) through the acquisition of more (inherting kingdoms) to social position and its privileges. Hence, Erznkacı in his further analysis will consider the three Thoughts of gluttony, avarice and vainglory to be the foundations of all the other Thoughts: "Thus gluttony gives birth to impurity; from avarice are born sadness, anger and acedia; and vainglory gives birth to pride."

Erznkacı then provides another explanation for the origin of the Eight Thoughts, deriving them from the teaching on the Four Virtues. The teaching on the Four Virtues has deep roots in the Armenian tradition. It began with ancient Greek philosophy and was adopted by the Church Fathers. Later, it continued to resonate and developed in the works of St. Gregory of Narek, among others. This teaching is based upon the tripartite structure of the human soul, according to which the primary forces of the soul are rationality, emotion and desire. The virtue of the rational force is wisdom or prudence; that of the emotional force is courage or valor; and that of desire is temperance or chastity. The fourth virtue, justice or righteousness, refers to all the parts of the soul at once, since one who has all the virtues at the same time is considered righteous.

The Fathers, and with them Erznkacı, cited two vices for each of the virtues. An excess of prudence becomes shrewdness; a lack of prudence is apathy. An excess of valor becomes temerity; its lack creates cowardice: an excess of temperance becomes parsimony; its lack creates prodigality. Finally, the extreme expression of righteousness is self-righteousness, while its deficiency is iniquity.

33 In the Armenian Church this teaching is first seen in the works of David the Invincible Philosopher. See Definition and Divisions of Philosophy by David the Invincible Philosopher, tr. B. Kendall and R.W. Thomson (Chico, California, 1983), pp. 62-66.
35 The teaching on the Four Virtues in the writings of the Fathers had its scriptural basis in the famous vision of Ezekiel. The four animals were interpreted as symbols of the Four Virtues. See Grigor Tafevaci, Գրիգոր Թաֆեվացի հրատարակություն արձակագիրը արձակագիր է հայերի սիմվոլիզմի [Book of Homilies: Volume for the Summer Season] (Constantinople, 1741; repr. Jerusalem, 1998), p. 569.
36 In the manuscript, pages 136a-137b seem to have been inserted into the original. These two pages represent a dogmatic treatise, perhaps by the same author. Page 138a is clearly the continuation of p. 135b and has been so presented in the accompanying translation.
Thus, Erznkači derives Eight Vices as deviations from a virtuous mean. Although he does not draw exact parallels between the terminology of the Eight Vices and that of the Eight Thoughts it is clear that he assumes their parallel nature, for after addressing these eight deviations and further qualifying them as manifestations of the evil which entered into human nature immediately after Adam's fall, he begins his exposition on the Eight Thoughts, in their original Evagrian order, starting with gluttony.

Until this point, Erznkači's writing has been philosophical in tone. The Vices have been presented in the analytical framework of genus and species. However, from this point on the tone changes. Having finished setting up the analytical framework of his exposition, Erznkači switches to a hortatory style, speaking directly to the heart of the reader with the intention of creating a revulsion in him towards the Eight Thoughts. In this he is following a distinctly different path from that taken by Evagrius himself in his writing on the Thoughts. Both Evagrius and Erznkači make extensive use of Scriptural quotations, it is true. But Evagrius assumed that the Thoughts were external, whereas Erznkači presupposes their attacks to be internal. The Thoughts, like their equivalent Vices, are rooted in the heart of humankind since the fall. Thus, Evagrius designs to offer the reader an arsenal of weapons to ward off the Thoughts, while Erznkači designs to revive the heart's internal recognition of evil and its desire to cast out the Thoughts, root and all.

With this design ever in mind, Erznkači follows a more or less similar compositional scheme in approaching each Thought. First, he presents its negative essence. Then, he offers scriptural examples showing the dangerous and destructive consequences of the Thought. (Here at times may be inserted a description of the contrasting virtue of the particular fault or Thought.) Finally, Erznkači addresses an exhortation to the reader giving practical ascetic recipes for conquering the Thought.

Let us turn to the Thoughts one by one, as Erznkači presents them.

---

37 It is worth noting at the outset, too, that unlike Evagrius, Nilus and others, Erznkači does not confine his remarks to a monastic audience. There is a clear effort on his part to apply his teachings to all Christians desirous of pursuing virtue.
1. Gluttony

Erzncaci views gluttony as the "source of all faults," since it was the cause of Adam's fall. By way of contrast to Adam's non-abstinence and infidelity, Kirakos gives the example of Enoch, about whom the Bible says, "God took him" (Gen. 5:24). Although there is no evidence in the canonical Scriptures for Enoch's having observed a fast or maintained abstinence, Erzncaci attributes these virtues to him on the basis of widely read apocryphal texts, and views his being taken into heaven as a result of this virtuous behavior.38 "Enoch by fasting and abstinence was transferred to immortality and by his faith he was found victorious against the nature of death, and he became the forerunner of immortality for the human race."

Erzncaci then refers to the times of Noah and Lot, reminding us of the Flood and the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah. He produces scriptural quotations demonstrating that the cause of sin, among the antediluvians and Sodomites alike, was gluttony. Continuing to develop his theme, he moves from the Law of Moses to the letters of Paul, showing through plentiful quotations and examples the unnatural and dangerous essence of this fault.

Once the scriptural testimonies have been adduced, Kirakos begins his exhortation. He begins by associating gluttony with gossip, a fault which also belongs to the category of things performed by lips and tongue. Then he refers to the entire body with all of its senses as potentially subject to the Thought of gluttony.

Man is the temple of God, according to the Apostle, (I Cor. 3:16) and there are seven doors to this temple: the five senses plus the organs of speech and reproduction. If you guard all the doors conscientiously but are careless of one door, a thief may take away all the treasure which is in the house through that one door, and you will derive no benefit from having kept all the others closed.

Thus Kirakos in his advice concerning gluttony presents not only scriptural associations from the past, but also important practical principles which he applies to present moral concerns. He concludes this chapter with the following words: Thus "the evil chain of sin is

linked together, for first comes gluttony, and after it impurity, and then the others one by one.” What one might be tempted to consider as a hierarchy of Thoughts is actually an evil circle.

2. Impurity

Although the heading to this section of the text begins with the title, “By the Same Kirakos Vardapet, on Adultery,” the Thought under consideration is the broader one of Impurity, with adultery physical and spiritual as the first manifestation of its evil influence.

Erznkači refers to the commandment “Thou shalt not commit adultery” as linked with the command “Thou shalt have no other gods before me.” The latter appears as the first commandment on the first table of the Law, while the former appears as the first commandment on the second table.\(^{39}\) He adduces many scriptural quotations describing spiritual adultery as the worship of other gods.

From adultery, Kirakos turns his attention to other forms of impurity, bringing all his severity to bear on unnatural unions, intermarriage between close relatives, and natural relations outside lawful bounds. A great amount of time and space is devoted to the awful consequences of impurity’s various manifestations, and their worthiness of condemnation.

When it comes to the hortatory part of this section, Erznkači offers to the reader’s consideration two valid means of conquering impurity: marriage, and celibacy.\(^{40}\) The purpose of both, as he expresses it, is “to cut out the fuel of desire.”

The fuel of fire is wood and reeds and straw, and the fuel of lust’s fire is debauchery and extravagant eating and drinking, leisure and idleness and talk, and the sight of women. These ignite the fire of lust. If you desire to extinguish the flames of lust’s fire, give these up.

\(^{39}\) He is aware that another way of counting the commandments would place “thou shalt not kill” in the key position, rather than “thou shalt not commit adultery,” and he comments on the frequent, unfortunate relationship between the two when a child born out of wedlock is murdered by its parents from fear of public shame.

\(^{40}\) In the classical works devoted to the Eight Thoughts we do not find such advice, since they were directed to monks. In this respect, Erznkači contributes an innovative touch to the teaching.
Evagrius and Nilus are called to witness the truth of this, as is Solomon, whose legendary experience with women made him an unquestioned authority. Erznkači concludes his exhortation with an apocalyptic threat to those who persist in impurity, and an apocalyptic encouragement to those who resist its wiles.

3. Avarice

Erznkači approaches the sinful nature of avarice and its destructive consequences with the words of the Apostle Paul, “The love of money is the root of all evil.” (I Tim. 6:10) and the example of Judas. He notes that avarice is a pernicious thing, a root which will continue to put out evil branches unless it is completely extirpated.

After citing the example of Judas, Kirakos reaches out to the hearts of his readers with warm and emotional words, entreating them to consider what everyone already knows: “Remember that when you were born, you were born naked, and you will go out naked when you die.” Slowly developing his subject with a reflective and meditative tone, Erznkači speaks of vanity and the awful consequences of avarice. As was the case with impurity as well, he links avarice to idolatry, saying that “the love of God and the love of possessions cannot dwell together.”

As he goes on, Kirakos begins to use the word “greed” frequently, instead of “avarice.” The word “greed” expressly reminds us of the teaching of the Seven Deadly Sins, where the word has a broader and deeper meaning. Avarice is not only an evil anxiety associated with possessions, which may tempt some hermits, but it is also an unhealthy psychology which is present, to some extent, in every human being. After associating the Thought of avarice with the Sin of greed, Erznkači returns to his original terminology, and contrasts the virtue of the monastic’s voluntary poverty with the vice of avarice.

Summing up the nature of avarice, Kirakos is careful to avoid merely equating the lack of possessions with an absence of avarice. The antidote for avarice is not poverty but mercy, the use of one’s possessions for purposes expressing God’s goodness to others. The conquest of avarice remains as possible for the rich as for the voluntary or involuntary poor. In a long speech plentiful with
scriptural quotations (often challenging the reader with the words “think” or “listen”) he implants in the heart of the reader a positive disposition towards mercy, seeing in it the assurance of spiritual healing and salvation.

4. Sadness

As we have already mentioned, the general Orthodox tradition lists anger before sadness. However Kirakos chooses to maintain the sequence as presented by Evagrius. It is impossible that Erznnkaćı was not acquainted with the work attributed to Nilus.\(^{41}\) Nonetheless, Erznnkaćı chose to preserve the sequence of Evagrius rather than that of Nilus.

This was not done merely for the sake of adherence to a tradition, but rather out of a profound and fundamental principle. As we have already discussed, Kirakos connects his analysis of the Thoughts, and of virtue and vice, with anthropology. That is, every vice or virtue or Thought operates within specific systems of the human spirit and body. Thus, referring to sadness, he connects it with the soul’s faculty of desire. He writes, “This [sadness] comes about because of frustration in desire.” Going on to name other reasons for sadness, Erznnkaćı refers to impurity, anger, *acedia* and vainglory. He relates them all to the soul’s faculty of desire: “Since when he fails in these desires (impurity, anger, *acedia*, and vainglory) he becomes sad.” That is to say, that when someone is baulked of committing a sin in the aforementioned areas but yet burns with the desire to do so, he becomes sad. Sadness should precede anger in the listing of the Thoughts because anger is a sub-species of sadness; it is connected with sadness of a specific type.

At the beginning of this chapter, Erznnkaćı refers to two kinds of sadness mentioned by the Apostle Paul in II Cor. 7:10: “godly sadness” and “worldly sadness.” The former, the Apostle declares, produces life, whereas the latter produces death. As an example of evil and destructive sadness Kirakos again refers to Judas; as examples of godly sadness he refers to Enoch, David, and the Apostle Peter,

\(^{41}\) It might even be argued that the Nilusian influence on Kirakos’ work is greater than that of Evagrius, but that constitutes a separate topic for consideration at another time.
who "were justified by spiritual sadness." There is an obvious connection here between sadness and repentance.

"Worldly sadness," on the other hand "is evil, and it darkens the mind's light and obscures it," and even those who successfully keep their soul's faculty of desire free from impurity may nonetheless fail in regard to sadness. However Job, who had ample reason to indulge in "worldly sadness," did not do so. Spotless, chaste and modest in terms of his desires, he also conquered worldly sadness after losing his possessions and his children in a single day, "since he did not count them as his own, but as God's; and when they were taken away, he attributed the deed to God's providence. Because of that he was not upset or sad, because he knew that whatever God does is good and beneficial."

Erznkači concludes this chapter by exhorting the reader to fully occupy the force of his soul's desire with spiritual aspirations, leaving no room for sadness to enter in. One should imitate those who rejoice "not at the increase of their possessions, but at the multiplication of faith and love with practical and theoretical virtues." Spiritual rejoicing should be maintained alongside all worldly causes of grief and pain, not allowing the soul to be darkened by evil sadness.

5. Anger

From the first words of this chapter Kirakos' concern with the anthropological aspects of the Thoughts is clear. "Anger is the energy of the blood roiling up around the heart." As he did in the case of sadness, he then distinguishes two kinds of anger: a good anger and an evil one. Good anger is directed against the enemy. Good anger is the guardian of the soul, that barks at and chases away wolf and robber. This anger is in accordance with the good laws of nature.

Evil anger, on the other hand, is outside the course of nature. It is directed not at the enemy but at one's brother. Rather than being connected with protective love, it is connected with hatred. Hence, just as "God is love, and whoever remains in love dwells in God and God dwells in him," (1 John 4:16) so "satan is hatred, and whoever remains in hatred dwells in satan, and satan dwells in him."

Erznkači then describes one physical consequence of anger: it produces turbulent and unsettling dreams because the angel of peace
cannot come to keep a person who has not heeded the Apostle’s admonition to resolve anger before sunset. In fact, he says, the angry person becomes a victim of evil thoughts not only at night, but during the day too, as anger distorts even his waking thoughts.

In the following section, Erznkači distinguishes two degrees of anger: anger and wrath. Anger may exist only in the mind; the Apostle says, “Be angry, and do not sin,” (Eph. 4:26) implying that anger need not be fully realized. Wrath, on the other hand, is realized in sin and destruction. Both anger and wrath have a “bitter composition” and are heavy and hard to bear, for their subject and object alike.

Anger corrupts like a rust, and has its physical manifestation not only in dreams, as mentioned above, but in the physiognomy of a person, causing him to have bleary and bloodshot eyes, and withered cheeks. Moreover, it gathers around itself a pair of related evils—envy and vengefulness—and creates a kind of mental darkness around itself which Erznkači characterizes as “bitterness.”

The introduction of envy here creates a correspondence between the Eight Thoughts and the Seven Deadly Sins. A century later, as we have mentioned, Grigor T’atevaci in his synthesis of the Sins and the Thoughts would make a correlation between the Sin of envy and the Thought of vainglory, saying in effect that the one is the equivalent of the other. Erznkači, on the other hand, synthesizes the Thoughts and the Sins in a more organic way: some of the things listed among the Sins result from the Thoughts, while others, like envy, feed the Thoughts.

And he is careful to preserve the ambivalent nature of envy, rather than relegating it wholly to the realm of the Deadly Sins. (In this he is assisted by the fact that ճմուրկի in Armenian means both jealousy and zeal.) As he says,

There is a jealousy which is good—like that of Phinehas and Elijah, for by killing Zimri the former put an end to death among the people, (Num. 25:6-8) and the latter being zealous for the Lord overthrew the prophets of Baal (I Kings 18:40). The Apostle Paul says to be zealous for the best graces (II Cor. 12:31) and he says, “I shall make you zealous with zeal for God.” (II Cor. 11:2)

Although evil anger results in estrangement from God and earthly kin, anger, too, can have its positive side. The flame of anger can sometimes be expressed in outbursts of justice against evil, and at
other times with powerful energy and aspiration towards good. The Thought of Anger, in other words, need not result in sin. If properly tempered with its antidotes meekness, courage, and zeal, it can result in good. “Wherefore,” Erznkači says in conclusion, “flee from anger and from evil jealousy and follow after meekness and valor and zeal, that you may be worthy of God’s kingdom.”

6. Acedia

In the teaching of the Eight Thoughts, what is said concerning the Thought of acedia is primarily associated with the ascetic or monastic life. Evagrius, as well as all other writers following him, talks mainly about acedia as a Thought which obstructs the ascetic order. Erznkači, on the other hand, presents it in a more generally applicable manner.

He uses the superlative “heaviest” for this Thought, and mentions that the Thought of acedia differs from the rest, since this one troubles all the parts of the soul and suffocates it, bringing forth numerous illnesses. The demon of anger touches only the soul’s emotional faculty; that of impurity touches its faculty of desire. But the demon of acedia causes an overall neglect of the self, a kind of total debility. Its main cause is a lack of will to courageously battle against temptation; a lack, if you like, of spiritual exercise. For, “just as food is the strength of a sound body, likewise also temptation [is the nourishment] of a valiant person.” It takes a north wind to make strong roots. A person who has struggled bravely can, like a fired pot, receive the water of spiritual grace.

Acedia manifests itself in impatience and restlessness, especially from mid-morning to mid-afternoon. Erznkači’s description of the various thoughts which it induces shows a clear experience with the Thought: “And first it makes the sun appear to move slowly, or not to move at all, as if the day were fifty hours long. It throws in hatred of the place and the way of life; it leads his desire to a place where his needs can be more easily met; and it brings to him memories of his family and his previous way of life.” In a monastic context, the purpose of the demon is to force the monk out of his cell and his way of life.

Since the attack of acedia is all-encompassing, to conquer it is to conquer all the other demons as well. However, one cannot rest on
one’s laurels: it is a recurrent Thought, and the only antidote to it is true patience. As the Lord said, “You shall possess your souls through patience.” (Luke 21:19)

7. Vainglory

Erznkači begins this brief chapter with the metaphor of weeds. Vainglory grows up near virtue like weeds grow up near a plant, and the true nature of the weed is hardly apparent until it chokes the plant. Vainglory is pernicious because it robs the virtuous person of any divine reward for his virtuous labors. “The vainglorious person is a farmer without wages: he bears the toil, and comes out without any part of his reward because he fasts to please people, and his prayers and charity are not for God’s sake but for the sake of human glory.”

In other words, the activities of the vainglorious person may be good, but the motivation for them is not. Neither the tax collector nor the Pharisee received any overt answer to his prayers, but the Lord tells us that the former went down to his house justified, rather than the latter. The act of prayer was a good in itself, but the attitude of prayer in the Pharisee’s case was not. However, one infers, the displeasure of God would not be manifest to the Pharisee until it was too late.

The antidotes to vainglory are two: an awareness of temporal impermanence, and humility. “All flesh is as grass, and all human glory is like the flower of the grass,” (I Peter 1:24-25) and “in humility let us consider one another better than ourselves” (Phil. 2:3).

8. Pride

“Pride is the beginning and culmination of all evils.” With these words Erznkači begins the last chapter of his work. Within this brief sentence, he connects two understandings of pride, the first being that of the Seven Deadly Sins and the second that of the Eight Thoughts. In the teaching of the Eight Thoughts, pride is the final Thought, ever present and difficult to conquer. In the teaching of the Seven Deadly Sins it is at the beginning, as the first sin in the universe (the sin of satan) and as the ever-present root of every subsequent evil. Of course
the writers representing the teaching on the Eight Thoughts did not imply by placing it last that one should postpone the battle against it until one had overcome the other Thoughts. Nor did the writers on the Seven Deadly Sins imply that pride had to be overcome before any other sin could be understood. Perhaps both traditions would have been happy to say, with Erzńkači, that it is the key element in the “vicious cycle” of Thoughts and Sins.

Erzńkači presents pride in its initial biblical setting: the fall of satan and of man. After referring to the consequence of the sin of Adam, whereby humans were exiled from Paradise and inherited “illness and death in the flesh, sin and spiritual death in their nature,” he goes on to say that from pride “sprout and flourish gluttony, impurity.” It seems that he begins again to number the Eight Thoughts in their sequence. The cycle, in other words, begins again. To break out of the cycle, one must pluck out pride by the root:

Whoever wishes to overcome these [Thoughts] by God’s help must first cut out pride, the root, and the rest will wither with it. But if the root remain in place, it is of no use for you to cut away at the rest, because it will put out even more shoots from the root than at first.

As a scriptural affirmation of this point Kirakos recalls the parable of the Lord concerning the unclean spirit which leaves only to return with seven other spirits more evil than itself (Luke 11:24-26).

Erzńkači considers the recipe for conquering pride to be found in its opposite virtue, humility. Beginning with Matt. 5:3, “Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven,” he offers a series of Gospel quotations illustrating humility’s power. Stressing its effectiveness as an antidote to pride he concludes, “As by the counsel of the tempter we fell from heaven through pride, so also by the counsel of the Savior we may ascend to heaven through humility.”

He then goes on to consider the particularly insidious nature of pride, which he attributes to its specific connection with the soul. Whereas anger is related to the emotive faculty of the soul and impurity to its faculty of desire, pride operates through the soul’s rational faculty. Thus, it blinds the very faculty through which its presence might be recognized. It is a blind fault, and it cannot see its own destructiveness. Like the eye “which cannot see when it is bloodshot,” the rational faculty cannot recognize pride when it is blinded by it. Therefore, it is essential to be mindful of the rebukes
and criticisms of others, since if one is unwilling to accept the possible that one's own vision may be faulty, "one cannot be humbled, and will be destroyed with an everlasting destruction." After all, James tells us that "God resists the proud," and with God against him, a person's healing becomes impossible.

Humility, in Erznkaci's perception, is the glorification of God for everything.

Whether we have a soul or a body or a mind or wisdom or power, they are all gifts of God and are not yours but God's, and the glory is God's, the Maker and the Creator. Why do you usurp God's glory and consider it your own, and become proud? Give glory and praise for good things to their Giver, from whom you came and by whom you were created and from whom you have your very being and power and effectiveness for spiritual and physical work.

With this exhortation to render glory to God in everything, the work concludes. The note it strikes is similar to that struck at the beginning of the introduction by the quotation from Paul: "Think on the things which are above." The Eight Thoughts below are counteracted by a proper focus on the thoughts above.

In summary, the following conclusions can be made. First of all, the teachings on the Eight Thoughts and the Seven Deadly Sins obviously have very similar constructs. However, in reality their teachings are the fruits of two different traditions. The first deals with incipient sin; it proceeds from asceticism and throughout the stages of its development remains a largely monastic and strictly practical teaching, referring to the conquering of evil thoughts and to ascetic practices. The second, rather than representing a later edition of the Eight Thoughts, was presented to the Church as a coordination of texts pertaining to repentance and confession. It too went through a specific development as a tool for facilitating the recognition, abhorrence and extirpation of actualized sin and the sinful state.

The teaching on the Seven Deadly Sins flourished and developed in a rationalistic, scholastic atmosphere where it was synthesized with the ancient Greek philosophical notions of the four Platonic virtues and their corresponding vices, and the Stoic eupatheiai or good emotions. The teaching on the Eight Thoughts, on the other hand, flourished and developed in settings where rationalism was not prevalent, or was condemned, while living spiritual practice was appreciated.
Since both teachings expound on the phenomenon of sin, albeit from different starting points, it was natural that syntheses should develop. John Climacus, for example, added to the teaching of the Eight Thoughts enough practical considerations in the style of the Seven Deadly Sins to create an entirely different version.

In the Armenian tradition, one synthesis of the Eight Thoughts and the Seven Deadly Sins is presented by the work of Kirakos Erznkači. While maintaining the Evagrian order and tone of the Thoughts, he made philosophical/anthropological connections between the Thoughts and the parts of the soul and body, as well as the virtues and the vices. He also moved away from the ascetic, monastic focus of the teaching, making it more applicable to the general Christian public, in the style of the Seven Deadly Sins. And rather than focusing only on the Thoughts as incipient sin, he also deals with their Deadly outworkings in life and the problems created when they take root in the individual.

A century after Erznkači, Grigor Ta'evaci would offer another, neater synthesis, creating a one-to-one correspondence between the Thoughts and the Sins. One has the impression that by his time, the Eight Thoughts and the Seven Deadly Sins were considered as two contrasting terminologies for identical concepts. By that time, one understood that sin was sin, and it was innate, whether in thought, word or deed.

Thus, Kirakos Erznkači represents a particularly interesting way station on the road towards the final coalescence of the Eight Thoughts and the Seven Deadly Sins: the moment when the Church recognized that the line between incipient and actual sin is not so clear as one would like it to be, but still preferred to hope that mankind would pause to reconsider before crossing it.

A fuller study of the two teachings remains desirable. This thesis has been limited to a consideration of only one aspect of a single work. It is hoped that it constitutes on the one hand a renewed acknowledgement of the importance of the synthesis of the two traditions, and on the other a starting point for further fundamental research related to them.
Բամբակերտի փառատուն, որտեղ այսօր գտնվում է մշակվելու ձևով իր բնական կերպով և գրականությամբ կարևոր կերպով, իսկ այդ թեև ռազմական, բնագրական, գործարար և գործարար փուլներին ու դերերին: Զրակերին, Արամին, Շուշիից դուրս գալու համար, ւերջինս նրանց համար իրավատեր և մագալար էր փառատուն, իսկ Արամինը սկզբում լիովին էր թարածվում, ուստի մեկնում էր այս փառատունից և վերջանում էր մշակության և բնագրության վերջինիս համար: Այս գործընթացն էր բարձր զարգացման ռազմական և գործարար փուլից մեկնություն, որոնք համապատասխանեցին ընդգրկված պատմության և գիտակցության համար:
Այսօր տևող է ուսուցվում եռապուտ ու սխալային կարգավոր՝ նման որը որպես երակնարար եմ հանդես ելույթ ունեցող մեկ ու կարապակերձ տեսանելու համար: 

Աստիճանաբար այսուհանրությունը, անպատասխան ստանդարտից մինչև տեսանելու համար կարգավորվում է ճիշտ՝ տեսանելու համար էլակատար երակնարար ուսուցվում է ուսուցվելու համար։ Նկարագրությունների նկարագրությունը տեստերով տեսելու համար էլակատար է։ Ուսերը կարող են թվային ու բանաստեղծական տեսանելու համար կարգավորվելու համար ուսուցվելու համար։

Աստիճանաբար այսուհանրությունը բացակայում է երակնարարության համար, և սկսելու դեպքում կարող են կատարել քննարկումներին և կատարել բանաստեղծություններին ուսերի համար։ Ուսերը կարող են գրանցվել ուսուցիչների կողմից ուսանողների համար։

Աստիճանաբար այսուհանրությունը, անպատասխան ստանդարտից մինչև տեսանելու համար կարգավորվում է ճիշտ՝ տեսանելու համար էլակատար երակնարար ուսուցվում է ուսուցվելու համար։

1 այսօր է բանաստեղծություն
Արքայազնի ուղեցույցով քվարդանի ձի զարդ կա փայտ։ Նրա զարդի քարճառեց պղնձ կլորված ծաղիկածներով, տափակած ու փուռնակած է կա հատուկություններն, որոնք անհրաժեշտ են փայտի զարդ եւ կարանության գործակցության: Տե նկալ գալուից եւ զարդ եւ զարդեգրմա եւ զարդագրման համար։ Պետք է զարդագրման օրենքները համապատասխան են բոլոր ակուակուլարների, այդ թվում ձի զարդ եւ զարդեգրման համար։ Անհրաժեշտ է զարդագրման օրենքները համապատասխան են բոլոր ակուակուլարների, այդ թվում ձի զարդագրման համար։

Դա իրականպես կարելի է արձանագրել եւ զարդագրման համար։ Տե նկալ գալուից եւ զարդ եւ զարդեգրման համար։ Պետք է զարդագրման օրենքները համապատասխան են բոլոր ակուակուլարների, այդ թվում ձի զարդ եւ զարդեգրման համար։ Անհրաժեշտ է զարդագրման օրենքները համապատասխան են բոլոր ակուակուլարների, այդ թվում ձի զարդագրման համար։

2 թվով գրավում են
3 թվով գրավում են
Ս.ՆԵՐՍԵՍՍ ԹԵՈԼՈԳԻԿԱԿ ՌԵՎՈՈՎԻ}

Այս գրքի էջի պատճառով պատմվածք տեղում է
տեղում բացվելու պատճառով կամ պատմվածքի տեղում ստեղծված պատմվածքի տեղում քաշված
Այս գրքի էջի պատճառով պատմվածք տեղում է
տեղում բացվելու պատճառով կամ պատմվածքի տեղում ստեղծված պատմվածքի տեղում քաշված
(Սահման գրքի մասին)

Ան կարճատեր դասընթաց քաշված է պատմվածքի տեղում է
տեղում բացվելու պատճառով կամ պատմվածքի տեղում ստեղծված պատմվածքի տեղում քաշված
Այս գրքի էջի պատճառով պատմվածք տեղում է
տեղում բացվելու պատճառով կամ պատմվածքի տեղում ստեղծված պատմվածքի տեղում քաշված
(Սահման գրքի մասին)

Ներկայիսը զավակ է գրքի տեղում է
տեղում բացվելու պատճառով կամ պատմվածքի տեղում ստեղծված պատմվածքի տեղում քաշված
Այս գրքի էջի պատճառով պատմվածք տեղում է
տեղում բացվելու պատճառով կամ պատմվածքի տեղում ստեղծված պատմվածքի տեղում քաշված
(Սահման գրքի մասին)

14 Ի սահման մոտ է թողել.
Ընդունել Աղաս ուսում առաջադրանքների համար, այսպիսի
ուշգգեր չի ճանաչել Աղաս առանձնահատկություն, բարեխաղ, զարգացած, սերտանորոգված, առավոտյան, որը ստացել է Լուսան Պատվեր ընկեր երգչուհի Մտերի գաղտնի քաղցկեցում։ Ուղիներ են որոշում են գաղութարվետի դիրքում իր արգելում, իր զբաղվածություններով, որոնք Աղասի զարգացման ուրախությամբ են հաջողվում։

Այսպիսով, Աղաս պարզապես Անդրեանում գարդ է Աղասի զարգացման ուրախությամբ, իսկ Մտերի առաջինը մեծապես սուրճում է Անդրեանում։ Ակնհայտ է, որ այս հարցի համար էլ ենթադրվում սպասարկում է Աղասի զարգացման ուրախության վայրին։ Անդրեանում զգացում է, որ էական զարգացող այս ժամանակներում պետք է զգացնել նման ձայներով, որոնք Աղաս վերջում որոշում են հաջողվել և Աղասի զարգացման ուրախության համար հաջողվել են այս ժամանակներ։
5  المسلحة

6 /sbin

7 պետություն
Այս հատվածի դրվածքների մնացորդը կարգաթոր չկան, և այս գրությունը սկսվում է ներքին հարավից ձգվելով աջակցող թևից Մայրամին ծրագրի վրա.


8 Պատմական ղեկավար է.
Այսօր կարծիքն ունեցած, եթե որ գրելու կան գրելու կան, իսկ ճիշտ ու ճաշակության փոքր են մարմնականության (ի) ճաշակություն։ Այստեղ այս առաջացող գիտության կցող մարդկանց է ու այս առաջացող (ի) ճաշակություն։ Այստեղ այս առաջացող գիտության կցող մարդկանց է ու այս առաջացող (ի) ճաշակություն։

Անրի Հերունյան Հայրենական Թատերական

Երիտասարդ աշխատակիցն է. պատմականության ըստուր Պատմության, է պատմություն է երկրորդ աշխատանք։ Իսկ զգայունը հայ երկրի պատմություն, իսկ կրոնը մեկ է զգայունը, իսկ զգայուն է զգայունը է զգայունը է զգայունը է զգայունը է զգայունը է զգայունը է զգայունը է զգայունը է զգայունը է զգայունը է զգայուն։
Թե զարդանա զուգահեռ զուգահեռ է ու ձավատի ճան
քան հատե ու ձգե ե դավիթ առ ի զավականավոր
ճանք, ամբողջ շագան է հեշ ի պահանջ ենթադրել:

Իսկ զարդական զուգահեռ զուգահեռ է քան քան
զ ու զ ու զ ու զ ու պահանջ բացելավոր ձգե է ու
ի քան կին չե քան, իսկ պահանջ բացելավոր է
զավականավոր ճանք, ամբողջ շագան է ենթադրել ի
այս բացելավոր ճանք է ու այս այդ
բացելավոր ճանք է՝

Եթե զարդական զուգահեռ զուգահեռ ճանք է ու
ի քան քան քան քան ու զ ու զ ու պահանջ բացելավոր
է քան քան քան քան քան քան քան քան քան քան
քան քան քան քան քան քան քան քան քան քան
քան քան քան քան քան քան քան քան քան քան
քան քան քան քան քան քան քան քան քան քան
քան քան քան քան քան քան քան քան քան քան
քան քան քան քան քան քան քան քան քան քա

Ք զուգահեռ զուգահեռ ճանք է ու
ի քան քան քան քան քան քան քան քան քան
քան քան քան քան քան քան քան քան քան քա

Այս զարդական զուգահեռ ճանք է ու
ի քան քան քան քան քան քան քան քան քան
քան քան քան քան քան քան քան քան քան քա

Ք զուգահեռ զուգահեռ ճանք է ու
ի քան քան քան քան քան քան քան քան քա

Այս։

9 ի դավիթ անհետակու
այն է. ներդրվելու կայանում երբեմն, եւ ինչպես զարմածվել Եսունը հասարակների է՝ հետո:

որոնց երկիրը անպատրաստելու եւ անհատական առաջին, բաց է՝ այն պատճառով, որ այս երկրի զեկուցված և զեկուցված է. այս ուրարկությունները կարելի է լինել, որ օրինակ հանգրված է: հաճախ, երբ հանգեցանում պատմության գծերում, երբ իրավիճակն է անհնար կամ հանդիպալված կամ պատկանում, այդպիսով այս պատմությունը կառուցված է ջութակար հանդիպման վերջին: այն, որ այսպիսի պատմությունները կարելի է հնարավոր ու ռազմի արդյունքի. կարծիք է անգամ բնապահակի արդյունքի, որ Ստեփան Երվանդը պատմության թեքեր է նշում և պատմական սահմանները կարծիք է բարդում ու բոլորը զգացնանա և կարծիք է բարդում ու բոլորը զգացնան տարբեր համակարգի պատմության արդյունքները և տարբեր համակարգի պատմության արդյունքները և տարբեր համակարգի պատմության արդյունքները և տարբեր համակարգի պատմության արդյունքները և տարբեր համակարգի պատմության արդյունքները և տարբեր համակարգի պատմության արդյունքները և տարբեր համակարգի պատմության արդյունքները և տարբեր համակարգի պատմության արդյունքները և տարբեր համակարգի պատմության արդյունքները և տարբեր համակարգի պատմության արդյունքները և տարբեր համակարգի պատմության արդյունքները և տարբեր համակարգի պատմության արդյունքները և տարբեր համակարգի պատմության արդյունքները և տարբեր համակարգի պատմության արդյունքները և տարբեր համակարգի պատմության արդյունքները և տարբեր համակարգի պատմության արդյունքները և տարբեր համակարգի պատմության արդյունքները և տարբեր համակարգի պատմության արդյունքները և տարբեր համակարգի պատմության արդյունքները և տարբեր համակարգի պատմության արդյունքները և տարբեր համակարգի պատմության արդյունքները և տարբեր համակարգի պատմության արդյունքները և տարբեր համակարգի պատմության արդյունքները և տարբեρ համակարգի պատմության արդյունքները և տարբեր համակարգի պատմության արդյունքները և տարբեր համակարգի պատմության արդյունքները և տարբեր համակարգի պատմության արդյունքները և տարբեր համակարգի պատմության արդյունքները և տարբեր համակարգի պատմության արդյունքները և տարբեր համակարգի պատմության արդյունքները և տարբեր համակարգի պատմության արդյունքները և տարբեր համակարգի պատմության արդյունքները և տարբեր համակարգի պատմության արդյունքները և տարբեր համակարգի պատմության արդյունքները և տարբեր համակարգի պատմության արդյունքները և տարբեր համակարգի պատմության արդյունքները և տարբեր համակարգի պատմության արդյունքները և տարբեր համակարգի պատմության արդյունքները և տարբեր համակարգի պատմության արդյունքները և տարբեր համակարգի պատմության արդյունքները և տարբեր համակարգի պատմության արդյունքները և տարբեր համակարգի պատմության արդյունքները և տարբեր համակարգի պատմության արդյունքները և տաρբե

10 ի բարդաց ռուսական

11 այնուր ի բարդաց
Այսպիսի, որքան այս գրագրության են պատմում ու գրավված, նա չի հայտնի այլ գրականության քանակություն։

Երբ ոչ ուշ Մատնադևի աքսեսորները գրականության հարցերը պարզելից էին Մատնադևի աստվածությունը, որի պատմական երկրորդակից է, նա տեղեկացելացուցակ է տվել Մատնադևի աստվածությունը, քանի որ այն տեղեկացուցակ է, որի համար հրամանում է, որ այս գրականության հարցերը պարզելից էին Մատնադևի:

Բայց երբ եթե հատուկ է հսկած հրամանագրություն, որը գրավված է, որը նշված է, որ համար հրամանում է զանգված զարգացված, սակայն այս վերակառուցված է, որ այս գրականության հարցերը պարզելից էին, որի համար հրամանում է, որ կատարվեց համար հրամանում է, որ այս գրականության հարցերը պարզելից էին, որի համար հրամանում է, որ կատարվեց համար հրամանում է, որ այս գրականության հարցերը պարզելից էին.

Բայց Մատնադևի աքսեսորներին պատմություն հավանաբար առաջարկում է, որ այս գրականության հարցերը պարզելից չէ, որի համար հրամանում է, որ կատարվեց համար հրամանում է, որ այս գրականության հարցերը պարզելից էին.
Անարգություն գրադարաններ աշխատելու գրքին: Եթե երբ գրական աշխատանքի գրքին, որ ուղղված գրական գրականության է տարբերվածության, պատկեր Քերին գրքին, որը գրական աշխատանքի գրքին, որը ծառայի տարբերվածության նշանակություն է ունենում։ Այս առկա
գրքի ճանաչման գրքին՝ էտուք է ստացվում, որը գրական աշխատանքի վերջին հատկանշական գրքի
ճանաչման տեսնում է, որը նույն ժամանակ տեղեկատվություն է տալիս, որը գրական աշխատանքի
ռեալիտացիոն առկա ծառայում է գրքին, որը ճանաչում է համարվում և որը կարողանում է
առաջարկել այս գրքի վերջին հատկանշական գրքի
ճանաչման տեսնում է, որը գրական աշխատանքի
ռեալիտացիոն առկա ծառայում է գրքին, որը ճանաչում է համարվում և որը կարողանում է
առաջարկել այս գրքի վերջին հատկանշական գրքի
ճանաչման տեսնում է, որը գրական աշխատանքի
ռեալիտացիոն առկա ծառայում է գրքի
ճանաչում է համարվում և որը կարողանում է
առաջարկել այս գրքի վերջին հատկանշական գրքի
ճանաչում է համարվում և որը կարողանում է
առաջարկել այս գրքի վերջին հատկանշական գրքի
ճանաչում է համարվում և որը կարողանում է
առաջարկել այս գրքի վերջին հատկանշական գրքի
ճանաչում է համարվում և որը կարողանում է
առաջարկել այս գրքի վերջին հատկանշական գրքի
ճանաչում է համարվում և որը կարողանում է
առաջարկել այս գրքի վերջին հատկանշական գրքի
ճանաչում է համարվում և որը կարողանում է
առաջարկել այս գրքի վերջին հատկանշական գրքի
ճանաչում է համարվում և որը կարողանում է
առաջարկել այս գրքի վերջին հատկանշական գրքի
ճանաչում է համարվում և որը կարողանում է
առաջարկել այս գրքի վերջին հատկանշական գրքի
ճանաչում է համարվում և որը կարողանում է
առաջարկել այս գրքի վերջին հատկանշական գրքի
ճանաչում է համարվում և որը կարողանում է
առաջարկել այս գրքի վերջին հատկանշական գրքի
ճանաչում է համարվում և որը կարողանում է
առաջարկել այս գրքի վերջին հատկանշական գրքի
ճանաչում է համարվում և որը կարողանում է
առաջարկել այս գրքի վերջի

Արաք Գրական Ժամանակացույց Թատում
Ադրբեջանից

Ադրբեջանից ժամանակ ադրբեջանից են նախատեսվում Ադրբեջանից Թատում, որի աճից շահագործված Ադրբեջանից է հայտնի, որը զարգացած էր նրա բազմազանությամբ։ Այս գրական ժամանակը զարգացած էր բազմազանությամբ ադրբեջանից թատում, որը զարգացած էր Ադրբեջանից Թատում իրավաբանկությամբ ու նրա համար զարգացած էր Ադրբեջանից Թատում։ Այս գրական ժամանակը զարգացած էր Ադրբեջանից Թատում, որը զարգացած էր Ադրբեջանից Թատում։ Այս գրական ժամանակը զարգացած էր Ադրբեջանից Թատում, որը զարգացած էր Ադրբեջանից Թատում։
Առանձին սկզբունկող գրական գործերով, մասնակցելով քաղաքացիական կենսագրական համագործակցության մեջ, պատմական երկրի իրավաբանական կարգավորման և սպասարկման համար մտնելու համար նախագծելով ուղին. Սակայն, այս պատմական կենսագրական համագործակցության մեջ տեղի ունեցող փոփոխությունների շնորհիվ, նրա մասնակցության և ազդեցությանը հատկապես հնարավոր է թրամբիկ եղանակ ու գրական կարգավորումից բացվել պատմական նոր փորձերը, որոնցից մեկը նախագծում են ազատագրելու ուղին ընդգրկում թույնական պատմական կենսագրական համագործակցության մեջ.
Հավասար, եթե վանքային Ստորաբաժանություն սահմ. աշխատակցության միջոցով որպես աշխատակցության մեջ են երեխաներ, որ որևէ գրավական բանի է, որը կազմված է համարվող գրական կարգով, բայց վրա, իսկ իրենից թուրքերին նպատակատեր սահմ. աշխատակցության:

Համապատասխան ձեր բերեք այն եթե այն բացառված մասը ու այն բերեք աղբյուրից եկեն նկարագրել համարվող գրական կարգով, որը կազմված է համարվող գրական կարգով, բայց վրա, իսկ իրենից թուրքերին նպատակատեր սահմ. աշխատակցության, ձեյ կատարելու մեջ կողմերում է զարգացնել գրական կարգով, բայց վրա, իսկ իրենից թուրքերին նպատակատեր սահմ. աշխատակցության:

Եթե գրական տեքստն ունի կարևոր կողմնորս, որը կազմված է համարվող գրական կարգով, բայց վրա, իսկ իրենից թուրքերին նպատակատեր սահմ. աշխատակցության, ձեյ կատարելու մեջ կողմերում է զարգացնել գրական կարգով, բայց վրա, իսկ իրենից թուրքերին նպատակատեր սահմ. աշխատակցության, ձեյ կատարելու մեջ կողմերում է զարգացնել գրական կարգով, բայց վրա, իսկ իրենից թուրքերին նպատակատեր սահմ.
ըստ Ս. Ներսեսսյանի, որպեսզի ազդին քաղաքաց շարժության, որը զարգացնում էր անուն, տեզ արագ էր աճում, սակայն մեծ գերակշիթություն ու բարենպաստ զգումներ, որ ևտևում էր հուջարան, զարգացացրել էր անհատի զիջումը, քանի որ այն իման էր, զարգացալ էր այդ փառավոր գիտություններ, հազարավոր վերջերին, որ տեղ էին, գիտակցել էր իրենց համար, զգումը էին տեղ տեղ և սակայն էին բանակրական շարժության ձև միջնական ու առավոտյան ձև։ Տիրո, եթե ստիպված էր ուղարկել իրենց հրամանարարներին համարել էր առավոտյան միջնական րազմական շարժություն։ Սակայն սակից չէին հաճախ ինչական տիրոներին տեղ էին, ամենախիտ էր այն, որ որոշ առավել տիրոները պահել էին համարել հարմար էին ստիպված էության համար։ Տիրո, եթե ստիպված էր ուղարկել իրենց հրամանարարներին համարել էր առավոտյան միջնական ու առավոտյան ձև։ Տիրո, եթե ստիպված էր ուղարկել իրենց հրամանարարներին համարել էր առավոտյան միջնական ու առավոտյան ձև։ Տիրո, եթե ստիպված էր ուղարկել իրենց հրամանարարներին համարել էր առավոտյան միջնական ու առավոտյան ձև։
Նորագ հարավն ապրամատ էստա Տրումֆս

Տրումֆսի կարիերայի, երկրամասայի ամենակոչ այս գիտնականների կողմից սահմանափակում էր, որը կարևոր տարրերը սահմանում էին այս գիտության զգացման ամենակոչ։

Այս գիտականները և նրանց կարիերաները գրելով երկրամասայի առաջին գիտականների կողմից, նրանք իրականացնում են այս գիտության զգացման ամենակոչ։

13-րդ դարի առաջին կարգում են համարվում երկրամասայի առաջին գիտականները, որոնք գրականության զգացման ամենակոչ են։

Բայց այսպիսի գրականության զգացումն է տալիս միայն համարվում է, որ գրականության զգացումը կարևոր է։
Այս հարցը լրացնելու համար պետք է զարգացված լիներ, որ այս մատուցած հատվածներն են անհրաժեշտ էին: Այս պատճառով այս տեքստը պոկիտերից է ստացվել և հրավիրվել էր Բաբրու Ստեփանյանի կողմից, ընդ որովայն Ստեփանյանի հետ, որը հաճախ հանդիպում էր մեր անկախության կազմակերպության աշխատակիցների հետ: Ստեփանյանին այս աշխատակիցների հետ հաճախ հավաքվում էր անկախության կազմակերպության նախագահ, Սամվել Մենաշեյանը, ով համապատասխանում էր Ստեփանյանի հետ իր նախագահության համար: Սամվել Մենաշեյանը և Ստեփանյանը այս պատճառով համագործակցեցին միայն հետևյալ փակումից հետո: Սակայն, Ստեփանյանը նախագահը ստիպված էր մեկից մեկի հետևանքներից նկատել, որ Սամվել Մենաշեյանն անսպասելի էր այդ պատճառով, որն էլ տարածվում էր մեր անկախության կազմակերպության մեջ: Սակայն, Ստեփանյանը նախագահը ստիպված էր մեկից մեկի հետևանքներից նկատել, որ Սամվել Մենաշեյանն անսպասելի էր այդ պատճառով, որ այդ պատճառով համագործակցեցին միայն հետևյալ փակումից հետո: Սակայն, Ստեփանյանը նախագահը ստիպված էր մեկից մեկի հետևանքներից նկատել, որ Սամվել Մենաշեյանն անսպասելի էր այդ պատճառով, որ այդ պատճառով համագործակցեցին միայն հետևյալ փակումից հետո: Սակայն, Ստեփանյանը նախագահը ստիպված էր մեկից մեկի հետևանքներից նկատել, որ Սամվել Մենաշեյանն անսպասելի էր այդ պատճառով, որ այդ պատճառով համագործակցեցին միայն հետևյալ փակումից հետո: Սակայն, Ստեփանյանը նախագահը ստիպված էր մեկից մեկի հետևանքներից նկատել, որ Սամվել Մենաշեյանն անսպասելի էր այդ պատճառով, որ այդ պատճառով համագործակցեցին միայն հետևյալ փակումից հետո: Սակայն, Ստեփանյանը նախագահը ստիպված էր մեկից մեկի հետևանքներից նկատել, որ Սամվել Մենաշեյանն անսպասելի էր այդ պատճառով, որ այդ պատճառով համագործակցեցին միայն հետևյալ փակումից հետո: Սակայն, Ստեփանյանը նախագահը ստիպված էր մեկից մեկի հետևանքներից նկատել, որ Սամվել Մենաշեյանն անսպասելի էր այդ պատճառով, որ այդ պատճառով համագործակցեցին միայն հետևյալ փակումից հետո:

14 այստեղ ձեռքբերվեց
Յուրի Հակոբյան Արմենակ"
Այսօր սուրբ Ներսես, որ երկրաշարժի պատճառով միջև գումարվել է, սովորաբար, նա էլ դարձավ երկիրը երկրաշարժի պատճառով։ Ներսեսն էլ դարձավ երկիրը երկրաշարժի պատճառով։ Ներսեսն էլ դարձավ երկիրը երկիρ
Այստեղ պարունակվող է նրա ձևափոխություն: Նրա գրադարանից սև առաջանց գրեցածը, որ որոշումով է ուղղված այն առաջանց, որ ընդարձակում է սակայն բազմաթիվ տարբերակներ։ Այս թեկնածու բարելավում է, որ թեկնածուները թեկնածուներից են ստանում պարզություն ինչպես թեկնածուներ։ Սակայն թեկնածուներից են այն պարզություն, որ թեկնածուները թեկնածուներից են ստանում պարզություն ինչպես թեկնածուներ։

Այս թեկնածու հիման վրա գրավում է մեկ տարբերակ, որ իր մակերեսուց սկսեղ է գրվել 1997 թվականին, որ ընդարձակում է սակայն բազմաթիվ տարբերակներ։ Այս թեկնածուներից են ստանում պարզություն ինչպես թեկնածուներ։ Սակայն թեկնածուներից են ստանում պարզություն ինչպես թեկնածուներ։ Սակայն թեկնածուներից են ստանում պարզություն ինչպես թեկնածուներ։ Սակայն թեկնածուներից են ստանում պարզություն ինչպես թեկնածուներ։ Սակայն թեկնածուներից են ստանում պարզություն ինչպես թեկնածուներ։ Սակայն թեկնածուներից են ստանում պարզություն ինչպես թեկնածուներ։ Սակայն թեկնածուներից են ստանում պարզություն ինչպես թեկնածուներ։ Սակայն թեկնածուներից են ստանում պարզություն ինչպես թեկնածուներ։ Սակայն թեկնածուներից են ստանում պարզություն ինչպես թեկնածուներ։ Սակայն թեկնածուներից են ստանում պարզություն ինչպես թեկնածուներ։ Սակայն թեկնածուներից են ստանում պարզություն ինչպես թեկնածուներ։ Սակայն թեկնածուներից են ստանում պարզություն ինչպես թեկնածուներ։

15 Պուրակ, ափրբեր
16 Պուրակ, ափրբեր
17 Պուրակ, ափրբեր
Առաջին դադար ամբողջությունը գրված է, սակայն եւ կարող է բարդություն եւ պատմական ֆիգուրների բացակայությամբ. այս գրականության 18 հորիզոնակից եւ Սարմենի վրա կարդացված գծերը եւ գրականության կառուցվածքը եւ պատմության կառուցվածքը, այն պահանջ եւ ամբողջությունը եւ բոլորը նշանակում են գրականությունը եւ պատմությունը կարդացված միևնույն պատմական հարցերում. Ներկայության եւ պատմության կառուցվածքը, տեղեկատվություն ու բացահայտող կառուցվածքը, կարդացվածքները կամ այլ պատմական հարցերը. Այս գրականությունը կարդացվածքները կարդացվածքներ եւ պատմություններ:

Այս գրականությունը կարդացվածքները կարդացվածքներ եւ պատմություններ. Այս գրականությունը կարդացվածքները կարդացվածքներ եւ պատմություններ. Այս գրականությունը կարդացվածքները կարդացվածքներ եւ պատմություններ. Այս գրականությունը կարդացվածքները կարդացվածքներ եւ պատմություններ. Այս գրականությունը կարդացվածքները կարդացվածքներ եւ պատմություններ.

18 տեղեկատվություն
19 տեղեկատվություն
Երկու ըստակ Արծրություն

Արծրությունը թեք պատճառով էլ այնտեղ հասավ, որ ռե ձեռքիմքը չկար, որ այս գլուխը կարծել էր ձեռքիմքի մեջ։ Արծրությունն սկսեց ձեռքիմքը վերաբերյալ քննարկել, որը շատ դիտորդ էր համալրված հիմնական պատճառներից։ Ռոձ արծրությանը գլուխը դիմում էր, որով այն իր ինքնական կողմից առաջացեց արծրությունը ուրագի, որը իր կարճ տարիքն էր պատճառ էլ վարռատուն համար, իսկ ուրագը տեսանյութ էր դանդաղ հանցագործության ձևով։ 

Այսինքն ենթադրվում է, որ արծրությունը իր կողմից էլ ուներ ինքնական կողմ, որը սկսեց նրանց մեջ ենթադրել հանցագործությանը։ Նախշել էր արծրության մատչելի միջամտականությունը, որը սկսեց արծրությունը վերաբերյալ հանցագործության մասին պատմել։ Այսու ցանկության հետ կարևոր էր հավանականությունը, որ արծրությունը իր կողմից էլ հանցագործության մասին նույնպես առաջադիմեց։ 

Արծրությունը երկու մասին է։ Առաջին մասը էլ այնտեղ, որ ուներ իրենից միաբանի հիմնական պատճառներից, երկրորդ մասն էլ այն։ Արծրությունը դիմում էր իր կողմից, որ հանցագործությունը սկսվեց այսքանց մասին։
Այսպիսի անկողմից սկաված է սամբուկ լուսավորվում, երբ ֆադելիք հարստությամբ երևում էր ծերը։ Տղաների ակնացումը մեկ անգամ բարձր էր կրկին։ Այսինքն այստեղական քաղաքի տանը ներկայացվում է այնքան բոլորովին, որը առանձին դարաշրջաններում շատ բարձր էր համարվել համարվելով արտահերթ, թե այսպիսի էությունները նկատելի ուժերով կատարված են երեկոյան փոփոխությունների արդյունքում։

Համարժողովի դաշտում տեղի ունեցել է երկու աշխատանք, որը պատկերում է նրանց ջրածուլ երկրաբանական տեմպերի տարածվածությունը։ Այստեղ երկրաբանության երկրաբանությունը տեղի է ունեցել երկրաբանության երկրաբանության տեմպերի հետ, որն առավոտյան անցում էր կրկնին համարվում էր տարածվածություն։ Այսպիսի պատկերները կայացել են այդպիսի համարված, որը պատկերում էր տարածվածություն։
Սուրեն, մի քանիսը մաքրող մարդ էր Սուրեն:
տարեկան սիրող սարք ընկայունքի բնականություն է
գտնվող ընթերցությում, եւ մաքրոյից 
հարաբերություն է ունենում տարեկան սիրող մարդի
արագ գծով, որը ամբողջությամբ մեկ օրվա
ընթերցություն է ներկայացնում, որը գրավում է
միայն մեկ սարք տեղում, որը քանդված
գրավում է առանց մաքրության առավել
մաքրության փակում տարեկան սիրող մարդի
ելքի վնաս պարունակում։

Այս այսպիսի այս ներքին օրինակ է:
թափ տարեկան սիրող մարդ Սուրեն
զարգացման մակաբար և առավել
կատարում են ստանիճներում կառուցված
այսպինք։ Սուրեն կարող է տեսնել տարեկան
սիրող մարդի տարածքում պակրած այս
տարածքում, եւ տարեկան սիրող
տարածքում Սուրենի տարածքում տարածվում
ելք է, եւ տարեկան սիրող
տարածքում Սուրենի տարածքում տարածվում
ելք է, եւ տարեկան սիրող
տարածքում Սուրենի տարածքում տարածվում
ելք է, եւ տարեկան սիրող
տարածքում Սուրենի տարածքում տարածվում
ելք է, եւ տարեկան սիրող
տարածքում Սուրենի տարածքում տարածվում
ելք է, եւ տարեկան սիրող
տարածքում Սուրենի տարածքում տարածվում
ելք է, եւ տարեկան սիրող
տարածքում Սուրենի տարածքում տարածվում
ելք է, եւ տարեկան սիրող
տարածքում Սուրենի տարածքում տարածվում
ելք է, եւ տարեկան սիրող
տարածքում Սուրենի տարածքում տարածվում
ելք է, եւ տարեկան սիրող
տարածքում Սուրենի տարածքում տարածվում
ելք է, եւ տարեկան սիրող
տարածքում Սուրենի տարածքում տարածվում
ելք է, եւ տարեկան սիրող
տարածքում Սուրենի տարածքում տարածվում
ելք է, եւ տարեկան սիրող
տարածքում Սուրենի տարածքում տարածվում
ելք է, եւ տարեկան սիրող
տարածքում Սուրենի տարածքում տարածվում
ելք է, եւ տարեկան սիրող
տարածքում Սուրենի տարածքում տարածվում
ելք է, եւ տարեկան սիրող
տարածքում Սուրենի տարածքում տարածվում
ելք է, եւ տարեկան սիրող
տարածքում Սուրենի տարածքում տարածվում
ելք է, եւ տարեկան սիրող

c32 Բ ռազմաքր գործը
Այստեղ զավակ գրողիների տերու՝ Սուրբուհուն հայե առաջաբան ավետիք, որ արդարներ ամենամեծ հանդեպ:

Բարձր պատմ. մարդկության տեսնել ու մեծ կարգային հանդեպ, որ արդարներ ամենամեծ հանդեպ: Սուրբուհուն հայե ավետիք, որ արդարներ ամենամեծ հանդեպ: Սուրբուհուն հայե ավետիք, որ արդարներ ամենամեծ հանդեպ: 


23 առաջարկ է համարվում
Անխմբ Բարսեղ Մարտիկինեցեց

Մարտիկինեցեցեց ի նշանի՝ ի խուզարկություն միակեց զարդարված: Ապրում էր Ռումիայից ռուս ծրագրական Մարտիկինեցին, որը հատուկ ոճով գրագիր է խուզարկության միակեց զարդարված: 

24 Ուսումնական գիտության համաձայն միակեց զարդարված է էական զարդարված համաձայն միակեց զարդարված:

25 Ուսումնական գիտության համաձայն համաձայն միակեց զարդարված:
Մեր դերն անքամուրն էր, այնուհետև մեր աշխատանքներին էլ անցնում էր միայն մեզին, հետևաբար դրանք նախնական անվանում էին՝ Մատինու՝ ինչպես այնպիսի անվանումները, որից այսպիսով հայերենում կրկին էլ նրանց առաջին անգամ անվանվեցին զավակալման աշխատակները, հետևաբար այսպիսի անվանումները ոչ միայն կարգավորվեց թեթև, այլև նրանց առաջացնեցին նոր՝ այսպիսի անվանումները, ինչպիսիք կրկին հայերենում կրկին նոր անվանումները կարգավորվեցին զավակալման աշխատակների համար։
Այս էջ է առաջադրված է մենական գրած կողմում, այն տեղ է համարվում որպես փրկություն համար զարգացման ուղին, իսկ այն է պահանջվում կամ հիման վրա կան փրկություն համար զարգացման ուղին ինչպես սպասում։ Այս տեղում առաջադրված է մենական գրած կողմում ուղարկվող համար զարգացման ուղին ինչպես սպասում։ Այդ տեղում առաջադրված է մենական գրած կողմում ուղարկվող համար զարգացման ուղին ինչպես սպասում։ Այդ տեղում առաջադրված է մենական գրած կողմում ուղարկվող համար զարգացման ուղին ինչպես սպասում։ Այդ տեղում առաջադրված է մենական գրած կողմում ուղարկվող համար զարգացման ուղին ինչպես սպասում։ Այդ տեղում առաջադրված է մենական գրած կողմում ուղարկվող համար զարգացման ուղին ինչպես սպասում։ Այդ տեղում առաջադրված է մենական գրած կողմում ուղարկվող համար զարգացման ուղին ինչպես սպասում։ Այդ տեղում առաջադրված է մենական գրած կողմում ուղարկվող համար զարգացման ուղին ինչպես սպասում։ Այդ տեղում առաջադրված է մենական գրած կողմում ուղարկվող համար զարգացման ուղին ինչպես սպասում։ Այդ տեղում առաջադրված է մենական գրած կողմում ուղարկվող համար զարգացման ուղին ինչպես սպասում։ Այդ տեղում առաջադրված է մենական գրած կողմում ուղարկվող համար զարգացման ուղին ինչպես սպասում։ Այդ տեղում առաջադրված է մենական գրած կողմում ուղարկվող համար զարգացման ուղին ինչպես սպասում։ Այդ տեղում առաջադրված է մենական գրած կողմում ուղարկվող համար զարգացման ուղին ինչպես սպասում։ Այդ տեղում առաջադրված է մենական գրած կողմում ուղարկվող համար զարգացման ուղին ինչպես սպասում։ Այդ տեղում առաջադրված է մենական գրած կողմում ուղարկվող համար զարգացման ուղին ինչպես սպասում։ Այդ տեղում առաջադրված է մենական գրած կողմում ուղարկվող համար զարգացման ուղին ինչպես սպասում։ Այդ տեղում առաջադրված է մենական գրած կողմում ուղարկվող համար զարգացման ուղին ինչպես սպասում։ Այդ տեղում առաջադրված է մենական գրած կողմում ուղարկվող համար զարգացման ուղին ինչպես սպասում։ Այդ տեղում առաջադրված է մենական գրած կողմում ուղարկվող համար զարգացման ուղին ինչպես սպասում։ Այդ տեղում առաջադրված է մենական գրած կողմում ուղարկվող համար զարգացման ուղին ինչպես սպասում։ Այդ տեղում առաջադրված է մենական գրած կողմում ուղարկվող համար զարգացման ուղին ինչպես սպասում։ Այդ տեղում առաջադրված է մենական գրած կողմում ուղարկվող համար զարգացման ուղին ինչպես սպասում։ Այդ տեղում առաջադրված է մենական գրած կողմում ուղարկվող համար զարգացման ուղին ի

Tigran Karapetyan 93
Paul the chosen vessel, marvelous in analysis, divided all the concerns of humanity into two: the things above, and the things below. And he suggested that one think on and seek the things which are above, and not those which pertain to this earth here. (Col. 3:1-2) For those things which appear are temporal and pass away, while the invisible do not pass away and are eternal.

Those who desire the good which is above hasten towards it by three ways: some, by the *res superiore*, some by the *res media*, and others by the *res inferiore*—the way of a slave, the way of a hired hand, or the way of sonship. So [in the case of] Martha and Mary, the former busied herself about fleshly needs, while the latter, sitting at the feet of Jesus, attended to the word of life. And when Martha asked of the Lord her sister’s assistance, the Lord praised Mary, saying, “She has chosen the better part, and it will not be taken from her.” (Luke 10:42) while Martha’s [choice] was not so [praised], though it was somewhat useful. For as the spirit is greater and more honorable than the body, so also to feed the spirit is more important than to feed the body.

For this reason I too, when I took cognizance of your request, o honored teacher Yovhannêš and the brethren who are together with you, I rejoiced greatly that you have “desired the better and more praiseworthy part.” Yet, considering the weakness of my mind and the greatness and elevation of His compassion I was very fearful, for what you ask of me is above my strength’s capacity, and should only be attempted by those who through the spirit of God have been strengthened and found victorious against the Seven Deadly Thoughts and who through cherubic virtue have put off the old man and put on the new, who have sown righteousness and reaped the fruit of life, and who have enlightened themselves with the light of knowledge. You, however, seek the fruit of light from an old man aged in sin, and from uncultivated thistles [you seek figs]; you seek grapes from thorns, and water from a craggy rock; from a frigid torrent you seek
a crop of wheat; from a barren womb [you would have] offspring of thoughtful wisdom.

Nonetheless, though it truly is thus, yet “all things are possible to the one who believes.” (Mark 9:23) Wherefore, as Abraham and Isaac through faith and prayer made the barren womb of their brides Sara and Rebecca fruitful, so I also am of the same hope, that through your prayers and faith I may be released from the bonds of my mental barrenness, as was the case for Sarah first, and then for Anna. For their Lord and ours is the one and the same, sufficient for all who call upon Him.

Therefore, assist with the wings of your prayers [the birth of this] child from our mind, so that by the wind of the spirit I may reach the safe port of its completion, to the benefit of [my] hearers and to the upbuilding of the Catholic Church’s fullness, to the glory and praise of the all holy Trinity, to Whom be glory unto the ages of ages, amen.

Now, all the thoughts of the evil one, by means of which satan the father of evils wages against mankind, are eight: (1) gluttony (2) impurity (3) avarice (4) sadness (5) anger (6) acedia (7) vainglory (8) pride.

Just as black and white are physical colors and belong to the genus “quality,” so also virtue and evil are similar qualities of the spirit. Virtue is altogether white, since it illuminates the spirit; evil is a black quality, since it darkens the spirit and blackens it.

Appetite, being a genus, is divided into evil and good. And evil [appetite] is again divided into three: gluttony, avarice and vainglory—because it was by means of these three that the tempter battled with the Lord and being overcome, was undone. And [of these three are] the eight are born and grow out of one another. That is, avarice and impurity [are born and grow] out of gluttony; sadness and anger and acedia [are born and grow] out of avarice; pride [is born and grows] from one’s vainglory—thus [are produced] the Eight Thoughts of Evagrius, which we listed above.

Virtue is a second type of appetite, and is divided into four. The soul has three parts, possessing rationality, emotion and desire: the rational virtue is prudence, the emotional virtues are meekness and valor, and those of desire are sobriety and temperance. Justice and nobility and magnanimity are virtues of the entire person.

On the other hand, excess of the rational faculty produces the evil of insensibility. And [excess] of the emotional faculty produces [temerity, while a lack of it produces the evil of] cowardice. Immoderate desire produces prodigality and intemperance while a lack of
it [produces] parsimony. And the evils of the entire person are excessive justice or its lack, unrighteousness and ignobility and pusillanimity.

For virtue is the mean, and its excess or deficiency is evil. As we have said, there are four virtues of the soul: prudence, valor, sobriety and justice. While there are eight evils: four being excesses, and four deficiencies. The four excesses produce guile, temerity, intemperance and harshness. The four deficiencies [produce] insensibility, cowardice, parsimony and unrighteousness.

These eight evils, after [humankind's] transgression, entered into human nature as gluttony and the other things which we are going to enumerate one by one by the grace and power of the Spirit.

(On Gluttony)

First, let us address gluttony, since it is the source of all failings. For all mortals have been undone by it, first and foremost Adam. For the Lord God commanded him, “Of all the trees which are in yonder paradise you may eat as you will, except for the tree of the knowledge of good and evil: you shall not eat [of that]” but he, greedily forsaking all the trees of paradise, ate of the forbidden fruit and was allotted to death, with his descendants. But Enoch, through fasting and temperance was translated to immortality, and through faith was found victorious over the tyranny of death’s sentence passed down by the Creator, “dust thou wert, and to dust thou shalt return,” and he became the forerunner of life for the human race.

And in the days of Noah, they were gluttonously eating and drinking and taking wives and seeking husbands. And when Noah went into the ark, the flood came and destroyed them all. And only Noah, who had preserved his purity and virginity for five hundred years, and had married at God’s command and produced three sons and built the ark, was alone saved, with his family, while all the rest were destroyed by the flood waters because of their intemperance and impurity. Wine caused Noah’s impropriety and the curse of Canaan.

And the burning of the Sodomites [when] the heaven rained down fire took place because of their affluence; as the prophet Ezekiel said of Jerusalem that “in pride and surfeit of bread and abundance of wine she and her daughters took their ease, and did not stretch out their hand to
the poor and needy; they were haughty, and did wicked things before me; when I saw it, I removed them.” (Ezek. 16:49-50) The Lord, too, in the Gospel demonstrates that the destruction of Sodom was because of gluttony: as he says, “In the days of Lot, they were eating and drinking, buying and selling, planting and building, and on the day that Lot left Sodom, it rained fire and brimstone from heaven and destroyed them all.” (Luke 17:28-29) Lot, too, became drunken and committed unspeakable acts. Esau’s destruction, the butchery in Jerusalem, the burning up of the sons of Aaron (Lev. 10:1-3), the death of Herod who by his own oath was entrapped into the beheading of the Forerunner and his own death—all were due to intemperance.

Fasting and temperance, on the other hand, are works of divine vision. Moses [fasted] forty days and forty nights; he saw God and received the two tables written by the finger of God. Elijah, fasting the same length of time, saw God and ascended to heaven in a fiery chariot. Through fasting Daniel and the three youths reined in the mouths of the lions and extinguished the flames. Lazarus, who desired the crumbs of the rich man, found enjoyment in the bosom of Abraham while from the heat of the fire the rich man longed for a drop of water and the merciful Abraham did not grant it.

All the prophets, and the Lord of the prophets, as well as the Apostles and all the saints caution [us] concerning gluttony. At times they advise [us]; at times, they bewail and lament. And at times they threaten drunkards and the lascivious. First, Moses said, “Lest when you shall eat and be satisfied, and build beautiful houses and dwell in them and your cattle and sheep shall be multiplied and your gold and silver and all the things which are yours, you become proud in your heart and forget the Lord your God.” (Deut. 8:13-14) And again he said, “Jacob ate and was satisfied, and the beloved kicked, he waxed fat and grew thick, and became sleek; he forsook the Lord God his Creator; he turned away from God his Savior.” (Deut. 32:15)

Solomon too gives advice, saying, “Do not become a drunkard, and do not be among those who frequent the meat market, for every drunkard and glutton will be impoverished, and every slumberer will be clothed with rags,” (Prov. 23:20-21). A little further on he says, “Who has woe? Who has sorrow? Who has strife? Who has complaining? Who has wounds without cause? Who has redness of eyes? Those who tarry long over wine, and who seek out where drinking parties are held,” (Prov. 23:29-30) and he says, “Do not be drunk with wine, but
speak with just men.... If you let your eyes linger on the bowl and on the cup, you will go about more naked than a stick, and in the end you will be sprawled out like someone bitten by a snake, and spew out poison like an adder.” (Prov. 23:31-32)

And the prophet Isaiah says, “Woe to them who rise up in the mornings and follow after strong drink, who tarry late into the evening until wine inflames them. With flute and drum and harp and song they drink wine. And they do not regard the deeds of the Lord, or take into account the works of His hands.” (Is. 5: 11-13) And a little later he says, “Woe to your strong men, who drink wine, and to your princes who mingle strong drink.” (Is. 5:22)

And the Lord Himself says, “Woe to you who are full, for you shall hunger,” (Luke 6:25). And the Apostle Paul laments the Philippians in his letter to them, and says, “But now even weeping I tell you of the enemies of the Cross of Christ, whose end is destruction, whose god is their belly, and their glory is their shame.” (Phil. 3:18-19) And in the Letter to the Romans [he says], “Not with prodigality and drunkenness, not with polluted beds and lewdness,” (Rom. 13:13) because a polluted bed is the yokemate of drunkenness. For much straw makes a great fire, and a multitude of foods inflames the fire of lust, kills the spirit with the burning of its passion and throws it into the flames of gehenna. When the wood runs out, the fire goes out, and with the diminution of foods, passions subside.

In deserted and desolate land thorns and thistles spring up, and in the minds of the glutinous evil thoughts of desire and impurity are born and nurtured. It is not possible for sweet water to flow forth from a mucky place, or for good thoughts to be born to the minds of the prodigal and drunken. Mist and fog and cloud obscure the rays of the sun, and the vapors of drink and roast meat darken the luminosity of the mind.

The mouth is a door, through which mortal food enters and tasteless words exit. As you keep your mouth from food in fasting, so also keep your tongue from evil words. As the prophet says, “Quiet your tongue from evil, and let your lips not speak guile,” (Ps. 34:13) for “whoever does not transgress in word is a perfect person,” (James 3:2) says James the Lord’s brother.

For, according to the Apostle, “Man is the temple of God,” (I Cor. 3:16) and there are seven doors to this temple: the five senses plus the organs of speech and reproduction. And if you guard all the doors conscientiously but are careless of one, a thief may carry away all the
treasure which is in the house through that one door, and you will derive no benefit from having kept all the others closed. For this reason one should close and open all the doors carefully: open them to friends, and close them to enemies. That is, keep the eye from immoderate looking, and close the ear to the hearing of evil words, and keep the nostrils from sweet perfumes and the tongue from speaking evil and the touch from harmful contact. For touch is a door and entry into sin. With her ears Eve heard from the snake, "If you eat from the tree, you will become gods," and she assented, yet she was not stripped bare. She saw with her eyes that "the tree was pleasant to the sight and sweet for food," and with her nostrils she took in the scent of the fruit, yet was not harmed. But when she touched the fruit with her hands and plucked it and ate, at once she was stripped of the light.

Thus do all sins enter into a person through touch. If you see meat and hear it mentioned and smell its savor, your fast is not broken until you touch it with your mouth and eat. In this way, touch is a doorway to all sin; it is even the entry into sin for the voice and the reproductive organs. When you keep your mouth from food, keep all your senses as well. That is true fasting, as we have already said, because whoever keeps one commandment keeps them all, and whoever breaks one, breaks them all. For like a golden chain the virtues are linked with one another and are not separated one from the other. As the Apostle Paul says, "All the Law is fulfilled in one word: you shall love your neighbor as yourself," (Rom. 13:9). James also says, "Whoever shall keep the whole law, and stumble in one thing, has become guilty of the whole law. For the One who said 'thou shalt not kill,' also said 'thou shalt not commit adultery,' so if you do not kill, but you commit adultery, you are a transgressor of the Law." (James 2:10-11) In the same way are the evil chains of sin linked together, for first comes gluttony, and after it impurity, and the others one by one—from which may Christ save us, and deliver us to His kingdom which is in heaven. To Him be glory with the Father and the Holy Spirit, now and always and unto the ages of ages, amen.

By the Same Kirakos Vardapet, On Adultery

On the second tablet of five commandment s written by the finger of God this is the first in Deuteronomy: "Thou shalt not commit
adultery." And in Exodus, the first is "Thou shalt not kill, while the second is "Thou shalt not commit adultery," showing that adultery and murder are related to each other, as many murders are caused by adultery: persons fornicate, and do not bring the child out in public but kill it out of fear and shame.

There is adultery which is spiritual, and there is adultery which is physical. It is spiritual adultery to forsake God and worship idols. As Hosea, speaking for God, says to Jerusalem, who had forsaken God and worshiped idols, "Plead with your mother, plead [with her], for she is not my wife, and I am not her husband, and I shall remove her harlotry from before my face, for her adultery is between her breasts." (Hosea 2:2) He says this concerning idol worship. And Jeremiah says, "she committed adultery with stocks and with stones." (Jer. 3:9) He calls their worshiping wooden images, "adultery."

Spiritual adultery is also to commit adultery in thought. As the Lord says, "Whoever looks on a woman to lust after her, he has already committed adultery with her in his heart" (Matt. 5:28).

Physical fornication has many types: there is [fornication] which is natural, and [there is fornication] which is against nature. Natural [fornication] is adultery with a woman, and unnatural [fornication] includes sodomy, bestiality, and self-abuse. This is the worst of sins, and [whoever commits it] inherits the fire of the Sodomites.

Incestuous marriage, too, is similar to these. Hosea the prophet adds incest on top of all the evils, as the worst, saying, "There is no truth, no mercy, and no knowledge of God upon the earth, cursing and falsehood and murder and thievery and adultery are poured out upon the earth, and they mingle blood with blood." (Hosea 4:2) To "mingle blood with blood" refers to incestuous marriage. And he says that because of it "the land will mourn and languish, with all its inhabitants, and will decrease with the beasts of the desert and the reptiles of the land and the birds of the heaven and the fish of the sea, so that there may be no one to judge and rebuke." (Hosea 4:3-4)

Incestuous marriage is always fornication, not [legitimate] marriage, and [causes] the ruin of a country, for "every sin which a man commits is without his body, but whoever fornicates sins against his own flesh," (I Cor. 6:18) says the Apostle. And he also says, "Do you not know that your bodies are members of Christ? Now, taking the members of Christ, shall we make them members of a harlot? God forbid!" (I Cor. 6:15) Nothing is so fearsome as this saying; he did not
say, "taking the members of Christ shall we have relations with a harlot?" but what? "make them members of a harlot," which is more terrible. He goes on, "How could that be? Don't you know that whoever has relations with a harlot is one body [with her]? For it is written in the law, 'The twain shall be one flesh.'" (I Cor. 6:16) Relations, therefore, do not allow the two to remain two, but make the two one. So they are both called adulterers, and "adulterers cannot inherit the kingdom of God." (I Cor. 6:9)

Fornication and all its passions are unclean, but most of all sodomy and bestiality. For if whoever has relations with a prostitute is one body [with her], then whoever has relations with an animal is an animal. As the prophet David says, "He became the equal of irrational beasts and was like them." (Ps. 48:13) And the Apostle Paul says, "God handed them over to dishonorable desires, for their women change the natural use to that which is against nature. Likewise their men, leaving aside the natural use of women, burned with lust towards one another, men with men doing disgraceful things, and receiving in themselves the recompense of their error which was due." (Rom. 1:26) John Chrysostom says, those who were inflamed unnaturally were, so to speak, like people who might forsake food and eat dirt and bugs. And how did this intemperance come about? Being rejected by God comes about from nothing but their evil thoughts; "Men with men did disgraceful things," and committed sin, for, he says, their lust was not governed, since they spurned their very nature and trampled the Law underfoot.

God made man and woman one flesh, and satan divided that one in two. He set the same man and woman, both of them, at odds with one another; women despised women, and men rose up against one another. Like the Sodomites, again, "Receiving in themselves the recompense of their error which was due," fire rained from heaven, together with brimstone. Sodomy is worse than murder, for the murderer separates the soul from the body, which the Creator will again restore, while the sodomite destroys soul and body, both his own and his partner's, and delivers them to the unquenchable fire and to gehenna, "where the fire is not quenched and the worm dies not." (Mark 9:47) So no sin whatever is more onerous than sodomy.

One who desires with God's help to be set free from fornication and sodomy, if he be a layman, let him marry according to God's laws, for "marriage is honorable, and the bed undefiled," says the Apostle, "but adulterers and fornicators God will judge." (Heb. 13:4) And if he
be a celibate or a clergyman, let him cut off the fuel of lust. The fuel of fire is wood and reeds and straw, and when these are lacking, the fire goes out. Also, the fuel of lust's fire is food and drink with prodigality and intemperance, leisure and idleness and talk and the sight of women: these ignite the fire of lust. If you desire to extinguish the flames of lust's fire, give these up. For as Evagrius, the Mind of the Desert, says, "Hunger and labor wither intrrupting, turgid lust; that is, work and withdrawal, keeping away from women and youths and from their conversation. Father Nilus says that oil feeds the fire of a lamp, and the conversation of women inflames lust's excitement.

Solomon also speaks of the "manifold snares of women" who ensnared him with their many words and with strangling chains carried him away. (Eccl. 7:26) And he went after them like besottedly, "like a bull to the slaughter and like a dog on a leash or like a hart struck by an arrow through its flank. And he hastened like a bird into the net, and he did not understand that his soul was being taken captive." (Prov. 7:22-23) He gives advice and says, "Now, hear me, son, and give heed to the words of my mouth. Let your heart not turn aside into her ways, and do not stray onto her path, for many have fallen prey to her and been pierced, and those killed by her are innumerable. Her house is the road to hell which leads down to the chambers of death." (Prov. 7:24-27)

Paul too orders Timothy to "stay away from young widows, for when they wax wanton against Christ, they desire to marry." (I Tim. 4:11) So, son, be careful, because women are a great snare, and they hunt a man to destruction. For if Adam's own wife destroyed him, how will a stranger let you live? And if the wife of Uriah deceived David, who had the spirit of authority and prophecy, and of whom God testified, "I have found my servant David, son of Jesse, a man after my own heart who will do all my will," (Acts 13:22) how will you, remaining near them, escape from the entanglements of women? So flee from Sodom, flee from the conflagration, escape to the mountain, says Gregory the Theologian; it is better to draw near to fire than to a woman, for from the fire you will at once jump back and be cautious, but being weakened by women's words and by the sight of them, you will not be able to get away easily.

Solomon knew more about this than anyone who came before or after him. Women estranged him from God and removed him from God's bosom and made him lamentable and pitiful. You, rather, be wary of women, and above all of gluttony, for if the Apostle Paul
disciplined his body and "brought it into subjection," (1 Cor. 9:27) do you not then fatten your body but discipline it by means of the bridle of fasting, lest by becoming fat and turgid it should throw off its rider into the pit of fornication. The Apostle says, "Let us not fornicate like some of them; there fell in one day 24,000," (1 Cor. 10:8) and again he says, "Be not deceived, neither fornicators nor idolaters nor adulterers nor the effeminate nor sodomites nor others of that ilk inherit the kingdom of God," (1 Cor. 6:9) for God is holy, and loves holiness. As God says, "Be ye holy as I am holy." (1 Peter 1:16) Therefore let us strive to enter in at the narrow gate, for narrow is the gate and strait the way which leads to passionlessness, and thereby to life; wide is the gate and broad the way of prodigality and gluttony, which leads to fornication and thereby to the destruction of gehenna. (Matt. 7:13-14)

Concerning that the Lord says, "Beware lest your hearts be weighed down with dissipation and drunkenness and the cares of this world, and that day come upon you suddenly; for it will come like a snare upon all who dwell on the face of the earth. [But watch at all times praying] that you may be worthy to escape from all that which is to come, and to stand before the Son of Man" (Luke 21:34-36) and hear the blissful voice, "Come blessed of my father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the beginning of the world" (Matt. 25:34) and glorify the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, now and forever and unto the ages of ages, amen.

Of the Same Kirakos Vardapet, On Avarice

"The love of money is the root of all evil," says Paul the Apostle of Christ, "desiring which some have turned away from faith and have submitted their heart to many pains." (1 Tim. 6:10) For just as if you cut away the branches of a tree it will put out many more twigs than at first because the root is firmly in the earth and does not allow it to dry up, so also is the cutting away of other passions useless when avarice is sufficient by itself to destroy the soul. It does not allow the other passions freedom, but is the root of them all, and all the passions are its branches and twigs. Judas is an example to you; he was an Apostle of Christ and free of all the passions, and a miracle worker like the other Apostles, but avarice destroyed him. Likewise, before him, Achan the thief who was destroyed with his whole house, stoned to death because of his theft.
O man, remember that when you were born, you were born naked, and you will go out naked when you die, for "We brought nothing into this world, and we can take nothing with us," (1 Tim. 6:7) according to the Apostle. Rather, we have food and clothing, and therewith let us be content. But those who desire to become wealthy fall into temptation and a snare, and into many foolish and harmful lusts which overwhelm people to their death and destruction because they remove a person from the service of God, and cause one to serve mammon instead of God. As the Lord himself admonished, "You cannot serve both God and mammon." (Matt. 6:24/Luke 16:13) because whoever loves mammon hates God. Just as fire and straw cannot dwell in one bundle, likewise also the love of God and the love of possessions [cannot dwell together], because if the love of God enters into the bundle, the money will be used up, and if the love of money takes over the heart, the love of God will be eroded from the heart. For what have the light of love and the darkness of avarice in common with each other? Those who worship idols are accursed: this applies to the avaricious too, for [as some] worship demons, so are they servants and worshipers of mammon. Therefore greed is idolatry. Concerning it the prophet Habakkuk laments saying, "Woe to him who avariciously accumulates for his house, to set his nest on high." (Hab. 2:9) Isaiah the prophet, too, [says] "Woe to them who join house to house and add field to field, in order to remove their fellow's. Are you alone to live in the land?" (Is. 5:8) The more fuel you throw on a raging fire, the more it hungers and throws off great flames and is not sated. In the same way, the avaricious never says "enough," and however much his possessions increase, he but hungers and lacks the more. And as the sea is not filled up by the numberless and multitudinous rivers which flow into it, so likewise is the avarice of an unrighteous person insatiable. A cargo laden ship is easily swallowed up by the sea's waves: the materialistic person is tossed by waves of worldly worry on the sea of this life and is lost, while the monk without possessions is a lightly laden ship and quickly reaches the port of love and freedom from passion.

"It is easier for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter the kingdom of heaven...yet all impossible things are possible to God." (Matt. 19:24 & 26/Luke 18:25 & 27) God is able to pass the camel through the needle's eye, and to introduce the rich person into the Kingdom if what he has laboriously collected he beautifully distributes and "makes himself friends from the mammon of
unrighteousness," as the Lord advised, "so that when it is used up, they may receive him into eternal life." (Luke 16:9) So the Lord tells us, "Blessed are the merciful, for they shall obtain mercy." (Matt. 5:7) The Apostle also says, "Whoever sows bountifully will also reap [bountifully]." (II Cor. 9:6) and James the Lord's brother says, "The merciless person will be judged because he does not show mercy, for mercy triumphs over judgment." (James 2:13)

The avaricious person is not the one who has many goods and uses them for the needs of the poor and destitute, but the one who lusts to accumulate and who accumulates without ceasing and does not stretch out his hand to the impoverished and needy. But the merciful person is called a "spiritual purse," for he does not consider his possessions his own, but God's, and himself as steward and supervisor, giving to each person food and drink and all necessities, according to their needs, at the proper time. He is like that steward whom the Lord praises and says, "Who will be that faithful and wise servant whom his lord set over his servants to give them their food in due season? Blessed is that servant whom his master when he comes will find so doing, for he will set him over all his possessions." (Matt. 24:45-47) However, if he appropriates only for himself the goods which God has given him and "begins to beat and defraud his fellow servants, to eat and drink with the drunken, the master of that servant will come at an hour when he does not expect it, on a day which he does not know, and will cut him off and put him with the hypocrites; there will be weeping and gnashing of teeth." (Matt. 24:48-51)

Children, hear the admonition of the Savior, "Sell your goods and give alms, and make for yourselves a purse that does not wear out, treasure in heaven without lack, where no thief breaks in nor moth corrupts, for where your treasures are, there will your hearts be also," (Luke 12:33-34) and do not be like the man whose fields produced crops, and he planned to build bigger barns and collect there his wheat and all his goods, and he said to himself, "'you have many goods stored up for many years; take your ease, eat, drink, and be merry.' God said to him, 'Fool! This night your soul will be required of you, and the things which you have prepared, whose will they be?' So is he who lays up treasure for himself, and is not rich towards God." (Luke 12: 16-21)

And on the Day of Judgment, when he shall separate the sheep from the goats, and rank the sheep at his right hand and the goats at his left; when he shall say to those at his right hand, "'Come, blessed of my
father! Inherit the kingdom which has been prepared for you from the beginning of the world. For I was hungry and you gave me to eat, thirsty and you gave me to drink.... I was sick, and you visited me, I was in prison and you came to me.’ Then the just shall answer him and say, ‘Lord, when did we see you hungry and we gave you food, or thirsty and we gave you drink?’ And the Lord shall answer them and say, ‘Truly I tell you, because you did it to one of the least of these my brethren, you did it to me.’ And to those who are on his left hand, [he will say] ‘Depart from me, accursed ones, to the eternal fire which is prepared for satan and his angels, for I was hungry and you gave me no food, I was thirsty and you gave me no drink,’ and so on. And they will answer, ‘Lord, when did we see you hungry or thirsty or a stranger or naked or sick or in prison and did not minister to you?’ Then he will answer them and say, ‘Truly I tell you, because you did it not to one of the least of these my brethren, you did it not to me.’ They will depart into eternal torments, and the just, to eternal life.” (Matt. 25:31-46)

Do you see how the merciful inherit eternal life and the unmerciful, eternal torment? Consider also the rich man and Lazarus, and the foolish and wise virgins; some crowned for their good works and others tormented because of their rude ways. Too, hear Daniel the prophet, who says, “You will wipe out your sins through mercy, and your wickedness with gifts to the poor.” (Daniel 4:27) And David says, “He distributed and gave to the poor; his righteousness endures for ever.” (Ps. 111:9)

Do you the same and you will live, through the grace of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, to whom with the Father and the Holy Spirit is due glory, dominion and honor.

Of the Same Kirakos Vardapet, On Sadness

Sadness is of two kinds, because there is a sadness which is godly: [the sadness] of repentance which leads to salvation without regret. And the second sadness is worldly: it produces death not only of the body, but of the soul. Witness Ahithophel and Judas, who killed themselves from sadness and were destroyed soul and body.

Whereas godly sadness is eternal life. Witness Enoch, who through his sadness and repentance was translated to immortality. [Or consider] David and Peter: the former kept his prophetic and kingly graces intact
through sadness and tears, saying, “I am weary with my groaning; all the night I wash my bed and with my tears I water my couch,” (Ps. 6:6) while the latter preserved his apostolic grace and his seat of seniority immaculate because “going out, he wept so bitterly” (Matt. 26:75/Luke 22:62) that his capillaries burst and instead of tears blood flowed from his eyes. And when Christ rose from the dead, He appeared to him first, and then to the other Apostles, as the Apostle Paul says: “He first appeared to Cephas, then to the other Apostles,” (I Cor. 15:5) and on the shore of the Sea of Tiberias He entrusted the faith to him with three questions, saying “Feed my sheep.” (John 21: 14-17) I forebear to mention the tax collector who beat his breast and the blessed prostitute who washed the Lord’s feet with her tears and wiped them with her hair. And all these were justified through spiritual sadness, as well as other innumerable figures ancient and new, which we cannot enumerate.

Worldly sadness, on the other hand, is harmful. It comes from unfulfilled desire, whether for food or for clothing or for gold and silver, or the desire of fornication, or anger or vanity or acedia. For when desire is thwarted in these things, it becomes sad. [Such] sadness is evil and blinds the luminosity of the mind, and darkens them. Whereas a modest person without possessions or passions is a strong tower, impregnable to the spirit of sadness. He is armored, and with helmet and shield and sword is he armed. [In fact,] the passionless person is even greater than this, because siege machinery tears down towers, and a sword or a forcefully shot arrow pierces armor, while the threat of sadness cannot overcome one without possessions. For if he lacks food and clothing, he embraces that voluntarily, and if he is despised by anyone, he testifies of himself that what he bears is little enough for his sins.

The avaricious person who suffers a loss is bitterly saddened and wastes away for love of his money when any of his possessions decreases, though it be ever so small. The one who despises possessions, on the other hand, remains unsaddened and even happy, though he suffer multiple losses and penalties like Job, who having lost his ten children in one day praised and blessed God, worshiped God and said, “Naked came I from my mother’s womb, and naked shall I return thither. The Lord gave, and the Lord has taken away. As it seemed pleasing to the Lord so did it come to pass. Blessed be the name of the Lord.” (Job 1:21) [He could say this] because when he had [them] he did not consider them as his own, but as God’s, and when they were
taken away, he attributed the deed to God’s providence. For that reason, he was not upset or sad, because he knew that everything which God does is good and beneficial.

Likewise the person who does not love possessions does not desire to accumulate and hoard them. If anyone takes what he has, he is not saddened, for he is not a servant of mammon, but of God, and he does not rejoice at the increase of possessions, but at the multiplication of faith and love with practical and theoretical virtue. As David says, “For this reason have I loved your law more than gold and topaz,” (Ps. 118:127) and again he says, “It is more to be desired than gold and than many precious stones, and it is sweeter than honey in the honeycomb.” (Ps. 19:10)

Let us likewise not be saddened over temporal things, whether over possessions or over the dead. As the Apostle says, “I would not that you be ignorant concerning the dead, lest you be saddened like those who have no hope of resurrection. Rather, we believe and hope that as they have died in dishonor, they will rise in glory, …and will be caught up in bright clouds to meet the Lord in the air, and so they will be with the Lord always, together with us” (I Thess. 4:13-17) in Christ Jesus our Lord, to whom be glory.

**Of the Same, Concerning Anger**

Anger is the roiling of the blood around the heart, causing fierce appetite rather than making it sad. Anger is of two kinds. There is good [anger], when it happens in the course of nature to be angry at the enemy and war against him, [as opposed to] being gentle towards one’s relations. [This anger is] like a dog who protects the flock of his master and chases away wolves and barks at and bites thieves and loves its master, and not infrequently dies for its master. In the same way is anger a protector of the spirit; it barks at and chases away the conceptual “wolf” and “thief;” it puts to flight one’s evil thoughts. But towards one’s brother one should be meek and sweet, and many times [one should even] lay down one’s life for one’s brother.

[Anger] outside the course of nature pours out its poison not against the enemy, but against one’s brother. As the prophet says, “Under their lips is the poison of vipers, whose mouths are full of curses and bitterness.” (Rom. 3:13-14) And again he says, “Their anger
is like that of the serpent, viper or asp, which closes its ears.” (Ps. 57:5)
Concerning this the Apostle James says, “Let every person be quick to hear and slow to speak, and slow to wrath, for the anger of man does not work the justice of God.” (James 1:19-20) And before him the Lord commanded, “Hear what was said to people of old, ‘Do not kill, for whoever kills is liable to judgment.’ But I say to you that everyone who is angry at his brother for no reason is liable to judgment, and whoever says to his brother, ‘Fool!’ is liable to court, and whoever calls his brother “Idiot!” is liable to the gehenna of fire.” (Matt. 5:21-22)

The Apostle Paul, following the Lord, also says, “Be angry, and do not sin. Let not the sun go down upon your wrath, and do not give place to satan,” (Eph. 4:26) because when people are angry and are not reconciled by sunset, the spirit of peace, which is God, departs from him, and the turbulent spirit, which is satan, takes up residence in him. For “God is love, and whoever remains in love, dwells in God, and God dwells in him.” (1 John 4:16) Satan is the opposite of God, and is called “hatred,” the opposite of love, and whoever dwells in hatred, dwells in satan, and satan dwells in him. In the night he sees various hallucinations, beasts and poisonous reptiles, and men attacking him with drawn sword, and he wakes up terrified and trembles with fear.

Whoever in a dream sees himself in a difficult and desolate place or drowning in the sea or in a river, or any other bitter scene which one sees in a dream, it is caused by going to sleep upset, and remaining unreconciled with one’s companion. So one ought to be reconciled before the setting of the sun, in order to chase away the upsetting demon and receive the guardian angel of peace and go to sleep undisturbed. One who has not done that becomes thereby the plaything of demons, during the daytime in thought and deed, and at night in dreams. If you wish to be free from the wiles of demons, lay hold on meekness, and even-temperredness. As the Apostle says, “Let all bitterness and wrath and anger and clamor and cursing be removed from among you, together with every evil.” (Eph. 4:31)

What is the difference between wrath and anger? I would say that the difference between wrath and anger lies in the will. Anger is such that the angry person can hold this passion in his thoughts only: the saying “Be angry, and do not sin,” makes this obvious. Whereas wrath is shown to be greater, for it says, “Their wrath is like a serpent’s.” (Ps. 57:7) “Herod was wrathful against the Tyrians and Sidonians.” (Acts 12:20) The emotion of wrath is called pusillanimity. And the malignant
composition of [its] malevolent evil is clear, for “anger destroys the wise,” says the Wise (Prov. 14:35), and “a soft answer turns away wrath, and a rough word stirs up anger.” (Prov. 15:1) Again he says, “A stone is heavy, and sand is hard to lift, but the anger of a fool is heavier than both.” (Prov. 27:3)

Sirach says, “The blows of a treacherous man are worse than wounds... whoever digs a pit for his friend will fill it himself.” (Sirach 27:26-28) And again he says, “Forgive your friend’s harm, and your sins will be forgiven you. For if you hold a grudge against your friend, how will you find forgiveness from the Lord?” (Sirach 28:2-3) And a little later he says, “An angry man stirs up conflict, and a sinful man disturbs friends and injects enmity into peace... If you blow on a spark, it is kindled, and if you spit upon it, it goes out. And both these things come from your mouth.” (Sirach 28:8-12) Again he says, “Curse both the slanderer and the double-tongued person alike, for they have destroyed many who were in peace. The tongue of a two-faced person has divided nation from nation and destroyed strong cities and dismantled great palaces... Whoever loves such a tongue will not find peace and will not be able to dwell in peace.” (Sirach 28:13-16)

David says concerning evil and angry people, “He has sharpened his treachery like a sharp razor; he has loved evil rather than good,” (Ps. 51:4-5) and the next verse tells what his reward is from God: “For this reason God will destroy him forever, pluck him up and remove him from his dwellings and his roots from the land of the living.” (Ps. 51:7-8)

Like rust corrupts iron, so do anger and vengefulness [corrupt] the heart of the angry person; the worm eats away... and jealousy and hatred wear down and wear out soul and body. So an angry person is recognized by his face: his eye is bleary and bloodshot, and his cheeks are withered and deformed, and they tell of his heart’s evil, whereas the face of a meek person is recollected and restrained, and has a sweet-eyed and pleasant appearance, because he is seen to be with the spirit’s grace. Mist and fog thicken the air and the emotion of wrath [thickens] the mind of the angry; a dark and dense cloud conceals the rays of the sun, and the Thought of anger and vengefulness obscures the luminosity of the mind.

Vengefulness made Cain a fratricide; wavering and wandering he went about upon the earth under the Creator’s curse. Esau’s vengefulness against his brother estranged him from God and from the blessing of his parents. I leave aside the brethren of Joseph, who being
jealous of their brother sold him into Egypt. Jealousy destroyed Dathan and Abiram with all their families, for the earth opened and swallowed Dathan and covered over the dwellings of Abiram. And Korah, being jealous of Moses, was destroyed by fire, with his two hundred and fifty.

There is a jealousy which is good—like that of Phinehas and Elijah, for by killing Zimri the former put an end to death among the people, and the latter being zealous for the Lord overthrew the prophets of Baal. The Apostle Paul says to “be zealous for graces which are good,” (II Cor. 12:31) and he says, “I shall make you zealous with zeal for God.” (II Cor. 11:2) Wherefore, flee from anger, and from evil jealousy and follow after meekness and valor and zeal, that you may be worthy of God’s kingdom by the grace and mercy of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, to whom with the Father and the Holy Spirit is due glory, dominion and honor, now and always and forever.

**Of the Same, Concerning Acedia**

The demon of *acedia* is the most weighty of all the demons, and is called the one “of noonday,” (Ps. 9:16) for the other demons resemble the rising or setting of the sun inasmuch as they take hold of the soul from one side. But the demon of *acedia* is like noon. At the noonday hour the sun seizes upon the body from all sides; because it stands overhead the light surrounds the entire body. In this way the noonday demon too surrounds all the soul’s parts and suffocates the soul in itself.

The others are like the rising or the setting of the sun because like the sun when it rises touches one side of the body, and when it sets [it touches] the other side: thus the demon of anger seizes only upon the emotive part, and the demon of fornication [seizes only upon] the part which desires, and the other demons likewise. But the noonday demon, as we have said, troubles the soul in every aspect, by foolishness, anger, desire and all the passions.

*Acedia* is a debility of the self. The Self is debilitated when it does not possess fortitude by nature, and cannot stand against temptations bravely. Just as food is the strength of a sound body, likewise also temptation [is the nourishment] of a valiant person. The hot wind dried up the seed which fell on rocky soil; so also [is] the soul which cannot stand temptations [dried up]. The north wind fattens and sprouts roots, and temptations firm the brave and valiant soul. A strong wind cannot
topple the tree settled and held firm by its roots, and the demon of *acedia* cannot topple the patient and restrained soul.

An impatient monk is dry desert grass, which is blown to and fro by the wind ceaselessly; it rests for a little, and then tumbles about again. A plant transferred from place to place bears no fruit; likewise also a wandering monk becomes unfruitful in good works. If you put water in an unfired clay pot, it is easily... and spoiled, whereas the one baked with fire is hardened and becomes a useful vessel for water and all things. Likewise also the soul which is not baked in the fire of temptation does not become a vessel of the Spirit's grace, for what is easily come by is easily devalued. But the one who is fired through bearing many temptations by the demon of *acedia* receives the water of the Spirit’s grace and becomes a chosen vessel of God, for what is hard-won is carefully kept.

Clouds without moisture are driven and evaporated by the wind, and a monk who has no tears [is blown about] by the appearance of the demon of *acedia*. The holy Evagrius says, when thoughts of the Warring One come into your heart, do not pray vaguely but sharpen the spear of tears against the champion, so that if we attack strongly with it, we may quickly turn the champion to flight from us.

As Evagrius says, the demon of *acedia* comes upon the monk at the third hour, and besieges his soul until the ninth hour. And first it makes the sun appear to move slowly, or not to move at all, as if the day were fifty hours long. Or it makes him look constantly out of the window, and tries to make him run out of his cell and look at the sun frequently to see how much longer until the ninth hour, and look around to see if any of the brothers are visible. Too, it throws in hatred of the place and the way of life and even with the work of his hands, [making him think that] love has diminished from among the brothers and there is no one to console him, and if it should be that any one of the brothers has offended the monk, the demon uses that as an extra factor to increase his hatred. Again, it leads his desire away from wild places to a place where his needs might be more easily met, and introduces the idea that it would be much easier and more convenient [elsewhere], and tells him that it is not only in one place that a person can be pleasing to the Lord but the name of the Lord is blessed in all locations. Again, it brings to him memories of his family and his previous way of life, and depicts the time of his life as a disciple as being long, and sets the labor of it before his eyes. And everything that
anyone might say it raises up as devices to the end that the monk leave his cell and flee from that calling, and forsake the field of battle.

Now, no other demon follows this one, but a solidity of peace and an unspeakable joy finds the souls of the fighters after the battle. For the demon of acedia attacks with all the demons, and when you have been found victorious against him in the power of God, you have vanquished all the demons. But do not be careless, for the enemy loves to return brazenly and fight again. For this reason the Lord warns, “Be vigilant and pray at all times.” (Matt. 26:41) And again he says, “Whoever endures to the end will be saved.” (Matt. 10:22) and “You shall possess your souls through patience.” (Luke 21:19) And the Apostle Paul says in the Letter to the Hebrews that “You need patience, so that having done the will of God you may attain the promise.” (Heb. 10:36) Before him David the Prophet said, “I waited patiently for the Lord, and he regarded me and heard my prayer.” (Ps. 39:2) So it is through much difficulty that we must into the eternal rest in Christ Jesus the Lord, to whom with the Father and the Holy Spirit be glory now and always and forever.

Of the Same, Concerning Vainglory

Vainglory is an unnatural passion and easily befalls virtuous persons. Harmful weeds sprout up near a plant; it is entwined by them and when they reach the tip of the plant they wither it. Vainglory, too, sprouts up near the virtuous person and is not spurned by him until it cuts off his strength. The vainglorious person is a farmer without wages: he bears the toil, and comes out without any part of his reward, because he fasts to please people, and his prayers and charity are not for God’s sake but for the sake of human glory, and that is his wages, according to the admonition of the Gospel. (Matt. 6:2,5,16)

Since a name is an abbreviated definition and a definition is an expanded name, so the person who wants the admiration of other people is named “vainglorious.” Like an empty ear of wheat which may appear like a [full] ear to those who see it but when you examine it, it has no kernels and is useless to the sower, so also are the virtues of the vainglorious. It appears to people that they are just and worship God, but instead of worshiping God they worship people, and they are not blessed but lamentable. The Lord calls them woeful, saying, “Woe to
you scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites, who devour the houses of widows while making a pretense of long prayers; you shall receive the greater judgment.” (Matt. 23:14) And they are like the Pharisee and the tax collector who went up to the Temple to pray: the Pharisee was destroyed by his vaunted justice and went down to his house a sinner, while the tax collector confessed his sins, beat his breast and said, “God forgive me my sins.” He went down to his house justified, rather than the Pharisee, (Luke 18: 9-14) for the prayers of the fatuous do not rise up to heaven but to people on earth. Because he does not seek God’s glory but human glory, he is called “vainglorious,” and a “laborer in vain.”

And it is [true] that, according to the Apostle, “All flesh is grass, and all human glory is like the flower of the grass. The grass withers and the flower fades, but the word of the Lord stands forever.” (I Peter 1:24-25) “For everything which is in the world, “the lust of the flesh and the lust of the eyes and the pride of this life is not from the Father, but from this world, and the world passes away and the lust thereof; but he who does the will of God abides for ever.” (I John 2:16-17) And the Apostle Paul says in the Letter to the Galatians, “If we live by the spirit let us also be one in the spirit and let us not be vain, vaunting ourselves to one another and envying one another.” (Gal. 5:25-26) To the Philippians, too, he says, “[Do] nothing for incitement and nothing according to conceit, but in humility let us consider one another better than ourselves.” (Phil. 2:3)

So let us not lust after temporal glory and riches and authority, but after the glory eternal and after the Kingdom of Christ. As the Apostle says, “If we endure, we shall reign with him,” (II Tim. 2:12) and the Lord said, “Where I am, there shall my servant also be” (John 12:26)—of which may we be worthy through the grace and mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Of the Same, Concerning Pride

Pride is the beginning and the culmination of all evils. For satan became the first to bequeath us pride, by turning against the Creator. He fell from heaven like lightening, and became darkened and received his name. And then he deceived the woman through trickery, pretending that she would become god, and through the woman [he
deceived] Adam and expelled him from Paradise. Instead of becoming
god, Adam inherited the curse and death, together with his offspring.

For God had first created man unsullied in body and without
sickness and death, and sinless in soul and holy like himself. It says,
"God created man in his own image, in the image of God created He
him." (Gen. 1:27) And how is man in God's image? God is holy, and
he made man holy like Himself; God is good, and he created man good
like Himself; God is just, and he adorned man with justice. Why should
I list these things one by one? He gave to mankind the seeds of all his
goodness, so that the good seeds of the one who received should not be
less than those of the Giver, as Gregory the Theologian says.

So long as he did not transgress the commandment, he was without
pain or death in body, and sinless and just in spirit, like God. When he
forgot the Creator's command and heeded the advice of the tempter,
who through trickery fed him the fruit of the tree from which God had
commanded him not to eat, and he disobediently ate it, he was stripped
of the divine glory, and sickness and death entered into his flesh and sin
and spiritual death [entered] into his nature.

Pride became the origin and the root of all evils. For as satan
himself through pride fell from heaven, likewise also did he deceive
and bring down man through pride. Then, springing out of pride as
from roots, there flourished other branches: gluttony and impurity and
all the rest. Whoever wishes to overcome these by God's help must first
cut out pride, the root, and the rest will wither with it. But if the root
remain in place, it is of no use for you to cut away at the rest. Because
it will put out even more shoots from the root than at first, according
to the Lord's parable that [relates], "The impure spirit when it went out of
a man wandered about in a desert place, and when it found no rest, it
said, 'I shall return to the home from which I came,' and coming, it
found the place empty, cleaned and garnished. And it took with it seven
devils worse than itself, and came and dwelt there, and the end of that
man was worse than the beginning." (Matt. 12:43-45)

Just as pride is the root of all sin, so also the root and foundation of
all good is humility. For this reason, the Lord set humility at the
beginning of his Teaching, saying, "Blessed are the poor in spirit, for
theirs is the kingdom of heaven." (Matt. 5:3) And again [he says],
"Learn of me, for I am meek and lowly of heart, and you will find rest
for your souls," (Matt. 11:29) and, "Whoever humbles himself will be
exalted, and whoever exalts himself will be humbled." (Matt.
23:12/Luke 14:11) So just as by the counsel of the tempter we fell from heaven through pride, so also by the counsel of the Savior we may ascend to heaven through humility.

Pride is worse than impurity and murder, for [those who commit] these know that they have committed a lawless deed and regret it and repent and find forgiveness, like David who through repentance and tears atoned for his adultery and murder. But pride is a blind passion, and cannot see its destructiveness, and does not accept healing and advice. Such were the Scribes and Pharisees, who did not listen to Christ because they were proud. As the Lord said, "How could you believe? For you receive your glory from one another, and you do not seek the glory which comes from the one God." (John 5:44) [They are like] the eye, [which] sees everything—heaven and earth and whatever is in them—but cannot see itself and does not comprehend its own disease but requires others to see and tell it. Just as the eye gives light to the body, so also the mind is the eye of the soul. It sees all the soul's parts, its anger and its desire, and when it errs it judges and rebukes and upbraids it by means of the conscience. Pride is a disease of the rational faculty, and diseases the mind so that it cannot see, like the eye of the body cannot see when it is bloodshot or jaundiced. But when others see [the problem] and tell a person, he believes them and goes to the doctor and is freed from the ailment. The proud person, too, is like this. He cannot see the disease of his soul, and if he does not heed spiritual physicians and does not believe them and does not humble himself, he is destroyed with an everlasting destruction. "God resists the proud, and gives grace to the humble," (I Peter 5:5) and who can heal the proud when God is against him? For nothing happens without God, and will not happen.

Pride comes from foolishness and ignorance. The Apostle, saying, "What do you have that you did not receive? And why do you boast of it as if you had not received it? " (I Cor. 4:7) shows that we have received everything from God; whether we have a soul or a body or a mind or wisdom or power they are all gifts of God and are not yours but God's, and the glory is God's, the Maker and the Creator. Why do you usurp God's glory and consider it your own, and become proud? Give glory and praise for good things to their Giver, from whom you came and by whom you were created and from whom you have your very being and power and effectiveness for spiritual and physical work. As the Apostle says, "In him we live and move and have our being."
(Acts 17:28) If whatever you have is from God, why are you proud? Give God praise for it all. As the Apostle says, "Give thanks always and for everything, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ to God the Father. Be subject to one another out of reverence for Christ," (Eph. 5:20-21) so that you may be worthy of the kingdom of heaven through Christ Jesus our Lord, to whom is due glory and honor and power with the Father and the Holy Spirit, now and always.

Blessed is God! Amen. Glory to the Holy Trinity and One Godhead unto the ages of ages, Amen.

(Colophon)

Now we offer thanks and praise to the consubstantial Holy Trinity, Father and Son and Holy Spirit, who has given ability to my dead spirit and weak self to conclude the writing of this "General Epistle" by St. Nersēs the Grace-filled and [works by] other teachers, respected spiritual admonitions to all bishops and priests, monks and people of the land.

Now, this was written by the hand of an unworthy individual falsely called a priest, a faulty scribe named Zacharia, at the request and for the enjoyment of the hermit and pure lover of holiness, this virtuous, holy and chosen priest, Lord Parsam who is from Tbilisi. It was written in the holy and renowned congregation of the Holy Enlightener at the grave of Vardihar in the monastery of Ankunik' and [under the auspices] of the other saints who are gathered therein. It was written in the Armenian year 925 (=1476) on the 20th of December, in the primacy of Patriarch Astuacatur1 and the episcopate of Lord Grigorios, and in the khanate of Hasan Beg.

---

1 It is not clear to whom this refers. The only Catholicos of Ejmiacin named Astuacatur was Astuacatur I, who reigned from 1715-1725, while in Cilicia, Astuacatur II reigned from 1695-ca. 1703. There were no catholicoses by that name in the See of Aghtamar.
PSYCHOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS CONCERNING CHRISTIAN Penance

Michael Merry

Thick-headed commentators upon the Bible, and stupid preachers and teachers, work more damage to religion than sensible, cool-brained clergymen can fight away again, toil as they may.¹

What Twain felt so viscerally to be the case with wrong-headed theology in American Protestantism of the nineteenth-century, we can also assume to be true of penance in much of church history. Indeed, to broach the subject of penance in our own time is to conjure up rigorist anecdotes involving deprecatory individuals from yesterday, among them a self-flagellating French Jesuit and a half mutilated Syrian eremite, a sad, reproached Spanish Friar and a scorned, gaunt-faced Russian recluse. But does this picture, with its familiar fixation on sexual sins,² and embellished with a cinematic panache that only the film industry could muster, do justice to our subject? Do these stark, Hawthornian images, etched in our minds from popular film and literature (including ascetic literature), manage to embrace the far more complex web of penitential practice that we find in the annals of history, and moreover in our own day? Hardly. In this short paper, we will consider the practice—or, lack of practice—of penance today in the Orthodox Church in North America.

¹ M. TWAIN, The Innocents Abroad (New York, 1966), 304.
² "What was at issue to begin with at the tribunal of penance was sex insofar as it was the basis of relations; the questions posed had to do with the commerce allowed or forbidden (...)" M FOUCAULT, The History of Sexuality: an introduction, vol. 1 (New York, 1978), 107. Today, sexual liberty is a sociological given, and is very often "harmonized with profitable conformity." Cf. H. MARCUSE, Eros and Civilization: A Philosophical Inquiry into Freud (New York, 1955), 86.
One does not have to look very long to notice the veritable lack of penance in our own times, at least when compared to more extreme, self-effacing versions like those alluded to above. Penance until fairly recently had a much more public face, and even in colonial America the New England “city set on a hill,” Puritan though it was, set about to demarcate strict, unrelenting lines between the godly elect and those who were not. Today we ask, righteous or intolerant? Today we go for the jugular: holiness or sanctimoniousness? Like Twain, we have grown weary of religion made onerous, and look askance at penance as that which infringes on our sovereignty, our freedom.

Answers to the questions thusly posed do not come easy, though we have grown habituated to labeling all things “set apart” as suspect and the stuff of cults. Penance goes hand in hand with these concerns. For penance, defined as suffering submitted to as an expression of penitence, demands something of a group’s members that may very well exact a heavy price. Loyalty to one’s group may be at stake. To the outsider, this unremitting kind of commitment to something or someone smacks of psychological demagoguery of one sort or another, and our pastors—many of them anyway—have hardly begun to address this problem.

Penance previously took on many varied forms. Penance today, however—outside of strategically secluded monasteries—seldom relegates the penitent one(s) to positions “outside the walls” as it were; nor have we witnessed any consignment of persons to the narthex for any length of time in recent days. Doubtless this lessening of penance in visible, corporate forms is given impetus by our ever-increasing appreciation of the psychological sciences and their mitigating effect on our judgment of others. Today we can, indeed we are prone, to see more subtle “forces” at work—namely psycho-somatic ones—in those who confess to wrongdoing, and even to those who don’t. Tolerance has replaced chauvinism; mercy and understanding have done away with expatriation. This is not to say that mercy and tolerance were nowhere to be found in previous centuries, but only that today we do not look for recourse in strictures and physical displacement in the

---

3 Penitence means, “sorrow for sin or repentance.” Collins GEM English Dictionary (Glasgow, 1987), 388.
same manner. Today we rarely believe separation from the Eucharistic community to be a necessary means to rapprochement with the church.

Today we ask whether mercy abounds towards the individual(s) in question before they've "repented." We typically eschew the extremisms of bygone days as imperious and hopelessly diffident to the communal aspects of the person in need. Today, more than ever, we scrupulously avoid penitential ritualism and invoke St. Paul⁴ to buttress our contention that penance, exercised too strenuously, does little good. We smile upon our ancestry with magnanimous indulgence, bemused by the turgid presumption of grace obtained through asceticism. We reluctantly concede a salutary effect to those engaged in such privation owing to another—more ascetically minded—dispensation.

But to dispense penance in similar fashion today is to risk too much. People unhesitatingly abandon the church, petulant and bitter over the slightest resistance, the sparsest judgment, from the hierarchy. Has this something to do with the peculiar phenomenon in this country that we have come to recognize as the all-consuming need for self-esteem and affirmation? Perhaps. Might it have something to do with an "individualistic" culture wherein personal autonomy and "conspicuous consumption" (Baudrillard) is above all prized? Possibly. Plenty of self-styled social critics (e.g., Bloom, Bennett, Postman, Hirsch, int. al.) have made these claims more—and mostly less—effectively, but is this very helpful? Most improbably. More constructive, pastoral ways of interpreting the dramatic shift in penitential practice must be sought out.

Very often we hear that the church is holy, its members' sins and shortcomings notwithstanding. Individual sin, then, becomes problematic for a host of reasons: how will we gauge whether someone has measured up to a particular standard of holiness? Whose standard shall we adhere to? Shall we follow the letter or the spirit of its norms? These and other questions beset the pastor today, and portend difficulties in maintaining the delicate, even tenuous, balance between individual and corporate accountability. But is penance still being widely practiced today? Here we move to our focus.

Confession is arguably the only vestigial practice of penance routinely performed by Orthodox Christians throughout the world. That is not to

---

⁴ Col. 2:23; 1 Tim. 4:8.
say that confession is widely adhered to; indeed, confession is now the bugbear of many a parishioner. Priests, too, regularly complain of the veritable lack of penitents in the confessional “booth.” Even so, confession is still a “normal” part of church life in a way that being ephemerally exiled from the church building itself is not.

There are a host of reasons why confession, however, is no longer taken very seriously,\(^5\) among them the aversion to gratuitous guilt over petty offenses. Persons are now likely to ask themselves which sins—and over what length of time—really need a formal confession. Indeed, divorce, abortion and infidelity—as in all times—are commonplace, but now devoid of shock value. What offends the sensibilities of persons today has shifted in more ways than one; child abuse and murder certainly continue to incite righteous indignation, but so do racial prejudice and religious intolerance. These have become the capital sins of our time and not anger, deceit, pride and vindication.

Today’s priest—as well as parishioner—is more inclined to think of the human “vices” as modern psychologists think of them, \(\text{viz.}, \) that they are more or less normal aspects of human development, and while they may need improving, they are not altogether “bad,” and certainly no worse than anyone else’s “hang-ups.” We can make little sense of the ceaseless groveling in one’s own sense of worthlessness, with no small amount of materialistic dualism thrown in for good measure. Yet there are also a great number of priests, let us not be remiss to mention, who ardently believe in the salvific effects of confession. But too often one hears these selfsame priests lamenting the number of persons who don’t come to confession, thus intimating that, in the final analysis, it really is a needful requirement to be in good stead with the church, both qualitatively and quantitatively.

With reference to sin and our proclivity to confess it formally, there is too great a likelihood that we will shy away from such “pastoral care” with the assurance that one can derive just as much cathartic good from venting with a confidant or receiving empathic listening from a trained psychologist.\(^6\) Priests—too many of them anyway—are not known for having cultivated listening skills, and fewer still know the

---

\(^5\) We will confine our remarks to contemporary practice, and will not discuss the reasons for lack of going to confession—particularly as it relates to partaking of the Eucharist—in the time prior to the liturgical “revival” in the mid-twentieth century.

\(^6\) We shall look more closely at the similarities and differences of psychotherapy and confession shortly. See \textit{infra}, 123.
art of empathy. Too often the person who desires to receive absolution today is convinced that such forgiveness conferred by another is wholly unnecessary and would gladly prefer—if an ultimatum were given—abstaining from participation in the Eucharist to an unnerving disclosure of "private" sins.\(^7\)

Today we are irremediably shaped and conditioned according to entirely different demographic equations, economies, population trends, and national and world-shaping events.\(^8\) What has become normal—indeed, devastatingly consistent—is \textit{change}. Penance, therefore, does not meet the "felt needs" of today's religious consumer, and if our religion were a commodity in a vast sea of equally viable options, we would prefer finding more "discreet" religion.

In the Orthodox Church(es), we find ourselves very much a part of this evanescent milieu. Our faithful are not "old country" types who see in the priest the sole means of communication with God.\(^9\) Our faithful are measurably more educated than ever before as well. Very often the parish priest has received considerably less education—including theological education—than many in the parish, thus undermining his "authority" that in many ways was previously taken for granted. Today many view the corporate Eucharistic prayers of forgiveness themselves as quite adequate to the task of confession, and moreover interpret the Eucharist as that which grafts one into the Body of Christ and not as the "reward" for having done so prior to participation. "What is the need for formal confession?" has become a tacit query for many indeed.

Enter now questions related to psychotherapy and its differences (if any) with the act of confession. Psychotherapy can be defined as "an

---

\(^7\) In the Christian West, up through the end of the eighteenth century, "three major explicit codes—apart from the customary regularities and constraints of opinion—governed sexual practices: canonical law, the Christian pastoral [i.e., confession], and civil law. They determined, each in its own way, the division between licit and illicit." M. Foucault, \textit{op. cit.}, 37. The Christian East (e.g., in Russia) was little different, and the confessional experience was often a relentless interrogation of one's innermost desires, but alas, invariably with a penchant for the sexual.


\(^9\) Here we shall assume the modern practice of seeing the priest, and not the monk or nun, for confession.
expressive procedure [used] to alleviate a psychological problem.¹⁰ Many religious persons both administer and receive psychotherapeutic treatment, oftentimes coupling psychoanalytic procedures with spiritual wisdom. Confession, while there is no prescriptive definition known to theologians, refers—quite similarly—to the alleviation of psychological problems, though with one critical difference, namely the spiritual dimension of the problems being addressed.¹¹ These "problems" are conventionally referred to as sin.

A psychoanalyst, like a father/mother confessor, endeavors to help the "patient" discern traces of behavior and thought patterns that give rise to recurring problems of conscience, including obsessive/compulsive behavior, chronic feelings of inadequacy and even depression. The Rogerian¹² school of psychotherapy—arguably the best known and most widely practiced in the sixties and seventies—aims at three levels of tacit communication with the person being counseled: empathy, genuineness and unconditional acceptance. But while these aspects of Carl Rogers' psychotherapy are commendable—indeed, to be emulated—they stop well short of what confession seeks to do. For the confessional, in traditional Christian practice, has been much more than "active listening" with the hope that the person being counseled will solve his own problems. Indeed, the confessional has been referred to as a sacramental encounter, and moreover, one in which sins are forgiven, very specific guidance is given, and grace is conferred.¹³

¹¹ Psychotherapy and pastoral confession seem uncannily similar, however, inasmuch as the "patient" is likely to feel existentially "maladjusted" or dissatisfied when one's self-concept (be it religious or otherwise) is at odds with one's experience in the environment—that is, when the self and experience lack congruence. "This discrepancy can be diminished when an individual is provided with a nonthreatening environment in which to make efforts at self-awareness." FERNALD, op. cit., 320.
¹² C. ROGERS, On Becoming a Person: A Therapist's View of Psychotherapy (Boston, 1961); id., Freedom to Learn (Columbus, 1979). The Rogerian school has been called the "person-centered" approach.
¹³ It is not altogether clear just what this grace is or how it is manifested in persons apart from theological speculation and willed belief. This is not to discredit the Christian claim, but merely to point to the ostensible lack of "evidence" for such a claim, as confession is situated within a faith system. Grace, to a psychotherapist, is a conundrum of religious adherence.
However that may be, while the priest is not infrequently concerned to ferret out the “latent content” of the person in question, as well as see concrete development in the life of the “patient,” the spiritual diagnosis often overrides the other aspects of the personality and very often obscures more complex issues that lie just beneath the surface. In fact, what most people will feel a confession to have done is to have bestowed a very privileged permission to walk away from such an “encounter” (brief though it typically is) with a clean conscience, obviating any feelings of guilt, remorse, or spiritual lethargy. In other words, confession very often has the effect of dealing only with one’s “religious life” and seldom the whole person.

Psychotherapy is not terribly concerned with attaining a tabula rasa before God. Rather, the stress is laid on a process of becoming (Frankl) a fuller human person. Various means are employed in order to ascertain the root of the problem, of which the behaviors in question are only symptomatic. Confession, too, is concerned with such “roots,” though they are more predictably spiritual in nature. Likewise confession—in theory anyway—is committed to the human person brought to completion. Both approaches, however, sadly tend to be reductive. For religious persons, spiritual “causes” take on preeminent importance, but all too often cloud the more reasonable—and systemic—dynamics that lurk just beyond the confessor’s assessment. For the psychotherapist, religious questions—beyond their merely idiosyncratic psychological value—are of little relevance to personal development. Hence the profoundest impetus in life for millions of people, becomes either at once discarded or, to a large extent, ignored.

Fr. Stanley Harakas writes, “there is little or no true spiritual development in the Christian life without [confession].” Put another way, infrequent participation in communion seems to require, in the opinion of Harakas, the need for confession as sacramentally efficacious to one’s spiritual well being. Even so, he proffers guidance

---

14 C. ROGERS, A Way of Being (Boston, 1980). One may also be reminded of Maslow’s “motivational hierarchy” that was meant to culminate in a process of self-actualization, which may be described as the desire to reach one’s highest potential. A. MASLOW, Motivation and Personality (New York, 1954); id., Toward a Psychology of Being (Princeton, 1962). Cf. E. ERIKSON, Childhood and Society, 2nd ed. (New York, 1963).

15 S. HARAKAS, The Orthodox Church: 455 Questions and Answers (Minneapolis, 1987), 87.
from one’s spiritual mentor—according to each person’s situation—as the best prescriptive approach. Above all, Harakas encourages his readers to view confession as a privileged opportunity for reconciliation with God.

Confession also has ethical dimensions. Who of us could forget, after all, the oft-repeated biblical injunction to do good works? Who of us doesn’t remember that we are known by our fruits? Perhaps, then, it is helpful to think of confession as having a medicinal effect on one’s conscience, for receiving guidance from a spiritual father or mother may very well enable one to strive unto the “fruits of repentance.” And hence, perhaps confession is both expedient and contributive to our spiritual progress in a day and age when submission to any kind of authority, including any kind of self-denial, is anathema.

Perchance if we returned to an understanding of confession (being one relevant form of penance) as an opportunity to disclose our inner lives to “ordained” advisors of the church, thereby receiving timely assistance and coming “to experience more fully God’s liberating grace,”16 we would come to treasure this sacramental encounter as an emancipation from the tyranny of private sin. This type of penance may very well enable one to throw off the shackles of self-sufficiency and cast aside the all-consuming need for independence from the help of others. To return to ethics, however, penance of some kind is a requisite ingredient in a “formula” for spiritual fortitude. For if by penance we mean demonstrating real repentance, then penance is a must, for only inasmuch as we have practiced virtue “unto the least of these,” will we attain unto salvation.

---

PROBLEMS THAT RESULT FROM LOCATING SPIRITUALITY IN THE PSYCHE

Rama P. Coomaraswamy

As my body without my Soul is a carcass, so is my Soul without Thy Spirit, a chaos, a dark obscure heap of empty faculties: ignorant of itself, insensible of Thy goodness, blind to Thy glory: dead in sins and trespasses. Having eyes, I see not, having ears, I hear not.

Thomas Traherne¹

...The Subconscious, not the intellect, is the organ through which Man lives his spiritual life, it is the fount of poetry, music, and the visual arts, and the channel through which the Soul is in communion with God.

Arnold Toynbee²

If we carefully consider the human soul in its nature, we see two different regions in it: the one belongs to the sensible order, the other to the supersensible or intellectual order. The sensible part of the soul is that which is common to men and animals; it includes the external senses and the internal senses which comprise the imagination, the sensible memory, and the sensitive appetites, whence spring the various passions or emotions which we call sensible love and hatred, desire

¹ Thomas Traherne was an Anglican Divine (1637-1674); the quotation is from the often published Centuries, 93 (original manuscript in the Bodleian Library, Oxford).
and aversion, sensible joy and sadness, hope and despair, audacity, fear, and anger. All this sensitive life exists in the animal whether its passions are mild like those of the dove or lamb, or whether they are strong like those of the wolf or lamb. Above this sensitive part common to men and animals, our nature likewise possesses an intellectual part which is common to men and angels, although it is far more vigorous and beautiful in the angel. By this intellectual part our soul towers above the body, this is why we say the soul is spiritual. True intelligence which alone deserves the name of intellect unqualified, is a faculty which, if it not be hindered as a result of insubordination on the part of the lesser faculties, its appointed handmaids, will fly straight to the mark. It does not think; it sees. The catalyzing of this power to see, which everyone bears within himself, whether he be aware of it or not, is the aim of spiritual method, in every man.

Marco Pallis

Arnold Toynbee has clearly delineated the prevailing attitudes and convictions about the nature of “spirituality.” This opinion however is a gross distortion, the consequences of which are fraught with dangers for those who legitimately seek out the “higher” things in life. Our psyches, which include not only our subconscious drives, but also our egos and our thinking processes are notoriously unstable in the sense that what we think or feel at any given time can easily shift and change. Moreover, they fail to embrace the totality of what we are as human beings. That spirituality should have its foundation on such “shifting sands” belies its intrinsic nature, for spirituality, if it be true and real, must be established on more solid ground. At the same time, it ignores what is most central to our nature as human beings made in the image of God. It almost inevitably follows that Spirituality has become divorced from religion, from true intellectuality, from reason, and even

---

3 From a private letter to Sri Iengar.
from common sense; and that some of the most bizarre cults become characterized as religion. ⁴

One of the reasons for this is that currently there is considerable confusion between “religion” and “belief systems.” Indeed, there is an attempt on the part of certain academics to reduce all religions to “belief systems” that have somehow “caught on” and become accepted by large numbers of people. But there is a distinction to be made between them, for genuine religions are based on revelation, which provide them with a fixed creed, code and cult that is independent of any individual thought or feeling, while belief systems not based on revelation are inevitably subject to human opinion. One recognizes of course that many founders of sects base themselves partially on revelation—accepting what they like and rejecting what they find offensive—and that almost all of them claim to be inspired by the Holy Spirit. But the fact remains that all of them are based in part, if not completely, on the thinking and understanding of a human person. The problem is that such thinking and feeling resides in the psyche and is subject to illusion, a problem that can only be avoided by adhering to a fixed external source. Unfortunately, many religious representatives currently attack the revealed basis of their faith in an attempt to accommodate them to the values of the modern world which in effect reduces them to the same level as other belief systems.

If one agrees that most of our belief systems are based on feelings and thoughts—all properties that, as will be shown, lie within the realm of the psyche—it follows that it becomes impossible to criticize any given belief system. As everyone’s psyche and thoughts are of equal value, it follows that all religions and belief systems are of equal value because everyone’s truth or beliefs—provided they do not create a problem for others—become acceptable. For one to say that any given cult or religion is false is an act of presumption which no one dares to express. Moreover, it is thought that it is this kind of exclusive outlook that has led to conflict and war—all in the name of God—and hence such attitudes must be eschewed. However much we like to indulge these in the name of God or Democracy, they remain the root cause of

⁴ Huston Smith has expressed the opinion that “the human mind stands ready to believe anything—absolutely anything—as long as it offers an alternative to the desacralized mechanomorphic outlook of objective science.” Cleansing the Doors of Perception: The Religious Significance of Entheogenic Plants and Chemicals (New York: Tarcher/Putnam, 2000), p. 145.
conflicts—like "our lust and greed" in St. Paul's thought. In the practical order, whatever works for an individual is considered acceptable. And indeed, psychiatrists are now recognizing that "religion" has its use in that it helps people face problems in life, and a belief in the afterlife makes death easier to deal with.\footnote{Psychoses expressed in religious forms is a natural result, when sick people have been brought up in a religious atmosphere. As William Wilson concludes: "In summary, it can be said that religion or religious experiences do not play a significant role in the etiology of schizophrenia. Religion can and does influence behavior as a result of its effect on the content of the patients thinking. Because of the blunted affect associated with schizophrenia, religious experiences are uncommon once the psychopathology has developed. They do however, occur frequently in psychotic state... Symptomatically, religion colors the illness of both manic and depressed patients. Religious beliefs can profoundly color the behavior of manic patients because of their increased affective tone and energy may act on their religious delusions. These delusions are exaggerations of normal religious beliefs and impulses, in contrast to those of schizophrenics that are bizarre and autistic. Many patients are often moved to preach, pray long prayers, indulge in exaggerated liturgical exercises, and are witness to the marvels of their religious experiences to any and all who will listen." "Religion and Psychoses," in Harold K. Koenig, ed., Handbook of Religion and Mental Health (San Diego: Academic Press, 1998), section III.11.}

Many people like to describe themselves as "non-believers." I have never met a "nonbeliever." Most people believe in evolution and that they themselves are the product of an ongoing evolution which makes them more intelligent than their ancestors. They believe in the inevitable progress of mankind towards a united humanity which will be socialist in its organization (without however reducing their personal holdings). They admit that things aren't perfect yet, but with the help of science such defects can be corrected. In essence they are sincerely convinced in the perfectibility of the world, and above all of man. This evolutionary secular "vision" was well described by H. G. Wells' Outline of History in the 20's which clearly replaced the Glory of God with the principle of Homo Mensura—man as the measure of all things. Many of these ideas may not be clearly thought out or formulated, but then the same can be said of the belief system of many Catholics—it is simply accepted without much thought.

Behind all this confusion is a certain "self image" of what we are as human beings. It is easy for philosophers to specify the origin of this self image, but most people don't read philosophy or even think in terms of the nature of man. However, it is useful to have some idea of the philosophical background involved. Now in some ways one can trace
this back to the fall of Adam, but more immediately, we can start with Descartes. Descartes taught that all reality could be encompassed by and was limited by what he called *res extensa*, that which has extension and therefore could be measured, and *res cogitans*, what we could think about. Such ideas took some time to permeate society, but from the middle of the 1800s this Descartian dualism has been the philosophical bedrock of scientific endeavor, as well as a great influence on all branches of academia, as well as the political and social order.

This Cartesian self image is vastly different from that which virtually all of mankind held prior to relatively modern times. Because of our convictions about progress and evolution we have blinded ourselves to other possibilities. How could we even consider examining the opinions of our forefathers prior to the time of Descartes? We might study them as part of a historical survey—usually in slightly distorted form—but to take seriously what they said and apply it in our own lives, that would be foolish, like attempting to reverse the hands of the clock. And so it is that we are stuck with our self image and refuse to consider any alternative. It may surprise us to know that our self image is not exactly new. Boethius in the sixth century commented that those who think man is only an animal who reasons have forgotten who and what they are. Be this as it may, let us for a moment consider the more traditional (traditional in the sense of “handed down”) view of man.

This Traditional view sees man as consisting of three parts: Spirit, Psyche (which includes our usual thinking processes) and Body. The following table outlines this in various cultures:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catholic</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Semitic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spirit</td>
<td>Spiritus (Animus vel Intellectus)</td>
<td>Pneuma (vel Nous)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psyche</td>
<td>Anima</td>
<td>Psyche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body</td>
<td>Corpus</td>
<td>Soma</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One should add that the Spirit in Hindu and Buddhist terminology is referred to as the *Atman* (cf. Egyptian *Amon*), corresponding with the

⁶ The term Ruah is also translated as "life breath," and the discussion of this term by Neil Gillman, *The Death of Death* (Woodstock, VT: Jewish Lights, 1997), p. 77, closely parallels the Hindu teachings about *Prana*.
Chinese Ch'i (Tai Ch'i or Wu Ch'i to avoid the limited meaning of Ch'i in martial arts). Again, the mediaeval theologians and physicians distinguished between Animus vel Intellectus and Anima which referred to the psyche and which included the mind or mental processes. It is perhaps unfortunate that the term "soul" is currently used for both Animus and Anima, but such is inevitable in so far as many contemporary theologians, while referring to the former as the Spirit, are in the practical order Cartesians.7

Even though traditional psychologies often speak of a tripartite anthropology, The Psyche and Body are frequently classified together

---

7 A clear exposition of this can be found in The Golden Epistle of Abbot William of St. Thierry to the Carthusians of Mont Dieu, trans. J. McCann and Walter Shewring (London: Sheed and Ward, 1930). Another example is provided by John Duns Scotus: "The woman is the rational soul [anima], whose husband [literally vir or 'man' (with the connotation of 'active power') not maritus or onjux] is understood to be the animus, which is variously named now intellect [intellectus], now mind [mens], now animus and often even spirit [spiritus]. This is the husband of whom the Apostle speaks, 'the head of the woman is the man, the head of the man is Christ, the head of Christ is God.' In other words, the head of the anima is the intellectus, and the head of the intellectus is Christ. Such is the natural order of the human creature. The soul must be submitted to the rule of the mind, the mind to Christ, and thereby the whole being is submitted through Christ to God the Father... Spirit revolves perpetually about God and is therefore well named the husband and guide of the other parts of the soul, since between it and its creator no creature is interposed. Reason in turn revolves around the knowledge and causes of created things, and whatever spirit receives through eternal contemplation it transmits to reason and reason commends to memory. The third part of the soul is interior sense, which is subordinate to reason as the faculty which is superior to it, and by means of reason is also subordinate to spirit. Finally, below the interior sense in the natural order is the exterior sense, through which the whole soul nourishes and rules the fivefold bodily senses and animates the whole body. Since, therefore, reason can receive nothing of the gifts from on high unless through her husband, the spirit, which holds the chief place of all nature, the woman or anima is rightly ordered to call her husband or intellectus with whom and by whom she may drink spiritual gifts and without whom she may in no wise participate in gifts from on high. For this reason Jesus says to her, 'Call your husband, come hither.' Do not have the presumption to come to me without your husband. For, if the intellect is absent, one may not ascend to the heights of theology, nor participate in spiritual gifts." Trans. Christopher Bamford, The Voice of the Eagle: Homily on the Prologue to the Gospel of John (Hudson, NY: Lindisfarne Press, 1992), p. 27. Again, Origen teaches: "Let us see also allegorically how man, made in the image of God, is male and female. Our inner man consists of spirit and soul. The spirit is said to be male; the soul can be called female. If these have concord and agreeement among themselves, they increase and multiply by the very accord among themselves and they produce sons, good inclinations and understandings... The soul united with the spirit and, so to speak, joined in wedlock..." (Homilies on Genesis and Exodus, trans. Ronald E. Heine [Washington, D.C.: Catholic Univ. of America Press, 1982], p. 68).
as the lesser “self” or “ego.” Thus it is that we have St. Thomas Aquinas teaching “duo sunt in homine” (there are two in man) and St. Paul speaking about the law of his members being opposed to the law of his mind (Romans 7:23). The Body and the psyche are conceptually merged for two reasons. 1) the Body in se has no directive force. It needs some higher “power” like the psyche to tell it what to do, or at least to go along with it; and 2) both the body and the psyche lack permanence or consistency in so far as they are always in flux, or in a state of what the theologians call “becoming.” Note that I, or rather, traditional psychologies, have equated the lesser self with the ego. Theologians use the term ego in a slightly different sense than Freudian psychologists do. They both agree that self-centeredness—what, when excessive, is called by psychologists malignant narcissism—resides in the ego; however, while the psychologist speaks in terms of “ego strengths,” the theologian sees egoism as equivalent to pride and seeks to control or convert this lesser self by having it accept the direction of the Spirit. Its refusal to do so renders the individual as “self-ish.” In such a state the lesser self or ego is in conflict with the Spirit, and thus many individuals are “at war with themselves.” Now the ego resides in the realm of the psyche (for it clearly is neither in the body nor in the Spirit), and is in itself a very nebulous entity. This Greek word for the first person singular pronoun has become but a name for what is really only a sequence of observed behaviors. As Albert Ellis puts it: “this ‘I’ is an ongoing, ever-changing process.” Yet the psyche (including our thoughts) and how we see ourselves is to a great extent organized around our egos. It is its very potential for change which makes this lesser self the subject of psychiatric endeavor.

As opposed to this lesser and inconsistent “self”—the self or “selves” that psychiatrists and psychologists deal with and attempt to modify, the traditional psychologies hold that Man also has a higher or inner Self. This inner Self, often distinguished by the use of a capital S, goes by many names, some of which have been listed above. It is seen

---

8 “Mind” is another ambiguous term, and is often used to translate the Greek nous or pneuma. Clearly St. Paul is not here speaking of “mental processes.” The previous verse makes this clear as Paul speaks of the “law of God, according to the inward man.”

9 The use of the plural “selves” is most appropriate as the innumerable current attempts at explaining the nature of the self make clear. How could it be otherwise when this self is always in a state of flux—always becoming?
as “divine,” is often described as the “indwelling of the Holy Spirit,” the scholastic “Synteresis,” the Hindu “source of the breaths” or Atman, the Arabic “Ruh,” Philo’s “Soul of the soul,” and Plato’s “Inner Man” etc. Such a metaphysical outlook further presumes that the average person is “at war with himself” precisely because these two selves are in conflict and that true sanity or wholeness is ultimately to found only in the saint whose two selves are at one—the essential nature of “at-one-ment” or “atonement,” a state in which the “lamb and the lion” can be said to lie down together. As Socrates prayed: “may my outer and my inner man be one.” St. Thomas Aquinas tells us that tranquility and happiness can only result from the ordered life, by which he means that Spirit, Psyche and Body must be ordered or “lined up” properly—any departure from the order to end being sinful. It is in this sense that we speak of someone being in control of him-self and admonish the distraught to “get hold of your self” or “pull yourself together.” It is also in this sense that one can speak of some forms of mental illness as a “dis-order.” On the practical level it is clear that one can center one’s life in the Body, in the Psyche or in the Spirit. The latter of course demands that we not do “as we like,” but “as we should.” From a metaphysical viewpoint, to chose to center our lives in our psyches is to ascribe to ourselves the property of discerning what is true and false—and as the Jewish Fathers state, to make oneself the source of truth is the greatest form of idolatry. It is to declare that “we will not serve,” that we are gods unto ourselves, a condition which in the last analysis is nothing other than pride.

Many New Age belief systems declare that we are in fact gods unto ourselves. And even those who declare that they will decide for themselves what is true are unwittingly playing the same game. It is important for us to understand in just what sense traditional religions envision the indwelling of God in man. Turning to St. Teresa of Avila’s explanation, we are told: “It is often of the greatest importance, that you

10 Mediaeval psychiatrists—however differently titled—saw psychiatric illness as originating in the Body, in the Psyche, or in some distortion of the Spiritual side of man.

11 For example, the contemporary religious view is universal and nonsectarian, at best portrayed as perennial wisdom or philosophy. “Accordingly, it warrants no piety, nor worshiping. Rather, in Cambell’s words, ‘The contemplation of life thus is undertaken as a meditation on one’s own immanent divinity.’” B. Karasu, “Spiritual Psychotherapy,” American Journal of Psychotherapy, 53/2 (1999) 143.
should understand this truth, namely that God dwells within you and that there we should dwell with Him... Let us not imagine that the interior of our hearts is empty... And to understand how God is always present in our soul, let us listen to St. John of the Cross, another distinguished master of the science of the saints: 'In order to know how to find this Bridegroom, we must bear in mind that the Word, the Son of God, together with the Father and the Holy Spirit, is hidden in essence and is present in the inmost being of the soul...' And this is why St. Augustine, speaking to God, said: 'I do not find Thee without, O Lord, because I had no right to seek Thee there, for Thou art within.' God is therefore hidden within the soul." (A Spiritual Canticle, Stanza 1).  

St. John of the Cross continues later on to explain this more at length, remarking that God may be present in the soul in three different ways: "To explain this," he says, "it must be observed that there are three ways in which God is present in the soul. The first is His presence in essence, and in this respect He dwells not only in souls that are good and holy, but likewise in those that are bad and sinful, and indeed, in all creatures; for it is this presence that gives them life and being, and if it were once withdrawn they would cease to exist and would return to their original nothing. Now this kind of presence never fails in the soul. The second manner of God's presence is by grace, when He dwells in the soul pleased and satisfied with it. This presence of God is not in all souls, because those who commit a mortal sin lose it. The third kind of presence of God is by means of spiritual affection; for God is want to show His presence in many devout souls in divers ways of refreshment, joy and gladness." St. Theresa continues: "Of the first kind of divine presence we can never be deprived. The second we must procure for ourselves with all the powers of the soul, and we must guard it at any cost. The third isn't within our power. God gives to whom He pleases."

To say that God dwells within each and everyone of us is not Pantheism. Indeed Pantheism is a fairly modernist concept, for other societies who give God's many manifestations a variety of names, have, to my knowledge, never denied the unity of God. What then of Pantheism? It is the idea that God is in everything and everything is in God—as such, no demands are made on us to either worship Him or conform to His commands. It is one thing to proclaim the immanence of God in all creation—for clearly He is immanent in all things—and

---

12 Taken from St. Theresa of Avila's Pater Noster.
quite another to deny His transcendscence. Both are realities. Transcendence without immanence cuts us off from the Divine, Immanence without transcendence cuts the Divine off from us. Both the Transcendent and the Immanent must go together because of the duality "Principle and Manifestation." While the Supreme Principle in itself is neither transcendent nor immanent, but "that which it is," on the plane of manifestation one needs a transcendent Creator and the resulting creation needs immanence for its very existence. And both are united in the Theophany, in the Logos, the Man-God. From our human point of view one can say that transcendence annihilates the manifestation, while immanence ennobles it. In accord with religious expression, on the one hand, transcendence reduces man to "sinner" and "slave", and on the other hand, thanks to immanence, he is also is a "child of God" and His "Representative" on earth. These two can be said to meet in the Man-God: for if on the one hand "God alone is Good", on the other, "He who has seen me has seen the Father". This brings us back to the issue of prayer; one cannot pray to oneself, but only to a transcendent God.\footnote{Pantheism is a western philosophical conception. It amounts to a kind of atheism that adorns the world with the name of "God." Be that as it may, a pantheism which includes a kind of vague theism also exists among liberal theologians as well as among Westernized Hindus, who deduce crude simplifications from the symbolism of their Scriptures.}

Those that recognize the indwelling of the Holy Spirit immediately recognize that Truth. Justice and a host of other values, cannot depend upon our feelings or even our personal thoughts. There has to be some "outside" source or criteria to which one can appeal, or to which one's thoughts can conform. This may be as a result of that immanence we have referred to above, or based on transcendent principles. Despite all the theories about the super-ego, patients, like the rest of us, often "know" when they are doing something wrong. As mentioned earlier, we have an "Intellectus vel Spiritus (not to be confused with the commonly understood meaning of intellect which is just clever thinking) that can direct our thoughts and will. The problem is that when one relies on "immanence," one runs the risk of error, for the Intellectus can be distorted, or as St. Paul said, "we see through a glass darkly." Adam before the fall "walked and talked with God." His intellect had a clear vision and understanding of Truth and Reality. After the fall his disobedience and self-will clouded his intellect,
leading to his expulsion from Paradise. Adam, originally made in the “image and likeness” of God, lost that likeness which it is our task to regain. Our intellects, while capable of apprehending Truth and Reality, are distorted by our passions and personal opinions. Hence it follows that, unlike Adam who before the fall “walked and talked with God,” we have need of a Revelation which provides us with a clear cut source of Truth and direction.

Freud found that patients did in fact have a sense of right and wrong. Being a convinced Descartian who ruled out the possibility of a “superconsciousness,” he had to find the source for this in one’s consciousness and subconsciousness, in what he called the “ego” and the “super-ego” shaped by both societal and parental pressures. Granted our morality is greatly influenced by family and society; it is also based on external principles, but this, which Freud philosophically denied, forced him to develop his theory of the super-ego. Jung threw the public a bone in accepting God, but then went on to show that God and the various “archetypes” all had their source in the subconscious. We are in many ways stuck with a psychology based on Descartian principles, and while at times we may use the Intellectus, in the practical order we deny its existence.

We have made a distinction between a “religion” and a “belief system” in that a religion is based on Revelation, on a code, cult and creed that is fixed and external to the individual. Indeed, Webster’s Dictionary defines a religion as an “adoration of God... as expressed in formal worship in obedience to divine commands...” A “belief system” is based upon what some individual has thought was worthy of belief, and frequently is accepted because the “collective unconscious” of the prevailing society finds it acceptable. As mentioned above, there is a tendency of scholars to describe true religions as “belief systems” that somehow caught on, but such fails to recognize the nature of true religions.15

14 All the great religions —Islam, Hinduism, Judaism and Christianity—clearly declare that they are based on Revelation. Adherence to Revelation is not a “fundamentalist” position as currently understood, for the term’s meaning has changed over the years. Orthodoxy is defined as “true faith and sound doctrine.” No one would accept a mathematics based on one’s feelings, so why should people accept a theology based on feelings? Of course, if one doesn’t believe in the possibility of absolute truths, what other choice does one have?

15 As Cardinal Manning put it, “Revelation of faith is no discovery which the reason of man has made for himself by induction, or by deduction, or by analysis, or by
Immediately one hears the protest of those who declare that nobody is going to tell them how to think or behave. They insist on the freedom to decide these things for themselves. And this is quite understandable in one whose whole outlook is based on the Descartian principle that we consist of Body and Mind. If that is all we are, then indeed, they have a right to such a stand, for your mind and body has no more authority than mine.\(^6\)

This tendency to place not only good, but also evil within the realm of the psyche has increasingly been accepted in the public arena. As a result one rarely hears evil spoken of, for evil implies a choice which evolutionary reductionism to a great extent denies. Evil is seen as the end result of childhood traumas or societal pressures. The fact that man is endowed with an Intellect (to know the Truth and what is right and wrong) and a Will, by which he can choose is almost forgotten. Belief systems based on the psyche rarely have a fixed morality with which to face such realities. Indeed, our moral codes are to a great extent based on public opinion which of course can be easily manipulated. We shall be examining Spiritism as a belief system, more as a case in point, but before doing so let us consider some of the problems that result from the Descartian outlook which places values and spirituality in the realm of the psyche.

One direct result of all this is that we no longer have a basis for morality. Serving on ethics committees at hospitals it is clear to one that decisions are made by vote, never on principle. This is not to deny that those involved do their best and vote according to their conscience, but only to say that any person’s conscience is only as good or as bad as his neighbor’s. More recently Princeton University has hired a Dr.

---

\(^6\) It was Protestantism which formalized the decision to take the decision making process about Truth out of the hands of the Church and place it in the individual’s own thinking process—for the “free interpretation” of Scripture was nothing other than applying one’s private opinions to standard understanding. Of course the forces were in the air—Huss, Wycliffe and others; and fostered by corruptions in the body of the Church which gave rise to resentments— to say nothing of the economic forces at play which led the German princes to back Luther.
Singer who has developed new criteria for deciding about the life and
death of children, namely determining if they are "sentient." If not, they
can be sacrificed in the name of—I don't know what "god." It is
forgotten that these were the criteria used by the Nazi regime to
slaughter schizophrenics and others in mental hospitals.

Another major problem that results is a false spirituality, a
spirituality based more on feeling than on principle, a spirituality
grounded in the psyche rather than the Spirit. Many people, aware of
the fact that crass materialism—in one sense the level of the body—is
insufficient to satisfy a certain inner hunger, seek for something
"spiritual" in their lives. Where to look? The answer is in the Psyche,
and not in the Spirit the existence of which they deny. They turn to
music, art, or a host of other interests such as ecology, ecumenism and
world government, many of which they label as having their source in
the "spirit," but which in the long run fail to feed their hunger for
something real. And those who guide them—often for a hefty
price—are happy to keep them in the psyche. Religion has become a
discouraging collection of cliches and sentimentalities, more concerned
with social issues than with Truth. Thus our religious spokesmen tend
to be Descartians and consequently are no longer trusted or respected
when it comes to truly spiritual concerns.

The "psyche" can never be synonymous with the "spiritual." The
psyche is a level of being based on the subject/object polarity, where
"objective" experience is conditioned by the "subjectivity" of the one
experiencing. Spirit or Intellect, on the other hand transcends this
polarity. We can describe it as perfectly Objective, since it is what it is
whether or not I am aware of it, and whether or not I accept it. The
Absolute is like a "ray" of the Divine intersecting with the human soul,
and as such it is the ultimate witness of all that is happening, either on
the plane of the spiritual or within the psyche. The important thing is
that it transcends one's individual subjectivity, for we always tend to
"see through a glass darkly."18

Placing spirituality in the psyche has many other consequences.
Not only is our morality completely subjected to public opinion, but

17 Albert Storr posits a return to self through solitude, which allows a way of putting the
individual in touch with his deepest feelings. Solitude, A return to self, (New York:

18 Taken in part from Charles Upton, The System of Antichrist (Ghent, NY: Sophia
dying patients are supported in group therapy based on these same principles—for example, they are taught and encouraged to engage in self-hypnosis which allows them to damn their souls in complacency. Again, various methods of “meditation” and “yoga” are taught which also allow for self-hypnosis, and not infrequently leave the soul open to invasion by negative influences. While little spoken of, it is known that those so engaged can at times have severe psychiatric problems. The opening of the psyche to external influences, the nature of which is poorly understood, is always of great danger (and clearly forbidden by all the religions) as there are evil forces both within and outside us, against which the psyche in isolation has very poor defenses.  

Yet another problem is raised, that of seeing religion as something that should be psychologically studied, which is in fact an inversion, since the higher should always delineate the lower. This attitude is embraced in a variety of ways. Thus for example, Hans Naegeli Osjord explains: “Modern psychology and psychiatry place any exorcistic effort into categories of persuasion, i.e., conveyance of a (counter-) opinion to convince the patient; suggestion, direct influence of the emotion and imagination of the patient, and auto-suggestion, a change of opinion and perception accepted by an essential part of the personality.” Or again, Henri Delacroix on the basis of his own investigations of St. Teresa, Madame Guyon, St Francis de Sales, John of the Cross and Heinrich Suso, concludes that the mystic possesses a peculiar aptitude that is founded in an unusually rich subconscious life. Although undoubtedly subject to exceptional and inescapable physiological and psychological processes, including the automatisms and intuitions of the subconscious self, the mystic uses them toward a self-chosen end: the total transformation of the personality.”

While this well recognized author wrote in 1908, this attitude is still pervasive, and colors the thinking of both many psychologists and clergy.  

---

19 The close ties of Yoga with New Age cults is well recognized. A recent review in The New York Times (Aug. 1, 2000) makes it clear that most Yoga teachers provide their clients with considerable spiritual guidance—an area in which one can be reasonably certain that they have little or no understanding.


22 The tremendous resistance to accepting the proper relationship between religion and psychiatry is well illustrated by the following quotation from Aldous Huxley: “I had
Akin to this is the current phenomena of using various forms of meditation for the benefits that supposedly accrue to those who practice it. That such benefits are associated with spiritual practices is obvious, but to divorce such practices from the purposes for which they were intended risks creating serious problems. The use of mantras, the meaning of which is unknown to the individual (and which are chosen by computer!) has resulted in some of the practitioners of “TM” being hospitalized in psychotic states. The use of Yoga for health reasons can be of some benefit, but also is not always benign. Yoga, which derives from the root of “Yoke” or union, ultimately aims at union with God and in India would never be practiced apart from a qualified spiritual director. Practices involving the “emptying” of the mind without such direction allows for self hypnosis and possibly the invasion of inferior forces.

These problems are by no means limited to the western world. Consider the case of Sai Baba who is said to have 20 million Hindu followers as well as many western disciples. Sai Baba informs us he is the reincarnation of a saintly Sai Baba who lived some 100 years ago. His firm belief in Reincarnation, which departs from orthodox Hindu doctrine, is a hallmark of Spiritist belief. In addition, Sai Baba indulges in magical tricks which are taken for miracles, as if any saint would perform miracles simply for the purpose of impressing his followers. He maintains links with New Age gurus in America who sent him disciples. He is also an active homosexual, though of course motives for not wanting the world to have meaning, consequently assumed that it had none, and was able without any difficulty to find satisfying reasons for this assumption. For myself, as no doubt, for most of my contemporaries, the philosophy of meaninglessness was essentially an instrument of liberation. The liberation we desired was simultaneously liberation from a certain political and economic system and liberation from a certain system of morality. We objected to the morality because it interfered with our sexual freedom.” Confessions of a Professed Atheist.

23 It is true that many Hindus believe in reincarnation, but then, so do many Catholics. The ideas of reincarnation were introduced into India by Annie Besant and is supported by the misinterpretation of statements in some of the sacred writings. There is however nothing in the Vedas to support this theory. Cf. Ananda K. Coomaraswamy, Hinduism and Buddhism, 2nd ed. (Delhi, India: IGNCA, 1998) and Roger Lipsey, ed., Selected Papers, Metaphysics, vol. 2, Bollingen Series (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1977), passim. Cf. also Rene Guenon, L’erreur Spiritiste (Paris: Les Editions Traditionelles, 1952); Eng. trans., The Spiritist Fallacy, by myself and Alvin Moore Jr. (in press).
this is denied.\textsuperscript{24} Or again consider the Ashram of Sri Aurobindo where prayer is forbidden, and where many of the more well known New Age “lights” in California have their roots—to say nothing of the fact that Catholic priests like Father Griffith have tried to blend their beliefs with those of the latter establishment, which receives support from the United Nations. Again, we have innumerable gurus who wander through the world teaching Spiritist principles and claiming they are Vedantic in origin.\textsuperscript{25} It is important to understand that we are in fact facing a worldwide phenomenon.

An excellent example of a “false religion” is Spiritism. I am calling it “false,” not because I personally disbelieve its tenets, but because it is not based on any immanent or transcendent principle, but only on what has been found in the psyche of certain individuals. It should be clear that Spiritists, and indeed, most modern cults that pass for religions, do not base their beliefs on any body of doctrine, and indeed such is impossible within the framework of their roots. This lack of credal stability and principle is the hallmark of non-revealed religion. Faith, instead of being defined as what the Church (Christ or Revelation) teaches, is any warm feeling. A recent essay in \textit{The New York Times} points out that “the boundaries separating denominations have long grown blurry for many Protestants who say that being Methodist or Presbyterian or Baptist does not really matter to them or, indeed, that they are not sure what it means.” The author further points out that this is “not really surprising... denominations were based, after all, on distinctions of social class, region, ethnicity and race, along with (perhaps more than) distinctions of doctrine, practice and policy...

\textsuperscript{24} Tal Brooks, \textit{Avatar of Night} (Berkeley: End Run Publ., 1999). It may seem tenacious to point to his homosexuality; however, there is a high correlation between the various cults and sexual inversion. Homosexuality and sodomy is forbidden in all the genuine traditions. It might be said that Mr. Brooks’ experience was negative, but this touches the heart of the matter, for it was hardly a real Hindu experience. Not only does Sai Baba teach the heresy of reincarnation, and perform many relatively useless miracles to impress his audience, he also democratizes Hinduism; makes no requirement that caste rules be obeyed, and while he tells many charming stories from the Mahabharata and Ramayana (which every child hears again and again), he makes no true spiritual demands. He accepts westerners as disciples without insisting on their engaging in serious disciplines or learning solid doctrine, or learning to live as simple Hindus prior to entering the supposed spiritual life. This is dangerous for westerners, as explained in an article of mine, “On Gurus and Spiritual Direction ,” \textit{Sophia}. 7/1 (2001) 25-32.

mobility, education, intermarriage and the common media-borne culture of entertainment and advertising have all taken their toll on these differences." 26 Unfortunately, the Catholic Church is currently joining this trend in its desire to unite itself with the various Protestant groups. A union such as Vatican II envisions demands that credal differences be suppressed if not abolished. Paralleling this change in attitude is a tendency to make religion a matter of feeling. One sees this particularly in the various Charismatic and ecumenical movements which eschew doctrinal distinctions and are clearly built on emotionalism.

All this can be delineated in yet another way: by considering the post modernist status of religion. In essence: 1) There is no objective truth, therefore 2) reality is not perceived but rather constructed, by inherent patters of perception, or by history, or by society and language, or by the individual; it follows that 3) all attempts to create comprehensive world views that transcend history, or society, or even (ultimately) the individual are oppressive, therefore 4) all such arbitrarily constructed world views should be deconstructed in order to celebrate diversity and preserve the rights of marginalized minority constructions of reality which, since they too are constructed, must also be deconstructed. So much for the preservation of minority rights. Postmodernism inevitably ends in deconstructionism, and deconstructionism ends (or hopefully will) in the deconstruction of deconstructionism. 27

It is clear then that our philosophical beliefs inevitably color our views of religion. Our conviction that man is nothing but a rational animal who has evolved over the centuries to his present high estate; our conviction that, being more intelligent than our forefathers, we cannot turn to them for wisdom but can only look ahead to some perfect future when the perfection of man will be complete; our belief that there is nothing in man that surpasses his psyche and thinking processes; all this forces us to place the "spiritual" in the realm of the "psyche," and precludes the possibility of our looking beyond these

26 Peter Steinfels, "Beliefs: Despite Decline of Protestant Denominations, a New Report Finds There's Room for Optimism," The New York Times, May 20, 2000, p. 18. Faith is objectively defined as what the Church teaches, and subjectively, our giving assent to this teaching. As St. Thomas Aquinas says, "Ad fidei duo requisitum, quod credibilia proponuntur et assensus," Summa, II.11, section V.

27 Upton, The System of Antichrist, p. 40
limited horizons. It is not that everything in the psyche is bad, but that there can be no integral humanity which does not take into consideration the whole man. The Jewish fathers taught that the worst form of idolatry was to assume to oneself the right to determine what is true and false. This indeed occasioned the fall of Adam and it is nothing other than pride and egotism that displace the divine with the human. The net result is that many who have a thirst for what is real are led into the dark pit of the psyche—well described by both psychoanalysts and spiritual writers—and never find their way out. By their fruits you shall know them.” Individuals have lost all the safeguards that were once provided by religion against spiritual delusion. Individuals not only become enmeshed in a variety of cults that range from the benign to the diabolical, but actually go out of their way to become channels for inferior influences—forgetting that the devil can appear as an angel of light. And even at best, they are discouraged from seeking the one thing useful—for they forget that the Kingdom of God is within them and that the aim of spirituality is to say with St. Paul, “I live, not I, but Christ lives in me.”

---

28 This is well shown in a recent website (issec-taste.org) in which scientists document their “spiritual” experiences, events that fall into the category of the psyche: paranormal events, or “feelings of elation” and a sense of “oneness with God,” which are described as a “cosmic consciousness events.”
TRANSLATING OUR VISION: 
THE ETHICAL DIMENSION

John Boojamra

By the waters of Babylon we sat down and wept, when we remembered Zion... How shall we sing the Lord’s song in a foreign land?

Psalm 137.1-4

The issue of survival of a minority coherent belief culture within the context of a majority and often hostile belief culture is an old one, usually associated with invasion, conquest, and subjugation. The same phenomenon, within a sociological non-consensus culture, has developed voluntarily by a process of Oriental and Orthodox Christian emigration to North America. The categories that apply with or without the presence of coercion are the same. New immigrants are literally “strangers in a strange land” and even more significant, raising offspring as “strangers in a strange land.” I will make the analogy and use some of the sociological terminology for the survival of minority belief groups as they emigrate to North American and western European cultures in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries and the survival of Christianity in Greater Syria with the movement of Islam from the peninsula in the seventh century.

The issues that arise for faith cultures arise also for their ethical corollaries. The new minority community is placed, albeit voluntarily, in a culture that does not hold any one system of belief, except the “tolerance” that allows the very immigrants to settle freely among

1 EDITOR’S NOTE: The late Professor John Boojamra († 1999) presented this paper at the Eastern and Oriental Orthodox Symposium, “From Common Vision to Common Witness: Orthodox Church Life in America Today,” co-sponsored by St. Vladimir’s Orthodox Theological Seminary and St. Nersess Armenian Seminary, held at SVOTS on March 9, 1999.

them.³ There is an implicit threat in any multicultural system and that is the threat of the relativism inherent in tolerance.⁴ It is this non-consensus beliefs’ structure which separates it from what the Aramaic/Arab Christian of Greater Syria found when Islam became the powerful, predominant, and coercive influence. What immigrant groups encounter in North America, and here is the real reason for the challenge to ethics, is 1) the rapidity of social change rooted in 2) the intensity and compression of technological advances which result in 3) spiritual and ethical reorientation.

No organism likes changes, whether organic or cultural, such is the very nature of adolescents, for instance. The response to that change is often 1) a blurring of vision, 2) a siege mentality, 3) liberality, or 4) fundamentalism. One of the first things to reevaluate in a period of rapid and radical change is virtues and values—war being perhaps the best, albeit perverse, example of the suspension of traditional personal standards. The single greatest variable affecting the degree and extent of reaction is the presence or absence of a locus of authority. Where do we look for right and wrong? Where do we take our ethical cues from? We can no longer blame Descartes, as John Paul II does in his On the Threshold of Hope, as the source of our collapse in values; it is rather the sheer speed and expansiveness of change that undermines our ethical and moral structures.

In North America, power is not an issue as it was in seventh-century Syria; neither is there a monolithic belief system as there is in contemporary Islam. The problem is that there is no belief system. The sociological dynamic is the same, excepting the major variables. How do belief systems survive in such multi-ethnic and multi-ethnic cultures when 1) coercion is not an issue, 2) the venue has been freely chosen, 3) the variable options are literally innumerable, 4) when authoritative guidelines are either fuzzy or absent, and 5) the very virtue which enables us eastern and Orthodox Christians to immigrate here is tolerance. The answer is difficult, but the beginning of the answer to what Jean Piaget would call assimilation and accommodation is the


understanding of the dynamic of process at work. Pedagogy, given the five variables enumerated above, becomes the mode of equilibration.

The first concept we have to deal with is viability or validity structures. This has immediate and direct meaning for our churches as sociological phenomena and as faith cultures. That is the validity of a belief system is as viable, or perceived to be as viable, to a believer or group of believers as it 1) is visible, 2) is active, 3) is numerous, 4) demonstrates proximity and propinquity, 5) has strong and moral leadership, and 6) a pedagogical program designed to communicate the content of the faith and the life of the community. The ratio is relatively simple: the smaller the group in relationship to the major belief culture, the more active it has to be. Similarly, the smaller it is the more principled the quality of the leadership must be. This is the dilemma of an immigrant minority belief culture in a majority foreign culture. This is the situation in which most of our communities as immigrant communities find themselves. There is a certain critical mass necessary to maintain a belief structure. It is at least the mass necessary to maintain a community, which Robert Bellah’s Habits of the Heart aims at enhancing in the midst of the American individualism he so efficiently describes. Bellah “upholds his central contention that communities are essential for sustainable moral beliefs.” I demonstrated in an article in Byzantion in 1998, “Christianity in Greater Syria: Surrender or Survival,” Christianity disappeared from North Africa because it lacked the faithful and quantifiable leadership of an indigenous episcopacy, strong community (social) ties, and an ongoing monastic tradition to provide the model of integrity and balanced faith rooted in glorifying the Almighty or scholarly activity that would maintain the faith in the new lingua franca.

The ethics of our Christian community must first be defined by the adults and the leaders; they must be defined in reference to the Gospels and history of the Church and then in reference to the cultural context out of which we have come. Then, the distinction must be made between the two categories. What is rooted in faith and what is rooted in our culture. I am in no way suggesting relativistic or Fletcher’s

---


“situation” ethics. We do, however, have the Stoic distinction, adopted by early moralists and fathers between the *jus gentium*, universal natural law, and *jus civile*, customary law. In certain places you do certain things to be ethical; in all places you do certain things to be ethical. In Paris, it may be acceptable to park on the sidewalk; in New York, it is unacceptable. These are the flexible categories, and where the cliché “when in Rome...” takes some significance. Certain things are proper to America and certain things are proper to a Greek or Syrian village that have nothing to do with right and wrong but with customs. This distinction has to be made in ethical education before we can realistically try to teach those evangelical virtues which define us as Christians. The distinction also makes raising children in two different cultures a bit easier for the courageous immigrant.

Changes have to happen, but too often our parents and clergy identify change with a challenge to our faith structures and value system, when they are actually challenges to our social culture which we, in the case of America, willingly left behind, in what we ourselves call “the old country.” For one thing, this is why the ethics class at St. Vladimir’s has been designed as “historical ethics.” It was the only way to give content to the particular virtue or value system without getting caught up in philosophical sophistry. We have first to distinguish between what is a moral and ethical issue from what is a customary issue.

No stage of human development likes change, but change is by definition part of life and certainly part of the phenomenon of emigration. Change, whether within the human person as it matures, the belief culture as it refines its faith, the social culture as it refines its faith, or the social culture as it seeks a material progress and the prosperity of another venue, is problematic. The problem with change is that it has to happen, but it makes everyone uncomfortable. The group willing to change has to adjust; the group not willing to change, as in the coercive invasions of Islam in the seventh through the ninth centuries, must also change. It cannot witness to its common vision until it has first made the necessary adjustments, first assimilating and then accommodating the new value structures with its frame of reference. What is essential is that we recalibrate and allow our children to recalibrate those relationships that we do not consider essential to the content of our faith or to a moral structure. Witness and vision has to do both with the foundation of Orthodox ethical theory and sociological phenomena of belief structures.
The disorientation in behavior and moral values is seen in the immigrant high school students most distressingly and powerfully. They are literally being raised in two worlds. Adolescents and children caught in that in-between generation, between self-described “old country” parents raising children in “a new world,” don’t get it right and are not clear of expectations. Some parents are literally raising children who are strangers and these same children are going home from school each day to a family of strangers. But this is a phenomenon that is truer and truer of all western technological cultures, that is all of us, whether we are immigrants or not. It is more common among immigrants and I am reminded of Robert Hemlines’ Stranger in a Strange Land. That is what we are living with. The more rapid the social and technological change experienced by western culture, the more we become “foreigners” in our own countries and homes. Our immigrant communities are raising strangers—literally and figuratively—in our strange land. I have observed this after twenty-eight years of teaching in a New York City high school with a highly diverse cultural spectrum. The transition is not easy; yet this same transition that the Korean, Coptic, Russian, Israeli, Palestinian, or Caribbean immigrant students are making is the same one we all face as we raise families in a new age of rapid social and technological change, in which generations are compressed and our ethical and moral values are recalibrated in the process. But while this may be true in Arabic, Serbian, Russian, Palestinian, Coptic, or Ethiopian homes, it is also true of your American born, “Yankee” to the core, Orthodox Christian. We have to be careful as adults to be able to distinguish between the essential and the non-essential of our social and faith cultures before we begin a battle and lose the war with our own children. Be mindful of the assertion above: in a period of rapid social and cultural and technological change, moral and ethical values are the first values to be set aside. This issue must be addressed.

It is on the issue of intentionality that the churches can play a major role in accommodating behaviors that do not harm our faith or the morality and virtues in which it is rooted. The more behavior and beliefs one makes issues of, the fewer the younger generation will take seriously! Again the key here is the integrity of our educational programs and the adults who lead them. The following references may be applied directly to virtues and values—the centrality of morality in the pedagogical mode in the twenty-first century. They are
characteristically American in the sense that education for values and virtues has always been a function of the American public schools; they were designed not for education, as such, but for the socialization of immigrants into the American value system, albeit Protestant. It was this emphasis which helped give rise to the Roman Catholic parochial school movement. My point here is simply to emphasize the essential importance of transmitting values through education. We did not have to do this before, when the “village,” now a myth of the “good old days,” existed. Recent studies indicate that education works and in the absence of a consensus culture is necessary in communicating values and virtues that are being lost as people adapt to a strange land.

In the twenty-first century formal pedagogy will be the single most important ministry in the Church, especially when the culture in which we have chosen to live or which we have ourselves created supports less and less what Christians deem virtuous and ethical. “Baby boomers” have increasingly brought their children to church to receive religious instruction. Not only have baby boomers taken their children to “Sunday schools,” they themselves have attended education programs in larger numbers than the previous generation. According to the Barna Report in 1992, one fourth of all adults in the U.S., or some forty million adults, attended a religious education class on any given weekend.\(^7\) *Newsweek* reported that “couples with children were twice as likely to join a religious congregation” with a Christian education program.\(^8\) *Christianity Today* noted that the upswing in Church attendance was directly tied to provisions for religious education for children of baby boomers.\(^9\) Barna also reported that churches with strong children’s programs were growing at a rate faster than other congregations. Some church leaders accurately predicted the tremendous potential for church groups in the area of religious education of children and adults during the last decade of this century.\(^10\)

---

7 George Barna, *What Americans Believe* (Ventura, CA: Regal Books, 1992), pp. 238-239. Another way of looking at this statistic is to say that just under one-half (46%) of all adults who attend church on a given Sunday engage in a “Sunday School” experience on the same day.

8 *Newsweek*, December 17, 1990, 51-52.


Finally, with regard to adult education, Maxwell, in discussing mature Christian faith and the programming of adult education around scripture study, writes that maturity of faith is strongly linked to age, "increasing with each successive decade." But he also notes that "The researchers also found that the primary factor associated with faith maturity was the amount of exposure to effective Christian education provided by local churches." However, their findings indicate that only about 31 percent of adult church members are actively involved in any Christian education program within the church. They defined Christian education as "Sunday school, church school, Bible studies, confirmation, camping, retreats, workshops, auxiliaries for men and women, prayer groups, religious plays and dramas, new member classes, and intergenerational or family events and programs." Harry J. Van Buren III writes that "ordered learning about Christianity is necessary for parishioners who desire to deepen their faith lives." Quoting Farley, he continues the theme: "Ordered learning does not either create faith or the reflective responses to faith, that is, theology. It can, however, give faith its reflective interpretation tools and knowledge that will assist it in its constant negotiations with the complexities of reality. This is why theology, the reflective interpretation of faith, should occur in pedagogical mode." Ethics, like religious education and Christian parenting, must be intentional. Very little in western technological societies just "happens" any more. We must determine what we want to have happen and then how to bring it about. It is a question of virtues and values in a pedagogical mode.

It is already clear that pedagogy (child education), andrology (adult education), or hypostagogy (personhood education) will be an important part of the Orthodox Church in the new century. The basic issue we have to deal with in ethics is the integrity of human

---

personhood, and that integrity growing and developing in a believing community which expresses itself both liturgically, in the broad sense of a worshipping community, and socially as carrying with it certain customary variables that describe it and by which it describes itself. The engine driving the ethical development of the human person is the dynamic movement from image to likeness in much of Byzantine theology, such as Clement of Alexandria and Irenaeus of Lyons describe. Ethically we are working with 1) the foundational notion of personhood and 2) the foundational notion of community, both rooted in social and theological truth established early in the life of the church, and 3) with the belief that there are certain givens that go beyond our "old country" customs and are essential to a virtuous nation. These are the givens that the Stoics and the early Christian writers would refer to as *jus gentium*, with the variables being the *jus civile*, or "old country" customs.

The foundations of Orthodox ethical systems and practice are centered in the integrity of the human person and personhood. of the community of faith and worship in which they grow. Arising out of the centrality of personhood and community are the ethical concerns that are to be maintained in a foreign culture, often a culture that does not value these virtues of 1) impulse control, 2) postponement of gratification, 3) task completion, and 4) frustration tolerance. This can be summarized by a line from Eric Fromm, *Modern Man in Search of a Soul*: the goal in raising children is to "Teach them to want to do what they have to do." It used to be obvious what they had to do; now it is not.

Finally, I would like to take up two key issues and their implications for values and virtues. First, television, as indeed the computer, is a threat not because of its values, but because of its very nature. It encourages *privatism* and separation from those things that make us human and Christian, interaction with other people, and, second, the weakening of the role of parents and the reversal of familial roles in America. The longer we look on America as a problem than an opportunity, the longer it will take us to see our traditional morality as well as faithfulness to the Church in a pedagogical mode. We will just continue to "bash" American culture and vilify it as the enemy. When the enemy really is within each of us and our communities. It will never happen unless we recognize that there is a conflict and the old way of dealing with it, homogeneous culture, no longer exists.
Intentionality is the response. We have to will to have happen what we want to have happen, both ethically and ecclesiastically. All of which speak immediately to the new and radically different culture which is growing up around us, which we are willingly admitting into our existence, and of which we are a part.

There is nonetheless a direct line between the rootedness in personhood and its fruition in a healthy community and the integrity of that community. The role of the community—as an intentional community—in maintaining personhood as the foundation of ethical and faith-filled behavior is all the more important when we do not live in a consensus culture. But we choose not to live in a non-consensus culture. It is too late to whine that we are victims of secularism; it is not too late to look at raising our children and ourselves in an intentional manner. All of our practices which used to happen by accident or by nature must now be intentional, including our teaching of ethics. It is one reason why I believe that formal Christian education, in this time and in the western technological world which we all enjoy, must be a greater part of a seminary curriculum and our parish planning. We must now make intentional what used to be left to the proverbial "village." There are no villages in our new world.
TOWARD A COMPREHENSIVE THEORY OF ETHICS IN PRAGMATISM

Sara Kärkkäinen Terian

Introduction

Pragmatism, in its emphasis on conduct and consequences, is often associated with utilitarianism and ethical relativism that would eschew any universal rule of conduct and would thus not be compatible with formalist ethics. The four American philosophers considered the founders of pragmatism—Charles Sanders Peirce, William James, George Herbert Mead, and John Dewey—address the question of ethics in various contexts and each in his own unique way, yet each arrives at conclusions similar enough to be covered by the same blanket of pragmatism. Furthermore, though each emphasizes the consequences of action as central to ethics, each nevertheless gropes for a larger principle that can cover the various empirical instances.

This article is not an attempt to present a comprehensive overview of the writings of these philosophers, it only reviews a sample of them to show that a universal ethical principle can fit within their framework. James, as a philosopher, "was through and through a moralist," emphasizing the notion that truth should make a difference. Mead, whose major focus is on the act, discusses ethical issues in several articles, and Dewey made a conscious effort to construct an ethical theory which Thayer calls "a major achievement in the history of pragmatism." The only one of the four pragmatists who does not offer a separate treatment of ethics is Peirce who discusses the topic somewhat briefly in the context of normative sciences in general. Yet Peirce's categories pro-


The second indented paragraph on p. 157 and the second indented paragraph on p. 158 should be read as regular text (Editor's apologies).
vide the most promising foundation for an ethical theory within pragmatism.

We shall first briefly review a sample of the writings of James, Mead, and Dewey (in that order), and then relate their views on ethics to Peirce’s categories that provide a comprehensive framework for these theories. Although most pragmatists seem to hold a notion of utilitarianism as the criterion of what ethical conduct should be, this paper shows that all of them try to grasp something higher as the ultimate. Among them all, however, Peirce’s category of Thirdness appears best able to provide the basis for the most satisfactory ethical principle.

**James on Ethics**

To begin with, James rules out the possibility of normative ethics: “there is no such thing possible as an ethical philosophy dogmatically made up in advance.” The content of ethical philosophy is determined by the people participating in life, and “there can be no final truth...until the last man has had his experience and said his say.” The aim of a moral philosopher is “to find an account of the moral relations that obtain among things, which will weave them into the unity of a stable system, and make of the world what one may call a genuine universe from the ethical point of view.” The subject matter is what he finds existing in the world and his purpose is to organize the material into some form. If the investigator has any other ideals, he will become an advocate of some cause instead of a student of ethics. In short, a philosopher can engage in only descriptive not normative ethics.

---

5 James spelled out his basic ethical theory in 1891 in two lectures which covered the same material but bore different titles. The first, delivered before the students’ Philosophical Club at Harvard, was entitled “The Essentials of an Ethical Universe”; the second was given to the Yale Philosophical Club and was entitled “The Moral Philosopher and the Moral Life.” It was published the same year in the *International Journal of Ethics*. The references in this study are from a reprint of this and other articles of James: John J. Mc Dermott (ed.), *The Writings of William James: A Comprehensive Edition* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1977).

6 Ibid., p. 610.

7 Ibid., p. 611.
James divides the field of ethics into three questions: the psychological, the metaphysical, and the casuistic. The psychological question asks what is the "historical origin of our moral ideas and judgments," the metaphysical question inquires about the meaning of "good," "ill," and "obligation," and the casuistic question looks for the measure of various goods and ills, "so that the philosopher may settle the true order of human obligations." The casuistic question thus has a normative aspect.

The psychological question has traditionally been settled by either the intuitionist (conscience) or evolutionist (environment) perspective. Neither of these extremes, however, gives a satisfactory explanation of the origin of all our moral ideals. While many of our ideals "must have arisen from the association with acts of simple bodily pleasures and reliefs from pain . . . it is surely impossible to explain all our sentiments and preferences in this simple way." Neither can association or utility explain all our moral perceptions; many "are quite inexplicable except by an innate preference of the moral ideal attitude for its own pure sake." While environmental conditioning has played a definite role, all the higher, more penetrating ideals are revolutionary. They present themselves far less in the guise of effects of past experience than in that of probable causes of future experience, factors to which the environment and the lessons it has so far taught us must learn to bend.

In human nature there are traces of "secondary affections" which relate the environmental factors with each other and with our impulses. On the other hand, there are unexpected circumstances in which "the hidden oracle alone can speak," resulting often in unusual consequences. "The forces which conspire to this resultant are subtle harmonies and discords between the elementary ideas which form the data of the case." Thus "rightness is not mere usualness, wrongness not mere oddity." Environmental factors account for only a small part of our cognitions. The causes of

---

8 Ibid., p. 611.
9 Ibid., p. 612.
10 Ibid., p. 613.
11 Ibid., pp. 612-613.
12 Ibid., p. 119.
the mental structure connected with ethical propositions are
natural, connected to our nervous structure, according to
James.\textsuperscript{13}

James' understanding of the metaphysical question is evident in his
article "Does 'Consciousness' Exist?"\textsuperscript{14} in which he asserts that there is
no consciousness without content, both being united in experience. The
same principle operates in his treatment of ethics:

Goodness, badness, and obligation must be \textit{realized} some-
where in order really to exist; and the first step in ethical
philosophy is to see that no merely inorganic 'nature of
things' can realize them. Neither moral relations nor the
moral law can swing \textit{in vacuo}. Their only habitant can be a
mind which feels them; and no world composed of merely
physical facts can possibly be a world to which ethical
propositions apply.\textsuperscript{15}

Just as subject and object, or consciousness and content, are
simply different functional attributes of one single entity
which is experience, goodness and badness are statuses in
the consciousness of a being who judges them to be good
or bad. There can be no moral rules without a conscious-
ness to feel them and act upon them. Furthermore, it is only
with a multiplicity of thinkers who orient their actions to-
ward each other that "the notion of obligation comes em-
phatically into view."\textsuperscript{16}

While in "moral solitude" anything that pleases the solitary thinker
is right, the problem of decision becomes acute with a multiplicity of
judges. Whose consciousness is to decide what is good or bad, what is
better or worse, what are the obligations of each, etc.? If one of the
thinkers were divine, the question would be settled, but even then the
ground of the obligation would remain a question, according to James.
It becomes clearer when one realizes that there is no obligation without
a claim, and no existence without desire.\textsuperscript{17} James gets into dialectical

\textsuperscript{13} Ibid., pp. 132, 612.
\textsuperscript{14} Reprinted in ibid., pp. 169-183.
\textsuperscript{15} Ibid., p. 614; emphasis in the original.
\textsuperscript{16} Ibid., pp. 615-616.
\textsuperscript{17} Ibid., pp. 616-617.
elements in this formulation. As he asserts at the beginning of his address, he again reiterates that there are no absolutes regarding good, bad, or obligation. These are simply objects of feeling and desire and must be connected to living minds. Good things and bad things, obligations, claims, and expectations would still be present even if there were nothing else in the universe “but one rock with two loving souls upon it.” This, however, would be a “thoroughly moral constitution,” there would be “a moral life, whose active energy would have no limit but the intensity of interest in each other.” We, James says, “are just like the inhabitants of such a rock”; thus ethics has a “genuine and real foothold in a universe where the highest consciousness is human.” James thus rules out the necessity of God as a basis for ethics.\(^{18}\)

As for the casuistic question, James asserts that “there is a system of truth” but it “can only exist in act,” or as an opinion held by an actual thinker. To arrive at a standard, however, would require investing a certain thinker with the authority to impose his view upon others. How can a moral philosopher arrive at an impartial test of ideas, especially when this test “must be incarnated in the demand of some actually existent person”? One answer comes with the realization that “goodness” could be seen as a common essence in a variety of things. “Various essences of good” have thus been proposed as bases for an ethical system: e.g. mean between extremes, intuition, happiness for oneself or others, dignity, avoiding harm, reason, will of God, survival of the human species, etc. The problem is that none of these has proved to be valid for all times and places or to be able to give general satisfaction, although “the capacity to bring happiness” may be the best. Since, however, there are acts and impulses that never aim at happiness, James proposes “the most universal principle—that the essence of good is simply to satisfy demand.” This principle is actually the height of relativism since the demand can be of any kind and need not be under any universal law. Demand, however, is always greater than possibility, thus the casuistic question becomes a practical one: since the whole ideal cannot be reached, which part is to be “butchered”?\(^{19}\)

Our environment, by handing the ideals to us already ordered, “encourages us not to be philosophers but partisans.”\(^{20}\) A philosopher must

\(^{18}\) Ibid., pp. 618-619.

\(^{19}\) Ibid., pp. 619-622.

\(^{20}\) Ibid., p. 622.
judge impartially. "Must not the guiding principle for ethical philosophy," James asks, be
simply to satisfy at all times as many demands as we can? That act must be the best act, accordingly, which makes for
the best whole, in the sense of awakening the least sum of
dissatisfactions. In the casuistic scale, therefore, those ide-
als must be written highest which prevail at the least cost,
or by whose realization the least possible number of other
ideals are destroyed.\textsuperscript{21}

The struggle is to find a more inclusive order and, while supporting
the "conventionally recognized good," be an agent of change. The
highest ethical life, in fact, "consists at all times in the breaking of rules
which have grown too narrow for the actual case." The only "uncon-
ditional commandment" is "so to vote and to act as to bring about the
largest universe of good which we can see."\textsuperscript{22} This is classic utilitarian-
ism, but it begs the question who or what decides what is good. Im-
plicitly, James appears to be looking for a universal principle, although
explicitly he denies the necessity for it.

Although James asserted earlier that the divine and the human are
equally good bases of ethics, he ends the address by asserting that "in a
merely human world without a God, the appeal to our moral energy
falls short of its maximal stimulating power." Concrete ethics cannot be
final because "they have to wait on metaphysical and theological be-
liefs." If there were no grounds for believing in a God, "men would
postulate one simply as a pretext for living hard, and getting out of the
game of existence its keenest possibilities of zest." We will demand
more of ourselves when we believe in an "infinite demander," and will
"joyously face tragedy" for the same reason. James thus concludes
"that the stable and systematic moral universe for which the ethical
philosopher asks is fully possible only in a world where there is a di-
vine thinker with all-enveloping demands."\textsuperscript{23} That leads Brennan to
assert that "the Christian saint, with his renunciation and self-sacrifice
and charity, embodies the highest moral ideals of James's pragmatism."
James believed in the existence of some kind of moral system and sub-

\textsuperscript{21} Ibid., p. 623; emphasis in the original.
\textsuperscript{22} Ibid., pp. 623-626.
\textsuperscript{23} Ibid., pp. 626-628.
ordination; in fact, "morality plays a major role in the pragmatism of James."24 Thus utilitarianism does not at the end measure up as the ultimate basis for ethical life.

Mead on Ethics25

Mead especially emphasizes the close connection of pragmatism with ethics when he refers to the former as "this debatable field, that is loosely defined by the term 'pragmatism'," the fullest statement of which "would found metaphysics upon ethics." He has no wish to enter this field, but he appears to be in basic agreement with the premises of pragmatism in that science, emotion, and perception "must find their functions, and hence their reason for existence, in the act." Morality also "inheres in the act alone," although not in the functions of the act.26 Obviously, however, Mead does not want to make this a metaphysical doctrine.

Moral consciousness, to Mead, "is the most concrete consciousness—the most inclusive statement which can be given of immediate experience." Environment plays a vital role in the development of this moral consciousness, yet it is not everything. To a certain extent, the organism determines its own environment, thus "form and environment must be phases that answer to each other." Community moral consciousness "goes back into a past that antedates moral consciousness itself," and "this control by the community over its members provides indeed the material out of which reflective moral consciousness builds up its own situation, but cannot exist as a situation until the moral consciousness of the individual constructs it."27 The intimate connection

26 Ibid., p. 85.
27 Ibid., pp. 83-84.
between society and the individual, so much part of Mead's social psychological theory, is evident also in his conception of morality.

Thus morality is not something separate but is present in "every possible content of the individual and his situation"; indeed, moral activity is to be identified with purposive activity, and "our intelligence is through and through purposive...the fundamental necessity of moral action is simply the necessity of action at all." The motive of moral action is the recognition of the end, and "the moral interpretation of our experience must be found within the experience itself." Thus, born in community and devoid of any "metaphysical and logical speculations," morality is nevertheless an integral part of life according to Mead. "We are familiar with three ethical standpoints," Mead continues,

that which finds in conscious control over action only the further development of conduct which has already unconsciously been determined by ends, that which finds conduct only where reflective thought is able to present a transcendental end, and that which recognizes conduct only where the individual and the environment—the situation—mutually determine each other.\footnote{Ibid., p. 86.}

The first one is a type of social determinism which is the aim of training, the second one refers to a superhuman criterion which Mead already ruled out from the sphere of ethics; the third one, the mutual determination of the individual and the environment, is the basis of ethics for Mead.\footnote{Ibid., pp. 86-88.} This involves interpretation and possible reconstruction of the situation; "responsibility should be tested by the consequences of an act," and "concrete valuations" should take the place of "abstract valuations" which are inadequate.\footnote{Ibid., p. 93.} Economy, effectiveness, and consistency are the characteristics of "uprightness," not a "transcendental ideal of perfection" neither the "attainment of the possible sum of happiness."\footnote{Ibid., p. 88.} It is obvious that Mead is as much a pragmatist as James, perhaps more so in his explicit ruling out of the metaphysical sphere.

Mead's discussion of philanthropy does not appear to have an immediate connection with his treatment of ethics discussed above, except
in its evolutionary approach. But as this article will show, his stages in the development of charity match Peirce’s three categories especially well. Charity, according to Mead, is based on a kindly impulse which humans have innately; not to have it is abnormal. Organized charity has risen to bring reason into the exercise of these impulses. This, in turn, has given rise to community obligations which are illustrated by practices such as “company insurance of employees against the disabilities of old age, sickness, and unemployment.” Now the appeal is no more to charity but to the sense of justice. Thus the helping situation includes both demand and obligation, and as such it implies a social order and a community. Any type of meaningful helping is a self-experience which is possible only by taking the attitude of the other, “it involves participation in some sense in the suffering of the other.” This is the real meaning of sympathy. The difficult step, however, is to carry this kindly impulse to a more profound level in which the goal is to remove the cause of suffering. Yet such a step is inevitable if we identify ourselves with the sufferer. The ultimate stage in the evolution of philanthropy is thus social reform, which Mead implies to be necessary if the charitable activity is to be fully ethical. This brings his emphasis close to that of Dewey.

**On Dewey’s Ethical Theory**

As was noted at the beginning, Dewey explicitly formulated an ethical theory which he first published in 1891 and then, with Tufts, in the form of a text in 1908. These books, however, do not contain a comprehensive formulation of all his moral writings which are scattered in various contexts. Dewey never provided an outline of his entire moral philosophy, no attempt is made to provide one here, but typical examples from his writings show his basic views on ethics.

Dewey’s philosophy is a “principled” one in which “certain enduring values (such as the democratic virtues) are proposed to guide

---

conduct in all situations." All life becomes as if working for something. Dewey, in fact, first called his form of pragmatism instrumentalism. The values he holds up, however, are not specifications for particular situations but rather general principles. Human nature, for example, is the outcome of the interaction between the organism and the environment; there is therefore a continuity between experience and nature. Dewey rejects dualism; both mind and matter belong to a "complex of events that constitute nature," and humans have "a unity with the universe that is to be preserved" and that makes conduct inherently valuable.

Dewey defines the field of ethics as the science of conduct, "in its entirety, with reference, that is, to what makes it conduct, its end, its real meaning." While social sciences study human action, the business of ethics "is to detect the element of obligation in conduct, to examine conduct to see what gives it its worth." Conduct is not to be simply defined by consequences, "there is conduct only when the consequences are foreseen; made the reason of action." Thus conduct includes motivation, and "the moral end" or "the Good" will consist in the exercise of interests which include interest both in self and others. The final moral end, however, is the realization of a community, and the best good is a common good which "satisfies others who participate in the environment." The moral end is thus "wholly social," and the best example of the social is community. "The local is the ultimate universal, and as near an absolute as exists."

Dewey's theory of valuation, being concerned with empirical contexts and consequences, has been called "an empirical ethic."

---

35 Ibid., p. xxiii.
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38 Ibid., p. 420.
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cording to this, moral judgments, including their genesis and testing (inquiry) as well as end, are no different from any other judgments. Moral and other terms are related logically in inquiry and existentially with reference to the situation which provides the context for the activity. Thus "‘moral’ and ‘ethical’ characterize situations for Dewey, a distinct class of situations possessing certain distinguishable features marking them off from other kinds of situations’; yet all judgments of a situation are moral in nature."46 A situation, furthermore, is to be seen not as “a single object or set of objects and events” but a “contextual whole”47 and a complexity which determines the action to be taken. "Moral goods and ends exist only when something has to be done."

Whereas classical ethical theory and behavior are construed in teleological terms, in which “good is defined as that at which all things aim,” Dewey insisted that “end” in ethical theory is ambiguous and cannot be seen in itself. He formulated the term “ends-in-view” which does not separate means and ends but places them within the situation and evaluates them in their capacity as guides to action:

Ends-in-view are appraised or valued as good or bad on the ground of their serviceability in the direction of behavior dealing with states of affairs found to be objectionable because of some lack or conflict in them. They are appraised as fit or unfit, proper or improper, right or wrong, on the ground of their requiredness in accomplishing this end.48

Conflict, which leads to desires and valuations, is found in actual existing situations that therefore determine what is needed. It is in these situations that the Good is located, not in any abstract or unconditional principles. The "pragmatic rule" requires relating the meaning of an idea to its consequences; these consequences are not general but specific. "Action is always specific, concrete, individualized, unique. And consequently judgments as to acts to be performed must be similarly

46 Ibid., pp. 389-390; emphasis in the original.
49 Ibid., pp. 46-47; emphasis in the original.
specific." The agents, persons, in the situations do the desiring and form the judgments, but "the source of authority in forming and testing ethical judgment is the objective, troubled situation within which need is felt, desires occur, and a good is realizable."

Dewey's "moral relativism" and his excessive emphasis on the situation have not gone without criticism. Not everyone agrees with the idea of the situation as the final judge, nor does Dewey's own definition of conduct, cited above, seem to agree with it. Grisez and Shaw, for example, assert:

The situation does not impose morality on us; we impose morality on the situation. That is to say, the moral dimension becomes present according to the manner in which we perceive the facts of the situation and respond to them through our free, self-determining choices.

Dewey's emphasis on values and principles seems contrary to his focus on the situation as the final judge, and so does his view of the ultimate realization of moral conduct in a community. If the situation is the final authority and the situation is defined by the acting individual, we have a clear case of circular reasoning unless there is something beyond the individual that guides him or her in the judgment. Even the realization of community—the ultimate end for Dewey—requires interest in the welfare of others; a principle that reaches beyond individual situations.

To summarize, James, Mead, and Dewey attempted to place individual acts and situations within a greater ethical framework, but appeared less than successful in making a convincing case. They still ended with highly relative, utilitarian conceptions which satisfy neither the advocates of a universal ethical principle nor their own implicit demands for such a principle. This inconsistency is evident in an example from James: after dismissing God as a source of ethical principles, James brings God back as an arbitrator to solve the casuistic problem, thus making a universal serve a purely utilitarian function. It appears

---


51 Thayer, *Meaning and Action*, p. 413.

that none of these three pragmatists was able to integrate his ethical theory with the basic tenets of pragmatism to make its philosophical basis wholly satisfactory. This paper proposes Peirce’s theory as able to provide a comprehensive framework for ethics, although Peirce himself did not pursue the lead that he gave.

Peirce’s Theory as a Basis for Ethics

Peirce, the major founder of pragmatism, approached his philosophical task at a more fundamental level than the other pragmatists discussed above. Being a mathematician, his aim was to construct a basic philosophy of science, and he conceived of science as a pursuit of knowledge which is never complete and which will never arrive at Truth in its entirety. Peirce saw philosophy as part of the “Science of Discovery” and divided it into three categories: phenomenology, normative science, and metaphysics. Phenomenology studies elements which are universally present in the phenomenon, “normative science distinguishes what ought to be from what ought not to be,” and “metaphysics seeks to give an account of the universe of mind and matter.” Normative science is further divided into three fields: esthetics, ethics, and logic. Peirce defines each as follows:

Esthetics is the science of ideals, or of that which is objectively admirable without any ulterior reason. I am not well acquainted with this science; but it ought to repose on phenomenology. Ethics, or the science of right and wrong, must appeal to Esthetics for aid in determining the sumnum bonum. It is the theory of self-controlled, or deliberate, conduct. Logic is the theory of self-controlled, or deliberate, thought; and as such, must appear to ethics for its principles. 54

Although the topic of this paper is ethics, which is a normative science, a brief review of Peirce’s phenomenology (or phaneroscopy) will help lay out the foundation on which the central argument will be built. In

54 Ibid., p. 62.
his phenomenology, Peirce establishes "three modes of being" which can be directly observed in any object of thought: "the being of positive qualitative possibility" or Firstness, "the being of actual fact" or Secondness, and "the being of law that will govern facts in the future" or Thirdness. Firstness involves feeling, Secondness, effort and resistance, and Thirdness, "synthetic consciousness;" meaning, habit, thought, or prediction. The corresponding semiotic units are the sign (or ground), the object, and the interpretant. Relating the categories with the normative sciences makes esthetics Firstness, ethics Secondness, and logic Thirdness—a match Peirce himself makes.

Relating ethics to other normative sciences made Peirce designate it as Secondness because, in the pragmatic fashion, ethics must be tied to action in actual, concrete situations, whereas esthetics refers more to a state of feeling and logic to a general law. Ethics must be central to pragmatism because pragmatism itself "has conceivable bearing upon the conduct of life, thus "expressing relation to some definite human purpose." As Dewey notes, however, there is a difference between action and conduct, the latter implying "purpose, motive, intention," qualities or entities which could be classified in the category of Firstness or potentiality. Peirce calls ethics "the philosophy of aims" and the "science of aims" or the "science of subtleties," thus belonging more to the class of potentials than actual, brute facts. Furthermore, Peirce states that "conduct controlled by ethical reason tends toward fixing certain habits of conduct," and "the only ethically sound motive is the most general one." These statements would suggest the classification of ethics as Thirdness, and conduct—as opposed to action—could be seen as Thirdness. Thus ethics itself could actually be classified in all three categories.

55 Ibid., pp. 75-76.
56 Ibid., p. 95.
58 Peirce, Philosophical Writings, p. 252.
60 Peirce, Philosophical Writings, pp. 142-144.
61 Ibid., p. 264.
62 Ibid., p. 308.
63 This possibility is suggested by Potter, Charles S. Peirce, p. 24, but is neither elaborated on nor carried out.
This suggests an interesting process of narrowing down and expanding Peirce's categories. His classification of various types of philosophy provides the basis. "Metaphysics is the proper designation for the third," Peirce states. Normative sciences, being most closely tied to actual facts, could thus be considered a second, and phenomenology, the study of essential features of phenomena, a first. Applying the categories only to the normative sciences yields the classification Peirce himself gives: esthetics first, ethics second, and logic third. Narrowing one step further, ethics (or esthetics or logic) could similarly be divided into three categories that will correspond with Firstness, Secondness, and Thirdness.

Such subcategories are indeed provided by writers on ethics. The above discussed pragmatists refer to various essences of good as criteria for ethical conduct. The pleasure-pain principle, or producing happiness, could be seen as first, the utility principle as second, and a universal law as third. Grisez and Shaw divide actions into three kinds that resemble these categories. "At the first level are those whose meaning comes from the natural consummation to which they lead"; the meaning of such action is already there and needs no imputed meaning; obvious Firstness. "At the second level of action we act in order to achieve specific, limited goals separate and distinct from the action. The meaning of the action is derived from its objective" which seems to be a concrete, factual one; pure Secondness. Acting continually in this fashion, however, "would be a sign of a fundamental commitment, a real act of self-determination, which itself would be a third level action serving as a sort of umbrella for many actions at the second level." This is nothing but generality, Peirce's Thirdness, although Grisez and Shaw make no mention of Peirce's categories. This is the highest ethical level, according to them, since it is the most inclusive.

---

64 Peirce, *Philosophical Writings*, p. 313.
66 E.g. James, *The Writings*, p. 620.
67 Potter, *Charles S. Peirce*, p. 43, makes it third; cf. Peirce's designation of Firstness as "the being of positive qualitative possibility."
68 Grisez and Shaw, *Beyond the New Morality*, pp. 16-17. The application to Peirce's categories, however, is mine.
and is "directed to a fundamental human good as something in which one participates."69

The above classification could be expressed in a figure, the bottom line representing Firstness, the middle line Secondness, and the top line Thirdness:

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Philosophy</th>
<th>metaphysics</th>
<th>logic</th>
<th>universal law</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>normative science</td>
<td>ethics</td>
<td>utility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>phenomenology</td>
<td></td>
<td>pleasure-pain</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

**Summary and Conclusion**

Although the pragmatist philosophers explicitly advocate utilitarian values that in Peirce’s categories would belong to Secondness, scattered in their writings there are indications that this criterion is not entirely sufficient as a basis for ethics. James, for example, specifies as the aim “of him who seeks an ethical philosophy” to “find an account of the moral relations among things,”70 the “subtle harmonies and discords between the elementary ideas”71, a generality principle—a Thirdness—based on material found in the world. Mead rules out the transcendental ideal and the principle of maximum happiness and settles on economy, effectiveness, and consistency as the criteria for ethics.72 Although in these concepts he appears to stay with Secondness, in his conception of philanthropy73 the kindly impulse could be Firstness, organized charity and community obligations Secondness, and social reform (removing the cause of suffering) Thirdness. These levels, especially Secondness and Thirdness, are also implicitly present in the writings of Dewey. His emphasis on conduct in concrete situations fits the category of Secondness, but his concept of community as the "ulti-
mate universal”\textsuperscript{74} or the final moral end incorporates a general principle and thus exemplifies Thirdness. Peirce, as was noted, explicitly advocates the most general principle as the most “ethically sound.”\textsuperscript{75} Thirdness—generality—is thus present in all these theories, and each of the four philosophers holds it up as more ethical than Firstness or Secondness—feeling or utility.

Peirce’s categories provide a framework for a comprehensive ethical theory to which the theories of James, Mead, and Dewey—and perhaps others—can be integrated and which clarifies their basic dimensions. This classification follows logically from Peirce’s categories and from his taxonomy of sciences. The category of Thirdness appears to provide the foundation for the most satisfactory ethical principle since it indicates generality, thus it could be a basis for formalist ethics. As the stop sign at a traffic intersection applies to all the instances in which the individual cars must stop, a universal ethical principle covers all the concrete instances in which an ethical decision has to be made. This article has shown that such a principle fits within the philosophy of pragmatism which is better known for its utilitarian and relativistic dimensions. The rank ordering of these categories, furthermore, shows that while hedonistic and utilitarian principles may have their place, moral life ultimately needs a higher rule of conduct.

\textsuperscript{74} Dewey, \textit{The Public and Its Problems}, p. 215.

\textsuperscript{75} Peirce, \textit{Philosophical Writings}, pp. 264, 308.
TO GABRIELE WINKLER
ON THE OCCASION OF THE PUBLICATION
OF A FESTSCHRIFT
IN HONOR OF HER SIXTIETH BIRTHDAY

Michael Daniel Findikyan

What an extraordinary honor it is for me to be invited to share my thoughts this evening on the occasion of Professor Gabriele Winkler’s sixtieth birthday, and on the publication of the *Festschrift, Crossroad of Cultures: Studies in Liturgy and Patristics in Honor of Gabriele Winkler*. As many of you know, it is the custom on such occasions to review the scholarly accomplishments of the honoree, outlining and reviewing writings and publications in order to resume his or her academic career and scholarly contributions. I must confess at the outset that I do not pretend to have the competence to rehearse and scrutinize for you Professor Winkler’s enormous bibliography. Such a résumé has been admirably and ably achieved by Professors Feulner, Velkovska and Taft in their Introduction to Professor Winkler’s *Festschrift*.

If I may be allowed, I would like to take a step back from a strictly academic review of Winkler’s scholarship to reflect rather on the broader implications and results of her remarkable research and teaching career thus far. Having never sat in Professor Winkler’s classroom, technically, I do not speak as one of her students. However, as my *Doktorvater* warned me when I first came to Rome, “If you want to study Armenian Liturgy, you’re going to have to read everything Gabriele Winkler has written.” Indeed, the most prominent gauge of the

---

1 Paper presented at the Pontifical Oriental Institute, Rome, on March 9, 2000 on the occasion of the publication of a *Festschrift* in honor of Gabriele Winkler, holder of the Chair in Liturgiology at the University of Tübingen, Germany.

magnitude of Winkler’s scholarly contribution is the plain fact that most students of liturgiology, and all specialists in eastern liturgy, not to mention Armenian Liturgy, are indirectly, yet inevitably, students of Gabriele Winkler. But even this is only one measure of the influence of our honoree’s life work.

As one who is directly involved in the ministry of the Church, as a priest and seminary professor, I cannot allow myself to forfeit this opportunity to reflect on the fruits of Professor Winkler’s work for the good of the Church. The immediate purpose of research and scholarly writing, in any field, is, of course, to advance our knowledge toward greater understanding. However, if I may be allowed to restrict Winkler’s expansive scholarly purview to my area of specialization, students of liturgy assume a greater burden. For a church’s liturgical tradition is no mere relic of antiquity to be excavated, analyzed, classified and admired in a museum display case. Nor must liturgy be considered merely a sparsely populated, esoteric academic domain in which to cultivate a scholarly career and construct a *curriculum vitae*. Liturgical structures are the fossils of a community’s living, life-sustaining, and life-defining faith. Liturgy is the virtual fossil record of the Church’s acknowledgment of, and commitment to the *Dabar*, the Gospel, the narrative of our salvation in Jesus Christ. This witness is paramount to the community’s life of faith today. The study of liturgy is thus inherently historical, yet it must rise above antiquarianism. Perhaps more than any other historical discipline, liturgiology intrinsically bridges the conceptual gap between evidence in the past and pertinence for the present. The eyes of the student of liturgy, in other words, must ultimately look to the mission of the Church; to the propagation of the Gospel and to the building up of the Kingdom of God.

The tenth-century Armenian theologian and exegete Xosrov Anjewac’i eloquently expresses this view of the liturgy’s true import when, in the conclusion of his *Commentary on the Divine Liturgy* he exhorts his readers:

I beg you not to regard it a superfluous task to contemplate these divine texts, especially those of the proclamations and prayers, on which our salvation depends, and not only ours, but those to whom we are obligated, whether alive or dead. For if the tongue strikes the air without thought following it, it produces no benefit. For God who knows the heart looks at the heart and mind and not the tongue. Therefore,
let us render prayer to God with alert mind, undistracted thoughts and soul fully-aware, to be of benefit to ourselves and others and thus gain from others’ prayers.\footnote{Xosrov Anjewae‘i, \textit{Commentary on the Divine Liturgy}, translated with an introduction by S. Peter Cowe (New York, 1991) 225.}

Xosrov seeks understanding. Not only the efficacy of the liturgy, but our very salvation depends on our attentive, thoughtful contemplation and comprehension of the proclamations and prayers of the liturgy. Gabriele Winkler has devoted her life to increasing our understanding of the liturgy, toward the greater end of thoughtful, meaningful worship of Almighty God. The work involved in achieving this lofty goal is hardly glamorous. As those familiar with her writings will know, it involves a disciplined, highly technical, exacting, at times excruciating investigation and analysis of the evidence, made possible only thanks to her fluency with languages, and facility with linguistic, philological, historical, and comparative and structural liturgiological methodologies.

Winkler’s work makes her a pioneer in what I regard as the Third Phase of scholarship in the area of Armenian Liturgy. The serious investigation of the Armenian Liturgy began quite suddenly around the turn of the twentieth century with a flurry of interest in the Armenian liturgy. The scholars of this First Phase could be characterized as Explorers: the Mechitarist fathers Hovsep Gatrjian, Hagop Dashian, and Vartan Hatsuni; the Echmiadzin Vartabeds Sahag Amaduni and Nersess Der-Mikaelian; the Armenian Patriarch of Constantinople Malachia Ormanian, and of course the indefatigable Frederic Conybeare. These men excavated and described the liturgy as they found it in the printed editions and manuscripts, eschewing any penetrating analysis or comparison with other rites. These scholars were succeeded by Abps. Norayr Bogharian and Tiran Nersoyan of the Armenian Patriarchate of Jerusalem, and by the Mechitarist Fr. Sahag Jemjemian, who continued this type of archival, synoptic work in other areas of the Armenian liturgy during the second half of the twentieth century.

The Second Phase of scholars were the Synthesizers, Anton Baumstark, Hieronymus Engberding and Juan Mateos, S.J., emeritus of this Institute, who first considered the Armenian evidence in the comparative, simultaneous study of the various liturgical rites. While
these scholars shed much new light on the Armenian liturgical evidence and demonstrated its centrality for liturgie comparée, their work did not address the Armenian liturgical forms themselves.

Apart from being the first woman to occupy herself with Armenian liturgy, Gabriele Winkler must be considered the first scholar to turn to the Armenian evidence itself, as the express object of analysis. Beginning with her work in Armenian Initiation Rites, and continuing with her inquiry into Byzantine and Latin influence on the Armenian Rite; her several studies of the Armenian Daily Office; her recent work on the Armenian Anaphoras and now her much-anticipated investigation of Armenian Creeds, Winkler has been the first to apply the comparative methods of historical synthesis and reconstruction to the Armenian evidence, in order to more fully understand the evolution and distinctive features of that rite. Alongside Renoux's magisterial work on the Armenian Lectionary and Calendar, a number of important contributions by Robert Taft, S.J., and some recent work by a number of young scholars, Gabriele Winkler remains at the vanguard of Armenian liturgiology.

The fruits of her tireless work have been plentiful for the Armenian Church. Among Winkler's students can be counted deacons, priests, bishops and archbishops of the Armenian Church. I remember fondly the visit of His Holiness Catholicos Karekin I of blessed memory to this Institute just over three years ago. In this hall, at the conclusion of a scholarly symposium in His honor, His Holiness warmly greeted Professor Winkler, recalling their cordial, scholarly camaraderie of many years. Those of our clergy who have been taught by Professor Winkler either in her classroom, or through her writings, have come to a deeper appreciation of our Church and its liturgy.

This, in my estimation, is Winkler's greatest contribution to my Church, and, for that matter, to all the eastern churches, Orthodox or Catholic. Today, more than ever before, in the ecclesiastical free-market of the post-modern world, the survival of the eastern churches will rest on how well each one knows itself: its Tradition, that is, what it has, what it is, and what it has to offer. I first met Professor Winkler almost ten years ago at St. John's University in Collegeville, Minnesota. I was unsure of what direction my future studies would take and, on my bishop's recommendation, I turned to her for guidance. At one point in our conversation, she looked me in the eyes, and in that provocative tone of hers she said: "You Armenians don't know the
treasure you have.” A stinging indictment; indeed, one with which I regularly challenge my seminarians.

Gabriele Winkler has consecrated her life to excavating, sifting through, and evaluating that treasure wherever she has found it. My seminarians will have the task not only of knowing that treasure, but of communicating it to our people, explaining its urgency for their lives, and justifying its coexistence with other ancient, Christian traditions. Otherwise, my church and other relatively small, eastern churches will be left in the dust of this world’s religious agora. Education must be the impetus for a new evangelization within the eastern churches whether in the so-called “diasporas” of North and South America, Europe and Australia; or in the new political-religious climate of post-Soviet Central and Eastern Europe, or the complex ethno-religious environment of the Middle East. These churches’ only hope for survival is to revisit their ancient Christian traditions, encoded in the liturgy, and, excavating and reinterpreting the subtleties of each Church’s distinctive historical expression and experience and witness of Christ’s Gospel, to communicate it effectively to a new generation.

That reevaluation of the Tradition begins with the scrupulous kind of work we have come to expect from Gabriele Winkler. As a pedagogue, Professor Winkler is at her best when she is poring over some medieval text in Armenian, or Coptic or Ge’ez, with a student of that ecclesiastical tradition. I remember fondly sitting in this library with Professor Winkler some years ago doing just that. Reviewing sections of my doctoral thesis together, we discussed the proper translation and interpretation of some early medieval Armenian exegetical texts. Again and again she challenged me to read and reread the text; to jettison preconceived categories of interpretation; to more directly “dialogue with the scholarly consensus;” and to challenge it if necessary, even if that consensus was forged by Winkler herself! When, in my thesis, I nuanced an hypothesis she had long ago advanced regarding the evolution of hymnography in the Armenian Night Office, Winkler urged me to sharpen my argument in order to show more unambiguously how I differed from her interpretation of the evidence. She seemed simply delighted that together we had taken a scholarly step ahead.

Many times Winkler warned me against accepting a priori the categories and conclusions of “the Byzantinists.” Again and again she would remind me of the relativity of the term “Christian East;” that for
Armenians, Copts, Christians of the Syriac traditions and Ethiopians, Constantinople is already the dreaded "West." A true orientalist, Winkler realizes that the Orient extends well beyond the geographic and cultural boundaries of the Byzantine Empire. Until today she will smile at me and say, "We are the true Christian East."

Here is Winkler at her scholarly best: brimming with enthusiasm for her research and that of her students; controversial; ultra-critical in her scholarship and writing; microscopic in her attention to detail, yet sweeping in her perception of larger structures and systems; taking calculated risks, pioneer that she is, in order to develop preliminary hypotheses for the sake of scholarly progress; encyclopedic in her knowledge of the sources and literature—as seen, for example, in her recent, indispensable appraisal of the state of research in the field of Armenian Liturgy, "Der armenische Ritus: Bestandsaufnahme und neue Erkenntnisse sowie einige kürzere Notizen zur Liturgie der Georgier,"4 which will long remain a true vade mecum for anyone who aspires to serious study of the Armenian liturgy.

The Armenian Church and the eastern churches in general owe Professor Gabriele Winkler a debt of gratitude for the enormous contributions she has made over many years. Most of all, her research, writing, and teaching have helped us better to understand the treasure our churches possess and confess. Professor Winkler, may God grant you continued health and fruitful study. And as we say in Armenian, «Քարեք երջևիր». May your reward be complete.

---

A NOTE ON NETS

James R. Russell

In an article published in the St. Nersess Theological Review four years ago, based upon a lecture read at Harvard in Feb. 1992, I offered a translation of the Tal hambarjman, “Song of the Ascension” by St. Gregory of Narek, which includes the hapax legomenon, yerazgayic’. It is used as an adjective modifying and in agreement with yeram-ic’, “flocks, throngs” (both in the ablative plural). The problem word I took to mean “adorned, arrayed”. Professor Anahit Perikhanian of St. Petersburg separately suggested, in a book printed at Erevan in 1993 (Materialy k etimologicheskому slovaryu armyanskogo yazyka, pp. 39-41), that it should be explained as a variant, by metathesis, of eragaz, a net used by hunters to trap prey. Although—as I have noted—she makes unjustifiable emendations of the text and misquotes the primary form of the toponym Erazgawork’, I now think her interpretation may nonetheless be the right one. Narekac’i’s poem is laden with imagery from the Song of Songs, which Christian mystics have interpreted as an allegory of the soul’s unification with God: Narekac’i himself wrote a lengthy commentary on it, parts of which Prof. R.W. Thomson has translated, noting Narekac’i’s debt to the writings of the Church Fathers.

In the Biblical poem, the (celestial) Bridegroom is seen coming behind the wall, looking through the window, seen through the nets, and Origen—one the earliest Christian mystics and commentators on the text—explains that Christ saw “a great throng of mankind entangled in the nets” (II.12, cit. by Andrew Louth, The Origins of the Christian Mystical Tradition, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981, p. 62). These nets are the snares of hostile powers by which sinful man is held captive; or they are also the temptations that beset Him. Christ both frees us and overcomes temptation: He ascends in triumph. The word erazgay- could also have the sense of an orderly array—the throngs to either side of the ascending Christ in virtually every Christian portrayal of the scene are disciplined and decorous to a fault, and perhaps Narekac’i had this in mind, too, lending his phrase the kind intricate double symbolism one might expect in a literary work of genius. But I
think the evidence of the mystical interpretation of the *Song of Songs*,
which she does not cite and of which she seems not to have been
aware—Perikhanian has netted, as it were, its primary meaning.
*Yermanc’ yerazgayic’* means flocks of men entangled in the nets of sin.
BOOK REVIEWS


Reviewed by Aelred Cody, O.S.B.

In this large collection of essays in honor of Gabriele Winkler, Hans-Jürgen Feulner, "List of Publications of Gabriele Winkler" (pp. 31-42) lists Professor Winkler's scholarly publications, and in the introduction, "Gabriele Winkler at Sixty: Vita et Opera" (pp. 11-29), signed by the volume's three editors, most of her publications are classified topically, with comment on their relevance and their importance. Much of her own work has been in Armenian, and the collection opens with a warmly appreciative letter by the learned Archbishop Khajag Barsamian, Primate of the Diocese of the Armenian Church of America in New York. Most of the studies in this volume are on topics that are not directly Armenian, however. Since the readers of *St. Nersess Theological Review* will be interested above all in the Armenian studies, the present review will begin with an account of them. The others will be listed at the end.

Armenuhui Drost-Abgarjan and Hermann Goltz, "Eine armenische Übersetzung des *Hymnos Akathistos*. Einleitung, Edition, deutsche Übersetzung und armenisch-griechisches Glossar" (pp. 193-249), give us the Akathistos Hymn (the alphabetic οικολ and the προοίμια) found in an eighteenth-century Armenian translation of the Greek *Great Horologion*, with a German translation of the Armenian text. They add a glossary of Armenian words in the translation with their Greek equivalents in the original text, but some important words in the glossary (e.g., *marmnaworut'iwn = σάρκιωσις*) are discussed in the notes accompanying the German translation. Drost-Abgarjan and Goltz are not yet sure whether this was an entirely new Armenian translation or a reflection of Armenian translations already made.

Michael Daniel Findikyan, "On the Origins and Early Evolution of the Armenian Office of Sunrise" (pp. 283-314), traces the history of this office, the *arewagali ëam* which follows Matins (the *aṙawôtean ëam*) in the modern *ëamagîrk* and which has often been called "Prime." Father
Daniel, whose knowledge of the Armenian sources is thorough, and whose critical judgment is keen, shows that at the time of the council held at Dvin in A.D. 719, in the days of Yovhannēs Ījneck 'i, there was no arewagali ūam, and that Matins in those days ended with the Trisagion followed by a “psalm of sunrise” (arewagali salmos) identified by the contemporary Step'anos Siwnec 'i as Psalm 112, still sung after the Trisagion at Matins on Sundays and ordinary ferial days. Father Daniel suspects that in the monastery of Siwnik 'i, but not in the Armenian Church generally, the monks were concluding the Night Office and Matins with the Trisagion, going to bed, then rising again at dawn to pray Psalm 112 (and perhaps a little more), either privately or in common. Not much later, the work De officiis ecclesiae Christi (Pseudo-Ījneck 'i), essentially a recasting of Step'anos's commentary on the Divine Office, may contain signs that monks were retiring after the Night Office, rising again for Matins, and attaching considerable importance to prayer at sunrise. When Xosrov Anjewac 'i wrote his liturgical comments in the tenth century, a proclamation and prayer based on Psalm 112 were in use. By the middle of the thirteenth century, when Movsēs Erznkacak 'i compiled his anthology of texts on the Divine Office, a Sunrise Office existed more or less as it is in the modern ūamagirk 'i, with consequent reworking of the end of Matins, from which the Sunrise Office, according to Movsēs, was supposed to be separated by an interval of time. We cannot claim that the Sunrise Office had already been detached from Matins when Xosrov Anjewac 'i wrote his comments in the tenth century, because we cannot be sure that Xosrov is the author of the pertinent scholia, extant only in the anthology compiled 300 years later by Movsēs Erznkacak 'i. Father Daniel raises the possibility that the Sunrise Office was detached from Matins by Nersēs Šnorhali, author of the hymns now found in all four sections (canons) of the Sunrise Office, who died in 1173.

Stefano Parenti, "Mesedi—Mesēdios" (pp. 543-55), accepts F. E. Brightman's suggestion that the Greek word μεσηδῖον is the basis of the Armenian word mesedi, which designates a psalmic text to be sung between the two readings preceding the Gospel in the Surb Patarag. Etymologically, the word μεσηδῖον fits nicely: the Armenian mesedi is a canticle (ὥδη) placed in the middle (μέσον), between two readings. Brightman advanced no evidence supporting his suggestion, but Parenti has found some. In Codex Barberini gr. 336 and in other manuscripts, mainly in Grottaferrata, the word μεσηδῖον is used instead of
προκεῖμενον in ritual contexts whose origin is probably Palestinian rather than Constantinopolitan. Parenti observes that the "μεσοβία between the hymns of the Three Children" discussed by Nilos of Sinai and the Palestinians John and Sophronios in the *Narration of the Abbots John and Sophronios* are bits of responsorial psalmody between the seventh and eighth canticles of the nine-canticle system. In other words, the Armenian word *mesedi* is based on the Greek word μεσοβίον as it was used liturgically in Palestine.

Erich Reinart, "Zu einem Gebetseinschub in der jüngeren armenischen Redaktion der Basiliusanaphora" (pp. 591-601), deals with the first of two prayers found after the dialogue beginning the anaphora in the more recent Armenian recension of the Liturgy of St. Basil. He prints the text of the prayer, with manuscript variants, and compares it with the prayer of preparation in the Greek version of the Liturgy of St. James on which most of it is based. He shows easily that this prayer has been inserted into its present context, but he leaves too many critical questions in suspense.

Charles Renoux, O.S.B., "Le Gloria in excelsis Deo de l'Église arménienne" (pp. 603-16), translates the Armenian text of the hymn (based on the Greek version at the end of the Psalter in Codex Alexandrinus), notes its particularities (which probably have little historical or theological significance), and tells us what ancient Armenian commentators wrote about it.

Robert W. Thomson, "Saint Ephrem and an Armenian Homily on the Passion" (pp. 693-703), believes that the text of the homily in question, printed in the Venetian Mekhitarists' edition of the homilies of Elišē in 1859, is probably composite. He finds that the order of Elišē's treatment of the Passion was not determined by the order in Ephrem's *Commentary on the Diatessaron*, and that some material which Elišē used in the homily is drawn not from Ephrem but from other sources.

Boghos Levon Zekiyian, "L'Armenia tra Bisanzio e l'Iran dei Sasanidi e momenti della fondazione dell'ideologia dell'Armenia cristiana (secc. V-VII). Preliminari per una sintesi" (pp. 717-44), insists that in the period from the Battle of Avarayr in 451 to the arrival of the Arabs Armenian ideology was vitally ambivalent, some Armenian attitudes being Eastern, others Western. He warns against emphasizing either East or West to the neglect of the other.

The other studies in the volume are these: Luise Abramowski, "Narsai, Ephraim und Kirill über Jesu Verlassenheitsruf. Matth. 27,46"
(pp. 43-67); Hansjakob Becker, “Aspiciens Aspiciebam. Tradition und Transformation des Antiphonale Officii im Mittelalter” (pp. 69-88); Gabriel Bertoniere, O.C.S.O., “Four Liturgical Canons of Elias II of Jerusalem” (pp. 89-149); Heinzgerd Brakmann, “η ύπεραντή τοῦ Κυρίου. Christi Lichtmess im frühchristlichen Jerusalem” (pp. 151-72); Sebastian P. Brock, “Towards a Typology of the Epicleises in the West Syrian Anaphoras” (pp. 173-92); Hans-Jürgen Feulner, “Zu den Editionen orientalischer Anaphoren” (pp. 251-82); Albert Gerhards, “Akklamationen im Eucharistiegebet. Funktion und Gestalt im Liturgievergleich” (pp. 315-29); Stephen Gero, “What Were the Holy Images of the Iconoclasts?” (pp. 331-43); Gregor M. Hanke, O.S.B., “Der Odenkanon des Tagzeitenritus Konstantinopels im Licht der Beiträge H. Schneiderers und O. Strunks—eine Relecture” (pp. 345-67); Andreas Heinz, “Sonntagsfrömmigkeit in der heutigen Liturgie der Syrisch-Maronitischen Kirche” (pp. 369-93); Sebastià Janeras, “Saint Jean Chrysostome et la ‘Grande Entrée’” (pp. 395-403); Maxwell E. Johnson, “The Origins of the Anaphoral Use of the Sanctus and Epiclesis Revisited: The Contribution of Gabriele Winkler and Its Implications” (pp. 405-42); Franz Kohlschein, “Konturen der Liturgiewissenschaft. Zur Berücksichtigung der östlichen Liturgien bei den Autoren liturgiewissenschaftlicher Handbücher Franz Xaver Schmid (1800-1871) und Johann Baptist Lüft (1801-1870)” (pp. 443-60); Christoph Markschies, “Origenes und die Kommentierung des paulinischen Römerbriefs—einige Bemerkungen zur Rezeption von antiken Kommentarwerkten im Christentum des dritten Jahrhunderts und ihrer Vorgeschichte” (pp. 461-91); Reinhard Meßner, “Zur Eucharistie in den Thomasakten. Zugleich ein Beitrag zur Frühgeschichte der eucharistischen Epiclese” (pp. 493-513); Marcel Metzger, “Pages féminines des Constitutions apostoliques” (pp. 515-41); Thomas Pott, O.S.B., “Réforme monastique et évolution liturgique. La réforme stoudite” (pp. 557-89); Samir Khalil Samir, S.J., “L’Encyclopédie liturgique d’Ibn Kabar (1324) et son apologie d’usages coptes” (pp. 619-55); Hans-Joachim Schultz, “Die Spiegelung urkirchlicher Taufmystagogie und Taupraxis in Joh 3,3-21 und Mt 28,19” (pp. 657-74); Robert F. Taft, S.J., “The βηματικον in the 67thc. Narration of the Abbots John and Sophronius (BHNGA 1438w). An Exercise in Comparative Liturgy” (pp. 675-92); Elena Velkovska, “I ‘dodici prokeimena’ del mattutino cattedrale bizantino” (pp. 705-16).

Reviewed by George Bournoutian

With this book, her first, Ina Baghdiantz McCabe, assistant professor of History at Tufts University, has established her credentials as a serious scholar specializing in the history of Armenian merchants in Iran during the seventeenth century. Utilizing Armenian and Persian primary and secondary sources, contemporary European travel accounts, relevant material from the French archives, as well as numerous articles in English, French, and Armenian, focusing on the Armenians merchants in Safavid Iran, Professor Baghdiantz has managed to present a complete and clear picture of the Eurasian trade undertaken by Julfa Armenians. In addition she has enabled us to understand the inner workings of this well-known Armenian enclave within the Safavid realm.

The author correctly points out that the first wave of Armenians who were forcibly deported to Iran became part of the Safavid administration. A distinct group from the second wave, however, merchants from Old Julfa, were given special privileges in New Julfa and sold the shah's silk to Europe. The Armenian deportees (together with the Georgian *ghulams*), who were entirely dependent on the goodwill of the shah, counterbalanced the power of the Qizilbash.

Chapters III-IX form the core of the book. Chapter III: *The Republic of New Julfa*, clearly demonstrates that New Julfa existed as an autonomous unit within the Safavid realm. Chapter V: *New Julfians as Financiers of the Court* compares the richest Armenian family, the Safraz, to the Fuggers and Grimaldis. The great wealth of the Armenian merchants becomes obvious when the author cites the fortune of Agha Piri, one of the richest merchants of New Julfa and compares it to the wealth of the two richest men (trading and textile and bankers) in Beauvais and Amiens. Agha Piri's fortune of 2 million *livres* was ten times more than the combined capital of the two, which totaled 193,000 *livres*. Chapter VII: *Merchant Organization and National Interest* makes extensive use of the work by the late professors Khachikyan and
Papazyan of the Matenadaran (*The Account Book of Hovhannes Ter-Davit’yan of Julfa*, Erevan, 1984) and provides the reader with details on the accounting system, letters of credit, interest rates, and loans. Chapters VIII-IX describe the Armenian Trading Company and the Russian route to Europe. Here Baghdiantz relies on the work of Sh. Khachikyan (*The Merchants of New Julfa and Their Commercial Ties with Russia in the 17-18th centuries* Erevan, 1988), who has used Russian documents. Unfortunately the vast store of published Russian documents relating to Armenian merchants in Russia were not available to Baghdiantz in an English translation (see my forthcoming annotated translation with commentary, *Armenians and Russia: A Documentary Record, 1626-1796*). Another source, Paul Bushkovitch, *The Merchants of Moscow (1580-1650)*, Cambridge, 1980, would have provided additional information.

The last two chapters make fascinating reading concerning the Julfa Armenians in the service of European powers and their relations with the European trading companies. Some three dozen illustrations and maps, appendices, and a superb bibliography completes this monograph, the first in English on this very important merchant community and the Eurasian trade in the seventeenth century.

By extending her scope from the over-emphasized seventeenth century to 1530-1750, Baghdiantz focuses on the political and financial ties between converted ghulam administrators and the Armenian merchants of Julfa. The novel thesis linking the mint, the palace administration and the Armenian silk traders is intriguing but needs further research. What Baghdiantz proves without a shadow of a doubt is that Iran, India, the Ottoman Empire, and Europe were part of a large trading network in which Armenian merchants based in Isfahan played a major role. By dealing with cross-cultural trade, the work also contributes to the ongoing debate on Orientalism and Eurocentrism.

The study bears some criticism. The sub-title is confusing, it may indicate that the Armenians of Isfahan began their trade activity in 1530. There is very little information about the Armenian merchants after 1700. Most of the data is on the seventeenth century. It was Baiburttian, whose work appears in Baghdiantz’s bibliography, and not Gregorian, who first (in 1969) introduced the notion that Armenian merchants blocked European capital from coming into Iran and kept Iran from falling under the power of foreign merchants. Furthermore, the title and transliteration of Baiburttian’s work is inaccurate. It should
read, V. A. Baiburtian, Armianskata koloniiia Novoi Dzhul’fy v XVII veke (Rol’ Novoi Dzhul’fy v irano-evropeiskikh politicheskikh i ekonomicheskikh sviaziakh). Finally this reviewer would have preferred a more detailed index. However, these minor problems in no way detract from the value of this scholarly monograph which will prove an asset to many students of Armenian and Iranian history, as well as to the history of international trade.

Reviewed by Sara Kärkkäinen Terian

As one of the most successful ethnic groups in the United States, Armenians provide a case study of a transition from persecution to perseverance, of a new life in a new country when life in the old country has become all but impossible. It is a story of overcoming obstacles, of mutual help, of vision and leadership, of living faith accompanied by hard work, and a story of ultimate triumph.

Deranian's extensive research and dedicated effort has produced a remarkable, well-documented study of one such Armenian community, that of the Worcester area in Massachusetts. Some men of the Kharpert Province in Turkish Armenia, including both of the author's grandfathers, had come to Worcester since the 1830s to work in Washburn & Moen wire mills, and then returned home. This and later immigration were encouraged by New England Protestant missionaries in Turkey. With the rise of Turkish atrocities toward the Armenians in their midst, however, an influx of immigration took place for several decades during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The book documents much of the immigration to the Worcester area, and illustrates the struggle involved in the effort to reinvent life in the city that became known as "the chief city" of Armenians in America.

In seventeen chapters and an epilogue—a gripping story of his mother's harrowing journey after losing all her family, Deranian not only provides a detailed historical documentary but also leads the reader to experience with these early immigrants their hardships and triumphs. Richly illustrated with photographs of both the old country and the new setting in a new country, and of family members and leaders of the Armenian community, the book is an invaluable storehouse of information. Numerous boxed inserts provide a window to some descriptive detail, whether of an Armenian club or a typical church day, a clipping from a local newspaper, or some other historical document. Thus the book also provides a glimpse of the city of Worcester at the time, and the role of Armenians in its development. In fact, for many of these early Armenian immigrants, Worcester was America—hence the title of the book.
Most people in Worcester, however, knew little or nothing about Armenians, so many Armenian immigrants experienced discrimination, even violence, and they were often pointed out as a curiosity or were classified as Turks in the workplace and elsewhere. Putting up with horrendous working conditions and long hours at the wire mill where most of them worked, they persevered, and eventually became known as creative, hardworking, and resourceful people, "one of the most industrious and...most intelligent races in the world" according to W. E. Gladstone (p. 151).

The book provides some important statistics as well. For example, the number of Armenians in various parts of town, their occupations, and comparative literacy rates among the various ethnic groups. The latter statistic places Armenians at the top of all the "new immigrant" groups, with a literacy rate of 92.1% in 1919 (p. 21). Education, in fact, was actively pursued; not only did children attend school but also workers flocked to night school after a long and tiring day at work. Furthermore, many a dedicated clergyman—or lay workers both Armenian and non Armenian—worked hard in teaching English to the immigrants. The Reverend Assadour Antreassian's statement, "I will teach English even to the chickens" (p. 57), exemplifies the determination of these educators.

Throughout the book, the role of faith shines through as the source of strength, the bond of the family and community, and the guiding light. Although most of the immigrants featured were evangelical, the role of the Armenian Apostolic Church is upheld as well, and there are examples of cooperation between the different churches. Having suffered because of their faith, Armenians in Worcester and elsewhere have clung to the faith that still unites them more than anything else can.

Deranian's book is an archive of information about the lives of early Armenian immigrants in the Worcester area, what brought them to this country, how they rallied together to support one another, and how they succeeded in creating one of the most viable ethnic communities. The book is a valuable addition not only to Armenian literature but also to ethnic studies in general. The multitude of short sketches on various individuals makes a reader wish for more of the story about each, but that is for someone else to pick up. Indeed, many books could be written, inspired by the leads that Deranian has provided.

Reviewed by Arten Ashjian

Among the seminarians to graduate from the Armath Seminary in 1895, Papken Guleserian was the foremost. His life was shaped by two twists of fate. First, unlike several of his classmates and colleagues, he did not fall victim to the Genocide of 1915: he was away from Turkey, having come to the United States in 1914 to undergo an operation. Second, though as coadjutor he was expected to succeed the aged Catholicos Sahag II Khabayan of the Cilician See in Lebanon, Guleserian himself died unexpectedly in 1936, a few years earlier than his senior partner.

This finely printed book is an English translation of the memorial volume published in Beirut in 1968 by the Central Committee of Aintab Armenians in the United States marking the centenary of their famous compatriot’s birth in Aintab in 1868. The translation is a labor of love and a gift of admiration on the part of the present generation of the Guleserian family to the memory of their illustrious uncle. As the title indicates, it comprises the story of Papken Guleserian’s life, enriched with excerpts from his writings. The volume is also illustrated with twelve photographs and two reproductions of periodical pages, all in black and white.

Ordained a bishop at Holy Etchmiadzin in 1910, Papken Guleserian remained a member of the brotherhood of the Mother See of Holy Etchmiadzin until his election as coadjutor Catholicos in 1931. It is appropriate therefore that *Greetings* from the Catholicos of All Armenians, His Holiness Karekin II, adorn the opening pages of the volume, following the editor’s two-page *Introduction*. A *Message* by His Holiness Aram I, Catholicos of Cilicia, and a *Foreword* by the very Rev. Fr. Krikor Maksoudian complete the preliminaries.

The volume is divided into four parts. The first is entitled *His Life*. Before focusing the reader’s attention on the areas of the Middle East within the jurisdiction of the transplanted Catholicosate of Cilicia, it details the great variety of activities in which Papken Guleserian became involved during his relatively brief life—not only in his native.
Aintab, Constantinople and other cities in Turkey, but also in the United States, Western Europe, Egypt and Jerusalem.

The second section, *His World*, offers selections from Guleserian’s writings, including letters, diary entries, proposals for church reform, sermons, editorials and essays. Pages 158-160 are devoted to a listing of twenty-five published and ten unpublished works by Guleserian, plus the dates of his editorship of the four periodicals—*Looys, Davros, Sion* and *Hasg*.

The book’s third section is entitled *His Legacy*. Its twenty pages bring together posthumous testimonials by thirteen clerical and lay admirers of Papken Guleserian. These are followed by three pages of clippings from newspaper articles on the occasion of two appearances by Guleserian in Portland and Fresno.

_In Addition_, the final section, reproduces the 1939 translation by the Rev. Terenig Poladian of Guleserian’s *The Armenian Church*.

Vatche Ghazarian has done a commendable job of bringing all the above elements together in a coherent framework. There are however a certain number of errors due to his lack of familiarity with theological terminology, and to difficulties he encountered in identifying various persons. For example, the Guleserian work whose title he has translated as *Christian* (pp. 76 and 159) is none other than the *Catechism for Christian Instruction*, a well-known textbook. The term “Humanization” used by Ghazarian on page 143 would be better translated using the accepted term “Incarnation.” The feast celebrated in the Armenian Church calendar on November 21 is not the Purification of the Virgin Mary, but the Presentation. Patriarch Torkom of Jerusalem, mentioned on p. 165, is not Patriarch Torkom I Koushagian, of blessed memory, but rather the present Patriarch Torkom II Manoogian, who writes of his impressions as a teenager when the coadjutor Catholicos visited the Cathedral of Sts. James in 1935.

There are numerous errors in English usage as well: the Armenian community of America, one thinks, was in “flux” rather than “influx” (p. 42); “abstinence” from voting (p. 64) should be replaced with “abstention,” while the use of “eludes” instead of “alludes” (p. 155) obscures the meaning of the sentence in which it is found.

These matters aside, the book is a worthy tribute to a great Armenian churchman who was endowed not only with intellectual
energy but also with prophetic vision, one who clearly saw the need for reform in the structure and practices of the Armenian Church.

Guleserian’s writings leave the reader with much food for thought. In his memorandum for Catholicos Georg V, prepared in Worcester, MA on Oct. 8, 1920, then Bishop Papken Guleserian wrote, “No matter what is said about the future of the Armenians in America, the Armenian Church will continue to exist on these shores, and in order for the church to justify itself in this country and among the greater community of churches, it needs to be organized according to the requirements of this land.” And again, “The Armenian Church of America exists within this environment, and it should be organized according to the methods of the environment in order to survive and secure its deserved stature next to American churches.” (p. 44) Vatche Ghazarian has done the Armenian Church and people a service by bringing these writings to light again, in the context of an illustrious life devoted to the church’s service.
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