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EDITOR'S NOTE: This year marks the fortieth anniversary of the establishment of St. Nersess Armenian Seminary by Archbishop Tiran Nersoyan. This number of the SNTR begins appropriately with a reflection on the Seminary's blessed founder.

ARCHBISHOP TIRAN NERSOYAN
(1904-1989)

AN APPRECIATION

Thomas E. Bird

Si monumentum requiris circumspice
Inscription in St. Paul's Cathedral, London

In the wake of the First World War, when Archbishop Yegishé Tourian was Patriarch of Jerusalem (1921-29), a cohort of students was brought to the Seminary, the first fruits of the revitalization instituted by the great patriarch. Included in this group was Tiran Nersoyan. Having taken monastic vows, he was soon elevated to the rank of Vardapet, and in rapid succession, named Dean of the Seminary.

After holding this post for several years, he was invited to serve as pastor of Armenian communities, first in Paris, and later in London. He served as head of the Armenian Church community in England, even as he pursued advanced academic studies.

At the conclusion of Archbishop Karekin Hovsepian's tenure, Vartabed Tiran was chosen Primate of the Eastern Diocese of the Armenian Church of America. (Father Tiran and Father Sion Manoogian were consecrated in the same ceremony in Holy Etchmiadzin).

Tiran Srpazan made an unprecedented and long-lasting contribution to the growth and prosperity of the Church in this country. His election marked a significant turning point, better, an upturn in the trajectory of the Church's history in the United States.

Among the significant accomplishments of his ministry that deserve recording are that he brought a number of remarkable priests from Jerusalem and Istanbul, whose names ornament the ecclesiastical life of this country, among them Father Torkom Manoogian, Archbishop, Primate, and presently Armenian Patriarch of Jerusalem; Father
Shhnork Kaloustian, who became Armenian Patriarch of Constantinople in 1963; Father Shahé Altounian, Father Arten Ashjian, Father Garen Gdanian, Father Arnak Kasparian, and Father Vartan Meurgerian. As Primate, he instituted the Armenian Church Youth Organization; began the Cathedral Project, resulting in the erection of a new diocesan headquarters and the landmark Cathedral of St. Vartan in Manhattan; worked for the establishment of St. Nersess Armenian Seminary, founding it in Illinois some forty years ago, in 1962; gave new impetus to the Sunday School program; and published an impressive number of books for religious education. Extramurally, he was a puissant voice and spokesman for his Church in the ecumenical arena, taking a prominent role in World Council and National Council enterprises and in the Oriental Orthodox/ Roman Catholic Theological Dialogue in North America.

During his tenure as Primate, he fell victim to the division that had taken place in the 1930s within the Armenian Church communities of North America and, unable to accomplish the healing of that rupture, he offered his resignation on April 28, 1954.

In one of the most neuralgic chapters of recent church history, Tiran Srpazan, although legally and properly elected Armenian Patriarch of Jerusalem in 1957, was not permitted to assume that ministry. He devoted the next thirty fruitful years to the roles of theologian, historian, occasionally diplomat, and – always – teacher.

Beyond the boundaries of his own faith community, this luminous scholar-archbishop exercised an enormous impact on the evolution of the ecumenical movement. During the 1960s and 1970s an astonishing series of developments significantly altered the atmosphere between the Armenian Apostolic Church and the Roman Catholic Church.

The theologians of the two communions commenced a series of dialogues in Vienna, Austria, beginning in 1971. Their scholarship led to meetings between popes and catholicoi and resulted in historic Common Declarations, signed by both primates on those several occasions. These events made it possible to develop relationships here in the United States that were not as easy to accomplish elsewhere. This “conversation in love,” the Oriental Orthodox/ Roman Catholic Theological Dialogue, begun in 1976, has the distinction of being the only formal on-going encounter between our two communities anywhere in the world.
Tiran Srpazan was a committed and constructive member and an important contributor to this theological dialogue from 1976 until his death in 1989. In this setting, as in all of his life, Archbishop Tiran placed his gifts, his knowledge, and his energy at the service of Christ’s Church. His inspiring presence was perennially marked by fraternal collegiality, the highest standards of discourse, and sound judgement. His capacious scholarship, his spirit of pastoral compassion, and his historical memory enriched us, challenged us, and mentored us.

It is apposite that the Professorship of Liturgy at St. Nersess Seminary and the Annual Lecture sponsored by the Seminary alumni are named for Archbishop Nersoyan and will keep his memory green for decades to come. The issuance of his previously unpublished writings will permit future generations to be nurtured by his wisdom.

The sentiment engraved in St. Paul’s Cathedral in London by Sir Christopher Wren’s son is also appropriate in recounting Srpazan’s ecclesial and ecumenical achievements: “If you require a monument to his memory, look about you.”
EARLY ARMENIAN AND SYRIAN CONTACT:
REFLECTIONS ON KORIWN’S LIFE OF MAŠTOĆ

Edward G. Mathews, Jr.

In his address to the Pontifical Oriental Institute, Thursday 12 December 1996, on the occasion of a one-day symposium to honor his visit there, His Holiness Karekin I commenced his remarks by emphasizing that “the Armenian Christian tradition... is not a tradition of isolation, grown by itself and confined to the boundaries of its own national existence. It has emerged and developed in association and inter-relationship with and under the influences of other Christian traditions, such as the Syriac, Greek, Georgian, and Latin traditions, to mention the most important ones. Armenia was – and is – not an island.” Of these ‘other Christian traditions’, the first two are of primary importance for the history of the early Armenian Church. Scholars have for some time noted that there were two early waves of missionary activity in the early Armenian Church: from the Byzantine empire in the northern regions, associated above all with Grigor Lusavorič, and from Syria in the southern regions, traditionally associated with the Apostle Thaddeus. In his address, His Holiness then went on to make a further and very important clarification when he added that “the very origin of the Christian history of Armenia is impregnated by the relationship [with these other cultures] as a conditioning factor in the very process of the shaping of Armenian Christian history. Jerusalem, Antioch, Nisibis, Melitene, Caesarea in Cappadocia, Alexandria, Byzantium were mixed in an inextricable way and in a decisive manner, and with determining scope of influence in the very core of the formation of the Armenian Christian tradition from its initial phase of evangelization to the normative constitution of the liturgical, theological, hierarchical, canonical, monastic, literary, and cultural aspects.” The influence was all-pervasive and affected nearly every facet of the theology of the early Armenian Church.

1 Karekin I, 1997, p. 32.
2 Karekin I, 1997, p. 32.
There has been great influence, of various sorts, from the Syrians throughout the history of the Armenian Church. Early ties with Syria were very close; as already noted, Syrian missionaries were very active in Armenia, especially from its two centers, Edessa and Antioch. Soon, the Armenian Church was embroiled in dealings with both the Nestorian and, later, the Monophysite branches of Syrian Christianity. In the twelfth century, in the time of Nerses Shnorahli, the Armenians and the Syrians seemed poised to make an attempt at reunion. Still later, in the times of Grigor Vayasër and Vardan Arewelçi, translations of much Syriac literature seemed to provide added impetus to an already blossoming renaissance in Armenian learning. To attempt even an overview of all these periods or worse, to try to sort out all the above-mentioned ‘inextricable’ influences would be a monumental task even for a team of specialists in the various disciplines that would be required. I propose, therefore, a much more modest and manageable task. I would like simply to look at a few select topics of Syrian influence at the time of the beginnings of the formation of the Armenian national Church, particularly those that can be gleaned from the Life of Maštoč, in order, perhaps, to see a little more clearly the “Syrian stones” in the foundation of the Armenian Church.

In the period that I would like to focus on, the late fourth and early fifth centuries, before Greek influences became dominant, Armenia was divided between the empires of the Byzantines and of the Sassanians, into two regions, ܝܦܩ ܐܘ ���� and ܦܝܫ ܐܘ ����, or as they are known in Western sources, Armenia Maior and Armenia Minor. The larger was under Persian suzerainty, but for a while was governed in the ecclesiastical realm by a series of Syrian bishops. Koriwn tells us that Maštoč was given a Greek education, but it is fairly clear that

---

3 See TER-MINASSIANTZ, 1904, for a general overview, with partial updates in MELK'ONYAN, 1970, for the early period, and TER-PETROSYAN, 1989, for the later period.

4 For the Nestorian period, see the letters in GIRQ' T'L'TOČ', 1901. Some of these are translated in FRIYOLD, 1981, but see now GARSOIAN, 1999, with translation of all the relevant texts. This magisterial study is the culmination of earlier studies found in GARSOIAN, 1985, 1999b. The Monophysite period has not been studied so thoroughly; see TER-MINASSIANTZ, 1904, pp. 32-34, 39-91.

5 TER-MINASSIANTZ, 1904, pp. 122-147.


the reason he relates this fact is because Maštoč was such a rare exception. Our earliest sources tell us that the general education was in Syrian schools and that even the liturgy was celebrated in Syriac;\(^8\) Gabrielle Winkler has done more than anyone to unearth the Syrian roots of the Armenian liturgy.\(^9\) These same sources also reveal other elements of Syriac influence. For example, the *Buzandaran* includes lives of certain Syrian saints as 'part and parcel' of its narrative\(^10\) and even its language reveals numerous Syriacisms,\(^11\) and it is a Syrian, Mar Abas, from whom Movses Xorenaci claims to have obtained archival material from Nineveh on the history of Ancient Armenia.\(^12\) Yovhannes Mamikonian's *History of Taron* purports to be a history of the monastery of Glak in Taron, the center of Syrian monastic influence.\(^13\) Lazar's oft-noted disdain for things Syrian would not be so acute if not for the fact that he considered Syrian influence to be far too widespread.\(^14\) Even the so-called Greek sources cannot help revealing a bit of their Syrian 'slip': Agat'angelos’ descriptions of the tortures and afflictions of Armenian Christians closely parallel the accounts of the *Martyrs of Edessa*, and it has even been suggested that the structure of his book follows that of the Syrian *Teaching of Addai*.\(^15\) These few examples, taken from among many, should be sufficient to demonstrate how deeply and widely imbued the early Armenian Church was with

\(^{8}\) KORIWN, 1980, XI; LAZAR, 1904, I.10; LAZAR, 1991, pp. 47-48: "The blessed Maštoč in his anxiety wept continuously on seeing the great effort and the even greater expense of the young men of Armenia, who at great cost and through long journeys and with continual distractions were spending their days in the schools of Syrian learning. For the worship of the church and the readings of scripture were conducted in Syriac in the monasteries and churches of the Armenian people. But the congregations of such a large country were quite unable to comprehend or profit from it, and the incomprehension of the Syrian tongue caused labour to the ministers and was unprofitable to the congregations."

\(^{9}\) See, for example, WINKLER, 1982, 1997, 2000, and bibliographies therein, although her conclusions are not universally accepted.

\(^{10}\) See, for example, BUZANDARAN III.10: Jacob of Nisibis; V.25-26: S&alitay. The Syrian Bishop Daniel, recounted in the descriptions of his disciples, is found in III.14, V.25-27, VI.7,14.

\(^{11}\) BUZANDARAN, 1989, p. 8; THOMSON, 1982, p. 147.

\(^{12}\) XORENAC'i, 1913, I. 8-9; XORENAC'i, 1978, pp. 82-84, and see pp. 54-55, for Thomson's introductory comments.

\(^{13}\) MAMIKONIAN, 1941; MAMIKONIAN, 1993.


\(^{15}\) AGAT'ANGELOS, 1976, p. xlv; THOMSON, 1982, p. 142
Syrian culture.

This contention can, of course, be bolstered when it is remembered how much of the fundamental early Armenian ecclesiastical vocabulary is actually Syriac, or at least comes from Syriac:

- priest \( \text{ρωσωῳδῷ} \) kahana
- preach \( \text{φωνηθήνετε} \) karoza/karozuta
- fast \( \text{δόρ} \) tsoma
- save \( \text{φράκ} \) p’rak
- translate \( \text{βοήθεστε} \) targem
- altar \( \text{βεμα} \) bema

Even the Armenian names for the days of the week clearly come directly from Syriac. Many other terms, particularly those of the ecclesiastical hierarchy, are obviously Greek words, but nevertheless came into Armenian via Syriac; for example:

- bishop \( \text{βαπυρωνήνου} \) episkopå
- metropolitan \( \text{βαπυρωνηνιον} \) metropolitå
- patriarch \( \text{απωρφωρφα} \) patriarkå
catholicos \( \text{λωβανηνηνου} \) katolikå

Even the very word for church itself, \( \text{κνερηφριόμφ} \), which is obviously the Greek word \( \text{ἐκκλησία} \), comes into Armenian through its Syriac form.\(^\text{17}\)

Our earliest source that tells us of Syrian influence is the well known Life of Maštoč, written by his disciple, Koriwn, some time just after the year 440.\(^\text{18}\) Koriwn informs us that when Maštoč was looking for Armenian letters he was directed by King Vramshapuh to a Syrian bishop, Daniel, who was in possession of such an alphabet. Alas, this alphabet proved to be unworkable as it was “insufficient to form all the syllables of the Armenian language.”\(^\text{19}\) Later however, once he was

---

\(^{16}\) See TER-MINASSIANTZ, 1904, pp. 11-12. The transliterations of the Syriac, here and below, are not scientific, but are rather intended to highlight their similarity to the corresponding Armenian term.

\(^{17}\) See MEILLET, 1929.

\(^{18}\) See MAKSODIAN, 1985.

\(^{19}\) KORIWN, 1980, VI, and see discussion of MAHÉ, 1988, pp. 245-247.
given the true Armenian alphabet, Maštoc began translating the Bible into Armenian and then began sending students to Edessa and to Constantinople “for the purpose of translating and writing down the traditions of the Church fathers.” There are two separate issues here and we must look carefully at Koriwn’s language in each case.

On the matter of the first translations of the Bible into Armenian, Koriwn’s witness is not at all clear; he nowhere says that he used a Syriac version, and the surviving evidence has yet to clarify the issue. Nonetheless, despite this unclarity, there is still no irreparable evidence on which basis we should not believe Koriwn. We are not even told by Koriwn whether the entire Bible was translated at this time, although Lazar and Mvosēs Xorenaci are both explicit that it was. It was only after the missionary work of Maštoc in Georgia and Albania that Koriwn and Levond joined Eznik in Constantinople and brought back to Armenia “the testaments of the Holy Church.” Upon the reception of these books, Sahak “once more undertook, with Eznik, the comparison of the former random, hurriedly done translations from the then available copies with the authentic copies.” Unfortunately, no complete version clearly and unquestionably identifiable as that initial “hurriedly done” version has been discovered to have survived in any known Armenian manuscript.

The discovery of an entirely new translation of the canonical books of Chronicles, published by G. Xalat’eanç in 1899, has provided scholars with a new vantage point from which they could evaluate the

20 KORIWN, 1980, XIX.

21 LAZAR, 1904, I,11; Lazar, 1991, p. 51. XORENAC’I, 1913, III, 53; XORENAC’I, 1978, p. 321. On this question, however, it is not impossible that these two writers are speaking rather of the second, or revised, translation, which was ordered by the Catholicos Sahak.


23 Koriwn, 1980, XIX; the entire passage reads: թե կուրըցեք Սուրբը քաղաքաշարի կրոնական օրենքի տեղեկատու համաձայնի իր ժայռա նշանակության առաջ սայից, ու պայքար են գրապատացնելու առցանց կրոնական օրենքի տեղեկատու համաձայնի առաջ սայից, ու պայքար են գրապատացնելու առցանց կրոնական օրենքի տեղեկատու համաձայնի առաջ սայից, ու պայքար են գրապատացնելու առցանց կրոնական օրենքի տեղեկատու համաձայնի առաջ սայից, ու պայքար են գրապատացնելու առցանց կրոնական օրենքի տեղեկատու համաձայնի առաջ սայից, ու պայքար են գրապատացնելու առցանց կրոնական օրենքի տեղեկատու համաձայնի առաջ սայից, ու պայքար են գրապատաց

24 LAZAR, 1904, I,10; LAZAR, 1991, p. 50, seems to be aware of only a single translation which was made from Greek versions, see below. XORENAC’I, 1913, III, 53-54; XORENAC’I, 1978, pp. 320-323, seems to suggest that the Bible was translated from Syriac. See further the discussion in COX, 1981, pp. 6-12.
history of this translation.\textsuperscript{25} While the “official” position of Armenian scholars, both from Ejmiacin and from Venice, was that the Armenian Bible was translated from a Syriac text,\textsuperscript{26} modern occidental studies had tended to minimize any Syriac influence on the Armenian translation. This discovery of another text of Chronicles has, however, caused many scholars to acknowledge that the Armenian version was indeed translated from a Semitic version, although opinion has not been unanimous as precisely which Semitic text or language was the basis for this new translation. Xalat'eanç argued for a translation from an Aramaic targum;\textsuperscript{27} N. Marr\textsuperscript{28} and V. Haçouni,\textsuperscript{29} followed by H. Melk'onyan,\textsuperscript{30} argued for a Peshitta Vorlage; while N. Bogharian\textsuperscript{31} proposed an underlying Syriac text older than the Peshitta. P. Vetter\textsuperscript{32} argued that it was translated from a Syriac text which was itself translated from a Theodotianic Greek recension (sic!), whereas K'Črak'ean\textsuperscript{33} and E. Durean\textsuperscript{34} preferred a non-committal position, maintaining that the base text remains unknown.

\textsuperscript{25} The discovery was first announced in XALAT'EANC', 1896, and then published in XALAT'EANC', 1899. This edition was compiled using two manuscripts: Jerusalem 1925, d. 1269, and Matenadaran 354, no date. Subsequently the text has also been discovered in London Ms. Arm. 1209, and Matenadaran 1500. On p. ix, XALAT'EANC', 1899, unabashedly states: “this newly discovered translation is, in all probability, among the oldest documents of the Armenian language, if not one of the very first writings.” See now the important introduction of TER-PETROSYAN, 1985.

\textsuperscript{26} These scholars argue their position primarily on the basis of the witness of Korìwn and Movsès Xorenàci; see LYONNET, 1950, pp. 9-10. Johnson, 1968, esp., 69-73, claims to have demonstrated Syriac influence, but see Cox, 1981, pp. 301-306, where he demonstrates the misleading nature of Johnson's statistics [see also the review of M. Stone in Revue Biblique 77 (1970) 259-264]. For Deuteronomy, COX, 1981, pp. 306-327, claims minimal influence of the Syriac versions. One must remember, however, that there does not exist any such complete text of an earlier version for either Deuteronomy or for the Samuel books as this one for Chronicles. COWE, 1992, pp. 287-289, believes that the Armenian translator of Daniel consulted a Syriac and Greek text simultaneously.

\textsuperscript{27} XALAT'EANC', 1896. He was followed in this opinion by Geworgean, 1905, who further argued that it was Movsès Xorenàci who did the translation.

\textsuperscript{28} MARR, 1902.

\textsuperscript{29} HAC'O UNI, 1935.

\textsuperscript{30} MELK'ONYAN, 1966.

\textsuperscript{31} BOGHARIAN, 1937.

\textsuperscript{32} VETTER, 1900.

\textsuperscript{33} Črak'ean, 1900.

\textsuperscript{34} DUREAN, 1900.
Estimating that all the above publications “présentent pour la plupart le caractère d’observations préliminaires,” Levon Ter-Petrosyan once again addressed the question of the underlying text used by the translator of this newly discovered text of Chronicles. In his study, Ter-Petrosyan states that “pour le moment, on ne peut faire que quelques observations préliminaires sur les relations de cette traduction ancienne avec les autres textes.” Nonetheless, Ter-Petrosyan assembled impressive and detailed evidence on the basis of which he concluded that this text of Chronicles was translated from a Syriac version in the first decades of the fifth century. He shows that there are more than thirty instances where the text agrees with the Peshitta against the Hebrew, Septuagint, and Targums. Many names are preserved in their Semitic forms and not in their Greek forms, as they are found in Zohrab and in later Armenian literature. There are other calques on the Syriac as well as non-Armenian constructions that can only be explained by an underlying Syriac expression. Subsequently, it was carefully corrected by comparison with the Septuagint text which resulted in the loss of nearly all traces of the Syriac original, and after the council of Ephesus, a new translation, based almost solely on the Septuagint, was effected.

More recently, Peter Cowe once again addressed the issue of the provenance of this new text of Chronicles. In a much more detailed study, Cowe showed that while Ter-Petrosyan rightly noted an important and varied set of affinities between the Peshitta and the Armenian text, he failed to note that these same affinities occur between the Armenian and other Greek versions as well. Examining numerous examples from this new text of Chronicles against not only the Peshitta, but also the Hebrew and the Greek versions, and analyzing a large number of passages with more advanced critical methods, Cowe demonstrated that rather than the Peshitta, or any other Semitic text, it was more likely that the translator of these Armenian books of Chronicles seems actually to have utilized a manuscript of the Greek Lucianic recension, generally associated with Lucian of Antioch.

The arguments of Cowe are based on sound critical principles and are certainly very persuasive. It must nevertheless be pointed out that

37 COWE, 1990-91.
scholars are still poorly served for a critical edition of the Armenian Bible — and we still do not have a complete critical edition of the Syriac Old Testament. In addition to this, there is no conclusive proof that this text of Chronicles, to which scholars have given the name Arm1, is in fact that first “hurriedly done” translation carried out under Maštoć; from its first discovery this identification has just been presumed and then asserted. These comments are not meant to undermine the progress scholars have made on this question of the history of the Armenian biblical text; rather they only attempt to show the tendentious nature of the evidence on which such study rests. And finally, it must be remembered that despite this long trek through the question of the biblical text our main focus remains that of the witness of Koriwn.

Whatever the results of these discussions, we must once again recall the witness of Lazar from above, and we must also note very carefully the wording of Koriwn when he describes the results of the mission to Constantinople: “Blessed Sahak, who had rendered from the Greek language into Armenian all the ecclesiastical books and the wisdom of the church fathers, once more undertook, with Eznik, the comparison of the former random, hurriedly done translations from the then available copies with the authentic copies, and they translated many commentaries of the Bible (emphasis added).” Since no community at that time had to worry about critical texts, we can perhaps venture to say with reasonable confidence that the “then available copies” were not likely to have been in the same language as “the authentic copies.” Lazar’s clear suggestion to the contrary no doubt reflects the situation that by his time the original versions were already lost or at least were no longer in use. There is little doubt that these “authentic copies” were Greek texts brought back by the translators. Secondly, it is important to note that Koriwn tells us that this first translation was carried out with the assistance of Yovhannēs of Ekeghiač and Yovsēp from the House of Baghan. That is, both are from Mec Hayk, the latter right near Taron. On the basis of this observation we can reasonably presume that these two were much more familiar with the Syriac Bible even if they too, like Maštoć, had been

38 In fact, the critical edition of the Peshitta of Chronicles only appeared in 1998; see GORDON, 1998.

39 See MAHÉ, 1988, pp. 244, esp. n.6, for reconstruction of the chronology.

40 KORJWN, 1980, XIX.
trained in Greek. On the other hand, when it came time to translate the "authentic" Greek texts, it was Eznik along with that same Yovsêp', whom Maštoc had sent to carry out all the translation work in Constantinople.

But here, it is even more imperative to look carefully at the precise wording that Koriwn gives us concerning the missions of the two disciples whom Maštoc sent to Constantinople for the translation of Greek works, as it is often glossed over or lost in translation. First, Koriwn states explicitly that Maštoc and Sahak "dispatched two brothers from among their pupils to the city of Edessa in the region of the Syrians: the first one Yovsêp' and the second, Eznik, from the village of Kolb in the province of Ayrrarat, for the purpose of translating and writing down the traditions of the church fathers from Syriac to Armenia." Now, contrast this wording with that of their later mission: "[These same two translators] then went to the region of the Greeks where they studied and became proficient translators from the Greek language [emphasis added]." It was these two, then, now proficient in Greek, who alone were capable of translating the Bible from Greek. Maštoc himself, though trained in Greek, was now apparently too occupied with more administrative duties to do the translation himself, but it can certainly be inferred that Yovhannês was not in fact capable of translation from Greek, and for this reason was not included, and that Yovsêp' became capable only after he went to Constantinople and studied Greek. Thus again, it is highly unlikely, on the witness of Koriwn, that Yovsêp' could have been involved in translating a Greek work prior to this; it must have been a Syriac version of the Bible that was first translated.

---

41 See, for example, WINKLER, 1994, pp. 364-367, where it is hardly even noted; see GARSOIAN, 1999, p. 25, for an exception.

42 Koriwn, 1980, XIX, the entire text reads: ἤπειρος σφαδευτεῖν ηθοποιοῦ τηρημάτων, ἐκ τῆς ἐποίησεν τής θεραπείας τοῦ θεραπεύτη τοῦ λέγεται ἤπειρος σφαδευτεῖν, οὕτως δὲ ἡ διδασκαλία, ὡς ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ μνήμῃ ἀπὸ τῆς πραγματείας, ἢ μάρτυρας, ὡς ἐν ἀπηγγελματίας ἄδικοτατλήτης ἅπανταν ἁρμόζειν ἄπὶ τῆς καταφύγειας, ἢ κατὰ τὴν ἀπηγγελματίας ἄδικοτατλήτης ἑτοιμαστεῖν ἁρμόζειν ἄπὶ τῆς καταφύγειας, ἢ κατὰ τὴν ἀπηγγελματίας ἄδικοτατλήτης ἑτοιμαστεῖν ἁρμόζειν ἄπὶ τῆς καταφύγειας, ἢ κατὰ τὴν ἀπηγγελματίας ἄδικοτατλήτης ἑτοιμαστεῖν ἁρμόζειν ἄπὶ τῆς καταφύγειας, ἢ κατὰ τὴν ἀπηγγελματίας ἄδικοτατλήτης ἑτοιμαστεῖν ἁρμόζειν ἄπὶ τῆς καταφύγειας.

43 Though Lazar maintains that, despite his Greek education, Maštoc was not capable of carrying out the work of translation from Greek; see LAZAR, 1904, 1.10, and GARSOIAN, 1999, pp. 24-25.
As for what were the non-biblical works that were translated during these missions, Koriwn, to the chagrin of the researcher, provides not a single detail, neither for the Greek works nor for the Syriac works. Scholars have simply presumed that the translations from Syriac must have included at least the homilies, or *Demonstrations*, of Aphrahat, as well as the corpus of the works of Ephrem the Syrian, as these were the two great fourth century Syrian authors. Of the other 'chronologically-possible' candidates, these include such prominent Syrian authors of this period as Cyrillonas, Balai, and Isaac of Antioch. However, there is absolutely no evidence that a single work from the corpus of these authors has ever existed in an Armenian version. Other anonymous texts, such as the *Teaching of Addai*, and various martyr acts, could have been available at this time, but these texts are very difficult to date and may not have been composed by the time the disciples of Maštoc came to Edessa; Armenian versions of these texts require much further study before any conclusion can be reached. As for the *Demonstrations* of Aphrahat, they were edited in modern critical editions only a quarter century ago. While there are twenty-six manuscripts, which suggests a certain amount of popularity, none predate the fifteenth century. To my knowledge, no one has followed up and made any attempt to determine if they were read by Armenians or if they ever exerted any influence on Armenian literature or early Armenian theology. Such a study ought to provide some helpful insight on the date of translation.

It has been the traditional opinion that most of the works of Ephrem the Syrian were translated in the fifth century, during the time of Maštoc. Ter-Petrosyan calls these translations "the greatest

---

44 *ADDAI*, 1981.

45 BIDIAN, 1890-97; WIESSNER, 1967.

46 There is, of course, an Armenian translation of the Syriac *Teaching of Addai*, but it is well known to be a retelling rather than a translation, and no study exists for its dating; for the texts, see ABGAR, 1868.


48 Lafontaine asserts rather than demonstrates that the translation of the works of Aphrahat was "exÉcuteur vraisemblant d's la deuxi'me moitiÉ du Ve siècle"; see APHRAGHAT, 1977, vol. 383, p.v.

49 It is perhaps, therefore, of interest to note that even in his new revised translation of the *Teaching of Saint Gregory*, R.W. Thomson finds no influence from Aphrahat; see Thomson, 2001. It remains to be seen whether those few instances found in Ter-Petrosyan, 1986, are real influences or only parallels.
contributions to the field of patristics". However important one might consider Ephrem to be, critical study of a number of his works has demonstrated them to be later compositions or works composed by other, later writers. For example, the results of recent scholarship have shown that the Old Testament commentaries attributed to him, while clearly translations from Syriac, are not genuine and cannot have been translated before the tenth century. A number of his homilies (διαλογία) also survive, but where any of these homilies have been the object of critical study, this study has rather demonstrated the work to be not genuinely Ephrem. It is possible that among the works of Ephrem translated under the direction of Maštoč were included his Commentary on the Diatessaron, and perhaps a number of his hymns (πενταχορνομάντινη), which are generally considered to be genuine, but it must be emphasized that there is no evidence for the date of translation, and no study of their influence has yet been attempted. It is worthy of note that the seventh-century Knik' Hawatoy preserves fragments from Ephrem's Sermons on Faith and from his Homily on Our Lord, for which no other Armenian version is known. It is not at all clear whether these texts already existed in Armenian translation, since no others exist, or whether they were translated specifically for that collection. In addition, there also survive the famous commentaries on the Letters of Paul, as well as a Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles, but while the latter at least exists in a critical edition, there is no trace of any Syriac original of either and none of these commentaries has yet received any critical study. Therefore, the opinion that the majority of

[50] TER-Petrosyan, 1992, p. 30; on p. 31, he calls Ephrem "the greatest authority in Oriental patristic literature."

[51] See Ephrem, 1998; Ephrem, 2001. None of the other Old Testament Commentaries have yet been edited or studied; I hope to remedy this in the near future.

[52] These homilies have received almost no attention at all. For a more detailed treatment, with bibliography, of the current state of these homilies and the other works attributed to Ephrem in Armenian, see Mathews, 1996.


[54] These hymns include those edited in Ephrem, 1961, and Ephrem, 1975. A translation and study of the former collection is currently in progress.


[56] The commentaries on the fourteen letters of Paul have still not been seriously studied; the texts are in Ephrem, 1834, vol. 3.

[57] The text is in Ephrem, 1921.
Ephrem’s works were translated into Armenian in the early fifth-century must now be abandoned.

Before moving to the final discussion, it is important also to note in this connection that several very important Greek works were translated into Armenian not from Greek but from already existing Syriac translations; these include the Church History of Eusebius\(^{58}\) and the Hexaemeron of St. Basil of Caesarea.\(^ {59}\) While it is certainly possible that these texts, and perhaps others, were conveniently at Edessa and it was easier to translate them there, it is still just as easy, in the context that I am trying to describe here, to imagine that they were translated from Syriac rather than from Greek for the simple reason that these first translators were far more familiar with Syriac than with Greek. Nonetheless, the question of what other works were translated by Maštoc and his disciples must remain an open one.

The last element of Syriac influence that I would like to present is one that, to my knowledge, has received little attention: that of the description of the lifestyle that Maštoc chose after leaving the employ of the Arsacid court. Unlike Movišės Xorenаци, who simply says that Maštoc lived “a hermit’s life,”\(^ {60}\) according to Koriwn, it was “in obedience to the commands of [faith]... [that Maštoc] subjected himself to all types of spiritual discipline – solitude, mountain-dwelling, hunger, thirst, and living on herbs, in dark cells, clad in sackcloth... [and] he would end in standing vigil.”\(^ {61}\) We can perhaps couple this description with the even more colorful description of the “holy and virtuous” Gind, which is found at the very end of the Buzandaran Patmutiwnk:

This Gind was from the district of Taron and had been a disciple of the great Daniel. And after him, he was the head of the religious
and the spiritual-teacher of hermits, the spiritual-leader of solitaries, the overseer of solitary-communities, the teacher of all anchorites-dwelling-in-the-desert, and the supervisor of all those who had renounced the world for the love of God.  

I would like here to cite a few lines of a Syriac poem, which is one of a cycle of five on the same subject, that was written at roughly the same time as both Koriwn and the Buzandaran. Its lengthy title reads: On Solitaries, desert-dwellers, mourners, and those who dwell on mountains, in clefts, in fissures, and in cavities of the earth, and who are bereft of everything in this world. These lines describe the life of these Syriac hermits:

They are human beings and they are clothed in flesh just like us;
Because of [their] love of God, they went out into the desert like animals.
They have family and lineage, households, property, and possessions,
But they consider them as nothing so they might set off for the Kingdom on high.
It is these who wander in the wilderness, lest they be marred by sin;
Like animals they move about, to be worthy of the joyous wedding feast.
It is these who, in the place of delicacies, feed on grass and roots;
Instead of exalted dwellings, they dwell in lowly caves.
It is these who, like birds, rise up and dwell on mountain crags;
About them the prophet proclaimed: "Let them shout from the mountaintops."
It is these who lie on bare ground instead of beds,
And instead of soft pillows they set their heads on rocks.
It is these who, in the place of tables at dinner time,
Set the grass they take for food upon their knees.
It is these whose drink is water in the place of wines,
And in the place of oils and creams on their bodies, emaciation;
(Their bodies are black because of [their] love for Christ.)
It is these who have exchanged silks for rags or nakedness,
And in the place of fine sandals, they fit themselves with barefeet.

It is hard to mistake the similarities here. This lifestyle, for which Syria was renowned in the early church and which was also described

---

62 Buzandaran, 1933. VI.16; translation from Buzandaran, 1989, p. 239.
63 For general descriptions, see Vooobus, 1960, pp. 1-41, esp., 1-10, though his position that they were written by Ephrem must be rejected.
by Theodoret of Cyr in his *History of the Monks of Syria*,\(^{65}\) was a relatively short-lived eremetical movement in Northern Syria that has clearly left its mark on Southern Armenia during this early period. Reminiscences of such hermits are also found in Elishè,\(^{66}\) and in the homilies of Yovhannèes Mandakuni.\(^{67}\) In the above description of Gind, the author bestows on Gind the following titles, each of which finds its root in the same Syrian heretical lifestyle described by the above poem:

- **mourner**  
  \(\omega\nu\beta\varsigma\nu\gamma\)  
  abilà\(^{68}\)
- **solitary**  
  \(\iota\varphi\omega\delta\varepsilon\varepsilon\)  
  ihidayâ
- **hermit\(^{69}\)**  
  \(\iota\omega\beta\rho\nu\gamma\)  
  dayaryâ
- **desert-dweller**  
  \(\omega\nu\nu\nu\alpha\nu\omega\omega\omega\)  
  madbarayâ
- **mountain-dweller**  
  \(\mu\nu\nu\nu\omega\nu\nu\nu\)  
  turayâ

The nature of these sources do not allow any further details that might help reconstruct the details of the monastic situation that existed here in the early fifth century, but it seems clear enough that these Syriac and Armenian texts are clearly describing the same rigorous eremetical lifestyle in the same terms and in the same essential manner. The origins of this style of eremetical life, clearly shared between Syria and Armenia, as well as the historical circumstances of those five Syriac texts that describe this lifestyle in such detail, require much further study, but simply to note the identity of the terminology and to present the parallels between these Syriac and Armenian texts is yet another clear witness of further Syrian influence on the early Armenian Church. It has not been noticed in even this little detail before and, it is to be hoped, will soon be the object of further study.\(^{70}\)

---

\(^{65}\) Theodoret, 1977-79; Theodoret, 1985.

\(^{66}\) Elishe, 1859; and see Outtier, 1988.

\(^{67}\) Mandakuni, 1860, pp. 32-35.

\(^{68}\) The Syriac title “rish abilè, head of the mourners”, used of Gind in the Buzandaran, was bestowed in Syriac sources upon both Symon Stylites and Barsauma of Nisibis.

\(^{69}\) The Armenian and Syriac words here both stem from the word that was later used for monastries, but in both cases here that is a later usage. I have here preferred the word hermit over monk, as the latter suggests a more organized, cenobitic lifestyle, one which does not seem to have entered into Armenia before the sixth century; see Garsóian, 2001.

\(^{70}\) For instance, Winkler, 1994, p. 215, notes only the similar description of Gind. Garsóian notes most of the parallel vocabulary; see Buzandaran, 1989, p. 547. I hope
This brief, sketchy overview of certain aspects of the early influence that the Syrian church had on the Armenian has, I hope, helped to make clear that the beginnings of the Armenian church were indeed born in foreign elements. But to say that the Armenian Church is nothing but a melding of foreign elements is to miss entirely the alacrity with which she established her own literature and her own identity. It is, I think, no coincidence that the Gold and Silver ages of the Armenian Church correspond to the two periods of her history that were most characterized by intense translation activity.71 It is indeed her genius that she absorbed these elements and made them so quickly her own.

soon to publish texts and translations of all five of the Syriac texts mentioned above; they are to appear in the new Eastern Christian Texts series published by Brigham Young University.

71 KAREKIN I, 1997, pp. 32-33, makes this same point in a wider ecumenical context.
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VANAKAN VARDAPET’S **DOCTRINAL PARAENESIS**

Hamlet Mehrarian

**Introduction**

For Armenians, as for others, the thirteenth century was a turbulent period both politically and theologically. Dialogue between the Armenian Church and the Church of Rome was a major element in the turbulence. Its fortunes fluctuated with the need of Armenia’s Cilician kingdom for military assistance against non-Christian enemies. It was not a uniquely Armenian phenomenon: dialogue with Rome was also an ongoing process for the Byzantine religious establishment of the day.

One element of the dialogue was the debate over the *filioque*, the addition to the credal formula which said that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son. It was a debate that would carry on into the fourteenth century as well, and find its most mature expression in the work of Essayi Něćeći. Interestingly, Essayi Něćeći and several other major participants in the debate were doctors of the Church who lived and worked not in cosmopolitan Cilicia but in the historical Armenian homeland, then under Mongol occupation. Although they made their contributions to the debate from what was deemed a more politically and culturally conservative region, their thought on the *filioque* and on other matters is not conservative. One might have expected that their study of the Armenian patristic tradition would lead them to defend the standard Orthodox position, that the Spirit proceeds from the Father with the Son; it did not do so.

Essayi Něćeći’s predecessor in the *filioque* debate was Vanakan Vardapet, a leading teacher and thinker in Armenia’s southeastern

---

1 The Armenians appear to have preferred not to exceed the simple formula of the Constantinopolitan Council, that the Spirit proceeds from the Father; a position expressed in such places as the second verse of Nerses Šnorhali’s hymn *Հաճեյհ
dում* (Morn of light): *Ողէջ։* *Ողէջ։* *Ողէջ։* *Ողէջ։* *Ողէջ։* *Ողէջ։* *Ողէջ։* *Ողէջ։* *Ողէջ։* *Ողէջ։* *Ողէջ։* *Ողէջ։* (Outpouring from the Father, pour out in my spirit utterance for your pleasure). No reference at all to the mode of the Spirit’s origin is made in the Creed as it is now recited by the Armenian Church.
region. As this article will attempt to show, Vanakan’s *Paraenesis*, a unique work on the issue of the *filioque*, may well be regarded as a forerunner of Gregory II of Cyprus’s thought regarding the issue of the Holy Spirit’s procession from the Father and the Son. Vanakan’s approach represented a point of possible unity between the Roman and other churches on the issue.

Let us first put the debate in its context. From the outset, the thirteenth century was marked by a deepening ecclesiastical schism between the Byzantine and Roman Churches. One of the primary reasons for this was the Fourth Crusade and the sack of Constantinople in 1204, when universal papal supremacy was imposed upon the Byzantines. This supremacy was the more repugnant to the Byzantine Church because it not only based itself on the idea of Petrine succession in Rome, but it assumed that succession’s power not to be limited geographically to the Latin West alone. Pope Innocent III considered it his right to exercise jurisdiction in the East. By virtue of his royal power he could and did appoint both a patriarch and an emperor in Constantinople.

Obviously the jurisdictional views of the two Churches were not compatible. Other churches besides the Byzantine also found the Roman attempt at hegemony unacceptable.

---

2 Vanakan Vardapet lived from 1181-1251. Born in the province of Ganjak, he became one of its leading intellectual lights. Educated at Getik Monastery under the famous teacher Mxifar Goš, he is an important link in the transmission of the latter’s intellectual tradition. Returning to Ganjak, Vanakan founded his own monastery with school and library in 1216, when he was thirty-five. After twenty years of existence, Xoranašat Monastery’s activities were abruptly cut off when the Mongols invaded the region; Vanakan and his students were carried off into captivity. Although their teacher’s freedom was purchased by Christian villagers, several of his students remained in Mongol hands. (The most famous of them being Kirakos Ganjakeči, whose history recounts their capture and describes their time with the Mongols.) Vanakan rebuilt Xoranašat and resumed his teaching. He died there at the age of seventy, and by his own wish was buried in the monastery’s cemetery for the indigent. See Եղեղիսական գիտություն, Հայ փրառություն (Abp. N. Polarian, *Armenian Writers*) Jerusalem: Sts. James Press, 1971, 290-293; Տարրուկարտություն, Հայաստան (Ašot Abrahamian, *The University of Glâgor*) Erevan, 1983.

3 For Gregory’s *Tomus* and his refutations of the positions taken by John Beccus see Migne, *Patrologia Graeca* 142.

Armenian prelates of the Cilician period were sometimes willing to consider various forms of compromise with Rome in matters of liturgy and doctrine. In 1243-1244, for example, Pope Innocent IV (1243-1254) sent a letter to the Armenian Catholicos Kostandin I Barjberdci in Sis, questioning why the Armenians did not perform the anointment of the sick with oil in the Latin manner. When the Catholicos sent to Greater Armenia for ratification the canons of the Second Synod of Sis which took place in that year, he appended Pope Innocent’s query to the end of the canons, stating that it was his wish to have anointment performed, not on the basis of the papal injunction, but on the basis of its recommendation by the eighth-century Armenian ecclesiastical authority Yovhan of Ocum.5

The question of jurisdiction, however, was problematic for the Armenians as well as the Byzantines. In 1248 Catholicos Kostandin and the chief theologian of the day, Vardan Arewelci (a student of Vanakan Vardapet) wrote their suggestions to the Armenian King Hetum, for use in preparing his response to the papal legate, or as the Armenians called him, Dimanche.6 In it they imply that Roman claims of authority were proper to the sphere not of religious argument but of politics: “We should beware of those wolves in sheep’s clothing who, having fomented a disturbance with God and with their own king, desire to stir up trouble with us as well. If they question you about faith, tell them that ...there are 620 Armenian regions, some in ruins and some in captivity. If they ‘have compassion’ for the Armenians, let them come and liberate them.”7 The Armenian representative at Acre in 1261 asked the papal legate, “Whence does the Church of Rome derive

5 The canons to be considered did not actually reach Greater Armenia until 1246, according to Հայաստան պատմական, Քաղաքական (Karakos Ganjakeci, History of Armenia) Erevan 1964, 311. The words of Innocent are not reported in the text of the canons given in Սութուն ԱՊԱ, Սրբառատություն, Քաղաքական Հայկական Կուսկեն (Abp. Abell Mifarianci, History of the Armenian Church Councils) Valarisapat: Catholicoosate Press, 1874, 122-125.

6 The response exists in two variants. The official one, printed in the Հռոմեան պահպան (Book of Letters) Jerusalem, 1994, 657-665 and another, unexpurgated version to be found in SJ888 and 898 together with Vardan’s Տիտխու (Tidbits).

7 Հռոմեան պահպան (Book of Letters), 665. Այս պահպանների համար, ես եւ ասկում եմ թե որոնք ութ իրենց երիտասարդ էր, որոնք պետք է ստացեն այս ցույցերը, որ ու իր հարաբերությունները նրանց զգացող ընկերություն. Երբ ես պահպանիչ եմ թե Հռոմեան, ես պատրաստ եմ ես եւ իմ իր Փարիզի կողմերը հեռանում եմ, որ ու զգացում, որ վերջինը կարող է դա արդարթան իրավունք.
the power to pass judgment on the other apostolic sees, while she herself is not subject to their judgment? We ourselves have the authority to bring you to trial, following the example of the Apostles, and you have no right to defy our competency.  

The contentious atmosphere created around matters of authority favored renewed debate on other long-existent issues such as discipline and the *filioque* clause which, in a way, became symbolic of the larger split between the churches. Both the Latins, in their adherence to the formula “who proceeds from the Father and the Son” and the Greeks, in their adherence to the formula “who proceeds from the Father with the Son,” desired to have the Armenians on their side in regard to the issue.  

Yovhannes Vanakan Vardapet was one of the Armenian doctrinal authorities to whom the Catholicos turned for an opinion on the matter, when once an inter-church panel of experts had failed to reach a consensus. Vanakan was completely the intellectual product of Armenia proper, rather than of Cilicia. Born in 1181 in the village of Tavus in the Ganjak region northeast of Lake Sevan in the present Armenian Republic, he was educated at the monastery of Getik. There, he studied under the famous and learned Mxifar Goş, founder of the monastery. Upon completion of his studies, Vanakan Vardapet established a monastery called Xoranašt in Tavus, passing down the Getik monastic intellectual tradition to a new generation of disciples.  

---

8 Aristides Papadakis, *The Christian East and the Rise of the Papacy*, 118 (q.v. for the original source). The compilation Ρηματα του Αποστολου ως Πρωτοκοιμησεως Βραβευματικά (Responses of Mxif’ar the Priest of Skewra Concerning the Equality of the Twelve Apostles) Jerusalem, 1860 contains a greater elaboration on this theme. Mxifar was the Armenian representative at Tmolus in 1263-4, to Urban IV’s legate Abp. William of Tyre, and he recorded his responses on the authority question as a report to King Het’um II.  

9 The Byzantine Patriarch Samuel wrote to Catholicos Konstandin from Nicaea, asking for clarifications of the Armenian position. Ἡ Ἐλασία, Ἑραλδεύς (Gh. Alishan, *Sissian*) Venice: St. Lazar, 1865, 554.  

10 For more detailed biographical information, particularly on Vanakan’s capture by the Mongols in 1236 see Փարսպի Պատմություն, Հայաստանի պատմության (Kirakos Ganjakeci, *History of Armenia*) Erevan 1964, 243-252. For an overview of his literary output see Հ. Օսկեյան, Դերասանական գրողեր ու նրա գրվել (H. Oskian, *Yovhannes Vanakan and His School*) Vienna 1922, 20-37.
Comments on the Text of the Paraenesis

We owe our possession of Vanakan’s Doctrinal Paraenesis (Ὑποικία Ελληνική) to its preservation in the History of Armenia written by his disciple, Kirakos of Ganjak. The Paraenesis appears in the 1964 critical edition of the History as chapter 52, following two preparatory chapters also devoted to the filioque issue: the first is Kirakos’s listing of the biblical and patristic references that could be adduced on the subject, and the second is a formal statement of faith that was presumably sent by the authorities in Armenia proper to the Catholicos in Cilicia. This statement of faith made use of the following phraseology, intended to cut a middle path between the Romans and the Byzantines: “The Holy Spirit emanating from the Father and revealed by the Son” (Ὑποικία Ελληνική Ερμηνευθείς η Ζωή της Ερμηνευθείς Φιλοκλήτης).

At the beginning of the Paraenesis, Kirakos explains its presence in the History at this point. “The great Vanakan Vardapet also wrote, [showing] how it would be possible to confess or say that the Holy Spirit is from the Father and from the Son.” In other words, Vanakan Vardapet maintained that it was possible to agree with the Romans provided one looked at the issue from a specific point of view. Although his viewpoint did not carry the day, as the formal confession mentioned in the preceding paragraph shows, Kirakos found the rationale worth including, perhaps to offset the opinions of hard-liners who felt that the Roman position was completely indefensible.

11 It appears as chapter 50 in the Venice, 1865 edition.
12 Among the patristic references are quotations from Gregory the Enlightener, Athanasius, Socrates the Historian, Gregory the Theologian, Gregory of Nyssa, Basil, Ephrem, John Chrysostom, Severian of Emesa, Moses Xorenaci, Step’anos Siwnedi, and Epiphanius. The quotations await a separate analysis.
13 Just before the outset of the Confession, in the final words of chapter 50, Kirakos makes it clear that his own personal beliefs coincide with this statement: “Such a confession as this is acceptable in the Armenian churches, and is in [keeping with] the spirit of Kirakos, and it is right to preach boldly ‘the Spirit proceeding from the Father and revealed by the Son’. (Ὑποικία Ελληνική Ερμηνευθείς η Ζωή της Ερμηνευθείς Φιλοκλήτης, και την Ζωήν την Ερμηνευθείς, και συνεργάζονται και ανέφηον η Ζωή της Ερμηνευθείς Φιλοκλήτης)

14 A number of scholars, notably the Armenian Catholic fathers, have considered Vanakan’s Paraenesis as a simple adoption of the filioque formula. Գ. Ավետիքյան, Սարուհբեդ, Սարուհբեդ Երազման (G. Avetikyan, Commentary on the Hymns) Venice: St. Lazar, 1814, 726 is a case in point. Certain writers of the Armenian Apostolic
In other words, the *Paraenesis* is not framed directly as a response to the inquiry of Pope Innocent, but as a response to debates taking place among the theologians of Greater Armenia. Vanakan refers to his Armenian interlocutor at several points as “wise and true believer,” “confessor” and “friend.” It is not written as a formal document, but as a kind of “working paper.” The tone is informal although it assumes a good grasp of the day’s specialized, theological vocabulary on the part of the reader.

The *Paraenesis* is carefully and thoroughly sprinkled with quotations from sources whose orthodoxy was unimpeachable from the Armenian point of view. There are fifty-two in all, drawn from Scripture, Philo of Alexandria, the Nicene Creed, Athanasius of Alexandria, Gregory the Theologian, Basil the Great, Gregory of Nyssa, John Chrysostom, Epiphanius, Dionysius the Areopagite and Gregory the Enlightener.15

Vanakan begins his exhortation with a series of cautions: first of all, to speak through the Spirit about the Spirit is a matter for those who are spiritual.16 As will later become clear, this means not only that an investigation into the Spirit’s origins and *modus operandi* must be carried out by those who have only spiritual ends in mind (rather than, say, the extension of their hegemony over other nations), but that it must use spiritual terms of reference. When it resorts to metaphors, it must be aware of their limited usefulness. The subject must be approached with “cognitive cognition” (*երկարագիտություն* *երկարագիտություն*) rather than “analytic analysis.”

Secondly, it must be an investigation conducted in tranquility. Elijah’s “still, small voice” will lead the investigation to a conclusion

---

15 As with the quotations in the Confession of Faith which precedes the *Paraenesis*, these too would repay further study. For more on St. Gregory the Enlightener’s teaching on the relationship between the Spirit and the other two persons of the Trinity, see *The Teaching of St. Gregory*, tr. Robert W. Thomson, AVANT: Treasures of the Armenian Christian Tradition 1, New Rochelle: St. Nersess Armenian Seminary, 2001, especially 15-19. Basil’s *On the Holy Spirit* is also of particular interest.

16 He goes on to imply modestly that a person with his capacities will produce “gleanings” rather than a “full ear” of doctrinal certitude.
that "glorifies the One Godhead's three persons, who are mutually revealed as light from light."\(^{17}\)

Thirdly, it must be an investigation carried out in the full realization of the investigators' human limits. We cannot understand physical light and fire in their operation; how much less can we hope to comprehend and formulate the operations of the divine Light within itself and among us its creatures?

With these caveats in place, Vanakan can begin to outline his basic points. First, that while the various attempts to express Trinity have followed certain patterns, they have also, perhaps inevitably, created a certain amount of confusion in terminology. This is obvious when one brings the expressions together on the same page. For example, at one point or another, all three persons of the triune Godhead have been referred to as "spirit": Jesus referred to the Father as "Spirit," Gregory the Enlightener referred to the Son as "Spirit," and naturally the Scripture is full of references to the Spirit as "Spirit."

The underlying reality is that the three Persons all share one nature. What, then, are the characteristics of this nature? It is eternal. All three Persons, equally, are "without temporal beginning."

This eternity is the key to Vanakan's understanding of the way in which the filioque formula may be seen as acceptable within the Armenian tradition. When one subtracts the temporal overtones from terms such as "source" "cause," "proceeds," and "emanates," the formulas "with the Son" or "and the Son" become equally possible expressions, on our temporal plane, of the Trinity's eternal and totally mutual inherence. Vanakan is willing to accept the filioque as an expression of the Spirit's part in the Trinity's inner life as he looks upon the procession \textit{ab intra}.\(^{18}\) In the \textit{Paraenesis}, in fact, he is not concerned at all with the temporal manifestations of the Trinity. Procession \textit{ab extra} would not have been an idea acceptable to his theology. To him, as to other thinkers of the time, procession \textit{ab extra}

\(^{17}\) Vanakan is playing with the two possible meanings of the credal phrase πάντα τὰ προφητεία in this context: "revealed as light from light," and "as light is revealed by light."

\(^{18}\) All of the ideas in the Tome of Gregory II of Cyprus at the Blachernae Council, some fifty years after Vanakan, are anticipated here, although without the technical terms \textit{eternal procession} or \textit{eternal manifestation}. See Aristides Papadakis, \textit{Crisis in Byzantium}, New York: Fordham University Press, 1986, 90-100.
involved the idea of subordination, something which was totally unacceptable in terms of the Trinity.\textsuperscript{19}

The eternal relationship of the Spirit to the Father and the Son cannot be defined by a single word, such as \textit{emanation}. This and other similar terms come into use where the user is viewing the Trinity in terms of its energy, manifested in time, rather than its essence in eternity. Since Vanakan is viewing the Trinity in the latter way, he uses at least seven words or phrases to describe the eternal relationship: the Spirit is the \textit{image} of the Father and the Son; the Spirit is the \textit{imprint} of the Father and the Son; the Spirit is \textit{from} the Father and the Son (used four times); the Spirit \textit{comes forth} from the Father and the Son (used four times); the Father and the Son are the \textit{cause} of the Spirit; the Spirit is a \textit{procession and emanation} from the Father and the Son; the Spirit \textit{takes} from the Father and the Son.

When “God created man in His image,” the triune nature of man (“the soul, mind and \textit{logos} which are in your body”) was established. Where one is present, all three are present. In terms of the Trinity, that mutual presence is an eternal rather than a localized or temporal manifestation. That Vanakan does not intend any linear progression between the three persons is clear from the illustrations he uses of the root, the stem and the blossom, on the one hand, and the entity, the mouth and the breath on the other. The blossom appears through the stem, from the root source; it is quite possible to say that the blossom comes from the stem. So also the breath comes from the breathing entity, through the mouth, but it is also proper to say that the breath comes from the mouth. The organic connection of the blossom with the root cannot be actualized without the stem; the organic connection between the breather and the breath cannot be actualized without the mouth. No one part has a full existence and function independent of the others.

On the basis of these illustrations Vanakan is able to counter the concerns of some more philosophically minded persons who seem to have objected that there is only one \textit{cause} or \textit{origin} possible for a single entity; Vanakan replies that there are \textit{primary} and \textit{secondary} causes;

\textsuperscript{19} A generation before Vanakan, Nerses Lambronac’i, Abp. of Tarsus, had stated, “When we say ‘the Spirit of Christ’ we do not mean [that the Spirit] started and emanates from Him; [the Spirit] by Personhood is equal with Him (Christ) and is of equal glory with Him.” \textit{Հանձելագերի, Հավերժական} Միացված Եկեղեցի \textit{(Nerses Lambronac’i, \textit{Reflection on the Divine Liturgy}) Jerusalem: St. James, 1842, 111.
there are causes of different types. For the Father and the Son to be causes of the Spirit does not imply that they are causes of the same type, or that their causality is manifested in the same way. For example, our recognition of the Spirit is caused by the Son: "the one who assumed our nature, the Logos, appears by means of what is ours, and the Father and the Spirit are known through Him" in a different way from the causation of the Spirit by the Father. Perhaps another way to put it would be that in saying "from the Son," Vanakan means the Holy Spirit is in the Son and thus comes out from him as well, rather than that the Son generates the Spirit.

From the point of view of eternity, that arena where the three inhere perfectly, it is impossible to separate the three: "Whose cause could the Father and the Son be, if not the Spirit's?" It is quite probable that Vanakan felt his opponents, in addition to their overly strict interpretation of the word cause, were in danger of creating too great a differentiation between the divine Persons. "These three terms [Father/ingenerate, Son/generate, Spirit/procession] are the coequal denotation of the three persons...They are not a symbol of three natures—let no one interpret it in that manner!—but the symbol of three Persons and one Nature." In speaking of the Trinity, his opponents were using categories which did not apply to an eternally inherent relationship.

There were, in addition, logical problems with a temporally based insistence that the Spirit proceeded from the Father only. "If you describe the Spirit as an emanation and procession from the Father only, [then] the Spirit is without reason (logos); and if you say from the Son only, then it has a separate cause [from the Son's]. But if you say from the Father and the Son that is true, as indeed it is. As neither the Fatherhood of God is material, nor His Sonship, by the same token neither is His Spiiration." Unlike any procession, begetting or causation in the temporal sphere, the Spirit's relationship with the Father and the son is such that the Spirit "is not diminished in any way, nor is it separated from them. The Father is full and perfect God, the Son is full and perfect God, the Holy Spirit is full and perfect God. A single godhead perfected in three persons equal in every way."

The Paraenesis closes with a return to Vanakan's initial emphasis on the unknowability of the Trinity and the mysterious nature of the eternal relationship between the three Persons in one Nature.
Do not attempt to understand this in terms of natural things, but in terms of the cognition which is within us. Otherwise, when God is called Light and Life, what do you mean to say? Is He such a light and life as we see and live? Are you capable of understanding your own soul's name and essence? This is promised us in the world to come, when 'what eye has not seen nor ear heard, neither hath entered into the heart of man, what God has prepared for those who love Him' is revealed.

In conclusion, we might say that in one sense Vanakan was ahead of his time. In a prophetic way, he expressed ideas which were to be tabled again in a larger way at the Council of Blachernae, fifty years later. In another way, he was true to the Armenian tradition of his school, which instilled in its students openness to the value in others' ideas and approaches to the great mysteries of faith.

It is to be hoped that further study of the writings of Vanakan and his students will shed greater light not only on the filioque issue as it affected the Armenian Church, but on the nature of the late medieval Armenian theological world as well.

Translation of the Doctrinal Paraenesis of Vanakan Vardapet

To speak through the Spirit about the Spirit is [a task] for the spiritual, and one who is willing to harvest with a firm hand loves to encounter both the summer's gleanings and the full ear. But if the immaterial spirit in Elijah inspires [it], the Word will go forth and the

---

20 We do not print the Armenian text here, as the Paraenesis is readily available in the edition of Kirakos's History by Melik-Ohanjanian, produced in Erevan, 1964 (338-344). For the purposes of the following translation, the 1865 edition by the Mekhitarist brotherhood at St. Lazar was also consulted. Punctuation in this translation is the writer's own, and does not reflect the punctuation of either Armenian edition. Biblical quotations have been noted. As mentioned in footnote 12 above, the patristic quotations would benefit from further study. Due to time and library constraints beyond the writer's control, many of the patristic quotations have not been traced here.
one godhead in three persons mutually revealed will be glorified, as
light from light.\textsuperscript{21}

So if this created light and fire is not cut off from its familiaris and
from others, how could the uncreated, creative [fire and light be cut off]
from one another and within the creatures? We cannot, however,
understand this. As it is not possible to suppose individual divisions in
air and fire, water and wine because of the subtlety of their
constituents,\textsuperscript{22} and as this seems to be necessarily and undeniably so,
how much less can the mind presume to understand by consensus the
uncreated, unmade, indefinable, united Holy Trinity which has nothing
whereby it may be limited, nor any place where it may be located!

But what the divinely inspired scriptures provide for the Church is
a starting point, intelligence intelligible to the intelligent, like a kind of
nourishment or food for thought. The angelic beings and their creative
powers intuit the intelligible—\textsuperscript{23} the intelligent intelligence—through
intuitive intellection.\textsuperscript{24} So, take heed to yourself, says the proto-Prophet
Moses, “Look to yourself.”\textsuperscript{25} And Philo admonishes, “Comprehend it
by means of the trinity which is in your body,” that is, soul, mind and
logos. In the same vein Paul also writes, “For us the Father is one, and
there is one Lord Jesus Christ,”\textsuperscript{26} and “there is one Holy Spirit.”\textsuperscript{27} The
holy Council of Nicaea transmits the same: “I believe in one God the
Father...and in one Lord Jesus Christ...and in one Holy Spirit.”\textsuperscript{28} John
the Baptist, too, confesses the unity of [the divine] nature; he posits the

\textsuperscript{21} The phrase is taken from the Nicene Creed.

\textsuperscript{22} There is no fire without air; once water and wine have been mingled they cannot be
separated again. In both cases, although the two elements are distinct, they are not
distinguishable.

\textsuperscript{23} Reading \textit{προσώπων} for \textit{προσώπῳ}

\textsuperscript{24} Angelic intellection is discussed in the first chapter of \textit{L. ἤθελον, Ἀρνηθῶν ἔχειν, Λαμπρὸν ὑπὸν ἐπαθῶν} (Yohannes Erzakaci’s
Compilation of Commentary on Grammar) ed. L. Khacheryan, Los Angeles: n.p.,
1983. That angels had a more direct knowledge, “an intellectual activity radiant with
unalloyed and unsullied purity,” was a given in angelology. Here, the implication is
that just as angels understand the Trinity in a way proper to their mode of intellection,
so also we, as human beings, must understand the Trinity in a way proper to our own
mode of intellection.

\textsuperscript{25} Deut. 8:11

\textsuperscript{26} I Cor. 8:6

\textsuperscript{27} Eph. 4:4

\textsuperscript{28} This sentence does not appear in the Venice, 1865 edition.
Father and the Spirit as the same genus, the selfsame [genus as the] Word. And [Scripture] says the Son has the Father, and the Father has the Son.

Athanasius calls [the Trinity] three hypostases or three persons. Gregory the Theologian [speaks of] three persons or three prosopoi, or call them whatever you prefer. God is the same, the One Who Is, who is without beginning and without cessation. Gregory the Theologian and Basil and Gregory of Nyssa, whom the whole Church follows, [spoke of] the Unbegotten and the Begotten and the Proceeding. John Chrysostom [used the image] root and shoot and bud. Paul calls the Father Being and the Son image; the Father is light and the Son is His radiance. Athanasius says the Son is the image of God the Father’s Being and the Spirit [is the image of] the Son’s [being]. The Lord himself calls the Father Spirit. And Gregory the Enlightener calls the Son Spirit. Too, all the inspired Scriptures call the Spirit Spirit. Paul says the Father is invisible, and the Son is the image of the Invisible.

It is obvious that the Spirit is the image of the Father and the Son, for the image and representation of their Being is one. According to the [verse], “God made man in His image,” there is one image of their nature, one prototype for the one man’s one nature and for the three persons of the one divinity. The whole Old and New Testaments attest to this.

The Father Himself told Abraham that He is without beginning and without cause: “I swear to you by My Being.” And to Moses [he said] “I am Who I Am,” as if to say that He is not [derived] from anyone. And Hosea says that the Son and the Spirit are from the Father: “My Spirit and my Word are among you.” And the Lord Himself says, “The wind blows where it wills, but you do not know from where it

29 John 1:32-34
30 Matt. 11:27
31 Heb. 1:3
32 1 John 1:5
33 John 4:24
34 II Cor. 4:4
35 Gen. 1:27
36 Gen. 22:16
37 Ex. 3:14
38 The quote is not from Hosea. Perhaps Is. 59:21 or Hagg. 2:5 is intended.
comes or where it is going; so also is every one who is born of the
Spirit." Concerning this saint Epiphanius of Cyprus says, "The Father
is Spirit, and from Him are the Son and the Spirit." For the name
"Father" denotes unbeginningness; the three of them are without
temporal beginning. To say "Spirit" denotes incorporeality; the three of
them are incorporeal. To say "Son" denotes hypostasis as well as
nature; and so they are three hypostases and a single nature.

The Son is said to be "from the Father;" the Father is not said to be
"from the Son," for the latter is from the former, not the former from
the latter. Both the Son and the Spirit are said to be "from the Father."40
It is not said that the Father is from them.41 Both the Son and the Spirit
are said to be "from the Father," the one by generation42 and the other
by procession.43 The Son is called emanation,44 and the Spirit is also
called emanation.45 It is said that the Son proceeds from the Father;46 it
is also said that the Spirit proceeds from the Father.47 The Father is
called Spirit, but He is not called Son; The Spirit is not called Father or
Son.

The Son is from the Father, and the Spirit is from the Father and
from the Son.48 the Father is the root, the Son is the shoot, and the
Spirit is the bud from the root and from the shoot.49 The Spirit is the
breath; the Son is the mouth; the Father is the being:50 "All its hosts
[were made] by the breath of His mouth;"51 "Your sending forth
(=breathing out) is an orchard of pomegranates;"52 "He breathed on

40 John 16:28; John 15:26
41 This sentence is missing from the Venice, 1865 edition.
42 I John 5:1, Heb. 1:5/5:5
43 John 15:26
44 Is. 11:1.
45 John 7:38-39
46 John 8:42
47 John 15:26
48 The Teaching of Saint Gregory: An Early Armenian Catechism tr. Robert W. Thomson,
49 Compare Tertullian's illustration of the root, the tree and the fruit, Against Praxeas
VIII.
50 II Thess. 2:8
51 Ps. 33:6
52 Song 4:13
them and said, 'Receive the Holy Spirit'.”53 The Father is the Being, the Son is the person, the Spirit is the arm, and the finger from the arm: “By the finger of God do I remove demons.”54

“The Son is from the Father and the Spirit is from them both,” says St. Epiphanius.55 The Son proceeds from the Father, and the Father proceeds from the Son and from the Father. “The Son takes from the Father.”56 Likewise also the Spirit takes from the Son: the Lord Himself says, “He will take from what is mine and will teach it to you.”57 And the Son too takes from the Spirit, according to [the verse] “That which is conceived in her is from the Holy Spirit.”58

The triune Sun is entirely light, uniformly ineffable, inaccessible, formless, unqualifiable, unquantifiable, illimitable. But the One who assumed our nature, the Word, appears by means of what is our own, and through Him the Father and the Son are recognized. The Son is called begotten, which implies having what pertains to someone else, and He is also said to proceed, which implies not having something which pertains to someone else, because He has neither the person of the Father nor the person of the Spirit, but His own filial [person]. The Spirit is said to proceed from the Father and from the Son, because He has neither the person of the Father nor the person of the Son, but rather His own spiritual person. These three, equal names denote the three persons, not one above the other, nor one below the other, but equal to each other in every respect. They do not signify three natures—let no one understand them in that manner!—but rather they signify three persons and one nature: one is Father, because He is not from another father, and one is Son, because He is from the Father, and one is Spirit, because He is from the Father and from the Son.

The Father is called unbegotten because He is not from anyone, and the Son is called begotten because He is from the Father. The Spirit is called neither Son nor begotten lest [He and the Son] be considered as two brothers, and He is not paired with the Son lest He be thought of

53 John 20:22
55 This phrasing is also to be found in The Teaching of Saint Gregory §362.
56 John 7:16/14:24
57 John 16:15
58 Matt. 1:20
as a daughter. Nor is He exclusively from the Son, lest He be accounted a “grandchild” [of the Father].

Why do you find it difficult, o wise person and true believer, to understand a dual source? Basil asked his brother Gregory, “What is the source of the source?” and he responded,” The Primary Cause of the second cause.”59 Dear person, whom else could the Father and the Son be the origin of, if not of His Spirit?

Gregory the Theologian considers the word of Plato where it is written that a mixer changes the being, [but] he rejects calling the mixture a being. However, he approves talking about primary and secondary causes. Why do you, confessor, resist the two causes? These names and this arrangement do not create distinctions in the one Nature: they are various indicators of the three hypostases in the one Nature so that the definition and order of faith’s confession may remain pure and unconfused—one godhead, who created everything in order and within its boundaries—so that the mind of the confessor should not fall into perturbation and confusion.

To you who are attentive I say, how do your thoughts remain in you, and yet the [same] thought arises in another person? If you do not comprehend this, why do you niggle concerning God, and oppose the Scripture? If you cannot see the light which arises in your wit and the prudence which accompanies your speech and the outpouring of your heart and the intonation of your voice, then do not attempt to apprehend something which is in opposition to God and Scripture.

[Let] me say it another way: does what you say come from your mind, or from your spirit? If it is from your mind, without your spirit, then your speech is spiritless. And if it is from your spirit, without your mind, then what you say is mindless. However, if it is from your spirit and from your mind, then what you say is spirited and rational—as is actually the case. (And if your speech [merely involves] animal intelligence, it is absurd.)

Do not look at the unity of God’s nature and the division of His hypostases in a corporeal fashion, lest you be scandalized. If you say that the Spirit proceeds and emanates from the Father alone, the Spirit is alogical;60 and if you say it is from the Son alone, it has a source foreign [to the Son’s]. Whereas if [you say it is] from the Father and the

59 Basil’s On the Holy Spirit has a long section on the types of causation.
60 That is, without the Logos.
Son, this is true—as indeed it is. And just as neither God’s Fatherhood is corporeal, nor His Sonship, neither is His Procession. There is a word used in the rural areas—"such-and-such came out of such-and-such whole (νηφ)," “it was divided into these things whole”: [we might use this same word of God’s hypostases, to express that] none of Him was left behind anywhere, and one brought no vestiges from another, nor was one cut out as a piece from the others, nor was one separated from others. Call Him whole if you will, or pure or simple. In this way is the Spirit from the Father and from the Son: He is not diminished, nor is He separated from them. The Father is full, perfect God; the Son is full, perfect God; the Holy Spirit is full, perfect God: one Godhead perfect in three Persons equal in every way. This is the orthodox faith’s confession. The Holy Dionysius uses the term proceeding for all three members of the Trinity, Father and Son and Spirit, saying, “The one called proceeding gives understanding,” and so on. And again, “giving wisdom, giving power, giving life,” and other such like.

I beseech you again, consider the name of God as His not by nature, but by virtue of the care which He has towards us. If it were not so, God is called light and life—[should we then understand] the same kind of light and life which we see and live? Or, are you able to know the name and the essence of your own spirit? This is promised for the life to come, when that which “eye has not seen, nor ear heard, neither has it entered into the heart of man” will be revealed, “what God has prepared for those He loves.” Do not investigate more [while you are] here [in this world], lest you fall short of everything.

---

61 ὄλεθρος and ἄμαρτωλος were two of the terms most commonly used to describe God’s nature.

62 A common etymology for God Θεόν και εὐαγγελία τοῦ Θεοῦ. Vanakan’s Book of Questions contains the following: Question: Who set the name “God”? Answer: They say that the serpent said to Eve, “Why did the one who brought you here say that?” And they took the phrase and called Him brought us here. But do not accept this: it was Adam who set the name God (=brought us here). ζητεῖται καὶ εὐαγγελία τοῦ Θεοῦ. Καὶ ἄμαρτωλος Θεὸς καὶ εὐαγγελία τοῦ Θεοῦ. Καὶ ἄμαρτωλος Θεὸς καὶ εὐαγγελία τοῦ Θεοῦ. Καὶ ἄμαρτωλος Θεὸς καὶ εὐαγγελία τοῦ Θεοῦ. Καὶ ἄμαρτωλος Θεὸς καὶ εὐαγγελία τοῦ Θεοῦ. Καὶ ἄμαρτωλος Θεὸς καὶ εὐαγγελία τοῦ Θεοῦ. SJS87 31r.
THE ANCESTRY OF
ST. GREGORY THE ILLUMINATOR
IN THE PANEGYRICAL TRADITION

Abraham Terian

Introduction

W
ith the appointment of Vahram Pahlawuni, son of Grigor Magistros, as Catholicos in 1066, there emerged a renewed interest in the Gregorid Dynasty. It was a timely interest given the unsettling times. The capital Ani was taken by the Byzantines some twenty years before it fell to Sultan Alp Arslan in 1064, and the Catholicosate was rootlessly and insecurely in exile. Upon his accession Vahram assumed the name Grigor II, later nicknamed Vkayasèr ("Martyrophile") because of his devotion to the martyred saints, whose hagiographies he translated personally or had them translated during his long wanderings (d. 1105). Above all, Vkayasèr was devoted to his namesake, St. Gregory the Illuminator, founder of the Armenian Church and a distant relative as a result of the Pahlawuni/Kamsarean (Neo-Kamsaran) and Gregorid intermarriages of bygone centuries. Moreover, the ancestral kinship to St. Gregory helped Vkayasèr revive the long-lost hereditary Gregorid succession. Maksoudian rightly observes:


2 On the Pahlawunis’ kinship to St. Gregory, see the eleventh letter in Grigor Magistrosi T’ght’erë, especially p. 40; Nersès Shnorhali, Vipasanut’iwn Haykazants’, in Bank’ Ch’ap’aw, pp. 539-608 (especially pp. 587-588).
At the time of Nersēs Shnorhalı’s death in 1173 there was no longer any doubt that the Catholicate was considered to be the hereditary office of the Pahlawuni clan, since by that time members of that family had held the position for more than a century – since 1066. There is also reason to believe that the same principle of hereditary succession was also the tradition in the see of Aght’amar where the presiding anti-catholicoi were related to the minor branches of the Artsruni clan.3

Among the hagiographies translated during the long yet unstable pontificate of Vkayasēr was a panegyric on St. Gregory the Illuminator, said to have been rendered from Greek into Armenian and traditionally attributed to Theophilos, a disciple of St. John Chrysostom (ca. 350-407): Eranelwoyn T’ēovp’ilosi asats’eal nermoghean patmagrabar surb hörn meroy ew lusaworch'i, k’ahanayapotin K’ristosi ew vkayi, Metsin Grigori Ark’episkopos Hayots’ Metsats’ ashkharhi (A historical panegyric recited by the blessed Theophilos on our holy father and illuminator, the high priest of Christ and martyr, Gregory the Great, the Archbishop of Greater Armenia).4 It was translated by a Greek rhetor, Theopistos, according to a twelfth-century colophon appended to certain manuscripts of this panegyric.5

This brilliant and beautifully composed oration was translated from Greek into our language by order of the thrice-blessed patriarch, Lord Gregory [III], Catholicos of Greater Armenia, by the wise and ingenious translator Theopistos. Until now this lamp was hid under a bed and was covered under a bushel.6 However, by God’s

---

4 Text in Sop’erk’, 4:89-125 and in Yovhannu Oskeberani... Meknut‘iwn T’ght’ots’n Pawghosi, 2:826-841.
5 Yovsep’eăn, Yishatakaran’ Dzetagrats’, no. 133, cols. 277-280, and elsewhere (references in ibid.). Theopistos, the named translator of the Panegyric, is also the translator of The Life of St. John Chrysostom, according to another colophon, in Yovsep’eăn, Yishatakaran’ Dzetagrats’, no. 138, cols. 283-286; cf. cols. 279-280. The title of the latter work may wrongly suggest that the translation was done by Vkayasēr himself, his involvement notwithstanding: Patmut‘iwn Varuts’... Surb Yovhannēs Oskeberan Hayrapetin Kostandnupolsoy: T’argm. i Yunakenē i Hays, i Grigorē Kat’ughikošē Vkayasēr Koch’ets’eloy (History of the life... of St. John Chrysostom, Patriarch of Constantinople, translated from Greek into Armenian by [order of] Kat’oghikos Grigor, called Martyrophile) (Venice: S. Ghazar, 1751).
6 Alluding to Matt. 5:15 and parallels and to what follows in the colophon, that the translation was temporarily obscured, until the scribe Paul made a copy of it at the place where it was found.
command, it was brought to light at the holy monastery of Ark’aykaghni.\textsuperscript{7} I, Paul, the unworthy, grievous sinner and useless cleric, strongly desired to place a copy of it in the glorious, capital-city-like [and] holy solitude of Ark’aykaghni, as a memorial for my sinful self and for my parents. Thus its fame, like that of a crown-ornamented king, reached the heaven-like solitude of Akner, where God dwells, to the holy and blessed father Step’anos who is draped in light. And he sent an official note and ordered to have a copy made and deposited at the door of the Church of Astuatsamayr,\textsuperscript{8} for the glorious celebration of the feast of our Illuminator, and as a memorial for himself, his parents, and myself, the altogether sinful. And I, within my ability, made a copy and sent it. And I plead with you, O seraphic choirs grouped in the light, that you remember in your prayers the Abbott of the holy order at the solitude of Akner, father Step’anos, the one honored by God, and his parents, and the wise musician Manuël, who brought on his shoulder this oration to the monastery, and me, Paul, the toiling scribe, and our parents, and all who believe in Christ. And may Christ have mercy on you who do remember habitually and on us who are remembered. Glory to Him, always. Amen.

Not long thereafter, another panegyric on St. Gregory appeared, this one attributed to St. John Chrysostom himself: \textit{Srboyn Yovhannu Oskeberani Nerboghean Asats’eal yaghags Varuts’ ew Nahatak’tean Srboyn Grigori Hayots’ Metsats’ Hayrapeti} (Panegyric Recited by St. John Chrysostom upon the Life and Martyrdom of St. Gregory the Patriarch of Greater Armenia). It was translated in 1141 by Abraham Gramatikos, a Greek rhetor, upon the request of the Catholicos Grigor III Pahlawuni (in office 1113-1166) and revised by St. Nersès Shnorhali, his brother and successor to the Catholicosate (in office 1166-1173), according to a colophon by the latter at the end of the text.\textsuperscript{9}

\textsuperscript{7} The monastery of “Royal Oaks,” on which see H. Oskean, \textit{Kilikiayi Vank’erê} (The Monasteries of Cilicia), Azgayin Matenadaran 183 (Vienna: Mkhit’arean Tparan, 1957), pp. 118-132.

\textsuperscript{8} The cathedral of the famed monastery of Akner, known also as Surb Astuatsatsin (Holy Mother of God), on which see Oskean, \textit{Kilikiayi Vank’erê}, pp. 93-95.

In the year 590 (of the Armenian Era = AD 1141), this oration was translated from Greek into ours at the hand of Abraham Gramatikos from old and faded copies, though certain words were emended by me, the humble [servant] Nersès, given my scholarship and vocabulary, upon the request of my lord and kin, Gregory [III], Catholicos of the Armenians; and it was penned by the scribe Step’anos. Those who read or copy it, remember by name before Christ Jesus the above mentioned individuals who labored on it, and copy the few words of this colophon with every copying; that a permanent memorial may be written for you in the living registers of Christ.

The traditional authorship and date of these two works, which came to be known since the twelfth century, cannot be supported. While Greek as the original language of their composition is likely, there can be no doubt about their Armenian patronage – if not authorship. The two “Chrysostomian” panegyrics had profound influence on all subsequent Armenian panegyrics on St. Gregory, especially those of Yovhannēs Sarkawag, Vardashet’i, and Yovhannēs Erznkats’i – the latter in particular. This leads to the conclusion that the renewed interest in the traditions surrounding St. Gregory at this time and the production of panegyrics on him are largely due to the succession of the Pahlawuni Catholicoi, from Grigor II to Grigor VI (1066-1203). Their legacy also explains the reason for the panegyrics on the descendants of St. Gregory, such as those by Vardashet’i (on Sts. Aristakēs and Vrt’anēs and their descendant successors; on St. Grigor Vkkayār and his descendant successors) and another by Yovhannēs Erznkats’i (on St. Nersēs the Great).

The panegyric by Yovhannēs Erznkats’i, Asats’uats Nerboghakan Govesti i Surb Lusaworich’n Hayots’ Grigories (Panegyric of Praise

The full title of the panegyric has this addition “… i Kokison Hayots’ minch’ yak’sorans Ṝr, i khndroy Hayazin orumn episkoposi ew vardapeti hamazgwoy norin Deoskoros anun koch’ets’eloy...” (... at Cucusa [Koukousos] in Armenia, while he was in exile, upon the request of a certain bishop and vardapet, his Armenian-born compatriot named Dioscoros...), suggesting that it was written between 404 and 407, the year of Chrysostom’s deportation to Pityus or Colchis on the Black Sea (he died en route at Comana in Pontus). The popularity of Chrysostom as preacher and writer gave rise to several spurious works in Greek. The colophon by St. Nersēs the Gracious emphasizes the antiquity of the work, translated “from old and faded copies” (i hin ew yeghts orinakats’).

10 All three are published in Sop’erk’, 5 (pp. 5-36, 39-82, 85-164, respectively; that of Vardashet’i being wrongly attributed to Vardashet’i).
Recited on St. Gregorios the Illuminator of the Armenians; hereinafter, *Panegyric on St. Gregory the Illuminator of the Armenians*) has been acclaimed as the best of these medieval compositions because of its artistic creativity seen in rich imageries and associations.\(^{11}\) Its prolific author is a distinguished *vardapet* of the thirteenth-century (ca. 1230-1293), a recognized rhetor and grammarian, hymnographer and theologian of the Armenian Church. Moreover, this panegyric brings together the best features of the earlier works dedicated to St. Gregory. It contains a considerable section devoted to the Saint’s ancestry, a problematic subject for the panegyrists – given the fact that his father Anak was a murderous traitor. Whereas nearly all of them speak of the Saint as a desirable rose from a thorny stem and employ similar apologetic language to fulfill the panegyrical requirement to extol the hero’s lineage, Erznkats’i draws from other, less frequented quarters while still relying heavily on the accumulated tradition regarding St. Gregory.\(^{12}\)

One part part of the selection below draws on the tradition that the Pahlawunis, being Parthians from Bahl (Bactria), were descendants of the Patriarch Abraham through his wife Keturah. They inhabited lands known for their incense, whence came the Magi with their gifts to pay homage to the new-born Jesus. Thus, St. Gregory was vicariously

---


\(^{12}\) Erznkats’i is cognizant of the entire tradition about St. Gregory, even beyond that given in the Armenian version of Agat’aneghoss (Aa). He relies on documentary sources, Agat’aneghoss and the early panegyrists on St. Gregory. At times he follows the text of Agat’aneghoss verbatim, as when he sets out to recount but a few of the twelve tortures of the Saint (§§ 24-26). He leaves no question about having a manuscript before him. Other sources of influence could be cited, such as the other versions comprising the Agat’aneghoss cycle, certain Greek panegyrics on various saints, especially those by the Cappadocian Fathers, and the occasional remarks on St. Gregory in the *History* of Movses Khorenats’i. Obviously, the hymns in praise of the saints anedate the more formal and lengthier panegyrics. Of such early hymns in the *Sharakan*’, one composed by Movses Bishop of Siwnik’ (in office, 725-731) to commemorate St. Gregory’s release from the pit is noteworthy (Sharakan Hogewor Ergots’ Surb ew Ughghap’ar Ekeghets’woys Hayastaneays’ [Hymnal of Spiritual Songs of the Holy Orthodox Armenian Church] [Jerusalem: St. James Press, 1936; repr. New York: St. Vartan Press, 1986], pp. 554-560).
represented, concealed behind the incense, at the time of Christ's birth. Another part of the selection draws on the tradition that St. Gregory was conceived near the grave of St. Thaddaeus, thus becoming his spiritual child and successor (sources and observations in the commentary below).

For the selection below, I have followed the 1853 Venice edition (V) alongside Srpanyan's versification of the text published in Ereven in 1986 (E). I have divided the entire text into sixty sections, which I have also translated as part of a forthcoming monograph. The section numbers are part of that overall division. Srpanyan's numerous typographical errors are apparent vis-à-vis the text published by the Venetian Mekhitarists. There are, nonetheless, hitherto unnoticed lexical corruptions that call for emendations in both editions. These I have noted in the apparatus.

Text

§ 19 Թեթերդուէր ավերքեի սփռեաղբջկա։ Թեթերդուէր ավերքեի սփռեաղբջկա, երբեք հարյուրդ սփռեաղբջկա։ Այն, եթե ավերքեի սփռեաղբջկա, Էլայ ավերքեի սփռեաղբջկա։ Այն, եթե ավերքեի սփռեաղբյուր։

§ 20 Թուքակներ եղեք Էրեևներ գերեզման։ Թուքակներ եղեք Էրեևներ գերեզման։ Թուքակներ եղեք Էրեևներ գերեզման։ Թուքակներ եղեք Էրեևներ գերեզման։ Թուքակներ եղեք Էրեևներ գերեզման։ Թուքակներ եղեք Էրեևներ գերեզման。


14 Srpanyan, Hovhannes Erznkats'i, Bank' Ch'ap' av, pp. 136-199. The selection below covers pp. 153-159.


19 ¹ անվսնա - անվսնա E

20 ² անվանա - անվանա E

2 հարպ - հարպ E
Աբրահամ Թերյան
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Հայսերգական ժամանակագրի մեկնաբանություն Մարգարի Թրոյացու վեպագրված գրքի մեջ հայտնի է, որ Արամայի 3-րդ դարը Հայոց գրականության տնտեսագիտական պատմության մեջ է որոշակի նշանակություն ունեցավ։ Այն հավասար էր այսօրյին շատ հայոց գրական պատմության մեջ ունեցած նշանակության։ Այս գրքի ամենահին տարածքը էլ հայկական գրականության պատմությանը կարելի է տալ հայկական գրականության պատմությանը։

3 արամայի կարգաակ 5-րդ դարի սկզբին է առաջացնում Հայոց գրականության մեջ և այս գրքի հետ կապվում է հայկական գրականության պատմությանը։

4 Երանոցայի հայկական գրականության սկզբները սկզբնակնները այս գրքի հետ կապվում են հայկական գրականության պատմությանը։

5 Հայկական գրականության սկզբները հայկական գրականության պատմությանը կապվում են հայկական գրականության պատմությանը։

6 Հայկական գրականության սկզբները հայկական գրականության պատմությանը կապվում են հայկական գրականության պատմությանը։

7 հայկական գրականության սկզբները հայկական գրականության պատմությանը կապվում են հայկական գրականության պատմությանը։

8 Հայկական գրականության սկզբները հայկական գրականության պատմությանը կապվում են հայկական գրականության պատմությանը։
§ 21 Հետևյալ բառերով նշված մասի մեջ պահանջանում ենք կարճ։

1. սերերեն ասել քրիստոսը իր աշխատանքների համար

2. գիտական աշխատանք

3. մարմանց հաստատություն

4. մարմանց կարծիք
Այս հոդվածը մեռելու համար, այս ճապոնական այս տվյալներով և տեղեկություններով երկիր ստեղծելու համար գրել էր Հոգոտեյ Սաքայա. նա տեսանելով, որ հազարամյակ տարի ընթացքում տեղի են ունենում զավթական մարմզային, նա եզրակցել էր իր ճանաչումները հաջողվում են այս օրվա մեջ. հայտնաբերդ էր միայն ժամանակի ընթացքում.

§ 22 Այս թեմայի մեջ, չկասեք կամ քննարկեք այս հարցը բավականապես այսավայր, որ էթիկետ են կարող կտրիին տեղակայել ոչ միայն համարյա ապրանքների, այլև իրաված գրական գործարկներ. Այսպիսով, երբեք երբեք այս հարցը ներկայացվում է, մշակերապես անցնում է ամբողջ պատմության մեջ.
§ 19 [Introduction to the unit]

Gregory, the much beatified witness, the one out of this world among visible creatures, the native of the heavenly Jerusalem, is kin to the incorporeal ranks in purity.¹

Now, should it still seem desirable to anyone that his lineage and provenience be recounted according to the panegyrical principles,² then it is proper for us to demonstrate it – we ought to, from the topmost point.³

§ 20 [Birth and upbringing: ancestral]

From Abraham the great and the beloved of God he descends; from the ancient patriarch a new patriarch is bequeathed, from the father of the righteous a parent of righteousness is proclaimed.⁴ He shines in absolute wisdom from the mind of the “elect [father] of sound”;⁵ he is the fragrance of incense concealed behind the descendants of Keturah,⁶ to whom he joined the children born of the baptismal font as an
adornment in shining gold, to the six sons of Keturah. The heavenly promise to the Eastern and Northern nations was fulfilled, spiritual light shone from the easterly part of the world; for the grace of the blessings bestowed upon the children of light by the father who birthed the stars, came concealed with them.

And as the Euphrates gushes forth from Eden, from the recesses of the bosom of the earth and through the crevices of the deep, and down the borders of Armenia it streams, so also our Illuminator.

He was born of the courageous and mighty Parthian race, the Pahlawuni chiefs who were summoned with their splendor from the royal country of the Shams by the crown-adorned Arshakunis and were surnamed Arshakuni. He came to us like dew of gladness from dark clouds, from the Surēnian line, and shone with a luminous birth. Stemming from Anak his father, like a rose with flaming petals from a thorny bush, he bloomed with fragrance for us. He appeared to us like an antidote derived from the venomous fangs of serpents, [like] the shimmering purple dye from unseemly snails yet given to adorn imperial clothing; so was he given as a life-giving gift for our souls, from traitorous ancestors, murderers of their masters. [He is like] a delicious date palm with fruit of righteousness and beautiful leafage, grown in a thorny vale; a pearl taken from a fetid and smelly sea yet given to be used for royal crowns; from rough stones, the hardness of rocks, a discovered topaz, beautiful in its vivid color.

And how and to what end are such things done? [They are done] by the most inventive Artisan, the Worker of miracles, the Creator and Transformer of nature, who raises up children to Abraham from stones, who turns old age to youth and barrenness to giving birth, who hangs a live ram as fruit from lifeless plants, providing it for the needed sacrifice. His wisdom is boundless and power unlimited; His will is an accomplished act, as the creation of the world in His thought! Moreover, at times He performs His wondrous acts in accordance with the skill of workmanship, as when tillers work the soil, those who cultivate with care, who wish to transform the sour and bitter pomegranate trees to sweet ones. They graft the wood of the pine tree, as they report, into the roots of the sour pomegranate, thus changing the fruit of bitterness to one of sweetness by the power of the substance in that wood; and the essence of bitterness dissolves and melts away and the sour taste becomes sweet, delicious and savory.
§ 21 [Birth and upbringing: physical]

And now, since these are done in the natural realm, why wouldn’t such an amazing, wonderful miracle be wrought afresh by the Husbandman of the well-bearing branches of the True Vine?²⁰

When this heaven-reaching plant²¹ from the sour-bearing parent tree with bitter roots was to be planted – being awaitedly destined for this special hour from distant centuries and early times – a proper place for the bearing of this plant was prepared beside the tombstone covering the grave of the [first] illuminator of our land and nation, which happened to be near to the [parents’] resting place, through whom the mortal and bitter plant was able to yield delicious fruit of immortality.²²

From a family that betrayed its lord, an heir to the Lord’s throne was raised.²³ From a belligerent nation, a savior of the world was affirmed.²⁴ From the apostolic remains, an apostle of Christ was chosen. From the God-lit light, a light-giving lamp was fashioned for this great world,²⁵ eternal, so that the world may be enlightened through his learned word and his virtuous, remarkable life; that those held in the darkness of indifference and ignorance may be enlightened by the light of wisdom and knowledge. He was sent by the Savior and the Benefactor and the Father of Wisdom²⁶ to invite to the heavenly banquet, to the table made ready and to the bowl of those who drink the wine of gladness,²⁷ to summon the people of Armenia.

As for the thorny plant, the brittle stem guarding this delicious fruit, bearing this full ear of wheat, yielded this joyous fruit for the Planter to reap.²⁸ As when the grains of wheat are ripe, harvested with the sickle of the Word, heaped for the righteous judgment, and the dust-like chaff is blown away by the wind,²⁹ so were his kinsmen and people wiped out with the sword and only our Illuminator was left, sheltered in the bosom of God’s care, then given as a gladdening cluster for the winepresses of the Church. This bread, stabilizing the hearts of the hungry, was then kept in the storehouse – under supervision from on high – by his nurses who brought him to the great capital, Caesarea in Cappadocia. The dew of the garden of the Church was lifted up to the cloud of God’s care, saved from the bloody massacre of his kinsmen,³⁰ like the Lord Jesus, who from the sword of Herod was smuggled away by a light cloud to Egypt.³¹
§ 22 [Birth and upbringing: spiritual]

Now, what a marvelous birth! Why should we speak of his genealogy according to the flesh since it has been shown that he is ranked above bodily nature, [having] the most excellent of earthly lives, the loudest praise ever in the district?

He, the crown of pride of the Arshakuni kings, the bestowed child of the Apostle Thaddaeus, a progeny blessed by his living remains, the chosen overseer appointed to his realm, of eastern origin, whose rising is bright like the sun, was nurtured in holiness in the land of the Gamri and tutored in the wisdom of the Christian faith.

Having reached a mature age with love for the wisdom of worshiping God, his undying deeds in life became a spiritual law for the world: not of the letter engraved on boards, like the stone slabs of Moses, nor written admonishments as commands inscribed on paper with ink, but a man of angelic piety, in pure body, set for the entire creation, to teach the whole earthborn, human race.

Commentary

§ 19 1 *Gregory... out of this world...* The introductory lines follow a poem in alphabetical acrostic. The section serves both as a summary of the preceding poem and as an introduction to the following encomium, which necessarily begins with the Saint’s birth and upbringing. After affirming the heavenly origin of our Saint, the author is in effect asking: “What more could one say about his birth?” – a thorny subject for the Armenian fathers. The author’s point is repeated at the beginning of § 22.

2 *panegyrical principles.* The author is cognizant of the panegyrical or encomiastic tradition, the principles of which were determined ever since classical times; e.g., Anaximenes *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum* 1440b5-1441b29; Aristotle *Rhetoric* 1366a23-1368a37; Cicero *De Oratore* 2.84.340-86.350; *Partitiones Oratoriae* 21.71-23.82; Pseudo-Cicero *Ad Herennium* 3.6.10-8.15; and Quintilian *Institutio Oratoria* 3.7.1-28 and 8.4.1-29. Koriwn’s *Life of Mashtots* is the foremost example of Armenian encomia, a source with which our author must have been well acquainted.
to demonstrate it... from the topmost point. Another of the author’s seven introductions of specific units within his overall composition. Others are found at §§ 10, 17, 26, 28, 47, and 54.

§ 20 From Abraham... Erznkats’i begins and ends with the Saint’s purported relation to Abraham, from one father of righteousness (Rom. 4; cf. Gen. 15:6) to another; however, there is more than a spiritual emphasis here because of the shortcomings of St. Gregory’s father, who was a murderer. See the remaining comments on this section. In the dedicatory preface to the Panegyric by Vardan Vardapet Arewelts’i, addressed to his patron Tër Hamazasp, Bishop of Haghbät (1243-1261), he refers to the Saint as “your Abraham” (Sop’erk’, 5:40).

“elect father of sound” (hayr ēntreal hnc’h’mn). This is the etymology of “Abraham” according to Erznkats’i in his Commentary on Grammar, ch. 15 (see R. Ervine [to whom I am indebted for this observation], Yovhannēs Erznkac’i Pluz’s ‘Compilation of Commentary on Grammar’,” 3 vols. Columbia University Dissertation, 1988, 1:362-363; cf. L. G. Khach’erean, Yovhannēs Erznkats’i (1230-1293 t’t’), Hawak’um Meknut’ean K’erakani [Y. E. [1230-1293]: Compilation of Commentary on Grammar] [Los Angeles and Glendale: Alco Printing, 1983], p. 246). The same etymology appears in various Patristic Onomastica Sacra that draw upon the allegory of Philo of Alexandria. Among Philo’s works, the etymology is found in Quaestiones in Genesim 3.43 and elsewhere (R. Marcus, ed., Questions and Answers on Genesis, The Loeb Classical Library: Philo Supplement I [Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press, 1953], p. 236 n. f). Moreover, Abraham symbolizes the wise and virtuous man (ibid., passim) and knowledge acquired through teaching (ibid., 4.144). This fragmentary work of Philo is extant only in an old Armenian translation and, like other works by the Alexandrian Jewish exegete and philosopher of the first century, was well known among learned Armenians (as suggested by the nearly thirty extant Armenian manuscripts containing several of Philo’s works, and the more than fifty manuscripts containing commentaries on them). The line in question runs parallel to the preceding line and is elaborated upon in the immediate, following context.

descendants of Keturah. Keturah was Abraham’s wife after Sarah’s death. By her he had six sons who became the ancestors of several Arabian tribes inhabiting lands known for their incense (Gen.
25:1-4). As a righteous person, St. Gregory is invariably related to Abraham, who exemplifies righteousness and is deemed the progenitor of the righteous ones who believe in God (Rom. 4). As for our author, however, he is contemplating more than the allegorical relationship between Abraham and St. Gregory. He has in mind the elaborate genealogy of St. Gregory as found in the Panegyric by Vardan Vardapet Arewelts’i, where the Saint’s clan of the Pahlawunis, like that of their cousins the Arsacids, is said to have come from Bahl (Bactria), a city built by [Z]imran and his brothers, the children of Abraham and Keturah (Sop’erk’, 5:45). This theory, in turn, depends on a tradition found in Khorenats’i, where the origin of these Parthian clans is traced to Bahl and the “seed of Abraham out of the descendants of Keturah” (History of the Armenians, 2.1-2, 68). Erznkats’i seems to dwell further on the tradition found in Khorenats’i, especially the conflated promise to Abraham in Gen. 17:6 and 16: “Kings of nations will come forth from you” (ibid.). In a note to this passage Thomson invites attention to the Yachakhapatum (p. 228 of the 1954 Venice edition), according to which the Arsacids are descended from Abraham like all kings of the earth – as the patriarch was promised (Moses Khorenats’i, p. 130 n. 7). Thus, the “Eastern and Northern nations” of the following line seem to be the Iranians and the Armenians ruled by the two branches of the Arsacid Dynasty: to the East and North of the Taurus. The North, as further below in this panegyric (§§ 24, 37) and elsewhere, refers to Armenia; see the author’s hymn “Aysör zuarchats’eal ts’ntsay ekeghets’i...” (Reveling today the Church rejoices...) dedicated to St. Gregory (Sharakan, p. 265); cf. Korwn, Life of Mashtots’, 16 (64.21); Agat’angeghos, History of the Armenians, 175, 741-742; and Khorenats’i, History of the Armenians, 1.10, 17; 3.68. Moreover, the line in question seems to be connecting our Parthian Saint with the incense-bearing “wise men” (the Magi, three by tradition, who paid homage to the infant Jesus, Matt. 2:1-12) who, according to the apocryphal Gospel of the Infancy (ch. 11), are somehow related to Abraham – presumably descendants of Keturah’s sons to whom “Abraham gave gifts... and sent away to the Land of the East” (Gen. 25:6). For the various Armenian versions of the Gospel of the Infancy, some fragmentary, see Ankanon Girk’ Hin ew Nor Ktakaranats’ (Non-canonical Books of the Old and New Testaments), T’angaran Haykakan Hin ew Nor Dprut’eants’ 2 (Venice: S. Ghazar, 1898). Erznkats’i has yet another layer of thought in these lines, in the words
khunk' ("incense," line 5), oski ("gold," line 6), and Kenturah (cf. kntruk ["myrrh"], line 7), which show a reflection on the three gifts presented by the Magi (cf. Matt. 2:11 and the Gospel of the Infancy 11:2).

7 Eastern and Northern nations. That is, the Iranians and the Armenians primarily (see the preceding comment).

8 children of light. This Johannine designation for Christian believers (12:36, borrowed from Jewish apocalyptic literature and frequently attested in the Dead Sea Scrolls) is here appropriated for the Armenian faithful, as also in § 23. Elsewhere, the Armenian people are referred to as "children of the common faith" (§ 3), "children of New Zion" (§§ 8, 11), "children of the Covenant" (§ 51) and, in the concluding lines, "children of your [i.e., St. Gregory’s] Church" (§ 60).

9 the father who birthed the stars... them. That is, Abraham (cf. Gen. 15:5; 22:17; 26:4). St. Gregory is part of both the descendants of Abraham and the blessings passed on by him. The pronoun "them" refers to the descendants of Keturah, including the incense-bearing Magi and, by extension, St. Gregory (see the third comment above) who is vicariously represented by them as they presented their gifts to the newborn King.

10 the Euphrates... so also our Illuminator. The Edenic imagery of the Euphrates is from Gen. 2:10-14; cf. §§ 18 and 43, where St. Gregory is similarly likened to the Euphrates.

11 Pahlawunis... Arshakunis. A nobleman of Parthian descent, St. Gregory was of the house of Surēn-Pahlaw, one of the seven branches of the ruling Arshakuni (Arsacid) Dynasty. The Sasanians, who rose to power early in the third century by putting an end to the Arshakuni Dynasty in Persia (226), were determined to wipe out the ruling Arshakunis in Armenia, legitimate claimants to the Persian throne and potential antagonists of the usurping Sasanians. At the instigation of the Sasanians, St. Gregory’s father, Anak, murdered the Armenian King Khosrov I (279/280-287; known also as Trdat II). The much weakened Arshakuni Dynasty in Armenia came to an end shortly after the Edict of Theodosius in 387, when Armenia (the Arshakuni Kingdom and the largely autonomous Satrapies) was divided into vassal states subject to either Byzantine or Sasanian rule. On the origin of the Parthian aristocracy and the high lineage of the Surēneans, see S. K. Eddy, The King is Dead: Studies in the Near Eastern Resistance to Hellenism 334-31 B.C. (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1961),
On the Pahlawuni family, see Vipasanuti'wn Haykazants' (Epic History of the Descendants of Hayk) by St. Nerses Shnorhali, in which he, as a member of the Pahlawuni family, traces his lineage to St. Gregory; text in Tn. Nerses Shnorhalwoy Hayots' Kat'oghikosi Bank' Ch'ap'aw (Words in Verse by Lord Nerses Shnorhali, Catholicos of the Armenians [1166-1173]) 2nd ed. (Venice: S. Ghazar, 1928), pp. 539-608.

12 Anak... a thorny bush. Erznkats'i has thus resolved the stigma of St. Gregory’s father Anak, the murderer of the Armenian King Khosrov I (see the preceding comment). Anak is the thorny bush that bears the beautiful rose, the venom that provides medicine, the unseemly shell that produces the purple dye, etc.

13 delicious date palm. St. Gregory is likened to a palm tree also in the author’s hymn “Aysör zuarchats’eal ts’ntsay ekeghets’i...” (Reveling today the Church rejoices...) (Sharakan, p. 267); so also in the Panegyric attributed to Theophilos, a disciple of St. John Chrysostom (Sop’erk’, 4:106).

14 beautiful leafage. Lit., “beautiful hair.”


16 turns... barrenness to giving birth. Alluding to the birth of Isaac through the aged Sarah (Gen. 18:9-15; 21:1-8).

17 ram... the needed sacrifice. Alluding to Gen. 22:13, as also in §§ 29 and 31.

18 the creation of the world in His thought. The medieval belief that the creation of the world – whether ex nihilo or from primordial matter – began in the thought of God, could be traced to Philo of Alexandria (see especially De opificio mundi 7-28 and De Providentia 1.6-8; the latter work survives only in Armenian and was well known to medieval Armenian scholiasts) and, ultimately, to Plato’s notion of the “ideas” and the creation myth in his Timaeus.


21 heaven-reaching plant. The metaphor of the plant with reference to the Saint, is commonplace in the panegyrics.

22 proper place... at the tombstone... The author here applies his agricultural illustration of deriving sweet fruit from a bitter plant (§ 20) to the birth of St. Gregory, who was conceived – according to later tradition – near the grave of St. Thaddaeus, the Apostle who traditionally was first to evangelize Armenia. The later, Karshuni version of Agat'angeghos (Vk), rendered from an Armenian vorlage in about 600, claims that St. Gregory was conceived at the hill in where St. Thaddaeus was martyred (text and commentary in M. van Esbroeck, "Un nouveau témoin du livre d’Agathance," Revue des études arméniennes, n.s. 8 [1971] 13-167; especially § 8, p. 24). So also in Khorenats’i, History of the Armenians, 2.74: “And there [by the grave of the holy apostle in the plain of Artaz] they say the mother of our holy and great Illuminator conceived. Therefore he received the grace of that same apostle, and having been begotten beside his grave he completed what was lacking in his spiritual labors.” This providential birth of St. Gregory, mentioned by several subsequent writers (e.g., in the Panegyric on the Saint by Vardan Vardapet Arewelts’i, Sop’erk’, 5:46, 49), is contemplated again in this panegyric (§§ 21-22, 24) as well as in the author’s hymn “Aysōr zuarchats’eal ts’ntsay ekeghets’i...” (Reveling today the Church rejoices...), likewise dedicated to St. Gregory (Sharakan, p. 266). St. Gregory thus becomes the spiritual progeny of St. Thaddaeus, whose remains were believed to have affected the conception and subsequent birth.

23 a family that betrayed its lord... There is a play on the words tiraneng (a family that betrayed its lord) and tirakan (an heir to the Lord's throne) in this comparison between father (Anak) and son (St. Gregory). The betrayal refers to Anak's crime of murdering King Khosrov I in 287.

24 belligerent nation... Describing the, Parthians as “belligerent” is rare in Armenian sources, where they are usually called “a sinful nation” primarily because of Anak’s crime (see the preceding comment). At the time when Armenians embraced Christianity, the Parthian Empire of the Arsacids was history, being overthrown by the Sassanids in 226/7. The old and long struggle between the Romans and the Parthians over Armenia, however, continued. This state of affairs at
the "Roman frontier" did not end with the short-lived peace agreement of 280 between Probus and Nares, son of Shapur I (240-271), who was left as King of Eastern Armenia (Armenshah; later, in 293, Great King of Persia; badly defeated in Armenia by Caesar Galerius in 297), while Western Armenia remained under Roman authority. A more lasting settlement came with the Edict of Theodosius in 387, whereby Armenia (the Arsacid Kingdom and the autonomous Satrapies) was divided into vassal states subject to either Byzantine or Sassanid rule.

25 light... for this great world. That is, St. Gregory’s mission transcends national boundaries; cf. § 22. He is vaguely credited for evangelizing neighboring regions; Agat’angeghos, History of the Armenians, 842-845. The author probably had Matt. 5:14-16 in mind. The universal role of St. Gregory is a recurring theme in the panegyrics.

26 the Savior... the Benefactor... the Father. Obviously a Trinitarian formula. The designation of the Spirit as the “Benefactor” is rare, and it seems to derive from the biblical doctrine of “Spiritual Gifts” of 1 Cor. 12-14 (in patristic writings the term is usually used for the Father and the Son, but not for the Spirit; q.v. “Euergetēs” [Benefactor] in G. W. H. Lampe, A Patristic Greek Lexicon [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961], p. 564).

27 the table... the bowl... the wine. A liturgical echoing of Luke 22:30.

28 ... for the Planter to reap. In this ongoing apology for the ancestry of St. Gregory, there is an echo of John 12:24 (cf. Matt. 25:26, on Christ as Sower and Reaper).


30 ... saved from the bloody massacre. Another survey of St. Gregory’s early life, as found in Agat’angeghos, History of the Armenians, 18-36.

31 smuggled away by a light cloud to Egypt. Referring to Matt. 2:13-15. The imagined role of the cloud may have been derived from one of the several late versions of the apocryphal “infancy gospels,” owing to the Protoevangelium of James (see 19:2 in the latter work, on

§ 22  
32 the crown... of the Arshakuni kings. On St. Gregory’s relation to the Arshakunis (Arsacids), see above, § 20.

33 child of the Apostle Thaddeus. The preceding lines, along with the next two, allude once more to the providential conception of St. Gregory near the grave of St. Thaddaeus (see §§ 5, 21, and 24). St. Thaddaeus (with St. Bartholomew) is the first of the two Apostles traditionally named as having evangelized the land of Armenia, where also they are said to have been martyred. St. Gregory, as the later evangelist of Armenia, is perceived as the spiritual descendant and successor of St. Thaddaeus. Unlike the Karshuni version of Agat'angeghos (Vk), the extant Armenian version (Aa) is silent about this story of a miraculous birth, as well as about the first-century Apostles to Armenia, perhaps to obliterate the earlier Syriac strain of Armenian Christianity as the pro-Byzantine Orthodoxy gained grounds within the nascent Armenian Church. Moreover, the extant Armenian version seeks to heighten the achievement of the Saint. In his *Panegyric* Vardan Vardapet Arewelts'i provides a fair assessment of the relationship between the earlier Apostles and St. Gregory: the former sowed the seed and the latter reaped the harvest (*Sop'erk*, 5:50).

34 the land of the Gamri. Armenian form for Cappadocia (Greek), also known as Gamirk’, derived from the name of the Gimiri or Kimmerians, a province west of Armenia Minor. It was at its metropolitan See of Caesarea where St. Gregory and several of his descendant successors were consecrated as chief bishops of Armenia.

35 the stone slabs of Moses. Allusion to the Decalogue inscribed on the two tablets given to Moses on Mount Sinai (Ex. 31:18; 32:15-19; 34:1, 28). Erznkats'i draws on the spiritualization of the Law in the Prophets (Isa. 51:7; Jer. 31:33 [38:33 LXX]; Ezek. 11:19) and in the New Testament (Gal. 5:16-18; 6:1-2; cf. Rom. 2:14-15; 3:21, 28;
6:14; 8:1-4; 10:4; 13:8-10; 1 Cor. 9:21; etc.). For comparisons with Moses elsewhere in this document, see §§ 13, 29, 33, 39, 44, 48, 58.

36 creation. Lit., “created nature.”

37 the whole... human race. The universality of St. Gregory’s role is contemplated also in the preceding section.
ADDITIONAL REMARKS CONCERNING
"MAN AS THE IMAGE OF GOD"
IN GRIGOR TAT'EWAC'I'S BOOK OF QUESTIONS

Sergio La Porta

Archbishop Mesrob Ashjian devotes a chapter of his Armenian Church Patristic and other Essays to the question of the image of God in man according to Grigor Tat'ewac'i (1344-1409). This paper aims to supplement that piece with additional observations about the sources Tat'ewac'i employed and with translations of the principal passages noted by Ashjian.

Tat'ewac'i addresses the topic of the 'image' very briefly in vol. V, ch. 19 (V:19) of his monumental Book of Questions (Girk’ Harc’manc’) and at greater length in V: 28, 29, and 30. In V:19 Grigor explains that since the human soul is the image of God it, like God, remains a mystery: "The soul is the image of God. For the religious man, one is not able to investigate God, whence He is, or where He is, or what is His measure, or how He is, or until where He is? Likewise

---

1 Abbreviations used in the footnotes:


3 Tat’ewac’i completed the Book of Questions in 1397. Composed of ten volumes (hatork’), the work was the first handbook of systematic theology for the Armenian Church. Numerous copies of the text were executed in the author’s own lifetime attesting to its popularity, see S. La Porta, "The Theology of the Holy Dionysius," Volume III of Grigor Tat’ewac’i's Book of Questions: Introduction, Translation, and Commentary," Ph.D. thesis, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA, 2001, chs. 1 and 2.
also [one is] not [able to investigate] the soul of man." 4 This short notice on the nature of the image reflects Vardan Arewelci'i's (1200-1271) comments on the soul in his Divertimenti (Zlank'), a compiloratory work commissioned by King Het'um I of Cilicia: "but reason is unable to discourse upon it [i.e., the soul], since it is the image of God; because the image which has the form of the archetype is then an image. For if our soul were knowable and God unknowable, [then] the statement that the soul is the image of God would be false." 5

Yet, argues Tat'ewac'i, as with God, "it is necessary to ask any question which brings man from heresy to freedom." 6 He thus proceeds to expand upon the notion of man as the image of God (V:28-30). In ch. 28, Grigor focuses specifically on the meaning of Gen. 1:26; he details how God created us in His image, that is, how pre-lapsarian man was the image of God. Some similarities still apply to man's post-lapsarian state, but Tat'ewac'i delays approaching that topic until chapter 30. In V:28, Grigor explicitly relies upon chapters 4 and 5 of Gregory of Nyssa's On the Composition of Man to establish the nature of the image. Tat'ewac'i reiterates the Cappadocian's distinction between a painted image and God's created image as well as his proposition that man is the image of God through his royalty. Grigor then elaborates how God created man in His image in thirty ways. Gregory of Nyssa's treatise still provides material for the Armenian, but he cites other authorities as well, such as Yovhannes Erznkac'i Pluz—cited as Eznkac'i Pluz—, Vardan Arewelci'i, and Grigor Lusaworić' (the Illuminator). 7

4 Hogin patker ê astucoy: ew astuacapast mardoy zastuac k'nnel oč' mart'i t'ë usti ē, kam ur ē, kam orč'ap'ē, ew kam t'ē orpēs ē, kam t'ē minč' i yur ē: Nmanapēs ew oč' zhogi mardoyn, BQ, p. 251.

5 ayl ančareli vasn nama bann. zi patker ê astucoy: k'anzi ork' zkerparann skizhnatpin uni patkern apay ê patker: zi t'ē mer hogis gideleli ēr. ew astuc aygitel. sut ēr bann , J 898, 77v-78r.

6 Ayl zayn inč' harc'uman or zmarda i herjwacoy i zat tani part ê harc'anel, BQ, p. 251.

7 BQ, pp. 271-272.
It is to be known that the beauty of the image is from the three things through which it resembles the prototype: first, measured form; second, harmonious parts; third, appropriate shading. Now, the divine beauty is not ornamented with these colors such that He formed us in His likeness; but the ineffable blessedness and virtue is the divine beauty which He granted us; that is, purity, dispassion, and estrangement from the evil one [as] Saint Gregory of Nyssa says.

And now, the authority of the king appears in four things. First, in the crown, since he is the head and lord of all those who obey him. Second, in the purple, since he is of royal blood and kingly-born. Third, in the staff and signet ring, since he is established over and supported by princes and subjects. Fourth, the red shoes, since to the extent of giving their blood they are subjugated under his feet. They signify this. And just as they depict the image of the king with crown and with the purple and with the other [things] and they call the image king; in this way, truly the King of the entire universe created man according to His own image.

And instead of the purple, He vested [him] in virtue which is more royal than any clothes. And instead of a crown, He adored [him] with free-will. And instead of the staff, He confirmed [him] with immortal blessedness. And instead of shoes, He made everything obedient under his feet [Ps. 8:6].

Giteli č, zi yeric' e patkerin gelec'kut'iwn orov nmani i naxatip: Nax č'ap'awor jewn: Erkrod hawasar masunk': Erroord yarmar šunk': Ard astuacayin gelec'kut'iwn oč' aysu erangök' zardari zi mez i nmann iwr kazmesc'e: Ayl ančar eranut'iwn eu arak'inut'iwn è astucoy gelec'kut'iwn zor mez pargeweac'. aysink'n mak'rut'iwn, anaxut'iwn, eu i č'arēn ōtarut'iwn asē niwac'i'n surb grigor:

Ew ard i č'ors irs erewi išxanut'iwn t'agaworin: Nax i t'agn. zi glux ew têr è bolor hnazendeloc'n: Erkrood i cirinin. zi ark'ayazn è ew t'agaworacin: Erroord i gawazann ew i matanin. zi i veray išxanac' ew išxec'eloc' è hastateal ew yec'elal: Čorrord kōšikn karmir. zi areamb č'ap' i nerk'oy otic' en hnazenduc'elk' amenayn: Zays nšanakēn: Ew orpēs zpatker t'agaworin nkaren t'agiw ew ciraneaw ew aylovn ew anuane zpatker i t'agawor: Ayspēs isk apa t'agaworn amenayn ašxarhi stelceac' zmardn ast patkeri iroy:

Ew p'oxanak ciranwoyn zārak'inut'iwn zgæc'oyc', or k'an zamenayn zgæt ark'unakan è: Ew p'oxanak t'agin ink'nįšxan kamōk' zardareac': Ew p'oxanak gawazanin anmah eranut'emab hastateac': Ew p'oxanak kōškac' zamenayn inč' hnazend arar i nerk'oy otic' nora:
And according to this, man is called the image of God in many ways. First, since God is autonomous and independent; likewise also this man. Second, God is lord and ruler and autocrat of all the creations, and He made everything visible obedient and servile to man. Third, since his soul is incorporeal. Fourth, since it is immortal like God. Fifth, since God sees and examines everything; likewise also man through the internal and external senses [sees and examines everything].

Sixth, in God are mind, intellection, and will; and this man has these. Seventh, God is a Trinity—Father, Son, and Holy Spirit—thus in the man, mind, reason, and soul, according to the Vardapet Eznakac'i Pluz.

Eighth, the three persons are perfect, and if one is missing God is not perfect, and this man is perfect with respect to three: in spirit and body and reason; and if one is missing man is imperfect says the Vardapet Vardan. Ninth, He examines and understands everything through His unmoving identity; and thus the mind examines the knowledge of beings through being in man.


Vec'erord i yastuac ë mitk' ew imac'umân ew kamk': uni ew mards zaysosik': Èôt'nerord Errordut'iwn ë astuac. Hay ew Ordi ew Hogi surb: ayspës i mardn mitk'ın bann hogin. ast eznkac'woy pluz vardapetin:

Ut'erorderek' anjink' katarelk': ew t'ë minn pakasic'ë oç' ë karateal [sic] astuac: ew mards errordut'eamb ë katarel. hogwoy ew marnmoy ew baniw. ew t'ë minn pakasic'ë ankatar ë mardn asë vardapetn vardan: Innerord anšarž noynut'eamb iwrov zamenayn k'nnë ew imanay: ayspës ew mitk' aë mardn golov zgitiw'ën eic's k'nnë:

*Reading katarel for karateal.*
Tenth, one and the same is the mind in God through which He sees everything and hears every word; likewise also in this man, one intellection is that which understands through various senses. Eleventh, God is without location and without place; the entirety of the spirit of man is in the whole body and the entirety in each of its parts. Twelfth, God is ineffable and uncontainable; and the uniting of the soul to the body is above reason.

Thirteenth, God is a knower and lover of truth; and only this man among the sensible [creatures] is he who knows and loves the truth.

Fourteenth, God is love and the spring of love [1 Jn. 4:7-8], and He commanded us to love each other [Jn. 13:35]. Fifteenth, the Lord is also compassionate and merciful, and He ordered us: "Be merciful, as also your heavenly Father is merciful" [Lk. 6:36].

Sixteenth, he is rational. Seventeenth, he is wise. Eighteenth, since his soul is without sin. Nineteenth, the shape of man is upright; and our Lord God is upright. Twentieth, since He is provident.

Twenty-one [sic], since he received the grace of the priesthood. Twenty-two, since he is a creator. Twenty-three, since he is tripartite. Twenty-four, according to state, power, and operation, although they exist differently in man and in God.

Tasnerord mi ew noyn mitk' è yastuac orov zamenayn tesané èw zamenayn barbař lsé: noynpès èw i mards mi imac'umñ è or zanan zgayarânôk' èmanay: Metasnerord anteli èw anur è èstuac: èw hogi mardoñ bolorn è i bolor marminn. èw bolor yiwrak'ènc'èwr èmañ: Èrkotasnerord ancăr èw anapatum è èstuac: èw hgowyn miac'umñ i marni i ver è k'an zban:

Èrek'tasanerord èçsmarti gitol èw siról è èstuac: èw miajn mards è i zgalis or èçsmarìn gitè èw sirè:

Č'orek'tasanerord sèr è èstuac èw aibiwr siroy: èw mez patuireac' siren zmimeans: Hingtasanerord ayl èw oformac èw gt'ac è tèr èw mez hramayè èleruk' gt'ack', orpès èw hayrn jèr erknavor gt'ac è:

Veštasnerord zi banakan è: Eòtn èw tasnerord zi imastut'iwñ è: Ut' èw tasnerord zi anmèl è hogan: ìnn èw tasnerord ultit è jèw mardoñ: èw ultit è tèr èstuac mer: K'sanerord zi naxates è:

K'san èw mek, zi sñorh k'ahanayuc'èan akalaw: K'san èw erku, zi aratèt'èt: K'san èw erkek', zi èramasney è: K'san èw è'ork', ast unak'tèan zòrut'èan èw nergorcut'èan: bayc' aylazgabar èn i mez èw yastuac:
Twenty-five, our Illuminator says that the shape of man was revealed at the [time of] creating—that same body which He would take in later times—and He made man in that same image. Twenty-six, God was born from God, and man from man. Twenty-seven, he glorifies God, so that he himself might be glorified.

Twenty-eight, on account of which everything, that is, [everything is] from God, and on account of man the entire world had come into being. Twenty-nine, God is good and the lover of good; likewise also He created man good and the lover of good. Thirtieth, one is the image, man; and one is the archetype, God. From these, some pertain only to the soul, and some to the soul and the body.

K'san ew hing, ase lusaworič'ın mer, t'e jew mardoj erewec'aw i stelcanel, zor aṙneloc' ėr znoy marmin yetoy žamanaki. ew i noyn patkern arar zmardn: K'san ew vec', astuc yastucoy cnani: ew mard i mardoj: K'san ew eot'ın, p'arawor ė zastuc: zi ew ink'n p'araworesć'i:

K'san ew ut', vasn oroy amenayn. aysink'n yastucoy: ew vasn mardoyn ē amenayn aşxarh eleal: K'san ew inn, bari ew baresēr ē astuc: noynpēs ew zmardn bari ew baresēr stelc: Eresunerord, mi ė patkern mard: ew mi skzbnatipn astuc: l soc'anē omank' ėst hogwoy miayn en. ew omank' ėst hogwoy ew marmnoyn:

In point seven, Tat'ewac'i ascribes the equation between the Trinity and the human possession of mind, reason, and speech to Yovhannēs Erznakac'i; lines 109-116 of Erznakac'i's Counsel to the Laity (Xrat ašxarhakanac') present such a formulation:

If you desire an example or sign from this world [concerning the holy Trinity], / You know that you have a mind and reason, and speech. // Regard your mind [as] Father, your reason [as] Son, your speech [as] Spirit, / And [thus] you know God from your image of God. // If a man does not have a mind, you call [him] mindless, / If he does not have reason and speech, you know him as dumb. // He who does not have a spirit in him, is dead, you bury [him], / And you know a man by these three names.⁹

⁹Ôrinak kam našan aysor t'e uzes, / Du unis mitk' u ban, u xōsk' t'e gites. // Mitk'd hayr, band ordi, zxōsk'od hogi tes, / U astucoy patkerēd zastuc čancač'es: // Tē ė uni mardn mitk', anmit du koč'es, / Tē č'uni ban u xōsk' munj oznay gites. // Ov hogi yink' č'uni, merac ė, t'ales, / U ayd erek' anuančo zmardon čancač'es: //, E. Baldasaryan (ed.), Hovhannes Erznakac'i ev ara xratakan arjako (Yovhannēs Erznakac'i and his prose counsels), Erevan, 1977, p. 190.
In point twenty-five, Tat’ewac’i attributes to Gregory the Illuminator the notion that God created man in the image which He knew He would take at the Incarnation, and that it is this image that we will receive again at the Resurrection. Par. 264 of Gregory’s Teaching (Vardapetut’iwn) implies such an understanding of the image:

But now, how would He set Himself as type for the created one, or form the stamped clay with the image of God, which it indeed says: ‘He made man according to the image of God’ [Gen. 1:27]? First He said the words predictive of the future history, then He passed to the present, and He gave a glimpse of what will be.10

According to Tat’ewac’i’s interpretation, the ‘future history’ indicates the Incarnation; the ‘present’, the creation of man; and the ‘what will be’, the Resurrection.

I have not been able to find the exact citation that Tat’ewac’i attributes to Vardan Arewelc’i in point eight—“man is perfect with respect to three: in spirit and body and reason; and if one is missing man is imperfect.” However, there is a passage in Arewelc’i’s Divertimenti (Zhlank’) which resembles Grigor’s argument. According to Vardan, man can know that God is composed of three persons because “the Lord said: ‘in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit’ [Mt. 28:19]; and the Seraphs ‘holy, holy, holy’ [Is. 6:3]; and since we, the image [of God], are three—spirit, mind, and body.”11

Tat’ewac’i only ascribes his eighth point to Arewelc’i, but parallels to points 3, 4, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 21, 22, and 29 can also be found in the following passage which Vardan devotes to an explanation of the image of God:

The soul is the image of God, since it is incorporeal, and since it is rational, and since it is immortal, and since it is

---


without location, and since it is unknowable, and since it is wise, and since it is creative. And since it is good, is love, and hates evil. And through the Incarnation of the Son another image came into being with the body: with kingship, with priesthood, with compassion, with mercy, with sweetness, with forgiveness.\textsuperscript{12}

Tat'ewac'i includes all of Arewelci'i's points—except for sweetness and forgiveness—in his list. A significant difference rests between the two, however. Vardan envisions man immediately after the Fall as the image of God in spirit only, while the body is restored to its former glory through the Incarnation. By contrast, Grigor merges that separation in his vision of pre-lapsarian man, claiming that he was a perfect image in body and spirit. In chapter 30, where Tat'ewac'i discusses man's post-lapsarian condition, he regards the soul alone as the image of God and does not posit the rehabilitation of the body until the Resurrection prefigured in the Incarnation as he interpreted the teaching of St. Gregory the Illuminator.

In ch. 29, Tat'ewac'i elucidates the difference between image (\textit{patker}) and likeness (\textit{amanut'own}) [Gen. 1:26] as a prelude to his discussion of how post-lapsarian man is the image and likeness of God. In this chapter, the monastic applies Aristotelian categories to explain how every image is a likeness, although the reverse is not true. According to Tat'ewac'i, an image can occur through identity or through likeness. When an image appears through an identity of essential form, then it may properly be called an image, and it when it occurs through likeness of accidental qualities, it is properly called a likeness. In this manner, Christ is the image of the Father but we are likenesses of God.\textsuperscript{13}

\textsuperscript{12}hogwovn ç patker. zi anmarmín ē, ew zi bákanān ē, ew zi amah ē, ew zi antelī ē, ew zi angitëli ē, ew zi imastun ē, ew zi arustawor ē: Ew zi bari ē, sër ē, ew ē'ar atac'ē. ew marmnalovn ordoyn êlew marmnovn. ayl patker. t'agaworut'eambn. k'ahanuyt'eambn. gt'ut'eambn. olormut'eambn. k'alcr'ut'eambn. anyisac'arut'eambn, J 898, f. 45v.

\textsuperscript{13}BQ, pp. 272-273.
Image and likeness are differentiated as man and animal [are differentiated], since every man is an animal, but not every animal is a man. Since something—which is reason—raises man above animals.

And similarly, every image by necessity means likeness, but not every likeness is an image. Since something—which is identity—raises the image above likeness and then it is an image.

And there is an image which occurs through identity and there is that which is through likeness. Now, image through identity means the only begotten Logos of the Father; like the Apostle wrote to the Thessalonians: 'Christ is the image of the Father and the form of His Essence.' Since He is not the image according to likeness, but according to an identity of nature.

For example, a man is not said to be like a[other] man with respect to humanity, since there is identity [on the level of humanity] and not [merely] likeness, but a man is said [to be] like a[other] man with respect to the likeness of face and color and shape. And man means [the] 'image of God' according to likeness, since he does not have the same essence, but the likeness of God's [essence].

Zanazanut'iw n patker ew nmanut'iw n, orpês mardn ew kendanin, zi amenayn mardn asi kendani. ayl oč' amenayn kendani mard: Zi ir inč' yawelu mardn i veray kendanwoyn, or ê banakann:

Noynpéw ew amenayn patker i harkē asi nmanut'iw n. ayl oč' amenayn nmanut'iw n ê patker: Zi i veray nmanut'eän ir inč' yawelu patkern or ê noynut'iw n, ew apa ê patker:

Zi patkern noynut'eamb ê patker. ew ê or nmanut'eamb:

Ard noynut'eamb patker asi miacin bann hör. orpês grê arak'eaın ar t'esalonikec'is: patker hör ew kerparan eût'ean ê k'ristos: Zi oč' ê ośt nmanut'eän patker. ayl ośt noynut'eän buñt'ean:

Zor ķrīnas oč' asi mard mardoy nman gol ośt mardku'eän. vasn zi noynut'eän ê ew oč' nmanut'iw n: bayc' asi nman mard mardoy ośt eresac'n ew gunoyn ew jëwoyn nmanut'eän: Isk mardn asi patker astucoy ośt nmanut'eän, vasn zi oč' uni zoyn eût'iw n. ayl znmanut'iw n zastucoy:

\[1^{\text{This quote is not found in Thessalonians; also noted by M. Ashjian, Church Patristics (see n.2), p. 45, n. 43., who provides Heb. 1:3 as a possible alternative.}}\]
For example, the son of a king is the image of the king, since he shares his nature with him. But the coin and the tablet where are inscribed the image of the king, only resemble the king according to shape, but not according to nature.

And again, like a chicken egg and an egg made of stone resemble each other, but [one is] not [the] image [of the other], since they have not come out from each other, and do not possess the same essence.

Again, the image is obtained in the form, and the likeness in the quality or quantity.

Ashjian is certainly correct in pointing out that the example of the king and the egg derive, if in an altered form, from Thomas Aquinas' Summa Theologica (ST) Ia 93, 1. The notion that there is an image through identity of nature, which in the case of God is the Son, also reflects Aquinas' concept of the 'perfect likeness': "And because there cannot be a perfect likeness of God if there is not an identity of nature, the image of God is in His firstborn Son just as the image of a king is in his son who shares his nature." 16

As there are differences between this passage in BQ and ST Ia 93, however, it seems likely that Tat'ewac'i was not directly dependent on Aquinas' text, but rather on some intermediary which included such a Thomistic argument. For example, Aquinas does not mention a stone egg, but only 'another egg'. There is also no trace in Tat'ewac'i's argument of the Dominican's association of image [imago] with imitation [imitatio], nor of his argument that the preposition in Gen. 1:26—'Let us make man after our image and likeness' [Lat.: ad imaginem; Arm.: ast patkeri]—indicates an approximation which is attained by a distant thing: praepositio enim 'ad' accessum quendam

15M. Ashjian, Church Patristics (see n.2), p. 29.
16Et quia similitudo perfecta Dei non potest esse nisi in identitate naturae, imago Dei est in Filio suo primogenito sicut imago regis in filio sibi connaturali.
significat, qui competit rei distant. Again, although the concept of the 'perfect likeness' [similitudo perfecta] or 'perfect image' [imago perfecta] underlies Tat'ewac'i's notion of image through identity [patker est noynut'eam], he does not use the phrase 'perfect image' [patker katareal]; nor does he refer to Aquinas' notion, derived from Augustine's seventy-fourth question of his Eighty-Three Questions, of the equality [aequalitas] attained in the perfect image. Finally, the last sentence—"the image obtains in the form and the likeness in the quality or quantity"—bears a marked resemblance to Peter Lombard's observation in his Sentences [II, Dist. 16.4] that "therefore the image pertains to form, likeness to nature," which Thomas Aquinas does not cite.

Although Ashjian suggests here that Tat'ewac'i may have read Augustine as well, he does not indicate why. The formula "every image by necessity means likeness, but not every likeness is an image," also ultimately stems from Augustine's Eighty-Three Questions (question 74): "where there is an image there is also necessarily a likeness, but where there is likeness there is not necessarily an image." Yet, Aquinas cites it at the beginning of his responsio and the remainder of the Grigor's argument does not parallel that of Augustine's. It seems most probable that Tat'ewac'i drew his information from a source that was familiar with ST Ia 93 among other scholastic texts, but which did not reproduce all of its positions exactly.

Finally, in ch. 30, Tat'ewac'i explains in detail how post-lapsarian man is the image of God and how he is like God:

---

17 PL 40.85.

18 Imago ergo pertinet ad formam, similitudo ad naturam.

19 ubi est imago continuo est et similitudo; sed ubi est similitudo, non continuo est imago, PL 40.85.

20 BQ, pp. 273-274.
Some say that the image of God the Father is the Son, and the likeness is the Holy Spirit. Thus they say that man is constructed in the image of the Son and according to the likeness of the Holy Spirit. And this is unacceptable because man has come into being as the image of the Trinity as was shown, and not only of the Son and of the Holy Spirit.

And others say that we are the image of God and like the paradigm of the idea. And this also is not acceptable, since it was shown above that God Himself is that same paradigm of everything.

And others say that we have come into being now as the image, but we will become like [Him] in the future, according to John: "we will become like Him, since we will see Him as He is" [1 Jn. 3:2]. And this also is not acceptable since St. Cyril responds to this in his Scholia that He said "image", we understand "likeness to the image" — as was shown above — since every image is necessarily a likeness.

And others say that man is not the image of God, but the image of the image of God, since the Son is the image of the Father, and man of the Son, on account of that He said both 'like' and 'image'. And St. Cyril shows this to be false that the Son is the true image of the Father, and man has come into being in the image of the Son. Therefore, man has also come into being in the image of the Father.

Omank' asen etë patker astucoy hör é ordi, ew nman hogin surb: Ayşpes asen t'ë mardn kazmeal é i patker ordwoy, ew ast nmanut'ean hogwoyn srboy: Ew ays é'e anduneli. zi mardn errordut'ean è patker eleal orpés c'uc'aw. ew oc'i miayn ordwoy ew hogwoyn srboy:

Isk aylk' asen t'ë patker emk' astucoy, ew nman yarac'oyc' naxagałat'arın. Ew ays ews é'e anduneli. zi c'uc'aw i veroy é'yarac'oyc'n noyn ink'n astuac é amenc'un:

Ew aylk' asen et'ë patker ekak' ayşm, ayl nman lineloc' emk'i handerjealn. ost yoğannu t'é nman nma lineloc' emk'. zi tesaneloc' emk' zna orpés ew é'n: Ew ays ews oc'i é anduneli. zi soc'a patasxani tay surbn kiwrel i girs parapmanc' t'é or asac' zpatkern, imanamk' znmanut'iwna i patkerin orpés c'uc'aw i veroy. zi amenayn patker i harkë nman è:

Ew aylk' asen t'ë mardn oc'i é patker astucoy. ayl patker patkeri. zi ordi è hör patker, ew mardn ordwoy, vasn ayn asac' ew nman ew patkeri: Ew zays sut aîne surbn kiwrel et'ë ordi è čšmarit patker hör. ew mardn eleal è i patker ordwoy: Apa uremn ew mardn eleal è i patker hör.
And again they say that the soul is the image of God according to faculties since it has mind and intellection and will, but it is like God since God is immortal and invisible and our soul is immortal and invisible.

Again according to the three natural faculties of the soul we are the image of God, but we are like God in holiness, in righteousness and in virtue. Again our soul is the image, since reason and the breath of vitality proceed from that same. And like, since one is the tripartite essence and nature, in this we are like God. Again we are the image of God since we recognize the truth; and like God, since we love goodness as was said above.

Again we say that man is understood as the image in three ways; that is, [he is the image] in nature, in grace, and in glory. He is the natural image in that we understand and are able to love God; and this is equal for good and evil [people]. And the image of grace and of glory is to recognize and to love God perfectly, and this is the likeness which the perfected have here and in the supernal region.

And Saint Gregory of Nyssa explains [this] with beautiful order. Since if He had not said to be 'like' with the image, everyone would be an occasion [of worship], and through worshipping man, he would fall into idolatry.

On account of which He said 'like', that when they see man the co-image of God in rationality, in immortality and in the other things which are in the soul, they may understand also the differentiation of God.
And he places four peculiarities in God, and four in the soul. First since it is confessed by everyone that He cannot be placed, that is [He is] not created. And since He is not created, nor changed from non-existence into existence; therefore He is uncreated. And since He is uncreated, He is by necessity everlasting and without end.

Whereas the peculiarity of the soul, first since everyone confesses it to have come into being, and since it has come into being, then it is not uncreated; and since it is not uncreated, it had changed from nothingness into essence.

And then since He is able [to make] that which has come into being from nothingness, it [is] also [able] to be changed [back] to that same if the will of God permits it. But on account of the will of God, the angels and the souls of men remain everlasting.

In this chapter, Tat’ewac’i first refutes four views concerning the nature of our being God’s image. The first claims that we are constructed in the image of the Son and the likeness of the Holy Spirit. This is unacceptable because the Father is omitted. The second declares that we are the image of God and like the paradigm of the idea; however, since God Himself is the paradigm, it is impossible for Him to be the paradigm of an idea greater than Himself. The third, citing 1Jn. 3:2, posits that we are the image of God in this world and like Him in the next. This argument creates a logical contradiction because every image is a likeness as Grigor demonstrated in chapter 29 and as is supported by Cyril of Alexandria. The fourth unacceptable position argues that man is the image of the Son, who is the image of God; we, then, are the image of the image of God. Again, Grigor relies on Cyril of Alexandria to refute his opponents. Tat’ewac’i’s references to Cyril in points three and four, however, are incorrect; they do not appear in

21 Tat’ewac’i elaborated upon this in BQ III: 9. see S. La Porta, "The Theology of the Holy Dionysius" (see n. 3), pp. 107-109, 144-146.
the Alexandrian’s *Scholia on the Incarnation*, but in his *De Dogmatum Solutione*.\(^{22}\)

Two perceptions are central for the Armenian monk: 1) as he demonstrated above, the Son is the image of the Father through identity while we are the image of God through likeness; and 2) he does not wish to imply that man is the image of the Son alone, but emphasizes that man is the image of the entire united and differentiated Trinity.

This view is important in understanding Tat’ewac’i’s seemingly contradictory assertion in III.4 that “the Logos is the image of God, and man is the image of the Logos. The image took the image, or the prototype took the image.”\(^{23}\) It is not that we are the image of only one of the persons of the Trinity, but that we are the image of the prototype of God. Grigor never defines his notion of prototype exactly, although he does link it to the concept of the paradigm.\(^{24}\) The paradigm and prototype is God’s pouring forth His existence into the creation through the Logos. The prototype is not a personal essence as the persons of the Trinity, nor is it something external and created like the angels. It was effected through God’s looking within Himself. The prototype represents God’s simultaneous procession and remaining; the mechanism that creates multiplicity while God remains an essential unity. Although God’s essence remains ineffable, His participation in the universe through the prototype is effable. Thus, when Grigor claims that we are the image of the Logos, the image of the prototype, he is not contradicting his point here that we are not an image of an image. Rather, he is asserting that we are the image of God, not in His essence, but in His self-revelation to the universe through this issuance of ecstatic love, for ecstasy means “concerning the sublime love which

\(^{22}\) Also indicated by M. Ashjian, *Church Patristics* (see n.2), p. 30. Ashjian cites the work according to Pusey’s edition (*S.P.N. Cyrillic archiepiscopi Alexandrini in D. Ioannis evangelium*, vol. III, Oxford, 1872, Brussels, 1965\(^2\), pp. 547-566). The text also appears in PG 76, 1065-1132, where it forms part of a work called *Adversus Anthropomorphitas*, see CPG vol. III, 5231]. The third objection is found in chapter five, PG 76.1085 B-C and 1088 B; the fourth objection is found in chapter six, PG 76.1089 B.

\(^{23}\)  *bana patker hör. ew mardn patker banin. patkern zpatkern ēt kam naxatipa zpatkern*, BQ, p. 107; S. La Porta “"The Theology of the Holy Dionysius"” (see n. 3), p. 144.

\(^{24}\) On the paradigm, see S. La Porta “"The Theology of the Holy Dionysius"” (see n. 3), pp. 107-109.
God has for us beings'; that is, to go out, to shed and to pour Himself into His beings [Acts 2:17; Tit. 3:6]" (III:21)\textsuperscript{25}

Tat'ewac'i's following points stem from Latin authors. Although Ashjian cites ST 1a 93, 9 and John of Damascus' *De Fide Orthodoxa* V, 27 as sources for this chapter, he does not indicate to which passages in BQ V, 30 they correspond.\textsuperscript{26} I have not found any correspondence between Tat'ewac'i's material and the Damascene's *magnum opus*. ST 1a 93, 7 and 9 do contain material similar to that found in paragraph two above; Aquinas here is dependent on Peter Lombard's *Sentences* Bk. II, 16, 3. The arguments which resemble Grigor's occur in the *praeterea* portion of the articles, not the *responsio*, and in one case Aquinas subsequently argues to the contrary. As above, this precludes Tat'ewac'i's relying directly upon ST 1a 93.

The first point—"they say that the soul is the image of God according to faculties since it has mind and intellection and will, but it is like God since God is immortal and invisible and our soul is immortal and invisible"—is a Lombardian reading of Augustine's *De Trinitate* XI, 2\textsuperscript{27} in which Augustine explains that the Trinity's image in the soul obtains in terms of memory (*memoria*), intellection (*intelligentia*), and will (*voluntas*). The replacement of memory with mind may derive from Augustine's prior assessment that the soul is the image of God in mind (*mens*), awareness (*notitia*), and love (*amor*), *De Trinitate* IX, 12.\textsuperscript{28} Peter terms the former grouping the three natural faculties of the soul in *Sentences* I, Dist. 3, 2. Aquinas, ST 1a 93, 9 argues against the Lombard that these three are not faculties (*vires*) of the soul but activities (*actus*). If Tat'ewac'i was dependent on Aquinas, we would then expect that the soul is the image of God through its activities (*nergorcut'eambk*'), rather than faculties (*zorut'eambk*'). The second half of the point likewise reflects Peter Lombard's reading of Augustine, here the Carthaginian's *De Quantitate animae*.\textsuperscript{29} In *Sentences* II, Dist. 16, 4, the Lombard proposed that "likeness [of the soul to God resides] in [its] essence which is both immortal and invisible" (*similitudo in essentia, quia et immortalis et indivisibilis est*). It is clear that Tat'ewac'i's underlying text was based on the Lombard.

\textsuperscript{25} *vasa gerazanc' siroy)n zor uni astuac ar ëss zarmanal asi. aysink'ni artnak elanel t'ap'il ew hetul i yëss*, BQ, p. 127, S. La Porta ""*The Theology of the Holy Dionysius*" (see n. 3), p. 174.

\textsuperscript{26} M. Ashjian, *Church Patristics* (see n.2), p. 31.

\textsuperscript{27} PL 42, 985.

\textsuperscript{28} PL 42, 972.

\textsuperscript{29} PL 32, 1037.
and not on Augustine as the latter here has indissoluble (indissolubilis) instead of indivisible (indivisibilis). Invisible, Arm. anerewoyt, in the Armenian monastic's text must derive from a misreading of Lat. indivisibilis, Arm. anbažaneli, as invisibilis (invisible); a mistake impossible to make if the reading were indissolubilis.

The first half of the next point—"according to the three natural faculties of the soul we are the image of God, but we are like God in holiness, in righteousness and in virtue"—appears to be a repetition of Peter Lombard's explanation above; the second half derives from Eph. 4:23.

I have not found the source of the next two points: "Again our soul is the image, since reason and the breath of vitality proceed from that same. And like, since one is the tripartite essence and nature, in this we are like God."

The final assertion—"we are the image of God since we recognize the Truth; and like God, since we love goodness"—again stems from Peter Lombard's Sentences II, Dist. 16, 4: "[the soul] is considered the image in recognition of the truth, likeness in love of virtue" (imago consideratur in cognitione veritatis, similitudo in amore veritatis).

The following series of definitions does derive from Aquinas, but ST Ia 93, 4, not Ia 93,9:

Thus the image of God is able to be considered in man in three ways; one such way is in terms that man has a natural aptitude for understanding and loving God, and this aptitude consists in the very nature of the mind itself, which is common to all men. Another way, in terms that man knows and loves God actually or habitually, but still imperfectly; and this is the image in conformity to grace. The third way, in terms that man actually knows and loves God perfectly; and thus the image in terms of the likeness of glory is attained."

There is a difference between the two passages in that Tat'ewac'i or his direct source does not accept that the image in conformity to grace is imperfect.

---

10 Unde imago Dei tripliciter potest considerari in homine; uno quidem modo secundum quod homo habet aptitudinem naturalem ad intelligendum et amandum Deum, et haec aptitudine consistit in ipsa natura mentis, quae est communis omnibus hominibus. Alio modo, secundum quod homo actu vel habitu Deum cognoscit et amat, sed tamen imperfecte; et haec est imago per conformatatem gratiae. Tertio modo, secundum quod homo Deu actu cognoscit et amat perfecte; et sic attenditur imago secundum similitudinem gloriae.
Finally, relying on Gregory of Nyssa's *On the Composition of Man*, ch. 16, 12-13, Tat'ewac'i explains that God said He created man 'like' Himself [Gen. 1:26] in order to indicate that a difference exists between man and God even when they resemble each other. Grigor highlights the difference implied in 'like' through the description of the four characteristics particular to God—not created, not changed, uncreated, and everlasting—and to the soul—brought into being, changed from nothingness into being, not uncreated, and able to be returned to nothingness. The difference between not created and uncreated rests in the notion of change. Something can be not created, yet come about through the change from one substance to another, for example, water from melting ice. Uncreated implies absolute non-creation in which no change is implied.

According to Tat'ewac'i, pre-lapsarian man enjoyed the blessing of fully being the image of God in body and soul. The fall of man created a disjunction between the soul and body which cannot be healed at present. As noted above, Armenian tradition has not always held this view; Vardan Arewel'i suggests that the Incarnation restored the image in the body (as does Cyril of Alexandria). By contrast, Tat'ewac'i, under the influence of Latin theology, does not include the body in his conception of post-lapsarian man as the image of God. For Grigor, the restoration of the body does not occur until the Resurrection. Likewise, the physical rewards of the just do not occur until then for "every virtue grants peace to the mind here, and after death to souls, and at the Resurrection to the soul and the body."  

---

31 *amenayn ark'inut'izn ast hanguc'ané zmits, ew yet mahu zhogis, ew yarut'eann zhogi ew zmarmn*, BQ, p. 689.
ORDER OR DISORDER:  
THE STRUCTURE OF THE  
VICES AND VIRTUES  
IN GALATIANS 5:19-23 RECONSIDERED  

Bertram L. Melbourne  

Paul made extensive use of the "virtues and vices" genre in his epistles.¹ Such lists were common features in Greek, Jewish, and Greco-Roman writings. Jewish literature has them in the apocrypha, the pseudepigrapha, the Qumran writings and the Alexandrian tradition. Christian writers adopted and/or utilized them as is seen in the New Testament and the post-canonical Christian literature.  

There have been debates regarding the source and function of these lists especially in Greek philosophy.² Our concern here is neither to reopen those debates nor to re-examine all those lists. Rather, this study treats the lists in Gal 5:19-23 and seeks to determine whether the claims made by some scholars, represented by Betz and Dockery,⁴ regarding disorder in the first list, are correct. Is the list of vices random and unstructured, especially as compared with the list of virtues? More precisely, what do we encounter in the passage: disorder in one and order in the other or order throughout the given vices and virtues?  

This passage in Paul's epistle, which has been characterized by Guthrie as "A New Charter for Freedom,"⁵ is closely related to Rom 8:1-11, treating the same conflict between the flesh and the Spirit. Indeed, much of the chapter is concerned with the responsible use of

² ABD 6:856-859.  
freedom. Our passage is in the first part of a chapter which not only concludes the doctrinal or theological section of the epistle, but which also restates the "indicative" of Christian Salvation: "for freedom Christ has set you free." The passage has Christian freedom as its primary focus.

The precise location of the passage is within the parenthetic section of the epistle. Its design is to relate the previous theological section (1:1-4:31) to practical living. An admonition that urges the Galatian believers to use their Christ-earned freedom responsibly precedes it (5:1-15). Paul implores his readers to ensure that they not turn their hard-earned freedom into license but rather by it to allow love to permeate their actions and interactions (5:13). The first sentence of this verse ("for you have been called to freedom, brothers; only do not use freedom as an opportunity for the flesh...") constitutes the immediate context for Paul’s instruction in vs. 16. This verse is transitional and contains the word μόνον that is pivotal for the thought of the rest of the chapter. Burton states: "On this word as on a hinge, the thought of the epistle turns from freedom to a sharply contrasted aspect of the matter, the danger of abusing freedom." It seems that Paul is saying that walking by the Spirit is more than a consequence of the call to freedom. It is a categorical imperative born out of what Christ has done for us.

With vs. 16 is introduced what Betz calls "the central issue with which the Galatians had to come to grips: ‘how to deal effectively with the powers of the flesh.’" Vs. 16 opens with λέγω ἐκείνῳ ("But I say"). These two introductory words, according to Betz, indicate that Paul is about to make an important statement. If paraphrased as "now this is what I mean," they could indicate that what follows is an exegesis of what was stated in vss. 13-15. The essential thought there being that Christian freedom ought not to give license to the flesh but ought to provide opportunities for love to be the lubricating influence in their

---


9 Ibid.
social interactions. What Paul means is expressed in a two-part statement.

First, let us examine the imperative πνεύματι περιπατεῖτε (“walk in the Spirit”). Wood reminds that περιπατέω pictures the Christian life as a journey and thus implies living.10 Williams sees it as a metaphor that implies movement, purpose and goal in Christian living.11 It appears that Paul used this common metaphor in the NT to denote the habitual conduct of persons, especially Christians. He often employed it in a moral or metaphorical use with a preposition (primarily κατά and ἐν) or with a dative, as here.12 Betz adds that it describes this life by one of the more important terms of ancient anthropology and ethics, Jewish and Greek included.13 The instrumental πνεύματι defines the how of the Christian’s manner of life. It indicates the metaphorical path, the manner or rule of action that should characterize theimodus vivendi.

A vigorous debate has ensued in respect to how πνεύματι should be translated. While many commentators agree it should be seen as a dative and consequently expressed by the preposition “by” rather than “in” as in the A.V., there is no unanimity as to whether it should be translated “by spirit” or “by the spirit.” More precisely, however, the word is instrumental and thus indicates the means by which they should walk. Lenski notes that while the word is employed seven times in Galatians, there are no qualifying genitives such ασθεού or χριστοῦ, as in Rom 8:1-11. He further notes that four of the seven uses are anarthrous and in the other instances the article denotes previous reference. He therefore asserts that all of the seven uses are anarthrous and that they should be translated “spirit,” thus indicating that Paul intends for the Galatian believers “to use in their walk and conversation what is spirit in its nature, i.e. the reborn new person.”14

Lenski, however, cannot be right; for there is nothing in humans that is the antithesis ofσάρξ (“flesh”) to prevent them from carrying out the desires of the flesh. Surely, when Paul asks ἐναρχάμενοι

---


11 Williams, Galatians, p. 148.


13 Galatians, p. 277.

πνεύματι σαρκί ἐπιτελεῖσθε; ("After beginning with the Spirit, are you now trying to attain your goal by human effort?" 3:3 NIV) he does not credit human initiative, not even on the part of the reborn, new person (this is one of the seven occurrences of the term πνεύματι). Rather, he says they began by the Spirit—God’s quickening, regenerating agent. Paul seems to be admonishing the believers in 5:16 to let the same power which transformed their lives be the effective agent in sustaining them against the desires of the flesh and the forces of evil. In fact, he is holding out the promise to them that if they do, they shall by no means fulfill the desires of the flesh. This indeed is the implication of the use of the imperative. Moreover, he employs the aorist active subjunctive with the double negative to hold out a promise to them. The effect of the double negative and the aorist subjunctive is to produce a future condition. If the believers walk by the Spirit they shall by no means fulfill the lusts of the flesh. The implication therefore is that if they do not walk by the Spirit, they are in fact walking by the flesh and will indeed fulfill its lusts. This further implies that there are two options open to human beings in terms of their manner of life, and the choice they make determines the success they will have in the war against the flesh as is spelled out in vs. 17.

It should be noted that τελέσητε ("do [not] accomplish") is a second-person plural verb, indicating that the individual is the one who carries out the "desires of the flesh." Yet, the implied thought is that it is the human spirit that is controlled by the flesh. To overcome this control, the indwelling of the Spirit is imperative. Σαρξ ("flesh") is apparently personified here. It is used in an ethical sense to denote "that element of man’s nature that is opposed to goodness and makes for evil." In Pauline usage it came to mean humanity as fallen beings whose desires even at best originate from sin and are stained by it. It came to mean all the evil that humanity is and is capable of apart from the intervention of God's grace in the life. As such, σαρξ is synonymous with the "natural man" or "the old nature." It is a power that can rule and reign.

Paul is therefore holding out to Christians the promise that if they allow themselves to be led by the Spirit, the flesh will have no power over them. On the contrary, if they do not walk the walk of the Spirit, the desires of the flesh will not only be fulfilled, but will be exhibited.

as the works of the flesh, to be spoken of later (vss. 19-21). Since the
walk of the flesh has lusts (works), the walk of the Spirit must also
have some kind of manifestation. In fact, it does. He later refers to it as
“fruit.” This notion of ethical demonstration is an integral and essential
part of Pauline parenesis.

Verse 17 makes explicit the war that is waged between the flesh
and the Spirit. It outlines an anthropological soteriological theory that
undergirds Paul’s entire parenesis;¹⁶ “the flesh sets its desires
(ἐπιθυμία) against the Spirit and the Spirit against the flesh...”
Robertson points out that ἐπιθυμία does not mean evil desires but
simply the longing or the inclination for them.¹⁷ The implication is that
Christ and Satan long for the possession of man’s soul or, in keeping
with the context, that the Spirit and the flesh are in conflict. Betz
contends that the human body is a battlefield on which the powers of
the flesh and spirit fight against each other so that the human will is
disabled from carrying out its intentions.¹⁸ Since the struggle that is
being waged in man is but part of the cosmic struggle between the
forces of good and evil, these interpretations are not mutually
exclusive. The flesh and the Spirit are the agents working in humans on
behalf of the greater powers. The verse climaxes with a result clause,
“so that you are not able to do that which you want to do,” this can be
understood in one of three ways:

1. The sinful nature keeps you from doing the good you desire.
2. The Spirit keeps you from doing the evil you desire.
3. Each nature hinders the desires of the other.

Some contend the last meaning is most fitting to the context. However,
if the clause were to be compared with Rom 7:5, 16 then the first would
seem most probable. It is also true that the second meaning is
compatible with the context. Again, these meanings are not mutually
exclusive. They are all true and compatible with the thoughts that have
been set forth in the passage. What this verse does is to re-enforce the
thought of vs. 16.

¹⁶ See Betz, Galatians, p. 278.
  Book House, 1931) 4:311.
¹⁸ Galatians, pp. 280-281.
Paul continues the argument in vs. 18: "If you are being led by the Spirit you are not under law." One would have expected Paul to say "you are not under the flesh." The argument is similar to what he has in Rom 7:1-6. Since "flesh" is the realm in which sin operates and since sin gains added force through the Law, Paul must be saying that those who are Spirit-led do not follow the dictates of sin. They are therefore neither under the dominion of the Law nor under its condemnation. It should be noted that ἀγετθε is present tense and therefore connotes a continual leading by the Spirit. Those therefore who are continually guided by the Spirit will not follow the dictates of the flesh. It should also be noted that being led by the Spirit does not imply passivity but rather the need to allow oneself to be led. It implies being in the sphere where the Spirit's work can be effectual. While Paul appeals to the reader to follow the continual leading of the Spirit, he acknowledges that there is a contrary way of living to which a misguided Christian can succumb.

Paul now illustrates what he implies in vs. 16 by resorting to the effects or manifestations of the conflicting manners of living. He does this by employing the literary genre of "virtues and vices."

The manifestations of the flesh seem to be drawn from the common catalogues of vices. Paul designates them τὰ ἐργα τῆς σαρκός ("the works of the flesh"). This designation is significant, for ἐργα suggests actions and activities. They are deeds that are not simply done, they seem to be done by choice. The plural ἐργα is significant as is the suggestion that they are φανερά ("obvious"). The latter probably denotes that the deeds bespeak their origin in the sinful way of life, which therefore makes them open to observation. They are by no means hidden. They are open, known, and discernible. A glance at the list suggests that it is a random sampling and is not meant to be exhaustive. Rendall thinks that the function of ἀτυχα is to emphasize that precise fact.19

As previously noted, there is debate regarding the arrangement of the items in this list. Commentators are in disagreement on whether or not the list reflects order and arrangement. Some suggest that its chaotic nature is reflective of the chaotic nature of evil, contrasted against the unity and oneness of the "fruit of the Spirit" and its orderly
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19 See his comments on Gal 5:19 in *the Expositor's New Testament.*
arrangement (Betz). Others detect some form of arrangement (Dockery). While the former view seems enticing by virtue of its contrast, as well as its correlation with the phenomena of evil and sin, the latter view seems more reflective of the facts.

Careful examination of the list of vices reveals that indeed there is some structure and arrangement to the list. In fact, the first three vices can be categorized as sexual in nature, and they affect the individual. These are πορνεία, ἀκαθαρσία, and ἀσέλγεια (“fornication,” “impurity,” and “debauchery”). The next two, εἰδωλολατρία and φαρμακεία (“idolatry” and “witchcraft”), are of a religious nature and affect one’s relationship with God. Though some commentators divide the next ten into two categories, personal relations and drunkenness, a more precise classification would be to characterize all ten as social sins since they affect relations with one’s neighbor. A closer look is necessary to verify the latter category.

It is interesting that Paul begins his catalogue of vices with the sins that would naturally be regarded as sins of the flesh. Lenski calls them “the nastiest, the most degrading on which a special curse seems to rest.” Perhaps the mixed body of the church—gentiles and former slaves—made this an urgent matter for him.

Πορνεία is used in the New Testament to designate all extramarital and unnatural sexual relations that are repudiated as immoral. It is a broad term denoting all aspects of sexual immorality that by their very debased nature exclude one from God’s kingdom. Paul characterizes it as a work of the flesh. Since the primary constituents of the Galatian Church were former Gentiles from a rigidly stratified society, some probably had committed πορνεία within certain determined roles in their ordinary lives as slaves—if not as part of cultic
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20 Betz, Galatians, passim.


23 See his comments on Gal 5:19.


25 Ibid. 6:593; See also Hendrickson, Exposition of Galatians, p. 219.
participation. One author remarks that "the one completely new virtue Christianity brought into the world was chastity."

The second word of this triad, ἀκαθαρσία, is no less repugnant. It connotes the pus of an unclean wound or the uncleanness of a sore or wound. Demosthenes used it to refer to moral depravity, while in the OT (LXX) it is used for ceremonial impurity. It is primarily ethical in nature and connotes that which makes a person unfit for fellowship with God. Barclay remarks: "it is the soiling of life with the things which separate us from Him." Paul often associates it with πυρεία. Basically it connotes moral impurity and characterizes the nature of the unregenerate person who is committed τοπλομία ("lust") and not God.

The third word is ἁδελγεία. In this context it has the special sense of sexual excess. It is a vice into which a person falls when cut off from God and is thus a characterization of the pagan world. It pictures a man who is so far gone with desire that he ceases to care what people say or think. It has been defined as readiness for any pleasure and was used by Josephus in his description of Jezebel. Bruce adds that it is a vice "that throws off all restraint and flaunts itself, unwavering by shame or fear, vice paraded with blatant impudence and insolence, without

28 Barclay, The Letters to the Galatians and Ephesians, p. 47.
31 Barclay, The Letters to the Galatians and Ephesians, p. 47.
33 TDNT “ἀκαθαρτος,” 3:429.
34 Ibid. s.v. “ἀδελγεία,” 1:490.
35 Ibid.
regard for self-respect, for the rights and feeling of others, or for public decency."\(^{37}\)

These three terms are singular. As such, Lenski designates them "comprehensive singulars" since in his opinion they are comprehensive and inclusive.\(^{38}\) This investigation, then, seems to verify the conclusion that they are all of a sexual nature and can thus be classified together.

The next section of the list of vices has two entries eἰδωλολατρία and φαρμακεία ("idolatry" and "witchcraft"). They are both singular and are two vices that were viewed in the first century as problematic for Christian living. Those involved in them cannot have any part with life in the Spirit. The word eἰδωλολατρία is thought to be of Hellenistic-Jewish origin.\(^{39}\) It is regarded as a gross sin.\(^{40}\) It replaces the worship of God by that of material things.\(^{41}\) It further "denoted undue devotion to anyone or anything other than the true and living God.\(^{42}\) Thus it connotes the worship of the creature instead of the Creator. Paul therefore felt that since the former life of the Galatian believers involved idolatry, there must now be a hiatus. As for φαρμακεία, in the ancient world it involved not only the use of drugs for medicinal purposes but also poisoning and sorcery.\(^{43}\) In the epistolary context it connotes witchcraft and sorcery, including magic and divination. This was a common practice in the Greco-Roman world and could include tampering with and worship of the powers of evil, hence a form of idolatry.\(^{44}\) The pairing of the two terms is significant. As Hendrickson points out, "When faith in magic replaces trust in God it is exposed as a form of idolatry."\(^{45}\) It is precisely this interrelatedness of the terms that

---


\(^{38}\) See his comments on Gal 5:19, *The Interpretation of St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians*.


\(^{40}\) *TDNT* s.v. "eἰδωλολατρία," 2:380.

\(^{41}\) Barclay, *The Letters to the Galatians and Ephesians*, p. 47.


helps provide a designation for this second grouping. The terms can be defined as religious sins, not only for defying the Creator by exalting the creature but also for manipulating the powers of nature for religious or magical ends. These two terms, εἴδωλολατρία and φαρμακεία, clearly belong together.

Some commentators divide the next ten items into two groups. They list the first eight as sins either of rivalry (Hendrickson), of personal relations (Robertson), or of the spirit caused by self-assertion and destructive of fellowship and brotherhood (Wood) and the last two as either sins of inebriety (Hendrickson and Robertson) or self-indulgence (Wood). It would seem to me that these ten could be categorized together since they are of a social nature and involve one's personal and social interactions. Sins of drunkenness and carousing (could refer to the behavior of devotees of the god of wine and to enjoyment that has degenerated into license) are as destructive to one's interpersonal relations as are other personal sins which result in rivalries and breach of fellowship and brotherhood. That they belong together could also be argued from the fact that apart from ἐρωτικός and ζηλος ("strife" and "jealousy") which naturally involve others, they are all listed in the plural. This further emphasizes their social nature, their disruption of good personal interactions by their common occurrences. After cataloguing the first five vices in singular, the plural listing of eight of the ten social vices is striking. The list begins with enmities and climaxes with intemperate habits. Another striking feature of this listing concerns the fact that vices are listed which might not ordinarily be regarded as sins of the flesh. For Paul, however, it seems that any practice characteristic of life apart from God must be seen as a work of the flesh. The foregoing is especially true of the attitudinal sins, which are listed.

That the catalogue is not intended to be exhaustive can be further deduced from the phrase that immediately follows the catalogue ἔκ τὰ δίκαια τούτοις ("and things like these"). The phrase indicates that
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46 So Hendrickson ( Exposition of Galatians ), Robertson ( Word Pictures in the New Testament ), and Wood ( The Glory of Galatians ), among others.

those listed are representative.\footnote{Robertson, \textit{Word Pictures in the New Testament}, p. 312. Cf. Wood, \textit{The Glory of Galatians}, p. 119, who says they are only suggestive of the kinds of sins.} Evil and sin are manifested in diverse forms and only examples are here given.

It seems then that the catalogue of vices does reflect some orderly arrangement. The first three listings are sexual, the next two are religious, and the final ten are social in nature. Sins dealing with the self and self-gratification are listed first, followed by sins touching the worship of God, and sins affecting interpersonal relations are listed last. The order would thus be \textit{self, God, others}. This is a significant perspective and will be revisited.

Betz sees the concluding clause following the listed vices as problematic (vs. 21b), since he translates it “in which I predict to you as I have predicted (\textit{sic}, in the past).” Προλέγω means not only “to predict” but also “to warn” or “forewarn.” In this context, the latter meanings are more appropriate. Paul had apparently pointed out the dangers of returning to the pagan way of life in his catechetical instructions: that that way of life was inimical to Christian expectations. Consequently, those whose \textit{modus vivendi} was thus oriented “could not inherit the Kingdom of God.”

In vs. 22 the Catalogue of Virtues is introduced. The first striking feature one encounters is that unlike the plural works of the flesh, here it is “fruit of the Spirit.” This is a significant singular usage. Further comparison of ἐργα and καρπός reveals another contrast between them. While work is produced by the efforts of the doer, fruit is a natural product. Theologically understood, works are consequent to the efforts of those who practice habitually the fleshly way of life while fruits are the natural products of the indwelling Spirit. Furthermore, two views in regards to the singular καρπός in relation to the virtues are found in the commentaries. The first states that love is the fruit and the other eight are segments of this fruit. The second is that all nine virtues characterize the fruit of the Spirit. The context seems to support the latter. While some commentators prefer comparing the fruit of the spirit to a bunch of grapes, a citrus fruit with its several segments may serve as a slightly more accurate illustration.

There are nine items in this list which seem to fall into three parts.\footnote{So Hendrickson, \textit{Exposition of Galatians}, p. 223; Betz, \textit{Galatians}, p. 287; Wood, \textit{The Glory of Galatians}, p. 120, among others.} The first part consists of ἀγάπη, χαρά and εἰρήνη ("love," "joy,"}
and "peace"). ἀγάπη is primarily a Christian word and a fitting first in the list. For Paul it fulfills the demands of the Decalogue, leading to Christian liberty and moral conduct in the Spirit: "the continuing debt to love one another" (Rom 13:8-10; cf. 12:9-21). It designates a love that is derived from the Divine and patterned after Christ's self-sacrifice on the cross. It is the love that is produced in the heart of one who has yielded to the Holy Spirit.²⁰ It is therefore not of human derivation. Bruce calls it "God's own love, as manifested in Christ." It is a bestowing, self-giving rather than a grasping love and signifies unconquerable benevolence. It is a feeling of the mind as much as of the heart, yet not necessarily an emotion.²² Xαρά most often describes that joy which has a basis in religion. Its foundation is in God and is not derived from anything earthly.²³ It is a mediated gift of the risen Lord according to Paul (Rom 5:2; 14:17) who wishes it to readers in the proems of his letters. Note that he sees it coming from both Jesus and the Father.²⁴ At least, it is another divine gift.²⁵ Εἰρήνη can connote the tranquility which a country enjoys, but in the NT it is equivalent to the Hebrew Shalom. Here it designates "the tranquility of heart which derives from the all-pervading consciousness that our times are in the hands of God."²⁶ Like χαρά, it is a mediated gift of the risen Lord (Rom 5:1-2; Col. 3:15) and is likewise wished believers in the proems of Paul's letters. Again, it is not an attribute that is inherent in humans. It results from justification by faith (Rom 5:1) and thus is of divine origin.

These qualities seem to belong together. They are all gifts of divine origin, which result from a relationship with God. Wood sees them as
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²⁰ Cf. Rom 5:5; Titus 3:6; etc.
²¹ Bruce, Commentary on Galatians, p. 252.
²³ Barclay, The Letters to the Galatians and Ephesians, p. 50. Wood elaborates that it has its basis in religious experience and its real foundation is in fellowship with God, adding that where it is present so also is spontaneous joy (The Glory of Galatians, p. 120). Cf. Phil 3:1; 4:4.
²⁴ See Rom 1:7; 1Cor 1:3; 2Cor 2:2; Gal 1:3; Eph 1:2, etc.
²⁵ Betz, Galatians, p. 287.
²⁶ Barclay, The Letters to the Galatians and Ephesians, p. 50.
the basic spiritual qualities, and Betz as “spiritual powers” of the first order.

The next three are μακροθυμία, χρηστότης, and ἀγαθωσύνη ("patience," "kindness," and "goodness"). Макрοθυμία is defined as the quality of putting others first, of forbearance and composure. Barclay observes that it is used of the grace of the person who could take revenge but does not. It implies the one who is slow to wrath. The NT often uses it for God’s attitude towards humans (Rom 2:4; 9:22; 1Pet 3:20), teaching us to display the same attitude in our dealings with others. Χρηστότης is the divine kindness out of which God acts toward sinners, and is to be shown in the believers’ dealings with others (Eph 4:32). It designates the outworking of God’s gifts from Christians towards their neighbors. Indeed, it is a fitting fruit of the spirit. ἀγαθωσύνη refers to that quality in a Christian that guides and inspires aspiration toward the things of moral worth. Moreover, it connotes moral excellence and goodness. It signifies generosity and could denote the actual manifestation of kindness. The antithesis of envy (Gal 5:21).

These three virtues are characterized by Betz as having to do with human action.

In fact, they seem to affect interpersonal relations between Christians and others. Hendrickson seems to concur with this notion, noting that they refer to the virtues which Christians need in their contacts with each other and with others outside the community of faith.

The last three virtues, πίστις, πραΰτης, and ἐγκράτεια ("faithfulness," "gentleness," and "self-control") pertain to the person.

---

57 *The Glory of Galatians*, p. 120.
58 *Galatians*, p. 287.
59 Barclay, *The Letters to the Galatians and Ephesians*, p. 51; cf. 1 Cor 13:4; Eph. 4:2; Col 1:11; 3:12.
60 *TDNT* s.v. "Χρηστότης." 9:491.
64 Betz, *Galatians*, p. 287.
While in the list of vices those pertaining to the individual came first, here Paul puts last those virtues that should permeate the Christian person. A Christian should be πιστός, i.e. faithful, trustworthy, etc.66 Besides, a Christian should be πραΰς, i.e. gentle, humble, considerate, etc. The Greek noun πραΰτης has several meanings: gentleness, humility, meekness, courtesy, and considerateness. All these meanings appear in the NT and are required of the Christian.7 Finally, by God's grace a Christian should always be in control of self. Ἐγκράτεια denotes being temperate. It is used of the athlete's discipline of the body. When related to the Christian, it designates self-mastery that is evident in one's chastity.68 It further denotes total abstinence from the harmful and a moderate use of the good.69

Paul's last clause in vs. 23 seems somewhat strange. One would expect that since "fruit" is singular he might have said, "Against which there is no law." Instead he has, "Against these things there is no law." Perhaps he is suggesting that those who manifest these virtues are not condemned by any law since they (the virtues) are the fulfillment of the law. There is no condemnation for those who manifest the fruit of the Spirit, "those who have crucified the flesh with its passions and desires" (vs. 24).

Is there orderly arrangement in the list of vices and that of virtues or are they random recitations drawn from Hellenistic sources? The evidence indicates an orderly arrangement. Just as the list of vices is divided into three parts, so are the virtues similarly classified. Note the following sequences or train of thought in both lists:

PERSONAL VICES:
1. As regards the individual
2. As regards the Divine
3. As regards others

PERSONAL VIRTUES:
1. Primarily as regards the Divine
2. Primarily as regards others
3. Primarily as regards the individual

66 Barclay, The Letters to the Galatians and Ephesians, p.51. See also Hendrickson, who renders πιστός as loyalty and fidelity (Exposition of Galatians, p. 225).
68 Barclay, The Letters to the Galatians and Ephesians, p. 52.
The arrangement is not insignificant and should not be overlooked. In fact, it is noteworthy and could be of theological importance. Not only are the lists divided into three parts respectively but also there is a degree of correlation between the lists and their constituent parts as well. Whereas in the vices the order concerns the individual (adultery), the Divine (idolatry), and others (interpersonal problems), in the virtues the order concerns the Divine (primarily through appropriation of what is of heavenly origin), others (primarily through interpersonal relations), and the individual (primarily through one’s disposition toward God, others, and oneself). The orderly arrangement of both lists and that of their constituent parts suggest deliberateness on the part of the author.

We are compelled to conclude that the lists are neither random nor unstructured, and that the list of vices is far from being jumbled.
MEDIEVAL ARMENIAN ARCHITECTURE: REVIEW OF A RECENT STUDY

Michael Daniel Findikyan

Christina Maranci’s recent book, Medieval Armenian Architecture: Constructions of Race and Nation, is essentially an historical survey of scholarship in the field of Armenian architecture. The author, Assistant Professor of Medieval Art at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, situates the study of architecture within Armenian cultural and intellectual history, observing significant ethno-political factors that have influenced work in the field over the past two centuries, hence the sub-title chosen for the book. Maranci’s historical analysis provides the foundation for her assessment of the current state of the field, in the final chapter, where she proposes new approaches for fruitful research.

Maranci’s work begins with “the travelers” from France, England and Germany, who made Studienreisen to or through Armenia beginning in the seventeenth century, and were the first to introduce Armenian architectural monuments to the West. Moving chronologically, the author surveys the observations of Frédéric Dubois, Charles Texier, Austen Henry Layard, Henry F. B. Lynch, as well as the general surveys of Karl Schnaase and Auguste Choisy, providing for each a critical assessment of his contributions to the field. A full chapter is devoted to T'oros T'oromanyan, known not only for his extensive field work and documentation, but also for his theory that Armenian architectural forms declined in Armenia as a result of foreign invasion and persecution while, conversely, flourishing in the dominating lands.

As a point of orientation the author takes the work of Josef Strzygowski, whose almost nine-hundred page tome, Die Baukunst der Armenier und Europa (Vienna, 1918), was the first systematic study of Armenian architecture, and the first to examine the Armenian monuments in the light of other architectural traditions, particularly those of Syria and Iran. Far more famous and controversial, however, was Strzygowski’s theory that Armenian building types and styles “diffused” or “migrated” to the West, influencing the development of

---

the Romanesque and Gothic styles in Europe. The bulk of Maranci's book, a weighty tripartite middle chapter, is devoted to an exacting examination of Strzygowski's principal theories. Such attention is necessary, the author argues, because many modern scholars have misunderstood or misrepresented Strzygowski's work, among them the noted specialists, J.-M. Thierry and Donabédian, Krautheimer, and Cuneo. Others have summarily dismissed Strzygowski's work because of its racist and anti-Semitic agenda. Maranci insists that while reprehensible in his motivation, and not infrequently dubious in his methodology, many of Strzygowski's highly complex arguments have yet to be critically examined or conclusively refuted.

Strzygowski proposed an elegant, if ultimately defective evolution for Armenian church architecture. Its seminal form was the centrally planned, domed structure, which, he proposed, was indigenous to Armenia, and from which all later forms evolved in increasing complexity. Its prototype was a dome resting on a simple square base. This pattern gave rise to more developed forms, such as Mastara and Hrşipsimé, in which semicircular apses are located on each side of the base, and the dome is sometimes supported on stone piers. Strzygowski was the first to draw attention to a significant structural feature of Armenian domed, apsed monuments, the squinches: half-conical forms filling in the spaces in the upper corners between adjacent apses, thereby creating an octagonal base for the drum of the dome. Structurally, the squinch would become for Armenian architecture what the pendentive was for Byzantine architecture. In the final evolutionary phase as Strzygowski reconstructs it, the square base disappears, leaving a "pure apsed structure" [86] with a circular core, such as the hexagon of Grigor Abulamrene at Ani, and the round church of Zvart'noc. Longitudinal constructions such as basilicas, first without domes, then with them, followed only later, according to Strzygowski.

Problems abound with this hypothetical evolution. Maranci observes, beginning with chronology. The first domed Armenian churches date only to the seventh century, as epigraphic and literary evidence testifies, evidence that Strzygowski knew but circumvented. Furthermore, as Khatchatrian and Grabar have shown, there are numerous examples of centrally-planned, apsed and niched structures in the Christian East that predate the Armenian examples. While Strzygowski sought to derive the domed basilica from domed, centralized plans, chronology belies the thesis that the scholar
developed in what Maranci calls "the most complex and technical section of Die Baukunst." [111]. The earliest dated Armenian churches include the domeless basilicas of Ereruyk' and K'asal from the fifth and sixth centuries. In a number of cases, the church at Tekor, or the small basilica at Ate', for example, the dome seems to be a later addition to what was originally a simple basilica. This sort of renovation is well documented in Byzantium and the West. Contrary to Strzygowski's theory, the basilica appears to be the earliest type of church structure in Armenia.

A complex, rather bizarre ethno-political ideology persuaded Strzygowski to overlook firm literary and epigraphic evidence in order to insist that the basilica was a late, derived, and ephemeral form in the history of Armenian church architecture. Influenced by contemporary Indo-European linguistic scholarship, Strzygowski believed that the Armenian domed, centrally-planned structure was an Aryan form—a vestige of the primitive architecture of Indo-Europeans, as Maranci explains:

While Strzygowski believed that the central plan was an Aryan form, the basilica was the work of Mediterranean "power-men", or Machtmenschen. Unlike the spiritual and introspective Aryans, the Machtmenschen were a decadent and tyrannical people. They used the basilica, along with the practice of representational art, as a means of propaganda for Machtmenschen to deceive the Aryans. The Machtmenschen saw the effectiveness of the basilican layout, in which all eyes were focused on a single point in the eastern apse. By erecting such structures all over the Christian East, and installing their clergy within them, they were able to win over native populations. The fifth-century basilicas of Armenia, according to Strzygowski, were a brief but unfortunate example of their success [117].

More intriguing was Strzygowski's theory of the "diffusion" of Armenian architectural forms to the north and west. Analyzing specific monuments, the scholar argued that the domed-apsed square, for example, migrated to Georgia, the Balkans, Eastern and Central Europe, and finally into Greece. Maranci critically examines Strzygowski's arguments, with reference to numerous plans and photographs. She finds that his theory is "striking in its neglect of the
chronological relationship of the monuments” [128], which “do not exhibit a consistent set of features borrowed from the prototype” [129]. Further, she traces Strzygowski’s theory of westward migration, once again, to contemporary Indo-European scholarship, which likewise tracked the migration of linguistic roots across cultures.

Ethno-political ideology can also be discerned at the heart of Strzygowski’s theory of Armenian influence on Romanesque architecture, particularly barrel and groin vaulting, whose origin the scholar located in Asia Minor, Mesopotamia, and possibly Armenia. Yet again, Maranci enumerates problems in Strzygowski’s argumentation and ultimately finds his theory of transmission from Armenia “unconvincing” [136]. Strzygowski highlighted other Romanesque features common to Europe and Armenia such as cubic capitals and the “arch frieze,” continuous, round-arched corbel tables that decorate the external walls of such western monuments as the Cathedral of Gurk in Carinthia (southern Austria) [137] and such Armenian examples as the tenth-century church of Tigran Honenc' at Ani, as well as that city’s Cathedral [138]. Here, Strzygowski stopped short of claiming an Armenian origin for the architectural features. Instead he implied that the similarity, specifically in “northern” Europe and Armenia, was to be explained either by a common root or perhaps by “migrating artists, either westerns to the Orient, or Armenians and other [easterners] migrating to the West” [138]. Here, Strzygowski’s racial bias rears its head again: he attributes much architectural creativity and innovation to “Northern Europe,” by which he means Austria and Germany. As Maranci summarizes the notion, “While the West must learn from the East, Northern Europe is characterized as equally able” [141].

Maranci also examines Strzygowski’s theories concerning Armenia’s role in the development of the Gothic style, in particular pointed arches, buttressing systems and ribbed vaulting. Maranci argues that while Strzygowski drew attention to fascinating similarities between certain Armenian and Gothic forms, his argumentation is often convoluted and equivocal, and, in fact, Strzygowski did not actually argue for Armenian priority or precedence. At best he suggested a simultaneous development of common forms in Armenia and “Northern” Europe. Viewing Strzygowski’s admittedly ambiguous arguments from the larger perspective of the intellectual climate of his times and his own ideological agenda, Maranci concludes that:
Armenia, contrary to the belief of many scholars, was not [Strzygowski's] Gothic homeland... [his] thesis of a common Northern artistic root for Northern Europe and Armenia was an attempt to reconcile the primacy of the East, which he had held so dear in his early works, to the powers of Northern Europe, which were emerging rapidly into his view [152].

The striking formal similarities observed by Strzygowski and scholars before him remain, however. After separating the wheat from the chaff of Strzygowski's complex argumentation, Maranci clears the way for "this generation" to confront the issues that remain.

Maranci's next chapter is devoted to a review of scholarship since Strzygowski. The author begins by incisively and critically surveying the research of scholars in the West, such as Jurgis Baltrusaitis, Armen Khatchatrian (considered a "westerner" because he trained in Paris), Adriano Alpago-Novello, Fernanda Da Maffei, Francesco Gandolfo, Paolo Cuneo, Sirarpie Der Nersessian, Jean-Michel and Nicole Thierry and W. Eugene Kleinbauer. Maranci examines these scholars' work on issues such as the origin of the rib-arch, the funerary chamber at Alc', the origin of the portico, and the original plan of the Cathedral of Êjmiacin. Against Strzygowski's overtly comparative and cross-cultural approach, Maranci finds that western scholarship after him has tended to focus on internal problems within the field. The Lithuanian Baltrusaitis, for example, saw the evolution of Armenian architectural forms as a rational process of solving structural and functional problems, and therefore an insular, not a cross-cultural pursuit [180]. While not sparing in praise for "The Italian Contribution" [pp. 208-219], Maranci observes that the prolific research begun in the 1960's in Milan and Rome has been concerned almost exclusively with documentation, typological classification and preservation of the monuments, with far less attention to the place of Armenian architecture within the larger development of early Christian architecture.

The same can be said for scholars in the East. Maranci observes that for the most part, Russian and Armenian scholars such as Nikolai Tokarskii, O.K. Xalpačyán, Step'an Mnac'akanyan, Murat Hasrat'yán, and Varazdat Harut'yunyan have eschewed
comprehensive, comparative studies, preferring to concentrate on monographic and regional studies that emphasize the distinctive, indigenous nature of Armenian architecture. This may be a reflection of Soviet nationalism, Maranci opines.

In the final chapter the author calls for a new comparative study of Armenian architecture that abandons the concepts of racial and cultural prejudice that so influenced the field since Strzygowski. Maranci proposes that in identifying sources for Armenian architecture, future studies should focus on three cultures: Syrian, Cappadocian and Iranian. Yet the very notion of a national Armenian style is in need of closer scrutiny, Maranci asserts, writing, "The interpretation of art as a national phenomenon often reflects the intellectual legacy of the nineteenth century more than the world of its production" [247]. The term "Transcaucasian" might be more appropriate, suggests the author, given, for example, the enduring difficulty in definitively and unequivocally distinguishing "Georgian" from "Armenian" church architecture. As for theories of Armenian influence on other architectural traditions, Maranci is cautious. While acknowledging certain striking similarities between Armenian and medieval European structures and forms, the author insists that, considering the current body of evidence, "the common forms can still be explained by independent geneses" [251]. The influence of Transcaucasian architecture in the development of Islamic architecture might be a more fruitful avenue of inquiry.

Maranci's ardent call for a return to comparative studies in the field of Armenian architecture also raises the issue of inter-disciplinary study. Her review of the scholarship and her proposals for future research almost entirely overlook the functional, i.e. liturgical significance of the architectural monuments. Indeed, I am aware of not a single architectural study of an Armenian church that simultaneously examines the ritual functions for which the edifice was built. The reason for this void is clear enough. Few scholars have the training, or the breadth of competence to engage in serious study in two highly specialized and technical disciplines. Scholars such as Robert Taft and especially Thomas Mathews, with their mastery of the ancient languages, history, theology, liturgy and architecture, are becoming increasingly few and far between. Nevertheless, liturgical evidence may clarify a number of heretofore unanswered questions regarding the evolution of Armenian architectural forms such as the gawit' [narthex];
interior chambers; the multiplication of apses; and the highly elevated Armenian bema, among others. In the last twenty years liturgiologists have made significant progress in delineating the major phases, influences, and distinctive features in the evolution of the Armenian rite.² It is at least conceivable that these precisions might cast light on some of the open questions that Maranci raises with regard to the origin and development of certain Armenian architectural forms and features.³

Conversely, architectural evidence in Armenia raises questions about liturgical function: What liturgical rite was used by those who built the basilica of Erevan⁴, with its portico and southern entrances? Does not the presence of interior niches in the northern walls of the apse in both centrally-planned Armenian, and at least some rock-cut Cappadocian churches⁴ require us to contemplate a common liturgical function for them? Architectural evidence for Cappadocia, a neglected area of research according to Maranci [244], could be crucial in compensating for a shortage of useful liturgical sources for Cappadocia in the fourth and fifth centuries, when the Armenian Rite was in formation under the undeniable, but as yet not adequately defined influence of the ecclesiastical See of Caesarea. The confrontation of liturgical texts and archaeological data can be complicated, it is true, and architectural form does not necessarily always follow liturgical function. Yet there is reason to believe that an inter-disciplinary approach applied to the Armenian evidence would be profitable.⁵

Liturgiology might also shed light on the circumstances by which Armenian church architecture was subjected to outside influences.

---


³ Boghos Levon Zekiyen also invites architectural study in relation to the celebration of the liturgy in “Studies in Armenian Art within the overall Field of Armenian Studies,” in Atti del Quinto Simposio Internazionale di Arte Armena (Venezia-S. Lazzaro, 1992) 57-72, esp. pp. 63-64.


⁵ Difficulties inherent in interpreting liturgical and architectural data are amply discussed in Sible de Blauw, “Architecture and Liturgy in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages: Traditions and Trends in Modern Scholarship,” Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft 33/1 (1991) 1-34.
Maranci observes that scholars have tended uncritically to characterize Armenia as "a passive recipient of imperial influence—conservative in its ways, until the force or persuasion of one or the other of its bigger neighbors induced an innovation" [245]. Yet in a recent study of the development of Armenian ordination rites during the Cilician period, Claudio Gugerotti makes a compelling case that far from being hapless victims of papal "Latinization," the Cilician Armenians were remarkably eclectic in the liturgical reforms they made, demonstrating uncommon scrutiny and self-awareness in their borrowings from the West.6 Gugerotti's counter-intuitive assertion might well be tested against the architectural evidence for possible correspondence.

Those with greater credentials than this reviewer may quibble with some of Maranci's assessments of her predecessors, and might perhaps differ with her dating and analysis of some of the monuments. Moreover, her critical reading of the architectural literature against a background of increasing nationalism will win her no friends among those desperately but misguidedly struggling to reconstruct an allegedly authentic identity for post-Soviet Armenia by perpetuating the myth of a purebred culture untouched by the outside world. Armenia's historic and documented openness to other cultures is not a sign of ethnic weakness, but of a remarkable self-awareness and resilience rarely encountered in other small, persecuted ethnic groups.7

This amply illustrated book is a precious contribution not only to the field of Armenian architecture, whose students must consider it a basic textbook, but for our understanding of modern Armenian intellectual and cultural history. Those henceforth attempting a synthesis in other fields of Armenian culture and letters will neglect this work at their peril.

---


7 See, for example, the remarkable assessment of His Holiness Karekin I, late Catholicos of All Armenians: "It is my strong feeling from my reading of Church history, that of my own Church and of other Churches, that the Armenian Christian tradition has been one of the Oriental Christian churches' historical experiences that has been the most open to other Church traditions." Idem, "Tradition: Living and Life-Giving" in The Armenian Christian Tradition, Scholarly symposium in honor of the visit to the Pontifical Oriental Institute, Rome, of His Holiness Karekin I, Supreme Patriarch and Catholicos of All Armenians, December 12, 1996, Robert F. Taft, S.J., ed (OCA 254, Rome, 1997) 35. Along these lines Robert Taft has written, "...what is most remarkable about Armenian religious culture, in contrast to its main competitor, Byzantium, is its receptivity to outside influences...the Armenians...were remarkably open to the uses of other nations, absorbing Latin and Byzantine customs with relative sangfroid." Idem, "The Armenian Liturgy: Its Origins and Characteristics," 23-24.
BOOK REVIEWS


Reviewed by Erich Renhart

First Impression. A four-color glossy protective cover contains the linen-bound volume. Its measurements are 33.5 x 24 cm, slightly larger than the manuscript on which it is based. The volume is heavy in my hands. Good, heavyweight paper has been utilized. The page layout is generous, the printing careful and neat. All of this corresponds to the significance of the Lemberg Gospel [LG]. I have the impression that the care with which this precious manuscript was produced 800 years ago is reflected in the quality of the present volume of commentary and documentation.

Contents and Composition. The volume is not exactly a reproduction of the LG or even a facsimile work, as the title might suggest. Rather, it contains studies on the origin of the manuscript, on its literary genre, on its codicology, on the illuminations and on the transmission history of the codex. The volume is dedicated to the memory of Klaus Wessel. To anticipate: the contributions are instructive throughout, several of them simply exquisite.

After the Preface [6] of the Armenian ambassador in Germany and the Foreword of the editor begins a series of nine essays of varying length:


5. Andrea B. Schmidt, "The Colophons of the Lemberg Gospel" [93-110]


7. Andrea B. Schmidt, "The Monastery of Skevra (12-14th c.) at the Crossroads of Ecclesiastical and Cultural Vicissitudes in Cilicia" [121-142]

8. Christian Weise, "Traces of the Armenian Community in Lemberg: From the Settling of the Armenians in Ukraine to the End of the Armenian Communities in the Years 1940-1946 and Their Re-Establishment in the Year 1989" [143-169]


A select bibliography [177], the list of sigla [178], two registers [179-181, 182-185], the list of illustrations [186], as well as two maps [187-189] and a section with 29 full-color plates close the volume.

In the first essay, an introduction as it were, G. Prinzing presents the entire work. What is presented here is developed in subsequent essays. The LG is a significant early Cilician manuscript, which was finished in the year 1198/99. It came later into the possession of the Armenian Uniate Archdiocese of Lembert, where it was the most valuable codex in the archdiocese's collection. Since the end of the second world war, the manuscript was considered lost until, in 1993, it was rediscovered in Polish Gnesen, where it lay "faithfully and securely preserved" [13]. At the end of March 1996, the codex came to the Gutenberg Museum in Mainz for nearly a year. There the manuscript was "stabilized" [15], that is, the binding was restored, the codex was photographed, and a codicological description was undertaken. After the manuscript was returned, a more than four-month exhibit took place, after which the LG was once again displayed for two days (sic!). "Thereafter it was removed" [26 n.45], and today must
once again be considered inaccessible. Presumably the manuscript "is no longer in the archeepiscopal archives of the Primas of Poland, and thus resides in Warsaw." [29].

From this opening essay, one additional detail should be mentioned. As a result of thorough research, the editors have definitively determined the date of the death of Norses of Lambron: "Therefore Norses could hardly have died in July, 1198, as is conventionally believed, but rather in the short time span between January 6 and January 30, 1199." This correction really need not have been "hidden" in a footnote [19 n.22].

Two authors were selected for the brief description of the LG: Christian Hannick and the co-editor. Here I would like merely to point out that the title opposite the table of contents is expanded by a valuable piece of information: "(Also called 'Gospel of Skevra')." The short description is a codicological one.

As a liturgist I am pleased to see that the LG was also embraced as a manuscript for liturgical use. Christian Hannick writes about the genre of the Armenian Gospel [3], about biblical works and translations, about the order of pericopes and lections. The LG belongs to the Tetraevangelion-type which, as a complete Gospel, is distinguished from the Lectionary containing selected Gospels. Worth particular attention in the manuscript is the double reference system for the pericope lections using letters notated in the margin.

The most extensive essay focuses on the LG as a work of art [4]. After a careful external description, Anton von Euw, Art Historian from the Schnützgen Museum of Köln, offers a study of the techniques used, the subjects of the images and their place in the context of the iconographic tradition. He adds to this analogs, which are added, in part, in a small appendix of illustrations as black and white photographs. Especially convenient are the references to illustrations noted in the margin.

In two essays, the philologist from Louvain, Andrea B. Schmidt, takes a look back to that hour in history that produced our manuscript. In the first essay she offers the first complete translation of the eight colophons of the LG, the accent being on the extensive main colophon of the patron: "As the patron of the Tetraevangelion, Stephanos presents his spiritual and theological motives in a stylistic, impressive and unique language." [95] What dignity speaks out of those words, which speak of the sublime value of the Gospel, of asceticism, indeed
of the voluntary martyrdom that the patron and scribe have taken upon themselves—very personal words that are combined with theological flourishes in order to flow into a doxology. For this good piece of work the translator and co-editor is to be greatly thanked.

The other essay of Andrea B. Schmidt [7] situates the Cilician monasteries of Skevra and Mlidsch, in which the manuscript was produced, in the multicultural context of its place and its time [12-14th c.]. The reader is introduced to a time that is filled with great spiritual personalities such as Nerses of Lambron (Skevra belonged to Lambron), Nerses Shnorhali, Grigor of Lambron and Gregor of Mlidsch. "We read the swansong of the monastic community of Skevra in a manuscript from the year 1349, the last to come down to us" [142], two and a half decades before the Mamelukes totally overran the Armenian Kingdom of Cilicia.

In her contribution, Anette Lang-Edwards, book restorer of the Gutenberg Museum, documents the LG's state of preservation [6] before and after the subsequent restorative efforts. Several alterations in the book's composition and binding would be undertaken during the course of the centuries, without being mentioned in a colophon. For the future Lang-Edwards advises "proper conservation and handling" [111] of the codex, a postulate whose fulfillment must now already be doubted (s.o.).

The theologian Christian Weise works together with Professor Friedrich Heyer of Heidelberg on a history of the Church of Ukraine. He publishes here a treatise on the history of the Armenian community of Lembert [8]. There I discover very telling the variable fate of the Armenians, which oscillates between privilege and persecution. In this game of changes the ecclesiastical powers of East and West are involved, but also a few "ambitious, indeed unscrupulous" [160/161] hierarchs have intermingled. Weise also considers the "Manuscripts and Archive Contents of the Lemberg Community" [159-167]. The most extensive stock of manuscripts was given in the seventeenth century. Great difficulties are connected with the search for the whereabouts of many manuscripts after 1945; "an extensive catalog of the holdings in Ukraine (and in Poland)" [167] is still wanting. There has been a start [165 esp. n.71]. The impressive achievements of the author are very clearly summarized in a chronological table [168/169]. One can eagerly anticipate further studies by Christian Weise.
A final essay about Nerses Akinian [9] concludes the series of studies. The Armenian archbishop of Vienna, Mesrob K. Krikorian writes very personally about his encounter and his friendship with the Mekhitarist father who died thirty-five years ago, and who was a great philologist and authority on manuscripts. Already in 1930, Akinian had described the LG in a slender publication (Armenian with a German summary). He was most probably able to see the LG himself two years later.

The Title. The editors might have presumably discussed the formulation of the book’s title in greater depth. Thus a few questions remain for me. In my opinion, the chapter subtitle is not the ideal place to discover that, in addition to “Lemberg Gospel,” “Gospel of Skevra” is also used. The nomenclature should have been clarified at the outset, if not, indeed, appearing in the title or subtitle. Along with its denomination “Gospel of Skevra” it might have been worth adding the year of its production, since there are other gospels from the same monastery, at least one splendid one among others [cf. 129 u.ö]. Akinian had entitled his description of the manuscript, “The Skevra-Gospel from the year 1197”. Obviously today the indication of the manuscript as the “Lemberg Gospel” has gained acceptance, above all, about its reception in the area of art history.

Whether the indication “Illuminated Manuscript” in the subtitle is appropriate, is questionable. It implies that the focus is on the magnificent layout and less on the text of the Gospel. It is altogether symptomatic, that magnificently illuminated Gospels are all too quickly valued and studied as works of art, that the textual research is so often set aside. For Christian Hannick must also note, “We are lacking an annotated translation of the old Armenian Gospel text in which the independent exegetical value of this version is emphasized. He speaks further of the “elucidation of the Greek spectrum of variants,” through the old Armenian version [33]. Whether the relatively late LG can be profitable in this endeavor remains to be seen.

The table of contents inappropriately combines the select bibliography [177] and the index of sigla (better: index of abbreviations). Likewise, it has subsumed under the title “Register” the index of manuscripts [179-181] and that of personal names [182-185].

Two maps are added to the publication [187ff]: Central and Eastern Europe in part, as well as the Kingdom of Lesser Armenia (End 12-14th c.). To have these appended is an aid for the reader. Some
names from Weise's essay [8] might have been included in the first map.

The volume concludes with a section of plates. Actually there are three such sections in the book: the last pages of the art historical treatise of von Euw [4] conclude with eight plates with 22 black and white illustrations; the essay on the colophons [5] ends with four plates, on which appear 14 black and white illustrations; the final part of the book has 29 color plates. Perhaps reference to the illustrations might have been made in both of the essays either after the title or in the first footnote. These plates also should have been paginated, since they have been counted.

In conclusion I would like to pose two questions concerning the page layout: Why must the headers of the left and right pages be identical? Here one might have otherwise provided additional information (perhaps the name of the author). Why were the black and white illustrations themselves not integrated into the running text? [4, 5] The additional expense could not have been inordinate.

**Summary**

- The present essays give solid information about the LG, the environment of its production, its codicological value, its art historical classification, its recent history.

- The "bibliophilistic" make-up and presentation of the volume are only appropriate to the subject of the book ("to offer to the eyes the sight of the living and life-givint words of Christ with exceedingly splendid adornment and magnificent brilliance," according to the main colophon as translated by Andrea B. Schmidt, p. 101).

- It is remarkable that the present commentary has embraced the works of several scholars in different fields. While this makes the job of editing no easier, it is ideally suited to the examination of the LG.

- In all of this the editors have raised the standard for future similar projects, especially for the commentary on the facsimile edition of the so-called *Codex Etchmiadzin* (Erevan, Matenadaran, cod. 2374), a tetra-evangelion from the year 989 [published in 2001].

Reviewed by Roberta Ervine

Gabriella Uluhogian’s meticulous scholarship needs no introduction to the armenological public. Her distinguished career has made her one of the great Armenian women scholars of this century, and many of the best armenologists in Europe have been formed under her tutelage. This latest volume in Professor Uluhogian’s extensive works, devoted to the presentation and analysis of a seventeenth century map of Armenian religious sites, is an exceptional pleasure to read, and of great potential benefit to many fields of study.

*Un’antica Mappa dell’Armenia* was published in the context of the celebrations on the 1700\(^{th}\) anniversary of Armenia’s conversion to Christianity. The map which it reproduces, the *Tabula Corographica Armenica* (rot.24) in the University of Bologna collection, was drawn in 1691 by Eremia Çelepi Kömurjian at the request of the Italian diplomat L.F. Marsili and illustrated by Eremia’s son Malakia the Priest. From the book’s beautiful format through the fine reproductions to the very readable print of the handy marginal footnotes, this volume is a worthy commemoration of that historic turning point and its profound influence on Armenian history, culture and sacred geography. If, as Uluhogian maintains, the map is in fact the *Geography* of Eremia Çelepi, often referred to in the literature but until now presumed lost, its value is all the greater.

The map embodies the principle of Armenia’s historical continuity within and without the homeland: its religious faith as maintained by the Church’s great institutions. It represents a symbolic as well as a physical geography. There are no lines of latitude or longitude. In the ancient tradition of maps, East is at the top, and west at the bottom. Large bodies of water and important mountains are indicated, but the main focus of the map is on the spiritual sites, laid out in a way which emphasizes the pervasiveness of Armenian religious presence and the linkage between the sites and the great Church administrative centers.

The map was viewed by Professor Uluhogian in 1991 in the context of an exhibition; over the next six years she published articles
dealing with various aspects of its significance. The map was exhibited again in 1999 in the Vatican. Now in this volume, the map is published and annotated in its entirety, and is thus made available to a much wider audience. The breadth of the intended readership is evident in all of the apparatus, from the pronunciation table at the front to the dual language appendices at the back. Information is offered at a very basic level for the general reader who has no Armenian literacy, but there is more than enough to interest the highly specialized scholar as well. In fact, the book is a special treasure trove of gems for anyone seriously interested in Armenian pilgrimage and hagiography.

Following a brief preface, the volume begins with a pronunciation chart offering in four columns the capital, and minuscule forms of the Armenian letters, their transliteration according to the Hübschmann–Meillet system, and a pronunciation guide with reference to German, French and Italian equivalents.

The first pages of the Introduction which follows modestly call the volume "a work in progress": a claim made possible by the range of the map’s implications for future study of Armenian pilgrimage, holy sites, episcopal geography and Ottoman history. The map portrays important cities, episcopal sees, monasteries (with an olive branch designating institutions for men and a palm, those for women) martyria, and saints' tombs. It has been color coded to show at a glance those places pertaining to the catholicosal sees of Cilicia, in green; Aght’amar, in blue; Ganjasar, in yellow; and Ejmiacin, in red. Martyria and significant tombs are marked in gold. In addition, there are several ornamental frames containing text of particular historical interest.

The main body of the Introduction is divided into five parts: the first, by Laura Miani, describes the history of the University of Bologna library, in whose collection the map resides, and the life of its oriental manuscript collection's founder, L.F. Marsili. A man of arms and sciences much involved in the wars against Turkey which occupied the second half of the seventeenth century, Marsili brought back from his campaigns valuable manuscripts, including maps. His collection was subsequently enriched by other donors, notably Pope Benedetto XIV.

Part II deals with the relationship between Eremia Çelepi and Marsili. Çelepi was born in 1637 to a family which emigrated to Istanbul. His father became a priest, receiving his consecration to holy orders in Jerusalem, in the year following Eremia’s birth. The family
maintained a long-standing relationship with Jerusalem, in whose Armenian church politics Eremia later became deeply involved.

Eremia lived in a period when Armenia was once again divided, this time between the Safavids of Persia and the Ottoman Turks. The situation was further complicated for the two empires’ Armenian populations by the rivalries between the Patriarchates of Jerusalem and Constantinople and by an attempt on the part of Jerusalem’s patriarch Eliazar of Aintab to set up an independent catholicosate for the governance of Armenians in Ottoman territory. Eremia Çelepi played a role in all these rivalrous machinations. He wrote prolifically about them, and about the Constantinople of his day, in Armenian and Turkish.

Marsili was born in 1658, making him Eremia's much younger contemporary. His first visit to Istanbul in 1679, at the age of twenty-one, coincided with the visit there of the Armenian Catholicos Yakob Jilyayeci, en route to Rome, and with his death there. Whether or not he knew Çelepi then, he certainly had contact with Armenians in the capital. Marsili came again to Turkey in 1691, and his acquaintance with Eremia dates at least from this time. So frequent did Marsili's visits become that he purchased a house in Istanbul, where he carried out his scientific work in the time allowed by his delicate diplomatic missions.

It was in 1691 that Marsili commissioned Eremia to produce this map. Since the writing on the map is entirely in Armenian, one assumes that, if it was not commissioned merely as a curiosity, Marsili had access to the knowledge requisite to use it. Unedited papers in the Venice collection describe Çelepi's pride at being asked to supply a document which would show that, despite the degradations of Persians, Caliphs, Mamluks, and Turks the Armenians still possessed so many monasteries. In fact, he lists in one of the map's historical texts the names of the various marauding powers no thanks to whom Armenian religious life survived and flourished. Of the maps of "Persia, India and Anatolia" also requested by Marsili, no trace remains. It is not certain that they were ever made. Eremia's eldest son, Ambakum (ordained a celibate priest with the name of Grigor) died in 1692 and this family tragedy may have impeded Çelepi's literary output. His chronological history of events in his own lifetime, begun in 1648, stops in 1690, and there are no other literary works from his pen until the year of his
death, 1695, when he produced a concise history of the Ottoman sultans.

Part III of the introduction deals with the history and organization of the Armenian Church, emphasizing the history of the major ecclesiastical centers featured in the map: the Catholicosates of Ejmiacim, Ganjasar (continuation of the ancient Caucasian Albanian See), Aght’amar, and Cilicia, and the Patriarchates of Jerusalem and Istanbul. Cyprus, the Crimea and Poland are also dealt with briefly. The devotion of more time and space to this section would have been welcome, as the overall context it provides for the specific sites is most important.

Part IV comprises an essay by Pavel Tchobanyan on Armenian pilgrimage. This section is the book’s weakest link, as it attempts to give a cursory outline of the entire gamut of Armenian pilgrimage traditions inside and outside Armenia rather than concentrating on things more directly pertinent to the map. Pre-Christian pilgrimage sites mentioned in Agafangelos and Movses Xorenci; national religious sites associated with St. Gregory the Illuminator, Mesrop Maštoč, Yovhannēs Ojneči and others; the exportation of relics such as that of St. Gregory to Naples; Jerusalem pilgrimage and Anastasius’ list of Jerusalem holy sites, the building of the seventh-century national sanctuaries during the interval when Jerusalem pilgrimage waned, the resumption of Jerusalem pilgrimage, and Armenian pilgrimage to Europe are all touched upon. A brief section on the organization of pilgrimages gives information gleaned from four colophons from the seventeenth and early eighteenth century. Tchobanyan’s references to MM 1079 and 8727 pique the interest and make the reader wish more use of them had been made in this section.

Part V deals with the actual reading of the map. It draws attention to the great emphasis placed by the map on the region of Lake Van, where the most ancient Grigorid Christian sites were clustered in the provinces of Taron and Turuberan. Not only are the sites themselves indicated, but there are notes on the natural phenomena of the area: the birds which lay their eggs on the island of Artez, and the seasons during which the fish called tarex are caught and dried. By comparison, the numerous Armenian sites in Jerusalem and the Holy Lands receive little elaboration. The historical accuracy of the map is also pointed out: for example, the bell tower of Ejmiacim’s cathedral, built only in 1682, is portrayed.
There are some preliminary indications of the map's sources. Vardan Arewelči's *Geography*, a work much copied in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, is one. Another is the apocryphal Acts of the Apostles Bartholomew and Judah. The matter of Ottoman Armenian geographical traditions and sources, as well as the interesting question of what guiding literature was available to pilgrims in seventeenth and eighteenth century Istanbul, would repay further study in the future.

Descriptions are also given of the various types of religions institutions marked on the map: the nature of *vank’, anapat*, and *uxt* are all discussed. The usefulness of the map's orthography for an understanding of West Armenian phonetic changes is also mentioned, and the presence of foreign words, especially Turkish, is pointed out.

A combined list of abbreviations and general bibliography concludes the introductory portion of the volume.

The main body of the book is devoted, of course, to the reproduction and annotation of the map itself. As the divider between introduction and plates a full, pull-out reproduction of the map is given followed by a modern map with as many of the equivalent sites as possible indicated on it. The full map is then divided into quadrants, which are enlarged as separate reproductions. On each quadrant the individual sites and pieces of text are numbered. Beginning on the page facing each quadrant map, every piece of text is then given in numerical order in typescript (with the abbreviations expanded), and translated. There are extensive and very useful footnotes for the over eight hundred entries. Surprisingly, the footnotes for the Jerusalem quadrant are least elaborate, despite (or perhaps because of) the large amount of information available concerning them. Mount Sepuh receives special attention, as do the various monasteries and locations where healings were reputed to take place.

The volume concludes with appendices listing episcopal sees, administrative centers, and proper names. Of the two proper names appendices, the first is in Armenian, preserving the spellings as they appear on the map. The second gives the same names in transliteration.

One might argue that the best books are those which instead of offering conclusions open up new areas of investigation. By that reckoning, this is an extraordinary work, providing a starting point for much further research in relation to all aspects of Armenian sacred geography. One hopes that its publication will encourage the reproduction and study of other unpublished maps, such as the one in
the collection of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, and that the invitation it issues to future scholarship will be taken up at the earliest opportunity.

Reviewed by George Bournoutian

The Iranian Revolution of 1979 has had a great impact on the non-Muslim religious minorities of Iran. Eliz Sanasarian, an Associate Professor of Political Science at the University of Southern California has done a superb job in explaining the history, experiences and the response of the Armenian, Assyrian, Chaldean, Jewish, Zoroastrian, Baha’i, and Iranian Christians in the last two decades since the formation of the Islamic Republic of Iran. Her findings gathered from personal interviews with keys figures of these communities as well as primary documents.

Scholars of modern Iran, including this reviewer, are well aware of the role some of these minorities have had in the transformation of Iran during the reign of Mohammad Reza Shah Pahlavi (1941-1979). The Armenians, Jews and Baha’is in particular played an important role in the Westernization of the urban centers, especially Tehran. The fate of these communities following the revolution has not been detailed however. Professor Sanasarian’s work has filled that gap admirably. The Islamic Revolution had a catastrophic effect on the Baha’is – their community has, for all intents and purposes, disappeared completely. Those Iranians who had converted to Christianity following the efforts of various Protestant missionaries have also been decimated. Since Islam is seen as the last revelation, those Muslims (Baha’is and Persian Christians) who turned away from Islam were apostates and their penalty for refusing to recant was death. The Jews of Iran suffered as well. The hostility of the regime towards Israel rendered them suspect. Many Jews emigrated and the rest lead a precarious existence. The Zoroastrians gained special favor during the reign of the last Shah, who tried to adopt the splendor of the Achaemenid Persian Empire.

The Armenians, the largest non-Muslim minority in Iran, have had an interesting history of their own. Reza Shah (1924-1941), who admired Kemal Ataturk, subjected them to discrimination. His son, the last Shah, restored their internal autonomy and the Armenian community flourished despite the fact that an Armenian minority worked with the Tudeh or Communist Party of Iran. Although the
Armenians have faced a number of problems in the last two decades, their community overall has been privileged. They have been permitted to conduct public demonstrations commemorating the Armenian Genocide. Armenians schools and numerous churches have continued their community activities and Armenian members of parliament have been vocal supporters of the regime and have distanced themselves from the small Armenian Catholic and Protestant groups. Furthermore, many Armenians served and died in the Iran-Iraq War, thus proving their loyalty and love for the new State.

Professor Sanasarian astutely remarks that during the Shah's tenure, all Iranians were viewed, at least on the surface, as fellow countrymen. This was especially the case in urban centers. After the revolution, the term *aqaliat* (minority) has gained prominence despite complaints from non-Muslim members of parliament who would prefer the term communities. Muslim citizens are addressed as Muslim sisters and brothers, hence a gap between countrymen and minorities. Ironically, as Professor Sanasarian observed some Muslims are envious of the social freedoms enjoyed by the minorities and consider them better off.

Despite minor flaws, such as the transliteration system and the choice of endnotes instead of footnotes, this is an important and original book which makes a significant contribution to the social history of Iran following the Islamic revolution. It is a must for all historians specializing in the history of modern Iran and the Islamic Republic.

Reviewed by Edward G. Mathews, Jr.

In the late seventies, Profs. Robert W. Thomson and Kevork B. Bardakjian, then both at Harvard University, conceived a project to compile a bibliographical guide for classical, medieval, and modern Armenian literature. For various reasons, it became impossible to continue the project as a single, combined work. It was decided that each should be responsible for his own specialty, with the year 1500 as the cutoff date. As a result, Thomson published his *A Bibliography of Classical Armenian Literature to 1500 AD* (Corpus Christianorum; Turnhout: Brepols) separately in 1995. With the volume under review here Bardakjian has now completed the original project. Bardakjian has followed Thomson in providing bibliographical information on the nearly 400 authors he treats but, as the subtitle reveals, he has gone a step further by appending to this bibliographical information an introductory history of the literature of the period covered. Consequently, Bardakjian, the Marie Manoogian Chair of Armenian Language and Literature and the director of the Armenian Studies Program at the University of Michigan, has provided both scholar and student of Modern Armenian Literature, with "an unsurpassed guide to five centuries of Armenian literature" (from advertising blurb).

The volume commences with the general history of Armenian literature (Section I, pp. 21-252). One chapter is devoted to each century, and each treats the major Armenian authors both from Armenia and from the diaspora. In each of these chapters Bardakjian first provides general background information on the historical, social, cultural, and religious milieu in which these authors wrote, as well as the various national and foreign factors that influenced their writings. These general comments are then followed by short "bio-literary" entries, in relative chronological order, for each of the Armenian authors who fall in that particular century. The authors are distinguished according to four categories: Eastern, Western, Soviet Armenian, and post-Genocide diasporan. Each of these sections, while
not intended to be exhaustive, nevertheless provides a wealth of detail and analysis that is not to be found in any other single volume. Cross-references to earlier authors, to sources of influence, and thematic discussions of the writings of more than 150 poets, historians, and monks, among others, aid in offering a stimulating portrait of prominent Armenian authors since the sixteenth century.

The second half of Bardakjian's work is an extensive bibliographical tool that is in itself to be regarded as a major reference work (pp. 253-648). This part is comprised of four separate sections. In Section 2 (Bio-Biographical Entries: Authors Born between 1500 and 1920), Bardakjian provides for each Armenian writer, here listed in alphabetical order, detailed references to printed editions of their collected works as well as of separately published individual texts. He provides the same details for translations, again of both collected and individual works, in the major western languages, including Russian. These references are then followed by an alphabetical listing of the secondary literature on each author. Section 3 (Bibliographies and Reference Literature) lists all the major works of compiled bibliographies, general reference works, as well as studies that deal with specific, shorter time periods. Section 4 (Anthologies) is a listing of the general anthologies of Armenian literature, again both those in the original Armenian and those in translation. Section 5 (Special Topics) then treats such specialized genres as Ašuls (Minstrels), Folklore, Literary Influences, and Prosody. Extensive indices containing names, pseudonyms, and place-names complete this indispensable volume.

It is impossible to describe the breadth of learning, the wealth of information, and the prodigious amount of work that went into the preparation of this volume. One cannot thank Bardakjian enough for making available this invaluable reference work. It will undoubtedly stand for years as an indispensable guide for both scholars and students of Armenian literature. As one who spends most of his time in Classical Armenian literature, I have found Bardakjian's volume to be a gold mine of information for the non-specialist; for such as myself and others more conversant in the field, it will clearly be a standard reference work for teaching and for research. Together with the volume of Thomson mentioned above, it will be a fundamental vade mecum for anyone interested in any aspect of Armenian literature.
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