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THE ARMENIANS, THE HOLY CROSS, AND DIONYSIUS BAR SALIBI

James R. Russell

(The conference dedicated to the 1700th anniversary of the baptism of the Armenians, at the Armenian Diocese in New York, for which this paper was to be delivered, was postponed from September to December 2001 because of the attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon. I dedicate it now to the memory of all the innocents and heroes lost.)

The extreme, even unusual, reverence in which Armenians hold both the image of the Holy Cross, and diverse consecrated crosses – xač’k’ar “Cross-stones”, reliquaries, etc. – to which supernatural powers are attributed, is commonly known. In many cases, instances of reverence involve the formal, ecclesiastical faith and a non-dogmatic, semi-magical folk religion equally: Classical and vernacular narratives, with socially important differences, of the Karos Cross survive side by side. The theft by Kurds of the Karos xač’ in balladry reflects the topos of the furta sacra and we find it also in the history of the Hac’uneac’ Cross. In many talismanic manuscripts the shrines called t’ux manuk, after a “black youth” of Indo-European mythological antiquity

---

(in India, he is Balakrishna; in Greece, Melanthos), appear in texts that are themselves cross-hatched to form numerous crosses, lists of the Holy Crosses of Armenia. Poets from St. Gregory of Narek in the 10th century to Bedros Tourian in the 19th have composed cruciform poems in which the parts of the Cross and of Christ are described in their proper places by key words, to create a verbal and iconic picture. There is mythologization of known crosses in folk poetry: an actual Cross called paterazmi, "of battle", enters the Epic of Sasun as the xač’ patrazin, a wholly mythical object which flies down to the forearm of a warrior-hero, exactly like the magic bāzūbund, "armband", of Rostam and his kin in the Iranian epic Sāh-nāme. Making the sign of the Cross is the crucial magical act in recitations of the folk prayer-book containing an abridgement of the Repentance of St. Cyprian of Antioch — who figures in magical literature from Coptic Egypt to the necromantic manual of Roger Bacon. Given the special centrality of the symbol to Armenians it is scarcely surprising, then, that one should find survivals of local cultural substrates in the iconography of the

---

2 See J.R. Russell, "The Armenian Shrines of the Black Youth (t'ux manuk)," *Le Museon* vol. 111.3-4, 1998, pp. 319-343. For additional, subsequent studies, see S.B. Harut'yunyan and A.A. K'alan't'aryan, eds., *T'ux manuk: asta'qan naq'ter*, Erevan: Hayastan, 2001, where my article is also reprinted (but without the illustrations and with numerous typographical errors).


4 The tale of the repentance of the sorcerer Cyprian of Antioch, ca. 300, will be best known in the West in the *Life of St. Justina in the Legenda Aurea* of Iacobus de Voragine; on the Armenian magical scrolls and books of the Kiprianos, see Jane Wingate, "The Scroll of Cyprian: an Armenian Family Amulet," *Folk-Lore* 41.2, 1930, pp. 169-187. The prayers of both Cyprian and Justina are included in the first Armenian printed book, the *Urbat'agirk'* of Yakob Metapart, Venice, 1512. A Coptic magical MS. contains a perfunctory, rather dejected autobiography of the saint in the first person, followed by a lively and lewd love defixion of precisely the sort he had ostensibly renounced, with full magical instructions, voces magicae, and a schematic sigil of Gabriel (the angel being, presumably, the magician's sole concession to his new-found Christian faith); see Marvin Meyer and Richard Smith, eds., *Ancient Christian Magic: Coptic Texts of Ritual Power*, San Francisco: Harper, 1994, text 73, pp. 153-158 (tr. by Howard M. Jackson). A mass to Cyprian must be ordered as part of the preparation of a magic circle, according to the De nigromancia associated with the English occultist and scholar Roger Bacon: see Richard Kieckhefer, *Forbidden Rites: A Necromancer's Manual of the Fifteenth Century*, University Park, PA: Penn. State Univ. Press, 1997, p. 171.
Cross; and strongly idiosyncratic features particular to Armenia in the rites surrounding it.

On the most archaic level, the pre-Armenian višap-steles and Urartean inscribed steles that fulfilled sacred purposes were simply re-used as xač'k'ars. But there is no indication beyond the general locus of holiness these objects possessed that specific iconographic values were remembered and transferred. The Zoroastrian stratum, representing a highly civilized, ethical, and intellectually sophisticated culture, presents a different case: the Mazdeans used a pair of wings as a sign of sacredness to frame an important symbol, and at Duin the Armenian cross rises from such a pair of wings. It is plain the Armenian Christians simply appropriated a known sign to new purposes. Subsequently the wings were stylized as acanthus or other leaves, in harmony with the pan-Christian vision of the Cross, much elaborated in exegetical works, as the p'ayt kenac', "tree of life". There is a striking parallel case in Christian Georgia, where local coins reproduce all the features of the Sasanian issues. On the reverse of the latter, two guardians flank a stepped Zoroastrian altar atop which the sacred fire is ablaze: the Georgians simply replace the fire with the Cross. It is a salient feature of Sasanian Zoroastrianism that, although the god Ohrmazd might be portrayed anthropomorphically in bas-relief, the cult statues of the divinities that the Arsacids had allowed in temples were forbidden and replaced by sacred fires. In general Armenians have shown an aversion, both to the painted icons typical of Orthodox Christian art, and to the portrayal of Christ's crucified body upon the Cross. The center of a cross is called in Armenian akin, a word which means eye, source, and jewel; areg- akin, a marked poetic term for the Sun, pairs akin as "source, spring" with the genitive of arew "Sun". Often a sunburst appears on the akin of Armenian crosses. This is doctrinally impeccable, since Christ is indeed the areg akin ardarut'ean; but it is also a neat co-optation of the Zoroastrian aniconic fire to a Christian purpose.

---

5 See J.R. Russell, "The Scepter of Tiridates," Le Musée vol. 114.1-2, pp. 187-215, esp. p. 193 & n. 17, with pl. 2. In the summer of 2002 I visited Mughni monastery in Aštarak, where in the garden near the church there is a stele with just such a winged cross, on a pediment with the same. I was unable to ascertain the provenance of these monuments.
For the top of the cross the Iranian word t'ag is employed, meaning "crown", and crowns indeed are to be found at the holiest Zoroastrian fires even now. The lower shaft is called by the Iranian term bun, which means both "base, foundation, bottom" and "tree, stock". Again, the cross seems superimposed upon the altar-base bearing the fire — sometimes in Armenian art the Cross stands on three steps, like the base of a fire altar — but again, too, the Christian symbolism is irrefutable. The Cross is, as we have noted already, the tree of life, which has a trunk. So the basic Armenian cross, and the predominant one, is of a type without the depiction of a human figure.

There are a number of Armenian cross-stones that portray Christ crucified and are called Amenap'rk'ič', "Savior of all": the historian Lewond reports that Aşot p'atrik brought "from the West" a kendanagreal patker, "life-portrait image" (Arm. kendanagir is a calque upon Greek zōgraphē, "portrait") of the mardelut'īwn K'r'īstosi, "human incarnation of Christ" and named the monastery of the Holy Savior after it (Surb P'rk'ič'). Vardan connects to it the hymn (šarakān) Zors ėst patkeri, translated with commentary below, which some attribute to Isahak Jorap'orec'i, but which Abp. Yovsēp'ean, in his pioneering article, sensibly attributed rather to Grigor Magistros Pahlawuni, who built Havuc' T'ar, where the image was kept — it is in Ejmiacin now. The images called Amenap'rk'ič' derive, then, from a prototype from the Greek West to which an Armenian writer with notably Byzantine sympathies paid homage in his hymn; and they achieved their greatest popularity in the thirteenth century, precisely at a time when Armenian contacts with the iconolatrous Catholic West were at their apex. Thereafter, except in manuscript painting, it is as though the depiction of the suffering Christ goes against the grain of the artist's own cultural conceptions and beliefs: on one such late cross from the 16th or 17th century, Christ seems to stand firmly in front of the Cross rather than being suspended from it; and, far from being nailed down, His powerful hands — the hands that are

ever extolled as having created the heavens and the earth, that judge the quick and the dead, etc. – are raised in a sovereign gesture of benediction. The Armenian understanding of the Cross as a symbol of victory (unremarkable in itself, when one recalls Constantine’s vision, but again cf. the Zoroastrian fire, which is *verathragan*, “victorious”) has entirely overwhelmed and displaced the theme of Christ’s suffering upon it. Again, the concept of the Cross as a victorious weapon against evil is pan-Christian; so in seeking a special, Armenian feature one must again suggest that nuance and emphasis, rather than difference from other Christian types, or even similar types for which one must take into account a radically different substratum,⁷ are the criteria upon which one must rely, keeping in mind again the Zoroastrian substrate – the “victorious” fire. I have noted the “battle” Cross; in the rite of anointment (*awcumj*) of a Cross, it is hailed as *amenayalt*, “all-victorious”, the *zën amrut’ean* “stout weapon” with which Christ smote the sinuous (*kamakor*, “crooked”), poisonous (*t’unawor*) dragon (*višap*) and fanged maw of hell (*xayt’oc’k’ dźoxoc*),⁸ a *pahapan* “protector” and

---

⁷ The Irish, too, have *xæč’k’ars* of a sort, for instance, but the substratum is different. Or again, Armenians portray the *Amenap’rkic* with the sun and moon to either side of the Cross. “Better to carve suns and moons on the joints of crosses/ as was done in my district...” writes the Polish Lithuanian poet Czeslaw Miłosz, cited in the *New York Review of Books*, 20 Dec. 2001, p. 18. On a certain level these symbols mean the same thing; but originally they did not.

⁸ A human figure in bas-relief, most probably St. Gregory the Illuminator, is shown with snakes hovering at either shoulder and threatening his head with their fangs, on the drum of the 10th-century Bagratid Cathedral of the Holy Apostles at Kars (see this writer’s discussion of the image in the forthcoming *Proceedings* of the UCLA Conference on Kars and Ani, ed. by R. Hovannisian). The *homme aux serpents* (there is a *femme*, also: see Anthony Weir and James Jerman, *Images of Lust: Sexual Carvings on Medieval Churches*, London: Routledge, 1999, pp. 58-79) is encountered often in mediaeval European church carvings, where the intent appears to be to warn the parishioner about the punishments hell has in store for the lustful and avaricious. And indeed the rich man *Dives* is so portrayed in mediaeval Armenian MSS. However in the Iranian milieu of early Armenian Christianity, the man with snakes was pre-eminently the accursed Aždahak, from whose shoulders serpents grew. St. Gregory, during his imprisonment in the pit of Xor Virap at Artašat, endured and overcame the threat of snakes just as Daniel had survived the lions. So the program of Gregory confronted by snakes iconographically echoes the popular image of Daniel with his lions to either side, making the scene specifically Armenian. It also *inverts* the Iranian image, turning a defeat into a victory. And Gregory overcoming the snakes recapitulates Christ’s harrowing of the dragon of hell. (At the University of California
črag luso'y "lamp of light" (the word črag, New Persian čirāy, is Parthian and would have been used by Arsacid Zoroastrians of the little holy lamps of fire kindled at home that modern Parsis call diva in Gujarati).

So I would suggest that the Amenap'rk'ič' type, the cross with the crucified Christ upon it, is the exception that proves the rule. The cross without the corpus Christi is the essential Armenian type, and the reason for this, I suggest, is the appropriation of iconoclastic Zoroastrian iconography of the sacred fire. This seems to be a possible explanation, also, for the general lack of enthusiasm for painted icons in Armenian Christianity. Again, there is a significant exception to this: portrayals of the Blessed Virgin Mary with the Christ child. The pre-Christian precedent for this type in the Anatolian area is the scene of the mother goddess Cybele with her son Attis; and numerous terracotta figurines of the pair have been found at ancient Artašat. The Zoroastrian Armenians might have considered these to be portrayals of their own much-revered goddess Anahit; and some of her store of honorific epithets have entered the vocabulary of the Armenian Christian cult of the Virgin Mary. Images of the Virgin and Child in Armenia are a powerful exception to the general aniconism of the cult of the Cross, though painted icons are rare. One of these is the well-known C'arxap'an surb Astuacacin, "Evil-defeating Holy Mother of God", a modern painting whose original is at Armaš near Constantinople and cannot leave the Turkish Republic; believers consider its miraculous properties to inhere also in copy that hangs in a niche in the Holy Cross Church of Armenia in New

in Los Angeles a Mr. Raphael Mathevosian, of the Institute of History of the "National" Academy of Sciences in Erevan, permitted a "special rebuttal" before the discussion period rose to exorcise this writer in the severest possible terms for my pernicious ignorance in failing to recognize that the Holy Apostles cannot possibly have been depicted on the Bagratid church named after them; no, all of these figures must be regarded as secular donors, and the snakes are a Bagratid totem. It is nice there is someone who "knows", and assurance of such knowledge is assisted by the firm refusal of Mr. Mathevosian and his colleagues to take into consideration the history of Christian art from the shores of the Atlantic to the mountains of the Caucasus.)
York, where pilgrims have hung silver ex votos before the sacred image.\textsuperscript{9}

I have alluded to the epithets accorded the Cross in a rite of the Armenian Church: that of the blessing and anointing of crosses. Conybeare provides a translation of the rite, to which are appended the texts of arguments by Armenian clerics to Greek and Melchite Syrian critics in defense of the practice. These date from the ninth to twelfth centuries.\textsuperscript{10} In 1931, Mingana published The Work of Dionysius Barsalibi Against the Armenians, in which the Syrian bishop, d. 1171, who had lived in Melitene and thus had first-hand knowledge of Armenian customs, criticized Armenians for baptizing crosses and bells (that is, the wooden planks called semantron that are struck to summon people to prayer: the rite of consecration of this in the Mec Maštoc’ immediately precedes that for crosses), and argued that crosses are images, not worthy of worship but meant only to remind us of their archetypes, just as paintings of the saints are intended to do. He condemned the Armenians also for practicing hereditary ordination to the priesthood, for using chrism (Arm. miwrōn, “myron”) to heal people and animal of disease, for having their clergy abstain from pork, and for using unmixed wine for the Eucharist – as Jews, pagans (Syriac ʰḥn̄) and Sun-worshippers (sgdy l-šms̄) do in their sacrifices.\textsuperscript{11} For such customs, Dionysius exclaimed in an outpouring of Christian charity, the Armenians are pigs (ḥzyr̄), even as their “head” (r’s, rather than “king”) Tiridates was a boar (lit. “wild pig”, ʰḥzyr br̄). The Sun-worshippers of the passage are most likely the small Zoroastrian community of Armenia who survived down to recent days, called in Armenian sources Arewordik’, the

\textsuperscript{9} The Holy Cross church, on West 187th Street in Washington Heights, published a commemorative booklet for the celebration of 14-15 Sept. 1996, with a color reproduction of the icon on the cover, English title Charkhapan Soorp Asdvadzadzin.

\textsuperscript{10} F.C. Conybeare, Rituale Armenorum, Oxford, 1905, pp. 39-53; Armenian text in Girk’ mec Maštoc’ koč‘ec‘e’al, Constantinople, 1807, pp. 204-213 (I gratefully acknowledge the help of Aram Arkun, Zohrab Information Center, Diocese of the Armenian Church of America, New York, who supplied to me a photocopy of this rare book).

Children of the Sun, many of whom St. Nersēs the Graceful, an exact contemporary of Dionysius, converted to Christianity. In the Arabic- and Syriac-speaking southern parts of the country they were called—by Dionysius—Arabic śamsīya.  

---

12 See J.R. Russell, *Zoroastrianism in Armenia*, Harvard Iranian Series 5, Cambridge, MA, 1987, ch. 15. In that work I cited a letter from a woman who recalled that in Marsovan before 1915 there had been a Mr. Areworean and a place called Arewordii gerezman, "Sun-child’s grave". To the dossier of testimonia on the community I can now add, tentatively, the contents of an E-mail communication of 27 Aug. 2001 from Mr. Shabah Mirakian of Toronto. He had written to me that his mother recalled meeting a man who was a Sun-worshipper. When I pressed him for details, he offered this reply: "Her recollection is that in the spring of 1970...she was volunteering at Los Angeles County Hospital and one of the nurses asked her to speak to a man who was Armenian and had no visitors. My mother visited the man (who to her recollection never mentioned his name and she did not take the opportunity to look for it) and stated that she was Armenian. The man replied (in Western Armenian) that he did not like Armenians. He then smiled and told her that he was 'Sassuntzee' [Sasunc'i, i.e., a native of Sasun- J.R.R.], she stated that her family was from Zeitun. He replied that she had not understood, he was saying that he was a 'Tontragetzee' [Tondrak'e't, i.e., a follower of the Tondrakite heresy- J.R.R.] and asked if she knew what that was. She did not want to offend the man, so she replied that she had read about it. The man laughed and told her she was a liar. He stated that no one knew about it because the Armenians (implying Christian Armenians) did not want anyone to know about it. He stated that he worshipped the sun and that his family had been driven out of the main area of Sassun to a village on the outskirts where there were many 'Tontragetzee'-s. He stated that the Armenians persecuted his family (he used the words 'mezee haladzetzeen' [mezi halacce'in- J.R.R.] and that he did not tell anyone of his religious beliefs. He said that he acted as though he were a Christian (he meant the Apostolic Church—my mother is Armenian Evangelical and asked which church he attended). He said that he was on his death bed and no one could hurt him any further so he could disclose this information. My mother never saw him again and her impression was that he had died soon after the conversation. My mother said that the man was definitely over 70 and could have been closer to 80, but his illness may have exaggerated the appearance of his age." In April 1995 I visited an elderly Armenian near San Diego, Mr. Bob Lion, who claimed to be a Paulician—that is, a member of a mediaeval heresy centered in Armenia that preceded the appearance of the Tondrakite heresy and seems in some respects to have been a precursor of it. I published a report on our discussion, together with a description of these heresies and the relationship of his beliefs to them ("The Last of the Paulicians," *Hask hayagaytakan taregirk*, new series 7-8, 1995-1996, Antelias, Lebanon, 1997, pp. 33-47). Mr. Lion's mother turned to the Sun in prayer every morning and spoke of the Arewordik'. Some writers identified the Paulicians with these, but Mr. Lion averred that they were different and lived in "another place" (p. 45; he himself was from Divrig, the ancient Paulician capital of Tephrice, near Sebastia/Sivas, and Sasun is certain another, very faraway, place from there). The heroes of Sasun in the epic always refer to Armenians an another, inferior people; and two of the four great heroes of the Epic are named Mher, that is, Mithra, the great Zoroastrian divinity closely associated with the Sun. Epistles and descriptions concerning these figures are plainly related to aspects of the Mithraic cult, which
The rants of the Syrian cleric fell on deaf ears. Armenians continued to offer the same reverence to the Cross as ever. In the centuries that followed, innumerable crosses were anointed, erected in stone across the landscape of Armenia, carved as trees of life upon world-mountains, above sickle-rayed disks of the Universe, traced with words as poems, intoned in lists that were themselves crosses on magical scrolls, sealed by readers of the Kiprianoς. The Holy Sign (מְנִי, a Parthian loan) was k’ařat’ew – a word as evocative of the four beating wings of an angel as of four arms outspread to bless the world – and at its heart was the shining eye of flame that was also a cooling spring of life, the ақ, sunburst at the crossroads of the dragon-slaying weapon of salvation. It is a profoundly Mazdean reception of the sign of Christ, without a scintilla of deviation from the complex and proper Christian symbolism. What is outside the Armenian mainstream is the symbolism of the Cross as an instrument of torture, a place of suffering. For even the hymn to the Amenap’rıkić, despite its telltale exploration of the crucial term kəndənaγir of the iconolater, is far from underscoring Christ’s physicality as agony; rather, it is suffused with the same lavish images of light and fire and victory that the children of the Children of the Sun received from their ancestors. That combined seamlessly with the teachings of their Arsacid Illuminator, Gregory son of Anak Surēn Pahlaw, seventeen centuries ago.

Spread to the Roman Empire from the Armenian area; so it is not surprising, and most welcome, to find Armenian Sun-worshippers hailing from Sasun within the twentieth century.
Those whom in your image you created,
You made of them your temple by their renewal.
The renewed from amongst us as temples
receive for your dwelling.
You grant to us, giver of life,
the living portrait (z-kendanagir) of your servile form,
conveying your uplifter of all
into the glory of your holy Trinity.
Save the son of your servant, whom above
the thrones of Rome you honored,
where they set the rock of faith,
of the foundation of the holy Church.
You who fashioned miraculously this final one,
made its shining foundation for your co-habitation,
the exultant and dazzling glory of this house,
this last, better than the first.

13 Arm. kendanagir is a calque on Gk. zôgraphê, 'painting'; but the translation seeks to
preserve the overtone of life itself rendered as an icon. In this line, too, "fit" has the
added sense of a dimension or stature (Arm. čap': the proportions of Christ's body
belong to the mystical geometry of the Divine economy.
Commentary on the hymn *Zors āst patkeri*:

The hymn envisages two stages in the perfection of man, two human types: first, his creation in Genesis in God’s image as Adam; then, his renewal by Christ's incarnation as a man (Arm. *mardelutʼiwn*). The human lot declines slowly from the first sin and expulsion from Eden to the nadir at which Christ arrives to elevate it far above the Garden, to Heaven, and the hymn follows this movement also. God, the giver (*təwot*) of life, amplifies both the life and the act of giving by bestowing grace (*šnorhes*) that One who is his *kendanagir*. The term, as we have already seen, is a calque upon Greek *zōgraphē* – portrait – and the Byzantine associations point to the image of the Amenap’rkič’, by a play on the elements of the term presenting justification for reverence to this icon, unusual for Armenians. The “image” (*patker*) of God in which the first man is made is inherently lifeless. It can be a statue, picture, or relief; but *kendanagir* encodes life itself (*kendani*, “living”) together with *gir*, writing, which can be understood to have overtones of Scripture, of Christ as the Logos (Arm. *ban*) incarnate. Believers renewed in Christ progress from being flat images to becoming three-dimensional temples (*tačar*) in which the Life, Christ, may establish His dwelling-place (*bnakutʼiwn*) – the body, Scripture tells us, is the Lord’s temple.

The meanness of that body before its glorification by Christ is reflected in the vanishing point of Christ’s kenosis, the assumption of a *cařayakan kerp*, “form of a slave”. This is the form visible upon the Cross; and from this nadir the hymn may move irresistibly towards its zenith, marking the upward movement with *ver-berot* “carrying up” and *vera-patuec’er* “you honored above”. The concluding lines juxtapose the divine dimensions of Christ’s body to resplendent images of thrones and of the Church, as though the temple were taking shape and furnishings before our eyes; and then there is a veritable sunburst of fiery splendor. An Armenian writing about the Cross cannot help it – the effulgence of the *akn* at its heart overwhelms. *Hraš* – “wonder” (<Avestan *fraša*-, “(visibly) wonderful”), *pʼayl* – “shine” (twice), *panc* – “rejoicing”, and *pʼārk’* – “glory” (from Iranian *farnah*-).
The final line explicitly contrasts the splendor of the Last to the lesser light of the First, and one must recall the old Biblical legend, well known to Armenians, of how Adam was stripped of his garment of light (Heb. 'ôr) and left to clothe himself in tenebrous garments of animal skin (Heb. 'ôr). So the luminous robe is restored; and not only does Christ dwell within the new Adam, but Adam clothes his own body in the light-garment that is Christ. St. Grigor Narekac'i, in ch. 65.2 of the Book of Lamentation (Matean olbergut'ean) implores God for just this salvific clothing. He asks for the sign of the Cross to strengthen the features of his face, for its seal of light to restore his beauty, for its Tree of Life to be traced upon his cheek, for its miracle to honor his brow and its sunburst (čaćanč') to touch his eyes – the latter image, referring to the sun often depicted on the center of the Cross, clearly fuses the akn of the Cross and the human eye of its worshipper. It is in this meditation, also, that Narekac'i declares the four arms of the Cross to harmonize the four warring elements in nature: Christ's incarnation alone pacifies those parts of which our bodies are compounded. Eznik Kołbac'i adumbrates this idea, but R.W. Thomson is surely right in considering it peculiarly Armenian.\(^1\) The idea of a luminous robe symbolic of the purified and perfected self has profound roots in Gnostic, Manichaean and other visionary systems that developed in the regions of the Arsacids and found Armenian followers, but that must be left for another discussion. Suffice it to observe here that the Armenian imitatio Christi is images of Sun and fire – where we began, and thus a good place to end.

---

VARDAN VARDAPET’S
SERMON ON THE TEN COMMANDMENTS

Roberta R. Ervine

The ten commandments have been treated with many different attitudes since Moses first brought the tables of the Law down from Mt. Sinai. By some they have been explained; by others, they have been explained away, or even parodied. There are cartoons and jokes created at their expense. One thinks of Arthur Hugh Clough’s cynical nineteenth-century poetic version of the seventh and eighth commandments in particular:

Adultery thou shalt not commit;
Advantage rarely comes of it.

Thou shalt not steal—how obsolete!
It’s much more lucrative to cheat.

Of course in Armenian literature, the subject of the decalogue is treated seriously, but nonetheless it is not an especially popular one. The commandments are mentioned briefly in pedagogical works, such as Vanakan Vardapet’s Questions and Answers, where the student learns that all ten commandments were written on each of the two tablets. And certainly the giving of the Law would be dealt with in commentaries on the Pentateuch, like Vardan’s.¹

It was quite surprising, however, to find an entire sermon devoted to the ten commandments in Jerusalem manuscript 372. This was all the more surprising because SJ372 calls itself a Tönapatjär. After all, a Tönapatjär, as its name implies, provides exegetical and homiletical material appropriate to the feasts of the liturgical year, and there is no feast of the ten commandments.

Jerusalem 372 is a fourteenth century manuscript produced in Surxaf, in the Crimea. I happened across it while making lists of the contents of various Tönapatjär, in hopes of eventually determining

¹ Thus far, I have been unable to consult a full copy of this work.
what might have been the contents of Samuēl Kamrjajoreči’s Ṭōnapatjai, created for bishop Anania of Aršarunik at the end of the tenth century, as distinguished from the later “editions” of Kirakos, made between 1253 and 1269, and of Vardan Arewelci.²

Jerusalem ms. 372’s apparently extraneous Sermon on the Ten Commandments is attributed to Vardan Arewelci, as are four other sermons in the same manuscript: a) To rejoice in the light is natural... b) From the Words of Paul on the Mystery of the Church c) On Paul’s Epistle to the Corinthians and d) a sermon for the Dormition of the Virgin which begins, All creatures shone in the effulgent light....

None of the other three Ṭōnapatjai in the Sts. James manuscript collection (SJ 154, 373 and 413) contains the Sermon on the Ten Commandments, although they all contain a quantity of Vardan material. The sermon’s absence from these other manuscripts might raise questions as to its authenticity, were it not that the contents of Ṭōnapatjai vary so widely. Even SJ327 and 373, which are contemporary with each other and come from the same area, differ almost completely from one another in content.³ As more of Vardan’s sermons are studied, a better picture of his homiletic style and vocabulary will emerge, aiding in the resolution of questions of authenticity.

It may be useful, as a first step in the development of such a picture, to consider the Sermon on the Ten Commandments in terms of its structure and some of its sources.

The sermon’s three-part structure is straightforward. After an introduction which answers certain questions that might arise in the listener’s mind when he hears the sermon’s text, the body of the sermon is devoted to a detailed exegesis of the ten commandments in

---

² It goes without saying that this determination is still a long way off

³ It begins to appear that while the Ṭōnapatjai was a recognized literary genre, it was not simply a standardized collection that went through three editions—those of Samuel, Kirakos and Vardan. Rather, many clergies whose duties included preaching on most of the major feasts made up quite individual Tōnapatjars that served their own specific needs. It may be that some compilers like Vardan or his disciples, chose to include more of their own or their mentors’ works, while other editors preferred to rely on a selection of choice compositions from more varied sources. Something comparable was going on in Europe at around the same time: one thinks of the early twelfth century figures Gueric of Igny and Isaac of Stella, who also produced their own equivalents of the Ṭōnapatjai. Much research remains to be done in this genre specifically, as indeed in the more general area of Armenian homiletics.
sequence, with explanations of their Old Testament significance plus relevant theological and linguistic considerations. This is followed by a conclusion which runs through all ten commandments again, briefly giving each one’s moral implications in the spirit of Christ’s well-known explication of the better righteousness, found in Matthew chapter five: “The Law says ‘thou shalt not kill,’ but I tell you that whoever shall be angry at his brother without cause is liable to judgment.” and so on. In Vardan’s summary, for example, the injunction honor thy father and thy mother includes not only physical parents but all those who are in loco parentis to us: kings, princes, judges, and all one’s elders.  

The introduction accomplishes three things: it involves the audience, answers implied questions on the part of the audience, and provides for the audience a dramatization of the historical setting in which the commandments were given. The introduction as a whole displays a fine rhetorical technique, indicating that it was actually delivered aloud.

The sermon opens with the preacher’s intoning of the ten commandments in an abbreviated form. What more dramatic beginning could there be rhetorically than the words, “I am the Lord thy God!” After the recitation of the decalogue, one imagines, there would have been a pause for effect. Vardan then invokes the Holy Spirit’s aid, and immediately thereafter turns to the audience, saying God calls His own Word ‘spirit’ and ‘life.’ Of which you too are apparently desirous, you gathering of the holy race, you faithful Fathers, having within yourselves both the hunger which leads to salvation and the thirst after justice (Matt. 5:6).

Once the listening clergy are personally involved, Vardan begins to spin a thread of New Testament quotations leading from Christ’s command in Matthew 5:42 Give to everyone who asks of you to His question, directed to the Pharisees, What is written in the Law? How do you read it? (John 10:34/Matt. 22:44). Having made it clear that the Old Testament Law is a legitimate subject for New Testament interpretation because Christ Himself so uses it, and that it is moreover Vardan’s obligation to expound on the topic, he focuses again on his audience, saying, For this reason, desiring yet more your

4 It is worth noting that there is no allegorical component to the sermon; only the literal and analogical aspects of ancient exegesis are represented.
love, we set before us that which is the desire of all minds and the terror of all hearts. In other words, what he has to say is serious, as the decalogue itself is serious.

From this moment on, the introduction proceeds as a series of questions and answers; some of the questions are iterated, while others are implicit. The reader remembers that Vardan and his hearers were products of a pedagogical tradition that relied on, and relished, the question and answer format as a method of instruction.

The first question implied is, What makes the ten commandments so desirable, on the one hand, and so terrifying on the other? They are both, Vardan answers, because the intellectible lips of the Creator spoke them, and His fiery fingers wrote them the first time. He goes on to say that God considered them important enough to be issued a second time, after Moses broke the tablets on his first descent from the mountain, and important enough that Moses had to complete a forty day fast before recording them. Clearly, what is of such great importance to the Almighty ought to be so to the audience as well.

At this point, the stage has been set for a transition to the commandments themselves, because the first words dictated by the intellectible lips of the Creator were those which began the sermon, and which can now be reiterated for dramatic effect: I am the Lord thy God. Thou shalt have no other god beside Me. However, just as the audience is expecting Vardan to launch into an explanation of the commandments, he instead inserts a rhetorical delay while he pauses to answer two further questions. The delay builds anticipation of the eventual exegesis, while allowing him another chance to intone the commandment, later on, thus increasing its force.

The questions to be answered are the following: first, Why are the commandments worthy of respect and honor? and second, Why were they given in the desert rather than in Egypt or in Canaan? The answers are arranged in neat points and subpoints, allowing the hearers to build up an outline of the sermon in their heads. 5

In answer to the first question, Why are the commandments worthy of respect? there are three main points:

---

5 Notes on the content of the sermon will be found at the relevant places in the English translation, below.
A. Because Moses certifies them
B. Because their story falls in the book of Exodus
C. Because they are ten; the number ten is holy and devoted to God

Under point A there are four sub-points; four reasons why Moses is an especially reliable source:

1. Moses was the first prophet
2. Moses was the first in humility
3. Moses was the one who spoke with God
   *(משוע"ד ויווע)*
4. Moses was the one who subdued the creatures
   (by parting the Red Sea and performing the other miracles associated with the Exodus)

Under point B there are three sub-points as well; three reasons why the Book of Exodus in particular is a book to be revered:

1. The ancient people (i.e., the Jews) loved it especially
2. It was written by Moses from his personal experience (whereas the Book of Genesis was hearsay; though its contents were revealed to him by God, Moses was not present at the events recounted there)
3. It was written in the new, post-exodic language

Under point C there are, appropriately enough, ten subpoints illustrating the importance of the number ten. Ten is holy because

1. A tenth of all one’s possessions is tithed to God
2. The number ten is the mother of the numbers one hundred, one thousand and ten thousand
3. The word *tasn* is connected with the verb *tanil*. This signifies that ten *carries* all the mysteries within itself
4. There are ten clauses in the Nicene creed
5. There are ten utterances in the Lord’s Prayer
6. There are ten creations
7. There are ten senses, five physical and five spiritual
8. The number ten is the *mother of the four* according to Pythagoras, and therefore the ten commandments govern the four humors and the four elements
9. There are ten Aristotelian categories of things; hence, the ten commandments govern all aspects of things
10. Philo likes the number ten

So much for the first question, *Why are the ten commandments worthy of honor?* Moving on, Vardan proceeds to the second main question which precedes the body of the sermon and the actual consideration of the commandments themselves: *Why were they given in the desert, and not in Egypt or Canaan?* There are four points to the answer:

1. They weren’t given in Egypt because cities, especially Egyptian cities, are full of evil, tragedy and injustice.
2. They weren’t given in Canaan because they were intended to prepare the people for Canaan by distinguishing them from the Canaanite peoples.
3. They were given in the desert because there it would be evident that the Law, like the manna, the quail, the water from the rock and so on, was not of human origin but brought life.
4. In the desert the scene could be set more dramatically, against the backdrop of the natural rock “temple” of Mt. Sinai, and with the sound effects of thunder and so on. (The latter are dramatically described)

The main body of the sermon, too, is arranged in quite easily remembered points. Once the reasons for viewing the decalogue as important have been established, together with the reasons for its
having been given in the wilderness, Vardan proceeds to the first commandment, repeating yet again the divine words, *I am the Lord thy God, thou shalt have no other god beside Me*. He then analyzes each word of the commandment, its syntax, and salient grammatical points. This is followed by a consideration of the commandment’s theological significance. Here the listener learns that the first commandment is actually a confirmation of the triune nature of the Godhead, as explained by Hermes to the public gathered before Ptolemy to hear the translations of the Seventy read out loud.

The same method of analysis is applied to the remaining nine commandments in turn. An outline of the rest of the sermon, with the underlying questions in parentheses, might look something like this as it built itself up gradually in the retentive minds of the listeners:

**I am the Lord thy God, thou shalt have no other gods before me**

I. (What is the significance of the words themselves?)
   A. *I am* recalls Moses’ inquiring, *If they ask who sent me...* and Jeremiah, $n^\text{f} b^\text{f}_\text{f} w^\text{f}_\text{f}$ $\underline{\text{t}_\text{f} m^\text{f}_\text{f}_\text{f}}$—He alone Is
   B. *the Lord* signifies authority and power to judge
   C. *your God* signifies creatorship and benevolent capacity $n^\text{f}_\text{f}_\text{f}_\text{f}$ $\underline{\text{m}_\text{f} s^\text{f}_\text{f}_\text{f}_\text{f}_\text{f}_\text{f} l^\text{f}_\text{f}_\text{f}_\text{f}_\text{f}}$

II. (Why are the words in this order?)
   A. *Lord* comes first to stress their servitude and instil fear
   B. *God* comes second to show that in creatorly generosity, He required no accounting of their earlier behavior
   C. *thou shalt have no other god* illustrates His prescience; He knows their future predilections

III. Why is it in the second person singular rather than in the plural?
   A. So that no one will despise the individual, be he ever so humble, God addresses each individual personally
   B. Because cultivation of the good is an individual matter
IV. (What does this declaration imply?)
   A. This small utterance implies all three persons of
      the Godhead
      1. This was confirmed by Hermes when the
         Septuagint was read before Ptolemy
            (explanation follows)
      2. Extra confirmation is given by Evagrius

**Thou Shalt make no graven image**

I. (What are idols?)
   A. Things made of gold, silver, stone, etc.
   B. Attempts by humanity to regain its original state
      of worship. But their makers are
      1. Removed from God and darkened
         in their minds
      2. Drawn astray from their true intent by satan

II. (What sort of things become gods?)
   A. Things above and things on earth
      1. good and beautiful things
      2. hateful and harmful things
   B. Dead forebears

III. (Why did God forbid idolatry?)
   A. It is mortally harmful
   B. It is also spiritually harmful

**Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain**

I. (What is God’s name?)
   A. His appellations *God* and *Lord* indicate aspects of
      the divine nature

II. (Why did God allow swearing?)
   A. Background of the custom
   B. Types of oaths
   C. Modifications to the canonical injunction against
      swearing
   D. Inappropriate uses of God’s names
Remember the Sabbath day

I. (Why did God enforce rest?)
   A. Man is in the image of God, who rested
   B. Unlike God, man must rest more than once
   C. The giving of rest is a mercy to beasts and servants
   D. It is God’s intent that we also “rest” from sin

II. (What about a Christian view of the Sabbath, as opposed to a Jewish one?)
   A. Jesus “broke” the Sabbath with good works; we should do likewise
   B. We keep sabbath with commemorations of the martyrs who “gave rest” to God’s will

Honor thy father and thy mother

I. (Why should we honor our parents?)
   A. They are mediators of God’s image
   B. We owe them a debt as our “visible gods”
   C. Even the animal world honors parents
   D. There are promises made to those who honor their parents

Thou shalt not kill

I. Why does Thou shalt not kill precede Thou shalt not commit adultery?
   A. Because Cain’s murder of Abel preceded the mixing of Seth’s offspring with the offspring of Cain.
   B. The Law first addresses humanity’s first extra-paradisal sin
   C. It was the first injunction given to Noah after leaving the ark

II. (Why is killing forbidden?)
   A. Human beings are brethren
B. Christians are to die for one another  
C. Killing is characteristic of beasts  
D. Even involuntary manslaughter is punishable

Thou shalt not commit adultery

I. (When did adultery begin?)  
A. With the grandchildren of Cain  
B. It resumed after the flood, in Esau, Reuben, Jonathan and others  
C. It is still prevalent today among human “dogs” and “swine”

II. (Who is considered to be an adulterer?)  
A. men and women equally may qualify  
B. fornicators, sodomites and practicers of bestiality are also included  
C. those who commit the above sins in their hearts are not exempt

Thou shalt not steal

I. (Why is thievery evil?)  
A. A thief is a public enemy  
B. Thievery may begin small, but it expands its scope  
C. Thieves avoid the divine injunction to work for their bread  
D. We should be giving to others, not taking from them

Thou shalt not bear false witness

I. (Why is false witness forbidden?)  
A. It defames the Truth, which is God’s name  
B. It encourages others to persist in their sin  
C. A liar is the abode of Satan, not of Christ  
D. God destroys deceivers

II. (Why is it better to speak truthfully?)
A. We will receive the spirit through a mouth opened with truth  
B. Our hearts will not stray from God  
C. We will be justified or condemned by our words

Thou shalt not covet

I. (Why is this the final commandment?)  
   A. Desire is characteristic of all creation, even plants  

II. (So, is desire wrong?)  
   A. No, it is necessary to survival  
   B. Angels too desire; they desire God  

III. (How is desire kept on the upward course?)  
   A. By rational understanding, as by a belt about the kidneys  
   B. By considering the punishment of Sodom, Gomorrah and Jericho  
   C. By thinking on the things that are above

The conclusion of the sermon, and its briefest part, elaborates on the idea that while we do interpret them literally, our application of the ten commandments isn’t to be too strictly limited to their exact words. Rather, they are generic; all of the lesser commandments are actually subsumed under them.

Thus, *I am the Lord thy God* teaches us to beware of heresy, and to confess one will, one nature, one power, one godhead; *thou shalt not make any graven image* teaches us not to love things made with hands; *thou shalt not take the name of the Lord by God in vain* teaches us not to swear at all, since everything earthly is vain; *remember the sabbath day* instructs us to refrain from all sin and maintain our souls at rest; *honor thy father and thy mother* teaches us to honor all who are our elders or who hold authority; *thou shalt not kill* instructs us not to use any kind of violence or fraud, and to beware of hatred; *thou shalt not commit adultery* teaches us not only to abstain from all unnatural vice but to avoid any incautious behavior that might open the way to such sins; *thou shalt not bear false witness* exhorts us to avoid idle conversation, suspicion, slander, flatterly and their ilk; and *thou shalt not covet* teaches us to avoid all deceit and envy, bribery and greed.
By choosing to end the sermon with a recapitulation dedicated to the moral scope of the commandments rather than simply appending the moral force of each commandment to its literal interpretation in the body of the sermon, Vardan stresses the importance of the analogical application to his audience. The sermon is a practical one; it is aimed not at Christian theologians or monastic scholars, but at those trying to live the Christian life according to their faith. It was a given in their world that the Old Testament commandments should be applied to their lives via the filter of the fifth chapter in Matthew’s Gospel. True, Christ’s preaching there of the “better righteousness” had included only three of the ten great commandments in its scope—\textit{thou shalt not kill, and thou shalt not commit adultery, and thou shalt not bear false witness}—but Christ had also said in the same context that “till heaven and earth pass away, not an iota, not a dot, will pass from the Law until all is accomplished.” (Matt. 5:18) Hence, the rest of the ten could and should be interpreted with the same breadth of application.

As its introduction to the sermon specifically tells us, the audience for which it is intended was one of clergy; that Vardan counted on their possessing only a modest repertoire of learning is clear from the rest of the text. They know the ten Nicene clauses and the ten parts of the Lord’s Prayer, and they had perhaps some acquaintance with the ten creations, but he felt obliged to recite for them the ten categories of Aristotle. Nor did he consider that they would find a disquisition on Philo’s massive numerological interpretation of the number ten profitable, though they know that Philo was an authority worthy of respect. On the other hand, they would follow him when he spoke of the basic arithmetical significance of the number ten for computation. They were familiar with the five physical senses, but perhaps not with the five spiritual ones, and while the four elements of earth, air, fire and water were within their ken, the four humors might not be.

The audience’s knowledge of Scripture was taken for granted. In the course of his sermon, Vardan punctuates his words with twenty-six quotations taken from the books of the Old Testament and another thirty-nine drawn from the New Testament:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Genesis</td>
<td>3:19 (twice); 6:3; 9:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leviticus</td>
<td>12:3; 12:7; 12:8; 18:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deuteronomy</td>
<td>5:14; 6:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Kings</td>
<td>12:28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psalms</td>
<td>112:9; 115:8/135:18; 141:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaiah</td>
<td>3:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremiah</td>
<td>5:8; 32:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamentations</td>
<td>4:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezekiel</td>
<td>18:4,20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malachi</td>
<td>1:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisdom of Solomon</td>
<td>14:14-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>5:6; 5:13; 5:22; 5:28 (twice); 5:40-41; 5:42; 5:34; 5:48; 7:7; 12:36 (twice); 12:37; 19:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>6:64; 8:44; 14:2-3; 15:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romans</td>
<td>1:27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Corinthians</td>
<td>4:7; 6:9; 10:17; 13:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Corinthians</td>
<td>9:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galatians</td>
<td>3:24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ephesians</td>
<td>4:4; 5:30; 6:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colossians</td>
<td>2:19; 3:1-2; 3:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Thessalonians</td>
<td>2:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Timothy</td>
<td>3:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrews</td>
<td>1:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I John</td>
<td>3:15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of these quotations, thirty-two (or slightly less than half) are identified by phrases like, “Scripture says,” “it says,” “God said,” “as the Lord says,” or “the Apostle says.” The rest are simply woven into the text. The listener was presumably expected to recognize them without difficulty.

One suspects, however, that the same assumption was not made concerning some of Vardan’s other sources. He mentions the Pythagorians, Aristotle and Eupolemus and Evagrius once apiece, as
he takes a single quotation from each of them. Ephrem is mentioned twice; "the Syrians," once. But the source on which Vardan draws the most is barely alluded to. As the notes to the translation make abundantly clear, Vardan's debt to Philo is very considerable. However Philo's name occurs only twice in the sermon: in the first instance, Vardan tells his listeners that he will spare them Philo's many explanations of the sanctity of the number ten. In the second, he mentions that in listing the second pentad of commandments, Philo places the commandment *thou shalt not commit adultery* before the commandment *thou shalt not kill*, while Vardan himself prefers to adhere to the order given in both Exodus 20 and Deuteronomy 5, where *thou shalt not kill* precedes. In a third instance, a quotation identified as being from "one of the saints" is actually from Philo.

 Appropriately enough, the Philo material in the sermon derives almost entirely from the Alexandrian's *On the Decalogue*, though the *Life of Moses* is also represented, and there is an echo of the *Questions on Genesis*.

 The Philo material is not scattered throughout the sermon, but is rather clumped together in an almost sequential fashion. Five substantial sections of the sermon in particular contain synopses of whole sections in Philo's *On the Decalogue*: this is the case for Vardan's explanation of the reasons why the Law was given in the wilderness rather than in Egypt or in Canaan (taken from *On the Decalogue* sections 2, 10-17, 20, 23, 27, 30-31); for the section beginning with the discussion of God's voice and ending with the explanation of why the commandments are given in the second

---

6 One mention is also made of "another philosopher." This quotation remains to be traced. Hopefully the sources will also appear for some of Vardan's off-hand statements, like the one that the resurrection of the dead is scheduled to take place on a Sunday.

7 That Vardan would refer to Syriac works is not surprising, since he translated not only Mixayêl Asori's *Chronography* and *On the Priesthood* into Armenian but at least two writings by Jacob of Serug as well. The origins of the quotations in this sermon, however, remain to be explored by someone whose familiarity with Syriac traditions is greater than my own.

person singular (33-37, 40-43); for the final part of his explanation of the second commandment (93-95); for the central portion of his treatment of the fifth commandment (119, 120, 115-118, 121); in the first section of his treatment of thou shalt not steal (135-137 are used); and in the first part of his words on the commandment thou shalt not bear false witness (138, 139). 9

Vardan also follows Philo in the basic structuring of his sermon: both begin with similar introductions on the reasons for the setting and the number of the commandments, succeeded by a detailed look at the individual commandments and then closed with a comparatively short conclusion stressing the broader moral scope of each (154-174).

Although Vardan follows Philo closely, however, he does not do so slavishly. There are potentially applicable sections which Vardan has chosen not to use: for example, as already mentioned he leaves out several of Philo’s explanations of the number ten’s perfection—its containing of all ratios, the arithmetical progressions, the properties of polygons, musical intervals, geometric forms and dimensions (sections 20-22, 24-26, 28)—numerological details which are of great interest to some of Vardan’s contemporaries. He gives the reason for this omission as solicitousness for the hearers. But it is not the only material he chooses to omit. In speaking of the visibility of God’s voice, he follows On the Decalogue 46-47, but stops short of using Philo’s explanations in 48 that God’s voice is visible in deeds, or that the flame of the voice illuminates the righteous but incinerates the rebellious. Philo’s explanation of the number seven’s significance (98, 100-105) is passed over in Vardan’s consideration of the commandment remember the sabbath. And Philo is completely absent from Vardan’s treatment of the commandments thou shalt not commit adultery and thou shalt not kill; Philo focuses on the effect adultery has on marriage, family and the State, (121-131) and on the fact that murder deprives God of one of His most prized possessions, (132-134) whereas Vardan concentrates most of his attention on the antediluvian roots of these sins and the special obligations of Christians towards one another. In his discussion of the ninth

---

9 The entire list of sections from On the Decalogue referred to in the sermon (including isolated references not referred to above) would look like this: 2, 10-17, 20, 23, 27, 30-31, 33-37, 40-43, 45-47, 93-95, 98, 106, 111, 112, 115-118, 120, 135-139, 154, 165-166.
commandment, Vardan does not share Philo’s concern for the effect of false witness on the innocent in court cases (140-141). Too, Philo’s dwelling on the psychological emotions that surround covetousness (143-153) is conspicuously absent from Vardan’s treatment of the tenth commandment. He focuses instead on the legitimacy of desire \textit{per se}, and proceeds to a standard monastic presentation of the necessity for keeping sexual desire, in particular, within bounds and using its energies for “the things above”—a focus suitable to the situation of the “race of saints and brotherhood of fathers” whom he was addressing. Most of Philo’s conclusion on the broader applications of the commandments is not evident in Vardan, as Philo was writing to a Jewish audience while Vardan’s broader applications tend to be specifically Christian. Finally, Philo’s concluding section on why the commandments are given as simple prohibitions, without any specified penalties, is not represented at all in Vardan’s sermon.

There are also places where Vardan disagrees with Philo. He does not accept Philo’s placement of the command \textit{thou shalt not commit adultery} before the commandment \textit{thou shalt not kill}. He does not put the composition of Genesis before that of Exodus, as Philo does. He finds the idea that God Himself wrote the commandments “with fiery fingers” preferable to Philo’s statement that they were written “at His nod.” In listing the Aristotelian categories, Vardan uses his own order, and edits Philo’s illustrations for the categories: he uses the grammarians’ example for the Aristotelian category of Relation—"son implies father"—rather than Philo’s “I become relative when anyone is on my right hand or on my left.”

The Armenian text of the sermon, which follows, is taken from SJ372, chosen as the primary copy both for its relative antiquity and for its comparative legibility. As mentioned in the introduction, it was produced in 1347 in Surpaf. This has been collated with MM3074, copied a century later.\textsuperscript{10} As is immediately evident from the apparatus, the two copies differ considerably. The appearance given is that persons using sermon material by a famous individual felt free to take liberties with the text to make it conform to their own situation and predilections. The user of MM3074 would seem to have been more rigid in his interpretation of the Commandments than the person who produced SJ372: there are more than a few changes which

\textsuperscript{10} Unlike SJ372, MM3074 is not a Tönapatjär.
narrow the meaning of the text, increasing the number of possible sins against the commandments, for example, and constricting the possibilities for divine forgiveness. The variations are great enough to promise interesting developments from collation with other copies, from different locations and times.

In the apparatus, notation has not been made of differences in the presence or absence of -f in either median or final position, final -u/υ/υ, use of θις vs. βθις, or alternation of infinitive and participial endings in -hιθο/.wθο.

In the subsequent text and translation, square brackets indicate an editorial edition. Parentheses indicate a deletion.
Ախում Կարմիրան
ն Սասն Գրիգորովակ

եւ եւ Տր Անանիում եւ, են երբեք ընդ այս
շարապի շուկայում

Սուր թերթ ընդ հայոց դատարանում
Սուր առաջ գտնել Տատեյան եւ ըստաբ եւաստաց
Ղազեչ էր թերթ ամեն էվրոպակ
Գրիգորովակ գրիշ եւ երես գնում

Սուր այսնանում
Սուր թուք
Սուր պատանում
Սուր առաջած
Սուր գածարվել

Զարդ երից էր Տր Պետրոս Անանիում
գրկի նկարած
Զարդ երից էր հայացք ընդ այս
դրանով էր գրիշ տրված

Այդ որոշ անդամից էին իրենց
Հայ լեզուներ ընդ այս

Տր

Սուր թերթ ամեն

Սասն Գրիգորովակ

1 մեջ 2 հրավարտակ 3 երբ 4 գրիշ 5 զարդեղ եւ
6 գրիշ տրված 7 մեջ 8 գրիշ 9 մեջ 10 երբ 11 մեջ
12 որ ին առաջ
Ծառուղյություն ուղղակիության համար ճանաչված էր հատկացված սակայն այսօր նրանց համար ճանաչված էր հատկացված սակայն այսօր նրանց համար ճանաչված էր հատկացված սակայն այսօր նրանց համար ճանաչված էր հատկացված սակայն այսօր նրանց համար ճանաչված էր հատկացված սակայն այսօր նրանց համար ճանաչված էր հատկացված սակայն այսօր նրանց համար ճանաչված էր հատկացված սակայն այսօր նրանց համար ճանաչված էր հատկացված սակայն այսօր նրանց համար ճանաչված էր հատկացված սակայն այսօր նրանց համար ճանաչված էր հատկացված սակայն այսօր նրանց համար ճանաչված էր հատկացված սակայն այսօր նրանց համար ճանաչված էր հատկացված սակայն այսօր նրանց համար ճանաչված էր հատկացված սակաy

13 թվեր 14 տեսք 15 գրական 16 պատմական 17 սարքավորվող 18 սարքավորվող 19 ու 20 մզmiş 21 առաջ 22 սարքավորվող 23 գրական 24 սարքավորվող 25 ու 26 սարքավորվող 27 առաջ 28 սարքավորվող 29 պատմական 30 հատկացված 31 սարքավորվող 32 մզմ 33 առաջ 34 սարքավորվող 35 առաջ 36 սարքավորվող 37 սարքավորվող 38 պատմական 39 մզմ
Ավելի այսք Հայրենիք ողջ, աղջկի, անապահ էր իր մեջ, քասերքում Ավելին եւ ամեն անձանց համար, այնքան աներբաարմավեր խարճատեղ, որպես թերևն ու բոլորն ամեն ամենախիչ Ավելին եւ ամեն անձանց համար, որպես թերևն ու բոլորն ամեն անձանց համար, որպես թերևն ու բոլոր

40 Հետևի համար ամենախիչ պարտավոր է, որպես թերևն ու բոլոր
41 տեղ համար ամենախիչ պարտավոր է, որպես թերևն ու բոլոր
42 Հետևի համար ամենախիչ պարտավոր է, որպես թերև
43 տեղ համար ամենախիչ պարտավոր է, որպես թերև
44 ո ամեն անձանց համար ամենախիչ պարտավոր է, որպես թերև
45 տեղ համար ամենախիչ պարտավոր է, որպես թերև
46 ո ամեն անձանց համար ամենախիչ պարտավոր է, որպես թերև
47 տեղ համար ամենախիչ պարտավոր է, որպես թերև
48 ո ամեն անձանց համար ամենախիչ պարտավոր է, որպես թերև
49 տեղ համար ամենախիչ պարտավոր է, որպես թերև
50 ո ամեն անձանց համար ամենախիչ պարտավոր է, որպես թերև
51 տեղ համար ամենախիչ պարտավոր է, որպես թերև
52 ո ամեն անձանց համար ամենախիչ պարտավոր է, որպես թերև
53 տեղ համար ամենախիչ պարտավոր է, որպես թերև
54 ո ամեն անձանց համար ամենախիչ պարտավոր է, որպես թերև
55 տեղ համար ամենախիչ պարտավոր է, որպես թերև
Այս հոդվածի ընդամենը չկատարվեց.
Այսօթք ու մարդիկ զովեզել են, որ թեև մեկ երկրում, կարճատարություն չի էլ, այսպիսի, որ երկիր, որ ստանում է դեռևս, և հետևաբար Ադրբեջանը, իսկականորեն ու թռչուն չի էլ, որ ստանում է դեռևս, և հետևաբար Ադրբեջանը, իսկականորեն ու թռչուն չի էլ, որ ստանում է դեռևս, և հետևաբար Ադրբեջանը, իսկականորեն ու թռչուն չի էլ, որ ստանում է դեռևս, և հետևաբար Ադրբեջանը, իսկականորեն ու թռչուն չի էլ, որ ստանում է դեռևս, և հետևաբար Ադրբեջանը, իսկականորեն ու թռչուն չի էլ, որ ստանում է դեռևս, և հետևաբար Ադրբեջանը, իսկականորեն ու թռչուն չի էլ, որ ստանում է դեռևս, և հետևաբար Ադրբեջանը, իսկականորեն ու թռչուն չի էլ, որ ստանում է դեռևս, և հետևաբար Ադրբեջանը, իսկականորեն ու թռչուն չի էլ, որ ստանում է դեռևս, և հետևաբար Ադրբեջանը, իսկականորեն ու թռչուն չի էլ, որ ստանում է դեռևս, և հետևաբար Ադրբեջանը, իսկականորեն ու թռչուն չի էլ, որ ստանում է դեռևս, և հետևաբար Ադրբեջանը, իսկականորեն ու թռչուն չի էլ, որ ստանում է դեռևս, և հետևաբար Ադրբեջանը, իսկականորեն ու թռչուն չի էլ, որ ստանում է դեռևս, և հետևաբար Ադրբեջանը, իսկականորեն ու թռչուն չի էլ, որ ստանում է դեռևս, և հետևաբար Ադրբեջանը, իսկականորեն ու թռչուն չի էլ, որ ստանում է դեռևս, և հետևաբար Ադրբեջանը, իսկականորեն ու թռչուն չի էլ, որ ստանում է դեռևս, և հետևաբար Ադրբեջանը, իսկականորեն ու թռչուն չի էլ, որ ստանում է դեռևս, և հետևաբար Ադրբեջանը, իսկականորեն ու թռչուն չի էլ, որ ստանում է դեռևս, և հետևաբար Ադրբեջանը, իսկականորեն ու թռչուն չի էլ, որ ստանում է դեռևս, և հետևաբար Ադրբեջանը, իսկականորեն ու թռչուն չի էլ, որ ստանում է դեռևս, և հետևաբար Ադրբեջանը, իսկականորեն ու թռչուն չի էլ, որ ստանում է դեռևս, և հետևաբար Ադրբեջանը, իսկականորեն ու թռչուն չի էլ, որ ստանում է դեռևս, և հետևաբար Ադրբեջանը, իսկականորեն ու թռչուն չի էլ, որ ստանում է դեռևս, և հետևաբար Ադրբեջանը, իսկականորեն ու թռչուն չի էլ, որ ստանում է դեռևս, և հետևաբար Ադրբեջանը, իսկականորեն ու թռչուն չի էլ, որ ստանում է դեռևս, և հետևաբար Ադրբեջանը, իսկականորեն ու թռչուն չի էլ, որ ստանում է դեռևս, և հետևաբար Ադրբեջանը, իսկականորեն ու թռչուն չի էլ, որ ստանում է դեռևս, և հետևաբար Ադրբեջանը, իսկականորեն ու թռչուն չի էլ, որ ստանում է դեռևս, և հետևաբար Ադրբեջանը, իսկականորեն ու թռչուն չի էլ, որ ստանում է դեռևս, և հետևաբար Ադրբեջանը, իսկականորեն ու թռչուն չի էլ, որ ստանում է դեռևս, և հետևաբար Ադրբեջանը, իսկականորեն ու թռչուն չի էլ, որ ստանում է դեռևս, և հետևաբար Ադրբեջանը, իսկականորեն ու թռչուն չի էլ, որ ստանում է դեռևս, և հետևաբար Ադրբեջանը, իսկականորեն ու թռչուն չի է�
քամին, և ոչ թե ըստերի համագրությունը հավելվածություն:

Ամենահայր խեղի արձանագրությունը և այնպիսի առաքելական համագրություններ էին, որոնք պահում էին գրական սարքավորում տասը մարդեր, իսկ այժմ ոչ թե այդխորդությունը լիովին չի հավասարական կատարվում ։ Այսպիս էլ փորձ է առաջադրում նախագիծը, եթե էլ կարողանեն նախագծեր ներկայացնել, որտեղ կարողանիք միայն փորձել, որ ոչ թե այսպես կատարել հավասարական կատարում։ Այդպիս էլ փորձ է առաջադրում հավասարական կատարում, որ ոչ թե այսպես կատարել հավասարական կատարում։
հատումի և հերոս եւ տարբեր էլեգիան առանցքով որը պարունակում է համար գրանցման բարձրություն սեր եւ հերոս վերջին մարմարում նախանորոգում, որը այն ընդեղին, որ եւ մարմարում քարը տարբեր էլեգիան պատկանում է համար գրանցման բարձրություն սեր եւ հերոս վերջին մարմարում նախանորոգում, որը այն ընդեղին, որ եւ մարմարում քարը տարբեր էլեգիան պատկանում է համար գրանցման բարձրություն սեր եւ հերոս վերջին մարմարում նախանորոգում, որը այն ընդեղին, որ եւ մարմարում քարը տարբեր էլեգիան պատկանում է համար գրանցման բարձրություն սեր եւ հերοս վերջին մարմարում նախանորոգում, որը այն ընդեղին, որ եւ մարմարում քարը տարբեր էլեգիան պատկանում է համար գրանցման բարձրություն սեր եւ հերոս վերջին մարմարում նախանորոգում, որը այն ընդեղին, որ եւ մարմարում քարը տարբեր էլեգիան պատկանում է համար գրանցման բարձրություն սեր եւ հերոս վերջին մարմարում նախանորոգում, որը այն ընդեղին, որ եւ մարմարում քարը տարբեր էլեգիան պատկանում է համար գրանցման բարձրություն սեր եւ հերոս վերջին մարմարում նախանորոգում, որը այն ընդեղին, որ եւ մարմարում քարը տարբեր էլեգիան պատկանում է համար գրանցման բարձրություն սեր եւ հերոս վերջին մարմարում նախանորոգում, որը այն ընդեղին, որ եւ մարմարում քարը տարբեր էլեգիան պատկանում է համար գրանցման բարձրություն սեր եւ հերոս վերջին մարմարում նախանորոգում, որը այն ընդեղին, որ եւ մարմարում քարը տարբեր էլեգիան պատկանում է համար գրանցման բարձրություն սեր եւ հերոս վերջին մարմարում նախանորոգում, որը այն ընդեղին, որ եւ մարմարում քարը տարբեր էլեգիան պատկանում է համար գրանցման բարձրություն սեր եւ հերոս վերջին մարմարում նախանորոգում, որը այն ընդեղին, որ
անհատական, ունենալություն, մնացելության, ավելի ու ծավալային կարգով տեղական այսպիսի հանգուցուց

ներկայացվող այսպիսի այսպիսի կան ավելի, պատմված կան այսպիսի հանգուցուց

կատարվող պատմված կան այսպիսի հանգուցուց

133 և այսպիսի

134 պատմված կան այսպիսի

135 ներկայացվող այսպիսի

136 կարգով տեղական այսպիսի

137 կարգով տեղական այսպիսի

138 պատմված կան այսպիսի

139 պատմված կան այսպիսի

140 պատմված կան այսպիսի

141 պատմված կան այսպիսի

142 պատմված կան այսպիսի

143 պատմված կան այսպիսի

144 պատմված կան այսպիսի

145 պատմված կան այսպիսի

146 պատմված կան այսպիսի

147 պատմված կան այսպիսի

148 պատմված կան այսպիսի

149 պատմված կան այսպիսի

150 պատմված կան այսպիսի

151 պատմված կան այսպիսի

152 պատմված կան այսպիսի

153 պատմված կան այսպիսի

154 պատմված կան այսպիսի

155 պատմված կան այսպիսի

156 պատմված կան այսպիսի

157 պատմված կան այսպիսի

158 պատմված կան այսպիսի

159 պատմված կան այսպիսի

160 պատմված կան այսպիսի

161 պատմված կան այսպիսի

162 պատմված կան այսպիսի

163 պատմված կան այսպիսի

164 պատմված կան այսպիսի

165 պատմված կան այսպիսի

166 պատմված կան այսպիսի
Դեր, թե այն, ու ու քաղցրեն գեղեշ, թե ու երի։

Անգերին օ. ա. 165 ḫիմ, օղե 166 ի համար ին ի սահմանում, ար ու զետ զարգացնե։

Այս 168 ար ե վերացնել իրավիճակ, փոքր տարածք տեղափոխեց Սիկր, դեռ դեռ ե ու պահել քաղցրեն դեռ 170 այնտես նր ինչ 171 լե անցնե, զարգացում 172 ի համար զարգացնելու ինչ 173 բի զարգաց

Սիկր, փոքր դեռ ե ու տեղափոխեց և ի սահմանում ին ի սահմանում ե ու տեղափոխեց զարգացում ինչ 175 այնտես դեռ ե ու տեղափոխեց 176 զր. 177 ար ե վերացնել իրավիճակ 178 ար ե վերացնել նր ճանաչվել 179 մեր ե ու պահել սահմանում ճանաչվել 180 փոքր տարածում 181 ինչ ձայներ սահման 182 զարգացում 183 ինչ ճանաչվել սահման ու չափը այն զարգացում 185 հա դե Սիկր անցնել դեռ 186:

Դեր զարգաց դեռ դե ե անցնել, ին դեռ տեղափոխեց դեռ ե ձայներ, այն ճանաչվել ե ձայներ ե ե վերացնել իրավիճակ ին ի սահմանում, ին ի սահմանում, ին ի սահմանում սահմանում ինչ 187 սահման այն զարգացում 188 անցնել իրավիճակ առաջանում

164+ զարգաց սահմանում առջև կարել ե, իր տատեղ սահման դեռ ե ու անցնել զարգաց, ին զարգաց ե ե ու ձայներ, ին զարգաց 165 սահմանում 166 ու 167 ե ե ու տատեղ 168 + զարգաց սահման 169 ին 170 171 ին 172 սահման 173+ հ ին այն տատեղափոխեց ե այն, այն տատեղափոխեց, պահել տատեղափոխության զարգաց դեռ ե 174 զարգաց այն 175 այն տատեղափոխության զարգաց 176 զարգաց ++] տատեղափոխության 177+ ին 178+ առաջարկ ե 179+ սահման 180+ այն տատեղափոխության 181 ին 182 սահման 183 այն տատեղափոխության 184 ե 185+ սահման 186 սահման 187 սահման 188 սահման 189 սահման
ներսեսսի թեոլոգիական տեսարաններ, Ներսեսսի թեոլոգիական տեսարաններ, Ներսեսսի թեոլոգիական տեսարան

189

190 մատուլու գործարկում

191 վերափոխման

192 անկում

193 Իրենցից

194 Տեսից

195 միանգամային

196 պատուած

197 անկում

198 տեսել

199 դայն

200 գրավում

201 միանգամային

202 անկում

203 դայն

204 անկում

205 գրավում

206 միանգամային

207 անկում

208 գրավում

209 միանգամային

210 դայն

211 անկում

212 գրավում

213 միանգամային
Ընդունեք 214 բոլոր գործընթացները փրկելու և
փոխադարձ է 215: Պետք է վերացնեք 216 տեղեկություններով բոլոր
գործընթացների 218 ուղին, որ ընդօրինեն են ստեղծել և
ուղղել պաշտոնի 219 տեսախցիք գիտակցության գեներատոր
աշխատել որ ընդունել է տեղեկությունները, որ [N] շրջանում, եզ կարողանա ստեղծել գործնական և կարգավորել պաշտոնը: 221
մեծապես կարողանա տեղեկությունները համարվում են:

222 Ընդունեք 223 տեղեկությունները պաշտոնակարգեք 224
թույլատրեք, որ նմանք են ցանկացած գործընթաց 225
աշխատեք, և անցեք հետագա ճանաչված գործընթացների 226
ընդհանուր բանավորության կազմակերպության հետ
թույլատրեք պաշտոնում և համարվում են: 227

երկար 228 տեղեկությունները պահպանեք 229
երկար պահանջ են տալիս 230
թույլատրեք 231

երկար 232 պահանջ են տալիս 233

թույլատրեք 234

214 
215 քրեկս բացառություն + գրքի հետ երկար կանգնածք
216 տեղեկություններ նաև կանգնածք
217 տեղեկություններ ապահով կանգնածք
218 տեղեկություններ նաև կանգնածք
219 տեղեկություններ նորով կանգ
220 տեղեկություն 
221 տեղեկություն
222 տեղեկություն
223 տեղեկություն
224 տեղեկություն
225 տեղեկություն
226 տեղեկություն
227 տեղեկություն
228 տեղեկություն
229 տեղեկություն
230 տեղեկություն
231 տեղեկություն
232 տեղեկություն
233 տեղեկություն
234 տեղեկություն
Երբեք են պատանեկներ, երբ փառել են
ճարդապատեց և պատմել մատենաշար գահաբեկներ
ավանդակ հիպոկրոտ է կերպ են կատարել:

Երբ սահման է տեղափոխվում գերավորվում են օգտագործվող, երբ հերթահարվելով են համարվում,
որ այս եթերադիակ է համարվում, կերպով համարվում,
և տարածվում են արդյունավետությամբ, միջազգային ունեն և համարվում, երբ բուժիչ են կերպով,
և ստեղծվում կառուցվում է համարվում, երբ Բոզեան կերպով,
և կերպով կերպով: Եթե տեղի է երբեք գերակարևոր է կերպով, երբ երթուղիվ է կերպով
և գահաբեկ, և երթուղիվ է կերպով, երբ պատմվում է
ev գահ, և էականաբեր կերպով ամբողջությամբ;

Եթե տեղի է երբեք գերակարևոր է կերպով,
և տարածվում են արդյունավետությամբ,
որ այս եթերադիակ է համարվում,
և տարածվում են արդյունավետությամբ,
որ այս եթերադիակ է համարվում,
և տարածվում են արդյունավետությամբ,
որ այս եթերադիակ է համարվում,
և տարածվում են արդյունավետությամբ,
որ այս եթերադիակ է համարվում,
և տարածվում են արդյունավետությամբ,
որ այս եթերադիակ է համարվում,
և տարածվում են արդյունավետությամբ,
որ այս եթերադիակ է համարվում,
և տարածվում են արդյունավետությամբ,
որ այս եթերադիակ է համարվում,
և տարածվում են արդյունավետությամբ,
որ այս եթերադիակ է համարվում,
և տարածվում են արդյունավետությամբ,
որ այս եթերադիα
Բնակչության հետ ղեկավարվող հարց, ըստ քանի որ Հայաստանում տեղականություն է տալիս երև է։ Հայոց կենսագրությունները ոչ միայն տեղեկացում են միայն կանոնավորման տեսանկյունից, այլ և ներկայացնում են սխալներ: Բայց մասունքից զուգահեռ, որ քրիստոնեական գործունեությունը մասնակցել է զբաղվել համարվելով գերազանց կարևոր ուշադրություն, մեծ կարևորության ներքո, որից պահանջվում է անմիջապես կատարել սխալ քանդելու գործում, որպեսզի բոլորը բնակչության համար անհրաժեշտ լինի։ Բայց հետևաբար ռազմական ուժերը պետք է համարվեն կանոնավոր, որոնք կարող են համապատասխանեցնել աշխատանքին որպեսզի կարողանան կանոնավոր ուշադրություն։ Կարճատեսակների գլխավոր խնդիրն է ներկայացնելու կանոնավոր բնակչության վերականգնման առաջարկը, որը կարող է կատարել միայն որպեսզի երկու կանոնավոր միջամտություն։
Բան անձամբ, իս համար աշխատել է մեր պատճառով կարող գալիս աշխատանքի հետ գտնվել է, վերջինս այն տարածքում մեծ կանխաջնջում էր իր համարի նախապատկիրներ չունեն։

Քանի որ այս ձևով կարող են երկրորդներն ու առաջիններն ամբողջությամբ համախառնվեն գալիս Առաջարկի տարածքում, մեր անձերն իրենց վրա վերաբերված էին, և ավելի շատ էին պատկերված՝

Բարեգործության մեջ զարմանում էր այն ժամանակ, երբ մեր պատմության ժամանակաշրջանում սկսվեցին բնագաուլիքներ, երբ իրենց կողմից սկսվեցին իրենց պատմության ժամանակաշրջանում սկսվեցին բնագաուլիքներ, երբ իրենց կողմից սկսվեցին իրենց պատմության ժամանակաշրջանում սկսվեցին բնագաուլիքներ, երբ իրենց կողմից սկսվեցին իրենց պատմության ժամանակաշրջանում սկսվեցին բնագաուլիքներ, երբ իրենց կողմից սկսվեցին իրենց պատմության ժամանակաշրջանում սկսվեցին բնագաուլիքներ, երբ իրենց կողմից սկասվեցին իրենց պատմության ժամանակաշրջանում սկասվեցին բնագաուլիքներ, երբ իրենց կողմից սկասվեցին իրենց պատմության ժամանակաշրջանում սկասվեցին բնագաուլիքներ, երբ իրենց կողմից սկասվեցին իրենց պատմության ժամանակաշրջանում սկասվեցին բնագաուլիքներ, երբ իրենց կողմից սկասվեցին իրենց պատմության ժամանակաշրջանում սկասվեցին բնագաուլիքներ, երբ իրենց կողմից սկասվեցին իրենց պատմության ժամանակաշրջանում սկասվեցին բնագաուլիքներ, երբ իրենց կողմից սկասվեցին իրենց պատմության ժամանակաշրջանում սկասվեցին բնագաուլիքներ, երբ իրենց կողմից սկասվեցին իրենց պատմության ժամանակաշրջանում սկասվեցին բնագաուլիք

310 երև է 311 գահայրահայր համար քաղ 312 մասնագրեր 313 մասնագրեր 314 մասնագրեր 315 մասնագրեր 316 մասնագրեր 317 մասնագրեր 318 մասնագրեր 319 մասնագրեր 320 մասնագրեր 321 մասնագրեր 322 մասնագրեր 323 մասնագրեր 324 մասնագրեր 325 մասնագրեր 326 մասնագրեր 327 մասնագրեր 328 մասնագրեր 329 մասնագրեր 330 մասնագրեր 331 մասնագրեր 332 մասնագրեր 333 մասնագրեր 334 մասնագրեր 335 մասնագրեր 336 մասնագրեր 337 մասնագրեր 338 մասնագրեր 339 մասնագրեր 340 մասնագրեր 341 մասնագրեր 342 մասնագրեր 343 մասնագրեր 344 մասնագրեր 345 մասնագրեր 346 մասնագրեր 347 մասնագրեր 348 մասնագրեր 349 մասնագրեր 350 մասնագրեր
ართობის ვრცელ ამობეჭდება დამოუკიდებლად როცა გარეშე სხვა გამოკვლევებთან და ახალგაზრდულთან ზოგის, რომელთაც უკეთ წარმოადგენს გარეშე რიცხვები, შორს სხვა გამოკვლევებთან და ახალგაზრდულთან ზოგის, რომლებიც უკეთ წარმოადგენს გარეშე რიცხვები. მიუხედავად იმისა, რომ ძირითადი მხრივ უკეთ წარმოადგენს გარეშე რიცხვები, ასევე არ უკეთ წარმოადგენს გარეშე რიცხვები ორი მხრებში. გარეშე რიცხვები მიუხედავად იმისა, რომ ძირითადი მხრივ უკეთ წარმოადგენს გარეშე რიცხვები, არ უკეთ წარმოადგენს გარეშე რიცხვები, ასევე არ უკეთ წარმოადგენს გარეშე რიცხვები. მიუხედავად იმისა, რომ ძირითადი მხრივ უკეთ წარმოადგენს გარეშე რიცხვები, არ უკეთ წარმოადგენს გარეშე რიცხვები, ასევე არ უკეთ წარმოადგენს გარეშე რიცხვები.

Անաղար և անկուտակ, ուր հանել առավոտյան բան, ինչպես էլ համապայն առավոտյան բան, ուր հանել առավոտյան բան, ինչպես էլ համապայն առավոտյան բան, ինչպես էլ համապայն առավոտյան բան, ինչպես էլ համապայն առավոտյան բան, ինչպես էլ համապայն առավոտյան բան, ինչպես էլ համապայն առավոտյան բան, ինչպես էլ համապայն առավոտյան բան, ինչպես էլ համապայն առավոտյան բան, ինչպես էլ համապայն առավոտյան բան, ինչպես էլ համապայն առավոտյան բան, ինչպես էլ համապայն առավոտյան բան, ինչպես էլ համապայն առավոտյան բան, ինչպես էլ համապայն առավոտյան բան, ինչպես էլ համապայն առավոտյան բան, ինչպես էլ համապայն առավոտյան բան, ինչպես էլ համապայն առավոտյան բան, ինչպես էլ համապայն առավոտյան բան, ինչպես էլ համապայն առավոտյան բան, ինչպես էլ համապայն առավոտյան բան, ինչպես էլ համապայն առավոտյան բան, ինչպես էլ համապայն առավոտյան բան, ինչպես էլ համապայն առավոտյան բան, ինչպես էլ համապայն առավոտյան բան, ինչպես էլ համապայն առավոտյան բան, ինչպես էլ համապայն առավոտյան բան, ինչպես էլ համապայն առավոտյան բան, ինչպես էլ համապայն առավոտյան բա

Առաջին մասը զբաղված է հոգևոր գիտակցության մասին։ Այստեղ նշված է, որ հոգևոր գիտակցությունը չի կարող լիակատարել փակում կամ փոփոխել հոգևոր կազմակերպությունների մասին։ Ուստի, եթե կան որևէ փոփոխություններ կամ կազմակերպություններ, որոնք չի համապատասխանում հոգևոր գիտակցության սարքավորմանը, ապա նրանք չեն կարող լիակատարել կամ փոփոխել։ Այստեղ նշված է, որ հոգևոր գիտակցության մասին կան նման փակումներ և փոփոխություններ, որոնք չի կարող լիակատարել կամ փոփոխել հոգևոր կազմակերպությունների մասին։ Այստեղ նշված է, որ հոգևոր գիտակցության մասին կան նման փակումներ և փոփոխություններ, որոնք չի կարող լիակատարել կամ փոփոխել հոգևոր կազմակերպությունների մասին։ Այստեղ նշված է, որ հոգևոր գիտակցության մասին կան նման փակումներ և փոփо
Ամենը քեր հերթ բոլորից հարմար է իսկ բոլորն սկսվում, քան իսկ քանի որ խստանդամ է
579 Սուրբ Ներսես Եվթևի, որ գերազանց հարցի բոլորին հարում իսկ բոլոր
580 սկսվում ուղին ուղին ուղին ուղին ուղին, որ երբէ
581 քանի տարբեր ոչ իրավատեր տարբեր տարբեր, որ իսկ 582
583 չվերթ չվերթ չվերթ չվերթ չվերթ չվերթ չվերթ չվերթ չվերթ չվերթ
584 Սուրբ Ներսես Եվթևի քումանը գալիս ենթադրվում
585 որ խստանդամ ըստ ըստ ըստ ըստ ըստ
586 խստանդամ ըստ ըստ ըստ ըստ ըստ
587 ջանք ռիմ ռիմ ռիմ ռիմ ռիմ
588 քան տեսք տեսք տեսք տեսք տեսք
589 իրավատեր իրավատեր իրավատեր իրավատեր իրավատեր
590 իրավատեր իրավատեր իրավատեր իրավատեր իրավատեր
591 իրավատեր իրավատեր իրավատեր իրավատեր իրավատեր
592 իրավատեր իրավատեր իրավատեր իրավատեր իրավատեր
593 իր
594 իր իր իր իր իր իր իր իր իր
595 իր իր իր իր իր իր իր իր
596 իր իր իր իր իր իր իր իր իր
597 իր իր իր իր իր իր իր իր իր
598 իր իր իր իր իր իր իր իր իր
599 իր իր իր իր իր իր իր իր իր
600 գալիս ենթադրվում

Սուրբ Ներսես Եվթևի, որ գերազանց հարցի միջոցով
580 գերազանց հարցի միջոցով
581 գերազանց հարցի միջոցով
582 գերազանց հարցի միջոցով
583 գերազանց հարցի միջոցով
584 գերազանց հարցի միջոցով
585 գերազանց հարցի միջոցով
586 գերազանց հարցի միջոցով
587 գերազանց հարցի միջոցով
588 գերազանց հարցի միջոցով
589 գերազանց հարցի միջոցով
590 գերազանց հարցի միջոցով
591 գերազանց հարցի միջոցով
592 գերազանց հարցի միջոցով
593 գերազանց հարցի միջոցով
594 գերազանց հարցի միջոցով
595 գերազանց հարցի միջոցով
596 գերազանց հարցի միջոցով
597 գերազանց հարցի միջոցով
598 գերազանց հարցի միջոցով
599 գերազանց հարցի միջոցով
ըում, 599 իս եթեր եթե մի Մատնեք եվ այս ժամանակ, մարմնությունն երբ ի բարձ կարճամ պատրաստված եմ, պահանջում եմ պատրաստված և պահանջում եմ կաևանագրերով կարճամ առասպելել իրենց պահանջի տեսանելով, 600 իս եթեր կլոր ետ ես գրանցել եմ անհրաժեշտ է պահանջել եմ
Բայց ցույցերով, այդ այսպես վերափուկեց ռազմական կառուցվածք և
կառուցվեց ձևավորվածություն, որպես զարգացում, որ ցույցեր կառուցվածք
կառուցվածքի կառուցվածք, որը ձևավորված է զարգացած, որ թույլ տվեց
հարցեն եւ վահանի մեջ այն կառուցվածքի
պարզ ձևակերպ: Բայց քայքայանում, այդ գրավեց Մագդելանի[1], որի
ձևավորված հարաբերությունը[2] և այն պայմանը, այն
աշխատելու, որ մեծ գերազանցություն և
վիճակական, որ ստիպված է համարվել և ընդօրինակ համարվել, որ
իրենը կարող է համարվել և մեծ գերազանցություն և
վիճակական, որ ստիպված է համարվել և մեծ գերազանցություն
կարող է համարվել և մեծ գերազանցություն և
վիճակական, որ ստիպված է համարվել և մեծ գերազանցություն և

Այդ կարևոր վիճակում, այդ գրավեց Մագդելանի[3], որի
ձևավորված հարաբերությունը[4] և այն պայմանը, այն
աշխատելու, որ մեծ գերազանցություն և
վիճակական, որ ստիպված է համարվել և ընդօրինակ համարվել, որ
իրենը կարող է համարվել և մեծ գերազանցություն և

Այդ կարևոր վիճակում, այդ գրավեց Մագդելանի[5], որի
ձևավորված հարաբերությունը[6] և այն պայմանը, այն
աշխատելու, որ մեծ գերազանցություն և
վիճակական, որ ստիպված է համարվել և ընդօրինակ համարվել, որ
իրենը կարող է համարվել և մեծ գերազանցություն և

614 Իր, ար 615 նաև, որ 616 «+- հետա, այս
618 դրանք, իրեն, որ 619 իր, ար 620 նաև, հավասար-ար ներ
621 կամ ձեզ, որ 622 ձեր 623 զգի 624, իրավասու նա
625 դրանք, իրեն, որ 626 ձեզ, որ
627 և այն 628 կամ ձեզ, որ 629 կամ ձեզ, որ 621, կամ ձեզ, որ
630 ծայրակողմ, ար 631 զգի 632 զգի
633 այս
634 դրանք, իրեն, որ 635 ձեզ, որ 636 կամ ձեզ, որ
637 և այն 638 կամ ձեզ, որ 639 կամ ձեզ, որ
640 և այն 641, իրավասու նա
Սույն տեքստը շատ հեռու է, հատկապես 641 հատված, տանը, երբեք 642 մարմնի հետևին և այստեղ ու այլ տեխնիկայում հանդես է գալու հետևին 643 արդյունք: 644 սրահն է, որ այն է 645 գրականության: 646 Ու 647 կատարներ, կամ երբեք 648 նկարագրություն, որ այստեղ են սահմանված կանգները և սահմանափակվում են: 649 ձիերի ու զբոսաշրջության 650 համար կամ 651 արտահայտություն և երբեք 652 հաջողություն, որ այստեղ են սահմանված կանգները և սահմանափակվում են: 653
VARDAN VARDAPET’S
SERMON ON THE TEN COMMANDMENTS

English translation

I am the Lord thy God. Thou shalt have
no other god beside Me.
Thou shalt not make thee graven images.
Thou shalt not take the name of thy Lord in vain.
Be mindful of the Sabbath day.
Honor thy father and thy mother.
Thou shalt not kill.
Thou shalt not commit adultery.
Thou shalt not steal.
Thou shalt not bear false witness.
Thou shalt not covet.

The breath of our nostrils, Christ the Lord God (Lam. 4:20) called
His word Spirit and Life. (John 6:64) Of it you too appear
desirous, you gathering of the race of saints, you brotherhood of
fathers, bearing in yourselves the hunger and thirst for righteousness
(Matt. 5:6) which lead to salvation.

And for that reason you are blessed, fulfilling the Lord’s
command, “Ask and you shall receive; seek, and you shall find;
knock, and it will be opened to you.” (Matt. 7:7/Luke 11:9)

So it is time for us to fulfil the commandment to us, “Give to
everyone who asks of you, and do not refuse him who would
borrow.” (Matt. 5:42)

And all the more so when those requesting are such [as you], and
the things [requested] are not of our own but of the Lord’s, for we do
not dare to boast of what we have received as if we had not received
it. (1 Cor. 4:7)

For which reason, I shall with gusto offer to you today [words] of
the early and fruitful clusters from the primal and primordial root,
itself planted by the Father, (Matt. 15:13) which none can disparage as
foreign, nor long for another, better one.
For Christ’s was the word which said, “No man who has drunk the old desires the new, for he says, ‘The old is sweeter’.” (Luke 5:39)

Thus He referred to it the lawyer who inquired concerning eternal life, saying, “What is written in the Law? How do you read it?” (Luke 10:25) Because it too is life-giving; as it says, “Do this, and you will live hereby.” (Lev. 18:5)

Wherefore, desiring yet more your love, we set before ourself that which is the desire of all minds and the terror of all hearts, that which the intellectible lips of the Creator spoke, and the fiery fingers wrote the first time, and vouchsafed again a second time through a forty day fast—the ten utterances which He Himself, the Primal Good, the Lord of All, enunciated, speaking with articulate voice.

I am the Lord thy God; thou shalt have no other god beside me.

First and foremost, one must understand that for many reasons this utterance is more greatly to be honored and respected than numerous wise sayings of divine writ.

Firstly, because Moses testifies to it, the first prophet and lawgiver, the friend of God and faithful in all His house, (Lev. 12:7) and praised more than all the earth for his meekness, (Lev. 12:3) with whom God spoke mouth to mouth, apparently and not in dark speeches, (Lev. 12:8) whereby he was divinized not only in appellation, but in reality and work. Moreover, the creatures obeyed him as they obeyed God; through them he tormented Egypt and elevated Israel with great signs and miracles.

Secondly, this utterance is to be respected because it comes from the Book of Exodus, which the ancient folk greatly loved as

---

1 Philo Questions and Answers on Exodus II.42 says, by contrast, that the commandments were written by God, but “not of hands, for He is not of human form, but at His command and nod.” Vardan’s Universal History, Moscow, 1861, p. 30 quotes Eupolemos as saying that God wrote the commandments using the letters Moses had invented. (further, see note 4, below)

2 Eusebius, Preparatio Evangelica IX. 18, 1.23.27 quotes Artabanus to the effect that Moses was honored as a God and named Hermes because he invented hieroglyphics and interpreted the sacred letters. Philo, Life of Moses I.xxviii also says, “Again, was not the joy of his partnership with the Father and Maker of all magnified also by the honour of being deemed worthy to bear the same title? For he was named god and king of the whole nation...."
containing all God's benefits and blessings to them. For as the Syrians say, Exodus was written by Moses first, [as the record of] what he himself had seen and known, and then he said, "I have written down what I have seen. Show me that which I have not seen, the creation, and I will write that down as well." 3

And the Lord heard him and took him into the bosom of the cloud which surrounded Mount Sinai for forty days and created before him all the creatures, incorporeally and conceptually.

He also commanded him to write down the structure of the Tabernacle. And He said, "Take care to make it after the pattern which was shown you on the Mount." (Ex. 25:40) And it was after this that he also wrote the book of Genesis and the others.

As the Jewish philosopher Eupolemos 4 says, when the children of Israel crossed the Red Sea, a spirit of grace came upon them and they received a new language. 4 Therewith they sang the "Let us bless...." (Ex. 15:1,21) forgetting the Egyptian language, just as at the building of the Tower [the original language was forgotten], so that they would distance themselves from the customs of Egypt. 6

---

3 This tradition stands in clear distinction to that of Philo, who states that in Moses' writing the history (i.e., Genesis) preceded the Laws because, it was necessary to show that God was the first and greatest lawgiver, in history first and then through the Laws (Life of Moses II.viii), and because to have put the Laws first would have smacked of tyranny (Life of Moses II.ix).

4 Eupolemos was a writer of the second century B.C. A priest, and the delegate of Judah Maccabee to Rome, he was also involved in the politics of his day. An awareness of his work seems to have come into the Christian world indirectly, through the compilation of Alexander Polyhistor of Miletos as preserved by Diogenes Laertius, Stephanus of Byzantium, Eusebius and Clement. The line of transmission behind Armenian quotations that can be traced ultimately to Eupolemos remains to be investigated. See Ben Zion Wachold, Eupolemos: A Study of Greco-Judaic Literature Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1974. Vardan's Universal History, p. 30 quotes Eupolemos as the source for Moses' having invented the script, and having first composed Exodus.

5 Vardan's Universal History, p. 30 etymologizes the word Hebrew as deriving from eber, to cross. In Vardan's teacher Vanakan's Questions and Answers (text and translation in progress) there is a further etymology: Eber was a wood-carrier; hence, his name derives from the aorist third person of the verb pblpblb.

6 Eber is mentioned in Genesis 10 and 11 as the grandson of Arphaxad and the father of Peleg. I Chronicles 1:19 adds that Peleg was so named because "in his days the earth was divided." Vanakan Vardapet's Questions and Answers includes information to the effect that after the Tower of Babel, people wanted to ascertain which had been the primal language, so they brought out an antediluvian text written by Enos; a certain Eber was able to read it, thus proving his language (named "Hebrew" after
The great Moses, being made wise by the same grace, first created letters for that language and then with that script the tables [of the Law] were written, and Moses composed the Pentateuch.\(^7\)

And another reason for the preeminence of these utterances is that they are the headings of all the specific ordinances which Moses stated and set, and contain them.

Moreover, the number ten is a mystical one, for it is holy and devoted to God.\(^8\) He ordered the tenth of all [their] goods to be given to Him. Too, the mathematicians honor it by calling it the Mother of the [three] even numbers and of the [one] even-odd and of the five odd integers.\(^9\) It is also progenitor of one hundred and one thousand.\(^10\)

---

7 Moses' invention of the alphabet and his writing of the Law with it are mentioned in Eusebius, *Preparatio Evangelica* IX 26. (Clement, *Stromates* 1.153.4 also mentions that Moses taught the Jews the letters which were passed on to the Phoenicians and from them to the Greeks, but there the use of the letters for writing the Law is not mentioned.) The same tradition is to be found in Mixayêl Asori, p. 33, where it is attributed to Eupolemos. Mixayêl, however, is interested in the story mainly as evidence that the Hebrew script is younger than the Syriac. Vardan's disciple, Yovhannes Erznkači, gives Moses as creator of the alphabet but also mentions the possibility that the letters were granted to him together with the Laws. See the Preface to his *Compilation of Commentary on Grammar* (annotated translation forthcoming).


9 *ibid*, VI.20. The odd are 1, 3, 5, 7, 9; the even are 2 and 8; and the even-odd is 6, whose factors are the odd number 3 and the even number 2. Arithmology was such a pervasive influence in Armenian thought, as also in other traditions, that the treatment of each number in Armenian deserves a volume on its own. A text and translation of Vardan Aygekči's sermon *On the Number Ten* will appear in the 2003 number of the *St. Nersess Theological Review*, and the translation of a treatise in verse on the number twelve will follow.
For this reason was it aptly named tasn, since it carries (tani) in itself many significant things. For example, in our [experience], the ten phrases of the Nicene creed and the ten phrases of the Lord’s Prayer.

Too, there are ten creations: [the first consisting of the four elements], and then the seven fixed stars, plus the one that is unmoving. These nine are everything sublunary, while the tenth is the uncreate Word of God, which sustains and directs Creation. (Heb. 1:3)

Again, within us there are the five physical senses and the five powers of the spirit. The physical senses are obvious, while the five powers [of the spirit] are these: reason, sensation, imagination, reflection and opinion. Reason is the visionary element of the spirit. Sensation is the understanding of particulars, without [awareness of their] cause. Imagination is a complex of understandings, without [awareness of their] cause. Reflection is a global comprehension [of something together with its] cause, revealed by God. Opinion is general knowledge [of things together with their] cause, [acquired] through learning, [as one is] informed by human beings.

\[10 \text{ ibid. vii.27. In other words, } 10 + 20 + 30 + 40 = 100 \text{ and } 100 + 200 + 300 + 400 = 1,000 \text{ in the same way that } 1 + 2 + 3 + 4 = 10.\]

\[11 \text{ In making this etymological pun, Vardan is mirroring Philo’s assertion that ten is rightly given the name of decad, because it is “the decad, or receiver of all kinds of numbers, ratios, progressions, concords and harmonies.” (ibid, VI.23)}\]

\[12 \text{ It is worth noting that the sermon on the Lord’s Prayer found in MM 1398 f. 64r-72r, attributed to Vardan, does seem to divide the prayer into ten phrases, but nowhere in the text is attention specifically drawn to this point.}\]

\[13 \text{ This paragraph offers a slight variation on Clement, Stromates II.xi: “as also certainly in the universe overleaping the nine divisions, the first consisting of the four elements put in one place for equal interchange; and then the seven wandering stars and the one that wanders not, the ninth, to the perfect number, which is above the nine, and the tenth division, he must reach to the knowledge of God, to speak briefly, desiring the Maker after the creation.” Vardan writes in his Commentary on the Pentateuch (MM 1267 f. 5r) /This also is to be inquired into. There were ten commandments on the tablets, and there are ten creations. Why did Scripture then write them not as ten, but as five [and five]? Because there are five senses, by means of which the passions were introduced and the creatures are examined. Five [commandments] are for their cleansing clarifying. Again, it wrote them as five, leaving the four Evangelists plus the one [book] of the Acts of the Apostles.”}\]

\[14 \text{ David the Invincible Philosopher. Definitions and Divisions of Philosophy (tr. Bridget Kendall and Robert W. Thomson) University of Pennsylvania Armenian Texts and Studies 5, Chico, California: Scholars Press, 1983, p. 109 lists the same five spiritual faculties, but in different order, and with different explanations.}\]
The Pythagorians, too, exalt the number ten, which they call the
generator of the four,\textsuperscript{15} which are the world’s matter, and the
elements, whose equivalents in us are phlegm, blood, and yellow and
black bile.\textsuperscript{16} And one plus two plus three plus four gives birth to ten.

In the same vein, too, there are ten categories elucidated by
Aristotle, whereby all the wit and wisdom of us beings can be
understood. And they are these: First, Substance; that is, being.
Second, Quantity; that is, measure. Third, Quality; for example, color.
Fourth, Relation; as the noun “son” implies “father.” Fifth, Place; that
is, location. Sixth, Time; that is, when. Seventh, Posture; for example,
seated or standing. Eighth, State; for example, possessing a weapon or
a garment. Ninth, Action; for example, making, planting or building.
Tenth, Passivity; for example being tormented or being beaten.
Nothing pertaining to us beings falls outside of these ten
[categories].\textsuperscript{17}

Thus the Creator rightfully used this number of virility and
wisdom in His law-giving. There are also many more preeminent
qualities of the decad that the philosopher Philo lists, which we have
left out in order to spare both your ears and our own tongue.

\textsuperscript{15} i.e., of the Tetraktys, the arrangement of the first four integers to form an equilateral
triangle, whose components not only added up to ten but which also contained the
symphonic rations 1:2 (octave), 2:3 (perfect fifth) and 3:4 (perfect fourth). The
transmission of Pythagorean ideas to Armenian circles is a largely unexplored field of
inquiry. One recalls that at a time of active intellectual interchange between Armenia
and Byzantium, the Byzantine Patriarch Photius preserved a \textit{Life of Pythagoras}. For
more on the Pythagoreans’ views on the number ten, see Fideler, David (ed.) \textit{The
Pythagorean Sourcebook and Library} (compiled and translated by Kenneth Sylvan
Guthrie) Grand Rapids, MI: Phanes Press, 1988, especially the fragments of Philolaus
found on p. 171.

\textsuperscript{16} In Vardan’s disciple Yovhannēs Erznači this commonplace of physical science
became the basis for a music therapy system intended to aid people with disordered
humors. (See the chapter On Reading in his \textit{Compilation of Commentary on
Grammar})

\textsuperscript{17} Aristotle, \textit{Categories IV} is the ultimate source for this list. There, however, the
example given for the category “Relation” is different; The example Vardan uses
here—that to say \textit{son} implies that there is a father—is part of the grammatical
tradition. Vardan’s disciple Yovhannēs Erznači uses it in the chapter On Nouns of
his \textit{Compilation of Commentary on Grammar}, deriving it from an anonymous source.
Philo’s list of the categories in \textit{On the Decalogue VIII.30-31 uses a different order. Its
example for the category “Relation” is the following: “I become relative when
anyone is on my right hand or on my left.”
After this, we must say for what reason God gave the Law in the depth of the desert, and not in the cities of Egypt or Canaan. It was because cities are full of a myriad evils and fathomless harm, and are hemmed in with iniquity against God and man.\textsuperscript{18} [This was] particularly [the case] in Egypt at that time,\textsuperscript{19} so the Lord did not consider it right to show honor to [Egypt] then by revealing Himself publicly to all and giving the Law. Instead, He took them aside from there, washed away the habitual filth from their hearts and then sent into their hearts His sweet drink.\textsuperscript{20}

It would also not have been right to give them the land of Canaan and afterwards institute the Law, just as there is no one who when making ready to sail first takes his ship out of port and then sets up tiller and sail and takes on cargo. Rather, while he is still in the planning stage and sitting at home, he carefully prepares it all. In the same way it was necessary and right first to compose instruction in good government and delimit the canons, thereby preparing the people who were to be called by the Creator’s name (Jer. 14:9 and elsewhere), and [then] to [have them] take possession of their allotted territory.\textsuperscript{21}

And again, it was right to settle firmly in the minds of all that the Law is no human invention and artifice, but the wit and wisdom of the true God.\textsuperscript{22} This was confirmed because [while they] remained in a desert place, rocky and without food or water, He produced manna from the air and water from the dry rock, and quail from the wind so that they would believe that the One for whom such things were possible was also the cause of their physical life, and the source of all life’s good is His, and from Him are the salvific Laws.\textsuperscript{23}

\textsuperscript{18} Philo, \textit{On the Decalogue} I.2

\textsuperscript{19} The Questions and Answers of Vanakan Vardapet says, "Satan’s fall is said to have been into Egypt, on the east side, onto the island of Tabithabios." Vardan’s \textit{Geography}, Paris, 1960 says only that when satan fell, he set his throne in Egypt (p. 66). However, Vardan’s \textit{Zlank} (SJ898) has the following passage: "They say that the fall of satan took place in Egypt, on the island of Tapiron, for which reason religions multiplied there more than in all countries; even to mice and weasels and dogs and ferrets, onions and garlic." (10v)

\textsuperscript{20} \textit{On the Decalogue} II.10-13

\textsuperscript{21} \textit{Ibid} III.14

\textsuperscript{22} \textit{Ibid} IV.15

\textsuperscript{23} \textit{Ibid} IV.16-17
So God purified Mount Sinai as a location and temple for His glory. The elements, receiving the command to make Him a temple, surrounded the Mount with darkness and mist mingled with flame, and [brought forth] rumbling peals of thunder like sounding trumpets. Rocks tumbled and rolled down to the terror and fear of beasts and human animals. And a pillar of light, tall and broad, descended from on high, whose pinnacle held up the vault of heaven; and all its length, molten and hardening, came down and engulfed the mountain’s peak in flame.

And [Moses] watched from the far side, purifying the people by a three day separation from their wives and by washing and laving their bodies in symbolic water and making their clothes white. In fear and trembling they waited, listening intently. After that, a fearful and astounding voice spoke.

And again there were lightning bolts out of nowhere, and the astounding voice of God, not like the voice of breathing creatures, beyond the articulated and modulated [voices] of rational living beings. For the voice took on the form of flame, tore through the mist like a spear and pushing it aside descended to the foot of the mountain. Scripture bears witness to what I say, attesting, “And all the people saw the voice of God.” (Exodus 20:18) And this is no mere figure of speech, but a real deed! It is appropriate for human speech to be audible to the ears, while [it is appropriate] for God’s to be visible to the eyes, [because sight] is more trustworthy than hearing.

And the words [of the divine voice] were thus: first it said, I am the Lord thy God. Thou shalt have no other god beside Me.

By saying I am, He expressed the very truth which [He had previously stated] when Moses asked Him, “What is your name?” and He had replied, “I am Who I Am.” (Ex. 3:14) As Jeremiah said, “You, Lord, who are the Lord,” (Jer. 32:17) making it clear that He is pure Being and we beings came into existence through Him.

24 The description of the Sinai setting parallels On the Decalogue XI.44-45 in dramatic tone. XI.45 uses the same word as the Armenian here, վթար (=.on tiptoe), to denote intent listening and anticipation. It occurs in Life of Moses I.xxx.169 as well, where it describes the people’s intent listening to the sound of Pharaoh’s pursuit.

25 On the Decalogue IX.33-35 speaks of the voice as flame, while stressing its audibility rather than its visibility. XI.46-47 says specifically that “so clearly and distinctly were the words formed by it that they seemed to see rather than hear them… it is the case that the voice of men is audible, but the voice of God truly visible.”
And [by then saying] the Lord He showed His authority and power to judge. And [by saying] God [He expressed] His creatorly and benevolent capacity, whereby He brought hither and established everything.

He put Lord first and then God, because He accepted them as servants, taking them out of Egypt so that they might fear Him: as it is written, “A servant fears his master.” (Malachi 1:6) And as a benevolent God, He did not require any accounting of their former behavior.

Thou shalt have no other gods besides me implies that there were none in the past, and there are none now, and let there be none in the future. For He knew that they were going to fashion the calf (Ex. 32:1-6) and the calves (I Kings 12:28) and were going to say, “These are your gods, O Israel, who brought you out of Egypt.”

But one should ponder why He speaks this utterance as if with a single person, saying “I am the Lord thy God,” rather than “I am the Lord your God,” and “thou shalt have,” rather than “you [shall have],” when the hearers were ten thousand ten thousands, aside from the women and children, whom they did not count.

Now, this is the resolution of the matter. By speaking as if with one individual, the Lord showed that one person who carries out the Law, even if he be poor or unremarkable, is the equal of the entire people. The Lord did this so that none of the kings or the honored princes or the arrogant judges should despise any of the poor. For the one who made all of us created each individual to be solicitous for the good, and for communion with the Good. Therefore, do not ignore any of the poor or neglect their welfare. For this reason He addresses each person individually, saying, I am the Lord thy God; thou shalt have....

He makes it clear that “I am God, and also the Son and Spirit who are from my own nature, the former begotten and the latter having

26 Vardan is very fond of this etymology, deriving לֶבַע From וָלִנָּה. It is to be found in his Commentary on the Pentateuch (MM 1267, 22a), and in his Żllánk (SJ 898, 34v)
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come forth by emanation, indivisible by nature, without time and uncreate and equal in all their essence: individual in person and one in all goodness and power and will.”

This Moses clarifies in Deuteronomy, saying, *Hear, O Israel, the Lord thy God is one Lord.* (Deut. 6:4) Another philosopher understood the force of these words and made it known to the Jews in the presence of King Ptolemy, when they read the translated books in order to test the unanimity of the translators. Coming to that point [in the text], Hermes halted the reading and said, “Know, O Jews, that by saying Lord and God and again adding the Lord is One [Scripture tells us that] God is Three Persons and One Nature. Using [the word] One, it removes Him from [the realm of] multiplicity: for there must be [only] one leadership and one authority and one creativity, so that the creation may stand firm. A multiplicity of authorities dissolves and corrupts [order] just as does a lack of authority. A country is destroyed and dismembered either by having no king or by having several.31

As Evagrius the Intellect of the Desert said, God is a single and unique and simple Nature, whereas we creatures are [made] by a patching together of many things. The excellent and the good and the noble is one and indissoluble, and everything which is near the simple and close to it, partakes of the Good and the excellent. Multiplicity, on the other hand, is destructive and dissoluble.

After this, [the text goes on to say] *Thou shalt not make for thee idols in the likeness of anything in heaven above or in the earth beneath.* He calls idols everything those benighted in mind, or deceived by satan with various rationalizations, made; whether beaten or cast of gold or silver, or from stone, wood and clay.

Since human nature, estranged from God’s nature and from Paradise, wallowed in all kinds of sin without discrimination, and by prodigal life became destitute of spiritual treasure or of divine glory and benefits, and it was afflicted in this state, and sought a way to recover its previous goodness.

31 Although Vardan’s preface to his *Commentary on the Psalms* contains a lengthy excerpt from Epiphanius on the production of the Septuagint, this reference to Hermes and the trinitarian teaching of the first commandment is not included there. The excerpt was reproduced in *The Armenian text of Epiphanius of Salamis’ On Weights and Measures*, ed. Roberta R. Ervine and Michael E. Stone (CSCO 583/Subsidia 105), Louvain: Peeters, 2000.
However, the enemy of the truth came forward and leading them astray like blind folk caused them to fall over a precipice, because he caused them to look at the heaven above and at the earth beneath, and made them regard as gods whatever seemed beautiful and useful.\textsuperscript{32}

So they took the creatures to worship: some worshiped the sun and called it Vahagn. Others [worshiped] the moon and named it Artemis. Some [worshiped] the hemispheres of heaven and called them children of Zruan.\textsuperscript{33} Others [worshiped] the whole earth and called it Chronos, and others [worshiped] other planets and fixed stars, giving them various names.

And they were not satisfied with that, but rather made images of them with their hands, and worshiped them. It is against this that He cautions them; not to look at the heavens above and set up gods made with hands.

And do not look at the earth below and set up any likeness [He says], because some of the heathen worshiped the air and called it Adoyis; and others [worshiped] the fire and named it Hephestos. Others [worshiped] the water and called it Poseidon. Some [worshiped] the earth and named it Demeter, and other blind-minded ones who were even worse impiously [worshiped] wild animals and reptiles and beasts, even weasels and mice, as the Persians [worshiped] fire and water and the Babylonians [worshiped] great vipers and snakes, and the Egyptians [worshiped] he-goats and rams,\textsuperscript{34} and the Ethiopians [worshiped] weasels and crocodiles.\textsuperscript{35} And those who were most voluptuous divinized the passions and desires. Others also [worshiped] other things and made their images and bowed down to them.

\textsuperscript{32} This explanation of the origins of paganism, which is a commonplace in Armenian literature, has roots in The Wisdom of Solomon, ch. 13.

\textsuperscript{33} On the Decalogue XII.53-55 also includes a list of things worshiped by the pagans. It includes sun, moon, planets, stars, heaven, the world. The earth is called Kore or Demeter or Pluto; the air, Poseidon; the fire, Hera; the fire, Hephaestus; the sun, Apollo; the moon, Artemis; the morning-star, Aphrodite; and the glitterer, Hermes. The most interesting differences between Philo’s list and that of Vardan are that whereas for Philo the sun is Apollo and the hemispheres of heaven are called the Dioscuri, Vardan calls them “Vahagn” and “children of Zruan,” respectively.

\textsuperscript{34} \textit{Ibid} XVI.76 mentions the Egyptians’ worship of rams and goats, among many other things. It does not mention the animals worshiped by other races.

\textsuperscript{35} The Wisdom of Solomon, ch. 15 mentions the worship of hateful animals, but does not name them individually.
Yet others made portraits of their loved ones, and when time had passed, they were considered gods by some of the ignorant and were worshiped. As Solomon says, a father immersed in mourning for his son who had died young made his portrait, and went day after day to greet it. His habit deceived others, and they turned it into an object of worship.\[36\]

The all-wise God distances the chosen nation from this, which is mortally harmful and deadly to the spirit. It is for this reason that He says, *thou shalt make no graven image.* It is as if to say, “Do not create your death with your own hands,” for “Idols are dead, and those who made them shall be like them.” (Ps. 115:8/135:18) The Almighty is not in need of any honor [offered by mortals].

The second commandment says, *Do not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain.* This was well arranged: following [the affirmation of] God’s existence it clarifies His name as well. All things have their existence first, and then their name.\[37\] Although the name of God’s real nature is unbearable and has not been revealed, yet *God* and *Lord* indicate His benevolent and punitive [characteristics] and it is not proper to use them for idle matters.

Thus, it is suitable for a perfect person not to swear at all, as Christ taught the mature disciples of the Gospel. (Matt. 5:34) However, He ordered the imperfect ancients, who were accustomed to swear by the name of their idols, to swear justly in His name, so that they should by all means distance themselves from swearing by idols and be bound in heart to the name of the true God, and speak it with their lips in all matters and utterances.

There are three varieties of oath: When they say, “God is my witness,” it is a testimony. It is a terrible and awful thing to call upon the name of the King of Kings to witness false matters! For anyone who calls upon [the name] of an earthly king or prince [in a false matter] is unforgivably condemned to die.

---

36 The Wisdom of Solomon 14:14-15. The idea that portraits evolved into objects of worship is mentioned in Eznik, *Refutation of Sects* I.10 and III.5.

37 David the Invincible Philosopher, *Definitions and Divisions of Philosophy* (tr. Bridget Kendall and Robert W. Thomson) University of Pennsylvania Armenian Texts and Studies 5, Chico, California: Scholars Press, 1983, p. 59 says categorically, “Everything must first exist before it can receive a name.” Yovhanēs Erznkači expands this idea to say that a thing receives its name either from its form, or from its function, or from the sound which it itself produces. See the chapter Concerning Grammar in his *Compilation of Commentary on Grammar.*
The second is when one says that if something is not so, one has denied God. This is called abjuration. To use this even in true matters is great iniquity.

The third is when one says, “By God,” “By God’s glory,” “By the power of the Cross,” “By this Gospel and cross.”

But [before swearing] one should ascertain that the matter is a great one—the saving of a life or the good of the church and other such—and that it actually happened and is right, that the one who takes the oath is pure in heart and that the place is cleansed and that the hearers in attendance are worthy. [Under these conditions] oaths of testimony are allowable.

There are some, however, who regularly mention the fearsome name of God in vain, and in vain situations, and with impure souls. If such persons do not come to repentance, they face an inescapable punishment even greater than that of idle chatterers, whom Christ said will “give account on the day of judgment.” (Matt. 12:36)

Again, it is not appropriate to use the name of God for things living or inanimate, as the errant heathen confessed empty and negligible things to be God, or as nowadays sinful and corrupt men “worship” other humans, [saying], “You are my god!” This also is a great iniquity.

The fourth commandment is Remember the Sabbath day. And its explanation is something great and important. For it says, “God rested on the seventh day,” and since man is in the image and likeness of God, in spirit and mind and rationality and in all virtue, one ought to emulate one’s prototype, God, in all good works. The same applies to labor and rest. God, however, [rested] only once, because His nature is without deficiency, while humans will continually do so, [as they] suffer and are condemned through sin. Thus, He commanded us to “eat bread in the sweat of one’s face.” (Gen. 3:19)

The Jews too denominated the Jubilee, “freedom.” Since they were lovers of evil and hard hearted towards their servants and beasts, God forcibly brought them to have mercy on servants and animals. “Your servant,” it says, “shall rest; your maid servant and your beast

38 On the Decalogue XIX.93-94.
39 ibid XIX.95
40 ibid XX.99
of burden. (Deut. 5:14) and you also shall cease from sin on the Sabbath, for the name of the day signifies idleness and relaxation.

The Commandment was a tutor to their imperfect childishness. (Gal. 3:24) But when Christ the perfection of the Law came, and taught the perfect [Law], He broke the Sabbath with good deeds just as his Father, who is ever motivated towards the good. And He commanded us likewise to “be perfect, as your Father [is perfect].” (Matt. 5:48) Because of this we take away the Jewish respect towards the seventh day and honor it [instead with] the commemoration of the holy martyrs, as the canons of Nicaea stipulated. For they truly gave rest to the will of God by their labors and their blood, as the word Sabbath indicates, and they are inseparable from the Lord in the same way that there is no gap between the Sabbath and Sunday.

And we make our relaxation from the weariness of labor on Sunday, which is the first-born and the beginning of Creation’s days. It received the Resurrection of Christ and again the general resurrection of all is reserved for it at the end of the world. On that day Christians are commanded to refrain from physical cares, to take account of whatever errors they have committed during the [other] six days, to cleanse them by confession, to be instructed carefully and with awe for the coming days, and to commune in the holy mystery of divine glory.

The fifth commandment says, Honor thy father and mother. This is the midpoint of the two [groups] of five [commandments]. The first [five] are called “dominical” and are to be carried out, while the second [five] are called “human” and are all things to be avoided.

This is appropriate, for one’s father and mother are mediators. They are like God immortal in this mortal world: in their parental role they are the image and likeness of God. God brought us into existence

---

41 The same idea is found in Ephrem’s Commentary on Exodus. See Edward G. Mathews, Jr., The Armenian Commentaries on Exodus-Deuteronomy Attributed to Ephrem the Syrian, CSCO 587, Scriptores Armeniaci 25, Louvain, 2001, p. 38.
42 Cf., the patarak: katarumn örinae ew margaréiê du es Krisdos, based on an understanding of I Cor. 13:10.
43 This is not among the canons of either Nicaea I or Nicaea II; canon LI of the Synod of Laodicea does mention the celebration of martyrs “on Sabbaths and Lord’s Days” in Lent.
44 On the Decalogue XXI.98
45 ibid., XXII.106
from nothing and gave us birth without passion and in an immortal way, while in this mortal sphere [parents] are His image and likeness in that they [gave us birth and brought us into existence] corruptibly, and with passion.46

For this reason, all god-fearing people should love their parents. This is not a benefit [we bestow on them] nor a grace [we offer them], but the repayment of a debt—and such a favor as can be recompensed equally by no amount of effort! From it one falls always short, for who can give [his parents] birth?47 And whatever one has, one has thanks to them; whether it be goods, they are given by them, or they are the cause of whatever good one has.48 So, as they say, “Parents are visible gods.”49 The invisible God [is God] of the whole world, while parents [are gods] for their own offspring, by the Creator’s good pleasure having become instruments for the increase of His image to the human race.

Lambs and calves and puppies and the cubs of all the beasts are knit to their mothers with a natural compassion, as are the young of all birds. Storks are especially loving towards their parents. People say that they gently lead their aged parents around, assisting them with their wings from this side and from that, and those who are especially weak they cause to sit in the nest and feed them with food from their hunting, as they themselves enjoyed parental care in their weak infancy.50

It would be most unbecoming for us to be found more cruel and ungrateful towards our parents than are the witless animals and birds! And that [commandment] is not without promise and a good blessing, but rather it is profitable in its words and its rewards. As Solomon said, “So that it may be well with you, and you may live long upon the earth.”51 The divinely inspired Apostle Paul also exhorted young people to the same: he recalls this promise saying, “Honor your father...which is the first commandment with promise.” (Eph. 6:2)

46 ibid, XXII.111
47 ibid, XXII.112
48 ibid XXIII.118
49 ibid, XXIII.120
50 ibid, XXIII.115-118 cites the behavior of storks, though it doesn’t mention that they lead their aged parents around.
51 This is found in Deut. 5:16, but I have not located it in the books of Solomon.
Although it is the fifth commandment, it is the first one to include a promise. For the other utterances of the ten commandments do not include any such good news of a promise for those who carry them out, but only this one which concerns parents.

Now, having completed the first five, those devoted to the divine, with a bit of commentary, let us move on to the second [five], which are appropriate to human beings’ [relationships] and an aid to our feeble nature. They say, *Do not kill, do not commit adultery, do not steal, do not bear false witness, do not covet.*

The wise Philo ranks adultery first, and then killing.\(^{52}\) However, in the text of Moses’ writing, *Do not kill* is put first, which is appropriate and suitable to the wisdom of the Creator.

For the pollution of killing began with Cain’s [killing] of Abel, and then adultery [arose] from the sons of Seth, a long time afterward. So the Law is a physician; pursuing our lostness, it seizes upon our first disease, murder, whereby Satan most angered God and moved Him to such wrath against the house of Cain that He blotted out the memory of them by the waters of destruction.

After that, He commanded Noah and his sons “Do not spill the blood of a human being. But if you do, I am the avenger,” He said, “for I made man in the image of God upon earth. For that reason I will require a man’s blood at his brother’s hand; at the hand of all beasts will I require the blood of a human being.” (Gen. 9:6)

He says, “At the hand of his brother,” expressing that every killer is a fratricide and the like of Cain. For humans are brethren to one another, being one nature and the work of one God. And Christians are all the more so, for they are the body of Christ and have one Mother, the font; and one food, the body of the Lord (I Cor. 10:17); and one instructor, the Gospel (II Tim. 3:16); and are called to one hope (Eph. 4:4). And according to Christ’s Gospel, [Christians] ought to die for one another. (John 15:13) Thus, unless he repent in a worthy fashion, anyone who intentionally causes the death of a Christian is a participator and collaborator with those who crucified Christ. As one of the pagan philosophers says, “we are all in one envelope, as it were; the string of createdness ties us together, and it is not fitting to break the tie and the signet seal of the Creator. Should anyone dare to

\(^{52}\) *On the Decalogue* XXIV.121-122 gives Philo’s reason for this; adultery has its roots in the love of pleasure, and it leaves nothing whole in the life it touches.
do so, he harms himself greatly, and in addition he is responsible to God for that person [whom he kills].” To kill and to rend is characteristic of fish and wild beasts, among whom the smaller are food for the larger and the more intrepid. However, the Lord’s instruction to the human race is that it is allowable to slaughter cattle and sheep and other living birds and prey, but the killing of a human being is inimical to God and unforgivable. Even involuntary killing is canonically subject to penance.\(^{53}\) For that reason He prevented the unrefined Jews from killing, with the threat [that a killer would be] killed in return.

It is also murder when we kill our own spirits with sin. As it is written, “Every soul that sins, it shall die.” (Ezekiel 18:4, 20)

The seventh commandment—the second in the [second] five—says Thou shalt not commit adultery. This began from the [time when] the sons of Seth were forbidden to mingle with [the daughters of Cain] in marriage, and they slighted God’s covenant which He had set between the house of Cain [and the house of Seth]. For the grandchildren of Cain were instructed by Satan: the men invented minstrelsy and the women invented rouge and eye-shadow.\(^{54}\) And they motivated the God-loving race [of Seth] with the hankerings of lust. From their adulterous lechery murder increased. As St. Ephrem says, “Twenty men or more died for a single woman.”\(^{55}\) At that point God, disgusted and offended, said, “My spirit will not remain among those humans, because they have become passion and flesh.”\(^{56}\) (Gen. 6:3) Thus, by reason of the two evils, murder and adultery, they were

\(^{53}\) *Life of Moses* I.I.viii.214 also stresses that even one who kills “justly and in self-defence and under compulsion has something to answer for, in view of the primal common kinship of mankind.”

\(^{54}\) This statement also features in Vardan’s *Universal History*, p. 11, where the men who invented music are Lamech’s sons Juval and Tubal, and the woman inventor of cosmetics is their sister Noyemi. The same information is also found in the *Questions and Answers* of Vanakan, and in *The Armenian Commentary on Genesis Attributed to Ephrem the Syrian*, tr. Edward G. Mathews, Jr. (CSCO 573 Scriptores Armeniaci 24) Louvain, 1998 56.

\(^{55}\) This same quotation, again attributed to Ephrem, is found in Vardan’s *Universal History*, pp. 12-13. It is not, however, from the Armenian Commentary on Genesis mentioned in note 54.

\(^{56}\) The Armenian text of this verse does not include the word “passion.” Philo’s *Questions on Genesis* I.90 does mention in its discussion of this verse that “the nature of flesh is alien to wisdom so long as it is familiar with desire.”
wiped out by the flood. All the animals [perished] as well, except those whose seed remained in the world because of the ark, by mercy of the Creator.

After that, when human beings had once again multiplied, the evil one re-appeared in Esau, Reuben, Jonathan, and many others. It still crops up in the libidinous persons of the intemperate, whom the prophet Jeremiah censures; those who have a wife but are not content with that he calls not only "dogs," but "horses roaming at large," (Jer. 5:8) and "wallowing swine." 57 One aptly calls them "dogs," because it is typical of dogs not to mate permanently, as it is of fornicators who have no legal spouse but either keep a whore at home or go to such, or who either deceive modest women or are deceived by impure women.

The censure applies equally to men and to women. As Paul says, "Do not be deceived by the words of those who say that God is merciful and forgiving. Neither murderers nor adulterers nor fornicators will inherit the Kingdom of God." 58 (I Cor. 6:9) Not to mention the crimes of sodomy or bestiality, whose enormity the punishment of Sodom and Gomorra and Jericho demonstrates.

The Lord cut to the root of murder when He said in the Gospel, "Whoever is angry at his brother without cause, pays in hell." (Matt. 5:22) Too, "Whoever looks on a woman to lust after her has committed adultery in his heart." (Matt. 5:28) Now, if anger leads to hell, and a look makes a man adulterous, what [punishment] will a murderer and an [actual] adulterer bear?!

The eighth commandment from the beginning, and the third in the second five says, *Thou shalt not steal.*

One of the saints says that a thief is a public enemy, since he would steal from everyone if he could; he is only prevented by his incapacity. To the best of his ability, he spares no one. 59 And it is clear enough that any thief with the capability steals estates and cities and fortresses. 60 So it is essential to nip this in the bud, and not to accustom young people to even the most insignificant filching, lest

---

57 The word *fung* does not appear in Jeremiah.
58 The liberties taken with this citation show a degree of editorial license not untypical for this period's use of Scripture.
59 On the Decalogue XXVI.135
60 *Ibid.* XXVI.136
they reach out their hands towards larger things and one be liable to God for their souls.  

A thieving person is doubly worthy of death, because He commanded man to eat bread in the sweat of his brow, (Gen. 3:19) and to clothe ourselves with raiment by our own exertion, not to defraud others by stealing as if we were pilfering mice or wild animals gnawing through the walls.

The one who gave us life commanded us to give our shirt to the one who takes our cloak, to go a second mile with the one who forcibly makes us go one mile, and never to resist the evil person. (Matt. 5:40-41) What answer will we give, then, if we cause many evils to others, by defrauding them?

If we are disciples of Christ, we should follow his admonition and call down upon ourselves the blessing of the Prophet who said, “You shall eat the fruit of your labors.” (Isaiah 3:10)

Moreover, we should dispense and give to the poor, so that our justice may live forever. (Ps. 112:9/II Cor. 9:9) We should hasten to put into action the virtuous admonition to work night and day in order not to be a burden to anyone, (I Thess. 2:9) but rather to give to those who may have need—seed corn so that in the time of harvest we may not fail to reap eternal life, receiving grace and blessing a hundred-fold in this life. (Matt 19:20)

The ninth exhortation, or the fourth in the second five, says Thou shalt not bear false witness.

This is a great iniquity, since first and foremost the false witness defames the truth, which is God’s name and the adornment of all things.  

He testifies to what he did not see or hear, and besides, he connives at others’ sins, and by confirming them emplants them in the evils which they have done. According to the Lord’s decree he becomes the abode of satan; as it says, “When one lies, one speaks out of what pertains [to satan].” (John 8:44) For the truth resides with God, and falsehood is satan’s. Christ says, “out of what pertains [to satan],” in other words, “Falsehood is none of mine, but it is satan’s store.”

---
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By it, satan deceived our foremother Eve, and as many or her offspring as he was able. Thus it says, “He is a liar, and the father of falsehood,” (John 8:44) for he is the begetter and the father of deception, and every false witness collaborates with his will. If [a false witness] is not remorseful and does not repent, he is in addition worthy of torment because the Lord destroys those who utter falsehood. For every mouth that speaks the truth is a portal for the Spirit of truth, while all lying lips are an entryway for demons and to hell.

Let us rather open our mouths with the word of God and with truth, that we may receive the Spirit, setting the fear of God as a guard and a strong gate for our lips (Ps. 141/2:3), lest our hearts go astray from the Lord through the evil words that are false witness. As He said, “By your words you will be justified, and by your words you will be condemned.” (Matt. 12:37)

The tenth utterance of God, the fifth and the conclusion of the second five, says Thou shalt not covet.

It is a fitting and brilliant conclusion to the decalogue, worthy of God Himself, that He set as the tenth commandment thou shalt not covet. This is the origin and source of all sin, for without desire no one can willfully commit sin, whether it be adultery, theft, murder or any other bodily transgression which a person might perpetrate. It is desire as well which leads one into all the spiritual [sins, such as] jealousy and pride, rancor, resentment of another’s good, blasphemy, spreading of rumors, tattling and their ilk.

Thus God, desiring to clip the root of all evil, said, Thou shalt not covet, knowing that desire is a treacherous and harmful thing, and that it overcomes all: nothing that shares in the breath of life escapes the ravages of its power, be it a creature of earth, water or air. Even the reptiles and vermin, as well as the respiring plants desire the substances necessary for them, and the proper proportion of the elements which makes for their good balance.

This passion, which is natural to the other living things and a cause for their continued existence, has entered twice as much or more into us human beings, and [for us] has become a sin and the cause of our spiritual demise. For in us too, desire, before it sickened, was the cause of our life, and was blameless. It is natural to desire food, and clothing, and sleep and rest, and labor. This is innocent: our Lord, too, took it upon Himself. As He said to the disciples, “With
desire have I desired to eat this Passover with you.” (Luke 22:15) The angels also have desire, but only towards God and the divine, when they desire intelligible nourishment and the all-holy and wholesome drink of being led by His word.

It is proper for us to emulate them, being rational and intelligent, the image of God and members of Christ, rather than becoming animals in our passions and proving to be even inferior to them. Accordingly, [the commandment] deters us from illicit desire, saying, “Do not covet your neighbor’s wife, nor his field, nor his orchard, nor any thing which is not your own.”

Concerning this Christ also admonishes us, saying, “Let your belts be girt about your loins,” (Luke 12:35) that is, fasten the belt of rational understanding above your kidneys, that is, the zone of desire, so that it may turn upwards towards God and things divine, and towards the spiritual, inexpressibly good things—according to the nature of fire, whose movement is upwards. For desire is warm, and is thus spoken of as fire by the pagan philosophers.

And its nature is to rise upward on the winds of reason, and not to be poured downwards towards things substantial as was the fire of Sodom which, contrary to the laws of nature, flowed downwards from above like the watery drops of rain, or like air laden with foaming snow that breaks up and descends flake by flake to earth in the snowy seasons. For the Sodomites had perverted the natural motion of desire and the natural use of the feminine to things unnatural. (Romans 1:27) in opposition to the Creator of our nature.

Therefore did the Judge punish them with a perverse punishment; transforming the wheat-bearing earth into sulfur and the vine-ripening and fruitful dew, and the air which produces corn and gives life through the restful respiration of the nostrils into bolts of fiery lightning and an asphyxiating, deadly suffocation. Being thus cautioned, let us be diligent for the natural order and for the directive of Christ, who came to fill up for the New Israel what was lacking in the shadowy [Law] of the ancients. We are members of Him, (Eph. 5:30 and elsewhere) and flesh of His flesh, knit to our awesome Head (Col. 2:19) who is our law and the defining factor of our life, who is seated at the right hand of His parent, having gone as our forerunner to prepare a place of incorruptible glory and fullness (John 14:2-3) concerning which the marvelous Paul causes us to reflect, saying,
"Think on those things which are above, where Christ sits at the right hand of God." (Col. 3:1-2)

One should know that these commandments are inclusively generic, and sum up all of [the others], and are the repository of all the specific ones and are the specifiers of those commandments which are to be found stored up in divine writ.\(^{64}\) The first one, which says \(I \text{ am the Lord your God, thou shalt have no other god beside } \text{Me}\) instructs us to keep away from all divisive heresy; to confess a single nature and power and will and creativity and divinity characterizing the three Persons. \(I \text{ am the Lord}\) indicates the Father; \(your \text{ God}\) indicates the Son; and to say \(Thou shalt have no other God beside Me\) indicates the Holy Spirit, three persons glorified in a single nature and principality.

And the second, which says \(Thou shalt not make for thyself any graven image\) orders us to keep away from all sins which are produced by the hands and set up with excessive love and fixed upon as objects of worship. Moreover, the love of gold and silver and buildings, which are amassed and preserved by our hands as durable possessions for ourselves and to which we desire to add the possessions of other people, is accounted as idolatry. Like the Apostle says, "...avarice, which is idolatry." (Col. 3:5)

And the third, which says \(Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain\) teaches us not to swear at all, for all things in this life are vain and insignificant, and it is not right to call upon the awesome name of God in regard to them.

While the fourth, which says \(Be \text{ careful of the Sabbath day}\) admonishes us to cease from all evil and to preserve our soul’s tranquility from the pangs of conscience which follow upon our deeds like avengers and prosecuting attorneys, for \(sabbath\) signifies cessation and rest.

And the fifth, which says \(Honor thy father and thy mother\) implies in itself the honor due to kings, princes, and judges, and that of children and young people towards their elders, for all these are \(in \text{ loco parentis}\) and we are obligated to submit to them as we would to parents.\(^{65}\)

---

\(^{64}\) \textit{ibid.}, XXIX.154

\(^{65}\) \textit{ibid.}, XXXI.165-166
While the sixth, which says *Thou shalt not kill* has within it the admonition not to coerce, defraud, curse, malign, harm or hate anyone, since “Everyone who hates is a murderer, and no murderer has life in himself.” (I John 3:15)

The seventh utterance, which says *Thou shalt not commit adultery* conceals within it many cautions against degrading evils, homosexuality, bestiality (which are dreadful to the ear and onerous to those who are modest and pious)—devices of satan and demonic crimes which through God’s wrath devastate the land. Jesting and banter, too, and flirtation and familiarity with women, and the glances which the Lord called “adultery of the heart.” (Matt. 5:28)

It is the eighth commandment, which says, *Thou shalt not steal*, that prevents us from snatching, grabbing, fraud, closing our eyes to the good out of greed and subornment, and other such viciousness.

The ninth utterance, which says, *Thou shalt not bear false witness*, advises us not to say what is not right, nor to babble on, for we will give account of every idle word. (Matt. 12:36) Neither should we be suspicious, provocative, malicious or unctuous, which never liberates from sin. This [commandment] bids pious people abstain from anything resembling these.

The tenth commandment is the one which says *Thou shalt not covet*. It forbids all components of covetousness which urge one to turn aside after various appetites—for food, drink, clothing, artifacts, authority, possessions and like things which people desire when they are overcome by their irrational and animal side, carried away and intoxicated by the drugs of evil.

There is no seed of any thistle, no exertion or endeavor of the adversary which is not to be found implicit within the decalogue of these divinely uttered commandments. For this reason it bears its portion of admonition and the Law, and is unbearable.⁶⁶ Let this utterance be an exhortation to us, and to Him be glory forever, Amen.

---

⁶⁶ Here Vardan reiterates his earlier derivation of *muhb* from *muhb*īd*".*
THE FILIOQUE CONTROVERSY IN ARMENIA

Sergio La Porta

The controversy revolving around the Latin Church’s insertion of the word *filioque* (“and the Son”) after the phrase, “the Holy Spirit... who proceeded from the Father” into the Nicene-Constantinopolitan creed was the definitive disagreement between the eastern and western churches in the middle ages. While the Latins asserted the legitimacy of the addition and its theological veracity adducing a number of patristic formulae for its defense, the Greeks labored against the interpolation as well as the Latin interpretation of their proof-texts, simultaneously sharpening their own pneumatological speculation. The dispute, naturally, was not limited to religious concerns, but bore political ramifications; acceptance of the addition by the Greeks was viewed by both parties as their subjugation to the Latin Church. Yet, the Latins and the Greeks were not the only participants in this theological battle. The Armenian Orthodox Church struggled to reach its own response to the matter; although she finally adopted an anti-*filioque* position, her early

---

1 Although Latin theologians had taught the doctrine of the procession of the Holy Spirit through the Father and the Son since the fourth century, the origin of the insertion is to be found in Spain during the 7th century. Thence it spread to France where Charlemagne had it inserted into the Mass. Rome finally officially accepted the addition at the beginning of the 11th century (c. 1013), due to the pressure of Henry II. On the *filioque* in general, see MANGENOT 1906; RUNCIMAN 1955; KELLY 1950, pp. 358-367; PELIKAN 1974, pp. 183-198, 275-278; KÜNG and MOLTMANN 1979, pp. 3-30; PAPADAKIS 1983. The history of the *filioque* controversy in Armenia has not received much attention in recent scholarship, although some scholars have addressed particular issues related to it: ĖĆAMĆĖEANC'E III:236-239; AWETI'K'EAN 1824, which I have unfortunately not been able to consult; PETIT 1909, pp. 1949-1950; TOURNEBIZE 1910, esp. pp. 289-291; ĖRMANEAN II:1641-1645; WINKLER 1976, pp. 344-345; ĖRSOYAN 1996, p. 227 review the origins of the issue in Cilicia; ĖRMANEAN 1985, pp. 122-132, “Concerning the Divinity and the emanation of the Holy Spirit” (Տիգավանք` հայտնելուն երաշխման ձևի) provides an overview of the theology of the Holy Spirit in the Armenian Church including the question of its succession, but it does not treat the matter in an historical fashion.
reaction to the controversy reflected the political concerns of the Cilician Kingdom which desired the support of the Latin Crusaders. Only later in Greater Armenia did Armenian Orthodox theologians—notably Yovhannēs Orot Neck' i and his pupil, Grigor Tat'ewac'i—establish firm arguments against the interpolation. This paper attempts to provide a summary of the development of the Armenian Church's position from the middle of the thirteenth century to the beginning of the fifteenth.

The thirteenth-century Armenian historian, Kirakos Ganjakec'i (1200-1271), describes in his History of the Armenians (Հայաստանի պատմությունը) the first official Armenian response to the filioque controversy. According to Ganjakec'i, the Latin Pope sent a letter to the Armenian Catholicos Kostandin I Barjrberde'i (1221-1267) and the Cilician King, Het'um I (1224-1261), in which he questioned the Armenians about their position on the emanation2 of the Spirit: ‘‘How do you confess the all holy Spirit of God, having emanated and manifested from the Father alone, or from the Father and the Son?’ because the Romans confessed from the Father and the Son.3

Unfortunately Kirakos does not indicate which Pope issued the delegation. According to the acta of the seventh Council of Sis (1342), Pope Gregory IX had initiated the exchange concerning filioque:

Moreover, it is to be known that when the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son as from the Father had been determined by the Roman Church, although the Greeks had been opposed [to it], the doctors of the Armenians nevertheless convened a synod to discover [the response] according to our accounts which are in Greater Armenia, but we evidently do not possess the name of the Pope who sent [the legation]. And in Lesser Armenia, in the time of the great king, Het'um, and

---

2 Throughout this article, the verb 'to emanate' and its derivatives consistently render Arm. քայքայնի and its derivatives; 'to proceed' and its derivatives render Arm. կահար and its derivatives.

the Catholicos, Lord Kostandin, Pope Gregory sent a legation and commanded to repeat and confess by letter the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son as from the Father, and they themselves convened a council and confirmed [the confession] and sent [it] to the east [i.e., Greater Armenia], and they also convened [a council] and agreed [to the formulation].

Dulaurier, apparently following the *acta*, concludes that it is to this pope Kirakos is referring. He further posits 1238 as the year in which the mission was sent to Cilicia and finds support for this dating in the *Annales Ecclesiatici* compiled by O. Raynaldus for that year. The *AE* for 1238, however, do not mention any conversation between the Latins and Armenians concerning *filioque* occurring in 1238. According to the *AE*, the only matter Pope Gregory IX addressed pertaining to the Armenians in that year was whether the Armenian Catholicos fell under the jurisdiction of the Patriarchate of Antioch. In the *acta* to the second Council of Sis (1243) the question of *filioque* is not breached at all, suggesting that the Curia addressed the issue after that date.

In 1245, Innocent IV (1243-1254) appointed the Franciscan brother, Dominicus of Aragon, as the Apostolic Legate in Syria (1245-1247). Dominicus must also have made himself known at the

---

4 *Item, sciemund est quod, quando processio Spiritus Sancti determinata fuit a Filio sicut a Patre per ecclesiam Romanam, quamvis Graeci contrarii fuerint, tamen magistri Armenorum cum synodo receperunt, sicut inventur apud nos in historias quae sunt in Majori Armenia; sed nomen Papae qui misit manifeste non habemus; et in Minori Armenia, tempore regis magni [om.,RHCDA] Hecon [sic for Herem], et catholicon domini Constantini, Gregorius papa misit legatum et mandavit per epistolam dicere [redicere, RHCDA] et confiteri Spiritum Sanctum procedere a Filio sicut a Patre, et ipsi cum consilio receperunt et confirmaverunt et miserunt in Oriente, et illi etiam receperunt et consenserunt | VS VII:315; SC XXV:1189; reprinted in RHCDA II, p. 564. No other source preserves an account of an earlier independent papal legation to Greater Armenia.

5 *AE, ann. cit., XXXIV; see also POTTHAST, I:899 (10620); HAMILTON 1978, p. 79. Although at first in favor of reducing the Catholicos' stature to a metropolitan bishop subject to the patriarchate of Antioch, due to the intervention of the King of Cilicia the Pope finally acquiesced and permitted the Armenian Church to retain its Catholicos, ÖRMANEAN 1914, par. 1110.

6 See GOLUBOVICH I, 190, II, 324-325; WADDING II: 621-624; TISSERANT 1924.
Armenian Cilician court, for in 1246 Vardan Arewele'ı (1200-1271) wrote a letter to king Het'um on behalf of Catholicos Kostandin outlining arguments against the Latin Church's doctrine as presented by the papal legate Dimanche (Timanč =Dominicus). The second of his fifteen points addresses the *filioque* controversy:

Second error. They say the Spirit from the Father and from the Son, which creates confusion and muddiness for the mind of the listener. And although we also say there is no danger [in saying from the Son] and we say [that there is testimony] from scripture, it causes pain for the ignorant to hear: [and thus] it is better not to say [it]. Since the cause, the Father, is one, through the generation of the one and through the procession of the other; and so, it is fitting that there be one cause, proper and distinct. And the Spirit is called of the Son, since the gift of the Spirit was distributed [Gal. 3:5] through the Son, like the paternal beneficences.

---

7 The letter appears in the ՀՊՊԳ ԲԵՏԵՐ (Book of Letters), GT*, pp. 657-665. It is also included in Vardan's ՀՓՈՐ (Divertimenti), see J MS 898 ff. 76v-81v; BN42, fol. 139v-149r; see also, ÖRMANEAN II:1642-1643. TOURREBIZE 1910, pp. 295-297, dates the letter to 1254, but cf. TISSERANT 1924, p. 347. Dominicus was already likely in Constantinople by the end of 1246 whence departed in April of 1247, TISSERANT 1924, p. 351, GOLUBOVICH, I, 190, II, 325; WADDINGTON II: 623-624. Čamč'eanc*. following Catholicos Mxit'ar I Ginc'ı (1341-1355), suggests that the author of the anti-Latin letter was not Vardan Arewele'ı, but "someone named Vardan or Varham, an unknown man, mentally deficient" (ուր տիրակային սարդ ՀՓՈՐ ամբային համաբալու և կարո"), Č'AMČ'EANC* III:231. According to Č'amč'eanc* an Armenian Catholic, it was Clement Galanos, the 15th-century Latin anti-Armenian polemicist, who confused the unknown Vardan or Varham with Vardan Arewele'ı. Č'AMČ'EANC* III:231-232. The manuscript evidence, however, does not support this assertion. As noted above, the letter is included as part of Vardan's ՀՓՈՐ in BN 42, copied in 1274 in Cilicia by Step'anos Iric'ordi; see also ANT'obyan 1987, p. 112.

8 On this biblical reference, see THOMSON 1970, p. 13 and par. 443, n. 2.

9 երևում է, զեարի եւ երետք սիրե, եւ երետք սիրե, եւ երետք սիրե, եւ երետք սիրե, եւ երետք սիրե, եւ երետք սիրե, եւ երետք սիրե, եւ երետք սիրե, եւ երետք սիրե, եւ երետք սիրե, եւ երետք սիրե, եւ երետք սիրե, եւ երետք սիրե, եւ երետք սիրե, եւ երետք սիրե, եւ երետք սիրե, եւ երետք սիրե, եւ երետք սիրե, եւ երետք սիրե.
Vardan’s letter, the earliest reference and response to the filioque controversy in Armenian, unambiguously rejects the filioque doctrine.

The issue was not resolved there for, as Kirakos Ganjakci'i relates, the King and Catholicoi convened the third Council of Sis, which—in contrast to the previous one—specifically addressed the filioque question. Vardan Arewelci'i records in his Chronicle (Զորավար Գանճակցի) that “in the year 700 [=1251] a question was agitated by the great Pope of Rome, and he wrote to all the Christian peoples that one should confess the all-holy God the Spirit emanated from the Father and the Son.”10 According to Ganjakci'i, the council was attended by the Armenians as well as by the Greeks, Syrians, and other Christians who lived in Cilicia. In the ensuing debate the Greeks remained resolute, adhering to the old formula. The Syrians were split; half maintained that the Spirit emanated from the Father alone, while half accepted the Latin innovation. Despite Vardan’s letter to the King penned five years previous arguing against the filioque position, the Armenian contingent was unsure and wrote to Greater Armenia for guidance. According to Ganjakci'i, they specifically asked Vanakan Vardapet, Vardan Arewelci'i again, and a certain Yovsi'epi as to what they should say.11

Ganjakci'i records their response,12 followed by Vanakan vardapet's “Confession of the true faith of the Orthodox” (նորհանդաս առաջնորդային զեմուկ զուգահանոց),13 as well as his “Advice for the Profession [of faith]” (կողմ զարքածունք).14

---


11 KG, p. 330. Yovhannes Vanakan Vardapet Tawusec'i (1180-c.1251), student of the famous codifier of secular law, Mxit’ar Goş (1130-1213), was the teacher of Vardan Arewelci'i and Kirakos Ganjakci'i. Yovsi'epi vardapet (13thc.), another student of Vanakan, was the abbot of the newly reconstructed St. Thaddeus monastery in the region of Artaz, see KG, pp. 311 and 328; and XAČI KYAN 1973, p. 51.

12 KG, pp. 330-333.

13 KG, pp. 333-338.

14 KG, pp. 338-344.
their response to the King’s request and in Vanakan’s “Confession”, these eastern theologians attack the issue tactfully, explaining that “it is worthy to preach the Spirit having come forth from the Father and manifested from the Son.”15 On the surface, this declaration adheres to the orthodox position that the Father was the hypostatic cause of the Spirit while the Son was the agent of the Spirit’s revelation. It is clear from his “Advice”,16 however, that Vanakan understood ‘from the Son’ to signify more than a reference to the Spirit’s operation within the economy of salvation, for in this final document he defends the notion of two causes (ἐπίστατον, ὑπάρχον) of the Spirit’s emanation. He compares the persons of the Trinity to a man’s nous, soul, and logos. According to Vanakan, if man’s logos is deprived of either nous or soul it is incomplete, being either nous-less or soulless. Likewise, if the Spirit is from the Father alone, then it would be Word-less (ἀγγέλος); if from the Son alone, it would be foreign (ἀνεπήρημος) to the Father.17 Therefore, the Spirit is from both.18

In his Chronicle, Vardan Arewelci remarks that the Armenians found filioque to be in accordance with traditional orthodoxy at the third Council of Sis, confirming that Vanakan’s interpretation was the one accepted:

And it [i.e., the addition of filioque ] was not satisfactory to the Syrians, and Greeks, and Georgians, but among the Armenians, who investigated the profession of the first saints through the close-to-God vardapet Vanakan, they found [the profession] in agreement [with the opinion] of famous, glorious men—of Athanasius, of Gregory


16 This text was composed for an anonymous ‘listener’ (γνωστή), whom Vanakan addresses in the second person singular. The listener is clearly an opponent of the filioque doctrine and may be a rhetorical antagonist.


18 KG, p. 343.
the Theologian, of Gregory of Nyssa, of Grigor Lusaworic’, and other saints.¹⁹

Unfortunately what transpired between Vardan and his teacher Vanakan during the composition of this response has not been recorded. Vardan could not have been very pleased at the result for he did not share his master’s view on this matter as his earlier letter to the King clearly demonstrates. Furthermore, Vanakan’s defense of the emanation of the Spirit from two causes explicitly attacks his pupil’s position that it is more fitting that there be only one cause. Yet, Vardan records the acceptance of filioque by the council without any animosity or derision, indicating that he may have been convinced of the addition’s legitimacy in the meantime.²⁰

It appears likely that the monarchy did not deem Vardan’s earlier anti-filioque stance politic and therefore requested that a new position be drawn up. In 1248, the forces of St. Louis IX’s Crusade had landed in Cyprus and the French king was instrumental in achieving an agreement between Cilicia and Antioch, securing that peace by negotiating the marriage of Prince Bohemond VI of Antioch-Tripoli with King Het’um I’s daughter, Sibyl.²¹ Ever since the middle of the twelfth century and the Catholicosate of Grigor III Pahlwuni, relations between the Latin and Armenian ecclesiastical leadership in Cilicia had been steadily improving despite sporadic setbacks.²² The Cilician royal family also developed ties with the papacy and the Frankish emperors; likewise, the Armenian nobility intermarried with Frankish princesses. The first king of Cilicia, Lewon, had sworn

¹⁹ be ἐπὶ θεοτόκου Ἱωάννης Παούλης ἢ Θεολόγος ἢ Ζωμῆν. ηπὶ ἀλλὸς δ’ Ἰουσίας ἢ Ἰουσίας ἢ Ὀμπίλης ἢ Ὀμπίλης ἢ Νομικαχαρῆς. ηπὶ ἀλλὸς δ’ Ἰσκουδάτης ἢ Ἰσκουδάτης ἢ Νασέλης ἢ Νασέλης ἢ Τσόπα γραφείον Ράμαν. Φαβίνουσι τηνομοσιάς. Φράζουσι της αρχιενεστής. Φράζουσι της αρχιενεστής. Φράζουσι της αρχιενεστής. Φράζουσι της αρχιενεστής. Φράζουσι της αρχιενεστής. Φράζουσι της αρχιενεστής.

²⁰ We may note that Vanakan died shortly after he penned this response in 1251 and may account for Vardan’s leniency in recounting this episode.


²² On the vicissitudes of Armeno-Latin politics during the Crusades and the different interpretations that the Armenians and the West held concerning ecclesiastical union, see BUNDY 1985, BUNDY 1986, HALFTER 1996, pp. 122-334, HAMILTON 1978, on the influence of the Curia on Armenian liturgical practice during this period, see WINKLER 1976; on the effort of the Catholicoi Grigor III Pahlawuni and Nersès Šnorhali to improve relations with the West, see DÉDÉYAN 1992.
allegiance to Rome in exchange for military aid and had received the royal crown from Pope Innocent III (1198-1216), during whose tenure the Fourth Crusade had captured Constantinople. Diplomatic attempts at union were continued and aggressively pursued under the papal tenures of both Gregory IX and Innocent IV. Catholicos Kostandin requested and received from Gregory IX the pallium, mitre, stole, and ring. In 1243 Kostandin convened the second council of Sis and concessions to the Latins were agreed upon. The twenty-fifth and final canon, advanced “by the Franks”, adopted the sacrament of extreme unction. The more conservative clergy of Greater Armenia were generally more reluctant to entertain such close relations with Rome. The pro-filioque stance of such an eminent vardapet as

23 AE, 10 March, 1239 (LXXXIII); POTTHAST I, p. 907 (10714); Č’AMČ’EANC’ III:226.

24 KG, p. 309: “The Franks wrote to us: Why did you not receive the command of the brother of the Lord to bless the sick and the hour of death, to anoint [them] with oil [James 5:14], that if one dies it is ointment for burial, and if he survives, it is penitence for sin and the cause of health. And you know that Yovhan Ojneck’i, who separated us from your people, had written, that you do [it] and that you should do [it], and you did [it] certainly!” (V ՔՐ Drops, ՔՐամ Քրենք Քզ Քրենք, քզ Քրենք Քրենք Քրենք Քրենք Քրենք, քզ Քրենք Քրենք Քրենք, քզ Քրենք Քրենք Քրենք, քզ Քրենք Քրենք Քրենք, քզ Քրենք Քրենք Քրենք, քզ Քրենք Քրենք Քրենք, քզ Քրենք Քրենք Քրենք, քզ Քրենք Քրենք Քրենք, քզ Քրենք Քրենք Քրենք, քզ Քրենք Քրենք Քրենք, քզ Քրենք Քրենք Քրենք, քզ Քրենք Քրենք Քրենք, քզ Քրենք Քրենք Քրենք, քզ Քրենք Քրենք Քրենք, քզ Քրենք Քրենք Քրենք, քզ Քրենք Քրենք Քրենք, քզ Քրենք Քրենք Քրենք, քզ Քրենք Քրենք Քրենք, քզ Քրենք Քրենք Քրենք, քզ Քրենք Քրենք Քրենք, քզ Քրենք Քրենք Քրենք, քզ Քրենք Քրենք Քրենք, քզ Քրենք Քրենք Քրե

25 This is not meant to imply that all the clergy of Greater Armenia were anti-Latin, cf. the activity of Zak’aria Concoreci’ at the monastery of St. Thaddeus in Artaz. XAČ’IKYAN 1973, COWE 1993, pp. XIV-XV. LA PORTA 2001, pp. 16-18; or, later, the brothers of the monastery of K’rina who voted in favor of union with Rome in 1330, on whom see VAN DEN OUDENRIJN 1960, LA PORTA 2001, pp. 18-23. Naturally, Cilicia’s proximity to the West and its interaction with—and often reliance upon—the Crusaders made it more susceptible to Latin innovations than Greater Armenia. The metropolitan bishop of Siwnek’ and historian, Step’annos Orbelian, clearly viewed the growth of Latin influence in the Armenian Church as a disease which spread from Cilicia to his door in Greater Armenia. In 1302, Orbelian decried in his Treatise against the Dyophysites that “all of Cilicia, which was our place of pride, is entangled in this... And it has reached us, so that this is clearly preached in the royal city of Tiflis, and in the ancient house of the Bagratuni. Ani, which is in Shirak, also in the capital, Tabriz, and in many other places” (V ՔՐ Drops, Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քզ Քز

26 cited from XAČ’IKYAN 1973, p. 65, see also YOVHANNES K’RNEC’I 1977, p. 18. There were divisions within Cilicia itself as monasteries and lower orders
Vanakan must have aided the royal court in its desire to maintain a favorable alliance with the papacy and the armies of the West.

If the clergy and the monarchy rejected Vardan's *anti-filioque* position in order to placate Rome, they would shortly rethink their relations with the papacy. The growing threat of the Mongol invasion soon outweighed any perceived alliance with the West. In 1253, Het'um I traveled to Karakorum and voluntarily submitted to the Great Mongol Khan, Mangu. The first independent ruler to have done so, he was greatly honored by the Khan and secured tax exempt status for the Armenian Church. On his return he convinced his son-in-law, Bohemond VI, of the advantages of such an alliance. In 1260, both Het'um and Bohemond assisted Mangu’s brother, Hulagu, in his conquest of North Syria. The Latins had taken an adverse stance towards the encroachments of the Mongols and were greatly displeased with the actions of Bohemond and the Cilician kingdom. In 1261, Thomas of Lentini, Latin Bishop of Bethlehem and papal legate, summoned the Armenian Catholicos Kostandin I to a meeting in Acre to discuss relations between the two churches. Rather than going himself, the Catholicos sent an envoy, Mxit’ar Skewätig'i, who was a known adherent of the anti-Latin party in Cilicia. During the discussions, Mxit’ar rebuked the Latin legate for presuming that the Roman Church possessed any jurisdictional power over the Armenian Church.

Although Mxit’ar rejected Roman primacy, he does not mention the question of *filioque*; nor do two other major witnesses to anti-Latin factions in Cilicia: the Continuator of Samuël of Ani and the author of the *Anonymous Life of Geôrg Skewätig'i*, whose subject was an ardent anti-unionist. In the last quarter of the thirteenth century, however, Vahram Rabuni of Edessa, secretary to King Lewon II of Cilicia, composed a metrical history of the Rubenid kings of Cilicia at the behest of the king in which he proclaims: “The

---

26 On the Armenian rapprochement with the Mongols, see HAMILTON 1978, pp. 81-82.
28 RHCHA 1:445-468.
29 Text published by BAŁDASARYAN 1964; see also BUNDY 1983 and BUNDY 1984.
ungenerated Father bore the Son, / And the Spirit emanated from the Father.”30 Rabuni repeats the same in his _Profession of Faith_, rejecting Vanakan’s interpretation of the analogy of the Trinity to the human nous, soul, and logos: “for according to that which is from your rational soul: your nous is a generation as from the Father, and your logos is an emanation as from a spring, thus the Son is the progeny of the Father, and the Holy Spirit the emanation from Him [i.e., the Father].”31 Again he declares later in that same work: “The Son is born from the Father, and the Holy Spirit is everlastingly emanated from Him [i.e., the Father]”; and “the Father is without beginning and without cause, and He is the beginning and cause of those who are from Himself. And on account of this, the Son and Spirit are begun from the Father, lest three beginningless beings be conceived”; and “they [i.e., the Son and the Spirit] are begun from the Father, the one beginning.”32 These non- _filioque_ formulations may reflect the change in the Armenian position which now tolerated anti-Latin, or at least non-Latin, pronouncements.

This policy changed once again with the pro-Latin king Het’um II (1289-1305). In 1292 the Catholics, Step’anos VI, convened a synod at Hromklay, the site of the Catholicossate, at which the Latin date of Easter was accepted, but the _filioque_ addition was not discussed.33 Nor is any mention of _filioque_ made at the fifth Council of Sis (1307) at which the Armenian ecclesiastical hierarchy declared themselves amenable to union with Rome and accepted the Chalcedonian definition of the nature of Christ, the authority of the seven ecumenical councils, the mixture of water into the Eucharistic celebration, the addition of the word Christ to the phrase “who was crucified for us” in the Trisagion, and the Latin dates of feasts.34

---

30_ _Ambrosian_ _Codex_ _Chaldean_ _Manuscript_ _930_ / _ASTI_ 1834, p. 495.
31_ _Rhymed_ _Poem_ _on_ _Church_ _History_ _of_ _Jrznahd_ _Amir_ _Jozhagh, RHCDA, I:495.
32_ _Armenian_ _Poetry_ _of_ _the_ _Tenth_ _Century_ _by_ _Hrastol _Jrznahd_ _Amir_ _Jozhagh, VAHRAM RABUNI 1856, p. 122.
33_ _MXIT_’AREANC’ 1874, pp. 127-128; _BUNBY_ 1985, p.51; _BUNBY_ 1986, p.28.
Likewise, the Council of Adana (1316), which reaffirmed the Council of Sis’ decisions did not broach the filioque question.\textsuperscript{35} Despite Vahram’s testimony and the fluctuating strength of relations between the Armenian and Latin Churches, it appears that no dissension existed between the Armenian and Latin Churches on this issue. The issue did not arise again until the seventh council of Sis (1342), which was provoked by accusations made by Nersès Palienc, and which reaffirmed the Armenian Church’s adherence to filioque.\textsuperscript{36} The acta included the information cited above concerning the history of the controversy in Armenia and suggest that the significance of the filioque addition was embraced by the Cilician Armenian authorities, although it was never formally inserted into the Armenian Creed. There is no evidence that indicates that the Armenian Church or Kingdom of Cilicia ever officially rejected the filioque addition after its acceptance by the fifth council of Sis in 1251.\textsuperscript{37}

In the fourteenth century the question of the filioque doctrine once again emerged in Greater Armenia in tandem with the increased efforts of the Latin missionaries in the region. At first it does not seem to have concerned Armenian theologians as much as questions of

\textsuperscript{35} HAMILTON 1978, p. 85, claims incorrectly that the addition, “who was crucified for us”, was suppressed; BUNDY 1985, p.52, claims that the phrase “who was crucified for us” was added, although on p. 54 he translates from Clement Galano’s text as follows: “Also the Trisagion, with you were crucified”, he deemed it proper to say in this manner to the Son. ‘Holy God, holy and strong, holy and immortal, Christ who was crucified for us, have mercy for us'”; cf. also the acta of the council as preserved in SC XXV:134: “Item Trisagium, Sanctus Deus, sanctus fortis, sanctus et immortalis cui additum hoc loco fuerat, qui crucifixus es pro nobis miserere nostri’ operae pretium duxit, directum sic in filium esse deinceps decantandum: ‘Sanctus Deus, sanctus fortis, sanctus et immortalis, Chrise, qui crucifixus es pro nobis, miserer nostri.’” It is clearly the addition of the word ‘Christ’ and the explicit reference to the Son that is the addition, not the phrase, ‘who was crucified for us’; he repeats this error in BUNDY 1986, p.29. Many Armenians did not agree to this union and there was a counter synod in 1309 in Sis which King Ösin, with the agreement of the Catholicos and the nobility, forcefully disbanded and imprisoned and exiled its participants, MXIT'AREANC 1874, pp. 134-135; BUNDY 1985, p. 56.

\textsuperscript{36} SC XXV:655-670; MXIT'AREANC 1874, pp. 135-137; BALGY 1878, app. IX; TOURNEBIZE 1910, pp. 311-312.

\textsuperscript{37} L. Petit sums up the situation best when he remarks: “Autant qu’on en peut juger par ces vagues données, le Filioque n’était pas entré d’une façon bien explicite dans la croyance de l’Église arménienne, non pas que cette Église y fût formellement opposée, mais parce qu’elle s’en était jusque-là désintéressée,” PETIT 1909, p. 1949.
Christology or differences in practice. In 1321 Esayi Nč’ec’i, head of the renowned monastic university at Glajor, penned a letter\textsuperscript{38} to the bishop of Tabriz, Tēr Matt’ēos, in which he cautions that “some among you, having estranged themselves from the religion of the holy Fathers, have contemplated in a foreign way falsely-called knowledge.”\textsuperscript{39}

Yet despite his strong anti-Latin activities and sentiments, the *filioque* addition does not appear to have greatly unsettled Esayi. In his letter, Nč’ec’i reviews the doctrine of the Armenian Orthodox Church beginning with the persons of the Holy Trinity. Rather than tackling the issue of *filioque*, he merely repeats patristic formulations concerning the distinctions in the mode of origin of the persons of the Trinity: “The Father is uncreated. He has not come into being, not having been made, not having been born. The Son is only from the Father, not having come into being, not having been made, but born. The Holy Spirit is from the Father and receives from the Son, not having come into being, not having been made, but emanated.”\textsuperscript{40} The ‘receives from the Son’ is based upon Jn. 16:14-15 and was used by Gregory of Nyssa and Epiphanius;\textsuperscript{41} but Nč’ec’i does not further explain what he means by this.

\textsuperscript{38} The letter is published in ESAYI NČ’EC’I 1860-61, pp. 157-164 and 205-211; and YOVSEÞEAN 1944, pp. 259-264; partial French translation and discussion in VAN DEN OUDENRIJN 1956, pp. 105-107; see also XAC’IKYAN 1973, 69-71.

\textsuperscript{39} Ἰωσὴφ ὁ ἱερομόναχος ὁ ἐν Χριστόν ἑκάστῃ ἀληθείᾳ. ESAYI NČ’EC’I 1860-1861, p. 158.

\textsuperscript{40} ἦλθεν ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ Σωτῆρος καὶ ἐποίησεν ἁγίαν πνεύματος ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ Σωτῆρος. Σωτὴρ παραδόθη ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ Σωτῆρος. ESAYI NČ’EC’I 1860-61, p. 159.

\textsuperscript{41} Cf. Gregory of Nyssa, C. Maced., 2, 10, 12, 24; also KH, pp. 24-25; Epiphanius, Anco. 7; KH, p. 28-29. According to Fahey, it was the preferred scriptural reference to express the relationship between the Son and the Holy Spirit in Byzantium, KÜNG and MOLTMANN 1979, p. 17. Note also its use by the Syrian Jacobite patriarch Ignatius II in his Confession of Faith written in response to Innocent IV’s offer of union: “We believe in the Father, and Son, and Holy Spirit; namely, one nature, three persons. The Father is generating, the Son is born from Him, and the Holy Spirit proceeding from Him, receiving from the Son” (Credimus in Patrem, et Filium, et Spiritum Sanctum, scilicet unam naturam, et tres personas. Pater est gignens. Filius genitus ab eo, et Spiritus Sanctus procedens a Patre, accipiens a filio), WADDING II:209; AE, 1246, 34; see also, PELLIO T 1924, pp. 225-262.
In his *Profession of Faith* (ἡ εὐφροσύνη τῆς ζωής), which focuses on the nature of the Trinity, Ὅσιος Ἐκκλησία addresses some of the proof-texts used in the *filioque* debate:

Whereas the Spirit [is called] ‘procession’ and ‘emanation’ and ‘true Spirit’ since it is His Spirit and it is also called ‘[the] one who proceeds from the Father’ since It truly comes forth from Him incessantly and from the Son ineffably, as the salvific *Logos* says, ‘He will praise me since he will receive from me thence and will relate it to you’ [Jn. 16:14]. See also that it is called Spirit of the Son as also of the Father, according to which Paul says: ‘You are not with body if the Spirit of God has dwelt in you; but if anyone does not possess the Spirit of Christ, he is not His. Then if Christ is in you, the body is dead on account of sin, and the soul is alive on account of righteousness’ [Rom. 8:9-10]. Keep in mind, he said ‘Spirit of God’ and again he said ‘Spirit of Christ’. Again he also calls the Spirit Christ, not by mixing identity as Sabellius [did], but by making it clear to be from the essence of the Savior; and not foreign to the one divinity, since by saying concerning the Spirit ‘Christ is in you’, he also demonstrates the Spirit as [having] a consubstantial nature of the Logos. Now the Holy Spirit has everything of the Father and the Son, but it is not the Father nor the Son. However, [it has everything] ‘of the Son’ in the manner in which Paul says, ‘we are sons, God sent the Spirit of His Son into our hearts’ [Gal. 4:6]. And the great Peter writes about the prophets to the believers, ‘they who prophesied concerning the grace which will be yours, [searched] in whom and what time the Spirit of Christ indicated in them’ [1 Pet. 1:10-11].

---

42 Ὅσιος Ἐκκλησία ἐν Περσίδα καὶ Βαβυλώνια καὶ Ἑλλάδα ἐνθάρρυνε διὸς ἐν Περσίδα καὶ Βαβυλώνια καὶ Ἑλλάδα ἐνθάρρυνε διὸς.
In the profession, Nē‘ec‘i adheres to the patristic conception of the emanation of the Spirit and interprets the Latin proof-texts as references to the consubstantiality of the persons of the Trinity and to the activity of the Spirit within the economy of salvation.⁴³ Yet, Esayi does not specifically attack the doctrine of filioque nor does he display a thorough understanding of the argument. Overall in his polemical writings, Nē‘ec‘i is much more concerned with questions of Christology and differences in practice—the day Christmas should be celebrated and the mixing of water into the wine of the Eucharistic offering—than with the filioque addition. It should be remarked that during the first half of the fourteenth century, the Latins likewise placed more emphasis on Christology and matters of practice than on the Trinitarian debate as the translations executed at the Uniate monastery of Křna demonstrate.⁴⁴

Esayi’s fellow student and then disciple, Mxit‘ar Sasanec‘i, similarly does not expostulate an argument against filioque in his Theological Discourses, which is dedicated to combating series of Latin practices and beliefs. P. Cowe remarks that Mxit‘ar merely “tacitly” rejects filioque in restating “the doctrine of the procession of the Spirit from the Father as embodied in the Constantinopolitan

⁴³ Cf. Gregory of Nyssa and Epiphanius cited above as well as Athanasius, Letters to Serapion III, 1 and Maximus Confessor’s Letter to Marinus. Thus, MATHEWS-SANJIAN 1991, p. 30, have inaccurately recorded Nē‘ec‘i’s position as accepting the theology of the filioque addition and rejecting the Greek formulation.

⁴⁴ On these translations, see VAN DEN OUDENRIJN 1960 and LA PORTA 2001, pp. 20-23.
creed. As in the case of his master, matters of Christology and practice superseded that of the Trinitarian formulation in the Armenian Orthodox battle against the Latin missionaries.

The responses of Nē'ec'i and Sasnc'i and the repetitions of patristic formulae were not adequate to rebut the Latin position as the debate over the *filioque* addition intensified over the next fifty years. The increased pressure the Latins exerted on acceptance of the addition and the greater concern the Armenian pro-Latin party displayed in demonstrating the acceptance of *filioque* by Armenians evidences the intensification. While at the papal court in Avignon, Nersēs Palienc’, an Armenian convert to the Dominican Order of Preachers who studied at the monastery of Křna, brought to the attention of Pope Benedict XII 117 errors in the way the Armenians practiced Christianity. At the outset of his *Libellus*, he accused the Armenians of Greater Armenia of having rejected the *filioque* addition. Daniel of Tabriz, an Armenian convert to the Franciscan order, in 1341 wrote a response to the accusations and assured the Pope that Armenians united with Rome adhered to the doctrine of *filioque*. Palienc’ s *Libellus* triggered the repetition of Armenia’s allegiance to Rome and the *filioque* addition at the seventh Council of Sis in 1342.

As the issue became more significant among Armenians of the pro-Latin party, Orthodox Armenians also dedicated greater effort to defending their side of the argument. Nē'ec'i’s last pupil, Yovhannēs Orotnc'i, elaborated the first theologically argued anti-*filioque*

---

45 COWE 1993, p.XIII.
46 Delacroix-Besnier has noted that especially in the middle of the fourteenth-century Dominican missionaries in Pera-Constantinople composed treatises dedicated to the issue of the procession of the Holy Spirit, DELACROIX-BESNIER 1996-1997, p. 176 n. 9.
47 MXIT-AREANC: 1874, pp. 137-138; TOURNEBIZE 1906; TOURNEBIZE 1910, pp. 347-365; PETROWICZ 1971, pp. 56-82; ÖRMANean II: 1864-1865. Palienc was present at Avignon in 1338 and must have submitted his accusations between then and 1340 in order for Daniēl to compose his response in 1341; on Armenian representatives at the Papal court of Avignon, see RICHARD 1992.
48 RHCDa II:559-566; AE 1341, XLV-LXX.
49 ÖRMANEAN II 1869-1902. Daniēl of Tabriz participated in the council and the 116 points contained in the *acta* greatly resemble those he proffered although they are not always in the same order, RHCDa II:559-650, SC XXV:1185-1270; VS 310-413; TOURNEBIZE 1910, pp. 365-388.
position for the Armenian Church subsequent to Vardan Arewcele‘i’s letter. In his *Profession of Faith*, written at the behest of prince Xut‘luši in Erznka and sent to the Catholicos Kostandin V Ssec‘i (1372-1374), Orotneč‘i accuses the Catholicos of having been infected by ‘Satan’s sickness’ and of abandoning the Armenian faith. His profession clearly demonstrates the new importance attached to the *filioque* controversy; the question of the emanation of the Spirit no longer elicits a brief recapitulation of the doctrine of consubstantiality, but now receives a full explication.

Orotneč‘i addresses the question three times in his *Profession*. First, he declares in his opening confession of faith that the Spirit emanates from the Father and is consubstantial with the Father and the Son: “We also believe in the Holy Spirit, emanation from the Father, true God; emanated from the Father before eternity; begun through emanation in a beginningless fashion; conjoined; and equal God with the Father and with the Son; of the same nature; of the same glory; sovereign and lord of one power and of one will with the Father and with the Son.”

---

50 The letter was most likely between April and September of 1373, BALDASARYAN 1973, pp. 21-22.

51 In his profession Orotneč‘i uses the verb ‘to proceed’ (*maw‘ ʰaɾ̄*), once, preferring the verb ‘to emanate’ (*p̄wba*). This may represent a tailoring of Orotneč‘i’s vocabulary to express the relationship within the Trinity restricting the semantic range of *p̄wba* to refer solely to the hypostatic relationship of the Spirit to the Father. Whereas *hr̄ab* and *maw‘ ʰaɾ̄* could be used to indicate either the hypostatic procession or the economic procession of the Spirit, *p̄wba* could only refer to the former. Orotneč‘i’s student, Grigor Tat‘ewac‘i, similarly reserves *p̄wba* to refer to the inner relationship of the Trinity, while he employs *hr̄ab* and *maw‘ ʰaɾ̄* in a more vague manner. Thus, despite his staunch anti-*filioque* position, Tat‘ewac‘i is able to make the following analogy in his discussion of the meaning of the shape of the letter *w* in Armenian: “Second, the first branch is the Father, not from anyone; and the middle branch is the Son, offspring from the Father; and the final is the Spirit, emanation [*p̄wba*] from the Father and procession [*hr̄ab*] from the Son, for it manifests itself through the Son, and [is on] an even level with respect to divinity and creatorship” (Trans. I. L. Watters). GH, p.178. See below for more on Grigor Tat‘ewac‘i’s attack on the *filioque* addition.

He approaches the issue again in the second part of his profession which seeks to show how the Armenian church differs from the Latin Church:

Come let us undertake to demonstrate the second [point], the cause of our schism from the Chalcedonian council and its adherents. First, they say that the Holy Spirit [is] an emanation from the Son and the Father. And second, since they say our Lord Jesus Christ [has] two natures and two energies and two wills. And third, since they celebrate the feast of Christmas on 25 December. Fourth, since they celebrate the mysterious offering of the body and blood of the Lord with water.\[^{33}\]

The difference between Orotneč'i's and Nē'ec'i's profession is evident; Orotneč'i considers the *filioque* controversy significant enough to be the first issue engaged.

In the third section of his work, Yovhannēs attacks the problem clearly, demonstrating from scripture that the Spirit emanates from God and that the proof-texts used by the opponents of Orthodoxy do not refer to the hypostatic emanation of the Spirit but to its diffusion through humanity at the time of the coming of Christ:

Come let us consider the testimony of the teaching of the gospels and apostles and let us speak first concerning the Spirit. First, John the Evangelist says, ‘the Spirit of Truth, which comes forth from the Father’ [Jn. 15:26], and ‘The Holy Spirit, the Comforter, whom the Father sends’ [Jn. 14:26]. And Matthew the evangelist says, ‘It is not as if you are, the one who speaks, but the Spirit of your Father’ [Mt. 10:20]. And the Apostle says, ‘Indeed you are a temple of God and the Spirit of God dwells in you’

\[^{33}\] ըստ Շանրահազարի գույքային ըղորդիչ ըղորդված առաքել է Շահարհազարի գույքային ըղորդը և ըղորդված Կերգում Խոր ըղորդիչ ըղորդված են ըղորդված։ Ուղի, ըղորդիչ ըղորդիչ ըղորդված են ըղորդված։ Ըղորդված ըղորդիչ ըղորդված են ըղորդված։ Ուղի, ըղորդիչ ըղորդված են ըղորդված։ Տանք սթորե ըղորդված Կերգում Խոր ըղորդիչ ըղորդված։ Ուղի, ըղորդիչ ըղորդված են ըղորդված։ Ուղի, ըղորդիչ ըղորդված են ըղորդված։ Նարեւու, ըղորդիչ ըղորդված են ըղորդված։ Սթորե ըղորդիչ ըղորդված։ ԲԱՆԴԱՍԱՐՅԱՆ 1973, p. 24; M557, ff. 5v-6r.
[1 Cor. 3:16]. And again he says, ‘We received the Spirit of God’ [cf. 1 Cor. 2:12]. And, ‘the Spirit of that one who raised Jesus from the dead’ [Rom. 8:11]. These are the gospel and apostolic witnesses concerning the Spirit; although there are many [more] also in the holy scriptures, may this much be sufficient. But we will respond bit by bit to those who say: ‘The Spirit emanated from the Father and the Son’. O you do you say the Father [is] able in the emanation of the Spirit or unable? If He is able, He emanates the Spirit perfectly and not imperfectly. If it is perfect, the emanation of the Son is superfluous. Whereas if you say the Father is imperfect, and you give the Son as an assistant to Him in the emanation of the Spirit, then, according to you, none exists as God, for that which proceeds from two imperfects is also imperfect! Whereas if they use these testimonies as a pretext: ‘Spirit of Christ’ [Rom. 8:9], or ‘I go and send him’ [Jn. 16:7] or ‘From me thence he receives and relates’ [Jn. 16:14], and others of this ilk; all of these and others of their ilk were said for the reason that the diffusion of the Spirit amongst the human races occurred at the coming of Christ; because it is not the letter, but the Spirit that gives life [2 Cor. 3:6].\footnote{Baldasaryan mistakenly omits the first word of the conclusion.}
In this passage, Orotneć’i articulates that those proof-texts used by adherents of the *filioque* position, and also cited by Nê’ec’i without explanation, refer solely to the temporal disbursement of the gifts of the Spirit and do not reflect the inner relationship of the persons of the Trinity; otherwise, the personal attributes of the persons would be confused and the monarchy of the Father compromised.\(^{55}\)

Yovhannēs Orotneć’i’s pupil, Grigor Tat’ewac’i (1344-1409),\(^{56}\) continued the work of his master. Tat’ewac’i devotes the thirteenth argument of the sixth section of his *Book of Questions* to refuting the pro-*filioque* position.\(^{57}\) He begins his argument “against those who say that the Spirit emanated from the Father and the Son” by reviewing their biblical proof-texts. Grigor enumerates eight ‘proofs’ that the pro-*filioque* camp offer: 1) that the Bible mentions the ‘Spirit of Christ’; 2) that Christ breathed on the Apostles and said, “Receive the Holy Spirit” (Jn. 20:22); 3) Christ tells the Apostles “if I go, I will send him [i.e. the Holy Spirit]” (Jn. 16:7); 4) Christ relates that the Spirit “will receive from me” (Jn. 16:14); 5) Christ declares that the Spirit “will glorify me” (Jn. 16:14a); 6) that as the “Spirit is the giver of life” (Jn. 6:64/6:63), the Son would be without life if the Spirit did not proceed from Him as well as the Father; 7) that since the Holy Spirit is referred to as the finger of God, and the Son as the right hand and arm of God, then the Spirit must also be from the Son; and 8) that as speech is from nous and logos, so too is the Spirit from the Father and the Son.\(^{58}\)

In his response to these ‘proofs’, Tat’ewac’i emphasizes that the biblical citations and analogies reflect the unity of the Trinity and not the origin of the Spirit. He begins by referencing his master,

\(^{55}\) His position is therefore similar to the one forwarded by Photius in his *Mystagogy*, 59.

\(^{56}\) PG 102:337; Photius had likewise argued in his letter to the metropolitan of Aquileia that if the procession from the Father is perfect, then He had no need of assistance from the Son, PG 104:801; see also PAPADAKIS 1983, pp. 67 and 76, n. 37; pp. 83-86; MEYENDORFF 1979, pp. 93-94; SHERRARD 1959, pp. 61-72.

\(^{57}\) On Tat’ewac’i’s date of birth, see LA PORTA 2001, pp. 2-5.

\(^{58}\) GRIGOR TAT’EWAC’I 1993, pp. 61-65 (henceforth abbreviated GH).

\(^{59}\) GH, p. 61. Many of these points are arguments made by Vanakan: point 1, cf. KG, p. 330, ll. 15-20; point 2, cf. KG, p. 341, ll. 9-10; point 4, cf. KG, p. 341, ll. 14-16; point 7, cf. KG, p. 341, ll. 11-12; point 8, cf. KG, p. 343, ll. 7-10.
Yovhannës Orotneck'i. Against the first three points in general, Grigor reiterates his teacher’s dictum, “they were said for the reason that the diffusion of the Spirit amongst the human races occurred at the coming of Christ,” although he provides a different proof-text: “for as yet the Spirit has not been, for Jesus was not yet glorified” [Jn. 7:39]. He then adds: “And again the Spirit [is that] which comes forth from the Father and rests in the Son, and through the Son when he distributes the good of the Father to all the heavenly and terrestrial beings before the assuming of the human body and during the Incarnation.” This reworking of Vardan Arewelc’i’s argument clarifies that the Spirit proceeds through the Son eternally within the creation, and not just through the historical Christ, thus preserving the identity of divine activity.

Grigor subsequently attacks each of the eight points individually. With respect to the first proof, Tat’ewac’i argues that the Spirit of Christ reflects the *homoousion* of the Trinity, but not the causal relationship: “since everything which is of the Father is of the Son, just as the Lord says [Jn. 16:15], therefore the Spirit of the Father is the Spirit of the Son on account of [their sharing] one essence. Therefore, the Father gave the thing to the Son, but not the relation.”

Against their second point, Grigor notes that if the notion that Christ breathed the Holy Spirit on the Apostles indicated the hypostatic emanation of the Spirit, “then the Son is begotten by the Holy Spirit according to the Angel [Gabriel]: ‘He who is conceived in

59 See above, p. 15.
60 *Verd e naro ammawr*, qe *Bemariq darpaj morawj evërtawj* qawatsawawj *Bishawd bid*: Luw mewd. «Qe nd Lajj, dawaj evwaq tle tle yew alaqebrwyw», GH, p. 61.
62 Although this idea bears general similarity to the doctrine of eternal manifestation formulated by the Patriarch Gregory of Cyprus, later incorporated into the thought of Gregory Palamas, it does not reflect other components of their formulation, especially any articulated notion of energies, see PAPADAKIS 1983, pp. 90-96, MEYENDORFF 1964, pp. 13-17, 228-232.
her is from the Holy Spirit’ [Mt. 1:20]. Instead, Christ’s exhalation of the Spirit demonstrates the identity of divine activity rather than the origin of Spirit.

Similarly, the sending of the Holy Spirit by the Son does not refer to the Spirit’s origin, but to the unity of the will of the Trinity. If not, “then [that] the Son was sent by the Father and by the Spirit means [that] He was begun from them.” The reception of the Spirit from the Son demonstrates the consubstantiality of the Trinity, for “if this ‘my’ means emanation from the Son, then elsewhere also according to you, you think the Father was incarnated in accordance with that which the Son said: ‘everything which is yours, is mine’ and there again He says: ‘that which is mine, is yours’ [Jn. 16:15].

The glorification of the Son by the Spirit does not indicate the Spirit’s beginning in the Son, but the equality of honor which the persons of the Trinity share. It cannot refer to the mode of origin as then the Son would also be the origin of the Father as the latter glorifies the former in Jn. 12:28. Grigor finds the notion that the Son would be without life if the Spirit did not emanate from Him untenable. If this were so, he argues, then the Spirit is without logos, for the Son did not emanate from it. Grigor dismisses the entire argument explaining that “it is very foolish to think or to say such things about one existence.”

Tat’ewac’i demonstrates further that the phrase, ‘finger of God’, sometimes indicates the Trinity, sometimes grace, sometimes one person of the Trinity, and sometimes a superior power. There are, however, only two proper interpretations when it refers to the Holy Spirit. First, it exemplifies the homoousion of the Trinity, for “as a finger is of the essence of the body, similarly the Holy Spirit is of the essence of God.” Secondly, the Spirit operates within the economy of salvation as the instrument of the Father and the Son, for it was...
through the Spirit that God wrote to the prophets and that the Son accomplished His miracles in a manner similar to when we write or perform acts by means of our own fingers.

Finally, Tat’ewac’i provides another interpretation of the nous-soul-logos analogy, which he presents as nous-logos-speech. He clarifies that there is a correct and incorrect understanding. The correct meaning of the analogy reinforces the second point made about ‘the finger of God’ and the operation of the Spirit in the economy of salvation. According to Grigor, “as speech is for the translation of nous and logos, likewise the Holy Spirit [is for the translation] of the Father and of the Son, as it says, ‘it is not as if He will say anything by Himself, but that which He hears’ (Jn. 16:13).” In contrast, there are two incorrect interpretations of this analogy. The first eliminates the Spirit altogether through equating the articulated logos (i.e., speech/Spirit) with the innate logos (logos/Son). The second asserts that speech is only a product of logos and not of the nous and “shows the Holy Spirit [to be] from the Son alone and not from the Father which is an inconceivable heresy.”

Having refuted the pro-philioque interpretation of these proof-texts, Tat’ewac’i subsequently aims to prove that the Spirit proceeds from the Father alone through negative and positive demonstration. He sets about this in three ways: first from questions, second from examples, and third from testimonies. The ten questions attempt to demonstrate that the double cause or origin implied in the philioque is untenable as it violates the consubstantiality of the Spirit and the monarchy of the Father central to orthodox Trinitarian thought.

Tat’ewac’i’s second method of refutation is by example (συμπαραγωγή). Disproving ‘by example’ entails illustrating the impossibility of his opponents’ argument in the case of analogous

---

69 The rewording of the analogy is due to the awkwardness of the identification of the logos with the Spirit and of the soul with the Son.

70 ξία ορεθ ορωτοθα ορωτοθα (sic, for ορωτοθα) διότι λε ορωθ, οροθα λε ορωθ. λε ορωθ. τον ωρα. «Πά καθε ορωθε το ωραθ, απε λε το να τον» , GH, p. 62.

71 ξιορα ορωθ ορωθοθ ορωθι τον απο ορωθοθ απο ορωθοθορωθοθ. GH, p. 62.

72 GH, pp. 62-63. On the difference between the Greek Fathers’ and Latin theologians conception of the origin of the persons, see MEYENDORFF 1979, pp. 181-186, especially, p. 183; and KELLY 1950, p. 359.
situations which approximate the emanation of the Spirit. Grigor again emphasizes that the Holy Spirit cannot possess two origins or causes.

Finally, Tat'ewac'i adduces Biblical, patristic, and conciliar testimonies that support his anti-*filioque* position. The Biblical citations are: a combination of Jn. 14:26 and 15:26; Mt. 10:20; Rom. 8:11; Ps. 35:10/36:9; Is. 57:16. Patristic evidence is culled from Ps.-Dionysius the Areopagite, John of Damascus, and Gregory Nazianzen. The councils referred to are Nicaea-Constantinople, Ephesus, and Chalcedon. Grigor naturally points out that the *filioque* addition is denied by Chalcedonians (i.e., John of Damascus and the Council itself) and “they are therefore anathematized by their own canons!”

Tat'ewac'i concludes his passage against the *filioque* addition with a profession of faith declaring the Armenian position to be “in accordance with the Holy and Orthodox teachings; thus, we profess and confess the Holy Spirit God, an emanation from God the Father, as it says, ‘the Spirit which proceeds from the Father’ [Jn. 15.26].” He continues, the Spirit is an emanation from the Father as the Son is begotten from Him; but the Spirit is also a receiver from the Son as Jn. 16:14b indicates: “thence he will receive from me.” This is due to the fact that everything which the Father has, the Son also has [Jn.

---

73 GH, pp. 63-64. Tat’ewac’i chooses six examples: 1) the movement from one object to another implied by the word ‘procession’, 2) the exhalation of breath does not proceed from a word but from a different origin in the body, 3) one’s will derives from one’s mind but not from one’s wisdom, 4) the way heat is given off by fire and not dependent on light, 5) the way a fragrance is emitted from a flower and again not from its color, 6) and the way a conjunction (ζωγραφία) binds two ends together forming a whole and not acting as a boundary between two other beings.

74 Χρησιμοποιήσαντες σχέσεις σχέσεως με σχέσεις, GHC, p. 64. Cf. John of Damascus, *De Fide Orthodoxa* 1.18. Grigor’s exclamation resembles Photius’ claim in his *Mystagogy* (PG 102. 286). The reference is likely to the Council’s assertion that “on account of those who impugn the Holy Spirit, it ratifies and confirms the doctrine delivered subsequently, concerning the essence of the Spirit, by the 150 holy Fathers, who were in assembled in the imperial city, which they made known to all, not as though they were supplying some omission of their predecessors, but distinctly declaring by written testimony their own understanding concerning the Holy Spirit, against those who were endeavouring to set aside his Sovereignty,” STEVENSON 1989, p. 352.

75 ζωγραφίαν ὁμορρίζει ζωχρισμόν ζωγραφικοῦ ζωχρισμοῦ, ἀλλὰ ζωχρίσθη τῇ ζωχριστῇ καὶ ἀλληλοκαθαρίσθῃ ζωχρίσθῃ καὶ ἀλληλοκαθαρισθῇ ζωρίσθῃ ζωοκοινωνίᾳ, ὡς ἡ ἁγιάστωσιν, GHC, p. 65.
16:15] and Christ is the power [Heb. 1:3] and wisdom [Col. 2:3] of God. Indeed, again echoing Yovhannes Orotneq'i, the Spirit receives from the wisdom and power of the Son and distributes it to the creations, but this does not reflect the Spirit's hypostatic origin.

In volume III of his Book of Questions, Grigor returns briefly to the questions of filioque. This volume presents Tat'evac'i's positive definition of Armenian Trinitarian, angelological, and demonological beliefs based upon the corpus of works attributed to Dionysius the Areopagite. As volume III is not polemical in nature, Tat'evac'i does not attend to rejecting the pro-filioque position, which in any case he had already done in the arguments discussed above. There is a point at which he does explicitly deny the validity of the filioque addition. The passage is interesting as it was not included in the first draft of the Book of Questions, nor in the first copies produced of that work. The passage was first inserted into the bottom margin of M9247 copied in 1407 at Mecop'avanq by T'ovma Mecop'ec'i under Tat'evac'i's supervision. The insertion occurs at the end of chapter five of volume III. The question is posed: "Why, when we give glory, [do we give it] first to the Father, with Him the Son, and then the Spirit?" Grigor is quick to respond that "the Father is the cause of the generation of the Son and the emanation of the Spirit, on account of which the Father is ranked first, and with Him the Son, not as some think [because] the Son is the cause of the emanation of the Spirit." A possible reason for such a clear rejection of the filioque doctrine at this juncture is that Tat'evac'i borrows from Honorius of Autun's Elucidarium for the material he includes immediately preceding this insertion. Although the Armenian theologian is mindful to eliminate any reference from Honorius's work that asserts or implies the doctrine of filioque, the use of a Latin text for the exposition of Armenian orthodox theology must have been considered risky and a direct countering of the unorthodox addition deemed necessary.

76 For a translation with commentary of this volume, see LA PORTA 2001.
77 Զառեփ թերակղզի զարգացման ճարտարապետ, զարգացման ճարտարապետ, զարգացման ճարտարապետ, GH, p. 109.
78 Զառեփ թերակղզի զարգացման ճարտարապետ, զարգացման ճարտարապետ, զառեփ թերակղզի զարգացման ճարտարապետ, GH, p. 109.
Grigor’s comparison of the Trinity to the sun in this volume also elaborates his anti-*filioque* position. Tat’ewac’i presents a unique analogy, describing the Son and Holy Spirit as two lights, the one yellow, the other white, which possess the sun, the Father, as their common origin. The analogy of the two lights works well as it allows for 1) the monarchy of the Father as the origin of both; 2) the distinction of the hypostases of the Son and Spirit as the yellow and white light differ in their individual characteristics; and 3) the distribution of the *charismata* of the Spirit through the Son as, according to Tat’ewac’i, the yellow light reveals the invisible white light; and it accomplishes this without the threat of confusion that the Son is the origin or cause of the Spirit.

As the passage inserted into the *Book of Questions* in 1407 suggests, the argument over *filioque* continued in the fifteenth century. Although the pro-Latin initiatives of the Catholicossate of Sis lost much of its vigor after the fall and capture of the Cilician kingdom by the Mamlukes in 1375, the imprisoned See still managed to send representatives to the Council of Florence (1438-1439). At the council, the Armenians once again declared their complete allegiance to Rome. Greater Armenia had had enough; in 1441, at the sixth Council of Ejmiacin, the eastern leaders of the Armenian Church returned the Catholicossate to Armenia. This move put an end to neither the Catholicossate of Sis nor to the discussion of the Church’s relationship with Rome, but did insure that the discussion took place at a greater distance and independence from Latin influence and power.

If the efforts of Yovhannēs Orotnc‘i and Grigor Tat’ewac’i did not put an end to the debate over the *filioque* controversy in Armenia, they gave a firm footing from which Armenian Orthodox theologians could argue and were formative in the anti-*filioque* position the Church holds to this day.
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“DOUBLE PRAYERS”
AND INCLINATIONS IN THE LITURGY OF
THE ARMENIAN CHURCH:
THE PRESERVATION AND PROLIFERATION
OF AN ANCIENT LITURGICAL USAGE

Michael Daniel Findikyan

Several chapters in the Old Testament First Book of Samuel relate
King Saul’s expedition to capture and destroy the great David,
whose military conquests against the Philistines had won him fame and
notoriety among the people of Israel. While pursuing David in the
wilderness of Engedi, Saul entered a dark cave to rest. Unbeknownst to
him, David and his men had earlier taken refuge deep within the same
cave. When David realized his dumb luck, that Saul had virtually
walked into a death trap, David sneaked up on the King and stealthily
cut off the skirt of his robe. Sword in hand, David could have easily
finished off the King with one swipe and claimed the Kingdom of
Israel as his own. But righteous David had a change of heart and
forbade his men from attacking Saul. The King was thus able to flee
from the cave humiliated, but alive and in control, if ignorant as to the
identity of his precocious offender. What follows is even more
surprising. David followed the King out of the dark anonymity of the
cave and called after him, “My lord the king!” When Saul turned and
looked back, the Old Testament narrative relates, “David fell on his
face upon the earth and he kissed the ground” (אֲבָנֵי דָּוִד לְפָנָיו אַךְ לָלָקַח, לְאִי אָבִּית לְפָנָיו לָלָקַח, literally,
“he kissed the ground to/for him”) [1Sam 24:8]. By lying prostrate
before the King, David had effectively offered up his life to Saul. Just
as, minutes earlier, Saul had sat utterly defenseless and subject to
David’s will in the darkness of the cave, so now David lay at the King’s
feet helpless. The difference is that David willingly fell on his face. He

1 Paper presented at a symposium commemorating the 1700th Anniversary of Christian
Armenia sponsored by the Prelacy of the Armenian Apostolic Church of America,
assumed a bodily posture that unequivocally expressed his total subjection to the King’s will. Seeing this, King Saul was moved by David’s fidelity and spared his life with the prophetic words, “And now, behold, I know that you shall surely be king, and that the kingdom of Israel shall be established in your hand” [1Sam 24:20].

Here, encapsulated in an obscure episode from the Old Testament, we find the functional meaning of prostration in worship.² Bowing the head, falling down on one’s knees or, more emphatically, falling down on one’s face is a universal human act of submission, and thus obedience, a gesture common to all civilizations. If the notion of a son bowing down in obedience before his father, or a subject kneeling before the king, or a slave submitting himself to his master seems disagreeable to our modern western sensibilities, this in no way diminishes the plain fact that societies tend toward hierarchical organization, with certain human beings subject to the will of others. From time immemorial, inclination of the head and prostration have been universal human rituals signifying the relationship of servant to served, of slave to master, of ruled to ruler.³

As it is in all ancient Christian liturgical traditions,⁴ bowing down is a common ritual gesture in Armenian worship. In the all-night vigils that precede Epiphany, Holy Friday, and Easter, the deacon calls on the faithful to bend the knee three times after each in the long series of Scripture readings that in large part constitute the vigil. The deacon’s invitation to genuflexion, ἀποτεθηκόντα προσκύνησις (or ἤκρυπνον ἐκπληκόντα) ἡσυχασμένον [With prayer and genuflexion let us beseech the Lord] is ancient. The ritual, with its formula, is already found in the old Armenian Lectionary of Jerusalem, which

---

² The Armenian քրիմ տղամարդկանց, քրիմականացին and cognates are generally used to translate the Greek προσκύνησις, which, however, may have originally meant “to throw a kiss to the god.” NBHL I, 703; H.G. Liddell and R. Scott, eds., A Greek-English Lexicon (Oxford, 1961) 1519. Eventually the Greek term comes to be used in liturgical contexts to signify an inclination of the head and shoulders as a sign of reverence or veneration. Clugnet, 129. The Armenian term comes to signify worship in the general sense. The Syriac ܐܥܐ (bow down, venerate, worship) may provide a closer analog.

³ See Bertaud, col. 216-217, who traces the act of prostration as a devotional form back in time at least to the Sumerians in the eighteenth century before Christ, and across the cultures of Egypt, China, India, Mongolia and Tibet.

⁴ Ibid., col. 218-222.
reflects liturgical practice in the Holy City in the early fifth century.\(^5\) The practice of punctuating psalms and scripture lessons with genuflexions or prostrations has been traced back to fourth-century Egyptian monastic practices, which eventually influenced monastic liturgy East and West, albeit in a variety of forms.\(^6\) The Armenian Daily Office contains numerous occasions for bowing down in worship. In the Morning Office the faithful bow down after “Glory in the highest” as the officiating priest offers the doxology, “Glory, honor and worship [κηρουμένοι τοις έθελέντες] in the highest to the Father and to the Son and to the Holy Spirit, now and always and unto the ages of ages. Amen.”\(^7\) The early eighth-century commentary on the Daily Office by Bishop Stepanos of Siwnik (†735) strongly suggests that at this early date the doxology was accompanied by a full prostration, not the slight inclination of the head that usually accompanies the doxology today. In his characteristically laconic style, Stepanos writes:\(^8\)

Φωνὴ χορηγῆσαι, αἴμαθείς, ἵπποι ἀμοιβής ἐκ
κηρουμένοι τοις έθελέντες προσερατίζοντος

Giving glory [and] bowing down: as if [the worshiper] extends still more, in order to invoke the united [Trinity].

The ambiguity of the word “extend” in the English translation is intentional, resulting from a play on words in the Armenian. The word κηρουμένοι can refer equally to stretching out the body in prostration, or perduring through time. A deep prostration at this point also explains the next liturgical structure in the Morning Office order. The so-called “Morning Song” [αναπλωμένη κηρ.] is a curiously isolated variable

---

\(^{5}\) Renoux, ALJ II, 181, 210-215, 270, 296, 298, 305, 342.

\(^{6}\) The description of Egyptian monastic prayer at the end of the fourth century, furnished by John Cassian in his Institutes, describes a pattern of psalmody, silent prayer, prostration, more silent prayer and a concluding prayer or “collect” by the presiding monk. Cited at length with analysis in Taft, LHEW 58-62. For other early sources documenting similar patterns of prayer and prostration in the Monastic Office of Upper Egypt see Taft, LHEW 63-66 and the references under “inclination” in the index.

\(^{7}\) «Φωνὴ χορηγῆσαι, κηρουμένοι τοις έθελέντες ζεύγος τὰ οργανόν ζηλεύων ἁπαντωμεν ἐκ τῆς εὐγενείας τῶν θεοκλητῶν υἱοθετημένης ὑπὲρ». Žamagirk, 281.

\(^{8}\) Stepanos Siwnecˇi, Commentary on the Daily Office III.14, Findikyan, Commentary, 93.
psalm verse whose purpose at this point in the service is otherwise difficult to explain. It is very likely that this structure was added to fill the liturgically vacant few moments it would take for the faithful to rise to their feet and continue the service following the prostration after “Glory in the highest.” It is extremely common in all liturgical rites to find Psalm verses used as filler to accompany a liturgical action or ritual.9

Another example of liturgical prostration is found in one of the two Armenian Compline Offices, the one known as the Rest Office [Համաձուլված Ժամանակ]. The clergy and faithful bow down during the priest’s supplication, “We fall before you, holy Mother of God, and we beseech you, the immaculate Virgin. Intercede with your only-begotten Son to save us from temptation and from our every danger.”10 This, of course, is the Armenian version of the ancient Marian hymn, “Sub tuum praesidium,” which is found in some form in virtually every liturgical rite East and West.11 One could easily multiply examples of prostration in the Daily Office, Eucharist,12 sacraments13 and festal celebrations14 of the Armenian Church, and one could do the same for

---

9 The now classic exposition of this phenomenon is Taft, BEW 161. For an example from the Armenian Rite see Findikyan, “Dedication,” 87-96.

10 Համաձուլված ժամանակ, ուռու Երազմանասիր, եկ դրանցից զարգացված տենդար, այլինքին զարգացնող արդիք զարդարլիս եկ սրբակազած ժամանակ դեպքում Ժամագիրք, 654.


13 See, for example, the adoration at the holy altar following baptism. The Order of Baptism according to the Rite of the Armenian Apostolic Orthodox Church (Evanston, Illinois, 1964) 70-77.

any of the ancient liturgical rites.

What is distinctive about prostration in the Armenian Rite is the pervasiveness of a particular pairing of prayer and inclination that consists of a prayer, followed by the priest’s greeting of peace (“Peace to all” ռազմակայացկություն ծածկեք) with its customary response (“And with your spirit” Երևույթ կատարեք ու հաղթեք); then a diaconal invitation to bow down (“Let us bow down to God” Երկրորդ կերպում կենս մRequestId: 4c3d7b06-163e-4e3f-9be6-c75f3f4ea0ed
Armenian Rite) and the popular acclamation, “Amen.” Consequently the observed structure comprises two complete prayers flanking the priest’s offering of peace and the deacon’s invitation to bow down. The designation “double prayer” is therefore preferable to “bi-partite prayer” [κρημνων μητρεία], which the Mechitarist scholar Vardan Hačuni used. The latter implies two components of a single prayer rather than two complete prayers.

Those familiar with the Armenian Rite know that the double-prayer framed around peace and inclination is found in virtually every liturgical service. The principal prayers of all the sacraments and virtually every occasional office such as the Blessing of Water, the Blessing of Grapes, the Dedication of a Newly-built Church, the Sanctification of a Defiled Church, the Blessing of a Cross, the Blessing of an Icon, Calling a Sinner to Penance, and many others are double-prayers with peace and inclination. The form is even more conspicuous in the Armenian Daily Office. The nearly 700-page Žamagirk [Book of Hours] contains only twelve prayers that are not followed by peace, prostration, and a second prayer. So common are double-prayers with peace and prostration throughout the liturgical rites.

---


16 Hačuni, 167.

17 Čašoč, 8-12.

18 Ibid., 199-201.

19 Findikyan, “Dedication,” 105-110.

20 Mec Mašoč, 198-199.

21 Ibid., 206-208, 211-212, 212-213.

22 Ibid., 214-215.

23 Ibid., 218-219.

24 Not including the elegies of St. Gregory of Narek, which are not, strictly speaking, liturgical prayers. There are eight additional prayers in the Žamagirk that are not followed by peace and prostration but by a diaconal proclamation [βραδων Σήμερον ἡμῶν καὶ ἡμῶν ἡμῶν ἡμῶν] and a prayer of dismissal [αύτῶν ἔχει ὑπεράνων] not attested before the twelfth century. These prayers are: Νημωνίας [330], Θεολογία [331], ὸντων ἡμῶν [359], ᾿Οντων ἡμῶν [572], ὸντων ἡμῶν [367], ὸντων ἡμῶν [391], Φωτισμός [402], and ὸντων ἡμῶν [416]. It is very likely that the structure of this dismissal formula, consisting of two prayers separated by a diaconal proclamation, was influenced by the structure of the ubiquitous double-prayer with peace and prostration. Page numbers refer to Žamagirk.
of the Armenian Church, that one could justifiably conclude that when Armenians worship, they pray “in twos.”

The double-prayer is not unknown to the Byzantine and other rites. We find it in various liturgical contexts in all other liturgical rites, though sparingly. The ancient Byzantine Prayer of Betrothal, for example, is a double prayer with inclination.\(^{25}\)

**Double Prayer #1**

**Byzantine Prayer of Betrothal**

O eternal God, who hast brought into unity those who were sundered, and hast ordained for them an indissoluble bond of love; who didst bless Isaac and Rebecca, and didst make them heirs of thy promise: Bless also these thy servants, \(N.\) and \(N.\), guiding them unto every good work. For thou art a merciful God, who loveth mankind, and unto thee do we ascribe glory, to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Spirit, now and ever, and unto ages of ages. Amen.

Peace be with you.
(Response: “And with thy spirit).
Bow your heads unto the Lord.
(Response: “To thee, O Lord”)

O Lord our God, who hast espoused the Church as a pure Virgin from among the Gentiles: Bless this Betrothal, and unite and maintain these thy servants in peace and oneness of mind. For unto thee are due all glory, honor and worship, to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Spirit, now and ever, and unto ages of ages. Amen.

The universality of this liturgical structure in the Armenian Rite and its only sporadic evidence in other rites begs the question of the etiology of the structure. How did such a structure originate? Is the interruption of prayer by peace and inclination fortuitous, or did the unit develop out of some specific liturgical context that accounts for the curious structure? Moreover, what led the unit to proliferate in the Armenian Rite? To answer these questions we must first look for a link between the text and context of the two prayers and the act of prostration. In most Armenian double-prayers, inclination by the faithful is not alluded to in the text of either of the two prayers that surround the deacon’s invitation to bow down. There are, however, a number of notable examples to the contrary, where the second prayer of the couple does indeed refer in some way to the fact that the people are bowing down. In one of the four variable double-prayers of the Night Office, the second prayer suggests that the faithful should be bowed down as the priest is praying.\footnote{\textit{Sir atiup hu kh'v\ldots\textit{Armenian Orthodox Church Hymns}, Zamagirk, 139-140.}}

Double Prayer \#2
Armenian Night Office Prayer (Tones 2 and 6)

Lord of heaven and earth, creator of all creatures, visible and invisible; to you we call at all times, for your lordship extends through all places, and your kingdom reigns over all. Grant us to make haste always to worship you in the fear of the Lord; to love you with all our heart, and with all our mind, and with all our strength; [and] to uphold your commandments; to lift up our hands to you in holiness, without indignation or vacillation; and to find grace and mercy from you, as well as success in our virtuous works. For you are the Lord of life and the God of mercies, and to you is befitting glory, lordship and honor, now and always and unto the ages of ages. Amen.
Peace to all.
Let us bow down to God.

*Every knee bends in worship to your all-powerful and triumphant lordship* [վարունք վարունք քարակարգ լքել եվ երբեմն մեր միջոցից սպառջություն երեխանենք], and your king-dom is glorified by all. Look down upon our worship, and teach us to do what is just and true. For you are the God of peace, who took away enmity from our midst and made peace in heaven and on earth. To those near and far you heralded the good news of the new gifts of your good things. Makes us also worthy of your great grace, appointing us with your true worshippers, our God and our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, who are blessed with the Father and the Holy Spirit, now and always and unto the ages of ages. Amen.

Similarly, the principal prayer of Vespers is a double prayer, in which the second prayer alludes to bowing down.²⁷

**Double Prayer #3**

**Armenian Prayer of Vespers**

Hear our voice, O Lord our God. Receive our supplications, the lifting up of our hands and the words of our prayers. Sanctify this our evening offering so that we may prepare it for your pleasure with a sweet fragrance. Increase in us, almighty Lord, faith, hope and love and all deeds of virtue. So that leading a devout, religious life day and night according to your good will, we may become worthy to beseech you for the salvation of our souls, and for our spiritual life, Lord, and to receive grace and mercy from you. So that we may thankfully glorify

²⁷*Գրաչ կարչը երգայ...Եր տերհի զարգացած։* Համագույն, 558-559.
the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, now and always and unto the ages of ages. Amen.

Peace unto all.
Let us bow down to God.

Bowing down to you, O Lord our God, we thank you for leading us through this day in peace [Քեր երգիսք իշպանության, ինք Մատուռքի ծեր, զորագրավոր զեղում իշպանության, թուջ զորագրավոր իշպանության]. Lord, we ask you to lead us through this evening and the coming night without sin and without stumbling, to stand firm, and to remain steadfast in faith, in hope, in love, and in the observance of your commandments. We ask you for peace in the whole world, and stability in your holy church, and salvation for our souls. So that receiving from you all that we ask, we may also always send up on high great and proper praise to your all-powerful dominion, O Christ our God, now and always and unto the ages of ages. Amen.

Yet another example is cited in the Commentary on the Daily Office by the tenth-century theologian Xosrov Anjewac'ī (†c. 963). Among the prayers and proclamations of the Sunrise Office that Xosrov quotes, and upon which he comments phrase by phrase, we find a double-prayer that no longer survives in our printed Hours Books. The second of the two prayers includes a clear reference to prostration.28

Double Prayer #4
Armenian Prayer of the Sunrise Office

From the rising of the sun to the setting of the sun you are blessed, O Lord; may your name be blessed from this time forth forevermore. You, who took

28 Hacuni, 199.
away from our midst the darkness of blindness, and shined on us the light of the knowledge of God, both in our foolish minds and in our mortal bodies. And now we beseech you and ask of your beneficence, make us worthy in holiness to see the rays of the sun, to pass in peace the length of this day, and to arrive at the service of the evening in worship [σπουδαιοι σπολαιδηστα] and in the glorification of your all-holy Trinity, to whom is due glory, lordship and honor, now and always and unto the ages of ages. Amen.

Peace unto all.
Let us bow down before God.

Before you, O Lord, and before your glory, and before your great lordship, we, your servants and hand-maidens incline our heads [μονηρις καισαρηνοι δεξιοι αρησις δεξιοι αρησις]. You, O Lord our God, stretch out your almighty right [hand] and bless us. Bless these [people] and enable them, so that at all times, by all people, your all-holy name may be glorified in these servants and these hand-maidens. And we shall offer blessing and glory to the Father and to the Son and to the Holy Spirit. Now and always and unto the ages of ages. Amen.

In all three of these examples, we find unambiguous references to bowing down in the second prayer of the double-prayer unit. A piece of eighth-century Armenian canonical legislation gives additional reason to suggest that originally there was a functional connection between the double prayer and the ritual of prostration. Several canons from the Armenian Synod of Duin, convoked by the liturgical reformer Catholicos Yovhannēs Ŭjneći in 719 AD, concern the proper sequence

29 For examples of double prayers with reference to prostration in the Armenian Euchology [Maštc] see Maštc, 58, 71, 73, 267, 377, 413, 455. See also the prayer for the Blessing of Incense, and the Blessing of Water on Holy Thursday, Čaštc, 207, 214; the Prayer for Re-admission of Penitents, Čaštc, 193-196
of the Night Office. Canon 25 cites by incipit four diaconal proclamations, each with a corresponding double prayer. It is surely significant that the canon uses the term hangist, which is translated “repose,” to characterize the second member of each double prayer.30

It is mandatory and proper at the Night Office to add these four proclamations of the canons: “For the peace from above;” “For at night and at day;” “For straightening our paths;” “For finding grace;” which St. Sahak, Catholicos of the Armenians composed for [the Night Office]. And for each one, these prayers [should be said] with their reposes [be pum $\ldots$ muqum]: “Lord God eternal.” Repose: “Granter of blessings.” “At night and at day.” Repose: “Good shepherd.” “We have fallen before you,” Repose: “To your almighty dominion.”

May we assume that the term hangist (repose) refers to a prayer offered while the people are prostrate? To my knowledge, Catholicos Yovhannēs Ōjneĉi, presumed author of these canons, is the only Armenian liturgical exegete to distinguish the two prayers of a double prayer with peace and prostration in this way.31 He uses the term casually, without further elaboration, suggesting that both the term and likely the underlying ritual were well-known to the Armenians at this time. Of the four double-prayers cited in Canon 25, only one (Double Prayer #1 above) has a patent reference to inclination in the second prayer. None of the others has any literary clue to bowing down. The fact that Ōjneĉi can use the term hangist for all of these prayers, whether they mention inclination in the text or not, suggests that these prayers functioned like, and are derived from ancient “Prayers of Inclination,” well known in the Christian East.

31 Ormanian, Ուհաղութհանի Բեպե, 13-14, mentions that the term is used by Ōjneĉi but he offers no further explanation of its meaning or application.
"Prayer of Inclination" is the term used to describe a conventional prayer of dismissal found in the liturgical traditions of the Antiochene liturgical sphere of influence. Abundant evidence in early liturgical sources from Jerusalem, Palestine and the environs of Antioch attests that at the end of a liturgical assembly the deacon invited the faithful to bow down, whereupon the presiding cleric offered a prayer τῆς κεφαλοκλώσεως, literally, "of bowing the head." 32 We know from Egeria, the Spanish nun who traveled to the Holy Land in 384 AD, that in fourth-century Jerusalem, all the synaxes that took place at the various shrines of the Holy City concluded with a Prayer of Inclination. Egeria was evidently impressed by this elaborate dismissal ritual, as she mentions it constantly, so often, in fact, that she sometimes refers to the practice using the abbreviation, "the dismissal." 33 In her description of daily Vespers, Egeria writes: 34

As soon as the deacon has done his part, the bishop says a prayer and prays the Prayer for All. Up to this point the faithful and the catechumens are praying together, but now the deacon calls every catechumen to stand where he is and bow his head, and the bishop says the blessing over the catechumens from his place. There is another prayer, after which the deacon calls for all the faithful to bow their head, and the bishop says the blessing over the faithful from his place. Thus the dismissal takes place at the Anastasis, and they all come up one by one to have the bishop's hand laid on them.

Here we see that the procedure for dismissing the various classes of worshipers in the socially well-defined liturgical milieu of fourth-century Jerusalem involved an inclination and blessing for each class.

The Apostolic Constitutions, a contemporary document from the environs of Antioch, quotes prayers of inclination at the conclusion of

33 Cf. Taft, Precommunion Rites, 193.
34 Egeria, 24.6. Wilkinson, 143-144. For a list of references see Taft, Precommunion Rites, 156 n.6.
Matins, Vespers, the Eucharistic Liturgy of the Word, and funerals. In each case, a diaconal proclamation invites the faithful to pray for specific intentions. The bishop then offers a "collect," an oration that takes up the intentions just listed by the deacon, and addresses them to God in the imperative voice as a prayer. After the collect, the deacon invites the faithful to bow their heads, while the bishop offers the Prayer of Inclination. The conclusion of the Morning Office, for example, reads as follows in the Apostolic Constitutions:

[Deacon:]
Let us beseech the Lord for his compassion and mercy; let us ask him for a morning [that is] peaceful and without sin...

Then the bishop shall pray, saying:
"God of spirits and of all flesh, peerless and without deficiency, who have given the sun to govern the day and the moon and the stars to govern the night. And now look upon us favorably and receive our morning thanksgiving, and have mercy on us, for we have not stretched out our hands toward a strange god, for there is no recent god among us but you alone, eternal and infinite. Through Christ you have granted us life, and again through him you have provided goodness for us. Judge us likewise worthy of eternal life. Through him, through whom, to you glory, honor and worship in the Holy Spirit, for the ages. Amen."

Then the deacon shall say:
"Bow down for the imposition of hands."

And the bishop shall pray, saying:
"God faithful and truthful, you show mercy on the thousands and on the myriads of those who love you, friend of the humble and defender of the poor. All

---

35 For a list of references see Taft, Precommunion Rites, 156 n.7.
things have need of you for all are your servants. Look upon your people here, who have inclined their heads before you. Bless them with a spiritual blessing. Protect them like the pupil of your eye. Keep them in piety and justice and judge them worthy of eternal life in Jesus Christ your beloved servant, through whom to you glory, honor and worship in the Holy Spirit, now and always and unto the ages of ages. Amen.”

And the deacon shall say: “Go in peace!”

The structure that emerges corresponds perfectly to the Armenian double prayers we have been examining, especially when we consider that in the Armenian Rite all double-prayers are preceded by a diaconal litany, resulting in the following structure:

1. Diaconal litany
2. Collect by the bishop
3. Peace and diaconal invitation to bow down
4. Prayer of Inclination

The apparent derivation of the Armenian double prayer with peace and inclination from ancient hagiopolite and Antiochene inclination prayers finds greater support on closer examination of the terminology of the Armenian prayers. As we have observed, some Armenian prayers explicitly refer to inclination in their text. A number of others, however, show certain verbal and thematic affinities with the Inclination Prayers in the *Apostolic Constitutions*. In particular, a supplication to “look” [ἐπιθέε, or to “look attentively” [ἐπιβλέψον] upon the faithful [βωλω(γ), ζωλω(γ)] is frequently encountered in both the second member of the Armenian double prayer and in the Inclination Prayers of the *Apostolic Constitutions*. The phrase provides a rhetorical contrast between the faithful, laid low in prayer, and God the Father, who dwells in the heights of heaven. Two of the four double prayers of the Armenian Night Office, mentioned above, contain a petition in the Inclination Prayer to “look” upon the faithful:
...look upon and visit your rational flock, which you have assembled for yourself in your compassion ![WindowText](image)

*Look* down upon our worship [lit. “kissing the ground”], and teach us to do what is just and true... ![WindowText](image)

Earlier in the ordo of the same Night Office we find another prayer with the same terminology. Right after the diaconal invitation to bow down the prayer begins:

*Look*, beneficent Lord, in your mercy, upon us who worship and glorify your holy name... ![WindowText](image)

The formula is also found in numerous prayers of the Armenian Euchology [Maštoc]. The second unit of the Armenian double prayer for a second marriage, for example, begins:40

---

37 Žamagir, 136.
38 Ibid., 140.
39 Ibid., 39-40.
40 Maštoc, 128. See also Ibid., 229. A few single prayers, i.e. prayers lacking a peace greeting and invitation to bow down, also contain this terminology. Ibid., 170, 188. It is possible that these prayers were once preceded by a collect, peace and inclination. Alternatively, the inclusion of a petition to “look” upon the faithful may be merely fortuitous. Another example of this terminology is found in the Precommunion Inclination Prayer of the Armenian Eucharistic Prayer attributed to St. Cyril of Alexandria: “Look, O Lord, in your beneficence, upon the worship of these people...” ![WindowText](image)

Yovsēp Gaffrēan (= J. Catergian) and Yakovbos Tašēan (= J. Dashiān). ![WindowText](image)

[Die Liturgien bei den Armeniern. Fünfzehn Texte und Untersuchungen] (Vienna, 1897) 266.
O Lord our God, who are aware of the secrets of mankind and who know that which we conceal, for to you are known the mysteries of the man, and the way of the woman. Look in your beneficence upon these servants [δωρίσω ρυθμωροις θωμαρην ρηθείς δανημομοιροι] and grant them the yoke of your love; so that they may receive the second crown, and by your command may dwell together in one mind in their holy bed...

The same petition to “look” is found regularly in Inclination Prayers of Apostolic Constitutions Book VIII. The Inclination Prayers associated with the various dismissals from the Liturgy of the Word, for example, include supplications to “Look upon your servants...” [ἐπιδε ἐπὶ τοὺς δούλους; “Look upon the candidates for baptism...” [ἐπιδε ἐπὶ τοὺς βαπτιζόμενους; “Look upon those who have bowed the necks of their soul and of their bodies...” [ἐπιδε ἐπὶ τοὺς κεκλικότας σοι αὐχένα ψυχῆς καὶ σώματος; “Look upon this your flock [ἐπιδε...ἐπὶ τὸ ποιμνίον σου τοῦτο]. The same verb occurs in the Precommunion Inclination Prayer: “Look upon us and upon this flock which you have chosen through [Christ]” [ἐπιδε οἵματι ἔφημας καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ ποιμνίον σου τοῦτο διὰ αὐτοῦ ἐξευδέλαξα]. We also find the formula in the dismissal prayer of Matins: “Look upon these your people, who have bowed their heads before you...” [ἐπιδε ἐπὶ τὸν λαὸν σου τοῦτον, τοὺς κεκλικότας σοι πᾶς ἐξουπνίαν κεφαλᾶς].

Another phrase that characterizes many Inclination Prayers is a reference to God’s mighty right hand, often phrased as a supplication to God to stretch out or to extend his right hand of protection over the faithful. The image evokes the Old Testament idea of God’s mighty providence, as in Ps 137(138):7: “Though I walk in the midst of

---

41 Apostolic Constitutions VIII 6:12, 8:5, 9:8, 11:3, 13:10, 39:5 SC 336 pp. 186-255 passim. The same terminology is also used in the collect preceding the Inclination Prayer of Matins: “Cast a favorable look upon us...” [ἐπιδε ἐπὶ καὶ ἔνοιχον ὑπερέξαντος ὄρθρωμοι]. Apostolic Constitutions VIII 38:4, SC 336 pp. 252-253. The collect (first prayer of the double-prayer unit) for the dead includes the phrase, “Look upon this your servant whom you have chosen and promoted to another condition” [ἐπὶ τὸν δούλον σου τὸνδε, ὡς ἐξελέξω καὶ προσελάβων εἰς ἐγερθεὶν λίπαν]. Might this be considered a final dismissal unto eternal life? Apostolic Constitutions VIII 41:5, SC 336 pp. 256-259.
trouble, you will quicken me. You have stretched forth your hand against my enemies' wrath, and your right hand has saved me." The theme is perfectly suited to dismissal benedictions, where God's protection is sought by the faithful as they depart the synaxis to carry on with their lives in the world. Moreover, the theme of God's mighty hand is undoubtedly linked to the dismissal rituals that Egeria observed in fourth-century Jerusalem.\(^{43}\) Habitually after an Inclination Prayer the faithful would approach the bishop and "come to his hand," presumably to kiss it. One of the Canons of Laodicea (c. 363 AD) refers to the catechumens and penitents "coming under the hand" of the bishop to receive their blessing of dismissal from a liturgical synaxis.\(^ {44}\) The pre-Communion Inclination Prayer in the Euchology of Sarapion, of mid-fourth century Egyptian provenance, links the act of hand-laying with the image of God's mighty hand:\(^ {45}\)

I extend (my) hand over this people, God of compassion, and pray that the hand of truth be extended and the blessing imparted to this people by your love for humankind, O God of mercies...

The "right hand" imagery, whose original source is in prayers for the Imposition of Hands, becomes a topos in Armenian (and other) Inclination Prayers. A reference to God's right hand is found in numerous Armenian double prayers, often in the second, i.e. the Inclination Prayer, but not infrequently in the preceding collect as well.\(^ {46}\) The Armenian Sunrise Prayer cited above (Double Prayer #4)


\(^ {43}\) Cf. Wilkinson, 53.

\(^ {44}\) Ibid., 65 n.7.


\(^ {46}\) See, for example the prayer from the so-called "Rite of Prayers for the Night Hour which is conducted over the gravely ill for the healing of pain and the expiation of transgressions": "Lord our God, place your all-powerful right [hand] upon this sick one, and heal his pains..." [δέως ἡμᾶς ἡμοῖοι ὑμᾶς ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἀμώμους τῷ πάθῳ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἀμώμους τῷ πάθῳ]. The long double prayer for sealing the grave beseeches the Lord to "extend your protective right [hand] and seal the place of his repose" [δέως ἡμὰς ἡμοῖοι ὑμᾶς ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἀμώμους τῷ πάθῳ]. Maštòč, 340, cf. Andrea B. Schmidt, Kanon der
asks the Lord to “stretch out your almighty right hand and bless us…”
[δηθω γηδησωνθησον ας γη δη ορισθησω γηθη].47 The phrase occurs in the second prayer of the double prayer unit, right after the deacon invites the faithful to bow down.

In the Armenian Rite of Initiation, the ancient double Prayer of Adoration at the altar (following the post-baptismal anointing) includes an Inclination Prayer that begins:48

O Lord God almighty, Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, these thy faithful here present bow their heads unto thee. Stretch forth thine invisible right hand and bless them and prosper the work of their hands... [Στηρ Υδησωνθησοντι ζωμ ο χρηστη άρει θυμωνθη στηρ Στηρ θημωνθη στηρ ινα αει ορισθησω γηθη σωτηρισμωνθησοντι ζωμ ινα δει ορισθησω ορισθησω ορισθησω ορισθησω]

Similarly, the Inclination Prayer for the Order of the Fortieth Day after a child’s baptism includes the following phrase:49

...so that he may become strong and have no fear of the operation of the enemy by the protection of your holy right [hand]... [κόθη γηθη ζωοι δη ορισθησω ορισθησω ορισθησω ορισθησω ορισθησω ορισθησω ορισθησω ορισθησω] αμαθη ωεν ινα αρειν.

We find the same concept in the rite of a child’s funeral.50


47 Haëmi, 199.


49 Maštoc, 73.

50 Ibid., 440.
...send the protective power of your right [hand] and bless the place of his rest so that when the trumpet sounds at the coming of your only-begotten... [ἀναμνήσθω γεμισθήσεσθαι ὁρθοτροπία ἑκεῖ ἀναγίγνεται ἡ εἰρήνη τῆς ὑμῶν ἁγίας καθημερινῆς ὑπηρεσίας, καθ' ἑαυτήν γεμίσθη αὐτοί· ἐπιθύμησε δὲ ἡ ἡμέρα ἐμπεπεζόμενή].

Book Eight of the Apostolic Constitutions contains a reference to God's right hand in the dismissal prayer of the funeral: "...and let them pasture under your right [hand] and protect them under your wings..." [καὶ ποίμανον αὐτοὺς ὑπὸ τὴν δεξιὰν σου καὶ σκέπασον αὐτοὺς ὑπὸ τὰς πτέρυγάς σου].

Conclusion

There can be little doubt that the peculiar liturgical unit of two prayers separated by the presiding cleric’s greeting and the deacon’s invitation to bow down, so widespread in the Armenian Rite, has its origin in ancient Antiochene and Palestinian dismissal Prayers of Inclination. No one familiar with the evolution of the Armenian Rite will be surprised to find yet another liturgical usage from the ancient Syrian and Palestinian liturgical realms, and from Jerusalem in particular, in the liturgy of the Armenians. Liturgical scholarship over the last thirty years has quite decisively, and via independent avenues, confirmed the early fifth-century Armenian patristic claim that liturgical books—and thus usages—were imported into Armenia from Edessa and from Jerusalem. Patent similarities between Armenian and East-Syrian initiation rites; certain aspects of the Armenian Daily Office with parallels in early Palestinian liturgical sources; and above all the discovery of the fifth-century Armenian Lectionary of Jerusalem allow no other explanation but the existence of a significant East-Syrian, Palestinian strand in the Armenian liturgical tradition in the period of its formation.

The very survival of the ancient Inclination structure illustrates another distinctive feature of the Armenian Rite, its tendency to preserve ancient liturgical structures and usages when in other rites these have either long since fallen out of use and been supplanted by

51 Apostolic Constitutions VIII 41.8. SC 336, pp. 258-259.
newer material, or have evolved into forms that barely resemble their archetypes. Practically every liturgical rite East and West has some form of prayer preceded by peace and/or inclination that ultimately derives from the patterns we have traced in Egeria and in the *Apostolic Constitutions*. But these vary widely in shape and context. The Armenian Rite has preserved these Inclination Prayers in tact structurally, and often thematically identical to their fourth-century models. In Armenia the structure remained pristine, while the function of the prayers evolved. In the Armenian Rite the double-prayer structure retains its original place at or near the conclusion of some offices, functioning still as a rite of dismissal. In other offices, such as Matins [ウンウムウンフレ追随] and Vespers [ブブブ追随] the big double prayer is in the middle of the ordo. Yet it can be shown that its place was once indeed at the end of the service. In both Matins and Vespers the principal prayer is introduced by a deacon’s proclamation, and is followed by the Trisagion, which, at the dawn of the eighth century in the writings of Bishop Stephanos of Siwnik and Catholicos Yovhannès Ojneči, marked the end of the offices. What follows the double prayer and Trisagion of Matins and Vespers in their present shape is new liturgical material appended to the services since the eighth century. Liturgical services tend to accrue new liturgical elements at the beginning and especially at the end of the ordo. Consequently, the double prayers of Matins, Vespers and other offices once indeed functioned as dismissal prayers.

Remarkable about the Armenian double prayer is that it became the structural model for all sacramental prayers. Eventually losing, in many contexts, its original function as a dismissal prayer, the form proliferated throughout the Book of Hours and Euchology, becoming the standard form for important Armenian liturgical prayers.

52 See Findikyan, *Commentary*, 378, 400, 488.


54 Taft, BEW 161.
The preservation and proliferation of the ancient Prayer of Inclination in the liturgy of the Armenian Church is one of many distinctive features of this liturgical rite. Such remarkable traits in the liturgy present pathways into the worshiping mind of the Armenian people. On the 1700th anniversary of the baptism of the Armenian people I cannot imagine a more appropriate and edifying endeavor than to trace these pathways in order to uncover the jewels of this liturgical tradition, which reflect the living Christian faith of the Armenian people.
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BOOK REVIEWS


Reviewed by Abraham Terian

Armenian monastics have copied countless biblical manuscripts through the Middle Ages. The existing copies, in number second only to Latin, are a telling commentary on the Armenians’ devotion to the Bible over the years. The beautiful illuminations that often adorn these biblical manuscripts have long interested art historians, and the text of the Armenian Bible has attracted a few scholars interested in textual criticism. Fewer is the number of those who have inquired about the ancient Armenian biblical commentaries that once accompanied the biblical manuscripts. This is precisely where Bp. Petrosyan and Ter-Step‘anyan make such a major contribution with their catalogue of the Armenian biblical commentaries from the fifth to the nineteenth century.

The catalogue lists a hundred commentaries arranged in the canonical sequence of the books of the Bible, from Genesis to Revelation, including the Apocrypha. An appendix lists ancient commentaries translated into Armenian: on the Old and New Testaments, respectively. Two lists of the Armenian commentators, one chronologically arranged and the other geographically (the latter from the 11th to the 15th centuries, to distinguish the Cilician authors at a glance), conclude the catalogue.

The compilers of the catalogue have done a commendable work, to the point of bringing to attention hitherto little known commentators like Géorg Kagh (11th cent.) with his commentary on the Letters of Paul; Yovhannès Mushi Ordi (12th cent.) with his commentary on Isaiah; and a certain Grigor Vardapet (13th cent.? ) with his commentaries on Genesis and Exodus, distinguishing him from Grigor Khlat‘ets‘i Cerents‘ (1349-1425) who likewise wrote commentaries on Genesis and Exodus. One would wish that they had been somewhat
critical in their ascription of the early commentaries, such as those attributed to Eghishē and Dawit' Anyaght'.

There are, however, serious omissions by the compilers. They list a lost commentary by Sargs Knd (ca.1100-ca.1185) on the book of Isaiah, but they fail to mention the lost commentary on Daniel by Step'annos Siwnets'i (d. 735), on which the commentary on Daniel by Vardan Arevelts'i (d. 1271) was partially dependent. As yet another lost and highly significant work that qualifies under the rubric of "commentary" broadly defined, is the Interpretation of Difficult and Hard to Understand Sayings in the Old and New Testaments by Petros Siwnets'i (ca. 500-557). Moreover, the compilers list the commentaries on the Gospel of Matthew and the Letters of Paul by Anania Sanahnets'i (ca.1000-ca. 1070), but omit his commentary on the book of Jonah. They list one commentary by Yovhannēs Orotnets'i (1315-1387), that on the Letters of Paul, whereas Orotnets'i has commentaries on the Gospel of Matthew, in addition to his commentary on the Beatitudes, on the Gospel of John, on the apocryphal 3 Corinthians, and of the Old Testament, on the books of Job and Isaiah.

In such a catalogue of early Armenian biblical commentaries, Bp. Petrosyan and Ter-Step'anyan could have done greater justice to ancient Armenian biblical scholarship had they included the Interpretation of the Lectionary, those significant comments on the assigned biblical readings of the liturgical year, by Grigor Arsharuni (ca.650-ca.729), published in Venice in 1964. One may cite other "commentaries" of this nature: Dawit' K'obayrets'i's (ca.1150-1220) biblical chronology, From Abraham to the Babylonian Captivity; Vahram Rabun's (ca.1250-ca.1290) Questions and Answers on Genesis, written upon the request of King Het'um II (once wrongly attributed to Yeghishē), published in Vienna in 1924. In a broader sense of "commentaries" one could also mention the abridgements of the Old Testament Apocrypha by Yakob Ghrimets'i (ca.1350-1426): those of Tobit and 3 Maccabees. One may also cite such epic works in verse as the abridgement of the Bible in one-thousand lines, To Manuch'i'r, by Grigor Magistros (ca.990-1059), published in Venice in 1868; Jesus, the Son by Nersēs Shnorhali (ca.1102-1173), in three books drawing upon the Four Gospels, published in Venice in 1830; and the Adamgirk' by Arakel Siwnets'i (ca.1356-ca.1422), in three books, drawing upon all known Armenian traditions about the forefather Adam (published in Istanbul in 1721 and in Venice in 1907).
A more accurate picture of Armenian biblical scholarship in the given periods would have emerged had the compilers mentioned certain of these works at least in the introduction—if not also the countless homilies on biblical events and characters.

The serious omissions notwithstanding, the compilers have accomplished a great undertaking in bringing a hundred Armenian biblical commentaries (a magical number perhaps) to the attention of many. They deserve our thanks not criticism. One would wish that the ancient and not-so-ancient Armenian biblical commentaries may soon be discovered by those interested in the history of biblical interpretation.
"Domar" is an Armenian loanword from the Greek τόμος (tome, book) and is used to designate a "calendar," particularly an ecclesiastical calendar. This comprehensive handbook on the Armenian liturgical year is the first publication of the "Armenian Orthodox Theological Research Institute," which, according to V. Rev. Ghevont Sannorian's Introduction to the work, has the laudable goal to "convey and communicate religious and secular values in all disciplines, according to the Armenian tradition, to the English-speaking dispersion" (vii). The last page of the book lists several dozen lay and ordained collaborators in the Institute's impressive initiative.

The vast work incorporates two volumes under one cover. Volume I presents the Armenian Church's complete liturgical Directory (Tōnačoyōc) as computed for the year 2003 with full English translation in parallel columns. Each day's entry gives the complete liturgical propers in Armenian and English translation, with abundant transliterations of Armenian liturgical terms, as well as liturgical and hymnographic incipits. Scripture readings from the Lectionary are also indicated. The day's hymnology is designated using the conventional but sometimes unwieldy Latin terminology coined by Archbishop Tiran Nersoyan in his partial English translation of the Book of Hours (Evanston, IL, 1964). Thus, for example, the terms Cantemus, Patrum and Pueri refer to the Armenian Ērhnut'iwn, Hac' and Mankunk' hymns, the šarakank' associated with the Canticle of Moses (Ex 15:1-19), the Canticle of Azarias (Dan 3:25-45) and Ps 112, respectively.

The second volume comprises, essentially, a latter-day Tōnapatçar, an exposition of every feast, liturgical season, and saint's commemoration for each day of the liturgical year. These explanations of almost every day of the year provide not only historical background to the feasts and biographical information concerning the saints such as one might find in a reference book, but also modest spiritual reflections on the liturgical year. As such, this section would serve well for daily devotional reading. The editors have compiled, translated and edited the
daily entries from a variety of sources, especially well-known works by Archbishops Shnork Kaloustian, Torkom Koushagian, and Maghakia Ormanian which, however, have not been accessible to those who do not read Armenian. The more than thirty pages of substantive endnotes and the bibliography also cite a variety of Armenian liturgical books; works by such authorities as Adolf Adam, Raymond Brown, F. C. Conyebeare, L. M. Froidevaux, John Meyendorff, Tondini de Quarenghi, and others; as well as standard reference books such as Butler's *Lives of the Saints* and Quasten’s *Patrology*. Also noteworthy are a number of references to studies on various topics related to the Armenian Liturgical Year by V. Rev. Fr. Ghevont Samoorian, cited above, who is one of the principal contributors to the volume.

Under-represented is the work of Charles Athanase Renoux, whose massive scholarly output has revolutionized our understanding of the historical development of the Armenian Lectionary and liturgical year, thus positively locating their origins in Jerusalem. Indeed, here and there the *Domar*’s explanations of feasts and saints need to be updated to reflect recent scholarly advances. For example, Renoux showed that "Absalom the Deacon" allegedly the deacon of Patriarch Peter of Alexandria, with whom the Armenians commemorate him, is actually Peter Abselamos, a fourth-century martyr who is already commemorated in the fifth-century Armenian Lectionary of Jerusalem. The confusion is due to a scribal error that has been perpetuated in the Armenian Church’s *Tōmačoyč* (Liturgical Directory/Typicon). Once again we are reminded that true liturgical reform is not a threat to the tradition, but the essential guardian of its authenticity.

The second volume of *Domar* concludes with a number of informative "Charts and Lists" including norms for dominical days and days when the sacrament of matrimony may be celebrated; classification of days in the calendar; a “Hymnological Chart” containing the genres of hymns used during the Daily Office; various Psalm proper for the pre-Gospel "Alleluia"; a paschal homily attributed to St. John Chrysostom (unfortunately without reference), in honor of whom, incidentally, the volume is dedicated; a Glossary of Armenian liturgical terms in transliteration; a directory of the Oriental Orthodox Patriarchates including heads of the churches and even websites. This is followed by a register of the Armenian patriarchal sees, hierarchy and monks, followed by chronological lists of patriarchs for each Armenian see and a helpful table of the dates of the principal feasts until the year
2013. The volume concludes with a bibliography and a helpful alphabetical index of saints and feasts: those not able to read Armenian finally have at their fingertips a complete list of saints commemorated by the Armenian Church.

This work is a remarkable achievement. A wealth of information has been compiled under one cover for the first time, and that in English translation. In a sense the editors have restricted its use to the 2003 calendar year, perhaps with the intention of updating and recalculating the calendar in subsequent annual editions. They might also consider an electronic format available via the internet, a medium particularly appropriate for such a reference tool requiring annual updating.

The Armenian Church's system for reckoning liturgical time is one of the more complex of the Christian East. And yet the liturgical year in any Christian tradition is a central component of that community's unique interpretation of, and expression of the Gospel of Christ. In the seemingly convoluted rhythm of feast and fast; in the selection of saints and martyrs held up as normative and in their placement throughout the year; in the selection and ordering of Bible readings for the various feasts—in all of these aspects of the church's calendar emerge the Armenian Church's unique and precious Christian witness. The editors are to be commended for their efforts at unpacking this theologically rich and historically significant component of the Armenian Church's tradition. May many Armenian Christians use this invaluable resource to live more meaningfully the annual liturgical cycle of their church.

Reviewed by Yervant V. Kutchukian

When looking for works dealing with the Crusader period, one can find many that offer Western perspectives and even several decisive accounts from an Eastern, namely Arab perspective. Few, however, are volumes dealing specifically with the Cilician Armenian perspective on the Crusades and the role of the Cilician Kingdom in the successes of Western efforts to liberate the Holy Land. It is the lack of accessible scholarship on this particular aspect of the Crusader period that Jacob Ghazarian aims to fill in his work, *The Armenian Kingdom in Cilicia During the Crusades: The integration of Cilician Armenians with the Latins 1080-1393*.

In his introduction, Ghazarian states his intention to offer the reader a “succinct account of the political intrigues that engulfed the rulers of the Armenians in Cilicia during the Crusades with the greater emphasis placed on the first three crusades” (p. 24). At the outset of his undertaking, the author has in mind the perceptions of younger Armenians whose understanding of ancient Armenian history hearkens back to the early years of Christian Armenia, with little awareness of medieval Armenian epic literature and folk tales that have their origins in this period. For this reason, Ghazarian aims “to bring into focus the all-important medieval history of the Armenians in Cilicia, and to show how their successes and failures there came to shape the future of their race and the perpetuation to this day of their conviction in the legitimacy of the uniquely Armenian non-Chalcedonian Christianity” (p. 25).

The study begins with a general survey of Armenian history from ancient times through the early medieval period, setting the scene for the focal period of Armenian Cilicia during the Crusader period. Of special interest is the attention given to the arrival of Armenians in Cilicia starting as early as the 6th Century. Ghazarian outlines the various reasons for migrations during this time, and specifically those of the Armenians. Armenians first arrived at the behest of the Byzantine government, but the arrival of the Seljuks in the 11th
Century led to massive movements of Armenians to Cilicia. Armenians quickly came to dominate Byzantine commerce, and by 1080 managed to achieve political domination through the founding of the Roupenian dynasty. The Hetumians, the dominant family in the western regions and coastal plains of Cilicia, had long served the Byzantine Empire and largely embraced the Greek Orthodox faith as Chalcedonian Armenians. Power in the eastern and mountainous regions belonged to the Roupenians, who were more traditional and maintained their non-Chalcedonian Orthodoxy. A protracted rivalry grew up between the two princely families, as has so often been witnessed throughout Armenian history. For a century the Roupenians held the upper hand, but following the death of Levon I in 1219, a power struggle ensued between his daughter Zabel and the Hetumian family. Her forced marriage to Constantine of Lampron's son, Hetum, ended the rivalry and handed political dominance of Cilician Armenia to the Hetumians.

The first contacts with the Latins came in 1074, with Grigor II Vakayaser, the Armenian Catholicoz, appealing to Pope Gregory VII for aid in fending off the Seljuk incursions. With the coming of the first crusade, contact increased greatly, and the Franks found valuable allies in the Armenian inhabitants of Cilicia. The Armenians welcomed the Crusaders as added reinforcements against Byzantine domination and the encroaching Seljuks, while the Crusaders valued the friendly oasis of Cilicia on their way to liberate the Holy Land.

With the liberation of the Holy Land and the founding of Latin baronies, the Frankish nobles established themselves in the region. Many took wives from the Armenian noble families of Cilicia, as this would have been the only acceptable option for men of their social standing. The result was the integration of Armenian and Frankish aristocracy, culminating in Cilicia's domination by the Lusignans of Cyprus. The invaluable role Cilician Armenia played in the liberation of the Holy Land is undeniable. Be that as it may, the united Armenian and Frankish forces could only stave off the advances of the Seljuks, the Mamluks and the Mongols for but a few centuries.

My interest in this fascinating period of Armenian history coupled with a personal interest in the region whence two of my grandparents hailed led me to review this book. The scarcity of works available in English devoted entirely to this period in Armenian history indicates the great value of the book, regardless of its shortcomings. At the very
least, it sets a standard for future scholarship to surpass, and at the most it offers great insight in an integral aspect of the Crusader period, hitherto inaccessible to the English reader.

The author attempts what would be a vast undertaking by the most seasoned of scholars, and for this he must be greatly commended. That he could write so cogently on the subject is even more impressive when one notes that his field of scholarship is not history or Armenian studies, but rather biochemistry. Clearly the author is very talented and he does present a work that would be easily read by someone with no background in the subject matter. From the perspective of scholarship, however, there are problems with the work that call into question whether such an undertaking would have been better left to a historian with greater knowledge of the languages of original sources from this historical period. Nevertheless, these inaccuracies should not detract from the fact that Ghazarian provides the most complete history of this period available in English. Until more scholarly works are available on the subject, I would certainly recommend this work as background reading for this period with the caveat that it was not written by an historian.

From the outset, Ghazarian seems to be writing for mainly an Armenian audience, though by no means would this book be inaccessible to a non-Armenian reader. While he attempts to write in a scholarly manner, one cannot but help detecting the patriotic lens through which the author views Armenian history, despite his efforts at writing objectively. While one could view this as perhaps tainting or weighting his efforts at scholarship, one could also see this as a valuable window into a contemporary Armenian perspective on Armenian history. The reader is offered a view into the landscape of the Armenian mind and what makes it tick. If one reads hoping only for objective history, then perhaps one will find disappointment. One might question whether any attempt to record or redact history may be objective. The question might be particularly apt here as the author is writing not only on history, but also on the collective history of his nation, which cannot help but conjure up strong feelings of emotion and identity. From a sociological perspective, this work offers invaluable insight into the psyche of a people and its self-perception. Therefore I would argue that the author's background and approach might be seen both as a drawback and as an asset, depending on what the reader hopes to glean from his reading of this work.
One problem I would like to point out is that of the author's limited ability to consult historical sources in their original languages. Specifically I noticed problems with his translation from Classical Armenian. While the author studied Classical Armenian at Oxford University, he has made seemingly gross errors in translation of fairly simple words. In one place he translates the word ʋkaysiaʁ (“martyrophile”) as “traveller” (p. 42). Such a mistranslation seriously draws into question the author's ability at commenting on original sources in an effective manner. To the author's credit, he does not claim mastery of the subject. Instead, throughout the work, he points to scholars who have written valuable works on various aspects of this period, as well as the whole of Armenian history. As valuable as a bibliography is to any scholarly work, the author's ample commentary on the various works noted throughout the book is invaluable for anyone seeking details on this period. This far more than makes up for any shortcomings the author exhibits in his own scholarship on this period.

If one views this work as drawing together scholarship that details various aspects of the period under study, one can see its great contribution. Barring the aforementioned shortcomings, Ghazarian should be commended for his attempt at filling a void in the English-speaking world with a comprehensive work. Until serious scholarship attempts a comparable undertaking, Ghazarian's work will stand alone for its comprehensive treatment of this important period in Armenian history and Cilicia's contributions to Western successes in the Crusades.
This second volume in The Heritage of Armenian Literature series is much larger and more ambitious than the first. The Dolores Zohrab Liebman fund has done well in choosing to fund this publication; it is an essential addition to the library of any English speaking Armenian who desires to have a reasonably complete survey of Armenian literature without having to invest in several shelves of books. Schools and universities will also find it useful as an introductory Armenian literature textbook. This volume, with its predecessor, clearly aims to be to Armenian literature what the Norton anthologies are to literature in English: a carefully chosen compendium with additional historical and biographical information presented, as the editors say in the preface, in a “seamlessly continuous and mutually illuminating manner. And indeed, in the pages of this volume more Armenian literature in English translation is brought together more conveniently than ever before. The fact that some of the texts represented here are appearing in English for the first time further enhances the value of the editors’ work.

The non-specialist audience is catered to from the outset. The transcription table which follows the preface and acknowledgments represents the Armenian Review system, geared to easy pronunciation rather than to actual transliteration. Even given that guideline, the editors are quick to point out that they deviate from it whenever “widely accepted usage” so dictates. A generic map of Armenia and the neighboring countries is also included, featuring place names chosen from a variety of time periods, and drawing no political boundaries.

The first three sections of the book carry the reader through Armenian literature in chronological order. Part One deals with the sixth to ninth century, although the sixth and ninth centuries weigh in with only two authors apiece. Part Two covers the tenth to fourteenth century; and Part Three, the fifteenth to eighteenth century. In other words, Part One deals with literature from the end of the Golden Age to just before the formation of the Bagratid kingdom; Part Two covers
writing from the Bagratid kingdom through the end of the Armenian Kingdom of Cilicia; while Part Three deals with the Ottoman period, though it is not limited to writers within the Ottoman Empire. Part One is the shortest of the three, comprising some one hundred fifty pages, while Parts Two and Three are roughly equal in length, at around four hundred fifty pages apiece.

Each of the three chronological sections is preceded by a substantial historical overview of the period covered, and there is an additional essay on the connection between the Armenians and the Aghvans included at the end of Part One, just before the excerpts from Movses Daskhurantsi's *History of the Caucasian Albanians*. The footnotes in these introductions are kept to a minimum, and are designed either to clarify confusing points or to direct the reader to additional texts, not to explain every interesting detail. There are some notes which, apparently by oversight, refer the reader to Armenian language texts of works which have, in fact, been translated into English, and whose English translation is readily available. It is possible, however, to find the English translations listed in the large bibliography given at the conclusion of the volume.

The selections chosen as illustrative of the work produced by each author vary in length, with histories providing the largest excerpts. Where an author has written in several other genres as well as history, it is usually from his historical writing that the representative excerpt has been chosen. Stepanos Orbelian is an exception, being represented by excerpts from both his history and his poesy. There are a few writers whose absence from this volume seems strange, given their importance: Vrtanes Kertogh, Davit the Philosopher, and Vanakan Vardapet are among the more surprising omissions.

After going through the writers and their works in chronological order, the editors have devoted Parts Four to Six of the volume to three literary genres: sharakans, epic, and folk poetry respectively. Naturally, these are much shorter than their chronological counterparts. As was the case with the chronological parts of the volume, the sections on specific genres are also accompanied by informative and readable introductions designed to get the reader an overview of each type of literature and its development. Clearly much time and effort have gone into the composition of these introductions, which more than fulfill their purpose.
In creating the sharakans section the editors have inevitably involved themselves in a certain amount of redundancy. Biographical sketches of the writers have already been given in the chronological sections of this volume, or in Volume One. So there is a second, briefer, introduction to their work given in the sharakan section, before each representative text. In some instances, the second introduction gives additional material directly relevant to the reading of the text; in others it reviews material already given in the chronological sections, while in yet others the reader is simply referred back to the first introduction. For convenience, the sharakan section has been divided in three: sharakan writers from the fifth century are grouped together, followed by those from the seventh to eleventh century, and then those from the eleventh to the fifteenth. In its eighty pages, this section offers the reader a total of thirty-one carefully-chosen selections.

Part Five, medieval Armenian epic, is devoted entirely to Davit of Sasun. The introduction and the excerpt from the epic are of about equal length, each filling some thirty pages. The introduction is enlightening, but the absence of references to the work of James Russell, one of the most prolific writers on the topic of Armenian epic, is strange, especially as studies of his on other subjects do appear in the bibliography.

When putting together Part Six, on folk poetry, the editors have clearly had to make some arbitrary decisions as to whether or not to include there the writings of certain authors like Mkrtich Naghash and Hovhannes Tlkurantsi, much of who work would qualify as folk poetry. In the end, they chose to include only three authors in the folk poetry section—Nahapet Kuchak, Naghash Hovnatan, and Sayat-Nova—each represented by multiple samples of his writing.

The editors do not explain why they have excluded all writing on the technical religious questions that in fact comprised an enormous part of Armenian literature through the ages, but there has obviously been an additional to do so. This reviewer would have felt more comfortable had this decision been openly stated, and accompanied by some acknowledgment of the major role that writing on the key religious issues of their day played in the intellectual and spiritual life of Armenian authors. Without a recognition of that writing's scope and importance, one cannot appreciate the full flavor of Armenian literature as a whole. The contents of this volume, fascinating as they are, do conspire to give one the impression that Armenia's thinkers were by
and large preoccupied with secular matters. This was far from true. The appearance of a similar anthology of Armenian writing on religious issues is long overdue, and would serve to complete the picture so lovingly drawn in these two volumes of *The Heritage of Armenian Literature*.

The book concludes with an eclectic bibliography of sources in Armenian, English and other European languages. These are apparently sources consulted by the editors, rather than of recommended sources for further reading. As a large number of seminal studies are conspicuous by their absence, one assumes that the editors have not offered a complete accounting of their research but only a selected list. The useful index which follows the bibliography includes place names, personal names both ancient and modern, and literary terms.

In short, this second contribution by editors Agop J. Hacikyan, the late Gabriel Basmajian, Edward S. Franchuk and Nourhan Ouzounian is a great addition to the list of resources available for teachers and students of the Armenian literary tradition. It is to be hoped that this dedicated team's future plans include at least one more volume, to bring their anthology into the modern era.

Reviewed by Yervant V. Kutchukian

In antiquity, the term poor encompassed two very different groups of people: those who chose a life of poverty and those who had no choice but to endure a life of poverty. The first group of poor encompasses ascetics, monks and others who gave up worldly wealth to live a life of poverty and simplicity. Numerous books and articles have provided detailed studies of such people. The second group of poor, however, refers to the truly destitute who were on the outside or at the fringes of society. These poor have received very little attention from modern scholarship. In this seminal work, *The Hungry Are Dying: Beggars and Bishops in Roman Cappadocia*, Susan Holman provides the first book-length treatment in any modern language to focus exclusively on a collection of sermons about poverty, starvation and disease by three prominent bishops of late Antiquity: Basil of Caesarea, Gregory of Nazianzus, and Gregory of Nyssa. In doing so, she sheds light on the situation of the involuntary poor in 4th-century Roman Cappadocia and their legitimatization within Christian morality.

In her introduction, Holman does an excellent job of providing thorough explanations of various themes and vocabulary within their 4th-century context. By defining and elaborating on these concepts, she provides a sound basis on which to build her analysis within a paradigm that the reader is now prepared to fully absorb. To this end, she includes relevant Greek vocabulary, elucidating the nuances of two words used for the poor, *penēs* and *ptōchos*, and juxtaposes them with their Hebrew counterparts, *'anîy* and *'evyon*. She then conceptualizes the study of poverty within three general approaches: those that emphasize evolution, those that emphasize continuity, and those that focus on the influence of history on civic identity. With a foundation for the study of poverty set, she unfolds her study within the context of three themes: leitourgia, paideia, and theology. She places these concepts within their 4th-century setting, imbuing them with the meanings and ramifications they would have held for the contemporaries of these three bishops.
In analyzing these sermons, Holman traces the position of the involuntary poor vis-a-vis society within the framework of leitourgia, starting with civic service and segueing into the evolution of Christian liturgy. By placing her study within the realm of both types of leitourgia, Holman more effectively illustrates the emergence of the poor as a liturgical image in Christian theology. This development takes place through the religious and social or civic significance of the poor in public works.

Holman demonstrates the role of paideia, the classical education in antiquity that focused on rhetoric, as a source of power in the time of these bishops. In a very significant way, paideia molded these bishops' administrative and theological expression and their power. Holman notes that this verbal power would have been especially effective in Cappadocia, where illiteracy was widespread.

Christian theology, specifically incarnation theology, weaves leitourgia and paideia together into the contextual fabric of these sermons. These bishops identify the poor and destitute with the body of Christ. In doing so, the theology of incarnation takes on special meaning. By using traditional New Testament images to identify the poor with Christ, the body of the poor gains social meaning. They come to be viewed as the body of the Logos, imbuing meaning in the theology of incarnation relative to the culture in which it is defined, and the culture in turn profoundly influencing the way the theology is understood.

Holman posits that the association between classical rhetorical style and incarnation theology deeply influences the development of Christian doctrine as found in the three sermons. Holman looks at the bodies of the poor in light of very specific theological perceptions: of the incarnation, of the meaning of food in religious practice, of the moral value of the created world, and of the body itself. A second subtext that she traces through the three sermons is the use of therapeutic language. Both theoretically philosophical and explicitly medical therapeutic language is found within the theology and body language of these sermons. The bishops rework the broad cultural use of therapeutic language, a fundamental theme in Greek philosophy, toward the right theological ordering of the macrocosms of community and cosmos. With the entrance of the poor into the community body, they become part of both theological and therapeutic language.

Perhaps the most significant feature of this work is the inclusion of
the three hitherto untranslated sermons. Holman does a great service for scholarship in the study of the poor by making these sermons accessible to the modern world. While I cannot attest to the accuracy of these translations, I think that they aid in filling an apparent void in scholarship, regardless of the quality of translation, which I have no means of gauging. Although other scholars have given briefer overviews of these sermons, Holman's analysis appears to be the most in-depth treatment on the subject. Another notable aspect of Holman's study is her tracing of poverty studies within different schools of thought. She has consulted a variety of sources, following the lines of thought in not only Anglophone scholarship, but French and German scholarship as well. Rather than relegating this information to footnotes or the bibliography, Holman includes it within the body of her work, enabling her reader to trace the evolution of modern thought on and understanding of the poor in Antiquity.

Holman does a superb job of presenting the study in such a way that it lends itself to facile understanding by a reader with little background in patristic or classical studies while at the same time maintaining a high level of scholarship that renders this work valuable to any scholar of 4th-century Christianity, Patristics, or Poverty Studies. This truly is a marvelous feat, as such studies in my experience lean either toward lofty heights that only experts could make sense of or toward such simplicity that they impart only very general and basic information. I firmly believe that someone with no background in the subjects treated would come away from reading this book with a solid understanding of not only the poor in 4th-century Roman Cappadocia, but also the socio-cultural trends that coursed through the veins of life in this milieu.

For those interested in furthering their knowledge on the various facets brought to light in this volume, Holman provides ample sources throughout the book that greatly facilitate the inquirers' search for such information—some of which is quite obscure and would have required considerable time and energies to locate on one's own. The fifteen-page bibliography is laden with works that should satisfy the thirst for knowledge in even the most voracious of inquirers.

In addition to her impressive scholarship, Holman brings a very human aspect to her work. She has an insight into the study of the poor that comes from her deep involvement with modern concerns over hunger and poverty relief. Her background in Nutrition Science and
Policy provides a unique perspective to her study, which provides a flavor that other scholars might lack. Interest in the religious roots of social welfare initially sparked her foray into this subject, and the culmination of her efforts in this volume is a tribute to her dedication in the field of poverty studies, setting a high standard for future scholarship in this field.

Reviewed by Maxwell Johnson

For those familiar with the important prior work of Gabriele Winkler on the origins of the anaphoral use of the Sanctus, this particular monograph may come as somewhat of a surprise. For in this volume there is little discussion of her earlier thesis that the particular origins of the anaphoral use of the Sanctus stem from the context of the rites of Christian initiation in the early Syrian tradition from where the Sanctus entered the anaphora by passing from the consecration of the prebaptismal oil at the inception of Christian initiation to the Eucharistic culmination of those rites (see "Further Observations in Connection with the Early Form of the Epiklesis," *Le Sacrement de l’Initiation: Origines et Prospectives, Patrimoine Syriague Actes du colloque III*, Antelias - Lebanon 1996, 66-80; "Nochmals zu den Anfängen der Epiklese und des Sanctus im Eucharistischen Hochgebet," *Theologisches Quartalschrift* 74, 3 (1994) 214-231; and "Weitere Beobachtungen zur frühen Epiklese (den Doxologien und dem Sanctus). Über die Bedeutung der Apokryphen für die Erforschung der Entwicklung der Riten," *Oriens Christianus* 80 (1996), 177-200). While not abandoning this position, however, Winkler herein moves the question beyond the context of Christian initiation in the early Syrian tradition and out of the Syrian *Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles* themselves into Old Testament Pseudepigraphal and other Jewish and Jewish-Christian sources from which the anaphoral Sanctus may have been derived in the first place, a research direction taken earlier by Bryan Spinks in the first three chapters of his own significant study (*The Sanctus in the Eucharist Prayer*), although Winkler herself makes use of additional sources. While, according to her, Syria remains the place of origin for the anaphoral use of the Sanctus, comparative liturgiological support is sought within other geographical and ecclesial locales, most notably that of Ethiopia, which, according to her, deserves much greater attention than past scholarship has normally given.
In her detailed investigation of the wider Jewish context of the *Qedushah/Sanctus* she directs our attention to the fact that the *Qedushah/Sanctus* can and does appear both with and without the added quotation of or reference to Ezekiel 3:12 ("and blessed be the glory of the Lord"), the equivalent to the *Benedictus*. Hence, according to her, neither the presence nor the absence of the *Benedictus* within an anaphoral *Sanctus* can be taken as a sign of antiquity within a particular anaphoral tradition since there is clear Jewish precedent for both in the sources. At the same time, allusion to the *Benedictus* may well be present within certain anaphoras that appear to lack it. In *Addai and Mari*, for example, the listing of the Cherubim before the Seraphim in the short introduction to the Sanctus suggests to her that there is here a missing or "hidden" Benedictus since it is the case in Jewish Hekhalot literature beginning with the Hebrew version of Enoch, and also in Pseudo-Dionysius and in Syriac hymns of the 5th - 6th century, that the Cherubim are associated always with the Benedictus and not with the Sanctus (see pages 107 –108, 129-136, and 154-155).

While Winkler clearly accepts the emerging scholarly view, especially as articulated by Bryan Spinks, that the anaphora of *Addai and Mari* already contained the *Sanctus* in the early third century, her work now directs us to Ethiopia and particularly to the Ethiopian Anaphora of the Apostles in its relationship to the Book of Enoch in the Pseudepigrapha. In chapter 39 of Ethiopian Enoch (the *Book of the Parables*), which, according to her, reflects the oldest Enoch tradition (although the date of the Ethiopian translation varies from the fourth to the seventh century), there appears a bipartite *Qedushah* consisting of Isaiah 6:3 and Ezekiel 3:12 (= *Benedictus*), which functions as the culmination of Enoch’s vision of the heavenly angelic liturgy:

**Ethiopic Enoch 39:**

Those who do not sleep bless thee,
they stand before your glory
and they bless, glorify, and exalt [Thee] saying
"Holy! Holy! Holy!...[Isaiah 6:3]

And here my eyes saw all those who do not sleep,
they stood before him and blessed him and said:
"Blessed art Thou"
and “Blessed be the name of the Lord for ever and ever”
[= further variant to Ezekiel 3:12]

Having noted this bipartite Qedushah in a context where there is no discernible Christian influence, Winkler next compares this text with the Sanctus and, previously undetected, Benedictus in the Ethiopian anaphora of the Apostles with the following result;

**Ethiopic Enoch**

(Qedusha):

Holy, holy, holy (cf. Isaiah 6:3)

Is the Lord of spirits,  
He fills the earth with spirits

Blessed art Thou…  
And:

Blessed be the name of the Lord

(cf. Ezekiel 3:12)

**Ethiopic Anaphora of the Apostles**

(Sanctus + Benedictus)

Holy, holy, holy

perfect Lord of hosts,  
heaven and earth are full

of the holiness of  
thy glory…

Blessed be the name of the Lord

and  
The name of his glory  
be blessed.

for ever and ever.

So be it. So be it.  
So be he blessed.

If, however, the Sanctus/Benedictus of the Ethiopian Anaphora of the Apostles comes from chapter 39 of Ethiopic Enoch, the problem is that in the anaphora itself the Sanctus and Benedictus are not connected but are actually separated by several other elements. That is, between the Sanctus and Benedictus the Ethiopian Anaphora of the Apostles contains what she calls a "short transition" to an Institution Narrative, an Anamnesis, a short petition, and a full consecratory epiclesis. Hence,
Winkler argues that at a very early point in Ethiopian anaphoral development the Sanctus/Benedictus would have been an integral unit which later became divided by the interpolation of these other anaphoral units. That is, in the Ethiopian liturgical tradition, the Institution Narrative, Anamnesis, and Epiclesis, are all later interpolations into an earlier anaphoral pattern which, like Addai and Mari in Syria, already contained the Sanctus but, unlike Addai and Mari, also contained an integral and connected Benedictus. She writes that: “the possibility of comparison between the Qedussah of Ethiopian Enoch with the Sanctus of the Ethiopic ‘Anaphora of the Apostles,’ especially the verbatim agreements concerning the ‘Blessed/Benedictus’ of Ethiopian Enoch and the Ethiopic ‘Anaphora of the Apostles’, does not allow the assumption that the ‘Blessed’ (= ‘Benedictus’) of the anaphora can be considered a secondary interpolation. The Benedictus formed part of the Ethiopian ‘Anaphora of the Apostles’ from the beginning. Only the fact that the Benedictus became separated from the Sanctus through the interpolation of the Institution Narrative (with its Antiochene position of the epiclesis) can be considered secondary. The dependence of the Ethiopian Anaphora on Ethiopian Enoch, especially with regard to the ‘Blessed,’ is quite obvious: the Sanctus-Benedictus of the Ethiopic ‘Anaphora of the Apostles’ emerged from the Jewish Qedussah of Ethiopian Enoch” (p. 96). And she claims further that: “…both the Syriac and Ethiopic ‘Anaphora of the Apostles’ reflect an ancient layer, the Syrian ‘Anaphora of the Apostles’ going back to the third century, and the form of the Sanctus-Benedictus of the Ethiopic ‘Anaphora of the Apostles’ being exceptionally old and preserving features of the Jewish Qedussah” (p. 143).

According to Winkler, therefore, the idea of the anaphoral Sanctus came from Syria, first attested in the anaphora of Addai and Mari, but the particular form it took in Ethiopia was from Ethiopian Enoch which included the Benedictus, a form which ultimately also reflects Syrian origins since Ethiopian Enoch is but a translation of Aramaic Enoch. And, of equal importance, the anaphoral use of the Sanctus-Benedictus had to have been “exceptionally old” also in Ethiopia, old enough for it to be split in two by the addition of the institution narrative, anamnesis, and epiclesis.

In the second part of her book Winkler turns to a descriptive analysis not only of the presence but of the overall formative influence
of the Sanctus throughout Eastern Christian liturgy. Here she argues that in many ways it is the Sanctus itself which has been influential in determining the various contents not only of the anaphora but of the entire Divine Liturgy. That is, Isaiah 6:3 appears to have provided for the emergence of the Trishagion as the Entrance Troparion, at the entrance of the Gospel, the entrance with the Gifts, the Sanctus itself, and even the sancta sanctis before communion. In other words, for Winkler, who provides a detailed analysis of the various troparia and chants in this section, the "Holy" functions as a "thread" running through all of Eastern liturgy which serves to mark its essential stages (see page 196). And closely related to this is the fact that several Eastern anaphoras in differing traditions are known by some form of the word Qedushah rather than "anaphora" in their titles.

A great work of liturgical scholarship such as this, of course, raises several intriguing questions for continued and ongoing research. For example, Winkler has again paved the way in this study, as she has done in several other areas (e.g., Christian initiation, the liturgy of the hours, and the liturgical year) for further investigation in liturgical sources and traditions which others have either neglected or lack the necessary linguistic skills to pursue further. For this reviewer, the most intriguing aspect of Winkler’s study is her attention to the liturgical texts and traditions of Ethiopian Christianity and the particular shape of the Ethiopian Anaphora of the Apostles. For those who have long argued that the Institution Narrative was a later addition to or interpolation into the Eucharistic anaphora, Winkler’s study of the “split” Ethiopian Sanctus and Benedictus provides additional comparative support for that position. Similarly, her hypothesis that the current textus receptus of the Ethiopian Anaphora of the Apostles reflects the later interpolation of the Institution Narrative, Anamnesis, and Epiclesis into an earlier anaphoral core, which very early on contained a connected Sanctus and Benedictus with a close (“verbatim”) literary relationship to the Qedusha of Ethiopic Enoch is worth pursuing in detail. If her hypothesis is correct, it may well be that it is the Ethiopian anaphoral pattern which ultimately explains the Alexandrian or Egyptian anaphoral pattern. That is, immediately following the Sanctus in the textus receptus of the Ethiopian Anaphora of the Apostles the post-Sanctus transition to the Institution Narrative, picking up on “heaven and earth are full of the holiness of thy glory” from the Sanctus, begins with the sentence: "Truly heaven and earth
are full of the holiness of thy glory through our Lord and our God and our Saviour Jesus Christ thy holy Son.” If this transition sentence (without an epiclesis!), Institution Narrative, Anamnesis, and Epiclesis are what originally divided the Sanctus and Benedictus causing the Benedictus to function now as a concluding doxology, and if the connected Sanctus/Benedictus was part of the Ethiopian Anaphora of the Apostles from the beginning, then the “unique” anaphoral pattern of Egypt with its post-Sanctus Epiclesis may have been simply a further development and expansion of this model. “Truly heaven and earth are full of the holiness of thy glory through our Lord and our God and our Saviour Jesus Christ thy holy Son becomes expanded in Egypt into a petition for the Holy Spirit to “fill” the Eucharistic gifts as in the Anaphora of St. Mark. What all of this means ultimately, of course, even if indirectly, is that Egypt would have originally received the Sanctus from Syria since the relevant Pseudepigraphal literature has an original Aramaic or Syrian provenance.

I suspect that increased study of the Ethiopian anaphoras and their relationship to other liturgical traditions is one of the important topics that will continue to occupy scholarly attention thanks now to Winkler’s pioneering work in this context. For example, what is the precise relationship of the anaphora in the Ethiopian version of the Apostolic Tradition to the textus receptus of the Anaphora of the Apostles and when was it composed? Similarly, is it only a question of Egyptian influence on Egypt or might there still be a case made for Egyptian influence on Ethiopia especially when it is noted that: (1) the textus receptus of the Ethiopian Anaphora of the Apostles contains its intercessions in the “Alexandrian” location in the “preface;” (2) the post-Sanctus “transition” is directly connected to the Sanctus by a sentence that closely parallels the Anaphora of St Mark: “Truly heaven and earth are full of the holiness of thy glory through our Lord and our God and our Saviour Jesus Christ thy holy Son; and (3) the (now consecratory) Epiclesis in the Antiochene position refers to both the “Holy Spirit” and “power” (“send the Holy Spirit and power upon this bread and upon this cup”), a phrase paralleled closely in the Egyptian anaphora contained in the British Museum Tablet (“We pray and beseech you to send your Holy Spirit and your power on these [your?] gifts...”). So also, the pre-institution epiclesis in the Anaphora of Sarapion of Thmuis, picking up on “Lord of Sabaoth/powers” in the Sanctus, asks that God’s “power and participation” might fill the
Eucharistic gifts. In other words, might it have been the evolving Egyptian anaphoral pattern itself which served to split the Ethiopian Sanctus and Benedictus?

Such questions, of course, cannot be answered at present but are the kinds of questions that Winkler’s excellent contribution begins to raise. And to that end, it is important to underscore that anyone concerned with the origins and development of the anaphoral Sanctus and of the Eucharistic prayer itself has to deal with this significant study in detail. For, together with Bryan Spinks’ *The Sanctus in the Eucharistic Prayer*, Robert Taft’s “The Interpolation of the Sanctus into the Anaphora: When and Where? A Review of the Dossier,” Part I, *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 57 (1991) 281-308; Part II, *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 58 (1992) 531-552, and Winkler’s earlier essays referred to above, *Das Sanctus: Über den Ursprung und die Anfänge des Sanctus und sein Fortwirken* is now required reading.
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