

ARMENIAN EVANGELICAL LITURGY AND SYMBOLISM

FR. KRIKOR HALEBLIAN

Liturgy and symbolism are inextricably related; liturgy involves an extensive use of symbols and in turn symbols draw much of their meaning from liturgy. In fact the difference between the two is hardly distinguishable because liturgy – the singing of hymns, Scripture readings, prayer and so on – itself is a symbolic act. Victor Turner has defined ritual and liturgy (the latter being an aspect of ritual), as a “*stereotyped behavior which is potent in itself in terms of the cultural conventions which serves to communicate information about a culture's most cherished values.*”¹ All human societies have culturally defined communication codes for transmitting messages of ultimate concern. Symbols and liturgies are thus deep level codes of communication of religious values we uphold and pass on to others.

In what follows, I will attempt to give a brief background on the origin and development of Armenian Evangelical liturgy and symbolism, and discuss their implication for us today. My concern is not so much to discuss the past but rather to point out ways in which Evangelical liturgy and symbolism may be enriched. My assumption is that changes in liturgy and symbolism must engage the old with the new involving continuity and never a break from the past.

THE ORIGIN OF ARMENIAN EVANGELICAL LITURGY AND SYMBOLISM

The forces, which caused the emergence of the Armenian Evangelical Church, are many,² but it is a well-established fact that the first Armenian Evangelical Church was founded under the auspices of western missionaries. Rufus Anderson, one of the early missionaries to the Armenians, gives an eyewitness account:

The Protestants were thus cast out forever... Nothing remained for them but to organize themselves into a separate church, and this they resolved to do.

They made a written request to the missionaries for aid in this matter, having themselves no experience. A meeting was accordingly held in Constantinople of delegates from the different stations of the Armenian mission. Messrs. Allan and Koenig, missionaries of the Free Church of Scotland to the Jews, were present by invitation; and also Dr. Pumroy, of Bangor in Main, and Mr. Laurie, then on his way home from Syria. Though the meeting was composed of two or three different denominations of Christians, there was the most entire harmony in the discussions, and a plan then drawn up for the organization of the Evangelical Armenian church, was agreed to be unanimous.

The evangelical Armenian in Constantinople came together on the first day of July for the public recognition of the church. After the reading of the Scriptures and prayer, the plan of organization, confession of faith, covenant, and rules of discipline, were read, with such explanations as seemed necessary. Those present were then requested to rise and give their assent to the articles of faith and to the covenant. All rose, and the articles were again read, at the end of which all audibly responded, "We do thus believe." In like manner they audibly assented to the covenant. The missionaries and others then rose, and, as the representatives of Protestant Evangelical Churches, publicly acknowledged them as a true church of Jesus Christ. Their names were then recorded, amounting to forty, three of whom were women.¹

The eminent Professor of Missions, Stephen Neill, comments on this event as follows: "regretfully, and perhaps rather unwisely, the Americans were led to form a new denomination for those who had left their ancestral Church."⁴ In the judgment of the present writer, "regretfully and unwisely" perhaps not so much for forming a new or a separate Church (since some of the blame for this separation lies on the Mother Church and more accurately on the Patriarchate of Constantinople) but for the outright rejection of the liturgy and symbolism of the Armenian Apostolic Church. The missionaries helped separate the people from their mother Church but more significantly from their rich heritage of Armenian liturgy and symbolism.

The early American missionaries to the Armenians in Constantinople were from the Congregationalist denomination. They were strongly anti-liturgical in that they preferred unstructured and spontaneous forms of worship. The origin of the Congregationalists can be traced to the English Separatists who were heavily influenced by the theology of Calvin and Puritanism. In their approach to worship, the Quakers who believed in the "Spirit-led worship" also heavily influenced the Congregationalists. Their places of worship were similar to meeting halls with little or no religious symbolism. The chancel was not distinctly separate from the nave, and the podium from where the Gospel was proclaimed was the most central symbol.

This attitude of anti-liturgy and anti-symbolism was even stronger among the American missionaries to the Armenians thousands of miles away from home. Commenting on their evangelistic methods, Leon Arpi states:

... missionaries' ideas and methods of evangelism were far too radical for the oriental churches, and certain on that account sooner or later to invite opposition. The missionaries' ideas were of the ultra-evangelical type. Rufus Anderson, the distinguished secretary of the American Board, was voicing the sentiments of the missionaries in the Levant when in 1842 he laid down the principle that the modern missionary should be more radical in his teaching than Luther; that he should insist on discarding all that was not expressly required by the Bible, instead of, like Luther, retaining all that was not expressly forbidden by the Bible.⁵

The early missionaries to the Armenians were in fact more radical than Martin Luther. Rufus Anderson quotes a correspondence from Mr. Leonard (a lay missionary, I suspect) dated January, 1871:

"Evidence," he says, "of a gradual reform in the Oriental church, especially the Armentan Church, chiefly as the result of evangelical labors, crops out in almost every city. Consecrated pictures leave church walls for the garret; silver crosses go into the refining pot; auricular confession is neglected; many superstitious ceremonies and foolish restrictions, imposed by the priesthood, are regarded only as a curious relic of the past."⁶

Chopourian, an authority on the history of the Armenian Evangelical movement, has also pointed out that: "*The early records of missionaries Eli Smith and H. G. O. Dwight provided a drastic criticism of the Armenian Church—its beliefs, practices, and traditions. They termed fasting and the cross...the most prominent of the superstitions.*"⁷ It is ironic, that the missionaries considered fasting and the cross superstitions while their attitude toward prayer and the Bible was no less superstitious. For example, they believed that placing an object on top of the Bible was wrong; prayers had to be done with closed eyes; and that prayers offered to God could not be valid unless the phrase "in the name of Jesus" was added at the conclusion.

It was pure naiveté on the part of the missionaries to assume that anti-ritualism and anti-symbolism was the best way to reforming the Armenian Church. As many contemporary studies have shown, the way to liturgical reform is not by discarding the old, nor by creating new symbols to replace the old, rather it is through integration of the old with the new (I shall say more about this in the following section). To be sure, we cannot avoid symbolism. Even if we gather in a plain room with four blank walls with or without a pulpit, we make a symbolic statement about our concept of God and the way He is to be worshiped. If we decide to meet outdoors, the presence of trees, rocks, grass and the sky, would become our symbols. We cannot be symbol free, and it so happened that the missionaries used their western liturgy and symbolism to replace that of our forefathers, under the false assumption that one can worship God devoid of symbols.

Many Armenian Evangelical writers⁸ have used the argument that there is no harm in adopting foreign liturgies and symbolisms, since even the Mother Church has done so throughout its history. I will respond to this view both positively and negatively but before doing so, let me clarify the issue of culture and Gospel, which I believe lies at the heart of this comment. Let it be known that the Gospel can neither be expressed nor comprehended apart from culture. The Gospel is the substance of the divine message communicated, while culture is the vehicle through which the Gospel is expressed. The analogy with a river may be helpful. The water flowing in a river may represent the Gospel and the landscape through which the water runs may represent culture. One is dependent on the other. So it is with the Gospel and all of liturgies and symbolisms. The

Gospel is always couched within culture. To assume there is some type of culture-free Christianity is to assume we can have a river without the landscape.

Positively speaking, the Mother Church, as many other churches, has incorporated liturgies and to a large extent the symbolism of neighboring cultures. In fact, Armenian Christianity owes much of its "color and character" to Zoroastrianism of Iran. There is no harm in adopting foreign forms and ideas. However, what is wrong and what the Mother Church has not done is to accept them at their face value without integrating them (and if you please contextualizing them) into her culture and expression of the Christian Faith. This fact may be substantiated through the examination of Armenian Church architecture, liturgy, music, miniature, and theology. The simple Latin cross, for example, has taken a special shape or configuration for the Armenians, i.e. the *khachkar*; the Armenian churches, though they incorporate elements of the neighboring Christian nations architecturally speaking, are nevertheless distinctly Armenian; a simple miniature painting of the Annunciation by the 14th century miniaturist Toros Taronetsi depicts a fountain with one spring, signifying the one nature of Christ which is the Armenian position on christology.⁹

To discard all of the Mother Church's liturgy, symbolism and theology with the assumption that they were totally unbiblical was simply a case of bad missionary strategy.

In retrospect, we cannot be too harsh and critical of the nineteenth century missionaries. They were the children of the age. They assumed innocently the Armenian rituals to be superstitious and empty symbols of conformity. They thought that ritual and liturgical conformity are not valid forms of personal commitment to Christ; the replacement of ritual conformity with personal and rational commitment, they seemed to think, would give greater meaning to the lives of the converts. Unknowingly and innocently, they introduced their own liturgy and symbolism and the inherent problem is that they believed there was no salvation in any other way except theirs.

It is this type of an anti-ritualistic mood, according to the British anthropologist, Mary Douglas "which has inspired so many evangelical sects."¹⁰ Not that the Armenian Evangelical Church is a sect; rather, the dynamics of separation and formation of new churches, in most cases, is

similar. The process of evolution from anti-ritualism and back is, quite fixed. Again, Mary Douglas, explains:

A movement which begins as a sect expressing the religious needs of the poor gradually moves up the social scale. It becomes respectable. Its rituals increase, its rigorous fundamentalism in devotion to the Word becomes as weighted with magic as the sacramental edifice it started by denying. With respectability comes ritualism. With loss of good fortune comes anti-ritualism and the new sect.¹¹

The point is, that the pendulum will swing back. A movement which started out as anti-liturgy and symbolism, in the end, may hopefully evolve to embrace them.

The shift from anti-liturgy and symbolism back to a rather moderate view is already apparent in the brief history of the Armenian Evangelical Church. The signs of change began under pressure for ecumenism in the late 1960s. The late Reverend Hovhannes Aharonian explains:

The present ecumenical movement, coupled with the Armenian Evangelical realities in respect to the Mother Church -- the spirit of cooperation, the new attitude of cooperation towards its forms of worship, created new trends or changes. But it should be said, that these changes were not necessarily in full pace with the changes within the Ecumenical movement. Limited changes, such as from one podium to two: one for the reading of the Scripture the other for preaching, were introduced, along with the placing of the communion table in a fixed center instead of the moveable table. There also came about encouragement for prewritten prayers, responsive readings, sharukans, and a special or fixed order of worship was introduced. But we have a long way to go in order to have a worship which is truly God-centered, God-pleasing, and uplifting.¹²

The words of the Reverend Aharonian are prophetic, in that the Armenian Evangelical congregations are still far away from a genuine Armenian Evangelical liturgy and order of worship. Writing on the "standard" Armenian Evangelical liturgy, Dr. Vahan Tootikian lists the following elements as central:

Musical Prelude

Call to Worship
Hymns
Prayers
The Scripture Readings
Responsive or Unison Readings
*The Sermon.*¹³

It is apparent that there has not been a radical departure from the liturgy and symbolism first introduced by the Congregational missionaries 150 years ago. According to Robert Schaper, the worship of the "restorationist" churches (which includes the Congregationalists) followed, for the most part, the following patterns until 1920:

Opening praise
Scripture lessons
Pastoral prayer
Communion
Offering
*Sermon*¹⁴

Comparison between the two liturgies, that is, between the present standard Armenian Evangelical liturgy and that of the Congregationalist prior to 1920, shows no substantial changes. And what little change is introduced has not been towards the Armenian Church liturgical heritage.

In terms of symbolism, however, there are hopeful signs and we are mildly encouraged as we examine closely the life and activities of the Armenian Evangelical churches worldwide. Speaking of architecture, while most of the Evangelical Armenian churches look more like lecture halls than sanctuaries for worship, yet there are churches such as the United Armenian Congregational Church of Hollywood, California and the Evangelical Church of Nor Marash, Lebanon, that integrate the symbolic elements of the Mother Church, at least from the facade or outside view of the church. The display of crosses whether it be on the pulpit or on sanctuary roofs was a taboo. However, they now have incorporated them into the church buildings, though a few of the Evangelical churches continue to ignore them. There are also changes in the name local churches bear. Many Armenian Evangelical congregations have moved away from western ways of labeling them as "First Church of..." or "Congregational Church of..." to a more biblical names such as,

"Holy Trinity", "Grace", "St. John ..." or better yet, names which affirm Christian Armenian heritage, for example, "Saint Nareg Church" in Montebello, California. But the Armenian Evangelical churches are still far from having a totally integrated, or to use a more appropriate term, "contextualized" churches. In what major ways would a contextualized church be different from the present approach in terms of liturgy and symbolism? In general, any noticeable change in direction of the Armenian Apostolic liturgy and symbolism will be helpful, and in particular, I would propose the following guidelines or criteria.

TOWARD ARMENIAN EVANGELICAL LITURGY AND SYMBOLISM

As hinted earlier, the way to reform a church is not by discarding existing liturgies and symbolisms, nor is it by creating new ones. Both options are doomed to fail, since liturgy and symbolism are deep level cultural codes, the violation of which will create disruption. Throughout history, the Armenian people have come to cherish certain forms or symbols, such as the outline of mount Ararat which has generated a number of subsidiary symbols; the *veghar* (black hood) of the Armenian vardapets, and the shape of the cupola of the Armenian churches. To discard this form is to violate, so to speak, the "grammar" of the Christian Armenian symbolism. In other words, as grammar is to a language so are symbols to a culture. One cannot violate the grammar of a language and still have it make sense to the listener, nor less can one destroy the cherished liturgy and symbolism of a people and hope to reform them. Continuity is the key for liturgical and symbolic reform. Most reforms based on discarding old symbols or creating new ones, may succeed only for a short time.

Given the above rationale for the integration of the old with the new – the Armenian Apostolic liturgy and symbolism with that of the Evangelical (or more accurately) western liturgy and symbolism – what types of changes are to be expected? Grisbrooke¹⁵ notes the following criteria for consideration for liturgical vestments, which are no less applicable to liturgy and symbolism: aesthetic, history and theology, and function. For the sake of this discussion, I will slightly modify the order of

Grisbrooke's criteria, and discuss the historical and theological criteria separately.

A. History

First and foremost, liturgical and symbolic reform must take into account the history and development of the Armenian Apostolic Church. The seventeen centuries of liturgical and symbolic heritage should not be ignored unless one is suspicious of history and tradition, as the American missionaries have been in the past. Nor is there a need to invent new liturgies and new symbols in total disregard of existing ones. This is not the place to discuss the origin and the evolution of the *patarag* yet, I must, for the sake of argument, emphasize that the changes within the *patarag* itself have not come out of the blue sky without consideration of existing forms. From the very beginning, that is, after accepting the proto-Syrian Christian liturgy, the Armenians have enriched it with their own original *sharakans* and prayers. It was thought that there were only two periods of liturgical reform. But recently, Gabriele Winkler, writing on the subject of the Armenian Night Office, has pointed out that there were many occasions for liturgical change and, more importantly, this was done without violating the original forms as accepted by the Armenians.¹⁶ The key to liturgical and symbolic reform is through the introduction of changes that are in continuity with the old, and never in violation of the original or the accepted.

In the area of symbolism, we have examples from church architecture, liturgical vestments, and *khachkars*. The architectural motif of the Edjmiatsin cathedral, for example, has generated thousands of churches in resemblance but not as a pure replica of the original. We have over 50,000 *khachkars* in Armenia that differ one from another. There are recent studies evidenced in the Edjmiatsin Gospel miniature, which point out that the priestly vestments are in many ways remnants of the old Zoroastrian cultic vestments. My point here is not that we should ignore the present and go back into ancient history in architecture, liturgical dress or other symbolism, but rather to argue that the Armenian Church has mostly used the old as a reference point and generated new ones without violating the code of what is Armenian. The lesson so essential for us today is to begin

with Armenian liturgy and symbolism in its current state, and to introduce changes that would be in continuity with and not in violation of them.¹⁷

B. Theology

Secondly, liturgical and symbolic reform must take into account the theology of the Armenian Apostolic Church. This does not and should not mean endorsement of all Apostolic Theology. The old missiological dictum still holds: discard what is negative, accept what is positive and build on what is neutral. To be sure, the Armenian Evangelicals have much in common with Apostolic theology, and in fact, the central tenets of the Christian faith are the same. The Nicene Creed, chanted every Sunday during the *patarag*, is the tie that binds us all as a community of Faith, and as members of the universal Church of Jesus Christ. The majority, if not all of the *sharakans* are theologically sound, and almost all of the words of the *patarag* are straight quotes from the scriptures. Even the Armenian Apostolic view of the Eucharist is not radically different from what most Evangelical Armenians hold. Again, this is not the place to expound on the theories of the Eucharist, but it may be necessary to point out, that the theory of Transubstantiation, (i.e., the elements are changed into the actual body and blood of Christ (standard Catholic view) is not espoused by the Mother Church just as it is readily rejected by most Evangelicals. The opposite view, the so-called Commemorative theory (i.e., the elements are mere symbols memorializing the Last Supper), is not accepted by all Evangelicals, and of course it is outright rejected by the Armenian Apostolics. The word used by most Armenian Orthodox theologians is *p'okharkel*. In his commentary on the Divine Liturgy, Archbishop Tiran Nersoyan explains: "The word shows that material elements as such remain the same in every respect except that they receive a new function and a new power. They are thereby raised to a new level or role in the order of things."¹⁸ This is not far from the contemporary Evangelical theories of the Eucharist, as I understand it. Hence, to argue that the Evangelical view of the Eucharist is radically different from that of the Apostolics is not true. For that matter, Christology is also not an issue to divide Evangelicals from the Apostolics. A careful study of the historical evidence will reveal that the Armenian position is, in essence, the same as that of the Chalcedonians albeit the terminology is not the same.¹⁹ The

principles of integration or contextualization require that we accept what is positive and build on what is neutral. The present Evangelical churches can thus incorporate most of the Armenian Apostolic liturgy. These include, but not limited to, making the sign of the cross; beginning the worship services with the Lord's prayer; singing of *sharakans*; the use of certain litanies, collects and benedictions of the Apostolic liturgy and these, I believe, will not violate the major Evangelical tenets such as: the priesthood of all believers, Scripture alone, salvation by faith alone, and so on. Even the integration of the Apostolic priestly vestments with that of the present Evangelical "academic robes" can be meaningful and uplifting. As long as the proposed changes reflect sound theology and are in continuity with Armenian Christian heritage, much can be gained by the way of liturgical and symbolic reform.

C. Function

Liturgy and symbolism must be functional in that they should express the nature and the occasion of the celebrations. It is not uncommon to find Evangelical ministers wearing red color stoles for funerals and purple on Pentecost Sundays. The colors of the stoles are functional in that they represent different seasons and occasions of the church calendar. Worse yet, many ministers ignore liturgical vestments altogether and opt to perform the divine office in civilian clothes. Normally people don't dare to entertain guests in their nightgowns or attend sport events in tuxedos, and yet many Evangelical ministers worship God in any way they like as if Faith is a license for freedom. Such an indiscriminate approach to liturgy and symbolism will create confusion in the minds of the Armenian Faithful. My point is not that we force the churches and their ministers into a rigid mold or pattern, but only to point out that liturgies and their associated symbols serve a specific function and to violate them creates bewilderment if not confusion in the minds of the worshipers.

Similar oversights are also apparent in many Evangelical liturgies. The choices of hymns are too often inappropriate for the occasion of the services in question. For example, I have found myself singing the very same hymn during worship, funeral and communion services. The *sharakan Marmin Terunakan*, or *Orhniale Astvats* are strictly related to Holy Communion yet they are listed in Evangelical hymnals without discerning their appropriate function. Recently, I attended a worship

service in an Evangelical Church where the words of the Institution as well as the prayer over the elements were ignored and no benediction was given at the conclusion of the service. If prayers and hymns have specific functions, to ignore or to make use of them inappropriately will hinder people from true worship.

D. Aesthetics

Liturgy and symbolism must also be aesthetically pleasing. While every culture has its own understanding of what is pleasing to the senses in terms of form, color, and texture, one must not ignore the environment in which we happen to find ourselves. For example, certain elements of the priestly vestments of the Mother Church are cumbersome and aesthetically speaking "out of place" for those of us living in the West. The black hood (*veghar*) of the Armenian Apostolic *vardapets* cannot be worn without the unfortunate association with the Ku Klux Klan (a clandestine political group in the U.S.) followers who wear similar hoods during their secret cross-burning events. In a city like Los Angeles or New York, we cannot build a church, which is an exact replica of Edjmiatsin Cathedral, or worse yet, one built of tufa imported from Armenia. It will not only clash with the existing structures surrounding it, but also it will stand out as a foreign edifice which will naturally repel those on the outside and foster parochialism among those inside. If and when the Edjmiatsin architecture is integrated with western architectural elements it will carry a potent message. Many of the *sharakans* are in need of rearrangement in order to become more pleasing for those of us accustomed to western musical idioms. This is a process that has been carried on throughout history; the Komitasian *patarag* has been rearranged by Makar Yekmalian, and Khoren Meykhanadjian, master choir director of Edjmiatsin, has his own arrangements (*Khorenian patarag*). The point is that liturgy and symbolism, in order to be uplifting and helpful, must be aesthetically "right" for the environment in question. Every Armenian Diaspora community must struggle with such issues and choose aesthetically pleasing and culturally fit colors and materials.

CONCLUSION

Symbols and liturgies are not simple acts and representations; they somehow "possess" the power of that which they represent in the minds of the believers. This is the reason, perhaps, why we find so much

opposition, in churches, to any small change. Mixing of water with wine for the Holy Communion has been a source of disputes between the Greeks and the Armenians for centuries, and today a change from real wine to grape juice or the other way around is an issue so volatile as to create divisions in the church. Yet the need for liturgical and symbolic reform is so vital for reviving, if not reforming, the church. It has been carried out throughout the seventeen hundred years of history of Armenian Orthodox Church, and the real challenge today is to introduce changes that will be historically, theologically, functionally, and aesthetically sound. To violate any one of these principles will undoubtedly be counterproductive.

ENDNOTES

¹ Victor Turner, "Ritual, Tribal and Catholic," *Worship*, vol. 50, 1976, p. 504.

² Tootikian, Vahan, *The Armenian Evangelical Church: Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow*, Michigan: Armenian Heritage Committee, 1996, pp. 13-52.

³ Anderson, Rufus, *History of the Missions of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions to the Oriental Churches*, Boston: Congregational Publishing Society, vol. I, 1873, pp. 417, 418.

⁴ Stephen Neill, *A History of Christian Missions*, Penguin Books, 1966, p. 303.

⁵ Leon Arpi, *The Armenian Awakening: A History of the Armenian Church*, Costa Mesa, California: Knowledge Resources Inc., 1909, p. 165.

⁶ Rufus Anderson, *History of the Missions of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions to the Oriental Churches*, Boston: Congregational Publishing Society, vol. II, 1872, p. 463.

⁷ G. H. Chopourian, *The Armenian Evangelical Reformation: Causes and Effects*, New York: Armenian Missionary Association of America, 1970, p. 39.

⁸ *Բաժանորդի և Աստուծոյ, Տոյ Առաքելոսի Եկեղեցի Եւրոպայեան Կոնգրեգացիոն*, Beirut, 1988, p. 80.

⁹ Avedis Sanjian and Thomas Mathews, *Armenian Gospel Iconography: The Tradition of the Glorious Gospel*, Washington: Dumbarton Oaks, 1991, pp. 135, 305.

¹⁰ Mary Douglas, *Natural Symbols*, New York: Vintage Books, 1973, p. 22.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 23.

¹² *Աստուծոյ*, p. 77 (translation mine).

¹³ Op. cit., pp. 157-160.

¹⁴ Robert N. Schaper, *In His Presence: Appreciating Your Worship Tradition*, New York: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1984, p. 147.

¹⁵ W. J. Grisbrooke "Vestments," in *The Study of Liturgy*, ed. C. Jones, G. Wainwright, E. Yarnolds, New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1978, p. 491.

¹⁶ Gabriele Winkler, "The Armean Night Office II: The unit of Psalmody, Canticles, and Hymns with Particular Emphasis on the Origins and Early Evolution of Armenia's Hymnography," *Revue des Etudes Armeniennes*, vol. 17, 1983, pp. 471-551. For the evolution of the Holy Patarag, see Robert F. Taft "The Armean Liturgy: Its Origins and Characteristics," in *Treasures in Heaven: Armenian Art, Religion, and Society*, ed. by Thomas F. Mathews and Roger S. Weick, The Pierpont Morgan Library 1998, pp. 12-30.

¹⁷ For more concrete examples, see this writer's *The Armenian Church in Context*, 1996.

¹⁸ Nersoyan, Tiran, "A Brief Commentary on the Divine Liturgy," in *Armenian Church Historical Studies: Matters of Doctrine and Administration*, ed. by Nerses Vrej Nersessian, New York: St. Vartan Press, 1996, pp. 352-353; see also, Սեպուհ Սողոմոն, *Հայոց Թեմիցույ Քրիստոսեկեմ Ք. Թեմիցու Գանձանար*, Հատար Ա. 1992, p. 81; and also, Արշակ Յէր Մարտիրոս, *Հայաստանուց Սուրբ Թեմիցույ Քրիստոսեկեմի Երուսաղէմ, Յակոբեանց Ճգարան*, 1899, (reprint 1993), pp. 435-437.

¹⁹ See Tiran Nersoyan's *Armenian Church Historical Studies: Matters of Doctrine and Administration*, ed. by Nerses Vrej Nersessian, New York: St. Vartan Press, 1996, pp. 127-174.

ՀԱՅ ԱՌԾՏԱՐԱՆԱԿԱՆ ԾՌՈՒՄԱՐԳԸ ԵՒ ԵՌՐԼՐՄԱՆԱԿԱՆՈՒԹՅՈՒՆԸ
(ԱՆՔԻՓՈՒՄ)

ՀԱՅՐ ԳՐԻԳՈՐ ՀԱՆՔՈՒՄԱՆ

Յարուածը ընդհանուր համայնում մը էր կտարք հայ աւետարանական միակարգի եւ յարցրոյանշարժանութեան զարգացման հայ Աւետարանական Եկեղեցույ Գեղարշակի միջին միջին միջին:

Հեղինակը էր էլէ. ՔԵ 1863ին՝ պայտաւայ իրականութեան մէջ գործող տնտեսական ժողովական Եկեղեցիի միակարգեկան միտքական կեցուածքը: Հայ Աւետարանական Եկեղեցույ միակարգի ու յարցրոյանշարժանութեան կեցուածքը, մեծապէս ազդած է հայ Աւետարանական Եկեղեցույ յարցրոյանշարժանութեան եւ միակարգին:

Ան զբաղած էր զհետադ վերջին շրջանին հայ Աւետ. Եկեղեցիին կրօն փոփոխութեանը միակարգի եւ յարցրոյանշարժանութեան շարժումը շարժողութեան առումով, զի հարցրոյով ՔԵ Հայ Աւետ. Եկեղեցին ազդած էր հիմնական հայ աւետարանական միակարգի եւ յարցրոյանշարժանութեանը: Հայոց ընդհանրակարգ զբաղմանը եւ կեցուածքով ձգտմանը: Հեղինակը միտքականութեան զեղծի հաստատակցութիւնը որդեկրան յետեան ընթացքը էր կեցուածքով ՔԵ Հայ Աւետ. Եկեղեցույ եւ Հայ Գեղարշակի հայ աւետարանական կեցուածքներուն հայ կարգադրութեան աւանդներով կառուցումը: Հայ Աւետ. կեցուածքներու հարկան աւանդութեանը, շարժաններու աւանդ կառուցութեանը որդեկրանը եւ այլ փաստեր: