

THE GENESIS OF ARMENIAN EVANGELISM

REV. DR. VAHAN H. TOOTIKIAN

On July 1, 1846, thirty-seven Armenian men and three Armenian women established the Armenian Evangelical Church in the "mission chapel" at Pera, Istanbul (then Constantinople). Four years later, on November 27, 1850, the Ottoman Sultan Abdul Medjid granted formal recognition to the newly established Church. The result: a permanent breach between the Armenian Apostolic Church and the Armenian Evangelical Church.

Three groups of people were involved, directly or indirectly, in the rise and development of the Armenian Evangelical Church. These three were the reformists in the Armenian Apostolic Church, the American Protestant missionaries, and the Armenian Patriarchate of Constantinople (Istanbul).

The Reformist Group in the Armenian Church

The first important group to play a decisive role in the rise of the Armenian Evangelical Church was the reformist or "spiritually-awakened" group in the Armenian Apostolic Church. It represented the religious counterpart of the Armenian secular Renaissance associated with the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. It was a period that marked a rebirth of intellectual life and a renewal of interest in the world outside the Armenian enclave. It paved the way for a great awakening in the social, economic, and religious realms.

Several factors and forces initiated the changes that provoked the Armenian Renaissance. The first and foremost of these was the Armenian Mekhitarist Order.¹ Abbot Mekhitar, an Armenian scholar and clergyman who embraced Catholicism in 1695 and founded the Mekhitarist Order in 1701, became one of the great benefactors of Armenian culture and scholarship. He was one of those rare geniuses who make unique contributions in the service of mankind once in a thousand years. Persecuted by both the Armenian Patriarchate and the Ottoman government, he found refuge in the French Consulate at Cons-

tantinople, and later left for Rome. In 1717 he was given the little isle of St. Lazarus [Lazzaro] in Venice where he opened his monastery. The Mekhitarist Monastery became an intellectual center. In 1773, the Order was divided, and one segment founded another monastery in Vienna, Austria, which became another important educational and cultural center.²

Besides being important links between the Armenian people and Europeans, the Mekhitarist Centers produced scholarly works on the grammar of classical and modern Armenian, laid the foundations of modern Armenian historiography and the publication of periodicals, compiled the first scholarly Armenian dictionaries and introduced many non-Armenian languages to Armenian readers through the multilingual grammars they published. Also, by establishing an extensive network of schools, the Mekhitarist fathers played an important role in the realm of education. Their cultural contribution fostered the reawakening of interest in the Armenian diaspora, particularly in the Caucasus and Turkey. In short, the Mekhitarists were both catalysts and propagators. In the process of becoming agents of change, their publication in Latin, French, German, Italian, and English languages brought the Armenian people to the forefront of European thought.

The second contributory impetus to the Armenian intellectual Renaissance was the revival of the Armenian press. The first Armenian periodical was published in 1793, in Madras, India, by Father Shmavonian. It marked the opening of a literary floodgate. New papers and new books in Armenian began to appear in great numbers. Several new printing presses and publishing houses were established in various important Armenian centers.³ This lively and exuberant age produced an enormous amount of literature. The number of Armenian Catholic publications alone were legion. Parallel to this literary floodgate was a flowering of the fine arts: music, drama, and art.

The third important factor was the opening of Armenian institutions of higher learning. Among these the most noteworthy were the Lazarian Institute in Moscow (1815), the Nersesian School in Tiflis (1824), and the Academy of the Armenian Patriarchate in Istanbul (reopened in 1827).⁴

The fourth potent force was the influence of European culture on Armenian young people. In the early part of the nineteenth century many young Armenians went to Europe, particularly to France, in pursuit of higher education. There they were exposed to a variety of revolutionary movements -- industrial, scientific, economic, and philosophical, that shaped the destinies of the people of the European continent. These influences also played an indirect but powerful role in the lives of Armenian intellectuals. Developments in science and industry in Europe ushered in the "New Age", accelerated the rate of change, and created a knowledge explosion. The latter affected not only the economics, politics, and culture of continental Europe, but also those who were exposed to it, including the Armenian scholars who were being educated in the capital cities of Europe.

Another far-reaching effect was in the field of philosophy which, along with the scientific revolution, heightened the political consciousness of the masses and gave rise to constitutional government in several countries. The spirit of the age was to question the traditional concepts of absolutism in favor of freedom of thought, speech, and press. This skepticism and these aspirations formed part of the intellectual legacy that Armenian expatriates imported when they returned home. Having been exposed to European ways, the Armenian intellectuals became "the leaven in the lump" by bringing about a new lifestyle, affecting changes in economic, social, and cultural fronts, elevating the intellectual and social levels of their compatriots, and triggering a genuine desire to build a better society. Thus, the soil was fertile and ready for a religious awakening, because "this revival of thinking on all fronts suggested a parallel revival in the religious area ... and braver souls deeply felt the need to revitalize the traditional Armenian Church."⁵

These braver souls, members of the Armenian community of Istanbul in the 1820's, were the first to give expression to these feelings. The religious revival in the Armenian Apostolic Church owed its existence in large measures to the Patriarchal Academy of the Armenian Patriarchate of Istanbul. The Academy was founded in the middle of the eighteenth century by Patriarch Hagop Nalian. It was subject to a sporadic existence. It was closed in the early 1760's and reopened in 1768. In 1826 it burned to the ground but opened once more in 1829 under the principalship of the learned Krikor Peshtimaldjian.⁶ A scholarly layman and an author of several important educational works, Peshtimaldjian is considered the greatest pioneer in the reform movement of the Armenian Apostolic Church prior to the advent of the Protestant reformers.⁷ Almost all of the early Armenian Evangelical Church reformers were graduates of his Academy. Among the most notable of these reformers were three Armenian Apostolic priests -- Der Kevork, Der Vertanes Yeznakian, and Der Haroutune Baghdassarian. There were also prominent laymen: Abissoghom Eutudjian and Hovhannes Der-Sahakian, who later became leaders of the Armenian Evangelical Church.⁸ The reformists became critical of the church and the clergy. They began to criticize openly the theology, rites, and rituals of the Armenian Church, to the extent that they accused her of losing her original New Testament simplicity and purity⁹ and insisted that the Church ought to be cleansed of her corruption and the Gospel be substituted for "human inventions."¹⁰

In 1836 the reformists established a secret society named *Barepashtoutian Miabanoutune* (The Society of Piety), in order to reform the Armenian Apostolic Church.¹¹ The organization of this Society may properly be said to mark the beginning of Armenian Evangelicalism.¹² The twelve reformists who organized the Society of Piety did not think of themselves as founding members of a new church. For them the Reformation was a renewal of the ancient Armenian Apostolic Church. They claimed that the Armenian Apostolic Church was at variance with the Bible and the faith of the ancient church. By reason of the

secular cares and concerns which had been thrust upon her as guardian of the Armenian people, she had neglected the fundamental aspects of the Christian Gospel.¹³ Theologically, the reformists thought of themselves as exponents of the authentic Armenian Apostolic tradition from which, they argued, the Apostolic Church had departed. To the reformists, in their "Mother Church" the Gospel was lost and its efficacy impaired in an intricate maze of non essentials. They demanded that the Gospel be restored, and that the Church in Armenia "return to its ancient purity and simplicity."¹⁴

Armenian Evangelicals

The Armenian Patriarchate of Istanbul characterized the "self proclaimed reformers" as hirelings of the American missionaries who, by this time, were well established among the Armenians.¹⁵ The Patriarchate charged that the dissenting element was being used by the American missionaries to challenge the teachings of the Armenian Apostolic Church.¹⁶ Avedis Berberian, chief clerk and learned spokesman of the Armenian Patriarchate, itemizes some of the contentious disclaimers of which the reformers stood accused:

- ... the declaration that the Gospel (*Avetaran*) was the sole authority in religion and morals;
- ... the refusal to accept the transubstantiation during the celebration of Mass of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ;
- ... the refusal to believe in the mediation of the saints;
- ... the rejection of confession of sins to the priest;
- ... the refusal to venerate pictures of the saints.¹⁷

Although angry, the ecclesiastical leadership of the Armenian Church at first used friendly persuasion to win the reformists over and to silence those who were "rocking the boat" and challenging the Church.¹⁸ One such persuasive technique, for example, was the offer of a larger salary to the leader of the reformist group -- Cantor Abissoghom Eutudjian -- than he was receiving as an employee of the missionaries.¹⁹

At the same time, many sympathizers of the missionaries, some of whom were denying their allegiance to their Mother Church because of the material considerations provided by the missionaries,²⁰ were personally questioned by the Patriarch. In addition, he spent about thirty-eight thousand Turkish piasters to stop the growth of Protestantism and strangle the reform movement.²¹

When these measures failed, the Patriarch used other means. He organized a series of debates in order to win back the dissidents. The chief spokesman of the Armenian Apostolic Church in these debates was the learned teacher Hovhannes Teroyents Chamoorjian, opposed by Abissoghom Eutudjian representing the reformists. These debates did not achieve their intended purpose, so the Patriarch was forced to cancel them in favor of another technique, namely, public sessions under his supervision calculated to enlighten those who were in doubt

and to influence them to accept the validity of the teachings of the Armenian Church.²² These debates, held in the patriarchal complex, also proved to be a failure.

Then Patriarch Choohajian resorted to a sterner measure against those who were questioning the teachings and authority of the Church: he demanded that they sign a statement, known as the "Paper of Recantation", prepared by the Patriarchate.²³ This document constituted an admission of a guilt, a confession of "sin" committed against the Apostolic Church.²⁴ Furthermore, those who signed the "Paper of Recantation" had to admit to "the soul-destroying doctrine of the new sectaries" (i.e., the American missionaries), had to pledge their allegiance to the Mother Church, and had to make a vow accepting spiritual and temporal punishment should they return to their "former impious way."²⁵

Immediately following the "Paper of Recantation", the Patriarch prepared a detailed statement of faith in the form of questions which were to be signed by those who had "doubtful standing" in the church. The early Armenian Evangelical historian Stepan Eutudjian calls this nine-article document, "The New Creed."²⁶

Each article of "The New Creed" started with the question "Do You Confess?" to which the penitent was required to answer affirmatively. Thus, signatories to this document confessed that:

- Salvation is not by faith alone but by good works as well.
- The Church militant is infallible.
- The Church has seven Sacraments which can be administered only by ordained clergy (catholicos, bishop, or priest).
- Baptism and confession of sins before a priest are absolutely indispensable for one's salvation.
- Whoever does not partake of Holy Communion, which is the true body and blood of Christ, is under eternal condemnation.
- The Virgin Mary, Mother of God, is worthy of adoration, whose intercession, like those of other saints, is acceptable to God and God works miracles by means of holy relics and the cross.
- To believe in the Church is to believe in its rite and rituals and everything that has been received by tradition from the apostles and the holy fathers who succeeded them.
- In the Church there are different offices and grades of authority successively rising, as reader, deacon, priest, bishop, catholicos; and that the patriarchs and catholicoses of every nation are Christ's viceregents to rule the Holy Church.
- Those who preach that error has entered into the Holy Church must be anathematized.²⁷

These nine articles of faith of the Church, issued by Patriarch Choohajian on February 4, 1846, were to be signed by the dissidents, or else they were to be

anathematized and ostracized. The so-called "New Creed" would not allow for any compromise. This inflexible attitude demonstrated by the spiritual leadership, coupled with subtle economic pressure and persecution, put the "reformists" between anvil and hammer, so much so that they wrote a letter to the Patriarch to decry the "persecution, privation, accusation, and losses suffered by them."²⁸ This letter, under the signature of "Persecuted Christians," was less a protest than a profession of reformist faith. The letter affirmed that:

- They were true believers of the church of Christ by virtue of their stated orthodox Christian beliefs.
- They accepted the Nicene Creed and refused to accept doctrine not sanctioned by Scripture.
- They loved their Nation and the Mother Church and deemed it a great honor and pride to be called Armenian Christian.
- They considered freedom of conscience a priority and claimed that they could not act against their conscience.
- The letter affirmed that they looked to the Patriarch for mercy and a solution to their hardships and sufferings.²⁹

Patriarch Choohajian's reaction to this letter was quick, rigid, and uncompromising. He issued a 47 page document in which he stated that:

- There was no persecution against anyone, and that the Church was admonishing the errants.
- The reformists were contradicting Scripture and that it was his responsibility as the shepherd of the flock "to reform the incorrigible" by informing the children of the Church not to associate with them and not to read their literature lest they be deceived by their erroneous doctrines.³⁰

Neither the warnings, nor the pressures of the Armenian Patriarchate changed the course of the reformists. It seemed that both sides were unyielding and deadlocked. Then Patriarch Matteos Choohajian took the ultimate measure against the reformists: he published a bill of excommunication and anathema against them on June 21, 1846, forever barring them from membership in the Armenian Apostolic Church. When the reformists were expelled from their Church and deprived of the civil status and protection of the Patriarchate, they were forced to leave the Mother Church and organize themselves under the aegis of a separate church on July 1, 1846.

The American Protestant Missionaries

The second group to play a decisive role in the rise of the Armenian Evangelical Church was the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign

Missions. This Board, composed of Presbyterian and Congregational mission-minded people, was one of the earliest missionary societies founded in Boston, Massachusetts, in 1810 and incorporated in 1812. Its aim was "to evangelize the heathen in foreign lands."³¹ One of the Board's prominent mission fields was the Middle East, where their missionaries began work in 1819 with instructions to "evangelize" the Jews and Muslims.³² Resistance from these two established religious groups frustrated the best efforts of the missionaries, so they changed their strategy. They turned to native Christian agents to reach the non-Christians. To this end, they approached various Eastern Orthodox Churches, such as the Greek, Nestorian, Jacobite, and Armenian [Apostolic] Churches. All except the Armenian Apostolic Church proved obdurate. Why?

The Armenians seem to have been imbued with a tremendous desire for learning and social progress. As a result, many of them were more open and broad-minded toward the American missionaries and their projects. This spirit of educational progress among Armenians opened the way for closer contact with the Armenian clergy and lay people.³³ What was the net result? A permanent schism in the Armenian Apostolic Church.

Be that as it may, the first American Protestant missionaries to set foot in the Middle East were Levi Parsons and Pliny Fisk. These two missionaries led a mission to Jerusalem in 1820 to evangelize and "impart the heavenly treasure ... to the Jews, Mohammedans, and Pagans."³⁴ Two years later, two other missionaries, William Goodell and Isaac Bird, were sent with specific instructions to apply "new modes of access and the speediest and most efficacious method of bringing divine truth into contact with the conscience and the hearts."³⁵ The missionaries soon came to appreciate, however, the difficulties and problems associated with converting Muslims to Christianity. In their Annual Meeting they reported that the laws of Islamic countries forbade the evangelization of the Muslims. The profession of Christianity by a Muslim was punished by death.³⁶ Consequently, in 1829 the Board's Prudential Committee resolved to establish a mission among Armenians of Turkey, with the hope that the "intelligent" and "enterprising Armenians" might be instrumental in exerting "a powerful influence for good throughout the Turkish empire."³⁷

The missionaries' earliest contact with the Armenians was in the mid-1820's, when missionary Goodell met three Armenian ex-bishops: Archbishop Hagop Aga, Bishop Dionysius Garabedian, and Bishop Hagopos of Bolou. These three had moved out of St. James Armenian Monastery of Jerusalem in protest against the "sunken morals of the clergy."³⁸ They were also instrumental in describing the existing spiritual state of the Armenian Apostolic Church to the American missionaries. Moreover, they stressed the dire need of the Armenian masses for education and knowledge of the Scriptures and informed the missionaries about the existing political and social conditions of the Armenians under Ottoman rule.

It was not long before the American missionaries saw for themselves the

deplorable psychological, political, social, educational, and religious conditions under which Armenians lived in the Ottoman Empire. They realized that the Armenians were deprived of political and social organization. In addition to the loss of their autonomous political life, Christian Armenians found themselves isolated or overwhelmed by the mainstream of their dominant Muslim neighbours and were forced to adapt to an alien way of life in order to guarantee their survival against reprisals, humiliation, degradation, and brutality.³⁹ Armenian females suffered more perhaps than Armenian males.⁴⁰ In accordance with Islamic law, the status of women was only one degree removed from servitude. In order to avoid the unwelcome attention of Muslim suitors, Armenian girls were married off young, one of many illustrations of expedients adopted for the sake of survival.⁴¹ With the exception of those who resided in large cities, Armenian men and women in the Ottoman Empire were left in a state of ignorance and oppression. Illiteracy and social stagnation were commonplace when the American missionaries arrived in the provinces during the nineteenth century.⁴²

From the very beginning, the American Protestant missionaries adopted a policy of evangelization through education.⁴³ In addition to their evangelical commitment to preach the Gospel, translate Scripture, and provide publishing and medical services, the missionaries embarked upon a widespread educational campaign. The instructions from their Boston-based missionary headquarters read: "An improved system of education must be given to the people ... and the missionary must surround himself by the constellation of schools, as numerous as he can effectively superintend."⁴⁴ This plan was implemented with the organization of numerous schools which played a prominent role in the history of the Armenians in the Ottoman Empire.

The missionary schools opened a new dimension in the educational, cultural, and social development of the Armenian population, despite initial resistance.⁴⁵ With the opening of the American College for Girls at Istanbul in 1832, the missionaries became pioneers in female education in the Middle East. These educational missionary initiatives prompted the Armenian Apostolic Church to establish its own parochial schools, since, up to that time, Armenian education was reserved primarily for men who took religious vows.⁴⁶

At first, the leaders of the Armenian Apostolic Church welcomed the endeavors of the American Protestant missionaries, but before long they were in conflict. The "Evangelical" theology of the American missionaries led them to condemn the doctrines and practices of the Armenian Apostolic Church. They criticized the Armenian Apostolic Church for her "superstitionism, worship of images, and the doctrine of salvation."⁴⁷ In fact, one missionary claimed that "like all the Oriental churches, the Armenian has become exceedingly corrupt ... as with all rigid formalists, the weightier matters of the law and Gospel are considered of small account compared with the punctilious performance of religious rites and ceremonies."⁴⁸ Not surprisingly, the leaders of the Armenian

Apostolic Church objected. They accused the missionaries of leading the Armenian people into heresy.⁴⁹

Earlier, Eli Smith and H.G.O. Dwight, who had made a two-month missionary tour among the Armenians in 1831, criticized the Armenian Apostolic Church as a "source of intrigues and corruption."⁵⁰ In addition, they accused the Armenian Apostolic Church of:

- believing in other mediators apart from Christ as the only mediator.
- believing that Baptism and Communion are sufficient for salvation.
- believing in Transubstantiation (i.e., the changing of the elements of bread and wine into the real body and blood of Christ).
- maintaining convents which are places of ignorance.
- doing away with preaching.
- advocating image worship.⁵¹

Twenty years later, in 1854, Dwight, a co-traveler and colleague of missionary Smith, wrote his own memoirs in which he criticized the Armenian Apostolic Church for introducing "auricular confession; intercession of the saints and angels; worship of relics; and prayers for the dead."⁵²

Such sentiments and heavy handed proselytizing were hardly reassuring to the hierarchy of the Armenian Apostolic Church. In addition, the American missionaries challenged the existing ecclesiastical system and the basic national unity of the Armenians. The missionaries rejected the concept of a church-state alliance. They were products of a culture where church and state are separated. The United States Constitution prohibited the establishment of a State Church or interferences in the practice of religion. The missionaries perceived this special church-nation relationship among Armenians as a detriment to evangelization.⁵³ They did not understand, let alone appreciate, the fact that the Armenian Apostolic Church played the dual role of State and Church for the Armenian people. They did not understand that the Armenian experience had not parallel among European nations. When the Armenian Church lost her temporal partner, the State, she assumed both religious and temporal responsibilities. Hence, anything that threatened the Church was considered a threat to the Armenian nation. When the missionaries encouraged "desertions from the Armenian Church" to the "evangelical point of view"⁵⁴ the Armenian Church considered this a serious threat, for the only bond that united Armenians culturally, politically, and spiritually was the National Church.

Furthermore, the Armenian Apostolic Church questioned the *modus operandi* of the American Protestant missionaries who had abandoned their original policy of non-proselytism and non-interference in the teachings, practices, and affairs of the Armenian Apostolic Church.⁵⁵ This change of policy was possibly motivated either by pressure from the home churches for tangible results, or by the official recognition of the United States government of the treaty rights of American missionaries in Turkey.⁵⁶ Whatever their justification, in

1836 the missionaries embarked upon an aggressive missionary campaign -- a change that marked a radical departure from their earlier activities limited to personal contacts to the administration of schools and publications. They organized an ambitious program of "evangelization" through public worship services and preaching on Sundays and during the week.⁵⁷ Soon many Armenian dissidents, including former members of the high-ranking clergy, Bishop Dionysius Garabedian and Bishop Hagopos of Bolou, joined the mission church.⁵⁸ Later that same year, twelve members of the Armenian Apostolic Church, encouraged by the missionaries, established "The Society of Piety" (*Barepash-toutian Miabanoutune*) with the purpose of reforming the Armenian Church.⁵⁹

The support and protection given by the American missionaries to this new society led the Armenian Apostolic Church to question the intention of the American missionaries.⁶⁰ These missionaries were hiring and employing persons considered by the Armenian Church as "undesirable elements." Bishop Dionysius and Bishop Hagopos were discredited among their former colleagues because they had renounced their celibate vows; yet they were employed by the American missionaries.⁶¹ Some Armenian Apostolics were accused of converting to Protestantism for ulterior motives because overzealous missionaries provided financial aid to Armenians converted to the "evangelical faith."⁶²

Undoubtedly, the American missionaries alienated the leadership of the Armenian Apostolic Church. But the main problem lay in the different perspectives embraced by the Armenian Apostolic Church, on the one hand, and the American Protestant missionaries on the other. The main objective of the American missionaries was to initiate reform in the Armenian Apostolic Church in order to evangelize Turkey. The Armenian Apostolic Church, however, was inclined to accept the educational benefits the American missionaries offered without their Protestant brand of reform or "evangelical" Christianity.

Confrontation seemed inevitable, especially when the American missionaries started making incursions into the Armenian Apostolic fold. Chopourian makes the pointed observation that, alarmed at the headway the American mission had made among Armenians and fearful that the Protestant incursion would destroy the bond of union between Church and Nation, the Armenian Apostolic Church reacted negatively and took strong measures to obstruct American missionary activities.⁶³ In fact, not only the Armenian Patriarchate but the lay leadership as well, particularly the *amiras* (the magnates), became very suspicious of the motives of the missionaries.⁶⁴

By the late 1830's there was widespread opposition against American missionaries not only from Armenians but also from other quarters:

- The Islamic government of the Ottoman Empire, because the bulk of its population was Muslim, vehemently opposed the spread of Christianity and missionary expansion;⁶⁵
- The European nations objected for political and economic reasons;⁶⁶
- The Roman Catholic Church, for centuries engaged in proselytizing acti-

vities among the Armenians, now saw a rival in the American Protestant missionaries.⁶⁷

- The Eastern Orthodox churches felt threatened by the American missionaries who, originally committed to work among Muslims and Jews, now directed their efforts exclusively to the native Christians.⁶⁸
- The Russians, as defenders of Orthodoxy, were opposed to any type of Protestant mission and Western influence in Turkey.⁶⁹

The motives of the American Protestant missionaries have been seriously questioned and severely criticized by some Armenian historians.⁷⁰ These Armenians argue that the motives of the missionaries were not so much the spread of the Gospel (i.e., evangelism) as the spread of American Protestantism (i.e. proselytism). This accusation is based, at best, on circumstantial evidence. Certainly, some missionaries may have cherished such a concept, but there is no direct evidence that this was the American Board's official policy. True, the initial efforts of these American Protestant missionaries involved some clumsy mistakes. But errors should not necessarily be construed as ulterior motives.

Again, other Armenians maintain that the religious tolerance characteristic of the Armenian Church made her vulnerable to the proselytizing efforts of foreign missionaries.⁷¹ The missionaries, by contrast, claim that their objective was "to devise, adopt, and prosecute the Gospel among those who are destitute of the knowledge of Christianity."⁷² In fact, the missionaries were under strict instructions not to proselytize, nor to encourage members of native Christian churches to abandon their own churches.⁷³ The rationale for the missionaries' presence was to revive the Armenian Apostolic Church so that she in turn could reach out to non-Christian groups such as Jews and Muslims.

The debate revolves around the question, "Were the missionaries of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions spreading the 'good news' to the Armenian people, or were they 'converting' them to Protestantism?"

Unfortunately, the question of *evangelism* vs. *proselytism* remains unresolved. In the end, the issue is a matter of personal interpretation. Two views persist. Some insist that since the Armenians were already Christians and did not need the good news, they were converted to Protestantism. Their evidence? The creation of an *Armenian Protestant Church*.⁷⁴ Others insist that the early Armenian Evangelicals were not coerced into changing their religion, nor were they required to join a foreign Protestant church denomination; non-Evangelical Armenians consider the Armenian Evangelicals proselytized.⁷⁵

Whatever the relative merits of these two conclusions may be, the American missionaries rendered invaluable services to the Armenian people, especially in the areas of education, philanthropy, culture, politics, and religion. A brief assessment of these contributions follows:

Education. Through their educational institutions, ranging from kindergarten

to college, the American missionaries supplemented in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries the Armenian intellectual Renaissance initiated by the Mekhitarists in the eighteenth.⁷⁶ Education became an attainable goal for all Armenians without discrimination. Thousands of Armenian young people received their higher education at the American Board's institutions of higher learning.⁷⁷ Many of them graduated from these schools to assume roles of leadership in the Armenian community. Higher education became a viable option even for females who, until the advent of institutions run by the American missionaries, had been excluded.

The missionary schools produced a large number of educated women who took their rightful place in society. Female graduates became in turn educators of the younger generations of Armenians throughout the Armenian community. In fact, toward the end of the nineteenth century, the vast majority of teachers in Armenian elementary schools were female graduates and undergraduates from the American missionary colleges, seminaries and teacher-training institutions.⁷⁸ The status of women was elevated in a male-dominated society as a result of higher education.

Inseparable from this intellectual revival was a social and political awakening. As Yervant Hadidian rightly observes, "the Armenian democratic education by its very nature kindled in the minds of youth the love of freedom and a better social order."⁷⁹ American missionary schools also exposed their students to American and Western thought and lifestyles.

Philanthropy. The American missionaries rendered a most valuable service to the less privileged Armenians by their constant assistance. Through their orphanages, nursing homes, hospitals, and dispensaries they ministered to the physical needs of many.⁸⁰ These services were considered means of "preaching the gospel ... and furthering the spiritual objects of the mission."⁸¹ In the interior provinces of Turkey where there were no medical facilities, the health services provided by the missionaries played a providential role. Countless lives were saved thanks to the medical skill of missionary physicians and nurses.⁸²

During World War I, when one and a half million Armenians were massacred with unparalleled brutality and another million were uprooted from their ancestral homeland and driven into the deserts of Syria without benefit of experienced leaders, the American missionaries assumed the role of Good Samaritans. They mobilized their resources and came to the aid of the battered Armenians. It was thanks to their vision and initiative that the Near East Relief was organized in 1915. It was a philanthropic and lifesaving institution, second to none in that part of the world. It embraced and served almost every area of need: social, educational, physical, and economic. It provided food for the starving survivors of the massacres, rescue homes for girls who had escaped from Muslim harems, orphanages, medical care, and relief for the sick. Moreover, the Near East Relief opened elementary schools for children and vocational

schools for young adults; it organized community health and recreational programs and industrial enterprises to teach various trades. These services were provided to "the Surviving Remnant" who found refuge in Syria, Lebanon, Egypt, Palestine, Iraq and Iran. But the greatest service that the Near East Relief rendered was to provide refuge and education to 132,000 Armenian children, many of whom became respected citizens of their adopted countries.⁸³

Literature and Culture. One of the most valuable services the American missionaries contributed was the translation of the Holy Bible into modern Armenian (*Ashkharhabar*) by a competent team of linguists and scholars under the capable leadership of Elias Riggs. Until the middle of the nineteenth century, the only Bible available to the Armenians was the classical Armenian (*Grabar*) Bible, which none but a small educated elite could read or understand. The *Ashkharhabar* Scripture made the Bible accessible to almost all Armenians.

In addition, the American missionaries published grammars, commentaries, religious books, and educational pamphlets in Armenian. The missionary press made a great contribution to the development of modern Armenian by publishing in the vernacular. In this respect also, they were innovators. Though by the end of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth centuries the use of ancient Armenian had substantially diminished to be supplanted by modern Armenian, ancient Armenian survived in print. Modern vernacular had only just begun to emerge as a written language. While there were some conservative elements who adamantly opposed the use of modern Armenian, there were many progressive intellectuals who advocated it. The American missionaries aligned themselves with these progressive elements, and through their vigorous espousal of the Armenian vernacular they greatly enhanced the *Ashkharhabar*. They also produced a corpus of religious literature destined to provide intellectual guidelines for decades to come.

Political Freedom and Social Justice. The American missionaries played a decisive role in the whole area of political freedom and justice for the Armenian populace in the Ottoman Empire. The oppressive Ottoman rule and the Turkish government's harassment of Armenians militated against the Armenian minority in Turkey economically, socially, politically, in so far as their religious life was concerned.

Because of their historical claim to their ancestral lands and their demands for basic human rights, the Turks considered them a political threat, treated them as second-class citizens, and denied them certain fundamental freedoms. For more than four centuries, the Armenians in the Ottoman Empire were forced to live in absolute obedience to Turkish rule. The American missionaries, coming from a free and democratic country, advocated the principle of the inviolability of freedom of thought and conscience. This struck a responsive chord among Armenians who throughout their history had cherished freedom even at

the cost of their lives.

The American missionaries also contended that education and intellectual enlightenment were important ingredients for the realization of a free society. They proudly noted, for instance, that the liberation of Bulgaria from Turkish rule was due to the education that Bulgarian students received at Robert College. They sincerely hoped that their other educational institutions would "provide the same results for 'Ancient Armenia'."⁸⁴ In 1887 the United States consul Milno A. Hewett, after a visitation to Anatolia College of Marsovan, stated that there was a "growing aspiration for the dignity and advantages of western civilization among Armenians due to the education offered by the American institutions of higher learning in Turkey."⁸⁵

Furthermore, the American missionaries openly criticized Turkish violation of the civil rights of Armenians and made frequent appeals to the Western Powers to intervene on behalf of the Armenians.⁸⁶

Religious and Spiritual Values. Finally, the American missionaries made a contribution to the spiritual realm of Armenians by introducing new methods of developing a vital Christian community, by laying the foundation for the proper understanding of the role of the laity in the mission of the church, by encouraging Christian outreach, by making the Bible accessible to lay people in a vernacular edition they could read, and by encouraging the study of the Scripture. Not only did they meet the needs of the emerging Armenian Evangelical Church, but they also brought about a spiritual revival among the Armenian people.

In short, the American missionaries made major contributions -- contributions sufficient to ensure them an important place in the cultural history of the Armenian Nation.

The Armenian Patriarchate of Istanbul (Constantinople)

The third important group to play a decisive role in the rise of the Armenian Evangelical Church was the Armenian Patriarchate of Istanbul. During the early years of the American mission among the Armenians, the leadership of the Armenian Church had a cordial relationship with the American Protestant missionaries. In 1832 the Armenian Patriarch, Archbishop Stepan, not only received the American missionaries "with great honor", but even invited them to participate in an ordination service. In 1835, the principal of the Armenian Seminary, Peshtimaljian, publicly commended the missionaries for their educational work. Missionary Goodell as late as November 30, 1835, reported no opposition on the part of the Armenian Church concerning the evangelistic work of the American missionaries.⁸⁷

There were, undoubtedly, individual Armenians who expressed their hos-

tility against the Protestant missionaries. For instance, a highly respected layman of the Armenian Apostolic Church, Hovhannes Teroyents Chamoorjian, publicly criticized Patriarch Garabed for his cordial treatment of the American missionaries.⁸⁸ Up to 1836, however, opposition came from individuals, not from the Church as such.

Beginning in 1837, the Armenian Apostolic Church changed her policy toward the American missionaries. Both the spiritual and lay leadership came to the conclusion that the missionaries were violating the trust placed in them. Hence, they first boycotted the American schools, ordering parents to withdraw their children.⁸⁹ Then they embarked upon a "vigorous persecution" of the American missionaries.⁹⁰ These measures underlined the apprehension the Church felt at the headway the American mission had made among the Armenians. The number of Armenians abandoning their Church was growing each day, so much so that by the year 1838 the missionaries counted about eight hundred evangelical converts.⁹¹ Another reason for this change of policy was a belated appreciation of the differences which distinguished the Armenian Apostolic Church from Protestantism.⁹² The Armenian historian and the then clerk of the Patriarchate, Avedis Berberian, accused the American missionaries of misleading the Armenians "so that they may accept the Protestant religion."⁹³ The Armenian Church which, in the past, had successfully defended her theology and faith against many "intruders" would not now willingly succumb to Protestant theological influence. Both lay and spiritual leaders of the Armenian Church became suspicious and fearful that Protestantism could undermine and destroy the unifying bond between Church and Nation.⁹⁴

It is not always easy to maintain a balanced perspective in the midst of continual change. The tendency is to over-react in one direction or another. The American missionaries, in their zealotry to "revive the Armenian people spiritually", moved too fast. The Armenian Church, on the other hand, retrenched in order to maintain the *status quo* on the pious assumption that no change was necessary or desirable.

This change of attitude toward the foreign missionaries was not surprising. It was a natural reaction to a threatening situation very similar to experiences in the Church's past. The Paulician-Thontrakian movement, for instance, in the Middle Ages had shaken the Armenian Church. The Paulicians from the seventh to the ninth centuries, and the Thontrakians from the ninth to the eleventh centuries not only challenged the theology and traditions of the Armenian Church but denounced her theology, ceremonialism, ritualism, and hierarchical system as unscriptural.⁹⁵

The pressure on the Armenian Apostolic Church to conform and submit to external forces was no less severe when it was exerted by the Greek and Roman churches. Beginning the seventh century, the Byzantine Empire attempted to absorb the Armenian nation through religious domination. These efforts resulted in the separation of a small minority of Armenians known as "Horoms"

or "Armenian Greeks", who pledged allegiance to the Greek Orthodox Church. This limited success encouraged the Byzantine Emperors to redouble their efforts to subjugate the Armenian nation. Part of this policy of subjugation was to bring the Armenian Church under the Greek Patriarchate.⁹⁶

The Roman Church also proselytized. Beginning in the eleventh century and for more than two hundred years, the Crusaders pursued a policy of attrition, undermining and denouncing the Armenian Church and trying to unite her with the Roman Catholic Church. Like the Byzantine Church, the Roman Church succeeded in separating some Armenians, whom they called "the Unitors," from their Mother Church.⁹⁷ The activities of the Catholic missionaries continued without much opposition until the early part of the nineteenth century. Then, in 1820, the Ottoman Turks provoked a wave of persecution against sympathizers and adherents of the Roman Church because they were accused of disloyalty to the Sultan. The persecution was, however, short-lived thanks to the intervention of European diplomats.⁹⁸ Finally, in 1830, the Armenian Roman Catholics were authorized to organize their own "Millet".⁹⁹

Once burned, twice shy. History appeared to be repeating itself in a time-honored pattern. In the light of past and bitter experiences, it is not difficult to understand why the Armenian Apostolic Church, burned many times and scarred by each fresh encounter, over-reacted in the face of reforms within the Church--reforms instigated by foreign elements. The missionary zeal of the evangelists coincided, moreover, with a period of political unrest inimical to Armenians. The Armenian Apostolic Church was already operating in a climate of defensive isolationism.

Of course, this attitude of isolation had not grown overnight, and it had not originated nor developed without reason. Both ecclesiastical and political pressures were responsible. The former dated back to the Council of Chalcedon in 451. The Armenians were at war¹⁰⁰ and unable to send representatives who might have accepted the Council's theological affirmations or spoken on their Church's behalf. The Armenian Church was criticized for her "heretical" Monophysite theology, and later accused of being a "Schismatic" Church.¹⁰¹ The aftermath of this ecclesiastical vilification persisted for centuries in the form of coercion and persecution. Political pressures were endemic concomitants of successive foreign invasions by the Zoroastrian Persians, Moslem Arabs, Christian Byzantine, Mamluks, Seljuks, and Ottoman Turks. This constant struggle for self-preservation and perpetuation naturally forced the Armenian Church to withdraw into her shell every time she felt threatened.

It was a legacy of fear that prompted conservative elements in the Armenian Apostolic Church to see the reformists as "divisive agents of the missionaries" trying to "destroy" the Church. Talks over Church reform were treated as disloyalty to the Armenian Apostolic Church and met with harsh criticism. The atmosphere was seeded with dark suspicions. Drastic measures were taken against the reformists. For example, in 1839 Patriarch Hagopos imprisoned and

exiled three Armenian priests for advocating reform with the Church.¹⁰² In 1839, approximately five hundred persons, including some bishops, priests, and influential laymen, were called up by the Patriarchate for the purpose of examining their "evangelical views."¹⁰³

A temporary lull ensued late in 1839 which lasted until 1844 due to political conditions in the Ottoman Empire.¹⁰⁴ A second round of persecution began with the ascension of Bishop Matteos Choochajian to the patriarchal throne in July, 1844.¹⁰⁵ His reign was marked by continuous tumult. He was against reform of any kind, and it was during his administration that the machinery of the ecclesiastical government was tightened. He embarked upon a campaign to halt the advance of the reformist movement. Among the measures invoked were exhortations, a number of public discourses and debates, and pressure tactics.¹⁰⁶ When these methods failed their intended end, the Patriarch resorted to stronger measures -- such as depriving them of the fellowship and the ordinances of the Church.¹⁰⁷ The reformists cited a long list of their grievances: economic boycott, social ostracism, imprisonment without open charge or trial, the encouragement by the church authorities to disinherit or expel members of the families who associated with the American missionaries, and excommunication from the Church.¹⁰⁸ The Patriarch went so far as to issue excommunication decrees stipulating that adherents of the "evangelical point of view were accursed and whoever went to visit them were to be made public to the Church by terrible anathemas."¹⁰⁹

The reformists protested that they adhered to most of the time-honored religious concepts of their Church. Their dissent lay in the conviction that they could not compromise the Gospel nor their freedom of conscience. The forty persons who founded the first "Evangelical Church of Armenia" on July 1, 1846 in Pera, Constantinople, made the following their declaration:

*"We accept with reverence our national traditions, sanctified by the blood of the martyrs. We love the Armenian nation with whole heart and mind. But the freedom of conscience we consider more precious than all else, and we shall not allow that authority, or tradition, or command take away from our hand the Gospel of Christ ..."*¹¹⁰

Armenian Evangelical historians maintain that had the leadership of the Armenian Patriarchate in Constantinople demonstrated a tolerant attitude, some imagination, understanding, and flexibility, they would not have created a situation which gave the reform-minded members of the Church little alternative but to leave their Mother Church and organize the Armenian Evangelical Church. Some Armenian Apostolic historians, on the other hand, not only dismiss this claim, but charge that the Armenian Evangelicals had a "persecution complex" -- that the reformists' accusation was totally unfounded and a mere figment of their imagination. Events do not seem to substantiate this conclusion. There are a number of Armenian Apostolic and non-Armenian historians who document instances of severe persecution against the Protestants. One

respected Armenian historian, Kevork Mesrob, not only describes these persecutions but lists more than half-a-dozen reasons for the rise of persecution against the protestants.¹¹¹

The argument that fewer reformists would have been prompted to leave their Church had Patriarch Matteos Choochajian shown greater sympathy to their aspirations is debatable. The odds against such an outcome seem high because conviction and conscience are human attributes which give life meaning and purpose. Dispassionate observers of these unhappy times can only regret the departure from the Mother Church of so many reform-minded people and hope that the Kingdom of God was better served by commitment to strongly held and deeply felt convictions than by compromises that negated the dictates of conscience.

It is a fact that for the Armenian Patriarchate the theological non-conformity of the reformists was synonymous with religious and national disaffection. Moreover, the instinctive fear of new experiences cried out against any change. It was so easy to cling to the *status quo* because it was safe and secure. The Patriarchate would much rather live with things as they were than run the risk of change.

Furthermore, the Armenian Patriarchate saw in the reform movement the meddling influence of the missionaries in the internal life of their Church: an intrusion. The intruders in this case were foreigners with a completely different theological and psychological background, who had a tradition of anti-episcopacy and anti-ceremonialism, who had no appreciation of the rites, rituals, and theology of the Armenian Apostolic Church, had the "arrogance" to claim that they were the bearers of "eternal truth" bringing "light to the darkness."¹¹² Besides, the historical, intimate nature of the relationship of the Armenian Apostolic Church and the Armenian Nation was such that it was unlikely that a "foreign and imported" religious faith could have been accepted as better than the Armenian Apostolic brand of Christianity, which had sustained the Nation from the fourth century on.¹¹³ The slightest deviation from the beliefs of the Armenian Church was considered a "betrayal" and a threat. One can therefore see why the "reform-ideas" of the reformists were not tolerated and why eventually the "separation" became inevitable, leading to the establishment of the first Armenian Evangelical Church.

It was regrettable that Armenian Evangelicals and the Church of their affections were thus compelled to separate. It would have been of great advantage if some solution other than division could have been found; under these circumstances, it seemed impossible then to find that kind of an alternative.

REFERENCES

1. The aims of the Mekhitarist order were: a- to prepare a class of clergy for the purpose of spreading Roman Catholic teaching among the Armenians; b- to establish schools for the purpose of training teachers and thereby acquiring the means of diffusing education; and c- to promote literary works by translating classical literature into the Armenian language, and encouraging the new generation to write original works in various fields, on Armenian themes. See H. B. Boghosian, "The Monastery of Mekhitar," *Highlights of Armenian History and Its Civilization*, Boston, 1957, p. 79 ff.
2. The Vienna Mekhitarist congregation was organized in Trieste in 1773. In 1810 Napoleon confiscated their property and the congregation took refuge in Vienna, where they have continued their work uninterrupted.
3. Armenian printing presses which were established in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries were located in the following Armenian centers: Echmiadzin (1774), Trieste (1776), St. Petersburg (1783), Nakhichevan (1790), and between 1810-1830 more than a dozen printing houses were founded in Istanbul and Izmir.
4. Kevork Mesrop, *Batmoutune Hay Yekeghetsvo* (History of the Armenian Church), Constantinople, 1914, pp. 478-513.
5. G. H. Chopourian, *The Armenian Evangelical Reformation: Causes and Effects*, New York, 1972, pp. 59-60.
6. Leon Arpee, *A History of Armenian Christianity*, New York, 1946, pp. 240-241.
7. Leon Arpee, *Ibid.*, pp. 13-14. See also Yeghia S. Kassouny, *Loosashavigh* (The Path of Light: History of the Armenian Evangelical Movement), Beirut, 1947, pp. 19-24. Also, Dicran G. Kherlopian, *Vosskematian* (Golden Book: A History of the Armenian Evangelical Movement and the Armenian Evangelical Union of the Near East), Beirut, 1950, vol. I, p. 4.
8. Abisoghom Eutudjian became the first pastor of the newly founded Armenian Evangelical Church in 1846, and Hovhannes Der-Sahakian served as a pastor of Armenian Evangelical Churches at Adabazar, Haskeuy, Bardizag, and Nicomedia from 1848 until his death in 1865. See G. D. E. Prime, *Forty Years in the Turkish Empire*, New York, 1883, p. 317.
9. Kassouny, p. 24.
10. *Ibid.*, p. 51.
11. American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, *Annual Report*, Boston, 1836, p. 15. Hereafter to be cited as A. B. C. F. M., *Annual Report*, [date of publication].
12. Arpee, p. 267. See also, Stephan Eutudjian, *Dzakoumn Yev Entatskn Avetaranakanoutyan Ee Hais* (The Rise and Course of Evangelicalism Among Armenians), Constantinople, 1914, pp. 10-15.
13. Eutudjian, pp. 169-173 (See Appendix).
14. *Ibid.*, p. 173

15. The American Missionaries of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions (A. B. C. F. M.) had been working among Armenians in Istanbul since 1831. The Reverend William Goodell was the first missionary sent by A. B. C. F. M. He established the first American mission station for Armenians in 1831. By 1836 the American mission was so well established among Armenians that it offered Protestant ministry of public worship service and preaching on a regular basis on Fridays and Sundays. The missionaries had established schools and their own printing presses and publications. They had even attracted a sizable group of adherents.
16. The accusation that the reformists were "being used by the American missionaries" See Puzant Yeghiayan, *Hay Haranvanoutiants Bajanoume* (The Separation of the Armenian Denominations), Antelias, 1971, pp. 536-537 is a harsh one. The reformists believed that the American missionaries shared their religious views and supported them morally. But this support led the Armenian Patriarchate to believe that the intention of the missionaries was to split the Armenian Apostolic Church.
17. Avedis Berberian, *Patmoutune Hayotz: Eskesial 1772 Minchev 1860 Handertz Karevor Teghekoutiamb Yev Jamanakagroutiamb Yerevelee Eeratz* (Armenian History: Beginning 1772 to 1860, along with Important Reports and Chronology Concerning Eventful Happenings), Constantinople, 1871, p. 112.
18. The reformists remained in the Armenian Apostolic Church and maintained strong ties with the missionaries until their excommunication in 1846. They considered themselves "the leaven of the Gospel", and vowed to reform their Mother Church and labor for their nation. See *Missionary Herald*, February, 1836, p. 42.
19. Chopourian, p. 78.
20. Berberian, p. 297.
21. Mesrob, p. 516.
22. Chopourian, p. 80.
23. O. G. H. Dwight, *Christianity Revived in the Near East*, New York, 1850, pp. 327-329.
24. *Ibid.*, p. 328.
25. *Ibid.*, p. 329.
26. Eutudjian, pp. 156-159.
27. *Ibid.*
28. *Ibid.*, pp. 160-163.
29. *Ibid.*, p. 162.
30. Armenian Patriarchate of Constantinople, *First Communique*, Constantinople, 1846, pp. 1 - 47.
31. William E. Strong, *The Story of the American Board*, Boston, 1910, p. 3.
32. Edwin M. Bliss, *A Concise History of Missions*, New York, 1897, p. 128.
33. So interpreted by Armenian Apostolic clergymen, Gorun Shrikian, *Armenians Under the Ottoman Empire and the American Missions' Influence*. (Doctoral Dissertation Presented to Concordia Seminary in Exile in Cooperation with Lutheran School of Theology at Chicago), 1977, p. 112.
34. A. B. C. F. M. *Annual Report*, Boston 1821, p. 30.

35. *Missionary Herald*, May, 1823, p. 143.
36. A. B. C. F. M. *Annual Report*, Boston, 1827, p. 61.
37. A. B. C. F. M. *Annual Report*, Boston, 1830, p. 81.
38. A. B. C. F. M. *Annual Report*, Boston, 1825, p. 86-87.
39. Shrikian, pp.88-90.
40. *Ibid.*
41. P. M. Parmelee, *Home and Work by the Rivers of Eden*, Philadelphia, 1881, p. 92.
42. *Ibid.*, p. 96.
43. A. B. C. F. M. *Annual Report*, Boston, 1832, p. 152.
44. *Ibid.*, p. 153.
45. *Missionary Herald*, 1833, p. 320.
46. *Ibid.*, p. 153.
47. C. T. Bridgeman, "An Evaluation of Foreign Missions," *News Bulletin of Near East Christian Council*, Cairo, July 1954, p. 10.
48. H. G. O. Dwight and Eli Smith, *Missionary Researches in Armenia*, New York, 1834, pp. 244-246.
49. Prime, p. 317.
50. Eli Smith, *Researches of the Rev. E. Smith and Rev. H.G.O. Dwight in Armenia: Including a Journey Through Asia Minor, and Into Georgia and Persia*, Boston, 1833, Col. I, p. 57.
51. *Ibid.*, pp. 126-230.
52. Dwight, pp. 6-7.
53. J. Richter, *A History of Protestant Missions in the Near East*, New York, 1910, pp. 111-112.
54. Prime, pp. 173-180.
55. John O. Chules and Thomas Smith, *The Origin and History of Missions*, Boston, 1837, p. 30.
56. Arpee, p. 256-266.
57. *Missionary Herald*, vol. 23, March, 1837, p. 9.
58. Eutudjian, pp. 40-50.
59. Cyrus Hamlin, *My Life and Times Among the Turks*, New York, 1878, pp. 25-35.
60. Chopourian, p. 44.
61. Eutudjian, p. 55.
62. In the January 1836 issue of the *Missionary Herald*, Missionary Goodell reports that he helped a number of Armenians who "consecrated themselves to the reformation of the Armenian people." See *The Missionary Herald*, January, 1836, p. 7.
63. Chopourian, p. 34.
64. Shrikian, pp. 129-130.
65. Mesrob, p. 519.
66. *Ibid.*
67. James S. Dennis, *Foreign Missions After a Century*, New York, 1839, p. 180.
68. Bridgeman, p.10.
69. Arpee, pp. 12-13.

70. Berberian, pp. 265-298. See also, Maghakia Archepiscopus Ormanian, *Azgapatoum* (Malachia Arch. Ormanian, *National History*), vol. III, Jerusalem, 1927, p. 3721, and Yeghiayan, pp. 160-244.
71. Malachia Ormanian, *The Church of Armenia: Her History, Doctrine, Rule, Discipline, Liturgy, Literature, and Existing Conditions*, (Second Revised English Edition), London, 1955, p. 99.
72. *American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions Annual Report*, Boston, 1810, p. 11.
73. Prime, p. 315; Shrikian, p. 115.
74. Yeghiayan, pp. 160-185.
75. Darakjian, "Evangelism and Proselytism," *First World Conference of Armenian Evangelicals*, Haverford, 1978, p. 119.
76. To have an idea of the educational contribution of the American Missionaries to the Armenians one has to look at the statistical account of the American schools as of 1913, the year preceding World War I: 10 colleges with 1748 students; 46 boarding and high schools with 4090 students; 3 theological seminaries with 24 students; 8 industrial schools, 2 schools for the deaf and the blind, and 369 other schools directly or indirectly connected with the American Board with 19,361 students. It must be stated, however, that these schools were supported generously by the Armenian Evangelicals. Although they were founded by the American missionaries, the Armenian Evangelical churches in Turkey gave them their wholehearted financial and moral support. By the end of the war of 1914-1918, most of these schools had ceased to exist.
77. The following is a list of the important educational institutions of the American Board:

High Schools

- The American High School for Girls at Brousa (1834)
 The American High School for Girls at Constantinople (1852)
 The American Home School at Iskutar-Constantinople (1856)
 The Girls' Seminary at Aintab (1860)
 Girls' High School at Bitlis (1860)
 Boys' High School at Bitlis (1860)
 Girls' Boarding High School at Harpoot (1863)
 Girls' Boarding High School at Marsovan (1865)
 Girls' Boarding High School at Paghesh (1868)
 Girls' High School at Garin (1868)
 The Girls' Boarding High School at Talas-Caesarea (1871)
 The Boys' High School at Talas-Caesarea (1871)
 The American Girls' High School at Adabazar (1871)
 Boys' Mount Ararat High School at Erzurum (1873)
 Girls' Boarding High School at Bardizag (1873)
 Girls' American High School at Erzurum (1873)

Girls' Boarding High School at Sepastia (1874)
 The High School at Van (1878)
 Bythinia High School for Boys at Bardizag (1879)
 The Girls' High School at Hadjin (1880)
 Boys' Normal School at Sepastia (1880)
 Girls' Boarding High School at Marash (1882)
 Girls' Boarding High School at Tigranagerd (1882)
 The Girls' Seminary at Adana (1885)
 The American High School at Gedik Pasha, Constantinople (1886)
 The Boys' High School at Kessab (1887)
 The Girls' High School at Kessab (1887)
 The Boys' High School at Hadjin (1887)
 Boys' Boarding School at Mardin (1891)
 Girls' Boarding School at Mardin (1891)
 The Boys' High School at Ourfa (1892)
 The Girls' High School at Ourfa (1892)
 Girls' High School at Edessa (1893)
 The Boys' High School at Afion Karahissar (1908)
 The Boys' High School at Paghesh (1908)

Colleges

The American College For Girls at Constantinople (1832)
 Robert College at Constantinople (1863)
 Anatolia College at Marsovan (1865)
 American University of Beirut (1866)
 Central Turkey College at Aintab (1876)
 Armenia (Euphrates) College at Harpoot (1876)
 The International College at Smyrna (1879)
 The College at Van (1880)
 The Sivas Normal School (Teachers' Training Institute) (1880)
 St. Paul's Institute at Tarsus (1888)

Seminaries

The Theological Seminary at Bebek (1840)
 Harpoot Theological Seminary (1854)
 The Theological Seminary at Marsovan (1865) continuation of the Bebek Seminary
 Cilicia Theological Seminary (1854 in Aintab and 1866 in Marash)
 See, Yervant H. Hadidian, "American Contribution to Armenian Culture," *Armenian/American Outlook*, Winter, 1973, Col. 9, No 1, pp.3-4; also, Garabed Adanalian, *Hooshartzan* (Monument), Fresno, 1952, pp. 472-474; also, Dikran G. Kherlopian, *Hountzk* (Harvest), Aleppo, 1948, pp. 10-33; also Shrikian, pp. 110-400.

78. Shrikian, pp. 450-451.

79. Hadidian, p.6.
80. In health care the services of the American missionaries were invaluable. They maintained 9 hospitals and 10 dispensaries with 39,503 patients. They also provided 5 Nurses' Training Schools besides instructors and ancillary personnel. These services were rendered from the inception of these institutions to the beginning of World War I.
81. A. B. C. F. M., *Annual Report*, 1932, p.156.
82. The following hospitals in Turkey were founded and run by the American Board:

The American Hospital in Harpoot
 The American Hospital in Talas
 The American Hospital in Konya
 The American Hospital at Aintab (1883)
 The American Hospital in Adana (1883)
 The American Hospital at Sepastia
 The American Hospital at Yevtogia-Nicomedia (1907)
 The American Hospital at Van
 The American Hospital at Charshu Kapu, Constantinople
 The American Hospital at Marsovan (1911)

The American missionaries also founded and administered a number of orphanages, old age homes, and schools for handicapped children, such as:

The American Old Age Home at Marsovan (1913)
 The American Old Age Home at Aintab
 The American Orphanage at Paghesh
 The American Orphanage at Aintab
 The American Orphanage at Garin
 The American Orphanage at Harpoot
 The American Orphanage at Van
 The School For the Blind at Marash
 The School for the Deaf and Dumb at Marsovan
 The School For the Blind at Edessa (1914)
 See, Hadidian, p. 5; also, Adanalian, pp. 473-474.

83. Hadidian, p. 5.
84. Alexander W. Terrell to Richard Olney, Secretary of State, Re: "Missionary Indiscretion: Missionaries Not Observing U.S. Policy of Non-Intervention in Turkish Civil Affairs, June 15, 1895," Letter No. 556 (Ministerial Reports).
85. Milno A. Jewett to James D. Porter, Ass't. Secretary of State, Re: "Report On American Colleges in Asia Minor, September 15, 1887," Letter No. 20 (Consular Reports).
86. Reynolds and Usher, "A Statement and Appeal to Christendom," Doc. No. 204, pp. 4-5, (Harvard-Houghton Library Collection); see also Richter, pp. 159-160.

87. *Missionary Herald*, January, 1836, p.16.
88. H. K. Murmurian, *Dasneinnerört Dare yev Broosayi Hovhannes Deroyentz* (Nineteenth Century and Hovhannes Deroyentz of Broosa), Constantinople, 1908, p. 46.
89. Hamlin, p.66.
90. Ellsworth William Strong, *The Story of the American Board: An Account of the First Hundred Years*, Boston, 1910, pp.92-94.
91. Joseph Tracy, *History of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions*, New York, 1842, pp. 325-326.
92. Chopourian, p. 68.
93. Berberian, pp. 294-295.
94. Chopourian, p. 71.
95. The Paulicians were distant successors of early Christian nonconformists organized in the sixth century by Constantine of Mananeli. They venerated the Pauline epistles, possibly because of their ascetic teachings. They had strong anti-iconoclastic tendencies, rejecting all icons, relics, and images. They rejected the intercession of the saints and the veneration of the Cross. They criticized the worship and the theology of the Armenian Church and because of their beliefs they were subjected to scourging, imprisonment, tortures, and tribulations. See, Arpee, pp. 11-117. In the year 872, the stronghold of the Paulicians, Tephrike in Western Armenia, was destroyed, and many of them were forcibly dispersed and deported.
- The Thondrakians or Thondrakites, an off-shoot of the Paulicians, were organized in the middle of the ninth century. Their founder was a certain Sumbat Zarchavantsi, whose headquarters were at the village of Thondrak. The Thondrakians were social reformers who attacked the feudal privileges of the Armenian princes and became champions of the Armenian peasantry. They also advocated asceticism and renunciation of the riches of the world. They were persecuted by the Armenian Church hierarchy and the Armenian aristocracy. See, David Marshall Lang, *Armenia; Cradle of Civilization*, Second Edition, London, 1977, pp.181-184.
96. Yeghiayan, p. 528.
97. *Ibid.*, p. 529.
98. Vahan M. Kurkjian, *A History of Armenia*, New York, 1949, p. 362.
99. The word *Millet* is derived from Arabic *milla* used in the sense of religious community. In the Ottoman Empire, the non-Muslim subjects were organized in semi-autonomous bodies called *Millets*. The leader of each *Millet* was entitled *Millet-bashi* (community head). The ecclesiastical head of the Catholic "Millet" was the "Agent of the Catholics." All Catholics were lumped together without national regard or identity. The Protestants also operated on the same basis.
100. In 451 A. D. Armenians were engaged in the Vartanants War against the Zoroastrian Persians in defense of their Christian faith, freedom of conscience, and the right to a national identity.
101. The Monophysite doctrine stated that in the person of Christ there was but a single, divine nature. The great advocate of this position was Eutyches. The Armenian Church was charged with the Monophysitism of Eutyches - a charge made mostly

- by Roman Catholic historians. Armenian Apostolic scholars like Karekin Catholicos Sarkissian and Puzant Yeghiayan claim that the Armenian Church's stand has been distorted; that the Armenian Church accepts the affirmations of all three first Councils and unlike the Eutychean Monophysitism which insists on infused unity in oneness, it confesses the harmonious unity of distinct natures.
102. According to the "Millet" System, like all spiritual heads, the Armenian Patriarch of Istanbul was responsible for the conduct of his constituency. He was granted by the Sultan of the Empire such civil powers as might be necessary to enable him to maintain his authority.
 103. Strong, p. 93.
 104. Chopourian, p. 75. Chopourian states that in 1839 war between Egypt and Turkey broke out and the Turkish Sultan Mahmoud demanded that the religious leaders of the Ottoman Empire, among whom also was the Armenian Patriarch, should furnish recruits for the army, thus shifting the attention of the Armenians from the missionaries to a more vital question.
 105. Chopourian, p. 77.
 106. G. H. Chopourian and S. K. Sulahian, *The One Hundred and Twenty-Fifth Anniversary of the Armenian Evangelical Movement: 1846-1971*, New York, 1971, p. 9.
 107. *Missionary Herald*, September, 1846, p. 120.
 108. Because the Patriarch was the religious and civic head of the Armenian Church, he justified many of his strong measures against the reformists as disciplinary actions. American missionary, Cyrus Hamlin, describing the power of the office of the Patriarch writes: "A brief note, with the Patriarch's official seal stamped on it, would send any one of his people into exile or prison... He had both spiritual and temporal power." See Hamlin, p. 24.
 109. Hagop A. Chakmakjian, *The Armenian Evangelical Church and the Armenian People*, Beirut, 1961, p. iv.
 110. See A. A. Bedikian, *The Rise of the Armenian Evangelical Movement Among Armenians*, New York, 1970, pp. 1-5; also Adanalian, pp. 106-108, and Kassouny, pp. 1-57.
 111. Mesrob, pp. 518-519.
 112. In 1840 missionary Dwight reported in the *Missionary Herald* that "A separation ought not to be forced, although it will, without doubt, ultimately take place, for light and darkness cannot always exist together," *Missionary Herald*, September, 1840, p. 355.
 113. Chopourian, pp. 7-9; Chopourian's argument breeds doubt on the facile generalization that the creation of the Armenian Evangelical Church was solely the outcome of the proslytistic efforts of the missionaries. He states that the cause was a cumulative effect of numerous factors including religious, political, psychological, and anthropological ones.

V. T.

ՀԱՅ ԱՒԵՏԱՐԱՆԱԿԱՆՈՒԹԵԱՆ
ԾՆՆԴՈՑԸ

(ԱՄՓՈՓՈՒՄ)

ՎԵՐ.-ԴՈՎՏ. ՎԱՀԱՆ Հ. ԹՈՒԹԻԿԵԱՆ

Մօտ հարիւր յիսուն տարի առաջ, 1 Յուլիս 1846-ին, Պոլսոյ Բերայի Ամերիկեան Միսիոնարական մատուոն մէջ հիմը դրուեցաւ Հայ Աւետարանական Եկեղեցիին: Քանի մը տարի ետք, 27 Նոյեմբեր 1850 թուակիր իր կայսերական հրովարտակով՝ Սուլթան Ապտիլ Մեհիտ ճանաչում շնորհեց նոր եկեղեցիին եւ համայնքին:

Ծնած էր Հայ Աւետարանականութիւնը:

Նոր չէր շարժումը սակայն: Մօտ քսանամեակ մը կարգ մը ուժեր հիմնական դեր խաղացին Հայ Աւետարանական Ծարժումի գոյառումին մէջ: Ծանօթ կամ անծանօթ այդ ուժերէն Վեր. Վահան Թութիկեան հոս ուսումնասիրութեան նիւթ կը դարձնէ երեք խմբաւորումներ, որոնք հետոյ կամ մօտէն առընչուեցան հայոց մէջ Հայ Աւետարանական Ծարժումին, անոր զարգացումին եւ կազմաւորումին: Անոնցմէ առաջինն էր բարեկարգիչներու այն խումբը, որ կը փափաքէր որոշ բարեկարգում մը իրագործել Հայ Եկեղեցին ներս, երկրորդը՝ Արեւմուտքէն Օսմանեան Կայսրութիւն հասած ամերիկացի միսիոնարները, որոնք փոխանակ իրենց սկզբնական ծրագիրը իրագործելով մահմետականութեան եւ մովսիսականութեան քրիստոնէութեան լոյսը տանելու՝ դարձան Աւետարանականութիւնը տարածելու աշխատանքին արդէն իսկ քրիստոնէայ հայութենէն ներս, եւ երրորդը՝ Պատրիարքը, Պատրիարքարանը եւ պոլսահայութեան ամիրայական խաւը, որոնք հայ կրօնին, ազգին, անոր մշակոյթին եւ էութեան պահպանումին համար դարերու ընթացքին իրենց յառաջացուցած մեկուսացումով եւ պահպանողականութեամբ իրենք գիրենք գտան հակադրութեան մը մէջ նորածնունդ եւ կազմաւորուող ուժերու: Արդիւնքն եղաւ բախում մը ընդմէջ երեք այս ուժերուն՝ ի՞նչ փոյթ որ սկզբնական շրջանին Հայ Եկեղեցին հասկացողութեամբ մօտեցաւ միսիոնարականութեան քերած նորութիւններուն՝ մանաւանդ անոր կրթական, դաստիարակչական, ուսումնական, մշակութային եւ խնամատարական գործունէութեան:

Սակայն շուտով ի յայտ եկան տարբերութիւնները, որոնք անջատումի պիտի առաջնորդէին հայ բարեկարգիչները եւ Հայոց դա-

բաւոր Եկեղեցին: Այս անջատումին մէջ հիմնական դեր խաղաց մի-
իոնարութիւնը, որ թիկունք կանգնեցաւ բարեկարգիչներուն՝ իր ծայ-
րայեղականութեամբ, եւ իրեն թիկունք կանգնող արեւմտեան դիւ-
նագիտութեամբ:

Հոս ներկայացուող յօդուածը մանրամասն մէկ ուսումնասի-
րութիւնն է յարաբերութիւններուն, առընչութիւններուն եւ շարժում-
ներուն, եւ այդ բոլորին ետին կեցող խմբաւորումներուն եւ կազմա-
կերպութիւններուն: Ժամանակակից սկզբնադրիւքներու եւ տուեալնե-
րու հոծ ու ծանր բեռի մը յենած՝ յօդուածը մանրամասն քննարկումի
կ'ենթարկէ դրական ու ծխտական, թեր ու դէմ, եւ լաւ կամ վատ այն
բոլոր տուեալները, որոնք յառաջացուցին, զարգացուցին եւ ի վերջոյ
ծնունդ տուին Հայ Աւետարանական Ծարժումին՝ նախ որոշ շրջան
մը ծոցէն ներս Հայ Առաքելական Եկեղեցիին, եւ ապա՝ որպէս ան-
ջատ շարժում ու եկեղեցի՝ անոնց կրօնական, ընկերային, դաստիա-
րակչական եւ ուսումնական արտայայտութիւններով, ուսումնասիրու-
թեան աւարտին եզրակացնելու համար, թէ «ցաւալի է որ Հայ Աւե-
տարանականներն ու անոնց սիրած եկեղեցին այս ձեւով ստիպ-
ուեցան բաժնուելու: Ծատ աւելի լաւ պիտի ըլլար եթէ կարելի ըլլար
որ բաժանումէ տարբեր լուծում մը գտնուէր: Այն ատեն, կը թուի թէ,
այս պայմաններուն տակ անկարելի եղաւ գտնել այդ փոխընտրու-
թիւնը»: