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“Open My Eyes So That I May See Wonderful Things” [Ps 118 (119):18]

Some Art Historical Remarks about the Consecration of a Painted Church

Christina Maranci

1 Introduction

In 2012, Gėorg Tēr-Vardanean published a critical edition of the Mayr Maštoc’, the Great Ritual Book, based on the earliest known manuscripts.¹ This 921-page volume, including a lengthy introduction and critical apparatus, holds significance not only for scholars of the Armenian Church and its liturgy, but also for those working in a host of other disciplines and neighbouring traditions. Tēr-Vardanean’s work particularly should encourage historians of medieval Armenian art and architecture, who will find in the Maštoc’ a vast library of interpretive tools for understanding imagery and monuments. Material objects and spaces play a major role in the performance of the rites, sometimes as objects of consecration themselves. Indeed, the Maštoc’ contains not only rites of the foundation and consecration (and re-consecration) of a church, but also ritual blessings for crosses, vestments, manuscripts, semantra,² baptismal fonts, church doors, and liturgical chalices and patens. The Maštoc’ also includes directives and readings for the consecration of a church that is painted: Kanon znkarel ekeləc’i awrnəl.³

In the following brief and preliminary study, I consider this last rite in relation to Armenian art. First, and most fundamentally, the text offers fairly early historical testimony that church interiors were regularly painted, thus confirming written sources and, of course, surviving programmes.⁴ Second, the rite makes clear that the paintings were consecrated, a point which holds significance in discussions of image worship and iconoclasm in Armenia. The direct-

---

¹ Tēr-Vardanean 2012 (hereafter Mayr Maštoc’). I wish to thank Father Daniel Findikyan for first bringing this work to my attention.
² Lit. “hour striker” (ժամահար), and thus translated by Conybeare as ‘rattle’.
ives, prayers, and psalm readings of this rite, I suggest below, offer important, and thus far largely neglected, insight into attitudes towards images in medi-
avael Armenia.\textsuperscript{5}

2 The Text

Tēr-Vardanean’s critical edition of the text is based on the two earliest manu-
scripts preserving the rite.\textsuperscript{6} Drawing on a study of the colophon, as well as codicological, paleographical, and linguistic evidence, he dates Venice San
Lazzaro MS 457/320 (= V 457/320) to around 960, copied perhaps at Argina but more certainly within the Bagratid kingdom.\textsuperscript{7} Written on parchment in erkat’agir by the married priest Giorg, this manuscript preserves in its approxi-
imately 240 pages almost all of the euchology. The second manuscript, Yerevan Matenadaran MS 1001 (= M 1001), written in erkat’agir but on paper, most likely dates to the early 11th century; Tēr-Vardanean also locates its production within the Bagratid kingdom.\textsuperscript{8} In both manuscripts, the rite appears towards the beginning, on fol. 40\textsuperscript{v} of MS 457/320 and on fol. 32\textsuperscript{r}–32\textsuperscript{v} of MS 1001.

\[\text{Պատմի գիտակցել եղեք ամենը}\]

\[\text{Երանուղում մենարարեք, որպեսզի երկար երկար երկար կարելի}

\[\text{Տիրուան երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երկու երknife

\[\text{For one of the few mentions of this rite by art historians, see Rapti 2014, 66 and n. 36.}\]

\[\text{For discussion of these two manuscripts, see Mayr Maštoc‘, 50–63. For Venice MS 457, see}

\[\text{Sargisean—Sargsean 1966. For an English translation based on Venice MS 457 and other}

\[\text{manuscripts, see Conybeare—Maclean 1905, 34–35. For a critical discussion of Conybeare's}

\[\text{translation, see Mayr Maštoc‘, 34–40.}\]

\[\text{Ibid, 57.}\]

\[\text{Ibid, 62.}\]

\[\text{Mayr Maštoc‘, 160–161, without the accompanying footnotes regarding variants between MSS Venice 457/320 and Yerevan MS 1001.}\]
19. You are holy, O Lord our God, who are at rest in the saints, sanctify the images of these martyrs of yours, which we have now obtained for you. In memory of those, not to be worshipped, as if honouring those who are alive, but for the illumination of your holy church, let us offer worship and glorification to you alone, beneficent God. You, O Lord, sanctify and bless these representations (զկերպագրութիւնս) to honour and make splendid your church, and grant good rewards to those who laboured in this because honour and dominical glory is given to you in this, for which praise and blessing is worthily fitting to the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, now and forever and ever.

And immediately they enter and the dedication is completed on the eighth day.

### 3 Art-Historical Remarks

In summary, the participants perform a psalmody (Pss 118 (119), 148, and 112), followed by blessings, anointment, a diaconal proclamation, and the prayer. This

---

10 The meaning of this last sentence is obscure. Did they introduce the hour, or enter the church? And if the latter, where were they prior to doing so? I read չարեցիր as “immediately” but it could also be a form of անարկեցան (vigil); thus: “they enter the vigil and the dedication is completed on the eighth day.” One notes, though, that “անարկեցան” seems to be a formula used through the Maštoc’, see for example Mayr Maštoc’, 168. Yerevan MS 1001 gives a slightly different locution, see Mayr Maštoc’, 161, n. 3. I thank the anonymous reviewer for the corrections to and suggestions upon a draft of this translation, and the paper as a whole.

11 Numbering of the psalms hereafter is given following the Armenian tradition; in the received Greco-Latin tradition Ps 118 corresponds to Ps 119.
would seem thus to be a fairly short rite, with a single prayer and minimal movement around the church. Yet it is important to remember that Ps 118(119) is the longest of the psalms, and that depending on the size of the church and, presumably, the copiousness of the imagery, anointing the “whole church” could take some time. Nevertheless, this rite is much shorter and less complex than the rite of church consecration, which is the subject of a study by Father Daniel Findikyan and which involves multiple units including movement inside and outside the church. Our text, moreover, omits mention of a bishop (unlike the modern version of the same rite), raising the possibility that the anointment and prayer could be performed by a priest.

Liturgiological questions I must leave to experts in that field; my focus here is on the significance of the rite for the study of art history. First and foremost, the rite stipulates that sacred images must be consecrated. This involves anointment (tearagnrel- lit. “writing the Lord”) with miwron. As scholars have observed, this practice is attested already in the time of Catholicos Yovhannēs Ōjnec’i (fl. 717–728). In his Treatise against the Paulicians, he writes

> behold, by means of the words of the apostles, we, believers in the All-Holy Trinity, regard anointment with oil as the instrument of salvation; similarly [when applied] to churches, altars, crosses, and images, we believe divine power enters them. And they are thus distinguished from other similar matter [niwt’], just as we ourselves are distinguished from those who, seized with deception, believe that matter is divine.

Two of the Canons of Ōjnec’i also concern the anointing of crosses:

27: If someone makes a cross of wood, or of any other material, and does not give it to a priest to consecrate and anoint with holy miwron, it is not worthy to receive honour and to be offered worship; it is also empty and

---

13 Attestations of this term date from the 5th century; see the Nor Baṙgirk’ Haykazean Lezui (hereafter NBHL) vol. 11: 862.
void of divine power, and [such practice] lies outside of the tradition of the Apostolic Church.\textsuperscript{16}

28: As for those [crosses] which have been consecrated and anointed, they thenceforth become instruments of the divine mystery, these one must honour and worship, prostrate oneself before and kiss: in them dwells the Holy Spirit, through them is dispensed protection of mankind, and the graces of healing the ailments of soul and body ...\textsuperscript{17}

The texts of Ōjnec'i establish a precedent for the element of anointment as a requirement in the preparation of objects and images for sacred use. While this is not the place for a general discussion of holy \textit{miwрон} in Armenia, one may point out that the practice of anointing crosses in particular is mentioned in a number of Armenian texts from the 10th century onward, sometimes in response to accusations of impropriety by the Byzantine and Syrian Churches.\textsuperscript{18} “You write dismissively of how we seal the cross,” the (appropriately-named) Catholicos Xač'ik writes to the metropolitan of Sebastia before embarking on his defence.\textsuperscript{19} Responding to the Syrian patriarch John's questions about the consecration of crosses, Gēorg Loṙec'i writes that not doing so would be “to worship mere stone or wood,” a practice that is “heathen and

\begin{enumerate}
\item Der Nersessian 1973, 409. \[27.\] Եթէոքխաչարասցէփայտեայեւկամյինչեւիցէնիւթիյ, եւոչտացէքահանայինաւրհնելեւաւծանելզնաﬕւռոնոﬖսրբով, ոչէպարտզնաիպատիւընդունելկամերկրպագութիւնմատուցանելզիդատարկեւունայնէ (Yovhannēs Ōjnecʽi in M.H. 2007, 703. See also Y.Ō. \textit{Matenagr tüwnek'} 1833, 32). Transla-
\item Der Nersessian 1973, 409. \[28.\] Իը (28). Իսկ զայնոսիկ, զորս աւրհնութեամբ եւ աւծմամբ կատարեալէ որքﬕանգամեւիցենաստուածայինխորհրդոցնզործարանք, պարտէ զնոսա պատուել եւ պաշտել, երկրպագել եւ համբուրել զի նոսա բնակէ Հոգին Սուրբ, եւ նոքաւք մատակարարէ ի մարդիկ զպահպանութիւնս եւ զշնորհս բժշկու֊ (Yovhannēs Ōjnecʽi in M.H. 2007, 703. See also Y.Ō. \textit{Matenagr tüwnek'} 1833, 32). On Ōjnec'i's Canons see Mardirossian, 2004.
\item For the earliest Armenian rite of consecrating crosses, see \textit{Mayr Maštoc'}, 168–192. For scholarly discussion of the anointing of crosses, see, in addition to Der Nersessian 1973, \textit{Mayr Maštoc'}, 57; Findikyan 1998, 101 and note 121; Rapti 2014, 69. For a very early attestation of the “oil of anointment”, see Terian 2008, esp. 104–106. For a recent comprehensive discussion of \textit{miwрон}, see Kabalyan 2001; see also Łazarosyan 2008, 60–73. For Narekac'i's famous poem on holy \textit{miwрон} (in which one also finds the term \textit{tēaṙngrel}) see M.H. 2008, 565–598; Mahé—Mahé 2000, 94, 95, 733–769; La Porta 2007, 361–363.
\item Step'anos Tarōnec'i (Greenwood 2017), 279. Xač'ik continues his letter to defend the “bap-
tising” of crosses with water and wine, rather than its anointing with oil.
demonic ... a worship of creations and not God the creator.”

Nersēs Šnorhali in the 12th century offers a particularly eloquent explanation of the validity of anointing (and worshipping) crosses:

Yet I offered worship and prostration to [the anointed cross], not, as we say, to the material, but rather to the power of the God which is united with it indivisibly ... Because without the finishing of blessing and anointment; [the cross] is only a mere house, and not the nuptial bed and bridal chamber of the word of God ...

The text of our prayer also states that images are not to be worshipped (կրպագելի), but are made in memory (յիշատակ) of and to honour (պատիւ) those represented within it. The subsequent sentence further stipulates that worship and glorification are owed “to God alone”. These declarations find a context in the robust discourse on image worship and iconoclasm in mediaeval Armenian literature, beginning with the work of Vrt’anēs K’ert’oł. In Concerning Iconoclasts, attributed to Vrt’anēs and dated to the 7th century, the text makes clear that images are not themselves divine, but instruments by which the represented figures are recalled in the mind:

58. And through the painting of images we remember them and their senders. And we do not say that this is God but rather the memorial (յիշողութիւն) of God and his servants.

66. Thus of what do you speak when you say this is handiwork? Because we come to know the invisible by that which is visible; and pigments and paintings are the memorial of God and his servants.

The concept of images as memorials is central to the subsequent Byzantine discourse on images, employed by John of Damascus and used in the Second

---

22 For Vrt’anēs and the Byzantine discourse on icons, see most recently on Mathews 2008–2009.
24 Արդ, առ այս զինչ ասիցէք, զի և սա ձեռագործ է, քանզի յայտնեաւք զաներեւոյթն ճանաչեմք, ևդեղքնեւնկարքնյիշողութիւնէԱստուծոյեւծառայիցնորա: Ibid., 499.
Council of Nicaea. In Armenian literature, it recurs in a treatise attributed to Yovhannēs Sarkawag (1050–1129), abbot of Hałpat. In this text, the author argues that "in seeing the outlines (գծագրութիւնս) we come even more to the recollection (յիշատակ) [of God], bound to pray and give thanks with the mind of the heart, to Him, Himself, the Saviour." In his study of Yovhannēs Sarkawag, K’yoseyan locates the precedents for this concept of “the mind of the heart” (սրտի մտօք) in Vrt’anēs’ declaration that “The writings are only heard with the ears, but the pictures are seen with the eyes and heard with the ears, and understood and believed by the heart," and in Ōjneci'i's phrase, the “undoubting heart” (աներկբայելի սիրտ), as used in Against the Paulicians.

Towards the close of the rite’s prayer is an exhortation to give “good rewards” to “those who laboured (վաստակեցան) in this.” The term “rewards” (վարձս) holds a range of meanings; in its most literal meaning it can refer to monetary compensation for work. Also noteworthy is the term վաստակեցան which seems, in the context of the prayer, to refer directly to those who worked on the church (as opposed to the patron who paid for it). Interestingly, the prayer eschews the term “artisan” (արուեստաբան), which is employed, for example, in the foundation rite of the same Maštoc’, in favour of a more modest semantic range. With both վաստակեցան and վարձս connoting those who labour for wages, our rite makes clear the inferior position of those who created the paintings of the church while at the same time beseeching God on their behalf.

This terminology generates a powerful contrast to the concept of God as supreme creator, pursued in the psalmody. Psalm 148, And To God in the Heavens Entirely, exhorts all God’s creations to praise him, beginning with the angels and the heavens, celestial bodies, and then the sea, landscape, marine creatures, mountains, trees, wild and tame animals, kings and rulers, and then young and old. Psalm 112, “Bless the servants (lit. children- mankunk’) of the Lord, and Bless the name of the Lord,” praises God and exhorts listeners to do so over the course of the day (v. 3 “from the rising to the setting of the sun”).

---

26 For his writings on relics and images, see Sahagean 1852 and Der Nersessian 1973, 412–413.
27 K’yoseyan 1979, 130.
28 Ibid., 130–131.
29 Ibid., 131.
31 For the foundation rite, see Mayr Maštoc’, 85–97.
32 Յարեւելիցﬕնչ իմուտսարեւու օրհնեալէանունտ (եառ ն).
Verses 5–6 ask, “Who is like the Lord our God who dwells on high, [6] who lowers himself to look on the heavens and earth?” In his commentary, Vardan Arewelci’i (1198–1271) explains these verses:

Residing in the heights, where he rests, and yet is not contained there, he looks down upon the humble, so that as high as the heavens are above the earth, so much higher is God than the heavens. Yet as the wise and the skilled exist by his means, so it is said in other words, that the creations are that much humbler than the creator.

For those participating in the rite, within a freshly painted church, the phrase “God who dwells on high” would have held immediate meaning. Surviving apsidal compositions dating from the 7th to the 13th centuries, with few exceptions, feature Christ in the semi-dome, whether enthroned, standing, in bust length, or administering Communion to the Apostles. Of dome compositions less is known, but one may make special note of the surviving drum paintings from Alt’amar, which show scenes from the Creation. Even for Alt’amar’s patron, King Gagik Arcruni (who probably counted himself one of the “kings of the earth” of Psalm 112:11) enthroned in his gallery in the church’s south conch, the Creator would have loomed high overhead.

Ps. 118 (119) is an acrostic poem of 22 stanzas corresponding to the 22 letters of the Hebrew alphabet. It is sung in rites across Jewish and Christian traditions, and in the mediaeval Armenian liturgy it occurs in many moments, including the present Peace Office, ordinations, lay burials, and the communion of the sick. Psalm 118 (119) offers a prayer to God, its verses alternately lamenting affliction and persecution, delighting in and praising God, and praying for deliverance. The theme of the divine Creator recurs here, as in v. 73: “Your hands...
made me and formed me; give me understanding to learn your commands.”

Noteworthy for present purposes are several verses referring to eyes and vision. Verse 18 asks God to “open my eyes that I may see wonderful things in your law.” In his commentary on Psalm 118:18, Vardan Arewelci compares the opening of the eyes to the veil which rises for those who turn to the Lord with faithful prayers. Quite appropriate for our ritual context are verses 55, “I have remembered your name, O Lord, in the night, and have kept your laws,” and 148, which invokes the image of wakefulness: “My eyes anticipated the [dawning] of the morning, so that your words will speak to me.” According to the directives of the *Mayr Maštoc*, these lines would have been sung at the opening of the rite, after an all-night vigil and the morning service. One may observe therefore the particular force of praying for spiritual sight accompanied by the gradually increasing natural light of the church, and increasingly visible painted imagery.

Psalm 118 (119) also laments the limitations of human vision, as in v. 37, “Turn my eyes from beholding vanity; keep me to your ways,” and v. 82, “My eyes awaited your word; I said, when will you comfort me?” Then the psalmist turns his attention from his own eyes to those of God. Verse 153 asks God to “Look upon my humility and save me/ for I have not forgotten your laws,” while verse 159 pleads “See how I love your commands/ preserve me, O Lord, by your mercy.” Again we may observe the particular power of these lines when sung before freshly composed images, particularly those of Christ in the apse.

As commentators have noted, Psalm 118 (119) offers a great range of synonyms for the Torah, in which the psalmist delights. Within the first ten lines are the terms “laws” (յօրէնս), “testimony” (զվկայութիւն), “ways” (ճանապարհս), “commands” (զպատուիրանս), “righteousness” (զարդարութիւնս), “rights” (զիրաւունս), and “words” (զբանս). These terms of course are consonant with...
general Christian exhortations to be obedient and faithful to God, and might also reflect a specifically Maccabean strain in Armenian theology. Yet, as we have noted above, by the 8th century, and particularly in the 10th and 11th centuries, the Armenian discourse on icons focused on the defence and explanation of correct worship. The textual tradition addresses the requirements of anointment, and the kind of worship owed to God, the Cross, acheiropoieta (images not made by human hands), and man-made images. When uttered during the consecration of a freshly-painted church, the verses of Psalm 118 (119) in praise of God’s commandments may thus be interpreted specifically in relation to the correct veneration of images—surely an important point to strike when introducing a new programme of imagery. The beholder is encouraged not only to view the representations, but to view them correctly, with an understanding of their function and their limitations.

4 Conclusion

Taken as a whole, the consecration of a painted church, with its opening psalms, ritual anointing, and prayer, exhibits many points of contact with mediaeval defences of sacred images. The prayer’s succinct statement on the function of images as memorials, and on the rendering of worship only to God, reflects a rich Armenian-language literature. The figure of God as superior to earthly creations and creators also find resonance in mediaeval literature. Finally, themes of vision, and of obedience to God, as pursued in Psalm 118 (119), would have gained particular power when performed during a rite of image consecration. Indeed, one can well imagine how the readings and prayers of the rite would have been dramatised within the church setting: after the night’s vigil, with the replacement of lamps and candles with sunlight, the imagery would have been ever more visible, allowing for the participants to engage in an encounter with the visual representation of God.

This consecration rite, however, is not merely a reflection and institutionalisation of a theological discourse. Indeed, one can argue the contrary: as part


50 James R. Russell’s discussion of Armenian mediaeval imagery in relation to the Old Iranian etymology of Armenian “truth”, ճշմարտութիւն, as that which is “seen by the eye” holds particular relevance to a study of the consecration rite (Russell 1998).

51 Indeed, this theme opens the treatise of Vrt’anēs K’ert’oł (M.H. 2004, 493): “All creatures are decorated by vivifying light.”
of the Maštoc’, it probably informed the development of mediaeval Armenian attitudes towards images as much or more than treatises and ecclesiastical correspondence. For this reason, among others, it deserves the attention of art historians.

From this brief study, however, many questions remain. One would like to know about the practicalities of this rite: how long did one wait after the production of the paintings before consecrating them? What was the drying time of the paintings? How frequently were paintings added to older foundations and under what circumstances, and how was the rite adjusted, if at all? How can this rite help us to understand when and why some churches contain wall painting and others do not? How might we understand the rite in relation to the iconography and architecture of mediaeval Armenian churches in all their diversity? These questions are made more interesting because of the growing corpus of published wall paintings. Comparative questions remain, too: a study of related rites from the Byzantine, Syriac, and Georgian worlds, should be undertaken by a specialist. Finally, how did this rite evolve from its most ancient iterations to the corresponding version in the 1807 Constantinopolitan Maštoc’, or even to that practised today?\(^\text{52}\) It is hoped that successive volumes of

---

\(^{52}\) The modern rite, as preserved in the 1807 Maštoc’ printed in Constantinople, is much longer and more elaborate than the earliest known version, as even its title reflects: “The Blessing and Anointing of a Painted Church and an Icon” (Maštoc’ 1807, 213–215). Like the early version, however, it begins after a night vigil, in the third hour, and proceeds to the psalms 118 (119), 148, and 112. While in the early version, this is followed by the anointment of the church with miwṙon, the episcopal prayer, and the liturgy of the hour, in the 1807 Maštoc’, the psalmody is followed by a proclamation, a long episcopal prayer, and a šarakan: Those created in your image (զՈրսըստպատկերքումստեղծեր) After this comes the anointment along with another prayer, followed by censing and kissing the image, and closing with the Lord’s Prayer. It is interesting to note that where the early rite expressly forbids the worship of the image, the modern rite does not contain this warning but declares instead that the image was made “in honour and worship of the All-Holy Trinity.” The two subsequent prayers make clear, too, the salvific and thaumaturgical properties of the image, “for those who take refuge in the Lord, a guardian of the path, helper to the distressed, healer of the sick, purgatory for the sinful, and encourager to those who doubt.” The rite as it is practised today retains much from the 1837 edition, with some additions. Entitled “The Consecration of a Painted Church and of Images,” it requires the ritual washing of the image with water and wine and then wiping with a clean cloth, all prior to the prayer and anointment; towards the conclusion of the rite, participants are directed to bow down and kiss the image. The distinctions between these three versions of the rite, and the rather significant development in attitudes towards holy images they seem to suggest, are worthy of further exploration. One therefore looks forward particularly to future volumes of the Mayr Maštoc’ in order to study the later mediaeval and printed versions of the rite.
Tēr-Vardanean’s series will help us to understand the development of this ritual and thereby to trace the evolution of attitudes towards images in the Armenian Church.
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