

ADDITIONS, INTEGRATIONS, CORRECTIONS AND SUPPLEMENTS
TO THE BIBLIOGRAPHY OF ARNOLD JOSEPH TOYNBEE*

by Teodoro Tagliaferri (University of Naples Federico II)

No. 333
(September 27th, 2023)

Integrations to Part I,
Works by Arnold J. Toynbee

1917

333) *Armenia, its Past and Future*, A Public Lecture delivered by Arnold J. Toynbee (late Fellow of Balliol College, Oxford) at King's College, University of London, May 16th, 1917, the Viscount Bryce, O.M., in the Chair, in «Ararat. A Searchlight on Armenia», IV, 48, June 1917, pp. 545-551 (text below).

NOTE

No. 333 (Item 971 in S.F. Morton's *Bibliography*) was «an abstract» of Toynbee's lecture, being based on notes «taken down at the time of delivery specially for "Ararat"» (see below, p. 2).

«Ararat» was published by the Armenian United Association of London.

The printed version of the lecture included introductory remarks and final comments by James Bryce and Ronald Montagu Burrows (Principal of King's College, 1913-1920).

The publication of the lecture had been announced in «Ararat», IV, 47, May 1917, p. 483, as follows: «In addition [to the celebration of an Armenia's Flag Day, T.T.] described before [*ibid.*], there was delivered on May 16th a Public Lecture by Mr. Arnold Toynbee at King's College, University of London, with Viscount Bryce in the Chair, the subject being *Armenia, its Past and Future*. The lecture was learned and of such intense interest that we shall reserve it for fuller consideration in our next issue. We are indebted to Dr. Burrows, Principal of King's College, for the inclusion of such a lecture in the Syllabus, and also for the sympathetic words with which he began and concluded the proceedings».

* *A Bibliography of Arnold J. Toynbee*, compiled by S. Fiona Morton, with a Foreword by Veronica M. Toynbee, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1980.

ARMENIA, ITS PAST AND FUTURE

Last month we referred to this lecture, and promised to come back to it for fuller consideration. We are now able to give an abstract of it, taken down at the time of delivery specially for «Ararat».

THE CHAIRMAN, in introducing the lecturer, said the subject should be far more studied in Western Europe than it had hitherto been and he would like to pay a tribute to the work which had been done with so much ability by their friend Mr. Toynbee. When it was determined to publish the documents showing with what ruthlessness the Turks had carried out their massacres it was a great piece of good fortune that Mr. Toynbee had consented to go through those documents and produce a succinct record of the facts which the records established. He also enriched the volume with a sketch map of Armenia. He would speak to them with a thorough knowledge of the history of Armenia as well as of recent events.

MR. ARNOLD TOYNBEE said that the greater part of what he knew about Armenia had been learned from Lord Bryce. The subject of his lecture was the history and the future of Armenia. Armenia could only be understood as a part of the Near East, that is, the zone extending from Vienna to Baghdad. The settlement of the Near East was one of the chief issues of the War because one of the causes of the War was the state of unrest there; while Western civilisation had been flowing in a steady stream, things had gone to and fro in the Near East. Most near Eastern nationalities had had no present for 1,500 years, only memories and hopes. You do not find Armenia on the map – this is regarded as a crime by the Ottoman Government! The Turks produced an album of documents to prove that the Turks had been massacred by the Armenians, and they reproduced a map of Armenia about 100 A.D. as a proof of the Armenians' evil intentions. The Russian point of view before the Revolution was not fundamentally different from the Turkish point of view.

There were 2,000,000 Armenians in Turkey, but there will probably be less than half a million Armenians before the end of the War. Those Armenians who survived deportation are just out of reach of our Expeditionary Force, but we may still save the remnant of these. In Russian Caucasia there are another 2,000,000; in Persia a certain number. Armenia is partitioned, like Poland, between three States – Russia, Persia and Turkey. The Armenians are not concentrated at all: they are scattered. In all the Armenian provinces there was not an absolute majority of Armenians; only in some parts of the province of Van were they in an absolute majority. They were scattered far beyond the original national territory of Armenia. In Russia the biggest centre is Tiflis, originally the capital of the Georgian Kingdom, that has now become practically an Armenian city. In Turkey you get isolated groups of Armenian population. One group which lived on the coast of Syria was rescued by the French Fleet. In Armenia proper 80% are peasants, the remaining 20% are the most important element in the Turkish Empire, the professional, commercial, and industrial element in the Northern part of the Empire. You may say that wherever the Greeks are not in Turkey, the Armenians are. In Constantinople there are as many Armenians as Greeks. Roughly, the Greeks carry on the export trade and the Armenians the import trade. «As 90% of the commerce of the interior was done by Armenians the country will be left in a practically helpless state».

The Armenians spread far beyond the limits of Turkey; in Bulgaria, for instance, there are many groups of Armenians. In Venice again, there has been an extremely important Armenian community, the Mekhitarists, a community of monks, Catholics, who have kept Armenian civilisation alive through the worst times of anarchy; also in Lithuania and in Lemberg; they have also crossed the Atlantic – at Fresno in California there is a flourishing colony of Armenian fruit growers; in San Francisco again you will meet Armenians. The Armenian dispersion to India coincides with the establishment of British rule there. A great part of the trade of India is in the hands of Armenians. The Armenians are the next most widely scattered race in the world after the Jews. If you tried to plot out Armenia you would want a map of the world; they extend from California to Singapore. Also if you desired to describe the racial type of the Armenians, it is an extraordinary mixture of types or sociological characteristics you would have to take account of financiers, shop-keepers,

peasants and mountain communities. The types range from the modern financier in Constantinople, Manchester or London to a man living an absolutely self-sufficing life in some canton of Armenia. You find distinguished Russian generals, socialists in Russia or Persia, American business men, Protestant pastors, every type of individual and of social class; and you find every religion. There is a national Church, the Gregorian Church; again there are Protestant Armenians and Catholic Armenians. There are also Turkish-speaking Armenians. The first publication of the American Missionaries was a translation of the Bible into Turkish, but in the Armenian script. The more one understands Armenia the more one understands the Near East. The Near East is really a social and political phenomenon which is very near the heart of the War, a state of passing tendencies which will probably be resolved finally by the War. The War is really being fought as to how people shall live. The Near East is one of the principal arenas of this battle.

What is Armenian Nationality. First one thinks of physical race – the factors by which a naturalist would define an Armenian. There is an extraordinary variety of physical type. You can distinguish a predominant type, brachycephalic or short-headed, with high skull and thick-set body. It has been called the Anatolian or Asia Minor race. You can trace the name of a god; the people of the Kingdom of Ararat (Urartu) worshipped a god called “Khaldis” and they were called the people of Khaldis. There is still an Orthodox Greek Archbishopric of Khaldis. If you look at Egyptian bas-reliefs of the 18th century B.C. you will find types of this character too.

The Armenian language is a distinct variety of the Indo-European family of languages. There is no evidence as to when this language was produced. The people in the Kingdom of Van in the 7th century B.C. had a language which was not Armenian. Modern Armenian was already the literary language of the 5th century A. D. Probably it was introduced about 600 or 700 B.C. by Scythian invaders. The most interesting thing is that the language survived at all. The languages that survive are extraordinarily few as compared with those that become extinct in the struggle. In the 11th century A.D. there was a great movement of Turkish tribes from the centre of Asia right into the Anatolian peninsula. The Greeks had Hellenised the population of Anatolia, but the Armenian language survived Hellenisation and then it survived Turkification. I think the explanation is the national Armenian Church. In most of

the countries of the West of Asia Minor the spread of Hellenisation came before Christianity; in Armenia the order was reversed. Armenia is the first instance of Christianity becoming a State religion, in the second part of the 3rd century.

Christianity has a curious double effect; it seems to be by turns an associative and a differentiating force; first of all associative – it came to Armenia as the prevailing religion of the Roman Empire, that is, of the great organised world of Western civilisation; and when Armenia was converted it was thus brought within the pale of Western civilisation, or associated with a great ancient body of civilization outside itself. But then a new national Armenian script was invented for setting down the language in writing. This new script and the translation of the Bible as the foundation of literature gave rise to a very strong national variety of literature, chiefly theological of course. As well as the theologians, however, there was a great school of Armenian historians beginning in the 5th century A.D. In the 5th century began the separate existence of the Armenian Church (or Gregorian Church, as it was called after St. Gregory, by whom Armenia was converted), but not by the Armenians branching off into any heretical doctrine; it was in a way a passive secession from the Catholic Church rather than an active heresy. By the 6th century you get the Armenian language with its own script and its own translation of the Bible, and the Armenian Church as a national Church; it is one of the first instances of the formation of a National Church as opposed to the Catholic Church. You find parallels in the West. You find that Christianity brought the English and Irish into civilisation; then you find in the Reformation that the Irish nation got their individuality by clinging to Catholic Unity; the English got their individuality by breaking away from Rome. The Irish case is curiously parallel to the case of the Turkish-speaking Armenians. About thirty or forty Years ago the new Primary Education drove out the native Irish language, but their Church kept them Irishmen. To illustrate what I mean about language – if you called a Turkish-speaking Armenian a Christian Turk, it would be as if you talked of an Irish nationalist as a Catholic Englishman. Perhaps nationality is a certain individuality of group on the one side and on the other the consciousness of belonging to a wider civilisation.

In Armenian history there is an oscillation from East to West, and then there is the territorial dispersion of Armenians all over the world. The first landmark is the Kingdom of

Van; this belonged entirely to the East. Its civilisation was drawn from the civilisation focussed in Mesopotamia. After the Scythian invasion the Armenian territories were absorbed by the Persian Empire – again an Oriental military monarchy.

The next landmark is King Tigranes, who welded together the Armenian provinces and made them a united, independent Kingdom. The oscillation between East and West immediately appears in this Kingdom's history. Tigranes was a patron of Greek culture. He also founded a new capital and peopled it with Greeks. He wanted a centre of Greek culture, but his aim did not succeed. Armenia remained an independent Kingdom, but it became a buffer State between Rome and Persia for about five centuries and a half.

The next landmark is King Tiridates, who adopted Christianity towards the end of the third century A.D., a gravitation towards the West. St. Gregory's successors assumed the title of Catholicos or head of the Armenian Church, and the Catholicos has been the ecclesiastical head of the Armenian nation ever since.

This western tendency was countered by the partition of Armenia between the Persian and Roman Empires. There has never been a united independent Armenian Kingdom since A.D. 373. Armenian national culture or civilisation has remained persistently Western and there has been an increasing dispersion of the Armenian nationality all over the world. The Persian State had a State religion, Zoroastrianism; they tried to assimilate the Armenians, but there was an acute resistance and the persecution failed; the Armenians kept their Church.

Then the national individuality of the Armenians comes out again. They developed an extraordinarily far-reaching religious movement; the sect or community called the Paulicians practically anticipated Protestantism; they were persecuted by the Roman Empire and the Greek Orthodox Church, but there is a curious survival in the existence of a heresy called the Bogomil heresy which spread through the southern Slavs to Languedoc, where it produced the Albigenses; and to Bohemia, where it perhaps sowed the seeds of the Hussite movement. You can trace a connection between this and the first Protestant movement of the West European Church.

After five hundred years of subjection, Armenia emerged again politically when the Arab Empire began to fall to pieces in the 9th century A.D. The real effect of this gleam of political independence in the Middle Ages was to bring Armenia into much closer relationship with

Western Europe. The Kingdom of Lesser Armenia was in effect one of the Crusading principalities established at the end of the 11th century; it even took a French dynasty. There was a great secession of Armenians from the Gregorian Church to the Catholic Church; later these Armenians migrated, some to Venice, some to Poland; the Poles planted these Armenians in Lemberg and Lithuania. The Catholic connection is one of the things which kept Armenian nationality alive during the Turkish ascendancy.

The next stage is the rise of the Ottoman Empire. The Empire was organised by Mohammed the Conqueror of Constantinople in 1453. He organised the subject nationalities in an interesting way, into "Millets" or ecclesiastical corporations – there was a patriarch resident in Constantinople, and he not only had the ecclesiastical government of Armenia in his hands, but a great deal of the administration of social law was entrusted to the patriarch. That lasted to the middle of the 19th century. It was a period of recuperation for the Armenians.

Then we come to the last century, when that great fermentation began in the near East which is, I believe, going to end its suspension between between East and West and finally settle its destiny. The two forces in Turkey were centralisation and the secession of various nationalities who broke off. Secession began with Greece and ended with the last Balkan War. The other tendency was the centralisation of government in what remained of Turkey. The Balkan nationalities formed compact nationalities which could break off from the Turkish body, but the Armenians were scattered. If Turkey in Asia survived by reform, the Armenians would be one of the most important commercial and economic elements.

Just then the first American Missions started in Turkey. You cannot exaggerate the work they have done in the Near East. The statistics of their work in education, in hospitals, in the foundation of native Churches are amazing. The most significant feature of their work is that when the Gregorian Church was re-organised, the Gregorian patriarch invited the Protestants to send delegates to the national assembly. It is quite exceptional that a national Church should invite members of the nation who had formed Protestant communities, that they should be reconciled to and work with them; it speaks volumes not only for the Americans but for the Armenians themselves. As to what the future of the Armenians was to be in a reformed Turkey, I will quote the German publicist Rohrbach, who considered that

the Armenians were the force to be counted on to increase German interests and German Kultur in Turkey; yet in a short time the Germans were looking on at their extermination.

The blame lies wholly with the Turkish Government. Before the Revolution of 1908 the Committee of Union and Progress had its quarters at Paris in exile, and had worked there with the Armenian Revolutionary Society Dashnaktzagan; when the revolution came off, both the Committee of Union and Progress and the Armenian Revolutionists became constitutional parliamentary organisations and worked together in the Turkish Parliament. In 1909, when there was a reaction against the Young Turks, many were given protection by their Armenian friends; the same men who afterwards had the Armenians murdered in cold blood! In conclusion I will quote from a German authority a resolution passed by the Young Turk Congress in 1911 to the effect that «The formation of new parties must be suppressed, Turkey must become a really Mohammedan country and Moslem ideas must be predominant; the existence of the Empire depends on the suppression of Liberal ideas [...] Other nationalities must be denied the right of organization». «You cannot», the German comments, «become a merchant by murdering one – you do not advance the progress of civilisation if you drive into the desert the element in your population which shows the greatest progressiveness in education and which was fitted by nature to be the bridge between East and West».

The blow aimed at Armenia by the Turks failed, and I believe the Armenians have a great part to play in the future of the Near East – may that future be happier than in the past.

THE CHAIRMAN: The influence which has worked against the Christian peoples of the East has been the policy of the so-called Christian nations of Europe. In the first place the nations of Europe, for what they supposed to be their own interests, maintained the Turkish Empire when it ought to have died – as it would have died if it had not been for the efforts some Western nations of Europe endeavoured to put forward to prop it up when it had no more vitality of its own. One of the greatest misfortunes has been the advantage given to tyrannical governments by the modern growth of artillery. The Turks would never have been able to provide themselves with rifles if they had not been able to borrow money in European countries; and being able to provide themselves with these munitions of war, they had an

unjustifiable advantage over their subjects. On the other hand, the influence for good has been that of the American Missions; they are the people who have really done good to the Eastern Christians. They have even done good to the Turks them-selves, who have sometimes sent their children to the Christian schools. There have been some good Turks, even Governors, who refused to carry out the orders to massacre which came from Constantinople. We all hope that no Turkish Government will ever again be allowed to rule over and massacre its Christian subjects.

DR. BURROWS, the Principal of King's College, seconded, and said that it was a very happy thing for Armenia that America had come into the War. In America they knew much more about Armenia than we did, owing to the American Missions. It was by such lectures as we had just heard that the knowledge of Armenia would extend to this country as well, and he hoped and fully anticipated that the London University would before long include Armenian language and literature, which were well worth studying, among the optional subjects of its curriculum.