

ISSN 2579-2504

ԱՐԴԻ ՀՈԳԵԲԱՆՈՒԹՅՈՒՆ
ԳԻՏԱԿԱՆ ՀԱՆԴԵՍ

MODERN PSYCHOLOGY
SCIENTIFIC BULLETIN

АКТУАЛЬНАЯ ПСИХОЛОГИЯ
НАУЧНЫЙ ВЕСТНИК

ԵՐԵՎԱՆ 2023, № 1 (12)

THE PSYCHOLOGICAL VIEWS OF THE MEDIEVAL ARMENIAN PHILOSOPHER GRIGOR TATEVATSI

Zakaryan S.A. (Yerevan State University, Yerevan, Armenia),
szakaryan@ysu.am

Received: 24.03.2023

Revised: 27.04.2023

Accepted: 18.05.2023



The article analyzes the psychological views of the famous medieval Armenian theologian-philosopher Saint Grigor Tatevatsi (1346-1409). The purpose of the article is to show the attitude of the Armenian thinker regarding the human nature, the relationship between the soul and the body, the composition of the soul, its types and powers. According to the author, Tatevatsi, as a scholastic thinker, strives to synthesize the theological and philosophical propositions during the discussion of various issues, including those related to the soul. On the one hand, Tatevatsi rejects the Platonic views that identify man with his soul and the materialistic view that represents man as only a body, and on the other hand, the dualistic view that represents man as having two separate natures. Man is a unity of soul and body, and although they are different in their nature, properties and roles, they form single human nature. Although he gives priority to the soul, he believes that a person is perfect with the unity of the soul and the body and the relationship between the soul and the body should be based on the principle of justice. Tatevatsi, opposed to the extreme viewpoints (platonic, ascetic) regarding the valuation of the soul and body, which consider the body as the cause of sin and evil, defends the Aristotelian approach of the unity of the soul and the body, which means the actual recognition of the "rights" of the body and its importance role in the salvation of man.

Key words: *Grigor Tatevatsi, psychology, soul, body, principle of justice, vegetal, sensual and rational parts of the soul, powers of the soul, rational and irrational parts of the soul.*

ПСИХОЛОГИЧЕСКИЕ ВЗГЛЯДЫ СРЕДНЕВЕКОВОГО АРМЯНСКОГО
ФИЛОСОФА ГРИГОРА ТАТЕВАЦИ

Закарян С. А. (Ереванский государственный университет, Ереван, Армения)

В статье анализируются психологические воззрения известного средневекового армянского богослова-философа святого Григора Татеваци (1346-1409). По мнению автора, Татеваци, как мыслитель-схоласт, стремится синтезировать богословские и философские положения при обсуждении различных вопросов, в том числе связанных с душой. С одной стороны, Татеваци отвергает платонический взгляд, отождествляющие человека с его душой, и материалистический взгляд, представляющий человека только как тело, а с другой стороны, дуалистический взгляд, представляющий человека как имеющего две отдельные природы. Человек есть единство души и тела, и хотя они различны по своей природе, свойствам и ролям, но образуют одну единую природу. Хотя Татеваци отдает приоритет душе в ценностном плане, однако считает, что человек совершенен при единстве души и тела, отношения которых должны строиться на принципе справедливости. Армянский мыслитель, выступая против крайних точек зрения (платонических, аскетических) на оценку души и тела, рассматривающих тело как причину греха и зла, отстаивает аристотелевский подход к единству души и тела, который означает фактическое признание «прав» тела и его роли в спасении человека.

Ключевые слова: Григор Татеваци, психология, душа, тело, принцип справедливости, вегетативная, чувственная и разумная части души, силы души, разумная и неразумная части души

ՄԻՋՆԱԴԱՐՅԱՆ ՀԱՅ ՓԻԼԻՍՈՓԱ ԳՐԻԳՈՐ ՏԱԹԵՎԱՑՈՒ ՀՈԳԵԲԱՆԱԿԱՆ ՀԱՅԱՅՔՆԵՐԸ

Ջաբարյան Ս. Ա. (Երևանի պետական համալսարան, Երևան, Հայաստան)

Հոդվածում վերլուծվում են միջնադարյան նշանավոր հայ աստվածաբան-փիլիսոփա Սուրբ Գրիգոր Տաթևացու /1346-1409/ հոգեբանական հայացքները: Հեղինակ կարծիքով՝ Տաթևացին որպես սքոլաստիկ մտածող ընդհանրապես տարբեր, մասնավորապես հոգուն վերաբերող հարցերի քննարկման ժամանակ ձգտում է համադրել կրոնաաստվածաբանական ու փիլիսոփայական դրույթները: Տաթևացին մի կողմից մերժում է մարդուն իր հոգու հետ նույնացնող պլատոնյան և մարդուն միայն մարմին ներկայացնող նյութապաշտական, իսկ մյուս կողմից՝ մարդուն երկու առանձին բնությամբ ներկայացնող դուալիստական տեսակետները:

Մարդը հոգու և մարմնի միասնություն է, և թեև դրանք իրենց բնությամբ, հատկություններով և դերակատարումներով տարբեր են, սակայն կազմում են մեկ միասնական բնություն: Թեև նա արժեքային առումով առավելությունը տալիս է հոգուն, այնուհանդերձ, կարծում է, որ մարդը կատարյալ է հոգու և մարմնի միասնությամբ և հոգու ու մարմնի հարաբերությունը պետք է խարսխված լինի արդարության սկզբունքի վրա: Հայ մտածողը, հակադրվելով հոգու և մարմնի արժևորման հարցում ծայրահեղ տեսակետներին (պլատոնական, ճգնավորական), որոնք մարմինը համարում են մեղքի և չարիքի պատճառ, պաշտպանում է հոգու և մարմնի միասնության արիստոտելյան մոտեցումը, ինչը նշանակում է մարմնի «իրավունքների» փաստացի ճանաչում և մարդու փրկության գործում դրա դերի կարևորում:

Հանգուցային բառեր՝ Գրիգոր Տաթևացի, հոգեբանություն, հոգի, մարմին, արդարության սկզբունք, հոգու բուսական, զգայական և բանական մասեր, հոգու զորություններ, հոգու բանական և անբան մասեր

Saint Grigor Tatevatsi or Grigor of Tatev (1346-1409) is the most prominent figure of the Armenian medieval theological-philosophical thought, and his theoretical legacy is the apogee of medieval Armenian thought, which includes the best traditions of both the Armenian and European scholastic thought of the previous centuries [1; 2]. He was the head of the Tatev University (XIV-XVcc.), which was the leading scientific and cultural centre of the time. Tatevatsi wrote many books: "The Book of Questions", "Vosceporik" ("Book of Golden Content"), Summer and Winter volumes of "Book of Sermons", "Solution to "Introduction" of Porphyry", "Commentary on the philosophy of David", interpretation and analysis of the Old and New Testaments, works of the holy fathers, etc. Some researchers call him "Thomas Aquinas of the Armenians" [3, p. 77].

In the religious-philosophical and anthropological-psychological teaching of St. Grigor Tatevatsi, the questions addressed to the soul and the body occupy a primary place, because as a philosophizing theologian, the problem of saving the human soul is at the center of his thoughts. Like many medieval Armenian thinkers, Tatevatsi's ideas about the soul come from the following sources: a) the Holy Book, b) the works of the church fathers (Basil of Caesarea, Gregory of Nazianzus, Nemesius of Emesa and others), c) ancient philosophy (mainly from the teachings of Plato, Aristotle), d) medieval Armenian philosophers (Davit Anhaght [Invincible], Hovhannes Pluz Yerznkatsi, Hovhan Vorotnetsi) and e) Latin representatives of the unionist movement, followers of the philosophy of Thomas Aquinas (Bartholomeos of Bologna, Petr of Aragon).

The ancient teachings about the soul are especially noteworthy, which, by the way, in addition to translations of some originals of Plato and Aristotle, were briefly described in the encyclopedic book "On The Nature of Man" by Nemesius Of Emesa, translated into Armenian in the VIII century, but mistakenly attributed to Gregory of Nyssa, which was used by the thinkers of Tatev's school. Naturally, Tatevatsi, first, selectively refers to the ancient teachings about the soul, criticizes and rejects from the threshold the materialistic and atheistic ideas that contradict the Christian religion, secondly, he tries to reconcile the acceptable provisions with biblical truths, thirdly, the synthetic spirit of his philosophy he presents thoughts of a psychological nature in the context of the ontological, epistemological, anthropological and especially religio-ethical thought.

Grigor Tatevatsi's psychological views are based on the religious-philosophical idea that human nature is made up of two opposite, radically different entities: the soul and the body, which determines the uniqueness of the human status in the created universe. As a unity of soul and body, man occupies an intermediate position between the heavenly and earthly, knowable and tangible worlds, being the point of their connection. Thanks to the soul, a person communicates with the knowable divine world, and through the body, with the tangible-material world. In fact, man's nature is such that all layers of heavenly and earthly existence are present in him in condensed form. In this sense, man is the most perfect being in the created universe, the most beautiful invention of divine wise creation. God honored man by making him a communicator of "two good natures", because the incorporeal lacks corporeal goodness, and the corporeal lacks immaterial goodness. Man is a unity of two good natures. Man is also perfect in his purposeful structure: body and soul with their parts and members form a harmonious whole. It is true, outwardly, the impression is created (especially among materialists and unbelievers) that a person consists only of the body ("And the substantial body is so heavy on the knowable soul and has overshadowed it that it seems to many that we are only the body" [4, p.13], while man is a unity of invisible soul and visible body. Answering the question of why God created man with a psycho-physical nature, Tatevatsi makes the following arguments: a) the unity of soul and body proves God's power and inadequacy; b) There are two worlds: knowable and sensible. Man should enjoy these two worlds: the knowable world with the soul, the sensible world with the body, c) angels have internal knowledge, animals - external, and man, thanks to his soul and body, has both internal and external knowledge of God and creatures, d) man is a comparative being, the point and destination of all elements and forces of the universe, e) the composition of

man corresponds to the structure of the world, that is, there is a similarity between the Big Universe and the Little Universe. Man knows like angels, is a companion of inanimate beings, grows like plants and feels like animals, his bones are like stones, veins are like rivers and springs, hair is like plants and saplings, his whole head is like the sky, his eyes are like the stars, etc. f) soul and the unity of the body forms the basis for understanding the incarnation of God, for being different natures, they are "united in one person and one nature."

Defending the idea of the duality of human nature, Tatevatsi refuse the point of view that accepts the existence of two separate natures in human. This view not only creates an ontological gap between human body and soul, but also contradicts the idea of a single human nature. Since a person does not identify either his soul or his body, it means that the soul and the body are the components of one unified nature. The soul and the body form a single human nature despite their differences. Thus, on the one hand, Tatevatsi rejects the Platonic views that identify man with his soul, and the materialistic views that represent man only as a body, and on the other hand, the dualistic views that represent man as having two separate natures. He defends the Aristotelian-Thomist approach to the unity of soul and body, which means actual recognition of the "rights" of the body, importance of the role of the physical-natural in human life.

When considering the question of the genealogy of the soul and the body, Tatevatsi notes that there are two opposing views on it in the religious literature. Some accept that the soul was created first, and then the body was created, while others claim that the soul was created after the body. Those who accept the primacy of the soul over the body argue that the knowable things, including the soul, were created first, and then the body. Some of them also follow Plato's theory of the transmigration of the soul, according to which the souls were in a heavenly city, but "those who become lazy crawl down to the earth, covering themselves with a human body." Tatevatsi objects to those who defend this point of view, noting that all things, including the soul and the body, were created at the same time, so it is pointless to look for temporal differences between them. And those who consider the body to be primary over the soul refer to the idea of Moses that at first the Creator took the earth, built a body, and then breathed into it. From this biblical thought, it is clear that the soul is not a property derived from the body, but a gift from God. If the body is considered prior to the soul, then the soul, which has a divine origin, will be honored. In addition, this approach calls into question the power of God, as if He is not able to create human nature all at once. Rejecting the above points

of view, Tatevatsi believes that, firstly, one should not interpret the biblical ideas about soul and body, time literally, secondly, the soul and body are simultaneous entities, which excludes the possibility of soul from body or soul from body.

The soul and the body were created at the same time, but they are independent entities and have opposite, mutually exclusive properties. The soul is an immaterial, immovable, immortal, sovereign and rational entity, while the body is a material, immovable, corruptible, sluggish and tangible entity. As separate entities, the soul is superior to the body, because it is independent and self-sufficient, as befits a true substance. In this sense, the body is a dependent entity and cannot manifest its properties without the soul. Without a soul, the body is a formless substance. This is the Aristotelian point of view regarding the relationship between the soul and the body, which is also supported by Tatevatsi. Apart from that, the body is created from earth and the soul is from God. When it is said that the body is made of earth, it does not mean that it is made up of only one element. Earth also contains the other material elements: air, water and fire, each of which imparts a certain quality to the body. For example, the earth has a natural density, and from what the body got its density. The soil is corruptible, which causes the corruption of the body. The creation of the body from the earth has a symbolic meaning. the earth shows humility. The earthly body forces man to get rid of the destructive sense of pride, to bow before his Creator and to see the various shortcomings of his own nature. The earthen body is filled with life when God breathes spirit into it. According to Tatevatsi, a person inherits his body from his parents, and his soul is from God, but he is not a part of the divine essence. The existence of the soul cannot be connected with providence either, because to provide means "to keep what has been in the same way". Providence causes the existence of the vegetative and sensual parts of the soul, and not of the rational soul, which is not of the parents, but of God. Tatevatsi is trying to find an edge of reconciliation between creation and providence. the vegetative and sensual parts of the soul are by providence, and the rational part by God. And God does not create a new one, nor does he use the old one, but "is in it". "It is not old, that according to each body the soul will be completely created. And not new. so that the same order from the beginning will be effected by the creator without weakness until it is fulfilled, and according to each soul, he will not issue a new order. In this sense, on the one hand, the rational soul is by providence, but not in the sense of being born from the body, but having its own image separately, and on the other hand, it is by creation, "because

according to its existence, the grace of God was given anew to the being of the body [5, p. 258]".

Accepting the idea of the united nature of man, Tatevatsi simultaneously states that in the union of soul and body, each side preserves its properties, that is, there is an "unconfused" union. At the same time, the soul penetrates into all parts of the body and "animates" them, after which a relationship of mutual dependence and influence is formed between the soul and the body. Referring to the naturalistic-physiological aspect of the union of soul and body, Tatevatsi believes that this happens through breath and blood.

Acknowledging that the soul is the form of the body, Tatevatsi is far from the idea that all people have the same form. People differ from each other and resemble each other both in body and soul. In general, corporeal entities are similar because they consist of four elements, and they are dissimilar because the entities in them are separated and individualized. They are similar to each other because they are created by the same Creator and have relations with Him, but they are different from each other because they are "different and separated from the Creator". Like bodies, souls also have similarities and differences. Addressing the question of how the soul will recognize its body in the afterlife, after a person's death, when the body rots and decomposes in the ground, Tatevatsi, firstly, refers to the omnipotence of God, secondly, he talks about some secret sign from above. "For my sign exists in a special way in front of the mixed and incorporeal. and this is my sign, it is inseparable, mixed in the soul and in the body. For even if he separates the soul and dissolves the body, this will not separate the soul. and not dissolved in the body. but there is and remains eternally mixing soul and body from the beginning» [4, p. 618].

If the soul and the body are genealogically equal creations, because they are the product of the same Creator's work, then they differ in their nature, role and significance and, accordingly, receive different honor and evaluation. Following the religious and philosophical point of view spread in the Middle Ages, Tatevatsi believes that the soul is honorable, superior and superior to the body, because it symbolizes the divine in man. The soul is the image of God, and the body is "the image of cattle". "The soul is an image of God, it must be honored as its original type and the body was given a second honor, which is an image of the earth. and such cattle... the soul is the master and the mistress, and the body is the servant and the maid, the body must obey the soul, and the soul must rule the body... the soul must lead. and the back of the body. and so let there be justice in the soul and the body, as God created us"[4, p.130]. Tatevatsi calls this approach the justice of the moral order. If that moral order and relationship is not maintained, that is, when preference is given to the

body, and the soul follows the body, then "let there be injustice in me." Although Tatevatsi gives the advantage to the soul, he believes that the relationship between the soul and the body should be based on the principle of justice. The principle of justice presupposes the acceptance of the existing natural inequality between the soul and the body, which primarily refers to the role functions of the soul and the body given from above. In that work, they are obliged to be helped by the mind and sovereign will, whose task is to establish a balance between the "warring" parties. This is especially true of the mind, which by its very nature is impartial, incorruptible, incorruptible and self-sufficient. A question arises: if ensuring the principle of justice is a God-pleasing act, that is, it is acceptable and exemplary, then how to understand the behavior of ascetic believers, saints and martyrs, when they are consciously engaged in torturing their body and killing their body? Tatevatsi admits that the hermits' behavior does not meet the requirements of the principle of justice, but this does not at all detract from the way of salvation they chose. Since Christ suffered and was crucified for people, so the ascetics strive to repay and become like Christ through self-torture.

Although soul and body live together in a common nature, they are "enemies" of each other. Because of their opposing qualities and aspirations, there is a constant struggle between soul and body in this world, a relentless struggle for dominance and influence. The soul loves heavenly things, virtue, and the body loves earthly goods, food, rest, and pleasures. According to Tatevatsi, no matter how much the soul is superior to the body, a person is perfect with the unity of soul and body. It is true that the body is an enemy of the soul, but being the result of divine creation, it cannot definitely be the embodiment of sin and evil. Not only and not so much the body is guilty of sin, but also the person, with all its parts and members, but first of all the mind or the heart, because "all sin is first sown in thought and then sprouts and grows in action." Moreover, since the most responsible for sins is the mind, which is called to control the parts of the soul and body, to control their extremes, so in order to choose a virtuous lifestyle and prepare for salvation in earthly life, it is necessary to first of all keep the mind away from sins. The body can be a precondition for sin and evil, but never a reason for existence, because it is a managed and managed existence. The body cannot be the cause of evil, sin, as well as good and virtue, because it does not think, therefore, the independent decision-maker is the mind, on which the responsibility for the attitude of both the soul and the body falls. In this sense, although bodily and mental sins are distinguishable, it would be correct to call them psycho-bodily sins, bearing in

mind that at the time of resurrection, the soul and the body will answer for their actions together.

Tatevatsi, being a defender of the "rights" of the body and the corporeal, puts forward the idea that the body, despite its shortcomings, has a positive meaning for the soul and that "the soul will encounter many goodness through unity". Thus: a) the soul serves God with the body and receives the greatest reward, because "where there is a great war, there is also a great victory and a great crown", b) when the soul sins, it repents through the body. If there was no body, then there would be no repentance, and therefore no salvation, c) The body is useful to the soul both in this world and in the world beyond. If during a person's life the body is necessary for repentance, then in the world to come, in order to get together "free life", d) the body is useful for the soul, because with its shortcomings, it is a reason for the humility of a person. A man is proud of his ornaments, wealth, power and beauty, while they are all transitory.

Along with the beneficial properties of the body, there are many dangers associated with the body. Thus: a) the initial sin was transferred to the soul through the body, b) "involuntary sin", that is, the body is easily involved in sins. It is true that the root of sin is in evil counsel, and the flesh is only a doer, yet it has a tendency to sin, c) the flesh becomes lazy and finds it difficult to do good deeds, but it tends to evil and becomes easy with evil, which weighs on the soul of a person like a stone, d) dulls the cognition, "for it is in the body that he simply does not see. let the one who has been seen forget everything", e) it is always opposed to the soul, the flesh is one of the three enemies of the soul (the other two are the world and the devil), f) the spiritual has been abandoned, it is occupied with worldly worries, g) because of the body, the soul endures many trials: sorrow, suffering, tribulation, misery, etc., h) the more the soul is under the influence of the body, the more alienated from God it will be, h) although the soul is a perfect being, it cannot be saved without the body's afterlife, it must wait for the body's resurrection.

Thus, opposing the extreme viewpoints (platonic, ascetic) regarding the valuation of the soul and body, which deny the merits of the body, consider them a cause of sin and evil, ignore the positive significance of the body in getting closer to God, Tatevatsi, without contradicting the Christian understanding of the body, strives to soften the body and the inherent-value opposition between the soul and to emphasize the usefulness of the body in the salvation of the soul and man. As a Christian thinker, he accepts the idea of the incarnation of God and the resurrection of the body. On the Day of Judgment,

the body and the soul must be resurrected together, answer for their earthly deeds together, and receive the corresponding recompense together.

When thinking about the types of soul, Grigor Tatevatsi follows the teachings of both Plato's three-part soul and Aristotle's three types of soul. Following Aristotle, whose point of view was widespread in medieval Armenian philosophy, Tatevatsi distinguishes three types of soul: vegetable (plant), sensual (animal) and rational, which correspond to three forms of being: a) beings that exist for others, (b) beings existing for themselves and for others, and (c) existing only for themselves. According to the sequence, three types of souls correspond to them: imperfect, mediocre and perfect. Plants that are created for animals and humans have an imperfect soul, that is, they exist only for others. Animals that exist for themselves and others (humans) have a soul. Finally, people who are created for themselves have a perfect soul. Just as a person in his nature includes all layers of being, so his soul includes the three known types of soul, which does not mean that a person has three souls. The physical, the sensual, and the rational are not separate souls, but constituent parts or powers of one soul, which together form an indivisible ontological entity; "because man is one existence and one animal. and one soul is one person and one animal." In Tatevatsi's opinion, the fact that the three types of soul exist simultaneously proves that the soul is a unified entity. The physical and the sensual are neither in time nor in nature prior to the rational soul, but only according to class, order and manifestation. First, the natural material has the vitality of the plant, in turn, the plant is part of the sensual, and the sensual part of the rational, and "it is not the most certain of all, because they are one in essence in man, although they are different in action." Tatevatsi notes that although the rational is the first in terms of honor than the nursery and the sensual, and according to order and class the nursery is the first, then the sensual, than the rational, nevertheless, they are "complete in essence". Although the three types of soul exist simultaneously, the rational soul manifests itself later. According to Tatevatsi, there is a correspondence between the composition of matter and the manifestation of soul types. Material is characterized by "formative power", which "first prepares matter for life, and then for sensation. and then in conversation. And especially because nature can't act suddenly, but with a little follow-up, it can go from perfect to perfect "[5, p. 255]. This pattern is characteristic of matter in general, and of the body in particular, but it does not mean that there is some cause-and-effect relationship between soul and matter from the genealogical point of view. Although Tatevatsi connects the manifestation of the soul and species with the process of improvement (maturation, growth, manifestation) of the human

organism, believing that the rational soul is transformed from a possible existence into a real existence, nevertheless, he supports the fundamental idea of the Christian doctrine that the rational soul is granted to man. By God. The "formative power" of matter simply creates the basis for the reception of a more perfect soul. God gives a person a soul, which manifests itself gradually, along with the physical and spiritual maturity of a person. This process is also manifested in the field of education and upbringing. Thus, young people, due to their degree of maturity, master the natural arts sooner than the intellectual arts and wisdom.

Grigor Tatevatsi gives two reasons for the late appearance of the intellectual soul: natural and moral. The natural reason is that nature acts not suddenly, but gradually, moving from the imperfect to the perfect, rising from the lower to the higher. And the moral reason is that after the sin, the order of the parts of the soul was reversed: first the plant and the animal are formed, then the rational.

Tatevatsi, following Armenian philosopher David Anhaght, divides the powers of the soul into two groups: epistemic (theoretical) and animal. The animal powers of the soul are will, choice, inclination, anger and desire. The cognitive powers of the soul are sensation, imagination, reasoning and reason (mind). Some of them are rational, others are irrational. Thought, reasoning, opinion, will and choice are rational, and imagination, sensation, mood, anger and desire are irrational. According to Tatevatsi, cognition and will are the main powers of the soul, and one presupposes the existence of the other. One endowed with intelligence is necessarily a willful being. "And again, because every rational being is self-governing by necessity, because with my intelligence, self-sovereignty is also inherent in me. ... Then, since we are rational, we should be an independent party"[6, p. 425]. Cognitive thought and sovereign will are equal because together they represent the essence of man. They are also equal in that both are the starting point of human activity: the rational is the beginning of variety, and the will is the beginning of practicality. However, this equality does not prevent one from having its advantage over the other. According to Tatevatsi, the epistemic is superior to the will in two respects. First, the mind first learns, then brings what it knows to life. Secondly, knowledge recognizes, chooses good or evil, true or false, while the will has no knowledge and choice, but has only wills. In turn, the will surpasses the epistemic in two cases: first, it guides the person, implements the decision taken by the epistemic, secondly, it prompts the epistemic to see, examine and recognize. Tatevatsi likens the will to a king, and the epistemological to a spiritual judge, which perform different functions.

Although the human soul is unified, its types perform different functions. The domestic soul has three powers: feeding, growth and reproduction, which provide the physiological-biological needs of the body (feeding, growth and reproduction). Sensory and intellectual souls satisfy the needs of a person not only and not so much physiological-physical as spiritual-cognitive nature. There is a division of labor between souls. The rational soul is the master of the "big house", the body, the sensual is the mistress, and the planter is the servant and maid. These three types of soul jointly preserve the body, "the rational soul keeps the body as a spiritual enemy, the sensual soul protects from carnal enemies, and the vegetable satisfies the needs of the body and keep the body"[6, p. 228]. And they dwell "in the house of the body" as long as the body is healthy and whole. When the body gets sick, weakens and grows old, then "they move and come out like that." After death, the plant and the sensuous are separated from the body and leave together with the rational. Although the plant and the sensual are connected with the body, nevertheless, they are "relics of the rational soul that is in us, because it is not separated from the soul." At the time of a person's death, the vegetable first ceases to function, then the sensual, and finally the rational. The most uncontrollable, disobedient type of soul is the plant soul, whose disobedience has an "unconscious" nature, because a person cannot control many physiological actions performed in his body, which "do not listen to us, but act according to their nature". The sensual soul sometimes obeys, and sometimes it rebels, and the powers of the rational soul and will, are mostly obedient to man.

Following Plato Tatevi distinguishes three parts of the soul: volitional, emotional and rational. The lustful soul in a certain sense coincides with the vegetative soul, the fertile soul with the sensuous soul, and the rational soul with the rational soul. Each part of the soul occupies a certain place in the human organism. The mental part of the soul is located in the head, the physical part is in the heart, and the desire part is in the liver. Their graceful arrangement is symbolic. The intellectual soul, which is superior and honorable to others, is "above" and rules over the sensual and the sensual. The main "occupation" of the rational soul is to ponder and communicate its results to other parts of the soul. The task of the tsasmin soul is to make sense of the knowledge received from "above", follow it with courage and become a "punisher-educator".

Each part of the soul has its good/virtuous and evil quality. The virtue of the intellectual part is prudence and wisdom, and the evil quality is callousness and thoughtlessness. Courage and courage are the virtues of the evil soul, and audacity and cowardice are the evil qualities. The virtue of the lustful soul is

prudence and moderation, and the evil quality is lust and extravagance. The virtue of each part of the soul has its manifestation size and limit, which, if violated, turns into its opposite quality, thereby collapsing the harmony and balance of the parts of the soul. In order to preserve the harmony of the soul, the parts of the soul must accept the virtue of justice, which "keeps the balance equal to the average. and don't let it be too much or too little, because both extremes are evil, and the middle is justice and good..." [7,p. 83]. The principle of justice, which is one of the key principles of medieval thinking, is interpreted in this case as a guarantee of maintaining balance between different parts of the soul. Thus, the principle of justice acquires not only ontological and scientific, but also moral meaning and significance. To follow the principle of justice means to avoid the extreme manifestations of the virtuous and evil qualities of the soul and to choose the "golden mean".

Conclusions: Thus, Tatevatsi tries to combine biblical and philosophical traditions when discussing psychological issues. According to Tatevatsi, a person is made up of a soul and a body, and they are equal because God created them at the same time. On the one hand, Tatevatsi rejects the Platonic views that identify man with his soul and the materialistic view that represents man as only a body, and on the other hand, the dualistic view that represents man as having two separate natures. Although Tatevatsi gives the advantage to the soul, he believes that a person is perfect with the unity of the soul and the body and the relationship between the soul and the body should be based on the principle of justice. Tatevatsi defends Plato's and Aristotle's views on the tripartite structure of the soul, emphasizing that a/ the three parts of the soul are not separate souls, but constituent parts or powers of one soul, b/ each part of the soul has its own virtue, if the extent and limit of its manifestation is violated, it turns into its opposite, thereby collapsing the harmony and balance of the parts of the soul. Opposing the extreme viewpoints regarding the valuation of soul and body, which consider the body as the cause of sin and evil, he defends the Aristotelian approach of the unity of soul and body, which means the actual recognition "rights" of the body and its positive role in human salvation. He divides the powers of the soul into two groups: theoretical (sensation, imagination, mind and reason) and animal (will, choice, inclination, anger and desire) of which mind, reason, opinion, will and choice are rational, and imagination, sensation, desire, anger and desire are irrational.

References

1. Arevshatyan C. S. Philosophical views of Grigor Tatevatsi, Yerevan, 1957(in Russian).
2. Zakaryan S. A., Philosophers of Tatev University, Yerevan, 2018, p. 132-237(in Armenian).
3. Krikorian M. K. Grigor of Tatev. A Great Scholastic Theologian and Philosopher (XIVth c.), «Haigazian Armenian review», v. 9, Beirut, 1981.
4. St. Grigor Tatevatsi. Summer volume of "Book of Sermons", Constantinople, 1741, (in Armenian).
5. St. Grigor Tatevatsi. The Book of Questions, Constantinople, 1729, (in Armenian).
6. St. Grigor Tatevatsi. Winter volume of "Book of Sermons", Constantinople, 1740, (in Armenian).
7. St. Grigor Tatevatsi, Commentary on Psalms (brief version), Yerevan, 1993, (in Armenian).

Information about the authors

1. *Seyran Zakaryan – Doctor of Philosophy, Professor, Yerevan State University, Armenia, szakaryan@ysu.am*