

Valentina Calzolari

The Transmission and Reception of the Greek Cultural Heritage in Late Antique Armenia: The Armenian Translations of the Greek Neoplatonic Works*

Abstract: This paper deals with the ancient Armenian translations of Greek philosophical texts (esp. the Neoplatonic corpus). Before focusing on this topic, a broad overview on the presence of Armenian students in the Greek schools in Late Antiquity will be presented, followed by a survey of the Armenian translations issued from the so-called “Hellenizing school”, through which the works necessary for learning the disciplines (*artes*) of the *trivium* (grammar, rhetoric, and dialectic) were introduced into Armenia. The core of this article will deal with the Neoplatonist heritage and the *translatio studiorum* in Armenia, with special emphasis on the Armenian translations of the Greek commentaries of the Neoplatonic philosopher David, who was called the “Invincible” in the Armenian tradition. The second part of the paper will pay particular attention to some methodological criteria that should be followed while studying such works in Greek and in Armenian. After some information on the approach of Classical philologists to the Armenian translations from Greek, the importance of cross-comparison and of an interdisciplinary investigation will be stressed in conclusion.

Over the centuries, Armenia played an important role in the preservation and transmission of the Greek cultural heritage. The old centres of translation of Late Antique Armenia as well as the *scriptoria* and libraries attached to the monastic schools of medieval Armenia contributed significantly to the diffusion of the Greek texts. These texts were first studied directly in Greek at the schools where they were used as textbooks, and later translated into Armenian, thus contributing to

* This paper was presented as a webcast lecture to the Genoa workshop from the Department of Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations at Harvard, which hosted me during the academic year 2013–2014 as a visiting scholar. I wish to express warm thanks to professor David Elmer and professor Gregory Nagy, who both helped me to organise this webcast lecture. Special thanks also to Ms Elizabeth DeLozier (Harvard University Network Services Group) for her perfect technical assistance and to the IT staff at the University of Genoa.

the formation of a distinctive Armenian *cursus studiorum*. While the first translations of Greek writings, in the first half of the fifth century, were concerned with religious works, by the end of the fifth century Armenian translators turned their interests towards secular works as well. These latter works were called *artak'in* in Armenian, i.e. “external”, a noun equivalent to a Greek expression (οἱ ἔξωθεν, “those of outside”, ἡ ἔξωθεν, “the [*paideusis*] of outside”) already used by Paul¹ and by the Church Fathers to refer to pagan authors or texts. Familiarity with Greek authors “of outside”, however, goes back to a more ancient time. As early as the fourth century, some Greek sources provide information on the presence of Armenian students in the most prestigious schools of Antiquity: Athens, Antioch, and later Alexandria, Byzantium, and Trebizond.

Before introducing and discussing the ancient Armenian translations of Greek philosophical texts, which is the topic of this paper, a broad overview of the presence of Armenian students in the Greek schools will be first given. This will be followed by a survey of the Armenian translations composed by the so-called “Hellenizing school”, with emphasis on the philosophical works. The second part of the paper will pay particular attention to methodological criteria that should be followed while studying such works, in Greek and in Armenian, focusing above all on the Armenian translations of the Greek commentaries by the Neoplatonic philosopher David, who was called the “Invincible” in the Armenian tradition². The importance of a multilateral approach and an interdisciplinary investigation will be stressed in the conclusion of the paper.

1 Armenian students in the Greek schools of rhetoric of Athens and Antioch

1.1 Athens

In the fourth century, the school of rhetoric of Athens was an international centre. In this respect, Paul Gallay wrote:

¹ 1 *Tim.* 3.7.

² On this topic, see also my previous articles Calzolari 2005; Calzolari 2007; Calzolari 2009a; Calzolari 2009b; Calzolari 2012; Calzolari 2014, from which I drew some information and considerations incorporated in this paper.

Au point de vue de l'enseignement, Athènes gardait un prestige incontesté ; par ses écoles, elle était encore la demeure de l'éloquence. Pour appartenir à l'élite des gens cultivés, il fallait presque nécessairement avoir passé par Athènes³.

Among the learned people who received an education at the desks of the School of Athens, one may recall the Armenian Prohaeresius (276–369), an important figure often mentioned in the context of the cultural contacts between the Greek and Armenian world, and concerning whom we are informed in particular by Eunapius of Sardis⁴. In his *Lives of the Sophists* (Βίοι φιλοσόφων καὶ σοφιστῶν)⁵ Eunapius relates that Prohaeresius was of Armenian origin; after studying first at Antioch under the professor of rhetoric Ulpian, Prohaeresius distinguished himself as one of the most brilliant students at the Athens school of rhetoric, where he later became a professor. As he came from the East, the students from Pontus and Asia Minor were assigned to his class.

In Athens, Prohaeresius' most famous pupils included Gregory of Nazianzus and Basil of Caesarea, as well as Eunapius himself⁶. Basil mentioned Prohaeresius as a professor⁷, while Gregory of Nazianzus wrote an epitaphium in honour of his master⁸. Eunapius also mentions a journey by Prohaeresius to Rome, where he was honoured with a statue bearing an inscription that read Η ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΟΥΣΑ ΡΩΜΗ ΤΟΝ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΟΝΤΑ ΤΩΝ ΛΟΓΩΝ “Rome, the Queen, to the King of Eloquence”⁹.

Several other sources contain a reference to the activity of Prohaeresius; some are interesting not only for the reconstruction of his biography, but also as evidence concerning the presence of Armenian students in Athens. Additional information on Prohaeresius and more generally on Armenian students attending Greek schools in the fourth century is also provided by Socrates, Sozomenus¹⁰, and other Greek authors.

In an encomium in honour of Basil, written after his death, Gregory stressed that Basil was a brilliant student at the time of his attendance at the School of Athens, far outshining the others in his class, to the point of raising the jealousy

³ Gallay 1943, 37–38.

⁴ On Prohaeresius, see Goulet 2000; Watts 2006; Di Branco 2011, especially on the question of his faith, Christian or pagan, and of his banishment from Athens for a while.

⁵ LCL 134, 476–514.

⁶ See Socrates, *Hist. eccl.* 4.26, Sozomenus, *Hist. eccl.* 6.17; see also the following footnotes.

⁷ PG 29.23.

⁸ Gregory of Nazianzus, *Epit.* 5 (PG 38.15).

⁹ See also Gregory of Nazianzus, *Epit.* 5 13A (PG 38.15); Libanius, *Ep.* 278.

¹⁰ See *supra*, n. 6.

of some classmates, and especially of some Armenian students¹¹. In a Letter¹², Gregory relates that at the beginning of his stay in Athens (350–355/6), some Armenians, former pupils of the father of Basil, Basil the Older, in Neocaesarea, approached the future Father of the Church and began a discussion aiming at testing Basil's talent. Their real aim was to make him fail, but they were shamefully defeated by his expertise in using the weapon of syllogisms and Homeric quotations. But regardless of this negative judgment, which may have been real or exaggerated¹³, the mention of Armenian students at the School of Athens is an interesting piece of evidence for our purposes.

The renown of the school of Athens in Armenia was so great that the Armenian medieval sources established a close connection between two founding figures of Armenian thought, namely David the Invincible and the historian Moses of Khoren – both considered as fifth century authors¹⁴ –, attributing to them a common sojourn in this Greek school, where, moreover, they are depicted classmates of Gregory and Basil (fourth century). This information cannot be possible for obvious chronological reasons.

1.2 Antioch

Still in the fourth century, other Armenians attended the school of rhetoric directed by Libanius in Antioch, which was a deeply Hellenized Syrian city. In his numerous letters, Libanius mentions several pupils of Armenian origin. Paul Petit underlined this statement with the following words:

De toutes les provinces orientales, c'est l'Arménie qui fournit à Libanius son plus important contingent avec ses 20 ressortissants, et c'est vraiment étonnant. D'autre part, s'il y a parmi eux quelques chrétiens [4/5], ils appartiennent tous à des familles curiales, ceux du moins – ils sont 11 – sur lesquels nous sommes suffisamment renseignés¹⁵.

11 Gregory of Nazianzus, *Or.* 43.17 (*PG* 36.517 = *SC* 384.43 17) (*Funerary encomium of Basil*). See also n. 13.

12 Gregory of Nazianzus, *epist.* 43.17.

13 Some possible personal reasons explaining this sharp judgment were given by Bernardi 1984, 352–359.

14 While the chronology of Moses is still debated (see for instance Traina 1991, for a dating in the fifth century, and Garsoïan 2003–2004 for a later chronology), it is accepted that David, a supposed author of the first half of the fifth century according to the medieval tradition, was a later author, living in the sixth century (see above).

15 Petit 1956, 132–135.

The students probably came from Armenia Minor, i.e. Western Armenia, which was under Roman influence, and not from Greater Armenia. Nevertheless, this information is noteworthy.

1.3 Alexandria, Trebizond and Constantinople

Later, around the sixth century, Armenian students attended the Neoplatonic school of Alexandria, on which we will focus below. In the seventh century, Anania Širakac'i, who introduced the arts of the *quadrivium* to Armenia, was a pupil of the Greek Tychikos at the school in Trebizond, to which Anania had travelled in order to study above all mathematics and philosophy. As he explained in his autobiography¹⁶, on his way “to the country of the Greeks”, he met several other Armenians coming from Byzantium, who dissuaded him from going to the capital, and recommended he should rather go to Trebizond, in order to attend the classes of Tychikos, a Byzantine doctor who lived in Armenia and knew Armenian¹⁷.

With regard to the Armenian presence in Byzantium, we may also mention that in the eighth century, Step'annos Siwnec'i went to the capital, where he met a number of Armenians who introduced him to the library of the Hagia Sophia and worked together with him on the translation of pseudo-Dionysus the Areopagite¹⁸.

2 The influence of Greek thought in Armenian native literature: the example of Eznik

By attending Greek schools, Armenians gained familiarity with the textbooks used in these centres, and began to translate them. This period of Armenian literature is generally called “Hellenizing School” (in Armenian, *Yunaban Dproc'*)¹⁹, where the use of the term “school” aims at indicating the main common – or supposed common – translation technique and vocabulary of the translations dating from this epoch, more than a localisation or the name of some teachers, which remains mostly unknown.

¹⁶ Berbérian 1964.

¹⁷ On Tychikos, see Lemerle 1964.

¹⁸ On an Armenian presence in Byzantium, see also Terian 1982.

¹⁹ On the Hellenizing School, see Manandean 1928; Mercier 1978–1979; Terian 1982; Calzolari 1989; Zekiyan 1997; Muradyan 2014.

Before focusing attention on this period of Armenian literature, and above all on the translations of the philosophical works, certain aspects should be underlined. Philosophical literature in the Armenian language includes both works in translation and works written directly in Armenian²⁰. A survey of the development of philosophical literature in Armenia and generally speaking of the influence of Greek thought should also take into consideration Armenian works that are not specifically philosophical, but which may presuppose traces of the influence of Greek philosophy. Too often the question of the knowledge of Greek sources by the Armenian authors is viewed only in terms of the existence or absence of Armenian translations. This is an argument *ex silentio*, which in itself is not determinant; moreover, the Armenian writers could read Greek sources directly in Greek. Consequently, even in the absence of Armenian translations, or with regard to the period before some of the sources were actually translated, it is legitimate to ask whether any of the Greek texts were actually known and whether they influenced Armenian literature. The corpus of Armenian texts is more difficult to define, but it is nevertheless important for an understanding of the conditions in which Greek philosophical thought spread in Armenia.

One such example is the theological treatise by Eznik *Against Sects* [*End or Etc alandoc*], from the classical age of Armenian literature (first half of the fifth century)²¹. One section of this treatise is directed against “outside” (*artak’in*) philosophers, that is to say, the pagan philosophers, and more specifically the Pythagoreans, Peripatetics, Stoics, and Epicureans. Eznik’s refutation is aimed particularly against Plato who, in Eznik’s assessment, “appeared to the Greeks as the most pious of all philosophers,” but who, more than any other, fell into impiety (§ 357). Eznik contended that Greek philosophers were to be reproached for failing to distinguish the Creator from the creature; they also wrongly supposed, like the Persian dualists and the heretic Marcion, the existence of a source of evil independent from God, the Hylē. Although Eznik provides information on the philosophical currents mentioned above, excerpts from his treatise on the Greek philosophers appear to rely heavily on Greek patristic sources such as the *Anakephalaiosis*, included in the *Panarion* by Epiphanius of Salamis († 403)²² and the *De Universo* by Hypopolitus of Rome (third century). It cannot be established with certainty whether the Armenian author had direct knowledge of

²⁰ This chapter does not seek to give exhaustive bibliographical references on the subject, but rather to provide a critical overview of the history of research. For additional bibliographic information, consult Thomson 1995 and Thomson 2007. On the works from the Hellenizing School, see also Zuckerman 2001.

²¹ See also the contribution by A. Orengo, in this volume.

²² Orengo 1996, 17–19.

the philosophical works that he refutes. Nevertheless, it is clear that Eznik's mode of development of arguments in his treatise seems to be inspired largely by Greek philosophy, if not directly by Aristotelian logic; this is one area of research that deserves to be examined further²³. In his works, we find for the first time in Armenian literature certain ideas that were widespread in the ancient world, such as the theory of the four elements (earth, air, fire, water), or lamps that revolve around fixed paths, returning each day to mark the passage of time.

The reception of philosophy and more generally of Greek thought in ancient Armenian historiography is thus an area for further research²⁴. The influence of Neo-Platonism on medieval poetry, for example, on Gregory of Narek²⁵ and on later poets, is also a major field that demands investigation.

3 Translations of Greek works at the time of the Hellenizing School

The diffusion of Greek philosophical literature in ancient Armenia was closely linked to the activity of translators from the Hellenizing School, which developed from the late fifth and early sixth century to the eighth. Through the activity of these translators, the works necessary for learning the disciplines (*artes*) of the first cycle of the encyclopaedic cursus – the *trivium* (grammar, rhetoric, and dialectics) – were introduced into Armenia. Among the first works translated into Armenian during this epoch is the *Grammar* attributed to Dionysios Thrax (second century BC)²⁶. Another noteworthy translation is the Armenian version of the first century AD rhetorician Aelius Theon's *Progymnasmata* (preliminary exercises for the study of rhetoric)²⁷, as well as the *Book of Chreias* (in Armenian *Girk' Pitoyic'*), which is a Christianized edition of Aphthonius of Antioch's *Progymnasmata* (fourth–fifth centuries AD)²⁸.

²³ Contin 2005.

²⁴ Stepanyan 2009.

²⁵ Tamrazyan 2004; see also Calzolari 2014, 388 and n. 2. Attention should likewise be devoted to the influence of philosophical thought on the Church Fathers or theologians translated into Armenian, such as Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite and Gregory of Nyssa. See among others, La Porta 2007; La Porta 2008; Thomson 1987; Vardanyan 2008.

²⁶ Adontz 1970; Sgarbi 1991; Clackson 1995; Weitenberg 2001; Sgarbi 2004. In the following centuries, the *Grammar* became the object of several Armenian commentaries: Adontz 1970; Ervine 1995.

²⁷ Patillon 1997, with an introduction to the Armenian translation by G. Bolognesi.

²⁸ Muradyan 1993.

The introduction of the third liberal art, namely dialectics and more generally, philosophy, was largely due to translations of the writings of Aristotle and Porphyry, as well as the commentaries by David on Aristotle and Porphyry. In addition to these works, the philosophical corpus that was created thanks to the translations of the Hellenizing School also included pseudo-Aristotle's *De Mundo* and *De Virtutibus*, some writings of the *Corpus Hermeticum*, a collection of the *Definitions*, the treatise *De Natura* attributed to Zeno²⁹, and several works of Philo of Alexandria or of the pseudo-Philo³⁰. Still open is the question of the dating of different versions of Plato's dialogues (*Euthyphro*, *Apology of Socrates*, *Minos*, *Laws*, *Timaeus*). According to some scholars, they were probably written by the translators of the Hellenizing School³¹, whereas other philologists believe they were the result of the work of Grigor Magistros, in the tenth and eleventh centuries³². The corpus of Greek philosophical writings translated into Armenian also included Proclus' *Elements of Theology*. However, this work was not translated until in the Middle Ages, by Simēon Gaṛnec'i, from an older Georgian version, rather than from the Greek text.

4 The Neoplatonist heritage in Armenia and the *translatio studiorum*

A large part of the corpus of philosophical texts reveals the debt that Armenian philosophical speculation owes in particular to the Neoplatonic schools of Alexandria. This is an important feature from the point of view of the transmission of the Neoplatonist Greek heritage outside the centres of production.

The question of the *translatio studiorum* is usually invoked to describe the transfer of the scholarly centres that followed the closing of the last philosophical school directed by pagans – the Neoplatonic school of Athens –, under the order

²⁹ A non-exhaustive list. On the translation of the philosophical works into Armenian, see Zuckerman 2001. See also Mahé 1998; Stone/Shirinian 2000, 7–15. There are also several manuscripts preserved in the Library of Ancient Manuscripts in Erevan (Matenadaran) that contain works still unedited and unidentified: see Stone/Shirinian 2000, 11–12, and nn. 40–42. Knowledge on the Armenian ancient philosophical corpus thus remains incomplete.

³⁰ *Quaestiones et Solutiones in Genesim et in Exodum*, *De Providentia* I-II, *De Animalibus*, *Legum Allegoriae* I-II, *De Abrahamo*, *De Vita Contemplativa*; Ps.-Philo, *De Jona*, *De Sampson*: bibliography by Terian 2001; see also Mancini Lombardi/Pontani 2010.

³¹ Arevšatyan 1971.

³² Leroy 1935. Recent studies in this direction have been carried out by Dr. Irene Tinti: see also her contribution, in this volume.

of the emperor Justinian, in 529. The *translatio* then took the direction of the Sassanid Empire at the time of the king Husrō I Anušīrvān (531–579). According to the testimony of the Byzantine historian Agathias (536–582), the Iranian king is said to have offered hospitality to the philosophers banished from Athens, among whom one may mention Simplicius and Damascius³³. The *translatio* took various paths. One well-known route is the Syro-Arab path, which led from Alexandria to Baghdad, after the closing of the Alexandrian school in the seventh century. This path took a Western direction, crossing through Cordoba and Toledo. At the same time, the “Libraries of the Neoplatonists”³⁴ also circulated in Armenia. As of the sixth and the seventh century, the activity of the translators shows a close link with the curricula of the ancient Neoplatonic schools of Athens and Alexandria, and especially with the Aristotelian curriculum (see also *infra*).

5 Similarities between the Aristotelian cursus of the Neoplatonic schools and the corpus of Armenian translations of the philosophical works

The *syllabus* of the Neoplatonic schools is known to have been organized around the two main lines of the Aristotelian and Platonic cursus, where the first was considered as an introductory phase necessary to approach the second. Both the curricula were structured in a precise order proceeding from the supposed easiest to the most difficult texts. Each commentary was preceded by an introduction organized around a pre-defined series of discussion points, which had the function of orienting the reading of the texts³⁵.

Study of Aristotle began with a general introduction to philosophy, in which four questions of Aristotelian inspiration³⁶ were raised and solved on the grounds of the definitions given by the ancient philosophers (Pythagoras, Plato, and Aristotle himself):

³³ According to a hypothesis put forward by Michel Tardieu, these philosophers settled in the city of Hârran (unless these two transfers constitute a single transfer), where they apparently opened a new school: Tardieu 1986, 1–44. But this hypothesis is not unanimously shared. On this question, see also Hadot 2014.

³⁴ See D’Ancona 2007.

³⁵ Hadot 1997, 173; see also Wildberg 1990; Mansfeld 1994; Mansfeld 1998.

³⁶ See Arist. *An. post.* 2.89b 23; Barnes 1994², 203–204; Hadot 1987, 100 n. 1.

Does philosophy exist? (εἰ ἔστι)

What is philosophy? (τί ἐστὶ)

What is it like? (ὁποῖόν τί ἐστι)

Why does it exist? (διὰ τί ἐστι)

The introduction also addressed the question of the different parts of philosophy – theoretical and practical –, with their subdivisions³⁷. This is the structure of the *Prolegomena to Philosophy*, i.e. the first work of the curriculum. Study of Aristotle then continued with the introduction *par excellence* to Aristotelian logic, i.e. Porphyry's *Isagoge* (third century), along with a commentary on the same text. After students had learned the *Isagoge*, they were considered ready to face the reading of the works of Aristotle, and in particular the *Categories*, the *De Interpretatione*, and the *Prior Analytics* (in this order). All these works were read and explained pericope after pericope, following the procedure of the so-called “continuous commentary” genre, which was the most common literary form of teaching philosophy, in Late Antiquity, and which survived the decline of the Neoplatonic schools³⁸.

A comparison between the Aristotelian *syllabus* and the corpus of Armenian translations made by the Hellenizing School allows many possible connections to be identified³⁹. Thus the philosophical works translated into Armenian include Aristotle's *Categories* and *De Interpretatione*⁴⁰, Porphyry's *Isagoge*⁴¹, David's commentaries on *Isagoge*, *Categories*, and *Prior Analytics*, as well as his *Prolegomena to Philosophy*. The same corpus also comprised two anonymous Armenian commentaries on the *Categories* and *De Interpretatione* attributed to David, mentioned above⁴², as well as a third *Commentary on the Categories* which is fragmentary and anonymous⁴³. These parallels may be considered as evidence of the contacts between Armenians and the Neoplatonic Greek schools. If the compar-

³⁷ Hadot 1979.

³⁸ Hoffmann 2007; Hadot 1997, 169.

³⁹ A different case is that of the Platonic *syllabus*, which is distinct from the Platonic corpus of the Armenian translations. The only parallel is offered by the *Timaeus*, which was very popular in the Late Antiquity.

⁴⁰ On the Armenian translations of the writings of Aristotle, see Tessier 1979; Bodéüs 2001, CLVII–CLXI; Tessier 2001; mention should also be made, despite its early date of publication, of Conybeare 1892. For other bibliographical references, see Thomson 1995, 35–36; Zuckerman 2001, 427–428; Thomson 2007, 170.

⁴¹ Sgarbi 1972.

⁴² Attributed in the manuscripts to a certain “Amelawxoy”, or “Amelaxos”, a noun in which some scholars have read a deformation of Greek Ἰάμβλιχος. On this topic, see Mahé 1989, who challenges this hypothesis.

⁴³ Shirinian 2009, 101–102.

ison is extended to encompass the Syriac philosophical collection created in the same centuries, then further interesting considerations arise: for instance, the Syriac corpus also features the translations of Porphyry's *Isagoge*, Aristotle's *De Interpretatione* and the *Prior Analytics*, as well as of some treatises attributed to Aristotle:

Aristotle's *Categories* (three translations, sixth–seventh centuries)

Aristotle's *De Interpretatione* (two translations, sixth–seventh centuries)

Aristotle's *Prior Analytics* (two translations, seventh century)

Porphyry's *Isagoge* (two translations, sixth–seventh centuries)

See also:

Ps.-Aristotle's *De Mundo* (sixth century)

Ps.-Aristotle's *De Virtutibus* (sixth century)

Beside the translations, the Syriac corpus contains several commentaries on Aristotle's *Categories*, *De Interpretatione*, and *Prior Analytics* as well as on Porphyry's *Isagoge*⁴⁴. The comparison with the Armenian renderings is interesting in various respects. The many correspondences that can be detected between the Armenian and Syriac corpora can be regarded as evidence for the circulation of an ensemble of works in common between the two oriental areas in the same epoch (sixth–eighth centuries)⁴⁵.

In the Syriac tradition, the names and personalities of many translators and commentators are known. In this respect, mention should be made at least of Sergius of Reshaina, Paul the Persian, Jacob of Edessa, Probus, Athanasius of Balad, Severus Sebokt, and George, bishop of the Arabs. In contrast, the transmission of Neoplatonic philosophy in Armenia is closely connected to only one figure, David the Invincible.

6 David the Invincible and his works in Greek and in Armenian

According to the majority of modern scholars, David studied at the Neoplatonic school of Alexandria at the time of Olympiodorus (still alive in 565) and Elias (sixth century). His Armenian origin, claimed by the Armenian medieval sources, is

⁴⁴ On the Syriac corpus, see Hugonnard-Roche 2007; Hugonnard-Roche 2009. The Syriac corpus does not include, for that period, any translation of Plato.

⁴⁵ On the circulation of the Neoplatonic libraries, see D'Ancona 2007.

not unlikely, even if it cannot be proved⁴⁶. David may have been one of the numerous Armenian students who studied in the Greek schools in Late Antiquity. Like the Armenian sophist Prohaeresius did about two centuries before, David obtained a chair and pursued his commentatorial activity at the same school where he had formerly been a student.

It is important to bear in mind that it is only on the basis of intertextual parallels and similarities concerning the content and the structure, shared by the Greek commentaries attributed to David and some other commentaries of the Alexandrian school, that David may be presumed to have belonged to the Ammonius – Olympiodorus – Elias line⁴⁷. No other information on David's life can be found in the Greek tradition⁴⁸, whereas the Armenian tradition, especially in the Middle Ages, is overflowing with biographical details, very often contradictory or legendary⁴⁹. Among many other details, in addition to the translation of his own commentaries on Aristotelian logic (see *infra*) the tradition further attributes to David the translation of Dionysius Thrax' *Grammar*, and of the works of Aristotle and Porphyry. By virtue of this attribution, David can be seen as one of the central figures of the Hellenizing School, and was instrumental introducing the arts of *trivium* to Armenia.

Today, a corpus of three works is generally attributed to David, in Greek and Armenian: the *Prolegomena*, the *Commentary on the Isagoge*, and the *Commentary on the Categories*, although with reservations by some scholars regarding the authorship of the latter⁵⁰. To these is added a fourth work, the *Commentary on the Prior Analytics*, attested only in Armenian, unless we recognize its model in the fragmentary Greek text of the *Commentary on Prior Analytics* by Elias, identified by Leendert Westerink in the 1960s⁵¹.

As an epigone of the school of Alexandria, in the sixth century, David stands on the shoulders of a long tradition. An in-depth understanding of his works not only in Greek, but also in Armenian, can be achieved only by taking into due consideration the links with the prior Greek tradition. This is an aspect often neglected by Armenian scholars in the past. Thanks to the investigations of

⁴⁶ On David's life, see Thomson 1983; Mahé 1986; Calzolari 2009a.

⁴⁷ Westerink 1990, XXXVII.

⁴⁸ On David in the Greek tradition, see Barnes 2009.

⁴⁹ This topic has already been discussed in Calzolari 2009a. See also Arevšatyan 1981; Kendall/Thomson 1983, XI-XXI; Mahé 1990; Mahé 1997.

⁵⁰ The question is summarized in Calzolari 2009a, 29–33; see also Mahé 1990, which summarizes the main points of Arevšatyan 1969.

⁵¹ Westerink 1961. The question is debated: Papazian 2009; Sweeting 2009; Topchyan 2009; Topchyan 2010.

modern historians of ancient Greek philosophy, today we know the main characteristics of the Neoplatonic commentaries and in particular of the *Prolegomena*⁵². We know, for instance, that these commentaries were highly stereotyped in structure and content, as well as in the choice of questions, examples, and style of argument. David's Greek works followed the same patterns⁵³.

If David inherited and continued a long tradition in Greek, the Armenian translator, or translators, whoever he or they may have been, undertook a pioneering task in Armenia, where the study of Aristotelian logic was only at its beginning. This situation, specific to the Armenian tradition, as well as the distance of the centres of translation from the centres of Greek production, allowed the translator, or translators, to enjoy a certain freedom from the more stereotypical aspects of the Greek tradition. The differences between the Greek and the Armenian texts represent important features to understand how the Greek heritage was transmitted outside its *milieu* of production.

All these considerations lead to a general question: what is the correct methodology for evaluating the divergences of the Armenian texts from their Greek models? That is to say, what is the right approach to follow while studying the Armenian translations of the Greek Neoplatonic commentaries?

7 Methodological considerations concerning the study of the Armenian and Greek works

Several avenues of investigation may be suggested. First of all, a correct enquiry into the differences between the Armenian and the Greek texts presupposes a general study of the method of translation that was adopted. In this regard, it can be stressed that unlike a number of other works of the Hellenizing School, the translations of the *Prolegomena* and of the *Commentary on Porphyry's Isagoge*, for example, are less *verbatim*⁵⁴. A number of reasons may be put forward for the differences, which can be summarized in the following main points⁵⁵:

52 See for instance Barnes 1994²; Hadot 1987; Hadot 1990; Hadot 1991; Hadot 1997; Mansfeld 1994; Mansfeld 1998; Mueller-Jourdan 2007; Westerink 1990.

53 Hoffmann/Luna 2001, 863.

54 See Calzolari 2009b; Muradyan 2009; Muradyan 2014. The case of the translation of the *Commentary on the Categories* appears to be rather different; a study on this work has been carried out by Manea E. Shirinian in the framework of the *Commentaria Aristotelem Armeniaca* (see *infra*).

55 In this respect, it is worth mentioning that Giancarlo Bolognesi and his school, in addition to other researchers in Italy and elsewhere, paved the way to correct methodological research on

a) In some cases, they may be explained as the result of an adaptation of the source language (Greek) to the target language (Armenian)⁵⁶. We are aware that in current research on translation such an argument could appear fairly obsolete. Nevertheless, this is an issue that does have relevance when studying ancient translations – not only in Armenian, but also for instance in Syriac⁵⁷ –, which calls for both a linguistic and philological approach.

b) In certain cases, the differences may be explained as the result of a misreading by the translators or of a corruption attested in the manuscripts (Greek or Armenian). The latter point can be further investigated as follows in point c) below:

c) In some cases, the divergences may suggest a Greek model different from that which has been handed down by the Greek manuscripts at our disposal today. A close examination of the variants of both the Armenian and Greek versions is therefore essential, in order to determine whether the Armenian translations have preserved passages now lost or corrupted in the Greek tradition that has come down to us. This is a very plausible hypothesis. In effect, the Greek manuscripts employed by the Armenian translator(s) in Late Antiquity were more ancient than the medieval manuscripts that modern editors of the Greek commentaries may read today. Quite often, the testimony of the Armenian is fundamental for restoring the Greek. For instance the *Prolegomena* and the *Commentary on Porphyry's Isagoge* have many examples of *lacunae* by homoteleuton which can be filled through the Armenian translations⁵⁸. The importance of the Armenian translations as witnesses for the critical restitution of the Greek text deserves greater attention from specialists in classical philology.

The above-mentioned observations are primarily philological and linguistic. Armed with dual training in Armenian studies and classical studies, scholars should focus on the question of the relationship between the Armenian versions and the underlying Greek models, in order to evaluate the contribution of Armenian as a “tool” for restoring the Greek originals. In certain cases, the Armenian evidence is essential, especially when the Greek original is lost, as is the case with some of the writings of Philo, Pseudo-Philo, and David's *Commentary on*

the Armenian translations resulting from the Hellenizing School, and especially on the correct interpretation of the differences between the Greek and the Armenian. See for instance his classical work on the *Progymnasmata* of Aelius Theon: Bolognesi 1962; on the scholarly research on the Armenian translations from Greek, see Finazzi 2012.

56 See examples in Calzolari 2009b, 41–48.

57 See the important works of Henri Hugonnard-Roche (for instance Hugonnard-Roche 2004) and of Sebastian Brock (for example Brock 1993 and Brock 2003).

58 See Calzolari 2009b, 55–65; Muradyan 2009.

*Prior Analytics*⁵⁹. Therefore, Armenian philology can and must be of service to classical philology.

It is nevertheless important to stress that the Armenian translations should also be studied for the sake of their own specificity. In order to understand the manner of reception of Greek thought in Armenia, the differences compared to the original text are notably more interesting than the fidelity *verbum de verbo*. For instance, as we have pointed out elsewhere, in the Armenian version of David's *Prolegomena to Philosophy* the omission of a passage dealing with Aristotelian teaching on the nature of the sky and of the *First Mobile* seems to reveal the desire to hedge a theme – that of quintessence – which provoked polemical reactions by both Christian and pagan ancient commentators alike⁶⁰.

d) Finally, it is therefore crucial for a correct analysis of the Armenian translations of the Greek texts to devote attention to differences that may be the result of intentional modifications by the translator.

This is a difficult part of the inquiry, which should be conducted by adopting an enlarged and broader approach, based not only on an intra-Armenian perspective, but also taking into account the results of the most recent investigation on Neoplatonic literature in Greek, as already mentioned above. Only thus can insight be gained into the mode of transmission and reception of Greek philosophical thought outside its sphere of production. Such research is thus a task of relevance not only to Armenologists, but also to specialists in the history of Greek philosophy and, more generally, to scholars interested in the mode of transmission of Greek thought in the East.

In this respect, it is crucial to promote a multilateral appraisal of the philosophical literature in translation, and to give a short overview of the history of the interdisciplinary research already conducted in this field.

8 Towards closer collaboration between specialists in ancient Greek philosophy and Armenologists

The importance of the Oriental translations of the Greek texts was already clear to scholars in the first half of the nineteenth century. For instance, the academics of the Royal Society of Science, meeting in Göttingen in 1830, expressed the

⁵⁹ But see above, n. 51.

⁶⁰ Calzolari, 2009b, 49–54.

wish to create a list of ancient translations of Greek works into Eastern languages, including Armenian, while recalling the value of these versions as evidence for reconstituting the original Greek⁶¹. This project was then initiated by scholars such as Johann Georg Wenrich, who, in his *De auctorum Graecorum versionibus et commentariis Syriacis, Arabicis, Armeniacis, Persicisque commentatio*, collected a great deal of information about the ancient Armenian translations of Aristotle, Porphyry, Plato, and David the Invincible, thanks to the Catalogue of the Oriental Manuscripts of the Bibliothèque royale de France, as well as the historical and philological works of the Mekhitarist Fathers of Venice and of Jean Saint-Martin⁶².

The heritage of ancient Armenian translations also drew the interest of Oxford scholars such as Frederic C. Conybeare, who conducted many philological studies on the Armenian translations of Philo, Plato, Aristotle, Porphyry, and David, in which he sought to identify the critical value of Armenian in relation to the Greek⁶³. Of course, the work of the nineteenth century scholars needs to be completed or corrected. However, these studies are important evidence of an enduring interest in the literature involving Armenian translations. They also contributed to paving the way to a new avenue of research in textual criticism of the Greek texts. In this respect, it is worth mentioning the edition of the *De Mundo* by William L. Lorimer, who included Armenian variants in the apparatus of his edition based on the work of Conybeare⁶⁴. The results of collating the Armenian text with the Greek text of the *Categories* and *De Interpretatione*⁶⁵ carried out by Conybeare later served as the basis of a new edition of the Greek by Lucio Minio-Paluello in 1949⁶⁶.

The turn of the millennium saw the beginning of a new impetus in this field. In recent works devoted to Greek philosophical texts, evidence from the Armenian versions has been analysed. This was the case with the edition of *De Interpretatione* by Elio Montanari and the *Categories* by Richard Bodéüs as well as the translation of Porphyry's *Isagoge*, with commentary by Jonathan Barnes⁶⁷. An interest in the corpus of Armenian works by David can also be seen in the work of

61 Wenrich 1842, IV: "Ut colligantur notitiae de versionibus auctorum Graecorum Syriacis, Arabicis, Armeniacis, Persicis, quarum versionum historia accurata adhuc caremus".

62 Saint-Martin 1818; Sevin 1739.

63 Conybeare 1889; Conybeare 1891; Conybeare 1892; Conybeare 1893; Conybeare 1895.

64 Lorimer 1933; on the limitations of this edition, see Tessier 1979, 46–49; new critical apparatus useful for restituting the Greek can be found in Tessier 1979, 53–122.

65 According to Waitz 1844.

66 Minio-Paluello 1949.

67 Montanari 1984; Bodéüs 2001; Barnes 2003.

Ilsetraut Hadot, director of a research project on the Greek work of Simplicius⁶⁸, or of Richard Goulet, the editor of the *Dictionnaire des philosophes antiques*⁶⁹. Another recent article, by Fr. Henri D. Saffrey, seeks to reconstruct the itinerary of the famous Greek manuscript A of Plato's works (Parisinus gr. 1807) from Alexandria and Byzantium to the Italy of Petrarch, taking into account a possible stop-over in Armenia at the time of Grigor Magistros⁷⁰.

Closer cooperation among experts from both subject areas constitutes a strong *desideratum* for the future. In this respect, a pioneering role has been played by the team focusing on the treatise by the Pseudo-Zeno, led by Michael E. Stone and Jaap Mansfeld, with the collaboration of David T. Runia and Manea E. Shirinian from the Matenadaran in Erevan⁷¹. More recently, research has begun in the context of an extensive project on the works of David the Invincible, set up at the University of Geneva under the direction of the chair of Armenian Studies (held by the author of this paper), in cooperation with two experts in the history of ancient philosophy, i.e. Jonathan Barnes (University of Geneva and subsequently University of Paris-Sorbonne) and Dominic O'Meara (University of Fribourg, Switzerland). This collaborative study has been extended to include scholars of the Institute of ancient Armenian manuscripts, known as the "Matenadaran" (Manea E. Shirinian, Gohar Muradyan, Aram Topchyan, Sen Arevšatyan and Arminē Melkonyan), and in the first phase of the project, the Erevan State University (Albert Stepanyan). The project has resulted in the creation of an editorial program called *Commentaria in Aristotelem Armeniaca*, which was incorporated in the collection *Philosophia Antiqua*⁷². It attempts to take into consideration all the above-mentioned main criteria necessary for a correct and fruitful interpretation of the Armenian translation of Greek philosophical literature.

⁶⁸ Hadot 1990.

⁶⁹ Goulet 2000. With regard to the issue of the authorship of the *Commentary on the Categories*, he mentions the need to resort to "la prise en compte systématique de la tradition arménienne" (p. 65).

⁷⁰ Saffrey 2007; but see Tinti 2012.

⁷¹ It is also important to mention the collaboration between Manea E. Shirinian and Doug Hutchinson on the Greek and Armenian texts of the Pseudo-Aristotelian treatise, *De Virtutibus*. See Shirinian [Širinjan] 2002.

⁷² The project of the *Commentaria in Aristotelem Armeniaca* is presented in Calzolari/Barnes 2009, XI-XIV, in Topchyan 2010, IX-X and in Muradyan 2015, XVIII-IX.

9 The “*Commentaria in Aristotelem Armeniaca. Davidis Opera*” project

The series *Commentaria in Aristotelem Armeniaca. Davidis Opera* will consist of five volumes dedicated to the commentaries on Aristotelian logic which the tradition attributes to David the Invincible. The first collective volume outlines the questions to be dealt with and serves the purpose of introducing the series. Each of the following four volumes will present a separate work: *Prolegomena* to the philosophy, *Commentary on Porphyry's Isagoge*, *Commentary on Aristotle's Categories*, and *Commentary on Aristotle's First Analytics*. Each volume will include the revision of the critical edition, a new commented translation of the Armenian text, as well as a comparison of the Armenian with the underlying Greek model, whenever the latter can be identified. This project has five chief goals:

1. To identify the position of the Armenian indirect witnesses within the Greek direct tradition of David the Invincible's works.
2. To assess the value of the Armenian translations for an editor working on textual recovery of the Greek original.
3. To analyse the differences between the Armenian versions and the Greek originals so as to investigate the methodology adopted by the Armenian translators when facing a new audience.
4. To pay particular attention to examination of the language and the translation technique of the Armenian version.
5. To inquire, more generally, into the ways Greek thought was transmitted to the Armenian tradition.

Three volumes have now appeared⁷³. We hope that the project will be able to revive scholars' awareness of this heritage and its importance for insight into the circulation of ideas and cultural exchange between East and West in Late Antiquity⁷⁴.

As a final consideration, I will conclude this article by insisting, once again, on the fact that in order to appreciate the real value of Armenian philosophical writings, the only proper methodological approach is an interdisciplinary study. In this respect, the meeting organised in Genoa offered a major opportunity to renew an important tradition created some decades ago in Italy, and to develop stronger cooperative research in this direction.

⁷³ Calzolari/Barnes 2009; Topchyan 2010; Muradyan 2015.

⁷⁴ On this respect, see for instance Lemerle 1971; Cavallo 2001, 189–199.

Bibliography

- Adontz, N. (ed.) (1970), *Denys de Thrace et les commentateurs arméniens*, Louvain (French translation of the Russian original edition, published in Saint Petersburg in 1915).
- Akinean, N. (1959), *Dawit' Hark'ac'i Anyalt' P'ilisop'ay. Keank'n ew gorcera/David Harkazi Unbesiegtter Philosoph. Leben und Wirken*, Vienna.
- Arevšatyan, S. S. (1969), "Dawt'i Anhalt'i žařangut'yunə nor lusabanut'eamb" [The legacy of David the Invincible in a new light], in: *Banber Matenadarani* 9, 7–22.
- Arevšatyan, S. S. (1971), "Platoni erkeri hayeren t'argmanut'yan žamanakə" [The epoch of the Armenian translation of Plato's works], in: *Banber Matenadarani* 10, 7–20.
- Arevšatyan, S. S. (1981), "David l'Invincible et sa doctrine philosophique", in: *Revue des Études Arméniennes* 15, 33–43.
- Barnes, J. (ed.) (1994²), Aristotle, *Posterior Analytics*, Oxford (1st ed. 1975).
- Barnes, J. (ed.) (2003), Porphyry, *Introduction*, Oxford.
- Barnes, J. (2009), "David and the Greek Tradition", in: Calzolari/Barnes (eds.) 2009, 3–14.
- Barnes, J. / Bobzien, S. / Flannery, K., s.j. / Ierodiakonou, K. (eds.) (1991), Alexander of Aphrodisia, *On Aristotle Prior Analytics 1.1–7*, London.
- Berbérian, H. (1964), "Autobiographie", in: *Revue des Études Arméniennes* 1, 189–194.
- Bernardi, J. (1984), "Nouvelles perspectives sur la famille de Grégoire de Nazianze", in: *Vigiliae Christianae* 38/4, 352–359.
- Bodéüs, R. (ed.) (2001), Aristote, *Catégories*, Paris.
- Bolognesi, G. (1962), "La traduzione armena dei *Progymnasmata* di Elio Teone", in: *Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei. Rendiconti della Classe di Scienze morali, storiche e filologiche* (ser. 8) 17, 86–125; 211–257.
- Brock, S. (1993), "The Syriac Commentary Tradition", in: C. Burnett (ed.), *Glosses and Commentaries on Aristotelian Logical Texts. The Syriac, Arabic and Medieval Latin Traditions*, London, 3–10.
- Brock, S. (2003), "Syriac Translations of Greek Popular Philosophy", in: P. Bruns (éd.), *Von Athen nach Bagdad. Zur Rezeption griechischer Philosophie von der Spätantike bis zum Islam*, Bonn, 9–28.
- Calzolari, V. (1989), "L'école héliénisante: faits et circonstances", in: M. Nishanian (ed.), *Agēs et usages de la langue arménienne*, Paris, 110–130.
- Calzolari, V. (2005), "Du pouvoir de la musique dans la version arménienne des *Prolegomena* de David le platonicien (Orphée et Alexandre le Grand)", in: A. Kolde / A. Lukinovich / A.-L. Rey (eds.), *Κορυφαίω ἀνδρί. Mélanges en l'honneur d'André Hurst*, Genève, 417–431.
- Calzolari, V. (2007), "Aux origines de la formation du corpus philosophique en Arménie: quelques remarques sur les versions arméniennes des commentaires grecs de David", in: D'Ancona (ed.) 2007, 259–278.
- Calzolari, V. (2009a), "David dans la tradition arménienne", in: Calzolari/Barnes (eds.) 2009, 15–36.
- Calzolari, V. (2009b), "La version arménienne des *Prolegomena philosophiae* de David et son rapport avec le texte grec", in: Calzolari/Barnes (eds.) 2009, 39–65.
- Calzolari, V. (2012), "The Ancient Armenian Translations of Greek Philosophical Texts: the Works of David the Invincible", in: *Scripta & e-Scripta. The Journal of Interdisciplinary Medieval Studies*, 10–11, 131–146.

- Calzolari, V. (2014), "Philosophical Literature in Ancient and Medieval Armenia", in: Calzolari (ed.) 2014, 349–376.
- Calzolari, V. (ed.) / with the collaboration of M. E. Stone (2014), *Armenian Philology in the Modern Era. From Manuscript to Digital Text*, Leiden-Boston.
- Calzolari, V. / Barnes, J. (eds.) (2009), *L'oeuvre de David l'Invincible et la transmission de la pensée grecque dans la tradition arménienne et syriaque*, Leiden-Boston.
- Cavallo, G. (2001), "Qualche riflessione sulla continuità della cultura greca in Oriente nei secoli VII e VIII", in: Fiaccadori (ed.) 2001, 189–199.
- Clackson, J. P. (1995), "The *Techne* in Armenian", in: V. Law / I. Sluiter (eds.), *Dionysius Thrax and the *Techne Grammatike**, Münster, 121–133.
- Contin, B. (2005), "Alle origini del pensiero filosofico armeno. Eznik di Koghb e Dawith l'Invincibile", in: *Annali di Ca' Foscari* 14/3, 69–78.
- Contin, B. (ed.) (2014), *Davide l'Invincibile, Definizioni e divisioni della filosofia*, introduzione, traduzione e note, Palermo.
- Conybeare, F. C. (1889), "Note on the Ancient Armenian Versions of Plato", in: *The Classical Review* 3, 340–343.
- Conybeare, F. C. (1891), "On the Ancient Armenian Versions of Plato", in: *The American Journal of Philology* 12, 193–210.
- Conybeare, F. C. (1892), *A Collation with the Ancient Armenian Versions of the Greek Text of Aristotle's Categories, De Interpretatione, De Mundo, De Virtutibus et Vitiis and of Porphyry's Introduction*, Oxford.
- Conybeare, F. C. (1893), "Aristotēli yałags əndōrinakut'ean 'Yałags Astucoy'" [A manuscript of Aristotle's *De Deo*], in: *Handēs Amsōreay* 7, 227–232.
- Conybeare, F. C. (1895), *Philo about the Contemplative Life, or the Fourth Book of the Treatise Concerning Virtues*, Oxford.
- Crisuolo, U. (1994), "Sull'epitafio' di Gregorio di Nazianzo per il retore Proeresio", in: C. Curti / C. Crimi (eds.), *Scritti classici e cristiani offerti a F. Corsaro*, Catania, 189–195.
- D'Ancona, C. (ed.) (2007), *The Libraries of the Neoplatonists. Proceedings of the Meeting of the European Science Foundation Network 'Late Antiquity and Arabic Thought. Patterns in the Constitution of European Culture', Strasbourg, March 12–14, 2004*, Leiden-Boston.
- Di Branco, M. (2011), "Politica e religione in Atene nel IV secolo d.C. Il caso del sofista Proeresio", in: *La parola del passato* 76, 31–46.
- Ervine, R. (1995), "Yovhannēs Erznkac'i Pluz's *Compilation of Commentary on Grammar* as a Starting Point for the Study of Medieval Grammars", in: J. J. S. Weitenberg (ed.), *New Approaches to Medieval Armenian Language and Literature*, Amsterdam, 149–165.
- Fiaccadori, G. (ed.) (2001), *Autori classici in lingue del Vicino e Medio Oriente*, Roma.
- Finazzi, R. B. (2012), "Cinquant'anni di ricerche sulle antiche traduzioni armene di testi greci", in: C. Baffioni / R. B. Finazzi / A. Passoni Dell'Acqua / E. Vergani (eds.), *Gli studi orientalistici in Ambrosiana nella cornice del IV centenario (1609–2009). Primo Dies Academicus 8–10 novembre 2010*, Milano, 144–170.
- Frede, M. (2005), "Les *Catégories* d'Aristote et les Pères de l'Eglise grecs", in: O. Bruun / L. Corti (eds.), *Les Catégories et leur histoire*, Paris, 135–173.
- Gallay, P. (1943), *La vie de saint Grégoire de Nazianze*, Lyon-Paris.
- Garsoïan, N. (2003–2004), "L'*Histoire* attribuée à Movsēs Xorenac'i: que reste-t-il à en dire?", in: *Revue des Études Arméniennes* 29, 29–48.

- Goulet, R. (2000), “Prohérésius le païen et quelques remarques sur la chronologie d'Eunape de Sardes”, in: *Antiquité Tardive* 8, 209–222.
- Hadot, I. (1987), “Les introductions aux commentaires exégétiques chez les auteurs néoplatoniciens et les auteurs chrétiens”, in: M. Tardieu (ed.), *Les règles de l'interprétation*, Paris, 99–122.
- Hadot, I. (dir.) (1990), Simplicius, *Commentaire sur les Catégories*, 1 and 3, Leiden-New York-København-Köln.
- Hadot, I. (1991), “The Role of the Commentaries on Aristotle in the Teaching of Philosophy according to the Prefaces of the Neoplatonic Commentaries on the *Categories*”, in: H. Blumenthal / H. Robinson (eds.), *Aristotle and the Later Tradition*, Oxford, 175–189.
- Hadot, I. (1997), “Le commentaire philosophique continu dans l'Antiquité”, in: *Antiquité Tardive* 5, 169–176.
- Hadot, I. (2014), *Le néoplatonicien Simplicius à la lumière des recherches contemporaines. Un bilan critique*, Sankt Augustin.
- Hadot, P. (1979), “Les divisions des parties de la philosophie dans l'Antiquité”, in: *Museum Helveticum* 36, 201–223.
- Hadot, P. (1990), “La logique, partie ou instrument de la philosophie?”, in: I. Hadot (dir.), Simplicius, *Commentaire sur les Catégories*, 1, Leiden-New York-København-Köln, 183–188.
- Hoffmann, P. (2007), “What was Commentary in Late Antiquity? The Example of the Neoplatonic Commentators”, in: M. L. Gill / P. Pellegrin (eds.), *The Cambridge Companion to Ancient Philosophy*, Oxford, 597–622.
- Hoffmann, P. / Luna, C. (eds.) (2001), Simplicius, *Commentaire sur les Catégories d'Aristote: chapitres 2–4*, Paris.
- Hugonnard-Roche, H. (2004), *La logique d'Aristote du grec au syriaque. Études sur la transmission des textes de l'Organon et leur interprétation philosophique*, Paris.
- Hugonnard-Roche, H. (2007), “Le corpus philosophique syriaque aux VI^e-VII^e siècles”, in: D'Ancona (ed.) 2007, 279–291.
- Hugonnard-Roche, H. (2009), “La tradition gréco-syriaque des commentaires d'Aristote”, in: Calzolari/Barnes (eds.) 2009, 153–173.
- Kendall, B. Thomson, R. W. (eds.) (1983), David the Invincible Philosopher, *Definitions and Divisions of Philosophy*, English translation of the Old Armenian version with introduction and notes, Chico, CA.
- La Porta, S. (2007), *Two Anonymous Sets of Scholia on Dionysius the Areopagite's Heavenly Hierarchy*, Leuven.
- La Porta, S. (2008), *The Armenian Scholia on Dionysius the Areopagite. Studies on their Literary and Philological Tradition*, Leuven.
- Lemerle, P. (1964), “Note sur les données historiques de l'autobiographie d'Anania de Shirak”, in: *Revue des Études Arméniennes* 1, 195–202.
- Lemerle, P. (1971), *Le premier humanisme byzantin*, Paris.
- Leroy, M. (1935), “Grégoire Magistros et les traductions arméniennes d'auteurs grecs”, in: *Annuaire de l'Institut de Philologie et d'Histoire Orientales* 3 (= Mélanges Jean Capart), 263–294.
- Lorimer, W. L. (ed.) (1933), *Aristotelis qui fertur libellus De mundo*, Paris.
- Lössl, J. / Watt, J. W. (eds.) (2011), *Interpreting the Bible and Aristotle in Late Antiquity. The Alexandrian Commentary Tradition between Rome and Baghdad*, Farnham.

- Mahé, J.-P. (1987), “*Quadrivium et cursus d’études au VII^e siècle en Arménie et dans le monde byzantin*”, in: *Travaux et Mémoires* 10, 159–206.
- Mahé, J.-P. (1989), “Amelaxos”, in: R. Goulet (ed.), *DPhA*, 1, Paris, 160.
- Mahé, J.-P. (1990), “David l’Invincible dans la tradition arménienne”, in: I. Hadot (dir.), *Simplicius, Commentaire sur les Catégories*, 1, Leiden-New York-København-Köln, 189–207.
- Mahé, J.-P. (1995), “L’Arménie et les Pères de l’Eglise: histoire et mode d’emploi (V^e–XII^e siècle)”, in: J.-C. Fredouille / R.-M. Roberge (eds.), *La documentation patristique*, Laval-Paris, 157–179.
- Mahé, J.-P. (1998), “Du grec à l’arménien”, in: *Encyclopédie philosophique universelle*. 4, *Le discours philosophique*, Paris, no. 64.
- Manandean, H. (1928), *Yunaban dproc’ə ew nra zargac’man šrjrunnerə* [The Hellenizing School and the phases of its development], Vienna.
- Mancini Lombardi, S. / Pontani, P. (eds.) (2010), *Studies on the Ancient Armenian Version of Philo’s Works*, Leiden-Boston.
- Mansfeld, J. (1994), *Prolegomena. Questions to be settled before the Study of an Author, or a Text*, Leiden-New York-Köln.
- Mansfeld, J. (1998), *Prolegomena Mathematica. From Apollonius of Perga to Late Neoplatonism*, Leiden-New York-Köln.
- Mercier, C. (1978–1979), “L’Ecole hellénistique dans la littérature arménienne”, in: *Revue des Études Arméniennes* 13, 59–75.
- Minio Paluello, L. (ed.) (1949), *Aristotelis Categoriae et liber de interpretatione*, Oxford.
- Montanari, E. (1984 and 1988), *La sezione linguistica del Peri hermeneias di Aristotele*. 1, *Il testo*; 2, *Il commento*, Firenze.
- Mueller-Jourdan, P. (2007), *Une initiation à la philosophie de l’Antiquité tardive. Les leçons du Pseudo-Elias*, Fribourg.
- Muradyan, G. (1993), *Gik’ pitoyic’* [Book of Chreias], Erevan.
- Muradyan, G. (2009), in: Calzolari/Barnes (eds.) 2009, 67–88.
- Muradyan, G. (2014), “The Hellenizing School”, in: Calzolari (ed.) 2014, 321–348.
- Muradyan, G. (2015), *David the Invincible’s Commentary on Porphyry’s Isagoge*, Leiden-Boston.
- Orengo, A. (ed.) (1996), Eznik di Kolb, *Confutazione delle sette (Elc Ałandoc’)*, introduzione, traduzione e note, Pisa.
- Papazian, M. B. (2009), “The Authorship of an Armenian Commentary on Aristotle’s *Prior Analytics*”, in: Calzolari/Barnes (eds.) 2009, 105–118 (First edition in: *Journal of the Society for Armenian Studies* 10 [1998–1999], 55–62).
- Patillon, M. (ed.) (1997), Aélius Théon, *Progymnasmata*, Paris.
- Petit, P. (1956), *Les étudiants de Libanius*, Paris.
- Rapava, M. (1982), “Traditions et innovations dans l’École néo-platonicienne d’Alexandrie (Ammonius Hermias et David l’Invincible)”, in: *Bedi Kartlisa* 40, 216–227.
- Richard, M. (1950), “Ἀπὸ φωνῆς”, in: *Byzantion* 20, 191–222 (= *Opera Minora*, 3, Turnhout-Leuven 1977).
- Saffrey, H.-D. (2007), “Retour sur le *Parisinus Graecus* 1807, le manuscrit A de Platon”, in: D’Ancona (ed.) 2007, 3–28.
- Saint-Martin, A.-J. (1818), *Mémoires historiques et géographiques sur l’Arménie*, 2 vols., Paris.
- Sanjian, A. K. (ed.) (1986), *David Anhagt, the ‘Invincible’ Philosopher*, Atlanta (GA).
- Sevin, F. (dir.) (1739), *Catalogus Codicum Manuscriptorum Bibliothecae Regiae*, 1, Paris.

- Sgarbi, R. (1972), "Osservazioni sul testo e sulla lingua della versione armena dell'*Isagoge* di Porfirio", in: *Memorie dell'Istituto Lombardo. Accademia di Scienze e Lettere. Classe di Lettere, Scienze morali e storiche* 31/5, 365–477.
- Sgarbi, R. (1991), *Studio contrastivo sull'adattamento strutturale armeno della Téchne dionisiana*, Milano.
- Sgarbi, R. (2004), "Problemi lessicali legati alla terminologia della versione armena dell'*Ars dionisiana*", in: V. Calzolari / A. Sirinian / B. L. Zekiyan (eds.), *Bnagirk' yišatakac' / Documenta memoriae. Dall'Italia e dall'Armenia studi in onore di Gabriella Uluhogian*, Bologna, 349–357.
- Shirinian [Širinjan], M. E. (2002), "Armenian Translation of [Aristotle's] *De Vitiis et Virtutibus*", in: *Verbum: Aristotel i srednevekovaja metafizika*, vypusk 6, Sankt-Peterburg, 166–171.
- Shirinian, M. E. (2009), "The Armenian Version of David the Invincible's *Commentary on Aristotle's Categories*", in: Calzolari/Barnes (eds.) 2009, 89–102.
- Sorabji, R. R. (ed.) (1990), *Aristotle Transformed. The Ancient Commentators and their Influence*, Ithaca (NY).
- Stepanyan, A. (2009), "On the Basic Idea of the *History of the Armenians* by Moses Khorenatsi" in: Calzolari/Barnes (eds.) 2009, 181–196.
- Stone, M. E. / Shirinian, M. E. (eds.) (2000), *Pseudo-Zeno, Anonymous Philosophical Treatise*, Leiden-Boston-Köln.
- Sweeting, Clive (2009), "The Relationship between the Armenian Translation of the *Commentary on Aristotle's Analytics* of David and the Greek Text of the *Commentary on Aristotle's Analytics* of Elias", in: Calzolari/Barnes (eds.) 2009, 137–150.
- T'amrazyan, H. (2004), *Grigor Narekac'in ev Norplatonakanut'yuna* [Grigor Narekac'i and the Neoplatonism], Erevan.
- Tardieu, M. (1986), "Sabiens coraniques et Sabiens de Harran", in: *Journal Asiatique* 274, 1–44.
- Tarrant, H. (1998), "Introduction", in: Olympiodorus, *Commentary on Plato's Gorgias*, Leiden-Boston-Köln, 1–52.
- Terian, A. (1982), "The Hellenizing School. Its Time, Place and Scope of Activities Reconsidered", in: N. G. Garsoïan / T. F. Mathews / R. W. Thomson (eds.), *East of Byzantium. Syria and Armenia in the Formative Period*, Washington (DC), 175–186 (= *St. Nersess Theological Review* 13 [2008]: *Opera Selecta Teriana. A Scholarly Retrospective*, 25–44).
- Terian, A. (2001), "Appendix: The Armenian Translation of Philo", in: Fiaccadori (ed.) 2001, 425–448 (1st ed. in Constantin Zuckerman [ed.], *A Repertory of Published Armenian Translations of Classical Texts*, Jerusalem 1995, 36–44).
- Tessier, A. (1979), *Il testo di Aristotele e le traduzioni armene*, Padova.
- Tessier, A. (2001), "Frederick Cornwallis Conybeare e le versioni armene da Aristotele", in: Fiaccadori (ed.) 2001, 133–138.
- Thomson, R. W. (1987), *The Armenian Version of the Works attributed to Dionysius the Areopagite*, Leuven.
- Thomson, R. W. (1995), *A Bibliography of Classical Armenian Literature to 1500 AD* (Corpus Christianorum), Turnhout.
- Thomson, R. W. (2007), "Supplement to A Bibliography of Classical Armenian Literature to 1500 AD: Publications 1993–2005", in: *Le Muséon* 120, 163–223.
- Tinti, I. (2012), "On the Chronology and Attribution of the Old Armenian *Timaeus*: A Status Quaestionis and New Perspectives", in: *EVO. Egitto e Vicino Oriente* 35, 219–282.

- Topchyan, A. (2009), "Remarks on David the Invincible's *Commentary on Aristotle's Prior Analytics*, its Structure, Contents, Language, and the Problems of Translator and Authorship", in: Calzolari/Barnes (eds.) 2009, 119–135.
- Topchyan, A. (ed.) (2010), *Commentary on Aristotle's Prior Analytics: Old Armenian Text with an English Translation, Introduction and Notes*, Leiden-Boston.
- Traina, G. (1991), *Il complesso di Trimalcione. Movsès Xorenac'i e le origini del pensiero storico armeno*, Venezia.
- Vardanyan, S. (2008), *S. Grigor Niwsac'i, Tesut'iwn i mardoyñ kazmut'iwn (Yalags kazmut'ean mardoy) / St. Gregory of Nyssa (On the making of man)*, Erevan.
- Waitz, T. (ed.) (1844), *Aristotelis Organon Graece*, Lipsiae.
- Watts, E. J. (2006), *City and School in Late Antique Athens and Alexandria*, Berkeley-Los Angeles-London, 48–78.
- Wenrich, J. G. (1842), *De auctorum Graecorum versionibus et commentariis Syriacis, Arabicis, Armeniacis, Persicisque commentatio*, Leipzig.
- Westerink, L. G. (1961), "Elias on the *Prior Analytics*", in: *Mnemosyne* 14, 126–139 (= *Texts and Studies in Neoplatonism and Byzantine Literature*, Amsterdam 1980, 59–72).
- Westerink, L. G. (1990), *Prolégomènes à la philosophie de Platon*, Paris.
- Wildberg, C. (1990), "Three Neoplatonic Introductions to Philosophy. Ammonius, David and Elias", in: *Hermathena* 149, 33–51.
- Zekiyan, B. L. (1997), "Quelques observations critiques sur le *Corpus Elisaeum*", in: R. F. Taft (ed.), *The Armenian Christian Tradition*, Roma, 71–123.
- Zuckerman, C. (2001), *A Repertory of Published Armenian Translations of Classical Texts*, in: Fiaccadori (ed.) 2001, 425–448.