

The Armenian Translation of Proclus' "Elements of Theology" and Ioane Petritsi's Commentaries

Maia Raphava

*Leading Specialist at the National Centre of Manuscripts, Doctor of
Philological Sciences, Professor*

Summary: Proclus' "Elements of Theology" and Ioane Petritsi's "Commentaries" were translated from the Georgian into Armenian in 1248 by a Chalcedonite monk Simeon Pghinhanketsi, flourishing in South Georgia. Doubts have been voiced in Armenian scholarship on the Georgian provenance of the Armenian translation. Textological-philological study of the Georgian and Armenian texts demonstrates indisputably that the Armenian text was translated from the Georgian. Bearing in mind a whole number of factual data, the Armenian translation is of major significance for the study of the Georgian text of Proclus "Elements" and Petritsi's "Commentaries".

Key words: *Proclus, Ioane Petritsi, Simeon Pghinhanketsi, Iamblichus*

In the extensive specialist literature on Proclus' "Elements of Theology" and Ioane Petritsi's "Commentaries" studies of the Armenian translation are assigned a very modest space. In Georgian scholarship I. Abuladze made their review in the form of preliminary essays (1.17-28; 2. 29-40). The interests of Armenian researchers proved to be limited to the provenance and authorship of the Armenian translation (4:11, 667-668; 21, 122: 22, 151-152; 23, 99-100; 24, 148). Here ends the history of research into the history of the Armenian translation. Now, the Armenian translation is indisputably of considerable value in the research into both Proclus' "Elements" and Petritsi's "Commentaries". It is also of major significance and value in the study of the Georgian original of the works of Proclus and Petritsi.

The texts of Proclus and Petritsi were translated from the Georgian in 1248 by an Armenian Chalcedonite monk Simeon Pghindzahanetsi, active in the Pghindzahank monastery, south

Georgia. This is the Simeon who had translated from the Georgian for Armenian Diophysitic circles other works as well, such as John of Damascus's "Dialectics" and "Expositio Fidei" (14), the Petre Gelateli version of "Clemachus" by John of Sinai, several works from Arsen of Iqalto "Dogmaticon" (2, 29-40). N. Akinian ascribes to him the translation of Greek "Hymns" and "Kartlis Tskhovreba" (4, 1-8).

In the 17th cent. Pghindzahanetsi's translation of Proclus' "Elements" had an interesting fate. The bishop, Simeon Jughaetsi used the unaltered text of Proclus' "Elements" translated by Simeon Pghindzahanetsi, substituting, however, his own commentaries for those of Ioane Petritsi. Simeon Jughaetsi follows rather Aristotle's "Organon", though quotations are made also from Dionysius the Areopagite, Philo of Alexandria, as well as Christian Church Fathers (23, 99-100). In the Foreword of Jughaetsi to his commentaries he notes the considerable value of Proclus' work, expressing his surprise at the old Armenian translators having failed to translate this work of Proclus. He assumes that there may have existed an old Armenian translation which was lost.

In Jughaetsi's view, it is also possible that old Armenian translators were aware of the links of Proclus' work with Porphyry's "Introduction" and Aristotle's "Categories" and "Metaphysics" and as the latter was translated into Armenian, they did not deem it necessary to translate the "Elements". Jughaetsi gives the reason for the renewed commentaries. According to him, it is difficult to understand Proclus' text by Pghindzahanetsi's translation (Matenadaran № 8, 150r).

In the same 17th cent. another Armenian writer, Simeon Erevanetsi again took up Simeon Pghindzahanetsi's translation of Proclus' work, supplying it with his own comments. Simeon Erevanetsi in his turn chides the commentaries by Jughaetsi. In his words, much is altered in Jughaetsi's translation and the meaning is often distorted (Materadaran № 1837, 108r).

The story of the Armenian translations of the "Elements" and the "Commentaries" by Simeon Jughaetsi and Simeon Erevanetsi did not end here. Proclus' text from the Armenian translation by Simeon Pghindzahanetsi was translated anew in 1757 on the initiative of Ioane Jambakur-Orbeliani and with the help of others (National Centre of Manuscripts, A 74, S192). It transpires that

Jambakur-Orbeliani had perfect knowledge of the existence of Petritsi's translation and commentaries. But he notes apologetically that Petritsi's translation was hard to understand. The scholarly and literary correlation between Ioane Petritsi's translation and the "New Elements" of Jambakur-Orbeliani is appraised well by Anton Bagrationi, the Catholicos.

The Armenian manuscripts of Proclus' "Elements" and Petritsi's "Commentaries", translated by Simeon Pghindzahanetsi, are provided with the translator's colophon: "This book, which is the "Elements" and chapter of the theology of the Platonic philosopher Proclus Diadochus, by Symeon the unworthy hieromonk from the Georgian language into the Armenian language, in the country of Armenia, in the monastery of Georgians, called Pghindzahank, from the Creation 6756 [1248]. I implore, you, brethren, I translated this with great labor in the first place, I was not worthy of such service because I was burdened with sins; and in the second, because I was very old and enfeebled in eyesight, mind and power - 60 years of age.

That which is the mother of theology, was not translated into our language. First Moses studied this book and arranged his theology according to it, [also] Dionysius the Areopagite and Hierotheos borrowed [wrote] their writings entirely from it, Gregory the Theologian enunciated his theology through it. All new [writers] derived their theology from this work. This is the basis and root or mother of all. From it they received completeness. But they are small sections, hence I translated them so that our people not be deprived of it. Now I entreat you whoever either corrects or copies it, mention me in your prayer and include my additions to this work, and do not leave out anything (Matenadaran MSS № 1500, 1121; № 1832, 309).

This colophon is well known in the scholarly literature (1, 17-28; 2, 29-40; 11, 667-668; 22, 151-152; 23, 99-100; 24, 148).

Notwithstanding the report of the colophon on the old Armenian translation having been made from the Georgian - and this report is repeated by Simeon Jughaetsi and Simeon Erevanetsi - certain doubts have been expressed in modern scholarly literature regarding the Georgian provenance of the Armenian text. The Armenist F. Conybeare was the first to doubt its Georgian

provenance. Of Armenian researchers some shared Conybeare's view according to which there existed an old Armenian translation of Proclus' "Elements of Theology", from which the Georgian translation was made and later, the text was translated anew from this Georgian original (23, 42-45). In order to argue their view, the Armenian scholars rely on the following data: 1. There is no old copy containing a Georgian translation that could have served as the source of the Armenian translation. 2. In the Armenian translation, on the one hand, the influence of the Greek language is evidenced, and on the other, such word-formations occur in it that are unusual for the Hellenophilic translations (21 99-100). The former argument was removed after an old Georgian Manuscript H 1337 (13th cent.) became available to researchers. As to the latter argument, textual study has shown that the Grecisms found in the Armenian text proved to have entered it via the Georgian. It is significant that all Greek words occur in Armenian only where this Greek word appears in the relevant context in Georgian too. Not a single example was found of a Greek word to be in the Armenian text and lacking in the Georgian. This fact is obviously symptomatic. Various principles of transferring of a Greek word from Georgian and Armenian are in evidence: 1. A Greek word, similarly to the Georgian text is found untranslated in the Armenian text too: Ελληκατῆξενος – ელეატექსენი 145,10 – էլէատացիքս 451,1; 2. The meaning of a Greek word is translated: πύρσος – პურსოჲ 102,26 – յոժարութիւն 286,13. εκμαγειον - ეკმაგიოჲ 78, 8 – կերպարան 212; 3. A Greek word is omitted in the Armenian, 4. A Greek word is translated in a different meaning δραστήριος – დრასტირიაჲ 106,24 – սնձնական 299,14; 5. A Greek word is transferred into the Armenian through a calque of Georgian derivation სტერიხნი 125,14 – ըստ երիւք 361,2.

The presence of Grecisms in the Armenian text via the Georgian original is confirmed by such facts when lexical forms in the Armenian text (In V. Tashian's words "curious lexical units"), occasionally the construction of a sentence, word-derivation affixes are formed through Georgian calque which often determines the artificial forms of the Armenian translation. ხედვაჲ სამათიმატიკოჲ 176, 22 – տեսութիւն սամաթիմათիկոյի 592,3. „ზედმიწევნულებაჲ“ – ի վերայ հասանել 260, 4. „ცისკარი“ 16,19

–ստւումն դունն էրկնից 164,12. Artificial forms, obtained thanks to a word for word translation, are often corrected in a later Armenian copy according to the terminology of the Armenian philosophical language (Matenadaran № 1832)

Grecisms, abundantly evidenced in the Georgian texts of Proclus and Petritsi are a clear manifestation of Petritsi's style. Grecisms have entered the Armenian translation in the same form. The evidence of the colophon of the translator Simeon Pghindzahanetsi to the effect that his translation was made from the Georgian is confirmed without any doubt. The translation calques found in the Armenian translation and textual slips of the pen point to the primacy of the Georgian text.

Two points should be noted: one that Simeon Pghindzahanetsi's translation is almost synchronous with the Georgian original and hence free from the possible intervention of later period copyist-editors, and the second that Armenian is a word for word translation from the Georgian - unequivocally point to the primary role Pghindzahanetsi's translation can play in the restoration of the archetype of the Georgian original and its correction and specification.

Naturally enough, the original make-up of the Georgian text is preserved in the Armenian translation - if not systematically, at least frequently. All types of deviations from the Georgian text should be taken into account, the additions and omissions found in the Armenian translation, different readings. Of course not all of them will be due to the Georgian text. On many occasions the Armenian translator's literary initiative should be taken into account. But each concrete case calls for special study.

Juxtaposition of the Georgian and Armenian texts points to the crucial significance of the Armenian translation for the establishment of the Georgian critical text.

In the first place such passages should be noted that appear too involved and vague in the Georgian text. Their comprehension is facilitated with the aid of the Armenian translation. The change of the sentence structure in the Armenian translation, replacement of syntagmas in many passages simplify comprehension.

There are cases when this or that context in the Georgian text seems obviously erroneous, while it is given correctly in the

Armenian text. This imprecision is probably due to the orthographically imprecise reading by the copyists of the Georgian manuscript. For example, chapter 32 of Petritsi's commentaries begins thus: "საკვრველად და აღმყვანებულად შემდგომთა პირველთა მიმართ ტრფიალებასა დასდებენ იდიოტიმა და სოკრატი". It refers to the gradational cycle in the metaphysical chain of beings, when thanks to emanation (proodos) and return (epistrophe), the subsequent beings aspire to the supreme. The striving of all beings to the supreme is due to love (the well-known Neoplatonic philosophy of love, in which love governs the system of beings - love bringing the world into a single whole).

In the quoted context the Armenian translation reads: կապակցութիւն ს վերաբերութիւն յետևոցն արագիսնս գտովութիւն դնեն (227,16). As an equivalent of Georgian "საკვრველი" the Armenian text has "կապակցութիւն" meaning "union", "to be tied". Appropriate to the semantic meaning of the context is obviously the Armenian "կապակցութիւն" ("to be tied") bound, for love is the binder and lifter of everything to the Highest One. Conclusion: The Georgian original too must have had "საკრველი" rather than "საკვრველი", as it is in the extant Georgian manuscripts. The confusion of "საკვრველი" with "საკრველი" occurred as a result of erroneous decoding of the abbreviation in the Georgian manuscripts. The Armenian translation enables to correct the erroneous reading.

One passage (ch. 152) speaks of two kinds of power: limitless maternal power, and the first limit - paternal power. These two powers create everything down to the last step "and in whatsoever possesses power and energy, those two Powers are present and they are stretched towards them, even down to the fields and tides" (177, 16). The use of "fields" and "tides" in parallel is unexpected, for it follows that the two powers are present everywhere down to "fields and tides". The relevant context of the Armenian translation introduces clarity into the vagueness of the Georgian. The Armenian reads: յարածգէն... մինչև ցրոյսս և քարինս 595,11. At the place of the Georgian "ქვევათა" (movement) the Armenian has քարինս or "ქვათა". It is obvious that the Armenian քարինս ("ქვათა") fits the context precisely: the two powers are present everywhere down to fields and stones. The

confusion again appears to have taken place on the ground of spelling "ქვთა" was probably encoded in the Georgian text, which was read by the copyist as "ქვევთა". nuskhuri -ვ and -ვ resemble each other and they may be easily confused when encoded.

In one place (chapter 55 of the commentaries) discussion concerns division and unification: "in the Eternity the ideas are individualized and so are the properties of numbers in the One; and they are neither mixed nor mingled, but they are in a unitary way, and [those] which are not united are divided" (122, 4-6). The following is the idea: the entity, which is individualized, i.e. distinguished, is neither merged nor mixed with others, but is in a unitary way. The last phrase "and [those] which are not united are divided" causes misunderstanding, which is clarified through the Armenian translation. Unlike the Georgian, the Armenian translation has more words: "վասն զի միեղենն և միաւորեալն" "for the unitary and united". Taking into account this addition, the context acquires the following meaning: "neither mingled nor mixed, but unitary, and neither united, for 'unitary' and 'united' are different [things]", i.e. in the Georgian MSS a phrase is missing between two "ერთეპროვ" (single) words. This lacuna can be filled through the Armenian translation.

In one passage (45, 3-4) a phrase is missing in the Georgian text of Proclus' "Elements"(ch. 69). In the edition the place of the lacuna is marked by dots. In the Armenian translation (394, 1-5) the phrase missing in Georgian is attested. Thus, the Georgian text can be filled through the Armenian translation.

Special note should be taken of the peculiarity of the Armenian translation when the Armenian text has phrases that are not in the Georgian original but are found in the Greek original (10, 50, 15; 116,18-20).

The listed examples demonstrate the role and significance of the Armenian translation in the study of the Georgian text of Proclus' "Elements" and Petritsi's "Commentaries".

Apart from translation-stylistic characteristics, indicated above, the Armenian translation claims attention structurally as well. Consideration of the structure of the Armenian translation allows the introduction of certain corrections in some views found in the literature. At the present stage of research some evidence lacks

the force of solid argument, but it stands in need of study, with noteworthy prospects of further research. After all, what is the character of the Armenian translation from the structural point of view?

1. In the first place, similarly to the Georgian text, the Armenian too comprises 211 chapters. Proclus' "Elements" and Petritsi's "Commentaries" are presented in the same form in the Armenian text as in the Georgian, i.e. in the form of keimena and scholia. Proclus' text and Petritsi's "commentaries" are numbered using letters from 1 to 211 inclusive; Proclus' text has only the number, while Petritsi has the number and abbreviation լԾ - լուծմունք commentary. Both, Proclus' text and Petritsi's "Commentaries" are prefaced with an abbreviation քն (քնագիրք) original".

2. Unlike the Georgian, in the Armenian translation commentaries are found that differ from those of Petritsi. These are separated from the text by the սկ abbreviation ("սեկնություն") "Commentary". The latter are much fewer than Petritsi's commentaries. It is noteworthy that these commentaries (սկ) in some cases accompany Proclus' text, but in the majority of cases they are inserted in Petritsi's commentaries.

In terms of content, the Armenian commentaries are largely of theological character (the Holy Trinity, the angels, Eden, etc). However, some carry Neoplatonic philosophical views. I shall quote a couple of examples by way of illustration.

Chapter 50 of Proclus' "Elements" deals with the understanding of different meanings in two Greek words for time "chronos" (that can denote Platonic understanding of time as image of eternity) and "kairos" – a simple time, as a measure of movement, that can be only a part of the chronos-time, but in no way identical to it. The Armenian translation contains the following commentary: "Gregory the Theologian begins his discourse which says that "God was and is and will be eternally" [8,II,23]. His entire theology is the same. Also the entire sense of Dionysi's words and other theologians is taken from these books and you will know the truth if you study diligently".

Further, in chapter 50, but now in Petritsi's commentary, in which it is explained that καιρος is part of χρονος, the following

commentary is inserted in the Armenian translation: "From this point onwards, he starts division and definition of God and the Everlasting - as Eternal, whereas the creatures as temporal. With reference of this my bright Paul says: "Who was, and eternally is and will be"; and all the newer ones, who have learned from those books theologized [in the same way], for in fact, those books are entirely expressing theology, for all of them are from God and from divinized souls".

In content both commentaries are close to each other. The linking of the wisdom of Gregory the Theologian and of Dionysius with Proclus' book, about which the anonymous author of the commentaries speaks, resembles very much a note found in Georgian manuscripts containing Petritsi's Commentaries, which also deals with the link of the theology of Dionysius and Gregory to Proclus' teaching (National Centre of MSS: H 1337, 3r). In content it is fairly close to the colophon of Simeon, the Armenian translator. The anonymous commentary on the "eternal" and "temporal" is inserted elsewhere in the Armenian translation, namely, in chapter 55. In Petritsi's commentary, where the argumentation of "likeness" (მსგავსობა) and "unlikeness" (უმსგავსობა) begins, the following commentary is inserted: "See all this in this chapter: how thoroughly he defines the eternal and everlasting God and the divine. Also time and its parts those that are from the latter-temporal, deep research and study of which is needed for scholars, for they are to be studied by all means." The quoted examples make clear the Neoplatonic purpose of the commentaries.

To whom must these commentaries belong? Researchers have expressed different views regarding the authenticity of the anonymous author of the commentaries. In the opinion of N. Akinian, the author of both insertions is the same person and he is an 11th c. Georgian figure versed in Greek (3, 143). B. Sargisian considers him to be the same Simeon Pghindzahanetsi (19, 122). It is likely that the author of commentaries differing from the original was, as believed by Sargisian, the translator himself - Simeon Pghindzahanetsi. I concur with this view. The ground for this is provided by two pieces of evidence: 1) The words of the translator's colophon: "I implore you, whoever may correct or copy it, mention me in your prayer and add my few words and do not omit anything."

The translator asks from the future editors or copyist to copy his few words too and not to omit them. It is thinkable that these few words said by him are precisely the inserted commentaries in the Armenian translation that differ from the Georgian. 2) Some phrases of the anonymous commentaries coincide in content with the translator's colophon at the end of the manuscripts of the Armenian translation. They have in common the view on the provenance of the teaching of Dionysius, Gregory the Theologian and other new theologians from this (i.e. Proclus') book. This coincidence in content makes me inclined to support Simeon Pghindzahanetsi. The commentaries may possibly be the result of Simeon's original thinking, or in the process of translating and writing the colophon he may have used some anonymous source.

3. Structurally, the Armenian translation differs from the Georgian original by one more important fact. In the Georgian MSS Proclus' text with Petritsi's Commentaries is prefaced by Petritsi's foreword and an epilogue at the end. The epilogue is absent in the Armenian translation. The Armenian translation of 1248 has no epilogue. This fact is noteworthy in connection with the views expressed in the epilogue. Some researchers believe that the first part of the so-called epilogue comprises fragments of commentaries on the Psalms as a book prophesying the Trinity and from this viewpoint it may be related to the basic theme - that of the Triad in Proclus' "Elements" (14, 168-183). The idea that the epilogue is not related to Petritsi's Commentaries was shared by other researchers as well, but differing views were put forth on its essence and composition (27, 113-126, 26, 121-139; 19). Several sources of the anonymous texts of the epilogue of the commentaries have been revealed (12; 13; 28). The absence of an epilogue in the Armenian translation points directly to the fact that the text of the so-called epilogue was not evidenced in the Georgian original in possession of Simeon Pghindzahanetsi (let me repeat that the Georgian original is almost contemporaneous or differs by a short span of time from the archetype of Petritsi's text).

4. A structural study of the Armenian translation allows revision and some specification of the views on the number of chapters of the Georgian original and their sequence. Along with other factors, from this viewpoint too the Armenian serves as a kind

of control for a definitive specification of the text of the Georgian original. I have in mind cases when a certain doubt is expressed regarding the authenticity of one or another chapter or context. As an example I can name chapter 129 of the Georgian translation of Proclus' "Elements", which begins thus "ყოველი სული ღმრთებრივი და ეშმაკებრივი" ("All the divine and demonic souls..."). This chapter has not been in any of the hitherto known Greek manuscripts of this treatise, owing to which E.R.Dodds, its English editor, has pronounced it not to be authentic. Recently, the researchers L. Alexidze (5,41-47; 6, 47-53; 7, 139-151) and H. Gunther (9, 18-25)) demonstrated the authenticity of this chapter. I think, the Armenian translation should be given crucial importance in the final solution of the problem. Chapter 129 of Proclus' "Elements", with the relevant chapter of Petritsi's commentaries in the Armenian translation is fully identical with the Georgian original. In the Armenian translation it has the number ճիթ (=129) ճիթ լծ (=commentary 129). The text of the Armenian translation follows word for word the text of the Georgian translation. How correct are some sections of this chapter in content and linguistically is another matter. For example, იროთაჲ = իւրոյացւոց. from դրձ „იროთაჲ“ is derived the plural form possessive noun „იროთაჲ“ = heroes". In the Armenian we have a word of the same derivation namely, a possessive pronoun=իւրոյացւոց. ჳელოვნება = իմացութիւն (wisdom, intellect) // մակաձութիւն, տბეთագանի = բնութիւն (of nature). Notwithstanding the inconsistencies, in the Armenian translation, we have a structurally precise picture analogues to the Georgian original.

5. The identicalness of the Georgian original and the Armenian translation is proved by one short adscript as well. The Georgian MSS of chapter 131 have a marginal „სხოლოთა იამვლობობი“ ("Scholion of Iamblichus)". In the oldest Georgian MS H 1337 this note is inserted in the text. The situation is analogous in the Armenian - there too, before the text, we find: Լուծմունք իսմնիխոսի - "Commentaries of Iamblichus".

6. In discussing the relation of the Armenian translation to the Georgian original we cannot bypass the fact of naming Amelachos as the author of the commentaries in the Armenian translation. As is known, in Georgian manuscripts Proclus' "Elements" and Petritsi's

“Commentaries” have no title, neither is it evidenced in the H1337 MS. In the Armenian translation, however, a title is attested before the “Commentaries”: Յոմէլախօսի, իմաստասիրի եւ հռետորի, Աթենացոց եպիսկոպոսի, Լուծմունք Պրոկլի Դիադոխոսի անուանեցելոյ աստուածաբանութեանց - Commentaries on the theology of Proclus Diodochus by Amelachos, philosopher and rhetorician, bishop of the Athenians.”

In the Armenian text, according to this title, Amelachos the philosopher, bishop of the Athenians is proclaimed the author. Amelachos is named for the second time in the cited text - where Petritsi's Commentaries begin. In this passage in Armenian MSS we read: Ամէլախօսի լուծմունք = “Commentaries of Amelachos.”

Who is Amelachos? Is this his name or nickname? According to Armenian researchers, Amelachos is a Greek author. In B. Sargisian's view, the Georgian Ioane Petritsi may be implied under this name (21). As far as I know, the name Amelachos is not attested in the Armenian onomasticon. Apart from the texts of Proclus and Petritsi, the name Amelachos is attested in other works of Armenian literature as well. These are Aristotle's “Categories” and “Peri hermeneias” (MS 112 of the Mchitarist Society of Vienna). In Armenian MSS Amelachos occurs in thirteen different forms, pointing to the fact that Amelachos is a nickname rather than name. It is a compound word, consisting of *ամէլ* being late' and *խօս* 'speaker'. In my opinion, by its meaning, Amelachos, fully coincides with the meaning of 'Petritsi' assigned to the word by Georgian writers of the period of revival (Timote Gabashvili, Ioane Batonishvili, Germane the priest-monk). In their opinion, “Petritsi” means heavy, strict-looking. The etymology of Petritsi and Amelachos – “heavy speaker” allows to consider them identical. Because of its meaning we could think that Amelachos is a translation of “Chimchimeli” (as is known, some Georgian researchers identify Ioane Chimchimeli, known in Georgian literature, with Ioane Petritsi (13, 26). In looking for the identity of Amelachos, one must also ascertain what the reference to him as “bishop of the Athenians” means.

The fact of pronouncing Amelachos as the author in the title of the Armenian translation of Ioane Petritsi's “Commentaries” is not accounted for definitively, despite the attempts of Georgian and

Armenian researchers. I believe this question stands in need of further research and complex study along with other known, yet hitherto unstudied works, in Georgian-Armenian-Byzantine literary contacts. I have in mind the Armenian translations of Aristotle's "Commentaries" on the above-cited "Categories" and "Peri-ermeneias" (in Armenian MS № 112 of the Mchitarist Society) the same person - Amelachos - is named as their author. Conducting research from this angle is not able as in much as, according to the evidence of 18th century scholars, Ioane Petritsi translated and commented the works of Aristotle just cited. Their translation has not survived in Georgian MSS. They may have survived in the form of an Armenian translation (20).

Thus, in the history of Georgian-Armenian literary contacts the names of Petritsi and Amelachos have become intersected in connection with the commentaries on the different works (Proclus' "Elements", Aristotle's "Categories" and "Peri ermeneias"). I think that along with Proclus, "Elements", it is absolutely necessary to study the Armenian texts of the works of Aristotle just cited, which may shed some light on a highly important question: to prove, on the basis of the Armenian translation the fact of Petritsi having translated and commented Aristotle's work, which will introduce some novelty into the complex research into the establishment and adaptation of Neo-Platonism and Aristotelianism in Eastern Christian thought.

References

1. Abuladze, I, Another Old Armenian translation of Georgian philosophical literature of Rustaveli's period (preliminary report). *Proc. TSU*. IV, Tbilisi 1985 (in Georgian).
2. Abuladze, I., Sources of Old Armenian texts translated from the Georgian (preliminary essay, *Proc. TSU*, IV, Tbilisi 1985 (in Georgian).
3. Ակիմեան, Ն., «Միմեոն Պղընձահանեցի եւ նրա թարգմանութիւնները ի վրացերենէ», ՀԱ, № 3-4-5, 1947
4. Ակիմեան., Ն., «Միմեոն Պղընձահանեցի եւ նրա թարգմանութիւնները ի վրացերենէ», ՀԱ, № 1-3, 1950.

5. Alexidze, L., Stages of cognition in the works of Proclus and Petritsi, *Matsne, Series of philosophy and psychology*, 7, 1984 (in Georgian).
6. Alexidze, L., "Das Kapitel 129 der Elemente der Theologie des Proklos bei Ioane Petritzi", *Georgica* (Zeitschrift fuer Kultur, Sprache und Geschichte Georgiens und Kaukasiens), 17, 1994.
7. Alexidze, L., *Ioane Petritsi and Classical Philosophy*, Tbilisi, 2008 (in Georgian).
8. Sancti Gregorii Nazianzeni Opera [Corpus Christianorum, series graecae, 45, Corpus Nazianzenum, 12], Versio iberica, III, Oratio XXXVIII, ed. a H. Metreveli et al., Turnhout-Leuven 2001
9. Guenther, H-Ch., *Die Uebersetzungen der Elementatio Theologica des Proklos und ihre Bedeutung fuer den Proklostext*, Lieden, Boston (Brill) 2007.
10. Dodds, E.-R., Proklus, *The elements of Theologie*, Oxford 1963.
11. Ջարբխանյան, Ն.Գ., «Մատենադարանի հայկական թարգմանությունների նախնեաց», Վենետիկ 1899.
12. Ioane Petritsi, *Works*, I, Cd. by S. Qaukhchishvili, Tbilisi 1940; II, 1937 (in Georgian).
13. Ioane Petritsi, *Lauder of Virtues*, ed. by Ivane Lolashvili, Tbilisi, 1967 (in Georgian).
14. Melikishvili, D., Towards the composition of the "After word" of Ioane Petritsi's "Commentaries" and some new sources. *Proc. TSU Chair of Old Georgian*, 27, 1988 (in Georgian).
15. Otkhmezuri, I., Bezarashvili, K. The Greek original of the so called afterword to Ioane Petritsi's "Commentaries", *Μνήμη*, dedicated to the memory of A.Alexidze, Tbilisi, 2000 (in Georgian).
16. Raphava, M., The Georgian-Armenian versions of John Damascus's "Dialectic", *Matsne, Series of language and literature*, No 1-2, 1965 (in Georgian).
17. Raphava, M., About the Armenian translations of Proclus' "Elements of Theology" and Ioane Petritsi's "Commentaries", *Matsne, Series of language literature*, I, 1969 (in Georgian).
18. Raphava, M., Gelati literary centre and Armenian translators, *Religia*, 1-2-3, 2002 (in Georgian).
19. Raphava, M., Again about the "afterword" to Proclus' "Elements of Theology and Ioane Petritsi's "Commentaries", *Μετάνοια*,

dedicated to the 130th anniversary of Grigol Tsereteli, Tbilisi, 2001 (in Georgian).

20. Raphava, M., Towards the identification of Amelachos-Petritsi, *Mravaltavi*, XVIII, Tbilisi, 1999 (in Georgian).

21. Սարգիսյան, Բ., «Մատենախousական Պրոկղ իմաստասիրի աստուածաբանական Շաղկապաց, Հայկական թարգմանութեան խնդիրն եւ մատենադարանիս թիւ 1123 գրչագրի գաղտնիքը», Բազմավեպ, 52, Վիեննա 1894.

22. Տաշեան, Վ., «Պրոկղի Դիադոխոսի Շաղկապ աստուածաբանականք, Մատենագրական մանր ուսումնասիրութիւնը», ՀԱ, 4, 1892.

23. Տաշեան, Վ., «Պրոկղի Դիադոխոսի Շաղկապ աստուածաբանականք, Մատենագրական մանր ուսումնասիրութիւնը», ՀԱ, 6, 1892.

24. Տաշեան, Վ., «Պրոկղի հնագոյն օրինակը», ՀԱ, 7, 1893.

25. Tisserant, *Codices Armeni Bybliothecae Vaticane*, Romae 1927.

26. Tskitishvili, T., On the essence and significance of one original work of Ioane Petrtsi, *Proc. Kutaisi university*, 4, 1995 (in Georgian).

27. Chelidze, E., The life and activity of Ioane Petrtsi, *Religia*, #3-4-5, 1994 (in Georgian).

28. Chqonia, I., Towards the study of the source of the Afterword to Ioane Petrtsi's "Commentaries". *Four texts of Old Georgian literature*, Tbilisi, 1965 (in Georgian).