

The Cauldron of the Titans

Quotations from Clement of Alexandria in the Letters of Grigor Magistros Pahlawuni (990–1058)

Federico Alpi

The life and work of Grigor Magistros Pahlawuni, who was born around 990 in Bjni, close to Ani, the capital of the Armenian Bagratid Kingdom located just west of the present border between Turkey and the Republic of Armenia, and died in 1058 in Taron, west of lake Van, can be considered both a late and a prime example of the Armenian appropriation and creative transformation of Greek learning, fusing Hellenistic erudition with the Irano-Armenian matrix of Grigor's cultural world.¹



1 Introduction

These words, by the scholar to whom the present volume is dedicated, perfectly summarise the most important facts about Grigor Magistros Pahlawuni. I had the pleasure to work on this Armenian prince, lay philosopher, and literary author under Professor van Lint's tutorship, and it is therefore somewhat natural for me to deal with Grigor Magistros in this contribution. As evidenced by van Lint,² the fusion of Hellenistic erudition with the Irano-Armenian heritage is particularly evident in Grigor's *Letters*.³ Furthermore, as Gohar Muradyan

1 Van Lint 2016, 197.

2 *Ibid.*, 203–205.

3 The *Letters* are a collection of Grigor's correspondence with various personalities of his time, amounting to a total of around 88 epistles (the division and total number of the letters varies slightly between the two editions: see *infra*). The letters were collected and copied as a literary work, in the tradition of late-antique and Byzantine epistolography. As far as I can tell,

has made clear in an important article,⁴ the Hellenistic erudition manifested by Grigor is often related to material drawn from the *Protrepticus* of Clement of Alexandria, a work of which no Armenian translation is known to have existed and that Grigor may therefore have read directly in Greek. In the *Letters*, many passages of the *Protrepticus* are quoted *verbatim*, while others are just the object of passing allusions; finally, some episodes are completely reworked and re-interpreted by Grigor Magistros. Interestingly, the Armenian prince occasionally reveals the sources of his quotations, but he never mentions Clement of Alexandria (nor the *Protrepticus* as a work).

Of course, the *Protrepticus* is not the only means by which Grigor ventured into the vast *repertoire* of Greek literature: he also refers to episodes reported by other Greek authors and works; in many other cases, his knowledge of ancient Greek literature is mediated by Armenian authors or by Armenian translations, such as Dawit' Anyalt' or the Armenian versions of the *Alexander Romance* and of Pseudo-Nonnus's *Commentary*.⁵ The use of Clement's work, however, is preponderant, as Gohar Muradyan has remarked by asserting that the quotations from the *Protrepticus* are "particularly significant".⁶ Her new edition of Grigor's work for the series *Matenagirk' Hayoc'*⁷ (= GM) allows us to further quantify this significance: in this edition, we can find 34 references to the *Protrepticus* in Grigor's *Letters*, to which one (or two, the second one being doubtful) can be added, for a total of 36. This makes the *Protrepticus* the second most-quoted work in the whole epistolary, just after the *Definitions* by Dawit' Anyalt' (37 references) and slightly ahead of the *History of the Armenians* by Movsēs Xorenac'i (32 references).⁸ The *Protrepticus* therefore plays a key role with respect to Grigor's knowledge of the Greek world (and indeed his literary production), even though the Pahlawuni prince does not acknowledge this explicitly.

Grigor's epistolary is the first work by a single author to have received such a treatment in Armenian literature.

4 Muradyan 2013. See also, on the same issue, Muradyan 2014 and Muradyan 2017.

5 Muradyan 2013, 33–40 and 63–65.

6 Muradyan 2014, 23: հատկապես նշանակալի են գուգահեռները, երբեմն էլ բառացի քաղվածքները քրիստոնեության ջատագով Կղեմես Աղեքսանդրացու 'Խրատ հեթանոսներին' երկից.

7 Muradyan 2012. Previously, Grigor's letter had been published by Kostaneanc' 1910. Here I will use Muradyan's edition.

8 I have counted the references on the basis of the notes referring to quotations or to *loci paralleli* in Muradyan's edition. Biblical references (by far the most frequent ones) have been excluded for this purpose. The additional references to the *Protrepticus* (not marked in Muradyan's edition) will be discussed below.

This special relationship between the Armenian author and Clement's work raises at least three questions: one philological, one pertaining to literature, and one historical. As far as the philological question goes, we should investigate what type of source text Grigor used, in what language, and in what condition that text was. This is a particularly interesting point to analyse, given that the Greek text of the *Protrepticus* has reached us through a single manuscript, *Parisinus graecus* 451 (P), which was copied between 913 and 914 for Arethas, the renowned Byzantine scholar (and Archbishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia) by a scribe with an Armenian name: Baanes.⁹ All other known witnesses of the Greek text depend on P and, as I will argue below, there are hints that Grigor used a text from a different branch of the tradition. The philological question, namely to what extent Grigor Magistros's quotations can contribute to our understanding of Clement's reception and use in Armenia—about which very little is known at the moment—is a topic of research in itself, but it can also be useful in order to address issues of textual criticism related to the Greek text.

It is clear that dealing with such a topic requires the collection of a wide array of data and a careful, deep analysis: it is a matter that cannot be dealt with in a short contribution like the present one. More importantly, before using Grigor's quotations of the *Protrepticus* to engage in textual criticism, it is imperative to answer at least the second question raised by the extensive use of Clement's work in Grigor's *Letters*, a question related to literature: in what way does the Armenian author employ the Clementine material? What is his literary purpose in this and how does he integrate the quotations or the general allusions to the *Protrepticus* into his work? This is an important point in order to define the boundaries of the possible quotations and the level of alteration to which they may have been exposed: it would be incautious to build any hypothesis concerning them before tackling this issue.

The third question, which is more related to history, is why Grigor used so much Greek material in his letters and for what reason—if any—did he rely on the *Protrepticus* to such an extent. The first part of this question (“Why so much Greek material?”) is clearly related to the eastward expansion of the Byzantine

9 The *Protrepticus* has been published in a critical edition by Stählin 1905 (reprinted in 1936 and later revised as Stählin—Treu 1972), by Butterworth 1919 (for the Loeb Classical Library, reprinted several times) and again by Mondésert 1949 and Marcovich 1995. For a critical review of this last edition (whose “changes of the text become somewhat problematic”), see van Winden 1996, 311. While acknowledging van Winden's judgement, in this contribution I will also use the text established by Marcovich, since—regardless of its limits—it takes account of all previous editions. Other relevant editions include Klotz 1831 and Dindorf 1869.

Empire in the second half of the 9th century, which put Armenians and Greeks directly in contact again, as the control of the Caliphate over Upper Mesopotamia and Armenia grew thinner. This produced a situation where Armenians and Eastern Romans interacted extensively in politics, military matters, culture, and religion.¹⁰ It is well known—as van Lint recalls—that as a result of this phenomenon many influential Armenians were co-opted into the imperial political and military system. However,

[w]hat has not been traced is the impact of Greek learning on those nobles and their families who were co-opted into the Byzantine reward system. Did this lead to an increase in familiarity with Greek philosophical thought, Greek poetry and historiography, and with Greek epistolography in Armenia?¹¹

To this sub-question van Lint gives a positive answer, while underlining that much remains to be done.¹² Following this direction, I have already discussed elsewhere further elements that reveal the direct influence of Byzantine epistolography on Grigor's *Letters* and, therefore, on the recipients of the letters themselves.¹³ As for the other sub-question (i.e. "Why the *Protrepticus*?"), it is clear that any answer will have to be based on deeper philological knowledge of the textual tradition of that work, both in Greek and in Grigor's Armenian quotations: we first have to understand what sources Grigor was actually using, before making any statement as to why he used precisely those.

To sum up, the philological question requires extensive treatment and partly depends on the literary question, while a complete answer to the historical question is impossible without first addressing the philological one. It is clear therefore that, in this contribution, we can only try to tackle the central, literary issue: how is the material from the *Protrepticus* employed in Grigor's *Letters*?

10 It is not my intention to provide even a concise bibliography on Armeno-Greek interactions in the 9th–11th centuries. As a general introduction, however, as regards military and political interactions, see Dédéyan 1975, Cheynet 1990 and Cheynet 2014; as regards cultural interaction, in addition to the contributions by Muradyan and van Lint mentioned above, see Lemerle 1971 (for the Byzantine context) and, for the Armenian context, the three books by T'amrazyan on the school of Narek (T'amrazyan 2013, T'amrazyan 2015 and T'amrazyan 2017), as well as Mahé—Mahé 2000. For the religious aspect see Dorfmann-Lazarev 2004.

11 Van Lint 2016, 199.

12 Van Lint 2016, 210.

13 Alpi 2018.

2 Quotations, Abridgements, and Allusions: An Overview

In her article, Muradyan presents several examples of Grigor's references to the *Protrepticus*. Some are described as resembling the Greek text "nearly verbatim",¹⁴ while others are recorded as abridgements which either maintain "the main idea of the story"¹⁵ as it appears in Clement's work or, alternatively, give the idea that Grigor "confused the information of his source";¹⁶ finally, Muradyan notes that in some cases we have "just a hint" at the *Protrepticus*.¹⁷ Given our aim here, it might be useful to maintain and expand Muradyan's categories, by further developing their rationale and by assigning each reference to one of those categories. With respect to length and to adherence to the Greek text, therefore, we find long quotations (with occasional abridgements), short quotations, and allusions (or hints).

The category of short quotations is the easiest to define and is rather self-explanatory. It includes single sentences or short portions of text (usually with no more than one finite verb) that closely resemble the Greek text of the *Protrepticus*. One brief and clear example will be sufficient here to account for the level of similarity: in letter 27 Grigor laments the difficult times through which Armenians are going,¹⁸ and attacks those who conspired for the destruction of the Armenian kingdom, because "the snake will bite he who destroys the walls of the motherland" (cf. Eccl 10:8). He then adds: "And what wonder is there, if the Tyrrhenian barbarians profess a cult of shameful passions, where even the Athenians and people elsewhere in Greece and Attica [do so]?"¹⁹ After this rather abrupt sentence, he goes on to recall that even Moses was moved to

14 Muradyan 2013, 41.

15 Muradyan 2013, 50.

16 Muradyan 2013, 44.

17 Muradyan 2013, 49.

18 In Grigor's lifetime, in 1045, the Armenian kingdom of Ani was annexed by the Byzantine Empire after a short war and amidst internal rivalries (for a detailed chronology see Shepard 1975). Grigor was deeply involved in these events, cf. van Lint 2014, 12–14.

19 See below for the Armenian text. Here and elsewhere, unless otherwise stated, translations are my own. Grigor's epistolary, however, presents such difficulties that it is not always possible to produce a faithful translation: his frequent use of puns, foreign or distorted words, and an unusual (often Hellenising) syntax are, for the time being, formidable obstacles to a clear understanding of his text. Only a comprehensive lexical and syntactical analysis of the *Letters*, ideally culminating in a full glossary of terms used by Grigor Magistros, can lead to a more accurate interpretation of his text. However, no such analysis is available as yet, and it remains a major *desideratum* in Armenian Studies. For this reason, all my translations should be considered provisional and open to later revisions.

anger by the misconduct of his people. This curious reference to “Tyrrhenian barbarians” in the middle of the paragraph is, as Muradyan noted, a word-by-word quote from the *Protrepticus*:

Եւ զի՛նչ զարմանալիք են, եթէ տիրոռենացի դուժքն ամաւթալեաց
պաշտան տանին ախտիցն, ուր եւ արթնացիք իսկ, եւ այլում Ելլադայ
եւ Ատտիկէ:

GM, lett. 27,29

Καὶ τί θαυμαστὸν εἰ Τυρρηνοὶ οἱ βάρβαροι αἰσχροῖς οὕτως τελίσκονται παθή-
μασιν, ὅπου γε Ἀθηναίους καὶ τῆ ἄλλῃ Ἑλλάδι (αἰδοῦμαι καὶ λέγειν) αἰσχύνῃς
ἔμπλεως ἢ περὶ τὴν Διῶν μυθολογία;

Protr. 20.1

Longer quotations are similar in form, but generally include more sentences and—because of their length—they are often abridged or somehow adapted to suit Grigor’s discourse. This does not prevent the single sentences or syntagms that form the quotation from being immediately identifiable as coming from the Greek text of the *Protrepticus*, as we can see in letter 80. Here we find an account of Dionysus’s murder by the Titans, which reads as follows:

When he [Dionysus] was still a little child, the Titans deceived him with tricks and acts of deception. They cut him into pieces, put him in a cauldron, and placed it upon Hephaestus [i.e., on the fire]; they also pierced some of the pieces with skewers, keeping them over the bonfire. From the smell of roasted meat, father Aramazd [i.e., Zeus] became aware of what had happened, struck the Titans with a thunderbolt, and placed Dionysus’s members in a box, which he entrusted to his son Apollo. The latter then seized the box, took it to Parnassus, and put it there somewhere.²⁰

The Armenian text again closely follows the *Protrepticus*, even though some passages are shortened or left out (the portions of text present in the Armenian are highlighted in the Greek):

Արդ սա մինչ տակաւին մանուկ տղայն էր, պատրանաւք խաբմամբ
խաղուց խաբեցին Տիտանքն, եւ զենեալ յաշմամբ, ի սան ամանեալ,

²⁰ See also the translation by Muradyan 2013, 41.

եղին ի վերայ Հեփեստայ, իսկ յանդամոցն ի շամփուրս հարեայ, ի վերայ ունելով հրատին: Զոր ի ճենճերաց հոտոյն ազդ եղեայ հարն Արամազդայ, շանթի զՏիտանսն տանջէր, եւ զանդամսն Դիոնետայ ի տապանակի եղեայ, Ասորոնն իրիւր իրիւր յանձն առնէր. իսկ նրա առեայ ի Պառնասոս տարեայ, ահա ուրեմն եղեայ:

GM lett. 80,7–8

Τὰ γὰρ Διονύσου μυστήρια τέλεον ἀπάνθρωπα· ὃν εἰσέτι παῖδα ὄντα ἐνόπλιω κινήσει περιχορευόντων Κουρήτων, δόλω δὲ ὑποδύντων Τιτάνων, ἀπατήσαντες παιδαριώδεσιν ἀθύρμασιν, οὗτοι δὴ οἱ Τιτᾶνες διέσπασαν, ἔτι νηπίαχον ὄντα, ὡς ὁ τῆς Τελετῆς ποιητῆς Ὀρφεύς φησιν ὁ Θράκιος·

κῶνος καὶ ῥόμβος καὶ παίγνια καμπεσίγυια,

μῆλὰ τε χρύσεια καλὰ παρ' Ἑσπερίδων λιγυφώνων.

Καὶ τῆσδε ὑμῖν τῆς τελετῆς τὰ ἀχρεῖα σύμβολα οὐκ ἀχρεῖον εἰς κατάγνωσιν παραθέσθαι· ἀστράγαλος, σφαῖρα, στρόβιλος, μῆλα, ῥόμβος, ἔσοπτρον, πόκος. Ἀθηναῖα μὲν οὖν τὴν καρδίαν τοῦ Διονύσου ὑφελομένη Παλλὰς ἐκ τοῦ πάλλαιν τὴν καρδίαν προσηγορεύθη· οἱ δὲ Τιτᾶνες, οἱ καὶ διασπάσαντες αὐτόν, λέβητά τινα τρίποδι ἐπιθέντες καὶ τοῦ Διονύσου ἐμβαλόντες τὰ μέλη, καθήψουν πρότερον· ἔπειτα ὀβελίσκοις περιπεύραντες «ὑπέιρεχον Ἥφαιστοιο.» Ζεὺς δὲ ὕστερον ἐπιφανεῖς (εἰ θεὸς ἦν, τάχα που τῆς κνίσσης τῶν ὀπτωμένων κρεῶν μεταλαβών, ἧς δὴ τὸ «γέρας λαχεῖν» ὁμολογοῦσιν ὑμῶν οἱ θεοί) κεραυνῶ τοὺς Τιτᾶνας αἰκίζεται καὶ τὰ μέλη τοῦ Διονύσου Ἀπόλλωνι τῷ παιδί παρακατατίθεται καταθάψαι. Ὁ δέ, οὐ γὰρ ἠπέιθησε Δί, εἰς τὸν Παρνασσὸν φέρων κατατίθεται διεσπασμένον τὸν νεκρόν.

Protr. 17.2–18.2

Allusions, in turn, are more difficult to assess. For example, even though Athena is mentioned in the *Protrepticus*, it is obvious that we cannot consider each and every reference to Athena in Grigor's *Letters* as an allusion to the *Protrepticus*. A more substantial argument is needed. Muradyan presents a perfect case of such a substantial argument when she notes that in a very brief allusion Grigor mentions Persephone by the extremely rare name of Pherephatte, which is present in the *Protrepticus*:²¹

Ոչ թողից շատել եւ զխարդաւանական երկպառակութիւն մղութեանն, որ առ Փերսիփոտայ ի ձեռն հարն գործիր, ոչ եւս Քիւսակահին Բրաքսիդէայ որ առ Թետպոմպոսի Ղակեդոնացոյ

GM, lett. 36,6

21 Cf. Muradyan 2013, 49–50.

[Grigor lists famous examples of deceit and betrayal] ... I will not avoid mentioning the deceitful, double act of depravity which was perpetrated against Pherephatte by her father, and [the deceit] of the *Biwtakan Brak'sideay* against Theopompus the Lacedaemonian.²²

Compare this with *Protr.* 16.1–2:

Κυεὶ μὲν ἡ Δημήτηρ, ἀνατρέφεται δὲ ἡ Κόρη, μίγνυται δ' αὖθις ὁ γεννήσας οὐτοσί Ζεὺς τῇ Φερεφάττῃ, τῇ ἰδίᾳ θυγατρὶ, μετὰ τὴν μητέρα τὴν Δηῶ.

Given the many other cases in which the *Protrepticus* is the source of Grigor's references, we can be fairly sure that also the rare form Pherephatte comes from there.²³ In this regard, we can add a further example, not noted by Muradyan, which arguably—on the same grounds—depends on the *Protrepticus*:

Եւ զինչ զարմանալիք այս. մի եւ պարսաւ որ իմասցի, իբրու ոստայնանգութիւնս, որք զպաստառակն խաշարս եւ անհոյծս եւ ազայտս յանգեն, անհարթութեամբ կեամատարազ կարկատեալ խեղկեալ մատանց մանուածով, եւ զպատկանեալն պոռփիւղիկոն Թեսմոյփաւոնեացն այպանեն եւ որք զկնի նառեանն լիզոնի Ակիւրրափաւրեացն սիողէն նրբաքարշիւքն քանոնիկոն հարթութեամբ հոյծեալ.

GM, lett. 26,21

The Armenian text is far too complex to produce a reliable translation. In the context of the letter, Grigor is using a series of examples to show that philosophy, like any other art, can be of good or bad quality:²⁴ the passage above is one such example. What Grigor seems to be saying is:

What is there to wonder about this? No one is going to learn through a thick rope, [it is?] just like the weaving arts: [there are] those who complete thick, large and thin carpets[?] by intertwining a sort of wicker in disorderly fashion, stumbling with their weaving fingers, and who make fun of the *poip'iwrikon*[?] fitting for the *T'esmoyp'awreac'n* [= Thesmo-

22 See also the translation by Muradyan 2013, 49.

23 Theopompus the Lacedaemonian is also a reference to the *Protrepticus*, specifically an allusion to *Protr.* 42.2, as already identified by Muradyan: on this and *Biwtakan Brak'sideay* see *infra*.

24 For this interpretation see also van Lint 2016, 208.

phoriae], and those who after the *naʿeann ligoni* of the *Akiwrrapʿawreacʿn* [weave?] the *spʿolē*, with thinly woven [threads?], regular and evenly polished.

The words left untranslated are *hapax legomena*, and their meaning is unknown: to make any sense of the text, an extensive treatment of each word would be required.²⁵ However, here we can focus on *Tʿesmoypʿawreacʿn* and *Akiwrrapʿawreacʿn*: the former is clearly a reference to the famous festival of the Thesmophoriae, which Clement of Alexandria mentions several times in the *Protrepticus*;²⁶ the second is extremely similar to the less-famous festival of the Scirophoriae, which is mentioned in *Protr.* 17.2:

Ταύτην τὴν μυθολογίαν αἱ γυναῖκες ποικίλως κατὰ πόλιν ἑορτάζουσι, Θεσμοφόρια, Σκιροφόρια, Ἀρρητοφόρια πολύτροπως τὴν Φερεφάττης ἐκτραγωδοῦσαι ἀρπαγην.

As we can see, the Clementine passage is closely connected to the Thesmophoriae and to the episode of Pherephatte, which Grigor knew: this makes the similarity even more striking. It is conceivable that *Akiwrrapʿawreacʿn* is here a corruption of “*Skiw(r)rapʿawreacʿn*”, i.e., “Scirophoriae”, caused by the oddity of the name and by the similarity of the characters for *s* (*u*) and *a* (*u*) in Armenian.²⁷

Other allusions are clear because Grigor makes passing references to episodes of the *Protrepticus* which he also mentions elsewhere in his letters as

25 The passage intriguingly alludes to carpets of varying thickness, which may be a reference to the terminology of “wide” and “subtle” writings that is attested in Armenia at least from the Eleventh century, see Shirinian 2019, 324–325 and Shirinian 1998. It is too obscure, however, to allow any further assessment. An attempt to interpret the unknown words in this passage has been made by Ačaryan 1922: see the following notes.

26 Ačaryan proposed to interpret the word as “temple” (Ačaryan 1922, 184), from the Greek Θεσμοφόριον, but the plural of the Armenian term and the unusual meaning of the Greek word seem to make the festival of the Thesmophoriae a more acceptable explanation for *Tʿesmoypʿawreacʿn*.

27 Unfortunately, this does not help us identify the other words of unknown meaning used here by Grigor. Ačaryan tried to explain them (Ačaryan 1922), and proposed we interpret *poipʿiwrikon* as some sort of cloth woven with purple, *ligoni* as “wreath” (from the Greek λύγος) and *spʿolēn* as a mistake for *spʿolen*, itself the 3rd person plural of an otherwise unattested form with *s-* of the verb *pʿotem*, *pʿotpʿotem*, with the meaning “to weave”, while *naʿeann* is left unexplained. Given the unusual exchange (at least in Grigor’s letters) of *-ēn* and *-en* (the 3rd person plural ending) and, in turn, the abundance of Greek words, I wonder if *spʿolēn* here could be a corrupt form of *stolēn*, i.e. “τὴν στολήν”, “the garment”, generated by the error of palaeographic origin *st>spʿ* (uun>uφi).

verbatim quotations or abridgements. Consider this reference to the Titans' killing of Dionysus, reported by Muradyan:

... եւ զամանն տիտանեան, յորում զյաւշեալ զանդամնն Դիոնէսիոսի եղին

GM, lett. 34,2

[*Grigor enumerates a series of famous pots or cauldrons*] ... and the titanic cauldron in which they put the torn members of Dionysus.²⁸

Again, following the same principle, there is another allusion concerning which some considerations can be made, in addition to those proposed by Muradyan:

զիարդ համարձակիր ընդ վիմիդ հաստատուն, կամ կարէ կարկաստել կեղծաորելով բան զարէն կորիբանդականին տիտանեան դաշեկաց:

GM, lett. 20,17

[*Grigor consoles Catholicos Petros I, who had to defend himself against an unnamed calumniator*]. How did he [dare to] rush against you, o stable stone, or how can he weave a discourse by dissimulating, like the Corybantic one by [literally: “of”] the titanic tutors?

The “titanic tutors” are again the Titans, who dared kill Dionysus, who had been entrusted to them, as in *Protr.* 17.2–18.2, mentioned above;²⁹ the adjective “Corybantic” may come from *Protr.* 19, a paragraph dedicated to the Corybants, and in fact Muradyan points to *Protr.* 19.4:

Καβείρους δὲ τοὺς Κορύβαντας καλοῦντες καὶ τελετὴν Καβειρικὴν καταγγέλλουσιν· αὐτῷ γὰρ δὴ τούτῳ τῷ ἀδελφοκτόνῳ τὴν κίστην ἀνελομένῳ, ἐν ᾗ τὸ τοῦ Διονύσου αἰδοῖον ἀπέκειτο, εἰς Τυρρηγίαν κατήγαγον, εὐκλεοῦς ἔμποροι φορτίου.

28 Muradyan 2013.

29 Martirosyan 2010, s.v. “*titan*”, links *titanian* in this passage to the Armenian word *titan*, “nurse”: while the meaning is fitting, the reference to the episode of the Titans and Dionysus is too explicit, especially because in lett. 34,2 Grigor uses *titanian* unequivocally with the sense of “pertaining to the Titans”. Given that *titanian* with the meaning of “pertaining to nurses” also exists, however, it is perfectly conceivable that Grigor used the term precisely with this ambiguity in mind, creating a pun that fits the canons of Byzantine epistolography nicely.

They [i.e., those initiated into the Corybantic mysteries] call the Corybants “Cabeirs”, and the initiation “Cabeirian [ritual]”; these two brother-slayers in fact [i.e., the Corybants], carrying away the box in which Dionysus’s member had been put, took it to Tyrrhenia ... traders of noble wares!

Muradyan’s suggestion is reasonable, and in this case “Corybantic” would be an adjective created by Grigor as a synonym for “inhuman, barbarous, terrible”, on the basis of this episode. However, there is the possibility that the adjective itself may have been borrowed from the *Protrepticus*, and not invented by Grigor. In that case the source for the adjective could be *Protr.* 19.2: “οἴονται γὰρ δὴ ἐκ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ απορρυέντος τοῦ Κορυβαντικοῦ τὸ σέλινον ἐκπεφυκέ- ναι”. Given that this sentence occurs just a few lines before the Corybants are said to bring a box containing Dionysus’s member to “Tyrrhenia”, it is very likely that Grigor (or his source) confused the Dionysus-carrying (and self-mutilating) Corybants and the Dionysus-slaughtering Titans. If that is the case, one might also advance the hypothesis that “Corybantic” in the Armenian passage above results from the misinterpretation of Κορυβαντικός as an appellation of Dionysus: the Armenian passage could therefore be simply translated “like [the deceit of] the Corybantic [i.e. Dionysus] by the titanic tutors”.³⁰

We have just seen that, as far as allusions are concerned, Grigor may often be hinting at two (or more) different sections of the *Protrepticus* in the same passage. Sometimes, the sections are quite distant in the Greek text, in which case the allusion is double, or even triple; let us reconsider letter 36,6:

Ոչ թողից չասել եւ զխարդաւանական երկպառակութիւն մոլորեանն,
որ առ Փերափտեայ ի ձեռն հարն գործիր, ոչ եւս Բիւտականին
Բրաքսիդեայ որ առ Թեոպոմպոսի Ղակեդոնացոյ:

I will not avoid mentioning the deceitful, double act of depravity which was perpetrated against Pherephatte by her father, and [the deceit] of the *Biwtakan Brak'sideay* against Theopompus the Lacedaemonian.³¹

The reference to Theopompus, as noted by Muradyan, is drawn from a *Protrepticus* passage (42.2) that Grigor quotes almost *verbatim* elsewhere, in letter

30 The association might have also been caused by the following sentence in *Protr.* 19.3, “ἐκ τοῦ Διονύσου αἵματος σταγόνων βεβλαστηκέναι νομιζουσαι τὰς ροιάς”, based on the conflation between αἶμα τοῦ Κορυβαντικοῦ and αἶμα τοῦ Διονύσου.

31 See *supra*.

16,4,³² while we have already seen that the mention of Pherephatte is an allusion to *Protr.* 16.1–2. This leaves out *Biwtakan Brak'sideay*, where *Biwtakan* is likely an adjective of origin (“from Bithynia”?) and *Brak'sideay* a personal name. The identified allusions, unfortunately, offer no assistance in clarifying who *Brak'sideay* might be: the reference, given the context, should be to someone who devised some sort of trick or deceit. Bearing this in mind, one might think of *Protr.* 53.5, where the famous sculptor Praxiteles is mentioned:

Ὁ Πραξιτέλης δέ, ὡς Ποσειδίππος ἐν τῷ Περὶ Κνίδου διασαφεῖ, τὸ τῆς Ἀφροδίτης ἄγαλμα τῆς Κνιδίας κατασκευάζων, τῷ Κρατίνης τῆς ἐρωμένης εἶδει παραπλήσιον πεποίηκεν αὐτήν, ἵν' ἔχοιεν οἱ δεῖλαιοι τὴν Πραξιτέλους ἐρωμένην προσκυνεῖν.

Praxiteles, as Poseidippus clarifies in *On Cnidus*, made the statue of Aphrodite of Cnidus in the shape of Cratine, his beloved one, so that the poor fellows [i.e., the inhabitants of Cnidus] would worship the woman loved by Praxiteles.

This is clearly a reference to a trick, and the name of Praxiteles is reasonably similar to *Brak'sideay*: it is conceivable that Grigor's allusion may point to this episode. However, this would not explain why the person mentioned by Grigor is called *Biwtakan*, and the evidence is not conclusive: after all, Grigor may also have had other works in mind here; for all these reasons, the allusion to *Protr.* 53.2 should be considered a mere hypothesis for the time being.

Bearing this in mind, it is now possible to arrange all 34 references to the *Protrepticus* found by Muradyan in Table 8.1, according to the aforementioned criteria. To these we can add the references noted above (the first is marked with an asterisk; the hypothetical allusion is marked with two asterisks).

3 Amusement and Fiction: The Fleeting Boundaries of Allusion

One of the purposes of the several quotations or allusions referring to the *Protrepticus*, as mentioned above and discussed in more detail elsewhere, is the embellishment of the letter in accordance with the stylistic rules of Byzantine—and late-antique—epistolography.³³ Mythological, epic, and Classical

³² For Muradyan's discussion of the passage in lett. 16,4, see Muradyan 2013, 52–53.

³³ Cf. Alpi 2018.

TABLE 8.1 References to the *Protrepticus* in Grigor Magistros's *Letters* (based on Muradyan 2012)

Long quotations		Short quotations		Allusions	
<i>Letters</i> (letter number, sentence)	<i>Protrepticus</i> (chapter.section)	<i>Letters</i> (letter number, sentence)	<i>Protrepticus</i> (chapter.section)	<i>Letters</i> (letter number, sentence)	<i>Protrepticus</i> (chapter.section)
9,107	72.1–2	12,1	19,3	6,15–16	19.4
9,108	72.4–5	15,5	11.1	6,15–16	42.3
9,111	74.3–5	27,29	20.1	6,19	17.2
9,112	77.2	34,2	11.1	15,16	1.1
16,4	42.1–5	34,2	18.1–2	20,17	17.2
26,48–51	1.1–2	47,2	54.2	20,17	19.2
30,10–11	1.1	71,4–5	11.1	26,21*	17.1 (or 19.3)
47,1–2	48.1–6	80,10	19.3	31,3	26.2
80,8	17.2–18.2	9,106	71.2–3	36,6	16.1–2
		9,110	74.1–2	36,6	42.2
		9,109	73.3	36,6**	53.5
				42,1–2	17.2–18.1
				47,1	39.5
				61,24	19.4
				61,24	18.2
				81,1	11.1

references are abundant in the letters of Byzantine authors of virtually any century, and their recurrent presence in Grigor's letters testifies to the spread of that model in 11th-century Armenia. Of course, not all the Greek material in Grigor's *Letters* depends on Clement of Alexandria: in addition to the borrowings from Clementine works,³⁴ certain themes are also drawn—as Muradyan noted—from the *Book of Chries* (*Girk' Pitoyic'*), from the Armenian version of the Pseudo-Nonnian *In IV Orationes Gregorii Nazianzeni Commentarii*, and from other Greek sources that are impossible to identify at the moment.³⁵ In

34 Muradyan, in addition to the references to the *Protrepticus*, notes three (possibly four) references to Clement's *Stromateis*: see Muradyan 2013, 46 (with a proposed reference at p. 71, note 86) and GM lett. 6,101 and lett. 46,14. Also, Grigor's mention of "brilliant [pearls] taken from the sea [the Attic Greek word *θάλαττα* is used here by Grigor]", associated with (gold) *nomismata* in GM, lett. 26,8 (արդ ընծայեմ քեզ նպաստ ոչ զնսմիզմստայն արաբացի, եւ ոչ զնարապիսանն ի թալաստայ արասիլիսեայ) is suspiciously reminiscent of a passage in Clement's *Paedagogus* (120.1), where pearls and gold are mentioned side by side: a few lines above (*Paedagogus*, 118.1), the Attic form *θάλαττα* is also present in a similar context: "Λίθους δὲ πελίουσ ἢ χλωρούσ καὶ τῆσ ἀπεξενομένησ θαλάττης τὰ ἐκβράσματα".

35 See Muradyan 2013, 55, 57, 59, 63, 65, and 68 for references to Pseudo-Nonnus; Muradyan

none of these cases, however, do we find the kind of lengthiness and level of adherence to the source text that can be observed in quotations from the *Protrepticus*. These other cases are in fact allusions, not quotations, and should be regarded as being on a par with the passing hints to Clementine works in the rest of the *Letters*: regardless of their provenance, such hints and allusions are embellishments, meant to display Grigor's erudition and to satisfy the Byzantine taste for *châris* in letter-writing.³⁶ We are dealing, admittedly, with a peculiar type of allusion, since an allusion presupposes that the author has a particular text in mind, which the reader must have read and recognised;³⁷ in our case it seems that Grigor is often alluding to *episodes* rather than to specific *texts*; but this does not significantly alter the mechanism: in any case, the Armenian prince engages his readers in a literary game whose purpose is to strengthen the internal ties the members of the learned élite.³⁸

In some cases, literary amusement is pushed to the extreme, and allusions become something different: in a couple of letters, almost entirely translated by Muradyan, Grigor indulges in tales for which no evident parallel can be found in Greek literature. In letter 31 an unnamed musician who is labelled the "son of Parmenides" is kidnapped by a "swift flying eagle" (արծիւ սրաթել) and then saved by fishermen, only to be brought to the temple of "stranger-slaying" (սսսարսսսսսս) Artemis; fortunately for him, the fishermen convince the priest (or priestess, բազնսսսսսս: Armenian has no grammatical gender) to spare his life. In letter 74 another musician called Pałētin, described as pupil of Eunomios, engages in a sort of dance with Demeter, sends sparkling flashes from his shoes, and finally receives honour in the "assembly of the Thomians" (ի ժողովին թոմացոյն).³⁹ Although some Clementine material is present, these can hardly be considered allusions. It is true that the *Protrepticus* (42.3) contains the plot of *Iphigenia in Tauris* by Euripides, where the human sacrifice of strangers to Artemis is described, and Grigor, who in letter 16,4 makes an abridgement with literal quotations from that section of the *Protrepticus* (i.e., 42.1–4, but without including Artemis), most probably took the concept from

2013, 36–37 for references to the *Girk' Pitoyic'*; Muradyan 2013, 58–65 for references whose source is unclear.

36 Cf. Grünbart 2004, 364: "La *χάρτις*, il fascino di una lettera, si manifesta nell'uso di citazioni, proverbi ed *exempla* mitologici adatti".

37 Cf. Pasquali 1994, 275: "Le reminiscenze possono essere inconsapevoli; le imitazioni, il poeta può desiderare che sfuggano al pubblico; le allusioni non producono l'effetto voluto se non su di un lettore che si ricordi chiaramente del testo cui si riferiscono".

38 On this function of epistolography see Papaioannou 2010, 191–192. See also Bernard 2015, 185–186 on the role of humour and jokes in that context.

39 For an almost full translation see Muradyan 2013, 70–71, note 86, and 50–51 respectively.

there. The “assembly of the Thomians” instead, as Muradyan notes, is merely Grigor’s misunderstanding of the *Θαυμασίων συναγωγή*, i.e., the “Collection of Wonders”, a literary work by one Monimos⁴⁰ which Clement mentions in that same passage (*Protr.* 42.4). In other words, Grigor Magistros here mixes up material extrapolated from Greek, Christian (e.g. the fishermen as saviours) and possibly Armenian sources (the “swift flying eagle”)⁴¹ into something new and, in a sense, original.

Regarding these episodes, Muradyan tentatively supposes that “some stories ‘in Greek style’ are Grigor’s original composition”.⁴² She may well be right: Grigor himself confesses, at the end of letter 31, that the Parmenides episode is “an allegorical tale, that we philosophised in the ways of the rhetors”.⁴³ It is an imitation of a myth, whose importance lies in the general atmosphere being conveyed, more than in the accurate reproduction of a source text (or episode). This is, after all, the very essence of the “ways of the rhetors”, since “Saper leggere e scrivere ed essere eloquenti (ovviamente al grado più evoluto) richiede che ci si faccia anche traduttori, interpreti, parafrasti, trasformatori di testi e in generale imitatori”.⁴⁴

The abundance of narratives for which a Greek background is often difficult to detect or absent⁴⁵ might also be explained by the fact that fables, tales,

40 Probably the philosopher of the 4th century BCE.

41 Muradyan notes that Clement of Alexandria uses the adjective *δξύπτερος*, corresponding to the Armenian *սրաթև*, “swift-flying, swift winged” in an otherwise unrelated passage of the *Stromateis* (II, 15, 67 and V, 8, 81, edition: Stählin—Früchtel—Treu 1985), describing an eagle. A relationship with the word used by Grigor is certainly possible, as is—one may add—the parallel with the etymologically correspondent *ώκυπέτης*, “swift-flying”, which is used by Hesiod in the *Works and Days* (Hes. *Op.*, 212, edition: West 1978) and Gregory of Nazianzus in his poems (*Carm. II.2*, I, 160, edition: Migne 1862, col 1463). The most probable source for *սրաթև*, however, is the famous epic fragment preserved by Movsēs Xorenac’i about the Alan princess Sat’enik and her lover king Artašēs, who crosses a river “like a swift-winged eagle” (“որպէս արծուի սրաթև”, Movsēs Xorenac’i *Patm.*, II, 50, 11, edition: Muradyan—Yuzbashyan 2003; translation in Thomson 1978, 192); on the same topic see also Martirosyan 2013, 96. This would be another perfect example of how, as van Lint remarked, Grigor is capable of “fusing Hellenistic erudition with the Irano-Armenian matrix” of his world (van Lint 2016, 197, cf. *supra*).

42 Muradyan 2013, 72.

43 GM, lett. 31,10: “սյտոյիկ բանք առակականք իմաստասիրեալ ի մէնջ հռետորական”.

44 Barchiesi—Conte 1989, 82: “to know how to read and write and to be eloquent (to the most advanced degree, of course) requires one to become a translator, an interpreter, a paraphraser, a transformer of texts and, more generally, an imitator”.

45 The examples, in Grigor’s *Letters*, are many: from the tale of a Persian princess, a fish and a pearl in letter 14,13–17, to the architect who builds a palace on the Indian seashore in let-

and myths, especially one with exotic settings, became increasingly common in 11th-century Byzantium.⁴⁶ Grigor, who indulges in many more similar tales with Greek, Iranian or even Indian settings⁴⁷ for the benefit of his Armenian or Byzantine-Armenian readers, may have been receptive to this new trend and may have included (or adapted) episodes from different literary traditions, which are impossible to identify at the moment; after all, the famous *Book of Syntipas*, one of the best-known Byzantine collections of fables, was translated from Syriac into Greek by Michael Andreopoulos, towards the end of the 11th century, for an Armeno-Greek patron, Gabriel, Duke of Melitene.⁴⁸

4 The Authority (and Reliability) of Quotations

Many allusions to the *Protrepticus* or to other, often unidentifiable, material in the letters could therefore have the sole function of amusing the reader. The situation with long or short quotations, however, is arguably different. Certainly, they serve the purpose of displaying Grigor's erudition, but their length and their adherence to the Greek text of the *Protrepticus* suggest that they also had a more practical use, and that their source text enjoyed a particular status. As for the function of the quotations, it may be observed that in many cases they serve an argumentative purpose: this is most evident in the many quotations contained in letter 9, addressed to the Muslim prince Ibrahim and intended as an apologetic and polemical work.⁴⁹ Such quotations are drawn from a section of the *Protrepticus* where Clement uses various (and at times spurious) quotes from Classical poets and philosophers in order to argue that, despite its polytheistic facade, pre-Christian Greek theological thought understood the concept of one, almighty God.⁵⁰ In letter 9 Grigor employs these quotations

ter 14,21–25; from the tree producing human fruits in letter 15,11–15, to the fish who fights alongside the Amazons in letter 14,18–20.

46 See Krönung 2016, 448–456.

47 See note 45 above.

48 See Conca 2004, Toth 2014, and Toth 2016.

49 On the exchange between Grigor Magistros and Ibrahim, see van Lint 2010 and van Lint 2016, 205–206.

50 As scholarly works have made clear, this collection in fact pre-dates Clement himself, and its core was probably developed in a Judaeo-Christian environment, from where it was included in the pseudo-Justinian *De Monarchia*, cf. Denis 2000 and Simonetti 2011; on the relationship between this collection and Clement's work, see Azzarà 2004. The quotations by Grigor Magistros Pahlawuni, in any case, appear to be exclusively dependent on Clementine material.

in order to reply to a question that Ibrahim has posed him, namely whether pagan philosophers affirmed the existence of one God, or of the Trinity.⁵¹ In his answer, Grigor uses the variety of theological positions of the “philosophers” (including poets like Hesiod) to show that their testimony, even if it contains hints about monotheism, cannot be used to argue against the Trinity.⁵² Even the passage on the Tyrrhenians mentioned above, in letter 27, is used as a maxim on the ingratitude and fallacy of nations, placed on the same level of a biblical reference:

And what wonder is there, if the Tyrrhenian barbarians profess a cult of shameful passions, where even the Athenians and people elsewhere in Greece and Attica [do so]? Therefore, what wonder [is there] or why should I marvel, given that even the great Moses suffered contempt from those whom he was leading to salvation, [to the point of] bringing the godly meekness to indignation, [he] who broke into pieces—because of the sin in front of God—even the letters inscribed by God, written on stone with the immortal finger?⁵³

In almost all cases, the quotations from the *Protrepticus*—whether long or short—are no mere literary amusements: they are used for “philosophising”, իմաստասիրել, a word that—as Muradyan correctly noted—means, for Grigor, “to examine whatever topic by bringing forth examples”.⁵⁴ Such is the case, for instance, with the passage on Dionysus in letter 71,4–5 (taken from *Protr.*, 11.1), which is used in a discussion about wine, or with that in letter 80,10

51 GM, lett. 9,36: “Եթէ արտաքին իմաստասէրք մի Աստուած ասացին զոչ եթէ երրորդութիւն”.

52 Because “they did not know the unity of God nor the Trinity: however, they did worship the number three”, see GM, lett. 9,115: “տոքա ոչ միութիւն Աստուծոյ ծաննաւ եւ ոչ երրորդութիւն, սակայն զերրորդն թիւ պատուեցին”.

53 GM, lett. 27,29–30: “Եւ զինչ զարմանալիք են, եթէ տիտռենացի դուծքն ամաութալեաց պաշտան տանին ախտիցն, ուր եւ աթենացիք իսկ, եւ այլում Ելլադայ եւ Ատտիկէ: Արդ այժմ զինչ սքանչանս, կամ զիմրոզ զարմացից, եթէ մեծին Մովսէսի յիւրոցն հասանէր փրկելոց փոխարէն անարգանս եւ ի սրտմտութիւն շարժեալ զաստուածային հեզութիւն, որ եւ զտառս աստուածային մակադրեալն ի վիմէ գծագրեալ մատամբն անմահի, մանրեալ մեղաւ Տեառն Աստուծոյ առաջի”.

54 Muradyan 2014, 30: “Իմաստասիրել՝ բայը Գրիգորի բառապաշարում ավելի հաճախ նշանակում է ոչ թե ‘գբազվել փիլիսոփայությամբ’, այլ քննարկել որևէ թեմա, օրինակներ բերելով Աստվածաշնչից եւ այլ գրքերից” (“the verb ‘to philosophise’, in Grigor’s lexicon, often means not ‘to engage in philosophy’, but rather to examine whatever topic by bringing examples from the Bible or from other books”).

(taken from *Protr.* 19.3) on pomegranates.⁵⁵ Only the quotation in letter 16,4 (about sacrifices to Zeus and about the Spartan king Theopompus) seems to be a purely erudite reference serving no clear argumentative purpose.

This use of the material from the *Protrepticus* suggests that Grigor regarded the text he was drawing from as an authoritative one; this also explains the adherence of the quotations to the source text, a feature that is shared with other authoritative works mentioned in the letters, such as Movsēs Xorenac'i's *History of the Armenians* and Dawit' Anyakt's *Definitions*.⁵⁶ Conversely, works of practical use—such as the *Book of Chries* or the Pseudo-Nonnian *Commentary*—are only echoed here and there, and they never appear to be quoted literally.⁵⁷ As we have seen, they offer material for allusions or even (unconscious?) reminiscences, not for quotes: as such, they can be ascribed to the model of “evolved” literature, which is not “authored” in a standard sense but is rather developed through time.⁵⁸

Conversely, in the case of quotations, Grigor Magistros transmits a sometimes abridged but overall precise translation of passages from the *Protrepticus*, to the point that in some cases his testimony is relevant even for textual criticism. He is careful to follow his source, even if he never names it. Let us consider a passage from letter 9 (GM lett. 9,108), containing a Pythagorean fragment from the *Protrepticus* (*Protr.* 72.4). The fragment, which is written in Doric Greek, is also present in Pseudo-Justin (*Cohortatio ad Graecos*, 19.2 = *Coh.*) and in Cyril of Alexandria (*Contra Iulianum Imperatorem*, 1, 42 = *C.Iul.*).⁵⁹ It has also been published by Mullach in 1960.⁶⁰

55 There are, of course, many other examples which cover many of the quotations listed in the table above: letter 30,10–11 (on music), letter 34,2 (on cauldrons), letter 47,1–2 (on the veneration of idols), and letter 15,5 (on trees).

56 These works are very often quoted word by word: see, for instance, letter 15,10 (for a quotation from Movsēs Xorenac'i) and letter 21,34 (for a quotation from Dawit').

57 See, for instance, the reference about Medea and Pelias taken from the *Book of Chries*, as documented by Muradyan (Muradyan 2013, 36–37): it only has a loose resemblance to the wider account of the *Book of Chries*, with which there are no precise syntactical parallels. Only the topic and the general information provided by Grigor allow us to posit with a good degree of certainty that the *Book of Chries* is indeed the source of the episode.

58 Kraft 1975, p. 185.

59 The *Cohortatio* has been published in a critical edition by Marcovich 1990. Riedweg, the editor of the last and most scrupulous edition of the work by Ps.-Justin, proposed to change the title to *Ad Graecos de vera religione*: see Riedweg 1994. Against this proposal (but otherwise in praise of Riedweg's edition, against that of Marcovich), see Simonetti 1996. For the edition of the *Contra Iulianum imperatorem* see Burguière—Évieux 1985 and Riedweg—Kinzig 2016: while taking the former into account, I have used the latter here for our comparison with Clement's text.

60 See Mullach 1860, 501–502. The fragment was later considered a Hellenistic fabrication

Իսկ պիրթագորականքն այսպէս ասեն. Աստուած մի է, եւ զաա ոչ, որպէս ոմանք կարծեն, արտաքոյ յարդարման զարդուս է, ի սմա. բոլոր ի բոլորում շրջանակի, ակնածու ղէտ ամենայն սերման ծննդեան, խառնումն բոլորեցուն, էլով գործաւ իւրոյ զաւրութեանն եւ գործոց, սկիզբն շնչացութիւն բոլոր շրջանակիս եւ ամենեցուն շարժումն.

3 ակնածու] ակնածի C Kostaneanc' 4 բոլորեցուն էլով] բոլորիցն ունէլով B C Kostaneanc'

But the Pythagoreans instead speak as follows: “God is one, and he does not—as some suspect—reside outside the order of this world, but is rather in it; he is all in the whole circle, he is overseer and sentinel over every generation, the mixture of all things, being the builder of his own strength and of his own deeds, beginning and breath of the whole circle and movement of all things”.

Οὐκ ἀποκρυπτέον οὐδὲ τοὺς ἀμφὶ τὸν Πυθαγόραν, οἱ φασιν· “ὁ μὲν θεὸς εἷς, χροῦτος δὲ οὐχ, ὡς τινες ὑπονοοῦσιν, ἐκτὸς τὰς διακοσμήσιος, ἀλλ' ἐν αὐτᾷ, ὅλος ἐν ὄλω τῷ κύκλῳ ἐπίσκοπος πάσας γενέσιος, κράσις τῶν ὄλων αἰώνων, καὶ ἐργάτας τῶν αὐτοῦ δυνάμιων καὶ ἔργων, ἀρχὰ πάντων, ἐν οὐρανῷ φωστήρ, καὶ πάντων πατήρ, νοῦς καὶ ψύχωσις τῷ ὄλω κύκλῳ, πάντων κίνασις”.

1–2 χροῦτος] P¹ Mondésert, Marcovich : οὔτος Wilamowitz *rec. edd. cet.* : αὐτὸς *Coh.*, *C. Iul.* 2 αὐτᾷ] P¹ *edd.* : ἐαυτῷ *Coh.* (*codd.*, Marcovich : αὐτῷ Riedweg) : αὐτῷ *C. Iul.* 3 ἐπίσκοπος ... γενέσιος] P¹ *edd.* : ἐπισκοπῶν πάσας γενεσίας ἐστὶν *Coh.* : ἐπ. πάσας γενεάς ἐστὶ *C. Iul.* | κράσις] *post* κράσις *add.* ἐὼν *Coh.*, ὡν *C. Iul.* | αἰώνων] Stählin *ex Coh. et C. Iul.*, *rec.* Butterworth, Marcovich : ἀεὶ ὡν P¹ Mondésert 4 αὐτοῦ] Victorius, *rec.* Mondésert, Marcovich : αὐτοῦ P¹ *edd. cet.*, *Coh.* (*codd.*, Riedweg : αὐτοῦ Marcovich), *C. Iul.* (αὐτοῦ *coni.* Migne, *rec.* Burguière) | δυνάμιων] M², *edd.* : δυνάμιων *corr. ex* δυνάμεων P¹ | ἀρχὰ πάντων] Marcovich *ex Coh. et C. Iul.* : ἀπάντων P¹ *edd. cet.* 5 τῷ ὄλω κύκλῳ] Klotz *rec. edd. pler.* : τῷ ὄλω κύκλῳ P¹ Mondésert : τῶν ὄλων κύκλων *Coh. et C. Iul.* πάντων] P¹, *edd.*, *C. Iul.* : ἀπάντων *Coh.*

In this passage, several points of accordance can be observed between the Armenian text and *Parisinus graecus* 451 (P), that is the manuscript from which the extant direct tradition of the *Protrepticus* originates (see *supra*). The most noticeably similar readings (regardless of their being correct or not) are the following: *ἐν quu* is closer to the transmitted reading *χροῦτος* than to *αὐτὸς*, as we

in Thesleff 1961, 122, and published as such (in the form it appears in the *Cohortatio*) in Thesleff 1965, 186. Consequently, it is not included in the collections of Pre-Socratic *fragmenta* by Diels—Kranz 1964 and Gemelli Marciano 2007.

read in *Coh.* and *C. Iul.*, on the basis of which the emendation οὔτος was proposed by Wilamowitz (note that the accusative mark Գ-, in Armenian, has no justification here, and is very likely an error that occurred in the Armenian transmission); Ի սմու reflects ἐν αὐτῷ (as in P), against the reflexive form ἐαυτῷ of *Coh.*;⁶¹ finally, the genitive/dative singular բոլոր շրջանակիս is more in accordance with τῷ ὅλῳ κύκλῳ (again as in P) than with the plural τῶν ὅλων κύκλων of both *Coh.* and *C. Iul.* The difficulties posed by the dative in Greek⁶² are ignored in the Armenian word, where genitive and dative coincide.

However, there are also substantial differences with the text of P, concentrated in the final sentence of the passage. Grigor's Խսանունս բոլորեցուն, ելով գործաւ իրոյ զարուրեանն եւ գործոց ("the mixture of all things, being the builder of his own strength and of his own deeds") has the participle ելով ("being"), which corresponds to [ἀεί] ὢν, partly in accordance with P (since ἀεί is left out) and against the text of *Coh.* and *C. Iul.*, where we read αἰώνων,⁶³ the reflexive Իրոյ presupposes the Greek αὐτοῦ instead of αὐτοῦ, as we read in P (and in *Coh.* and *C. Iul.* as well).⁶⁴ Most interestingly, Grigor has the term սկիզբն ("beginning"), which does not appear in P (probably because of a scribal error) but only in *Coh.* and *C. Iul.*;⁶⁵ the following portion of the Greek text is omitted in Grigor's quotation, which continues from ψύχωσις (accurately translated as շնչացութիւն, "breath") until the end of the sentence. In other words, the Greek text presupposed by Grigor's quotation is κράσις τῶν ὅλων ὢν, ἐργάτας τῶν αὐτοῦ δυνάμιων καὶ ἔργων, ἀρχὰ [πάντων ...], notably different from that of P; the lack of ἀεί in the translation is not particularly significant in itself, nor is the reflexive pronoun Իրոյ (= αὐτοῦ) instead of αὐτοῦ:⁶⁶ however, the presence of սկիզբն (= ἀρχὰ) can hardly have been invented on the basis of a text like that of the *Parisinus graecus* 451.⁶⁷

61 Since Armenian lacks a grammatical gender, of course, Ի սմու could also stand for ἐν αὐτῷ, as we read in Cyril.

62 On the basis of this, τῷ ὅλῳ κύκλῳ was proposed by Klotz and accepted by Stählin and Marcovich.

63 This word is therefore accepted by Stählin and Marcovich, as an emendation of ἀεί ὢν.

64 Note that a few words before, αὐτός was translated with the equally non-reflexive Armenian pronoun սու.

65 Hence Marcovich proposes to correct the text of P.

66 This could be the outcome of a lucky error (a misreading of the breathing) or a successful—and rather easy, given the context—*divinatio*. It is obvious that the divinity should be the source of its own power: as noted in the apparatus, Pietro Vettori (Victorius) also printed αὐτοῦ (already in the 16th century): was he motivated to do so by the same considerations?

67 In this case, the Armenian text would represent an element in support of Marcovich's conjecture—unless, of course, one advances the hypothesis that սկիզբն is a some-

Another passage, which is placed just before the Pythagorean fragment both in Grigor's letter 9 (GM lett. 9,107) and in Clement's *Protrepticus* (72.1–2), offers a further point of interest. In this case we are dealing with a fragment of Cleanthes, the Stoic philosopher of the 3rd century BC. The fragment, other than in Clement of Alexandria—in the *Protrepticus* and (with minor differences) in his *Stromateis* (*Strom.* v, 110), is only present in the *Praeparatio Evangelica* by Eusebius of Caesarea (*Praep.* XIII, 13.37), a work which incorporates large portions of the *Protrepticus*.⁶⁸ The Greek text has also been published in the first volume of von Arnim's *Stoicorum veterum fragmenta*.⁶⁹

Իսկ Կղէանթէս Պէգէսացի՝ արդար, իրաւակ, արժանաւոր եւ սուրբ, իշխան անձին ունի զինքն, պիտանացու, գեղեցիկ, հզար, աներկիւղ, պատուական, անհպարտ, խնամածու, հեզ, ի յամենայնէ անբիծ, միշտ նոյնպէս կայ մնայ.

Cleanthes *Pēgesac'i* [calls God] “orderly, just, pious and holy, he is the only lord over himself, useful, beautiful and hard, fearless, esteemed, without arrogance, careful, gentle and deprived of any blame, he always remains the same”.

- 1 **Κλεάνθης δὲ ὁ Πηδασεύς, ὁ ἀπὸ τῆς Στοᾶς φιλόσοφος, ὃς οὐ θεογονίαν ποιητικὴν, θεολογίαν δὲ ἀληθινὴν ἐνδείκνυται, οὐκ ἀπεκρύψατο τοῦ θεοῦ περὶ ὅτι περ εἶχεν φρονῶν·**
 |τάγαθὸν ἐρωτᾷς μ' οἷόν ἐστ'; Ἄκουε δὴ· *inc. Strom., Praep.*
τεταγμένον, δίκαιον, ὄσιον, εὐσεβές,
 5 **κρατοῦν ἑαυτοῦ, χρήσιμον, καλόν, δέον, αὐστηρόν, αὐθέκαστον, ἀει συμφέρον, ἄφοβον, ἄλυπον, λυσιτελές, ἀνώδυνον, ὠφέλιμον, εὐάρεστον, ἀσφαλές, φίλον, ἔντιμον, <εὐχάριστον,> ὁμολογούμενον**

what loose rendering of the *πατήρ* which appears in the passage otherwise ignored in the Armenian. This is possible, even though the lexical similarity between Greek and Armenian in this passage would argue against such a loose translation. Additionally, it should be noted that P also contains (in ff. 163^v–187^v) the *Cohortatio ad Graecos*, where we read *ἀρχὰ πάντων*: in theory, this could have been a possible (if unlikely) source for an emendation based solely on the contents of P.

68 Book 5 of the *Stromateis* was edited by Stählin in 1906 (Stählin 1906) and revised several times up to the final edition of 1985 (Stählin—Früchtel—Treu 1985), and then, in 1981, by A. Le Boulluec and P. Voulet (Le Boulluec 1981). For the *Praeparatio evangelica* see the editions by Mras 1983 (a revision of Mras 1956) and by des Places (des Places 1983).

69 Von Arnim 1905, 126–127.

- 10 εὐκλεές, ἄτυφον, ἐπιμελές, πρᾶον, σφοδρόν,
 χροניζόμενον, ἄμεμπτον, αἰεὶ διαμένον.
 Ἄνελεύθερος πᾶς ὅστις εἰς δόξαν βλέπει,
 ὡς δὴ παρ' ἐκείνης τευξόμενος καλοῦ τινος.

1 Πηδασεύς] Wilamowitz *ex Strab. XIII 6n*, *edd.* : πισαδεὺς P¹ : Ἀσσεύς Ménage : Τρωαδεύς Meineke 8-9 ἀσφαλές, φίλον, ἔντιμον] P¹, *edd.*, *Praep.* : *om. Strom.* 11 ἄμεμπτον] P¹, *edd.*, *Praep.*, *Strom.* : *cum v.l. ἀμίμητον Strom.* | αἰεὶ] Klotz, *rec.* Marcovich : αἰεὶ P¹ *edd. cet.*

No variant readings are recorded in Muradyan's edition of the Armenian text. As is evident, in this case Grigor makes an abridgement of his *Vorlage*, retaining only the parts highlighted in bold but maintaining the order of God's attributes, sometimes expanding them in the translation through the use of periphrases. This is the case with κρατοῦν ἑαυτοῦ, rendered as իշխաւն աւձին ունի զհարս (literally "he has himself as ruler over his own self"); ἄμεμπτον, translated as աւրբո՞, "blameless", and reinforced by ի յաւննայիւն; and αἰεὶ διαμένον, paraphrased with two finite verbs, միշտ նիշուլիս կայ մնայ (literally "he always stays remains the same"). What is interesting to note, however, is that Cleanthes is called *Pēgesac'i* (Պէգեսացի), i.e., "from Peges" in Grigor's text, while the direct tradition of the *Protrepticus* (which relies only on a *codex unicus*, P, and its copy M, see above) has the corrupted form *πισαδεύς*. In all other works where this fragment is present, it is introduced without any reference to Cleanthes's origin. The mistaken reading has led philologists to conjecture either Pedasos (<Πηδασεύς), Assos (<Ἀσσεύς) or even the Troad (<Τρωαδεύς) as Cleanthes's birthplace. Grigor's testimony seems to support Pedasos, since *Pēgesac'i* (Պէգեսացի) is an easily explainable corruption of *Pēdasac'i* (Պէդասացի), given the similarity of *g* (գ) and *d* (դ) in Armenian. It is highly unlikely that even someone as erudite as Grigor would correct a reading similar to that of P (*πισαδεύς*) into *Pēgesac'i* or even *Pēdasac'i*. Not even Arethas, who had commissioned P and revised it on several occasions, emended the text here: it is difficult to imagine that 11th-century Armenian scholars were more acquainted with Stoic philosophers than him. Realistically, Grigor's *Vorlage* had the correct reading Πηδασεύς,⁷⁰ allowing us to conclude that Grigor's text is not dependent on P; rather, it represents a previous stage, or a separate branch of the tradition.

70 This would confirm Wilamowitz's conjecture. Marcovich, in his edition, erroneously credits Sylburg instead of Wilamowitz as the author of the conjecture; the 1592 edition by Sylburg and Heinsius, to which Marcovich refers, reads Πισαδεύς, just like P.

5 Conclusions: More Questions Than Answers?

In conclusion, we have seen that Grigor Pahlawuni Magistros, in his *Letters*, makes extensive use of material taken from the *Protrepticus* of Clement of Alexandria, albeit without ever naming that work or its author: the *Protrepticus* is indeed one of the most widely quoted individual works in the whole epistolary. The references to this Clementine work are used in accordance with the principles of Byzantine epistolography, which requires a frequent use of allusions, *exempla* and mythical references. In Grigor's case such allusions may come from Armenian literature, from Scripture, or from Greek literature: in the last case, they often take the form of allusions to (or even quotations from) the *Protrepticus*. However, there are also several other cases where the episodes to which Grigor is referring are unknown: some of them may be his own invention, others might be related to lost Greek or Armenian material or (perhaps more probably) to other literary traditions. Further investigation is needed in this direction.

As for the relationship between Grigor Magistros's work and the *Protrepticus*, a good number of quotations can be found in which there is a very close correspondence with the Greek text as preserved in *Parisinus graecus* 451, copied in the beginning of the 10th century and serving as the archetype for the direct tradition of that work. There are hints, however, that Grigor's *Vorlage* did not depend on the *Parisinus*, or even on a copy of it: a tempting hypothesis is that Grigor could access a manuscript now lost, belonging to a different (and extinct) branch of the Greek tradition, but this is already a step into uncharted territories. There are simply too many things that we still do not know: was Grigor translating directly from the Greek, or was he using an extant Armenian translation of which no other trace has reached us? Was he drawing on a complete text of the *Protrepticus* or on an abridgement of it? Was he relying on a manuscript with a content comparable to that of *Parisinus graecus* 451—which also includes the *Stromateis* and the *Paedagogus* by Clement of Alexandria, as well as Pseudo-Justin's *Cohortatio ad Graecos*, Eusebius's *Praeparatio evangelica*, and other works—or did he have a different selection at hand? As we have seen, addressing these issues means tackling the philological question, for which much research still remains to be done.

Bibliography

- Ačariyan, H. 1922. *Hayerēn nor baṛer: hin matenagrut'ean mēj'* [New Armenian Words. In Ancient Literature], Venetik: Tparan S. Łazar, 1922.
- Alpi, F. 2018. "Reuse of Byzantine Models in the Letters of Grigor Magistros Pahlawuni (990–1058)", *Nea Rhome* 15, 5–22.
- Azzarà, S. 2004. "Le antologie pseudepigrafe nelle citazioni dei Padri", in Funghi, M.S. (ed.), *Aspetti di letteratura gnomica nel mondo antico*, Firenze: Olschki (Studi / Accademia toscana di scienze e lettere La Colombaria 225), 111–132.
- Barchiesi, A.—Conte G.B. 1989. "Imitazione e arte allusiva. Modi e funzioni dell'intertestualità", in Cavallo, G., Fedeli, P., Giardina, A. (eds). *Lo spazio letterario di Roma antica, I. La produzione del testo*, Roma: Salerno editore, 81–114.
- Bernard, F. 2015. "Humor in Byzantine Letters of the Tenth to Twelfth Centuries: Some Preliminary Remarks", *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 69, 179–195.
- Burguière, P. Éviex, P. (eds) 1985. *Cyrille d'Alexandrie. Contre Julien. Tome I: Livres I et II. Introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes*, Paris: Éditions du Cerf (Sources chrétiennes 322).
- Butterworth, G.W. (ed.) 1919. *Clement of Alexandria: Exhortation to the Greeks, the Rich Man's Salvation, and the Fragment of an Address Entitled to the Newly Baptized*, London: William Heinemann; New York: G.P. Putnam's sons (The Loeb Classical Library).
- Cheyne, J.-C. 1990. *Pouvoir et contestations à Byzance: 963–1210*, Paris: Univ. de Paris 1, Panthéon-Sorbonne (Série Byzantina Sorbonensia 9).
- Cheyne, J.-C. 2014. "Les Arméniens dans l'armée byzantine au X^e siècle", in Mardirosian, A., Ouzounian, A., Zuckerman, C. (eds). *Mélanges Jean-Pierre Mahé*, Paris: Association des Amis du Centre d'Histoire et Civilisation de Byzance (Travaux et Mémoires 18), 175–192.
- Conca, F. (ed.) 2004. *Novelle bizantine. Testo greco a fronte*, Milano: Rizzoli.
- Cupane, C.—Krönung, B. (eds) 2016. *Fictional Storytelling in the Medieval Eastern Mediterranean and Beyond*, Leiden—Boston: Brill (Brill's Companions to the Byzantine World 1).
- Dédéyan, G. 1975. "L'immigration arménienne en Cappadoce au XI^e siècle", *Byzantion* 45, 41–116.
- Denis, A.-M. (ed.) 2000. "Anthologie judéo-hellénistique de citations fictives d'auteurs grecs", in Id., *Introduction à la littérature religieuse judéo-hellénistique*, Turnhout: Brepols, 1063–1106.
- des Places, É. 1983. *Eusèbe de Césarée. La préparation évangélique. Livres XII–XIII*, Paris: Éditions du Cerf (Sources chrétiennes 307).
- Diels, H.—Kranz, W. (eds) 1964. *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*, Zürich: Weidmann.
- Dindorf, W. 1869. *Clementis Alexandrini Opera. Vol. I: Protrepticus, Paedagogus*, Oxonii: E Typographeo Clarendoniano.

- Dorfmann-Lazarev, I. 2004. *Arméniens et byzantins à l'époque de Photius: deux débats théologiques après le triomphe de l'orthodoxie*, Lovanii: Peeters (Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium 609; Subsidia 117).
- Gemelli Marciano, M.L. (ed.) 2007. *Die Vorsokratiker. 1: Thales, Anaximander, Anaximenes, Pythagoras und die Pythagoreer, Xenophanes, Heraklit: griechisch-lateinisch-deutsch*, Düsseldorf: Artemis und Winkler (Sammlung Tusculum). DOI: 10.1515/9783050092096.
- Grünbart, M. 2004. "L'epistolografia", in Cavallo, G. (ed.), *Lo spazio letterario del medioevo 3. Le culture circostanti, 1. La cultura bizantina*, Roma: Salerno editrice, 345–378.
- Klotz, R. (ed.) 1831. *Titi Flavi Clementis Alexandrini opera omnia: vol. I, continens Protrepticum ad Graecos et Paedagogi libb. III*, Lipsiae: Sumptibus E.B. Schwickerti.
- Kostaneanc', K. (ed.) 1910. *Grigori Magistrosi t'ht'erə*, Alek'sandrapöl: Tparan Gëorg Sanoyeanc'i.
- Kraft, R.A. 1975. "The Multiform Jewish Heritage of Early Christianity", in Neusner, J. (ed.), *Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults: Studies for Morton Smith at Sixty*, Leiden: Brill (Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity 12), 174–199.
- Krönung, B. 2016. "The Wisdom of the Beasts: The Arabic Book of Kalila and Dimna and the Byzantine Book of Stephanites and Ichnelates", in Cupane—Krönung 2016, 427–460. DOI: 10.1163/9789004307728_019.
- Le Boulluec, A. (ed.) 1981. *Clément d'Alexandrie, Les Stromates: Stromate v, tome 1*, Paris: Éditions du Cerf (Sources chrétiennes 278).
- Lemerle, P. 1971. *Le premier humanisme byzantin; notes et remarques sur enseignement et culture à Byzance des origines au x^e siècle*, Paris: Presses universitaires de France.
- Mahé, A.—Mahé, J.-P. (eds) 2000. *Tragédie: Matean otbergut'ean: le livre de lamentation*, Lovanii: Peeters (Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium 584; Subsidia, 106).
- Marcovich, M. (ed.) 1990. *Cohortatio ad Graecos. De monarchia. Oratio ad Graecos*, Berlin-New York: De Gruyter (Patristische Texte und Studien 32).
- Marcovich, M. (ed.) 1995. *Clementis Alexandrini Protrepticus*, Leiden-New York-Köln: Brill (Vigiliae Christianae Supplements 34).
- Martirosyan, H. 2010. *Etymological Dictionary of the Armenian Inherited Lexicon*, Leiden-Boston: Brill (Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary Series 8). DOI: 10.1163/9789047426837.
- Martirosyan, H. 2013. "The place of Armenian in the Indo-European language family: the relationship with Greek and Indo-Iranian", *Voprosy jazykovogo rodstva. Meždunarodnyj naučnyj žurnal* 10, 85–137. DOI: 10.31826/jlr-2013-100107.
- Migne, J.-P. (ed.) 1862. *Patrologiae graecae tomus xxxvii*, Lutetiae Parisiorum: Migne.
- Mondésert, C. (ed.) 1949. *Clément d'Alexandrie. Le protreptique*, Paris: Éditions du Cerf (Sources chrétiennes 2^{bis}).
- Mras, K. (ed.) 1956. *Eusebius Werke, achter Band: Die Praeparatio evangelica, 2*, Berlin:

- Akademie-Verlag (Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte 43, 2).
- Mras, K. (ed.) 1983. *Eusebius Werke, achter Band: Die Praeparatio evangelica, 2*, Berlin: Akademie-Verlag (Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte 43, 2).
- Mullach, F.W.A. (ed.) 1860. *Fragmenta philosophorum graecorum: poeseos philosophicae caeterorumque ante Socratem philosophorum quae supersunt*, Parisiis: Editore Ambrosio Firmin Didot.
- Muradyan, P.—Yuzbashyan, K. [as Muradean, P.—Iwzbašean, K.] (eds) 2003. “Movses Xorenac'i. Patmut'iwn Hayoc' Mecac' [Movses Xorenac'i: History of Greater Armenia]”, in *Matenagirk' Hayoc' E dar*, Ant'ílías: Haykakan matenašar Galust Kiwlpēnkean himnadrut'ean; Meci tann Kilikioy kat'ohikosowt'iwn; Mesrop Maštoc'i anuan matenadaran (Matenagirk' Hayoc' II), 1743–2122.
- Muradyan, G. [as Muradean, G.] (ed.) 2012. “Grigori Magistrosi T'ułt'k' ew Č'ap'abera-kank' [Letters and Poems of Grigor Magistros]”, in *Matenagirk' Hayoc' ŽA dar*, Erewan: Haykakan matenašar Galust Kiwlpēnkean himnarkut'ean; Meci tann Kilikioy kat'ohikosut'iwn; Mesrop Maštoc'i anuan matenadaran (Matenagirk' Hayoc' XVI), 139–385.
- Muradyan, G. 2013. “Greek Authors and Subject Matters in the Letters of Grigor Magistros”, *Revue des Études Arméniennes* 35, 29–77. DOI: 10.2143/REA.35.0.3023308.
- Muradyan, G. 2014. “Grigor Magistrosi matenagrut'yunə [The Literary Production of Grigor Magistros]”, *Banber Matenadarani* 20, 5–44.
- Muradyan, G. 2017. “Medieval Greek-Armenian Literary Relations”, in Torlone, Z.M., Munteanu, D.L.—Dutsch, D. (eds). *A Handbook to Classical Reception in Eastern and Central Europe*, Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 516–525. DOI: 10.1002/9781118832813.ch 43.
- Papaioannou, S. 2010. “Letter-Writing”, in Stephenson, P. (ed.), *The Byzantine World*, London: Routledge, 188–199.
- Pasquali, G. 1994. “Arte allusiva”, in Russo, C.F. (ed.), *Pagine stravaganti di un filologo*, Firenze: Le Lettere, 275–282.
- Riedweg, C. (ed.) 1994. *Ps.-Justin (Markell von Ankyra?), Ad Graecos de vera religione (bisher «Cohortatio ad Graecos»): Einleitung und Kommentar*, Basel: F. Reinhardt (Schweizerische Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft 25).
- Riedweg, C.—Kinzig, W. (eds) 2016. *Kyrrill von Alexandrien, Werke: erster Band. Gegen Julian, Teil 1: Buch 1–5*, Berlin-Boston: De Gruyter (Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte, neue Folge 20). DOI: 10.1515/9783110362626.
- Shepard, J. 1975. “Scylitzes on Armenia in the 1040 and the Role of Catacalon Cecaumenos”, *Revue des Études Arméniennes* 11, 269–311.
- Shirinian, E.M. [as Širinyan, Ė.M.] 1998. “Artak'in ew nurb greank' [External and Subtle Writings]”, *Aštanak* 2, 1998, 15–45.

- Shirinian, E.M. 2019. "Vitaie Homeri, Pseudo-Nonnos' Commentary on Sermon 4 by Gregory of Nazianzus and the Armenian Book of Causes", in Bläsing, U., Dum-Tragut, J., van Lint, T.M. (eds). *Armenian, Hittite, and Indo-European Studies. A Commemoration Volume for Jos J.S. Weitenberg*, Leuven—Paris—Bristol, CT: Peeters (Hebrew University Armenian Studies 15), 323–345.
- Simonetti, M. 1996. "[Review of] Justin (Ps.) (Markell von Ankyra?), 'Ad Graecos de vera religione' (bisher 'Cohortatio ad Graecos')". Einleitung und Kommentar von C. Riedweg", *Rivista di Filologia e di Istruzione Classica* 124, 225–229.
- Simonetti, M. 2011. "In margine allo Pseudogiostrino", *Augustinianum* 51–1, 5–19. DOI: 10.5840/agstm20115111.
- Stählin, O. (ed.) 1905. *Clemens Alexandrinus, erster Band: Protrepticus und Paedagogus*, Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs (Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Drei Jahrhunderte 12).
- Stählin, O. (ed.) 1906. *Clemens Alexandrinus, zweiter Band: Stromata Buch I–VI*, Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs (Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Drei Jahrhunderte [52] 15).
- Stählin, O. (ed.) 1936. *Clemens Alexandrinus, erster Band: Protrepticus und Paedagogus*, Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs (Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Drei Jahrhunderte 12.1).
- Stählin, O., Früchtel, L. Treu, U. (eds) 1985. *Clemens Alexandrinus, zweiter Band: Stromata Buch I–VI*, Berlin: Akademie Verlag (Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte 52).
- Stählin, O.—Treu, U. (eds) 1972. *Clemens Alexandrinus, erster Band: Protrepticus und Paedagogus. dritte, durchgesehene Auflage*, Berlin: Akademie Verlag (Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Drei Jahrhunderte 12).
- T'amrazyan, H. 2013. *Grigor Narekac'i ew Narekyan dproc'ə: girk' A* [Grigor Narekac'i and the School of Narek. Book I], Erevan: Nairi.
- T'amrazyan, H. 2015. *Grigor Narekac'i ew Narekyan dproc'ə: girk' B* [Grigor Narekac'i and the School of Narek. Book II], Erevan: Nairi.
- T'amrazyan, H. 2017. *Grigor Narekac'i ew Narekyan dproc'ə: girk' G* [Grigor Narekac'i and the School of Narek. Book III], Erevan: Nairi.
- Thesleff, H. 1961. *An Introduction to the Pythagorean Writings of the Hellenistic Period*, Åbo: Åbo Akademi (Acta Academiae Aboensis, Humaniora 24).
- Thesleff, H. (ed.) 1965. *The Pythagorean texts of the Hellenistic period*, Åbo: Åbo Akademi (Acta Academiae Aboensis, Ser. A, Humaniora 30).
- Thomson, R.W. (ed.) 1978. *Moses Khorenats'i: History of the Armenians*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Toth, I. 2014. "Authorship and Authority in the Book of the Philosopher Syntipas", in Pizzone, A. (ed.), *The Author in Middle Byzantine Literature: Modes, Functions, and Identities*, Boston—Berlin: De Gruyter (Byzantinisches Archiv 28), 87–102. DOI: 10.1515/9781614515197.87.

- Toth, I. 2016. *Fighting with Tales: 2 The Byzantine Book of Syntipas the Philosopher*, in Cupane—Krönung 2016, 380–400. DOI: 10.1163/9789004307728_017.
- van Lint, T.M. 2010. “Grigor Magistros”, in Thomas, D., Mallett, A., Roggema, B. (eds). *Christian-Muslim Relations. A Bibliographical History. Volume 2 (900–1050)*, Leiden: Brill, 703–713. DOI: 10.1163/1877-8054_cmri_com_24828.
- van Lint, T.M. 2014. “La cultura armena nella visione del mondo di Grigor Magistros Pahlawuni”, in Baffioni, C., Finazzi, R.B., Passoni Dell’Acqua, A., Vergani, E. (eds), *Storia e pensiero religioso del Vicino Oriente. Letà bagratide, Maimonide, Afraate*, Milano: Biblioteca Ambrosiana, 3–22.
- van Lint, T.M. 2016. “Among Others: Greek in Context in the Letters of Grigor Magistros Pahlawuni (eleventh century)”, in Gazzano, F., Pagani, L., Traina, G. (eds). *Greek Texts and Armenian Traditions, An Interdisciplinary Approach*, Berlin-Boston: De Gruyter, 197–213. DOI: 10.1515/9783110489941-012.
- van Winden, J.C.M. 1996. “[Review of] Clementis Alexandrini *Protrepticus*. Edited by M. Marcovich (Supplements to *Vigiliae Christianae* 34). Leiden-New York-Köln, Brill, 1995”, *Vigiliae Christianae*, 50–53, 310–311.
- von Arnim, H.F. (ed.) 1905. *Stoicorum veterum fragmenta: volumen 1. Zeno et Zenonis discipuli*, Stutgardiae: In aedibus B.G. Teubneri.
- West, M.L. (ed.) 1978. *Hesiod. Works and Days*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.