This paper is an attempt to present the primary information (i.e. the data and the macro and micro level research) concerning the Armenian Version of the Commentary on Aristotle’s Categories ascribed to David the Invincible and to show that there is need for a new edition of this translation as well as of its Greek original. An integral part of this enterprise is the provision of a critical introduction and a textual commentary (mainly on the question of the textual relationships between Greek and Armenian texts), which together will serve as vehicles, at the macro and micro levels respectively, for the elucidation of issues concerning the significance of both texts for: a) ancient philosophy; b) Armenian literature; c) Hellenizing translations. An important part of this project will be the English translation.

Before going into the details of this research one should say a few words about the ‘Hellenizing’ style of translation to which the commentary belongs. Starting from the second half of the 5th century, the Greek philosophical, grammatical, rhetorical, mathematical, geographical and astronomical works translated by the representatives of the so-called ‘Hellenizing school’ formed the basis of the beginnings of Armenian science. The artificial language of the Hellenizing translations was not only due to the influence of Greek but was also the result of a deliberate project of creating new technical terms in order to translate complicated philosophical, theological etc. texts.

The preliminary goal of the Hellenizing translations was the creation of handbooks on the sciences of the *trivium* (grammar, rhetoric and dialectic), which were necessary as a step for passing on to the *quadrivium* (arithmetic, geometry, music and astronomy). This was needed to achieve the final aim—the defence of Christianity and the possibility of determining dogmatic controversies.

The investigation of the Hellenizing translations helps to recover some texts which are no longer extant in Greek, to assess the contents of many writings lost in their original and preserved only in Armenian
translation (e.g. certain important works of Philo of Alexandria), and even to restore some literary terms which Armenian literature borrowed from the Greek. In addition, the extreme literalness of the Armenian translations sometimes helps us to choose readings while making critical editions of Greek texts (among them texts of Plato, Aristotle, and the Church Fathers). Even today, when there are chairs of Armenian Studies in many countries, one of the biggest problems of Armenology is that the material which the Armenian sources provide lies, except in few cases, outside the purview of the scholarly world. For example, philosophical writings in Armenian remain relatively unknown to specialists in Greek philosophy.

1. David the Invincible

A few words should be said about David the Invincible Philosopher and on the subject of the authorship of the Greek original and of the Armenian Version of the Commentary on Aristotle’s Categories ascribed to David. There is much scholarly debate on these points.\footnote{See for example: Neumann (1829); Kroll (1901); Busse (1904); Khostikian (1907); Arevšatjan (1973); Benakis (1983); Westerink (1967), p. xvi (who considers that “David was a Thessalonian”); Bolarean (1971), pp. 73–76; Kendall-Thomson (1983); Sanjian (1986); Mahé (1990); Wildberg (2003a) et al.} Even in the Armenian tradition there are many unclear questions concerning the person of David and the date of his activity inasmuch as in the Armenian sources there is a confusion among three authors—David the Philosopher, David Nerginaci and David Harkac’i.\footnote{As a rule, in Armenian sources David the Philosopher is regarded as an author of the 5th century, while David Nerginaci (590–660) and David Harkac’i (610?–685?) lived in the 6th and 7th centuries.} N. Bolarean, for example, believed that David the Philosopher lived from 550 to 620 and was the teacher of David Nerginaci the Invincible who lived in around 590–660.\footnote{Bolarean (1971), p. 73.}

However, the strong tradition in the Armenian sources cannot be considered as unreliable or as ‘Armenian legends’. Moreover, there are some still unpublished\footnote{Some information from these MSS is published in Širinyan (2004) and Širinyan (2005).} writings, the evidence of which should be examined scrupulously and used for elucidating some of the