

The Marble of Armenian History: Or Armenian History as World History*

SEBOUH D. ASLANIAN

University of California, Los Angeles

I would like to start by thanking David Myers for putting together this important event and for being a pillar of support during my time here at UCLA. I am also grateful to all of you for being here, and before proceeding with my talk I would like to acknowledge a special debt of gratitude to my distinguished predecessor, Professor Richard Hovannisian, for many decades of dedication, labor, and sacrifice in the field of Armenian history. It is a great honor for me to inherit the position that he has so painstakingly created, and I promise to him that I have no intention of transforming the chair of Armenian History that I now occupy into the “Lazy boy”¹ of Modern Armenian History. As someone who is *pathologically* addicted to his work and his vocation at the expense of many another thing (just ask my wife about it) I plan to contribute vigorously to the field.

When David Myers asked me to tailor a short talk today around my “vision” for the future of the field, I was excited and deeply honored for obvious reasons and at the same time, full of trepidation. Trepidation because I have much to say about the future direction of the field and did

* This essay was originally given as an inaugural lecture at the author’s installation ceremony at UCLA on May 22, 2012 as the first holder of the Richard Hovannisian Endowed Chair in Modern Armenian History, established by the Armenian Educational Foundation. The flavor of the oral and informal nature of the presentation has been, for the most part, preserved; however, footnotes and minor modifications have been introduced in the present version. The author would like to thank Hourii Berberian for her constant support and inspiration and the editors of this journal for finding the lecture relevant enough for publication.

not know if I could say it all in a manner that was concise, informative, not too dry, and if possible entertaining. After some deliberation, therefore, I resolved to part ways from the lengthy and footnote-saddled and methodologically-informed, and academically dry text I had originally written and instead decided to weave together the broad strokes of my conceptual ideas about Armenian history with my own humble intellectual trajectory and personal journey as a scholar to this very spot before you.

Thus, on the assumption that all good knowledge, especially historical knowledge, must begin with critical self-knowledge, I will offer you some thoughts on how and why I became a historian who developed a passion for and a crush on the Armenian past and how my vision of that past, as I will argue today, must necessarily depart from the conventional

1. Lazy boy or “La-Z-Boy” is the trademark of a popular brand of American sofas and recliner chairs in the 1980s.

reading of Armenian history as “autonomous history” to one that is interactive and framed within the larger context of world/global history. In order not to detain you for very long, I will present my humble thoughts as a shrimp dumpling appetizer or *amuse bouche*, if you will, in the hope that it will whet your appetite for the field.

Let me begin my intellectual trajectory by drawing your attention to a remarkable passage regarding the later philosophy of the French thinker Michel Foucault and his attempts to sketch out a philosophical position on what he called “self fashioning” and the aesthetics of existence. In an interview I conducted while a Master’s student at the New School for Social Research in New York city with Foucault’s controversial biographer, James Miller, Miller had this to say about the French philosopher’s attempts to deal with the problem of freedom or unfreedom and of “how one becomes what one is”:

In the book, I tried to elaborate the theme of unfreedom in Nietzsche and Foucault by discussing the *daimonic*, which is, I think, a mystical word for the features of one’s life that can’t be controlled. Let me use a metaphor. You are thrown into the world as if you were a block of marble. You’re taken from a quarry wherever Michelangelo would get the marble for his statues. Your parents hammer and chip away to try to make a face and limbs and make you into a certain image. You come of age, and you look at yourself in the mirror; somebody hands you the chisel; and you have to figure out what to do next. You can’t put back the marble that’s been chipped away. You might want to sculpt as

Michelangelo did, in the veins of the stone and try to work with the grain, or you might try to work against the grain; in which case you might end up splitting the whole piece, with disastrous consequences. And in the end what you are left with – at best – is an unfinished statue, like one of Michelangelo’s unfinished statues that you can go see in Florence surrounding his statue of David. You see these figures struggling to emerge from the stone often with blocks of marble connecting to the stone. So to become what you are involves trying to understand, appraise, assess what I’m metaphorically calling a “block of marble,” and trying to exercise your element of freedom, to carve a figure of your own. This process goes on until you die.²

Needless to say, I do not make any claims to have discovered fully the grain of my own marble let alone to have come to terms with what the German sociologist Max Weber, whose name is usually not mentioned in the same breath as Foucault’s, calls “the demon who holds the fibers of [one’s] very life.”³ But at least I have been trying to get a feel for it for a long while now, and I would like to believe that my choice of being an Armenian historian with more than a passing interest in world history and how I see history and its uses in life are part and parcel of this long research into my own past.

2. S. Aslanian and T. Benjamin, 1993, p. 81-82.
3. M. Weber, 1946, p. 156.

Let me now turn to the “quarry” into which I was thrown and from which my parents got the marble block that became me. How did I become what I am or put differently how was becoming a historian interested in Armenians in world history connected to my own modest attempts at understanding, appraising, and assessing, the veins in the block of marble from which I emerged without splitting the whole into pieces? At least not yet...

I was born in Ethiopia. My grandparents and forebears on both sides were not Italian colonizers, European missionaries, or venture capitalists in search of lucrative markets. They were refugees who fled their homes in the Ottoman Empire in the 1890s, during a wave of massacres that took the lives of over 100,000 Armenians, and found a safe haven in Ethiopia in the early years of the twentieth century. My paternal grandfather’s brothers who had survived the 1890s massacres in their birthplace of Sepastea/Sivas perished in the genocide of 1915 after they repatriated to their homes in 1908 enticed by prospects of peace and protection of minorities proclaimed by the Young Turk leadership following their

assumption of power. My maternal grandfather, Georges Djerrahian, was born in Addis Ababa in 1911 and in 1931 had opened (with his brother Elias) Ethiopia's first commercial printing press. My father Bedros was also a printer and owned two printing presses with his brother Torkom. I'd like to think that the fact that much of my work deals with merchants and printers in the early modern period is, in part at least, motivated by this fact.⁴

I grew up in Addis Ababa and attended the Matig Kevorkoff Armenian school there. While growing up, I was exposed to stories of the suffering my grandparents and others of their generation had endured. As a result, I came to look upon Turks, at the very least, rather suspiciously. I also came to internalize a less than scholarly version of Armenian history as a story of the heroic survival of a small nation against great odds. This story and its narrative arc bending over Armenian history has many small, finer elements unique to the Armenians. In many other ways, however, its overall tenor and narrative "emplotment," to use Hayden White's terms, are not exceptional but rather familiar elements in the histories of more than one persecuted

4. For an excellent study of the Ethiopian-Armenian community, see B. Adjemian, 2013.

5. For the concept of narrative emplotment, see H. White, 1975.

6 The notion of root paradigm is developed in V. Turner, 1974, 67-68 and passim.

7. R. W. Thomson, 1982, p. 41.

8. See Elišē Vardapet, *History of Vardan and the Armenian War*, tr. and comm. R.W. Thomson, 1982.

minority.⁵ Its "root paradigm," to borrow a term from anthropologist Victor Turner, contains a significant social drama pitting good against evil, purity against pollution, heroism and unity against cowardice, betrayal, and dissent.⁶ It is a story of a titanic struggle of a beleaguered small people in a world of towering empires. Contrary to what one might initially think, this framing of Armenian history as social drama about the preservation of an endangered identity was not born with the Genocide of 1915, even if it was reinforced by the Catastrophe in powerful ways that still shape our popular conception of Armenian history today. Rather, this root paradigm of survival was probably first given shape to in one of the "classics of Armenian literature,"⁷ Yeghishe Vardapet's *The History of Vardan and the Armenian War*, which chronicled the revolt of the Armenians and their church in the fifth century against the rule and religion of Sassanian Iran.⁸ Yeghishe himself had in all likelihood borrowed his root paradigm for the struggle of the Armenians from an earlier struggle of the Jews against the Seleucid

authorities as told in the Book of Maccabees, one of the first texts to be translated into Armenian using the newly forged script by the monk Mashtots who lived only a generation before the battle of Vardanants of 451 C.E.⁹

As a young boy growing up in Ethiopia, I remember celebrating the military defeat of Vardan as a moral victory and even, like many other young Armenians, wanting to be as “brave” as Vardan himself. In my history class in grade three or four, just before we were forced to flee post-revolutionary Ethiopia, Yeghishe’s root paradigm was drilled into us. It was mobilized and projected forward in time to make sense of the humiliating and abject experience of the Genocide and from there to us – the remnants of the catastrophe living in eastern Africa.

With effortless ease, the root paradigm was also projected retrospectively into the mists of antiquity where it was used to explain how nearly all the mighty nations of antiquity – Assyrians, Hittites, Babylonians, Medes, Romans, and others – whose histories were entwined with that of the Armenians, had all vanished, while “we” Armenians were still around.

This idea of “monumental” or heroic history with which I grew up and continued to hold onto well into my adolescence in Dubai and even into my first years in college in Montreal was probably an effective means of imposing internal group solidarity and discipline and consequently safeguarding an identity perceived to be endangered, although one may debate the relative merits of such an approach. However, it also had several less than desirable consequences. It fostered first and foremost a rather narrow and one-dimensional kind of identity that was aimed almost exclusively at collective self-protection and self-preservation. It was, much like Yeghishe’s history was meant to be, what anthropologist Frederik Barth and following him John Armstrong have called, a “boundary maintenance mechanism,” (a topic to which I shall return later) a bulwark against the ever-present forces of assimilation.¹⁰ Moreover, and most important perhaps, it was not suitable for fostering in the mind of a curious young man like myself a conception of history as professional historians recognize critical history to be. What it contributed to shaping instead, was what sociologists of the study of memory call “collective” or “historical memory,” a political tool that most if not all communities

9. My reading of Yeghishe is influenced by R.W. Thomson, 1982 and P. Cowe, 1997, p.341-360.

10. See F. Barth, 1969, and J. A. Armstrong, 1976.

from time to time employ to promote their own future agendas and to remember and commemorate an event and root paradigm they regard to be vital to the maintenance of their collective identity.¹¹ For most Armenians today, that event is the Genocide of up to a million and a half Armenians almost a hundred years ago and the long and debilitating shadow it and *especially* its continued denial have cast on Armenian life. This denial has created a hypertrophied or bloated historical memory for most Armenians and has held them captive to the past. Even more vexing is the fact that in some circles in Armenia the trauma of the genocide has lent itself to shoring up a politics of paranoiac nationalism.¹²

The unresolved trauma of the Genocide, in some cases, has also encouraged parochial insulation from the larger world. As a historian who studies the Armenian past, I am reminded of the classic text by

Nietzsche, "On the Uses and Disadvantages of History for Life." Written in the heels of the nineteenth century's fixation on monumental history, of the "flooding of memory," and the proliferation of mnemonic practices (monuments, museums, archives, and most notably the hegemonic genre of nationalist historiography), Nietzsche's text reads like an early twenty-first century meditation on the "uses of forgetting."¹³

For Nietzsche, a bloated historical memory has the potential of becoming the "gravedigger of the present."¹⁴ His thoughts foreshadow the work of the brilliant and inimitable Argentine writer Jorge Luis Borges' fascinating fictional tale about a certain *Funes el memorioso* who one day falls from his horse and instead of suffering from amnesia becomes a repository of the whole world's memory. Unable to filter out anything from his memory, Funes becomes a living encyclopedia of all the events, sensations, moments and so on that have taken place since the beginning of the world. His memory is disabling. For both Nietzsche and Borges, too much memory uproots the ground of the future and enervates, or worse cripples, the life instinct for creation. Those who allow memory to choke their present and future, Nietzsche warns us, live as though their motto were "let the dead bury the living."¹⁵ That is why for Nietzsche "Life in any true sense is absolutely impossible without forgetfulness."¹⁶

11. M. Halbwachs, 1992.

12. See S. Aslanian, 2002.

13. My thoughts here are profoundly influenced by Y.H. Yerushalmi, 1996.

14. "On the Uses and Disadvantages of History for Life," in F. Nietzsche, 1997, p. 62.

15. *Ibid.*

16. Quoted in Y.H. Yerushalmi, 1996, p. 107.

In singling out the at times unbearable weight of the Genocide on contemporary Armenian life, I am certainly not advocating here a down-playing of its study, much less praising the virtues of oblivion. What I am saying, however, is that we should not allow a bloated memory of the events of 1915 either to neglect the existence of Armenian history prior to and after the genocide, or when we do remember it, to study it in a way that is not seen exclusively through the Yeghishean lens of the root paradigm of genocide survival. This focus as I have explained at more length elsewhere tends to lead to two unfortunate problems with the way Armenian historians have often represented the past.¹⁷ The first is what I call following the historian of the Jewish diaspora, Salo Baron, the “lachrymose” conception of Armenian history, in which the Armenian past before the Genocide is represented as a “sheer succession of miseries and persecutions,” especially in the diasporas of the Islamic Middle East.¹⁸ Consider, for instance, the following programmatic statement from a standard (and widely-cited) popular work on the history of Armenian diaspora settlements published during the Soviet period:

The history of Armenian diaspora settlements is the history of migration, of living amidst foreigners, of migrancy [bandkhtut‘iwn]. In other words, it is the history of misery and wretchedness. It is difficult to seek periods of happiness in its pages; and in recording that history, we would have considered ourselves to be tragic historians had we not been fortunate enough to see the resplendent dawn of Armenia under the Soviet sun, and *the [realization of the] centuries-long and arduously pursued goal of the Armenian people to return to the homeland, which was the desired and sacred dream of innumerable generations of Armenians.*¹⁹

The “misery, wretchedness, and migrancy” the above author associates with “living amidst foreigners” makes it difficult to imagine how such a lachrymose conception of Armenian history could seriously

17. See Sebouh Aslanian, “From Autonomous to Interactive Histories: World History’s Challenge to Armenian Studies,” unpublished paper.

18. Quoted in D. Engel, 2006, p.247. For an application of Baron’s views to post-1967 Jewish revisionist historiography that has a “a gloomy representation of Jewish life in the lands of Islam that emphasizes the continuity of oppression and persecution from Muhammad to the demise of Arab Jewish communities in the aftermath of the 1948 Arab-Israeli war,” (J. Beinín, 1998, p.14) see M.R. Cohen, 1991, and Idem., 2008. See also Beinín’s work cited above. Needless to say, the lachrymose conception of Armeno-Turkish/Islamic history is a direct response to the denial of the Armenian genocide and will likely begin to change only after proper recognition of this tragedy is made.

19. A.G. Abrahamyan, 1964-1967, vol.2, p.421. Emphasis added.

accommodate within it an exploration of real cross-cultural interactions/connectedness between Armenians and “foreigners” amidst whom they were living for centuries.

The second and related consequence of the continued denial of the genocide is a conception of Armenian history that privileges the teleological and linear unfolding of the nation-form in history toward its natural nirvana of the nation-state. In this scenario, Yeghishe’s root paradigm of history as a social drama of purity against pollution is not only part and parcel of collective memory or the stuff from which primary school lessons, such as the ones I received in Ethiopia, are made but becomes a substitute for historical writing by some. The first casualty of this tendency to see history exclusively as autonomous history or a drama of survival against great odds is the downplaying of cross-cultural relations between Armenians and the many cultures and peoples with whom they have interacted over the past millennia and more. The above passage from Ashot Abrahamyan about his lachrymose conception of Armenian history is a representative sampling of such a view.

20. S. Subrahmanyam, 1997; for the above author’s views on the complex genealogy of global history, one that does not sufficiently emphasize important breaks that occur in the 1960s and focuses on deeper continuities, see *Aux origines de l’histoire globale*, leçon inaugurale prononcée le jeudi 28 novembre 2013 (Collège de France, 2013).

21. See J. Bentley, 2002.

In place of the above, I propose instead an interactive approach to Armenian history that incorporates methodological insights from the burgeoning and relatively new subfield of history known as the “new” world or global history and its cognate field of “connected histories,” whose most celebrated practitioner is our very own colleague here Sanjay Subrahmanyam.²⁰ But what is world history really and how is it useful to Armenian history? Also if the methodological perspectives of world history are useful to Armenian history as I argue, is the opposite also true? Is knowledge of Armenian history not only relevant for world historians but also possibly necessary? And if so, why?

To dispel a common misunderstanding, world history is not the same thing as the “history of the world.”²¹ For the purposes of our discussion, the most succinct and necessarily simplified definition of what the “new” world history is would include some or all of the following interrelated points: 1) it is a subfield of historical writing arguably conceived at the University of Chicago in the 1960s that came of age right here in California in the 1990s and seems to have swept across university cam-

puses in North America and increasingly in Europe; 2) unlike the conventional field of history as a professional discipline, world history does not take the national state or national community as its default unit of historical analysis; rather, it focuses on larger units such as hemispheres, oceans, continents and sometimes the entire globe itself; 3) it is, simply put, usually a macro-scale study of the comparisons, interactions, encounters, and connectedness between regions, cultures, and peoples with one other on a large scale and in such a fashion whereby cross-cultural interactions and exchanges help to define and mutually shape the interacting parties; 4) interactions among cultures and societies are most commonly studied through the framework of what I have elsewhere referred to as “networks of circulation and exchange” as opposed to the more conventional notion of unidirectional diffusion and influence, where one party is seen as having the agency of acting and influencing, while the other is usually represented as a reactive and passive borrower.²² In short, world historians usually study communities or individuals who are adept “boundary-” or “border-” “crossers” and whose history makes them “go-between”²³ or cross-cultural brokers living across the porous frontiers of languages and cultures that have shaped the development of humankind.

Given their chronic history of dispersion, the skill and expertise with which some Armenians have historically navigated between multiple cultural, religious, and regional divides, and their ability to speak numerous languages, not to mention the geographic location of their homeland on the hinge of the great Eurasian continent, where Greco-Roman empires and civilizations and their heirs have periodically bumped up against Perso-Arabic, Islamic and Turco-Mongol civilizations and empires, a fact that has both wreaked havoc with Armenian political, institutional, and environmental history but also enriched its culture and identity as Nina Garsoian’s formidable work has taught us – given all of this, Armenians are unusually suited to be the ideal-typical subjects of world historical analysis.²⁴

In some ways, this is paradoxical, not to say ironic, because as I mentioned earlier in connection with the feats of Vardan Mamigonian

22. The above summary of world history is a distillation of a section in Aslanian, “From Autonomous to Interactive Histories” where the notion of networks of circulation and exchange is also developed. My list of hallmarks characterizing world or global history is based on the following sampling of the historiography. J. Bentley, 2002, 2011 and 1999; D. Christian, 2005, p.72-73. See also “Defining World History” and “Global Studies,” in P. Manning, 2003, p.3-15 and 163-180.

23. For a perceptive study of go-between, see K. Raj, 2009.

(Mamikonian) and Yeghishe Vardapet's retelling of his ill-fated war, a retelling that came with the injunction *against* cultural and religious border-crossing, Armenians have been historically rather talented border-crossers. No matter how one looks at them they almost always appear as sophisticated "go-between." World history and its interactive approach to analyzing the past almost seems like it was crafted with Armenians and others like them, such as the Jews, in mind. But have the Armenians any-

24. For Garsoïan's seminal work in the field, see "Prolegomena to a Study of the Iranian Aspects in Arsacid Armenia," and "The Iranian Substratum of the 'Agat'angelos Cycle," in N. Garsoïan, 1985; and especially Garsoïan's short but brilliant entry, "Armenia, History of," Dictionary of the Middle Ages, vol. 1, 1982, p. 474-487.

25. On centralizing states, noble families and juridical institutions and their role in constructing archives, see J. Le Goff, 1992, p. 87-90 and *passim*.

26. S. Aslanian, 2011, p. 18-22.

27. For early modern global Armenian print, see S.D. Aslanian, 2014(a), 2014(b) and 2014(c).

thing of theirs to offer world history? They may not have rich archives of their own since the custodians of the latter have usually been either aristocratic families or more commonly states and their juridical bodies, neither of which has existed much for the Armenians since the fourteenth century at least.²⁵ But they do have a rich heritage of scribal culture some of which has survived many wars and the shifting of political frontiers and has come down to us in the form of approximately 31,000 manuscripts preserved in half a dozen collections the world over. There are also tens of thousands of primary source documents written by the border-crossers themselves in their own language, dialect, or script and preserved in over thirty archives of the host states and societies where Armenian merchants not only succeeded but also prospered during the early modern period as my recent book on Julfans demonstrates.²⁶ The surfeit of these sources makes

Armenian history not only relevant but also *necessary* for world history where the bulk of primary sources used has usually been of European provenance often with little in the way of original primary source documentation written by non-European actors themselves. At least this seems to be the case for the two areas where I can claim some degree of expertise, namely global trade in the early modern Indian Ocean and the history of early modern global print culture.²⁷



In conclusion, the field of Armenian Studies and Armenian history is a young and developing field. Until very recently, it has, for the most part, been characterized by high levels of insularity, most likely owing to its uncritical adoption of the “nation-form” as the central if not exclusive optic through which Armenian history is examined. I am hopeful that the future generations trained in the field and particularly in Armenian history will continue building on the solid foundations laid down by scholars who preceded them but also remain open to the broadening and deepening of their field by being more attentive to the methodological insights offered by world historians. A more interactive approach to Armenian history can only help open up the field of Armenian studies and Armenian history and enable scholars of the Armenian past(s) to capture the complexities and nuances of Armenian history in ways that the insular approaches are unable to do. Moreover, integrating a more world historical approach can help showcase Armenian history and attract the attention of a new generation of global historians to a rich and complex world that for too long has been studied on the margins of world history.

Let me return to and conclude with the metaphor of the marble block with which I began my talk. In the same way that we are all unfinished marble statues, so too is the field of Armenian history/studies. I am very optimistic that my own generation and the next – some of whom I look forward to training here – will continue to chisel away, as did the previous generation represented by maestros of the field, carving out and giving new shape to the marble of Armenian history.

Bibliography

ABRAHAMYAN Ashot G., *Hamarot urvagits hay gaghtavayreri patmut'yan* [*A Concise Overview of the History of Armenian Settlements*], Erevan: Haypethrat, 1964-1967, 2 vol.

ADJEMIAN Boris, *La fanfare du négus: Les Arméniens en Éthiopie (XIX^e-XX^e siècles)*, Paris: Éditions de l'ÉHESS, 2013.

ARMSTRONG John A., “Mobilized and Proletarian Diasporas,” *The American Political Science Review*, vol. 70, no. 2, June 1976, p. 393-408.

ASLANIAN Sebouh and BENJAMIN Timothy, “Conference Exchange:

A Debate on The Passion of Michel Foucault,” *Conference: A Journal of Philosophy and Theory*, vol. 4, no. 1, Spring 1993, p.77-92.

ASLANIAN Sebouh D., “The Early Arrival of Print in Safavid Iran: New Light on the First Armenian Printing Press in New Julfa, Isfahan (1636–1650, 1686–1693),” *Handes Amsorya* (Vienna/Yerevan), 2014(a), p. 381-468.

ASLANIAN Sebouh D., “Reader Response and the Circulation of Mkhitarist Books Across the Armenian Communities of the Early Modern Indian Ocean,” *Journal for the Society of Armenian Studies*, vol.22, no. 1, 2014(b), p.31-70.

ASLANIAN Sebouh D., “Port Cities and Printers: Reflections on Early Modern Global Armenian Print,” *Book History*, vol. 17, 2014(c), p.51-93.

ASLANIAN Sebouh D., “From Autonomous to Interactive Histories: World History’s Challenge to Armenian Studies,” unpublished paper.

ASLANIAN Sebouh D., “The ‘Treason of the Intellectuals’: Reflections on the Uses of Revisionism and Nationalism in Armenian Historiography,” *Armenian Forum*, vol. 2, no. 4, Spring 2002, p. 1-38.

ASLANIAN Sebouh D., *From the Indian Ocean to the Mediterranean: The Global Trade Networks of Armenian Merchants from New Julfa*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 2011.

BARTH Fredrik, *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries: The Social Organization of Cultural Difference*, Boston: Little Brown and Company, 1969.

BEININ Joel, *The Dispersion of Egyptian Jewry: Culture, Politics, and the Formation of a Modern Diaspora*, Berkley: University of California Press, 1998.

BENTLEY Jerry, “Introduction: The Task of World History,” in Jerry Bentley (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of World History*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011, p. 1-18.

BENTLEY Jerry, “Sea and Ocean Basins as Frameworks of Historical Analysis,” *Geographical Review*, vol. 89, no. 2, *Oceans Connect*, April 1999, p.215-224.

BENTLEY Jerry, "The New World History," in Lloyd Kramer and Sarah Maza (eds.), *A Companion to Western Historical Thought*, Oxford: Blackwell, 2002, p. 393-416.

CHRISTIAN David, "Scales," in Marnie Hughes-Warrington (ed.), *Palgrave Advances in World Histories*, London and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005, p. 72-73.

COHEN Mark R., "The Neo-Lachrymose Conception of Jewish-Arab History," *Tikkun*, vol. 6, no. 3, 1991, p. 55-60.

COHEN Mark R., *Under Crescent and Cross: The Jews in the Middle Ages*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008 (revised edition).

COWE Peter, "Elise's 'Armenian War' as a Metaphor for the Spiritual Life," in Jean-Pierre Mahé and Robert W. Thomson (eds.), *From Byzantium to Iran: Armenian Studies in Honour of Nina Garsoïan*, Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1997, p. 341-360.

ELIŠE VARDAPET, *History of Vardan and the Armenian War*, tr. and comm. R.W. Thomson, Harvard: Harvard University Press, 1982.

ENGEL David, "Crisis and Lachrymosity: On Salo Baron, Neobaronianism, and the Study of Modern European Jewish History," *Jewish History*, vol. 20, no. 3/4, 2006, p. 243-264.

GARSOÏAN Nina, "Armenia, History of," *Dictionary of the Middle Ages*, vol. 1, 1982, p. 474-487.

GARSOÏAN Nina, "Prolegomena to a Study of the Iranian Aspects in Arsacid Armenia," in Nina Garsoïan, *Armenia between Byzantium and the Sasanians*, London: Variorum Reprints, 1985.

GARSOÏAN Nina, "The Iranian Substratum of the 'Agat'angelos Cycle,'" in Nina Garsoïan, *Armenia between Byzantium and the Sasanians*, London: Variorum Reprints, 1985.

HALBWACHS Maurice, *On Collective Memory*, edited and translated by Lewis A. Coser, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.

LE GOFF Jacques, *History and Memory*, translated by Steven Rendal and Elizabeth Claman, New York: Columbia University Press, 1992.

MANNING Patrick, *Navigating World History: Historians Create a*

Global Past, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.

NIETZSCHE Friedrich, "On the Uses and Disadvantages of History for Life," in Friedrich Nietzsche, *Untimely Meditations*, ed. Daniel Breazeale and translated by R. J. Hollingdale, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

RAJ Kapil, "Mapping Knowledge Go-Betweens in Calcutta, 1770–1820," in Simon Schafer, Linda Roberts, Kapil Raj, and James Delbourgo (eds.), *The Brokered World: Go-Betweens and Global Intelligence, 1770-1820*, Sagamore Beach, MA: Science History Publications, 2009, p. 105-150.

SUBRAHMANYAM Sanjay, "Connected Histories: Notes towards a Reconfiguration of Islamic Eurasia," *Modern Asian Studies*, vol. 31, no. 3, Special Issue: *The Eurasian Context of the Early Modern History of Mainland South East Asia, 1400-1800*, July 1997, p. 735-762.

THOMSON Robert W., "Elišč's History of Vardan: New Light from Old Sources," in Thomas J. Samuelian (ed.), *Classical Armenian Culture*, Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1982, p. 41-51.

TURNER Victor, *Dramas, Fields, and Metaphors: Symbolic Action in Human Society*, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1974.

WEBER Max, "Science as a Vocation" in *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*, translated and edited by H. H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills, Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1946.

WHITE Hayden, *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe*, Baltimore: University of John Hopkins Press, 1975.

YERUSHALMI Yosef Hayim, "Postscript: Reflections on Forgetting," in *Zakhor: Jewish History and Jewish Memory*, Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1996.