

*Editions:*

F.C. Conybeare, *A Collation with the Ancient Armenian Versions of the Greek Text of Aristotle's Categories, De Interpretatione, De Mundo, De Virtutibus et Vitiis and of Porphyry's Introduction* (Anecdota Oxoniensia, Classical Series, vol. I, part VI), Oxford: 1892. This work includes the text of *Categories* on pp. 107-154, and of *De Interpretatione* on pp. 165-183. S. Lalafaryan, V. Č'alojan (eds.), S. Arevšatyan (tr.), *Անանուկ մեկնութիւն «Ստորոգութեանցն» Արիստոտէլի / Анонимное толкование "Категорий" Аристотеля* (Anonymous Commentary on Aristotle's "Categories"), Erevan: 1961 (the text of *Categories* is integrated into the commentary). *De Virtutibus et Vitiis* and *De Mundo* are still to be consulted in *Կորիւն Վարդապետի, Մամբրէ Վերծանողի եւ Դաւիթ Անվաղթի Մատենագրութիւնը* (Works of Koriwn vardapet, Mambre the Lector and Dawit' the Invincible), Venice: 1833; a partial edition of *De Mundo* is to be found in F.C. Conybeare, *Արիստոտէլի ընկաշինակութիւն «Յաղագս Աստուծոյ»* (A Manuscript of Aristotle's "De Deo"), *Handēs Amsoreay* 7: 1893, pp. 227-232.

*Textual Studies:*

Conybeare [1892]; W.L. Lorimer, *The Text Tradition of Pseudo-Aristotle "De Mundo"* (St. Andrews University Publications, 18), Oxford: 1924, pp. 21-23; A. Tessier, *Il testo di Aristotele e le traduzioni armene* ('Proagones', Studi 17), Padova: 1979; idem, "Some Remarks about the Armenian Translations of Aristotle," *Proceedings of the World Congress on Aristotle (Thessaloniki, August 7-14, 1978)*, Athens: 1982, pp. 94-97; idem, "Some Remarks about the Armenian Tradition of Greek Texts," *Medieval Armenian Culture* ed. T.J. Samuelian and M.E. Stone (University of Pennsylvania Armenian Texts and Studies, 6) Chico, CA: 1984, pp. 405-424; idem, "Sulla traduzione armena del *Peri hermeneias* di Aristotele," *Corolla Londiniensis* 5: 1989, pp. 79-85; G. Lafontaine, "La traduction arménienne des 'Catégories d'Aristote' par David l'Invincible," *Le Muséon* 96: 1983, pp. 133-144; G. Bolognesi, "Remarques sur la version arménienne '*Patmowt'iwn yalags ašxarhi*' attribuée à David l'Invincible," *David the Invincible—The Great Philosopher of Ancient Armenia*, Erevan: 1983, pp. 402-418; idem, "La trasmissione di testi greci attraverso le traduzioni armene," *Autori classici in lingue del Vicino e Medio Oriente*, ed. G. Fiaccadori and M. Pavan, Rome: 1990, pp. 11-19.

The Aristotelian tradition had a crucial impact in Armenia through the translation of original treatises as well as through commentaries, notably by DAVID of Alexandria, also translated from Greek. The translations, very literal in character, are a typical product of the so-called Hellenizing school; they may be dated no later than the end of the sixth century. Commented upon more than once and adapted for teaching purposes, these texts became the corner-stone of Armenian philosophical thought, notably in the later Middle Ages. Every standard history of Armenian literature and philosophy tells the story of the Aristotelian legacy.

The popularity of the Aristotelian treatises as textbooks accounts for the very considerable number of manuscripts which transmit them and, by implication, for the fact that none is yet available in a critical edition. Conybeare's publication of superior manuscripts of the *Categories* and *De Interpretatione* [1892] and of a small part of *De Mundo* [1893], however, are a partial compensation for that. Using the old printed text of Venice and his own when available, Conybeare attempted a systematic collation of the Armenian translation with the Greek. Largely relying on his findings, the subsequent editors of the treatises in question strove to integrate the data of the Armenian version into their apparatuses (see W.L. Lorimer, *Aristotelis qui feritur libellus De Mundo*, Paris: 1933, esp. pp. 20-23; L. Munio-Paluello, *Aristotelis Categoriae et Liber de Interpretatione*, Oxford: 1956; E. Montanari, *La sezione linguistica del "Peri hermeneias" di Aristotele*, Florence: 1984). These attempts have been thoroughly reviewed by Andrea Tessier who reveals, in scores of textual notes, the drawbacks of Conybeare's collation but also, more generally, both the difficulties and possible profit to be discerned in the application of an Armenian translation to the criticism of its Greek original.