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Preface

The present "philological commentary" is directed at those who have decided to take time for reading the original text, at least in an English translation. The first two volumes ("Textual Criticism", "The Composition of the Metaphysics") are intended to meet the difficulties caused by the two main features of this text which distinguish it from the books we are used to: the facts that our text editions are based on manuscripts separated from the original by more than a millennium, and that this original was not a book at all, but a torso of lectures, not destined for publication. A book with the title Metaphysics (?? ???? ?? ?????? = "the writings after the Physics") was not known until the times of Nicolaus of Damascus (born around 64 BC) and Plutarchus (Alexander, c. 7), who tells us (Sulla, c. 26) that Andronicus of Rhodes (first century BC) published a new edition of the works of Aristotle and Theophrastus. The title "Writings after the Physics" clearly points to editors as its authors.

In two further volumes, we can turn then towards more luxurious topics: "Sources and Parallels" and "Reception and Criticism". Dividing up the mass of notes into these four topics will have its advantages not only for the author, but, as I hope, for the reader too.

It can hardly be said that the previous commentaries are user-friendly. Ross (i 214), for example, refers to "Leutsch und Schneidewin, Paroemiographi, II. 678". Which reader will have this book at hand? The utmost degree of cruelty is reached when the author gives a cryptic abbreviation of a wrongly remembered title (see for example our note on 1077a21-22). Contrary to this usage, I have, as far as possible to me, substituted references by quotations, so as to provide the reader with the complete material needed for understanding the passage in question.

I hope I have done a useful job by collecting what is widely dispersed in the learned literature, even if my own contributions are worthless.

Since even the present volume of my commentary (the most philological one) is not meant exclusively for philologists, I have chosen as reference not the Greek text of the Metaphysics, but the classical translation by William David Ross, which appeared in the framework of the The Works of Aristotle series. Also, the translations which I have added to quotations of parallel passages are taken from this series.

For the use of the philologist, I present the relevant text-critical contributions in extenso. Those of them which are in German or French are translated by me into English. Without mentioning it, I have made standardizations in formal things (orthography, way of citing), abbreviations less commonly used are identified.
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Critical notes on Ross's translation

The notes are divided into:

(1) alternative translations or atheteses respectively.

If the translation is based only on a certain branch of the tradition, the main representative of this branch (Codex Parisinus = E or Codex Laurentianus = Ab) is indicated. If it is based on a conjecture, this is also indicated.

This part should be useable also for non-Grecists.

Then follows (2) a documentation of the most important efforts for the establishment of the text,

at last (3) my own view (optionally).

The paraphrases of the Greek commentators (given under 2) can also serve as complement to the apparatus criticus of the text editions.

Book I

980a28-29. and from sensation memory is produced in some of them, though not in others. (E)

(1) Ab has "and from this memory is produced".

(2) Jaeger (1917, p. 490): "In the recensio ?, the original reading ?????? has been superseded by the gloss ??? ????????? - the same case as in 985b27."

980b21-22. And therefore the former are more intelligent and apt at learning than those which cannot remember. (Ab)

(1) E has "some are intelligent, the others more apt at learning". The right continuation would be "the others not", see (3).

(2) Alexander (3. 7-10): ????? ?? ??? ??? ????? ???????? ??????? ?????????? ????? ?? ???? ?? ??????????? ??? ??????????? ?? ??????????? ????????, ? ??? ??????????? ??? ???????????? ????? ???? ??? ?? ????????? ???????????.

Thomas Aquinas (Sententia Metaphysicae, liber 1 lectio 1 numerus 11): "Ex hoc autem, quod quaedam animalia memoriam habent, et quaedam non habent, sequitur quod quaedam sunt prudentia et quaedam non."

Fonseca: "Non colligit his verbis Aristoteles alteram adaequatam divisionem animalium in prudentia, et docilia. Nam ut alia mittam, quibus haec divisio impugnari potest; certe animalia, quae carent memoria, nec prudentia sunt, nec docilia, ut ipse mox aperte docebit. Non desunt, qui ob id suppleant hoc loco opposita membra, duasque divisiones hic colligi existiment, quasi dicat Aristoteles; Hinc fit, ut alia prudentia sint; alia non prudentia: alia disciplinae capacia; alia non item. Sed obstat inter alia, quod haec supplendi licentia videatur nimia, et non necessaria. Quocirca dicendum videtur, non tradi hoc loco ullam generalem divisionem animalium, sed quandam subdivsionem posterioris membri praecedentis divisionis, cum quadam subintellecta exclusiva particula ad alterum membrum, quasi dicat Aristoteles, ex eo, quod dantur animalia, quae memoriam habeant, effici, ut eorum quaedam sint prudentia dumtaxat (quatenus hac particula docilitas excluditur) alia non solum prudentia, sed etiam docilia. Quae enim ita memoriam habent, ut humanam vocem percipere nequeant, ita prudentia sunt, ut doceri non possint: quae autem vocem quasi praeceptoris memoria retinent, ea doceri possunt. Sed obstat adhuc, quod Aristoteles non ait «disciplinae capacia» sed «disciplinae capaciora etc.» quibus verbis omnia animalia videtur facere docilia. Ac si contextus Aristotelicus ita haberet, ut Argyropulus vertit (sic enim habet «alia prudentia sunt, alia magis discere possunt» missis ceteris verbis, quae sequuntur) nihil esset difficultatis; sumpto tamen verbo «magis» pro «etiam», aut «insuper», ut sensus esset: Alia prudentia sunt, alia non modo prudentia, sed etiam docilia. Verum quia omnes graeci codices quotquot viderim, addunt verba illa: ??? ?? ????????? ???????????, hoc est, iis, quae meminisse nequeunt, quod idem ceterae omnes latinae versiones testantur, nec verbum ?????????????? apte redditur latine, si exponatur, ut dictum est: crediderim approbandam esse lectionem Alexandri, qui pro verbo ??????? legit ??????????? idest prudentiora, quo pacto hunc in modum habebit contextus: «Hinc fit, ut quaedam prudentiora sint, alia disciplinae capaciora iis, quae meminisse nequeunt», sensus autem erit: Quia vero quaedam animalia memoria praedita sunt, ex quibus alia humanam vocem memoria non tenent, alia tenent; ideo quaedam prudentiora sunt iis quae meminisse nequeunt; alia non solum prudentiora, sed etiam dociliora eisdem; ut utrumque comparativum referatur ad ea, quae carent memoria."

Schwegler (i 5) prefers the reading of Ab: "After having divided the animals into two classes (those not having memory and those having) Aristotle now first utters a general statement about the animals of the latter class, that they are ??????????? ??? ???????????? ??? ?? ????????? ???????????, and then only, under the aspect of audition, he divides also this class into two classes, ??? ??????? and ??? ????????."

Bywater (1913, p. 109): "This is said of creatures possessed of memory; but it is not true that they are all ??????????? ??? ????????????; the following context explains that the capacity for learning implies a capacity for hearing, which is not always found in creatures possessed of memory. The true reading, here, therefore, would seem to be ??????????? <?? ??> ??? ???????????? - of which the E reading, ?? ??? ??????? ?? ?? ????????????, may perhaps be thought to retain a trace."

Ross (i 115): "The difficulties which have been felt about the reading of Ab and Alexander are somewhat unreal. Aristotle first uses ??????????? and ???????????? as almost synonymous, and then by an afterthought distinguishes between them. Of the emendations the best is that of Bywater, who inserts ?? ?? after ???????????."

(3) The text of E (and Asclepius) poses two insurmountable difficulties:

(a) The positive ??????? is colliding with the comparative ????????????. The continuation should be: ?? ?? ???????? ('docilia' in Fonseca), without the genitivus comparationis which follows.

(b) ?? ??? … ?? ??, corresponding with ???? ??? … ???? ?' in the preceding sentence, lets us expect an alteram adaequatam (generalem) divisionem animalium (Fonseca). What follows, however, is a subdivisio posterioris membri praecedentis divisionis (Fonseca). For if we suppose a generalem divisionem, we are forced to equate the animals lacking memory with the ???????, what is obviously not Aristotle's opinion.

Since the 19th century, editors and translators prefer the reading of Ab (and Alexander). However, the objection can be raised, that not all animals equipped with memory are ????????????. That's what Bywater takes into account; but his conjecture does not work, for the syntagma ?? ?? ??? (extremely rare without preceding ?? ???) is disjunctive (as ?? ?? without ???); ??? here does not mean 'besides that' ('as well'), as Bywater postulates. See, for instance, Xenophon, Institutio Cyri, VI 3, 5:

?? ?’ ?? ????????? ?????? ?????? ?? ?? ????? ???? ????????? ??????????? ??? ????? ??? ????, ??? ???????? ?? ????? ????? ??????? ??????, ?? ?? ??? ????????,

"[…] beasts of burden laden with other such things, and others feeding" (Watson/Dale p. 191).

I am inclined to take this difficulty with Ross for 'somewhat unreal'. Immediately in the next sentence Aristotle presents the required specification; to anticipate it here would have made the sentence clumsy.

But how, then, the strange reading of E could happen? Or, to put the question in another way: can we imagine a context, where the positive ??????? gives a good sense? This context is not only conceivable, but already conceived by Thomas Aquinas: If we relate ??? ????? not to the equipment with memory, but to the whole preceding sentence, the continuation must be: "quaedam sunt prudentia et quaedam non", i. e. ?? ??? ???????, ?? ?'??. We have before us the fragment of another version, from which E with ???????????? jumps abruptly to the version of Ab.

981a1-2. And experience seems pretty much like science and art.

(1) Blass (p. 494): "Deleting the addition ??? - ????????, which is flawed with multiple hiatus, gives an irreproachable parallelismus membrorum."

(3) The sentence is anticipating ll. 12-13.

981a11-12. e.g. to phlegmatic or bilious people when burning with fever. (E corrected)

(1) The uncorrected text runs "or people burning with fever". The whole example is lacking in Ab.

(2) Jackson (1876, pp. 206-207): "According to the received text the words ???? ????????????? ? ?????????? ????? designate ???? ???? ????????? (Berlin Index, s. v. ???????????): so that, whereas ???????? determines that a particular medicine is beneficial to Callias and Socrates when they are suffering from a particular disorder, ????? determines that a particular medicine is beneficial to all persons who are suffering from a particular disorder, the words ???????? ????? ??? ????? being explanatory of ???? ???????? ???' ????? ?? ???????????. But is this the distinction which Aristotle wishes to make? and is not the use of the adjectives ????????????? and ????????? to indicate persons in diseased states very strange? Rather, I think, ???????? determines that a particular remedy suits Callias and Socrates when they are suffering from a particular known disorder: ????? on the other hand determines that a particular remedy suits persons of a particular habit (???? ????????), when they are suffering from a particular known disorder (???????? ????? ??? ?????). Thus the phrase ???????? ????? ??? ????? does not explain ???? ????????, but corresponds exactly to ???????? ????? ??? ????? in the earlier part of the sentence. The parallelism having been so far complete, it is reasonable to expect that it will be [207] maintained in the exemplificatory clause introduced by ????. Now ?????????? ????? exactly corresponds to ???????? ????? ??? ?????. Hence in order to obtain the required sense it is only necessary to omit the ? which at present precedes ??????????. ???? ???? ????????????? ? ???????? ?????????? ????? will then mean - 'for example to persons of phlegmatic or bilious habits when they are suffering from the fever called ??????. Cf. Nic. Eth. X. 9, § 21. ?? ??? ????????? ???' ???????? ?? ??? ???????????? ????????. ?????? ????????? ?? ?????? ?? ????? ?? ???????????, ???? ??? ?? ??????? ?? ??? ?? ??? ?????????? ????????, ?????????? ??? ?????. On this principle the sanitary effects of particular kinds of weather are considered in the Problemata (I. 9-12, p. 860), as they affect ???????????? and as they affect ????????. So too Galen (ed. Kühn) X. 651 regards the study of the patient's temperament as a condition of artistic, as opposed to empirical, treatment. In the concise statement of the Rhetoric, I. 2, p. 1356b28, misunderstanding is hardly possible."

Bywater (1903, pp. 245-246): "If this is to correspond, as it should, with the original formula, ???? ???????? ???????? ????? ??? ?????, we must excise the ? before ??????????. This change in the text is, it seems to me, absolutely demanded by the logic of the statement. The circumstantial participle, ?????????? ?????, is wanted to describe the particular malady; and the nouns to which it is appended, ???? ????????????? ? ?????????, to represent the kinds of persons (i.e. the kinds of constitutions), for which in maladies of this sort a remedy of this particular nature is supposed to be appropriate. One must always think twice before disagreeing with Bonitz, but it seems to me that he is in this instance distinctly wrong in supposing ?????????????, ????????? and ?????????? to be three coordinate terms designating three kinds of sufferers (???? ???? ?????????, Ind. 824a15). ?????????? ????? no doubt implies an actual illness, but that cannot be said of ????????????? ? ?????????; these two terms refer not to actual maladies but to constitutions; or, as the ancients said, temperaments; the literal translation of the words in fact is 'men of a phlegmatic or of a bilious constitution.' In ancient medical theory ?????? (= pituita) and ???? play a leading part, the predominance of the one producing the 'phlegmatic,' that of the other the 'bilious' constitution. In the language of Hippocrates the individuals exemplifying these two types of constitution are termed ?????????? and ????????. That Aristotle should use ???????????? and ???????? in the same sense was natural enough; and there is distinct evidence of this use of the two terms in writings of the Aristotelian school, if not in the other works of Aristotle himself. In Probl. 1. 9-12, 860a12 sqq., where the writer follows Hippocrates so closely as to borrow at times the very words of his De aere, aquis, locis, ???????????? and ???????? are regularly used where Hippocrates himself had said ?????????? and ????????. [246] But if the two words are to bear the same sense in the present passage of the Metaphysics, as it seems to me that they ought, on grounds of language as well as logic, it becomes necessary, as I have said, to bracket the intrusive ? before ??????????."

981a18-19. except in an incidental way.

(2) Ross (i 117): "???? ???' ? does not seem to be an Aristotelian combination, and the reading of Ab, which omits ????, is probably the original one."

Jaeger: "???? ???' ? E varias lectiones contaminans."

(3) ???? ???' ? is not only non-Aristotelian, but non-Greek. Frequent in later Greek, however, is ???? ????. That may have suggested the juxtaposition of the variae lectiones ???? and ???' ?.

981a23-24. for it is the individual that is to be cured. (Ab)

(1) E reads "it is more (= in the first place)".

(2) The reading of Ab is supported by Asclepius (9. 19: ?? ??? ??????? ???? ?? ?????????????), and additionally, as Jaeger thinks, by Ethica Nicomachea 1097a13.

(3) But the whole passage (1097a8-13) runs: ?????? ?? ??? ?? ???????????? ??????? ? ?????? ???? ??? ????? ?????? ????? ???? ???????, ? ??? ???????????? ? ??????????????? ????? ? ??? ????? ????? ??????????. ???????? ??? ??? ???? ??? ??????? ????? ?????????? ? ??????, ???? ??? ????????, ?????? ?' ???? ??? ?????? ???' ??????? ??? ????????.

981b2-5. (we think the manual workers are like certain lifeless things which act indeed, but act without knowing what they do, as fire burns, - but while the lifeless things perform each of their functions by a natural tendency, the labourers perform them through habit). (E)

(1) The whole passage is omitted by Ab and Alexander.

Alternative translations:

(a) the manual workers are … (omitting "we think"). (Bessarion)

(b) we think the manual workers - as certain lifeless things - act indeed, but act without knowing what they do, as fire burns, - the lifeless things, then, are believed by us to perform each of their functions by a natural tendency, the laborers to perform them through habit. (Rolfes, Slezák)

(2) Asclepius (10. 6-15): ???????? ??? ?? ?????????? ???? ???????· ????? ??? ?? ??? ?????, ??? ???? ?? ??? ?? ?????, ??? ? ???? ?????, ??? ???? ?? ??? ?? ?????, ????? ??? ?? ?????????? ??????? ???, ??? ????? ?? ??? ?? ????????. ??? ?????? ???????, ??? ?????????? ??? ?????? ?? ??????. ?? ??? ??? ????? ?????? ???????? ? ????????, ????, ?? ?????, ?? ??? ?????? ?????·?? ?? ????? ???????, ???? ??????? ? ??????? ????? ??? ????????, ??? ? ?????? ??????? ??? ??????????· ?? ?????? ?? ?????????? ???? ????? ?????, ?? ??? ?? ???????. ??? ???? ???? ?? ??????????? ??’ ????, ??? ????? ?????????? ???? ?? ????? ?????????? ??? ?????, ???? ???? ?? ???? ????? ????? ?????? ??? ??? ?????? ?????????, ?? ??? ?? ?????? ???? ???????????.

Luthe (1880, p. 189): "?? - ????????? [981b5-6] is connected by Bonitz with the immediately preceding sentence. In rebus inanimis, he says, a naturali quodam instinctu, in opificibus a consuetudine causam repetimus agendi; neutri generi propterea sapientiam adscribimus, quoniam eius vis non in agendi facilitate sed in cognoscendis rerum causis cernitur. If this interpretation was correct, instead of ?????????? (v. 5) it should be ??????: We deny wisdom of anybody, who does not have knowledge, because being wise (not: being wiser) depends on knowledge. […] Therefore ?? - ????????? is to be connected with ??? - ?????? [981a30-b2]." The construction, then, is parallel to 981a24-27; the apparently absolute participle ?? … ????? (981b5) depends on ????????? (981a31) as ?? … ???????????? (981a26-27) depends on ????????????? (Luthe, p. 190).

Ross (i 118): "These words [981b2-5 ???? … ????], omitted by Ab and Alexander, are sufficiently warranted by the other MSS. and by Asclepius 10. 6, and need cause no difficulty if they are treated as parenthetical and ?? ??, etc. (l. 5) is taken to refer to the ???????????? (a30). […]

These words [981b2-3 ????? ??? … ?? ???] fall within the ????? clause and go with ??? ?????? ????. Aristotle begins by likening the action of ??????????? to that of lifeless things, but proceeds to point out a contrast (that the latter act as they do by nature and the former by habit), which interrupts the construction and produces a not unnatural anacolouthon."

(3) What makes difficulty is firstly the coocurrence of two accusatives (???? ?' and ???? ?? ???????????), which can only depend on 981a31 ????????? and therefore demand complementary infinitives, secondly the threefold finite ????? in the main clause.

The text was corrected in both directions: by changing the accusatives into nominatives, or the finite verb into the infinitive. A third way (Hengstenberg, Ross 1924) is to take the first two ????? as predicates of ???? (so that with ????? begins a comparison clause), and the third, by changing it into ??????, together with ???? ?? ??????????? as a. c. i. Since the first a. c. i. now remains incomplete, an anacoluthon must be assumed.

All possibilities being exhausted, the question is whether we can come to a decision. The interpreters agree, that 981b2-5 ???? … ???? interrupts the context, because 981b5 ?? relates to ????????? in 981a31. According to Schwegler, Christ and Jaeger this passage is a later addition, whereas Ross treats it as a mere parenthesis. If we decide in favor of the former view, suspicion falls on the two accusatives at the beginning and the end, which establish a syntactic connection with the surrounding text. Add to this that the characterization here given of the ??????????? by means of a comparison with the ????? hardly can be mentioned as popular belief (?????????), so that the passage also materially seems not to fit into the frame of a sifting through the ?????? ??????? about the ?????.

981b25-982a1. We have said in the Ethics what the difference is between art and science and the other kindred faculties; but the point of our present discussion is this, that all men suppose what is called Wisdom to deal with the first causes and the principles of things.

(1) Bracketed by Jaeger as a later addition.

(2) Thomas Aquinas (Sententia Metaphysicae, liber 1 lectio 1 numerus 34): "Sed quia usus nomine artis fuerat et sapientiae et scientiae quasi indifferenter, ne aliquis putet haec omnia esse nomina synonyma idem penitus significantia hanc opinionem removet, et remittit ad librum Moralium, idest ad sextum Ethicorum, ubi dictum est, in quo differant scientia et ars et sapientia et prudentia et intellectus."

Christ (1853, pp. 77-78): "Verbis extremis: ???? - ?????? ea, quae supra latius exposita sunt, strictim comprehenduntur: experientiam sensu, artem experientia, disciplinas denique theoreticas practicis praestare. Quae res cum in priore capitis parte usque ad ?????? ????? (981b25) expositae sint, verba ???? - ?????? statim post ????? multo concinnius adnecterentur. Nunc verbis interpositis ??????? - ??????, ut ex quibus nulla conclusio fiat, perincommode interrumpuntur. Accedit, quod eo loco, quo nunc verba ???? - ?????? leguntur, necessario post ?? ?? ?????????? ??? ????????? addenda fuerint haec fere: ? ?? ????? ??? ????? ??????????, ne ea, quae in verbis ?? ?' ????? - ?????? laterent, in conclusione particula ???? indicata negligerentur; nam practicis quidem diciplinis non magis prima philosophia quam mathematicae disciplinae praestant. Difficultas vero augetur fine capitis I et initio capitis II acrius inspectis. In initio enim capitis II Aristoteles indicat hoc: priore capite demonstratum esse, a sapienti principia explorari debere, sed quae illa sapientiae principia sint, nunc investigandum esse. Atque omnes disciplinas, quae sint rerum principia, demonstrare Aristoteles in priore capite 981b1-12 optime illustraverat. Sed si verba ??????? - ?????? genuina essent, altera quoque propositio in priore capite jam confecta esset. Nec quidquam excusationis hinc cum Bonitzio petendum est, quod Aristoteles hanc rem in priore capite contendat, in altero demonstret. Ita enim in secundo capite Aristoteles de philosophiae principiis disputat, tamquam nihildum de hac re significatum sit. Quas ob causas valde eo inclino, ut verba ??????? - ??????, quibus ethica cum metaphysicis connecterentur, postea ab Aristotele leviter addita fuisse censeam."

Susemihl (1887, p. 7) athetizes these lines. "For Aristotle is using here in the beginning of the Metaphysics ????? (in the sense of 'theory') nearly equivalent with ????????, therefore he can not - even in a later addition - have referred for the difference of the two on a passage of the Ethics (Eth. VI), where ????? (in the sense of 'skill') is rather opposed both to ???????? and ????????, being property of quite another part of reason."

Ross (I 119): "The reference to the Ethics is found in all the MSS. and in Alexander and Asclepius, and the reasons alleged for treating it as spurious are illusory. True, the difference between art and science has hitherto been ignored, as it often is in Aristotle; but that is because he has been dealing with the difference between both of them and unreasoning experience. Now, however, the difference between art and science becomes important; it is just that which already (l. 21) has been indicated between systems of knowledge that aim at utility or pleasure and those whose end is in themselves; and nothing is more natural than to refer to the work in which the difference is most fully treated. It must not, however, be inferred that the Ethics was written before Book I; the reference may easily have been added by Aristotle in a later revision."

981b29-982a1. so that, as has been said before, the man of experience is thought to be wiser than the possessors of any sense-perception whatever, the artist wiser than the men of experience, the master-worker than the mechanic, and the theoretical kinds of knowledge to be more of the nature of Wisdom than the productive.

(1) A spurious addition.

(2) Fonseca (on 981a31-32): "Quo loco dicet fortasse aliquis nomine ??? ??????????? non significari eos, qui arte simul,et manibus, ut verbum sonat, opus artis conficiunt, sed meros operarios; cuiusmodi sunt ii, qui jussu artificium funes trahunt, aut machinas applicant. Quid enim aliud significat Aristoteles, cum ait, ???? ??????????? esse similes rebus inanimis, quae non cognoscunt id, quod faciunt, tametsi eo superiores sunt in agendo, quod illae agunt naturae impulsu, ipsi vero consuetudine? Addet etiam, non esse hanc usurpationem alienam a vi nominis. hi enim etsi non operantur arte, quam non habent, ministerio tamen suo opus artificiosum conficiunt.

Verum obstat, quod Aristoteles ad finem capitis colligens gradatim ea, quae dixerat, complectitur nomine artificum ???? ???????????: quo fit, ut non significet hoc [42] vocabulo meros operarios, sed eos, qui ex arte operantur, cuiusmodi sunt fabri, caementarii, et alii huiusmodi artifices.

Hac de causa non diximus simpliciter «Qui manibus operantur» sed «Opifices». Quanquam enim ne hoc quidem vocabulum exprimit vim Graeci nominis, pro iis tamen solis accipitur, qui operantur ex arte. Quod autem Aristoteles eos confert cum rebus inanimis, solaque consuetudine agere docet, eo pertinet, ut intelligamus discrimen eorum ab architectis non quidem in simplici cognitione eorum, quae faciunt (ex arte enim operantur) sed in cognitione causae suorum effectorum. Architecti enim cum causas rerum teneant, demonstrativam cognitionem habent, et ex habitu scientiae operantur: illi vero, cum causas ignorent, solo habitu ex consuetudine certa quadam ratione agendi acquisito opus artis efficiunt. Unde collige, cum Aristoteles hoc loco tribuit artificibus cognitionem causae, non universe intelligendum esse de omnibus artificibus, sed indefinite, ut verum sit in iis, qui sunt quasi principes in quaque arte, quos architectos vocat."

Fonseca (on the present passage): "Expertus sapientior habetur (seu potius magis accedens ad rationem sapientis) eo, qui simpliciter rem sensu percipit; artifex autem experto, atque inter artifices architectus opifice; theoreticus autem practico, hoc est contemplator actore, et effectore, ut patet ex iis, quae per totum caput diffuse tradita sunt: at ex his semper posteriores dicuntur sapientiores, ad plenamve rationem sapientis magis accedentes, quod propiores sint causarum, et principiorum considerationi; aut magis eam attingant: ergo sapiens, et (quod hinc sequitur) scientia, quae sapientia dicitur, versatur circa causas.

Graeci codices hoc loco habent ?? ?? ?????????? ??? ????????? hoc est contemplativae activis, quod refert ad artes. Crediderim tamen locum esse corruptum pro ?? ?? ?????????? et cet. ut referatur ad artifices: tametsi parum interest utro modo res habeat, cum sensus eodem redeat, omnesque interpretes membra omnia ad artifices referant."

Luthe (1884, p. 2\*): "In my opinion, the words ??????????? ?? ? ?????????? [981b31-982a1] are to be deleted. For the statement p. 981a30 (??? - ?????????) that the architect is wiser than the manual worker serves only as example for the general assertion that the artist is wiser than the experienced."

982a12-14. and more capable of teaching the causes.

(1) "the causes" is a spurious addition.

(2) Alexander (10. 7-9): ???? ??? ??? ???????????????? ??? ??????, ???????? ??? ??? ??????????? ??? ??? ??? ?????? ?????????? ??????????, ?????? ????? ??????? ??? ?? ????? ???????????.

Thomas Aquinas (liber 1 lectio 2 numerus 4): "Illum dicimus magis sapientem in omni scientia, qui potest assignare causas cuiuslibet quaesiti, et per hoc docere."

Gomperz (1876, p. 566): "What would be the purpose of this whole analysis [982a6-b7], if the result was certain from the outset?" The words ??? ?????? are "an interpolation anticipating the final result" 982b7-10. Gomperz compares Rhetorica A 2, 1355b28-29: ?????? [?????] ???? ?? ???? ??????????? ???? ???????????.

Christ: "??? ?????? ex 29 interpolatum putat Baumann."

Ross (i 121): "[…] similar carelessness is not uncommon in Aristotle".

(3) Naturally, ??? ?????? (or ??????) must be genitivus objectivus, but 'teach the causes' is against the sense of the following argumentation (not only 'careless' diction, as Ross believes). The philosophical interpreters therefore found themselves compelled to free paraphrasing. They were well aware that according to Aristotle teaching as such requires knowledge of the causes; in this sense they paraphrase. Because the text cannot be understood in this way, ??? ?????? is to be ejected.

982a28-29. But the science which investigates causes is also instructive, in a higher degree.

(1) Alternative (incorrect) translations:

But the science which investigates causes in a higher degree is also instructive. (William of Moerbeke)

But the science which investigates causes in a higher degree is also instructive in a higher degree. (Thomas Aquinas, Argyropulus, Ross 1924)

But the science which investigates what is cause in a higher degree is also instructive in a higher degree. (Alexander)

(2) Alexander (13. 9-17): ????? ?? ??? ??? ???????????????? ?? ?? ????? ???????· ??? ??? ??????????? ????? ?? ??? ?????? ?????? ??? ????????????, ?? ??????????. ???? ?? ?????? ????? ???????????? ??? ??? ?????? ?????????? ??? ?? ???????? (??? ??? ??? ?????? ? ??????????) ?? ????? ?????? ????? ??? ?????? ??????????· ?? ??? ?????? ????? ?????· ? ?? ????????? ????? ??? ? ??? ?????? ?????? ????????? ??? ??????????? ??????, ?????? ??? ??? ?????? ? ??????????· ???? ?? ? ??? ?????? ?????? ????????? ??? ??????????? ??????.

William of Moerbeke: "At vero et doctrinalis quae causarum est speculatrix magis."

Thomas Aquinas (Sententia Metaphysicae, liber 1 lectio 2 numerus 13): "Illa scientia est magis doctrix vel doctrinalis, quae magis considerat causas."

Argyropulus: "At vero magis etiam ad docendum accommodata esse videtur ea scientia: quae causarum magis est contemplatrix."

Bessarion: "at vero illa magis docet, quae causas speculatur."

Fonseca: "Vetus interpres jungit hoc loco verbum ?????? cum verbo ?????????, ut sensus sit «Sed et ea apta est ad docendum, quae magis in causarum consideratione versatur», Bessario et Perionius cum nomine ???????????, ut haec sit sententia «Sed et ea aptior est ad docendum, quae in causarum consideratione versatur», Argyropulus utrumque verbum affici putat ea comparationis particula, ut ea scientia hoc loco aptior ad docendum dicatur, quae magis in causarum consideratione versatur. Quae interpretatio nobis eo magis placuit, quod conveniat cum posteriori Alexandri explicatione, magisque congruat cum probatione, quae mox ab Aristotele subjicitur. Nam quia ii soli vere docent, qui causas rerum afferunt, ut capite etiam superiori explicatum erat; inde fit, ut ea scientia sit ad docendum aptior, quae magis versatur in causarum consideratione: versatur autem magis in consideratione causarum, quae considerat ea, quae magis sunt causae.

Accedit, quod superius quoque cum utroque verbo juncta est comparatio, ubi dictum est, eum esse sapientiorem, qui causas melius tradere docendo potest.

Quod si verborum syntaxis conjunctionem adverbii cum utroque nomine non patitur, satis est quod sententiam ab Aristotele institutam reddiderimus."

Ross (i 122): "?????? seems to go both with ??????????? and with ??? ?????? ?????????."

(3) As we see, the point at issue is, whether ?????? belongs to ??????????? or to ??? ?????? or to ?????????. There can be no doubt, however, if we pay attention to the context. The following ???-sentence clearly accounts for the ???????????, nothing else. To our present sentence applies what Kühner/Gerth (I 25) say about periphrasing the comparative with ??????: "It is self-evident that periphrasis is more emphatic than the simple comparative forms. So, if a word is to be emphasized, periphrasis is employed, especially if this word [as ??????????? in our present sentence] is placed at the front or at least in the beginning of the sentence". ??????????? … ?????? therefore answers the ???????????????? in l. 13. The statement gets the greatest possible emphasis by the additional end position of ??????. About this word order Kühner/Gerth (II 596-597) write: "[…] if in one sentence two words are to be emphasised by position, one of them is placed at the front of the sentence, the other at the end." As an example for distributing a phrase over beginning and end of a sentence they (II 597) cite Plato, Phaedo 58 E: ???????? ??? ??? ???? ????????, ? ?????????, ??? ??? ?????? ??? ??? ?????. The two genitives at the end belong to ???????? ('happy because of …', v. Kühner/Gerth I 388 and 390-391).

The same word order occurs in 983a28 (???????? … ???????), where ??????? is adverb to ????????.

982b4-5. and more authoritative than any ancillary science.

(1) A spurious intrusion.

(2) According to Luthe (1884, p. 5 n.), the words ??? ?????? ?????? ??? ??????????? are to be deleted. "For it is more than pointless, explaining the thought that a certain science is the most authoritative of all, to add that it is more authoritative than any ancillary one. It should read, at least, «It is more authoritative than any other», namely authoritative science. The words are intruded from p. 982a16."

982b22-24. for it was when almost all the necessities of life and the things that make for comfort and recreation had been secured.

(1) Alternative (incorrect) translations:

for it was when almost all what is necessary for comfort and recreation had been secured. (Argyropulus, Bonitz)

for it was when almost all what is necessary and makes for comfort and recreation had been secured. (This mistranslation is avoided by Jaeger's emendation.)

(2) Alexander (16. 18 - 17, 4): ???? ??? ??? ??? ????????? ?? ??? ??? ???? ???????? ??? ??? ???? ?????????? ????? ??? ??? ??? ???? ?????????? ??????? ??? ??? ??? ???????? ???????. ?? ?? ?????? ??????????, ??? ?? ????????? ??? ??? ???? ????????, ??????? ??? ???? ?????????? ????????, ????? ?? ??’ ??????? ????????? ??? ???? ???????? ??? ???? ???????????? ??????? ??? ??????? ?????????. ???? ??? ????? ?? ?????????· ? ??? ??? ????????? ???? ??? ???????? ??????? ?? ??? ????????, ? ??? ???? ????????.

Argyropulus: "cum enim omnia necessaria ad facile cum voluptateque vivendum adessent: quaeri talis prudentia coepit."

Bessarion: "fere enim omnibus inventis quae ad necessaria et ad facilitatem ac ad degendum conducant: huiusmodi prudentia quaeri coepta est."

Schwegler (i 19-20) proposes to connect the words ??? ???? ???????? ??? ???????? with ? ??????? ???????? ?????? ?????????. But then ??? had to go with ? ??????? ???????? ("begann man, zum Behufe feineren, edleren Lebensgenusses auch nach wissenschaftlicher Einsicht zu streben"), what is highly unnatural. He refers to Politica VIII, 5, 1339a25-26 (? ???? ???????? ?? ??????????? ??? ???? ????????;), wrongly deducing from this passage that ???? ???????? and ???? ???????? are equated.

Bonitz (1849, p. 53): "Sed neque oportebat, quod opinatur Schweglerus, iterari articulum, siquidem una notione scriptor comprehendi voluit quae vel ad sustentandam vitam necessaria vel utilia sunt ad eam ornandam; neque notiones admodum sibi affines ??????? et ??????? per particulas ??? - ??? conjunxisset, sed per particulas ?? - ???: neque ??????? significat otium, sed vivendi facilitatem vel commoditatem […]. Denique vocabulum ??????? latius patet, ut philosophia eodem iure et dici possit requiri ad ????????, et inventa demum esse perfectis jam artibus omnibus quae pertinerent ad ???????? […]."

Ross (I 123): "???? ???????? ??? ???????? is co-ordinate with ?????????, as is clearly shown by 981b17. ??????? means physical comfort, ??????? mental enjoyment. The insertion of ??? would make the meaning clearer, but is not necessary." But, as Jaeger (1917, p. 495) rightly argues, the text suggests that ?? ???????? ??? ???? ???????? ??? ???????? are synonymous terms.

Jaeger (1956, p. 155): "I have supplied ??? since without the article there would be only two stages; cfr. also 981b17 where the same trichotomy occurs (??? ??? ???? ?????????, ??? ?? ???? ???????? and (21) ?? ?? ???? ?????? ???? ???? ?????????, i. e. ?? ??????????). This tripartition is also confirmed by the Protrepticus (frg. 8, Walzer), from which it was taken over into the Metaphysics. The expression ? ??????? ???????? for theoretical philosophy seems strange, for later Aristotle distinguished ???????? (prudence) from ????? (theoretical reason or wisdom); cf. Nic. Eth. book VI. But this Platonic use of ???????? too is derived from the Protrepticus; cfr. frg. 5 b (p. 31, Walzer), line 12, where Aristotle speaks of ??? ???? ?????? ?? ??? ??? ???????? ???????? ???????? and names as examples of this type Anaxagoras and Parmenides, i. e. the greatest theoretical thinkers of the past (see my Aristotle, Italian ed., p. 107)."

Jaeger: "??? addidi ex Alexandri paraphrasi; eadem artium tripartitio extat 981b17-25 et Protr. frg. 8 Walzer: ?? ????????, ?? ???? ????????, ?? ?????????? vel ?????????? ????????? (??????? et ??????? idem valent et ???? ?????????? opponuntur); cf. Herm. 52. 495 et Theophr. frg. LXXXIV."

982b25-28. but as the man is free, we say, who exists for his own sake and not for another's, so we pursue this as the only free science. (Ab)

(1) E exhibits a mutilated text: but as the man is free, we say, who exists for his own sake and not for another's, so this science [exists for its own sake] being the only free science.

(2) Alexander (17. 9-10): ??? ??? ? ??????? ?????? ?? ???? ???? ???????? ??? ????? ????????? ???? ????? ????? ?????.

Asclepius (20. 23-29): ????? ??? ? ????????? ????? ????? ???? ??? ?? ??’ ?????. […] ???? ??? ? ????? ????????? ???? ???????? ???? ??? ?????????.

Argyropulus: "sed ut hominem eum liberum esse dicimus qui sui ipsius est gratia, non ob alium, sic et ipsam solam scientiarum liberam esse. est enim haec sui ipsius gratia sola."

Bessarion: "sed quemadmodum dicimus liber homo de eo qui sui ipsius et non alterius gratia est, ita et haec sola scientiarum libera est, siquidem sola haec sui ipsius gratia est."

According to Wirth (1884, p. 45), the ????? in connection with direct speech is "hardly tolerable". Because the reading of Ab ????? ?? ????? ????? ????????? (to be understood as depending on ???????? in l. 25) "looks too much like the conjecture of a diasceuast", he proposes ????????.

Jaeger (1956, p. 154): "Impressed with the agreement of E and Alexander on the nominative case ???? ??? ???? after the preceding ???' ????? ????????, Wirth doubted ????? in line 26, which if correct seemed to require the acc. cum infin. construction, and changed it to ????????, a conjecture that both Christ and Ross list in their apparatus, criticus. But its palaeographical probability is not great, and the ?? preserved by both Ab and Alexander proves that we are to understand ???? ??? ????? [????????] ?? ????? ????? ?????????. After ???????? this ?? would be impossible. I therefore follow Ross, who reads the sentence as printed above and includes the ????? in commas, making it parenthetical. That it must not be touched by conjecture we can again prove by the Protrepticus, where (51, 13 [Walzer]) we read the following version of this argument: ???? ??? [on the Islands of the Blessed] ??????? ????? ???? ??? ????? ????? ?????? ?? ???????, ????? ?? ???????????? ?? … ???????, ????? ??? ??? ????????? ????? ???? ?????. This is, to be sure, already a shortened form of the text of the Protrepticus, but even Iamblichus' excerpt permits us to recognize that the word ????? occurred in the original sentence, from whence it was taken over into the passage of the Metaphysics. Proceeding again from the common experience that we call free a man who exists for his own and no one else's sake (i. e. who is not a slave), Aristotle transfers the word to the 'first philosophy' because it serves no other purpose, as do other arts and sciences."

(3) Already Alexander must have had at hands a corrupted text, because his paraphrase turns the argument upside down: it is not being end in itself from freedom, but freedom from being end in itself (shown in the preceding lines) what must be deduced. Therefore the ???? in l. 27 must respond to the ?? in l. 26. The problem is, that the complement ???? ????? ?????? is lacking, being supplied (with regard to content) subsequently in the following ???-sentence. As in 980b21, the manuscript E has preserved the fragment of a different version, without any attempt at smoothing.

Asclepius, Bessarion and Bonitz omit the ????, whereas Ross and Jaeger, following the manuscript Ab, change the nominatives into accusatives (depending on ???????? in l. 25). Thus the grammatical offence is eliminated, but at the cost of logic; for now neither the ???? stands in a meaningful connection relation with the ????? nor the ??? with the preceding sentence.

983a5-6. and this science alone must be, in two ways, most divine. (Ab)

(1) E: and this science must be most divine only in two ways.

"alone" should be omitted.

(2) Alexander (18. 6-9): ? ?? ??????? ???????? ???? ?? ?? ??????? ?????? ?? ??? ????? ???????? ????? (???????? ??? ??? ??????? ?? ?????, ??? ???? ?? ??? ???????? ???? ???? ???? ??? ????????), ???? ??? ??? ?? ??? ????? ?????? ?????.

Argyropulus: "At haec sola dupliciter talis est."

Bessarion: "Talis vero bifariam dumtaxat utique fuerit."

(3) The ????? is unmotivated. Why should it be emphasized, that there are "only" two meanings? Apparently ????? is changed from ???? (transmitted in Ab), recognizing that the result reached not until l. 7 ought not be anticipated. Same case as ??? ?????? in 982a13. Evidently, Alexander did not find neither ???? nor ????? in his text.

983a13-14. For all men begin, as we said, by wondering that things are as they are.

(1) Incorrect translation: … by wondering whether things are as they are. (Bessarion, Bonitz)

(2) Bessarion: "incipiunt etenim omnes (ut diximus) ab admiratione: an sic se habeat."

For the use of ?? (= that) Jaeger (1917, pp. 496-497) refers to Phys. ? 1, 225a30, Metaph. ? 11, 1067b35.

(3) Hereby, as Kühner/Gerth (II, p. 369) comment, "the object of admiration is presented as not really existing, but as merely possible or as still questionable. Attic urbanity, which likes to admix to its language the color of doubt and indecision, makes use of this expression very often, even when speaking of unquestioned facts."

983a14-17. as they do about self-moving marionettes, or about the solstices or the incommensurability of the diagonal of a square with the side; for it seems wonderful to all who have not yet seen the reason, that there is a thing which cannot be measured even by the smallest unit. (Adopting the transposition of the words "who have not yet seen the reason" [???? ???? ??????????? ??? ??????] proposed by Bonitz.)

(1) The text as it stands would have to be translated: (that things behave) like self-moving marionettes to the eye of those who have not yet seen the reason, either about the solstices ….

In my view, we must eliminate the relic of a second version, so that the text runs: either about the solstices or the incommensurability of the diagonal of a square with the side; for it seems wonderful to all, that there is a thing which cannot be measured even by the smallest unit.

The second version reconstructed by me would run: … for these phenomena seem wonderful like self-moving marionettes to those who have not yet seen the reason (sc. of these phenomena).

(2) Asclepius (22. 11-15): ????? ??? ?????, ??? ??? ?????? ??? ?????????? ??? ????? ????? ??? ??????????, ????? ??? ??? ?????????· ?????????? ??? ?????, ??????? ?? ??????? ???????, ??? ???????? ????? ?????. ???????? ??? ??? ?? ???????? ??? ??? ????????? ??? ?? ?? ????????? ??? ?????? ? <????> [my addition] ??? ??? ????? ?????? ? ??? ??? ????????? ???????????.

Asclepius assumes that ??????? does only belong to ??? ???????? ????????? (cf. ????? ??? ??? ?????????), and that ? ???? ??? … depends on ???? ???? ??????????? ??? ?????? (cf. ??? ?? ?? ????????? ??? ?????? ? <????> ??? …).

William of Moerbeke: "Incipiunt quidem enim, ut diximus, omnes ab admirari si ita habent, quemadmodum mirabilium automata, nondum speculantibus causam, aut circa solis conversiones aut diametri non commensurationem."

Thomas Aquinas (Sententia Metaphysicae, liber 1 lectio 3 numerus 15): "Initiata est autem (ut praedictum est) inquisitio huius scientiae ab admiratione […]. Quae quidem admiratio erat, si res ita se haberet sicut automata mirabilia, idest quae videntur mirabiliter a casu accidere. […] Et ideo cum homines nondum poterant speculari causas rerum, admirabantur omnia quasi quaedam casualia. Sicut admirantur circa conversiones solis […]. Et etiam circa hoc quod diameter non est commensurabilis lateri quadrati."

Argyropulus: "ut fit cum mira quaedam spectantur causa nondum perspecta. miranturque si ita res se habeat aut circa solstitia aut circa diametri quadrati incommensurabilitatem. mirabile namque cunctis esse videtur, si quid omnino non mensuretur."

Bessarion: "sicut de praestigiosis quae per seipsa moventur illi qui nondum speculati sunt causam. aut de solstitiis aut de diametri incommesurabilitate. admirabile enim omnibus videtur, si quid, cum non sit minimum, non mensuretur."

Bessarion takes ??????? in the same sense as ????, cf. Bonitz, Index (354a22 sq.) s. v. ???????: "ad afferenda exempla perinde atque ???? usurpatur ?? 4. 124b16."

Bonitz (1849, pp. 56sq.): "Quemadmodum, ait Aristoteles, spectatores causarum ignari admirantur simulacra illa, quae praestigiatores fidibus vel nervis occultis movent, ut suapte sponte moveri videantur (????????? ??? ????????), ita solis motus et alia id genus admiratione eos implent, num vere ita res se habere possit. Hanc fere esse verborum sententiam facile apparet, sed dativum ???? - ??????????? quo referendum putem, ut apta vel tolerabilis exsistat enuntiati conformatio grammatica, non possum reperire. Aptissime quidem haec verba ???? ???? ??????????? ??? ?????? et cum grammatica enuntiati forma et cum sententiarum ordine concinent, si post ????? a16 posita fuerint."

Jaeger (1917, p. 497): "The last two examples are expressed by ???? with accusative, in the accusative is also ?????????, therefore, after ???????, a ???? has probably dropped out." This conjecture is anticipated in the translations of Bessarion (see above), Bonitz and Ross.

(3) Jaeger's text (which was adopted by Ross and others) is insufficient on several points hitherto neglected.

(a) It is too natural to connect ??????? with ????? (l. 13), as Thomas Aquinas does. This should make us suspicious about its actual position.

(b) The rhetoric (inverted) word order ??? ???????? ?????????; usual would be ?? ??? ???????? ???????? or ?? ???????? ??? ????????, as in De generatione animalium B, 734b10. According to Madvig (§ 10), the genitive is put first "when it stands with emphasis on account of an opposition, or in a transition: ??? ??????? ? ????????? (Plato, Protagoras 343 B). ??? ?????? ? ?????? (Thucydides 4, 29)." By the emphatic position of the genitive attribute ??? ???????? certain ???????? are opposed to other ???????? mentioned already.

(c) It is absurd to put the marionettes on a par with the big questions of astronomy and mathematics; they can only serve for comparison: the perplexity about the world's riddles, at the beginning of philosophy, is like (cf. Bonitz: Quemadmodum …, ita …) the perplexity about marionettes, which seem to move spontaneously (?????????), i. e. without a moving cause. This (the said comparison) must be the function of ???????; it refers to a preceding ???????? - just like the dative ???? … ???????????, which was transposed to after ????????? (l. 16) for this reason. We have, therefore, to consider the words ??????? … ??? ??????, firstly, as an unit, secondly (because the reference word ???????? is missing), as an incomplete one, i. e. as relic of an alternative version, probably a duplicate of l. 16 sq. (????????? ??? … ?????????). This supposed, the other ???????? (see point 2) are the solstices and the incommensurability of the diagonal.

With all this, however, we still have not reached the goal; for what remains (l. 15 sq. ? ???? ??? ??? ????? ?????? … ???????????) is not, as it should be, an enumeration of examples, but a complete disjunction ("either - or"). A comparison with 982b15-17 shows that the first example, introduced by ????, is missing.

The result is, therefore, that it is impossible to make our text coherent.

983a28-29. (for the 'why' is reducible finally to the definition, and the ultimate 'why' is a cause and principle). (Ab)

(1) The reading of E is to be translated: for the first 'why' … Instead of 'finally to the definition' (Argyropulus, Bonitz, Ross), also grammatically possible is 'to the last definition' (Bessarion), but we have here the same inverted word order as in 982a28sq.

(2) Argyropulus: "nam ipsum propter quid primum ad ipsam ultimo rationem redigitur. causa vero principiumque id est quod primum, cum propter quid quaeritur, assignatur."

Bessarion: "nam ipsum quare primum refertur ad rationem ultimam, causa autem et principium ipsum quare primum."

Bonitz (1849, p. 60) quotes Physics ii 7. 198a16: ??? ?? ?? ????? ???????? ?? ??? ?? ??????? ?? ???? ?????????, ???? ?? ???? ?????????? ??? ??????? ??? ??? ?????? ? ????????? ? ????? ????? ???????? ???????.

983b9-10. (the substance remaining, but changing in its modifications).

(2) Alexander (23. 18sq.): ??? ?????? ????????, ???? ?? ?????? ?????????????.

Argyropulus: "substantia permanente quidem: mutationem autem in affectibus subeunte."

Bessarion: "substantia quidem permanente: mutata vero passionibus."

Sylburg (p. 163) agrees with Argyropulus: "??? referenda magis ad participium ???????????, quam ad nomen ??????, hoc sensu, substantia permanente quidem, sed passionibus mutata."

(3) In a comparison of substance and modifications, grammatical symmetry would require: whereas the modifications change (??? ?? ????? ?????????????). Aristotle, however, is reluctant to make modifications the subject of the genitivus absolutus, because really it is substance which is the subject of change.

983b13-18. since this sort of entity is always conserved, as we say Socrates neither comes to be absolutely when he comes to be beautiful or musical, nor ceases to be when he loses these characteristics, because the substratum, Socrates himself remains. Just so they say nothing else comes to be or ceases to be; for there must be some entity - either one or more than one - from which all other things come to be, it being conserved.

(2) Bywater (1913, p. 109): "The full stop here after ??? ???????? ????? should be replaced by a comma; the sentence is a clear instance of what Riddell terms the Binary Structure with comparisons, when the fact illustrated is stated before the illustration and then restated after it; so that the ????? clause does duty as it were twice over, in relation to what precedes and also in relation to what follows. I need not say that the construction is not uncommon in Aristotle."

The reference is to: James Riddell, The Apology of Plato, Oxford 1877, p. 206:

"In Similes or Comparisons. In such cases there is great tendency to the Binary Structure: the fact illustrated is stated (perhaps only in outline) before the illustration, and re-stated after it."

As examples from Plato are mentioned (p. 207): Gorgias 483 E (?? ???? ?????? ??? ????? … ??????????????), Politicus 296 E-297 A (?????? ??? … ???? ??? ???? ??? ????? ?????? ??????, ?.?.?.), Phaedo 60 E-61 A (???? ???????? … ????? ???????????) and 109 E (???????? … ????????), Crito 54 D (????? ??? ???? ??????? … ??????), Politicus 260 C-D (??? ??? ????? … ?????????), Cratylus 417 B-C (?????? … ?? ??????????) and 433 A-B (??? ?? ??????? … ??? ???????), Timaeus 19 B-C (????????? ?? … ?????????).

On p. 204, the author had given the following general characterization of Binary Structure:

"Certain Idiomatic affections of the Sentence are the grammatical result of expressing in two parts a conception which exists in the speaker’s mind as one.

The immediate use of this artifice is to present the conception to the hearer in two parts, which, after entering his mind separately, will there reunite.

The ulterior use is (1) to facilitate a clear expression of a complex conception, and (2) to set before the apprehension two images of the object, as it presents itself at two successive moments; and by this means to give it the same kind of fullness with which the image of material objects is invested by «binocular vision.»

This Idiom has been, in certain of its forms, ranked under Apposition. But it does not resemble it except in a nakedly grammatical point of view. Apposition forms but one description of the object, and therefore is no Binary Structure at all: in other words in Apposition the two representations are simultaneous; whereas in the Idiom before us they are substitutive ; the thought has moved in the interval between them ; and though the one is in some sort a repetition of the other, they are not identical."

According to Jaeger (1917, pp. 497-498), a full stop after ??? ????????? (983b13) and addition of <???> after ????? is called for to distinguish the "development of the universal conceptual formula for the characterization of the most ancient thinkers" from the following "illustration of the formula by means of a scholastic example". This illustrative sentence is "quite similar in structure and identical at the end (cf. 12 ??? ???????? ?????? ??? ?????????) to the sentence which contains the formula", the main clause beginning with ?????.

Agreeing with Bywater, Ross (i 129) quotes evidence from Aristotle: 1002b14-22, 1003a33-b5, 1017a10, 1024a8, 1066a31-34, 1068b11, 1075a7.

(3) Jaeger ignores Bywater's interpretation still in 1957, repeating his own (inferior) suggestion of 1917.

983b17. for there must be some entity.

(1) for there is always some entity (according to Bywater).

(2) Bywater (1913, p. 109): "For ??? I suggest ???, in order to bring the ????? which comes after it into line with the other infinitives after the ??????? at the beginning of the passage."

Richards (1918, p. 248): "This, like what precedes it, should be part of what is said (????? line 11) by certain persons, but the finite verb ??? makes this difficult. The least change would be to read ????; but, as ??? or ???? is not really very suitable in sense here, it seems probable that ??? is a mistake for ???. See Christ's Preface, p. vii, and cf. 984a9 ????? ??? ??? ????????? ???."

(3) Bywater's conjecture is validated by Alexander's paraphrase (24. 12-13): ????? (related to ?? ???????????) ??? ??? ??????? ?????? ?? ??? ?? ?. ? and ? are liable to be confused in majuscule script.

Ross (i 129), who treats ??? and ???? as alternatives of equal value, seems to have overlooked Richard's contribution.

983b24. and kept alive by it. (Ab)

(1) and that the animal is kept alive by it.

(2) Alexander (24. 25-29): ??? ???? ?? ?????? ?? ?????? ?????????, ?? ??? ?????. ?? ??? ??? ???????????? ??? ??? ??? ????? ??? ??????? ??? ?????? ?? ??? ????? ?? ???? ????? ????????? ????????· ??? ??? ????????? ??? ?????? ???? ??? ????? ?? ??? ????????· ????? ??? ???? ?? ??? ????? ???.

Asclepius (24. 40 - 25, 1): ???????? ??? ????? ???? ????????? ????????? ?? ???.

Jaeger: "E varias lectiones conglutinans."

(3) ??? ?? ????, which is missing in Ab, makes the statement trivial and weakens the argument, the intention being to show that everything comes to be out of the humid. Asclepius seems to have found it already, but not Alexander, whose explanation is supported by Meteorologica B 2, 354b33-355a8:

??? ??? ??????? ?????? ???? ??? ???????? ???????? ??? ????? ????????? ?? ????. ??? ??? ????' ????? ?? ???? ??? ????????? ??? ?????? ?????? ?? ??? ??? ???? ?????? ???????? ?????? ????????????? ???? ??? ??????. ????????? ?' ????? ????? ?????????? ???? ????? ? ??????????? ??? ??? ?? ??????? ???, ??? ?? ??? ??????, ????? ????? ???, ?? ?' ????? ?? ???? ?????? ????? ?????, ????? ???????????? ????? ???? ??? ????? ?? ?????????? ??? ?????, ? ??? ?????? ???????? ????? ??????? ?? ????????? ?????, ??' ?? ?? ????? ???????? ???? ??? ???? ??? ????? ????????.

The opinion, that the sun is nourished by the vapours of the ocean, occurs as late as in Cleanthes (Cicero, De natura deorum II 40: "cum sol igneus sit Oceanique alatur humoribus").

Jaeger, commenting "varias lectiones conglutinans", postulates a (corrupt) reading ?? ???? instead of ????? ???, but more probable than a copyist's error is a librarian's endeavor to establish grammatical symmetry with ??? ?????? ????? ????? and ???? ?? ?????? ?? ?????? ??????????.

983b32. to which they give the name of Styx. (Christ)

(2) Christ: "??? ??????? tamquam interpretamentum [of ?????] inclusimus."

984a8-9. (adding a fourth - earth - to those which have been named). (Ab)

(1) E: after having added …

984a13-15. for he says almost all the things that are made of parts like themselves, in the manner of water or fire, are generated and destroyed in this way, only by aggregation and segregation.

(1) Bonitz (1843) translates "for example water and fire", but corrects himself in his commentary.

(2) Alexander (28. 13-21): ?????? ??? ?????? ?? ?????????, ??????? ???? ??? ??? ??????? ??? ???????? ???????, ????????? ???????? ?? ??? ?????????? ?????· ?? ??? ??? ???????? ?????? ?????? ??????? ???? ?????????. ????? ?????????? ???? ????? ?? ????????? ?????? ???? ??? ????? ????????? ?? ?????? ??? ??????????, ????????? ??? ?? ??? ???????? ?????? ??????, ?????????? ?? ?? ?????????. ?????? ?? ????? ???? ?? ?????????· ?? ??? ????? ?? ???? ?????? ???????·?? ???? ???? ??? ?? ??? ??? ??? ??? ??? ??? ???? ????????? ????, ?? ????? ?? ??? ????????? ??????, ??? ????? ???????? ?????, ???? ??????????.

Asclepius (25. 29-31): ????? ??? ?? ?????????, ??????? ???? ??? ???, ???? ???????? ??? ?????????? (??? ?? ???? ??? ??? ?? ??? ?? ??? ?????????? ??????), ????????? ?? ??? ???????.

Fonseca: "Alexander existimat dictum esse, paene omnia, quia Anaxagoras non sensuit quattuor vulgata elementa esse principia materialia, sed mixturas quasdam. Quorsum tamen haec dicta sint, non satis video. Namque idem dici potest de ceteris omnibus similium partium, ut de carne, osse, lapide, et huiusmodi aliis, non esse inquam principia, sed mixturas quasdam. Aut igitur nulla similaria dicenda erant generari ex infinitis minimis aut omnia. Nam si sumantur, ut integra corpora, et divisibilia, omnia gignuntur ex minimis secundum Anaxagoran. Si vero, ut minima, nulla eorum ex minimis gignuntur, quia non datur minus minimo."

Bonitz (1849, p. 68): "non exempla affert earum rerum ??????????, ex quarum mixtione omnem rerum varietatem Anaxagoras repetierit, […] verum potius notionem ??? ?????????? comparata aquae et ignis natura illustrat. Prope omnes illas res, ait, numero infinitas, quae partes habent ipsi rei similes eundem in modum, atque aqua et ignis, principia esse voluit neque aliam nisi miscendi et discernendi mutationem subire. Aquam autem et ignem potissimum ut ad explicandam ??? ?????????? naturam adhiberet, nec potius carnes ossa alia id genus [cf. De caelo 302a ???? ?' ???? ????? ??? ?????? ??? ??? ???????? ???????] enumeraret, eo videtur effectum esse, quod Anaxagoram cum Empedocle comparat; propterea Anaxagorea elementa comparatis Empedocleis illustrat. Eadem de causa mutationis rationem, antequam verbis ????????? ??? ????????? describat, adverbio ???? videtur significasse, h. e. eum in modum, quem ab Empedocle positum esse modo dixi, ???????????? ??? ????????????."

Susemihl (p. 7 n.) calls the words ??????? ???? ? ??? "highly suspicious" and Bonitz's interpretation "much too artificial".

Ross (i 133), however, points to the "exact parallel" 992a6sq.

984a15-16. and are not in any other sense generated or destroyed.

(1) and are, in absolute sense [cf. 983b14], neither generated nor destroyed (according to Zeller).

(2) Asclepius (25. 31 sq.): ????? ?? ?????????? ????? ????? ????? ???? ????????.

Zeller (1920, p. 1210 n.): ????? (l. ?????).

Ross (i 133): "Zeller's emendation ????? is unnecessary."

Jaeger: "sed cf. Meteor. 383a16."

The whole passage (383a13-19) runs thus: ??? ?? ????? ??? ??? ??????, ??? ??? ????? ???????? ??? ??? ??? ??????, ????????? ?' ??' ?????? ???? ??? ?? ??? ????? ??????, ???? ?' ?? ?????, ??? ??? ?????? ?? ????? ????????? (???????????? ??? ??? ????? ????????? ?? ????? ??? ??????????), ??? ?? ??? ?????? ?? ?????? ???????????, ???' ?? ?? ????? ???????????? ????????????. Obviously, it proves nothing for our case.

Jaeger's paraphrasis: 'uno sensu fiunt, alio autem sensu non fiunt, sed manent'.

(3) Zeller will probably have taken offense at the fact that by ????? is repeated pleonastically what was said by ????? … ?????. His ????? - in contrast to the vague ????? - indicates precisely what matters in the context, namely substantial generation and corruption as alternative to ????????? ?????. (For 'absolute generation' as a characteristic of substance see Physics i, 190a31-33: ???????? ?? ????????? ??? ?????????, ??? ??? ??? ?? ????????? ???? ???? ?? ?????????, ????? ?? ????????? ??? ?????? ????? …)

984a19-20. However true it may be that all generation and destruction proceed from some one or (for that matter) from more elements.

(1) … that all generation proceeds … (according to Jaeger).

(2) Jaeger: "an verba incertae sedis delenda sunt, cum de generatione sola hic agatur? cf. sq. ?? ????? ???? ? ??? (omittit Ab) ???????? ????, quae verba ad substratum ???????? spectant, sed de ????? dici non possunt."

(3) Jaeger's conjecture is perfectly convincing, because, in Aristotle's usage, destruction proceeds "into" (not "from") matter, v. 983b6-11 and 1000b25 sq. Hence it becomes clear that Aristotle is thinking only of generation in our passage.

984b1-3. Of those who said the universe was one, then none succeeded in discovering a cause of this sort, except perhaps Parmenides. (Ab)

(1) My proposal: … those who said only one thing existed … (deleting ?? ??? in l. 2).

(2) Alexander (31. 1-3): ? ????? ?? ???? ??? ?? ??? ???????? ?? ??? ??????? ????? ????? ?????, ???? ??? ???? ??? ?? ?? ??????????? ??? ??? ???? ????· ??? ??? ????? ?? ??????? ?? ???.

Asclepius (27. 18 sq.): ??? ??? ??? ????? ????????? ?? ????? ?? ?????? ?????? ?????? ???????? ??? ???????? ?????? ???? ?? ?????????.

(3) Up to now, the difference between ?? (Ab) and ?? ????? (E) remained unnoticed. ?? ?? ??? means that the universe is absolutely homogeneous in itself, containing no plurality. ?? ????? ?? ???, on the other hand, would mean that the universe is only a single one (cf., for example, Physics i 2, 184b25-185a4: ?? ??? ??? ?? ?? ??? ???????? ?? ?? ??????? ?? ???? ?????? ???? ???????? ????? ??? ??? ?? ???????? ?????? ????? ???? ???? ??? ???????? ??? ?????, ???' ???? ?????? ????????? ? ????? ??????, ????? ???? ?? ???? ?????? ?? ??? ??? ???? ?????, ?? ?? ????? ??? ????? ?? ????? ["if Being is just one, and one in the way mentioned"], or De caelo iii 5, 303b9-11: ???? ?' ?????? ?????????? ?? ????????, ?????? ????????? ??????? ????? ????? ? ??. ????? ??? ?? ????? ??????????? …) - what is nonsensical. So it emerges that ?? ??? does not go with ?????.

The difficulty disappears, if we, with Alexander or Asclepius, substitute ?? ??? by ?? ??????????? or ?? ?????? respectively (the former could also be supplied in thought from 984a28 sq.). But comparison with l. 4 (?? ????? ?? … ?????) and 986b29 (see below) shows that ?? ??? should simply be omitted.

Once again, the codex E has preserved the trace of an alternative version.

984b4. he supposes that there is not only one but also in some sense two causes.

(1) he supposes that Being is not only one, but that there are also in some sense two causes (according to Alexander, 31. 15 sq.: ???’ ???? ??? ?????? ?????, ???’ ?? ???? ?? ????? ?? ?? ?????.).

he supposes not the One, but in some sense two causes (Bonitz).

My proposal: he supposes that not only one thing exists, but also in some sense two (deleting ??????).

(3) Ross's translation is in accordance with Asclepius (27. 21 sq.), who adds in thought ?????? to ??: ??????? ?????? ?? ???, ??? ??? ??? ???? [?????] ?????? ??? ??? ?????? ???? ????? ??????. But why should Aristotle change between ?????? and ??????? Cf. 987a2-9, where ???? is used two times. If ?? is correct, instead of ?????? had to be read ????????, cf. 998a28sq. and 1014a34sq., further On the Soul, 405b17 (???? ??? ??? ???? ???? ???????? ?????? ??? ????????? ??).

In order to justify Bonitz's translation, we had to write <??> ??. For that, one could refer to the parallel 986b31-34; but there, Ross wants to delete the ??.

In accordance with our interpretation of ll. 1-2 (and of 986b28-33, see below), ?? … ????? must rather be taken as a complete accusativus cum infinitivo: that not only one thing exists, but in some sense two.

984b5. But for those who make more elements …

(1) But for those who assume more than one … (Bonitz)

My proposal: But for those who assume that more than one thing exists …

(3) Ross's translation is in accordance with the extant parallels, as there are:

De generatione et corruptione i 1, 314a8-13: ???? ??? ??? ?? ?? ?? ??? ???????? ????? ??? ????? ?? ???? ????????, ??????? ??? ?????? ??? ??????? ????????? ????? ??? ?? ?????? ?????????? ???????????? ???? ?? ????? ??? ???? ???? ????????, ???? ?????????? ??? ?????????? ??? ?????????, ??????? ?? ??????.

314b1-6: ???? ??? ??? ?? ???? ????? ??????????????? ????????? ?????? ??? ??????? ??? ??? ?????? ?????????? ??? ??? ?????? ?? ??????????? ????? ??? ??? ?? ?? ???????? ??????????? ?????? ???? ?? ?? ???? ????? ??????? ????????? ??? ????????? ??? ????????? ????????? ??? ??? ??????????? ? ??????? ????????? ??? ? ?????.

i 10, 328b32-329a5: ??????? ??? ??? ??? ????? ?????? ???? ????? ??????????? ??????? ??? ???? ??? ???????? ???????? ?????? ?? ??? ??????????? ???? ?? ??? ????? ????? ????, ???? ???? ? ??? ? ?? ?????? ??????, ???? ?? ?? ??? ????????, ?? ?? ????? ??? ??????? ????, ?? ??? ??? ??? ???, ?? ?? ????? ?? ??? ???? ??????, ?? ?? ??? ???? ?????? ????????, ????? ??????????? ?? ?? ????????????? ??? ????????????? ? ???????????? ?????????? ??? ??????? ??? ??? ?????? ???? ????????.

ii 3, 330b7-15: ??????? ??? ?? ?? ???? ?????? ???????? ????????? ?? ??? ??, ?? ?? ???, ?? ?? ????, ?? ?? ??????? ????????. ???? ??? ??? ?? ????? ????????, ???? ???????? ??? ??????? ????? ???????, ??????? ????????? ??? ?????? ??? ?????, ?? ?? ????? ??? ?? ?????? ? ?? ?????? ??? ?? ??????? ????? ??? ?? ?????????????, ?? ?' ?? ????????? ??????? ???. ?? ?' ????? ??? ?????????, ????? ?????????? ??? ??? ???, ?? ?????? ??????? ??????? ??????, ???? ???? ??? ????. ("For all who make the simple bodies 'elements' postulate either one, or two, or three, or four. Now (i) those who assert there is one only, and then generate everything else by condensation and rarefaction, are in effect making their 'originative sources' two, viz. the rare and the dense, or rather the hot and the cold: for it is these which are the moulding forces, while the 'one' underlies them as a 'matter'. But (ii) those who postulate two from the start-as Parmenides postulated Fire and Earth-make the intermediates (e.g. Air and Water) blends of these.")

In our present text, however, we have no ????????, which can be supplied to ?????.

The precise meaning of ?????? (literally "make"), in its present metaphorical use, is "to assume that something (e. g. the Ideas, 995b16-17) exists" (as to "make" means to effect that something exists). If we, accordingly, translate "those who assume that more than one thing exists", we have a perfect opposition to l. 1-2 "those who said only one thing existed". This opposition, indicated by ??? … ?? … , is one more reason to delete ?? ??? in l. 2.

984b14-15. nor again could it be right to entrust so great a matter to spontaneity and chance. (Ab)

(1) … can it be right … (according to Asclepius, Thomas Aquinas and Bessarion).

(3) ????? (E) seems to be a combination of the readings ????? (Ab) und ????. The latter is presupposed by Thomas Aquinas (liber 1 lectio 5 numerus 7: bene se habet) and Bessarion (probe se habet); it is ????? ???? what Asclepius (28. 5-6) interpretes by ??????? ?????: ???? ?? ??????? ????? ???????? ??? ???? ???????? ????????? ??????.

Again we have two versions of equal value. ????? refers to the situation of the ??????? (l. 13), whereas ???? is in accordance with ???' ????? ?????? ?????.

984b19-20. but Hermotimus of Clazomenae is credited with expressing them earlier.

(1) My proposal: … is said to have expressed them earlier.

(2) Alexander (32. 14-16): ?? ??? ???? ??? ????? ????????? ? ??????? ????? ????? ?? ??? ???????? ?????? ???????????.

Asclepius (28. 12-15): ??????? ?? ????? ?????? ????? ?????? ??? ???????? ???????? ????????? ??? ???????????. ????? ??? ??? ????????? ? ??????? ????? ??? ???????? ?????? ???????????.

Argyropulus: "Hermotimum autem Clazomenium hoc prius dixisse ferunt."

Bessarion: "attamen Hermotimus Clazomenius dicitur causam prius dixisse."

(3) ?????? ???? originally means 'he has incurred the accusation', 'he is accused', then, in a vague sense, 'he is said'. Pape gives as example Athenaeus XIII, 584, c: ???????? ?? ?????? ?????? ??????, 'she was said to have bladder stone'.

The same evolution of meaning was undergone by ?????????.

984b32. let us be allowed to decide later.

(1) shall be allowed … (Richards).

(2) Alexander (33. 11): ???????, ?????, ?????? ??????.

Asclepius (29. 36): ??????? ??????? ??????.

Richards (p. 248): "Is the imperative in place, or should we read ???????? ????, ?????, ???? are sometimes confused."

(3) ?????? occurs nowhere else in Aristotle, ??????? once (Topics 164a5). So the basis seems too narrow for a decision. ??????, however, is frequent in Plato and Thucydides.

985a10. since the cause of all goods is the good itself. (Ab)

(1) E adds: "and of all evils the evil".

(2) Alexander (33, 23-26): ?? ?? ?? ??? ?????? ?????? ?????? ??? ?? ??? ????? ?????, ????? ?? ??? ?????????? ?? ?????? ??? ?? ????? ?????????, ?????? ??? ??? ??????, ?? ?????? ?? ?????. ????? ?? ????? ???? ??? ??????, ???? ??? ????? ???? ?????????? ????????.

Thomas (liber 1 lectio 6 numerus 3): "Si tamen secundum Empedoclem fuit hoc quod bonum est causa omnium bonorum, et malum omnium malorum. Quod enim aliquorum malorum posuit causam malam, scilicet corruptionis, et aliquorum bonorum bonum, scilicet generationis, manifestum est: sed quia non sequebatur quod omnia bona essent per amicitiam, nec omnia mala per odium, cum distinctio partium mundi adinvicem esset per odium, et confusio per amicitiam, ideo non usquequaque posuit bonum causam bonorum, et malum causam malorum."

Ross (i 137): "??? … ?????, omitted by Ab, Alexander and Asclepius, was probably suggested to some copyist by Alexander's remark that something of the sort must be supplied to complete the sense."

985a16-17. and so too these thinkers do not seem to know what they say.

(1) … these thinkers are like such who do not say with awareness what they say (Gomperz).

… these thinkers do not seem to say with awareness what they say (Christ).

(2) Asclepius (31. 34 - 32. 1): ???? ????? ??????? ?????? ??????? ? ???????.

Argyropulus: "neque hi quid dicunt scire videntur."

Bessarion: "nec isti videntur scire quid dicant."

Gomperz (p. 567): "The comparison with the fighters ignorant of the theory of struggle, who only as random deal out many a stalwart blow, and the reference to the inadequate application made by the natural philosophers of the truths occasionally dawning on them - both prove crystal clear that Aristotle did not want to say: they are like men who doe not know to say what they say, but: they are like such who do not say with awareness what they say. Therefore: - ???? ????? ???????? ?????? ???????? ? ?? ???????? -."

Christ: "ipse potius in ??????? ?????? correxerim collato p. 986b, 28."

Jaeger:"??????? scripsi et post ????????? distinxi; cf. 23: ??????? Ab ex coniectura ut videtur, ??????? ?????? E quod ex variis lectionibus ??????? ? ?? ???????? et ??????? ?????? conflatum videtur."

(3) Agreeing with Jaeger, I only like to add that if we prefer the second reading ??????? ?????? it is better to write ? ????????, cf. Asclepius, cited above, and 981b2-3: ??? ?????? ?? ????? ? ?????.

985a22-23. And Empedocles, though he uses the causes to a greater extent than this, neither does so sufficiently nor attains consistency in their use.

(1) My proposal (in accordance with Argyropulus and Bessarion): … nor hits upon what is agreed to in the case of these (the causes).

(2) Argyropulus: "… nec in his id invenit cui omnes assentiunt atque concedunt."

Bessarion: "… neque in his reperit quod sequitur."

Hengstenberg: "… and not in agreement with himself."

Alexander (35. 6-7): ????????? ??? ?????????? ??? ????? ????? ?????????? ???? ?????????? ???????, ?? ??? ???? ????? ??????, ???’ ???? ???????? ?? ?????????????.

Asclepius (32. 9-15): ?? ??? ???? ????? ?????? ?????. […] ???? ????? ??? ?????? <?????> ????????? ?? ?????????????.

"malim cum Alexandro Asclepio scribere ?? ??? ???' ????? ?????? ???': cf. Hist. an. 515a19 [?? ??? ???'], Pol. 1280b32 [?? ??? ???']." (Jaeger)

(3) The translators after Argyropulus and Bessarion were misled by the alledged parallel B 4, 1000a25 (????????????? ????). ?? ?????????????, however, cannot mean "agreement with oneself" or "consistency", but solely "what is agreed to", "what is conceded", so in Rhetorica III 16, 1417a7-10 (the only further example in Aristotle):

???????????? ?? ??????? ? ????????· ?? ??? ????????????? ? ?? ????????? ? ?? ???????? ????? ? ?? ?????? ? ?? ??????????, ???? ???? ?? ????????????? ?? ??????????? […].

There it is translated "facts acknowledged on both sides" by Gillies (p. 434), "acknowledged points" by Buckley (p. 259).

What is the ????????????? at our present passage, we are told indirectly in the next sentence: ? ??? ????? ????????? ?? ?? ?????? ?????????. Empedocles does not "find" (hit upon) this commonly accepted opinion, saying "at many occasions" (????????) the contrary.

What remains is to clarify what Alexander means with ???????? ?? ?????????????. Information is given by his comment on 1000a25 (219, 29-37):

? ?? ????? ??? ?? ?????? ???? ????? ??????, ???????? ???????? ?????? ?? ?????? ????????? ?????, ????? ??? ??? ??? ?????? ??????, ?? ??? ???????? […], ????? ?’ ?????’ ???????????? ????? ?? ????· ?? ??? ?? ??? ????? ?? ???? ??? ????? ??? ??????, ???????? ?? ???? ?????? ?????, ??’ ? ?????? ? ???? ????? ?? ??????? ?????.

Here ????? is obviously equivalent to ???????? and ??????? to ?????????????, cf. 219, 15-18:

 […] ??????????, ?? ????? ??????? ??? ????? ?????????? ???????????? ??????· ???? ??? ??? ????????? ???????? ?? ??? ??? ????? ?????? ???????, ???????? ??? ? ????? ????, ???? ?? ??????, ?? ??? ?????? ????????.

The "acknowledged fact" is according to this, that coming-to-be and passing-away have different causes; since he does not consistently "hold on to" (???????, ?????) that conviction, Empedocles falls into self-contradiction (?????’ ???????????? ????? ????). As we see, Alexander distinguishes between ???????????? and ???????????? ????, thus confirming our interpretation.

985b6. calling the one being and the other non-being.

(1) Athetized by Jaeger.

(2) Jaeger: "verba ???????? … ?? ?? seclusi; sunt altera recensio verborum ?????? … 7 ?? ??."

985b7. the empty non-being. (Ab)

(1) E: the empty and loose non-being.

(2) Jaeger (1917, pp. 483-486): "Parmenides had understood by the ?? the ????? (in prose = ??????): accordingly Melissus (in the demonstration perserved to us, B 7 p. 189, 6 Diels) says, that there can be no ?????: the vacuum is nothing; what is nothing, cannot exist. It is the same equations ????? = ?? ?? [484] and ?????? (????) = ??, that we find again as the keystones of the Democritean system. But we are strangely affected by the additional words ?? ?? ????? ?? ??? ????? ?? ?? ?? (sc. ????????). Logically and terminologically impeccable is the pair of contraries ?? and ?? ??, ????? and ??????; but offensive is ??????? and ?????, because ??????? is the quality of the ???? per se, whereas the ?????? or ????? are ???? ??? ???????. […]

[486] The manuscript Ab (which goes back to an ancient papyrus codex) and Alexander doe not have the words ?? ??? ?????, just as there is preserved no trace of them in Asclepius nor at the parallel passage in Theophrastus Phys. opin. 8 (II p. 4, 16 D.), where only ?????? and ????? is in question. Accordingly the late addition is without doubt to be deleted […]."

985b9. because the solid no more is than the empty. (Ross)

(1) The manuscripts give: because the empty no more is than the solid.

(2) Alexander (35. 27 - 36. 3): ????? ?????? ?????? ????? ?? ?????? ??? ?????.

Asclepius (33. 11-13): ??? ?????? ??? ??? ????? ??? ????? ?? ?? ??? ?? ?????, ?????? ???? ?? ????, ????????? ?? ??????, ???????? ????????? ??? ?????.

Argyropulus: "quoniam neque vacuum minus quam corpus est."

Fonseca: "Graeca sic habent, ??? ???? ?? ????? ??? ???????, hoc est, quia nec vacuum, quam corpus; subauditur autem plane inter verba haec particula «magis est» quae praecesserat, ut sensus sit: Quia nec vacuum magis est, quam corpus. Sed quia hic sensus non respondet superiori membro (oporteret enim commutatis verbis dicere: Quia nec corpus magis est, quam vacuum; ex hoc enim sequitur illud, quod antecesserat, non magis ens esse, quam non ens), Argyropulos, ut verum sensum retineret, nec tamen verba commutaret, inseruit particulam contrariae significationis, ita vertens «quoniam nec vacuum minus, quam corpus, est». Nobis tamen, ne novam dictionem, contrariamque praecedenti adverbio adscisceremus, placuit magis ipsa tantum verba transponere «?? ???? ??? ?????» ad verum sensum retinendum, quia facillime accidere potuit, ut Aristoteles docta quadam scribendi incuria, seu potius securitate, quae magnis hominibus contingit (in rebus praesertim parvi momenti) verba commutarit. Eo autem libentius id fecimus, quod explanatio Alexandri eundem sensum exprimit."

Schwegler (i 41) compares Plut. adv. Colot. c. 4. p. 1109, a.: ?????????? ?????????? ?? ?????? ?? ???, ? ?? ????? ?????? ??? ???????? ?? ????, ????? ?? ?? ?????. He suspects that ?? ????? ??? ??????? is caused by "the desire to establish a more exact grammatical parallelism of the two sentences".

Zeller (I, 1056 n.) refers to Simplicius (In Physica, 28,13-15 Diels, about Leucippus): ??? ??? ??? ?????? ?????? ?????? ??? ????? ???????????? ?? ?????? ????? ??? ?? ?? ???? ????????, ???? ?? ?? ?????? ??? ??? ??????? ??? ????? ????? ????, and conjectures ?? ????? <???????> ??? ???????. The same reading is presupposed already by Argyropulus.

Jaeger (1917, pp. 486-487): "But should not the wearing-off of the much-used adverb [????? ??????] to the meaning 'in the same way as' (with genitive or ?) have permitted Aristotle to say, in non-stylized speech, ????? ?????? ?? ????? ??? ??????? (i. e. the vacuum exists as well as the solid) instead of the strictly logical ????? ?????? ?? ???? ??? ??????" Jaeger (pp. 487-488) compares 990a14, 996b33 and Meteor. ? 2, 356a15-16 (???? ??? ??? ?? ????? ??????????, ??' ????? ?????????, ????? ?????? ?????????? ??????? ? ??????, ???' ??' ??????' ?? ???? ???????? ? ????????. ["For since they flow to the centre from which they issue forth they will not be flowing down any more than up, but in whatever direction the surging of Tartarus inclines to."]).

(3) The parallels alleged by Jaeger prove the opposite of what he intends: "not any more than" is said of what might be expected to be "more", e. g. water is expected to flow rather down than up. In our present passage, it is the solid, not the empty, what is expected to "be".

985b32-33. since, then, all other things seemed in their whole nature to be modelled on numbers. (Ab)

(1) … the other things seemed to all in their nature to be modelled on numbers (E).

… the other things seemed in their nature to be modelled on numbers in their entirety (Bonitz).

(2) Alexander (38. 2-3): ???? ?? ??? ???? ????? ????????? ???? ???? ???????? ?????. Bonitz suggests that Alexander's ????? is varia lectio to ?????, but it can also be his own addition. In every case, he probably did not find ??? ????? … ????? in his manuscript.

Asclepius (37. 6-7) omits ????? and interprets ??? ????? as ???? ??? ?????: ?????? ??? ?? ??? ???? ???? ???????? ???????? ???? ??? ????? ?????.

Bessarion, as Alexander, omits ??? ?????, but reads <??> ?????: cum itaque cetera quidem viderentur in omnibus numeris assimilari.

Bonitz (1849, 78) argues against the reading ?????: "???? ? ????? nihil videtur aliud significare posse, nisi rerum universitatem, cf. 986a1, nec vero universam rei alicuius naturam, id quod hoc loco dicendum erat. Quare nisi audacius videretur, pro ????? scriberem ?????, adhibita Alexandri auctoritate […]."

Ross (i 145): "The proposal is attractive, but in view of Aristotle's carelessness in using words or phrases in different meanings in close succession it is hardly necessary."

(3) If we take, with Asclepius, Bonitz and Ross, ??? ????? as accusativus respectus, the closest parallel is De caelo i 8, 276a30 sq.: ??? ?????? ?????? ???? ??????? ?? ??? ????? ????? ?????????, ??????? ?' ????? ??? ?????.

As to the meaning of ???? ? ?????, in favor of Bonitz ("rerum universitatem"), besides of 986a1, the following passages can be quoted: 982b7, 995a17, 1010a7, On Generation and Corruption i 1, 315a7, On the Soul iii 5, 430a10, Politics i 5, 1254a31. There are two passages where ???? ? ????? is qualified by a genitive attribute, 986a9 and On the Generation of Animals iv 10, 777b30-33 (????? ??? ??? ???????? ??? ????? ?????? ??? ??? ????? ????? ????????? ??? ????????????? ???? ??? ??? ????????? ??????? ??? ?????? … ["Just as we see the sea and all bodies of water settling and changing according to the movement or rest of the winds …"]); here, however, "nature" is not = "essence", but must be subsumed under what Bonitz (Index, p. 838a5) calls "????? collective usurpatum".

986a3-6. And all the properties of numbers and scales which they could show to agree with the attributes and parts and the whole arrangement of the heavens … (E)

(1) And all the properties of numbers and scales, agreeing with the attributes and parts and the whole arrangement of the heavens, which they knew … (Ab).

(2) Jaeger prefers the reading of Ab (without ????????? in l. 4) and comments: "primum opus est habere (?????), deinde ????????; eadem verba conjungit Rhet. 1396a5-7."

The whole passage of the Rhetorics (ii 22, 1396a3-7) runs thus: ?????? ??? ??? ??? ?????? ??? ???? ?? ??? ?????? ??? ????????????? ???? ???????? ?????????? ???' ????????, ????????? ??? ?? ????? ????? ?????????, ? ????? ? ????? ????? ??? ???? ?? ??????? ?? ????? ????????. ("The first thing we have to remember is this. Whether our argument concerns public affairs or some other subject, we must know some, if not all, of the facts about the subject on which we are to speak and argue. Otherwise we can have no materials out of which to construct arguments.")

Cf. Bonitz, Index, 305b46-53 (????? = cognitum habere).

986a6-8. and if there was a gap anywhere, they readily made additions so as to make their whole theory coherent.

(2) Alexander (40. 24-27): ?? ?? ???? ????????? ????????? ?? ???? ???? ???????? ????????? ??? ???? ??? ??????? ??????????, ????? ?? ???????????? ????? ??? ????????? ?????????? ???? ?? ???????????? ?????? ????? ??? ??????????? ?????.

Asclepius (37. 13-14): ??? ?? ?? ?????????, ????????? ???????, ??? ??????? ??? ??? ??????? ?????? ??? ???????????.

Syrianus (180. 7-8, on N 3, 1090b31-32): ????????????? ???? ?????? ?????????? ?? ??????????.

Pseudo-Alexander (816. 36-38, on the same passage): ????????????? ???? ?????? ?? ??????????, ???????? ??? ????? ??????????? ?? ?????????? ???? ??????.

Bonitz (1849, pp. 78-79): "????????? verbum haud ita frequens vehementiam videtur quandam significare concupiscendi, cf. Herod. II 102. III 72. VII 161. VIII 143. Plat. Phaedr. 248 A. Phaedon. 117 A. Hipparch. 226 E. Arist. de mund. 5. 396b7 et ad N 3. 1090b31. Inde verba Aristotelis hunc in modum videntur explicanda esse: sicubi quid desideraretur, addendo (?????????????) id efficere enixissime studuerunt, ut universa de numeris disputatio ac doctrina […] perfecta esse et sibi constare videretur."

Ross (i 145): "It seems best to take it, with Alexander and Asclepius, to mean 'they added it eagerly', ??? … ????? being a final genitive".

Liddell/Scott give the meaning as "desire eagerly besides".

(3) Such a verb as ??????????????? nowhere else is documented; probably the readings ????????????? and ??????????? are confused. ???????????? occurs in Clemens Alexandrinus (Paedagogus, II 7, 55, 3):

?????? ????????????? ??? ?????????? ?????????????? ???? ???? ??? ?????????????? ???????????? ????? ?????? ???.

?????????????? here means 'out of greed' (that is 'seduced by voracity', ??? ?????????? ??????????????). The same sense ('to be out for') is to be assumed for ????????????? (which apart of our present passage occurs only in N 3, 1090b31); it is presupposed by Alexander (?????????), Asclepius (?????????) and Syrianus, who accordingly supply an infinitive (??????????, ???????, ??????????). Only Pseudo-Alexander reads the missing ?????????? into ?????????????; in this, since Bonitz, he is followed by most of the interpreters and lexicographers.

986a29-31. In this way Alcmaeon of Croton seems also to have conceived the matter. (Ab)

(1) For in age Alcmaeon was in the old age of Pythagoras, and his views were similar to theirs. (E)

(2) For Alcmaeon was young in age in the old age of Pythagoras … (Diels).

Alexander (42. 3-4): ??????? ?? ?? ??? ?????????? ??? ??????????? ??? ????? ??????? ?????? ???? ??? ????? ????????????.

Brandis (1835, p. 508 n.): "Evidently, Alexander and the other Greek exegetes did know just as little as we about the list of Alcmaeon, v. Schol. p. 543, b [= Alexander, 42. 3-4], and they ignore in their paraphrases the words ??? ??? ??????? ???????? ??? ??????? ????????, which have quite the appearance of a marginal note intruded into the text."

<????> ??? ??????? ????????. (Diels I, p. 132, comparing Plato, Theaetetus 183 E).

Iamblichus, De vita Pythagorica, caput 23, sectio 104: ??? ??? ?? ?? ??? ???????????? ??????, ??????? ?? ?? ??????????? ??? ???? ?????????????? ??? ????????????? ?? ???????? ???????? ????, ???????? ?? ??? ??????? ??? ???????? ??? ???????? ??? ??????, ??????? ?? ? ??????????? ??? ????????? ??? ????? ??? ?????????? ??? ???????? ??? ?????????? ??? ?????, ????????? ?? ??? ???????? ??? ??????? ??? ????????? ??? ?? ???’ ?????? ??????? […].

Ross (I 152): "??????? ??? ??????? ??? ??????? ???????? and ?? are omitted by Ab, and there is no trace of them in Alexander; they are probably a later addition, though the statement is likely enough to be true (cf. Iambl. Vit. Pyth. 104). The suspiciousness of the words is increased by the fact that Aristotle only once elsewhere mentions Pythagoras, and nowhere claims any knowledge of his date. Cf. 985b23."

(3) ??? ??????? cannot be but an accusativus respectus ("in age", "aetate"); then, however, it needs an adjective to qualify it. So Diels' addition of ???? seems to be necessary. It is symptomatic that Argyropulus and Fonseca omit ??? ???????, while Bonitz is forced into free translation ("for Alcmaeon was a younger contemporary of Pythagoras").

The phrase ???? ??? ??????? occurs once in Aristotle, in the Nicomachean Ethics, (i 1, 1095a6 sq.): ???????? ?' ????? ???? ??? ??????? ? ?? ???? ??????. Here two senses of being "young" are distinguished. In later Greek (e. g. in Diodorus Siculus), the phrase is used to distinguish the two senses "young" and "new". This is the case in our present passage.

986b11-12. though they were not all alike either in the excellence of their statement or in its conformity to the facts of nature.

(1) … or in respect of nature and essence (Bonitz, according to Alexander and Asclepius).

(2) Alexander (42. 28 - 43. 5): ??????????? ?? ??? ??? ???????? ??? ???????? ?? ??? ?????????? ???? ??? ????? ?? ??? ??? ????? ?????? ????????? ?????????? ???? ??? ??????, ?? ???? ???????? ?????, ???? ??? ????? ???? ??? ???? ?????. ??? ??? ???? ?????, ??? ????? ? ??? ??? ??? ?? ???? ????? ???????, ? ?? ??? ??? ?? ?????, ??? ?? ?????, ??? ? ??? ????? ??????? ? ?? ?????? ???? ??? ? ??? ??????????? ? ?? ?????.

Asclepius (40. 27-31): ??? ???? ?????? ?? ?? ??? ????? ??????, ???? ??? ????? ???? ??? ???? ?????. ?????? ?? ???????? ? ?????????? ????? ????????????, ????? ? ????? ???? ???? ??? ????? ???????????, ??? ????????. ???? ????? ?????? ??? ????? ????· ???? ????? ??? ??? ?? ????? ???????????.

Bonitz (1849, p. 83): "Inter se ipsos Eleatae discrepant ita, ut nec pariter via ac ratione sua exponant placita (???? ??? ????? b12) nec eandem naturam ??? ???? esse censeant (???? ??? ???? ??? ????? b12, cf. b22)."

Ross (i 152): "??? ???? ??? ????? cannot mean 'in respect of naturalness', which, besides not being in point here, would be ??? ???? ?????. It must mean 'in respect of conformity to the nature of the sensible world'. This was just the point in which the Eleatics, who denied the existence of plurality and change, were lacking […]."

Jaeger: "??? omittunt Alexandri citatio Asclepii citatio; seclusi."

(3) Why the article was deleted is easily explained by the obvious association of ????? and ???? ?????, cf. for instance Protrepticus, 50, 17-18 (Pistelli): ?????? ?? ?? ??????? ?? ?? ??? ???? ????? ???? ?????.

986b28-30. For, claiming that, besides the existent, nothing non-existent exists, he thinks that of necessity one thing exists, viz. the existent and nothing else.

(1) … that, besides the existent, the non-existent exists in no way, he thinks that of necessity the existent is one, and that, besides it, nothing else exists (Schwegler).

… that, besides the existent, the non-existent is nothing, he thinks that of necessity the existent is one and nothing else (Bonitz).

My proposal: … that, besides the existent, nothing exists, he thinks that of necessity one thing exists and nothing else (deleting ?? ?? ?? in l. 28-29 and ?? ?? in l. 29).

(2) Alexander (44. 13-15): ???????? ?? ???? ?? ?? ?? ??, ????? ?? ???? ?? ?????? ?? ??????, ?? ?? ?? ?? ????? ?????· ??? ????????? ?????? ?? ??????? ??????? ?? ?? ?? ?????.

Alexander, In Aristotelis analyticorum priorum librum i commentarium, 357. 1-2: ???? ????????????? ??? ?????????? ?????? ????? “?? ???? ?? ?? ??? ????? ??, ?? ?? ?? ????? ?????”.

Simplicius, In Aristotelis physicorum libros commentaria, p. 115, 10-13: ??? ?????????? ?????, ?? ? ?????????? ???????, ? ??? ?????????? ????? ????????? ?? ?? ????? ??? ??????? ????????· «?? ???? ?? ?? ??? ??· ?? ??? ?? ?????· ?? ??? ?? ??.» ??????? ?? ?????· «?? ???? ?? ?? ??? ??· ???? ??? ??????? ??????? ?? ??· ?? ??? ?? ??.»

Ibidem, p. 162. 13-14: ??? ??? ?? ????? ????????,·?? ?? ?? ?? ????? ????.

Ibidem, p. 244. 9-12: ??? ??? ??????? ?? ???????? ???????? ?? ??????? ?? ???? ?? ?? ??? ??, ???’ ??? ?? ?????????? ?? ?? ?? ????????. ?????? ??? ??????? ?? ?? ?? ?????.

Asclepius (42. 4 sq.): ????? ??? ????? ‘?? ???? ?? ?? ??? ??· ?? ??? ?? ?????· ?? ??? ?? ??.’

Argyropulus: "praeter enim id quod est id quod haud est nihil esse censens: id quod est necessario unum et nihil aliud esse putat."

Bessarion: "quod enim est praeter ipsum ens ipsum non ens nihil judicans esse: necessario unum putat ipsum ens esse et nihil aliud."

Ross (i 154): "Parmenides' mistake, Aristotle points out, was that while he only proved that there is one single term which includes everything that is, viz. ??, he thought he was proving that there is only one thing, the truth being that the one term ?? is applicable to many things."

(3) Bonitz' translation is the grammatically correct one, whereas Schwegler and Ross take liberties: Schwegler overloads the second ????? with the double function of predicate ("exist") and copula; Ross neglects the second ?? in l. 28, and in l. 29 he is forced to put up ?? ?? as apposition to ??, thus disrupting the phrase ?? ?? ??, to which the reader is accustomed (cf. 1028b4-5, 1089a2, Topics, 104b22, 184b26, 185b4, 187a10, 325a3).

Nevertheless, the latter interpretation is philosophically more appealing. Hence, if the "correct" interpretation is unsatisfying, suspicion arises whether the text is correct. Fortunately, we can control it, consulting the Parmenides passage (Simplicius, In physica, p. 86, 31-32 Diels = B 8, 36-37 Diels) which Aristotle has in mind:

????? ??? <?> ????? ? ????? [?????]

???? ????? ??? ??????.

("For nothing else either is or shall be except Being.")

Here we have the confirmation that ????? in l. 29 is to be taken as subject, with ????? ("exists") as predicate: Parmenides assumed that "besides what exists, nothing exists". Now the consequence must be that "(only) one thing exists and nothing else". A grammatical parallel (with ??? ???? ????? as subject) is provided by Herodotus, Historiae, ii 179, 3: ?? ?? ?? ??????? ????? ????????? ???????? ??? ???? ????? ????????. ("Now in old times Naucratis alone was an open trading-place, and no other place in Egypt.")

But what to do with ?? ?? ?? and ?? ??? These alien elements can be explained as additions by a reader who compared the text with Alexander's commentary and decided that he should supply the (in his opinion) missing subjects to ????? … ????? and ?? … ?????. Alexander, however, is not so much paraphrasing the text as reconstructing Parmenides' argument in syllogistic form.

986b31-33. and supposing the existence of that which is one in definition, but more than one according to our sensations.

(1) supposing the existence of the one according to definition, the existence of a plurality according to sensation (Hengstenberg).

supposing unity according to concept, plurality according to sensation (Bonitz 1843).

My proposal: supposing that there is one thing according to concept, but a number of things according to sensation (deleting, with Bywater, ?? in l. 31).

(2) Alexander (45. 3-4): ?? ??? ???? ????? ??? ??? ???????? ????? ?? ?? ?????, ????? ?? ???? ??? ????????.

Asclepius (42. 25): ?? ?? ???? ??? ????? ??????? ????? ???? ??? ????????.

Ross (i 155): "In view of ll. 14, 29 and Alexander 45. 3 there is much to be said for Christ's proposal of ?? ?? ??. Or perhaps ?? should be excised."

(3) If we want to follow Alexander, we must either read ?? <??> ?? with Christ or, with Bywater, delete the article and supply ?? ?? from l. 29. Asclepius omits ??? … ?? and understands ???? ??? ????? as attribute (according to l. 19), but the word order (?? ?? ???? ??? ????? instead of ?? ???? ??? ????? ??) is against this.

After all what was said about 984b1-2. 4 and 986b28-30, there can be no doubt that we have to understand "… one thing exists …, a number of things exist …", deleting the ?? in l. 31 (which comes from l. 19).

987a3-9. … we have got thus much - on the one hand from the earliest philosophers, who regard the first principle as corporeal (for water and fire and such things are bodies), and of whom some suppose that there is one corporeal principle, others that there are more than one, but both put these under the head of matter; and on the other hand from some who posit both this cause and besides this the source of movement.

(1) … namely from some we have got one corporeal principle, from others more than one … (Bonitz 1843, omitting ???????? in l. 7).

My proposal: … we have got thus much—on the one hand from the earliest philosophers, who regard the first principle as corporeal (for water and fire and such things are bodies), and from some of them (we have got) one corporeal principle, from others more than one, but from both under the head of matter; and on the other hand from some (we have got) both this cause and besides this the source of movement (deleting both ???????? in ll. 7-8).

(2) Alexander (45. 14 - 46. 4): ???????????? ??? ????????? ???????, ??? ?? ??? ??????????? ?? ??? ?????? ????????? ????? ??????? ??? ??????, ?? ???? ??? ?????, ??? ?? ??????? ?? ??? ??????????, ??? ?? ??????? ?????· ??? ???? ???, ?? ???????, ???????? ????? ?????????? ?? ??? ????????. ?? ??????? ?’ ?? ??? ???????????? ??? ? ??? ?????? ????? ???????, ?? ????? ???????????? ?? ???? ???? ????????. ???????? ?? ??? ????????? ??? ??????????· ??? ??? ????? ?????? ??? ????? ??????.

??? ??? ??? ???? ??? ?? ???????. ?????? ????, ?? ????? ?????????? ??????????, ???????, ?? ?? ???? ????????? ?? ??? ??????????· ???? ??? ??????? ?????? ?? ?????? ????? ???????, ??? ???? ??????????.

???? ?? ????? ?????? ?? ??? ?????? ???????? ??? ???? ????? ??? ???? ? ???????.

?????? ??? ??? ??????. ????? ?? ???? ???? ????? ?????????? ??? ???? ? ??????? ?????????? ?? ??? ???? ??? ???? ?? ???? ?????? ?????? ?? ????? ?????????, ??? ??????????, ?? ??? ?????? ??? ?? ?????? ???????? ???? ???????? ??????????, ? ??? ?? ????, ?????? ????????· ??? ??? ???? ??? ??? ???? ?????? ??? ????????? ?????, ?????????? ?????, ??? ?? ???· ????? ??? ?????????? ??.

Asclepius (42. 36 - 43. 6): ?? ?????? ?????????? ????????? ??? ????? ????????· ?? ??? ??? ???? ????? ?????, ?? ?? ???, ?? ??????????, ??? ?? ??? ???? ??????????, ?? ?? ???????, ???? ??? ??? ???, ????? ??????????· ????????? [to be corrected to ????????? by comparison with 987a6-7] ?? ?????? ?????????? ??? ?????. ????? ?? ????? ??? ???? ?? ????? ????? ??? ????????? ?????????, ??????? ?????????? ??? ????????? ??? ??????????· ?? ??? ??? ????, ?? ?? ?????? ??? ??????. ??? ? ??? ?????????? ??? ????????? ????? ?? ????????, ??? ?? ?????? ??? ??? ??????, ?? ?? ???? ????????? ????, ??? ????.

Christ (1903) on l. 8: "???????? seclusimus, supplendum enim est ????????????." ???????? is also skipped by the translatio antiqua.

Ross (i 155): "The construction here is somewhat confused. It is not clear whether the accusatives in ll. 4-6 are governed by ???????????? or by ????????. The general structure of the sentence leads us to expect accusatives epexegetic of ????? as ???? ??? ?????? … ???? ????? is epexegetic of ???? ??? ?????????????. Yet to take the accusatives in ll. 4-6 as governed by ???????????? involves (1) taking ????????? ??? ????? to mean 'we have received the principle bodily', i. e. we have received it stated as something bodily; (2) supplying ???? before ??? ??? and ??? ??; and (3) taking ????????? ???????? as a genitive absolute - all of which are rather awkward. It seems, then, that the accusatives in ll. 4-6 are governed by ????????, and that this construction has taken the place of an epexegetic object of ???????????? such as Aristotle meant to have proceeded to. This originally intended construction appears however in l. 9, where ?????? can only be the object of ????????????. Christ thinks that this construction prevails in the whole latter part of the sentence (ll. 7-9), and excises ???????? in l. 8 as an emblema from l. 7. This would be attractive if it made the sentence a good one, but it leaves the difficulty of the first part untouched; considering the general confusion of two constructions which the sentence shows, ???????? in l. 8 is not surprising."

(3) What Ross finds 'rather awkward', does definitely occur in Greek language. For double accusative after ???????????? cf. e. g. Theophrastus, Physicorum opiniones, 12, 146 (= Philo, De aeternitate mundi, 145, 4): ??? ???????????? ??? ????????? ???????, or Strabo, Geographica, III 4, 2, 9-11: ?? ??????? […], ?? ??????? ??? ???????? ?????? ???? ????? ???????? ????????????. About 'omitting prepositions' Kühner/Gerth (I 549) remark: "More seldom in strict antithesis by ??? … ??. X. Hell. 4. 1, 15 ??? ????? ?? ??? ??? ?? ???????????????? ???????????, ?? ?? ??? ?????????????? ?????? […]. Ven. 4, 9 ????? ?? ??????? ??? ????? ??? ?? ???, ?? ?? ???? (arva) ????? […]."

An impeccable syntax therefore is obtained by deleting both ????????. For the 'confusion of two constructions' assumed by Ross no evidence is found in Alexander and Asclepius, who from the beginning drop ????????????, replacing it by ??????. ???????? in Alexander's citatio seems to be a later 'correction' (from a manuscript); for what Alexander factually explains of l. 7-8 is ?????? and ???? ????? ???? ? ???????. As before, and later in l. 9, he ignores the ????, writing: ????? ?? ???? ???? ????? ?????????? ??? ???? ? ???????, as on l. 8-9: ??? ??? ???? ??? ??? ???? ?????? ??? ????????? ?????, […] ??? ?? ???.

987a10. philosophers have treated these subjects rather obscurely. (adopting Diels' emendation)

(2) Alexander (46. 23-24): ???????? ?? ????? ???? ??? '???????????' '???????????', ? ??????????? ?? ??? ????????????? ????????, ?? ?? ???????????. "So his personal copy had ???????????, but because he found this reading senseless (it is in fact absurd), he - with the philological carelessness that we know about him - easily took up into his paraphrase the latter explanation ???????????, because this word was well-known and well-intelligible to him: ????? ?? ????? ??? ??? ??????????? ????? ???? ????????? ??????????? ???? ?????? ????????? (46, 15-17)." Through Alexander's authority the gloss became a reading. (Diels 1905, p. 302)

Asclepius (43. 9-10) ??????????? ?????????, ???????? ??????????? ????? ????????????? ? ???????????. ??????????? turns out to be a gloss as well; ????????????? ? ??????????? is copied from Alexander's explanation of '???????????'. (Diels 1905, p. 303)

Diels (1905, pp. 303-304): Thus of the meaningful readings only ??????????? remains. Of the two senses given by Alexander, "we may consider ??????????? with mistrust, because it could be guessed too easily from the context by an Aristotelian". The other one, ?????????????, is confirmed firstly by the ??????? at 988a23, 985a13 and 993a13, secondly by etymology. For ??????? must be related to ?????????, which the ancients explain with ???????? [Zenobius V 13: ??????? ?? ???????? ???????? ??? ??? ?? ???????? ????? ??????????, ??????? ??????? ?? ??? ??? ??????? ??????? ??? ???? ??????? ??????? ??????? ??? ?? ???????.]. In the Odyssey (? 435) occur clothes ??????????? ?????, "blackened through smoke"."

987a15-16. that they thought that finitude and infinity were not attributes of certain other things. (deleting ??? ?? ?? in l. 16)

(2) Alexander (47. 10-12): ??? ?? ??? ??? ?? ????? ???? ???? ????????????, ????, ?? ?????, ?? ???????????? ??? ?? ??????? ??? ?? ??; ????? ??? ???? ?????????.

Asclepius (43. 16-22): ????? ??? ??? ?? ??????????? ??? ????? ??????????, ?????? ?????? ??? ?????????, ?????????? ?? ???????, ??? ?? ??? ?? ??? ????????? ???????? ??? ?????, ???? ??? ? ???? ? ?? ???????? ???????? ?? ???????????? ??? ?? ???????, ????? ?? ?? ??????????? ?????? ?????? ?????????? ???? ???’ ???? ????? ?? ???????, ??? ?? ????? ???????? ??? ????????, ??? ????? ???? ???’ ???? <??> ????????????, ??? ?? ????? ???????? ??? ??????? ??? ????????????, ???????? ???? ?????? ??? ????? ??? ??? ????.

Rothenbücher (1867, p. 10): ??? ?? ?? in l. 16 "was at first written on the margin to explain ?? ????????????, and placed into the text by a later copyist, because he saw follow ?? ??????? ??? ?? ?? immediately. If ?? ?? stood originally in the text, its right place would be after ?? ????????????."

Ross (I 156): ??? ?? ?? "seems to have been mistakenly added by a copyist who looked forward to l. 18."

Burkert (p. 33 n.): "Since Alexander (47. 11) read ??? ?? ??, whereas the systemization ?? = ????? suggested itself to any later (Platonizing) reader, the full text is to be defended. Aristotle is enumerating unsystematically: the primary opposite as well as the ?? and number in general, are ????? for the Pythagoreans; in his repetition, Aristotle omits ????? beside ??, being consciously or unconsciously guided by Platonic views (cf. CHERNISS Pres. 45; 175; 224 ff.)."

(3) Burkert's objections to the deletion are not convincing. Firstly he makes no mention of the fact, that already Alexander has trouble with the change from two to three principles, and secondly he insinuates that, within few lines, Aristotle at first thinks like a Pythagorean (positioning the ?? unsystematically besides the 'primary opposite'), and then, 'being consciously or unconsciously guided by Platonic views', like the 'later (Platonizing) reader' who took offence to ??? ?? ??.

987a25 because 2 is the first thing of which 'double' is predicable.

(1) because 'double' is first predicable of 2 (literal translation).

(2) Alexander (48. 20-21): ?????? ????? ????????? ??? ?????, ?????? ????? ????? ?? ????????? ???????.

According to Goebel (1889, p. 3), the sense must be "Because 2 is the first number which is subsumed under the concept of double"; but then we should write ????? instead of ??????; "the ????????? is the ??????? ????, which ????? ??????? ???? ????" (cf. ll. 22-23 and Alexander's paraphrase ????? ?????).

(3) What Ross factually translates is Goebel's emendation, which he, however, does not mention in his commentary. ?????? occurs as alternative reading to ?????? in Posterior Analytics i 16, 80a3, to ????? in Physics v 3, 226b22; in both cases it is rejected by the editors (Bekker, Ross).

On the phrase ????? ???????? see Bonitz' Index, 653b52-59.

987b8-9. and sensible things, he said, were all named after these, and in virtue of a relation to these.

(1) and sensible things, he said, existed all apart from these, and were named in virtue of a relation to these. (Alexander, Argyropulus, Bonitz)

(2) Alexander (50. 14-16): ??? ?????? ?? ??? ?????? ??? ???? ?? ???????, ?? ?? ??????? ?????, ????? ?????????????, ??’ ?? ??? ?? ??????? ????? ?? ??? ????????.

50. 19-20: ????? ?? ?? ??????? ???? ????? ??? ???? ????? ???????? ????? (???? ????? ??? ???? ??? ???? ?????? ???? ???? ????? ???????? […]).

Asclepius (46. 7-8): ?? ?? ??????? ???? ?????· ?? ?????? ??? ??? ????? ??? ?? ??????? ??????? ????? ?? ??? ????????.

Argyropulus: "sensibilia vero praeter haec esse dixit et <secundum> haec dici cuncta."

Ross (i 161): "[…] it may be doubted whether the current interpretation of ???? ????? as 'apart from the Ideas' is the right one. It involves the supplying of ????? after ???? ?????. This, however, is difficult; it is more natural to take ???????? with ???? ????? as well as with ???? ?????, and to translate 'and he said the sensibles were called after these and were called what they were called by virtue of their relation to these'. For this sense of ???? cf. E. E. 1228a35 ? ??? ?????? ???? ?? ?????? ??????? ?????????, Plato, Cratylus 399 A ???????? ???????????? ????????, ?? ?' ??????????, ???' ? ????????? ???????????. It is the sense implied in the common Aristotelian word ?????????."

Cherniss (1944, p. 178\*) adds: "The notion which Aristotle here reproduces is expressed in Parmenides 133 C-D (?? ????? ?????????? ????? ?????? ?????????????) and Phaedo 103 B (??? ?? ???? ??????? ????? ?? ??????? ???? ??? ????????? ?? ???????????), cf. Phaedo 102 B (?????????? ????? ?? ??????? ??? ????? ??? ?????? ????? ?????????????? ????? ?????? ??? ????????? ??????) ; all sensibles have their denominations after the ideas according as they participate in them (note that Aristotle follows his statement with a reference to participation as the reason, 987 B 9-10). The fact that Aristotle always speaks of the ideas as existing ???? ?? ??????? (e. g. 1028 B 18-21 ; 1078 B 15-16, 31-32; 1086 A 31-B 2) is itself a reason for not supplying ????? here, since that would make him say that the sensibles exist ???? ??? ?????. Cf. also Eth. Eud. 1217 B 12: ?? ????????? ??? ?????, ? ??????? ?? ???????? ???????."

987b9-10. for the many existed by participation in the Ideas that have the same name as they.

(1) for it is by participation that most of the synonyms have the same name as the Ideas. (Argyropulus) This is the only grammatically possible translation of the text transmitted by E.

for the many that have the same name as the Ideas existed by participation. (Hengstenberg 1824, omitting ??? ?????????)

for it is by participation that the many have the same name as the Ideas. (Ross 1924)

(2) Alexander (50. 19 - 51. 15): ????? ?? ?? ??????? ???? ????? ??? ???? ????? ???????? ????? (???? ????? ??? ???? ??? ???? ?????? ???? ???? ????? ????????, ? ????????? ??? ??? ???? ??????? ??? ?? ????? ???? ?? ????? ??? ????????) ???? ???? ?? ????? ??????????? ??????????? ?? ??? ????????? ???? ???????, ? ???? ?? ??? ???? ?????????? ?????? ??????· ?? ??? ???????? ???? ?????? ???????. ????? ?? ????? ??? ?? ?????? ??? ???????? ?????? ????? ?????· ??? ??? ???? ?????? ??? ?? ???? ???? ?? ??? ?????? ????? ?????, ???’ ???? ??? ???? ????? ?????, ???’ ???? ??? ?????. ? ??? ?? ????? ?? ????? ???? ??? ?? ???????, ?? ????? ?? ?????????, ???? ??????? ?? ????? ?? ??? ??????? ???? ??? ????? ?????? ??? ???? ????????· ?? ??? ???????? ???? ??????? ???????? ??? ????? ?????. ?? ????? ?? ?????????, ???? ??????? ??? ?? ????? ???? ?? ??????? ?? ??? ???????? ???? ??????, ??? ??? ?????. ??????? ??? ???? ??? ??????? ??? ??????, ???? ??????? ??? ??? ????? ????? ?? ?????, ????? ?? ????? ?? ???????? ????????· ?? ??? ????? ??? ???????? ???????? ?? ????? ???? ???? ??????? ????? ????. ?? ??? ????? ???? ????? ???????, ???’ ??? ??????? ?? ????? ???????? ??? ????????. ?? ??? ?? ???? ?????? ????? ?? ??????? ???????? ?????, ??????? ??? ???????? ?????, ????????? ??????? ???????? ??? ????? ???? ?????????? ???? ?????. ? ??? ???? ??????? ??? ???????? ?? ???? ?? ????? ???? ???? ?????, ???? ?????????· ?? ??? ??? ?????? ?? ??????? ???????, ?????????? ???? ??? ????????? ????? ??.

Asclepius (46. 11-31): ????? ??? ????? ?? ???????, ??? ?? ??? ???????, ????, ???? ??????? ????????? ?? ?????· ?? ??? ??? ????? ????? ??? ??????? ??? ??? ????? ??????? ?? ???? ????? ??? ?? ???? ???????. ????? ??? ????? ?? ???????, ? ??? ?? ?????? ??? ???????? ?????? ????? ?????· ??? ??? ???? ?????? ?? ??? ??? ???? ?? ??? ???????? ?????, ???’ ???? ??? ???? ????? ?????, ???? ?? ???? ??? ?????. ???? ??????? ??? ??? ????? ????????? ?? ?????, ???????? ???? ???????? ?? ?????· ???? ??? ???? ?????? ????????. ?? ??? ????? ??? ???????? ???????? ???? ??????? ?? ????? ???? ????? ????. ?? ??? ????? <????> ????? ???????, ???’ ??? ??????? ?? ????? ???????? ??? ????????, ?? ????????, ?????, ????, ????????· ?? ??? ?? ???? ?????? ????? ?? ??????? ???????? ????? ??????? ??? ???????? ?????, ??????? ????????? ???????? ??? ????? ?? ?? ??’ ???? ??? ???? ??. ? ???? ???? ??????? ???????? ?? ????? ???? ???? ?????, ???? ?????????· ?? ??? ??? ?????? ?? ??????? ???????, ?????????? ???? ??? ????????? ????? ??. ?? ??? ?? ???? ??? ????? ??? ?? ????? ???????? ?? ???? ?? ???? ?????, ???? ?? ?? ????; ????? ??? ???????? ??????? ??? ????, ???? ?? ?????? ??????????. ?? ?? ???? ?? ????? ????? ????????. ?? ??? ? ???????????? ????? ?? ????? ??????, ??????? ??? ?? ?????????? ???? ???? ?? ????? ?? ???????. ???? ??? ?? ??????? ???? ?? ????? ??? ??? ??????· ???? ?? ???? ?? ????? ?? ???????? ?? ????? ???????, ?????? ?? ???? ?? ????, ????? ???? ????, ??? ? ??????? ?? ????? ? ????? ??? ??? ????? ???.

Joannes Philoponus, De aeternitate mundi, 28, 21-26: ??? ??? ????? ???? ??? ?????????? ???????? ???? ????? ???????? ???? ?? ??????? ????????? ???????? ????????? ????? ????? ?????? ??? ???????? ??? ???????????? ?????????????, ?? ???? ??????? ????? ?? ??????? ????????? ???????? ???????????????.

Argyropulus: "per participationem enim pleraque univocorum formis esse aequivoca inquit."

Fonseca: "Docet qua ratione omnia secundum Platonem appellentur nominibus Idearum, quod proxime dixerat, quodque hic vocat, esse ???????, sive aequivoca formis; simulque corrigit verbum «omnia», quo usus fuerat. Neque enim omnia individua apud Platonem appellabantur nominibus idearum, sed sola univoca, ut homines, ut equi; quandoquidem his tantum communes ideas tribuendas esse censuit. Nec vero omnia univoca, sed pleraque. nam, nec relationes, nec ea, quae sunt praeter naturam, nec item mala dicebat Plato habere ideas, ut Alexander annotavit. sed nec eorum, quae pertinent ad diversas species, tradebat ille communem ideam, ut Aristoteles plerisque locis asserit.

Hac igitur de causa ait Aristoteles hoc loco, secundum Platonem pleraque univocorum, eiusdem nominis esse cum formis. Ratio vero, ob quam haec secundum Platonem appellantur nominibus Idearum, docet Aristoteles esse participationem."

Bonitz (1849, pp. 89-91): "Quae verba quamquam constat omnino sic referri ad superiora, tamen quomodo ipsa interpretanda sint dissentiunt viri docti, qui haud scio an difficultates ipsi sibi facessiverint in verbis intellectu facillimis. (Cf. Trendel. de ideis p. 32 sqq. A. Stahr, Berl. Wiss. Jahrb. 1841. N. 91.) Ac primum quidem quod ad textum attinet probanda est sine dubio scriptura a Brandisio et Bekkero recepta, quae licet a codicibus plurimis recedat, tamen certa Alexandri auctoritas plus habet ponderis quam codicum vel plurimorum consensus, praesertim quum eam exhibeat lectionem, quae propter rationem sententiae vel de conjectura fuerit restituenda. Explicari autem aptissime videtur Aristotelis sententia his verbis Alexandri: ???? ??????? ??? ?? ????? ???? ?? ??????? ?? ??? ???????? ???? ??????, ??? ??? ????? p. 38, 11. Etenim ???? ??????? ????? eodem modo dictum est, ut ????? ?????, ??? ?????, ???? ?????????? ????? et similia, quae vulgatissima sunt apud Aristotelem. Dativum ???? ??????? construere cum ???????, quod voluit A. Stahr l.l., licet illud quidem per leges grammaticas, sed vix putandum est licere per collocationem verborum, qua necessario ducimur ad coniungendum dativum ???? ??????? cum ?????????. Deinde ?? ????? non est interpretandum plurima, […] hoc enim repugnaret verbis superioribus, quibus ?? ??????? - ????? ad normam idearum formata Aristoteles dixerat; explicandum potius ?? ????? ex notissimo illo Platonis usu, quod singulas res sensibiles et ideam cui subjiciantur opponit inter se tamquam ?? ????? et ?? ??, cf. Plato de republica X 596 A. Phaedrus 265 D. Phaedo 78 D. al. Qualia sint illa ?? ????? definitur per genitivum ??? ?????????, appositionis instar additum, quasi dicat ?? ?????, ? ???????? ???? ???? ??????. Sensibilia autem Aristoteles ex sententia Platonis, quam simpliciter referri ipsa forma enuntiati documento est, appellat ???????? ???? ??????, quod aptissime dictum esse apparebit reputanti et Aristotelicum inter ???????? et ????????? discrimen et Platonis de ideis doctrinam. Aristoteles enim quum duo in lingua Graeca inveniret vocabula non multum distantia ???????? et ?????????, ea pro suo arbitrio suum in usum ita distinxit, ut ??????? diceret quae nomen tantum, ???????? quae et nomen et substantiam communem haberent, cf. Cat. 1. Trendel. de an. p. 334. Atqui Plato, qui singulas res sensibiles propterea et eatenus esse omnino censeret, quatenus ab idea aliqua conformarentur, profecto non nominis modo, sed substantiae etiam communionem esse voluit inter ideas et res iis subjectas. Quare recte ex sententia Platonis sensibilia dicuntur ???????? ???? ??????.

Sed objici video huic explicationi (cf. Trendel. l. l.), et Platonem numquam ?????????? dicere ideas et res sensibiles, et ab Aristotele alibi de eadem re usurpari vocabulum ????????: quae nescio an speciosius disputentur quam verius. Etenim discrimen illud inter ???????? et ????????? neque ex origine horum vocabulorum neque ex communi usu linguae repetitum, ipse commentus est et pro suo arbitrio statuit Aristoteles; apud Platonem nullum eius discriminis est vestigium; is enim, ut est religiosior in retinenda usitata vi vocabulorum, ???????? utrumque in sensum usurpat, ut et nomen una cum substantia (Tim. 52 A, cf. Phaed. 78 E) et nomen sine substantia commune significet (Prot. 311 B. Parm. 133 D), cf. Alex. p. 38, 19. Jam Aristoteles ubi refert simpliciter Platonis sententiam, ad significandam rationem, quae ideas inter et res sensibiles intercedat, vocabulis utitur ????????? vel ??? ????????, veluti h. l. et I 10. 1059a13 […]: ubi vero judicium ferens de doctrina Platonica illam substantiae communionem inter ideam et res sensibiles negat, ibi usurpat voc. ????????, cf. A 9. 991a6, nec longe alia videtur ratio esse eius loci, de quo uno possit dubitari 9. 990b6."

Gillespie (1918, pp. 151-152): "Eject ???? ??????? as a gloss. As the text stands ??? ????????? has to be construed as a genitive defining ?? ????? (Bonitz, Comm., p. 90), which is intolerably harsh. If the words are omitted, a simple meaning is obtained, viz. 'The 'many' exist by participation in the (Ideas) of the same name." For the position of the genitive in the sentence, compare E. N. VI. 1142b16 ???' ??????? ??? ????? ? ???????? ??????.

A genitive after ???? ??????? is required by the sense: the whole phrase ???? ??????? ????? ??? ????????? is the explanation of ???? ????? ???????? above. ???????? implies that the ????? derive their names from the corresponding Ideas; the explanatory clause states that they derive their names, because they derive their being, from the Ideas of the same name. The whole passage is excessively condensed, and the sentence as thus emended puts no greater strain on the attention of the reader than its neighbours do. It cannot be said that it is more in Aristotle's manner to speak of the particulars as being of the same name as the Ideas than to speak of the Ideas as of the same name as the particulars: see Metaph. ? 9, 990b6 ???' ??????? ??? ???????? ?? ???? ??? ???? ??? ?????? ??? ?? ?????, ?? ????? ?? ??? ??????. ? 10, 1059a13 ?????? ?? ????? ????? ??????? ????? ?? ???? ???? ???? ??? ??? [152] ???????, and compare de Lin. Insec. 968a9 ??? ?? ????? ???? ???????, ? ?' ???? ????? ??? ?????????."

Cherniss (1944, pp. 178\*-179\*): "This clause purports to be Plato's reason for asserting that the sensibles ???? ????? ??? ???? ????? ???????? ?????. Now, the words ????????? and ???????? had different meanings for Aristotle (Categ. 1 A 1-12), whereas Plato uses only the latter word in the dialogues (n. b. the Speusippean distinction which differs from that of Aristotle [Lang, Speusippus, p. 25 and frag. 32]). In the Timaeus (52 A) the " second class " is called ???????? ?????? ?? ?????? (scil. the class of ideas) ; and in the Parmenides (133 D), just after the ideas are referred to as ?? ????? ?????????? ????? ?????? ?????????????, the phenomenal particulars are called ?? ???' ???? ????? ??????? ???? ???????? (cf. Phaedo 78 E: ??? ???????? ???????? and see Alcimus apud Diog. Laert. III, 13: ?? ???' ???? ??? ?? ???????? ??????? ??????? ???????? ???????). This Platonic use of ???????? is represented by Aristotle's ????????? inasmuch as the ideas and particulars are understood to be "specifically the same" (Metaphysics 1040 B 32-34, 1059 A 13-14, 1086 B 10-11), although for Plato ???????? when used of the relationship of sensibles and ideas meant not merely " synonymous " in Aristotle's sense. The particular is ???????? ?? ?????, not vice versa, because it has its name and nature derivatively from the idea (cf. Taylor, A Commentary on Plato's Timaeus, p. 342 [52 A 5]) […].

[179\*] The phrase ??? ????????? ???? ??????? is, then, the Aristotelian equivalent of Plato's ??????? ????????, and the ??????? of the variant reading, ??? ????????? ??????? ???? ???????, must be regarded as a gloss which is later than the text of Alexander (cf. Robin, loc. cit.). If this is so, ??? ????????? ???? ??????? must be the particulars, and the phrase must depend upon ?? ?????, which would signify the multiplicities of these various particulars (cf. Plato, Republic 596 A: ????? ??? ??? ?? ?? ??????? ???????? ???????? ???? ?????? ?? ?????, ??? ?????? ????? ??????????). Ross, following Gillespie, objects to this construction of the genitive as impossible and excises ???? ???????, translating: " ' the many exist by participation in their ???????? ' the Forms" (Metaphysics, I, p. 162). Yet ???? ??????? is in all the MSS and was read by Alexander who saw no difficulty in the construction itself (Metaph., p. 51, 6-7). ?? ????? is here a plural substantive, the ?????? ?? ????? of the Republic passage above, taken together as the sum of the multiplicities which constitute the phenomenal world, and the opposite of that other technical expression, ?? ?? ?????? (Philebus 16 D 4), which many editors have sought to eliminate. Gillespie's argument (Journal of Philology, XXXIV [1918], p. 151) that ???? ??????? requires a genitive is answered by a reference to 1031 B 18: ??????? ??? ???? ???????. There as here the stress is on the fact that the existence is only derivative, dependent upon an external relationship; the genitive is no more necessary than it is in 992 A 28-29: ?? ??? ???????? … ????? ????? (cf. also De Generatione 335 B 14: ???? ??? ?????????)."

Ross (1951, p. 154 n.): "I now think the true reading in 987b9 is ???? ??????? ??? ????? ?? ????? ??????? ???? ???????. It is probable that an early copyist, not recognizing the significance of ?? ????? (the many, as opposed to the one), and taking it to mean 'the majority', introduced ??? ????????? as a gloss, and that the gloss got incorporated in the text of the manuscripts, and drove out ??????? in that of Ab, Alexander, and Asclepius. ????????, not ?????????, is Aristotle's usual way of expressing the relation of the particulars to the ideas in Plato's system (990b6, 991a6), and it is also Plato's way (Phaedo 78 E 2, Parmenides 133 D 3, Timaeus 52 A 5). The interpretation of ?? ????? ??? ????????? as meaning 'the many consisting of the ????????' seems to me most unlikely."

Jaeger (1957) remarks on the ???????, which is missing in Ab: "ex varia lectione ortum, quo recepto ????? ??? ????????? delevi".

(3) It appears impossible to obtain agreement. If we give up, however, the postulate that there was a single original version, out of the insights gained in the course of the debate two versions of equal value can be reconstructed. The first one is the one recommended by Ross: ???? ??????? ??? ????? ?? ????? ??????? ???? ???????. But what to do with ??? ?????????? The stupidity of the copyist supposed by Ross is too incredible. Here Gillespie seems to be on the right track; it is not enough, however, to excise ??????? ???? ???????, but after ????????? is to be added <?????> as well. The ideas cannot simply be called ????????, because the ????? also fall under this concept. According to the passage De lineis insecabilibus 968a9-10 quoted by Gillespie, the idea is 'the first among the synonyma', cf. also Metaphysics ? 1, 993b24-26.

This second version (???? ??????? ??? ????? ?? ????? ??? ????????? <?????>) is the perfect Greek equivalent to Ross' translation of 1928.

Both versions are of equal value. The first one corresponds better to what precedes (l. 9 ???? ????? ????????), the second to what follows (ll. 11-12 ?? ???? … ?????).

987b11-12. for the Pythagoreans say that things exist by 'imitation' of numbers, and Plato says they exist by participation, changing the name.

(1) My proposal: for the Pythagoreans say that things exist by 'imitation', and Plato says they exist by participation (deleting ??? ??????? = "of numbers") …

(2) As to the correctness of the explanatory ??? ???????, Zeller (Presocratics i, p. 372, n. 2) points to "Aristoxenus, ap. Stob. i. 16: ????????? … ????? ?? ???????? ????????? ???? ????????. Cf. the expressions ????????? and ??????????? in the passage quoted above from Metaph. i. 5 [985b27, 33], and the ?????? ?? ?? ????’ ???????v, ap. Plut. De An. Procr. 33, 4, p. 1030; Theo. Mus. c. 38; Sext. Math. iv. 2; vii. 94, 109; Iambl. V. Pyth. 162; Themist. Phys. 32a (220, 22 Sp.); Simpl. De Caelo, 259 a, 39 (Schol. in Arist. 511 b, 13)".

(3) Notwithstanding its correctness, ??? ??????? is to be deleted here on the same reason as ??? ????? in l. 14.

987b13-14. But what the participation or the imitation of the Forms could be they left an open question.

(1) But what the participation or the imitation could be they left an open question (deleting with Gillespie ??? ????? = "of Forms", which is omitted by Alexander).

(2) Alexander (52. 3-5): ?????? ?? ??? ??????? ?? ??? ??????? ?? ?’ ???? ??? ??? ???????, ???? ??? ??????????? ??? ???? ?????? ????????, ???’ ?????? ?? ????? ????????? ??? ??????? ??? ???? ??????.

Gillespie (p. 152): "The words ??? ????? are to be ejected as a gloss. They are awkward in situation and inappropriate to the context. They cannot be construed with ??????? but only with ???????. Aristotle clearly intends to draw a sharp distinction between the Numbers of the Pythagoreans and the Forms of Plato, for he has just stated that Plato is responsible both for the thing he called a Form and for this use of the word 'Form.' Aristotle never uses the word ????? in his account of the Pythagoreans ? 5, 985b23 sqq., and he never applies the name of Numbers to the Platonic Forms except in their relation to the superior principles of the One and the indeterminate Dyad from which they are derived. Here the context shows that he is thinking of the Pythagorean doctrine as ??????? ??? ??????? and of the Platonic doctrine as ??????? ??? ????? and is asserting that the ??????? factor of the one is derived from the ??????? factor of the other: he has just explained that the Platonic Form has an origin independent of the Pythagorean Number. Hence ??? ????? can only be connected with ???????; but such slipshod writing is out of keeping with the clear simple style of the chapter as a whole. Jackson's suggestion (Journal of Philology, vol. 10, p. 292) to transpose the words so as to follow ??????? in the preceding clause is unsatisfactory, as no reason can be given for the mistake of the copyist."

987b21-22. for from the great and the small, by participation in the One, come the Numbers. (deleting ?? ????)

(1) The alternative is to delete ???? ????????: "… come the Forms".

(2) Susemihl (1860, p. 514 n.) considers ???? ???????? as interpolation, "which was made to prepare already here for what is said about numbers in the following. Because the fact that Plato conceived the ideas also as numbers surely does not contribute anything to account for and to explain the immediately preceding ?? ??? ??? - ?? ??."

Zeller (1889, pp. 261-262): "The conjecture (Phil. d. Gr. IIa, 750, 14) that the words ?? ????, which cannot be constructed together with ???? ???????? at all, are an explanatory marginal gloss to ???? ????????, still recommends itself to me. The simple expedient to read ??? ???? ???????? with Asclepius (perhaps already Plotinus V, 4, 2. 518 A [= 8-9]) is rightly rejected by Christ: for firstly we would get a pleonasm not agreeing with the concise diction of our passage; secondly it is scarcely credible that the ???, which is indispensable for the construction, should be vanished (from the text where it was originally read) since the time of Alexander. […] On the other hand, if we delete ???? ????????, we get - with the words ?? ???? ????? (instead of: ????? ?? ????) - apart from the hiatus, a cacophonic closure of the sentence, and we could not explain how anyone should hit upon explicating ???? by ????????. From Simpl. Phys. 454, 19ff. we see that […] it was number what Plato had derived from the One and the great and the small."

Gillespie (pp. 153-154): "If one of the phrases is to be rejected, it must be ?? ????:

for:

(a) It is the most likely to have been inserted.

(b) ???? ???????? is the most expressive, because it shows that the ???? are ??????? in respect of their origin: the reader would fully understand that the ideal numbers were meant. The Forms are spoken of again lower down as numbers, and the most appropriate place for the substitution of the new term is in this sentence.

(c) The sentence without ?? ???? is in exact keeping with the style of Aristotle in this book, the sentence without ???? ???????? is not. The word ????? occurs some 112 times in the book: 83 times in the middle of the clause, only 19 times at the end, and of these 7 are cases of phrases like ????? ?????, while 5 are very short clauses. On the other hand ????? (or ?????) is more frequently put at the end of the [154] clause: it occurs 80 times, of which 41 are final, 39 medial (but 12 of these seem to be of special type)."

Ross (1951, p. 176 n.): "It is not certain which of the two phrases [?? ???? oder ???? ????????] should be omitted. ???? ???????? is rather surprising, because Aristotle has said nothing about Plato's identification of the Ideas with numbers; but that Plato did identify them is for Aristotle so much a matter of common knowledge that he does not notice his omission to state it here."

Jaeger: "???? ???????? delevit Christ, quem sequi praestat, cum ex 18 hoc loco ?? ???? nominari exspectes, non numeros (cf. 988a11). […] ???? ???????? olim in margine scriptum fuisse videtur: omittit Arabus [v. Walzer 223-224; the 'Arabus' is the 10th century translation Nazif]."

(3) Healing the text seems as hopeless as at ll. 9-10. What consists 'out of these' as 'elements' (l. 19 and 20 ????????) can only be the ideas or the numbers, not the statement 'that the ideas are numbers'. Since ?? ???? and ???? ???????? 'absolutely cannot be constructed together' (Zeller), they should be taken as variant readings. But all efforts to prove one of them to be the right one were futile. For Zeller it is ?? ????, what can more easily explained as 'marginal gloss', for Jaeger ???? ????????. The stylistic objection against ?? ???? ????? raised by Zeller and Gillespie can be refuted by simple reference to 991b7. On the other hand, it is no argument that, after what precedes, ?? ???? is expected (Susemihl, Jaeger), for at l. 24 we are as little prepared for the change from ideas to numbers. Apparently the equation of ideas and numbers is supposed to be well-known to the listeners.

987b26. but positing a dyad and constructing the infinite out of great and small, instead of treating the infinite as one.

(1) My suggestion: "but positing a dyad, instead of treating the infinite as one" and "but constructing the infinite out of great and small" are two alternative versions.

(2) Alexander (54. 11-13): ?? ?? ??????? ????? ???? ??? ?? ??? ???????, ? ???’ ????? ?? ??????? ??????? ??? ??????· ????? ??? ?? ?? ?? ????? ??????????.

(3) Unfortunately, modern commentators do not say anything about Alexander's trouble with ?? ?? ??????? ?? ??????? ??? ??????. To understand ?? as equivalent to ??? is a desperate excuse (which fails if only because we had to supply ??????? instead of ???????). Alexander, however, is quite right that the said phrase is explanatory, not additive ("and …", as Ross translates), cf. Physics iii 4, 203a15 sq.: ?????? ?? ??? ?? ??????, ?? ???? ??? ?? ??????. But such an explanation is not necessary after ll. 20 sq. Thus, being parallel in form and content, the phrases ?? ?? ???? ??? ??????? ?? ???? ????? and ?? ?' ??????? ?? ??????? ??? ?????? are likely to be duplicates.

988a1-2. Yet what happens is the contrary; the theory is not a reasonable one.

(1) Literally: "… for the theory is not a reasonable one".

"… the theory, therefore, is not a reasonable one" (Susemihl).

My proposal: "Yet what results is the contrary; for the theory is not a reasonable one."

(2) "?? ??? is obviously corrupt, it should read ??? ??'." (Susemihl, p. 8)

(3) Susemihl's text change ceases to apply if we translate ????????? by "results" (cf. Bonitz, Index, 713b10-11: "saepe transfertur ad concludendi necessitatem").

988a2-3. For they make many things out of the matter. (Ab)

(1) For nowadays they make many things out of the matter. (E)

(2) Alexander (58. 5-6): ?? ??? ??? ??? ????? ?? ???? ????? ????????? ?????? ????? ??????? ??????????.·

Jaeger: "opponuntur ?? ??? et ???????? ??; ??? scripsit qui mirabatur cur Aristoteles de Platone plurali loqueretur."

(3) What Jaeger says about the reading of Ab is supported by De generatione animalium A 18, 725a21-24:

?? ??? ??? ?? ??? ?????? ?????, ????? ?? ?? ???? ?????’ ????? ??????? ?????? ???????, ??? ?? ??? ????????, ???????? ?? ????????? ??????.

But ??? (in E) evidently comes from a contemporary of the old academy. The same ??? ??? for a view or method of the academics with corresponding ?? for the true fact or the right method occurs at two further passages:

??? ??? ??? ?? ???????? ??? ????????? ???? ????? ???? ??? ?????????? ????? ???????? ??????????. ?????????? ?' ???? ?? ??????? ??????? ??? ? ????? ????? ????, ??????? ????, ? ???' ??????? ??????, ???? ?????, ?????, ????????, ????. (De anima A 1, 402b3-7)

??? ??? ??? ?? ??? ????????????? ????? ?? ??????, ?? ??????? ?? ???????????? ????? ????? ???????????, ?? ???????, ??? ? ?????????? ??? ? ?????? ??????? ?????? ??? ??? ???????, ?? ???? ???????? ??? ???? ??????? ?????? ??????? ??? ?? ????? ?? ?? ???? ??????. ??? ?' ?? ??? ?????????????, ???? ??????? ?????? ??????????, ??? ??? ?? ???? ????????? ?????? ?? ?????. ????? ??? ???? ????? ??? ??????? ?? ???, ?????? ??????? ???????? ??? ??????? ???? ??????. (Ethica Eudemia A 8, 1218a16-24)

It follows that the reading of E is not only of equal value, but perhaps even older as the one of Ab.

988a12-13. of which the Forms are predicated in the case of sensible things, and the One in the case of Forms. (Ab)

(1) of which the Forms are predicated, partly in the case of sensible things, partly in the case of Forms (Alexander).

(2) Alexander (59. 16-27): ??? ?? ?????????? [?? ?? ???? ????????? ??? ?? ???? ??????, v. l. 13] ???????????? ????? ???’ ?? ?? ???? ?? ??? ??? ??? ???????? ?? ?? ??? ???? ?????? ???????, ???? ????? ?? ???’ ?? ?? ???? ??????? ?? ?? ??? ???? ????????? ??? ?? ??? ???? ??????, ???????? ???? ??????· ??????? ??? ??? ?? ???????? ??? ?? ???? ????????? ????? ??? ??? ??????????, ???’ ?? ?? ????, ????????? ? ?????????????. […] ???????? ??? ????? ???’ ?? ?? ???? ??? ??? ??? ????????, ?? ?? ?? ?? ???? ?????? ???????, ??? ??? ?? ?? ?????????, ???’ ?? ???? ?? ??? ???? ???? ?? ??? ??????? ?? ???? ????????? (?? ??? ?? ??? ????? ?? ???? ???? ?? ??? ????????), ?? ?? ?? ?? ???? ?????? ??? ???? ??????· ? ??? ?? ???????? ??? ??? ??? ???? ????????????.

(3) As in 980b21, (after ????????) E changes abruptly from one reading (Alexander) to another (Ab).

988a15-17. as we say some of his predecessors sought to do, e.g. Empedocles and Anaxagoras.

(1) as we said … (according to Jackson).

(3) For Jackson's ?????? no more can be said than that it is possible too, cf. Physics iv 2, 209b25, on the other side ????? ????? in On the Generation of Animals iv 4, 771b21. ?? ????? is very frequent in Plato.

988b1-2. that the Forms are the matter of sensible things, and the One the matter of the Forms. (according to Bonitz)

(2) Alexander (62. 12-14): ?? ?? ?? ???? ?????? ????? ?? ??? ????? ??? ?????· ???? ??? ????? ??? ???? ?????????, ???? ???? ???????? ??? ?????, ??? ?? ???? ?????? ????? ?? ???????? ?????.

Bonitz (1849, p. 97): "?? ?? ???? ?????? de conjectura scripsi pro lectione et codicum omnium et Alexandri ?? ?? ???? ??????, quia haec verba non videntur explicari posse. Nam quod Alexander dicit ?? ?? ???? ?????? significare principia idearum, quae ad notionem substantiarum pertineant, non ad materiam, oblitus videtur ex Aristotelis certe narratione eandem esse et idearum et rerum sensibilium materiam cf. ad 6. 987b18 sqq., ideoque non posse elementa idearum simpliciter ad formale genus causae referri. Ad confirmandam conjecturam cf. b5. 6. 988a13."

988b18-19. Besides this it is plain that when the causes are being looked for, either all four must be sought thus or they must be sought in one of these four ways.

(1) Besides this it is plain that when the causes are being looked for, they all must be sought thus or in a similar manner (according to Bywater).

(2) Alexander (64. 3-7): ???? ?? ???????, ??? ???????? ?? ????? ? ????? ??????. ??? ????? ???? ????? ?? ??? ???????????? ?????, ??? ??? ?????? ???? ??? ????? ? ???? ????? ?? ?????????, ???????? ?????????? ??? ?????? (?? ?? ? ????? ???????? ?? ???? ?? ? ????? ?????? ?????????), ? ?? ??? ???????? ?????? ?????.

Bywater (1913, p. 109): "Read surely ???????? for ??????."

(3) Bywater's emendation was adopted later (1924) by Ross; it is supported by Nicomachean Ethics v 2, 1129b16sq. (? ???' ????? ???? ?????? ????????).

988b20-21. Let us next discuss the possible difficulties with regard to the way in which each of these thinkers has spoken, and with regard to his situation relatively to the first principles.

(1) I propose to distinguish three versions:

(a) Let us next discuss the way in which each of these thinkers has spoken, and how matters stand about the principles.

(b) Let us next discuss the possible difficulties.

(c) <Let us nevertheless> discuss them [the difficulties] <also in the following way>.

(2) Argyropulus: "post haec autem pertractemus oportet quomodo quisque horum dixit et quaenam de principiis ipsis dubitationes emergunt."

Bessarion: "quo vero pacto horum quisque dixerit et quomodo de principiis se res habet dubitationes quae contingere possunt de his ipsis deinceps percurramus."

Alexander (64. 11-12): ?????? ?? ?????????? ?????? ??? ??????? ??? ???????????? ??????, ??? ???? ?????? ???? ????? ??????.

(3) The confusion of this transitory sentence arises from the fact that three constructions possible after ???????? are mixed up:

(a) with indirect interrogative clause (??? … ??????, ??? ????), cf. Politics iv 12, 1296b13-14 (??? ?? ???????? ???? ??? ???? ???????? ??????, ???????? ???? ??? ????????? ????????.) or Rhetoric ii 12, 1388b31-32 (?? ?? ??? ????? ????? ???? ?? ???? ??? ??? ????? ??? ??? ??????? ??? ??? ?????, ????????? ???? ?????);

(b) with accusative object (??? ??????????? ???????), cf. Meteorology i 8, 345a12-13 (???????????? ?? ??? ???? ?????? ?? ???? ??? ????? ???????? ??????);

(c) with ???? ????? (???? ?????), as for instance Topics i 2, 101b1-2 (?????? ???? ????? ????????).

The confusion is increased still by the possibility that ???? ????? is depending on ??????? (cf. for instance 1086a31-32 ??? ?? ??? ????? ???????? ??? ??? ?? ?????? ???????' ?? ??? ??? ??? ??????? ??? ???? ?????), only the word order is against this.

Two versions can easily be restituted:

(a) ??? ?? ?????? ??????? ?????? ??? ??? ???? ???? ??? ?????, ???? ????? ?????????. The two interrogative clauses are isolated already by Owens (1957, p. 364): "The sentence, as it stands in A 7, is evidently incomplete. To judge by the parallel form at A 10, 993a24, it should contain a verb like ?????????. The sequence of thought should be: 'The opinions of these philosophers have been treated; let us next proceed to the aporiae about the principles.'" What Owens overlooks is that ?????????, added after ?????, would collide with ????? in l. 19. The interrogative clauses are not recapitulating, but announcing.

(b) ??? <?'> [transmitted in the manuscript underlying Moerbeke's latin translation] ??????????? ??????? ???? ????? ?????????.

What makes trouble is ???? ?????. It looked 'suspect' already to Christ, the reason being that it strangely lags behind, unconnected and superfluous (most translators ignore it). Regarding the unclear reference of ?????, von Arnim (1928a, 22) thinks: "He who wrote this understood ???? ????? as masculin = 'about the ancient thinkers'. For ???? ????? cannot be separated from ?????? ???????." Then, however, it ought to depend on ??????? (cf. the passage 1086a31-32 quoted above); if it depends on ?????????, it must refer to objects of investigation, as otherwise in similar lecture situations:

??? ?? ?? ?? ???? ?????????, ??? ??? ? ?????? ??? ????????, ??? ?? ????? ??????? ??? ?????, ???????, ????????????? ?????? ???? ?????. (Analytica posteriora ii 3, 90a36-38);

??????? ??? ?????? ?? ???? ??? ????? ????????, ??? ????????????? ??? ???? ??? ?????? ?????? ??????? ?????????, ???? ??? ?? ?????????? ???? ??????? ???? ?????. (De caelo iv 1, 308a4-7);

??? ??? ??? ?????? ?? ?????? ????????, ??? ???? ?????? ??? ?????? ????????? ????????, ???????. ?? ??? ???' ??? ??? ??? ?????????? ???? ?????. (De generatione et corruptione ii 4-5, 331b36-332a3).

On the basis of the last parallel, we can reconstruct a third version: <?? ??? ???' ??? ??? ???> ????????? ???? ?????.

988b25-26. though there are also incorporeal things. (E)

(1) These words (????? ??? ????????) are in Ab.

(2) Alexander (64. 21-23): ??? ????? ??????? ???? ????? ??????????, ?????? ??? ??? ?????????? ??? ????? ????? ???????? ??????, ?? ?? ??? ??????? ????? ???????????, ????? ????? ??? ????????.

Asclepius (57. 7-8): ??? ??? ??????? ????? ????? ???????????, ?????? ?? ??? ??? ????????.

Jaeger: "est varia lectio ad ??? ?' … ??."

988b28-31. Further, they err in not positing the substance, i.e. the essence, as the cause of anything, and besides this in lightly calling any of the simple bodies except earth the first principle, without inquiring how they are produced out of one another. (reading with Bywater ?? in ll. 28 and 29).

(2) Bywater (1903, p. 246): "The ordinary view, which even Bonitz accepts, is that ???????? ????, or something of the same kind, is to be understood from the ?????????? in b24. This interpretation is perhaps a little too artificial; but apart from that, the case of the participle ????????????? seems fatal to it. I would suggest that understanding ???????????? from b24, which is the natural word to supply, we should restore ?? ??? ?????? for ?? ??? ?????? in b28, and ?? ?????? for ?? ?????? in b29."

(3) Bywater's emendation is supported by 1040a29 sq. (????????????? ?? ???????????).

989a15-16. But if that which is later in generation is prior in nature. (E)

(1) But if that which is later in generation is prior in nature. (Ab)

(3) It is only the reading of E which fits into the syllogism (as major, ll. 16 sq. ?? ?? … ??????? ?? ??????? being the minor).

989a26. he must be thought to have spoken neither correctly nor altogether plausibly. (Ab)

(1) he must be thought to have spoken neither altogether correctly nor altogether unreasonably. (E)

(2) Alexander (68. 3-4): ? ??????? [than ???? ???????] ????????? ?? ???? ??????, ??? ? ?? ????????? ???? ????? ????? ???? ?????? ?????.

????????? and the article before ???? ?????? can only mean that Alexander found this reading; the indication 'conjecit Alexander' given by Ross in his apparatus criticus is therefore wrong.

Asclepius (60. 24-27): ??? ????? ??? ????? ? ??????????? ??? ??? ???? ??? ????????? ??????, ??????? ?? ? ??? ??????, ???? ????? ???? ??????, ?? ???????????. ? ??? ???????? ??? ??????????? ??? ????????????, ?? ??????? ?? ?? ???? ???????? ??? ??????.

(3) The reading ??????? is to be preferred, because ???? ????? ???? ??????? is the negative pendant to the apparently popular phrase ????? ??? ??????? (see for instance Artemidorus, Onirocritica I 79, 80. II 37, 55. II 39, 5).

989a26-30. And in general, change of quality is necessarily done away with for those who speak thus, for on their view cold will not come from hot nor hot from cold. For if it did there would be something that accepted the contraries themselves, and there would be some one entity that became fire and water, which Empedocles denies.

(2) Ross (i 182): "These words, omitted by Ab and Alexander, are found in the other MSS. and in Asclepius. This points to a very early divergence of the tradition, but there is no reason to regard the words as not genuine."

989b19-21. he means something like what the later thinkers say and what is now more clearly seen to be the case.

(1) My proposal: he intends to say something nearly the same as what the later thinkers do say, and in particular the thinkers of now (reading ?????? instead of ??????? and ejecting ??????????? ??????).

(2) Argyropulus: "vult tamen aliquid iisce simile dicere quae posteriores dixerunt et quae nunc magis apparent."

Bessarion: "vult autem simile quiddam et iis quae posterius dicunt et iis quae nunc magis apparent."

Alexander (70. 5-9): ???????? ?????? ??????????? ???? ?? ??????? ???????, ???? ???? ??????? ?????, ???? ?? ?? ??? ??? ???????? ????? ????? ???????? ??? ?????· ??? ???? ??????????? ??????, ???????? ?? ????????· ???????? ??? ????? ?????? ???? ??????????? ?? ?????? ?????.

Following Alexander, Hengstenberg translates: "who speak more in accordance with the phenomena".

Breier (1840, p. 84) objects: "But […] it cannot be said that the Platonic doctrine is more in accordance with the phenomena than the doctrines of other previous philosophers."

Asclepius (63. 1-4): ???????? ?????? ?? ??????????? ???? ?? ??????? ???????, ???? ???? ??????? ????? ???? ?? ?? ??? ??? ???????? ????? ????? ?????????? ??? ?????, ??? ???? ??????????? ??????· ???????? ?? ????????· ???????? ??? ?????? ???? ??????????? ?? ?????? ?????.

Fonseca: "Hoc loco pro illo ??? ???? ??? ??????????? ??????, quod est ad verbum «et iis, quae nunc magis apparent» diximus «et iis, quae nunc magis probantur» quod sensum eundem clarius contineat."

Bonitz (1849, pp. 103-104): "Adverbium ??? ante ???????????, quod et scripti libri et editi reliqui omnes habent, cum Brandisio ex auctoritate Alexandri omisi. Si retinuerimus adverbium ???, dativus ???? ??????????? non habendus est pro genere masculino, quod voluit Breier […], sed pro genere neutro, quod expressit Schwegler […]. Usurpatur enim interdum ??????????, ?? ????????? eodem fere sensu ac ?????, ?? ????????, cf. An. pr. I 1. 24b11. Top. VIII 5. 159b21, 18. I 14. 105b1, 2 coll. 104a8-15. Sin omiseris adverbium ???, dativus ???? ??????????? pariter pro genere neutro habendus, et ?? ????????? eo accipienda erunt sensu, de quo expositum est ad 6. 988a3, ut hoc dixisse videatur Aristoteles: id quod voluit Anaxagoras propius accedit et ad posteriorum philosophorum doctrinam et ad sensuum evidentiam. Nimirum Aristoteli, ex sua sententia iudicanti aliena placita, propius profecto videbatur ad evidentiam sensuum accedere, quicunque quolibet modo formam et materiam distinxisset, quam qui rerum omnium posuisset mixtionem. - Aptam etiam illam esse sententiam, quam habemus servato adverbio ???, non nego; obtemperandum tamen putavi auctoritati Alexandri, quia et facilius quispiam superioribus verbis ???? ??????? ??????? adduci poterat ut adderet adverbium ???, quam ut omitteret si scriptum erat, et omisso adverbio ??? cavetur ne bis idem dixisse Aristoteles videatur."

Ross (i 183): "If ??? be omitted, ?????? has to be taken with ???????????, which is awkward in view of the distance between the words. ???? ??? ??????????? ?????? means ' what is now more clearly seen to be the case ' - now, when the distinction of form and matter has been clearly recognized."

Jaeger: "???????? deesse conjecit Alexander, supplevi ?????????; cf. 986b31 ubi similiter de Parmenide dicitur."

(3) The dispute relates to three words the interpretations of which strongly differ: ????????, ??????????? and ??????.

Ross translates as if the text had ???????? ?????? (cf. l. 5); but ???????? alone can only mean "wants" (Bonitz).

The meaning supposed by Bessarion for ???? ??????????? as masculinum cannot be documented otherwise (it is only inferred from the context). Understood as "natural phenomena" (Alexander, Hengstenberg, Bonitz, Jaeger), the phrase does not go well together with ?????? (Ross), which must be connected then rather with ??????????? (Hengstenberg: "more in accordance"), or with something supplied (???????? according to Alexander, ????????? according to Jaeger). Schwegler ("what has become apparent") and Ross ("what is seen to be the case") opt for a third interpretation. The latter, in order to connect ?????? with ???? ???????????, must resort to free translation ("more clearly").

Since most of the interpreters have mentally added ?????? to ????????, they should have been suspicious about ???????. If we replace it by ?????? and omit the words ??????????? ??????, we get an impeccable sentence: ???????? ?????? ?? ??????????? ???? ?? ??????? ?????? ??? ???? ???, which in content fully agrees with ???????????????? ????? in l. 6. The whole sentence ll. 19-20 ???? ????? ??? … ??? has a parallel in Plato's Symposium (187 A 3-4): ????? ???? ??? ?????????? ???????? ??????, ???? ???? ?? ??????? ?? ????? ?????.

For ???? ??????? cf. 1074b2 and On the Heavens ii 1, 284a22, for ???? ??? cf. 992a33, 1000a6 and Politics vii 2, 1324a31. For ??????????? with dativus personae Pape gives as example Herodotus, Historiae 4, 78: ???????? ?? ????? ????? ??????? ?????? ? ??????????? ????? ?????????? ?????. ("And very many years afterwards Skyles the son of Ariapeithes suffered nearly the same fate as he [Anacharsis].") As in many cases, ?? … ??? is equivalent here to ??? alone (the reading of Ab), the second member specifying the first one, v. Kühner/Gerth (ii 249) who refer to Stallbaum's commentary on Plato's Gorgias (p. 124). There, Gorgias 460 D (??? ? ?????? ?? ??????? ?????? ?? ??? ?????) is compared with Phaedo 68 B (??????????? ?? ?????????? ??? ??? ??????? ????? ??????), Res publica 602 B (???? ??????? ?? ??? ????? ???????), Phaedrus 242 B (?? ????????? ?? ??? ?? ?????? ???????) and Alcibiades Major 110 A (??????? ?? ??? ??? ??? ???????).

The interpretation proposed by me has the advantage of being grammatically correct, taking into account the position of the particles ?? … ???, which establih a relation between the two ????, not between two predicates (???????? and ?????????) or objects of ???????? (?? ??????????? and ????????).

How ????????o?? ?????? came into the text, is a difficult question. ?? ??? ????????? was a well-known phrase ("what appears now", Meteorology I 7, 344a7; particularly frequent in Galenus), originating from ??? ???????? ("now it appears"), which is frequent already in Plato (Lysis 221 D, Gorgias 460 E, Phaedo 94 C, 107 C etc.). So ????????o?? suggested itself as pendant, after ?????? had been changed into ???????. ??????, however, is quite unintelligible. Was it added by the one who made the preceding changes, meaning "or rather", as ?????? ?? in Plato (e. g. ???????, ?????? ?? ????????, Timaeus 57 E)?

989b29-31. The 'Pythagoreans' treat of principles and elements stranger than those of the physical philosophers. (Bonitz)

(1) The 'Pythagoreans' treat of the principles and elements in a stranger way than the physical philosophers. (E and Ab)

(2) Alexander (71. 12 - 72. 4): ???????? ???? ????????????, ?? ??????? ??? ????? ??? ???????? ?????? ???????????, ??? ????? ??? ???????? ??????????? ??? ??????????? ??? ??????? ??? ???????????, ????????? ??? ????? ??????????? ??? ??????????? ??? ????????? ??? ????? ?????? ????? ????? (????????? ??? ??? ?????????· ?? ??? ??????? ????????· ?? ??? ????????? ???? ????????), ???? ??????? ??? ????????????? ???? ??????? ????????? ??? ???? ??? ??????? ?????? ???????? ??? ?????· ????????????? ??? ???? ???????? ??????? ?? ??’ ??????? ????? ???????? ??? ???????????.

Asclepius (64. 1-7): ????? ??? ??? ?? ?????????? ??????????? ??????????? ??????? ??? ?????????? ???? ?????????? ??? ???? ??????, ???????? ?????????? ??? ???????????· ??????????? ???, ??? ??????????? ????? ??????? ???? ???????? ??? ?????? ??? ????????? ??? ???????, ?????? ?? ??? ??? ????????· ?????????? ??, ??? ??????? ???? ???????? ???????? ????? ??? ??? ??????? ??? ??? ????????.

65. 31-35: ???????? ???? ????????????, ?? ??????? ??? ????? ??? ??? ???????? ?????? ???????????, ??? ????? ???????? ??????????? ??? ??????????? ??? ??????? ??? ???????????, ????????? ??? ????? ??????????? ??? ??????????? ??? ????????? ??? ????? ?????? ????? ?????· ????????? ??? ??? ?????????· ?? ??? ??????? ????????.

Bonitz (1849, p. 104): "Adjectivum ???????????? exhibui invitis codicibus, qui omnes adverbium ??????????? habent, fretus et Alexandri auctoritate (p. 53, 24: ??? ????? ??? ???????? ??????????? ??? ??????????? ??? ??????? ??? ???????????) et ipsa sententiarum ratione. Neque enim usus principiorum, quem faciunt Pythagorei, differt a veteribus physiologis, quod significaret adverbium ??????????? - utuntur enim suis utrique principiis ad explicandam generationem et omnino sensibilem rerum naturam -, sed ipsa principia Pythagoreorum longe differunt a principiis veterum philosophorum, cf. b31: ?? ?' ?????? ??? ????????? ?????."

990a1. and with regard to their parts and attributes and functions they observe the phenomena.

(1) The words "and attributes and functions" were missing in Alexander's text.

(2) Alexander (72. 13-16): ??? ?? ??? ??????? ??? ?? ??????? ???? ???????? ?? ??? ????? ?? ??????????? (????? ?? ???? ?? ?????? ?? ??? ????????, ?? ??????????), ??? ?? ??????????? ???? ????? ??????????, ????? ???? ?? ?? ?? ??????.

Christ: "??? ?? ???? ??? ?? ???? non interpretatur Alexander, unde ea seclusi tamquam interpretamentum sive alteram lectionem."

(3) For the phrase ?? ???? ??? ?? ???? cf. On the Heavens iii 8, 307b19-23: ???? ?? ?????????? ???????? ??????? ?? ?? ???? ?? ???? ??? ?? ???? ??? ??? ???????? (??????? ??? ????? ????? ??? ????? ??? ???? ??? ???? ??? ????????), ?????? ?? ??? ???? ?????? ???????. ("Now the most important differences of the bodies are those of attribute, function, and power; for every natural being has, we maintain, its own functions, attributes, and powers. Our first business, then, will be to speak of these.")

990a14-16. To judge from what they assume and maintain they are speaking no more of mathematical bodies than of perceptible.

(1) To judge from what they assume and maintain they are speaking no more of perceptible bodies than of mathematical. (Casaubonus)

(2) Alexander (73. 2-3): ? ??? ??????? ???? ??? ???????, ?? ?????? ????? ??????? ???? ???????? ???? ???? ???????????? ???????.

Asclepius (67. 19-21): ? ??? ??????? ???? ??? ???????, ?? ?????? ????? ??????? ???? ???????? ? ???? ???????????? ???????.

Bessarion: "e quibus supponunt et aiunt: nil magis quam de mathematicis corporibus de sensibilibus dicunt."

Ross (i 183): "Casaubon's proposal to interchange ??????????? and ???????? derives some support from Alexander 73. 2, but the manuscript reading is probably right. The Pythagoreans mean to be giving an account of sensible objects as well as of mathematical; this is why they have said nothing about any of the elements, viz. because they have nothing special to say of them but mean their account of mathematical bodies to apply to these also."

(3) Casaubon's proposal, anticipated in Bessarion's translation, is quite plausible. The correct explanation which Ross gives cannot be gathered from the manuscript reading.

990a22-24. When in one particular region they place opinion and opportunity, and, a little above or below, injustice and decision or mixture.

(1) … opinion or opportunity … (Zeller).

(2) Alexander (74. 6 - 75. 2): ?????? ??? ?? ???? ??? ????? ??? ?????? ????? ???????????, ?? ???? ?? ??????, ????? ?’ ?? ?? ???? ? ??????? ?????? ? ?????? ? ??????? ? ?????? ? ????? ? ???? ?? ??? ?? ?? ??????. ?????? ??? ??????? ??? ??????? ?????, ?????? ?? ???? ?? ?? ????? ??????? ??? ????? ???????. ?? ??? ??? ???? ?? ?? (?????? ??? ????? ???????), ???? ?? ?? ????? ?? ???, ? ????? ?? ?????? ??? ??????· ??? ????? ??? ??????????? ??? ??? ????? ??????? ??? ??????? ????????? ??? ???????????? ??? ?? ??? ???? ???????? ?? ?? ???????????, ?????? ?? ??? ???? ?????, ????????? ?????· ?? ??? ??? ??????? ???? ??? ???? ???????? ???? ?????? ?????????? ???? ?? ?? ?????? ??? ???????? ?????? ?????· ??? ??? ?? ?????? ?? ?????? ?????????????.

38, 8 - 39, 3 (on 985b29-31): ???? ?? ?? ????????? ?? ???? ???????? ?????? ????? ???? ?? ???? ?? ??? ????????, ???????· ??? ??? ??? ??????????? ????? ?????????????? ????? ?? ???????????? ?? ??? ????, ?? ???? ???????? ????? ??????????? ??, ??? ????? ??? ??? ?????? ???? ??????? ?????? ?????? ????? ???????????· ?? ??? ?????? ?? ?????? ??? ??? ????? ????? ??????? ??????? ????? ????? ? ???????. ?????? ?? ?? ??? ??? ??????? ??????, ???? ?????? ?? ?????????? ??? ??? ?????????? ??? ????? ???? (??? ??? ???), ?? ?? ??? ?????, ?? ???? ?????? ?????????? ??? ???????? ??? ???? ??’ ????? ?????????. ?????? ?? ????? ?????? ??? ????· ????? ??? ?? ?????? ???? ???????? ??????? ?????? ??? ???????? ??? ?????????? ???? ?????????, ?? ??’ ????????. ??? ??? ???????? ???????????, ??? ?????????? ???????? ?????, ??? ??????? ???? ??? ???????? ????????, ??? ?????? ???? ??? ??????. ??? ??? ????? ??, ???? ????? ?????? ????? ??? ??????, ????, ?????, ??????? ????? ???????? ???’ ? ? ??????? ??????? ?????, ?? ?????? ????????· ??????? ??? ????? ????? ????? ??? ???? ?? ????? ??? ??? ?????? ?????????? ???? ???????· ????????? ??? ???? ??? ??? ??????? ??????? ??? ??? ????? ??? ??? ????????· ???’ ?? ?????? ??? ???????, ??? ??? ??? ???????, ???’ ?? ??? ?????????.

Luthe (1880, 193-194): "Since ????, the two, is the number of the terrestrial region, and ??????, the seven, is the number of the solar region, they cannot be in the same part of the universe. According to this Alexander says: ?????? ?? ???? ??? ????? ??? ?????? ????? ???????????, ?? ???? ?? ??????. Therefore ???? ?? is probably to be read instead of ???."

Diels (1912, p. 351) reads: … ?? ???? ??? ?? ????? ???? ??? <?????, ?? ???? ??> ?????? …, "according to Alexander's commentary 74. 13 ???? = 2, ?????? = 7, ?????? (ancient manuscripts of Alexander ??????) = 5, ?????? = 4".

(3) The transmitted text is perfectly consistent with itself; contrary to Alexander's account, it implies that in one particular region several concepts can be placed. Trying to get rid of this disagreement by way of textual criticism is wrong on principle; besides, the proposed emendations are insufficient, because they remove the said contradiction only for the first part of the sentence.

990a24-25. and allege, as proof, that each of these is a number. (Alexander)

(1) … that each one of these is a number. (E and Ab)

(2) Alexander (74. 9-11) ??? ?? ?????? ???? ??? ????? ??? ???????? ????????? ????????? ?????? ??? ?????? ??? ??????? ??? ??????? ?????, ?????? ?? ???? ?? ?? ????? ??????? ??? ????? ???????.

Asclepius (68. 20-22): ??? ?? ?????? ???? ??? ???????? ????? ????????? ????????? ??????, ??? ?????? ??? ??????? ??????? ?????, ?????? ?? ???? ?? ?? ????? ??????? ????? ???????.

Ross (i 185): "there is no reason for the unusual and very emphatic combination ?? ???????".

(3) The combination ?? ??????? is unusual in Aristotle (where it occurs otherwise only in 1039b13-14, and even there only as reading of Ab), but frequent in Plato. Its "emphatic" meaning is illustrated by Herodotus 8, 138: ????, ?? ??????? ???? ???????? ????? ("roses which have each one sixty petals"). Misled by Alexander (see previous note), Ross is reluctant to accept the clear message of the transmitted text that, several concepts being placed in one celestial region, not only their sum, but each of them by itself is a number (just as Herodotus wants to emphasize that not all roses together have sixty petals, but each of them by itself).

990a25-26. and that there happens to be already in this place a plurality of the extended bodies composed of numbers.

(1) My translation: and that there happens to be already in this place a plurality of the assembled magnitudes.

(2) Christ (1853, 25): simulque contingere, ut hoc in loco - nimirum eo, in quo opportunitatem, opinionem aliamve rem esse dicebant - multitudo quaedam consociatorum corporum - i. e. numerus aliquis coelestis, ??????? ????????? - jam praesto sit.

Burnet (pp. 291-292 n.): "… that there is already in that part of the world a number of composite magnitudes (i. e. composed of the Limit and the Unlimited)."

(3) Christ's translation of ???????????? ("consociatorum") is to be preferred to the ones by Burnet and Ross ("composed"), because it fits better with ???? ??? ????? ??????, cf. phrases as: ???????????? ???? ????? ???? (Plutarch, Brutus, 39), ?????? ??? ???? ??? ???? ???????????? (Philo, De Abrahamo, 159), ???????????? ???? ??? ?????? (Dionysius of Halicarnass, Antiquitates Romanae 12, 1, 4).

In order to understand the context of ll. 25-27, it is essential to notice the parallelism ???? ??? ????? ?????? … ?? ???? ????? … ???? ?????? ????????. Both ?????? and ????? do not refer to what precedes (ll. 22-23, as Christ thinks), but, as ???? in l. 22, point at variables of the same type (????? and ????? respectively).

990a26-27. because these attributes of number attach to the various places.

(2) Christ (1853, pp. 25-26): "Sed vix hac difficultate superata in alteram irruimus, quid verba sequentia «??? ?? ?? ???? ????? ?????????? ???? ?????? ????????» sibi velint. Ad sententiam enim proxime praecedentem «????????? ?? — ???????» referri non possunt. Nam ut Pythagoreos caelestes sane numeros ex distantiae ratione disposuisse videri [Footnote: cf. N. c. I. 1087b10 sqq.] omittam, haud facile certe ad «?????» affectiones numeri, de quibus antea nil dictum est, subaudiveris. Mihi diu dubio, an non spuria sint verba, nunc peruasi, post ??????? interpungendum, et verba extrema ??? — ???????? ad conjunctas praecedentes partes ??? — ??????? sive ad concentum naturae loci cujusque caelestis et notionis loco injunctae trahenda esse."

Zeller (Presocratics I, p. 422 n.) substitutes ??? for ??? ??, interpreting: "and that consequently these concepts belong to these regions (opinion to the earth, and the proper time to the sun)".

Ross (i 185): "The proof is not very well stated; ????????? … ??????? is really irrelevant and the point comes in ??? … ????????."

(3) Christ, Zeller and Ross agree that the logical connection designated by ??? does not exist. This, again, is due to the preconceived idea that only one concept can be placed in one celestial region. The key to understanding the argument is the "already" (???): "each of these (concepts) is a number"; now "it happens" (?????????) that, in the celestial regions, there is to be found something "already" derived from number, namely magnitudes (??????); all the more, then, numbers must be placed there. Now, if the magnitudes belong to certain regions because they have certain "attributes" (????), the concepts, which have the same attributes, must belong to the same regions.

990b6-8. For to each thing there answers an entity which has the same name and exists apart from the substances, and so also in the case of all other groups there is a one over many. (E)

(1) For in every particular case there is something of the same name as well apart from the substances as of the other things which have a 'one over many' (for this technical term cf. 990b12, 991a2, 1040b29, 1079a33). (according to Alexander)

(2) Argyropulus: "est enim per singula quaedam eiusdem nominis forma praeterque substantias ceterorum quorum est unum in multis."

Bessarion: "nam secundum unumquodque aequivocum quid est et (praeter substantias) ceterorum quoque in multis est unum."

Bonitz (1849, pp. 107-108): "Paullo aliter eadem enuntiatio scripta exhibetur eo loco libri ?, qui eandem de ideis disputationem iisdem verbis repetitam continet 4. 1079a2: ???' ??????? ?? ??? ???????? ???? ??? ???? ??? ??????, ??? ?? ????? ?? ????? ??? ??????, ??? ??? ?????? ??? ??? ???? ???????. […] Hanc libri ? si sequimur scripturam, et ita quidem ut cum Bekkero post ?????? commate distinguamus, facilem ea verba videntur habere explicationem: singularum rerum - vel potius singulorum generum rerum - ponuntur ideae cognomines eaeque seiunctae a substantiis rerum, et in aliis quoque unum est quod de multis praedicetur (et nimirum pro idea singulorum ponatur), pariter in rebus sensibilibus intereuntibus atque in aeternis. Ac possit quispiam animum inducere ad huius loci normam emendare eum, de quo nunc agimus, ut relativum ??, quum praesertim in codicibus prope omnibus desit, omittendum censeat. Sed diligentius attendentem non potest fugere, quid maneat in illa interpretatione difficultatis. Etenim ??? ?? ????? oppositum est verbis ???' ???????: ex hac oppositione quum debeat necessario explicari, quae dicat Aristoteles ?? ????, tamen nihil prorsus inde potest repeti; namque ???' ??????? a quaslibet potest res referri, ut non relinquantur quae praeter eas dicantur ?? ????, nec quod his aliis rebus tribuitur ?? ????? ??? ?????? quidquam confert ad eas distinguendas a superioribus. Quare ne prorsus inane sit hoc vocabulum, conjungendum erit cum verbis superioribus ??? ???? ??? ?????? 'aliorum quae sunt praeter substantiam', h. e. qualitatum, affectionum, accidentium. Eam autem si probaverimus verborum constructionem, particula ?? ante ????? quo possit referri equidem non possum divinare; propterea quamquam et codicum praeter Ab omnium et Alexandri certa auctoritate firmata est, tamen unum illum librum Ab secutus omittendam eam suspicor."

Ross (i 191): "?? however, is very strongly attested, and the objection to it is removed if we interpret ??? ????? in the light of the whole phrase ???' ??????? ??? ???????? ?? ???? ??? ???? ??? ??????, and not of ???' ??????? merely."

Bonitz (1849, p. 108): "Jam vero relativum ?? post ????? omittunt illud quidem in libro ? omnes, in libro ? prope omnes libri manuscripti, attamen Alexandri auctoritate satis est firmatum, quem vel ? p. 57, 33 [??? ?? ????? ? ????? ?? ??? ??????] vel ?? p. 58, 8 [??? ?? ????? ?? ????? ?? ??? ??????] in textu legisse liquido apparet (etenim quod legitur p. 70, 18 [??? ????? ??? ???? ??? ??? ?????? ??? ?? ????? ????? ?? ??? ?????? ??? ??? ?????? ??? ??? ???? ???????] corruptelae suspectum est). utrum praetuleris nominativum an genitivum, ad sententiam non multum facit; nominativo enim significatur, earum unitatem, i. e. generum, poni ideas, quae multitudinem rerum singularum complectantur; genitivo autem, earum rerum poni ideas, quarum multitudo sub eiusdem generis cadat unitatem; hoc autem, quum nimirum omnium rerum, quae in eodem sunt genere, una sit idea, ad idem redit atque illud. Genitivum autem scriptum fuisse ab Aristotele jam propterea vero est similius, quod ita in iteratis iisdem literis facilior apparet corruptelae occasio."

Ross (i 191): "The question remains whether ?? should be read. The balance of evidence is against it, and the construction without it is at any rate not more difficult than that which we get by reading it.

The whole sentence, with ?? and without ??, will mean: 'for to each thing there answers an entity having the same name as it and existing apart from the substances, and in the case of non-substantial things there is a one-over-many.'"

Jaeger: "oratio turbata est. ?? magnam habet auctoritatem sed ??? ei correspondens abest, quod latere puto in ??? ???? ??? ??????, quae verba transposui post ?????? ubi melius quadrant. in margine olim extitisse videntur, postea falso loco in textum recepta sunt. cf. easdem res conjunctas bis sed per ?? ????? … ???? ??? 990b23."

(3) Ross's interpretation (based on the reading of E) has two essential flaws: firstly, ???????? and ???? ??? ?????? as attributes of ?? is a strange arrangement, secondly, it makes Aristotle give different reasons (of being ????????) for the ?????? and the ????, as if the ?????? had no ?? ??? ?????? and the ???? no ????????.

Therefore, Alexander's reading (???' ??????? ??? ???????? ?? ????? ??? ???? ??? ?????? ??? ?? ????? ?? ????? ?? ??? ??????, v. 77, 11-12. 17-19. 27-28) must be the correct one. The subject of the main clause is ???????? ??, with the two predicates ??? ???? ??? ?????? and ??? ?? ?????. The second half of the main clause (???????? ?? ????? … ??? … ?????) cor responds in structure to the subordinate clause ?? ????? ?? ??? ??????.

Greek usage (represented, for instance, by Herodotus, Historiae i 40, 7: ????? ?? ??????????? ?????? ??? ?? ????? ???????? ??? ??? ?? ??????? ?????), however, requires to transpose, with Jaeger, ??? ???? ??? ?????? to after ??????.

990b34. Therefore the Forms will be substance.

(2) Alexander (91. 11-13): ?? ?? ???? ????? ????? ?? ???? ????? ???? ??? ???? ?? ????? ?? ????, ?????· ? ???? ????? ???? ????? ?? ????· ????? ??? ??????.

Asclepius (82. 18): ??? ?????? ??? ????? ??????? ????? ???? ?? ????????? ??????.

Fonseca: "Quare cum ea, quae non sunt substantiae, quatenus accidentia sunt, non possint participari nisi accidentaliter, participatio autem idearum debeat esse essentialis (hoc enim pacto intelligenda sunt hoc loco verba «per accidens» et «per se») efficitur, ut omnes ideae sint substantiae; quod Aristoteles singulari numero Substantiae significat."

Schwegler (i 86): "The transmitted text ???' ????? ????? ?? ???? is in flat contradiction with the context. The demonstrandum was not that the Ideas are ?????? - that was self-evident -, but that there are Ideas only of that which is ?????."

Bonitz (1849, p. 114): "[…] conclusionem apparet non esse posse ???' ????? ????? ?? ???? b34, sed vel ???' ????? ?????? ?? ???? vel certe ???' ????? ?????? ?? ????." The latter conjecture is anticipated by Pierron/Zévort (1840): "Donc il n'y a d'idées que de l'essence".

Christ (1853, p. 27): "Bonitzius ?? in ??? et ????? in ?????? vel ?????? mutanda esse censet dubia Alexandri auctoritate nixus. At, ni fallor, virum doctissimum nexus harum sententiarum latuit. Cum Aristoteles praecedentibus verbis demonstrasset, non accidens quoddam sed ipsam substantiam ab aliis rebus participari posse, Platonicis autem ideas a rebus sensibilibus participari placuisset, hinc nihil concludi potuit, nisi ideas, ut quae participentur, substantias esse (????? ?? ????). Sed inde nondum efficitur, ut solarum substantiarum ideae poni debeant, quod probandum Aristoteles sibi proposuerat. Itaque addidit: ????? ?? - ?????: si vero ideae sunt substantiae, nec diversa est substantiae notio hisce in rebus sensibilibus et in illo ideali mundo, per se patet res quoque sensibiles, quae quidem ideas participent, substantias esse."

Ross (i 197) contra Alexander, Schwegler und Bonitz: "[…] but (1) if Aristotle were assuming that the Ideas are substances, ????? ??????? ?????? ???????? ????? would in itself prove that there are Ideas only of substances, and the rest of the argument would be otiose. (2) Alexander probably read ????? in l. 34 (see Al. 91. 11, 12), though he ignores it as long as possible and interprets it loosely when he comes to it; and we cannot safely infer from 91. 2 that he read ????? ???. Since Aristotle has already in l. 29 said ??? ?????? ????????? ????? ????? ?????, it is hard to see how ?????? or ??????, if it had been the original reading in l. 34, could have been corrupted into ?????."

(3) Fonseca's and Christ's understanding is perfectly correct. In the next sentence with ?? a further premiss is brought up, from which follows that there are ideas only of ??????.

990b34-991a1. but the same terms indicate substance in this and in the ideal world.

(2) Alexander (91. 13-17): ?? ??? ?? ?? ? ???’ ???? ??????? ?? ???????? ????? ?????, ?????? ??? ?????? ??? ??????? ????? ????? ????? ??????· ?? ??? ?? ???? ?? ??????? ?????? ?????, ??? ???? ????? ?????????? ?? ??? ?????? ????? ?? ?? ???? ??. From Alexander's explanation follows that he has read ?????, not ????? as the manuscripts.

Asclepius (82. 20-21): ?? ??? ???? ?????? ?????? ???????? ??? ??? ??? ?????, ???? ? ???????? ??????? ????? ?????, ?? ?????? ????? ??????? ?????.

(3) The reading ??? instead of ?? is the consequence of changing ????? in ?????? (see previous note).

991a3-5. for why should '2' be one and the same in the perishable 2's or in those which are many but eternal?

(2) Bywater (1903, pp. 246-247): "As far as I can discover, ?? ???? ????? (the reading of Ab) has been passed without question by all the editors, though the ????? here is wanting in some of the mss. (notably in that known as E), and also in the repetition of this statement in Metaph. ?. 4, 1079a35. ?? ???? ????? has been variously rendered by the interpreters. Bessarion, connecting ?? ???? ????? with what follows, translates it by 'dualitatem esse unum et idem'—just as though ?? ????? ????? were the reading in the Greek text. In more recent times it has been usual to suppose that ?? ???? ????? has a more technical sense, and that it is to [247] be taken in fact as equivalent to ?? ????? ?????. Pierron and Zévort render it by 'le caractère constitutif de la dyade'—with a note to explain that it means 'ce qui fait que la dyade est une dyade, son essence.' Schwegler represents it by 'die Zweiheit'; Bonitz in his version (comp. his commentary, p. 115) by 'das Wesen Zweiheit zu sein'; and the anonymous Cambridge translator by 'the Reality or Essence of the Dyad.' No one of these interpreters, however, has told us on what principle of Aristotelian or other grammar the nominative ???? is to be explained in a context like that which we have before us. If one may ignore the ????? for the moment, the natural meaning of ?? ???? would be 'the word ????'; and as a matter of fact this is the rendering of Argyropulus, who has 'dualitatis praedicatio' in his version of this passage. Alexander also must have taken much the same view, to judge from the language he uses in his expansion of the Aristotelian statement: ?? ?? ?????? ?? ??? ?????? ? ???? ???????????? (p. 93, 22 ed. Berol.).

????????????? ???? ?????? ???? ?????? ????? ?????? ??? ????? (93, 25).

?????? ?? ???? ??????????????? (96, 2).

Ancient authority, therefore, as well as considerations of language, is against the now dominant view of the formula in this passage. ?? ????, both here and in Metaph. ?. 4, must mean 'the word ????.' What are we to do, then, with the ????? that follows it? As it does not look like an emblema - for no reason can be seen for the insertion of the word - I venture to suggest that it is a corruption, possibly a very early corruption, of ????????, and that the clause should be read thus : ?? ???? ???????? ?? ??? ?????? - 'the word ???? means one and the same thing,' in these two applications of the term. The alternative hypothesis, that the term does not 'mean one and the same thing,' so that the objects to which it is applied must be held to be mere ???????, is considered in the context in the next sentence."

Ross (i 198): "The common reading is ?? ???? ?????, but this is an impossible form, and we must either omit ????? with E? Al. and ?. 1079a36 or read ?? ???? ???????? with Bywater (Journal of Philology XXVIII 246)."

Ross refers to 1040b33, 1079a36.

991a5. and not the same in the '2 itself' as in the particular 2?

(2) Alexander (93. 17-18): ????? ??????????????? ??? ??????? ?? ?????? ??? ?? ????? ??? ??? ???? ?????.

93. 26- 94. 2: ????? ??????? ??? ??? ??? ????? ????? ??? ?????????? ??? ??? ????? ?????? ??? ??’ ??????? ?? ????? ??????? ?????? ?? ???? ???????????????.

Bonitz (1849, p. 115): "Non magis in dyadibus sensibilibus et in mathematicis [cf. 987b16], ipsa dyadis notio et substantia eadem est, quam in dyade ideali, ??? ?' ????? a5, et singulis quibusque dyadibus."

991a23-25. And anything can either be, or become, like another without being copied from it.

(2) Richards (p. 249): "?????? has nothing to refer to, until we read ??????."

(3) Even better seems to be adding ?????? behind ??????, cf. Alexander's paraphrase (102. 6-7: ????????? ??? ????? ???? ???? ???????? ??? ??????? ?????????? ???? ??? ???? ?????? ?????????) and Plato, Protagoras, 331 D (??? ??? ?????? ?????? ??? ?? ?? ??????????).

991b18. his Idea also will be a number of certain other underlying things.

(1) My proposal: he (Callias) will be it (numeral proportion) even if certain other things (other than fire, earth, water and air) are underlying (as substrate), and the Idea will be nevertheless number.

(2) Argyropulus: "dico autem hoc pacto, si Callias sit ratio in numeris ignis et terrae et aeris atque aquae: et aliorum subjectorum quorumdam <erit>."

Bessarion: "dico autem ut si Callias proportio est in numeris ignis/terrae/ aquae et aeris: et ipse homo aliquorum aliorum subjectorum erit."

Bonitz (1842, pp. 28-29): "Aristoteles ita ratiocinari apparet: siquidem res sensibiles, quatenus numerorum ratione definitae sunt, subjectam quandam habent materiam, quae ex illa ratione distributa conjuncta determinata sit, inde consequitur, ideas etiam, quarum ad exemplum res sensibiles formatas esse volunt, non absolute et per se numeros esse, sed referri ad aliquid, cujus rationem numero definiant, ????? ? ???????????? ????? ?? ???????? ?????. Sed hic ratiocinandi nexus prorsus interrumpitur, quum ????? ????? ??????????? ????? commate dirimatur a ??? ? ???? ???????. Ex hac enim distinctione subjectum ad ????? repetendum est e superioribus ? ???????, atque plane idem in apodosi philosophus concludit, quod in protasi posuit: si homo singularis est proportio numeris finita ignis terrae aquae aëris, consequitur ut sit proportio subjectae cujusdam materiae. Immo superioribus verbis ??????? ??? ??? ????? ?? ??????? satis aperte significavit, se a rebus sensibilibus transire velle ad ideas. Itaque commate deleto scribas ????? ????? ??????????? ????? ??? ? ???? ??????? i. e. inde efficitur ut etiam idea numerus sit non absolute [cf. Alexander, 109. 20-21: ??? ??????? ????? ? ????· ???? ??? ???? ?????? ??????? ?? ??? ????? ?? ????????], sed numerus relatus ad aliud quid ei subjectum."

Jaeger (1917, p. 510) omits ???, interpreting: "the Idea, the copy of which is Callias, also ought to be not simply a number, but a number or an arithmetical proportion respectively of some intelligible ??????????".

(3) An alternative not yet considered would be to take ????? ????? ??????????? as an absolute genitive. The advantages are, firstly, that Callias can remain subject, secondly, that both ??? can be made use of, whereas Ross omits the second tacitly, Jaeger the first expressly.

991b20-21. nor will it be a kind of number merely because it is a numerical ratio.

(2) Alexander (109. 30- 110. 2): ?? ?? ???? ????? ??? ??? ????? ??????? ???? ?? ??? ?? ???? ????? ??? ????? ? ???? ???????, ???? ?? ?? ?? ???? ??????? ?? ??? ???????.

Fonseca: "Ita ergo fit, ut nulla idea sit numerus. Quam conclusionem significant verba illa «Ac propter haec non erit numerus quidam», nempe idealis, quasi ipsa idea sit numerus."

Schwegler (i 93): "Write ???' ????? ??? ??? ????? ???? ???????."

Zeller (1889, p. 262): "It seems to me that the words ???' ????? ??? ??? ????? ??????? are a paraphrase of the preceding ??? ??? ???????."

Referring to Alexander (109. 30 sq.), Jaeger (1917, p. 510) reads ???' ????? ??? <????> ??? ????? ???????, "and therefore no Idea can be number". "Falling out by homoioteleuton is not hard to believe."

Annas (1976, 66\*): "The argument is not (as Ross takes it) that ratios imply a substrate, implausible for Forms; rather the point is that if Forms are conceived of as numerical ratios of some kind this has no weight as showing them to be numbers, since ratios are not numbers. The argument is often misread because of Jaeger's unsupported insertion of 'Form' into the text at line 20, changing the argument from 'a ratio will not be a number' to 'a Form will not be a number'."

(3) To my opinion, Zeller and Annas are right. That no idea is number cannot be concluded from the fact that a certain idea (????????????) is no number. ??? ????? must rather refer to ????? ????? ?? ???????? ?????. ??? … ??????? corresponds to ??????? ??? in l. 19.

991b24-26. (neither the units in one number being themselves like one another nor those in other numbers being all like to all). (in accordance with Fonseca and Bywater)

(2) Alexander (112. 6-7): ???? ?? ????? ???? ?? ????? (?????? ??? ????????? ?? ???? ?? ?????).

Fonseca translates: "neque ipsae inter sese" and interprets: "Hoc est, nec illae, quae ad eundem numerum pertinent." Obviously, he reads ????? instead of ?? ?????.

Bywater (1913, p. 110): "Though Alexander seems to recognize ?? ?????, I think the true reading here would be [??] ?????, without the comma after ???? ?? ?????????."

991b29-30. and how do these exist or from what principles do they proceed?

(2) Alexander (113. 9-13): ?????, ????, ????? ???? ??? ???????????, ? ?? ????? ?????? ????? ?????, ?? ?? ?? ??? ????? ?? ?? ??? ?? ????? ??? ? ????????? ???????, ????? ?????? ????? ????????; ??? ?? ??? ??? ?????? ?????? ?? ?????????? ????? ??? ?? ???????? ??? ??? ?????, ????? ???? ?????? ??? ?? ????? ?????;

The transmitted text seems to confirm the reading ?????, but as is shown by the immediate continuation, Alexander has read ? ???; because ????? ???? ??? ??????????? can only be meant as explanation of ?. In the two sentences which follow Alexander first explains the question ?? ?????, then the question ???. So we have an example of how the librarians corrected the citationes on the basis of a manuscript.

Bonitz (1849, p. 121): "Quod in textu b29 non ????? cum Bekkero dedi, sed ? ???, nec librorum fide destitutum est et per sententiae rationem necessarium videbitur; quid est enim, quod res mathematicas simpliciter, ?????, medias Plato posuisse dicatur? Et a particula ?, ? ?? ????? ???., quum ordiri soleat alterum quaestionis bipartitae membrum, hoc quidem loco vix dixeris, quale sit illud prius membrum, quod huic alteri apte praeponendum putes."

Bonitz (1842, p. 66): "Scribendum vero ? ?? ????? ????? ?????; nam idem dicit ac si scripsisset ??? ??????? ?????, ?? ?? ???? ???????? ???????. Atque ita proximis verbis rem amplius persequitur ? ??? ?? ?? ?????? ??? ????? ?' ????? ??? ?????; Alexander non dubito quin in textu Aristotelis legerit ?? ????? ????? quod scribit ? ?? ????? ?????? (ex eorum sententia) ????? ?????, ?? ?? ?? ??? ????? ?? ?? ??? ?? ????? ??? ? ????????? ???????."

(3) Bonitz's interpretation is confirmed by N 3, 1090b34.

992a29-30. Nor have the Forms any connexion with what we see to be the cause in the case of the arts.

(1) My proposal: Nor have the Forms any connexion with what we see to be the cause for things that come into being (reading ???? ??????????? instead of ???? ??????????).

(2) Alexander (121. 14-16): ????? ??? ??????? ??? ???? ?? ?? ?? ????? ??? ?? ????? ?????? ???? ????? ?? ????? ???’ ??????, ???? ????? ?? ???? ???? ???? ???? ??? ????????? ??? ????? ??????????? ???? ????????? ?????.

Fonseca: "Ideo autem vocat causam finalem id, quod scientiarum causa est, et propter quod omnis mens, et omnis natura agit; quia potissima causa cunctarum actionum, sive artis, sive intellectus sive arte operantis, sive etiam naturae, est causa finalis, ut ipse docet partim 2. Phys. cap. 8. partim 1. Eth. cap. 1."

Bonitz (1849, p. 123): "Sed finalem causam cur his potissimum verbis significet: ???? ???? ?????????? ?????? ?? ?????? a29, equidem non intelligo, siquidem scientiae natura ac virtus in formali potius quam in finali causa cognoscenda ponitur, cf. Z 6. 1031b6, 20. Nec multum proficimus si pro verbis ???? ???? ?????????? receperimus e codice Ab ? ???? ??? ?????????."

Susemihl (1887, p. 9): "Aristotle wrote ???? ???? ??? <?????> ?????????, i. e. the others except mathematics, v. 996a29 ff. Thus only becomes also 32 sq. ???? ?????? ?? ???????? ???? ??? ? ????????? understandable."

Zeller (1889, p. 262) conjectures ???? ??? ????????? ?????????, "as IX, 2. 1046b3".

Rolfes (1920): "Possibly ???? ????? is to be read."

Ross (i 208): "Difficulty has been felt about this, since science is concerned even more essentially with the formal than with the final cause (?. 1031b6, 20). But the clause is not meant to define the nature of the cause in question (that comes in the second clause), but only to emphasize its importance. It says no more than the opening words of the Ethics, ???? ????? ??? ???? ??????? … ?????? ????? ???????? ?????, and the proposed alterations of the text are unnecessary. If any were to be made, that of Rolfes […] would seem the best."

(3) Alexander's paraphrase deviates considerably from the transmitted text (Bonitz: "Alexander paulo longius a verbis philosophi recedit"). By ?? ???? ???? ???’ ????????? ??????????? neither the reading of E (???? ?????????? … ??????) nor the one of Ab (???? ??? ????????? … ??????) is rendered. The key to this problem is comparison with a passage in De fato (195, 5-6) obviously modeled on our present one: ?????? ??? ??? ?????? <??> ???? ??? ???? ??????? ??? ???? ???????? ?????????? ?? ??????. Is it chance that here again ???? ??????????? occurs, as in the paraphrase? If we insert this instead of ???? ??????????, the paraphrase fits the text, and the passage in De fato turns out to be a reminiscence even more clearly.

992b7. if the great and the small are to be movement.

(1) if there shall be motion here below (Jaeger).

(2) Alexander (123. 7) explains ????? by ? ??????? ??? ? ????????.

Asclepius (105. 23-26): ?? ??? ??? ?? ??????? ????????? ?? ????, ??????? ??? ??? ?? ????? ????????????· ???’ ????????? ??? ??? ????? ????????? ????? ?? ???????. ??? ?? ????? ????? ??? ??????????· ????????? ??? ?????????? ??? ?????.

The meaning of the phrase ?? ??????? ????????? becomes clear from three other passages:

47. 19-20: ?? ??? ??????? ??? ?? ??????? ????????? ??? ?????? ????.

64. 8-11: ?? ??? ?????????? ??????? ?????????· ??? ??? ?? ??????? ????????? ?? ?????? ????????, ??? ????? ??? ??? ????????? ??? ????? ????? ???????? ?????;

150. 8-9: ?? ?? ???????? ?? ??????? ?????????.

As we see, ?? ??????? ????????? means nothing but ?????????. Then, however, the conclusion ?? ??? ??? ?? ??????? ????????? ?? ????, ??????? ??? ??? ?? ????? ???????????? is nonsense. ?? ???? therefore is to be substituted by ?? ????; then the following sentence ???’ ????????? ??? ??? ????? ????????? ????? ?? ??????? fits as an argument. This was seen already by Heidel (1908, p. 172): it is "easily clear that the absurd ???? must be changed. Read for instance ?? ??? ??? ?? ??????? ????????? ????????, which at least gives the right sense".

Fonseca: "hoc est, si magnum et parvum ponantur a Platone materiale principium motus."

Schwegler (i 98), too, maintains that "????? can refer only to ???? ??? ??????".

Bonitz (1849, p. 124) remarks on ?????: "??????? ??? ???????? vel ?? ???? ??? ??????."

Jaeger (1911, p. 23): "ut ideae, ita ?? ????????; terrena aeternorum modum et rationem imitantur. scribendum erit igitur procul dubio ?? ??? ????? ??????? ???????, ????? ??? ????????? ?? ????, h. e. if there shall be motion here below, the Ideas obviously would have to move."

(3) It is probable, indeed, that this was what Asclepius (or his teacher Ammonius respectively) read. As a consequence, ????????? ?? ???? is now to be supplied in thought to ?? ?? ?? (Asclepius, 105, 26-27: ?? ?? ?? ????????? ?? ?????, ????? ??????? ??????? ? ???????;), instead of ????? ????? ???????. Aristotle, however, by means of the two ??-clauses, formulates an alternative; by the second one must be denied what was assumed in the first one, not the difficulty arising for the Platonists from this assumption.

992b18-19. In general, if we search for the elements of existing things without distinguishing the many senses in which things are said to exist, we cannot find them.

(1) My proposal: In general, searching for the elements of existing things, without distinguishing the many senses in which things are said to exist, is absurd; and it is impossible to find them.

(2) Alexander (128. 12-22): ? ????? ????????. ?? ?? ???? ?????? ?????, ?????? ???????? ?????? ????? ????? ??????· ??? ?? ????? ??? ????? ????? ??????, ???? ??? ???????? ????? ?????? ?????? ?????. ??? ?? ??? ????? ??? ????? ????? ?????? ?? ??? ?? ?????, ????? ????????· ??? ???????? ????????? < ??? ????? ????? ?????? ??? ?? ????? > [supplied from Asclepius, 108. 32-33] ?? ?? ???? ???????? ???????· ??? ????? ??? ??? ????? ????? ?? ?????. ??? ?? ?? ?? ??? ???????? ?????????, ?? ??????? ???????. ???????? ?? ?????? ??? ??????? ????? ??? ????? ?? ???????? ?????????? ???? ??? ?? ??????????? ????????? ??? ?????. ????? ?? ??? ?????????? ?? ??? ???????? ??? ????? ????? ??? ????? ?????? ??? ?? ?? ?????, ????? ?? ????? ? ?? ??? ??? ?? ?????· ???????? ??? ?? ??????????? ?????, ? ?? ???????? ???? ??? ? ?????.

Nearly identical Asclepius (108. 29 - 109. 3).

Fonseca translates: "Denique, si quis rerum elementa quaerat, nec eas, cum multipliciter dicantur, distinguat, fieri non potest, ut inveniat."

Ross (i 209) asserts that "the two infinitives are not out of keeping with Aristotle's style".

Richards (1918, 249): "The two infinitives cannot stand together. Should we read ?? ??? ????? ????????? ????????? ????????? comes in the following line, ?? ??? ????? ??????? ?? ???????? ?????? ? ??????? ????? ??? ?????? three lines below, and our ?? ?????? may be due by mistake to the other one. Possibly ?????? should be simply omitted and ?? changed to ??."

Richards' conjecture is anticipated by Hengstenberg (1824: "Ueberhaupt ist es unmöglich die Elemente der Dinge zu finden ohne dieselben einzutheilen, da sie von vielfacher Bedeutung sind") and Bonitz (1843: "Ueberhaupt ist es unmöglich die Elemente des Seienden zu finden, wenn man nicht die verschiedenen Bedeutungen, die das Seiende hat, unterscheidet").

(3) The fact that Alexander generally leaves ????? without article is in disfavor of changing ?? to ??.

The key question is: To what does ?????? ??? ?????? refer? To the indirect interrogative clause which follows, or to the preceding ?? ??????????

Both interpretations lead to a dilemma. If we follow the first one, we must (with Alexander) replace ???????? by ????? in l. 18, for the sense must be then: particularly if by ????? the 'elements' of the Platonists are meant. According to the second one (which is to be preferred grammatically), the sentence appears to be a mere repetition of the previous one - if we connect ?????? (as ??????) with ????????.

This is the point where textual criticism is called for; because ?????? would much better go with ??????? (1006a13) or something like this. The fitting word is hinted by Alexander in his paraphrase of ll. 19-20: ????? ?? ??? ?????????? ?? ??? ???????? ??? ????? ????? ??? ????? ??????. To his opinion, searching for the principles of being is 'even more absurd', if done in Platonic fashion; this indicates that he has read ?????? in the previous sentence. Therefore I propose to write in l. 19: <??????? ??? ?????> ????????. The assumption that a copyist's eye jumped from ?????? to ???????? is not difficult.

992b31. whether the learning be by demonstration or by definitions.

(2) Alexander (131. 18-20): ??? ???? ?? ? ??? ??????????? ?????? ??? ????????????????· ??? ??? ??? ????????? ?? ???????????? ?? ??? ??????? ???. ??? ? ??’ ??????? ?? ?? ???????????????? ????????.

Bonitz (1842, pp. 113-114): "[…] non id agit philosophus, ut quot sint cognoscendi genera discernat et disjungat, sed ut, quotquot sint, conjungat et omnia cognitionem antecedentem requirere demonstret; quare non disjunctivis particulis ? - ?, sed conjunctivis utendum erat, quibus utitur Anal. post. I, 1., ubi de eadem re eundem in modum disserit. Deinde ipsum dilemma quod proposuit ne verum quidem est ac plenum; neque enim demonstratio et definitio unica sunt cognoscendi genera, sed accedit tertium genus inductionis. His de causis ita emendandum locum arbitror ut particula ??? ante ? ??' ??????? interponatur, quo facto etiam cum proximis verbis haec multo aptius cohaerebunt et concinent, quam e vulgata textus scriptura: ???? ??????? ??? ????????????????, ??? ? ??' ?????????? ??? ? ??' ???????? ??? ??? ?? ?? ? ??????? ?????????? ??? ????? ???????? ?????? ?? ??? ? ??' ????????."

Ross (i 210): "Bonitz's emendation […] is shown to be right by ??? ? in l. 33 and is confirmed by Al. 130. 18, 20."

993a5-7. some say za is made out of s and d and a, while others say it is a distinct sound and none of those that are familiar.

(2) Bonitz (1842, p. 85): "Alexander unice habuit ?? pro ???, eamque lectionem aptissime explicat ?? ????????????? ???? ??? ?? ???????? ??????? ????? ??? ??? ??? ? ??? ? ??????? ? ??? ??? ? ??? ? ??? ?, ???? ?? ??? ???? ??? ????? ???????????? ?? ???. ???????? ?? ??? ????? ??? ??? ????? ??????? ????? ?????????, ??? ??? ???????? ??? ????????? ????? ????????, ??? ?? ??? ? ??? ??? ?? ???."

993a8-10. if the elements of which all things consist, as complex sounds consist of the elements proper to sound, are the same. (reading, with Alexander and Bessarion, ????? instead of ?????)

(2) Alexander, 133. 22-23: ??? ????? ???? ?? ?? ??? ????? ??????? ????? ????? ??? ???????? ?????.

134. 4-7: ?? ??? ?? ???????? ????? ?????, ?? ?? ???? ????????, ?? ??? ????? ?????????? ?????????, ???? ??? ?? ???? ????? ?? ??? ????? ????????? ????? ???????????, ?? ?? ???? ?????? ????? ???? ????????.

Bessarion: "siquidem eadem cunctorum elementa sunt."

993a16. since it is young and in its beginnings. (omitting, with Diels, ??? ?? ??????)

(1) My proposal: since it is young <and awkward> in its beginnings.

(2) According to Diels (1905, p. 303 n.) the words ??? ?? ?????? "are to be deleted, being an explanation of ??? ???' ?????".

Jaeger: "?? ??? recentiores quidam recte, post quae alterum adjectivum excidisse videtur."

(3) A suitable supplement would be ??? ?? ??? <?????> ???' ????? ????, cf. Euripides fr. 510 Nauck: ?????, ???? ??? ?????? ???? ???' ????. In every case, it is impossible to take ???' ????? as equivalent to an adjective (??????).

993a19-20. But it is similarly necessary that flesh and each of the other tissues should be the ratio of its elements.

(1) But it is similarly necessary that flesh and each of the other tissues should exist by virtue of the ratio in it (according to Alexander).

(2) Alexander (135. 18-24): ?? ?? ???? ?????? ???? ??? ?????, ???????? ???? ?? ????? ??? ?? ?? ?? ????? (????? ??? ????? ? ?????), ?? ?????? ????? ???’ ?????, ????? ?? ??? ?? ????? ??? ?? ????? ??? ?????? ??? ?????, ???? ???? ????, ???? ??? ????? ??? ?? ????? ?? ?????· ? ??? ??? ?????? ?? ????? ??? ? ????? ?????? ??? ??????? ????? ? ?????, ? ??’ ???????. ??? ??? ??? ????? ??? ??? ?? ????? ? ??????? ?? ???? ????, ??? ????? ????? ?? ??? ?? ???? ?? ?? ?? ?????? ?? ?? ???? ??.

Bessarion: "ac vero similiter necesse est etiam carnis ceterorumque singulorum esse rationem."

Bonitz (1849, p. 126): "… accusativus ??????? omnem enuntiationis conformationem perturbat. Ac facili quidem conjectura, eaque Bessarionis etiam auctoritate confirmata, pro ??????? posuerunt ??????? Brandisius et Bekkerus, sed dubito num in ea emendatione acquiesci possit. Nam ??? ????? ????? ?????? ??? ??????? ??? ????? non videtur per se significare posse, notionem esse quae constituat et carnis et omnium rerum naturam, nisi praedicatum aliquod additum sit, veluti ??????, ?????. Propterea suspicor praeferendam esse vel librorum TEb lectionem ????? vel libri Ab ??????, ut scribatur: ??? ????? ??? ??? ????? ??????? ????? ??? ?????. Similiter enim de eadem re scribit Aristoteles de part. an. I 1. 642a18: ?????????? … ??? ??? ?????? ??? ??? ????? ??????????? ????? ??? ????? ?????, ???? ?????? ????????? ?? ?????? ???? ??? ?? ?? ??? ????????? ????? ???? ???? ??? ? ???? ???? ?????, ???? ????? ??? ?????? ?????."

Ross (i 213): "?????? is preferable to ?????, as accounting better for the corruption. Once ?????? had been corrupted to ??????, ??????? naturally followed. The plural ?????? is common in Aristotle."

Jaeger writes <???> ??? ?????, commenting: "??? ex Alexandri paraphrasi supplevit Blass. But by ??? ??? ????? Alexander paraphrases ??? ??????."

(3) Alexander seems to have read ?? ???? (cf. l. 17), to which his ???? ??? ????? is equivalent.

Book II

993b1. while, on the other hand, we do not collectively fail.

(1) … we do not totally fail. (according to Brandis)

(2) Alexander (139. 10-13): ??? ?? ?? ?????? ????? ??????? ????? ???????? ?? ?? ????? ???? ???? ????? [scilicet ??? ????????] ???????? ?????????????, ???? ??? ???????? ??????? ?????? ????? ?? ???? ?????.

139. 19-22: ???? ?????? ????????????. ????? ??????? ?? ???? ?? ???? ???? ??? ?????? ???????????? ????? ?????. ??? ?? ????? ?????, ????? ???????? ????????? ???’ ??????? ?????? ?? ???? ??? ??????·????? ??? ??????? ?? ?????? ????????????.

Bonitz (1842, p. 60): "Non debebat Bekkerus omittere evidentem Brandisii emendationem, ?????? pro ?????? conjicientis, quod quum per ipsum sententiae nexum flagitatur, tum antiquitus fuisse in textu e commentario Alexandri apparet, ?? ?? ????? ???? ???? ????? ???????? ?????????????. ???? ???? ??? ?????? ???????????? ?????."

Bonitz (1849, pp. 127-128): "Quod in libris et scriptis et editis exhibetur ???? ?????? ????????????, alienum videtur esse a sententiae ratione; quod enim non omnes aberraverint a veritate, inde non potest concludi facilem eius esse cognitionem. Propterea non dubitavi ?????? pro ?????? ex conjectura Brandisii in textu exhibere, quum praesertim Alexander, licet in lemmate habeat ??????, in explicatione tamen utatur vocabulis ?????, ?????????? ???????????? […], ut eum ?????? in textu habuisse non sine specie veri inde colligas. Quod enim L. Spengel objicit (Münchner Gelehrte Anzeigen 1843. N. 243), ex eadem Alexandri interpretatione […] etiam vulgatam lectionem ?????? confirmari posse, dubito num recte judicaverit; illud enim ??????, quod est apud Alexandrum, trahendum potius videtur ad explicanda verba proxima ???' ??????? ?????? ?? ???. Ceterum Erasmus in explicando proverbio ubi haec verba Aristotelis affert, scribit ??????."

Ross (i 214): "[…] but the sense required for ?????? is not that which it generally has in Aristotle, viz. 'in all circumstances', 'in any and every case'. The opposition required is that between ?????? and ??????, as is shown by the following words, ???' ??? ??? … ?? ?????? ??."

(3) But the "following words" are a new argument, and the primary meaning of ?????? is 'totally'; it could be translated by 'in any and every case' also in our present passage.

In favor of ?????? ???????????? is the fact that Simplicius uses this expression repeatedly in his commentary on Epictetus (17, 4-5; 19, 14. 22). A further argument (not noticed so far) is that with ?????? the syntax shifts from double negation (???? … ??????) to single negation (because ?????? cannot be supplied).

993b6-7. but the fact that we can have a whole truth and not the particular part we aim at shows the difficulty of it.

(1) My proposal: but the fact that we can find a whole truth and not the particular part we aim at shows the difficulty of it. (reading ????? <??????>)

(2) Alexander (140. 19 - 141. 30): ?? ?? ???? ?? ????? ??? ????? ?? ???????? ????? ?? ??????? ?????. ????? ??? ??????? ??? ???????? ??? ??????????? ????? ??????? ???????? ?? ?????? ??? ????????????. ?? ?? ?? ???’ ??? ??? ? ?????? ? ????? ?????????? ????, ?? ???? ???’ ??? ???? ???? ???? ?????? ??? ??????????? ???? ???? ?????? ????? ?????????. ?? ??? ????? ? ?????? ???????????? ???? ???? ?? ??? ?????? ???????????? ???????????? ?? ??? ??? ????? ?????. ????? ?? ?? ??????? ????? ???????????. ???? ?? ?? ? ????? ??????????? ? ?? ?’ ???? ?? ????? ??? ????? ?? ???????? ????? ?? ??????? ?????. ????? ??? ??’ ????? ?? ???????????? ?????? ?? ?????????. ????????? ??? ??? ??? ???? ????? ??? ??????? ????????? ?? ??? ????? ???????, ???? ?? ???????????· ??? ?? ????? ?????? ?? ??? ???? ????? ???? ???????????? ????, ?? ?? ????? ?? ????????. ? ????????? ????? ?????????? ???? ??? ????? ??? ????? ?? ?????????? ????? “?? ?? ???? ?? ???????? ??? ????? ????? ????? ?? ??????? ?????”· ????? ??? ???????? ????? ???? ?????????????. ?????? ?? ??????? ??? ?????? ???????, ?? ????????????, ?? ?????????? ?? ??????? ??? ??????????? ??? ??? ???? ?? ???? ????? ???? ????? ????????? ????? ????????· ?? ????? ?? ????????? ???? ?? ?? ?? ???? ???? ?? ????? ???? ???? ????? ????????· ?? ??? ? ?????? ? ????? ?????????? ???? ???? ?? ???? ????? ?? ???? ????? ????? ????· ?? ??? ??? ?? ????? ?????????, ??????? ?????. ??? ??? ?? ????????? ?? ?? ????? ????????, ?? ?? ???????? ???? ?? ????? ??? ?????, ?? ?? ?????, ?? ?? ????????? ???????? ????? ?? ??????? ?????. ??????? ??? ??? ????? ??????? ??? ?? ?’ ???? ?? ????? ??? ????? ?? ????????, ?? ??? ??????? ??? ??? ???? ??? ????????? ?????? ??????, ????? ?? ????? ????? ?????????????? ????????? ????? ?? ??????? ?????. ??????? ??? ??????? ?? ????? ?? ?????? ???, ??’ ? ?? ?’ ???? ?? ????? ?????? ???, ????? ?? ??????? ?? ????????, ????? ?? ??????? ?????. ??? ????? ?? ?????? ?????????? ????? ???? ????????????? ???? “???’ ??? ??? ? ?????? ? ????? ?????????? ????, ?? ?????? ?? ??? ??????????????? ????????? ?? ???????.” ??????? ???? ????? ?? ????????? ?? ?? ?? ?? ???????? ??? ???? ?? ????? ??? ?????, ???? ????? ?? ????? ????????? ?????.

Fonseca: "[…] significat Aristoteles, communissima principia facile intelligi, quia sunt per se notissima; cetera vero pronuntiata, quae velut partes sub illis continentur, difficile; vel quia non sunt per se nota; vel quia eorum per se nota veritas minus perspicua est."

Bonitz (1849, p. 128) refers to Physica A 1, 184a23 sqq., Ross (i 214) adds Analytica priora, 67a29.

(3) Against the transmitted text two objections arise, the first being stylistic. Compare the following translations:

Bessarion: "totum autem et partem habere non posse".

Hengstenberg (1824): "Daß man wohl ein gewisses ganzes [???? ??], aber nicht den bestimmten Theil besitzen kann".

Bonitz (1843): "dass man aber etwas im Ganzen haben, im Einzelnen aber verfehlen kann".

Slezák (2003): "daß man aber eine Gesamteinsicht haben kann, ohne das Detail (zu verstehen)".

In order to construct the sentence at all, translators must either add ???????? to ????? and ????? to ???????? or, assuming a hyperbaton, draw ????? to ?? ???????? (Bessarion).

Unease is also caused by the expression 'have' in connection with 'whole' and 'part', whereby the translators are compelled to periphrases ("verfehlen", "inne haben", "a whole truth", "Gesamteinsicht", "verstehen").

Secondly, according to the traditional interpretation, a totally new thought would be introduced; but that does not go well with ???? in l. 4. The context demands that ???? corresponds to the door (l. 5) as a whole and ????? to a certain point on the door more difficult to hit. (The door stands for the sphere of that what is not completely wrong, the point on the door for that what is exactly right.) Therefore we need a verb that corresponds to ??????? in l. 5. Such a verb would be ??????. If we understand ????? in the sense of ???????? and insert ?????? behind it, both objections are removed. ????? ?????? is a current phrase in Greek literature, first documented in Aeschylus (Prometheus vinctus, 474-475: ??? ??????? ??? ????? ?????? ??????? ????????? ???????) und Isocrates (In Callimachum, 55, 2-3: ? ??? ?? ?????? ???? ?????????? ?????? ??????? ??? ??????????? ??? ????????;).

993b16-17. The same holds good of those who have expressed views about the truth.

(2) Alexander (144. 11-12): ?? ?? ??’ ??????? ????, ???? ?? ??? ??? ??? ????? ???? ??? ???????? ???????.

Asclepius (118. 13): ????? ??? ??? ????? ??? ???? ??? ???????????? ???? ??? ????????.

Jaeger (1917, p. 498): "Alexander furnishes the correct reading: ??? is to be inserted before ??? ???? ??? ???????? ????????????."

(3) Cf., e. g., 1043a11 and 1061a27-28.

993b22-23. practical men do not study the eternal, but what is relative and in the present.

(1) practical men do not study what is eternal and absolute, but what is relative and in the present. (Bonitz)

(2) Alexander (145. 19-26): ??? ?? ??? ?????? ??? ?????? ??????? ??? ?? ?? ????? ???? ?????????? ??????? ?? ??? ????????· ?????? ??? ?? ????????? ??? ???????. ???????? ?? ?? ????? ??????????? ?? ?? ?????? ???’ ???? ???? ???? ?? ??? ??? ?????????. ?? ??????????? ??? ?? ????? ??? ?? ?? ?????? ??? ???’ ???? ??????, ? ??? ????? ???????? ?????? ????? ?????? ????, ????????? ?? ?????????, ???? ??? ???? ???? ??? ??? ?????? ???? ?????· ???????? ??? ?? ?? ?? ???? ???????? ?????? ??? ?? ?? ??????? ????? ??????.

Asclepius (118. 32-33): ??? ??? ?? ??? ???? ????????, ? ?????? ?? ?? ?????? ???’ ???? ????, ???? ???? ??.

(3) As the oppositions ?????? - ??? and ???' ???? - ???? ?? make sense, why not ?? ?? ?????? <???> ???' ????, ???? <??> ???? ?? ??? ???? This is exactly what Bonitz (1843) translates: "nicht das Ewige und das An-sich, sondern das Relative und Zeitliche". Cf. Syrianus, 110. 13-16: ?????? ?? ????? ????? ?? ???????? ???? ?????, ?? ?? ?????? ???????? ??????????, ???? ?? ?? ??????? ? ?????????· ?? ??? ????????? ?????? ?????, ????? ?? ??????? ????? ?? ??????????????? ?? ???? ?? ????? ??? ???’ ???? ???? ??? ??? ??????? ?????????? ???????????????.

As 'practitioner', for example, a physician is concerned with what is ???? ??????? (1003a35) and what helps 'now'.

The variant reading ?????? (instead of ??????) may be caused by assimilation to 995b33.

993b26-27. so that that which causes derivative truths to be true is most true.

(2) Jaeger writes ??????????? <???> with reference to Ethica Nicomachea A 5, 1097b19-20 (?????? ?? ?? ?????? ??????????? ???) and Protrepticus 57, 12-16 Pistelli: ?? ??? ????? ?? ?????? ??????? ???’ ???????? ?? ?? ??? ? ?????, ???? ??? ???? ?? ???????? ????? ?? ?? ???????, ???? ??? ?????? ??? ???????? ?????? ?????? ????? ?????, ??? ?? ???’ ???? ??? ????? ??????? ??? ?????????. "Aristoteles distinguit ?? ??????? et ?? ?????? et unum ex altero derivat".

(3) What is 'derived' is rather, to which causes of being true the general characterization applies. Besides, the logical connection with the preceding sentence (????) demands a superlative (l. 24 ???????!).

993b28-29. Hence the principles of eternal things must be always most true.

(1) Hence the principles of eternal things must be most true. (according to Bessarion and Christ)

(2) Alexander (148. 22-24): ???????? ??? ?????? ????? ????? ??? ???????????· ?? ??? ?? ?? ??????, ?? ??? ?? ?????? ???. ? ?? ??? ??? ??????? ????? ???????????, ??? ??????????? ?? ???.

Bessarion: "propter quod principia semper existentium necesse est verissima esse."

(3) The word ??? (before ?????), omitted by Bessarion and deleted by Christ, may come from a variant reading ??? to ?????????, cf. for example Analytica posteriora A 2, 71b29-30: ????? ?? ??? ??????????? ??? ????? ??? ???????.

994a11-12. For in the case of intermediates, which have a last term and a term prior to them, the prior must be the cause of the later terms. (Ab)

(1) For in the case of intermediates, outside which there is something extreme and something prior, the prior must be the cause of the later. (E and J)

(2) Alexander (150. 31-33): ?? ??? ???? ???? ????, ?? ????? ?? ?????? ??? ????? ?? ??????? ??? ?????? ?????? ????, ?????? ?????? ?? ?????? ?????? ????? ??? ????? ?? ??? ???’ ???? ?????.

Asclepius (120. 27-28): ??? ??? ?????, ?????, ??????, ?? ????? ??? ??????? ??? ????????.

(3) For the expression ??? ??, cf. 1021b12 and 32. The additional "outside" stresses the difference to the second case (mentioned in ll. 16-18), where there are only intermediates.

Ross' translation narrows the meaning of ????? ("intermediate") down to 'terminus medius in syllogism', but the continuation (ll. 16-18) requires to take it in the broadest sense.

994a22-24. For one thing comes from another in two ways - not in the sense in which 'from' means 'after' (as we say 'from the Isthmian games come the Olympian'), but either (i) as the man comes from the boy, by the boy's changing, or (ii) as air comes from water.

(1) For one thing comes from another in two ways, either (i) as the man comes from the boy, by the boy's changing, or (ii) as air comes from water. (according to Jaeger)

(2) Alexander (154. 7-13): ?????????? ??? ?? ??????????? ??? ???? ????????? ?? ??? ?????? ??? ?? ????? ????????? ????????· ???? ?? ????? ?? ???? ???? ????· ??????? ??? ?? ??????? ??????? ? ????????, ??? ???????? ???? ?????? ??????? ? ???? ??????? ??????· ??? ?? ?? ?????? ?????????? ??? ?????? ??????? ??? ??? ???? ?????????? ?? ????? ???? ?????????, ??? ?? ???????????? ?????????? ?????.

Bonitz (1849, p. 132): "a22 ?? scripsi [Alexandri potissimum secutus auctoritatem], ubi Bekkerus ex aliquot codicibus exhibuit ?, ac deinde a23 ??? ????? ???' cum codicibus prope omnibus omisi. Neque enim id agit, ut omnes iuxta significationes formulae ?? ????? enumeret, sed ut secludat, quae huc non pertinent, ?? ?? ???? ??????? ???? ????, et eas modo recenseat, in quibus haec quaestio et debet versari et re vera deinde versatur."

Luthe (1880, pp. 200-201): "The first meaning of ???? ?? ????? ????????? is ???? ???? ????. Within this falls becoming man from boy. ????????, says Aristotle (de gen. an. A p. 724a20), ???????? ???? ?? ?????. ?????? ??? ??????, ?? ?? ?????? ????? ??? ???????? ??? ?? ?????? ????, ??? ???? ???? ????. But the ???? ???? ???? is equivocal: ???? ?? ??????? ??????? ? ?? ?????? ????. The latter differs from the former by the fact that there is a transition from one to another. [Met. v 24 p. 1023b5-11] Why Aristotle conceives becoming man from boy simply as ???? ???? ????, appears from de gen. an. B p. 734a25: ???? (??? ??? ??????? ??????) ?? ??? ???????? ?? ?' ???????, ??????? ??????? ????? ???????, ??? ???? ??? ?? ????????, ? ?????? ???? ???? ???????? ????; ???? ?' ???? ? ?????? ???????? ????? ?? ????,????? ?' ?????? ??, ???? ???? ???? ????, ????? ???? ?? ???? ???? ???????, ???' ??? ??' ???????. ????? ?? ??????, [201] ??? ??? ??? ?????????? ????? ?? ??????? ?? ??????? ?? ???? ????? ? ????? ??????????, ???? ???? ?? ?? ????? ??? ??? ?????? ?? ?????? ?????, ???? ?? ?? ?????? ?? ??? ??????. Therefore we must write ? instead of ??. Further, to emphasize the antithesis, ?? should be transposed to before ?? ??????."

Jaeger (1917, pp. 500-501): "The riddle is solved, if we substitute the non-interpolated readings from Ab or Alexander respectively: ????? ??? ???????? ???? ?? ????? [? ?? ???? ??????? ???? ???? ???? ?? ??????? ???????] ? ?? ?? ?????? ???? ????????????? ? ?? ?? ?????? ???. Because Alexander (or whoever conjectured ?? ?? instead of the first ? ??) considered the text as sanctioned, and on the other side the open contradiction with ????? had to be removed, he eliminated by conjecture the first of the three members beginning with ? ??. On this steep road, ? went further, changing the second ? ?? to ???' ?? ? and expunging ?? after the third ?. […] the first member [? ?? ???? ??????? ???? ???? ???? ?? ??????? ???????] is a marginal gloss by a reader who had in mind the more numerous kinds of ?? ?????, which are enumerated ? 24."

Walzer (p. 228): ?? instead of ? is supported by the Arabian translators Ustath (= Eustathius) and Ishaq. They must have met with an other example than ???? ?? ??????? ???????, which is reconstructed by Walzer (p. 228) as follows: ???? ?? ??????? ??????.

994a25. By 'as the man comes from the boy' we mean 'as that which has come to be from that which is coming to be, or as that which is finished from that which is being achieved'.

(1) We say that, 'as the man from the boy', what has come to be comes to be from that which is coming to be, or what is finished from that which is being achieved. (according to Jaeger)

(2) Jaeger secluded the second ??, referring to l. 31.

994a32-b1. for it is not that which comes to be something that comes to be as a result of coming to be, but that which exists after the coming to be. (according to Christ)

(2) Christ (1853, 28): "His in verbis explicandis et veteres commentatores et Bonitzius discrimen in praepositionibus ?? et ???? collocatum esse rati ita verba explicuere: res enim generata non ex ipso generationis processu sed post generationem perfectam prodit. Sed ut de hoc praepositionum ?? et ???? discrimine vel maxime arguto sileam, hac ratione numquam, cur alterum genus non invertatur, explicari potest. Quid enim? Nonne aqua et ipsa post generationem perfectam provenit? Nec novae rei, de qua Bonitzius dicit, ullum vestigium in Aristotelis verbis indagare possum. Equidem igitur, dum quis meliorem interpretationem afferat, una litera ? interjecta lego: ?? ??? ???????? ?? ??? ???????? ?? ??????????, ???' ? ???? ???? ??? ???????. ?? ?????????? cum rem ad alteram condicionem tendentem designet (versu 25: ?? ?? ??? ?????????? ?? ???????), hic fere sensus evadit: neque enim ex generatione prodit ea res, quae ad alium statum feratur, i. e. ????, sed ea, quae post generationem sit i. e. ????. In altero enim generationis genere utraque pars (et aqua et aër) in naturam alterius partis transit, in altero autem prior tantummodo pars ad posteriorem nec posterior ad priorem tendit."

994b9. Further, the final cause is an end. (E and J)

(1) Since the final cause is an end. (Ab)

(2) Ustath and Ishaq follow ? reading ??? (Walzer 227).

In favor of the reading ????, Jaeger remarks: "???? in apodosi est usus late patens apud Aristotelem."

994b10-11. so that if there is to be a last term of this sort. (according to Alexander)

(2) Alexander (160. 1-2): ?? ???? ?? ?? ????? ??? ?? ??????? ??????, ??? ??’ ??????? ? ??????? ??? ????? ??????.

994b16-18. But the essence, also, cannot be reduced to another definition.

(1) My proposal: But the essence, also, cannot be reduced to another definition again and again.

(3) The transmitted text reads as if only two definitions were in question. But ??? in l. 18 makes sense only if an infinite series is in view. So Thomas Aquinas (Sententia Metaphysicae, liber 2 lectio 4 numerus 5) paraphrases: "dicit quod non convenit hoc quod est quod quid erat esse, in infinitum reduci ad aliam definitionem." Therefore we must write ??? ????? <??? ?????>. Such a reading is assumed in the translations of Hengstenberg ("Ebenso wenig geht es an, das was auf eine immer fernere Bestimmung zurückzuführen") and Lasson ("auch der begriffliche Grund läßt sich nicht immer wieder auf eine andere Bestimmung zurückführen").

How the phrase 'other again and again' belongs to the semantic field of ???????, is particularly well illustrated by Physics iii 6, 206a27-29: ???? ??? ??? ????? ????? ?? ???????, ?? ??? ???? ??? ???? ???????????, ??? ?? ???????????? ??? ??? ????? ????????????, ???’ ??? ?? ?????? ??? ??????.

994b18. which is fuller in expression.

(2) Alexander proposes two explanations for the expression ??????????? ?? ????, which cannot be documented elsewhere:

(a) ????? ??? ? ??????? ??? ??????? ?? ???? ??????????· ?? ??? ???? ?? ????? ???? ???????? ??? ???? ??????? ??????. (161. 2-4)

(b) ????? ??????? ??? ??????????? ?? ????, ?? ???????? ?????, ??? ?? ????? ?????????? ?????? ???????????? ??, ?? ?????????? ??? ???????? ??? ??? ????? ???? ??? ????? ?? ???????????? ?? ????, ???? ??? ???????? ?? ? ??? ?????? ??? ???? ????? ??????, ????? ?? ????? [????] ???? ?????? ?????? ????? ???? ??? ???????????? ???????? ????????????, ???? ?? ???????, ??? ????? ????? ?????, ?? ????? ??’ ??????? ??????????? ??? ?????? ?????????? ????. (162. 10-16)

(3) The first one is to be preferred, cf. Analytica posteriora A 22, 83b1-5: ????? [????? und ???????] ?? ????????? ??? ??? ????? ??????, ???' ??? ?? ???? ???' ??? ?? ??? (???? ???????? ??????, ????? ????, ????? ?' ??????? ???? ?? ???? ???' ????????, ????? ?? ???? ???????, ????? ?? ???' ????? ?? ?? ?? ?????).

994b18-19. For the original definition is always more of a definition, and not the later one.

(1) My proposal: For the definition before is always more of a definition [whereas the later one is not a definition].

(3) It is dubious,

(a) what ?? is responding to. According to Bonitz with one of the two ?? in l. 19, according to Ross to ??? in l. 20. Bonitz refers to Hermann (1822, p. 836: "Deinde ?? non semper sequentem habet particulam ?? vel ???, sed etiam ??.") and Hartung (1832, p. 171), who quotes as example Plato, Respublica 367 C (? ??? ?? ???????????? ??' ????? ????? ???? ?????????, ???? ?? ?????? ???? ?????). Ross refers to Bonitz's Index, 749b39-40. Of the three passages mentioned there only the first one can be compared with our present one (??? without ??), Physics vii 4, 248a19-24: ?????? ?? ???, ?? ?? ???? ????? ?????? ????? ????????? ??? ????? ??? ??? ???????, ???' ????? ?????? ? ?????? ? ??????????, ????? ?? ????????, ?? ?' ???????. ??? ????? ???????? ???' ?? ?? ????, ?? ??? ??????? ??????? ????? ?????? ????? ? ?????????? ?????????.

In favor of the latter interpretation is De caelo, 308b27-28: ??? ?? ??? ? ?????? ??? ??? ??????? ??????, ??? ???? ?????? ????? ????? ??? ??????? ?? ??? ??????. Here, too, ?? is connecting two arguments, not two parts of one argument, and the second argument is more general as the first.

(b) what ????????? ??????? and ??????? ??????? does mean. Alexander (161. 10-14) thinks that the order of reduction is affected: ??? ??? ?? ????????? ??????? ??? ????????? ????? ??? ???????? ?? ???????, ??????? ???????? ?? ????? ??? ???????? ??? ??????? ????? ????????· ??? ??? ? ?????? ??? ???????? ????? ????????? ??????? ???? ??? ?????????, ? ?? ??????? ?????? ??????? ???? ??? ???? ??????? ???????????. According to this explanation (which is followed by Ross, I 219), the reduction comes to a stillstand immediately after the first step. This contradicts the other assumption necessary (in the frame of this interpretation) to explain ??????, that the value of the definitions diminishes with growing distance from the defined. Therefore Bonitz (1843) tacitly replaces ??? by ?????: "Denn immer ist der frühere Begriff mehr Begriff der Sache als der spätere"; Ross (1928) adds a ?????? also to the second ?????, whereas Rolfes (1920) omits ??????: "denn da würde immer eine frühere Bestimmung, nicht die spätere gelten".

The aforesaid assumption in turn contradicts the sense of 'reduction' which is, after all, ascent into higher regions of being (994b8 ??? ?? ???). As from the moved, which no longer is moving, to the moving, which no longer is moved, the regress must go from the defined, which is no longer a definition, to the definition, which no longer can be defined. This definition must be meant by ?????? in the next sentence. The comparative ?????? points to a superlative ???????, to something which is definition 'in the highest degree'.

An infinite causal chain is characterized by each of its links being both cause and caused, in the present case both definition and defined. It is such a link from which Aristotle proceeds. In comparison with it, its definition, the ????????? ???????, is definition 'in higher degree' (??????); ??????? ??????? is the one who is defined by it; considered in this way, the ??????? ??????? is 'not' a definition.

Thomas Aquinas gives an explanation coinciding with ours (Sententia Metaphysicae, liber 2 lectio 4 numerus 7): "In multitudine formarum vel rationum semper illa quae est prius est magis. (Quod non est intelligendum quasi sit completior; quia formae specificae sunt completae. Sed dicitur esse magis, quia est in plus quam illa quae est posterior, quae non est ubicumque est prior. Non enim ubicumque est ratio animalis, est ratio hominis.) Ex quo argumentatur, quod si primum non est, nec habitum id est consequens est. Sed si in infinitum procedatur in rationibus et formis, non erit prima ratio vel forma definitiva; ergo excludentur omnes consequentes."

It is striking that Thomas ignores the sentence ? ?' ??????? ??? ?????, which in itself is not wrong (see above), but abundant - typical for a marginal gloss. Inserted into the text, it almost necessitates the false equation of ?????? and ????????? ???????.

994b25-26. but the whole line also must be apprehended by something in us that does not move from part to part. (reading <??> ?????????)

(2) Alexander (164. 15 - 165. 5): ???? ??? ??? ???? ?????????? ????? ??????. ??? ?? ??????? ???????? ????? ?? ????? ????? ??????????? ??????? ??? ????, ???? ????? ???? ??? ????? ????? ??????? ?????, ???????????? ???? ???? ??? ????? ????? ??? ??????? ????? ??? ??????. ?? ?? ???????? ????? ????? ???? ????????? ????? ??????· ????????? ??? ???? ??????????? ?????· ??????? ??? ???? ??? ??? ????????, ??? ?? ??? ? ?????? ????, ???? ??????? ??????, ?? ?? ???????????, ???????? ?????? ??? ???????, ?? ??? ????? ??????? ?? ???? ????????. ?? ???? ?? ???????? ?? ??? ?? ??? ??????????? ???? ??? ??? ???? ?? ????????? ????? ??????. ????? ?? ?????????? ????????, ??? ?????????? ??? ????? ??? ??? ????? ??????? ?? ?? ???????? ??????. ??? ?????? ??? ???????, ???? ?? ??????? ???? ??? ???????? ???? ?? ??? ?? ??????? ??? ???????? ???? ?????? (?? ??? ?? ????? ??????? ????? ? ???? ????????, ?????? ???? ????? ???????? ??? ???????????), ???? ?? ???? ??????? ?? ??? ?? ????????? ??????? ???????? ??????? ????? ?? ???? ??? ????????· ?? ??? ?????? ???? ????????? ???????· ??? ???? ? ?? ????????? ?? ???? ??? ??? ???? ?????????? ??? ??? ?? ????? ????? ??? ??? ????? ??????? ????? ?????????, ????? ??? ??? ??????? ??? ??? ????? ????? ??????, ???? ?? ??????? ????? ???????. ? ?????????? ????? ???? ??? ?? ?????????? ??? ?? ????? ??? ?? ??????? ??????? ?????· ??? ????? ??? ???? ? ??? ????????.

Asclepius (131. 22): ?? ????????? ????? ??????, ????????? ?? ??????? ????????.

Schwegler (i 111): "Even the ???, to which the quality of infinity seems to belong especially, does not exist as ??????? in reality. It exists (i. e. is sensually perceptible) only ?? ????????? […]."

Bonitz (1849, p. 134): "Sed cogitari eam [scilicet materiam] semper oportet tamquam quae insit uni cuidam ex iis rebus, quae motu ac mutatione ex ea procreantur."

This paraphrase agrees altogether with Asclepius' and Schwegler's; from it, however, the defects of this interpretation become particularly clear: ??? is not considered at all, and ???? is drawn to ?????, which thereby is displaced into emphatic front-position, in the text ??? ???? being emphasized.

Ross (i 219-220): "The variety of readings in Alexander points to early corruption. I read, with hesitation, ??? ???? ?? ?????????, which at least connects better with what precedes (?????? … ??????? being parenthetical). 'It is not possible to apprehend the line without calling a halt to the process of dividing, but the whole line also must be apprehended by something in us which does not move (in thought) from part to part.'"

This conjecture is unsatisfying, for 'the line as a whole' is not opposed to the 'line' in l. 23.

Jaeger: "an verba ???? … ?????? sunt nota lectoris e margine intrusa?"

(3) Indeed, the sentence does not fit in with the context, the opening words 'but also the matter' presupposing that what follows was sayed before of something other than matter.

Concerning its sense, the first question is whether the readings ?? ?????????, ????????? and ?????????? must be derived from a lost one (as Ross assumes), or whether from one of them the other two can be derived. The most easily understood one is the reading ??????????. The 'moved matter' comes from the Middle Platonist Timaeus-exegesis, v. Albinus, (Didascalicus 12, 2, 1-3), who is reporting on Timaeus 30 A:

?? ??? ????? ??? ???? ????? ???????????· ?? ??????? ??? ????????? ?????????? ??? ??? ??????? ???????? ?? ??? ??????? ????????? ???? ??? ??????? ????? ?????.

Or Plutarchus, De E apud Delphos, 392 E: ??????? ??? ?? ??? ????????? ??????????????? ??? ??? ???? ??? ? ??????.

The reading ?? ????????? may have been originally conceived as equivalent to ??????????; ?? means the sphere of a concept, cf. Plotinus, Enneades, 3, 7, 2, 31-32: ???? ??? ????? ?? ????? ?? ?????? ??? ?????, ???? ??? ?? ???.

Unlike this, with ????????? only a part of the soul can be meant (as Alexander takes it), cf. Porphyrius, Sententiae ad intelligibilia ducentes, 44, 12: ??? ???? ??? ????? ??????? ??? ???? ???? [sc. ? ????]. If we now consult l. 24 ?????? ?' ??? ???? ?? ????????, it becomes clear that among the preserved readings ????????? must be the original one, but that it, too, must be corrupted from <??> ????????? (already proposed by Ross). The negation is also required by ???? ???, which implies that the same was said (in ll. 23-24) of something else as the ???, that is of the ?? ?? ????? (l. 17).

Book III

995a32-33. for in either case it is impossible to go forward.

(1) for it is impossible for both to go forward. (according to Richards)

(2) Richards (p. 250): "Should not ????????? be ???????????"

(3) Richards is right. The original ?????????? was 'corrected' on the example of 994b3-4, but there the situation is a different one: two ways of understanding an assumption were distinguished before, then follows the statement: but (??) in both ways it is impossible. (Cf. the same case in De generatione et corruptione i 5, 320a32-34.) In our present passage, by contrast, a reason is given (???) for a comparison. A real parallel is the following bon mot from an unknown comedy (Fragmenta comicorum anonymorum, 346):

??????????? ?????’ ???? ????? ??? ?????.

?????? ??? ????? ????????? ???????????,

???? ?? ??????? ??????? ?????????.

("A similar thing is old age and matrimony: for we make every effort to get it, but when we have it, we moan.")

995a36-b1. besides, a man does not otherwise know even whether he has at any given time found what he is looking for or not. (E)

(1) besides, a man otherwise does never know whether he has found what he is looking for or not. (Ab)

According to Jaeger's text, "at any given time" is to be omitted.

(2) Alexander (173. 18-20): ??? ????? ??? ???????? ????? ?????? ??? ??????? ????? ???? ??? ??? ???????? ?????????, ??? ????????? ?? ?????· ??????? ?? ???’ ?? ???? ??????? ???????? ?? ????? ??? ? ??????.

Asclepius (139. 32): ??? ?? ????????? ?? ?????, ??????? ???????? ??????? ????????.

Jaeger writes: ???? ????<???> ?? ?????????? ??????? ? ?? instead of ???' ?? ???? ?? ?????????? ??????? ? ?? (E) or ???????? ?? ?????????? ?? ??????? ? ?? (Ab).

(3) Jaeger has recognized correctly that in ???? (which makes little sense) a varia lectio (???????) to ?? is hiding.

996a23. For how can a principle of change or the nature of the good exist for unchangeable things?

(1) … exist in the field of unchangeable things? (according to Jaeger)

(2) Alexander (181. 35-36): ??? ??? ?? ??? ?? ???? ????????? ??? ????????? ?????? ????????? ??? ?????????;

Jaeger (1917, p. 493) proposes ????? <??> ???? ?????????: "That <??> must be supplied appears from the resumption of the protasis by ???' ?? ???. (a27)." Besides, he refers to ? 7, 1072b1-2, ? 1, 1059a38 and Alexander's paraphrasis.

996a32-33. And so for this reason some of the Sophists, e.g. Aristippus, used to ridicule mathematics.

(2) According to Goebel (1889, p. 5) "????? must be changed into ????, for it refers to the preceding ?? ???? ????????".

Jaeger: "sed attrahitur ad sq. 33, 35."

996b18-20. And further in all other cases also we think that the knowledge of each even of the things of which demonstration is possible is present only when we know what the thing is.

(1) My proposal: And further we think that the knowledge of each thing is present only when we know what the thing is.

(2) Alexander (185. 22-25): ?? ?????????? ???? ??? ??????· ??? ?? ??? ?? ???? ?????? ?? ??????? ??????? ???? ??????? ???????? ?? ?????????? ?????, ???? ??????? ?? ?? ?????. ?? ?? ??? ?? ???? ?????? ????? ?? ???? ?? ?? ????? ?? ????? ??????????.

Thomas Aquinas (Sententia Metaphysicae, liber 3 lectio 4 numerus 11): "Sed etiam in aliis cognoscendis, puta proprietatibus rei, magis dicimus scire singula, de quibus sunt demonstrationes, quando etiam de ipsis accidentibus vel proprietatibus scimus quod quid est; quia quod quid est non solum invenitur in substantiis, sed etiam in accidentibus."

Argyropulus: "In ceteris etiam quorum est demonstratio, tum scire quidque putamus, cum quidnam sit unumquodque cognoscimus."

Fonseca: "Nam et in accidentibus, de quibus etiam fiunt demonstrationes, tum scire nos putamus maxime, cum novimus quid sit eorum quodque."

Jaeger: "verba ??? ?? ?????????? ????, quae definitionem sciendi interrumpunt, delevi, in perversa eorum collocatione jam haesitabat Alexander p. 185. 22. ad 22 ????? pertinere videntur."

Slezák (2003) transposes ??? ?? ?????????? ???? to after ??? ?? ???? ??????, thus giving a textual basis to Argyropulus's translation.

(3) Translating ?? ???? ?????? by "in all cases" (instead of "in the other cases"), Ross avoids the difficult question what ?????? ("the other") is complementary to. The answers given hitherto are: (1) substance, so that the "other cases" are the accidents (Thomas Aquinas, Fonseca); (2) the things of which demonstration is not possible (Alexander, Argyropulus, Slezák). A very simple solution is achieved by observing Aristotelian usage: ?? ???? ?????? is equivalent to ??? ??? ????? in ll. 21-22, cf. the phrase ?????? ?? ??? ?? ???? ?????? in Physics ii 9, 200a7, On Generation and Corruption ii 4, 331b33, Nicomachean Ethics iii 7, 1114a1. Now we can reconstruct the steps of corruption: once the variant reading ?? ???? ?????? was inserted at the wrong place, a glossator tried to explain the unintelligible ?????? by ?? ?????????? ????, which, as Jaeger observed, is out of place too. As usual, in order to connect them with the text, in front of both insertions a ??? was added.

The expurgated text corresponds almost literally with Z 1, 1028a36-37.

997b23. For if there are sensible things and sensations intermediate between Form and individual …

(1) For if there are sensible things intermediate between Form and individual, there are also sensations; and if sensations … (according to Alexander)

(2) Alexander (198. 25-30): ?? ??? ?????? ????? ?? ???? ?????? ?????? ??? ?? ???????? ?? ???? ????????. ????? ??? ??????????? ??? ????????? ????? ?????? ?????? ??? ????? ????? ???? ??????, ??’ ?? ? ????????? ??????? ??? ??????. ?? ?? ?????????, ????? ??? ??? ??? ?? ??? ????????? ??????? ??????, ?????? ???? ????? ?? ??? ????, ???????? ??? ?????, ??? ??? ???????· ?? ??? ?? ????????? ???? ?? ???? ???? ?????.

Jaeger derives a remarkable variant reading out of Alexander's paraphasis: ?? ??? ????? ??????? ??????, ??? ?????????? <?? ?' ?????????,> … It is quite possible that ?????????? ?? ?' was omitted by anticipation.

998a4-5. nor are the movements and spiral orbits in the heavens like those of which astronomy treats.

(2) Alexander (200. 21-22): ???' ???? ?? ???????? ????? ???? ??? ???????, ???' ???? ????? ??? ???????, ?? ?? ????? ????????? ??? ?? ???? ??????, ???????? ?????? ? ?????????? ????????.

Jaeger (1917, pp. 489-490): "Instead of ?????? [998a5], we must read ???? or ??????, for it affects not mere similitude, but ? ???? ?????, and ?????? ???? ?? cannot mean ?????? ????????, ???? ??." From these two possible readings, "the palaeographically easy ?????? is less probable than ????, because it belongs to Alexander's vocabulary, not Aristotle's".

998a32-b3. Besides this, if we want to examine the nature of anything else, we examine the parts of which, e.g., a bed consists and how they are put together, and then we know its nature.

(1) Besides this, if we want to examine the nature of anything else, e.g. of a bed, when we know the parts of which it consists and how they are put together, then we know its nature. (according to Jaeger)

(2) Alexander (202. 26-28): ??? ??? ?????? ??? ??????? ??? ???????? ???? ??????????? ??? ? ????? ??????? ????? ?????, ? ?????? ?? ?? ????????? ?????? ????????.

Schwegler (i 130): "We would expect at least: ???? ??????? ??? ??? ????? ?? ??? ?????? ??? ????? ??????, ???? ??????, ????? ?? ?? ?????? ????????? ??? ??? ???????????, ??? ???? ???????? ??? ????? ?????. In any case, the words ?? ?? ?????? ????????? must be drawn to the apodosis, be it that we write ??? ???? (with codex Ab), supplying in thought ????? to what precedes, or be it that we change ???? into ????? (or into a word of similar meaning)."

Susemihl (p. 10): "perhaps Aristotle wrote ?????? <?????>".

Jaeger supplies <???? ???> before ?? ?? ?????? ?????????, commenting: "cf. ad orationis formam 983a25, 996b20, 1028a36 sq."

998b18-19. for these are predicated of all things.

(2) According to Jaeger (1917, p. 490) "this sentence disturbs the context. It is a variant to the sentence b21, which has ??????? in surplus. Alexander, who paraphrases our passage word-for-word, does not know it."

998b21. for these are most of all predicated of all existing things.

(1) Jaeger (1917, p. 490) rightly takes ??? ????? as a "glossema". Its author did not understand that ???? ?????? is equivalent to ???????.

999a27-28. how then is it possible to get knowledge of the infinite individuals?

(1) but how is it possible to get knowledge of the infinite individuals? (according to Jaeger)

(2) Bonitz (1849, pp. 155-156): "apodosis enuntiati quum ordienda sit a ??? ?' ???????, particulam ?' retinendam esse non possum mihi persuadere, siquidem quod vulgo Aristotelem liberius particulam ?? in apodosi adhibuisse existimant (Waitz ad Org. I. p. 335, cf. quae exposui Jen. N. Lz. [= Neue Jenaische Literatur-Zeitung] 1845. Sept. p. 859) temere statuitur; vel omittenda erit, vel mutanda in ??."

According to Jaeger (BBA 265), in the apodosis an objection is made.

Ross (i 240): "For ?? in apodosi with an adversative suggestion cf. K. 1059b33 n., ?. 1071a24, 1075a10, Phys. 215b15, Pol. 1287b13."

999a32-34. Further, if we admit in the fullest sense that something exists apart from the concrete thing, whenever something is predicated of the matter.

(1) Further, if we admit in the fullest sense that something exists apart from the concrete thing (<I say 'concrete thing'> whenever something is predicated of the matter), … (according to Jaeger)

(2) Alexander (211. 22-24): ?? ?? ???? ?????????? ?? ??? ???? ???? ????????? ???? ??? ???? ??? ??????? (???? ??? ???? ?? ?????, ???? ?????????? ?? ??? ????, ????????? ???? ?? ?? ??? ??????????· ????? ?? ???? ?? ?????.

Jaeger (1917, p. 492): "That it was wrong to suspect these words [???? ?????????? ?? ??? ????], is proven by the exact parallel ? 1, 995b34: ??? ??????? ???? ?? ???? ?? ??????? (???? ?? ???????, ???? ?????????? ?? ??? ????) ? ?????, ? ??? ???, ??? ?' ??, ??? ???? ????? ??? ?????. The copyist switched from ??????? to ???????, thus mutilating the parenthetical definition of the ???????."

Ross (i 241): "But the insertion of these words seems unnecessary, and is not supported by Alexander (211. 22)."

(3) Ross is wrong: The parallel alleged by Jaeger proves that predication of the matter is constitutive for the concrete thing, not for existing apart from it. This was well understood by Alexander, who, in that respect, supports Jaeger.

1001a11-12. their essence being just unity and being.

My proposal: in the opinion that the essence (supply: of things) is just unity and being.

(2) Alexander (224. 2-5):· ?? ?? ?? ????? ??? ?????? ???? ?? ?? ????? ??? ?? ?? ???? ???? ?? ?? ??? ????? ?????? ????? ??? ???? ?? ??? ??? ?????, ??? ?????? ????? ??? ????? ??? ????.

Asclepius transmits two readings, of which the editors did not take notice:

?? ?? ?? ????? ??? ?????? ?????? ??? ????? <???> ????, ???? ?? ??? ?? ?? ??? ?????? ????? ?????? ??? ???? ?? ??? ??? ????? ??? ?????? ????? ??? ?? ??? ???? ?????. (203. 24-26)

?? ????? ??? ?????? ????? ???? ??? ????? ??? ????, ????????? ?????? ??? ??????. (204. 6-7)

Bonitz (1842, pp. 41-42): "Corruptelae suspicionem primum movet pronomen ??, quod est in fine enuntiati. Etenim ea ipsa re quum maxime Plato et Pythagorei a physicis dissentiunt, quod non ponunt aliquid, ??, quod esse vel unum esse dicant, sed quod ipsam unitatis et essentiae notionem tamquam substantiam, ?????? ??? ?????, exsistere statuunt. Itaque vereor ut recte ex Platonis et Pythagoreorum sententia dici possit ???? ?? ?? ????? ??? ?? ?? ??. Neque tamen propterea ??, quod in libris manuscriptis est, omittendum censeam, modo cum ?? in unum vocabulum conjugatur ac proinde pro ?? casus dativus substituatur; ita enim eadem sententia aptius etiam et accuratius explicabitur. Physici materiam quandam posuerunt, sive aquam, sive ignem, sive aliud quid, quo essentiae et unitatis notionem referrent; Plato vero et Pythagorei ipsam notionem unitatis et essentiae, ab omni materiae cognatione secretam, substantiam esse statuerunt, ???? ?? ??? ????? ??? ?? ????. His enim formulis ?? ??? ?????, ?? ????? ????? et similibus ipsam significari notionem, qualem universe Aristoteles suo vocabulo ?? ?? ?? ????? nominavit, satis notum est.

Sed nondum persanatus locus videri potest, quoniam ipsa illa vocabula, de quibus disputavimus, ???? ?? ?? ????? ???., sive ex nostra sententia scribi placet ???? ?? ??? ????? ???., non habent, quo referri recte possint. Quod si ea conjungas cum superioribus ???? ????? ????? ??? ????? ????? ???? ?? ??? ????? ??? ?? ????, haec sane aptam praebent sententiam, sed interposita ?? ????? ??? ?????? explicari nequeunt; sin referas ad ?? ????? ??? ??????, fieri non potest quin pro ???? ?? ponatur casus genitivus. Jam quum in uno libro Ab, qui saepe meliora exhibere videtur, legatur ????? ??, haud scio an cum aliqua veritatis specie universum locum ita constituere liceat: […] ????? ??? ??? ????? ??? ??? ????."

Winckelmann (1843, pp. 285-286): "??? ?????? must be taken as subject, ????? ??? ??? ????? ??? ??? ???? as predicate."

Schwegler (i 141) proposes to "change ????? ??? ?????? into ????? ??? ??????", referring to 987a17-19.

Bonitz (1849, 163): "Duplex inest in his verbis difficultas; primum enim perturbata est grammatica verborum conformatio, quia neque accusativus ???? ?? ????? construi potest cum verbis ?? ????? ??? ??????, neque ipsa haec verba ita possunt per parenthesin accipi, ut accusativus ???? ?? coniungatur cum verbis ??? ????? ?????. Deinde pronomen indefinitum ?? offendit, ?? ??, quod quum frequentet Aristoteles ad significandas res singulas opposita universali earum notione (cf. ad ? 2. 1003b33), aptum illud quidem erit in describenda physicorum sententia, qui singulare quidpiam posuerunt ac de eo unitatis et essentiae notionem praedicarunt, repugnat autem Platonicis ac Pythagoreis placitis. His ut mederer difficultatibus scribendum proposui Obs. p. 42: ?? ????? ??? ?????? ????? ??? ??? ????? ??? ????, quamquam ne eam quidem scripturam prorsus sufficere libenter confiteor."

(3) As we see, Bonitz himself had much less confidence in his conjecture ????? ??? than his successors Christ, Ross and Jaeger. It is indeed unsatisfying, because firstly an ugly pleonasm results from the confusion of the equivalent expressions ???? ?? ?? and ?? ??? ?????, secondly substantivated infinitives are badly suited to predicative complements, and thirdly the variety of readings remains unexplained.

It was a neglect to ignore Winckelmann's contribution, because he is the only one who has realized that ??? ?????? must be subject; the following passages show the same construction:

Metaphysica ? 26, 1023b35-36: ????? ??? ??? ??? ???? ????????, ?? ????? ??? ???????? ???????? ?????.

Physica B 1, 192b20-23: ?? ????? ??? ?????? ????? ????? ??? ?????? ??? ????????? ??? ??????? ?? ? ??????? ?????? ???’ ???? ??? ?? ???? ??????????.

De anima B 2, 413b18-19: ?? ????? ??? ?? ?????? ????? ?????????? ??? ???? ?? ?????? ????, ??????? ?? ????????.

Ethica Nicomachea ? 3, 1156a23-24: ?? ????? ??? ?????? ???? ??????.

Kühner/Gerth (II 94) present as examples for this construction two passages from Plato: ?? ???????? ????? ??? ?????? (Meno 95 E), ?? ????? ????? ??? ????????????? (Phaedrus 234 B).

For our present passage the predicative complement to ????? is wanted, which also must be in genitive. Such one is fragmentarily preserved in the genitives ????? of codex Ab and ?'????? of the first reading in Asclepius. Taken together with Asclepius' second reading ????? ????, this leads to ?????? ?????. Finally we must (with Bonitz and Christ) put the substantivated infinitive ?? ??? ????? ??? ???? into genitive, so that the result is: ?? ????? ??? ?????? ?????? ?????, ??? ??? ????? ??? ????, 'in the opinion that the essence (supply: ??? ?????) is just unity and being'. The genitivus absolutus ????? ??? ?????? ?????? ????? is derived from the phrase ????? ???? ? ????? (1054a8, cf. 1053b28 ????? ???? ? ?????).

The next grammatical parallel to this new-got reading is Eustathius, Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem, 1, 285, 25-27 (to B 140): ????? ??? ??? ???????? ???????? ??????, ?? ?? ??? ????? ?????????? ???????, ?? ??? ??????? ???? ???????? ?????? ????? ??? ???????, ?? ?? ????? ??? ???? ??? ????????? ???? ????????? ??? ?? ??????? ??? ??? ??.

Evidence from earlier time exists for ????? ?????? (instead of ?????? ?????):

Xenophon, Cyropaedia, 8, 3, 19: ?????? ??? ???? ?????? ??? ?????????? ?????, ?? ?????????? ???? ????? ?????????? ??? ??????? ????? ?????? ????? ??? ???????????.

Plato, Theaetetus, 182 D: ?????? ?? ???? ????? ?????, ?? ?????? ???? ?? ????, ???? ??????????, ???? ??? ????? ?????? ????? ????, ??? ??????????.

An especially welcome confirmation is furnished by two passages in Pseudo-Alexander, where ????? ???? occurs in connection with the Academic doctrine of ??:

???? ?? ??? ????? ????????? ??? ?????? ????????, ????? ???? [sc. ?? ?? ?????] ???????? ????? ??? ????? ????? ??? ?? ????? ????????? ?? ?? ?? ????? (602. 2-3, Prooemium to book X),

?? ??? ?????? ?? ?????? ??? ????? ???? ?? ?? ????? ??? ? ????? ????? ????? (613. 10-11, paraphrase of 1053b28).

If the reading proposed by me is accepted as the original one, the manuscript readings can be deduced from it. The tradition forks off into three branches:

(a) The genitive ?????? ????? ??? was put into nominative (????? ???? <??> in Asclepius, cf. also the parallels in Pseudo-Alexander quoted above).

(b) In the opinion (probably based on the reading ??? ?? ?? ?? ????? in ll. 13-14) that the identity of ?? and ?? is concerned, ?????? was changed into ?'?????, ????? being ejected (the first reading of Asclepius). This, then, is smoothed to ?'???? (the reading of E).

(c) ?????? was ejected, in the opinion that it is a genitivus possessivus (Ab). In reminiscence of the technical term ???? ?? ??, ????? was finally corrected to ???? (Alexander).

1001a13-14. says what unity is. (according to Bonitz)

(2) Bonitz (1842, pp. 40-41): "Immo vero non dicit unum esse ens; ita enim consentiret cum iis, a quibus distinguitur, Platone et Pythagoreis; sed aperte et distincte, ??? ???????????? ??????, demonstrat qualis sit illa natura, quae esse et una esse dicatur. Et hanc quidem sententiam, quam et superiora verba flagitant ?? ???' ???? ???., et proxima confirmant ?????? ??? ?? ?????? ????? ??? ?????? ?????, facillima mutatione habebimus, vocabulo ??? distinctim scripto ? ?? ut sit pronomen interrogativum. Ita recte Brandisius scripsit, adjecta particula ????, quae in uno codice est, ? ?? ????. Idem legisse Alexandrum [224. 8-9] inde apparet quod scribit ?? ??? ???????????? ?? ?????? ?? ??, ??? ?????? ?????????, ?????? ????????? ?? ??. Qui enim ?????????? aliquid, is significat quid sit illud, ad quod referatur et cui tribuatur unitas."

(3) If we write ? ?? retaining ??, we must complete the latter to <??? ??> ??, cf. l. 16, from where it may be intruded. But ?? does not go well with ?????.

1001a14. for he would seem to say it is love.

(1) A version of equal value is given by codex Ab with ?? ????? instead of ?????. Here the construction is the same as in A 9, 991b14-15, we must therefore translate:

"for he seems to mean that this (scilicet ? ?? ?? ?? ?????, the subject, of which unity is predicated) is something, namely ?????".

(3) Jaeger's conjecture ?? ??????? is not only unnecessary, but even noxious: "something like this" is too weak, for then, besides ?????, there could be other natural powers with the same status. Alexander's commentary to 996a7-9 (179. 33 - 180. 3) shows, where the expression ?? ??????? would be appropriate: ? ????? ????? ?????? ??????????, ????? ?? ?? ?? ?? ??? ?? ?? ???????? ??????????, ?? ?????? ?? ???????, ? ???? ? ???? ? ?????? ? ???? ? ?? ???????? ???????????? ??? ????? ?????.

1001a28-29. for it is not something else that is predicated universally of the things that are and are one, but just unity and being.

(1) for (what is the 'essence' or 'nature' of things, see ll. 25-28) is not something else, of which unity and being are predicated, but just unity and being. (according to Bonitz)

(2) Bonitz (1842, pp. 114-115): "[…] quid significent […] verba neque enim aliud universe praedicatur, sed haec ipsa difficile est dictu […]. Accedit ad obscuritatem sententiae grammatica dubitatio, quod ad ???????????? objectum quo referatur desideratur. Sed hoc certe constat, quum per particulam ??? haec enuntiatio superiori subjiciatur, debere in ea significatam esse naturam substantiae. Jam vero substantia eo discernitur a reliquis praedicamentis, quod ipsa per se est neque de alio praedicatur, cui quasi inhaereat. ?, 8. p. 1017b13. […] ?, 3. p. 1029a8. […] ibid. p. 1029a21. de reliquis praedicamentis qualitatis, quantitatis ceterisque dicit ???? ??? ?? ???' ?? ???????????? ?????? ???????, ? ?? ????? ?????? ??? ??? ?????????? ??????. Inde colligas nostro loco pro ??????? scribendum esse ???' ??, ut haec sit enuntiati sententia: si quid est ipsum per se unum et ens, substantiam esse oportet; neque enim aliud quidquam est, de quo praedicetur unum vel ens, sed haec ipsa. Quod si meminerimus pro ????? ???' ?? ???????????? prorsus eodem sensu dici posse ?? ???????????, quippe quod significet id ipsum, cui praedicatum aliud inhaereat, ex ipsis Aristotelis verbis conjecturam confirmari videmus. Sententiam enim eorum philosophorum, qui non cum Pythagoreis vel Platonicis ipsum ens et ipsum unum ponant, ita describit, ut eos ?????? ?? ??????????? statuere dicat. Cf. ?, 4. p. 1001a7. […] ?, 1. p. 996a5."

Bonitz (1849, p. 164): "Contra codicum omnium fidem, spreta etiam Alexandri auctoritate, ???' ?? scripsi pro ???????. cf. Obs. p. 114 sq. Alexander quantum laboret, ut vulgatam lectionem ad sententiam quodammode aptam vel conformet vel detorqueat, ex eius commentario ad hoc locum cognoscitur; frustra eum laborare ex ipsa sententiae ratione facile est perspicere. neque enim propterea ipsum unum et ipsum ens dici possunt substantiae esse, quia nihil aliud de iis universe praedicetur; nimirum de substantiis nihil impedit quominus alia diversa ab ipsarum notione universe praedicentur, ?? ???' ???? ????????? ?? ?????, immo vero hoc ut fiat proprium est ac peculiare substantiae, Cat. 5. 2b4. At hoc constituit vim ac naturam substantiae, quod ipsa non praedicatur de alia re, cf. ? 8. 1017b13: ??????? ????? ??? ?? ???' ???????????, ???? ???? ?????? ?? ????. ? 3. 1029a8: ? ????? - ?? ?? ???' ??????????? ???? ???' ?? ?? ????. ? 5. 1001b30. Inde mutatione satis leni scripsi ???' ??, quam si probaveris emendationem, aptissime opponi videbis physicos Platonicis et Pythagoreis: illi ponunt ??????????? ???? ????? a8, de qua praedicetur unum et ens; hi vero ita ponunt unum et ens, ut nihil sit aliud de quo praedicentur, sed ipsa sint de quibus praedicentur reliqua."

Ross (i 245): "Bonitz's ???' ?? does not seem to be necessary. His explanation ignores ????? and gives no good sense to ???? ????? ????."

(3) The reader may judge whether my translation of Bonitz's text gives a good sense to ???? ????? ???? ("but just unity and being"). Ross's interpretation leaves the sentence without function in the context (the topic is whether unity and being need a 'subject' [??????????? = ???' ??] to be principle). The (only apparent) difficulty which caused the 'correction' of ???' ?? to ??????? (which we also meet in 1049a28) is that the predicate must be supplied from the preceding sentence. Quite rightly, Jaeger adopts Bonitz's emendation ignoring Ross's criticism.

1002a30-32. For if substance, not having existed before, now exists, or having existed before, afterwards does not exist, this change is thought to be accompanied by a process of becoming or perishing. (according to Brandis's emendation, which is anticipated by Argyropulus)

(1) My proposal: For whenever substance …

(2) Alexander (231. 29-31): ?? ??? ??? ??????, ???????? ?? ?????, ??? ???????? ??? ?? ????? ????????, ?????? ?? ??? ?? ???????? ????? ??? ?? ?? ????? ??? ??????.

Asclepius (214. 14-16): ????? ??? ???, ???? ? ????? ?? ???? ???????? ???????, ? ???????? ???? ??????? ?????? ?????, ??? ???????? ??? ?????? ????? ????????? ????? ???????.

Argyropulus: "Substantia enim si prius non erat et nunc est aut si ante erat et postea non est haec ipsa pati cum generatione corruptioneque videtur."

(3) Better than the conditional ??? is the temporal ???? in Asclepius's paraphrasis, equivalent to ???? in l. 34. Cf. De generatione et corruptione A 7, 323b8-9: ??? ??? ???? ?? ??????? ??? ??? ??? ???????? ?????????, ??? ??? ?????????? ????? ???? ???????. ???? is rare in Aristotle, but in Asclepius too.

1002b24. there will be no substance which is one in number, but only in kind. (according to Alexander)

(1) there will be no substance which is one in number [and in kind]. (the reading of the manuscripts, "and in kind" deleted by Schwegler and Jaeger)

(2) Alexander (233. 26-28): ??????? ?? ????????? ??? ????? ??? ?????? ???' ?????? ????? ??? ??????? ?? ?? ??????????? ??? ?? ???????????? '???' ?? ????? - ???' ?????'.

Schwegler (i 147) prefers to eject the words ??? ?????, "which too much resemble an interpolation or a marginal addition".

1003a9-10. And if we are to be allowed to lay it down that a common predicate is a 'this' and a single thing. (according to Richards)

(1) My proposal: And if we are to be allowed to set out the common predicate apart from the particulars.

(2) Jaeger (1917, p. 494) supplies <???> ????????, interpreting: "If the universal is supposed to be (?????) a certain individual substance and must be hypostasized as an ens per se (????????)". He compares (p.495) ? 2, 998a21, ? 4, 999a34 and 29.

Richards (1918, p. 250): "The last words [l. 12 ???? ?? ??? ??] and the want of propriety in the compound ???????? point distinctly to ?? ?' ????? ???? ?? ??? ?? ?????? ?? ????? ??????????????."

Ross (i 250): "The manuscript reading would require the rendering 'if the common predicate is to be a this and it is to be possible to set it out apart from the particulars' - an intolerable zeugma."

(3) This "intolerable zeugma" is not removed by Jaeger's conjecture, for we are still forced to understand ?? ????? ?????????????? first as nominative, then as accusative. Richards has found a remedy, but one is reluctant to give up the characteristic technical term ????????. That it was added, is less probable, than that it inversely gave cause to add ???? ?? as explanation. ????? [???? ?? ???] ???????? is good Aristotelian language, cf. Sophistici elenchi 22, 179a1-3: ?? ??? ??? ???? ??, ?? ?? ??????? ????????, ???’ ??? ????? ???? ????????. Similar are phrases like ????? ???????? in Isocrates (Panathenaicus, 155, 3) and ????? ???????? in Aristotle (De generatione et corruptione, 337b29, and Metaphysica, 1047a12).

1003a10-11. Socrates will be several animals.

(2) Christ: "??? delendum censeo."

(3) For Thomas Aquinas, too (Sententia Metaphysicae, liber 3 lectio 15 numerus 8), ????? ????? (namely "tria hoc aliquid", "three ???? ??") is the immediate conclusion ("sequitur quod Socrates sit tria hoc aliquid"); in order to gain ????? ????? ???, a further step is needed: "Et ulterius sequitur quod sit tria animalia: nam animal praedicatur de ipso et de homine et de Socrate." But this seems superfluous; for the deductio ad absurdum it is sufficient, that One becomes Many. At two other passages, this One is the Idea: 1039b9 (????? ????? ???? ?? ????) and De generatione et corruptione, 316a12 (?? ???????????? ????? ?????).

Book IV

1003b12-14. For not only in the case of things which have one common notion does the investigation belong to one science, but also in the case of things which are related to one common nature.

(2) Alexander (243. 32-33): ?? ????? ??, ????, ??? ????? ??????? ???? ?????? ??? ????????, ???? ??? ??? ??’ ???? ??? ???? ??.

Apelt (pp. 222-223): "Maybe the words ????????? ???? ???????? ???? are a spurious addition […], the genitives depending on the preceding ??? ???????? ????? in l. 11."

Richards (1918, p. 250): "<????> ??? ???' ?? ????????? is alone Greek with ????????, as in a25 and b35."

(3) The passages quoted by Richards are no parallels, because there the objects of ??????? are accusatives (?? ?????????? or ?? ?? ???? respectively). A real parallel is Eudemian Ethics i 8, 1217b34-36: ???? ???????? ???? ??? ???? ??? ????? ???? ??? ??????. ???’ ???? ?? ????????????? ???????? ????? ???? ???? ????????. From here it becomes evident that our present passage is a mixture of two readings: ?? ??? ????? ??? ???' ?? ????????? ???????? ???? ??? ???? ??? ??? ???? ???? ????????? ?????, and: ?? ??? ????? ?? ???' ?? ???????? ????????? ???? ???????? ???? ???? ??? ?? ???? ???? ???????? ?????.

1003b35-36. I mean, for instance, the discussion of the same and the similar and the other concepts of this sort.

(1) My proposal: I mean, for instance, the discussion of the same, the similar, <the equal> and the other concepts of this sort.

(2) Alexander (250. 1-3): ?? ??? ??? ?? ?????? ???? ?????? (?????? ??? ???’ ?????? ?? ??????), ??? ?? ?????? ???? ??????? ?????? ??? ?? ????????? ?????? ??? ?? ????? ?????? ??? ??? ????? ?? ????.

Fonseca: "Alexander adjungit «eorumque quae sunt his opposita» sed haec non habentur in plerisque Graecis codicibus; eisdemque carent fere latinae interpretationes; ac demum videntur ascititia, cum Aristoteles paulo inferius incipiat ea de re agere, ubi ait: «Cum autem unius sit, opposita contemplari, etc.»."

Rolfes (i 61): "Maybe ??? ???? has dropped out after ??????, cf. 1004a18."

(3) Rolfes is right. As clearly seen from his comment, Alexander read here ???? ?????? ??? ?????? <??? ????>.

1004a3-4. And there are as many parts of philosophy as there are kinds of substance, so that there must necessarily be among them a first philosophy and one which follows this.

(2) Alexander (250. 30-32): ??? ?? ??? ?????? ?? ??? ?????? ?? ?? ????????, ????? ? ????????? ? ??? ??? ????? ????? ? ?? ??? ??????? ??? ???’ ???????, ?? ? ????? ? ?? ??????.

Asclepius (237. 24-25): ???? ?????? ????????? ????? ???? ?????? ????????? ??? ???????? ?????.

Bonitz (1843): so that necessarily one among them [the substances] must be the first one, another the one which follows.

(3) ?????? and ????? are later additions (the first to ??????, the other to ????) of a reader, who referred ?????? and ???????? to ?? ??????.

1006b3-4. one of which would have one definition, viz. 'two-footed animal'. (according to Christ)

(2) Christ's emendation ???? ??? ??? ????? is anticipated by Thomas Aquinas (Sententia Metaphysicae, liber 4 lectio 7 numerus 4): "et unius eorum sit ratio animal bipes."

1006b5-7. for a peculiar name might be assigned to each of the definitions. If, however, they were not limited but one were to say that the word has an infinite number of meanings, obviously reasoning would be impossible. (according to Gomperz)

(1) "for a peculiar name might be assigned to each of the definitions" should be deleted. (according to Jaeger)

(2) Alexander (278. 3-5): ?? ??? ?? ??????, ????, ????????? ?? ?? ??????????? ??????????? ????? ?? ??’ ??????? ???????? ???????????, ???’ ??????, ????????? ?? ????? ????? ? ?????.

Jaeger: "verba [?????? … ?????] seclusi, cf. b1-2 (sim. a28 et 30, 1005a8 et 11)."

Gomperz (p. 565) deletes ?????? in l. 6, because firstly Aristotle cannot "assert in the same breath that equivocity is innocuous, and that it destroys the possibility of any discussion", and secondly ???' ?????? ????????? ???? cannot be opposed to ?? ?? ?? ??????. To ?? ?? ?? we have to supply ???????? from 1006a34-b1.

Jaeger: "sed cf. a33-b2."

(3) Alexander and Gomperz have understood that the alternative is not whether to each definition a different word might be assigned or not, but whether the word has a finite number of meanings or an infinite one. Since, however, the ?????? in l. 6 establishes a connection with ll. 1-2, it must be deleted. It was added, after ?????? … ?????, a duplicate to ll. 1-2 ?????? … ????? (Jaeger), had been inserted.

1007a6. that it would follow that all things are one. (according to Alexander and Bonitz)

(2) Alexander (283. 27-30): ?? ?? ??? ????? ??? ?? ?????? ????? ?? ??????? ????? ?????? ????????? ?? ???????? ???? ??? ????? ???? ?????????????, ??????? ????? ?? ???? ? ??? ????????, ??? ????? ?? ????? ????? ????? ??????? ????, ?? ????? ?? ???????????.

Bonitz (1842, p. 65): "Requiritur […] in ea apodosis parte, qua exponitur, quid ex illa propositione ?? ?????? ?? ???? ?? ??????? consequatur, futurum conditionale ?? ????? ?????, cujus in locum non poterat substitui futurum ???????. Conferri potest et is locus, ad quem Aristoteles respicit p. 1006b16 […], aliique similes […] 1007b20. ?, 11. p. 1036b20. […] ?, 12. p. 1037b24. al., et interpretatio Alexandri, quem futurum habuisse apparet ?? ?? ??? ????? ??? ?? ?????? ????? ?? ??????? ????? ?'????? ????????? -, ??????? ????? ?? ???? ? ??? ????????, ??? ????? ?? ????? ?????."

1007a21-23. For they must say that all attributes are accidents, and that there is no such thing as 'being essentially a man' or 'an animal'.

(2) Alexander (285. 34 - 286. 6): ?? ?? ?? ?? ????? ?? ????? ??????????? ????? ?????· ?????? ??? ???? ? ‘???’ ?????????, ??? ? ‘??? ?? ?? ?? ????? ?? ?????’, ???????? ??? ??? ??????? ?? ?????. ???????????? ??? ??? ?? ?? ????? ????? ???? ?????????????, ?????????? ??????? ??? ?? ????? ????? ???????· ? ??? ??????? ?? ??? ???’ ???? ??????????. ??????? ??? ?? ???? ??????? ? ??? ????? ?? ?? ????? ?? ????? ???????? ???? ??? ?? ???? ??????? ????? ? ??? ????? ?? ????? ?? ?? ????? ?????, ???????? ?? ?? ?? ????? ???? ?? ?? ?? ???? ?????????????, ?? ???????? ?? ?? ?? ????? ???? ??? ?? ?????.

Christ (1853, p. 32): "Cum formula ???? ??????? ????? ipsa rei essentia, accidenti opposita, designetur, foeda tautologia ex Bonitziana lectione [?? ?? ????? ?? ?????] evadit. Quodsi inter illas formulas hoc loco aliquid discriminis subesse censueris, sequentia verba, ?? ??? ????? ?? ???? ??????? ?????, ????? …, parum concinent, quoniam hic certe nullum indicium talis discriminis spectatur. Alexandrum quidem non ?? ?? ?????, sed ?? ?? ?? ????? in textu habuisse, ex ejus paraphrasi colligi potest (?????? ??? ???? ? ??? ?????????, ??? ? ??? ?? ?? ?? ?????), sed ne hoc quidem mihi probatur, immo vero verba ?? ?? ????? ex vetusto glossemate irrepsisse videntur, unde diverso loco in Alexandri textu et in codice Ab collocata sint."

(3) ?? ?? ????? makes only sense as relic of an alternative reading ??? ?? ?? ?? ????? ??????? ? ??? ?? ?????.

1007a34. there will be nothing primary about which they are made. (according to Alexander and Bonitz)

(2) Alexander (288. 9-10): ??????? ????????? ????? ????? ?????? ?? ???’ ??.

Bonitz (1842, p. 116): "Accidens, ?? ??????????, semper ad aliud refertur, de quo praedicetur, sive dicitur semper ???' ???????????, numquam ipsum est ???????????. Itaque si omnia ???? ?????????? dicantur, ita ut ad aliud referantur, non erit ?????? ??????????? vel ????? ?????, non erit quo referantur omnia, ipsum vero non referatur alio; substantiam igitur prorsus tollunt, qui omnia accidentia esse statuunt. Hanc oportere sententiam inesse iis verbis, quae e textu exhibuimus [1007a33-b1], ex argumentandi ordine manifestum est; itaque legendum ????? ????? ?????? ?? ???' ??, quod idem est ac ?????? ??????????? et consentit cum superioribus verbis ????????? ??? ??????."

1007b29-30. But they must predicate of every subject the affirmation or the negation of every attribute. (according to Alexander and Bonitz)

(1) But they must predicate of every subject the affirmation or the negation. (according to the manuscripts)

(2) Alexander (292. 5-6): ??? ????????? ??? ?????? ?????? ?????? ??? ?????? ????? ????????? ?????????????.

Fonseca: "Probat priorem partem majoris ex eo, quia qui putant contradictoria posse esse simul vera, coguntur fateri, quamlibet, sive affirmationem sive negationem posse esse veram."

Bonitz (1849, p. 195): "In explicandis verbis b29: ???? ??? ??????? ?' ?????? ???? ?????? ??? ????????? ? ??? ????????, conjecturam secutus sum, quam verba proxime sequentia videntur flagitare. Proximo enim enuntiato, ut illorum verborum ??????? - ???????? sententiam confirmet, absurdum fore Aristoteles dicit, si de qualibet re sua ipsius negatio nec vero aliarum rerum negationes praedicentur; haec argumentatio ita demum concinet cum superiore enuntiato, si in illo non solum de qualibet re, sed etiam quamlibet affirmationem vel negationem praedicandam esse contenderit. Inde conjicio: ???? ?????? ?????? ??? ????????? ???., quocum consentit Alexander …"

Goebel (1891, p. 4): "But it is the minor proposition, attributing as fact the condition of the major (l. 21-22 ?? ???? ?????? ?? ? ????????? ? ???????? ?????????) to these who deny the principium contradictionis."

Jaeger (BBA 264) assumes haplology, comparing 1035b24, where it suggests it to read ???????? <????????>.

(3) The sentence in ll. 21-22 is something what Aristotle holds for true and uses for a deductio ad absurdum, whereas the sentence in ll. 29-30 must be something what Aristotle's opponents are forced to say from their standpoint (for this meaning of ??????? cf. Physics viii 3, 253a30 and Topics viii 5, 159b33). Therefore, Alexander and Bonitz are right.

1008b11-12. what difference will there be between him and a vegetable? (according to Alexander)

(2) Alexander (298. 31): ? ???????? ????? ?? ???????? ?????.

Bonitz (1842, pp. 87-88): "Et Bessarion et Hengstenbergius ???????? intellexerunt de plantis, nec sane alia de re hoc loco cogitari potest. Sed ??????? apud Aristotelem ubique, quod sciam, sigificat id quod natura qualitatem quandam et vim habet, non plantam. Alexander si in textu habuisset ??? ?????????, non omisisset adnotare, quae est ejus in explicando diligentia, alia vi id vocabulum hoc loco usurpari, ac plerumque. Sed nulla ejusmodi mentione facta simpliciter locum his verbis interpretatur: ?? ???? ????? ??? ????? ???? ??? ???????????, ???' ?????? ?????? ?? ??? ??? ?????? ??? ??????????? ??? ??? ??????????? ???? ???????, ? ???????? ????? ?? ???????? ?????, ???? ???? ???? ???? ??? ??????????? ??????? ??? ?????; eodem vocabulo ????? bis deinde in ejusdem rei explicatione utitur ????? ??? ?? ??? ????? ??? ??? ???????? ? ???? ???????. ???' ?? ?????? ???. Inde veri est simillimum ab Aristotele scriptum fuisse ?? ?? ??????????? ???? ??? ????? vel ??? ?? ?????. Quid quod ipsum Aristotelem emendationis nostrae testem adhibere possumus; etenim de eadem re paullo ante p. 1006a14 scribit ?????? ??? ???? ? ???????? ? ???????? ???."

1010a18-19. for that which is losing a quality has something of that which is being lost.

(1) for that which is losing a quality has yet something of that which is being lost. (according to Alexander and Bonitz)

(2) Bonitz (1842, pp. 88-89): "Quum his verbis [1010a15-19] ipsa mutatio describatur, ubi necdum altera rei natura prorsus evanuit, quam antea habebat, neque altera jam perfecta est, ad quam transit, aegre careas in priore enuntiati membro ea particula, quae particulae ??? in altero membro respondeat, ita quidem ut scribendum censeas ???? ?? ??? ??? ?????????????. Atque hanc particulam ???, quae propter similitudinem proximae voculae facillime a librariis omitti poterat, ab Aristotele adjectam fuisse, Alexandri interpretatione [309, 5-7] probari videtur: ??? ??? ?? ????????? ?? ???? ??? ????????????? ?? ???? ??????????? ??? ?? ???? ??? ??? ????????? ??? ??."

1010a25-28. And again, it would be fair to criticize those who hold this view for asserting about the whole material universe what they saw only in a minority even of sensible things.

(2) Alexander (310. 25-29): ??? ?? ??????? ??? ???????? ???????? ??????? ?????????? (?? ??? ???? ???? ???? ??? ???? ?? ??????? ??? ????? ? ??????? ?????, ? ????? ?????? ??? ?????? ?????) ??? ??? ?????? ???? ?????? ????? ?????????? ??? ????? ??? ???? ??? ??????? ??? ???? ?????? ??? ????? ?? ??? ?????? ???????.

Natorp (p. 191 n.) conjectures ????? ????.

(3) Natorp's emendation is supported by Alexander's paraphrasis (???????? ??????? ??????????) and Nicomachean Ethics iv 13, 1127a17 (??? ?????? ????? ???? ??????????).

1010a37. for there is nothing into which they can change.

(2) Richards (p. 250): "The idiomatic ????????? will be better. So in 6. 1011a5 ??? ? ?????? should be ??? ? ??????, like ??? ?????????, and ????? in 11. 6. 1063a24 ?????."

1010b2-3. Regarding the nature of truth, we must maintain that not everything which appears is true; firstly, because even if sensation - at least of the object peculiar to the sense in question - is not false, still appearance is not the same as sensation. (according to Alexander and Bonitz)

(1) The correct translation of Bonitz's text would be: Regarding the nature of truth, (with respect to the thesis) that not everything which appears is true, we have to say firstly that this must be maintained even if sensation - at least of the object peculiar to the sense in question - is not false; but appearance is not the same as sensation.

(2) Alexander (311. 28-29): ?????? ??? ??? ??? ?? ? ???????? ?? ???? ?????? ????????? ?? ???????????, ??? ???? ? ????????.

Bonitz (1849, pp. 205 sq.): "Alexander dubito an paullo diversum ab hoc habuerit textum, fortasse: ??? ???' ?? ? ???????? ?? ?????? ??? ????? ?????, ???' ? ???????? ?? ?????? ?? ????????, unde longe dilucidior exsisteret argumentandi ratio."

(3) By "still", Ross does not translate the ???' of the text, but the ??? of Alexander's paraphrasis. This changes the whole grammar of the sentence. In the text restored by Bonitz, ???? refers to ?? in l. 1: "not everything which appears is true, even if …" Therefore, the main clause to which the "even if" sentence belongs is not the following one beginning with ???' ("but"), but the preceding one. Translating ??? in l. 2 by "because" is certainly wrong, since what follows gives no sufficient reason for the thesis 'not everything which appears is true'. For ?????? ??? ??? = 'we have to say firstly that' cf. 1040a16 and On Sophistic Refutations 7, 169a37. ???? ?? ??? ???????? … ?????? ??? ??? is, so to speak, 'telegram style'.

1010b14-16. And again, among sensations themselves the sensation of a foreign object and that of the appropriate object, or that of a kindred object and that of the object of the sense in question, are not equally authoritative.

(1) I propose to delete the words "or that of a kindred object and that of the object of the sense in question".

(2) Alexander (314. 1-3): ?? ?? ? ??? ??????? ??? ??? ????? ???? ?? ??? ??? ??? ????? ? ??? ??????? ? ??? ?????· ????? ??? ??? ????????????? ?? ?????.

Asclepius (282. 2-3): ?????? ?? ??? ??? ??? ??????? ??? ??? \*\*\* ???????? ??? ?????.

Bonitz (1849, p. 206): "Verba ? ??? ??????? ??? ??? ????? b16 jam Alexandri aetate eadem apparet corruptela inquinata fuisse, quae adhuc textui inhaeret; scriptum fuisse ab Aristotele eiusmodi quidpiam: ? ??? ??????? ??? ??? ?????? ex sententiae ratione manifestum est, sed de ipso vocabulo in textum reponendo nihil ausim affirmare."

Ross (i 277): "But the supplying of ? ??? ????? is difficult, and, further, the reference to the distance of the object has already been made in l. 5 and would be a mere repetition here."

(3) As the adversative clause which follows in ll. 16-17 takes reference only to ? ??? ????????? ??? ?????, the problematical words ? ??? ??????? ??? ??? ????? (or ?????) seem to be a later addition, whatever the glossator had in mind. Perhaps, ??? ????? is meant as explanatory of ??? ?????.

1011a16. for they demand to be allowed to contradict themselves—a claim which contradicts itself from the very first.

(1) My proposal: for they demand to be allowed to contradict themselves, contradicting themselves from the very first.

(2) Alexander (318. 9-12): ????? ????? ???? ??? ?? ??????????? ??? ????? ?????, ???? ??? ?? ???????? ???????? ??? ?? ????? ??????, ???? ????? ????? ?????, ??? ?? ????????????? ????????? (???? ??? ??? ????? ???? ???? ?? ??????? ???????????) ???? ????????? ??? ?????????? ?? ???? ????????????.

Richards (pp. 250-251): "The obscurity and difficulty of these last words I believe to be due to the loss of a negative, <???> ???????. The [251] meaning is that they rely on the coercive force of reasoning and will not allow their adversary to be in any way inconsistent, while yet their very thesis is that a thing can both be and not be, that is that two inconsistent statements can both be true. But then no argument proves anything, for the conclusion and the opposite of the conclusion may both be true."

Ross (i 281): "Richards's <???> ???????, 'they demand that we shall not contradict ourselves, when they contradict themselves from the outset' gives no satisfactory connexion with the previous clause."

(3) The translation given by me is the only one allowed by grammar. And it makes sense: what the opponents demand is an impossibility (ll. 15-16), namely to say something contradictory (??????? ??????) after having invalidated the principle of contradiction 'from the very first', so that they are disabled to say anything meaningful at all.

1011a28-30. For to those who for the reasons named some time ago say that what appears is true.

(1) The sentence is incomplete. What is missing is Aristotle's response "to those who …".

(2) Alexander (321. 1-3): ????? ?? ?? ????? ?? ????? ? ?????????. ????? ??? ?? ????????? ???? ?? ???? ???? ?? ???? ??? ??? ????? ????????? ?????? ?? ?????????? ????????? ?????? ????? ????? ? ?????????.

According to Jaeger (1917, p. 513), Alexander has overlooked that the sentence cannot be constructed, if his addition is inserted after ?????? ????? and not after a31 ??? ?????.

Bonitz (1849, p. 209): "Addidi in explicandis verbis ad ???? ?? ???? ???. eiusmodi aliquid ut ????? ? ?????????, cf. Alex. p. 278, 20-22, non quod vere aliquid omissum putarem, sed ut facilius verba interpretari possem; frequens enim est apud Graecos et apud Latinos ea loquendi brevitas, ut omittant id quod exspectes "dici potest" vel "dicendum est", et continuo id ipsum subjiciant, quod est dicendum. Cf. Naegelsbach lat. Stil. §. 151, 1. Hac ratione cum verbis ???? ?? ???? ???. conjungenda sunt ???' ???? ?? ???? ?? ???. Sejungenda ab his et, quo facilius verborum conformation perspiciatur, parenthesi includenda ea sunt, quae in medio sunt posita ???? ??? ????? - ? ?' ???? ??. Etenim his verbis non exponi, quid responderi possit illis viris, ???? ?? ???? - ?????????, sed eorum ipsorum explicari et confirmari judicium, et ex forma enuntiati apparet, siquidem infinitivo ????????? explicat ??? ????? ????????? ??????, et ex ipsa verborum sententia facile cognoscitur."

Nägelsbach (p. 368) gives as example Cicero, De Finibus Bonorum et Malorum 5, 29, 87: "nisi enim id faceret [philosophia], cur Plato Aegyptum peragravit?" "We would say: if philosophy did not have this effect, we had to ask why Plato journeyed over Egypt."

Jaeger (1917, pp. 514-516): "First, the apodosis cannot begin only with a34 ???' ?? ??, because this apodosis cannot be constructed with the protasis and moreover is obviously the antithesis to a31. […]

Secondly: that the alleged apodosis a34 […] follows closely the preceding words ? ??? ??? ??? etc. […], appears from ? 5, 1010b21. […]

Having lost the apodosis to ???? ???? ?? 28, and rejecting Alexander's supplement [see above], we must suppose a gap a30 after ????????? ?????? ?????. What should be supplied, appears from ? 5, 1009a30 or 1010a15. […] Assuming that the copyist was misled by a homoioteleuton, the text would run like this: ???? ???? ?? ???? … ?? ?????????? ????????? ?????? ????? <???????, ??? ????????? ?????? ?? ???? ?????????? ?????? ?????> ??? ??? ????? ????' ?????? ????? ????? ??? ?????." On the conjectured ????????? ?????? could also depend the ????????? in l. 31.

1011b7-8. Again, if a thing is one, it is in relation to one thing or to a definite number of things.

(1) The sense reqires "Again, if a thing is relative …". This is what Alexander paraphrases.

(2) Alexander (323. 17-19): ??? ?? ???? ?? ??????? ???? ?? ???????, ? ?? ??? ???? ????? ?? ????, ???’ ??????? ??? ???? ? ??????? ?????????, ??? ?? ?? ?????· ??????? ??? ??? ???? ?? ???? ????????? ?? ???????.

1012b8-9. If that which it is true to affirm is nothing other than that which it is false to deny. (according to Asclepius)

(1) If that which it is true is nothing other than to affirm that which it is false to deny. (according to Thomas Aquinas and Jaeger)

(2) Alexander (339. 3-10): ?? ????????? ?????? ??? ???????, ??? ?’ ?? ????????. ?? ????? ???? ?? ?????? ????? ? ?? ????? ???? ????? ????? ?????, ??? ????? ?? ????? ???? ???????? ??????, ????? ?? ???? ??? ??? ??? ??????? ?????????? ???? ?? ??? ??? ???????, ??? ???????? ??? ??? ????????????? ???? ??? ????? ??? ?? ???????????? ? ?????? ?????? ????????? ? ?????? ?????????. ?? ??? ??? ?? ????????????? ??????????, ?? ???? ?? ?????? ???????? ???? ?????, ?? ???? ????? ???????????? ????? ?????????· ????? ??? ??? ??? ????????? ??????????, ?? ?????????? ????? ? ??????? ????.

Asclepius (299. 30 - 300. 3): ??? ????? ?? ?? ????? ???? ??????? ???????? ????? ? ???? ???????? ?????? ???????, ???????? ?????? ????? ?????· ?????? ??? ??? ?????????? ??????? ?????? ????? ??????.

Jaeger writes: ?? ?? ????? ???? ?? ?????? ? ?????, <?> ???????? ?????? ?????, 'si verum nil aliud est quam affirmare id quod negare falsum est'. Jaeger's conjecture was anticipated by Thomas Aquinas (Sententia Metaphysicae, liber 4 lectio 17 numerus 5): "Si autem non est aliud verum, quam illud affirmare, quod falsum est negare."

Book V

1012b35-1013a1. e.g a line or a road has a beginning in either of the contrary directions.

(2) Alexander (345. 24-25): ???? ??? ?????? ??? ????, ???? ????????? ?????? ?????.

Jaeger: "??? delevi, omittit Alexander."

1013a21. and essence.

(2) Alexander (347. 15-16): ?????????? ?? ??? ??? ?????? ??? ?? ?? ?????.

Jaeger: "? supplevi."

1013a21-23. for the good and the beautiful are the beginning both of the knowledge and of the movement of many things. (according to Alexander)

(2) Alexander (347. 20-21): ????? ?????? ??? ??? ??? ?????? ??? ??? ???????? ???? ?? ?????? ??? ?? ?????.

(348. 5-8): ???? ??, ????? ?? ?????? ???? ???????, ???? ???????? ??? ?? ?????· ????????? ??? ???? ????????? ????. ??? ?? ???? ???????? ?????? ??? ??? ??? ?????? ??? ??? ???????? ???? ?? ?????? ??? ?? ?????.

1014a26-27. 'Element' means (1) the primary component immanent in a thing, and indivisible in kind into other kinds.

(1) Alexander transmits a reading without 'into other kinds'.

(2) Alexander (354. 28-32): ??? ?? ????????? ???????? ???????, ??????, ??? ??? ?????? ????????? ????????? ????? ?????????, ?? ?? ????????? ?????? ????????????, ?????????? ?? ?????· ?? ??? ???? ?? ????? ?????????? ?? ?????????, ???? ???? ?? ????? ?????. ???????? ?? ??? ?????????? ?? ????? ??? ?????? ????? ??? ?????????? ??? ?? ???? ?????.

1014a31. (while a part of the syllable is not a syllable). (according to Richards)

(2) "???????? <???????>?" (Richards 251)

1014b7-8. (because each of them being one and simple is present in a plurality of things, either in all or in as many as possible).

(1) … either in all or in most of them. (according to Alexander)

(2) Alexander(355. 34-36): ?? ?? ? ????? ? ???? ????????? ?????, ???? ????? ??? ?? ?? ????? ???????? ?????· ? ?? ????? ????, ?? ????? ?? ??? ??????.

Christ: "cf. 998a,27".

1014b26-27. 'Nature' means the primary material of which any natural object consists or out of which it is made.

(2) Jaeger: "?? ????? Ab ex conjectura ut videtur, ut opponantur hic ?? ??????? verbis 32 ??? ??? ????? ?????. at ????? ????? hic non res ipsas significat, sed materiem et cum ?? ?? conjungendum est, non cum ??."

(3) Jaeger's construction of the sentence is excluded both by the word order and by the parallel Physics ii 1, 193a9-12. From the following ll. 12-17 of this passage it becomes clear that the usage in question was initiated by the sophist Antiphon, who illustrated his thesis on the examples of technical products like a statue (cf. 1014b29 with 193a12).

1015b3-4. and similarly as regards the conditions of life and of good. (according to Alexander and Bonitz)

(2) Alexander (361. 11-13): ??? ?? ????????? ??? ????? ??? ??? ?????? ????????? ??? ?? ?? ?????????? ????? ????? ????? ? ?????? ?????.

1015b15. If, then, there are any things that are eternal and unmovable, nothing compulsory or against their nature attaches to them.

(1) … nothing compulsory or against their nature could exist in their field. (according to Jaeger).

(2) Alexander (362. 4-6): ????? ?? ????? ???????? ??? ?? ???? ????? ?? ???? ????? ???? ??? ???????, ???? ?????? ?? ???????? ????? ???? ???? ?????.

Asclepius (309. 24-25): ??? ?????? ??? ????? ????? ????????? ?????? ?? ???????.

(3) As ?? after ????? could easily have dropped out by haplography, nothing can be objected to Jaeger's emendation, although it is not supported by Alexander and Asclepius. But the parallels quoted by him (996a27, 1059a36 and 38) are convincing.

1015b18-19. (for it is the same thing to say 'Coriscus and what is musical', and 'musical Coriscus').

(1) for it is the same thing to say 'Coriscus and what is musical is one', and 'musical Coriscus'. (according to Alexander and Bonitz)

(2) Alexander (362. 15-16): ?????? ??? ?? ?????? ???????? ??? ???????? ??, ??? ??????? ?? ???????? ??????????, ??? ???????? ???????? ?????.

Bonitz (1849, p. 234): "[…] post ???????? e commentario Alexandri p. 321, 17 addendum est ??, quod ad sententiam necessario requiritur et ex superioribus verbis vix potest repeti. Sed idem ?? deinde facile suppletur ad verba proxima ??? ?? ???????? ??? ?? ???????.

1015b19-20. and 'what is musical and what is just', and 'musical Coriscus and just Coriscus'. (according to Alexander)

(2) Alexander (362. 17-18): ?? ???? ???? ?????????? ????? ??? ?? ???????? ??? ?? ???????, ??? ?? ???? ?????????? ???????? ???????? ??? ??????? ????????.

1015b27. because one part of each is an accident of one and the same subject.

(1) because a part of each is an accident of one and the same subject. (according to Jaeger)

(2) Alexander (362. 33 - 363. 1): ?? ?? ???????? ???????? ?? ?????? ??????? ?? ????? ?????, ??? ???????? ?? ????? ?? ????, ? ?? ?????????? ?????? ????, ?????????.

Asclepius (314. 3-4): ??? ???????? ????? ?? ???? ??????????.

Argyropulus: "quod utriusque partis [???????? ??????, the reading of Ab] unum eidem accidit uni."

Bessarion: "quoniam utriusque pars una eidem uni accidit."

Jaeger about ?????????? ??: "dittographia ortum".

(3) Jaeger is right in deleting ?? (which is missing in Ab). For the purposes of the argument, it only matters that the subject of ???????? and ??????? is one and the same (?? ???? ??? ??????????), whereas ?? (in emphasized end-position!) would pose the accent on the (quite irrelevant) fact that each of the predicates ???????? and ??????? is one. Whether this ?? arose by dittography (as Jaeger supposes) or was added deliberately, according to the pattern ?? ??? ???????? ("one thing has one contrary", 995b27, 1004b3, 1055b30), must remain an open question.

1015b27. for it makes no difference to say instead of this that what is musical is an accident of Coriscus. (EJ, not translated by Ross)

(2) Argyropulus: "nihil enim differunt in hoc: Corisco musicum accidere aut Corisco musico Coriscum justum."

Bessarion: "nihil enim differt: aut Corisco musicum accidere aut isti hoc [= ? ?????? ?????, according to Jaeger]."

(3) This additament is evidently a gloss, aiming to explain the preceding sentence. A further addition was made in the manuscripts translated by Argyropulus and Bessarion: 'or that one of this one'. It is based on the wrong assumption that the sentence is incomplete, the ? calling for another ?. But cf. e. g. Topics vi 9, 147b, 23: ?? ?? ????? ????? ???????? ? ?? ?? ????? ???????? ("evil is nothing other than the contrary of good").

1016a27-28. and indeed in a way similar to that in which the matter is one.

(1) and indeed in a way similar to that in which things are one of which the matter is one. (according to Alexander and Jaeger)

(2) Alexander (365. 4-6): ?????? ?? ???? ????? ?????? ????? ?? ???????? ???? ?????????????, ?? ?? ??????? ??????????? ??? ? ??? ???? ???????? ?? ???? ?? ? ????.

Asclepius (315. 1-2): ?????????? ?? ??????? ???? ??? ???????????? ????????, ????? ??? ?? ??????????? ???? ??? ????.

Jaeger: "?? ex Alexandri paraphrasi addidi; cf. 1018a6."

(3) What Aristotle means is not the way "in which the matter is one", but the way "in which things are one of which the matter is one": in both cases, the things have a common 'substrate' (???????????) which 'underlies' the differences (l. 26). Therefore, Jaeger's emendation is required by the sense.

1016a29-30. but sometimes it is the higher genus that is said to be the same (if they are infimae species of their genus)—the genus above the proximate genera.

(1) but sometimes (they are called one) because the higher genus is the same, if they are infimae species of their genus. (according to Jaeger)

(2) Alexander (365. 16-22): ??? ?? ?? ??? ?? ????? ????? ???????? ???????? ?? ???? ?? ???????? ?????, ?? ?? ???????????, ???? ???? ?? ???????. ??? ????? ??’ ?? ?????. ???? ??? ? ???? ???? ???????? ??? ????? ?? ???? ?? ??? ??????????? ??????, ? ?????? ???? ??????? ?? ????? ????? ?????, ???? ?? ??’ ??????, ????????? ???? ??? ?????? ???????? ?? ?? ???? ?? ???????? ?????? ??????? ?????, ???? ???? ?? ???????· ?? ??? ??? ?????? ????????? ?????, ?? ??? ?? ??????? ??????.

Asclepius (315. 6-7): ??? ????? ??? ????? ??? ???? ??? ???? ?? ??? ????? ??????? ?? ????, ?? ? ????????? ??? ?????? ???? ?? ??????? ??????.

Argyropulus: "interdum superiore genere idem dicuntur, ut si non propinquae, sed ultimae sint generis species."

Argyropulus omits the words ?? ??????? ??????, which were deleted later by Christ.

Bessarion: "quandoque vero [unum dicuntur] superiore genere, quod idem dicitur [= ? ?????? ???????, the reading of EJ]: si ultimae generis species sunt, illa autem superiora ipsis."

Bonitz (1849, p. 236): "Ea verba, quibus haec peculiaris ratio specierum extremarum significatur, ??? ?? ?? ??? … ??????? ??????, manifesto depravata sunt. Nam ?? ????????? ??? ?????? ????, veluti triangulum aequicrurum et scalenum, non possunt ipsa dici ?? ??????? ??????, quum per pronomen ?????? ipsae significentur species ultimae. Itaque necesse est cum Alexandro [365. 22] ?? ??????? scribatur. Praeterea si omiseris ? ante ??????, et ?? ??????? per appositionem explicativam conjunxeris cum ?? ??? ?????, omnia satis erunt plana."

Jaeger: "sed ?? (Alexander 365. 22) non ad verba citata pertinet."

Christ: "ipse haec verba [?? ??????? ??????] ab interpolatore addita notavi."

Jaeger: "??? supplevi, cf. 23 et 26, 1015b29."

Jaeger: "???? ante ?? ??? ex Alexandri paraphrasi Asclepio addidit Christ, sed cave ?????? conjungas cum ???????, immo ?? animo supplendum est ad ??????? ex eis quae praecedunt (29), nam non dicit hoc loco de variis significationibus ??? ?????, sed ??? ????."

Jaeger: "? post ????? addit ? e conjectura ut videtur ut ??? ????????? generis causam faciat unitatis, quia ??? exciderat."

(3) First of all, it must be clear that the ???-clause needs a neutrum pluralis as subject, which can be supplied (as subject) in the following ??-clause. As Argyropulus ("idem dicuntur") and Jaeger have rightly perceived, the ???-clause must run ????? ?? ???????. These words can be supplied completely from the preceding clause (not only ????? ??, as Jaeger thinks). Therefore, the transmitted text (where ?? ????? has become subject) must be corrupt.

What is needed is further a pendant to ????? (in l. 29), i. e. another reason or sense of being one. Argyropulus and Bessarion yield it: "superiore genere", in Greek ?? ??? ?????. This is what Asclepius paraphrases by ???? ?? ??? ????? (???? ?? ??????? in Alexander).

But ?? ??? ????? cannot be the original wording, because what is transmitted cannot be derived from it. This requirement is met by Jaeger's <???> ?? ??? ????? ??????. Once the ??? had dropped out, two alternative remedies were tried: changing ?? ??? ????? to ?? ??? ?????, and adding ???????.

To delete this word is what remains to do after Jaeger. Joining it, as Jaeger demands, not with ??????, but with a ?? to be supplied in thought, is too much to expect from the reader.

1016b17-18. The essence of what is one is to be some kind of beginning of number. (Ab)

(1) The essence of what is one is the principle of being a certain number. (according to Jaeger)

(2) Alexander (368. 15-16): ?????????? ???? ?????????? ??? ??? ?? ??? ????? ?? ???? ??????? ????? ?????.

Christ (1853, pp. 36-37): "In sequentibus Aristoteles neutiquam docet, unitatem principium numeri esse, sed eo tendit, ut unitatem, primam omnium rerum cognitarum mensuram (???? ??? ??? ??????? ???? ???????), principium quoddam esse probet. Qui sententiarum nexus luculentissime apparet ex proxima enuntiatione causam rei propositae tradenti ?? ??? ?????? ?????? (primam enim mensuram unitatem esse sumitur) ????. Jam quid significat illud ???? (versu 18)? Num aliis in rebus aliud est principium numeri? Ne longior sim: ???????, jam ob diversam formam annexionemque in diversis codicibus suspectum, est glossema quoddam ex 1021a13 ?? ?? ??? ??????? ???? et 1052b23 ??? ?? ?? ??????? ???? ? ??????? perverse huc inlatum. Ejecto igitur hoc commenticio verbo lectio codicis Ab, quocum Alexander fortasse conspirat, arcessenda est: ?? ?' ??? ????? ???? ???? ????? ?????, casu dativo ???? per attractionem abunde munito."

Jaeger (1917, pp. 504-505): "But from what follows, it appears that ???? and ?????? is to be read with ?, and that the notion of unity is not the principle of a certain number, but of being a certain number". He therefore proposes ?? ??? ????? ???? <???> ???? ????? ?????? ?????, "the concept of One is the principle for the concept of every certain number".

Jaeger: "???? ad ?????? pertinet; cf. ?? ??????? ????? similiaque."

(3) That ???? belongs to ?????? (Jaeger), not to ???? (Ross), seems to me obvious: the One is the principle of number, not some principle.

1016b26. a line if it is divisible in one dimension.

(2) Alexander (368. 36-37): ?? ?? ?????? ????????? ?????? (???? ??? ?????), ???????? ?? ?? ????, ?? ?? ????? ?? ??? ????? ????? ????????? (?? ??? ?????) ????.

Jaeger (1917, p. 505): "Supplying ????????? appears necessary. Alexander seems to have read the word."

1017a9-10. and 'the musician is a man'.

(1) and what is musical is a man. (according to Alexander and Jaeger)

(2) Alexander (370. 9-12): ????? ?? ???? ?????????? ?? ?? ??? ?? ????? ?????????? ???? ???? ???, ?? ???? ???????, ? ??????? ???????? ?????, ????? ?? ??? ???? ?????????? ??, ???? ?? ?? ?????, ? ???????? ???????? ?????, ???? ??, ?? ?????, ?? ???????? ???????? ?????.

Jaeger: "cf. 17."

1017a21. or because that to which the attribute belongs is. (EJ)

(3) ?????? (EJ, Ross) is to be preferred to ?????? (Ab, Jaeger), cf. ll. 18-19. ?????? is not supported by Alexander (371, 11-12: ? ??? ?? ?????????? ????? ???? ??????? ??? ????????? ?? ??????????????), as Jaeger pretends; ??? ????????? ?? ?????????????? is rather Alexander's amplification of ???????.

1017a34-35. but 'the diagonal of the square is not commensurate with the side' means that it is false to say it is. (Alexander, Bonitz)

(2) Bonitz (1842, pp. 89-90): "[…] Aristoteles exemplum affert, qua illustretur, per negativam copulam ??? ???? significari aliquid tamquam falsum, ?? ?' ??? ????? ? ????????? ??????????, ??? ??????. At ut recte se habeat hoc exemplum non universam enuntiationem falsam esse oportet, quae quidem est hujus enuntiationis ratio ut nunc legitur, sed eam partem enuntiationis, cui negativa copula ??? ????? adjicitur. Itaque ex ipsa sententiae ratione apparet pro ?????????? scribendum esse ?????????: ?? ?' ??? ????? ? ????????? ?????????, ??? ??????, h. e. si quis dicit lineam diagonalem quadrati non esse rationalem ad latus quadrati, significat eum falli, qui rationalem esse (? ????????? ?????????) opinetur. Hanc interpretationem praecepit Alexander [372. 6-10]: ?? ?? ?????? ?? ?? ????????, ?? ???? ???? ??? ?? ????? ??? ????????? ?? ?????? ?????????. ???????? ??? ?? ??? ????????? ????????? ?? ?????? ?? ?? ?????, ?????? ????? ?? ????? ?????. ? ??? ??? ??? ????????? ????? ?????? ????? ????? ?? ?????, ? ?? ??? ???????? ??????? ?? ????? ?? ?????? ??. Emendationem, si qua confirmatione egere videatur, ipse Aristoteles potest confirmare, qui idem exemplum paullo post post his prope iisdem verbis exponit ?, 12. p. 1019b23 […] et ?, 29. p. 1024b17."

1017a35-b3. Again, 'being' and 'that which is' mean that some of the things we have mentioned 'are' potentially, others in complete reality. For we say both of that which sees potentially and of that which sees actually, that it is 'seeing'. (Alexander, Bonitz)

(2) Alexander (372. 12-15): ?? ?? ? ??????????? ???? ??? ??????? ?? ?????, ????? ?? ????? ?? ???????, ??? ??????? ??? ?????? ?????, ?? ??? ??? ????? ???. ?? ?? ?????????? ??? ????????? ??????, ???????? ??? ????? ?? ??? ???????.

Bonitz (1849, p. 242): "Sententia Aristotelis nihil habet obscuri, sed de ipsis verbis plus una oritur dubitatio. Primum ????? et ????? antiquitus jam in textum irrepsisse testis est Alexander [372. 12-15], non genuinum illud esse facile sibi persuadebit, qui omnes Aristotelis de potentia locos contulerit; sed qui potuerit inferri in textum non video."

(3) ????? and ????? are glosses by a reader who misunderstood ??????? as "in substance, implicitly", the opposite of which is "expressly" (?????), see Sextus Empiricus (Against the Logicians I. 16): … ?? ???????? ??? ?????????? ?? ??? ?? ????? ??????? ?? ?? ?????? ?? ?? ???????? ?? ??????? ??? ?????? ????? ???????, … ???????? ?? ?? ???? ??? ?????????? ??? ?? ??? ??? ????????? ("… those who divide Philosophy into Physics, Ethics, and Logic. Of these Plato is, in substance, the pioneer … but those who most expressly adopt this division are Xenocrates and the Stoics").

1018a5. others are the same by their own nature, in as many senses as that which is one by its own nature is so. (Alexander, Jaeger)

(2) Alexander (376. 15-16): ??? ?? ???? ?????????? ?????? ???????? ????????? ???? ???? ??????, ?????? ??? ?? ???? ?????????? ?? ?? ??? ?? ???????.

Alexander (377. 17-18): ?? ?? ???’ ???? ????? ???????? ???????? ?????????? ???? ???????? ?????? ??? ?? ???’ ???? ??.

Asclepius (320. 15-16): ??? ?? ??? ???? ?????????? ????? ????????, ?? ?? ???’ ????, ????? ??? ??.

Jaeger (1917, p. 506): "The editors have failed to notice that ????? is somewhat vague, and that in ??? ????? (the reading of the Byzantine recensio ?) the trace of the genuine reading is hidden: ?? ?? ???' ???? (???????) ????????? ??? ?? ??." He refers to Alexander's paraphrasis.

1018a25. hence their constituents are opposed.

(1) because their constituents are opposed. (according to Jaeger)

(2) Alexander (381. 2-4): ?? ?? ??? ?? ?? ????? ?????????? ??????? ????????? ???? ?? ??? ?? ??? ?? ?? ???? ?? ?????? ???????? ??????????.

Jaeger: "????? correxi; ??? Ab ? Alexandri citatio; de lectione jam Alexander dubitabat, sic intellege: ?? ????? et ?? ?????? eidem rei non competunt propterea quod ?? ????? et ?? ?????? (i. e. ?? ?? ???? ?? ?????) inter se opposita sunt."

1018a37-38. and therefore 'same', 'other', and 'contrary', must correspond, so that they must be different for each category.

(1) and therefore 'same', 'other', and 'contrary', must be different for each category. (according to Jaeger)

Alexander (383. 13-14): ???? ????? ???? ??? ?????????? ? ????????? ??? ?? ?????? ??? ?????? ??? ?????? ??? ????????.

Christ: "???' … ?????????? non interpretatur Alexander atque vel iterata particula ???? suspecta sunt."

Ross (i 315): "Christ brackets these words and thinks there is no trace of them in Alexander, but they are paraphrased in Al. 383. 13."

Jaeger: "???' delevi; verba ???' ????? …?????????? seclusit Christ, sed in eis summa totius sententiae posita est."

1018b4-5. and so are those things whose definitions differ in the infima species of the genus.

(2) Alexander (383. 37 - 384. 2): ????? ????? ?? ????? ????? ??? ?? ?????? ????? ?? ?? ???? ????? ????? ?? ????? ??? ?? ??????? ????? ??????, ?? ????? ??? ????· ?? ??? ????? ???? ?????????.

(384. 26-28): ???? ??? ?? ?? ?? ????????? ??? ?????? ????? ?? ????? ?? ????? ??????· ????? ???????? ??????? ??? ????? ???? ????? ?? ?????.

Ross (i 316): "But this use of ?? with ?????? is surprising (the closest parallel I have found is Poetics 1448a16 ?? ????? ?? ?? ??????? ??? ? ???????? ???? ??? ???????? ?????????); and we should expect 'differ in respect of the last differentia'. Alexander's words ?? ?????? ????? ?? ?? ???? ????? ????? (383. 37) suggest the reading ????, ????? ?????????? ??? ?????? ?????, ?? ????? ??????, which gives a good sense. If ????? were once corrupted into ?? ??, the remaining changes would follow. But in 384. 26 Alexander presupposes the manuscript reading."

Jaeger: "sed cf. 7 ??? ?? ?? ???? ?????."

1018b10-12. because they are nearer some beginning determined either absolutely and by nature, or by reference to something or in some place or by certain people. (Alexander, Bonitz)

(2) Alexander (384. 36 - 385. 2): ??????? ?? ?? ??? ???? ??????? ???????? ?? ????? ????? ????????? ???????? ????? ? ????? ??? ?? ????? ????????? ??? ???????? ????? ?????, ? ???? ?? ?????, ? ??? ????? ?? ???????????.

Bonitz (1849, p. 250): "?? ????????? scripsi pro vulgato ?? ?????????, secutus Alexandri auctoritatem [384. 37] et similitudinem proximorum verborum b12: ?? ????? ?????????, quibus illa ipsa explicantur; cf. 6. 1016a17. 13. 1020a30. al."

Jaeger (1917, pp. 506-507) additionally supplies ?????: ?? ????? ????????? ????? ????? ?????????. "Only b15 und b17, having repeated the formula constantly, Aristotle can omit the ?????." Jaeger compares ? 22, 1022b33-1023a4.

1018b18-19. (for the Nemean games are prior to the Pythian, if we treat the present as beginning and first point, because they are nearer the present).

(1) for the Nemean games are prior to the Pythian, because they are nearer, if we treat the present as beginning and first point. (according to Alexander and Jaeger)

(2) Alexander (385. 25-29): ??? ?? ??? ????????? ??????? ??????? ??? ?? ???????? ??? ???, ?????? ?? ?? ?????????. ?? ??? ???? ?????? ???????? ???? ?? ??? ?? ??? ???????? ??? ???????? ?????? ???????? ??????? ???????, ?? ?? ????????? ??? ????????? ??????? ?????????.

Jaeger: "??? ??? delevi, omittit Alexandri paraphrasis."

1018b26-27. these are the things that are placed at intervals in reference to some one definite thing according to some rule. (Alexander, Jaeger)

(2) Alexander (386. 10-12): ??? ??? ???? ?? ?? ????????? ????????? ?? ???? ????, ?? ?????? ???? ????? ?? ????? ??? ?? ???????, ?? ? ?? ???? ??????????? ??? ??????????? ????????·

Jaeger (1917, pp. 508-509): "???? ??? ????? means «in respect of the concept» (cf. b32), but the sense requires «according to the relation» (cf. ? 9, 991b15, ? 10, 993a17). ??? is mistaken for ????, as often." He refers to Alexander, de gener. anim. ? 2, 767a15 sq. (?? ??? ???? ??? ??? ?????????? ???? ??????. ????? ??? ?? ???????? ???? ?????? ? ????? ???? ???? ?????), de gener. anim. ? 4, 740b32 sq. (??? ???? ???? ??????? ???????), mechan. 1, 848b10 (? ?????? … ?? ???? ???? ???????).

1019a19-20. 'Potency' then means the source, in general, of change or movement in another thing or in the same thing qua other.

(1) My proposal: 'Potency' then means, in one sense, the source of change or movement in another thing or in the same thing qua other.

(2) Alexander (389. 18-20): ??? ??? ??? ????? ???? ??????? ????????, ?? ?? ???? ?????????? ???? ??? ??????? ?????????, ?? ????? ?? ????????? ‘? ??? ??? ??????? ???? ?????????’, ? ??? ??????.

Jaeger (1917, p. 517) corrects ???? to ?????, comparing 9, 1018a4 ??? ?? ??? ????? ??????? ?????, ?? ?? ???' ???? (sc. ?????); 11, 1019a1 ?? ??? ?? ???? ??????? ??????? ??? ??????, ?? ?? ???? ????? ??? ??????; 13, 1020a26 ??? ?? ???? ?????????? ????????? ????? ?? ??? (correxi, ?? ??? codd.) ????? ??????? … ?? ?? ?? ??????? ??? ??????; 15, 1021b3 ?? ??? ??? ???' ????? ???????? ???? ?? ?? ??? ???? ???????, ?? ?' ??? ?? ???? ????? ? ???????, 1015b35, 1018b29, 1020b1.

Jaeger: "????? ex Alexandro (389. 8 [recte: 389. 18]) correxi."

Ross (i 320) defends the manuscript reading: "What answers to ? ??? ??? ???? is not ? ?' l. 20, since that also introduces a general sense. The general sense of ??????? introduced by ? ??? ??? ???? is opposed to the narrower sense introduced in l. 23."

(3) Two things appear from Alexander's paraphrasis: that he has read ????, and that by ????? he is substituting (for the sake of brevity) ???? ????????? ? ???????? … ?? ????? ? ? ??????. Where this disturbing ???? originates becomes immediately visible, if we compare 1049b6-8, an obvious parallel. To delete it is easier for me than to believe, with Ross, that a 'narrower sense' can be introduced by ???.

1019a31-32. because of a 'potency' and because they 'can' do something and are in some positive state.

(2) Jaeger (1917, pp. 505sq.): "?? ???????? ??? ?? ????? ??? should be corrected into ?? ???????? ??? ?? ????? ???, cf. 1019b6, 7, 8, 10, 12. To refer ?? ???????? and ?? ????? ??? to ???, coordinating it with (zero article) ???????, is stilistically impossible. Especially in book ?, dativi causae as nominalized infinitives are a pastime, of which any number of examples can be gathered."

1019b8-10. so that things are capable both by having a positive habit and principle, and by having the privation of this, if it is possible to have a privation; and if privation is not in a sense 'habit', 'capable' is used in two distinct senses. (Alexander, Ross)

(1) and if privation is not in a sense 'habit', 'capable' is used in two distinct senses, so that things are capable both by having a positive habit and principle, and by having the privation of this, if it is possible to have a privation. (according to Jaeger)

(2) Alexander (392. 10-15): ???? ?? ??? ?? ????? ??? ??????? ?????, ???’ ?? ????? ??? ???????? ???? ?? ?? ???????, ??????? ??????? ??, ?? ?? ?? ??? ??? ???????? ???????? ????????. ????? ?? ????? ????????, ? ?? ?? ??? ???? ??? ? ????????, ???????? ?? ??? ?????? ?? ?? ???? ?? ??????? ???????????? ??? ?? ??? ?? ??????· ?? ??? ??? ?? ???? ?????, ?? ?? ?? ?????????? ?????? ??? ?????.

Christ (1853, pp. 37-38): "Corruptelam his verbis [???????? ?? ????????? ?? ??, the reading of EJ] insidere vidit Bonitzius, difficilior est medela. Atque verba ?? ????????? ?? ?? ex interpolatione orta esse ipsa forma, aliter in alio codice detorta, ostendit. Primam autem interpolationis formam auguror fuisse hanc: ???????? ?? ?????????. Praeterea verba codicis Ab ?? ????? - ??????? manifesto ex sequentibus versu 8 perperam huc tracta sunt. Idcirco legas sic: ????? ?? ????? ?? ??? ??, ?? ?? ??, ????????, ???? …; verba enim ?? ?? ?? propter similitudinem praecedentium literarum in reliquis codicibus praeter Ab facillime excidere potuerunt. Quam apte vero extrema verba Aristoteles adjecerit, facile intellectu est. Etenim si quis propter solam vocis ambiguitatem verbum ????? ad privationem designandam adhiberi dixerit, is homonymice saltem omnia ?? ????? possibilia esse concedet."

Jaeger (1917, p. 512): "???????? ?? ????????? ?? ?? is not an interpolation but a marginal gloss for the purpose of explaining the term ???????? […]. For these mysterious words are nothing but as the mutilated opening sentence of the Categories ??????? ??????? ?? ????? ????? ??????."

1019b10-11. and a thing is capable in another sense because neither any other thing, nor itself qua other, has a potency or principle which can destroy it. (Alexander, Bonitz)

(2) Alexander (392. 18-22): ????? ?? ???? ?????? ??????? ???????? ?? ??????, ?? ????? ???? ??????? ????????? ???? ????? ?? ????? ???? ?? ????· ?????? ??? ????????? ?? ???????????? ?? ? ????· ?? ??? ??? ???? ?? ?? ???? ?? ????????? ???? ????????, ???’ ?? ???? ?? ???? ?? ???? ????· ????? ??? ???? ????? ?????????.

Bonitz (1849, pp. 254-255): "Quod autem b11 pro ?? ???? scripsi ????, id et comparatis verbis a35: ??? ??? ?? ????? ???? ??????? ???????? et auctoritate Alexandri satis comprobatum videbitur."

1019b22-23. while others are so [???????] in another sense; i.e. both ??????? and ???????? are used as follows.

(1) while others are called dunaton (possible) and adunaton (impossible) in another sense. (according to Christ)

(2) Alexander (394. 11-13): ?? ?? ????? ?????? ???? ???? ??????????· ??? ??? ??????? ?? ??? ???????? ?? ???? ???????? ????????? ????? ? ???????? ????????, ???? ??? ?????.

Christ: ???? seclusi.

Jaeger: "omittit Alexander ut videtur."

(3) Jaeger is wrong: ???? is what Alexander paraphrases by ??? ???. But Christ is nevertheless right in secluding it, because ??????? ?? ??? ???????? (not ???????, as Alexander and Ross suppose) must be subject of ????? ?????? (???????); this subject is divided into ???????? ??? … (l. 23), ?? ?' ???????? ?????, ?? ??????? (ll. 27-28). He who added ???? (on the model of 1022b4) did not grasp the syntax of this long sentence. Having grasped it, we will not be tempted to delete the ?? before ??????? in l. 28.

1019b25-26. because such a statement is a falsity of which the contrary is not only true but also necessary. (deleting ?????????? ?????)

(2) Alexander (394. 14-16): ???????? ?? ??? ??????? ?? ?? ???????? ?? ??????? ??????, ???? ?? ??? ????????? ????????? ????? ???????? ?? ????? ????? ??????????. ?? ?? ?? ???????? ?? ??????? ??????, ?? ??????? ?????? ????.

Argyropulus: "propterea quod falsum est istiusmodi: ut contrarium eius non solum sit verum sed etiam necessario verum, diametrum inquam incommensurabilem esse."

Argyropulus has well understood that the relative clause must make a general statement (not a statement about the diagonal, ?????????? ?????).

Ross (i 321): "?????????? ????? is plainly a gloss. For this usage of ?????? cf. Plato's Gorgias 475 B 8, 499 B 2."

Jaeger: "sed ?????? infinitivum postulat; homoeoteleuto haec fere verba excidisse puto: ???? ??? ?????? <?????? ?????? ??? ?? ????????? ??????> ?????????? ?????? ?? ??? ????????? …"

(3) Jaeger neglects the two instances of ?????? without infinitive given by Ross.

1019b32. in one, that which is true. (deleting ?????)

(2) Ross (i 321-322): "?? ?????? ????? if retained must = ? ????? ?????? ?????, ????? being epexegetic of ???????? ?? ??? ???????, ? ?????? ????? ?????? ????? - 'that of which it is true to say that it is'. ???????? ?? ??? ???????, ? ?????? ????? ?????? ????? Alexander [394. 29]. The analogy of ?? ?????? ????? ?. 1012b9, ?????? ?????? Analytica Priora 28b29 is not very close, and there is little doubt that ????? is an emblema from the next line."

1019b35-1020a1. But the senses which involve a reference to potency all refer to the primary kind of potency. (Alexander, Bekker)

(1) But the senses which involve a reference to potency all refer to a single one. (variant reading according to Asclepius)

(2) Alexander (395. 2-5): ????? ?? ??? ??????? ?????? ???? ?? ??????? ????? ? ??? ?????? ? ??? ???????, ? ??? ???????? ?????? ????? ?? ??? ?????? ?? ?? ??????? ? ?????? ?????, ????? ?? ????? ????? ???? ??? ?????? ??????? ??? ???????? ?????.

Asclepius (330. 25-27): ?? ?????? ?? ???????? ?? ???????? ???? ??????? ????? ???????? ???? ??? ?????? ????? ? ??? ???? ???? ??? ??????· ????? ??? ??????? ? ?????.

Jaeger: "sed cf. 1046a10 ubi hunc locum citat Aristoteles."

(3) Jaeger neglects the fact that in 1046a10 the article ??? is omitted. It seems that ???? ??? ?????? and ???? ?????? ???? are alternative readings.

1020a7-8. 'Quantum' means that which is divisible into two or more constituent parts of which each is by nature a 'one' and a 'this'.

(1) 'Quantum' means that which is divisible into constituent parts of which each is by nature a 'one' and a 'this'.

(2) Alexander (395. 31-32): ????? ?? ????? ????? ?? ????????? ??? ???????????, ?? ??????? ? ???????? ?? ?? ??? ???? ?? ??????? ?????.

(396. 2-5): ??? ?’ ?? ??? ??? ?? ???????? ? ??????? ?? ?? ??? ???? ?? ??????? ????? ??????? ??? ????? ?? ?? ?? ????? ??????? ??? ?????? ??????????, ? ?? ? ?? ?????? ??? ? ?????.

Jaeger: "???????? ? seclusi, erat varia lectio ad ???????; cf. Alexandrum."

(3) Jaeger's reference to Alexander sounds as if the latter gave support to deleting ???????? ?, but this is not true.

1020a18-19. for 'a certain kind of quantum' is present in the definition which states what it is.

(1) for quantity is present in the definition which states what it is. (according to Alexander)

(2) Alexander (397. 2-4): ??? ??? ???’ ???? ??? ?????? ????? ?? ??? ???? ??? ??????? ?????? ???? ????· ????? ?? ????? ???? ?? ?? ?????? ?? ????? ?????????.

(3) The definitions of line (??????) mentioned by Bonitz in his Index (p. 162a4-7) are: ??????? ?? ??' ?? (268a8), ?? ?????? ????????? (1016b26), ????? ???????????? (1020a4), ????? ??????? (143b12). ????? ?? is not present in any one of them. In all probability, the ?? has been intruded from l. 18. What Aristotle wants to say is that the concept of quantity is implied in the definition of line, not that the word 'quantum' does occur in it.

1020a22. heavy and light.

(1) To be omitted according to Christ and Jaeger.

(2) Alexander (397. 21-24): ???? ??? ?? ???? ??? ?????? ?? ???? ???’ ???? ?????? ???· ???????????? ?? ???? ???’ ?????? ??? ?? ???? ??????. ??? ???? ??? ?? ???? ???, ???? ???????? ????? ? ????????? ??????????, ???? ??, ???? ?? ??? ???? ???????? ?? ?????? ???? ?????.

Christ: "??? ???? ??? ?????? spuria, cf. 1020b10 et Alexandrum 364, 18."

Jaeger: "cf. etiam 1089b11-14."

1020a26-28. Of things that are quanta incidentally, some are so called in the sense in which it was said that the musical and the white were quanta.

(2) Jaeger: "?? correxi."

(3) Ross presupposes already the correction made by Jaeger.

1020b6-7. and in general that which exists in the essence of numbers besides quantity is quality.

(2) Alexander (399. 36-38): ??? ???? ??? ? ???? ?? ????? ??? ??? ?????? ??? ??? ????? ??? ??????? ?? ?? ?????? ???????, ????? ??????? ???????.

Thomas Aquinas (Sententia Metaphysicae, liber 5 lectio 16 numerus 5): "Id ergo, quod existit in substantia numeri praeter ipsam quantitatem, quae est numeri substantia, dicitur qualitas eius."

Fonseca: "Sensus est: quicquid absolutum cernitur in substantia numeris compositis subjecta praeter ipsam quantitatem seu unitatum collectionem, in qua essentia eorum consistit, ad qualitatem huius secundi generis spectat."

(3) If we understand ??? ??? ?????? ??? ??? ????? ??? ??????? in Alexander's paraphrasis as explanatory of ?? ?????, he says the same as Thomas Aquinas and Fonseca, which is a quite satisfactory interpretation.

1020b17-18. Secondly, there are the modifications of things that move, qua moving, and the differentiae of movements.

(2) Alexander (401. 6-9): ???????? ?? ?????? ????????? ?? ???? ??? ?? ??????? ?????? ???’ ? ?????????? ?? ???? ??? ???????. ?????????? ?? ???? ?????? ???????, ???’ ? ?? ?????????? ?????????, ??? ??? ??? ???????? ????????.

Jaeger: "?? addidi; cf. 18 ??, 15 ?, Alexandri paraphrasin 401. 7."

(3) Ross's translation presupposes Jaeger's emendation.

1021a2-3. that which is n+1/n times something else is in an indefinite relation to that something.

(1) that which is n+1/n times something else is numerically indefinite. (according to Jaeger)

(2) Alexander (403. 22-26): ????? ?? ??? ??? ? ????????? ???? ??? ??????????? ???? ?? ??? ???????? ????? ???????, ???????? ?? ???? ??? ????????· ?? ??? ??? ???????? ??? ???? ?????, ?????? ?????? ??? ??? ????? ??? ???????? ????? ?? ?? ????????? ??? ?? ????????· ????? ?? ???? ??? ?? ???????????? ???? ?? ??????????????, ? ???? ?? ??? ???????, ?? ??? ?????????.

Jaeger: "??????? ???????? ex Alexandri paraphrasi scripsi: non omnino (????) ???' ??????? ???????? (1021a4) est ?? ????????? ???? ?? ???????????, immo sicut ?? ???????????? ???? ?? ?? se habet (cf. 1020b35)."

1021a5-6. for number is always commensurate, and 'number' is not predicated of that which is not commensurate. (reading ????????? instead of ????????? or ?????????)

1021a21-22. Of relations which imply potency some further imply particular periods of time.

(2) Alexander (406. 3-6): ??? ?? ???? ???????, ????, ????????? ???? ?????? ??? ????????? ?? ??? ?????????, ???????? ??? ???? ?? ???????? ?????? ?? ??? ???????, ??? ???? ?????? ???? ???????? ???? ???? ??.

Ross (i 330): "The subject of the sentence must be extracted out of the partitive genitive .The construction is not common, but cf. ?. 1070b7 ???? ?? ??? ?????? ????????? ????, Rhetorica 1416a21 [? ????? ? ??? ?????], Xenophon Anabasis iii. 5. 16 (??????) ????? ???? ??? ???????? ?????????, ??? ??????????? ???? ?? ???? ???????? ??? ??????? ???? ???????."

Jaeger: "???? ex Alexandri citatione supplevi."

1021a26-28. Relative terms which imply number or potency, therefore, are all relative because their very essence includes in its nature a reference to something else.

(2) Alexander (406. 24-25): ????? ?? ????? ????? ???? ?? ???????? ???? ?? ??????? ????? ???? ????? ????? ????????, ???? ?? ?? ???? ???? ????.

Christ (1853, p. 32): "[…] ???? ? ????? ex glossemate formulam ???? ????? explicante in textum irrepsisse ipse Alexander ad hunc locum docet, ut qui verba ???? ????? ipsis illis interpolatoris verbis interpretetur: ???' ????? ? ?????, ??? ???? ? ????? ? ????? ???????."

Without mentioning Christ, Jaeger (1917, p. 505), too, considers ???? ? ????? as varia lectio: "The wording must be either ?? ???? ?????, ????? ????????, or ?? ???? ? ?????, ????? ????????. Both together cannot be constructed. A similar varia lectio is shown by Bonitz to ? 7, 1017b1 and b3."

1021b3. 'the sight is of that of which it is.' (Ab)

(1) 'the sight is of that of which it is sight.' (according to Asclepius, Bonitz, Jaeger)

(2) Alexander (407. 34-35): ??? ????? ???? ?? ????? ????.

Asclepius (337. 33): ??? ????? ? ???? ?? ????? ????.

Bonitz (1842, p. 54): "Extrema verba [1021a29-b3] si quis comparaverit cum iis e superioribus, quibus ea respondere ex universa sententiae conformatione (??????) patet, ??? ?'????? ?????????? - ??? ??? ?'????? ????????? ?? ???, ????? ???? ?? ????? ? ???? - ???? ?' ? ??????? ???? ????? ?? ???? ???????, non dubitabit vel ex mera conjectura extrema eam in formam restituere, quam subjecti et praedicati natura requirit ??? ????? ? ???? ?? ????? ???? (cf. b1. ?? ????? ????). Sed nec recedimus quod textum hunc in modum exhibemus a fide librorum manuscriptorum, siquidem Hb adjecto articulo ad ???? priore loco, omisso eodem ad ???? posteriore loco eandem habet lectionem, quam nos veram esse censemus."

Ross (i 331): "But the right form is got by adopting Ab's reading ??? ????? ?? ????? ? ????, 'sight is of that of which it is'. The first ???? is doubtless a gloss."

(3) Asclepius' reading is the better one because it corresponds perfectly with l. 32 ???? ?' ? ??????? ???? ????? ?? ???? ???????.

1021b29-30. But the ultimate purpose is also an end.

(1) But the end and the purpose are also something ultimate. (according to Jaeger)

(2) Alexander (411. 34-37): ?? ?? ????? ?? ??? ?? ?? ????? ??????? ?? ???? ???? ?? ?????? ?? ????? ?? ?? ?? ????? ???????. ? ????? ???? ?????? ????? (??? ??? ? ??????? ???????) ?????????? ??? ??? ?? ????? ?? ??? ?? ????? ??? ???? ???????.

Jaeger: "an ?? ante ????? alterum addi oporteat dubitat Alexander in paraphrasi, supplevi."

(3) Jaeger's reading is supported by ?? ????? ??? ??????? ?? ???? in l. 25.

1022a11-12. 'limit' has as many senses as 'beginning'.

(2) Alexander (414. 14): ??????? ??, ?????, ??? ?????? ? ???? ???????, ?????????? ??? ?? ?????.

Jaeger: "?? omittit Alexander in citatione; an ?? corrigendum est?"

(3) In favor of Jaeger's ?? can be said that ??? ?? is frequent in Aristotle (e. g. 1050b33).

1022a15. e.g. that in virtue of which a man is good is the good itself.

(1) e.g. that in virtue of which the good man is good is the good itself. (according to Alexander and Christ)

(2) Alexander (414. 32-36): ??? ?? ?? ?? ????? ?? ??????, ?????? ????? ?? ?????? ??????· ?????? ?? ???’ ? ? ?????? ??????. ?? ?? ???? ?????? ????? ???? ???, ???’ ? ? ?????? ?????? ?????, ?????? ????· ?? ??? ???’ ???? ?? ?????? ? ?????? ? ???? ?? ?????? ??? ??? ??? ?????? ??????.

(3) Alexander's reading supposed to be the original one, the manuscript reading can easily be explained by haplography.

1022a22-24. Further ???' ? is used in reference to position, e.g. 'at which he stands' or 'along which he walks.

(2) Alexander (415. 27-29): ??? ???? ???? ?????????? ??????? ?? ???’ ? ????????? ???? ????? ???? ??? ?????.

Jaeger: "?? [before ???’ ?] seclusi; cf. b10, 13."

(3) Ross tacitly omits the ?? before ???? ????? and adds ???? before ???' ? ???????. These changes are indeed necessary because ???' ? ??????? ? ???' ? ??????? is an example, not a definition, of ???? ?????. After ???? had dropped out, ?? was inserted, in order to make the sentence grammatically correct. Jaeger's reading is pleonastic and does not remove the main difficulty.

1022a35-36. Whatever attributes belong to a thing alone, and in so far as they belong to it merely by virtue of itself considered apart by itself.

(1) Whatever attributes belong to a thing alone, and in so far as it is alone; therefore what is apart is in virtue of itself. (E, Alexander, Jaeger)

(2) Alexander (416. 37 - 417. 4): ?? ?? ??? ?? ???????????? ???’ ???? ????????? ?? ??? ??? ??? ????? ??? ?? ??????? ???’ ????, ??? ????????? ??????? ?????? ???????. ???????? ??? ??? ?? ??????????? ???’ ????, ??? ??? ?? ?????? ?? ?? ?????????· ???’ ???? ??? ??????? ?? ?????????.

Ross (i 335): "I read, without much conviction, ??' ???? ???????????? ???' ????."

Jaeger: "sed noli tentare ??? in clausulis; cf. 1022b13, 1023a5, b24, 1024a28."

(3) I cannot see any objection to the reading of the manuscript E. Cf. 1060a12, 1075a12-13, Plato's Phaedo 64 C. From 995b32-33 it appears that, conversely, not all what is ???’ ???? is also ????????.

1022b4-5. 'Having' means a kind of activity of the haver and of what he has.

(1) 'Having' means a kind of activity between the haver and what he has. (according to Rassow)

(2) Alexander (417. 23-26): ??? ??? ????? ?? ??? ??? ???? ????? ????? ????????? ??? ??????? ?? ??? ????????· ? ??? ?????? ???????? ??? ?? ??????? ??? ??? ????????, ???? ?? ?? ???? ???????? ??? ? ???? ??? ?? ???????, ??? ?? ???????? ?????? ???????? ??????, ???? ?????, ??????? ??? ???????? ???? ????????.

(3) Rassow's emendation ???????? <??????> seems to be necessary in order to get an adequate argument out of ll. 5-8 ???? ??? … ????.

1022b20-21. Misfortunes and painful experiences when on a large scale are called affections.

(1) "and painful experiences" omitted by Alexander, secluded by Jaeger.

(2) Alexander (418. 30-33): ??? ??? ?? ?????? ??? ???????? ???? ???????, ?? ??? ?????? ????? ?? ??????? ??????? ?????. ????? ?? ????? ??????? ? ?????? ????????? ? ???????? ? ?? ???????? ??????? ?????.

Jaeger: "??? ??????? omittit Alexander, seclusi; ????? ??? ??????? varia lectio ad ???????? fuisse videtur."

1022b30-31. Similarly a thing is called blind if it has not sight in the medium in which, and in respect of the organ in respect of which, and with reference to the object with reference to which, and in the circumstances in which, it would naturally have it. (according to Bonitz)

(2) Bonitz (1849, pp. 269-270): "Enuntiatio […] b30: ?????? ?? ??? ?? ? ?? ??? ???' ? ??? ???? ? ??? ?? ?? ?? ??? ???????, etiam deleto commate, quod post ???? ? Brandisius Bekkerus habent, admodum difficilem habet constructionem verborum. Hunc enim in modum videntur conjungenda: ?????? ?? ??? ?? ?? ??? ??????? ?????, ?? ? ?? ? ??????? ????? ??? ???' ? ??? ???? ? ??? ??. Longe facilior erit totius enuntiati conformatio, si vocem ?, ad quod supplendum est ??????? ?????, vel omiserimus vel mutaverimus in particulam ?."

Jaeger (1917, p. 504): "If we, maintaining Bonitz's quite adequate explanation, supply <???????> after ?? ? ?? ? (be it in thought or actually), the ??????? at the end of the sentence disturbs us. On the other hand, not ?? ?? ??? ??????? is required there, but (as in the preceding sentences) ?? ?? ???." He recommends transposing ??????? after ?? ?.

1023a6-7. but there is also an intermediate state.

(2) Jaeger: "an ???? ???? cf. 1061a21."

(3) What Ross translates is not the manuscript reading ???? ??? ?? ?????? (which can not be constructed with what precedes), but ???' ???? ??? ?? ??????. In favor of this reading, cf. 1012a26, 1056a15, 1057a18.

1023a31-32. From the compound of matter and shape.

(1) As from the compound of matter and shape. (according to Alexander and Jaeger)

(2) Alexander (422. 5-7): ????? ?? ?????? ?? ????? ???????? ?????, ?? ?? ??? ??????????? ?? ?????, ??? ??????????? ?? ?????? ?? ??? ???? ????? ??? ????? ???? ?????.

Jaeger: "?? ex Alexandri paraphrasi addidi; cf. 29, 35."

1023b19-20. the 'whole' meaning either the form or that which has the form.

(1) the 'whole' meaning either the form or that which has a form. (according to Alexander and Jaeger)

(2) Alexander (424. 26-34): ?? ?? ?? ???? ? ?? ????? ? ?? ???? ????? ???????? ?? ???? ??? ?? ?? ???? ????, ?? ? ????????? ????? ??? ?? ???? ?? ???????????? ?? ???? ????. ?? ?? ? ?? ????? ????? ????? ??? ?? ?????? ?????????. ???? ??? ??? ?????? ?? ?????? ????, ???? ??? ????? ?????? ????? ?? ???????? ????, ??? ?? ??? ? ????????? ?????. ?? ?? ???? ????? ?? ????? ???? ?? ????????????, ?? ?? ???????????? ????? ???? ?? ?? ??????????? ????, ?? ?????? ??? ????????? ????????? (???????? ??? ?? ?? ?? ????) ??? ?? ?????, ?? ???????? ???????????.

Jaeger: "?? ultimum omittit Alexander in citatione recte ut videtur; cf. a34, 1022a6 similiaque."

1024a8-9. To things, to which qua one the term 'total' is applied, the term 'all' is applied when they are treated as separate. (according to Christ)

(2) Alexander (426. 19-21): ????? ?? ??? ?? ????? ???????? ??? ???????, ?? ?? ??? ?? ???? ????? ????????????· ??? ??? ??? ?? ?? ?? ???, ?? ?????????? ???????????? ?? ????? ???????.

Christ: "?? ????? Alexander."

1024b4-6. Again, in definitions the first constituent element, which is included in the 'what', is the genus, whose differentiae the qualities are said to be.

(1) Again as, in definitions, the first constituent element, which is included in the 'what'; for genus is that whose differentiae the qualities are said to be. (according to Alexander and Jaeger)

(2) Alexander (429. 7-14): ???????? ???????? ??? ????? ????????? ?????? ????????? ?? ?????? ????????? ??????? ?? ?? ???????? ??? ?? ?? ?? ????? ?????????? ????, ? ???????????? ?? ?? ?? ???? ??? ???????????. ?????? ??? ????????? ?? ? ??????? ?? ?? ?? ????· ??? ??? ?? ????? ????????? ????? ???????? ?? ???? ???????? ??? ??????????? ?? ????? ?? ?? ?? ???? ??????????????· ??? ??? ?????? ?? ?? ?????? ???????????? ???????? ???????? ????? ?? ?????????, ???’ ?? ???????? ??????? ?? ?? ?? ?? ?????? ?? ???? ???? ?????.

Jaeger: "??? ex Alexandri paraphrasi addidi et post ???? distinxi."

(3) Ross neglects the ?? in l. 4, which calls for completing (in thought) the main clause ??? by something like ???? ????? ??????? (cf. 1020b26-32, 1021a25). Therefore, Jaeger's reading must be the correct one. The most close parallel to it I could find is 1038b11 ????? ??? ??????? ??????? ? ???????? ???????? ???????.

1024b26-27. A false account is the account of non-existent objects, in so far as it is false.

(1) A false account is an account of things that are not, inasmuch as they are false. (according to Christ)

(2) Alexander (433. 15-24): ?????? ??? ????? ????????? ?? ? ??????, ??? ? ?? ?????????· ?????? ????? ????? ? ??? ?? ????? ? ?? ?? ???? ????? ?????, ?? ? ????? ????????????? ?????, ? ? ???? ??????. ???? ??? ??? ??? ? ???? ????? ????? ????? ??????? ?????? ?????, ?? ??? ?????? ???? ????? ???????? ??? ????? ??????? ????????????. ??? ??? ?? ????????? ?? ???????????? ?? ??????? ?????????· ?? ??? ????? ? ?? ?? ???? ????? ????? ??????, ???? ??? ??? ????? ???? ??????, ???? ???? ?????? ??????? ??? ?? ???? ?? ????? ??????. ??? ?? ?? ? ?????? ?????? ?????????????, ??? ?? ?? ?????????· ????? ?????? ????? ? ??? ?? ?????· ?? ??? ? ?????? ????????? ???? ??? ???? ?????? ???? ?? ????? ????? ?????.

Bonitz (1849, p. 276): "Quid debuerit dicere Aristoteles, cognosci potest collato ? 7. 1011b26: ?? ??? ??? ?????? ?? ?? ?? ????? ? ?? ?? ?? ????? ??????: simile quidpiam hoc loco dicere voluit, sed ipsa verba, quoniam in definitione definiendum nomen adhibet, manifesto sunt perplexa, ut frustra in iis interpretandis laboremus, sive vulgatam lectionem retinemus, sive praeferimus conjecturam parum aptam Alexandri, qui ? pro ? scribi posse putat."

Christ (1853, 39-40): "Sententiam perplexam esse Bonitzius aperte exposuit, sed facilis est medicina verbo ?????? in ????? mutato. Nam cum Aristoteles priore capitis parte, quae res falsae dicendae sint, jam declarasset, nunc orationem (?????) falsam ex rebus falsis explicare potuit. Cum vero Aristoteles plura genera entium et non entium distinxisset, optime se habent verba ??? ?? ????? ? ?????, quo simili sensu antea dixit: ???? ??? ??? ???? ????? (b21)."

Ross (i 345): "But now it occurs to Aristotle that the account which is not true of the triangle may be true of something else; it is not wholly false, and in so far as it is true it is ??? ?????. He therefore qualifies the statement that it is ??? ????? by adding ? ??????, 'in so far as it is false'."

p. 346: "Christ's conjecture ? ?????, 'a false ????? is a ????? of things that are not, inasmuch as they are false' - cf. l. 21 ???? ??? ??? ???? ????? - is ingenious but unnecessary."

(3) Ross is unsuccessful in defending the manuscript reading. By his interpretation, what should be a definition of false account becomes a mere statement about 'a false account in so far as it is false'.

1025a8-9. and further that he who is willingly bad is better. (according to the codices recentiores)

(1) and further that he who does bad willingly is better. (according to Jaeger)

(2) Alexander (437. 7-8): ??? ?? ???? ???? ????? ????? ?? ?? ????? ???????? ????????, ?? ??? ?????? ????? ????????? ???????? ????? ??? ???????.

According to Jaeger (1917, p. 503), ????????? (before ?? ?????) has dropped out by homoioteleuton (?????? - ?????????).

Ross (i 348) objects: "but we cannot be sure that Alexander read ?????????".

(3) Jaeger's emendation is supported by Nicomachean Ethics x 10, 1180a17 (?????? ???????? ?? ?????).

1025a15. but neither of necessity nor usually.

(2) Alexander (437. 21): ???? ?? ?? ?? ??????? ???? ?? ??? ?? ????.

Eucken (1868, p. 57): "?? is added everywhere [to ??? ?? ????], except Metaphysics 1025a15, where we, therefore, must add it without doubt."

1025a30. and this was Aegina.

(1) Omitted by Alexander and Asclepius, deleted by Jaeger. Cf. 1004a32.

Book VI

1025b8. all these sciences mark off some particular being - some genus, and inquire into this.

(1) all these sciences deal with some particular being, and, marking off some genus, inquire into this. (my translation of the same text)

(3) Ross neglects the ???? before ?? ??, making both ?? ?? and ????? ?? objects of ??????????????. If we want to include it we must add in thought ????? after ?? ?? (cf. 1026a26-27), as Bonitz did ("alle diese Wissenschaften handeln nur von einem einzelnen Seienden").

1026a13-14. For physics deals with things which exist separately but are not immovable. (according to Schwegler)

(2) Schwegler (ii 14) has corrected ???????? to ???????, this correction "being required by the logical schematism, into which the three theoretical sciences are casted: physics treats of the individually existent, but not immovable, mathematics of the immovable but not individually existing, metaphysics of things both (??? … ???) immovable and individually existing".

(3) From l. 15 it follows that being 'in' (or 'on') a matter is not compatible with 'separability'. Therefore, the concept of 'separability' required by Schwegler's text must include immateriality. This is what we find in 1042a26-31.

1026a35. ('non-being' being the false).

(1) and non-being in the sense of 'false'. (according to Bonitz)

(2) Bonitz (1842, p. 55): "Articulum in nomine ?????? omittendum esse quum ex ipsa rei natura consentaneum sit, quoniam, si hoc enuntiationis membrum ad plenam enuntiati formam restituerimus, praedicati locum obtinet, tum confirmatur opposito ?????? sine articulo, et loco simillimo ejusdem libri ?, 4. p. 1027b18. ?? ?? ?? ?????? ??, ??? ?? ?? ?? ??????. Omisit articulum etiam in eo loco, quem tractamus, codex E."

Jaeger (in his apparatus criticus) additionally refers to 1051b33-34.

1026b7-9. the house that has been made may quite well be pleasant for some people, hurtful to some, and useful to others.

(1) the house that has been made may quite well be pleasant for some people, and painful to others, hurtful for some, and useful to others. (according to Jaeger)

(2) Asclepius (365. 11-12): ???? ??? ??? ????? ??????? ? ????????? ?????, ???? ?? ???????, ?????? ?? ????????.

Pseudo-Alexander (448. 18-21): ?????? ??? ????, ??? ?’ ??????? ?????? ?????????. ?????? ??? ??? ????????? ?????????, ?? ? ???????? ????? ?? ???????? ???? ?????? ??????? ???? ??? ?? ??????? ???????, ? ????????? ??? ????? ????????? ?? ??????.

Jaeger: "???? ??? ??? ?????? <???? ?? ???????, ??? ???? ???> ???????? conjicio ex Alexandri paraphrasi."

1026b29-31. and some are not of necessity nor always, but for the most part, this is the principle and this the cause of the existence of the accidental.

(1) My proposal: and some are not of necessity nor always, but for the most part, and some are not even for the most part, but only sometimes; this is the principle and this the cause of the existence of the accidental.

(2) Asclepius (368. 16-21): ?? ?? ??? ????????? ??? ?? ??????? ???’ ?? ??? ?? ????, ????? ??????? ??? ?? ??? ?? ???? ? ???????? ????????????? ????. ?? ?? ?? ??’ ??????? ?????????·??? ???? ????? ????? ??? ???? ??? ????????????, ?? ?? ??’ ???????· ? ??? ?? ????? ???? ??? ???? ?? ?? ??? ?? ????, ????? ????? ????? ??????????.

Pseudo-Alexander (451. 10-13): ?????? ??? ?? ??? ??? ??? ?? ??????? ????, ?? ?? ?? ??????? ??? ??? ????? ???? ???, ?? ??? ?? ???? ?? (???? ??? ?? ??????? ????? ?? ???????? ????????????? ???? ???, ???’ ?? ??? ?? ????), ????? ?? ???? ???? ??? ?????? ??? ????? ?? ??????????.

idem, 453. 1-2: ?? ?? ?????????? ???? ???? ?? ??? ??? ?? ?? ??? ?? ????.

Spengel (p. 915) supplies ?? ?' ???' ?? ??? ?? ????, Jaeger (1917, p. 491) ?? ?' ???' ??? ???' ?? ??? ?? ????, referring to ? 1064b35, Alex. 453, 1, Asclep. 368, 18, Top. ? 6, 112b10 and besides 1026b 36, 1027a10, a15.

Ross (i 360): "I. e., since there are things which happen more than n and less than 2n out of 2n, there must be things that happen less than n times out of 2n."

(3) Ross does not notice the fact that Aristotle, by ?? ??? … ?? ?? (… ?? ?? …), is used to giving a complete division; if missing the 'things that happen less than n times out of 2n', the present division would be incomplete. Of the emendations proposed, I prefer Spengel's, because a descending line is established: from what is always, via what is for the most part, to what is 'not even' likely to happen. A fine example of such a descendent line is On the Heavens ii 12, 292b10-13: ?? ??? ??? ???? ??? ??????? ??? ???????, ?? ?' ?????????? ????? ??' ??????, ?? ?? ??? ??????, ?? ?' ???' ????????, ???' ?????? ??? ?? ????? ??? ??????? ??????. ("One thing then has and enjoys the ultimate good, other things attain to it, one immediately by few steps, another by many, while yet another does not even attempt to secure it but is satisfied to reach a point not far removed from that consummation.") As this parallel shows, a positive statement is missing: ???' ??????. In the following note, we will see that ?? ?????? is the missing part of the present enumeration.

1027a5-6. For to other things answer faculties productive of them, but to accidental results there corresponds no determinate art nor faculty.

(1) My proposal: For to other things answer faculties productive of them, but to the things that happen only sometimes there corresponds no determinate art nor faculty.

(3) The editors do not know what to do with ?????? and delete it. By transposing it we get an excellent sense: ??? ??? ??? ????? [??????] ???????? ????? [??] ?????????, ??? ?' <??????> ??????? ????? ???? ??????? ????????. ?????? is the opposite of ??? and ?? ??? ?? ????.

1027a25-26. for even that which happens on the day of new moon happens then either always or for the most part. (EJ)

(1) for inasmuch (honey-water is useful for a patient in a fever) either always or for the most part, (it will be useful) also on the day of new moon. (according to Bonitz)

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (452. 38 - 453. 1): ???? ??? ??????? ?? ?? ?? ???????? ???????? ? ??? ????? ???????? ? ?? ??? ?? ????.

Thomas Aquinas (Sententia Metaphysicae, liber 6 lectio 2 numerus 20): "Quia quod determinatur fieri in tempore novilunii, vel est semper, vel ut in pluribus."

Bonitz (1849, pp. 290-291): "In exemplo febris, quae mulso adhibito levetur, obscuritas quaedam inest […]. Extrema enim verba hunc videntur in modum accipienda esse: etenim id quoque, quod interlunii tempore fit (?? ?? ????????), aut semper (hoc est quoties est interlunium) aut plerumque fit, neque cadit extra normam et consuetudinem. Quod licet per se haud inepte dicatur, tamen non potest cum superioribus verbis conciliari; antea enim ipsum interlunii tempus pro exceptione positum est, quae non contineretur eadem ac reliquum tempus lege. Quare non videtur negligendum, quod articulum ?? ante ?? ???????? Bekkerus ex uno codice E recepit; quodsi hunc articulum ex auctoritate reliquorum librorum omiseris, et, quae vix dici potest mutatio, prius ? in ? mutaveris: ? ??? ??? ? ?? ??? ?? ????, ??? ?? ????????, longe aptior exsistet sententiarum ratio. Medicus docet febricantibus plerumque prodesse mulsum, at non potest docere, quando non prosit, veluti si sumamus interlunii tempore illud non esse salubre; quatenus enim vel semper vel plerumque utile est mulsum, utile erit etiam interlunii [291] tempore, quod nimirum intra illos fines sive perpetuitatis sive consuetudinis cadit."

Ross (i 361) thinks that the traditional reading "gives a good if difficult sense. 'For even that which happens at new moon (viz. honey-water's not being beneficial) happens then either always or for the most part'. I. e. the conditions of the accidental as such cannot be stated. If you can state the conditions of an event, then even if it is an exception to a wider law it has a law of its own and is not a mere accident."

(3) The crucial point is the grammar of the phrase ?? ?? ????????. Pseudo-Alexander supplies ???????? from l. 23, Thomas Aquinas ????????? ("quod determinatur fieri in tempore novilunii ") from l. 22; Bonitz ("quod interlunii tempore fit") and Ross ("that which happens at new moon") unanimously take it as nominalized adverb. All these interpreters assume that ?? ?? ???????? is subject to ? ??? ??? ? ?? ??? ?? ????. A possibility not yet considered is that ?? ?? ???????? is an adverbial expression, the ?? being added because "the whole area of a period is to be marked", as, for instance, "?? ??????, immediately (so to speak in the sphere of the moment)" (Kühner/Gerth i 595). In this case, there would be only a subtle difference between ?? ?? ???????? and ?? ????????, the reading of Ab. That is a credit to Bonitz's suggestion ? ??? …, because we are no longer forced to delete the ?? in the reading of EJ.

As translated by Bonitz and Ross (saying indirectly that things which happen at new moon do so not only sometimes), the reading of EJ, far from giving "a good if difficult sense", is in reality non-sensical, because that things happen 'for the most part' implies that other things happen only sometimes (??????). Thomas Aquinas is the only one who presents a philosophically satisfactory interpretation, which is, however, too forced grammatically.

1027a34. And B will exist if C happens. (Pseudo-Alexander, Bonitz)

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (455. 12-13): ????? ??? ??? ??? ?? ???? ???????, ?? ?? ??, ??, ????? ?? ?? ????.

Argyropulus: "id autem erit, si aliud fiet."

Bonitz (1842, p. 118): "Pro ????? ?? ???? scribendum esse ????? ?' ??? ???? et ex ordine sententiarum intelligitur, et proximis verbis confirmatur ???? ??? ??????????? ???? ? ???, ??? ?? ??????? ????? ?' ??? ??????? ????? ?' ??? ????? ??? ????? ???? ??? ? ??? ???????, quocum conferendus est libri undecimi locus, quo de eadem re agitur ?, 8. p. 1065a16. […] Bessarion nostro loco eam lectionem habuisse videtur, quam de conjectura dedimus, quod vertit: hoc vero, si aliud."

1027b10. e.g. the presence of contraries in the same body. (EJ)

(1) e.g. the presence of contraries in the same thing. (Ab)

(2) According to Jaeger (1917, p. 513), not the ???? is in question, but a general sentence, cf. ? 2, 1046b15 sq, ? 10, 1018a25.

1027b31-33. (for the thought attaches or removes either the subject's 'what' or its having a certain quality or quantity or something else).

(1) for the thought combines or separates either the subject's 'what' or its having a certain quality or quantity or something else. (Pseudo-Alexander, Bonitz)

(2) Bonitz (1842, p. 91): "Notioni conjungendi, ?????????, unice opponi potest notio dirimendi ????????, non ????????, quod ubique abstrahendi vim habet. […] Quamobrem uti supra opponitur ???????? ??? ?????????, ???????? ??? ?????????, ita scribendum est ?? ?? ???? ???????? ? ??????? ? ???????. Atque hanc lectionem ii commentarii exhibent, qui Alexandri nomine feruntur [458. 8-9] ? ???, ?????, ? ??????? ?? ?? ???? ??? ?????? ???? ?????? ???????? ? ???????, ? ????? ????? ???? ?????? ???."

Book VII

1028a12-13. and in another sense it means a quality or quantity or one of the other things that are predicated as these are. (Ab)

(1) sometimes that it [= "this", the present thing, cf. l. 15] is of a certain quality or quantity or one of the other things that are predicated as these are. (EJ)

(2) Asclepius (376. 19-23): ???????? ??? ?? ??? ?? ???? ??? ???? ??. ??? ??’ ????????? ??? ?????? ????????· ?????????? ??? ?? ???? ???? ?? ??????, ?????? ??????????, ?? ??????????, ???? ??? ???? ??????? ??????· ??? ????? ????????? ???? ??? ?????? ?????????? ?? ???? ?? ??????????. ????? ??? ?? ???’ ???? ?? [cf. ? 7, 1017a22-23] ??????, ?????, ????? ??? ??? ????? ??????????.

Pseudo-Alexander (459. 17-20): ???????? ?? ??? ????? ?? ??? ?? ???? ??? ?????? ??? ???? ??· ??????? ??? ?? ??????????? ???? ??? ?????? ?? ???? ?? ??? ?? ?? ???? ?????????. ?? ??? ??? ??? ????? ???????? ??????, ?? ?? ????? ??? ??? ?????? ???? ??????????.

(3) The reading of E and J is presupposed by the Arabic text, whose translation from the Greek was established by Astat in the 11th century. (Bauloye 287) It is further supported by Metaphysics N 2, 1089a7-9.

Codex Ab and both Greek commentators omit the ???. This reading is supported by two passages of the same book, 1017a24-27 and 1024b13-15, as well as Ethica Eudemia 1217b26-29: ?? ?? ??? ??, ????? ?? ?????? ????????, ???????? ?? ??? ?? ????, ?? ?? ?????, ?? ?? ?????, ?? ?? ????, ??? ???? ??????? ?? ??? ?? ?? ????????? ?? ?? ?? ?? ??????. and Topica A 9, 103b26-27: ? ?? ????? ? ????? ? ????? ? ??? ????? ???? ?????????? ???????????.

Syntactically more uniform are passages with indefinite pronouns throughout, the (elliptic) interrogative clause ?? ???? (scilicet ???? ?? ??????, see Asclepius) being replaced by the indefinite pronoun ??: 989b11-12, 1026a35-b1, 1045b32-33, 1054a17-18, 1089b6-8; further Analytica posteriora, 85b20-21: ??? ?? ?? ???????? ???’ ? ????? ? ???? ?? ? ??????.

1028a15-18. For when we say of what quality a thing is, we say that it is good or bad, not that it is three cubits long or that it is a man; but when we say what it is, we do not say 'white' or 'hot' or 'three cubits long', but 'a man' or 'a god'.

(1) My diagnosis: a later addition, inserted into the text on the wrong place, the right place being ll. 11-12.

(2) Asclepius (376. 23-31): ?????????? ???, ?????, ????????? ??? ????? ??????? ????? ??? ?????? ?????? ????? ?? ? ?????. ???? ??? ??? ???? ???????????? ?????????? ????? ?? ?????, ????? ???????· <?? ???> ?????? ????? ?????????? ???????? ????????, ???? ?? ??????? ?????????? ????? ????? ????????, ???? ?????? ???????????, ???? ??? ?????? ? ?????. ???? ?? ?? ????? ??????????, ??? ?????????? ?????????? ????? ???????? ?????? ? ??????, ???’ ?????? ????? ???????? ???????? ? ????. ???? ?? ?? ??????????? ??????? ??? ??????, ? ?? ????? ?? ??????, ???????? ??? ? ????? ??? ????????????.

Pseudo-Alexander (459. 23 - 460. 1): ???? ??? ???, ?????, ??????? ????? ?? ????, ? ?????? ??????? ? ?????, ???’ ?? ??????? ??? ???? ?????, ???’ ???????? ??? ??????, ???? ?????· ???? ?? ?? ?????, ?? ????? ?????, ???’ ???????? ? ????, ?? ??? ?? ????? ??? ????? ????????? ??? ??????. Pseudo-Alexander then takes the second sentence as argument for ll. 14-15.

Thomas Aquinas (Sententia Metaphysicae, liber 7 lectio 1 numerus 4-6): "Secundo ibi, nam quando [= ???? ??? ???] probat propositum; et utitur tali ratione. Quod est per se et simpliciter in unoquoque genere, est prius eo quod est per aliud et secundum quid. Sed substantia est ens simpliciter et per seipsam: omnia autem alia genera a substantia sunt entia secundum quid et per substantiam: ergo substantia est prima inter alia entia.

Minorem autem dupliciter manifestat. Primo ex ipso modo loquendi sive praedicandi; dicens, quod ex hoc palam est quod substantia sit primum entium, quia quando dicimus de aliquo quale quid sit, dicimus ipsum esse aut bonum aut malum. Haec enim significant qualitatem, quae aliud est a substantia et quantitate. Tricubitum autem significat quantitatem, et homo significat substantiam. Et ideo quando dicimus quale est aliquid, non dicimus ipsum esse tricubitum neque hominem. Sed quando dicimus quid est de aliquo, non dicimus ipsum esse album, nec calidum, quae significant qualitatem; nec tricubitum, quod significat quantitatem; sed hominem aut Deum, quae significant substantiam.

Ex quo patet quod illa quae significant substantiam, dicunt quid est aliquid absolute. Quae autem praedicant qualitatem, non dicunt quid est illud de quo praedicatur absolute, sed quale quid. Et simile est in quantitate, et aliis generibus."

Fonseca: "Duabus rationibus probat substantiam esse primum ens. Prior ratio est, quia sola substantia redditur ad quaestionem, qua quaeritur «Quid est hoc aut illud»; cetera enim non redduntur, nisi cum quaeritur «Quantum est, aut quale, etc.»."

Bonitz (1849, p. 295): "Nimirum non id agitur, ut quaelibet substantia a reliquis distinguatur omnibus, sed ut ab una substantia reliquae distinguantur categoriae omnes eique opponantur. Itaque jure exspectes qualitati, ????? ?? ????, non opponi exemplum et quantitatis et substantiae, ???' ?? ??????? ? ????????, sed et qualitati et deinde quantitati pariter unam opponi substantiam, quemadmodum deinde substantiae opponitur quale et quantum, ?? ?????? ???? ?????? ???? ???????."

Christ: "??????? ? suspecta, nisi ???' ?? ??????? ? ???????? delere malis."

Ross (ii 160): "Aristotle's object being to distinguish quality from substance, not from the other categories, ??????? ? is irrelevant."

According to Frede/Patzig (II 17), the object is "to show, that the ?? ????? is the ?????" (see l. 14-15).

(3) Let us compare the syntactic structure with Analytica posteriora A 22, 83a1-14: ???? ??? ?????? ?????? ?? ?????? ???????? ??? ?? ???? ?????? ????? ?????, ??? ????? ?? ????? ???? ????? ??? ??? ???????? ????????. ?????? ?? ???? ?? ????? ?????? ??? ?? ???????. ???? ??? ??? ?? ?????? ????? ?? ?????, ???? ???? ??? ? ????????? ????? ????? ????? ?????, ???' ??? ?? ?? ??????????? ?? ???? ?? ?????? ????? ??? ??? ???? ?????? ?? ???' ???? ?????? ?? ??????? ?????, ???' ??? ????? ???' ? ???? ??????????. ???? ?? ?? ????? ?????? ????? ??, ??? ??? ?????? ?? ???? ??????, ?????? ?? ????????? ???? ?????, ???? ???? ??? ???????? ?????? ????? ??? ???? ??? ??? ? ???????? ?????? ?????, ? ?????????? ????? ???????, ????? ???? ?? ????? ???? ?? ???????????, ???? ??? ???????, ??? ?????? ?? ?? ? ???? ????? ? ????? ??.

Here the object is clearly to show the diversity of two façons de parler (?????? ?? ???? ?? ????? ?????? ??? ?? ???????). Now it's hardly a coincidence that in our parenthesis the very three categories (quid, quale, quantum) are illustrated, which in the enumeration ll. 11-12 are mentioned. To these lines the parenthesis must refer; it is a later addition, inserted into the text on the wrong place.

The actual position makes the interpreters assume that the question is primarily about ?????. By this they go wrong in different ways. He who believes, that the statement ll. 14-15 is explained (Thomas Aquinas, Fonseca, Frede/Patzig), cannot say how the first sentence ll. 15-16 should contribute to that end; he who believes that the difference between ????? and ????? is affected (Bonitz, Christ, Ross), does not know what to do with the ???????.

In l. 16, the Arabic text supports the reading ????? (Bauloye 287).

1028a20. And so one might even raise the question.

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (460. 11): ??? ?????????? ?? ???, ????.

Jaeger: "?? addidi ex Alexandri citatione."

(3) Jaeger's emendation is confirmed by Meteorologica B 4, 361a25-26: ??? ??? ?????????? ?? ??? ????????? ? ???? ??? ????????? ????, ??????? ?????? ? ???????.

1028a20-21. whether the words 'to walk', 'to be healthy', 'to sit' imply that each of these things is existent.

(1) whether walking, being healthy, sitting are being or not-being. (Asclepius, Pierron/Zévort, omitting ??????? ?????)

(2) Asclepius (376. 36): ??????? ???? ?????????? ???? ???’ ???? ? ???? ????.

Pseudo-Alexander (460. 11-12): ??????? ?? ???????? ??? ?? ????????? ??? ??????? ????? ?? ??????? ? ??.

Pierron/Zévort (1840): "si marcher, se bien porter, s'asseoir, sont, ou non, des êtres."

Ross (II 160): "Ab's reading ???????? seems to be required, instead of ? ?? ??, to explain the grammar of ??????? ?????. 'Whether the words "to walk", etc., imply that each of these things is existent'. Cf. Liddell and Scott ??????? III. 1."

Frede/Patzig (II 18): "But ???????? ??????? ????? ?? is hardly intelligible Greek. ??????? ????? rather stands in apposition to the three preceding infinitives and is intended to point at the fact, that the difficulty mentioned suggests itself especially if one considers something like walking or health isolated (i. e. without relation to a subject)."

(3) The difficulty is what to do with ??????? ?????. In which context concerning the relation substance - accidents it would make sense, appears from K 3, 1061a8-10: ?? ??? ??? ????? ? ?? ????? ? ???? ? ???????? ? ??????? ? ??? ????? ?? ??? ???????? ????? ??????? ??????? ????? ??. In our present passage, the corresponding reference words are missing. The key to this problem is offered by a parallel unnoticed up to now, Categoriae 4a29-34: ?? ??? ??? ??? ??? ?????? ???? ???????????? ??????? ??? ???????? ?????, — ?????? ??? ?? ?????? ????????? ????????? (????????? ???), ??? ????? ?? ?????? ??? ????????? ?? ??????. ??????? ?? ??? ??? ??? ????? ??????? ???? ????????? ????????? ??? ???????? ???????? ?????. Instead of ???? in l. 33 (codex C) - which is clearly the right reading, responding to the ???? in l. 30 - the codices A and B have ?????. If we now pay attention to the striking resemblance of the phrases ??????? ?? ??? ??? ??? ????? and ?????? ?? ??? ??? ??? ????? in the sentence which follows immediately in our passage, it becomes clear that ??????? ????? belongs after ????? also here. It is a gloss by a reader who remembered the (already corrupted) Categoriae-passage, all the more so because in ll. 22-23 the text continues with ????? … ?????.

As to the reading ?? ? ?? ??, cf. Physics i 3, 186b4-12:

?? ??? ?? ???? ?? ?????? ?????????? ???? <?? ????> ??????, ?? ?????? ?? ???? ?? ???????? ?? ?? ? ?? ??; ?? ??? ????? ?? ???? ?? [?????] ??? ??????, ?? ????? ?’ ????? ?? ????? ???? ?? (???? ??? ???????????? ???? ???? ?? ?? ??· ????? ??? ?? ? ??? ???? ??), ??? ??? ?? ?? ??????· ??? ???? ?? ????? ?? ?? ??, ???’ ???? ?? ??. ?? ??? ???? ?? ??? ??· ?????? ??? ?????? ??? ??????, ????? ?? ??? ?? ?????????. ???? ??? ?? ?????? ???????? ???? ??· ????? ??? ???????? ?? ??.

1028a22-24. for none of them is either self-subsistent or capable of being separated from substance.

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (460. 13-14): ????? ???, ?????, ????? ???? ???’ ????, ????? ? ?????, ???? ?????? ?????????? ?????.

Jaeger: "??????? seclusi, omittit hic Alexander; erat varia lectio ad ??????? ubi ?????? ?????????? legit Alexandri paraphrasis (de ??????? cum infinitivo cf. Index Aristotelicus 833a15)."

(3) According to Frede/Patzig (II 18), firstly from the fact that Pseudo-Alexander does not use the word ??????? does not follow that he did not read it, and secondly, without ???????, we would have to coordinate the ????? in a23 to the ??????? in a24.

This objection to an obvious emendation is unfounded for several reasons: First, Pseudo-Alexander has indeed read the ???????, but in conjunction with ??????????, as Jaeger correctly indicates; second, coordinating ????? with ??????? is quite natural, because Aristotle often uses ??????? instead of ??????? (see for example 980b2 with comment). Moreover, Pseudo-Alexander is giving not a paraphrase (in which he "uses" his own terms), but a word-for-word quotation (?????).

1028a32-33. yet substance is first in every sense - (1) in definition, (2) in order of knowledge, (3) in time.

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (460. 33 -461. 26): ????? ??? ? ????? ???? ?? ?????? ?? ??? ?????? ??, ?????? ?? ?????? ??????? ????????, ?? ??????? ???????? (??????? ??? ?????? ??? ?? ?????? ??? ?? ???? ??? ?? ?????), ????????? ??? ???? ???? ????? ??????? ??????? ???? ????? ??? ????? ? ?????. ??? ?????? ????????? ??? ?? ????? ????? ?????, ????? ??? ??? ??? ????? ????????????? ????? ????????, ???? ?? ????. ?? ??? ??? ???????? ????? ???? ??? ????? ????????????? ? ????? (???????? ??? ??? ??? ??????? ?????? ???? ??? ???? ????????? ? ????????? ? ??? ????????), ?? ??? ??? ???????? ????? ???? ??? ?????, ???’ ???? ?????? ?????????? ????? ??? ???? ??? ???? ??????? ?? ????, ????? ?? ???? ??? ???? ??????, ??? ???’ ??????? ?? ?????? ????? ???????, ??????? ??? ??????? ???? ?? ????? ??? ?????. ?? ??? ? ???????? ???? ?????? ???????? ???? ?? ????? ??? ???’ ??????? ?? ???? ??????????? ?????, ???? ??? ? ????? ??? ???’ ??????? ????????? ??? ???????????? ?? ???? ????????????. ???? ??? ???’ ???? ?????????? ??? ????, ?? ????????????? ?? ??’ ?????, ??????? ?????. ?? ????? ?? ?? ????? ??????? ?????, ???? ??? ?? ????, ?? ??????????. ?? ??? ?? ??? ??????? ????? ??????????? ??????? ???? ?? ???? ??? ???????, ?????????? ?? ?? ?? ??? ????????? ???? ? ??? ??? ?? ?? ??? ????? ?? ????, ????? ??? ??? ?? ???? ??????? ????? ? ????? ??? ????????????. ?? ????? ?? ??? ??? ????????? ??? ??? ??????? ????’ ????? ????, ???’ ?? ????? ???? ?????? ??? ??? ?? ?????? ??? ?? ????? ?????????? ??? ?? ?? ????? ???’ ??????? ???? ???????? ????? ??????????? ?? ?????????? ??? ?????? ?? ?? ?????? ?????· ???? ?? ??? ?????????????, ?? ??????? ??????????? ????? ?? ?? ?????? ?????. ???? ??? ?? ?????? ??????? ????? ? ????? ??? ????????????· ???? ??? ??????? ??????? ???????, ???? ?????? ??? ?????? ?????· ???? ??? ??????? ????????? ?? ????? ???????? ? ???, ???? ?????? ??? ?????? ?????, ???’ ??? ???? ?????? ?????? ????? ???????? ? ?????. ??? ?? ???? ??? ??? ?????? ??? ???? ?????? ?????, ???? ?? ????? ?????? ????? ??????; ??? ??? ??? ???????????? ????? ?????· ???? ??? ?? ???? ?????? ??????, ???? ????? ????.

Thomas Aquinas (Sententia Metaphysicae, liber 7 lectio 1 numerus 13): "Ostendit quomodo substantia dicatur primum; et dicit quod cum hoc quod dico primum dicatur multis modis, ut in quinto est habitum, tribus modis substantia est prima inter omnia entia: scilicet secundum cognitionem, et secundum definitionem et secundum tempus. Et quod sit prima tempore aliis, ex hoc probatur, quod nullum aliorum praedicamentorum est separabile a substantia, sola autem substantia est separabilis ab aliis: nullum enim accidens invenitur sine substantia, sed aliqua substantia invenitur sine accidente. Et sic patet, quod non quandocumque est substantia, est accidens, sed e contrario: et propter hoc substantia est prior tempore."

(3) According to Frede/Patzig (II 20), the first argument "is not an argument for a certain kind of priority, but the demonstration that the ????? has priority in every respect, a special argument for priority in respect of time missing". But ??? ?? ???? ?? in l. 34 presupposes that another kind of priority was just treated.

The traditional view, according to which the ?????? ????? is explained in ll. 33-34, is the only one possible grammatically, and philosophically well founded. The combination of "separateness" and priority in respect of time originates from the doctrine of pre-existence of the 'separated' ideas. If, for example, the ?????? (l. 28) has a separate existence, then it exists "before" the good people. This is what Aristotle denies: The good comes into existence only when a person is good. The pre-existing ????? is the single man. Generally speaking, the Aristotelian metaphysics is to be understood as a new answer to the Platonic question about the ??????? ????? (at least as Aristotle understands it). "Separate entity" is no longer what is intended in the Socratic question (cf. A 6, 987b1-4), but rather what is answered in ordinary life to the question ?? ?????.

1028b12. (either of parts or of the whole bodies).

(1) My proposal: either of partial quantities or of the total quantity (of one element).

(2) Asclepius (378. 29-32): ? ?????? ? ??????. ??? ?????? ??? ????? ?? ???· ?? ??? ??? ?????? ??? ????????? ????????????· ?? ?????? ?? ??? ????? ??????. ??? ???????? ???? ? ?? ??????? ??? ?? ????? ?????, ????? ??? ?????? ??? ?????. ??? ?????????? ??? ??????? ?? ??? ???????? ????????? ????? ????? ??? ???????.

Pseudo-Alexander (462. 6-17): ?? ?? ? ?????? ? ??????, ?? ??? ??? ??? ?????? ??? ????? ??????? ???? ?? ???, ?? ?????? ?? ??? ??????? ????? ? ??????? ??? ?? ????? ?????, ????? ??? ??????. ????? ?’ ??????? ??????? ??? ??????· ????? ??? ?????? ??? ??? ? ??????? ??? ?? ??????? ?? ??? ???????? ???? ?????????· ?? ????? ?? ?????, ???’ ????? ??? ?????? ???? ?? ?????? ??? ??? ????? ?????? ? ?? ?????? ????? ? ?????? ? ?????, ??????? ???? ??????? ??? ? ??? ??????? ??? ?????? ?? ?????? ??? ??????? ??? ??? ?????? ????? ?????· ???’ ? ??? ???? ??? ?????????? ??????? ?? ??? ???? ??????? ??? ?????? ???? ??????? ??? ??? ?????? ?????, ?? ?? ???????????? ??? ?????????? ?? ??? ???????? ??? ???????????? ??? ??? ?????? ?????, ???????? ??? ??? ???????, ?????? ?? ??? ?? ?????? ??????.

Thomas Aquinas (Sententia Metaphysicae, liber 7 lectio 1 numerus 19): "Et etiam omnes partes elementorum, et etiam corpora, quae sunt composita ex elementis, vel ex aliquibus partibus elementorum, sicut particularia corpora mixta aut ex omnibus elementis, idest totis, sicut tota ipsa sphaera activorum et passivorum et sicut etiam caelum quod et quoddam corpus naturale praeter elementa dicimus esse substantiam, et partes eius, ut astra et luna, et sol."

Argyropulus: "quaeque ex his ut partibus aut quibusdam aut omnibus constat."

Fonseca: "Hoc est, sive constent ex partibus simplicium corporum, ut mixta inanimata, (de his enim hactenus non est facta mentio) sive ex ipsis integris corporibus simplicibus, ut globus elementorum, et aether. Ille enim ex quatuor vulgatis elementis constat, hic autem ex orbibus caelestibus."

Bonitz (1849, p. 297): "Adjectivo ?????? opponi potius exspectes ? ????? vel ?????."

Frede/Patzig (II 28) defend the transmitted text, interpreting: "What is composed of the elements contains the elements either in their entirety or part. This suggests that ??????? means 'universe', not 'firmament'. Only the universe is an example for an ????? which contains as parts the elements in their entirety, whereas the stars contain only part of the elements."

But that is excluded by the illustration ????? ??? ?????? ??? ?????.

(3) ?????? was misunderstood hitherto. What is meant is not 'all elements' (= all kinds of elements), but the respective total quantity of one element ('the elements as a whole'). This is the only way that the following example goes well: the heavens consist of the total quantity of the element ?????, the parts of the heavens consist of partial quantities of it.

1028b13-15. But whether these alone are substances, or there are also others, or only some of these, or others as well, or none of these but only some other things, are substances, must be considered.

(1) My proposal: delete.

(2) Asclepius (378. 35 - 379. 2): ????? ??? ??? ???? ???????, ??????? ????? ??? ????? ?????? ?????????? <??> ????????, ? ??? ?????, ????????? ????????, ? ?????? ??? ???????? ????? ? ??? ?????, ???????? ??? ????????, ????? ??? ?? ?????, ? ????? ??? ??? ????? ??????, ???? ?? ?????? ???? ?? ????????, ???? ?????.

Pseudo-Alexander (462. 18-23): ??????? ?’ ????? ????? ?????? ????? ? ??? ?????, ? ?????? ??? ?????, ?????? ?? ?????, ????????.

????? ??? ?????????? ??? ?????? ???? ?? ?? ?????? ??? ?? ????? ??? ?????????, ????? ??????? ????? ????? ?? ????????? ????? ?????? ? ??? ???? ?????? ????? ?????, ? ?? ??? ???????????? ?????? ??? ??? ????? ???’ ?? ???? ??????.

Argyropulus: "at utrum hae tantummodo an et aliae substantiae sint an horum quidem nihil rationem substantiae subeat, aliae vero sint substantiae quaedam, consideremus oportet."

Bessarion: "utrum autem hae solae substantiae sint an etiam aliae an harum quidem nulla, sed aliquae aliae, considerandum est."

Ross (ii 162): "The possibilities stated by Aristotle are that the complete list of substances should include -

(1) only those already named,

(2) those and others,

(3) only some of those already named,

(4) some of those already named and some others (? ??? ????? [the reading of codex T]),

(5) only certain others."

Tarán (1979, pp. 168-169). "I accept Ross' text of these lines […]. In his commentary, however, he asserts that Aristotle's main concern was to offer a complete list of five possibilities of substances, [169] and this seems to me to be wrong; for in the phrase ? ?????? ????? ? ??? ????? the first ? is not parallel to the second, as it would have to be for Ross to be right; rather, it is parallel to the ? in ? ?????? ??? ????? ???., whereas the second ? is parallel to the ? in the phrase ? ??? ????? of the first question. In short, we have three main questions presented as successive alternatives: (a) are the physical substances enumerated in 1028b9-13 the only substances or are there also substances of another kind; or (b) are some of the physical substances enumerated in 1028b9-13 the only kind of substances or are there also substances of another kind; or (c) is it the case that none of the sensibles are substances but that there are other substances. Aristotle has provisionally accepted in 1028b8-13 the existence of sensible substances, i.e. of bodies; those he specifically mentions are entities the substantial character of which he himself admitted. Neither the Pythagoreans nor the Platonists denied, according to Aristotle, that bodies are substances; rather, they thought, again according to Aristotle, that the limits of body are more real than bodies. But since he wishes to consider all the possibilities Aristotle mentions also (c): only non-sensible substances are real. (a) and (b) are really the same kind of question, except that Aristotle wishes to leave open the possibility that some of the entities he mentions in 1028b9-13 may turn out not to be substances. (Cf. the notorious difficulties Aristotle has in ascribing substantiality to the 'parts' of living beings.) Thus, in all three questions the main point is whether or not there are non-sensible substances besides the sensibles. (Cf. also 1028b28-31.) Ross' failure to see this is partly responsible for his misinterpretation of 1028b15-19."

Frede/Patzig (II 29): "? ??? ????? is an abbreviated manner of speaking for ? ?????? ????? ??? ?????. Apparently Aristotle has skipped ?????? ?????, indicating it by the assimilation of ????? to the genitive ??????."

(3) First of all, we should get straight that we are dealing with an interpolation. As the recapitulation H 1, 1042a6-12 shows, ????? ?? ???? in l. 16 goes on from the ????? in l. 8. The interpolation competes with ll. 27-31 (the two ???????? in l. 15 and 31!).

The interpolator shows himself as fond of schematizing. The only question in which Aristotle is interested is the first one (which reoccurs ll. 28-29, cf. also 1037a10-13). The possibility that some or even all of the ????????????? ?????? could be no ?????? at all is nowhere else considered by Aristotle.

There is no need of changing the text. ????? … ?????? … ?????? each refer to the ?????? mentioned before, ????? … ????? … ?????? to the ??????? supposed to exist by some thinkers. The following scheme results:

(a) ?????? only (l. 14 ????? ?????),

(b) ?????? and ??????? (l. 14 ??? ?????),

(c) ??????? only (l. 15 ?????? ??? ????? ?????? ?? ?????).

The clause ? ?????? ????? ? ??? ?????, which is missing in an important branch of tradition, adds to the alternative (b) a further compromise: some of both.

1028b19. but others think there are eternal substances which are more in number and more real.

(1) but others think there are substances (besides sensible things) which are more in number, and these substances, being eternal, are more real than sensible substance. (according to Thomas Aquinas, Christ, Tarán)

My proposal: but others think there are substances (besides sensible things) which are more in number and more real. (deleting ?????)

(2) Asclepius (379. 10-12): ?? ?? ???????? ??????????? ??????, ????? ??????, ??? ??? ???????? ??? ?? ???????? ??? ??? ??????· ??? ?????? ???? ?????? ?????? ?????, ???????? ??? ??????.

Pseudo-Alexander (462. 31-32): ?? ?? ??????? ????? ??????? ??? ??????.

Thomas Aquinas (Sententia Metaphysicae, liber 7 lectio 1 numerus 21): "Alii vero ponebant quaedam entia sempiterna a sensibilibus separata, quae sunt plura et magis entia quam sensibilia: magis inquam entia, quia ista sunt incorruptibilia et immobilia, haec autem corruptibilia et mobilia."

Christ (1853, p. 41): "Ideae Platonicae non magis rebus sensibilibus aeternae sunt, sed hac in re ipsa a rebus sensus ferientibus differunt, quod hae interitui obnoxiae, illae aeterno vigore gaudent. Idcirco virgula ante ???? interpungendum esse duco, ita ut ad ?????? suppleatur ??????? sive ??????, extremis autem verbis causa majoris dignitatis indicetur."

Christ's punctuation is presupposed by Tarán (1979, p. 170): "and these substances, being eternal, are more real than sensible substance."

(3) The interpretations by Christ and Ross are both implausible. Christ tears apart the Platonic phrase ?????? ???? (Republic 515 D 3, 585 D 7), and eternity is not the reason why "the limits of body, i.e. surface, line, point, and unit, are substances, and more so than body or the solid" (ll. 16-18). ????? as subject (Ross) is equally awkward, because, from the preceding clause, ??????? can easily be supplied (Christ). Most probably this superfluous and disturbing word is a gloss to ?????? ????.

1029a3-5. (By the matter I mean, for instance, the bronze, by the shape the pattern of its form, and by the compound of these the statue, the concrete whole.)

(1) Alternative: deleting "the concrete whole". (Jaeger)

(2) Asclepius (380. 4-9): ?? ?? ??????????? ???????? ????? ??? ? ??? ?? ?????????? ??? ????????, ???????? ????? ??? ?? ????? ?? ???????? ??? ???? ??? ?????? ??? ?????? ???? ??? ?? ????? ???????, ?????? ?? ?? ???????? ?? ?? ??????. ??? ??? ???? ???? ????????? ????? ? ??????, ?? ?? ????? ?? ??????? ????? ??? ??????, ???? ??? ??????????, ?? ?????? ??????????? ????? ? ???????.

Pseudo-Alexander (463. 29-31): ???? ??? ??? ???????????? ????????? ?? ??? ????? ????, ?? ?? ????? ??? ?? ?? ?? ??????, ??? ???? ??? ??? ??????, ????? ?? ?? ??????? ?????, ?? ?????? ?? ??? ??????? ?????????.

Jaeger: "?? ??????? nota lectoris, delevi, omittit Alexandri paraphrasis (cf. a3)."

Frede/Patzig (II 40): "This explanation may be unnecessary, but therefrom does not follow that it is to be deleted. The grammatical relation to ?? ?? ?????? can be avoided, if we put a comma after ??? ?????????."

(3) What needed to be explained was the technical term ?? ?? ??????; by ?? ??????? an equivalent technical term is quoted, which is not an 'explanation' but a scholarly gloss typical for readers.

1029a5-7. Therefore if the form is prior to the matter and more real, it will be prior also to the compound of both, for the same reason.

(1) My proposal: transposing to after ll. 27-30.

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (463. 31-33): ??? ?? ???????? ?? ????? ??? ???? ??? ?????? ??, ??? ?? ?? ??? ?????? ??? ??? ???? ???????? ???? ??? ????.

Thomas Aquinas (Sententia Metaphysicae, liber 7 lectio 2 numerus 9): "Deinde cum dicit quare si species [???? ?? ?? ?????] comparat partes divisionis praemissae adinvicem: et circa hoc tria facit. Primo ostendit quod forma sit magis substantia quam compositum. Secundo ostendit, quod materia sit maxime substantia, quod erat opinio quorumdam, ibi [1029a10], et adhuc materia substantia fit [??? ??? ? ??? ????? ????????]. Tertio ostendit quod tam forma quam compositum est magis substantia quam materia, ibi [1029a27], sed impossibile [???????? ??] et cetera."

Fonseca: "Quidam codices, etiam Graeci, aliter habent hoc loco: dicunt enim formam etiam esse priorem, et magis ens, quam compositum: id quod D. Thomas verum esse ait, quatenus compositum includit materiam, quae est posterior, et minus ens, quam forma. Sed nos cum Alexandro et aliis interpretibus aliam lectionem secuti sumus. Accedit Budaei correctio, qui pro «??? ?? ??????» substituit «?? ?? ??????». Priorem lectionem secuti sunt Averroes, et ex Latinis Albertus, Alensis et alii nonnulli, sed posteriorem esse germanam vel ex eo, quod inferius hoc ipso capite tradit Aristoteles, plane intelligitur, cum ait, id quod separabile est, et hoc aliquid, maxime videri esse substantiam: nemo enim dubitat, quin compositum cum forma, quae eius pars est, comparatum, magis separabile sit, hoc est, per se constans, atque cohaerens, et hoc aliquid, sive demonstrabile, quam forma ex qua est compositum."

(3) ???? … ????? belongs to ll. 27-30. Only there the 'reason' (?????) is mentioned why form (?????) is 'prior' to matter (???) and the thing composed of them.

1029a11. it baffles us to say what else is.

(3) Bonitz's proposal ????? (instead of ?????) is motivated by passages as 997a32, 1004b1, 1084a14, but in all theses examples the interrogative clause is a direct one. An example of an indirect interrogative clause, dependent on ?????????, is 1002a27-28 ?? ?? ?? ??? ??? ? ????? ??? ?????.

1029b13-14. The essence of each thing is what it is said to be propter se. (reading ??????? instead of ???????)

(2) Asclepius (383. 20-21): ??? ????? ??? ??????? ????? ??????? ? ????? ??? ????? ??? ??????????? ????????? [= ?? ?? ?? ????? ????????] ???’ ????.

Pseudo-Alexander (467. 14-15): ?? ?? ?? ????? ????? ? ??????? ??????? ???’ ????.

Fonseca: "quidditas cuiusque [= ?? ?? ?? ????? ???????] est id, quod illud dicitur per se."

Bonitz (1842, pp. 95-96 n.): "Haec verba Hengstenbergius recte quidem ita interpretatur, ut ??????? non ad ?? ?? ?? ????? referat, sed praedicati loco ponat: dass das was jedes ist das an und für sich ausgesagt wird; at sententiarum series postulat, ut hoc potius dicatur, notionem substantialem (?? ?? ?? ?????) cujusque rei in eo cerni, quod de re ipsa per se praedicetur, vel ut ait Bessarion: «illud est, quod quid erat esse unumquodque, quod secundum se dicitur.» Namque deinceps hoc exemplo Aristoteles rem illustrat ?? ??? ???? ?? ??? ????? ?? ??????? ?????? ?? ??? ???? ?????? ?? ????????. Cf. Schol. p. 742a 22. sqq. Itaque scribendum est ??? ???? ?? ?? ?? ????? ?????? ? ??????? ???' ????. Eadem verba ?? ?? ?? ????? ?????? leguntur ?, 17. p. 1022a9."

Ross (ii 168): "??????? ? ??????? is palaeographically better than Bonitz's ?????? ? ???????. For the genitive cf. 1032a3, b2."

1029b17. not that which is propter se as white is to a surface. (EJ)

(1) not that which is propter se as a surface is said to be something white. (Ab)

1029b19. because 'surface' itself is added. (Ab)

(1) Why? Because … (EJ)

(3) Of the whole Corpus Aristotelicum, this is the only passage where the phrase ??? ??; ??? … occurs as a rhetoric question, except the spurious Magna Moralia, and that 4 times right in the first chapter (1182b17. 32; 1183a9. b11). In 1041b6 and 95b32-34 (?? ??????? ?????, ?????? ????????? ?????? ??? ?????????. ????? ??? ??; ??? ?????? ???????? ?????????, ????? ??? ?????? ?????????.) the question is not rhetoric.

1029b21-22. Therefore if to be a white surface is to be a smooth surface, to be white and to be smooth are one and the same.

(1) My recommendation: deleting.

(3) By ???' ?? Aristotle usually introduces the minor proposition of a syllogism (cf. for example 31a28. 32. 41 or 1083a37). Therefore, the premiss that the white and the smooth are only found on surfaces is required in order to obtain the conclusion that 'being white and being smooth are one and the same'. So we are dealing with an interpolation incompletely preserved.

1029b27. e.g. to 'white man'. (omitting ?? ?? ????? ???????).

(2) Asclepius (384. 9-11): ?? ??? ??????? ??????? ??? ?????? ??? ????????????, ???? ??? ????? ? ??????? ??? ?????? ????????.

Pseudo-Alexander (469. 25-26): ??? ???????? ?? ?? ?? ????? ?? ????? ??????? ??? ????? ??????? ??? ?????? ????????.

Bonitz (1849, p. 306): "Vocabulum ????? ante ????? ??????? omnes quidem libri et scripti et editi omittunt, sed adeo constans haec formula est apud Aristotelem, et ipsum verbum ????? ad conficiendam eius formulae vim tam necessario requiritur, ut additum fuisse a scriptore persuasum habeam."

Ross (II 169): "The omission of ????? with ?? ?? is unparalleled in Aristotle, and it is probable that the bracketed words are a gloss."

1029b28-29. But, it may be said, this also is not a propter se expression.

(2) Asclepius (384. 13): ?????? ??? ????????? ??? ???’ ???? ?????????.

Argyropulus: "neque hoc est ex eorum numero quae per se esse dicuntur."

Bessarion: "at vero nec eorum est quae secundum se dicuntur."

Jaeger: "????? correxi."

(3) There is nothing wrong with the syntactic structure of this sentence; for the syntagma ???? - predicate - ???? - subject cf. Plato, Euthydemus. 279 A 5-7 (? ?? ??????? ???? ?????? ?????? ???? ?? ???? ????? ?????? ????? ????????;) and Athenaeus, Deipnosophistae (epitome). 2,2 page 51, 11-12 (???? ??? ??????? ???? ????? ?? ???? ???? ???? ???????", for a genitive as predicative complement the nearest parallel is Analytica posteriora, 84b16-17 (????? ??? ???’ ???? ?????????? ????? ?? ??????). Jaeger's text change ????? is therefore unjustified.

1029b33. One kind of predicate is not propter se because the term that is being defined is combined with another determinant.

(2) Asclepius (384. 18-20): ????? ?? ?? ???????? ?? ??????? ?????? ????????, ? ?? ?????????? ?? ??????? ???????? ?? ??????· ????? ??? ??? ???? ???’ ????, ???? ?? ???? ?? ?????????? ? ??????? ?????????.

Pseudo-Alexander (470. 13-20): ?? ??? ??? ???? ??????? ?? ???’ ????, ?? ?? ?? ???? ????. ??????? ?? ?????????? ??? ?????????? ?? ???? ???????????, ? ?? ??????????, ??? ? ?? ??? ????????· ?? ?? ??????? ?? ???’ ???? ?? ?? ???? ???? ??????????? ????, ? ?? ??????????· ???? ?? ?? ??????? ???????? ??? ?????? ????????, ?????????? ?? ??????? ????? ??? ??????? ???? ????? ??????????? ?????. ???? ??? ??????????? ?? ?????? ??? ??????? ??? ???? ??, ???? ?? ???? ????? ??????, ?? ??????????, ???? ?? ???’ ???? ??????? ?? ???????.

About this, Bonitz (1849, p. 306 n.) says: "At tale additametum, ???? ???????????, nec potest e superioribus verbis recte repeti, nec si posset aptam efficeret sententiam, siquidem ita diceretur substantia ??????????? accidenti, quum potius accidens dicendum sit ??????????? substantiae."

Thomas Aquinas (Sententia Metaphysicae, liber 7 lectio 3 numerus 15): "Et ideo ad hoc exponendum subiungit, quod istorum duorum, quae dicuntur non secundum se, unum adiungitur alteri, eo quod ipsum accidens additur illi subiecto, quod in accidentis definitione ponitur cum definitur."

Fonseca: "Ait igitur fortasse dici posse duo esse genera entium per accidens. Unum eorum, quae ideo dicuntur entia per accidens, quia non per se, sed additione ad aliquid extrinsecum a suo formali significato, quod quidem ut subjectum innuunt, habent esse: quo pacto album est ens per accidens. […] Alterum genus entium per accidens est eorum, quae non ideo talia dicuntur, quia habeant esse ex additione ad aliquid extrinsecum a suo formali significato, quod quidem extrinsecum innuant tamquam subjectum, quippe cum re vera habeant esse per se ipsa, et non adminiculo eiusmodi extrinseci, veluti homo albus, quod uno verbo appellavit indumentum [???????]."

Bonitz (1849, p. 307): "Alterum igitur ??? ?? ???' ???? ???????? genus hoc est, si id quod est definiendum aliud quidpiam habet sibi inhaerens (?? ???? ???? ???????????), quemadmodum homo albus inhaerentem sibi habet album colorem."

Ross (ii 169): "The antithesis is misleadingly stated. Really the error arises in one case because in the definition the definiendum is added to to something else; in the other because in the definiendum something is conjoined with what is stated in the definition. ??????????? in l. 31 refers, as ?????????? does in l.30, to the addition in thought of a qualification; the ??????????? which has to be understood in l. 33 refers to the conjunction of a qualification in fact. Alexander's understanding of ???? ??????????? in this line, which would remove the ambiguity, is indefensible."

Frede/Patzig (ii 63): "We are following an unpublished conjecture by Dorothea Frede, who reads ???? ???? <??>. Ross, too, hits the sense; this, however, cannot be read out from the transmitted text."

(3) Bonitz's explanation seems to me quite satisfactory. Unfortunately, it is no longer mentioned and considered by Ross and Frede/Patzig.

The conjecture by Dorothea Frede is anticipated in Argyropulus' translation: quoddam ex eo dicitur quia aliud ipsi non additur. It is, however, inacceptable because it destroys the antithesis.

1030a1-3. white man is white indeed, but its essence is not to be white. But is being-a-cloak an essence at all? Probably not. For the essence is precisely what something is.

(1) My proposal: white man is white indeed, but not being-white. But being-a-cloak is not an essence at all or at any rate not in the strict sense; for the essence is precisely what something is.

(2) Bonitz (1841, p. 383): "The question ??? ???. strikes grammatically by the lack of connection with the preceding, in respect to the sense by dealing not with the question whether a ?? ?? ?? ????? exists at all, but whether it exists for the ???????, of which ??????? is an example.

The next words ???? ??? ???. are a tautology, incapable to form the opposite to what follows (as they should do). […] The variant reading ?? ?????? ?????, instead of ?? ?????? ????? […], in connection with Asclepius' paraphrase [], leads to punctuate before ???? instead of before ???."

Bonitz (1842, pp. 119-121): "[…] quod exhibetur ?? ?? ?????? ????????, particula ?? non est apta ad significandum ratiocinandi nexum; manifesto enim haec verba superioribus opponuntur si quis definierit hominem album tamquam album per se; at homo albus est quidem album aliquid, nec tamen ipsum album. Hanc ut efficiamus sententiam, quae unice loco apta esse videtur, recipienda est e codice T particula ?? pro ??.

Deinde duplex oritur dubitatio in proximis verbis ??? ???? ?? ?? ???., grammatica altera, altera philosophica. Licet enim scribendi elegantiam non quaesiveris in Aristotelis Metaphysicis, illud tamen vix feras, quod nulla omnino particula significatum est, qua ratione haec quaestio ad universum sententiarum contextum pertineat. Ac ne illud quidem dicitur, quod erat dicendum; nam non id quaerit Aristoteles utrum omnino exsistat notio substantialis necne, sed utrum ad res compositas eadem pertineat an unice ad substantias, ??? ??? ???????, ???????? ??? ????????, ????? ??????? ? ??? ????, ut recte Asclepius interpretatur. Utramque difficultatem facillime removere mihi videor deleto puncto ante ???, ut nova enuntiatio ab ???? ordiatur, et pro nominativo ?? ?????? recepto dativo ?? ?????? ?????, quem quidem casum, a Bekkero in lectionis varietate e codicibus non enotatum, in Sylburgiana tamen editione reperio.

Praeterea quod scribitur ?? ?? ?? ????? ????? ?????, necessario alterum ????? omittendum est; ac priore quidem loco ?? ?? ????? ????? illud omittendum esse verisimilius est, quum propter frequentem usum formulae ?? ?? ?? ????? facile ibi a librariis adjici potuerit.

Ac deinde in verbis ??? ???? ?? ?? ????? ?? ? ???? ? ?? quid in interrogatione ab ??? ordiente particula ? bis posita faciam non video, nec dubitaverim priorem expungere […].

Sed nec proxima verba videntur integra esse ???? ??? ?? ?? ????? ???? ?? ?? ?? ?????. His enim verbis, nisi fallor, idem per idem significaret philosophus. Quae autem debeat inesse iis sententia vel e commentariis Alexandri et Asclepii ad hunc locum colligi potest ??? ???? ?? ?? ?? ????? ??? ??? ?????? ????? ???. ??? ??? ?????? ???? ?????? ???????, vel apertius etiam e proximis verbis Aristotelis cognoscitur ???? ?' ???? ???' ????? ???????, ??? ????? ???? ???? ??. Inde cum apparet Aristotelem antea notionem substantialem ita descripsisse, ut eam ???? ???? ?? esse contenderet. Hac ratione ductus scribendum arbitror ???? ??? ???? ?? ???? ?? ?? ?? ?????. Codicum vestigia eodem ducere videntur, siquidem in codice Ab omissum est prius ?? ?????, et e codice Reg. enotatur ??. '???? ??? ?? ???? ?? ?? ?? ?????', ????? ????? ??? ??? ????? ???? ?? ?? ?? ????? ??????.

Universum igitur locum hunc in modum constituendum esse suspicor: - ? ?? ?????? ?? ??????? ?? ??????? ?? ?? ?????? ???????? ???? ??? ??????, ?? ?????? ?? ?? ?? ????? ?????. ???? ?? ?????? ????? ??? ???? ?? ?? ????? ?? ???? ? ??; ???? ??? ???? ?? ???? ?? ?? ?? ?????, ???? ?' ???? ???' ????? ??????? ??? ????? ???? ???? ??."

Ross (II 170): "???? ??? ??, the reading of Ab ??. E, gives a good sense, and it is not necessary to read with Bonitz ???? ??? <????> ??. For ?? = ???? ?? cf. 1029a20, 24."

(3) An objection against deleting the prior ? is the fact that ? ???? ? ?? is a stereotyped phrase; it recurs in the same book (1035a29-30; cf. also 1030b26-27). A further instance is Meteorologica A 14, 351b32-352a2:

???????? ?' ??? … ?? ??????? ? ???????? ????? ??????????. ????? ?? ??? ??????, ???? ????????? ?? ?? ?????? ???? ??? ???????? ?????????? ??????? ??? ??? ????? ???????? ?????? ?? ???? ??????? ????? ? ???? ? ?? ??????????.

("So we can see that […] the old name of Egypt was Thebes. Homer's evidence proves this last point, though in relation to such changes he is comparatively modern: for he mentions the country as though Memphis either did not exist as yet at all or at any rate were not a place of its present importance.")

The problem is, that our present passage lacks two conditions for the use of this phrase: the preceding negation and the following alternative. These two conditions can be established, if we read as follows:

?? ?? ?????? ???????? ???? ??? ??????, ?? ?????? [?? ?? ?????] ????? ?????. ???? ?? ?????? ????? ??? ???? ?? ?? ????? ?? ? ???? ? ?? <??????>. ???? ??? ?? [?? ?????] ???? ?? ?? ?? ?????.

The alternative is explained in ll. 17-27; to ?????? cf. l. 22 ??????, which is constantly associated with it. The dropping of a word like ?????? has caused the confusion we are confronted with: the fact that ? ?? seems to be the question now has entailed the insertion of ???.

The expression ???? ?? is documented Analytica posteriora B 4, 91b3-4: ???' ?? ???? ?? ? ???? ?? ??? ???? ??? ? ???????????? ??????.

1030b7-8. For if we suppose this it does not follow that there is a definition of every word which means the same as any formula; it must mean the same as a particular kind of formula.

(2) Asclepius (387. 29-32): ????? ??? ??? ??? ?? ???????, ??? ????? ??????? ??? ????????? ??????? ????? ????? ??? ?????????, ? ?? ??????? ?? ???? ????? ???????, ????????? ? ?? ????? ???? ?? ???? ???????, ??? ??????? ????? ??????.

Pseudo-Alexander (475. 22-25): ?? ??, ?????, ??????, ????????? ??? ????????? ?? ?? ?????????, ?? ????? ?????, ??? ? ?? ????? ???? ?????? ???????, ??????? ??? ?????, ? ?????? ?? ????? ????????, ??????? ???? ??? ????????? ?????.

Argyropulus: "eius definitionem esse cuius nomen idem quod oratio significat, sed quod oratio quaedam."

Jaeger: "????? ex Alexandro (qui citat decies) et Asclepii citatione restitui; cf. a7 et 9."

Frede/Patzig (II 72): "What is certain is only that Pseudo-Alexander and Asclepius, quite correctly, are paraphrasing the text in this manner. In reality, it is probably a further instance of Aristotle's changing to and fro between speaking about the thing and about the term which designates the thing."

1030b26-27. Therefore there is either no essence and definition of any of these things, or if there is, it is in another sense, as we have said. (Ab)

(1) "Therefore the essence and the definition either does not exist of any of these things". (EJ)

(3) The reading of Ab is supported by 1030a14-17, the reading of EJ by 1030b5-6.

1030b35-1031a1. for in snub-nose nose yet another 'nose' will be involved. (following EJ, but reading ???? instead of ????)

(1) for being nose and being snub-nose will be different. (Ab)

(2) Frede/Patzig (II 85): "It is so strange that Aristotle does write here ????, not ????, that one is tempted to conjecture ???? or to think of an even more grave serious corruption, particularly as Ab offers three variant readings, which give (even if laboriously) quite an other sense: 'a nose will be something other than a snub nose'."

(3) The reading of Ab is to be corrected by adding ???: ???? ??? <???> ???? ???? ???? ?????, cf. 1007a29, 1032a3-4, On the Heavens i 9, 278a8-9 (????? ??? ????? ???? ????? ?? ????? ????? ??? ???? ?? ?????). This is where the strange ???? in EJ comes from, which is to be corrected into ???? (as Ross tacitly did).

1031a2-3. e.g. the qualitative is defined thus, and so is the odd.

(1) e.g. the odd is defined thus. (according to Jaeger)

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (478. 28 - 479. 4) has ??? ????? ??? ??? ?????? ??? ??? ???????? ??? ??? ??????, but what he comments is only ???????? and ????: ?? ??? ??? ??? ????? ??????????, ???? ??? ????? ??? ??? ?????? ??? ??? ???????? ??? ??? ?????? ??? ??? ????????, ???????? ????? ?????, ?????? ??? ?? ??????????? ?????????, ????? ??????? ??? ??? ?????. ?? ??? ??? ?? ???? ????????? ???????, ?????? ?? ???? ??? ????????????· ?? ??? ???? ????? ???? ????, ????? ???????? ?? ????, ?????? ?????? ??? ???? ???? ???? ???? ?? ? ??????? ???? ??????. ?????? ??? ???????? ????? ??????? ????, ???? ????? ???????? ?? ????????, ?????? ?????? ??? ???????? ????? ??????? ??????? ?? ????????? ??? ??? ??? ???????????. ???? ????? ??? ???????? ? ??? ?????? ??? ????? ???????, ???? ??? ????????????? ?????, ???? ??????? ???????? ? ?????? ????.

Thomas Aquinas (Sententia Metaphysicae, liber 7 lectio 4 numerus 20) presupposes the reading ???? ??? ???? (instead of ???? ??? ?????): "Palam est itaque, ut videtur, quod solius substantiae est definitio. Si enim esset aliorum praedicamentorum, oporteret quod esset ex additione subjecti, sicut definitio aequalitatis [=??? ????] et definitio imparis oporteret quod sumeretur ex definitione suorum subjectorum."

Bonitz (1849, p. 315): "Pro voce ????? scribendum suspicor ??????, quia eiusmodi accidentis requiritur mentio, quod certi cuiusdam subjecti complectatur notionem; quod quidem subjectum quum dicat esse numerum, ?? ??? ???? ???????, probabile est eum scripsisse ??? ?????? ??? ????????."

Jaeger: "????? ??? seclusi; ad verba ??? ????? ?????????? (a2) aliquis ????? ??? ????? adscripserat, ut videtur, quae ex parte in textum pervenerunt, cf. 6."

1031a29-30. E.g. if there are some substances which have no other substances nor entities prior to them.

(2) Asclepius (393. 1-2): ??? ???? ?????? ??? ????? ?????? ????? ????? ???????? ????? ??????????.

Pseudo-Alexander (481. 12-14): ?? ????? ???, ?????, ????? ?????? ????? ???’ ????? ????????????, ?? ? ?????? ??????, ?? ?????? ?? ????? ?????? ?????? ???? ?????? ????????.

Argyropulus: "quibus aliae non sunt substantiae neque naturae priores."

Jaeger: "duae lectiones verborum ordinem variantes contaminatae sunt."

Frede/Patzig (II 93): "But the repetition of ?????? makes clearer that ???????? refers both to ?????? and ??????, not only to the latter."

(3) Frede/Patzig overlook that referring ???????? only to ?????? is excluded by the word order; to make it possible the text would have to run: ?? ?? ????? ?????? ??????. The corrupted reading ????? ???????? presupposed by Asclepius can only come from ?????? ????????.

1031b2. and, secondly, these others will be prior substances. (EJ)

(1) and, secondly, these others will be prior and substances. (Ab)

and, secondly, these others will be prior and substances in a higher degree. (according to Jaeger)

(2) Asclepius (393. 6-8): ??????? ????? ?????? ??? ?????? ??? ????? ???? ??? ?????????, ??? ???????? ?????? ???????.

Pseudo-Alexander (481. 20-21): ??????? ????? ?????? ??? ?????? ??? ????? ???? ??? ????????? ??? ????????, ??? ??????? ??????? ??????.

Jaeger: "?????? ex Alexandri paraphrasi recuperavi, quod si excidit, ??? bene conservavit Ab."

Frede/Patzig (II 93-94, contra Jaeger): "But firstly, Pseudo-Alexander has ???????, not ??????, and secondly he paraphrases the next protasis too by ?? ??? ????? ??????? ???? ?? ?? ?? ????? [ll. 21-22], so that Jaeger here too should have made the analogous addition."

(3) ??? ?????? (Ab) gives a good sense also without Jaeger's ??????, because priority is the reason of substantiality (1073a36, 1038b26, 1087a1, Physics, 189a34).

1031b8-9. so that if the essence of good is not good, neither is the essence of reality real, nor the essence of unity one.

(2) Bonitz (1842, p. 50): "Hoc loco est sane quo defendi possit dativus, si quis e superioribus repetendum censeat ??????? (versu 5 ?? ????? ??????? ?? ????? ?????); quamquam neque ???????? huc satis apte referri videtur, quum notio ????? ????? tunc subjecti locum, res ?????? praedicati obtineret, et arctius haec cohaerent cum proximis quam cum superioribus. Sed quum his verbis scriptor deinde rem persequatur ?????? ?? ????? ????? ? ????? ?? ?? ?? ?????? ???? ?? ???? ?? ???? ??, ???? ??? ????? ?????, apertum est etiam ad ea verba, de quibus agimus, verbum ????? cogitatione addendum atque ita scribendum esse: ???' ?? ???? ?? ????? ????? ??????, ???? ?? ???? ??, ???? ?? ??? ??."

Frede/Patzig (II 97): "Evidently, the reading ?? is due to the misconception that ???????? is to be supplied."

1031b13. and so with all things which do not depend on something else but are self-subsistent and primary. (Alexandri citatio)

(1) in as far as they do not depend on something else but are self-subsistent and primary. (Ab, EJ)

(2) Frede/Patzig (II 98): "Without ???, the sentence ??? ?? … would have the function of restricting the consequence to the Good and the Beautiful, as far as they are really primary. According to Aristotle's own theory, good and beautiful are no (or at least not without exception) per se predicates. If we read <???>, the sentence ??? ?? … has the function of generalizing the consequence."

1031b20-21. and because to know each thing, at least, is just to know its essence.

(1) and because to know each thing itself, at least, is just to know its essence. (according to Jaeger)

(2) Jaeger: "an ???? legendum? cf. 19, 24."

1032a18. and the something which they come to be is a man or a plant or one of the things of this kind.

(2) Jaeger: "?? ? ? fortasse contaminatum ex variis lectionibus ?? ?? ?? et ?? ?? ? (sic Alexandri paraphrasis!)."

(3) Cf. 1033a27, where Jaeger refers to our passage.

1032a21-22. and this capacity is the matter in each.

(2) Asclepius (397. 24): ?? ?? ??????? ????? ??? ?????.

Pseudo-Alexander (488. 5-6): ????? ??? ?????? ??? ????? ??? ??? ?????? ??? ????? ??? ?? ????? ? ??? ?????.

Jaeger: "fortasse ?????? ?' ????? ????? ? ?? ?????? ??? legit Alexander."

(3) ????? refers to ??????? ??? ????? ??? ?? ?????, an excellent definition of matter.

1032b4-5. (for disease is the absence of health). (Ab)

(1) for disease is explained by the absence of health. (EJ)

(2) Frede/Patzig (II 114-115): "Presumably, ???????? has dropped out because it was understood as 'reveals itself', not as 'is explained'."

1032b8-9. and the physician goes on thinking thus until he reduces the matter to a final something which he himself can produce.

(2) Jaeger: ??????? post ????? transponendum videtur, neque enim rem ad id deducit, quod ipse ultimum facere potest sed deducit rationem ad id ultimum, quod ipse jam facere potest, cf. simili de ????????? usu E. N. 1112b19 et 23, quae quaerit ???????, quod idem initium est actionis (aliter ??????? usurpatur De an. 433a16).

Frede/Patzig (II 115 contra Jaeger): "The text gives the required sense also without that."

1032b26-28. Warmth in the body, then, is either a part of health or is followed by something similar which is a part of health.

(2) Jaeger: "<? ??????> ? ????? fortasse scribendum est, cf. 1034a28."

Frede/Patzig (II 119 contra Jaeger): "But in the second member of the parallel passage [Z 9, 1034a28], also health itself (besides its parts) is taken into account among the possible effects of warming. In order to establish parallelity, Jaeger's addition would require an analogous supplement in the second part of our sentence too; but above all, mentioning health would contradict the conclusion drawn here, that each time some part of the thing coming to be must preexist."

1032b28. (either directly or through several intermediate steps). (according to Pseudo-Alexander)

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (492. 9-11): ???? ?? ?? ???????? ?? ????????? ??? ????? ?? ??? ??????? ? ????? ?????? ????, ? ?? ?? ?????, ???’ ??? ??? ????????.

Jaeger: "? ????? ex Alexandri paraphrasi addidi."

1032b28-29 and this, viz. that which produces the part of health, is the limiting-point. (Ab)

(1) and this, viz. that which produces and which is part of health in this sense (as producing it), is the limiting-point. (my reading, based on EJ)

(3) For the sake of clarity, the readings of Ab and EJ shall be placed side by side:

????? ?' ???????, ?? ?????? ?? ????? ??? ???????. (Ab)

????? ?' ???????, ?? ?????? ??? ?? ????? ????? ???? ??? ???????. (EJ)

To get a satisfying text out of EJ, it needs no more than to eject the meaningless ???? (which belongs to ???????): ????? ?' ???????, ?? ?????? ??? ?? ????? [scilicet ?? ??????] ????? [????] ??? ???????.

1033a4. and figure is the proximate genus in which it is placed.

(1) and figure is the genus in which as the first (genus) it is placed. (my translation)

(2) Asclepius (400. 17-20): \*\*\* ??????? ???? ?????· ??? ????? ???? ?? ????? ??? ?????? ??????, ??? ? ?????? ???????, ???????? ?? ????? ??? ???????? ??? ?????? ????? ????? ?????.

Pseudo-Alexander (492. 19-23): ??? ?? ??? ??? ??? ??????? ????? ?? ????? ???? ??????, ??? ??????· ?? ??? ???? ??? ????????, ??? ????? ????? ?? ??? ??? ??????? ?????? ??? ???????? ????? ????, ??? ?? ?????? ??? ?? ?????, ??? ??? ?????? ?? ??? ????????????, ?? ?? ????? ?? ??? ??????. ???? ?? ? ??????? ?????? ?? ????? ???? ?? ???????????? ??? ????, ???? ??? ?? ?? ????.

Schwegler (ii 78) and Bonitz (1849, p. 324) follow Pseudo-Alexander.

Ross (II 186): "These words are perhaps a gloss due to some one who thought there was a reference to the doctrine that genus is ???. For glosses of similar form cf. ?. 1009a26, ?. 1073b33, and possibly A. 984b1, Z. 1041a28, b8."

(3) That these words are a later insertion is proved by the fact that ?? in line 4 refers to ll. 2-4 ????????? … ???????. Therefore we are not obliged to understand them from what precedes, i. e. to refer ????? to ????? ???????, and to make the bronze ring (? ??????? ??????) the subject of ???????. For ????? may be substituted 'figure' (?????), as subject of ??????? the circle (??????). The vocabulary is good Aristotelian; for ??? ? ?????? v. Physics vi 5, 236b15. Meteorology i 3, 339b2, for ??????? ??? Topics i 18, 108b21-22. vi 6, 145b11-12. Physics iii 2, 201b24, for ?????? ????? 999a1. 1023a27.

1033a27. and since something is produced. (Pseudo-Alexander)

(1) literally: and becomes something (cf. 1032a13-14 and 1032a17-18).

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (494. 35 - 495. 1): ?????? ??? ?? ????????? ??? ?? ????????? ??????? ??? ?? ??? ????????? ? ??? ?? ??? ????, ??? ?? ???????, ???? ???????? ? ????? ? ?????? ? ?????? ? ???? ??.

Bonitz (1842, p. 91): "Pro ??? ? ???????? scribendum esse pronomen indefinitum ??? ?? ???????? apparet comparatis verbis superioribus ??? ?????, ?? ?????. Exhibent autem pronomen indefinitum codex Fb et paraphrasis Alexandri ?????? ??? ?? ????????? ??? ?? ????????? ??????? ??? ?? ??? ????????? ? ??? ?? ??? ????, ??? ?? ???????, ???? ???????? ? ????? ???. Conferri etiam possunt loci consimiles ex ipsis metaphysicis libris. ?, 7. p. 1032a13. […] ?, 3. 1069b36."

As to the reading ??? ? ???????? (Ab, EJ), Jaeger refers to 1032a18.

1033a31-32. For to make a 'this' is to make a 'this' out of the substratum in the full sense of the word. (Ab)

(1) For to make a 'this' is to make 'this' out of the substratum in the full sense of the word. (EJ)

(2) Frede/Patzig (II 133) defend the reading of EJ ????, comparing 1033b2-3. "One could even think that, as explication of ???? ?? ?????? in 1032a31, the repetition of ???? ?? ?????? in 1032a32 is disturbing."

1033b5-7. Obviously then the form also, or whatever we ought to call the shape present in the sensible thing, is not produced, nor is there any production of it.

(2) According to Jaeger, l. 5: ???? and l. 6 ?? are variae lectiones.

Frede/Patzig (II 135) defend the text of EJ: "The two outer negations (???? in b5 and b7) correspond as the two inner ones (?? and ???' in b6). The ???' in b6 requires the ?? before ????????, in order to guarantee its relation to ???????? and to exclude a connection with ???? ?? ?? ?? ????? in the next line. Besides, ???? in 1033b5 refers to 1033b2 and 1033a28: That a thing comes to be does not imply that the matter or substratum comes to be. And thus also the form does not come to be, when a thing of a certain form comes to be."

1033b7. nor is the essence produced. (Ab)

(1) nor is the essence of this thing produced. (EJ)

Frede/Patzig (II 137) prefer the reading of EJ ?? ?? ?? ????? ?????: "????? can easily have dropped out by haplography before ?????."

1033b16. which corresponds to the brazen sphere.

(1) e. g. the brazen sphere. (to be deleted according to Frede/Patzig)

(2) Ross (ii 188): "???? here introduces not an example but a comparison."

Frede/Patzig (II 140) propose to delete ???? ? ????? ??????, as being from a reader, "who, erroneously, understood the lines b14-15 as a further description not of the spherical form, but of the concretum".

(3) In the ll. 14-15, the deductio ad absurdum, beginning with l. 12 ??????, is continued (?????): if the form, e. g. the form sphere, is generated, then in 'the figure whose circumference is at all points equidistant from the center' will occur the difference of matter, form and the whole of them, quod est absurdum. The brazen sphere is not needed here in any function (comparison or example).

1033b17. that that which is spoken of as form or substance is not produced.

(1) that that which is spoken of as substance in the sense of form is not produced. (according to Frede/Patzig)

(2) Frede/Patzig (II 140) conjecture ?? ??? ?? ????? ????? ?????????, "since Aristotle is distinguishing here between the two meanings of ?????, ?? ????? ???????? and ? ??????? ? ???? ?????? ????????".

1033b19-21. Is there, then, a sphere apart from the individual spheres or a house apart from the bricks?

(1) Is there, then, a sphere apart from the individual spheres or a house apart from the bricken ones? (according to Sepulveda, Argyropulus and Bonitz; cf. 1033a19)

(2) Argyropulus: "aut praeter laterinas domos aliqua alia domus."

Bonitz (1849, p. 327 n.): "Sepulveda vertit 'laterinas': ac superiori membro: ???? ????? (intellige ???????), aptius certe responderetur, si scriptum esset: ???? ??? ??????????."

1033b21. Rather we may say that no 'this' would ever have been coming to be, if this had been so.

(1) Perhaps the answer is that if the form were an individual subsistent in this manner, coming-to-be would never take place at all. (Ross ii 189)

(2) Argyropulus: "an si sic esset, nunquam hoc aliquid esset ortum."

Bessarion: "an nec factum fuisset unquam, si ita esset quod quid."

(3) Ross's translation of 1928 is decidedly preferable, since the essence of the reasoning is that a 'this' cannot be produced from a 'such'. For the phrase ?? ????? ??, cf. On the Parts of Animals i 3, 643a5: ?? ?' ????? ????? ("If that is so").

1034a17-18. and so it is with fire.

(1) To be secluded according to Schwegler and Jaeger.

(2) Schwegler (ii 87): "The words ??? ?? ??? seem to be a glossema (in view of their syntactic setting), although mentioning the fire would fit, inasmuch as, its natural motion being opposed to the natural motion of the stone, a natural association of ideas could lead there."

Jaeger: "seclusi notam e margine intrusam."

1034a20-21. but can themselves be moved by other things which have not the art.

(1) To be omitted according to Ross.

Frede/Patzig (i 89) translate: "… which also have not the art", but "also" has no equivalent in the Greek text and is added by them only to make their interpretation possible.

(2) Asclepius (407. 5-6): ???????? ??? ????????? ?? ?????? ??? ??? ????? ?? ??????? ??????, ???? ??? ???????? ?????? ????????? ??????, ? ??? ??????.

Pseudo-Alexander (498. 29-30): ? ??? ??????????? ??? ??? ??? ?????? ?? ???????, ? ?? ??????.

Jaeger thinks that Pseudo-Alexander is omitting ????????? … ??? ??????? ??? ?????? by homoioteleuton.

Bonitz (1849, p. 329): "Quae ex sua ipsorum parte aliqua moventur, ea quodammodo ex se ipsis moveri videbuntur, ut ????????? ????????? ????? - ? ?? ?????? non multum differat; quare haud scio an ????? hoc loco ea vi Aristoteles usurpaverit, qua supra causam antecedentem rei effectae partem dixit esse, veluti calorem sanitatis partem, cf. 7. 1032b26."

Christ (1853, pp. 44-46): "Haec verba scribarum culpa atque interpolationibus turpiter foedata sunt. Aristoteles distinxit inter eas res, quae nonnisi artificis manu adjuvante moveri possint, et eas, quae artifice non indigeant (- versu 18); has enim res aut ab aliis artis expertibus aut ipsarum aliqua parte (?? ?????? cf. Alexandrum) effici. Sed ut hoc rerum genus suo vigore in motum transduci potest, ita nihil interest, ut rudes motores sponte moveantur. Jam cum nec bruta nec ulla res artis expers dici possit, homines autem omnes insito vigore moveantur, omnino non intelligitur cur addantur verba ????????? - ?????. Quodsi quis dixerit, omnes quidem homines innata vi moveri, sed non omnes eum in modum, ut haec vel illa res procreetur: tum multo magis verbum agens quam patiendi exspectari urgere nolo, id autem certum apparet, homines ad rem efficiendam minus habiles artis imperitia premi solere. Atqui hinc sensus contrarius efficeretur. Etenim ii, qui sponte hunc in modum moveri possent, homines non rudes sed callidi ac periti essent. Sed haec omnia argutius disputata sunt. Manifesto enim verba ????????? - ?????? ex glossemate in textum irrepserunt. Hanc ad sententiam me primum duxit fides codicis Ab ??? et ? omittentis, confirmavit Alexandri paraphrasis. Atque adeo ex ipso Alexandro intelligitur, qui illa interpolatio orta sit. Nam glossator quidam in margine adjecerat ad ??????????? subaudienda esse ?? ????????? ???????? ???? vel negligentius ?????????? ??' ?????, alius quidam variam lectionem ??' ????? - ?????? ad ??? ??? - ?????? adnotaverat. His glossematis in textum illatis particulae ??? et ? ad verba interpolata cum genuinis conjungenda interpositae sunt; ab extrema tamen labe codex Ab integer mansit. Difficultates igitur in corruptela hujus enuntiationis quaesivi; sequentia enim verba, ??? ?????? ???? ????? ???????? ?? ????????, ????? ?? ?????, ? ?? ?????? ????????, ???? ????? ?? ?????? … ? ?? ?????? ? ??????? ?? ?????, facile explicari possunt, modo quis, ipsum Aristotelem secutus, duplicem vim verborum ?? ?????? recte assecutus erit: omnia fiunt aut ex synonymis (???????? ?? ????????), aut ex eo, quod aliqua ex parte synonymum dicatur (? ????? ? ?????? ???? ?? ??? ???? ???? ??????), aut ex parte quadam sc. rei synonymae vel rei ipsius (?????? ?? ??????????, ?????? ??? ??????? ?????) aut denique ex eo, quod partem rei sequatur.

Bonitzius atque Schweglerus ea de causa mihi falli videntur, quia praepositionem ?? in secundo divisionis membro non ad simplex verbum ?????? sed ad conjuncta verba ?????? ????????? retulerunt. Quodsi rationem inter tertium et quartum membrum intercedentem respexissent, praepositionem ?? primo et tertio membro praefixam suam vim ad inferiora membra, secundum et quartum dico, propagare vidissent."

Ross (ii 191): "There is no trace of these words in Alexander (498. 29), and they are decidedly suspicious; the ??? of EJ looks like a piece of patchwork inserted in view of an intrusive de clause following."

Frede/Patzig (II 154) defend the text: "the words ????????? ?? … ?? ?????? (a20-21) do not denote three possibilities (self-motion, external motion, motion by some part), but two possibilities how the motion of these things (?????, a20) can be created: either by another thing or out of itself, this second possibility being expressed by ?? ??????."

1034a21. or with a motion starting from a part of the product.

(2) Schwegler (ii 87-88) presumes that the words ? ?? ?????? have intruded from the following lines (23, 24).

Ross (ii 191): "?? ?????? is difficult, but a comparison with 1032b26-1033a1, 1034a12, 24-30 shows what is meant. Asclepius gives a good instance of Aristotle's meaning, ??? ??????? ?????? ???????????? ??? ????????????? ??? ?????? ?????????? (407. 6). Not improbably, however, ? ?? ?????? has been wrongly inserted here, as in l. 24, from the margin."

1034a23. ? ?? ?????? ????????. (not translated by Ross)

(2) Jaeger (BBA 267): "After ???????? had dropped out [in l. 24], the original wording was added later in the margin, wherefrom it fell into the text."

Jaeger (in his apparatus): "haec verba exemplum ?????? separant a re illustranda (?? ?? ????????)."

1034a24. qua produced by reason. (according to Robin and Jaeger)

(1) My proposal: delete "qua produced by reason" (which is corrected from "or by reason").

(2) Jaeger (BBA 267) proposes to read ? ??? ???: "these words are intended to explain the paradoxon" (that "the house is produced from a house").

(3) ??? ??? is an alternative to ????? (l. 23), cf. 1071b35-36. Therefore, the words ? ??? ??? should not be changed, but taken as a later addition, inserted at the wrong place.

1034a24-25. or from a part of itself which shares its name, or from something which contains a part of it. (secluding l. 24 ? ?? ??????)

(2) Bonitz (1849, p. 329): "Haec quin aliquo librariorum errore depravata sint non dubito; videtur enim ferri vix posse, ut opponantur inter se ????? ???????? et ????? simpliciter, praesertim quum hoc etiam ????? cogitandum esse ???????? ex superioribus verbis a22 appareat."

(3) Frede/Patzig (ii 156) are right that ll. 24-25 ? … ? ... is a subdivision of ?? ????????. ?? ?????? is either the heat or something that has heat. Jaeger is right that l. 23 ? ?? ?????? ???????? is an insertion. The part is of the same name, but not "part of the thing which shares its name". The heat as part of what causes health is of the same name as the heat as part of health.

1034a29-30. because it causes that to which health attaches as a consequence. (according to Pseudo-Alexander and Bonitz)

(2) Asclepius (410. 25-27): ??? ??? ??????? ?????? ?????? ? ???????? ?? ??? ???????, ??? ?????? ?? ?????? ????? ??? ??????, ? ????? ??????????? ? ????????.

Pseudo-Alexander (500. 4-6): ?? ?? ????? ?????? ?? ??? ??????? ??????; ? ????????, ?, ???? ?? ?????????, ????????? ??? ?????????? ? ??????.

Bonitz (1849, p. 330): "quia illud judicatur sanitatem efficere, cui tamquam consequens accidit calor corporis, et ex eo nimirum sanitas. Sed contortam hanc esse explicationem, et parum apte subjectum poni verbi ????? atque antea verbi ??????, apparet; accedit quod Alexander pro ????????? ???????? videtur habuisse: ?????????? ? ??????. Hoc reputantibus non improbabile videbitur scriptum fuisse: ??? ??? ??????? ?????? (intellige ? ?? ?? ??????? ???????? ??? ???????), ??? ?????? (intellige ??? ?? ?? ?????? ?????????) ?????, ? ????????? ??? ?????????? ? ??????."

Jaeger: "et ???????? et ??? ??????? glossae erant ad ??????? ?????? e margine in textum intrusae. Alexander in paraphrasi post ????????? cogitando supplebat ? ?????? recte, noli tamen cum Bonitzio in textum recipere."

Frede/Patzig (II 160): "Asclepius's paraphrasis cannot be understood otherwise than that he did not read ????????."

1034a33. Things which are formed by nature are in the same case as these products of art.

(2) Jaeger (BBA 266): "Here too [as in 1075a10], the schema ????? - ????? is interrupted by the parenthesis, here too, ?? accedes to the demonstrative member. The ?? of the main manuscript ? is to be rejected."

1034b3-4. unless the offspring be an imperfect form; which is the reason why the parent of a mule is not a mule. (according to Pseudo-Alexander)

(2) Ross (ii 193): "??? … ??????? does not follow naturally on the previous clause. […] Alexander interprets ??? … ? as coming before ??? … ???????, and may have had the clauses before him in that order. The sense gained by the transposition is quite satisfactory; ?? ??? … ?????? is interposed parenthetically to explain the cautious ??? in l. 1, and then the exception to ???? ??? ???????? is stated in ??? ?? ?????? ? (cf. the position of ??? ?? ???? ?????????? ???????? in a25), and illustrated."

Jaeger: "sed dubito an 1-3 ?? ??? … ?????? parenthesis esse possint."

Frede/Patzig (ii 162): "From 500. 19-22 and 500. 33-37, it rather results that Pseudo-Alexander had before him the same text of 1034b1-3 as we have today."

1034b13-14. so is it both in the case of substance and in that of quality and quantity and the other categories likewise.

(1) so is it also in the case of quality and quantity and the other categories likewise. (according to Frede/Patzig)

(2) Frede/Patzig (II 164) suspect the words ??? ??? ??? ?? ????, "because the sentence which begins 1034b10, in its entirety, seems to mean that, like the substantial form, also quality, quantity etc. are not created".

1035a12. but the segments are parts in the sense of matter on which the form supervenes. (according to Jaeger)

(2) In favor of his emendation ??' ?? Jaeger (BBA 268) compares 1035a5, 1036a31 and 1036b6. The writing ??? is, according to him, one of the rare cases of itacism overlooked by the Byzantine editors.

1035a23. where the formula does not refer to the concrete object.

(1) A later addition according to Christ and Jaeger.

(2) Christ (1853, pp. 83-84): "Totum per caput decimum Aristoteles distinguit inter integram formam (?????) et formam cum materia coalitam (?????????????): hic partes materiae respiciendas, illic omittendas esse. Hinc apparet nostro loco sub ??? ?? res concretas, sub ??? ??? puras formas intelligendas esse. Quod si probatur, non intelligitur, cur verba ?? ?? ? ??? ????????????? adjecta sint, quoniam in altero genere nulla res concreta continetur. Quominus autem cum Bonitzio haec verba explicationis causa addita esse censeamus, multa prohibent. Primum particulae ?? ?? post negationem solemni usu de exceptione quadam usurpari solent, deinde cur per ambages res negative explicetur non video, tum in illa explicatione multo magis ??? ?? exspectaretur, nihil denique languidius excogitari posset. Praeterea particula ??? multum offensionis habet. Nam in antecedenti enuntiatione significationem ????? arctioribus limitibus definitionis purae formae includendam esse connexus sententiarum demonstrat. At non ex hac angusta significatione, sed ex latissima definitionis (?????) vi id consequens est, quod proximis verbis proponitur (??? ??? ??? - ?????????????). Jam codicum discrepantia succurrit. Atque viam corruptelae indicat fides codicis Ab particulam ??? omittentis, certiores nos facit lectio in margine codicis E. adjecta, quacum Alexander fortasse conspirat: ?????? ???? ??? ??????? ? ??? ???????? ????? ?????, ???? ?' ?? ??? ???????. Duplicem enim recensionem exstare crediderim, alteram: ?????? ???' ?? ???? ?????? ??? ?? ? (sive omisso ? cum Ab) ??? ????????????? (sc. ?????? ?? ??? ???? ????), alteram: ?????? ???? ??? (sc. ???????????, quod facile ex sequenti ???? subauditur) ??????? ? ??? ???????? ????? ?????, ???? ?' ?? ??? ???????. Hoc si quis minus probaverit, is transpositione facta legat: ?????? ???' ?? ???? ??????, ?? ?? ? ??? ?????????????. ??? ??? ??? …."

Jaeger (1911, pp. 31-34): "??? ?' ?? ??? ??????? (scilicet ?? ?? ???? vel ?? ?? ?????? id quod idem est) ??? ?? ? ??? ????????????? non aliter verti posse apparet nisi 'but in the definition of the other things (the forms) they must not be contained, unless they are parts of the composed'. (non recte Lasson 'they do not need' vertit, quod jam Bonitz recte intellexerat et toto capite X certe refellitur.) sed totam sententiam sic ut vertimus pugnare manifestum est cum iis, [32] quae Aristoteles hac omni distinctione partium formae et partium rei concretae assecuturus sibi videbatur. immo eo, quod sunt partes rei concretae, non pertinere ad definitionem formae neque recipiendas esse in eam apparet. at tamen etiam cum Lassonio equidem facere nequeo, qui vertat 'namely if they are not parts of the composition of form and matter'. quod si recte scriberetur, supplendum foret: but if they are parts of the form. sed hoc non solum Aristotelem simplicius, si voluisset, dicturum fuisse veri simile est, verum etiam cum sententia Aristotelis omnino pugnat. nam si re vera sunt formae, non rei concretae partes, inesse debent definitioni, non contra. verum enim vero ?? ??? ??????? ??? ?? ? ??? ????????????? nil significare potest nisi, ut supra monebam, 'they must …, unless …', quod absurdum esse ostendi.

At occupet quispiam: cur tu ???? supplere pergis, cum mihi ????? magis placeat, ut cuius mentio haud longe antea inciderit? sed non is ?????, qui coniungitur cum ? ???????? ?????, sed ille, qui ad ??? ?? … ??? ?? supplendus est ex antecedentibus verbis ?? ???? ??????. eadem hercle, manet difficultas. nam omne distinctioni acumen dematur, cum dicas: These parts must be contained in the definition of the composed, but they must not be contained in the definition of the form, unless it is the definition of the composed. hoc stolidum, immo perversum addi nemo non videt.

Ita verba ??? - ?????????????, quippe quae cum universa sententia nullo pacto coniungi possint, in suspicionem veniunt. quam auctam mihi fateor miro quodam usu verbi ??? ?????????????. pro ?? ??????? vel ? ??????? ????? saepius ?? [33] ????????????? ?? ???, ?? ???????, ???? ??? ???? apud Aristotelem invenitur. sed statim perlustratis illis locis philosophum nunquam - uno loco excepto - sine ?? ??? vel alio eius modi additamento verbum ????????????? usurpavisse elucet. hoc autem loco eo minus sine ?? ??? poni poterat, quod hoc toto libro nondum lectum est e per se minime perspici potest. at met. ? 11, 1036a27 quoniam ter jam ante in proximo capite et saepius etiam ?? ??????? usurpatum est, facile intellegitur, quid sit ?? ?????????????, praesertim cum ?? ????? opponatur. quod cum loco 1035a23 non contingat, nonne lector in voce ??? ????????????? iure haesitabit, velut me ipsum, cum primum legerem, haesitasse memini? adde quod Aristoteles sententiam ita continuat: ??? ??? ??? ???????????? ?? ????? ??? ? ??? ?????, ???? ?? ????? ? ? ??????? ??????, ????? ??? ???. ubi ad illustrandam vocem ??? ????????????? non modo appositionem ?? ????? ??? ? ??? addit, verum etiam duo exempla, ?? ????? ??? ??? ??????? ??????, proponit, quo clarius hanc se notionem tanquam novam atque inauditam inducere doceret legentiumque vel audientium animos in eam converteret. […] quibus de causis fateamur necesse esse verba ??? … ????????????? non ab ipso philosopho profecta esse.

Quod simulac statuerimus, interpretatio elegantissima praesto erit. nam aliquis qui postea ea verba legeret, cum distinctionem sagacissimam et subtilissimam ??? ??? ??? ??????? ? ??? ???????? ????? ?????, ??? ?' ?? ??? ??????? minus [34] intellexisset, perlectis sequentibus enuntiationibus, quibus agitur de ?? ???????????? ?? ???, jam perspexit illam distinctionem perspectaeque in margine adiecit haec verba: ??? ?? ? ??? ????????????? scilicet ? ????? h. e. namely if the definition does not concern the concretum (supple but the form); tum enim re vera ?? ??? ??????? ? ??? ???????? ????? ????? (scil. ??? ??????). ???? vero etiam sic supplere non possumus. quare verba ??? ?? ? ??? ????????????? e textu quasi interpretamentum ejicienda esse censeo."

1035a27. Those things which are the form and the matter taken together, e.g. the snub, or the bronze circle, pass away into these materials, and the matter is a part of them.

(2) Asclepius (413. 14-17): ??? ????? ??? ???? ??? ?? ??????, ???????? ?? ???????, ?? ????? ????· ??? ??? ??? ???? ??????????. ?? ??? ????? ? ? ??????? ?????? ??? ????? ??????????, ?? ?? ??? ???????????, ??? ????? ????? ? ??? ???????.

Pseudo-Alexander (506. 3-4): ????? ????????? ??? ???? ??? ????? ????? ????? ? ???.

Jaeger: "???? cum Alexandri citatione scripsi: ????? codices."

Frede/Patzig (II 181) object that confusion arises by ???? ??? ????? ????? ? ???.

(3) The second ????? in l. 27 is supported by the ????? in l. 30.

1035a32-33. and the ball into bronze.

(1) and the bronze ball into bronze. (according to Pseudo-Alexander and and Bonitz. Asclepius omits this example.)

(2) Asclepius (413. 23-25): ??? ??? ????? ????????? ? ??????? ??????? ??? ????? ??? ??? ???????? ?????, ??? ? ??????? ??? ????? ??? ?????, ??? ? ?????? ?????? ??? ?? ???????.

Pseudo-Alexander (506. 12-15): ??? ??? ?? ????? ??? ???????? ????? ???? ?????????? ????? ?? ??????? ??? ????, ? ??? ??????? ??????? ??? ????? ??? ? ????? ?????? ??? ?????? ??? ? ??????? ??? ????? ??? ???? ??? ? ?????? ??? ?? ???????.

Bonitz (1842, p. 92): "Ante ?????? omissum esse ????? ex sententiae ratione adeo manifestum est, ut adjicere hoc vocabulum non dubitemus; neque enim ipse globus per se ita interire potest, ut in aes recidat, sed globus aëneus. Comprobatur haec conjectura et verbis simillimis, quae locum nostrum antecedunt, ??? ??? ??? ??????????? ?? ????? ??? ? ??? ?????, ???? ?? ????? ? ? ??????? ?????? p. 1035a26, et interpretatione Asclepii ?? ??? ????? ? ? ??????? ??? ????? ??????????, ?? ?? ??? ??????????? ??? ????? ????? ? ??? ???????."

Ross (ii 198): "Bonitz's addition of ????? between ? and ?????? is not necessary. The bronze circle has been mentioned already (1033a30 ff.), so that ????? can easily be supplied in thought."

1035b7. but the formula of the acute includes that of the right angle. (reading ???' <?> instead of ????, cf. Pseudo-Alexander)

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (507. 4-5): ???? ?????? ? ????? ??? ?????? ?????????? ??? ??? ?????.

1035b16-18. at least we shall define each part, if we define it well, not without reference to its function. (Ab)

(2) Jaeger (reading ??????? with Ab) deletes ?? ?????.

Frede/Patzig (II 186) follow the reading of EJ: ???????. "For (i) ??????? would be redundant, (ii) the construction ??????? ?? ????? (instead of ??????? ?????) would be unusual, and (iii) in point of fact, the topic is that the definition of a part of a thing must refer to this very thing."

(3) The article after ???????, called 'unusual' by Frede/Patzig and Jaeger ('insolitum'), is, on the contrary, frequent in Plato and Xenophon, v. Plato, Euthydemus, 307 B 1; Symposium, 191 A; Republic, 480 A, 484 D, 487 B and C; Parmenides, 191 A 4; Laws, 903 B; Xenophon, Anabasis, i 8, 9, 6; Cyropaedia, vi 1, 54, 4; vii 5, 13-14 (??????? ?? ?????).

1035b24. for it is not a finger in any and every state that is the finger of a living thing. (supplying in thought ???????? <????????>)

(2) According to Jaeger (BBA 264), the text is a haplological abbreviation for ?? ??? ? ?????? ???? ???????? <????????> ???? (cf. 1036b30-31).

1035b31-33. 'A part' may be a part either of the form (i.e. of the essence), or of the compound of the form and the matter, or of the matter itself. (according to Bonitz)

(2) Bonitz (1842, pp. 92-93): "His verbis [1035b31-33], sicuti etiam in Bekkeri editione exhibentur, duo tantum distinguuntur, forma materiae expers et forma cum materia conjuncta; ita vere nulla prorsus causa est, cur ????? adjiciatur ad ????, quod quidem pronomen tum demum suum habebit sensum, si non solum materia cum forma conjuncta, sed etiam ipsa per se expers formae materia commemoretur. Jam si comparamus interpretationem Asclepii [415. 35 - 416, 2], non duo tantum sed tria distingui videmus: '????? ??? ??? ???? ??? ??? ??????' ????? ??? ???? ????? ??? ??? ?????? ??? ?????? ??? ???? ?? ?? ?? ?????? ??? ??? ????? ?? ??????? ??????????, ???? ?? ???? ??? ??? ?????? ??? ???????? ??? ??? ???? ???.; distinguuntur enim ?? ????? ?? ?????, ?? ????? ?? ????????, ? ???. His ductus indiciis, quae et in textu Aristotelis et in scholiis reperire mihi videor, scribendum esse suspicor ????? ??? ?? ???? ??? ??? ?????? (????? ?? ???? ?? ?? ?? ?????) ??? ??? ??????? ??? ?? ??? ?????? ??? ??? ????, ??? ??? ???? ?????."

1036a15-16. or the things into which they are divided and of which they consist, i.e. the parts.

(1) "i.e. the parts" seems to be a gloss. (Jaeger)

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (510. 10-13): ??? ?? ???? ??? ???? ??? ?????? ???????? ??? ????? ??? ???? ??? ?????? ??????? ?? ???? ??? ? ???? ????? ??? ? ?????? ??????? ? ??? ? ???????????, ????????? ? ?? ????? ????? (??? ??? ?? ????? ????? ?? ???? ??? ? ?????? ??? ? ???? ????? ??????????).

Jaeger: "?? ???? glossema esse videtur."

1036a17-18. and 'being a circle' is the circle, and 'being a right angle' and the essence of the right angle is the right angle.

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (510. 27-28): ??????? ??? ?? ????? ? ?????? ?? ????? ????? ??? ? ???? ?? ???? ?????.

Jaeger: "<?> addidi, legisse videtur Alexander."

Frede/Patzig (II 197) defend the text comparing 1036a24, "where ? ???? clearly is subject term".

1036a19-23. then the whole in one sense must be called posterior to the part in one sense, i.e. to the parts included in the formula and to the parts of the individual right angle (for both the material right angle which is made of bronze, and that which is formed by individual lines, are posterior to their parts); while the immaterial right angle is posterior to the parts included in the formula, but prior to those included in the particular instance, and the question must not be answered simply.

(1) My proposal: then it must be said, 'posterior in certain respect and of something' (e. g. to the parts included in the formula and to the parts of the individual right angle; for both the material right angle which is made of bronze, and that which is formed by individual lines, are posterior to their parts; while the immaterial right angle is posterior to the parts included in the formula, but prior to those included in the particular instance), but not simply 'posterior'.

(2) Asclepius (416. 30-32): ??? ??? ??? ???? ??? ????? ?????, ???? ??? ??????, ?????????????? ? ????? ????, ???? ??????? ??????? ??? ?? ???? ???????? ???? ???’ ?????? ? ????? ??????.

Pseudo-Alexander (510. 28-35): ?? ??? ??? ????? ?????? ???????, ???? ??? ?? ?? ????, ???????? ?? ??? ????? ??? ????? ???? ??? ?????? ???????, ?? ?? ??? ??????? ???? ???????? ??? ????. ?? ??? ???, ????, ??? ?? ?? ????. ????? ?? ??????? ?? ?? ????? ?????, ???? ????????? ?? ?? ???? ??? ??????. ?????? ??? ??? ?? ?? ???? ?? ?????? ??????? ??? ????. ??? ??? ???? ?? ??? ?????· ?? ??? ??? ??? ???? ?? ?????, ???? ??? ????? ??? ????????, ???? ??? ????? ????? ??? ???? ??? ????.

Thomas Aquinas (Sententia Metaphysicae, liber 7 lectio 10 numerus 18): "[…] dicendum est determinando quid sit posterius, et quo sit posterius; quia secundum hoc partes materiae sunt posteriores his, quae sunt in ratione, et sunt etiam posteriores aliquo recto, scilicet recto communi, sed sunt priores recto singulari. Hic enim rectus qui est aereus, est cum materia sensibili. Et hic rectus qui est cum lineis singularibus, est cum materia intelligibili. Sed ille rectus qui est sine materia, idest communis, erit posterior partibus formae quae sunt in ratione, sed erit prior partibus materiae quae sunt partes singularium. Nec erit secundum hanc opinionem distinguere inter materiam communem et individualem. Sed tamen simpliciter non erit respondendum, quia erit distinguendum inter partes materiae et partes formae."

Argyropulus: "aliqua pars atque aliquo toto posterius est dicenda ut illa quae est ipsius singularis atque aliquo recto."

Bessarion: "substantia quoque recti aliquid quidem et aliquo posterius dicendum est utputa iis quae in ratione et aliquo recto."

Bonitz (1849, p. 338): "Per verba ?? ??? res singulas et concretas significari, ut ex ipso huius pronominis usu Aristotelico consentaneum est (cf. ad ? 2. 1003b33), ita comprobatur verbis oppositis: ? ?' ???? ???? a22, ex quibus intelligitur ?? ??? esse ??? ???? ???? vel ?? ???????. Hoc ??????? posterius est ?????, certo quodam, ???? (nempe, cf. ad A 4. 985b6) ??? ?? ?? ???? ??? ????? ?????, i. e. ??? ?? ?? ???? ?????? ??? ??? ????? ????? ??????, utrisque partibus et notionis et sensibilibus posterior est res concreta. Genitivum ????? ????? non pendere ab ???????, sed ab articulo ???, h. e. ??? ??????, intelligitur collato a22-23."

Ross (ii 100): "Aristotle's answer to the question of priority is as follows:

(1) Some wholes are posterior to some parts; viz., the particular or materiate right angle (whether its matter be sensible or intelligible) is posterior (a) to the elements in the definition, and (b) to the parts of a particular right angle (whether sensible or intelligible).

But (2) the immateriate right angle, while (a) posterior to the parts of the definition, is (b) prior to the parts of the particular right angle.

According to this interpretation ??? ?? ?? ???? answers to ????? in l. 19, and ??? ??? … ???? ???' ?????? answers to ??. I take ??? ????? ????? as = ??? ??? ????? ?????. But this is very doubtful Greek, and ??? should perhaps be inserted."

According to Frede/Patzig (II 197, contra Ross) "it is much more probable that the ???? clause explains either only the ????? or both the ?? and the ????? of l. 19 [in this latter case, the text must be corrected, e. g. ??? ?? ?? ???? ?? ??? ????? ?????, ??? ?? ?? ???? ????? or ??? ?? ?? ???? ?? ????? ?????, v. Frede/Patzig, p. 198], and that the following ???-clause explains ????? ?????."

(3) The ??? in l. 19 finds its correspondence not until l. 23: ?? ??? ??? ????? ?????? ???????, ????? ?' ?? ??????. All we have to do is to transpose the closing brackets. For ?? … ??? ?????, cf. ????? ?? 1057b35, 1058a12. Both times, ?? is accusativus limitationis vel respectus.

1036b2. for none the less the bronze would be no part of the form.

(2) Jaeger adds ????? after ?????.

Frede/Patzig (II 203) defend the text, referring to 1036a33, where "Aristotle uses the construction ????? ??? X ????? in the sense of 'to be no part of X'".

(3) A further evidence is Physics, 209b29-30: ?? ?’ ??????? ????? ??? ????????? ?????.

1036b2-3. but it is hard to eliminate it in thought.

(2) Frede/Patzig (II 203) prefer ????? (the reading of EJ), referring it "to every kind of matter to which applies that a form occurs only in it". They argue that the continuation ???? ?? ??? ???????? ????? … is in favor of this interpretion.

1036b11-12. and bronze or stone to the statue. (Ab)

(1) and bronze or stone to the circle. (EJ)

(2) Jaeger comments that ?????? is "varia lectio fortasse melior, cf. a32".

Frede/Patzig (II 207) prefer ?????? (the reading of EJ): "In 1036a32-33 already brass and stone were mentioned as materials of the circle, and it is more probable that Ab and Alp substituted the standard example of the statue, than that EJ changed ?????????? into ?????? because of the connection with a32-33."

1036b33-34. why are the formulae of the parts not parts of the formulae of the wholes; e.g. why are not the semicircles included in the formula of the circle?

(1) Literally: why are the formulae not parts of the formulae; e.g. the semicircles of the circle?

(2) Frede/Patzig (II 214) approve of Ross' translation, pointing to the fact that, strictly speaking, it presupposes the wording ???? ??? ????? ?? ????? ??? ?????.

(3) To me, the literal translation is the best one. The sense is: 'Why should not the case happen that the definitions are parts of the definitions? For example, that the semicircles are parts of the circle in this sense?'

1037a1-2. indeed there is some matter in everything which is not an essence and a bare form but a 'this'. (Ab)

(1) and of everything which is not an essence. (EJ)

(2) Frede/Patzig (II 215) reject the text of Ab: "In point of language, the first ??? in 1037a1 is offensive. In point of fact, ???? ???? ?? is dubious, since Aristotle repeatedly (e. g. ? 8,1017b25, Z 3, 1029a29) calls the form ???? ??."

1037a7-8. if even the soul of Socrates may be called Socrates. (Ab)

(1) if the soul is meant. (EJ)

(2) Frede/Patzig (II 215-216): "What is disturbing about the reading of Ab is that Coriscus, scarcely mentioned, is forgotten again in a8; about the reading of EJ that, without ??? in ?? ??? ??? ? ????, the assertion that the term 'Socrates' is to be taken in a double sense, would become false. Therefore, we read ?? ??? ??? ? ????, shelving our general dislike for eclecticism in text setting."

1037a9. but if 'Socrates' or 'Coriscus' means simply this particular soul and this particular body.

(1) but if 'Socrates' or 'Coriscus' has only one meaning, this particular soul and this particular body is meant. (according to Christ)

(2) Christ: "post ????? distinxi."

Ross (ii 204): "Christ is perhaps right in reading a comma after ?????."

1037a9-10. the individual is analogous to the universal in its composition. (according to Pseudo-Alexander and Bonitz)

(1) the individual corresponding to the universal. (Ross ii 204, according to Christ's punctuation in l. 9)

Pseudo-Alexander (516. 3-5): ?? ???? ? ??????? ?????????? ???? ???? ?? ??????? ?????????? ????, ???? ??? ? ???’ ?????? ???? ?? ???’ ???????.

Bonitz (1849, p. 341): "Particulam ??, quam post ??????? et editi libri et scripti ut videntur omnes habent, ex Alexandri auctoritate omisi, flagitante, nisi fallor, ipsa sententiae ratione."

1037a16-17. for the physicist must come to know not only about matter, but also about the substance expressed in the formula.

(2) Argyropulus: "non enim de materia solum, sed de substantia etiam quae ad rationem accommodatur, ac magis, philosophum cognoscere naturalem oportet."

Christ: "fortasse ??? ??????."

Jaeger (1912, p. 72 n. contra Christ): "Because it is hard to supply a second ?????? (genitivus singularis) out of the preceding plural ??????, I prefer to insert ?????? [after ???? ??? ?????]."

In BBA 275 he adds: "In this case, the conceptual essence would have to be understood as immaterial." There he proposes to read <???? ??? ??????> ??? ???? ??? ?????.

Frede/Patzig (II 217), contrary to Jaeger (1912), assert that "it is easy to supply ?????? out of l. a15".

1037a30-32. for from this and the nose arise 'snub nose' and 'snubness'. (omitting ??? ??? ?? ??????? ??????? ? ???)

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (517. 16-20): ????? ?? ??????? ??? ??? ??????? ?????? ??????? ??? ???? ??? ??? ????? ??????? [l. 23-24] ??? ?????? ????? ????????? ?????? ??? ??? ?????? ??? ???? ??? ???? ??? ???????? ???????, ????? ??? ??? ?? ??????? ??????? ? ???, ????????? ??????? ???? ??? ???? ??? ???????? ??? ?? ???? ?????? ???????, ????????? ??? ?? ???? ??????.

Ross (ii 205): "These words appear quite irrelevant in this context, and seem to be due to a copyist who had 1030b32 in mind."

(3) As Pseudo-Alexander rightly observed, ?????? refers to ll. 23-24 ??? ?' ??.

1037b2-3. e.g. curvature and the essence of curvature if this is primary.

(1) Omitted by Asclepius and Pseudo-Alexander, secluded by Jaeger.

(2) Asclepius (422. 25-28): ??? ??? ?? ????? ??? ?? ?????? ??? ??? ????? ?? ???? ????? ??? ????? ????? ??? ??? ?????? ?????? ??? ?????? ?????? ??? ???? ???? ??? ???? ?????. ????? ?? ?????? ?????? ??? ????? ??? ?? ???????? ??????????? ???? ?? ?????.

Pseudo-Alexander (517. 22-26): ?? ????? ?? ???? ?????? ???????, ???’ ??? ??? ??????? ??? ?? ?? ?? ????? ???? ??? ????? ?????? ?????, ????? ??? ??? ?????? ??????, ????????? ??? ???? ????? ? ????? ?????, ?????? ???? ?? ?????? ? ?? ??????? ?? ???? ?? ???? ????? ?????????? ?? ???.

Jaeger: "est glossa lectoris Categoriarum memoris (3b11sq.), ubi non ?? ????? sed ?? ??????? prima ????? vocatur."

1037b4-6. But things which are of the nature of matter, or of wholes that include matter, are not the same as their essences, nor are accidental unities like that of 'Socrates' and 'musical'.

(2) Asclepius (422. 28-32): ??? ?? ?? ?? ??? ??????????, ????? ?? ?? ?????????? ???????? ?? ????? ??? ? ???· ?? ?? ?? ????? ???????? ???? ??? ?? ???? ??????????, ????? ? ???????? ??? ? ???????? ???????? ???? ?????????? ????? ??, ?????? ?????? ??? ??????? ???????? ?????.

Pseudo-Alexander (517. 31-35): ??? ?? ?? ??? ? ?? ???????????? ?? ???, ?? ?????. ?? ?? ??? ?? ? ?? ?? ???????????? ?? ??? ?? ???????? ???? ?? ????????· ?? ??? ??? ????????? ? ???????? ?? ???????. ??? ??? ????? ? ???????? ??? ?? ???????? ???’ ???? ??? ??? ???? ??????, ???? ?????????? ??.

Bonitz (1842, p. 97): "[…] si quis sententiarum seriem attente persecutus eos locos in memoriam revocaverit, quorum uberiores quaestiones Aristoteles jam breviter complectitur, non hoc exspectabit dici: in iis rebus, quae conjunctam habeant cum forma materiam, non esse unum et idem notionem rei et ipsam rem, neque per accidens idem, sed potius: neque in iis rebus, quae conjunctam habeant cum forma materiam, neque in iis, quae per accidens aliquid secum conjunctum habeant, unum idemque esse notionem rei et ipsam rem. Hoc enim in superioribus Aristoteles exposuit. Cf. ?, 6. p. 1031a19-28, praecipue 24. […] Inde in eo loco, de quo disputamus, pro ???? ???? ?????????? scribendum arbitror ???' ??? ???? ??????????."

Winckelmann (p. 288) conjectures ???? <??> ???? ?????????? ??.

Christ: "facilius emendes ???' ???."

Ross (ii 205): "The simplest emendation of ???? is ???' ??."

1038a9-10. But it is also necessary that the division be by the differentia of the differentia. (according to Joachim)

(1) But it is also necessary to divide the differentia of the diferentia. (according to the manuscripts)

(2) Ross (ii 207): "?? … ???????, Prof. Joachim's emendation of ??? … ????????, seems to be required by the sense."

Frede/Patzig (II 238) reject Joachim's conjecture, referring to 1038a25: ??? ??? ?? ???????? ??????? ???????? and De partibus animalium A 3, 643b17: ??? ?? ?? ???????? ??????? ??? ????????.

1038a10-11. again the differentia of 'animal endowed with feet' must be of it qua endowed with feet. (Ab)

(1) again it is necessary to know the differentia of 'animal endowed with feet' qua endowed with feet. (EJ)

again it is necessary to take the differentia of 'animal endowed with feet' qua endowed with feet. (according to Frede/Patzig)

(2) Frede/Patzig (II 238) propose ??? ????????? ? ???????, based on the ??????? in De partibus animalium A 3, 643b17 (cf. the previous note).

1038b18-19. Then clearly it is a formula of the essence.

(1) Then clearly it will be a formula of the essence. (according to Jaeger)

(2) Jaeger reads ????? instead of ????.

(3) Jaeger's emendation is needed because the consequence is drawn from a questionable (Platonic) supposition.

1038b23. e.g. 'animal'.

(1) To be omitted according to Jaeger.

(2) Jaeger: "seclusi exemplum [???? ?? ????], quod structuram sententiae interrumpit." It is an "illustrative gloss" (Frede/Patzig II 256).

1038b27-28. for neither in formula nor in time nor in coming to be can the modifications be prior to the substance.

(2) Ross (ii 210-211): "Aristotle nowhere else distinguishes between ????? ???????? and ??????? ????????, nor is any possible distinction apparent. Prof. A. R. Lord has suggested ?????? for ???????, and this derives some support from 1028a32. But (1) the Greek commentaries as well as the manuscripts read ???????, and (2) ????? would not be likely to be put between ???? and ??????, which are at least very near another in sense (in ? 1049b17 they seem to be identified). It is better therefore to keep ??????? and to suppose that it is added as a synonym of ?????."

(3) Lord's emendation is a must, because in both passages, 1028a32-33 and 1038b27-28, the enumeration, being the reason for what precedes, is intended to be a complete one (1028a32 ??????). And the enumerations must be identical, because the demonstrandum is the same, being (or not being respectively) substance.

1039a3-4. A substance cannot consist of substances present in it in complete reality. (according to Pseudo-Alexander)

(1) A substance cannot consist of substances present in it in the sense of complete reality. (Ab and EJ)

(2) Asclepius (432. 8-9): ???????? ?????? ????? ?? ?????? ???????????? ????? ???????????? ????????.

Pseudo-Alexander (525. 38-40): ??? ??, ????, ??? ??? ????? ?? ???????? ????? ?????? ?? ?????? ????? ???????? ?????????? ??? ???? ??.

Jaeger writes ?????????? instead of ?? ?????????? (Ab) or ????? ?? ?????????? (EJ) respectively, referring to Pseudo-Alexander.

(3) For ????? ?? = 'in the sense of' see 1035a20-21 and 1084b31, further Posterior Analytics, 85b36 (????? ????? ?? ?? ?????), Physics, 199b32-33 (??? ??? ??? ????? ? ?????, ??? ????? ?? ????? ???, ???????), 206b14-15 (??? ??????? ????? ?? ? ???), 214a24-25 (?????? ?? ???????? ??????? ????? ?? ????? ????? ?? ?? ? ????????), On the Soul, 412a16 (????? ?’ ????? ?? ???????). ??, the reading of Ab, is equivalent to ????? ??. There is no need for correcting.

1039a34-b1. how will the one in things that exist apart be one. (Ab)

(1) how will what is in things that exist apart be one. (according to Jaeger)

how will it ['animal', v. l. 33] in things that exist apart be one. (EJ)

(2) Jaeger: "?? ?? scripsi (scil. ????)."

(3) To me, ?? ?? looks like an awkward addition by someone who missed the subject, which is to be supplied from l. 33.

1040a5-6. And so when one of the definition-mongers defines any individual.

(1) My proposal: And so when one of those who are attacking a definition defines any individual.

(2) Bonitz (1849, p. 353): "??? ???? ???? genitivum neutri esse arbitror, non masculini, ut voluit Alexander [531. 2]: ??? ???? ???? ????? ???????????????."

Ross (ii 215): "Parallels to such a use of ?? ???? ???? may be found in Top. 102b27, 120b13 (???? ?? ????? ???????? ??? ???? ???? ?????), but the genitive is very difficult."

Jaeger: "aliquid excidisse videtur."

(3) That "the genitive is very difficult" (Ross) means in effect that ??? ???? ???? cannot be constructed, but must be supposed to be a gloss, which, however, would be out of place here. On the other hand, it is quite natural to connect the genitive with ???, as Pseudo-Alexander did; but firstly, his ??????????????? ('busy in relation to definition') is not specific enough, and secondly, it is not sufficient to supply some participle only in thought (v. Jaeger). What we need is a characterization which explains the tendency to define individuals, by a verb which is used by Aristotle in combination with ???? ????. Both conditions are met by ?????????????, cf. Topics, 155a7 (??? ???? ??? ???? ????????? ??? ??? ??? ????? ??????????). He who is 'attacking a definition' (which is normally universal) may be tempted to define a singular instance of the defined concept, to show that the two definitions are not identical, v. Topics, 102a11-14: ????????? ??? ??? ?????? ??? ??? ?????? ???????????, ?? ???? ????? ??? ???? ???? ???????? ?????????? ???????????? ????????? ??? ??? ?? ?????? ????? ?????????? ??????? ??? ???????. ("For if we are able to argue that two things are the same or are different, we shall be well supplied by the same turn of argument with lines of attack upon their definitions as well: for when we have shown that they are not the same we shall have demolished the definition.").

1040a16-17. that they [all the attributes] belong also to both the elements; e.g. 'two-footed animal' belongs to animal and to the two-footed. (EJ)

(1) My proposal: that the compound of genus and differentia is posterior to both, e.g. 'two-footed animal' to 'animal' and to 'two-footed'.

(2) Asclepius (442. 31 - 443. 1): ?????? ??? ???? ?????? ??? ?????? ??? ??????? ???????? ? ???????, ?? ??? ??? ?? ??????, ???? ?? ???? ??? ??? ?????? ????? ??? ?? <?????? ???> ??? ???? ?????, ??? ????? ??????? ?? ???? \*\*\* [perhaps <?????? ???? ?????? ??>] ???? ????, ???? ????? ??????.

Pseudo-Alexander (531. 35 - 532. 5): ?? ?? ???, ????, ????? ??? ?? ???? ??? ?? ?????? ??? ?? ?????? ????? ??? ??????? ???????, ??? ?? ?????? ?? ?? ???? ?? ?????????, ?????? ??? ?? ???? ??? ?? ????? ????? ??? ??? ??????, ??? ?? ?? ??????????? ????, ????? ??? ?? ???? ??? ?? ????? ??? ?? ?????? ????? ??? ??????? ??????? ???????, ??? ?? ???? ?? ???????· ?? ?? ????? ??? ?????, ?????? ???, ????, ??????? ??? ??? ??????, ???? ?? ???? ?????? ??????? ?? ??? ??? ????? ?? ???? ?????? ?? ??????, ???? ????? ??? ??? ??????? ?? ???? ?????? ???? ?????.

Thomas Aquinas (Sententia Metaphysicae, liber 7 lectio 15 numerus 14): "quod definitio assignata alicui ideae etiam aliis inerit; sicut si definitio ideae hominis sit animal bipes, haec duo inerunt animali et bipedi, idest ideae animalis et ideae bipedis; quia etiam illae duae ideae simul conjunctae erunt animal bipes."

Fonseca: "Nam si quis Platonis dicta perpendat, animal et bipes simul juncta non solum dicuntur de homine illo separato, sed etiam de animali per se, et de bipede per se, tamquam de rebus diversis et numero differentibus, ut mox probabit."

Bonitz (1849, p. 354): "Ambiguitas verbi ???????? videtur fraudem fecisse. Nimirum notum est ???????? ???? eodem fere sensu dici ac ????????????? ???? ?????, et eo quidem sensu usurpatum est, quum dicitur: ?? ???? ?????? ??????? ???? ?????, ???? ?? ???????, i. e. animal bipes non de alio praedicatur, nisi de homine. Eam si tenemus vim verbi, genus ??????? speciebus, non species generi (cf. Cat. 5. 2b20), igitur ???? et ?????? dicenda sunt ???????? ?? ?????? ???, nec potest dici ?? ???? ?????? ???????? ?? ??? ??? ?? ??????. Quod quum nihilo minus contendat Aristoteles, commutatam esse apparet vim vocis ????????, ut non significet esse in complexu (Inhalt) alicuius notionis, sed contineri in eius ambitu (Umfang) […]."

Ross (ii 215): "???????? has, in fact, its ordinary sense. Aristotle means that 'two-footed animal' is predicable (1) of 'animal' (not universally, but in certain cases), and (2) of 'the two-footed' (universally, since two-footedness belongs only to animals, as a differentia should belong only to its genus, Top. 143a30)."

(3) ??? ??? ?????? (the reading of EJ, translated by Ross) is suspicious. Grammar leaves us no choice but to supply ????? as subject and ??????? as predicate, but what is the point of ??? ????? ??? ?????? ???????? It is too much to ask that we shall know that 'all the predicates' are only two, and that we shall understand 'both' as 'each of them apart'. In this situation, Asclepius, Pseudo-Alexander and Fonseca resort to substituting ????? by ???? ?????? or ?? ???? ??? ?? ?????? respectively, Thomas Aquinas by substituting ?????? by "aliis".

Another big problem is what ??????? shall mean as predicate of ?? ???? ??????. Asclepius, Pseudo-Alexander, Fonseca ("dicuntur") and Ross take it in its "ordinary sense", but for Asclepius, ?? ???? ?????? ??????? ?? ??? ??? ?? ?????? is only an absurd consequence of the proposition laid down in ll. 14-15. Thomas Aquinas and Bonitz, on the other side, postulate an unusual meaning ("inesse", "contineri").

In view of these not very appealing alternatives, it suggests itself to take a look on the reading of Ab ?? ??????, sidelined by the editors. Showing a manifest gap between ?? and ??????, it seems to represent the primordial state of the suspected corruption. On the basis of l. 18 ??????? ?' ???? … ????????, we can heal the text as follows: ??? ?? <???????? ?? ?????? ??? ???????? ???????> ??????, ???? ?? ???? ?????? ??? ???? ??? ??? ???????. After ?????? was understood as dative, depending on ???????, the two other genitives were changed to datives.

1040a17-18. And in the case of eternal entities this is even necessary, since the elements are prior to and parts of the compound.

(1) [And this happens in the case of eternal entities.] And it is necessary, that these ('animal' and 'two-footed') are substances, since they are prior to and parts of the compound ('two-footed animal').

The bracketed sentence belongs to ll. 25-26.

(2) Fonseca: "Ait autem «Et hoc quidem in sempiternis», quia exemplum adductum [ll. 16-17] non habet locum in singularibus caducis. Animal enim et bipes, quae sunt in Socrate, non diversae res, sed una atque eadem sunt, utpote ipse Socrates."

Jaeger: "??????? ?' ???? … ???????? cum antecedentibus jungi non possunt; exciderunt nonnulla ante ??????? ?' ???? quibus hoc participium subjungebatur."

(3) Firstly, we have to recognize that ??? ?????? ????? cannot be the predicate of ?????; Ross is forced to skip the second ???. What we have to expect is shown by the other two instances of ??? ????? ??? ??? in Aristotle, Eudemian Ethics, 1246a20 (??? ????? ??? ??? ???????? ?????????) and Politics, 1304b24 (??? ????? ??? ?????? ?? ??? ???? ?????????? ????). Most common in conjunction with ??? is ?????????, which was already guessed by Thomas Aquinas (Sententia Metaphysicae, liber 7 lectio 12 numerus 21) for our passage ("accidit").

Secondly, we must acknowledge that ????? (in its present position) has nothing to relate to. It refers rather to ll. 25-26 ????? … ? ????. That ????????? goes well with ????? is shown e. g. by 1038b30 and 1092a5-6.

Now we have to reconstruct what has dropped out before ??????? ?' ???? … ???????? (v. Jaeger). It must be a first statement about 'animal' and 'two-footed', the second being ???? ??? ??? ???????; and ??????? ?' ???? … ???????? must be the reason of it. Remembering the argument that 'what is prior to substance must be substance itself' (1073a36, cf. 1038b26, 1087a1, Physics, 189a34), we can supply with great probability ??? ?????? ????? <?????? ????? [???? and ??????, v. ll. 16-17]>.

1040a20-21. Secondly, we must reply that 'animal' and 'two-footed' are prior in being to 'two-footed animal'

(2) Bonitz (1849, p. 355): "non videtur per particulam ???? nova afferri ratio, siquidem eandem jam habemus a18."

Ross (ii 216): "Bonitz's objection is removed if we treat ??? ????? … ??????? (17-21) as parenthetical, and ??? ??? &c. as answering to ?????? ???, l. 15."

(3) Priority in being is too good an argument for separability as to be taken for anything else. For why it is important to stress the fact that genus and differentia on the one side and the compound on the other side 'do not destroy each other' (??? ?????????????)? It is because being separable means to can exist without certain other things, whereas these other things cannot exist without what is separable of them, and because this is exactly the relation of ??? ?????????????. In 1028a32-34, separability reversely serves as argument for priority.

The ???? makes no difficulty if we accept the interpretion proposed above of ll. 17-18, that ??????? ?' ???? is an argument for substantiality. The same argument is new as proving separability.

1040a21-22. and things which are prior to others are not destroyed when the others are.

(2) Bonitz (1849, p. 355): "Quo sensu hic [Topics vi 4, 141b28] et alibi, veluti Cat. 7b37, 8a4, verbum ??????????? usurpatum est, eundem fere hoc loco habet ???????????."

Jaeger writes ?????????????, wrongly referring to Bonitz.

(3) Considering the fact that ??????????? occurs elsewhere in Aristotle only Topics viii 3, 158b33-34, it is improbable that an original ????????????? was corrected to ????????????? in all manuscripts (cf. Frede/Patzig, II 293).

1040a23-24. it will be further necessary that the elements also of which the Idea consists, e.g. 'animal' and 'two-footed', should be predicated of many subjects.

(1) According to Jaeger, "further" should be omitted.

(2) Jaeger: "cum Christ seclusi ??? quod ex varia lectione ad 22 ?????? ortum puto."

1040a28-29. the impossibility of defining individuals escapes notice in the case of eternal things, especially those which are unique.

(1) More exact would be: "… especially in the case of those which are unique".

(2) Asclepius (443. 20-22): ?????? ??? ?? ??????? ????? ??? ?????? ???????, ???????? ????? ??? ??? ??? ?????? ???????? ?? ???????? ??? ??????? ??????? ??? ???? ??????? ???????.

Ross (ii 216): "?? ???? ??????? goes (as Asclepius sees) not with ???????? ????????? but with ????????."

(3) The interpretation Asclepius/Ross is confirmed by 1041a32-33. Consequently, ??? must be understood as dependent on ?? ???? ???????. "The impossibility of defining individuals escapes notice … especially in the case of those eternal things which are unique", because sun and moon are the only representants of an own species (as we say 'sun, moon and stars', cf. 982b15-16), so that defining them seems to be defining a species (like 'stars').

1040a31-32. for from their view it follows that if it stands still or is visible, it will no longer be the sun.

(2) Bonitz (1842, p. 98): "Recte opponuntur ??? et ???? ??? ???, non item ???? et ???????????, sed ut sol negetur noctu abscondi, dicendus est perpetuo apparere. Jam quum Asclepius [445. 17-19] in interpretatione hujus loci haec habeat ??? ??? ???' ???????? ??? ? ????? ????? ??? ????? - - ?? ?? ????????? ????? ????? ??? ?????? ????? ??? ????????, vere Brandisius in adnotatione critica editionis conjecisse videtur scribendum ?? ??? ??? ? ??? ????."

Ross (ii 217): "??? may well be understood without being actually inserted."

1040b10-12. One might most readily suppose the parts of living things and the parts of the soul nearly related to them to turn out to be both, i.e. existent in complete reality as well as in potency.

(1) One might be specially tempted to suppose that the parts of the animals come-to-be more or less on the same level of being as the parts of the soul, thus possessing, both taken together, a being which is actual as well as a being which is potential. (alternative translation by Ross, ii 219)

My proposal: One might most readily suppose the parts of living things and the parts of the soul to come-to-be close together, existent in complete reality as well as in potency.

(2) Asclepius (446. 6-7): ????? <?’ ???> ??????? <??> ??? ??????? ????? ??? ?? ??? ????? ?????? ??? ????? ??????, ???? ?? ?? ???????? ??? ???????.

Pseudo-Alexander (535. 27-29): ??????? ??, ?????, ???????? ?? ??? ?? ??? ??????? ?????, ??? ?????? ?? ?????? ???? ?????, ?????? ?? ??? ??? ?????, ???????? ??? ??? ???????? ???? ??? ???? ???? ?????? ???? ?????? ??? ???????.

Schwegler (ii 127): "In certain parts, however, it seems as if they would be almost both, actual and potential."

Bonitz (1849, p. 357): "post ????????? comma omisi, quia enuntiatum sic puto construendum esse: ????????? ???????? ???? ???? ??? ?????????? ??? ???????, quasi dicat: ????????? ?????? ???? ????????? ??? ?????????? ??? ???????."

Christ (1853, p. 48): "Cum antea in universum de animalium partibus (????? ??? ???? 1040b6) quaesitum, novam autem rem afferri particula ??????? ?? indicatum esset, Schweglerus verissime ?? ??? ??????? ferri non posse perspexit, quoniam notio ??????? notionem ???? aequat. Sed infelicem et temerariam ejus conjecturam ??????? verba sequentia aspernantur ??? ???? ??? …. Nam ex his verbis apertum fit, certum animalium genus nondum nominatum esse. Itaque quaenam illa animalia sint, non aperte pronuntiatum sed paullo obscurius adumbratum esse debet. Jam quominus cum Bonitzio ac Schweglero ?? ??? ????? a verbis praecedentibus ?? ??? ??????? ????? dissolvamus, prohibent sequentia verba, unam rem illustrantia: ?? ????? - ???????. Quodsi haec ad solas partes animalium referre volueris, inverso certe ordine dicendum fuit: ?? ??? ????? ??? ?? ??? ??????? ?????. His de causis, dum quis meliorem et feliciorem emendationem afferat, legerim: ??????? ?' ?? ??? ?? ??? ??????? ???????? ????? ??? ?? ??? ????? ???????? ????, ???? ????????? ??? ?????????? ??? ???????, hoc sensu: maxime autem et actu et potentia fieri dicuntur eae partes animalium, quae juxta animae partes positae sive ab animae partibus non divulsae sint."

Frede/Patzig (II 300) object to Ross's translation that the parts of the soul cannot but exist in complete reality. They propose to take ??? ?? ??? ????? ???????? as an epexegetic addition to ?? ?????: "the parts of the animals, namely those which are nearly related to the soul". "The last offense would be removed if we would delete the ??? in b11" (II 301).

(3) Frede/Patzig's proposal must be rejected for the very simple reason that our passage would be the only one in the whole Greek literature with ???????? postponed to the genitive governed by it. That the other interpreters too do not arrive to a clear decision must be due to a mistake at the beginning: they all refer ???? to l. 12 ???? ??? ?????????? ??? ???????. If we refer it to 'the parts of living things and the parts of the soul' (ll. 10-11), ???????? ????????? remains as predicate, what gives the required sense: both parts 'come-to-be close together', so that, e. g., a certain part of the soul is placed 'in the joints' (l. 13).

1040b32-33. They make them, then, the same in kind as the perishable things (for this kind of substance we know) - 'man-himself' and 'horse-itself'. (EJ)

(2) Frede/Patzig (II 305): "The assumption is near that, in the text tradition followed by Ab, ????? was misread to ?? ???, and all other variations come from attempts to smooth the disturbed text."

1041a13-14. is either to inquire - as we have said - why the man is musical, or it is something else.

(2) Asclepius (449. 24-25): ???? ?? ????????? ????? ?? ????? ??????, ??? ?? ? ???????? ???????? ????, ? ????.

Pseudo-Alexander (539. 11-12): ?? ??? ?????? ??? ??? ?? ? ???????? ???????? ???????? ???????? ?????, ? ?? ???? ?????? ????, ???????? ??? ?? ???? ?? ????? ?????, ? ????.

Schwegler (ii 130): "If I ask ??? ?? ? ???????? ???????? is ???????? ????????, I ask either ?? ????????? = ?? ???? (i. e. I ask ??? ?? ???? ????? ????) or I ask ????, namely ???? ???' ?????. But ??? ?? ? ???????? ???????? ?????, which is added as apposition to ?? ????????? ??????, does not express this idea."

Bonitz (1849, p. 359 n.): "At ?? ????????? ?????? ex verbis superioribus apparet idem esse ac ?????? ??? ?? ???? ????? ???? a14; qui autem quaerit ??? ?? ? ???????? ???????? ?????, is non quaerit ??? ?? ???? ????? ????, sed distincto potius subjecto quaestionis, ? ????????, a praedicato, ????????, quaerit: ?? ???? ????? ??? ?? ??????? a23. Istud autem alterum quaerendi genus quum his verbis nondum possit significari, scribendum arbitror: ???? ???? ?? ????????? ?????? ??? ?? ? ???????? ???????? ???????? ???????? ?????, ? ????. Alexandri interpretatio [539. 11] hanc conjecturam videtur confirmare."

Christ (1853, p. 49): "Quae difficultas his verbis insit sagaciter perspexit Bonitzius, et alteram partem ita emendavit, ???? ???? ?? ????????? ?????? ??? ?? ? ???????? ???????? ???????? ???????? ????? ? ????. Sed si ad conjecturas confugiendum est, equidem malo: ?? ??? ?????? ??? ?? ? ???????? ???????? ?????, ???? ???? ?? ????????? ?????? ??? ?? ? ???????? ???????? ???????? ???????? ????? (i. e. quaerere id ipsum, quod dictum erat [???????? ????????] nimirum, num homo musicus sit homo musicus) ? ???? (i. e. quaerere cur accidens illud ???????? homini inhaereat). Generalior enim sententia praeire debet, quae has duas partes involutas habeat; quam ob causam communem quaestionem non iisdem verbis in alterutro membro repetere licet."

Ross (ii 222): "The question 'Why is the musical man a musical man?’ is either (1) of the type just mentioned (l. 11), viz. 'Why is the man musical?' or (2) it is different from this."

Jaeger: "??? ?? ? ???????? ???????? ????? omittit Alexander in paraphrasi, secludenda videntur."

(3) The problem is what ?? ????????? refers to. The apposition ll. 13-14 ??? ?? ? ???????? ???????? ????? says that l. 11 ??? ?? ???? ???? ???? ??????? is meant, but the context requires that we refer it to ll. 13-14 ??? ?? ? ???????? ???????? ???????? ???????? ?????, because otherwise Aristotle in l. 14 (?? ??? ??? …) would start discussing the second alternative ? ????. I agree with Jaeger who proposes to delete the said apposition, which remains a superfluous gloss also if corrected.

1041b5. clearly the question is why the matter is some definite thing. (according to Christ)

(2) Bonitz (1842, pp. 99-100): "[…] verba ??? ???? ????? ??? ?? ????? aperte manca sunt; neque enim quaeritur, qua de causa hoc sit, i. e. hanc formam habeat; quaerendum enim utique esse docuit ??? ?? ???? ???? ???? ???????. Emendatio e proximis verbis peti potest; sicuti enim legimus ???? ????? ???? ??? ?? restituendum existimo ??? ???? ????? ???? ??? ?? ?????. Quam facile enim similitudo verborum ???? et ??? ?? librarios in errorem deducere potuerit, ex ipsis illis verbis ???? ????? ???? ??? ?? cognosci potest, in quibus Bekkerus primus sublata codicum confusione verum restituit. Alexander non dubito quin in textu id habuerit quod de conjectura dedi, quum scribat [541. 31] ??? ???? ?????, ??? ??? ??? ????? ????????? ??????? ???? ?????."

Christ: "??? ?? ?? scripsi."

1041b7-9. Therefore what we seek is the cause, i. e. the form, by reason of which the matter is some definite thing; and this is the substance of the thing.

(1) "i. e. the form" deleted by Christ and Jaeger.

(2) Christ: "????? ?' ???? ?? ????? varia lectio verborum ????? ?' ? ????? videtur, unde ea inclusimus."

1041b9-11. Evidently, then, in the case of simple terms no inquiry nor teaching is possible; our attitude towards such things is other than that of inquiry.

(1) Evidently, then, in the case of simple terms there is no inquiry nor teaching, but another method of inquiry than that described above. (according to Ross, ii 225)

My proposal: Evidently, then, in the case of simple terms there is no inquiry nor teaching, but some other way of exhibiting such things.

(2) Asclepius (451. 12-15): ???? ??? ???????? ??????? ???? ??????? ??? ??? ??? ????? ??? ???? ??????? ??? ??? ?? ???? ???????, ???? ?????? ?????? ??? ???????? ??? ????????, ? ??? ?? ???? ??? ??? ?? ?????.

Pseudo-Alexander (542. 6-9): ?????? ??? ?? ??? ?? ??????? ????? ????? ?? ???? ??????????, ????? ??? ??? ??? ????? ??? ????? ????? ??? ???? ???????, ???? ?? ??? ??, ???’ ?????? ?????? ????????. ??? ????, ???? ???? ??????? ????, ??? ? ?????? ??? ??? ????? ????????.

Christ: "fortasse ? ???? ???????."

Jaeger: "sed paulo neglegentius hoc dictum est."

(3) Ross's translation is a desperate attempt to avoid the illogical opposition 'no inquiry, but another method of inquiry' by taking ??? ???????? as genitivus comparationis; in his second attempt, he resigns himself with the illogicality, making ??? ???????? a genitivus comparationis, what is equally absurd. To me, it is evident that a distracted copyist substituted ???? (which he had in mind from the preceding clause) for ????, cf. 1025b15-16 (????? ?????? ??? ????????).

1041b11-12. Since that which is compounded out of something so that the whole is one, not like a heap but like a syllable. (according to Pseudo-Alexander)

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (542. 13-14): ????? ?? ??? ?????? ?? ?? ????? ???????? ????? ????? ???? ?? ????? ?? ???, ?? ?? ????? ???? ???? ???’ ?? ? ?? ???????.

According to Jaeger, the reading of Ab ?? ?? is to be explained by dittography (?????).

1041b29-30. in accordance with a nature of their own and by a process of nature. (J)

(1) 'in accordance with a nature of their own' is omitted by Ab, 'by a process of nature' by E.

(2) Asclepius (452. 10-11): ?????? ?? ???? ????? ??? ???????.

Pseudo-Alexander (543. 20): ???? ????? ??? ??? ??????.

Jaeger: "[???? ????? et ?????] varias lectiones esse indicavi."

Frede/Patzig (ii 322-323) argue against Jaeger that the expressions ????? and ???? ????? are not synonymous: "????? relates to the fact that things have emerged in a process which originates in nature; ???? ?????, in contrast, can relate to the fact that this process also has gone according to nature, and has led to a natural result." But the two concepts are coextensive, so that ???? ????? ??? ????? ('in accordance with nature and by a process of nature') is nevertheless pleonastic: if things are created 'in accordance with nature', it goes without saying that they are created 'by a process of nature', and vice versa.

Book VIII

1042a27-28 (and by matter I mean that which, not being a 'this' actually, is potentially a 'this').

(1) Probably a later addition (Jaeger).

(2) Jaeger: "verba ????? ?' ? ????? post 27 ? ??? praebet, sed post 28 ???? ?? iterat Ab et ut videtur Alexander in paraphrasi, post 27 ??? collocat E ??; aliquid simile cf. 1005a8 et 11. apparet verba in parenthesi posita [ll. 22-23 ???? ?? ???? … ???? ??] incertae sedis et nescio an additicia fuisse."

1042b12-13. the underlying body, the matter, is one and the same.

(1) 'the matter' is a trivial explanation, typical of a gloss.

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (548. 3-4): ????? ?? ??? ?????????? ??? ?? ??? ??????????? ??? ??? ???? ?? ?????.

Jaeger (on ??? ????): "an est explanatio e margine intrusa?"

1042b26-27. and its being means its lying in that position.

(1) and being threshold means its lying in that position. (Pseudo-Alexander, Jaeger)

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (548. 36-37): ????? ??? ????? ??? ?? ????? ???? ?? ????? ????? ??????? ????, ??? ?? ????????? ????? ?? ???? ???????????.

Bonitz (1849, p. 365): "Dativum ?????????, quem praeferendum esse ipsa sententia comprobat - describitur enim ipsa forma rei - non dubitavi e commentario Alexandri [548. 37] recipere pro vulgato accusativo. Similem in modum ex eiusdem Alexandri auctoritate ([548. 36-37] ????? ??? ????? ??? ?? ????? ???? ?? ????? ????? ??????? ????) fortasse etiam proxime antecedentia verba mutanda sunt, ut scribatur: ??? ?? ????? ???? ?? ????? ??????? […]."

Jaeger: "???? ex Alexandri paraphrasi supplevi, suasit Bonitz."

1042b36-1043a1. And for other things their being will mean their being mixed.

(3) I entirely fail to comprehend Jaeger's ?? ???????? (instead of ?? ????????). The right parallel is, of course, not 1042b29 (as given by Jaeger), where the ?? depends on ???????????, but ll. 27-28.

1043a3-4. we must seek in these differentiae what is the cause of the being of each of these things.

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (549. 17-219): ???? ????? ?? ????? ? ????? ??? ?? ????? ?????? ???? ??? ????? ??????? ????’ ???? ?????, ?? ??????? ???????? ?? ?? ?????? ??? ????? ???????.

Jaeger: "??? omittit Alexander in paraphrasi, seclusi; cf. 34."

1043a4-5. yet it is what is analogous to substance in each case.

(1) yet something analogous is found in each of them. (Bonitz, Jaeger)

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (549. 30-381): ???? ??, ?????, ?????? ????????? ?????? ???? ??? ??????.

Jaeger: "an ?? ?? scribendum? ????????? ?????? interpretatur Alexander in paraphrasi [549. 30]."

(3) There is no evidence for a nominal ?? ???????? in Aristotle; in Physics, 216a7 it is attribute (?? ???????? ????). On the other hand, the text is confirmed by On the Parts of Animals, 677a30-31: ?????? ?? ??? ???? ???????? ????? ?? ????????, ?? ?? ???? ???????? ? ?????? ???????? ?????. ?? ???????? could be translated, here too, by 'something analogous', so Bonitz's translation (which Jaeger refers to) does not require Jaeger's reading.

1043a16-17. but those who propose 'a receptacle to shelter chattels and living beings', or something of the sort. (reading ??????????? instead of ??????????)

(3) In 982a27, ?????????? (E) is, conversely, corrupted to ????????? (Ab).

1043a27-28. one kind of it as matter, another as form or actuality. (according to Pseudo-Alexander and Bonitz)

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (551. 5-8): […] ????? ??? ??????? ????? ?? ??? ????????? ??? ? ??????? ????? ??? ???, ??? ? ??? ????? ?? ??? ??? ???????, ? ?’ ?? ?? ????? ??? ? ????????, ? ?? ????? ?? ??????.

Bonitz (1842, p. 121): "Haec duo membra, ? ??? ??? ?? ??? et ? ?' ?? ????? ??? ????????, quum ita sibi inter se opponi appareant, ut alterum alteri respondeat, non possunt tamen grammatice ita construi, ut alterum cum altero apte concinat. In priore enim ?? ??? praedicati locum obtinet, ? ??? ??? ????? ????? ?? ???, in altero vero ?? ????? pro subjecto enuntiati habendum est ? ?' ?? ????? ????? ??????? ??? ???????? ?????. Quam quidem discrepantiam vix adducor ut ab ipso Aristotele ortam putem. Jam vero videmus in ea disputatione, quae locum nostrum proxime antecedit et subsequitur, conjungi fere per notiones formae et actus, et conjunctas opponi materiae, veluti a25. […] a30. […] a23. […] Inde admodum probabile est, scriptum fuisse ? ??? ??? ?? ???, ? ?' ?? ????? ??? ????????."

1043a33-34. and whether a line is 'twoness in length' or 'twoness'. (according to Bywater)

(2) Bywater (1913, p. 110): "The ??? here looks very like an intruder, a repetition of the ??? in the previous line (??? ????????)."

Bywater was preceded by Argyropulus: "et lineam, utrum dualitatem in longitudine an dualitatem."

1043b12. but is the substance.

(2) Christ: "???' ? ????? interpolata duco."

Jaeger: "minus apte, cum ???? post ? ???? … necessarium sit; seclusi ? ?????, quia non debebat Aristoteles hic antecapere, quod 14 dicturus erat, immo verbis ? … ???????? hic notionem ??? ?????? circumscribit, ut jam intellexit Alexander."

(3) ???? is not necessary, because ? ???? … cannot refer to the predicative complements ????????? and ?? ?????????, but only to ??. For two unconnected relative clauses in a row cf., e. g., 1069a31-32.

1043b12-13. but this people eliminate, and state only the matter.

(1) which people call (scil. 'essence') by eliminating the matter. (according to Bonitz 1843)

My proposal: but this they (scil. those against whom ll. 4-11 are directed) eliminate, and state only the matter.

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (553. 7-10): ? ??? ?????? ?????? ???????? ??????????? ?? ???? ??? ?????????? ??? ????. ?????? ?? ?? ? ??????????? ??? ???? ??????? ???? ??? ??? ????? ???????? ???????, ??? ???? ????? ?????????? ??? ???? ??? ???’ ???? ????? ???????? ?????? ???? ?????.

Bonitz (1849, p. 368): "Hanc diversam ab elementis formam si dempserimus et abstraxerimus, ipsa materia rei relinquitur." Hereby Bonitz retracts his translation, deviating from Pseudo-Alexander and referring ? to ???????????.

Ross (ii 232): "Aristotle is dealing in this chapter with the common tendency to describe a whole as a sum of parts or materials, omitting the principle of unity; cf. 1044a3, 6. Lines 10-14 form a much more consecutive piece of reasoning if ??????????? be taken to govern ?. Cf. (in a similar context) De Generatione et Corruptione 335b35 ????????? ??? ?? ?? ?? ????? ??? ??? ??????."

(3) Those who connect ??????????? with ??? ???? suppose that subject to 13 ???????? and 14 ??????? are the Platonists (Pseudo-Alexander) or 'people' respectively (Bonitz: "man bezeichnet", "kann man nennen"). Aristotle, however, is dealing neither with Platonism nor with ordinary language, but with those who define, e. g., 'house' by 'bricks + juxtaposition' (l. 6). Therefore the Bonitz of 1849 and Ross are right in connecting ??????????? with ?. In his translation of 1928, however, Ross retains, inconsequently, 'people' as subject.

1043b13-14. If, then, this is the cause of the thing's being, and if the cause of its being is its substance, they will not be stating the substance itself. (EJ)

(1) If, then, this is the cause of the thing's being, and if the cause of its being is its substance, they will be stating the substance itself. (Ab)

If, then, this is the cause of being and essence, people may call it the essence itself. (Bonitz)

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (553. 10-12): ?? ??, ?? ???????? ?????????, ?? ????? ???? ?? ?????? ?? ?????? ??? ???? ??? ?????? ???? ????, ????? ?? ?? ??? ???? ?????? ?????, ????? ???’ ? ?? ????? ?????.

Bonitz (1849, p. 368): "Atque hac forma quoniam efficitur, ut res quaelibet id sit quod est, jure eam substantiam rei dixeris. (Ex hac explicatione apparebit, cur b13 ?????? scripserim pro vulgato ?????, et commate ante vocem ????? distinxerim.)"

Bonitz was preceded by Argyropulus: "si igitur hoc causa est ipsius esse atque substantiae: hoc sane substantiam ipsam dicerent esse."

Jaeger: "sic vitatur inanis tautologia et rhetorica pronominis ????? iteratio."

(3) Bonitz was not aware that he had to give up the reading ??????, ????? (on which his translation was based), once he had changed his interpretation of ll. 12-13. A further objection is that the term ????? now plays two roles: 'being' (synonymous with ?????) and 'cause of being'.

1043b26-27. but of what sort a thing, e. g. silver, is, they thought it possible actually to explain.

(1) My proposal: but of what sort a thing, e. g. silver, is, they thought it possible actually to inquire and explain.

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (554. 19-20): ???? ?????? ??? ????? ???????? ? ???? ????????? ???????, ????????? ?? ??.

Jaeger: "????????? ???????, ????????? ?' ??·ex Alexandro restitui, nam particulae ??? (26) correspondere debet ?? velut in exemplo argenti."

Jaeger was preceded by Argyropulus: "sed fieri quidem potest, ut doceas quale quid quippiam est. ut definias vero, minime fieri potest."

(3) It seems more probable to me that ??????? has dropped out before ???, cf. 1041b9-10; for why should anyone have disfigured the plainly understandable phrase ????????? ??????? by interposing a ???? Adding "but not to define" seems pleonastic after l. 15, whereas ellipsis of the ??-clause after ??? is not uncommon: "The opposed is often missing, or seemingly missing, and must be supplied then in thought." (Kühner/Gerth ii 272) A good example is Metaphysics i, 983b20-21, where we have to supply in thought the physicists who assumed another primary matter.

1043b33-34. and not, as some say, as numbers of units.

(1) and not, as some say, as plurality of units. (according to Pseudo-Alexander and Jaeger)

My proposal: and not, as some say, as synthesis of units.

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (555. 4): ?? ?’ ????? ???, ??? ? ??????? ???? ??????? ??????, ?? ?????.

Argyropulus: "et non (ut quidam inquiunt) unitatum multitudo."

Jaeger: "an ?????? ??????? legit Alexander? nisi forte ??????? conjicias collato 1044a8."

(3) There is evidence for ?????? ??????? in 1053a30; even more plausible is ???????? ??????? (1039a12), which is expressly marked as doctrine of "some" philosophers (ll. 12-13).

1044a2-4. And the number must be something in virtue of which it is one, and this these thinkers cannot state, what makes it one.

(1) My proposal: and the modern thinkers cannot say in virtue of what the number is one.

(2) Argyropulus: "esse praeterea quippiam oportet quo ipse numerus est unum: quod quidem assignare non possunt."

Bessarion: "Et numerum oportet aliquid esse quo unus: quod nunc non habent dicere quo unus."

Bonitz (1842, p. 100): "[…] numerus dici potest quodammodo unus esse, siquidem multitudo conjuncta est et quasi coaluit in unitatem; neque vero numerus dici potest ipse id esse, quo ipse fiat unus; ?? ???????? enim sua notione distinguitur a numero. Haec difficultas solvetur si pro ??? ??????? casum dativum scripserimus ??? ?? ?????? ??? ????? ?? ? ??? i. e. numerus habeat aliquid oportet, quo fiat unus. Atque haud scio an Alexander hanc ipsam lectionem in textu legerit, quam de conjectura restituere tentavimus. Quod enim scribit [555, 14-15] ??? ????? ??? ????? ?? ?? ??? ??????? ????? ??? ??' ?? ????? ??? vulgarem certe lectionem interpretari non potest, sed talem fere qualem nos proposuimus."

Ross (ii 233-234): "Bonitz proposes ?? ?????? for ??? ???????, but Aristotle means not that number must have, but that it must be a principle of unity, just as in general he identifies substance with the unifying principle."

(3) If number is its own 'principle of unity', as Ross assumes, the question about the 'principles of number' becomes meaningless. So the last word of the editors is Jaeger's self-contradictory note: "??? ??????? corruptum videtur […] an ????? pro ????? scribendum est?" Difficult, too, is the ???, which is simply omitted by Argyropulus, Schwegler and Ross: what shall be the meaning of "quod nunc non habent dicere" (Bessarion) or "können sie jetzt aber nicht angeben" (Bonitz)?

In my view, an exact reconstruction is possible, if we bring to mind the logic of the whole passage ll. 2-6. As in 1043b34-36 and 1043b36-1044a2, an analogy is established between number and definition, so that what is said about definition in l. 6 gives the clue to what should be said about number in l. 2-4. Now the only meaningful translation of l. 6 ?????? ?? ???? ?????? ?????? ?????? is "but similarly they cannot say what makes it one" (Ross). To make it possible, we must supply in thought ???? ??? from ll. 3-4. The construction ?????? … ???? ??? is known under the name of 'prolepsis' or 'anticipation'. It "means that the subject of the subordinate clause is brought over into the main clause and made the object here" (Kühner/Gerth, § 600, 4). Another example is found in 1064b23-27: ???? ??? ???? ???????? ??? ????????? ??????????? ??? ????? ?? ???????? … ????? [??] ??????? ????? ??? ????????????? ????? ?????????.

With this, we have already the solution of our whole problem. In order to establish the said analogy, we have to construct ??? ??????? with ??? ?????? ??????, ???? ???: "they cannot say in virtue of what the number is one".

The words which interrupt and destroy this structure form two groups: (1) [??? ????? ?? ? ???], an alternative version to l. 5 ??????? ?? ?? ?????? ?? ?? ??????, and (2) the unintelligible ? ???, which, however, transformed into ?? ??? ("the modern thinkers", cf. 992a33 and 1000a5-6), turns out to be the subject of the clause. So the corrected text runs as follows: ??? ??? ??????? [??? ????? ?? ? ???] ?? ??? ??? ?????? ??????, ???? ???.

1044b2-3. What is the material cause? We must name not fire or earth, but the matter peculiar to the thing.

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (557. 25-26): ???? ????? ??? ??? ???????? ????? ?? ???, ?? ??? ?????????? ??? ?? ??????? ????????, ???’ ??? ?? ??????????.

Jaeger: "???? ex Alexandri paraphrasi supplevi."

(3) Cf. 1041a24-25.

1045a7-10. In the case of all things which have several parts and in which the totality is not, as it were, a mere heap, but the whole is something besides the parts, there is a cause.

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (560. 26-29): ?????? ???, ?????, ??? ????? ???? ???? ??? ?? ???? ?? ??? ???? ?????, ???? ??????? ?? ??? ?????? ?? ???? ???? ?? ????? (?? ??? ???? ?????? ????? ??????? ??? ?? ???? ????? ? ??????), ???? ?? ?????? ??? ?? ?????.

Argyropulus: "est enim profecto causa quaedam, ut id omne sit unum quod plures partes habet."

Bessarion: "omnium namque quaecunque plures partes habent […] est aliqua causa."

Jaeger received Pseudo-Alexander's reading ?????? (instead of ?????) into the text.

What Ross translates by "in the case of all things" (and Bonitz by "bei allem"), is, strictly speaking, ??? ??????.

1045a33-35. Of matter some is intelligible, some perceptible, and in a formula there is always an element of matter as well as one of actuality; e.g. the circle is 'a plane figure'.

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (562. 13-19): ???’ ?? ??? ? ???????? ??? ???? ?? ?? ?? ????? ?????, ?? ??? ????????? ??? ??? ???? ? ??? ???? ????? ? ?? ???????· ?????? ??? ??? ?? ???? ??? ????????, ?? ??? ???? ???? ????? ??? ??? ??? ??? ??????, ?? ?? ?????? ??? ?? ???? ???????· ??? ????? ?? ??? ????? ?????, ? ?? ?????? ???????. ???? ?? ??? ????? ??? ????? ??? ??? ??????, ? ?? ?????? ??? ?? ???? ??? ?? ????? ? ??? ??? ???????? ?? ?????? ??? ??? ??????? ????????, ?? ?? ????? ??? ???? ??? ???????? ????????.

Jaeger: "35 ???? … ???????? seclusi, omittit Alexander in paraphrasi."

(3) What Pseudo-Alexander expressly refers to is only ll. 33-34 ???? ?? ??? ???? ? ??? ????? ? ?' ???????, but his example l. 17 ?? ??? ????? ??? ????? (scil. ??? ?????) seems to be taken from ll. 34-35 ??? ??? ??? ????? … ????? ????????.

1045a36-b1. each is by its nature essentially a kind of unity, as it is essentially a kind of being.

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (562. 24-25): ????? ??????? ????? ???? ?? ?? ??? ????? ?? ??? ?????? ?? ????? ??? ??.

Argyropulus: "eorum unumquodque continuo unum quid proprie est."

(3) The superfluous ????? seems to be varia lectio to ??, cf. 1051b30 ???? ????? ??.

1045b2-7. (and so neither 'existent' nor 'one' is present in their definitions), and the essence of each of them is by its very nature a kind of unity as it is a kind of being - and so none of these has any reason outside itself, for being one, nor for being a kind of being; for each is by its nature a kind of being and a kind of unity, not as being in the genus 'being' or 'one' nor in the sense that being and unity can exist apart from particulars.

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (563. 8-12): ???? [i. e. after l. 2 ?? ?????] ?? '??? ?? ?? ????? ?? ???? ??? ?? ???' [l. 6], ???’ ?????, '??? ??? ????? ?? ???? ???????? ???? ?? ?? ???? ?? ??' ??? ?? ???? ??? ??? '????? ??? ??????? ????? ?? ?? ??? ?? ??' [ll. 2-6], ??? ????? ?? '???’ ?? ???????? ????? ???? ?? ???’ ??????' [l. 7].

Schwegler (ii 153): "The reason, why ?? and the ?? do not occur in the definitions of ?????, ????? etc. [ll. 2-3], cannot be but because neither ?? nor ?? are generic concepts [l. 6]." Therefore, he recommends to transpose ll. 2-4 ??? ??? ??? ??????? … ????? ??? ?? ?? to after l. 7 ???? ?? ??? ??????.

Bonitz (1849, p. 377): "Sed licet probabilis sit haec transpositio, num necessaria sit dubito; haud scio an Aristoteles illud ??? b2 retulerit ad particulam ????? a36, qua continuo, nulla praeterea intercedente causa, illis categoriis unitatem et existentiam tribuendam contendit."

1045b9-10. and others speak of 'communion'. (omitting ?????)

Bonitz (1849, p. 377): "Vocem ????? quamquam et codices tuentur omnes et Alexander habuit, tamen non potest pro genuino haberi. Primum enim universe ???????? perinde atque antea ??????? tamquam causa unitatis nominanda erat; postea demum quum adhiberetur ad exemplum scientiae, aptum erat adjici ?????. Ex hoc exemplo in superiora verba videtur perperam illatum esse."

1045b15-16. and the fact that a thing is white will be a 'composition' of surface and whiteness.

(1) and the fact that a surface is white will be a 'composition' of surface and whiteness. (according to Bonitz)

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (563. 39): ?? ?? ?????? ??? ?????????? ??? ?????? ?? ?????.

Bonitz (1849, p. 377): "Ad praedicatum ?????? ????? non poterat omitti subjectum, sed uti antea additum est: ?? ?????? ????? ????????, ita hic profecto scriptum fuit: ?? ?????????? ?????? ????? vel: ?? ?????????? ?????? ?????. Confirmari haec emendatio videtur collato Alexandro [563. 39]."

Ross (ii 239): "Bonitz's ?? ??? ?????????? ?????? ????? would be easier, but the subject of ?????? ????? may as well be omitted as that of ????????? (l. 13). A surface is the only thing that can per se be white."

1045b17-19. But, as has been said, the proximate matter and the form are one and the same thing, the one potentially, and the other actually. (according to Bonitz)

(2) Bonitz (1842, p. 122): "Primum falsa distinctione sententia obscurata est; neque enim post ???????, sed post ????? commate distinguendum est; deinde ante ??????? aegre desideres ?? ???, cui oppositum sit ?? ??, uti paullo ante de eadem re dicit ?? ?' ?????, ????? ???????, ?? ??? ??? ?? ?? ?????, ??? ?? ??? ??????? ?? ?' ????????, ?????? ?????? ??????? ?? ????? ?? ?????????? p. 1045a23. Inde locum, quem supra posui, ita emendandum arbitror: ???? - ? ?????? ??? ??? ? ????? ?????, ?? ??? ??????? ?? ?? ????????, vel retenta particula ??? - ??? ?? ??? ??????? ???."

Bonitz (1849, p. 377): "Reputanti autem variam lectionem e codice E enotatam probabilius videtur scriptum fuisse: ????? ??? ??, ?? ??? ???????, ?? ?? ????????."

1045b23. And all things which have no matter are without qualification essentially unities. (Ab)

(1) And all things which have no matter are without qualification essentially unities, as they are essentially beings. (according to Pseudo-Alexander and Bonitz)

(2) Bonitz (1842, pp. 122-123): "At non agitur de causa exsistentiae, sed unitatis, non ??? ?????, sed ??? ?? ?????. Quare recipienda in textum lectio codicis Ab ????? ????? ???? ?? ??, praesertim quum superioribus verbis Aristotelis et interpretatione Alexandri ad hunc locum confirmetur. Cf. p. 1045a36-b1 et [Pseudo-Alexander, 564. 15-16] ??? ?? ?? ???? ????, ????? ????? ??? ?????? ???? ?? ?? ??? ???? ?? ??."

Bonitz (1849, p. 377): "???? ?? ??, quod pro vulgato ???? ???? ?? e codice Ab in textum recepi (cf. Observationes p. 122), confirmatur Alexandri auctoritate [564. 16]; quamquam haud scio an ex hac ipsa Alexandri [564. 16] interpretatione: ????? ????? ??? ?????? ???? ?? ?? ???? ??? ???? ??, collatis superioribus huius capitis verbis b1, 3, plenius scriptum fuisse scriptum intelligatur: ????? ????? ???? ?? ??, ????? ??? ???? ?? ??, quam si putamus genuinam fuisse scripturam, corruptela, quae codices prope omnes invasit, facilius explicari potest."

Book IX

1045b32-33. And since 'being' is in one way divided into individual thing, quality, and quantity. (reading ?? ??)

(1) And since 'being' is in one way distinguished in respect of individual thing, quality, and quantity. (reading ?? ??)

(2) Jaeger prefers ?? ??, commenting: "intellege ?? … ?????".

(3) I, too, prefer ?? ??, but interpreting ?? as dativus respectus, equivalent to the following ????.

1046a16-17. And again these so-called potencies are potencies either of merely acting or being acted on, or of acting or being acted on well.

(2) Bonitz (1842, p. 56): "At ita tres inter se distinguuntur notiones ?? ????? ???????, ?? ??????, ?? ????? (sc. ?????? ? ??????), quum ex ipsa rei natura pariter atque e sententiae nexu appareat duas tantummodo distingui, ?? ????? ??????? ? ?????? una notione comprehensum, et ?? ????? ??????? ? ??????. Haec ut efficiatur sententia unice apta et sana, articulus in nomine ?????? omittatur oportet et scribatur ? ??? ????? ??????? ? ??????, ? ??? ?????. Et hanc quidem lectionem non est dubium quin Bessarion habuerit, qui vertit: rursus autem hae potentiae dicuntur aut ipsius faciendi solum aut patiendi, aut ipsius bene. Confirmant praeterea conjecturam nostram duo loci, quibus de eadem re agitur, ?, 12. p. 1019b11. […] ?, 2. 1046b24."

The text was understood in the same way already by Argyropulus: "hae rursus aut faciendi aut patiendi tantum potentiae, aut bene faciendi vel patiendi dicuntur."

1046a30-31. so that every potency belongs to the same subject and refers to the same process as a corresponding impotence. (reading ????????)

(2) Jaeger: "nisi ??? ???????? scribendum est." This is the reading presupposed by Argyropulus: "quare eiusdem atque per idem omnis potentia et impotentia sane."

(3) The dative ???????? must be understood as dependent on ??? ????? and ???? ?? ????. The same construction is found in an example given by Kühner/Gerth (§ 423, 9): ??????? ???????? ??? ??? ????? ?????? ???? ??? ????? ("About the same time with the affair of Delium took place the death of Sitalces", Thucydides 4, 101). With this, it is clear that the readings ???????? and ??? ???????? are not different in sense.

1046b22-23. And so the things whose potency is according to a rational formula act contrariwise to the things whose potency is non-rational.

(1) And so the things which have a rational power can produce contrary results. (according to Ross ii 243)

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (570. 12-13): ??? ??? ????? ?? ???? ????? ???????? ???????? ??????? ???? ???? ?????.

Christ (1853, pp. 51-52): "Irrationales potentias singulos quamque effectus procreare, rationales easdem contraria efficere jam bis Aristoteles in hoc capite monuerat (b4 et b10). Itaque hoc loco dici non potest, rationales potentias contraria ac irrationales efficere, quoniam illa ipsa, quae a ratione procreantur, inter se, non effectui potentiae irrationalis contraria sunt. Potestas autem verbi ??????? eo minus in simplicem diversitatis vim detorqueri potest, quia stricta contrariorum membrorum significatio in sequentibus necessario flagitatur: ??? ??? ???? ?????????? sc. ????????. Nihilominus vereor, ne is, qui verba ???? ???? ????? ???????? ejici jusserit, audacior sit, atque nescio, an explicatione vulgatae lectioni succurri possit. Etenim cum in efficienda re duae potentiae exigantur, una quae vim quandam rei invehat (?????????), altera, quae ad hanc vim suscipiendam idonea sit (?????????), potentia passiva, qua passiva, semper ratione caret, activa autem rationis lumine pleraque instructa est cf. 1049a3 sqq. Itaque nostro quoque loco verba ???? ???? ????? ???????? non a ???????? sed a ????? suspensa esse crediderim: potentiae rationales res irrationali potentia praeditas contrario modo afficiunt."

According to Ross (ii 243), ???? ???? ????? ???????? is "rather pointless, and may be a mistaken gloss on ????????".

1047a9. when it would naturally have it and when it still exists.

(2) Bonitz (1849, p. 386): "Admodum languidum et inane hoc [??? ??? ??] est additamentum; etenim ????????, ut quae non mera sit negatio, per se constat non posse tribui nisi ei rei quae est. Quare haud scio an codex exiguae auctoritatis T, quocum hoc loco non solum editiones Aldinae Sylburgianae, quae eum fere sequuntur, sed etiam Bessario consentit, genuinam lectionem servaverit: ??? ??? ??."

Ross (ii 244): "??? ??? ??, which has been suspected, is undoubtedly right. Cf. Analytica Posteriora 74b32 ??? ?? ??? ?? ???? ??? ???? ??? ????? ??? ?????????, ????????? ??? ?????????, ?? ?????????????, ???? ???????? ???? (a reminiscence of Plato Theaetetus 163 D)."

Jaeger: "?? <??????> correxi (scil. ??????); cf. 1047b29-30, 1048a1."

(3) Ross's explanation is convincing: the remark "and when it still exists" (which is equivalent to ????????? in the parallel passage quoted from the Posterior Analytics) is essential, because what has not sight can have lost this faculty by losing its existence.

1047a9-10. the same people will be blind many times in the day - and deaf too.

(1) "and deaf too" suspected by Bonitz.

(2) Bonitz (1849, p. 386): "Haec verba non interpretatur Alexander, et si initium huius exempli respexeris: ?? ??? ?????? ???., expectes potius caecitati, ut privationi, opponi eiusdem sensus habitum, quam alius sensus privationem. Quare dubito an quid per librariorum errorem depravatum sit."

1047a23-24. or capable of not walking and yet walk. (according to Joachim)

(2) Hayduck (p. 112): "extrema verba ??? ?? … ???????? non dubito quin corrupta sint. ut enim supra non solum oppositis sed contrariis orationis membris dicitur posse aliquid esse, quod non sit, itemque, quod sit, posse non esse: eadem ratione hic priori membro ??????? ???????? ?? ?? ???????? necessario opponendum est ??? ??????? ??????? ????? ?? ????????: idque Aristoteles sine dubio scripsit."

Ross (ii 245): "The manuscript reading must be wrong, since it says the same as has already been said in ??????? ???????? ?? ?? ????????. The reading adopted [???????? ??????? ??] is that proposed by Prof. Joachim. The other emendations which involve less change are in themselves less natural. Once ???????? got corrupted into ???????, the corruption of ?? into ????? would naturally follow."

1047b3. If what we have described is identical with the capable or convertible with it. (reading ? ?????????)

(1) if, according to what was said before (1047a24), possible is from what nothing impossible follows [or, better, "which is followed by nothing impossible"]. (Zeller)

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (574. 7-9): ????? ??? ?? ???? ?? ????????? ??????? ? ?????????, ????????? ?? ??????? ??????? ??, ???? ??????? ???????? ??? ????????? ???? ?? ?????????.

Argyropulus: "ad quod sequitur actus."245Schwegler (ii 165): "To ? ?????????, ?? ?????????? ????? is to be supplied from the preceding sentence, not without harshness."

Bonitz (1849, p. 389): "Construe: ?? ?' ???? ??????? ?? ????????? (intellige ?????, ? ??? ?????? ? ????????, … ????? ????? ???????? 3. 1047a24), ? ?????????, intellige ? ????????, quod vocabulum propterea potest suppleri, quia per ?? ????????? est significatum."

Christ (1853, pp. 86-87): "Cum hac in enuntiationis conformatione necessario ?? ????????? subjecti, ??????? praedicati partes sustineant, ambiguum est, quid sit illud ?????????. Nam non unum, sed permulta exempla potentiae in priore capite allata sunt. Nec omnino certum exemplum, sed generalis sententia exspectatur. Unde hoc Aristotelis menti obversatum esse puto: si quid secundum ea, quae in priore capite exposuimus, possibile est, qua sequitur: ?? ?' ???? ?? ???? ?? ?????????. Sed quomodo praepositio ???? exciderit, intelligi nequit. Itaque lectione codicis Ab edoctus crediderim primo Aristotelem scripsisse: ?? ?' ???? ?? ????????? (i. e. si certum est, quod in priore capite (a24-29) expositum est), deinde negligentius explicandi causa addidisse: ?? ??????? ? ?????????."

According to Zeller (1882, pp. 156-157), supplying ?? ????????? (Pseudo-Alexander), ?? ?????????? ????? (Schwegler) or ? ???????? (Bonitz) as subject of ? ????????? is not only "inadmissible" ("unstatthaft") in point of grammar, but gives a sense contrary to the author's intention, namely that "the possible is possible only insofar as it comes to actuality, whereas according to Aristotle it is sufficient that nothing impossible results if it becomes actual".

Zeller's proposal is to read ?? ?' ????, ?? ?????????, ??????? ? ???????? ?? ?????????, "if, according to what was said before (1047a24), possible is from what nothing impossible follows".

"It hardly need be said how easily the present text could arise from the one presupposed here, nothing more being required than a copyist's eye deviating from ??????? to ????????, and consequently ?? being transformed progressively into ? and then into ?; how well the sense got by this emendation fits into the context; and how the phrasing of the Aristotelian statement about the ???????, which we meet in Diodorus, is explained in the best way."

Ross (ii 247): "The traditional text ?? ?’ ???? ?? ????????? ??????? ? ????????? can only mean ‘if what we have described is possible in so far as the two things are convertible’ (with ? ????????? may be compared ? ?????? Analytica Posteriora 73b22); it is quite impossible to understand, as Alexander and Bonitz do, ?? ????????? as the subject of ?????????. There is much to be said for Zeller’s ?? ?’ ????, ?? ?????????, ??????? <? ????????> ?? ?????????. ? ???????? ?? ????????? would be a good summary of ?? ?????????, i. e. of the criterion of ??????? given in a24. (Alternatively we might omit Zeller’s commas and interpret ‘assuming that the ??????? about which we have been speaking is that’, &c.) This reading derives some support from the phrase in the ???????? of Diodorus Cronus (cf. 1040b29 n.) ?????? ???????? ?? ??????????. A comparison of 1047b9 with the phrase in the ????????, ??????? ????? ? ???' ????? ?????? ???' ????? suggests that Diodorus was borrowing Aristotle’s language.

There is, however, no absolute need to depart from the well-attested reading given in the text, which derives some support from Analytica Priora 32a24 ???? ????? ????? ? ????????? ????????."

Jaeger: "lacunam statui post ?????????."

(3) In Zeller's emendation, ? ???????? ?? ????????? should be translated by "which is followed by nothing impossible", in view of ll. 4-5 ??? ??????? ??? ????, ??? ????? ??. Temporal succession is meant, not logical consequence.

1047b7-8. - one who did not take account of that which is incapable of being -

(1) - one who does not consider the impossible to exist. (alternative translation by Ross, ii 247)

My proposal: he who does not take into account the impossibility.

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (574. 24-26): ? ?? ??????????? ???, ????, ???? ???? ?? ???????? ?? ???? ????, ??? ??? ???????? ?? ???? ???? ?? ???????, ??????? ?? ????? ?? ????? ?????? ?? ?? ??????? ????? ? ???????? ?? ????? ???’ ???????.

Ross (ii 247): "In any case the clause is parenthetical, and ??? ????? ???. gives the reason for ??????? … ?????????????."

Jaeger: "nisi haec verba commentum lectoris sunt."

(3) In my view, the incrimined words are a gloss to l. 6 ?? ??? ???? ???????: if a man were to assert that it is possible …, he does not take into account the impossibility.

1047b10-11. if we actually supposed. (according to Pseudo-Alexander)

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (574. 33-34): ?? ????????? ?? ?? ?? ??? ????????? ?? ???????? ??? ?????.

(3) ??? seems to be an alternative version of ??? ?????????? ????? ? ?????????.

1047b15-16. then, when A is possible, B also must be possible. (reading, with Bekker, ??????? ????? ??? ????? ?)

(1) then, when A can be, necessarily B also can be. (EJAb)

(2) Argyropulus: "si possibile est A esse, et B necessario possibile est esse."

Ross (ii 248): "The reading of EJAb, ??????? ????? ????? ??? ?, clearly ought to be restored here."

1047b20-21. If, then, B is impossible, A also must be so. (according to Bonitz)

(2) Argyropulus: "si igitur ipsum B impossibile est esse, necesse est et A impossibile esse."

Bonitz (1842, p. 124): "Haec […] verba quomodo intelligas, frustra vel veteres commentatores vel recentiores interpretes consulas; Sylburgius certe confitetur, se ea non intelligere, quod dicit: sententia in Bessarionis quoque versione obscura est. Videtur tamen mutatione haud ita magna verbis aptus sensus restitui posse. Quum enim a particula ?? enuntiatio ordiatur, id resumi consentaneum est, quod antea jam dictum ac comprobatum erat; jam quum antecedat ?? ???????? sc. ?? ?, ???? ?? ???????? sc. ?? ?, non exspectes dici ?? ?? ???????? - ?? ?, sed ?? ?? ???????? - ?? ?. Deinde si comparaverimus eam enuntiationem, quae proxime subsequitur ???' ?? ??? ?? ? ???????, atqui ? erat possibile, intelligimus antea demonstratum esse, ? esse impossibile, cui quidem sententiae opponatur ???' ?? ?? ? ???????; itaque non in protasi, sed in apodosi superioris enuntiati contineri censeas, ut ? impossibile dicatur. Haec si recte collegimus, scribendum videtur transpositis ? et ? et nomine ?????? ejecto: ?? ?? ???????? ?? ?, ?????? ??? ?? ? ?????, sc. ????????. Si vero impossibile est ?, necessario etiam ? erit impossibile. Positum autem est ? possibile esse, possibile igitur etiam ?."

1047b24-26. If, then, A and B being thus related, B is not possible on this condition, and B will not be related as was supposed. (reading ????? ???????)

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (576. 4-5): ????? ?? ?? ????? ??????? \* \* \* ?? ?? ???? ?? ?????.

Argyropulus: "si igitur A et B ita sese habentibus B non sit hoc pacto possibile, neque ipsa AB sane ita sese habebunt uti posita sunt."

Bessarion: "si itaque sic sese habentibus AB non ita possibile sit B, nec ipsum B se habebit ut positum est."

1048a15-16. And it has the potency in question when the passive object is present and is in a certain state. (omitting ??????)

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (577. 26-27): ???? ???????? ??? ?????????, ???? ??? ????????, ??? ??? ???????, ????? ?????????, ??????? ?? ????? [scil. ? ??????].

Argyropulus: "habet autem ita ut agat praesente atque sic se habente passivo."

Christ: "?????? prius fortasse omittit Alexander."

1048a37. but be content to grasp the analogy. (Ab)

(1) but be content to grasp by analogy. (EJ)

(2) Jaeger: "cf. b7."

(3) In b7, ?? ???????? is clearly a dativus modi; here it ought to be a dativus instrumenti (= ??’ ?????????, as paraphrased by Pseudo-Alexander, 579. 14), which, in connection with ???????, is unparalleled not only in Aristotle. Most probably, therefore, ?? is intruded from b7.

1048b4-6. Let actuality be defined by one member of this antithesis, and the potential by the other. (EJ)

(1) Let determinate actuality be one member of this antithesis, and the potential the other. (according to Pseudo-Alexander and Jaeger)

(2) Bonitz (1842, p. 101): "Sententia aperta est; nimirum in iis exemplis quae attulit alterum utique membrum ad ????????? referendum est; alterum ad ???????. Sed verba non videntur sana esse; namque et ex sententiae ratione et ex enuntiati conformatione necesse est ???????, quum utroque loco eodem modo construendum sit, eodem etiam casu scribi. Itaque aut priore loco pro ??????? ?????? scribendum, ut est in codicibus ET, ?????? ?????, qui casus aptus sit ab ???? ??????????, assignetur, attribuatur, aut posteriore loco pro ?????? nominativus ???????, qui est in codice F, construendus cum ????, ita ut ?????????? conjungatur tamquam epitheton cum ? ????????. Utrumque habet sane quo defendatur; sed et aptius ?????????? conjungitur cum ???????? actus definitus, die bestimmte Wirklichkeit [determinate actuality], cf. ?, 2. p. 1027a6 , ?, 8. p. 1049b6, et Alexandri [579. 31-35] interpretatione nominativus confirmatur: ?????? ?? ??? ???????? ??????? ?????? ????? ? ????????, ?? ?? ???? ??? ?? ???????????, ??????? ?? ?? ???????, ?? ?? ???? ??? ?? ????????."

Winckelmann (p. 290) remarks that if ?????????? is drawn as attribute to ????????, the article must be put before ??????????.

Jaeger: "? alterum [before ??????????] supplevi; nam ?????????? non idem est quod ??????????, sed opponitur notioni ??? ??????? ?????, cf. Physica 208a6, Metaphysica 1002a23, 1077b26."

1048b9-11. But also the infinite and the void and all similar things are said to exist potentially and actually in a different sense from that which applies to many other things. (inserting ? before ???????)

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (580. 16-20): ?????? ?? ?? ??????? ????? ???????? ?? ???? ??????? ?????? ????? (?? ??? ??? ???? ??????? ??????? ????????, ?? ?? ???? ?????? ???????), ????? ??? ?? ??????? ??? ???????? ????? ??????? ???????? ??????? ??? ?????, ???? ?? ?????? ??? ????????? ??? ?? ?????? ??? ?? ????????? ????? ??????? ???????? ?? ??????? ??? ?? ????????.

Argyropulus: "atque alio modo et infinitum ipsum et vacuum et quae sunt istiusmodi potentia atque actu dicuntur, et alio modo complura eorum quae sunt, ut videns et ambulans et quod videtur."

Bessarion: "aliter autem infinitum et vacuum et quaecumque huiuscemodi quam pleraque entium potentia et actu dicuntur, ut quam videns ambulans et visum."

Bonitz (1849, p. 395): "??????? construendum est cum adverbio ????? b9, quod cum dativo conjunctum est pariter atque adjectiva et adverbia similitudinem vel dissimilitudinem aliaque eiusmodi significantia."

Ross (ii 252): "The construction of the sentence is hardly possible as it stands in the manuscripts, and it may be that after ??????? ??? ???????? something like ? ??????? ?? ??????? ??? ???????? may have dropped out; perhaps, however, it is sufficient to insert ? and treat the following datives as ethical datives used loosely as in the instances quoted in Bonitz's Index 166b26 -38 , viz. Analytica Priora 43b29, Analytica Posteriora 82b21, De Respiratione 476a18, De Generatione Animalium 755b12. For a somewhat similar change of construction cf. ?. 1024a8, 9."

Jaeger: "ego majorem lacunam exstare censeo homoeoteleuto ortam, quam sic exempli causa suppleverim: <??? ?? ????? ????? ???????? ?? ??????? ??? ????????> ??????? ??? ?????, ????."

(3) The minimalistic solution of inserting ? (Ross) fails, because l. 9 ????? must relate to what precedes, v. Jaeger: "sic [by ????? ??] Aristoteles saepe in libro ? diversas notionis alicuius significationes distinguit." Since, on the other hand, a comparison is intended, as appears from the following ll. 12-17, a second ????? is required, so that Jaeger's "exempli causa" supplement reaches a high degree of probability. For ???????? in combination with ??????? ??? ????? cf. 996a21-22.

1048b15-17. For the fact that the process of dividing never comes to an end ensures that this activity exists potentially, but not that the infinite exists separately. (according to Pseudo-Alexander)

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (581. 9-11): ??? ????? ???, ???? ?? ?? ??’ ??????? ?????????, ?????? ?? ?? ?????????? ??? ????????? ???’ ??? ????? ?????????, ?? ?? ?????????? ??? ???????? ????? ?? ??????? ?? ???????.

Argyropulus: "hoc enim divisionem inquam numquam deficere praestat quidem ut potentia sit iste actus, ut separetur autem non praestat."

Christ: "17 ?? restitui ex Alexandro."

1048b19-20. e.g. the removing of fat, or fat-removal. (according to Christ and Bywater)

(1) "or fat-removal" a reader's note according to Jaeger.

(2) Christ: "???? et ???? variae lectiones esse videntur."

Ross (ii 253): "The manuscript reading ???? ??? ?????????? ? ???????? ???? cannot stand, ???? cannot be interpreted (as by Bonitz) as ?????. Nor is it enough to excise ???? (with Christ) as due to dittography; for ???????? is not the end of ?? ?????????? but the same thing. It is named among the ???????? ??????? in l. 29. The end of ?? ?????????? is ???????? or, more remotely, ?????? (?. 1013b1, Phys. 194b36). I therefore follow Bywater’s suggestion and read o??v ?? ?????????? ? ???????? (sc. ?? ????? ????? ???? ??? ???? ?? ?????)."

Jaeger: "??? ?????????? ? ???????? codices (scil. ????? ????), sed ???????? (29) dicitur ??????? neque est ?? ????? ??? ??????????, sed eius synonymum."

"?? ????????? ? ???????? conjecit Bywater, cum quo ?? scripsi, sed ? (vel ?) ???????? lectoris notam esse puto."`

1048b20-21. (i.e. without being already that at which the movement aims).

(2) Ross (ii 253): "The construction of ????????? is very awkward, and perhaps we should with Fonseca read ??????????. ?? would drop out easily by homoioteleuton."

Jaeger: "sententia construi non potest."

1048b22-23. but that movement in which the end is present is an action. (according to Bonitz)

(2) Ross (ii 253): "Bonitz's emendation ?????? ?, and his omission of ?, are necessary."

1048b23-24. E.g. at the same time we are seeing and have seen, are understanding and have understood, are thinking and have thought. (according to Bonitz)

(2) Fonseca: "cuiusmodi sunt actiones sensuum et intellectus; nam videt et vidit unum atque idem sunt, eodemque modo intelligit et intellexit, ut clarius exponit ad finem capitis."

Ross (ii 253-254): "Bonitz has emended this line successfully by the aid of De Sensu 446b2 ??? ?? ???? ??? ?????? ??? ?????? ??? ???? ?????????? ??? ???????, and Soph. El. 178a9 ??' ????????? ?? ???? ??? ?????? ?? ??? ???????????; ??. ???? ??? ???? ?? ?? ??? ??? ????????? ?? ???? ??? ???? ????? ?????????.

The manuscripts give ??? ???? ??? ?????? ??? ???? ??? ????????. ?onitz writes ??? ??? ??? ??????, ??? ?????? ??? ?????????, ??? ???? ??? ????????. Fonseca had already conjectured ?????? for ??????, but that is much less probable. Bywater, while accepting ???, thinks that the one perfect tense ???????? is enough and that the others are understood. But in the rest of the section Aristotle is careful to supply all the perfects; and in so corrupt a passage we may allow a greater freedom of emendation than usual. I therefore follow Bonitz."

1048b24-25. (while it is not true that at the same time we are learning and have learnt, or are being cured and have been cured).

(2) Jaeger: "verba ???' ?? … 25 ???????? falso loco in textum intrusa post 26 ???????????? collocanda erant."

1048b32-33. but what is being moved is different from what has been moved, and what is moving from what has moved.

(2) Christ: "???' ?????? post ????????? transponenda."

Jaeger: "immo ??? ????? ??? ????????? varia lectio sunt e margine intrusa, delevi."

1049a9-11. if nothing in the thing acted on - i.e. in the matter - prevents it from becoming a house.

(2) Jaeger: "??? ?? ??? an varia lectio vel glossema ad ????? est?"

1049a14-15. for it must be deposited in something other than itself and undergo a change. (according to Pseudo-Alexander)

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (582. 32-33): ??? ??? ?? ???? ???? ?? ?? ?? ?????? ??? ???????????.

Argyropulus: "sit enim in alio atque mutetur oportet."

Bessarion: "oportet namque in alio esse et transmutari."

Ross (ii 256): "?????? may be simply Alexander’s interpretation, but it is difficult to suppose that some such verb can be ‘understood’ with ?? ????, and accordingly ?????? or some similar word should be inserted in the text. Cf. ??? ?????? ???? ? ?????? ?? ??????, ?. A. 583a22."

Jaeger: "infinitivus certe post ??? desideratur, sed nescio an ????????? cogitando supplendum sit."

1049a27-29. For the subject or substratum is differentiated by being a 'this' or not being one. (according to Apelt)

(2) Apelt (p. 244) reads ???' ?? instead of the transmitted ???????: "a confusion that took place frequently in the manuscripts. Cf. Met. 1007a34 Bonitz and Sext. Empir. p. 721, 2 Bekker."

1049b16-17. so that the formula and the knowledge of the one must precede the knowledge of the other.

(1) so that the formula and the knowledge of the one must precede the formula and the knowledge of the other. (according to Pseudo-Alexander and Jaeger)

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (585. 7-9): ?????? ??? ????? ??? ??? ?????? ??????????? ??? ????????? ??? ????? ??? ??? ??????? ??? ????????.

Jaeger: "??? ????? ex Alexandri paraphrasi restitui."

1050a14. or because they have no need to theorize.

(1) Deleted by Diels and Jaeger.

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (588. 4-6): ????? ???’ ? ???, ????????? ?? ?????????? ? ?????? ???? ?????????, ? ??? ?? ??????? ??? ???????· ? ???? ?? ??? ?? ? ?? ??????? ??? ???? ??????? ???????.

Apelt (p. 245) conjectures ?? ???????? (or ???? ????????) ???????.

Ross (ii 262-263): "? ??? ????? ??????? ??????? is excessively difficult, and one would be tempted to regard it as a gloss (so Diels, according to the editor of Bonitz’s translation), if one saw what the gloss meant. Alexander’s interpretation implies that he had these words, except ???, of which his interpretation (as distinct from the lemma) has no trace. This being so, it is possible (1) that we should omit ??? as an intruder which has come in from the next line, and take ? as equivalent to ?? ?? ?? (cf. Z. 1041b23, E. N. 1170b17). For the intrusion of ??? cf. H. 1043a34 n., Probl. 962a2. 'They are not speculating, except in a qualified sense of that word' (speculating in the proper sense means speculating for the sake of doing so, or of reaching the truth (cf. ?. 993b20, Pol. 1325b20)); ‘otherwise (if they are speculating in the proper sense) they have no need to speculate’ (sc. for the sake of acquiring ?????????, because in that case they must already have it). (2) Alternatively we might read with E ??? ? (???? has replaced ??? ? in good manuscripts in An. Post. 84b8, E. N. 1161a1) and interpret ‘and these are said to speculate in order to get the speculative faculty, not in so far as they speculate but only in so far as they do so in a particular way, or because they have no craving to speculate (for its own sake)’. Or (3) we might, besides reading ??? ?, read ? ?? or ??? for ???. ‘And these speculate in order to get the speculative faculty, not in so far as they speculate, but only in so far as they speculate in a particular way, or about subjects about which’ (or ‘at a time at which’) ‘they have no craving to speculate.’

Apelt’s ???’ ? ???, ??? ?? ???????? ??????? is not very probable."

(3) I cannot see why the words ? ??? ????? ??????? ??????? should be "excessively difficult" (Ross). As they stand, they are a simple-minded but well intelligible explanation of the fact that those who are learning by practice do not theorize (ll. 13-14). It is in this way that Diels must have understood them.

1050b30-33. But the other potencies, according to our previous discussion, are all potencies for opposites; for that which can move another in this way can also move it not in this way, i.e. if it acts according to a rational formula. (Ab)

(1) But the other potencies, according to our previous discussion, are all potencies for opposites (for that which can move another in this way can also move it not in this way), in so far as they act according to a rational formula. (EJ)

(2) Argyropulus: "ceterae vero potentiae de quibus est definitum contradictionis sunt universae (quod enim hoc pacto movere potest, potest et non hoc pacto movere), dico autem eas omnes quae sunt participes rationis."

Bessarion: "ceterae vero omnes potentiae, ut determinatum est, contradictionis sunt (quod enim potest sic movere, potest etiam non sic), quaecunque scilicet secundum rationem."

Jaeger: "???? tenendum est et ?? ??? … ??? parenthesin intellege."

1050b34-36. If, then, there are any entities or substances such as the dialecticians say the Ideas are.

(1) If, then, there are any entities or substances such as the dialecticians maintain. (according to Pseudo-Alexander)

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (593. 26-28): ????? ????? ???? ?????? ???????? ? ?????? ???? ???????? ?? ?? ???? ?????? ???? ???? ????????? ????????????.

Jaeger: "??? ????? omittit Alexander in citatione."

(3) Omitting ??? ????? changes the structure of the sentence. For the construction with ??? ?????, cf. 1002b22-23 and 1031a29-31, for the construction without it cf. 997b35-998a1 and 1059a11.

1051a6-7. e.g. that of which we say that it can be well is the same as that which can be ill. (according to Pseudo-Alexander)

(2) Bonitz (1842, p. 101): "Non id quod aegrotum est (?? ??????) idem valere potest, sed id quod potest aegrotare idem potest valere; namque ?????? ???? ??????? ????????. Quamobrem pro ?? ?????? scribendum est ?? ?????? sc. ???????? ?????????. Fidem huic conjecturae faciunt et proxima verba Aristotelis ? ???? ??? ??????? ??? ????????? ??? ???????, ??? ??????? ??? ????????? ???., et explicatio Alexandri [594. 3] ? ??? ??????? ?????????, ????? ??? ?????? ???."

Argyropulus: "ceu idem est quod dicitur sanum esse posse et aegrotare ac simul."

Jaeger: "cf. 1049b15 ?? ???? scil. ?????????."

1051a26-27. Why is the angle in a semicircle in all cases a right angle? If three lines are equal.

(2) Bonitz's emendation <?> ?? ????????? is anticipated by Argyropulus: "cur is angulus qui est in semicirculo rectus est absolute?"

Ross (ii 270): "The vulgate reading is ??? ?? ?? ????????? ???? ???????; ????? (??? ???.). The best manuscripts read ??? ?? ?? ????????? ???? ??????? ??? ??. Alexander says (596. 21) ????? ?????????? ??? ??? ?? ?? ????????? ???? ???? ??? ??????? ??? ?? ???? ?????, ?? ?? ?????? ??? ? ????? ???????????? ‘??? ?? ?? ????????? ????’ ? ???? ‘??????? ??? ?? ? ?? ????????? ????’, from which it would appear that his text read ??? ?? ?v ????????? ????; ??????? ??? ??; ?????, the reading of the inferior manuscripts in l. 27, cannot be right; the angle in a semicircle is not right because it is clear to people who know certain facts that it is so. We should either read and punctuate as in the text [26-27 ?????? ?? ?? ????? ????? ??? ??. ?? ????????? ???? ??????? ??? ??; ??? ???? ?????], or follow Alexander’s text. For ??? ?? at the end of the sentence cf. H. 1044b17 ???? ????? ???? ??;

Bonitz’s addition of ? seems to be unnecessary; for the form of the proposition cf. Analytica Posteriora 94a33 ?? ?? ????????? ????? ?????."

Jaeger: "at ??? ?? (26) non cum ????? conjungendum est (cf. 28) sed initium quaestionis indicat (cf. Analytica posteriora 94a28 ??? ?? ???? ? ?? ?????????;), cui respondet ????? vel ??? (cf. 24 et Analytica posteriora 94a37, 95a14)."

(3) Jaeger does not go into the substantial objection against ?????.

1051a29-30. Obviously, therefore, the potentially existing constructions are discovered by being brought to actuality. (EJ)

(2) Ross (ii 272): "In l. 30 EJ and apparently Alexander (???? 597. 14, ?????? 597. 16) read ??????? where the other manuscripts have ?????????. Now a philosopher might be said ?? ??????? ???? ??? ????????? ??????? (‘refer back’) when he shows as Aristotle does here that the actuality is the prius of the potentiality. Cf. E. N. 1170a16 ?? ?? ??? ????????? ???? ????? ??????? ?????????, ????????? ?’ ????????? ? ???????? ? ?? ?????is ??? ??? ????????? ????????, ?? ?? ?????? ?? ?? ????????? ????? ?? ?? ??? ????? ?????? ?? ??????????? ? ?????. 1113a5 ??????? ??? ??????? ????? ??? ??????, ???? ??? ????? ??????? ??? ?????. b19 ?? ?? ????? ???????? ??? ?? ?????? ??? ????? ????? ????????? ???? ??? ?? ????, ?? ??? ?? ????? ?? ????, ??? ???? ??’ ???? ??? ???????. But the operation here described is that of the mathematician; the sense required is ‘the constructions which exist potentially are discovered by being actualized’ (perducta ad actum potentia, Bonitz), and this sense demands ???????. Cf. E. N. 1153a12 ??? ??? ??? ????????? ???????? ??? ??????."

Jaeger:"?? ex ????????? iteratum."

1051a30-31. the reason is that the geometer's thinking is an actuality. (reading ? ?????? ????????)

(2) Ross (ii 272): "The manuscript reading ?????? ?? ??? ?????? ? ???????? is difficult. ‘The potentially existing constructions are discovered by being brought into actuality; the reason is that the actuality is an act of thought.’ This identifies the actuality of the figure with the actuality of thought, while ll. 32, 33 seem to distinguish them. […]

?????? ? ???????? may have arisen from ? ?????? ???????? (cf. ?. 1072b16), which goes well with what precedes and what follows: ‘the potentially existing constructions are discovered by being actualized; and the explanation is that the geometer’s thinking is an actuality, so that the potentiality proceeds from an actuality, and therefore it is by doing that people come to know’ (or ‘by making constructions that people come to know them’)."

1051b1-2. and thirdly in the sense of true and false. (omitting ????????? ??)

(1) and what is being in the most proper sense is the true and the false. (according to Bonitz)

(2) Ross (ii 274-275): "Being as truth and not-being as falsity are elsewhere treated as emphatically not the primary or strictest senses of being and not-being (?? ?’ ????? ?? ?????? ?? ??? ??????, E. 1027b31), but as being due merely to ??? ???????? ?? ????? (ib. 34) and presupposing being in its primary sense, that in which it is subdivided into the categories (? ??? ?? ?? ????? ? ??? ????? ? ??? ????? ? ?? ???? ???????? ? ??????? ? ???????, ib. 31)."

Jaeger: "an lacuna exstat post ????????? ?? velut <? ?????, ???????? ?? ?????????? ?? ??> ?????? ????"

(3) To justify Ross's translation ("in the sense of"), ?? would have to be added before ?????? ? ??????.

In my opinion, we are not dealing with a question of textual criticism. The striking contradiction to 1027b31 is a fact to be explained when we come to speak about the composition of the Metaphysics.

1051b5-6. when is what is called truth or falsity present, and when is it not? (Ab)

(1) when is what is called being in the sense of truth or falsity present, and when is it not? (according to Christ)

(2) Christ: "?? ?? E quod corrigas in ?? ??." Anticipated by Argyropulus: "quod ut verum dicitur aut falsum".

1051b11-13. 'being' is being combined and one, and 'not being' is being not combined but more than one.

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (598. 23-25): ???? ?? ?? ??? ????? ??? ?? ?????? […] ?? ?????????? ?? ?????????????? ?? ?????????? ??? ?? ?????.

Bonitz (1842, pp. 35-36): "ante ?? ??? ????? ???. adjicienda est, ut constructio constare possit, particula ???."

Ross (ii 275): "It seems probable, however, that grammatically ?? ??? … ????? is the apodosis, though logically it only prepares the way for what follows."

Jaeger: "11 ??? ut videtur Alexander in paraphrasi, addidi."

(3) The efforts to establish a grammatical connection seem to me inappropriate from the start, because there is no substantive one. An answer is given to a question about the ???????, analogous to the question about the ???????? in ll. 17-18.

1051b20. like 'that the wood is white' or 'that the diagonal is incommensurable'. (according to Bywater)

(2) Bywater (1913, p. 110): "If we may restore <??> ?????, ?????? will become a predicate, like ??????????."

This emendation is anticipated by Bessarion: "sicuti album lignum aut diametrum incommensurabilem esse."

1051b23-24. but truth or falsity is as follows - contact and assertion are truth.

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (599. 27): ?? ?? ????? ?? ???’ ???? ?? ??? ?????? ?? ?? ??????.

Goebel (1892, p. 6) and Jaeger propose to delete l. 23 ???.

Christ: "? ?????? ?? ??? et 24 ?????? ejicienda censeo, nisi mavis ???? ?? ?? ??? ?????? ? ??????."

Ross (ii 276): "?? ??? ?????? ? ?????? is answered by ?? ?? ????? in l. 33."

(3) The adversative relation initiated by l. 23 ??? is that of truth and being, v. ll. 22-23 ???? ?? ?????? … ???? ?? ?????. This 'being' is not identical with 'being in the sense of true' in l. 33 (v. our note on ll. 33-34), so that ?? ??? ?????? ? ?????? cannot be "answered by ?? ?? ????? in l. 33", as Ross asserts. Therefore we have the case of ??? solitarium, in which "the speaker originally intends to supply an answering clause, but subsequently forgets his intention (e. g. Plato, Republic 466 E, where ???? ??? ??? ??? ?? ?????? is never answered at all)" (Denniston, p. 380). In substance, however, the statement about the 'being' follows at ll. 28-30.

1051b32-33. viz. whether they are of such and such a nature or not.

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (600. 34-35): ??? ???????? ?? ?? ???? ???? ????? ??? ?? ????????????? ????? ??, ???? ????? ???????? ??? ?????? ???????.

Bonitz (in his apparatus criticus): "fortasse ??? ??, cf. Alexandrum p. 572, 29 [??? ?? ????????????? ????? ??]."

(3) Bonitz has misunderstood Pseudo-Alexander's paraphrasis. ??? ?? ????????????? ????? ?? is a mere amplification of ???????? ??? ?????? ???????. The real interpretation is implied in the comparison with sight, which is, like understanding (??????), an immediate and indisputable apprehension of a quality (?? ??????? ????? ? ??, cf. ll. 31-32 ? ????? ? ??).

1051b33-34. As regards the 'being' that answers to truth and the 'non-being' that answers to falsity. (EJ)

(1) As regards 'being' in the sense of truth and 'non-being' in the sense of falsity. (according to Argyropulus, Bessarion and Jaeger)

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (600. 39 - 601. 3): ?? ?? ?? ?? ??????, ????, ??? ?? ?? ?? ?? ?? ?? ??????, ??? ??? ???? ??????, ?? ????????? ? ?????????????? ?? ?????????? ??? ????? ????? ??????????, ????? ????? ?? ?? ?? ??????· ?? ?? ?? ?????????, ??????? ?? ??????????, ?? ?? ?? ?? ??????.

Ross (ii 278): "Aristotle's carelessness of language has made his meaning seem more obscure than it really is. In ll. 22, 23 he distinguishes the two modes of being (sc. of composites and of incomposites) from the corresponding two senses in which apprehension of them may be said to be true or false. He has treated the question of truth in ll. 23-33, and in 33-1052a4 he is treating the question of being. But instead of saying 'the being of the object which answers to the truth of the apprehension' he says (l. 33) 'the being in the sense of truth'."

So it appears that, in his translation, Ross makes Aristotle say what he should have said.

Jaeger: "33 ?? ?? scripsi cum Alexandri paraphrasi (cf. 1026a35, 1027b18, 33)."

Jaeger's reading in ll. 33-34 (?? ?? ????? ?? ?? ??????, ??? ?? ?? ????? ?? ?? ??????) is presupposed already be Argyropulus and Bessarion, who both translate "esse ut verum" and "non esse ut falsum".

Book X

1052a17-18. the things that are directly and of their own nature and not accidentally called one.

(2) Bonitz (1842, pp. 61-62): "Adjectivum ?????? interdum apud Aristotelem ita usurpatum videmus, ut notionem cui adposita est ad suam ac primariam vim restringat, veluti ?, 12. p. 1020a5. […] Sed hoc significatu nusquam, quod ex vi et natura adjectivi facile explices, adjectivum ?????? cum verbo ???????? conjunctum reperias, ? ????? ???????? ???????, sed ? ?????? ???????? ???????, i. e. potentia quae primitus hac notione significatur. Cf. ?, 4. p. 1015a13. […] Quare scribendum censeo ??? ?????? ??? ???' ???? ????????? ??."

Winckelmann (p. 287): "Then the following passages would have to be corrected too: p. 1031b14. ??? ?? ???' ???? ???????, ???? ???' ???? ??? ?????. p. 1032a5. ??? ??? ?????? ??? ???' ???? ?????????."

Jaeger: "?????? Sylburg; cf. 1016b8, sed cf. 1052a33."

(3) Winckelmann's first passage is a momentous example against the rule set up by Bonitz.

1052a29. Some things, then, are one in this way, qua continuous or whole.

(2) Jaeger: "? ??????? ? ???? an lectoris commentum sunt?"

(3) The disjunction ??????? ? ????, ??????? being subordinate to ???? (v. ll. 23-25), is indeed too awkward.

1052b4-5. and each of the things to which one of these kinds of unity belongs will be one.

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (604. 38 - 605. 1): ??? ??????? ??? ????? ?? ??????? ? ?? ??? ??? ??? ???? ???????????? ?????? ??????.

Bonitz (1849, p. 416): "Pronomen ?????? priore loco positum nihil videtur aliud significare posse nisi ?? ???????, ?? ????, ?? ??? ???????, ?? ?????: at eadem iterum significantur verbis: ?????? ??? ??????. Quod quum absurde dictum esse appareat, locum corruptum esse persuasum habeo; illud vero dubito, utrum pronomen ?????? ab Aristotele priore tantum loco scriptum - ????? ??, ?????? ? ?? ??? ?????? ??? ?????? (cf. de collocatione verborum ? 3. 1047a27) - et quum a librariis in eum, qui aptior iis videretur, locum translatum esset, falso utrobique haesisse putem, an ex interpretatione Alexandri p. 576, 28 conjiciam pro ?????? scriptum fuisse: ??? ?????. Sed utrum probaveris, haec erit sententia: quidquid sub unum ex quatuor illis modis cadit, unum esse censetur."

This is wrongly reported by Ross and Jaeger as if Bonitz considered deleting the first ??????.

Jaeger: "?????? [in l. 4] ex linea sequenti irrepsit."

1052b5-6. but 'to be one' will sometimes mean being one of these things. (Ab)

(1) but 'to be one' will sometimes belong to one of these things. (EJ)

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (605. 1-2): ?? ?? ??? ????? ??? ? ????? ??? ???? ??? ??? ?????? ???? ???????.

Jaeger: "?? ?????? Ab fortasse recte; quod si ?? recipias, ????? post ???? addendum, cf. b15-16, sed ????? = ??????? intellexit Alexander."

1052b17-18. or perhaps 'to be whole and indivisible'. (according to Bonitz)

(2) Bonitz (1849, p. 417): "fortasse ea corruptela verba liberanda sunt, quae saepissime a librariis commissa est quum ?? pro ?? scriberent, ut legendum sit: ? ?? ??? ??? ?????????, h. e. ?? ??? ????? ?? ????????? ????? ????? ???., ? ?? ??? ??? ????????? sc. ?????, h. e. sive notio unitatis in eo consistit, quod aliquid totum est et individuum."

1052b18. but it means especially 'to be the first measure of a kind'. (according to Christ)

(2) Christ: "?? ????? ????? ????? scripsi."

1053a23. while the former must be placed among things which are undivided to perception. (reading ?????? instead of ??????)

(1) while the former is divisible into what is undivided to perception. (according to Jaeger)

while the former is undivided to perception. (according to Bonitz)

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (610. 24-28): ??? ?????? ?? ??? ???????? ??????? ??? ??? ?????? ?????????? ??????????, ???? ??? ??? ?????? ????? ?????? ??????????, ??? ?? ???????? ?? ???? ? ?????? ??????? ??? ???? ??? ????????· ?????????? ??? ??? ?????? ????? ???? ?? ??’ ????? ???????????, ??????? ??????? ??? ????????.

Argyropulus: "aliud ad sensum indivisibile sumi solet."

Goebel (1892, p. 6) conjectures ??? ????????? ???????, referring to 1053a1 ??? ??? ?????? ??????? ????? ??????????.

Ross (ii 283-284): "?????? is Professor E. S. Forster’s conjecture. For ??????? 'to class among', cf. Phys. 201b24, E. N. 1156a30, &c. Ab’s ????? represents the first stage in the corruption. This emendation gives a better sentence than Bonitz’s [1849, p. 419] ????? ?????????? (for ??? ?????????), in which the position of ????? is unnatural."

Jaeger: "?????? frequens usus apud Aristotelem (cf. Bonitz, Index Aristotelicus 216b6 'idem fere ac ???????'). noli mutare in ?????? vel ??????? (Forster, Goebel); deest infinitivus ut vidit Bonitz nisi is ex 19 ??????????? cogitando suppleri potest."

(3) The text as it stands is correctly interpreted by Jaeger; ??????????? is the only word eligible for supplying, cf. 1043b35 and Physics, 231b10-20. The problem is that we get a statement about the continuum (cf. l. 24), not, as required, about the foot qua measure and undivided. Of the emendations which give the required sense, Bonitz's is the best, being supported by 1088a2-3 (??? ?????????? ?? ??????, ?? ??? ???? ?? ????? ?? ?? ???? ??? ????????). The flaw of "unnatural" word order (Ross) can be removed by transposing ????? behind ??????, cf. Physics, 195a25 and Plato, Phaedo 102 DE. Bonitz's mistake was that he sought for paleographical probability in a case, where we are dealing not with a copyist's error, but with the conscious redaction by a librarian, who misunderstood l. ???? ??? ??? ??????? ????????? as continuing a statement about the continuum. The conjectures of Goebel and Forster are rightly criticized by Jaeger; it may be added that they would require the article <??> before ?????????.

1053b13-15. or there is, rather, an underlying nature and the one should be described more intelligibly and more in the manner of the physical philosophers.

(2) Argyropulus: "an natura potius ipsi quaedam subjiciatur. et quomodo notius oporteat dici. an ut ii dixerunt qui versabantur circa naturam."

Bessarion: "an magis aliqua subjicitur natura. et quo modo oporteat notius dici. an magis sicuti physici."

Schwegler (ii 192): "The words ??? ??? ??? are not opening a new question, but continuing the second alternative of the preceding double-question. In other words, ??? is not interrogative, but enclitical adverb. […] Any possibility of misunderstanding would be removed, if ??? were placed after ????????????."

Bonitz (1849, p. 421): "Quod in proponenda quaestione legimus: ??? ??? ??? ???????????? ???????? ??? ?????? ????? ?? ???? ??????, non videtur ita ab Aristotele scribi potuisse. Quoniam enim nondum dijudicatum est sed etiamtum quaeritur, utra statuendi ratio scientiae et veritati accommodatior sit ( ???????????? ), non potest additis verbis ??? ?????? ???. jam significare physicorum sibi rationem videri veriorem et ad eam accedere oportere eum, qui scienter rem velit judicare. Sed hoc ipsum in quaestione ponendum est, sicuti posuit Alexander p. 584, 2 9 [Bonitz, = 612. 12-13 Hayduck]: ??? ??? ??? ???????????? ????????, ??? ????? ?? ???? ?????? ?????. Inde suspicor scribendum potius esse: ? ?????? ????? ???."

Christ (1853, p. 54): "Quibus difficultatibus haec verba implicata sint, ut sagacissime Bonitzius significavit, ita conjecturam ejus ???????? ? ?????? ????? ?? ???? ?????? mihi haudquaquam probavit. Equidem censeo rectam vel emendandi vel explicandi viam monstrari uno loco collato 1001a9. ?????? ??? ??? ??? ?? ??????????? ??? ?????? ?? ?? ?? ???? ?? ?? … ?? ?? ???? ??????, ???? ??????????, ?? ??? ???????????? ?????? ????? ? ?? ?? ?? ?????. Platonicos enim et Pythagoreos obscurae atque abstrusae doctrinae de mera unitatis natura Aristoteles incusat: enucleatius physicos, quid unitati substratum sit, explanavisse. Hinc apparet eos, qui de hoc loco apertius rem declarasse laudantur, ipsos physicos esse, nec a Bonitzio a physicis distingui debuisse. Atque omni parti satisfieret, si omisso ??? legeretur ? ?????? ????????? ??? ????? ??? ??? ???????????? ????????."

Ross (ii 285): "Bonitz sees that the question ??? ??? ???????????? ???????? should not be answered at the same moment that it is asked, by the words ??? ?????? ????? ???. In view of this, and of Alexander’s ??? ????? o? ???? ??????, he proposes ? ?????? (interrogative) for ??? ??????. But this does not remove all difficulties: ??? ??? ???????????? ???????? remains a very curious phrase.

The order is much against Schwegler’s ??? for ???.

The best solution is to excise ??? as an emblema from ??? ??? ???, l. 11."

Jaeger: "?????? vel 13 vel 14 delendum videtur."

(3) ? ?????? and ?????? ????? are typical phrases for introducing an alternative, cf. e. g. Politics, 1339a21-2 (? ?????? ??????? ???? ?????? ?? ??????? ??? ????????) and 1083a32-33. Therefore both ?????? should be retained.

1053b18-19. and if being itself cannot be a substance in the sense of a one apart from the many. (EJ)

(2) and if just that, substance, cannot exist in the sense of a one apart from the many. (Ab)

that being itself cannot be a substance in the sense of a one apart from the many. (Bywater)

Bywater (1913, p. 110): "I suspect that a little word, very apt to be omitted even in the best MSS., has dropped out, and that we should restore ??????? ?????? <???> ???' ???? ?????. Aristotle's point is that what he has already proved to be true of ?? ?? is equally true of ?? ??."

Ross (ii 285): "The traditional reading makes ???' ???? ????? ???. dependent on ??, and ???? after ?? is irregular. The irregularity may be removed by reading with Bywater ??? ???', depending on ???????. For omissions of ??? in the manuscripts cf. ?. 1048a37, Top. 122b10, 146b11, Soph. El. 182a33. Alternatively the irregularity might be removed by punctuating after instead of before ????? ?? in l. 20; for ????? ?? at the end of a clause cf. ????? ??? in De Caelo 282a12, De Gen. et Corr. 316b11, De An. 411a22, Pol. 1333a26. But ???? is not surprising in view of the facts that ?? here = ???? and that a clause has intervened. Cf. ? 1049a9, 10, where there is not even an intervening clause, and Cope’s ed. of Rhet. vol. i. 301-303.

???? ????? refers to ?? ?? (???? ??? ?????, l. 17). ???? ????? is subject, ?????? predicate; this is preferable to making ???? ?????, ??????, subject, as Bonitz does."

Jaeger: "certe ???' non potest esse continuatio hypotheseos ?? ?? ????? (16)."

1053b25-26. so that since in the sphere of qualities the one is something definite - some particular kind of thing.

(1) so that if in the sphere of qualities the one is something definite—some particular kind of thing. (Pseudo-Alexander)

(2) Jaeger: "????? Alexandri paraphrasis an recte? cf. 32 et 1054a5."

1053b29-32. and then the other colours are observed to be produced out of this and black, and black is the privation of white, as darkness of light. (omitting ll.31-32 ????? ?' ???? ???????? ?????)

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (613. 16-18): ????? ?? ?????????? ????, ?? ?? ??? ?? ??? ?????? ??? ??? ??????? ???? ?? ????, ??? ?? ??? ?? ????? ???????? ???? ??? ?????? ????? ??? ?? ?????? ?????· ???????? ??? ???’ ??? ?????????? ???? ???? ?? ????????.

Ross (ii 285-286): "Jaeger [BBA 272] is probably right in treating this as a gloss; for glosses somewhat of this form cf. A. 984b11, ?. 1009a26, ?. 1073a33."

1053b32-34. Therefore if all existent things were colours, existent things would have been a number, indeed, but of what? Clearly of colours.

(1) Therefore if all existent things were colours, existent things would have been a number, indeed, but of certain things, namely of colours. (according to Christ)

Jaeger (in favor of Christ): "cf. 1054a6, 991b18, 20."

1054a7-8. and its substance is not just to be one.

(2) Bonitz (1849, p. 422): "quum libri scripti plerique habeant: ???’ ???? ????? ????? ? ?????, unus autem Ab: ???' ???? ????? ???? ? ?????, genuinam lectionem ex utraque putavi conjungendam: ???’ ???? ????? ???? ????? ? ?????. Huc ducit et comparatio locorum simillimorum 1053b28: ??? ????? ???? ? ????? ?????, 1054a10: ??? ??????? ????? ?' ???? ? ????? ?? ??, et Alexandri explicatio p. 586, 22 [= 613. 39 Hayduck]: ??? ??? ?? ????? ???? ?? ?? ??? ????? ????????, et vero Bessarionis interpretatio: «non autem hoc ipsum substantia eius sit.»"

1054a12-13. so too in substance the one-itself is one substance.

(1) so too in substances the one-itself is one substance. (according to Bonitz)

(2) Bonitz (1842, p. 18): "Pro ????? dubium est an ??????? scribendum sit, ut plane conspiret cum plurali , sicuti paullo ante de eadem re pluralis usurpatur ??? ??? ??? ?????? ?????? ??????? ????? a8."

1054a18-19. and that to be one is just to be a particular thing. (reading ??? <?? ?????> ?? ??? ????? ?? ?????? ?????)

(1) and in 'to be one' nothing more (is predicated) than in 'to be a particular thing'. (according to Jaeger)

(2) Jaeger: "??? scripsi; […] pendet a ?? ?? ?????????????????."

1054a23-26. Now since opposition is of four kinds, and one of these two terms is privative in meaning, they must be contraries, and neither contradictory nor correlative in meaning. (EJ)

(1) Now since opposition is of four kinds, and the other (of the two terms) is neither privative in meaning, nor contradictory nor correlative, they must be contraries. (according to Bonitz)

(2) Bonitz (1842, p. 102): "Quattuor omnino oppositionis genera Aristoteles distinguit, ?????????, ????????, ???????????, ?? ???? ??, cf. ?, 4. p. 1055a38; 7. p. 1057a33-37; jam quum probare instituat unum et multa contraria inter se esse, ???????, reliqua tria oppositionis genera ?????????, ????????, ?? ???? ??, pariter excludenda sunt. Hac ratione ductus si quis vel ex ingenio pro ??? ?????? ???? ???????? ???. scipserit ??? ????, legentium assensum facile feret; sed accedit quod codex Ab pro ?????? particulam ???? exhibet, unde eam Brandisius in textum recepit. Alexandrum eandem in textu Aristotelis habuisse ex ejus interpretatione intelligitur: ???? ?? ?? ?????????? ????????, ?? ?? ??? ?? ????? ?? ?? ??????? ??????????, ??? ???? ?? ?? ???? ?? ???? ?? ???? ??? ???????? ???? ?? ????????? ??? ????????. - Sed licet pro ?????? restituerimus id quod necessarium est ????, nondum omnes dubitationes remotae erunt. Quum enim unum et multa contraria inter se esse ita comprobetur, ut tria reliqua oppositionis genera excludantur, apodosis ??????? ?? ???, quae ex tribus demum generibus exclusis conficitur, non poterit excluso uni vel alteri postponi, quod nunc fit, sed aut omnibus postponenda est aut praeponenda omnibus. Quare sucpicor hunc in modum enuntiationem esse restituendam: ???? ??? ?? ?????????? ????????, ??? ???? ???? ???????? ??????? ??????? ???? ?? ????????? ???? ?? ?? ???? ??, ??????? ?? ???."

Ross (ii 287): "Bonitz’s adoption of ???? (Ab) for ?????? gives an impossible sense, unless his suggested rearrangement of l. 25, ???? ?s ????????? o??? ?? ?? ???? ?? ????????, ??????? ?? ???, be adopted also. Alexander says (615. 2) ???? ?? ?????????? ????????, ?? ?? ??? ?? ????? ?? ?? ??????? ??????????, ??? o??? ?? ?? ???? ?? o??? ?? ???? ??? ???????? ???? ?? ????????? ??? ????????. It is impossible to say exactly what he read; he may be merely interpreting freely.

It seems better to keep the reading ??????, which gives a fair sense. ‘Since one of the terms “divisible" and “indivisible” is privative, they must be contraries and not contradictory or relative terms.’ Aristotle should have said, in accordance with his fourfold division of opposites, ‘since they are not privative, nor contradictory, nor relative, they must be contrary’; but privation and contrariety are not mutually exclusive. Contrariety is the extreme form of privation, the form in which the attribute present in the one term is entirely absent in the other (1055b14, 26, ?. 1004b27, 1011b18)."

(3) Ross's argumentation is strange: what "Aristotle should have said" is precisely what Bonitz proposes to read.

1054a33-34. we sometimes mean 'the same numerically'. (omitting ??? ??? ??????)

(1) in one sense numerically, which we call sometimes 'just that'. (according to E in margine)

in one sense what is called 'the same' is the same numerically, which we call sometimes 'just that'. (according to Pseudo-Alexander)

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (615. 22-23): ??? ??? ?????? ?????? ??????? ?? ???’ ???????, ? ??????? ?????? ????? ?????.

Jaeger: "????? ex Alexandri paraphrasi restitui."

(3) The readings of E in margine and Pseudo-Alexander are the only ones, in which ?????? makes sense (otherwise ??? ??? ?????? … ?????? is pleonastic). ????? is not "ex ????? ortum" (Jaeger), but, reversely, the reading of Ab, ????, ????? ??, originates (by haplography) from ???? ?????, ?? ?? (E in margine).

In Ross's translation, the said pleonasm is concealed by omitting ??? ??? ??????.

1054b12-13. e.g. tin is like silver, qua white, and gold is like fire, qua yellow and red. (amending Ab)

(1) e.g. tin is like silver, qua white, or fire is like gold, qua yellow and red. (Jaeger, amending EJ)

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (616. 28-30): ? ?? ?????????? ?? ?????? ???? ?? ?????????, ???? ?? ??????· ?????? ??? ?? ?? ?????? ?????? ????????? ?? ???????? ? ?? ????. ??? ? ?????? ?? ???? ???? ?? ?????? ? ??????.

Schwegler (ii 194): "One is tempted to write ? ?????? instead of ? ?????."

Ross (ii 287-288): "There is no trace in Alexander of the manuscript reading ? ????? [?b: ? ????? ?????? ?? ????], which is in itself highly improbable. The balance of the sentence would lead one to expect something like ? ??????, and Alexander probably read this; his words are ? ?? ?????????? ?? ?????? ???? ?? ?????????, ???? ?? ??????. ????? doubtless came in by dittography."

Ross's last remark is corrected by Jaeger: "varias lectiones [? ????? ??? and ?????? ?? ????] contaminans".

1054b21-22. for everything that is existent and one is by its very nature either one or not one with anything else. (according to Apelt)

(2) Apelt (p. 247) conjectures ? ??? ?? ? ??? ?? ?????? ??? ?? ??? ??.

Ross (ii 288): "Something like Apelt’s ?????? ??? (cf. l. 19) appears to be wanted instead of ???????. I have p rinted the elided form, for which cf. PI. Phil. 35 C 3 ????????' ????, Dem. 21. 120 o???? ?? ????' ?????, &c."

Jaeger: "? ?? ? supplevi; cf. 19 et 25."

1054b30-31. ('genus' meaning that identical thing which is essentially predicated of both the different things).

(1) 'genus' meaning that in virtue of which both the different things are said to be essentially identical. (according to Jaeger)

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (618. 9-10): ????? ?? ????, ?????, ?? ? ???????? ?? ??????? ???? ??? ?????? ?????? ?????.

Instead of ?, Jaeger writes ?, which is the reading presupposed by Argyropulus ("genus vero dicitur quo ea ambo quae differunt idem per substantiam esse dicuntur") and Bessarion ("dicitur autem genus quo ambo quae differunt secundum substantiam idem dicuntur").

1054b33-34. For all of these [the contraries] too are seen to be different. (reading ??? ?????)

(1) For all things are seen to be different. (Ab)

For all things are seen to be both different and identical. (EJ)

For all what is different is seen to be identical too. (Pseudo-Alexander)

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (618. 17-18): ????? ??? ?? ?????????? ?? ????? ????? ????? ???? ??? ?????.

Bonitz (1842, p. 104): "[…] pro ?????????? ?? legendum suspicor ?????????? ??, i. e. omnia quae differunt apparet aliqua re differre, sicuti supra dixit ?? ???????? ????? ???? ????????. p. 1054b25."

Ross (ii 289): "Alexander’s reading ????? ??? ?? ?????????? ???????? ??? ????? is excluded by the fact that some things which are ‘different’, viz. those that are different in category, are in no respect ?????. The point which Aristotle makes above and in l. 35 is not that things that differ must be the same in some respect, but that there must be some one thing in which they differ. ????? ??? ?????????? ?? ???????? ??? ?? ????? ????? ???? would be a preferable departure from the manuscripts (though Aristotle would probably have said ???? rather than ??, cf. l. 26); but no departure seems necessary."

Jaeger: "locus nondum sanatus, cf. 1018a12."

(3) The vulgata reading ??? ?????, adopted by Ross, can be excluded on several grounds.

(a) because of its triviality. Who can doubt that all contraries are different from another?

(b) It cannot be seen what ??? refers to.

(c) Of the contraries cannot be said that part of them is "other in genus" (l. 35), v. 1055a27-28.

In view of the fact that 1055a1 is the only other case in which ???????? was to be read ??? ?????, no further explanation is needed.

In criticizing Pseudo-Alexander, Ross takes recourse to a "fact" nowhere mentioned by Aristotle, namely that things "different in category, are in no respect" identical. Identity is rather implied in predication, v. 1017b27-1018a11.

I cannot see any objection to the reading of EJ: ????? ??? ?????????? ?? ???????? ??? ?????. It is an ontological statement, which underlies the doctrine that all things are composed of ?? and ?? ?? (1089a5-6). The fact "that things that differ must be the same in some respect" implies "that there must be some one thing in which they differ", otherwise they would be simply and absolutely 'other'.

1055a11-12. and that is complete beyond which nothing can be found.

(3) ??????? seems to be varia lectio to ?????, cf. ll. 25-26.

1055b34-35. unless we are proceeding on a prior assumption and asking.

(1) unless we are asking on a prior assumption. (omitting ???)

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (625. 10-11): ?? ?????? ????? ??? ?????????? ??????? ???? ?? ??????? ?????? ???’ ?? ?????????.

In his apparatus criticus Ross asks: "??? an omittendum?". It was already omitted by Argyropulus: "nisi ex suppositione quaerentes".

Jaeger: "cf. ?????? … ?? ????????? Alexandri paraphrasis."

1056a14-15. but rather it always has something intermediate between its own terms. (J)

(1) but rather it must itself have something intermediate. (according to Jaeger)

(2) Jaeger proposes to read: ???? ?????? ????? ??? ???? ?? ??????.

(3) ??? seems rather pointless here, and since ??? and ??? were easy to confuse, there is no objection to Jaeger's proposal.

1056b14-15. the 'many' are in a sense said to be also 'much'. (according to Bonitz, who refers to Pseudo-Alexander)

(1) the 'many' are in a sense said to be 'much', and the 'much' 'many'. (according to Pseudo-Alexander)

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (629. 14-15): ????? ??? ??? ???? ?? ????? ??????? ??? ????, ??? ???????.

(3) From Pseudo-Alexander's paraphrasis it clearly appears that he must have read ???' ???? ?? ????? ??????? ??? ??? <????> ??? ?? ???? <?????>.

1056b21-22. or to compare the things that have been measured with the measure. (according to Jaeger)

(2) Argyropulus (anticipating Jaeger): "atque mensurata ad ipsam mensuram."

According to Jaeger (BBA 274), ?? ??????????? ???? ?? ?????? "is left hanging in the air, as long as not linked with ???? ??? ?? ??????????? by supplying ?????". "??? ?? ???????? is a variant reading to ??? ?? ???????????, probably caused by the ???????? ??? of the following clause."

Ross (ii 296): "Jaeger is no doubt right in treating ??? ?? ???????? as a gloss on ??? ?? ???????????, suggested by ???????? in l.23. Besides this he reads a colon after ?????, inserts ????? before ?? ???????????, and a comma after ??????. This produces a neat sentence, but is (I think) an unnecessary departure from the evidence."

(3) ????? ??? at the beginning of a clause, without a preceding ?????, ??????? or ??, occurs very seldom, but two times in our present book I, here and 1052b14-15. The real difficulty is that ??? ?? ??????????? ???? ?? ?????? cannot depend on ?????. Hence Ross is forced to supply an additional verb, 'compare'. Since, furthermore, ????? refers exclusively to ??? ?? ??????????? ???? ?? ??????, everything speaks for Jaeger's reading ??? <?????> ?? ??????????? ???? ?? ?????? [??? ?? ????????].

1057a10-11. that all knowledge is knowable, but not all that is knowable is knowledge.

(1) that all knowledge is of a knowable, but not all the knowable is relative to actual knowledge. (suspected by Ross)

(2) Fonseca: "Nam scibile potest esse sine scientia (quo pacto multae res sciri poterunt antequam de illis scientia esset inventa) non item scientia sine scibili: quandoquidem et ipsa scientia scibile quoddam est, cum sub scientiam cadere possit."

Ross (ii 297-298): "The sentence [1057a9-12] is difficult; the alleged fact (????????? ??) is surprising in itself, and does not stand in a proper antithesis to what ‘one might suppose' (?????? ??? ??? ??). The expression is loose, but the point (if the reading be right) seems to be this: Knowledge might be thought to be the measure of the knowable (a free rendering of Protagoras’ maxim), but in point of fact, while all knowledge must be knowable, not all that is knowable is actually known or knowledge. The point is stated more accurately in Cat. 7b22-35, where as here the relation of the knowable to knowledge is distinguished from the relation of a genuine ???? ?? term to its correlative. Cf. 1053a31-35. The doctrine of the identity of knowledge with its object (De An. 430a4, &c.), to which Alexander and Bonitz refer, does not seem to be relevant.

I suspect, however, that we should read ????????? ??? ????? ????????? ????? ?? ?? ????????? ?? ??? ???? ?????????,'that all knowledge is of a knowable, but not all the knowable is relative to actual knowledge'. This agrees better with Cat. 7b29 ????????? ??? ??? ?? ????? ??? ????? ???????? (??????? ??? ????? ????????), ????????? ?? ?? ????? o???? ?????? ????????? ?????, ???? ??? ? ??? ?????? ????????????? ???? ????? ?????????, ???????? ??? ????? ??? ????? ??????, ????? ?? ????????? ?????."

(3) Compared with the reading proposed by Ross, the text as it stands is the lectio difficilior, but perfectly well understandable. Knowledge becomes knowable by being something 'determinate' (?????????, Eudemian Ethics, 1245b1-3), which is located in the 'column' (?????????) of the good (cf. Metaphysics, 1072a34-35). The sphere of the knowable and the good is thought to be larger than that of knowledge. To this context probably belong two fragments from lost dialogues, Politicus and On Prayer: "The good is the most accurate measure of all things" (?????? ??? ???????????? ?????? ??????? ?????, Syrianus, 168. 33-35), and "God is either intellect or something even beyond intellect" (? ???? ? ???? ????? ? ???????? ?? ??? ???, Simplicius, in De Caelo 485. 19-22).

1057a24-25. and in colours if we were to pass from white to black. (according to Christ)

(2) Christ: "24 ???? inclusi, supplendum fuit ?????????? [from l. 23]."

1057b4-5. And if there is to be a genus in such a way that it is something prior to the contraries.

(2) Bonitz (in his apparatus criticus): "fortasse ?????."

(3) There is nothing wrong with the future, which is correctly translated by Ross. Cf. for example 1011b11-12, 1022b9, 1031a31, 1032a2-3, b7. 20.

1057b5-7. the differentiae which constituted the contrary species-of-a-genus will be contraries prior to the species.

(1) the differentiae which are to constitute the contrary species-of-a-genus will be contraries prior to the species. (writing ??????????)

(2) Ross (in his apparatus criticus): "?????????? scripsi."

1057b37-38. For by genus I mean that one identical thing which is predicated of both. (EJ)

(1) For by genus I mean that thing in virtue of which both are called identical. (Ab)

(2) Jaeger: "cf. 1054b30."

1058b12-13. Neither do a brazen and a wooden circle, then, differ in species.

(2) Bonitz (1842, p. 125): "Conjuncta esse oportet ea, quae quum et materia et notione differant, non propter materiae diversitatem sed propter notionis differentiam specie diversa censeantur. Scribendum igitur videtur ???? ??????? ?? ?????? ??? ??????? ????????, ???? ???????? ??????? ??? ?????? ??????? ???."

Ross (ii 304): "The substitution of a colon for a comma before ???? does away with any need for Bonitz’s emendaion, ??????? ???????? for ???????. 'The bronze circle and the wooden circle, then, do not differ in kind; nor do the bronze triangle and the wooden circle differ in kind because of their matter, but because of the contrariety in their definitions’, i. e. between triangle and circle."

1058b16-17. For why is this horse other than this man in species.

(2) Ross (ii 304): "????? ???????? would (I think) be unparalleled in Aristotle, and the addition of ??? is necessary."

(3) The computer too does not find any parallel.

1058b30-31. so that it might be thought not to be necessary that every imperishable thing should be different from every perishable thing in form. (reading, with the recentiores, ???? instead of ?? ??)

(1) but perhaps it might be thought not to be necessary that every imperishable thing should be different from every perishable thing in form. (according to Jaeger)

(2) Jaeger: "???? ?? correxi, ?? ?? codices vestigium veri servantes: ???? E ?? recentiores vili conjectura."

Book XI

1059a23. what sort of sciences are those with which it is to be identified?

(1) My proposal: which principle does this science (Wisdom) investigate?

(3) Comparison with 996b1-3 shows that we have to read ????? ??? ?????? ??????, ?????? being related to ????? as ?????? in l. 25.

1059a25-26. what sort of sciences must these be said to be?

(1) My proposal: which principle does this science (Wisdom) investigate?

(3) There is no parallel in book iii, because Aristotle, after asking in 996b26-27 the same question as in 1059a23-24, turns off into the more special question "whether the same science deals with them (the starting-points of demonstration) as with substance". Here, however, the general question is maintained; therefore the problem must be again ????? ??? ?????? [not ??????] ???????;

1059a26. Further, does Wisdom investigate all substances or not?

(1) Further, does one science investigate all substances or not? (according to Pseudo-Alexander)

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (634. 35): ??? ????? ??? ?????? ??? ????? ???????? ? ??;

Bonitz (1848, p. 194): "ante ????? fortasse addendum ??? ex Alexandro et Aristotele p. 997a15."

(3) From the next two sentences it appears that 'Wisdom' is to be supplied as subject.

1059a27. it is hard to say which [substances Wisdom does investigate].

(1) My proposal: it is hard to say which [substance Wisdom does investigate].

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (634. 36-37): ?? ??? ??? ?? ???? ??? ????? ??? ??????, ????? ?????? ???? ???? ??????? ?????????.

(3) Here again, ????? (instead of ?????) is the right reading, cf. 997a17. The alternative ?? ??? ??? ?? ????? (ll. 26-27) must be meant as avoiding the difficulty "how the same science can embrace several subject-matters" (ll. 28-29).

1059a32-34. If we think of it as demonstrative, the science of the attributes is Wisdom, but if as dealing with what is primary, the science of substances claims the title.

(1) If Wisdom is demonstrative, it is the science of the attributes; if it is dealing with what is primary, the science of substances claims the title. (according to Jaeger)

(2) Christ: "????? inclusi, supplendum est ????????."

Ross (ii 308): "Christ has rightly found ? ??????????? ????? impossible, and therefore brackets ?????, but Luthe’s ? ??? … ? ?? for ? ??? … ? ?? is manifestly a better alteration of the text. Qua demonstrative, the knowledge of properties might be thought to be ????? (since knowledge is often identified with demonstration); but qua dealing with ?? ?????, the knowledge of substances might seem to be so. Luthe’s reading is established by the parallel in 996b10-14."

Jaeger writes: ?? ??? ??? ??????????? <?> ?????, ? ???? ?? ???????????? ?? ?? ???? ?? ?????, ? ??? ??????.

(3) Jaeger's ?? … ?? is better than Luthe's ? … ?; the alleged 'parallel' 996b10-14 is no instance, because there it is presupposed that Wisdom has both characteristics.

1059a35. For it does not deal with the final cause.

(2) Bonitz (1849, p. 453): "pro particula ???? scribendum videtur ????, quoniam nihil sequitur, quod ad ???? referatur."

Décarie (1972, p. 126 n.): "Remembering the fact that the causa efficiens is mentioned in B, 2, 996a22, we rather would believe that a second ???? denying the existence of the causa efficiens in the unmoved beings, should respond to the one of l. 35, but was forgotten in the course of the long parenthesis."

(3) Kühner/Gerth (ii 288) quote another example (Lysias 25, 14), where the speaker had in mind a continuation with a second ????, but switched over to another construction after a long parenthesis.

1060a21-22. And it would seem rather that the form or shape is a more important principle than this.

(1) And it would seem that the form or shape is principle in a higher degree and in a more proper sense than this. (according to Argyropulus)

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (639. 10): ?????? ????? ?? ????? ????.

Argyropulus ("atque forma potius quam haec principium propriusve videbitur esse") and Bessarion ("magis itaque ac principalius ea videatur esse principium species et forma") read ??? ??????????.

Christ: "fortasse ??? ?????????."

(3) Apparently, ???? ????????? has a parallel in 1075b18-19, but ?????? … ????????? is strange. More natural is ?????? … ??? ??????????, in analogy to ????????? … ??? ??????? (Categories, 2a11-12, Nicomachean Ethics, 1098b14-15). ?????? … ??? ?????????? occurs in Theodorus Gaza, Adversus Plethonem pro Aristotele de substantia, 2, 4, 12-13: ??? ?? ???? ?? ?? ???????? ?????? ?? ??? ?????????? ??? ??????? ???? ?? ?????, a text which may be partly inspired by our passage (1060a20-22).

1060b4. all things that are are substances.

(1) all things that are will be substances. (according to Bonitz)

(2) Bonitz (1842, pp. 63-64): "Duo enuntiationis membra, quibus dilemma conficitur, ita sibi inter se respondent, ut necessario tempus futurum sententiae unice aptum, quod est in priore, idem etiam in posteriore requiramus ????' ????? ?????? ?? ???? […]. Fidem emendationi nostrae addit commentarius Alexandri [639. 36 - 640. 2], qui futurum ????? in textu habuisse videtur ?? ?? ????? ????? ??? ?? ?? ??? ?? ??, ??? ??? ????? ????, ????? ??????? ??????. - - ????? ?? ????? ???????????? ?????? ???????, ??? ????? ??? ?? ????? ??? ?? ????? ??? ?? ?????? ?????????? ??????."

1060b4-5. for being is predicated of all things (and unity also of some).

(1) My proposal: for being and unity are predicated of all things.

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (640. 2-6): ?? ?? ??’ ????? ??? ??? ?? ?? ???????????? ?? ???????? ??????????, ???? ??? ???? ???????? ??? ?? ?????. ?? ??? ??? ??????? ?????, ?? ?? ?? ??????? ??? ?? ?? ?? ?????, ? ??????? ?? ????? ? ??????? ???? ???????, ??? ????? ???· ?????? ??? ??? ??? ???????.

Ross (ii 311): "Really everything that is is one (1061a18); ????? is used by way of caution. Alexander explains ????? as meaning all things but numbers, but this is unlikely."

(3) I propose to read ???? ?????? ??? ?? ?? <??? ?? ??> ???????????? [???' ????? ?? ??? ?? ??]. ???' ????? ?? ??? ?? ?? must be the gloss of a reader who, after ??? ?? ?? had dropped out, drew the conclusion that it is only 'being' that is "predicated of all things". The excuses offered by Pseudo-Alexander and Ross are too weak.

1060b30. all things will be the same.

(1) real things will be just of the same number as the principles (according to Cherniss, cf. 1086b21-22)

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (641. 7): ?? ??? ??? ??????, ?? ????? ?????.

Cherniss (1944, p. 340 n.): "read ????? or ???????, cf. 1000a3, 1086b21".

Jaeger: "fortasse ?? ????? ????? cum Alexandri paraphrasi scribendum."

(3) It is known that the authenticity of book xi is controversial. Now if the reading ????? (adopted by Ross and Jaeger) was original, the case could be decided on the basis of this very passage: for it would mean that the author has ridiculously misunderstood the question raised in book iii, 999b24-1000a4, whether the principles are "one in kind only" or "numerically one": namely in the way that there is either a species 'principle' containing a multitude of singular ones, or only one singular principle. The second alternative assumed, the consequence could be deduced that "all things will be the same". If we refuse to believe the author capable of such a stupidity, we have to adopt Cherniss's recommendation ???????, which can be easily restored from ???????, the reading of E.

1061b10. in so far as they [the things we have named] are being. (E)

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (645. 24-25): ???? ???????? ??? ????????? ????? ?????????? ??? ????? ??? ??? ???????? ??????????? ? ???? ?????.

Jaeger: "????? correxi: ????? Ab: ????? J: ???' E sed duae literae post ?' erasae, igitur syllaba -??? vel -??? ab omnibus tradita videtur; cf. 1027b29, 1028b7."

4) There is nothing wrong with the text of E ???' ???? ???' ????? (scil. ?? ????????), which exactly responds to l. 6 ? ???? (scil. ?? ??????????? ??? ?? ???????????).

1062a12-13. for if this does not happen how are they to join in argument with one another? (according to Pseudo-Alexander)

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (649. 17-19): ?? ????????? ??? ?????? […] ??? ?? ???????????? ?????;

1062b6-7. the whole taken as an affirmation will be no more true than the negation.

(2) Ross (ii 317): "????? ?????? ? ???????? ? ?? ???? ?? ?? ????????? ????????? ??????????? gives just the opposite of the right sense. The simplest emendation is to transpose ? to before ?, where it would easily have dropped out. A less probable alternative is to read ????? for ??????."

Jaeger (contra Ross): "sed cf. ad 985b9; hunc usum illustravi exemplis Hermes 52. 486-8."

(3) In our note to 985b9 we have seen that Jaeger's "examples" are irrelevant.

1062b26-29. Since, then, white cannot come to be if the perfectly white and in no respect not-white existed before, that which becomes white must come from that which is not white. (according to Bonitz)

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (653. 5-6): ???? ???, ?????, ?? ?????? ??????? ?? ?????? ?????? ????? ??? ?????? ?? ??????.

Schwegler (ii 216): "After ?? ?????? ????????, ?? seems to have dropped out."

Bonitz (1849, p. 461): "Ratiocinatio, qua Aristoteles putat adversarios principii in errorem deductos, haec videtur esse: Non posse quidquam fieri ex non-ente constat inter omnes physicae disciplinae magistros. Jam vero nihil fit album (???? ??? ?? ?????? ???????? i. e. ???? ??? ?? ???????? ??????, non est conjungenda particula negativa ?? cum adjectivo ??????, ut vult Alexander, tum enim scriptum esset ?? ??????), si jam plane et ubique est album; fit igitur album ex non-albo. Ergo consequens esse illi putant, ut ex non-ente fieri judicetur, quoniam fit ex non-albo, nisi id quod est non-album idem esse album concesserimus. Haec, quae necessaria videtur esse, sententia neque ex ipsis verbis repeti, nec leni emendatione restitui potest. Negationem ?? a28 post ?????????? omittendam esse satis probabile videbitur; sed ne sic quidem enuntiatum explicari potest, nisi praeterea verba ??? ?? ??????????? ?? ?????? expunxerimus, quae possunt e proximis verbis ?? ?????????? ?? ?????? falso transpositis orta esse, ut haec exsistat enuntiati forma: ???? ??? ?? ?????? ???????? ?????? ?????? ????? ??? ?????? ?? ??????, ???????' ?? ?? ?? ????? ?????? ?? ?????????? ?????? ???' ?? ?? ????? ???. Sed lubricum hac in re judicium, quum libri manuscripti non praebeant talem variam lectionem, ex qua conjectura videatur repeti posse; Alexander manifesto eundem habuit textum, qui nunc vulgatur, et in eo explicando copiose nugatur."

Ross (ii 318-319): "‘Since, then, white does not come to be if the perfectly white and in no wise not white existed before, that which becomes white must come from that which is not white; so that it will come from what is not, according to them, unless the same thing was white and not white.’ In the first clause the general sense shows that ?? goes with ????????, not with ??????, and the use of ??, not ??, confirms this interpretation. ??? ?? ??????????? ?? ?????? is not only unmeaning in itself, but spoils the structure of the sentence, since the apodosis should begin with ???????' ??. ???? but rarely introduces an apodosis except after a parenthesis. Bonitz is therefore right in suggesting that ??? … ?????? should be excised. These words look like a gloss by a copyist who took ?? ?????? together in l. 26. Bonitz is also right in suggesting the excision of ?? after ??????????. An alternative would be to insert ?? before ??????, where it is read by E (in margine) ?; but there seems to be no reason why the case of the not-white comin g from the not-not-white should be substituted for the simpler case of the white coming from the not-white.

The argument then is:

Nothing can come to be from what is not.

The white comes to be from the not-white.

Therefore the not-white m ust also have been white."

Jaeger writes ????? ??????, assuming that ??? got lost by haplography (??????).

1063a6-9. For to maintain the view we are opposing is just like maintaining that the things that appear to people who put their finger under their eye and make the object appear two instead of one must be two (because they appear to be of that number) and again one. (EJ)

(1) For this is just like maintaining that the things that appear to people who put their finger under their eye and make the object appear two instead of one must be two (because they appear to be of that number) and again one. (according to Jaeger)

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (654. 32-33): ????? ????? ???????? ??? ?????? ??, ?????? ??? ???????? ???????? ??? ??????? ??? ????, ?? ?? ??? ??? ????????, ?? ?? ?? ????, ????? ?? ????.

Ross (ii 319): "The unintelligible vulgate reading ??? ?' ????? has been produced by haplography from the correct ??? ???? ????? preserved in J?. ?? ????????? … ??? ???? ????? is the object of ?????? understood."

Jaeger writes ????? ??? ?????? [?], based on Ab and Pseudo-Alexander.

1063a13-15. For in pursuing the truth one must start from the things that are always in the same state and suffer no change.

(2) Jaeger: "????? scripsi. cf. 1009a34."

(3) ?? ??? ??? ???? ????? ??????? is good Platonic language (Phaedo 78 C 6, 79 A 9. D 5, Sophist 248 A 12). Jaeger, who regarded book xi as a document of an early 'Platonizing' period (Aristotle, pp. 209-210), should have been happy with this reading.

1063a37-b6. For to them also, because they are not in the same condition as when they were well, sensible qualities do not appear alike; yet, for all that, the sensible things themselves need not share in any change, though they produce different, and not identical, sensations in the sick. And the same must surely happen to the healthy if the afore-said change takes place.

(1) For as to them, because they are not in the same condition as when they were well, sensible qualities do not appear alike; yet, for all that, the sensible things themselves need not share in any change, though they produce different, and not identical, sensations in the sick, the same must surely happen to the healthy if the afore-said change takes place. (according to Pseudo-Alexander)

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (656. 25-28): ?? ??? ???? ???????? ??? ?? ?? ?????? ????? ??? ???? ??? ?? ???????? ??? ???????? ??? ???????? ??? ?????? ????????? ?? ???? ??? ????????? ??? ??? ???????? ?????????? ?????????, ??? ????? ?? ?????? ????????? ????? ?????.

Jaeger: "?? ??? Alexandri paraphrasis an recte?"

(3) A passage to be compared with ?? ??? … ??? ????? ?? ?????? would be 1061a28-b3 ??????? ?' … ??? ????? ?? ??????.

1964a36-b1. and this must be the first and most dominant principle.

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (661. 9-11): ??? ????? ????, ????, ????? ??? ??????? ??????? ??? ????????, ??????? ?? ??? ??? ??? ?? ?????, ????????? ???? ?? ??? ? ????, ?? ????? ? ????? ??? ????????? ????.

Bonitz (in his apparatus criticus): "fortasse ??? ? cum Alexandro."

(3) ??? most probably comes from ???? by haplography.

1064b23-27. And as for the argument that 'when he who is musical becomes lettered he'll be both at once, not having been both before; and that which is, not always having been, must have come to be; therefore he must have at once become musical and lettered', - this none of the recognized sciences considers. (excising l. 23 ???? ???????? ??? ???????????)

(1) And that 'when he who is musical becomes lettered he'll be both at once, not having been both before; and that which is, not always having been, must have come to be; therefore he must have at once become musical and lettered', - this too none of the recognized sciences considers. (additionally deleting ?? in l. 26, and adding ???? before ?????)

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (663. 20-21): ??? ????? ??????????? ?? ????? ??????? ????? ??? ????????????? ????? ????????? ??? ?? ????.

Bonitz (1849, p. 464): "Nihil desideraveris, si haec verba [???? ???????? ??? ???????????] omissa sint, ut omittuntur ab Alexandro; sin retinentur in textu, mutanda vel supplenda quin sint aliquo modo, non est dubium. Itaque secutus vestigia codicis T editionis Aldinae Sylburgianae Bessarionis scribendum proposui: ???? ?? ???????? ??? ???????????. Eundem in sensum, sed a vulgata lectione longius recedens, Schweglerus haec verba suppleri vult, recepta lectione libri E 2. 1026b16: ???? ??????? ?????? ? ?????? ???????? ??? ???????????. Sed utut haec verba probabiliter restitueris, ut possit enuntiatio juste construi, punctum post ??????????? 26 delendum, et particula ?? vel delenda cum Alexandro, vel mutanda in ?? videtur."

Bonitz, Index (p. 167a24-26: "post interjectam parenthesin interdum, perinde atque ???, ??, particula ?? adhibetur."

Ross (ii 323): "It seems best to excise ???? ???????? ??? ???????????, which is omitted in Alexander and was probably inserted by a reader who wished to indicate briefly the sophistical question mentioned in the corresponding passage of E — ??????? ?????? ? ?????? ???????? ??? ??????????? (?. 1026b16, where see n.). ???? ???????? ??? ??????????? will not stand by itself, an d if these words be retained we must introduce after ???? either ?? with Bonitz, ?? with Christ, or (best) ?? ?? with Bullinger."

Jaeger: "sed ex altera recensione E 1026b11 lacunam ante ???? ???????? exstare suspicor velut <???' ?? ?? ?????????? ???? ?? ?????? ? ??????>."

Ross (ii 323): "Bonitz brackets ??, and as an alternative suggests ??. But ?? is justified by the passages quoted in Bonitz Index 167a24-34."

(3) The accusative ??? ???? ???????? (l. 24) depends on ????? (l. 27), being proleptic (cf. our note on 1044a2-4). ????? (l. 26) continues the ???? in l. 23, the following ?? spoils this connection. ???? … ??????? is double (in the sense of reinforced) negation, cf. e. g. 1039a18-19 and 1040a8. This ???? should be iterated before ?????; then we get a rhetorical epanalepsis as in On the Soul, 427b8-11 (???’ ???? ?? ?????, ?? ? ???? ?? ????? ??? ?? ?? ?????, ?? ??? ????? ???????? ??? ???????? ??? ???? ??????, ?? ?? ?? ????? ???????? ?????? - ???? ????? ???? ????? ?? ???????????), Politics, 1261b16-18 (???? ??? ???' ?? ????? ??????? ????, ?? ???? ??? ??????’ ????? ??? ?????????, ???? ????' ????????????? ???????? ???? ??? ?????) or Plato, Apology, 19 DE (???? ?’ ?? ????? ???????? ?? ??? ????????? ???????? ????????? ??? ??????? ?????????, ???? ????? ??????).

1064b37-1065a1. but this occurs neither always and of necessity, nor for the most part. (secluding ??)

(3) Cf. l. 35 ???' ???.

1065a21-22. As to that which 'is' in the sense of being true or of being by accident.

(2) Ross (ii 323): "The insertion of ?? after ??? in most of the manuscripts and Alexander is doubtless due to the previous corruption of ?????? into ??????. ?? ???? ?????????? would be a proper synonym for the latter. Strict grammar would require ?? ???? ??????????, but for the omission of the article cf. Pol. 1280b15, Poet. 1459b2, 37, &c. There is no reason to suspect, with Bonitz, that the true reading is ?? ?' ?? ?????? ?? ??? ??, ??? ?? ???? ??????????."

Book XII

1069a21-22. At the same time these latter are not even being in the full sense, but are qualities and movements of it. (EJ)

(1) At the same time these latter are not even being in the full sense, e. g. qualities and movements. (according to Pseudo-Alexander)

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (669. 24-27): ??? ??????????????? ????? ??? ?’ ???’ ???? ????? ?? ?????? ?????, ????? ????? ??? ???? ??? ?????? ??????????. ????? ?? ??? ??????? ?????????, ???? ???? ?? ???? ??? ??????, ????????, ???? ????????? ????????.

Jaeger: "?????, ???? cum Alexandri citatione scripsi (cf. 24). […] ????? et ????? sunt variae lectiones quarum altera ???? repressit ut videtur."

1069a30-36. There are three kinds of substance—one that is sensible (of which one subdivision is eternal and another is perishable; the latter is recognized by all men, and includes e.g. plants and animals), of which we must grasp the elements, whether one or many; and another that is immovable. (according to Alexander)

(1) My proposal: There are three kinds of substance: one that is sensible, of which one subdivision is eternal and another is perishable [which is recognized by all men, and includes e.g. plants and animals] [of which we must grasp the elements, whether one or many]; and another that is immovable.

(2) Alexander in Averroes (p. 72 Genequand): "Alexander says: one must not understand by that [?? ?????? ?? ???????? ??????] the substance subject to generation and corruption, but the two substances: sensible and subject to generation, and not subject to generation."

Bonitz (1842, pp. 104-105): "Quod enim dicit ?? ?????? ??????????? non pertinere ad eam unice substantiam sensibilem, quae corruptioni obnoxia est, sed omnino ad sensibilem substantiam, aperte docemur principio octavi libri ?, 1 [1042a6-11]. Pertinet igitur caelum cum partibus suis, ea est autem substantia sensibilis aeterna, ad id substantiarum genus, de quo inter omnes convenit."

Ross (ii 350): "But the eternity of the heavenly bodies was not universally admitted, and ?? ?????? ??????????? might well here be said only of terrestrial bodies."

Oehler (1955, p. 71 n.): "That ?? ?????? ???????????, contrary to the opinion of Ross, is to be referred not only to the ?????? ?????, but to the whole ??????? ????? appears from Metaphysics ? 1042a6-11 and 24-26. Besides, the ?????? find their opposite in the following ?????."

Frede (2000, pp. 79-80, also contra Ross): "This seems to me to be wrong on two counts: (i) the relevant point here is not whether it was universally agreed that celestial bodies are eternal, but whether they were treated as substances. And Aristotle talks of the Presocratics in this context as if they did treat all sensible bodies as substances, and hence also the celestial bodies. (ii) Aristotle in 1069b3ff. proceeds on the assumption that sensible substances, including celestial bodies, are generally agreed to be substances. Hence we should presume that this is the assumption he introduces in 1069a31."

Jaeger on 1069a32 ? ?' ??????: "omittit Alexander genuinus (sed ????????) apud Averroem et Themistium, seclusit Freudenthal." Additional confirmation is provided by the Arabian translation Matta from the 10th century (Walzer 224).

(3) The two relative clauses 31 ?? ... ??? 32 and 32-33 ?? … ????? are later additions, equally referring to l. 30 ??????? as the preceding one l. 30 ?? ... 31 ??????: it is the ??????? ????? which is "recognized by all men as substance" (?, 1042a24-25), and it is the "principles of the ???????" which are treated in the section 1069b3-34 (v. the recapitulation 1071b1-2). These three clauses compete with each other; since the first one (ll. 30-31) is supported by the reference made in l. 36 (???????), the other two ones have to be ruled out.

1069a36-b2. The former two kinds of substance are the subject of physics (for they imply movement); but the third kind belongs to another science, if there is no principle common to it and to the other kinds.

(3) More exact would be: "if there is no one principle …". ??????? implies a plurality of principles; if 'no one' of them is shared with physics, the science of the unmoved substance cannot be part of physics. The underlying assumption is that every science has its own principles, which do not overlap with those of other sciences.

This is in accordance with Posterior Analytics, I 28 (87a39-b1: ????? ?' ???????? ????? ??????, ???? ?? ????? ???' ?? ??? ????? ???' ?????? ?? ??? ??????), but here we learn that the alternative, which depends on the conditional clause, is between 'other' and 'superior', v. Ross's commentary (p. 397): "When the premisses of two pieces of reasoned knowledge are derived from the same ultimate principles, we have two coordinate parts of one science; when the premisses of one are derived from the premisses of the other, we have a superior and a subaltern branch of the same science." Ross refers to 78b34-79a16, where we are given examples of subordination within the one science of mathematics: optics to geometry, mechanics to stereometry, harmonics to arithmetic.

With divinatory instinct, Thomas Aquinas already avoids the (seemingly cogent) alternative 'physics or another science': on one hand, he believes that there is a common principle (being and substance), on the other hand he maintains that it is metaphysics which considers it (Sententia Metaphysicae, liber 12 lectio 2 numerus 4: "Substantia autem separabilis et immobilis pertinet ad considerationem alterius scientiae, et non ad eamdem, si tamen nullum principium sit commune utrisque substantiis: quia si in aliquo conveniant, pertinebit utrarumque substantiarum consideratio ad illam scientiam, quae illud commune considerat. Et ideo naturalis scientia considerat solum de substantiis sensibilibus, inquantum sunt in actu et in motu. Et ideo tam de his etiam quam de substantiis immobilibus considerat haec scientia, inquantum communicant in hoc quod sunt entia et substantiae.")

The commentators who accept the alternative 'physics - another science' have to deny that there is a common principle (because it is out of question that the unmoved substance cannot be treated by the science which is limited to the study of motion), in contradiction to 1072b1-3. Düring (p. 190 n.) briefly remarks: "The clause is to be interpreted as meaning that motion is the principle for the former two, immobility for the latter one." By eliminating the plurality of principles implied in the question (see above!) he fails from the start to pose the problem correctly.

Nevertheless it must be admitted that the philosophically satisfying interpretation is not supported by the text. After ll. 1069a36sq., the reader is certain that the unmoved substance belongs to 'another' science, and feels perplexed by the following conditional clause which makes him uncertain again. From where should he know that he has to distinguish between 'another' and 'superior', all the more so because in On the Heavens (III 1, 298b19-20 ?? ??? ????? ???? ??? ????? ??????? ??? ???? ??????? ?????? ????? ?????? ??? ???????? ? ??? ??????? ???????) and On coming-to-be and passing-away (I 3, 318a5-6: … ???? ??? ??? ???????? ????? ??? ?????? ??? ???????? ??????? ???? ?????????? ?????) 'another' goes with 'superior'?

All this speaks in favor of deleting the crucial clause, which has the typical characteristics of an interpolation: not wrong in itself, but incompatible with the logic of the passage.

1069b5. for the voice is not-white.

(1) for the voice too is not-white. (according to Pseudo-Alexander)

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (671. 32): ??????? ??? ??? ? ???? ?? ?????.

1069b21-23. for instead of 'all things were together' - and the 'Mixture' of Empedocles and Anaximander and the account given by Democritus - it is better to say 'all things were together potentially but not actually'. (E ????????)

(1) for instead of 'all things together'—and the 'Mixture' of Empedocles and Anaximander and the account given by Democritus - it was better for us to say 'all things potentially but not actually'. (EJAb)

(2) Argyropulus: "melius enim hoc dicere quam omnia simul esse et Empedoclis item mixtum atque Anaximandri et ut Democritus inquit erat nobis potentia cuncta non tamen actu."

Jackson (pp. 139-140): "In this passage Aristotle's conception of matter as ??????? ??? ?? ?? ?? ?? ????????, 'what is potentially existent but not actually', is brought face to face with the primitive conceptions of Anaxagoras, Empedocles, Anaximander, and Democritus. So much is clear. But when we come to details, several perplexing questions present themselves. In particular, (a) why does Aristotle—who at ? VIII 989b17 identifies, Anaxagoras' ???? with ?? in the Platonic sense of the word and his ?????????? with ??????? - here assert that ?? is a better description of the ?????????? than ???? ?????? (b) by what right does Aristotle (implicitly) use ????? to describe the material principle of Anaximander, which, if he was a monist, was certainly not a ?????? (c) what does Aristotle mean by ascribing to Democritus the doctrine that ?? ???? ????? ??????? ???????? ?' ??? and, finally, (d) would it not seem that the addition of the words ??????? ???????? ?' ?? is exactly what ought to reconcile Aristotle to Anaxagoras' theory of the material cause?

It seems to me that these difficulties have their origin in the assumption of the commentators that the proposition ??????? ??? ? ???? ????? is a parenthetical sentence having for its subject ?? ??. For my own part, I believe (1) that the subject of the proposition ??????? ??? ? ???? ????? is, not ??, but ?? ???? ????? ??????? ???????? ?' ?? in line 23: (2) that, for ??, ?? should be substituted: (3) that ???????????? and [140] ???????????? are governed, not by ?? ?????, but by ?? ??, so that ?? ?????, in apposition to ?? ??, refers to Empedocles alone: (4) that the words ????????????, ?? ?????, ??? ????????????, ??? ?? ?????????? ????? parenthetically appended to ?? ?????????? ??, indicate that the doctrines of Empedocles, Anaximander, and Democritus, should be amended in the same way as the doctrine of Anaxagoras, namely, by a distinct admission that the material principle, in its elemental state, is no more than potentially existent.

I write then - ??? ????' ???? ?? ?????????? ??? ??????? ??? ? ???? ????? (??? ????????????, ?? ?????, ??? ????????????, ??? ?? ?????????? ?????) ?? ???? ????? ??????? ???????? ?' ??: and I understand Aristotle to say - 'and this is Anaxagoras' ?? ??; for ?? ???? ????? ??????? ???????? ?' ?? is a better statement of Anaxagoras' meaning than ???? ????? without the qualifying words: and similar supplements would help to a better appreciation of the teaching of Empedocles, Anaximander, and Democritus. Thus these philosophers must have grasped the notion of a material cause'.

It will be seen that with my text (a) Aristotle no longer seeks to force upon Anaxagoras a technical use of ??: (b) the principle of Anaximander is no longer absurdly spoken of as a ?????: (c) the doctrine ?? ???? ????? ??????? ???????? ?' ?? is no longer absurdly foisted upon Democritus: (d) the words ?? ???? ????? ??????? ???????? ?' ?? take their proper place as Aristotle's improved presentation of Anaxagoras' doctrine.

For the phrase ??? ?? ?????????? ???? compare ? VI 1071b26 ?????? ?? ?? ???????? ?? ???????? ?? ?? ?????? ?????????, ? ?? ?? ??????? ?? ???? ????? ??????? ????, ?? ???? ????????. de gen. et corr. ? I 329a13 ?? ?' ?? ?? ?????? ????????? ?????? ???? ?????????. ? I 329b1 ????? ??? ??? ?????????? ??? ??????, ??? ??? ?? ?????????? ??? ?????? ????????. For the order of the words ??????? ??? ? ???? ????? … ?? ???? ????? ??????? ??????? ?' ??, compare de anima ? XII 435a5 ??? ??? ???? ??????????, ??????? ? ??? ???? ???????? ??????????, ??? ???? ??????? ??? ??? ???????? ??? ???????? ????? ??? ?? ?? ??? ?."

Ross (ii 351-352): "The first and the third point of Jackson’s interpretation seem to be right, but in two respects a view different from his seems preferable.

(1) ?? ?????????? ?? can be defended. It is true that ?? ?? does not seem to have been used by Anaxagoras as a technical name for his material principle. But that principle is called a ????? (Phys. 187a23, ?. 1012a28), and ?? ????? ?? ???????? ????? (De Sensu 447b10), so that ?? ?? is not an inappropriate name for it, and in Phys. 187a21 it is actually called ??. It is true that in contrast with ???? it may be opposed to ‘the one’, but in contrast with the various substances that come out of it it is properly called one.

(2) It is not necessary to take ???????????? ?? ????? ??? ???????????? in the awkward way in which Jackson takes it. It has commonly been thought necessary to apologize for, or explain away, the description of Anaximander’s ??????? as a ?????. Thus Zeller supposes that it is by an ‘easy zeugma’ that ?????, which is strictly applicable to Empedocles, is applied to Anaximander (i.6 279 n. 1), and Prof. Burnet at one time (Early Greek Philosophy2 59) regarded ??? ???????????? ?? ????? as an afterthought and held that ‘???????????? depended on ?? ?? (he now, ed. 3, p. 56, takes ???????????? to depend on ?? ?????.)."

Jaeger writes ?? ??? ????? ???????, referring to 1072b16, where the prima manus of E has ? ??? instead of ????.

de Ley (pp. 196-197): "Since the edition of Sir David Ross […] the meaning of this passage seems quite definitely established, viz. that ?? ???? ????? ???????… forms the subject of ??????? ??? (?????) and not the object of ?? ?????????? ?????. Yet the form of the sentence still poses some serious problems.

1. There is, in the first place, the parenthesis about Empedocles, Anaximander, and Democritus. Its function is clearly to extend the statement about Anaxagoras to all the important Presocratic physical theories. But why, then, place it here, so that it rudely interrupts the explanatory phrase after ??? ????' ???? …? That it should be intended to serve as an apposition of the second part of the comparison, viz. ? ???? ?????, is highly improbable: Aristotle, here, is not criticizing the theories of his predecessors, but only completing the sense (so he thinks) of an authentic utterance of one of them. On the other hand, the construction of this parenthesis (??? … ??? … ??? ?? ?????????? ?????) could not have been more defective. To reject it as an intrusive marginal note is not permitted, however, as the closing consecutive phrase is referring to a group of thinkers.

2. In the second place, the reading ???? in ?? ???? ????? ??????? …, accepted by Ross and all his predecessors, is based only on a conjecture in one of our manuscripts (sc. the Parisinus Graecus 1853), all the other offering ????. But a corruption of ???? into ???? is not a very probable one. Jaeger's correction, ?? ??? instead of ?? ???? seems to approximate far more closely to the archetype, as it is more acceptable from the point of view of palaeography as well as for the sense.

Nevertheless, as Jaeger, for the rest, accepts the text of Ross, his new reading is open to the following two objections: (1) it cannot explain very well the survival of ??; [footnote: "Jaeger, l. c., refers to 1072b16, but there the corruption of the original ???? ??? into ? ??? ??? is quite simple and does not explain that of ????? into ??????."] (2) as the particle ??? in ?? ??? has a conditional-confirmative function, i.e. the utterance quoted is accepted in a certain sense, it is surely strange that the verb which is thus stressed did not occur in the quotation which Aristotle is supposed to complete here. The more so as this [197] ',mixture' forms the primary matter of the cosmogonical systems of these philosophers and so refers to a moment in the past, a fact which is of a certain importance here, as Aristotle is not talking about the origin of the cosmos, but about matter and its change in general.

All the difficulties here exposed disappear, if we consider the parenthesis ??? ???????????? … to have been removed from the place it originally occupied, i.e. from after ?? ?????????? ??, and if we complete the quotation of Anaxagoras with its verb, viz. ?? (i.e. remove the ?? of the tradition) [Fußnote: "Cf. B 1 ???? ????? ??????? ?? … Cf. Met. 1056b29."]. So we obtain the following text: ??? ????' ???? ?? ?????????? ?? (??? ???????????? ?? ????? ??? ????????????, ??? ?? ?????????? ?????)? ??????? ??? ? '???? ????? ??' '?? ??? ????? ???????, ???????? ?' ??'? ???? ??? ???? ?? ???? ???????.

The fact that in this way the ???? ????? theory of Anaxagoras is quoted only after the mentioning of the other philosophers, does not form an objection. [footnote: "It may, on the contrary, explain the later removal of the parenthesis."] The plural of the ???? sentence, which clearly is meant to indicate the bearing of this 'rewording' of Anaxagoras' utterance, suggests that Aristotle uses the quotation from Anaxagoras (probably not finding in the others a more direct allusion to a 'mixture') as a testimony of the Presocratic cosmologies in general. This is proved by the fact that, furtheron [1071b27], when Aristotle returns to this same notion, he undistinctly speaks of of ?? ???????, i.e. without confining it there to Anaxagoras either."

(3) I cannot see what is wrong with the reading ??????? ??? … ?? ???? and Argyropulus' translation "melius enim hoc dicere … erat nobis". '?? ????' is a quite normal way of referring to something stated before, cf. Plato, Philebus 61 D 7 (?? ???? ????? ?? ??????, ?? ???????, ?????? ?????? ???? ??? ?? ??? ????? ?????? ???????????;), Laws 672 E 5. (??? ??? ??? ?????? ??? ????????? ?? ????) and 700 A 9 - B 1 (????????? ??? ?? ???? ?? ???? ? ??????? ???? ???? ?? ?????? ???? ??? ???????). The fact that this statement does not occur in book xii is not an argument in view of the fragmentary tradition. (Theiler, p. 97 n., thinks that the reference is to ???? ??????????.) The proposed emendations are based either on the paleographically implausible reading ???? or on Jaeger's ???, which is implausible psychologically (why should anyone have corrected this ??? to ?????).

1069b24-25. Now all things that change have matter, but different matter.

(2) Bonitz (1842, p. 125): "Immo potius alia aliam; nam, ut ait Aristoteles Phys. II, 2., ???? ????? ???? ???; ac de eadem re hoc ipso Metaphysicorum libro dicit cap. 5. p. 1071a5. […] 2. p. 1069b29. […], cf. 4. p. 1070a31, b26; 5. p. 1071a24. Inde nostro loco scribendum censeo ????? ?' ???? ???? ??? ??????????, ???' ????? ??????."

Goebel (1891, p. 16) rightly objects that the correct Greek would be ???? ?????, cf. Plato, Timaeus, 53 A 6.

Ross (ii 352): "Bonitz’s conjectural insertion of ????? appears not to be necessary. Schwegler’s parallels for ???’ ??????, A. 991b10, H. 1044a30, I. 1058b15, are not sound, but the use of ???? for ???? ????? in 1071a28 seems to be a good parallel."

1069b32. that must have come to be in actuality which the matter was in potency. (according to Schwegler)

(1) that must have come to be in actuality for which the matter was in potency. (EJAb)

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (674. 24-26): ?? ??? ?????? ??????? ????????, ?? ? ??? ?? ???????, ????????? ???? ??? ?? ?? ????????, ? ??????? ???????? ? ???, ???’ ?? ?????.

Schwegler (ii 240): "better ? [instead of ??]".

Bonitz (1849, p. 474): "nisi potius scribendum est: ? ? ??? ?? ???????, quamvis et codicibus et Alexandro invitis; vulgata enim verba non video quomodo construi grammatice possint."

The reading ? is confirmed by the Arabian translations Ustath and Matta (Walzer 224).

Ross (ii 353): "?? is explicable in the same way as ??? ????????, l. 28, so that Schwegler’s conjecture ? is unnecessary."

1070a9-10. the matter, which is a 'this' in appearance. (according to Alexander)

(1) My proposal: the matter, which is a 'this' by appearing like that.

(2) Alexander in Averroes (p. 95 Genequand): "Alexander says: he starts by saying about matter that "one is matter, which is 'this thing' insofar as it is seen". There are obscurities in this statement; its meaning is that there are three substances; one is matter, which is "this thing" when it receives its form and is defined; since it is then with the form, it is the form in actuality and it is visible here and now, whereas in its essence it is not visible. He says: alternatively, the meaning of this statement is that matter is "this thing" insofar as it is seen, for matter in itself and in reality is not "this thing", but it appears and is thought to be that by the fact that matter is present in everything, because it is the substratum."

Bonitz (1849, p. 476): "Materiam autem quod dicit esse ???? ??, i. e. definitum quidpiam, aperte repugnat aliis locis, veluti H 1. 1042a27: ???? ?? ???? ? ?? ???? ?? ???? ???????? ??????? ???? ???? ??. ? 3. 1029a20, 27. de an. II 1. 412a7, ubi his ipsis verbis ???? ?? materia esse negatur. Sed addit certe quod eam definitionem laxet quodammodo et excuset, ?? ?????????, i. e. materia non re vera, sed imaginationi tantum est ???? ??, quoniam potentiam habet ??? ????????? ???? ??. Ita obscurius idem videtur dixisse, quod H l. l. aptius definivit: ??????? ???? ???? ??."

Ross (ii 356): "None of the attempts at emending this phrase seems at all successful. It is possible to make something of it as it stands. Pseudo-Alexander [676. 19-20] interprets ?? ????????? as ???? ????????? [?? ?????????, ???????? ???? ?????????· ??????????? ??? ???, ?? ????? ??????? ? ????? ???? ????? ??? ?????? ??? ??????????? ????, ????????? ? ????????], and Bonitz follows him in supposing that the meaning is that matter is a ‘this’ to the eye of imagination, since it has the power of becoming a ‘this’. This interpretation of ?? ?????????, however, seems impossible, and it is better to adopt the simpler interpretation which, with others, is given by Alexander as quoted by Averroes, viz. ‘which is a «this» in appearance. I. e. to outward appearance the material parts of a whole as they lie side by side look like an individual thing, but if the organic unity is not there the appearance is deceptive (??? ??? ??? ??? ?? ????????, ??? ??? ???????????). Cf. ?. 1040b5 ??? ???????? ????? ?????? ?? ???????? ???????? ????, ?? ?? ????? ??? ???? … ??? ?? ??? ??? ??? ???.

It must be admitted, however, that this interpretation of ???? ?? ????????? as = ????????? ????? is not altogether satisfactory."

Jaeger: "an ? ??? ??? ?? <???????> ???? ?? ???? ??????????"

(3) Possibly Pseudo-Alexander has misunderstood his source (the genuine Alexander?), for ???? ????????? can mean 'in appearance', v. e. g. Galenus (De naturalibus facultatibus, ii 129, 9-12 Kühn): [they say] ??? ?????? ????? ?????? ??? ????? ?????, ?? ??? ??? ??????’ ???? ????????. ????????? ??? ?????? ????? ?? ???? ????????? ????? ??? ???? ???????.

According to Alexander and Ross we have to interpret ?? ????????? as dative of respect, equivalent to ???? ?? ?????????. As Ross rightly remarks, this interpretation "is not altogether satisfactory". It is based on the reflection that matter is not a 'this' in the full sense, and that the restricted sense can be expressed by a dative of respect, in analogy to ??????? in 1042a27-28. What is unsatisfactory is the necessity of taking ????????? in the narrow sense of 'outward appearance'.

The alternative (not yet considered) is interpreting ?? ????????? as dative of cause, equivalent to ??? ?? ?????????. This expression actually occurs in 1063a9, in a context where Aristotle is exposing the opinion of others. These thinkers who identified being with appearance are treated at length in book iii (1007b18-29, 1009a6 sqq.) and xi (1062a30-1063b35). Among them are Anaxagoras, Empedocles and Democritus, who, according to 1069b24, "seem to have had some notion of matter" (??? ???? ?? ???? ???????). Aristotle does not totally refuse the basis doctrine of those who deny the principle of contradiction: that one and the same thing behaves this way, that way; by his concept of matter he rather makes his tribute to it. Matter is the strange thing which in itself is nothing definite, but each time that what it appears to be.

A decisive objection would be that ll. 10-11 ??? ??? … ??????????? ("for all things that are characterized by contact and not, by organic unity are matter and substratum") can no longer be interpreted as giving the reason for ?? ?????????. But this sentence is clearly out of place here, for it implies that organic unity is the only one constituted by form, i. e. it anticipates the result of the following discussion. Moreover, the phrase ??? ??? is nowhere in Aristotle used for the purpose of definition, but rather of subsumtion. What can be subsumed under "characterized by contact" are "fire, flesh, head (= skull bone, v. On the Parts of Animals, 656b7-13)" (l. 19). For the opposition ??? - ???????? v. 1014b20-26.

1070a11-12. the nature, which is a 'this' or positive state towards which movement takes place. (according to Pseudo-Alexander)

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (676. 29-33): ???? ?? ????? ????? ???? ????? ???? ?? ???? ??? ???? ??? ??? ??. ????? ?? ????? ??? ???? ?? ??? ???? ?? ?????· ?? ?????????? ??? ????? ??????. ?? ?? ??? ?? ???? ??? ??? ?? ????? ??? ????? ? ??????? ?????· ???? ??? ??????? ???? ????? ??? ????? ??.

Argyropulus: "quae quidem hoc aliquid est ac habitus quidam ad quem per ipsam pergitur generationem."

Bessarion: "quaedam vero natura quod quid, et quidam habitus ad quem."

Ross (ii 356): "The vulgate reading ? ?? ????? ???? ?? ??? ?? ??? ???? ??? is intolerably harsh, and it seems best to read, as Alexander apparently did (676. 30), ? ?? ????? ???? ?? (sc. ???? from l. 10) ??? ???? ??? ??? ?? (sc. ? ??????? ?????).

1070a18-19. that there are as many Forms as there are kinds of natural object.

(1) that there are Forms only of natural objects. (according to Pseudo-Alexander, Argyropulus, Bessarion)

(2) Alexander in Averroes (pp. 100-101 Genequand): "Alexander says: these words refer to Plato, as is found in some manuscripts. He says: he (Aristotle) does not say that they are right in an absolute way, but merely that it was right to suppose them to be the natural things. It would be easier to understand if it was put in this way: «therefore, those who postulated the Forms were right, if they exist at all, in assuming all that comes from them to be by nature». He (Alexander) says: it is also possible to understand his statement in this way: therefore, he who postulated a Form for all these things which exist by nature, if this form exists at all, was not wrong. He says: it would be easier to understand what he means if the word «existing» was transposed from its place near «the forms» and taken together with «they» (fa-hiya), so that the sentence would be «therefore, he who postulated the Forms to be all things that exist by nature was not wrong, if the Forms exist at all»."

Pseudo-Alexander (677. 12-16): ???, ?????, ?? ????? ???? ?????? ??? ??? ???????? ???? ??? ????? ???? ??? ?????. ?? ??? ????? ???? ????, ??? ????? ?? ???? ???’ ?? ??? ??? ?????? ?????????. ?? ??? ???? ?????? ????????? ???? ??? ??? ????? ??????? ????, ???? ???? ??????, ???? ??? ????? ??? ????????.

Argyropulus: "formas eorum esse quae natura constant."

Bessarion: "quod species eorum sunt quae natura sunt."

(3) It is evident that the translation Argyropulus/Bessarion gives a better sense, more in accordance with ll. 17-18 and Pseudo-Alexander's paraphrasis. The fact that the equivalent to "eorum" is missing can be explained as "omission of the antecedent to a relative" (Smyth/Messing, § 2509, cf. Kühner/Gerth, § 554, 4). Another possibility is that Pseudo-Alexander read ?????? (= ?????? ?????) instead of ?????. For ?????? as example of case attraction v. Lucianus, Dialogues of the Dead 25, 4 (??? ?????? […] ?????? ?????? ?????? [= ?????? ???????, cf. Xenophon, Hellenica, iii 1, 20, 5] ? ????? ????????? = "I scorned to confine myself to the kingdom that I inherited from my father").

1070a19. distinct from the things of this earth. (E Ab)

(1) but not of these. (according to Alexander in Averroes, Cherniss)

(2) Alexander in Averroes (p. 101 Genequand): "According to Alexander, we can understand that in two ways: the first is that he is not thinking of all natural forms, but some of the natural forms are known to be inseparable from matter, e.g. the form of fire, of bone, of head and of flesh. According to this interpretation, it is as if he had said: what belongs to these forms like fire, flesh and bone all has a matter and cannot be separated from it. We can also understand this as meaning that it is not possible to believe that in the case of all forms, because some of the forms of natural things are forms of things which constitute the matter of something else, like fire and the other elements which are the matter of other things."

From this paraphrasis appears that Alexander must have read ???' ?? (not ????, as Jaeger reports).

Pseudo-Alexander (677. 16-23): ?? ?? ???? ??? ???? ??????·?????? ??? ??? ????, ??? ??? ??????? ?????? ? ????????? ???????? ???? ?????????? ???? ???????? ?????????, ???? ???? ?????? ???????, ???? ??????? ?? ?? ??? ??? ??? ??? ?? ????????, ??? ??? ???????????. ??? ???? ?? ??????? ??? ????????? ???????? ??? ??? ??? ??? ?? ????????, ??? ??? ???????????, ???? ??? ???? ??????· ?????? ??? ??? ???? ??? ??? ??????? ?????? ? ?????????· ???? ?? ? ?? ????? ???? ?? ??? ?? ??? ???? ??? ?? ?????.

Ross (ii 356-357): "????? ????? ???? ???? ?????? gives a good sense, ‘if there are Forms distinct from the things here on earth' (??? ????? ??? ???????? Al.). ????? does not seem to be used in this sense elsewhere by Aristotle, but it is by Plato (Parmenides 133 D 3, Philebus 58 E 5, 62 A 9). If we adopt this reading we must suppose with Alexander that ???? … ????????? (ll. 19-20) is out of place, and is really a note to ??? … ??????????? (ll. 10-11). Bonitz’s interpretation, 'if there are Forms other than these things, i. e. than fire,' &c. gives an unnatural sense.

If we read ???' ?? ??????, we should have to interpret ?????? as referring forward and as explained by ???? ??? ???? ??????. But (1) ?????? ???? in this sense is very unnatural, and (2) the denial of Forms of fire, flesh, or head does not agree with what we know of Plato’s theory. ???? … ????????? would come in much more naturally in l. 11, and it must be remembered that the first five chapters of ? present, more perhaps than any other part of the Metaphysics, the appearance of a rather hastily put together series of notes, in which misplacements are likely to have occurred. Cf. note on 1069b35."

(3) The instances given by Ross for ????? in the sense of "the things of this earth" are no evidences at all: in Parmenides 133 D 2-3 the text is ?? ?? ???' ???? ?????, in Philebus 62 A 8-9 ??? ?? ?????????? ?????? ??????? ??? ???? ??????? ???????, i. e. ????? does not stand alone. In Philebus 58 E 5 ????? must be corrected to ?????? (with Badham), so that the text runs: ??? ???? ???? ?????? [scil. ??? ??????] ??????????. How unnatural the interpretation Pseudo-Alexander/Ross is appears, if we compare Plato, Cratylus 438 D, Republic 510 C, Xenophon, Memories ii 2, 7, 2. In all these instances, ?????? refers to something mentioned before.

???? ?????? usually occurs at the beginning of a sentence, as in 1049b23, Plato, Phaedo 114 C 6, D 8, Xenophon, Symposium iv. 49.

As regards the reading ???' ?? ??????, Ross is right that ?????? cannot refer forward. In the two other instances of ???' ?? ?????? known, [Plato], Theages 124 A and Lysias, In Epicratem, 12, 1, it refers backward. And if ???? would be illustrative of ??????, it would have to be followed by genitives, cf. On the Soul, 425a20-21 (???????? ??????? ????? ???????? ????? ??????, ???? ????????).

The most probable sequence of corruption is from ???' ?? to ???? via ????? and ????. "but not of these" is a meaningful continuation of "that there are Forms only of natural objects" (cf. previous note), "these" referring to l. 17 ??? ?? ???? ?????? ("all ideals of art"), which is equivalent to ????? ?? ???? ??????.

Since there is no grammatical connection with the following words ???? ??? ???? ??????, we have to assume a gap in the text.

1070a21-22. The moving causes exist as things preceding the effects, but causes in the sense of definitions are simultaneous with their effects.

(1) My proposal: The causes in the sense of moving things have come to be before the effects, but causes in the sense of definitions are simultaneous with their effects.

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (677. 31-34): ???? ?? ???? ???????? ? ?????. ?? ??? ??? ???????? ????? ?? ????????????? ????, ?? ???? ???? ??? ?????????, ??’ ? ?? ????????? ‘?? ???????? ????????? ??? ????? ?????? ???? ?? ????????? ??? ???????? ???? ??????· ?? ?? ?????? ????? ???.’

Ross (ii 358): "?? ??? ??? ???????? ????? (sc. ????? ?????) ?? ????????????? ????."

(3) The symmetry of the sentence requires ?? ??? ??? <??> ???????? [??] ????????????? [????], ?? ?' ?? ? ????? ???. ???? is varia lectio to ??, cf. 1071a16-17; for ?? ???????? cf. 1013b16 and De generatione animalium, 789b7 (????? ?’ ?? ???????? ??? ?? ?????? ??? ?? ??? ?????). If Ross was right in supplying ????? ?????, ???? would have to be transposed to after ???.

1070b1. What then will this common element be?

(1) What then will these common elements be? (according to Jaeger)

(2) Jaeger: "an ????'?"

(3) Pseudo-Alexander seems to have read ????? instead of ????? in a35: ?????? ???, ????, ?? ?????? ?????? ?? ???? ????????? (678. 36). This points to a double version in ll. a35 and b1: either ????? … ?? ??? ????' ????? or ????? … ???? ??? ????' ?????.

1070b24. and 'principle' is divided into these two kinds.

(2) Bonitz (1842, p. 130): "[…] paucis verbis interjectis ?, 4. p. 1070b24 et 29. […] eadem iterantur verba ??? ??? ????? ?????????? ? ????, quae quum apta sint posteriore loco, minus apta priore, huc per errorem librarii videntur translata esse."

Ross (ii 361): "But it is better to follow the authority of Ab Al. and omit it in l. 29. Here it makes quite good sense - ‘principles are divided into two kinds, the ????????? and the ????? '; cf. ?. 1013a4, 7."

Jaeger: "verba incertae sedis (cf. 29) e margine intrusa, seclusi auctore Bonitz."

1070b25. and that which acts as producing movement or rest is a principle and a substance. (Ab)

(1) and that which acts as producing movement or rest, while being a principle, is not an element. (according to Jaeger)

(2) Bonitz (1848, p. 222): "fortasse ??? ????? [instead of ??? ?????]."

Jaeger: "sed vestigium veri servavit ?; post ???? excidisse videtur ??? ???? ????????? (cf. ad ???? post neutrum 1072a25)."

1070b27. and the proximate moving cause is different for different things.

(1) and the first moving cause is different for different things. (literally)

(2) Bonitz (1849, p. 482): "?? ?????? ?????? ?? ?????? dubito num ita scriptum sit ab Aristotele, quum iisdem prope verbis paullo infra, b34, primum motorem immobilem significet. Aptius fortasse scriptum fuerit: ?? ????????? ??????."

Ross (ii 361): "But Aristotle is careless in matters of this sort (cf. a1 n.), and further ?? ?? ?????? ?????? ?????? ????? is different enough from ?? ?????? ?????? ?? ?????? to remove any misunderstanding."

(3) There is no reason to reject the literal translation "first moving cause". The medical art is the first moving cause of health (l. 28), insofar as it initiates a motion independent of the motion of the universe. The first mover of the universe is not "first" in the sense that there is an uninterrupted chain of causality from him to, e. g., the health of a certain man. This is the very reason why the compatibility of causality and freedom is no problem in Aristotle.

1070b30-31. And since the moving cause in the case of natural things is - for man, for instance, man. (according to Zeller)

(1) And since the moving cause in the case of natural things is of the same species, for man, for instance, man. (according to Jaeger)

(2) Zeller (Aristotle i 357 n.): "????????? (read ???????, approved by Schwegler and Bonitz) ????????."

Christ: "ipse malo ?? ???????? ???? ????????."

Jaeger (in favor of Christ): "desideratur terminus cui opponatur ?? ?????." (Cf. 1071a16-17.) He combines the emendations by Zeller and Christ, writing <?? ???????? ????> ??????? ????????.

1070b34-35. further, besides these there is that which as first of all things moves all things. (according to Bonitz)

(1) My proposal: further, besides these there is the first of all things as moving all things.

(2) Argyropulus: "insuper praeter haec est quod est omnium primum omnia movens."

Bonitz (1849, p. 483): "Scribendum profecto est: ?? ?? ??????. Addit enim ad causas antea expositas causam moventem, eamque ut primam et communem omnibus distinguit a singulis singularum rerum causis moventibus."

(3) Comparison with l. 27 suggests reading [??] ?? ?????? ?????? <??> ?????? ?????. 'Moving' is one sense of 'first', and not vice versa.

1071a1. And therefore all things have the same causes. (according to Christ)

(2) Christ (1853, pp. 57-58): "Libri ?. capitibus IV et V Aristoteles quaestionem excutit, an omnium rerum eadem sint principia an diversa. Atque in capite quarto hanc quaestionem limitibus substantiae includit, in quinto eandem quaestionem ad reliquas categorias transfert. Hoc si probabiliter persecutus sum, vix dubium esse potest, quin legendum sit ??? ??? ????? ?????? ????? ?????; 'cum priore capite omnium substantiarum secundum analogiam communia principia subesse docuerimus, reliquae autem categoriae ab illis suspensae sint, omnium quoque categoriarum eadem esse principia consentaneum est. Firmatur vero haec emendatio extremis hujus capitis verbis, quibus summa rei expositae comprehenditur, versu 33 […]."

1071a7. e.g. wine or flesh or man does so.

(1) My proposal: deleting "or flesh or man".

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (682. 27-31): ?? ?? ???? ????? ? ???? ? ???????? ???????????? ???? ??? ??? ??? ???????? ??? ?? ???????. ? ??? ???????, ???? ??? ????? ???????? ?????, ??????? ????? ????· ??????? ??? ???? ??? ????? ???????? ????, ??????? ????? ?????· ?????? ??? ??? ??? ?????? ???.

This explanation is based on 1044b31-1045a6.

Christ: "? ???????? spurium."

Ross (ii 362): "???? ?????, i.e. the same matter is at one time potentially wine and later actually wine."

Jaeger: "????? est ??????? ???? velut ???? est ??????? ????????: quod nisi ???? excidit, ? ???????? fortasse cum Christ delendum; Alexander ???? in commentario offert, in textu non habet."

(3) The crucial question is whether "wine or flesh or man" are examples of subjects or of predicates for "is at one time". The former assumption is made by Jaeger, the latter by Ross. That "wine is potentially vinegar" (Jaeger) is expressely denied 1044b35, and it is nowhere said that "flesh is potentially man" (cf. rather 1034b1, 1049a1 and b22). On the other hand, Ross's explanation "the same matter is at one time potentially wine and later actually wine" does only apply to wine (v. 1044b31-1045a6), not to flesh (v. On the Heavens iii3, 302a21-22: ?? ??? ??? ????? ??? ???? ??? ?????? ??? ???????? ?????? ??????? ??? ??? ??) and man (v. ll. 13-16).

1071a9-10. and the privation, e.g. darkness or disease.

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (682. 34-35): ? ??? ??? ???????? ????? ?? ????? ??? ?? ????? ?? ????????, ? ?? ??????? ?? ???????? ??? ? ???????? ?? ???????, ?? ?? ??????????? ?????? ?? ???.

Bonitz (1849, p. 484): "Privationem Alexander non ad actum, sed ad potentiam referri putat p. 656, 8 [Bonitz, = 682. 34-35 Hayduck], et concedendum sane est, Aristotelem si volebat eam ad actum referri, rectius scripturum fuisse: ??? ???????? quam: ???????? ??. Attamen proximis demum a verbis ad potentiam transiri, apparet ex manifesta oppositione: ???????? ??? … ??????? ??. Ac praeterea notum est, Aristoteli privationem etiam esse quodammodo ?????, cf. ad 4.1070b26, materiam vero non per se, sed per accidens privationi adnumerari, cf. ad 2. 1069b18, ut nec propterea privatio referri possit ad potentiam. Etiam quae affert privationis exempla, ??????, ??????, hanc confirmant sententiam."

Christ: "???????? - ?????? spuria."

Ross (ii 363): "???????? ?? (vulg. ??) ???? ?????? ? ??????. The traditional reading is open to three objections: (1 ) If privation is being brought under the heading of actuality (as it must, since ??????? comes only in the next clause), the clause should be introduced not by ???????? ?? but by ??? ? ????????. (2) The adducing of instances, darkness and disease, is peculiar, when form, concrete substance, and matter are left unillustrated. (3) ?????? is an instance not of privation but of the union of privation with matter; the privation in question is ????? (cf. 1070b28).

Themistius apparently did not read ???????? ??, and Christ condemns the whole clause. But the manuscripts and Alexander agree in having it, and some mention of privation is wanted in order to account for ???? in l. 11. I have endeavoured to remove the first objection by reading ?? for ??, ?? in this usage is rare in Aristotle, but cf. ?. 1004b14, ?. N. 1158b10, 13. For confusion of ?? and ?? in manuscripts cf. for instance E. N. 1153b7. The second objection is not very important, and as regards the third, the confusion is one which Aristotle makes elsewhere. The adjective or participle in the neuter with the definite article may always stand for an attribute as well as for a concrete thing. Cf. ?? ??? ?????? ????????? ??? ??? ?????, ? ?? ???????? ???????? De Gen. et Corr. 318b16. Or, in the highly abbreviated mode of expression which is used in chs. 1-5, ??? ?? ?? ?????? (???? ??? ?????????), answering to ?? ?? ?????? (???? ??? ??????), may be meant to be supplied in thought, ?????? is an instance of ????????, ?????? of ?? ?? ??????."

The ?? proposed by Ross is presupposed by Matta and Averroes (Walzer 224), just as by Bessarion: "privatio etiam, ut tenebrae aut aegrotans."

Jaeger: "???????? … 10 ?????? suspexit Christ, sed cf. 16 et 11 ???? i. e. ?? ???????, ????? et ????????."

1071a11-12. But the distinction of actuality and potentiality applies in another way to cases where the matter of cause and of effect is not the same.

(2) Bonitz (1849, pp. 484-485): "Haec [a11 ????? — 17 ????????] verba per brevitatem et negligentiam dicendi admodum obscura ut probabilem certe in modum interpretemur, incipiendum videtor ab extrema enuntiati parte: ??? ???? ????? ? ????? — ????????. Solis per eclipsin obliquum cursum (? ????? ??? ? ????? ?????? b15) universae generationis naturalis et corruptionis esse causam, uberius Aristoteles exponit de gen. et corr. II 10, cf. praecipue 336a31: ??? ??? ??? ? ????? ???? ????? ???? ???????? ??? ??????, ???' ? ???? ??? ????? ??????, et b15: ???????? ?? ??? ???? ??? ???????? ???????????? ???? ??? ???? ??????? ?????? ??? ??? ??o??????? ??? ??? ????? ??????? ?????, ???????? ?? ??????, ??? ?? ??? ????? ????????. Phys. II 2. 194b13: ???????? ??? ???????? ????? ??? ?????. cf. ad 6. 1072a10. Haec communis omnis generationis causa movens, quam eandem paullo aliter supra respexit 4. 1070a34: ???? ????? ?? ?? ?????? ?????? ????? (cf. 6. 1072a9), distinguenda est a quatuor illis causis, quae, quamquam iisdem generibus continentur, tamen aliae aliis in rebus et suae cuique rei propriae sunt, cf. a15: ???? ?????, et a16: ???? ??? ???? ???? ????? ???? ???????? ???? ????????, ubi quidem per ?. ???????? significatur singularum rerum causa movens ea, quae continetur in alia eiusdem generis ac speciei re concreta (???????? ???????? ?????), ut quatuor causarum genera antea exposita his verbis enumerata sint. Atqui haec quatuor causarum genera referri docuit ad potentiae et actus discrimen, b7 - 11; ab illis igitur si est distincta communis universae generationis causa motrix, eadem etiam distinguenda est a potentia et actu, utpote singulis singularum generationum principiis. Hoc ut significetur initio enuntiationis, recipientdam arbitror eam conjecturam, quam proposuit et aliis praeterea rationibus commendavit Trendelenburgius Kategorienlehre p. 193: ????? ?' ? ???????? ??? ??????? ????????, i. e. reliqua causarum genera quum possint referri ad potentiam et actum, distinguenda ab iis est et aliter ac potentiae et actus discrimine differt communis omnium rerum causa motrix."

Ross (ii 363): "11 ????, 'qualified by the form and by the privation', cf. 1070b12, 13. It is implied that the privation no less than the form is a mode of realization of the matter, so that Alexander is wrong in supposing that Aristotle reckons privation to the side of potentiality (682. 34). Privation is in fact a kind of form (Phys. 193b19).

Bonitz accepts Trendelenburg’s emendation ????? ?' <?> ???????? ??? ??????? ???????? ??. But this ignores the evident correspondence between ????? here and ????? in l. 6, and the opposition between ????? ?' here and ?? ?????? ??? in l. 6. Aristotle has said that the distinction of ??????? and ???????? belongs to different things in different ways. He has stated one way in ll. 6-11; he now has to state the other. 'The distinction in virtue of actuality and potency is present in another sense in things which', &c."

1071a12-13. in some of which cases the form is not the same but different.

(2) Bonitz (1849, pp. 485-486): "Aptiorem ipsis verbis interpretationem videmur divinare posse, si reputaverimus, commune illud principium movens, quamquam ab omnibus quatuor causis distinguitur, praecipue tamen ab ea distinguendum esse, cui simillimum esse videatur, singulas dico singularum rerum causas moventes. Hae autem sunt specie eaedem (???????? a17), materia diversae a rebus inde generatis; communis causa motrix ne speciem quidem eandem habet ac res generatae. Inde hunc in modum suspicor haec verba accipienda esse: ????? ?' ? ???????? ??? ??????? ??????, ?? ?? ????? ? ???? ??? (i. e. ??? ?? ???????? ?????????) ???????? ?????, ?? ??? ???? ?? ???? ????? (i. e. ?? ?? ?????? ??????)."

Ross (ii 363-364): "It is to be noted that the negative in the first clause is ??, in the second ???. The two clauses are therefore not of the same nature. The first gives the essential nature of a certain class; the second states an additional fact about it; ??? in fact shows that the second ?? might be replaced by ??? ??????. This prevents us from interpreting the two clauses as meaning 'things which have neither the same matter nor the same form' (Alexander, Trendelenburg), or 'things which have not the same form differ from things which have not the same matter' (Bonitz).

[…]

In view of the whole context, it seems that we must insert ????? after the second ??, and translate as follows: 'The distinction in respect of potency and actuality is present in a different sense in the case of causes which have not the same matter as their effects, some of them indeed not having the same form either'.

If we emphasize ????? ????? (l. 14) we may say that even the father has a different (individual) form from the child, and then ????? will be unnecessary. But the distinction between the relation of the father, and that of the sun, to the child, is emphasized, and is expressed by saying that the latter, unlike the former, is not ???????? with the child, so that ?? ???? ????? probably means the same specific form or kind (as in l. 27), and this would involve ?????. The addition of this word does a good deal to diminish the harshness of the two juxtaposed ?? clauses. In view of the similarity to ? of one of the abbreviations of ?? in manuscripts (Bast 762) ?????????? would not unnaturally become ????? by haplography."

(3) For ?? <?????> cf. Poetics 8, 1451a17-18: ????? ??? ??? ?????? ?? ??? ?????????, ?? ?? ????? ????? ????? ?? ("For infinitely various are the incidents in one man's life which cannot be reduced to unity").

1071a24-27. Further, if the causes of substances are the causes of all things, yet different things have different causes and elements, as was said; the causes of things that are not in the same class, e.g. of colours and sounds, of substances and quantities, are different except in an analogical sense. (reading, with Rolfes ?? ?? in l. 24)

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (684. 19-22): ???? ???? ?????????? ??????? ???? ??? ???? ????? ??? ????? ?????· ????? ?? ???? ?? ???? ??? ??????· ???? ?? ?????, ????? ???????· ???? ??? ????? ??? ???? ????????. ?? ????? ?? ??? ?????? ????? ????? ?? ?????, ???? ??? ??? ???????? ?????.

Thomas Aquinas (Sententia Metaphysicae, liber 12 lectio 4 numerus 29): "Deinde inducit alium modum, secundum quem principia substantiarum sunt universaliter omnium, inquantum accidentia ex substantiis causantur. Sicut autem actus et potentia sunt universaliter principia omnium [cf. ll. 34-35], quia consequuntur ens commune, ita oportet quod secundum quod descendit communitas principiatorum, descendat communitas principiorum. Eorum enim quae non sunt in eodem genere, puta colorum, sonorum, substantiarum et quantitatis, sunt aliae causae et elementa, ut dictum est, praeterquam quod proportionaliter sint eadem omnium."

Argyropulus: "deinde jam ea quae sunt substantiarum, alia vero sunt aliorum causae et elementa, ut dictum est, eorum quae genere in eodem non sunt, colorum sonorum substantiarum quantitatis, nisi similitudine rationis."

Bessarion: "deinde species eae quae substantiarum sunt. verum aliorum aliae causae ac elementa, ut dictum est, verumtamen eorum quae non in eodem genere sunt, colorum sonorum substantiarum quantitatis, eo quod analogon."

Fonseca: "Cum initio huius capitis reduxisset principia aliorum generum ad principia substantiarum, docet hoc loco aut potius innuit illa ipsa substantiarum principia posse etiam dici rerum omnium principia universali ratione: id quod verum est si non ratione universali quoad praedicationem, (neque enim aut substantiae de accidentibus, aut eorum principia de principiis accidentium dicuntur) certe universali quoad causandi et principiandi rationem: quo pacto ratio principiorum substantiae erit quodammodo ratio principiorum accidentium, eo videlicet modo quo ratio causae modo aliquo continet rationem suorum effectorum. Sunt igitur verba illa «Deinde jam quae sunt substantiarum» hunc in modum intelligenda, ac si diceret Aristoteles: Deinde ea etiam quae substantiarum principia sunt, possunt universali ratione dici omnium rerum principia [cf. ll. 34-35], quia eorum ratio est quodammodo ratio principiorum accidentium quae ab illis pendent. Quod Aristoteles cum insinuavit, regreditur verbis illis «sed alia sunt aliorum» ad explicandam·magis diversitatem simpliciter eorum principiorum quae pertinent non solum ad diversa genera, sed etiam ad diversas species et individua."

Bonitz (1843): "Further, the forms of the substances are causes. Causes and elements are, however, different for different things, as has been said, i. e. they are different not only for what is not included in the same genus, e. g. colors, sounds, substances, quantity, except in an analogical sense […]."

Bonitz (1849, pp. 486-487): "Alexander eumque secutus Schweglerus [and Bonitz himself 1843!] supplendum putant ????? ?????. Sed hoc si supplemus, nec video quomodo haec cohaereant cum superioribus, nec quomodo proxime sequentibus in verbis ad eam causae diversitatem transeatur, quae ex diversa repetitur materia, a28. Quare equidem potius ex superioribus, a17, addendum arbitror: ???? ???, vel ??????? ???, ut haec sit sententia: ut recte judicemus de universali dignitate aut tribuenda causis aut non tribuenda (cf. a29: ?? ?? ?????? ???.), attendendum est ad rerum diversa genera et species. Etenim earum rerum, quae diversae sunt specie (????????, ????? ???. a26 ), causae etiam, quamquam eadem universali notione comprehendi possunt (???? ?? ???????? a26), singulae tamen et ipsae specie diversae sunt; quae autem res eadem specie continentur, numero inter se diversae, earum causae numero (??? ??? ??????? ???? a28) differunt, specie et notione eaedem sunt."

Christ: "?????? ?? scripsi."

Ross (ii 365-366): "The manuscript reading ?????? ???? (or ???) ?? ??? ?????? does not give a satisfactory sense. If ???? be kept, it is at least necessary to insert ?? before it, with Christ. In that case we may (1) understand, with Bonitz, ???? ??? from l. 17, so that the general sense would be 'that we may judge rightly whether all things have the same causes (cf. l. 29 ?? ?? ?????? ???.) we must attend to the different species of things as well as to the different individuals', - for which v. ll. 20-24. But the ellipse of ???? ??? after such an interval is difficult. Or (2) we may with Alexander understand ????? ????, taking ?????? ???. to be opposed to ?????? ?? ?????? ?????, l. 18; but this also is not very satisfactory.

The right solution seems to be provided by Rolfes’s reading ?? ??, though in other respects his interpretation is questionable. If ?? ?? be read, a comma instead of a colon must be read after ??????. Then the sense is: 'Further, if the causes of substances are (as Aristotle has shown in 1070b36-1071a2) the causes of all things, yet different things have different causes and elements'. For ?? adversative in the apodosis of a conditional sentence cf. Phys. 215b15, Pol. 1087b13, B. 999a27 n."

(3) Supplying "are the causes of all things" (with Ross, who is preceded by Thomas Aquinas and Fonseca) is required by the context (v. ll. 34-35), but not justified by the text as it stands. What Ross factually translates is: ??????, ?? ?? ?? ??? ?????? <????? ?????? ????? ?????>. Cf. 987b19-20.

The combination ?????? ??? does not occur elsewhere in the Corpus Aristotelicum, and is rare in Greek literature. An example is Strabo, Geography, xiv, 3, 1 ?????? ??? ??? ????? ??????????? ? ???? ??? ??????? ?????? ??????? ??? ????? ??? ?????? ????????. ("Then the sea-coast near the Bay of Issus, beginning from Soli and Tarsus, spreads out into plains.")

1071a31. when the names of the causes are used in several senses.

(2) Ross (ii 366): "In view of the frequent confusion of ?? and ?? in manuscripts (cf. ?. N. 1099a22, 1101a8, 1113b17, 1124a9, 1178b18, Pol. 1291a17, 1339a29 and Bast 710) we need not hesitate to accept Christ’s ?? for ??."

1071a33. They are the same or analogous in this sense.

(1) They are the same by analogy. (according to Bonitz)

(2) Bonitz (1849, p. 487) secludes ?, interpreting "nimirum et simili earum ratione".

Ross (ii 366): "The sense requires ????? ? ?? ????????', cf. ?. 1089b3 ????? ??? ?? ????????. ?? ???????? has come in from l. 26."

(3) ?? ???????? and ? ?? ???????? are variae lectiones; for the former cf. 1070a32, 1071a4, 26 (Jaeger), for the latter e. g. De partibus animalium 652a3 (???? ?? ??? ??? ??? ????? ?????? ????? ???????? ???? ?????, ? ?? ???????? ???? ??????) and 668a24 (?????? ?’ ?????? ??? ?? ???? ??? ?? ???????? ????? ??????? ???? ??? ???? ? ?? ???????? ?????).

Since the subsequent ???-sentence describes ways of identity by analogy, Bonitz must be right.

1071a34-35. and the causes of substances may be treated as causes of all things in this sense.

(1) My proposal: and the causes of substances are clearly causes of all things in this sense.

(2) Themistius (p. 13. 3-8 Landauer): "diximus posse eadem esse uno trium modorum: aut universali ratione, aut proportione et comparatione quadam, aut propterea quod principia substantiae sunt principia omnium. nam si alia dicantur esse, hoc habent a substantia. et cum ab ipsa substantia sint, patet quoque a principiis substantiae esse."

Agreeing with Themistius, Bonitz (1849, p. 487) interpretes "et propterea, quia substantiarum causae eaedem causae sunt affectionum", reading ??? instead of ???.

Argyropulus: "et hoc etiam pacto substantiarum causas omnium causas esse."

Bessarion: "ac illo modo substantiarum causae quasi omnium causae sunt."

Bessarion translates ?? by "quasi" also in 1087b5, but there the case is different.

Ross (ii 366-367): "The superfluous ?? is difficult. Perhaps ??????? is to be understood, in which case the phrase would be parallel to ??? ??????? ?? ??????, Meteor. 388b19, cf. Phys. 200a31, Meteor. 379b26."

(3) Themistius does not stick very closely to the text, so that from his paraphrase nothing can be concluded for the exact wording. The most natural seems to be adding ????? before ??.

1071a36-b1. But in another sense there are different first causes, viz. all the contraries which are neither generic nor ambiguous terms.

(1) My proposal: And in another sense (they are the same), insofar primary are the contraries which are neither generic nor ambiguous terms.

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (685. 20-21): ?? ?? ?? ????? ?? ??? ?? ????? ??? ?? ??????? ?? ??? ???????? ?????.

Jaeger: "??? abundare censet Alexander; an ???"

Thomas Aquinas (Sententia Metaphysicae, liber 12 lectio 4 numerus 32): "Alio autem modo sunt diversa principia; quia contraria, quae sunt principia rerum, et ipsa materia, non univoce dicuntur, quia non sunt genera; nec etiam dicuntur multipliciter quasi aequivoca; et ideo non possumus dicere quod sunt eadem simpliciter, sed secundum analogiam."

Fonseca: "alio tamen modo formam et privationem, quae dicuntur prima contraria, nec sunt vera genera , nec vera universalia, cum privatio non sit ens; alio vero materiae corruptibilium et incorruptibilium, quia vel utraque est pura potentia, ut rei veritas habet, vel altera tantum , ut quidam volunt; pura autem potentia nullius similitudinis (quae tota est a forma) causa esse potest si proprie loquendum est. Quo loco recte Alexander ait verbum ??? vacare; qua de causa illud interpretati non sumus. Verbum quoque ???????? quemadmodum paulo superius pro ??????? sumitur: nisi cui placeat D. Thomae expositio, qui dictionem multipliciter, quae Graeco ad verbum respondet, pro aequivoce sumit, ut sensus sit formam et privationem diversa esse, sed non aequivoce, quia quandam habent inter se analogiam. Nobis tamen magis placet, ut idem verbum modo eodem in utroque loco sumatur, praesertim cum in hoc posteriori nil attineat de formae et privationis convenientia, sed de earum diversitate loqui. Atque hoc pacto satis obscurus locus videtur intelligendus."

Argyropulus: "hoc autem pacto diversa prima esse, quot sunt contraria ipsa, quae neque ut genera dicuntur neque multipliciter dicuntur."

Bessarion: "illo vero modo alia prima, quaecumque contraria, quae nec ut genera neque multipliciter dicuntur."

(3) The commentators have overlooked the parallel 1057b19-20 (???? ????? ????? ???????? ??? ??????? ?? ?? ?????, ?? ????? ?? ?????? ?????, "Therefore it is with regard to these contraries which do not fall within a genus that we must first ask of what their intermediates are composed"), which brings light into our "rather obscure" (Fonseca) passage. Firstly it appears that ??? ??????? and ?? ??????? are variae lectiones; secondly that the words ????? … ???????? ??????? (ll. a36-b1) describe a way in which the "principles and elements" (l. 30) are the same for all things, i. e. that l. 36 ????? which says the contrary must be wrong. According to Empedocles (988b32-34) and Anaxagoras (984a15) it is by "combination" (?????????) and "piercing" (?????????) of the elements that all things come to be or perish; therefore "piercing" and "compressing" (1057b18-19) are meant to be the "primary differentiae" (?????? ????????, 1057b18) or "primary contraries" (????? ???????, 1057b16) of all things, which transcend every genus (as e. g. "color", cf. 1057b13-19). (Ross's explanation of this passage is completely inappropriate.) Empedocles is also alluded by the phrase ???? ?? ???? ???????, cf. 998a30-32 ?????????? ??? ??? ???? ??? ?? ???? ?????? ???????? ????? ????? ?? ?? ???? ?? ???? ????????????, ???' ??? ?? ???? ????? ????? ??? ????? ("Empedocles says fire and water and the rest are the constituent elements of things, but does not describe these as genera of existing things").

Hence it is probable that ????? was inserted after ? or something similar had dropped out.

1071a37-b1. which are neither generic nor ambiguous terms.

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (685. 18-20): ???? ???????, ?????, ???? ?? ???? ???????, ????????? ?? ???, ???? ????????, ????????? ???? ?? ???????, ???’ ?? ????????????????.

Jaeger: "??????? alterum omittit Alexandri citatio, seclusi variam lectionem."

1071b10-11. And there is no continuous movement except movement in place. (reading ???' ? ?)

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (688. 10-11): ??????? ?? ??????? ??? ????? ???? ? ? ???? ?????, ??? ?????? ? ?????.

Argyropulus: "motus autem non est continuus ullus nisi isce qui loco accommodatur."

Bessarion: "motus vero non est continuus praeter hunc qui secundum locum."

1071b13. there will not necessarily be movement.

(2) Bonitz (1842, p. 64): "In apodosi pro praesenti tempore futurum ????? reponendum esse, si ex ipsa protasis forma nondum satis certum videatur, evincitur proximis verbis […] b17. […] Alexander quoque futurum in textu habuit, quod scribit [688. 19-20 Hayduck] ????? ??? ??? ????? ???????? ?? ??? ????????? ?? ????????? ????? ???? ??? ????????."

1071b28. the same impossible result ensues.

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (690. 17-23): ?? ??? ?? ???? ?????? ?? ????? ???????? ??, ??? ?? ???? ????? ?????? ???? ?? ????????? ??? ???? ????????, ???? ?? ?????? ???? ???? ?? ?? ???? ?????? ?????? ???? ???? ?????????, ???? ???????? ??? ??????? ??? ????????? ????????. ? ????? ?? ??? ?? ???? ?????? ?????? ??? ???? ????????? ??? ???? ????????, ?? ????? ???’ ????? ??? ?? ??????? ??? ?? ???????? ?????? ?????? ???????? ??? ??????? ??? ?????????.

(3) Pseudo-Alexander's reading ?????? may be corrupted from ??????.

1071b33-34. But why and what this movement is they do say, nor, if the world moves in this way or that, do they tell us the cause of its doing so.

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (690. 35-36): ??? ??? ?? ??? ??? ???? ????????? ??? ?? ????, ?????? ??? ?????? ?? ????????.

Bessarion: "cur vero vel quem, non aiunt, nec cur sic, nec causam."

Schwegler (ii 254): "The words ???? ??? ???? ??? ?????? seem to be corrupt. The most natural emendation would be ???? ??? ??? ??? ??????."

Bonitz (1849, p. 491): "Quod quamquam apte dici non nego, necessario tamen ita scribendum non arbitror; etenim ?? ?????????? haec posita videntur verbis superioribus ??? ?? et ????, ut v. ??? idem significet ac ???? ???????, et ?????? idem ac ??? ??."

Zeller (1889, p. 263): "Still closer to the transmitted text would be: ???', ?? ???, ??? ??????."

Diels (ii 6) writes ???' ?? ??? ? ???, referring to Pseudo-Alexander 690. 35.

Jaeger: "???? ??? ??? ? ??? scripsi."

(3) The phrase ??? ? ??? occurs in Prior Analytics i, 46b28, Rhetorics iii, 1404a10 and Poetics, 1461a35.

1071b35. but there must always be something present to move it.

(1) [but something must always exist] (in accordance with Argyropulus and Bessarion, cf. 1072a10)

(2) Argyropulus: "sed semper sit quippiam oportet."

Bessarion: "sed oportet ut semper aliquid praeexistat."

Fonseca: "semper enim causa aliqua certa existat opus est."

Bonitz (1849, p. 491): "Sed quomodo vel construenda sint vel intelligenda haec verba: ???? ??? ?? ??? ????????, non video."

On the basis of Ab, Usener (1861, p. 313) conjectures ????? ??? ?? ????? ????????, ???? ??? ?? ??? ?????? ????????.

Jackson (p. 141): "[…] I suspect that the original had ??? ?? ??? ?? ????????, which manifestly gives a perfect sense: 'there must be a reason'. That ??? ?? might easily become ???? ?? is obvious. For the confusion of ? and ??, see Bast p. 706."

Ross (ii 370): "Prof. Jackson thinks that the readings of Ab (??? ???? ??) and of ? (??? ?? ???) point to an original ??? ?? ??? ??. But the two readings are merely an instance of the constant tendency of the two manuscript groups to vary the order of words, and the required sense 'there must be a cause' may be got out of the traditional reading. 'There must in every case be something present sc. to account for the particular movement. The simplest emendation would be ??? ???’ (sc. ??????) ??? ????????."

(3) To my opinion, l. 35 ???? ??? ?? ??? ???????? is a spurious insertion, modeled on 1072a10 ??? ?? ??? ??????.

Firstly, in ll. 35-36 the sense requires supplying ???????? to ??? from the ?????-clause, but grammatically we would be obliged to join it with ????????.

Secondly, ?????, ??? and ??? ??? are the alternatives to ?? ?????. According to Aristotelian doctrine, nothing in the world happens "at random", v. On the heavens ii, 290a31 (????? ??? ?? ????? ????? ? ?????) and iii, 301a11 (?????? ????? ?? ????? ???????? ??? ???? ?????).

Thirdly, Aristotle uses the particle combination ????? ??? when he is confirming a general conclusion by a fact which is "present" to common observation, cf. Physics ii, 199b5-7 (??? ?? ???? ?? ????? ??? ????????? ?? ???????, ?? ?? ???? ???? ???? ??? ????? ?????? ?? ??????, ?????????????? ?? ????? ????? ????????, ????? ??? ??? ?????????. "Thus in the original combinations the 'ox-progeny' if they failed to reach a determinate end must have arisen through the corruption of some principle corresponding to what is now the seed."), On the Soul iii, 425a20-22 (???? ????? ??? ???????? ??????? ????? ???????? ????? ??????, ???? ????????· ???? ??? ????? ????? ??? ?? ???? ?? ????? ???????????. "So that it is clearly impossible that there should be a special sense for any one of the common sensibles, e.g. movement; for, if that were so, our perception of it would be exactly parallel to our present perception of what is sweet by vision."), On the Parts of Animals iii, 663b7-10 (???’ ???? ??? ?????? ??? ??? ???????, ??? ?? ??? ????? ????????, ?? ?? ???? ??????? ???? ??? ?????? ??????? ??, ????????? ????? ??? ???????, ??? ??? ??????? ?????. "But as the bull has no hands and cannot possibly have its horns on its feet or on its knees, where they would prevent flexion, there remains no other site for them but the head; and this therefore they necessarily occupy."), Politics vi, 1318a38-40 (??? ?? ???? ?????????, ?????? ????? ?????? ????????? ??????? ????? ??? ??? ???? ? ???????? ??????? ? ?? ???????????. "If they [the voters] turn out to be equal, there is no greater difficulty than at present."). This general conclusion is ll. 34-35 "nothing is moved at random".

The interpolator refers to l. 33 ??? ??? ????? ???? ??????? and takes ll. 34-35 ?? ????? ???????? as denying an adequate cause of eternal movement.

1072a9-10. If, then, there is a constant cycle.

(1) If, then, the same things have always existed. (omitting ???????, cf. l.8)

(2) Schwegler (ii 255): "The added ??????? seems to be a glossema."

Zeller (I 410 n.): "??????? l. 10 is probably corrupt."

Ross (ii 371): "It is not necessary with Schwegler to treat ??????? in l. 10 as a gloss."

(3) One of Ross's apodictic "not necessary". As the argument applies also for ????? (v. l. 8-9), it is illogical to mention only the other case.

1072a24-25. And since that which moves and is moved [corrected by me from "is moves and moved"] is intermediate, there is something which moves without being moved.

(2) The ??? before ????? is read by the Arabian translators Ustath and Matta (Walzer 225).

Themistius (18, 17-19 Landauer) paraphrases: "cum igitur detur mobile et idem movens, et mobile tantummodo non movens, necessario datur et movens non mobile."

Thomas Aquinas (Sententia Metaphysicae, liber 12 lectio 6 numerus 18): "Sed quia in ordine mobilium et moventium inveniuntur tria, quorum ultimum est quod movetur tantum, supremum autem est movens quod non movetur, medium autem est quod movetur et movet; necesse est, quod ponatur aliquod sempiternum movens quod non movetur."

Fonseca: "Neque enim aliter fieri posse,cum necessario concedenda sint tria rerum genera, unum eorum quae ita moveantur, ut <non> [my addition] moveant, qualia apud nos sunt plurima: alterum eorum quae et moveantur et moveant, cuiusmodi sunt corpora caelestia; tertium eorum quae ita moveant, ut nullo modo moveantur, cuius generis unum tantum numero ponendum est, quod non tantum sit substantia et actus omnino purus, ut ex dicendis clarius patebit."

Bonitz (1842, p. 126): "Extremis verbis haec inest sententia: Quoniam est aliquid, quod et movetur et movet, oportet etiam medium aliquid sit, quod quum non moveatur aliunde, ipsum moveat. At haec manifesto falsa; quod enim immobile ipsum alia moveat, id quidem ita est universi motus principium, ut nulla ratione medium dici possit. Itaque fuerunt qui mutata distinctione aptam sententiam restituere conarentur; veluti Sylburgius, cujus in editione ??? ante ????? omissum est, Morellium dicit post ????? distinxisse, ut ????? tamquam praedicatum referatur ad ?? ?????????? ??? ??????, quod sane aptissimum est. Eadem distinguendi ratio praecipitur in iis commentariis, qui Alexandri nomine feruntur ??????????? ??? ?? '???? ?????'; reliqua autem ejus interpretatio, quum multa cogitando supplere jubeat quae non poterant omitti, adeo ab omni ratione grammatica abhorret, ut vix quidquam sani inde repetas.

Sed licet cum his interpretibus, omissa particula ??? ante ?????, distinxerimus post ?????, locus nondum persanatus est, quoniam proximum colon a particula ?????? ordiri non potest. Paucis vocabulis transpositis locum videmur apte restituere posse: ???? ?? ?? ?????????? ??? ?????? ?????, ???? ?????? ?? ??? ? ?? ?????????? ?????. Quae quidem conjectura vel simili conformatione superioris enuntiationis commendari potest, ???? ?????? ?? ??? ? ?????, vel eo quod prorsus concinit cum versione Bessarionis: Quum vero id quod movetur et movet medium sit, est etiam aliquid quod non motum movet."

Bonitz (1849, pp. 495-496): "Haec verba, ut vulgo exhibentur, corrupta esse, nec sufficere ad ea emendanda distinctionem ab Alexandro propositam, quam in textu dedi, demonstravi Obs. p. 125. Sed quid ab Aristotele scriptum fuisse putem, dubito; lenis quidem nec improbabilis ea est conjectura, quam loco laudato commendavi […], sed considerato universo tenore eiusdem argumentationis, qualem Physicorum extremo libro [256b20] et de anima III 10 [433b15] legimus, haud scio an plura propter similitudinem verborum excidisse et hunc fere in modum locum restituendum censeam: ???? ?? ?? ??? ?????????? ??? ?? ??????, ?? ?? ?????????? ??? ??????, ??? ?????? ?????? ???? ? ?? ?????????? ?????."

Jackson (1904, pp. 141-142): "What Aristotle means, is plain enough: 'whereas there are (a) that which both receives motion and communicates it, ?????????? ??? ??????, and (b) that which receives motion without communicating it, ?????????? ??? ?? ??????, we require, to complete the series, (c) that which communicates motion but does not receive it, , or, as it is here expressed, ? ?? ?????????? ?????. But how is this meaning to be obtained from the words? […]

[142] Now it seems to me that the requisite sense may be obtained at a very small cost. For ?????, substitute ??, ??. We shall then have ???? ?? ?? ?????????? ??? ?????? ??? ??, ?? ?????? ???? ?? ? ?? ?????????? ?????: 'since the ?????????? is both ?????? and ?? ??????, [in other words, 'since there are two sorts of ??????????, a ?????????? which is ?????? and a ?????????? which is ?? ??????,] 'there is also, to complete the series, something existent which is ?????? and ?? ??????????.

Plainly, this is exactly what we want. Moreover the correction is palaeographically plausible. For an uncial H having for its second limb a line slightly curved and slightly detached from the central bar, might well be read as EC, just as, notoriously (see Bast pp. 716, 916 &c), the same letter has been not seldom converted into IC.

It has occurred to me to wonder whether Themistius had before him the correct reading. For, in the Hebrew-Latin version published in 1558, Finzius has 'cum igitur detur mobile movens et mobile non movens, necessario datur et movens non mobile': whence it would seem that Themistius' paraphrase was something such as ???? ?????? ??????? ?????????? ??? ?????? ??? ?????????? ??? ?? ??????, ?? ??????? ??????? ?????? ??? ?? ??????????.

In conclusion, I may note that, as here, starting from ??????????, Aristotle distinguishes two sorts of ??????????, one which is ?????? and another which is ?? ??????, and thence infers the existence of a ?????? which is ?? ??????????, so in de anima ? X 433b13, where in a study of appetency Aristotle has occasion to enumerate the three members of this series, starting from the other end of the scale he begins by dividing ?????? into two sorts, ?????? which is ???????? and ?????? which is also ??????????."

Ross (ii 374): "The traditional reading ???? ?? ?? ?????????? ??? ??????, ??? ????? ?????? ???? ?? gives an unsatisfactory sense; the unmoved mover is not a ?????. Nor does it mend matters if we punctuate after ????? instead of after ??????. ???? ?? ??? ?? ?????????? ????? cannot as Alexander suggests be understood, and ?????? cannot begin a clause, nor is ??? ????? intelligible, ??? must in any case be excised; we may then read for ?????? ???? either ???? ?????? or ?????? ???? or simply ????. The argument then is as follows: Aristotle has just remarked that there must be something that moves the ??? ???????vov of l. 21. This ?????? may be (a) ?????????? or (b) ?? ??????????. But a ?????????? ??? ?????? is something intermediate, which presupposes ?? ? ?? ?????????? ?????. For the description of the ?????????? ??? ?????? as a ????? cf. M. A. 703a5, and for the argument cf. Phys. 256b20 ff.

Professor Jackson proposes ???? ?? ?? ?????????? ??? ?????? ??? ??, ?? ?????? ???? ?? ???., 'since there are two sorts of ??????????, a ?????????? which is ?????? and a ?????????? which is ?? ??????, there is also, to complete the series, something existent which is ?????? and ?? ??????????'. But (1) Aristotle has not established the existence of a ?????????? ??? ?????? and that of a ?????????? ??? ?? ??????, but only that of a ?????????? (l. 21) and that of a ?????? (l. 23). (2) ?? ?????? ???? ?? is not a very natural mode of expression. Professor Jackson quotes De An. 433b13 in support of his view, but there we have not what his view implies, a division of ?? ?????????? into two kinds, but what our interpretation above implies, a division of ?? ?????? into two kinds."

Jaeger: "sin lacuna latet, eam sic fere ex Physicis 256b21 expleverim: ???? ?? <?? ?????????? ??? ?? ?????? ??????? ???> ?? ?????????? ??? ?????? ?????, <?????? (vel ??????)> ?????? ???? ??."

(3) ???? and ?????? cannot go together. For ???? ?????? concluding the existence of something cf. l. 23 and Eudemian Ethics 1218a10-11 (???? ??????, ?????, ???? ?? ??????). ?????? ???? presupposes, at the beginning of the sentence, either one emphasized word, as in Plato (Charmides 156 D 3, Theaetetus 145 E 8, Sophist 225 A 4, Politicus 269 B 5), or, as in Aristotle, a conjunction, mostly ?? (Posterior Analytics i, 71b19, ii, 93a7, On the Heavens i, 276b29, 282b14, iv, 311b21), but also ???? (On the Parts of Animals iv, 680b9). This makes the reading proposed by Jaeger improbable. Most likely, ?????? is intruded from l. 23.

1072a26-27. And the object of desire and the object of thought move in this way; they move without being moved.

(2) Argyropulus: "hoc autem modo ipsum appetibile atque intelligibile movet: movens enim non movetur."

Bessarion: "hoc autem modo: concupiscibile et intelligibile movet non motum."

Ross (ii 375): "The colon after ?????? gives a better sense than Bekker’s full stop after ??? or Bonitz’s comma after ??????? (with ?????????? for ?????????). For ??? referring backwards cf. b26, Kühner i, p. 646."

(3) What we read in Kühner/Gerth I, 646-647 is not very favorable: "It is far more seldom (at least in Attic prose) that ???, ???????, ??? are related to what was mentioned already […]." But the parallel 1072b26 is convincing.

1072b2-3. For the final cause is (a) some being for whose good an action is done, and (b) something at which the action aims.

(2) Schwegler (ii 262): "Guessing that the enigmatic ???? is a corrupted reading I write ???? ??? ?????? ?? ?? ?????, cf. de anima 415b2: ?? ?' ?? ????? ??????, ?? ??? ??, ?? ?? ?, b20: ?????? ?? ?? ?????. Eth. Eud. 1249b15: ?????? ?? ?? ?????, Phys. 194a35: ????? ?? ?? ?????. For the construction cf. passages as Met. xiii, 10, 11 [= 1087a15-16]: ?? ?????????? ??????, ?? ?? ??? ??????? ?? ?? ????????."

Christ (1853, p. 58): "Cum vulgata lectio ferri non possit, Schweglerus ???? mutavit in ??????: acuta sane atque etiam a Bonitzio probata emendatio. Nihilominus dubito num recta sit, quia ?????? nec per librariorum errores nec per interpolatorum audaciam in ???? abire potuit. Sed modo videas lectionem codicis Ab ???? ??? ???? ?? ?? ????? ?????. Quid ergo? Nonne genuina lectio addito ???, ut quod extremis literis praecedentis verbi haustum sit, facillime hunc in modum restitui potest ???? ??? ???? ?? ?? ????? ??? ?????? Augetur vero fides hujus emendationis, quia alias quoque discrimen horum generum ??? ?? ????? distincto casu genitivo et dativo designatur: de an. 415b2, et b20. ?? ?? ????? ??????, ?? ??? ?? ?? ?? ?; de gen. an. 742a22-23. ?? ??? ??? ????? ???? ? ???????, ?? ?? ? ?????? ?? ?? ?????. cf. Themist. ad de an. f. 45b2. Neve quis objiciat ob sequentia verba inverso ordine dicendum fuisse: ???? ??? ????? ?? ?? ????? ??? ????. Nam liberior haec construendi ratio alias quoque apud Aristotelem invenitur 992a11, 1077b2, 3."

Ross (ii 376-377), while assenting to Christ, subtracts de gen. an. 742a22-23, "for the true reading there is not ?? ?? ????? but ?? ?????? ?????."

1072b4. but all other things move by being moved. (reading ????????? instead of ?????????)

(1) but it is by something moved (not by something unmoved as what is loved) that it moves the other things (which come after what is first moved). (according to EJ and the manus prima of Ab)

(2) Alexander (343. 5-9, commenting on 1012b30-31 ???? ??? ?? ? ??? ????? ?? ?????????): ?? ??? ??? ??? ??? ????????? ?????????? ??????? ??????? ?? ??? ??? ???????? ?????? ?? ?????? ??????? ????? ???? ?? ?????????· ????? ?? ?? ? ?????, ? ??? ???????????? ????? ????· ??? ??? ?????? ??? ?? ???? ????? ?? ??? ??????.

Alexander in Simplicius (In Aristotelis physicorum libros commentaria, 258, 17-24, commenting on 192a34 ???? ??? ???? ?? ????? ?????): "?? ?? ?????? ????? ??? ?? ????????? ?? ??? ??????. ????? ??? ?? ???? ???? ?? ??????, ??? ????? ?? ?????????? ??’ ?????, ????? ?? ???? ?? ??????? ????, ?? ???? ????? ?? ?? ??????? ??? ?????. ????? ??? ??? ?????????. ??????? ?? ????? ?? ?????? ?????? ??? ??????? ??????????? ????????, ?? ??? ????? ??????? ???????, ??? ???????, ?? ????? ?????? ????? ?? ???? ???? ?? ??????, '????? ?? ?? ????????', ??? ?? ?? ?? ????? ??? ?? ?? ????? ??????. ???????? ??? ?? ???????.

Thomas Aquinas (Sententia Metaphysicae, liber 12 lectio 7 numerus 11): "Deinde cum dicit movet autem [= ????? ??, 1072b3] comparat primum movens immobile ad primum mobile; dicens, quod cum primum movens immobile moveat quasi amatum, necesse est, quod aliquid sit primo motum ab ipso, per quod movet alia; et hoc est primum caelum."

Bonitz (1849, pp. 497-498): "non potest omitti articulus in participio ??????????, quia hoc non continet subjecti superioris enuntiati, quod est ?? ?????? ????????, attributum, sed novum significat subjectum. Alexander p. 670, 11 [= 696. 2-3 Hayduck] recte interpretatur: ?????????? ?? ?? ????? ???????? ? ??????? ????? ?? ???? ?????, sed quid in textu habuerit dubium est."

Ross (ii, 377): "The manuscript reading ?????????, 'and by something moved it moves all other things', is hardly possible Greek, and ??????????,'while the other (the ?????? ???????) being moved moves all other things' is little better. ????????? gives the right sense, 'it moves as being loved (sc. without itself being moved), while all other things move by being moved', i.e. simply transmit the motion impressed on them. ? and ? are often confused in manuscripts (Bast 183, &c.)."

(3) The reading of the manuscripts ????????? is clearly the right one. It is presupposed by the genuine Alexander, and in accordance with On the Soul, 433b13-19 (???? ?’ ???? ????, ?? ??? ?? ??????, ???????? ?' ? ?????, ??? ?????? ?? ?????????? […]? ???? ?? ?? ??? ???????? ?? ??????? ??????, ?? ?? ?????? ??? ?????????? ?? ????????? […], ?? ?? ?????????? ?? ????? ? ?? ????? ?????? ? ??????, ??? ????? ????????? ?????.). Ross's stylistic doubt ("hardly possible Greek") ceases to apply if if we, having in mind that 'what is loved' is something unmoved, supply in thought "<it is by something unmoved that it moves what is first moved>, but it is by something moved …".

1072b5. Therefore if its actuality is the primary form of spatial motion. (reading ???' ?? ???? ????? ? ???????? ?????)

(1) Therefore the primary form of spatial motion, even though it exists actually. (according to Jaeger)

(2) Ross (ii 377): "Alexander’s commentary [696. 10 Hayduck] here says ??? ????? ? ???????? ??? ??????? ? ????? ????, which leaves it doubtful what he read, except that there is no trace of the ??? which the manuscripts have before ????????. I have adopted a reading [???' ?? ???? ????? ? ???????? ?????] which may have been that of Alexander, and which gives better sense than those of the manuscripts and, I think, than those of previous editors (?? ???? ? ????? ???????? ?????, ? ???????? Bonitz, ?? ? ???? ? ????? ???????? ????? ? ???????? Christ). Taking ???????? with what follows, and reading ????? ??, which the sense requires, we get the following meaning for the sentence. Aristotle has said, with the heavenly spheres in mind, 'the other things move only by being moved. Now if a thing is moved, it is capable of being otherwise than as it is'. He now continues 'so that if its actual mode of existence is the primary kind of local movement (sc. circular movement), then in so far as it is subject to change, in this respect it is capable of being otherwise, i.e. in respect of place even if not in respect of substance', i. e. even if it is not subject to generation or destruction. The words ?? ??? ??v … ?????? (ll. 4-7) are preparatory to the second part of the sentence, in which Aristotle points out that the ?????? ??????, in contrast to the ?????? ??????????, is in no respect subject to contingency."

1072b6. in this respect it is capable of being otherwise.

(2) Bonitz (1842, p. 105): "Apodosin posterioris enuntiationis incipiendam esse a ?????? ?? ?????????, apparet e verbis superioribus ?? ?? ????????, ????????? ??? ????? ?????. Unde efficitur, ut ante ?????? commate tantum distinguatur, et particula adversativa ?? mutanda sit in consecutivam ?? vel in restrictivam ??."

Jaeger (BBA 265): "The ????? ?' in apodosi, queried by Bonitz, is here too [as in 999a27] both conclusion from what precedes and objection to a thesis not expressly stated", this thesis being: the first locomotion is the highest principle (cf. l. 8).

1072b23. Therefore the possession rather than the receptivity is the divine element which thought seems to contain.

(1) Therefore intellection rather than hopes and memories is the divine element which thought seems to contain. (my proposal, cf. ll. 16-18)

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (698. 34-36): ? ??? ????? ???? ? ???????? ???? (???? ?? ????? ?? ????? ??????), ????? ?????? ???????, ???????? ??? ?????? ???? ?????.

Bonitz (1849, p. 502 n.): "hoc enim Aristoteles dicit: ???' ??????? (intellige ??? ???????? ?????) ?????? ????? (intellige ?? ????????, et supple ?????) ? ????? ???."

Ross (ii 380-381): "???' ??????? ?????? ????? is the reading implied by Alexander (698. 35). He interprets the clause as meaning 'so that the divine thing in ???? (i.e. its self-knowledge) belongs rather to the ?????? ????' (than to the actual ???? of mankind). ? ?????? will then mean not contemplation in general but 'God’s contemplation’. But it is difficult to supply ?? ?????? ????? as the meaning of ? ????? ? ???? ????? ?????. We must, it seems, choose one of two interpretations:

(1) 'so that what reason is thought to have of the divine belongs to the prime mover (???????, cf. ??????? l. 27) rather than to the human mind', sc. since it always ???? ?? ?????? while we only sometimes do so. Then ? ?????? = 'God’s contemplation'.

(2) ‘so that this (actuality) rather than that (potentiality) is what reason is thought to have of the divine. This derives some support from 1074b21 ??? ?? ???? ???? ? ????? ????? ???? ?????? ????. Then ? ?????? will mean ‘actual contemplation’ in general. So Bonitz takes the passage.

If ?????? ?????? ?????? be read the meaning must be 'so that that which reason is thought to have of the divine belongs to the prime mover (??????) rather than to the human mind'. This is slightly less natural than the two interpretations above."

(3) Bonitz and Ross have correctly seen that (1) the transmitted ?????? … ?????? has no relation to the preceding sentence, (2) that one of them must refer to contemplation (??????), and (3) that ?????? is the actuality (????????) of knowledge. But they left out of account the two different meanings of 'actual knowledge' pointed out by Aristotle on several occasions:

Physics viii, 255a33-b5: ???? ?? ??????? ????? ? ???????? ????????? ??? ? ???? ??? ??? ?? ??????. ??? ?, ???? ??? ?? ????????? ??? ?? ????????? ???, ??????? ?????? ???????? ?? ???????, ???? ?? ???????? ?? ??????? ????? ?????? ??????? ???????. ? ??? ???? ????????? ?? ?????? ?? ??????? ????? ????????? ???, ???' ??? ?? ??? ???? ??????. ???? ?' ????? ???, ??? ?? ?? ?????, ??????? ??? ??????, ? ????? ?? ?? ????????? ??? ??????. ("One who is learning a science potentially knows it in a different sense from one who while already possessing the knowledge is not actually exercising it. Wherever we have something capable of acting and something capable of being correspondingly acted on, in the event of any such pair being in contact what is potential becomes at times actual: e.g. the learner becomes from one potential something another potential something: for one who possesses knowledge of a science but is not actually exercising it knows the science potentially in a sense, though not in the same sense as he knew it potentially before he learnt it. And when he is in this condition, if something does not prevent him, he actively exercises his knowledge: otherwise he would be in the contradictory state of not knowing.")

On the Soul ii, 412a9-11: ???? ?' ? ??? ??? ???????, ?? ?' ????? ??????????, ??? ????? ?????, ?? ??? ?? ????????, ?? ?' ?? ?? ???????. ("Now matter is potentiality, form actuality; of the latter there are two grades related to one another as e.g. knowledge to the exercise of knowledge.")

417a21-29: ?????????? ?? ??? ???? ???????? ??? ???????????? ??? ??? ????? ??????? ???? ?????. ???? ??? ??? ????? ????????? ?? ?? ?? ???????? ???????? ??????????, ??? ? ???????? ??? ??????????? ??? ??????? ?????????? ???? ?' ?? ??? ??????? ?????????? ??? ?????? ??? ???????????. ???????? ?? ?????? ?? ??? ????? ?????? ??????? ?????, ???' ? ??? ??? ?? ????? ???????? ??? ? ???, ? ?' ??? ????????? ??????? ???????, ?? ?? ?? ????? ??? ??????? ? ?' ??? ?????? ?????????? ?? ??? ?????? ??????????? ???? ?? ?. ("But we must now distinguish not only between what is potential and what is actual but also different senses in which things can be said to be potential or actual; up to now we have been speaking as if each of these phrases had only one sense. We can speak of something as 'a knower' either (a) as when we say that man is a knower, meaning that man falls within the class of beings that know or have knowledge, or (b) as when we are speaking of a man who possesses a knowledge of grammar; each of these is so called as having in him a certain potentiality, but there is a difference between their respective potentialities, the one (a) being a potential knower, because his kind or matter is such and such, the other (b), because he can in the absence of any external counteracting cause realize his knowledge in actual knowing at will. This implies a third meaning of 'a knower' (c), one who is already realizing his knowledge-he is a knower in actuality and in the most proper sense is knowing, e.g. this A.")

Nicomachean Ethics vii, 1146b31-33: ???' ???? ????? ??????? ?? ?????????? (??? ??? ? ???? ??? ?? ???????? ?? ?? ???????? ??? ? ???????? ??????? ??????????). ("But, since we use the word 'know' in two senses (for both the man who has knowledge but is not using it and he who is using it are said to know).")

Protrepticus fr. 14 Ross (= Iamblichi Protrepticus, p. 56. 15-22 Pistelli): ???????? ?????? ???????? ?? ???, ?? ??? ???? ??????? ?? ?? ???' ?????????? ?????? ??? ????? ????? ??? ?? ???? ??? ???? ???? ??? ?????? ??????? ?????, ??? ?????? ???????, ??? ?? ??????? ?? ??????? ??? ???????????? ??? ????. ?????? ?? ??? ?? ?????????? ??? ?? ??????????, ?? ??? ?? ??????? ??? ??????? ???????, ?? ?? ?? ????????? ??? ??????? ??? ??? ????????? ?????. ("The word 'live' seems to be used in two senses, one implying a potentiality, the other an actuality; for we describe as 'seeing' both those animals which have sight and are born capable of seeing, even if they happen to have their eyes shut, and those which are using this faculty and looking definitely at something. Similarly with cognition or knowing; we sometimes mean by it the use of the faculty, actual contemplation, and sometimes the possession of the faculty of knowledge.")

From these passages it becomes clear that by "having" (l. 23 ????) knowledge only the first degree of actuality is reached, cf. On the Soul, 429b5-10 (???? ?' ????? ?????? ??????? ?? ????????? ??????? ? ???' ????????? (????? ?? ?????????, ???? ??????? ???????? ?? ?????), ???? ??? ??? ???? ??????? ???, ?? ??? ?????? ??? ???? ?????? ? ??????? ??? ????? ?? ????? ???? ??????? ?????. "Once the mind has become each set of its possible objects, as a man of science has, when this phrase is used of one who is actually a man of science (this happens when he is now able to exercise the power on his own initiative), its condition is still one of potentiality, but in a different sense from the potentiality which preceded the acquisition of knowledge by learning or discovery: the mind too is then able to think itself.")

The second (and highest) degree is 'contemplation' (??????), and it is this actuality which is meant in l. 16 (? ???????? ??????); l. 24 ??? ? ?????? ?? ??????? ??? ??????? resumes l. 16 ????? ? ???????? ??????. Thus it suggests itself to refer l. 23 ?????? to l. 17 ?????? and ?????? to l. 17-18 ??????? ?? ??? ??????, regarding ll. 18-23 ? ?? ?????? … ???? as insertion. This result is confirmed by the fact that in chapter 9 the self-knowledge of the intellect is introduced as a new topic, the reference point being its "divine" character, cf. 1074b15-16 with 1072b23.

1072b28-29. We say therefore that God is a living being, eternal, most good. (reading ?? with Bonitz)

(2) Themistius (p. 24. 19-20 Landauer): dicamus igitur deum esse vitam aeternam sempiternam ac perfectissimam.

Bessarion: "dicimus itaque deum sempiternum optimumque vivens esse."

Bonitz (1849, p. 502): "????? ?? b28 scribendum videtur, quoniam complectitur Aristoteles quae antea comprobavit."

1073a37. there must be substances which are of the same number as the movements of the stars.

(2) Bonitz (1849, p. 505): "nihil desideraveris si omittatur particula ?? [after ????????], ut est omissa in editione Sylburgiana. Si est genuina, referenda videtur ad ??? ?? ?????, ut inter se coniungantur numerus et natura substantiarum aeternarum."

1073b4-5. from the standpoint of that one of the mathematical sciences which is most akin to philosophy. (according to Bonitz)

(2) Themistius (p. 26. 14-15 Landauer): "ex illa scientia, quae philosophiae familiaris<sima> est."

Pseudo-Alexander (702. 7-9): ????? ??? ?? ?? ?????? ??? ??? ??????? ?? ??? ??????????? ????????? ??? ??????????? ????????? ??? ???????.

Bonitz (1849, p. 506): "??????????? ????????? in textu scripsi, Alexandrum et Themistium secutus, pro vulgata librorum et scriptorum et editorum lectione ??????????? ??????????, licet enim ?????????? nomen facile ita potuerit extendi, ut universe doctrinam ac scientiam significet, cf. ad A 3. 983b21, tamen aegre ad adjectivum ??????????? desideres significari, cui doctrinae maxime sit cognata."

1074a22. For if there are others.

(1) My proposal: For also if there are others.

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (708. 22-24): ?? ??? ????? ?????? ?????? ???? ??????, ??????? ??, ?????? ?????? ?????? ????? ??? ????? ????? ?????· ?????? ??? ???? ????????? ?? ?? ????? ????? ?????.

Jaeger writes ?? instead of ????, referring to Pseudo-Alexander.

(3) A similar ???? (without a corresponding second one) occurs 1009a7. In both passages we can translate it by "also if".

1074a35. while Socrates is one.

(1) My proposal: while Socrates is numerically one.

(2) Thomas Aquinas (Sententia Metaphysicae, liber 12 lectio 10 numerus 29): "Et sic Socrates est unus non solum secundum rationem, ut homo, sed etiam secundum numerum."

Christ: "??? ??? … ???????? ?? ??? nescio an sint interpretamentum versui 32 subjunctum."

Ross (ii 395): "Aristotle expresses himself rather obscurely, but the point seem s to be this: One and the same definition, e. g. that of man, applies to many individuals, but Socrates is only one, and therefore must have in him something over and above the definition of man, something to distinguish him from other men, i. e. must have ???."

Jaeger: "fortasse ???????? ?? <??? ??????? ???> ??? scil. ??????; cf. 32-33."

(3) As Thomas Aquinas and Ross rightly recognize, we need an example of numerical unity, so simplest is to supply ??? <??????>.

1074b3-4. The rest of the tradition has been added later in mythical form.

(1) The rest of the tradition has been introduced later in mythical form. (according to Liddell/Scott)

(2) Bywater (1913, p. 111): "Aristotle is explaining how the purely mythical accretions came to be added on to the primeval philosophy which preceded mythology. I suspect that he wrote ?????????, not as in the text, ?????????."

(3) It is Bywater's ????????? what Bonitz ("hinzugefügt") and Ross ("added") factually translate. The phrase ?? ????? ????????? occurs in Topics, 132a18 (cf. 132a12-13 ???????????? ?? ?????). ????????? is translated by "have been introduced" in Liddell/Scott (sub voce ???????, 8b), as already in Thomas Aquinas (Sententia Metaphysicae, liber 12 lectio 10 numerus 31): "Reliqua vero introducta sunt fabulose."

1074b19-20. (since that which is its substance is not the act of thinking, but a potency).

(1) since then that which is its substance will not be the act of thinking, but a potency. (according to Bonitz)

(2) Thomas Aquinas (Sententia Metaphysicae, liber 12 lectio 11 numerus 3): "Si autem intellectus primi intellectus intelligat quidem actu, sed principale eius bonum, quod est operatio eius, sit aliquid aliud ab ipso, quia eius intelligentia, idest operatio intellectualis ipsius non est hoc quod sua substantia, comparatur ad ipsum sicut potentia ad actum, et perfectibile ad perfectionem. Et sic sequitur quod primum intelligens non sit optima substantia."

Fonseca: "etsi mens illa actu intelligat, et tamen eius substantia non sit ipse intelligendi actus, adhuc mens ipsa non erit aliquid optimum, ut suppositum est."

Bessarion: "non enim id quod est eius substantia intellectio erit, sed potentia."

Bonitz (1849, p. 515): "quoniam concludit Aristoteles, quid esset consecuturum si hoc poneremus, scribendum videtur: ?? ??? ?????."

(3) Thomas Aquinas and Fonseca rightly take ?? … ??????? as giving reason for 20 ??? ?? ? ?????? ????? ??? ("it cannot be the best substance"). Grammatically, this clause is the apodosis to ll. 18-19 ???? … ??????; the ???-clause is explanatory to it, illustrating the absurdity of the proposition ?????? ?' ???? ??????. It is therefore necessary (a) to accept Bonitz's emendation ????? (anticipated by Bessarion), and (b) to transpose the ???-clause to after l. 20 ???.

1074b23. and if of something else, either of the same thing always or of something different.

(1) and if of something else, either of the same thing always or of something new again and again. (reading <??????> ???? with Pseudo-Alexander and Argyropulus)

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (711. 23-24): ??? ?? ??????, ? ??? ?? ???? ????, ? ??? ??? ?????? ?????? ?? ????.

Argyropulus: "et si quippiam aliud, aut idem semper aut aliud aliudque."

1075a1-2. In the productive sciences it is the substance or essence of the object, matter omitted.

(2) William of Moerbeke: "in factivis quidem sine materia, substantia enim et quod quid erat esse."

Jaeger: "? ??? ????? J Lat, sed ??? nescio an post 1 ??? addi debeat signo interrogationis post ?????? posito."

(3) Probably the addition of ??? was caused by the unusual (inverted) word order ???? ???? ? ????? (instead of ? ???? ???? ?????), i. e. ???? ???? was understood as "what is without matter" (= ?? ???? ????, an expression which occurs in Proclus, Simplicius, Themistius and Johannes Philoponus, cf. On the Soul, 430a3 ??? ??? ??? ??? ???? ????) and taken as subject. By the said word order the attribute is emphasized, as in ??? ????? ?? ??????? (Xenophon, Hellenica, 6. 4. 19, v. Smyth, § 1161c).

1075a10. so throughout eternity is the thought which has itself for its object.

(2) Ross (ii 399): "Bonitz’s ????? ?? is not improbably right. But for ?? after a comparative clause cf. ?. 1003b5 n. There is a certain degree of opposition between the principal and the subordinate clause which makes ?? not unnatural; cf. B. 999a27 n."

1075a16. And all things are ordered together somehow, but not all alike, - both fishes and fowls and plants.

(1) My proposal: deleting "but not all alike".

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (715. 18-21): ??? ???? ???? ?? ???????????? ???? ??? ??? ???? ???????????, ?????????, ????? ????? ???? ??? ?? ?????. ???’ ?? ??? ????? ?????? ????????, ???’ ??? ?????? ??????, ???? ?? ??? ?????? ?? ?? ?????.

(3) It is hard to understand why Jaeger (ad locum) believes that Pseudo-Alexander has read the words ???’ ??? ?????? after the second ??????????? in l. 19; but he is right in so far as they anticipate ll. 19-23 (???' ????? … ????? ?????). This is why Christ comments on these lines: "???' … ????? ????? pertinent ad verba ???' ??? ?????? (16) illustranda." It is, however, scarcely conceivable that these pieces of text, both beginning with ???', originally coexisted; apparently, the first of them is a gloss.

1075a22-23. for this is the sort of principle that constitutes the nature of each.

(2) Zeller (1889, p. 263) conjectures ??????? ??? ??????? ????? ? ????? ???? ?????.

Lasson (1907, p. xvi) conjectures ??????? ??? ???? ??????? ????? …

Lasson's emendation is adopted by Jaeger: "???? ante ??????? collocavi."

(3) The transmitted word order ??????? ???? ????? is a hyperbaton (= "separation of words naturally belonging together", Smyth, § 3028). Among the instances given by Kühner/Gerth (§ 607. 1), the nearest parallel is Lysias de inval. §. 21 ???? ?? ??????? ???? ??? ?????????. The emendations by Zeller and Lasson are due to the prejudice that such stylistic devices are alien to Aristotle's 'acroamatic works'.

1075b5. Now even if it happens that the same thing is a principle both as matter and as mover. (according to Bonitz)

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (718. 12-14): ????? ???? ?????, ?? ??? ???????????? ??? ?????? ?? ?????????? ????? ??? ?? ???? ??? ?? ??????, ???? ?? ?? ???? ???????? ?? ??????.

Argyropulus: "quod et si eidem accidit ut sit principium ut materies atque movens."

Bonitz (1842, p. 107): "Transponendam esse […] particulam ???, ita quidem ut scribatur ??? ?? ??? ???? ????? ??? ?? ????????, ex superioribus verbis apparet. Confirmat hanc emendationem interpretatio Alexandri ????? ???? ?????, ?? ??? ???????????? ??? ?????? ?? ?????????? ????? ??? ?? ???? ??? ?? ??????, ???? ?? ?? ???? ???????? ?? ??????, et versio Bessarionis: si etiam eidem accidat et ut materiae principio esse et ut moventi."

1075b7. the nature of his 'evil' is just strife. (according to Shorey)

(2) Argyropulus: "haec autem apud ipsum est ipsa mali natura."

Shorey (1913, pp. 369-370): "For ???? we should read ????. What Aristotle says is that for Empedocles, in Empedocles' system, ?????? is the principle of evil. Cf. Metaphysics 985a6. This is of course an inference, but the epithets of ?????? in Empedocles bear it out.

[370] For the dative cf. ibid. 985a23, ???????? ???? ???? ? ??? ????? ?????????, ?? ?? ?????? ?????????, and Plato Laws 706 D, ???????? ??? ???? (sc. ?????) ???????? ??? ??????????. There is no lack of other examples.

???? here could hardly be construed 'the very nature of evil' and 'this itself' would not be satisfactory. Aristotle assumes as self-evident that the principle of evil is not primal and eternal. Cf. inter alia, 1072b34, 1075a38, 1091b30. Evil is an accident of the region below the moon. And if for Empedocles strife is evil it is absurd that strife should be eternal as it is in his system."

1075b17-19. And those who suppose two principles must suppose another, a superior principle, and so must those who believe in the Forms. (omitting l. 19 ??? ???? ???? ?????????)

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (719. 10-13): ????? ????? ????? ??? ??? ???? ??? ????? ????????, ???? ?? ???????, ??? ???? ?? ????, ??? ????? ????? ???? ?? ?? ???? ????? ????? ????, ???’ ?????? ????? ????? ?????????? ?????? ?????????.

Christ: "??? … ????????? ab interprete ad ??? ?? … ??????? addita videntur."

(3) More probably ??? … ????????? is a duplicate to l. 18 ????? … ?????.

1075b23-24. and the ignorance which is contrary to any knowledge leads to an object contrary to the object of the knowledge; but what is primary has no contrary. (according to Pseudo-Alexander)

(1) My proposal: deleting.

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (719. 35-38): ???? ???? ?? ???? ????? ???????? ????? ??????? ? ??????· ?? ??? ????? ? ?????? ???????? ?? ??????? ????????, ????? ??? ?? ???? ? ? ?????? ???????? ?? ????? ????.

Thomas Aquinas (Sententia Metaphysicae, liber 12 lectio 12 numerus 29): "relinquitur […] quod primae scientiae non sit contraria aliqua scientia, sed solum ignorantia."

Ross (in his apparatus criticus): "an ????? ?????????"

Jaeger: "an ????? ??? ???????? <?? ?????>? cf. Alexandrum."

(3) The interpretation Pseudo-Alexander/Ross is grammatically impossible, because the expression ? ??????? ?????? implies that there are two kinds of ignorance contrary to one another: "In this arrangement ["the article and the attributive precede the noun"] the emphasis is on the attributive." (Smyth, § 1157). Kühner/Gerth (§ 463. 3. A) give as example Plato, Laws, 805 D (?? ???? ????? … ?? ??? ??????? ?????). Examples with ? ?? ??????? are Plato, Menexenus, 238 C (???????? ??? ????? ???????? ?????, ???? ??? ??????, ? ?? ??????? ?????) and Aristotle, On the Heavens, 271a19-22 (???? ??? ???’ ? ??? ??? ? ??? ?? ? ????? ???? ??????? ?? ??? ??? ? ??? ?? ?· ?? ?????? ??? ??? ????? ? ???????, ? ?’ ??????? ???????? ???? ?? ??? ???????? ??? ?? ???????? ?????. "Nor again can motion along the circle from A to B be regarded as the contrary of motion from A to C: for the motion goes from the same point towards the same point, and contrary motion [i. e. contrary to the circular, v. 270b32] was distinguished as motion from a contrary to its contrary.").

Is it chance that our problematic passage 'quotes' exactly the beginning and the end of the sentence ? ?' ??????? ???????? ???? ?? ??? ???????? ??? ?? ???????? ????? in On the Heavens, 271a21-22? Indead, I cannot see any other solution than to take ? ?? ??????? ??? ?? ???????? as a note referring to this passage, 'for use in the home' of a reader. Because it was, of course, unintelligible to any other reader, ?????? was added to ? ?? ??????? and ?? ?? ????? ???????? ????? to ??? ?? ????????. The latter addition is suspicious in itself, because it is a mere repetition of ll. 21-22 ?? ??? ????? ???????? ?? ????? ?????.

1075b24-25. Again, if besides sensible things no others exist. (factually translating ??? ??)

(2) Argyropulus: "praeterea si non sint alia praeter res ipsas sensibiles."

Bessarion: "praeterea si non erunt alia praeter sensibilia."

Jaeger: "??? ?? Lat, recepi."

1075b27. But if the Forms or the numbers are to exist.

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (720. 13-15): ????? ?? ?? ????? ????? ?? ?????, ?? ? ?????? ?????, ? ?? ???????, ?? ?? ??????????? ?????, ??????? ????? ?????.

Bonitz (in his apparatus criticus): "?? addidi ex Alexandro."

1075b34. And we have said how this must be done.

(2) Argyropulus: "dictum est autem, quo pacto actum potentia antecedit."

Bonitz (1849, p. 525): "quod ??? de conjectura scripsi pro vulgato ??, allato loco 6. 1072a4 satis confirmatum videbitur."

Book XIII

1076b27-28. and prior to these points in the prior lines there will have to be other points. (reading ?????? ???)

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (727. 14-17): ??????? ??? ???????? ??????? ????? ???????? ??????? ?? ?? ???????? ????? ???’ ????? ???’ ?????. ?????? ?? ??? ??????? ??? ??????? ????? ???????? ???????.

Bonitz (1842, p. 58): "[…] ut grammatica enuntiationis conformatio recte se habeat, pro ?????? aut scribendum est ?????? ??? aut simpliciter ???. Nam hoc dicit Aristoteles, iis punctis, quae insunt in lineis prioribus, priora statuenda esse alia puncta, quae per se exsistant."

Christ: "aut ??? aut ?????? ??? scribendum fuit."

1076b31-32. those which exist apart from the sensible planes, and those in the mathematical solids, and those which exist apart from those in the mathematical solids. (according to Bonitz)

(2) Bessarion: "illae scilicet praeter sensibiles quae in mathematicis sunt solidis quaeque praeter eas quae in his sunt."

Bonitz (1842, p. 58): "Tria esse demonstravit superficierum absolute exsistentium genera, primum earum, quae praeter superficies sensibiles esse statuantur a14-16, alterum earum quae insint in ipsis solidis mathematicis, tertium denique earum, quae praeter superficies in solidis mathematicis contentas absolute ponantur a16-24. Haec diversa tria genera ita sunt significanda, ut singula cum articulo pronuntientur ?? ?? ???? ?? ??????? ??? ?? ?? ???? ???????????? ???????? ??? ?? ???? ?? ?? ???????. Ultimo loco articulus per eandem incuriam in omnibus libris manuscriptis excidisse videtur, per quam etiam medio loco ?? ?? ???? ???????????? ???????? in duobus codicibus T Ab omissus est. Alexander, qui in explicando hoc loco ad ipsa Aristotelis verba proxime accedit, articulum quem requirimus non omisit ?? ?? ???? ?? ?????? ??????? ??? ?? ?? ???? ???????????? ?????? ??? ?? ???? ?? ?? ???? ???????????? ? ???' ???? ??????? [727. 20-22]. Eundem articulum Bessarion sive in textu Aristotelis invenit, sive de conjectura adjecit."

1076b37. for there will be a different set of units apart from each set of points.

(1) My proposal: for there will be a different set of units apart from each set of units.

(3) The context requires ??????? instead of ???????:

(a) l. 36 ? ?' ????? ????? ??? ???? ??? ??????? leads us to expect that all what follows will unfold within the sphere of numbers.

(b) In what precedes, there is homonymy throughout; for just that is considered as the absurdity: that planes are supposed to exist apart from the planes known to all or points apart from the points known to all. Now, in the sphere of numbers, the same absurdity occurs: units are supposed to exist apart from the units known to all.

1076b38-39. so that there will be various classes of mathematical numbers.

(1) so that there will be infinitely many classes of mathematical numbers. (according to Pseudo-Alexander)

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (728. 22-23): ???? ??????? ?????? ???? ??? ??????????? ??????? ??? ???????.

Bessarion: "quare numerorum mathematicorum infinita genera erunt."

Fonseca: "Quapropter infinita erunt numerorum mathematicorum genera."

Jaeger: "?????? ex Alexandri paraphrasi et recentioribus addidi cum Bessarione."

(3) That there will be "genera of mathematical numbers" at all would be too modest a result. Since the ??????? are infinite in number, the first member of the disjunction in line 38 is just sufficient to give reason for an infinity of genera. This also motivates the ????: "then, on top of that (above all), also …."

1077a1-3. For the objects of astronomy will exist apart from sensible things just as the objects of geometry will. (according to Bonitz)

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (729. 7-9): ?? ??? ???? ? ? ????????? ???? ?????? ???? ???’ ?????? ??? ???????????? ??? ??? ???????? ???????, ????? ???? ??? ???? ? ? ??????????.

Bonitz (1842, p. 64): "Non ex sua ipsius sententia Aristoteles dicit eas res, ad quas astronomia pertinet, exsistere praeter res sensibiles, pariter ac res mathematicas, sed hoc conficit ex sententia eorum, qui mathematicas res seorsim et absolute exsistere statuant, eaque consequentia utitur ad eosdem refellendos. Itaque e constanti usu Aristotelis scribendum est ?????? ????? ???? ?? ???????. Confirmatur haec emendatio quum proximis verbis ?????? ?? ??? ?? ?????? ??? ?? ????????? ????? ??? ???? ?? ??? ???? ???? ?? ??????? ??? ?? ???' ??????? - ??? ??? ??????? - - ????? ??? ??? ???? ??? ???? ?????, tum eo loco, ad quem ipse Aristoteles respicere nos jubet, quod ?? ???? ?????????? eam rem se attigisse significat ?, 2. p. 997b16."

1077a3-4. but how is it possible that a heaven and its parts - or anything else which has movement - should exist apart?

(1) but how is it possible that a heaven and its parts - or anything else which has movement - should be unmoved? (according to Pseudo-Alexander)

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (729. 11-14): ??????? ?? ???????? ???????? ????? (??? ??? ??????? ?? ?? ????? ?? ??????? ?????? ???? ?? ??????? ?????), ?????? ??? ???? ?? ?? ??????? ?? ??? ?? ???? ?? ????? ???? ??? ????????? ???????? ?????.

Jaeger: "ante ??????? lacunam statui, excidit <??????? ???? ??? ????????> vel <??????? ????? ???????? ???? ????? ???> ???????; cf. 997b16, 19sq. unde Alexander sua sumpsisse videtur (BBA 278)."

(3) It is evident that Pseudo-Alexander read ????? ?' <????????> ???????. This reading is preferable to Jaeger's, because ???????? also applies to ? ???? ?????? ???? ???????.

1077a20-21. Again, by virtue of what, and when, will mathematical magnitudes be one?

(1) Again, by virtue of what in the world will mathematical magnitudes be one? (according to Bonitz)

(2) Bonitz (1849, p. 532): "???? ??? ???' ????? scripsi pro vulgato ???? ??? ???' ?????, quia causa quaeritur, non tempus unitatis, eamque causam vix inveniri posse significatur addita particula ????, qua vis interrogandi intenditur, cf. de an. III 4. 429a13. de sens. 3. 439a10. de mem. I. 450a28. Vig. p. 146."

The last reference is to Francisci Vigeri Rotomagensis De Praecipuis Graecae Dictionis Idiotismis Liber, cum animadversionibus Henrici Hoogeveeni, Ioannis Caroli Zeunii et Godofredi Hermanni (Leipzig 1813), pp. 146-147: "Eidem [???] interroganti saepe additur ???, ????, vel utrumque simul, ut, ??? ??? ?? ?????? ???????????; quis tandem usque adeo te a solita morum integritate dimovit? Aliquando alia vox interjicitur, ut, ??? ?? ???? ????? ????? ????????; quis te obsecro tam injuriose tractavit? Quae additio locum in omnibus casibus habere potest."

Ross (ii 414): "Bonitz’s ???? ??? ???', 'by virtue of what in the world’ is attractive, but though ??? ???? is common ??? ??? ???? does not seem to be recorded as occurring in this sense, and it is better to keep Bekker’s reading ???? ??? ???'."

Jaeger: "nisi forte ??? et ???' variae lectiones sunt in libris conflatae."

(3) I am unable to understand (a) the sense of the question "When will mathematical magnitudes be one?", and (b) how ???? ??? and ???? ???' can be variant readings. In order to get the translation intended by Bonitz, we have to delete the ???, which may have been intruded from Nicomachean Ethics, 1137a16.

1077a21-22. For things in our perceptible world are one in virtue of soul, or of a part of soul, or of something else that is reasonable enough.

(1) For it is reasonable that things in our perceptible world are one in virtue of soul, or of a part of soul, or of something else. (according to Jaeger)

For things in our perceptible world are one in virtue of soul, or of a part of soul, or of something else, with good reason. (reading ???????)

(2) Jaeger (BBA 268) corrects ?????? into ???????.

Ross writes ???????, commenting (ii 414): "For ??????? added thus at the end of a clause cf. Bonitz, Index 297b22-27."

Bonitz (l. c.) gives the evidences where "??????? in fine enuntiationis positum ita ut ante ??????? commate distinguendum sit (cf. ??????? ita collocatum Krüger gr gr 66, 1, 8)": 1153b15, 673b10, 690a28, 1162b6, 688a14, 738a18, 753a22.

The reference is to K. W. Krüger, Griechische Sprachlehre für Schulen (Berlin 1861), § 66, 1, A. 8: "Even without a verb, adverbs are found which, like a sentence, exclamatively, express a judgement about what precedes (epicritically). Particularly ??????? naturally! ??????? rightly!"

1077b10-11. for it is by adding a determinant to pale that we speak of the pale man.

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (733. 33-35): ?? ?? ?? ?????????? ??? ?? ????? ? ?????? ???????? ??????? ???? ??? ????????? ??? ??? ?????? ? ?????? ???????? ??????? ?? ??????????.

Bonitz (1849, p. 533): "?? ?????????? ?? ????? ???., non videtur significare: eo quod additur ?? ????? ? ????????, sed potius: per ?? ??????, quod additur ad hominem, exsistit homo albus; nam consentaneum est hominem subjici colori, qui ei inhaeret, non contra. Sed facilius et aptius hoc significari videtur, si receperimus lectionem Alexandri p. 710, 14 [= 733. 34-35 Hayduck]: ??? ??????."

Ross (ii 415): "?onitz proposes ??? ??????, which he takes to be Alexander’s reading. He argues that 'man' cannot be considered as added to 'white', but rather 'white' as added to 'man'. On this interpretation the clause would mean something like this: 'We have spoken of "white man" as if it were ?? ?????????? compared with "white". But really it is ?? ?????????? only as compared with "man".' Alexander’s general interpretation agrees with this, but it seems clear that he read ????? with the manuscripts, and interpreted this as 'by virtue of white' (????????? ??? ??????); v. 733. 34. This is surely an impossible interpretation. It seems better to translate 'by addition to the white'. It is true as Bonitz says that we cannot suppose a 'white' to exist first and then to become a man. But we can think first of 'white' and then add the thought of 'man', and this is the Aristotelian use of ?????????. Cf. Z. 1029b33, where we have ?? ???? (sc. ????????) ???? (sc. ?????) ???????????, and ?. 5. where the definition of ?? ????? as ??? ???? or of ?? ????? as ????? ???? is described as being ?? ??????????. On this view the clause in question does not correct what has gone before but justifies the previous description of ?????? ???????? as being ?? ?????????? in comparison with ??????."

1077b18-19. apart from extended magnitudes and from numbers. (according to Pseudo-Alexander)

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (734. 22-25): ????? ???, ????, ??? ?? ??????? ?? ???? ????????? ?? ???? ???????????? ???? ????? ??? ???’ ???? ????? ??? ?????? ???? ?? ??????? ?????? ??? ????????.

(3) ???? and ???? (i. e. the abbreviations for these prepositions) are frequently confused in the manuscripts. Reversely, ???? is mistaken for ???? in 1085b23.

1077b36. and the science has the healthy as its subject. (according to Bonitz)

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (736. 16-18): ??? ????? ??? ? ??????? ??? ??????, ? ?’ ????? ????????, ????????? ???? ???? ????? ????????, ????? ????? ? ???????, ??? ?? ???? ??????.

From Pseudo-Alexander's reading ? ?’ ????? ???????? Bonitz (1842, p. 46) deduces ? ?' [scil. ??????? ????????] ????? ???????? as original reading.

1077b36-1078a1. but with that which is the subject of each science. (according to Pseudo-Alexander)

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (736. 23-25): ?? ?? ???’ ??????? ?? ????? ??????, ?? ???????? ????????, ?? ???’ ??????? ???? ??? ????· ??’ ? ?? ????????? ??? ???? ?????? ???????? ??????? ????? ?? ???? ??? ?? ??????? ?????.

1078a1. with the healthy if it treats its object qua healthy, with man if qua man. (according to Bonitz)

(2) Bonitz (1842, p. 46): "[…] quod autem in verbis ?? ???????? ???????? interposui ?, proximis verbis ita confirmatur, ut vix excusatione egeat. Quamquam notum est, quam saepe a librariis ?? et ? confundantur, et quam facile, quum duae pares vel similes voculae deinceps positae sint, altera omittatur."

1078a2-4. if its subjects happen to be sensible, though it does not treat them qua sensible, the mathematical sciences will not for that reason be sciences of sensibles. (omitting ??? in l. 2)

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (736. 31-36): ?? ??? ??? ?????? ?????, ????, ??? ??? ??????????· ??? ?? ?????????? ??????? ????? ?? ????, ?? ???? ?’ ? ???????. ??? ???????? ?? ?? ?? ????? ?? ??? ?? ?????????? ??????? ????? ? ?? ????????. ???? ?? ?? ?????????? ??? ?????? ???????? ‘???? ??? ??? ??????????, ?? ?????????? ??????? ????? ?? ???? ?????????, ??? ???? ?? ?????? ????????? ? ????? ???????.

Jaeger: "?? seclusi; difficultatem jam sensit Alexander, negatione duplicata sententia in contrarium abit; cf. 35-36 ubi duplex negatio recte ponitur."

1078a10-11. i.e. simplicity.

(2) Jaeger: "an ?????… 11 ????? delendum?"

(3) The style is the same as in 1025a30 (????? ?' ?? ??????). The source of inspiration is 1052b33-36.

1078a11-12. Therefore a science which abstracts from spatial magnitude is more precise than one which takes it into account.

(2) Jaeger: "?? scripsi."

(3) For the combination ???? ?? cf. 1025b29, Physics, 218b21. ?? and ?? are confused innumerable times.

1078a17-20. and calls it a foot long when it is not. (according to Bonitz)

(2) Bessarion: "ac eam quae pedalis non est, pedalem dicat."

Fonseca: "et eam quae pedalis linea non est, pedalem esse dicat."

Bonitz (1842, p. 107): "Alexander [738. 17-19] sic interpretatur ???? ???' ? ?? ?? ?????? ??? ?? ???????? ?? ???????? ?????? ????????? ?? ??? ?? ?? ???????? ?? ?????? ???' ?? ?? ?????????, unde intelligimus articulum ??? in ejus textu non ad prius sed ad posterius ???????? appositum fuisse, ??? ???????? ?? ??? ?? ????????. Ac multo sane aptior haec est lectio; geometra enim saepe de linea, quam pro arbitrio duxit, ita agit quasi certam quandam habeat longitudinem, veluti pedalem, etsi revera non est pedalis. Ponit igitur pedalem esse eam lineam, quae fortasse non est pedalis. Nec vero aptiorem tantum, sed genuinam esse hanc lectionem ad liquidum perducitur, si comparaveris proximi libri locum, ubi de simili re eodem exemplo Aristoteles utitur. ?, 2. p. 1089a21 […], et ?, 1. p. 1052b32. Quantopere autem in ejusmodi exemplis sibi constet Aristoteles satis est notum."

Jaeger: "cf. 1052b33, 1089a23."

1078a26-28. For evidently the properties which would have belonged to him even if perchance he had not been indivisible, can belong to him even apart from these attributes.

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (739. 13-16): ?????? ??? ???? ????????? ?? ??? ?? ?? ??? ?? ?????????? ??????? ????, ???????? ??? ???? ??????, ???? ??? ??????????, ????????? ???????? ???? ?? ???????, ???? ?? ????? ?????????, ?? ??’ ??????? ?????????.

Bessarion: "quae certe (etiam tametsi nullibi erat indivisus) inerant ei, patet quod etiam absque his contingit ei posse inesse."

Fonseca: "quae sane (tametsi nullibi erat indivisus) inerant ei, ut perspicuum sit, illa sine his ei posse convenire."

Ross (ii 417-418): "Alexander takes this [?? ???????] as subject of ???????? and supposes that it is a geometrical attribute which Aristotle states to be capable of belonging to man even if he were not indivisible. Alexander is no doubt thinking of the sense of ???????? which has led to the use of the word 'power' in its arithmetical meaning. But (1) what is said ???????? in this sense is the line on which a square or a cube is erected, so that ??????? in this sense is not a suitable epithet for a man, and (2) the subject of ???????? is undoubtedly ? … ????. Bonitz [in his translation, p. 276 Wellmann] takes ?? ??????? to mean 'so far as possibility is concerned' ["der Möglichkeit nach"], but this with ????????? is otiose, and the usage is apparently not found elsewhere. ?? ??????? is probably a gloss on ?????? (l. 31), perhaps introduced here by a copyist who took ?????? to be the antecedent of ? and thought that ???????? needed a subject. The words are omitted by ? [= William of Moerbeke]."

Jaeger: "aut varia lectio est ad ????????? (addito ??) aut commentum marginale ad 31 ?? ?' ??????."

1079a2-4. For to each thing there answers an entity which has the same name and exists apart from the substances, and so also in the case of all other groups there is a one over many.

(1) For to each thing there answers an entity which has the same name, as well in the case of the substances as of all other groups of which there is a one over many. (according to Jaeger)

(2) Syrianus (108. 25-26): ??????? ????? ????? ?????, ??? ??? ?? ??????? ?????? ??? ??? ??????????? ?????· ?????? ??? ?? ???’ ??????? ????? ????????.

Jaeger: "??? … 3 ?????? post ?????? transposui (eadem inter se opponuntur sed reverso ordine 20); ??? … ?????? grammatice correspondent verbis ??? ?? ?????, idem error in A quod alter liber ex altero correctus est, cf. e. g. 990b18-19."

(3) Cf. the parallel 990b6-8 and our note on it, which is in favor of Jaeger's reading.

1079b6. but 'what really is' has to be added. (according to Shorey)

(2) Shorey (1925): "For ?? ???? both Platonic usage and Platonic thought require us to read ? ????. What first arouses suspicion is the fact that there is nothing in Plato to which the criticism expressed by ?? ???? could plausibly apply. Plato nowhere converts a definition of a concept, a class, a group of particulars into a definition of the idea by adding that it is a definition of the thing in question. Such a procedure would be senseless from the point of view either of Plato or of common sense."

1079b7. For to what is this to be added?

(2) Jaeger: "?? et ??? variae lectiones sunt velut 28."

1079b9-11. Further, there must be some Idea answering to 'plane' above, some nature which will be present in all the Forms as their genus.

(1) Further, there must be some Ideal, answering to 'plane' above, and some nature which will be present in all the Forms as their genus. (according to Jaeger)

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (742. 31 - 743. 3): ???, ?????, ????? ?? ??????????? ?? ??????????? ???? ?? ???? ??? ?? ?????, ?????? ??? <??> [my addition] ?? ?????????, ?? ????? ?? ???????? ?? ?????, ?????? ???? ????? ???’ ??????, ?????? ??? ?? ???????????? ?????? ?? ‘?????????? ?? ??? ????????’ ????? ????? ???? ??? ?????? ???’ ????? ??? ?????, ??’ ?? ????? ?????? ?????? ???? ??????. ?? ??? ?? ???? ????? ?? ??????????? ?? ????? ???????, ???? ??? ?? ‘?????????? ?? ??? ????????’ ?? ????? ???? ?? ??? ???? ?????? ??????? ??????. ??? ?? ??? ?? ???? ??????? ?? ??????????? ????? ??? ??? ????? ????, ?? ?? ‘?????????? ?? ??? ????????’, ??????? ????, ??? ????? ????? ??? ??? ?????; ???? ??? ?????, ???? ?? ?? ????? ????? ??? ?????? ?? ????????, ??????????.

Christ: "?? deleverim."

Ross (ii 423): "It is not necessary to omit ?? as Christ suggests. ‘“So-and-so itself” (???? ??) will be a nature present in all the Forms as their genus, as “plane” is present in all the species of plane figure.' ???? ?? is a generalization of Platonic phrases like ???? ??????, and the meaning is that Formness will itself be a Form; and this can be attacked by a ?????? ???????? argument."

According to Jaeger (BBA 279), ???? ?? and ????? ??? are both predicate, so that a ??? is required.

(3) Ross's earlier interpretation (in his commentary, agreeing with Pseudo-Alexander's) is excluded by the position of the ?????, which had, then, to stand before ?????, as in Pseudo-Alexander's paraphrasis. The fact that he constantly adds ??? ?????(?) suggests that he read ????? ???? <??? ??????>. For the phrase ???? ????? ?? cf. Physics, 204a17-18 (??? ??? ????????? ????? ?? ???? ???????), where the codices FI and Michael Psellus write ??? ??? ????????? ???? ????? ?? ???????.

1080a20-21. and any of them are associable with any. (reading ????????? ??????????)

(1) and any of them is associable with any. (according to Jaeger)

(2) William of Moerbeke: "et est inconferibilis quaecumque unitas cuicumque unitati."

Bessarion: "aut sunt confestim consequenter omnes et quaecunque quibuscunque combinabiles."

Fonseca: "vel omnes continuo quaelibet cum qualibet deinceps sunt communicabiles."

Jaeger writes ???????? ????????.

1080b3-4. either one kind and not another, or all of them.

(2) Syrianus (121. 24-27): ??? ?????? ???? ????? ????????? ????? ?? ???????????? ??????????, ???’ ?? ???????? ??????? ????????? ?????????? ???? ???????? ????? ? ?????????? ??? ???????, ?? ?????????? ?????? ??? ???????? ?????, ? ???? ??? ????????? ???? ?? ??????????.

Pseudo-Alexander (744. 32-35): ? ?? ????? ????????? ???? ??????, ? ????? ??? ????? ?? ???????? ????? ??? ???????? ?????????? ???? ????????? ????? ?? ?? ??????????, ? ?????? ????????, ? ?????? ?? ????????.

Bonitz (1849, p. 543): "Quod vulgo additur: ? ?????? ?????, vel quod Alex. p. 721, 30 videtur in textu habuisse: ? ?????? ????? ? ?????? ?? ?????, omittendum arbitror cum codicibus Gb/Ib, quoniam ad omnia numerorum idealium genera haec partitio supra jam refertur, a37: ??? ??????? ? ????????? ???."

Ross (ii 427-428): "Bonitz argues that the view that all the numbers are immanent in sensibles has been already mentioned in l. 1, so that ? ?????? is unmeaning. But Alexander evidently had these words (perhaps ? ?????? ?? as well), though his interpretation of them cannot be right; and so have all the good manuscripts. The solution of the difficulty is to treat ??? ????? … ??????? as parenthetical. ‘The numbers must be either transcendent, or immanent … either some immanent and not others, or all immanent.’"

1080b14-16. and others say mathematical number alone exists, as the first of realities, separate from sensible things.

(1) My recommendation: deleting "as the first of realities".

(2) Ross (ii 428): "??? (not ??) ?????? ??? ????? is somewhat strange; in the light of 1083a23 (also on Speusippus) ?? ?? ?????????? ????? ??? ???? ???????? ??????? ??? ????? one may conjecture that ??? should be omitted."

Jaeger: "an <??? ???>???? cf. 1028b21 sq."

(3) If ??? is omitted, the resulting sentence "mathematical number alone is the first of realities" is even more "strange". ????? must mean "exists", as in l. 11. To me, the words ??? ?????? ??? ?????, being completely irrelevant, look like a gloss reminiscent of 1083a23 and 1073a24.

1080b22-23. Another thinker says the first kind of number, that of the Forms, alone exists, and some say mathematical number is identical with this.

(2) Syrianus (123. 17-19): ?????, ????, ??? ??? ????????????? ??????????? ???????, ??? ?? ????????? ??????? ??? ????????? ??? ????? ?????? ??????? ??? ???????????.

Pseudo-Alexander (746. 12-15): ????? ?? ??? ??? ??????????? ??? ????? ??????, ???????? ????? ?? ??? ??????????? ??? ??? ????????????? ??????????? ???????, ??? ?? ????????? ???????, ??? ?????????, ??? ????? ?????? ??????? ??? ???????????.

Ross (ii 429): " It is not easy to identify ????? … ???, who believed in ideal number only. Alexander’s suggestion that it was a Pythagorean can hardly be right, since Aristotle never ascribes the belief in Ideas to Pythagoreans. It must be a Platonist, but further than this we cannot go. Elsewhere in enumerating the views held Aristotle omits this one (1076a19-22, 1086a2-13, cf. 1080b24-30).

Jaeger [BBA 270] would remove the difficulty by treating ????? as a variant for ????? and removing ????? in l. 23 as a later addition due to the intrusion of ?????. But Alexander and Syrianus had our text; and it is not particularly surprising that Aristotle should mention here a view he does not mention elsewhere - a view which is almost certain to have been held by some Platonist."

1080b29-30. for they say that neither is every spatial magnitude divisible into magnitudes, nor do any two units taken at random make 2.

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (746. 31-33): ??? ??? ??????? ??? ?????? ????? ????????? ????? [scil. ?? ??????????? ????????, cf. ll. 26-27] ????? ??? ????????? ??????? ????????????? ?????? ????? ???????????.

Jaeger: "???? primum non legisse videtur Alexander quo omisso ???' ????????? scribi oporteret."

(3) Pseudo-Alexander is freely paraphrasing, because he is aiming to conclude e contrario what is meant by ??????????? ???????? in ll. 26-27.

1080b32-33. but they suppose the numbers to have magnitude, as has been said before.

(2) Syrianus (124. 6-8): ?? ?? ?????? ???? ??? ??????????? ?????????? ?????? ??????? ???? ????????, ?????? ?? ???? ???????????? ???????? ??????? ??? ???????, ?????? ???? ???’ ????????.

Pseudo-Alexander (747. 10-12): ????? ??? ?????????????? ??? ??????? ??? ???????? ??? ???? ???????? ???????????, ?? ??? ?????? ???????.

1081a1. in which of the two ways we distinguished. (reading ????? with Joseph)

1081a7. and the Ideas cannot be the numbers.

(2) Bonitz (1842, p. 53): "??? ????? subjectum enuntiati esse, si cui dubium videatur, e proximis verbis intelligitur ????? ??? ????? ??????? ???????????? ? ???? ? ???? ?????? ??? ?????; itaque delendus articulus ???? et hunc in modum verba interpretanda sunt: si omnes unitates consociabiles et pares esse statuuntur, exsistit numerus mathematicus neque alius praeterea, nec fieri potest ut idearum naturam numeris definiri censeas, die Ideen können nicht Zahlen sein. Confirmat emendationem ipse Aristoteles, qui postquam paucis hanc sententiam explicuit, deinceps rem ita persequitur: ?? ?? ?? ????? ??????? ?? ?????, ???' ???? ???? ?? ????? ?????. a12. cf. 1082b24. ???? ??????? ?? ????? ???????. p. 1086a6. ?? ?? ?? ???? ?????????? ??? ??? ???????? ??????."

Bonitz (1849, p. 547): "Articulum ???? omittendum conjeceram Obs. p. 53, ut ???????? praedicati locum obtinere posset. Ac pro praedicato quidem habendum esse ???????? ex ratiocinatione ipsa manifestum est; omittendum autem propterea esse articulum non ita certo contenderim; videtur additus esse, ut non simpliciter dicat: ??? ????????? ??? ????? ????? ????????, sed: ??? ????? ????? ????????? ????????, i. e. ?????????? ??? ????????????."

Ross (ii 434): "Bonitz’s proposal to omit ???? is supported by l. 12, but is not absolutely necessary. As he himself says, we may render the manuscript reading ‘and the Ideas cannot be the numbers thus produced."

(3) The article is necessary if Aristotle wants to express equalizing Ideas and numbers, which is indeed the doctrine ascribed by him to Plato. Cf. Smyth, § 1152: "Even in the predicate the article is used with a noun referring to a definite object (an individual or a class) that is well known, previously mentioned or hinted, or identical with the subject." For the last mentioned case, Kühner/Gerth (§ 461, Anmerkung 4) give inter alia examples from Plato: Theaetetus, 145 D; 205 A; Gorgias, 483 B; Cratylus, 417 D; Symposium, 204 C.

1081a15-17. and the principles or elements are said to be principles and elements of number, and the Ideas cannot be ranked as either prior or posterior to the numbers.

(1) and they (the 1 and the indefinite dyad) are said to be the principles and the elements of number. (according to Bonitz's translation "und diese werden als die Prinzipien und die Elemente der Zahl bezeichnet")

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (748. 26-28): ?? ?? ??? ?? ????? ??? ?? ???????? ???????? ??? ??????? ????? ???? ??? ??? ?? ????? ??? ?? ???????? ??? ??????? ???’ ?????? ????? ????? ????????, ?? ?? ?? ??? ? ???????? ????.

Ross (ii 435): "?? ????? ??? ?? ???????? = ?? ?v ??? ? ???? ? ????????. The argument seems to be: ‘the only principles put forward by these thinkers are put forward as principles of number. If, then, they are also the principles of the Ideas, which they are clearly meant to be, the Ideas must be (1) identical with numbers, which we have shown they are not, or (2) prior or posterior to, causes or effects of, numbers, which they evidently cannot be, since they are composed of a different kind of units. Therefore the Ideas are left without any ????? at all’. The order of the words is against Apelt's proposal to interpret l. 15 ‘and the principles (sc. of the Ideas) are said to be also the elements of number’."

Jaeger: "????? [before ?? ?????] supplevi ex Alexandri paraphrasi."

(3) Jaeger's emendation does not help, because <?????> ?? ????? … ???????? cannot have the sense intended by him "these (the 1 and the indefinite dyad) are said to be the principles": every Greek reader would understand ????? ?? ????? simply as "these principles" (cf. e. g. 1024a10, 1057b9, 1082a9). Best seems to supply in thought "the 1 and the indefinite dyad" as subject (as Pseudo-Alexander and Bonitz did). Then the reasoning of ll. 13-17 is as follows:

(a) Supposed that Ideas and numbers are not identical (l. 12), "from what principles will the Ideas come?" (l. 13).

(b) The number comes from the One and the indefinite duality (l. 14).

(c) Now (?) these principles (the One and the indefinite duality) "are said (by the Platonists) to be the the principles and the elements of number" (ll. 15-16), and (?) the Ideas (?????) "cannot be ranked as either prior or posterior to the numbers" (ll. 16-17). In the second case (Ideas posterior to the numbers), One and infinite duality could be the principles of the Ideas because they are the principles of number. In the first case, reversely, One and infinite duality could be firstly the principles of the Ideas and therefore the principles of number.

(d) Ergo, under the supposition that Ideas and numbers are not identical, the One and the indefinite duality can in no way be the principles of the Ideas.

From this analysis it becomes evident that Ross's interpretation must be wrong. If "the principles or elements are principles and elements of number" this would imply that the numbers are the uppermost sphere of being, so that the alternative "the Ideas prior to the numbers" would be excluded from the outset.

1081a21-29. For 2 will not proceed immediately from 1 and the indefinite dyad, and be followed by the successive numbers, as they say '2, 3, 4' - for the units in the ideal 2 are generated at the same time, whether, as the first holder of the theory said, from unequals (coming into being when these were equalized) or in some other way - since, if one unit is to be prior to the other, it will be prior also to the 2 composed of these; for when there is one thing prior and another posterior, the resultant of these will be prior to one and posterior to the other.

(2) Bonitz (1849, p. 548): "Duas videtur Aristoteles argumentationes conjungere, a23-25, a25 ?????? — 29, sed re vera id quod ab initio demonstrandum ponit: ??? ????? ? ???? ?????, altera demum parte comprobat; priore autem parte quasi per parenthesin monet, Platonicos certe numeros non esse ex eo quod descripsit genere, sed singulos quosque consociabiles inter se habere unitates. Ipsa autem, quae altera parte continetur, argumentatio e notione ??? ?????? repetita est, de qua cf. ad b2."

Ross (ii 435): "21-29 is a difficult piece of argument. Alexander supposes ll. 21-23 to mean that if the units are incomparable each with each, the numerical series will be destroyed because the numbers will be all formed simultaneously (749. 19), and this view is adopted by Robin (note 285, iii). But this is contrary to Aristotle’s usage, according to which ‘incomparability’ implies the very opposite of simultaneity; ?? ??? ?????? ?? ????? ?? ?’ ???????? 1080a17 is synonymous with ?????????? ib. 19. Alexander, continuing to misunderstand the passage, thinks that Aristotle should have said (l. 23) ? ??? ??? ?? … ??????? ????????? ? ??? ???. This means that Alexander is quite at sea. Bonitz perceives the general nature of the argument as it stands in the received text, viz. that Aristotle offers two proofs to show that the supposition of units incomparable each with each is contrary to the Platonic view of ideal number as forming the series 1, 2, 3, 4, &c. (ll. 21-23), one proof being given in ll. 23-25, another in ll. 25-29; and that really what Aristotle professes to show (that ??? ????? ? ???? ?????) is proved only by the second proof. The argument can be made right by the alteration of one word - by reading ???? for ?????? in l. 25 (?????? has probably come in through the influence of ?????? in l. 22). Then the argument runs thus: ‘For the two will on this hypothesis not proceed first from the one and the indefinite dyad, and then the other numbers, as the Platonists say «2, 3, 4» - for they generate the units in the first (i. e. the ideal) two simultaneously - since if the one unit in the two were prior to the other (as it must be, on the hypothesis of incomparability, cf. 1080a17, 19), it would be prior also to the two which is composed of them. Thus the order would be not, as they say, 1, 2, 3, 4, but 1, first unit in 2, 2, second unit in 2, first unit in 3,’ &c. For the combination ???? ?? cf. 1087a21."

1081a34-35. and a fourth and a fifth in 3 before the numbers 4 and 5 exist.

(1) and a fourth and a fifth in 3 and 4 before these numbers exist. (according to Jaeger)

(2) Jaeger (BBA 277) conjectures ?????? <??? ???????> ??????? ??? [?] ??????.

(3) Jaeger's emendation <??? ???????> is required by the plural ???? ???????? ???????, [?] ?????? is what Ross factually translates by "and a fifth".

1081b21-22. but they say 4 came from the first 2 and the indefinite 2, -which makes it two 2's other than the 2-itself.

(1) but if 4 came from the first 2 and the indefinite, there will be two 2's other than the 2-itself. (according to Jaeger)

(2) Jaeger (BBA 277): "By supplying ?? [???' <??> ??], a hypothetical period is established, the second part of which continues with ?? ?? ??."

Ross (ii 437): "Jaeger's addition of ?? is ingenious, but not strictly necessary."

1081b29-30. All this is absurd and fictitious. (according to Jaeger)

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (754. 12-14): ???? ?? ????? ????? ??????? ??? ??????????, ???????? ????? ?????? ??? ?????????, ???? ??? ??????????.

Jaeger (BBA 277) supplies ????? before ????: "The fact that a second adjective has dropped out before or after ???? is manifest in itself; the supplement is furnished by 1082b2."

1082a17. Either by one's sharing in the other. (according to Christ)

(2) Christ: "??????? ??????? vulgo, at ??????? dativo nominis non tempore verbi dictum videtur, unde aut ??????? ??????? scribendum aut ??????? ??????? delendum fuit."

Ross (ii 438): "The manuscript reading ??????? ??????? ??????? (‘one will participate in the other’) does not offer a grammatical parallel to the other alternative ? ???? ? ???. Christ is therefore right in proposing ??????? ??????? ??????? (‘by participation of one in the other’)."

1082a31-32. Therefore if the first 2 is an Idea, these 2's also will be Ideas of some kind.

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (758. 24-27): ??? ?? ??? ? ????? ???? ???? ? ???????? ?? ??? ????? ??? ???????? ???????? ?????? ???? ?????, ?? ?? ????? ??? ???????; ? ?’ ????? ????? ??? ??? ??? ???????.

Ross (ii 39): "Jaeger [BBA 278] points out that E1JAb read ????? after ???? in l. 32 (he infers from Al. 758. 21 that Alexander also read ?????; but 758. 25 has ????). He concludes that ? ????? ?????? has dropped out before ??? ? ????? ????. But the argument in ll. 28-32 is that the dyads in 4, since they generate the tetrads in 8 as the first dyad generates them, must be Ideas as much as the first dyad; a reference to the first tetrad would be out of place. ????? has come in because the eye of the writer of the archetype travelled on to ????? later in the line. For the idiomatic ??? before ? ????? ???? cf. ?. 1089a16."

1082b9. If not, not even the 2's in the 10-itself will be undifferentiated, though they are equal. (according to Schwegler and Bonitz)

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (760. 16-20): ?? ?? ??? ????? ??? ?? ?? ?? ?????????? ?????? ???? ??? ???? ??? ?????????, ?? ?? ?????, ???? ?? ?? ?? ?????? ??? ??????? (?????? ??? ??? ??????? ??????) ???? ???, ???????? ?? ??? ??????????, ? ????? ????? ???? ?????? ???? ?????? ??’ ?? ?? ??? ?? ?? ?????? ?????? ???? ????? ????????? ?????, ?? ?? ????? ???? ??? ???????? ??.

Schwegler (ii 322): "A decade [to which ????? could refer] was not mentioned before. Write ???? ?? ?????? - as Alexander seems to have read 738, 11 [= 760. 16 Hayduck]."

Bonitz (1849, p. 551): "???? ?? ??????, quod pro vulgato ????? ?? ?????? scripsi secutus auctoritatem Alexandri p. 738, 11 [= 760. 16 Hayduck], per ipsam sententiae rationem necessarium esse apparet."

1082b11-14. Again, if every unit + another unit makes two, a unit from the 2-itself and one from the 3-itself will make a 2. Now (?) this will consist of differentiated units; and (?) will it be prior to the 3 or posterior?

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (760. 27-35): ? ????? ???????? ?????. ?????? ???? ????? ???? ??? ????? ??????? ????? ?????, ?? ?? ??? ?????? ????? ??? ??? ??????? ?????, ????????? ?? ?? ??? ?????????? ??? ??? ??????????? ????? ??? ??? ???? ?????? ??? ??????? ??????? ?????, ?????? ??? ??????? ????? ?? ??????????? ???????· ?? ??? ??? ?????????? ??????? ???? ??? ?? ?? ?????????? ???????? ???’ ??????· ?????? ??? ??? ????? ???? ?? ??????????? ???????, ???? ?? ?????????. ??? ?? ??? ????? ??????? ?????? ????? ?????, ?? ??? ??? ??????. ?????? ?? ????? ????? ?????, ???? ??? ?????? ??????, ???? ??? ??? ?? ????????? ???????.

Jaeger: "intellege ? ?? ??? ??????? ????? <?????> ???? ????? nisi ita scribendum est. ?? omittit Alexandri citatio; an ?? (scil. ???????)? sed nescio an plura exciderint velut ???? ????? ?? ??????????? ?? <??? ?????????? ???????>; cf. Alexandri paraphrasin 761. 16, 17-18. 34. is haec ex commentario antiquiore (e genuino Alexandro?) hausisse videtur, qui textu sano utebatur (cf. etiam ad 36)."

(3) Pseudo-Alexander (760. 35) says expressly that he has read "the conjunction ??". In 761. 16-18 he is commenting on 1082b19-22, in 761. 34 on 1082b26-28.

1082b36. But we do both.

(1) But we do both; <for we are dividing if the greatest number is definite, and we are composing if it is indefinite>. (according to Syrianus)

(2) Syrianus (138. 24-30): ???????, ?????, ???????, ??????? ??? ??? ??? ??? ??? ???? ??? ??????????? ??? ??????? ??? ????? ??? ???? ???? ???????? ????????, ? ???? ????????? ??? ??? ??????? ????????? ?? ??? ???? ???????· ?????? ??? ??? ????????? ?????? ???????. ???? ??, ????, ?????? ??? ??????? ?? ????? ?????????? ????????? ??????? ??? ??????? ???? ?????? ??? ?????. ?????????? ?? ???? ?????? ??? ????????? ????????· ????????? ??? ??? ??? ???????? ??????????, ???????? ?? ????? ??????????.

Pseudo-Alexander (762. 29-35): ????? ??, ?????, ????????? ????????· ????????? ??? ????? ??? ???????, ???? ??? ???? ? ??? ?? ? ????? ??????????, ?????????? ?????? ??? ?? ?????? ????· ???????? ?? ??????????? ???? ?????? ???????, ??? ?? ???????????? ??? ??? ???????, ?? ?????? ??? ????????? ?????????. ???? ??? ???????? ???? ??? ???????; ? ?????? ??? ? ??? ??? ? ???? ??? ?? ?????? ??? ???? ??? ???????, ?? ??? ?????? ????????? ??????????, ???? ?? ??? ??????? ????? ???????? ?? ????? ??????? ???? ??? ????.

Bonitz (1849, p. 552): "pleniorem textum quin habuerit Alexander, conferenti praecipue p. 741, 3 [= 762. 32-33 Hayduck ???? ??? ???????? ???? ??? ???????;], vix potest dubium videri."

Ross (ii 440): "Bonitz seems right in supposing that Alexander had before him words which do not exist in our text (cf. especially 762. 32 ???? ??? ???????? ???? ??? ???????;); and there are traces of something similar in Syrianus."

(3) It seems that Syrianus (138. 29-30) is quoting almost literally a sentence (????????? ??? ??? ??? ???????? ??????????, ???????? ?? ????? ??????????) missing in our manuscripts, whereas Pseudo-Alexander (762. 29-32) gives an enlarged paraphrase of the same sentence (????????? ??? ????? … ????????? ?????????).

1083a3-4. and neither of these seems to be possible. (factually omitting ???????)

(1) and neither of these seems to apply. (omitting ??????????)

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (763. 8-10): ????????? ???, ????, ?????? ??????????? ???????? ???????? ???? ??????? ? ???? ????????.

Jaeger: "?????????? et ??????? variae lectiones contaminatae, seclusi; e conjectura ??????????? ???????? Alexander."

(3) For ????????? ???????? ??????? cf. De sensu et sensibilibus, 437b19, for ?????????? ??? ???????? Physics, 212a10-11.

1083b26-27. for in one there is the great and in another the small.

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (767. 35 - 768. 5): ?? ??? ??? ?? ????, ????????? ?? ??? ??? ?? ??? ?? ??? ??????? ?? ?? ?? ??? ??????, ??? ??? ?????? ?????? ??? ????????? ?????, ???’ ? ??? ?? ??? ??????? ? ?? ?? ??? ??????· ???? ???? ???? ??????? ???? ?????????, ???? ???? ?? ???????? ????? ??? ??????????? ?????? ???? ???????, ?? ?? ?? ??? ??????? ??????? ??? ?? ?? ??? ??????? ?????, ?? ?? ?????? ??? ?? ?? ??????. ?????? ??? ???? ????????? ?? ???? ????????? ?? ???????· ?? ?? ??? ??? ?? ???? ?? ?? ?? ?? ?????? ???????, ???????? ?? ????? ??.

Christ: "??????? scripsi,: ??????? codices Alexander, sed idem recte futurum interpretatur."

(3) What is put into the future by Pseudo-Alexander (???????) is the consequence of the units' being (???????) great or small.

1084a15-16. It must, then, be one of the numbers within these limits. (according to Pseudo-Alexander and Bonitz)

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (770. 25-28): ?????? ?? ??? ????????? ???? ????? ??? ?? ??????? ???????, ???????? ???? ??? ?? ??????? ???? ?????????? ???????? ????????????????? ???????, ??????? ????? ???? ??? ???????· ??????? ??? ?? ????? ??? ??????? ?????? ???’ ?????? ??? ?????.

Anonymus: "necesse quoque ex hiis numeris aliquem esse."

Bonitz (in his apparatus criticus): "???? scripsi cum Alexandro."

1084a21. each of the numbers will be man-himself.

(1) each of the 3's will be man-himself. (according to Slezák)

(2) Slezák (2003) conjectures ???? ?????? (scil. ?????) ????????.

1084a21-25. And if the smaller number is part of the greater (being number of such a sort that the units in the same number are associable), then if the 4-itself is an Idea of something, e.g. of 'horse' or of 'white', man will be a part of horse, if man is 2. (according to Bonitz)

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (770. 36 - 771. 3): ???? ??? ?? ????? ? ??????? ??????? ????? ??? ???????? ???????, ????????? ?? ??? ?? ?? ?? ???? ?????? ???????, ?????? ?? ?? ??????????? ???????? ???? ??????? ??? ????????? ????????, ?? ????? ? ?????????? ? ????????? ? ?? ??????????, ? ?? ???????????? ? ????????, ???? ?? ?? ?? ??????????? ?? ???????? ????, ????? ? ???????????? ????? ??? ?????, ?? ???? ? ????????.

Bessarion: "et si minor pars sit majoris, qui ex iis combinabilibus unitatibus est, quae in eodem sunt numero. si alicuius idea sit ipse quaternarius, veluti equi aut albi, homo erit pars equi, si homo dualitas sit."

Fonseca: "itemque, si minor numerus pars est majoris, qui constat ex communicabilibus unitatibus, quae sunt in eodem numero; si quaternarius ipse idea alicuius est, veluti equi aut albi, homo erit pars equi, si binarius homo est."

Bonitz (1842, pp. 108-109): "Mutanda primum videtur enuntiati distinctio. Verba enim haec ? ?? ??? ????????? ??????? ??? ?? ?? ???? ?????? non continent apodosin, quae pertineat ad protasin ?? ????? ? ??????? ??? ????????, sed hanc ipsam protasin accuratius definiunt; agi nimirum de eo genere numerorum idealium, in quo uniuscujusque numeri unitates inter se combinabiles sint, diversorum vero numerorum unitates non combinabiles. Itaque continuanda est protasis ad ea usque verba, quae futuro tempore verbi ????? manifestum prae se ferunt signum apodosis, ? ???????? ????? ???., et commutato colo, quod est ante ?? ?' ? ??????, in comma, haec conditio accipienda est tamquam subjecta et subordinata superiori. Quod si recte collegimus, inde consequetur ut particula adversativa ?? commutetur in ??. Pro ???? autem recipiendum videtur ???? e codice T, quocum consentit interpretatio Bessarionis; neque enim agitur de hoc numero quaternario ipso per se, i. e. eo in quo ideae vis et natura inest. - Quae ex ipsa loci sententia repetivimus, eadem confirmata videmus commentario Alexandri ???? ??? ?? ????? ? ??????? ??????? ????? ??? ???????? ???????, ????????? ?? ??? ?? ?? ?? ?????? ???????, ?????? ?? ?? ??????????? ???????? ???? ??????? ??? ????????? ????????, ?? ????? ? ?????????? ???. […] Universus locus inde ita videtur conformandus et interpretandus: ??? ?? ????? ? ??????? ??? ????????, ? ?? ??? ????????? ??????? ??? ?? ?? ???? ??????, ?? ?? ? ?????? ???? ???? ????? ?????, ???? ????? ? ??????, ? ???????? ????? ????? ?????, ?? ???? ? ????????, i. e. si in eo numerorum genere, in quo ejusdem unitates combinabiles ponuntur, minor numerus pars est majoris, inde consequitur, ut homo pars sit equi, siquidem quaternarius numerus idealis idea est alicujus veluti equi vel albi, binarius vero hominis."

1084a29-30. Again, it is paradoxical if the number series up to 10 is more of a real thing and a Form than 10 itself.

(2) Syrianus (149. 15-17): ?????? ?? ????, ?? ??? ??????? ??· ??? ?????? ?? ? ??????? ?? ????? ??? ?????????, ???? ??? ?? ?? ?????? ??? ??????? ?? ??? ????? ?????, ??? ?? ????.

Pseudo-Alexander (771. 10-15): ??? ?????? ?? ? ??????? ????? ??? ??????? ?????? ?? ?? ??? ????? ????? ??? ???????.

??????? ??????????· ?? ?’ ?? ?? ??? ?????? ???????, ?? ???? ??? ?? ??????????? ‘??? ?????? ?? ? ??????? ????? ??? ???????, ??? ????? ?? ?? ???’ ?????? ?????? ?? ?? ??? ????? ??? ???????’· ???? ?????? ?? ??? ????? ?? ???’ ?????? ??? ?????????.

Bonitz (in his apparatus criticus): "vel ? ante ????? omittendum videtur cum Alexandro, vel scribendum ?? ????? ??? ????????? e Syriano."

"post ?? fortasse addendum ?? ??, cf. Alexandrum p. 749, 30 [= 771. 14 Hayduck] et Syrianum."

Jaeger: "plura excidisse recte vidit Alexander quamvis non satisfaciat eius conjectura."

Ross (ii 449-450): "It seems pretty clear that Alexander and Syrianus had the same reading as our manuscripts. Alexander interprets it as meaning ??? ????? ?? ?v ???’ ?????? ?????? ?? ?? ???.; so also Syrianus (Alexander may have read in the next clause ??? for ??????). Bonitz’s proposal to read ?? ? ??????? ????? ??? ???????, ?????? ?? ?? ?? ?v ??? ????? ???. has not the authority of the Greek commentators; and the accusative absolute is not probable. The interpretations of Alexander and Syrianus do not commend themselves. According to Alexander the argument is: ‘If the One is both the Form of the 10 and ungenerated, while the 10 has come into being, there will be an 11 whose Form is the One and whose matter is the decad. According to Syrianus the One in question is the One which is the formal principle of number, and what it is in relation to all the numbers, the ideal 10 is in relation to the other tens, the hundreds, and the thousands, for which reason it was called ?????????????? ????s.

The meaning seems to be: ‘Further, it is paradoxical if the number series up to 10 is more of an entity and a Form than the 10 itself; to this we may object that there is no generation of the series as a unity, while there is of the 10. Yet they try to speak as if the number series up to 10 were complete'. Certain Platonists may have said something (we do not know what) to justify Aristotle in describing them as holding the series up to 10 to be more of an entity than the 10 itself; once grant this and Aristotle's objection becomes plain. He objects that, as the Platonic theory only describes the origin of the numbers severally and not of the series ?? ????, the series cannot form a true entity or Form."

1084b1-2. e.g. the first, the indivisible, line, then the 2 &c.

(1) My proposal: e.g. first indivisible line, then 2 &c.

(2) Schwegler (ii 328) considers writing ???? ????? ? ?????? ??????.

Ross (ii 451): "? ????? ?????? ?????? is difficult, and it seems best to read ? ????? ??????, ? ??????. (Alternatively we might omit ? after o?ov as Schwegler proposes, and translate ‘first comes the indivisible line’; but ? is more likely to have been omitted after ????? than to have been inserted after o?ov.) I know of no exact parallel to ????? ?????? in this sense, but in A. 992a21 the indivisible line is called ???? ???????, and ? ?? ???? ?????? ??? ?? ?????? ????, Top. 121b9."

(3) Schwegler has rightly recognized that ll. 1-2 ????? … ???? … ???? is an enumeration, cf. 1080a24, 1081a21-22, Diogenes Laertius vii 137 (??????? ??? ??? ????? ?? ???, ? ?? ?????? ?????????, ?? ? ?????? ??? ??? ??????? ??????? ?????????, ???? ??? ??? ??????????? ???' ?? ??? ????, ???? ?? ???? …. "Fire has the uppermost place; it is also called aether, and in it the sphere of the fixed stars is first created; then comes the sphere of the planets, next to that the air, then the water …"). Better, however, than transposing the article ? is deleting it, in order to keep the symmetry with ????.

1084b14-15. but both the universal, and the particular or the element, are indivisible.

(1) My proposal: but both the universal, and the part or the element, are indivisible.

(2) Ross (ii 452): "The list of three things that are indivisible - the universal, the particular (for the meaning of ?? ??? ?????? cf. Meteor. 359b30, ?. E. 1107a30), and the element - is somewhat embarrassing, since in the passage as a whole only two things are opposed to each other (e. g. ?? ??? 15, ?? ?? 16, ??????? 16). Alexander seems not to have read ??? ?? ?????????, but it is ?? ??? ?????? that could be best dispensed with, since it is the opposition of universal or form to element, not to particular, that is insisted on through the greater part of the passage (cf. ll. 4, 5; 19, 20). At one point, indeed (ll. 9-12), the opposition of number to one is seen to be more truly that of whole to element; and the whole (?? ???? ?? ?? ??? ???? ??? ??? ??????) = the particular (?? ??? ??????); but for the most part number is treated as a universal. In fact the relations of whole and part, and of universal and particular, are not kept sufficiently distinct.

The difficulty may be escaped in various ways. (1) We might read ?? ?? in l. 16 and take it to refer to both the particular and the element, ?? ??? referring to the universal. (2) We might suppose ?? ??? ?????? to be added for the sake of completeness though it does not enter into the argument and is forthwith ignored. (3) We might suppose that ??? ?? ????????? is explicative of ?? ??? ??????. The mention of ?? ???????,we may suppose, led Aristotle to its natural opposite ?? ??? ??????, which elsewhere means the particular, but, the relations of whole and part and of universal and particular being here confused, Aristotle uses ?? ??? ?????? in the sense of ‘part’ and explains his usage by adding ??? ?? ?????????. This use of ??? ?????? would be to some extent in line with the uses of ???? ?????, ??? ?????, ???? ?????, ?? ????? quoted in Ind. Ar. 455b3-23. - Of these possibilities the last is, in view of the dichotomy which pervades the passage, the most probable."

(3) ??? ?? ????????? can be explicative of ?? ?????, cf. ll. 8-9. Or ??? ?? ????? and ??? ?? ????????? were originally variant readings. (This would explain the fact that Pseudo-Alexander ignores ??? ?? ?????????.) In any case, an original ????? could easily be 'corrected' into ??? ??????, because ??????? and ??? ?????? were opposites familiar to every reader of Aristotle's Analytics.

1084b32-33. If the 1-itself must be unitary. (reading ??? ????????? ?????)

(1) If the 1-itself must be only uncomposed. (according to Bywater)

(2) Schwegler (ii 330): "The 1 differs from the unit by being princple. Therefore ?????? must be corrupt (??????, i. e. ????? ?? ?????? [cf. 1016b24-26; On the Soul, 409a6 ? ??? ?????? ????? ???? ????? ??????], is the duality too); I conjecture ??????????."

Ross (ii 454): "‘But if the One itself must only be without position (for it differs in no respect except in that it is a first principle).' What the One differs from only by being a first principle is the unit; but its being without position distinguishes it from the point (l. 26). Thus the two clauses have not any such connexion as ??? indicates, and can hardly be right as they stand. Alexander feels no difficulty, but gives an impossible interpretation; and Bonitz's interpretation, which takes ?????? as if it could mean ???????, does nothing to meet the difficulty. The proposed emendations of ?????? (?????????? Schwegler, ????????? Bywater) would give a satisfactory sense if it were not for ?????, but in the presence of ????? are unsatisfactory. Two suggestions may be made. (1) It is just possible that ?????? may be used in a new sense. Each unit has, on the Platonic view, a setting or ????? in some particular number; all that distinguishes the One which is the formal principle of number is that it has no such particular setting, that it is ??????. It would not be unlike Aristotle to use ?????? thus in a different sense from that which it bore in l. 27, but the suggested use of ?????? is apparently without parallel. (2) We might suppose ????????? to have been corrupted into ????? ??????, and this to have been altered through a reminiscence of l. 27 into ????? ??????."

(3) Bywater's ????????? is a very easy emendation. Ross did not realize that ????? is referred to by ?????? ???.

1085a6. and whether, of the terms that succeed it, 2 or either of the units in 2 is prior.

(1) and whether, 2 or either of the units in 2 is prior in succession. (according to Bonitz)

My proposal: and whether 2 or either of the units in 2 is prior to the terms that succeed it.

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (777. 1-3): ??? ??????? ? ???? ??????? ?? ??????; ???????? ??? ??????? ??? ????? ??????? ????? ?????? ????? ?? ????? ???, ? ??? ?? ?? ????? ?????? ?? ?????????? ????? ?? ???;

Bonitz (1849, p. 561): "Quae emendanda putavi in hoc enuntiato, ?? pro ??? a6 et ?????????? pro ?????????? a7 [given by Bekker as the unanimous reading of the manuscripts], et Alexandri auctoritate et facili, quam inde assequimur, interpretandi ratione commendabuntur."

Ross (ii 455): "Bonitz reads ?? ?????? and claims the authority of Alexander. But it is not clear what Alexander read, so that it seems better to retain the manuscript reading ??? ??????, which gives a good sense. Aristotle does not here state the objections which follow if (1) the units, or one of the units, in two, or (2) two itself, are to succeed the number one directly. The objection to (1) is that then there is a two (composed of the number one + one of the units in two) before there is the number two itself (cf. 1081a32). The objection to (2) is that the first unit in two, being prior to the second unit, should be prior to the two composed of them (1081a25-27)."

(3) Jaeger rightly gives ?? as "Alexandri citatio"; Ross's statement "But it is not clear what Alexander read" is stunning in view of the fact that Pseudo-Alexander, by ???????? ?.?.?., is evidently interpreting what he has read. Considering the value of this reading, however, the question arises what shall be the contrary to ??????? ?? ??????. In the light of the distinction made in ll. 3-4, it ought to be ??????? ???, but does this make sense?

If we, therefore, retain the manuscript reading ??? ??????, we must, with Bessarion ("utrum dualitas prior est iis quae consequuntur"), take the genitive as genitivus comparationis, not, with Ross, as genitivus partitivus, for in this case the word order had to be ??????? ??? ?????? ? ???? ??????? ? …

1085a25. when one posits the universals.

(1) when one gives separate existence to the universals. (according to Schwegler and Jaeger, cf. 1086b7-10)

(2) Schwegler (ii 332): "The words ???? ??? ?? ?? ??????? are paraphrased by Alexander in this way: ?? ??? ???? ??????? ???? 757, 25 [= 778. 29 Hayduck]. Should he perhaps have read ???? instead of ???"

Bonitz (1849, p. 562): "Notiones enim universales, ait, si quis substantias esse ponit (?? a25) […]."

Jaeger (BBA 276): "Adding ??????? [after ??] is absolutely necessary, because ?? apart would merely mean 'posit', not 'posit as ?????, as subsistent', what is rightly supposed by Bonitz (Commentary, p. 562) to be the required meaning."

Ross (ii 456-457): "Alexander and Bonitz take this [??] in the sense of 'ascribes separate existence to', but it seems doubtful if the word can mean this; nor is either of the suggested emendations very plausible. I believe that ?? has its ordinary meaning and that the argument runs thus: ‘A question which can be applied to all these Platonic beliefs is that which must be faced in the case of species of a genus, when one posits the existence of universals, viz. whether it is ‘animal’ itself that is present in the particular species of animal, or an 'animal’ distinct from ‘animal’ itself. If we do not assign separate existence to the universal there is no difficulty; if we do assign separate existence to the One and the numbers, the question is difficult, not to say impossible.’"

(3) Schwegler's ???? is supported by 1086b7-10. ?? in "its ordinary meaning" (Ross) "posit" or "posit the existence" is unsufficient, because the existence of the universals in our mind is not denied by anyone. It is highly improbable that Pseudo-Alexander paraphrases ?? by ??????? ???? without mentioning that he is supplementing something (e. g. ???? ???????? ??????? ????).

1085a25-26. whether it is animal-itself or something other than animal-itself that is in the particular animal.

(2) Schwegler (ii 332): "????? ???? is impossible both in point of sense and grammar (it should read ????? ??? ????): delete ???? (or emend ????? into ??)."

Jaeger (BBA 276): "It is essential to emend ???? into ????, because otherwise the change of subject is intolerable. The transmitted text is in contradiction with Aristotelian usage: ?????? ??? ???????, ?????? ???????? (scil. ???? ??? ????????) is fixed terminology for the transcendent ????? of the Platonists. The Idea of the ???? is «something distinct from the visible ????», «another ????» ???? ?? ???' ???????; not reversely the visible ???? «another one, separate from the ????????», as the transmitted text says."

Ross (ii 457): "Jaeger reads ???? for ???? and renders 'or an animal distinct from the sensible animal'. But this would be a mere synonym for ?? ???? ????, whereas ??????? … ? suggests alternatives. The meaning is made clear by ll. 29-31."

(3) According to Schwegler and Jaeger, the alternatives suggested by ??????? … ? are whether the "animal itself" is in the (particular, sensible) animal or (an animal) distinct from it. This is, however, not the problem which Aristotle is dealing with, v. Ross.

1085a33-34. and from other matter like plurality, but not identical with it.

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (779. 34-36): ? ?? ????? ? ??? ????? ???? ???? ?? ??????, ???’ ?? ??????? ????????? ?? ??, ?? ????? ????? ‘??? ????? ???? ???? ?? ??????, ???’ ?? ??????’.

Ross (ii 457): "For the construction ????? ???? ???? ?? ?????? cf. De An. 424b2, G. A. 766b13."

(3) The relevant construction is called "attraction or assimilation of case" in Kühner/Gerth (§ 555, cf. Smyth, § 2522). An example (given by Kühner/Gerth) is Xenophon, Memorabilia 2, 9, 3 ??????????? ??? ??? ????? ("gratifying a man like yourself"; without attraction: ????? ???? ?? ?? = "a man such as you are").

1085b11. but the same difficulties will follow. (reading ?? ?????)

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (780. 21-22): ???’ ?? ???????? ???????? ??????? ??? ??????? ???????.

Bonitz (1849, p. 563): "?? ??????? ????? ????????????? b11, quamquam exspectes potius dictum esse ?? ??????? ?? ?????."

1085b23. in view of this theory also. (reading ??? ???? ???? ???? ????????)

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (781. 17-20): p. 1085b23 ??? ???????? ??? ???? ???? ???? ????????.

??? ???? ?? ??? ??????? ??? ??? ????, ????, ???? ???????? ????????? ?????? ????? ????? ??? ???? ?? ??? ???? ??? ??? ???????? ?????? ?????????, ??????? ? ??????? ??????? ????? ? ????????????.

Ross (ii 458): "The manuscripts read ???? ???., and Bonitz Ind. Ar. 562a7 interprets ???? as ‘according to’, but this use seems unparalleled in Aristotle. Alexander seems not to have had the preposition, and to have taken ???? ???? ???????? as object of ????????; but this is not an Aristotelian construction."

1085b26. And there is another plurality that is plurality-itself and infinite plurality.

(1) My proposal: And further, plurality-itself is different from infinite plurality.

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (781. 33-36): ??? ??, ?????, ?????? ???? ?? ?????? ??? ?? ??????? ??????, ????? ??? ?? ???? ??? ?? ?????? ????. ?? ??? ?? ???? ?????????? ??? ??????? ???? ??? ?????? ????, ???? ??? ?? ?????? ??? ??????? ??? ???????????? ??????.

Bonitz (1849, p. 564): "[…] quoniam in ipsa multitudinis notione infinitas nondum contineatur […]."

Christ (1853, p. 62): "Alexander in suo textu habuit ?? ?????? ac vereor, ne ???? ex interpolatione fluxerit. His enim non tam idea multitudinis quam elementum (?????????), unde singuli numeri efficti sint, indicari videtur, cf. 1089b10 […]."

Ross (ii 458): "Alexander explains 'and plurality is different from infinite plurality'. (Though he does not use the word ????, it would not be safe to infer with Christ that he did not read it.) So too Bonitz. The only objection to this interpretation is that if we adopt it, ll. 24-26 give no reason at all why the original plurality should not have been finite. But Aristotle evidently thinks that he is putting Speusippus into a difficulty. Perhaps, then, we should interpret the whole passage thus: 'There was, according to Speusippus, a finite plurality from which and the One the units were derived. And there is another plurality which is «plurality itself» and infinite plurality. Which sort of plurality, then, is the material principle in number?'"

(3) The interpretation Pseudo-Alexander/Bonitz is, grammatically, the natural one (cf., for instance, 1026b12 and 17-18), the only flaw being that ???? ?????? ("plurality-itself") is not recognized as technical term (for the idea of plurality). This term has survived in Neo-Platonism, v. Proclus (Theologia Platonica, iii 92, 7-9: ?????? ??? ???? ?????? ??? ??????????, ?? ?? ?????????? ?????? ???? ??? ?????? ???????? ???????.) and Damascius (In Parmenidem, 85, 2-3: ????? ?? ?? ?????????? ???? ???? ??? ?? ???????? ??????, ???? ??? ? ????? ??????? ???? ?? ????? ????? ???? ?? ???????? ??????). Further, Pseudo-Alexander's ??? ?? is, in point of language, preferable by far to the manuscript reading ???? ??, because it is documented 6 times in Aristotle (41b6, 85b18, 163b20, 290b18, 422a21, 1341a29), whereas the combination ???? ?? occurs only in the spurious Physiognomica (809a7).

Concerning the context, Ross did not take sufficient notice of the ??? in l. 24: Aristotle is presupposing that the Platonists in question understood the principle "plurality" as belonging to the same "column of cognates" (?????????) as "infinite" (cf. the table of contraries in book i, 986a23-26), when he objects that "there must be also a finite plurality". By ??? ?? a new argument is intr?duced: "plurality-itself" (the principle formulated by the Platonists explicitly) is not equivalent with infinite plurality (as implied by them).

1085b31-32. Nor again can there be indivisible parts of a distance. (secluding ????? in l. 32)

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (782. 12-14): ???? ??? ???? ?? ????? ??? ???????????, ??’ ?? ??? ??? ?????? ??????? ????????? ??? ????? ??? ???????, ????????? ??????? ??????.

Jaeger (BBA 275): "????? was either transmitted in twofold order and inserted, by mistake, at both places into the text, or it is, in the second place, a gloss to ?? ??, originally written above the line."

1085b36-1086a1. Again, the discord about numbers between the various versions.

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (782. 20-25): ??? ????????????? ????? ????? ?? ?? ??????? ??? ???? ??????? ??? ???? ??????? ??????? ????? ??? ???????? ?? ??? ????? ??????? ??? ?????? ???????. ??? ???? ??????? ???? ?? ????????? ???? ‘???????’ ? ‘???????’. ??? ?? ??? ??? ??????????? ???????, ????? ?? ???? ??? ??????????, ??? ??????? ?? ??? ?????????· ?? ?? ???????, ? ??? ??????, ????? ?? ???? ???????????? ??? ??? ????? ??????????.

Ross (ii 459): "Alexander knew both this reading and ??????, and preferred the latter, interpreting it as ???? ???????????? (782. 25). But this is awkward, considering that Aristotle uses ? ?????? immediately after (1086a11) in the chronological sense. It is equally awkward to suppose that Plato, Speusippus, and Xenocrates could be grouped as o? ?????? in the chronological sense, since in 1086a11 Plato is distinguished from the other two as ? ??????. It seems better, then, to read with EJ ???????, which is used quite similarly in 1080b4, 10, 35, 1083b2, 1086a31. There is perhaps, as Goebel remarks, a special appropriateness in the use of the musical term ?????? with ?????????."

1086a7. if one assumed these principles.

(1) if one assumed that the principles are the same (for Ideas and numbers). (reading ??? ????? as proposed by Ross in his commentary)

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (782. 36 - 783. 5): ????? ?? ??? ???? ??????? ????????? ??? ????? ??? ???? ?? ????? ????? ????????? ??? ???????? ????? ????????, ??????? ?? ????? ????? ?? ????? ??? ??????? ??? ????? ??? ???????? ??????, ??? ????? ??? ?????, ???? ?? ?? ??? ????? ??? ???????? ????? ? ?????? ?? ???????? ????? ?????, ??? ????? ? ??????????? ??????? ???? ??? ?????????.

Ross (ii 459): "Alexander (783. 3) seems to have omitted ???, and Jaeger [BBA 275] follows him, taking ?????? as = ?? ????. But there would be no special point here in the description of the ???? as ?????. A comparison with 1081a12-17, N. 1090b36 shows the point to be that if the One and the great-and-small are taken as the first principles, it is hard to deduce both the Ideas and mathematical numbers from them. If ?????? be kept, the reference is to the discussion of the One and the great-and-small in 1083b23-1085b34. But ??? ????? would be rather more pointed, and may be the true reading."

1086a11-13. And he who first supposed that the Forms exist and that the Forms are numbers and that the objects of mathematics exist, naturally separated the two.

(1) And he who first supposed that the Forms were also numbers naturally separated the Forms and the mathematical objects. (according to Christ)

And he who first supposed that the Forms exist and that they are numbers naturally separated the Forms and the mathematical objects. (according to Cook Wilson)

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (783. 22-23): ? ?? ?????? ? ?????? ????? ???? ??????? ??? ???????? ?????? ?????, ??????? ?? ????? ??? ?? ??????????.

Christ: "????? ejecerim."

Ross (ii 459-460): "According to the manuscript reading Plato is described as laying it down (1) that the Ideas existed, (2) that they were numbers, (3) that mathematical objects existed; ???????? is left rather awkwardly without an object. There is therefore something to be said for Christ’s proposal to omit the second ?????. This gives the sense 'He who first posited that the Ideas were also numbers naturally separated the Ideas and the mathematical objects'. Cook Wilson’s proposal to put ????? after ???????? gives a still better sentence."

1086a20-21. one not yet convinced would not come any nearer to conviction.

(2) Bonitz (1849, p. 565): "haec verba ut possint construi ??????????? vel ???????????? scribendum est."

Jaeger: "sed nescio an post ?????? exciderint nonnulla velut <?? ??????????> vel aliquid simile."

(3) ??????????? is all right if we do not connect it with the infinitive ????????? but take it as subject and supply in thought ????????. This is the way Ross constructed the clause.

1086a32-34. For they at the same time make the Ideas universal and again treat them as separable and as individuals. (omitting ?? ??????)

(2) Jaeger (BBA 270): "?? ?????? is a variant reading to ????????, cf. 1087a11 or 1039a24."

1086a35-37. The reason why those who described their substances as universal combined these two characteristics in one thing, is that they did not make substances identical with sensible things. (according to Jaeger)

(2) Christ: "??????? delendum censeo."

Jaeger (BBA 270): "In point of fact, it is correct that the Platonists did not identify the ?????? with the ??????? […] (???? ????????? ?? ??? ????? ???????), but ?????? must come first. Now we realize that it has slipped a line down, and that ????? (probably a gloss written above it) has intruded into the text, occupying its place."

1086b37-1087a1. either the substances composed of them are also universal, or non-substance will be prior to substance. (adding ? before ?????)

(2) Syrianus (164. 36-37): ?? ???, ????, ??????? ?? ?????, ??????? ??? ?? ?? ?????.

Ross (ii 464-465): "According to the manuscript reading the argument is: 'But if the principles are universal, or for that matter if the substances composed of them are universal, non­substance will be prior to substance; for the universal is not substance, and the element or principle is universal, and an element or principle is prior to the things of which it is principle and element'. There is manifestly no argument here; the second clause makes nonsense of the passage. All that is needed is to insert ? before ????? in 1087a1. 'But if the principles are universal, either the substances composed of them are also universal or non-substance will be prior to substance.' Cf. 1087a21 ???? ?? ?????? ??? ????? ??????? ?????, ?????? ??? ?? ?? ?????? ???????. When the first ? once came to be misunderstood as 'or', the second was bound to drop out. Syrianus (164. 36) treats the clause beginning ? ??? as apodosis, and therefore probably read the second ?.

Aristotle has already (ll. 20-37) shown the difficulties that arise if the elements of substances be taken to be numerically single. He has now (1086b37-1087a4) shown that if the elements are universal, either non-substance will be prior to substance (which is absurd) or the substances will be universals; but this contradicts the very notion of substances, which is that they are ????????????, ??? ??? ?????? ?????? ?? ??????? ?? ???’ ?????? ??? ????? (1086b17).

Jaeger [BBA 271] treats 37 ? … 1087a1 ??????? as a gloss intended originally to have come after ?????? in 1087a1. But the clause goes back to Alexander (790. 9), and the insertion of ? cures the passage more simply."

Jaeger: "sed eadem manet difficultas."

(3) There remains no "difficulty" in the contradiction between 1086b37-1087a1 ? … ??????? and 1087a2 ?? ??? ??? … ?????, as Jaeger claims, because the former sentence is no longer Aristotle's own opinion.

1087a5-6. apart from the substances which have the same form. (omitting ??? ????? with Bonitz)

(2) Bonitz (1849, pp. 568-569): "Extrema verba quomodo explicanda sint dubium est. Etenim aut eam Aristoteles significat Platonicae doctrinae partem quod praeter res sensibiles, quae sunt eiusdem speciei, unum quidpiam, nimirum ideam, seorsim ac per se ponunt (cf. Alexandrum p. 770, 9 [= 791. 3-4 Hayduck]: ???????? ?? ?? ????? ???????????? ????????? ?????? ???? ??? ?????? ??? ???????? ??? ??????? ?? ??????? ??? ?????), aut eam, quod praeter singulas ideas ?? ?????? ponunt tamquam principium formale, quo eae definiantur (cf. Alexandrum p. 770, 13 [= 791. 7-10 Hayduck]: ???? ??????? ?? ?? ????????? ????? ???????????? (????? ????????? ?? ??????? ??) ???? ??? ??????, ????? ?? ??? ????? ??? ??????? ?? ??????? ?? ???? ?? ?????????). Utraque sententia per se probari, neutra cum ipsis verbis Aristotelis plane conciliari potest; illam enim si sequimur, inepte ad ??????, i. e. ???????? ??????, additur ??? ?????, hanc si probamus, illud ????????? ab Alexandro inventum vereor ut Aristoteleum sit, nec pronomen indefinitum ?? ad ?? apte videtur additum esse. Itaque haud scio an omissis verbis ??? ????? prior explicatio accipienda sit."

1087a16-17. The potency, being, as matter, universal and indefinite, deals with the universal and indefinite. (omitting ??? before ??????? with Bonitz)

(2) Bonitz (1842, p. 57): "Sicuti in altero enuntiationis membro ???????? et ipsa definita et singularis esse, et rem sibi subjectam habere definitam et singularem dicitur, ita in priore membro opponatur oportet natura ejus rei, ad quam ??????? pertinet, universalis et indefinita, et ipsa universalis et indefinita ???????? natura. Omittendum igitur ??? ante ??????? ????, et scribendum ? ??? ??? ??????? ?? ??? ??????? ???? ??? ????????, ??? ??????? ??? ???????? ?????."

Book XIV

1087b2-3. but just as appearances suggest that there is nothing contrary to substance, argument confirms this.

(1) but there is nothing contrary to substance, as appearances suggest and argument confirms. (according to Pseudo-Alexander, Bessarion and Jaeger)

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (795. 36-38): ?, ????, ???????? ?? ??? ? ????? ???????? ??? ??????? ????? ???’ ????? ???? ??? ?? ??????? ???? ?? ????????.

Bessarion: "ceterum, quemadmodum apparet ratioque testatur, nihil substantiae contrarium est."

Jaeger: "????? ??? ???????? ante ????? alterum collocant codices: post ???????? transposui: cum ??? ? ????? ???????? conjungit Alexander."

(3) Since it is unmotivated to emphasize the accordance between appearance and argument, Jaeger's transposition is an improvement.

1087b5. some making the unequal - which they take to be the essence of plurality - matter for the One. (omitting ?? ???)

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (796. 29-32) ???? ??? ??? ?????? ?????? ??’ ?? ?? ??? ?? ?????? ?????????? ???’ ?? ?? ??????. ?????????????? ???, ?????, ?? ???? ??????? ?? ?????? ????? ??? ????? ??? ?????? ??? ???????, ???? ??? ??????? ?? ?????? ?????????? ?? ???.

Jaeger (BBA 274): "Were it decided that ?v was to them [the Platonists] = ????, as it is in the transmitted text, any explanation that the ?????? stands for the ?????? would be superfluous."

Ross (ii 470): "?? ??? which is read by all the manuscripts and by Alexander (796. 26), is difficult, since ?? ????? ??? ??? ??????? ????? ????? explains why these thinkers opposed ?? ?????? instead of ?????? to ?? ?v, and this clause would be unnecessary if ?? ?? had already been identified with ?? ????. Jaeger is probably right in treating ?? ??? as a gloss."

1087b12. and does not draw the distinction that they are one in definition, but not in number.

(2) Syrianus (166. 26-28): ???? ???, ????, ??? ??????? ??????, ??? ????? ???? ??? ??? ?????? ?? ??· ???? ??? ??????? ?????????? ? ?? ? ?????????? ???????? ????? ??????.

Pseudo-Alexander (795. 15-17): ??? ?? ???????? ??? ?? ??? ?????? ??? ?? ?????????? ?? ????, ?? ?? ???? ?????.

Ross (ii 470-471): "Alexander reads ?????? ???? ?' ??, and apparently takes the words to mean that the unequal, though in point of fact the same thing as the great and the small, has a different definition. But it seems more probable that the manuscript reading is right, and that the meaning is: Plato treats the unequal (or the great and the small) as one and does not draw the distinction that though definable by a single definition it contains within itself a plurality, sc. the great and the small. This has more point in the context. Obviously contraries go in pairs, and Aristotle is confirming his statement that the Platonists make their first principles contraries by showing that for Plato the One and the-great-and-the-small are but two things. Aristotle himself in accordance with his usual misinterpretation of the great and small (cf. M. 1083b23 n.) insists on treating them as three (l. 14). This interpretation is rendered certain by comparison with 1088a15."

(3) The genuine Alexander, to whom Syrianus refers, seems to have interpreted our manuscript reading, whereas Pseudo-Alexander agrees with Syrianus.

1087b30. and the other to the thing itself.

(1) and the other to the same. (reading ?? ?????, as proposed by Ross in his commentary)

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (798. 31-35): ?? ??? ?????? ?? ????? ????? ???????? ???’ ?? ?? ???, ??? ?? ???? ????. ????????? ?? ??? ?? ?????????? ???????? ?????? ??? ?????. ?? ??? ??? ?????? ??????????? ????? ?? ????? ???? ??? ??? ??? ????????? ?? ??? ??????????, ?? ?? ???? ?? ???? ????? ??? ?? ?????? ??? ??? ??? ??? ????????? ?? ??? ??????????.

Ross (ii 472): "Alexander read ???? (798. 34), and evidently takes ?????? to be opposed to ?????, 'the same', and ???? to ????, 'the thing itself'. But in I. 1054b15 ?? ???? is opposed to ?? ?????, and there is no trace in Aristotle of such a distinction between ?????? and ????; the two words are synonymous. Presumably one of the thinkers he is criticizing used the words ?? ?????? and ?? ?????, another the words ?? ???? and ?????."

1088a8. The measure must always be some identical thing predicable of all the things it measures.

(2) Bywater (1913, p. 111): "To my mind the fault in the passage is in the ?? ?????? after ???????? ????, which I suspect to be a repetition of the ?? ?????? in the preceding line. If we ignore it as an emblema, the sense of the second sentence (??? ?? ??? ???.) will be practically this: There must always be an element of identity (?? ???? ??) in the group of objects counted together - horses, for instance, if the unit of measurement with which one starts be a horse, and men, if it be a man. But if one starts with a man, a horse, and a god, as the units in the group, these dissimilars have to be brought under a common term, say ????, and the sum of them, when counted together, will be so many ???."

Jaeger: "?? ?????? seclusit Bywater, sed subjectum est, de quo ?? ???? ?? praedicatur."

1088a8-9. e.g. if the things are horses, the measure is 'horse', and if they are men, 'man'. (according to Bonitz)

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (800. 14-15): ???? ??? ???? ????? ?? ????? ??? ?? ?????? ????? ????? ?????, ??? ??????? ?? ?? ?????? ????? ??? ?? ????? ?????.

Bonitz (1842, p. 127): "Duo exempla, quae postremo loco posita sunt, apta sunt ad comprobandam sententiam, mensuram esse ex eodem genere atque ea, quae metimur vel numeramus; non item duo priora, quae neque cum sententia probanda, neque cum exemplis posterioribus concinunt. Sed mutata distinctione et paucis literis inflexis habebis id quod et sententiae ratio et posteriorum exemplorum forma requirere videtur. ??? ?? ??? ?? ???? ?? ???????? ???? ?? ??????, ???? ?? ?????, ?? ?????? ?????, ??? ?? ????????, ????????? ?? ?' ???????? ??? ????? ??? ????, ???? ????."

Ross (ii 473): "Lines 10, 11 indicate that the ?? clause should relate not to the measure but to the things measured, so that Bonitz’s conjecture (which is confirmed to some extent by Alexander) seems necessary. Bywater’s proposal to excise ?? ?????? in l. 8 (J. of P. xxxii. 111) does not meet the whole difficulty."

1088a15-16. Those who treat the unequal as one thing, and the dyad as an indefinite compound of great and small.

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (800. 28-30): ?? ??????? ??, ????? ???????, ???? ??? ?? ???????? ???? ?? ????, ?????? ?? ??? ??? ???????? ????? ?? ?????? ????????? ??? ???????, ??? ??? ?? ?? ?? ?????? ????? ????????????.

Bessarion: "qui vero inaequale ut unum quid, dualitatem autem indeterminatam ex magno parvoque faciunt."

Ross (ii 473): "?? has its usual adversative force. The first clause states the unity of the ??????, the second its twofold nature (cf. 1087b9-12). Thus Trendelenburg's [1826, p. 62 n.] proposal to omit ?? is unnecessary."

Jaeger: "?? ex Alexandri paraphrasi addidi; cf. 1087b10."

1088a22-24. but what is relative is least of all things a kind of entity or substance, and is posterior to quality and quantity. (secluding ??? ?????????? and reading ??????? with Christ)

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (801. 19-20): ?????? ??? ??? ????? ????? ?????????? ????? ??? ??? ????? ?? ???? ??.

Christ: "fortasse ???????."

Ross (ii 473): "??? ?????????? is clearly a gloss on ??????."

Jaeger: "?? ?? ex Alexandri citatione correxi et 24 ?????? scripsi."

(3) I prefer Christ's reading to Jaeger's, which causes an awkward change of numerus (?? ???? ?? … ??? ????? ??? ?????). The manuscript reading ?????? is easily explained by assimilation to ??? ??????????, after this gloss had intruded into the text.

1088a25-27. since something with a distinct nature of its own must serve as matter both to the relative in general and to its parts and kinds.

(1) if something with a distinct nature of its own is the substratum of the relative in general and its parts and kinds. (according to Christ)

or if something other (than quantity) is the substratum of the relative in general and its parts and kinds. (according to Jaeger)

(2) Christ: "equidem ????????? vel tale quid inter ?????? et ??? intercidisse duco."

Ross (ii 473): "With ?? ?? ?????? there is no difficulty in supplying ??? ?????."

Jaeger adopts Christ's ????????? and inserts ? before ??.

(3) Jaeger does not consider the explanation given in ll. 27-29. But Christ's ????????? is all right, cf. the distinction ???? - ?????????? in ll. 17-18. Ross postulates that "there is no difficulty in supplying ??? ?????"; for his predecessors, however, it was too difficult.

1088b8-9. If there is a plurality, then, of which the one term, viz. few, is always predicated. (according to Pseudo-Alexander)

(2) Ross (ii 473-474): "The sentence is very difficult. Various solutions of the difficulty may be proposed:

(1) The manuscript reading may be translated ‘if plurality is a class of which one member is always few'. This, however, is very unnatural.

(2) Alexander 802. 37 says ????? ?? ?? ?? ??? ???? ?? ??????, ????? ?? ?????? ??? ?????, ???’ ?? ?? ?????? ?????? ??? ??????????? ????????????, ???? ?? ??????. This suggests the reading ?? ?? ??? ???, ?? ??????; we may understand ???????????? from l. 6 (cf. l. 12).

(3) All the difficulties would be removed by a change of two letters if we read ?????? ? ??????? ??? ??????. But it is hard to see how this could have been corrupted into the manuscript reading."

Jaeger: "?????? ????? desideratur propter 10 ???? ?????, ??? idem significare non potest, in quo latere videtur ???; an fuit ?? ????? ?????????? ??? ???????"

(3) The manuscript reading is "unnatural" (Ross) only in point of grammar, i. e. it would be quite natural if the continuation (in l. 10) were "and another member is always many" (?? ?? ??? ????). (For ?? ?? ???… ?? ?? … cf. e. g. 555b8, 686b4, [Plato], Axiochus 371 B 2.) Aristotle is arguing against the thesis that "many" and "few" are the elements of numbers (ll. 4-6): it ceases to apply if there is one number which is only "few", and another which is only "many". The whole difficulty disappears if we suppose an anacoluth in l. 10.

1088b10-11. e.g. 10 is many (if there is no number which is greater than 10), or 10,000. (omitting ??? with Bonitz)

(2) Bonitz (1849, p. 573): "particulam ??? omittendam arbitror, quia non habeo quomodo eam explicem."

1088b31-33. which inevitably arise from the treatment of the unequal, i.e. the relative, as an element.

(2) Bonitz (in his apparatus criticus): "fortasse ????????? ??????????."

Jaeger: "an ???????? ???????????"

(3) Bonitz's emendation is confirmed by the following phrase ???????? ????????? (l. 34). The manuscript reading gives a different sense, cf. Nicomachean Ethics, 1135b21: ??? ???????? ? ?????? ????????? ???? ?????????.

1089a5. They thought it necessary to prove that that which is not is.

(2) Bonitz (1842, p. 67 n.): "Bekkerus nominativum ?????? dedit; accusativum, quem unus habet codex Gb, enuntiati conformatio requirit. Pendent enim haec verba ab ?????, quod luculenter apparet e proximis ???? ??? ???????. - Ad ??????? ????? cf. ?, 3. p. 1090b7."

Ross (ii 475): "?????? is the right case after ????? l. 2; Bonitz's proposal of ??????? is a mistake."

(3) Ross is right, cf. Plato, Phaedo, 76 E 8, Cratylus, 439 B 3, Symposium, 200 B 1. Nevertheless, Jaeger continues to quote Bonitz's failed emendation, thus unsettling the less experienced reader.

1089a6. if they are many.

(1) if there shall be plurality. (according to Bonitz)

(2) Bonitz (1842, p. 67): "Non hoc dicit si multae sunt res sed si probare volunt esse multas, wenn es eine Vielheit geben soll. Itaque scribendum videtur [as in 1081b31] ?? ????? ?????."

1089a7-8. for it means sometimes substance. (omitting ???)

(2) Ross (ii 475): "??? seems to be an emblema from l. 2. Cf. H. 1043a34 n."

1089a9. what sort of 'one', then, are all the things that are.

(1) My proposal: what sort of 'being', then, shall be one.

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (806. 5-6): ????? ?????? ? ?????????? ????? ?? ?? ?????;

Bonitz (1842, p. 25): "Initio hujus enuntiationis non facile erit explicare, cur hypothetice Aristoteles dixerit ?? ?? ?? si ens est vel si quid est ens, vel quocumque modo ea verba interpretari libet. Ac profecto non ita scripsit, certe non ita distingui voluit Aristoteles, sed ?? ?? ?? ???????? conjungenda sunt, si quidem ens multiplici modo dicitur; hanc notionis varietatem eodem nomine comprehensam deinde per parenthesin exponit; nam parenthesi includenda sunt verba ?? ??? ??? - ??????????; tum a ????? ??? incipitur apodosis, adjecta ea particula, qua saepissime interrupta per parenthesin oratione superiora in memoriam revocantur, cf. infra ad ?, 3. p. 983a24 et Hartung Partik. II. p. 22.

Sed in ipsa hac apodosi inest, quod sanum esse non potest. Quod enim scribitur ????? ??? ?? ???? ????? ??, non potest ????? alio quam ad praedicatum referri. Quaereret igitur Aristoteles, quali unitate omnia entia Parmenides comprehensa censeat. At non hoc Parmenidi objicit Aristoteles, quod naturam illius unitatis non satis definierit, sed quod non distinxerit, quae entia vel quod entium genus unitate contineatur. ???????, ait, ?? ?????? ? ?? ????, quae sunt diversa ??? ????? genera. Ac deinde ?? ????? ??? ????? ??? ?? ????? ????? ?? ????. Itaque quum e ratiocinandi nexu ipsisque e verbis Aristotelis appareat, ????? referri debere ad subjectum enuntiati ?? ????, non dubito quin reponendum sit ????."

The reference is to Johann Adam Hartung, Lehre von den Partikeln der griechischen Sprache, Zweiter Theil (Erlangen 1833), p. 22: "For resuming an interrupted speech (?????????????? [recapitulation]), ??? is more apt than any other particle, because it means discarding what is not pertinent and recapitulating the matter."

Schwegler (ii 347): "Considering the whole context - the preceding ?? ?? ?? ????????, the following ?? ????? ?? ????? and ?? ????? ??? ????? - it is rather appropriate to correct ?? to ??."

Ross (ii 475): "Aristotle means that Plato hastened to maintain the existence of ?? ?? ?? without considering what sort of unity of all things Parmenides' denial of ?? ?? ?? implied - whether a unity of substance, or of substance with all the other categories.

Aristotle asks 'what sort of unity all things make?', and interprets this (l. 10) as meaning 'what things make the unity?' The question he addresses to the Platonists really is 'do you mean that all substances make a one of substance, or that all the categories make a one which embraces them all?' Cf. Phys. 185a20-30.

Bonitz's ???? is impossible, and the text needs no emendation."

3) ?? ???? ????? (omitted by Pseudo-Alexander) is to be deleted. After having distinguished several meanings of "??" (ll. 7-9), Aristotle now asks: ????? ??? (add in thought ??, cf. ll. 15 and 19) ??; The apparent lack of a subject prompted someone to add ?? ???? ?????, following the example of l. 2. So I follow Bonitz in the diagnosis, but propose another remedy.

1089a12. and the other categories that indicate each some one class of being will all be one.

(1) and the other categories that indicate each some one class of being. (according to Bonitz)

(2) Bonitz (1842, p. 26): "Denique sub finem enuntiati […] levis error editores videtur latuisse in verbis ?? ??, quae mutanda sunt in ?? ??. Namque ?? ??, ut saepius hoc loco Aristoteles monet, dicitur ????????, ipsisque categoriis, quae verbis ??? ????? - ???????? significatae sunt, diversi illi modi comprehenduntur, quibus ?? ?? dicitur. Cf. ?, 28. p. 1024b13; ?, 4. p. 1030b11; ?, 1. p. 1045b32."

Ross (ii 475): "Bonitz's ?? does not seem necessary. ?? ?? = one genus or category."

(3) Bonitz's emendation is imperative because ?? ?? would say that each category has a single meaning, cf. On Sophistical Refutations, 166a19-20: ???????? ??? ???, ?? ??????, ?? ?? ????????, ?? '?????????' ??? ?? '????????' ("for each word, both 'knowing' and 'letters', possibly has a single meaning"). That each category is, in a higher or lower degree, ?? ?? is implied in 1088a29-30.

1089a17. and 'not being a man' means not being a certain substance.

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (806. 16-17): ??????? ??? ??? ? ?? ???????? ?? ?? ??? ???????? ???????? ????????.

Jaeger (BBA 278): "The neutrum of the article and the triple ????? of the object (?? ?? ????? ????, ?? ?? ????? ???????, ?? ?? ????? ???????) prove convincingly that the accusative ???????? (which is unanimously transmitted in the manuscripts) has preserved the trace of the real and the ????? before ???????? has dropped out."

Ross (ii 475): "Jaeger is probably right in supposing ????? to have dropped out by haplography; this is more likely than that ???????? should have been corrupted into ????????. Alexander's ? ?? ???????? (806. 16) is probably only his interpretation of ?? ?? ????????."

1089a20-21. This thinker means by the non-being the false and the character of falsity.

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (806. 22-26): ?? ??? ?? ???? ?? ??? ????? ??? ?? ?????, ?? ?? ?? ?? ??????, ?? ???? ??? ?? ??? ??????? ??? ??? ?????. ?? ?? ?? ????? ?? ??? ?????? ??? ????? ????? ?? ??? ?? ?? ????????? ???? ???? ?? ??? ?? ??? ?? ?????? ??? ????? ?????, ???? ??? ?? ??? ?? ?????? ??????? ?? ??? ??????? ?????.

Ross (ii 475-476): "Either the manuscript ?????? or Alexander’s ????? gives a possible sense. (1) 'He means by "not-being" the false and everything of that sort'. (2) 'He means the false and calls that kind of entity not-being'. The manuscript reading is the more idiomatic (cf. M. 1086b18-19 n.), and the other has probably arisen from a failure to understand it."

1089a28. and besides this the false is said not to be, and so is the potential. (according to Pseudo-Alexander and Bonitz)

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (807. 2-3): ???? ?? ???? ?? ?????? ???????? ???? ??????????? ?? ???? ??? ?? ?? ?????? ?? ?? ??? ?? ???????.

Bonitz (1842, pp. 56-57): "Non multum tribuerim auctoritati codicis T, qui articulum ?? ante ?? ?? omisit, quoniam in eo codice saepius librarii negligentia omissa quaedam esse et e scripturae discrepantia apparet et a Brandisio confirmatur, nisi ipsa sententiae ratio exstinguendum articulum doceret. Sicuti enim dicitur ?? ???? ??? ??????? ?? ??, ubi ???? ??? ??????? articulo et nomini interpositum quasi in naturam adjectivi abit, ita dicendum est ?? ?? ?????? ?? ??, non ?? ?? ?????? ?? ?? ??. Cf. ?? ???? ?????????? ??, ?? ?? ?????? ??, ?? ?? ?? ?? ?????? et similia ?, 4. p. 1027b17."

1089b25-27. Since they are not separable from substances, qualities and quantities are many just because their substratum becomes and is many. (ejecting the ????? after ?????)

(2) Ross (ii 477): "It seems impossible to interpret the ????? after ?????. We should either read ??? ?? with Apelt (or ???? or ?????) or treat ????? as an emblema and understand ????."

1089b35-36. unless it means a measure or the quantitatively indivisible. (reading ??? instead of ???)

(2) Syrianus (176. 6-7): ?? ?? ???, ?????, ? ????? ?? ?????, ??? ?????? ??????? ??? ??????????.

Ross (ii 477-478): "The manuscript reading seems to mean that if the unit is not some finite measure it is the limiting case of quantity - infinitesimal quantity; it is always quantity of some kind. But ??? is superfluous, and the opposition of ?????? to ?? ???? ?? ????? ?????????? is not Aristotelian. Alexander (812. 23) says ????????? ????? ?????, ?? ?? ??? ? ????? ?? ?????, ????? ?????? ??????? ??? ????? ???? ????? ??????????. Cf. Syr. 176. 6. This suggests the reading ?? ?? ?????? ??? ?? ???? ???. 'The unit indicates a quantity unles it means a measure or what is indivisible in quantity.' 'Measure' and 'indivisible in Quantity' are not, indeed, absolute synonyms, for the measure may be an 'indivisible in quality' (I. 1053b4-7), but ?? ?? is a measure of quantity primarily (1052b20, 1053b5).

For a similar confusion between ??? and ??? in the manuscripts, where Alexander preserves ???, cf. H. 1043a28. The error probably arose from the misreading of a contraction."

1090a11-13. Neither does he who says it exists maintain that it is the cause of anything.

(2) Zeller (Plato, p. 574 n.): "for neither does he wh? assumes this number maintain that it is the cause of anything, since he represents it as a self-subsistent essence; nor does it show itself to be so; the ????? ????? has to be completed by the ?????? that follows."

Ross (ii 480): "??????? depends on ??????, which can be supplied from ?????? l. 13."

Jaeger (BBA 277): "The genitive ??????? requires supplying ??????, which could easily drop out after ?????."

1090a16-19. As for those, then, who suppose the Ideas to exist and to be numbers, by their assumption - in virtue of the method of setting out each term apart from its instances - of the unity of each general term they try at least to explain somehow why number must exist.

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (813. 20-31): ????? ????? ????? ???????????? ??? ????? ?? ??? ??? ????????? ??? ????? ???????? ??? ?????, ?? ? ????????? ? ?????? ????, ??? ???????? ????? ????????? ?? ?? ?????? ???????, ???? ?? ??????? ??? ???????? ????????, ???? ??????? ???????? ?????????? ?????, ??? ?????? ??? ? ???????? ? ????? ???? ?? ???????? ? ??????, ???? ??????? ??? ?? ? ????? ??, ??? ?? ?????? ??? ?? ?? ???????· ?????? ??? ?????????, ?????? ?? ??? ??? ????? ?????? ??? ??????? ??? ?????????? ??? ?????? ??? ??????· ?? ?? ?????, ????? ??? ?? ?? ???? ???? ??????? ????????? ??? ????? ????? ? ???????????? ????? ???’ ?????·?????? ??? ??? ????? ????? ???????? ??? ???? ??? ??? ????? ???????·????? ??? ??? ?? ?? ????? ?????? ????????? ?????? ???? ??????, ??? ?? ???? ?? ?? ???? ???? ??????? ????????? ??? ?????? ??? ?? ???? ?????.

Bessarion: "Qui igitur ponunt ideas esse ac numeros eas esse, dicere tentant quo modo et qua de causa sint, eo quod secundum expositionem cuiusque unum quid praeter multa accipiunt unumquodque."

Bonitz (1842, p. 128): "Si quis attente contulerit, quae hunc locum proxime antecedunt, omnem vim sententiae in eo cerni intelliget, quod idearum auctores studuerunt probare et quodammode probarunt, numeros re vera esse; idem etiam e proximis verbis apparet ?? ??? ???' ???? ???? ???????? ???? ?????? ?????, ???? ??? ??????? ??? ?? ????? ????? ???????. Itaque […] scibendum videtur ??? ??? ??? ?? ?????, nisi praetuleris pro ?? ?? ??????? scribere ?? ?? ???????.

Non multo majore mutatione emendanda videntur verba ???? ??? ??????? ??????? ???? ?? ????? ?????????, quae sicuti nunc exhibentur construi non possunt; infinitivus enim ????????? aptus profecto est a praepositione ????, siquidem aliud non est quo referatur; ita autem articulo, quo adjecto infinitivus nominis substantivi naturam induat, carere non possumus. Scribendum igitur arbitror ???? ?? ??????? ??????? ???? ?? ????? ?????????, i. e. ideo, quod statuunt ??????? cujusvis praeter multa."

Ross (ii 480): "The best interpretation of this very difficult sentence seems to be got by reading, as Bessarion perhaps did, ?? before ???? in l. 17, omitting ?? in l. 18 , and reading ????? in l. 19. 'As for those who assert that the Ideas exist, and that they are numbers, by their assumption - in virtue of the method of setting out each term apart from its instances - of the unity of each general term they try at least to give some account of why they believe number to exist.' I take the subject of ????? to be number, which is the subject of the whole discussion (cf. ll. 3 f., 10, 13, 20). It is impossible to say what Alexander read, except that he does not seem to have had ??.

Other attempts to deal with the sentence are (1) that of Winckelmann, who keeps the manuscript reading and translates ‘those who posit the Ideas … try at least to say how and why it is possible, according to the doctrine which separates each kind of thing from its many particulars, to assume each to be a unity The objections to this are that (a) ?? is unexplained, and (b) the order in which the words are taken is intolerably unnatural.

(2) Bonitz suggests ???? ?? ??????? … ?????????. This leaves the difficult ??, and it neglects a passage which in some respects illustrates the present passage, Z. 1031b21 ???? ??? ??????? ?????? ?? ?? ????? ????.

(3) Maier proposes ?? ???? ??? ??????? … ????????? ?? ?? ???????. But if, as he says, the subject of ????? (sic) is ?? ?? ???????, then ?? … ????????? is left without a construction, while if ?? … ????????? ?? ?? ??????? is the subject, the order is highly unnatural.

(4) Bullinger proposes ??????????? ?? for ????????? ?? ??, which gives much the same sense as the reading we have adopted but is somewhat less probable as an emendation.

(5) Prof. Joachim proposes ?? ???? ??? ??????? ??????? ???? ?? ????? ?????????, ?? ?? ??????? ????????? ???.

The reading adopted in l. 18 as being the better attested, ??? for ??? ???, does not affect the main difficulties of the passage."

Jaeger: "an ??? et ??? ?? variae lectiones erant in codicibus conflatae?"

1090a21-22. because they saw many attributes of numbers belonging to sensible bodies.

(1) because they saw many attributes of numbers existing in sensible bodies. (according to Jaeger)

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (813. 34-35): ??? ?? ???? ????? ???? ??? ??????? ????????? ?? ???? ?????????.

Anonymus: "quia viderunt multas numerorum passiones existentes in sensibilibus corporibus."

Bessarion: "quod multas numerorum passiones sensibilibus inesse corporibus videbant."

Fonseca: "quia multas numerorum affectiones in corporibus sensibilibus inesse videbant."

Jaeger: "?? addidi ex Alexandri citatione; cf. 30 et 1090b3-4."

1090a35-37. But those who make number separable assume that it both exists and is separable. (according to Bonitz)

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (814. 29-32): ??? ?? ?????????? ??? ??????? ??? ?? ?? ???????? ??? ???? ??? ??????? ????????? ???? ????? ??? ???? ?????????, ?????? ?? ????? ?????? ??? ????? ??? ????? ????????? ???????? ??? ??????? ?????????? ?????? ?????????.

Bonitz (1849, p. 580): "??????? si retinemus, supplendam est ?? ??????????, non ?? ???????? a36; sed quoniam sequentibus demum verbis ?????? ?? ???. a numeris ad magnitudines Aristoteles transgreditur, longe est probabilius scribendum esse ???????? et supplendum ??????? perinde atque ad superiora enuntiati verba ?? ?? ???????? ????????? a35)."

Ross (ii 481): "The subject of ????? should be ??? ??????? (cf. l. 35 ?? ?? ???????? ?????????). But Aristotle has, not unnaturally, passed in thought to a vague subject such as ?????; it is not necessary to adopt Bonitz's conjecture ????????."

Jaeger: "major lacuna exstat vel ante vel post ????? ?? ?? ???????? … ?????, etiam Alexander alium textum habuisse videtur: Aristoteles non negat facta, quibus nititur Platonicorum demonstratio, sed conclusionem rejicit."

(3) To me, it is evident that Pseudo-Alexander read ???????? (????? ????????? ???????? = ????? ?? … ??? ???????? ?????, scil. ??? ???????). 37-38 ????? ?? ????????????? ??? ???????? ????? corresponds to ll. 25-26 ???? ?? ??? ??????????? ????? ??????? ???????.

1090b8-9. For extremes are not substances.

(1) For extremes are neither substances nor capable of existing apart. (according to Jaeger, cf. l. 13)

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (815. 7-9): ??? ???????? ?????? ????? ??? ?????? ??? ?? ?????? ??? ??????? ??? ???? ??? ???????? ??? ????? ??? ??????? ?????, ?????? ?? ???? ????? ???? ????? ????? ???????? ??????.

Jaeger (BBA 278): "It is the double property of points, lines and planes, according to the doctrine of Speusippus - that they are ?????? and that they are ??????? - which is contested by Aristotle. The second member with ???? has dropped out. The fact that these geometrical quantities are ?????? does not prove that they are ???? ?? ??? ?????. But even if they are ??????, they do not exist but in sensible things; so they must not be ???????. Being ??????? and being ????? is clearly distinguished, here we have the content of the lost second member with ????. The dropping out was caused mechanically by homoeoteleuton [?????? <???? ???????>]."

Jaeger (in his apparatus): "post ?????? supplendum puto ex Alexandro ???? ???????; cf. 13."

1090b37-1091a1. he makes spatial magnitudes out of some other small and great.

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (817. 6-7): ?? ?? ??? ????? ?????? ??? ??????? ??? ??? ??????? ?? ?????? ?????.

Bessarion: "verum ex alio quodam magno et parvo magnitudines sane facit."

Schwegler (ii 353) deletes ???, referring to Pseudo-Alexander and Bessarion.

Bonitz (1849, p. 582): "Hoc aperte dicit Aristoteles, non posse Platonem aliam indefinitam parvi et magni dyadem ad explicandos mathematicos numeros ponere praeter eam quae principium sit idealium numerorum, quoniam aliam dyadem jam adsciverit ad progignendas magnitudines. Sed ipsa verba, quibus hanc sententiam contineri oportet, grammatice construi et explicari nequeunt. Facile quidem videtur sublata post ??????? distinctione particulam ??? omittere vel in ?? mutare, quae emendatio Alexandri et Bessarionis auctoritate firmari potest, sed num ita genuina scriptoris manus restituta, an plura turbata sint dubito."

Christ (1853, p. 63): "Corruptela aliqua haec verba squalere perspicue demonstravit Bonitzius, conjecturam autem, quam proposuit, ??????? ?? ?????? ?????, nec Alexandri certa auctoritate firmatur, nec omnino mihi probatur, premendum enim fuit, ex alia specie magni et parvi numerum mathematicum procreari non posse, ut quae magnitudines effingat. Simplicissima mutatione legendum esse suspicor: ?? ??? … ?????; ?? ????? ?? ????? ?????? ??? ??????? ??? ?? ??? ?????? ?????. Sic enim ordo disputationis procedit: ex eodem magno et parvo numerus mathematicus effici nequit, nec denique ex alio quodam genere (?????? ??)."

Christ (in his apparatus): "ipse ?? post ??????? excidisse et ?? ????? … ????? ex nota marginali irrepsisse puto."

Ross (ii 482): "The manuscript reading, ?? ????? ?? ????? ?????? ??? ??????? ?? ??? ?????? ?????, may be dealt in various ways.

(1) We may omit the colon and the ??? (the reading implied in Bessarion, and possibly in Alexander 817. 7; but cf. 817. 14 [?? ????? ??? ?? ?????? ?????]).

(2) We may read ????? for ?????, and translate 'from what other small and great can he construct mathematical numbers? He already constructs spatial magnitudes out of one other'. But the supplying of 'out of one other' is difficult.

(3) Christ's ??????? ?? is open to the same objection."

(3) Interpreting the sentence as a polemic question (?????) can be ruled out because it should read then ???????, not ?????, cf. On the Soul, 406b19-24 (?????? ?? ??? ?????????? ?????· ?????????? ??? ???? ??? ??????????? ???????, ??? ?? ????????? ???????? ??????, ??????????? ??? ?????? ?? ???? ???. ????? ?’ ?????????? ?? ??? ???????? ????? ????? ????· ??? ?? ???????, ??????? ? ??? ???????? ??????. "similarly Democritus says that the spherical atoms which according to him constitute soul, owing to their own ceaseless movements draw the whole body after them and so produce its movements. We must urge the question whether it is these very same atoms which produce rest also - how they could do so, it is difficult and even impossible to say.").

Fortunately, there is a parallel which throws light on our passage: 992a10-18. Here we learn that "the many and few" (ll. 16-17) is the "kind of small and great" (ll. 11-12) which constitutes number. For the constitution of "spatial magnitudes" (1091a1), it needs "another kind of small and great" (1090b37sq.). The whole sentence is good Aristotelian in itself, but clearly out of place in the present context (as already stated by Christ).

1091a3-4. and we must inquire how the one is these many things.

(2) Christ: "fortasse ????? ????? ?? ??."

Ross (ii 482): "For the absence of the article cf. Xen. An. iv. 7. 5 ??????? ??????? ?????????, Lys. 7. 10 ??????? ????? ???? ???, and Kühner, Griech. Gramm. § 465 Anm. 6a."

(3) In Kühner/Gerth (l. c.) we read: "The article is omitted when the pronoun takes the place of the subject, and the noun the place of the predicate." Lysias 7. 10 is interpreted by them: "it is 3 years", Xenophon, Anabasis 4, 7, 5: "we see these men who are only few". Neither the rule nor the instances do apply to our passage, ?? ?? is subject as in ll. 2-3 (and in Ross's translation). Nevertheless, the plural is allright, ????? resumes the ?????? in l. 3; ????? is predicative attribute to ?????: "these (kinds of unity), being many". Cf. Plato, Republic, 423 DE: ?????, ?? ?' ???, ? ????? ?????????, ?? ??????? ?? ???, ????? ????? ??? ?????? ???????????? ("These orders we give them, Adeimantus, are neither as numerous nor as important as one might think.").

1091a15-18. for they say plainly that when the one had been constructed, whether out of planes or of surface or of seed or of elements which they cannot express, immediately the nearest part of the unlimited began to be constrained and limited by the limit.

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (819. 2-9): ??????? ??? ???????? ??? ??? ???? ??????????? ???? ?? ???????? ???? ?? ???????? ???? ?? ????????? ???? ?? ????? ????? (???????? ??? ??? ????? ?????? ?? ????? ??????? ?? ??, ??? ??? ????? ??? ??? ?? ???????? ??? ???????? ???????? ???? ?? ??, ??? ?? ?? ????? ?????), ??????? ?? ????????, ??? ??? ???? ??????????? ?? ??? ??? ??????? ??? ?? ?????? ?????? ?????? ??????????? ????? ?? ??????? ??? ????????? ?? ??? ??????? ??? ?????????? ??? ??????????? ??? ??? ????· ?? ?? ??? ???? ?????.

Christ: "??? superfluum antecedente ??."

Jaeger: "an est varia lectio ad ???"

Ross (ii 484): "For similar tautology cf. Ind. Ar. 538b33-39."

Here Bonitz remarks (ll. 33-34): "??? pleonastice positum vel iteratum", with reference to 153a18, 20. 454a15. 1283b16. 1337b5.

Burkert (p. 34 n.): "??? must not be deleted; it has the function of a quotation mark, probably separating paraphrasis and citation."

1091a19-20. it is fair to make some examination of their physical theories.

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (819. 18-23): ??????? ??? ??????? ??? ???? ??????? ???????? ?? ???? ???????? ???????????? ?? ??’ ????? ???????? ?????????·?????? ??? ???? ????????? ?? ??????? ??? ?????? ????????? ???? ???? ??????. ???? ?? ?? ??? ?????? ???????· ??? ?’ ?? ?? ?????? ‘??????? ??? ?????? ????????? ???? ???? ??????, ???’ ?? ???? ???? ??? ????? ??? ???????? ?????????????.

Schwegler (ii 354-355) conjectures ????????? ?? ???? ???? ??????.

Bonitz (1849, pp. 583-584 n.): "Schweglerus quod pro ?? scribendum conjicit ?? ????, sententiam verborum recte explicat, sed emendatione propterea non videtur opus esse. Pythagoreos enim quum dicit Aristoteles examinandos esse ???? ??????, nimirum hoc judicium ad eos libros rejicit, in quibus ???? ?????? disputat neque vero ???? ??? ????????."

Christ: "fortasse ?? sc. ??????."

Ross (ii 484): "There is much to be said for Bywater’s proposal ????????? ?? ?? ???? ??????."

Jaeger: "nisi forte ?? ???? ?????? est varia lectio olim ad 18 ??????? adscripta."

(3) The phrase ?? ?? ?????? occurs 1076a9, 1289a26 and 1317b34.

1091b8-9. for those of them who combine the two characters in that they do not use mythical language throughout. (omitting ??? with Bonitz)

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (821. 21-23): ?? ?? ?????????? ????? (????? ?? ???? ?? ????? ??????? ??? ????????????, ????? ?? ???????, ????????).

Bessarion: "quia ii quidem eorum qui mixti fuerunt nec omnia fabulose dicunt."

Bonitz (1849, p. 586): "haec verba ut possint construi, particula ??? omittenda videtur esse."

1091b13-15. Of those who maintain the existence of the unchangeable substances some say the One itself is the good itself.

(2) According to Zeller (1839, 277 note) the text is corrupt, for ?? ??? has no correlate, ?????? ?????? ???. presupposes that people were mentioned who denied the identity of ?? and ??????, the same being indicated by ???????. Consequently, Zeller assumes that some words have dropped out before ?????? ??????, saying: others did not take the ?????? to be the ??.

Bonitz (1849, pp. 586-587 n.): "Una […] manet difficultas, quod ?? ??? dixit neque ei quidquam opponit, cf. Alexandrum p. 800, 34 [=822. 1-2 Hayduck]: ????? ?? ?? "?? ???" ??? ??????? ?? ?? ??. Sed inde quidem dictionis oritur quaedam inconcinnitas, non obscuritas sententiae; qui enim philosophi oppositi sint iis, qui dicunt idem esse unum et bonum, supra jam est dictum, a34. Atque hanc quidem dicendi inconcinnitatem, quum nullum praeterea accedat corruptelae vestigium, equidem Aristotelis potius negligentiae, quam librariorum incuriae tribuam."

1091b16-18. It would be strange if to that which is primary and eternal and most self-sufficient this very quality - self-sufficiency and self-maintenance - belongs primarily in some other way than as a good.

(1) My proposal: It would be strange if to that which is primary and eternal and most self-sufficient this very quality - primacy and self-sufficiency and self-maintenance - belongs in some other way than as a good.

(3) Symmetry requires to read [??????] ??? ?? ?????? ???????, <?? ?????? ???>.

1092a13-14. on the ground that the more complete always comes from the indefinite and incomplete. (reading ?? with Ravaisson)

(2) Ravaisson (1838, p. 8): ??? ?? ???????? ?????? ?? [leg. ??] ??? ?? ??????????.

1092b9-10. (as points are of spatial magnitudes).

(2) Syrianus (187. 30-31): ???? ???, ?????, ???? ??? ?????? ????? ?? ???????, ????? ??? ??????? ?? ???????.

Pseudo-Alexander (826. 32-33): ????? ?? ??????? ???? ????? ??? ??????? ????????? ?????.

1092b13. viz. by imitating the figures of living things with pebbles.

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (827. 24-26): ???????? ?? ??? ??? ????? ????????? ????? ??? ??? ??? ??????? ??????? ????????, ????? ?? ?????, ??? ???? ?????? ??? ???? ???? ???? ??? ?????.

Christ: "fortasse ??? ???? ??? ?????."

Ross (ii 494-495): "????? is surprising when the instances given have been man and horse. Christ conjectures ???? ??? ????? from Alexander (827. 26), but it is by no means clear that Alexander read this (cf. 826. 35 [??????? ??? ? ??????????? ??????? ????? ????? ??? ??? ????? ????? ??? ??????? ???? ?????, ??? ????? ??? ????? ??? ????? ????????, ??? ??? ??? ????? ??????]), and it seems that Aristotle uses ????? in its older and wider sense of 'living being', which is found in Plato (Sophist 233 E 8, Republic 401 A 4, Timaeus 90 A 6). Aristotle may be quoting from Archytas' account of Eurytus."

1092b17-18. for the ratio is the essence, while the number is the matter.

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (827. 39-41): ?? ??? ? ??????? ????? ??? ?? ????? ? ????? ??? ?? ????? ????? ?????, ? ?? ???????, ?? ???? ?????????? ?? ???? ????????, ?? ????? ???? ??? ??????? ????.

Schwegler (ii 364) conjectures ? ?' ??????? ???? (sc. ??????? ?????).

Bonitz (1849, p. 592 n.): "[…] quod licet non displiceat, dubito num necessarium sit, modo ??????? hoc loco dici putes ??????? ? ?????? b20, i. e. talem, qui certam materiae cuiusdam magnitudinem definiat."

Ross (ii 495): "Aristotle's view, however, is that ??????? ????????? (l. 22) (i. e. amounts of certain simpler forms of matter, numerically determined) is the ??? of a compound, though ??????? ????????? (l. 20) is not the ??? of any material thing but only the measure of its constituents; so that both statements are true, though of number in different senses."

1092b35-1093a1. The number of fire, then, cannot be 2 x 5 x 3 x 6, and at the same time that of water 2 x 3.

(2) Bonitz (1849, p. 593): "?????? scribendum est pro vulgato ??????, cf. Alexandrum p. 809, 28 [? ??? ?? ??? ?? ??? ??? ?? ???? ??? ??? ?? ???? ?????????? ?? ???????? = 831. 3-4 Hayduck]."

Christ: "verum Bonitzii scriptura recepta exspectamus ???' (non ???) ??????."

Diels (I p. 352 n.): "probably, ? is to be read instead of ???."

1093a23-24. and if the cause is that there are three parts of the mouth and one letter is in each applied to sigma.

(2) Syrianus (191. 28-29): ?????? ?? ????? ????? ??? ??????????, ??? ????? ??’ ??????? ?? ???????????.

Pseudo-Alexander (833. 27-29): ??? ????? ????? ?? ?? ??????? ?????, ???’ ??? ?? ? ?????????? ????? ???????????? ????????????· ?? ??? ?? ???? ?????? ???????????? ?? ? ??????????? ?????????? ?? ? ?? ????????.

Diels (I, pp. 352-353): "?????? ?? ??? ????? ????? ????? ??? ??’ ??????? ?????????? ?? ?????", referring to Syrianus, 191. 28.

Ross (ii 497-498): "'a single letter (guttural, labial, or dental) is applied to the sigma in each region'. Alexander seems to have read ?? ?????, assuming the sigma to be sounded after the other element in the double sound. But ?? … ?? ????? would be an unnatural combination, and further ? = ??, not ?? (A. 993a5). ???????? must be taken as implying nothing with regard to the order of the two sounds combined."

1093b3-4. from the lowest note of the flute to the highest. (omitting ??????)

(2) Pseudo-Alexander (835. 6-9): ??????? ?? ????? ?? ???????? ??? ?????? ?? ?? ???? ???????, ??’ ?? ??? ? ???????? ??? ? ????????? ???? ???????????, ???????? ?? ?? ????????? ???????, ???? ???? ?? ???, ??’ ?? ???????? ??????????? ???????.

(3) "????? (scil. ?????): the lowest of the three strings which formed the framework of the musical scale (opp. ????, ?????), but the highest in pitch". (Liddell/Scott)