

ALEXANDER APHRODISIENSIS. ADDENDA ET CORRIGENDA *

by F. EDWARD CRANZ
(Connecticut College)

1. The new anonymous translations of the Thomson manuscript.
2. Specific addenda et corrigenda (arranged in the order of the original article, Vol. I, 77-135).

1. *The new anonymous translations of the Thomson manuscript.*

The main new material on the translations of Alexander Aphrodisiensis comes from a manuscript in the possession of Frank Allan Thomson of Stockholm; I am indebted to Paul Oskar Kristeller for a description of the manuscript and to Mr. Thomson for generously providing me with a complete microfilm copy.

Ms. A 1: a. cart. misc. XV ex. Several hands. II, 276 folios. At the end (folios a-d), an old table of contents.

f. I-II. Hieronymi Donati patricii Veneti in interpretationem Alexandri Aphrodisei prefatio.

[*Inc.*]: Aristotelem philosophum ita ab initio antiquitas admirata est ut eum laudaret potius quam sectaretur. . . . [*Expl.*]: (f. II) Si quid quenquam inter legendum offenderet, non auctorem accuset sed interpretem.

f. 1-66 (other hand, except for title) Alexandri Aphrodisei enarratio de anima ex Aristotelis institutione, interprete Hieronymo Donato, patricio Veneto.

[*Inc.*]: Propositum nostrae institutionis est ut de anima disseramus que versatur in corpore, quod generatur et interit. . . . [*Expl.*]: (f. 66) in nervos musculosque dif-

* In addition to the specific acknowledgements which appear below, the author wishes to express his gratitude once more for the ever-helpful advice and encouragement of Professor P. O. Kristeller.

funditur quibus intercedentibus partium membrorumque motio et progressus passim in omni animalium natura dignit.

Auspicato exscriptus animae codicillus per me Joannem Stephanum Extraneum Alexandrinum de Bergolio Bartholomini in amplissimo lare Magnifici equitis aurati ac iuris utriusque neenon philosophiae doctoris D. Dominici Grimani Antonii patricii Veneti generosissimi XII^o kalen. Februarias 1491^o.

f. 66v. Ad lectorem. An epigram of six lines.

[*Inc.*]: Spiritus aethereus divinae mentis alumnus.

[*Expl.*]: Rem vides: haud facias quin tuearis onus.

f. 67-70 blank.

f. 71-71v. (other hand) Alexandri Aphrodisei successive (sic) glosarieve questiones ac solutiones quedam, earum capita sunt in numero 30. A table of chapters.

f. 72-93. Alexander Aphrodisiensis, Questiones morales. Questio contra negantes bonum esse vivere.

[*Inc.*]: Si prospere navigare bonum est, et male navigare malum, navigare ipsum neque bonum neque malum est. . . .

[*Expl.*]: (f. 93) cum sit quedam generatio, non autem simpliciter generatio ex contrariis, que autem secundum substantiam non etiam ex contrariis sed ex oppositione per contradictionem, neque substantie contrarium quicquam est.

f. 93v-94. Alexandri Aphrodisei Naturales questiones glosarie, earum solutiones et capita. Table of chapters.

f. 94-173. Alexander Aphrodisiensis, Questiones naturales. Per que constituere

quis possit primam causam secundum Aristotelem.

[Inc.]: Si substantie omnes corruptibiles sunt, omnia erunt corruptibilia, nam separabilia cetera sunt a substantia. . . . [Expl.]: (f. 173) et rursum sequitur si dicatur in impartilia ipsum dividi quod ex impartialium compositione fiunt magnitudines.

f. 174-243. Alexandri Aphrodisei, De anima secundus.

[Inc.]: De anima quid sit et quenam eius substantia et que accidentia ei sint non est promptum nec facile cognoscere sed est ex difficillimis huiusmodi rerum contemplatio. . . . [Expl.]: (f. 243) sed manifestissime Theophrastus ostendit in Calistene idem esse secundum fatum ac secundum naturam et Polizelus in opere hoc modo inscripto de fato.

f. 243-266v. Alexandri Aphrodisei Ad imperatores de fato et eo quod in nobis est.

[Inc.]: Erat quidem mihi votis omnibus optandum, imperatores maximi Severe et Antonine, coram vos videre et alloqui atque agere gratias pro vestris in me plurimis beneficiis. . . . [Expl.]: (f. 266v) si eorum causas pro Aristotelis sententia semper attulerimus sum conatus hac disputatione explicare.

The Thomson manuscript makes a notable contribution to our knowledge of the Renaissance translations of Alexander. The details will be discussed in connection with the particular translations, but the problem of the manuscript as a whole will be treated first and separately.

The first item in the manuscript is the already known translation of Alexander, *De anima* I, by Hieronymus Donatus. The copy is dated January 21, 1491. This permits us to make more precise the *terminus ante quem* of the Donatus translation, which was published in 1495. Further the scribe notes that the copy was made in the household of the later Cardinal Domenico Grimani (d. 1523). On Grimani, see Pio Paschini, *Domenico Grimani, Cardinale di S. Marco* († 1523), *Storia e Letteratura* IV (Rome 1943).

In addition to the *De anima* I, the Thomson manuscript contains three other works of Alexander: 1. *De anima* II. 2. *Quaestiones naturales et morales* (the manuscript

has the ethical questions first, followed by the three books of the natural questions). 3. *De fato*. All these translations are anonymous in the manuscript; all differ from the translations previously identified.

The question of the authorship of the translations cannot be decided on the basis of the evidence now available. Two general points may, however, be made.

In the first place, it seems clear that the three translations are the work of a single author. The basic argument is the agreement in the general style of the translations and in the somewhat unusual translation of certain technical terms. In style, the translations are simple and clear; in vocabulary they are almost purely 'Latin' and very few transliterations of Greek terms occur. As an illustration of the identical translation of a technical term, one might cite *De sublimibus* for *Meteorology* (*Quaestiones Naturales* III, 10, ed. Bruns 98,25, and III, 14, ed. Bruns 108,22, as well as *De anima* II, ed. Bruns 186,14). In most other translations one finds *Meteorologica* or *Meteora*. Similarly, both in the *Quaestiones naturales* II, 9 (ed. Bruns 54,19) and in the *De anima* II (ed. Bruns 103,3) ἐντελέχεια appears as *perfectihabia* [*perfectihabentia*]. This seems the necessary reading, though both in the Thomson manuscript and in the translation by Barbarus, cited below, we find *perfectihabia*, with no sign of an abbreviation.] H. Barbarus uses *perfectihabentia* in his version of Themistius, *Paraphasis de anima* (Venice, c. 1500. Goff T-132) f. 77v: Hanc igitur formam et speciem si quis enthelechiam, idest verbum ex verbo perfectihabiam [*perfectihabentiam*] appetet, haud iure reprehendetur ceu novo usus et horrenti vocabulo.' (ed. R. Heinze, CIAG V, 3, Berlin, 1899, p. 39,16 f.). I have not noted the term *perfectihabentia* elsewhere in translations of Alexander. But if the anonymous of the Thomson manuscript borrowed the term from H. Barbarus, the vocabulary of the anonymous seems otherwise quite different and his translation closer and more exact.

Likewise there are similarities between the new translation of the *De fato* and the other new translations. εἰρημός appears

as series in the *De fato* (ed. Bruns 195,19 and 196,2) and also in the *De anima* II (ed. Bruns 185,5); *μοῖρα* appears as *sors* both in the *De fato* (ed. Bruns 166,7) and also in the *De anima* II (ed. Bruns 182,15). Heracleitus, Fragment # 118, appears as *Mos hominum deus* both in the *De fato* (ed. Bruns 170,18) and in the *De anima* II (ed Bruns 185,23). Similarly *βούλευτικός* and its cognates appear both in the *De fato* (ed. Bruns 178,11 f.) and in the *Quaestiones Naturales* (ed. Bruns 107,34 f.) as *deliberativus*.

Hence the evidence points to a single translator as the author of the three new translations, but it also seems that this translator cannot be identified with either of the two possibilities suggested by the external evidence, Hieronymus Donatus or Angelus Politianus.

Hieronymus Donatus had translated Book I of the *De anima*, and we know that he possessed a Greek manuscript of Book II and that he was searching for a more complete copy (See Vol. I p. 85a). It is a natural hypothesis that he went on to translate Book II and that the new translations of the Thomson manuscript are his. However, the fragments of his translation of the *De intellectu* of *De anima* II do not correspond with the new anonymous translation. (See below IX, 1 a). Further the anonymous translation of the *De anima* II offers a unique translation of the crucial *θύραθεν* which is not in agreement with Donatus' standard translation as *extrinsic* (e.g. *De anima* I, ed. Bruns 90,19 f.). In the anonymous translation of the *De anima* II in the Thomson manuscript, *θύραθεν* is regularly given a temporal or inchoative meaning. Thus we find such renderings as *principio statim*, *primo statim*, *primo*, and finally as a standard translation for *νοῦς θύραθεν*, *intellectus incoatus* (*De anima* II,108,22 ff.).

In the case of Angelus Politianus, there is some evidence that he translated all or part of some *Quaestiones Naturales* of Alexander, though it must be remembered that this title was also applied to the *Problemata* (See above, Vol. I,119 f.). One is therefore tempted to connect him with the new anonymous translations. However, a provisional

study of the style of these translations does not seem to favor Politianus' claims. For example, in the *Miscellaneorum Prima Centuria*, probably contemporary with the new translations, Politianus discusses (Chapter I, in his *Opera*, Venice, 1498) the question of *ἐντελέχεια* at some length but we find no references to *perfectihabentia* or *perfectihabita*. Similarly in Chapter LXXXVII of the *Centuria* Politianus discusses *Automatum* in Suetonius; he suggests that it might be rendered as *ultroneum et spontale*; on the other hand, in the Thomson manuscript of *De anima* II (ed. Bruns 176,2) we find the Latin given as *casus*. But a final decision on Politianus' authorship must await more careful stylistic comparisons.

Hence, in summary, the Thomson manuscript presents us with three new translations of Alexander: the *De anima* II, the *Quaestiones naturales et morales*, and the *De fato*. All seem to be by a single translator, not yet identified. On the basis of the manuscript itself and on the basis of the clean humanist style, one would suggest a date in the late fifteenth century or very early in the sixteenth century. For further details on the particular translations, see below under I, 2a, VIII,1b, and XII,1a.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

II. B. LATE ANCIENT AND BYZANTINE

F. P. Hager, 'Die Aristotelesinterpretation des Alexander von Aphrodisias und die Aristoteleskritik Plotins bezüglich der Lehre vom Geist.' *Archiv f. Geschichte der Philosophie* XLVI(1964) 174-87 ; P. Henry, 'Une comparaison chez Aristote, Alexandre, et Plotin' in: *Les Sources de Plotin* (Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique, Tome V, Genève, 1960) pp. 427-49 ; F. Masai, 'Le "De fato" d'Alexandre d'Aphrodise attribué à Pléthon' *Byzantion* XXXIII (1963) 253-256 ; P. Moraux, 'Aristoteles, der Lehrer Alexanders von Aphrodisias,' *Archiv f. Geschichte der Philosophie* 49 (1967) 169-82 ; John M. Rist, 'On Tracking Alexander of Aphrodisias,' *Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie* 48 (1966) 82-90. Ernst Günther Schmidt, 'Alexander von Aphrodisias in

einem altarmenischen Kategorien-Kommentar,' *Philologus* 110 (1966) 277-286 ; G. Verbeke, 'Aristotélisme et stoïcisme dans le *De Fato d'Alexandre d'Aphrodisias*', *Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie* 50 (1968) 73-100.

II. C. SYRIAC AND ARABIC

P. Thillet, 'Un traité inconnu d'Alexandre d'Aphrodise sur la Providence, dans une version arabe inédite' in : *Actes du premier Congrès International de Philosophie Médiévale* 1958 (Louvain, 1960) pp. 313-24 ; A. Dietrich, 'Die arabische Version einer unbekannten Schrift des Alexander von Aphrodisias über die Differentia specifica' *Nachrichten d. Akad. der Wiss. in Göttingen*, Philolog.-hist. Kl. Jg. 1964, Nr. 2 pp. 90-148 ; J. Finnegan, S. J., 'Al-Fārābī et le IIEPI NOY d'Alexandre', *Mélanges Louis Massignon* II (Damascus, 1956-7) pp. 133-52 ; S. Pines, 'Omne quod movetur necesse est ab aliquo moveri. A refutation of Galen by Alexander of Aphrodisias and the theory of motion,' *Isis* LII (1961) 21-54.

II. E. WESTERN EUROPE

2. Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries.

Edward P. Mahoney, 'Nicoletto Vernia and Agostino Nifo on Alexander of Aphrodisias : An Unnoticed Dispute,' *Rivista critica di storia della filosofia*, 1968, Fasc. III, 268-296. W. Risso, 'Averroismo e alessandrino nella logica del Rinascimento', *Filosofia* XV (1964) 15-30.

I. 2. (Book I only)

HIERONYMUS DONATUS

On the basis of the Thomson manuscript (See above p. 411), the *terminus ante quem* of the Donatus translation of the *De anima* can be moved back from 1495 (the date of publication) to January 21, 1491, the date of the copy made by Johannes Stephanus Extraneus Alexandrinus de Bergolio Bartholomini in the household of Dominico (later Cardinal) Grimani.

I. 2a. (Book II only)

ANONYMUS.

The Thomson manuscript (see above p. 411) contains a complete Latin translation of *De anima* II. The translation seems to be by the same author who translated the *Quaestiones* and the *De fato* in the Thomson manuscript, but he has not yet been identified (for the evidence, see above p. 412). The manuscript is of the late fifteenth or early sixteenth century, and it does not seem that the translation can be much earlier in view of its attempt to achieve a good but not florid humanist Latin. A cursory examination suggests that the Greek manuscript used was identical with or very similar to that used for the Aldine edition (Venice, 1534). Thus the anonymous translator omits most of the passages listed by Bruns p. xi as omitted from the Aldine edition. However, the translator did not use the Aldine edition (an assumption unlikely on chronological grounds) since he occasionally includes phrases omitted in that edition (e.g. ed. Bruns 128,16).

Thomson manuscript A 1 : a. (micro.)

[Inc.] : (f. 174) De anima quid sit et quae nam eius substantia et que accidentia ei sint non est promptum nec facile cognoscere sed est ex difficillimis huiusmodi rerum contemplatio (beginning of Chapter De intellectu. See IX above and below) [Inc.] : (f. 178) Intellectus est secundum Aristotelem triplex. Quidam enim est intellectus materialis. [Expl.] : (f. 184) separatus vero a nobis hoc ipso quod non intelligitur, non quod transeat. Ita enim etiam esset in nobis.

[Expl. of De anima II] : (f. 243) sed manifestissime Theophrastus ostendit in Calistene idem esse secundum fatum ac secundum naturam et Polizelus in opere hoc modo inscripto de fato.

II. 4. (Book I, Partial)

ANTONIUS DE ALBERTIS.

Vol. I. 87b (Reported by G. H. Jonker, Velp, Holland and by P. O. Kristeller).

Added biographical information : Born October 2, 1495. The son of Niccolò (1454-1512), the grandson of Antonio (1396-1461). Involved in a plot against the Medici 1521 but not sentenced. Offices under the regime of Nic. Capponi 1528-29, and again under Cosimo I 1534, 1542, 1550. Assisted Diaceto in teaching mathematics, ethics, and philosophy at Pisa ; see Fabroni I, 324. Compiled the statutes of the Accademia degli Umidi 1540, and was its console. Died February 27, 1555.

Works : Antonius de Albertis also translated Bryennius, *Harmonica*. The autograph manuscript of the translation is found in Codex Vindob. 10437 (See Lambecius-Kollar, *Commentariorum de August. Biblioth. Caesarea Vindob. Liber VII* 1781, col. 169-70 ; *Tabulae VI*, 189). He emended Boccacio's *Decamerone* in the edition of 1527.

Bibl. : L. Passerini, *Gli Alberti di Firenze*, 2 vols. (Florence, 1869). Vol. I, 173-6, no. 17 and Tavola V (facing p. 155).

IV. 1. GUILLELMUS DE MOERBEKE (?)

vol. I p. 91b, line 14 (reported by S. Mansion).

Read : The translation is found in four manuscripts.

VI. 1. GUILLELMUS DE MOERBEKE.

(reported by A. J. Smet)

Vol. I, 96b, line 2. Read : Three manuscripts state... (add. : Firenze, Biblioteca Laurent., cod. Plut. LXXXIV, 17).

line 7 : and seven manuscripts give the date... .

Bibl. : Add : A. J. Smet, 'Alexander van Aphrodisias en S. Thomas van Aquino. Bijdrage tot de Bronnenstudie van de Commentaar van S. Thomas op de Meteorologica van Aristoteles,' *Tijdschrift voor Philosophie* XXI (1959) 108-41.

I, 97a, line 14 : Add : Partial Edition. Alexander van Aphrodisiae, *Commentaar op de Meteorologica, Boek I-II, 5. Latijnse vertaling door Willem van Moerbeke*. Deel I. *Inleidung op de tekstuitleg en Studie over het gebruik van de Commentaar door Thomas van Aquino*. Deel II : *Tekstuitleg* (Proef-

schrift aangeboden tot het bekomen van de graad van doctor in de wijsbegeerde door A. J. Smet). Leuven, 1958 (dactyl.). Complete edition : Alexandre d'Aphrodias, *Commentaire sur les Météores d'Aristote. Traduction de Guillaume de Moerbeke*, ed. A. J. Smet, C. P. (Corpus Latinum Commentariorum in Aristotelem Graecorum IV). Louvain and Paris, 1968.

VI. 6. c.

An Oxford manuscript (Bibl. Bodl., Selden supra 24, s. XII-XIII) contains fragments of a commentary on the *Meteorologica* attributed to Al and perhaps translated by Henricus Aristippus. See *Aristoteles Latinus, Supplementa altera* (1961) 23 and 38-39.

I, 107a, line 48. Read : 8. Doubtful.

VIII. 1. ANONYMUS

(Guillelmus de Moerbeke)

The medieval translation of the *De fato* has now been published in a critical edition by P. Thillet : Alexandre d'Aphrodise, *De fato ad Imperatores, Version de Guillaume de Moerbeke* (Études de Philosophie Médiévale LI) Paris, 1963. By a careful analysis of the vocabulary of the translation, the editor shows that the work is definitely to be ascribed to Guillelmus de Moerbeke ; he also demonstrates that the translation was made from a Greek manuscript written in uncials and not from any now extant.

Meanwhile Miss L. Labowsky had shown that our most important Greek manuscript for the independent philosophical works of Alexander, Marc. Zan. gr. 258(668), the V of Bruns, once belonged to Guillelmus and bears his name, with his title of penitentiary of the pope, on the first folio. (L. Labowsky, 'Bessarion Studies. III. William of Moerbeke's Manuscript of Alexander of Aphrodisias,' *Mediaeval and Renaissance Studies* V[1961] 155-62). Since as Thillet has shown, Guillelmus worked from a Greek manuscript in uncials, he cannot have made the translation from his own manuscript. As Thillet points out, Guillelmus did not bear the title of penitentiary after 1278 (*op. cit.* p. 62)

and must hence have come into possession of the manuscript before then. Thillet suggests that Guillelmus must therefore have made his translation *before* obtaining his own Greek copy and that he possibly made use of a lost papal manuscript.

VIII. 1a. ANONYMUS

The Thomson manuscript (see above p. 411) contains a previously unknown translation of the *De fato*. The translation appears to be the work of the same author who translated the *De anima* II and the *Quaestiones* in the Thomson manuscript, but he has not yet been identified (for the evidence, see above p. 412). The translation of the *De fato*, like the others, is probably to be dated in the late fifteenth or early sixteenth century. To judge from the evidence presented by Bruns in his edition p. xxviii f., the translation seems to have been based on Marc. Zan. gr. 261 (the B of Bruns) or another manuscript related to it.

Thomson manuscript A 1 : a (micro.)
 [Inc.] : (f. 243) Erat quidem mihi votis omnibus optandum, imperatores maximi Severe et Antonine, coram vos videre et alloqui atque agere gratias pro vestris in me plurimis beneficiis... / ...[Expl.] : (f. 266v) si eorum causas pro Aristotelis sententia semper attulerimus sum conatus hac disputatione explicare.

VIII. 1b. HIERONYMUS DONATUS

Nicoletus Vernias in his *De intellectu* of September, 1492 cites the *De fato* * briefly in connection with his citations of the *De anima* I and the *De intellectu* in the translation of Hieronymus Donatus (See above I,2 and below IX 1a). In what appears to be the first edition of Vernias, *De intellectu* (with Albertus de Saxonia, *Quaestiones in Aristotelis Physica*. Venice, J. Pencius. April 13, 1504) we read, f. 86ra 'Unde ipse [sc. Alexander] in suo De fato consiliativum

hominem et libertatem habere arbitrii dicit. Sed ut Severinus ait, nos liberum arbitrium non dicimus facere quod quisque voluerit sed quod quisque iudicio et examinatione collegerit, alioquin irrationalia animalia habebunt liberum arbitrium, videmus enim alia quaedam sponte refugere, quibusdam sponte adhaerere ; quod si ad velle vel nolle hoc recte liberi arbitrii vocabulo teneretur, non solum hoc hominum sed ceterorum animalium esset'. (In the next edition, with N. Vernias, *Quaestio de gravibus et levibus*, Venice, 1505, the first portion of the passage appears in what seems to be a different recension, though corrupt. f. 5ra : unde ipse in suo de facto (sic) consiliarivum [consiliativum?] hominem et libertatem habere arbitrii dicitur. Sed ut Severinus ait, nos liberum arbitrium non nisi dicimus quod quisque voluerit secundum quod quisque iudicio et examinatione collegerit).

One cannot make too much of so brief and unclear a reference. However, it does seem to show that Vernias had access to a translation of the *De fato*. The reference appears to be to Chapter XI (ed. Bruns 178,11 f.) and XIV (ed. Bruns 183,26 f.). It is not clear whether the reference to Severinus is a part of the original text or a gloss ; possibly it refers to Boethius, *De consolatione* V, Pr. 2. As far as Alexander is concerned, the translations of the *De fato* by Hieronymus and Johannes Baptista Bagolinus are too late to be considered (See VIII,2 and 3 above). The translation by Guillelmus de Moerbeke (see VIII,1 above) uses *consiliativus* in its version of the passage in question (ed. Thillet p. 76,26 f. and see p. 124b s.v.) ; but Moerbeke's translation seems to have been little known in fifteenth century Italy, and Vernias' context suggests a Renaissance translation. The anonymous translation of the Thomson manuscript (see above, VIII, 1a) seems to be excluded since it usually renders *βούλευτικός* by *deliberativus* rather than *consiliativus*. Thus one of the passages in question (Bruns 178,10) begins, Quod si frustra et incassum homo deliberat vana nulliusque momenti est quam habet deliberandi potestatem. Quamquam si nihil facit incassum natura, ex precedentibus hominem autem esse deliberativum ani-

* I am indebted to Professor Edward P. Mahoney, of Duke University, for calling my attention to this citation.

mal principaliter est a natura... colligeretur nimirum non esse frustra deliberativos homines'. On the other hand, Hieronymus Donatus in parallel passages of *De anima* I appears to use cognates both of *consiliativus* and of *deliberativus* in translating *βούλευτικός* (e.g. Bruns 82,16 f.).

Hence, until more definite evidence is available, the citation of the *De fato* by Vernias seems to leave us with the possibility that there was another Renaissance translation of the *De fato*, possibly by Hieronymus Donatus.

IX. 1a. HIERONYMUS DONATUS (fragments only preserved)

Fragments of a translation of the *De intellectu* by Hieronymus Donatus are cited by Nicoletus Vernias in his *De intellectu* of September, 1492. (The following citations are all taken from the edition of 1504, see VIII, 1b above; there are no essential differences in the edition of 1505).

Vernias is explicit on the translator. f. 86ab. Superius dicta ad mentem Alexandri Aphrodisei pro maiori parte accepi ex paraphrasi eiusdem super libro de anima et ex tractatu quodam eius de intellectu, quae omnia accuratissime et elegantissime translulit Magnificus patritius Venetus utriusque linguae doctissimus integerrimus philosophus iuris utriusque doctor Hieronymus Donatus compater meus dilectissimus.' We may assume that Vernias' quotations from the *De intellectu* are substantially accurate, since his quotation of *De anima* I (ed. Bruns 84,24 f.) differs only in details from the printed Donatus version: f. 86ra. Sed Alexander dixit et bene quod intellectus magis assimilatur rasurae tabulae quam ipsi tabulae, aptitudo existens sicut et rasurae [rasura, 1505], id est privatio inscriptionis. Et quod hoc sit ita audias verba eius in capitulo de speculativo intellectu et pratico (sic). 'Solum igitur materialis intellectus facultas promptitudo quaedam est ad formas recipiendas tabellae nundum scriptae persimilis, quinimmo ipsius tabellae agraphio, hoc est inscriptionis parentiae quam tabellae similior. . . .'

The main quotations in Vernias from *De intellectu* are:

1. f. 85va. Unde opinatur Alexander quod in una simplici substantia animae sunt duae potentiae sempiternae. Audias verba eius. 'Intellectus activus quidem est. Non solum enim conditor rerum plurimarum sed earum fabricator in iisdem intelligendis efficitur, nisi forte quispiam intellectum ob id passivum concedat quod suscipiendarum specierum vim retinet. Suscipere enim videatur esse quod pati, et hoc intellectui et sensui commune est. Verum quia unaquaque res non ab eo quod commune est caeteris, sed quod peculiare et proprium est definitionem capiat, proprium autem intellectui est ut activus sit specierum quas recipit, ab actione potius definiendus est. Et est socius nostri intellectus in opere qui ab extra est intellectus.' (ed. Bruns 111,5-14 with omissions and 27-28)

2. f. 85va. De intellectu agente, quod sempiternus sit, audias quae ipse [sc. Alexander] ponit. 'Intellectus agens cum ab extra eiusmodi species actu sit, intellectus immortalis et sempiternus iure ab Aristotele nuncupatur.' (Bruns 108,29-109,1)

3. f. 86ra. . . huic opinioni adhaerebant hi qui (ut inquit Alexander in tractatu suo *De intellectu*) solebant in porticibus disputare, Stoici scilicet, qui dicebant 'intelligere non esse nostrum opus' sed divinae providentiae. (Bruns 113,16)

4. f. 86ra. Unde in suo *De intellectu*, de agente loquens ait, 'Non enim cum ullo in loco sit transitum facit, sed cum ubique sit, manet in corpore quod a temperamento dissolvitur, corrupta organica portione' (Bruns 112,31-113,1)

On the basis of these fragments, there can be no doubt that Hieronymus Donatus translated at least the *De intellectu* of *De anima* II. The *terminus ante quem* is provided by the date of Vernias, *De intellectu*: September, 1492. The translation cannot be earlier than 1489, when Donatus first read the *De anima* (See Vol. I,85a).

One cannot identify the manuscript on the basis of the extant fragments. It would seem however that Donatus may well have used at least one and possibly two manuscripts belonging to Domenico Grimani, in

whose household our earlier manuscript of Donatus' translation of the *De anima* I was copied (see above, p. 412). In March, 1490, Donatus wrote to Angelus Politianus (See Vol. I, 85a). He tells Politianus that he has Books I and II of the *De anima*; however his copy of *De anima* II is mutilated at the beginning. Accordingly, he asks Politianus if there is a better copy at Florence. Politianus replies on April 22 that there is no manuscript in the Medicean Library, but he adds, 'Tum Grimanus proxima aestate missurum se mihi exemplum alterum, quod tibi pridem commodaverat, ultiro est pollicitus...' (Politianus, *Opera omnia*, Basel, 1553, 26).

XII. 1a. ANONYMUS

The Thomson manuscript (see above p. 411) contains a previously unknown translation of the *Quaestiones naturales et morales*. The translation seems to be the work of the same author who translated the *De anima* II and the *De fato*, but he has not yet been identified (for the evidence, see above p. 412). The translation of the *Quaestiones naturales et morales*, like the other translations of the Thomson manuscript, is probably to be dated in the late fifteenth or early sixteenth century. On the basis of the criteria provided by Bruns in his editions (*De anima* p. x f.; *Quaestiones* p. xix f.), the translation seems to be based on Marc. Zan. gr. 261 (the B of Bruns) or a manuscript closely resembling it. Thus, for example, in II,iii (Bruns 48,14) the translation indicates a lacuna as does B; in I,xxvi (Bruns 41,22) and in IV,xxx (Bruns 161,34) the translation follows B in repeating the title of the question at the beginning of the text.

Thomson ms. A 1 : a (micro).

(*Quaestiones morales* = Book IV). [Inc.]: (f. 72) Si prospere navigare bonum est, et male navigare malum, navigare ipsum neque bonum neque malum est...[Expl.]: (f. 93) cum sit quedam generatio, non autem simpliciter generatio ex contrariis, que autem secundum substantiam non etiam ex contrariis sed ex oppositione per contradictionem, neque substantie contrarium quicquam est.

(Book I). [Inc.]: (f. 94) Si substantie omnes corruptibles sunt, omnia erunt corruptibilia, nam separabilia cetera sunt a substantia. . . . (Book III). [Expl.]: (f. 173) et rursum sequitur si dicatur in imparitia ipsum dividi quod ex imparitium compositione fiunt magnitudines.

XII. 6 ANGELUS POLITIANUS

It still seems impossible to give a definite answer to the question whether or not Politianus translated the *Quaestiones naturales et morales*, and the problem is made more difficult by the fact that in our sources *Naturales quaestiones* may also refer to the *Problemata* (See XII. 6 above and XVII. 4 above and below XVII. 4a). However, the following additional evidence may be noted.

Jacobus Philippus Bergomensis in his *Supplementum Chronicarum*, beginning with the edition of Venice, 1503, writes of Politianus: f. 408a 'vertit Alexandri Aphrodisei quaestionum libros quattuor, item Problemata eiusdem Alexandri.' Jacobus clearly intends to affirm a separate translation of the *Quaestiones naturales*, and his *Supplementum* contains a good deal of valid information on literary history.

In his correspondence with Hieronymus Donatus (See Vol. I, 85a) Politianus expresses a fear that he may have translated the same work of Alexander that Donatus had translated; at the same time he refers to two manuscripts of Domenico Grimani. Further, in the Thomson manuscript (see above p. 412) which contains the *De anima* I-II, the *Quaestiones naturales et morales*, we find that *De anima* I was copied in the household of Grimani in January of 1491. Finally, in February, 1490, Politianus writes to Antonius Pizamanus: 'De quaestionibus Alexandri cupio aliquid transigas cum Grimano [germano], cui salutem Picus ascribit, et Hermolao Barbaro...' (Lorenzo d'Amore, *Epistole inedite di Angelo Poliziano*, Napoli, 1909, p. 37). In reading *Grimano*, I follow the translation in Pio Paschini, *Domenico Grimani, Cardinale di S. Marco* († 1523), *Storia e Letteratura IV* (Roma, 1943) p. 11. Paschini refers to Bibl. Vatic., Cod. Cappon. 235, fol. 81 and dates the letter as March 1,

1490. See Ida Maïer, *Les manuscrits d'Ange Politien* (Travaux d'Humanisme et Renaissance LXX) Genève, 1965, p. 269.

In summary, there is considerable evidence, none of it conclusive, for Politianus' active interest in the *Quaestiones naturales et morales*; there is even less definite evidence that he actually translated them. It is possible that further study of the style of the translation of the *Questiones* in the Thomson manuscript may permit the ascription of this translation to Politianus; the first indications, however, seem to deny his authorship. (see above p. 413).

XIV. 2. DOUBTFUL

Two fragments of the medieval translation of the *Commentaria in Aristotelis Analytica Posteriora* have been found in a Paris manuscript (BN, lat. 16080), and it appears that the translator was Jacobus Venetus.

Bibl.: *Aristoteles Latinus*, Supplementa altera (1961) 23 and 39-40; L. Minio-Paluello, 'Note sull'Aristotele Latino Medievale. XIV. Frammenti del commento di Alessandro d'Afrodisia ai Secondi Analitici tradotto da Giacomo Veneto (?) in un codice di Goffredo di Fontaines,' *Rivista di Filosofia Neo-Scolastica* LIV (1962) 131-147.

XV. 6. DOUBTFUL

Add to bibliography:

Aristoteles Latinus, Supplementa altera (1961) 23 and 40.

XVII. 2. THEODORUS GAZA

Additional edition (reported by Richard J. Durling).

1550. Lyons, N. Baccaneus. With Aristotle, *Problemata* (Wellcome Historical Medical Library).

XVII. 4. ANGELUS POLITIANUS (Book I)

For further details on the translation of the *Problemata*, see Ida Maïer, *Ange Politien. La formation d'un poète humaniste* (Travaux

d'Humanisme et Renaissance LXXXI) Genève, 1966, pp. 380-84. Maïer dates the translation between May 22 and August 5, 1479. This dating apparently rests on an emendation of the date of the letter of Politianus to Collenuccius (See Vol. I, 132a) from 1478, as given in the Aldine edition, to 1479. On this emendation, see also R. P. Oliver, 'Politian's translation of the *Enchiridion*', *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* LXXXIX (1958) p. 199.

It may also be noted that Politianus purchased a partial manuscript of the *Problemata* from Ficino (See Ida Maïer, *Les manuscrits d'Ange Politien*, Travaux d'Humanisme et Renaissance LXX, Genève, 1965, p. 337 with references).

Additional editions (reported by Richard J. Durling).

1558 s.l. s.n. With Aristotle, *Problemata* and M.A. Zimara, *Problemata etc.* (Wellcome Historical Medical Library).

1626. Venice, P. Milocus. With Aristotle, *Problemata etc.* (Wellcome Historical Medical Library).

XVII. 4a. ANGELUS POLITIANUS (Book II) Doubtful.

Nicoletus Vernias in his *De intellectu* (see above p. 416) cites a translation of Alexander, *Quaestiones naturales* (edition of Venice, 1504, f. 86ra): 'Item ipse Alexander in naturalibus quaestionibus inquit: Medicina etsi scientia est, tamen in opere suo ars apparel, quemadmodum anima etsi immortalis, tamen in corpus mortale demersa videtur esse mortalis. Item ait noluisse mundi opificem divinos celestesque hominum animos corporibus terrenis absque congruo quodam medio colligare. Medium est anima cogitativa.' The first part of the passage (I have not been able to locate the second) is a reference to the *Problemata* II, Proemium (ed. Ideler I, 52, 15 ff.), though it is not an exact quotation.

The Proemium to Part II of the *Problemata* is not translated by Petrus Padubanensis or by Theodorus Gaza (see XVII. 1 and 2, above). It does appear in the translation of Georgius Valla, published in 1488 (see

XVII. 3 above), but it seems likely that Vernias would have cited this under the published title of *Problemata*. And in view of the fact that Vernias had close connection with Domencio Grimani, and indeed dedicated the *De intellectu* to him, we are tempted to think of a new translation from the Grimani-Donatus-Politianus circle.

As a hypothesis, one might suggest that we have here a fragment of a lost translation of the later portion of the *Problemata* by Politianus. Politianus declares that he had translated the *Problemata* in 1479 (see XVII.4 above), but in the posthumous edition of his works, Petrus Crinitus published only Book I. It might be that a complete translation from 1479 circulated in manuscript. Or it could be that when Politianus writes to Donatus in 1490 'Equidem nonnullas Alexandri huius peracutas in philosophia quaestiones anno iam tum superiore Latinas feci' (see above XII. 6), he refers to a further translation of the later portion of the *Problemata*, and it is this from which Vernias cites. The second possibility seems the more likely; it is supported by the fact that, as Ida Maier points out (*Ange Politien* pp. 383-4), during his last years Politianus was keenly interested in scientific texts of all sorts, and specially in those concerned with medicine.

ALEXANDER APHRODISIENSIS :
(DOUBTFUL)

c) Augustinus Niphus in his *De daemonibus* I,14 discusses at some length a writing of Alexander, *De magicis*; it is possible that the same writing is mentioned by Albertus Magnus in his *De mineralibus* II,II,1 in a discussion of alchemy.

Augustinus Niphus declares (in the edition with his *De intellectu*, Venice, 1503, f. 80ra Capitulum xiiii, in quo narratur positio Ale. aphrodisii) :

'Legimus his diebus librum Ale. peripatetici quem de magicis scripsit, ubi reperimus modum satis pro peripateticis convenientem ad haec et reducam eum ad formam.' Niphus goes on to make three points. 1. . . . in tota sphaera activorum et

passivorum esse coelorum virtutem in rebus diffusam ubi continentur omnia opera possibilia fieri a rebus naturalibus. . . 2. . . . aliquid posse fieri concursu rerum naturalium quod non potest fieri ab una tantum re naturali. . . 3. . . . multa opera similia unum fiunt a rebus naturalibus seorsum acceptis. On this basis, he can go on to state the general position of Alexander 'His igitur tribus suppositionibus acceptis secundum Alexandri sententiam potest inveniri modus quo salvetur opera magorum sive [sine] daemonibus. Dicendum itaque quod cum aliqua res sensibilis vel multae res sensiles habentes virtutes certas ac determinatas congregantur in quadam una forma atque potestate, servatis horis caelestibus et aspectibus et aliis ex parte caelestium motuum, et seruatis etiam aliis ex parte locorum conditionum et circumstantiarum a magicis dictis, tunc virtus corporum caelestium in rebus omnibus disseminata actuatur et quasi reducitur de potentia ad actum, et operatur secundum meritum materiae quam magus praeparavit. opera ergo magorum non sunt immediate a daemonibus, sed immediate a virtute caelestium corporum tanquam a causa per se, ab ipsis rebus naturalibus ordinatis ad unum meritum tanquam ab organis, ab ipso mago tanquam a causa removente prohibens.' According to Niphus, Alexander illustrated his thesis by the fact that the magi first consider the stars and then prepare herbs and other materials to receive the celestial power. Niphus concludes with what may be a direct quotation from the *De magicis* : et ut Ale. inquit, 'qui considerasset quanta sit rerum potentia et caelestis vigor, haec et plura opera posse per magicas artes fieri non ambigeret, sed quoniam occultus est modus, quo virtus illa potest actuari vel (ut rectius loquar) contrahi a rebus naturalibus, et occulta potentia rerum et mensura congregationis etiam latet, hinc nos latet opera talia posse fieri per (80rb) haec sic ordinata, mihi autem (inquit) multo latenter erit, quomodo a virtute separata aeterna (qualis est potentia daemonica) possit effici opus huiusmodi, et maxime cum sit quasi principium apud sapientes, nullum novum

posse effluere ab antiquo aeterno et separato.' Quo modo quidem igitur salvantur opera magorum apud Alex. perspicuum.

In Chapter XV, Niphus notes an objection to the solution of Alexander ; he replies and makes incidental mention of Alexander *De anima* as well as of 'Alexander rodius in libro quem fecit Antibolo filio de opinione Platonis de anima'. In Chapter XVI (f. 80rb) he notes other difficult objections but adds 'quod si tu aut aliis vir modum habet salvandi haec, nolo amplius disputare, sed consentire Alexan. et aliis peripateticis qui daemones negant.'

Albertus Magnus in his *De mineralibus*, Liber II, Tractatus I, Caput II (Albertus Magnus, *Opera*, 38 vols., Paris 1890-99, v. V, p. 25) discusses the various positions on the causes of the virtues of stones (circa causam virtutum lapidum). 'Haec ergo est opinio quorundam antiquorum philosophorum, quam Alexander Graecus Peripateticus defendere videtur, eo quod ipse omnia quae-cunque sunt, sive sint animata sive non, elementis attribuit. Ita etiam quod dicit intellectum esse quoddam elementorum complexionem consequens. Ipsa enim elementa cum complexa sunt, mirabiliorum et altissimarum dicit esse operationum. Virtutum autem quae in commixto regit et dirigit qualitates elementales, non dicit esse nisi complexionem consequentem, et hanc mirabilem asserit esse, et probat per opera alchimiae in quibus simplicia parum prosunt, et cum complexa fuerint, admirabiles valde reddunt effectus.' In the following Chapter III, Albertus refutes the opinion of Alexander and adds a few details on it (*ibid.* V,27) : 'Dicta vero Alexandri Peripatetici convenientia ideo non sunt, quia scimus quod licet quodlibet calidum simplex et calidum commixtum diversas habet operationes, tamen convenient in genere. . . Adhuc autem male dictum est nihil dirigere et informare qualites [qualitates] elementorum nisi ipsam mixtionem et complexionem. . . propter virtutes enim lapidum non complexionales nec elementales prae omnibus magici utuntur lapidibus pretiosis tam in anulis quam in caeteris imaginibus, quorum effectus est mirabilis. Propter hoc autem et hujusmodi falsificatur dictum Alexandri.'

The statements of Niphus and Albertus Magnus demonstrate the existence of one (or possibly two) works on magic and alchemy attributed to Alexander. In each case it appears that the author was originally listed simply as 'Alexander Peripateticus.' He is identified as Alexander Aphrodisiensis in the margins of the 1890-99 edition of Albertus, *Opera* ; but he does not so appear in the text, and the marginalia are absent in the early edition I have seen (Oppenheim, 1518). Niphus first refers to him simply as Alexander Peripateticus, but it is clear that he identified him with Alexander Aphrodisiensis as the author of the *De anima* (*De daemonibus* I, 14, f. 80ra ; I,15, f. 80rb). In the case of Albertus, one might cite the use of *alchimia* as showing that his translation was one coming through the Arabic, but it is not certain that this word belongs to Alexander and not to Albertus. In the case of Niphus, the terminology suggests a translation from the Greek and it is possible that Niphus was working directly from a Greek text.

There are no firm links between the references of Albertus Magnus and of Augustinus Niphus, on the one hand, and the ancient tradition of Alexander's works, on the other.

The eleventh century Byzantine writer, Michael Psellus, at the end of his work *De lapidum virtutibus* (ed. P. J. Maussacus, Leiden, 1745 p. 38-39 ; reprinted PG CXXII, Coll. 899-900) lists the authors who discussed the causes of the powers of stones ; of the earlier writers he mentions Anaxagoras, Empedocles, and Democritus, and he adds 'of those who did not live long before us, Alexander of Aphrodisias, a man, to speak briefly of many things, most ready even with respect to the ineffable things of nature'. A pupil of Psellus, Michael Ephesius, in his commentary on Aristotle, *De divinatione per somnum* twice cites Alexander Ηερὶ Δαιμόνων (on 464a3 and 464a24, ed. P. Wendland, CIAG, Berlin, 1903, p. 83, 27 and 84, 26) but the references are brief and cannot be directly connected with the citations of Albertus Magnus or of Niphus.

It must also be remembered that 'Alexander' was a powerful name in the world of alchemy and of magic (see, e.g., Lynn

ADDENDA ET CORRIGENDA TO VOLUME I

Thorndike, *A History of Magic and Experimental Science*, v.I, second printing, New York, 1929, pp. 331, 555-6, 710-19), and it may be that some anonymous work was successively attributed to 'Alexander', 'Alexander peripateticus,' and finally to 'Alexander Aphrodisiensis'. Possibly Alber-

tus Magnus, and even Niphus, may be drawing from a work on alchemy which in a Brussels manuscript is attributed to 'Alexander philosophus' though in other manuscripts it is anonymous (Thorndike-Kibre, *A Catalogue of Incipits.* .[1963] col. 1372.)