THEMISTIUS

ROBERT B. TODD

(University of British Columbia)

Fortuna.

Bibliography.

Composite Editions.

Genuine Works of Themistius.

I. Analyticorum posteriorum paraphrasis.
   Translations.
   1. Gerardus Cremonensis.
   2. Hermolaus Barbarus Junior.
   3. Paulus Orsatus.

   Commentary.
   a. Anonymus Venetus.

II. In libros De anima paraphrasis.
    Translations.
    1. Guillelmus de Moerbeka.
    2. Hermolaus Barbarus Junior.
    3. Ludovicus Nogarola (Book 3.4–13).
    4. Federicus Bonaventura.

    Commentaries.
    a. Anonymus Venetus.
    b. Marcus Antonius Zimarra.
    c. Ludovicus Nogarola.
    d. Federicus Pendasius.
    e. Federicus Bonaventura.

III. In libros De caelo paraphrasis.
    Translation.
    1. Moyses Alatinus.
IV. *In Metaphysicorum librum duodecimum paraphrasis.*
   Translation.
   1. Moyses Finzius.

V. *In Physica paraphrasis.*
   Translation.
   1. Hermolaus Barbarus Junior.

Commentaries.
   a. Anonymus Venetus.
   b. Marcus Antonius Zimarra.

VI. *Orationes.*
   Translations.
   1. Antonius Covarrubias (*Or. 26, fragment*).
   2. Hieronymus Donzellinus (*Or. 18–25*).
   3. Anonymus Vaticanus (*Or. 7*).

Spurious Works.

VII. *In librum De insomniis paraphrasis.*
   Translation.
   1. Hermolaus Barbarus Junior.

Commentary.

VIII. *In librum De divinatione per somnum paraphrasis.*
   Translation.
   1. Hermolaus Barbarus Junior.

IX. *In librum De memoria et reminiscentia paraphrasis.*
   Translation.
   1. Hermolaus Barbarus Junior.

X. *In librum De somno et vigilia paraphrasis.*
   Translation.
   1. Hermolaus Barbarus Junior.

XI. *Oratio ad Valentem imperatorem (Or. 12).*
   Imitation.
   1. Andreas Duditius.
Fortuna*

Themistius (ca. 317–ca. 385 A.D.) is a complex figure in the history of later Greek philosophy and the wider intellectual history of the later Roman Empire. His life fell into two distinct phases. The first, up to 355, involved the study, and later teaching, at Constantinople of the major works of Aristotle and Plato. The second saw Themistius hold high office in the Eastern capital under a succession of mainly Christian emperors, often addressing them in epideictic orations that displayed classical learning without any Christian commitment. Themistius thus actively continued the traditions of Greek philosophy and literature.

His reputation as a philosopher is based on his paraphrases of Aristotelian treatises in the areas of logic, physics, and psychology. For pedagogical reasons he chose the paraphrastic method of exegesis in deference to his predecessors, notably Alexander of Aphrodisias (fl. ca. 200 A.D.). The extent of Themistius’ dependency on Alexander is unclear, mainly because of the loss of the Alexandrian commentaries that could have been sources for Themistius’ paraphrases. He did, however, criticize Alexander’s interpretation of Aristotle’s account of the intellect, and this gained for Themistius a special influence on Arabic, medieval, and Renaissance thought. Themistius also developed an original, though less well-known, reading of the associated theory of divine intellect in book 12 (lambda) of Aristotle’s Metaphysics. Although his modest form of exegesis often makes him appear to be an orthodox Aristotelian, he also had a deep knowledge of the Platonic corpus, engaged in Platonic exegesis, and was familiar to some extent with the earlier Neoplatonism of Plotinus and Porphyry.

Themistius’ surviving Aristotelian paraphrases in Greek are those of the Posterior Analytics, Physics, and De anima, while the paraphrases of the De caelo and Metaphysics 12 are extant only in Hebrew translations. Other paraphrases of the Prior Analytics and of treatises from the Parva naturalia were mistakenly attributed to him in the Byzantine tradition (see below). Of Themistius’ lost paraphrases, those of the Categories, Prior Analytics, and Topics were the most important. Arabic sources attribute further paraphrases to him, sometimes questionably (see below). Apart from some minor treatises, the rest of the Themistian corpus is represented by his thirty-three surviving orations. These are important documents for the cultural and political history of the fourth century and reveal much about Themistius’ own life and education. They are replete with echoes of ancient literature, particularly the Platonic dialogues. The orations did not become significant in Themistius’ fortuna until the seventeenth century when they were widely read by historians, who have continued to study them with far closer attention than students of philosophy have given the paraphrases.

* The paraphrases of Themistius and works by other Greek Aristotelian commentators are identified by the Latin title of the relevant Aristotelian work prefixed by In. The editions used in this article are those in the Commentaria in Aristotelis graeca series (= CAG) (Berlin, 1882–1907) and its Supplementum aristotelicum (= SA), cited by the numbers of the volumes and their parts. More abbreviated references will be given for the works of Themistius, which are fully cited below in Bibliography II.A. The text and traditional numbers of Themistius’ orations are cited according to the Teubner edition, Themistis Orationes, ed. H. Schenkel, G. Downey, and A. F. Norman, 3 vols. (Leipzig, 1965–74). The letters of Ermolao Barbaro the Younger are cited from Ermolao Barbaro: Epistolarum, orationes et carmina, ed. V. Branca, 2 vols. (Florence, 1943).
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2. The tradition that he was merely a follower of Alexander is ancient; see Priscian, Solutiones ad Chosroem (SA 1.2), ed. I. Bywater (Berlin, 1886), 42.17–18. Ermolao Barbaro knew and rejected it; see I.2 below.


4. See the two articles by S. Pinès in Bibliography II.C. (Book 12 of the Metaphysics will hereafter be cited only by its number).

5. This is most evident from his commentary on the De anima; see Schroeder and Todd, “Two Greek Aristotelian Commentators on the Intellect” (n. 3 above) for some references. For Porphyry’s possible influence on Themistius’ views on religious plurality see J. Vanderspoel, Themistius and the Imperial Court: Oratory, Civic Duty, and Paideia from Constantius to Theodosius (Ann Arbor, 1995), 25–26.
Late Antiquity

Themistius’ works were known to the Greek Aristotelian commentators of the fifth and sixth centuries A.D., notably Simplicius (sixth century) who refers to Themistius’ paraphrases of the Categories and De caelo in his own commentaries on those works. Such later references have occasionally been thought to show that Themistius composed major commentaries (ὑπομνήματα) in addition to his extant paraphrases, but this view has not won wide support. The later Greek commentators made limited use of Themistius since, unlike many of them, he was not a Platonist and, as a relatively unadventurous exegete, he was rarely crucial to their preoccupations.

Themistius’ visits to Rome (in 357 and 376) helped to spread his influence. Of the paraphrases that became known in the Latin West during his lifetime, those of the Organon were the most popular, and the two paraphrases of the Prior Analytics and Posterior Analytics may have been translated, or at least used, by Vetutius Prætextatus (ca. 320–384). Bothess (ca. 480–524) later made extensive use of Themistius’ commentary on the Topics, notably in his own De differentiis topicis, and his reports were subsequently used by Cassiodorus (ca. 490–ca. 583) in the latter’s De artibus et disciplinis liberalium artium. Finally, a work known as the pseudo-Augustinian De decem categoriis from the late fourth century (so called from a later attribution to St. Augustine) is based on Themistius’ lost commentary on the Categories.

It survived in a large number of manuscripts and was, along with the works of Boethius, a major source of the knowledge of Themistius in the Latin West.

Syria, Arabic, and Hebrew

More of the Themistian corpus was known to Syriac and Arabic authors than has survived in Greek, although some of the attributions in these sources are dubious. There are, for example, Arabic versions of an important letter of Themistius to the emperor Julian and a work on the syllogism. Syriac and Arabic translations of the Aristotelian paraphrases included those on the Prior Analytics, Categories, Metaphysics 12, and De caelo. The latter two survive only in Hebrew translations made from the Arabic in the thirteenth century; for their sixteenth-century Latin translations see III.1 and IV.1 below. The modern discovery of the Arabic manuscript of the paraphrase of the De anima, translated probably by Ishaq ibn Hunayn (d. 910), revealed an independent witness in the manuscript tradition that significantly improves the Greek text.


For inventories, see ‘A. Badawi, La transmission de la philosophie grecque au monde arabe, 2d rev. and enl. ed., Études de philosophie médiévale 56 (Paris, 1987), 100–102 and F. E. Peters, Aristoteles arabus. The Oriental Translations and Commentaries of the Aristotelian Corpus (Leiden, 1968), passim. The Syriac work De virtute is edited in Themistii Oratones, vol. 3, 7–71 Downey-Norman. On one questionable attribution, see Mattock (Bibliography II.C below). The commentary on the Nicomachean Ethics mentioned by an Arabic source is also questionable, and there is no corroboratory evidence from Greek sources for the paraphrases of the De generatione et corruptione and Poetics.


thors (see the literature cited in Bibliography II.C below). This influence, reflected notably in the works of al-Fārābī (d. 950),15 began when the works of Alexander of Aphrodisias and Themistius were translated into Arabic at Baghdad during the ninth century; subsequently they became the most widely used of the Greek commentators. The Aristotelian commentaries of Ibn Rushd (Averroes, 1126–98), particularly those on the De anima and the Topics,16 and the citations contained in these commentaries were a major source of medieval Europe’s knowledge of Themistian exegesis.

The Middle Ages

In medieval Europe Themistius was well known not only from references in Arabic sources but also through a Latin translation of the paraphrase of the Posterior Analytics (I.1 below).17 The Latin tradition continued to furnish indirect access to the paraphrase through the treatise De decem categoriis and to the paraphrase of the Topics through references in Boethius and Cassiodorus.18 The Greek world provided William of Moerbeke (ca. 1215–85/86) with the manuscript for his translation in 1267 of the paraphrase of the De anima (II.1 below).19

The availability and circulation of so much material ensured that Themistius was used and assimilated in a variety of contexts. In the first half of the thirteenth century, for example, Robert Grosseteste (ca. 1168–1253) used the paraphrase of the Posterior Analytics in his commentary on that work.20 Themistius, however, came to be primarily associated with debates about the status of the active intellect in Aristotle’s psychology and its implications for the Christian conception of the immortality of the soul. Here a lengthy digression in his paraphrase of Aristotle’s De anima 3.5 was crucial.21 Modern studies have thoroughly explored this issue, especially with reference to the De unitate intellectus contra Averroistas of Thomas Aquinas (ca. 1225–74) and the works of Siger of Brabant (ca. 1240–84), Henry Bate of Malines (ca. 1245–after 1310), and James of Viterbo (ca. 1255–1308).22 Themistius’ contribution, of course, formed only a part of the inheritance from Greek Aristotelianism, since opuscula were available on the same topic by Alexander of Aphrodisias and John Philoponus.23

16. The editions of the Hebrew translations of the paraphrases of the De caelo and Metaphysics 12 (CAG 5.3 and 5.4 respectively) also include evidence of Averroes’ citations of Themistius.
17. This translation also helped generate one pseudonymous Themistian work in some manuscripts of Gerard of Cremona’s translation of al-Kindi’s treatise De somno et visione, where the author is given as Themistius and the title as De somno et vigilia. See the edition by A. Nagy, Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters, vol. 2.5 (1897), xxxi where this misattribution is noted for Venice, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, ms. Marc. lat. VI 55 (2665) (Aristoteles latinus 2.1104). It also occurs in Cesena, Biblioteca Malatestiana, ms. D XXII 4; see G. Avarucci et al., eds., Catalogo di manoscritti filosofici nelle biblioteche italiane, vol. 4 (Florence, 1982), 50–51.
18. Some twelfth-century manuscripts of the Dialectica of Cassiodorus, a work based on the Boethian treatise, display an attribution to Themistius; see V. Rose, “Die Lücke im Diogenes Laërtius und der alte Übersetzer,” Hermes 1 (1886) 367–97 at 384. See also Aristoteles latinus 3.84, no. 2054 (Orléans, Bibliothèque de la Ville, ms. 263 [219], s. X–XI, pp. 74–80) for a collection of Themistian material, undoubtedly taken from Boethius’ De differentiis topicis.
19. A letter, dated to 1156, of Henricus Aristippus refers to the availability of Themistius’ works in Sicily; see Phaedo, interprete Henrico Aristippo, ed. L. Minio-Paluello, Plato latinus 2 (London, 1950), 80. There is no further evidence to corroborate this, although Aristippus may have been otherwise engaged with the Greek commentators; fragments survive of a translation, perhaps by him, of Alexander of Aphrodisias’ commentary on the Meteorologica (CTC 2.145). See also N. G. Wilson, Scholars of Byzantium (London, 1983), 213–14 on Aristippus’ Greek texts.
21. See the annotated translation in Schroeder and Todd, Two Greek Aristotelian Commentators on the Intellect (n. 3 above), 87–117.
22. See Bibliography II.D.1 below. Since Theophrastus and Themistius were often coupled in Arabic and medieval reports, many of the key medieval texts reporting Themistius’ views on the intellect are now available in Theophrastus of Eresus: Sources for His Life, Writings, Thought and Influence, ed. W. W. Fortenbaugh et al., vol. 2 (Leiden, 1992), 52–105.
BYZANTINE

The *fortuna* of Themistius in Byzantium between the ninth and fourteenth centuries is inseparable from the *fortunae* of the other ancient Aristotelian commentators in an era that, particularly in its later phase, was rich in Aristotelian scholarly. Hence Themistius was included in a wider movement in which Byzantine scholars continued the ancient tradition of Aristotelian exegesis.\(^4\)

The Suda Lexicon (end of the tenth century) and Photius (d. before 858)\(^25\) describe the Themistian corpus of paraphrases and orations much as it actually survives today, although the report in the Suda suggests that the commentaries on the *Categories* and *Prior Analytics* may have been available in early Byzantium. In addition to the paraphrases, Photius refers both to Aristotelian commentaries and also to "exegetical exercises on Plato". But these works were probably not available to him, and, in the case of the latter, Photius may simply be referring to Themistius' discussions of Platonic texts in his paraphrases.\(^26\)

Eleventh- and twelfth-century Byzantine Aristotelianism, represented principally by Michael Psellus (1018–ca. 1081) and Michael of Ephesus (fl. ca. 1100–50), does not show marked signs of Themistian influence, but his works must have been known to both of them and may have been a model for their paraphrastic exegesis.\(^27\) Eustratus (fl. 1100) mentions Themistius only once in his commentary on the *Posterior Analytics*.\(^28\) Psellus' commentaries have not been sufficiently studied to determine whether he incorporated material without acknowledgement from Themistius, as Michael of Ephesus did from the works of Alexander of Aphrodias.\(^29\)

Around 1300 the commentator Sophonias, in a survey of exegetical technique, coupled Psellus and Themistius as major practitioners of the paraphrastic type of commentary.\(^30\) Another noted figure of that period who mentions Themistius is Theodorus Metochites (1270–1332).\(^31\) His Aristotelian paraphrases may also have been influenced by the form and content of the Themistian works.\(^32\) Finally, Themistius' commentary on the *Topics* may have been known indirectly through the translation by Maximus Planudes (1255–1305) of Boethius' *De differentiis topicis*.\(^33\)

The earliest complete manuscript of Themistius presently known was copied by a Greek scribe in the eleventh century (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Coisl. 386), and it contains the paraphrase of Aristotle's *De anima* together with the text of the Aristotelian work.\(^34\)

---


25. For both texts see *Themistii Orationes*, vol. 3, 134–35 Downey-Norman.


27. The title of Psellus' commentary on the *De interpretatione*, for example, is Παραφράσικτι ἐξήγησις.


32. Certainly the Latin translation by Gentian Hervet (1509–1584; CTC 1.109–50) of Metochites' collection of paraphrases *In Aristotelis universam naturalem philosophiam* (Basel, 1559 and 1652) has at the opening of its paraphrase of the *De anima* (ed. of Basel, 1562, p. 183) a passage that resembles Themistius, *In De an.* 1.11–17. Similar use might also be anticipated in another compendium, the *Philosophia* of George Pachymeres (1248–ca. 1310), which, like Metochites' *work*, has never been completely edited; see Benakis, "Grundbibliographie", 360–61.


34. See R. B. Todd, "An Inventory of the Greek Manuscripts of Themistius' Aristotelian Commentaries*, *Byzantion* 67 (1997) 268–76; this updates the sometimes inaccurate and incomplete data in the introductions to the CAG editions. For a project which will describe in detail the manuscripts of the Greek and Byzantine Aristotelian commentators, together with some sample inventories, see G. de Gregorio and P. Eleuteri, "Per un catalogo sommario dei manoscritti greci dei *Commentaria in Aris-"
The same combination is found in other manuscripts of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, with the Themistian paraphrase sometimes in the form of marginal scholia to the Aristotelian text. Moreover, analogies with other commentaries may include also the paraphrases of Themistius.

Themistius’ status by the fourteenth century is evident from the attribution to him of paraphrases of some treatises from Aristotle’s Parva naturalia, namely, De memoria, De somno, De insomniis, and De divinazione per somnum. Originally these may have been compiled by Sophonias from the works of Michael of Ephesus, and they were presumably associated with Themistius because of the exegetical form that he was thought to typify. A similar, although less influential, error was the fourteenth-century attribution to Themistius of a paraphrase of the Prior Analytics. By the end of that century Byzantine Aristotelianism was thoroughly engaged with the Greek Aristotelian commentators generally, and twenty-two of the manuscripts of Themistius’ paraphrases belong to the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.

Regarding the circulation and use of Themistius’ orations in Byzantium there is little to say. Byzantine orators may have addressed emperors, as Themistius had their ancient predecessors, but they did so without his commitment to pagan culture. The contents of surviving manuscripts suggest that Themistius’ orations were anthologized into small groups for convenient thematic reading. This tendency was so marked that there is only one surviving witness (Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, J 22 sup.), dated to the beginning of the fifteenth century, which contains all thirty-three speeches.

35. For example, Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, 87.25 (s. XIII) is a copy derived from Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Coisl. 386 and containing both Themistius and the Aristotelian text, while Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Var. gr. 307 (s. XIII) has Themistian marginalia to a text of books 1–4 of Aristotle’s Physics.

36. One such instance is Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, 71.32 (a. 1309/10), a wide-ranging anthology of commentaries on logic and psychology which includes Themistius’ paraphrase of the Posterior Analytics.

37. See the discussion of their provenance by P. Wendland (CAG 5,6v–xi) and the articles by Rose and Freundenthal cited in Bibliography II.B below.

38. M. Wallies in CAG 23.3 (Berlin, 1884), v.

Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries

Themistius’ fortuna in this period is, like his Byzantine fortuna, inseparable from the wider history of the assimilation of the Greek commentators and the development of Aristotelianism, although it is as yet difficult to compare the reception of Themistius with that of the other Greek commentators.

The period from 1400 up to the publication of the first edition of Ermolao Barbaro’s translation of Themistius in 1481 can be documented through the external evidence of the copying, ownership, and circulation of Greek manuscripts. One significant thread links the Florentine exile Palla Strozzi (ca. 1373–1462) with two Greek scholar-scribes, John Argyropoulos (1416–86) and Andronicus Callistus (fl. 1440–80). Strozzi copied the paraphrase of the De anima at Milan in 1401/2 and also copied parts of the paraphrase of the Physics. Both Argyropoulos and Callistus, who were associated with Strozzi at Padua around 1440, copied the paraphrase of the De anima. Argyropoulos pioneered a new paraphrastic style of translation of Aristotelian works; he was later attacked for being in part influenced by Themistius.

39. This is particularly true of the fifteenth century; see R. B. Todd, “Baltasar Meliavacca, Andronicus Callistus, and the Greek Aristotelian Commentators in Fifteenth-Century Italy,” Italia medioevale eumanistica 37 (1994) 67–75. The only other major Greek commentator whose fortuna in this period has been documented is Alexander of Aphrodisias; see CIC 1.177–135, 2.411–22, and 7.296–98.


41. Argyropoulos’ copy is now Venice, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, Marc. gr. IV.13 (1329), fols. 10r–10r; the apograph by Callistus is, I argue (article cited in n. 39 above), Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Ashburnham 1599 (fols. 11r–10v). Callistus also wrote marginalia in the text of a manuscript of Themistius’ paraphrase of the Physics (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, gr. 1890); see E. Gamillscheg and D. Harlfinger, Repertorium der griechischen Kopisten 800–1600, vol. 2 A (Vienna, 1989), 34, no. 25.

42. The attack was launched by Michael Sophianus (ca. 1530–65) in the preface to his translation of Aristotle’s De anima, first published at Venice in 1562. See A. Meschini, Michele Sofianò, Studi bizantini e neogreci 12 (Padua, 1981), 38.
Several Themistian manuscripts were in the Aristotelica collected by Cardinal Bessarion (ca. 1395–1472). In 1430 Francesco Filelfo (1398–1481) loaned his manuscript of Themistius’ paraphrase of the Posterior Analytics to Vittorino da Feltre (1378–1446). Later, in the century, Giovanni Pico della Mirandola (1463–94) sought the help of Giorgio Valla (1447–1500) in obtaining a manuscript of the same work. George of Trebizond (1395–1484) had access to a manuscript of the paraphrase of the Physics that he used in his school on the Aristotelian work.

Themistian studies were given impetus and a Latin focus when Ermolao Barbaro the Younger (1454–93), still only in his twenties, translated the whole of the Themistian corpus between 1473 and 1480. His ambitious undertaking paralleled that of two of his dedicatees, namely, Antonio de Ferraris (Galateo) (1448–1517) and Girolamo Donato (ca. 1456–1511), both of whom translated works of Alexander of Aphrodisias.

Nicoletto Vernia (d. 1499) was active at the University of Padua when Barbaro studied there in the 1470s. Later Vernia and his pupil Agostino Nifo (ca. 1470–1538) made extensive use of the Greek commentators, particularly in dealing with Aristotle’s account of the active intellect as it impinged on the issue of the immortality of the soul.

Barbaro’s translation of Themistius reflected his claims that Aristotle could be read more effectively with the help of his Greek commentators than by reliance on representatives of other exegetical traditions, a program that he tried to implement in his teaching at Venice in the 1480s. This attitude, apparently shared by Vernia and Nifo, formed part of a general movement in the 1490s to make the Greek commentators more widely available. Although Prince Alberto Pio of Carpi (ca. 1475–1531), for example, encouraged Aldo Manuzio (1449–1515) to produce printed editions of the Greek texts of the commentators, a complete set of editions was not available for some decades. Themistius’ paraphrases first appeared in the Aldine edition of 1534, edited by Vettore Trincavelli (1491–1593); this was the only


44. For the evidence, see A. Calderini, “Ricerche intorno alla biblioteca e alla cultura greca di Francesco Filelfo,” Studi italiani di filologia classica 20 (1913) 204–424 at 250 and G. Pesenti, “Vittorino da Feltre e gli inizi della scuola di greco in Italia,” Athenaeum, N. S., 3 (1925) 1–16 at 9 and 16 (on Filelfo see CTC 1:215 and 7:93). The scribe Gerard of Patras (fl. 1420–43), who was associated with Vittorino da Feltre and Filelfo, has been identified as the scribe of two Themistian works: the paraphrase of the Physics in Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, gr. 1890 (Gamillscheg and Harlfinger, Repertorium, vol. 2, part A, 60, no. 107) and the paraphrase of De anima in the form of scholia in Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. gr. 2183 (Codices Vaticani graeci: S. Lilla, Codices 2162–2254 [Vatican City, 1985], 80–81).


47. For Galateo and Donato, see below n. 53 and X.1 respectively.
edition to be produced before the nineteenth century, and it was inevitably inadequate since the Greek text is based on a single manuscript.\textsuperscript{52} Meanwhile Barbaro’s translations of the paraphrases were widely diffused. Twice before 1500 and thirteen times between 1500 and 1570 they were published in their entirety; there are also editions that included selected translations. Barbaro’s translations of the strictly exegetical works of a Greek commentator are the first of this genre to be published in the Renaissance as well as the most popular, to judge from the number of editions.\textsuperscript{53}

The impact of this diffusion among philosophers can be determined to some extent. Clearly at Padua the Themistian works, and particularly the paraphrase of the De anima, contributed to a debate centered on the Aristotelian theory of the intellect and its ramifications for the issue of the immortality of the soul. In addition, Marsilio Ficino (1433–99) was probably led to Themistius by Barbaro.\textsuperscript{54} Otherwise Themistius may have been involved in a reaction against any form of Aristotelian exegesis that depended heavily on secondary works of any kind in favor of a return to the text itself.\textsuperscript{55} Certainly Jacques Lefèvre d’Étapes (Faber Stapulensis, ca. 1455–1536), who advocated such an approach, had met Barbaro at Rome in 1491 and doubtless knew the Themistian paraphrases.\textsuperscript{56} They may well have served as an ancient precedent for his own commentaries, which Lefèvre also entitled paraphrases.\textsuperscript{57} More generally, Themistius must have been welcomed by students of Aristotle as offering an exegesis unencumbered by extensive criticism of predecessors or any emphatic philosophical parti pris.

Throughout the sixteenth century Themistius was cited in Aristotelian commentaries and treatises as one voice among many in the chorus of commentators, particularly when it was a question of the status of the intellect.\textsuperscript{58} Padua, where manuscripts circulated and were copied, is the source of much of this evidence.\textsuperscript{59} In exegesis, utraque lingua dixerint referre, sed breviter et cum delectu (Ep. 2.107–108 Branca).

52. *Adversaria* by Pier Vettori (Petrus Victorius, 1499–1585; CTC 4.235 and 7.175) on this edition were written into a copy at Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek (A.gr.b.1070); these were used by L. Spengel in his edition of the paraphrases (Leipzig, 1866).


54. Ficino notes that Themistius and Priscianus Lydus had taught him that the differences between Plato and Aristotle on the soul were only verbal (*Expositio in interpretationem Prisciani Lydii super Theophrastum*, dedicatory letter to Philippus Valorus, in *Opera omnia* 2.2 [Basel, 1576; rpt. Turin, 1599], 1801). On Ficino see CTC 1.139.

55. Barbaro himself advocated an arm’s-length approach to all commentators. See his *Oratio 3*, delivered to his students at Venice in 1494, where he proclaims: “Animus est et professo primum Aristotelis ipsius tum verba tum sensum interpretari, deinde quid expositores eius

---


58. For a typical example, see the *Commentarii in tercium librum Aristotelis De anima* (Paris, 1541) by Francesco Vicomercato (fl. 1540–80) (on whom see N. W. Gilbert, “Francesco Vicomercato of Milan: A Bio-Bibliography,” *Studies in the Renaissance* 12 [1965] 188–217), where in a lengthy digression “de anima rationali peripatetica” (ed. cit., pp. 209–93) Themistius’ views are contrasted, as they frequently were, with those of Alexander of Aphrodisias (p. 213).

59. Oxford, Bodleian Library, Auct. F. inf. 2.4 (the paraphrases of the *Posterior Analytics and Physics*) was copied at Padua by Leonellus Leonus in 1518. Udine, Biblioteca Arcivescovile, 257 (olim gr. V.4.4) was once owned by Cardinal Domenico Grimani (d. 1523) who was at Padua in the first quarter of the sixteenth century. A manuscript from Padua or Venice was probably used by the annotator of later Venetian editions of Barbaro’s translations (“Anonymus Venetus”; see la below). Two other scribes
from Marcantonio Zimarra (1475/6–ca. 1537), who wrote a set of problems and solutions on Themistius (see II.b below), to Federico Pendasio (d. 1603) and Jacopo Zabarella (1533–89), Themistius played a role in Paduan Aristotelianism.60 Barbaro’s version of the paraphrase of the Physics engaged Galileo Galilei (1564–1642) in his early work De motu.61 Padua was also the university of Francesco Patrizi da Cherso (1529–97; CTC 1.1.41) who supported a translation from the Hebrew of Themistius’ paraphrase of Metaphysics 12 by his friend, the Jewish physician Mosè Finzi (fl. 1540–80), which was published in 1558 (IV.1 below).62

The quality of Barbaro’s translations of the paraphrases was to draw some unfavorable comment, as, for example, in the case of the De insomniis. The Latin version of this work had been hurriedly prepared during the years in which Barbaro was initiating a public career.63 Barbaro had also been a pupil of Theodore Gaza (ca. 1400–75), who, like John Argyroupoulos, had practiced a paraphrastic style of translation from the Greek. In his vigorously formulated dedications Barbaro developed a philosophy of translation that avoided a literal style and any excess of post-classical terminology. This reflected his wider concerns, developed in a celebrated exchange of letters with Giovanni Pico della Mirandola, on the extent to which philosophy should be expressed with literary eloquence.64

When Barbaro’s translations came to be examined closely, the wider issue receded in the face of doubts about their basic accuracy.65 Misgivings were first expressed in the notes of an anonymous scholar, probably from Venice or Padua, which appear in eight editions of Barbaro’s translations published at Venice between 1527 and 1570. This scholar suggested alternative translations and noted superior readings in a Greek manuscript (see I.a below). The critique continued in the work of Ludovico Nogarola (1507–59), another scholar educated at Padua, whose translation and notes on the paraphrase of De anima 3.4–13 were added to the four final Venetian editions of Barbaro’s translations (II.3 and II.4 below). Nogarola also objected to what he considered Barbaro’s use of Silver rather than Ciceronian Latin.66 Then in the 1580s Federico Bonaventura of Urbino (1555–1602) undertook further scrutiny and spared neither Barbaro, whom he found diffuse and inaccurate, nor Nogarola, whom he regarded as too Ciceronian. Bonaventura espoused a more austere form of translation, and in this he seems to have been influenced by the Aristotelian translations of Michael Sophianus (d. 1565) (see II.4 below).67


66. In this he was echoing Erasmus (ca. 1467–1536), who in his Ciceronianus, first published in 1528, also linked Barbaro with Silver Latin authors. See Opera omnia Desiderii Erasmi Roterodami, vol. 1.2 (Amsterdam, 1669), 662.

67. The claim that philosophical texts need to be translated elegantly is put forward with reference to Themistius by Donzellini in the preface to his translation of

60. On Pendasio see II.d below. For Zabarella see, for example, his Liber de mente agenti, ch. 9, at De rebus naturalibus (Venice, 1590), col. 1021.


62. Patrizi, Discussiones peripateticae 1.10 (Basel, 1581), 141 discusses Themistius briefly and identifies him as an unorthodox Christian. Patrizi may have derived this view from Girolamo Donzellini’s introduction to his translation of some of the orations (VI.2 below). Patrizi’s manuscript of Themistius’ paraphrase of the De anima is among the missing Escorial volumes; see G. de Andrés, Catálogo de los códices griegos desaparecidos de la Real Biblioteca de El Escorial (El Escorial, 1968), 111, no. 250.

63. Barbaro’s haste is evident from the dedication to the translation of the paraphrase of the De insomniis, where the dedicatee, the poet Galeazzo Pontico Faccino, was enlisted to oversee the printing of the first edition at Treviso in 1481; see VII.1 below.
The fortune of Themistius in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries is, then, primarily that of his paraphrases, and this even included the lost paraphrase of Aristotle's *Topics* when Boethius' references to the missing text (see n. 10 above) were collected separately. The orations were not entirely neglected, but they were clearly less popular. Byzantine excerpting (see above) had made a complete edition impossible. The Aldine edition of 1534 by Vettore Trincavello appended an edition of only eight speeches (Or. 18–25) to the paraphrases. This octad was later translated at Venice by Girolamo Donzellini (1513–87) (VI.1 below). In 1562 Henri Estienne (ca. 1531–98) produced an edition of six more orations (Or. 2, 4, 5, 7, 9, 10). Nonetheless, the orations did not come into their own until the seventeenth century. It is difficult to say how widely they were read before that time. The case of Angelo Poliziano (1454–94), who owned a manuscript containing two orations and exploited one of them in a lecture on Aristotelian logic, seems atypical.

Themistius' orations (VI.1 below) and Alatino in the pref- ace to his Hebrew-Latin version of Themistius' paraphrase of the *De caelo* (III.1 below).


70. For Henri Estienne (Henricus Stephanus), see CTC 3.48 and 7.98. On the Aldine and Estienne editions of The- mistius, see R. Maisano, "La critica filologica di Petru e Hardouin e l’edizione parigina del 1684 delle orazioni di Temistico," *Archivum historico Societatis Iesu* 43 (1974) 267–300 at 277–78 and 280–82. Estienne’s edition had the patronage of Ulrich Fugger (1526–84) to whom Girolamo Donzellini’s translations (VI.1 below) were also dedicated.

71. Only two other sixteenth-century translations have been located (VI.1 and 3 below), neither of which was published. For a vernacular translation of fourteen orations published at Orvieto in 1542, of which no copies have yet been found, see Maisano, ibid., 280.

72. Poliziano’s manuscript of Or. 20 and 21 is now Flo- rence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, 66.51; see I. Maier, *Les manuscrits d’Angelo Poliziano* (Geneva, 1965), 335. For a commentary that collects Poliziano’s references to The- mistius, see A. Wesseling, ed., *Angelo Poliziano, Lamia: praelection in Priora Aristotelis analytica*, Studies in Medieval and Renaissance Thought 38 (Leiden, 1986). Giovanni Pico della Mirandola also owned a manuscript of some of the orations; see Kibre, *The Library of Pico della Mirandola* (n. 45 above), 147, no. 192.


74. For analyses of these and earlier editions see Schenk, ibid., 5–46; Maisano, "La critica filologica," pass- im; and Downey, *Themistii Orations* 1.xiii–xxv.

75. See especially ch. 25 of *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* for examples of Gibbon’s use of Themistius. For his copy of Hardouin’s edition, see G. Keynes, *The Library of Edward Gibbon*, 2d ed. (Dorchester, 1980), 264.
lar translations, but Themistian scholarship in this period was not extensive. Gibbon and Ces- sarotti both cite the bellettrist survey of the orations by Antoine-Léonard Thomas (1732–85).76

In 1816 Angelo Mai (1782–1854), using the most complete of the Themistian manuscripts (Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, J 22 sup.), published the one remaining unedited speech (Or. 34). The complete edition of 1832 by Wilhelm Dindorf (1802–83) held sway for over a century, but, being hasty and derivative, occasioned much textual criticism, notably from the prolific Carolus Gabriel Cobet (1813–89). Heinrich Schenkl (1859–1919) produced several studies preliminary to an edition, which was finally published in the Teubner series (1965, 1971, 1974), along with some Arabic and Syriac material. Recent studies, however, by Riccardo Maisano (Bibliography III.B below) have shown that the manuscript tradition of the orations needs further examination.

Philosophers and historians of philosophy paid limited attention in these centuries toThemis-
tius.77 Jacob Brucker (1696–1770) dealt with him in a section on the “Secta Peripatetica” but showed more interest in his orations and his relation to Christianity than in his Aristotelian commentaries. Although Themistius was neglected by Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel (1770–1831),78 the Hegelian history of Greek philosophy by Eduard Zeller (1814–1908) placed Themistius in a section on the Neoplatonic school after Iamblichus, with the evasive label of “eclectic.” Dispute over Themis-
tius’ scholastic affiliation continues, and he defies easy categorization. His Aristotelian para-

76. Thomas’s Essai sur les éloges was first published at Paris in 1773; I have used the edition of Oeuvres de Thomas, 2 vols. (Paris, 1819), where the discussion of The-
mistius (mostly through translations on selected translations) is in vol. 1, 113–22 (= ch. 21 of the Essai). Thomas is cited by Gibbon, Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire (London: Dent, Everyman’s Library, 1910; rpt. 1978), 477 n. 2 and by Cesaro-
tti, Corso ragionato di letteratura greca, vol. 2 (Padua, 1784), 315–31 passim.

77. For an instance in which Gottfried Wilhelm Leib-
niz (1646–1717) used Ermlaco Barbaro’s translation of Themistius, see T. Ebert, “Entelechie und Monade: Be-
merkungen zum Gebrauch eines aristotelischen Begriffs bei Leibniz,” in Aristoteles: Werk und Wirkung (n. 7 above), 579–82.

78. See, however, S. Piniès, “Some Distinctive Metaphysical Conceptions in Themistian Commentary on Book Lambda and Their Place in the History of Philosophy,” ibid., 202–204 for a possible Themistian element in Hegel.

phrases are too austere to convey strong doctrinal commitments, while his orations inevitably exclude serious philosophical discussion.

The Greek paraphrases were reedited in the mid-nineteenth century by Leonhard Spengel (1803–80), and again at the turn of the century by various editors in vol. 5 of the Commentaria in Aristotelem graeca. The latter series also included the first editions of the Hebrew texts of the paraphrases on the De caelo and book 12 of the Meta-

physics. There were subsequent editions of the medieval translations of the paraphrases of the De anima and Posterior Analytics. The availability of these Greek texts enabled editors and commenta-
tors to exploit Themistius for both textual and exegetical purposes. Finally, much of the Arabic Themistius has now been edited, notably the translation of the paraphrase of the De anima and the fragments of the commentary on Metaphysics 12. This scholarship has deepened knowledge of Themistius’ influence, but his paraphrases need closer study in order to understand better the ideas and methods of the commentator himself.
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**Composite Editions**

1481, Tarvisii (Treviso): B(artholomaeus) Con-
falonierus et Morellus Gerardinus de Salodio. With the translations by Hermolaus Barbarus Ju-
nior of Themistius’ paraphrases of the Posterior Analytics, Physics, De anima and ps. Themistius’ paraphrases of the De memoria, De somno, De insomniis, De divinatione per somnum. Prepared for publication by Galeatus Ponticus Facinus. BMC 6.894; Goff T-129; H* 15463; IGIBI 9491; Klebs 995.1; Polain 11.944; Polain (B) 3677.

1499, Venetiis (Venice): Bartholomaeus de Zanis de Portesio. Contents the same as in the preceding entry. Reported to contain Barbarus’ corrections of the 1481 Treviso edition and reproduced in Themistii Libri paraphrasisos, ed. C. Lohr, Commentaria in Aristotelem graeca, Ver-
siones latinae 18 (Frankfurt, 1978). BMC 5.434; 
Goff T-130; H* 15464; IGIBI 9492; Klebs 955.2; Po-
lain 11.045; Sander 7233; Stillwell T 112.

1500, Venetiis (Venice): Johannes Hertzog. Contents the same as in the edition of Venice, 1499, plus Hieronymus Donatus’ translation of Alexander of Aphrodisias’ De anima (see CTC 1.85). BMC 5.429, 596–97; Goff T-131; GW 1.425; 
H* 15465; IGIBI 9493; Klebs 955.4; Sander 7234; 
Stillwell T 113.

1502, Venetiis (Venice): [Simon Bevilaqua]. Contents the same as in the preceding entry. CTC 1.85. For the attribution to this printer see Proctor and Isaac 2.243, no. 12657. NUC. BL; BNF; Ox-
ford, New College; (NCC; NUNAM).

1520, Venetiis (Venice): Lucantonius de Gun-
ta. Contents the same as in the edition of Venice, 1502. P. Camerini, Annali dei Giunti (Florence, 
1962), 190, no. 238; CTC 1.85; NUC. BL; Oxford, 
New College; (MH).

(*) 1527, Venetiis (Venice): Octavianus Scotus. With notes “ab excellentissimo quodam philoso-
pho quae Themistii obscuriora quaedam loca apertissima reddunt” (= “Anonymous Venetus”) on the translations by Hermolaus Barbarus Ju-
nior of Themistius’ paraphrases of the Posterior Analytics, De anima, Physics and ps. Themistius’ paraphrases of the De insomniis, De divinatione per somnum, De memoria, De somno. Graesse 6.2, 
112; NUC. Rome, Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale; 
Cuneo, Biblioteca Civica; (OKU).

1529 (1528 on the title page), Parisiis (Paris): Si-
mon Colinaeus. With the translations by Hermo-
laus Barbarus Junior of Themistius’ paraphrases of the Physics, De anima and ps. Themistius’ paraphrases of De memoria, De somno, De insomniis, De divinatione per somnum; Hieronymus Donat-
us’ translation of Alexander of Aphrodisias’ De 
 anima (see CTC 1.85). P. Renouard, Bibliographie 
des éditions de Simon de Colines 1520–1546 (Paris, 
1894), 110; Inventaire chronologique des éditions 
parisiennes du XVIe siècle, vol. 3 (Abbeville, 1985), 
514, no. 1923; NUC. BL (without Hieronymus Do-
натus’ translation); BNF; Oxford, New College; 
Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine; (ICN).

1530, Basileae (Basel): Henricus Petrus. With the 
translations by Hermolaus Barbarus Junior of 
ps. Themistius’ paraphrases of the De insomniis, De 
divinatione per somnum, De memoria, and De 
somno. Maittaire 2.736; NUC. BL; Mainz, Stadt-
bibliothek; (NNC).

1530, Venetiis (Venice): Lucantonius Iunta. 
Contents the same as in the edition of Venice, 
1527. P. Camerini, Annali dei Giunti (Florence, 
1962), 238, no. 232; Adams T-455; NUC. Cam-
bridge, University Library; Naples, Biblioteca 
Nazionale; Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine; (InU).

1533, Basileae (Basel): Joannes Valderus. With the 
translations by Hermolaus Barbarus Junior of 
Themistius’ paraphrases of the Posterior Analy-
tics, Physics, De anima and ps. Themistius’ par-
aphrases of the De memoria, De somno, De insom-
niis, De divinatione per somnum. Adams T-451; 
VD T-707; NUC. BNF; Basel, Öffentliche Biblio-
theck der Universität; Oxford, Bodleian Library; 
Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana; (DNLM; ICU).

1535, Parisiis (Paris): Prigentus Calvarin. With the 
translations by Hermolaus Barbarus Junior of 
Themistius’ paraphrases of the Posterior Analy-
tics, Physics, De anima and ps. Themistius’ par-
aphrases of the De memoria, De somno, De insom-
niis, De divinatione per somnum; the single dedi-
catory letter precedes the paraphrase of the 
Physics. The translations have separate title pages 
and are sometimes listed separately, but they are 
identified as a single volume at the end of the 
translation of the De divinatione per somnum.
Adams T-453; NUC. Cambridge, University Library; BNF; Paris, Bibliothèque de l’Arsenal (without the paraphrase of the Physics); (DNLM).

1542, Venetiis (Venice): Hieronymus Scotus. Contents the same as in the edition of 1527, plus the “Contradictiones et solutiones” by Marcus Antonius Zimarra on Themistius’ paraphrases of the De anima and Physics and ps. Themistius’ paraphrase of the De insomniiis. Dedication to the translation of the De divinatione per somnum omitted. NUC. BL; Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana; London, Wellcome Library for the History and Understanding of Medicine; (MiU; PPC; NNC; IUnS).

1545, Basileae (Basel): Hieronymus Curio. Contents the same as in the edition of Basel, 1533. VD T-708; NUC. BNF; Oxford, St. Edmund Hall; Oxford, Christ Church; (TuU; MiU).


1554, Venetiis (Venice): Hieronymus Scotus. Contents the same as in the preceding entry, plus Ludovicus Nogarola’s annotated translation of the paraphrase of De anima 3.4–13. NUC. Oxford, Bodleian Library; Naples, Biblioteca Nazionale; Rome, Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale; (CtY; OY).

1559, Venetiis (Venice): Hieronymus Scotus. Contents the same as in the edition of 1554. Despite a date of “1560” at the end, it is distinct from the succeeding edition. NUC. BNF; Oxford, Keble College; Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine; (ICU).


Genuine Works of Themistius

I. Analyticorum Posteriorum Paraphrasis

Translations

1. Gerardus Cremonensis

Gerardus Cremonensis (Gerard of Cremona, ca. 1144–87) translated Themistius’ paraphrase of the Posterior Analytics from the Arabic at Toledo some time between 1144 and 1187. No manuscript survives of the Arabic translation by Abū Bishr Mattā (d. 940); see F. E. Peters, Aristoteles Arabus. The Oriental Translations and Commentaries of the Aristotelian Corpus (Leiden, 1968), 18. Gerard’s version is no. 2 in the list of his works appended to his translation of Galen’s Τεγνία; see F. Wüstendorf, “Die Übersetzungen arabischer Werke in das Lateinische seit dem XI. Jahrhundert,” Abhandlungen der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen 22.3 (1877) 55–81 at 59 and K. Südhoff, “Die kurze ‘Vita’ und das Verzeichnis der Arbeiten Gerards von Cremona,” Archiv für Geschichte der Medizin 8 (1914) 73–82 at 77. (For an English translation of the list of Gerard’s works see M. McVaugh in E. Grant, ed., A Source Book in Medieval Science [Cambridge, Mass., 1974], 35–38).

In Posteriora analytica paraphrasis (ed. O’Donnell). [Inc.]: (p. 242; Themist., In An. post. 1.2–3) Scio quod si intendo ad expondendum unamquamque litteram libris Aristotelis, cum iam praecesserint me ad illud illi, qui praecesserunt me . . . . . . . [Expl.]: (p. 315; Themist., In An. post. 66.3–6) Igitur est principium scientiae priimi, et est causa principiorum, et scientia tota est scito toti. Quod est quia dispositio principii apud principium est sicut dispositio totius ad totum. Finit. Explicit Commentum Themistii super librum Posteriorum Aristotelis.

Manuscripts:

(*) Assisi, Biblioteca e Centro di Documentazione Francescana (Sacro Convento), fondo antico 658, s. XIII, fols. 256v–257r (Aristoteles latinus 2.877–78, no. 1266). A fragment in the margins of a manuscript of Aristotle’s Posterior Analytics.

(*) Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 317, s. XIII ex./XIV in., fols. 129r–151r (Aristoteles latinus 1.722, no. 1017; O’Donnell 239).

(*) Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, lat. 16097, s. XIII ex./XIV in., fols. 226r–237v.
The quotations from Barbaro’s translations will be taken from the second edition (Venice, 1499). Barbaro died in 1493, six years before the publication of this edition. His Aristotelian studies and teaching, particularly in the early to mid 1480s, undoubtedly led him to make the revisions identified in the 1499 Venice edition as the author’s own castigations; see Barbaro, Ep. 69 (1.87 Branca), where in 1485 he invites criticism of his translations, and Ep. 115 (2.33 Branca) for a reference in a letter of 1488 to a commentary on the Posterior Analytics (probably Bologna, Biblioteca Universitaria, 124, fols. 218r–284v) that must have drawn on Themistius and perhaps resulted in corrections. Barbaro’s commentaries on Aristotle’s Physics and De anima can be found in his Compendium scientiae naturalis (Venice, 1545), of which there were six other editions in the sixteenth century.

Even so, a preliminary analysis of the changes in the 1499 Venice edition indicates that only typographical corrections were made, along with the addition of chapter headings that may not even have been Barbaro’s. Such alterations are tacitly recorded in the passages cited below.

Preface (ed. of Venice, 1499). Hermolae Barbari Patricii Veneti Zachariae Equitis filii in Paraphrasis Themistii Peripateticis praefatio ad Sextum III Pontificem Maximum. [Inc.]: (fol. 1v) Qui tibi studiorum suorum opera nuncupant, pontifex summe Sixte quarte, aliis id agunt ut te utcumque sibi promereantur, aliis ut fructum aliquem sentiant iudicii tui de se, aliis ut abs te tantum probentur, aliis ob alias causas. Ego vero haec tibi dedico tum ut meam in te observantiam, praesertimque Zachariae patris, qui istic ad te pro Venetis agit legatus, agnoscas; tum vel maxime ut te pro fide ea, quae a me tibi ut principi meo debetur summa, instituti illius tui praecel et divini commoneam, quod, protinus quam creatus pontifex es, flagrantissime amplexus videris, adivuvandi provendique litteras, quae procub dubio sine auctoritate et diligentia doctissimi principis aut interituarum penitus videbantur aut ad pristinam barbariem redituarum. Nam et ingenia unique conduxisti et bibliothecam opulentissimmam aere tuo impensaque publicasti. Nunc te obsecrant obtestanturque bonae omnes arte, ne, quae tuae maxime occupations sunt, negligentiusculce in posterum ha-beantur. . . . Sub Nicolao princepe exerere se ac revirescere studia coeperunt; nisi tu quod facis
facere perseveres, necesse est consenescant denuo atque decedant. Igitur Themistium, e familia Aristotelis elegantem philosophum, ad te in latinum sermonem converti, ratus non ingratisimam tibi rem me facturum, si philosophia ea, quae de natura est, latinis litteris, quanta modo legitur in scholis, contineretur. Videbam nihil incultius, horribius, ineptius quam partem istam litteraturae haber. Placuit periclitari inThemistio an istae quoque propretatem et lucem romanae linguae recipere.

Oppido quam laboratum mihi in hac interpretatione est, non tam quod nihil iuvari ab iis auctoribus potui, qui Aristotelem commentarii feode ac barbare pridem sunt, quam quod ne ab illis quoque qui, acetate nostra latinam eloquentiam professi, gregis eius philosophi commentaria transiturunt. Horum plerique, dum alienam inscitantiansectantur, suam prodidere: adeo omnia ab his perverse depravateque sunt perscripta, ut si quis interpretationes eorum cum illis veteribus conferat quas reprehendunt, vel in aliqua Aristophasis libra aut Critoali appensa examinet, utrae earum vergant internoscis non possit. Percenserem singillatim quaequeccament, nisi plura eorum essent errata quam verba. Aliquin non incessendi quemquam lacendaris studiio, sed iuvandi bonas mentes haec scribimus. Magnam incomparabiliique facturam non pri dem fecimus, Pontifex Maxime, in Theodoro Gaza, qui vir graecus latinos omnes in hoc munere scribendi interpretandique superavit. Is si diutius vivisset, lingua latimam hac quoque parte locupletasset; quot et fecit in libris absolutionissimis De animalibus Aristotelis et Theophrasti De stirpibus [cf. CTC 2.266—68, 273—74]. Hic unus mihi certare cum vetustate ipsa visus est, hunc mihi quem colorem, quem imitarenter proposu, ab huius scriptis adiutum me et fateor et praedico. Hunc ego non magnopere incurios<=us legi quam M. Tullium, Plinium, Columelam, Varronem, Senecam, Apuleium et ceteros quos in hoc genere commentandi diligenter evolvere necessarium est. Ne ille quoque minimus labror noster fuit, quod in his libris vertendis non modo non expressimus verbum et verbo, quod interpretates in indisertos solere Cicero meminit [De finibus 3.4.15], sed libere et translationibus et figuris et tropis usi sumus, ad morem romanum sensibus stantibus. Lusimus arbitratu nostro, sed sententiam integram dedimus auctori. Tantum vero abest ut aliquid praetermiserimus dissimulaverimusve, ut illud periculum sit ne, quod eruditione impens[a]e studiumus, addidisse aliqua potius quam detraxisse invisoribus videri possimus: in plenum, non tam latinum reddere Themistium quam certare cum eo volui. Haec enim laus, ut ille ait, linguae latinae est, ut graecam proprietatem et gratiam in transferente aut aeques aut etiam antecellae. Hoc me non dico assecutumuisse, sed crimen meum confiteri: laboravi plane hoc ambitu. Sed an effecerim quod quaerebam alii iudicent; ipse certe mea nec magni facio nec probo.

Sed quid te, princeps humanissime, oratione longa detineo? Finem faciam, si quaedam de Themistio dixer. Is Libanii Sophistae et Iuliani Caesari Caesaris temporibus floruit. A quibusdam abbreviator creditus Alexandri ex Aphrodis<di>siade st, sed falsus. Nam et ab eo dissentit haut timide, cum collibuit, et ad ordine ac serie eius evariat; praeterea isepsem se paraphrastem Aristotelis facit. Est autem paraphrasis exercitamenti apud rhetores genus; ea finitur a Graecis hoc modo, ut sit quae narrationi proportione respondet aut sit in qua vertimus aliorum scripta, non in alia quae humilia grandiorave sint, ut a metaphoris differat, sed in paria, sensu modo servato. Quod et Fabius [sc. Quintilianus] dubos locis sic explicat: "Tum mutatis verbis interpretari, tum paraphrasi audacius vertere, qua et breviare quaedam et exornare, salvo modo sensu, dimittitur; quod opus, consummatis professoribus difficile, qui commode tractaverint cuciunque discendo sufficient" [Inst. 1.9.2—3]. Ario item loco [Inst. 10.5.5]: "Sed et ipsis, inquit, sententias adicere licet oratorium robur et omissa suppleere et effusa subtrin gere. Neque ego paraphrasin esse interpretationem tantum volo, sed circa eosdem sensus certamen atque aemulationem." Dictus est et a quibusdam ecphrastis; est autem ecphrasis mera puraque enarratio.

Quod ergo diximus inter initia, doctissime Pontifex, susceptor abs te patrocinium litterarum, ne desere; cum dico litteras philosophiam intelligi, quae coniuncta cum eloquentia sit. In te eruditio summa et summa fortunata. Facile sperare possimus temporibus tuis futurum ut recta studia volente te (nam potes nec alius potest) ad dignitatem pristinam revocentur. Vale. Venetiis, MCCCCLXXX.

In Posteriora analytica paraphrasis. [Inc.]: (fol. 2r; Themist., In An. post. 1.2—3) Facturum me superfluom iuxta perambitioseque sentio si aris-
totelicarum commendationum post tales tan-
tosque auctores interpretationem iustam aggredi-
ar . . . [Explan.]: (fol. 16v; Themist., In An. post.
66.4–6) Ita enim principium ad principium se
habet, sicut scientia tota ad totum id quod
subjectum scientiae est.

Manuscript:
(*) Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vati-
cana, Vat. lat. 2142, s. XV (a. 1482–84), fols. 1r–36r
(Codices Vaticani latini: A. Maier, Codices 2118–
2192 [Vatican City, 1961], 53–54). The scribe was
Salvato da Cagli, and a subscription notes that his
copy was made in response to the imperfections
of the edition of Treviso, 1481. On this manuscript
see B. Nardi, “Il commento di Simplicio al De
Anima nelle controversie alla fine del secolo XV e
del secolo XVI,” in Nardi, Saggi sull’aristotelismo
padovano dal secolo XIV al XVI (Florence, 1958),
ch. 13 at p. 366. This manuscript and the edition
of Treviso, 1481 are the sources for the edition of
Barbaro’s prefaces by V. Branca (cited below). His
apparatus shows that the manuscript contains a
number of omissions not paralleled in printed
editions.

Manuscripts containing only the Preface:
(*) Gouda, Stedelijke Librije, 1324, s. XVI, fols.
138r–140v (Kristeller, Iter 4.31b).
(*) Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm
441, s. XVI, fols. 106v–107r (Kristeller, Iter 3.613b).

Editions:
1481. See above, Composite Editions.
1499. See above, Composite Editions.
1500. See above, Composite Editions.
1502. See above, Composite Editions.
1511, Parisii (Paris): Henricus Stephanus. With
the translation of the paraphrase of the Posterior
Analytics in a volume entitled Logices admicinula,
also containing commentaries on the Organon by
Ammonius and Boethius. B. Moreau, Inventaire
chronologique des editions parisienes du XVIe
siecle, vol. 2 (Paris, 1977), 91, no. 149. The editor of
the section containing the translation of Themis-
tius was Franciscus Vatablus (Francois Vatable, d.
1547); for an edition and discussion of his pre-
fatory letter, see E. F. Rice, Jr., The Prefatory
Epistles of Jacques Lefèvre d’Etaples and Related
Texts (London and New York, 1972), 249–53. BNF;
Paris, Bibliothèque de l’Arsenal; Paris, Bibli-
thèque Mazarine.
1520. See above, Composite Editions.
(*) 1527. See above, Composite Editions.
1530 (Venice). See above, Composite Editions.
1533. See above, Composite Editions.
1535. See above, Composite Editions.
1541, Parisii (Paris): Simon Colinaeus. With
the translation of the paraphrase of the Posterior
Analytics (the dedicatory letter has been omitted).
Not recorded in P. Renouard, Bibliographie des
éditions de Simon de Colines 1520–1546 (Paris,
1894). It presumably supplements the same print-
er’s edition (Paris, 1529; see II.2 below) of Bar-
barus’ translation of the other paraphrases. Dub-
lin, Trinity College.
1542. See above, Composite Editions.
1545. See above, Composite Editions.
1549. See above, Composite Editions.
1554. See above, Composite Editions.
1559. See above, Composite Editions.
1560. See above, Composite Editions.
1570. See above, Composite Editions.

Editions containing only the Preface:
(*) 1498, Venetii (Venice): Aldus Romanus.
Angeli Politiani Opera omnia, fol. 144r. As Branca,
Ep. 1, p. xxxiv notes, several subsequent editions
of Poliziano’s works also contain Barbaro’s letters;
these will not be listed here. NUC. BL; BNF;
(DLC; MH).
(*) 1518 Basileae (Basel): Gregorius Bartholo-
meus. Philippi Beroaldi Varia opusula, fol. 52r.
NUC. (DNLM; MH; FU; PPULC; CTY).
Branca, Ep. 8 (1.7–10).

Biography:
CTC 4.343–44. Add to the Bibliography: “Er-
molao (I) Barbaro,” Contemporaries of Eras-
um 1.91–92 (M. J. C. Lowry); E. Garin, “Le traduzioni
umanistiche di Aristotele nel secolo XV,” Atti e
memorie dell’Accademia fiorentina di scienze
morali “La Colombardia”; N. S., 2 (1947–50) 55–104
at 87–90; C. H. Lohr, “Medieval Latin Aristotle
Commentaries: Authors G-I,” Traditio 24 (1968)
149–245 at 236–37 (Barbaro’s Aristotelian com-
mentaries); V. Branca, ed., Dizionario critico della
letteratura italiana, vol. 1 (Turin, 1974), 195–99; M.
L. Doglio, “Ambasciatore e principe: ’l’Instituto
legati’ di Ermolao Barbaro,” in Miscellanea di stu-
di in onore di Vittore Branca, vol. 3: Umanesimo e
Rinascimento a Firenze e Venezia (Florence, 1983)
(= Biblioteca dell’“Archivio Romanicum”, Serie I,
Storia), 297–310; V. Branca, “Fra mule gonzaghe-
sche e levrieri turchi: una lettera inedita di Ermo-
lao Barbaro a Gian Francesco Gonzaga,” in R.
Cardini et al., eds., Tradizione classica e letteratura

3. Paulus Orsatus

The undated and incomplete translation by Paulus Orsatus (Paolo Orsatto) is a corrected and annotated revision of Ermolao Barbaro the Younger’s translation. Orsatto’s translation survives in a single manuscript (Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, D 129 inf.) heavily corrected by the original scribe; this suggests that the codex could be Orsatto’s own working copy, but there is no external evidence that he is actually the scribe. The probable date for Orsatto’s version is the second half of the sixteenth century, and there may be some connection with Padua since the manuscript was owned by Gian Vincenzo Pinelli (1535–1601), who was there after 1558. Orsatto compared Barbaro’s version of the paraphrase of the Posterior Analytics with a Greek text or manuscript in an exercise parallelling those of Ludovico Nogarola (II.3 below) and Federico Bonaventura (II.4 below) for parts of Barbaro’s translation of Themistius’ paraphrase of the De anima.

In Posteriora analytica paraphrasis (Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, D 129 inf.). Themistii in Posterioriores Aristotelis resolutiones paraphrasis in nostrum sermonem versa. [Inc.]: (fol. 34r; Themist., In An. post. 1.2–3) Mihi quidem post tot tantosque (atque viros s p s.s.) viros librorum Aristotelis interpretationem perscribere . . . [Expl.]: (fol. 60v; Themist., In An. post. 60.24–26) ex causa neque ex alio quod cogitatione prius sit. Neque enim casu confectus . . .

Manuscript:
(micro.) Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, D 129 inf., s. XVI, fols. 34r–60v (Kristeller, Iter 1.321b).

Biography:
Paulus Orsatus (Paolo Orsatto) is known by name only from an insertion made by a later hand (“Estratti di Paolo Orsatto etc.”) on fol. 61r of the manuscript cited above where he is identified as the author of an outline of logic and rhetoric as well as of the translation from Themistius. This suggests that he was a student or teacher, active perhaps at Padua (see above).

COMMENTARY
a. Anonymus Venetus

The editions of Barbaro’s translations published at Venice between 1527 and 1570 also contain notes on the paraphrases of the Posterior Analytics, De anima, and Physics. These notes are attributed to an “excellentissimus quidam philosophus”, who is called here “Anonymus Venetus” because of the place of publication; he may have been, however, a scholar from Padua where the Greek Aristotelian commentators were studied intensively in the first quarter of the fifteenth century.

Many notes are philological and initiate the process continued by Ludovico Nogarola and Federico Bonaventura (II.3 and II.4 below) of correcting Barbaro’s translation. The anonymous author had access to a Greek manuscript whose text offered readings different from the codex used by Barbaro. There are also frequent comparisons with the commentaries by John Philoponus and Simplicius.

T. Ebert (cited below) assumes that these notes can be attributed to Ermolao Barbaro the Younger, but he presents no historical or bibliographical evidence and does not explain why these notes were not published until nearly fifty years after the first edition of Barbaro’s translation of Themistius.

Commentary (ed. of Venice, 1530). [Inc.]: (fol. 1r) Εά Themistii verba ἐπί τῶν διὰ λόγου τι διδασκόντων (In An. post. 2.16) interpretatus est
quae sermocinale dicuntur . . . / . . . [Expl:] (fol. 13r) Graece aliter Themistius loquitur. Sic enim ait: "Artis, si circa ea sit quae ab ipsa fuit; scientiae, si circa ea quae a natura" (In An. post. 63.25–26).

Editions:
(*) 1527. See above, Composite Editions.
1530 (Venice). See above, Composite Editions.
1542. See above, Composite Editions.
1549. See above, Composite Editions.
1554. See above, Composite Editions.
1559. See above, Composite Editions.
1560. See above, Composite Editions.
1570. See above, Composite Editions.

Bibliography:

II. In Libros De Anima Paraphrasis

Translations
1. Guillelmus de Moerbeke

This translation of Themistius’ paraphrase of the De anima is attributed to Guillelmus de Moerbeke (William of Moerbeke) mainly on stylistic grounds. There is also a subscription in one of the manuscripts (Toledo, Archivo y Biblioteca Capitular, 47.12, fol. 37v; see Verbeke lxii) that refers to its completion on 22 November 1267 at Viterbo, the papal court where William is known to have been at the time with Thomas Aquinas. The translation is based on a Greek manuscript very close to the present Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, 87.25 (Verbeke lvii–lxxix), itself dated to the second half of the thirteenth century (P. Moraux et al., eds., Aristoteles graecus: die griechischen Manuskripte des Aristoteles, Peripatoi 8, vol. 1 [Berlin, 1976], 327–29, where no reference is made to Verbeke’s discussion). For a full treatment of the translation and its manuscripts see Verbeke lxiii–xcvii.

In De anima paraphrasis (ed. Verbeke). [Inc.]: (p. 1.4–6; Themist., In De an. 1.2–3) [Bonorum honorabilitum etc.] De anima quaequecumque est possibile comprehendere, assequentes Aristotelem temptandum nobis in hoc tractatu comprehendere . . . / . . . [Expl:] (p. 281.57–59; Themist., In De an. 126.18–21) Ad nutriri enim solum nutritiva potentia sufficeret utique, sicut et plantis; auditum autem ad significari aliquid sibi; linguam autem duorum gratia, et ad gustum et ad significare alteri.

Manuscripts:
(*) Erfurt, Wissenschaftliche Allgemeinbibliothek der Stadt, Ampl. Fol. 40, s. XIV, fols. 1r–31v (Aristoteles latinus 1.658, no. 874; Verbeke xciv).
(*) Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 317, s. XIII ex., fols. 86r–126r (Aristoteles latinus 1.722, no. 1017; Verbeke xciv).
(*) Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, lat. 16133, s. XIV, fols. 31r–51v (Aristoteles latinus 1.563–64, no. 672; Verbeke xcvi).
(*) ——-—, lat. 14698, s. XIII/XIV, fols. 1r–34r (Aristoteles latinus 1.543, no. 639 and 1.206 for the incipit and explicit; Verbeke xcvi).
(*) Rome, Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale, fondo Vittorio Emanuele 828, s. XIV, fols. 15r, 15v (Aristoteles latinus 2.1069, no. 1557; Verbeke xcvi–xcvii). Fragments from Themistius’ paraphrase as glosses in a manuscript of William of Moerbeke’s translation of Aristotle’s De anima.
(*) Toledo, Archivo y Biblioteca Capitular, 47.12, s. XIII ex., fols. 1r–37v (Aristoteles latinus 2.853, no. 1233; Verbeke xciv; Kristeller, Iter 4.643a).
(*) Venice, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, Marc. lat. VI 21 (2461), s. XIV, fols. 71r–92r (Aristoteles latinus 2.1091–92, no. 1592; Verbeke xcvi).

Edition:

Biography:
CTC 1.92. Add to the Bibliography: “Moerbeke, William of,” DSB 9.434–40 (L. Minio-Paluello); J. Brams and W. Vanhamel, eds., Guillaume de Mo-
2. Hermolaus Barbarus Junior

This was the most important of the Themistian translations by Hermolaus Barbarus Junior (Ermolao Barbaro the Younger), and he dedicated it to one of his teachers, Giorgio Merula (1431–94), who held the public chair in rhetoric at Venice from 1468 to 1484. On Merula see CTC 1.134–35 and 4.265–66; “Giorgio Merula,” *Contemporary of Erasmus* 2.437 (E. Lee); and M. L. King, *Venetian Humanism in an Age of Patrician Domination* (Princeton, 1986), 400–402.

*Dedication* (ed. of Venice, 1499). Hermolaus Barbarus Georgio Merulai Statiliensi s. [Inc.]: (fol. 67v) Plato in divina illa sua institutione De legibus [cf. 2.658e–659b] inter prima commemorat in omni republica praeviscri caverique oporetere, ne cui liceat quae composeserit aut privativi ostendere aut in usum publicum edere, antequam ea constituti super id iudices viderint nec damnarint. Utinam hoc dieque haberetur haec lex, Merula vir doctissime! . . . . . [Expl.] Dicavimus porro tibi libros Themistii De ingenio animalium utramque ob causam, et ut argumento hoc utcunque scires te a nobis amari colique, et ut magistri in nobis impetus aliquos, bona frugis indices, pro tua bonitate humanitateque quibuscumque rebus posses, faveres. Vale. Venetiis, MCCCCLXX.

*De anima paraphrased* (ed. of Venice, 1499). [Inc.]: (fol. 68r [incorrectly numbered 67r]; Themist. *De an.* 1.2–3) Cum enarrandis interpretandis iis quae de animae natura traduntur quam fieri proxime potest sequi Aristotelis verimax, conari nos oportet . . . . . [Expl.]: (fol. 100v; Themist., *De an.* 126.20–21) Tum auditus praestitus utipsi ab alio indicitur quid. Postremo lingua adhibita ad gemina opera, et ad perceptus saporum et ad vocis officium.

*Manuscript:*

(*) Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 2142, s. XV (a. 1482–84), fols. 161v–250v (see I.2 above).

*Editions:*

1481. See above, Composite Editions.
1499. See above, Composite Editions.
1500. See above, Composite Editions.
1502. See above, Composite Editions.
1520. See above, Composite Editions.
(*) 1527. See above, Composite Editions.
1529. See above, Composite Editions.
1530 (Venice). See above, Composite Editions.
1533. See above, Composite Editions.
1535. See above, Composite Editions.

1542. See above, Composite Editions.
1545. See above, Composite Editions.
1549. See above, Composite Editions.
1554. See above, Composite Editions.
1559. See above, Composite Editions.
1560. See above, Composite Editions.
1570. See above, Composite Editions.

*Editions containing only the Dedication:*

(*) 1498, Venetiis (Venice): Aldus Romanus. *Angeli Politiani Opera omnia*, fol. 145r. See I.2 above.

Branca, Ep. 10 (1.12–14).

*Biography:*

See I.2 above.

3. Ludovico Nogarola

While serving as ambassador from Verona, Ludovico Nogarola (Ludovico Nogarola) was involved in the edition of Ermolao Barbaro the Younger’s translations of Themistius at Venice in 1554. Nogarola contributed a new annotated translation of the paraphrase of *De anima* 3.4–13 as well as two textual notes: two to the translation of the paraphrase of the *Physica* and one to the translation of the *Posterior Analytics*. These notes are too slight to be listed as separate commentaries. Nogarola also attached his own translation of the relevant Aristotelian text (*De anima* 3.4–13) on which the Themistian paraphrase was based. The Greek text of Themistius which he used was probably that of the Aldine edition of 1534.

Like most of Nogarola’s works, his translation of Themistius’ paraphrase of the *De anima* is dedicated to a prelate, in this case Julius Feltrus (Giulio Feltrio della Rovere, 1555–78), cardinal at the age of thirteen (1547), later bishop of Vicenza.
(1560), archbishop of Ravenna (1566), and archbishop of Urbino (1578). He was the brother of Guidobaldo II of Urbino (1514–74), duke since 1538.

Preface (ed. of Venice, 1554). (fol. 103v) Iulio Feltro Quercenti Urbini Cardinali et Persiaie legato Ludovici Nogarolae Com(mentarii) in tertiam Themistii De anima paraphrasim praefatio. [Inc.]: Marcus Musurus, antistes amplissimus, cuius praeclara doctrina et singularis in erudientis iuvenibus industria latissime patuit, priusquam Respublica Veneta cum Gallis primo, mox cum Germanis, calamitosum illud gereret bel- lum, in Academia Patavina maxime floruit. Ut enim adhuc puere ex Creta insula Laurentii Medici studio Florentiam deceverat est, graecas et latinas litteras discere primum coepit, quas statim cum miro earum teneretur desiderio, sic avide arripuit ut brevi alios docere facile posset. In quo quidem munere ipse postea sese studiosissime exercens, plurimum glorie et laudis est consecutus. Nam cum ad eum ex omni fere terrarum orbe magno concursu iuvenes confluenter, tantam in illis exorandis et augendis curam adhibuit et diligentiam ut veri doctissimi ex eius officina paene innumerabiles prodierint.


Nam Hermolai Barbari iam mortui memoriam pie sancteque colebam ac venerabar, tum quod in Rempublicam Venetam, quae quidem praestantiam atque excellentium hominum parentem semper et altior fuit et habita est, pluri- num decoravit et illustraverit, tum etiam quod optime de mea patria meritus sit, quippe qui C. Plinii Secundi civis mei, quem tamen veronensem non agnovit, libros Naturalis Historiae ab infinitis mendis et erroribus liberaverit. Verum postea quam progredivideae etate Themistium diligentius evolvere atque eius verba graeca cum Hermolai interpretatione conferre mihi licuit, facile perspexi eundem in eo transferendo, qui etiam admodum corruptus ac depravatus esset, satis licenter per aetatem luisset. Siquidem cum ille Aristotelis paraphrasses <t>es graeco edodemque puro et simplici utatur sermone, eundem tamen Hermolais ita latine loquentem facit ut, spreto penitus et reiecto Ciceroine, Plinium, Apuleium, Capellam effingere atque imitari tantummodo videatur. Quapropter non magnum me facturum facinus putavi si tertiam De anima paraphrasim ut ille Iam suo, ita ego nunc meo arbitratu in latinum converteremer, non ut de gloria illius viri et fama quipiam detrahirerem, sed ut itidem studiose iuventuti, quae graeciae linguae rudis ignaraque sit, pro mea virili prosedesset.

Hunc autem laborem meum qualiscumque sit, nomini tuo dicare constitui, praeusul ornatisse, quo apud te quantum te observem et colam eo quo possem modo testatum relinquerem. . . . [. Expl.]: Quod sane etiam si te facturum tum pro tua humanitate, tum pro veteri illustrissimae familiae tuae instituto, quae studiosos semper fo- vere et complecti consueverit, magnopere confidem, tamen ut facias (cum id tua dignitas et ampli- tudo postules) et etiam atque etiam rogo.

In De anima paraphrasis (ed. of Venice, 1554). [Inc.]: (fol. 104r; Themist., In De an. 92.32–33) De ea animae parte, qua utimur ad contemplandum et agendum, sive ea loco sit separabilis (ut existi- mavit Plato) . . . . [. Expl.]: (fol. 118v; Themist., In De an. 126.20–21) Lingua in ore sita est duplici fungens munere tum gustandi saporis, tum altered quicpiam significandi.

Manuscript: (micro.) Glasgow, University Library, Hamilton 131, s. XVI (a. 1554), unnumbered fols. (Kri- steller, Iter 4.32a). This is an incomplete working copy with corrections; it is superseded by the printed edition.

4. Federicus Bonaventura

Federicus Bonaventura (Federico Bonaventura) worked on a translation of the Themistian paraphrase of the *De anima* at various times between 1582 and 1588. The manuscript remains of these efforts, accompanied by some notes, are preserved in eleven fascicules in Pesaro, Biblioteca Oliveriana, 1509. The manuscript is not consistently foliated or paginated, and it has never been described in any detail. There is a brief notice in Mazzatinti, *Inventario*, vol. 45 (Forlì, 1930), 221, and a somewhat fuller description is given by Kristeller, *Iter* 2.67b–68a. The latter identifies twelve fascicules, although they are not separately numbered. Of these the ninth ("[Other fascicule]. Text without title, dated Pisauri 1583"); Kristeller, *Iter* 2.68a17–18) does not directly concern Bonaventura’s Themistian studies, although it deals with interpretations of Aristotle’s theory of the intellect. Of the remaining fascicules, nos. 1–4, 11, and 12 are translations, while nos. 5–8 and 10 (described in II.e below) contain notes. Only the translation of the paraphrase of *De anima* 3.4–13 was prepared for publication by Bonaventura.

This manuscript material consists mostly of working copies with corrections. It was impossible to obtain a microfilm, and the *incipits* and *explicit* have been rechecked from photographs. Other information is based on an autopsy inspection conducted in May 1993. It should be noted that the script is extremely difficult to read, and some uncertainties remain in the transcriptions given below.

---

*a. Translation of the paraphrase of book 1 (incomplete)*

This is divided into two parts. The first is a version of Themistius, *In De an. 27.1–32.18* undertaken in November 1584; the second is a version of Themistius, *In De an. 1.1–5.3* produced in September 1588.

---

*i. Version of 1584*

*In De anima librum primum paraphrasis* (Pesaro, Biblioteca Oliveriana, 1509, fasc. 4). In Dei nomine. Amen. Die 17 Novembris 1584, Pisauri. Hora secunda noctis scripsi. [*Inc.*]: (fol. 4r; Themist., *In De an. 27.8–10*) Rationabilibus autem dubitaret quispam de ipsa ut quae moveratur ad haec respiciens. Dicimus si animam eveniat confidere, dolere, praeterea et irasci, sentire et ratiocinari . . . . . . . [*Expl.*]: (fol. 9v; Themist., *In De an. 32.16–18*) Quod perspicuum fuerit si quis ex ratione hac affectus et munera animae aggridentur describere, ut cogitationes, sensus, voluptates, dolores ceteraque generis eiusmodem; ut enim superior diximus, nemum rare quidem ex ipsis facile est.

*Manuscrit:*

Pesaro, Biblioteca Oliveriana, 1509, s. XVI (a. 1584), fasc. 4, fols. 4r–9v (unnumbered) (Kristeller, *Iter* 2.68a1–6).

---

*ii. Version of 1588*

*In De anima librum primum paraphrasis* (Pesaro, Biblioteca Oliveriana, 1509, fasc. 11). Laus Deo optimo maximo. Die prima Septembris hora 11,30 1588. Themistii Paraphrasis in primum librum De anima Aristotelis. [*Inc.*]: (fol. 2r; Themist., *In De an. 1.2–5*) De anima quaequecumque scientia comprehendi possunt, conandum est nobis Aristotelem secuti (corr. ex secti) in praesenti tractatione explicare . . . . . . . [*Expl.*]: (fol. 5v; Themist., *In De an. 5.1–3*) Haec igitur et tot sunt quaestionum capita quae de anima habentur. Omnia sane ad quod quid erat esse ipsius invasive . . . utilia et necessaria.

*Manuscrit:*

Pesaro, Biblioteca Oliveriana, 1509, fasc. 11, s. XVI (a. 1588), fols. 2r–5v (unnumbered) (Kristeller, *Iter* 2.68a19–22).

*b. Translation of the paraphrase of book 2 (incomplete)*

This undated translation of part of the paraphrase of *De anima* 2.1 was probably undertaken at about the same time as the preceding item, i.e., in late 1588.
In De anima librum secundum paraphrasis (Pesar, Biblioteca Oliveriana, 1509, fasc. 12). Paraphrasis Themistii super secundum De anima Aristotelis. [Inc.:] (fol. 1r; Themist., In De an. 38.34–35) Quae igitur ab veteribus habuimus tradita de anima (fuere s.s.) sufficierent diximus. Nunc autem principium illud (alia facto principio s.s.) aggregidentes conabimur et ipsi explicare quid sit anima . . . / . . . [Expl.:] (fol. 6r; Themist., In De an. 45.11–12) Fatendum (dicendum s.s.) igitur (et canc.) plantas particulam animae participantes (habentes s.s.) et vivere et animatas esse.

**Manuscript:**

Pesar, Biblioteca Oliveriana, 1509, s. XVI (ca. 1588 ex.), fasc. 12, fols. ir–6r (unnumbered) (Kristeller, Iter 2.68a22–25).

c. Translation of the paraphrase of book 3.4–8

Fasc. 1 of Pesar, Biblioteca Oliveriana, ms. 1509 is Bonaventura's working copy with corrections. He began work on this translation on 20 March 1582 and completed it on 26 April of that year. Fasc. 2, an undated fair copy of fasc. 1, seems to have been written in Bonaventura's more careful hand and exhibits some corrections; it was probably written after July 1583, when Bonaventura completed his notes on other translations of the paraphrase of De anima 3 (II.e below). Fasc. 3, dated 10 June 1627, is a partial version of the calligraphic copy used for typesetting when the translation was published posthumously in 1627. (The date 1582, given by Kristeller, Iter 2.6764, refers to Bonaventura's completion of the translation, not to the date at which this particular copy was made). Fasc. 3 is a copy of fasc. 2 and incorporates the latter's corrections. Given the state of the text in fasc. 3, the printed edition of 1627 can be said to reflect Bonaventura's intentions, and the specific details of fasc. 1–3 need not be reported separately. The posthumous publication was undertaken by Bonaventura's son, Pietro (1578–1653; see Firpo 646), who in the first of the Opuscula (of which this translation is the fourth) states in a letter to the reader: "En habes, amice lector, haec, quae mihi patris scripta recensenti occurrerunt."

Bonaventura translated the same portion of the Themistian paraphrase as had Ludovico Nogarola approximately thirty years earlier. The dedication makes clear his reservations about the translations of Ludovico Nogarola and Ermolao Barbaro the Younger (which he analyzed in the manuscript material described on p. 86 below).


Bonaventura's main innovation was to highlight the Aristotelian language in his translation of the Themistian paraphrase. The italics of the printed edition are retained in the quotations below. For his translation of Aristotle's De anima he used the version of Michael Sophianus (d. 1565), which had been published in four editions between 1562 and 1574; see A. Meschini, Michele Sophianòs, Studi bizantini e neogreci 12 (Padua, 1981), 36 and n. 80 for the bibliographical details. As Meschini 36–43 shows, Sophianus reacted against the paraphrastic style of the translations of Theodore Gaza (1400–76) and particularly John Argyropoulos (ca. 1415–87) in favour of a more austere style, even though his version was still humanist in character. (For the full text of Sophianus' preface see Legrand, Bibliothèque hellénique 4.184–89.) Given Bonaventura's views on earlier translators, it is clear why he favoured Sophianus as a guide to the Aristotelian material.

The translation is dedicated to Francesco Maria II della Rovere (1549–1631), the sixth and last duke of Urbino, in whose service Bonaventura spent much of his adult life. Bonaventura draws attention to the fact that Francesco Maria was the third member of that family to be the dedicatee of a Themistian translation; the others were Francesco della Rovere, later Pope Sixtus IV (I.2 above), and Cardinal Giulio Feltrio della Rovere (I.3 above).  

**Dedication** (ed. of Urbino, 1627). Serenissimo principi Francisco Mariae II, Urbini Duci VI, Domino suo clementissimo, Federicus Bonaventura f. [Inc.:] (p. 3) Summus ille poetarum philosophorumque omnium doctor Homerus res duas, quae principem optimum ac omnibus suis partibus expletum redderent, inter ceteras sum-
mopere necessarias esse existimavit ... (p. 9)
Itaque ut nulla admiratione affliciatis, rationi consentaneum est si hanc ego Themistii paraphrasim aristotelicarum interpretum primarum in tertium Aristotelis De anima librum ab eo graecæ editum, a me vero in latinum sermonem convertam, in qua de humanæ mentis natura atque praestantia elegantissime disseritur, tibi uni inter principes principi, qui maxime mentem excoluerit, dicaverim. Quamquam autem unus Aetnae gravius [Cic., De sen. 4] mihi suscipisse [suscepisse ed.] videar, quod post Hermolaum Barbarum et Ludovicum Nugarolam [sic] viros erudissimimos huic libello interpretando rursus admove re manus sim ausus, multae tamen me ad hanc provinciam capessendam causae, eaque non leves, impulerunt. Primo Themistium in Aristole interpretem eam accuratæ et diligententer secutum fuisse rationem videbam, quam noweram te, et iure quidem, probare vehementer. Cum autem hanc miram huius interpretis artem in Barbari ac Nugarolae versionibus latera perspicerem, quippe qui Aristotelis et Themistii verba sic vicissim confundant atque perturbent ut quae summus hic interpretes ad eorum explicationem addiderint, quae intacta relinquentes summo artificio in sua paraphrasie interesserur prorsus cognosci nequente, operae pretium me facturum duxi si Themistii interpretationem ab Aristotelis contextu ita distinguerem ac dividerem ut facile quae Aristotelis quaevae Themistii essent unusquisque judicare posset.

Accedit quod Barbari versio (ut libere dicam quod sentio) potius altera paraphrasis est in Themistii paraphrasiam, ut ipse in epistola ad Sextum IIII fatetur [cf. I.2 above], quam fidelis auctoris illius interpretatio. Secunda vero quae Nugarolae, est ciceroniana profecto et elegans, sed quae tamen a philosophico loquendi modo atque scholaram usu valde nimis recedat. Quod num in pertractanda philosophia liceat, aliorum sit iudicium. Nam quemadmodum magnus illus Picus aiebat, nec etiam Tullius eloquentiam in philosopho desiderat, sed ut rebus et doctrina satisfaciet. Et qui insitus apud philosophos aliquando vocabulis utuntur, quos res oratione illustrandas suscipticis, ii rebus non lumen afferre mihi videntur sed tenebras offundere. Adde quod, ut M. Antonius Flaminius vir eruditissimus quodam in loco inquit, non quoties aut ens aut essentiam appellabimus, verbis apud Romanos antiquos inauditis utemur. Si quidem quo tempore latine linguae maiestas una cum imperio floreat, Sergius et Flavius philosophi et haec et alia plurima eiusdem generis vocabula nova verunt. Sed iam haec missa faciamus.

Tu interea, princeps serenissime, libellum hunc gloriosissimo tuo nominis dicatum libenti animo accipe, atque eo libertiori, quo videtur Themistius omnes suas exarasse lucubrationes, ut tuo semper tuorumque maiorum nominis nuncupatae perpetuo edentur, quandoquidem Hermolaus Barbarus et Ludovicus Nugarola suas in hunc auctorem vigiliae Sexto IIII Pontifici Maximo atque Iulio Cardinali amplissimo dedicarunt. Ego autem tibi, princeps serenissime, meas, ut quaecumque incredibilis mea erga te amoris ac reverentiae monumentum. Hac tantum de te admontit esse volo, me in Aristotelis contextu interpretando novum susciendi esse laborem non existimasse cum Sophiani versione elegantiori inveniri posse mihi religio sit arbitrari. Ea igitur perpetuo usus, non parum in eo etiam laboris habui ut Themistium ipsum illius verbus adicerem.

In De anima librum secundum paraphrasiam. [Inc.]: (p. 15; Themist., In De an. 93.32–33) De ea autem parte animae, qua utimur ad contemplationem et actionem, sive separabili sit loco ut opinabatur Plato ... / ... [Expl.]: (p. 110; Themist., In De an. 126.20–21) auditum autem, ut ei aliquid significet; linguam ad duo, ad gustum, et ut quidpiam alteri significet. Finis.

Manuscript:
Pesaro, Biblioteca Oliveriana, 1509, fasc. 1–3 (Kristeller, Iter 2.67b54–64): fasc. 1 (s. XVI [March/April 1582]), folios 8r–54v (numbered from 1r–47v); fasc. 2 (s. XVI [probably late 1583]), folios 2r–24v (unnumbered); fasc. 3 (s. XVII [June 1627]), folios 9r–48v (numbered from 1r–40v), with the title and dedicatory letter on unnumbered folios 2r–6v and folios 4, 13, 15–18, 21–22, 24, 27–28, 36, 40 missing (presumably because these pages were separated and lost in the course of printing).

Edition:
1627, Urbini (Urbino): Marcus Antonius Mazantini. L. Moranti, L’arte tipografica in Urbino (1493–1800) (Florence, 1967), 215, no. 92. The complete edition, entitled Opuscula, contains three other works by Bonaventura (Moranti 214, no. 88), but the translation of Themistius has a
separate title page and is separately paginated. BL; BNF; Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine; Urbino, Biblioteca Universitaria.

Biography:

COMMENTARIES
a. Anonymus Venetus
On this commentator and the general character of the commentary, see I.a above. In the notes on the paraphrase of the De anima considerable use is made of Simplicius’ commentary on this work. This coincides with the publication of the Aldine editio princeps of that work at Venice in 1527, the year in which these notes first appear with Ernolao Barbaro the Younger’s translation. Notes (ed. of Venice, 1530). [Inc.]: (fol. 55r) Verbum graecum τύμισιν (Themist., In De an. 1.12) pulchram interpretatur; ceteri vero honorabilem. Unde Simplicius hoc in loco ait [In De an. 6.27–29] bonum et honorabilem cadem subiecto esse . . . [Expl.] (fol. 84r; ad Themist., In De an. 125.27–28) Caelestia corpora animalia sunt nobiliiora quam ut sensum requirant.

Editions:

b. Marcus Antonius Zimarra
Marcus Antonius Zimarra (Marcantonio Zimara) composed a set of problems and solutions based on Themistius’ paraphrases and published with Ernolao Barbaro’s translations of the latter in 1542, at least five years after Zimara’s death. They belong perhaps to the period 1501–1509 when Zimara taught at Padua since, in 1508, a similarly entitled work by him, Contradictiones et solutiones in dictis Aristotelis et Averrois, was published at Venice. Nothing, however, is known with certainty regarding the date and origin of the Themistian problems and solutions.

There are ten items in this collection: five dealing with the De anima, four with the Physics, and one with the De insomniis. They are not narrowly focussed on the Themistian exposition, using instead Themistius along with other commentators (Alexander, Simplicius, Philoponus, Averroes) to propound and solve problems.

Contradictiones ac solutiones Marci Antonii Zimarrei in dictis lucidissimi Themistii (ed. of Venice, 1542). [Inc.]: (fol. +1r [unnumbered]) In libros De anima. Contradictio in primo De anima super textum 6 [403a10–16]. Themistius (In De an. 6.4–33) et Averroes (Commentarium magnum in Aristotelis De anima libros, 18–20 Crawford) per passiones animae propriae exponunt, sicut est intelligere et contemplari . . . [Expl.]: (fol. +2r [unnumbered]; Themist., In De an. 78.7–13) sed tamen quoad iudicium non dicit Commentator sensum esse materiam sed actum et formam.

Editions:

Biography:
Marcus Antonius Zimarra (Marcantonio Zimara) was born at San Pietro in Galatina in 1475 or 1476 and died before 1537. He was educated at the University of Padua from 1497 to 1501 when he obtained his doctorate. His teachers included Agostino Nifo (1469/70–1538) and Pietro Pomponazzi (1462–1525). Zimara taught at Padua after graduation, acquired another doctorate (in medicine) in 1505, and was professor of natural philosophy until 1509. He was later professor of natural philosophy at the University of Salerno from 1518 to 1522 and thereafter taught at Naples, probably until his death.

Works:
Zimara edited Aristotle and Albertus Magnus and wrote numerous exegetical works on Aristotelian themes; see Lohr (cited below) for a full inventory.

Bibliography:

c. Ludovicus Nogarola

On the translation which these notes accompany see II.3 above. They deal mostly with specific points of language and interpretation.

Notes (ed. of Venice, 1554). [Inc.]; (fol. 104r) ὑ χρώμεθα πρὸς θεωριαν καὶ πραξιν (Themist., In De an. 93,32–33). Poteram ego hunc locum transferre sed magis obscure nec a Ciceronis more . . . / . . . [Expl.]: (fol. 118r; ad Themist., In De an. 125,25–27) ut satis sit perspicuum Platonem dissimulasse horum duorum sensuum nomen et naturam cognosceri, qui tamen res eisdem sujectas (-tus ed.) optime noverit.

Manuscript:

(micro.) Glasgow, University Library, Hamilton 131, unnumbered fols. (Kristeller, Iter 4,32a). This working copy is superseded by the printed edition.

Editions:

1554. See above, Composite Editions.
1559. See above, Composite Editions.
1560. See above, Composite Editions.
1570. See above, Composite Editions.

Biography:

See II.3 above.

d. Federicus Pendasius

The essay by Federicus Pendasius (Federico Pendasio) on Themistius’ interpretation of Aristotle’s theory of the intellect in book 3 of De anima is not dated. Since, however, other works by him on the same book and on the related theme of the immortality of the soul have been dated to 1566–77 (see Lohr, cited below, nos. 24–27), Pendasio’s study of Themistius was probably a part of this general program. The present collection, then, would date from the period when he taught at the universities of Padua and Bologna (see below).


Manuscript:

(micro.) Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, S 87 sup., s. XVI (ca. 1560–80), fols. 47r–79v (Kristeller, Iter 1,313b; Lohr [see below], no. 28). Owing to the closure of the Biblioteca Ambrosiana at the time that this article was prepared, an autopsy of the manuscript was impossible. The microfilm provided by the University of Notre Dame was insufficiently legible to allow much more than a repetition of the incipit and explicit given by Lohr.

Biography:

Federicus Pendasius (Federico Pendasio) was born at Mantua some time before 1545 and died at Bologna in 1603. He was educated at the universities of Bologna, where he was a student of Ludovicus Boccadifero (1482–1545), and Padua. He taught at Pavia, Mantua (at the court of Cardinal Ercole Gonzaga), Padua (1564–70), and finally Bologna (1571–1603), where his most noted pupil was Cesare Cremonini (1550–1631). Pendasio’s particular interest in the Greek Aristotelian commentators is reflected in his dispute with Francesco Piccolomini (1523–1607) at Padua in 1568–71 on the longstanding problem of the Aristotelian theory of the active intellect (see Lohr).

Works:

Pendasio’s surviving works are mostly manuscript commentaries on Aristotelian works or treatises on Aristotelian themes. To Lohr’s list (see below) add the printed edition Federici Pendasii . . . Physicae auditionis textusque libri octo (Venice, 1604).

Bibliography:


e. Federicus Bonaventura

The sets of notes by Federicus Bonaventura (Federico Bonaventura) on the paraphrases of books 1 and 2 of the De anima are mostly philological in character and include analyses of the translations of the same work by Ermolao Barbaro (II.2 above) and Ludovico Nogarola (II.3 above). Bonaventura’s notes were clearly undertaken in connection with his own translations of this work.

i. Notes on the paraphrase of book 1

These notes on the opening sections (pp. 1–5.3 Heinze) of Themistius’ paraphrase were composed on 2 September 1588, the day after Bonaventura translated the material (see II.4.a.ii above), and they are preceded by lemmata from the Greek text.

Notes (Pesaro, Biblioteca Oliveriana, 1509, fasc. 10). Laus Deo optimo maximo. Die 2 Septembris 1588. Super prooemium Themistii et primum De anima. [Inc.]: (fol. 1r) τῷ δὲ μίαν ἕκκαλίσσαι etc. (Themist., In De an. 1.3–4). Paraphrasis duplex est ut inter ceteros notat ... / ... [Expl.]: (fol. 5v) Πολλὰ γὰρ τρέφεται (Themist., In De an. 4.22). Hermolaus ‘pleraque nutriuntur’ etc. In qua interpretatione particulum γὰρ causativam omittit ... et ‘pleraque nutriantur augeantur ac gignant quae non sentiunt nec vita (?) concipiuntur’ (Themist., In De an. 4.22–23).

Manuscript:

Pesaro, Biblioteca Oliveriana, 1509, s. XVI (a. 1588), fasc. 10, fol. 1r–5v (unnumbered) (Kristeller, Iter 2.68a19–22).

ii. Notes on the paraphrase of book 3

These four sets of notes (identified as “primus” through “quartus”) comprise a continuous series in fasc. 5–8 of Pesaro, Biblioteca Oliveriana, 1509. The notes in fasc. 5 are dated to 26 April, and the year must be 1582, since it was on that day of that year that Bonaventura completed the first draft of his translation of the paraphrase of De anima 3.4–13 (see II.4 above). The notes in fasc. 6 are dated to 9 August; again the year must be 1582, given the explicit dates of fasc. 7 (13 November 1582) and fasc. 8 (10 July 1583). Fasc. 8 is incomplete.

Notes (Pesaro, Biblioteca Oliveriana, 1509, fasc. 5). Laus Deo optimo maximo. Die 26 Aprilis. Super vers(iones) Com(mentarii) prim(i). [Inc.]: (fasc. 5, fol. 1r) Invertera est inter omnes Aristotelis latinos interpretes opinio Themistii ... / ... [Expl.]: (fasc. 8, fol. 5or) patet supra esse de intellectu καθ’ ἐξίν (cf. Themist., In De an. 3.5, 98.21 and 100.2). Esse autem sic duas...

Manuscript:

Pesaro, Biblioteca Oliveriana, 1509, fasc. 5–8; fasc. 5, s. XVI (26 April [1582]), 50 fols. (fols. 2–41 numbered 1–40) (Kristeller, Iter 2.68a6–12); fasc. 6, s. XVI (9 April [1582]), 34 fols. (fols. 2–19 numbered 1–18) (Kristeller, Iter 2.68a12–13); fasc. 7, s. XVI (13 November 1582), fols. 52 (unnumbered) with 11 interleaved folios (Kristeller, Iter 2.68a14–15); fasc. 8, s. XVI (10 July 1583), fols. 66 (unnumbered) (Kristeller, Iter 2.68a15–16).

Biography:

See II.4 above.

III. In Libros De Caealo Paraphrasis

TRANSLATION

1. Moyes Alatinus

In his dedicatory letter Moyes Alatinus (Mosè Alatino) explains that he began his translation of this work after discovering a manuscript of the Hebrew translation when he was a medical student at the University of Perugia, i.e., shortly before 1556, the year of his graduation. At the time Alatino was studying with the distinguished Aristotelian commentator Francesco Piccolomini (1523–1607, professor of philosophy at Perugia between 1550 and 1560; C. H. Lohr, Latin Aristotle Commentaries, vol. 2: Renaissance Authors, Corpus philosophorum Medii Aevi, Subsidia 6 [Florence, 1988], 331–42) and the eminent physician and anatomist, Bartolomeo Eustachi (ca. 1500/10–74; “Eustachi, Bartolomeo,” DSB 4.486–88 [C. D. O’Malley]). Alatino further reports that he began work on the translation five years after
acquiring the manuscript at Perugia, where he showed the codex to Eustachii and to his brother Vitale Alatino (probably also a doctor). Because of poor health and other duties, he completed the translation later at Ferrara with the assistance of another Jewish physician, Elia da Nola, and oversaw its publication at Venice in 1574. The dedicatee is Luigi d’Este (1538–86), archbishop of Ferrara and a cardinal since 1561. In the later stages of his work Alatino was encouraged by Benedetto Manzoli (ca. 1530–85), a friend of Francesco Patrizi. Manzoli played a similar role in Mosè Finzi’s translation of Themistius’ paraphrase of book 12 of the Metaphysics, published in 1558 (IV:1 below).

Alatino’s prefatory letter addressed generally to “students of philosophy” (philosophiae studiosis) shows that his later meeting with Piccolomini during a visit to the baths near Padua with Camillus Varannus (an otherwise unidentified individual) also provided an impetus for the completion of the translation. This letter reveals as well Alatino’s scholarly fastidiousness as a translator and his concern with the necessity to sacrifice stylistic elegance for the sake of accuracy. For a more detailed study of the manuscript tradition and the translation, see M. Zonta, “Hebraica Veritas: Temistio, Paraphrasi De Coelo. Tradizione e critica del testo,” Athenaeum, N. S., 82 (1994) 403–28.

The manuscript of the Hebrew translation once owned by Alatino is now missing. According to S. Landauer, the modern editor of the Hebrew version (CAG 5.4:vi), this codex was older than the two surviving manuscripts presently known. The Hebrew translation itself was made from the Arabic in 1284 by Zerahjah ben Isak ben Schealtiel ha-Sefardi. The Arabic version has not survived and is known only through quotations in the commentary by Ibn Rushd (Averroes); see F. E. Peters, Aristoteles Arabus. The Oriental Translations and Commentaries of the Aristotelian Corpus (Leiden, 1968), 36, and Landauer viii–vii.

Dedication (ed. of Venice, 1574). Illustrissimo ac reverendissimo Aloysio Aestensi, principi et cardinale amplissimo Galliaeque protectori dignissimo, Moyse Alatini Hebraeus s. p. d. [Inc.]: (fol. azr) Inter veteres illos patres, bonorum nobis omnium auctores, reverendissime ac illustrissime Cardinalis, ii mea quidem sententia summa laude digni videntur, qui philosophiam, quam princeps ille ingenii et doctrinae Plato divinarum huma-
sime ac illustrissime antistes, dicare (-cere ed.) atque consercere vo1i ut in manus hominum sub tuo clarissimo nomine veniat. . . (fol. 43r) Verum (ut cetera praetermittam) quo studio, quo amore litteratos omnes ampleretis? ut eos auxiliooveae, praemiis alilicias et amplissimo stipendio locupletes? Inter quos magnificus ac reverendus dominus Benedictus Mangiolus (sic) mutinensis, vir omnium bonarum artium doctissimus ac tuus a secretis philosophus, connumerandas venit, qui ad hoc opus perferendum me semper hortatus est et quasi torpement excitavit, ut hoc nomine studiosi omnes non minus ei quam mihi debant. . . . [Expl.]: Accipe igitur hiliari et ex porrecta fronte has nostras vigiliae, princeps illustissime. Quod si feceris, ut spero, ad maiora deinde nomini tuo conscedenda animum extimulabis meum. Deus optimus maximus te in multos annos sospitem et incolumem conservet faxitque ut te singulari principe diutissime omnes frui valeamus. Ferrariae, Calendis Sextis. MDLXXXIII.

Prefatory letter (ed. of Venice, 1574). Moyzes Alatinus Hebraeus philosophiae studiosus s. [Inc.]: (fol. 43v) Cum superiori anno ad patavinias themas proprii ac diurni morbi propulsandi gratia cum illustriissimi ac maxime reverendi domini mei Camilli Varanni communicatus professus essem, curatione tandem absoluta nihil mihi potius fuit quam ut magnificum dominum Franciscum Piccolomineum (-lem ed.), omni disciplinarum genere abundantem philosophum ac meum in philosophia praeceptorem clarissimum amantis simumque, salutandi gratia convenirem, qui in almo patavino gymnasio iam per multis annos ordinare philosophiae professor multis nominibus suspiciendus primas tenet. Ei igitur radem adhuc et incohatam hanc Themistii paraphrasim ostendi, ut quid de ea sentire mihi libere pronuntiaret et gravissimum eius iudicium consulerem. Qui obiter nonnula percurrere laudavit quidem opus, ut solet, meque summopere rogo vit ac monuit ut meipsum non desererem ac operi tandem iam diu incohato divulgatoque et a philosophiae studiosi admodum expendit extremam manum imponerem. Ego vero, juvenes amansissimi, licet de meo ingenio tantum pollicitus non sim ut crediderim me alioquin in hac interpretandi professione non admodum exercitatum propriis, ut aiunt, nervis grave hoc omus totum subire posse, praecipue in rebus tam ardvis ac difficillimis quae ipsimet Aristotelis non numquam imponunt ac negotium facessunt, quod sane opus consummatis etiam professoris perdifficile exitisset, sperabam tamen me opes doctissimi alii cius viri adiutum, qui Arabum linguam profiteretur, in explicatione praecipe nonnullarum vocum quae per hanc paraphrasim arabice dispersae inveniebantur, posse a tanto onere nonnihil sublevari meamque interpretationem interim utcumque prosequi. Sed, bone deus, nenum talem adire hominem numquam mihi contigit, sed etiam multos locos inveni qui ad eorum explicationem diligentissimo atque excerctatissimo homine indigebant. Etenim cum ex graeco Averrois tempore ad Arabas ac inde in hebraicum idiomata eiusmodi paraphrasia futuisset delata, cui in dubium venit ex hac multiplica versione errores aliquos contigisse, qui obscuriores difficilioresque nonnullas orationes reddebant? Quare, quod vulgò fertur, vero sapiunt Phryges. Agnovi enim quam magnum onus suscepsisse, et fatare, ingenui. Sed cum amplius referre pedem non liceret, necesse quidem fuit ut tantum ac tale onus subierim, quale certe vobis, o juvenes amansissimi, numquam explicare possem.

At quo ordine in hac versione inesserem, nunc audietis. Primo enim cuiusque Aristotelis contextus germanam pro viribus sententiam assecutus, nonnulla quae ante admodum confusa et ambigua erant, mihi perspicua reddebantur, aliqua ob phrasis mutationem agnouimus sensus perspicuitatem amisses, idque ea potissimum ratione. Etenim utrumque idioma, hebraicum nempe arabiceumque, ob multorum nominum verborumque affinitatem magna cum consortium habent inter se; in eo vero potissimum differunt, siquidem hebraica locutio concisa admodum est, brevis et luculenta ac idem verbum plures sortitur significationes, arabica vero contra. Utraque autem propriam phrasim habet. Different etiam in hoc, siquidem hebraicum idioma pronuntiationem brevem habet, arabicum vero longam eademque nomina ac infinita propemodium verba diverso quidem modo in utrisque pronuntiantur. Hac itaque ratione agnouimus ob phrasis nempe mutationem obscurorem difficilioremque sensum nonnullas as orationes habere, quibus deinde sano modo intellectis, hoc est, in ordinem redactis, sensus perspicuitatem recuperarunt. Quaedam insuper redundabant in hebraico idiomate, quae arabice conscripta perfectum sensum pariunt; quae omnino deleri

Quod vero orationis reliquum erat, semper conati sumus, ubi id commodae fieri potuit, verbum reddere verbo; ubi vero minus, orationis sensum non deserimus ac integram sententiam dedimus auctori (non lusimus arbitratu nostro) Themitiumque latium reddere volumus, non autem cum Hermolao viro undequaque doctissimo atque elegantissimo certare. Res enim quae per se arduae ac difficiles sunt, modo inculta ac barbarae oratione non explicentur, elegantissimo illo orationis cultu suavissimoque verborum lenocinio decorari haudquaquam facile possunt. Etenim cum satiis ornatae ac lúculentae per se sint, ornamentis exstrinsecus additis fucatae corrupuntur. Quare maluimus cum Themitio non adeo exquisite loqui quam cum Cicerone longe lateque divagari. Non raro enim experti sumus ornatissi et cultus gratia in nonnullis orationibus verborum seriem mutare velle, ac sensum simil mutatum esse omnino animadverimus. Quare scio studiosos hac in nostra versione nonnullas orationes offensuros, quae maiorem fortasse cultum requirant, quas libuit ita potius relinquere minus elegantes quam seriem verborum permutando earum sensum pervertere vel quovis modo lacerare. Ita etiam nonnullas voces reperient quae forte ciceronianis auribus suavem harmoniam non efficiunt. Hae tamen ad faciliorem intellectum philosophis permittuntur, qui non de exquisita dicendi ratione sed de rerum veritate et falsitate disputant. His ita utcumque a nobis animadversis ac interpretatione tandem ad finem perduca proprio iudicio non contenti, domini Heliae Nolani hebraei medici undequaque doctissimi ac philosophi peritissimi opera adiuti, maiorem denuo operis partem percurrere libuit nonnullaque diligentius adnotavimus castigavimusque quae quoquo modo castigatione egere videbantur. Accipite igitur haec nunc, qualicumque sint, quae si vobis non dispuicuisses cognoverimus, meliorm in dies a nobis favente deo expectate (-to ed.). Etenim curabimus ut primum Avicennae librum ex he-

braico idiomate in latinum a nobis conversum aspirante deo propedie habeat.

In De caelo et mundo paraphrasis (ed. of Venice, 1574). [Inc.]: (fol. 1r; p. 15–7 Landauer) Tria veteres caeli nomine appellare consuevere: etenim inerrantium stellarum orbem tantum, in- super corpus quintum, ac demum mundum universum . . . [Expl.]: (fol. 66v; p. 247.23–25 Landauer) Minus autem dividuntur, cum eorum corporum quae continuata sunt, vis expulsionis superabit. Finis quarti et ultimi libri.

Editions:
1574, Venetiis (Venice); Simon Galignanus de Karera. NUC. BNF; Oxford, Bodleian Library; Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana; (CTY; OU; PPID).

1902, Berolini (Berlin): Typ. et impensis G. Reimeri. S. Landauer, ed., Themistii In libros Aristotelis De caelo paraphrasis hebraice et latine, CAG 5.4. With Moyses Alatins’ Dedication and Prefatory letter and a revised version of his translation.

Biography:
Moyses Alatins (Mosè Alatino) was born at Spoleto in 1529. He studied at Perugia with the Aristotelian Francesco Piccolomini (1523–1607) and obtained a doctorate in medicine there in 1556. Alatino practiced medicine at Spoleto until 1569 when, after the expulsion of the Jews from papal territories, he moved to Ferrara where he spent most of the remainder of his life. He died at Venice in 1606.

Works:
Alatino’s only other published work is a translation from Hebrew into Latin of Galen’s commentary on Hippocrates’ De aere, aquis et locis (R. Charterius, ed., Hippocratis Coi et Claudii Galeni Pergameni . . . Opera, vol. 6 [Paris, 1679], 194–212, 546 [= 557]). He worked with his son on a Latin translation of the first book of Avicenna’s Canon in Hebrew (the last sentence of the prefatory letter cited above contains a reference to this endeavor).

Bibliography:
“Alatino, Mosè Amram di Buonaiuto,” DBI 1.586-87 (unsigned).
IV. In Metaphysicorum
Librum Duodecimum
Paraphrasis

1. Moshe Finzi

Moises Finzi, Moshe Finzi, who began his translation in the 1550s, used a Hebrew manuscript of the translation from the Arabic made by Moses ben Samuel ibn Tibbon in 1255. The surviving Arabic version is a fragment of an abridged version, probably by Ishaq ibn Hunayn [d. 910]; it was edited by A. Badawi, Aristot. ‘inda ‘l-‘Arab (Cairo, 1947), 12–21 and 329–33. On its Arabic fortuna, see E. F. Peters, Aristotelis Arabus. The Oriental Translations and Commentaries of the Aristotelian Corpus (Leiden, 1968), 52; and on the question of the identity of the translator, Pines, “Some Distinctive metaphysical Conceptions” (Bibliography II.C above), 177, n. 3. Finzi himself mentions the references to Themistius in the commentary on this book by Averroes, on these see S. Landauer at p. vii of the edition cited below. R. Brague’s translation (Bibliography II.A above) is now the most thorough treatment of this paraphrase.

Finzi acknowledges the support of Benedetto Manzoli of Mantua (ca. 1530–85; CTC 2.284), who had played a similar role in Moses Alatini’s translation of Themistius’ paraphrase of the De caelo (III.1 above). Manzoli was a contemporary of Francesco Patrizi (1529–97) at the University of Padua and the dedicatee of book 4 of Patrizi’s Discussiones peripateticae. Finzi does not mention Patrizi, but in Discuss. Peripat. 11.10 (= p. 141, ed. of Basel, 1581) Patrizi refers to Finzi as “amicus noster” and to Finzi’s translation of Themistius as published “nosta cura.” Since book 1 of the Discussiones peripateticae was first published in 1571, Patrizi must have been associated with the publication of the first edition of Finzi’s translation in 1558.

Dedication (ed. of Venice, 1558). Illustriissimo ac reverendissimo Mariano Sabello episcopo eugubino Mose Finzius s. p. d. [Inc.]: (fol. aii) Themistii paraphrasis in duodecimum librum Aristotelis de prima philosophia, praesul amplissime, quae iamdiu a Graecis desideratur, cum hebraice nescio quo fato redditas in manus meas pervenisset, non eram nescius opera operetum et rem omnibus eius scientiae studiosus pergratam me facturum esse, si eam in latinum sermonem transtulisset, ne libri perdifficilis interpres locupletissimus diutius in tenebris delitesceret. Eam rem cum iam saepius inchoassem, nondum tamen variis distentus negotios perficere potueram, cum forte omnem consilii mei rationem exposui Benedicto Manzolzo mutinensi, viro in omnium scientiarum genere exercitatissimo et mecum summa familiaritati coniuncto. Is me perceptra re non solum hortari sed etiam inflammare et impellere coepit ut susceptum munus absolverem, neque his contentus, ut quasi stimulum et calcar adderet, paucis post diebus suas ad se litteras ostendit mihi, quibus institutum meum summopere laudabas rogabasque ut, cum primo opus perfectum esset, eius tibi videndi potestas fieret. Tunc ego, abiecta omni cunctatione, cunctis reiectis negotiis, totum animum ad vertendum paraphrasim appuli. Eam enim nactus esse mihi visus sum occasionem quae iampridem a me vehementer exoptaretur, ut ita tecum agerem ut me tibi penitus deditum et consecratum esse intelligere. Ea enim de te iampridem audio ab omnibus, praesertim a Benedicto Manzolo, qui te in primis colit atque observat, ut te unum admirer, te unum suspiciam, qui ea qua ex actate, nobilissimo genere natus, quod his temporibus rarum admodum est, ne dicam inauditum, in omni litterarum genere adeo profereris ut eruditorum nobilissimus, nobilitum eruditissimus habearis ... [Expl.]: Hac igitur famae tuae celebritate incredibili in te amore inflammatum, Themistii interpretationem a me tandem absolutam tibi dedico et sacro, non solum ut cuius auspiciis opus ad finem perductum est, eius etiam tectum atque munitum auctoritate in lucem prodeat (quantum enim sibi apud lectorum gratiam hoc nomine conciliare possit liber intelligi), sed etiam ut meae huius erga te singularis observantiae monumentum vulgo exstet. Quod quemdem si quis attentius perlegerit, eum minus inicitarum esses confido, hanc eam esse paraphrasim quam Themistio describerit passimque citat Averroes in ii commentarius quos in duodecimum Aristotelis libros de prima philosophia edidit. Tu autem una cum aliis qui aci ingenio praediti sunt, optime etiam hic perspicies themistianam illam interpretandi rationem miramque in rebus obscuris claritatem. Quamquam enim auctor de via fessus ac longa peregrinatione con-
fectus (-tas ed.), vestitu immutato in sordibus et squalore versatur—a Graecis enim ad Arabas et inde ad Hebraeos migravit, apud quos circiter tercentum et tres annos delituit, nunc vero tandem in latinum pervenit—non adeo tamen eius deleta sunt lineamenta ut Themistium agnoscerem non possis. Quo quidem, qualscumque sit, interea perfruavi studioi, dum expectant ut archetypus a te, ut es omnis antiquitatis solertissimus et liberalissimus indagator, e Graeciae ruinis ac tenebris eruatur, nec laborem meum contemnant. Nam quemadmodum nobiles illas et immortales substantias vel leviter attigisse satius est quam pleniori intelligentia cetera assequi, ita Themistium, qui de iis ex Aristotelis praescrito loquitur, non ignorasse melius fore existimo quam quosdam aios interpretes summo studio perlegisse. Tu igitur, optime antistes, Themistium quem tibi dedico, amplexarist et foveas meque in fidem et clientelam tuam accipias ut ad alia tibi offerenda alacrior sim. Vale. Mutiniae, Idibus Martii, MDIVIII.

_In Metaphysicorum librum duodecimum paraphrasis._ [Inc.]: (p. 1; p. 1.4—5 Landauer) Quanquam ens pluribus modis dicitur, nos tamen dum eius principia inquirere volumus, substantiae dumtaxat principia investigamus ... / ... [Expl.]: (p. 26; p. 39.39—41 Landauer) sed nihil eorum quae sunt male gubernatur, nec principium multitudo bona est.

**Editions:**
1576, Venetiis (Venice): haeredes Hieronymi Scoti. Contents the same as in the preceding entry. Adams T-457. BL; BNF; Cambridge, Peterhouse.
1903, Berolini (Berlin): Typ. et impensis G. Reimeri. S. Landauer, ed., _Themistii In Aristotelis Metaphysicorum librum lambda paraphrasis hebraice et latine_, CAG 5.5. Finzi’s Dedicatory letter and a revised version of his translation.

**Biography:**
Nothing is known of the details of the life of Moyses Finzio (Moşé Finzi). He was born around 1530, probably at Modena, since Francesco Patrizi (Discuss. peripat. 1.10) refers to him as “Mutinensis”. Finzi seems to have been a contemporary of Patrizi (see above) and thus probably had some associations with Padua where Patrizi was educated, and perhaps Ferrara, where Patrizi lived for much of his life.

**Works:**
The translation of Themistius’ paraphrase of _Metaphysics_ 12 is the only work by Finzi that has been identified at present.

**Bibliography:**
“Finzi,” _The Jewish Encyclopedia_ 5.389 (I. Elbogen); _Encyclopaedia Judaica_ 6.1015; Steinschneider, _Hebräische Übersetzungen_, 177, 975.

V. In _Physica Paraphrasis_

**Translation**
1. Hermolaus Barbarus Junior

This translation by Hermolaus Barbarus Junior (Ermolao Barbaro the Younger) is dedicated to Antonino di Ferraris (Galateo) (1448–1516), a scholar and translator active at Lecce and Naples after about 1470 (see CTC 7.296–97). In a response to Barbaro’s dedication Galateo recalled their contacts at Naples between 1471 and 1473; see the passage quoted in CTC 7.296. This, however, does not mean that Barbaro worked specifically on the paraphrase of the _Physics_ at this time. In a letter of 1485 (Ep. 69 [1.87 Branca]), he refers only in general terms to beginning work on Themistius while at he was at Naples.

The prologue to this translation in the Greek manuscripts is taken from Simplicius’ commentary on the _Physics_ (In _Phys._ 1–8.30; CAG 9.1, ed. H. Diels [Berlin, 1882]), as the sixteenth-century commentator, Anonymous Venetus (V.a below), noted. But since Barbaro regarded the prologue as an integral part of Themistii’s paraphrase, the _incipit_ below has not been adjusted to correspond with the beginning of the authentically Themistian part of the work. For some discussion of the terminology of this translation, see P. Galluzzi, _Momenta: studi galileiani_, Lessico intellettuale europeo 19 (Rome, 1979), 125–27.

Preface (ed. of Venice, 1499). Hermolai Barbari Patricii Veneti Zachariae filii in paraphrasim Physices Themistii praefatio ad Antonium Galateum. [Inc.]: (fol. 17v) Philoxenum Eryxidis et Gnathonem siculum gulae proceres, immo vero extremos ac perditos guiones cuppedivorasque, infamant litterae, quod convivis adhibiti emunge se in pultarisi soliti essent, ut abstinentibus ceteris soli epulis ampliter fruementur ... / ...
[Expl.]: Nunc restat ut de me ipso tibi aliqua dicam. Mirari te nolim si infinitos errores, quos isti partim imperitia linguae partim aristotelicae disciplinae inscitia praelegunt (perlegunt ed. Branca) et defendunt in scholis, non coarguo. Nec enim hanc provinciam suscepmus scribendi res physicam ut cum illis tamquam in palaestra, ut dicitur, certaremus de laude et gloria, quippe quos vincere nullum negotium sit, sed ut vel nobis ipsis commentaremur haec, si nullus habituri sectores essemus, vel si quibus idem qui nobis stomachus esset, is ad bonas litteras aliquid operuclae adderemus. Nec enim spiritus magis magnos in hoc quam utiles, ut ille inquit [Liv., Hist. 30.30.15], afferimus, nec de nobis quicquam magnopere arduum pollicemur, sed quaedam tamen invenisse non negamus, quae aggregientes ad haec tantisper morari non inventa potuerint. Iliud tempus est in calce ut dicamus nos tibi interpretationem in paraphrasim Physics pro nostra veteri ac stabilis necessitutine volentes dicasse; aliquin dicaturam hanc stipulatus a nobis es, cum essemus istic. Oppigeratam tibi fidem relinquimus, quamquam praescriptione uti poteramus et fori et decennii. Sed beneficio harum legum renuntiant philosophi, quibus in fraude ponitur vel furioso abiuare gladium. Vale. Venetiis, MCCCCCLXXX.

In Physica paraphrasis (ed. of Venice, 1499). [Inc.]: (fol. 18r; Simplici., Prologus in Phys. 1.3–5) Librorum Aristotelis De ausculazione physica facile est assequi intentionem, si prius eius partis philosophiae divisio, quae de natura est, ad memoriam revocata, in medium proferatur ... / ... [Expl.]: (fol. 19r; Simplici., Prologus in Phys. 8.29–30) Plutarchus Chaeroneus in vita Alexandri de edizione librorum metaphysicæ haec utro citroque fuisse scripta meminit. [Inc.]: (fol. 19v; Themisti., In Phys. 1.1–3) Est autem totius operis propositum naturae earumque rerum scientiam rationemque explicare. Nam sine ratione cognoscere facile est cuivis homini ... / ... [Expl.]: (fol. 67v; Themisti., In Phys. 236.2–4) sed ocissime moventur ea quae finitima et proxima sunt moventi. Pernicissim autem motus est is quo mundus convertitur. Illic ergo est id quod movet.

Manuscripts:

(*) Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 2142, s. XV (a. 1482–84), fols. 36v–160r (see I.2 above).

(*) Naples, Biblioteca Governativa dei Geron- laminii, membr. 46 (M.C.F. 3–4), s. XV, fols. 2r–294v (Kristeller, Iter 1.396b and 2.546a; Codici miniati della Biblioteca Oratoriana dei Girolamini di Napoli, ed. A. Pututuro Murano et al. [Naples, 1995], 96–101, no. 30). With the dedication.

Manuscript containing only the dedication:

(*) Udine, Biblioteca Comunale, Manin 1210, s. XVII vel XVIII, fol(s). not given (Kristeller, Iter 2.206b).

Editions:

1481. See above, Composite Editions.
1499. See above, Composite Editions.
1500. See above, Composite Editions.
1502. See above, Composite Editions.
1520. See above, Composite Editions.
1527. See above, Composite Editions.
1529. See above, Composite Editions.
1530 (Venice). See above, Composite Editions.
1533. See above, Composite Editions.
1535. See above, Composite Editions.
1542. See above, Composite Editions.
1545. See above, Composite Editions.
1549. See above, Composite Editions.
1554. See above, Composite Editions.
1559. See above, Composite Editions.
1560. See above, Composite Editions.
1570. See above, Composite Editions.

Editions containing only the Preface:

(*) 1498, Venetiis (Venice): Aldus Romanus. Angeli Politiani Opera omnia, fol. 143r. See I.2 above.

(*) 1518, Basileae (Basel): Gregorius Bar- tholomeus. Philippo Beroaldi Varia opuscula, fol. 31r. See I.2 above.

Branca, Ep. 9 (1.10–12).

Biography:

See I.2 above.

COMMENTSARIES

A. Anonymus Venetus

On this commentator and the general character of this commentary, see I.a above. For the reference to Simplicius' prologue cited in the incipit below, see V.1 above.

Commentary (ed. of Venice, 1530). [Inc.]: (fol. 14r) Non est Themistii prooemium hoc, quamvis illi id Hermolaus ascriptserit, sed Simplicii (In Phys. 1.1–8.30 [CAG 9.1]), sicuti illi facile cognoscere poterunt qui callent litteras graecas
VI. ORATIONES

TRANSLATIONS

1. Antonius Covarrubias

In a letter of 1553 sent by Gaspar Cardillo de Villalpando to Juan Ginés de Sepúlveda (1490–1573; CTC 1.95) (Joannis Genesii Sepulvedae Opera, vol. 3 [Madrid, 1780], 270–78, book 5, Ep. 18), reference is made to a Latin translation of Themistius, Or. 26 by Antonius Covarrubias (Antonio de Covarrubias). De Andrés 241–42 (cited below) discusses this report and convincingly argues that the Greek manuscript used by Covarrubias is the present Salamanca, Biblioteca de la Universidad, M.232, sct. F, fols. 377–48v. A manuscript containing the complete Latin translation has not yet been located.

At p. 276 of the letter Villalpando says, with reference to Or. 26: "... quoniam ea oratio latina non facta est, utar ea versione quam veluti ludens fecit vir omni genere litterarum ornatussum et summa mihi familiaritatem coniunctus, Antonius Covarrubias. Ea sic habet ..." (there follows the quotation given immediately below).

Or. 26, fragment (Joannis Genesii Sepulvedae Opera 3.276–77). [Inc.]: (p. 276; Or. 26 [p. 131.9])

Proprium est hoc Aristotelis, quod non eodem sermones vulgo putavit esse utiles et philosophiae... /... [Expl.]: (p. 277; Or. 26 [p. 132.13–14])

Quo factum est ut cum ante pedes hi sermones versentur, pluribus sint moenium ambitibus specum Ecbatanis Persarum regum regia. Hactenus Themistius.

Biography:

Antonius Covarrubias (Antonio de Covarrubias) was born at Toledo in 1524 and died there in 1602. He studied and later taught law at the University of Salamanca. In 1561 he moved to Granada to serve as chancellor of that city. Covarrubias attended the Council of Trent between 1562 and 1564 with his more celebrated brother, Diego de Covarrubias. In 1569 he added to his duties the chancellorship of Valladolid and later served at the royal court. An avid collector of Greek manuscripts, he was particularly associated with the prolific scribe Andreas Darmarius (de Andrés’ study is an exhaustive account of Covarrubias’ activities in this area).

Works:

Although Covarrubias does not seem to have published anything, his philological abilities were admired by Andreas Schott (1552–1629) and Justus Lipsius (1547–1606). He also composed Latin poetry (Kristeller, Iter 4.556a). According to the two biographical articles listed below at the beginning of the Bibliography, his manuscript re-
mains include a commentary on Aristotle’s Politics, but it has not been possible to locate this work.

Bibliography:

2. Hieronymus Donzellinus
Hieronymus Donzellinus (Girolamo Donzellini) translated the eight orations published in the Aldine edition of 1534 during what he himself describes as a three-year period. This may have occurred between 1545 and 1553, when he was practicing medicine at Venice. Donzellini did initiate some work on Themistius at that time, since he reports searching for manuscripts in Venetian libraries and refers to a codex owned by Diego Hurtado de Mendoza (1503–75), the Spanish ambassador to Venice from 1538 to 1547. Donzellini was in exile between 1553 and 1559, and, although nothing is known for certain of his movements, he is thought to have visited Germany. He must have completed his translations at this time (Perini [1967] 373–74, cited below), since his preface was obviously written after he had left Venice. He may not have personally supervised the printing at Basel in 1559 by Petrus Perna (with whom he had had contacts while still at Venice; see Perini [1966] 147–51, 158–59 and Portmann), since he complains that the printer misrepresented him as the translator rather than as the author of the summaries affixed to the orations.

Despite Donzellini’s claims in the Preface, the translation, according to Maisano (see below), is not based on any new manuscript sources, although the imperfect text of the Aldine edition is emended. Donzellini’s manuscripts are, therefore, at least indirectly those from which the Aldine was derived: Venice, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, Zan. gr. 513 (770) for Or. 18, 19, 22–25 and a manuscript seemingly no longer extant for Or. 20–21. On the former codex, see M. Sicherl, Die griechischen Erstausgaben des Vettore Trincavelli, Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Altertums, 1. Reihe, Monographien, N. F., 5 (Paderborn, 1993), 26–27; on the missing manuscript, Sicherl, “Handschriftenforschung und Philologie,” in Paleografa e codicologia greca (Atti del II Colloquio internazionale Berlin-Wolfenbüttel, 17–21 ottobre 1983), ed. D. Harlfinger et al. (Alessandria, 1991), 485–508 at 497–99.

The dedicatee, Ulrich Fugger (1526–84) (ADB 8.182–83), was in Italy in the service of Pope Paul III during the 1540s. Given Fugger’s later conversion to Protestantism, he would be a plausible associate of Donzellini who also flirted with Lutheran ideas and was eventually executed for such heresy. Fugger probably financed the publication of Donzellini’s translations, as he did the edition of a new Greek text of Themistian orations by Henri Estienne in 1562.

Preface (ed. of Basel, 1559). Ad nobilissimum ac praestantissimum virum Huldricum Fuggerum Kirchergaeae et Vuesenhorni comitem Hieronymi Donzellini philosophi ac medici in Themistii orationes latinas a se factas praefatio. [Inc.]: (fol. *2r) Sapientiam, ornatissime vir ac prudentissime, praelo creo optimi maximim munere mortalium generi concessam non tantum divina oracula testantur . . . (fol. *2v) Cum itaque prudentes ac sapientes viros imitari semper fuerit laudatissimum, horum ego secutus exemplum ac vestigia, ante triennium Themistii philosophi peripateticci orationes et eruditione et sapientia plenas in latinum sermonem verti. Cum enim bonae frugis refertas esse illas viderem nec adhuc tamen a quo quom latinas fuisse factas, non putavi illos quibus graeca lingua est incognita earum lectione defraudandos. Deterruit me quidem ab ea provincia non semel depravati exemplaris corruptela, ac nisi amicorum hortatu fusse impulsum, ab incepto opere destitissems. Ne tamen ulla in me diligentia desideraretur, veteres ac reconditas bibliothecas omnes Venetiis excussi, atque (fol. *3r) ex manuscriptis codicibus loca aliquot emendavi. Nonnulla tamen fuerunt quae in illis aequo ac in impressis ita sunt corrupta ut ad legitimum sensum erundum delio opus fuerit natare. Nihilominus ex praecedentibus et consequentibus commodum sensum (ni fallo) collegi. Unus tantum locus est in quo, cum verba aliquot desint neque ea in (in ea ed.) manuscriptis illis in-
venerim, imperfectum relinquere sum coactus. Atqui videbitur fortassis aliqui mea versio a Themistii verbis discrepare ac variare, nec tamen ii qui ea animadverterit, quidquid temere aut in-
scite fusse a me factum iudicabunt, potius vero ex antiquis codicibus ac exemplaribus, quae ego summo meo cum labore consului, ea me loca emendasse ut integra auctoris sententia redder-
tur. Ut autem paratior atque instructor ad harum orationum lectionem lector accederet, argumen-
tus eis illustravi, quae tamquam periochae singulis praefixa, earum intelligentiam non med-
ocriter patfacient (-unt ed.) ac adiuvabant. De quibus cum dubitaret typographus, essentiae
e me versa an vero facta, minus veram partem ac-
cipiens, errore quodam in titulo, eorum me non opificem sed versorem faci. . . . (fol. +7r) Sex
alias orationes scripisse furtur Themistius, quae
in Dieghi Hurtadi Hispani bibliotheca lateant,
nondum editae. Eas ego cum essem Venetiis sum-
misc prescis expetivi ac omnes lapidem movi ut
illas impetrarem: cupiebam enim cum his con-
junctas in publicum prodire. Verum tanta reli-
gione fuerunt adservatae ut ne semel quidem
videre illas potuerim. Non desistam tamen donec
alia ratione illas obtineam, ac tum græcas
omnes ac latinas aut simul aut seorsum in lucem
mittam. Utcumque autem hactenus egregia atque
erudita ingenia in hoc genere elaborarint, nullum
tamen fuisse reperio qui non alicubi sit hallucina-
tus. Quare etsi ego multos doctrina praestantes
viros meae huius versionis iudices fecerim ac eo-
num monitu loca nonnulla immutaram, a com-
uni tamen sorte me immunem esse non profi-
teor. Erunt procul dubio loca aliqua a me non
intellecta aut parum feliciter versa, de quibus si
quis me amice monuerit, gratias agam ac illa
emendabo. . . . (fol. +8r) Si Cicero latinae elo-
quentiae princeps et parens in vertendo Platonis
Timaeo, eius maiestatem aequare non potuit, quis
iam futurus est tam audax ut hoc ausit sibi pol-
licerii? Latinoigitursermonecontentissintlecto-
tes, qui sententiam legitimam candide, pure ac
bona fide reddat, etiam si eos lepores, lumina ac
ornamenta orationis in mea versione non reperi-
ent, quibus græce loquens Themistius est usus.
Alioqui umorationes hae philosophicae, de sententis magam quam de ver-
borum elegantia sollicitos esse debere lectores ar-
bitror. . . . / . . . [Expl.]: (fol. :3r) tanta nunc est
obtrectatorum copia atque proventus, magni
atque illustris viri nomine, ceu clipeo, ab impor-
tuna eorum libidine atque intemperantia me non
temere munierundum duxi. Vale.

Or. 18 (ed. of Basel, 1559). [Inc.]: (p. 3; p. 18.1–2)
Viri, quicumque hodierno die audiendi mei gra-
tia in hoc Musarum theatrum convenitis . . . / . . . [Expl.]: (p. 244; Or. 25, p. 115.21–22) sed
cuiusmodi a principio erant, cum sepositae sunt,
tales ad perpetuum tempus duraturas.

Editions:
1559, Basileae (Basel): Petrus Perna. VD T-706;
NUC. BL; BNF; Oxford, Bodleian Library; Paris,
Bibliothèque Mazarine; (ICN; CIY).
1633, Helmstadi (Helmstedt): e typographo
Luciorum. With a preface by Heinrich Scheur1
and Hieronymus Donzellinus’ translation of Or.
22 (“De amicitia”). Graesse 6.2:112. Göttingen,
Niedersächsische Staats- und Universitätsbibli-
othek. The copy identified in VD T-710 (Wolfen-
bütel, Herzog August Bibliothek) seems to be
identical, but the title page (and consequently the
date) is missing.

Doubtful edition:
Schutte (DBI 41.242) refers to an edition of Vi-
nena, 1550; no copy has been located.

Biography:
Hieronymus Donzellinus (Girolamo Donzellini)
was born at Orzinuovi near Brescia in 1513. He
obtained a medical degree from the University of
Padua in 1541 and taught there for two years be-
fore moving to Rome. He left Rome for Venice in
1545 after his interest in Lutheran ideas led to ac-
cusations of heresy. Similar charges led to Don-
zellini’s departure from Venice in 1553. His move-
ments in the next seven years are unclear, but he
may well have traveled to Switzerland and Ger-
many, where he would have made contact with
Protestant thinkers. He may also have overseen
the publication of his translations of Themistian
orations at Basel in 1559 (see above). Tried on his
return to Venice, Donzellini was briefly impris-
oned. He then moved to Verona, where he mar-
rried, but again he ran foul of the Inquisition in
1574, was returned to Venice for a review of his
earlier trial, and sentenced to life imprisonment
in 1575. Released in 1577, he practiced medicine
until a trial for heresy in 1587 led to his execution.

Works:
Donzellini was an outstanding physician, par-
ticularly skilled in the treatment of plagues, and
an erudite scholar. In addition to several medical
treatises of his own, he also published editions of other medical works, notably those of Giambattista da Monte (1498–1551), his former colleague at Padua; see Schutte (cited below) for a full inventory.

Bibliography:

Biographie universelle 11.223–24; Nouvelle biographie générale 14.584; “Donzellini (Donzellino, Donzellinus), Girolamo,” DBI 41.238–43 (A. Jacobson Schutte), with a list of works, and extensive bibliography.


3. Anonymus Vaticanus

This translation of Themistius’ Or. 7 was undertaken after its first printed edition by Henri Estienne in 1562. It can probably be dated to the period 1562–1605 or 1613 when further editions of this oration were published by George Rehm and Denys Petau. The author calls it the ninth oration because in Estienne’s edition it was the first to follow the eight orations (the present Or. 18–25) published in the Aldine edition of 1534. The translation, preserved only in a late sixteenth-century codex, Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 6243, is an extensively corrected working copy with a facing transcription of the Greek text. The four Vatican manuscripts with which the author claims that the text has been collated are probably Vat. gr. 80, 82, 435, and 936.


Or. 7 (Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 6243). Eiusdem Themistii et praecepti pro iis qui infeliciter (calamitosis sup. lin.) se gesserunt coram Valente (tempore Valentinis s.s.) oratio nona. [Inc.]: (fol. 175r; p. 128.1–2) Existimo te admirari, o rex, cur ego tandem aliquando post victoriam et res proxime gestas gratulans et gratias agens ... / ... [Expl.]: (fol. 191v; p. 151.8–10) ut necessitas sit per manus tradi (propagari s.s.) famam eorum qui bene ipsa usi fuerint in omne fere saeculum. Finis nonae orationis.

Concluding note (Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 6243). (fol. 191r) Hic in fine maxima est difficultas ob menda, et quod breviter historias tangit atque latenter.

Manuscript:

(micro.) Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 6243, s. XVI ex., fol. 174r–191r (Kristeller, Iter 2.339a).

SPURIOUS WORKS

VII. IN LIBRUM DE INSOMNIIS PARAPHRASIS

TRANSLATION

1. Hermolaus Barbarus Junior

The dedicatee of this translation, Galeatus Ponticus Facinus (Galeazzo Pontico Faccino), supervised the first edition of the Themistian paraphrases (see above, Composite Editions, 1481, Treviso). In his dedication Hermolaus Barbarus Junior (Ermolao Barbaro the Younger) invites Faccino to undertake this work during 1480. On Faccino see CTC 3.397; Branca, Ep. 2.145–46; and J. F. C. Richards, “The Poems of Galeazzo Pontico Faccino,” Studies in the Renaissance 6 (1959) 94–128 (three poems addressed to Ermolao Barbaro).

Preface (ed. of Venice, 1499). Hermolai Barbari Patricii Veneti Zachariae filii in paraphrasim Themistii De insomniis ad Galeatum Ponticum Facinum praeftatio. [Inc.]: (fol. 110v) Dicavi pri- dem tibi, ut nosti, interpretatiunculam De in-
somniis quo pro mea in te benevolentia et pro ea spe, quam de ingenuo et doctrina tua conceperam, volens feci. Nunc ceu fato quodam nostra adoreola sine te non possit stare: Themistius noster te rogat ut se transcribas. Periclitatur enim nisi suppeditas venis, ne (quae desidia et nequitia librarui est) antevortat se impressorum diligentia . . . . [Expl.] Et, hercules, miratus sum unde mihi tantum otii ad sales, praesertim tam occupato quam antehac numquam; et nisi quod ad te scribem, quicum licuit insanire, manias et in temperamentum incidisse me veererer. Vale. Venetiis, MCCCCLXXX.

In De insomniis paraphrasia (ed. of Venice, 1499). Capitolum primum. Insomnia sensu non percipi. [Inc.]: (fol. 111v; ps. Themist., In De insomniis. 29.2–4) Post haec de insomniis est agendum, primumque illud quaerendum cui animae potestatis compareant, et utrum affectio mentis an sensus sit. . . . / . . . [Expl.]: (fol. 113v; ps. Themist., In De insomniis. 39.31–32) Nam immutazione vel ae-tatis vel affectionis aliquovis secuta necessarium est naturam quoque ipsam et temperamentum mutari.

Manuscript:
(*) Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 2142, s. XV (a. 1482–84), fols. 270v–277v (see I.2 above).

Editions:
1481. See above, Composite Editions.
1499. See above, Composite Editions.
1500. See above, Composite Editions.
1502. See above, Composite Editions.
1520. See above, Composite Editions.
(*) 1527. See above, Composite Editions.
1529. See above, Composite Editions.
1530 (Basel). See above, Composite Editions.
1530 (Venice). See above, Composite Editions.
1533. See above, Composite Editions.
1535. See above, Composite Editions.
1542. See above, Composite Editions.
1545. See above, Composite Editions.
1549. See above, Composite Editions.
1554. See above, Composite Editions.
1559. See above, Composite Editions.
1560. See above, Composite Editions.
1570. See above, Composite Editions.

Edition containing only the Preface: Branca, Ep. 13 (1.18).

Biography:
See I.2 above.

COMMENTARY
a. Marcus Antonius Zimarra
On these Contradictiones et solutiones, see II.b above. Only one item is related to the paraphrase of the De insomniis.
Contradictiones ac solutiones Marci Antonii Zimarræ in dictis lucidissimi Themistii (ed. of Venice, 1542). In libro De insomniis. [Inc.]: (fol. +2r [unnunbered]) Aristoteles in libro De insomniis qui immediate est post librum De somno et vigilia et ante librum De divinatione ostendit visum esse digniorem tactu (46b2–3; cf. ps. Themist. 36.19–25). . . . / . . . [Expl.]: (fol. +3v [unnunbered]) in alico vero casu convenit contra ut in casu philosophi. Absolute tamen visum est certior.

Editions:
1542. See above, Composite Editions.
1549. See above, Composite Editions.
1554. See above, Composite Editions.
1559. See above, Composite Editions.
1560. See above, Composite Editions.
1570. See above, Composite Editions.

Biography:
See II.b above.

VIII. In Librum De Divinatione Per Somnum Paraphrasia

TRANSLATION
1. Hermolaus Barbarus Junior

The dedicatory letter to this translation is dated 1478; the dedicatory letters to the other Themistian/ps.-Themistian translations by Hermolaus Barbarus Junior (Ernalao Barbaro the Younger) are all dated 1480. The earlier date of 1478 may indicate that the translation of the De divinatione per somnum was the first to be ready for the printer. In the preface Barbara notes that two years earlier (i.e., in 1476) he had borrowed a manuscript of Aristotle from the dedicatee, Marcus Barbus (Marco Barbo, 1420–90), and he asks to keep the codex for another month until his work on the paraphrases was complete. The Aristotelian manuscript in question has not yet been identified; presumably it contained all or most of the treatises paraphrased by Themistius and ps. Themistius.

Marco Barbo belonged to an aristocratic fami-
ly in the Veneto. He had an important ecclesiastic
career, had extensive connections with con-
temporary humanists, and made translations
from the Greek (see M. L. King, Venetian Human-
ism in an Age of Patrician Dominance [Princeton,
1986], 327–28).

Preface (ed. of Venice, 1499). Hermolai Barbari
Zachariae filii Patricii Veneti in paraphrasim
Themistii De divinatione secundum quietem
praefatio ad Marcum Barbum. [Inc.]: (fol. 116r)
Libellum De divinatione secundum quietem inter-
pretati sumus ad te. Id munusculum, cum
quod e licio (Branca; Sicio ed.) est tum quod a me
venit, gratum tibi fore non dubito. Judicium
tuum quod sit, simul haec legeris, aveo de te per
litteras scire. Ceterum hospes biennium meus
Aristoteles tuus, sive quod comiter a me et li-
beraliter tractatus est sive quod veretur ne tam lon-
ga pereginatione offenseorem animi tui subierit,
discedere sed ne avelli quidem a nobis potest
. . . / . . . [Expl.]: Sed iocari collibuit illud serio:
Aristotelem tuum apud me esse adhuc mensem
oporet, quod dum Themistius noster totus ex-
eat. Nec vero mi (ni ed.) fraudi si quod re tua in-
vito te abutor. Primum ne (Branca; me ed.) invito
tei id faciam, humanitas tua metu illo me liberat;
deinde ut invito te faciam quod facere me
oporet, eius rei culpam necessitas, non ipse
habuerim. Vale. Venetiis, MCCCCLXXVIII.

In De divinatione per somnum paraphrasium (ed.
of Venice, 1499). Capitulum primum. An existi-
mandum sit aliquam divinationem haberi per
somnum. [Inc.]: (fol. 116v; ps. Themist., In De div.
per somn. 40.2–3) Divinationem in somno ali-
quam esse quae dormientibus nobis pervenire di-
catur a somnis neque pertinaciter resistendum
neque temere assentendum puto. . . . / . . .
[Expl.]: (fol. 114v [sic]; ps. Themist., In De div. per
somn. 44.23–25) quid sit somnum et quid insomni-
um, quamobrem utrumque animantibus iunct-
tum. Item qualsinam divinatio ea sit quae profi-
ciscatur ex somnis, dictum iam est. Nunc de
communi animalium motu agendum videtur.

Manuscript:
(*) Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vati-
cana, Vat. lat. 2142, s. XV (a. 1482–84), fols.
277v–280v (see I.2 above).

Editions:
1481. See above, Composite Editions.
1499. See above, Composite Editions.
1500. See above, Composite Editions.
1502. See above, Composite Editions.
1520. See above, Composite Editions.
(*) 1527. See above, Composite Editions.
1529. See above, Composite Editions.
1530 (Basel). See above, Composite Editions.
1530 (Venice). See above, Composite Editions.
1533. See above, Composite Editions.
1535. See above, Composite Editions.
1542. See above, Composite Editions.
1545. See above, Composite Editions.
1549. See above, Composite Editions.
1554. See above, Composite Editions.
1559. See above, Composite Editions.
1560. See above, Composite Editions.
1570. See above, Composite Editions.

Edition containing only the Dedication:
Branca, Ep. 7 (1.8–7).

Biography:
See I.2 above.

IX. In Librum De Memoria Et
Reminiscentia Paraphrasis

TRANSLATION
1. Hermolaus Barbarus Junior
Hermolaus Barbarus Junior (Ernolao Bar-
baro the Younger) states in the Dedication that he
began to work on this translation “in his nine-
teenth year” (i.e., in 1472), and thus while he was
at Naples (see I.2 above). The dedicatee is Fran-
ciscus Thronus (Francesco Tron), a Venetian aris-
tocrat, of whom almost nothing is known (see Ep.
11 [1.14–16 and 2.160 Branca]).

Preface (ed. of Venice, 1499). Hermolai Barbari
Zachariae filii Patricii Veneti paraphrasiam The-
mistii De memoria et reminiscencia praefatio ad
Franciscum Thronum L. filium. [Inc.]: (fol. 102v)
An ti ber agere memimisseve aliquas gratias de-
beam, Franciscus suavissime, qui me ad editionem
impuleris Themistii mei, non facile habeo dicere.
Sic enim quam sit ardua ratio, primum interpre-
tari graeca, deinde physica, tum hoc aevi, quo
omnes scientias invasit barbaries. . . . Fuit enim
apud me opus hoc annis amplius septem pres-
sum, quippe quod anno aetatis uno de viginti
coeptum a me sit, ne multum abesse a praescrip-
to noni videar. Nec tamen propertea magnum ali-
quid expectarei de nobis velim. Nam tametis ali-
qua in editionibus nostris sint, in quibus si non
frugem saltem rudimentum ingenii et igniculos
quosdam agnoscas, non tamen mihi id sum[m]o aut arrogo ut a doctis viris probatum iri haec credam. . . . . [Expl.]: (fol. 102v) An mihi de futurus unquam tu es, cuius vel unius iudicio niti possim? Aut si tu minus aequum te praebueris, quae mea errata tam frequentia aut insignia eripient mihi Antonium Clarium (Calvum Branca) meum? Cui, praeter id quod clarus-ius ed.) vir et probus intelligitur, etiam lectione varia et multa exercito, fides de me non haberi non poterit. Nam de Hieronymo Donato [sc. Girolamo Donato] (meo dicam an nostro?) quid mihi non respondeam, cuius eminenceimus et divinum ingenium doctrina exquissitissimae et singularis humanitas comitatur? Is mihi vel evidenter noxae comperto et assistere et subsignare se etiam quo- cunque periculo nominis paratus atque adeo animatus est. Quamquam vero haec ita sunt, nondum tamen liquet habere tibi gratias debeam, qui me in locum tam lubricum conieceris. Sed ne cui ingratus utcumque possem videri cui constet quod mihi non constat, nuncupavi tibi librum De memoria et reminiscencia, id est, particulam consili tui. Quod si improbabitur, non tam mihi qui acceperim quam tibi qui dederis poenitendum depudendumque sit. Volo enim qui haec damnarit, autorem flagitis intelligat. Ita fiet ut et se mihi in tua culpa faciles exhibeat et minus fraudis in me decumbat, quae partiario allevata sit. Vale. Venetiis, MCCCCLXXX.

In De memoria et reminiscetia paraphrasis (ed. of Venice, 1499). Capulfum primum. Non eosdem facile minisci qui facile reminiscantur. [Inc.]: (fol. 103r; ps. Themist., In De mem. 1.4–6) Nunc de memoria quid sit meminisse et quas ob causas habeatur et ad quam partem animae pertinere possit accurate agendum explicandumque est. . . . . [Expl.]: (fol. 106v; ps. Themist., In De mem. 16.9–12) Item de reminiscetia et quid sit reminisci et memoria quemadmodum redintegretur repareturque amissa et unde profiscatur dictum.

Manuscript:
(*) Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 2142, s. XV (a. 1482–84), fols. 251r–263r (see I.2 above).

Editions:
1481. See above, Composite Editions.
1499. See above, Composite Editions.
1500. See above, Composite Editions.
1502. See above, Composite Editions.
1520. See above, Composite Editions.
1527. See above, Composite Editions.
1529. See above, Composite Editions.
1530 (Basel). See above, Composite Editions.
1530 (Venice). See above, Composite Editions.
1533. See above, Composite Editions.
1535. See above, Composite Editions.
1542. See above, Composite Editions.
1545. See above, Composite Editions.
1549. See above, Composite Editions.
1554. See above, Composite Editions.
1559. See above, Composite Editions.
1560. See above, Composite Editions.
1570. See above, Composite Editions.

Edition containing only the Dedication: Branca, Ep. 11 (1.14–16).

Biography:
See I.2 above.

X. In Librum De Somno Et Vigilia Paraphrasis

Translation

1. Hermolaus Barbarus Junior

The dedication to this translation shows that the dedicatee, Hieronymus Donatus (Girolamo Donato, 1456–1511), had previously read an unrevised version. Donato was an almost exact contemporary of Hermolaus Barbarus Junior (Ermola Barbaro the Younger) and, like him, had studied Greek at Rome with Theodore Gaza (1400–76; CTC 2.130) and law at Padua before entering the service of the Venetian state. Donato also translated a work of an Aristotelian commentator, Alexander of Aphrodisias’ De anima, which was conjoined with Barbaro’s Themistian translations in some later editions (see CTC 2.85). On Donato, see further “Girolamo Donato,” Contemporaries of Erasmus 1.396–97 (T. B. Deutscher); “Donà (Donati, Donato), Girolamo,” DBI 40.741–53 (P. Rigo); M. L. King, Venetian Humanism in an Age of Patrician Dominance (Princeton, 1986), 366–68.

Dedication (ed. of Venice, 1499). Hermola Barbari Zachariae filii Patricii Veneti in librum De somno et vigilia Themistii ad Hieronymum Donatum Antonii filium. [Inc.]: (fol. 107r) Optavi tecum esse, mi Hieronyme, his diebus quibus interpretationi nostrae in paraph<asiasim Th</noasim>
municare tibi omnia ea possem et quod tuum in
iis iudicium esset praeans intelligerem. Ac legisti
tu quidem olim haec et, quod meminerim,
probasti; sed sive in peius effinxisti et, ut ille inquit
[Plin., Ep. 5.15.1], ab archetypo decidi, sive
dispensatione limae nonnihil profectit, certe in to-
tum alia sunt quam quae vidisti. Quod si affluxisses
tu, periculum non erat ut ab iis quae commu-
tassem detraxisseme laberet; aloquiu in haec
impensius studium contuli quam volebam. . . .

[End of extract]

Editions containing only the Dedication:
Branca, Ep. 12 (1.16–17).
E. Garin, ed., Prosatori latini del Quattrocento,
vol. 7 (Turin, 1977), 838–41. With an Italian trans-
lation.

Biography:
See I.2 above.

XI. ORATIO AD VALENTEM
IMPERATOREM (OR. 12)

IMITATION
1. Andreas Duditius

Andreas Duditius (Andreas Dudith) died at
Breslau (mod. Wrocław) in 1586. At some point in
his varied career he arguably composed the present
oration, a pastiche based on evidence that
Themistius delivered an oration on religious tol-
erance to the emperor Valens (364–378) as well as
material from the authentic Or. 5. The date of
composition is uncertain. Costil 348–49 (cited be-
low) argues for the years 1568–72 when Dudith
was at Cracow and occupied with issues of reli-
gious tolerance. But this oration could also have
been composed during Dudith’s later years at
Breslau, when he was an apostate Catholic living
in a city noted for its religious tolerance. Dudith’s
interest in Themistius may reflect his earlier con-
tacts in the 1550s at Venice with Girolamo
Donzelli (1513–87) at a time when the latter was
translating some of the Themistian orations (see
VI.2 above).

On the authenticity of this speech see Förster
(cited below), who was the first to argue in detail
that it was spurious, although this had been sus-
ppected earlier, e.g., by Costil.

The speech was published posthumously in an
dition of the orations by Georg Rehm (1561–
1625), then a judge at Nuremberg. Rehm does not
indicate how he acquired the manuscript, but it
may have been sent to nearby Altdorf, where Dudi-
th’s close friend, the astronomer and mathemati-
cian Johannes Praetorius (1573–1616), taught.
There is no evidence that Dudith tried to repre-
sent the work as an authentic composition of
Themistius, and a misunderstanding about its
authorship may have arisen after Dudith’s death.

Or. 7 (ed. of Hamburg, 1605). [Inc.]: (p. 225; p.
137.1–3 Downey-Norman) Nemo est, sapientissi-
me Imperator, qui iudicium tuum in eo non ve-
hemeneter probet quod ut quisque optimus vir est . . . . [Expl.]: (p. 230; p. 144.21–22 Downey-Norman) quacumque religione utantur, incolutatem a deo et diurnitatem imperio tuo precentur.

Manuscript:
(micro.) Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, D 462 inf., s. XVIII, fols. 189r–191v (Kristeller, Iter 1.323a). This was probably copied from a printed edition.

Editions:
1613, Flexiae (La Flèche): Jacobus Rezé. Ed. D. Petavius, pp. 403–17; with a Greek version by this editor. NUC. BL; BNF; (CTY). (*)
1615, Gerae (Gera): Johannes Spiessius. In M. Wendland, Discursus de pace et cura religionis, pp. 333–48. BNF.
1617, Flexiae (La Flèche): Jacobus Rezé. Contents the same as in the edition of 1613. NUC. BNF; (MH).
1618, Parisiis (Paris): Sebastianus Cramoisy, Ed. D. Petau, pp. 498–511; with a Greek version by this editor. NUC. BL; BNF; (CU; ICU; MoSU).
1618, Parisiis (Paris): Claudius Morellus. Contents the same as in the preceding entry. NUC. (CLU; MH; NJP; ViLxW; MA).
1618, Parisiis (Paris): Michael Somniius. Contents the same as in the edition of 1618 (Sebastianus Cramoisy). NUC. BL; BNF; (MoSU; CU; ICU).

Biography:
Andreas Duditius (Andreas Dudith-Sbardellati, András Dudith, Andrzejda Dudyczka) was born at or near Buda in 1533, a Hungarian Catholic of Croatian origin on his father's side and Venetian origin on his mother's side. Faced with the Turkish invasion, during which his father was killed, the family moved to Breslau (mod. Wroclaw), where Dudith was educated by religious teachers. He spent the years 1550–53 in northern Italy (Verona, Padua, Venice), and from 1553 to 1557 he was secretary to Cardinal Reginald Pole (1500–58), with whom he travelled to Paris, where he continued his education by learning Hebrew, and later to London during the reign of Queen Mary Tudor (1553–58). After returning briefly to Hungary in 1557, Dudith was at Padua in 1558–60 and in northern Europe in 1560–61. He was a controversial speaker at the Council of Trent in 1562–63.

Between 1561 and 1567 Dudith held successively the bishoprics of Tina (Knien), Csanad, and Pécs (Fűnfkirchen), but his marriage to a Polish noblewoman in 1567 led to his excommunication and departure to Cracow. There he played some role in Polish politics as a representative of the Hapsburg emperor until the election of a Polish king in 1576. Dudith also made contacts with Georg Joachim Rheticus (1514–74) and Johannes Praetorius (1537–1616), and he developed an interest in mathematics and astronomy that would be prominent in his later years. After spending 1577–79 at Paskov in Moravia, Dudith returned to Breslau and devoted himself to scholarship. Although he had become a Lutheran, he flirted for a time with Calvinism and Socinianism. He died in February 1589, in the presence of the English scholar Thomas Savile (see CTC 8.20).

Works:
In a career dominated by ecclesiastical and diplomatic duties, Dudith did not publish extensively. His Latin translation of Dionysius of Halicarnassus' treatise on Thucydidus (Dionysii Halicarnassi De Thucydidis Historia Iudicium [Venice, 1560]) was the only major scholarly work to appear in his lifetime. For a list of his published and unpublished works see Costil 387–403.

Bibliography:

R. Förster, "Andreas Dudith und die XII. Rede