

**UNIVERSITÉ DE COPENHAGUE**

**CAHIERS  
DE  
L'INSTITUT DU MOYEN-ÂGE GREC ET LATIN**

**87**

**Centre for the Aristotelian Tradition**

**Saxo Institute**

**2018**

## Michael of Ephesus on the Fallacy of Consequent

*Sten Ebbesen*

In the article preceding this in *CIMAGL* 87, Francesco Bellucci and Costantino Marmo suggest that for his scholium on Aristotle's *Sophistici Elenchi* 5.167b1ff. Michael of Ephesus' may have drawn upon John Philoponus' commentary on *Posterior Analytics I*.<sup>1</sup>

*Prima facie* this is by no means improbable. As I showed in 1981, Michael incorporated material from several sources in his commentary, and in his prologue there is a clear loan from Philoponus on *Posterior Analytics I* (*Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca* II.3: 2.1-3 & 2.5-8 ≈ *CAG* XIII.3: 2.14-17 & 2.5-9, respectively).<sup>2</sup> But there is a complication: There are two versions of Michael's commentary, an early one ("Ps.-Alexander 2") of which only extracts have been printed, and a final, expanded one ("Ps.-Alexander 1"), which is the one edited by Max Wallies in *CAG* II.3.

Now, much of the material found in the early version may well have been gathered before Michael, so if a passage containing a loan from Philoponus on *APo.* occurs already there, we have no guarantee that Michael himself had consulted the old commentator. And this is precisely the case with the loan from Philoponus' *APo.* in the prologue, for the whole of the prologue of Michael's final edition is already found in the early edition.

With the scholium on 167b1 the situation is different. The text found in the final edition is a considerably expanded version of the original one, as will appear from the table below, in which material not shared by both editions is in black type, while identical sections are in colour. The section

---

<sup>1</sup> F. Bellucci and C. Marmo, "Sign and Demonstration in Late-Ancient Commentaries on the *Posterior Analytics*," *CIMAGL* 87 (2018): 30.

<sup>2</sup> S. Ebbesen, *Commentators and Commentaries on Aristotle's Sophistici Elenchi. A Study of Post-Aristotelian Ancient and Medieval Writings on Fallacies*, vols. I–III = *Corpus Latinum Commentariorum in Aristotelem Graecorum* VII.1-3. Brill: Leiden 1981. See vol. I, ch. V.14, pp. 268ff., where also about the two editions of Michael's commentary.

that Bellucci and Marmo suspect of being inspired by Philoponus is highlighted with yellow background colour.<sup>3</sup>

<b>Michael of Ephesus on SE 5.167b1 sqq.</b>	
<b>First edition</b>	<b>Final edition. CAG II.3: 47.28–49.3</b>
<p>Ὁ παρά τὸ ἐπόμενον ἔλεγχος, ὡς καὶ αὐτὸς προϊὼν ἐρεῖ, μέρος ἐστὶ τοῦ παρά τὸ συμβεβηκός</p> <p>ἀμφοτέροι γὰρ</p> <p>ἀπὸ συμβεβηκός ὥρμηται. διαφέρουσι δέ, ὅτι ὁ μὲν παρά τὸ συμβεβηκός οὐκ ἀντιστρέφει τοὺς ὅρους, ἀλλ' οὕτως συλλογίζεται· ὁ Σωκράτης ζῶν, τὸ ζῶν γένος, ὁ Σωκράτης ἄρα γένος· ὁ δὲ παρά τὸ ἐπόμενον ὡς ἀντιστρέφοντας τοὺς ὅρους λαμβάνει, οἷον εἰ ὁ κλέπτης νύκτωρ πλανᾶται, καὶ ὁ νύκτωρ πλανώμενος κλέπτης ἐστὶ, καὶ εἰ τὸ μέλι ξανθόν, καὶ τὸ ξανθὸν μέλι,</p> <p>καὶ κατὰ τοῦτο τὸν κατασοφισμὸν συμβαίνει γίνεσθαι. οὐκ ἀνάγκη δέ, εἰ ὁ μοιχὸς καλλωπίζεται, καὶ τὸν καλλωπιζόμενον μοιχὸν εἶναι· πολλοῖς γὰρ ταῦτα ὑπάρχει, λέγω δὴ καὶ τὸ νύκτωρ πλανᾶσθαι καὶ τὸ καλλωπίζεσθαι· τὸ δὲ κατηγορούμενον οὐχ ὑπάρχει.</p>	<p>Ὁ παρά τὸ ἐπόμενον ἔλεγχος πέμπτος ἐστὶ τρόπος τῶν ἐκτὸς τῆς λέξεως φαινομένων ἐλέγχων. μέρος δέ ἐστὶ τοῦ παρά τὸ συμβεβηκός παραλογισμοῦ, ὃς πρῶτός ἐστι τῶν ἐκτὸς τῆς λέξεως σοφισμάτων· τοῦτο δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ Ἀριστοτέλης προϊὼν ἐρεῖ· ἀμφοτέροι γὰρ οὗτοι οἱ σοφισμοὶ ἀπὸ συμβεβηκός ὥρμηται. διαφέρουσι δέ, ὅτι ὁ μὲν παρά τὸ συμβεβηκός οὐκ ἀντιστρέφει τοὺς ὅρους, ἀλλ' οὕτως συλλογίζεται· ὁ Σωκράτης ζῶν, τὸ ζῶν γένος, ὁ Σωκράτης ἄρα γένος· ὁ δὲ παρά τὸ ἐπόμενον ὡς ἀντιστρέφοντας λαμβάνει τοὺς ὅρους καὶ γίνεται, ὅταν καὶ τὰ μὴ ἀντιστρέφοντα ὡς ἀντιστρέφοντα λαμβάνηται. ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ἔπεται τῷ κλέπτη τὸ νύκτωρ πλανᾶσθαι, ἀντιστρέφοντας οἱ σοφισταὶ λέγουσι καὶ ὁ νύκτωρ πλανώμενος κλέπτης ἐστὶ· καὶ ἐπειδὴ τὸ μέλι ξανθόν ἐστὶ, καὶ τὸ ξανθὸν μέλι εἶναι φασι. καὶ κατὰ τοῦτο τὸν κατασοφισμὸν συμβαίνει γίνεσθαι. οὐκ ἀνάγκη δέ, εἰ ὁ μοιχὸς καλλωπίζεται, καὶ τὸν καλλωπιζόμενον μοιχὸν εἶναι· πολλοῖς γὰρ ταῦτα ὑπάρχει, λέγω δὲ καὶ τὸ νύκτωρ πλανᾶσθαι καὶ τὸ καλλωπίζεσθαι· τὸ δὲ κατηγορούμενον οὐχ ὑπάρχει.</p>

<sup>3</sup> The text of the early version (Ps.-Alex.-2) is taken from ms Vat. gr. 1770: 20v–21v; I have compared it with ms Paris gr. 1843: 343v–344r, but found no significant variants, only some minor errors of no interest in the present context.

<p>εἶπε δὲ τὴν μοιχείαν κατηγορούμενον τοῦ καλλωπίζεσθαι οὐχ ὡς ἀληθῶς κατηγορούμενον, εἴρηται γὰρ ὡς οὐκ ἀνάγκη ἀντιστρέφειν, ἀλλ' ὡς ὑπὸ τῶν σοφιστῶν ὡς κατηγορουμένην λαμβανομένην.</p> <p>ἡ μὲν οὖν τῶν λεγομένων διάνοια τοιαύτη. τὸ δὲ κατὰ τὴν λέξιν τὴν ὅθεν καὶ αἱ περὶ τὴν δόξαν τῆς αἰσθήσεως ἀπάτη γίνονται τοιοῦτόν ἐστιν· ὅτι</p> <p>ἡ μὲν γεῦσις ἀντιλαμβάνεται τοῦ μέλιτος ὡς γλυκέος, ἡ δ' ὄψις ὡς ξανθοῦ, ἀφ' ὧν ἡ δόξα τὰ πάθη συνθεῖσα καὶ ὡς ἐν δοξάζουσα, ὀπηνίκα ἐνεργεῖ ἡ ὄψις περὶ τι ξανθόν, οἶονεὶ τὴν χολήν, εὐθὺς καὶ μέλι ταύτην εἶναι δοξάζει,</p> <p>καὶ τὸν ἥλιον πολλάκις ποδιαῖον</p> <p>εἶναι δοξάζει διὰ τὸ ἔπεσθαι ταῖς τῆς ὄψεως φαντασίαις.</p>	<p>ἀλλὰ τοιαύτη μὲν ἡ τῶν λεγομένων διάνοια. τὰ δὲ κατὰ τὴν λέξιν οὕτως ἔχει· ὅταν γὰρ μέλιτος ὄντος ἐξ ἀνάγκης ἔπεται καὶ τὸ ξανθόν, καὶ τινὸς ξανθοῦ ὄντος οἶονταί εἶναι μέλι· καὶ γίνεται ὁ παραλογισμὸς ἐντεῦθεν· συμβαίνει γὰρ εἶναι χολήν, ἥτις ἐστὶ ξανθή, πλὴν οὐχὶ καὶ μέλι. ὁ δὲ παραλογιζόμενος οὕτως ἀπατᾶ· οὐχὶ τὸ μέλι ξανθόν ἐστὶ, ναί· ὥστε καὶ τὸ ξανθὸν μέλι· ἡ δὲ χολὴ ξανθή· ἡ χολὴ ἄρα μέλι. καὶ αἱ περὶ τὴν δόξαν ἀπάται ἐντεῦθεν τίκονται·</p> <p>ἡ μὲν γὰρ γεῦσις ἀντιλαμβάνεται τοῦ μέλιτος ὡς γλυκέος, ἡ δὲ ὄψις ὡς ξανθοῦ· ἀφ' ὧν ἡ δόξα τὰ πάθη συνθεῖσα καὶ ὡς ἐν δοξάζουσα, ὀπηνίκα ἐνεργεῖ ἡ ὄψις περὶ τι ξανθόν καὶ ὄρα τι χολοβαφές, εὐθὺς καὶ μέλι τοῦτο εἶναι δοξάζει. πάλιν ἐπειδὴ ἐξ ἀνάγκης ὄμβρου κατενηνεγμένου ἡ γῆ διάβροχος γίνεται, καὶ ὀπηνίκα ὕδατος ἔκχυσις γένηται, ἕτεροῦ καταφορὰν γενέσθαι νομίζομεν.</p> <p>ἐντεῦθεν</p> <p>καὶ τὸν ἥλιον πολλάκις ποδιαῖον ἡ ὄψις εἶναι δοξάζει διὰ τὸ ἔπεσθαι ταῖς τῆς ὄψεως φαντασίαις.</p> <p>οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τοῖς ῥητορικοῖς συλλογισμοῖς αἱ σημειώδεις ἀποδείξεις ἐκ τῶν ἐπομένων γίνονται. ἐπειδὴ γὰρ σημείον τοῦ μοιχοῦ τὸ καλλωπίζεσθαι ἐστὶ καὶ τοῦ κλέπτου τὸ νυκτὸς πλανᾶσθαι (ἔπεται γὰρ καὶ τῷ μοιχῷ τὸ καλλωπίζεσθαι καὶ τῷ κλέπτῃ τὸ νυκτοπορεῖν), διὰ τοῦτο αἱ ῥητορικαὶ ἀποδείξεις ἐκ τῶν ἐπομένων γίνονται· ὁ γὰρ βουλόμενος δεῖξαι ὅτι μοιχὸς ἐστὶ, τὸ ἐπόμενον ἔλαβεν, ὅτι καλλωπιστής, καὶ ὁ τὸν κλέπτην ἐλέγξει βουλόμενος ὅτι νύκτωρ πλανᾶται. τὸ</p>
--	--

	<p>δὲ πολλοῖς μὲν ταῦτα ὑπάρχει, τὸ δὲ κατηγορούμενον οὐχ ὑπάρχει λύσις ἐστί. κατηγορούμενον δὲ λέγει τὴν μὲν μοιχείαν κατηγορίαν τοῦ καλλωπίζεσθαι, τοῦ δὲ νυκτὸς βαδίζειν τὸ κλέπτειν, οὐχ ὡς ἀληθῶς κατηγορουμένων (εἴρηται γὰρ ὡς οὐκ ἀνάγκη ἀντιστρέφειν), ἀλλ' ὡς ὑπὸ τῶν σοφιστῶν ὡς κατηγορουμένων λαμβανομένων.</p>
--	--

The table shows that the section suspected of being inspired by Philoponus is one that Michael added after the publication of the first edition, so if it was indeed inspired by Philoponus, Michael was the person who had the inspiration. But did he consult the old Alexandrian on this occasion? Maybe, but two considerations speak against the assumption:

- 1) Michael tends to keep close to the wording of his sources instead of providing a free paraphrase or just picking up an idea. But there are no close verbal parallels between his scholium on *SE* 5.167b1 and Philoponus' comments on *APo.* I.13.
- 2) Michael's αἰ σημειώδεις ἀποδείξεις functions as a paraphrase of a strikingly similar expression in Aristotle's text, as will appear in the following juxtaposition of the authoritative text and Michael's paraphrase:

Aristoteles, <i>SE</i> 5.167b8-12	Michael, <i>Comm. SE</i> <i>CAG</i> II.3: 48.27-35
<p>ἐν τε τοῖς ῥητορικοῖς <u>αἰ κατὰ τὸ σημεῖον ἀποδείξεις</u> ἐκ τῶν ἐπομένων εἰσίν·</p>	<p>οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τοῖς ῥητορικοῖς συλλογισμοῖς <u>αἰ σημειώδεις ἀποδείξεις</u> ἐκ τῶν ἐπομένων γίνονται. ἐπειδὴ γὰρ σημεῖον τοῦ μοιχοῦ τὸ καλλωπίζεσθαι ἐστί καὶ τοῦ κλέπτου τὸ νυκτὸς πλανᾶσθαι (ἐπεταὶ γὰρ καὶ τῷ μοιχῷ τὸ καλλωπίζεσθαι καὶ τῷ κλέπτῃ τὸ νυκτοπορεῖν), διὰ τοῦτο αἰ ῥητορικαὶ ἀποδείξεις ἐκ τῶν ἐπομένων γίνονται·</p>

<p>βουλόμενοι γὰρ δεῖξαι ὅτι μοιχός, τὸ ἐπόμενον ἔλαβον, ὅτι καλλωπιστής ἢ ὅτι νύκτωρ ὁρᾶται πλανώμενος.</p> <p>πολλοῖς δὲ ταῦτα μὲν ὑπάρχει, τὸ δὲ κατηγορούμενον οὐχ ὑπάρχει.</p>	<p>ὁ γὰρ βουλόμενος δεῖξαι ὅτι μοιχός ἐστι, τὸ ἐπόμενον ἔλαβεν, ὅτι καλλωπιστής, καὶ ὁ τὸν κλέπτην ἐλέγξει βουλόμενος ὅτι νύκτωρ πλανᾶται.</p> <p>τὸ δὲ “πολλοῖς μὲν ταῦτα ὑπάρχει, τὸ δὲ κατηγορούμενον οὐχ ὑπάρχει” λύσις ἐστὶ.</p>
---	---