ANONYMI BODLEIANI IN SOPHISTICOS ELENCHOS
ARISTOTELIS COMMENTARII FRAGMENTUM.

by Sten Ebbesen.

Summary:
I   Short description of the MS Oxf.Bodl.Laud.Lat. 67
II   Questions of sources and authorship (Greek influence).
III   Edition of the fragmentary commentary.
IV   The translation of Arist.SE used by the author (the "Moerbeke"
      trl.,though the text is from round 115o).
V   Notes on the text (mostly references to IV,VI & VII).
VI   Edition of some Latin scholia on Arist.SE.
VII   Edition of some Greek scholia on Arist.SE.
VIII The Latin Alexander: Sources and a request for help.
IX   Abbreviations.

I. The manuscript.

Bodl.Laud.Lat. 67, membran., mm. 2o4 x 142 circ., saec. XII, binis
columnis, variis manibus scriptus.

The contents are described in some detail by L.M. de Rijk in
Logica Modernorum II.1 pp. 77-81.

The part of the codex which concerns us here is f. 8 which
contains a fragment of a commentary on the Sophistici Elenchi of
Aristotle. De Rijk (op.cit. p.8o) says the handwriting is from
the second half of the 12th century.

II. Sources etc.

The fragmentary commentary has a strong claim to an unusual interest
on the part of the historians of philosophy, because it is an
early evidence for the translation into Latin of a Greek comment-
ary on the SE, presumably that of Alexandros of Aphrodisias
(floruit round AD 2oo), which was to exert a profound influence on
the high Mediaeval study of fallacies in the West.

Several years ago Minio-Paluello (in NOTE IX from 1954) called
attention to the fact that the Anonymus Bodleianus, as I shall call
the text with which this paper deals, twice cites an Alexander who

must be a Greek. Minio-Paluello also quoted from the manuscript
those two passages, and he furthermore showed that there are other
fragments of this work by Alexander in Mediaeval Latin texts. De
Rijk in his LM added to the evidence. During my work on editing
Ps.-Boethius de Dacia's Quaestiones super librum Elenchorum from
the last quarter of the 13th century (see Cahiers 3, 1970), I have
found several more fragments of Alexander's commentary. In a study,
which at present is available only at the University of Copenhagen,
I have collected and discussed all those fragments plus a good
deal more from other sources (cf.VIII). A comparison with Greek
scholia in SE leaves no doubt that "Alexander" was a Greek -or at
any rate drew heavily on Gk. sources. My preliminary conclusion is
that the ancient Peripatetic ἐξηγητής Alexandros of Aphrodisias
wrote a commentary on the SE which ca. 1130-1140 was translated,
with some adaptions, into Latin by Iacobus Veneticus Graecus. In
this I do not differ from Minio-Paluello or de Rijk who in a series
of articles and books have advanced the same thesis, but the facts
are much more complicated and the conclusion less obvious than
either of them knew. I shall have more to say on the subject
when my study of Greek commentators on the SE of Aristotle, into
which I intend to include the edition of the Alexander-fragments,
will be issued, which -humano casu excepto- should happen within
a couple of years.

Parts of the Bodleian commentary will have to be included in
the edition of the fragments of Alexandri in SE, but I think it
deserves complete edition, which will be outside the scope of my
future work, so it is edited here. Anyone acquainted with the Gk.
commentary generally known as Ps.-Alexander or Michael Ephesius
(CAG 2.3) will recognize similarities with the Bodleian anonymus.
Something more can be gained from comparison with other Gk.
sources, viz. the commentary by Leon Magentinos (probably round
1250, not, as generally supposed, from the 14th century) and the

scholia found in Greek manuscripts of Aristotle. I think that most
probably a great part of the material embodied in the Mediaeval
Gk. commentaries and scholia on the SE ultimately derives from
Alexandros (I intend to discuss this problem more thoroughly in
the work on the Gk. commentaries). If that is correct, similarities
between Latin and Greek Mediaeval treatises are most easily ex-
plained as dependence on Alexandros in both cases.

The general impression which one gets from the Bodleian fragment
is that is is the beginning of a fairly detailed literal comment-
ary, much of the type that Ps.-Alexander and Leon represent. Among
published Latin works the Glossae (and the Summa) in LM vol. I
offer the closest parallels.

I feel sure the Anonymus Bodleianus was much inspired by Alex-
ander, to which degree it is not possible to estimate (now, at
any rate). It may be that whole parts are translations or adaptions
of a Gk. original (Alexandros), but the Anon.Bodl. is not the
Latin translation-adaption itself: both because it quotes Alexander
and because it lacks certain elements which other sources expressly
attribute to Alexander, and which must belong to the part of the
commentary covered by the Bodl. fragment. It does not seem possible
either to ascribe the treatise to Iacobus Veneticus Graecus: the
fragments of his commentary as found in LM vol. I discourage the
identification.

So the author eludes identification. Nor are there any certain
signs from which to deduce the place of origin of the tract, or
the exact age. But the date must be round 115o, not much later,
nor much earlier, twenty years plus or minus must be the maximum
allowance. The somewhat exuberant style might be a hint of the
school to which the author belonged. Chartres has occurred to
my mind, but we should expect a person attached to that school
to use the translation of Arist.SE which Thierry incorporated into
his Heptateuchon. Section IV will, however, show that this is not

the case. Furthermore Mrs. Fredborg who in Cahiers 7,1971
argued that Thierry of Chartres might have written a commentary
on the SE, thinks the pattern of the prolegomena does not fit
what one should expect from Thierry.

III

ANONYMI IN SOPHISTICOS ELENCHOS ARISTOTELIS COMMENTARII
FRAGMENTUM EX CODICIS OXON. BODLEIANI LAUDIANI 67 FOLIO 8° EDITUM.

I edit with normalized orthography and have added references
to Bekker's edition of Aristotle. In the apparatus I have put a
VEL in some cases where I was not quite sure what the scribe
meant. The MS seems to be in a fairly good condition, but I have
had to work from a microfilm which was not always easily readable.

〈 PROLEGOMENA 〉   8rA

1	" 〈D〉 e sophisticis elenchis" liber hic inscribitur.
2	In eo igitur quae sit materia, quae intentio, quis modus
3	agendi et quis ordo, quae utilitas, cui parti philosophiae
4	subiciatur intuendum.
5	Sed et ad istorum et ad totius seriei promptiorem
6	intelligentiam quid ars, quid artis imitatio, quid
7	imitationis similitudo intimandum.
8	Ars igitur est facultas artificiose quid agendi.
9	Artis vero imitatio alicuius secundum illam etiam inventio.
1o	Et haec quidem tum usus, tum artis, tum naturae est.
11	Imitationis autem est similitudo quotiens id invenitur
12	quod ad artem non pertinet, sed pertinere videtur. Ut
13	quoniam eorum aequales sunt quadraturae, si quid alii etiam
14	aequale, huius et horum quadraturas syllogizetur aequales,
15	quoniam hoc his sit aequale. Vel si quod alterum contra-
16	dictorie oppositorum sit necessarium concludatur, quoniam
17	id est necessarium quod esse verum est necesse. Hic enim,
18	cum non sit ex primis et veris, conclusionis fides esse
19	videtur. Ideoque ex hac ratiocinandi similitudine pro-

2o   greditur deceptio. Similitudo enim haec, sed non quaelibet,

21   est deceptoria. Est namque similitudinum quaedam secundum

22   substantiam, quaedam secundum qualitatem. Et ea quidem quae

23   secundum substantiam est, tum est secundum substantiam

24   communem, ut in eo quod est esse animal, tum autem

25   secundum propriam, ut in Pyrrho et Achille secundum

26   membrorum dispositionem. Similiter et quae secundum quali-

27   tatem est, tum est secundum propriam, tum secundum communem.

28   Item et similitudinum alia est secundum repraesentationem

29   solam, ut quae est inter statuam alicuius expressam et ipsum,

3o   alia secundum repraesentationem et participationem, ut in

31   Pyrrho ad Achillem, alter enim alterum in forma figurat, sed

32   et uterque ea $\langle n \rangle$ dem natura $\langle \hat{m} \rangle$ participat. Hinc etiam est

33   quod dicitur "quoniam species Priami digna est imperio".

34   Harum autem similitudinum nulla quidem, sed ea sola

35   quae imitationis est deceptoria.

36   His igitur expeditis de praeenumeratis est dicendum.

37   Est ergo Aristotelis hic materia elenchus sophisticus

38   et elenchus apparens et non existens.

39   De hiis enim intendit. De modis autem arguendi, quorum

4o   quidam in dictione, quidam extra dictionem sunt, agere,

41   cum sit idem, ab hac quidem intentione non dissidet.

42   Modus autem agendi vere Aristotelicus est: in verbis

43   enim veritas, in sententiis subtilitas, in transpositione

44   quidem etiam obscuritas.

45   Ordo vero talis: Prooemium praemittit in quo de quo

46   et qualiter agit primum insinuat. Demum autem syllogismos

47   et elenchos apparentes et non existentes a veris seiungens

48   animatorum et inanimatorum inductione, syllogismi etiam et

49   elenchi definitionis ab illis remotione tales quinque

5o   fieri declarat. Quare autem fiant, et ad quos usus eorum

51   pertineat sequenter demonstrat. Deinceps vero de speciebus

52   et de partibus disputationis sophisticae se dicturum

53   pollicens ut illius ad alias differentia patefiat, dispu-

54   tationum genera connumerat. Quibus definitis transitum facit

55   prooemiumque finit. In seriei autum initio quot et qui

56   sint fines sophisticae eos et enumerando et breviter describ-

57   endo notificat. Demum si quidem modos arguendi in secundum

58   dictionem et in extra dictionem partitur, eos autem qui in
59   dictione sunt in tractatum prius assumens cuiusque supponit
6o   exemplum, eos vero qui extra dictionem sunt, tum illos describ-
61   endo, tum exempla, sed vulgaria, subiciendo, ut doctrinae
62   facilius veritas liquescat. Deinceps exequitur docens eis
63   uti ad redargutionem. Post haec vero generales eorum omnium
64   causas ostendens elenchi ignorantiam et dividendi impotentiam,
65   in eas omnes reducit fallacias. Quó facto qualiter et ad falsum
66   et ad reliquos fines sophisticae sit nitendum ostendit.
67   In fine autem huius primi voluminis interrogandi sophistice
68   ordinem explanat. In principio vero secundi de responsione,
69   quid et quomodo et ad quam utilitatem sit solvendum mani-
7o   festat. Sed solutionum quoniam quaedam sunt ad hominem,
71   quaedam ad orationem, prius ad hominem, deinde ad orationem
72   per singulas et species et partes disputationis sophisticae
73   solutiones docet afferre. Denique vero quid egerit breviter
74   commemorat, sic et tractatum terminat.
75   Utilitas autem est quae in omni scientia illationem
76   veram praepediunt et ad fallere fidem sophistice arguunt
77   scire et vitare posse.
78   Quod autem alicui parti philosophiae subiciatur non
79   videtur. Est enim sophistica fraudendi et decipiendi
8o   scientia. Item docet et illa paralogizare, quare et inconvenien-
81   ter argumentari, quare et falsitati non est impermixta. Item,
82   ut asserit Aristoteles, sophistica est apparens et non existens
83   sapientia. Et, ut dicit Boethius, argumenta nec necessaria
84   nec probabilia ipsis sophistis sunt attributa. Item sophistica
85   nec ut ratio disserendi invenit nec iudicat de argumentis.
86   Quare nec illa illi per illam supponitur. Ex his igitur nec
87   eam philosophiae esse partem, sed nec liberalem artem, sed
88   nec etiam philosophiae suppositam verisimile. Sed nec id
8rB   quidem verum. Sophistica // namque vera ars quidem est, forsan
9o   et liberalis. Sed non tamen aliqua, sed de aliqua liberalium
91   est. Est enim de ratione disserendi. Ipsa namque scientia est,
92   sed nec paralogizandi vel fraudendi, sed paralogismum et fraud-

82 Arist.SE c.1 165a21
83-84 Boethius:De diff.Topicis PL 64:1182A

93 ulentem fallaciam evitandi. Nec est ea quidem sapientia apparens
94 et non existens, nec illius est nec necessariis nec probabilibus
95 uti argumentis, sed paralogistica talis, et id suum est.
96 Quod enim sophistica vera veris innitatur argumentis ex his
97 manifestum. Est enim, ut in Topicis asserit Aristoteles,
98 litigiosus quidam syllogismus, quidam vero non. Cum itaque
99 litigiosus sit syllogismus, est et argumentatio necessaria
loo et conveniens. Quare, cum solius sophisticae sit docere talem
lol invenire syllogismum – omnis enim litigiosus sophisticus est – est
lo2 et sophisticae conveniens invenire argumentum, quare et conveniens
lo3 docere argumentari. Item, ut dicit Boethius, omnis ratio disserendi
lo4 quattuor facultatibus et earum velut quattuor opificibus est
lo5 subiecta, scilicet dialectico, sophistae, oratori, philosopho. Sic
lo6 igitur et sophistae est subiecta. Quare et illi per continentiam
lo7 vel per administrationem vel per praedicationem. Si autem
lo8 per praedicationem, ipsa quidem ratio disserendi est. Si vero
lo9 per continentiam vel per administrationem ex ratione dis-
llo serendi suam habet inventionem et iudicium. Item, cum sint
111 sophisticae aliqua principia et in ea aliqua per se nota, secundum
112 illa quidem argumenta sophistica et inveniri et inventa per
113 illa confirmari possunt. Quare et, cum ipsa principia necessaria
114 et indemonstrabilia, possunt et argumenta sophistica esse
115 necessaria. Item verae sunt propositiones sophisticae ex
116 quibus aliqua sequitur necessario, quare et argumentum sophis-
117 ticum necessarium. Item est, ut dicit Aristoteles, litigiosus
118 syllogismus ex probabilibus vel apparentibus, sed omnis liti-
119 giosus est sophisticus, quare et ille ex probabilibus est.
12o Item, cum dicat Boethius eosdem locos dialecticis et sophistis
121 esse communes, verisimile est ab eisdem argumenta elicita esse
122 vel esse posse necessaria. Quare sophistica. Item et plerumque
123 ex officio suo probabilibus argumentis utitur sophista. Non
124 enim sub manifesta falsitate semper incedit, ne artificiose non

---

97–98 Arist.Top. 1 c. 1 looB23–lola4

lo3–lo5 Boethii de Differentiis Topicis PL 64.1181C-D

lo5 velut) reldet MS, velut BOETHIUS L.c.

117–118 Arist.Top. 1 c.1 loob23ff, SE c.2 165b7f

12o–121 cf. Boeth. Diff.Top. PL 64:1182C (???)

125 decipiat. Patet igitur, quod argumenta nec necessaria nec pro-
126 babilia sophisticae vere non sunt attributa. Quae quidem cum in
127 tractatu hoc doceatur, eum rationi disserendi supponi manifestum
128 est. Sicut enim et invenire et iudicare ad rationem disserendi sci-
129 re utile est, sic etiam quae hoc impedire possunt scire necessaria.
13o Sophistica autem purgat iudicium. Quae quidem, et si aliter quam
131 dialectice argumentari doceat, non tamen dialecticae minus est
132 subiecta. Ratio enim disserendi quattuor facultatibus est sub-
133 iecta, sed nec omnes quidem dialectice arguunt.

164a2o[1]

1 ⟨D⟩e sophisticis elenchis et cetera.
2 Operi suo prooemium praemittit in quo de quo et qualiter agit
3 breviter ostendit. In eo autem quod ostendit de quo, quodam
4 modo innuitur inscriptio. Est et hoc
5 autem expletivum, vel continuativum, ⟨ut⟩ sit sic: "De syllogismo
6 dialectico et demonstrativo diximus,
7 autem, id est sed
8 nunc dicitur de sophisticis elenchis."
9 'En' quidem graece 'contra' latine, 'lexis' autem 'dictio'. Hinc igi-
1o tur elenchi contradictionis syllogismi nuncupantur, id est syllogismi
11 propositionis concessae contradictoriam vel contrariam concludentes.
12 Et hi quidem sophistici dicuntur quia ad finem sophisticum nituntur,
13 vel quia in sophistica fiunt materia, vel quia ex sophistice
14 interrogatis colliguntur. Sed nec, et si elenchi omnes sint
15 sophistici, duo isti termini inconvenienter coniunguntur, ut nec
16 'unus' et 'homo', sit licet omnis homo unus. Elenchi enim epi-
17 theton est esse sophisticum. Sed quaeritur hic, ubi in hoc tracta-
18 tu de sophisticis agit elenchis. Elenchos enim sophisticos nec
19 describere nec dividere, sed et paralogismorum plurima, elenchorum
2o vero nulla invenitur exempla subicere Aristoteles, nec de illis
21 agit. Quod quidem falsum. Elenchi etenim descriptionem ponit, quae
22 quidem intellecta sit, et quis elenchus verus erit perspicuum.
23 Quaecumque etiam de paralogismis dicuntur, ad notitiam veri elenchi
24 congeruntur. Scito namque quae vitanda, quae assumenda facile
25 intelligere.

---

8 dicitur) FORTASSE dicetur (PER COMPENDIUM SCRIPTUM HABET MS)
23 dicuntur) LECTIO INCERTA

164a2o^2

1   Et de hiis.

2   De elenchis, nec de illis solis dicemus, sed

3   et de hiis qui videntur elenchi sed non sunt

4   autem, id est sed, sunt

5   paralogismi, id est argumentationes falsae iuxta rationem, sed

6   non in ratione, syllogismi compositae. 'Para' enim 'iuxta',

7   'logos' vero 'ratio'. Liquet igitur hic Aristotelem illis con-

8   trariari qui argumentum omne sophisticum arbitrantur falsum.

9   Dicit enim se distincturum de sophisticis elenchis et de his

lo   qui videntur elenchi sed non sunt, hos et illos quasi diversa

11   disiungens. Quare quidem †inconvenienter loquitur vel aliquem

12   sophisticum esse elenchum palam quare et syllogismum quare

13   et argumentum sophisticum esse argumentum.† Quod enim

14   et pro 'id est' dicunt legendum merito tacendum. Sequens

15   enim littera haec

16   quoniam ergo alii et cetera a tali expositione dissidet.

164a22

1   incipientes

8vA De his, inquam, dicemus, nec indisposite, sed //

3   incipientes a primis secundum naturam, id est ab his

4   quae priora sunt secundum naturalem ordinem tractandi, ut a modis

5   arguendi, qui quoniam primi primum distinguendi. Et sic quidem

6   modus arguendi evidenter hic innuitur. Vel :

7   a primis, id est a generalioribus, ut a syllogismo quem, quia

8   elencho naturaliter prior est, prius illo, sed et causa illius,

9   definit.

164a23

1   Quoniam ergo et cetera

2   In demonstratione dicendorum elenchum alium esse syllogismum,

3   alium autem non esse, sed videri, evidenter innuit. Inde ergo

4   infert dicens

5   Manifestum est ergo et cetera

6   Quaeritur an divisio haec sit conveniens. Si enim conveniens est,

164a22 5 sic quidem) FORTASSE EXPUNXIT SCRIBA

7   sunt quicumque videntur syllogismi. Quod quidem falsum. Quod
8   non sit divisio vel enumeratio, sed quaedam potius elenchorum
9   apparentium et verorum disiunctio manifestum.   Id enim idem est
1o et si sic diceret: 'Argumentationum syllogismi formam habentium
11 quaedam est syllogismus, quaedam vero syllogismus non est.' Non
12 enim materiam [et formam] habet sanam. Ut enim in commento dicit
13 Alexander, argumentationes quaedam solam materiam habent sanam,
14 ut quarum omnis propositio vera, sed complexio est falsa; quaedam
15 autem solam formam, ut quarum complexio vera, sed
16 propositionum aliqua falsa; quaedam vero utramque sanam,
17 quae quidem solae verae sunt.

8vA   164a24
1   nam quem ad modum et cetera.
2   Ne, ut dixit, sic non esse videatur, elenchum scilicet alium
3   esse syllogismum, alium non esse, sed videri syllogismum,
4   in rebus simile ostendit accidere, ut collatione similium sit
5   id manifestum. De similibus enim idem iudicium, et hoc est
6   nam quem ad modum in aliis, scilicet in rebus, quae quidem
7   aliae sunt ab orationibus
8   fit hoc, scilicet quod quaedam eius generis rerum cuius sunt,
9   quaedam autem cuius non sunt, esse videntur
1o per quandam similitudinem, id est ex similitudine quam ad
11 ea quae ipsa non sunt, sed esse videntur, habent
12 sic et in orationibus, id est in argumentationibus, quaedam
13 enim sunt, quaedam non sunt, sed videntur syllogismi vel
14 elenchi.
15 Vel:
16 quem ad modum in aliis hoc fit, id est fieri contingit,
17 sic et in orationibus, id est in argumentationibus,
18 per quandam similitudinem, id est per quandam similium colla-
19 tionem. Res enim esse et videri et non esse sed videri, et
2o syllogismos et elenchos esse et videri et non esse sed
21 videri, quodam modo quidem similia sunt.

164a23 7 quidem) quia (?) MS   12 et formam) SECLUDENDA VEL
MAIOREM CORRUPTELAM SUBESSE STATUENDUM

164a26

1 Etenim habitum et cetera
2 Probat aperte quod similiter sit in aliis dicens
3 etenim habitum et cetera. Ut super hunc locum in commento
4 Alexander commemorat, in statutis temporibus Athenis litari
5 solet. Ditiores ergo pinguiores, minus vero divites minus
6 pingues hostias immolabant. Sed et ex his quidem aliqui hostias
7 inflabant, ut, cum non essent, ⟨ae⟩ mulatione pinguium divites
8 viderentur, quod quia per tribus faciebant -erant enim in
9 tribubus qui id facerent- dicit
lo tribualiter inflantes.
11 Vel:
12 inflantes tribualiter, id est quod non habent sibi tribuendo.
13 Vel:
14 tribualiter, id est ad eorum modum qui de tribu, id est
15 generosi, sunt.

164a27-28

1 Et pulchri
2 Idem iterum aperte probat, et hoc est
3 et pulchri alii, scilicet videntur
4 propter decorem, scilicet naturalem,
5 alii autem componentes se, id est se artificialiter venustantes.

164b21

1 Et in inanimatis et cetera.
2 Ostenso quoniam in animatis ut in orationibus est, ostendit
3 et in inanimatis similiter esse, et hoc aperte dicens
4 nam et horum, scilicet inanimatorum,
5 haec quidem, id est aliqua aurea vel argentea vere sunt
6 alia autem non sunt, scilicet vere aurea vel argentea, sed esse
7 videntur secundum sensum. Ratio enim per sensum fallitur,
8 sensus vero numquam. Eo enim nihil comprehenditur nisi quale
9 et quod ipsum est. Non enim aureum videtur quod aureum non

164a26 7 aemulatione) imitatione Minio-Paluello.
164a27-28 2 iterum) VEL item

lo	est, sed videri videtur. Quare et ut corrective dicamus, non
11	rationem, sed opinionem falli asseramus. Non enim rationis
12	sed opinionis cassae est baculum in aqua fractum temere aesti-
13	mare. Id enim nec scimus, nec intelligimus, sed opinamur. Hinc
14	etiam et inter philosophos quaestio haec, verine sensus. Quidam
15	enim sensus, quidam sensu utentes posse falli dicebant.

164b23

1	ut lithargyrea et cetera.
2	Quoniam quae aurea, quae argentea vere erat manifestum, non
3	quae haec, sed quae talia, cum non sint, videantur,
4	ostendit dicens
5	ut lithargyrea et stannea, id est de lithargyro et de stanno
6	composita, cum non sint argentea, quidem videntur. Dicitur autem
7	lithargyrus quodlibet metallum argento simile praeter stannum.
8	Vel scoria argenti lithargyrus appellatur. Vel 'lithos' lapis
9	est quo fricata metalla videntur argentea. Vel ex quo
lo	quidem fiunt vasa argenteis similia.

164b24

1	aurichalcea vero
2	Quod quaedam, cum non sint argentea, videantur ostenso, quia
3	quaedam, cum non sint aurea, videantur ostendit. Commento:
4	quaedam, cum non sint argentea, videntur, sic et quaedam quidem
5	non sunt aurea
6	vero, id est sed, videntur, ut
7	aurichalcea et cetera, haec enim taurino felle tincta
8	auro sunt similia.

164b25

1	eodem autem
2	Ostenso quod animatorum et inanimatorum quaedam quod videntur
3	vere sunt, quaedam non sunt, sed videntur, in syllogismis et
4	elenchis idem esse ostendit, et hoc est
5	eodem autem modo, id est similiter
6	et syllogismus et elenchus quidam scilicet est, quidam nec
7	syllogismus nec elenchus est, sed videtur. Et quare, cum non sit,
8	videatur, consequenter ostendit, scilicet

9   propter imperitiam, id est considerationem indiscretam. Quod
lo   et sic probat:
11   nam imperiti, id est indiscreti et indisciplinati
12   speculantur, id est discernunt et iudicant
13   velut longe distantes, id est sicut eminus positi. Ipsi enim
14   idem aliquid tum hominem, tum aliud frequenter iudicant. Quia
15   sicut pro immoderata loci distantia fallitur visus, sic et
16   pro consideratione incircumspecta fallitur intellectus, ut quod
17   nec syllogismus, nec elenchus est, id alterum esse iudicetur.

164b27-165a1

nam syllogismus et cetera

⟨***⟩

---

13 positi) VEL posita
14 aliquid) VEL ali quidem

IV. Which translation
of Aristotle did the Anonymus Bodleianus use ?

A comparison with Mediaeval MSS of the SE in Latin whows that the
translation used by the Anonymus was certainly not the Boethius
texts as contained in the Chartres 498 MS (Thierry's Heptateuchon).
Nor was it the mixed translation of Ambros I.195 inf. which
Minio-Paluello (NOTE IX:225) suggested might be the Boethius text
infected with some Iacobus Veneticus-readings. It shows some
relationship with the translation in Vindob. 2355, and it is
very close indeed to the one in Paris. 16080 which Minio-Paluello
(NOTE VI 405) attributes to Moerbeke. If the attribution is
correct, we can now add the statement that Moerbeke worked on the
basis of a much older translation, which was known to the Anon-
ymus Bodleianus. But we might also begin to have doubts about
the Moerbekian authorship.

I subjoin a reconstruction of the beginning of the SE as it
seems to have looked in the MS which the author af the Bodleian
commentary knew. I underline the words which are actually pre-
served as lemmata in the Anon.Bodl. The apparatus shows the
variations from this hypothetical text in the following manu-
scripts:

CARN. = Carnutensis 498,sc.XII (Boethius' trl.). Aristoteles
    Latinus I, N$^{\circ}$ 475
AMBROS. = Ambrosianus I.195 inf.,sc.XII ex. (Mixed trl.)
    Aristoteles Latinus II N$^{\circ}$ 1450
PARIS. = Parisinus Lat. 16080, sc.XIII ex. (Moerbeke trl.?)
    Aristoteles Latinus I N$^{\circ}$ 656
VIND. = Vindobonensis Lat. 2377, sc. XIV in. (? trl.)
    Aristoteles Latinus I N$^{\circ}$ 116

164a2o De sophisticis autem elenchis et de hiis qui videntur

21 elenchi, sunt autem paralogismi, sed non elenchi, dicemus

22 incipientes a primis secundum naturam.

23 Quoniam ergo alii quidem sunt syllogismi, alii autem,
        cum non sint,

24 videntur, manifestum est [ergo]. Nam quemadmodum in aliis

25 fit hoc per quandam similitudinem, sic et in orationibus

26 se habet. Etenim habitum alii bene habent, alii autem
        videntur

27 tribualiter inflantes et fingentes se, et

164b2o pulchri alii quidem propter decorem, alii autem videntur
        componentes

21 se, et in inanimatis quidem similiter, nam et horum haec
        quidem

22 argentum, illa vero aurum sunt vere, alia autem non sunt

23 videntur autem secundum sensum ut lithargyrea

24 et stannea argentea, aurichalcea vero et felle tincta
        aurea.

25 Eodem autem modo et syllogismus et elenchus hic quidem

26 est, ille vero non est, videtur autem propter imperitiam.

27 Nam imperiti speculantur velut longe distantes.

28 Nam syllogismus .....

164a2o videntur) quidem ADD.CARN.
    22 a - naturam) secundum naturam a primis CARN.AMBROS.
                        duplex lectio ADD.AMBROS.
    23 quoniam ergo) quoniam igitur AMBROS.(?) quorum quidem
                        igitur PARIS.
        sunt) OM. AMBROS.
    24 est) OM. CARN.
        ergo) OM. OMNES PRAETER BODL.
    24-25 modum - hoc) modum et in aliis hoc fit CARN. VIND.
                        modum hoc et in aliis fit AMBROS.
    25 per) propter AMBROS.
    26 habitum - habent) habitum alii quidem habent bene CARN.
                AMBROS., alii quidem habent habitum bene VIND.

```
164a27   et) vel AMBROS.
         fingentes) NESCIOQUID VIND. ANTE CORRECTURAM
164b21   inanimatis) animatis CARN. VIND. AMBROS.ANTE CORRECTURAM
         quidem) quoque CARN. AMBROS. VIND.
         haec) res ADD. AMBROS. ("glosa" SUPRASCRIPSIT CORRECTOR)
         quidem) quidam (?) VIND.
     22  argentum ) argentea VIND.
         illa) alia CARN.
         aurum) aurea VIND.
         sunt) est CARN. AMBROS., OM.VIND.
         vere) OM.PARIS.
         autem) OM.AMBROS.
         sunt2) quidem ADD.CARN.AMBROS.VIND.
     23  lithargyrea) quidem ADD. CARN. AMBROS. VIND.
     24  argentea) videntur ADD. VIND.
         aurichalcea) OM. CARN. AMBROS. PARIS.ANTE CORRECTURAM.
         vero - felle) felle vero AMBROS.
         et) OM. CARN. AMBROS. PARIS.ANTE CORRECTURAM
         tincta)videntur ADD. AMBROS.
     25  et1) OM. VIND.
     26  est2) quidem ADD. VIND.
         videtur) videntur VIND.
         imperitiam) vel propter inferitatem (??) ADD. VIND.
     27  speculantur - distantes) velut distantes longe speculantur
                 CARN. AMBROS., velut distantes a longe speculan-
                 tur PARIS. , velut longe distantes speculantur
                 VIND.
```

Text with superscript numbers: $sunt^2$, et^1, est^2.

V. Notes on the Anonymus Bodleianus.

The following remarks do not pretend to be an exhaustive study of
the text, I just want to adduce some parallels and a few other
facts. (VI) and (VII) mean that the source referred to is found
in section VI and VII of this paper, repectively.

Prolegomena

In general compare the introduction of Ps.-Alexander,Leon
and comm. I (VII). Furthermore there are important similarities
with the SUMMA and the GLOSSAE in LM vol. I

5 & 55   "series" is a somewhat puzzling expression. Could it be a
translation of σύνταξις ?

2o ff. The discussion of similarity has certain points of con-
tact to explanations given in connection with the treatment of
the fallacy of figura dictionis in 13th century Latin works and
connected somehow with the name of Alexander. A short extract
from one of these texts is found in (VI) 166b1o. I have not been
able to trace the origin of the Pyrrhus-Achilles example, which
is neither found in any of the volumes of CAG nor in LM.

42-44 This looks very much like the Greek proofs of a book's
genuineness. Cf. in particular Simplikios (in Cat.,CAG 8.6) who
regards ἀσάφεια (= obscuritas) a certain mark of Aristotelian
authorship. Subtilitas as a criterion is found in Boethius in
C^{a}t. PL 64:161D.

75-77 Similar descriptions of the utility of sophistics are
met with in most Greek commentaries and scholia. Cf. the proleg-
omena in (VII).

164a2o^1

4-8 Cf. LM.1.193, comm.I prolegomena (VII) lines 4ff. *
9f. Same etymology in LM. 1.194, except that there one finds the
quite meaningless "e" instead of "en" which at least has the ad-
vantage of being a Greek word.
1of. A locus communis of the Greek commentaries and scholia. See
(VII) 164a2o and (VI) 165a2-3 where the statement is ascribed to
Alexander.

164a2o^2

6-7 Same etymology LM 1.193 and 1.499.
13f. Must mean "they propose to read 'et' in the sense of 'id est'.
But the expression is rather clumsy. There are Latin manuscripts
which have 'id est' and 'pro id est' as interlinear notes, see
(VI) 164a2o. The gloss is of Greek origin, as can be seen from
(VII) 164a2o.
_____
* & Arist.SE 165b8-11

164a22

The whole of this section is ultimately due to Greek inspiration.
Cf. Ps.-Al. p.7 and the scholia in (VII) 164a22. A very similar
section is found in LM 1.193. The naturalis ordo appears in comm.
I on 164a22 (VII) as φυσικὴ τάξις καὶ ἀκολουθία. It is also met
with in later Latin literature : (VI) 164a21-22.

164a23

In general cf. the Gk. scholia 164a23 (VII). As regards the
Alexander-fragment we may add Leon α on 164a2o (VII) and Ps.-Alex.
8.12-14 (already adduced by Minio-Paluello in NOTE IX 23o). The
distinction peccans in materia - peccans in forma, which was to
become important both in Greek and Latin literature on the falla-
cies, is first met with in Alex.Top. 2o (CAG 2.2)

164a24

6 Scilicet in rebus: the gloss is found in Latin manuscripts,
see (VI) 164a24, but also in Gk. ones: (VII) 164a24.
8f. Similar (VII) 164a24.
12-14 The same in (VII) 164a23 & 164a25.

164a26

3-9 The Greek origin of this explanation is beyond dispute. For
comparison see Ps.-Alex. 8-9, Leon δ on 164a27 (VII) and the Gk.
scholia 164a27 (VII). Who invented the infelicitous note I cannot
tell. The sources cited by Ps.-Al. do not quite convince. If it
was found in the commentary of Alexandros of Aphrodisias, it is
of considerable age. The best explanation I know of, is Poste's
(p. 97 of his 1866 ed. of the Sophistici Elenchi): "This seems
an allusion to the choral exhibitions at Athens. Each tribe,
through its choragus, furnished a chorus, and was emulous for its
reputation, which depended on....the size and strength of the

choristers, as well as their vocal powers...Xen.Mem.3.3." It has
much in common with the Greek interpretations,but it has the
immense advantage of not making the ancients inflate animals.
12f. In LM 1.1o1 de Rijk cites an instance of the derivation from
tribuo. One might add Albertus Magnus I.I.I and Aegidius Romanus
(Expositio super libros Elench.Aristotelis,Venetiis 15oo, f.5rA).

164a27-28

4 Cf. (VII) 164b2o.

5 Cf. (VII) Leon δ on 164a27, lines 2 and 1o.

164b21

4 Cf. (VI) 164b21.

6 Cf. (VII) 164b22.

11f. Cf. (VII) 164b23. On the stick in the water: Lucretius 4.435
ff.,Cicero Acad. 2.7.19 & 2.25.79 (cf.Tertull.de An.17),Sextus Em-
piricus adv.Math.7.242 = Stoic.Vet.Fragm.(v.Arnim) 2.25.

164b24

"Aurichalcea" is an intrusive element. It is remarkable to find it
quoted in so early a text. It is not in the Chartres- or in the
Ambrosianus- texts of Arist.SE (see IV). But the Vindob. has it,
and so has the Paris.post correcturam.(I am not quite sure who
corrected: scribe or owner). The C commentary (round 13oo)also knew
the reading: (VI) 164b24. I have retained the spelling 'auri-'
though it is wrong, because the Mediaeval writers obviously connect-
ed the word with aurum. The possibility of confusing gold with
brass is also employed in an ancient moral problem exposed in Cic.
Rep. 3.19.29 and Cic. Off. 3.23.92.

164b25

Cf. (VII) 164b26. The 'indisciplinati' of line 11 are ἀνεπιστήμο-
νες in Greek.

VI. Latin scholia

Concerning abbreviations v. section IX. Orthography normalized.

164a2o

PARISINUS   et) pro id est

VINDOBON.   et) id est

164a21-22

ALBERTUS MAGNUS I.I.II (Borgnet 527B) : Dicemus in hoc libro
incipientes ab his quae prima sunt secundum naturam eorum et
ordinem naturalem eorum quae sunt dicenda

164a24

PARISINUS   in aliis) scilicet in rebus

VINDOBON.   aliis) rebus ...

164b21

VINDOBON. horum haec) id est quae sunt de numero rerum inanimatarum

164b24

C 4 : cum enim aurichalcea vel fellentica apparent aurea huic
apparentiae non subiacet existentia auri

165a2-3

VINDOBON.   Alexander. Elenchus non est syllogismus contradictionis
eo quod concludat contradictoriam alicuius propositionis, sic
enim omnis syllogismus esset elenchus, nec eo quod concludat con-
clusionem negativam alicuius contradictoriam, quia sic omnis syl-
logismus negativus esset elenchus, sed eo quod concludat contra-
dictoriam conclusionis actualiter conclusae aut actualiter con-
cessae.

VINDOBON.   Alexander. Elenchus formaliter est elenchus per re-
spectum ad propositionem actualiter concessam vel conclusam.

<u>166b10</u>

SF 76 : Dicendum secundum Commentatorem quod figura proprie sig-
nificat dispositionem partium exteriorum corporis.

<center>VII. Greek scholia</center>

<center>Abbreviations:v.IX</center>

<u>PROLEGOMENA</u>   Orthography as the MSS.

248,255,72o4 (comm.I)

1   +προλεγόμενα τῶν σοφιστικῶν ἐλέγχων :-

2   τριττόν ἐστι τὸ εἶδος τῶν κατηγορικῶν συλλογισμῶν. ἀποδεικτικόν,

3   διαλεκτικὸν καὶ σοφιστικόν. διαλαβὼν οὖν ἀριστοτέλης περὶ τοῦ

4   ἀποδεικτικοῦ συλλογισμοῦ καὶ τοῦ διαλεκτικοῦ, νῦν ἥκει διδάξων

5   ἡμᾶς καὶ περὶ τοῦ σοφιστικοῦ, οὐχ ἵν' ἡμεῖς τούτω χρώμεθα, ὥσ-

6   περ καὶ τῶ ἀποδεικτικῶ καὶ διαλεκτικῶ συλλογισμῶ. οἱ μὲν γὰρ ἐ-

7   πιστήμης ἔργα, τὰ δὲ σοφίσματα καὶ οἱ σοφιστικοὶ ἔλεγχοι, ἐπι-

8   στήμης μὲν ἔργον οὐδέν. παιζόντων δὲ μᾶλλον ἢ σπουδαζόντων τὸ

9   τοιοῦτον ἔργον ἐστί. καὶ ἐνοχλήσεις τινὲς καὶ παρεμποδισμοὶ τῶν

10 ἐπιστημῶν. καθὼς καὶ αὐτὸς ἐν τῶ περὶ ἑρμηνείας, σοφιστικὰς ἐν-

11 οχλήσεις ὠνόμασεν. εἰπὼν καὶ ὅσα ἄλλα διοριζόμεθα πρὸς τὰς σο-

12 φιστικὰς ἐνοχλήσεις. ἀλλ' ἢ πάντως τοῦτο ποιεῖ, διδάξων ἡμᾶς

13 τίνες οἱ τρόποι οἷς οἱ σοφισταὶ χρώμενοι, πειρῶνται τοὺς πολλοὺς

14 ἐλέγχειν. καὶ τοὺς ἀμαθεῖς τῆς συλλογιστικῆς μεθόδου. ἐπειδὴ γὰρ

15 ἀεὶ ταῖς ἀρεταῖς αἱ κακίαι παραπεπήγασι, καὶ ταῖς τέχναις αἱ ἀ-

16 τεχνίαι, οἷον τῆ ἀνδρεία ἀρετῆ οὔση παραπέπηγεν ὥσπερ τις κακία

17 ἡ θρασύτης, οὕτω καὶ τῶ ἀποδεικτικῶ καὶ διαλεκτικῶ συλλογισμῶ.

18 οἱ ἐπιστήμης ἔργα εἰσίν, ὥσπερ τις κακοτεχνία ὁ σοφιστικὸς συλ-

19 λογισμὸς παραπέπηγε. διὰ γοῦν τοῦτο διδάξει καὶ περὶ τοῦ σοφι-

20 στικοῦ οὐχ ἵν' ἡμεῖς, ὡς εἴρηται τούτω χρώμεθα. ἀλλ' ἵνα μὴ κα-

21 τασοφιζώμεθα ὑπὸ τῶν σοφιστῶν τῶν πειρώντων ἐλέγχειν ἡμᾶς. καὶ

22 ἁπλῶς ὥσπερ ὁ ἰατρὸς οὐ μόνον διδάσκει τὰ πρὸς ὑγίειαν συντεί-

23 νοντα φάρμακα, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ δηλητήρια. οὐχ ἵνα τούτοις τις χρή-

24 σαιτο. ἀλλ' ἵν' ὡς βλαβερὰ καὶ θανάσιμα ταῦτα φεύγοι. τὸν αὐτὸν

25 τρόπον καὶ ὁ ἀριστοτέλης οὐ μόνον περὶ τῶν κατὰ ἀλήθειαν διδά-

26 σκει συλλογισμῶν καί εἰς ἐπιστήμην συντεινόντων, ἀλλ᾽ ἐπεί
27 ἐστί καί τι ἄλλο εἶδος συλλογισμοῦ, τό σοφιστικόν καί ἐρι-
28 στικόν. ὅ καί σοφιστικόν καλεῖ ἔλεγχον, ἔστι δέ τοῦτο πρός
29 μέν ἐπιστήμην οὐδαμῶς συντελοῦν. παρενόχλημα δέ τι μᾶλλον
30 ὄν τῶ τε ἀποδεικτικῶ συλλογισμῶ καί τῶ διαλεκτικῶ. βούλεται
31 νῦν καί περί τούτου διδάξαι. καί ἐπεί διττῶς ὁ ἔλεγχος γί-
32 νεται. ἤ γάρ ἡμεῖς ἑτέρους ἐλέγχομεν ἤ παρά ἄλλων ἐλεγχόμεθα,
33 διδάξει ἐνταῦθα ὡς εἴρηται, οὐχί πῶς ἄν ἡμεῖς ἑτέρους ἐλέγχοι-
34 μεν. ἀλλά πῶς οὐκ ἄν ὑπό τῶν σοφιστῶν ἐλεγχοίμεθα. εἰ γάρ
35 γινώσκοιμεν τούς τρόπους καθ᾽οὕς οἱ σοφισταί συνιστῶντες
36 προβάλλονται τά σοφίσματα, ἐλεγχθησόμεθα μέν παρ᾽ αὐτῶν,
37 οὐδαμοῦ. ἐλέγξομεν δέ μᾶλλον αὐτούς, λύοντες τά προβαλλόμενα
38 σοφίσματα παρ᾽ αὐτῶν. ὡς καί τόν τρόπον εἰδότες τόν τῆς συν-
39 θέσεως. ὡς γάρ ἐν ἄλλοις αὐτός εἴρηκεν, ὁ τόν τρόπον εἰδώς
40 τοῦ δεσμοῦ, ἐκεῖνος λύσει τό συνδεθέν. ὁμοίως οὖν καί ὁ τόν
41 τρόπον εἰδώς τῆς συνθέσεως τοῦ σοφίσματος. ἐκεῖνος λύσει τό
42 προβαλλόμενον. ἰστέον δέ ὅτι ὁ σοφιστικός ἔλεγχος. ἤ κατά
43 τήν ὕλην ἡμάρτηται, ἤγουν κατά τάς προτάσεις, ἤ κατά τό εἶ-
44 δος, ἤτοι κατά τό σχῆμα τό συλλογιστικόν: εἰ μέν οὖν κατά
45 τήν ὕλην μόνην ἡμάρτηται, ῥηθήσεται ἔλεγχος σοφιστικός. εἰ
46 δέ κατά τό εἶδος ἤ καί κατά ἀμφότερα, τότε σοφιστικός μέν
47 ἔλεγχος οὐ ῥηθήσεται. μετά προσθήκης δέ φαινόμενος ἔλεγχος.
48 ὥσπερ γάρ τόν νεκρόν ἄνθρωπον ἀπολύτως μέν ἄνθρωπον οὐκ ἄν
49 εἴποι τις, ἀλλά μετά προσθήκης νεκρόν ἄνθρωπον, οὕτως καί
50 τόν παρά τό εἶδος ἡμαρτημένον ἔλεγχον, οὐκ ἄν ἁπλῶς εἴποι
51 τις σοφιστικόν ἔλεγχον. ἀλλά φαινόμενον ἔλεγχον. διά τοῦτο
52 καί αὐτός ἀμφοτέρους τούς ἐλέγχους αἰνιττόμενος οὕτως εἴρηκε.
53 περί δέ τῶν σοφιστικῶν ἐλέγχων. καί τῶν φαινομένων μέν ἐλέγχ-
54 ων ὄντων δέ παραλογισμῶν. διά μέν τοῦ εἰπεῖν τῶν σοφιστικῶν
55 ἐλέγχων, αἰνιξάμενος τούς ἔχοντας ἐρρωμένον τό σχῆμα τό συλ-
56 λογιστικόν, ἡμαρτημένους δέ παρά τάς προτάσεις, διά δέ τοῦ
57 εἰπεῖν. καί τῶν φαινομένων ἐλέγχων, τούς παρά τό εἶδος ἡμαρ-

58   τημένους οἷος ὁ τοῦ καινέως ἐν δευτέρω σχήματι ἐκ δύο κατα-

59   φατικῶν συλλογιζόμενος ὅτι τὸ πῦρ ἐν πολλαπλασίω ἀναλογία

60   γεννᾶται καὶ αὔξεται.

61   ἢ καὶ ἄλλως. ἐπειδὴ καὶ ὁ ἀποδεικτικὸς καὶ ὁ διαλεκτικὸς

62   χρῶνται ἐλέγχοις. οἳ καὶ κατὰ ἀλήθειαν λέγοιντ᾽ ἂν ἔλεγχοι.

63   χρᾶται δὲ ἐλέγχω καὶ ὁ σοφιστής. ὃς οὐκ ἔστι κατὰ ἀλήθειαν

64   ἔλεγχος. ἀλλὰ φαινόμενος ἔλεγχος, διὰ τοῦτο εἰπὼν περὶ δὲ

65   τῶν σοφιστικῶν ἐλέγχων, προσέθηκε τὸ, καὶ τῶν φαινομένων

66   μὲν ἐλέγχων. ὄντων δὲ παραλογισμῶν. ἐφερμηνεύων τὸν σοφι-

67   στικὸν ἔλεγχον, ὅτι οὐ κυρίως ἐστὶν ἔλεγχος: ἀλλὰ φαινόμε-

68   νος ἔλεγχος. καὶ διαστέλλων αὐτὸν, ἀπὸ τῶν ἐλέγχων οἷς

69   χρῶνται ὅ τε ἀποδεικτικὸς καὶ ὁ διαλεκτικός :-

   (I omit the app.crit. which is unnecessary for the purpose
   of this paper. So also in the following scholia.)

Prolegomena cont.

24,222,1o24   φησὶν ὁ ἀλέξανδρος ὅτι χρησιμεύει τὸ παρὸν βιβλίον
εἰς φιλοσοφίαν διδάσκον ἡμᾶς πῶς ἂν ἐλέγχειν τοὺς σοφιζομένους
δυναίμεθα etc.

164a2o

248,255 (comm.I): ἐν μὲν τῶ εἰπεῖν περὶ δὲ τῶν σοφιστικῶν
ἐλέγχων, ἐδήλωσεν τοὺς φαινομένους ἐλέγχους. φαινόμενος δὲ
ἐστιν ἔλεγχος, ὁ τὸ σχῆμα μὲν ὑγιὲς ἔχων. σφαλλόμενος δὲ εἰς
τὸν τοῦ ἐλέγχου ὁρισμόν. ἐν τῶ εἰπεῖν δὲ καὶ τῶν φαινομένων
ἐλέγχων, ὄντων δὲ παραλογισμῶν, ἐδήλωσεν οὐ τοὺς φαινομένους
ἐλέγχους. ἀλλὰ τοὺς φαινομένους σοφιστικοὺς ἐλέγχους. εἰσὶ δὲ
φαινόμενοι σοφιστικοὶ ἔλεγχοι οἱ σφαλλόμενοι καὶ κατὰ τὸν ὅρον
τοῦ συλλογισμοῦ. ἀλλὰ δὴ καὶ τοῦ ἐλέγχου :-

241,1o24   ἐλέγχων) ἐκ παραλλήλου
24,192 καὶ) ἤτοι (quod 222 in textum recepit, cf. inferius)
222,24 καὶ (ἤτοι 222) τῶν φαινομένων) ἐκ παραλλήλου κεῖται

Leon α : περὶ δὲ τῶν σοφιστικῶν ἐλέγχων :-

1   ὁ σοφιστικὸς ἔλεγχος εἰ μὲν ἡμάρτηται περὶ τὴν ὕλην ἤγουν

2   τὰς προτάσεις, καὶ ἢ ἀμφοτέρας ἔχει ψευδεῖς ἢ τὴν μίαν. ἔχει

3   δὲ τὸ εἶδος τοῦ σχήματος ἐρρωμένον, λέγεται καὶ ἐριστικὸς

4   συλλογισμός. καὶ σοφιστικὸς καὶ ἔλεγχος. οἷον ὁ χιτὼν ἀνδρεῖ-

5   ος πᾶς ἀνδρεῖος, ἀνδρίαν ἔχει. ὁ χιτὼν ἄρα ἀνδρίαν ἔχει. ἀλλὰ

6   μὴν ἄψυχον ἐστιν ὁ χιτών. ἡ δὲ ἀνδρία ἐπὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων λέγε-

7   ται οὐκ ἐπὶ τῶν ἀψύχων ἢ τῶν ἀλόγων ζῴων. ἔστι δὲ τὸ σχῆμα

8   τρίτος τρόπος τοῦ πρώτου σχήματος. καὶ ἔστιν ἡ ἐλάττων πρό-

9   τασις ψευδής. ὅτι ὁ χιτὼν ἀνδρεῖος. οἰκειότερον γὰρ τὸν χι-

1ο τῶνα εἰπεῖν ἰσχυρόν, οὐ μὴν ἀνδρεῖον. εἰ δὲ ὁ σοφιστικὸς ἔ-

11 λεγχος περὶ μὲν τὴν ὕλην οὐχ᾽ἡμάρτηται. ἀλλ᾽ ἄμφω τὰς προ-

12 τάσεις ἔχει ἀληθεῖς. τὸ δὲ εἶδος τοῦ σχήματος οὐκ ἔχει ὑγι-

13 ές, λέγεται φαινόμενος συλλογισμός. καὶ φαινόμενος ἔλεγχος.

14 ὁ γὰρ κυρίως ἔλεγχος συλλογισμός ἐστιν· ὁ τοιοῦτος δὲ ὡς μὴ

15 ἔχων τὸ εἶδος τοῦ σχήματος ὑγιές, φαίνεται μὲν συλλογίζεσθαι

16 καὶ ἐλέγχειν τῇ δὲ ἀληθείᾳ, οὐδὲν τούτων ποιεῖ. οἷον εἴ τις

17 λάβη προτάσεις ἀληθεῖς καὶ συλλογίσεται ἐν δευτέρῳ σχήματι

18 ἐκ δύο καταφατικῶν οἷον τὸ ζῷον παντὶ ἀνθρώπῳ. τὸ ζῷον παντὶ

19 ἵππῳ. ὁ ἄνθρωπος παντὶ ἵππῳ. καὶ πάλιν ἐκ δύο μερικῶν ἐν δευ-

2ο τέρῳ σχήματι. οἷον τὰ δύο διπλάσιον. τὰ δύο οὐ διπλάσιον. τὸ

21 διπλάσιον ἄρα οὐ διπλάσιον. καὶ ταῦτα μὲν εἴπομεν, χωρίζοντες

22 τίς ἐστιν ὁ σοφιστικὸς ἔλεγχος. καὶ τίς ὁ φαινόμενος ἔλεγχος·

23 προϊὸν δὲ τελεώτερον μαθήση ὡς πάντα τὰ σοφίσματα, φαινόμενοι

24 συλλογισμοὶ καὶ φαινόμενοι ἔλεγχοι φαίνονται. δοκοῦσι μὲν

25 γὰρ συλλογίζεσθαι καὶ ἐλέγχειν οὐδὲν δὲ τούτων ποιοῦσιν :-

164a22

2ο3,248,255,525,1917,2171 (comm.I) κατὰ φύσιν) κατὰ φυσικὴν τάξιν
καὶ ἀκολουθίαν ἀπὸ τῶν πρώτων ἤτοι τῶν ἀρχῶν τῶν οἰκείων τοῖς σο-
φιστικοῖς συλλογισμοῖς. προσεχεῖς δὲ καὶ οἰκείας ἀρχὰς λέγει τοὺς
δεκατρεῖς τρόπους, οἷς ὡς τισιν ἀρχαῖς καὶ τόποις κοινοῖς οἱ σο-
φισταὶ χρώμενοι ἐπάγουσι τὰ σοφίσματα :-

(Auctorem 255 secutus singula scholia coniunxi. In duo sch. divi-
sit 2o3: I τάξιν II ἤτοι-τρόπους.In tria 248:Ιχατᾶ-ἀχολουθίαν
II ἀπὸ τῶν III πρώτων-σοφίσματα. Libri alius alia omiserunt.)

116: κατὰ φύσιν ἀπὸ τῶν πρώτων) φύσει πρῶτον λέγει. ἢ τὰ κοινά.
κοινὰ δὲ ἐν τούτοις ὁ συλλογισμὸς οὗ δ' γένη προϊὸν ἐρεῖ εἶναι. ἢ
τὰς ἀρχὰς ἑκάστου τῶν σοφισμάτων καὶ τὰ αἴτια ἐξ ὧν ἔχουσι τὴν
παρείσδυσιν τῆς γενέσεως τὰ σοφίσματα. ὥσπερ γὰρ φύσει πρῶτον καὶ
ἀρχαὶ τῆς γεωμετρίας. σημεῖα καὶ γραμμαὶ καὶ κύκλοι οὕτω καὶ τῆς
σοφιστικῆς ἥ τε διαίρεσις ἣν λέγει καὶ τὸ δεῖξαι ὅτι ἔστι τι τοι-
οῦτον εἶδος λόγου καὶ ὅτι προαιροῦνται τινὲς αὐτὸ μετιέναι καὶ
τίνα ἐστὶ δι᾽ ἃ μετίασι τοὺς τοιούτους λόγους. ὅτι διὰ πλοῦτον
καὶ χρηματισμὸν :- ὁ συλλογισμὸς γένος ἐστὶ τοῦ ἀποδεικτικοῦ καὶ
διαλεκτικοῦ καὶ σοφιστικοῦ. τὰ δὲ γένη φύσει πρῶτα τῶν εἰδῶν :-

        (Cf. CAG 2.3.XIX & Ps.-Al. p.7)

 164a23

24,222: ὅτι μὲν οὖν) προθέμενος εἰπεῖν περὶ τῶν σοφιστικῶν ἐλέγ-
χων, διαλαμβάνει πρῶτον περὶ τῆς διαιρέσεως αὐτῶν λέγων τῶν σο-
φιστικῶν ἐλέγχων οἱ μὲν εἰσὶ συλλογισμοὶ ἐκ φαινομένων ἐνδόξων,
οἱ δὲ φαινόμενοι συλλογισμοὶ οὐκ ὄντες. εἶτα πιστοῦται αὐτὸ
τοῦτο δι᾽ ἐπαγωγῆς. ὥσπερ γὰρ καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἄλλων τῶν τῇ αἰσθήσει
ὑποπιπτόντων, διὰ τινος ὁμοιότητος γίνεται, καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν λόγων
τουτέστι τῶν συλλογισμῶν, ὡσαύτως ἔχει. εἶτα ἀπαριθμεῖται αὐτά :

248,255,72o4 (comm.I): ὅτι μὲν οὖν τῶν συλλογισμῶν. οἱ μὲν κατὰ
ἀλήθειαν εἰσὶ συλλογισμοί. οἷος ὁ ἀποδεικτικὸς καὶ ὁ διαλεκτικός.
οἱ δὲ κατὰ ἀλήθειαν μὲν οὐκ εἰσὶ δοκοῦσι δὲ καὶ φαίνονται εἶναι.
οἷος ἐστὶν ὁ σοφιστικός. εἴτε παρὰ τὸ εἶδος. εἴτε παρὰ τὴν ὕλην
ἡμάρτηται, δῆλον :-

2o3,1845: οἱ δ᾽ οὐκ ὄντες) οἱ σοφιστικοὶ οἵ,τε παρὰ τὸ εἶδος, οἵ
τε παρὰ τὴν ὕλην ἡμαρτημένοι, τῇ ἐπαγωγῇ δείκνυσιν ὅτι τῶν συλ-
λογισμῶν οἱ μὲν εἰσὶν ἀληθῶς συλλογισμοί, οἱ δ᾽ οὐκ ὄντες δοκοῦ-
σι :-

164a24

248,255,1843: ἄλλων) πραγμάτων

248,255,525,1917,2171,72ο4 (comm.I) τοῦτο) τό, τὰ κατὰ ἀλήθειαν
μὴ ὄντα τοιαῦτα, δοκεῖν εἶναι τοιαῦτα. διά τινα βραχεῖαν ὁμοιό-
τητα :-

164a25

248,255,72ο4 (comm.I) λόγων) ἤτοι καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν συλλογισμῶν ὡσαύ-
τως ἔχει. καὶ οἱ μὲν εἰσὶ τῇ ἀληθείᾳ συλλογισμοί. οἷον ὁ ἀπο-
δεικτικὸς καὶ ὁ διαλεκτικός. οἱ δὲ εἰσὶ φαινόμενοι μέν, μὴ ὄντες
δέ. οἷοι εἰσὶν οἱ σοφιστικοί. εἰ μὲν παρὰ τὴν ὕλην ἡμάρτηνται,
λέγονται συλλογισμοί. εἰ δὲ παρὰ τὸ σχῆμα,παραλογισμοί τὸ ὅλον
καὶ οὐ συλλογισμοί :

164a27

116: φυλετικῶς φυσήσαντες) τὸ παλαιὸν ἑορτῆς τελουμένης τὰ πρὸς
θυσίαν ἐπιχορηγούμενα πρόβατα καὶ πρὸς δαπάνην τῶν χορευόντων
ἐφύσσων ἵνα δοκῶσι πίονα ἐπὶ τῆς ἀγορᾶς πεμπόμενα :-

Leon δ : φυλετικῶς φυσήσαντες καὶ ἐπισκευάσαντες ἑαυτοὺς ἤγουν
2   ἐξ ἐπιτεχνήσεως τινός. φοροῦσι γὰρ ἱμάτια πολλά. καὶ οὕτως
3   δοκοῦσιν εὐτραφεῖς. εἴληπται δὲ τὸ φυλετικῶς φυσήσαντες ἐκ
4   τῶν ἐν ταῖς ἑορταῖς γενομένων. δέκα γὰρ φυλαὶ ἤγουν γειτονίαι
5   παρὰ ἀθηναίοις ἐτύγχανον: ἑκάστη δὲ φυλὴ ἑορτῆς γινομένης.
6   προσῆγεν ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ, πρόβατα εἰς θυσίαν. ἵνα δὲ διαβιβαζό-
7   μενα διὰ τῆς πανηγύρεως τὰ πρόβατα δοκῶσιν εὐτραφῆ καὶ πί-
8   ονα, ἐφύσσων ταῦτα καὶ ἐπεσκεύαζον ὥστε δοκεῖν πίονα εἶναι
9   μὴ ὄντα τοιαῦτα. φυλετικῶς ἤγουν κατὰ φυλάς. καὶ σκευάσαι
1ο   μὲν ἐστὶ τὸ εὐτρεπίσαι ἐπισκευάσαι δὲ τὸ ἐξ ἐπιτεχνήσεως τι-
11   νὸς παρασκευάσαι τι. καὶ οἱ μέν, εἰσὶ καλοὶ καὶ εὐειδεῖς κυ-
12   ρίως. διὰ τὸ προσὸν αὐτοῖς φυσικῶς κάλλος. οἱ δέ, δυσειδεῖς
13   ὄντες φαίνονται εὐειδεῖς κομμώσαντες ἑαυτοὺς ἐν κόμμι. καὶ
14   στίμμι. καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἀψύχων ὡσαύτως ἔχει. καὶ γὰρ τὰ μέν, εἰ-
15   σὶν ἄργυρος ἀληθῶς. τὰ δέ, χρυσός. τὰ δὲ οὔ, οἷον τὰ λιθαργύ-

16 ρινα καὶ κασσιτέρινα δοκοῦσι τῇ αἰσθήσει τοιαῦτα. ἐπιβάπτουσι

17 δὲ πολλάκις καὶ διὰ τῆς ξανθῆς χολῆς τινά. ἃ καὶ χολοβάφινα

18 λέγεται. τὰ δὲ τοιαῦτα χολοβάφινα μὴ ὄντα χρυσᾶ φαίνεται χρυ-

19 σᾶ. τὸν αὐτὸν δὲ τρόπον ἔχει καὶ συλλογισμὸς καὶ ἔλεγχος: ὁ

20 μὲν ἐστὶν ἀληθῶς συλλογισμός, ὡς ⟨ὁ⟩ ἀποδεικτικὸς καὶ διαλεκ-

21 τικός. καὶ ὁ μὲν, ἐστὶν ἀληθὴς ἔλεγχος. ἤγουν ἡ εἰς ἀδύνατον

22 ἀπαγωγή. ὁ δὲ. ὁ παρὰ τοῖς σοφισταῖς συλλογισμὸς καὶ ἔλεγχος

23 οὐκ ἔστι συλλογισμὸς καὶ ἔλεγχος ἀληθῶς: φαίνεται δὲ καὶ δο-

24 κεῖ τοιοῦτος, διὰ τὴν ἀπειρίαν καὶ ἀμαθίαν τῆς συλλογιστικῆς

25 μεθόδου τῶν ἀκουόντων :-

                           (4 γινομένων malim)

164b2o

248,255,525: κάλλος) φυσικόν

164b22

248,255,525,1917,2171,72o4 (comm.I) ἔστι μὲν οὔ) κατὰ ἀλήθειαν

164b23

24,222: φαίνεται δὲ κατὰ τὴν αἴσθησιν) ἀπατῶσι δὲ τὴν ἐσφαλμένην
κρίσιν τῆς αἰσθήσεως

164b26

116,1845 (comm.III): φαίνεται δὲ διὰ τὴν ἀπειρίαν) φαίνονται δὲ
οἱ σοφισταὶ ἐλέγχειν. καὶ ταῦτα ἐλέγχοντες διὰ τὴν ἀπειρίαν τῆς
συλλογιστικῆς μεθόδου ἣν ἔχουσι καὶ οἱ ἀκροαταὶ καὶ οἱ ἀποκρινό-
μενοι. ὡς γὰρ οἱ πόρρωθεν ἱστάμενοι πλανῶνται περὶ τὰ ὁρώμενα.
οὕτω καὶ οἱ ἄπειροι καὶ ἀνεπιστήμονες ὥσπερ ἀπέχοντες καὶ πόρρω-
θεν ἱστάμενοι τῆς συλλογιστικῆς μεθόδου οὐ δύνανται κρίνειν τόν
τε κυρίως ἔλεγχον καὶ τὸν μὴ :-

164b28

24,222,2173   ὁ μὲν γὰρ συλλογισμὸς) ὁ μὲν γὰρ συλλογισμὸς ἐστὶ   1
λόγος ἐκ προτάσεων συγκείμενος καὶ συνάγων ἕτερόν τι τῶν κει-   2
μένων διὰ τῶν προτάσεων τῶν κειμένων. ὁ δὲ ἔλεγχος συλλογισ-   3
μὸς μετὰ ἀντιφάσεως τοῦ συμπεράσματος. ὡς τὸ ζῶον παντὶ ἀνθρώ-   4

5   πω, τὸ ζῷον οὐδενὶ λίθῳ. ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἄρα οὐδενὶ λίθῳ. εἰ δ'

6   ἐνίσταταί τις πρὸς τὸ οὐδενί, ἔστω τὸ ἀντιφατικῶς ἀντικείμενον

7   τὸ τινί. καὶ συνάγεται ἐκ τῆς ὑποθέσεως, τὸ ζῷον τινὶ λίθῳ.

8   ὅπερ ἄτοπον καὶ οὕτως μὲν συλλογισμὸς καὶ ἔλεγχος γέγονε.

9   προσειληφὼς τὸ ἀντιφατικῶς ἀντικείμενον τῷ συμπεράσματι :-

> 2 ἕτερόν τι scripsi :συμπέρασμα MSS
> 9 τῷ συμπεράσματι scripsi : καὶ (?) τὸ συμπέρασμα 24,
>   τὸ συμπέρασμα 222, συμπέρασμα 2173

VIII. The Latin Alexander.

As I am preparing an edition of the fragments of the Latin version
of the commentary on Arist.SE by Alexander, I should be very
grateful if anyone who knows of Mediaeval Latin texts which quote
Alexander or Commentator (for so he is also called) super librum
Elenchorum would be so kind as to inform me. I am at present
aware of the following sources:

1.   The texts edited by de Rijk in Logica Modernorum I-II.

2.   The Anonymus Bodleianus.

3.   The C commentary (Cordoba Cath,MS 52).

4.   The SF commentary (Salamanca UB 1839 & Laur.St.Crucis 12-3).

5.   Anonymi de arte opponendi et respondendi (Paris.Lat.16617).

6.   Petrus Hispanus : Fallaciae maiores.

7.   Ps.-Petrus Hispanus: Summulae.

8.   Iohannes Duns Scotus : Super libros Elenchorum.

9.   Sigerus de Cortraco: Sophisma "Omne verum et deum esse dif-
        ferunt"(Vat.Ottob.Lat.252o).

1o. Id. Sophismata edited in Les Philosophes Belges vol. 8.

11. The Vindobonensis scholia (Vindob.Lat. 2377).

Please address answers to : Sten Ebbesen
                Institut f. græsk & latinsk Middelalder
                       Gråbrødretorv 6
                     DK-1154 Copenhagen
                          Denmark

IX. Abbreviations.

The texts used in VI:

ALBERTUS MAGNUS = Alberti Magni...opera...ed. Iammy,Lugd.1651
         (Liber Elenchorum,Tractatus)
C 5 = Anonymi in SE commentarium (MS Cordoba Cath.52),quaestio 5.
         This commentary from round 13oo is partly identical w.
         SF. Further informations in Cahiers 3:2-3 (197o)
PARISINUS = MS Paris.Lat. 1608o, cf. section IV. The scholia are
         written by Godefroid de Fointaines.
SF = Ps.-Boethii de Dacia super librum Elenchorum. Cf. Cahiers
         3:3*,6,29-37,46-51 (197o). The text dates (probably)
         from the 127o's. The number added to SF is the number
         of the quaestio.
VINDOBON(ENSIS) = MS Vindob.Lat.2377,cf. section IV. The MS has
         plenty of scholia.

The texts used in VII:

Leon δ = Scholium N^o δ in Leon Magentinos' commentary on the SE
      as found in MS Vat.Gr.244 which is the only complete MS
      of any relevance to the editor: the remaining MSS are
      descendants of the Vat.244 which dates from ca.1275. The
      date of Leon is a problem in its own right. Maybe ca.12oo/5o.
24 = MS Wolfenbüttel Gudianus Gr.24
116 = MS Vat.Reg.Gr.116
192 = MS Laur.Conv.Soppr. 192
2o3 = MS Marc.Gr.2o3
222 = MS Mcnac.Gr.222
241 = MS Vat.Gr. 241
248 = MS Vat.Gr. 248
255 = MS Ambros.Gr. D 82 sup.(N° 255)
525 = MS Ambros.Gr. M 71 sup.(N° 525)
1o24 = MS Vat.Gr. 1o24
1843 = MS Paris.Gr. 1843
1845 = MS Paris.Gr. 1845
1917 = MS Paris.Gr. 1917
2171 = MS Vat. Gr. 2171
2173 = MS Vat. Gr. 2173
72o4 = MS Laur. 72-4

---

*Cahiers 3:3 (197o) : correct the signature of (F) by adding
 "Sanctae Crucis" after "Firenze,B.Laur.-Med. Cod."

It is not possible to assign any certain age to the scholia found
in these Greek manuscripts. The MSS are generally from the XIII-
XV cent., but the scholia have usually older ancestors. As a hy-
pothesis I have posited three works (commentaries or extensive
extracts from commentaries) from which a part of the scholia de-
rive. I call these works "comm.I, comm.II etc.". Comm. I is very
close to Ps.-Al. Comm. I- III must belong somewhere before 13oo.
The whole question will be up for examination in my future study
on the Gk. commentators.

Other abbreviations

CAG = Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca, Berlin 1882ff

Cahiers = Cahiers de l'Institut du Moyen-Age grec et latin.
        Université de Copenhague 1969ff.

Leon = Leon Magentinos, cf. above.

Minio-Paluello NOTE = L.Minio-Paluello:Note sull'Aristotele Medie-
        vale,Rivista di filosofia neoscholastica. NOTE VI: vol.
        44:398-411,1952. NOTE IX : vol. 46:211-231, 1954

PL = Patrologia Latina (Migne)

Ps-Al(ex). = Alexandri quod fertur in Aristotelis Sophisticos
        Elenchos commentarium, ed. M.Wallies, Berl.1898 = CAG 2.3

(de Rijk)LM = L.M.de Rijk :Logica Modernorum, Assen 1962ff.