

**UNIVERSITÉ DE COPENHAGUE**

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

**80**

**Centre for the Aristotelian Tradition**

**Saxo Institute**

**2011**

## Yet another Fragment of James of Venice's Translation of Michael of Ephesus on the *Sophistical Refutations*

*Sten Ebbesen*

In 1981 I published a large number of Latin references to and quotations of the translation of Michael of Ephesus' commentary on the *Sophistical Refutations* that James of Venice's had produced some time in the second quarter of the twelfth century. At the time, I was not quite sure the text translated was Michael's commentary, because all sources called the author *Alexander* and there was some "noise" in the material – statements attributed to Alexander which might well be of Greek origin, but could not be found in Michael's work. Since then, all doubts were dispelled when I found a 12th-century text that referred to *Efesius* instead of *Alexander*.<sup>1</sup>

Additional references to and quotations of the lost translation have kept turning up after 1981, several of them are spurious, however. In 1990 I published addenda to the 1981 collection, and in 2008 an enlarged version of the 1990 addenda. Here comes one more find, and this time it is a genuine piece of information.

The source is Anonymus Monacensis, *Commentarium in SE*, a work from about the middle of the 13th c. The context is a question raised concerning the passage in ch. 11, 172a8-9, where Aristotle says,<sup>2</sup>

Or if some one were, on the strenght of Zeno's argument, to deny that it is good to take a walk after dinner, this would not be a medical argument, for it is common.

The idea is that someone opposes the medical verdict that a walk after dinner is healthy by saying that such a walk is not even possible, for, as Zeno has shown, movement is impossible.

---

<sup>1</sup> Edition in Ebbesen 1996. The reference to the Ephesian at p. 283 (repeated in Ebbesen 2008: 199); discussion in 1996: 255-257.

<sup>2</sup> ἢ εἴ τις μὴ φαίη βέλτιον εἶναι ἀπὸ δειπνοῦ περιπατεῖν διὰ τὸν Ζήνωνος λόγον, οὐκ ἰατρικός· κοινὸς γάρ. In Boethius' Latin (*Aristoteles Latinus* VI.1: 26): Vel si quis dicat non melius esse post cenam deambulare per Zenonis rationem, non medicinalis; communis enim.

Here, then, is Anonymus Monacensis' text:<sup>3</sup>

Ad aliud solvit Alexander in commento<sup>4</sup> dicens quod si Zeno accepisset istam propositionem 'Nullus motus quo extrahuntur cibi incocti a venis est utilis, deambulatio post cenam est<sup>5</sup> huiusmodi, ergo etc.', sumpsisset proprium medium, et non commune.

And here is Michael's text:<sup>6</sup>

πάλιν ἔάν τις συλλογίζεται ὅτι οὐ συμφέρει περιπατεῖν ἀπὸ δείπνου, ὅτι κίνησις οὐκ ἔστιν, ὡς ὁ Ζήνων συλλογίζεται, οὐκ ἔστιν ἰατρικός· οὐ γὰρ ἔκ τινων ἰατρικῶν ἐστὶν ἀρχῶν ἀλλ' ἐκ κοινῶν. διὸ ἔστι καὶ τοῦτον μετενεγκεῖν εἰς ἄλλα, οἷον ὅτι οὐ συμφέρει εἰς ἀγορὰν ἢ εἰς διδασκαλεῖον φοιτᾶν· οὐ γὰρ ἔστι κίνησις. ὁ δὲ λέγων μὴ δεῖν ἀπὸ δείπνου περιπατεῖν, ἵνα μὴ ἄπεπτα τὰ βρώματα ὑπὸ τῶν φλεβῶν ἔλκηται, ἰατρικός, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν εἰς ἄλλα μετενεγκεῖν.

The Latin text paraphrases rather than quotes, but the phrase *extrahuntur cibi incocti a venis* is very close to Michael's (ἵνα μὴ) ἄπεπτα τὰ βρώματα ὑπὸ τῶν φλεβῶν ἔλκηται. Probably, James' translation had *ne incocti cibi a venis extrahantur*.

---

<sup>3</sup> Mss: A = Admont, Stiftsbibliothek 241: 55vA; M = München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, clm 14246: 28rB

<sup>4</sup> in commento M] *spat. vac. 15 fere litterarum capax reliquit A.*

<sup>5</sup> est M] et A.

<sup>6</sup> Michael Ephesius, *Comm. SE, CAG II.3: 92.28-93.3* The text in *CAG* is that of Michael's final edition of the commentary. I have compared Wallies' edition with ms Vat. gr. 269: 46r, which belongs to a different and superior branch of the tradition than the ms on which Wallies relied, but found no differences. I have also collated five mss of Michael's first edition ("Ps.-Alex.-2"), two representing branch ρ of the stemma (see Ebbesen 1981: 3.17), viz. 229 = Escorial Φ.3.10: 10v and 2019bI = Paris. gr. 2019: 226r; and three representing branch π, viz. 150 = Jerusalem, St. Sepulchri 150: 194v, 1770 = Vat. gr. 1770: 48r-v, 1843 = Paris. gr. 1843: 356v. In the first edition the section is introduced by Τὸ δὲ ἢ ὅστις μὴ φαίη βέλτιον εἶναι ἀπὸ δείπνου περιπατεῖν οὕτως ἐπήγαγεν ὡς εἰ ἔλεγεν· ἦ. Save for a few individual errors in the mss, the text is identical with that of the final edition, except that branch ρ has ἔστιν ἰατρικόν instead of ἔστιν ἰατρικός, while branch π adds ὁ συλλογισμός after ἀρχῶν and reads διδασκάλους instead of διδασκαλεῖον.

**Literature:**

- Ebbesen, S. 1981: *Commentators and Commentaries on Aristotle's Sophistici Elenchi. A Study of Post-Aristotelian Ancient and Medieval Writings on Fallacies*, 3 vols., Corpus Latinum Commentariorum in Aristotelem Graecorum VII.1-3, Brill: Leiden.
- 1990: 'New Fragments of "Alexander's" Commentaries on *Analytica Posteriora* and *Sophistici Elenchi*', *CIMAGL* 60:113-120.
  - 1996: 'Anonymi Parisiensis Compendium Sophisticorum Elenchorum. The Uppsala Version', *CIMAGL* 66: 253-312.
  - 2008: 'Fragments of "Alexander's" Commentaries on *Analytica Posteriora* and *Sophistici Elenchi*', in: *Greek-Latin Philosophical Interaction: Collected Essays of Sten Ebbesen, Volume I*, Ashgate: Aldershot, pp. 187-201.