

MANLIUS BOETHIUS ON ARISTOTLE'S ANALYTICA POSTERIORA

Sten Ebbesen

Summary: I. Boethius wrote a commentary on Arist.APo

II. Greek and Latin interpretations of Arist.SE c.4 165b30-34

I

The manuscript CLM 14246 which was described by Grabmann (1) contains inter alia a commentary on the Sophistici Elenchi of Aristotle. The author is unknown, apparently he belongs in the first half of the 13th century. The MS is from the latter part of the same cent. On f.8rA the text deals with Arist.SE c.4 165b30-34 which in Latin translation runs:

Sunt autem secundum aequivocationem huiusmodi orationes, ut quoniam discunt scientes, nam secundum os* discunt grammatici. Discere enim aequivocum, et** intellegere eum qui utitur disciplina et accipere disciplinam. (*hos a common variant. ** ad a common variant)

At the bottom of 8r someone who is not the text scribe, but probably also from the 13th century, added:

Quoniam discunt scientes Boethius in commento primi libri Posteriorum facit quod haec sit maior, et format sic paralogismum: 'Sapientes addiscunt* , addiscentes nesciunt, sapientes ergo nesciunt.' "Addiscere" enim, inquit Boethius, aequivocum est, in ... enim "scire" et in ... "doceri" dicitur. (*addiscant MS. The two words which I could not read appear to be the same.)

Until now Boethius was not known to have written a commentary on the Posterior Analytics (2), but there can hardly be any doubt that the quotation is genuine, for I) it is far from self-evident that this example should be found in a commentary on APo, II) it is a standard item of the Greek commentaries on Γ c.12 77b27, and it is well known that Boethius based his Organon commentaries on Gk. ones, but III) it is no standard item of the Latin comm., so 'Boethius' in the Munich MS is not likely to be an error for the name of some later Latin scholar. The general silence in our sources about 'Boethius on APo' indicates that the work was little read, and so it is no wonder that this particular feature did not find its way into the stock materials of Mediaeval commentaries on APo.

In the Greek sources the remarks about *discere/μανθάνειν* are found as a comment on APo. I.c.12 77b27: *ἐν δὲ τοῖς μαθήμασιν οὐκ ἔστιν ὁμοίως ὁ παραλογισμός, ὅτι τὸ μέσον ἐστὶ διττὸν αἰεὶ*, to show how a middle term may be double. The relevant texts are:

Philoponos in APo, CAG 13.3.154: οἷον οἱ σοφοὶ μανθάνουσιν, οἱ μανθάνοντες οὐκ ἴσασιν, οἱ σοφοὶ ἄρα οὐκ ἴσασι· τὸ γὰρ μανθάνειν ὁμώνυμον <ὄν> καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ συνιέναι καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ διδάσκεισθαι λέγεται.

Themistios in APo, CAG 5.1.26: οἷον οἱ σοφοὶ μανθάνουσιν, οἱ μανθάνοντες οὐκ ἴσασιν, οἱ σοφοὶ ἄρα οὐκ ἴσασι· τὸ γὰρ μανθάνειν καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ συνιέντος ὁμοίως καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ διδασκομένου.

Leon Magentinos (3) in APo, scholium ρξη, MS Vat.gr.244:332v καὶ τὸ μανθάνειν διττὸν ἐστὶ. λέγεται γὰρ μανθάνειν, καὶ τὸ ξυνιέναι καὶ τὸ διδάσκεισθαι

The Latin texts in which I have looked up the comments on 77b27 without finding the above example are: Grossteste in APo (MS Vindob.dominicanus 192(155):12or & the incunabulum Venice 1497) - Albertus Magnus (ed.Jammy,Lugd.1651) - Thomas Aquinas (ed. Leonina vol.1) - Aegidius Romanus (incunabulum Venice 1488) - Anonymus CLM 8002:44vA - MS Paris.lat.16080:99r (this MS contains the Organon with scholia by Godefroid des Fointaines).

In view of these facts I conclude that Boethius the Consul wrote a commentary on the Posterior Analytics which survived till c. 1300 at least, but was little known. A single fragment is preserved in CLM 14246. Future research may discover more quotations. The appearance of this new work by Boethius lends support to the suspicion which I share with many others that he commented the whole of the Organon.

II.

The Greek text of Arist. SE c.4 165b30-34 runs εἰσὶ δὲ παρὰ μὲν τῆν δμωνυμίαν οἱ τοιοῦδε τῶν λόγων, οἷον ὅτι μανθάνουσιν οἱ ἐπιστάμενοι, τὰ γὰρ ἀποστοματιζόμενα μανθάνουσιν οἱ γραμματικοί· τὸ γὰρ μανθάνειν δμῶνυμον, τὸ τε ξυλιέναι χρώμενον τῇ ἐπιστήμῃ καὶ τὸ λαμβάνειν ἐπιστήμην. The paralogism is not easy to understand from so short a description. The whole story is told by Plato from whose Euthydemus (275D) it is taken: there it is concluded A) that those who μανθάνουσι (learn) must be the ἀμαθεῖς, B) that those among the pupils who μανθάνουσι (understand) what is dictated by the teacher must be the σοφοί. -Aristotle calls those good pupils γραμματικοί which was to cause problems to later times where that would normally mean "grammarian" or "teacher".

The Greek commentators on SE generally 'translate' γραμματικοί as ἐπιστήμονες or σοφοί without always showing quite clearly whether they intend them to be the teachers or the pupils (understanding their intention requires understanding how they understand ἀποστοματίζω, whether as "to dictate" or "to declaim what one has learned by heart"). They circumscribe μανθάνειν in sense A) with διδασκασθαι or "to proceed from ignorance to knowledge", and in sense B) with νοεῖν (cf. Ps.-Alexandros CAG 2.3.24, Paraphrasis CAG 23.3.5 and the texts appended below). I believe that some of the Greek commentators thought the γραμματικοί to be teachers, and surely that one did who invented the scholium ad 165b31 which is found in MS Vat.gr.241:229v where a διδάσκουσι is written above μανθάνουσιν οἱ ἐπιστάμενοι. That is not the correct interpretation, but in fact it makes the paralogism completely intelligible: the teachers know and μανθάνουσι = διδάσκουσι, the pupils are ἀμαθεῖς and μανθάνουσι = learn. It would be interesting to know when this scholium was written for the first time. In Ancient Greek μανθάνω never means "teach", but it can have that sense in Modern Greek (τον/του ἔμαθε γράμματα "he taught him to read and write", ἔμαθε γράμματα "he learned to read and write"). The earliest evidence for "teach" seems to be Ioannes Nesteutes (dead AD 595) Migne PG 88.1924C περι τῶν μανθανόντων ἑτέρους κακίας. (4)

To a Western reader with no Greek the text must have been even harder to understand, a fact which caused much textual corruption (which in turn became a source for misunderstandings). Thus 'secundum os' (ἀποστοματιζόμενα) is 'secundum hoc' in the venerable Carnutensis 498

(Thierry of Chartres' Heptateuchon), and 'secundum hos' in many other MSS. None of the Latin sources known to me (5) pay any attention to the Boethian interpretation of the paralogue, unless someone had misread his 'doceri' as 'docere', for in some way or other most Latin commentaries and scholia conclude that the sense must be that the teachers (scientes=grammatici=doctores) teach (discunt=docent) and the discipuli learn (discunt, addiscunt). As, however, this double sense cannot be forced into the Latin word 'discere', some 13th century writers invoke the testimony of French 'apprendre' and suggest that the Greek word rendered "discere" in the text might be equivocal in a similar way. (See texts below.) The Medieval Western doctores made a brave try, but, as so often, they failed in the interpretation of the locus Aristotelicus due to their ignorance of Greek. On the other hand they discovered a real case of equivocality in their own language.

SCHOLIA ON ARIST.SE c.4 165b30-34

Vat.Gr.244:588v (Leon Magentinos κη) ...καὶ ἐνταῦθα μὲν ὁ Εὐθύδημος ἐξελάβετο τὸ μανθάνειν ἐπὶ τοῦ ξυσιέναι καὶ νοεῖν, ὃ [ιδίον ἐστὶ τῶν σοφῶν καὶ ἐπιστημόνων, ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ πρώτου σοφίσματος ἐξελάβετο τὸ μανθάνειν ἐπὶ τοῦ ἐξ ἀνεπιστημοσύνης καὶ ἀγνοίας εἰς ἐπιστήμην καὶ γνῶσιν ἔρχεσθαι. καὶ ταῦτα μὲν οὕτως, ἐπισκεπτέον δὲ καὶ τὸ κείμενον· τὸ μανθάνειν ὁμώνυμον· τοῦτο ἢ λύσις τοῦ σοφίσματος, τὸ γὰρ μανθάνειν δύο σημαίνει, τὸ τε συσιέναι καὶ νοεῖν τὰ λεγόμενα τὸν χρόνον τῆ ἐπιστήμῃ, ἢ γοῦν τὸν ἐπιστήμονα, καὶ τὸ λαμβάνειν ἐπιστήμην καὶ γνῶσιν ἐξ ἀνεπιστημοσύνης. καὶ ὁ μὲν ἐρωτῶν ἐξελάβετο τὸ μανθάνειν ἐπὶ τοῦ ἐξ ἀνεπιστημοσύνης εἰς ἐπιστήμην ἔρχεσθαι, ὁ δὲ ἐρωτώμενος ἐπὶ τοῦ μανθάνειν καὶ νοεῖν, ὅθεν καὶ τὸ σόφισμα γέγονεν:-

Vat.gr.241:229v sch.ad 165b31 μανθάνουσιν, Inter lin.: διδάσκουσι, In marg.: Πλάτωνος

Vat.gr.248:296v ad 165b32, inter lin.:μανθάνουσι) ξυσίασι, νοοῦσι. -Ibid.&Ambros.gr.D.82.sup.:249r ad 165b33 ξυσιέναι χρόνον τῆ ἐπιστήμῃ) οἷον οἱ σοφοί

Vat.gr.248:296v ad 165b34, in mg.: καὶ τὸ λαμβάνειν ἐπιστήμην) καὶ πάλιν μανθάνειν λέγεται τὸ ἐξ ἀνεπιστημοσύνης καὶ ἀγνοίας μετὰ γοῦν τὸν ἀμαθῆ εἰς γνῶσιν καὶ ἐπιστήμην

Ambros.gr.B.103.sup.: 247r, inter lin. καὶ-ἐπιστήμην) τὸ διδάσκεισθαι

Marc.gr.203:203v, inter lin.: καὶ-ἐπιστήμην) τὸ ἐξ ἀνεπιστημοσύνης εἰς ἐπιστήμην καὶ γνῶσιν προάγεισθαι

ROBERTUS ANGLICUS (Kilwardby?) super SE, lectio 5, MS Bodl. Canon. Misc. 4o3:226vA

....in prima parte dicit sic: quod sunt orationes huiusmodi secundum aequivocationem quae sequuntur, ut quoniam discunt scientes, et debet sic formari paralogismus: 'grammatici discunt, et scientes sunt grammatici, ergo scientes discunt' grammatici enim di(s)cunt secundum os, id est secundum officium oris, sunt enim sermocinales (?), et approbat huiusmodi exemplum dicens quod discere est aequivocum ad intellegere eum qui utitur disciplina et ad accipere disciplinam, et potest hoc diversimode exponi, quia quidam dicunt quod ad addiscere duo exiguntur, scilicet ut recipiantur figurae scibiles et ut fiat conversio supra receptum et iudicium de receptis, unde discere est aequivocum ad recipere figuras scibiles et ad iudicare de receptis. Sed ista expositio non est bona, sicut mihi videtur, quia conclusio debet esse duplex, scilicet 'scientes discunt', uno modo conveniens, alio modo non. Sed sic sumendo discere semper conclusio erit falsa, quia scientes nec recipiunt ab aliis figuras scibiles in quantum huiusmodi, nec iudicant de receptis quia nihil recipiunt. Et ideo dicendum quod ponit auctor hoc exemplum quia discere in graeca lingua est aequivocum similiter et in gallica, quia iste liber fuit translatus, potest enim significare doctorem vel discipulum, quia dicitur in gallico 'mon fil apren bien', et ad magistrum debemus dicere 'aprendes bien mon fil' (VEL fis). Sed in latino non est aequivocum addiscere, quia ad discipulum dicemus 'addiscas bene'. ad magistrum 'doceatis eum bene'. Ideo dicendum (dicit 4o3) quod quantum ad graecum addiscere est aequivocum ad intellegere eum qui utitur disciplina, id est doctorem, et ad intellegere eum qui accipit disciplinam, id est ad discipulum ...

SCHOLIASTA MS TOLEDO CABILDO 95-4:295v in mg.

(manus prima:) Nota quod addiscere secundum idioma literale nostrum non est aequivocum, sed solum stat pro addiscere, et non pro docere, et sic forte est apud graecos, quare hic erit aequivocum addiscere ad actum doctoris et ad actum discipuli. Unde paralogizatur sic: 'grammatici discunt, grammatici sunt scientes, ergo scientes discunt'. Patet quod discunt in maiori stat pro addiscere, in conclusione vero pro docere.

(manus secunda:) Vel sic: 'enim' pro 'quid', 'discere est' id est ...
... .. intellegere aequivocum, scilicet ad ista duo, scilicet ad eum qui utitur disciplina, id est ad docentem sive doctorem, et ad accipere disciplinam, id est ad discipulum. Unde dicitur secundum vulgare +alicuius contracte(?) + magistro 'disce mihi hunc puerum!', id est 'doce!' et de discipulo dicitur 'iste discit grammaticam' vel aliam artem etc.

AEGIDIUS ROMANUS super SE, MS Salamanca UB 1839:128vB

Dicit ergo quod secundum aequivocationem sunt orationes et paralogismi qui dicentur, quorum unus est iste 'scientes discunt' -ista est conclusio paralogismi, nam secundum hos, id est secundum scientes sive a scientibus discunt grammatici, id est addiscentes grammatici. Haec est minor. Formetur sic paralogismus: 'secundum quos discunt grammatici, illi discunt, sed secundum hos, id est secundum scientes, discunt grammatici, ergo scientes discunt'. Exponitur autem dictus textus aliter prout li grammatici non stat pro addiscentibus grammaticam, sed pro scientibus, et est sensus "scientes discunt, et bene dico quod ita est, nam secundum hos, id est secundum istos modos paralogizandi, sequitur quod grammatici, qui sunt scientes, discunt. Formetur autem sic paralogismus: 'grammatici dis-

cunt, sed grammatici sunt scientes, ergo scientes discunt', et ut habeatur conclusio manifeste falsa arguatur ulterius: 'quicumque discunt addiscunt, scientes discunt, ergo addiscunt', quod falsum est, scientes enim secundum quod huiusmodi non addiscunt, sed docent. § Demum cum dicit 'discere enim' ostendit in dicto paralogismo esse aequivocationem dicens quod discere est aequivocum ad intellegere eum qui utitur disciplina in docendo, id est ad docere, et ad disciplinam/super accipere, id est ad addiscere. /129rA Igitur scholares grammatici discunt a scientibus, quia addiscunt ab eis, et scientes discunt, non quod addiscunt, sed quod docent eos. §..... § Notandum etiam quod discere secundum idioma literale nostrum non est aequivocum, solum enim stat pro addiscere, non pro docere. Secundum tamen Romanum vulgare discere aequivocum est ad addiscere et ad docere, et forte sic est apud graecos. Roma enim cum partibus illis versus Apuliam quondam magna Graecia vocabatur. Achilles enim, qui fuit fortissimus graecorum, fuit de regno Apuliae, Italia enim antiquitus Graecia dicebatur iuxta illud poetae "Italiae tunc tellus Graecia magna fuit".

ANONYMUS super SE MS CLM 14246:8rA

Circa secundam partem sic procedit: primo ponens particulare proemium dicens quod 'omnes orationes' id est paralogismi qui sequuntur sunt secundum aequivocationem. Primus paralogismus sic formatur -et intellegatur prius fieri talis quaestio, utrum sciens discat vel non. Data parte negativa, sc. 'scientes non discunt', arguatur sic:- 'grammatici discunt, grammatici sunt scientes, ergo scientes discunt'. Hoc habito in secunda parte approbat exemplum, ubi dicit 'discere est aequivocum'. Dicit ergo quod discere est aequivocum ad intellegendum illum qui dat disciplinam, id est doctrinam, et ad intellegendum illum qui recipit disciplinam, quasi dicens 'doctor' potest dici 'discit' et iterum 'discipulus discit', sed aequivoce discere, et ita illae duae non contradicunt 'scientes discunt' et 'scientes non discunt' quia utrumque est verum in diversis sensibus. Unde notandum quod iste primus paralogismus non impedit syllogismum et illationem, sed contradictionem solum.

OCKHAM super SE , MS London Lambeth Palace 7o:27or

'Grammatici discunt, grammatici discunt, grammatici sunt scientes, ergo scientes discunt', nam hic est aequivocatio, discere enim aequivocum est ad intellegere secundum disciplinam vel scientiam iam acquisitam vel ad eum qui accipit de novo disciplinam vel scientiam.

FOOTNOTES:

- (1) M.Grabmann: *Mittelalterliches Geistesleben* 2.225-236, München 1936
- (2) cf. L.M.de Rijk in *VIVARIUM* 2:154, 1964, L.Minio-Paluello: *Opuscula-The Latin Aristotle*, Amsterdam 1972 p.334. -In the index to the Leonine edition of Thomas Aquinas in *APo* there are references to "Boethius in commento", that is an error, what is referred to is the Latin translation.
- (3) Author of unknown date. Maybe c.1200-1250. Cf. *CAHIERS* 8:31, 1972
- (4) The reference in Δημητρίου Μέγα Λεξικόν της 'Ελληνικῆς φιλώσης μανθάνω 3 to Demokritos frgm.244 D-K. is due to a misinterpretation.
- (5) Including besides the texts quoted below several annotated manuscripts with the Sophistici Elenchi in Latin.