

GNOMON

KRITISCHE ZEITSCHRIFT
FÜR DIE GESAMTE
KLASSISCHE ALTERTUMSWISSENSCHAFT

HERAUSGEGEBEN VON

MARTIN BENTZ · RUTH BIELFELDT
PETER EICH · HANS-JOACHIM GEHRKE
CHRISTOPH HORN · MARTIN HOSE
JOSEPH MARAN · KATHARINA VOLK
PAUL ZANKER

SCHRIFTFLEITUNG

MARTIN HOSE (VERANTWORTLICH) UND
OLIVER SCHELSKE

Online-Ausgabe auf
elibrary.chbeck.de



91. BAND

Sonderdruck

HEFT 1

VERLAG C.H.BECK MÜNCHEN

Aristotle's Metaphysics Lambda. Annotated Critical Edition Based upon a Systematic Investigation of Greek, Latin, Arabic and Hebrew Sources by **Stefan Alexandru**. Leiden/Boston: Brill 2014. X, 295 S. (Philosophia Antiqua. 135.) 94 €.

This volume was published in 2014 as a «slightly revised version» (p. vii), with the same title and subtitle, of a 2002 PhD thesis supervised by Michael Frede. The main title, 'Aristotle's Metaphysics Lambda', introduces the general subject – one of the most intriguing, controversial and widely discussed books in the history of thought. While A. does not argue for a general interpretation of his own, nor for a distinctive reading of the principal text, 'Aristotle's Metaphysics Lambda' dominates the core of this volume, as a reference point around which various materials are collected: the editorial policy tends to be comprehensive and all-inclusive. Given this complexity, one can understand that diverse factors may have played a role in delaying the final draft. A significant period of time elapsed even after the author's preface written in 2011, suggesting that no further changes were made thereafter, and that subsequent literature, which developed significantly in these latest years, could not have been taken into account. Discussion of work published in 2011, 2012 and 2013 is virtually absent, in spite of rare inclusions in the final bibliography. The PhD thesis, in its revised form, actually constitutes the first half of the book: it is prefaced, as was the thesis, by the author's main contribution to the Greek tradition, a transcription of Georgios Scholarios' (15th c.) extracts from *Lambda* as found in the **Vk** manuscript of the *Metaphysics*, the Vat. gr. 115. This series of extracts had been described in catalogues as a mere summary, yet the extracts are so close to the original and extensive that they can be counted among relevant witnesses of the **β** family, which is poorly represented in the manuscript tradition, as is often the case with one of two stemmatic branches. The author's introduction is mainly devoted to the affiliation of textual witnesses and clearly shows a stemmatic approach; the Greek text of *Metaphysics Lambda* with apparatus follows and then a series of critical notes. Throughout, the author argues in favour of the bifid stemma codicum published in 1979 by Dieter Harlfinger ('Zur Überlieferungsgeschichte der Metaphysik', in 'Études sur la Métaphysique d'Aristote', ed. by P. Aubenque, Paris 1979, pp. 7–36), composed of a main group **α** and a thin group **β** (with no **Ω**). The introduction adds and revises details concerning the lower part of the **α** branch of the stemma (without affecting the text's constitution, pp. 22–32); the author then argues (p. 33ff) for the independency of the **β** group of manuscripts and especially of ms. **Ab** (*Laur. Plut.* 87.12, early 12th century ca.), thus responding with particular force to recent literature challenging this view. **Ab** played an increasing role in 19th and 20th century general editions of the *Metaphysics* but its value has become a *vexata quaestio* that needs to be handled with care. I will comment further on the main part of A.'s arguments in this regard, probably the most controversial aspect of the book. Let us say from the outset that, where textual choices are concerned, A. is very conservative, thus arguing *de facto* for the legitimacy of Jaeger's (1957) and Ross' (1924) textual choices (which largely overlap).

A. thus still holds that all of **Ab**'s readings for this book, whether individual, or supported by alleged β manuscripts (**M**, **C**, now **Vk** as well) originate from an ancient source (possibly a papyrus scroll) and not from editorial activity on the scribe's and/or his source's part, as frequently held by scholars in the last thirty years. Although Primavesi's 2012 edition of book *Alpha* is listed in the bibliography ('Aristotle, *Metaphysics A: A New Critical Edition with Introduction*', in C. Steel, O. Primavesi [eds.], 'Aristotle's *Metaphysics Alpha*', Oxford 2012, 385–516) there is no trace of Primavesi's dismissive attitude toward **Ab**'s text. One understands that things had been moving so quickly thereafter that it was probably difficult to take new literature into account without a thorough revision of the whole work. However, the first and the strongest view in the 20th century against adopting **Ab**'s readings is Michael Frede and Günther Patzig's ('Aristoteles *Metaphysik Z*', München 1988, p. I 14–16). An explanation of A.'s attitude is offered if one supposes his focus to be elsewhere than in the text's constitution. Other clues point in the same direction, as we shall see.

The Greek text of *Lambda*, which is the bulk of the work, has an extremely large critical apparatus. It is split into chapters as it was, supposedly, in all printed editions since 1515 (this is a *terminus post quem* which A. actually establishes anew). Critical notes follow, without building, as A. points out, any running commentary. As a matter of fact, most of these thirty-eight notes deal with textual transmission, some of them with the text constitution as well. Apart from these, no further interpretation is provided, and no translation is included, except for rare references, usually according to Barnes' standard 'Revised Oxford Translation'. This all builds the main part of A.'s book, as corresponding to his 2002 thesis. The second half of the volume is a newly assembled Appendix of complementary materials. Most rewardingly, even though of dubious pertinence, we find there a particularly interesting part of the work: an unpublished translation of *Metaphysics Lambda*, with critical notes on the Greek text, attributed to Fabio Nifo (a grandson of Agostino, 16th c.).

A further section shows that a comparatively late manuscript (Athous, Iberorum 388, including inter alia copies of 15th c. texts) which was supposed to contain the text of this *Metaphysics Lambda* book, in fact, does not; possibly, a footnote with references would have been sufficient. However, in a sense, this again mirrors the very nature of this work, the overall intention of which is apparently to bring together various materials related to the textual history of this hugely influential book. The Appendix is followed by carefully prepared indexes, first of Greek, Latin, English, German and Italian *verba potiora*, then of proper names, broken down in chronological order, Antiquity, Middle Ages, Renaissance, Modern Age, then of manuscripts, sorted both by geographic area and by code, and finally of plates.

The indexes have been carefully and thoughtfully prepared, especially where medieval and Renaissance sources are concerned. The index of Greek words is probably less significant, given the availability of the Unicode text on-line, and somewhat redundant (not only are key words such as οὐσία and κίνησις indexed, but also many others without any obvious criterion, e.g. τις, δή, εις, ἐκ, οὐδέ, ἄν, ὥστε...). Moreover, with regard to the index of English words, one may wonder what, in fact, it includes, since the volume is not provided with an English

translation of book *Lambda*. Apparently, words from all sections have been included and combined, including A.'s own English text – we are told, for example, that A. used the word 'occasionally' twice in his introduction. An Index of the 13 plates is useful, but the reasons for their selection remain obscure; five of the 13 plates concern the Athous ms. the very one which is shown not to contain book *Lambda*; this would have been less unexpected in a dedicated journal article. In contrast, the focus of five other plates, as I understand it, is rather crucial to the text: are **J** and **J**² two different hands? It seems that they are indeed different (the way of holding the pen and of tracing letters and nexuses is slightly different) but very close to one another both in time and style and in milieu. This appears for example at p. 48 (ad 1069a35). At p. 49 one is struck by the similarity at first glance, whereas technical differences are revealed under closer scrutiny. The trouble is that not a single line in the work is devoted to the problem, nor does the critical apparatus distinguish **J**² as such at all (not even at 1069a35), so the reader is left with the open question as to what A. intended to assess. Moreover, additional plates might have better shown the differences between **J** and **J**² (e.g. f. 185r25, 186r26, 30).

No index is provided for A.'s Critical Notes, which are a key feature of the volume and could perhaps have been valorised better. They concern a series of thirty-eight passages whose textual constitution «is not self-explanatory» and/or «have not been investigated in sufficient detail elsewhere». Hence I assembled a list of them myself, as follows: 1069a22, 1069a24, 1069a30, 1069a30–32, 1069b2; 1069b11, 1069b21–23, 1070a9–10, 1070a10, 1070a36, 1070b7, 1070b20, 1070b24, and 29–30, 1070b24 and 29–30, 1070b26, 1071a24, 1071a29, 1071a37–38, 1071b28, 1071b34, 1072a24–25, 1072b3 (two notes), 1072b5–6, 1072b8, 1073a16, 1074a13, 1074a16, 1074a22, 1074a29, 1074a38, 1075a7, 1075a38, 1075b19, 1075b23, 1075b23–24, 1075b24, 1076a4. A rich bibliography, only part of which is actually used and quoted, concludes the volume. As a matter of fact, most of the bibliography predates the thesis discussion (2002); as mentioned above it seems that A. did not make any substantial use of the few items included from 2012 and 2013 and I suspect this would have been the case with my own 2012 *Lambda* edition, had it been listed in the bibliography ('Il libro Lambda della Metafisica di Aristotele', *Elenchos LXI–I*, Naples 2012, the corresponding 2009 UNITN PhD thesis being on-line since 2010). Again, this all makes sense if one considers that the main focus of the work is not on the textual constitution.

Critical discussion of the *pros* and *contras* of different readings rarely plays a principal role. Most references to 'true readings' and to 'wrong readings' within A.'s introductory chapter remain unexplained, even though the issue may appear controversial. Hence there is little that is new in this regard, not that this is unexpected given that A. accepts also for *Lambda* the main lines, and especially the high part of Harlfinger's 1979 stemma, as applied to the first part of the *Metaphysics*, according to which, after all, Ross and Jaeger were already on the right trade in selecting of their manuscript sources. Nonetheless, the *vexata quaestio* concerns the independence of **Ab** as a representative of a **β** family, which Harlfinger 1979 already denied after *Lambda* 7.1073a1. Harlfinger did not directly deal with the previous part of the book *Lambda*, which is the more controversial from the critical point of view. If **Ab** with its cognate manuscripts were not to build an independent **β** family (i.e. **β** vs **α**), a substantially different edition from Jaeger's and Ross' would be needed. With this dilemma in mind we

now have to consider A.'s alleged proofs of the independence of β vs α , as listed at p. 33. Some of them have little weight: 1070a18 Πλάτων **JE** : ὁ Πλάτων **Ab MC**: ||1070b20 χρώματι **JE** : χρώμασι **AbMC** || 1072b15 οἷα **AbMC** : οἷα τε. Further details, which are also given, have none, and it is hard to believe that they are mentioned at all: 1072a19 τε **Ab MC**: τ' **JE**|| 1070a8 ἐαυτῷ **Ab MC**: αὐτῷ **JE** ||1072a4 δ' alt. **JE**: δὲ **Ab MC** ||1072b23 ὅστ' **Ab MC**: ὅστε **EJ**. Overall, the independence of **Ab** as a representative of a β family, which Harlfinger 1979 already denied for the last three of ten chapters of the book (10050 characters of 23000), is far from being certain for the book as a whole.

Troublesome consequences do not concern these unproven β readings, which are too insignificant to harm the text's constitution at any rate. Nor do they concern the **MC** readings when different from **Ab**'s: these prove to be either identical with **JE**, which one would probably follow at any rate in most of the cases, or 'contaminated' with low branches of the α group (a case in which they have no stemmatic authority, but can be considered as valuable suggestions). The *quaestio vexata*, as is now well known, concerns **Ab**'s individual readings. These are still adopted by A. almost as often as they were by general editors in the 20th century, i.e. in the time when **Ab** was considered, in Jaeger's footsteps, as a possible witness of Aristotle's (or his school's) second thought (see Jaeger's reference to «Aristotelis additamenta» in his 1957 *Praefatio*, p. xviii). There is thus no evidence that A. sees his mission in a new constituted text based on this newly collected data. Incidentally, A.'s textual choice does not always entirely follow the discussed evidence, or stemma and critical apparatus (e.g. at 1072b5s., on the one hand A. emphasizes that **J**, the most ancient manuscript of the *Metaphysics*, does not read εἰ before φερῶν, as Ross reports, but ἦ [like the second *vetustissimus E*], and yet, on the other hand A. prints in the main text εἰ and secludes ἦ, which Jaeger regarded as the correct reading). On occasion, A. adopts an **Ab** reading which editors have so far discarded; for example he diverges from Jaeger's and Ross' texts in 1072b8; he thus reads ἐνέργεια ὄν instead of ἐνεργεῖα ὄν, which is an interpretation in **A^b** – for subscript iota is mostly a question of interpretation in Aristotelian manuscripts and especially in **Ab** – and in **M**. I really wish he had seen and reacted to my discussion, Fazzo, op. cit., p. 58, i.e. § 1.6.3 (and to my further contributions to this theme), on the relevance of the ἐνεργεῖα vs. ἐνέργεια reading in book *Lambda*, the latter being a part of the late theological interpretation of this book, whose prime mover was seen as God; that is, as 'Pure Activity'. Given this perspective, it seems that one can evaluate the kind of wide ranging information in the volume by discussing at least those two pieces of the textual reception which A. makes available here for the first time.

The first already prefaced the original thesis: *Lambda's verbatim* extracts by Georgios Scholarios' hand in ms. **Vk**, Vat. gr. 115 have been edited. The context is stemmatically relevant: ms. **Vk** is known to be a β source of the *Metaphysics* because of its former part, a full copy of books A-E. A further section follows of mere notes and abstracts (ἀποσημειώσεις) from *Met.* VII–XIV (more exactly, 144r ἐκ τοῦ Z, 145v ἐκ τοῦ H, 147r ἐκ τοῦ Θ, 148v ἐκ τοῦ I, 149v ἐκ τοῦ K, 151r ἐκ

τοῦ Λ, 155r-v ἐκ τοῦ Μ καὶ Ν – my inspection *in situ*). The *Lambda* extracts are found there (151r–152v and 154r–155r), and A. publishes them here, less as a reception witness than as a further β source. Yet, in this latter sense, it is not clear that A. does not overestimate V_k, whose independence from C he does not fully demonstrate: differences between V_k and C as recorded by A. (at n. 41 p. 10) may be due to scholarly activity on Georgios Scholarios' (i.e. V_k's scribe's) part, whereas the presence of the same catch-words in V_k (whenever the corresponding section is transmitted) as in C, M, Ab does not need to prove the ancient origin of V_k, C, M, but support instead the hypothesis that all of these manuscripts derive the one from the other, or from a very close exemplar (e.g. M from Ab, C from M, V_k from C). Yet, the *Lambda* section in V_k has something to say about the kind of attention paid and of priority given to *Lambda* above the 'central books' of the *Metaphysics* by such a major figure as Georgios Scholarios, who became Patriarch twice as Gennadios II.

Secondly, a remarkable piece of evidence is produced regarding the book's *fortuna* in 16th century Italy; that is, an annotated Latin translation of Aristotle's *Metaphysics Lambda*. This is edited here for the first time by A. from its codex unicus (so far), i.e. ms. Ambr. D 465 inf., ff. 95^r–112^v. The text is in Latin but relevant notes are partly in Greek as well, for they deal with Aristotle's Greek text. They are so subtle and thoughtful that it is hard to believe that we know so little about the supposed author, Fabio Nifo, the grandchild of the famous Agostino Nifo (1469/1470–1548). His identification as the author is based solely on a note, 'Fabii Nifi', at the top left corner of f. 95r, written in a different hand and ink compared to the main text. Transcribing this latter must have been a demanding task, as is evident from even a short glance at the Ambrosiana manuscript (which has abundance of abbreviations). Alexandru should be credited for this, even though this *editio princeps* is not located in the most obvious place for Renaissance scholars to look for it. Perhaps, an article in a more general journal, not restricted to ancient philosophy, would have equally suited the purpose of valorising this piece of evidence, which illustrates the kind of Greek scholarship practiced in Italy (not only in Padua and Venice) during the second half of the 16th century. The most distinctive feature of this work is the close interest in the Greek text as such which is discussed by the translator, not unlike we do nowadays, both *ope ingenii* and with reference to other witnesses and especially to former critical literature – as we do nowadays when comparing *variae lectiones*. Fabio being a shadowy figure, it would be interesting to know how this kind of work is connected with Agostino Nifo's impressive work on Aristotle's Greek texts. The attribution of the work to the grandson (as opposed e.g. to mere ownership) may deserve further exploration. As for the fact that A. does not provide a context for, nor comments on this seemingly rewarding material, this must be due, as he says (p. 156), to the comparatively late date of his discovery of the manuscript, when the volume was almost ready for press.

This being said, how and where exactly this 16th c. translation can be relevant for a critical edition (as suggested by A. *ibid.*) is not obvious. With this we come to a more general issue about the manifold pieces of indirect tradition (glosses, translations, commentaries and paraphrases) which are collected or referred to in

the critical apparatus, either in their own language, or according to a plausible Greek retroversion. As most of them have no detectable stemmatic affiliation, how can they affect the Greek text's constitution? Yet, in A.'s stemmatic perspective, a selection is needed, otherwise the reader is left with the misleading suggestion that any non-authorized reading, as found in the critical apparatus, could be used in order to adjust the critical text to one's own purposes. A. himself sometimes adopts readings from the lower branches of the stemma, although other plausible readings are available in J and E: this is an awkward choice in a work whose introductory part is entirely devoted to the stemma. Elsewhere, A.'s critical notes sometime praise a reading in so far as witnessed in indirect tradition and in secondary manuscripts, with no regard to stemmatic value, let alone to the *lectio difficilior potior* criterion.

As an alternative, a selection would permit careful examination of those sources whose reading can be assessed as valuable for the archetype reconstruction. A case in point has been mentioned above: the proper recognition of J², a revising hand of the 9th century that could probably still access the uncial exemplar. A. has three plates devoted to a comparison, all of which reveal subtle, albeit crucial, differences between each other. Yet, in his main text, he does not acknowledge or even discuss the difference.

It seems that A. has collected as many textual witnesses of book *Lambda's* reception as he could find. Some of them are available in printed books (Latin versions, Bouyges Edition of Averroes for Arabic readings), a few of them are not, but all are made selflessly available for future reference. In this sense, the volume has some interest, although very restricted as far as its potential readership is concerned. The lack of translation and of discussion of most main interpretation issues make it difficult to read for anyone not truly specialized in textual history; and even among those who are, only few benefit from this kind of collection. This book might be of use mainly for those who are willing to focus either on the textual reception of some of its lemmata, or on a new critical edition of book *Lambda*, at least at some stage of their investigation. For the sake of those readers, a series of articles would also have been welcome. However, the Brill volume spares them the need to consult them looking at diverse journals one after another.

Milano

Silvia Fazzo

*

Angela Jöne: *Abschiedsszenen Liebender im lateinischen Epos*. Münster: Aschendorff 2017. XVIII, 564 S. (Orbis antiquus. 52.) 76 €.

In seiner eindringlichen Studie 'Der Abschied. Theorie der Trauer' hat der Literaturwissenschaftler Karl Heinz Bohrer das titelgebende Konzept von semantischen Altlasten befreit:¹ Er fasst den Abschied nicht inhaltlich, sondern als ästhe-

¹ Karl Heinz Bohrer, 'Der Abschied. Theorie der Trauer: Baudelaire, Goethe, Nietzsche, Benjamin', Frankfurt a.M. 1996 (Zitat im Folgenden aus dem neuen Vorwort, S. II). Vgl. dens., 'Abschied. Eine Reflexionsfigur des je schon Gewesenen', in: K. Stierle/R. Warning