



**HAL**  
open science

**A legacy from the library of the Lyceum? Inquiry into the joint transmission of Theophrastus' and Aristotle's Metaphysics based on evidence provided by manuscripts E and J**

Myriam Hecquet

► **To cite this version:**

Myriam Hecquet. A legacy from the library of the Lyceum? Inquiry into the joint transmission of Theophrastus' and Aristotle's Metaphysics based on evidence provided by manuscripts E and J. Harvard Studies in Classical Philology, 2004. halshs-02480650

**HAL Id: halshs-02480650**

**<https://shs.hal.science/halshs-02480650>**

Submitted on 16 Feb 2020

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

[OFFPRINT]

HARVARD STUDIES  
IN  
CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

VOLUME 102



Department of the Classics, Harvard University  
Cambridge, Massachusetts and London  
Distributed by Harvard University Press  
2004

COPYRIGHT © 2005  
BY THE PRESIDENT AND FELLOWS OF HARVARD COLLEGE  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

A LEGACY FROM THE LIBRARY OF THE LYCEUM?  
INQUIRY INTO THE JOINT TRANSMISSION OF  
THEOPHRASTUS' AND ARISTOTLE'S *METAPHYSICS*  
BASED ON EVIDENCE PROVIDED BY  
MANUSCRIPTS E AND J\*

MYRIAM HECQUET-DEVIIENNE

THE starting point for this inquiry is a scholium in one of the most important pieces of evidence for the handwritten tradition of the Aristotelian corpus: *Parisinus graecus 1853*, from the tenth century. This scholium concerns a somewhat strange opusculum by Theophrastus that was first transmitted to us within the Aristotelian corpus under the title *Metaphysics*. The scholium reveals that this opusculum was not on the lists of Theophrastus' works drawn up by Hermippus in the Library of Alexandria in the third century B.C., or those by Andronicus two centuries later. It also reveals that Nicolaus, still in the first century B.C., identified its true author in his study of Aristotle's *Metaphysics*. The history of the transmission of this opusculum is thus closely linked to that of the Aristotelian corpus. My codicological inquiry has led me to some new findings, not only concerning the history of the transmission of

\*Following T. W. Allen, R. Pfeiffer, and M. J. Apthorp, Gregory Nagy defends the reliability of the Alexandrian editors as witnesses to authentic variants. And because he takes seriously information that the manuscript tradition provides, he is able to go back to the oral tradition of Homer and to lay down the groundwork for a multitext edition of Homer (see *Poetry as Performance. Homer and Beyond*, Cambridge MA, 1996, esp. 107 ff.). In the same way, I think it is possible to get a pretty good idea of the early state of the Aristotelian works in the library of the Lyceum and also of the school's research methods. I would like to thank the Director of the Center for Hellenic Studies for the exceptional help I received there in 2001–2002. I also thank my colleagues Sylvia Berryman and Sean Kelsey for their careful reading of this article. And I extend particular thanks to Gudrun Vuillemin-Diem and to Paul Canart, who read this paper with the greatest attention.

Theophrastus' *Metaphysics*, but also that of Aristotle's *Metaphysics*, and even the history of the transmission of part of the Aristotelian corpus which includes some zoological treatises. These findings support other research on the nature and function of Theophrastus' opusculum, and confirm its particular literary status.

### I. PARISINUS GR. 1853

I will begin by recalling some of the findings of my codicological and paleographic study of *Parisinus graecus 1853*, a manuscript that jointly transmitted Aristotle's *Metaphysics* and Theophrastus' opusculum, among other treatises by Aristotle. Indeed, this study allowed me to confirm and clarify certain hypotheses formulated by scholars who have studied one or the other of these two works.

My work first showed that this manuscript, one of the most ancient of Aristotle's works, is the result of a strong "editorial" project.<sup>1</sup> It was carried out by three scribes capable of correcting transliteration errors and other types of copying errors. It is the result of a collation of models, which were themselves carefully executed. At least one of these models was the object of highly documented research, since the scholia it contained transmitted information on Hermippus' and Andronicus' catalogues, a study by Nicolaus of Damascus (ἡ θεωρία τῶν Ἀριστοτέλους Μετὰ τὰ φυσικά), and the commentaries by Alexander of Aphrodisias and Asclepius. *Parisinus gr. 1853* stemmed from a chosen line and was clearly intended to become a reference copy placed in a great library.

Some of its scholia are of major importance for the history of the transmission of the text. Among them is one that mentions a discussion on the authenticity of one of the *Alpha* books of *Metaphysics*, due perhaps to Pasicles. Gudrun Vuillemin-Diem and Enrico Berti made an in-depth study of it.<sup>2</sup> They compared it to a scholium which, in this

<sup>1</sup> M. Hecquet-Devienne, "Les mains du *Parisinus graecus 1853*. Une nouvelle collation des quatre premiers livres de la *Métaphysique* d'Aristote (folios 225v-247v)," *Scrittura e Civiltà* XXIV (2000) 103-171.

<sup>2</sup> G. Vuillemin-Diem, "Anmerkungen zum Pasikles-Bericht und zu Echtheitszweifeln am Grösseren und Kleineren Alpha in Handschriften und Kommentaren," *Zweifelhaftes im Corpus Aristotelicum*, Proceedings of the Ninth Symposium Aristotelicum (Berlin, September 7-16, 1981), ed. Paul Moraux and Jürgen Wiesner (Berlin and New York

manuscript also, attributes authorship of the opusculum copied following Aristotle's *Metaphysics* to Theophrastus. This is the scholium that particularly interests us here. I took up their analyses, integrating therein a decisive piece of information: the identicalness of the copyist, hitherto unnoticed because of the change of writing style between the two scholia. This allowed me to confirm the conclusions that Enrico Berti had reached through less strictly codicological channels: like the scholium attached to Theophrastus' opusculum, the scholium conferring authorship of one of the books *Alpha* to Pasicles refers to the work it follows and not to that which it precedes. It was an error of interpretation of the same nature that led to the spread of the belief that *Alpha Meizon* (and not the opusculum which precedes it in one branch of the tradition) could be a work of Theophrastus,<sup>3</sup> and *Alpha Elatton* (and not *Alpha Meizon* as in Asclepius' testimony), a work by Pasicles.<sup>4</sup>

As we shall see, the codicological and philological study of the scholium attached to Theophrastus' opusculum allows us to draw still other conclusions about the literary and editorial history, both of this treatise and of Aristotle's *Metaphysics*.

### II. THE REDISCOVERY OF THEOPHRASTUS' OPUSCULUM

Theophrastus' opusculum is an enigmatic treatise in several regards. Its exact "history" is not known. Why was it said that Hermippus (third century B.C.), and Andronicus (two centuries later) did not yet know of it? And what exactly are the purpose and nature of this work? What is its genuine title? All these questions are linked to the content of the scholium that follows the opusculum, and for which the most ancient testimony is supplied by *Parisinus graecus 1853* (=E). It is therefore advisable to examine how much credit can be lent to the information it transmits.

1982) 157-193. E. Berti, "Note sulla tradizione dei primi due libri della *Metafisica* di Aristotele," *Elenchos* III (1982) 5-37.

<sup>3</sup> In the branch of the tradition which transmitted Aristotle's *Metaphysics* following the opusculum.

<sup>4</sup> M. Hecquet-Devienne, "L'authenticité de *Métaphysique 'Alpha'* (meizon ou elatton) d'Aristote, un faux problème? Une confirmation codicologique," *Phronesis* (2005, forthcoming).

Let us quickly remind ourselves of the text of this scholium (folio 312r):

τοῦτο βιβλίον Ἀνδρόνικος μὲν καὶ Ἑρμιππος ἀγνοοῦσιν· οὐδὲ γὰρ μνειάν αὐτοῦ ὅλως πεποιήνται ἐν τῇ ἀναγραφῇ τῶν Θεοφράστου βιβλίων· Νικόλαος δὲ ἐν τῇ θεωρίᾳ τῶν Ἀριστοτέλους Μετὰ τὰ φυσικὰ μνημονεύει αὐτοῦ λέγων εἶναι Θεοφράστου· εἰσὶ δ' ἐν αὐτῷ οἷον προδιαπορίαι τινὲς ὀλίγαι τῆς ὅλης πραγματείας.

This book was not known to Andronicus and Hermippus; indeed they make no mention of it at all in the list of Theophrastus' works. But Nicolaus, in his *Study of Aristotle's Metaphysics*,<sup>5</sup> mentions it and attributes it to Theophrastus. It contains what may be considered to be a few "preliminary issues" for the work as a whole.

The author of this scholium transmits a first piece of important information: the catalogues of Theophrastus' works drawn up by Andronicus and before him Hermippus, librarian in Alexandria, made no mention of the opusculum. He introduces this objective data to justify (γάρ) his initial assertion: that Andronicus and Hermippus did not know of the opusculum. This assertion is clearly the result of inductive reasoning (all the works by Theophrastus known at that time were mentioned in their lists; however the opusculum was not mentioned there; thus the opusculum was not known). He adds that this work, by contrast, was known to Nicolaus who said it was a work by Theophrastus.

If the second inference is legitimate (if Nicolaus was referring to Theophrastus' opusculum, then he knew of it), Aristotle would no doubt have denounced, in the first reasoning, an error in the consequent (such as when one infers from wet ground that it has rained or, in rhetorical debate, from the elegance and nocturnal walks of a man that he is unfaithful).<sup>6</sup> It is somewhat risky to draw so strong a conclusion from a silence.

Nevertheless, some critics, in turn, inferred from the information given in the scholium that this work reappeared during the first century B.C. after a long period in oblivion.<sup>7</sup> For Regenbogen and Drossaart-

<sup>5</sup> Θεωρία τῶν Ἀριστοτέλους Μετὰ τὰ φυσικά, probably a part of the *Περὶ τῆς Ἀριστοτέλους φιλοσοφίας* by Nicolaus.

<sup>6</sup> See Aristotle, *Sophistical Refutations*, 5.167b6–12.

<sup>7</sup> H. Usener, "Zu Theophrasts Metaphysischem Bruchstück," *Rheinisches Museum* 16

Lulofs,<sup>8</sup> the scholium even indicates that the opusculum was discovered by none other than Nicolaus of Damas. But if that were the case, it is surprising that the discovery was not pointed out more explicitly, first by Nicolaus himself in his *Study of Aristotle's Metaphysics*, and afterwards, by the scholiast.

Jaeger and Drossaart-Lulofs<sup>9</sup> have even explained the insertion of the opusculum into the Aristotelian corpus as being due to this relatively late identification by Nicolaus: this insertion could have happened either immediately after this identification, or still later, on information given by the scholiast. But why would the identification of Theophrastus as the author have led to the insertion of the work in the Aristotelian corpus?<sup>10</sup>

First let us return to the information given by the scholiast. Nicolaus spoke of the opusculum (μνημονεύει αὐτοῦ), in order to attribute it to Theophrastus. It therefore seems that he dissociated himself from the common opinion, which would appear to be either that for some it was not a work by Theophrastus, or perhaps that its author was unknown. Yet, on the one hand we note that Theophrastus' *Metaphysics* was transmitted throughout the Middle Ages "with" Aristotle's treatise in one part of the tradition (that which includes the most ancient surviving manuscripts and notably *Vindobonensis phil. gr. 100* from the ninth century). And we know, on the other hand, that it is precisely in Nicolaus' study on Aristotle's *Metaphysics* (ἡ θεωρία τῶν Ἀριστοτέλους Μετὰ τὰ φυσικά) that Nicolaus identified the opusculum as a work by Theophrastus. Consequently, it seems more likely that this work was already included in an ancient "edition"<sup>11</sup> of Aristotle's *Metaphysics*

(1861) 260. W. Jaeger, review of Ross-Fobes, *Gnomon* 8 (1932) 290. O. Regenbogen, "Theophrastos," *RE Suppl.* VII (1940) 1378. H. J. Drossaart-Lulofs, *Nicolaus Damascenus, On the Philosophy of Aristotle, Fragments of the First Five Books*, translated from the Syriac with an introduction and commentary (Leiden 1965) 28. It may be that Strabo's tale of the adventurous destiny of Aristotle's library had some influence here, cf. Strabo 13.1.54 (608–609).

<sup>8</sup> E. Berti is apparently also of the same opinion cf. "Note sulla tradizione." 22.

<sup>9</sup> Jaeger, *ibid.* Drossaart-Lulofs, 30.

<sup>10</sup> The "introductory" function ascribed to the opusculum, to which we will return later, could be the reason why the opusculum was inserted into the Aristotelian corpus before Aristotle's *Metaphysics*. We will see however that, in reality, the reasoning must be reversed.

<sup>11</sup> Here, I would take up Gregory Nagy's interpretation: the use of the term ἔκδοσις in the Homeric scholia shows that this is the production of a new copy offering readings fol-

(and was perhaps attributed to the latter), when Nicolaus identified its author. This conclusion ties in with the hypothesis already formulated by Rose, who was followed by Burnikel and Most:<sup>12</sup> if Hermippus and Andronicus did not include the work in their respective catalogues, it must at the time have been known under the name of Aristotle. As a matter of fact, it may be compared with the title *Περὶ ἀρχῆς α'* which is found in the list of Aristotle's works transmitted by Diogenes Laertius, or the title *Περὶ ἀρχῶν ἢ φύσεως α'* transmitted by Hesychius' catalogue, as suggested by Rose.<sup>13</sup> But this identification under another title raises the question of the genuine title of the opusculum.

### III. THE TITLE OF THE OPUSCULE

The title under which Theophrastus' opusculum was passed on in the Greek handwritten tradition raises several problems. Firstly, we do not understand its syntax: Θεοφράστου τῶν μετὰ τὰ φυσικά.<sup>14</sup> Why this genitive τῶν μετὰ τὰ φυσικά?<sup>15</sup> It looks as though a word has been dropped. Interpreting it as a partitive genitive, Burnikel suggested that προδιαπορίαι must be understood on the basis of the last sentence of the scholium that is linked to the opusculum: εἰσὶ δ' ἐν αὐτῷ οἷον προδιαπορίαι τινὲς ὀλίγαι τῆς ὅλης πραγματείας. "Es enthält sozusagen einige wenige Erörterungen aus dem ganzen Traktat im voraus."<sup>16</sup> But

allowing a διόρθωσις, that's to say, according to Pfeiffer, a procedure that includes the collation of manuscripts and the correction of the texts, in other words a recension. See G. Nagy, *Poetry as Performance*, 115–116 and n. 43; R. Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship from the Beginnings to the End of the Hellenistic Age* (Oxford 1968) 94.

<sup>12</sup> Aristoteles *Pseudepigraphus*, ed. V. Rose (Leipzig 1863) 183; W. Burnikel, *Textgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu neun Opuscula Theophrasts* (Wiesbaden 1974) 124–125; G. Most, *Théophraste, Métaphysique*, XIV–XV.

<sup>13</sup> Rose, *Aristoteles Pseudepigraphus*, 183. Nevertheless, this connection was contested by Ross-Fobes who rather see *Περὶ ἀρχῆς* as the first book of our *Physics*: Theophrastus, *Metaphysics*, ed. W. D. Ross and F. H. Fobes (Oxford 1929; repr. Hildesheim 1967) IX–X.

<sup>14</sup> In J and A (the *Vat. gr. 1302*). Or Θεοφράστου τῶν μετὰ φυσικά in E.

<sup>15</sup> This problem no doubt explains the omission of the article τῶν in manuscripts C (*Marc. gr. 211*, from the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries), L (*Laur. 28.45*, from 1445) and O (*Vat. Ott. gr. 153*, from the fifteenth century for the opusculum); see Most, X.

<sup>16</sup> Burnikel, 126 and n. 43. For Theiler and Most, this sentence can be explained by the misinterpretation of the end of the opusculum. Indeed, this says: Αὕτη γὰρ ἀρχὴ τῆς τοῦ σύμπαντος θεωρίας, ἐν τίσιν τὰ ὄντα καὶ πῶς ἔχει πρὸς ἄλληλα. "For this is the start-

his translation of this sentence shows he is bothered by the articulation of the concept of "preliminary discussions" (he is obliged to dissociate: "Erörterungen . . . im voraus") with the partitive value of the genitive: "aus dem ganzen Traktat." As a matter of fact, this association of ideas seems inconsistent and forces him to attach the notion of preliminary to the verb εἰσὶ rather than to the noun group προδιαπορίαι τινὲς ὀλίγαι τῆς ὅλης πραγματείας. I would rather qualify the genitive of this sentence as objective, a genitive called notably by the prefix προ- of locative value: "a few preliminary (introductory) problems to the treatise as a whole." These aporiae are not extracted from the treatise as a whole, but rather introduced. In this case, however, it is difficult to consider that προδιαπορίαι could have been simply inferred from the title.

τῶν μετὰ τὰ φυσικά, in this title, could also be a genitive of origin. Most suggested inferring the preposition ἐκ, on the model of Stobaeus' lemma, where we find Πορφυρίου τῶν Πρὸς τὰ νοητὰ ἀφορμῶν interchangeable with Πορφυρίου ἐκ τῶν Πρὸς τὰ νοητὰ ἀφορμῶν.<sup>17</sup> But this is not the interpretation he favors:<sup>18</sup> according to Most, Θεοφράστου τῶν μετὰ τὰ φυσικά has probably been copied exactly from the same mould as, for example, Ἀριστοτέλους τῶν μετὰ τὰ φυσικά β'.<sup>19</sup> As a matter of fact, the similarity between the opusculum's title and the titles of the books of Aristotle's *Metaphysics* is striking, and in the latter, the genitive is clearly partitive. In this case, the title of the opusculum should have a number linked to the place of the opusculum in a treatise.<sup>20</sup> If it is true that the opusculum was attributed to Aristotle before being restored to Theophrastus, it may have been considered by a copyist-compiler (an "editor"?) as one of the books of Aristotle's *Meta-*

ing point for the study of the whole: in what are beings and what relationships connect them to each other." (12a1–2). See W. Theiler, "Die Entstehung der Metaphysik des Aristoteles mit einem Anhang über Theophrasts Metaphysik," *Museum Helveticum* 15 (1958) 102, and Most, *Théophraste Métaphysique*, ed. A. Laks and G. Most (Paris 1993) XVI.

<sup>17</sup> Stobaeus, V.LI.18 and 31; see further 22: Αἰλιανοῦ Ἱστοριῶν. Cf. Laks-Most, X n. 6.

<sup>18</sup> Yet it seems to me to be quite convincing. One should see if this usage was widespread among the ancient interpreters so as to be able to draw conclusions as to the scholiast's possible usage.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, X n. 6.

<sup>20</sup> According to Most (*ibid.*), this number was supplied in manuscript A and three of its descendants.

*physics* and be given a number.<sup>21</sup> But not necessarily. On the grounds of the apparently introductory function of the opusculum (or of the last sentence of the scholium which suggests this function), this “editor” may have slipped it to the front of the Aristotelian treatise, between the title and the first book (whichever this *Alpha* book may have been: *Meizon* or *Elatton*), and then forgotten to correct the genitive which has been left hanging. Neither do I dismiss Most’s other hypothesis, mentioned above, of a genitive of origin, which could well be a usage among interpreters at the time.

However, the difficulties do not end with the syntactic form of the Greek title transmitted through the handwritten tradition. Indeed, this title does not seem to be suited to the short treatise either, whose contents are largely aporetic in nature and whose object is a program and methodology of research.<sup>22</sup>

A final difficulty is that the Greek title does not correspond to the title transmitted by the Latin tradition: *De principiis*.<sup>23</sup> A parallel can be established between this title and the titles *Περὶ ἀρχῆς* and *Περὶ ἀρχῶν ἢ φύσεως* found in the ancient lists of Aristotle’s works, which tend to confirm it rather than the one transmitted by the direct Greek handwritten tradition. It is also better adapted to the content.

To summarize, we have seen that the origin of the Greek title *Θεοφράστου τῶν μετὰ τὰ φυσικά* is probably linked to the title of Aristotle’s treatise, whether it was considered at one point to be one of the books in Aristotle’s *Metaphysics*, or whether it was integrated as an

<sup>21</sup> A discussion of the precise number of books contained in this treatise can be found in Asclepius. He affirms that Aristotle wrote fourteen books, and that up to *Nu*, they are by him: εἶδέναι τοῖνον χρὴ ὅτι δεκατέσσαρα βιβλία ἔγραψεν ὁ Ἀριστοτέλης ἐν τῇ παρούσῃ πραγματείᾳ· μέχρι τοῦ ν' στοιχείου ἔγραψε καὶ αὐτοῦ. Should it then be inferred that the opusculum was, at some point, considered as the third candidate for the *Alpha* title or, on the contrary, was it given the number *Xi* (ξ'), which after the substitution of the name of Theophrastus for Aristotle as author of the opusculum, was removed from the title without the hanging genitive being corrected? The problem raised by these hypotheses is that, no reference to a fifteenth book transmitted under the name of Aristotle, or to a third *Alpha* book is found in the sequel of Asclepius’ commentary. Although Asclepius bears witness to a discussion of the exact number of books comprised in *Metaphysics*, these two hypotheses are not very probable. Asclepius simply means that *Metaphysics* contains fourteen books and not thirteen, as would suggest those who atheize *Alpha Meizon*, and that those fourteen books are all authentic, with not one less, as we can legitimately induce from the lines which follow.

<sup>22</sup> See Most, XVIII and XXIII.

<sup>23</sup> See the translation by Bartholomeus of Messine.

introduction to the treatise. We have also seen that the ancient catalogues probably bear witness to this transmission of the opusculum within the Aristotelian corpus under another title, which happens to correspond to that transmitted by the Latin tradition and which would be better suited to it than the Greek title *Metaphysics*.<sup>24</sup> The title transmitted by the Greek tradition seems therefore not to be authentic.

But the Latin title could also simply have been drawn from the *incipit*<sup>25</sup> and was perhaps not originally attached to this opusculum. In fact, must we assume that this opusculum necessarily had a title from the outset? And did Theophrastus conceive it as a real treatise, which was later accidentally omitted from part of his handwritten tradition, or was not its joint transmission with that of Aristotle’s *Metaphysics* the result of pure chance? We must now inquire as to why a text by Theophrastus was transmitted in the Aristotelian corpus, thereby becoming attributed to Aristotle.

#### IV. THE PLACE OF THEOPHRASTUS’ OPUSCULE IN THE HANDWRITTEN TRADITION OF ARISTOTLE

Let us return to the information transmitted in the scholium. We have already noted that it plays an important role for those seeking to reconstruct the history of the transmission of the Aristotelian corpus and the Theophrastean corpus, since it signals both the absence of the opusculum from the catalogs of Hermippus and Andronicus, and the identification of its author by Nicolaus. We have also seen that it supplies a few indications on the relationship of the opusculum to a more extensive treatise: “it contains what can be considered to be a few ‘preliminary issues’ to the work as a whole.”<sup>26</sup> According to the scholiast, the opusculum may have played an introductory role to a more extensive treatise; but to which treatise is he referring? Perhaps it is a treatise by Theophrastus, which has been lost.<sup>27</sup> Yet we have no testimony to sub-

<sup>24</sup> See Most, XVIII and n. 33.

<sup>25</sup> Burnikel, 125 n. 38.

<sup>26</sup> According to Most, this indication is based on a misinterpretation of the last words of the opusculum: ἀρχὴ τῆς τοῦ σύμπαντος θεωρίας, and not, as Theiler thought, on I 1b23–24 (see Most, XVI and n. 24).

<sup>27</sup> See its insertion in the fragments of Theophrastus in F. Wimmer’s edition of *Theophrasti Eresii opera*, 3 vol. (Leipzig 1845/1862).

stantiate this hypothesis. On the other hand, Ross-Fobes, Burnikel, Most, and Devereux agree on the fact that the opusculum cannot be part of a larger work, but that it is a treatise in itself.<sup>28</sup> Finally, this opusculum has been transmitted at the front of Aristotle's *Metaphysics*, and therefore in an introductory position, in its oldest manuscript, *Vindobonensis phil. gr. 100* (J, from the ninth century) and in its descendants. This perhaps explains the presence of the opusculum in the Aristotelian corpus. So, let us examine the Greek handwritten tradition of Theophrastus' opusculum.<sup>29</sup> Burnikel, followed by Most, has shown that it is divided into two main branches: one is represented exclusively by *Parisinus gr. 1853* (the one that we call manuscript E of Aristotle, from the tenth century, identified by the sign P for the handwritten tradition of Theophrastus), while the other branch is subdivided into *Vindobonensis phil. gr. 100* (J, from the ninth century, a close relative to E)<sup>30</sup> and its descendants on the one hand and, on the other, all the manuscripts stemming from *Vaticanus gr. 1302* (A, from the end of the thirteenth century or the beginning of the fourteenth century). This genealogical distribution of the manuscripts does not coincide exactly with the two large sets that can be distinguished, depending on whether the opusculum was transmitted with Aristotle's treatises (the two most ancient testimonies, E and J, fall into this category) or with Theophrastus' treatises (in A and its "descendants"). Scholars generally consider that the opusculum was integrated into the corpus of Theophrastus' writings later on.

<sup>28</sup> See Ross-Fobes, X; Burnikel, 126; Most, X–XI; and D. T. Devereux, "The Relationship between Theophrastus' *Metaphysics* and Aristotle's *Metaphysics* Lambda," *Studies in Classical Humanities* III, *Theophrastean Studies on Natural Science, Physics and Metaphysics, Ethics, Religion, and Rhetoric*, ed. W. W. Fortenbaugh and R. W. Sharples (New Brunswick, NJ, and Oxford 1988) 168. Burnikel, for example, explains that the sentence 'Αλλὰ δὴ τούτων μὲν περὶ σκοπεύειν in 11b24 (= at the end of the treatise) merely returns to the introductory words of the treatise by means of conclusion, in Theophrastus' usual style. This sentence is not, therefore, an announcement. See Theiler, 102. See also the description of the "annular composition" of this programmatic piece of writing in the commentary on the end of the text in Laks–Most, 89 n. 3.

<sup>29</sup> See Burnikel, 112–123, and Most, XL–LXXX.

<sup>30</sup> J stems from the same transliteration as the part of E containing the "metaphysical" texts of Aristotle and Theophrastus, see D. Harlfinger, "Zur Überlieferungsgeschichte der *Metaphysik*," *Études sur la Métaphysique d'Aristote*, Proceedings of the Sixth Symposium Aristotelicum, ed. P. Aubenque (Paris 1979) 7–36: 30; and J. Irigoin, "Deux traditions dissymétriques: Platon et Aristote," *Annuaire du Collège de France* (April–June, 1986) 149–169 and (1986–1987) 186–187 in *Tradition et critique des textes grecs* (Paris 1997).

Burnikel, however, was not of this opinion. He believed that the Theophrastean corpus including the opusculum goes back to the tenth century, for A already contains many characteristic distinctive mistakes that are indicative of an already long tradition. Given this, can we doubt that the edition of the opusculum in the Theophrastean corpus is more recent? If it is true, as I suggest, that the title *Metaphysics* fell to the opusculum because of its joint transmission with Aristotle's homonymous treatise, this could be an argument in favor of the older age of this part of the tradition. The other part of the tradition would have integrated it into the Theophrastean corpus later, keeping the same title. But the hypothesis of a contamination cannot be dismissed, and therefore this argument is not decisive.

Let us, then, examine more precisely the set of manuscripts which include Theophrastus' opusculum in the Aristotelian corpus. They present the opusculum either just before Aristotle's *Metaphysics*, as in *Vindobonensis phil. gr. 100* (but without the scholium to the opusculum, at least in the present state of the manuscript),<sup>31</sup> or just after Aristotle's *Metaphysics*, as in *Parisinus gr. 1853* (and in this case, the opusculum is itself followed by the scholium). Although apparently insignificant, this difference could reveal an "editorial" intention which it is important to understand in order to reconstruct the history of this transmission. Now, to my knowledge, nobody has explained it. It is simply noted that J follows the same order as the vulgate, by presenting first Aristotle's physical treatises, then *Metaphysics*, unlike E, in which *Metaphysics* has curiously been inserted among the zoological writings. J has been considered to represent a more ancient state of the corpus, modified by E or by the immediate ancestor of E,<sup>32</sup> probably because J is earlier than E, but also because it transmits the traditional order of the vulgate,<sup>33</sup> while

<sup>31</sup> Indeed, the quire which contained the end of Theophrastus' opusculum, from ἐνεκα in 11a1, the first book, and the beginning of the second book of Aristotle's *Metaphysics*, up to ἀνθρώπων ὑπό in 994a6, has disappeared. The other manuscripts linked to J do not have it either. By contrast, the family of manuscript A, with one exception, contains the scholium to the opusculum, like manuscript E.

<sup>32</sup> See notably G. Vuillemin-Diem, "Untersuchungen zu Wilhelm von Moerbekes *Metaphysikübersetzung*," *Studien zur mittelalterlichen Geistesgeschichte und ihren Quellen*, ed. A. Zimmermann, edited text checked by Gudrun Vuillemin-Diem (Berlin and New York 1982) 197–198. See Jaeger, 290–291 and 292 (with confusion between manuscripts E and J), and Burnikel, 127.

<sup>33</sup> It is traditionally supposed that this order is due to Andronicus' edition (Ross-Fobes even attribute to him the Greek title under which Theophrastus' opusculum was transmitted, see IX); but see the very skeptical and stimulating study by J. Barnes, "Roman Aris-



the Parisian manuscript is an isolated case in the handwritten tradition of Theophrastus. A hypothesis of this type nevertheless raises the question of why a copyist or a scholar would have decided to implement the radical change that E represents. The fact that manuscript E was originally composed of two separate volumes<sup>34</sup> does not provide a satisfactory answer, since these two volumes are obviously the result of a common project. So what was the original place of Theophrastus' opusculum in this branch of the handwritten transmission of Aristotle?

We have seen that because of the title under which the opusculum was transmitted through the Greek handwritten tradition, and because of the very configuration of part of this tradition, the opusculum was closely linked to Aristotle's *Metaphysics*. And for Drossaart-Lulofs and Burnikel,<sup>35</sup> the scholium ends with a reference to Aristotle's *Metaphysics* as a whole. And if we now accept the path opened up by this scholium, by supposing that the judgement referred to in its last sentence offers information as reliable as the sentences which immediately precede it, the opusculum served as an introduction to Aristotle's *Metaphysics*.<sup>36</sup> Consequently, the opusculum must have come before it, which confirms the belief that the order in J could be older than the order in E.<sup>37</sup>

However, the research undertaken by G. Vuillemin-Diem has shown that the last sentence of the scholium is not contemporary with the first information provided by it. Indeed, this last sentence is not attested by William of Moerbeke's translation: his Greek model did not yet contain it.<sup>38</sup> On the other hand, in this last sentence, the nature of the information differs, since it is no longer an objective testimony (that is, the

title," *Philosophia Togata II, Plato and Aristotle at Rome*, ed. J. Barnes and M. Griffin (Oxford 1997) 1–69.

<sup>34</sup> M. Hecquet-Devienne, "Les mains du *Parisinus graecus 1853*," 117–118.

<sup>35</sup> See Drossaart-Lulofs, *Nicolaus Damascenus*, 30, Burnikel, 125–126 and Most, XV.

<sup>36</sup> See Burnikel, 127, and also Most, XV.

<sup>37</sup> See notably Jaeger, 292, who confuses the order presented by E, as noted above.

<sup>38</sup> See Gudrun Vuillemin-Diem, "Untersuchungen zu Wilhelm von Moerbekes," 192, and *Metaphysica lib. I–XIV. Recensio et translatio Guillelmi de Moerbeka*, ed. G. Vuillemin-Diem (Leiden, New York, and Cologne 1995) 317. Theiler, followed by Drossaart-Lulofs and Burnikel, believed that the last sentence of the scholium was due to Nicolaus himself; according to Jaeger, it could have been added by the scholiast, a Peripatetic scholar; and finally, Most hesitates between the glossator and a subsequent addition to the scholium. See Theiler, "Die Entstehung der *Metaphysik*," 102; Drossaart-Lulofs, 30; Burnikel, 125–126; Jaeger, 290; Most, XVI n. 25 and XVII.

absence of the opusculum from the lists of Hermippus and Andronicus), but is a personal analysis of the contents of the work and of its relationship with another work. This clue does not thus prove that the opusculum really was conceived as an introduction to Aristotle's *Metaphysics*.

By contrast, whatever the relationship of the opusculum to Aristotle's *Metaphysics*, the relationship postulated by the scholium and which is suggested by part of the handwritten tradition through the joint transmission of the two works, must be based on an objective fact. And if such is the case, it is not necessary to suppose that the initial place held by the opusculum was at the beginning of Aristotle's treatise. On the contrary, we must reverse the usual reasoning: it is because the expected position for an opusculum considered to have an introductory function was at the front of the treatise introduced rather than following it, that it must be supposed that the order presented by J (opusculum, then Aristotle's treatise) is probably later than the disconcerting order in E (Aristotle's *Metaphysics*, then Theophrastus' opusculum). In the same way that the scholium of which we are aware through manuscript E was written after Theophrastus' opusculum to which it referred, Theophrastus' opusculum itself could initially have come after Aristotle's *Metaphysics*, to which it also referred, in accordance with a probably ancient usage. This could explain the order kept in manuscript E, more faithful thus to the ancient handwritten tradition.

It is only *later*, probably because of the last sentence of the scholium which seems to ascribe an introductory function to the opusculum, and because the expected place for a text considered to be introductory to Aristotle's *Metaphysics* was at the beginning of this treatise, that an "editor" decided to reverse the initial order found in E, thus giving birth to a new lineage witnessed by J.<sup>39</sup>

So if this opusculum was, so to speak, a commentary on Aristotle's treatise, as the scholium is a commentary on the opusculum, what was the true function of this opusculum?

<sup>39</sup> I do not believe that this transfer was done by the author of the last sentence of the scholium to Theophrastus' opusculum, but on the strength of this scholium. Indeed, the analysis it expresses, although ambiguous, remains relatively cautious, as is witnessed by οἶον.

### V. A PART OF THE ARCHIVES OF THE LYCEUM LIBRARY

The very ancient relationship between Theophrastus' opusculum and Aristotle's treatise, as witnessed by the manuscript tradition, has also been studied by scholars in terms of the content of the works. E. Berti has reminded us how the opusculum was perceived by these scholars.<sup>40</sup> It was initially thought to be the introduction to a work by Theophrastus, which has been lost. Next it was more rightly perceived to be a critique of Aristotle's *Metaphysics*. Because of that, its writing was first dated after the death of Aristotle.<sup>41</sup> But such an hypothesis posed new problems, since Theophrastus seems to ignore the Aristotelian conception of the science of being qua being, that is, the doctrine of the central books of Aristotle's *Metaphysics*. G. Reale tried to resolve the difficulty by interpreting Theophrastus' silence as a condemnation of this doctrine.<sup>42</sup> More recently, however, scholars have opted for a more positive analysis of the discussion between the two men as witnessed by these works. And the polemical relation between Theophrastus' *Metaphysics* and the doctrine of principles of the Academy required the view that it is related to the most ancient parts of Aristotle's *Metaphysics*.<sup>43</sup>

<sup>40</sup> E. Berti, "Teofrasto e gli Accademici sul moto dei cieli," *Gigantomachia. Convergence e divergenze tra Platone e Aristotele*. Proceedings of the Conference held in the Department of Philosophy and Human Sciences of the University of Macerata, 1998–1999, ed. Maurizio Migliori (Brescia 2002) 339–358.

<sup>41</sup> W. D. Ross and F. H. Fobes; O. Regenbogen; J. Tricot, *Théophraste. La Métaphysique* (Paris 1948); W. Theiler, "Die Entstehung der Metaphysik des Aristoteles mit einem Anhang über Theophrasts Metaphysik," *Museum Helveticum* 15 (1958) 85–105; G. Reale, *Teofrasto e la sua aporetica metafisica* (Brescia 1964); M. van Raalte, "The Idea of the Cosmos as an Organic Whole in Theophrastus' *Metaphysics*," in *Theophrastean Studies on Natural Science, Physics and Metaphysics, Ethics, Religion, and Rhetoric*, ed. W. W. Fortenbaugh and R. W. Sharples (New Brunswick, NJ and Oxford 1988) 189–215; M. van Raalte, *Theophrastus, Metaphysics* (Leiden, New York, and Cologne 1993) 24–25; and S. Romani, *Teofrasto, La metafisica* (Milan 1994) 12.

<sup>42</sup> The interpretation offered by W. D. Ross and F. H. Fobes, O. Regenbogen ("Theophrastos," 1389–1395), and J. Tricot was still moderate: the criticisms formulated by Theophrastus did not cast doubt on his attachment to the teachings of his master. But the general meaning of the opusculum did not come across clearly.

<sup>43</sup> The writing of the opusculum was then placed before the death of Speusippus (338 B.C.). E. Berti refers to H. J. Krämer, "Zum Standort der 'Metaphysik' Theophrasts," in *Zetesis*. Festschrift für Prof. Dr. Emile de Strijcker (Antwerp and Utrecht 1973) 206–214, and K. Gaiser, *Theophrast in Assos. Zur Entwicklung der Naturwissenschaft zwischen Akademie und Peripatos* (Heidelberg 1985).

Daniel Devereux<sup>44</sup> has reminded us that, besides allusions to the metaphysical doctrines of Plato, Speusippus, and Xenocrates, only the Aristotelian theses of book *Lambda* are discussed in the opusculum, and that Theophrastus' conception of *Metaphysics* is very similar to that of book *Lambda*. The "science of the being qua being" is absent, as is the comparison of *Metaphysics* on the one hand and physical sciences and mathematics on the other. In other words all that which is characteristic of the central books is absent.<sup>45</sup> Devereux has deduced that this opusculum was written after Aristotle finished book *Lambda*, and before he had developed the doctrines of the central books.<sup>46</sup> This hypothesis was already made by D. Frede.<sup>47</sup>

Glenn Most<sup>48</sup> has reached a conclusion complementary to that of Devereux. He starts with the following observations: up to present, the interpreters have almost exclusively been interested in the link between the two *Metaphysics*, and notably in the discussion on unmoved movers in Aristotle's book *Lambda* 8, but without reaching truly satisfying results. By contrast, the obvious link between chapter 9 of Theophrastus' opusculum (that is, the teleological aporiae) and Aristotle's biological writings has been neglected. Most supports the view that not only was Theophrastus' opusculum written before Aristotle's *De partibus animalium* and *De generatione animalium*, but also that these were written to answer the difficulties raised by Theophrastus, in the context of a highly profitable scientific exchange. And Most dates Theophrastus' opusculum at the same period as Aristotle's *Historia animalium*.

E. Berti has developed an hypothesis according to which Theophrastus' aim is to defend, in the framework of the discussion on the

<sup>44</sup> D. T. Devereux, "The Relationship between Theophrastus' *Metaphysics* and Aristotle's *Metaphysics Lambda*," 167–188.

<sup>45</sup> Notably he shows that it is incorrect to compare, as did Düring, *Lambda* 8 to the rest of this book, as this chapter could come later: this chapter "contains the same tripartite classification of substances found in chapter 1, and conceives of first philosophy as dealing with a particular kind of substance—the suprasensible, divine, unmoved movers" (172–174).

<sup>46</sup> *Ibid.*, 182.

<sup>47</sup> D. Frede, "Theophrasts Kritik am unbewegten Bewegten des Aristoteles," *Phronesis* 16 (1971) 65–79.

<sup>48</sup> In A. Laks, G. Most, E. Rudolph, "Four Notes on Theophrastus' *Metaphysics*," *Studies in Classical Humanities III, Theophrastean Studies on Natural Science, Physics and Metaphysics, Ethics, Religion, and Rhetoric*, ed. W. W. Fortenbaugh and R. W. Sharples (New Brunswick, NJ and Oxford 1988); G. Most, "I. The Relative Date of Theophrastus' *Metaphysics*," 224–233.

movement of the heavens, the Aristotelian doctrine of the first unmoved mover against a Platonist interpretation which could have been an attempt to reconcile this doctrine with that of the Academy.<sup>49</sup>

The conclusion suggested by these studies is that:

- 1) both *Metaphysics Lambda* and Theophrastus' opusculum were written before the central books of Aristotle's treatise as it is known to us,
- 2) and Theophrastus' opusculum could have provoked, in response, the writing of *De partibus animalium* and *De generatione animalium* by Aristotle.

These studies corroborate my hypothesis that Theophrastus' opusculum did, in effect, come after Aristotle's *Metaphysics*, at a stage of the composition of the latter treatise previous to that of which we are aware. It came after *Metaphysics Lambda* not only from a chronological point of view, but also from that of the constitution of a documentary collection corresponding to ongoing research. And it is also understandable why the opusculum was transmitted in the Aristotelian corpus from as early as the Hellenistic period, instead of being integrated into the lists of Theophrastus' works: it constitutes Theophrastus' contribution to a "first" *Metaphysics* by Aristotle. Manuscript E consequently seems to bear witness to an ancient state of the Aristotelian corpus, which was subsequently completed with the central books of *Metaphysics*. E represents a state of the Lyceum library, which bears witness to ongoing research.

Furthermore, manuscript E transmits *Metaphysics* in the middle of the biological treatises, and *De partibus animalium*, notably, comes shortly after the so-called "metaphysical" works by Aristotle and Theophrastus—it could even be supposed that *De partibus animalium* was already followed by *De generatione animalium* before the manuscript lost its final part. There is no easy way to explain this arrangement as a result of editorial intervention. But if manuscript E does bear witness to a more ancient state of Aristotle's corpus than manuscript J, by having Theophrastus' opusculum after Aristotle's *Metaphysics*, then perhaps it also includes the zoological treatise after Theophrastus' opusculum according to a more or less chronological order that reflects the development of the researches in the Lyceum.

<sup>49</sup> E. Berti, "Teofrasto e gli Accademici sul moto dei cieli."

In objection to this hypothesis, it may be pointed out that the so-called "Metaphysics" by Aristotle and Theophrastus are separated from *De partibus animalium* by a treatise whose authenticity is itself contested and which, probably for that very reason, has been little studied: *De coloribus*. However, according to Léon Robin, this treatise should also be restored to Theophrastus.<sup>50</sup> Moreover, it is more a series of observations than a theoretical treatise, and M. F. Ferrini notes therein the constant attention given to the formation and changing of colors,<sup>51</sup> and to the physical causes of these phenomena,<sup>52</sup> in the framework of some categories and concepts characteristic of Aristotelian physics.<sup>53</sup> The link with the first chapters of *Metaphysics Lambda*, which does not seem to have been perceived by Ferrini, would also deserve to be studied.

The ongoing research in the Lyceum to which E seemingly bears witness may also explain the origin of the "short series" of zoological writings (containing only *De partibus animalium* and *De generatione animalium*).<sup>54</sup> The other short zoological and psychological treatises may have been integrated into this set later, during a reorganization of the corpus. In fact, Mansion notes, with Nuyens, that *De partibus animalium* and *De motu animalium* are probably part of the most ancient

<sup>50</sup> L. Robin, *Aristote* (Paris 1944) 18. See also H. B. Gottschalk, "The *De Coloribus* and its Author," *Hermes* 92 (1964) 83–85.

<sup>51</sup> Pseudo Aristotele *I colori*, critical edition, translation, and commentary by M. F. Ferrini (Pisa 1999) 34.

<sup>52</sup> *Ibid.*, 9, 32 ff.

<sup>53</sup> *Ibid.*, 42–43.

<sup>54</sup> See notably A. Mansion, *Introduction à la Physique aristotélicienne* (Louvain and Paris 1946) 26–27. He distinguishes three schemas: to this first "short series" in which *De gen. an.* is announced at the end of *De part. an.*, Aristotle could have next added, between *De part. an.* and *De gen. an.*, *De incessu an.* (whose first sentence links it, together with *De anima*, to *De part. an.*), *De anima*, the first series of *Parva naturalia*, i.e., *De sensu et sensibilibus*, *De memoria*, *De somno*, and the appendices of the latter: *De insomniis* and *De divinatione* (this set was unified through the transition sentences linking the three first short treatises and through the conclusion of the latter, while the introduction of the first links them to *De anima*), and finally *De motu an.* whose conclusion links it to *De div. an.* and to *De gen. an.*, recapitulating on all that precedes, with the exception of *De inc. an.*; Mansion states that *De inc. an.* may be considered as the sequel to or an appendix of *De part. an.* Finally, Aristotle could have completed the set of *Parva naturalia* with *De longitudine et brevitate vitae*, *De iuventute et senectute*, *De vita et morte*, and *De respiratione*, adding a general introduction at the beginning of *De sensu*. Jaeger had already emphasized that the characteristic functions of the animal soul are sensation and movement (W. Jaeger, "Das Pneuma im Lykeion," *Hermes* 48 [1913] 36).

works.<sup>55</sup> Now, these two zoological treatises accompany *Metaphysics* in the ancient part of *Parisinus gr. 1853*, which presents successively *Physics*, *De caelo*, *De generatione et corruptione*, *Meteorologica*, *De anima*, *De sensu*, *De memoria*, *De somno et vigilia* and *De divinatione per somnum*, *De motu animalium*, *Metaphysics*, *Theophrastus' Metaphysics*, *De coloribus*, and *De partibus animalium*. On the other hand, Paul Moraux already noted that it "is very probable that *Metaphysics* was originally situated at the end of the group, after the zoological treatises; and that it may also be that *De caelo* directly followed *Physics*."<sup>56</sup> Broadly speaking, *Parisinus gr. 1853* would corroborate this hypothesis. The appendix to the anonymous catalog of Aristotelian works would also bear witness to this first chronological "stage" in Aristotle's works. It presents, according to descending order specific to the Peripatetics<sup>57</sup> (and with an unusual order for the treatises of natural philosophy),<sup>58</sup> *Physics*, *De generatione et corruptione*, *Meteorologica*, *De caelo*, *De anima*, *Metaphysics*, *Historia animalium*, *De motu animalium*, *De partibus* and *De generatione animalium*.<sup>59</sup> Indeed, therein are found the same zoological treatises, plus the compendium *Historia animalium* which belongs rather to the ὑπομνήματα genus than to the didactic genus.<sup>60</sup> This time, *Metaphysics* is placed before them, just after *De anima*, without the first part of *Parva naturalia* transmitted almost entirely by E<sup>61</sup> (*De sensu et sensibilibus*, *De memoria et reminiscentia*, *De somno et vigilia*, *De insomniis* and *De divinatione per somnum*).<sup>62</sup>

<sup>55</sup> F. J. Nuyens, *Ontwikkelingsmomenten in de zielkunde van Aristoteles: een historisch-philosophische studie* (Nijmegen and Utrecht 1939) 143–145; see Mansion, *Introduction à la Physique aristotélicienne*, 31.

<sup>56</sup> Paul Moraux, *Les listes anciennes des ouvrages d'Aristote* (Louvain 1951) 268.

<sup>57</sup> Natural philosophy, then man, animals, plants and minerals. The Neoplatonists replaced it with ascending order: principles, mineralogy, botany, zoology, and anthropology.

<sup>58</sup> The traditional order is *Physics*, *De caelo*, *De generatione et corruptione*, and *Meteorologica* (as in manuscripts E and J).

<sup>59</sup> See Moraux, *Les listes anciennes*, 268. On the series of physical treatises, see Mansion, 13–22.

<sup>60</sup> It was thus more of a compendium of facts intended to flesh out the theoretical studies.

<sup>61</sup> Except for *De insomniis*.

<sup>62</sup> This first part of *Parva naturalia* could be older than *De longitudine et brevitate vitae*, *De iuventute et senectute*, *De vita et morte*, and *De respiratione*.

Consequently, manuscript E could pass on a precious testimony to an order of the treatises prior to a scholarly revision attested by J, on the one hand because of the inversion of the sequence of Aristotle's and Theophrastus' *Metaphysics*, and on the other because of the insertion of *Metaphysics* in the zoological writings according to an order that probably pre-dates a reorganization of the treatises. Of course, *Metaphysics* in manuscript E is presented in fourteen books, that is, in what has become the traditional state: the completion of the treatise was taken into account during earlier collations (before the edition attested by E), but the corpus seems to be still in progress. E may be indeed the descendant of a copy of Aristotelian writings that corroborates a state of the research in the Lyceum before Aristotle achieved the revision of his works on basis of contributions by other philosophers of the school.

I would lastly suggest a slight change of Jaeger's theory according to which this manuscript could come from a Byzantine edition which itself stemmed from an "augmented" Peripatetic edition: an edition enlarged with Theophrastus' treatise ("Andronicus Auctus");<sup>63</sup> in fact, Theophrastus' treatise was already included in the Peripatetic collection of Aristotelian writings (possibly edited by Andronicus).<sup>64</sup>

#### CENTER FOR HELLENIC STUDIES

<sup>63</sup> W. Jaeger, *Aristotelis Metaphysica*, vii.

<sup>64</sup> See previously mentioned objections by J. Barnes, n. 33.