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The investigation of the Greek, Latin, Arabic and Hebrew sources for the knowledge of Metaphysics Lambda promised in this volume is an important contribution to the field and deserves to be gratefully acknowledged.

The volume falls into three main parts: Prolegomena, edition of Book Lambda, and Appendix. The Prolegomena consist of the description and transcription of a “new, independent manuscript” of Book Lambda of Aristotle’s Metaphysics (pp. 3-21), and of a section entitled “Affiliations of the hitherto known codices” (pp. 23-69). Then comes the critical edition announced in the title (pp. 71-111), accompanied by a commentary (pp. 115-51). The Appendix contains the transcription of the Latin version of Lambda authored by Fabius Niphus (second half of the 16th century), the grandson of Augustinus Niphus (pp. 155-83), followed by a new description of the manuscript Mount Athos 4508 (pp. 185-91). The bibliography and indexes occupy pp. 193-296. This volume is devoted exclusively to Lambda: the A. works on the assumption that the critical edition of an individual book of the Metaphysics is legitimate – an assumption that the present writer does not intend to challenge, but whose rationale is not accounted for: the words with which the Prefatory Note opens, “The twelfth book of the Metaphysics, which was originally an independent treatise, is crucial for the understanding of Aristotle’s philosophy” (p. vii) might even suggest the idea that since in the beginning, when Aristotle wrote it down, this book was an independent treatise, then it can be dealt with from the philological point of view in isolation from the other books. It is surely not so in the view of the A., but more explanation on this point would have been welcomed.

The reader is expected to be already acquainted with the structure of the textual tradition of the Metaphysics – which has luckily been studied in a number of foundational works1 – because at p. 9

1. Another edition of this book of the Metaphysics has been published recently: S. Fazzo, Il libro Lambda della Metafisica di Aristotele, Bibliopolis, Napoli 2010 (Elenchos. Collana di testi e studi sul pensiero antico, 41, 1). This work is not taken into account by the A., nor does it feature in the Bibliography.

2. Among these foundational studies, I will limit myself to mentioning here the well-known essay by D. Harlfinger, “Zur Überlieferungsgeschichte der Metaphysik”, in P. Aubenque (ed.), Études sur la Métaphysique d’Aristote. Actes du VIe Symposium Aristotelicum, Vrin, Paris 1979, pp. 7-36, duly acknowledged by the A. at p. 3, n. 1 and on various occasions later on. It is also necessary to mention an important article, which on the contrary is surprisingly ignored by the A.: C. Luna, “Observations sur le texte des livres M-N de la Métaphysique d’Aristote”, Documenti e studi sulla tradizione filosofica medievale 16 (2005), pp. 553-93. This essay contains the results of the collation (books M-N) of the two manuscripts Milano, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, F 113 Sup. (gr. 363), siglum: M, and Torino, Biblioteca Nazionale Universitaria, B. VII. 23 (siglum: C) as well as of the three basic manuscripts of the Metaphysics, namely Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, gr. 1853 (siglum: E), Wien, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Phil. gr. 100 (siglum: J), both belonging to branch z, and Firenze, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Plut. 87, 12 (siglum: Aβ), belonging to branch β until the middle of Lambda 7. The fact that the A. is not acquainted with this study is especially regrettable, because it deals with the same issue to which is devoted the present volume, namely the importance of later independent manuscripts belonging to branch β: see below, n. 9.
branch $\beta$ is mentioned without any previous information on the A.’s part about the existence of other branches or, more in general, about the number and known dates of the manuscripts through which Aristotle’s *Metaphysics* has come down to us. Such information is partially provided in the section devoted to the affiliations of the manuscripts, where the reader is informed that the direct tradition is bipartite, and a list of manuscripts belonging to branch $\alpha$ is given; but for the moment, in Chapter I, the reader finds himself directly in medias res. As mentioned before, this volume begins with the description of what is labelled as a “new, independent manuscript” of *Metaphysics Lambda*, namely Città del Vaticano, *Vat. gr. 115* ($V^k$). $V^k$ is presented in the title of this section of the *Prolegomena* as a “new” manuscript, but obviously it is not: as noticed by the A., it had already been taken into account by no less an Aristotelian scholar than Christian Brandis, as well as by other specialists in the field. $V^k$ features in the studies on the textual tradition of the *Metaphysics* chiefly as a testimony of books A-E, but it contains also (fols. 144r - 155v) a section entitled παραστημένωτες ἐκ τῶν ύπολοιπών στοιχείων του μετὰ τά φυσικά. This section too is known to the scholarship; if the A. speaks of a “new” testimony it is because “a close inspection of the manuscript in situ reveals on fols. 151r - 152v and 154r - 155r extensive passages from the twelfth book of this Aristotelian work” (p. 8), something that raises $V^k$ to the rank of “hitherto neglected evidence” (p. 9) of the textual tradition of this part of the *Metaphysics*. The parts of Book Lambda attested by $V^k$ are transcribed at pp. 15-21, with the indication at each line of the correlated Bekker line.

$V^k$ was written by the Byzantine copyist Gennadios Scholarios (d. ca. 1472); thus, it belongs to the low branches of a textual tradition whose earliest testimonies can be traced back to the 9th century, as is famously the case with manuscript J (branch $\alpha$). That nothing prevents a later manuscript from being an important testimony of a given textual tradition is, after Pasquali, a well-known rule; but that this is indeed the case with $V^k$ has to be proven, and this the A. tries to do at pp. 9-11. Before we turn to this issue, let me follow the A.’s path in presenting the reasons why a “hitherto neglected evidence” of the Greek text of *Lambda* is so important. The point is that $V^k$ contains “approximately

---

3 Only the manuscripts containing book *Lambda* are taken into account, and they are said to be forty-two (p. 25); should the reader be willing to know something about the total number, or the known dates of the manuscripts of the *Metaphysics* taken as a whole, he should refer to other studies, and in particular to the essay by Dieter Harl quoted in the preceding note.

4 At p. 8 n. 32, we are told that this section of the manuscript was examined by Ch.A. Brandis, *Die Aristotelischen Handschriften der Vatikanischen Bibliothek*, Druckerei des König. Akademie der Wissenschaften, Berlin 1832 (Abhandlungen der König. Akad. der Wiss. zu Berlin, Histor-philol. Cl. 1831), p. 82.

5 The manuscript Wien, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Phil. gr. 100 (J) has been dated to the middle of the 9th century by Jean Irigoin in his foundational study “L’Aristote de Vienne”, *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik* 6 (1957), pp. 5-10 not mentioned by the A. Other important studies on this manuscript and on its relationship to the so-called “Collection philosophique” that are lacking in this volume include G. Vuillemin-Diem, “Untersuchungen zu der Überlieferung der König. Akad. der Wiss. zu Berlin, Histor-philol. Cl. 1831), p. 82.

6 As mentioned before, this volume begins with the *Prolegomena* of the Aristotelian scholar than Christian Brandis, namely Città del Vaticano, *Vat. gr. 115* ($V^k$). $V^k$ is presented in the title of this section of the *Prolegomena* as a “new” manuscript, but obviously it is not: as noticed by the A., it had already been taken into account by no less an Aristotelian scholar than Christian Brandis, as well as by other specialists in the field. $V^k$ features in the studies on the textual tradition of the *Metaphysics* chiefly as a testimony of books A-E, but it contains also (fols. 144r - 155v) a section entitled παραστημένωτες ἐκ τῶν ύπολοιπών στοιχείων του μετὰ τά φυσικά. This section too is known to the scholarship; if the A. speaks of a “new” testimony it is because “a close inspection of the manuscript in situ reveals on fols. 151r - 152v and 154r - 155r extensive passages from the twelfth book of this Aristotelian work” (p. 8), something that raises $V^k$ to the rank of “hitherto neglected evidence” (p. 9) of the textual tradition of this part of the *Metaphysics*. The parts of Book Lambda attested by $V^k$ are transcribed at pp. 15-21, with the indication at each line of the correlated Bekker line.

$V^k$ was written by the Byzantine copyist Gennadios Scholarios (d. ca. 1472); thus, it belongs to the low branches of a textual tradition whose earliest testimonies can be traced back to the 9th century, as is famously the case with manuscript J (branch $\alpha$). That nothing prevents a later manuscript from being an important testimony of a given textual tradition is, after Pasquali, a well-known rule; but that this is indeed the case with $V^k$ has to be proven, and this the A. tries to do at pp. 9-11. Before we turn to this issue, let me follow the A.’s path in presenting the reasons why a “hitherto neglected evidence” of the Greek text of *Lambda* is so important. The point is that $V^k$ contains “approximately

---

3 Only the manuscripts containing book *Lambda* are taken into account, and they are said to be forty-two (p. 25); should the reader be willing to know something about the total number, or the known dates of the manuscripts of the *Metaphysics* taken as a whole, he should refer to other studies, and in particular to the essay by Dieter Harl quoted in the preceding note.

4 At p. 8 n. 32, we are told that this section of the manuscript was examined by Ch.A. Brandis, *Die Aristotelischen Handschriften der Vatikanischen Bibliothek*, Druckerei des König. Akademie der Wissenschaften, Berlin 1832 (Abhandlungen der König. Akad. der Wiss. zu Berlin, Histor-philol. Cl. 1831), p. 82.


three quarters” of the second part of book *Lambda* (p. 9). As demonstrated by Dieter Harlfinger,7 in this second part one of the basic manuscripts of branch 蚌 skips from the latter to branch 兀.8 Hence, determining if V$k$ belongs to branch 蚌 and if it is an independent member of this branch is especially important: should this be the case, then the readings of V$k$ should be taken into account in the establishment of the text of the *Metaphysics* in a particularly problematic section. That V$k$ is an independent manuscript is clearly stated in Harlfinger’s *stemma codicum*, and Luna has shown apropos two other manuscripts of the same branch how promising is the collation of the independent manuscripts of branch 蚌 for the second part of *Lambda*.9

But in the A.’s view this is not the only reason why this manuscript is so important. In his account of its importance the Arabic translation of the *Metaphysics* comes to the fore, in a way however that is not clear to me. The A. says: “One should not forget in this context that the second part of *Lambda* is more poorly transmitted than the first and that it abounds in textual problems; the Florentine manuscript *Laurentianus 87*, 12 ceases to represent a valuable and insufficiently known stream of the tradition in the posterior part of the book, and the Arabic version of Abū Bishr Mattā, which is mainly based on the lost commentary of Alexander of Aphrodisias, breaks off at 1072b15, a few lines before Gennadios Scholarios starts copying out the portions of the text we are concerned with” (p. 9). Taken at its face value, this statement implies that the only Arabic translation of Book *Lambda* available is the one made by Abū Bishr Mattā, and that it ceases to be so after *Lambda* 7, 1072 b 15. But this is far from being the case: first, as far as we know for the moment there is no such thing as an Arabic translation of *Metaphysics Lambda* made by Abū Bishr Mattā which was based upon Alexander’s commentary:10 what we know (from the *K. al-Fihrist* by Ibn al-Nadim)11 is that Abū Bishr Mattā authored the translation of Alexander’s commentary on *Lambda*,12 whose lemmata are in

8 The demonstration provided by Harlfinger, “Zur Überlieferungsgeschichte der Metaphysik”, that starting from A 7 the manuscript Firenze, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Plut. 87, 12 skips from branch 蚌 to branch 兀 counts (obviously) as one of the main points of the reconstruction presented in this volume; however, at p. 51 the A. speaks of the “supposed change of allegiance” of this manuscript (my emphasis), something that I do not understand.
9 See above, n. 2. The following remarks by Luna, “Observations sur le texte des livres M-N”, p. 583, are worth quoting in full: “L’analyse que l’on vient de présenter confirme, nous semble-t-il, la conclusion à laquelle est parvenu Dieter Harlfinger: à partir de A 7, ce sont les ms. Ambros. F 113 sup. (M) et Taur. B. VII 23 (C), et non plus A$, qui représentent la branche 蚌 de la tradition de la *Méthaphysique*. Ils permettent, en effet, d’améliorer le texte des éditions courantes pour les livres M-N dans une quarantaine d’endroits, tantôt par des leçons inconnues des éditeurs, tantôt en confirmant des leçons de la tradition indirecte ou des conjectures de savants. Ils permettent aussi, d’une part, d’éliminer du texte un certain nombre de leçons isolées de A$ qui ne jouissent plus d’aucune autorité, et, d’autre part, de prendre en considération une dizaine de leçons de E [that is, one of the basic manuscripts of the *Metaphysics*, belonging to branch 兀: see above, n. 2] qui, jusqu’ici isolées, sont maintenant confirmées par MC. C’est donc à juste titre que Dieter Harlfinger clôt son article en rappelant ce qui, à partir de la *Storia della tradizione e critica del testo* de Giorgio Pasquali, est devenu un principe incontestable de la critique textuelle: *Recentiores, non deteriores*”.
10 The same uncertainty reappears at pp. 72-3, where the A. says apropos Abū Bishr Mattā that “This version is related to the lemmata of Alexander’s commentary, but is not based exclusively on them, since it repeatedly shows striking similarities with the translation of Ustāth”. The implication is that Abū Bishr Mattā translated *Lambda* having at his disposal Alexander’s commentary and the translation by Ustāṭ (on which see below, n. 20; on this translator, n. 21); but the sources say that Abū Bishr Mattā’s translated Alexander’s commentary on *Lambda* (see below, n. 18), and not *Lambda* itself, consulting Alexander’s lemmata.
11 See below, n. 18.
12 The A. correctly says that Alexander’s commentary on *Lambda* is lost in Greek, but omits to explain here that what is extant and edited in Greek is the commentary by the pseudo-Alexander, in fact Michael of Ephesus, as advanced already
part quoted by Averroes. More importantly, the impression that after 1072 b 15 there is no Arabic version extant should immediately be rectified: the translation of the second part of Book Lambda is extant, and edited. It can easily be read and checked against the Greek; the A. is well aware of this fact, since in the apparatus of his own edition the readings of the Arabic are recorded, and the various Arabic versions are endowed each with its own siglum; the A. also sums up the main information about the Arabic versions of Lambda elsewhere in the volume (p. 72). Thus, we are left with the possibility that what the A. wanted to say at p. 9 is that since Alexander’s commentary is lost in Greek, and since its Arabic version extends only until 1072 b 15, the testimony of Vk is particularly important because it fills a gap in our knowledge of the text of Lambda, a gap that would have been filled by the lemmata as quoted by Alexander, if only we had access to them through the mediation of the Arabic, as is the case with previous sections of Lambda.

Be that as it may, it seems to me that a plain presentation of what kind of textual evidence one can get from the Arabic versions of the Metaphysics would have been helpful to the reader, and I deem it necessary to sum up here the main data, before presenting the way in which the A. deals with Vk and its stemmatic position. In what follows, the Greek text and its Arabic translation are presented according to the “sections”, so to say, that are created by the lemmata quoted by Averroes. This because the Arabic version of the Metaphysics has come down to us through Averroes’ Great Commentary, that is preserved in only one manuscript housed in Leiden, Bibliothecae der Rijksuniversiteit, or. 2074 (and, for a little number of folios, in another manuscript of the same library, Or. 2075). A series of fortunate circumstances makes the Arabic Metaphysics available, and in more than one translation: first, Averroes himself had recourse to various versions; second, the copyist of the Leiden manuscript was lucky enough to have more than one translation at his disposal, and accurate enough to copy in the margins the version which was alternative to that quoted by Averroes; third, all these stratified materials (only a part of which I have mentioned here) found between the 30’s and the 50’s of the past century the erudition, restless care and intelligent reading of the Jesuit priest Maurice Bouyges, who edited them in the κτῆμα αἰώνιον represented by the volumes V-VII of the series “Bibliotheca Arabica Scholasticonum”, published in Beirut. Thus, that there is an Arabic text corresponding to the Greek after 1272 b 15 is a fact. Another point that is worth mentioning is that Abū Bīr Mattā’s version of Alexander’s genuine commentary16

by K. Praechter in his review of Michaelis Ephesii In libros De Partibus animalium, De Animalium motione, De Animalium incessu ed. M. Hayduck, CAG XXIII 2, Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen 168 (1906), pp. 861-907, and as demonstrated by C. Luna, Trois études sur la tradition des commentaires anciens à la Métaphysique d’Aristote, Brill, Leiden 2001 (Philosophia Antiqua, 88), esp. pp. 1-71. The distinction between Alexander’s genuine commentary on Lambda (indirectly and partially attested by Averroes) and the Greek pseudo-Alexander is mentioned later on by the A., e.g. at p. 117; once again, it is regrettable that Luna, Trois études, is not taken into account. 13

13 See below, n. 18.


15 See the preceding note. Thanks to a license agreement with the Publisher Dar el-Machreq, this work is available online at http://www.greekintoarabic.eu/index.php?id=106.

16 The text that Averroes quotes as being the commentary by Alexander on Lambda is not that which is edited to-
– which included the lemmata, as we learn from Averroes’ quotations – possibly extended even after 1272 b 15, as has been suggested with good arguments.\(^{17}\)

From the beginning of book \textit{Lambda} (1069 a 18) to approximately the middle of Chapter 7 (1072 b 16) the lemmata commented upon by Averroes come from Abū Bīr Mattā’s translation of Alexander’s commentary.\(^{18}\) For the subsequent passages, Averroes had recourse to another version,\(^{19}\) that from which he took most of the lemmata that feature in his commentary on the \textit{Metaphysics:} the earliest translation of this work, made for al-Kindī\(^{20}\) by a scholar named Uṣṭāt (Eustathios)\(^{21}\) whose translation technique has been studied by Gerhard Endress\(^{22}\) and Manfred Ullmann.\(^{23}\) From 1073 a 14 onwards, and until the end of \textit{Lambda}, either Averroes continued to make use of Uṣṭāt’s...
translators, as maintained by Bouyges, or, as advanced by Marc Geoffroy, he went back to Abū Bišr Mattā’s version of Alexander’s commentary.

In Averroes’ commentary the lemmata of the *Metaphysics* are interwoven with his own exegeses. The two formulaic expressions that mark the alternance between Aristotle’s text and Averroes’ commentary are *qāla Aristātālis* (“Aristotle said” = Textus = T.) and *tafsir* (“Commentary” = Commentum = C.). Here I will limit myself to quoting the first lemma after the switch from Abū Bišr Mattā’s lemmata to Usṭāṯ’s. The chart below is intended to allow the reader to realize how literal the Arabic rendering is. Then, another chart will follow in which, without quoting the lemmata in extenso, I will give the correspondences between the Greek and Arabic passages from *Lambda* 7, 1072 b 30 to the end of the chapter (1073 a 13).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lambda 7, 1072 b 16-30</th>
<th>Bouyges, pp. 1613.6-1615.2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ἐπεὶ καὶ ἥδων ἡ ἐνέργεια τοῦτο (καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἐγρήγορας αἵθερης νόησις ἱδίον, ἐξελίξεις δὲ καὶ μνήμης διὰ τούτου), ἡ δὲ νόησις ἡ καθ’ οὕτων τοῦ καθ’ οὕτως ἄριστον, καὶ οὕτως τοῦ ἀμιστο. οὕτων δὲ νοεῖ ὁ νοεῖ κατὰ μετάληψιν τοῦ νοητοῦ νοητὸς γὰρ γίγνεται θειγόνω καὶ νοῶν, οὕτως τοῦτο νοῶν καὶ νοητόν. τὸ γὰρ δεκτικὸν τοῦ νοητοῦ καὶ τῆς ὑπάρχοντος νοοῦ, ἐνέργεια δὲ ἐγγυών, ὡς ἐκεῖνον μᾶλλον τοῦτο ὁ δοκεῖ ἡ νοοῦ ἁντίθεν ἔχειν, καὶ ή τεωρεῖ τὸ ἡδίστον καὶ ἄριστον. εἰ οὖν οὕτως εὖ ἔχει, ὡς ἡμᾶς ποτε, ὁ θεός οὐκ ἐκατομμύρων: εἰ δὲ μᾶλλον, ἐτι θαμαμώσεσαν, ἔχει δὲ ὦδε. καὶ τῷ θεῷ γὰρ ἐπὶ ἄριστον ἐνέργεια ἐνεργοῦν ἐκεῖνον ὑπό τινι ἀδίκος· ἀδίκος δὲ τὸν θεόν εἰκασεν ἄριστον, ἐνεργεῖα δὲ τῷ θεῷ· τοῦτο γὰρ ο θεός.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| فإن اللذة فعل لذلك أيضا أيضا لهذه العلة البقعة والحس والفهم لذا هذا أنا وذكر هذا فلما كان هذا الفهم الذي أبداه فلذلي هو أفضل بيانه والذي هو أكثر فلهذي هو أكثر الذي يفهم ذاته هو العقل باكأس العقول فإنه بصير معقولا حين بلبس ويفهم ذلك العقل والعقول شبيه واحد، فإن قلب العقول والجوهر هو عقل وإنما يعمل إذ إذا بنظير أن العقل ذلك الألازم أكثر من هذا أيضا وأنا أيضا أشياء لم يذكيد جدا، فقابل فإن كان الآلهة أيضا كحالة في وقت فما ذلك عجب فإن كان أكثر فأكثر عجبًا فلهذا وهم هو عقل THEN Hautien 129 et littéralement)، et que le commentaire de Abū Bišr dans la traduction de l’Aristote d’Alexandre. Au niveau terminologique, l’une des indications les plus évidentes est l’usage du terme *sarmadī* pour *ċëĎēęĢ* (‘éternel’), qui est habituel chez Abū Bišr mais n’est jamais utilisé par Usṭāṯ. It is useful to quote also the synthesis made by Geoffroy, ibid., p. 423: “On peut donc vraisemblablement conclure que non seulement Averroès connaissait le commentaire d’Alexandre pour le texte d’Aristote jusqu’à 1074 a 31, mais qu’il a continué d’utiliser comme texte de base pour son commentaire les Textus contenus dans Alexandre et traduits par Abū Bišr, jusqu’à l’endroit où s’interrompait sa copie du *Commentaire* d’Alexandre, avec seulement une exception pour les Textus 39 à 41.”

---


25 M. Geoffroy, “Remarques sur la traduction Uṣṭāṯ”, quoted above n. 17, p. 421: “Sans aucun doute, jusqu’au Textus 38 (1072b16), la version commentée est Abū Bišr. Pour la suite immédiate du texte, Averroès est retourné à Uṣṭāṯ. Mais comme l’a noté P. Thillet, la suite du commentaire porte des traces de la connaissance par Averroès du commentaire d’Alexandre au-delà de cette limite, même si plus aucune citation littérale d’Alexandre ne peut être relevée. Mais ce qui est vrai pour le commentaire d’Alexandre l’est aussi pour les Textus provenant de ce commentaire et traduits par Abū Bišr. L’analyse stylistique que nous avons entreprise tend à montrer que, contrairement à l’opinion de Bouyges, qui considérait que ‘Les Textus 39 et suivants sont pris par Averroès à la traduction Asṭāt’, l’on pouvait penser qu’au moins les Textus 43, 44 et 45 (= 1073a22-b22), vraisemblablement aussi le T 46 (= 1073b22-32), proviennent de la même version que les Textus antérieurs à 39, c’est-à-dire celle d’Abū Bišr dans la traduction du commentaire d’Alexandre. Au niveau terminologique, l’une des indications les plus évidentes est l’usage du terme *sarmadī* pour *ċëĎēęĢ* (‘éternel’), qui est habituel chez Abū Bišr mais n’est jamais utilisé par Uṣṭāṯ. It is useful to quote also the synthesis made by Geoffroy, *ibid.*, p. 423: “On peut donc vraisemblablement conclure que non seulement Averroès connaissait le commentaire d’Alexandre pour le texte d’Aristote jusqu’à 1074 a 31, mais qu’il a continué d’utiliser comme texte de base pour son commentaire les Textus contenus dans Alexandre et traduits par Abū Bišr, jusqu’à l’endroit où s’interrompait sa copie du *Commentaire* d’Alexandre, avec seulement une exception pour les Textus 39 à 41.”
The translation by Uṣṭāṭ, of which this is just a specimen, is of obvious importance from the viewpoint of the Greek text of the *Metaphysics*: it was made for al-Kindī (d. after 860), which means that the Greek manuscript at Uṣṭāṭ’s disposal was either coeval with the earliest extant Greek manuscript, J, or earlier than it. It is true that the value for the Greek text of this indirect testimony which, on a chronological basis, seems to be of great importance heavily depends upon how accurate and skilful the translator was; but if one decides to take into account the indirect testimony represented by the Arabic version, it is primarily to this early version that one has to turn. Indeed, it counts as the best candidate for a check in the case of passages dagged in the direct tradition, while Abū Biṣr Mattā’s translation of Alexander’s commentary on *Lambda* comes necessarily second, for the following reasons: first, this translation is available only in part and of second hand, namely through Averroes; second, it was made out of a Syriac version (Abū Biṣr Mattā had no Greek). On the contrary, Uṣṭāṭ’s translation extends for the most part of the entire *Metaphysics*, and was made from Greek on the basis of a manuscript that, although predictably not connected with the textual tradition of the Greek *Metaphysics* – since in all likelihood it ended its life in Baghdad – was chronologically parallel to the earliest extant Greek manuscript, J. Also in consideration of this, the following chart lists the lemmata of the second part of *Book Lambda* that surely belong to Uṣṭāṭ’s translation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><em>Lambda</em> 7, 1072 b 30 - 1073 a 3</th>
<th>Bouyges, p. 1624.7-12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>δῆται δὲ ὑπολογιζόμεναι (... ἐξ ὑμᾶς ὁ σπέρμα.</td>
<td>فاْما جَمِيعُ الَّذِينَ يَظْلُونُ (…) الَّذِي مَنِي الْزِرْعَ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><em>Lambda</em> 7, 1073 a 3 - 13</th>
<th>Bouyges, pp. 1625.11-1626.4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>δῆται μὲν οὐν δῆται οὐσία (…) τῶν τρόπων.</td>
<td>فاْما أَنَّ جَوْهْرَ (…) عَلَى هَذَا الْحَالِ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is time to go back to manuscript Vk. The proof that it belongs to branch β is pursued by the A. not by presenting the cases in which Vk communes in error with the other manuscripts of the same branch, but the other way round: the passages mentioned at pp. 10-11, that are meant to prove “the affiliation of the passages mentioned above [i.e. the part of *Lambda* transcribed by Gennadios Scholarios] to the β family” (p. 10), are all of them cases in which Vk communes with Ab (as for the passages in which it still belongs to branch β), as well as with M and C (branch Č) in what the A. himself declares to be the sound reading. It is on this ground that the A. claims that “a strong affinity” of Vk “with this group is indisputable”; but the fact that Vk communes in the sound reading attested by branch β means only that it does not belong to branch α. The proof that it belongs to branch β can be provided only by cases apt to prove that it communes in error with it. That Vk is an independent manuscript is argued on the basis of the fact that “many peculiar errors

---

26 See above, n. 20.
27 See above, n. 2.
28 When, in the section devoted to the “Affiliations of the hitherto known codices”, the “Relationship between the independent codices of the β family” is discussed, the A. affirms once again that C and M “have hitherto remained uncollated and neglected by editors” (p. 32), what – once again – is true only if *Lambda* alone is taken into account: as mentioned above, n. 9, the results of the collation of M and C for books M-N have been published by Luna in 2005. That the A. thinks that these manuscripts have been neglected tout court is shown by n. 59, p. 52, where he claims apropos M that “For some reason the relevant evidence, presented at the Sixth Symposium Aristotelicicum, has not been discussed at all in the recent literature” (my emphasis).
of M and C are not present in the Vatican manuscript”; thus, says the A., “Vk cannot be regarded as their apograph” (p. 10). It is therefore the A.’s conviction that Vk “can help to reconstruct readings of the lost hyparchetype ß; this is especially useful in the section of Metaph. A where cod. Laur. 87, 12 represents the α family (i.e. 1073 a 1 - 1076 a 4) and where the lections of the hyparchetype ß had to be restored until now almost exclusively from M and C” (p. 11). The relationship between Vk, M and C is discussed at n. 41 p. 10 on the basis of five separative errors of “M against Vk” and two of C against Vk. In the section entitled “Relationships between the independent codices of the ß family” (pp. 32-39) the point is no longer discussed; particularly puzzling for the reader is the fact that Vk does not feature in the stemma codicum on p. 39, devoted to the section 1073 a 1 - 1076 a 4, i.e. the section where Ab ceases to represent branch ß, and where Vk should represent this branch as an independent testimony as M and C.

The core of the volume is represented by the edition of Lambda. Fourteen manuscripts are considered as the basic ones, and twenty-nine further manuscripts plus three editions (editio Aldina, editio Erasmi and Casaubon’s edition) are listed as supplementary testimonies. As I said at the beginning of my review, one has surely to be grateful to the A. for having included in his apparatus also a number of indirect testimonies of the text of Lambda, derived from the Greek commentaries both genuine and spurious, from the Arabic translations and commentaries, from the Latin translations from Greek, and from the partial Hebrew version of Averroes’ commentary. The fact that the respective value of all these testimonies is not discussed may leave room for some disappointment on the part of the reader, but it would be unfair not to acknowledge that it is incredibly difficult to master such a huge amount of documentation on a text on which every age, in every language, had so many things to say.

From the Bibliography some studies are lacking, that would surely have been useful for the purpose of this book.30

Cristina D’Ancona

---

29 The so-called Metaphysica nova, namely the version from Arabic into Latin of the lemmata of Averroes’ Great Commentary translated in all likelihood by Michael Scot (d. 1236) is not included. More information on the metaphysica nova in the article by G. Vuillemin-Diem, “Les traductions gréco-latines de la Métaphysique au moyen âge: le problème de la Metaphysica Vetus”, Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie 49 (1967), pp. 7-57, esp. pp. 22-23 (this study features in the bibliography of this volume).