



2012

## New Manuscripts of the *Divisiones Aristoteleae*

Justin Barney

Brigham Young University - Provo, [justin.barney@outlook.com](mailto:justin.barney@outlook.com)

Follow this and additional works at: [https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/libraryrg\\_studentpub](https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/libraryrg_studentpub)

The Library Student Research Grant program encourages outstanding student achievement in research, fosters information literacy, and stimulates original scholarship.

---

### BYU ScholarsArchive Citation

Barney, Justin, "New Manuscripts of the *Divisiones Aristoteleae*" (2012). *Library Research Grants*. 19. [https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/libraryrg\\_studentpub/19](https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/libraryrg_studentpub/19)

This Peer-Reviewed Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Harold B. Lee Library at BYU ScholarsArchive. It has been accepted for inclusion in Library Research Grants by an authorized administrator of BYU ScholarsArchive. For more information, please contact [scholarsarchive@byu.edu](mailto:scholarsarchive@byu.edu), [ellen\\_amatangelo@byu.edu](mailto:ellen_amatangelo@byu.edu).

# New Manuscript of the *Divisiones Aristoteleae*

## Introduction

---

The following is one leaf of a manuscript containing a fragment of the work now called the *Divisiones quae vulgo dicuntur Aristoteleae* (*DA*). Of the sixty-nine divisions that are known from M (Marcianus gr. 257), our most complete manuscript, six (37-42) are preserved in the newly discovered copy. The manuscript (hereafter B) was acquired by the Harold B. Lee Library at Brigham Young University as a part of a three-volume collection on January 19, 1979. The *DA* is bound in the second volume and occupies ff. 5-6. Also contained in volume two are lectionaries, a portion (chs. 26-30) of the treatise *Περὶ Μεθόδου Δεινότητος* by Hermogenes of Tarsus, and several liturgical texts. This fragment of the *DA* is the first text to be published from the volume.<sup>1)</sup>

The manuscript is written in a single, early tenth-century miniscule hand. While the body of the text is written with miniscule letters, section headings are written in majuscules. The letters are scrupulously formed and display no discernable slope. All letters stand on the line, suggesting that the text was written in the first half of the tenth-century, when scribes began forming characters below the scored line.<sup>2)</sup> Comparanda include Harley MS 5694 (ca. 912-4); MS. Laud gr. 39 (early tenth-century); Laurentianus 69.02 (tenth-century); and Clarke MS. 39 (AD 896).<sup>3)</sup> Such an attribution would make B the earliest manuscript of the *DA* by three centuries.<sup>4)</sup>

The first line of each section displays reverse-indentation (*ekthesis*) to the width of one letter (always delta), which is written in the left gutter. Diacritical marks and marks of punctuation are regularly applied, though marks of diaeresis are absent. Accents are of the rounded type, and slight stylizations demarcate section headings. The leaf measures 200 x 130 mm. and the text is written in a single column. The scoring of the manuscript comports with Sautel's standard ruling type 20A1.<sup>5)</sup>

Dorandi has demonstrated that in comparing the extant manuscripts of the *DA*, two dominant groups emerge: a late pairing of manuscripts (LN) and a somewhat earlier pairing (AM).<sup>6)</sup> Based upon textual evidence, it can be said with some certainty that manuscript B is closely related to manuscripts L (*Leidensis Vossianus* gr. Q 11) and N (*Leidensis* BPG 67C). While manuscripts A (*Parisinus* gr. 39) and M diverge from the readings of BLN throughout, LN stray from B's text only slightly. For disjunctive errors that suggest a division between the two sets of manuscripts, see H.8, 8-10; F.8-9, 12-3, 16. Moreover, where the text of A is wanting, the discrepancies between M and BLN often verify the genealogical distance between B and AM. Conjunctive readings that indicate an association of B with LN are shown in the apparatus wherever LN do not appear with an alternate reading. These readings are most instructive when AM diverge

---

<sup>1)</sup> Roger Macfarlane has edited volume one of the collection and [current state of project].

<sup>2)</sup> See Barbour (1981, xxx).

<sup>3)</sup> Plates can be found in Thompson (1912, 227-30) and Wilson (1973, 15). For Harley MS and Laurentianus 69.02, see digital images at, respectively, <http://www.bl.uk/manuscripts/> and <http://teca.bmlonline.it/TecaRicerca/>

<sup>4)</sup> Diogenes Laertius transmits an earlier account, however it only preserves divisions 1-32, and may transmit its own, distinct corpus. Cf. Dorandi (2011, 145-8).

<sup>5)</sup> Cf. Sautel (1995, 45). For the significance of each component of the formula, (17-23).

<sup>6)</sup> See Dorandi 2011.

from B (see above). This affiliation between B and LN demonstrates that the LN family, as a distinct tradition, has older origins than was once supposed.<sup>7)</sup> More detailed explanation of larger passages is provided in the commentary following the transcription.

---

<sup>7)</sup> The most recent representation of the manuscript tradition is given by Dorandi. In his schema, he imagines that the common source of LN ( $\delta$ ) was produced after M (2011, 637).

1. καιοσύνη ἢ ἀνδρεία. θεωρητικῶν δὲ αἷς θεωροῦμεν  
τὸ τοιοῦτον, πότερον ταῦτόν ἐστι νόσος καὶ ὑγεία καὶ  
εὐεξία ἢ ἕτερος, ἐριστικαὶ δὲ αἷ<ς> τοῦ ὄρους ἀναιροῦ-  
μεν, οἷον οὐκ ἐστὶν εὐεξία ἕξις σωμάτων ἢ κρα-  
5. τίστη. Διαίρεσις Λύπης:  
διαίρεται ἢ λύπη εἰς τρία. ἔστι γὰρ αὐτῆς ἓν μὲν  
ἐν οἷς προσήκει τὸν φρόνιμον λυπεῖσθαι, ἓν δὲ  
τὸ ἐπ' ἄλλοτρίοις ἀγαθοῖς λυπεῖσθαι, ἓν δὲ τὸ ἐπὶ πά-  
10. σιν ἀγαθοῖς καὶ κακοῖς καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις τοῖς μηδὲν προ-  
σῆκουσιν λυπεῖσθαι. ἔστιν δὲ τὸ μὲν ἐφ' οἷς προ-  
σῆκει λυπεῖσθαι, οἷον ἐπὶ τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ ἀτυχήμασιν  
ἢ τῶν αὐτοῦ τινός οἰκεῖων ἢ φίλων ἢ τῆς ἀπάσης  
πολέως καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἄλλων τῶν τοιοῦτων, τὸ δὲ ἐπ' ἄλ-  
λοτρίοις ἀγαθοῖς λυπεῖσθαι ἔστιν φθόνος καὶ βασκα-  
15. νία καὶ πάντων τῶν τοιοῦτων, τὸ δὲ ἐπὶ πᾶσιν  
κακοῖς τε καὶ ἀγαθοῖς καὶ πᾶσιν τοῖς ἄλλοις τοῖς μη-  
δὲν προσήκουσι λυπεῖσθαι, τὸ μὲν ἐπὶ τοῖς κακοῖς  
τοῖς ἄλλοτρίοις ἔλεος, τὸ δὲ ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς  
φθόνος, τὸ δὲ ἐπὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις τοῖς μηδὲν προ-  
20. σῆκουσι φθόνος καὶ βασκανία.  
Διαίρεσις Ἡδονῆς:  
διαίρεται ἢ ἡδονὴ εἰς τέσσαρα. ἔστι γὰρ αὐτῆς ἓν  
μὲν περὶ τὸ λογιστικόν, ἓν δὲ περὶ τὸ ἐπιθυμητι-  
κόν, ἓν δὲ περὶ τὸ θυμικόν, ἓν δὲ περὶ τὰς αἰσ-  
25. θήσεις. ἔστιν δὲ τὸ λογιστικὸν εἴτε ἀπὸ τοῦ μαν-  
θάνειν καὶ ἀνευρίσκειν ἡδονὴ καὶ αἰ τοιαῦτα πε-  
ρὶ δὲ τὸ θυμικὸν εἴτε τοῦ κρατεῖν καὶ νικᾶν καὶ ἐπιτι-  
28. μωρεῖσθαι τὸ δὲ ἐπιθυμητικὸν οἷον ἀπὸ τρυφῆς

1-5. καιοσύνη...λύπης om. A 1. -καιοσύνη, ἀνδρεία, θεωρητικόν, θεωροῦμεν/ B | θεωρητικαὶ LN 2. ὑγία, ταῦτων B | οἷον ante πότερον, νόσος ἐστὶν M | καὶ ante ὑγεία om. L 3. ἐριστικὴ B | ὀριστικαὶ, τοὺς ὄρους LN | δὲ om. L | οὔ pro ἕτερος M | ἕτερον N 4. ἢ om. N | ἢ M, om. ἕξις 4-5. καλλίστη L 5. Διαίρεσις Λύπης om. MN 6. διαιρῆται B | εἰς pro ἢ M 7. φρόνημον, λυπεῖσθαι B 8. τὸ ante ἐπ' om. AM | ἐπὶ τοῖς ἄλλοτρίοις ἀγαθοῖς καὶ κακοῖς καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις τοῖς μηδὲν προσήκουσι ante λυπεῖσθαι AM 8-10. ἓν δὲ... λυπεῖσθαι om. AM 9-10. προσήκουσι LN 10-20. ἔστιν δὲ... βασκανία om. A 10. ἔστι L 11. τὸν φρόνιμον ante λυπεῖσθαι add. M 12. ἀπάσης/ B | συμπάσης M 13. ἐπ' ἄλλων LN | ἐπὶ τοῖς ἄλλοτρίοις M 14. ἔστι L | φθόνος τις M 15. πᾶν τὸ τοιοῦτον M | πᾶν τοιοῦτον L, om. τῶν, πᾶσιν | πᾶσι M 16. πᾶσι L | ἀγαθοῖς τε καὶ κακοῖς LN | τε om. M 18. ἔλεως B 21. Διαίρεσις Ἡδονῆς om. AMN 22. διαιρῆται B | δ̄ A 23. λογικόν M | δὲ om. N 23-24. θυμικόν pro ἐπιθυμητικόν, ἐπιθυμητικόν pro θυμικόν A 24. ἓν δὲ ἐπὶ τὸ ἐπιθυμητικόν N | ἓν δὲ περὶ τὸ θυμικόν om. M 25. ἢ τε pro εἴτε M, add. ἢ τὸ μανθάν(ειν) περὶ ante τὸ λογιστικόν | ἔστι, ἢ τε L | ἦτε N 25-4<sup>F</sup>. ἔστιν...εὐταξίας om. A 26. ἡδονὴν L | τὰ τοιαῦτα M 27. ἦτε LN | οἷον ἢ τε M | τοῦ ante νικᾶν add. L 27-8. ἐπιτιμωρεῖσθαι B | ἀντιτιμωρεῖσθαι M 28. καὶ αἰ τοιαῦτα αἰ δὲ περὶ τὸ ἐπιθυμητικόν αἰ τε ἀπὸ τῆς τρυφῆς M | τρυφῆν N

1. καὶ συνουσίας καὶ αἰ τοιαῦται ἡδοναὶ γινόμεναι, ἡ δὲ  
περὶ τῶν αἰσθητικῶν, περὶ τὰς αἰσθήσεις οἷον εἶτε  
διὰ τοῦ ὄραν καὶ γεύεσθαι καὶ ὀσφραίνεσθαι καὶ αἰ τοι-  
αῦται ἡδοναί. Διαίρεσις Ἐυταξίας:
5. διαιρεῖται ἡ εὐταξία εἰς τέσσαρα. ἔστι γὰρ αὐτῆς ἓν  
μὲν περὶ ψυχῆν, ἓν δὲ περὶ σῶμα, ἓν δὲ περὶ πλή-  
θος, ἓν δὲ περὶ κίνησιν. ἡ μὲν οὖν ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ εὐτα-  
ξία γινομένη κατάστασιν ποιῆται, ἡ δὲ ἐν σῶμα-  
τι εὐταξί' ἐγγινομένη κάλλος καλεῖται, ἡ δὲ ἐν τῷ πλή-  
θει οἷον στρατοπέδῳ καὶ ἐλευθέροις καὶ οἰκέταις  
καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις τοῖς τοιοῦτοις πειθαρχία εὐταξία  
προσαγορεύεται, ἡ δὲ ἐν κινήσει εὐταξία γινομέ-  
νη εὐρυθμία ὀνομάζεται. Διαίρεσις Ἀταξίας:
10. διαιρεῖται ἡ ἀταξία εἰς τέσσαρα. ἔστι γὰρ αὐτῆς  
ἓν μὲν ἐν ψυχῇ, ἓν δὲ ἐν σώματι, ἓν δὲ ἐν πλή-  
θει, ἓν δὲ ἐν κινήσει. ἡ μὲν οὖν ἐν ψυχῇ ἀταξία  
γινομένη, οἷον ἀσωτία ἀκολασία καλεῖται, ἡ δὲ  
ἐν σώματι ἀταξία ἐγγινομένη αἰσχροτής καλεῖται,  
ἡ δὲ ἐν τῷ πλήθει ἀταξία ἀπειθαρχία καλεῖ-  
ται, ἡ δὲ ἐν κινήσει ἀταξία ἀρυθμία προσαγορεύεται.
15. Διαίρεσις τῷ Προβλήματι τῷ ἐν Φιλοσοφίᾳ:  
διαιρεῖται τὰ ἐν φιλοσοφίᾳ προβλήματα εἰς πέντε.  
ἔστιν γὰρ αὐτῶν ἓν μὲν πολιτικόν, ἓν δὲ διαλε-  
κτικόν, ἓν δὲ φυσικόν, ἓν δὲ ἠθικόν, ἓν δὲ ρη-  
τορικόν. πολιτικόν μὲν οὖν ἔστι τὸ ὑπὲρ νόμων  
καὶ τιμῶν καὶ τιμωριῶν προβαλλόμενον, οἷον πό-  
τερον δεῖ κολάζειν τὰ ξενικὰ ἁμαρτήματα ἢ  
τὰ πολιτικὰ ἢ ἀνόμοια καὶ τὰ ἄλλα τὰ τοιαῦτα.

2. τὸ αἰσθητικόν M 3. γεύεσθαι, ὀσφραίνεσθαι B | ἦτε LMN 4. ἡδοναί om. M | Διαίρεσις Ἐυταξίας om. AMN 5. διαιρηται B | δ̄ A 6. ψυχ(ήν) B 7. κινήσεις AL | τῇ om. LN 8. γενομένη B 8-9. κοσμιότης pro κάλλος AM, om. γινομένη... εὐταξί' | κατάστασιν...ἐγγινομένη om. LN 9. ἐγγινόμε(ν)ε/(ν)η B 10. στρατοπαίδῳ B | στρατοπέδῳ, οἰκείαις N 9-11. ἡ δὲ ἐν τῷ σώματι εὐταξία κάλλος καλεῖται. ἡ δὲ ἐν κινήσει εὐταξία εὐρυθμία ὀνομάζεται ἡ δὲ ἐν τῷ πλήθει οἷον ἢ πρὸς ἄρχοντας pro ἡ δὲ...τοιοῦτοις M 9-12. ἡ δὲ ἐν τῷ σώματι κάλλος ἡ δὲ ἐν κινήσει εὐρυθμία ἡ δὲ ἐν τῷ πλήθει ὑπακοή pro ἡ δὲ...προσαγορεύεται A 12. ἡ δὲ περὶ σῶμα οἷον εὐμορφία εὐεῖδία καὶ ἡ τῶν μελῶν εὐ καὶ ἄρμοζόντως ἔχουσα θέσις ante ἡ δὲ ἐν add. L 12-13. ἡ δὲ...ὀνομάζεται om. AM 13. ἀταξία\ς/ B | Διαίρεσις Ἀταξίας om. Vulg. 14. διαιρηται B | ὡσαύτως καὶ pro διαιρεῖται, δ̄ A | τῆς δὲ ἀταξίας pro διαιρεῖται... αὐτῆς L 15. ψυχῇ B | ἔστιν ante ἐν add. L 14-16. περὶ σῶμα περὶ ψυχῆν περὶ πλήθος περὶ κίνησιν pro ἔστι...κινήσει A 15-16. πλήθει B 16. add. τῇ ante ψυχῇ add. AM 16-18. ἡ ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ ἀταξία ἀσωτία περὶ σῶμα αἰσχροτής A 17. ἐγγινομένη M, om. οἷον, add. ἡ ante ἀκολασία | ἀκολακία N 18. καλεῖται om. A | γινομένη, αἰσχρός τις pro. αἰσχροτής N | ἀκολασία pro ἀταξία M, add. τῷ ante σώματι, om. ἐγγινομένη | ἀταξία ἐγγινομένη om. L 19. ἀπειθεία pro ἀπειθαρχία A | ἀκολασία pro ἀταξία M 19-28. καλεῖται... τοιαῦτα om. A 20. εὐρυθμία M, om. ἀταξία | ἀριθμία N 21. προβλημάτων B, L | ἐν om. L | Διαίρεσις τῷ Προβλήματι τῷ ἐν Φιλοσοφίᾳ om. MN 22. διαιρηται, ε̄ B 23. πολιτικόν B | ἔστι LMN 25. πολιτικόν, νόμω(v) B 26. τινῶν M, om. καὶ ante τιμωριῶν 27. δῆ B 28. πολιτικὰ B | τ' ἄλλα N | τἄλλα LM

## HAIR

**1. –καιωσύνη ἢ ἀνδρεία** The leaf begins in the middle of division 37 (διαίρεσις μεθόδων). The initial word must be δικαιοσύνη. As indicated in the apparatus, the manuscript reads –καιωσύνη, thus lengthening the omicron to omega. This and all other such instances of vowel alteration have been amended in the text and noted in the apparatus.

**3. ἐριστικαί** An undecipherable character precedes the epsilon in ἐριστικαί, which seems to be a scribal error. While the form approximates minuscule beta, it can be identified with none of the characters found in the remainder of the document. A smooth breathing mark ensures that no consonant (such as the proposed beta) was intended to precede the epsilon. Moreover, the breathing mark, while directly above the error, is consistent in its placement with breathing marks on epsilons throughout.

**5. Διαίρεσις Λύπης** This provides our first indication of the manuscript family of B. The section title Διαίρεσις Λύπης, as well as all other section headings excepting Διαίρεσις Ἀταξίας, is only present in L.

**8-10. λυπεῖσθαι... λυπεῖσθαι** Manuscripts A, M transmit the reading of a common source (Dorandi 1996 hypothesizes γ). Thus, A, M preserve a reading that results from the parablepsis of γ, who supposedly skipped over the text between λυπεῖσθαι (ln. 8) and λυπῆσθαι (ln. 10). B preserves the fuller reading, which is also manifest in L and N. This further suggests a connection between B and L, N.

**10-20. ἔστιν δὲ... βασκανία** Manuscript A reflects a substantial abridgment of the *DA* text.<sup>8)</sup> Where the text of A is lacking, we are left with only M to represent the common reading from γ. In such circumstances (H.1-5, 10-21; H.25-F.4; F.10-28), M indicates a divide between the two sets of manuscripts, being in substantial disagreement with B, L, and N. In lines 10-20, for example, note the variants of M in lines 11-6.

## FLESH

**8-9. εὐταξία γινομένη... εὐταξί' ἐγγινομένη** All other manuscripts record an abbreviated version of the text transmitted in B. In each MS, the abbreviation is caused by inadvertent parablepsis. A, M record a reading that omits γινομένη to εὐταξί', whereas L, N (Dorandi 2011 hypothesizes a common source δ), omits κατάστασιν to ἐγγινομένη. The scribes of A, M (or of γ) errs in jumping from εὐταξία to εὐταξί', and the scribes of L, N (or of δ) commit a similar, though discrete error in jumping from γινομένη to ἐγγινομένη. A, M read κοσμιότης whereas L, N agree with B is reading κάλλος.

**9-12. ἡ δὲ... προσαγορεύεται** The readings of the manuscripts in this area of the text diverge greatly. N accords with the reading of B, but all other manuscripts differ. A, M

---

<sup>8)</sup> For further discussion of the lacunose state of A, see Boudreaux (1909, 221-2).

preserve a reading that is entirely distinct from B. The variant readings of A, M follow the same general formula, but vary from one another in vocabulary and concision. L agrees with B, N where A, M provide alternate readings, but L adds to the text attested by them.

**21. προβλήματι** The spelling has been corrected from the original reading of προβλημάτω, where the scribe mistakenly used the second declension ending of the dative singular rather than the third. The same mistake is made in L.

**28. τὰ ἄλλα τὰ τοιαῦτα...** The leaf terminates approximately halfway through division 42.<sup>9)</sup>

---

<sup>9)</sup> [Acknowledgments to be added]

## Bibliography

---

- Barbour, R. 1981. *Greek Literary Hands: A.D. 400-1600* (Oxford: Clarendon Press)
- Boudreaux, P. 1909. *Un nouveau manuscrit des Divisiones Aristoteleae*, RPh 33, 221-4
- Dorandi, T. 2011. *Le Leidensis BPG 67C et l'histoire du texte des Divisiones quae vulgo dicuntur Aristoteleae*. *Mnemosyne* 64, 632-8
- 1996. *Ricerche sulla trasmissione delle Divisioni aristoteliche*, in: Algra, K.A., van der Horst, P.W., Runia, D.T. (eds.) *Polyhistor. Studies in the History of Historiography of Ancient Philosophy* (Leiden), 145-65
- Sautel, J.H. 1995. *Répertoire de réglures dans les manuscrits grecs sur parchemin: base de donnée établie à l'aide du fichier Leroy*. *Bibliologia* 13
- Thompson, E.M. 1912. *An Introduction to Greek and Latin Palaeography* (Oxford: Clarendon)
- Wilson, N. 1973. *Mediaeval Greek Bookhands: Examples Selected from Greek Manuscripts in Oxford Libraries*. (Cambridge)