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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 Περι 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.¹)

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.²) 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).³) Such an attribution would make B the earliest manuscript of the *DA* by three centuries.⁴)

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 20A1.⁵)

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).⁶) 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

---

¹) Roger Macfarlane has edited volume one of the collection and [current state of project].
  ²) See Barbour (1981, xxx).
  ³) 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/
  ⁴) 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).
  ⁶) 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. More detailed explanation of larger passages is provided in the commentary following the transcription.

---

7) The most recent representation of the manuscript tradition is given by Dorandi. In his schema, he imagines that the common source of LN (δ) was produced after M (2011, 637).
1. καισοσύνη ἡ ἀνδρεία. θεορητικοὶ δὲ αἱ θεοροῦμεν τὸ τοιοῦτον, πότερον ταύτην ἔστι νόσος καὶ ύγεια καὶ εὐεξία ἢ ἐτέρος, ἐριστικοὶ δὲ αἱ ἀπ’ τοῦ ὄρους ἀναροῦμεν, οἶον οὐκ ἔστιν εὐεξία ἔξις σωμάτων ἢ κρατίστη.

5. Διαίρεσις Λύπης: διαφέρει ἡ λύπη εἰς τρία. ἔστι γὰρ αὐτῆς ἐν μὲν ἐν όις προσήκει τὸν φρόνιμον λυπεῖσθαι, ἐν δὲ τὸ εἰς ἀλλοτρίους ἁγαθοῖς λυπεῖσθαι, ἐν δὲ τὸ ἐπὶ πᾶσιν ἁγαθοῖς καὶ κακοῖς καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις τοῖς μηδὲν προσήκουσιν λυπεῖσθαι. ἔστιν δὲ τὸ μὲν ἐφ’ οἷς προσήκει λυπεῖσθαι, ὥσπερ ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀνατικήμασιν ἂν τῶν αὐτῶν τινὸς οἰκείων ἢ φίλου ἢ τῆς ἀπάσης πολέως καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἄλλων τῶν τοιοῦτων, τὸ δὲ εἰς ἀλλοτρίους ἁγαθοῖς λυπεῖσθαι ἔστιν φθόνος καὶ βασκανία καὶ πάντων τῶν τοιοῦτων, τὸ δὲ ἐπὶ πᾶσιν κακοῖς τε καὶ ἁγαθοῖς καὶ πάσιν τοῖς ἄλλοις τοῖς μηδὲν προσήκουσιν λυπεῖσθαι, τὸ μὲν ἐπὶ τοῖς κακοῖς τοῖς ἀλλοτρίοις ἐλεος, τὸ δὲ ἐπὶ τοῖς ἁγαθοῖς φθόνος, τὸ δὲ ἐπὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις τοῖς μηδὲν προσήκουσι φθόνος καὶ βασκανία.

10. Διαίρεσις Ἡδονῆς: διαφέρει ἡ ἡδονή εἰς τέσσαρα. ἔστι γὰρ αὐτῆς ἐν μὲν περὶ τὸ λογιστικόν, ἐν δὲ περὶ τὸ ἐπιθυμητικόν, ἐν δὲ περὶ τὸ θημικόν, ἐν δὲ περὶ τὰς αἰσθήσεις. ἔστιν δὲ τὸ λογιστικὸν εἶπε ἀπὸ τοῦ μανθάνει καὶ ἀνευρίσκειν ἡδονή καὶ ἀι τις περὶ δὲ τὸ θημικὸν εἶπε τὸ κρατεῖν καὶ νικᾶν καὶ ἐπιτιμωρεῖσθαι τὸ δὲ ἐπιθυμητικὸν οἶον ἀπὸ τρυφῆς.
1. καὶ συνουσίας καὶ αἱ τοιαῦτα ἢδονα γινόμεναι, ἢ δὲ περὶ τῶν αἰσθητικῶν, περὶ τὰς αἰσθήσεις οἷον εἴτε διὰ τοῦ ὅραν καὶ γευσθήσας καὶ ὀσφραίνεσθαι καὶ αἱ τοιαῦτα ἢδοναι. 

Διαίρεσις Εὐταξίας:

5. διαρείπτει ἡ εὐταξία εἰς τέσσαρα. ἔστι γὰρ αὐτής ἐν μὲν περὶ ψυχῆς, ἐν δὲ περὶ σῶμα, ἐν δὲ περὶ πλήθους, ἐν δὲ περὶ κίνησιν. ἢ μὲν οὖν ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ εὐταξία γινομένη κατάστασιν ποιεῖται, ἢ δὲ ἐν σώματι εὐταξίᾳ ἐγγυνομένη κάλλος καλεῖται, ἢ δὲ ἐν τῷ πλήθει οἰστοὶ στρατοπέδῳ καὶ ἐλευθέροις καὶ οἰκέταις καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις τοῖς τοιούτοις πειθαρχία εὐταξία προσαγορεύεται, ἢ δὲ ἐν κινήσει εὐταξία γινομένη εὐφροσύνη ὀνομάζεται.

Διαίρεσις Αταξίας: διαρείπτει ἡ ἀταξία εἰς τέσσαρα. ἔστι γὰρ αὐτῆς ἐν μὲν ἐν ψυχῇ, ἐν δὲ ἐν σώματι, ἐν δὲ ἐν πλήθει, ἐν δὲ ἐν κινήσει. ἢ μὲν οὖν ἐν ψυχῇ ἀταξία γινομένη, ὅσιως ἀκολούθησα καλεῖται, ἢ δὲ ἐν σώματι ἀταξία ἐγγυνομένη αἰσχρότητας καλεῖται, ἢ δὲ ἐν τῷ πλήθει ἀταξία ἀπειθαρχία καλεῖται, ἢ δὲ ἐν κινήσει ἀταξία ἀρυθμία προσαγορεύεται.

Διαίρεσις τῷ Προβλήματι τῷ ἐν Φιλοσοφίᾳ: διαρείπτει τά ἐν φιλοσοφίᾳ προβλήματα εἰς πέντε. ἔστιν γὰρ αὐτῶν ἐν μὲν πολιτικοῖς, ἐν δὲ διαλεκτικοῖς, ἐν δὲ φυσικοῖς, ἐν δὲ θειοτορικοῖς. πολιτικοῖς μὲν οὖν ἔστι τῷ ύπέρ νόμων καὶ τιμῶν καὶ τιμωρίων προβαλλόμενον, οἷον πότερον δει κολαξίαν τὰ ἐν εἰκόνα ἀμαρτήματα ἢ τὰ πολιτικὰ ἢ ἀνόμοια καὶ τὰ ἄλλα τὰ τοιαῦτα.
HAIR

1. καιοσύνη 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 (In. 8) and λυπεῖσθαι (In. 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. 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... εὐταξίά 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 εὐταξία, whereas L, N (Dorandi 2011 hypothesizes a common source δ), omits κατάστασιν to ἐγγινόμενη. The scribes of A, M (or of γ) errs in jumping from εὐταξία to εὐταξία´, and the scribes of L, N (or of δ) commit a similar, though discrete error in in jumping from γινομένη to ἐγνομένη. A, M read κοσμίσθης 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

---

8) 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. 9)

9) [Acknowledgments to be added]
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