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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 Περὶ Μεθόδου Δαινύμητος 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. 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). Such an attribution would make B the earliest manuscript of the DA by three centuries.

2) 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.

3) 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). 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.
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).
καισούνη ἢ ἀνδρεία. θεωρητικόν δὲ αἰς θεωροῦμεν τὸ τοιοῦτον, πότερον ταύτην ἐστι νόσος καὶ ύγεία καὶ εὐεξία ἢ ἐτέρος, ἐριστικαὶ δὲ αἱ <φυσικὲς> τοῦ ὄρους ἀναροῦμεν, οἷον οὐκ ἔστιν εὐεξία εξὶ σωμάτων ἢ κρατίστῃ.

5. Διαίρεσις Λύπης: διαιρεῖται ἡ λύπη εἰς τρία. ἔστι γὰρ αὐτῆς ἐν μὲν ἐν ὅς προσήκει τὸν φόνον μον λυπεῖσθαι, ἐν δὲ τὸ ἐπ’ ἄλλοτριος ἀγαθοὶς λυπεῖσθαι, ἐν δὲ τὸ ἐπὶ πάσιν ἀγαθοὶς καὶ κακοῖς καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις τοῖς μηδὲν προσήκουσιν λυπεῖσθαι. ἔστιν δὲ τὸ μὲν ἐφ’ ὅς προσήκει λυπεῖσθαι, οἷον ἐπὶ τοῖς ἐμαυτοῦ ἀτυχήμασιν ἢ τῶν αὐτοῦ τινὸς οἰκεῖοιν ἢ φιλῶν ἢ τῆς ἄπασης πολέως καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἄλλων τῶν τοιοῦτοιν, τὸ δὲ ἐπὶ ἄλλοτριος ἀγαθοὶς λυπεῖσθαι ἔστιν φθόνος καὶ βασκανίᾳ καὶ πάντων τῶν τοιοῦτον, τὸ δὲ ἐπὶ πάσιν κακοῖς τε καὶ ἀγαθοὶς καὶ πάσιν τοῖς ἄλλοις τοῖς μηδὲν προσήκουσιν λυπεῖσθαι, τὸ μὲν ἐπὶ τοῖς κακοῖς τοῖς ἄλλοτριος ἔλεος, τὸ δὲ ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς φθόνος, τὸ δὲ ἐπὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις τοῖς μηδὲν προσήκουσιν φθόνος καὶ βασκανίᾳ.

10. Διαίρεσις Ἡδονῆς: διαιρεῖται ἡ ἱδονὴ εἰς τέσσαρα. ἔστι γὰρ αὐτῆς ἐν μὲν περὶ τὸ λογιστικὸν, ἐν δὲ περὶ τὸ ἐπιθυμητικόν, ἐν δὲ περὶ τὸ θυμικόν, ἐν δὲ περὶ τὰς αἰσθήσεις. ἔστιν δὲ τὸ λογιστικὸν ἐπὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ μανθάνειν καὶ ανευρίσκειν ἱδονὴ καὶ αἱ τοιαύται περὶ δὲ τὸ θυμικὸν ἐπὶ τοῦ κρατεῖν καὶ νικᾶν καὶ ἐπίτιμοι πορεῖσθαι τὸ δὲ ἐπιθυμητικὸν οἷον ἀπὸ τρυφῆς.
καὶ συνουσίας καὶ αἱ τοιαῦτα ἦδοναι γινόμεναι, ἢ δὲ περὶ τῶν ἀισθητικῶν, περὶ τὰς αἰσθήσεις οίνον εἶτε διὰ τοῦ ὅραν καὶ γεύσεσθαι καὶ ὀφραίνεσθαι καὶ αἱ τοιαῦτα ἦδοναι.

Διαίρεσις Ἐυταξίας:

5. διαιρεῖται ἡ εὐταξία εἰς τέσσαρα. ἔστι γὰρ αὐτῆς ἢν μὲν περὶ ψυχῆν, ἢν δὲ περὶ σῶμα, ἢν δὲ περὶ πλῆθος, ἢν δὲ περὶ κίνησιν. ἢ μὲν οὖν ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ εὐταξία γινομένη κατάστασιν ποιητά, ἢ δὲ ἐν σώματι εὐταξία ἐγγυνομένη κάλλος καλεῖται, ἢ δὲ ἐν τῷ πλῆθει οἶον στρατοπέδῳ καὶ ἐλευθέροις καὶ οἰκέταις καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις τοῖς τοιούτοις πειθαρχία εὐταξία προσαγορευέται, ἢ δὲ ἐν κίνησι εὐταξία γινομένη εὐφυμία ὁνομάζεται.

Διαίρεσις Ἀταξίας:

10. διαιρεῖται ἡ ἀταξία εἰς τέσσαρα. ἔστι γὰρ αὐτῆς ἢν μὲν ἐν ψυχῇ, ἢν ἐν σώματι, ἢν ἐν πλῆθει, ἢν ἐν κίνησι. ἢ μὲν οὖν ἐν ψυχῇ ἀταξία γινομένη, οἷον ἀσωτία ἀκολούθσα καλεῖται, ἢ δὲ ἐν σώματι ἀταξία ἐγγυνομένη αἰσχρότης καλεῖται, ἢ δὲ ἐν τῷ πλῆθει ἀταξία ἀπειθαρχία καλεῖται, ἢ δὲ ἐν κίνησι ἀταξία ἀραβία προσαγορευέται.

Διαίρεσις τοῦ Προβλήματος τοῦ ἐν Φιλοσοφία:

20. διαιρεῖται τὰ ἐν φιλοσοφίᾳ προβλήματα εἰς πέντε. ἔστιν γὰρ αὐτῶν ἢν μὲν πολιτικὸν, ἢν δὲ διαλεκτικόν, ἢν δὲ φυσικόν, ἢν δὲ ἡθικόν, ἢν δὲ κτητικόν.

25. πολιτικὸν μὲν οὖν ἔστι τὸ ὑπὲρ νόμων καὶ τοιούτων καὶ τιμῶν καὶ τιμωρίων προβαλλόμενον, οἷον πότερον δεῖ κολαζεῖν τὰ ἐν εἴς ἀμαρτίματα 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 –καιοσύνη, 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. έριστικαί  An undecipherable character precedes the epsilon in έριστικαί, 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 λυπεῖσθαι (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. 8) 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... εὔταξι´ 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 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

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.\textsuperscript{9)}

\textsuperscript{9)} [Acknowledgments to be added]
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