

ELIAS ON THE PRIOR ANALYTICS

BY

L. G. WESTERINK

The sixth century A.D., though admittedly not a fruitful period in the history of Greek philosophy, was a time of weighty decisions. It was then that the long-delayed issue whether Platonic or Aristotelean philosophy, or both, could be taught by Christians, had to be faced at short notice. It is probably entirely owing to the choice then made that we can now read most of the Neoplatonic thinkers in the original, instead of collecting their fragments.

The history of the Alexandrian school during this critical period is known only incompletely. There is a gap in the succession after the death of Ammonius (c. 520); we do not know who saw the school through those dangerous years that witnessed the end of the Academy. After Olympiodorus (d. after 565) there is another gap, which means that even the name of the first Christian who taught philosophy at Alexandria is uncertain. The possibilities of completing these lacunae are not yet exhausted. Even now some texts are still awaiting publication, and the available material has not been explored thoroughly.

Of the three known representatives of what is usually called the school of Olympiodorus, *viz.* Elias, David and Stephanus, only the last is a little more than a name. His appointment as οἰκουμενικός διδάσκαλος by Heraclius (between 610 and 618) meant the transference of the university to Constantinople¹). But Elias and David are counted as disciples of Olympiodorus only because

¹) H. Usener, *De Stephano Alexandrino* (Bonn 1879) pp. 3-8; *id.*, *De Steph. Alex. commentatio altera* (Bonn 1880) pp. 6-7.

of formal and material correspondences between their work and his.

The volume of Elias published by Busse in the *Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca* (XVIII 1 [1900]) is the result of V. Rose's philological flair ¹⁾, for neither of the works included bears Elias's name. The commentary on Porphyry's *Isagoge* is anonymous in the manuscripts and the one on the *Categories* is unanimously attributed to David. Elias's authorship of the former is attested by some extracts in marginal scholia and the two are linked together by unmistakable cross-references. There is a good explanation for the ascription to David: the commentary on the *Categories* is usually preceded by David on the *Isagoge* (CAG XVIII 2), of which the last pages are missing and have been replaced by those of Elias, so that a τοῦ αὐτοῦ in the title of the following commentary on the *Categories* would automatically be misunderstood as referring to David ²⁾.

Parallels between Elias and Olympiodorus are so frequent, especially in the introductions (both to the *Isagoge* and to the *Categories*), that Praechter ³⁾ was inclined to consider the two commentaries as lectures given by Olympiodorus and taken down by Elias, just as Philoponus published his notes of the lectures of Ammonius under his own name. Busse, however, had already cited some extracts in which Elias is referred to as ὁ φιλόσοφος and ὁ ἐξηγητής, i.e. a professor of philosophy.

Busse also mentions the existence of a commentary on the *Prior Analytics* in Paris. suppl. gr. 678, which he seems to have known only from Omont's *Inventaire* ⁴⁾. On examination it proved to be only a small portion of the commentary, but as it is the only work of Elias that has been preserved under his own name and as it contains a few valuable data, it is well worth publishing.

The first point of interest is the unexpected information which the heading provides about Elias himself. Before becoming a professor of philosophy he had held the high office of prefect. Among the

1) V. Rose, *Leben des heiligen David* (Berlin 1887) p. VIII, n. 1.

2) On all this see Busse's ed., pp. V-IX.

3) Byzant. Zeitschr. 18 (1909) p. 524⁵.

4) III p. 296.

officials of this rank mentioned in Justinian's Novels the name of Elias actually occurs: Novel CLIII (dated Dec. 12, 541) is addressed to Ἡλίας ἐπαρχος τοῦ Ἰλλυρικοῦ. In it the prefect is instructed to safeguard the rights of foundlings in cooperation with the archbishop of Thessalonica, which was also his own residence. In secular circles the name was decidedly rare at the time; there is not one instance of it among the hundreds of proper names occurring in the historians of this period (Procopius, Agathias, Malalas, Euarigius) nor in the *Codex Iustinianus* or elsewhere in the Novels. In view of this, the comparatively frequent examples among ecclesiastics¹⁾ should probably be explained as early cases of monastic names. The chance that there were two prefects called Elias under Justinian is therefore slight, and until evidence to the contrary emerges the philosopher and the addressee of the Novel must be considered identical.

The lifetime of Olympiodorus can be fixed between narrow limits. He attended a course of Ammonius on the *Gorgias*²⁾ and as Ammonius died about 520, Olympiodorus's birth-year cannot be much later than 500; on the other hand, since he was still teaching in 565, 495 is the probable *terminus post quem*. His death (or at least his retirement, which is the really relevant point) must fall between 565 and 570. If Elias succeeded him then, twenty-five or more years after the date of the Novel, he had become a prefect rather young and was an old man when he took up philosophy again. This last conclusion is inevitable in any case: the title of the commentary can mean only that Elias had finished his official career when he began to teach. A difference of ten or fifteen years between Olympiodorus and Elias is sufficient to leave open the possibility that Elias was a pupil of Olympiodorus, who seems to have come into the professorate quite young.

1) A. Busse, *Die neuplatonischen Ausleger der Isagoge des Porphyrius* (Berlin 1892), p. 13¹, mentions three bishops: the well-known patriarch of Jerusalem (d. about 518; *Letters* 45 and 50 of Procopius of Gaza are probably addressed to him) and, from the acts of the Council of Constantinople (553), the bishops of Diocletianopolis and Thessalonica (!).—The name is written Ἡλίας, Ἡλιάς, or Ἡλιός.

2) *In Gorgiam* p. 183, 8-13 Norvin.

This brings me to the second item of historical interest in the new text: Elias's reference to a course in Aristotelean logic given by Eutocius. This Eutocius can be nobody else than the well-known mathematician, the commentator of Apollonius and Archimedes and a personal friend of Ammonius ¹⁾. His career as a philosopher cannot have been sensational, since no other traces of it have survived, and it may have been a short one; but as the obvious surmise is that he taught at Alexandria, his professorate probably fills the lacuna between Ammonius and Olympiodorus. The latter calls Ammonius his πρόγονος ²⁾, and this has always been understood in the sense in which Proclus speaks of Plutarch of Athens as his προπάτωρ ³⁾; rightly, I believe, though one should not entirely bar the possibility that it simply means grandfather or great-grandfather, for the phenomenon of hereditary professorates was then more common than ever ⁴⁾. But even in that case, an *interregnum* would be likely because of Olympiodorus's extreme youth, and Eutocius may have filled the place while he prepared himself for the task.

But is it really so certain that Elias taught at Alexandria and not at some other centre? In Elias's own work I have found no evidence one way or the other; there is, however, reason to think that David held the Alexandrian chair, and Elias and David are so closely linked, both by a common fund of ideas and by the manuscript tradition, that they must almost certainly have belonged to the same school.

As regards the first point, we have a clue in the unpublished commentary on the *Isagoge* from which Busse gives extracts in his preface to David, pp. XIX-XXIV. In the manuscripts (then three, now only Paris. gr. 1939 and Monac. gr. 399 after the loss of a Taurinensis) it is ascribed to David, but as the text is *initio mutilus*, the title does not count for much. Among the scholia on

1) P. Tannery, *Sur la periode finale de la philosophie grecque*, Revue philos. 42 (1896) p. 275.

2) G. Stüve in CAG XII 2, pp. VIII-IX.

3) *In Parm.* p. 831 Stallbaum; Marinus, *Vita Procli* c. 29.

4) J. Maspero, *Horapollon et la fin du paganisme égyptien*, Bull. de l'institut français d'archéol. orientale 11 (1914) p. 180.

the *Isagoge* in Vindob. phil. gr. 139 there are five consecutive πράξεις from this commentary under the name of Elias, so that it is now usually called Pseudo-Elias. Busse thought it a 'Byzantine' compilation from Elias and (mainly) David, but his own extracts contain some authentic information not to be found in either ¹⁾ and the whole shows all the characteristics of the genuine Alexandrine tradition ²⁾. Unless we suppose a deliberate forgery, for which there is not the slightest reason, it can only belong to the late sixth or to the early seventh century, and differences between this commentary and the published text of David go no farther than can be expected when the same lecturer repeats his own course after an interval of some years. Somehow (by a lucky guess or by some kind of evidence left in the manuscript after the loss of the first few quaternions) the copyist who added the name of David must have arrived at the truth: the 'Pseudo-Elias' is another version (an earlier one, I should say provisionally) of David's commentary.

That these lectures were given at Alexandria appears from the fact that Alexander the Great is spoken of as ὁ κτίστης, a title none but an Alexandrian could use. It occurs also in the *Vita vulgata* of Aristotle, which has more than one point of contact with the unpublished version of David ³⁾. I shall have occasion to return to this question presently.

Busse has pointed out several other instances of the strange tricks tradition has played with the names of David and Elias. One is the supplementing of David's commentary on the *Isagoge* from that of Elias and the consequent attribution of Elias's commentary on the *Categories* to David. On the other hand, Laur. 71, 11 and 72, 5 contain a part of David's introduction (pp. 80-94) under the name of Elias. In Vat. gr. 1023 David's work is preceded by a miniature with the caption ὁ φιλόσοφος ἡλίας ἐξηγούμενος

1) E.g. the quotation from Proclus on the *Enneads*, p. XXI. Both Elias and David depend on this source in the corresponding passage, but without mentioning it.

2) Division into πράξεις, and of each πράξις into θεωρία and λέξις. See M. Richard, 'Απὸ φωνῆς, Byzantion 20 (1950), p. 213.

3) I. Düring, *Aristotle in the Ancient Biographical Tradition* (Göteborg 1957) p. 139

τὰς πέντε φωνάς (f. 8v); the caption of another picture, on f. 84v, mentions David (ὁ δαίδ θεσσαλονίκης ἐξηγούμενος). We have thus four (apparently independent) cases in which the two names have been exchanged. The most obvious explanation for this general confusion is that it started in the school at which both taught and where copies of their lectures would circulate without any name.

With all reserve, the Alexandrian succession in the sixth century can be outlined as follows: Ammonius dies about 520, and for a short period Eutocius takes charge of the chair of philosophy, but he is soon succeeded by Olympiodorus, who continues the pagan tradition till 565 or a little later. After him Elias, a broad-minded Christian, educated at Alexandria, but acceptable to the authorities, is found willing to carry on for a few years. His successor David may have been the predecessor of Stephanus, the last Alexandrian.

The innovation for which Elias cites Eutocius concerns one of those petty problems of procedure that occupied the minds of the successors of Ammonius: what is the appropriate moment, in a course of logic, to deal with the function of logic in the whole of philosophy, in other words, with the question whether logic is a material part of philosophy or merely its instrument (ὄργανον)? The traditional place was the introduction to the *Prior Analytics* (Alexander, Themistius, Ammonius, Philoponus); Eutocius, we learn now, transferred it to the introduction to the *Isagoge*, where the others are content to mention the point and refer to a later discussion of it ¹); Olympiodorus found a place for it in the prolegomena to the *Categories* ²), to which he thus gave a beautiful concentric composition: (I) introduction to Aristotelean philosophy; (II) introduction to Aristotelean logic; (III) introduction to Aristotle's *Categories*. Elias returned to the usual scheme, but David follows Olympiodorus. In the extant literature, the following passages deal with the subject:

1) Ammon., *In Isag.* 23, 23-24 (ἐν ἑτέρῳ); Boetius, *In Isag.*, ed. pr. 10, 2-5 Brandt ('*alio in opere*'; in the second edition, however, the question is dealt with at length at 140, 13-143, 7); Elias 39, 31-33 (ἐν τῇ 'Αποδεικτικῇ'); David 94, 7-10 (ἐν ταῖς Κατηγορίαις); David ined. f. 69 v Paris. (ἐν τελειότεροις μαθήμασι).

2) CAG XII 1, pp. 1-25.

(i) Alexander, *In Analyticorum Priorum librum I*, 1,3 - 4,29. The rest are all from the school of Ammonius and show little variation:

(ii) Ammonius, *In Analytica Priora* 8,15 - 11,21;

(iii) Philoponus, *In Analytica Priora* 6,19 - 9,24, another version of the preceding;

(iv) Elias, *infra*;

(v) extracts from an anonymous commentary on the *Prior Analytics* (from Paris. gr. 2061) in Brandis 140 a 45-141 a 2. Then, as a part of the commentaries on the *Categories*, in:

(vi) Olympiodorus *In Categorias* 14, 12-18, 12;

(vii) a sequel to the *Vita vulgata* of Aristotle in the best manuscripts¹⁾; edited by Busse, *CAG* XII 1, pp. X-XII. The opening words 'Ἐπειδὴ δὲ λογικῆς πραγματείας ἀρχὴ τὸ προκείμενον βιβλίον show that the place before the *Categories*, where it is found in Laur. 72, 5, is the original one. The parallels between the *Vita* and the unpublished redaction of David on the *Isagoge* have already been mentioned; as David states formally in the edited text that he is going to reserve the question for the lectures on the *Categories*, this is another argument for attributing the commentary on the *Isagoge* to David. In other cases, too, the place given to the treatise on logic can be a useful criterion. Thus the commentary under (v) can be neither by Olympiodorus nor by David. As it has the division into πράξεις usual since Olympiodorus, this leaves only Stephanus or an entirely unknown lecturer as possible candidates.

The way in which the question is handled in the first lecture of Elias does not present any new aspects; it is interesting only in so far as it confirms the narrow relationship between Olympiodorus and Elias, who have in common, for example, the quotation from Aratus and the comparison between ἵππικὴ and χαλινοποιικὴ (the latter also in Alexander 2, 31). The extant part of the second lecture, on σκοπός and χρήσιμον, corresponds to Ammonius 1,3-5,5, Philop. 1,5-4,29, anonymous scholia 139 a 36-140 a 10 Brandis.

Paris. suppl. gr. 678 is a MS. of Mynas. It consists of a number of stray fragments bound together; one of these is formed by ff. 131-

1) Düring, *op. cit.* p. 121.

138, a paper quaternion of the 13th or 14th century. At the top of f. 131 r Mynas has written in red ink „82. Scholies sur les topiques par Hélias”; ff. 131-134 are numbered from 1 to 4 in the same way. As f. 131 r is the last page of the text, the copyist must have started on the first verso of a quaternion, filled the remaining pages, and then returned to the recto of the first leaf to finish his text, which means that the exemplar cannot have contained more than the fragment we now possess.

The text is written in a good, correct hand (P); here and there variants have been added in the margin in very neat, small writing (P^c). The inner and lower margins are worm-eaten and have been restored, so that one or two marginal notes may have disappeared, while the text itself is as good as undamaged.

As practically all contemporary commentaries, this one too is divided into *πράξεις*. It is the only one, however, that adds a summary to each (?) lecture. The summary must be the idea of the *reportator*, who worked out his own notes in this elaborate way, for a later scribe or scholar would scarcely have taken so much trouble over a text of secondary importance. The corrector of the MS. collated the complete text with the summary and added the variants in the margin, sometimes in the text.

Orthographical errors (which are rare) are not mentioned in the apparatus. The MS. consistently writes *φλεβότομον*, and sometimes *ἄρα* when *ἔρα* is required ¹).

EMMEN (Dr.), Molenkamp 20

1) For the description of the MS. I am indebted to Father H.D. Saffrey; for photographs both of this MS. and of Paris. gr. 1939 (David ined.) to the Netherlands Organisation for the Advancement of Pure Research.

- f. 131^v Σχόλια σύν θεῷ εἰς τὸ πρῶτον τῶν Προτέρων Ἀναλυτικῶν ἀπὸ φωνῆς
Ἡλιοῦ φιλοσόφου καὶ ἀπὸ ἐπάρχων

Πρᾶξις α'

- Εἰ μέρος ἢ ὄργανον ἡ λογικὴ φιλοσοφίας, Εὐτόκιος μὲν ζητεῖ τῆς
Εἰσαγωγῆς ἀρχόμενος, Ἀλέξανδρος δὲ καὶ Θεμιστίσιος τῶν συλλογιστικῶν 5
πραγματειῶν ἀρχόμενοι. καὶ ἄμεινον οὗτοι· ἡ γὰρ λογικὴ κατὰ μόνην
τὴν συλλογιστικὴν μέθοδον ζητεῖται εἰ μέρος ἢ ὄργανόν ἐστι φιλοσοφίας.
τρεῖς τοίνυν γεγόνασιν περὶ τούτου δόξαι, ἡ Στωϊκὴ, ἡ Περιπατητικὴ, ἡ
Πλατωνικὴ ἢ τοι Ἀκαδημαϊκὴ. οἱ μὲν γὰρ Στωϊκοὶ μέρος οἶονται τὴν
λογικὴν φιλοσοφίας· τοιγαροῦν ἀντιδιαίρουσιν αὐτὴν τῷ θεωρητικῷ καὶ 10
τῷ πρακτικῷ· οἱ δὲ Περιπατητικοὶ ὄργανον· Πλάτων δὲ τὰς ἀμφοτέρων
νίκας ἀναδησάμενος μέρος ἅμα καὶ ὄργανον τὴν λογικὴν φιλοσοφίας
ἐκήρυξε. καὶ ἐπιχειροῦσιν ἐκότεροι τῶν ἄκρων διχῶς. Στωϊκοὶ μὲν γὰρ
α' οὕτως· πᾶν, φασίν, ὃ κέχρηται τις τέχνη ἢ ἐπιστήμη, τοῦτο ἐάν μὴ ἢ
f. 132^r ἑτέρας τέχνης μέρος ἢ μόριον, αὐτῆς τῆς χρωμένης μέρος ἐστὶν ἢ μόριον. 15
οἶον ἡ ἱατρικὴ κέχρηται τῷ διαιτητικῷ καὶ τὸ διαιτητικὸν οὐκ ἔστιν
ἑτέρας τέχνης μέρος ἢ μόριον, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο τῆς ἱατρικῆς μέρος ἐστὶν ἢ
μόριον. πρόσκειται δὲ τὸ 'ἐάν μὴ ἢ ἑτέρας τέχνης μέρος ἢ μόριον' διὰ
τὴν κυβερνητικὴν καὶ τὴν ἀστρονομίαν· κέχρηται γὰρ ἡ κυβερνητικὴ
τῇ ἀστρονομίᾳ, 'τῇ καὶ Σιδόνιοι ἰθύντατα ναυτίλλονται', καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἡ 20
ἀστρονομία τῆς κυβερνητικῆς μέρος ἢ μόριον, ἐπεὶ δὲ ἔφθη τῆς μὲν
μαθηματικῆς οὕσα μέρος, τῆς δὲ φιλοσοφίας μόριον. ἐπεὶ δὲ οὖν, φασί,
κέχρηται τῇ λογικῇ ἡ φιλοσοφία δεικνύσα ἐν μὲν τῷ θεωρητικῷ τί μὲν
ἀληθὲς τί δὲ ψεῦδος, ἐν δὲ τῷ πρακτικῷ τί μὲν ἀγαθὸν τί δὲ κακόν, ἵνα
μόνα τὰ ἀληθῆ δοξάσωμεν καὶ μόνα τὰ ἀγαθὰ διαπραξώμεθα, καὶ οὐκ 25
ἔστιν ἑτέρας τέχνης μέρος ἢ μόριον, τῆς ἅρα φιλοσοφίας μέρος ἢ μόριον
f. 132^v ἡ λογικὴ· καὶ οὐκ ἔστι μόριον (τοῦτο γὰρ δείξομεν)· μέρος ἄρα./ μόριον
γὰρ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐπεὶ δὲ οὐδὲ τοῦ θεωρητικοῦ μέρος ἐστὶν οὐδὲ τοῦ πρακτικοῦ.
τὰ γὰρ μέρη τῷ ὅλῳ καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν ἔχει ὕλην καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ τέλος· νῦν δὲ
τοῦ μὲν πρακτικοῦ ὕλη μὲν μόναι αἱ ἀνθρώπιναι ψυχαί, τέλος δὲ ἡ μετριο- 30

2 ηλιοῦ (sic) P 5 Alex., *In Anal. Pr.* 1, 3-4, 29; Themistius in commen-
tario genuino nunc deperdito 8 στωϊκῇ] marg. signum correcturae P^c
13 ἐκότεροι] marg. γρ. καὶ ἀμφοτέροι P^c 14 φασίν: φησίν P (cf. 137, 6) /
τοῦτο: circumflexus tantum extat; cf. 135, 7; 137, 6 20 Arat. *Phaenom.* 44

- πάθεια κατὰ Ἀριστοτέλη ἢ ἡ ἀπάθεια κατὰ Πλάτωνα, τοῦ δὲ θεωρητικοῦ ὕλη μὲν τὰ ὄντα πάντα, τέλος δὲ ἡ ἀλήθεια· τῆς δὲ λογικῆς καὶ ἡ ὕλη ἄλλη παρ' ἄμφω τὰς ὕλας, αἱ γὰρ φωναί, καὶ τὸ τέλος ἄλλο, ἢ γὰρ γένεσις τῆς ἀποδείξεως. ἀλλ' ἐλλιπῶς, ὡς Στωϊκοί, ὁ κανὼν ἔχει καὶ τὸ ζητούμενον παρελείψατε, τὸ ὄργανον· καὶ εἰ ἀκούσομεν αὐτοῦ οὕτως, ἔσται τὸ φλεβο- 5 τόμον σῶμα ὃν μέρος ἢ μόνιον τῆς ἱατρικῆς. ἔδει γὰρ οὕτως ἔχειν τὸν κανόνα· πᾶν ὃ κέχρηται τις τέχνη ἢ ἐπιστήμη, τοῦτο ἐὰν μὴ ἢ ἐτέρας τέχνης μέρος ἢ μόνιον, αὐτῆς τῆς χρωμένης ἢ μέρος ἐστὶν ἢ μόνιον ἢ ὄργανον. ὥσπερ οὖν ἡμεῖς ἐδείξαμεν μὴ οὔσαν μόνιον λογικὴν φιλοσοφίας,
- f. 133^fβ' καὶ αὐτοὶ δεῖξάτωσαν ὅτι οὐδὲ ὄργανον, ἵνα ἢ μέρος. δεύτερος λόγος 10 Στωϊκός· εἰ ἡ φιλοσοφία τὴν λογικὴν ἀπετέλεσε, μέρος ἢ λογικὴ φιλοσοφίας. ἀλλ' ἐνδέχεται τι, ὡς Στωϊκοί, καὶ ὄργανον ἑαυτῷ ἀποτελέσαι· καὶ γὰρ ἡ χαλκευτικὴ καὶ ἄκμονα καὶ ῥαιστῆρα καὶ ἡ τεκτονικὴ πῆχυν καὶ κανόνα· καὶ ὅτι ὡς ὄργανα ταῦτα ποιοῦσι καὶ οὐχ ὡς ἀποτελέσματα δηλοῦσι μὴ ἴσης αὐτὰ σπουδῆς ἀξιοῦσαι τοῖς ἄλλοις δημιουργήμασιν. 15 εἰ δὲ καὶ αἱ ἄλλαι τέχναι τῇ λογικῇ ὡς ὀργάνῳ κέχρηται τὰ οἰκεῖα δεικνῦσαι ἢ διαιροῦσαι ἢ ὀρίζομεναι, οὐδὲν ἐντεῦθεν· καὶ αἱ τέχναι γὰρ καὶ ἑαυταῖς καὶ ταῖς ἄλλαις ὄργανα τὰ αὐτὰ ποιοῦσιν, ὡς ἡ τεκτονικὴ πῆχυν καὶ κανόνα καὶ ἑαυτῇ καὶ τῇ οἰκοδομικῇ. ὅτι δὲ ὄργανον ἢ λογικὴ, καὶ οἱ
- α' Περιπατητικοὶ διχῶς οὕτως ἐπιχειροῦσιν· εἰ μέρος ἢ λογικὴ φιλοσοφίας, 20 ἐπειδὴ κέχρηται τῇ λογικῇ αἱ ἄλλαι τέχναι ὡς ὀργάνῳ τὰ οἰκεῖα διαιροῦσαι
- f. 133^v ὀρίζομεναι ἀποδεικνῦσαι ἀναλύουσιν· καὶ οὐ / μόνον αἱ <λογικαί> τέχναι, ἀλλὰ καὶ αἱ βάναστοι (συλλογίζεται γὰρ καὶ ὁ οἰκοδόμος λέγων 'εἰ μέλλοι ἀσφαλῶς στῆναι ἡ οἰκία, χρὴ θεμελίους καταβαλέσθαι· δεῖ δὲ τὸ πρῶτον, δεῖ ἄρα καὶ τὸ δεύτερον γενέσθαι')· ἔσται ἄρα ἡ φιλοσοφία καὶ τῶν 25 βανύσων τεχνῶν, ὃ μὴ θέμις εἰπεῖν, ἀτιμότερα. καθόλου γάρ, ἐὰν ὦσι δύο τέχναι καὶ τῷ ἀποτελέσματι τῆς ἐτέρας ἢ ἐτέρα ὡς ὀργάνῳ χρήσεται, ἀτιμότερα μὲν ἢ ποιοῦσα, τιμιωτέρα δὲ ἢ χρωμένη· διὸ τιμιωτέρα ἵππικὴ χαλινοποιικῆς, τῷ γὰρ ἀποτελέσματι τῆς χαλινοποιικῆς αὕτη ὀργάνῳ
- β' κέχρηται. δεύτερος λόγος Περιπατητικός· τὰ μέρη ἀναιρούμενα ἀναιρεῖ 30 τὸ ὅλον, ἢ δὲ λογικὴ οὐ συναναιρεῖ τὴν φιλοσοφίαν· ἦν γὰρ ἀπόδειξις καὶ πρὸ τῆς ἀποδεικτικῆςπραγματείας τοῦ Ἀριστοτέλους· οὐκ ἄρα μέρος ἢ λογικὴ φιλοσοφίας. ταῦτα καὶ ὁ Περίπατος· ἢ δὲ Ἀκαδήμεια ὅτι μὲν ὄργανον διὰ τῶν Περιπατητικῶν λόγων δείκνυσιν, ὅτι δὲ μέρος οὐκέτι

7 ὃ] marg. δ P^c 17 οὐδὲν] marg. γρ. οὐκ ἀποπον P^c (= 137, 24-25)
 22 <λογικαί> addidi, cf. Ammon., *Isag.* p. 8, 24 23 βάνανσαι P, οι sscr. P^c

- f. 134^r διὰ τῶν Στωϊκῶν λόγων, / ψευδεῖς γὰρ ἄμφω ἀπεδείχθησαν· ἀλλὰ διότι μέρος φιλοσοφίας ἢ γνῶσις τῶν ὄντων πάντων καὶ οὐχ ὅλη φιλοσοφία, λείπει γὰρ καὶ τὸ εὖ ζῆν. καὶ γὰρ μέρος ἅμα καὶ ὄργανον τὴν λογικὴν φιλοσοφίας ὁ Πλάτων ἀποφαίνεται, ἐν μὲν τῷ Φαίδρῳ καὶ Φαίδωνι μέρος, λέγων τὴν διαλεκτικὴν θριγκὸν τῶν ὄντων πάντων, ἐν δὲ τῷ Παρμενίδῃ 5 ὄργανον, λέγων ἑγύμνασαι σαυτὸν διὰ τῆς καλουμένης παρὰ τοῖς πολλοῖς ἀδολεσχίας ἕως ἔτι νέος εἶ· εἰ δὲ μή, διαφεύξεταί σε τὸ ἀληθές. τὴν γὰρ ἐν κανόσι λογικὴν ἑγύμνασίαν καὶ ἀδολεσχήαν ἐκάλεσεν· ἑγύμνασίαν μὲν ὡς προεுτρεπίζουσιν ἡμᾶς εἰς τὰ πράγματα, ἀδολεσχήαν δὲ ὡς ἀποσταῖσαν τῶν πραγμάτων. καὶ πῶς, ὦ Πλάτων, δύναται τὸ αὐτὸ τοῦ 10 αὐτοῦ καὶ μέρος εἶναι καὶ ὄργανον; εἰ γὰρ καὶ ἡ χεὶρ καὶ μέρος καὶ ὄργανον, ἀλλ' οὐ τοῦ αὐτοῦ· τοῦ μὲν γὰρ ζώου μέρος, δόσεως δὲ καὶ f. 134^v λήψεως ὄργανον. καὶ ὁ ξέστης εἰ καὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ / ὕγρου καὶ μέρος καὶ ὄργανον, ἀλλ' οὐχ ὁ αὐτός· μέρος μὲν γὰρ ὁ κατὰ τὸ μετρηθὲν ὕγρον, ὄργανον δὲ ὁ κατὰ τὸ μετρητικὸν ἀγγεῖον. ἢ καὶ νῦν φαίη ἂν ὁ Πλάτων· 15 ἀλλ' ἢ μὲν λογικὴ μέρος, ἢ γὰρ ἐν πράγμασιν, οἷον ἡ ψυχὴ αὐτοκίνητος, τὸ αὐτοκίνητον ἀεικίνητον, ἢ ψυχὴ ἄρα ἀεικίνητος, ἢ δὲ ἐν κανόσιν ὄργανον, οἷον ὅτι ἐκ δύο καθόλου καταφατικῶν καθόλου καταφατικὸν συναγεται ἐν α' σχήματι. καὶ τὴν μὲν ἐν πράγμασιν ἔστιν εὐρεῖν παρὰ τε Ἀριστοτέλει καὶ πολλοῖς ἄλλοις, τὴν δὲ ἐν κανόσι παρὰ μόνῳ Ἀριστοτέλει· μόνος γὰρ 20 οὗτος ἀνθρώπων οὐκ ἐνάρκησε συλήσας τὰς μεθόδους ἀπὸ τῶν πραγμάτων καὶ τέχνην συστησάμενος λογικὴν, ὡς καὶ Πλάτωνα πρὸς αὐτὸν εἰπεῖν ὡς ἑτεχνύδριον ἡμῶν τὴν φιλοσοφίαν ἐποίησας. οἱ δὲ πρὶν ἄνθρωποι οὐκ ἠγνόουν τί ἐστιν ἀπόδειξις οὐδὲ παρελογίζοντο ἑαυτοὺς ἐν ταῖς ἀποδείξεσιν· f. 135^r αἱ γὰρ μεγάλαι φύσεις ὑπὲρ κα/νόνας ἐνεργοῦσαι αὐταὶ κανόνες γίνονται 25 τοῖς μεταγενεστέροις. οὐ γὰρ ἐδεήθη, φησὶν ὁ Θεμιστιος. Πλάτων ἀποδεικνύς τῆς συλλογιστικῆς Ἀριστοτέλους, ἵνα μὴ παρίδῃ τὰ ἴδια τῶν σχημάτων, ἀλλ' Ἀριστοτέλης τῶν Πλάτωνος διαλόγων, ἵνα ἐξ αὐτῶν ἀθροίσῃ τὰ ἴδια τῶν σχημάτων. οὕτως οὐχ Ὅμηρος τοῦ Περὶ ποιητικῆς Ἀριστοτέλους, οὐ Δημοσθένους τῆς Ῥητορικῆς τέχνης Ἑρμογένους, τούναντίον δὲ 30 Ἀριστοτέλης Ὁμήρου ἐν τῷ Περὶ ποιητικῆς καὶ Ἑρμογένους Δημοσθένους ἐν τῇ Ῥητορικῇ τέχνῃ. καὶ ποῦ ὁ Ἀριστοτέλης τὴν λογικὴν ὄργανον εἶπεν φιλοσοφίας; ἢ ἐν τοῖς Τόποις, φήσομεν, ὅπου διαιρεῖ τὰ προβλήματα <εἰς τὰ> πρὸς αἴρεσιν καὶ φυγὴν καὶ εἰς τὰ πρὸς ἀλήθειαν καὶ ψεῦδος καὶ

3 ἅμα inseruit P^c (= 138, 3) / de *Phaedro* et *Phaedone* cf. Philop., *In Anal. Pr.* p. 9, 18-19 5 Pl., *Resp.* VII 534 E 5-7 Pl., *Parm.* 135 D 15 μετρητικὸν: μετρικὸν cum signo correcturae P 25 αὐταὶ P 33 Ar., *Tor.* I 11, 104b 1-3

εἰς τὰ συνεργὰ τούτοις. δύναται δὲ καὶ ὁ Πλάτων καὶ ὅτε λέγει θριγκὸν τὴν διαλεκτικὴν τῶν ὄντων πάντων ὄργανον λέγειν τὴν λογικὴν φιλοσοφίας·
f. 135^v καὶ γὰρ οἱ κα/νόνας ἔξω ὄντες δίκην θριγκοῦ φρουροῦσι τὰ πράγματα.

Ἐπιτομὴ τῆς α' πράξεως

Τὴν λογικὴν οἱ μὲν Στωϊκοὶ μέρος εἶναι φιλοσοφίας διχῶς πειρῶνται 5
α' δεικνύναι οὕτως· πᾶν, φασίν, ὧ κέχρηται τις τέχνη ἢ ἐπιστήμη, τοῦτο
ἐὰν μὴ ἢ ἑτέρας τέχνης μέρος ἢ μόριον, αὐτῆς τῆς χρωμένης μέρος ἐστὶν
ἢ μόριον· οἷον τὸ διαιτητικὸν τῆς ἱατρικῆς μέρος. πρόσκειται δὲ τὸ 'ἐὰν
μὴ ἢ ἑτέρας τέχνης μέρος ἢ μόριον' διὰ τὴν κυβερνητικὴν χρωμένην τῇ
ἀστρονομίᾳ· οὐκ ἔστι γὰρ αὐτῆς μέρος ἢ μόριον, ἐπειδὴ τῆς μὲν μαθη- 10
ματικῆς μέρος ἐστὶ, τῆς δὲ φιλοσοφίας μόριον. ἐπειδὴ οὖν τῇ λογικῇ κέχρη-
ται ἡ φιλοσοφία καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλης μέρος ἢ μόριον, τῆς ἄρα φιλοσοφίας
μέρος ἢ μόριόν ἐστὶν ἡ λογικὴ· καὶ οὐκ ἔστι μόριον, ἐπειδὴ οὐδὲ τοῦ
θεωρητικοῦ οὐδὲ τοῦ πρακτικοῦ μέρος ἐστίν, οὔτε γὰρ τὴν αὐτὴν τοῦ- /
f. 136^r τοις ἔχει ὕλην οὔτε τὸ αὐτὸ τέλος ἢ λογικὴ. μέρος ἄρα φιλοσοφίας. ἀλλ' 15
ὅσον ἐπὶ τῷ κανόνι τῶν Στωϊκῶν ἔσται τὸ φλεβοτόμον σῶμα ὃν μέρος ἢ
μόριον τῆς ἱατρικῆς· καὶ ἐλλιπῶς ἔχει ὁ κανὼν. ἔδει γὰρ οὕτως ἔχειν·
πᾶν ὧ κέχρηται τις τέχνη ἢ ἐπιστήμη, τοῦτο ἐὰν μὴ ἢ ἑτέρας τέχνης μέρος
ἢ μόριον, αὐτῆς τῆς χρωμένης ἢ μέρος ἢ μόριον ἢ ὄργανόν ἐστιν. ὥσπερ
οὖν ἐδείχθη ἡ λογικὴ μὴ οὔσα μόριον φιλοσοφίας, δειξάτωσαν ὅτι οὐδὲ 20
<β> ὄργανον, ἵνα ἢ μέρος. δεύτερος λόγος Στωϊκός· εἰ ἡ φιλοσοφία τὴν λογικὴν
ἀπετέλεσε, μέρος ἢ λογικὴ φιλοσοφίας. ἀλλ' ἐνδέχεται τι ἑαυτῷ ὄργανον
ἀποτελέσαι· καὶ γὰρ ἡ χαλκευτικὴ καὶ ἄκμονα καὶ ῥαϊστῆρα καὶ ἡ τεκτονι-
κὴ πῆχυν καὶ κανόνα. καὶ εἰ χρῶνται τῇ λογικῇ καὶ αἱ ἄλλαι τέχναι, οὐκ
ἄτοπον· καὶ ἑαυταῖς γὰρ καὶ ταῖς ἄλλαις αἱ τέχναι ὄργανα κατασκευά- 25
- f. 136^v ζουσιν. οἱ δὲ Περιπατητικοὶ τὴν λογικὴν φιλοσοφίας ὄργα/νον καὶ αὐτοὶ
α' διχῶς οὕτω δεικνύουσιν· εἰ μέρος ἢ λογικὴ φιλοσοφίας, ἐπειδὴ κέχρηται
τῇ λογικῇ αἱ ἄλλαι τέχναι ὡς ὄργανῳ, καὶ αἱ βάνηυστοι, ἔσται ἡ φιλοσοφία
καὶ τῶν βανύσεων ἀτιμότερα. καθόλου γὰρ, ἐὰν ὦσι δύο τέχναι καὶ τῷ
ἀποτελέσματι τῆς ἑτέρας ἢ ἑτέρα ὡς ὄργανῳ κέχρηται, ἀτιμότερα μὲν ἢ 30
ποιούσα, τιμιωτέρα δὲ ἡ χρωμένη· διὸ τιμιωτέρα ἵππικὴ χαλινοποιικῆς,
β' τῷ γὰρ ἀποτελέσματι τῆς χαλινοποιικῆς αὕτη ὄργανῳ κέχρηται. δεύτερος
λόγος Περιπατητικός· τὰ μέρη ἀναιρούμενα ἀναιρεῖ τὸ ὅλον, ἡ δὲ λογικὴ

1-2 Pl., *Resp.* VII 534 E 6 φασίν: φησίν P (cf. 134, 14) / ὧ] marg. δ P^e
15 post τέλος dist. P 23 ἢ alt. supra add. P^e 32 αὕτη P, sed cf. 135, 29.

οὐ συναναιρεῖ τὴν φιλοσοφίαν· ἦν γὰρ ἀπόδειξις καὶ πρὸ τῆς ἀποδεικτικῆς
πραγματείας τοῦ Ἀριστοτέλους· οὐκ ἄρα μέρος ἡ λογικὴ φιλοσοφίας· ἐν
ὃ δὲ Πλάτων μέρος ἅμα καὶ ὄργανον φησὶ τὴν λογικὴν φιλοσοφίας· ἐν
μὲν τῷ Φαίδρῳ καὶ Φαίδωνι μέρος, ἐν δὲ τῷ Παρμενίδῃ ὄργανον· καὶ
f. I37^r μέρος μὲν τὴν ἐν πράγμασι/σι διαλεκτικὴν, ὄργανον δὲ τὴν ἐν κανόσι. καὶ 5
τὴν μὲν ἐν πράγμασι διαλεκτικὴν ἐστὶν εὐρεῖν παρὰ τε Ἀριστοτέλει καὶ
ἄλλοις πολλοῖς, τὴν δὲ ἐν κανόσι παρ' Ἀριστοτέλει μόνῳ καὶ τοῖς μετ'
αὐτόν· μόνος γὰρ οὗτος τὰς μεθόδους τῶν πραγμάτων ἀποσυλήσας τέχνην
συνεστήσατο λογικὴν. οἱ δὲ πρῶην οὐκ ἠγνόουν τὰς μεθόδους τῶν ἀποδεί-
ξεων, ἀλλ' ἐπιστημονικῶς καὶ ὑπὲρ κανόνας ποιούμενοι τὰς ἀποδείξεις 10
κανόνες ἐγένοντο τοῖς μεταγενεστέροις, ἐξ ὧν τὰς μεθόδους εἰληφότες τὴν
λογικὴν συνεστήσαντο. ὄργανον δὲ φησι τῆς φιλοσοφίας ὁ Ἀριστοτέλης
τὴν λογικὴν ἐν τῇ Τοπικῇ αὐτοῦ πραγματεία.

Πρᾶξις β'

Ὁ σκοπὸς τῶν Προτέρων ἀναλυτικῶν περὶ συλλογισμοῦ. ἔδει γὰρ μετὰ 15
τὰ μέρη πάντα τοῦ συλλογισμοῦ (τὰ προσεχέστατα, τὰς προτάσεις· τὰ
f. I37^v πόρρω, ὄνομα καὶ ῥῆ/μα· τὰ πορρωτάτω, τὰς ἀπλᾶς φωνάς) καὶ περὶ τοῦ
ὅλου συλλογισμοῦ πραγματεύσασθαι. καὶ πῶς ὁ Ἀριστοτέλης περὶ ἀπο-
δείξεως ἔφη εἶναι τὸν σκοπὸν; ἢ περὶ ἀποδείξεως ἔφη τὸν σκοπὸν ἐπειδὴ
καὶ τὸν συλλογισμόν διὰ τὴν ἀπόδειξιν διδασκόμεθα, ὡς εἴ τις καὶ τῆς 20
δρυοτομικῆς τέλος λέγοι τὴν ναυπηγίαν καὶ τῆς φλεβοτομίας τὴν ὑγείαν,
ὑπερβὰς τὴν κένωσιν τοῦ λυποῦντος χυμοῦ. ἢ ἐράσμιον ἐκ θυρῶν ποιῶν
τὸ βιβλίον τὸ χρήσιμον αὐτοῦ σκοπὸν αὐτοῦ ἀπεφήνατο. ἢ ὡς Ἀναλυτι-
κῶν σκοπὸς ἡ ἀπόδειξις, ὡς δὲ Προτέρων ἀναλυτικῶν ὁ συλλογισμὸς· ἐν
δὲ τῷ πέρατι τῶν τεσσάρων Ἀναλυτικῶν τὸν ὡς προτέρων καὶ ὑστέρων 25
σκοπὸν λέγει συμπεραίνόμενος οὕτως· 'περὶ μὲν οὖν συλλογισμοῦ καὶ
ἀποδείξεως τί τε ἐκάτερόν ἐστι καὶ πῶς γίνεται φανερόν ἐστιν, ἅμα δὲ
καὶ περὶ ἐπιστήμης ἀποδεικτικῆς· ταῦτόν γάρ ἐστιν'. ἐπεὶ / ὅτι νῦν τὸν
f. I38^r σκοπὸν περὶ συλλογισμοῦ βούλεται, δηλοῖ μὴ προλαμβάνων τί ἐστὶν
ἀπόδειξις καὶ τίς ἡ ἄμεσος πρότασις, ἀλλὰ τί συλλογισμὸς καὶ τίνες αἱ 30
διαφοραὶ αὐτοῦ, τὸ τέλειον καὶ ἀτελές· τίς ἡ πρότασις· τίνες αἱ διαφοραὶ
τῶν προτάσεων ἐξ ὧν πᾶς συλλογισμὸς· τίνες οἱ ὅροι ἐξ ὧν πᾶς συλλογισ-
μὸς καὶ εἰς οὓς πᾶς ἀναλύεται. περὶ συλλογισμοῦ δὲ ὁ σκοπὸς οὐ κατη-

16 πάντα: vestigia tantum apparent 24-28 Ar., *Anal. post.* II 19, 99 b
15-17 25 τὸν: τῶν P 27 ἀποδείξεως P, sscr. v (= -εων)

- γορικοῦ μόνον, ἀλλὰ παντός· ἐφαρμόζει γὰρ ὁ ὅρος τοῦ συλλογισμοῦ ὁ ἀποδοδεδεμένος ὑπ' αὐτοῦ καὶ τῷ ὑποθετικῷ, καὶ ἐπ' ὀλίγον καὶ περὶ ὑποθετικῶν συλλογισμῶν διαλέγεται, ὡς καὶ ἐν τῷ Περὶ ἐρμηνείας πλεονάσας ταῖς κατηγορικαῖς προτάσεσιν ἐπ' ὀλίγον καὶ περὶ τῶν ὑποθετικῶν διειλεγκται, τὸ γὰρ ἀληθεύειν καὶ ψεύδεσθαι κοινὸν ἑκατέρας. πενταχῶς δὲ 5 λεγομένου τοῦ συλλογισμοῦ· ἢ γὰρ πάντῃ ἀληθεῖς εἰσὶν αἱ προτάσεις, καὶ γίνεται ὁ ἀποδεικτικὸς· ἢ πάντῃ ψευδεῖς καὶ μυθώδεις, καὶ γίνεται ὁ ποιητικὸς· ἢ πῇ μὲν ἀληθεῖς πῇ δὲ ψευδεῖς, καὶ τοῦτο τριχῶς· ἢ γὰρ /
- f. 138^v μᾶλλον ἀληθεῖς, καὶ γίνεται ὁ διαλεκτικὸς καὶ ἐνδοξος· ἢ μᾶλλον ψευδεῖς, καὶ γίνεται ὁ σοφιστικὸς· ἢ ἐξ ἴσου ἀληθεῖς καὶ ψευδεῖς, καὶ γίνεται ὁ 10 ῥητορικὸς, ὁ διὰ τοῦτο μόνος στασιαζόμενος ἐν τοῖς συλλογισμοῖς καὶ ἀσύστατος ἐπὶ μὴ στασιάζῃται· συνῆψεν ὁ Ἀριστοτέλης τῷ γένει μόνον τὸ τιμιώτατον τῶν εἰδῶν καὶ μίαν πραγματείαν περὶ ἀμφοτέρων ἔγραψε τὴν Ἀναλυτικὴν. τινὲς δὲ τρία μόνον φασὶν εἶδη τοῦ συλλογισμοῦ, ἀποδεικτικὸν διαλεκτικὸν σοφιστικόν, συνωθοῦντες τὸν μὲν ῥητορικὸν τῷ δια- 15 λεκτικῷ, τὸν δὲ ποιητικὸν τῷ σοφιστικῷ. καὶ ὅτι τρία μόνον, οὕτως δείκνυται. πέντε εἰσὶ τὰ γινώσκοντα ἐν ἡμῖν, νοῦς διάνοια δόξα φαντασία αἴσθησις· ἢ γὰρ γνῶσις ἢ μερικοῦ ἢ καθόλου· καὶ εἰ μερικοῦ, ἢ ἐκτὸς κειμένου, καὶ γίνεται αἴσθησις, ἢ ἐντός, καὶ γίνεται φαντασία· εἰ δὲ καθόλου, ἢ μετ' αἰτίας, καὶ γίνεται διάνοια, ἢ ἄνευ αἰτίας· καὶ εἰ τοῦτο, ἢ 20 κρεῖττον ἢ κατ' αἰτίαν, καὶ γίνεται νοῦς, ἢ χεῖρον ἢ κατ' αἰτίαν, καὶ /
- f. 131^r γίνεται δόξα. καὶ γινώσκει μὲν τὰ πέντε, συλλογίζεται δὲ μόνῃ ἢ διάνοια· ταύτης γὰρ μόνῃς τὸ διανύειν ὁδὸν τὴν ἀπὸ τῶν προτάσεων ἐπὶ τὸ συμπέρασμα, διὸ καὶ μόνῃ διάνοια λέγεται. καὶ οὔτε τὰ ἄκρα συλλογίζεται, νοῦς καὶ αἴσθησις, ὡς αὐτοπτοῦντα, οὔτε ἡ φαντασία συλλογίζεται· πόθεν 25 γὰρ ἢ πῶς λαβοῦσα, τῆς αἰσθήσεως μὴ συλλογιζομένης; οὔτε μὴν ἡ δόξα συλλογίζεται ὡς μόνον τὰ συμπεράσματα εἰδυῖα καὶ διὰ τοῦτο διανοίας ἀποτελεῦται λεγομένη. μόνῃς ἄρα διανοίας ὁ συλλογισμὸς· ἀλλ' αὕτη ἢ παρὰ νοῦ τὰς προτάσεις λαμβάνει, ὅτε δεῖται τῶν κοινῶν ἐννοιῶν, καὶ ποιεῖ τὸν ἀποδεικτικόν· ἢ ἀπὸ δόξης, καὶ ποιεῖ τὸν διαλεκτικόν· ἢ ἀπὸ φαντα- 30 σίας καὶ διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ἀπὸ αἰσθήσεως, καὶ ποιεῖ τὸν σοφιστικόν.

Τὸ χρήσιμον. χρήσιμον πρὸς ἀπόδειξιν· ὡς γὰρ ἀδύνατον τοιῶσδε γράφειν τὸν οὐκ εἰδόμενον ὅπως, οὕτω καὶ τοιῶσ

20 ἢ alt. supra add. P