ALEXANDER APHRODISIENSIS. ADDENDA ET CORRIGENDA *

by F. EDWARD CRANZ
(Connecticut College)

1. The new anonymous translations of the Thomson manuscript.
2. Specific addenda et corrigenda (arranged in the order of the original article, Vol. I, 77-135).

1. The new anonymous translations of the Thomson manuscript.

The main new material on the translations of Alexander Aphrodisiensis comes from a manuscript in the possession of Frank Allan Thomson of Stockholm; I am indebted to Paul Oskar Kristeller for a description of the manuscript and to Mr. Thomson for generously providing me with a complete microfilm copy.

Ms. A 1 : a. cart. misc. XV ex. Several hands. II, 276 folios. At the end (folios a-d), an old table of contents.

f. I-II. Hieronymi Donati patricii Veneti in interpretationem Alexandri Aphrodisicen prefatio.

[Inc.]: Aristotelem philosophum ita ab initio antiquitas admirata est ut eum laudaret potius quam sectaretur. . . . [Expl.]: (f. II) Si quid quenquam inter legendum offendor, non auctorem accuset sed inter pretem.

f. 1-66 (other hand, except for title) Alexandri Aphrodisici narratio de anima ex Aristotelis institutione, interprete Hieronymo Donato, patricio Veneto.

[Inc.]: Propositum nostrae institutionis est ut de anima disseramus que versatur in corpore, quod generatur et interit. . . . [Expl.]: (f. 66) in nervos musculosque dif-

funditur quibus intercedentibus partium membrorumque motio et progressus passim in omni animalium natura gignitur.

Auspicio exerptus animae codicillus per me Joannem Stephanum Extraneum Alexandrimum de Bergolio Barthomini in amplissimo lare Magnifici equitis aurati ac iuris urtisque necnon philosophiae doctoris D. Dominici Grimanii Antonii patricii Veneti generosiissimi XII° kalen. Febrarius 1491°.

f. 66v. Ad lectorem. An epigram of six lines.

[Inc.]: Spiritus aethereus divinæs mentis alumnus.

[Expl.]: Rem vides: haud facias quin tuarius onus.

f. 67-670 blank.

f. 71-71v. (other hand) Alexandri Aphrodisici successive (sic) glosarieve questiones ac solutiones quedam, earum capita sunt in numero 30. A table of chapters.

f. 72-93. Alexander Aphrodisiensis, Questions morales. Questio contra negantes bonum esse vivere.

[Inc.]: Si prosper navigare bonum est, et male navigare malum, navigare ipsum neque bonum neque malum est. . . . [Expl.]: (f. 93) cum sit quodam generatio, non autem simpliciter generatio ex contrario, que autem secundum substantiam non etiam ex contrario sed ex oppositione per contradictionem, neque substantie contrarium quiequam est.

f. 93-94. Alexander Aphrodisici Naturales questiones glosarie, earum solutiones et capita. Table of chapters.

f. 94-173. Alexander Aphrodisiensis, Questiones naturales. Per que constitue
qui possit primam causam secundum Aristotelem.

[Inc.]: Si substantiae omnes corruptibles sunt, omnia erunt corruptibilia, nam separabilia cetera sunt substantia...[Expl.]: (f. 173) et rursum sequitur si dicatur in impartiliium ipsum divid quod ex impartiliium compositione fiunt magnitudines.


[Inc.]: De anima quid sit et quenam eius substantia et quo accidentia ei sint non est promptum nec facile cognoscere sed est ex difficillimis huismodi rerum contemplatio...[Expl.]: (f. 243) sed manifestissime Theophrastus ostendit in Calistene idem esse secundum fatum ac secundum naturam et Polizelius in opere hoc modo inscripto de fato.

f. 243-266v. Alexandri Aphrodisiei Ad imperatores de fato et eo quod in nobis est.

[Inc.]: Erat quidem mihi votis omnibus optandum, imperatores maximi Severe et Antonine, coram vos videre et alloqui atque agere gratias pro vestris in me plurimis beneficis...[Expl.]: (f. 266v) si eorum causas pro Aristotelis sententia semper attulerimus sum conatus huc disputacione explicare.

The Thomson manuscript makes a notable contribution to our knowledge of the Renaissance translations of Alexander. The details will be discussed in connection with the particular translations, but the problem of the manuscript as a whole will be treated first and separately.

The first item in the manuscript is the already known translation of Alexander, *De anima* I, by Hieronymus Donatus. The copy is dated January 21, 1491. This permits us to make more precise the *terminus ante quem* of the Donatus translation, which was published in 1495. Further the scribe notes that the copy was made in the household of the later Cardinal Domenico Grimani (d. 1523). On Grimani, see Pio Paschini, *Domenico Grimani, Cardinale di S. Marco* († 1523), Storia e Letteratura IV (Rome 1943).

In addition to the *De anima* I, the Thomson manuscript contains three other works of Alexander: 1. *De anima* II. 2. *Quaestionum naturales et morales* (the manuscript has the ethical questions first, followed by the three books of the natural questions). 3. *De fato*. All these translations are anonymous in the manuscript; all differ from the translations previously identified.

The question of the authorship of the translations cannot be decided on the basis of the evidence now available. Two general points may, however, be made.

In the first place, it seems clear that the three translations are the work of a single author. The basic argument is the agreement in the general style of the translations and in the somewhat unusual translation of certain technical terms. In style, the translations are simple and clear; in vocabulary they are almost purely 'Latin' and very few transliterations of Greek terms occur. As an illustration of the identical translation of a technical term, one might cite *De sublimibus* for *Meteorology* (*Quaestionum Naturales* III, 10, ed. Bruns 98,25, and III, 14, ed. Bruns 108,22, as well as *De anima* II, ed. Bruns 186,14). In most other translations one finds *Meteorologica* or *Meteor*. Similarly, both in the *Quaestionum naturales* II, 9 (ed. Bruns 54,19) and in the *De anima* II (ed. Bruns 103,3) *ἔντελαχεω* appears as *perfectihabia* [*perfectihabentia*]. This seems the necessary reading, though both in the Thomson manuscript and in the translation by Barbarus, cited below, we find *perfectihabia*, with no sign of an abbreviation.] H. Barbarus uses *perfectihabentia* in his version of Themistius, *Paraphrasis de anima* (Venice, c. 1500. Goff T-132) f. 77v: *Hanc igitur formam et speciem si quis entelechiam, idest verbum ex verbo perfectihabiam [perfectihabentiam] appelleat, haud iure reprehendetur eum novo usus et horrenti vocabulo.* (ed. R. Heinz, CIAG V, 3, Berlin, 1899, p. 39,16 f.). I have not noted the term *perfectihabentia* elsewhere in translations of Alexander. But if the anonymous of the Thomson manuscript borrowed the term from H. Barbarus, the vocabulary of the anonymous seems otherwise quite different and his translation closer and more exact.

Likewise there are similarities between the new translation of the *De fato* and the other new translations. *ἐγιμός* appears
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as series in the De fato (ed. Bruns 195,19 and 196,2) and also in the De anima II (ed. Bruns 185,5); μοίγα appears as sors both in the De fato (ed. Bruns 166,7) and also in the De anima II (ed. Bruns 182,15). Heracleitus, Fragment # 118, appears as Mos hominem deus both in the De fato (ed. Bruns 170,18) and in the De anima II (ed Bruns 185,23). Similarly βουλευτικός and its cognates appear both in the De fato (ed. Bruns 178,11 f.) and in the Quaestiones Naturales (ed. Bruns 107,34 f.) as deliberativus.

Hence the evidence points to a single translator as the author of the three new translations, but it also seems that this translator cannot be identified with either of the two possibilities suggested by the external evidence, Hieronymus Donatus or Angelus Politianus.

Hieronymus Donatus had translated Book I of the De anima, and we know that he possessed a Greek manuscript of Book II and that he was searching for a more complete copy (See Vol. I p. 85a). It is a natural hypothesis that he went on to translate Book II and that the translations of the Thomson manuscript are his. However, the fragments of his translation of the De intellectu of De anima II do not correspond with the new anonymous translation. (See below IX, 1 a). Further the anonymous translation of the De anima II offers a unique translation of the crucial δύοφειν which is not in agreement with Donatus’ standard translation as extrinsic (e.g. De anima I, ed. Bruns 90,19 f.). In the anonymous translation of the De anima II in the Thomson manuscript, δύοφειν is regularly given a temporal or inchoative meaning. Thus we find such renderings as principio statim, primo statim, primo, and finally as a standard translation for νοεί δύοφειν, intellectus incoatus (De anima II,108,22 ff.).

In the case of Angelus Politianus, there is some evidence that he translated all or part of some Quaestiones Naturales of Alexander, though it must be remembered that this title was also applied to the Problemata (See above, Vol. I,119 f.). One is therefore tempted to connect him with the new anonymous translations. However, a provisional study of the style of these translations does not seem to favor Politianus’ claims. For example, in the Miscellaneorum Prima Centuria, probably contemporary with the new translations, Politianus discusses (Chapter I, in his Opera, Venice, 1498) the question of ἐνέλεξα at some length but we find no references to perfectihabentia or perfectihabia. Similarly in Chapter Lxxxvii of the Centuria Politianus discusses Automatum in Suetonius; he suggests that it might be rendered as ultroneum et spontale; on the other hand, in the Thomson manuscript of De anima II (ed. Bruns 176,2) we find the Latin given as causus. But a final decision on Politianus’ authorship must await more careful stylistic comparisons.

Hence, in summary, the Thomson manuscript presents us with three new translations of Alexander: the De anima II, the Quaestiones naturales et morales, and the De fato. All seem to be by a single translator, not yet identified. On the basis of the manuscript itself and on the basis of the clean humanist style, one would suggest a date in the late fifteenth century or very early in the sixteenth century. For further details on the particular translations, see below under I, 2a, VIII,1b, and XII,1a.

Bibliography.

II. B. LATE ANCIENT AND BYZANTINE


II. E. Western Europe

2. Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries


I. 2. (Book I only)

**Hieronymus Donatus**

On the basis of the Thomson manuscript (See above p. 411), the *terminus ante quem* of the Donatus translation of the *De anima* can be moved back from 1495 (the date of publication) to January 21, 1491, the date of the copy made by Johannes Stephanus Extraneus Alexandrinus de Bergolio Bartholomini in the household of Dominico (later Cardinal) Grimani.
Added biographical information: Born October 2, 1495. The son of Niccolò (1454-1512), the grandson of Antonio (1396-1461). Involved in a plot against the Medici in 1521 but not sentenced. Offices under the regime of Nic. Capponi 1528-29, and again under Cosimo I 1534, 1542, 1550. Assisted Diacceto in teaching mathematics, ethics, and philosophy at Pisa; see Fabroni I, 324. Compiled the statutes of the Accademia degli Umidì 1540, and was its console. Died February 27, 1555.


IV. 1. Guillelmus de Moerbeke (?)

vol. I p. 91b, line 14 (reported by S. Mansion).

Read: The translation is found in four manuscripts.

VI. 1. Guillelmus de Moerbeke.

reported by A. J. Smet)


line 7: and seven manuscripts give the date...


VI. 6. c.


VIII. 1. Anonymus

(Guillelmus de Moerbeke)

The medieval translation of the De fato has now been published in a critical edition by P. Thillet: Alexandre d’Aphrodise, De fato ad Imperatores, Version de Guillaume de Moerbeke (Études de Philosophie Médiévale L1) Paris, 1963. By a careful analysis of the vocabulary of the translation, the editor shows that the work is definitely to be ascribed to Guillelmus de Moerbeke; he also demonstrates that the translation was made from a Greek manuscript written in uncials and not from any now extant.

Meanwhile Miss L. Labowsky had shown that our most important Greek manuscript for the independent philosophical works of Alexander, Marc. Zan. gr. 258(668), the V of Bruns, once belonged to Guillelmus and bears his name, with his title of penitentiary of the pope, on the first folio. (L. Labowsky, ‘Bessarion Studies. III. William of Moerbeke’s Manuscript of Alexander of Aphrodisias,’ Mediaeval and Renaissance Studies V[1961] 155-62). Since as Thillet has shown, Guillelmus worked from a Greek manuscript in uncials, he cannot have made the translation from his own manuscript. As Thillet points out, Guillelmus did not bear the title of penitentiary after 1278 (op. cit. p. 62)
and must hence have come into possession of the manuscript before then. Thillet suggests that Guillelmus must therefore have made his translation before obtaining his own Greek copy and that he possibly made use of a lost papal manuscript.

VIII. 1a. ANONYMUS

The Thomson manuscript (see above p. 411) contains a previously unknown translation of the De fato. The translation appears to be the work of the same author who translated the De anima II and the Quaestiones in the Thomson manuscript, but he has not yet been identified (for the evidence, see above p. 412). The translation of the De fato, like the others, is probably to be dated in the late fifteenth or early sixteenth century. To judge from the evidence presented by Brun in his edition p. xxviii f., the translation seems to have been based on Marc. Zan. gr. 261 (the B of Brun) or another manuscript related to it.

Thomson manuscript A 1: a (micro.)

[Inc.]: (f. 243) Erat quidem mihi votis omnibus optandum, imperatores maxim i Severe et Antonine, coram vos videre et alloqui atque agere gratias pro vestris in me plurimis beneficiis... /...[Expl.]:

(f. 266v) si eorum causas pro Aristotelis sententia semper attulerimus sum conatus hac disputatione explicare.

VIII. 1b. Hieronymus Donatus

Nicoletus Vernias in his De intellectu of September, 1492 cites the De fato * briefly in connection with his citations of the De anima I and the De intellectu in the translation of Hieronymus Donatus (See above I,2 and below IX 1a). In what appears to be the first edition of Vernias, De intellectu (with Albertus de Saxonia, Quaestiones in Aristotelis Physica. Venice, J. Pencius. April 13, 1504) we read, f. 86ra 'Unde ipse [sc. Alexander] in suo De fato consiliativum hominem et libertatem habere arbitrii dicit. Sed ut Severinus ait, nos liberum arbitrium non dicimus facere quod quisque voluerit sed quod quisque iudicio et examinatione colegir, alioquin irrationabila animalia habebunt liberum arbitrium, videmus enim alia quaedam sponte refugere, quibusdam sponte adhaerere; quod si ad velle vel nolle hoc recte liberi arbitrii vocabulo teneretur, non solum hoc hominum sed etrerorum animalium esset'. (In the next edition, with N. Vernias, Quaestio de gravibus et levibus, Venice, 1505, the first portion of the passage appears in what seems to be a different recension, though corrupt. f. 5ra: unde ipse in suo de facto (sic) consiliariu[m [consiliativum?] hominem et libertatem habere arbitrii dicitur. Sed ut Severinus ait, nos liberum arbitrium non nisi dicimus quod quisque voluerit secundum quod quisque iudicio et examinatione colegir.)

One cannot make too much of so brief and unclear a reference. However, it does seem to show that Vernias had access to a translation of the De fato. The reference appears to be to Chapter XI (ed. Brun 178,11 f.) and XIV (ed. Brun 183,26 f.). It is not clear whether the reference to Severinus is a part of the original text or a gloss; possibly it refers to Boethius, De consolatione V, Pr. 2. As far as Alexander is concerned, the translations of the De fato by Hieronymus and Johannes Baptista Bagolinus are too late to be considered (See VIII.2 and 3 above). The translation by Guillelmus de Moerbeke (see VIII.1 above) uses consiliativus in its version of the passage in question (ed. Thillet p. 76,26 f. and see p. 124b s.v.); but Moerbeke's translation seems to have been little known in fifteenth century Italy, and Vernias' context suggests a Renaissance translation. The anonymous translation of the Thomson manuscript (see above, VIII, 1a) seems to be excluded since it usually renders βουλευτικὸς by deliberatius rather than consiliativus. Thus one of the passages in question (Brun 178,10) begins, Quod si frustra et incassum homo deliberat vana nulliusque momenti est quam habet deliberandi potestatem. Quamquam si nihil facit incassum natura, ex precedentibus hominem autem esse deliberatium ani-

* I am indebted to Professor Edward P. Mahoney, of Duke University, for calling my attention to this citation.
mal principaliter est a natura...colligeretur nimirum non esse frustra deliberatvs ho-
mnes'. On the other hand, Hieronymus Donatus in parallel passages of De anima I appears to use cognates both of consi-
lativus and of deliberativus in translating βουλευτικός (e.g. Bruns 82,16 f.).

Hence, until more definite evidence is available, the citation of the De falo by Vernias seems to leave us with the possi-
bility that there was another Renaissance translation of the De falo, possibly by Hiero-
nymus Donatus.

IX. 1a. Hieronymus Donatus
(fragments only preserved)

Fragments of a translation of the De intellectu by Hieronymus Donatus are cited by Nicoletus Vernias in his De intellectu of September, 1492. (The following citations are all taken from the edition of 1504, see VIII, 1b above; there are no essential differences in the edition of 1505.) Vernias is explicit on the translator. f. 86ab. Superius dicta ad mentem Alexandri Aphrodisei pro maior parte accepit ex para-
phrasi eiusdem super libro de anima et ex tractatu quodam eius de intellectu, quae omnia accuratissime et elegantissime trans-
tulit Magnificus patritius Venetus utriusque linguae doctissimus integerrimus philosophus iuris utriusque doctor Hieronymus Donatus compater meus dilectissimus.' We may as-
sume that Vernias' quotations from the De intellectu are substantially accurate, since his quotation of De anima I (ed. Bruns 84,24 f.) differs only in details from the printed Donatus version: f. 86ra. Sed Alexander dixit et bene quod intellectus magis assimilatur rasurae tabulae quam ipsi tabulae, aptitude existens sicut et rasurae [rasura, 1505], id est privatio inscriptionis. Et quod hoc sit ita audias verba eius in capitulo de speculativo intellectu et pratico (sic). 'Solum igitur materialis intellectus facultas promptitudo quaedam est ad formas recipiendas tabellae nundum scriptae persi-
milis, quinimmo ipsius tabellae agraphio, hoc est inscriptionis carentiae quam tabellae similior... .'

The main quotations in Vernias from De intellectu are:

1. f. 85va. Unde opinatur Alexander quod in una simplici substantia animae sunt duae potentiae sempiternae. Audias verba eius. 'Intellectus activus quidem est. Non solum enim conditor rerum plurimarum sed earum fabricator in idem intelligendis efficitur, nisi forte quispiam intellectum ob id passivum concedat quod suscipterandararum specierum vim retinet. Suscipere enim vide-
tur esse quod pati, et hoc intellectui et sensui commune est. Verum quia unaqua-
que res non ab eo quod commune est caeteris, sed quod peculiare et proprium est definitionem capiat, proprium autem intellectui est ut activus sit specierum quas recipit, ab actione potius definierud est. Et est socius nostri intellectus in opere qui ab extra est intellectus.' (ed. Bruns 111,5-14 with omissions and 27-28)

2. f. 85va. De intellectu agente, quod sempiternus sit, audias quae ipse [se. Alexander] ponit. 'Intellectus agens cum ab extra elusmodi species actu sit, intellectus immortalis et sempiternus iure ab Aristotele nuncupatur.' (Brus 108,29-109,1)

3. f. 86ra. . . . huic opinioni adhaerebant hic qui (ut inquit Alexander in tractatu suo De intellectu) solebant in porticibus disputare, Stoici scilicet, qui dicebant 'intelligere non esse nostrum opus' sed divinae providentiae. (Bruns 113,16)

4. f. 86ra. Unde in suo De intellectu, de agente loquens ait, 'Non enim cum ullo in loco sit transitum facit, sed cum ubique sit, manet in corpore quod a temperamentum dissolvitur, corrupta organica portione' (Bruns 112,31-113,1)

On the basis of these fragments, there can be no doubt that Hieronymus Donatus translated at least the De intellectu of De anima II. The terminus ante quem is pro-
vided by the date of Vernias, De intellectu: September, 1492. The translation cannot be earlier than 1489, when Donatus first read the De anima (See Vol. I,85a).

One cannot identify the manuscript on the basis of the extant fragments. It would seem however that Donatus may well have used at least one and possibly two manu-
scripts belonging to Domenico Grimani, in
whose household our earlier manuscript of Donatus' translation of the De anima I was copied (see above, p. 412). In March, 1490, Donatus wrote to Angelus Politianus (See Vol. I,85a). He tells Politianus that he has Books I and II of the De anima; however his copy of De anima II is mutilated at the beginning. Accordingly, he asks Politianus if there is a better copy at Florence. Politianus replies on April 22 that there is no manuscript in the Medicean Library, but he adds, 'Tum Grimanus proxima aestate missurum se mihi exemplum alterum, quod tibi pridem commodaverat, ultro est polititus...' (Politianus, Opera omnia, Basel, 1553, 26).

XII. 1a. ANONYMUS

The Thomson manuscript (see above p. 411) contains a previously unknown translation of the Quaestiones naturales et morales. The translation seems to be the work of the same author who translated the De anima II and the De fato, but he has not yet been identified (for the evidence, see above p. 412). The translation of the Quaestiones naturales et morales, like the other translations of the Thomson manuscript, is probably to be dated in the late fifteenth or early sixteenth century. On the basis of the criteria provided by Bruns in his editions (De anima p. x f.; Quaestiones p. xix f.), the translation seems to be based on Marc. Zan. gr. 261 (the B of Bruns) or a manuscript closely resembling it. Thus, for example, in I,lii (Bruns 48,14) the translation indicates a lacuna as does B; in I,xxvi (Bruns 41,22) and in IV,xxx (Bruns 161,34) the translation follows B in repeating the title of the question at the beginning of the text.


(Quaestiones morales = Book IV). [Inc.]: (f. 72) Si prosperare navigare bonum est, et male navigare malum, navigare ipsum neque bonum neque malum est. / / / [Exp1.]: (f. 93) cum sit quidem generatio, non autem simpliciter generatio ex contrariis, que autem secundum substantiam non etiam ex contrariis sed ex oppositione per contradictionem, neque substantiae contrarium quicumque est. (Book I). [Inc.]: (f. 94) Si substantiae omnes corruptibiles sunt, omnia erunt corruptabilia, nam separabilia cetera sunt substantiae.../... (Book III). [Exp1.]: (f. 173) et rursum sequitur si dicatur in impartia ipsum dividit quod ex impartiulio compositionis fiunt magnitudines.

XII. 6 ANGELUS POLITIANUS

It still seems impossible to give a definite answer to the question whether or not Politianus translated the Quaestiones naturales et morales, and the problem is made more difficult by the fact that in our sources Naturales quaestiones may also refer to the Problemati (See XII. 6 above and XVII. 4 above and below XVII. 4a). However, the following additional evidence may be noted.

Jacobus Philippus Bergomensis in his Supplementum Chronicarum, beginning with the edition of Venice, 1503, writes of Politianus: f. 408a 'vertit Alexandri Aphrodisei quaestionum libros quattuor, item Problemati eiusdem Alexandri.' Jacobus clearly intends to affirm a separate translation of the Quaestiones naturales, and his Supplementum contains a good deal of valid information on literary history.

In his correspondence with Hieronymus Donatus (See Vol. I,85a) Politianus expresses a fear that he may have translated the same work of Alexander that Donatus had translated; at the same time he refers to two manuscripts of Domenico Grimani. Further, in the Thomson manuscript (see above p. 412) which contains the De anima I-II, the Quaestiones naturales et morales, we find that De anima I was copied in the household of Grimani in January of 1491. Finally, in February, 1490, Politianus writes to Antonius Pizamogus: 'De quaestionibus Alexandri cupio aliquid transigas cum Grimano [germano], cui salutem Picus ascribit, et Hermolaus Barbaro. ...' (Lorenzo d'Amore, Epistole ineditae di Angelo Politiano, Napoli, 1909, p. 37). In reading Grimano, I follow the translation in Pio Paschini, Domenico Grimani, Cardinale di S. Marco (f 1523), Storia e Letteratura IV (Roma, 1943) p. 11. Paschini refers to Bibl. Vatic., Cod. Cappon. 235, fol. 81 and dates the letter as March 1,

In summary, there is considerable evidence, none of it conclusive, for Politianus’ active interest in the *Quaestiones naturales et morales*; there is even less definite evidence that he actually translated them. It is possible that further study of the style of the translation of the *Questiones* in the Thomson manuscript may permit the ascription of this translation to Politianus; the first indications, however, seem to deny his authorship. (see above p. 413).

**XIV. 2. Doubtful**

Two fragments of the medieval translation of the *Commentaria in Aristotelis Analytica Posterioria* have been found in a Paris manuscript (BN, lat. 16080), and it appears that the translator was Jacobus Venetus.


**XV. 6. Doubtful**

Add to bibliography:

**XVII. 2. Theodorus Gaza**

Additional edition (reported by Richard J. Durling).


**XVII. 4. Angelus Politianus**

(Book I)


It may also be noted that Politianus purchased a partial manuscript of the *Problematæ* from Ficino (see Ida Maier, *Les manuscrits d’Ange Politien*, Travaux d’Humanisme et Renaissance LXX, Genève, 1965, p. 337 with references).

Additional editions (reported by Richard J. Durling).

1558 s.l. s.n. With Aristotle, *Problematæ* and M.A. Zimara, *Problematæ* etc. (Wellcome Historical Medical Library).


**XVII. 4a. Angelus Politianus**

(Book II) Doubtful.

Nicoletus Vernias in his *De intellectu* (see above p. 416) cites a translation of Alexander, *Quaestiones naturales* (edition of Venice, 1504, f. 86ra): ‘Item ipse Alexander in naturalibus quaestionibus inquit: Medicina etsi scientia est, tamen in opere suo ars appareat, quemadmodum anima etsi immortalis, tamen in corpus mortale demersa videtur esse mortalis. Item ait noluisse mundi opificem divinos celestesque hominum animos corporibus terrenis absque congruo quodam medio colligare. Medium est anima cogitativa.’ The first part of the passage (I have not been able to locate the second) is a reference to the *Problematæ* II, Proemium (ed. Ideler I,52,15 ff.), though it is not an exact quotation.

The Proemium to Part II of the *Problematæ* is not translated by Petrus Padubanensis or by Theodorus Gaza (see XVII. 1 and 2, above). It does appear in the translation of Georgius Valla, published in 1488 (see
The image contains a page from a document, which appears to be a continuation from a previous page. The text is written in Latin and discusses a translation of the work of Problematum by Politianus, mentioning that it was translated in 1479. The text also references a translation by Petrus Crintius and discusses the work of Alexander in the context of medicine and alchemy. The text is highlighting the importance of accurate translations and the contributions of scholars in preserving knowledge from antiquity.

The document also contains notes that are marked as "doubtful," indicating areas where the author is uncertain about the accuracy of the information. The page number 420 is visible at the bottom right corner of the page.
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posse effluere ab antiquo aeterno et separato.' Quo modo quidem igitur salvantur opera magorum apud Alex. perspicuum.

In Chapter XV, Niphus notes an objection to the solution of Alexander; he replies and makes incidental mention of Alexander De anima as well as of 'Alexander rodius in libro quem fecit Antibolo filio de opinione Platonis de anima'. In Chapter XVI (f. 80rb) he notes other difficult objections but adds 'quod si tu aut alius vir modum habet salvandi haec, nolo amplius disputare, sed consentire Alexan. et aliiis peripateticis qui daemones negant.'

Albertus Magnus in his De mineralibus, Liber II, Tractatus I, Caput II (Albertus Magnus, Opera, 38 vols., Paris 1890-99, v. V, p. 25) discusses the various positions on the causes of the virtues of stones (circa causam virtutum lapidum). 'Haec ergo est opinio quorumdam antiquorum philosophorum, quam Alexander Graecus Peripateticus defendere videtur, eo quo ipse omnia quaecunque sunt, sive sint animata sive non, elementis attribuit. Ita etiam quod dicit intellectum esse quoddam elementorum com-plexionem consequens. Ipsa enim elementa cum complexa sunt, mirabiliorum et altissimiarum dicit esse operationum. Virtutum autem quae in commixto regit et dirigit qualitates elementales, non dicit esse nisi complexionem consequentem, et hanc mirabilem asserit esse, et probat per opera alchimiae in quibus simplicia parum prosunt, et cum complexa fuerint, admirablese valde reddunt effectus.' In the following Chapter III, Albertus refutes the opinion of Alexander and adds a few details on it (ibid. V,27): 'Dicta vero Alexandri Peripatetici convenien- tia ideo non sunt, quia scimus quod licet quodlibet calidum simplex et calidum com-mixtum diversas habet operationes, tamen conveniunt in genere. ..Adhuc autem male dictum est nihil dirigere et informare qua-lites [qualitates] elementorum nisi ipsam mixtionem et complexionem.. Propter virtutes enim lapidum non complexionales nec elementales prae omnibus magici utuntur lapidibus pretiosis tam in anulis quam in caeteris imaginibus, quorum effectus est mirabilis. Propter hoc autem et hujusmodi falsificatur dictum Alexandri.'

The statements of Niphus and Albertus Magnus demonstrate the existence of one (or possibly two) works on magic and alchemy attributed to Alexander. In each case it appears that the author was originally listed simply as 'Alexander Peripateticus.' He is identified as Alexander Aphrodisiensis in the margins of the 1890-99 edition of Albertus, Opera; but he does not so appear in the text, and the marginalia are absent in the early edition I have seen (Oppenheim, 1518). Niphus first refers to him simply as Alexander Peripateticus, but it is clear that he identified him with Alexander Aphrodisiensis as the author of the De anima (De daemonibus I, 14, f. 80ra ; I,15, f. 80rb). In the case of Albertus, one might cite the use of alchimia as showing that his translation was one coming through the Arabic, but it is not certain that this word belongs to Alexander and not to Albertus. In the case of Niphus, the terminology suggests a translation from the Greek and it is possible that Niphus was working directly from a Greek text.

There are no firm links between the references of Albertus Magnus and of Augustinus Niphus, on the one hand, and the ancient tradition of Alexander's works, on the other. The eleventh century Byzantine writer, Michael Psellus, at the end of his work De lapidum virtutibus (ed. P. J. Maussac, Leiden, 1745 p. 38-39 ; reprinted PG CXXII, Coll. 899-900) lists the authors who discussed the causes of the powers of stones; of the earlier writers he mentions Anaxagoras, Empedocles, and Democritus, and he adds 'of those who did not live long before us, Alexander of Aphrodisias, a man, to speak briefly of many things, most ready even with respect to the ineffable things of nature'. A pupil of Psellus, Michael Ephesius, in his commentary on Aristotle, De divinatione per somnum twice cites Alexander Πεδίο Δαιμόνων (on 464a3 and 464a24, ed. P. Wendland, CIG, Berlin, 1903, p. 83, 27 and 84, 26) but the references are brief and cannot be directly connected with the citations of Albertus Magnus or of Niphus.

It must also be remembered that 'Alexander' was a powerful name in the world of alchemy and of magic (see, e.g., Lynn
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Thorndike, *A History of Magic and Experimental Science*, v.1, second printing, New York, 1929, pp. 331, 555-6, 710-19), and it may be that some anonymous work was successively attributed to 'Alexander', 'Alexander peripateticus,' and finally to 'Alexander Aphrodisiensis'. Possibly Alber-tus Magnus, and even Niphus, may be drawing from a work on alchemy which in a Brussels manuscript is attributed to 'Alexander philosophus' though in other manuscripts it is anonymous (Thorndike-Kibre, *A Catalogue of Incipits*. [1963] col. 1372.)