

jam diu viget et vigebit. Ex hisque omnibus perpensis mihi sedet sententia de *non mutandis Manuscriptis*:—Quoad autem B—ii conjecturam, διὰ τοῦτο οὐ θελίαν, κ. τ. λ., hanc quidem existimo viri hujus ingenio erudito indignissimam.

W.

Dabam Liverpoolii D. 3. Aprilis, 1822.

OBSERVATIONS

On that part of a work entitled, EMPEDOCLIS ET PARMENIDIS FRAGMENTA EX CODICE TAURINENSIS BIBLIOTHECÆ RESTITUTA ET ILLUSTRATA, AB AMEDEO PEYRON, LIPSIÆ, 1810, in which the author treats of the genuine Greek text of the Commentary of Simplicius in Aristotelem De Cælo et Mundo.

THE intention of the learned Professor Peyron in this part of his work, is to demonstrate that the Greek text of the Venice edition of this commentary of Simplicius is a translation by some modern Greek sophist from a barbarous Latin version of this work made by Guillelmus de Moërbeka, in the 13th century. And the Professor thinks that he has most satisfactorily proved this to be the case, from this version of Moërbeka so exactly corresponding with the Greek of the Venice edition, which is faulty in the extreme, as he shows in many instances by comparing it with the Codex Taurinensis of this work, in which alone the genuine text of Simplicius is to be found.

Plausible however as the Professor's arguments in support of this opinion may appear to be, I trust that the following instances of variations between the version of Moërbeka, and the Greek of the Venice edition, will be found to be at least equally powerful in proving that the latter is not a translation of the former.

But previous to the detail of these instances, it is necessary to observe, in the first place, that I am in possession of the first edition of this version of Moërbeka, which was published at Venice in the year 1540, of which the Professor says, (p. 8.) "At quum hanc habere hucusque non licuerit, utor alia editione anni 1563. ibidem fol." He adds, "Hæc etsi dicatur in fronte novi-

ter fere de integro interpretata, ac cum fidissimis codicibus Græcis recens collata, tamen quam parum promissis editor steterit, vel ex eo licet agnoscere, quod postremi duo libri eduntur ex *Guilielmo Morbeto Do Interprete*. Priores duos, licet nusquam appareat nomen interpretis, a versione Moërbeka penitus fuisse desumptos, tum ex barbarica scriptura, tum ex pari interpretandi modo, plane judico?" And he concludes with observing, that he shall cite this edition of 1563 as the true version of Moërbeka. In the second place, it is remarkable that this version, which the Professor confidently ascribes to Moërbeka, should in the first edition of it be said to have been wholly made by *Guillermus Morbetus*; for the following is the title of this translation: *Simplicii Philosophi Acutissimi Commentaria in Quatuor Libros De Cælo Aristotelis. Guillermo Morbete Interprete. Quæ omnia, cum fidissimis Codicibus Græcis recens collata fuere. Venetiis 1540*. Whether therefore this Morbetus is in reality the same with Moërbeka, who was the Archbishop of Corinth in the 13th century, and whose version of the treatise of Proclus De Providentia¹ is extant in the 8th volume of the Bibliotheca of Fabricius, I shall leave to others to determine, who are better qualified than I am for such philosophical discussions. I shall only remark, that to me it appears that the version of Proclus De Providentia, which is ascribed to Moërbeka, is far more barbarous than that of Simplicius De Cælo, which is ascribed to Morbetus; and this opinion of mine might be corroborated by many instances, if it were necessary. It is however sufficient for my purpose that this edition of 1540 is that of which the edition of 1563 is a reprint.

Having premised thus much, I proceed to the detail of instances, which sufficiently, as I conceive, confute the opinion of Professor Peyron, that the Venice Greek edition of Simplicius De Cælo is a translation of the Latin version of that work by Moërbeka, or Morbetus.

In the first place, in p. i. of the Preface,² we have in the Latin, "Sed si velit aliquis Aristotelis theoriam de mundo videre, in omnibus simul ipsius negotiis naturalibus, *primum* de mundo

¹ At the end of my translation of Proclus on the Theology of Plato, in 2 vols. 4to, I have given a translation of this treatise of Proclus, accompanied by numerous emendations of the text.

² All the following citations are made from the above-mentioned Latin version of Morbetus, and the notes in the margin of it, which were made by me from comparing it with the printed Greek edition of this work, when I was engaged in translating all the works of Aristotle.

tractasse dicendum." But in this passage, the Greek word for *primum* is wanting in the original. A little after, in the passage, "Ad alios autem expositores dicendum, quod non videtur sermo de quatuor elementis in his *præter necessarium*, neque simpliciter præter theoriam de celestibus assumptus esse, sed principaliter de ipsis docet," the Greek for the words *præter necessarium*, i. e. *παρα το αναγκαιον*, is wanting in the Venice edition. In p. 3 a, "motus quidem enim *animalium* (ut æstimo) neque unus proprie est, cum fiat secundum extensionem et inflexionem membrorum." But the Greek, instead of *ζωων* for *animalium*, has erroneously *σωματων*.

Again, in p. 7 a, "et quidem et totum a sui *unionem* in seipso producit propriam discretionem." The whole, or the universe, from the union of itself, produces in itself a proper distinction and separation [of its parts.] But the Greek for *unionem* has erroneously *ονοματος*, instead of *ενοτητος*, which the interpreter found in his Ms. In p. 8 b, Comment. 15. Simplicius having observed, that Aristotle in what he there says departs much from nature, contrary to his usual custom, *οτι επι πολυ παρα το εθος αποβαινει της φυσικης*, adds, according to the Latin interpreter, "hæc enim sunt *mutabilia*:" but the Greek has rightly *θαυμαστα γαρ ταυτα*. P. 106. Comment. 20. "appetitus enim et totius et partium est ad medium, et apud illud salvari volunt et contineri, *vagam* in sui ipsorum natura consistentiam habentia." In this passage the Greek for the word *vagam* is wanting in the Venice edition. P. 146. "Sed quoniam duorum horum sermo totus dictus est, uno quidem, si debeat aliquid generari et corrumpi, oportet esse omnino subjectum aliquid et contrarium ex quo fit et in quod corrumpitur, altero autem quod *circulari* motui non est motus contrarius." Here the Greek word which should correspond to *circulari*, is in the Venice edition erroneously *φυσει*, instead of *κυκλικη*; I say *erroneously*, for it is a well-known position of Aristotle, that to a circular motion no other motion is contrary. And shortly after in the same page, Simplicius shows that Aristotle and Plato are not discordant with each other, when the former asserts that the world is *unbegotten*, and the latter that it is *generated*; because according to Plato, though the world perpetually proceeds from its cause, yet as every thing which derives its existence from a certain cause is generated, the universe also, in consequence of not being self-subsistent, is generated. Hence he observes, "genitum autem communiter dicitur quod suiipsius subsistentiam ab aliqua causa accipit; etenim quod fit, ab aliquo faciente fit, et quod generatur ab aliquo generante generatur, et impossibile, ut ait Plato, sine

causa generationem habere ; et palam, quod secundum hoc *ingenitum* est quod primum omnium causa, quod et unum et simplicissimum est, siquidem omnia participant uno, et quod non participat uno, nihil est : quod autem unum nihil participat multitudine : quare genitum omnem multitudinatum est." In this passage, in the original, instead of *αγεννητον*, *ingenitum*, which Morbetus evidently read in his Ms., and which is the true reading, we find by a strange blunder *κεχωρισμενον*, in the printed Greek. P. 156, in the first line of the page, "corrumpitur enim *aqua* ab igne in ignem." But the Greek, instead of *υδωρ*, *aqua*, has erroneously *τινα*. Thus too in the same page, at the beginning of the second column, "et quamvis habeat aliquid *animale* nutritiva virtus, tamen secundum naturales transmutationes ita perficitur." But the Greek, instead of *ψυχικον*, *animale*, has erroneously *φυσικον*.

In p. 17 a, Comment. 23, in which Simplicius is speaking of augmentation, we have in the Greek *το γαρ αυτα προστιθεμενον, και εναντιον και ομοιον εστι αυτω φ προστιθεται*, i. e. "That which is added to a thing, is both contrary and similar to that to which it is added." But the Latin has, "quod enim ipsi quod apponitur est contrarium, et simili eiscilicet cui apponitur contrarium est." This however is erroneous, and not what Simplicius meant in this place to say. For he had just before observed, that augmentation is a certain generation, and that a thing which is increased, is increased from something which is contrary to it. The Greek therefore is right, and the Latin is evidently not that from which it was translated. P. 176. "Deinde dicendum (ut estimo) quod Arist. non omnem alterationem abnegat a celestibus : *non enim utique et imperfectivam invicem tarditatem et transumptionem*." But the Greek of the latter part of this sentence is, *ουδε γαρ την τελειωτικην προς αλληλα μεταδοσιν και μεταληψιν*, which is correct ; but the Latin is erroneous in the extreme. For the intention of Simplicius in this part of his Commentary, is to show that Aristotle does not deny all change of quality (*αλλοιωσιν*, in Morbetus *alterationem*) in the heavenly bodies ; since he does not deny of them a mutual communication and reception [of light and power] of a perfective nature. In p. 18 a, Comment. 26. Simplicius says, conformably to Aristotle, that it is impossible an immortal nature [i. e. the heaven] should not be co-adapted to an immortal being [i. e. to deity.] And that as this is asserted by all men, not only by the Greeks, but also by the barbarians, it shows that such an opinion is natural *to the souls of men*, *εν ταις ψυχαις των ανθρωπων* ;—so the Greek, but the

Latin of Morbetus has, *in animalibus*. P. 18 a, Comment. 27. "Si enim *mundani* Dii, quod quidem tanquam probatum et evidens dimisit, est aliquod divinum *corpus exemptum* ab ipsis." But in the Greek *εγκοσμιοι*, *mundani*, is wanting; and for *εξηρημενον*, *exemptum*, it is necessary to read *εξηρητημενον*. In the same page also, and shortly after, we find in the Latin, "Audivi autem ego Ægyptios quidem astrorum observatione, habuisse descriptas non paucioribus quam a quinque millibus annorum, Babilonios autem adhuc a pluribus." But the Greek, instead of five thousand years, which is doubtless what Simplicius wrote, has *ουκ ελαττοσιν η δισχιλιοις ενιαυτοις*, for not less than two thousand years. Again, in the same page, the following passage, Comment. 25, which I had overlooked, is defective, but the deficiency is supplied in the Greek. The passage is, "mihi enim non frustra videtur ultimo apposuisse, [impossible,] sed tanquam omnibus his secundum *passiones* accedentibus." But the Greek rightly adds, *αμοιρον δειξη τον ουρανον*, which Morbetus has not translated. And a few lines after the Latin has, "hoc enim tanquam suppositiones accipiens ex ipsis contraria conclusit." But the Greek which should correspond to *contraria conclusit*, is so far from this correspondence, that it is *τον ουρανον αγενητον συνεπερανε*.

Again, in p. 23 b, near the bottom, Comment. 36, Simplicius, speaking of the motion of the planets, and the motion of the sphere of the fixed stars, and showing, conformably to Aristotle, that the one is not contrary to the other, is made to say rightly in the Latin, "deinde utraque harum secundum idem tempus *ab oriente et ab occasu* dicitur utique moveri;" but in the Greek, instead of what should correspond to the words *ab oriente et ab occasu*, we have *απ' ανατολων επ' ανατολας*. P. 30 b, Comment. 37, "principaliter quidem de simplicibus elementis proponit inquirere, et ostendit *quod finita et secundum numerum, et secundum magnitudinem*." So the Latin rightly, but the Greek, which should correspond to *quod finita*, is, instead of doing so, *οτι απειρον*. Thus also in p. 31 b, Comment. 42. "Ostensum est in naturali auditu, quod assequitur tempus quidem motui, motus autem magnitudini ejus quod movetur, et ejus super quod motus, et quod si tempus fuerit finitum, necesse et motum esse *finitum*, et magnitudinem amborum, scilicet ejus quod movetur, et ejus super quod motus." In this passage, the Latin in the words "*necesse et motum esse finitum*," has rightly *finitum*, as must be obvious to every one; but the Greek has most erroneously *απειρον*. In p. 33 a, Comment.

49, in the words, "principalis intentio in hoc *capitulo* est de simplicibus in mundo corporibus ostendere, &c.," the Latin has rightly *capitulo*, but the Greek, instead of κεφαλαίῳ, has κεντρῶ.

Farther still, in p. 34 a, Comment. 56, Simplicius says, it is demonstrated in the Physics of Aristotle, "quod nullum finitum finitam distantiam in infinito tempore pertransit." And this is rightly asserted, and is undoubtedly what Simplicius intended to say; but the Greek has most erroneously, οτι ουδεν πεπερασμενον εν πεπερασμενω χρονῳ διισιν. In p. 35 a, Comment. 60, Simplicius, in elucidating the demonstration of Aristotle, that there is not an infinite body, observes that Aristotle physically infers this "ex eo quod elementa numero et magnitudine sunt finita. Neque enim omnia *infinita* possibile est esse, non enim utique multa infinita, &c." Here the Latin has rightly *infinita* in the words *Neque enim omnia infinita, &c.*, but the Greek most erroneously πεπερασμενα. In p. 37 a, Comment. 71, Simplicius rightly referring to the Physics of Aristotle, says that in the 8th book of that work, Aristotle demonstrates that no finite magnitude possesses an infinite power, "nullam autem finitam magnitudinem virtutem habere infinitam, quod quidem in octavo ejusdem negotii demonstravit." But the Greek, instead of εν τῷ ογδοῳ, has εν τῷ εννατῳ, though the Physics do not consist of more than eight books. In p. 45 b, Comment. 97, Simplicius observes, that Aristotle is there speaking of the intellectual and immoveable principles which are the causes of the motions of the celestial spheres; "de intellectualibus et immobilibus principiis videtur dicere de moventibus cœlestes sphaeras.—Nam cœlum movet immobilis causa existens melior ipso." But the Greek, instead of περι των νοητων, de intellectualibus, has most erroneously περι των ουρανικων. In p. 46 a, Comment. 97, we find in the Latin, "Continuus autem circularis motus ostensus est in octavo de naturali auditu." And this is correct; for Aristotle does demonstrate in his Physics, that a circular is a *continual* motion. But the Greek, instead of συνεχης, *continuus*, has κοινοτερον. And in the next line, the Latin has rightly, "Sed et quia circulariter movetur cœlum ad intellectum conversum." In the Greek, however, we have ουρανον, *heaven*, instead of νουν, *intellect*. In one part of the following passage in p. 47 b, Comment. 102, both the Latin and Greek are discordant with each other, and both are erroneous. The passage is this, "puta quod trigonum ex tribus rectis secundum angulum compositis, *tribus autem ex trigonis sex* secundum angulos et lineas, sed non secundum plana compositis."

Simplicius is here speaking of the analysis of things composite into such as are simple, after the manner of mathematicians. Hence the Latin should be, *cubum autem ex tetragonis sex*; instead of "*tribus autem ex trigonis sex*;" and the Greek, which is *ἐκ τριῶν δὲ τριγῶνων ἕξ*, should be *τὸν κύβον δὲ ἐκ τετραγώνων ἕξ*. For the terminating sides of a cube are six squares. That this reading is correct, is evident from what Simplicius shortly after says, i. e. "Nam mathematicus quidem—resolvit trigonum in tres rectas et cubum in sex tetragona."

Many other instances of great difference between the Latin and Greek might be adduced; but as I persuade myself that the learned and intelligent reader will be sufficiently convinced from those already given, that the Greek of Simplicius is not a translation from the Latin of Moërbeka or Morbetus, I shall conclude this article with corrections of certain passages which are faulty, both in the Latin and Greek, but which, though erroneous, accord with each other.

In p. 30 b, Comment. 37, Simplicius observes, that Aristotle having shown that no simple body is infinite in magnitude, and it being evident that simple bodies are finite in number, concludes that the whole, which is composed of them, viz. the universe, is finite. He then adds, "Primo autem ostendit, quod necessaria est naturalis ratio discernens, sive est aliquid corpus infinitum sive non; siquidem hæc differentia causa fere totius contradictionis inter naturales est, quæ apud physiologos. Propter hanc enim hi quidem unum mundum, et finitum dicebant, quicumque non acceptabant infinitum in principio, ut Aristoteles et Plato; hi autem unum infinitum, ut Anaximenes aërem infinitum principium esse dicens; hi autem et *multitudine* infinitos mundos, ut Anaximandrus quidem infinitum magnitudine principium ponens, infinitum sic et mundum dicebat." In this passage, for *multitudine* in the words "hi autem et *multitudine* infinitos mundos," it is necessary to read *magnitudine*: for it was the dogma of Democritus, as Simplicius shortly after observes, that there are worlds infinite in multitude. But the Greek has also erroneously in this part of the above passage, *τῶ πλεθει*, instead of *τῶ μεγεθει*. In p. 46 a, Comment. 99, in the words, "et hæc scripsit, mundum hunc neque aliquis deorum, neque aliquis hominum fecit, sed erat semper," the name of *Heraclitus* is wanting immediately after scripsit, and it is also wanting in the Greek. For from what is afterwards added by Simplicius, it is evident that the above words are to be ascribed to Heraclitus. But he adds as follows: "Verumtamen Alexander volens *Heraclitum* dicere mundum genitum et corrupti-

bilem, de intelligibili mundo sic ipsum dixisse ait." Alexander, who considered Heraclitus as one who asserted that the world is generable and corruptible, says, that in the above citation he speaks of the intelligible world. This remarkable passage of Heraclitus is in the Greek *τον κοσμον τουτον, ουτε τις θεων, ουτε τις ανθρωπων εποιησεν, αλλ' ην αει.* In p. 58. b, Lib. 2, Comment. 3, Simplicius, explaining what Aristotle says about the fable of Atlas supporting the heavens, and which is alluded to by Homer when he says of Atlas in the *Odyssey*,

And the long pillars which on earth he rears

End in the starry vault, and prop the spheres,

observes as follows: "Si autem fabula est divinum aliquid occultans in seipsa et sapiens, dicatur quod Atlas unus quidem est et eorum Tartareorum qui circa Bacchum sunt, qui eo quod non attendebat ipsi perfecte, hoc est non secundum solum Tartaream *congregationem* operabatur circa Bacchi operationem, sed declinabat aliquid et ad Jovialem *continentiam*, secundum ambos proprietatis operatur circa *maximas* mundi partes, discernens quidem et sursum tenens cœlum a terra, ut non confundantur superiora cum inferioribus.——cum etiam columnæ simul utramque habeant virtutem, *discretivamque* simul et *continuativam* eorum quæ supra posita sunt cum inferius positis." In this passage for *congregationem* it is necessary to read *separationem*, and in the Greek for *συγκρισιν* which corresponds to *congregationem*, we must substitute *διακρισιν*. This emendation is evidently requisite from what Simplicius adds in the latter part of this extract, viz. "that pillars possess both these powers; a power of *separating*, and a power of *connecting* things placed above with those placed below." In p. 82 a, Comment. 47, Simplicius observes that the Pythagoreans supposing the decad to be a perfect number, were willing to collect the number of the bodies moved in a circle, into the decadic number. He adds, "hence they say, that the inerratic sphere, the seven planets, this our earth, and the antichthon, complete the decad; and in this manner Aristotle understands the assertions of the Pythagoreans." He then observes: "Qui autem sincerius ista callent (*γνησιωτερον αυτων μετασχοντες*) ignem quidem in medio dicunt conditivam virtutem (*δημιουργικην δυναμιν*) ex medio totam terram alentem, et quod in frigiditatum ipsius est recreantem (*αντεγειρουσαν*). Propter quod hi quidem Zenus turrem (*Ζηνος πυργον*) ipsum vocant, ut ipse in Pythagoricis narravit. Alii autem Jovis custodiam (*Διος φυλακην*) ut in his. Alii autem Jovis thronum (*Διος θρονον*) ut alii aiunt. Antrum (*αντρον*) autem

terram dicebant, tanquam organum et ipsum temporis. Dierum enim hæc et noctuum causa est. Diem enim facit versus solem pars illuminata. Noctem autem versus conum umbræ factæ ab ipsa. Antichthonam autem lunam vocabant Pythagorici, sicut et ætheriam terram, et tanquam obumbriantem solare lumen quod est proprium terræ, et tanquam terminantem cœlestia sicut terra id quod sub luna est." In that part of this remarkable passage in which it is said both in the Latin and the Greek, that the Pythagoreans called the earth a cavern, it is necessary for *αντρον* to read *αστρον*, a star. For a little before, both Aristotle and Simplicius inform us that the Pythagoreans asserted that *the earth exists as one of the stars*. And this is confirmed by their calling the earth one of *the instruments of time*: for the stars are thus denominated by Plato in the *Timæus*. Meursius in his *Denarius Pythagoricus*, p. 19. thinks we should read *κεντρον* for *αντρον*; but he was evidently mistaken.

From this account given by Simplicius, it appears that the above mentioned decad of the Pythagoreans consists of, the inerratic sphere, the seven planets, the earth, and the fire in the centre of the earth. It is also evident from this passage, as I have elsewhere observed, that the moderns are mistaken in supposing, that by the fire in the middle, the Pythagoreans meant the sun. And in p. 87 a, Comment. 60, Simplicius observes: "Cum autem ostendisset ambo problemata, et quod in medio est terra, et quod immobilis, neque circulariter circa medium, neque super rectam mota, communem adjecit conclusionem dicens esse manifestum ex dictis, quod neque movetur, neque extra medium movetur." In the last word of this passage for *movetur*, it is obviously necessary to read *ponitur*, and in the Greek for *μινεται*, to substitute *κειται*.

I shall conclude these observations, with noticing an error into which the learned Professor has fallen, through not understanding what Simplicius says of Empedocles and Eudemus the celebrated disciple of Aristotle. The error I allude to is in p. 52, where the Professor cites the following passage of Simplicius, in his commentary on the *Physics*. *Τουτο δ' εοικεν Εμπεδοκλῆς ἂν εἶπειν, ὅτι τὸ κρατεῖν καὶ κινεῖν ἐν μερεῖ τὴν φιλίαν καὶ τὸ νεῖκος ἐξ ἀναγκῆς ὑπαρχει τοῖς πραγμασίν· εἰ δὲ τοῦτο, καὶ τὸ ηὐμενεῖν ἐν τῇ μεταξὺ χρόνων τῶν γὰρ ἐναντιῶν κινήσεων ηὐμενία ἐν τῇ μεταξὺ ἐστίν. Εὐδημος οὖν τὴν ἀκινήσιαν ἐν τῇ τῆς φιλίας ἐπικρατείᾳ κατὰ τὴν σφαιρᾶν ἐκδέχεται, ἐπειδὴν ἀπάντα συγκριθῆναι ἐνθ' οὗτ' ἡλιοιο διείηται ὠκεῖα γῆ.*

ἀλλ' ὡς φησιν,

ουτως αρμονιης πυκινω κρυφω εστηρικται,
σφαιρος κυκλοτερης μονη περιγηθει αιων.¹

And after these other verses follow. The Professor then remarks, "Quis credat totidem esse Eudemi versus? Etsi ejus φυσικα, liber περι γωνιας, et Historia Geometrica et Astrologica exciderint, fragmenta tamen a Simplicio servata argumento sunt, illum neque metro sua scita commendasse, neque eum esse cui Amicitia, Discordia, Sphærus saperent. Quapropter nullus vereor emendare, ut sit *Εμπεδοκλης ουκ την ακινησιαν* pro eo quod est *Ευδημος ουν*, facillima nominum permutatione, si *Εμπεδοκλης* compendiose scribatur." The Professor's mistake originated from not perceiving that in the words *αλλ' ως φησιν*, Empedocles is understood; for the verses that follow these words were evidently written by that philosopher. The meaning of Simplicius therefore is, that Eudemus admits immobility in the domination of friendship in the sphere of Empedocles.

T.

AN INQUIRY

*into the Symbolical Language of Ancient Art and
Mythology.*

BY R. P. KNIGHT.

PART VIII.—[Continued from No. 51. p. 51.]

184. AFTER the conquests of Alexander had opened a communication with India, Minerva was frequently represented with the elephant's skin upon her head instead of the helmet;² the elephant having been, from time immemorial, the symbol of divine wisdom among the Gentoos; whose god Gonnis or Pollear is represented by a figure of this animal half humanised; which the Macha Alla, or god of destruction of the Tartars, is

¹ For *αιων* here, the Professor very properly substitutes *γαιων*. Thus too, Parmenides, speaking of the one being, says,

παρτοθεν ευκυκλου σφαιρης εναλιγκιον ογκω
μισον ισθαλις, και μωτη περιγηθει χειρων.

² See coins of Alexander II. king of Epirus, and some of the Ptolemies.