On that part of a work entitled, EMPEDOCLIS ET PARMENIDIS FRAGMENTA EX CODE TURINENSIS BIBLIOTHECA RESTITUTA ET ILLUSTRATA, AB AMEDEO PEYRON, LIPSIAE, 1810, in which the author treats of the genuine Greek text of the Commentary of Simplicius in Aristotelem De Caelo 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 Moërbeke, in the 13th century. And the Professor thinks that he has most satisfactorily proved this to be the case, from this version of Moërbeke 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 Moërbeke, 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 Moërbeke, which was published at Venice in the year 1540, of which the Professor says, (p. 8.) “At quum hunc habere hucusque non licuerit, utor alia editione anno 1563. ibidem fol.” He adds, “Hac etsi dicatur in fronte novi-
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ter fere de integro interpretata, ac cum fidissimis codicibus Gracis recens collata, tamen quam parum promissis editor steterit, vel ex eo licet agnoscre, quod postremi duo libri eduntur ex Guillelmo Morbeto Do Interprete. Prioris duo, licet nusquam appareat nomen interpretis, a versione Moërbeka perpetius fuisse desumtos, 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 Celo Aristotelis. Guillermo Morbete Interprete. Quae omnia, cum fidissimis Codicibus Gracis recens collata fuere. Venetiis 1540. Whether therefore this Morbetus is in reality the same with Moërbeke, who was the Archbishop of Corinth in the 15th century, and whose version of the treatise of Proclus De Providentia 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 Celo, 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 Celo is a translation of the Latin version of that work by Moërbeke, or Morbetus.

In the first place, in p. i. of the Preface, we have in the Latin, "Sed si velit aliquis Aristotelis theoriam de mundo videre, in omnibus simul ipsius negotii 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.
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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 preter necessarium, neque simpliciter preter theoriam de celestibus assumptus esse, sed principaliter de ipsis docet,” the Greek for the words preter necessarium, i.e. παρά τον αναγκαίον, is wanting in the Venice edition. In p. 3 a, “motus quidem enim animalium (ut estimo) neque unus proprie est, cum fiat secundum extensionem et inflexionem membrorum.” But the Greek, instead of ξύον for animalium, has erroneously οὐματος.

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 οὐματος, instead of εντοτος, which the interpreter found in his Ms. In p. 8 b, Comment. 15. Simplicius having observed, that Aristotelion in what he there says departs much from nature, contrary to his usual custom, osti ού τον παρά το έθος ἀποδιαιρεῖ της φύσεως, adds, according to the Latin interpreter, “hanc enim sunt mutabilitas.” But the Greek has rightly θαυμάστα γαρ τοντα. 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 debat aliquid generari et corrumpi, oportet esse omnino subjectum aliquod et contrarium ex quo fit et in quod corrumpitur, altero autem quod circulari motui nos est motus contrarius.” Here the Greek word which should correspond to circulari, is in the Venice edition erroneously φυσις, instead of κυκλικ; 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 selfsubsistent, is generated. Hence he observes, “genitum autem communiter dieiur quod suiipsius subsistentiam ab aliqua causa ac cipit; etenim quod fit, ab aliquo faciante fit, et quod generatur ab aliquo generante generatur, et impossibile, ut sit 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 genus omnem multitudinatum est." In this passage, in the original, instead of αγενηστον, ingenitum, which Morbetus evidently read in his Ms., and which is the true reading, we find by a strange blunder κεραυριομενον, 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 σωμαι, 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 ista perfectur." 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 γερανω προστιθεμενον, και ενακτιον και οροιον εστι αυτω, 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 est illic et 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 γερα τινη τελειωτην προς αληθη μεταΘαι και μεταιμην, 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 (αλλωσιν, 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 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, in tais ψυχις των ανθρων;—so the Greek, but the
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Latin of Morbetus has, in animalibus. P. 18 a, Comment. 27. “Si enim mundani Di, quod quidem tamquam probatum et evidens dimisit, est aliquod divinum corpus exemptum ab ipsis.” But in the Greek συνέσωμα, mundani, is wanting; and for εξηνθητων, exemptum, it is necessary to read εξηρητων.

In the same page also, and shortly after, we find in the Latin, “Audiui autem ego Αἰγυπτίως quidem aστρορῶν observatiónes, habuisse descripsas non paucioribus quas a quinque millibus annorum, Bablionios autem adhuc a pluribus.” But the Greek, instead of five thousand years, which is doubtless what Simplicius wrote, has οὐκ ἔλαττον η δισεκατος εἰς τοὺς, 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 opposuisse, [impossible,] sed tamquam omnibus his secundum passiones accedentibus.” But the Greek rightly adds, αμορφω δει τον ουαναν, which Morbetus has not translated. And a few lines after the Latin has, “hoc enim tamquam suppositiones accipiens ex ipsis contraria concluisset.” But the Greek which should correspond to contraria conclusit, is so far from this correspondence, that it is τον ουαναν αγνητον συνεκτειναι.

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 ανατολαν καθ' ανατολας. P. 30 b, Comment. 37, “principaliter quidem de simplicibus elementis proposit 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 ανατας. 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 ανατας. In p. 35 a, Comment.
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49, in the words, "principalia intentio in hoc capitulo est de simplicibus in mundo corporibus ostendere, &c.," the Latin has rightly capitulo, but the Greek, instead of κατάλαγη, has κατάργη.

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, οἵτινες πεπερασμένοι εν πεπερασμένω ζητοῦν διόνο. 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 πεπερασμένα. 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 aetem finitam magnitudinem virtutem habere infinitam, quod quidem in octavo ejusdem negotii demonstravit." But the Greek, instead of εν τῷ οὐδὲν, has εν τῷ πεπερασμένῳ, though the Physics do not consist of more than eight books. In p. 43 b, Comment. 97, Simplicius observes, that Aristotle is there speaking of the intellectual and immovable principles which are the causes of the motions of the celestial spheres; "de intellectuabilibus et immobiliis principiis videtur dicere de movetibus caelestes spheres.—Nam caelea movet immobiles causa existens melior ipso." But the Greek, instead of πρὶ τοῖς ωραῖοι, de intellectuabilibus, has most erroneously πρὶ τοῖς ωραίοις. 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 ωραῖος, continuus, has ωντωριον. And in the next line, the Latin has rightly, "Sed et quia circulariter movetur caelestes ad intellectum conversum." In the Greek, however, we have ωραῖος, heaven, instead of ων, 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 compositus, tribus autem ex trigonis sex secundum angulos et lineas, sed non secundum plana compositis."
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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 *εκ τριγωνων εξ*, should be *τοις κυβοις εκ τετραγωνων εξ*. 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 Moëbeeks 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 contradicitionis inter naturales est, quo apud physiologistos. Prop- ter 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 magnitudinis 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, *το πλαθυν*, instead of *το μεγαθυν*. 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 solens Heraclytum dicere mundum genitum et corrupti-
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blem, 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 κυμον τουτον, ουτε τις θεον, ουτε τις ανθρωπων εκτιθειναι ειταν' ναι δει. 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 aliquud occultans in seipsa et sapiens, dicitur quod Atlas unus quidem est et eorum Tartareorum qui circa Bacchum sunt, qui eo quod non attendebat ipsi perfecte, hoc est non secundum solum Tartarem congregationem operabatur circa Bacchi operationem, sed declinabat aliquid alter et ad Joviam continentiam, secundum ambos proprietatis operatur circa marinas mundi partes, discernens quidem et sursum tenens colenum a terra, ut non confundantur superiura cum inferioribus.——cum etiam columnae simul utramque habeant virtutem, discretivamque simul et continuativam eorum quae supra posita sunt cum inferioris 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 decadical 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: "Quic autem sincerius istor callent (γνωστερον autem metaγγυνεις) ignem quidem in medio dicunt couditivam virtutem (ιδιωτουργος δυναιμα) ex medio totam terram alentem, et quod infrigiditatum ipsius est recreament (αυτης τουγραφος). Propier quod hi quidem Zenus turrem (Ζενος πουγον) ipsum vocant, ut ipse in Pythagoricas narravit. Alii autem Jovis custodiam (Διος φυλακην) ut in his. Alii autem Jovis thronum (Διος θρονον) ut alii alium. Antrum (αυτον) autem
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terrar dicebant, tanquam organum et ipsum temporis. Dierum enim hac et noctuum causa est. Diem enim facit versus solem pars illuminata. Noctem autem versus conum umbrae factae ab ipsa. Antichthonam autem lunam vocabant Pythagorici, sicut et aliteriam terram, et tanquam obumbiantem solare lumine quod est proprium terre, et tanquam terminantem coelestia 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 cæstern, it is necessary for antro to read astro, 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 Timeus. Meursius in his Demarius Pythagoricus, p. 19, thinks we should read kastro for antro; 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 immobiliis, neque circulariter circa medium, neque super rectam mota, communem adjecti 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 κείσται, to substitute κείται.

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. Ταύτα δ' αυτῶν ἐμπεδοκλῆς αὕτην, οτι το κρατεῖν και κινεῖν εν μορφή της φιλίας και το νεκρός εξ αναγκῆς υπάρχει τοὺς πραγμάτων εἰ δὲ τούτω, καὶ το θεομαχίν εν τῷ μεταξὺ χρόνῳ τῶν γαρ εννοιων κινήσεων θεωρείν εν τῷ μεταξύ αὐτῶν. Εὐδημός oun την ακολουθίαν εν τῇ τῆς φιλίας επικρατεῖν κατα τὴν σφαιραν εὐθύγραμμα, εκείναν απαντάν πολυπλοροποιοῦται εἴπ' ουτ' ἦπεροι διενεργών συγκρίσθη πιον εἰς τῆν ἑλέους διενεργών αὐταί γὰρ.
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; the elephant having been, from time immemorial, the symbol of divine wisdom among the Gentoos; whose god Gomis or Pollar is represented by a figure of this animal half humanised; which the Macha Alfa, or god of destruction of the Tartars, is

---

1 For αυτος here, the Professor very properly substitutes γινεται. Thus too, Parmenides, speaking of the one being, says, πανταθει ευκαλυφος σφαιρις παλαισεων φωχων μεσον τουτοις, και μενη ισερνη χαμεν.

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