

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-48002-4 - Aristotle: *Historia Animalium*, Volume I

Edited by D. M. Balme

Excerpt

[More information](#)

INTRODUCTION

Historia Animalium books I–IX have been transmitted as a unit in the Greek MSS. Doubts about the authenticity of VII–IX arose only in the nineteenth century, and will be dealt with in the Introduction to volume II, where it will be argued that these doubts are unfounded. The book standardly labelled ‘VII’ was always placed as IX until Gaza reordered it as VII. As will be discussed in the Introduction to volume II, Gaza was probably mistaken, and in this edition, as in the Loeb, the manuscript ordering of the books is restored. In references the restored number is given first followed by the more familiar number in parentheses. The order of these books in this volume is thus: I–VI, VII(VIII), VIII(IX), IX(VII) (and X, on which see below), and in the corresponding Greek letters at the head of each book: A–Z, H(Θ), Θ(I), I(H) (and K). Bekker page and line numbers are of course retained.¹

Gaza also reordered parts of IX.631–633, and early editions followed him; but after Bekker restored the MSS order editors have followed him, as this edition does. Here, too, Bekker’s chapter divisions are retained for convenience of reference, although they do not occur in the MSS or in the earliest printed editions but first appeared in this form in the 1492 edition of Gaza’s translation (based in part on divisions in the 1476 *Gaza editio princeps*). They were taken up in the second Basel edition (1539) and repeated in the third Basel edition (1550) upon which Bekker based his text. Camus and Schneider, in their editions, made different chapter divisions. To reflect their lack of manuscript

[On the constitution of this Introduction, see Preface, pp. xviii–xix.]

¹ [Sequential citations in this Introduction are given in MS order and not simple numerical order, so that citations from 581a9–588a12 come after 633b8 and before 633b12.]

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-48002-4 - Aristotle: *Historia Animalium*, Volume I

Edited by D. M. Balme

Excerpt

[More information](#)

INTRODUCTION

authority, chapter numbers are printed in square brackets within the text rather than in the margin as is more customary.²

Book x, however, whose claim to a place in *HA* has been doubted since at least the fifteenth century, is lacking in many Greek MSS. Those that do have it have all derived it, some directly and some indirectly, from the extant Vaticanus 262. Pages 636–637 were reordered by the Aldine editor, and again by Scaliger and Schneider, but the MS order was restored by Bekker and is followed here. The book was excluded by Gaza and by some editors including Camus. Although book x will be shown in the Introduction to volume II to have formed no part of the original *HA*, it is included here on the grounds that it has its own interest, and that this is where a reader would naturally look for it.³

The Aldine *editio princeps* of 1497 is the only text of *HA* that has ever been based primarily upon the Greek MSS; it is a good text, but suffered in its later books through not consulting the α family (C^a, A^a, etc.).⁴ The numerous sixteenth- and seventeenth-century editions are all derived from the Aldine, but make many conjectural alterations which are mostly either guesswork or devised from Gaza's fifteenth-century Latin version; few if any of their variants agree with the Greek MSS or with the far more accurate but less readable Latin of William of Moerbeke (William's version was never printed, whereas Gaza's went through many printed editions). Camus (1783) was the first to make serious use of some MSS, including C^a; he altered the text considerably, partly from these MSS and partly from his own conjectures. Schneider (1811) introduced many more changes,

² [For information on which Balme relied in regard to the origin of the chapter divisions, cf. A. Gotthelf in *Theophrastean Studies*, ed. W. W. Fortenbaugh and R. W. Sharples (New Brunswick, N.J., 1988), 130 n. 27. The divisions in the Gaza MS Vat. 2094 are completely different.]

³ For a fuller discussion, see my 'Aristotle *Historia Animalium* Book x', in *Aristoteles – Werk und Wirkung* (essays presented to P. Moraux, Berlin 1985), I, 191–206.

⁴ [See below, pp. 21, 36–38.]

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-48002-4 - Aristotle: *Historia Animalium*, Volume I

Edited by D. M. Balme

Excerpt

[More information](#)

INTRODUCTION

some quite extensive, based partly on MSS readings which he took from Camus (some wrong) but largely on William's Latin whose value he rightly recognized but possibly overestimated. Bekker (1831) took the text primarily from the Basel third edition (1550), itself eventually derived from the Aldine, but thoroughly checked it against the most important Greek MSS. His aim was to return to the MS tradition; most of his changes agree with A^a C^a; he admitted few conjectures. Although his reports of the MSS are often inaccurate, Bekker's instinct for Greek was so sound that his text of *HA* is outstandingly the best and the nearest to the MSS. Some subsequent editors have followed Bekker closely (Bussemaker 1854, Louis 1964), but conjectures were introduced on a wide scale by Piccolos 1863, Aubert and Wimmer 1868, and Dittmeyer 1907. The last two believed most of VII–X to be both spurious and especially corrupt. Dittmeyer collated the three most important MSS (C^a, A^a, D^a) in order to correct Bekker's reports, but his consultation of other MSS was no more than occasional and his reports of them are mostly taken from Bekker. No editor but Camus, Bekker and Dittmeyer appears to have consulted Greek MSS at all. For a list of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century editions see Camus' introduction, for later editions see volume 1 of the Loeb edition (A. L. Peck, 1965), to which must be added the Budé edition by P. Louis (1964–79), and the Italian translation (excluding VIII(IX) and X) with notes and essays by D. Lanza and M. Vegetti (Turin 1971); both these editions and Peck's Loeb edition of books 1–VI rely on Dittmeyer's, as does J. Barnes's translation of book X in the revised Oxford Translation (Princeton 1984).

Since Bekker's text, which is often difficult, has come under suspicion because of the inaccuracy of his apparatus criticus, while other texts differ widely and are grossly conjectural, I thought it best to establish the MS tradition, as the only secure base from which one can set out to make conjectures. To this end I have collated all the Greek MSS that I can trace, and have tried to present the most authoritative text that they offer, together with a full report of significant variants. Even so the

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-48002-4 - Aristotle: *Historia Animalium*, Volume I

Edited by D. M. Balme

Excerpt

[More information](#)

INTRODUCTION

text cannot be free of conjectures, for most of the extant MSS themselves are not simple copies whose variants are merely mistakes, but intelligent editions containing the scribe's deliberate conjectures in place of words which he thought mistaken. I have tried to identify such conjectures and to trace their origin or basis, in order to assess their authority; but often one cannot tell whether they derive from another source or from guesswork. Nevertheless the variants of scribes are so much more modest than those of later editors that it seems reasonable to draw a line at the point when printing began. In this edition therefore no editorial conjectures from Aldus onwards have been admitted to the text, but those that seem worth considering are given in the apparatus or in the commentary. Where the best traditional reading is impossible, it is marked with an obelus, and here the apparatus and/or commentary should be consulted for suggested emendations. In choosing between variants I have been eclectic, judging each case on its merits in the context, for as will be seen there is little basis for regularly preferring any one MS or family. The result, which is not very far from Bekker's text, is admittedly more difficult sometimes and more roughly expressed than in the drastically 'emended' editions, but it is often more subtle and interesting than the easier and anodyne conjectures.

The Greek MSS and Latin versions are discussed in detail below, but it may be convenient to extract here certain general inferences from them. The Greek MSS have proved to fall into three family groups, not two as hitherto supposed. D^a with its group of copies (=β) does not agree with P and its associated group (=γ), but is a third independent witness alongside the A^a group (=α). The belief that D^a and P formed one family, inferior to A^a C^a, is explainable as a historical accident. It originated with Camus (i.xxxv) who had asked for a collation of the best of the five Vatican MSS listed by Foggini, and was unluckily advised to use Vat. 1339 (=P). He did not obtain reports from D^a, but after checking Vat. Pal. 260 concluded that all the Vatican MSS were of one family, from which he rightly dis-

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-48002-4 - Aristotle: *Historia Animalium*, Volume I

Edited by D. M. Balme

Excerpt

[More information](#)

INTRODUCTION

tinguished C^a (and later A^a). Camus therefore never saw any of the D^a group but consulted only MSS of the C^a and P groups (namely Laur. 87,4; Vat. 1339; Paris. 1921; Ambr. 462) and reasonably suggested ‘two families’. This has been repeated by subsequent scholars (but not by Bekker, who expressed no judgment), and Dittmeyer himself pointed out that D^a is different from and superior to P.⁵ Moreover D^a has proved to be arguably the most plausible and complete MS, while P is among the worst and contributes nothing.

A second inference is a warning to stylometrists that in dealing with *HA* VII–X they are on infirm ground. As the apparatus will show, it is the little words – δέ, τε, γε, γάρ, και and others that may be represented by small signs – that are most vulnerable: for instance, in the first five Bekker pages of VIII(IX), fifty such words in strategic positions are subject to variation.⁶ Further, differences involving word order are affected by stylistic ‘diorthosis’, in which the scribes have shown dissimilar tastes (cf. the transpositions at 581b9, 582b7, 584b1, 34, *passim*). In many cases there seems to be no way of establishing which version is correct. More generally, the extant MSS are all so far from their source that it is, I am afraid, fanciful to suppose that we can recover the original formulation with any exactness. The most that is possible is to show which version is older, which makes better sense, which is more like fourth-century Greek.

Thirdly, in observing the misreports made by far better scholars than myself, I realize that I cannot hope to have avoided making many mistakes too. The most likely are omissions; for when reading a MS, so long as its grammar and sense are acceptable, one easily overlooks variants, especially in particles and in word order. While therefore I have done my best

⁵ [Friederike Berger now argues that the γ family had early contamination. D^a and γ have a common ancestor until the end of book VII(VIII), while in book VIII(IX) and IX(VII) γ shares an ancestor with α (p. 26 below). Cf. F. Berger, *Textgeschichte d. Hist. An.* (above, p. xiv).]

⁶ [Similar results appear to be obtainable for *HA* I–VI.]

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-48002-4 - Aristotle: *Historia Animalium*, Volume I

Edited by D. M. Balme

Excerpt

[More information](#)

INTRODUCTION

to avoid positive misreporting, I must advise my colleagues to let the apparatus speak for itself but not to put words into its mouth, i.e. not to argue *ex silentio*. In particular, in reporting the less useful MSS such as P n T^c which are bad simple copies, I have deliberately omitted many of their mistakes where they can have no significance for the purpose of establishing the text. In the others too I have omitted variants of spelling and accentuation if they seem to have no possible interest.

THE GREEK MANUSCRIPTS⁷

The twenty-six MSS listed below are all that I know to contain all or part of books I–IX; nine of them (marked *) also contain book x. Since more than half of them have never been collated for *HA*, and the reports of the remainder made by Camus, Bekker and Dittmeyer are known to be defective, I felt it necessary to collate all twenty-six in full, so as to ascertain not only what each says but also which seem to be independent witnesses, and

⁷ For an authoritative account of these MSS see *Aristoteles Graecus*, edited by P. Moraux and collaborators at the Aristoteles-Archiv, Berlin (vol. 1, 1976). A. Wartelle's *Inventaire des MSS grecs d'Aristote* (Paris 1963) relied on library catalogues and therefore contains many errors. L. Dittmeyer, *Untersuchungen über einige HSS und lateinische Übersetzungen der aristotelischen Tiergeschichte* (Prog. Würzburg 1902), together with the preface to his edition of *HA* (1907), gives a reliable account of Laur. 87,4 and Marc. 208, but only an impressionistic survey of the others. Book x is thoroughly examined in G. Rudberg, *Zum sogenannten zehnten Buche der aristotelischen Tiergeschichte* (Uppsala 1911), which unfortunately has many errors but usefully reviews the question. The list and description of MSS in P. Louis' edition of *HA* (Budé) vol. 1 (1964) xlvii relies on Dittmeyer and Wartelle and is erroneous in many places. Several of these MSS are judiciously discussed in D. Harlfinger's wide-ranging study, *Die Textgeschichte der ps.-aristotelischen Schriften* *περὶ ἀτόμων γραμμῶν* (Amsterdam 1971). [See now also F. Berger, *Textgeschichte d. Hist. An.* (p. xiv above) written under Harlfinger's supervision. Berger (in occasional consultation with Harlfinger) has kindly supplied the descriptions which appear below of the seven MSS for which Balme did not leave descriptions: W^c, Y^c, H^c, I^c, U^c, N^c, Z^c, and we have where needed provided updating information for the others, including occasional MS citations for books I–VI. Notes provided by Berger to her MS descriptions are placed in square brackets.]

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-48002-4 - Aristotle: *Historia Animalium*, Volume I

Edited by D. M. Balme

Excerpt

[More information](#)

INTRODUCTION

with what reliability. I have read, not the MSS themselves, but microfilm of them supplied through the courtesy of the libraries named in the list, to all of which acknowledgments and gratitude are due. The microfilms have clearly shown the configuration of the script, except in the damaged Taurinensis C I 9 (56) (discussed below), but have not distinguished the colours, so that separating the different hands has been uncertain. Codicologists (who I hope may find these reports useful) will note this reservation, and will also note that, while I must suggest inferences about the filiation of the MSS, my actual evidence shows their agreements and disagreements only. The MSS are as follows, with Bekker's sigla where available, otherwise mine:

- W^c Parisinus suppl. gr. 1156 (Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris)
- (α) C^a Laurentianus 87,4 (Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Florence)
- Y^c Vaticanus Palatinus gr. 260 (Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vatican)
- A^a Marcianus gr. 208 (Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, Venice)
- *G^a Marcianus gr. 212 (Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, Venice)
- *Q Marcianus gr. 200 (Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, Venice)
- *F^a Marcianus gr. 207 (Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, Venice)
- *X^c Laurentianus 87,27 (Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Florence)
- H^c Parisinus suppl. gr. 212 (Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris)
- (β) *D^a Vaticanus gr. 262 (Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vatican)
- *S^c Taurinensis C I 9 (56) (Biblioteca Nazionale, Turin)

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-48002-4 - Aristotle: *Historia Animalium*, Volume I

Edited by D. M. Balme

Excerpt

[More information](#)

INTRODUCTION

- O^c Riccardianus 13 (Biblioteca Riccardiana, Florence)
 T^c Laurentianus 87,1 (Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Florence)
 *R^c Utinensis VI,1 (Biblioteca Arcivescovile e Bartoliniana, Udine)
 U^c Neapolitanus III D 4 (288) (Biblioteca Nazionale, Naples)
 *V^c Neapolitanus III D 5 (289) (Biblioteca Nazionale, Naples)
 I^c Oxoniensis Auct. T.4.23 (Misc. 261) (Bodleian Library, Oxford)
- (γ) E^a Vaticanus gr. 506 (Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vatican)
 P Vaticanus gr. 1339 (Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vatican)
 K^c Berolinensis Phillips 1507 (Deutsche Staatsbibliothek, Berlin)
 M^c Mosquensis 240 (453) (Gosudarstvennyj Istoričeskij Musej, Moscow)
 N^c Vaticanus gr. 905 (Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vatican)
 Z^c Matritensis 4563 (N 26) (Biblioteca Nacional, Madrid)
 *L^c Ambrosianus I.56 sup. (Biblioteca Ambrosiana, Milan)
 m Parisinus gr. 1921 (Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris)
 n Vaticanus Urbinas gr. 39 (Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vatican)

The apparatus criticus will show that these MSS fall into the three families marked α , β , and γ , and the fragment from the *vetustissimus* W^c, which seems to be independent. But in book x the position is quite different: those members of the α and γ families which include x have obtained it directly or indirectly from the β family, as will be discussed below.

While α , β , and γ are close enough to indicate a common ancestor, their extant representatives show the mutual indepen-

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-48002-4 - Aristotle: *Historia Animalium*, Volume I

Edited by D. M. Balme

Excerpt

[More information](#)

INTRODUCTION

dence of the families:⁸

Om. α habent β γ : 493a6 μέρος, 509a21 λοκαλδς, 523b1 ζώνων, 575a28 (8 words), 586a26 περιέχονται, 600b24 (14 words), 626a21 (6 words), 627b33 (12 words), 628b1 (19 words), 583a16 λεία;

Om. β habent α γ : 490a17–18 (10 words), 495b13 (2 words), 497b9 ἔτερα, 595b7 ἐρηριγμένοις, 629b22 (7 words quoted from Homer), 586b9 φυράδας;

Om. γ habent α β : 498b11 ζῶα, 509b18 ἄνωθεν, 513b12 (13 words), 561b6 (26 words), 576a30 (10 words), 589a31 (5 words), 590a8 (3 words), 590a17 (4 words), 592b3 (4 words), 592b6 (16 words), 598b23 (12 words), 600a28 (10 words), 604a27 (34 words), 614a2 (4 words).

W^{cs}

The oldest Greek manuscript of *HA* has been preserved in Par. suppl. 1156. Fol. 13 and 14 originally formed the interior of a quaternio and contain a fragment from book vi. On fol. 13 the text 567a10–569a1 can be read with the help of an ultraviolet lamp. Of fol. 14 where the text 569a1 σαντικ – 570b28 θέρους stood, only a narrow strip still exists which contains on the recto page the first 5–9 letters, on the verso page the last 4–9 letters. The text is written in a ninth-century hand, in a small minuscule inclined to the left and with angular breathing marks; the accents are incomplete, uncial letters and abbreviations (except for καί) are missing.¹⁰ The writing and layout of both preserved

⁸ [Here and throughout, unless otherwise clear from the context, the citations are representative examples rather than an exhaustive list.]

⁹ [See bracketed addition to n. 7 above.]

¹⁰ [D. Harlfinger.]

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-48002-4 - Aristotle: *Historia Animalium*, Volume I

Edited by D. M. Balme

Excerpt

[More information](#)

INTRODUCTION

folios are identical with those of the Vindob. phil. 100 which contain Aristotle's physical treatises (*Phys.*, *Cael.*, *GC*, *Mete.*) and *Metaphysics*.¹¹ The fragment in Par. suppl. 1156 originally must have belonged to this MS, because on one folio the first sentences of *HA* are represented in a graphical scheme after which the text must have begun on the following folio.¹² The Vindob. phil. 100 certainly originated from Constantinople. The hand of the corrector that likewise must be dated to the ninth century can also be found in a collection of philosophical manuscripts that probably was in the possession of the patriarch Photios.¹³ In the thirteenth century William of Moerbeke must have bought this collection or a part of it on one of his voyages, and used it for his translations of Aristotle.¹⁴ The Vindob. apparently was in southern Italy in the early fourteenth century and later came back to Constantinople where it was bought by Augerius de Busbeck in the sixteenth century. When it returned to the east and how long it contained *HA* is unclear.¹⁵

The fragment in Par. suppl. 1156 (*W^c*) contains a number of secure separating errors, and thus cannot have been an anti-graphon of the younger MSS. Cf. e.g. 567b8, 568b2.

The α family: C^a, Y^c, A^a, G^a, Q, F^a, X^c, H^c.¹⁶

The omissions and disagreements in C^a, A^a and Y^c are enough to show that neither was the model for the others. The agreements of C^a and A^a (against Y^c β γ) however show that they

¹¹ [J. Irigoin, 'L'Aristote de Vienne', *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinischen Gesellschaft* 6 (1957), 5–10.]

¹² [G. Vuillemin-Diem, 'Untersuchungen zu Wilhelm von Moerbekes *Metaphysikübersetzung*', in *Studien zur mittelalterlichen Geistesgeschichte und ihren Quellen* (= Misc. Mediaev. 15), Berlin 1982, 102–212.]

¹³ [T. W. Allen, 'A Group of Ninth Century Greek Manuscripts', *Journal of Philology* 21 (1893), 48–55.]

¹⁴ [Vuillemin-Diem, *op. cit.*]

¹⁵ [Vuillemin-Diem, *op. cit.* 168–172.]

¹⁶ [See bracketed addition to n. 7 above in regard to Y^c and H^c.]