

Witwicki, Władysław, trans. 1999. *Platon: Dialogi*. Kęty.

Yunis, Harvey. 1988. *A New Creed: Fundamental Religious Beliefs in the Athenian Polis and Euripidean Drama*. Göttingen.

OBSERVATIONS ON VAT. BARB. GR. 75, A NEGLECTED MS  
OF THE *NICOMACHEAN ETHICS*

THE TEXTUAL CRITICISM OF THE *NICOMACHEAN ETHICS*

Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics* is one of the most important texts in the history of Western thought. Its influence attracted readers and commentators in antiquity and the Middle Ages, and thanks to its role in the rise of contemporary virtue ethics, it is today more popular than ever. Christopher Bobonich remarks that "the *Nicomachean Ethics* . . . might well be the most analyzed text in the history of Western philosophy."<sup>1</sup>

It is startling, then, that despite its acknowledged philosophical significance, the Greek of the *Nicomachean Ethics* has been neglected by textual critics for a hundred years. Today's standard edition, Ingram Bywater's Oxford Classical Text, was published in a year<sup>2</sup> that saw *New York Times* headlines such as "KILLED BY HOSTILE APACHES,"<sup>3</sup> and "GEORGE THATCHER'S HORSE RUNS AWAY."<sup>4</sup> The most recent edition, Otto Apelt's second revision of Franz Susemihl's Teubner text, was published less than a generation later, in 1912. These editions are products of a sixty-year period of activity in the textual study of the *Nicomachean Ethics* that began in earnest in 1874 with Hermann Rasso's *Forschungen*, proceeded with critical editions by Gottfried Ramsauer,<sup>5</sup> Susemihl,<sup>6</sup> the Bywater and Susemihl/Apelt editions already mentioned,<sup>7</sup> and a number of notes and studies,<sup>8</sup> and then tailed off in the 1920s after Harris Rackham's Loeb edition and subsequent series of articles on the text.<sup>9</sup>

Since then, comparatively little has been published on the Greek text of the *Nicomachean Ethics*. Meanwhile, new and potentially helpful information has become available with the discovery of a nearly complete copy of a ninth-century Arabic translation, and its publication in critical edition;<sup>10</sup> with the first critical edition of the various medieval Latin recensions, notably the thirteenth-century translation by Robert Grosseteste and William of

1. Bobonich 2006, 14.

2. The year was 1890. The date for Bywater's edition is usually cited as 1894 (even in the front matter of Oxford's twenty-first-century reprint), but the edition certainly appeared in 1890 (see Richards 1891; Susemihl 1892), and later printings contain no acknowledgement of revision or re-edition.

3. *The New York Times*, May 27, 1890. <http://perma.cc/G6GZ-W7UA>.

4. *The New York Times*, June 10, 1890. <http://perma.cc/BBB9-9DFY>.

5. Ramsauer 1878.

6. Susemihl 1880a.

7. Bywater 1894; Susemihl and Apelt 1903; 1912.

8. These include Ashburner 1916, 1917, and 1918; Burnet 1889; Busse 1883; Bywater 1892; Cook Wilson 1895; Greenwood 1905; Grenfell and Hunt 1899; Heylbut 1886; Jackson 1876 and 1879; Mulvany 1920; Solomon and Burnet 1889; Stewart 1882; and Susemihl 1878, 1879, 1880b, and 1883.

9. Rackham 1925a; 1925b; 1926; 1929.

10. The Arabic MS was brought to light in Morocco in the 1950s (see Arberry 1955; Dunlop 1962). Prolific Egyptian scholar 'Abdurrahmān Badawī published the first edition (Badawī 1979), but the more recent critical edition (Akasoy et al. 2005) is the current standard. The MS was thought to contain the translation of Iṣḥāq ibn Hunain, until the recent work of Manfred Ullmann identified in it the work of two separate translators, Iṣḥāq and

Moerbeke;<sup>11</sup> and with the unearthing of six papyri.<sup>12</sup> These developments give good reason for renewed study of the text, but even better reason is given by the incomplete nature of the work done in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. As René Gauthier put it bluntly in 1970, “Il n'existe pas encore d'édition critique du texte grec de l'Éthique à Nicomaque.”<sup>13</sup> No stemmatic or otherwise comprehensive assessment of the textual tradition of the *Nicomachean Ethics* has ever been published.<sup>14</sup> At least 130 full or partial Greek manuscripts of the work are extant;<sup>15</sup> Immanuel Bekker's 1831 edition (the basis for all subsequent efforts) took full or partial account of six.<sup>16</sup> Susemihl expanded his consideration to fourteen,<sup>17</sup> plus two Latin translations,<sup>18</sup> six fragmentary Greek commentaries and paraphrases,<sup>19</sup> and the Aldine edition of 1498; but Bywater subsequently dismissed as worthless and unnecessary everything besides two Greek MSS,<sup>20</sup> Robert and William's Latin, and the second-century Greek commentary of Aspasius.

Even if Bywater's contempt for the bulk of Susemihl's sources is warranted, and even if we assume (which we should not) that the *recentiores* are *deteriores*, there remains a significant number of relatively early Greek manuscripts that have not been mentioned in any published critical edition or study. Nineteen of these date from the fourteenth century or earlier, making them contemporary to or earlier than at least two of the four MSS traditionally acknowledged to be most important in establishing the text.<sup>21</sup> It is possible that none of these previously unmentioned MSS will prove important, but they must be examined and included in any future stemmatic analysis of the transmission of the *Nicomachean Ethics*, if such an analysis is to be reasonably comprehensive.

It must be noted, too, that the unsatisfactory state of the text is not only due to the want of work not yet attempted. When it comes to knowing what even the most oft-cited MSS

---

Eustathios (an earlier ninth-century scholar). Since both translators were working from exemplars older than any of our extant Greek MSS, the Arabic is potentially highly valuable. Work on applying it to the Greek text has lately begun in earnest (see Ullmann 2011–12; Schmidt and Ullmann 2012).

11. Gauthier 1972–74. For background on the medieval Latin *NE*, see Gauthier and Jolif 1970, 111–61.

12. *CPF* I.1.24, 261–63, 313–15.

13. Gauthier and Jolif 1970, 301.

14. The state of the art is a scanty schema in Gauthier and Jolif 1970, 311. Gauthier emphasizes that the conclusions presented there are “. . . encore précaires et tout provisoires” (p. 312).

15. There are altogether 130 unique Greek *NE* MSS listed in Wartelle 1963 (not counting the erroneously listed nos. 867 and 1205), Harlfinger and Wiesner 1964, Moraux et. al. 1976, and Argyropoulos and Caras 1980. Ninety-four of these MSS contain a complete text of ten books. Moraux's compendium was published in only one of its originally intended four volumes, and the several new entries in that one volume indicate the possibility that a few extant MSS of the *NE* have yet to be acknowledged in any published list of Aristotle's MSS.

16. Bekker regularly consulted four MSS: K<sup>b</sup> (Laurentianus 81.11), L<sup>b</sup> (Parisinus gr. 1854), M<sup>b</sup> (Marcianus gr. Z 213), and O<sup>b</sup> (Riccardianus 46), and sporadically referred to two others: N<sup>b</sup> (Marcianus gr. IV.53) and H<sup>a</sup> (Marcianus gr. Z 214).

17. Bekker's six, plus Q (Marcianus gr. Z 200), P<sup>b</sup> (Vaticanus gr. 1342), O<sup>1</sup> (Oxford Corpus Christi 112), O<sup>2</sup> (Oxford New College 227), O<sup>3</sup> (Oxford Bodl. Holkham Hall gr. 93), P<sup>1</sup> (Parisinus gr. 2023), P<sup>2</sup> (Parisinus Coislinianus 161), and Par.1417 (Parisinus gr. 1417).

18. That of Robert and William, plus that of Leonardo Bruni (aka Aretino), published in 1416.

19. The commentaries of Aspasius (2nd cent.), Anonymous (probably 2nd cent.), Eustratius (12th cent.), Michael of Ephesus (12th cent.), and Anonymous (probably 12th cent.), and the paraphrase doubtfully attributed to Heliodorus of Prusa (possibly 14th cent.).

20. K<sup>b</sup> and L<sup>b</sup>.

21. The four are K<sup>b</sup> (10th cent.), L<sup>b</sup> (12th/13th cent.), M<sup>b</sup> (15th cent.) and O<sup>b</sup> (14th cent.). The understudied nature of the *NE*'s text is illustrated by Elpidio Mioni's discovery in the 1950s that the previously ignored G<sup>a</sup> (Marcianus gr. 212, 15th cent.) is in fact the exemplar of M<sup>b</sup>, dethroning the latter from 130 years of recognition as a top-flight MS (Mioni 1958, 87–88, 101–2); it is illustrated further by the fact that this shift in priority remains widely unacknowledged today (e.g., in Schmidt and Ullmann 2012, 95–96, 122).

actually say, we are in some ways worse off today than Bekker's readers of the early nineteenth century—and they were not necessarily well informed. With the exception of  $K^b$ ,<sup>22</sup> no MS of the *Nicomachean Ethics* has been collated properly since Bekker,<sup>23</sup> and it is questionable whether Bekker collated them properly himself (by today's standards, at least).<sup>24</sup> The repeated recyclings of readings into new editions and apparatuses over the next century, and the partial, not always careful re-collations and corrections by Susemihl and others have inevitably ushered in corruption along with occasional improvement. Even Apelt's attempts to revise and correct Susemihl are not entirely benign. Part of his task was to unpack Susemihl's unhelpful usage of a variously superscripted *II* to signify shifting sets of consilient MSS in various parts of the *Nicomachean Ethics*. As always happens when things are packed and unpacked, some contents have been jumbled, broken, and lost.<sup>25</sup> Besides this, Apelt's effort to streamline Susemihl's apparatus often cut too deep, removing potentially interesting readings along with idle ones. The standard edition of Bywater is no better—it hardly has an apparatus at all.

In summary, far too few extant MSS of the *Nicomachean Ethics* have been studied, the MSS that have been studied are not reliably understood, and the potentially helpful medieval translations have not been fully applied to the Greek text. Once these shortcomings have been addressed, the way will be clear for compilation of the first thorough critical edition of the Greek text.

#### INTRODUCTION TO VAT. BARB. GR. 75 (F)

In this paper, I will try to make headway toward a better understanding of the text of the *Nicomachean Ethics* by giving some observations on one of the earliest of the previously unmentioned manuscripts: Vaticanus Barberinianus graecus 75 (hereafter F). I chose to analyze F because of its early date, and its availability online in a high resolution digitization, thanks to the BAV.<sup>26</sup> Before analyzing F's text, I will give a brief account of its contents, provenance, and material makeup.

F dates from the mid-thirteenth century,<sup>27</sup> is written on parchment,<sup>28</sup> and measures 208 × 147mm.<sup>29</sup> It contains the *Nicomachean Ethics* (ff. 1r–92v) and *Magna moralia* (ff. 92v–119v) back-to-back, with one sizable lacuna in Books VII and VIII of the *Nicomachean Ethics*, and another lacuna in Book II of the *Magna moralia*.<sup>30</sup> A dodecasyllabic

22. Rudolf Schoell collated  $K^b$  completely anew in the 1870s (published in Ramsauer 1878, 730–40); Walter Ashburner collated  $K^b$  completely again (1917) and later published a facsimile of it (1927).

23. One exception being in Book V, for his stand-alone edition of which Henry Jackson fully collated, by personal autopsy, seven MSS: Bekker's six ( $K^b$ ,  $L^b$ ,  $M^b$ ,  $O^b$ ,  $N^b$ , and  $H^b$ ), plus  $P^b$  (Vaticanus gr. 1342); and, less thoroughly, Q (Marcianus gr. Z 200). See Jackson 1879, ix–xii.

24. Ashburner praises Bekker's care (compared to Schoell and Susemihl) in collating  $K^b$ , but I have encountered a number of head-scratchers in Bekker's apparatus, and Gauthier laments Bekker's unreliability, which he documents by presenting a selection of his mistakes and their consequences (Gauthier and Jolif 1970, 302–3).

25. On the problems in Susemihl and Apelt's reports of  $K^b$  readings, see Ashburner 1917, 31–33, 51.

26. The persistent URL of the digitization is [http://digi.vatlib.it/view/MSS\\_Barb.gr.75](http://digi.vatlib.it/view/MSS_Barb.gr.75).

27. Arnesano 2006, 155; *RGK* III.A.372, 142.

28. Daniele Arnesano (2006, 155) says F is “in pergamena di buona qualità,” but this assessment may be too rosy. F's hair sides are minimally treated, dark, and rough; flesh sides tend to be more yellow than white; and five folia have holes located in the body of the text.

29. Capocci 1958, 94.

30. The lacuna in *MM* II is a result of leaves lost from between f. 112v (ending with II.3.1200a32) and f. 113r (beginning at II.8.1207a26). The lacuna in the *NE* was suspected by Valentino Capocci (1958, 155–

colophon on the final leaf identifies the scribe as the otherwise unknown Constantine Furates,<sup>31</sup> working on the commission of an otherwise unknown Renaldo of Gallipoli, an island city off the west coast of Italy's Salentine peninsula. All published references to F's production attribute the entire MS to Furates alone,<sup>32</sup> without noting the existence of a fairly abrupt shift in the script that occurs about halfway through the *Nicomachean Ethics*: the first portion of the MS (ff. 1r–48v) is neatly legible, largely unabbreviated, and comfortably spaced, while the second portion (ff. 49r–119v) is noticeably more compressed in its lineation, with significantly higher rates of abbreviation and ligature throughout. It is tempting to posit a change of hands, with the first portion of the MS attributable to an anonymous scribe, and only the last portion attributable to Furates, but close inspection of letter-forms reveals no obvious evidence for multiple hands. I suspect that Furates did indeed copy all 119 folia, and that the hasty, compressed aesthetic of F's latter part resulted from a conscious decision in response to some unexpected change in Furates' commission or available materials.<sup>33</sup>

Glossae and scholia occur with irregular frequency throughout the *Nicomachean Ethics*, in several different hands of several different periods, none of which appear to be that of Furates, but the most frequent of which may be from the same thirteenth century.<sup>34</sup> Most of the scholia are anonymous and, so far as I can tell, not excerpted from any previously known commentary. But many of the marginal notes are taken from extant commentaries, in a pattern suggesting that F's most prolific, earliest scholiast did have access to an identifiable anthology of ancient and Byzantine *Nicomachean Ethics* commentary that remains extant today.<sup>35</sup> Charts and diagrams are fairly frequent in the margins as well, and three diagrams are incorporated by Furates into the body of the text.<sup>36</sup> In-line corrections are occasionally provided by what appears to be a single hand dating somewhat later than that of Furates.

The recorded holding history of F begins with its entry into the collection of the seventeenth century Florentine humanist Carlo Strozzi, as marked in the inferior margin of f. 1r. From Strozzi's collection, it passed into the immense library of his friend and fellow bibliophile, Cardinal Francesco Barberini,<sup>37</sup> a library that in turn became a part of the Vatican Library in 1902.<sup>38</sup>

---

56) to have been the result of a single lost quaternion, and my own analysis of F's average amount of text per page confirms this.

31. *RGK* III.A.372, 142; *PLP* XII 30.200.

32. With the exception of Brockmann (1993, 53–54), who mistakenly identifies the patron Renaldo as F's sole scribe.

33. E.g., a shortfall in funding for writing supports, or the late addition of the *MM* to an original commission of the *NE* alone (a suggestion I owe to conversation with Renée Altergott).

34. Capocci 1958, 94.

35. This commentary compilation, first published as a collection in twelfth-century Constantinople, came in two varieties. The original compilation consisted of Eustratius on Books I and VI, an anonymous ancient scholiast on II–V, Michael of Ephesus on V, IX and X, Aspasius on VIII, and an anonymous Byzantine scholiast on book VII. A later edition replaced the anonymous scholiast on II–V with Aspasius on I–IV. In F, I have found excerpts from Eustratius in Books I and VI, from the anonymous Byzantine scholiast in Book VII, and from Michael in Book X (the latter noted also by Capocci [1958, 95]). Since I could not identify any excerpts of Aspasius in the margins of Books I–IV, it seems likely that F's early scholiast was looking at a copy of the original compilation. For more on the composite commentary, see Mercken 1990; Barber and Jenkins 2009.

36. On ff. 52v and 53v.

37. For more on Strozzi and the transfer of his Greek manuscript collection to Cardinal Barberini, see Jacob 2000.

38. Capocci 1958, viii.

F IN THE TEXTUAL TRADITION OF THE *NICOMACHEAN ETHICS*

There exists only one published text-critical consideration of F, contained in Christian Brockmann's 1993 article on the textual tradition of the *Magna moralia*. Although the *Nicomachean Ethics* has always been held in higher esteem than the possibly pseudonymous *Magna moralia*, F's *Nicomachean Ethics* text has apparently never been collated or examined, a fact made more surprising by Brockmann's assessment that F's *Magna moralia* text is important, being a very early offshoot of K<sup>b</sup>, and "ein wichtiger Vermittler auf dem Weg zur Aldina."<sup>39</sup> In the remainder of this paper, I will offer some collations and preliminary conclusions as to F's place in the textual tradition of the *Nicomachean Ethics*.

I collated four selections of F's text against Susemihl and Apelt's 1903 Teubner edition, selections totaling about 15.5 Bekker pages, or about 18% of the *Nicomachean Ethics*. The selections were guided by the collations and discussion offered in John Stewart's 1882 *English Manuscripts of the Nicomachean Ethics*, which were guided in turn by the pioneering work of Rassow and Susemihl on the texts of K<sup>b</sup>, L<sup>b</sup>, O<sup>b</sup>, and M<sup>b</sup>. It is generally agreed that K<sup>b</sup> and L<sup>b</sup> are the two most important manuscripts extant, and that each represents a distinct text-type. O<sup>b</sup> and M<sup>b</sup> are the other two MSS that Bekker used frequently, and their complex relationship to K<sup>b</sup> and L<sup>b</sup> has been the basis of much of the subsequent text-critical study of the *Nicomachean Ethics*.<sup>40</sup> To illustrate the complexity of these relationships, I reproduce here some numbers from Stewart's article.

TABLE 1. BOOK-BY-BOOK AGREEMENT AND DISAGREEMENT  
BETWEEN K<sup>b</sup>, L<sup>b</sup>, O<sup>b</sup>, AND M<sup>b</sup>

	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X
K <sup>b</sup> M <sup>b</sup> —L <sup>b</sup> O <sup>b</sup> :	38	29	12	5	8	58	80	29	67	43
K <sup>b</sup> O <sup>b</sup> —L <sup>b</sup> M <sup>b</sup> :	7	6	71	78	18	10	17	25	8	17
K <sup>b</sup> L <sup>b</sup> —M <sup>b</sup> O <sup>b</sup> :	14	5	5	5	31	7	3	9	5	12

Note: From Stewart 1882, 2. Stewart reports that the numbers include all incidences of the given configurations of agreement and disagreement, and he appears not to have evaluated the significance of the readings involved.

As table 1 shows, there is a curiously mutual alternation in the relationship that O<sup>b</sup> and M<sup>b</sup> have with K<sup>b</sup> and L<sup>b</sup>. In places where K<sup>b</sup> and L<sup>b</sup> disagree, and M<sup>b</sup> sides with K<sup>b</sup>, O<sup>b</sup> tends to side with L<sup>b</sup>—and vice versa. That is to say, where K<sup>b</sup> and L<sup>b</sup> disagree, and M<sup>b</sup> sides with L<sup>b</sup>, O<sup>b</sup> tends to side with K<sup>b</sup>. Stewart's project was to collate the MSS of the *Nicomachean Ethics* held in English libraries, using the curious patterns shown in table 1 as a guide. His findings show that most of these English MSS, along with the Aldine edition, often stick together in a mixed text-type that does not consistently follow any of the four MSS from table 1. One notable exception is in C, which abruptly begins to follow K<sup>b</sup>

39. Brockmann 1993, 53–54.

40. If Mioni is right that M<sup>b</sup> was copied from G<sup>a</sup>, then these figures could likely be improved upon by looking to G<sup>a</sup> instead of M<sup>b</sup> in this context, but since no collations of G<sup>a</sup> are yet available, I base my study of F on the traditional K<sup>b</sup>M<sup>b</sup>—L<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup> / K<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>—L<sup>b</sup>M<sup>b</sup> framework.

almost exactly, even in obvious mistakes, at III.6.1115b1, and continues to do so until V.9.1136b1.

I began my work on F by collating it word-for-word throughout I.6–8 (Collation A below) and X.6–8 (Collation D below) in order to get a feel for the text, and to see if its character near the beginning is noticeably different from its character near the end. I then collated III.6–12 (Collation B below; word-for-word in III.6–7, and the remainder selectively against Stewart's list of  $K^bO^b$ — $L^bM^b$  readings), to see if F exhibits any abrupt shift in text-type at the point where C begins closely to follow  $K^b$ , and where  $M^b$  and  $O^b$  first switch their allegiances. Finally, having observed some consilience between F and both C and the Aldine edition, I selectively collated F against Stewart's list of Book VI readings in which C and Ald. disagree (Collation C below).<sup>41</sup> Throughout all these collations, I tracked all reported readings of F's apparent relatives  $B^1$ ,  $B^2$ , C, and Ald.

Below, I give the results of my word-for-word collations, along with numerical summaries of the notable rates of agreement, the latter of which are totaled from (1) my word-for-word collations; (2) my collations against Stewart's lists of  $K^bM^b$ — $L^bO^b$  and  $K^bO^b$ — $L^bM^b$  readings; and (3) my collations against C,  $B^1$ ,  $B^2$ ,  $N^b$ , and Ald., at any point in the text where readings of those MSS are reported by Susemihl 1880a, Stewart 1882, or Susemihl and Apelt 1903. The summary figures and final agreement percentages are therefore not deducible only from the particular readings reported in this paper, since the figures and percentages draw on further readings which are witnessed by Susemihl, Stewart, and Apelt, but not reported here.

I pass over without mention small variations like accentuation, punctuation, iota subscripts, common spelling variants like οὐθέν vs. οὐδέν or γίγνομαι vs. γίνομαι, and the presence or absence of elision and movable nu. These omissions aside, I give complete results for each of the collations, intending to allow readers to get a sense of F and the variants it presents, and to make their own judgements about the significance and validity of each reading. I append to the collations the readings of Robert and William's Latin translation, wherever they are reported in Susemihl 1880, Stewart 1882, or Susemihl and Apelt 1903. No readings of any MS can safely be inferred from silence. For a list of MSS cited, see the appendix (pp. 350–51).

COLLATION A: I.6.1096a11–I.9.1099b9

- 1096a 13. τοιαύτης om. F  
 18. τὸ add. after καὶ  $FM^bO^b$ Ald.  
 23. δ' om.  $FL^bCB^1B^2$ ΓAld.  
 1096b 9. μὴ om. F (οὐ corr.F)  
 10. ποιεῖσθαι: εἰρήσθαι  $FL^bO^bCB^1B^2$ Ald.  
 19. τις ἄν: ἄν τις  $FL^bO^b$ ΓAld.  
 25. καὶ om. codd.  
 32. τι καὶ: τι τὸ  $FL^bO^bCB^1B^2$ ΓAld.  
 33. αὐτὸ τι: τι αὐτὸ  $FL^bO^bCB^1B^2$   
 1097a 4. τινα ἔχει: ἔχει τινα  $FL^bO^bCB^1B^2$   
 7. τοὺς τεχνίτας ἅπαντας: ἅπαντας τοὺς τεχνίτας  $FL^bO^bCB^1B^2$   
 18. ἐκάστης: ἐκάστη  $F$ ΓO<sup>b</sup>Ald.  
 24. ταῦτόν: τὸ αὐτὸ  $F$ Ald.

41. Stewart 1882, 53–55.

29. εἴη: εἰ F (εἴη corr.F)  
 32. καὶ post τῶν add. F<sup>1</sup>B<sup>142</sup>  
 1097b 7. συμβαίνειν F in ras.  
 15. ἐνδεῖα: ἐνδεῖ F  
 32. ἄν om. F  
 33. εἴη om. F  
 1098a 15. δῆ: δ' codd.ΓAld.  
 22. ἀναγράψαι: ἀναγράφειν FM<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>Ald.  
 25. K<sup>b</sup>Asp. αἰ: om. F etc.  
 32. δῆ: δὲ F  
 1098b 5. διορισθῶσι: ὀρισθῶσι FL<sup>b</sup>M<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>  
 7. K<sup>b</sup>Γ γάρ: οὐν F etc.  
 8. δὲ: δῆ FM<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>ΓAld.  
 23. K<sup>b</sup> τὰ: om. F etc.  
 29. ἐν γέ: ἐπί FL<sup>b</sup>M<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>Ald.  
 30. τὴν ἀρετὴν: τὴν πᾶσαν ἀρετὴν FL<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>  
 1099a 7. ἔστιν: ἔτι F  
 28. ἐρᾷ τὸ: ἐρᾶται FM<sup>b</sup>  
 30. φαμὲν εἶναι: εἶναι φαμὲν FAld.  
 1099b 1. καὶ post ὀργάνων add. FK<sup>b</sup>M<sup>b</sup>  
 2. τητῶμενοι: τητῶμενοι corr.F  
 6. προσδεῖσθαι: προσθεῖναι F  
 8. ἕτεροι: ἔνιοι FL<sup>b</sup>M<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>  
 9. καὶ post ἦ add. K<sup>b</sup>M<sup>b</sup>: om. FL<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>B<sup>1</sup>B<sup>2</sup>ΓAld. in ras. C

TABLE 2A. NOTABLE RATES OF AGREEMENT  
 IN COLLATION A (I.6.1096A11–I.9.1099B9)

Readings in question	Notable (dis)agreements	Rate of agreement
K <sup>b</sup> M <sup>b</sup> —L <sup>b</sup> O <sup>b</sup>	FL <sup>b</sup> O <sup>b</sup>	15/17
K <sup>b</sup> —L <sup>b</sup> M <sup>b</sup> O <sup>b</sup>	FK <sup>b</sup>	0/11
B <sup>1</sup>	FB <sup>1</sup>	15/16
B <sup>2</sup>	FB <sup>2</sup>	15/16
Ald.	FAld.	25/26
C	FC	16/17

42. At 1097a32, καὶ after τῶν was placed in angle brackets by Susemihl in his 1880 edition, with a critical note explaining that the καὶ was added by two commentators and a Latin translation. The brackets were retained by Bywater, and by Apelt in his second and third editions of Susemihl's text, and Apelt's apparatus reads, "καὶ post τῶν om. codd. ut videtur omnes: add. Aspasius, al." Bekker, however, printed the καὶ in 1831 with a note reading only "om. O<sup>b</sup>," despite never explicitly taking into account any commentaries or Latin translations in establishing his text. I have confirmed via facsimiles that K<sup>b</sup> and L<sup>b</sup> omit the καὶ, which shows that Bekker's note should have read at least "om. K<sup>b</sup>L<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>." I have had no access to Bekker's other three MSS, but it is likely that, contra Susemihl and Apelt and Bywater, one or more of M<sup>b</sup>, N<sup>b</sup>, and H<sup>a</sup> do read the καὶ, since Bekker otherwise probably would not have known the καὶ to print it. Whatever is read by these MSS, Apelt is wrong to assert that καὶ is omitted by all MSS, since I have found it in F, and, upon inspection of the British Library's online digitization of F's close relation B<sup>1</sup>, in that MS as well. The Aldine edition, despite its close ties with F and B<sup>1</sup>, omits the καὶ.

COLLATION B: III.6.1115A23—III.12.1119B17  
 (WORD-FOR-WORD III.6.1115A23—III.7.1115B31)

- 1115a 29. εἰ post οἶον add. FN<sup>b</sup>B<sup>1</sup>B<sup>2</sup>Ald.  
 29. ἐν ante νόσοις add. FL<sup>b</sup>M<sup>b</sup>N<sup>b</sup>B<sup>1</sup>B<sup>2</sup>ΓAld.  
 1115b 4. ἡ ante ἀλική add. F  
 8. γε om. FK<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>N<sup>b</sup>B<sup>1</sup>B<sup>2</sup>Ald.  
 14. καὶ. . .φοβεῖσθαι om. F  
 15. δῆ: δὲ codd.ΓAld.  
 15. δ om. codd.Ald  
 21. δ' om. codd.  
 23. δῆ: δὲ FK<sup>b</sup>L<sup>b</sup>M<sup>b</sup>

TABLE 2B. NOTABLE RATES OF AGREEMENT IN  
 COLLATION B (III.6.1115A23—III.12.1119B17)

Readings in question	Notable (dis)agreements	Rate of agreement
K <sup>b</sup> O <sup>b</sup> —L <sup>b</sup> M <sup>b</sup>	FL <sup>b</sup> M <sup>b</sup>	25/37
K <sup>b</sup> M <sup>b</sup> —L <sup>b</sup> O <sup>b</sup>	FL <sup>b</sup> O <sup>b</sup>	3/5
B <sup>1</sup>	FB <sup>1</sup>	29/29
B <sup>2</sup>	FB <sup>2</sup>	21/21
Ald.	FAld.	33/36
C	FC	17/43

COLLATION C: VI.1.1138B19—VI.11.1142B25

TABLE 2C. NOTABLE RATES OF AGREEMENT IN  
 COLLATION C (VI.1.1138B19—VI.11.1142B25)

Readings in question	Notable (dis)agreements	Rate of agreement
K <sup>b</sup> M <sup>b</sup> —L <sup>b</sup> O <sup>b</sup>	FK <sup>b</sup> M <sup>b</sup>	11/20
B <sup>1</sup>	FB <sup>1</sup>	19/19
B <sup>2</sup>	FB <sup>2</sup>	6/20
Ald.—C:	FAld.	21/26

COLLATION D: X.6.1176A30—X.8.1179A32

- 1176a 31. ἡδονάς: ἡδονῆς F  
 32. δὲ: δῆ FK<sup>b</sup>M<sup>b</sup>  
 1176b 15. τοιοῦτων: τούτων FL<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>Ald.  
 16. τὸ om. F  
 27. δῆ ἡ: δὲ FL<sup>b</sup>M<sup>b</sup>CB<sup>1</sup>Ald.  
 31. ἔνεκα: χάριν F  
 1177a 2. μετὰ σπουδῆς: σπουδαῖος F  
 4. τῶν add. L<sup>b</sup>: om. F etc.  
 25. καθαριότητι: καθαρείότητι FL<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>  
 27. διαγωγὴν: ἀγωγὴν FL<sup>b</sup>Ald.  
 33. σοφώτερος: σοφός F  
 1177b 1. δόξαι K<sup>b</sup>: δόξειε F etc.



3. πρακτικῶν: πρακτῶν FL<sup>b</sup>M<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>  
 3. ἢ πλείον: om. F  
 4. ἀσχολούμεθα: σχολούμεθα F  
 7. ἐνέργεια: ἐνέργειαι FL<sup>b</sup>ΓAld.  
 9. παρασκευάζει: παρασκευάζειν FL<sup>b</sup>M<sup>b</sup>CB<sup>1</sup>ΓAld.  
 18. αἰρεταί εἰσιν: εἰσιν αἰρεταί F  
 21. τελείαν om. FL<sup>b</sup>ΓAld.  
 22. ἀνθρώπων: ἀνθρώπινον FL<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>ΓAld.  
 24. δὴ om. F  
 26. βίος κρείττων: κρείττων βίος FΓAld.  
 31. οὐ χρή δέ: χρή δέ οὐ FL<sup>b</sup>M<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>CB<sup>1</sup>Ald.  
 33. ἀθανατίζειν: ἀαθανατίζειν FN<sup>b</sup>Ald.  
 33. πάντα: ἅπαντα F  
 1178a1. ἀλλὰ post ἐστι add. FCAld.  
 2. εἶναι ἕκαστος: ἕκαστος εἶναι FL<sup>b</sup>Ald.  
 6. ἐστίν: ἔσθ' FL<sup>b</sup>Ald.  
 7. τοῦτο μάλιστα: μάλιστα τοῦτο FL<sup>b</sup>ΓAld.  
 9. κατὰ ταύτην: κατ' αὐτήν FL<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>CB<sup>1</sup>ΓAld.  
 13. διατηροῦντες τὸ πρέπον ἐκάστω: τὸ πρέπον ἐκάστω διατηροῦντες FL<sup>b</sup>ΓAld.  
 20. καὶ post πάθεσι FM<sup>b</sup>Ald.  
 23. εἰρήσθω: εἰρηται codd.  
 27. διαφέρει: διαφέρη FL<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>Ald.  
 32. τὴν K<sup>b</sup>: om. F etc.  
 34. ἀμφισβητεῖται τε: ζητεῖται δέ FL<sup>b</sup>ΓAld.  
 34. τι post δέ add. FB<sup>1</sup>  
 1178b6. τὴν add. K<sup>b</sup>: om. F etc.  
 12. ἀλλὰ post ὅσα add. FL<sup>b</sup>ΓAld.  
 15. αἰ L<sup>b</sup>: εἰ F etc.  
 19. δὴ: δεῖ FΓAld.  
 20. ἀφαιρουμένου: ἀφρημένου FL<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>CB<sup>1</sup>Ald.  
 21. θεωρία: θεωρίας FL<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>N<sup>b</sup>CB<sup>1</sup>Ald.  
 26. ἅπας: πᾶς F  
 28. οὐδαμῆ: οὐδαμοῦ FO<sup>b</sup>Ald.  
 1179a1. εὐδαίμονήσοντα: εὐδαίμονα F  
 3. οὐδ' ἢ κρίσις post αὐταρκες add. FL<sup>b</sup>Γ  
 4. ἄρχοντα: ἄρχοντας FL<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>CB<sup>1</sup>ΓAld.  
 18. ἔχει: ἔχειν F  
 18. δ' ἀληθές: ἀληθές δέ F  
 19. πρακτικοῖς: πρακτοῖς FL<sup>b43</sup>  
 20. δὴ: δέ FL<sup>b</sup>M<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>  
 24. εἶναι post ἔουκεν add. FL<sup>b</sup>ΓAld.  
 29. πάντα ταῦτα: ταῦτα πάντα FL<sup>b</sup>M<sup>b</sup>CAld.

#### CONCLUSIONS ON F'S *NICOMACHEAN ETHICS* TEXT

Given Brockmann's judgment that F's *Magna moralia* text is a close descendant of K<sup>b</sup>'s *Magna moralia* text, it might have been expected that F's *Nicomachean Ethics* text

43. The apparatuses of Susemihl 1880a and Susemihl and Apelt 1903 and 1912 disagree on 1179a19. Susemihl gives: πρακτοῖς K<sup>b</sup>M<sup>b</sup>, πρακτικοῖς L<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>ΓAld., while Apelt gives: πρακτικοῖς K<sup>b</sup>M<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>: πρακτοῖς L<sup>b</sup>. Bywater agrees with Apelt, giving only: πρακτοῖς L<sup>b</sup>. I have confirmed by facsimile that K<sup>b</sup> reads πρακτικοῖς as Apelt has it, and so I have given Apelt's readings above.

TABLE 2D. NOTABLE RATES OF AGREEMENT IN COLLATION D (X.6.1176A30–X.8.1179A32)

Readings in question	Notable (dis)agreements	Rate of agreement
K <sup>b</sup> M <sup>b</sup> —L <sup>b</sup> O <sup>b</sup>	FL <sup>b</sup> O <sup>b</sup>	10/11
K <sup>b</sup> O <sup>b</sup> —L <sup>b</sup> M <sup>b</sup>	FL <sup>b</sup> M <sup>b</sup>	4/7
L <sup>b</sup> —K <sup>b</sup> M <sup>b</sup> O <sup>b</sup>	FL <sup>b</sup>	11/31
B <sup>1</sup>	FB <sup>1</sup>	14/16
B <sup>2</sup>	FB <sup>2</sup>	8/10
Ald.	FAld.	38/43
C	FC	15/18

TABLE 3. TOTAL NOTABLE RATES OF AGREEMENT FROM ALL COLLATIONS

Readings in question	Notable (dis)agreements	Rate of agreement	Agreement %
K <sup>b</sup> M <sup>b</sup> —L <sup>b</sup> O <sup>b</sup>	FL <sup>b</sup> O <sup>b</sup>	39/53	74
K <sup>b</sup> O <sup>b</sup> —L <sup>b</sup> M <sup>b</sup>	FL <sup>b</sup> M <sup>b</sup>	29/43	67
K <sup>b</sup> —L <sup>b</sup> M <sup>b</sup> O <sup>b</sup>	FK <sup>b</sup>	0/11	0
L <sup>b</sup> —K <sup>b</sup> M <sup>b</sup> O <sup>b</sup>	FL <sup>b</sup>	11/31	35
B <sup>1</sup>	FB <sup>1</sup>	77/80	96
B <sup>2</sup>	FB <sup>2</sup>	50/67	75
Ald.	FAld.	117/131	89
C	FC	53/104	51
N <sup>b</sup>	FN <sup>b</sup>	7/8	88

is of similar lineage. The rates of agreement and disagreement in my collations, however, indicate that F's *Nicomachean Ethics* text has more affinity with L<sup>b</sup> than with K<sup>b</sup>, although it follows neither consistently. F does not follow the curious alternating pattern of agreement with K<sup>b</sup> and L<sup>b</sup> that is exhibited by M<sup>b</sup> and O<sup>b</sup>, nor does it show the abrupt segment of near-total agreement with K<sup>b</sup> that is exhibited by C in Books III–V.<sup>44</sup>

The closest well-attested relatives of F are B<sup>1</sup> (the fifteenth-century Oxford Corpus Christi 112) and the first Aldine edition of 1498, with B<sup>1</sup> tracking F somewhat more consistently than Ald. does. It is noteworthy, then, that although F's *Nicomachean Ethics* text is not descended from K<sup>b</sup> as the *Magna moralia* text is, it is nonetheless related to the *Nicomachean Ethics* text of the Aldine edition in its own right. F also displays a marked affinity with N<sup>b</sup> (the twelfth-century Marcianus IV.53), although sparse reporting of N<sup>b</sup>'s readings makes it impossible to say much about this relationship (in the portions I collated word-for-word, only eight N<sup>b</sup> readings are reported by all published sources com-

44. On the latter point, however, one oddity may be worth noting. On F's f. 29v, the text is inscribed in lines of consecutively shorter length, resulting in only about half of the usual ruled text field being inscribed, and this in the shape of a right triangle tapering downward to the right. The surface of f. 29v is on the flesh side of its parchment sheet; no obvious imperfections in the surface required the avoidance of writing on the bottom left part of the page. But the final word of f. 29v (θαλάττιοι) is also the final word of Bekker line 1115b1—the exact line at which Stewart observed C abruptly changing its text-type to follow K<sup>b</sup>. I am not sure what conclusions, if any, can be drawn from this.

bined). N<sup>b</sup> was held by Jackson to be the exemplar for the first Aldine edition of the *Nicomachean Ethics*, since it contains careful rulings and textual corrections apparently meant to guide the printer, and since its text is largely identical to Ald.<sup>45</sup> In Gauthier and Jolif's proto-stemma of the textual tradition, N<sup>b</sup> is the most prominent member of what Gauthier identifies as a possible third family of *Nicomachean Ethics* MSS, intermediate between the two long-recognized families of K<sup>b</sup> and L<sup>b</sup>.<sup>46</sup>

It seems likely that F is a member of this proposed third family of MSS, but given our still rudimentary understanding of this family, and given the number of thirteenth-, fourteenth-, and fifteenth-century MSS whose *Nicomachean Ethics* texts have not been studied,<sup>47</sup> a precise assessment of F's place in the textual tradition is not yet possible. The obvious starting point for further work on this family of MSS is a thorough collation of N<sup>b</sup>, which would reveal whether F may have been copied directly from it, and would cast light on the various MSS that show a family resemblance to these two. Understanding of F and its family might also be advanced by a collation of the *Nicomachean Ethics* text of Vindobonensis philosophicus graecus 315, an MS listed by Wartelle as thirteenth–fifteenth century, but dated by Brockmann at 1200, and placed as a close ascendant of F in Brockmann's *Magna moralia* stemma.

All things considered, the value of F for establishing the text of the *Nicomachean Ethics* is doubtful. It probably possesses little individual authority, and unique readings taken from it would need to be accepted on their own merit, rather than on the strength of F's recommendation. But F appears to be an early member of the least well-understood family of *Nicomachean Ethics* MSS, and insofar as the textual tradition of a monumental work like the *Nicomachean Ethics* deserves to be documented in detail, the foregoing observations are worthy of note.<sup>48</sup>

KYLE OSKVIK  
Princeton University

#### MSS AND EDITIONS CITED IN COLLATIONS

- B<sup>1</sup> = British Library Additional 14080, 15th cent.  
 B<sup>2</sup> = British Library Additional 6790, 15th cent.  
 C = O<sup>1</sup> = Oxford Corpus Christi College 112, 15th cent.  
 F = Vaticanus Barberinianus graecus 75, 13th cent.  
 K<sup>b</sup> = Laurentianus 81.11, 10th cent.  
 L<sup>b</sup> = Parisinus graecus 1854, 12th/13th cent.  
 M<sup>b</sup> = Marcianus graecus Z 213, 15th cent.  
 N<sup>b</sup> = Marcianus graecus IV.53, 12th cent.

45. Jackson 1879, x. Gauthier accepts this, but cautions that the extent to which other MSS influenced Ald. is not yet clear (Gauthier and Jolif 1970, 150). N<sup>b</sup> does not contain the *Magna moralia*, so if N<sup>b</sup> was in fact the Aldine exemplar for the *Nicomachean Ethics*, it is only a coincidence that F happens to display Aldine-family texts in both works.

46. Gauthier and Jolif 1970, 311–13.

47. Of these neglected MSS, I count five thirteenth-century MSS besides F (including Laur. 81.1, listed in Wartelle 1963 as 12th/13th cent., Vat. gr. 1026 and 2387, both listed as 13th/14th cent., and Vindob. phil. gr. 315, listed as 13th–15th cent.), fourteen fourteenth-century MSS (including Beinecke 240, listed as 14th/15th cent.), and thirty-nine fifteenth-century MSS (not including nine MSS listed as 15th/16th cent.).

48. I owe thanks to Bob Kaster, Christian Wildberg, Dave Jenkins, and Christian Brockmann for their advice and encouragement during the project that led to this paper.

**O<sup>b</sup>** = Riccardianus 46 (K.I.22), 14th cent.

**F** = Latin translation of Robert Grosseteste and William of Moerbeke, 13th cent.

**Ald.** = First Aldine edition, 1498

## LITERATURE CITED

- Akasoy, Anna, Alexander Fidora, and Douglas Dunlop, eds. 2005. *The Arabic Version of the "Nicomachean Ethics."* Boston.
- Arberry, Arthur John. 1955. The *Nicomachean Ethics* in Arabic. *BSOAS* 17: 1–9.
- Argyropoulos, Roxane, and Iannis Caras. 1980. *Inventaire des manuscrits grecs d'Aristote et de ses commentateurs: Supplément.* Paris.
- Arnesano, Daniele. 2006. Un nuovo codice di Giovanni Santamaura ('Galatiniensis' 25). In *Miscellanea Bibliothecae Apostolicae Vaticanae XIII*, 7–25. Vatican.
- Ashburner, Walter. 1916. Studies in the Text of the *Nicomachean Ethics*. *JHS* 36: 45–64.
- . 1917. Studies in the Text of the *Nicomachean Ethics* (Continued). *JHS* 37: 31–55.
- . 1918. Studies in the Text of the *Nicomachean Ethics* (Continued). *JHS* 38: 74–87.
- Badawi, 'Abd al-Rahmān, ed. 1979. *al-Akhlāq; ta'liḥ Aristūṭālīs; tarjamat Ishāq ibn Hunayn*. Kuwait.
- Barber, Charles, and David Jenkins, eds. 2009. *Medieval Greek Commentaries on the "Nicomachean Ethics."* Leiden.
- Bekker, August Immanuel, ed. 1831. *Aristoteles Graece*. Berlin.
- Bobonich, Christopher. 2006. Aristotle's Ethical Treatises. In *The Blackwell Guide to Aristotle's "Nicomachean Ethics,"* ed. Richard Kraut, 12–36. Oxford.
- Brockmann, Christian. 1993. Zur Überlieferung der aristotelischen *Magna Moralia*. In *Symbolae Berolinenses: Für Dieter Harlfinger*, ed. Friederike Berger, 42–73. Amsterdam.
- Burnet, John. 1889. Notes on the *Nicomachean Ethics*. II. *CR* 3: 373.
- Busse, Adolf. 1883. Zur Textkritik der *Nikomachischen Ethik*. *Hermes* 18: 137–47.
- Bywater, Ingram. 1892. *Contributions to the Textual Criticism of Aristotle's "Nicomachean Ethics."* Oxford.
- , ed. 1894. *Aristotelis Ethica Nicomachea*. Oxford.
- Capocci, Valentinus. 1958. *Codices Barberiniani Graeci*. Vatican.
- Cook Wilson, John. 1895. Testimonia for the Text of Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics*, for the *Metaphysics* and for the *Posterior Analytics*. *CR* 9: 1–4.
- Dunlop, Douglas Morton. 1962. The *Nicomachean Ethics* in Arabic, Books I–VI. *Oriens* 15: 18–34.
- Gamillscheg, Ernst, and Dieter Harlfinger, eds. 1981. *Repertorium der griechischen Kopisten, 800–1600*. Vienna.
- Gauthier, René Antoine, ed. 1972–74. *Aristoteles Latinus 26: Ethica Nicomachea*. Leiden.
- Gauthier, René Antoine, and Jean Yves Jolif. 1970. *L'Éthique à Nicomaque: Introduction, traduction, et commentaire*. Louvain.
- Greenwood, Leonard Hugh Graham. 1905. Suggestions on the *Nicomachean Ethics*. *CR* 19: 14–18.
- Grenfell, Bernard Pyne, and Arthur Surridge Hunt. 1899. Note on Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics* VII.4. *CR* 13: 290–91.
- Harlfinger, Dieter, and Jürgen Wiesner. 1964. Die griechischen Handschriften des Aristoteles und seiner Kommentatoren. *Scriptorium* 18: 238–57.
- Heylbut, Gustav. 1886. Scholien zur *Nikomachischen Ethik*. *RhM* 41: 304–6.
- Jackson, Henry. 1876. On a MS of the *Nicomachean Ethics* (Cambridge University Library, Ii. V. 44). *JP* 6: 208–11.
- . 1879. *The Fifth Book of the "Nicomachean Ethics" of Aristotle*. Cambridge.
- Jacob, Andre. 2000. Carlo Strozzi et sa collection de manuscrits grecs: Contribution à l'étude du fonds Barberini de la Bibliothèque Vaticane. *Bollettino della Badia greca di Grottaferrata* 54: 53–77.

- Mercken, H. Paul F. 1990. The Greek Commentators on Aristotle's *Ethics*. In *Aristotle Transformed: The Ancient Commentators and Their Influence*, ed. Richard Sorabji, 407–44. London.
- Mioni, Elpidio. 1958. *Aristotelis Codices Graeci qui in Bibliothecis Venetis Adservantur*. Padua.
- Moraux, Paul, Dieter Harlfinger, Diether Reinsch, and Jürgen Wiesner. 1976. *Aristoteles Graecus: Die griechischen Manuskripte des Aristoteles*. Berlin.
- Mulvany, Charles Matthew. 1920. Some Vicissitudes of *Eth. Nic.* IV. 8, 6. *CR* 34: 51–54.
- Olschki, Leo, ed. 1989–. *Corpus dei Papiri Filosofici Greci e Latini*. Florence.
- Rackham, Harris. 1925a. *Aristotle: The "Nicomachean Ethics."* Cambridge, MA.
- . 1925b. Notes on the Text of the *Nicomachean Ethics*. *CR* 39: 157–59.
- . 1926. More Notes on the Text of the *Nicomachean Ethics*. *CR* 40: 189–92.
- . 1929. The Text of the *Nicomachean Ethics*. *CQ* 23: 37–38.
- Ramsauer, Gottfried, ed. 1878. *Aristotelis Ethica Nicomachea*. Leipzig.
- Rassow, Hermann. 1874. *Forschungen über die Nikomachische Ethik des Aristoteles*. Weimar.
- Richards, Herbert. 1891. Bywater's Edition of the *Nicomachean Ethics*. *CR* 5: 153–55.
- Schmidt, Ernst, and Manfred Ullmann. 2012. *Aristoteles in Fes: Zum Wert der arabischen Überlieferung der Nikomachischen Ethik für die Kritik des griechischen Textes*. Heidelberg.
- Solomon, J., and John Burnet. 1889. Notes on Aristotle's *Ethics*. *CR* 3: 196–99.
- Stewart, John Alexander. 1882. *The English Manuscripts of the "Nicomachean Ethics."* Oxford.
- Susemihl, Franz. 1878. Die Bekkerschen Handschriften der *Nikomachischen Ethik*. *Jahrbücher für classische Philologie* 24: 625–32.
- . 1879. *De recogniscendis ethicis Nicomacheis dissertatio II*. Greifswald.
- , ed. 1880a. *Aristotelis Ethica Nicomachea*. Leipzig.
- . 1880b. Fr. Susemihlii ad Editorem Epistula Critica. In *Aristotelis Ethica Nicomachea*, ed. G. Ramsauer, 730–40. Leipzig.
- . 1883. Die Textüberlieferung der *Nikomachischen Ethik*. *Jahrbücher für classische Philologie* 29: 615–21.
- . 1892. *Aristotelis Ethica Nicomachea: Recognovit brevique adnotatione critica instruxit I*. Bywater. *BPW* 12: 74–78.
- Susemihl, Franz, and Otto Apelt, eds. 1903. *Aristotelis Ethica Nicomachea*<sup>2</sup>. Leipzig.
- , eds. 1912. *Aristotelis Ethica Nicomachea*<sup>3</sup>. Leipzig.
- Trapp, Erich, Rainier Walther, et al., ed. 1976–96. *Prosopographisches Lexikon der Palaiologenzeit*. Vienna.
- Ullmann, Manfred. 2011–12. *Die Nikomachische Ethik des Aristoteles in arabischer Übersetzung*. Wiesbaden.
- Wartelle, André. 1963. *Inventaire des manuscrits grecs d'Aristote et de ses commentateurs*. Paris.

#### EGNATIUS AS DUX GREGIS (CATULLUS 37 AND 39)

In Poem 37, Catullus complains about the patrons of a “lusty inn” (*salax taberna*) who believe that they alone are entitled to fornicate with all women, and that every other man is a goat.

Salax taberna vosque contubernales,  
 a pilleatis nona fratribus pila,  
 solis putatis esse mentulas vobis,  
 solis licere, quidquid est puellarum,  
 confutuere et putare ceteros hircos?  
 an, continenter quod sedetis insulsi  
 centum an ducenti, non putatis ausurum  
 me una ducentos irumare sessores?