Studia graeco-arabica

Editorial Board

Mohammad Ali Amir Moezzi, École Pratique des Hautes Études, Paris

Carmela Baffioni, Istituto Universitario Orientale, Napoli

Sebastian Brock, Oriental Institute, Oxford

Charles Burnett, The Warburg Institute, London

Hans Daiber, Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität Frankfurt a. M.

Cristina D'Ancona, Università di Pisa

Thérèse-Anne Druart, The Catholic University of America, Washington

Gerhard Endress, Ruhr-Universität Bochum

Richard Goulet, Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, Paris

Steven Harvey, Bar-Ilan University, Jerusalem

Henri Hugonnard-Roche, École Pratique des Hautes Études, Paris

Remke Kruk, Universiteit Leiden

Concetta Luna, Scuola Normale Superiore, Pisa

Alain-Philippe Segonds (†)

Richard C. Taylor, Marquette University, Milwaukee (WI)

Staff

Elisa Coda, Cristina D'Ancona, Giulia Guidara, Issam Marjani, Cecilia Martini Bonadeo

Submissions

Submissions are invited in every area of the studies on the trasmission of philosophical and scientific texts from Classical Antiquity to the Middle Ages, Renaissance, and early modern times. Papers in English, French, German, Italian, and Spanish are published. Prospect authors are invited to check the *Guidelines* on the website of the journal, and to address their proposals to the Editor in chief.

Peer Review Criteria

Studia graeco-arabica follows a double-blind peer review process. Authors should avoid putting their names in headers or footers or refer to themselves in the body or notes of the article; the title and abstract alone should appear on the first page of the submitted article. All submitted articles are read by the editorial staff. Manuscripts judged to be of potential interest to our readership are sent for formal review to at least one reviewer. Studia graeco-arabica does not release referees' identities to authors or to other reviewers. The journal is committed to rapid editorial decisions.

Subscription orders

Information on subscription rates for the print edition of Volume 9 (2019), claims and customer service: redazione@pacinieditore.it

Web site: http://learningroads.cfs.unipi.it/sga

Service Provider: Università di Pisa, ICT - Servizi di Rete Ateneo

ISSN 2281-2687

ISSN 2239-012X (Online)

Registration at the law court of Pisa, 18/12, November 23, 2012.

Editor in chief Cristina D'Ancona (cristina.dancona@unipi.it)

Mailing address: Dipartimento di Civiltà e Forme del Sapere, via Pasquale Paoli 15, 56126 Pisa, Italia.

Italian Scientific Journals Ranking: A (ANVUR, Classe A)

Indexing and Abstracting; ERIH PLUS (SCH ESF); Index Islamicus (Brill Bibliographies); Scopus (Elsevier)



© Copyright 2019 by Industrie Grafiche Pacini Editore, Pisa.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the Publisher. The Publisher remains at the disposal of the rightholders, and is ready to make up for unintentional omissions. *Studia graeco-arabica* cannot be held responsible for the scientific opinions of the authors publishing in it.

Cover

Mašhad, Kitābḥāna-i Āsitān-i Quds-i Raḍawī 300, f. 1v Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, grec 1853, f. 186v

Table of Contents

Giulia Guidara The Celestial Bodies in Enn. II 9 [33] Implications of Plotinus' Criticism of Gnostic Astrology»	1
Concetta Luna Addenda et corrigenda <i>à l'édition de la</i> Théologie platonicienne <i>de Proclus</i> »	15
Tiziano Dorandi <i>Un manoscritto trascurato del I libro dell'</i> Anthologion <i>di Giovanni Stobeo:</i> Ambrosianus <i>A 183 sup. (76 Martini-Bassi)</i> »	47
Biancamaria Giommoni <i>Nota sulle fonti della</i> Risāla fī l-farq bayna l-rūḥ wa-l-nafs (Epistola sulla differenza tra lo pneuma e l'anima) <i>di Qusṭā ibn Lūqā</i> »	55
Sami Aydin The Remnant of a Questions and Answers Commentary on Aristotle's Categories in Syriac (Vat. Syr. 586)	69
Najib George Awad Dāwūd ibn Marwān al-Muqammaṣ on the Trinity: A Moment in Abbasid Jewish-Christian Kalām»	107
Matthias Perkams The Syro-Persian Reinvention of Aristotelianism: Paul the Persian's Treatise on the Scopes of Aristotle's Works between Sergius of Rēš'aynā, Alexandria, and Baghdad	129
Richard Sorabji The Cross-cultural Spread of Greek Philosophy (and Indian Moral Tales) to 6 th Century Persian and Syriac»	147
Andrea Pintimalli "L'espressione 'apoteosi' suona male alle orecchie dei musulmani" Al-Bīrūnī tra falsafa e comparazione religiosa»	165
Paul Hullmeine Al-Bīrūnī's Use of Philoponus for Arguing Against the Eternity of the World»	183
Cristina D'Ancona Philoponus, or "Yaḥyā al-naḥwī". An Overview»	203
Yehuda Halper Are there Second Intentions in De Interpretatione 16 a 3-8? The Hebrew Aristotelian Commentary Tradition in the 13 th -15 th Centuries	243

Tools for Research

Rüdiger Arnzen, Yury Arzhanov, Nicolás Bamballi, Slavomír Čéplö, Grigory Kessel The Quest for 'Falsehood', or a Survey of Tools	
or the Study of Greek-Syriac-Arabic Translations»	263
Reviews	281
Index of Manuscripts»	360
Index of Ancient and Medieval Names»	362
Index of Modern Names	365

The Remnant of a Questions and Answers Commentary on Aristotle's Categories in Syriac (Vat. Syr. 586)

Sami Aydin*

Abstract

Seven folios at the Vatican Library (*Vat. Syr.* 586) constitute the only remaining part of a manuscript from the 13th century that contained a large commentary on the *Categories* of Aristotle. The text features an exchange between a pupil and a master, where the pupil either puts a question on a certain matter regarding the *Categories* or asks for a clarification to a lemma that is cited from it, to which the master attempts to offer a basic explanation. The extant part of this commentary, which deals with Aristotle's concluding discussion on the category of quantity and his initial presentation of the relatives, with some noteworthy observations, is edited here for the first time from the partially mutilated folios with a translation and some annotations. The question of its date of composition, its possible author and some other relevant points are treated in the introduction.

Introduction

The text that is presented here constitutes the remnant of a commentary on Aristotle's *Categories*, which is now preserved at the Vatican Library (Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, *Vat. sir.* 586). It has remained unedited until now, but images of the folios that preserve it are accessible. The folios are briefly described by van Lantschoot in his catalogue of the Vatican Syriac manuscripts (nos. 460-631). The extant part of the manuscript is from the 13th century, written in the Syriac estrangela script and its material is parchment. All the 7 extant folios are unbound and measure 215 x 175 mm. They are written in single-column format and the pages have 31-36 lines. The beginning and the end of the manuscript are lost and the folios are partially mutilated at the top and bottom of the pages. A few letters of the initial words of the top lines are missing and at the bottom, there are lacunas covering anything from a few letters to whole words. The current order of the folios is wrong, the correct order being: 1, 5, 4, 3, 2, 6, 7. Because of the condition of the folios, it is not possible to supply any certain information about the provenance or scribe of the manuscript.

The extant part of this commentary covers Aristotle's *Categories* 6 a 17 - 7 a 4, that is, the last part of Aristotle's discussion on quantity and its properties in chapter 6 of the *Categories* and his

^{&#}x27;I wish here to express my gratitude to Daniel King (Cardiff University) and to the anonymous reviewers of *Studia graeco-arabica* for proofreading this contribution and suggesting important improvements to it.

¹ The manuscript Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, *Vat. sir.* 586 is available online at https://digi.vatlib.it/view/MSS Vat.sir.586.

² A. van Lantschoot, *Inventaire des manuscrits syriaques des fonds Vatican (490[460]-631). Barberini oriental et Neofiti*, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Città del Vaticano 1965, p. 113: "586. XIII° siècle, parch., mm. 215 x 175, ff. 7, ll. 35; *estrangelā*. Questions et réponses concernant les *Catégories* d'Aristote, mutilées du début et de la fin, ... (le texte au bas des pages est partiellement mutilé)".

that the extant part of this Syriac commentary consists of just a small portion of a much larger work, even though its aim appears to have been the delivery of brief explanations (cf. § 16). It seems to be extant in only these folios and the question of its author, or less likely its translator from Greek, can therefore not be determined with certainty. Its contents offer some hints towards an approximate date. Even though the format of the commentary is that of questions and answers, it is largely a lemmatized commentary. For the most part, the student ($\sim 10^{\circ} \text{La} \text{mid} \, \text{d} \, \text{a}$) starts saying "explain3" the passage" and then presents a lemma from the Categories, to which the master ($\sim 10^{\circ} \text{rabban}$ "our master") many times supplies just an elementary explanation. What is important here is that the quoted lemmas from the Categories are given in the Syriac translation of Jacob of Edessa (d. 708). Thus, this commentary could have appeared in Syriac at the earliest at the end of 7^{th} century. This is based on the time when Jacob produced his translation of the Categories, which according to Hugonnard-Roche dates from the beginning of his literary career, linked with his studies at the monastery school at Qenneshre.⁴

Another piece of evidence concerning the date of this commentary is found in the Syriac lexicon of Hasan bar Bahlul (fl. mid-10th century), who undoubtedly quotes two Greek words for 'bird' from this commentary (here §40). The two cited Greek words are \(\text{constant}\) is \(\text{constant}\) (\(\text{opu}\)\) \(\text{opu}\)\(\text

Not much is known about this Bar Serošway, but he was probably active during the second half of 9th century and is known to have compiled a Syriac lexicon, which is no longer extant. In the preface to his lexicon, Bar Bahlul writes: مستخم محمت معتصل, محمت معتصل 'and Ḥənānīšo' bar Serošway, bishop of Ḥirta,9

³ The different words used here are translated as follows: Δω 'explain'; iou 'elucidate'; λα interpret'; ωλω 'explicate'; κατα 'expound'; ion' 'set out/forth'; ωνω 'examine/expose'.

⁴ H. Hugonnard-Roche, "Jacques d'Édesse et sa réception d'Aristote", La logique d'Aristote du grec au syriaque. Études sur la transmission des textes de l'Organon et leur interprétation philosophique, Vrin, Paris 2004 (Textes et traditions, 9), pp. 39-55, here p. 39. English version: "Jacob of Edessa and the Reception of Aristotle", Jacob of Edessa and the Syriac Culture of His Day, ed. B. ter Haar Romeny, Brill, Leiden - Boston 2008, pp. 205-22, here p. 205.

⁵ Bar Bahlul, *Lexicon syriacum auctore Hassano bar Bahlule:* voces syriacas græcasque cum glossis syriacis et arabicis complectens e pluribus codicibus edidit et notulis instruxit R. Duval, Reipublicae Typographaeo, Paris 1888-1901, col. 93; cf. also *Thesaurus syriacus*, ed. R. Payne Smith, Clarendon, Oxford 1879-1901, coll. 99, and 2530.

⁶ Bar Bahlul, Lexicon syriacum, coll. 1473f. Duval; cf. also Thesaurus syriacus, col. 3019 Payne Smith.

⁷ L. van Rompay, "Henanisho' bar Seroshway", in S. P. Brock - A.M. Butts - G.A. Kiraz - L. van Rompay (eds.), Gorgias Encyclopedic Dictionary of the Syriac Heritage, with contributions by seventy-six scholars, Gorgias Press, Piscataway 2011, p. 195; on Bar Seroshway, see also S. Minov, "Bar Sarōšway on Melchizedek: Reception of Extra-Biblical Material in the East-Syrian Tradition of Scriptural Exegesis", in L. Di Tommaso - M. Henze - W. Adler (eds.), The Embroidered Bible. Studies in Biblical Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in Honour of Michael E. Stone, Brill, Leiden - Boston 2018 (Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha, 26), pp. 718-35, in part. pp. 720f.

⁸ In the index volume of his edition of Bar Bahlul's lexicon, Duval translates Bar Bahlul's preface and states that it seems that this should be مغلم (vol. 3 [1901], p. xi n. 7).

⁹ On this city, where Qiyore/Cyrus of Edessa (6th century) had founded a school, where some East-Syrian bishops

whose lexicon is very accurate and it completed/supplemented (that) of Hunayn the physician'. 10 And Abdisho bar Berikha (d. 1318), in his The Metrical Catalogue of Syriac Writers, has the following to report about him: Karaz maker ... aio (see). The to report about him: Karaz maker ... aio (see). questions about a passage/lemma, glossaries and interpretations. 11 In accompanying notes, Assemani cites an entry from the Book of Exercise by Elias of Anbar (fl. around 930)12 from Bar Serošway's now lost lexicon and the same entry (viz. اعدمة is quoted by Bar Bahlul (col. 1961) as well. And in a word list section of MS Vat. sir. 573 (fol. 160r) he is cited (عثمتانية) Bar Sərūšoy/Serushoy) in connection with the explanation of some units of measurement.¹³ Based on the philosophical nature of much of the material that Bar Bahlul borrowed from Bar Serošway, Hyvernat states that "the bishop of Hirta seems to have devoted much of his energy to the study of philosophy and logic". 14 The question is whether Bar Bahlul for the two Greek words for winged creatures cites Bar Serošway from his lexicon or from the present commentary, to whom it in that case should be attributed. When Bar Berikha mentions a work of his entitled with the words من منه منه و 'questions on a passage/lemma', he may perhaps be referring to this work and not to any biblical interpretation, as was thought by Assemani and accepted by some researchers, since in the present commentary a lemma from the Categories is named https://passage, 'lemma'. The entries in Bar Bahlul lexicon citing him show clearly that he was engaged with philosophical texts.

The very close wording in the discussion about birds in this Syriac commentary on the Categories of Aristotle and the entries in Bar Bahlul that are ascribed to Bar Serošway indicates clearly that, if the present commentary was not composed by Bar Serošway, it was at least available to him and cannot have been produced later than in 9th century. It is also possible that the passage about birds was indirectly available to Bar Serošway through the lost lexicon of Ḥunayn ibn Isḥāq or another source. Considering the fact that the cited passages from the Categories are presented in the Syriac translation of Jacob of Edessa and do not constitute an independent rendering, makes it reasonable to assume that we are concerned with a work composed in Syriac and not a translation from Greek. Thus, its terminus post quem of composition would be the second half of seventh century and the terminus ante quem the second half of ninth century.

The form of the commentary is a combination of the 'catechetical' or questions-and-answers and of the continuous or lemmatized commentary.¹⁵ The erotapocritic composition has predecessors

resided and whence Bar Serošway's near contemporary Hunayn ibn Ishāq (d. 873) originated, and whose lexicon he completed or supplemented, see H. Takahashi, "Hirta", in Gorgias Encyclopedic Dictionary (above, n. 7), pp. 198-9.

¹⁰ Bar Bahlul, *Lexicon syriacum*, 1901, vol. 1, p. 3.6-8 Duval. Duval's Latin translation of this passage: "Henanišo filius Serošwai, episcopus Ḥirtae, cujus lexicon maxime accuratum est atque opus Ḥonaini medici explevit"; see also p. xv

¹¹ Abdisho bar Berikha, Catalogum Ebedjesu Episcopi Sobensis, ed. G.S. Assemani, Bibliotheca Orientalis Clementino-Vaticana, 3.1: De Scriptoribus Syris Nestorianis, Rome 1725, pp. 3-362, here p. 261: "Ananjesus Episcopus Hirtae, cognomento Bar-Saru, edidit Quæstiones in Textum Scripturae, et Vocabularium cum Interpretationibus".

¹² On him, see A. Juckel, "Eliya of al-Anbār", Gorgias Encyclopedic Dictionary (above, n. 7), p. 142.

¹³ Reference to Bar Serošway in this manuscript is given by van Lantschoot, *Inventaire des manuscrits syriaques* (above, n. 2), p. 99.

¹⁴ H. Hyvernat, "An Ancient Syriac Lexicographer", The Catholic University Bulletin 8/1 (1902), pp. 58-74, quotation p. 63, see also p. 70.

¹⁵ A combination of the 2nd and 5th groups in Hadot's listing of various forms of commentaries, see I. Hadot, "Simplicius, In Cat., p. 1,3-3,17 Kalbfleisch. An Important Contribution to the History of the Ancient Commentary", Rheinisches Museum für Philologie 147 (2004), pp. 408-20, in part. pp. 411ff.

in Porphyry's short commentary by questions and answers on Aristotle's Categories and the dialogue-form commentary of Dexippus on the same book. Their form is ultimately inspired by the philosophical dialogue, which was also adopted for the interpretation of religious works, like Philo of Alexandria's Questions and Answers on Genesis and Exodus. 16 The purpose of the Syriac commentary in question is to clarify most of the passages in Aristotle's Categories in an elementary way and it might have been produced and used in an educational setting. The form of the composition and author's designation of the different parts of his commentary shows a clear similarity to how a lesson or a section of a textbook was divided by the late Neoplatonic commentators, first by Olympiodorus and then by Elias-David and Stephanus. As Praechter writes: "A lesson (πρᾶξις) is divided, insofar as the material allows, into two parts, a general discussion ($\theta \epsilon \omega \rho i \alpha$) and an explanation of the text (λέξις), of which the first provides an exegesis of a portion of text as regards its main content and its larger context, while the second provides a detailed exegesis focusing on individual sentences and words." The Syriac commentator too designates his more general discussion on the category of quantity (§11) τίοτ λ (< θεωρία) and the explanation of the individual passages or lemmas (§ 12 and § 16) Δα Δαω (< λέξις), which points towards an arrangement for an analogous educational context.

In its contents, the commentary exhibits a relationship to the exegesis of the Neoplatonist school of Ammonius Hermeiou (d. 517-526) in Alexandria, as will be shown in my annotations (esp. to § 17), but also to that of some later commentators, such as Olympiodorus and Elias (see annotations to §\$12-14). In the extant part of this partly catechetical and partly lemmatized commentary we find the incomplete answer of the master to the definition of contrariety as given by Aristotle at *Cat.* 6 a 17f. The exchange of the student with the master proceeds with the presentation of the other properties of the category of quantity (§\$ 2-11). The discussion moves on to the category of the relatives, where five preliminary questions connected to this category are treated at first (§\$ 12-14). Some nine species of the category of the relatives are then specified (§ 15) before the explanation of the individual lemmas. Relating to the category of the relatives, the statement of Protagoras that "everything is relative" (§ 17) is discussed and Plato's purported refutation of it is presented. Following from that, a definition of the relatives that is attributed to Plato is examined (§ 18). The questions and answers are then centred around the initial lemmas of Aristotle's discussion on relatives in the *Categories* (up to 7 a 4). The text contains some noteworthy observations.

Aristotle's treatise *Categories* became very influential and gave rise to many commentaries from the earliest time of the philosophical commentary tradition around first century BC and onwards.¹⁸

¹⁶ See Dillon's introduction to Dexippus, *On Aristotle's Categories*, Translated by J. Dillon, Cornell University Press, Ithaca, New York 1990, pp. 8f.; and also C. Zamagni, "Is the Question-and-Answer Literary Genre in Early Christian Literature a Homogeneous Group?", in M.-P. Bussières (ed.), *La littérature des questions et réponses dans l'Antiquité profane et chrétienne*, Brepols, Turnhout 2013 (Instrumenta Patristica et Mediaevalia, 64), pp. 241-68.

¹⁷ K. Praechter, "Die griechischen Aristoteleskommentare, Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca", Byzantinische Zeitschrift 18/2 (1909), pp. 516-38 (reprinted in Id., Kleine Schriften, ed. H. Dörrie, Olms, Hildesheim 1973, pp. 282-304). English trans.: "Review of the Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca", in R. Sorabji (ed.), Aristotle Transformed: The Ancient Commentators and Their Influence, Cornell University Press, Ithaca - New York 1990; Second Edition, Bloomsbury, London 2016, pp. 31-54, quotation p. 48; see also A.-J. Festugière, "Modes de composition des Commentaires de Proclus", Museum Helveticum 20 (1963), pp. 77-100, in part. p. 81. and L.G. Westerink, "Ein astrologisches Kolleg aus dem Jahre 564", Byzantinische Zeitschrift 64 (1971), pp. 6-21, in part. pp. 7f.

H.B. Gottschalk, "The Earliest Aristotelian Commentators", in Sorabji (ed.), Aristotle Transformed (above, n. 17), pp. 69-81 and R.W. Sharples, "Habent sua fata libelli: Aristotle's Categories in the First Century BC", Acta Antiqua Academiae Scientarum Hungaricae 48/1-2 (2008), pp. 273-87; see also S. Aydin, Sergius of Reshaina: In-

Some commentators attacked the notions expressed in it, while others defended it against those attacks and tried to prove the validity of its teachings. It was placed first in the ancient collection of Aristotelian writings, and Porphyry and most subsequent commentators considered that it should to be studied first by students of Aristotle's works. 19 The text of the Categories was popular in the Syriac tradition too and was translated at least three times into Syriac and was much commented on, as also indicated by the extant part of the present commentary.²⁰

There are not many new lexical items in the text and only two forms of the word § 36 and § 43 & 41 καραρα 'conversion', 'reciprocation' (equivalent to Greek ἀντιστροφή) are not found in the Syriac dictionaries or in other Syriac texts that I have consulted.

Editorial Principles

The edition is critical to some extent, where it has been possible to introduce some emendations particularly to the lemmas cited from the Categories in the Syriac translation of Jacob of Edessa, according to the edition of Georr [= J].²¹ However, at a few instances, the text of this commentary seems to give better readings than the edited text of Jacob's translation.²² The scribe of the commentary has sometimes been unable to distinguish where a cited passage begins and where the answer of the master follows, which I have stated and separated in my edition. When just a few letters are missing because of the mutilation of the folios, they have been marked by three dots in parenthesis (...) and when more words are missing, they have been marked by three lines (---). Additions found in angle brackets < >, but not notified in the critical apparatus are supplied by the editor ex coniectura. The supplying or deletion of səyāmē dots, i.e., the two dots that state the plural number in Syriac, are indicated in the critical apparatus for nouns, but not for verbs inflected in the feminine plural form. The two common abbreviations $\Delta \lambda$ for 'pupil' and a _ for אוֹם ב 'passage/lemma' are expanded throughout the text, but in the critical apparatus this has been indicated only at their first occurrence.

troduction to Aristotle and His Categories, Addressed to Philotheos. Syriac Text, with Introduction, Translation, and Commentary, Brill, Leiden - Boston 2016 (Aristoteles Semitico-Latinus, 24), pp. 70ff.

¹⁹ For the earliest commentary tradition of the Categories, see M.J. Griffin, Aristotle's Categories in the Early Roman Empire, Oxford U.P., Oxford 2015 and, for a brief introduction to the commentators of the later period, see L.G. Westerink, "The Alexandrian Commentators and the Introductions to Their Commentaries", in Sorabji (ed.), Aristotle Transformed (above, n. 17), pp. 325-48; M.J. Griffin, "Ammonius and the Alexandrian School", in A. Falcon (ed.), Brill's Companion to the Reception of Aristotle in Antiquity, Brill, Leiden - Boston 2016 (Brill's Companions to Classical Reception, 7), pp. 394-418; and Aydin, Sergius of Reshaina (above, n. 18), in part. Introduction, pp. 52-61, with the cited literature.

²⁰ For the Syriac translations of and commentaries on the *Categories*, see King's introduction to D. King, *The Earliest* Syriac Translation of Aristotle's Categories. Text, Translation, and Commentary, Brill, Leiden - Boston 2010 (Aristoteles Semitico-Latinus, 21), pp. 1-38.

²¹ [Jacob of Edessa], Les Catégories d'Aristote dans leurs versions syro-arabes. Édition de textes précédée d'une étude historique et critique et suivie d'un vocabulaire technique, ed. K. Georr. Préface de L. Massignon. Institut Français de Damas, Beyrouth 1948.

²² Reference has occasionally also been to the Syriac translation of the *Categories* by George, Bishop of the Arabs [= G]. Cf. [George Bishop of the Arabs], Le Categorie e gli Ermeneutici di Aristotele nella versione siriaca di Giorgio delle Nazioni, ed. G. Furlani, Bardi, Roma 1933 (Atti della Reale Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, Memorie della classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche. Ser. VI, Vol. V. Fasc. 1).

[مالمهند: مامك ب بدروه برابرية]

- 18 ... a acts then control of the co
- - 3) الملحنية: لحنه حدل ٥١، به «حصادنه» مخذ.
 - ناح: «معملاتا» بالمسلم وحلم المتابع ما عند منام منام الله والما ما المام الله والمام والم
- 4 و الملاحدي: wi و oiky. ديم مح، الأدب هذي هدي الله كن يموه، معن المراب المراب
- نے: حتی ترحمد ماریک کا تعلی المحدد کی اللہ دوں کے تحدد مہر المراب کی اللہ دوں کے اللہ دوں کی اللہ کا اللہ کہ وحدہ کی اللہ کہ دور ماریک کی اللہ دوں کی مہر کی اللہ دوں کی مہر بری اللہ کا مہر بری مہر اللہ کا دوں کی اللہ میں مہر بری اللہ کی دوں کی اللہ میں مہر اللہ کی دوں کی اللہ میں مہر اللہ کی دوں کی مہر اللہ کی مہر اللہ کی دوں کی مہر اللہ کی مہر اللہ کی دوں کی دوں

³ ما مدهنا العبير العب

¹⁴ كند cod., səyāmē supplevi ex J.270.17 ا نعر ك scripsi ex J.270.17 ا عند ا

¹⁵ איזייר cod., səyāmē delevi | איזייר cod., səyāmē supplevi ex J.270.18.

[Questions and Answers on Aristotle's Categories]

- §1 ... left, that the definition that the ancients have given: those things which are most distant from one another. But the ancients called contrariety the motion of opposition, like the motion of fire and water. For fire ascends upwards and water descends downwards. And since their motion is much distant from each other, that of fire and water, the ancients therefore defined contraries: those things which are most distant from one another (Cf. Cat. 6 a 17f.).
 - §2 PUPIL. Explain the passage: quantity is not supposed to admit of more and less (Cat. 6 a 19f.).²³

MASTER. He (i.e., Aristotle) says: it corresponds to the second property, that which is not found only in quantity and says that quantity does not admit of more and less.

§3 PUPIL. Why does he everywhere say "is supposed"?²⁴

MASTER. He puts forth "is supposed" always in all properties, instead of a solution, 25 and it is a custom of the ancients to make use of such an expression (λέξις).

§4 PUPIL. Elucidate the passage: as for example, a two-cubited is not more two-cubited than another. And neither concerning number, as for example, a three than a five is not something called number more a three than a five, nor a five (more) than a three (Cat. 6 a 20-22).²⁶

MASTER. When he wants to show all the species of quantity, that among them there is none which admits of more and less, he starts at first with number, as he did at the beginning of this speech on quantity, and means to say that a two-cubited – whether they are two or three or four – there is nothing in them which is called more number. Even if the number three is less than five, yet in being a number both are equal, in that the former is called a number and the latter (is called) a number.

§5 PUPIL. Interpret the passage: neither yet one (instance of) time is called more a time than any other (instance) of time, nor at all does that to be called more or less apply to any of the things that have been mentioned. Thus, quantity does not admit of a more or a less (Cat. 6 a 22-25).²⁷

MASTER. He says that neither a time than a time is called more time, nor one of the other species that have been mentioned, so that it is known from this that quantity does not admit of more and less.

²³ "A quantity does not seem to admit of a more and a less" cf. Aristotle's Categories and De Interpretatione, Translated with notes by J.L Ackrill, Oxford U.P., Oxford 1963.

 $^{^{24}}$ Corresponding to Greek δοκε $\tilde{\iota}$, which here could also be translated 'it is held'; as to this, see the explanation of Simplicii In Aristotelis Categorias commentarium, ed. C. Kalbfleisch, Reimer, Berlin 1907 (CAG VIII), p. 176.19-21 and R. Bolton, "Two Doctrines of Categories in Aristotle: Topics, Categories, and Metaphysics", in E. Feser (ed.), Aristotle on Method and Metaphysics, Palgrave Macmillan, London 2003 (Philosophers in Depth), pp. 68-101, in part. pp. 86-93 with n. 11.

²⁵ Fol. 1r13 seems to have 🛪 🚉, but a fitting meaning to this form is not found in Syriac lexicons and is probably used in the same sense as κίνε 'solution' (Gr. λύσις), that is, a fixed or accepted answer.

²⁶ "Four-foot for example: one thing is not more four-foot than another. Or take number: we do not speak of a three as more three than a five, nor of one three as more three than another three" (trans. Ackrill - cf. Aristotle Categories and De Interpretatione, translated with Notes by J.L. Ackrill, Clarendon Press, Oxford 1963 (Clarendon Aristotle Series).

²⁷ "Nor yet is one time called more a time than another. Nor is there a single one, among those we listed, as to which a more and a less is spoken of. Hence a quantity does not admit of a more and a less" (trans. Ackrill).

90 الملحنية: عاد ع oilda. د حليله بر ، المناهم المحدد في مناهم و مناهم عدد مناهم عدد

7) الملحند، فعم عوالم، على سنه مع ملم محنة المهممة والمعامدة والمعامدة والمعامدة المعامدة ال

نے: لحلص میں ہنتی تحصیلا کے حک تبصیف کینی میں تعدیلا کی المحدید ک

9 אלבינא: ניסו ב oikא. מס מבסא גין אפ בל מלין אינינולא גאאאפיני. בל ענא פנמן שסילא בול מלא שמילא אפינים.

i <ב>: ובל עו מעמם בשחה מולא בחא מלאמיו.

10 ﴿ الْكُلِمِيْةِ مِنْ اللهُ مَا اللهُ مَنْ وَ اللهُ مَنْ اللهُ اللهُ

انے: اعلی کے کہ کا میں دھیں کی ان انے ملے المعد کی بطابہ کے المحد کی المحد کی المحد کی المحد کی المحد کی المحد کی المحدد کی ا

1 אביל בא הוא scripsi ex J.270.24 || 2 אביב ביי באביא scripsi ex J.270.25 || 3 ביי supplevi | אביב מביי מודים אווים מבול מו מודים אווים אווים

30

§ 6 PUPIL. Explicate the passage: it is chiefly <a property> of quantity to be said to be equal and unequal (*Cat.* 6 a 26f.).²⁸

<MASTER.> As he did in the speech on substance <and first> put forth the properties that are not distinctive and then the distinctive property, so did he also here and said that it is a distinctive property of quantity to be said to be equal and unequal.

§ 7 PUPIL. Expound the passage: each of these quantities that have been said is said to be equal and unequal (*Cat.* 6 a 27f.).²⁹

MASTER. He wanted to list all the species of quantity one by one and to show that all of them are said to be equal and unequal, and that this is a distinctive property of quantity. And he says that all the mentioned quantities, that is, the seven species of quantity, each of them is said to be equal and unequal.

§ 8 PUPIL. Interpret the passage: as for example, a body is said to be equal and unequal (Cat. 6 a 28).30

MASTER. He means to say that there is a body which is equal with a body, not only to length and breadth, but also to thickness, and there is one which is unequal, in that the former is two cubits only and the latter three. So is also number, for the day of June (Hozīrān) is not equal with the day of December-January ($K\bar{a}n\bar{u}n$), but the day of the 19th March ($\bar{A}d\bar{a}r$) is equal <with> the night of the 19th September (*Ēlūl*).

§ 9 PUPIL. Elucidate the passage: so also with these other things that have been mentioned, we say each of them to be equal and unequal (Cat. 6 a 29f.).³¹

MASTER. That each of them is said to be equal and unequal.

§ 10 PUPIL. Set out the passage: but of the rest, that which is not quantity, is hardly³² supposed to be said to be equal and unequal (Cat. 6 a 31f.).³³

MASTER. That all those which are not quantity, that is, the other nine (categories), are hardly said to be equal and unequal, and because equal and unequal pertain to the species of relatives, he therefore said "hardly".

🐧 11 PUPIL. Set out the passage: as for example, a condition (διάθεσις) is hardly said to be equal and unequal, but <rather> similar; and whiteness too is hardly said to be equal and unequal, <but similar>. Thus, it would chiefly be a property of quantity to be said to be equal and unequal (Cat. 6 a 32-35).³⁴

²⁸ "Most distinctive of a quantity is its being called both equal and unequal" (trans. Ackrill).

²⁹ "For each of the quantities we spoke of is called both equal and unequal" (trans. Ackrill).

³⁰ "For example, a body is called both equal and unequal" (trans. Ackrill).

³¹ "so also with the others we spoke of, each is called both equal and unequal" (trans. Ackrill).

³² The Syriac , Δ , literary 'not much', is here rendering the Greek οὐ πάνυ.

^{33 &}quot;But anything else – whatever is not a quantity – is certainly not, it would seem, called equal and unequal" (trans. Ackrill).

³⁴ "For example, a condition is certainly not called equal and unequal, but, rather, similar; and white is certainly not equal and unequal, but similar. Thus most distinctive of a quantity would be its being called both equal and unequal" (trans. Ackrill).

15

11 و المورد ملك مداري من المداري المداري و المداري ال

13 و الملحدين: ١٥ ملم مدم علم ١٤

ناح: معلم مدهم مدهم مدهم مناهم مناهم المام الما المه مدر مهممناع»، مومعم مدر ممه مل مدر مدر مدم با בעידאה וום ומאאבי בליטוא ולא בוע אם ביל אלו ביו איניאים ווים ומאאבי Khaunk gad Kkrão Tri Mrk wit isk conflorik baki به در کا در کا در المان میکه المان میدم مسامه المان الارم بهديدي صبل عجد ١٥٠٨ مد حد معه لادريها مهمسده دزم سانعمه ادم دهه محز. عب دله سه م دولدله دمه مية عن دام ەنعەلم خىش مەن دے خىمن مولى ، بى دەنى ھەن ، كى بخالمىلى ھالى 25 المه حدم مه لم. حلل اعلمام احداد منه ومعدم. عدمه المعدان. الماله حدم ١٠٤١ مالعت كم حدام المامة من حديم. الملعلم المامة <١٠٥٥ على حلا من الله على الله على على الله على على الله 5v סל מה של ממש לשו אל יהי לה, לה יהי לבשול א ממש ממש > cal אויים אל משל א ממש אמש > cal איים אל א משל א משל א لم. وعلى منه مود منه ووعدم. دمر دمرة ما الما حدم درسور وسوء حر اخدد اسعد المحاب المرام كالم المرامك المحاب المعرب المحاب المحاب

⁴ במבז, מבא scripsi et səyāmē supplevi] במבז, באר וו ארבים, scripsi | 28 מבל א מבים, אר מבים באר וו ארבים, באר וו אר מבים באר וו ארבים, בארבים, באר וו ארבים, באר וו ארבים, בארבים, ב

MASTER. He brings forward evidence from the species of quality: the condition (διάθεσις), that is 'instability', that it is hardly said to be equal and unequal, likewise whiteness too, being a species of quality, is hardly said to be equal and unequal. But remember also this: in that they hardly appear to be equal with each other, and he means to say that because of this I said: "it is a distinctive property of quantity", to be equal and unequal (cf. Cat. 6 a 34f). And similar and dissimilar is a distinctive property of quality (cf. Cat. 11 a 15-19). One ought to know that these two properties, that of quantity being equal and unequal and that of quality being similar and dissimilar, pertain to the species of relatives, as for example, the equal is equal to what is equal to it and the similar is similar to what is similar to it. Here ends the discussion (θεωρία) on quantity.

§ 12 The speech is now concerned with relatives. Passage: relatives and so on (cf. Cat. 6 a 36ff.). PUPIL. If there is anything that needs to be said before the explanation of the text (*lexis*), say it!

MASTER. One ought to know that the commentators put forth five main points (κεφάλαια) before they comment on the speech about the relatives.

§ 13 PUPIL. Which are these?

MASTER. The first main point is about what Aristotle said: "relatives are said" (cf. Cat. 6 a 36), and there is a certain dispute concerning this. For Aristotle spoke of each of all the categories in the singular, but he spoke of the category of relatives in the plural. Some people are puzzled about whether the category of relatives should be said in the singular or in the plural. We say that even if Aristotle spoke of it as about many, he said this regarding relation, because the category of relatives has relation and relation signifies many. He therefore spoke of it in the plural. However, it should be spoken of in the singular, so that confusion does not occur in the categories and they appear to be more than ten. The second main point is this: whether the relatives are learned or not. Because everything that is learned possesses an uncertainty until it is verified, one ought to know that in the way the (other) nine categories are learned, so are also the relatives not perceived without learning, even if they are rooted in nature. The third (main point): whether they have independent existence or not. There is <also> a dispute concerning this, in that some people have said that some of the relatives are of (...) and some of them (...). The fourth (main point): whether they would be a genus or not. There is also a dispute concerning this, in that some of the species of relatives pertain to quantity, some of them to quality, and some of them to doing and being-affected. And we say that the category of relatives is a most generic genus, properly, in that it is predicated (κατηγορεῖσθαι) of many things that differ in species; Riving case, 1. of a serving contains and serving cased the case of the cased and cased as a cased and a cased and a cased and a cased and a cased to case and a cased to cased the cased the cased and cased as a ca

14 & Merin: 41 / 20 00, incip. 1-7 con cours reffere brunks and nice situated and only 1104 con on to toly 1104 con on on one results.

نو: هعنه لهته حلل مهند خلل سته من معتصله حلل العملات المحلمة المحلمة

15 ללבינה: בכא אני אניא ולהל כנוב.

ic: אושא ולטה מות: מנחס בן ומנטהא מהנשבים. אבוא וונעמא וונעמא אוהסת, אועאר מוברא. ספרבא ושרבא ושרבא. סודאי מלטת, שרבא. סודאי מלטת, שרבא. סודאי מוברא ושרבא ושרבא ושרבא וושרבא אוברא מובאו מובאו מובאו מלטת מובאו מלטת מובאו מובאו ממנחס בן או ומנטהא שבילא ממונים בן או ממנחס אבן או ממנחס בן או וונבא ממולא. ממנחס בן אין או ווידי ממולא. ממנחס בן אין אוא ממנחס בן אוא. אבוא ממולא. ממנחס בן אוא. אבוא אבוא אואסת, מנואא אואסת, מנואא. ממנחס בן באוא ממנחא. אבוא וממרא אבן אואסת בן מונאא אואסת, בן מונאא. ממנחס בן מאוא אואסת, בן ממנחס בן מנואא. אבן אואסת בן באואסת בן ממנחס בן מנואא אואסת, בן ממנחס בן מונאא אואסת, בן ממנחס בן בא בן אואסת אואסת בן באואסת בו באואסת בו באואסת בו באואסת בן באואסת בן באואסת בו באואסת בו

16 אלבינה: אל מסב מות אעונה ווגם וומאמי מות פסשמא ולבששם.16 אל אלא לא מאפשמנא מס.

⁷ べいか (ut videtur) || 8 べんらい scripsi] べれらい || 13 べいま べっ べいま いっ scripsi et səyāmē supplevi] べっま べっ べいま いっ || 14 スカーカイ scripsi] スカーカイ || 15 大いこと cod., səyāmē delevi || 16 ベモスト cod., səyāmē supplevi || 16-17 べわいいん - のよっ scripsi] べわいいん かわいっこ かっかい なんしん

and it is not at all contradictory that some species (that) appear in one category (appear also) in other categories in varying ways. And the fifth (main point) is the one that he said regarding order $(\tau \alpha \xi \iota \zeta)$, as there is a dispute about the relatives in the enumeration of the categories: that Aristotle in the introduction (προούμιον) of his book placed quality before the relatives (Cat. 1 b 26). Regarding this (point) we will talk later, because we will begin our speech with this main point, which is the last one, so that the beginning of our speech follows on the end of the main points.

§ 14 PUPIL. Interpret what you (just) said! Why did Aristotle place quality before the relatives in the enumeration of the categories and here took and placed the relatives before quality?

MASTER. He did that because of four reasons. One and the first: because he at the end of the speech on quantity ended up with equals and unequals, which are the species of the relatives. And since he at the end of his speech mentioned the species of the relatives, he wants to place (next) the category of those species. The second (reason): since the species of quantity and quality are found in the relatives, he wants to place the category of relatives between quantity and quality. The third (reason): since the relatives are included in all categories, he wants to honour a category like this, which is more generic, and place it <before> quality. And the fourth (reason): since most of the species (...) are not <of the relatives>, for knowledge (---), these (...) the species of quality, the category of the relatives contains them.

§ 15 PUPIL. How many are the species of relatives?

MASTER. The species of relatives: some are taken from similarity, as the friend of his friend is a friend, the neighbour of his neighbour is a neighbour and the like. Some are taken from dissimilarity, as double and half, and large and small. Some from participation (?),35 as knowledge and knowable. Some from position, as right and left. Some from nature, as father and son. Some from chance, as slave and master. Some from possession, as possession is the possession of a possessor. Some from paronymy (παρόνυμα), as standing and sitting. Some from weakness, as what we cannot see, cannot be visible to us.

§ 16 PUPIL. Is there anything else that needs to be said before the explanation of the text (λέξις)?

MASTER. There is, but it cannot be said in brief.

³⁵ See annotation to §15.

יבן: מוא המו השומה ומונדים ומערט במ לשלאים אולו הבים: בים המשלבש ופלף אמלהם, מוא מנוסבא. אמי ביו מבוא. «להל מות ויץ מש במסת ייר בא ישים משל בשם בשל בשם איר זו לאם בש באשהמא פללם במאאמן איי וושהוב ולי בביוא איקישל של ורייף מועל בועלי 20 אמיייע אלא בי בייייע אייי ביאאבי בייייע איייער אראבי בייייע איייער איייער אראבי איייער אראבי איייער אראבי איייער אראבי מואה מיי ורט ברומו ביוף ביוף באונים של אלא אב באייואי בלבוע איי ובל מרים מיי ומס אבות אלם מול אל אעולא מי בשמשמי ים, וים ואפוסי "אם אלם וישים וישים אלם וישים אלם וישים אלם וישים אלם וישים من الله فر كيمسلم، مامه فر مودها، والمو فر حلمسلم، من المرادة و و المرادة المرادة و و المرادة و ואמים בשנואא משעון. ואלום וכו אולום אולום אבלים בפלים בשנואא משניים ומאר אביא ומאר אולום אולום בא ואלום אולום בא וואלום אולום בא אולום אול האמוש וכליד ובורא ביו בא באיו ביו בא באווא באיו ביו ביו באיז ביו באיז ביו ביו בא באיז ביו ביו באיז ביו ביו ביו Li ethous south caniza. olar noncha. ocah alkuta. arly la יש ליים שיא שביא איבין ביי ובל ולא מפט וליים אים משא ביי לה מובת. לא מחם ביו ובל ומלאמו ואשוש בן ולה מוב אמחח, בל ובל אחם ואש מות ומאאמו ואשונא בס משם ושא עיי ביי בי הו אירו «ها المرده المرد المرده المرده المرده المرده المرده المرده المرده المرده المرد المرد المرده المرد المرده المرده المرده المرده المرده المرده المرده المرده المرده ا 3r Ka Kirk Ka Kei K<10> | <... >, on duk Kir Kir Ka Kir Ka ou > duk i Lts. wifix Li <0> coics: Led Los iss. cr. fe uno ha ruboon, et ur. عن عاما حاماه المامية المام حته المام ا לה בינא. כינה לה בל וכלא כין <ו>אמינא כי להול כינה לה בל וכלא כינה להול כינה לול כ

¹³ אנת iter., correxi ex J.271.13 || 14 באראביי supplevi ex J.271.13f. || 20 באראביי cod., səyāmē suppl. || 21 אייה scripsi באראביי || 25 alterum היה אמלס scripsi היה מלס.

§ 17 PUPIL. Tell me what Protagoras said, that everything is relative!

MASTER. He states evidently that honey is sweet and bitter. It is sweet to those whose sense of taste is sound, but bitter to those who have the sickness of jaundice.³⁶ Therefore, whatever someone says is true. If he says honey is sweet, it is true, and if he says it is bitter, it is true. Again, if one says about fire, that it is burning or nonburning, it is true. It burns all matters, but is nonburning of salamander. If the salamander enters fire, it extinguishes it. Again, a long pole, that is a long stick, when it is thrown into water, if someone says it is broken, it is true, in that it appears as broken, but if he says it is not broken, it is true, in that as truth is, it is actually not broken. Concerning this Plato said: "O Protagoras, as you have said, whatever someone says is true and you said the truth. And I say about you, that you have spoken falsely and since whatever someone says is true, it has appeared that you are a liar, (...) I have spoken the truth".

§ 18 PUPIL. Interpret now the passage: relatives are those which are like this: <all those things which are said to be what they are of other things>, or howsoever differently in relation to something else. (*Cat.* 6 a 36f.).³⁷

MASTER. This is the definition of the ancients by which they defined the category of relatives and, as it is handed down, this is Plato's definition. For he says in this way: "Relatives are those which are said like this: all those things of what they are". And Plato added to this definition "are said", to signify that the relatives do not exist naturally, but (rather) relationally, that is, it is said and they are said by the sharing of each other's natures. Because of the relation they have and not in that they are. That which he said "they are of other things" means this: they are not solely known by themselves, but also by another thing. For everything that pertains to relatives, its referring is towards another thing. That which they said: "or howsoever differently" means that they do not refer only to one grammatical case $(\pi\tau\tilde{\omega}\sigma\iota_{S})$, but to three, that is to the genitive, to the dative, and to the accusative. When we say: 'a father is the father of a son', we make use of the genitive case. When we say: 'the knowable is knowable by knowledge', we make use of the accusative case. The (letter) dālad (i.e. d'of) signifies the genitive case, the (letter) lāmad (i.e. l'to') dative, and the (letter) bēt (i.e. b 'by') accusative. Some criticize this definition in this way: they say everything that does not convert straightforwardly³⁸ is not a relative. Not everything that is said of another thing, pertains to the relatives, because there is something that is said of another thing, but does not convert. For head, feet, hands, eyes are said of animal, but they do not convert. Everything that has eyes is animal, but there are animals which have neither head nor hands nor feet. For crab and scorpion do not have a head, even though each of them is an animal. And snake and fish have neither hands nor feet. Again, mole does not have eyes. Thus, not everything that is said of another thing, pertains to the relatives.

³⁶ The Syriac אבים היים אביר 'having the sickness jaundice', corresponds to the Greek ἐκτερίαν as also found in Ammon., In Cat., p. 67.2 Busse; Philop., In Cat., p. 104.3f. Busse; Olymp., In Cat., p. 98.25 Busse; and Elias, In Cat., p. 202.7, p. 204.7 Busse.

³⁷ "We call relatives all such things as are said to be just what they are, of or than other things, or in some other way in relation to something else" (trans. Ackrill).

³⁸ This is the basic meaning of the Syriac adverb אוֹב ארשל, but it is also possible that it should be translated according to its rare meaning 'in the nominative case', M. Sokoloff, A Syriac Lexicon. A Translation from the Latin, Correction, Expansion, and Update of C. Brockelmann's Lexicon Syriacum, Eisenbrauns, Pennsylvania State 2009, p. 1668. It was however just stated that the relatives are expressed by three cases.

i<=>: מ משוח <c>> אושה ולחל מות לוכא סלומוץ שאת מומעל. <o>> מוא מאמל וומה או אל מחו או במללא <i>> בל ממשלא. מאא אל מחו אל מה אל מה אל מה מולי וומה אל מולי ווב. מן אל מולי ווב. מן אל מולי ווב. מן אל מולי ווב. מן מולי ווב. מולי ווב. מן מולי ווב. מולי ווב. מן מולי ווב. מן מולי ווב. מן מולי ווב. מולי

ובן: אמי ואפ אבא ומות מלאמי אבר מנו ון ופלצא.

10 אל אליבידא: ופסי ביסיואא. פיס מבסא זיך אב בלמיך איניעאא 10 אליבידא: ופסי ביסיואא. פיס מבסא זיך אב בלמיך איניעאאי ווי

ים: אמי האב בלמץ אשינעלא מבמל. מני הץ ישלא הישלא. משברא האם הומלא למס הומלא למס הומלא למס המלא הומלא למ המלא. מבלמץ אולץ הלא מלאבמה למס .. מן מלח במולא הומלא מומל.

22 אל המיא: מכל היסואא. אישישים ויא אה מלא וואא מכן בא מלא 12 אול מביע.

نے: ہخن دہم ملے ہستسلام دعلاء ہما لحمحن مصلا ہما جا دے۔ ملے دلملا حدم

24 אלבינא: מפשם מפשם לאלש השה יוה או המהים הניהום.

30

² אבאת possis במתן possis במתן ex J.271.16, sed vd. G.22.9 | 11 בלה מילא scripsi ex JG] במתל וו פון -20 בינ בא המער און בער איי באראי. מונאה אל בלחק מילא המער איי ביני באראי. מונאה אל בלחק מילא המילא המער איי ביני מילא ביני מילא ברון מ

§ 19 PUPIL. Elucidate the passage: as for example, larger is said of this which is what it is of another thing, for it is larger than something (Cat. 6 a 37-39).³⁹

MASTER. When he starts with the species of relatives, he at first puts forth the large and small, and that is justly done, because most of them were mentioned in the speech about quantity. He means to say that the larger is said to be larger than another thing, that is, than the one that is smaller than it. And the small is said to be smaller than the large.

§ 20 PUPIL. Expound the passage: also double is said of another thing, this which is what it is, is said double of something (Cat. 6 a 39-6b1).⁴⁰

MASTER. He means to say that also 'double' is said to be double of something, that is, of half.

§ 21 PUPIL. Set out the passage: similarly are also all other such things (Cat. 6 b 1f.).⁴¹

MASTER. He means to say that also other things are in this way, that is, the friend of a friend, the neighbour of a neighbour, what is similar is similar to what is similar to it, and all these which he does not mention, pertain to the category of relatives.

§ 22 PUPIL. Explain the passage: those which are suchlike too, pertain to relatives (Cat. 6 b 2).⁴²

MASTER. He means to say that also those other things, which I am about to tell, pertain in this way to relatives.

💲 23 PUPIL. Explain the passage: as for example, state (ἔξις), condition (διάθεσις), perception, knowledge, position. For all these that have been mentioned, what each one of them is is spoken of as being of something else or being in relation to another thing (Cat. 6 b 2-4).⁴³

MASTER. He listed the species of the category of relatives when he says: state (ἕξις), that is possession, is said of a possessor. Condition (διάθεσις), that is instability or a separable accident, is said of somebody. Perception too (is said) < perception of the perceivable > and knowledge (is said) knowledge of the knowable. The position is said of a substrate. All these species that I have listed are said in <this way> and they refer to others, for each of them is said of something. State (is said) of the possessor; condition (is said) of the one who does not possess; perception (is said) of the perceivable; knowledge (is said) of the knowable; positions (are said) of the substrate; and other things too in this way.

§ 24 PUPIL. Expound well what you have listed in order that they will become elucidated.

<MASTER.> And he says that all those which I have not mentioned are too like those that I have recounted.

³⁹ "For example, what is larger is called what it is than something else (it is called larger than something)"(trans. Ackrill). The wording of this passage is different from that of Jacob of Edessa (J.271.17f.).

⁴⁰ "and what is double is called what it is of something else (it is called double of something)" (trans. Ackrill).

⁴¹ "similarly with all other such cases" (trans. Ackrill).

⁴² "The following, too, and their like, are among relatives" (trans. Ackrill).

⁴³ "State, condition, perception, knowledge, position. For each of these is called what it is (and not something different) of something else" (trans. Ackrill).

ים: איץ השבי בשהיא. השת למנהמא המנגא: האםב כמיה ליכא הלובהיא: מביא שבי אב משא האבי. הלוא יכא הובהיא ממאאמי יכא. האופ, לה, האבי בל אבצא. האמבית לה, הבביה מכץ. מנה הן המה הגמא להם המא לה המא. האיץ ישת בשיםמא אמי הבלהן מנון הלהמ מבת 15 מבהמ ממאמי.

27 المراجع: عدد عرونها المراجع المراع

828 אלבינה: ומסו ב סוואה. <מֹר,> ובי ישראה ומסב אם ונוסב אל אל אלבינה ומסל בי מונה אה מונה את מונה אה מונה את מונה אה מונה אה מונה אה מונה אה מונה אה מונה אה מונה את מונה את מונה אה מונה אה מונה את מונה את

ic: noting, the order order of hand and and the color of the color of

1 מהה scripsi ex J.272.4] מה || 2 מביבה אמל supplevi ex J.272.5 || 18 prius בים cod., səyāmē supplevi || 23 הה add. ex J.272.10 || 25 מביבה scripsi ex J.272.12 || באהמביב בים מביבה scripsi במלחמבים || 27 מביבה scripsi במלחמבים || 28 מביבה scripsi במלחמבים || 28 מביבה scripsi במלחמבים scripsi || 30 מלחמבים scripsi || 30 מלחמבים scripsi || 30 מלחמבים scripsi || 30 מביבה scripsi || 30

25

§ 25 PUPIL. Interpret the passage: relatives are all those things which are said to be what they are of another thing, or howsoever differently <in relation to something else> (Cat. 6 b 6-8).⁴⁴

MASTER. He stated the same definition again in order that his speech would be clear. He says: "relatives are all those things which are said to be what they are of another thing, or in relation to something else howsoever differently". We have given its explanation above and since he was a friend of brevity, he did not want to list all the species of relatives, but he said that all relatives are those which are said of another thing howsoever, that is, they are said by means of variation of grammatical case.

§ 26 PUPIL. Expound the passage: as for example, a mountain is called 'large' in relation to another mountain, for a mountain is called 'large' in relation to something; and what is similar is said to be similar to something; and the others of this kind too are in the same way said in relation to something (*Cat.* 6 b 8-11).⁴⁵

MASTER. As he did at the beginning, by putting forth the definition of the ancients and letting follow on it the large and small, so did he also now and said that a large mountain is said to be 'larger' than a small one and he digressed from what he said about double and mentioned that which is pertinent to (the point) there, that is, what is similar is similar to what is similar to it; and as a friend of brevity, he states that all relatives are said in the same way.

§ 27 PUPIL. Explicate the passage: lying, standing, and sitting too are positions and position pertains to relatives (Cat. 6 b 11f.).46

MASTER. He means to say that standing, sitting, and lying are three species of the substrate. Aristotle <counts> them in the species of relatives and he means to say that position is said position of a substrate. And standing (is said) of the one who stands, sitting (is said) <of the one who sits, and lying (is said) of the one> who lies. Thus, position too is said to pertain to relatives.

§ 28 PUPIL. Set out the passage: that to lie, <to sit> or to stand, are themselves not positions, (but) they are paronymously (παρονύμως), namely nominally (men šəmāhā īt), said of the aforesaid positions. (Cat. 6 b 12-14).47

MASTER. He means to say that to lie, to sit, and to stand are not positions, but are said paronymously (men šəmāhā'īt), that is, from position, and therefore they do not pertain to relatives, in that all those said paronymously, even if (one of them) pertains to whichever category, yet it passes on to another category by the change of grammatical case. As place, pertaining to quantity, when the letter bēt (i.e. b-) has been added to it, that is the accusative case, and is said 'in place', then it appears in the category of where. That to lie is derived from lying, that to sit from sitting, that to stand from standing. Thus, these are (said) paronymously.

⁴⁴ "All things then are relative which are called just what they are, of or than something else – or in some other way in relation to something else" (trans. Ackrill).

⁴⁵ "Thus a mountain is called large in relation to something else (the mountain is called large in relation to something); and what is similar is called similar to something; and the others of this kind are in the same way spoken of in relation to something" (trans. Ackrill).

⁴⁶ "Lying, standing, and sitting are particular positions; position is a relative" (trans. Ackrill).

⁴⁷ "To-be-lying, to-be-standing, or to-be-sitting are themselves not positions, but they get their names paronymously from the aforesaid positions" (trans. Ackrill).

29 الملحديم: الما يع عورة.

. אמלז האט אדים ושוא הושא הושא הוא מומ.

نو: محن دراح حمد در المسلم حمد حمد المسلم مدر المسلم الله هدر المسلم الله هدر المسلم المسلم

§ 29 PUPIL. Interpret well!

MASTER. The philosopher, from having divided the species of relatives, came to define it, as a typical rule. And since the category of relatives is a most generic genus and there is no genus above a most generic genus, neither does it have substantial differences, he defines it by its property, in that property substitutes for definition. For wherever a definition cannot be obtained, which is compounded of genus and substantial differences, any entity whatsoever is defined by its property. And since the category of relatives has non-distinctive and distinctive properties, he first mentioned the non-distinctive ones and then taught about the distinctive properties.

§ 30 PUPIL. Tell me what are the distinctive properties of relatives.

MASTER. Since the relatives are included in all categories, he brings forth evidence from other categories, those which are found in relatives: substance, quantity, quality and the rest. When he takes evidence from them to the category of relatives, he teaches about them in the way they are found <in those> categories. For whenever he brings forth something in the category of relatives from substance and quantity, in which contrariety is not found and which do not admit of more and less, he does not say that they have contrariety and do not admit of more and less.

§ 31 PUPIL. Elucidate the passage: there is also contrariety in relatives, as for example, vice is contrary to virtue, each of them pertaining to relatives, and knowledge to ignorance (Cat. 6 b 15-17).⁴⁸

MASTER. He means to say that sometimes when I treat the species of quality (at the same time I do treat) the relatives. He says that, since contrariety is found in the category of relatives, vice is contrary to virtue and knowledge to ignorance, and these pertain to quality. However, because virtue is said of the virtuous, knowledge of the knowable, and ignorance of the ignorant and they pertain to relatives on account of (their) relation. As pertaining to the category of quality, contrariety is found in them here too. One ought to know that this is not a distinctive property of relatives.

§ 32 PUPIL. Examine the passage: but contrariety is not found in all relatives, for there is no contrary to double, nor to treble or to anything like that (*Cat.* 6 b 17-19).⁴⁹

MASTER. He refers to those which enter the category of relatives from quantity, and since there is no contrariety in quantity, nor is there contrariety in those which are derived from it into the relatives. For there is no contrary to ten, which is the double of five, and to fifteen, which is the treble of five, nor to all of those things from (any) category, which are said of the category of relatives.

⁴⁸ "There is contrariety in relatives, e.g. virtue is contrary to vice (and each of them is relative), and knowledge to ignorance"(trans. Ackrill).

⁴⁹ "But there is not a contrary to every relative; there is no contrary to what is double or treble or anything like that" (trans. Ackrill).

10

33 אלגעוא: בען בסואא. משאכן זין אפ הי, ואיואיא מבביואיא מבביואיא מבין אול מוק.

نے: کھن تھھدنے ھی بہت تھمدنے ملے تلمہ ھتر طفاعہ محد اللہ مدر اللہ

36 < دلالحدید:> هدس و oik که و حلمی دی های دله لا مدیر و له های دهدی حلایم و در که در که و در که در که و که و حلایم و که در ک

§ 33 PUPIL. Examine the passage: relatives are as well supposed to admit of more and less (Cat. 6 b 20f.).50

MASTER. He means to say that many people believe that relatives admit of more and less, but this is not true regarding those which are <truly?> relatives, but as (...) those which are derived from <quality> into this category, more and less is said of them.⁵¹

§ 34 < PUPIL. > Examine the passage: for what is similar is said to be more and less; what is equal and unequal is said to be more and less; and each of them pertains to the relatives. For what is similar is said to be similar to something, and those which are unequal (are said to be) unequal to something. (Cat. 6 b 21f.).52

<MASTER.> Similar and dissimilar belong to quality, and since more and less similar and dissimilar are said there, this very same manner is said of them here too. And since equal and unequal are a property of quantity and quantity does not admit of more and less, he states that when equal and unequal are counted to the species of relatives, they admit of more and less. For he states that this is said to be more and less equal to that, and again unequal to it. It is equal to it in something and unequal to it in something, their being in quantity. The equal is equal in everything and the unequal is (un-?)equal in everything. See well! Thus, also here in the same manner equal and unequal will be said to not be more or less. As the equal and unequal belongs to quality, the same manner will be said of it in relatives too, if this expressed opinion is accurate.

§ 35 PUPIL. Expound the passage: but not all admit of more and less; for double is not said to be more <or less> double, nor anything like that (*Cat.* 6 b 24-27).⁵³

MASTER. He worked out his speech in order that it would be clear to beginners. For he says that not all relatives admit of more and less, as for example, all those that pertain to substance and quantity, when they are inferred within relatives, do not admit of more and less. And as he explains, he says that double, which pertains to quantity, does not admit of more and less, when it is said within relatives, and so are all those which pertain to substance and quantity.

§ 36 < PUPIL. > Explicate the passage: all relatives are said in relation to those that convert, as for example, slave is called slave of a master and master is called master of a slave; double (is called) double of a half; <half (is called) half of a double;> and large (is called) large of small; and so for the others too (Cat. 6 b 28-33).54

⁵⁰ "Relatives seem also to admit of a more and a less" (trans. Ackrill).

⁵¹ Cf. Cat. 10 b 26.

^{52 &}quot;For a thing is called more similar and less similar, and more unequal and less unequal; and each of these is relative, since what is similar is called similar to something and what is unequal unequal to something" (trans. Ackrill).

^{53 &}quot;But not all admit of a more and less; for what is double, or anything like that, is not called more double or less double" (trans. Ackrill).

⁵⁴ "All relatives are spoken of in relation to correlatives that reciprocate. For example, the slave is called slave of a master and the master is called master of a slave; the double double of a half, and the half half of a double; the larger larger than a smaller, and the smaller smaller than a larger; and so for the rest too" (trans. Ackrill).

(ic): return bluster roly rloss cra. loss orly roses that colorismos return roles and roles roles roles return chances respondent roles roles roles roles return on respondent roles roles return on return color roles roles

نے: ہمن دہم علمہ ہمتی ہستہ دلمہ مدر ہلے دہم ہمارہ مارہ ہمارہ ہمار

38 الالمعدي: محل لم ١٠٠٠.

ic: $\operatorname{coch} \lambda$ arcub notice och is to it is not that it is the intermed of the point of the point of the intermediate of the color of the intermediate of the color of the object of t

10 post אוֹם שאם add. א משבוער בלים של ביז אמבים מהָ cod. || 23 אלא supplevi ex J.273.12 || 24 במר אלא scripsi ex J.273.13 (שבים אלא)] במר מה אל || 35 משבישא cod., səyāmē supplevi.

<MASTER.> The third property of relatives: they are said in relation to those that convert. And when he wants to elucidate his speech, he brings forth evidence from the species of the category of relatives and he tells how a conversion of a property of relatives is. Not like the conversion of a property: 'every man is able to laugh' and so on; nor again like the conversion of a property that declares: 'not a single man is stone, not a single stone is man'; nor again like the conversion of a deduction (συλλογισμός) that declares: 'a women has given birth, and she who has given birth has milk'; except another conversion which is not similar to these, that which starts with something and again connects the end to the beginning, as for example, son is son of a father, slave is slave of a master, and double is double of a half, large is large of small.

§ 37 PUPIL. Explicate the passage: in *ptôsis* however, that is case (*mappūltā*), they may sometimes differ in expression, as for example, knowledge is said to be knowledge of (d-) the knowable, and the knowable (is said to be) knowable by (b-) knowledge; perception (is said to be) perception of (d-)the perceptible, and the perceptible (is said to be) perceptible by (b-) perception (Cat. 6 b 33-36).⁵⁵

MASTER. He means to say that all the other species of relatives, which we have not mentioned, should be said like that. That which he said: "in $\pi \tau \tilde{\omega} \sigma \iota \zeta$, that is case (mappūltā), they may sometimes differ in expression", pertains to the species of relatives. They are expressed in the genitive case in the first expression.

§ 38 PUPIL. Explain this to me!

MASTER. In the first expression, we express it like this: knowledge is knowledge of (d-) the knowable, and this $d\bar{a}lad$ [i.e., the letter d- 'of'], that we have added to knowable, is for the genitive case. In the second expression, we express it like this: the knowable is knowable by (b-) knowledge, and this $b\bar{e}t$ [i.e., the letter b- 'by'], that we have added to knowledge, is for the accusative case. So also (...) that he said: "in $\pi \tau \tilde{\omega} \sigma \iota \zeta$, that is in case (*mappūltā*), they may sometimes differ in expression".

§ 39 PUPIL. Explicate the passage: not only, <but> sometimes they are not supposed to convert, if they are not given properly in relation to that which they are said of, but the giver has made a mistake (*Cat.* 6 b 36-38).⁵⁶

MASTER. He means to say that some people supposed that all the relatives convert and therefore the philosopher states that not all the relatives convert. By no means does everything that is said of another thing convert. That which he says "not only" (means) that (all) the relatives not only do not convert, but they cannot convert also when a person errs in defining them. Mistake occurs in (the definition of) relatives in two ways: one of them is when one of the limitations of a proposition (protasis) is more general than the other and one is more deficient than the other. The second way is when one of the limitations of a proposition becomes accidental, and we will speak about this later. We will now speak about the way when one is more general than its counterpart (i.e., correlate), as for example, the head of animal is called a head, and animal is more general than head, so are also eyes, hands, feet and so forth. Again, regarding bird and boat, if their definitions will not be given accurately, they do not convert.

^{55 &}quot;Sometimes, however, there will be a verbal difference, of ending. Thus knowledge is called knowledge of what is knowable, and what is knowable knowable by knowledge; perception perception of the perceptible, and the perceptible perceptible by perception" (trans. Ackrill).

⁵⁶ "Sometimes, indeed, they will not seem to reciprocate – if a mistake is made and that in relation to which something is spoken of is not given properly" (trans. Ackrill).

40 < الملحدة عند ما عند الما يم الما المادة المادة

ונתפס א מאדלי. ושפעלא ושמבוא אלים שפעלאי שבו אארי ביותאאי. ونسلم به من من الله توعى ما مدر الما من ترفع الله ترفع المامه واسلام عنه فاسلام بالمام الله ترفع المام DORGER WAS LOCALD DE CHEN LIE CHEN CHEN EINHA. 5 الله من الماد معامد معتصم الماد معتصم بالماد معامد الماد ال مدمع رحتم باقلم ومعمدم لمرب لمالم سلقد ترمه، ممالم μ גם א הובה א הובה הובבא. בשות בשות בשות בשות הפושה הפושה המודא: הע μ Edmy yer had log: leturk in, Ecarcas tim roturbas. olerfus حج مما مدم ما من تعم مل لف لف ما دمية عدم ما مرية على الما تعم אשוא מולץ זם השיבה משב (?) שא ביז ממסמה השבישה מולץ משל שול מובא 15 ,, مهمد مامس مدم عده .ملت ما لما ملام بهمهد مامس به Khuis Kla ram Koon Kl Khuis www. Kly i ml hel Kla معمدم بالم المراه المراع المراه المراع المراه المراع المراه المر eiub>. o>e< >> eiug.

ים: בו בת המחים למ, האלי: האנים הנשבל אני בנתם במלא אם ביל בלעום לא הבת. לא תם א תפחבת לא. אלים היא הלו האי אלים לא הביא היה האלים לא הביא פישלא בא הפיעלא ביא הפיעלא ביא הפיעלא ביא הפיעלא ביא הפיעלא ביא הפיעלא ביא הפיעל ביא הפיעל ביא הביא פישלא ביא מהלל ביא מה א המשב מאלים.

ic): Note in the seist s

25

² אביבאס cod., səyāmē supplevi || 7 منتف cod., səyāmē delevi || 8 معتدر cod., səyāmē supplevi || 9 معدر cod., səyāmē supplevi || 12-13 منافع cod., səyāmē supplevi || 13 (...) possis مدنج منافع المدن الم

§ 40 < PUPIL. > Clarify what you just have said!

<MASTER.> We say: a rudder is the rudder of a boat, but it is not possible to convert and say: a boat is the boat of a rudder. So also for bird. A bird has wings, but not everything that has wings is a bird. We will first talk about the Greek word (λέξις), for in the Greek language it not called bird, but the feather-winged, and they name this Hove θ_0 . And those which are nonfeather-winged, they name them πετεινόν, ⁵⁸ those (which are) membrane-winged, such as locusts, wasps, and flies; and flesh-winged, such as bats. And because all of them have wings, bird is that which they name ornithos, and peteinon is that which they do not call bird, for wing is more general than bird, as boat is more general than rudder. For every bird has wings, but not everything that has wings is bird. And every rudder belongs to a boat, but not all boats have rudder. And every rudder belongs to a boat, but not all boats have rudders, such as rowing-boats. <And every> head belongs to an animal, (...)⁵⁹ head, such as crabs and scorpions. < Also the same for> eyes, hands, and feet: the mole is an animal, but it does not have eyes; the snake is also an animal, but it does not have feet. However, the word (λέξις) for bird is not like this, but they name bird all those which are nourished by pecking of seeds and they call bird of prey those which are nourished by meat. They do not however name locusts, flies, and wasps bird, even though they fly.

§ 41 PUPIL. Elucidate the passage: as for example, if wing is given as of bird, (the expression) 'bird of wing' does not convert (Cat. 6 b 38f.).60

MASTER. He wants to elucidate what he says: if someone fails with the presentation, namely the definition, of relatives, conversion does not occur. He says, for example, what I say is, that is, if wing is said to be of bird, (the expression) 'bird of wing' does not convert. It is why he adds and says this.

§ 42 PUPIL. Elucidate the passage: for <the first> (expression) is not properly given: 'wing of bird' (Cat. 6 b 39-7a1).61

MASTER. He declares that if you say: 'wing of bird' and 'bird of wing', the statement does not turn out accurately, because 'wing' is more general than 'bird', in that not only bird has wing, but also others that are not bird have it, as we (already) have said above. Thus, the first (expression), that is 'wing of bird', is not accurately given and therefore it does not convert, because the definition is defective.

⁵⁷ The Syriac מוסיבאלבים seems to render the Greek ὄρνιθες in the plural, but since it is treated as being in the singular, it is probably based on the genitive singular form ὄρνιθος found in Philop., In Cat., p. 112.12 Busse [cf. Philoponi (olim Ammonii) In Aristotelis Categorias commentarium, ed. A. Busse, Reimer, Berlin 1898, CAG XIII.I)].

⁵⁸ The Syriac Σομήτα seems to render the Greek πετεινόν in the singular or πετεινῶν the genitive plural form, but it is also possible that it renders the Greek form πτηνῶν in the genitive plural as found in Philop., In Cat., p. 112.13 Busse, even though the səyāmē dots for the plurals in Syriac should have been supplied.

⁵⁹ It should probably be added here: "but not all animals have head, such..."; cf. Cat. 6 b 36f.; Simpl., In Cat., p. 185.22 Kalbfleisch (cf. Simplicii In Aristotelis Categorias commentarium, ed. C. Kalbfleisch, Reimer, Berlin 1907, CAG VIII).

⁶⁰ "For example, if a wing is given as of a bird, bird of a wing does not reciprocate" (trans. Ackrill).

⁶¹ "For it has not been given properly in the first place as wing of a bird" (trans. Ackrill).

548 h lowers: 100 min 100 min 100 min 100 min 100 moder that 100 moder 100

ن (۶) جامنه مسلاء نهد :حانه نهر :حانه نهر :

¹ של cod., punctum supplevi ex J.273.17 || 5 יבל scripsi ex J.273.18 || 6 מפבי scripsi ex J.273.19 מפבי || 10-11 מפבי שר supplevi ex J.273.19f. || 12 ב־i scripsi], a בּ (= מוֹם בּ scripsi).

§ 43 PUPIL. Elucidate the passage: for (the fact of) being a bird is not the thing by which wing is said to belong to it (Cat. 7 a 1f.).62

MASTER. He means this: wing does not belong only to bird, but also to others, and therefore conversion does not occur, since there is a fault in the delimitation.

§ 44 PUPIL. Elucidate the passage: but by being winged, for wings belong to many others as well, which are not birds (Cat. 7 a 2f.).63

MASTER. He means to say that wing belongs to anything that has wings, not simply to bird, that is, to it alone, because there are many things that are not called birds, such as locusts, wasps, and flies.

§45 PUPIL. Elucidate the passage: so that if (the expressions) are properly given, <they will likewise convert> (Cat. 7 a 3f.).⁶⁴

MASTER. He says that if they are given ...

⁶² "For it is not as being a bird that a wing is said to be of it" (trans. Ackrill).

⁶³ "But as being a winged, since many things that are not birds have wings" (trans. Ackrill).

⁶⁴ "Thus if it is given properly there is reciprocation; for example, a wing is wing of a winged and a winged is winged with a wing" (trans. Ackrill).

Annotations

- § 1 (p. 60) The definition of contrary things (καωράνω). The first section that we have extant here, which is the partial answer of the master to the question of the student, deals with the definition of contrary things ascribed to the ancients and found in Aristotle's Categories 6 a 17-18: τὰ γὰρ πλεῖστον ἀλλήλων διεστηκότα τῶν ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ γένει ἐναντία ὁρίζονται 'for they define as contraries those things in the same genus which are most distant from one another' (tr. Ackrill).
- § 2 (p. 60) The "second property" of quantity. Aristotle specifies quantity by three properties. The first is that quantity does not have contrariety (§ 1 pp. 60[Syr.] and 61[Engl.]) and the second is that of not admitting of more or less, and these two are not distinctive properties of quantity, since they are also said of substance (cf. *Cat.* 3 b 33). The third property however is distinctive of it and states that quantities are said to be equal and unequal (cf. § 6 pp. 62[Syr.] and 63[Engl.]).⁶⁵
- § 6 (p. 62) Non-distinctive and distinctive properties. Cf. also § 29 (74[Syr.] and 75[Engl.]), where the commentator states that Aristotle usually provides the non-distinctive properties before the distinctive ones, especially if the discussion is about a most generic genus, of which a definition cannot be supplied; see the annotation to § 29 (pp. 74[Syr.] and 75[Engl.]).
- § 7 (p. 62) The "seven species" of quantity. In the *Categories* 4 b 20-25, Aristotle specifies seven things that are said to be quantities, namely number (ἀριθμός), speech (λόγος), line (γραμμή), surface (ἐπιφάνεια), solid (σῶμα), time (γρόνος), and place (τόπος).
- § 8 (p. 62) The giving of equinoxes as example of equal and unequal quantities. The Syriac commentator presents here the vernal/spring equinox and autumnal equinox as examples of something that is equal in number and number is counted to quantity (see previous note). I have not found the same example in other commentaries on the *Categories*.
- \$ 11/23 (pp. 62/70) Condition (διάθεσις) explained as 'instability' (κλολλως ΚΔ) or a separable accident (σιάθεσις), and state (σιάθεσις) as possession (\$23 κλομας and \$15 κμως). The use here of 'instability' (κλολλως ΚΔ) for Greek διάθεσις 'condition' is in line with Sergius' usage. 66

⁶⁵ Cf. also Ammon., In Cat., p. 65.9-18 Busse (cf. Ammonius. In Aristotelis Categorias commentarius, ed. A. Busse, Reimer, Berlin 1895, CAG IV.4); and Iohannes Damasc., Dialectica v'/p. 50.81-91 Kotter (cf. Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos, I, Institutio elementaris. Capita philosophica (Dialectica). Als Anhang Die Philosophischen Stücke aus Cod. Oxon. Bodl. Auc. T. I. 6, ed. B. Kotter, W. de Gruyter, Berlin 1969 [Patristische Texte und Studien, 7], tr. by F.H. Chase Jr., Ch. 49, pp. 76f. in Saint John of Damascus, Writings, trans. F.H. Chase Jr., New York 1958 (The Fathers of the Church, 37).

⁶⁶ Sergius, *Intr.* § 81 and § 83 Aydin, and the commentary at pp. 242-3 (cf. Sergius of Reshaina, *Introduction to Aristotle and his Categories*, above, n. 18).

While work by Jacob of Edessa. 67 The variant form acused at § 15 (pp. 66 [Syr.] and 67 [Engl.]).

§ 12-13 (pp. 64-66) Five initial points. The commentator begins his discussion on the relatives by specifying five preliminary points that were dealt with in connection with this category. We may assume that he had initial discussions on the other categories as well. The examination of five initial points is also present in the works of the Greek commentators, but with a somewhat different wording. Ammonius, for example, begins his treatment of relatives by saying (Ammon., In Cat., p. 66.5-7 Busse): Πρὸ τῆς τῶν πρός τι διδασκαλίας πέντε ταῦτα χρὴ ζητεῖν· τὴν τάξιν αὐτῶν τὴν αἰτίαν τῆς ἐπιγραφῆς τὴν ὑπόστασιν τὸν τρόπον τῆς διδασκαλίας τὴν εἰς τὰ εἴδη διαίρεσιν. "Before going into Aristotle's teaching on relatives, these five things must be examined: (1) their location; (2) the explanation of the title; (3) their independent existence (ὑπόστασις); (4) the manner of teaching; (5) their division into species" (tr. Cohen - Matthews). 68 Sergius of Rešaina treats four initial points at the outset of book five of his commentary on Aristotle's Categories (unedited), omitting the point about the title of this category. A nearer parallel is found in Olympiodorus (In Cat., pp. 96.35-97.1 Busse) who commences the lecture on the relatives by saying: πέντε παρακολουθήματα έπεται τοῖς πρός τι, τὸ λέγεσθαι, τὸ διδάσκεσθαι, τὸ εἶναι, τὸ γένος εἶναι, τὸ συναριθμεῖσθαι ταῖς κατηγορίαι. 'Five concomitant points are followed on the relatives, that to be said, that to be learned, that to exist, that to be a genus, and that to be counted among the categories', (so also in Elias, In Cat., p. 200.33-35 Busse).

The first point (1) in the Syriac commentary deals with the question of the title of this category, or more precisely, why this category was given by Aristotle in the plural (ωντικῶς) πληθυντικῶς) and not in the singular (κικῶς), as he treats the other categories. 69

The second point (2) is more closely related to the account of Olympiodorus and Elias that deals with the question of the study of relatives, which Olympiodorus (In Cat., pp. 97.3f. Busse) says is about την διασκευήν τῶν πρός τι "the arrangement of the relatives" (cf. also ibid., p. 97.9-25 Busse). Elias (In Cat., p. 201.4-6, p. 205.17-31 Busse) however clearly connects this point with that of Ammonius (In Cat., p. 67.11-15 Busse) and Philoponus (In Cat., p. 105.12-18 Busse) that investigates the manner of teaching used by Aristotle with regard to this category.

The third point (3) concerns the question of whether relatives have independent existence (>> \tag{\sigma} ὑπόστασις/ὕπαρξις) or not, that is, if their existence is in physical things or in a relation that is perceived by us, a question which is also discussed by other commentators.⁷⁰

⁶⁷ Jacob, [Syriac trans. of Cat.], pp. 271.23-272.1 Georr; see also Hugonnard-Roche, "Jacques d'Édesse" (above, n. 5), p. 46; King, The Earliest Syriac Translation of Aristotle's Categories (above, n. 20), pp. 208f., and 224; and our commentary in Sergius of Reshaina, Introduction to Aristotle and his Categories (above, n. 18), p. 242.

⁶⁸ Ammonius, On Aristotle Categories, translated by S. M. Cohen - G. B. Matthews, Duckworth, London 1991 (The Ancient Commentators on Aristotle). Concerning the five preliminary questions, see also Philop., In Cat., p. 102.13-16 Busse; Olymp., In Cat., pp. 96.35-97.6 Busse; and Elias, In Cat., pp. 200.33-201.17 Busse.

⁶⁹ On this point, see Ammon., In Cat., p. 66.18-21 Busse; Philop., In Cat., pp. 102.29-103.17 Busse; Olymp., In Cat., pp. 97.2f., 97.27-37 Busse; Elias, In Cat., pp. 200.35-201.3, 205.32-206.24 Busse; and Simpl., In Cat., pp. 169.1-162.11

⁷⁰ Ammon., In Cat., pp. 66.21-77.11; Philop., In Cat., pp. 103.18-104.36 Busse; Olymp., In Cat., pp. 97.4f., 98.7-99.20; Elias, In Cat., pp. 201.6-9, 203.35-35.15; and Simpl., In Cat., pp. 169.1-172.10 Kalbfleisch.

The dispute of the fourth point (4) is about whether the relatives are a genus or not. This corresponds to the fifth point of Ammonius about the division of relatives into species, because Olympiodorus (*In Cat.*, p. 97.5 Busse) specifies that since the relatives are a genus, one need to learn its species.⁷¹ The argument that a species found in a given category can also be found in other categories is already found in Porph., *In Cat.*, p. 114.8-22 Busse (cf. Porphyrii *Isagoge et in Aristotelis Categorias commentarium*, ed. A. Busse, Reimer, Berlin 1887, *CAG* IV.1).

The discussion of the fifth and last point (5), which is about the order of relatives in the list of the ten categories, is also found in the Greek commentators.⁷²

§ 14 (p. 66) Olympiodorus and Elias too, in discussing the order of the relatives among the categories, present four reasons for why Aristotle treats relatives before quality. For the first reason, Olympiodorus (*In Cat.*, p. 97.13-15 Busse) and Elias (*In Cat.*, p. 201.29-31 Busse) give the same argument as the Syriac commentary, which is already found in Porphyry (*In Cat.*, p. 111.11-15 Busse). Olympiodorus' (*In Cat.*, p. 97.15-18 Busse) and Elias' (*In Cat.*, p. 201.31-33 Busse) second argument is about the fact that many points in the teaching about quality appear already in the discussion on the relatives, which makes it proper to discuss relatives before quality for an easier understanding; this is also the idea of the Syriac commentator. Regarding the third reason, Olympiodorus (*In Cat.*, p. 97.18-22 Busse) says that relatives do not have matter, but appear to be present in the other categories; the teaching about relatives points towards that of quality, and in order to avoid confusion in the discussion on quality it is appropriate to introduce relatives before it. The fourth point is defectively preserved in the Syriac text, but Olympiodorus (*In Cat.*, p. 97.22-26 Busse) connects it with the doctrine of Protagoras that also quality belongs to the relatives, which makes it necessary to introduce it first in order to assess the validity of that statement. Elias (*In Cat.*, p. 202.4-9 Busse) also notes that statements about quality involve the relatives.

§ 15 (p. 65) The species of relatives. In this Syriac text, the species of relatives are partly differently denoted compared to the Greek commentaries. Nine species of relatives can be distinguished as follows: ⁷³

Some relatives are said here in the Syriac text to be derived κ איז (from similarity', while Ammonius (In Cat., p. 67.17 Busse) and Philoponus (In Cat., p. 105.1 Busse) say καθ' όμωνυμίαν 'homonymously'. Others are said to be derived κ שבים 'from dissimilarity', where Ammonius (In Cat., p. 67.17f.) and Philoponus (In Cat., p. 105.2) have καθ' ἑτερωνυμίαν 'heteronymously'. The third kind of relatives are said to be derived κ , which might be translated 'from participation'. The basic meaning of the Syriac word κ , which might 'concealment', but based on the example given, it might correspond to Greek μέθεξις 'participation'

⁷¹ Cf. also Olymp., *In Cat.*, p. 99.21-38 Busse; Elias, *In Cat.*, pp. 201.9-11, 202.11-203.34 Busse; and Simpl., *In Cat.*, p. 168.20-36 Kalbfleisch.

⁷² See Porph., *In Cat.*, p. 111.11-15 Busse; Dexip., *In Cat.*, pp. 64.1-66.13 Busse (cf. Dexippi *In Aristotelis Categorias commentarium*, ed. A. Busse, Reimer, Berlin 1888, *CAG* IV.2); Ammon., *In Cat.*, p. 66.7-14 Busse; Philop., *In Cat.*, p. 102.16-29 Busse; Olymp., *In Cat.*, pp. 97.6, 97.7-26 Busse; Elias, *In Cat.*, pp. 201.11f., 201.18-202.9 Busse; and Simpl., *In Cat.*, pp. 155.33-159.22 Kalbfleisch.

⁷³ For the division of the relatives, see also Sergius of Reshaina, *Introduction to Aristotle and his Categories* (above, n. 18), §74 Aydin, and the comm. *ad loc.*, pp. 236ff.

⁷⁴ Cf. however Porph., *In Cat.*, p. 113.6f. Busse and Simpl., *In Cat.*, p. 176.21-24 Kalbfleisch.

(Olymp., In Cat., p. 99.23 Busse). Ammonius (In Cat., p. 67.21f. Busse) and Philoponus (In Cat., p. 105.7f. Busse) have κατὰ τὸ μετέχον. The secondary sense of the Syriac may have evolved according to the following phases: concealment → initiation → participation. That is, in religious terms, to be initiated into something concealed and then, as a member, participate in it. It is also possible that this division of the relatives refers to the one called κρίσις 'discernment' by Olympiodorus (In Cat., p. 99.22, and ll. 28f. Busse) and Elias (In Cat., p. 203.7f. Busse). Furthermore, in an alternative division of the relatives, Elias (In Cat., p. 203.30-33 Busse) gives the following relevant passage: ὅτι τῶν πρός τι τὰ μὲν φύσει, ὡς πατὴρ καὶ υίός, τὰ δὲ τύχη, ὡς δοῦλος καὶ δεσπότης, τὰ δὲ τέχνη, ώς ἐπιστήμη ἐπιστητοῦ ἐπιστήμη, τὰ δὲ προαιρέσει, ώς φίλος φίλου φίλος. "Some relatives are by nature, as father and son; some are by chance, as slave and master; some are by acquisition, as knowledge is the knowledge of the knowable; and some by preference, as a friend is the friend of a friend". Thus, τέχνη 'art', 'skill', here translated 'acquisition', is another option and is plausible in the sense that the concealed or hidden knowledge is unveiled and reached. The fourth group of relatives is clearly derived ܡܩܝܩܐ 'from position' (κατὰ θέσιν), 75 whereas Ammonius (In Cat., p. 67.25 Busse) and Philoponus (In Cat., pp. 105.10f. Busse) have κατά τὴν ἐν τόπω διαφοράν "by a difference in place", (tr. Cohen - Matthews).

The Syriac master says that some relatives are derived $(In\ Cat., p.\ 203.30f.$ Busse). There is parallel to this is found the passage cited above from Elias (In Cat., p. 203.30f. Busse). There is also a Byzantine Handbook, which says that some relatives are φύσει 'by nature', '6 and John of Damascus, who states that the relation (σχέσις) of some self-subsistent things is φυσική 'natural', ως πατρὸς καὶ υίοῦ "like that of the father and son". Ammonius (In Cat., p. 67.23 Busse) however has τὰ δὲ κατὰ τὸ αἴτιον καὶ αἰτιατὸν ως ὁ πατήρ υίοῦ πατήρ "some [relatives that involve heteronymy] relate cause and effect (aitiaton), as a father is a father of a child", (tr. Cohen - Matthews), which is also found in Philop., In Cat., p. 105.9 Busse. The Byzantine Handbook (line 186) has this latter species as in Ammonius and Philoponus as well. Olympiodorus (In Cat., p. 99.22, 31f. Busse) and Elias (In Cat., p. 203.3f. Busse) use also γένεσις 'origin' for this species of relatives.

A close parallel to those relatives that are said to be derived (π) from chance' is once again found in the passage cited above from Elias (In Cat., p. 203.31f. Busse), as well as the Byzantine Handbook (II. 179f.), which states that τὰ δὲ τύχη ὡς δοῦλος καὶ δεσπότης "some (relatives) are by chance, as slave and master", and in John of Damascus, who calls that relation τυχική 'fortuitous' (Dialect. να'/p. 51.49 Kotter). Olympiodorus (In Cat., p. 99.22, and I. 27 Busse) and Elias (In Cat., p. 203.5f. Busse) view this relation also as that of ὕφεσις 'subjection'. See also Ammon., In Cat., p. 67.19f. Busse and Philop., In Cat., p. 105.5f. Busse, who do not use any specific word for his relation.

There is a relation specified in the Syriac text which is the one that a state/possession (act) has to its holder (act). This is not a relation that is treated in the Greek commentaries, but cf. Simpl., In Cat., pp. 161.36-162.1 Kalbfleisch.

For a discussion of the idea that positions that are paronymously (καρωνύμως) derived do belong to the relatives, along with other categories, see again Simpl., *In Cat.*, pp. 163.30-165.30 Busse, in part. p. 165.11ff.

⁷⁵ Cf. Porph., In Cat., p. 112.31 Busse; Olymp., In Cat., p. 99.23, and ll. 32f. Busse; and Elias, In Cat., p. 203.8f. Busse.

⁷⁶ M. Roueché, "A Middle Byzantine Handbook of Logic Terminology", *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik* 29 (1980), pp. 71-98, here line 179.

⁷⁷ Iohannes Damasc., *Dialectica*, να′/p. 51.48f. Kotter, tr. Chase, Ch. 50, p. 79.

Regarding the view that a certain relation may be perceived from the weakness (κλαλως) of a subject towards the object of its action, it is worth giving a passage of Iamblichus in Simplicius (In Cat., p. 161.21f. Kalbfleisch): [ἡ διαίρεσις τοῦ πρός τι] εἰς τὰ κατὰ στέρησιν δυνάμεως, ὡς τὸ ἀδύνατον ὁραθῆναι πρὸς τὸ ἀδύνατον ἰδεῖν "[the division of the Relative is made into] that based on privation of potentiality, e.g. that which cannot be seen in relation to what cannot see", (tr. Fleet). For the latter three kinds of relations, Simplicius seems to render the exegesis of Iamblichus, whose lost commentary on the Categories might therefore directly or indirectly have influenced the Syriac commentator too.

§ 16 (pp. 66-68) Protagoras: everything is relative! (,ποδως και καλα καλα καλα κρός τι; Philop., In Cat., p. 103.31f. Busse: πάντα τὰ πράγματα πρός τι; Olymp., In Cat., p. 98.23 Busse: πάντα εἶναι τῶν πρός τι; Elias, In Cat., p. 203.37 Busse: πάντα τὰ ὅντα πρός τι). This is one of the most interesting passages in the commentary, where the enquiry on ontology appears to be confused with that on epistemology. Namely, the question of how things are in themselves seems to have been mixed up with how the knowledge of them reaches our perception and is handled by our senses, which are two different philosophical questions. The same discussion is also made by Ammonius (In Cat., pp. 66.26-67.7 Busse), Philoponus (In Cat., p. 104.18-25 Busse), Sergius (In Cat., book 5); and partially by Olympiodorus (In Cat., pp. 98.22-99.20 Busse) and Elias (In Cat., pp. 203.35-204.36 Busse) in connection with the category of relatives. The inquiry is however justified if the aim is to determine how relational things are linked to each other and to establish on what premises that relation is based. In that case, the question is relevant for how we, on the basis of our knowledge, put (two) separate things into relation to each other and include them in the category of the relatives.

The passage at the end of § 17 (p. 68), in Ammonius (In Cat., p. 67.3-7 Busse), Philoponus (In Cat., p. 104.18-25 Busse), and Sergius (L f. 41va8-22 / P f. 77r8-15)⁷⁹ appears to be a quotation from a work by Plato, where he refutes Protagoras' view regarding the relativity of everything. This topic is not found as such in Plato's dialogues. The editor of Ammonius' and Philoponus' commentaries (Ammon. p. [144] and Philop. p. [XIX] Busse) and the former's translators into English (Cohen - Matthews, p. 78 n. 94) refer to Plato's Theaetetus 170C.⁸⁰ But neither Ammonius, nor Philoponus or Sergius are really quoting Plato literally here, even if the nearest correspondence of such a refutation of Protagoras by Plato is found in the passage from the Theaetetus. Nor is the Syriac passage here in question a faithful quotation from any known text by Plato, or even closely related to Sergius' wording, who is reliant on Ammonius. Instead, Ammonius seems to paraphrase Plato's refutation by chiefly adopting his form of argument. The same mode of procedure is applied by Ammonius to the refutation of the sceptical or ephectic stand towards the possibility of obtaining firm knowledge.⁸¹ Thus, a

⁷⁸ Simplicius, *On Aristotle's Categories 7-8*, translated by B. Fleet, Cornell U.P., Ithaca, New York 2002. On this point, see also Anonymi *In Aristotelis Categorias paraphrasis*, ed. M. Hayduck, Reimer, Berlin 1883 (*CAG* XXIII.2), p. 30.21f.

⁷⁹ Sergius, *Commentary on Aristotle's Categories, to Theodore.* L = London MS, British Library, *Add.* 14658; and P = Paris MS, Bibliothèque nationale de France, *Syr.* 354.

⁸⁰ See also the quotations in Elias, In Cat., pp.110.4-7, 204.33-35 and Busse's reference [p. 289] to Plato's Theaet. 170A.

⁸¹ See Ammon., *In Cat.*, p. 2.14-17 Busse, tr. Cohen - Matthews, with n. 2 *ad loc.*; and Philop., *In Cat.*, p. 2.21-24 Busse, tr. Sirkel - Tweedale - Harris, with n. 8 *ad loc.*: Philoponus, *On Aristotle Categories 1-5*, translated by R. Sirkel - M. Tweedale - J. Harris, with Philoponus, *A Treatise Concerning the Whole and the Parts*, translated by D. King, Bloomsbury, London 2014.

type of argument is employed here rather than being a direct quotation, which also explains the difference in wording between Ammonius, Philoponus, and Sergius.

§ 17 (p. 68) Salamander being unburning. The idea that the salamander is believed not to be destroyed by fire but rather that it extinguishes a fire that it enters, is reported already by Aristotle (History of Animals, V 19, 552 b 15-17). This belief was transmitted by several subsequent writers, such as Olympiodorus in his commentary on Aristotle's Meteorology. The source of this Syriac commentary however is probably the more popular anonymous work called Physiologus, which is supposed to have been written in Greek during the second/third century A.D. During the following centuries it was translated into many languages, such as Latin, Syriac, Ethiopic, and Armenian. The old Syriac version is extant in incomplete form in two manuscripts, of which only one preserves the chapter on the salamander (Vat. Syr. no. 217, ff. 213r-219v). In the edition of the Greek text of the Physiologus by Sbordone, chapter 31 concerns the salamander's ability to put out fire, and in the Syriac text edited by Tychsen the topic is found in chapter 9. The same report about the salamander is also found in the other versions of the Physiologus and books on animals in Syriac. In the Greek commentaries on Aristotle's Categories, this example is not found, although the salamander is said not to be hot by Elias (In Cat., pp. 202.6, 204.6, and 220.26 Busse) in connection with the discussion on the relatives.

§ 18a (p. 68) The definition of the relatives and its attribution to Plato. The definition of the relatives that is given at the outset of chapter 7 of the *Categories*, is attributed to Plato also by Porphyry, which he says is corrected by Aristotle (*Cat.* 8 a 28-b 24) later on, ⁸⁶ but Simplicius (*In Cat.*, p. 159.12-22 Kalbfleisch) reports that Boethus of Sidon (1st century BC) noted its connection to Plato (see also Fleet's nn. 25-27 *ad locum*).

§ 18b (p. 68) Relatives expressed by grammatical cases. The use of grammatical cases for the purpose of specifying the different ways in which things are related to each other is also found in Porphyry (*In Cat.*, p. 112.8-21 Busse) and Simplicius (*In Cat.*, pp. 162.19-163.5 Kalbfleisch). What in Greek is expressed by the grammatical cases through the change of word endings is in Syriac expressed by the addition of prepositional particles. This means that Syriac lacks the inflection of grammatical cases. This would perhaps indicate that the original of this commentary was written in Greek, but that conclusion would require an explanation to the high degree of adaptation to the grammar of the Syriac language that has been imposed on the text.

⁸² Olympiodori In Aristotelis Meteora Commentaria, ed. G. Stüve, Reimer, Berlin 1900 (CAG XII.2), p. 331.13-18.

⁸³ Physiologus, ed. F. Sbordone, Società Dante Alighieri, Milano - Genova - Roma - Napoli 1936, pp. 101f.

⁸⁴ Physiologus Syrus seu Historia Animalium XXXII in S. S. memoratorum, Syriace e codice Bibliothecae Vaticanae, nunc primum edidit, vertit et illustravit O. G. Tychsen, Rostochii 1795, p. 7. A few words from the end of this chapter are unfortunately dropped in this edition and the manuscript should be consulted here (Vat. Syr. 217, f. 214v4-7). I intend however to prepare a new edition with translation of this Syriac version of the Physiologus.

^{85 &}quot;Physiologus Leidensis", Anecdota Syriaca, vol. 4: Otia Syriaca, ed. J.P.N. Land, Brill, Lugduni Batavorum 1875, Ch. 52, pp. 75f. ['The Book of Natural Things'], Das "Buch der Naturgegenstände", herausgegeben und übersetzt von K. Ahrens, C.F. Haeseler, Kiel 1892, Ch. 118, p. 63; and Bar Bahlul, Lexicon syriacum, col. 1354 Duval.

⁸⁶ Porph., In Cat., p. 111.28f. Busse, see also Porphyry, On Aristotle's Categories, trans. by S. K. Strange, Cornell U.P., Ithaca N.Y. 1992, p. 113 n. 307 ad loc.

Besides, the ancient Syriac grammarians considered the prefixed letters, in a way, as functioning for case variations.⁸⁷

The function of the accusative case described here (§ 18 p. 68 and § 38 p. 78) is probably that of the one called the 'accusative of respect' for Greek, which is to be understood in the way that something is knowable with respect to the knowledge found in it, although the use of accusative in § 28 p. 72 is closer to that of the Indo-European locative, which in Greek has in fact merged with the dative case.

- § 29 (p. 74) Something is described by its properties, whenever a definition of it cannot be provided. The view that an adequate definition of a most generic genus cannot be supplied is found in Porphyry (*In Cat.*, p. 111.16f., and p. 121.24ff. Busse), ⁸⁸ Sergius, ⁸⁹ Simplicius (*In Cat.*, p. 29.13-24, and p. 159.9-12 Kalbfleisch), and others.
- § 31 (p. 74) Contrariety not being a distinctive property of relatives. For a discussion about his point, see Simpl., *In Cat.*, p. 176.1-18 Kalbfleisch.
- § 35 (p. 76) The *Categories* is intended for beginners. For this point, see Sergius of Reshaina, *Introduction to Aristotle and his Categories* (above, n. 65), in part. our Introduction, p. 71 n. 7, with additional reference to Dexip., *In Cat.*, p. 40.21f. Busse.
- § 36 (pp. 76-78) The different conversions (κραρασ, and §41 and 43 κλαρασ ἀντιστροφή). Of the first two conversions or categorical propositions that are presented here, the first one is that of a universal affirmative proposition and the second one is that of a universal negative proposition. A slightly different example for the syllogism (Φαρασια συλλογισμός, cf. *Prior Analytics* 24 b 18-22) or deduction is presented by Aristotle (*Prior Analytics* 70 a 3-16), who seems to describe it as "a sign" (σημεῖον) that indicates "a demonstrative proposition" (πρότασις ἀποδεικτική). While the Syriac commentary speaks of the last conversion as that "which starts with something and again connects the end to the beginning", Simplicius (*In Cat.*, pp. 180.18-181.18 Kalbfleisch, in part. p. 181.9f.) speaks of the use of the same case ending (πτῶσις).
- \$39 (p. 78) Two kinds of mistakes may occur in the presentation of the relatives. The account that not all propositions about the relatives reciprocate if they are not of equal limitation or extension with reference to each other is also present in Porphyry (*In Cat.*, p. 117.26-31 Busse), Ammonius (*In Cat.*, pp. 71.11-72.10 Busse), Philoponus (*In Cat.*, pp. 112.5-113.11 Busse), Olympiodorus (*In Cat.*, pp. 103.6-106.15 Busse), Elias (*In Cat.*, pp. 209.30-211.33 Busse), and Simplicius (*In Cat.*, pp. 183.17-185.3 Kalbfleisch). In this connection, mistakes may occur in the presentation of their relation in two ways. One of the ways is if a proposition is more general/wider (καθολικώτερον, Olymp., *In Cat.*, p. 104.38ff. Busse; and Elias, *In Cat.*, p. 211.8 Busse) than its correlate or if it is more deficient/narrower (καθολικώτερον, Elias, *In Cat.*, p. 211.11 Busse)

⁸⁷ See for example, A. Merx, Historia artis grammaticae apud Syros, F. A. Brockhaus, Leipzig 1889, (Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes, 9.2), pp. 115, 150, 155f., 212, and the Syriac text of Yaʻqub/Severos bar Shakko (d. 1241), pp. 17-18/عب - بنج and Dionysius Thrax, pp. 61-62/عب - بنج . There is an unpublished English translation by Daniel King (Cardiff University) of Merx's monograph in Latin. On this point, see also Eliya of Nisibis (975-1046), A Treatise on Syriac Grammar by Mâr(i) Eliâ of Ṣobhâ, Edited and translated from the manuscripts in the Berlin Royal Library, by R.J.H. Gottheil, Wolf Peiser Verlag, Berlin 1887, Syr. pp. 12-15/pp. 30-32.

⁸⁸ See also the note of Cohen - Matthews to Ammonius, On Aristotle Categories, p. 17 n. 14.

⁸⁹ See Sergius of Reshaina, Introduction to Aristotle and his Categories (above, n. 18), p. 74 and p. 221, comm. to § 61.

than it. 90 The other way that a presentation may contain a mistake is if a proposition refers to something accidental, and such cases were probably discussed in the following part of the Syriac commentary, which is lost. Cases with propositions that contain accidental elements are however discussed by Olympiodorus (*In Cat.*, p. 107.17-29 Busse), Simplicius (*In Cat.*, p. 185.28-35, p. 186.14-20, and also p. 172.27-36 Kalbfleisch), and others as well.

§ 40 (p. 80) Examples of improper presentations. The discussion in the Syriac work contains examples that are present already in Aristotle's *Categories* and its Greek commentaries. Porphyry for example says (*In Cat.*, p. 116.11-13 Busse): πολλῶν γὰρ καὶ ἄλλων ἔστι πτερά, ἃ οὖκ ἔστιν ὅρνιθες, μελισσῶν, σφηκῶν, ἀκρίδων, τεττίγων καὶ μυρίων ἄλλων "For there are many other winged creatures that are not birds, for example bees, wasps, locusts, cicadas, and a myriad of others" (tr. Strange), and Philoponus (*In Cat.*, p. 112.12f. Busse): οὐ γὰρ πᾶν πτερὸν ὄρνιθός ἐστι πτερόν εἰσὶ γάρ τινα πτηνὰ ἃ οὖκ εἰσιν ὅρνιθες 'for not every wing is a wing of a bird, since there are some flying creatures that are not birds'. Another near parallel is found in Simplicius, who writes (*In Cat.*, p. 183.18-21 Kalbfleisch): ἔστιν γὰρ καὶ ἄλλα πτερωτά, ἃ οὔκ εἰσιν ὅρνιθες τῶν γὰρ πτερωτῶν τὰ μέν ἐστιν σαρκόπτερα, τὰ δὲ κολεόπτερα, τὰ δὲ σχιζόπτερα, ὧν τὰ σχιζόπτερα μόνα ὅρνιθές εἰσιν "for there are other winged creatures which are not birds; for some winged creatures are flesh-winged, others sheath-winged, others feather-winged, of which only the last are birds" (tr. Fleet).

The terminology used being: τὰ σχιζόπτερα 'split/feather-winged'; and τὰ σχιζόπτερα 'split/feather-winged'; and τὰ σχιζόπτερα 'split/feather-winged'; and τὰ σχιζόπτερα 'split/feather-winged'; and τὰ σκετεινά/πετηνά/πτηνά 'flying creatures', which are τοῦς τον τον τον τον τον 'non-split-winged creatures', that is, τὰ ὁλόπτερα 'whole/nonfeather-winged creatures'; and these are either του ὑμενόπτερα⁹¹ 'membrane-winged', such as ποῦς ἀκρίδες 'locusts', πίορα σφῆκες 'wasps', and ποῦς μυῖαι (Olymp., In Cat., p. 105.6 Busse) 'flies'; or του σαρκόπτερα⁹² 'flesh-winged', such as πιοινία νυκτερίδες 'bats'. While the κάνθαροι 'beetles' are said by Ammonius (In Cat., p. 71.22 Busse) to be κολεόπτερα 'sheath-winged'.

As an example of boats that do not have a rudder, the Syriac text has α (lit. 'boats of sea'), which probably corresponds to the Greek ἀκάτια 'rowing-boats', 'skiffs', 'dinghies' as found in Ammon. (*In Cat.*, p. 72.2 Busse), Philop. (*In Cat.*, p. 112.25 Busse), Olymp. (*In Cat.*, p. 105.7 Busse), whereas Elias (*In Cat.*, p. 210.36 Busse) just mentions τὰ μικρὰ πλοῖα 'small boats'; see also Porph. (*In Cat.*, p. 116.31 Busse) and Simpl. (*In Cat.*, p. 184.31-33 Kalbfleisch).

Furthermore, Porphyry (*In Cat.*, p. 116.23f. Busse) writes: πολλὰ γάρ ἐστι ζῷα, ἃ μὴ ἔχει κεφαλήν, ὡς ὄστρεα, καρκίνοι καὶ τὰ παραπλήσια "for there are many animals that do not have heads, such as oysters, crabs and similar animals" (tr. Strange); cf. also Philop., *In Cat.*, p. 113.4ff. Busse.

§ 42 (p. 80) The statement does not turn out accurately. For a discussion on this, see for example, Simpl., *In Cat.*, pp. 184.3-185.3 Kalbfleisch.

⁹⁰ Cf. also Simpl., In Cat., p. 183.30f. Kalbfleisch: ὑπερβάλλειν and ἐλλείπειν; and p. 186.19f.: ὑπερβολή and ἔλλειψις, with n. 142 ad loc. by Fleet.

⁹¹ Philop., In Cat., p. 112.15f. Busse has ὑμενόπτερα 'membrane-winged' for νυκτερίδες 'bats'.

⁹² Simpl., In Cat., p. 183.21 Kalbfleisch; Olymp., In Cat., p. 105.2 Busse; but Ammon., In Cat., p. 71.22 Busse has δερμόπτερα; and Elias, In Cat., p. 211.3f. Busse has δερματόπτερα.

Finito di stampare nel mese di dicembre 2019 presso le Industrie Grafiche della Pacini Editore S.p.A. Via A. Gherardesca • 56121 Ospedaletto • Pisa Tel. 050 313011 • Fax 050 3130300 www.pacinieditore. it

