

# THEMISTIUS

ROBERT B. TODD

(*University of British Columbia*)

<i>Fortuna.</i>	59
Bibliography.	68
Composite Editions.	72
Genuine Works of Themistius.	
I. <i>Analyticorum posteriorum paraphrasis.</i>	73
Translations.	
1. Gerardus Cremonensis.	
2. Hermolaus Barbarus Junior.	
3. Paulus Orsatus.	
Commentary.	
a. Anonymus Venetus.	
II. <i>In libros De anima paraphrasis.</i>	78
Translations.	
1. Guillelmus de Moerbeka.	
2. Hermolaus Barbarus Junior.	
3. Ludovicus Nogarola (Book 3.4–13).	
4. Federicus Bonaventura.	
Commentaries.	
a. Anonymus Venetus.	
b. Marcus Antonius Zimarra.	
c. Ludovicus Nogarola.	
d. Federicus Pendasius.	
e. Federicus Bonaventura.	
III. <i>In libros De caelo paraphrasis.</i>	86
Translation.	
1. Moyses Alatinus.	

IV. <i>In Metaphysicorum librum duodecimum paraphrasis.</i>	90
Translation.	
1. Moyses Finzius.	
V. <i>In Physica paraphrasis.</i>	91
Translation.	
1. Hermolaus Barbarus Junior.	
Commentaries.	
a. Anonymus Venetus.	
b. Marcus Antonius Zimarra.	
VI. <i>Orationes.</i>	93
Translations.	
1. Antonius Covarrubias ( <i>Or.</i> 26, fragment).	
2. Hieronymus Donzellinus ( <i>Or.</i> 18–25).	
3. Anonymus Vaticanus ( <i>Or.</i> 7).	
Spurious Works.	
VII. <i>In librum De insomniis paraphrasis.</i>	96
Translation.	
1. Hermolaus Barbarus Junior.	
Commentary.	
a. Marcus Antonius Zimarra.	
VIII. <i>In librum De divinatione per somnum paraphrasis.</i>	97
Translation.	
1. Hermolaus Barbarus Junior.	
IX. <i>In librum De memoria et reminiscencia paraphrasis.</i>	98
Translation.	
1. Hermolaus Barbarus Junior.	
X. <i>In librum De somno et vigilia paraphrasis.</i>	99
Translation.	
1. Hermolaus Barbarus Junior.	
XI. <i>Oratio ad Valentem imperatorem (Or. 12).</i>	100
Imitation.	
1. Andreas Duditius.	

## FORTUNA\*

Themistius (ca. 317–ca. 385 A.D.) is a complex figure in the history of later Greek philosophy and the wider intellectual history of the later Roman Empire. His life fell into two distinct phases. The first, up to 355, involved the study, and later teaching, at Constantinople of the major works of Aristotle and Plato. The second saw Themistius hold high office in the Eastern capital under a succession of mainly Christian emperors, often addressing them in epideictic orations that displayed classical learning without any Christian commitment. Themistius thus actively continued the traditions of Greek philosophy and literature.

His reputation as a philosopher is based on his paraphrases of Aristotelian treatises in the areas of logic, physics, and psychology. For pedagogical reasons he chose the paraphrastic method of exegesis in deference to his predecessors, notably Alexander of Aphrodisias (fl. ca. 200 A.D.).<sup>1</sup> The extent of Themistius' dependency on Alexander is unclear, mainly because of the loss of the Alexandrian commentaries that could have been sources for Themistius' paraphrases.<sup>2</sup> He did, however, criticize Alexander's interpretation of Aristotle's

account of the intellect, and this gained for Themistius a special influence on Arabic, medieval, and Renaissance thought.<sup>3</sup> Themistius also developed an original, though less well-known, reading of the associated theory of divine intellection in book 12 (*lambda*) of Aristotle's *Metaphysics*.<sup>4</sup> Although his modest form of exegesis often makes him appear to be an orthodox Aristotelian, he also had a deep knowledge of the Platonic corpus, engaged in Platonic exegesis, and was familiar to some extent with the earlier Neoplatonism of Plotinus and Porphyry.<sup>5</sup>

Themistius' surviving Aristotelian paraphrases in Greek are those of the *Posterior Analytics*, *Physics*, and *De anima*, while the paraphrases of the *De caelo* and *Metaphysics* 12 are extant only in Hebrew translations. Other paraphrases of the *Prior Analytics* and of treatises from the *Parva naturalia* were mistakenly attributed to him in the Byzantine tradition (see below). Of Themistius' lost paraphrases, those of the *Categories*, *Prior Analytics*, and *Topics* were the most important. Arabic sources attribute further paraphrases to him, sometimes questionably (see below). Apart from some minor treatises, the rest of the Themistian corpus is represented by his thirty-three surviving orations. These are important documents for the cultural and political history of the fourth century and reveal much about Themistius' own life and education. They are replete with echoes of ancient literature, particularly the Platonic dialogues. The orations did not become significant in Themistius' fortuna until the seventeenth century when they were widely read by historians, who have continued to study them with far closer attention than students of philosophy have given the paraphrases.

\* The paraphrases of Themistius and works by other Greek Aristotelian commentators are identified by the Latin title of the relevant Aristotelian work prefixed by *In*. The editions used in this article are those in the *Commentaria in Aristotelem graeca* series (= CAG) (Berlin, 1882–1907) and its *Supplementum aristotelicum* (= SA), cited by the numbers of the volumes and their parts. More abbreviated references will be given for the works of Themistius, which are fully cited below in Bibliography II.A. The text and traditional numbers of Themistius' orations are cited according to the Teubner edition, *Themistii Orationes*, ed. H. Schenkl, G. Downey, and A. F. Norman, 3 vols. (Leipzig, 1965–74). The letters of Ermolao Barbaro the Younger are cited from *Ermolao Barbaro: Epistolae, orationes et carmina*, ed. V. Branca, 2 vols. (Florence, 1943).

I acknowledge the support of research grants from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, the University of British Columbia, and the Ancient Commentators Project (per Professor Richard Sorabji). I would also like to thank, in addition to the CTC's readers, Professors Virginia Brown and John Vanderspoel for advice and suggestions.

1. Themist., *In Anal. post.* 1.2–2.4. For a discussion of his paraphrastic method see R. B. Todd, *Themistius on Aristotle on the Soul*, *Ancient Commentators on Aristotle* (London, 1996), 4–7.

2. The tradition that he was merely a follower of Alexander is ancient; see Priscian, *Solutiones ad Chosroem* (SA 1.2), ed. I. Bywater (Berlin, 1886), 42.17–18. Ermolao Barbaro knew and rejected it; see I.2 below.

3. See Bibliography II.D below and F. M. Schroeder and R. B. Todd, *Two Greek Aristotelian Commentators on the Intellect: The De intellectu Attributed to Alexander of Aphrodisias and Themistius' Paraphrase of Aristotle De anima* 3.4–8, *Mediaeval Sources in Translation* 33 (Toronto, 1990), 101–103.

4. See the two articles by S. Pinès in Bibliography II.C. (Book 12 of the *Metaphysics* will hereafter be cited only by its number).

5. This is most evident from his commentary on the *De anima*; see Schroeder and Todd, *Two Greek Aristotelian Commentators on the Intellect* (n. 3 above) for some references. For Porphyry's possible influence on Themistius' views on religious plurality see J. Vanderspoel, *Themistius and the Imperial Court: Oratory, Civic Duty, and Paideia from Constantius to Theodosius* (Ann Arbor, 1995), 25–26.

## LATE ANTIQUITY

Themistius' works were known to the Greek Aristotelian commentators of the fifth and sixth centuries A.D., notably Simplicius (sixth century) who refers to Themistius' paraphrases of the *Categories* and *De caelo* in his own commentaries on those works. Such later references have occasionally been thought to show that Themistius composed major commentaries (ὑπομνήματα) in addition to his extant paraphrases, but this view has not won wide support.<sup>6</sup> The later Greek commentators made limited use of Themistius since, unlike many of them, he was not a Platonist and, as a relatively unadventurous exegete, he was rarely crucial to their preoccupations.<sup>7</sup>

Themistius' visits to Rome (in 357 and 376) helped to spread his influence.<sup>8</sup> Of the paraphrases that became known in the Latin West during his lifetime, those of the *Organon* were the most popular, and the two paraphrases of the *Prior Analytics* and *Posterior Analytics* may have been translated, or at least used, by Vettius Praetextatus (ca. 320–384).<sup>9</sup> Boethius (ca. 480–524) later made extensive use of Themistius' commentary on the *Topics*, notably in his own *De differentiis topicis*,<sup>10</sup> and his reports were subsequently used by Cassiodorus (ca. 490–ca. 583) in the latter's *De artibus et disciplinis liberalium artium*. Finally, a work known as the pseudo-Augustinian *De decem categoriis* from the late fourth century (so called from a later attribution to St. Augustine) is based on Themistius' lost commentary on the *Categories*.<sup>11</sup>

6. C. Steel's suggestion has been rejected, e.g., by H. J. Blumenthal, "Photius on Themistius (Cod. 74): Did Themistius Write Commentaries on Aristotle?" *Hermes* 107 (1979) 168–82.

7. See H. J. Blumenthal, "Alexander of Aphrodisias in the Later Greek Commentaries on Aristotle's *De anima*," in J. Wiesner, ed., *Aristoteles: Werk und Wirkung: Paul Moraux gewidmet*, vol. 2 (Berlin and New York, 1987), 90–106 at 102–103.

8. Vanderspoel, *Themistius and the Imperial Court*, especially 184–85.

9. Boethius, *Commentarii in librum Aristotelis Περὶ ἐρμηνείας*, ed. K. Meiser (Leipzig, 1880), ed. sec., pp. 3.7–4.3.

10. See E. Stump, "Boethius's Work on the Topics," *Vivarium* 12 (1974) 77–93 at 87–91 for the relevant passages; see also S. Ebbesen, *Commentators and Commentaries on Aristotle's Sophistici Elenchi. A Study of Post-Aristotelian Ancient and Medieval Writings on Fallacies*, vol. 1, *Corpus latinum commentariorum in Aristotelem graecorum* 7.1 (Leiden, 1981), 117–22.

11. For this work, see the edition by L. Minio-Paluello, *Aristoteles latinus* 1.5 (Bruges and Paris, 1961). On the au-

It survived in a large number of manuscripts and was, along with the works of Boethius, a major source of the knowledge of Themistius in the Latin West.

## SYRIAC, ARABIC, AND HEBREW

More of the Themistian corpus was known to Syriac and Arabic authors than has survived in Greek, although some of the attributions in these sources are dubious.<sup>12</sup> There are, for example, Arabic versions of an important letter of Themistius to the emperor Julian and a work on the syllogism.<sup>13</sup> Syriac and Arabic translations of the Aristotelian paraphrases included those on the *Prior Analytics*, *Categories*, *Metaphysics* 12, and *De caelo*. The latter two survive only in Hebrew translations made from the Arabic in the thirteenth century; for their sixteenth-century Latin translations see III.1 and IV.1 below. The modern discovery of the Arabic manuscript of the paraphrase of the *De anima*, translated probably by Ishaq ibn Hunayn (d. 910), revealed an independent witness in the manuscript tradition that significantly improves the Greek text.<sup>14</sup>

Themistius' philosophical works are quoted and discussed by several Arabic and Hebrew au-

thorship, see Minio-Paluello, "The Text of the *Categoriae*: The Latin Tradition," *Classical Quarterly* 39 (1945) 63–74 at 66–68; his attribution of the *De decem categoriis* to one Albinus has been challenged by G. Pfligersdorffer, "Zur Frage nach dem Verfasser der pseudo-augustinischen *Categoriae Decem*," *Wiener Studien* 65 (1950) 131–37. P. Hadot, *Marius Victorinus: recherches sur sa vie et ses oeuvres* (Paris, 1971), 197, argues that Vettius Praetextatus was the author.

12. For inventories, see 'A. Badawī, *La transmission de la philosophie grecque au monde arabe*, 2d rev. and enl. ed., *Etudes de philosophie médiévale* 56 (Paris, 1987), 100–102 and F. E. Peters, *Aristoteles arabus. The Oriental Translations and Commentaries of the Aristotelian Corpus* (Leiden, 1968), passim. The Syriac work *De virtute* is edited in *Themistii Orationes*, vol. 3, 7–71 Downey-Norman. On one questionable attribution, see Mattock (Bibliography II.C below). The commentary on the *Nicomachean Ethics* mentioned by an Arabic source is also questionable, and there is no corroboratory evidence from Greek sources for the paraphrases of the *De generatione et corruptione* and *Poetics*.

13. See Badawī, *ibid.*, 166–80 for a French translation. For the letter to Julian, see *Themistii Orationes*, vol. 3, 73–119 Downey-Norman.

14. See M. C. Lyons, ed., *The Arabic Version of Themistius' 'De Anima'* (London, 1973) and G. M. Browne, "Ad Themistium Arabum," *Illinois Classical Studies* 12 (1986) 223–45.

thors (see the literature cited in Bibliography II.C below). This influence, reflected notably in the works of al-Fārābī (d. 950),<sup>15</sup> began when the works of Alexander of Aphrodisias and Themistius were translated into Arabic at Baghdad during the ninth century; subsequently they became the most widely used of the Greek commentators. The Aristotelian commentaries of Ibn Rushd (Averroes, 1126–98), particularly those on the *De anima* and the *Topics*,<sup>16</sup> and the citations contained in these commentaries were a major source of medieval Europe's knowledge of Themistian exegesis.

### THE MIDDLE AGES

In medieval Europe Themistius was well known not only from references in Arabic sources but also through a Latin translation of the paraphrase of the *Posterior Analytics* (I.1 below).<sup>17</sup> The Latin tradition continued to furnish indirect access to the paraphrase of the *Categories* through the treatise *De decem categoriis* and to the paraphrase of the *Topics* through references in Boethius and Cassiodorus.<sup>18</sup> The Greek world provided William of Moerbeke (ca. 1215–85/86) with the manuscript for his translation in 1267 of the paraphrase of the *De anima* (II.1 below).<sup>19</sup>

15. F. W. Zimmermann, trans., *Al-Fārābī's Commentary and Short Treatise on Aristotle's 'De Interpretatione'* (Oxford, 1981), ci–ciii.

16. The editions of the Hebrew translations of the paraphrases of the *De caelo* and *Metaphysics* 12 (CAG 5.3 and 5.4 respectively) also include evidence of Averroes' citations of Themistius.

17. This translation also helped generate one pseudonymous Themistian work in some manuscripts of Gerard of Cremona's translation of al-Kindī's treatise *De somno et visione*, where the author is given as Themistius and the title as *De somno et vigilia*. See the edition by A. Nagy, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters*, vol. 2.5 (1897), xxxi where this misattribution is noted for Venice, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, ms. Marc. lat. VI 55 (2665) (Aristoteles latinus 2.1104). It also occurs in Cesena, Biblioteca Malatestiana, ms. D XXII 4; see G. Avarucci et al., eds., *Catalogo di manoscritti filosofici nelle biblioteche italiane*, vol. 4 (Florence, 1982), 50–51.

18. Some twelfth-century manuscripts of the *Dialectica* of Cassiodorus, a work based on the Boethian treatise, display an attribution to Themistius; see V. Rose, "Die Lücke im Diogenes Laërtius und der alte Übersetzer," *Hermes* 1 (1886) 367–97 at 384. See also Aristoteles latinus 3.84, no. 2054 (Orléans, Bibliothèque de la Ville, ms. 263 [219], s. X–XI, pp. 74–80) for a collection of Themistian material, undoubtedly taken from Boethius' *De differentiis topicis*.

19. A letter, dated to 1156, of Henricus Aristippus refers

The availability and circulation of so much material ensured that Themistius was used and assimilated in a variety of contexts. In the first half of the thirteenth century, for example, Robert Grosseteste (ca. 1168–1253) used the paraphrase of the *Posterior Analytics* in his commentary on that work.<sup>20</sup> Themistius, however, came to be primarily associated with debates about the status of the active intellect in Aristotle's psychology and its implications for the Christian conception of the immortality of the soul. Here a lengthy digression in his paraphrase of Aristotle's *De anima* 3.5 was crucial.<sup>21</sup> Modern studies have thoroughly explored this issue, especially with reference to the *De unitate intellectus contra Averroistas* of Thomas Aquinas (ca. 1225–74) and the works of Siger of Brabant (ca. 1240–84), Henry Bate of Malines (ca. 1245–after 1310), and James of Viterbo (ca. 1255–1308).<sup>22</sup> Themistius' contribution, of course, formed only a part of the inheritance from Greek Aristotelianism, since opuscula were available on the same topic by Alexander of Aphrodisias and John Philoponus.<sup>23</sup>

to the availability of Themistius' works in Sicily; see *Phaedo, interprete Henrico Aristippo*, ed. L. Minio-Paluello, *Plato latinus 2* (London, 1950), 89. There is no further evidence to corroborate this, although Aristippus may have been otherwise engaged with the Greek commentators; fragments survive of a translation, perhaps by him, of Alexander of Aphrodisias' commentary on the *Meteorologica* (CTC 2.145). See also N. G. Wilson, *Scholars of Byzantium* (London, 1983), 213–14 on Aristippus' Greek texts.

20. C. Prantl, *Geschichte der Logik im Abendlande*, vol. 3 (Leipzig, 1867), 85.

21. See the annotated translation in Schroeder and Todd, *Two Greek Aristotelian Commentators on the Intellect* (n. 3 above), 87–117.

22. See Bibliography II.D.1 below. Since Theophrastus and Themistius were often coupled in Arabic and medieval reports, many of the key medieval texts reporting Themistius' views on the intellect are now available in *Theophrastus of Eresus: Sources for His Life, Writings, Thought and Influence*, ed. W. W. Fortenbaugh et al., vol. 2 (Leiden, 1992), 52–105.

23. For Alexander, see CTC 1.111–12 on Gerard of Cremona's translation of the *De intellectu*; for Philoponus' commentary on part of book 3 of the *De anima* in William of Moerbeke's translation, see G. Verbeke, ed., *Jean Philopon: Commentaire sur le De Anima d'Aristote, traduction de Guillaume de Moerbeke*, *Corpus latinum commentariorum in Aristotelem graecorum 3* (Louvain and Paris, 1966) and the English translation by W. Charlton, *Philoponus 'On Aristotle on the Intellect' ('De anima' 3,4–8)* (London, 1991).

## BYZANTINE

The *fortuna* of Themistius in Byzantium between the ninth and fourteenth centuries is inseparable from the *fortuna*e of the other ancient Aristotelian commentators in an era that, particularly in its later phase, was rich in Aristotelian scholarship. Hence Themistius was included in a wider movement in which Byzantine scholars continued the ancient tradition of Aristotelian exegesis.<sup>24</sup>

The Suda Lexicon (end of the tenth century) and Photius (d. before 858)<sup>25</sup> describe the Themistian corpus of paraphrases and orations much as it actually survives today, although the report in the Suda suggests that the commentaries on the *Categories* and *Prior Analytics* may have been available in early Byzantium. In addition to the paraphrases, Photius refers both to Aristotelian commentaries and also to “exegetical exercises on Plato”. But these works were probably not available to him, and, in the case of the latter, Photius may simply be referring to Themistius’ discussions of Platonic texts in his paraphrases.<sup>26</sup>

Eleventh- and twelfth-century Byzantine Aristotelianism, represented principally by Michael Psellus (1018–ca. 1081) and Michael of Ephesus (fl. ca. 1100–50), does not show marked signs of Themistian influence, but his works must have been known to both of them and may have been a model for their paraphrastic exegesis.<sup>27</sup> Eustratius (fl. 1100) mentions Themistius only once in his commentary on the *Posterior Analytics*.<sup>28</sup> Psellus’ commentaries have not been sufficiently studied to determine whether he incorporated material without acknowledgement from Themistius, as

24. On Byzantine Aristotelianism, see H. Hunger, *Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner*, vol. 1 (Munich, 1978), 25–41 and L. Benakis, “Grundbibliographie zum Aristoteles-Studium in Byzanz,” in *Aristoteles: Werk und Wirkung* (n. 7 above), 352–79 (where the Renaissance editions and translations of works by Byzantine Aristotelians are listed); see also the bibliography in R. Sorabji, ed., *Aristotle Transformed: The Ancient Commentators and Their Influence* (London and Ithaca, N. Y., 1990), 519–20.

25. For both texts see *Themistii Orationes*, vol. 3, 134–35 Downey-Norman.

26. Further information is provided by J. Vanderspoel, “The ‘Themistius Collection’ of Commentaries on Plato and Aristotle,” *Phoenix* 43 (1989) 162–64.

27. The title of Psellus’ commentary on the *De interpretatione*, for example, is *Παραφραστική ἐξήγησις*.

28. Eustratius, *In An. post.* (CAG 21.1), ed. M. Hayduck (Berlin, 1907), 11.5–9.

Michael of Ephesus did from the works of Alexander of Aphrodisias.<sup>29</sup>

Around 1300 the commentator Sophonias, in a survey of exegetical technique, coupled Psellus and Themistius as major practitioners of the paraphrastic type of commentary.<sup>30</sup> Another noted figure of that period who mentions Themistius is Theodorus Metoichites (1270–1332).<sup>31</sup> His Aristotelian paraphrases may also have been influenced by the form and content of the Themistian works.<sup>32</sup> Finally, Themistius’ commentary on the *Topics* may have been known indirectly through the translation by Maximus Planudes (1255–1305) of Boethius’ *De differentiis topicis*.<sup>33</sup>

The earliest complete manuscript of Themistius presently known was copied by a Greek scribe in the eleventh century (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Coisl. 386), and it contains the paraphrase of Aristotle’s *De anima* together with the text of the Aristotelian work.<sup>34</sup>

29. The references to Themistius in Opusc. 13 of *Michaelis Pselli Philosophica minora*, vol. 2, ed. J. M. Duffy and D. J. O’Meara (Leipzig, 1989), 59.27–60.2 are from an intermediary source, i.e., Philoponus’ commentary on the *De anima* (CAG 15). On Michael’s borrowings, see P. L. Donini, “Il ‘De Anima’ di Alessandro di Afrodisia e Michele Efesio,” *Rivista di filologia e di istruzione classica* 96 (1968) 316–23.

30. Sophonias, *In De an.* (CAG 23.1), ed. M. Hayduck (Berlin, 1883), 1.11–22.

31. *Theodori Metochitae Miscellanea philosophica et historica. Graece*, ed. M. C. G. Müller (Leipzig, 1821), 95–96, where Themistius’ name occurs in a catalogue of several ancient Aristotelian commentators.

32. Certainly the Latin translation by Gertius Hervet (1499–1584; CTC 1.109–10) of Metoichites’ collection of paraphrases *In Aristotelis universam naturalem philosophiam* (Basel, 1559 and 1562) has at the opening of its paraphrase of the *De anima* (ed. of Basel, 1562, p. 183) a passage that resembles Themistius, *In De an.* 1.11–17. Similar use might also be anticipated in another compendium, the *Philosophia* of George Pachymeres (1248–ca. 1310), which, like Metoichites’ work, has never been completely edited; see Benakis, “Grundbibliographie,” 360–61.

33. On this translation, see A. Pertusi, “La fortuna di Boezio a Bisanzio,” in *ΠΑΓΚΑΠΤΕΙΑ: Mélanges Henri Grégoire*, vol. 3 (Brussels, 1951) (= Université libre de Bruxelles, *Annuaire de l’Institut de philologie et d’histoire orientales et slaves* 11 [1951]), 301–22.

34. See R. B. Todd, “An Inventory of the Greek Manuscripts of Themistius’ Aristotelian Commentaries,” *Byzantion* 67 (1997) 268–76; this updates the sometimes inaccurate and incomplete data in the introductions to the CAG editions. For a project which will describe in detail the manuscripts of the Greek and Byzantine Aristotelian commentators, together with some sample inventories, see G. de Gregorio and P. Eleuteri, “Per un catalogo sommario dei manoscritti greci dei *Commentaria in Aris-*

The same combination is found in other manuscripts of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, with the Themistian paraphrase sometimes in the form of marginal scholia to the Aristotelian text.<sup>35</sup> Moreover, anthologies with other commentaries may include also the paraphrases of Themistius.<sup>36</sup>

Themistius' status by the fourteenth century is evident from the attribution to him of paraphrases of some treatises from Aristotle's *Parva naturalia*, namely, *De memoria*, *De somno*, *De insomniis*, and *De divinatione per somnum*. Originally these may have been compiled by Sophonias from the works of Michael of Ephesus, and they were presumably associated with Themistius because of the exegetical form that he was thought to typify.<sup>37</sup> A similar, although less influential, error was the fourteenth-century attribution to Themistius of a paraphrase of the *Prior Analytics*.<sup>38</sup> By the end of that century Byzantine Aristotelianism was thoroughly engaged with the Greek Aristotelian commentators generally, and twenty-two of the manuscripts of Themistius' paraphrases belong to the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.

Regarding the circulation and use of Themistius' orations in Byzantium there is little to say. Byzantine orators may have addressed emperors, as Themistius had their ancient predecessors, but they did so without his commitment to pagan culture. The contents of surviving manuscripts suggest that Themistius' orations were anthologized into small groups for convenient thematic reading. This tendency was so marked that there is only one surviving witness (Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, J 22 sup.), dated to the beginning of the fifteenth century, which contains all thirty-three speeches.

---

*totalem graeca et byzantina: specimen (Leiden, Modena),*" in F. Berger et al., eds., *Symbolae berolinenses für Dieter Harlfinger* (Amsterdam, 1993), 117–67.

35. For example, Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, 87.25 (s. XIII) is a copy derived from Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Coisl. 386 and containing both Themistius and the Aristotelian text, while Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. gr. 307 (s. XIII) has Themistian marginalia to a text of books 1–4 of Aristotle's *Physics*.

36. One such instance is Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, 71.32 (a. 1309/10), a wide-ranging anthology of commentaries on logic and psychology which includes Themistius' paraphrase of the *Posterior Analytics*.

37. See the discussion of their provenance by P. Wendland (CAG 5.6:v–xi) and the articles by Rose and Freudenthal cited in Bibliography II.B below.

38. M. Wallies in CAG 23.3 (Berlin, 1884), v.

#### FIFTEENTH AND SIXTEENTH CENTURIES

Themistius' *fortuna* in this period is, like his Byzantine *fortuna*, inseparable from the wider history of the assimilation of the Greek commentators and the development of Aristotelianism, although it is as yet difficult to compare the reception of Themistius with that of the other Greek commentators.<sup>39</sup>

The period from 1400 up to the publication of the first edition of Ermolao Barbaro's translation of Themistius in 1481 can be documented through the external evidence of the copying, ownership, and circulation of Greek manuscripts. One significant thread links the Florentine exile Palla Strozzi (ca. 1373–1462) with two Greek scholar-scribes, John Argyropoulos (1416–86) and Andronicus Callistus (fl. 1440–80). Strozzi copied the paraphrase of the *De anima* at Milan in 1401/2 and also copied parts of the paraphrase of the *Physics*.<sup>40</sup> Both Argyropoulos and Callistus, who were associated with Strozzi at Padua around 1440, copied the paraphrase of the *De anima*.<sup>41</sup> Argyropoulos pioneered a new paraphrastic style of translation of Aristotelian works; he was later attacked for being in part influenced by Themistius.<sup>42</sup>

39. This is particularly true of the fifteenth century; see R. B. Todd, "Baltasar Meliavacca, Andronicus Callistus, and the Greek Aristotelian Commentators in Fifteenth-Century Italy," *Italia medioevale e umanistica* 37 (1994) 67–75. The only other major Greek commentator whose *fortuna* in this period has been documented is Alexander of Aphrodisias; see CTC 1.77–135, 2.411–22, and 7.296–98.

40. The first of these is now Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, gr. 1851; the second, Modena, Archivio di Stato, II.13. Strozzi also owned two manuscripts of the paraphrase of the *Physics*: Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. gr. 1025 and Wrocław, Biblioteka Uniwersytecka, Magd. 1442 (M. L. Sosower, "Palla Strozzi's Greek Manuscripts," *Studi italiani di filologia classica*, 3d Ser., 4 [1986] 140–51 at 150–51).

41. Argyropoulos' copy is now Venice, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, Marc. gr. IV 13 (1329), fols. 1r–103r; the apograph by Callistus is, I argue (article cited in n. 39 above), Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Ashburnham 1599 (fols. 1r–104r). Callistus also wrote marginalia in the text of a manuscript of Themistius' paraphrase of the *Physics* (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, gr. 1890); see E. Gamillscheg and D. Harlfinger, *Repertorium der griechischen Kopisten 800–1600*, vol. 2 A (Vienna, 1989), 34, no. 25.

42. The attack was launched by Michael Sophianus (ca. 1530–65) in the preface to his translation of Aristotle's *De anima*, first published at Venice in 1562. See A. Meschini, *Michele Sofianòs*, *Studi bizantini e neogreci* 12 (Padua, 1981), 38.

Several Themistian manuscripts were in the Aristotelica collected by Cardinal Bessarion (ca. 1395–1472).<sup>43</sup> In 1430 Francesco Filelfo (1398–1481) loaned his manuscript of Themistius' paraphrase of the *Posterior Analytics* to Vittorino da Feltre (1378–1446).<sup>44</sup> Later in the century, Giovanni Pico della Mirandola (1463–94) sought the help of Giorgio Valla (1447–1500) in obtaining a manuscript of the same work.<sup>45</sup> George of Trebizond (1395–1484) had access to a manuscript of the paraphrase of the *Physics* that he used in his scholia on the Aristotelian work.<sup>46</sup>

Themistian studies were given impetus and a Latin focus when Ermolao Barbaro the Younger (1454–93), still only in his twenties, translated the whole of the Themistian corpus between 1473 and 1480. His ambitious undertaking paralleled that of two of his dedicatees, namely, Antonio de Ferraris (Galateo) (1448–1517) and Girolamo Donato (ca. 1456–1511), both of whom translated works of Alexander of Aphrodisias.<sup>47</sup> Nicoletto Vernia (d.

1499) was active at the University of Padua when Barbaro studied there in the 1470s.<sup>48</sup> Later Vernia and his pupil Agostino Nifo (ca. 1470–1538) made extensive use of the Greek commentators, particularly in dealing with Aristotle's account of the active intellect as it impinged on the issue of the immortality of the soul.<sup>49</sup>

Barbaro's translation of Themistius reflected his claims that Aristotle could be read more effectively with the help of his Greek commentators than by reliance on representatives of other exegetical traditions, a program that he tried to implement in his teaching at Venice in the 1480s.<sup>50</sup> This attitude, apparently shared by Vernia and Nifo, formed part of a general movement in the 1490s to make the Greek commentators more widely available. Although Prince Alberto Pio of Carpi (ca. 1475–1531), for example, encouraged Aldo Manuzio (1449–1515) to produce printed editions of the Greek texts of the commentators, a complete set of editions was not available for some decades.<sup>51</sup> Themistius' paraphrases first appeared in the Aldine edition of 1534, edited by Vettore Trincavelli (1491–1593); this was the only

43. Venice, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, Zan. gr. 261 (725), fols. 202r–238v (text of the paraphrase of the *De anima*) includes "lemmata et scholia Bessarionis"; see E. Mioni, *Codices graeci manuscripti Bibliothecae Divi Marci Venetiarum*, vol. 1 (Rome, 1981), 377. Other manuscripts of Themistian paraphrases owned by Bessarion are Venice, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, Zan. gr. 205 (605), 211 (750), 228 (406), and 230 (579). On Bessarion see CTC 2.306 and 7.167–68.

44. For the evidence, see A. Calderini, "Ricerche intorno alla biblioteca e alla cultura greca di Francesco Filelfo," *Studi italiani di filologia classica* 20 (1913) 204–424 at 250 and G. Pesenti, "Vittorino da Feltre e gli inizi della scuola di greco in Italia," *Athenaeum*, N. S., 3 (1925) 1–16 at 9 and 16 (on Filelfo see CTC 1.215 and 7.93). The scribe Gerard of Patras (fl. 1420–43), who was associated with Vittorino da Feltre and Filelfo, has been identified as the scribe of two Themistian works: the paraphrase of the *Physics* in Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, gr. 1890 (Gamillscheg and Harlfinger, *Repertorium*, vol. 2, part A, 60, no. 107) and the paraphrase of the *De anima* in the form of scholia in Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. gr. 2183 (*Codices Vaticani graeci*: S. Lilla, *Codices 2162–2254* [Vatican City, 1985], 80–81).

45. See the letter in J. L. Heiberg, *Beiträge zur Geschichte Georg Vallas und seiner Bibliothek, Centralblatt für Bibliothekswesen*, Beiheft 16 (1896), 61. For Pico's ownership of the 1481 edition of Barbaro's translations of Themistius see P. Kibre, *The Library of Pico della Mirandola* (New York, 1936), 196, 223, and 277.

46. J. Monfasani, ed., *Collectanea Trapezuntiana: Texts, Documents and Bibliographies of George of Trebizond*, Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies 25 (Binghamton, N. Y., 1984), 605–606. On George see CTC 2.137 and 5.185.

47. For Galateo and Donato, see below n. 53 and X.1 respectively.

48. There are two letters from Barbaro to Vernia: *Ep.* 31 (1.45–47 Branca) from 1483 and *Ep.* 62 (1.79–80 Branca) from 1484.

49. See the studies of Paduan Aristotelianism by E. P. Mahoney in Bibliography II.D.2 below. On Nifo's use of Themistius' paraphrase of the *Posterior Analytics* see N. Jardine, "Galileo's Road to Truth and the Demonstrative Regress," *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science* 7 (1976) 277–318 at 290–93. Earlier an anthology entitled *Propositiones universales Aristotelis* had been published at Treviso around 1476 containing (fol. 22r) passages from the medieval translation of Themistius' paraphrases of the *De anima*. For the edition (copy at BNF), see Hain 13413. Vernia's annotated copies of the first edition of Barbaro's translations survive; see Mahoney, "Philosophy and Science in Nicoletto Vernia and Agostino Nifo," 156 n. 46. I have not seen London, British Library, Add. ms. 10316 (Kristeller, *Iter* 4.88b), a fifteenth-century Italian manuscript in which Themistius is included in a philosophical doxography, to determine if it is linked with contemporary Aristotelianism in northern Italy.

50. See *Ep.* 72 (1.92 Branca).

51. C. B. Schmitt, "Alberto Pio and the Aristotelian Studies of His Time," in *Società politica e cultura a Carpi ai tempi di Alberto III Pio. Atti del Convegno internazionale, Carpi, 19–21 maggio 1978* (Padua, 1981), 43–64, reprinted in Schmitt, *The Aristotelian Tradition and Renaissance Universities* (London, 1984), no. 6. Aldus' goal of publishing the Greek commentators is stated in a dedicatory letter to Alberto Pio in his edition *Aristotelis Organon* (Venice, 1495); this letter is reprinted in C. Dionisotti and G. Orlandi, *Aldo Manuzio editore: dediche, prefazioni, note ai testi* (Milan, 1975), 7.



edition to be produced before the nineteenth century, and it was inevitably inadequate since the Greek text is based on a single manuscript.<sup>52</sup> Meanwhile Barbaro's translations of the paraphrases were widely diffused. Twice before 1500 and thirteen times between 1500 and 1570 they were published in their entirety; there are also editions that included selected translations. Barbaro's translations of the strictly exegetical works of a Greek commentator are the first of this genre to be published in the Renaissance as well as the most popular, to judge from the number of editions.<sup>53</sup>

The impact of this diffusion among philosophers can be determined to some extent. Clearly at Padua the Themistian works, and particularly the paraphrase of the *De anima*, contributed to a debate centered on the Aristotelian theory of the intellect and its ramifications for the issue of the immortality of the soul. In addition, Marsilio Ficino (1433–99) was probably led to Themistius by Barbaro.<sup>54</sup> Otherwise Themistius may have been involved in a reaction against any form of Aristotelian exegesis that depended heavily on secondary works of any kind in favor of a return to the text itself.<sup>55</sup> Certainly Jacques Lefèvre

d'Étaples (Faber Stapulensis, ca. 1455–1536), who advocated such an approach, had met Barbaro at Rome in 1491 and doubtless knew the Themistian paraphrases.<sup>56</sup> They may well have served as an ancient precedent for his own commentaries, which Lefèvre also entitled *paraphrases*.<sup>57</sup> More generally, Themistius must have been welcomed by students of Aristotle as offering an exegesis unencumbered by extensive criticism of predecessors or any emphatic philosophical *parti pris*.

Throughout the sixteenth century Themistius was cited in Aristotelian commentaries and treatises as one voice among many in the chorus of commentators, particularly when it was a question of the status of the intellect.<sup>58</sup> Padua, where manuscripts circulated and were copied, is the source of much of this evidence.<sup>59</sup> In exegesis,

---

utraque lingua dixerint referre, sed breviter et cum delectu" (*Ep.* 2.107–108 Branca).

56. See further E. F. Rice, Jr., "Humanist Aristotelianism in France: Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples and His Circle," in *Humanism in France at the End of the Middle Ages and in the Early Renaissance*, ed. A. H. T. Levi (Manchester, 1970), 132–49 at 137–40. On Faber see also CTC 1.143.

57. That at least is suggested by Johannes Cochlaeus (d. 1552; "Johannes Cochlaeus," *Contemporaries of Erasmus* 1.321–22 [I. Guenther]) in a dedicatory letter to an edition (Nuremberg, 1512) of Lefèvre d'Étaples' paraphrase of Aristotle's *Meteorologica*. He describes Barbaro as having translated Themistius' paraphrase into Latin, while Lefèvre d'Étaples "illum secutus latinam interpretationem planiorem reddidit." For the text, see E. F. Rice, Jr., *The Prefatory Epistles of Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples and Related Texts* (New York and London, 1972), 260 and 257–61 for the whole dedication with some commentary. At the other extreme, Juan Luis Vives (1492–1540) included Themistius among the host of commentators he felt had impeded an understanding of Aristotle; see C. G. Noreña, *Juan Luis Vives*, Archives internationales d'histoire des idées 34 (The Hague, 1970), 168.

58. For a typical example, see the *Commentarii in tertium librum Aristotelis De anima* (Paris, 1543) by Francesco Vicomercato (fl. 1540–80) (on whom see N. W. Gilbert, "Francesco Vimercato of Milan: A Bio-Bibliography," *Studies in the Renaissance* 12 [1965] 188–217), where in a lengthy digression "de anima rationali peripatetica" (ed. cit., pp. 209–93) Themistius' views are contrasted, as they frequently were, with those of Alexander of Aphrodisias (p. 213).

59. Oxford, Bodleian Library, Auct. F. inf. 2.4 (the paraphrases of the *Posterior Analytics* and *Physics*) was copied at Padua by Leonellus Leonus in 1518. Udine, Biblioteca Arcivescovile, 257 (olim gr. VI.4) was once owned by Cardinal Domenico Grimani (d. 1523) who was at Padua in the first quarter of the sixteenth century. A manuscript from Padua or Venice was probably used by the annotator of later Venetian editions of Barbaro's translations ("Anonymus Venetus"; see I.a below). Two other scribes

52. *Adversaria* by Pier Vettori (Petrus Victorius, 1499–1585; CTC 4.235 and 7.175) on this edition were written into a copy at Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek (A.gr.b.1070); these were used by L. Spengel in his edition of the paraphrases (Leipzig, 1866).

53. In fact, there is only one other contemporary translation of an exegetical work, namely, the now missing translation made in the late 1470s by Antonio de Ferraris (Galateo) of Alexander of Aphrodisias' commentary on Aristotle's *Meteorologica*; see CTC 7.296. The sole commentary approaching Barbaro's Themistiana in frequency of editions is the translation of John Philoponus' commentary on the *Posterior Analytics* with twelve editions before 1600; see C. B. Schmitt, "Philoponus' Commentary on Aristotle's *Physics* in the Sixteenth Century," in R. Sorabji, ed., *Philoponus and the Rejection of Aristotelian Science* (London, 1987), 210–30 at 228, reprinted in Schmitt, *Reappraisals in Renaissance Thought*, ed. C. Webster (London, 1989), no. 8.

54. Ficino notes that Themistius and Priscianus Lydus had taught him that the differences between Plato and Aristotle on the soul were only verbal (*Expositio in interpretationem Prisciani Lydi super Theophrastum*, dedicatory letter to Philippus Valorus, in *Opera omnia* 2.2 [Basel, 1576; rpt. Turin, 1959], 1801). On Ficino see CTC 1.139.

55. Barbaro himself advocated an arm's-length approach to all commentators. See his *Oratio* 3, delivered to his students at Venice in 1484, where he proclaims: "Animus est et professio primum Aristotelis ipsius tum verba tum sensum interpretari, deinde quid expositores eius

from Marcantonio Zimarra (1475/6–ca. 1537), who wrote a set of problems and solutions on Themistius (see II.b below), to Federico Pendasio (d. 1603) and Jacopo Zabarella (1533–89), Themistius played a role in Paduan Aristotelianism.<sup>60</sup> Barbaro's version of the paraphrase of the *Physics* engaged Galileo Galilei (1564–1642) in his early work *De motu*.<sup>61</sup> Padua was also the university of Francesco Patrizi da Cherso (1529–97; CTC 1.141) who supported a translation from the Hebrew of Themistius' paraphrase of *Metaphysics* 12 by his friend, the Jewish physician Mosè Finzi (fl. 1540–80), which was published in 1558 (IV.1 below).<sup>62</sup>

The quality of Barbaro's translations of the paraphrases was to draw some unfavorable comment, as, for example, in the case of the *De insomniis*. The Latin version of this work had been hurriedly prepared during the years in which Barbaro was initiating a public career.<sup>63</sup> Barbaro had also been a pupil of Theodore Gaza (ca. 1400–75), who, like John Argyropoulos, had practiced a paraphrastic style of translation from the

---

who may have been engaged with Themistius at Padua were Constantinus Mesobotes, the copyist of two manuscripts containing the paraphrase of the *Physics* (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, gr. 1891, fols. 11–141v and gr. 1886, fols. 41r–91v), and Scipione Forteguerra (Scipio Carteromachus) (1466–1515), who contributed marginalia to Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, gr. 1921 (paraphrase of the *De anima*). Both these scribes have Paduan connections in the first decade of the sixteenth century with Zacharias Callierges (ca. 1473–1524), who had a particular interest in the Greek commentators; see "Calliergi [Callerggi], Zaccaria," DBI 16.751 (E. Mioni). Finally, Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. gr. 2107A (paraphrase of the *De anima*) was copied at the end of the fifteenth century at Padua by Petrus Syncleticus; see Lilla, *Codices 2162–2254* (n. 44 above), 31–32.

60. On Pendasio see II.d below. For Zabarella see, for example, his *Liber de mente agente*, ch. 9, at *De rebus naturalibus* (Venice, 1590), col. 1021.

61. P. Galluzzi, *Momento: studi galileiani*, Lessico intellettuale europeo 19 (Rome, 1979), 98–100.

62. Patrizi, *Discussiones peripateticae* 1.10 (Basel, 1581), 141 discusses Themistius briefly and identifies him as an unorthodox Christian. Patrizi may have derived this view from Girolamo Donzellini's introduction to his translation of some of the orations (VI.2 below). Patrizi's manuscript of Themistius' paraphrase of the *De anima* is among the missing Escorial volumes; see G. de Andrés, *Catálogo de los códices griegos desaparecidos de la Real Biblioteca de El Escorial* (El Escorial, 1968), 111, no. 250.

63. Barbaro's haste is evident from the dedication to the translation of the paraphrase of the *De insomniis*, where the dedicatee, the poet Galeazzo Pontico Faccino, was enlisted to oversee the printing of the first edition at Treviso in 1481; see VII.1 below.

Greek. In his vigorously formulated dedications Barbaro developed a philosophy of translation that avoided a literal style and any excess of post-classical terminology. This reflected his wider concerns, developed in a celebrated exchange of letters with Giovanni Pico della Mirandola, on the extent to which philosophy should be expressed with literary eloquence.<sup>64</sup>

When Barbaro's translations came to be examined closely, the wider issue receded in the face of doubts about their basic accuracy.<sup>65</sup> Misgivings were first expressed in the notes of an anonymous scholar, probably from Venice or Padua, which appear in eight editions of Barbaro's translations published at Venice between 1527 and 1570. This scholar suggested alternative translations and noted superior readings in a Greek manuscript (see I.a below). The critique continued in the work of Ludovico Nogarola (1507–59), another scholar educated at Padua, whose translation and notes on the paraphrase of *De anima* 3.4–13 were added to the four final Venetian editions of Barbaro's translations (II.3 and II.c below). Nogarola also objected to what he considered Barbaro's use of Silver rather than Ciceronian Latin.<sup>66</sup> Then in the 1580s Federico Bonaventura of Urbino (1555–1602) undertook further scrutiny and spared neither Barbaro, whom he found diffuse and inaccurate, nor Nogarola, whom he regarded as too Ciceronian. Bonaventura espoused a more austere form of translation, and in this he seems to have been influenced by the Aristotelian translations of Michael Sophianus (d. 1565) (see II.4 below).<sup>67</sup>

64. The relevant texts are discussed and translated in Q. Breen, "Giovanni Pico della Mirandola on the Conflict of Philosophy and Rhetoric," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 13 (1952) 384–412. See also F. Bausi, *Nec rhetor neque philosophus: fonti, lingua e stile nelle prime opere latine di Giovanni Pico della Mirandola (1484–87)*, Studi picchiani 3 (Florence, 1996); Bausi, ed. and trans., *Filosofia o eloquenza? Ermolao Barbaro, Giovanni Pico della Mirandola* (Naples, 1998).

65. The process is briefly surveyed by B. Nardi, "Il Commento di Simplicio al *De anima* nelle controversie della fine del secolo XV e del secolo XVI," in Nardi, *Saggi sull'aristotelismo padovano dal secolo XIV al XVI* (Florence, 1958), ch. 13, 366–68.

66. In this he was echoing Erasmus (ca. 1467–1536), who in his *Ciceronianus*, first published in 1528, also linked Barbaro with Silver Latin authors. See *Opera omnia Desiderii Erasmi Roterodami*, vol. 1.2 (Amsterdam, 1969), 662.

67. The claim that philosophical texts need to be translated elegantly is put forward with reference to Themistius by Donzellini in the preface to his translation of

The fortune of Themistius in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries is, then, primarily that of his paraphrases, and this even included the lost paraphrase of Aristotle's *Topics* when Boethius' references to the missing text (see n. 10 above) were collected separately.<sup>68</sup> The orations were not entirely neglected, but they were clearly less popular. Byzantine excerpting (see above) had made a complete edition impossible. The Aldine edition of 1534 by Vettore Trincavelli appended an edition of only eight speeches (*Or.* 18–25) to the paraphrases.<sup>69</sup> This octad was later translated at Venice by Girolamo Donzellini (1513–87) (VI.2 below). In 1562 Henri Estienne (ca. 1531–98) produced an edition of six more orations (*Or.* 2, 4, 5, 7, 9, 10).<sup>70</sup> Nonetheless, the orations did not come into their own until the seventeenth century.<sup>71</sup> It is difficult to say how widely they were read before that time. The case of Angelo Poliziano (1454–94), who owned a manuscript containing two orations and exploited one of them in a lecture on Aristotelian logic, seems atypical.<sup>72</sup>

Themistius' orations (VI.2 below) and Alatino in the preface to his Hebrew-Latin version of Themistius' paraphrase of the *De caelo* (III.1 below).

68. *Le differenze locali di Boezio abbreviate, cavate da Temistio e da Cicerone*, included in a vernacular translation: *La Topica di Cicerone col Commento* (Venice, 1556); see S. Bonghi, ed., *Annali di Gabriel Giolito de'Ferrari da Trino di Monferrato*, vol. 1 (Rome, 1890), 496–97.

69. On this edition, see M. Sicherl, *Die griechischen Erstaussagen des Vettore Trincavelli*, Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Altertums, 1. Reihe, Monographien, N. F., 5 (Paderborn, 1993), 8–27.

70. For Henri Estienne (Henricus Stephanus), see CTC 3.48 and 7.98. On the Aldine and Estienne editions of Themistius, see R. Maisano, "La critica filologica di Petau e Hardouin e l'edizione parigina del 1684 delle orazioni di Temistio," *Archivum historicum Societatis Iesu* 43 (1974) 267–300 at 277–78 and 280–82. Estienne's edition had the patronage of Ulrich Fugger (1526–84) to whom Girolamo Donzellini's translations (VI.2 below) were also dedicated.

71. Only two other sixteenth-century translations have been located (VI.1 and 3 below), neither of which was published. For a vernacular translation of fourteen orations published at Orvieto in 1542, of which no copies have yet been found, see Maisano, *ibid.*, 280.

72. Poliziano's manuscript of *Or.* 20 and 21 is now Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, 60.51; see I. Maier, *Les manuscrits d'Ange Politien* (Geneva, 1965), 335. For a commentary that collects Poliziano's references to Themistius, see A. Wesseling, ed., *Angelo Poliziano, Lamia: praelectio in Priora Aristotelis analytica*, Studies in Medieval and Renaissance Thought 38 (Leiden, 1986). Giovanni Pico della Mirandola also owned a manuscript of

## 1600 TO THE PRESENT

Themistius' orations were edited several times in the seventeenth century, whereas his Aristotelian paraphrases were predictably neglected. Fédéric Morel (1552–1630), Pierre Pantin (1556–1611), and Georg Rehm (1561–1625) enlarged the available corpus of orations in the first decade and a half of the century.<sup>73</sup> Then two Jesuit scholars, Denys Petau (1583–1652) between 1613 and 1618 and Jean Hardouin (1646–1729) in 1685, built on the work of Petau's continuator Gabriel Croisart (d. 1652) and completed the editing and annotation of all but one of the thirty-three orations extant in Greek (Bibliography III.A below).<sup>74</sup> Hardouin's edition provided the standard text for eighteenth-century historians who began to take an increasing interest in later antiquity, the most celebrated of whom was Edward Gibbon (1737–94).<sup>75</sup> In the late eighteenth century Melchiorre Cesarotti (1730–1808) published the first vernacu-

some of the orations; see Kibre, *The Library of Pico della Mirandola* (n. 45 above), 147, no. 192.

73. For Morel, see CTC 1.162, 5.107, and 6.68. On Pantin, see CTC 7.322–24. On the origin of his Greek manuscript for the edition, see G. de Andrés, "El Helenismo del canónigo toledano Antonio de Covarrubias. Un capítulo del Humanismo en Toledo en el s. XVI," *Hispania sacra* 40 (1988) 237–313 at 264–65 and 295–96. The notes to Pantin's edition (Leiden, 1614) by a "vir eruditus" may well be the work of Andreas Schott (1552–1629; J. Fabri, *Bibliotheca belgica*, 2d ed., vol. 6 [Brussels, 1970], 252) rather than Daniel Heinsius (1580–1655; CTC 3.395–96), as suggested by Downey, *Themistii Orationes* 1.xiv. On the role of Isaac Casaubon (1559–1614; CTC 2.262–63) in Pantin's edition, see H. Schenkl, "Beiträge zur Textgeschichte der Reden des Themistios," *Sitzungsberichte der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien*, philosoph.-hist. Klasse, 191.1 (1919) 11–12. (To the adversaria by Casaubon noted by Schenkl add those in a copy of Stephanus' edition of 1562 in London, British Library, C.78.a.9 (2) [Kristeller, *Iter* 4.205a]). On Rehm (Remus), see H. Kunstmann, *Die Nürnberger Universität Altdorf und Böhmen. Beiträge zur Erforschung der Ostbeziehungen deutscher Universitäten* (Cologne and Graz, 1963), 29–144. The six orations translated by Rehm are also extant in two related manuscripts: Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Pal. lat. 1901, fols. 1r–40r (*Or.* 2, 4, 5, 7) and Heidelberg, Universitätsbibliothek, Pal. lat. 1914, fols. 113r–124v (= *Or.* 10, 9); see Kristeller, *Iter* 2.396a and 3.573b respectively.

74. For analyses of these and earlier editions see Schenkl, *ibid.*, 3–46; Maisano, "La critica filologica," *passim*; and Downey, *Themistii Orationes* 1.xiii–xv.

75. See especially ch. 25 of *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* for examples of Gibbon's use of Themistius. For his copy of Hardouin's edition, see G. Keynes, *The Library of Edward Gibbon*, 2d ed. (Dorchester, 1980), 264.

lar translations, but Themistian scholarship in this period was not extensive. Gibbon and Cesarotti both cite the belletrist survey of the orations by Antoine-Léonard Thomas (1732–85).<sup>76</sup>

In 1816 Angelo Mai (1782–1854), using the most complete of the Themistian manuscripts (Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, J 22 sup.), published the one remaining unedited speech (*Or.* 34). The complete edition of 1832 by Wilhelm Dindorf (1802–83) held sway for over a century, but, being hasty and derivative, occasioned much textual criticism, notably from the prolific Carolus Gabriel Cobet (1813–89). Heinrich Schenkl (1859–1919) produced several studies preliminary to an edition, which was finally published in the Teubner series (1965, 1971, 1974), along with some Arabic and Syriac material. Recent studies, however, by Riccardo Maisano (Bibliography III.B below) have shown that the manuscript tradition of the orations needs further examination.

Philosophers and historians of philosophy paid limited attention in these centuries to Themistius.<sup>77</sup> Jacob Brucker (1696–1770) dealt with him in a section on the “Secta Peripatetica” but showed more interest in his orations and his relation to Christianity than in his Aristotelian commentaries. Although Themistius was neglected by Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel (1770–1831),<sup>78</sup> the Hegelian history of Greek philosophy by Eduard Zeller (1814–1908) placed Themistius in a section on the Neoplatonic school after Iamblichus, with the evasive label of “eclectic”. Dispute over Themistius’ scholastic affiliation continues, and he defies easy categorization. His Aristotelian para-

phrases are too austere to convey strong doctrinal commitments, while his orations inevitably exclude serious philosophical discussion.

The Greek paraphrases were reedited in the mid-nineteenth century by Leonhard Spengel (1803–80), and again at the turn of the century by various editors in vol. 5 of the *Commentaria in Aristotelem graeca*. The latter series also included the first editions of the Hebrew texts of the paraphrases on the *De caelo* and book 12 of the *Metaphysics*. There were subsequent editions of the medieval translations of the paraphrases of the *De anima* and *Posterior Analytics*. The availability of these Greek texts enabled editors and commentators to exploit Themistius for both textual and exegetical purposes. Finally, much of the Arabic Themistius has now been edited, notably the translation of the paraphrase of the *De anima* and the fragments of the commentary on *Metaphysics* 12. This scholarship has deepened knowledge of Themistius’ influence, but his paraphrases need closer study in order to understand better the ideas and methods of the commentator himself.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

This bibliography is selective, particularly in part III for the orations, which are widely discussed in works on the history of the fourth century; for literature on them see G. Dagron, “L’Empire romain d’Orient du IV<sup>e</sup> siècle et les traditions politiques d’hellénisme: le témoignage de Thémistios,” *Travaux et mémoires* [Centre de recherche d’histoire et civilisation byzantines] 3 (1967) 1–242, and J. Vanderspoel, *Themistius and the Imperial Court: Oratory, Civic Duty, and Paideia from Constantius to Theodosius* (Ann Arbor, 1995). On Themistius’ philosophical works, and his account of Aristotle’s theory of the intellect, see also F. M. Schroeder and R. B. Todd, *Two Greek Aristotelian Commentators on the Intellect: The De intellectu Attributed to Alexander of Aphrodisias and Themistius’ Paraphrase of Aristotle De anima 3.4–8*, *Mediaeval Sources in Translation* 33 (Toronto, 1990), 31–41 and 77–133; Todd, trans., *Themistius. On Aristotle On the Soul*, *Ancient Commentators on Aristotle* (London, 1996), 1–10; also the bibliography in R. Sorabji, ed., *Aristotle Transformed: The Ancient Commentators and Their Influence* (London, 1990), 503–504.

76. Thomas’ *Essai sur les éloges* was first published at Paris in 1773; I have used the edition of *Oeuvres de Thomas*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1819), where the discussion of Themistius (mostly through observations on selected translations) is in vol. 1, 113–22 (= ch. 21 of the *Essai*). Thomas is cited by Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* (London: Dent, Everyman’s Library, 1910; rpt. 1978), 477 n. 2 and by Cesarotti, *Corso ragionato di letteratura greca*, vol. 2 (Padua, 1784), 315–31 passim.

77. For an instance in which Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz (1646–1717) used Ermolao Barbaro’s translation of Themistius, see T. Ebert, “Entelechie und Monade: Bemerkungen zum Gebrauch eines aristotelischen Begriffs bei Leibniz,” in *Aristoteles: Werk und Wirkung* (n. 7 above), 579–82.

78. See, however, S. Pinès, “Some Distinctive Metaphysical Conceptions in Themistius’ Commentary on Book Lambda and Their Place in the History of Philosophy,” *ibid.*, 202–204 for a possible Themistian element in Hegel.

## I. GENERAL

K. Gesner, *Bibliotheca universalis*, vol. 1 (Zurich, 1545), 608; Fabricius-Harles 6.790–822; J. J. Brucker, *Historia critica philosophiae a mundi incunabulis ad nostram usque aetatem deducta*, vol. 2 (Leipzig, 1767), 484–90; Hoffmann 3.469–72; E. Zeller, *Die Philosophie der Griechen in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung*, 5th ed. rev. by W. Nestle, vol. 3.1 (Leipzig, 1923), 797–801; H. Scholze, *De temporibus librorum Themistii* (Diss. Göttingen, 1911); “Themistios,” PW V A, 2.1642–80 (W. Stegemann). For other encyclopedia articles see Schroeder and Todd, *Two Greek Aristotelian Commentators on the Intellect*, 33 n. 109; add “Themistius,” *Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, 2035–36 (B. Baldwin).

## II. ARISTOTELIAN PARAPHRASES

## A. Editions and Translations

V. Trincavelli, ed., *Omnia Themistii opera, hoc est, Paraphrases et orationes, Alexandri Aphrodisiensis Libri duo De anima et De fatis unus* (Venice, 1534); L. Spengel, ed., *Themistii Paraphrases Aristotelis librorum quae supersunt* (Leipzig, 1866); M. Wallies, ed., *Analyticorum posteriorum paraphrasis*, CAG 5.1 (Berlin, 1900); H. Schenkl, ed., *In Aristotelis Physica paraphrasis*, CAG 5.2 (Berlin, 1900); R. Heinze, ed., *In libros Aristotelis De anima paraphrasis*, CAG 5.3 (Berlin, 1899); S. Landauer, ed., *Themistii In libros Aristotelis De caelo paraphrasis hebraice et latine*, CAG 5.4 (Berlin, 1902); Landauer, ed., *In Aristotelis Metaphysicorum librum lambda paraphrasis hebraice et latine*, CAG 5.5 (Berlin, 1903); P. Wendland, ed., (*Sophonias*) *In Parva naturalia commentarium*, CAG 5.6 (Berlin, 1903); V. de Falco, trans., *Themistio: Parafrasi dei libri di Aristotele sull'Anima* (Padua, 1965); M. C. Lyons, ed., *An Arabic Translation of Themistius' Commentary on Aristotle's De anima* (London, 1973); F. M. Schroeder and R. B. Todd, trans., *Two Greek Aristotelian Commentators on the Intellect: The De intellectu Attributed to Alexander of Aphrodisias and Themistius' Paraphrase of Aristotle De anima 3.4–8*, *Mediaeval Sources in Translation* 33 (Toronto, 1990), 75–133 (translation of Themistius, *In De an.* 3.4–8); Todd, trans., *Themistius. On Aristotle On the Soul*, *Ancient Commentators on Aristotle* (London, 1996); R. Brague, trans., *Thémistius. Paraphrase de la Métaphysique d'Aristote (Livre Lambda)* (Paris, 1999) (French transla-

tion, with commentary, based on both the Hebrew and Arabic material).

## B. Studies

V. Rose, “Über eine angebliche Paraphrase des Themistius,” *Hermes* 2 (1867) 191–213; J. Freudenthal, “Zur Kritik und Exegese von Aristoteles' *Parva Naturalia*,” *Rheinisches Museum* 24 (1869) 81–93 at 88–91; C. Steel, “Des commentaires d'Aristote par Themistius?,” *Revue philosophique de Louvain* 71 (1973) 669–80; H. J. Blumenthal, “Themistius: The Last Peripatetic Commentator on Aristotle?,” in *Arktouros: Hellenic Studies Presented to B. M. W. Knox on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*, ed. G. W. Bowersock et al. (Berlin and New York, 1979), 391–400, reprinted and revised in R. Sorabji, ed., *Aristotle Transformed: The Ancient Commentators and Their Influence* (London, 1990), 113–23; H. J. Blumenthal, “Photius on Themistius (Cod. 74): Did Themistius Write Commentaries on Aristotle?,” *Hermes* 107 (1979) 168–82; P. Moraux, *Le commentaire d'Alexandre d'Aphrodise aux “Seconds Analytiques” d'Aristote*, *Peripatoi* 13 (Berlin and New York, 1979), 3–4; O. Ballériaux, “Thémistius et l'exégèse de la noétique aristotélicienne,” *Revue de philosophie ancienne* 7 (1989) 199–233; J. Vanderspoel, “The ‘Themistius Collection’ of Commentaries on Plato and Aristotle,” *Phoenix* 43 (1989) 162–64; P. M. Huby, “Stages in the Development of Language about Aristotle's *Nous*,” in H. Blumenthal and H. Robinson, eds., *Aristotle and the Later Tradition*, *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy*, Suppl. vol. (Oxford, 1991), 129–43 at 140–43; O. Ballériaux, “Thémistius et le néoplatonisme. Le *νοῦς παθητικός* et l'immortalité de l'âme,” *Revue de philosophie ancienne* 12 (1994) 171–200; M. Capone Ciollaro, “Osservazioni sulla Parafrasi di Temistio al *De anima* aristotelico,” in C. Moreschini, ed., *Esegesi, parafrasi e compilazioni in età tardoantica. Atti del Terzo Convegno dell'Associazione di Studi Tardoantichi*, *Collectanea* 9 (Naples, 1995), 79–92; P. Volpe Cacciatore, “La parafrasi di Temistio al secondo libro degli *Analitici Posteriori* di Aristotele,” in Moreschini, *ibid.*, 389–95; O. Ballériaux, “Eugénios, père de Thémistios et philosophe néoplatonicien,” *L'antiquité classique* 65 (1996) 135–60; R. B. Todd, “An Inventory of the Greek Manuscripts of Themistius' Aristotelian Commentaries,” *Byzantion* 67 (1997) 268–76.

## C. Themistius Arabus

M. Bouyges, "Notes sur des traductions arabes d'auteurs grecs," *Archives de philosophie* 2 (1924) 1–23 at 15–23; M. C. Lyons, "An Arabic Translation of the Commentary of Themistius," *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 17 (1955) 426–35; R. M. Frank, "Some Textual Notes on the Oriental Versions of Themistius' Paraphrase of Book 1 of the *Metaphysics*," *Cahiers de Byrsa* 8 (1958–59) 215–30; 'A. Badawī, *La transmission de la philosophie grecque au monde arabe*, 2d rev. and enl. ed., *Etudes de philosophie médiévale* 56 (Paris, 1987), 166–80 (French translation of an opusculum on logic: *Traité de Thémistius en réponse à Maxime au sujet de la réduction de la deuxième et la troisième figures à la première*); A. A. Ghorab, "The Greek Commentators on Aristotle Quoted in Al-ʿĀmiri's 'As-Saʿada wa'l-Isʿad,'" in S. M. Stern et al., *Islamic Philosophy and the Classical Tradition: Essays Presented by His Friends and Pupils to Richard Walzer on His Seventieth Birthday* (London, 1972), 77–88 at 83–85; J. N. Mattock, "The Supposed Epitome by Themistius of Aristotle's Zoological Works," in *Akten des VII. Kongresses für Arabistik und Islamwissenschaft. Göttingen, 15. bis 22. August 1974*, ed. A. Dietrich (Göttingen, 1976) (= *Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen*, philolog.-hist. Klasse, 3. Folge, 98 [1976] 260–67); S. Pinès, "Les limites de la métaphysique selon Al-Fārābī, Ibn Bājja et Maïmonide: sources et antithèses de ces doctrines chez Alexandre d'Aphrodise et chez Thémistius," in J. P. Beckmann et al., eds., *Sprache und Erkenntnis im Mittelalter: Akten des VI. Internationalen Kongresses für Mittelalterliche Philosophie der Société internationale pour l'étude de la philosophie médiévale 29. August–3. September 1977 in Bonn*, *Miscellanea mediaevalia* 13.1 (Berlin and New York, 1981), 211–25; G. M. Browne, "Ad Themistium Arabum," *Illinois Classical Studies* 11 (1986) 223–45; S. Pinès, "Some Distinctive Metaphysical Conceptions in Themistius' Commentary on Book lambda and Their Place in the History of Philosophy," in J. Wiesner, ed., *Aristoteles: Werk und Wirkung: Paul Moraux gewidmet*, vol. 2 (Berlin and New York, 1987), 177–204; S. Rosenberg and C. Manekin, "Themistius on Modal Logic: Excerpts from a Commentary on the *Prior Analytics* Attributed to Themistius," *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 11 (1988) 83–103; J. W. Watt, "From Themistius to al-Fārābī: Platonic Po-

litical Philosophy and Aristotle's *Rhetoric* in the East," *Rhetorica* 13 (1995) 17–41; M. Zonta, *La filosofia antica nel Medioevo ebraico: le traduzioni ebraiche medievali dei testi filosofici*, *Philosophica* 2 (Brescia, 1996); G. M. Browne, "Ad Themistium Arabum II," *Illinois Classical Studies* 23 (1998) 121–26.

## D. Studies of Themistius' Influence

## 1. Medieval

M. Grabmann, "Mittelalterliche lateinische Übersetzungen von Schriften der Aristoteles-Kommentatoren Johannes Philoponos, Alexander von Aphrodisias und Themistios," *Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, philosoph.-hist. Abt., 7 (1929) 3–68 (= Grabmann, *Gesammelte Akademieabhandlungen*, vol. 1 [Paderborn, 1979], 497–564); Grabmann, "Mittelalterliche Deutung und Umbildung der aristotelischen Lehre vom ΝΟΥΣ ΠΟΙΗΤΙΚΟΣ nach einer Zusammenstellung im Cod. B III 22 der Universitätsbibliothek Basel. Untersuchungen und Textausgabe," *Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, philosoph.-hist. Abt., Heft 4 (1936) (= Grabmann, *Gesammelte Akademieabhandlungen* 1.1021–1122); P. Wilpert, "Die Ausgestaltung der aristotelischen Lehre vom Intellectus agens bei griechischen Kommentatoren und in der Scholastik des 13. Jahrhunderts," *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie und Theologie des Mittelalters*, Supplementband 3.1 (1935) 447–62; G. Verbeke, *Thémistius: Commentaire sur le Traité de l'âme d'Aristote*, traduction de Guillaume de Moerbeke (Louvain and Paris, 1957), ix–lxii; E. P. Mahoney, "Themistius and the Agent Intellect in James of Viterbo and Other Thirteenth-Century Philosophers (Saint Thomas, Siger of Brabant and Henry Bate)," *Augustiniana* 23 (1973) 422–67.

## 2. Renaissance

E. P. Mahoney, "Nicoletto Vernia and Agostino Nifo on Alexander of Aphrodisias: An Unnoticed Dispute," *Rivista critica di storia della filosofia* 23 (1968) 268–96; Mahoney, "Nicoletto Vernia on the Soul and Immortality," in E. P. Mahoney, ed., *Philosophy and Humanism: Renaissance Essays in Honor of Paul Oskar Kristeller* (Leiden, 1976), 144–63 (reprinted in Mahoney, *Two Aristotelians of the Italian Renaissance. Nicoletto Vernia and Agostino Nifo* [Aldershot and Burlington, Vt.,

2000], no. 3); Mahoney, "Neoplatonism, The Greek Commentators, and Renaissance Aristotelianism," in D. J. O'Meara, ed., *Neoplatonism and Christian Thought* (Albany, N. Y., 1982), 169–77; Mahoney, "Philosophy and Science in Nicoletto Vernia and Agostino Nifo," in A. Poppi, ed., *Scienza e filosofia all'Università di Padova nel Quattrocento*, Contributi alla storia dell'Università di Padova 15 (Padua and Trieste, 1983), 135–202 (reprinted in Mahoney, *Two Aristotelians of the Italian Renaissance. Nicoletto Vernia and Agostino Nifo* [Aldershot and Burlington, Vt., 2000], no. 1); Mahoney, "Plato and Aristotle in the Thought of Agostino Nifo (ca. 1470–1538)," in G. Roccaro, ed., *Platonismo e aristotelismo nel Mezzogiorno d'Italia (secc. XIV–XVI). Testi della VII Settimana residenziale di Studi medievali, Carini, Villa Belvedere, 19–25 ottobre 1987*, Biblioteca dell'Officina di Studi medievali 1 (Palermo, 1989), 79–102; R. B. Todd, "Baltasar Meliavacca, Andronicus Callistus, and the Greek Aristotelian Commentators in Fifteenth-Century Italy," *Italia medioevale e umanistica* 37 (1994) 67–75.

### III. ORATIONS

#### A. Editions and Translations

V. Trincavelli, ed., *Omnia Themistii opera, hoc est, Paraphrases et Orationes, Alexandri Aphrodisiensis Libri duo De anima et De fatis unus* (Venice, 1534); H. Stephanus, ed., *Themistii . . . Orationes XIII* ([Geneva], 1562); F. Morel, *Synesii . . . de benignitate oratio* [= edition of Or. 6] (Paris, 1604); J. Caselius, ed., *Θεμιστίου Βασανιστήης* [= Or. XXI] (Helmstedt, 1605); G. Rehm, ed. and trans., *Themistii philosophi . . . Orationes sex augustales ad Constantium, Jovianum, Valentem et Valentinianum II* (Hamburg, 1605); D. Petau, ed. and trans., *Themistii . . . Orationes XVI* (La Flèche, 1613 and 1617); P. Pantin, ed. and trans., *Themistii Euphradae Orationes aliquot* (Leiden, 1614); D. Petau, ed. and trans., *Themistii . . . Orationes XIX* (Paris, 1618) (the latter edition produced by three different printers: S. Cramoisy, C. Morellus, and M. Somnius); J. Hardouin, ed. and trans., *Themistii Orationes XXXIII* (Paris, 1684); M. Cesarotti, *Corso ragionato di letteratura greca*, vol. 2 (Padua, 1784), 344–65 [Italian translations of Or. 5, 7, 9, 10]; Cesarotti, *Il fiore della letteratura greca*, vol. 2 (Florence, 1843),

813–64 [Italian translations of selections from Or. 1–4, and of Or. 5 and 9]; A. Mai, ed., *Themistii oratio* (Milan, 1816) [= Or. 34]; Mai, ed., *Classicorum auctorum e vaticanis codicibus editorum tomus IV* (Milan, 1830), 306–53 [= Or. 34]; W. Dindorf, ed., *Themistii Orationes duae ex codice mediolanensi emendatae* (Leipzig, 1830) [= Or. 20, 34]; Dindorf, ed., *Themistii Orationes* (Leipzig, 1832); G. Downey, "Themistius' First Oration," *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 1 (1958) 49–69 [= English translation of Or. 1]; H. Kesters, ed. and trans., *Plaidoyer d'un Socratique contre le Phèdre de Platon. xxvi<sup>e</sup> discours de Thémistius* [= Or. 26] (Louvain, 1959); S. Oppermann, *Themistios: 20. und 21. Rede. Überlieferung, Text und Übersetzung* (Diss. Göttingen, 1962); H. Schenkl and G. Downey, eds., *Themistii Orationes quae supersunt*, vol. 1 (Leipzig, 1965); H. Schenkl, G. Downey, and A. F. Norman, eds., *Themistii Orationes quae supersunt*, vols. 2 and 3 (Leipzig, 1971–74); H. Schneider, *Die 34. Rede des Themistios (Περὶ τῆς ἀρχῆς): Einleitung, Übersetzung und Kommentar* (Winterthur, 1966); P. Heather and J. Matthews, eds., *The Goths in the Fourth Century*, Translated Texts for Historians 11 (Liverpool, 1991), 13–15 (Or. 8 [partial] and Or. 10 translated into English by D. Moncur); H. Leppin and W. Portmann, trans., *Themistios. Staatsreden*, Bibliothek der griechischen Literatur 46 (Stuttgart, 1998) (German translation of Or. 1–11 and 13–19); R. J. Penella, trans., *The Private Oration of Themistius* [Or. 17, 20–34] (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 2000).

#### B. Studies

For studies of the text see H. Schenkl and G. Downey, eds., *Themistii Orationes quae supersunt*, vol. 1 (Leipzig, 1965), xxii–xxiii. The following recent studies also contain extensive bibliographies: R. Maisano, "La critica filologica di Petau e Hardouin e l'edizione parigina del 1684 delle Orazioni di Temistio," *Archivum historicum Societatis Iesu* 43 (1974) 267–300; G. Matino, "Tendenze linguistiche nella tradizione del testo delle orazioni di Temistio," *Koinonia* 1 (1977) 131–40; R. Maisano, "Per una riedizione dei Discorsi di Temistio," *ibid.* 2 (1978) 93–116; Maisano, "La Paideia del Logos nell'opera oratoria di Temistio," *ibid.* 10 (1986) 29–47; B. Colpi, *Die παιδεία des Themistios: ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Bildung im vierten Jahrhundert nach Christus*, Europai-

sche Hochschulschriften, Reihe XV, Klassische Sprachen und Literaturen 36 (Bern, 1987); O. Balériaux, "Le Μετριοπαθής ἢ Φιλότεκνος (Discours XXXII) de Thémistius," *Byzantion* 58 (1988) 22–35.

## COMPOSITE EDITIONS

1481, Tarvisii (Treviso): B(artholomaeus) Confalonerius et Morellus Gerardinus de Salodio. With the translations by Hermolaus Barbarus Junior of Themistius' paraphrases of the *Posterior Analytics*, *Physics*, *De anima* and ps. Themistius' paraphrases of the *De memoria*, *De somno*, *De insomniis*, *De divinatione per somnum*. Prepared for publication by Galeatus Ponticus Facinus. BMC 6.894; Goff T-129; H\* 15463; IGIBI 9491; Klebs 995.1; Polain 11.044; Polain (B) 3677.

1499, Venetiis (Venice): Bartholomaeus de Zanis de Portesio. Contents the same as in the preceding entry. Reported to contain Barbarus' corrections of the 1481 Treviso edition and reproduced in *Themistii Libri paraphraseos*, ed. C. Lohr, *Commentaria in Aristotelem graeca, Versiones latinae* 18 (Frankfurt, 1978). BMC 5.434; Goff T-130; H\* 15464; IGIBI 9492; Klebs 955.2; Polain 11.045; Sander 7233; Stillwell T 112.

1500, Venetiis (Venice): Johannes Hertzog. Contents the same as in the edition of Venice, 1499, plus Hieronymus Donatus' translation of Alexander of Aphrodisias' *De anima* (see CTC 1.85). BMC 5.429, 596–97; Goff T-131; GW 1.425; H\* 15465; IGIBI 9493; Klebs 955.4; Sander 7234; Stillwell T 113.

1502, Venetiis (Venice): [Simon Bevilaqua]. Contents the same as in the preceding entry. CTC 1.85. For the attribution to this printer see Proctor and Isaac 2.2:43, no. 12657. NUC. BL; BNF; Oxford, New College; (NNC; NUNAM).

1520, Venetiis (Venice): Lucantonius de Giunta. Contents the same as in the edition of Venice, 1502. P. Camerini, *Annali dei Giunti* (Florence, 1962), 190, no. 238; CTC 1.85; NUC. BL; Oxford, New College; (MH).

(\*) 1527, Venetiis (Venice): Octavianus Scotus. With notes "ab excellentissimo quodam philosopho quae Themistii obscuriora quaedam loca apertissima reddunt" (= "Anonymus Venetus") on the translations by Hermolaus Barbarus Junior of Themistius' paraphrases of the *Posterior*

*Analytics*, *De anima*, *Physics* and ps. Themistius' paraphrases of the *De insomniis*, *De divinatione per somnum*, *De memoria*, *De somno*. Graesse 6.2, 112; NUC. Rome, Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale; Cuneo, Biblioteca Civica; (OkU).

1529 (1528 on the title page), Parisiis (Paris): Simon Colinaeus. With the translations by Hermolaus Barbarus Junior of Themistius' paraphrases of the *Physics*, *De anima* and ps. Themistius' paraphrases of *De memoria*, *De somno*, *De insomniis*, *De divinatione per somnum*; Hieronymus Donatus' translation of Alexander of Aphrodisias' *De anima* (see CTC 1.85). P. Renouard, *Bibliographie des éditions de Simon de Colines 1520–1546* (Paris, 1894), 110; *Inventaire chronologique des éditions parisiennes du XVIe siècle*, vol. 3 (Abbeville, 1985), 514, no. 1923; NUC. BL (without Hieronymus Donatus' translation); BNF; Oxford, New College; Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine; (ICN).

1530, Basileae (Basel): Henricus Petrus. With the translations by Hermolaus Barbarus Junior of ps. Themistius' paraphrases of the *De insomniis*, *De divinatione per somnum*, *De memoria*, and *De somno*. Maittaire 2.736; NUC. BL; Mainz, Stadtbibliothek; (NNC).

1530, Venetiis (Venice): Lucantonius Junta. Contents the same as in the edition of Venice, 1527. P. Camerini, *Annali dei Giunti* (Florence, 1962), 238, no. 232; Adams T-455; NUC. Cambridge, University Library; Naples, Biblioteca Nazionale; Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine; (InU).

1533, Basileae (Basel): Joannes Valderus. With the translations by Hermolaus Barbarus Junior of Themistius' paraphrases of the *Posterior Analytics*, *Physics*, *De anima* and ps. Themistius' paraphrases of the *De memoria*, *De somno*, *De insomniis*, *De divinatione per somnum*. Adams T-451; VD T-707; NUC. BNF; Basel, Öffentliche Bibliothek der Universität; Oxford, Bodleian Library; Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana; (DNLM; ICU).

1535, Parisiis (Paris): Prigentus Calvarin. With the translations by Hermolaus Barbarus Junior of Themistius' paraphrases of the *Posterior Analytics*, *Physics*, *De anima* and ps. Themistius' paraphrases of the *De memoria*, *De somno*, *De insomniis*, *De divinatione per somnum*; the single dedicatory letter precedes the paraphrase of the *Physics*. The translations have separate title pages and are sometimes listed separately, but they are identified as a single volume at the end of the translation of the *De divinatione per somnum*.



Adams T-452; NUC. Cambridge, University Library; BNF; Paris, Bibliothèque de l' Arsenal (without the paraphrase of the *Physics*); (DNLM).

1542, Venetiis (Venice): Hieronymus Scotus. Contents the same as in the edition of 1527, plus the "Contradictiones et solutiones" by Marcus Antonius Zimarra on Themistius' paraphrases of the *De anima* and *Physics* and ps. Themistius' paraphrase of the *De insomniis*. Dedication to the translation of the *De divinatione per somnum* omitted. NUC. BL; Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana; London, Wellcome Library for the History and Understanding of Medicine; (MiU; PPC; NNC; IMunS).

1545, Basileae (Basel): Hieronymus Curio. Contents the same as in the edition of Basel, 1533. VD T-708; NUC. BNF; Oxford, St. Edmund Hall; Oxford, Christ Church; (TxU; MiU).

1549, Venetiis (Venice): Hieronymus Scotus. Contents the same as in the edition of 1542. BL; Oxford, Bodleian Library; Rome, Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale.

1554, Venetiis (Venice): Hieronymus Scotus. Contents the same as in the preceding entry, plus Ludovicus Nogarola's annotated translation of the paraphrase of *De anima* 3.4–13. NUC. Oxford, Bodleian Library; Naples, Biblioteca Nazionale; Rome, Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale; (CtY; OU).

1559, Venetiis (Venice): Hieronymus Scotus. Contents the same as in the edition of 1554. Despite a date of "1560" at the end, it is distinct from the succeeding edition. NUC. BNF; Oxford, Keble College; Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine; (ICU).

1560, Venetiis (Venice): Hieronymus Scotus. Contents the same as in the edition of Venice, 1554. Adams T-453. BL; BNF; Oxford, Bodleian Library.

1570, Venetiis (Venice): Hieronymus Scotus. Contents the same as in the edition of Venice, 1554. Adams T-454; NUC. BNF; Oxford, Bodleian Library; Rome, Biblioteca Angelica; (ICN; WU).

## GENUINE WORKS OF THEMISTIUS

### I. ANALYTIORUM POSTERIORUM PARAPHRASIS

#### TRANSLATIONS

##### 1. Gerardus Cremonensis

Gerardus Cremonensis (Gerard of Cremona, ca. 1114–87) translated Themistius' paraphrase of the *Posterior Analytics* from the Arabic at Toledo some time between 1144 and 1187. No manuscript survives of the Arabic translation by Abū Bishr Mattā (d. 940); see F. E. Peters, *Aristoteles Arabus. The Oriental Translations and Commentaries of the Aristotelian Corpus* (Leiden, 1968), 18. Gerard's version is no. 2 in the list of his works appended to his translation of Galen's *Tegni*; see F. Wüstenfeld, "Die Übersetzungen arabischer Werke in das Lateinische seit dem XI. Jahrhundert," *Abhandlungen der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen* 22.3 (1877) 55–81 at 59 and K. Sudhoff, "Die kurze 'Vita' und das Verzeichnis der Arbeiten Gerards von Cremona," *Archiv für Geschichte der Medizin* 8 (1914) 73–82 at 77. (For an English translation of the list of Gerard's works see M. McVaugh in E. Grant, ed., *A Source Book in Medieval Science* [Cambridge, Mass., 1974], 35–38).

*In Posteriora analytica paraphrasis* (ed. O'Donnell). [*Inc.*]: (p. 242; Themist., *In An. post.* 1.2–3) Scio quod si intendo ad exponendum unamquamque litteram libri Aristotelis, cum iam praecesserint me ad illud illi, qui praecesserunt me . . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: (p. 315; Themist., *In An. post.* 66.3–6) Igitur est principium scientiae primi, et est causa principiorum, et scientia tota est scito toti. Quod est quia dispositio principii apud principium est sicut dispositio totius ad totum. Finit. Explicit Commentum Themistii super librum Posteriorum Aristotelis.

#### *Manuscripts:*

(\*) Assisi, Biblioteca e Centro di Documentazione Franciscana (Sacro Convento), fondo antico 658, s. XIII, fols. 256v–257r (Aristoteles latinus 2.877–78, no. 1266). A fragment in the margins of a manuscript of Aristotle's *Posterior Analytics*.

(\*) Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 317, s. XIII ex./XIV in., fols. 129r–151r (Aristoteles latinus 1.722, no. 1017; O'Donnell 239).

(\*) Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, lat. 16097, s. XIII ex./XIV in., fols. 226r–237v

(Aristoteles latinus 1.559–60, no. 668; O'Donnell 239). For the *incipit* and *explicit* see Aristoteles latinus 1.206–207.

(\*) Toledo, Archivo y Biblioteca Capítular, 17.14, s. XIII, fols. 54r–77v (Aristoteles latinus 2.851, no. 1229; O'Donnell 239; Kristeller, *Iter* 4.636a).

(\*) Worcester, Cathedral Chapter Library, Q 81, s. XIII, fols. 69r–84r (Aristoteles latinus 1.392–93, no. 394). This manuscript is now deposited at the University Library, University of Birmingham. Not used in O'Donnell's edition.

*Edition:*

J. R. O'Donnell, "Themistius' Paraphrasis of the Posterior Analytics in Gerard of Cremona's Translation," *Mediaeval Studies* 20 (1958) 239–315.

*Biography:*

CTC 1.89, 170–71 and 8.17.

## 2. Hermolaus Barbarus Junior

Hermolaus Barbarus Junior (Ermolao Barbaro the Younger) began his translations of the paraphrases of Themistius during the period October 1471 to September 1473 that he spent in Naples (*Ep.* 69 [1.87 Branca] and Vecce, "Esercizi," 124), and he completed them by 1480. See also *Ep.* 11 (1.15 Branca; IX.1 below) and *Ep.* 72 (1.92 Branca), where he refers to working on Themistius from his nineteenth to his twenty-sixth year (i.e., 1472–79).

Although the chronological order of the translations cannot be determined with certainty, the translation of the paraphrase of the *De divinatione per somnum* (VIII.1 below) may have been the first to be completed (1478). There is no external evidence by which we can identify Barbaro's Greek manuscript or manuscripts, and his diffuse style of translation would make this difficult to determine on internal grounds. The Anonymus Venetus commentator (I.a below) compared the translations with a Greek manuscript, but he does not provide enough evidence to permit easy identification of Barbaro's source.

The dedicatee of this paraphrase, Francesco della Rovere (1414–84) who later became Pope Sixtus IV (1471–84), supported humanist scholarship in the 1470s; see "Pope Sixtus IV," *Contemporaries of Erasmus* 3.256–57 (De Etta V. Thomsen and T. B. Deutscher). He thought enough of Barbaro's translation to have the crude first edition calligraphically reproduced (see below).

The quotations from Barbaro's translations will be taken from the second edition (Venice, 1499). Barbaro died in 1493, six years before the publication of this edition. His Aristotelian studies and teaching, particularly in the early to mid 1480s, undoubtedly led him to make the revisions identified in the 1499 Venice edition as the author's own *castigationes*; see Barbaro, *Ep.* 69 (1.87 Branca), where in 1485 he invites criticism of his translations, and *Ep.* 115 (2.33 Branca) for a reference in a letter of 1488 to a commentary on the *Posterior Analytics* (probably Bologna, Biblioteca Universitaria, 124, fols. 218r–284v) that must have drawn on Themistius and perhaps resulted in corrections. Barbaro's commentaries on Aristotle's *Physics* and *De anima* can be found in his *Compendium scientiae naturalis* (Venice, 1545), of which there were six other editions in the sixteenth century.

Even so, a preliminary analysis of the changes in the 1499 Venice edition indicates that only typographical corrections were made, along with the addition of chapter headings that may not even have been Barbaro's. Such alterations are tacitly recorded in the passages cited below.

*Preface* (ed. of Venice, 1499). Hermolai Barbari Patricii Veneti Zachariae Equitis filii in Paraphrasin Themistii Peripatetici praefatio ad Sixtum IIII Pontificem Maximum. [*Inc.*]: (fol. 1v) Qui tibi studiorum suorum opera nuncupant, pontifex summe Sixte quarte, alii id agunt ut te utcumque sibi promereantur, alii ut fructum aliquem sentiant iudicii tui de se, alii ut abs te tantum probentur, alii ob alias causas. Ego vero haec tibi dedico tum ut meam in te observantiam, praesertimque Zachariae patris, qui istic ad te pro Venetis agit legatus, agnoscas; tum vel maxime ut te pro fide ea, quae a me tibi ut principi meo debetur summa, instituti illius tui praeclari et divini commoneam, quod, protinus quam creatus pontifex es, flagrantissime amplexus videris, adiuvandi provehendique litteras, quae procul dubio sine auctoritate et diligentia doctissimi principis aut interiturae penitus videbantur aut ad pristinam barbariem rediturae. Nam et ingenia undique conduxisti et bibliothecam opulentissimam aere tuo impensaue publicasti. Nunc te obsecrant obtestanturque bonae omnes artes, ne, quae tuae maximae occupationes sunt, negligentiuscule in posterum habeantur. . . . Sub Nicolao principe exerere se ac revirescere studia coeperunt; nisi tu quod facis

facere perseveres, necesse est consenescent denuo atque decedant. Igitur Themistium, e familia Aristotelis elegantem philosophum, ad te in latinum sermonem converti, ratus non ingratisimam tibi rem me facturum, si philosophia ea, quae de natura est, latinis litteris, quanta modo legitur in scholis, contineretur. Videbam nihil incultius, horridius, ineptius quam partem istam litteraturae haberi. Placuit periclitari in Themistio an istaec quoque proprietatem et lucem romanae linguae reciperent.

Oppido quam laboratum mihi in hac interpretatione est, non tam quod nihil iuvari ab iis auctoribus potui, qui Aristotelem commentati foede ac barbaramente pridem sunt, quam quod ne ab illis quoque qui, aetate nostra latinam eloquentiam professi, graeca eius philosophi commentaria transtulerunt. Horum plerique, dum alienam inscitiam insectantur, suam prodidere: adeo omnia ab his perverse depravateque sunt perscripta, ut si quis interpretationes eorum cum illis veteribus conferat quas reprehendunt, vel in aliqua Aristophanis libra aut Critolai appensas examinet, utrae earum vergant internosci non possit. Percenserem singillatim quaecumque peccassent, nisi plura eorum essent errata quam verba. Alioquin non incessendi quemquam lacerandive studio, sed iuvandi bonas mentes haec scribimus. Magnam incomparabilemque iacturam non pridem fecimus, Pontifex Maxime, in Theodoro Gaza, qui vir graecus latinos omnes in hoc munere scribendi interpretandique superavit. Is si diutius vixisset, linguam latinam hac quoque parte locupletasset; quot et fecit in libris absolutissimis De animalibus Aristotelis et Theophrasti De stirpibus [cf. CTC 2.266–68, 273–74]. Hic unus mihi certare cum vetustate ipsa visus est, hunc mihi quem colerem, quem imitarer proposui, ab huius scriptis adiutum me et fateor et praedico. Hunc ego non magnopere incuriosus legi quam M. Tullium, Plinium, Columellam, Varronem, Senecam, Apuleium et ceteros quos in hoc genere commentandi diligenter evolvere necessarium est. Ne ille quoque minimus labor noster fuit, quod in his libris vertendis non modo non expressimus verbum e verbo, quod interpretes in indisertos solere Cicero meminit [*De finibus* 3.4.15], sed libere et translationibus et figuris et tropis usi sumus, ad morem romanum sensibus stantibus. Lusimus arbitrato nostro, sed sententiam integram dedimus auctori. Tantum vero abest ut aliquid praetermiserimus dissi-

mulaverimusve, ut illud periculum sit ne, quod eruditione impens[a]e studuimus, addidisse aliqua potius quam detraxisse in visoribus videri possimus: in plenum, non tam latinum reddere Themistium quam certare cum eo volui. Haec enim laus, ut ille ait, linguae latinae est, ut graecam proprietatem et gratiam in transferendo aut aequas aut etiam antecellas. Hoc me non dico assecutum fuisse, sed crimen meum confiteor: laboravi plane hoc ambitu. Sed an effecerim quod quaerebam alii iudicent; ipse certe mea nec magni facio nec probo.

Sed quid te, princeps humanissime, oratione longa detineo? Finem faciam, si quaedam de Themistio dixerem. Is Libanii Sophistae et Iuliani Caesaris temporibus floruit. A quibusdam abbreviator creditus Alexandri ex Aphro<di>siade est, sed falso. Nam et ab eo dissentit haud timide, cum collibuit, et ab ordine ac serie eius evariat; praeterea ipsemet se paraphrastem Aristotelis facit. Est autem paraphrasis exercitamenti apud rhetores genus; ea finitur a Graecis hoc modo, ut sit quae narrationi proportionem respondeat aut sit in qua vertimus aliorum scripta, non in alia quae humiliora grandiorave sint, ut a metaphrasi differat, sed in paria, sensu modo servato. Quod et Fabius [sc. Quintilianus] duobus locis sic explicat: “Tum mutatis verbis interpretari, tum paraphrasi audacius vertere, qua et brevare quaedam et exornare, salvo modo sensu, dimittitur; quod opus, consummatis professoribus difficile, qui commode tractaverint cuicumque discendo sufficient” [*Inst.* 1.9.2–3]. Alio item loco [*Inst.* 10.5.5]: “Sed et ipsis, inquit, sententiis adicere licet oratorium robur et omnia supplere et effusa substringere. Neque ego paraphrasin esse interpretationem tantum volo, sed circa eosdem sensus certamen atque aemulationem.” Dictus est et a quibusdam ecphrastes; est autem ecphrasis mera puraque enarratio.

Quod ergo diximus inter initia, doctissime Pontifex, susceptum abs te patrocinium litterarum, ne desere; cum dico litteras philosophiam intelligo, quae coniuncta cum eloquentia sit. In te eruditio summa et summa fortuna. Facile sperare possumus temporibus tuis futurum ut recta studia volente te (nam potes nec alius potest) ad dignitatem pristinam revocentur. Vale. Venetiis, MCCCCLXXX.

*In Posteriora analytica paraphrasis.* [Inc.]: (fol. 2r; Themist., *In An. post.* 1.2–3) Facturum me superfluo iuxta perambitioseque sentio si aris-

totelicarum commentationum post tales tantosque auctores interpretationem iustam aggredi ar . . . / . . . [Expl.]: (fol. 16v; Themist., *In An. post.* 66.4–6) Ita enim principium ad principium se habet, sicut scientia tota ad totum id quod subiectum scientiae est.

*Manuscript:*

(\*) Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 2142, s. XV (a. 1482–84), fols. 1r–36r (*Codices Vaticani latini*: A. Maier, *Codices 2118–2192* [Vatican City, 1961], 53–54). The scribe was Salvato da Cagli, and a subscription notes that his copy was made in response to the imperfections of the edition of Treviso, 1481. On this manuscript see B. Nardi, “Il commento di Simplicio al *De Anima* nelle controversie alla fine del secolo XV e del secolo XVI,” in Nardi, *Saggi sull’aristotelismo padovano dal secolo XIV al XVI* (Florence, 1958), ch. 13 at p. 366. This manuscript and the edition of Treviso, 1481 are the sources for the edition of Barbaro’s prefaces by V. Branca (cited below). His apparatus shows that the manuscript contains a number of omissions not paralleled in printed editions.

*Manuscripts containing only the Preface:*

(\*) Gouda, Stedelijke Librije, 1324, s. XVI, fols. 138r–140v (Kristeller, *Iter* 4.341b).

(\*) Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 441, s. XVI, fols. 106v–107r (Kristeller, *Iter* 3.613b).

*Editions:*

1481. See above, Composite Editions.

1499. See above, Composite Editions.

1500. See above, Composite Editions.

1502. See above, Composite Editions.

1511, Parisiis (Paris): Henricus Stephanus. With the translation of the paraphrase of the *Posterior Analytics* in a volume entitled *Logices adminicula*, also containing commentaries on the *Organon* by Ammonius and Boethius. B. Moreau, *Inventaire chronologique des éditions parisiennes du XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle*, vol. 2 (Paris, 1977), 91, no. 149. The editor of the section containing the translation of Themistius was Franciscus Vatablus (François Vatable, d. 1547); for an edition and discussion of his prefatory letter, see E. F. Rice, Jr., *The Prefatory Epistles of Jacques Lefèvre d’Etaples and Related Texts* (London and New York, 1972), 249–53. BNF; Paris, Bibliothèque de l’Arsenal; Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine.

1520. See above, Composite Editions.

(\*) 1527. See above, Composite Editions.

1530 (Venice). See above, Composite Editions.

1533. See above, Composite Editions.

1535. See above, Composite Editions.

1541, Parisiis (Paris): Simon Colinaeus. With the translation of the paraphrase of the *Posterior Analytics* (the dedicatory letter has been omitted). Not recorded in P. Renouard, *Bibliographie des éditions de Simon de Colines 1520–1546* (Paris, 1894). It presumably supplements the same printer’s edition (Paris, 1529; see II.2 below) of Barbaro’s translation of the other paraphrases. Dublin, Trinity College.

1542. See above, Composite Editions.

1545. See above, Composite Editions.

1549. See above, Composite Editions.

1554. See above, Composite Editions.

1559. See above, Composite Editions.

1560. See above, Composite Editions.

1570. See above, Composite Editions.

*Editions containing only the Preface:*

(\*) 1498, Venetiis (Venice): Aldus Romanus. *Angeli Politiani Opera omnia*, fol. 144r. As Branca, *Ep.* 1, p. xxxiv notes, several subsequent editions of Poliziano’s works also contain Barbaro’s letters; these will not be listed here. NUC. BL; BNF; (DLC; MH).

(\*) 1518 Basileae (Basel): Gregorius Bartholomeus. *Philippi Beroaldi Varia opuscula*, fol. 52r. NUC. (DNLM; MH; FU; PPULC; CtY).

Branca, *Ep.* 8 (1.7–10).

*Biography:*

CTC 4.343–44. Add to the *Bibliography*: “Ermolao (I) Barbaro,” *Contemporaries of Erasmus* 1.91–92 (M. J. C. Lowry); E. Garin, “Le traduzioni umanistiche di Aristotele nel secolo XV,” *Atti e memorie dell’Accademia fiorentina di scienze morali “La Colombaria”*, N. S., 2 (1947–50) 55–104 at 87–90; C. H. Lohr, “Medieval Latin Aristotle Commentaries: Authors G–I,” *Traditio* 24 (1968) 149–245 at 236–37 (Barbaro’s Aristotelian commentaries); V. Branca, ed., *Dizionario critico della letteratura italiana*, vol. 1 (Turin, 1974), 195–99; M. L. Doglio, “Ambasciatore e principe: ‘L’Istituto legati’ di Ermolao Barbaro,” in *Miscellanea di studi in onore di Vittore Branca*, vol. 3: *Umanesimo e Rinascimento a Firenze e Venezia* (Florence, 1983) (= Biblioteca dell’ “Archivio Romanicum”, Serie I, Storia), 297–310; V. Branca, “Fra mule gonzaghesche e levrieri turchi: una lettera inedita di Ermolao Barbaro a Gian Francesco Gonzaga,” in R. Cardini et al., eds., *Tradizione classica e letteratura*

umanistica per Alessandro Perosa (Rome, 1985), 525–31; M. L. King, *Venetian Humanism in an Age of Patrician Dominance* (Princeton, 1986), 322–23 (with further secondary literature); P. Salman, “Barbaro’s Themistius and Gelli’s *Lecture*: Philosophy Lost in Translation,” in I. D. McFarlane, ed., *Acta Conventus neo-latini sanctandreami: Proceedings of the Fifth International Congress of Neo-Latin Studies, Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies 38* [Binghamton, N. Y., 1986], 177–84; T. Ebert, “Entelechie und Monade: Bemerkungen zum Gebrauch eines aristotelischen Begriffs bei Leibniz,” in J. Wiesner, ed., *Aristoteles: Werk und Wirkung: Paul Moraux gewidmet*, vol. 2 (Berlin and New York, 1987), 560–83 at 579–81; M. Dzelzainis, “Samuel Daniel and Giovanni Pico della Mirandola’s Letter to Ermolao Barbaro,” *Notes and Queries* 232 (1988) 487–88; C. H. Lohr, *Commentateurs d’Aristote au moyen âge latin* (Paris, 1988), 110 (bibliography); C. Vecce, “Esercizi di traduzione nella Napoli del Rinascimento: II. Alessandro d’Afrodisia, Altilio e Galateo,” *Annali dell’Istituto Universitario Orientale di Napoli, Sezione romanza*, 32.1 (1990) 103–37 at 117–28.

### 3. Paulus Orsatus

The undated and incomplete translation by Paulus Orsatus (Paolo Orsatto) is a corrected and annotated revision of Ermolao Barbaro the Younger’s translation. Orsatto’s translation survives in a single manuscript (Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, D 129 inf.) heavily corrected by the original scribe; this suggests that the codex could be Orsatto’s own working copy, but there is no external evidence that he is actually the scribe. The probable date for Orsatto’s version is the second half of the sixteenth century, and there may be some connection with Padua since the manuscript was owned by Gian Vincenzo Pinelli (1535–1601), who was there after 1558. Orsatto compared Barbaro’s version of the paraphrase of the *Posterior Analytics* with a Greek text or manuscript in an exercise paralleling those of Ludovico Nogarola (II.3 below) and Federico Bonaventura (II.4 below) for parts of Barbaro’s translation of Themistius’ paraphrase of the *De anima*.

In *Posteriora analytica paraphrasis* (Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, D 129 inf.). Themistii in Posteriores Aristotelis resolutiones paraphrasis in nostrum sermonem versa. [Inc.]: (fol. 34r; Themist., *In An. post.* 1.2–3) Mihi quidem post tot

tantosque (atque viros s\_\_\_\_\_p\_\_\_\_\_ s.s.) viros librorum Aristotelis interpretationem perscribere . . . / . . . [Expl.]: (fol. 60v; Themist., *In An. post.* 60.24–26) ex causa neque ex alio quod cogitatione prius sit. Neque enim casu confectus . . .

#### Manuscript:

(micro.) Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, D 129 inf., s. XVI, fols. 34r–60v (Kristeller, *Iter* 1.321b).

#### Biography:

Paulus Orsatus (Paolo Orsatto) is known by name only from an insertion made by a later hand (“Estratti di Paolo Orsatto etc.”) on fol. 61v of the manuscript cited above where he is identified as the author of an outline of logic and rhetoric as well as of the translation from Themistius. This suggests that he was a student or teacher, active perhaps at Padua (see above).

### COMMENTARY

#### a. Anonymus Venetus

The editions of Barbaro’s translations published at Venice between 1527 and 1570 also contain notes on the paraphrases of the *Posterior Analytics*, *De anima*, and *Physics*. These notes are attributed to an “excellētissimus quidam philosophus”, who is called here “Anonymus Venetus” because of the place of publication; he may have been, however, a scholar from Padua where the Greek Aristotelian commentators were studied intensively in the first quarter of the fifteenth century.

Many notes are philological and initiate the process continued by Ludovico Nogarola and Federico Bonaventura (II.3 and II.4 below) of correcting Barbaro’s translation. The anonymous author had access to a Greek manuscript whose text offered readings different from the codex used by Barbaro. There are also frequent comparisons with the commentaries by John Philoponus and Simplicius.

T. Ebert (cited below) assumes that these notes can be attributed to Ermolao Barbaro the Younger, but he presents no historical or bibliographical evidence and does not explain why these notes were not published until nearly fifty years after the first edition of Barbaro’s translation of Themistius.

*Commentary* (ed. of Venice, 1530). [Inc.]: (fol. 1r) Ea Themistii verba ἐπὶ τῶν διὰ λόγου τι διδασκόντων (*In An. post.* 2.16) interpretatus est

quae sermocinales dicuntur . . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: (fol. 13r) Graece aliter Themistius loquitur. Sic enim ait: "Artis, si circa ea sit quae ab ipsa fiunt; scientiae, si circa ea quae a natura" (*In An. post.* 63.25–26).

*Editions:*

- (\*) 1527. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1530 (Venice). See above, Composite Editions.
- 1542. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1549. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1554. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1559. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1560. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1570. See above, Composite Editions.

*Bibliography:*

T. Ebert, "Entelechie und Monade: Bemerkungen zum Gebrauch eines aristotelischen Begriffs bei Leibniz," in J. Wiesner, ed., *Aristoteles: Werk und Wirkung: Paul Moraux gewidmet*, vol. 2 (Berlin and New York, 1987), 559–89 at 580–81.

## II. IN LIBROS DE ANIMA PARAPHRASIS

### TRANSLATIONS

#### 1. Guillelmus de Moerbeka

This translation of Themistius' paraphrase of the *De anima* is attributed to Guillelmus de Moerbeka (William of Moerbeke) mainly on stylistic grounds. There is also a subscription in one of the manuscripts (Toledo, Archivo y Biblioteca Capitular, 47.12, fol. 37v; see Verbeke lxiii) that refers to its completion on 22 November 1267 at Viterbo, the papal court where William is known to have been at the time with Thomas Aquinas. The translation is based on a Greek manuscript very close to the present Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, 87.25 (Verbeke lxvii–lxix), itself dated to the second half of the thirteenth century (P. Moraux et al., eds., *Aristoteles graecus: die griechischen Manuskripte des Aristoteles*, Peripatoi 8, vol. 1 [Berlin, 1976], 327–29, where no reference is made to Verbeke's discussion). For a full treatment of the translation and its manuscripts see Verbeke lxiii–xcvii.

*In De anima paraphrasis* (ed. Verbeke). [*Inc.*]: (p. 1.4–6; Themist., *In De an.* 1.2–3) [*Bonorum honorabilium* etc.] De anima quaecumque est possibile comprehendere, assequentes Aris-

totelem temptandum nobis in hoc tractatu comprehendere . . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: (p. 281.57–59; Themist., *In De an.* 126.18–21) Ad nutriri enim solum nutritiva potentia sufficeret utique, sicut et plantis; auditum autem ad significari aliquid sibi; linguam autem duorum gratia, et ad gustum et ad significare alteri.

*Manuscripts:*

(\*) Erfurt, Wissenschaftliche Allgemeinbibliothek der Stadt, Ampl. Fol. 40, s. XIV, fols. 1r–31v (Aristoteles latinus 1.658, no. 874; Verbeke xciv).

(\*) ———, Ampl. Fol. 363, s. XIV, fols. 100v–102v (Aristoteles latinus 1.663, no. 888; Verbeke xcv–xcvi). Fragmentary.

(\*) Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 317, s. XIII ex., fols. 86r–126r (Aristoteles latinus 1.722, no. 1017; Verbeke xciv).

(\*) Oxford, Balliol College, 105, s. XIV in., fols. 15r–65r (Aristoteles latinus 1.400, no. 343; Verbeke xciv–xcv; R. A. B. Mynors, *Catalogue of the Manuscripts of Balliol College Oxford* [Oxford, 1963], 86–87).

(\*) Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, lat. 16133, s. XIV, fols. 31r–51v (Aristoteles latinus 1.563–64, no. 672; Verbeke xcv).

(\*) ———, lat. 14698, s. XIII/XIV, fols. 1r–34r (Aristoteles latinus 1.543, no. 639 and 1.206 for the *incipit* and *explicit*; Verbeke xcvi).

(\*) Rome, Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale, fondo Vittorio Emanuele 828, s. XIV, fols. 15r, 15v (Aristoteles latinus 2.1069, no. 1557; Verbeke xcvi–xcvii). Fragments from Themistius' paraphrase as glosses in a manuscript of William of Moerbeke's translation of Aristotle's *De anima*.

(\*) Toledo, Archivo y Biblioteca Capitular, 47.12, s. XIII ex., fols. 1r–37v (Aristoteles latinus 2.853, no. 1233; Verbeke xciv; Kristeller, *Iter* 4.643a).

(\*) Venice, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, Marc. lat. VI 21 (2461), s. XIV, fols. 71r–92r (Aristoteles latinus 2.1091–92, no. 1592; Verbeke xcvi).

*Edition:*

G. Verbeke, ed., *Thémistius: Commentaire sur le Traité de l'âme d'Aristote, traduction de Guillaume de Moerbeke*, Corpus latinum commentariorum in Aristotelem graecorum 1 (Louvain and Paris, 1957).

*Biography:*

CTC 1.92. Add to the *Bibliography*: "Moerbeke, William of," DSB 9.434–40 (L. Minio-Paluello); J. Brams and W. Vanhamel, eds., *Guillaume de Mo-*

*erbeke. Recueil d'études à l'occasion du 700<sup>e</sup> anniversaire de sa mort (1286)*, Ancient and Medieval Philosophy, Series 1, 7 (Louvain, 1989).

## 2. Hermolaus Barbarus Junior

This was the most important of the Themistian translations by Hermolaus Barbarus Junior (Ermolao Barbaro the Younger), and he dedicated it to one of his teachers, Giorgio Merula (1431–94), who held the public chair in rhetoric at Venice from 1468 to 1484. On Merula see CTC 1.134–35 and 4.265–66; “Giorgio Merula,” *Contemporaries of Erasmus* 2.437 (E. Lee); and M. L. King, *Venetian Humanism in an Age of Patrician Dominance* (Princeton, 1986), 400–402.

*Dedication* (ed. of Venice, 1499). Hermolaus Barbarus Georgio Merulae Statiellensi s. [*Inc.*]: (fol. 67v) Plato in divina illa sua institutione De legibus [cf. 2.658e–659b] inter prima commemorat in omni republica praescribi caverique oportere, ne cui liceat quae composuerit aut privatim ostendere aut in usum publicum edere, antequam ea constituti super id iudices viderint nec damnarint. Utinam hodieque haberetur haec lex, Merula vir doctissime! . . . / . . . [*Expl.*] Dicavimus porro tibi libros Themistii De ingenio animae utramque ob causam, et ut argumento hoc utcumque scires te a nobis amari colique, et ut agnoscens in nobis impetus aliquos, bonae frugis indices, pro tua bonitate humanitateque quibuscumque rebus posses, faveres. Vale. Venetiis, MCCCCLXXX.

*In De anima paraphrasis* (ed. of Venice, 1499). [*Inc.*]: (fol. 68r [incorrectly numbered 67r]; Themist., *In De an.* 1.2–3) Cum enarrandis interpretandisque iis quae de animae natura traduntur quam fieri proxime potest sequi Aristotelem velimus, conari nos oportet . . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: (fol. 100v; Themist., *In De an.* 126.20–21) Tum auditus praestitus ut ipsi ab alio indicetur quid. Postremo lingua adhibita ad gemina opera, et ad perceptus saporum et ad vocis officium.

### *Manuscript:*

(\*) Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 2142, s. XV (a. 1482–84), fols. 161r–250v (see I.2 above).

### *Editions:*

- 1481. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1499. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1500. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1502. See above, Composite Editions.

1520. See above, Composite Editions.

(\*) 1527. See above, Composite Editions.

1529. See above, Composite Editions.

1530 (Venice). See above, Composite Editions.

1533. See above, Composite Editions.

1535. See above, Composite Editions.

1538, Basileae (Basel): Thomas Platterus. With the Greek text and Barbarus' translation of Themistius, *In De an.* 1.2–10. *Index aureliensis* \*107.969; F. E. Cranz, *A Bibliography of Aristotle Editions 1501–1600*, Bibliotheca bibliographica aurieliana 38, 2d ed. rev. by C. B. Schmitt (Baden-Baden, 1984), 32; NUC. BL; BNF; (CtY).

1542. See above, Composite Editions.

1545. See above, Composite Editions.

1549. See above, Composite Editions.

1554. See above, Composite Editions.

1559. See above, Composite Editions.

1560. See above, Composite Editions.

1570. See above, Composite Editions.

### *Editions containing only the Dedication:*

(\*) 1498, Venetiis (Venice): Aldus Romanus. *Angeli Politiani Opera omnia*, fol. 145r. See I.2 above.

Branca, *Ep.* 10 (1.12–14).

### *Biography:*

See I.2 above.

## 3. Ludovicus Nogarola

While serving as ambassador from Verona, Ludovicus Nogarola (Ludovico Nogarola) was involved in the edition of Ermolao Barbaro the Younger's translations of Themistius at Venice in 1554. Nogarola contributed a new annotated translation of the paraphrase of *De anima* 3.4–13 as well as three textual notes: two to the translation of the paraphrase of the *Physics* and one to the translation of the *Posterior Analytics*. These notes are too slight to be listed as separate commentaries. Nogarola also attached his own translation of the relevant Aristotelian text (*De anima* 3.4–13) on which the Themistian paraphrase was based. The Greek text of Themistius which he used was probably that of the Aldine edition of 1534.

Like most of Nogarola's works, his translation of Themistius' paraphrase of the *De anima* is dedicated to a prelate, in this case Julius Feltrus (Giulio Feltrio della Rovere, 1535–78), cardinal at the age of thirteen (1547), later bishop of Vicenza

(1560), archbishop of Ravenna (1566), and archbishop of Urbino (1578). He was the brother of Guidobaldo II of Urbino (1514–74), duke since 1538.

*Preface* (ed. of Venice, 1554). (fol. 103v) Iulio Felto Quercenti Urbini Cardinali et Perusiae legato Ludovici Nogarolae Com(mentarii) in tertiam Themistii De anima paraphrasim praefatio. [*Inc.*]: Marcus Musurus, antistes amplissimus, cuius praeclara doctrina et singularis in erudiendis iuvenibus industria latissime patuit, priusquam Respublica Veneta cum Gallis primo, mox cum Germanis, calamitosum illud gereret bellum, in Academia Patavina maxime floruit. Ut enim adhuc puer ex Creta insula Laurentii Medici studio Florentiam devectus est, graecas et latinas litteras discere primum coepit, quas statim cum miro earum teneretur desiderio, sic avide arripuit ut brevi alios docere facile posset. In quo quidem munere ipse postea sese studiosissime exercens, plurimum gloriae et laudis est consecutus. Nam cum ad eum ex omni fere terrarum orbe magno concursu iuvenes confluerent, tantam in illis exornandis et augendis curam adhibuit et diligentiam ut veri doctissimi ex eius officina paene innumerabiles prodierint.

Hunc ergo cum ego et Montanus [*sc.* Johannes Baptista Montanus] amicus et civis meus Patavii admodum adolescentes audiremus, memini de summis et nostrae et superioris memoriae viris sermonem frequenter habere solitum, in quo quidem alios interdum laudabat, alios reprehendebat, semper tamen Hermolaum Barbarum divinis efferebat laudibus, quod Themistii paraphrases in Aristotelis libros tam apte et commode convertisset ut Theodorum Gazam et Argyropulum byzantium in optimo interpretandi genere versatus longe superasset. Cuius etiam auctoritati et eloquentiae ipse adeo tribuebat ut in graecis poetis et oratoribus publice exponendis nulla umquam alia quam Hermolai lingua uti vellet. Haec cum a graeco illo homine non sine magna tanti viri laude fieri viderem, vehementer laetabar (*latebar ed.*).

Nam Hermolai Barbari iam mortui memoriam pie sancteque colebam ac venerabar, tum quod in Rempublicam Venetam, quae quidem praestantium atque excellentium hominum parens semper et altrix fuit et habita est, plurimum decorarit et illustraverit, tum etiam quod optime de mea patria meritis sit, quippe qui C.

Plinii Secundi civis mei, quem tamen veronensem non agnovit, libros Naturalis Historiae ab infinitis mendis et erroribus liberaverit. Verum postea quam progrediente aetate Themistium diligentius evolvere atque eius verba graeca cum Hermolai interpretatione conferre mihi licuit, facile perspexi eundem in eo transferendo, qui etiam admodum corruptus ac depravatus esset, satis licenter per aetatem lusisse. Siquidem cum ille Aristotelis paraphras<t>es graeco eodemque puro et simplici utatur sermone, eundem tamen Hermolaus ita latine loquentem facit ut, spreto penitus et reiecto Cicerone, Plinium, Apuleium, Capellam effingere atque imitari tantummodo videatur. Quapropter non magnum me facturum facinus putavi si tertiam De anima paraphrasim ut ille iam suo, ita ego nunc meo arbitrato in latinum converterem, non ut de gloria illius viri et fama quippiam detraherem, sed ut itidem studiosae iuventuti, quae graecae linguae rudis ignaraque sit, pro mea virili prodessem.

Hunc autem laborem meum qualiscumque sit, nomini tuo dicare constitui, praesul ornatissime, quo apud te quantum te observem et colam eo quo possem modo testatum relinquerem. . . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: Quod sane etiam si te facturum tum pro tua humanitate, tum pro veteri illustrissimae familiae tuae instituto, quae studiosos semper fovere et complecti consueverit, magnopere confido, tamen ut facias (cum id tua dignitas et amplitudo postulet) et etiam atque etiam rogo.

*In De anima paraphrasis* (ed. of Venice, 1554). [*Inc.*]: (fol. 104r; Themist., *In De an.* 92.32–33) De ea animae parte, qua utimur ad contemplandum et agendum, sive ea loco sit separabilis (ut existimavit Plato) . . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: (fol. 118v; Themist., *In De an.* 126.20–21) Lingua in ore sita est duplici fungens munere tum gustandi saporis, tum alteri quicquam significandi.

*Manuscript:*

(micro.) Glasgow, University Library, Hamilton 131, s. XVI (a. 1554), unnumbered fols. (Kriessler, *Iter* 4.32a). This is an incomplete working copy with corrections; it is superseded by the printed edition.

*Editions:*

- 1554. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1559. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1560. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1570. See above, Composite Editions.



*Biography:*

CTC 1.98–99. Add to the *Bibliography*: Cosenza 3.2486–87 and the description of manuscripts in Kristeller, *Iter* 4.31b–32b. The date of Nogarola's birth is given as 1507 in CTC 1.98. But when “admodum adolescens” (see the *Preface* above), he heard Marcus Musurus (ca. 1470–1517; CTC 1.101–102 and 6.129), who taught at Padua from 1503 to no later than 1512 (perhaps only to 1509; see CTC 1.101–102), when he became professor at Venice. Moreover, Nogarola's notes from Pietro Pomponazzi's lectures are dated to 1515; see Kristeller, *Iter* 4.32b, describing Glasgow, University Library, Hamilton 134. His date of birth, then, may be earlier than 1500 and perhaps close to that of his Veronese contemporary at Padua, Montanus, i.e., Giambattista da Monte (1498–1551), to whom he refers in the *Preface* above.

## 4. Federicus Bonaventura

Federicus Bonaventura (Federico Bonaventura) worked on a translation of the Themistian paraphrase of the *De anima* at various times between 1582 and 1588. The manuscript remains of these efforts, accompanied by some notes, are preserved in eleven fascicules in Pesaro, Biblioteca Oliveriana, 1509. The manuscript is not consistently foliated or paginated, and it has never been described in any detail. There is a brief notice in Mazzatinti, *Inventari*, vol. 45 (Forlì, 1930), 221, and a somewhat fuller description is given by Kristeller, *Iter* 2.67b–68a. The latter identifies twelve fascicules, although they are not separately numbered. Of these the ninth (“[Other fascicule]. Text without title, dated Pisauri 1583”; Kristeller, *Iter* 2.68a17–18) does not directly concern Bonaventura's Themistian studies, although it deals with interpretations of Aristotle's theory of the intellect. Of the remaining fascicules, nos. 1–4, 11, and 12 are translations, while nos. 5–8 and 10 (described in II.e below) contain notes. Only the translation of the paraphrase of *De anima* 3.4–13 was prepared for publication by Bonaventura.

This manuscript material consists mostly of working copies with corrections. It was impossible to obtain a microfilm, and the *incipits* and *explicitis* have been rechecked from photographs. Other information is based on an autopsy inspection conducted in May 1993. It should be noted that the script is extremely difficult to read, and some uncertainties remain in the transcriptions given below.

## a. Translation of the paraphrase of book 1 (incomplete)

This is divided into two parts. The first is a version of Themistius, *In De an.* 27.1–32.18 undertaken in November 1584; the second is a version of Themistius, *In De an.* 1.1–5.3 produced in September 1588.

## i. Version of 1584

*In De anima librum primum paraphrasis* (Pesaro, Biblioteca Oliveriana, 1509, fasc. 4). In Dei nomine. Amen. Die 17 Novembris 1584, Pisauri. Hora secunda noctis scripsi. [*Inc.*]: (fol. 4r; Themist., *In De an.* 27.8–10) Rationabilius autem dubitaret quispiam de ipsa ut quae moveatur ad haec respiciens. Dicimus si animam eveniat confidere, dolere, praeterea et irasci, sentire et ratiocinari . . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: (fol. 9v; Themist., *In De an.* 32.16–18) Quod perspicuum fuerit si quis ex ratione hac affectus et munera animae aggreditur describere, ut cogitationes, sensus, voluptates, dolores ceteraque generis eiusdem; ut enim superius diximus, nedum rare quidem ex ipsis facile est.

*Manuscript:*

Pesaro, Biblioteca Oliveriana, 1509, s. XVI (a. 1584), fasc. 4, fols. 4r–9v (unnumbered) (Kristeller, *Iter* 2.68a1–6).

## ii. Version of 1588

*In De anima librum primum paraphrasis* (Pesaro, Biblioteca Oliveriana, 1509, fasc. 11). Laus Deo optimo maximo. Die prima Septembris hora 11.30 1588. Themistii Paraphrasis in primum librum De anima Aristotelis. [*Inc.*]: (fol. 2r; Themist., *In De an.* 1.2–3) De anima quaecumque scientia comprehendi possunt, conandum est nobis Aristotelem secuti (*corr. ex sectati*) in praesenti tractatione explicare . . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: (fol. 5v; Themist., *In De an.* 5.1–3) Haec igitur et tot sunt quaestionum capita quae de anima habentur. Omnia sane ad quod quid erat esse ipsius inveniendum \_\_\_\_\_ utilia et necessaria.

*Manuscript:*

Pesaro, Biblioteca Oliveriana, 1509, fasc. 11, s. XVI (a. 1588), fols. 2r–5v (unnumbered) (Kristeller, *Iter* 2.68a19–22).

## b. Translation of the paraphrase of book 2 (incomplete)

This undated translation of part of the paraphrase of *De anima* 2.1 was probably undertaken at about the same time as the preceding item, i.e., in late 1588.

*In De anima librum secundum paraphrasis* (Pesaro, Biblioteca Oliveriana, 1509, fasc. 12). Paraphrasis Themistii super secundum De anima Aristotelis. [Inc.]: (fol. 1r; Themist., *In De an.* 38.34–35) Quae igitur ab veteribus habuimus tradita de anima (fuere s.s.) sufficienter diximus. Nunc autem principium illud (alio facto principio s.s.) aggredientes conabimur et ipsi explicare quid sit anima . . . / . . . [Expl.]: (fol. 6r; Themist., *In De an.* 45.11–12) Fatendum (dicendum s.s.) igitur (et *canc.*) plantas particulam animae participantes (habentes s.s.) et vivere et animatas esse.

*Manuscript:*

Pesaro, Biblioteca Oliveriana, 1509, s. XVI (ca. 1588 ex.), fasc. 12, fols. 1r–6r (unnumbered) (Kristeller, *Iter* 2.68a22–25).

*c. Translation of the paraphrase of book 3.4–8*

Fasc. 1 of Pesaro, Biblioteca Oliveriana, ms. 1509 is Bonaventura's working copy with corrections. He began work on this translation on 20 March 1582 and completed it on 26 April of that year. Fasc. 2, an undated fair copy of fasc. 1, seems to have been written in Bonaventura's more careful hand and exhibits some corrections; it was probably written after July 1583, when Bonaventura completed his notes on other translations of the paraphrase of *De anima* 3 (II.e below). Fasc. 3, dated 10 June 1627, is a partial version of the calligraphic copy used for typesetting when the translation was published posthumously in 1627. (The date 1582, given by Kristeller, *Iter* 2.67b64, refers to Bonaventura's completion of the translation, not to the date at which this particular copy was made). Fasc. 3 is a copy of fasc. 2 and incorporates the latter's corrections. Given the state of the text in fasc. 3, the printed edition of 1627 can be said to reflect Bonaventura's intentions, and the specific details of fasc. 1–3 need not be reported separately. The posthumous publication was undertaken by Bonaventura's son, Pietro (1578–1653; see Firpo 646), who in the first of the *Opuscula* (of which this translation is the fourth) states in a letter to the reader: "En habes, amice lector, haec, quae mihi patris scripta recensenti occurrerunt."

Bonaventura translated the same portion of the Themistian paraphrase as had Ludovico Nogarola approximately thirty years earlier. The dedication makes clear his reservations about the translations of Ludovico Nogarola and Ermolao Barbaro the Younger (which he analyzed in the manuscript material described on p. 86 below).

Bonaventura's reference to Giovanni Pico della Mirandola undoubtedly concerns the famous letter to Barbaro in which Pico answered Barbaro's criticisms of medieval Latin (E. Garin, ed., *Prosatori latini del Quattrocento*, vol. 6 [Turin, 1977], 804–23 for the text and an Italian translation, and for an English translation Q. Breen, "Giovanni Pico della Mirandola on the Conflict of Philosophy and Rhetoric," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 13 [1952] 384–412 at 394–402). There (Garin 820–21; Breen 401) Pico paraphrased Cicero, *De oratore* 3.142 ("malim equidem indisertam prudentiam quam stultitiam loquacem"), and this is perhaps reflected in Bonaventura's brief reference to Cicero.

Bonaventura's main innovation was to highlight the Aristotelian language in his translation of the Themistian paraphrase. The italics of the printed edition are retained in the quotations below. For his translation of Aristotle's *De anima* he used the version of Michael Sophianus (d. 1565), which had been published in four editions between 1562 and 1574; see A. Meschini, *Michele Sofianòs*, *Studi bizantini e neogreci* 12 (Padua, 1981), 36 and n. 80 for the bibliographical details. As Meschini 36–43 shows, Sophianus reacted against the paraphrastic style of the translations of Theodore Gaza (1400–76) and particularly John Argyropoulos (ca. 1415–87) in favour of a more austere style, even though his version was still humanist in character. (For the full text of Sophianus' preface see Legrand, *Bibliothèque hellénique* 4.184–89.) Given Bonaventura's views on earlier translators, it is clear why he favoured Sophianus as a guide to the Aristotelian material.

The translation is dedicated to Francesco Maria II della Rovere (1549–1631), the sixth and last duke of Urbino, in whose service Bonaventura spent much of his adult life. Bonaventura draws attention to the fact that Francesco Maria was the third member of that family to be the dedicatee of a Themistian translation; the others were Francesco della Rovere, later Pope Sixtus IV (I.2 above), and Cardinal Giulio Feltrio della Rovere (II.3 above).

*Dedication* (ed. of Urbino, 1627). Serenissimo principi Francisco Mariae II, Urbini Duci VI, Domino suo clementissimo, Federicus Bonaventura f. [Inc.]: (p. 3) Summus ille poetarum philosophorumque omnium doctor Homerus res duas, quae principem optimum ac omnibus suis partibus expletum redderent, inter ceteras sum-

mopere necessarias esse existimavit . . . (p. 9) Itaque ut nulla admiratione afficiaris, rationi consentaneum est si hanc ego Themistii paraphrasim aristotelicarum interpretum primarii in tertium Aristotelis *De anima* librum ab eo graece editum, a me vero in latinum sermonem conversam, in qua de humanae mentis natura atque praestantia elegantissime disseritur, tibi uni inter principes principi, qui maxime mentem excoluerit, dicaverim. Quamquam autem onus Aetna gravius [Cic., *De sen.* 4] mihi suscepisse [suscepisse *ed.*] videar, quod post Hermolaum Barbarum et Ludovicum Nugarolam [*sic*] viros eruditissimos huic libello interpretando rursus admovere manus sim ausus, multae tamen me ad hanc provinciam capessendam causae, eaeque non leves, impulerunt. Primo Themistium in Aristotele interpretando eam accurate ac diligenter secutum fuisse rationem videbam, quam noveram te, et iure quidem, probare vehementer. Cum autem hanc miram huius interpretis artem in Barbari ac Nugarolae versionibus latere perspicerem, quippe qui Aristotelis et Themistii verba sic vicissim confundant atque perturbent ut quae summus hic interpres ad eorum explicationem addiderit, quae intacta relinquens summo artificio in sua paraphrasi interseruerit prorsus cognosci nequeant, operae pretium me facturum duxi si Themistii interpretationem ab Aristotelis contextu ita distinguerem ac dividerem ut facile quae Aristotelis quaeve Themistii essent unusquisque iudicare posset.

Accedit quod Barbari versio (ut libere dicam quod sentio) potius altera paraphrasis est in Themistii paraphrasim, ut ipse in epistola ad Sixtum IIII fatetur [cf. I.2 above], quam fidelis auctoris illius interpretatio. Secunda vero quae Nugarolae, est ciceroniana profecto et elegans, sed quae tamen a philosophico loquendi modo atque scholarum usu valde nimis recedat. Quod num in pertractanda philosophia liceat, aliorum sit iudicium. Nam quemadmodum magnus ille Picus aiebat, nec etiam Tullius eloquentiam in philosopho desiderat, sed ut rebus et doctrina satisficiat. Et qui inusitatis apud philosophos aliquando vocabulis utuntur, quas res oratione illustrandas suscipiunt, ii rebus non lumen afferre mihi videntur sed tenebras offundere. Adde quod, ut M. Antonius Flaminius vir eruditissimus quodam in loco inquit, non quoties aut ens aut essentiam appellabimus, verbis apud Romanos

antiquos inauditis utemur. Siquidem quo tempore latinae linguae maiestas una cum imperio florebat, Sergius et Flavius philosophi et haec et alia plurima eiusdem generis vocabula novaverunt. Sed iam haec missa faciamus.

Tu interea, princeps serenissime, libellum hunc gloriosissimo tuo nomini dicatum libenti animo accipe, atque eo libentiori, quo videtur Themistius omnes suas exarasse lucubrationes, ut tuo semper tuorumque maiorum nomini nuncupatae perpetuo ederentur, quandoquidem Hermolaus Barbarus et Ludovicus Nugarola suas in hunc auctorem vigilias Sixto IIII Pontifici Maximo atque Iulio Cardinali amplissimo dedicarunt. Ego autem tibi, princeps serenissime, meas, ut quaecumque incredibilis mei erga te amoris ac reverentiae monumentum. Hac tantum de re te admonitum esse volo, me in Aristotelis contextu interpretando novum suscipiendum esse laborem non existimasse cum Sophiani versione elegantiore inveniri posse mihi religio sit arbitrari. Ea igitur perpetuo usus, non parum in eo etiam laboris habui ut Themistium ipsum illius verbis addicerem.

*In De anima librum secundum paraphrasim.* [Inc.]: (p. 15; Themist., *In De an.* 93.32–33) De ea autem parte animae, qua utimur ad contemplationem et actionem, sive separabilis sit loco ut opinabatur Plato . . . / . . . [Expl.]: (p. 110; Themist., *In De an.* 126.20–21) auditum autem, ut ei aliquid significetur; linguam ad duo, ad gustum, et ut quidpiam alteri significet. Finis.

*Manuscript:*

Pesaro, Biblioteca Oliveriana, 1509, fasc. 1–3 (Kristeller, *Iter* 2.67b54–64): fasc. 1 (s. XVI [March/April 1582]), fols. 8r–54v (numbered fols. 1r–47v); fasc. 2 (s. XVI [probably late 1583]), fols. 2r–24v (unnumbered); fasc. 3 (s. XVII [June 1627]), fols. 9r–48v (numbered fols. 1r–40v), with the title and dedicatory letter on unnumbered fols. 2r–6v and fols. 4, 13, 15–18, 21–22, 24, 27–28, 36, 40 missing (presumably because these pages were separated and lost in the course of printing).

*Edition:*

1627, Urbini (Urbino): Marcus Antonius Manzantini. L. Moranti, *L'arte tipografica in Urbino (1493–1800)* (Florence, 1967), 215, no. 92. The complete edition, entitled *Opuscula*, contains three other works by Bonaventura (Moranti 214, no. 88), but the translation of Themistius has a

separate title page and is separately paginated. BL; BNF; Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine; Urbino, Biblioteca Universitaria.

*Biography:*

CTC 2.289. Add to the *Bibliography*: “Bonaventura, Federico,” DBI 11.644–46 (L. Firpo); “Bonaventura, Federigo,” DSB 2.283 (C. B. Schmitt).

COMMENTARIES

a. Anonymus Venetus

On this commentator and the general character of the commentary, see I.a above. In the notes on the paraphrase of the *De anima* considerable use is made of Simplicius' commentary on this work. This coincides with the publication of the Aldine *editio princeps* of that work at Venice in 1527, the year in which these notes first appear with Ermolao Barbaro the Younger's translation.

*Notes* (ed. of Venice, 1530). [*Inc.*]: (fol. 55r) Verbum graecum *τιμίαν* (Themist., *In De an.* 1.12) pulchram interpretatur; ceteri vero honorabilem. Unde Simplicius hoc in loco ait [*In De an.* 6.27–29] bonum et honorabile eadem subiecto esse . . . / . . . [*Expl.*] (fol. 84r; ad Themist., *In De an.* 125.27–28) Caelestia corpora animalia sunt nobiliora quam ut sensum requirant.

*Editions:*

- (\*) 1527. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1530 (Venice). See above, Composite Editions.
- 1542. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1549. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1554. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1559. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1560. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1570. See above, Composite Editions.

b. Marcus Antonius Zimarra

Marcus Antonius Zimarra (Marcantonio Zimarra) composed a set of problems and solutions based on Themistius' paraphrases and published with Ermolao Barbaro's translations of the latter in 1542, at least five years after Zimarra's death. They belong perhaps to the period 1501–1509 when Zimarra taught at Padua since, in 1508, a similarly entitled work by him, *Contradictiones et solutiones in dictis Aristotelis et Averrois*, was published at Venice. Nothing, however, is known with certainty regarding the date and origin of the Themistian problems and solutions.

There are ten items in this collection: five dealing with the *De anima*, four with the *Physics*, and one with the *De insomniis*. They are not narrowly focussed on the Themistian exposition, using instead Themistius along with other commentators (Alexander, Simplicius, Philoponus, Averroes) to propound and solve problems.

*Contradictiones ac solutiones Marci Antonii Zimarrae in dictis lucidissimi Themistii* (ed. of Venice, 1542). [*Inc.*]: (fol. +1r [unnumbered]) In libros De anima. Contradictio in primo De anima super textum 6 [403a10–16]. Themistius (*In De an.* 6.4–33) et Averroes (*Commentarium magnum in Aristotelis De anima libros*, 18–20 Crawford) per passiones animae proprias exponunt, sicut est intelligere et contemplari . . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: (fol. +2r [unnumbered]); Themist., *In De an.* 78.7–13) sed tamen quoad iudicium non dicit Commentator sensum esse materiam sed actum et formam.

*Editions:*

- 1542. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1549. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1554. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1559. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1560. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1570. See above, Composite Editions.

*Biography:*

Marcus Antonius Zimarra (Marcantonio Zimarra) was born at San Pietro in Galatina in 1475 or 1476 and died before 1537. He was educated at the University of Padua from 1497 to 1501 when he obtained his doctorate. His teachers included Agostino Nifo (1469/70–1538) and Pietro Pomponazzi (1462–1525). Zimarra taught at Padua after graduation, acquired another doctorate (in medicine) in 1505, and was professor of natural philosophy until 1509. He was later professor of natural philosophy at the University of Salerno from 1518 to 1522 and thereafter taught at Naples, probably until his death.

*Works:*

Zimarra edited Aristotle and Albertus Magnus and wrote numerous exegetical works on Aristotelian themes; see Lohr (cited below) for a full inventory.

*Bibliography:*

C. H. Lohr, “Renaissance Latin Aristotle Commentaries: Authors So-Z,” *Renaissance Quarterly* 35 (1982) 245–54 (= Lohr, *Latin Aristotle Commen-*

*taries*, vol. 2: *Renaissance Authors*, Corpus philosophorum Medii Aevi, Subsidia 6 [Florence, 1988], 504–12); to the bibliography add D. A. Iorio, *The Aristotelians of Renaissance Italy: A Philosophical Exposition*, Studies in the History of Philosophy 24 (Lewiston, Queenston, and Lampeter, 1991), 197–259.

### c. Ludovicus Nogarola

On the translation which these notes accompany see II.3 above. They deal mostly with specific points of language and interpretation.

*Notes* (ed. of Venice, 1554). [*Inc.*]: (fol. 104r) ᾧ χρώμεθα πρὸς θεωρίαν καὶ πράξιν (Themist., *In De an.* 93.32–33). Poteram ego hunc locum fortasse ornatius transferre sed magis obscure nec a Ciceronis more . . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: (fol. 118r; ad Themist., *In De an.* 125.25–27) ut satis sit perspicuum Platonem dissimulasse horum duorum sensuum nomen et naturam cognoscere, qui tamen res eisdem subiectas (-tus *ed.*) optime noverit.

#### *Manuscript:*

(micro.) Glasgow, University Library, Hamilton 131, unnumbered fols. (Kristeller, *Iter* 4.32a). This working copy is superseded by the printed edition.

#### *Editions:*

- 1554. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1559. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1560. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1570. See above, Composite Editions.

#### *Biography:*

See II.3 above.

### d. Federicus Pendasius

The essay by Federicus Pendasius (Federico Pendasio) on Themistius' interpretation of Aristotle's theory of the intellect in book 3 of *De anima* is not dated. Since, however, other works by him on the same book and on the related theme of the immortality of the soul have been dated to 1566–77 (see Lohr, cited below, nos. 24–27), Pendasio's study of Themistius was probably a part of this general program. The present collection, then, would date from the period when he taught at the universities of Padua and Bologna (see below).

*Text* (Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, S 87 sup.). Excellentissimi Federici Pendasii Expositio

digressionis Themistii de intellectu agente \_\_\_\_\_ etc. [*Inc.*] (fol. 47r): Haec expositio paraphrasis Themistii quae pertinet ad intellectum agentem maxime, ut spero, vobis proderit . . . / . . . [*Expl.*] (fol. 79v): Anima mundi non aberrat. Postea eadem tibi ipsi ad \_\_\_\_\_ tur capite quinto [cf. Aristot., *De an.* 1.5 (411b6–19); Themist., *In De an.* 37.27–28] differre animae rationales rationibus internis.

#### *Manuscript:*

(micro.) Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, S 87 sup., s. XVI (ca. 1560–80), fols. 47r–79v (Kristeller, *Iter* 1.313b; Lohr [see below], no. 28). Owing to the closure of the Biblioteca Ambrosiana at the time that this article was prepared, an autopsy of the manuscript was impossible. The microfilm provided by the University of Notre Dame was insufficiently legible to allow much more than a repetition of the *incipit* and *explicit* given by Lohr.

#### *Biography:*

Federicus Pendasius (Federico Pendasio) was born at Mantua some time before 1545 and died at Bologna in 1603. He was educated at the universities of Bologna, where he was a student of Ludovico Boccadiferro (1482–1545), and Padua. He taught at Pavia, Mantua (at the court of Cardinal Ercole Gonzaga), Padua (1564–70), and finally Bologna (1571–1603), where his most noted pupil was Cesare Cremonini (1550–1631). Pendasio's particular interest in the Greek Aristotelian commentators is reflected in his dispute with Francesco Piccolomini (1523–1607) at Padua in 1568–71 on the longstanding problem of the Aristotelian theory of the active intellect (see Lohr).

#### *Works:*

Pendasio's surviving works are mostly manuscript commentaries on Aristotelian works or treatises on Aristotelian themes. To Lohr's list (see below) add the printed edition *Federici Pendasii . . . Physicae auditionis texturae libri octo* (Venice, 1604).

#### *Bibliography:*

C. H. Lohr, "Renaissance Latin Aristotle Commentaries: Authors N-Ph," *Renaissance Quarterly* 32 (1979) 556–62 (= Lohr, *Latin Aristotle Commentaries*, vol. 2: *Renaissance Authors*, Corpus philosophorum Medii Aevi, Subsidia 6 [Florence, 1988], 305–11), which lists the manuscripts of Pendasius' works and provides a bibliography; C. B. Schmitt, "Philoponus' Commentary on Aristotle's

*Physics in the Sixteenth Century*," in R. K. R. Sorabji, ed., *Philoponus and the Rejection of Aristotelian Science* (London, 1987), 210–30 at 223–24, reprinted in Schmitt, *Reappraisals in Renaissance Thought*, ed. C. Webster (London, 1989), no. 8; D. A. Iorio, *The Aristotelians of Renaissance Italy: A Philosophical Exposition*, Studies in the History of Philosophy 24 (Lewiston, Queenston, and Lampeter, 1991), 264–71.

e. Federicus Bonaventura

The sets of notes by Federicus Bonaventura (Federico Bonaventura) on the paraphrases of books 1 and 2 of the *De anima* are mostly philological in character and include analyses of the translations of the same work by Ermolao Barbaro (II.2 above) and Ludovico Nogarola (II.3 above). Bonaventura's notes were clearly undertaken in connection with his own translations of this work.

i. Notes on the paraphrase of book 1

These notes on the opening sections (pp. 1–5.3 Heinze) of Themistius' paraphrase were composed on 2 September 1588, the day after Bonaventura translated the material (see II.4.a.ii above), and they are preceded by lemmata from the Greek text.

*Notes* (Pesaro, Biblioteca Oliveriana, 1509, fasc. 10). Laus Deo optimo maximo. Die 2 Septembris 1588. Super prooemium Themistii et primum De anima. [*Inc.*]: (fol. 1r) τῷ δὲ μίαν ἐκκαλύψαι etc. (Themist., *In De an.* 1.3–4). Paraphrasis duplex est ut inter ceteros notat . . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: (fol. 5v) Πολλὰ γὰρ τρέφεται (Themist., *In De an.* 4.22). Hermolaus 'pleraque nutriuntur' etc. In qua interpretatione particulam γὰρ causativam omittit . . . et 'pleraque nutriantur augeantur ac gignant quae non sentiunt nec vita (?) concipiuntur' (Themist., *In De an.* 4.22–23).

*Manuscript:*

Pesaro, Biblioteca Oliveriana, 1509, s. XVI (a. 1588), fasc. 10, fols. 1r–5v (unnumbered) (Kristeller, *Iter* 2.68a19–22).

ii. Notes on the paraphrase of book 3

These four sets of notes (identified as "primus" through "quartus") comprise a continuous series in fasc. 5–8 of Pesaro, Biblioteca Oliveriana, 1509. The notes in fasc. 5 are dated to 26 April, and the year must be 1582, since it was on that day of that year that Bonaventura completed

the first draft of his translation of the paraphrase of *De anima* 3.4–13 (see II.4 above). The notes in fasc. 6 are dated to 9 August; again the year must be 1582, given the *explicit* dates of fasc. 7 (13 November 1582) and fasc. 8 (10 July 1583). Fasc. 8 is incomplete.

*Notes* (Pesaro, Biblioteca Oliveriana, 1509, fasc. 5). Laus Deo optimo maximo. Die 26 Aprilis. Super vers(iones) Com(mentarii) prim(i). [*Inc.*]: (fasc. 5, fol. 1r) Inveterata est inter omnes Aristotelis Latinos interpretum opinio Themistii . . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: (fasc. 8, fol. 50r) patet supra esse de intellectu καθ' ἑξῆς (cf. Themist., *In De an.* 3.5, 98.21 and 100.2). Esse autem sic duas . . .

*Manuscript:*

Pesaro, Biblioteca Oliveriana, 1509, fasc. 5–8: fasc. 5, s. XVI (26 April [1582]), 50 fols. (fols. 2–41 numbered 1–40) (Kristeller, *Iter* 2.68a6–12); fasc. 6, s. XVI (9 April [1582]), 34 fols. (fols. 2–19 numbered 1–18) (Kristeller, *Iter* 2.68a12–13); fasc. 7, s. XVI (13 November 1582), fols. 52 (unnumbered) with 11 interleaved folios (Kristeller, *Iter* 2.68a14–15); fasc. 8, s. XVI (10 July 1583), fols. 66 (unnumbered) (Kristeller, *Iter* 2.68a15–16).

*Biography:*

See II.4 above.

### III. IN LIBROS DE CAELO PARAPHRASIS

#### TRANSLATION

##### 1. Moyses Alatinus

In his dedicatory letter Moyses Alatinus (Mosè Alatino) explains that he began his translation of this work after discovering a manuscript of the Hebrew translation when he was a medical student at the University of Perugia, i.e., shortly before 1556, the year of his graduation. At the time Alatino was studying with the distinguished Aristotelian commentator Francesco Piccolomini (1523–1607, professor of philosophy at Perugia between 1550 and 1560; C. H. Lohr, *Latin Aristotle Commentaries*, vol. 2: *Renaissance Authors*, Corpus philosophorum Medii Aevi, Subsidia 6 [Florence, 1988], 331–42) and the eminent physician and anatomist, Bartolomeo Eustachi (ca. 1500/10–74; "Eustachi, Bartolomeo," DSB 4.486–88 [C. D. O'Malley]). Alatino further reports that he began work on the translation five years after

acquiring the manuscript at Perugia, where he showed the codex to Eustachi and to his brother Vitale Alatino (probably also a doctor). Because of poor health and other duties, he completed the translation later at Ferrara with the assistance of another Jewish physician, Elia da Nola, and oversaw its publication at Venice in 1574. The dedicatee is Luigi d'Este (1538–86), archbishop of Ferrara and a cardinal since 1561. In the later stages of his work Alatino was encouraged by Benedetto Manzoli (ca. 1530–85), a friend of Francesco Patrizi. Manzoli played a similar role in Mosè Finzi's translation of Themistius' paraphrase of book 12 of the *Metaphysics*, published in 1558 (IV.1 below).

Alatino's prefatory letter addressed generally to "students of philosophy" (*philosophiae studiosis*) shows that his later meeting with Piccolomini during a visit to the baths near Padua with Camillus Varannus (an otherwise unidentified individual) also provided an impetus for the completion of the translation. This letter reveals as well Alatino's scholarly fastidiousness as a translator and his concern with the necessity to sacrifice stylistic elegance for the sake of accuracy. For a more detailed study of the manuscript tradition and the translation, see M. Zonta, "Hebraica Veritas: Temistio, Parafrasi del *De Coelo*. Tradizione e critica del testo," *Athenaeum*, N. S., 82 (1994) 403–28.

The manuscript of the Hebrew translation once owned by Alatino is now missing. According to S. Landauer, the modern editor of the Hebrew version (CAG 5.4:vi), this codex was older than the two surviving manuscripts presently known. The Hebrew translation itself was made from the Arabic in 1284 by Zerahjah ben Isak ben Schealtiel ha-Sefardi. The Arabic version has not survived and is known only through quotations in the commentary by Ibn Rushd (Averroes); see F. E. Peters, *Aristoteles Arabus. The Oriental Translations and Commentaries of the Aristotelian Corpus* (Leiden, 1968), 36, and Landauer vii–viii.

*Dedication* (ed. of Venice, 1574). Illustrissimo ac reverendissimo Aloysio Aestensi, principi et cardinali amplissimo Galliaeque protectori dignissimo, Moyses Alatinus Hebraeus s. p. d. [*Inc.*]: (fol. a2r) Inter veteres illos patres, bonorum nobis omnium auctores, reverendissime ac illustrissime Cardinalis, ii mea quidem sententia summa laude digni videntur, qui philosophiam, quam princeps ille ingenii et doctrinae Plato divinarum huma-

narumque rerum cognitionem esse voluit, summo studio summaque animi attentione ac diuturna speculatione invenere. . . . (fol. a2v) veluti in iis De caelo et mundo commentariis facile perspici potest quantum Themistianae lucubrationes praestiterint quantumque studiosis emolumenti attulerint. In iis enim cum de rebus arduis ac difficillimis Aristoteles pertractarit, multo sane clariores et faciliores sua hac paraphrasi a Themistio redduntur. Quae cum per multa annorum saecula, ab Averrois nempe aetate in hodiernum usque diem, in tenebris semper latitaverit, nescio quo fato contigerit, dum Perusiae sub magnifico domino Francisco Piccolomineo praeceptore meo clarissimo philosophiae operam navabam, ut vetustissimo quodam codice, hebraico idiomate manuscripto, ad manus meas pervenerit. Quare tantum ac tamdiu reconditum thesaurum nactus magnifico domino Bartholomaeo Eustachio, reverendiss(imi) ac illustriss(imi) Cardinalis Urbini [*sc.* Iulii Feltri; cf. II.3] medico nostra aetate eximio meoque in medicina praeceptori clarissimo, necnon Vitali Alatino fratri, illud ostendi, qui tunc temporis ab illustrissimo et reverendissimo Urbini Cardinali ad praefati domini Bartholomaei gravi et capitali morbo impliciti curationem accersitus, Perusiam venerat. Quibus ut in omni disciplinarum genere ita in hebraicis litteris admodum versatis et rarissimum et gratissimum spectaculum fuit. Quare hinc etiam spem non mediocrem concepi magnum quid boni me assecutum esse et, ut vere ingenueque fatear, magnopere laetatus fui. Fore enim aliquando sperabam, si eam latino sermoni reddidissem, rem me non ingrattam philosophiae studiosis effecturum eisque non parum utilitatis allaturum. Quod sane opus iam quinque abhinc annis inceperam. Sed cum ob adversam ac diuturnam valetudinem in quam incidi, tum ob alias multas animi etiam occupationes nec opus ad finem perducere nec colophonem ei imponere valui. Nunc autem dei optimi munere restituta sanitate, momentibus et quasi cum convicio nonnullis amicis meis efflagitantibus ut opus iam diu inceptum tandem absolverem ac philosophiae studiosis illud communicarem, iustis monitis eorum parens id amplius procrastinare nolui. Quare dedi operam, ut parum id otii, quod a medendi munere ac domesticis curis mihi relinquebatur, in hanc Themistii versionem dispensarem. Qua tandem dei optimi gratia absoluta, eam tibi, reverendis-

sime ac illustrissime antistes, dicare (-cere *ed.*) atque consecrare volui ut in manus hominum sub tuo clarissimo nomine veniat. . . . (fol. a3r) Verum (ut cetera praetermittam) quo studio, quo amore litteratos omnes amplecteris? ut eos auxilio foveas, praemiis allicias et amplissimo stipendio locupletes? Inter quos magnificus ac reverendus dominus Benedictus Mangiolus (*sic*) mutinensis, vir omnium bonarum artium doctissimus ac tuus a secretis philosophus, connumerandus venit, qui ad hoc opus perficiendum me semper hortatus est et quasi torpentem excitavit, ut hoc nomine studiosi omnes non minus ei quam mihi debeant. . . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: Accipe igitur hilari et exporrecta fronte has nostras vigilias, princeps illustrissime. Quod si feceris, ut spero, ad maiora deinde nomini tuo consecranda animum extimulabis meum. Deus optimus maximus te in multos annos sospitem et incolumem conservet faxitque ut te singulari principe diutissime omnes frui valeamus. Ferrariae, Calendis Sextilis. MDLXXIII.

*Prefatory letter* (ed. of Venice, 1574). Moyses Alatinus Hebraeus philosophiae studiosis s. [*Inc.*]: (fol. a3v) Cum superiori anno ad patavinas thermas proprii ac diuturni morbi propulsandi gratia cum illustrissimi ac maxime reverendi domini mei Camilli Varanni comitatu profectus essem, curatione tandem absoluta nihil mihi potius fuit quam ut magnificum dominum Franciscum Piccolomineum (-lem- *ed.*), omni disciplinarum genere abundantem philosophum ac meum in philosophia praeceptorem clarissimum amantissimumque, salutandi gratia convenirem, qui in almo patavino gymnasio iam per multos annos ordinarie philosophiae professor multis nominibus suspiciendus primas tenet. Ei igitur rudem adhuc et incohatam hanc Themistii paraphrasim ostendi, ut quid de ea sentiret mihi libere pronuntiaret et gravissimum eius iudicium consulerem. Qui obiter nonnulla percurrens laudavit quidem opus, ut solet, meque summopere rogavit ac monuit ut meipsum non desererem ac operi tandem iam diu incohatato divulgatoque et a philosophiae studiosis admodum expetito extremam manum imponerem. Ego vero, iuvenes amantissimi, licet de meo ingenio tantum pollicitus non sim ut crediderim me alioquin in hac interpretandi professione non admodum exercitatum propriis, ut aiunt, nervis grave hoc onus totum subire posse, praecipue in rebus tam arduis ac difficillimis quae ipsimet Aristoteli non-

numquam imponunt ac negotium facessunt, quod sane opus consummatis etiam professoribus perdifficile extitisset, sperabam tamen me ope doctissimi alicuius viri adiutum, qui Arabum linguam profiteretur, in explicatione praecipue nonnullarum vocum quae per hanc paraphrasim arabice dispersae inveniebantur, posse a tanto onere nonnihil sublevari meamque interpretationem interim utcumque prosequi. Sed, bone deus, nedum talem adire hominem numquam mihi contigit, sed etiam multos locos inveni qui ad eorum explicationem diligentissimo atque exercitatissimo homine indigebant. Etenim cum ex graeco Averrois tempore ad Arabas ac inde in hebraicum idioma eiusmodi paraphrasis fuisset delata, cui in dubium venit ex hac multiplici versione errores aliquos contigisse, qui obscuriores difficilioresque nonnullas orationes reddebant? Quare, quod vulgo fertur, sero sapiunt Phryges. Agnovi enim quam magnum onus suscepissem, et fateor, ingemui. Sed cum amplius referre pedem non liceret, necesse quidem fuit ut tantum ac tale onus subierim, quale certe vobis, o iuvenes amantissimi, numquam explicare possem.

At quo ordine in hac versione incessem, nunc audietis. Primo enim cuiusque Aristotelis contextus germanam pro viribus sententiam assecutus, nonnulla quae antea admodum confusa et ambigua erant, mihi perspicua reddebantur, aliqua ob phrasim mutationem agnovimus sensus perspicuitatem amisisse, idque ea potissimum ratione. Etenim utrumque idioma, hebraicum nempe arabicumque, ob multorum nominum verborumque affinitatem magnum consortium habent inter se; in eo vero potissimum differunt, siquidem hebraica locutio concisa admodum est, brevis et luculenta ac idem verbum plures sortitur significationes, arabica vero contra. Utraque autem propriam phrasim habet. Differunt etiam in hoc, siquidem hebraicum idioma pronuntiationem brevem habet, arabicum vero longam eademque nomina ac infinita propemodum verba diverso quidem modo in utrisque pronuntiantur. Hac itaque ratione agnovimus ob phrasim nempe mutationem obscuriorem difficilioremque sensum nonnullas orationes habere, quibus deinde sano modo intellectis, hoc est, in ordinem redactis, sensus perspicuitatem recuperarunt. Quaedam insuper redundabant in hebraico idiomate, quae arabice conscripta perfectum sensum pariunt; quae omnino deleri



oportuit ut perfecta oratio redderetur. Demum nonnullas voces arabice conscriptas latinas fecimus, quia graece eandem significationem habebant. Nonnullas vero ex orationis sententia agnovimus talem sensum necessario nobis significare voluisse, ut in toto opere unum vel alterum verbum tantum intactum remanserit, quod latine omnino explicatum non fuerit.

Quod vero orationis reliquum erat, semper conati sumus, ubi id commode fieri potuit, verbum reddere verbo; ubi vero minus, orationis sensum non deserimus ac integram sententiam dedimus auctori (non lusimus arbitrato nostro) Themistiumque latinum reddere voluimus, non autem cum Hermolao viro undequaque doctissimo atque elegantissimo certare. Res enim quae per se arduae ac difficiles sunt, modo inculta ac barbara oratione non explicentur, elegantissimo illo orationis cultu suavissimoque verborum lenocinio decorari haudquaquam facile possunt. Etenim cum satis ornatae ac luculentae per se sint, ornamentis extrinsecus additis fucatae corrumpuntur. Quare maluimus cum Themistio non adeo exquisite loqui quam cum Cicerone longe lateque divagari. Non raro enim experti sumus ornamentis et cultus gratia in nonnullis orationibus verborum seriem mutare velle, ac sensum simul mutatum esse omnino animadvertimus. Quare scio studiosos hac in nostra versione nonnullas orationes offensuros, quae maiorem fortasse cultum requirent, quas libuit ita potius relinquere minus elegantes quam seriem verborum permutando earum sensum pervertere vel quovis modo lacerare. Ita etiam nonnullas voces reperient quae forte ciceronianis auribus suavem harmoniam non efficiunt. Hae tamen ad faciliorem intellectum philosophis permittuntur, qui non de exquisita dicendi ratione sed de rerum veritate et falsitate disputant. His ita utcumque a nobis animadversis ac interpretatione tandem ad finem perducta proprio iudicio non contenti, domini Heliae Nolani hebraei medici undequaque doctissimi ac philosophi peritissimi opera adiuti, maiorem denuo operis partem percurrere libuit nonnullaque diligentius adnotavimus castigavimusque quae quoquo modo castigatione egere videbantur. Accipite igitur haec nunc, qualiacumque sint, quae si vobis non displicuisse cognoverimus, meliora in dies a nobis favente deo expectate (-to *ed.*). Etenim curabimus ut primum Avicennae librum ex he-

braico idiomate in latinum a nobis conversum aspirante deo propediem habeatis.

*In De caelo et mundo paraphrasis* (ed. of Venice, 1574). [*Inc.*]: (fol. 1r; p. 1.5–7 Landauer) Tria veteres caeli nomine appellare consuevere: etenim inerrantium stellarum orbem tantum, insuper corpus quintum, ac demum mundum universum . . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: (fol. 66v; p. 247.23–25 Landauer) Minus autem dividuntur, cum eorum corporum quae continuata sunt, vis expulsionis superabit. Finis quarti et ultimi libri.

*Editions:*

1574, Venetiis (Venice): Simon Galignanus de Karera. NUC. BNF; Oxford, Bodleian Library; Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana; (CtY; OU; PpID).

1902, Berolini (Berlin): Typ. et impensis G. Reimeri. S. Landauer, ed., *Themistii In libros Aristotelis De caelo paraphrasis hebraice et latine*, CAG 5.4. With Moyses Alatinus' Dedication and Prefatory letter and a revised version of his translation.

*Biography:*

Moyes Alatinus (Mosè Alatino) was born at Spoleto in 1529. He studied at Perugia with the Aristotelian Francesco Piccolomini (1523–1607) and obtained a doctorate in medicine there in 1556. Alatino practiced medicine at Spoleto until 1569 when, after the expulsion of the Jews from papal territories, he moved to Ferrara where he spent most of the remainder of his life. He died at Venice in 1606.

*Works:*

Alatino's only other published work is a translation from Hebrew into Latin of Galen's commentary on Hippocrates' *De aere, aquis et locis* (R. Charterius, ed., *Hippocratis Coi et Claudii Galeni Pergameni . . . Opera*, vol. 6 [Paris, 1679], 194–212, 546 [= 557]). He worked with his son on a Latin translation of the first book of Avicenna's *Canon* in Hebrew (the last sentence of the prefatory letter cited above contains a reference to this endeavor).

*Bibliography:*

"Alatino, Mosè Amram di Buonaiuto," DBI 1.586-87 (unsigned).

IV. IN METAPHYSICORUM  
LIBRUM DUODECIMUM  
PARAPHRASIS

TRANSLATION

1. Moyses Finzius

Moses Finzi (Mosè Finzi), who began his translation in the 1550s, used a Hebrew manuscript of the translation from the Arabic made by Moses ben Samuel ibn Tibbon in 1255. The surviving Arabic version is a fragment of an abridged version, probably by Iṣḥāq ibn Ḥunayn [d. 910]; it was edited by ‘A. Badawī, *Aristu ‘inda ’l-‘Arab* (Cairo, 1947), 12–21 and 329–33. On its Arabic *fortuna*, see F. E. Peters, *Aristoteles Arabus. The Oriental Translations and Commentaries of the Aristotelian Corpus* (Leiden, 1968), 52; and on the question of the identity of the translator, Pinès, “Some Distinctive Metaphysical Conceptions” (Bibliography II.C above), 177, n. 3. Finzi himself mentions the references to Themistius in the commentary on this book by Averroes; on these see S. Landauer at p. vii of the edition cited below. R. Brague’s translation (Bibliography II.A above) is now the most thorough treatment of this paraphrase.

Finzi acknowledges the support of Benedetto Manzoli of Mantua (ca. 1530–85; CTC 2.284), who had played a similar role in Moses Alatino’s translation of Themistius’ paraphrase of the *De caelo* (III.1 above). Manzoli was a contemporary of Francesco Patrizi (1529–97) at the University of Padua and the dedicatee of book 4 of Patrizi’s *Discussiones peripateticae*. Finzi does not mention Patrizi, but in *Discuss. Peripat.* 1.10 (= p. 141, ed. of Basel, 1581) Patrizi refers to Finzi as “amicus noster” and to Finzi’s translation of Themistius as published “nostra cura”. Since book 1 of the *Discussiones peripateticae* was first published in 1571, Patrizi must have been associated with the publication of the first edition of Finzi’s translation in 1558.

*Dedication* (ed. of Venice, 1558). Illustrissimo ac reverendissimo Mariano Sabello episcopo eugubino Mose Finzius s. p. d. [*Inc.*]: (fol. aiir) Themistii paraphrasis in duodecimum librum Aristotelis de prima philosophia, praesul amplissime, quae iamdiu a Graecis desideratur, cum hebraice nescio quo fato reddita in manus meas pervenisset, non eram nescius operae pretium et

rem omnibus eius scientiae studiosis pergratam me facturum esse, si eam in latinum sermonem transtulisset, ne libri perdifficilis interpres locupletissimus diutius in tenebris delitesceret. Eam rem cum iam saepius inchoassem, nondum tamen variis distentis negotiis perficere potueram, cum forte omnem consilii mei rationem exposui Benedicto Manzolo mutinensi, viro in omnium scientiarum genere exercitatissimo et mecum summa familiaritate coniuncto. Is me percepta re non solum hortari sed etiam inflammare et impellere coepit ut susceptum munus absolverem, neque his contentus, ut quasi stimulum et calcar adderet, paucis post diebus tuas ad se literas ostendit mihi, quibus institutum meum summopere laudabas rogabasque ut, cum primum opus perfectum esset, eius tibi videndi potestas fieret. Tunc ego, abiecta omni cunctatione, cunctis reiectis negotiis, totum animum ad vertendam paraphrasim appuli. Eam enim nactus esse mihi visus sum occasionem quae iampridem a me vehementer exoptaretur, ut ita tecum agerem ut me tibi penitus deditum et consecratum esse intelligeres. Ea enim de te iampridem audio ab omnibus, praesertim a Benedicto Manzolo, qui te in primis colit atque observat, ut te unum admirer, te unum suspiciam, qui ea qua es aetate, nobilissimo genere natus, quod his temporibus rarum admodum est, ne dicam inauditum, in omni litterarum genere adeo profeceris ut eruditorum nobilissimus, nobilium eruditissimus habearis . . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: Hac igitur famae tuae celebritate incredibili in te amore inflammatus, Themistii interpretationem a me tandem absolutam tibi dedico et sacro, non solum ut cuius auspiciis opus ad finem perductum est, eius etiam tectum atque munitum auctoritate in lucem prodeat (quantam enim sibi apud lectorem gratiam hoc nomine conciliare possit liber intelligo), sed etiam ut meae huius erga te singularis observantiae monumentum vulgo exstet. Quod quidem si quis attentius perlegerit, eum minime inficiaturum esse confido, hanc eam esse paraphrasim quam Themistio adscribit passimque citat Averroes in iis commentariis quos in duodecimum Aristotelis librum de prima philosophia edidit. Tu autem una cum aliis qui acri ingenio praediti sunt, optime etiam hic perspicies themistianam illam interpretandi rationem miramque in rebus obscuris claritatem. Quamquam enim auctor de via fessus ac longa peregrinatione con-

fectus (-tas *ed.*), vestitu immutato in sordibus et squalore versatur—a Graecis enim ad Arabas et inde ad Hebraeos migravit, apud quos circiter tercentum et tres annos delituit, nunc vero tandem in latinum pervenit—non adeo tamen eius deleta sunt lineamenta ut Themistium agnoscere non possis. Quo quidem, qualiscumque sit, interea perfruuntur studiosi, dum exspectant ut archetypus a te, ut es omnis antiquitatis solertissimus et liberalissimus indagator, e Graeciae ruinis ac tenebris eruatur, nec laborem meum contemnant. Nam quemadmodum nobiles illas et immortales substantias vel leviter attigisse satius est quam pleniori intelligentia cetera assequi, ita Themistium, qui de iis ex Aristotelis praescripto loquitur, non ignorasse melius fore existimo quam quosdam alios interpretes summo studio perlegisse. Tu igitur, optime antistes, Themistium quem tibi dedico, amplectaris et foveas meque in fidem et clientelam tuam accipias ut ad alia tibi offerenda alacrior sim. Vale. Mutinae, Idibus Martiis, MDLVIII.

*In Metaphysicorum librum duodecimum paraphrasis.* [*Inc.*]: (p. 1; p. 1.4–5 Landauer) Quamquam ens pluribus modis dicitur, nos tamen dum eius principia inquirere volumus, substantiae dumtaxat principia investigamus . . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: (p. 26; p. 39.39–41 Landauer) sed nihil eorum quae sunt male gubernatur, nec principium multitudo bona est.

*Editions:*

1558, Venetiis (Venice): Hieronymus Scotus. Adams T-456; NUC. BL; BNF; Oxford, Bodleian Library; (CtY).

1576, Venetiis (Venice): haeredes Hieronymi Scoti. Contents the same as in the preceding entry. Adams T-457. BL; BNF; Cambridge, Peterhouse.

1903, Berolini (Berlin): Typ. et impensis G. Reimeri. S. Landauer, ed., *Themistii In Aristotelis Metaphysicorum librum lambda paraphrasis hebraice et latine*, CAG 5.5. Finzi's Dedicatory letter and a revised version of his translation.

*Biography:*

Nothing is known of the details of the life of Moyses Finzius (Mosè Finzi). He was born around 1530, probably at Modena, since Francesco Patrizi (*Discuss. peripat.* 1.10) refers to him as "Mutinensis". Finzi seems to have been a contemporary of Patrizi (see above) and thus probably had some associations with Padua where Pa-

trizi was educated, and perhaps Ferrara, where Patrizi lived for much of his life.

*Works:*

The translation of Themistius' paraphrase of *Metaphysics* 12 is the only work by Finzi that has been identified at present.

*Bibliography:*

"Finzi," *The Jewish Encyclopedia* 5.389 (I. Elbogen); *Encyclopaedia judaica* 6.1015; Steinschneider, *Hebräische Übersetzungen*, 177, 975.

## V. IN PHYSICA PARAPHRASIS

### TRANSLATION

#### 1. Hermolaus Barbarus Junior

This translation by Hermolaus Barbarus Junior (Ermolao Barbaro the Younger) is dedicated to Antonio de Ferraris (Galateo) (1448–1516), a scholar and translator active at Lecce and Naples after about 1470 (see CTC 7.296–97). In a response to Barbaro's dedication Galateo recalled their contacts at Naples between 1471 and 1473; see the passage quoted in CTC 7.296. This, however, does not mean that Barbaro worked specifically on the paraphrase of the *Physics* at this time. In a letter of 1485 (*Ep.* 69 [1.87 Branca]), he refers only in general terms to beginning work on Themistius while at he was at Naples.

The prologue to this translation in the Greek manuscripts is taken from Simplicius' commentary on the *Physics* (*In Phys.* 1–8.30; CAG 9.1, ed. H. Diels [Berlin, 1882]), as the sixteenth-century commentator, Anonymus Venetus (V.a below), noted. But since Barbaro regarded the prologue as an integral part of Themistius' paraphrase, the *incipit* below has not been adjusted to correspond with the beginning of the authentically Themistian part of the work. For some discussion of the terminology of this translation, see P. Galluzzi, *Momento: studi galileiani*, Lessico intellettuale europeo 19 (Rome, 1979), 125–27.

*Preface* (ed. of Venice, 1499). Hermolai Barbari Patricii Veneti Zachariae filii in paraphrasim Physices Themistii praefatio ad Antonium Galateum. [*Inc.*]: (fol. 17v) Philoxenum Eryxidis et Gnathonem siculum gulae proceres, immo vero extremos ac perditos gulones cuppedivorasque, infamant litterae, quod conviviis adhibiti emungere se in pultariis soliti essent, ut abstinentibus ceteris soli epulis ampliter fruerentur . . . / . . .

[*Expl.*]: Nunc restat ut de me ipso tibi aliqua dicam. Mirari te nolim si infinitos errores, quos isti partim imperitia linguae partim aristotelicae disciplinae inscitia praelegunt (perlegunt *ed. Branca*) et defendunt in scholis, non coarguo. Nec enim hanc provinciam suscepimus scribendi res physicas ut cum illis tamquam in palaestra, ut dicitur, certaremus de laude et gloria, quippe quos vincere nullum negotium sit, sed ut vel nobis ipsis commentaremur haec, si nullos habituri sectores essemus, vel si quibus idem qui nobis stomachus esset, iis ad bonas litteras aliquid operculae adderemus. Nec enim spiritus magis magnos in hoc quam utiles, ut ille inquit [Liv., *Hist.* 30.30.15], afferimus, nec de nobis quicquam magnopere arduum pollicemur, sed quaedam tamen invenisse non negamus, quae aggredientes ad haec tantisper morari non inventa potuerint. Illud tempus est in calce uti dicamus nos tibi interpretationem in paraphrasim Physices pro nostra veteri ac stabili necessitudine volentes dicasse; alioquin dicaturam hanc stipulatus a nobis es, cum essemus istic. Oppigneratam tibi fidem reluimus, quamquam praescriptione uti poteramus et fori et decennii. Sed beneficio harum legum renuntiant philosophi, quibus in fraude ponitur vel furioso abiurare gladium. Vale. Venetiis, MCCCCLXXX.

*In Physica paraphrasis* (ed. of Venice, 1499). [*Inc.*]: (fol. 18r; *Simplic.*, *Prologus in Phys.* 1.3–5) Librorum Aristotelis De auscultatione physica facile est assequi intentionem, si prius eius partis philosophiae divisio, quae de natura est, ad memoriam revocata, in medium proferatur . . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: (fol. 19v; *Simplic.*, *Prologus in Phys.* 8.29–30) Plutarchus Chaeroneus in vita Alexandri de editione librorum metaphysicae haec ultro citroque fuisse scripta meminit. [*Inc.*]: (fol. 19v; *Themist.*, *In Phys.* 1.1–3) Est autem totius operis propositum naturae earumque rerum scientiam rationemque explicare. Nam sine ratione cognoscere facile est cuivis homini . . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: (fol. 67v; *Themist.*, *In Phys.* 236.2–4) sed ocissime moventur ea quae finitima et proxima sunt moventi. Pernicissimus autem motus est is quo mundus convertitur. Illic ergo est id quod movet.

*Manuscripts:*

(\*) Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 2142, s. XV (a. 1482–84), fols. 36v–160r (see I.2 above).

(\*) Naples, Biblioteca Governativa dei Girolamini, membr. 46 (M.C.F. 3-4), s. XV, fols. 2r–294v (Kristeller, *Iter* 1.396b and 2.546a; *Codici miniati della Biblioteca Oratoriana dei Girolamini di Napoli*, ed. A. Putaturo Murano et al. [Naples, 1995], 96–101, no. 30). With the dedication.

*Manuscript containing only the dedication:*

(\*) Udine, Biblioteca Comunale, Manin 1210, s. XVII vel XVIII, fol(s). not given (Kristeller, *Iter* 2.206b).

*Editions:*

- 1481. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1499. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1500. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1502. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1520. See above, Composite Editions.
- (\*) 1527. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1529. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1530 (Venice). See above, Composite Editions.
- 1533. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1535. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1542. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1545. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1549. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1554. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1559. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1560. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1570. See above, Composite Editions.

*Editions containing only the Preface:*

(\*) 1498, Venetiis (Venice): Aldus Romanus. *Angeli Politiani Opera omnia*, fol. 143r. See I.2 above.

(\*) 1518, Basileae (Basel): Gregorius Bartholomeus. *Philippi Beroaldi Varia opuscula*, fol. 51r. See I.2 above.

Branca, *Ep.* 9 (1.10–12).

*Biography:*

See I.2 above.

COMMENTARIES

a. Anonymus Venetus

On this commentator and the general character of this commentary, see I.a above. For the reference to Simplicius' prologue cited in the *incipit* below, see V.1 above.

*Commentary* (ed. of Venice, 1530). [*Inc.*] (fol. 14r) Non est Themistii prooemium hoc, quamvis illi id Hermolaus ascripserit, sed Simplicii (*In Phys.* 1.1–8.30 [CAG 9.1]), sicuti illi facile cognoscere poterunt qui callent litteras graecas

... / ... [Expl.]: (fol. 54r; ad Themist., *In Phys.* 236.1–2) Deinde si ita in ea sit ut in totam sit digestus, et tota per partes movetur; cur et ipse per accidens motu partium non movetur? Themistii in libros Physicorum paraphraseos finis.

*Editions:*

- (\* ) 1527. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1530 (Venice). See above, Composite Editions.
- 1542. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1549. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1554. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1559. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1560. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1570. See above, Composite Editions.

b. Marcus Antonius Zimarra

On this set of problems and solutions (*Contradictiones et solutiones*), see II.b above. Four items deal with the paraphrase of the *Physics*.

*Contradictiones ac solutiones Marci Antonii Zimarrae in dictis lucidissimi Themistii* (ed. of Venice, 1542). [Inc.]: (fol. +1r [unnumbered]) In libro Physicorum. Contradictio in quarto Physicorum super textum 130 [223a16–24]. Lucidissimus Themistius (*In Phys.* 160.26–161.28) reprehendit Boethum [sc. Sidonium Peripateticum] opinantem numerum remanere posse absque eo quod numerat ... / ... [Expl.]: (fol. +2v [unnumbered]); ad *Phys.* 192b8–23) Et isto modo non sequitur quod elementa habeant principium intrinsecum activum per se motus alterationis; unde aequivocatio deceptit expositores, sicut videt.

*Editions:*

- 1542. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1549. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1554. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1559. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1560. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1570. See above, Composite Editions.

*Biography:*

See II.b above.

## VI. ORATIONES

### TRANSLATIONS

#### 1. Antonius Covarrubias

In a letter of 1553 sent by Gaspar Cardillo de Villalpando to Juan Ginés de Sepúlveda (1490–

1573; CTC 1.95) (*Joannis Genesii Sepulvedae Opera*, vol. 3 [Madrid, 1780], 270–78, book 5, Ep. 18), reference is made to a Latin translation of Themistius, Or. 26 by Antonius Covarrubias (Antonio de Covarrubias). De Andrés 241–42 (cited below) discusses this report and convincingly argues that the Greek manuscript used by Covarrubias is the present Salamanca, Biblioteca de la Universidad, M.232, sct. F, fols. 37r–48v. A manuscript containing the complete Latin translation has not yet been located.

At p. 276 of the letter Villalpando says, with reference to Or. 26: “. . . quoniam ea oratio latina non facta est, utar ea versione quam veluti ludens fecit vir omni genere litterarum ornatissimus et summa mihi familiaritate coniunctus, Antonius Covarrubias. Ea sic habet . . .” (there follows the quotation given immediately below).

Or. 26, fragment (*Joannis Genesii Sepulvedae Opera* 3.276–77). [Inc.]: (p. 276; Or. 26 [p. 131.9]) Proprium est hoc Aristotelis, quod non eosdem sermones vulgo putavit esse utiles et philosophis ... / ... [Expl.]: (p. 277; Or. 26 [p. 132.13–14]) Quo factum est ut cum ante pedes hi sermones versentur, pluribus sint moenium ambitibus spes quam Ecbatanis Persarum regum regia. Hactenus Themistius.

*Biography:*

Antonius Covarrubias (Antonio de Covarrubias) was born at Toledo in 1524 and died there in 1602. He studied and later taught law at the University of Salamanca. In 1561 he moved to Granada to serve as chancellor of that city. Covarrubias attended the Council of Trent between 1562 and 1564 with his more celebrated brother, Diego de Covarrubias. In 1569 he added to his duties the chancellorship of Valladolid and later served at the royal court. An avid collector of Greek manuscripts, he was particularly associated with the prolific scribe Andreas Darmarius (de Andrés' study is an exhaustive account of Covarrubias' activities in this area).

*Works:*

Although Covarrubias does not seem to have published anything, his philological abilities were admired by Andreas Schott (1552–1629) and Justus Lipsius (1547–1606). He also composed Latin poetry (Kristeller, *Iter* 4.556a). According to the two biographical articles listed below at the beginning of the *Bibliography*, his manuscript re-

mains include a commentary on Aristotle's *Politics*, but it has not been possible to locate this work.

*Bibliography:*

*Biographie générale* 6.297; *Biographie universelle* 9.407; C. Graux, *Essai sur les origines du fonds grec de l'Escorial . . .*, Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Etudes, Sciences historiques et philologiques 41 (Paris, 1880), 322; H. Schenkl, "Beiträge zur Textgeschichte der Reden des Themistios," *Sitzungsberichte der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien*, philosoph.-hist. Klasse, 191.1 (1919) 4; G. de Andrés, "El Helenismo del canónigo toledano Antonio de Covarrubias. Un capítulo del Humanismo en Toledo en el s. XVI," *Hispania sacra* 40 (1988) 237–313.

## 2. Hieronymus Donzellinus

Hieronymus Donzellinus (Giroloamo Donzellini) translated the eight orations published in the Aldine edition of 1534 during what he himself describes as a three-year period. This may have occurred between 1545 and 1553, when he was practicing medicine at Venice. Donzellini did initiate some work on Themistius at that time, since he reports searching for manuscripts in Venetian libraries and refers to a codex owned by Diego Hurtado de Mendoza (1503–75), the Spanish ambassador to Venice from 1538 to 1547. Donzellini was in exile between 1553 and 1559, and, although nothing is known for certain of his movements, he is thought to have visited Germany. He must have completed his translations at this time (Perini [1967] 373–74, cited below), since his preface was obviously written after he had left Venice. He may not have personally supervised the printing at Basel in 1559 by Petrus Perna (with whom he had had contacts while still at Venice; see Perini [1966] 147–51, 158–59 and Portmann), since he complains that the printer misrepresented him as the translator rather than as the author of the summaries affixed to the orations.

Despite Donzellini's claims in the Preface, the translation, according to Maisano (see below), is not based on any new manuscript sources, although the imperfect text of the Aldine edition is emended. Donzellini's manuscripts are, therefore, at least indirectly those from which the Aldine was derived: Venice, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, Zan. gr. 513 (770) for *Or.* 18, 19, 22–25 and a manuscript seemingly no longer extant for *Or.*

20–21. On the former codex, see M. Sicherl, *Die griechischen Erstaussagen des Vettore Trincavelli*, Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Altertums, 1. Reihe, Monographien, N. F., 5 (Paderborn, 1993), 26–27; on the missing manuscript, Sicherl, "Handschriftenforschung und Philologie," in *Paleografia e codicologia greca (Atti del II Colloquio internazionale Berlin-Wolfenbüttel, 17–21 ottobre 1983)*, ed. D. Harlfinger et al. (Alessandria, 1991), 485–508 at 497–99.

The dedicatee, Ulrich Fugger (1526–84) (ADB 8.182–83), was in Italy in the service of Pope Paul III during the 1540s. Given Fugger's later conversion to Protestantism, he would be a plausible associate of Donzellini who also flirted with Lutheran ideas and was eventually executed for such heresy. Fugger probably financed the publication of Donzellini's translations, as he did the edition of a new Greek text of Themistian orations by Henri Estienne in 1562.

*Preface* (ed. of Basel, 1559). Ad nobilissimum ac praestantissimum virum Huldricum Fuggerum Kirchbergae et Vuessehorni comitem Hieronymi Donzellini philosophi ac medici in Themistii orationes latinas a se factas praefatio. [*Inc.*]: (fol. \*2r) Sapientiam, ornatissime vir ac prudentissime, praeclaro Dei optimi maximi munere mortalium generi concessam non tantum divina oracula testantur. . . . (fol. \*2v) Cum itaque prudentes ac sapientes viros imitari semper fuerit laudatissimum, horum ego secutus exemplum ac vestigia, ante triennium Themistii philosophi peripatetici orationes et eruditione et sapientia plenas in latinum sermonem verti. Cum enim bonae frugis refertas esse illas viderem nec adhuc tamen a quoquam latinas fuisse factas, non putavi illos quibus graeca lingua est incognita earum lectione defraudandos. Deterruit me quidem ab ea provincia non semel depravati exemplaris corruptela, ac nisi amicorum hortatu fuissem impulsus, ab incepto opere destituissem. Ne tamen ulla in me diligentia desideraretur, veteres ac reconditas bibliothecas omnes Venetiis excussi, atque (fol. \*3r) ex manuscriptis codicibus loca aliquot emendavi. Nonnulla tamen fuerunt quae in illis aequae ac in impressis ita sunt corrupta ut ad legitimum sensum eruendum delio opus fuerit natatore. Nihilominus ex praecedentibus et consequentibus commodum sensum (ni fallor) collegi. Unus tantum locus est in quo, cum verba aliquot desint neque ea in (in ea *ed.*) manuscriptis illis in-

venerim, imperfectum relinquere sum coactus. Atqui videbitur fortassis alicubi mea versio a Themistii verbis discrepare ac variare, nec tamen ii qui ea animadvertent, quidquam temere aut in-scite fuisse a me factum iudicabunt, potius vero ex antiquis codicibus ac exemplaribus, quae ego summo meo cum labore consului, ea me loca emendasse ut integra auctoris sententia redderetur. Ut autem paratior atque instructor ad harum orationum lectionem lector accederet, argumentis eas illustravi, quae tamquam periochae singulis praefixa, earum intelligentiam non medicriter patefacient (-unt *ed.*) ac adiuvabunt. De quibus cum dubitaret typographus, essentne a me versa an vero facta, minus veram partem accipiens, errore quodam in titulo, eorum me non opificem sed versorem fecit. . . . (fol. +7r) Sex alias orationes scripsisse fertur Themistius, quae in Dieghi Hurtadi Hispani bibliotheca lateant, nondum editae. Eas ego cum essem Venetiis summis precibus expetivi ac omnem lapidem movi ut illas impetrarem: cupiebam enim cum his coniunctas in publicum prodire. Verum tanta religione fuerunt adservatae ut ne semel quidem videre illas potuerim. Non desistam tamen donec aliqua ratione illas obtineam, ac tum graecas omnes ac latinas aut simul aut seorsum in lucem mittam. Utcumque autem hactenus egregia atque erudita ingenia in hoc genere elaborarint, nullum tamen fuisse reperio qui non alicubi sit hallucinatus. Quare etsi ego multos doctrina praestantes viros meae huius versionis iudices fecerim ac eorum monitu loca nonnulla immutarim, a communi tamen sorte me immunem esse non profiteor. Erunt procul dubio loca aliqua a me non intellecta aut parum feliciter versa, de quibus si quis me amice monuerit, gratias agam ac illa emendabo. . . . (fol. +8r) Si Cicero latinae eloquentiae princeps et parens in vertendo Platonis Timaeo, eius maiestatem aequare non potuit, quis iam futurus est tam audax ut hoc ausit sibi polliceri? Latino igitur sermone contenti sint lectores, qui sententiam legitimam candide, pure ac bona fide reddat, etiam si eos lepores, lumina ac ornamenta orationis in mea versione non reperient, quibus graece loquens Themistius est usus. Alioqui cum orationes hae politicae non sint sed philosophicae, de sententiis magis quam de verborum elegantia sollicitos esse debere lectores arbitror. . . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: (fol. :3r) tanta nunc est obtrectatorum copia atque proventus, magni atque illustris viri nomine, ceu clipeo, ab impor-

tuna eorum libidine atque intemperantia me non temere muniendum duxi. Vale.

*Or. 18* (ed. of Basel, 1559). [*Inc.*]: (p. 3; p. 18.1–2) Viri, quicumque hodierno die audiendi mei gratia in hoc Musarum theatrum convenistis . . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: (p. 244; *Or. 25*, p. 115.21–22) sed cuiusmodi a principio erant, cum sepositae sunt, tales ad perpetuum tempus duraturas.

*Editions:*

1559, Basileae (Basel): Petrus Perna. VD T-706; NUC. BL; BNF; Oxford, Bodleian Library; Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine; (ICN; CtY).

1633, Helmstadi (Helmstedt): e typographo Luciorum. With a preface by Heinrich Scheurl and Hieronymus Donzellinus' translation of *Or. 22* ("De amicitia"). Graesse 6.2:112. Göttingen, Niedersächsische Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek. The copy identified in VD T-710 (Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek) seems to be identical, but the title page (and consequently the date) is missing.

*Doubtful edition:*

Schutte (DBI 41.242) refers to an edition of Vienna, 1550; no copy has been located.

*Biography:*

Hieronymus Donzellinus (Girolamo Donzellini) was born at Orzinuovi near Brescia in 1513. He obtained a medical degree from the University of Padua in 1541 and taught there for two years before moving to Rome. He left Rome for Venice in 1545 after his interest in Lutheran ideas led to accusations of heresy. Similar charges led to Donzellini's departure from Venice in 1553. His movements in the next seven years are unclear, but he may well have traveled to Switzerland and Germany, where he would have made contact with Protestant thinkers. He may also have overseen the publication of his translations of Themistian orations at Basel in 1559 (see above). Tried on his return to Venice, Donzellini was briefly imprisoned. He then moved to Verona, where he married, but again he ran foul of the Inquisition in 1574, was returned to Venice for a review of his earlier trial, and sentenced to life imprisonment in 1575. Released in 1577, he practiced medicine until a trial for heresy in 1587 led to his execution.

*Works:*

Donzellini was an outstanding physician, particularly skilled in the treatment of plagues, and an erudite scholar. In addition to several medical

treatises of his own, he also published editions of other medical works, notably those of Giambattista da Monte (1498–1551), his former colleague at Padua; see Schutte (cited below) for a full inventory.

*Bibliography:*

*Biographie universelle* 11.223–24; *Nouvelle biographie générale* 14.584; “Donzellini (Donzellino, Donzellini), Girolamo,” *DBI* 41.238–43 (A. Jacobson Schutte), with a list of works, and extensive bibliography.

H. Schenkl, “Beiträge zur Textgeschichte der Reden des Themistios,” *Sitzungsberichte der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien*, philosoph.-hist. Klasse, 191.1 (1919) 4–6; P. Costil, *André Duidith: humaniste hongrois 1533–1589. Sa vie, son oeuvre, et ses manuscrits grecs* (Paris, 1935), passim (see index); L. Perini, “Note e documenti su Pietro Perna librario-tipografo a Basilea,” *Nuova rivista storica* 50 (1966) 145–99; Perini, “Ancora sul librario-tipografo Pietro Perna e su alcune figure di eretici italiani in rapporto con lui,” *ibid.* 51 (1967) 363–404; M.-L. Portmann, “Der venezianer Arzt Girolamo Donzellini (etwa 1527–1587) und seine Beziehungen zu Basler Gelehrten,” *Gesnerus* 30 (1973) 1–6; R. Maisano, “La critica filologica di Petau e Hardouin e l’edizione parigina del 1684 delle Orazioni di Temistio,” *Archivum historicum Societatis Iesu* 43 (1974) 267–300 at 278–79.

3. Anonymus Vaticanus

This translation of Themistius’ *Or.* 7 was undertaken after its first printed edition by Henri Estienne in 1562. It can probably be dated to the period 1562–1605 or 1613 when further editions of this oration were published by Georg Rehm and Denys Petau. The author calls it the ninth oration because in Estienne’s edition it was the first to follow the eight orations (the present *Or.* 18–25) published in the Aldine edition of 1534. The translation, preserved only in a late sixteenth-century codex, Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 6243, is an extensively corrected working copy with a facing transcription of the Greek text. The four Vatican manuscripts with which the author claims that the text has been collated are probably Vat. gr. 80, 82, 435, and 936.

*Prefatory note* (Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 6243). (fol. 174r) Orationes Themistii sunt valde difficiles. Adeo enim mendosae sunt ut ipse etiam Henricus Stephanus

multis in locis haesitaverit quomodo corrigendae essent, et ipse auctor tamquam philosophus acutissimus immiscuit sententias et elegantes locutiones ex gravi quopiam auctore collegit. Eas tamen ut quam emendatissime (-mae *post corr.*) ederentur cum quatuor vaticanis codicibus contulimus.

*Or.* 7 (Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 6243). Eiusdem Themistii et praefecti pro iis qui infeliciter (calamitosis *sup. lin.*) se gesserunt coram Valente (tempore Valentis s.s.) oratio nona. [*Inc.*]: (fol. 175r; p. 128.1–2) Existimo te admirari, o rex, cur ego tandem aliquando post victoriam et res proxime gestas gratulans et gratias agens . . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: (fol. 191r; p. 151.8–10) ut necessitas sit per manus tradi (propagari s.s.) famam eorum qui bene ipsa usi fuerint in omne fere saeculum. Finis nonae orationis.

*Concluding note* (Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 6243). (fol. 191r) Hic in fine maxima est difficultas ob menda, et quod breviter historias tangit atque latenter.

*Manuscript:*

(micro.) Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 6243, s. XVI ex., fols. 174r–191r (Kristeller, *Iter* 2.339a).

## SPURIOUS WORKS

### VII. IN LIBRUM DE INSOMNIIS PARAPHRASIS

#### TRANSLATION

##### 1. Hermolaus Barbarus Junior

The dedicatee of this translation, Galeatus Ponticus Facinus (Galeazzo Pontico Faccino), supervised the first edition of the Themistian paraphrases (see above, Composite Editions, 1481, Treviso). In his dedication Hermolaus Barbarus Junior (Ermolao Barbaro the Younger) invites Faccino to undertake this work during 1480. On Faccino see CTC 3.397; Branca, *Ep.* 2.145–46; and J. F. C. Richards, “The Poems of Galeazzo Pontico Faccino,” *Studies in the Renaissance* 6 (1959) 94–128 (three poems addressed to Ermolao Barbaro).

*Preface* (ed. of Venice, 1499). Hermolai Barbari Patricii Veneti Zachariae filii in paraphrasim Themistii De insomniis ad Galeatum Ponticum Facinum praefatio. [*Inc.*]: (fol. 110v) Dicavi primum tibi, ut nosti, interpretatiunculam De in-



somniis quod pro mea in te benevolentia et pro ea spe, quam de ingenio et doctrina tua conceperam, volens feci. Nunc ceu fato quodam nostra adorea sine te non possit stare: Themistius noster te rogat ut se transcribas. Periclitatur enim nisi suppetias venis, ne (quae desidia et nequitia librarii est) antevortat se impressorum diligentia . . . / . . . [*Expl.*] Et, hercules, miratus sum unde mihi tantum otii ad sales, praesertim tam occupato quam antehac numquam; et nisi quod ad te scribebam, quicum licuit insanire, manias et intemperias incidisse me vererer. Vale. Venetiis, MCCCCLXXX.

*In De insomniis paraphrasis* (ed. of Venice, 1499). Capitulum primum. Insomnia sensu non percipi. [*Inc.*]: (fol. 111r; ps. Themist., *In De insomn.* 29.2–4) Post haec de insomniis est agendum, primumque illud quaerendum cui animae potestati compareant, et utrum affectio mentis an sensus sit. . . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: (fol. 113v; ps. Themist., *In De insomn.* 39.31–32) Nam immutatione vel aetatis vel affectionis aliquovis secuta necessarium est naturam quoque ipsam et temperamentum mutari.

*Manuscript:*

(\*) Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 2142, s. XV (a. 1482–84), fols. 270v–277v (see I.2 above).

*Editions:*

- 1481. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1499. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1500. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1502. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1520. See above, Composite Editions.
- (\*) 1527. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1529. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1530 (Basel). See above, Composite Editions.
- 1530 (Venice). See above, Composite Editions.
- 1533. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1535. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1542. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1545. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1549. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1554. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1559. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1560. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1570. See above, Composite Editions.

*Edition containing only the Preface:*

Branca, *Ep.* 13 (1.18).

*Biography:*

See I.2 above.

COMMENTARY

a. Marcus Antonius Zimarra

On these *Contradictiones et solutiones*, see II.b above. Only one item is related to the paraphrase of the *De insomniis*.

*Contradictiones ac solutiones Marci Antonii Zimarrae in dictis lucidissimi Themistii* (ed. of Venice, 1542). *In libro De insomniis*. [*Inc.*]: (fol. +2r [unnumbered]) Aristoteles in libro De insomniis qui immediate est post librum De somno et vigilia et ante librum De divinatione ostendit visum esse digniorem tactu (461b2–3; cf. ps. Themist. 36.19–25) . . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: (fol. +3v [unnumbered]) in alio vero casu convenit e contra ut in casu philosophi. Absolute tamen visus est certior.

*Editions:*

- 1542. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1549. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1554. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1559. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1560. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1570. See above, Composite Editions.

*Biography:*

See II.b above.

## VIII. IN LIBRUM DE DIVINATIONE PER SOMNUM PARAPHRASIS

TRANSLATION

1. Hermolaus Barbarus Junior

The dedicatory letter to this translation is dated 1478; the dedicatory letters to the other Themistian/ps.-Themistian translations by Hermolaus Barbarus Junior (Ermolao Barbaro the Younger) are all dated 1480. The earlier date of 1478 may indicate that the translation of the *De divinatione per somnum* was the first to be ready for the printer. In the preface Barbaro notes that two years earlier (i.e., in 1476) he had borrowed a manuscript of Aristotle from the dedicatee, Marcus Barbus (Marco Barbo, 1420–90), and he asks to keep the codex for another month until his work on the paraphrases was complete. The Aristotelian manuscript in question has not yet been identified; presumably it contained all or most of the treatises paraphrased by Themistius and ps. Themistius.

Marco Barbo belonged to an aristocratic fami-

ly in the Veneto. He had an important ecclesiastical career, had extensive connections with contemporary humanists, and made translations from the Greek (see M. L. King, *Venetian Humanism in an Age of Patrician Dominance* [Princeton, 1986], 327–28).

*Preface* (ed. of Venice, 1499). Hermolai Barbari Zachariae filii Patricii Veneti in paraphrasim Themistii De divinatione secundum quietem praefatio ad Marcum Barbum. [*Inc.*]: (fol. 116r) Libellum De divinatione secundum quietem interpretati sumus ad te. Id munusculum, cum quod e licio (*Branca*; *Sicio ed.*) est tum quod a me venit, gratum tibi fore non dubito. Iudicium tuum quod sit, simul haec legeris, aveo de te per litteras scire. Ceterum hospes biennium meus Aristoteles tuus, sive quod comiter a me et liberaliter tractatus est sive quod veretur ne tam longa peregrinatione offensionem animi tui subierit, discedere sed ne avelli quidem a nobis potest . . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: Sed iocari collibuit illud serio: Aristotelem tuum apud me esse adhuc mensem oportet, quoad dum Themistius noster totus exeat. Nec vero mi (ni *ed.*) fraudi sit quod re tua invito te abutor. Primum ne (*Branca*; *me ed.*) invito te id faciam, humanitas tua metu illo me liberat; deinde ut invito te faciam quod facere me oportet, eius rei culpam necessitas, non ipse habuerim. Vale. Venetiis, MCCCCLXXVIII.

*In De divinatione per somnum paraphrasis* (ed. of Venice, 1499). Capitulum primum. An existimandum sit aliquam divinationem haberi per somnum. [*Inc.*]: (fol. 116v; ps. Themist., *In De div. per somn.* 40.2–3) Divinationem in somno aliquam esse quae dormientibus nobis pervenire dicatur a somniis neque pertinaciter resistendum neque temere assentiendum puto. . . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: (fol. 114v [*sic*]; ps. Themist., *In De div. per somn.* 44.23–25) quid sit somnus et quid insomnium, quamobrem utrumque animantibus iunctum. Item qualisnam divinatio ea sit quae profisciscatur ex somniis, dictum iam est. Nunc de communi animalium motu agendum videtur.

*Manuscript:*

(\*) Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 2142, s. XV (a. 1482–84), fols. 277v–280v (see I.2 above).

*Editions:*

1481. See above, Composite Editions.  
1499. See above, Composite Editions.  
1500. See above, Composite Editions.

1502. See above, Composite Editions.  
1520. See above, Composite Editions.  
(\* ) 1527. See above, Composite Editions.  
1529. See above, Composite Editions.  
1530 (Basel). See above, Composite Editions.  
1530 (Venice). See above, Composite Editions.  
1533. See above, Composite Editions.  
1535. See above, Composite Editions.  
1542. See above, Composite Editions.  
1545. See above, Composite Editions.  
1549. See above, Composite Editions.  
1554. See above, Composite Editions.  
1559. See above, Composite Editions.  
1560. See above, Composite Editions.  
1570. See above, Composite Editions.

*Edition containing only the Dedication:*  
*Branca, Ep. 7* (1.6–7).

*Biography:*

See I.2 above.

## IX. IN LIBRUM DE MEMORIA ET REMINISCENTIA PARAPHRASIS

### TRANSLATION

#### 1. Hermolaus Barbarus Junior

Hermolaus Barbarus Junior (Ermolao Barbaro the Younger) states in the Dedication that he began to work on this translation “in his nineteenth year” (i.e., in 1472), and thus while he was at Naples (see I.2 above). The dedicatee is Franciscus Thronus (Francesco Tron), a Venetian aristocrat, of whom almost nothing is known (see *Ep.* 11 [1.14–16 and 2.160 *Branca*]).

*Preface* (ed. of Venice, 1499). Hermolai Barbari Zachariae filii Patricii Veneti paraphrasis Themistii De memoria et reminiscencia praefatio ad Franciscum Thronum L. filium. [*Inc.*]: (fol. 102v) An tibi agere meminisseve aliquas gratias debeam, Francisce suavissime, qui me ad editionem impuleris Themistii mei, non facile habeo dicere. Scio enim quam sit ardua ratio, primum interpretari graeca, deinde physica, tum hoc aevi, quo omnes scientias invasit barbaries. . . . Fuit enim apud me opus hoc annis amplius septem pressum, quippe quod anno aetatis uno de viginti coeptum a me sit, ne multum abesse a praescripto noni videar. Nec tamen propterea magnum aliquid expectari de nobis velim. Nam tametsi aliqua in editionibus nostris sint, in quibus si non frugem saltem rudimentum ingenii et igniculos

quosdam agnoscas, non tamen mihi id sum[m]o aut arrego ut a doctis viris probatum iri haec credam. . . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: (fol. 102v) An mihi defuturus umquam tu es, cuius vel unius iudicio niti possim? Aut si tu minus aequum te praeberis, quae mea errata tam frequentia aut insignia eripient mihi Antonium Clarium (Calvum *Branca*) meum? Cui, praeter id quod clarus-ius *ed.*) vir et probus intelligitur, etiam lectione varia et multa exercito, fides de me non haberi non poterit. Nam de Hieronymo Donato [*sc.* Girolamo Donato] (meo dicam an nostro?) quid mihi non respondeam, cuius eminentissimum et divinum ingenium doctrina exquisitissima et singularis humanitas comitatur? Is mihi vel evidenter noxae comperto et assistere et subsignare se etiam quocumque periculo nominis paratus atque adeo animatus est. Quamquam vero haec ita sunt, nondum tamen liquet habere tibi gratias debeam, qui me in locum tam lubricum coniecideris. Sed ne cui ingratus utcumque possim videri cui constet quod mihi non constat, nuncupavi tibi librum De memoria et reminiscencia, id est, particulam consilii tui. Quod si improbabitur, non tam mihi qui acceperim quam tibi qui dederis poenitendum depudendumque sit. Volo enim qui haec damnarit, auctorem flagitii intelligat. Ita fiet ut et se mihi in tua culpa faciliores exhibeant et minus fraudis in me decumbat, quae partiario allevata sit. Vale. Venetiis, MCCCCLXXX.

*In De memoria et reminiscencia paraphrasis* (ed. of Venice, 1499). Capitulum primum. Non eosdem facile meminisci qui facile reminiscantur. [*Inc.*]: (fol. 103r; ps. Themist., *In De mem.* 1.4–6) Nunc de memoria quid sit meminisse et quas ob causas habeatur et ad quam partem animae pertinere possit accurate agendum explicandumque est. . . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: (fol. 106v; ps. Themist., *In De mem.* 16.9–12) Item de reminiscencia et quid sit reminisci et memoria quemadmodum redintegretur reparaturque amissa et unde profisciscatur dictum.

*Manuscript:*

(\*) Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 2142, s. XV (a. 1482–84), fols. 251r–263r (see I.2 above).

*Editions:*

1481. See above, Composite Editions.  
1499. See above, Composite Editions.  
1500. See above, Composite Editions.  
1502. See above, Composite Editions.

1520. See above, Composite Editions.  
(\* ) 1527. See above, Composite Editions.  
1529. See above, Composite Editions.  
1530 (Basel). See above, Composite Editions.  
1530 (Venice). See above, Composite Editions.  
1533. See above, Composite Editions.  
1535. See above, Composite Editions.  
1542. See above, Composite Editions.  
1545. See above, Composite Editions.  
1549. See above, Composite Editions.  
1554. See above, Composite Editions.  
1559. See above, Composite Editions.  
1560. See above, Composite Editions.  
1570. See above, Composite Editions.

*Edition containing only the Dedication:*  
*Branca, Ep.* 11 (1.14–16).

*Biography:*

See I.2 above.

## X. IN LIBRUM DE SOMNO ET VIGILIA PARAPHRASIS

### TRANSLATION

#### 1. Hermolaus Barbarus Junior

The dedication to this translation shows that the dedicatee, Hieronymus Donatus (Girolamo Donato, 1456–1511), had previously read an unrevised version. Donato was an almost exact contemporary of Hermolaus Barbarus Junior (Ermolao Barbaro the Younger) and, like him, had studied Greek at Rome with Theodore Gaza (1400–76; CTC 2.130) and law at Padua before entering the service of the Venetian state. Donato also translated a work of an Aristotelian commentator, Alexander of Aphrodisias' *De anima*, which was conjoined with Barbaro's Themistian translations in some later editions (see CTC 2.85). On Donato, see further "Girolamo Donato," *Contemporaries of Erasmus* 1.396–97 (T. B. Deutscher); "Donà (Donati, Donato), Girolamo," DBI 40.741–53 (P. Rigo); M. L. King, *Venetian Humanism in an Age of Patrician Dominance* (Princeton, 1986), 366–68.

*Dedication* (ed. of Venice, 1499). Hermolai Barbari Zachariae filii Patricii Veneti in librum De somno et vigilia Themistii ad Hieronymum Donatum Antonii filium. [*Inc.*]: (fol. 107r) Optavi tecum esse, mi Hieronyme, his diebus quibus interpretationi nostrae in paraph<r>asim Themistii summam manum imposui, ut coram com-

municare tibi omnia ea possem et quod tuum in iis iudicium esset praesens intelligerem. Ac legisti tu quidem olim haec et, quod meminerim, probasti; sed sive in peius effinxi et, ut ille inquit [Plin., *Ep.* 5.15.1], ab archetypo decidi, sive dispendium limae nonnihil profecit, certe in totum alia sunt quam quae vidisti. Quod si affuisses tu, periculum non erat ut ab iis quae commutasset detraxissemve laberer; alioquin in haec impensius studium contuli quam volebam. . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: Nos quidem tempus omne quod viximus et quod deinceps, deum voluntate, victuri sumus, in illam curam destinavimus, ut pro virili parte naturalis philosophia cum studiis humanitatis in gratiam redeat. Vale. Libellum De somno et vigilia, quem ad te vertimus, scio tibi pro tua in me benivolentia non ingratisimum fore. Venetis, MCCCCLXXX.

*In De somno et vigilia paraphrasis* (ed. of Venice, 1499). Capitulum primum. Quaestiones ad somnum et vigiliam pertinentes. [*Inc.*]: (fol. 107v; ps. Themist., *In De somn.* 17.2–3) De somno et vigilia consideranda haec arbitror: primum quid sint et cui parti et potestati animae credita. . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: (fol. 110r; ps. Themist., *In De somn.* 28.22–23) Dictum est et illud, somnum animalibus exhibitum ad salutem, quae potissimum de quiete contingeret.

*Manuscript:*

(\*) Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 2142, s. XV (a. 1482–84), fols. 263r–270v (see I.2 above).

*Editions:*

- 1481. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1499. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1500. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1502. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1520. See above, Composite Editions.
- (\*) 1527. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1529. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1530 (Basel). See above, Composite Editions.
- 1530 (Venice). See above, Composite Editions.
- 1533. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1535. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1542. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1545. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1549. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1554. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1559. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1560. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1570. See above, Composite Editions.

*Editions containing only the Dedication:*

Branca, *Ep.* 12 (1.16–17).

E. Garin, ed., *Prosatori latini del Quattrocento*, vol. 7 (Turin, 1977), 838–41. With an Italian translation.

*Biography:*

See I.2 above.

## XI. ORATIO AD VALENTEM IMPERATOREM (OR. 12)

### IMITATION

#### 1. Andreas Dudithius

Andreas Dudithius (Andreas Dudith) died at Breslau (mod. Wrocław) in 1586. At some point in his varied career he arguably composed the present oration, a pastiche based on evidence that Themistius delivered an oration on religious tolerance to the emperor Valens (364–378) as well as material from the authentic *Or.* 5. The date of composition is uncertain. Costil 348–49 (cited below) argues for the years 1568–72 when Dudith was at Cracow and occupied with issues of religious tolerance. But this oration could also have been composed during Dudith's later years at Breslau, when he was an apostate Catholic living in a city noted for its religious tolerance. Dudith's interest in Themistius may reflect his earlier contacts in the 1550s at Venice with Girolamo Donzellini (1513–87) at a time when the latter was translating some of the Themistian orations (see VI.2 above).

On the authenticity of this speech see Förster (cited below), who was the first to argue in detail that it was spurious, although this had been suspected earlier, e.g., by Costil.

The speech was published posthumously in an edition of the orations by Georg Rehm (1561–1625), then a judge at Nuremberg. Rehm does not indicate how he acquired the manuscript, but it may have been sent to nearby Altdorf, where Dudith's close friend, the astronomer and mathematician Johannes Praetorius (1573–1616), taught. There is no evidence that Dudith tried to represent the work as an authentic composition of Themistius, and a misunderstanding about its authorship may have arisen after Dudith's death.

*Or.* 7 (ed. of Hamburg, 1605). [*Inc.*]: (p. 225; p. 137.1–3 Downey-Norman) Nemo est, sapientissime Imperator, qui iudicium tuum in eo non ve-

hementer probet quod ut quisque optimus vir est . . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: (p. 230; p. 144.21–22 Downey-Norman) quacumque religione utantur, incolumitatem a deo et diurnitatem imperio tuo precentur.

*Manuscript:*

(micro.) Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, D 462 inf., s. XVIII, fols. 189r–191v (Kristeller, *Iter* 1.323a). This was probably copied from a printed edition.

*Editions:*

1605, Amburgiae (Hamburg): Johannes Schonfeldius. Ed. G. Remus, pp. 225–30. BL; BNF.

1613, Flexiae (La Flèche): Jacobus Rezé. Ed. D. Petavius, pp. 403–17; with a Greek version by this editor. NUC. BL; BNF; (CtY).

(\* ) 1614, Francofurtæ (Frankfurt): Johannes Bringerus. Ed. G. Remus. Regensburg, Staatliche Bibliothek.

1615, Gerae (Gera): Johannes Spiessius. In M. Wendland, *Discursus de pace et cura religionis*, pp. 333–48. BNF.

1617, Flexiae (La Flèche): Jacobus Rezé. Contents the same as in the edition of 1613. NUC. BNF; (MH).

1618, Parisiis (Paris): Sebastianus Cramoisy. Ed. D. Petau, pp. 498–511; with a Greek version by this editor. NUC. BL; BNF; (CU; ICU; MoSU).

1618, Parisiis (Paris): Claudius Morellus. Contents the same as in the preceding entry. NUC. (CLU; MH; NjP; ViLxW; MA).

1618, Parisiis (Paris): Michael Somnius. Contents the same as in the edition of 1618 (Sebastianus Cramoisy). NUC. BL; BNF; (MoSU; CU; ICU).

1684, Parisiis (Paris): Sebastianus Marbre-Cramoisy. Ed. J. Hardouin, pp. 154–61; with Petavius' Greek version. The oration is numbered '12' for the first time. NUC. BL; BNF; (DLC; MH).

1832, Lipsiae (Leipzig): Karl Knobloch. Ed. W. Dindorf, pp. 183–97; with Petavius' Greek version.

1974, Lipsiae (Leipzig): Teubner. *Themistii Orationes*, ed. G. Downey and A. Norman, vol. 3, pp. 137–44. Latin version only.

*Biography:*

Andreas Dudithius (Andreas Dudith-Sbardellati, András Dudith, Andrzedja Dudycza) was born at or near Buda in 1533, a Hungarian Catholic of Croatian origin on his father's side and Venetian origin on his mother's side. Faced

with the Turkish invasion, during which his father was killed, the family moved to Breslau (mod. Wrocław), where Dudith was educated by religious teachers. He spent the years 1550–53 in northern Italy (Verona, Padua, Venice), and from 1553 to 1557 he was secretary to Cardinal Reginald Pole (1500–58), with whom he travelled to Paris, where he continued his education by learning Hebrew, and later to London during the reign of Queen Mary Tudor (1553–58). After returning briefly to Hungary in 1557, Dudith was at Padua in 1558–60 and in northern Europe in 1560–61. He was a controversial speaker at the Council of Trent in 1562–63.

Between 1561 and 1567 Dudith held successively the bishoprics of Tina (Knien), Csanad, and Pécs (Fünfkirchen), but his marriage to a Polish noblewoman in 1567 led to his excommunication and departure to Cracow. There he played some role in Polish politics as a representative of the Hapsburg emperor until the election of a Polish king in 1576. Dudith also made contacts with Georg Joachim Rheticus (1514–74) and Johannes Praetorius (1537–1616), and he developed an interest in mathematics and astronomy that would be prominent in his later years. After spending 1577–79 at Paskov in Moravia, Dudith returned to Breslau and devoted himself to scholarship. Although he had become a Lutheran, he flirted for a time with Calvinism and Socinianism. He died in February 1589, in the presence of the English scholar Thomas Savile (see CTC 8.20).

*Works:*

In a career dominated by ecclesiastical and diplomatic duties, Dudith did not publish extensively. His Latin translation of Dionysius of Halicarnassus' treatise on Thucydides (*Dionysii Halicarnassi De Thucydidis Historia iudicium* [Venice, 1560]) was the only major scholarly work to appear in his lifetime. For a list of his published and unpublished works see Costil 387–403.

*Bibliography:*

*Biographie universelle* 11.419–20; *Dictionnaire d'histoire et géographie ecclésiastiques* 14.988–89; *Jöcher* 2.230–31; *Lexicon für Theologie und Kirche* 3.594–95; *Nouvelle biographie générale* 15.44–45; *Theologische Realenzyklopädie* 9.204–206; CTC 2.28, 41, 194, 196 (on possible translations of Longinus and Demetrius of Phalerum).

R. Förster, "Andreas Dudith und die XII. Rede

- des Themistios," *Neue Jahrbücher für Pädagogik* 3 (1900) 74–93; I. Hegedius, "Themistios es Dudith Andras," *Irodalomtörténeti Közlemények* 11 (1901) 189–99; P. Costil, *André Dudith: humaniste hon-grois 1533–1589. Sa vie, son oeuvre, et ses manuscrits grecs* (Paris, 1935), 394–95, 423–28 on the above speech, and passim on Dudith's life and works; L. Glesinger, *Der Humanist Andreas Dudith im Kreise der Antiparacelsisten*, Salzburger Beiträge zur Paracelsusforschung 7 (Vienna, 1967); C. Vasoli, "Andreas Dudith-Sbardellati e la disputa sulle comete," in T. Klaniczay, ed., *Rapporti veneto-ungheresi all'epoca del Rinascimento* (Budapest, 1975), 299–324 and reprinted in Vasoli, *I miti e gli astri* (Naples, 1977), 351–87; S. Scheiber, "Közös rémtörténet Bornemisznál és Dudithnál," *Filológiai Közlöny* 26 (1980) 353–54; R. S. Westman, "The Astronomer's Role in the Sixteenth Century: A Preliminary Survey," *History of Science* 18 (1980) 105–47 at 129–30; A. Dufour, "La définition de l'Eglise: un dialogue entre Dudith et Bèze," *Musée neuchâtelois* 4 (1982) 207–14; M. Sztatky, "Dudith András (1533–1589) humanista philológus levelezésének orvostörténeti jelentőségéről," *Orvostörténeti Közlemények* 105–106 (1984) 91–101; L. Szczucki, "Pomiedzy ortodoksja a nikodemizmen (Andrzej Dudycz na Soborze Trydenckim)," *Odrodzenie i Reformacja w Polsce* 21 (1984) 49–90; C. Maccagni and G. Derenzini, "Libri Apollonii qui . . . desiderantur," in C. Mangione, ed., *Scienza e filosofia: saggi in onore di Ludovico Geymonat* (Milan, 1985), 678–96 at 683–86; L. Szczucki, "Ars dissimulandi: Andrzej Dudycza rozstanie z Kościołem," in *Kultura polska a kultura europejska* (Warsaw, 1987), 189–204; Szczucki, "L'epistolario di Andrea Dudith," *Rinascimento*, 2d Ser., 28 (1985) 297–308; Szczucki, "Gli interessi matematico-astronomici di Andrea Dudith," *ibid.* 31 (1988) 361–73; R. Goulding, "Who Wrote the Twelfth Oration of Themistius?" *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 63 (2000) 1–23.