

Theory and History of Ontology ([www.ontology.co](http://www.ontology.co)) by Raul Corazzon | e-mail: [rc@ontology.co](mailto:rc@ontology.co)

## Bibliography on the origins of the Corpus Aristotelicum's Writings and the Rediscovery of the *Corpus Aristotelicum*

### Contents

This part of the section [History of Ontology](#) includes of the following pages:

The Philosophy of Aristotle:

[Index of the section "History of the Doctrine of Categories"](#)

[Aristotle and the Debate about the Subject Matter of First Philosophy](#)

[Aristotle: Bibliographical Resources on His Logical and Metaphysical Works](#)

[Aristotle's Definition of a Science of \*Being qua Being\*](#)

[Selected bibliography on Aristotle's Concept of Metaphysics](#)

[The Origins of the \*Corpus Aristotelicum\*](#)

[The Rediscovery of the \*Corpus Aristotelicum\* and the Birth of Aristotelianism](#)

[Bibliography on the origins of the Corpus Aristotelicum](#)

[Studies in English: A-Gra](#)

[Studies in English: Gut-Z \(Current page\)](#)

[Studies in German, French, Italian and Latin](#)

Ancient Catalogues of Aristotle's Works:

[Diogenes Laertius, \*Lives\*, V 22-27](#)

[Hesychius and Ptolemy al-Garib](#)

Listes Anciennes des Ouvrages d'Aristote :

Diogène Laërce, *Vies* V, 22-27

Hésychius de Milet et Ptolémée el-Garib

On the website "History of Logic"

Aristotle's Logic: General Survey and Introductory Readings

Aristotle's *De Interpretatione*: Semantics and Philosophy of Language

Aristotle's *Prior Analytics*: the Theory of Categorical Syllogism

History of Ancient Philosophy from the Presocratics to the Hellenistic Period



Aristotle's Doctrine of Categories: annotated bibliography of the studies in English: Complete PDF Version on the website [Academia.edu](https://www.academia.edu)

#### Annotated bibliography of the studies in English: Gut-Z

1. Gutas, Dimitri. 1986. "The Spurious and the Authentic in the Arabic Lives of Aristotle." In *Pseudo-Aristotle in the Middle Ages: the Theology and Other Texts*, edited by Ryan, William Francis, Kraye, Jill and Schmitt, Charles Bernard, 15-36. London: Warburg Institute. University of London.  
Reprinted as Chapter VI in D. Gutas, *Greek Philosophers in the Arabic Tradition*, Aldershot: Ashgate, 2000.  
"The study of the Arabic lives of Aristotle is an old and tired subject; it can fairly lay claim to the distinction of being the first area of sustained scholarly concentration in Graeco-Arabic studies. I would not undertake an extensive treatment anew in a volume on Pseudo-Aristotle were it not for the fact that, despite considerable discussion for more than a century now, much light can still be shed on the scope and nature of this material from the vantage point of an examination of the spurious and the authentic in it, and for the rather ironic state of affairs that the secondary literature has itself generated its own share of the spurious. A review of the whole subject, then, that would list in detail the sources and remark on the ways of analysing them, remove the incrustations of outdated or misguided scholarship, and put the tasks of future research in perspective would seem to be in order. For the purposes of the present discussion, all the Arabic biographical material on Aristotle can be conveniently categorized under the following six headings:
  - 1) Reports in Arabic biographies of scholars;
  - 2) Information in Arabic histories and chronographies, in so far as it does not derive from No. 1;
  - 3) The story of young Aristotle, the precocious orphan, in Hunayn's *Nawâdir al-falasifa* ('Anecdotes of the Philosophers');
  - 4) The story of Aristotle's death in *The Book of the Apple*;
  - 5) Various scattered reports, the Aristotelian *adespota*;

- 6) The voluminous material on Aristotle in his relation with Alexander: anecdotes, stories, correspondence, the 'legend' of Aristotle.  
In this paper I shall concentrate mainly on No. 1, deal very briefly with Nos. 2 to 5, and omit altogether No. 6 which, in addition to being biographical only peripherally, clearly requires a volume -- if not volumes -- of its own." (p. 15)
2. ———. 2012. "The Letter before the Spirit: Still Editing Aristotle after 2300 Years." In *The Letter before the Spirit: The Importance of Text Editions for the Study of the Reception of Aristotle*, edited by van Oppenraai, Aafke M. I., 11-36. Leiden: Brill.  
Summary: "Survey of the methods and practices used to edit the texts of Aristotle from the time of Aristotle himself to the present. Special attention is paid to the significance of the translations of Aristotelian texts, in particular into Arabic, for the establishment of their critical editions, as well as to the relative value of the vet-eres and recentiores Greek codices. Attention is also paid to some of the shortcomings of modern research and the challenges it faces." (p. 11)
3. Hatzimichali, Myrto. 2013. "The Texts of Plato and Aristotle in the First Century BC." In *Aristotle, Plato and Pythagoreanism in the First Century BC*, edited by Schofield, Malcolm, 1-27. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.  
"One of the main developments that characterise first-century bc philosophy is that the detailed study of texts became an autonomous and often central philosophical activity in its own right. For this reason, any investigation of philosophical developments during this period must address questions surrounding the circulation of written texts. In this chapter I will examine the respective fates of the texts of Plato and Aristotle, and the editorial interventions that shaped each tradition. The case of Plato, as well as further evidence on the activity of ancient scholars and editors, will then inform my proposed interpretation of developments in the textual tradition of Aristotle, where the first century bc holds particular prominence thanks to the well-known sensational stories about the rediscovery of long-lost works. The history of these texts indicates two different and separable types of activity, namely textual criticism and canon-organisation. However, the modern term 'edition' is sometimes used to describe either activity, thus making it more difficult to ascertain what it was that ancient 'editors' actually did. In fact, as Dorandi pointed out, Porphyry is probably the only 'real' ancient editor of a philosophical corpus, having dealt with both aspects of Plotinus' text.(1) Keeping the two activities distinct will help to clarify what happened to Aristotle's text in the first century bc and inform the eventual value judgement that this period was of paramount importance for the way in which Aristotle has been transmitted to us." (p. 1)  
(1) Dorandi 2010: 172.  
References  
Dorandi, Tiziano. (2010) ' "Editori" antichi di Platone', *Antiquorum Philosophia* 4: 161–74.
4. ———. 2016. "Andronicus of Rhodes and the Construction of the Aristotelian Corpus." In *Brill's Companion to the Reception of Aristotle in Antiquity*, edited by Falcon, Andrea, 81-100. Leiden: Brill.  
"The present chapter will be an effort to trace some of the steps in the complicated history of the Aristotelian corpus, with particular emphasis on the role of Andronicus of Rhodes. We shall be asking what happened in the first century BC that led Strabo to speak of a rediscovery of Aristotle's writings with an impact on Peripatetic philosophizing; and we shall also be looking for factors that could have contributed to the published dialogues' falling out of circulation. For a long time it was traditional to speak of a "Roman edition" of Aristotle, prepared by Andronicus of Rhodes, and often credited with being a canonical or standard edition. But Jonathan Barnes in his "Roman Aristotle"(2) reminded us quite emphatically that no ancient source speaks of such a respected reliable edition, nor is Andronicus held in any esteem anywhere as a textual critic. So it is important to make a distinction between two different and separable types of activity, namely textual criticism on

the one hand and canon- or corpus-organization on the other. A modern edition of an author's entire oeuvre normally involves both activities, and this can lead to the term "edition" being used for either one when speaking of ancient "editors," which does not help with ascertaining what it was they actually did. In fact, as Tiziano Dorandi has shown very convincingly,(3) Porphyry is the only individual that we can safely speak of as a full-blown ancient editor of a philosophical corpus, because we know that he dealt with both aspects of Plotinus' text, namely ordering (διάταξις) and correction (διόρθωσις) (*Life of Plotinus* 24).

As we shall see, Andronicus can only be credited with the former activity, that of canon- or corpus-organization, and in that respect he was very successful and influential indeed."(pp. 81-82)

(2) Barnes 1997.

(3) Dorandi 2010.

#### References

Barnes, J. 1997. Roman Aristotle. In *Philosophia Togata II: Plato and Aristotle at Rome*, edited by J. Barnes and M. Griffin. Oxford, Clarendon Press: 1–69.

Dorandi, T. 2010. 'Editori' antichi di Platone. In *Antiquorum Philosophia* 4: 161–74.

5. Hecquet-Devienne, Myriam. 2004. "A Legacy from the Library of the Lyceum? Inquiry Into the Joint Transmission of Theophrastus' and Aristotle's *Metaphysics* Based on Evidence Provided by Manuscripts *E* and *J* ." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* no. 102:171-189.  
 "The starting point for this inquiry is a scholium in one of the most important pieces of evidence for the handwritten tradition of the Aristotelian corpus: *Parisinus graecus 1853*, from the tenth century.  
 This scholium concerns a somewhat strange opusculum by Theophrastus that was first transmitted to us within the Aristotelian corpus under the title *Metaphysics*. The scholium reveals that this opusculum was not on the lists of Theophrastus' works drawn up by Hermippus in the Library of Alexandria in the third century B.C., or those by Andronicus two centuries later. It also reveals that Nicolaus[\*], still in the first century B.C., identified its true author in his study of Aristotle's *Metaphysics*. The history of the transmission of this opusculum is thus closely linked to that of the Aristotelian corpus. My codicological inquiry has led me to some new findings, not only concerning the history of the transmission of Theophrastus' *Metaphysics*, but also that of Aristotle's *Metaphysics*, and even the history of the transmission of part of the Aristotelian corpus which includes some zoological treatises. These findings support other research on the nature and function of Theophrastus' opusculum, and confirm its particular literary status." (pp. 171-172)  
 [\*] *Nicolaus Damascenus On the Philosophy of Aristotle*, edited by H. J. Drossart Lulofs, Leiden: Brill, 1965 (reprint with additions and corrections 1969).
6. Huby, Pamela M. 1969. "The transmission of Aristotle's writings and the places where copies of his works existed." *Classica et Mediaevalia* no. 30:241-257.  
 "This is an attempt to trace the history of the Aristotelian tradition, (1) mainly by means of a study of the evidence about the whereabouts of the manuscripts of his esoteric writings in ancient times. In this particular case the task is a relatively easy one, because these works are too difficult to have had a wide circulation. A few important centres of learning probably had good copies of all of them, and some works like the *Organon*, may have been much more widely known at certain periods, but most of the material that once existed must have been destroyed, and we can often say where and when such destruction is likely to have happened. We can distinguish four main centres of tradition, by which I mean places where manuscripts were kept, studied and copied over a long period — Athens, Alexandria, Rome and Constantinople. (2) Of these the Roman tradition is completely lost, except in some Latin translations; the large collection at Athens probably slowly decayed, though some manuscripts may have gone to

- Constantinople; the perhaps even larger collection at Alexandria was scattered, but its tradition survived in Antioch and other parts of the Arab dominions, and is probably at the base of the Arabic translations. Even in Constantinople much was lost through fire or neglect, but a certain amount survived till the revival of interest in the ninth century, when our earliest extant Greek manuscripts were made." (p. 241)
- (1) The following books are frequently referred to by an abbreviated title:  
Düring, ABT = I. Düring, *Aristotle in the Ancient Biographical Tradition*, (Göteborg, 1957)  
Lulofs = H. J. Drossaart Lulofs, ed. & trans: *Nicolaus Damascenus, On the Philosophy of Aristotle* (Leiden, 1965).
- 2) Too much must not, however, be made of the idea of a separate tradition in each place. For long periods there was close contact between two or more of these centres, and men, and their private libraries, might move from one to another. But it has some value.
7. Jaeger, Werner. 1948. *Aristotle: Fundamentals of the History of His Development*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.  
English translation by Richard Robinson of: *Aristoteles. Grundlegung einer Geschichte seiner Entwicklung*, Berlin: Weidemann, 1923.  
"This book, being at once treatise and monograph, demands a brief word of explanation.  
It does not seek to give a systematic account, but to analyse Aristotle's writings so as to discover in them the half obliterated traces of his mental progress. Its biographical framework is intended merely to make more palpable the fact that his previously undifferentiated mass of compositions falls into three distinct periods of evolution. Owing to the meagerness of the material the picture that we thus obtain is of course fragmentary, yet its outlines constitute a distinctly clearer view of Aristotle's intellectual nature and of the forces that inspired his thinking. Primarily, this is a gain to the history of philosophical problems and origins. The author's intention is, however, not to make a contribution to systematic philosophy, but to throw light on the portion of the history of the Greek mind that is designated by the name of Aristotle." (From the Author's Preface to the German Edition)
8. Keaney, John J. 1963. "Two Notes on the Tradition of Aristotle's Writings." *American Journal of Philology* no. 84:52-63.  
"In recent years, scholars have taken up anew the problem of the knowledge of Aristotle's works, most particularly his school treatises, in the period from Theophrastus to Andronicus, and the question of the sources of the catalogues of Aristotle's writings, especially of that preserved by Diogenes Laertius (V, 22-7). The names of Paul Moraux and Ingemar Düring have been prominent in this activity.(1) In the present paper, I propose to deal with two of the many points raised by these scholars." (p. 52)  
(1) P. Moraux, *Les listes anciennes des ouvrages d'Aristote* (Louvain, 1951); I. Düring, "Notes on the history of the transmission of Aristotle's writings," *Goteborgs Hogskolas Araskrift*, LVI (1950), pp. 35-70.
9. Lindsay, Hugh. 1997. "Strabo on Apellicon's Library." *Rheinische Museum* no. 140:290-298.  
"A remarkable tale, full of fabulous elements, appears in Strabo's *Geography* in the course of his discussion of notable figures from Scepsis (2). It relates to the history of the text of the *Corpus Aristotelicum*. The passage has been taken to contain an important discussion of the chain of events surrounding the fate of Aristotle's personal library between the time of Aristotle and Cicero. It certainly purports to deal with this topic, but there are good reasons for believing that it exaggerates the extent to which Aristotelian texts were unavailable in the interim (3). This has frequently been noticed, but in this paper I shall suggest that Strabo had motives related to his own career for wishing to add to the mystique over the history of Aristotle's text, and for dismissing the value of earlier editions of Aristotle. It may

- be that Apellicon before him had started the process of making excessive claims over the importance of the documents that passed through his hands." (pp. 290-291)
- (2) Strabo 13.1.54 p.608-9. For a summary of the vast literature on this passage see H. B. Gottschalk, *Notes on the Wills of the Peripatetic Scholarchs*, *Hermes* 100 (1972) 335 n. 2, and further in "Aristotelian philosophy in the Roman world from the time of Cicero to the end of the second century AD", ANRW II.36.2, 1079-1174, partially reprinted as "The earliest Aristotelian commentators", in: *Aristotle Transformed: The ancient commentators and their influence*, ed. R. Sorabji (London 1990) 55-81 (henceforth Gottschalk 1990).
- (3) As emphasized by A.H. Chroust, *The Miraculous Disappearance and Recovery of the Corpus Aristotelicum*, C&M 23 (1962) 50-67; D.C. Earl, Prologue form in *Ancient Historiography*, ANRW I.2, 851.
10. Lord, Carnes. 1986. "On the Early History of the Aristotelian Corpus." *American Journal of Philology* no. 107:137-161.  
 "The manner in which the collection of Aristotelian writings now extant was originally constituted remains very much a mystery. The curious and in many respects implausible story of the disappearance and subsequent recovery of the library of Theophrastus is the best known element in this puzzle. But the most detailed evidence concerning the early condition of the Aristotelian corpus is that provided by three lists of books ascribed to Aristotle which have been preserved in ancient biographies of him. These catalogues are the chief source of external evidence touching on both the condition of Aristotle's writings in the period immediately following his death and the alterations they appear to have undergone in the edition of Aristotelian works prepared by Andronicus of Rhodes in the first century B.C. Because of the many problematic features of the catalogues, their evidence has often been ignored or dismissed, or used only in selective and unsystematic fashion.  
 The extensive studies devoted to the catalogues in recent years by Paul Moraux and Ingemar Düring have rectified this situation to some degree, and have secured general agreement as to their authority and importance.(1) At the same time, however, the problem of the catalogues, and of the early history of the Aristotelian corpus as a whole, can hardly be said to have been satisfactorily resolved. Disagreements persist over such questions as the identity of the original source of the earliest catalogues and the circumstances and precise nature of Andronicus' editorial activity. Moreover, even when liberal recourse is had to textual emendation, no fully convincing account has yet been given of the exact relationship of the three catalogues to one another, to the edition of Andronicus, and to the corpus as presently constituted.(2) In the state of our knowledge, many uncertainties must remain concerning matters such as the status of book titles and the meaning of the numbering of books of larger treatises. Still, it has to be acknowledged that much information in the lists appears to be transmitted with great fidelity, and under these circumstances it seems legitimate to wonder whether there are not alternative hypotheses concerning the catalogues which remain to be explored.  
 In what follows, an attempt will be made to establish the plausibility of such a hypothesis and to examine some of its implications with respect to the composition and early history of Aristotle's writings." (pp. 137-138).  
 (1) Paul Moraux, *Les listes anciennes des ouvrages d'Aristote* (Louvain 1951); Ingemar Düring, *Aristotle in the Ancient Biographical Tradition* (Göteborg 1957); Düring, art. "Aristoteles," *RE Suppl.* XI (1968) cols. 184-90.  
 (2) Consider the negative judgment on Moraux' undertaking expressed by R. Stark, *Aristotelesstudien* (Munich 1972) 160-64.
11. Lynch, John Patrick. 1972. *Aristotle's School: A Study of a Greek Educational Institution*. Berkeley: University of California Press.  
 See Chapter V. *The Athenian Peripatos and Its Decline Among the Successors of Aristotle and Theophrastus*, in particular pp. 146-154.

"The research presented here does not make great claims for its utility in understanding Greek philosophy as a speculative phenomenon. Pure philosophers will not find in these pages much even about the educational theory of Aristotle and his successors. My inquiry originates from a concern with what Aristotle and other Greek philosophers actually did as teachers, not what they said should be done. Such a concern is, I believe, both proper and desirable. For Greek philosophy as it developed in the Athenian schools of the fourth century B.C. was more than a general name for various kinds of theories and systems, and that "more" — philosophia as higher education among the Greeks — can be legitimately isolated and subjected to analysis on its own. Much confusion results from not clearly distinguishing between theory and practice. Histories of ancient education almost always conflate the two with misleading results, and interpretations of Greek philosophical texts often lapse into concrete formulations such as "Plato's University," "Scholarch of the Stoa," or "chair in the Peripatos" without considering concrete facts which such language implies.

To those scholars who are interested in ancient educational practice and the external history of the Athenian philosophical schools, the modifications in traditional views which have been suggested above may seem too drastic. Because of the vastness of the area concerned, this may well prove in some measure to be the case. But if these six chapters serve to stimulate some debate in a virtually unexplored field, the purpose of this investigation will be fulfilled." (pp. 7-8)

12. McAdon, Brad. 2006. "Strabo, Plutarch, Porphyry and the Transmission and Composition of Aristotle's *Rhetoric*—a Hunch." *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* no. 36:77-105.

Abstract: "Scholars who have been writing recently about the unity and composition of Aristotle's *Rhetoric* make either brief or no mention of the transmission and editorial history of Aristotle's texts. This essay addresses this void by first presenting and discussing Strabo's, Plutarch's, and Porphyry's accounts of the transmission and editorial history of Aristotle's and Theophrastus' texts in conjunction with discussing the list of works that Diogenes Laertius ascribes to both authors. Once the transmission and editorial history is considered, evidence is presented from the *Rhetoric* that may indicate two important points—the extent to which the text is a compilation of previously independent texts that were ascribed to both Aristotle and Theophrastus and that Andronicus, rather than Aristotle, may be responsible for the text as we have it."

13. Menn, Stephen. 1995. "The Editors of the *Metaphysics* ." *Phronesis. A Journal for Ancient Philosophy* no. 40:202-208.

"Christopher Kirwan writes as follows in his introductory note to *Metaphysics* Γ: We are told that the fourteen books of *Metaphysics* were brought into their present arrangement by editors after Aristotle's death."(1)

(...)

"To conclude: we have not been "told," as Kirwan says we have, that editors after Aristotle's death brought the fourteen books of the *Metaphysics* into their present arrangement. We have been told that the editors received from Aristotle fourteen books of *Metaphysics* in their current order (except possibly for α or A), and that, perhaps to repair some damage, they made local changes which did not affect the overall structure (although we might consider it a major change if the original K has been completely replaced).

Apart from the possibly correct general tradition that the present text comes from the school of Eudemus, those who "tell" us about the history of the text know no more than what we know, namely, that there are doublets, and that sometimes we have difficulty construing the argument. Of course, we may very well conclude that the order of the text as we have it fails in some major way to reflect Aristotle's intentions; we might even conclude that we have before us fourteen independent treatises on metaphysical topics; but we cannot draw such conclusions from authority. We can only draw them if, after serious effort, we are unable to make sense of the text as we have it.

- Kirwan may possibly be right that *Metaphysics* Γ "announces its subjectmatter in the first chapter" and that it and later books of the *Metaphysics* proceed to explore the science first defined there, "hardly more dependent on what has preceded than on other parts of Aristotle's works," rather than specifying further the science of first principles described in AαB and resolving problems in that science; but the claim cannot be allowed to pass without argument." (p. 208)
- (1) *Aristotle's Metaphysics, Books Γ, Δ, and E*, translated with notes by Christopher Kirwan (Oxford, 1971), p.75. The second edition (Oxford, 1993) reproduces the original edition with new supplementary material. The passage here cited is not modified by anything added in the second edition.
14. Natali, Carlo. 2013. *Aristotle: His Life and School*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.  
Translated and edited by D.S. Hutchinson from Italian *Bios theoretikos. La vita di Aristotele e l'organizzazione della sua scuola*, Bologna: Il Mulino, 1991.  
"In my view, the interest to be taken in an investigation into the biography of Aristotle, as with the biography of Plato or of other figures of the ancient world, lies principally in the paradigmatic value of their intellectual experience. With Aristotle, in my view, a new cultural type was born, a model of the wise man different from that of his predecessors, and especially different from the sages who have been called the "Presocratics"; and a new style of philosophical reflection was worked out, the impact of which on European culture in all the centuries that followed would be very difficult to overestimate. What I am interested in doing here is to reconstruct as well as possible the historical features of this new intellectual figure, and to determine its specific characteristics.  
In the reconstruction of these historical events I shall not concern myself directly with the content of Aristotle's thought; its birth and its development will be understood in a more global context, by means of a comparison with the philosophical discussions of the school of Plato and the influences of other cultural currents of his time. In this sense my research is lacking and insufficient, but it is impossible to proceed otherwise, given the enormous difficulty and the great complexity of this material.  
(...)  
In the first three chapters of the present work I have started off by going back to the ancient sources, rather than the scholarly status quaestionis; and I have instead devoted the whole of chapter 4 of the present study to a delineation of the panorama of biographic research on Aristotle from the time of Zeller to the present. In the first three chapters I have not failed to keep in mind the results of the critical debate, at least of most of it, but I have undertaken first and foremost to re-read the texts, and have attempted to reconstruct a coherent picture of the life and of the intellectual personality of the philosopher by making use of the most reliable facts or, if not those, of the least uncertain ones. In order to give my readers some tools with which to check up on what I am going to be saying, I thought it a good idea to provide for them, in my own Italian translation, most of the data and most of the texts upon which I base my reconstruction." (pp. 3-4)
15. Pajón Leyra, Irene. 2013. "The Aristotelian Corpus and the Rhodian Tradition: New Light from Posidonius on the Transmission of Aristotle's Works." *Classical Quarterly* no. 63:723-733.  
"There are clear pieces of evidence (6) that point, if not to a broad circulation of the Corpus' treatises, at least to the existence of copies of several Aristotelian works, preserved in the various culture centres of the Hellenistic period associated with the Peripatos. Though it is most unlikely that the works of Aristotle and Theophrastus were at that time widely known and available, the idea that they were preserved in single copies can hardly be sustained, so that the problem now is not to determine if there was a total loss of the Corpus, but when and where the different treatises were known, and what their relation is to the version of the Corpus that we know today.

- In this context, the preserved fragments of the works of the Stoic philosopher Posidonius of Apamea might offer useful information. The aim of this paper is, then, to examine how they demonstrate that the author had access to some Aristotelian treatises during the time when they were supposed to be lost, and how Posidonius' reading of Aristotle can shed light on the tradition of Peripatetic studies developed in Rhodes, and on its role in developing the final version of the Aristotelian *Corpus* as we know it today." (pp. 724-725)
- (6) Particularly important is the information provided by Philodemus and Simplicius. See Phld. *Cont.: P.Herc. 1005*, fr. 111 Angeli; W. Crönert, *Kolotes und Menedemos. Texte und Untersuchungen zur Philosophen und Literaturgeschichte* (Amsterdam, 1965 = 1874), 174, on the existence of copies of the Aristotelian *Analytics* and *Physics*. See F. Grayeff, *Aristotle and his School. An Inquiry into the History of the Peripatos. With a Commentary on Metaphysics Z, H, A and Θ* (London, 1974), 70 n. 2. Simpl. *In Phys.* 923.9 ff., on the letters exchanged between Theophrastus and Eudemus, regarding a mistake of the scribe on the copy of the *Physics* available in Rhodes. See Zeller, *Die Philosophie der Griechen in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung, Zweiter Teil, zweite Abteilung: Aristoteles und die alten Peripatetiker* (Hildesheim, 1963 = 1921 4th edition = 1878) 149 n. 2; J. E. Sandys, *A History of Classical Scholarship. Vol. 1: from the Sixth Century B. C. to the End of the Middle Ages* (Cambridge, 1921), 85.
16. Perkams, Matthias. 2019. "The Date and Place of Andronicus' Edition of Aristotle's Works According to a Neglected Arabic Source." *Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie* no. 101:445-468.  
Abstract: "This paper presents and discusses the notice on the life and work of Andronicus of Rhodes by the famous Arabic philosopher Abū Naṣr al-Fārābī, which has been transmitted by the historian of medicine Ibn Abī 'Uṣaibi'a. This text, which has never been discussed by modern scholarship on Andronicus, is our only direct source on the life, the time and the place of Andronicus' famous edition of Aristotle. The paper argues that the informations in this passage must stem from a rather well informed Greek source, which presented an alternative and more complete account than the informations we have from Plutarch.  
We learn that Andronicus taught Aristotelian philosophy in Alexandria before 30 B.C. and based his editorial work on old Aristotelian manuscripts from the library there. After that date, he accompanied Augustus to Rome where he may have completed his edition. Thus, the late dating of Andronicus' edition is confirmed by an independent source."
17. Plezia, Marian. 1961. "Supplementary Remarks on Aristotle in the Ancient Biographical Tradition." *Eos. Commentarii Societatis Philologae Polonorum* no. 51:241-249.  
"Ingemar Düring's excellent book *Aristotle in the Ancient Biographical Tradition* (Göteborg 1957) represents an important step forward in the development of research on Aristotle, in so far it manages to present an almost complete collection of biographical material available to us and relating to the philosopher of Stagira, not only in the form of his proper biographies in Greek, Latin, Syrian and Arabic, but also in the shape of a rich collection of loose references to him (some taken from valuable sources) which can be found scattered in the whole of the ancient and parts of medieval literature. At the end of the book the author makes an attempt to draw some conclusions, of a broadest nature, from the collected texts, which are all very clearly annotated.  
However, like all human works, Düring's valuable book shows some shortcomings and defects, which are unavoidable at such first attempts; we thought it therefore both necessary and useful to present here a handful of supplementary remarks, based on our research on the same subject, carried out between the years 1943 to 1957, in the belief, that they may prove useful to those interested in Aristotle's biography and how it took shape in the course of centuries. Our remarks are divided, in conformity with the way Düring handles his material, into three parts: (a) those dealing with full biographies of the philosopher of Stagira; (b) those

dealing with loose references to him, contained in sources pertaining to various epochs; and finally (c) certain amendments relating to the question of how the ancient tradition about Aristotle has developed." (p. 241)

18. Richardson, Nicholas J. 1994. "Aristotle and Hellenistic Scholarship." In *La philologie grecque à l'époque hellénistique et romaine. Sept exposés suivis de discussions*, edited by Montanari, Franco, 7-28. Genève: Fondation Hardt. Followed by a discussion, pp. 29-38).  
 "Modern scholars have on the whole viewed Strabo's story with scepticism(3). The serious question is not so much what became of the books which Neleus inherited, but rather whether other copies of Aristotle's esoteric works were available, and if so to what extent. It is generally believed that the catalogue of Aristotle's writings preserved by Diogenes Laertius (V 22-7) dates from the Hellenistic period, and this includes many (but not all) of the esoteric works, arranged in a way which suggests the work of a member of the Peripatos. Moraux argued that this may have been done by Ariston of Ceos in the third quarter of the third century B.C., whereas Diiring and others have ascribed it to Callimachus' pupil Hermippus of Smyrna(4). In a more recent work Moraux concluded, after a careful review of the evidence, that some at least of the esoteric texts were available and used during the Hellenistic period, but that they were probably not in general circulation(5). As we shall see, there is indeed evidence to suggest that this is correct, although much of it relates to the documentary and antiquarian areas of Aristotle's scholarship (where, moreover, his work shades most naturally into that of his followers). The situation becomes a good deal less clear when we turn to such a key text for literary studies as the *Poetics*." (pp. 11-12)  
 3 Cf. H.B. Gottschalk *ANRW* !I 36, 2, 1083 ff. and *Hermes* 100 (1972), 335-42; P. Moraux, *Der Aristotelismus bei den Griechen I* (Berlin 1973), 3-31. But see [*Les éditions de textes*] pp. 51 f. below, where J. Irigoien argues for its truth, and suggests that what Athenaeus refers to could be the purchase by Philadelphus of the "bibliothèque de documentation réunie par Aristote et Th6ophraste", whereas the esoteric works, i.e. the papers and notes of Aristotle's own lectures, were kept in Scepsis.  
 4 Cf. P. Moraux, *Les listes anciennes des ouvrages d'Aristote* (Louvain 1951), especially 243 f.; 1. Düring, in *Classica et Medievalia* 17 (1956), 11-21. For a review of other opinions cf. P. Moraux, *Der Aristotelismus bei den Griechen I* (Berlin 1973), 4 n. 2.  
 (5) *Aristotelismus I* 3-31. For further discussion see A. Rostagni (ed.), *Aristotele, Poetica* (Turin 1945), pp. lxxxvi-xcii; D.W. Lucas (ed), *Aristotle, Poetics* (Oxford 1968), pp. ix-xi, xxii-xxiii; F. Grayeff, *Aristotle and his School* (London 1974), 69-85; L. Taràn, in *Gnomon* 53 (1981), 723ff. (review of Moraux); C. Lord, in *AJP* 107 (1986), 137-61; L. Canfora, *The Vanished Library: a Wonder of the Ancient World*, transl. M. Ryle (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1990), 173-82; R. Janko, in *Cronache Ercolanesi* 21 (1991), 7.
19. Rist, John M. 1964. "Demetrius the Stylist and Artemon the Compiler." *Phoenix* no. 18:2-8.  
 "The appearance of G. M. A. Grube's book (1) on Demetrius the Stylist has revived interest in the date of his work. Grube dates it at about 270 B.C. whereas G. P. Goold holds (2) that it was written in the Augustan Age. Such a discrepancy is disturbing; two hundred and fifty to three hundred years is a wide margin of error. This note therefore is intended to reduce the gap by an investigation of the Artemon who is described by Demetrius (223) as the editor of Aristotle's Letters. It seems that some progress may be possible here, although the matter has been quickly passed over by both Grube (3) and Goold. (4) More in fact can be discovered about the date of Artemon than either of these scholars has indicated. To attain such knowledge, it is necessary to examine the traditional accounts of the contents of the Aristotelian corpus." (p. 2)  
 (1) G. M. A. Grube, *A Greek Critic: Demetrius on Style* (Toronto 1961).  
 (2) G. P. Goold, "A Greek Professorial Circle at Rome," *TAPA* 92 (1961) 168-192.

- (3) Grube (note 1), who on p. 111 writes that nothing is known of the Artemon who edited Aristotle's letters, mentions on p. 42 the suggestion of H. Koskenniemi, "Studien zur Idee und Phraseologie des griechischen Briefes," *Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae* B.102 (Helsinki 1956), that the Artemon mentioned by Demetrius may have been a contemporary of Theophrastus.
- (4) Goold (note 2) 181.
20. Searby, Denis Michael. 1998. *Aristotle in the Greek Gnomological Tradition*. Uppsala: Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis.  
Dissertation for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Classical Languages presented at Uppsala University 1998.  
Abstract: "This dissertation consists of a new collection of maxims and apophthegms associated with Aristotle in the Greek gnomologies along with an introduction to the sources and a commentary on the content of the sayings. The major sources have been Diogenes Laertius, the anthology of Stobaeus, *Gnomologium Vaticanum* and related collections, cod. Par. gr. 1168 (*Corpus Parisinum*) and cod. Bodl. Digby 6, the *Loci Communes of ps.-Maximus the Confessor* and related anthologies, the *Florilegium Atheniense*, and the gnomology of Joannes Georgides. The introductory chapters concern the definition and history of the gnomological tradition, the investigation of the extant sources, the problem of multiple attributions, possible explanations for the title *The Chreiae of Aristotle* found in Stobaeus, and the different ways Aristotle makes his appearance in the tradition. The collection of sayings is based on Greek sources alone, but frequent references are made to the Latin and Arabic traditions, and Appendices I and IV offer a sampling of the material to be found in these traditions. Appendix VI shows the sources of the so-called *Gnomologium Parisinum Ineditum*. The commentary dwells primarily on the attribution to Aristotle and the possible Aristotelian content of the sayings while at the same time relating the sayings to the gnomological tradition as a whole."
21. Sharples, Robert W. 2007. "Aristotle's Exoteric and Esoteric Works: Summaries and Commentaries." In *Greek and Roman Philosophy 100 BC - 200 AD. Vol. II*, edited by Sharples, Robert W. and Sorabji, Richard, 505-512. London: Institute of Classical Studies.  
"A familiar and once popular account of the revival of interest in Aristotle's esoteric works runs as follows. Ancient tradition tells us that Andronicus of Rhodes produced a standard edition of Aristotle's esoteric works in the first century BC. Even if we do not have to believe - and would be very unwise to believe - the story that these works were completely inaccessible in the preceding, Hellenistic period because the only surviving copies were buried in a ditch in Asia Minor, it is clear that Andronicus' edition marked a turning-point; he himself wrote commentaries on the works, his pupil Boethus did so too, and from that day onwards philosophy, inspired by the attempt to understand Aristotle's treatises, has never looked back. The part of that account which is most securely established is in fact the last. Andronicus did indeed have a major influence on the whole subsequent course of philosophy. Whatever exactly Andronicus' role was in the ordering of the Aristotelian texts and in establishing an order in which they should be studied, it is with him that the series of commentaries on the *Categories* starts. Because of its place in the curriculum the *Categories* was a major concern of commentators subsequently, and it thus formed an early part of Boethius' project to translate Aristotle's works into Latin and provide commentaries on them. Consequently the early Western Middle Ages found their philosophizing influenced by the preoccupations of the *Categories* and the commentaries on them, such as the problem of universals. While what is new and distinctive about post-Hellenistic philosophy may well be the contribution of revived dogmatic Platonism, a case might be made for the decisive influence of Andronicus on what eventually replaced that post-Hellenistic philosophy - though I do not want to suggest that the influence of both Plato and Aristotle was not present throughout, in varying degrees at different times.

What is less clear is how else Andronicus really contributed to the 'Aristotelian revival'. There has long been a problem over dating Andronicus and his so-called edition, for Cicero shows no awareness of or interest in either, even though he refers quite often to Aristotle and his followers, and was aware of some of the esoteric works. Jonathan Barnes has shown that later commentators on Aristotle never refer to Andronicus as settling disputed textual questions, or even cite his reading of the text as a particularly authoritative one, and has pointed out that if the earlier editions referred to by Strabo were based on defective manuscripts, it is at least quite unclear where Andronicus could have got better ones from.(8)" (pp. 505-506. some notes omitted)

(8) Barnes, 'Roman Aristotle' [in *Philosophic Togata II*, eds J. Barnes and M. Griffin (Oxford 1997)] 1-69, 28-31.

22. Shute, Richard. 1888. *On the History of the Process by which the Aristotelian Writings Arrived at Their Present Form*.

Reprint: New York, Arno Press, 1976.

Table of Contents: I. The problem 1; II. From Aristotle to the time of Cicero and the Latin Renaissance 19; III. Cicero and the Latin Renaissance 46; IV. From Cicero to Alexander Aphrodisiensis 66; V. Of titles and references 96; VI. Of repetitions and second and third texts, illustrated especially from the *Physics*, *Metaphysics*, and *De anima* 117, VII. Of the *Nichomachean ethics* 141; VIII. The *Politics* and evidence from the avoidance of hiatus 164; General summary 176; Index of references 183. "General Summary.

I have in this essay attempted to prove, first, that of the great bulk of the Aristotelian works as we now have them, there was no kind of publication during the lifetime of the master, nor probably for a considerable period after his death. Secondly, that as to this portion of the Aristotelian whole, we cannot assert with certainty that we have ever got throughout a treatise in the exact words of Aristotle, though we may be pretty clear that we have a fair representation of his thought. The unity of style observable may belong quite as well to the school and the method as to the individual. We have certainly got a most precious Aristotelian literature; we have not certainly got Aristotle in the strongest and most literal sense. Thirdly, I have tried to prove that the works which are preserved to us come chiefly, if not entirely, from the tradition of Andronicus, and stand in no very definite relation to the list of Diogenes, and consequently we have a very considerable proportion, and not a merely insignificant fraction of the reputed works of Aristotle known to Latin antiquity. Fourthly, I have laid down that the majority of the titles, and probably all the definite references, are post-Aristotelian, and that therefore no safe argument can be drawn from the latter as to the authenticity or original order of the Aristotelian works, though other very valuable inferences as to the subsequent history of these works result from their careful consideration. Fifthly, I have attempted to trace the double texts and repeated passages each to several original sources, and not to a single point of origin. I have applied the doctrines arrived at to the consideration of those Aristotelian treatises which have given rise to most controversy, and seem to myself to have found some solutions at least, through the method I have followed. Incidentally I have been led to investigate the question of another class of works which bear Aristotle's name, of which we can say with certainty that the portions which we have of them are precisely as the final author wrote them; but cannot with equal certainty assert that that author was Aristotle. We can safely assume, however, that these works, and works like these, were those best known to our earliest authorities on the subject, Cicero and his predecessors, and that on them all the praise of Aristotle's style is founded.

If there be any value in these conclusions, the practical lesson to be drawn from them will be, that the present duty of scholarship is to determine as far as possible the course of the Aristotelian argument, by bracketing superfluous and repeated passages. In some cases there will be internal or external evidence for bracketing the one of two passages rather than the other. In other cases, and I believe they will be the majority, there will be no trustworthy evidence which shall lead us to reject

one of such passages more than the other. We shall not follow such assumptions as that of Torstrik in the *De Anima*, that the former of two like passages is always the preferable; nor shall we rashly assume that the one is more strictly Aristotelian than the other. When we have pointed out such reduplications to the student we shall leave him to choose which of them he prefers, showing him only that both cannot be wanted in the text. If we bracket at all, it will not be that we assert the one passage rather than the other to be spurious (except in those rare cases where we have definite proof). It will merely be in order that he may see what is the general line and connection of the argument. We shall be cautious in many cases in assuming even reduplication; for an author or lecturer may deliberately repeat himself. But this caution will not be necessary in the case of repeated and almost identical passages which follow immediately after each other.

In a word, we shall try to get as near as we can to the earliest form of the teachings of the master, but shall not vainly and pedantically hope to restore his actual words; nor shall we rashly reject this or that passage or phrase as being clearly un-Aristotelian, since we shall know well that the Aristotle we have can in no case be freed from the suspicion (or rather almost certainty) of filtration through other minds, and expression through other voices. Criticism of Aristotle must in truth always be of thought rather than of phrase, of sentence rather than of word." (pp. 176-177).

23. Sollenberger, Michael George. 1992. "The Lives of the Peripatetics: an analysis of the contents and structure of Diogenes Laertius' *Vitae philosophorum* Book 5." In *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, vol. 36: *Philosophie, Wissenschaften, Technik*. 6. Teilband: *Philosophie (Doxographica [Forts.])*, edited by Haase, Wolfgang, 3793-3879. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- On the Catalogue of Aristotles' writings see § 2. Writings pp. 3849-3855.
- "Accounts of the lives of six early Peripatetic philosophers are contained in the fifth book of Diogenes Laertius' 'Vitae philosophorum': the lives of the first four leaders of the sect -- Aristotle, Theophrastus, Strato, and Lyco -- and those of two outstanding members -- Demetrius of Phalerum and Heraclides of Pontus. Our knowledge of the history of two rival schools, the Academy and the Stoa, is aided not only by the lives of several members of these two schools in Books Four and Seven of Diogenes' work, but also by accounts in the 'Index Academicorum' and the 'Index Stoicorum' which have been preserved for us among the several papyri from Herculaneum.(1) But for the Peripatos there is no such second source of information. There are, to be sure, numerous bits and pieces of evidence which concern the school and its members scattered throughout ancient and medieval literature, many of which have been made readily accessible by F. Wehrli in his well-known series 'Die Schule des Aristoteles'.(2) Moreover, in addition to Diogenes' version, several other lives of Aristotle have come down to us and have been collected and analyzed in detail by I. Düring in his 'Aristotle in the Ancient Biographical Tradition'.(3) But for the lives and careers of other Peripatetics, Diogenes' accounts are the only ones available to us.
- All of the many aspects of these six lives cannot be discussed here with comprehensive thoroughness. Rather, relying on the studies and findings of past scholars, sometimes heavily, I shall offer a compilation of those findings in a systematic manner. Although oversimplification is inevitable in view of the many complex problems encountered in these lives, consideration will be given to general matters of content, structure, organization, and arrangement of material in Book Five as a whole, to the different categories of information in the individual lives, and to the two most striking features of this book which set it apart from other books: the wills of the first four scholars and the extensive catalogues of writings included by Diogenes for five of the six philosophers." (pp. 3793-3794)
- (1) P. Herc. 1021 (and 164) and 1018 respectively, edited by S. Mekler, *Academicorum Philosophorum Index Herculaneensis* (Berlin, 1902), which should be read in conjunction with W. Crönert, *Die Ueberlieferung des Index*

- Academicorum* , Hermes 38 (1903) p. 357-405, and A. Traversa, *Index Stoicorum Herculensis* . Istituto di filologia classica 1 (Genoa, 1952).
- (2) F. Wehrli, *Die Schule des Aristoteles. Texte und Kommentare* , 2nd ed. vol. 1 - 2 (Basel, 1967), vol. 3 --10 (Basel, 1969), suppl. vol. I (Basel, 1974), and suppl. vol. 2 (Basel, 1978). The fragments of Theophrastus, not included by Wehrli are being prepared by a team of scholars headed by W. Fortenbaugh in a series of volumes which is scheduled to appear soon. [Theophrastus of Eresus. *Sources for his life, writings, thought and influence* . Edited by Fortenbaugh William W. et al. Leiden: Brill 1992, two volumes].
- (3) Ingemar Düring Ingemar. Aristotle in the ancient biographical tradition. *Studia Graeca et Latina Gothoburgensis* 5 (Göteborg, 1957).
24. Staikos, Konstantinos. 2016. *The Library of Aristotle: The Most Important Collection of Books Ever Formed* . New Castle, DE: Oak Knoll Press.  
Translated from Greek by Alexandra Dumas.  
"The Library of Aristotle follows the adventures of Aristotle's book collection down to the edition of the corpus aristotelicum by Andronicus of Rhodes in the first century CE. Aristotle started to collect books in order to form his personal library even before he became a member of the Academy and a pupil of Plato (367 BCE). The kernel of his collection consisted in the texts of his father Nicomachus and medical treatises which the latter, who was physician to Amyntas III of Macedonia, probably had in his possession. Aristotle's own writings, the exoteric together with the didactic, cover 106 cylinders. In order to comment on the whole of the cultural tradition, he also collected all written texts accessible to him at the time: treatises on physics, philosophy, poetry, rhetoric, theory of government and politics, cosmogony, the diatribes of the sophists and all the works of Plato and the members of the Academy. His knowledge of the written tradition is evident from the numerous citations he uses in his texts and his critical comments on the works of other authors. There are three discernible periods in Aristotle's writing, which correspond to the three stages in his life in which he made major additions to his library: the period of the Academy (c. 367-347), the period of his self-imposed exile to Assus, Lesbos and Macedonia (c. 347 - 335) and the time when he taught at the Lyceum of Athens (c. 335-322). His library, comprised of all these books, came to form part of the Lyceum library, and remained intact until Theophrastus's death." (Publisher's website)
25. Tanner, R.Godfrey. 2009. "Aristotle's Works: The Possible Origins of the Alexandria Collection." In *The Library of Alexandria. Centre of learning in the ancient world* , edited by MacLeod, Roy, 79-91. London: I. B. Tauris.  
"Some of the most puzzling issues surrounding the Alexandria Library involve the source and content of the Library's holdings of Aristotle's works. The history of these works bears a close and intriguing relationship to the history of the library. The argument of this paper is that there are two sources for the transmission of Aristotle's work from the ancient to modern world. The first - what we may call the traditional view - holds that Aristotle's corpus was inherited entirely by Theophrastus, and subsequently buried, sold, and edited in Rome. Thence, in Roman times, copies made their way to the library. The second, the more controversial, but possibly more interesting view, argues that there is a ,collection of Aristotle's works which was derived from the works prepared at Mieza for the education of Alexander; and that these were either given by Alexander to Alexandria, or were subsequently stolen for the library by Ptolemy Soter. These two, parallel accounts, present us with Aristotle's thought at two different stages in its chronological development. One phase we can describe as the 'educational stage', dealing with works intended for the education of Alexander, and embracing Aristotle's four so-called 'non-scientific' works on poetry, ethics, politics and rhetoric; the other can be described in terms of Aristotle's larger philosophical corpus." (p. 79)

26. Tarán, Leonardo. 1981. "Aristotelianism in the First Century B.C." *Gnomon* no. 53:721-750.  
 Review-article of Paul Moraux, *Der Aristotelismus bei den Griechen, Von Andronikos bis Alexander von Aphrodisias* . Vol. I: *Die Renaissance des Aristotelismus im I. Jh.v. Chr.* (1973).  
 Reprinted in: L. Tarán, *Collected papers (1962-1999)*, Leiden: Brill, 2001 pp. 479-524; on the Aristotelian Corpus see in particular pp. 481-511.  
 "This is the first volume of a work which will comprise three.  
 In that work Moraux proposes to study the history of the Aristotelian tradition from Andronicus of Rhodes (first cent. B.C.) to Alexander of Aphrodisias (latter part of the second cent. A.D.). The book under review covers the first cent. B.C. It contains five parts: The first is devoted to the fate of Aristotle's scholarly treatises up to and including Andronicus' edition and catalogue. The second deals with the earliest Aristotelian commentators, Andronicus himself the Peripatetic Boethus of Sidon, and Ariston of Alexandria.  
 The third is concerned with Xenarchus of Seleuceia, a Peripatetic who criticized some of Aristotle's central doctrines.  
 The fourth discusses Staseas of Naples and Cratippus of Pergamum, two authors M. characterizes as offshoots of Hellenistic Aristotelianism. The fifth and final part is devoted to complete expositions and summaries of Aristotelian and/or Peripatetic philosophy. The two authors discussed are Arius Didymus and Nicolaus of Damascus.  
 The main purpose of M.'s work is to investigate that part of Aristotelian tradition whose main concern was the study and interpretation of Aristotle's works and doctrines especially of his scholarly treatises. Therefore his decision to include both authors who perhaps cannot be regarded as "orthodox" peripatetics, e.g. Xenarchus, and Stoics such as Arius Didymus seems to be justified." (p. 479 of the reprint (...))  
 "The three chapters making up the first part of the book (1. Das Schicksal der Bibliothek des Aristoteles"; 2. Tyrannion von Amisoss"; 3. "Andronikos von Rhodos") are devoted to the fate of Aristotle's scholarly treatises after his death up to the time of Andronicus' edition and catalogue. As M. himself indicates, the subject requires that three investigations be undertaken: (i) A critical assessment and evaluation of the ancient notices and anecdotes concerning the fate of Aristotle's scholarly treatises during the period in question; (ii). A study of the ancient lists of Aristotle's writings, of their origins and contents; (iii) An analysis of the philosophical and scientific literature of the first two hundred and fifty years after Aristotle's death in order to determine whether or not there is evidence of direct acquaintance with Aristotle's scholarly treatises on the part of Hellenistic philosophers. One must therefore regret that the author decided to limit his discussion to the first topic only. It is of course well known that M. himself has published an important monograph on the ancient lists of Aristotle's writings.(4) But the results of that work are scarcely used at all in the book under review. Doubtless, however, a systematic exploitation of the catalogues of Aristotle's works in Diogenes Laertius and in the so-called Vita Hesychii (M. himself and others have shown they go back to the early part of the Hellenistic age) combined with an analysis of later quotations, paraphrases from, and references to, Aristotle's treatises and doctrines would have yielded important results." (pp. 481-482)  
 (4) Cfr. P. Moraux, *Les listes anciennes des ouvrages d'Aristote* , (Louvain, 1951)
27. Tarán, Leonardo, and Gutas, Dimitri, eds. 2012. *Aristotle Poetics. Editio Maior of the Greek Text with Historical Introductions and Philological Commentaries* . Leiden: Brill.  
 See the *Introduction* by Leonard Tarán: Chapter One, *History of the Text of the Poetics* : 1. *The Poetics and Its Place among Aristotle's Works. The Availability of Aristotle's Scholarly Treatises during His Lifetime and those of Theophrastus and Eudemus* , pp. 11-25; 2. *From the Deaths of Theophrastus and Eudemus until the*

*End of the First Century CE*, pp. 25-31; 3. *From the Second Century CE to the Poetics' Archetype* pp. 32-35.

"The extant evidence to determine what kinds of works Aristotle wrote is: 1) References and cross-references found in Aristotle's scholarly treatises; 2) Ancient lists of his writings; 3) Fragmentary remains of his lost works; 4) References by later authors to the kind of works Aristotle was supposed to have written.

Discussion of the last two topics need not concern us here.

Let us begin with the three ancient lists of Aristotle's writings: that in Diogenes Laertius V, 21–27, which is part of his life of Aristotle; the catalogue extant in the *Vita Hesychii*; and the list extant in the life of Aristotle by a certain Ptolemy, most probably a Neoplatonist, whose biography exists in Arabic translation." (p. 14, a note omitted)

(...)

"These three lists present to the modern interpreter difficult problems which more often than not cannot be solved with reasonable certainty.

The earliest list is preserved by Diogenes Laertius. It has been claimed that it goes back to Ariston of Ceos (Moraux), who succeeded Lyco, ca. 225 bce, as head of the Peripatos, or to Hermippus of Smyrna, called "the Callimachean" (so Düring, and many other scholars before and after him). Though we need not decide this issue here, I believe the latter opinion to be right. Therefore, the likelihood is that the list in Diogenes Laertius reproduces the record of some library; in any case, it was most probably drawn up during the third century bce. There is evidence that Diogenes himself had access to Aristotle's scholarly treatises in an edition different from the one which the list exhibits. In Diogenes' list we find no evidence of the later arrangement of the Aristotelian corpus generally ascribed to Andronicus of Rhodes (first century bce); for example, there is in it no separate work called "Metaphysics," though we do recognize a few individual treatises, some of which were later rearranged by Andronicus or someone else. In short, whereas Diogenes is to be dated in all probability to the third century ce, the list of Aristotle's writings he has preserved goes back to the third century bce." (p. 15, notes omitted)

28. Verdenius, Willen Jacob. 1985. "The nature of Aristotle's scholarly writings." In *Aristoteles. Werk und Wirkung: Paul Moraux Gewidmet. Erster Band: Aristoteles und seine Schule*, edited by Wiesner, Jürgen, 12-21. Berlin: de Gruyter.

"It is commonly held that Aristotle's scholarly writings were not meant for publication but served the internal purposes of his school. (p. 12)

(...)

"It is true that the writings sometimes show a way of expression which is remarkably full and even circumstantial. On the other hand, many passages of crucial importance are so condensed and elliptical that students who had missed the lectures would hardly have understood the notes. In addition Aristotle's accuracy leaves much to be desired: his writings are full of contradictions and obscurities. We cannot but conclude that during his lectures Aristotle did not simply read his text but added a considerable amount of oral expansion and explanation. It may further be assumed that he continually rewrote and amplified his notes, but the unity of style is so manifest that a multiple authorship is out of the question. The editors of his writings may have modified the arrangement of the notes, but they seem to have been scrupulous in preserving the master's own words. There are interpolations and alterations, but these have an incidental character and are comparatively easy to detect. The unity of style also shows that the text is not based on notes taken by students. Besides, they were hardly able to take notes, for Aristotle seems to have been walking up and down when he lectured to his students.

There remains a problem to which not much attention has been paid, viz. the coexistence of a literary and a non-literary style in Aristotle's writings." (p. 14-15, notes omitted)