

On the other hand, as I followed Woolf through the dialogue, many times I wrote “good” opposite analyses of particular passages, e.g. that: tensions between Socrates’ story about the soul-body doctrine of the Thracian doctor and his offers to apply it to Charmides’ headache are resolved if Socrates cares about the well-being of soul over body (98-100); Charmides’ first definition of temperance as “doing everything ... in an orderly and quiet way,” despite its limitations, does appear to picture temperance as “capable of suffusing a whole life” (232); if knowledge of knowledge is “directed at internal relations between propositions,” we might be able to flesh out the scaled-back benefit Socrates envisions for it in 172b-c (204); if our self consists in what we think, by testing propositions we contribute to realising ourselves (223). Woolf lays bare many discontinuities in Socrates’ narrative. The reader comes away with much over which to ruminate about this challenging dialogue.

Woolf writes with an engaging style. The book is well produced, and I noticed only one typo. The extensive and current bibliography, mostly of works in English, is followed by an index of ancient passages and a short, general index of topics and names ancient and modern. I recommend Woolf’s reading especially to those interested in the relationships that Plato represents between Socrates and interlocutors, in Socrates’ attitudes toward those individuals, and in Plato’s strategies for pushing us to deeper critical responses.<sup>4</sup>

DAVID J. MURPHY  
New York  
david.murphy20@verizon.net

OLIVER PRIMAVESI, CHRISTOF RAPP, BENJAMIN MORISON, *Aristotle: De Motu Animalium. Text and translation*, Oxford-New York: Oxford University Press, 2023, 256 pp., ISBN 978-0-19-887446-1.

The book under review comes at the end of a long and truly remarkable scholarly journey punctuated by the dissemination of several outstanding research products and involving, at every stage of the process, serious and unselfish teamwork. Let me recall, briefly, the main lines of this journey. Everything started with the discovery of a small group of recent manuscripts that preserve a pure, that is uncontaminated, version of the Greek text of the *De motu animalium* (hereafter *De motu*). The discovery was made by the late Pieter De Leemans and made available to the public in his edition of the Latin translation of Aristotle’s *De motu*

<sup>4</sup> I am grateful to Chris Raymond for comments on an earlier draft of this review.

produced by William of Moerbeke.<sup>1</sup> De Leemans's main concern at the time was the Latin text of Aristotle's *De motu*, so he did not pursue the implications of his discovery for the establishment of the Greek text. The potentially transformative value of his discovery was understood by Oliver Primavesi, who along with his research team established that we are dealing with a second, independent branch of the manuscript tradition. Primavesi and his team named this branch 'family  $\beta$ '. Besides being uncontaminated, the manuscripts that belong to this family were not used by any of the previous editors of the Greek text of Aristotle's *De motu*, from Imanuel Bekker (in his edition of Aristotle's works published in 1831) to Martha Nussbaum.<sup>2</sup> They all (no one excluded) only availed themselves of manuscripts belonging to what is now labeled 'family  $\alpha$ '.<sup>3</sup>

Since the variant readings transmitted by these two families have equal stemmatic value, it became clear very early on that most decisions on which variant to print could not be taken on purely philological grounds. In dealing with a philosophical text such as Aristotle's *De motu*, even the expert philologist needs help from historians of philosophy. In this particular case, help came in two ways. First, Oliver Primavesi teamed up with Klaus Corcilius, who at the time was still teaching at UC Berkeley. Their collaboration resulted in a new critical edition of the text accompanied by German translation, philological and philosophical introduction plus running commentary.<sup>4</sup> This volume is not superseded by the one under review. On the contrary, it contains the most in-depth and most useful philosophical commentary in any modern language on the text of Aristotle's *De motu*. Primavesi was able to find additional expert feedback under way: a version of his Greek text was presented at the 19<sup>th</sup> Symposium Aristotelicum, which took place in Munich in 2011. Among the participants at the Symposium were a few noted specialists of Aristotle's philosophical thought (Pierre-Marie Morel, the author of the most recent translation of the *De motu* and the *Parva Naturalia* into French, and the late John Cooper, among others). This Symposium Aristotelicum was also the occasion for a collective, in-depth look at the historical

<sup>1</sup> P. De Leemans, *Aristoteles, De progressu animalium, De motu animalium: Translatio. Guillelmi de Morbeka, Aristoteles Latinus XVII 2.II-III*, Turnhout 2011

<sup>2</sup> M. Craven Nussbaum, *Aristotle's De motu animalium: Text with Translation, Commentary and Interpretative Essays*, Princeton 1978, 1985<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>3</sup> While no pure  $\beta$ -manuscript was used by any of the modern editors of Aristotle's *De motu*, some of the distinctive  $\beta$ -readings were known, since they had been adopted by contamination by the scribe of *Vaticanus gr*: 1339 (P) and by William of Moerbeke. It is the presence of these apparently extra-archetypal readings in the otherwise insignificant manuscript P, as already documented by Bekker (I. Bekker, *Aristoteles graece*, 2 volumes, Academia Regia Borussica, Berlin 1831), that was the driving force behind the gradual discovery of hyparchetype  $\beta$ .

<sup>4</sup> Oliver Primavesi, Klaus Corcilius, *Aristoteles. Über die Bewegung der Lebewesen / De motu animalium*, Philologische Einführung, neuer griechischer Text von O.P., philosophische Einführung, Übersetzung und Kommentar von K.C., Hamburg 2018 [Durchgesehene und korrigierte Lizenzausgabe der Wissenschaftlichen Buchgesellschaft, Darmstadt 2019].

and philosophical implications of the new Greek text. The proceedings of the Symposium were published by Christof Rapp and Oliver Primavesi.<sup>5</sup>

The book under review is a special reprint of the following components of the Symposium volume: the philosophical introduction by Christof Rapp, the philological introduction plus Greek text by Oliver Primavesi, and the facing English translation based on the Greek text by Benjamin Morison. The three co-authors have tried to make the volume more user-friendly by adding a detailed table of contents which can serve as a useful guide for the perusal of the philosophical and philological introductions. The Greek text printed in this volume differs from the one offered in the Symposium Aristotelicum volume in two cases. Primavesi explains why he changed his mind in those cases in the Foreword (page viii). It is worth stressing that this volume is not the final product of this endeavor, let alone the end of this scholarly journey. An *editio maior* of Aristotle's *De motu* is announced at pages 70 (footnote 26), page 90 (footnote 167), and 126 (footnote 262). This edition will document all the readings as well as the stemmatic position of all the *codices descripti*. In this way it will provide the *apparatus lectionum omnium* with all the relevant materials for a full *Überlieferungsgeschichte*.

One thing that should not be left unmentioned in this attempt to highlight the transformative value of this new edition is that the work done on the manuscript tradition of Aristotle's *De motu* has prepared the way for a radical reassessment of the Greek text of the following writings: *De sensu*, *De memoria*, *De somno*, *De insomnis*, and *De divinatione per somnum*. It has become customary to refer to this corpus of writings with the acronym *PNI*.<sup>6</sup> As Primavesi makes it clear at the outset of his introduction, our *De motu* is part and parcel of this corpus of writings, not only in the mind of Aristotle but also for its textual tradition. We have, therefore, every reason to expect the stemma of Aristotle's *De motu* to be confirmed by the stemma of *PNI*. Here let me only say, in the interest of space, that the most recent research on this front has put beyond any reasonable doubt the existence of a  $\beta$ -text for the whole of *PNI*.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>5</sup> C. Rapp, O. Primavesi, *Aristotle's De motu animalium*, Proceedings of the Symposium Aristotelicum, Oxford 2020.

<sup>6</sup> To the best of my knowledge, the first to employ the notations *PNI* and *PN2* to distinguish the two groups of texts that jointly forms our *Parva naturalia* was Marwan Rashed (in M. Rashed, "Agrégat de parties ou *vinculum substantiale*? Sur une hésitation conceptuelle et textuelle du corpus aristotélicien", in A. Laks, M. Rashed, eds., *Aristote et le mouvement des animaux. Dix études sur le De motu animalium*, Villeneuve d'Ascq 2004).

<sup>7</sup> In addition to Appendix IV in the volume under review, which is entirely devoted to the study of the stemmatic position of *Berolinensis Phill.* (B<sup>o</sup>) for the text of *De insomniis*, the reader who wants to learn more on this point should look at the following research products: (1) Primavesi's new edition of the quotation of Empedocles's simile of the lantern as reported in Aristotle's *De sensu* 2 (= O. Primavesi, "Zitatfragment und Textkritik: Empedokles' Theorie der Augenfunktion und der Text des Laternengleichnisses", in A.K. Bleuler, O. Primavesi, eds., *Lachmanns Erbe: Editionsmethoden in klassischer Philologie und germanistischer Mediävistik*, Berlin-New York, 427-562); and (2) the PhD dissertation in two volumes on the text of the *Parva Naturalia* 1 by J. Winzenrieth (J.

I sketched out the scholarly context in which this special edition of Aristotle's *De motu* has to be placed for two main reasons. To begin with, this critical edition is the outcome of more than ten years of innovative, cutting-edge scholarly research. Moreover, it shows that real progress is possible in our discipline provided that we work as part of a competent team in which philological, historical, and indeed philosophical skills are joint together. Let me elaborate further on this second point. Many still think that we are barred from making real progress in the study of ancient philosophy because there is an insurmountable gap separating us from ancient texts. This is especially true for Plato and Aristotle whose works have been known, read, and commented upon for millennia. What can we possibly add to what has already been said on and around those works?

Let me try to answer this question with a focus on Aristotle. For a number of reasons, including the complicated reception of Aristotle's works in Hellenistic and post-Hellenistic times, we will never be able to close up the gap that separates us from his works. But we can reduce this gap as far as possible with the help of all the information in our possession. The edition produced by Primavesi has achieved this goal. In the case of Aristotle's *De motu*, the earliest accessible state of the text is represented by Alexander of Aphrodisias and his paraphrasis and verbal quotations of the text toward the end of his own *De anima*. Here Alexander violates the strict division of labor that Aristotle envisioned, and indeed enforced, between study of the soul and study of what he regarded as being common to soul and body. We do not need to discuss why Alexander chose to violate this division of labor. What matters here is that by so doing he affords us glimpses of the state of the Greek text at a relatively early stage (beginning of the third century AD). To be sure, we are still more than 500 years removed from Aristotle, with no way to close the gap any further. But this does not take anything away from what is achieved by Primavesi in his critical edition of Aristotle's *De motu*. For the first time in the history of scholarship, we have a text that is based on a full collation of the forty-seven extant Greek manuscripts that constitute our direct tradition for the text of Aristotle's *De motu*. The additional information provided by the hitherto unknown family **β** allowed Primavesi to print a Greek text that differs from the one established by Martha Nussbaum in 120 cases. This is a staggering number especially if one keeps in mind that Aristotle's *De motu* is a rather short text (six Bekker pages, from 698<sup>b1</sup> to 704<sup>b3</sup>).<sup>8</sup>

Primavesi has provided his edition with two critical apparatuses. In addition to an *apparatus plenior* placed at the end of the Greek text, where all the significant readings of all the independent manuscripts, Primavesi has printed an abridged and simplified apparatus at the foot of each page. This second apparatus only registers where the two hyparchetypes **α** and **β** diverge from one another. This is

---

Winzenrieth, *Les Parva naturalia d'Aristotele. Édition et interprétation*, PhD Dissertation Sorbonne Université Paris 2023, 2 vols, defended in July 2023).

<sup>8</sup> All divergences are conveniently registered in an *ad hoc* appendix to the Greek text (Appendix III: 142-6).

a most welcome innovation. As Primavesi explains in the Forward to the volume, (1) the variant readings transmitted by  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  have stemmatic equal weight, and (2) the users of the Greek text are unlikely to agree in every case with the editor on their respective merits. This abridged and simplified apparatus lets them free to decide for themselves what text to use in all cases of  $\alpha/\beta$  divergence. Readers do not have to be trained philologists to be able to use this apparatus. But if they are, they will be also able to appreciate the unabridged information for the two branches of the direct tradition provided in the *apparatus plenior*. Primavesi relied on this information to draw his *stemma codicum*, which is printed on page 133.

What Primavesi has accomplished has a significance that goes beyond the narrow boundaries of scholarship on and around Aristotle. His edition illustrates, in a vivid and remarkable way, the truth conveyed by the dictum: *recentiores, non deteriores* (“later [witnesses], but not inferior [ones]”). Quite tellingly, Primavesi has chosen this very dictum as the epigraph for his philological introduction. This dictum is forever associated with Giorgio Pasquali, the great Italian classical scholar, who used to stress that the value of a witness does not depend on its age. A young manuscript may be a direct copy of an old and very good witness. While we may have lost the latter, we still have access to its valuable readings thanks to the young manuscript. This is exactly what happened in our case. The manuscripts that are crucial for the newly discovered branch of the tradition (family  $\beta$ ) are all late (that is, fourteenth- or even fifteenth-century) but very good copies of an old manuscript that goes back to late antiquity. They are *Berlin Phill.* 1507/I (= B<sup>e</sup>) and *Erlangen Univ. Bibl.* A 4 (= E<sup>r</sup>). Their close relationship is explained by positing that an early, perhaps ninth-century, manuscript produced by transliteration. This lost manuscript was copied twice. While B<sup>e</sup> is a late uncorrected copy of this manuscript, E<sup>r</sup> depends on another carefully corrected copy of this manuscript which was also used by William of Moerbeke for his revisions of the Latin translation of Aristotle’s *De motu*.

It is time to turn to the philosophical introduction by Christoph Rapp. There are at least two ways to write an introduction. Some writers like to give precise instructions on how to navigate a difficult text, thereby imposing a strong structure on the text and keeping their readers on a very short leash. Others, by contrast, design their introduction so as to leave the reader open to explore a text, no matter how difficult it is. Christof Rapp belongs to the second group of writers. That does not mean that his introduction is thin, or that it lacks philosophical ambition. Quite the opposite. Scholars have not been able to see how the first part (*De motu* 1-5) and the second (*De motu* 6-11) form a coherent unity. In the first part of his introduction, Rapp provides an expert and lucid analysis of the overall argument of Aristotle’s *De motu*. He argues for its integrity and thematic unity and shows that the second part of the treatise can be seen as a natural continuation of the first. He also defends the authenticity of the work, which has been doubted by a few scholars (especially in the nineteenth century). By my lights, however, the most valuable contribution of this introduction consists in all the careful work done to

remove a few incorrect assumptions that have historically hampered our ability to appreciate the contents of Aristotle's *De motu*.

Let me illustrate this point with the help of one example. Take the putative incompatibility of cardiocentrism and psychological hylomorphism. By 'psychological hylomorphism' I mean the thesis that the soul is the form of the organic body. The theoretical framework for this view is found in Aristotle's *De anima* II 1. The argument of Aristotle's *De motu* ends up with the view that the soul is located at the center of the living body. In the most developed (most perfect) animals, which are blooded animals, this center is the heart. In the less developed (less perfect) animals, which are all bloodless, this is to be identified with something that plays an analogous function. We do not need to elaborate further on this Aristotelian doctrine, which gives rise to a few idiosyncratic results. What matters is that the view defended in Aristotle's *De motu* is also promoted in the short essays that are traditionally known as *Parva Naturalia*. Scholars have often felt that cardiocentrism, as defended in Aristotle's *De motu* and *Parva Naturalia*, and psychological hylomorphism, as embraced in his *De anima*, belong to different, indeed incompatible, ways to conceive the relation between soul and body. It has been difficult for scholars to see how it is possible for Aristotle to claim that the soul is the form of the whole organic body and at the same time to claim that the soul is located in a specific bodily part. As a result, they have dealt with what they perceived as a tension between cardiocentrism and psychological hylomorphism mostly by means of a developmental approach. Very briefly: while Aristotle would have endorsed cardiocentrism at an early stage of his intellectual development, he would have later settled for psychological hylomorphism (Nuyens 1948, endorsed with minor modifications in Ross 1955, 1-18 [his introduction to Aristotle's *Parva Naturalia*] and Ross 1961 [his *editio maior* of Aristotle's *De anima*]).<sup>9</sup> Rapp shows, convincingly and expertly, that cardiocentrism is compatible with the main tenets of psychological hylomorphism. He highlights various strategies that can be adopted to downplay, or even to outright dismiss, the perceived tensions. Without telling his reader how to read Aristotle's *De motu*, let alone Aristotle's *De anima*, Rapp provides the exegetical resources that allows us to integrate cardiocentrism and psychological hylomorphism into a coherent philosophical position.

Other topics that are discussed by Rapp in his introduction include the use Aristotle makes of the so-called practical syllogism in *De motu* 7, the role that both *phantasia* and desire play in Aristotle's explanation of animal motion, and his treatment of animal motion as a case of self-motion. All in all, Rapp has been able to produce a comprehensive and well-argued overview of the contents of Aristotle's *De motu* combined with an accurate appraisal of the scholarly

<sup>9</sup> D.W. Ross, *Aristotle's Parva naturalia*, Oxford 1955; F.J.C.J. Nuyens, *L'évolution de la psychologie d'Aristote*, Éditions de l'Institut supérieur de philosophie, UC Louvain 1948; D.W. Ross, *Aristotle's De anima*, Oxford 1961.

debates on and around them. In my view, this is exactly what is expected from an introduction which does not want to impose itself on its reader.

Let us move on to the final component of this special edition of Aristotle's *De motu*: the English translation of the Greek text by Benjamin Morison. Any translator of Aristotle's *De motu* has to confront Aristotle's difficult, and at times convoluted, prose style. How does Morison get by in his translation of the Greek text? I will answer this question by concentrating on the first two sentences of the treatise. There, Aristotle is trying to accomplish a few things at once: he not only announces the main topic of the treatise but also gives us an idea of how the investigation is to be conducted. More directly, it is not sufficient to explain swimming, flying, walking, and the like. Apparently, this has already been done elsewhere.<sup>10</sup> At this point, one has to supply an account of animal motion that maps on all animal motion. Two salient features of this account are announced. First, this is a causal account that will explain animal motion by pointing to a common cause. Second, this account will say in general what the common cause is. At the very least, we can safely say that these features are meant to demarcate the investigation to be launched and explain how it contributes to the overall study of animal motion. Here is the Greek text followed by Morison's translation:

Περὶ δὲ τῶν ζώων κινήσεως, ὅσα μὲν αὐτῶν περὶ ἕκαστον ὑπάρχει γένος—καὶ τίνες διαφοραὶ καὶ τίνες αἰτίαι τῶν καθ' ἕκαστον συμβεβηκότων αὐτοῖς—ἐπέσκεπται περὶ ἁπάντων ἐν ἑτέροις. ὅλως δὲ περὶ τῆς κοινῆς αἰτίας τοῦ κινεῖσθαι κίνησιν ὅποιαν οὖν—τὰ μὲν γὰρ πτήσει κινεῖται τὰ δὲ νεύσει τὰ δὲ πορεία<sup>11</sup> τῶν ζώων, τὰ δὲ κατ' ἄλλους τρόπους τοιούτους—ἐπισκεπτέον νῦν. (*De motu* 698a1-7)

Concerning the movement of animals, those features which apply to each kind of them—what their differences are, and for what reasons they each have their particular features—have all been investigated elsewhere. What needs investigation now is, quite generally, the common cause of this moving, whatever type of movement it is, for some animals move by flying, some by swimming, some by walking and some in other such ways. (*De motu* 698a1-7)

A good translation must achieve the following results: (1) preserve, as much as possible, the word order; (2) recreate the impersonal style self-consciously adopted

<sup>10</sup> Most likely, Aristotle has in mind his investigation into animal locomotion which has come down to us under the Greek title Περὶ πορείας (rendered into Latin with the less-than-ideal title *De incessu animalium*)

<sup>11</sup> In his edition, Primavesi follows our most ancient manuscript, namely *Parisinus gr.* 1853 (E) in printing *iota adscriptum*.

by Aristotle at the outset of the treatise; and (3) capture the salient markers that are meant to give an idea of the kind of investigation that is announced. Morison has accomplished, elegantly and effectively, all the above *desiderata*. His translation of the two sentences of Aristotle's *De motu* turns out to be not only faithful to the Greek text but also very readable. This is emphatically no small achievement.

The volume under review is, as a whole, an outstanding piece of scholarship. The new Greek text, coupled with an English translation which is not only reliable but also readable, and supplemented by two masterful introductions, one philosophical and the other philological, is a more than fitting replacement for what was accomplished by Martha Nussbaum in her edition of Aristotle's *De motu* (Nussbaum 1978 [1985<sup>2</sup>]). It is a must-have for all libraries.

ANDREA FALCON  
Concordia University (Canada)  
Università degli Studi di Milano  
andrea.falcon@unimi.it

SANDRA ZAJONZ, *Demosthenes, Gegen Aristokrates. Einleitung, Text, Übersetzung und Kommentar*, Texte und Kommentare 71, Berlin-Boston: De Gruyter, 2022, viii+688 pp., €139.95, ISBN 978-3-11-079267-6.

Die klassische Philologin Sandra Zajonz ist bereits seit langem als Expertin zur griechischen (bzw. attischen) Rhetorik insbesondere des 4. Jh. v. Chr. bekannt.<sup>1</sup> Nun legt sie eine umfangreiche deutschsprachige Monographie (mit Einleitung, griechischem Text, deutscher Übersetzung und Kommentar) zu Demosthenes' in der älteren Forschung zuweilen unterschätzten Rede 23 *Gegen Aristokrates* vor.<sup>2</sup> Im Vergleich zu anderen und bekannteren demosthenischen Gerichtsreden wurde nicht selten an dieser Rede die "rabulistische 'Beweisführung'" und eine "absichtsvolle Obskürität" (V) mancher Passagen kritisiert. Für diese kann jedoch die Kommentatorin aus der rhetorischen Strategie des Demosthenes, der als Logograph diese Rede für seinen Mandanten Euthykles schrieb (vgl. die

<sup>1</sup> Siehe neben verschiedenen Artikeln und Rezensionen und vor allem ihre gründliche Monographie *Isokrates, Enkomion auf Helena. Ein Kommentar*, Hypomnemata 139, Göttingen 2002.

<sup>2</sup> Zu älteren Ausgaben, Kommentaren und Übersetzungen siehe Zajonz 635-6. Für philologische Erklärungen behalten erstaunlicherweise, wie auch Zajonz verdeutlicht, die in manch anderer Hinsicht inzwischen veralteten Kommentarnotizen aus dem 19. Jh. von Weber, Westermann, Schaefer, Weil oder Rosenberg weiterhin ihren Wert. Aus dem 20. Jh. sei neben den knappen Lesehilfen von Leone Volpis, *Demostene, L'orazione contro Aristocrate, introduzione, traduzione e note*, Mailand 1940, und Louis Gernet, Jean Humbert, *Démosthène, Plaidoyers politiques. II. Contre Midias, Contre Aristocrate*, CUF, Paris 1959 (repr. 2003) besonders auf die wertvollen 'notes' in Edward M. Harris, *Demosthenes, Speeches 23-26. Translated with introduction and notes*, Austin 2018, verwiesen.