

Chapter 1 : Averroes's Commentaries on Aristotle

Commentaries on Aristotle refers to the great mass of literature produced, especially in the ancient and medieval world, to explain and clarify the works of Aristotle.

Commentaries on Aristotle Save Commentaries on Aristotle refers to the great mass of literature produced, especially in the ancient and medieval world, to explain and clarify the works of Aristotle. The pupils of Aristotle were the first to comment on his writings, a tradition which was continued by the Peripatetic school throughout the Hellenistic period and the Roman era. The Neoplatonists of the late Roman empire wrote many commentaries on Aristotle, attempting to incorporate him into their philosophy. Although Ancient Greek commentaries are considered the most useful, commentaries continued to be written by the Christian scholars of the Byzantine Empire and by the many Islamic philosophers and Western scholastics who had inherited his texts. Greek commentators The first pupils of Aristotle commented on his writings, but often with a view to expand his work. Thus Theophrastus invented five moods of syllogism in the first figure, in addition to the four invented by Aristotle, and stated with additional accuracy the rules of hypothetical syllogisms. He also often differed with his master,[1] including in collecting much information concerning animals and natural events, which Aristotle had omitted. During the early Roman empire we find few celebrated names among the Peripatetic philosophers. Nicolaus of Damascus wrote several treatises on the philosophy of Aristotle; and Alexander of Aegae also wrote commentaries on Aristotle. On account of the number and value of his commentaries, he was called, by way of distinction, "The Commentator". Several of his works are still extant, among which is a treatise On Fate, wherein he supports the doctrine of divine providence. Themistius 4th century , who taught at Constantinople with great success, paraphrased several of the works of Aristotle, particularly the Posterior Analytics , the Physics , and the book On the Soul. In the 5th century, Ammonius Hermiae represented Plato and Aristotle in agreeing that god was the artificer of a beginningless universe. John of Damascus lived under the patronage of the Arabs, and was at first secretary to the Caliph , but afterwards withdrew to a monastery. They wrote commentaries on Aristotle, and developed still further the abstract logical element. Many of these commentaries are still extant. Al-Ghazali wrote compendiums of logic and metaphysics. Averroes was especially distinguished as a commentator of Aristotle. In the 12th century Anna Comnena organised a group of scholars which included the commentators Michael of Ephesus ,[3] and Eustratius of Nicaea who employed himself upon the dialectic and moral treatises, and whom she does not hesitate to elevate above the Stoics and Platonists for his talent in philosophical discussions. Theodore Metochites , who was famous in his time for his eloquence and his learning, has left a paraphrase of the books of Aristotle on Physics, On the Soul, On the Heavens , etc. Albertus Magnus , Thomas Aquinas , Duns Scotus , and William of Ockham , among many others, wrote important philosophical works in the form of Aristotelian commentaries. Authors Jacobus-Johannes Juff", Traditio, 26, Authors Johannes de Kanthi's Myngodus", Traditio, 27, Authors Narcissus's Richardus", Traditio, 28, Authors Robertus's Wilgelmus", Traditio, 29, Supplementary Authors ", Traditio, 30, Authors A-B", Studies in the Renaissance, 21, Authors C", Renaissance Quarterly, 28, Authors D-F", Renaissance Quarterly, 29, Authors G-K", Renaissance Quarterly, 30, Authors L-M", Renaissance Quarterly, 31, Authors N-Ph", Renaissance Quarterly, 32, Authors Pi-Sm", Renaissance Quarterly, 33, Authors So-Z", Renaissance Quarterly, 35, The articles are reprinted in the following volumes by Charles H. Subsida, 17 , Firenze: Sismel Edizioni del Galluzzo, Subsida, 18 , Firenze: Subsida, 15 , Firenze:

Chapter 2 : Commentaries on Aristotle - Wikipedia

This first volume of St. Thomas's Commentaries on Aristotle contains the commentaries on the On Interpretation and the Posterior Analytics. On Interpretation considers the relationship between language and logic, while the Posterior Analytics is Aristotle's famous treatise on logic.

Introduction The primary purpose of a commentary is to explain a text. Typically, the text is divided into lemmata. A lemma is what is quoted from a text in order to explain and interpret it. Some times the text is quoted in its entirety. Other times only its beginning is quoted. The lemma is always followed by an analysis of the text. Commentaries were not written exclusively on philosophical works. For example, the tradition of writing commentaries on the Hippocratic corpus started very early. Although most of this tradition is lost, the commentaries that Galen wrote on the Hippocratic corpus have come down to us. Galen was a doctor who lived and wrote in the second half of the 2nd century CE. Interestingly enough, his exegetical activity was not confined to Hippocrates. In all probability, these commentaries were not intended for publication but only for the use of a small group of friends and students. Here is what Galen says about his commentary on the Categories: Galen makes clear that he regards the commentator as a teacher, an expositor with a specific audience of students in mind. Moreover, as Galen presents the matter, the commentary was a teaching tool addressed to students with specific levels of knowledge. The students who were expected to read Galen on the Categories were not absolute beginners. They were students who either had previously benefited from the study of this treatise with a teacher or had become acquainted with the Categories through some more elementary commentaries. Galen refers to the commentaries written by Adrastus and Aspasius. By so doing, he gives us an idea of the profusion of commentaries that were written on the Categories. These commentaries were written one after the other as part of an already consolidated exegetical practice. Unfortunately, most of these commentaries have not reached us. We no longer have the commentaries that Adrastus and Aspasius wrote on the Categories, nor do we have the commentary that Galen wrote on the same treatise. This frustrating at least for us fact is ultimately due to the very nature of this literary production. Each generation of commentators read and interpreted Aristotle in the light of their own theoretical preoccupations and proclivities, only to be replaced by the next generation of commentators. One remarkable exception is Alexander of Aphrodisias, a younger contemporary of Galen. His commentaries survive because they were adopted as exemplary models by later commentators. But not all of them have come down to us. This commentary is not extant. It suffered the same fate as those written by Adrastus, Aspasius, Galen, and others. It survives only in fragmentary form, incorporated in the commentaries that a later generation of interpreters wrote on the Categories.

The Pre-History of the Commentary Tradition: The Fortune of the Categories in the 1st century BCE The critical engagement with Aristotle that began toward the end of the Hellenistic age and continued throughout the centuries that followed was directed to works such as the Categories, which had been largely ignored in the preceding centuries. Although the information in our possession is slim, it strongly suggests that an intense editorial activity took place in the 1st century BCE. According to the tradition, these editorial labors were surpassed by that of Andronicus of Rhodes, who is credited with the production of the first reliable edition of Aristotle; an edition that exercised an enormous influence on the post-Hellenistic return to Aristotle. More information on this putative edition is available in Andronicus of Rhodes, a supplementary document. In reality, Andronicus could not be entirely responsible for the revival of interest in the philosophy of Aristotle. This revival was, at least in part, independent of him. Moreover, a close study of the fortune that the Categories enjoyed in this context suggests that the return to Aristotle took different forms and involved a great variety of exegetical positions not necessarily related to one another. Finally, the return to Aristotle did not necessarily involve either the acceptance of the views stated by Aristotle or codification in the form of the commentary. It is likely that, of these five philosophers, only Boethus of Sidon wrote a commentary on the Categories. We cannot exclude that Simplicius projected his own literary conventions onto Andronicus and Boethus, and that by his own standards Boethus and Andronicus were engaged in two different exegetical exercises. On the other hand, there is no reason to think that Andronicus wrote in the style that will later be

codified as paraphrase. Themistius was the champion of this particular form of exegesis in antiquity. Interestingly enough, Themistius does not give us names of predecessors. His silence is open to different interpretations: Fortunately, it is not essential for us to establish whether or not Andronicus was the first paraphraser of Aristotle. What matters is that his style of exegesis was perceived as different from that of Boethus. Unlike Andronicus, Boethus was engaged in an in-depth examination of whole book of the Categories in the form of a word-by-word commentary. Boethus was highly regarded in antiquity. Except for a few testimonies, his commentary has not survived. The Stoics attacked the Categories on the assumption that this treatise is on language and about linguistic expressions. They argued that as a treatise on language and about linguistic expressions the Categories was incomplete. Boethus resisted this reading of the Categories and anticipated a line of interpretation that was then followed, among others, by Porphyry. We know very little about Athenodorus. If he is the same person as Athenodorus of Tarsus, who was a friend and adviser of the Emperor Augustus and was appointed by him as governor of Taurus, then Athenodorus was active in the second half of the 1st century BCE. There is no compelling reason to think that his critique of the Categories was written in the form of a commentary. Athenodorus could have been content with offering a series of objections and difficulties, just as the Platonist Lucius and Nicostratus would do more than a hundred years later Simplicius, *In Cat* 1. The temptation to credit all the ancient interpreters of the Categories with a commentary must be resisted also in the case of Eudorus of Alexandria. It is generally assumed that Eudorus flourished in the middle of the first century BCE. Simplicius is not content to enumerate Eudorus among the ancient interpreters of the Categories. He preserves nine testimonies in which Eudorus took issue with Aristotle. But no inference about the form of his literary production is possible. The only safe inference is that the study of the Categories was not confined to the school of Aristotle. In fact, Eudorus was not a Peripatetic philosopher. The last name on list of the ancient interpreters of the Categories is that of Ariston of Alexandria. Cicero depicts Ariston as a pupil of Antiochus. A list of his students is also given. What immediately follows is extremely interesting: We are not told the reasons for their defection to Peripatetic philosophy. In the case of Ariston it is also difficult to see what this defection really involved. From the information in our possession we can only say that he wrote about the Categories. But there is no evidence that Ariston wrote in the form of a commentary. His case is significantly different from that of Andronicus and Boethus. Andronicus and Boethus made an attempt to organise, clarify, and indeed defend, the philosophy of Aristotle. This does not seem to apply to Ariston. His name is never related to those of Andronicus and Boethus. In addition, there is no evidence that Ariston was aware of the existence of Andronicus and Boethus, or that he was influenced by their works. That the edition of Andronicus played a role in the conversion of Ariston to the philosophy of Aristotle is merely a conjecture. The exegetical activity on the works of Aristotle continued to flourish in the 1st and 2nd century CE. New layers of interpretation were added in these two centuries. They greatly contributed to the formation of the exegetical tradition that found its culmination in the commentaries of Alexander of Aphrodisias. Since he is said to have been teacher of the Emperor Nero, his exegetical activity can be dated in the first half of the 1st century CE. Nothing can be said about the form of his literary production. This is also the case of two other interpreters of the Categories: Sotion and Achaius Simplicius, *In Cat*. Although their exegetical activity is much more difficult to date, there is one line of argument that places it in the 1st century CE. The information at our disposal is frustratingly meagre, but it is hard to escape the conclusion that the Categories continued to be at the centre of the exegetical activity on the philosophy of Aristotle. The situation did not change in the first half of the 2nd century CE. From Galen we learn that Adrastus of Aphrodisias and Aspasius wrote elementary commentaries on the Categories. From the way Galen refers to these commentaries, they must have been easily available and routinely used to introduce students to the Categories. Adrastus and Aspasius established themselves as respected interpreters of Aristotle. We know that their commentaries were still used about one hundred years later by the great Plotinus Porphyry, *Life of Plotinus*. Aspasius did not confine his exegetical activity to the Categories. He wrote commentaries on the *De Interpretatione*, the *Physics*, and the *Metaphysics*. These commentaries were used and quoted by later generations of commentators. This commentary is the earliest surviving commentary on an Aristotelian text. One significant impact on the way the practice of philosophy developed toward the end of the 2nd century CE

was the intervention of the imperial power in matters of education. This intervention seems to go as far back as the Emperor Antoninus Pius, who is said to have established public chairs of rhetoric and philosophy in the provinces. From our ancient sources we are told that those chairs were in Platonic, Stoic, Peripatetic and Epicurean philosophy.

Chapter 3 : Line by Line Commentary on Aristotle's De Anima

These commentaries are being translated in the Ancient Commentators on Aristotle Project. The General Editor is Richard Sorabji. For an update on the volumes published or in press see the website: Ancient Commentators on Aristotle Project.

Opuscula Exposure to the works of Aristotle was intellectually stimulating for St. Not only did St. In these commentaries, which include the original texts of Aristotle in Greek, Latin, and English, the best of Greek and scholastic philosophy is presented. Oesterle and Fabian R. Physics Translator s Richard J. Blackwell and Richrad J. Edmund Thirlkel and Pierre H. In the Physics, Aristotle delves into what makes things what they are. In commenting on this fundamental text of Aristotelian philosophy, St. Larcher and Pierre H. On Heaven and Earth was influential in forming St. Finally, the work Meteorology treats of the material explanations of the physical world. By analyzing On the Soul, St. Metaphysics I Translator s John P. Rowan Source TextsMarietti edition Foundational in its consideration of being and the transcendentals, the Metaphysics of Aristotle is a dense and difficult work on its own. This volume contains the first half of St. Thomas begins by showing how previous philosophers did not explore being itself, while Aristotle does. The commentary concludes as St. Nicomachean Ethics Translator s C. Aristotle speaks of moderation, virtues and the need to pursue an intellectual life. Fortin and Peter D. Brill edition The final volume in our set of Commentaries on Aristotle includes the Tabula Libri Ethicorum and the commentary on Politics. The Tabula Libri Ethicorum is a table drawn up by St. In the incomplete commentary on Politics St. Subscribe to Blog via Email Enter your email address to subscribe to this blog and receive notifications of new posts by email.

Chapter 4 : Averroes - Wikipedia

Commentaries on Aristotle refers to the great mass of literature produced, especially in the ancient and medieval world, to explain and clarify the works of Aristotle. The first pupils of Aristotle were the first to comment on his writings, a tradition which was continued by the Peripatetic school throughout the Hellenistic period and the Roman era.

A work attributed to Apuleius, and bearing the same Greek title transliterated as the *De Interpretatione* ("Peri hermeneias") enjoyed a certain vogue among the earliest medieval logicians. For modern scholars, it is a useful source of Stoic logical theories; but its philosophical content is slight. By the time of Porphyry, however, a development had taken place in the status, rather than the doctrine, of Aristotelian logic, which would be of great importance for medieval philosophy. Aristotelian logic had been adopted by the Neoplatonists and given a definite place in their programme of teaching. Aristotle had rejected the notion of Platonic Ideas; and he had consequently treated genera and species in his logic purely as class-designations for individual things. The Neoplatonists assimilated this approach, which contradicted the very basis of their metaphysics, by limiting the application of Aristotelian logic to the world of concrete things. Stripped of its metaphysical relevance, the tendency was for logic to become more purely formal than it had been for Aristotle. However, the extra-logical aspects of the *Categories* and the *De interpretatione* were too intrinsic to these works to be ignored; and the result was the growth of a body of philosophical discussion and commentary within the Neoplatonic logical tradition, only vaguely related to Neoplatonic metaphysics, and sometimes seemingly antithetical to its principles. Porphyry himself did more than anyone to establish Aristotelian logic within the Platonic schools. The *Isagoge* is devoted to explaining five concepts which play an important part in the *Categories*: The language of philosophy in the Roman Empire was Greek. The few philosophers who wrote in Latin were of vital importance in transmitting the logical tradition to the Middle Ages, even -perhaps especially - where their activity was limited to translation and paraphrasing. From the circle of Themistius c. He searches for a word which will include that is, presumably, designate all things, and arrives But, a little later The suggestion here is that *ousia* refers, not to the individual thing as in the *Categories* although this definition is also given by the paraphraser , but to that which every individual has in common by virtue of being something at all. Marius Victorinus seems to have been a prolific translator of philosophical and logical works into Latin. But the only part of his logical work which reached the Middle Ages intact was a brief treatise *De diffinitione*, an aid to studying the *Topics*. In the *Confessions* iv. When he came to write his *De trinitate*, he included a discussion v. But he stated that *ousia* could be applied to God: A short treatise, *De dialectica*, was also attributed to Augustine in the Middle Ages; and most scholars now accept its authenticity. The work is remarkable for its linguistic approach to dialectic. Having separated words into single and combined I - as Aristotle distinguishes at the beginning of the *Categories* between things said with and without combination - Augustine devotes most of his energies to discussing single words, how they gain their meaning and how 26 The antique heritage ambiguity is possible. Dialectic includes, says Augustine iv , the discussion of the truth or falsity of sentences and conjunctions of sentences; but the treatise does not go on to consider this topic. John Marenbon -Early medieval philosophy It is scarcely imaginable that anything meriting the name of commentary was composed before BC, but by BC the literary commentary must have been around for some time, and the philosophical commentary appears. We have to wait almost half a millennium to find a fully preserved philosophical commentary. Indeed, the second- to third-century Aristotelian commentaries of Aspasius and Alexander of Aphrodisias are among the oldest commentaries on any text that we have got and among all preserved commentaries from Antiquity those on Aristotle or Plato are massively represented -- the two philosophers are in the heavyweight league together with the Bible and Hippocrates. The bulk of the preserved commentaries are from the fifth or the sixth century, with a special concentration of Aristotle commentaries in the sixth century. The sixth century, then, was to have a very strong influence on the medieval approach to philosophical texts, whether in the East, where people read Aristotle with Ammonius, Simplicius and Philoponus at their elbow; or in the West, where Boethius alone made an impact as strong as that made by his three Greek colleagues together in the East. But much more

important than those lectures were the compendia, the sort of books that since Antiquity have often carried the title of Introduction to Most of the extant ancient specimens, insofar as they are philosophical, are about logic. In principle, and sometimes in practice, such works can be independent of any particular authoritative text. Boethius used a work by Porphyry for his models. We cannot tell for certain how closely he followed his model, but at least the general structure is likely to have been the same in Porphyry. A brief compendium of logic may also be found in Martianus Capella and an ultra-brief one in Cassiodorus. The genre also survived in Byzantium, but only barely so -- only three reasonably complete ones are extant, dating from , ca. The typical Latin compendium or *summulae* is characterized by combining sections that summarize certain parts of the *Organon* with sections that deal with more recent parts of logic. This is not the case with the Byzantine compendia⁷. Most often people would read a compendium before they read the original texts. In that way the compendia could be very influential by preconditioning students for a certain way of reading the authoritative texts. The sources do not allow us to decide whether his work was some sort of essay on the *Timaeus* or more like a series of explanatory notes on the text. Christina Thomsen Thornqvist of the university of Gothenburg will discuss the title question in her forthcoming critical edition of the first version. University of Gothenburg *Caeteros vero quinque modos Theophrastus et Eudemus addiderunt, quibus Porphyrius, gravissimae vir auctoritatis, virus est consensisse* ". Sten Ebbesen - Late-ancient ancestors of medieval philosophical Commentaries. Ebbesen - Greek-Latin philosophical interaction. Collected essays of Sten Ebbesen. Volume 1 - Aldershot, Ashgate, , pp. We find these problems discussed in modern research ¹ , but they are also dealt with in medieval philosophy. To have a better understanding of the theories of the categories, we would like to point out that, in our view, ancient and medieval authors took for granted a parallelism between thought and reality. These things as conceived by human understanding are designated by a term. So human understanding involves a subjective element when the thing is conceived or named, but thanks to the parallelism, the thing conceived by man is also the thing in nature. Now different authors put emphasis on different things, i. The question need not be asked whether a kind of gap had to be overcome: The use of *e*. A term in its deictic function refers to things, though they need not factually exist, i. Signification of factual existence is a complementary function of the name. So the theory of the categories is fundamental for philosophy. One could even say that the choice of a particular theory of categories depends on what kind of a philosopher one is. What is the nature of the members of the categories? Are these members primarily terms which refer to something in reality? Or are they things so far as, and only so far as, these are captured in a linguistic expression or thought? When the nature of the members of the categories has been determined, the question arises for medieval philosophers how they are divided, i. Is their number ten, which is usually supposed to be held by Aristotle. Can this number be established by proof or deduction? Egbert Peter Bos and A. Yet, because it laid the foundation for many subsequent philosophical discussions in general, and for logic in particular, it was, during much of the Middle Ages, often the very first philosophical text students encountered. Even contemporary philosophers who are steeped in philosophy and who have studied the *Categories* in depth often find it difficult, albeit for different reasons. One difficulty, as the ancient commentators on the *Categories* recognized, is that Aristotle himself is ambiguous about the subject of the work. What exactly is he categorizing? For all of these reasons the *Categories* has historically acted like a magnet, attracting commentaries from Aristotelians, Platonists, and Stoics alike. Finally, still others, especially during the Late Middle Ages, use the *Categories* as a means to expound their own philosophical systems in the process of interpreting Aristotle. Though many of the ancient and medieval commentators, such as Porphyry, Boethius and Albert the Great, did write original treatises on philosophical issues, their commentaries are in themselves valuable contributions to philosophy, particularly those from the later Middle Ages. As Robert Andrews points out, medieval "*Categories* commentaries are the repository of centuries of analyses of the basic concepts of Western thought, all carefully organized and awaiting modern rediscovery. Of course, this number does not take into account the commentaries that are not extant, nor the ones written in Greek, Arabic, or Hebrew. Catholic University Press, , p. Categorization of items constituting the world is today called ontology; the medievals attempted to classify the world according to the ten categories of Aristotle. The modern accusation, that medieval philosophers were actually dealing with linguistic classification, was in fact

acknowledged by many medievals. While the medieval treatment of some categories and here I am thinking especially of relation was arcane, resulting from a particular interaction of theology and philosophy, other discussions, such as on the nature of number, involved speculative thought comparable to modern reflections on the subject. Medieval Categories commentaries are the repository of centuries of analyses of the basic concepts of Western thought, all carefully organized and awaiting modern rediscovery. The study of the Categories is uniquely able to take advantage of the continuity and traditionalism of the Middle Ages. Not only was the Categories the first Aristotelian work introduced to the Latin Middle Ages, but it was the only work of dialectic available for several centuries, in one form or another. During the beginnings of Latin scholasticism, when the study of philosophy faced a struggle for acceptance, Church Fathers such as Tertullian and Peter Damian denounced all pagan learning, including Aristotle. Against them it was argued that the study of dialectic and grammar is useful for the correct interpretation of Sacred Writings. The utilization of the Categories during the period of the seventh through tenth centuries escaped censure in special measure because it was available in two vehicles associated with St. Augustine. Furthermore, Augustine was mistakenly attributed the Themistian paraphrase *De decem praedicamentis*, placating those who feared the pagan Aristotle. This work was utilized by commentators during the time when no complete work of Aristotle was accessible, as informatively recounted by Marebon in *From the Circle of Alcuin to the School of Auxerre*. When the *logica nova* was introduced, the Categories was recognized as first in a ranked order of logical works; its subject matter, individual words, is requisite for the understanding of sentences in *De interpretatione*, syllogisms Prior analytic and science Posterior analytic. This order was later overturned by the terminist logicians, who proposed an analysis of language which treated sentences, rather than words, as fundamental. Pseudo-Augustini Paraphrasis Themistiana, ed. Minio-Paluello, Brill, Leiden A. Marebon, *From The Circle of Alcuin*, *Rivista di Storia della filosofia Medievale*

Chapter 5 : Commentators on Aristotle (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy)

Save. Commentaries on Aristotle refers to the great mass of literature produced, especially in the ancient and medieval world, to explain and clarify the works of Aristotle.

Thus Theophrastus invented five moods of syllogism in the first figure, in addition to the four invented by Aristotle, and stated with additional accuracy the rules of hypothetical syllogisms. He also often differed with his master, [1] including in collecting much information concerning animals and natural events, which Aristotle had omitted. During the early Roman empire we find few celebrated names among the Peripatetic philosophers. Nicolaus of Damascus wrote several treatises on the philosophy of Aristotle; and Alexander of Aegae also wrote commentaries on Aristotle. On account of the number and value of his commentaries, he was called, by way of distinction, "The Commentator". Several of his works are still extant, among which is a treatise On Fate, wherein he supports the doctrine of divine providence. Themistius 4th century, who taught at Constantinople with great success, paraphrased several of the works of Aristotle, particularly the Posterior Analytics, the Physics, and the book On the Soul. In the 5th century, Ammonius Hermiae represented Plato and Aristotle in agreeing that god was the artificer of a beginningless universe. John of Damascus lived under the patronage of the Arabs, and was at first secretary to the Caliph, but afterwards withdrew to a monastery. They wrote commentaries on Aristotle, and developed still further the abstract logical element. Many of these commentaries are still extant. Al-Ghazali wrote compendiums of logic and metaphysics. Averroes was especially distinguished as a commentator of Aristotle. In the 12th century Anna Comnena organised a group of scholars which included the commentators Michael of Ephesus, [3] and Eustratius of Nicaea who employed himself upon the dialectic and moral treatises, and whom she does not hesitate to elevate above the Stoics and Platonists for his talent in philosophical discussions. Theodore Metochites, who was famous in his time for his eloquence and his learning, has left a paraphrase of the books of Aristotle on Physics, On the Soul, On the Heavens, etc. Albertus Magnus, Thomas Aquinas, Duns Scotus, and William of Ockham, among many others, wrote important philosophical works in the form of Aristotelian commentaries. Authors Jacobus-Johannes Juff", Traditio, 26, Authors Johannes de Kanthi "Myngodus", Traditio, 27, Authors Narcissus "Richardus", Traditio, 28, Authors Robertus "Wilgelmus", Traditio, 29, Supplementary Authors ", Traditio, 30, Authors A-B", Studies in the Renaissance, 21, Authors C", Renaissance Quarterly, 28, Authors D-F", Renaissance Quarterly, 29, Authors G-K", Renaissance Quarterly, 30, Authors L-M", Renaissance Quarterly, 31, Authors N-Ph", Renaissance Quarterly, 32, Authors Pi-Sm", Renaissance Quarterly, 33, Authors So-Z", Renaissance Quarterly, 35, The articles are reprinted in the following volumes by Charles H. Subsida, 17, Firenze: Sismel Edizioni del Galluzzo, Subsida, 18, Firenze: Subsida, 15, Firenze:

Chapter 6 : Volume 9 - Commentary on Aristotle's Nicomachean Ethics - The Davenant Institute

Commentaries on Aristotle's wiki: Commentaries on Aristotle refers to the great mass of literature produced, especially in the ancient and medieval world, to explain and clarify the works of Aristotle.

Greek commentators[edit] The first pupils of Aristotle commented on his writings, but often with a view to expand his work. Thus Theophrastus invented five moods of syllogism in the first figure, in addition to the four invented by Aristotle, and stated with additional accuracy the rules of hypothetical syllogisms. He also often differed with his master, [1] including in collecting much information concerning animals and natural events, which Aristotle had omitted. During the early Roman empire we find few celebrated names among the Peripatetic philosophers. Nicolaus of Damascus wrote several treatises on the philosophy of Aristotle; and Alexander of Aegae also wrote commentaries on Aristotle. On account of the number and value of his commentaries, he was called, by way of distinction, "The Commentator". Several of his works are still extant, among which is a treatise On Fate, wherein he supports the doctrine of divine providence. Themistius 4th century , who taught at Constantinople with great success, paraphrased several of the works of Aristotle, particularly the Posterior Analytics , the Physics , and the book On the Soul. In the 5th century, Ammonius Hermiae represented Plato and Aristotle in agreeing that god was the artificer of a beginningless universe. John of Damascus lived under the patronage of the Arabs, and was at first secretary to the Caliph , but afterwards withdrew to a monastery. They wrote commentaries on Aristotle, and developed still further the abstract logical element. Many of these commentaries are still extant. Al-Ghazali wrote compendiums of logic and metaphysics. Averroes was especially distinguished as a commentator of Aristotle. In the 12th century Anna Comnena organised a group of scholars which included the commentators Michael of Ephesus , [3] and Eustratius of Nicaea who employed himself upon the dialectic and moral treatises, and whom she does not hesitate to elevate above the Stoics and Platonists for his talent in philosophical discussions. Theodore Metochites , who was famous in his time for his eloquence and his learning, has left a paraphrase of the books of Aristotle on Physics, On the Soul, On the Heavens , etc. Albertus Magnus , Thomas Aquinas , Duns Scotus , and William of Ockham , among many others, wrote important philosophical works in the form of Aristotelian commentaries. Authors Jacobus-Johannes Juff", Traditio, 26, Authors Johannes de Kanthi" Myngodus", Traditio, 27, Authors Narcissus" Richardus", Traditio, 28, Authors Robertus" Wilgelmus", Traditio, 29, Supplementary Authors ", Traditio, 30, Authors A-B", Studies in the Renaissance, 21, Authors C", Renaissance Quarterly, 28, Authors D-F", Renaissance Quarterly, 29, Authors G-K", Renaissance Quarterly, 30, Authors L-M", Renaissance Quarterly, 31, Authors N-Ph", Renaissance Quarterly, 32, Authors Pi-Sm", Renaissance Quarterly, 33, Authors So-Z", Renaissance Quarterly, 35, The articles are reprinted in the following volumes by Charles H. Subsida, 17 , Firenze: Sismel Edizioni del Galluzzo, Subsida, 18 , Firenze: Subsida, 15 , Firenze:

Saint Thomas Aquinas: Commentaries on Aristotle Over the centuries, the Catholic Church regularly and consistently reaffirmed the central importance of Thomas's work for understanding its teachings concerning Christian revelation.

Commentaries on Texts from the Corpus Aristotelicum In no other period of the history of philosophy, as far as we know, have so many commentaries on works by Aristotle been written both per year and in total as in the Renaissance. However, the reasons might include: It is possible to name Renaissance Aristotle commentaries influenced by one or more of each of these. As a whole, the reasons given above contribute to the great variety of what can be found in Renaissance Aristotle commentaries[11]. It may even be that such delightful variety is what chiefly attracts current scholars to studying this genre of philosophical literature. And yet most of these commentaries have not yet been studied by anyone since the Renaissance. However, it is doubtful that such a sorting contributes to a better understanding of their texts and contexts. This is because many authors of Aristotle commentariesâ€”including some who had a particular preference for one or more of the earlier commentatorsâ€”used the earlier commentaries on a case by case basis. As far as we know, most of these commentaries were written for use in a university setting see below. As a consequence, the choice of texts commented upon and the degree of detail given to a certain passage is often due, at least in part, to its use in a classroom, a universitarian debate or its relevance for exams. There are no sharp borderlines between commentaries proper, textbooks, encyclopedias, and treatises. Although most of the commentaries apparently deal with those texts from the corpus aristotelicum that have been the focus of interest from the 13th century to today, the Renaissance is a period where the percentage of commentaries and other texts dealing with the works of Aristotle less frequently read today e. In general, only some of the fields covered by the corpus aristotelicum were part of any single university curriculum. We do not yet have a survey on what was taught where and when, so we cannot yet give a complete assessment,[15] but permitting some margin of error, we can say: Logic was taught everywhere in some cases with a special stress on the Prior Analytics material and in some cases with special stress on the Posterior Analytics material, and in some cases with a special stress on Topics and argumentation, and in later timesâ€”perhaps starting with Antonius Rubius[16]â€”also on the Categories. Philosophy of nature was widely taught: Metaphysics was sometimes a niche subject without any relevance for the regular degree examinations e. The stress laid on moral philosophy differed considerably, and generally ethics was far more prominent than politicsâ€”let alone economics. This may be due, in part, to the specialization of teachers Melanchthon not agreeing that all knowledge rises from the senses, Cremonini disinterested in moral philosophy and thus not making statements on virtues, â€œ. There are a few explicit statements of the reasons for basing the teaching of philosophy at universities on the corpus aristotelicum or works derived from it. Augustinus Niphus died â€”who probably gave the fullest treatment of this questionâ€”gives the following reasons Niphus, , f. The parts of philosophy are treated by Aristotle one by one in books each of which is dedicated to just one part of philosophy; he proceeds from what is better known to us to that which is less known to us; he finds out about things by discussing views held by others; he treats everything with apt ampleness and conciseness; his style is that of a philosopher and not that of an orator; he is consistent. But as research progresses and more knowledge is gained about more universities and authors, the image gets more complex and less apt for generalizations. This adds insight into the diversity of the traditions at each university and the diversity of philosophies taught by teachers at each one. Textbooks and Encyclopedias Textbooks and encyclopedias are not necessarily contrasting genres, as sometimes encyclopedias were used as textbooks. Commentaries and textbooks are not the only types of texts used for interpreting, discussing, defending, adapting and transforming the doctrines of Aristotle and his commentators in the Renaissance. Specialized treatises cover a wide range of subjects: Many printed collections of theses for doctoral dissertations or other purposes can also be considered as specialized monographs â€” though in the form we have them most of them do not provide us with the argumentations that lead to the assumptions made. And it does not easily fit into any of the sections used here. It is an approach, that is useful to give order to a text that treats a great number of Renaissance Aristotelians. Bibliography Reference Fletcher, J. Ohio

State University Press, â€” Bibliography of Secondary Literature, Firenze: Philosophia generalis c, Pars 2. Logica e, Pars 4. Ethica et Politica f, Pars 5. De anima g, Pars 6. Philosophia naturalis h, Pars 7. Doxoscopia i, Pars 8: Index disputationum; Aagardusâ€”Maes k, Pars 8: Index disputationum; Maestlinusâ€”Zyra, Opera anonyma l, Pars 8: Index respondentium m, Pars 9. Ueberweg volumes on 17th century philosophy, edited by J.

Chapter 8 : Aristotle Commentators

1. *Commentaries on Texts from the Corpus Aristotelicum. In no other period of the history of philosophy, as far as we know, have so many commentaries on works by Aristotle been written (both per year and in total) as in the Renaissance. []*.

Based on the texts of the Master -- on their precise wording and terminology -- Aristotelian philosophy found in the commentary format not only a means of transmission, but also a preferred tool for the development of doctrine. A closed system, but not a static one, it evolved in two main directions: Thus, the basic aim was, on the one hand, systematic coherence and didactical proficiency; on the other, fuller responsiveness to the various issues that emerged in the long span of time between Aristotle and the last traces of an Aristotelian school. But a major part of the process -- namely, work on the texts of Aristotle -- probably came to a halt in the next generation. We are told that the libraries of Aristotle and Theophrastus were dispersed, while the dialogues and the more popular texts remained in circulation the so-called exoteric works, i. As a matter of fact, the Aristotelian legacy among masters and teachers of the Hellenistic period was often elementary and non-specialized, open to various influences from other contemporary schools, especially Stoicism. The development of Aristotelianism into a commentary tradition was not completed until the first centuries of the Christian era. Here, according to the commonly held view, a decisive role was played by the editorial activity of Andronicus, a Peripatetic scholar who arranged them and made them accessible during the first century BC. A major qualitative change took place in the course of the second century AD, when the commentary tradition adopted the specific aims of a period of archaizing and of a return to the classics. Literary Atticism is one of the best-known expressions of this archaizing tendency, which saw in the ancients both a timeless model for stylistic imitation and, in the context of philosophy, a legacy of truth that could be neither extended nor surpassed. This is why the commentary gained such a central position in Aristotelian literature. Still, it was conceived as something to be used, rather than as a product with a cultural value of its own. For this reason, the successive stages of the commentary tradition tend to obliterate one another. A new commentary on a given work of Aristotle thus appropriated, not without criticism and selection, the interpretative legacy of the preceding commentary. At this point the earlier commentary could cease to be consulted and transmitted and so often came to be lost. In the new commentary, both recent and earlier components co-exist in successive layers, often without distinction, so that it is difficult to determine what the most recent commentator has himself contributed and what he has inherited from his predecessors. For both reasons, therefore, commentaries tend to be an impersonal product: Within the Peripatetic tradition, the personality of the commentator is overshadowed not only by the authority of the Master, but also by the collective authority of the school. We are now in a position to understand the first basic difficulty that the history of philosophy faces in attempting to give an account of the work of commentators and, hence, in evaluating the Aristotelianism of late antiquity. The evidence is plentiful, but it does not sufficiently explain the activity of individuals. This difficulty is further increased by another factor: In both respects, the historical approach has been opposite to the emphases and aims of the commentary tradition itself, which tends to play down the intermediary contributions while looking backward to the past in order to search for or to reconstruct a timeless truth, held to be definitively contained in the foundational texts of the school. Such historiographical difficulties have led to negative judgements on the culture of commentaries. Hence its summary treatment -- if not complete neglect -- in many scholastic manuals, where the commentary seems to be just a dry and long-winded repetition of what is already contained in the texts of the great masters. And even now, this does not mean that the relevant problems mentioned have been resolved in a single way, nor that methodological principles of inquiry have been firmly and generally agreed on. Rather, specific interests and contexts have prompted the different, particular direction that research on individual topics has followed. But it is precisely this plurality of complementary approaches that is producing now one of the richest, most lively and dynamic fields of research in ancient philosophy. Silvia Fazzo - Aristotelianism as a commentary tradition - in:

Chapter 9 : SparkNotes: Nicomachean Ethics: Book X, page 2

The Commentary is designed for scholars of Aristotle, but I divided it so that it can be useful also to beginning readers. The main part aims at clear assertions that should be helpful.

Subject Index Index Locorum Simplicius: Corollaries on Place and Time by Simplicius, edited and translated with introduction and notes by J. It provides the best neoplatonic bridge to basic Aristotle categories. There is his identification of the "Active Intellect" with the "Unmoved Mover" whereby "intellect" "intellectualizes the best of beings" by "intellectualizing" "itself. One also finds a discussion of universals that any conceptualist would accept. Other points of interest are that the heavens are "ensouled," "it is impossible for soul to be on its own," and that there was confusion over whether what is "actually" something is simultaneously "potentially" that same thing. In many ways this commentary advances certain basic ideas in Aristotle. Alexander of Aphrodisias by Alexander of Aphrodisias, edited and translated with introduction and notes by William E. He explains the logical sequence of the arguments, notes where the text supports more than one interpretation, and provides variant readings. Williams Ancient Commentators on Aristotle: Cornell University Press Philoponus: Urmson Ancient Commentators on Aristotle: Change, which enters into the very definition of nature as an internal source of change, receives two definitions in Chapters 1 and 2, as involving the actualization of the potential or of the changeable. Alexander of Aphrodisias is reported as thinking that the second version is designed to show that Book 3, like Book 5, means to disqualify change in relations from being genuine change. Chapter 3 introduces a general causal principle that the activity of the agent causing change is in the patient undergoing change, and that the causing and undergoing are to be counted as only one activity, however different in definition. The Physics is about nature, and change enters into the very definition of nature as an internal source of change. Alexander is reported Simplicius in Phys. Rather, if you are counting how many activities are going on, there is only one to be counted. This enables Aristotle in Physics 8, as Simplicius observes in Phys. It is central to Neoplatonism that Intellect can be identical with its intelligible objects, the Platonic Forms, although this identity allows that the activity of the intelligibles, like that of the teacher, acts as agent and so has a certain priority. The identity also means that, in being aware of its objects, Intellect is in a way aware of itself. It further gives the human intellect the opportunity of being united with the Forms, while at the same time sowing the seeds of the Averroist problem about how disembodied intellects, if united with Forms, are still distinct from each other. He gives an account of infinity still propounded by modern school teachers, according to which there is never a more than finite number of anything, but to talk of infinity is to say that however large a finite number of something you have, you can always have a larger finite number. Infinity is thus an ever expandable finitude, just as it is in modern talk of approaching a limit, or getting as close as you like. This helps to make it seem less frightening. Can I stretch out my hand or stick, or not? There is nothing rather than empty space beyond the furthest stars, and one cannot stretch into nothing, nor even want to. Beyond the furthest stars, there are no surroundings. A man is not prevented from stretching by nothingness. Rather, nothingness neither repels nor accommodates a hand. It does not equally imply an agent doing the limiting. Alexander illustrates the point by offering three sufficient conditions for a whole being limited, none of which implies a limiting agent outside. I have interpreted these three conditions in Matter, Space and Motion, ch. Simplicius thinks this impossible, but surely Alexander is right. Philoponus was to complain of an asymmetry in Aristotle. His universe ought to be temporally, as well as spatially, finite, and that would refute pagan Aristotelians and Neoplatonists and vindicate the Christian view that the universe had a beginning. Without a beginning, the universe will have finished going right through a more than finite number of years and that will be only a fraction of the more than finite number of days. Finishing an infinity and infinite fractions had both been ruled out by Aristotle. Simplicius replies by citing an idea from Aristotle Physics 3. Temporal objects, like the Olympic games, or a day, or the generations of men differ from spatial objects, in that, as one gets more and more members of the collection, the previous members perish. Simplicius asks how many past years would exist in a beginningless universe. Not a more than finite number, but none. Never does more than one year exist at a time. Even in a more than finite collection of defunct years,

parts of the collection would be more than finite, like the whole. Surprisingly, it turns out that a division is not superseded by the next division, but rather is said to be prolonged *auxanesthai*, line 10. But the distinction was sometimes denied, e. On pain of regress, there must be an unmoved mover. If this unmoved mover is to cause motion eternally, it needs infinite power. It cannot, then, be a body, since bodies, being of finite size, cannot house infinite power. The unmoved mover is therefore an incorporeal God. Eternal existence, no less than eternal motion, calls for an infinite, and hence incorporeal, force. Unlike many of these translations, the introduction to this work is far more expansive about the importance and continual relevance of this late antique commentator. The magnitude of the work is impressive in its own right, but sheer quantity does not make for a good commentary. However, in it Simplicius constantly brings to bear his thorough knowledge of Aristotle and the entire Greek philosophical tradition, as well as his acuity in dissecting arguments. His independence is instanced by his occasional disagreement with Alexander, whom he frequently cites with approval. As a Neoplatonist, Simplicius attempts to reconcile the doctrines of Aristotle with those of Plato, and this interpretive programme is prominent in the present volume. In Chapter 6, Aristotle argues that there is an eternal and unmoved primary mover; it causes a single, eternal, continuous motion, and therefore what is primarily moved by it is eternal as well, and it is the motion of this that causes generation, perishing, and other kinds of change to occur in other things. He also analyses the nature of self-movement that animals possess and concludes that it is not continuous, whereas even when not undergoing this motion animals undergo other motions such as breathing and growth, which are due not to their own agency, but to the changing environment, whose motion is ultimately due to the unmoved primary mover. At 10.30, he raises and then solves a serious objection: Chapter 7 establishes by means of several arguments that locomotion is the primary kind of change and the only kind that can be continuous, and hence that this is the kind of motion that the first mover causes. Chapter 8 establishes that circular locomotion is the only kind of motion that can be eternal, single and continuous. In Chapter 9 Aristotle proves that circular motion is the primary kind of motion, since it alone is simple and complete, it alone can be eternal, one, continuous and uniform, and it is the measure of other motions. In Chapter 10 Aristotle proves that the first mover must have no parts or size; it is also indivisible. It is the cause of the eternal circular motion of the heavens, which in turn cause the changes in the sublunary world. The first mover causes motion without effort, and is located at the circumference of the sphere of the fixed stars. In this chapter Aristotle also discusses projectile motion, and states why a projectile does not stop moving when it loses contact with what throws it: In his comments on this chapter Simplicius gives further insight into his views on kinematics and dynamics. Simplicius holds that while a finite body cannot have infinite power all at once together, it can be moved *ad infinitum*, and that the latter property rather than the former is what is required in order for the world to be eternal. At 10.20, he says that Aristotle desires to geometrize nature. Aristotle holds that projectile motion does not violate his principle that in every motion the mover is continuously in contact with the moved even though the projectile keeps moving after losing contact with the thrower, because the air receives from the thrower the power of causing motion in the projectile; but how can the air continue to move the projectile even after the thrower ceases to move it? His answer is that the earthy nature of projectiles makes them unsuitable for either lateral or upwards motion, and that air also water as an intermediate element that is suitable for both upward and downward motion and consequently for lateral motion as well contributes to the persistence of upward and lateral motions of projectiles. If the mover is located on something that moves, how will it not be moved incidentally? Shortly below, he clarifies this proposal: Thus pace Philoponus, what is moved *ad infinitum* has by its own nature the ability to be moved, and it gets its motion through the agency of something else; hence, the sphere of the fixed stars, which is finite, does not possess all at once together an infinite power of causing motion, but it is subject to motion *ad infinitum*, so that, again, in a way the planets, which move together with the sphere of the fixed stars, are moved by the same unmoved mover.