

Bibliography on the Ancient and Medieval Commentaries on Aristotle's *De Interpretatione*

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Adamson, Peter. 2006. "The Arabic Sea Battle: al-Fārābī on the Problem of Future Contingents." *Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie* no. 88:163-188.
Abstract: "Ancient commentators like Ammonius and Boethius tried to solve Aristotle's "sea battle argument" in *On Interpretation* 9 by saying that statements about future contingents are "indefinitely" true or false. They were followed by al-Farabi in his commentary on *On Interpretation*. The article sets out two possible interpretations of what "indefinitely" means here, and shows that al-Farabi actually has both conceptions: one applied in his interpretation of Aristotle, and another that he is forced into by the problem of divine foreknowledge. It also explains the relevance of al-Farabi's remarks as a link between the non-statistical modal theories of Philo and Avicenna."
2. Baffioni, Carmela, and Nasti de Vincentis, Mauro. 1981. *Il capitolo 9 del De interpretatione di Aristotele nel commentario di Al-Farabi*. Napoli: Istituto Universitario Orientale.
Premessa
Parte Prima: Carmela Baffioni, Lo šarḥ li-kitābi Aristūṭālīs fī'l-'ibāra: traduzione e interpretazione del cap. 9
Parte seconda: Mauro Nasti De Vincentis: Interpretazione di al-Fārābī e interpretazione «farabiana». A proposito del commento di al-Fārābī a *De interpretatione* 9
Appendice alla Parte seconda:: Emanuela Galanti: Necessità e onnitemporalità in alcuni testi aristotelici.
3. Bechtle, Gerald. 2005. "Connaissance divine et contingence humaine dans le commentaire d'Ammonius au *De interpretatione*. Théologisation d'un traité aristotélicien logique dans la philosophie tardo-antique." In *Signe et prédiction dans l'Antiquité : actes du colloque international interdisciplinaire de Créteil et de Paris, 22-23-24 mai 2003*, edited by Kany-Turpin, José, 97-109. Saint-Etienne: Publications de l'Université de Saint-Etienne.
4. Black, Deborah. 1992. "Aristotle's *Peri hermeneias* in Medieval Latin and Arabic Philosophy: Logic and the Linguistic Arts." In *Aristotle and His Medieval Interpreters*, edited by Bosley, Richard and Tweedale, Martin, 25-83. Calgary: University of Calgary Press.
Supplementary volume 17 to *Canadian Journal of Philosophy*.
"This paper compares the views of a number of Arabic and thirteenth-century Latin commentators on Aristotle's *Peri Hermeneias* on the status of logic as a linguistic art and its relation to grammar. The discussion considers the commentators' general positions on the logician's treatment of linguistic topics, and their attempts to reconcile the dual claim of logic to be both a linguistic and a rational art. These general principles are then traced through the treatment of a number of particular themes in the *Peri Hermeneias*'s linguistic sections: The definition of the noun, the

cases of the noun, and the indefinite or infinite noun (i.e., of the form non-X). The article concludes that, although there are basic differences between the Latin and Arabic traditions stemming from the presence in the Latin world of a philosophical theory of grammar, authors in both traditions are adamant that a balance must be maintained between the linguistic and rational characterizations of logic."

5. Braakhuis, Henk Antonius, and Kneepkens, Corneille Henri, eds. 2003. *Aristotle's Peri hermeneias in the Latin Middle Ages. Essays on the Commentary Tradition*. Groningen: Ingenium Publishers.
Table of Contents V; Preface VII; Introduction IX-XLI; Yukio wakuma: William of Champeaux and the *Introductiones* 1; Sten Ebbesen: *Questions and Sophismata*: tracking Peter of Auvergne 31; Alan Perreiah: Orality and literacy in the *De interpretatione* tradition 51; Robert Andrews: The *Modistae* and John Duns Scotus's *Quaestiones super Perihermeneias* 67; Claude Panaccio: Debates on mental language in the early Fourteenth century 85; Joël Biard: Le statut des énoncés dans les commentaires du *Peri hermeneias* de Gautier Burley 103; M. Kaufmann: The discussion on the nature of the concept in Ockham's *Perihermeneias* Commentary 119; Mieczyslaw H. Markowski: Der Kommentar des Peter Wysz von Polen zu *De interpretatione* des Aristoteles 135; Gino Roncaglia: Mesino de Codronchi's discussion on *Syncategoremata* and mental language in his *Quaestiones on De interpretatione* 149; Irène Rosier: Variations médiévales sur l'opposition entre signification "ad placitum" et signification naturelle 165; L. M. de Rijk: The logic of indefinite names in Boethius, Abelard, Duns Scotus and Radulphus Brito 207; Judith Dijs: Radulphus Brito's use of *Intentio* in *Quaestio* 9 of his *In Peri hermeneias* 235; Christian Strub: *Propositio una / multiplex* in Abelard: a note on the relationship of dialectic and grammar 257; Joke Spruyt, The semantics of complex expressions in John Duns Scotus, Peter Abelard and John Buridan 275; F. Beets: Theories of predication from Boethius to Thomas Aquinas 305; Allan Bäck: Aquinas on predication 321; Andrea Tabarroni, The 10th Thesis in Logic condemned at Oxford in 1277 339; C. H. Kneepkens, Aristotle's transposition and the Twelfth-century commentaries on *De interpretatione*, 20b1-12: an exploratory study 363; Simo Knuuttila: Truth and falsity as modal notions: some medieval comments on *De interpretatione*, 12, 22a13 413; Elizabeth Karger: John Buridan's theory of the logical relations between general modal formulae 429; Indices 445; Index locorum 447; Index nominum 462; Index rerum 468; Manuscripts mentioned 483; Bibliography 485-509.
"The majority of the twenty essays of the present volume were originally delivered at the Xth European Symposium on Medieval Logic and Semantics held at Nijmegen, 22 - 26 June, 1992, that was devoted to the tradition of Aristotle's *Peri hermeneias* in the Latin Middle Ages. Circumstances made it impossible to publish the proceedings immediately after the symposium. Since the editors were, nevertheless, aware that the material presented was extremely important for further studies on the history of medieval logic, semantics and philosophy of language, they decided, some time ago, to ask the contributors to update, revise or rewrite their essays in preparation for the publication of this collection. Although some authors have partially drawn on material found in this collection for publications elsewhere, most of the information contained in these essays remains new, including the many detailed descriptions and editions of unedited works that will constitute a greatly appreciated resource in the study of medieval philosophy." (From the Preface)
6. Diebler, Stéphane. 2002. "Les canons de Proclus: problèmes et conséquences de l'interprétation syriano-proclienne du *De interpretatione*." *Dionysius* no. 20:71-94.

"Ammonius' commentary on the third section of Aristotle's *De interpretatione* offers insight into the hermeneutical and logical debates of the 5th-cent. Neoplatonic school in Athens. These debates reveal one of the rare cases of a theory that was developed by Proclus in contradiction to that of his teacher Syrianus, and in the course of which the authoritative status of *De interpretatione* as a carefully composed, syntagmatic work was itself put into question. Ammonius was concerned to establish the coherence of Int. 19 B 19-20 B 12. According to his interpretation, this section falls into two further sections, arranged around two types of logical sequences : the first section (19 B 19-20 A 6) is explained according to an interpretation that derives from Syrianus ; the second (20 A 20-20 B 13) recalls the canons of Proclus."

7. Eck, Job van. 1988. "Another Interpretation of Aristotle's *De interpretatione* IX. A Support for the So-Called Second Oldest or "Mediaeval" Interpretation." *Vivarium. An International Journal for the Philosophy and Intellectual Life of the Middle Ages and Renaissance* no. 26:19-38.
8. Fernández Garrido, María Regla. 1996. "Los comentarios griegos y latinos al « De interpretatione » aristotélico hasta Tomás de Aquino." *Emerita. Boletín de Lingüística y Filología Clásica* no. 64:307-323.
9. Furlani, Giuseppe. 1922. "Aristoteles, *de interpretatione*, 16a, 6-7, nach einem syrisch erhaltenen Kommentar." *Zeitschrift für Semitistik und verwandte Gebiete* no. 1:34-37.
10. García Cuadrado, José Angel. 2012. "La *consignificatio verbal* (Per hermeneias 16b 8-10): Ammonio, Boecio y Tomás de Aquino." *Revista Española de Filosofía Medieval* no. 19:87-100.
11. Gaskin, Richard. 1993. "Alexander's Sea Battle: A Discussion of Alexander of Aphrodisias *De Fato*." *Phronesis* no. 38:75-94.
12. Groneberg, Michael. 2002. "Ammonios und die Seeschlacht. Seels Entlarvung des Aktualismus der Neuplatoniker." *Freiburger Zeitschrift für Philosophie und Theologie* no. 49:236-250.
13. Gyekye, Kwame. 1977. "Al-Farabi on the Problem of Future Contingency." *Second Order* no. 6:31-54.
14. Hasmaoui, Chantal. 2003. "La tradition des commentaires grecs sur le *De interpretatione* (Int)." In *Dictionnaire des philosophes antiques. Supplément*, edited by Goulet, Richard, 122-173. Paris: CNRS Éditions.
15. Hissette, Roland. 1989. "Des éditions du XVI^e siècle a Guillaume de Luna? À propos d'un commentaire d'Averroès." *Bulletin de philosophie médiévale* no. 31:168-182.
16. ———. 1990. "Guillaume de Luna - Jacob Anatoli - Jacob Mantinus. À propos du commentaire moyen d'Averroès sur le „De interpretatione“." *Bulletin de philosophie médiévale* no. 32:142-158.
17. Hugonnard-Roche, Henri. 2005. "Scolies syriaques au *Peri Hermeneias* d'Aristote." In *Scientia in margine. Études sur les marginalia dans les manuscrits scientifiques du Moyen Âge à la Renaissance*, edited by Jacquart, Danielle and Burnett, Charles F., 27-55. Genève: Droz.
18. ———. 2011. "Du commentaire a la reconstruction: Paul le Perse interprete d'Aristote (sur une lecture du *Peri Hermeneias*, à propos des modes et des adverbes selon Paul, Ammonius et Boece)." In *Interpreting the Bible and Aristotle in Late*

- Antiquity: The Alexandrian Commentary Tradition between Rome and Baghdad*, edited by Lössl, Josef and Watt, John W., 207-224. Burlington: Ashgate.
19. Isaac, Jean. 1953. *Le Peri hermeneias en Occident de Boèce à Saint Thomas. Histoire littéraire d'un traité d'Aristote*. Paris: Vrin.
 20. Jacobi, Klaus. 1985. "Diskussionen über unpersönliche Aussagen in Peter Abaelards Kommentar zu *Peri Hermeneias*." In *Mediaeval Semantics and Metaphysics*, edited by Bos, Egbert Peter, 1-63. Nijmegen: Ingenium Publishers.
 21. Kneepkens, Corneille Henri. 1994. "From Eternal to Perpetual Truths: A note on the Mediaeval History of Aristotle, *De interpretatione*, ch. 1 16a18." *Vivarium. An International Journal for the Philosophy and Intellectual Life of the Middle Ages and Renaissance* no. 32:161-185.
 22. Knuutila, Simo. 2003. "Truth and Falsity as Modal Notions: Some Medieval Comments on *De interpretatione* 12, 22a13." In *Aristotle's Peri hermeneias in the Latin Middle Ages. Essays on the Commentary Tradition*, edited by Braakhuis, Henk Antonius and Kneepkens, Corneille Henri, 413-427. Groningen: Ingenium Publishers.
 23. ———. 2010. "Medieval Commentators on Future Contingents in *De Interpretatione* 9." *Vivarium. An International Journal for the Philosophy and Intellectual Life of the Middle Ages and Renaissance* no. 48:75-95.
Abstract: "This article considers three medieval approaches to the problem of future contingent propositions in chapter 9 of Aristotle's *De interpretatione*. While Boethius assumed that God's atemporal knowledge infallibly pertains to historical events, he was inclined to believe that Aristotle correctly taught that future contingent propositions are not antecedently true or false, even though they may be characterized as true-or-false. Aquinas also tried to combine the allegedly Aristotelian view of the disjunctive truth-value of future contingent propositions with the conception of all things being timelessly present to God's knowledge. The second approach was formulated by Peter Abelard who argued that in Aristotle's view future contingent propositions are true or false, not merely true-or-false, and that the antecedent truth of future propositions does not necessitate things in the world. After Duns Scotus, many late medieval thinkers thought like Abelard, particularly because of their new interpretation of contingency, but they did not believe, with the exception of John Buridan, that this was an Aristotelian view."
 24. Magee, John. 1989. *Boethius on Signification and Mind*. Leiden: Brill.
Contents: Acknowledgements IX; Sigla X; Abbreviations and Editions XI; Introduction 1; I. Aristotle: *Peri Hermeneias* I, 16a3-9; 7; II. Boethius' Translation 49; III. Orandi Ordo 64; IV. Cogitabilis Oratio 93; Afterword 142; Bibliography 150; Index Locorum 155; Index Nominum et Rerum 162-165.
"The present work is divided into four chapters, taking as its starting point the lines of Aristotle's *Peri Hermeneias* around which Boethius' theory of signification turns. The first chapter of the study plunges in *medias res*, and for that the reader's patience is requested. The Greek text is both difficult and compressed, and necessarily brings into consideration questions of the history of transmission and commentary, as well as numerous aspects of Aristotle's thought both in this and in other works. But since Boethius translated either all or part of the *Peri Hermeneias* before commenting upon it, and then revised the translation for the second commentary; and since in his translation, as in all translations, there is an element of "commentary" upon the meaning of the original, it has been thought necessary to come to a clear understanding of what Aristotle wrote before proceeding to the translation and

commentaries. After careful examination of the Greek passage and of the questions it poses, there follows in the second chapter an analysis of Boethius' Latin translation of the same, and of the interpretation implicitly contained therein." (pp. 1-2)

25. ———. 2010. "On the Composition and Sources of Boethius' Second *Peri hermeneias* Commentary." *Vivarium* no. 48:7-54.
 Abstract: "The paper is in three parts, prefaced by general remarks concerning Boethius' logical translations and commentaries: the text of the *Peri Hermeneias* as known to and commented on by Boethius (and Ammonius); the organizational principles behind Boethius' second commentary on the *Peri Hermeneias*; its source(s). One of the main purposes of the last section is to demonstrate that the *Peri Hermeneias* commentaries of Boethius and Ammonius are, although part of a common tradition, quite independent of one another, and special consideration is given to the question of how Boethius interpreted and shaped the doxographical material concerning Aspasius, Herminus, and Alexander that had been handed down to him by Porphyry."
 "Sifting through the interpretations of earlier commentators was painstaking and laborious, Porphyry's interpretation of 19b22-24 alone requiring, as we have seen, seventeen pages of commentary. By about the year 515 Boethius' attention must have been turning toward other projects, to new translations and commentaries, the theological tractates, logico-rhetorical monographs, and so on. If the *Peri Hermeneias* were allowed to consume so much time and energy, what would become of the rest of the *Organon* and Aristotle, not to mention Plato? Even for a treatise as rich and complex as the *Peri Hermeneias* Boethius may have had finally to calculate his "point of diminishing returns." He may have grown impatient with the project, his copy of Porphyry may have failed, or both. Had he known of the premature end that awaited him, he might have thought differently about how to weight the commentary, might have sought compensation in other projects for problems left unsolved in connection with the *Peri Hermeneias*; but as it is, he left a work which, despite its imperfections, has proved to be one of his most fascinating and influential." (p. 54)
26. ———. 2011. "Preliminary Observations on the Textual Tradition of Boethius' First *Peri Hermeneias* Commentary." In *Logic and Language in the Middle Ages: A Volume in Honour of Sten Ebbesen*, edited by Fink, Jakob Leth, Hansen, Heine and Mora-Márquez, Ana María 13-26. Leiden: Brill.
 "In editing the first of Boethius' two commentaries on Aristotle's *Peri Hermeneias* Carl Meiser essentially worked from a single witness, F (below), which he ranked both *antiquissimus* and *optimus*. (1) Readings from three other Munich manuscripts, e (MS Bayer. Staatsbibl. clm 14401, s. XI), M (below), and T (MS Bayer. Staatsbibl. clm 18479, s.XI), he reported *perpetuo more* but with varying degrees of accuracy. (2) He further consulted two st. Gall manuscripts, G (below) and S (MS Stiftsbibl. 817, s. XI-XII) *omnibus locis paulo difficilioribus* — citing them only infrequently, however, in his critical apparatus. from *Peri Hermeneias* 17b20 on, F preserves excerpted lemmata, and Meiser correctly recognized that the supplemented versions found in other witnesses violate Boethius' intention. (3)
 But F is in fact neither *antiquissimus* nor *optimus*, and Meiser's edition suffers from a particular failure to distinguish between the three versions of Boethius' *Peri Hermeneias* translation, two of which form his commentary lemmata. Hence a full assessment of the evidence seems called for. In what follows, I hope to shed some light on certain salient characteristics of the textual tradition." (p. 13)

(1) Boethius, *Commentarii in librum aristotelis peri erμηνειασ, pars prior versionem*

continuum et primam editionem continens, ed. C. Meiser (Leipzig: Teubner, 1877), pp. VIII-X.

(2) Cf. J. Magee, 'On the Composition and sources of Boethius' second *Peri Hermeneias* Commentary', *Vivarium* 48 (2010), 15, n. 32.

(3) Above, n. 1; cf. Aristotle, *De interpretatione vel Periermenias: Translatio Boethii*, ed. L. Minio-Paluello, AL 2.1 (Bruges: Desclée de Brouwer, 1965), pp. XI; LIII.

[MS F = Munich Bayer. Staatsbibl. clm 6374, s. IX

MS M = Munich Bayer. Staatsbibl. clm 14377, s. X-XI]

27. Mignucci, Mario. 1989. "Truth and modality in late antiquity: Boethius on future contingent propositions." In *Le teorie delle Modalità. Atti del Convegno internazionale di storia della logica*, edited by Corsi, Giovanni, Mangione, Corrado and Mugnai, Massimo, 47-78. Bologna: CLUEB.
28. ———. 1996. "Ammonius on Future Contingent Propositions." In *Rationality in Greek Thought*, edited by Frede, Michael and Striker, Gisela, 279-310. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
29. ———. 1998. "Ammonius' sea battle." In *Ammonius: On Aristotle On Interpretation 9 with Boethius: On Aristotle On Interpretation 9*, edited by Blank, David L. and Kretzmann, Norman, 53-86. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
30. ———. 2001. "Ammonius and the Problem of Future Contingent Truth." In *Ammonius and the Seabattle: Texts, Commentary and Essays*, edited by Gerhard, Seel, 247-284. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
31. Monteil, Jean-François. 1996. "De la traduction en arabe et en français d'un texte d'Aristote: le chapitre VII du *Peri Hermeneias*." *Bulletin d'Etudes Orientales* no. 48:57-76.
 "Les propositions indéterminées du chapitre VII de *Peri Hermeneias* sont des particulières traduites par des universelles fausses. La cause de cette bizarrerie est dans le maître, et non dans les traducteurs. Aristote mutile un système naturel de propositions dont l'intégrité est restaurée par l'hexagone de Robert Blanché. Celui-ci ajoute deux postes au carré: Y (quantité partielle) et U (exclusion de la quantité partielle). Le carré représente A (totalité) et E (quantité zéro), mais pas avec la tierce quantité Y. Or, la quantité partielle (Y) est essentielle: c'est celle des particulières naturelles contenant notoirement plus d'information que les particulières logiques. U (exclusion de la quantité partielle) est le signifié commun aux deux phrases qu'Aristote élimine du système naturel."
32. ———. 2004. "La transmission d'Aristote par les Arabes à la chrétienté occidentale: une trouvaille relative au *De Interpretatione*." *Revista Española de Filosofía Medieval* no. 11:181-195.
 "Some men are not white and Some men are white versus No man is white are illegitimately identified to the two pairs of logical contradictories constituting the logical square: A versus O and I versus E, respectively. Thus, the level of natural language and that of logic are confused. The unfortunate Aristotelian alteration is concealed by the translation of propositions known as *indeterminates*. To translate these, which, semantically, are *particulars*, all scholars, except for Paul Gohlke, employ the two natural *universals* excluded by the Master! The work of Isador Pollak, published in Leipzig in 1913, [*Die Hermeneutik des Aristoteles in der Arabischen übersetzung des Ishiik Ibn Honain*] reveals the origin of this nearly universal translation mistake: the Arabic version upon which Al-Farabi unfortunately bases his comment. In adding the vertices Y and U to the four ones of the square, the

logical hexagon of Robert Blanché (*) allows for the understanding of the manner in which the logical system and the natural system are linked."

(*) *Structures Intellectuelles. Essai sur l'organisation systématique des concepts*, Paris: Vrin, 1966; *Raison et Discours. Défense de la logique réflexive*, Paris: Vrin, 1967.

33. ———. 2005. "Isidor Pollak et les deux traductions arabes différentes du *De interpretatione* d'Aristote." *Revue d'Études Anciennes* no. 107:29-46.
 "Dans le chapitre VII du *De interpretatione*, Aristote mutile un système naturel de trois couples de contradictions naturelles. Il évince le couple où deux universelles naturelles "Les hommes sont blancs", "Les hommes ne sont pas blancs" s'opposent contradictoirement. Conséquence grave: les deux couples de contradictoires naturelles, qu'Aristote considère exclusivement, sont identifiés illégitimement aux deux couples de contradictoires logiques constituant le carré logique. Cette mutilation est dissimulée par la traduction des propositions dites "indéterminées". L'ouvrage d'Isidor Pollak, publié à Leipzig en 1913 (*Die Hermeneutik des Aristoteles in der arabischen Übersetzung des Ishak Ibn Honain, Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, 13,1), révèle l'origine de cette faute de traduction quasi universelle: la version arabe sur laquelle al-Farabi fonde son commentaire."
34. Mora-Márquez, Ana María 2011. "*Peri hermeneias* 16a3-8 : Histoire d'une rupture de la tradition interprétative dans le bas Moyen-Âge." *Revue Philosophique de la France et de l'Étranger* no. 136:67-84.
35. Normore, Calvin G. 1982. "Future Contingents." In *The Cambridge History of Later Medieval Philosophy. From the rediscovery of Aristotle to the disintegration of Scholasticism 1100-1600*, edited by Kretzmann, Norman, Kenny, Anthony and Pinborg, Jan. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
36. Rescher, Nicholas. 1963. "An Interpretation of Aristotle's Doctrine of Future Contingency and Excluded Middle." In *Studies in the History of Arabic Logic*, 43-54. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
37. Rijk, Lambertus Marie de. 2003. "Boethius on *De interpretatione* (ch. 3): is he a reliable guide?" In *Boèce ou la chaîne des savoirs. Actes du Colloque International de la fondation Singer Polignac (Paris, 8-12 juin 1999)*, edited by Galonnier, Alain, 207-227. Paris: Peeters Publishers.
 "There can be no doubt whatsoever about Boethius's exceptional merits for transmitting Aristotle's logic to us. But while 'Aristotelian' logic is in many respects synonymous with 'Aristotelico-Boethian' logic, the question can be raised whether Aristotle himself was an 'Aristotelian'. To give just one example: from Lukasiewicz onwards there has been much debate among scholars about the telling differences between traditional syllogistic and that of the *Prior Analytics*. (1)
 In this paper I intend to deal with two specimens of Boethius's way of commenting upon Aristotle's text. They are found in his discussion of *De interpretatione*, chapters 2 and 3, which present Aristotle's views of *ónoma* and *rhema*. (2) One concerns the semantics of indefinite names, the other that of isolated names and verbs." p. 227
 (1) Jan Lukasiewicz, *Aristotle's Syllogistic from the Standpoint of Modern Formal Logic*, Oxford, 1951. G. Patzig, *Aristotle's Theory of the Syllogism. A logico-philological study of Book A of the Prior Analytics*, Dordrecht, 1969.
 (2) *Rhema* properly stands for 'what is said of', including not only our 'verb' but also adjectives, when used in attributive position. One should realise, however, that 'verb' refers to a word class, rather than a semantic or syntactical category, as *rhema* does.
 "Conclusion. Returning now to Boethius' manner of commenting upon Aristotle's

texts, the following points can be made:

[1] In the wake of Ammonius, (3) Boethius explains [*De int.*] 16b22-25 on the apophantic level, i.e. in terms of statement-making, instead of framing significative concepts, i.e. on the onomastic level.

[2] Whereas in Ammonius' report of the predecessors, Alexander and Porphyry, as well as his own exposition of the issue, there are many clues to the previous alternative reading and interpretation on the onomastic level, Boethius does not even refrain from cleansing the text (including his 'quotations'), by changing, at any occurrence, '*ens*' into '*est*'.

[3] In doing so, Boethius decisively influenced the commentary tradition on account of the purport of *De int.* 3, 16b19-25. He effectively contributed to the common verdict on this paragraph in terms of 'a curious medley'.

[4] As far as the semantics of the indefinite verb (3, 16b14-15) is concerned, Boethius' apparently adhering to the so-called 'Ammonii recensio' was far less disastrous for the common understanding of Aristotle on this score, and, in effect, merely provided us with some stimulating Medieval discussions of the semantics of term infinitation.

[5] Finally by way of speculative surmise, it might be suggested that both the fact that Boethius dealt with the 'Ammonii recognise' without reading it in his lemma of 16b14-15, as well as his rather ruthlessly interfering in the quotations of the pre-Ammonian sources, should make it more plausible that Boethius had extensive, but incomplete marginal notes to his Greek text of Aristotle at his disposal, rather than a full copy of Ammonius' commentary (or those of other Greek commentators).

To comment upon Aristotle's work naturally includes developing his lore. But nothing can ever guarantee that this will happen *ad metem auctoris*. (4)"

(3) It is unmistakably plain that in *De int.* ch. 3, Boethius is strongly influenced by what he read in Ammonius (or in marginal notes on Ammonius' view).

(4) Cf. the interesting paper on this subject by Frans A.J. de Haas, "Survival of the Fittest? Mutations of Aristotle's Method of Inquiry in Late Antiquity" (forthcoming).

[Conference: *The Dynamics of Natural Philosophy in the Aristotelian Tradition (and beyond)*, Nijmegen, 16-20 August 1999.]

38. Schneider, Jakob Hans Josef. 1994. "Al-Farabis Kommentar zu 'De interpretatione' des Aristoteles. Ein Beitrag zur Entwicklung der Sprachphilosophie im Mittelalter." In *Scientia und ars im Hoch- und Spätmittelalter, 687-738*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
39. Seel, Gerhard, ed. 2001. *Ammonius and the Seabattle: Texts, Commentary and Essays*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
40. Sillitti, Giovanna. 1980. *Tragelaphos. Storia di una metafora e di un problema*. Napoli: Bibliopolis.
41. Teixidor, Javier. 1996. "L'introduction au *De interpretatione* chez Proba et Paul le Perse." In *Symposium Syriacum VII. Uppsala University, Department of Asian and African Languages, 11-14 August 1996*, edited by Lavenant, René, 293-301. Roma: Pontificio Istituto Orientale.
Repris comme Chapitre V dans: J. Teixidor, *Aristote en syriaque: Paul le Perse, logicien du VIe siècle*, Paris: Éditions CNRS 2003, pp. 99-121.
42. Tessier, Andrea. 1979. *Il testo di Aristotele e le traduzioni armene*. Padova: Antenore.
43. Todd, Robert B. 1976. "Alexander of Aphrodisias on *De Interpretatione* 16a 26-29." *Hermes* no. 104:140-146.

44. Verbeke, Gérard. 1956. "Ammonius et saint Thomas. Deux commentaires sur le *Peri hermeneias* d'Aristote." *Revue Philosophique de Louvain* no. 54:228-253.
"La comparaison entre le commentaire d'Ammonius, dans la traduction latine de Guillaume de Moerbeke, et celui de saint Thomas, permet de préciser dans quelle mesure saint Thomas s'inspire d'Ammonius. Édition critique du texte latin du *Peri hermeneias* d'Aristote, dans la traduction de Moerbeke du commentaire d'Ammonius, avec références au texte des manuscrits grecs."
45. ———. 1991. "Interprétation et langage dans la tradition aristotélicienne." In *Historia philosophiae Medii Aevi. Studien zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters*, edited by Mojsisch, Burkhard and Pluta, Olaf, 1029-1045. Amsterdam: R. Grüner.
"A la lumière des analyses qui précèdent, qu'en est-il maintenant du titre *peri hermeneias*? Ce titre correspond-il au contenu de l'ouvrage?
La question posée ne vise pas directement l'authenticité Aristotélicienne de la formule: il est vrai cependant, qu'un titre qui ne traduirait pas bien le contenu du traité, aurait peu de chances d'avoir été rédigé par le Stagirite. Par contre, il est probable que l'ouvrage ait reçu un certain titre de la part de son auteur et si le titre traditionnel correspond au contenu de l'écrit, il peut très bien remonter à l'auteur lui-même. Quoi qu'il en soit de la question d'authenticité, nous croyons pouvoir conclure que le titre donné recouvre bien le contenu du traité, dont le sujet principal est l'énonciation catégorique et ses composants. En se basant sur les analyses de Boèce et d'Ammonius, on peut dire que tous ces éléments correspondent à l'idée d'interprétation telle qu'elle est expliquée dans le traité:
1. L'énonciation y est conçue comme l'interprétation d'un contenu de pensée. Toutefois si le langage se rapporte directement à un objet pensé, il se réfère indirectement au réel: il en résulte que le discours énonciatif est aussi une interprétation de la réalité. Il l'est à un double niveau: le contenu particulier de chaque énonciation se rapporte à un sujet déterminé du monde et en exprime certaines caractéristiques; on peut donc le considérer comme un acte d'interprétation. Par ailleurs, il y a la structure même du jugement, qui, elle aussi, est une interprétation à un niveau plus fondamental de la physiologie du réel.
2. Les noms et les verbes constituent à leur tour un acte d'interprétation. Selon Aristote, la signification des mots est conventionnelle: elle est le résultat de la vie en communauté, où les hommes sont amenés à se mettre d'accord sur des notions fondamentales de la vie morale et sociale. Ammonius croit que le sens des mots n'est pas purement artificiel, mais qu'il est adapté à la nature des choses. Quoi qu'il en soit, le fait d'appliquer au réel des noms et des verbes est un acte d'interprétation. Exprimer le réel dans les catégories du langage implique toujours un acte interprétatif.
La doctrine aristotélicienne sur la nature du langage justifie donc le titre de *peri hermeneias*."
46. White, Michael J. 1983. "Time and Determinism in the Hellenistic Philosophical Schools." *Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie* no. 65:40-62.
47. Wieland, Wolfgang. 1979. "Aristoteles und die Seeschlacht. Zur Struktur prognostischer Aussagen." *Berichte zur Wissenschaftsgeschichte* no. 2:25-33.
48. Williams, C. J. F. 1978. "True Tomorrow, Never True Today." *The Philosophical Quarterly* no. 28:285-299.
49. Zimmermann, Albert. 1971. "'Ipsum enim ("est") nihil est" (Aristoteles, Periherm. I, c.3). Thomas von Aquin über die Bedeutung der Kopula." In *Der Begriff der*

Repraesentatio im Mittelalter, edited by Zimmermann, Albert, 282-295. Berlin:
Walter de Gruyter.

RELATED PAGES

The Logical Works of Aristotle

[Aristotle's Logic: General Survey and Introductory Readings](#)

[Selected Bibliography on the Logic of Aristotle: General and Introductory Readings](#)

[Aristotle's *De Interpretatione*: Semantics and Philosophy of Language](#)

[Annotated bibliography on Aristotle's De Interpretatione \(*Peri Hermeneias*\)](#)

[Aristotle's Earlier Dialectic: the *Topics* and *Sophistical Refutations*](#)

[Aristotle's *Prior Analytics*: the Theory of Categorical Syllogism](#)

[Selected Bibliography on Aristotle's Theory of Categorical Syllogism](#)

[Aristotle's *Prior Analytics*: the Theory of Modal Syllogism](#)

[Selected Bibliography on Aristotle's Theory of Modal Syllogism](#)

[Aristotle's *Posterior Analytics*: The Theory of Demonstration](#)

[Selected Bibliography on Aristotle's *Posterior Analytics*](#)

[On the website "Theory and History of Ontology"](#)

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

[Aristotle's *Categories*. Annotated Bibliography of the studies in English:](#)

[First part: A - C](#)

[Second part: D - H](#)

[Third part: I - O](#)

Fourth part: P - Z

Bibliographie des études en français sur les *Catégories* d'Aristote

Bibliographie der deutschen Studien zur Aristoteles *Kategorien*

Bibliografia degli studi italiani sulle *Categorie* di Aristotele

Annotated Bibliography of the studies in English: Complete Version (only PDF)