

## A new collation and text for *EN* X.6-9 [=Bywater X.6-8]<sup>1</sup>

Victor Gonçalves de Sousa

In this paper, I attempt to explore a recent hypothesis about what the main mss. are for establishing the text of Aristotle's *Ethica Nicomachea* (henceforth *EN*). This hypothesis was recently advanced on the basis of evidence coming from *EN* I-II. In exploring this hypothesis, I confine myself to the text of *EN* X.6-9 [=Bywater X.6-8], and, as a result, I propose a new text for *EN* X.6-9 [=Bywater X.6-8] based on a fresh collation of nine mss—four of which were not taken into account in previous editions of the *EN*—and based on readings that can be gathered from the Arabic translation of the *EN* that was preserved in the Fez ms. The text proposed in this paper is accompanied by textual notes that justify my decisions regarding some difficult passages.

### 1. *Introduction*

‘*Il n'existe pas encore d'édition critique du text grec de l'Étique à Nicomaque.*’ It is with this dramatic claim that Gauthier begins the chapter on the text of the *EN* in the second edition of his monumental work with Jolif (Gauthier & Jolif, 1970, vol.1, p. 301). In the lines that follow, Gauthier says there are two conditions necessary for a critical edition: first, all the witnesses of the text must be recensend and examined; second, there is need for a *stemma* or, at the very least, some classification on the basis of which one can judge the value of each of the witnesses.

As Gauthier himself recognises, the first requirement began to be partially fulfilled already by his time.<sup>2</sup> Besides, his own contributions gave a first step in fulfilling the second

<sup>1</sup> Thanks to Nataly Ianicelli Cruzeiro, Daniel Lopes, Dionatan Tissot, and Marco Zingano for comments on earlier versions of this paper and to Fernando Gazoni, the editor. I am also thankful to the detailed and helpful comments made by the two anonymous referees, which improved the quality of this paper in many respects and allowed me to correct some mistakes prior to its publication. My understanding of the text of *EN* X.6-9 [=Bywater X.6-8] was widely improved by i) the translation and discussion of *EN* X.6-10 [=Bywater X.6-9] led by Professor Marco Zingano at the University of São Paulo (USP) throughout 2023 and by the discussions that took place then (for which I have to thank all participants), and ii) by the workshop ‘Practical and contemplative virtue in Aristotle's conception of the human good: Nicomachean Ethics 10.6-8,’ jointly organized by Princeton University (PU), Universidade de São Paulo (USP), Universidad Panamericana (UP), and Universidad de los Andes (UA) that took place in early 2024 at Princeton (in which I presented a translation and commentary to *EN* X.7 1177a12-1177b1 together with Irene Soudant, whom I thank here along with the other participants of the workshop). This paper is a result of a project funded by the São Paulo Research Foundation (FAPESP), grant 2019/05555-7.

<sup>2</sup> Gauthier mentions the work of Wartelle (1963).

requirement (although, as he recognizes [p. 312], his conclusions are indeed precarious and provisory).

With the recent publication of Pelagia-Vera Loungi's *Die Manuskripte und die Überlieferung der Nikomachischen Ethik des Aristoteles (Buch I)* (2022), the situation has changed considerably. Loungi has not only freshly collated, for book I, all mss. of the *EN*,<sup>3</sup> and, for book II, what she concluded are the main mss., but she also provides us with a *stemma* that is carefully grounded on the evidence gathered from her collations.

The main results of Loungi's work seem to be that i) the two mss. families (namely  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ )<sup>4</sup> do not have the same value, since whilst the text transmitted by the  $\alpha$  family derives from the late antiquity, the text transmitted by  $\beta$  derives from an intense reworking of the text of the *EN* by Byzantine scholars that took place in the 12th century; ii) that the improvements found in the text transmitted by the  $\beta$  family do not derive from ancient sources like papyri;<sup>5</sup> iii) most *recentiores* do not have any value in establishing the text of the *EN*.<sup>6</sup>

No doubt these results are still to some extent provisory in that they require further study to be fully confirmed. As Loungi herself emphasises, it is still an open question whether the transmission of the *EN* is unified for all its books. Since Rasso and Susemihl, it has been assumed that the mss. of the *EN* constitute two main families (for Susemihl, these are  $\Pi^1$  and  $\Pi^2$ ; Loungi calls these  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ ). Yet it has been argued that, depending on the books from the *EN* one has in view, the members of these two families differ.<sup>7</sup> Accordingly, it may be argued that Loungi's results, if indeed correct, cannot be generalized to the whole *EN*, but can only be expanded to some books of the *EN*.<sup>8</sup>

A definitive answer to this issue depends on further studies on the transmission of books III, IV, V, VIII, and X. The present paper aims at giving a very small step in this direction in what concerns book X.

<sup>3</sup> As Loungi herself reports (2022, p. 66), she did not collate all mss. in full, but did so for all of the more ancient mss., and for a large number of the *recentiores*.

<sup>4</sup> Below I shall indicate what mss. Loungi takes to be the most important for reconstructing the text of each of these families.

<sup>5</sup> There may be an exception to this in book VI: in *EN* VI.13 [=Bywater VI.12] 1144a6, the reading of some mss. from the  $\beta$  family (LL<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>), namely *εὐδαιμονίαν*, is confirmed by POxy 2402. (cf. *Corpus dei papiri filosofici greci e latini*, 1989-2023, I.1\*, p. 263, IV.2 [I.1 & III], Tav. 185).

<sup>6</sup> See Loungi (2022, pp. 417-418) for brief summary of these claims.

<sup>7</sup> See, for instance, Susemihl (1887, pp. VIII, XX) and Gauthier and Jolif (1970, p. 312) for two slightly different versions of this claim. Similarly, see Loungi (2022, p. 61).

<sup>8</sup> In rough lines, it would seem that, if we follow Susemihl's division of the mss., Loungi's proposal (if correct) may hold for books I, II, VI, VII, IX, and X; but if we follow Gauthier's division of the mss., that it may hold for books I, II, VI, VII, and IX.

In this work, I focus on the text of *EN* X.6-9 [=Bywater X.6-8], the chapters from the *EN* in which Aristotle presents his arguments for the superiority of contemplative life.<sup>9</sup> This text has been for long object of deep interpretative controversy, and, moreover, is part of books in which there would allegedly be a difference in how the two families of mss. are organized (on Gauthier version of this claim at least, see footnote 8).<sup>10</sup> In the face of this, with the objective of exploring Loungi's hypothesis, I freshly collated, for the text of *EN* X.6-9 [=Bywater X.6-8], the eight mss. Loungi takes to be (on the basis of her collations) the most important for determining the readings of the  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  families, namely Laur. Plut. 81.11 (K<sup>b</sup>), Vat. gr. 1342 (P<sup>b</sup>), Cant. gr. li.5.44 [=1879] (C<sup>c</sup>), Laur. Plut. 81.18 (L), Par. gr. 1854 (L<sup>b</sup>), Ricc. 46 (O<sup>b</sup>), Ambros. B 95 sup. [=Martini-Bassi 117] (B<sup>95sup.</sup>), and Vind. Phil. 315 (V).<sup>11</sup> In addition to these mss., I have also freshly collated the relevant part of ms. Marc. Gr. Z 213 (M<sup>b</sup>), which despite not having much stemmatic worth on Loungi's hypothesis<sup>12</sup>, was central for previous editions of the *EN*.

Furthermore, I have checked the Arabic translation (in the edition by Akasoy and Fidora [2005] and taking into account the corrections proposed by Ullmann [2011-2012, vol. 2, pp. 123-274])<sup>13</sup> and the Latin version of Averroes's *Middle Commentary* (edited by Woerther [2018])<sup>14</sup> for all passages where their readings seemed relevant.<sup>15</sup> For a single passage (1176b26-27),

<sup>9</sup> I recognise that this choice is arbitrary, and in making it I do not intend to take a stance regarding the unity of book X. I thank one of the anonymous referees for pressing me on this.

<sup>10</sup> Similarly, Rassow (1874, p. 6) thinks that, in book X, O<sup>b</sup> occupies an intermediate position between K<sup>b</sup>M<sup>b</sup> and L<sup>b</sup>, different from how it behaves in other books.

<sup>11</sup> On Loungi's hypothesis, for determining the readings of the  $\alpha$  family, the relevant mss. are K<sup>b</sup>, P<sup>b</sup>, and C<sup>c</sup> (together with the Arabic translation); whereas for determining the readings of the  $\beta$  family, the relevant mss. are L, L<sup>b</sup>, O<sup>b</sup>, and B<sup>95sup.</sup>. V, in turn, should be used with care, since although it is a mss. from the  $\beta$  family, it is in many places contaminated by readings of the  $\alpha$  family.

<sup>12</sup> The importance of M<sup>b</sup> was already called into question after the work of Mioni (1958, pp. 85-87), who suggested that this ms. is closely related to G<sup>a</sup> (Marc. gr. Z 212) (Mioni suggests that M<sup>b</sup> is actually a copy of G<sup>a</sup>). Further study of M<sup>b</sup> and G<sup>a</sup> is required to clarify the relationship between these two mss. and their relationship with E<sup>a</sup> (Vat. gr. 506—M<sup>b</sup>'s exemplar according to Loungi's *stemma*) and with F (Vat. Barb. 75—which is a copy of V that contaminates M<sup>b</sup> according to Loungi's *stemma*). For a discussion of the relationship between E<sup>a</sup> and M<sup>b</sup>, see Loungi (2022, pp. 359-361); for a discussion of the relationship between E<sup>a</sup> and G<sup>a</sup> on the basis of the evidence from book I of the *EN*, see Loungi (2022, pp. 367-376). For a collation of the text of F for *EN* X.6.1176a30-X.9.1179a32, see Oskvig (2018, pp. 347-348).

<sup>13</sup> I did not have access to Dorothy G. Axelroth's 1968 doctoral dissertation *An Analysis of the Arabic Translation of Book Ten of Aristotle's Nicomachean Ethics*, which contains an edition and English translation of the Arabic version of *EN* X.

<sup>14</sup> The relevance of Averroes *Middle Commentary* for establishing the text of the *EN* lies in the fact that it consists mostly of a paraphrasis of the Arabic translation of the *EN*, and in some cases, as we shall see, it seems to be free of some corruptions found in the text preserved in the Fez ms. (and vice versa).

<sup>15</sup> The majority of the passages I have checked were already flagged by Akasoy and Fidora (2005) in their edition, and by Schmidt and Ullmann (2012), who list passages in which the Arabic translation

moreover, I have checked ms. Par. 1417, which is the only ms. Susemihl and Bywater mention in support of a reading that cannot be found in any other ms. they collated, but which is attested by L and by the Arabic translation.<sup>16</sup>

The Arabic translation and four of the nine mss. I collated (namely, C<sup>c</sup>, L, B<sup>95sup.</sup>, and V) were not taken into account by previous editions of the text. This is perfectly expected in the case of the Arabic translation, since its only extant ms.<sup>17</sup> was only discovered in the fifties (by A.J. Arberry and by D.M. Dunlop)<sup>18</sup>, and a series of misfortunes made it so that a *critical* edition of it only came to light in 2005.<sup>19</sup>

The fact that L, V, and B<sup>95sup.</sup> were not taken into account by previous editions, in turn, is explained by the fact that the dating of these mss. has been revised only recently: L was for long regarded as belonging to the 14th century. This remained so until the work of Brockmann (1993, pp. 49-50), which showed that it belongs rather to the 12th century<sup>20</sup>, and that it is the result

---

departs from the text edited by Susemihl. There are, however, some other instances in which this translation proved to be decisive in establishing the text of *EN* X.6-9. All relevant readings are listed in the *apparatus*.

<sup>16</sup> As can be seen in the *apparatus*, this is 1176b27, and Susemihl and Bywater do not report the reading of Par. 1417 correctly for this passage, a mistake due to their depending on Zell's collation of this ms. (see Susemihl, 1887, p. VII). As noted in my *apparatus*, Par. 1417 has δὴ one line above this one, which is perhaps what led to this mistake. This particular mistake is committed by Zell on page 450 of the second volume of his edition (1820, vol. 2, p. 450).

<sup>17</sup> Although the Arabic translation dates from the ninth century (the translation of books I-IV is by *Ishāq ibn Hunayn* and dates from around 870 CE, whereas the translation of books V-X is by Euthathius [*Uṣṭāṭ*] and dates from around 830 CE), the two parts of the Fez ms. date from 1222 CE (cf. Dunlop's introduction in Akasoy & Fidora, 2005, p. 1; and Ullmann, 2011-2012, vol. 1, p. 13). Furthermore, it is important to note that there are good reasons for thinking that this Arabic translation was made from a Greek ms. in majuscules without separation between the words, and which, besides being older than all extant Greek mss, is also free from many mistakes resulting from the transcription to the miniscule script (cf. Ullmann, 2011-2012, vol. 1, p. 12; Schmidt & Ullmann, 2012, pp. 99ff).

<sup>18</sup> See their reports in Arberry (1955) and in Dunlop (1962). Arberry's report of his discovery of the part of ms. containing the Arabic translation of *EN* VII-X is accompanied by a collation of *EN* IX.1. Dunlop's report of his discovery of the part of the ms. containing the Arabic translation of *EN* I-VI, in turn, is accompanied by a number of passages from these books he takes to be illustrative of the merits and defects of the Arabic translation of the *EN*.

<sup>19</sup> On this, see Akasoy and Fidora (2005, pp. vii-x). On the differences between the objectives of Abdurrahmān Badawi's 1979 edition of this translation and those of Akasoy & Fidora's, see Akasoy and Fidora (2005, pp. ix, ixn1), Ullmann (2011-2012, vol. 1, pp. 14-15), and Schmidt and Ullmann (2012, pp. 9-10). For a critical assessment of Akasoy & Fidora's edition, according to which it is as unreliable as Badawi's, see Ullmann (2011-2012, vol. 1, pp. 15-21).

<sup>20</sup> Since the publication of this work, we have been provided with a collation of L for books I-III made by Vuillemin-Diem and Rashed (1997), and, more recently, with a full collation of the text of the *EN* in L made by Panegyres (2020). For my current purposes, it should be noted that Panegyres's collation of L proved to be quite reliable in what concerns the text of *EN* X.6-9. In comparing the part of his collation that covers *EN* X.6-9 with my own collation, I have found only two mistakes of his (at 1178b20, where he reports that L reads ἀφρηρημένον but it reads rather ἀφρηρημένω; and at 1178b28, where he reports that

of the work of Ioannikios and his *scriptorium*.<sup>21</sup> Similarly, V and B<sup>95sup.</sup> were both previously dated as belonging to the 14th century together with O<sup>b</sup>, which despite being taken into account by previous editors, was not regarded as being of much importance.<sup>22</sup> However, it turns out that O<sup>b</sup> belongs to the 12th century<sup>23</sup>, that V was produced between the 11-12th centuries<sup>24</sup>, and that B<sup>95sup.</sup> comes from the end of the 12th century or from the beginning of the 13th century.<sup>25</sup>

The case of C<sup>c</sup> is slightly different. Since the work of Jackson (1876), it has been thought that C<sup>c</sup> was a copy of P<sup>b</sup>. Accordingly, although C<sup>c</sup> uniformly agrees with K<sup>b</sup>—as has been shown by Stewart (1882, p. 3) (who collated C<sup>c</sup> in full for book X and partially for the other books of the *EN*)—, C<sup>c</sup> was taken to be subordinate to P<sup>b</sup>, which, in turn, was not taken as being of much value.<sup>26</sup> It was only after the work of Harlfinger (1971) on the transmission of the *EE*, and the work of Brockmann (1993) on the transmission of the *MM* that it became clear that C<sup>c</sup> was not a copy of P<sup>b</sup>, but that these two mss. are copies of the same exemplar made by the same copyist (Nicolaus Damenus). Besides, as far as I can tell, Loungi (2022, pp. 113-126) was the first to provide us with reasons for thinking that although P<sup>b</sup> and C<sup>c</sup> are related to K<sup>b</sup> in what concerns the text of the *EN*, they are neither copies of K<sup>b</sup> nor of its exemplar (sub-hyperarchetype *a*1 on Loungi's *stemma*), for there is reason for thinking that P<sup>b</sup>'s and C<sup>c</sup>'s exemplar, on the one hand, and K<sup>b</sup>'s exemplar, on the other, stem from the same ancestor.<sup>27</sup>

---

L reads *οὐδαμοῦ*, but it reads rather *οὐδαμῶς* and just one imprecision (at 1179a30 he simply says that L omits *ἄρα*, but it actually writes *εἶναι* in place of *ἄρα*).

<sup>21</sup> On Ioannikios and his *scriptorium*, see Wilson (1983).

<sup>22</sup> See, for instance, the judgment given by Jackson (1879, p. xi) about O<sup>b</sup>'s value for *EN* V in comparison to its value for other parts of the *EN*: 'O<sup>b</sup>. Riccardianus 46. More correct than M<sup>b</sup>, O<sup>b</sup> contributes fewer peculiar readings to the text than that ms. In this book however it does not seem to be as decidedly inferior to M<sup>b</sup> as (according to the best authorities) it is elsewhere.' Similarly, Susemihl (1878, p. 630) ranks O<sup>b</sup> after M<sup>b</sup>, which he takes to be inferior both to K<sup>b</sup> and L<sup>b</sup>. Busse (1883, p. 137), in turn, is a bit more pessimistic, and thinks that much of the authority attributed to O<sup>b</sup> (and to M<sup>b</sup>) by Rassow and Susemihl vanishes if one accepts that O<sup>b</sup> (and M<sup>b</sup> too) cannot be fully assigned to one of the two families (but may be taken as having a very close relationship to each of them in different places of the *EN*).

<sup>23</sup> As has been shown by Baldi (2011). More recently, see Martinelli Tempesta (2016).

<sup>24</sup> As suggested by Brockmann (1993, p. 49n27), who identifies the copyist of this ms. with that of Par. gr. 1808, a ms. important to the transmission of Plato's works that dates from 11-12 centuries.

<sup>25</sup> On this, see Loungi (2022, p. 154n204).

<sup>26</sup> Jackson (1879, p. xi), for instance, claims that, in regard to book V, P<sup>b</sup> 'contribute[s] to the text nothing which is not to be found in one or more of the remaining five codices [sc. K<sup>b</sup>L<sup>b</sup>M<sup>b</sup>N<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>].' Similarly, Susemihl (1878, p. 631) says that he compared the readings of P<sup>b</sup> for 1176a11-1177a30 with those of H<sup>a</sup> (Marc. gr. Z 214) and N<sup>b</sup> (Marc. gr. IV.53), and then says: '*der Gewinn aber ist beinahe gleich null.*'

<sup>27</sup> On the hypothesis advanced by Loungi (2022, pp. 113-126), sub-hyperarchetype  $\gamma$  (P<sup>b</sup>'s and C<sup>c</sup>'s exemplar) depends on sub-hyperarchetype  $\alpha$ 2, which, in turn, comes from the same ancestor as sub-hyperarchetype  $\alpha$ 1 (K<sup>b</sup>'s exemplar), namely hyperarchetype *a*. However, as we shall see, there is a caveat: as Loungi (2022, p. 114) observes, it is probable that the copyist of C<sup>c</sup> did not simply copied  $\gamma$  as he did in the case of P<sup>b</sup>, but availed himself of a corrective exemplar. Besides, there are signs that both

Regarding  $K^bL^bO^bM^b$ , it should be noted, to begin with, that both Susemihl and Bywater rely on Schöll's collation of  $K^b$  (which can be found in Rassow [1874, pp. 10-14]). Besides, although Susemihl depends on Bekker's collations for many mss., he reports that he collated  $M^bO^b$  for many passages and has relied on information provided to him by Charles Graux and by Henri Omont for many passages of  $L^b$  (cf. Susemihl in Ramsauer, 1878, p. 731; and Susemihl, 1887, pp. vi-vii).<sup>28</sup> Bywater, in turn, besides relying on Bekker, Schöll, and Susemihl, has also taken into account the collation of parts of  $K^b$  made by Girolamo Vitelli that can be found in Stewart (1882), and reports that he also examined the mss. himself for certain passages (cf. Bywater, 1894, pp. vi-vii).

In collating the relevant parts of  $K^bP^bC^cLL^bO^bB^{95sup}VM^b$  and in comparing their readings with those from the Arabic translation, I was led me to propose a tentative new text for *EN* X.6-9 [=Bywater X.6-8].

The resulting text differs from that printed by Bekker, Susemihl, and Bywater in nine instances; from that printed by both Bekker and Susemihl (disagreeing with Bywater) in three instances; and from that printed by both Bekker and Bywater (disagreeing with Susemihl) in one instance.

Moreover, it differs from the text printed only by Bekker (disagreeing with Susemihl and Bywater) in five passages; from that printed only by Susemihl (disagreeing with Bekker and Bywater) in five passages; and from that printed only by Bywater (disagreeing with Bekker and Susemihl) in seven passages.

All these instances are listed in the *apparatus*. Whenever the text I print departs from that printed by Bekker, Susemihl, or Bywater, there are indications about the text they print.

In addition to that, my collations also allowed me to correct some mistakes and imprecisions that can be found in the *apparatus critici* of the editions of Bekker, Susemihl, and Bywater.

In deciding between different readings, I have favoured those of the  $\alpha$  family.<sup>29</sup> This is

---

$P^b$  and  $C^c$  adopt corrections found in the  $\beta$  family for some passages (most notably, from  $L$ ), as Loungi (2022, p. 113) argues (more on this below in footnote 30).

<sup>28</sup> Moreover, for  $P^b$ , Susemihl depends on Jackson (1879) for book V, and, for book X, on a collation made by his '*collega coniunctissimus*' von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff. Besides, the fact that Susemihl does not give the readings of  $P^b$  in his apparatus after 1177a30 strongly suggests that the collation made by von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff that Susemihl is talking about (cf. Susemihl, 1887, p. vii) is just the collation of 1176a11-1177a30 (the part of book X that is missing in  $K^b$ ) that Wilamowitz made on his behalf a couple of years earlier (cf. Susemihl, 1878, p. 631).

<sup>29</sup> Except, of course, in those cases in which the reading of the  $\alpha$  family is clearly a corruption.

easy to determine when there is agreement between  $K^b P^b C^c$  and the Arabic translation.<sup>30</sup> When  $P^b$  and  $C^c$  diverge from  $K^b$ , I have, as a rule, favoured their reading only if it agreed with the Arabic translation and it is clear what the Arabic translation is translating or if the reading of  $K^b$  can be clearly explained away as being due to a corruption.

It may be objected, however, that the temporal distance between the making of the Arabic translation and the Fez ms. (see footnote 17) suggests that this translation and Averroes' commentary (which paraphrases it) should be used with care. Yet, inasmuch as it may be argued that the corruptions this translation was subject to during this period are of a different nature from that the Greek mss. were subject to, I think this translation may nevertheless be of great value in establishing the text of the *EN* in those cases in which we can determine what it is translating with some degree of plausibility.<sup>31</sup> Besides, Ullmann's (2011-2012) careful and detailed work on the translation practices of *Ishāq ibn Hunayn* and Eusthatus (*Uṣṭāṭ*) are of great help in effort of reconstructing its Greek exemplar in spite of idiosyncrasies of this translation.

In the final section of this paper (after the text of *EN* X.6-9 [=Bywater X.6-8]), I have provided some notes on the text explaining my decisions for some difficult passages.

An important result of my collations is that they strengthen the suspicion that  $O^b$  and  $M^b$  do indeed agree with  $K^b$  in more instances than one would expect in light of Loungi's *stemma*. As a matter of fact, there are a couple of common mistakes that suggest that  $O^b$  is contaminated either by  $K^b$ , by its exemplar or, at the very least, by some other non-extant mss. that preserves some readings of  $K^b$ . However, the evidence from *EN* X.6-9 [=Bywater X.6-8] is not enough for settling this issue, which would certainly demand a full collation of *EN* X. Moreover, because the text of the *EN* in  $O^b$  is the result of the work of two different hands (which appear to be from the same period and from the same *scriptorium*)<sup>32</sup>, perhaps a full collation of these nine mss. for the text of *EN* III or IV will prove to be necessary to show with certainty that  $O^b$ 's agreeing

---

<sup>30</sup> Things are not so clear before 1177a30, since  $K^b$  omits 1176a11 (τέρπει) - 1177a30 (ικανῶς). In lines 1176a30-1177a30 one has to rely only on  $P^b C^c$  and on the Arabic translation to determine the readings of  $\alpha$  family. However, because in some cases the copyist of  $P^b C^c$  tends adopt corrections from the  $\beta$  family (in particular, from L—on this, see Loungi [2022, p. 113]), it is hard to tell whether, in those passages from 1176a30-1177a30 where i)  $P^b C^c$  agree with L and ii) the Arabic translation is not decisive, the *gemelli* are giving the reading of the  $\alpha$  family or a correction from L. A passage that is quite unclear in this regard is 1176b17 (see my discussion of it below).

<sup>31</sup> I thank one of the anonymous referees for pressing me to take a position on this issue.

<sup>32</sup> The first original hand is responsible for ff.7r-33v (until 1129b11 περιέχει πᾶσαν ἀδικίαν [part of a stretch of text also added by  $L^b$  and  $M^b$  after 1129b10-11 'τοῦτο γὰρ περιέχει καὶ κοινόν']), the second original hand is responsible for ff.34r-90v (from 1129b11 καὶ κοινόν ἐστὶν πάσης ἀδικίας until the end of the *EN*). See Martinelli Tempesta (2016, pp. 209ff) on this.

with  $K^b$  against other members of the  $\beta$  family is not something that happens only in the parts of  $O^b$  copied by its second original hand, but also in parts of the text copied by its first original hand<sup>33</sup>, and to confirm the results about its stemmatic value.

In any case, the evidence from *EN* X.6-9 [=Bywater X.6-8] seems to suggest that, of the nine mss. I collated, only  $O^b$  and  $M^b$  exhibit this unexpected behaviour. In fact, although there is reason for thinking that, in regard to  $O^b$  and  $M^b$  at least, book X does not belong with books I, II, VI, VII, and IX—in which case Gauthier’s division of the mss. would prove to be more accurate in this particular regard than Susemihl’s (see footnote 8)—, the remaining mss. I collated exhibit the behaviour one would expect them to have in light of Loungi’s *stemma*.

## 2. *The apparatus and collation method*

Below in section 3 I have provided an edition *EN* X.6-9 [=Bywater X.6-8] with a positive *apparatus*. For the sake of clarity, I give indications about what is missing (due to physical damage) from the witnesses I collated above the *apparatus criticus*. This is especially relevant in the case of L, since a large section of the top left side of the *recti* and of the top right side of the *versi* of the folios of L containing *EN* X.6-9 [=Bywater X.6-8] (i.e., ff. 81r-82v)<sup>34</sup> is missing due to physical damage.<sup>35</sup> When giving indications of what is missing in these mss., I have used brackets around parts of words to indicate that they are not missing (e.g., when in 1176b6-7 I say that L does not have ‘[εἶ]ναι ... ἀ[ρικήν]’, I mean that ‘εἶ-’ and ‘-ρήν’ are not missing in L)

The relevant readings from the Arabic translation are reported in the *apparatus* with vocalizations (which are absent in the original), so as to make clear the meaning of the many isolated chunks of text that I quote in the *apparatus*. I also provide modified versions of Dunlop’s English translation of the Arabic version (and also some translations of my own) in most cases I mention its readings in the *apparatus*.

$K^b$ ,  $P^b$ ,  $C^c$ , L,  $L^b$ ,  $O^b$ ,  $B^{95sup.}$ , and V were all collated using digital colour images that are

<sup>33</sup> There are good indications that this also happens in the parts of  $O^b$  copied by its first original hand. On this, see Rasso (1874, pp. 3-4), who claims that, in regard to books III-IV,  $O^b$  either stems from the same source as  $K^b$  or is itself dependent upon  $K^b$  directly and then provides some evidence in support of this claim.

<sup>34</sup> Although *EN* X.6-9 [=Bywater X.6-8] actually ends in f. 83r, only the last three lines of the text are located in this folio (i.e., 1179a31-33: ‘θεοφιλέστατος ... εὐδαίμων’).

<sup>35</sup> Besides, from 1178a33 onwards, the folios copied by V’s original hand (the one that dates from XI-XII centuries) are missing. Thus, although a later hand (from the XV century) completes the missing parts of V, I have not taken it into account.



available online in the repositories of the Libraries in which they are located.<sup>36</sup> M<sup>b</sup>, in turn, was collated using digital colour images provided by the Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana.

To secure more accuracy to my collations, I collated the relevant the mss. in small sections of about 30 Bekker lines each. The mss. were collated in the following order: K<sup>b</sup>, P<sup>b</sup>, C<sup>c</sup>, L, L<sup>b</sup>, O<sup>b</sup>, B<sup>95sup.</sup>, V, and M<sup>b</sup>. For every variant I found, I went back to the mss. I already collated to check them again. After this, I checked my results against previous collations<sup>37</sup> (checking all mss. again for every passage where I found a divergence between my results and those of the work of other scholars). Notwithstanding all these precautions, it is possible that the results presented in the *apparatus* can still be improved upon, and it is probable that further work may show that some corrections are necessary.

In the *apparatus*, I have not reported minor orthographical variants, and I have supplied iota subscripts in the *apparatus* when the mss. did not have them in all cases where their omission was not a source of textual problems.

I have strictly observed the lineation found in Immanuel Bekker's edition. To indicate the beginning of a new line, I have employed '|', with the exception of lines multiple of five and lines that correspond to the beginning of a new Bekker page or of a new Bekker column. For these, I have employed '||'. In the *apparatus*, in turn, I have employed '||' to separate entries for different lines or line intervals, and '|' to separate different entries for the same line or line interval.

---

<sup>36</sup> For K<sup>b</sup> and L, see <<https://tecabml.contentdm.oclc.org/digital>>; for P<sup>b</sup>, see <<https://digi.vatlib.it/>>; for C<sup>c</sup>, see <<https://cudl.lib.cam.ac.uk/>>; for L<sup>b</sup>, see <<https://gallica.bnf.fr/>>; for O<sup>b</sup>, see <<http://teca.riccardiana.firenze.sbn.it/>>; for B<sup>95sup.</sup>, see <<https://ambrosiana.comperio.it/>>; and, for V, see <<https://www.onb.ac.at/>>.

<sup>37</sup> I have checked my results against Stewart (1882), Susemihl (1887), Bywater (1892, 1894), Ashburner (1917), and Panegyres (2020). I have not checked my results against Susemihl and Apelt (1912). In fact, not only Apelt omits a series of readings reported by Susemihl (such as those of P<sup>b</sup>), but also, as already observed by Ashburner (1917), in translating Susemihl's sigla for the mss. groupings, he ends up introducing some mistakes into the *apparatus*.

3. *EN X.6-9 [=Bywater X.6-8]*

Sigla

K <sup>b</sup>	(Laur. Plut. 81.11, saec. IX, ff. 121v-124v—1176a11 [τέρπει] ad 1177a30 [ικανῶς] om. K <sup>b</sup> )
K <sup>b2</sup>	(Corrections made by a later hand [saec. XIII])
P <sup>b</sup>	(Vat. gr. 1342, saec. XIII, ff. 93r-95v)
C <sup>c</sup>	(Cant. gr. Ii.5.44 [=1879], saec. XIII, ff. 98v-101r)
L	(Laur. Plut. 81.18, saec. XII, ff. 81r-83r)
L <sup>1</sup>	(Corrections made Ioannikios himself or by his anonymous partner)
L <sup>2</sup>	(Corrections made by a later hand [different from L <sup>1</sup> ])
L <sup>b</sup>	(Par. gr. 1854, saec. XII-XIII, ff. 175r-182r)
O <sup>b</sup>	(Ricc. 46, saec. XII, ff. 85v-88v)
B <sup>95sup.</sup>	(Ambros. B 95 sup. [=Martini-Bassi 117], saec. XII-XIII, ff. 197r-205r)
B <sup>95sup.1</sup>	(Corrections made by a later hand)
V	(Vind. Phil. 315, saec. XI-XII, ff. 204v-209r—1178a33 ([δη]λος) ad finem desunt V <sup>1</sup> )
M <sup>b</sup>	(Marc. gr. Z 213, 1565-1572, ff. 117v-120v)
Arab.	(Arabic translation—ed. Akasoy & Fidora [2005])
Aver.	(Averroes's [Latin version]—ed. Woerther [2018])

1176a30 6. || εἰρημένων δὲ τῶν περὶ τὰς ἀρετὰς τε καὶ φιλίας καὶ  
| ἡδονάς, λοιπὸν περὶ εὐδαιμονίας τύπων διελθεῖν, ἐπειδὴ  
τέλος αὐτὴν τίθεμεν τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων. ἀναλαβοῦσι δὲ τὰ  
προειρημένα συντομώτερος ἂν εἴη ὁ λόγος. εἶπομεν δ' ὅτι  
οὐκ | ἔστιν ἕξις· καὶ γὰρ τῷ καθεύδοντι διὰ βίου ὑπάρχοι  
35 ἄν, φυ|τοῦ ζῶντι βίον, καὶ τῷ δυστυχοῦντι τὰ μέγιστα. εἰ δὲ  
1176b1 ταῦτα || μὴ ἀρέσκει, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον εἰς ἐνεργειάν τινα θετέον,  
καθά|περ ἐν τοῖς πρότερον εἴρηται, τῶν δ' ἐνεργειῶν αἱ μὲν  
εἰσιν | ἀναγκαῖαι καὶ δι' ἕτερα αἰρεταὶ αἱ δὲ καθ' αὐτάς,  
δηλον | ὅτι τὴν εὐδαιμονίαν τῶν καθ' αὐτὰς αἰρετῶν τινὰ  
5 θετέον καὶ || οὐ τῶν δι' ἄλλο· οὐδενὸς γὰρ ἐνδεῆς ἢ εὐδαιμο-  
νία ἀλλ' αὐτάρ|κης. καθ' αὐτὰς δ' εἰσὶν αἰρεταὶ ἀφ' ὧν μηδὲν  
ἐπιζητεῖται | παρὰ τὴν ἐνεργειαν. τοιαῦτα δ' εἶναι δοκοῦσιν

a30–31 εἰρημένων ... ἡδ[ονάς] desunt L

a35–b1 τὰ ... μὴ desunt L

b1–4 καθάπερ ... θετέον desunt L

b4–5 καὶ ... ἐν[δεῆς] desunt L

b6 δ' ... μηδὲν desunt L

b7–8 [εἶ]ναι ... ἀ[ρετήν] desunt L

|| a30 τε P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>LO<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup.</sup>VM<sup>b</sup>: om. L<sup>b</sup> || a32 τίθεμεν  
P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>LL<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup.</sup>V: ἀντιτίθεμεν M<sup>b</sup> | δη P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>LB<sup>95sup.</sup>VM<sup>b</sup>:  
δὲ L<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup> || a33 δ' P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>LL<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup.</sup>VM<sup>b</sup>: δη Bywater ||  
a34–35 φυτοῦ P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>B<sup>95sup.</sup>V: φθιτοῦ Arab. (553.9: 'المُعْدُوم') [*al-*  
*ma'dūmi*]—literally 'of what is nonexistent/lacking,' but see  
Arberry's conjecture [in Akasoy & Fidora, p. 552n131]: φυ-  
τῶν LL<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>M<sup>b</sup> Bekker Susemihl Bywater 1176b1 ἀρέσκει  
P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>LL<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>V: ἀρέσκοι B<sup>95sup.</sup>: ἀρέσκουσιν M<sup>b</sup> || b5 post ἄλλο  
add τι P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup> || b7 παρὰ P<sup>b</sup>LL<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup.</sup>VM<sup>b</sup>: περὶ C<sup>c</sup>

- αἰ κατ' ἀρε|τὴν πράξεις· τὰ γὰρ καλὰ καὶ σπουδαῖα πράτ-  
τειν τῶν δι' | αὐτὰ αἰρετῶν. καὶ τῶν παιδιῶν δὲ αἰ ἡδέϊαι· οὐ  
10 γὰρ δι' || ἕτερα αὐτὰς αἰροῦνται· βλάπτονται γὰρ ἀπ' αὐ-  
τῶν μᾶλλον | ἢ ὠφελοῦνται, ἀμελοῦντες τῶν σωμάτων καὶ  
τῆς κτήσεως. | καταφεύγουσι δ' ἐπὶ τὰς τοιαύτας διαγωγὰς  
τῶν εὐδαιμο|μιζομένων οἱ πολλοί, διὸ παρὰ τοῖς τυράννοις  
εὐδοκιμοῦσιν | οἱ ἐν ταῖς τοιαύταις διαγωγαῖς εὐτράπελοι·  
15 ὧν γὰρ ἐφίεν||ται, ἐν τούτοις παρέχουσι σφᾶς αὐτοὺς ἡδέϊς·  
δέονται δὲ τοιού|των. δοκεῖ μὲν οὖν εὐδαιμονικὰ ταῦτα εἶ-  
ναι διὰ τὸ τοὺς ἐν | δυναστείαις ἐν τούτοις ἀπασχολάζειν,  
οὐδὲν δὲ ἴσως σημεῖον | οἱ τοιοῦτοι εἰσίν· οὐ γὰρ ἐν τῷ δυ-  
ναστεύειν ἢ ἀρετῇ οὐδ' ὁ νοῦς, | ἀφ' ὧν αἰ σπουδαῖαι ἐνέρ-  
20 γειαι· οὐδ' εἰ ἄγευστοι οὔτοι ὄντες || ἡδονῆς εἰλικρινοῦς καὶ  
ἐλευθερίου ἐπὶ τὰς σωματικὰς κατα|φεύγουσιν, διὰ τοῦτο  
ταύτας οἰητέον αἰρετωτέρας εἶναι· καὶ | γὰρ οἱ παῖδες τὰ  
παρ' αὐτοῖς τιμώμενα κράτιστα οἴονται | εἶναι. εὐλογον δῆ,  
ὥσπερ παισὶ καὶ ἀνδράσιν ἕτερα φαί|νεται τίμια, οὕτω καὶ  
25 φαύλοισι καὶ ἐπιεικέσιν. καθάπερ οὖν || πολλάκις εἴρηται,  
καὶ τίμια καὶ ἡδέα ἐστὶ τὰ τῷ σπουδαίῳ | τοιαῦτα ὄντα·  
ἐκάστῳ δὲ ἢ κατὰ τὴν οἰκείαν ἕξιν αἰρετω|τάτη ἐνέργεια,

- b8–9** τῶν ... αἰρετῶν desunt L  
**b10** αἰροῦνται· βλάπτονται desunt L  
**b11** σωμάτων καὶ τῆς desunt L  
**b12–13** [εὐ]δαιμονιζομένων deest L  
**b14** διαγωγαῖς deest L  
**b15** δέονται deest L  
**b16–17** ἐν δυναστείαις desunt L  
**b18** ἐν τ[ῷ] desunt L  
**b19** οὐδ' deest L  
**b20** [σω]μα[τικὰς] deest L  
**b21–22** καὶ γὰρ ο[ὐ] desunt L  
**b23** δῆ deest L  
**b25** κα[ὶ] deest L

|| **b8** καλὰ καὶ om. L<sup>b</sup> || **b12** διαγωγὰς mg.P<sup>b</sup>s.l.C<sup>c</sup>LL<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup</sup>.VM<sup>b</sup>: ἀγωγὰς P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup> | ante τῶν add καὶ L || **b15–16** τοιούτων P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>LB<sup>95sup</sup>.VM<sup>b</sup>: τούτων L<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup> || **b17** ante δυναστείαις add ταῖς P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>B<sup>95sup</sup>.V | ἀπασχολάζειν L<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup</sup>.VM<sup>b</sup>Arab. (555.6: يَشْتَغِلُونَ [yaš-taḡilūna]): ἀποσχολάζειν P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>L Bekker Susemihl Bywater || **b18** οὐδ' ὁ LL<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup</sup>.V: οὐδὲ P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>: ὁ δὲ O<sup>b</sup>M<sup>b</sup> || **b20** ἐλευθερίου P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>LL<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup</sup>.V: ἐλευθέρως M<sup>b</sup> || **b22** αὐτοῖς P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>LL<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup</sup>.V: αὐτῶν M<sup>b</sup> || **b23–24** φαίνεται P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>LO<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup</sup>.VM<sup>b</sup>: φαίνονται L<sup>b</sup> || **b26** δὲ P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>LL<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup</sup>.VM<sup>b</sup>: δῆ Par. 1417 (pace Susemihl and Bywater, who report that it gives δῆ for the following line)

καὶ τῷ σπουδαίῳ δὴ ἢ κατὰ τὴν ἀρετὴν. οὐκ | ἐν παιδιᾷ  
ἄρα ἢ εὐδαιμονία. καὶ γὰρ ἄτοπον τὸ τέλος εἶναι | παιδιάν,  
30 καὶ πραγματεύεσθαι καὶ κακοπαθεῖν τὸν βίον || ἅπαντα τοῦ  
παίξεν χάριν. ἅπαντα γὰρ ὡς εἰπεῖν ἑτέρου | ἔνεκα αἰρού-  
μεθα πλὴν τῆς εὐδαιμονίας· τέλος γὰρ αὕτη. | σπουδάξεν  
δὲ καὶ πονεῖν παιδιᾶς χάριν ἠλίθιον φαίνεται καὶ | λίαν παι-  
δικόν· παίξεν δ' ὅπως σπουδάξῃ, κατ' Ἀνάχαρσιν, | ὀρθῶς  
35 ἔχειν δοκεῖ. ἀναπαύσει γὰρ ἔοικεν ἢ παιδιά, ἀδυνα||τοῦν-  
τες δὲ συνεχῶς πονεῖν ἀναπαύσεως δέονται. οὐ δὴ τέλος ||  
1177a1 ἢ ἀνάπαυσις· γίνεται γὰρ ἔνεκα τῆς ἐνεργείας. δοκεῖ δ' ὁ |  
εὐδαίμων βίος κατ' ἀρετὴν εἶναι· οὗτος δὲ μετὰ σπουδῆς, |  
ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐν παιδιᾷ. βελτίω τε λέγομεν τὰ σπουδαῖα τῶν |  
5 γελοίων καὶ μετὰ παιδιᾶς, καὶ τοῦ βελτίονος αἰεὶ καὶ || μο-  
ρίου καὶ ἀνθρώπου σπουδαιοτέραν τὴν ἐνέργειαν· ἢ δὲ τοῦ |  
βελτίονος κρείττων καὶ εὐδαιμονικωτέρα ἦδη. ἀπολαύσειέ  
| τ' ἂν τῶν σωματικῶν ἡδονῶν ὁ τυχὼν καὶ ἀνδράποδον  
οὐχ | ἦττον τοῦ ἀρίστου· εὐδαιμονίας δ' οὐδεὶς ἀνδραπόδῳ  
μεταδίδω|σιν, εἰ μὴ καὶ βίου. οὐ γὰρ ἐν ταῖς τοιαύταις δια-  
10 γωγαῖς ἢ || εὐδαιμονία, ἀλλ' ἐν ταῖς κατ' ἀρετὴν ἐνεργείας,  
καθάπερ | καὶ πρότερον εἴρηται. |  
7. εἰ δ' ἐστὶν ἢ εὐδαιμονία κατ' ἀρετὴν ἐνέργεια, εὐλογον  
| κατὰ τὴν κρατίστην· αὕτη δ' ἂν εἴη τοῦ ἀρίστου. εἴτε δὴ

**b27** κα[τὰ] deest L

**b28** [ἄτο]πον deest L

**b30** πα[ίξεν] deest L

**b31** [εὐδαι]μον[ίας] deest L

**b34** παι[διά] deest L

**1177a1** [ἀνά]π[αυσις] deest L

**a2** δὲ μ[ετὰ] desunt L

**a3** [σπ]ου[δ]αί[α] deest L

**a3** τῶν deest L

**a5** σπου[δαιοτέραν] deest L

**a6** [ἀπο]λ[ασσειε] deest L

**a8–9** μεταδίδωσιν ... ταῖς desunt L

**a10** ἀλλ' ... κα[θάπερ] desunt L

**a12** ἐστὶν ... ἐνέρ[γεια] desunt L

**a13** ἂν ... νοῦς desunt L

|| **b27** δὴ ἢ L Arab. (555.13: 'وَعِنْدَ الْفَاعِلِ أَيْضًا' [wa-'inda l-fādili aydan]—'and in the case of the excellent person too,' cf. Akasoy & Fidora [2005, p. 554n139], compare 1178a21, where the δὴ from καὶ ... δὴ is rendered in the same way, and 1178a5 and 1178a30, where it is rendered as 'likewise' [كَذَلِكَ]): δὲ ἢ O<sup>b</sup>a.r. Par. 1417: δὲ P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>L<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup</sup>.VM<sup>b</sup> Bekker || **b28** τὸ om. M<sup>b</sup> || **b31** ἔνεκα P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>LL<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>M<sup>b</sup>: χάριν B<sup>95sup</sup>.V || **b33** σπουδάξῃ P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>LB<sup>95sup</sup>.VM<sup>b</sup>: σπουδάξεν L<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup> || **1177a2** μετὰ σπουδῆς P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>LL<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup</sup>: σπουδαῖος V || **a3** ἀλλ' om. O<sup>b</sup>M<sup>b</sup> || **a4** ante μετὰ add. τῶν L<sup>b</sup> Susemihl || **a5** σπουδαιοτέραν P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>LO<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup</sup>.V: σπουδαιοτέρου M<sup>b</sup>: σπουδαιοτάτην L<sup>b</sup> || **a9** οὐ P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>L<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup</sup>.V: οὐδὲ M<sup>b</sup> | γὰρ P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>LL<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>M<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup</sup>.V: ἄρ' ci. Susemihl

15 νοῦς | τοῦτο εἴτε ἄλλο τι, ὃ δὴ κατὰ φύσιν δοκεῖ ἄρχειν καὶ  
ἡγεῖσθαι καὶ ἔννοιαν ἔχειν περὶ καλῶν καὶ θείων, εἴτε θεῖον  
ὄν | καὶ αὐτὸ εἴτε τῶν ἐν ἡμῖν τὸ θειότατον, ἢ τούτου ἐνέρ-  
γεια | κατὰ τὴν οἰκείαν ἀρετὴν εἴη ἂν ἡ τελεία εὐδαιμονία.  
ὅτι | δ' ἐστὶ θεωρητικὴ, εἴρηται. ὁμολογούμενον δὲ τοῦτ' ἂν  
20 δόξειεν | εἶναι καὶ τοῖς πρότερον καὶ τῷ ἀληθεῖ. κρατίστη  
τε γὰρ || αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ ἐνέργεια· καὶ γὰρ ὁ νοῦς τῶν ἐν ἡμῖν,  
καὶ τῶν | γνωστῶν, περὶ ἃ ὁ νοῦς. ἔτι δὲ συνεχεστάτη· θε-  
ωρεῖν τε γὰρ | δυνάμεθα συνεχῶς μᾶλλον ἢ πράττειν ὀτι-  
οῦν. οἰόμεθά τε | δεῖν ἡδονὴν παραμεμίχθαι τῇ εὐδαιμονίᾳ,  
ἡδίστη δὲ τῶν | κατ' ἀρετὴν ἐνεργειῶν ἢ κατὰ τὴν σοφίαν  
25 ὁμολογουμένως || ἐστίν· δοκεῖ γοῦν ἡ φιλοσοφία θαυμαστὰς  
ἡδονὰς ἔχειν καθαριότητι καὶ τῷ βεβαίῳ, εὐλογον δὲ τοῖς  
εἰδόσι τῶν ζῆ|τούντων ἡδῖω τὴν διαγωγὴν εἶναι. ἢ τε λεγο-  
μένη ἀντάρκεια | περὶ τὴν θεωρητικὴν μάλιστ' ἂν εἴη· τῶν  
30 καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ δέονται, || τοῖς δὲ τοιούτοις ἰκανῶς κεχορη-  
γημένων ὁ μὲν δίκαιος δεῖται | πρὸς οὓς δικαιοπραγήσει  
καὶ μεθ' ὧν, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ ὁ σώ|φρων καὶ ὁ ἀνδρείος καὶ  
τῶν ἄλλων ἕκαστος, ὁ δὲ σοφὸς | καὶ καθ' αὐτὸν ὧν δύνα-  
ται θεωρεῖν, καὶ ὅσῳ ἂν σοφώτερος | ᾗ, μᾶλλον· βέλτιον δ'  
1177b1 ἴσως συνεργοὺς ἔχων, ἀλλ' ὅμως || ἀνταρκέστατος. δόξαι

a14–15 [ἄρχ]ειν ... ἔχειν desunt L

a16 [εἴ]τε ... τούτου desunt L

a17–18 [εὐ]δαίμονια ... θεω[ρητικὴ] desunt L

a19 πρότερον ... ἀληθεῖ desunt L

a20–21 καὶ<sup>2</sup> ... νοῦς desunt L

a22 πράττειν ... οἰόμε[θά] desunt L

a24 ἀρετὴν ... κα[τὰ] desunt L

a25 [θα]υμαστὰς ... ἔ[χειν] desunt L

a27 [ἡδ]ίω δια[γωγὴν] desunt L

a28 τῶν μὲν γὰρ desunt L

a30 τοιούτοις ἰ[κανῶς] desunt L

a31 ὁμοίως deest L

a33–b33 δύναται θεωρεῖν desunt L

a34 [ὄ]μως deest L

|| a15 ante περὶ add. καὶ M<sup>b</sup> || a18 δὲ om. M<sup>b</sup> || a19  
τε om. LO<sup>b</sup>M<sup>b</sup> || a21 τε del. Bywater || a25 φιλοσοφία  
LL<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup</sup>.VM<sup>b</sup> Arab. (559.2: بِالْفَلْسَفَةِ [bi-l-falsafati]): σο-  
φία P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup> | θαυμαστὰς ἡδονὰς P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>L<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup</sup>.V: θαυμα-  
στην ἡδονὴν O<sup>b</sup>M<sup>b</sup> || a25–26 καθαριότητι P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>LB<sup>95sup</sup>.V:  
καθαριότητι L<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup> Bywater: καθαρσιότητι M<sup>b</sup> || a26 δὲ  
P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>LO<sup>b</sup>M<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup</sup>.V: τε L<sup>b</sup> || a27 διαγωγὴν P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>LL<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>VM<sup>b</sup>:  
ἀγωγὴν B<sup>95sup</sup>. || a29 ante σοφὸς add. ὁ P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>B<sup>95sup</sup>. || a30  
τοιῖς δὲ τοιούτοις P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>LO<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup</sup>.VM<sup>b</sup>: τῶν δὲ τοιούτων L<sup>b</sup> |  
κεχορηγημένων K<sup>b</sup>P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>LL<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>V: κεχορηγημένοις B<sup>95sup</sup>.M<sup>b</sup> ||  
a34 ᾗ K<sup>b</sup>P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>LL<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup</sup>.: εἴη O<sup>b</sup> | ἔχων K<sup>b</sup>P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>LL<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup</sup>.V:  
ἔχειν O<sup>b</sup>M<sup>b</sup> 1177b1 δόξαι K<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>M<sup>b</sup>: δόξειε P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>LL<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup</sup>.V

τ' ἂν αὐτὴ μόνη δι' αὐτὴν ἀγαπᾶσθαι· οὐδὲν γὰρ ἀπ' αὐ-  
τῆς γίνεται παρὰ τὸ θεωρῆσαι, ἀπὸ | δὲ τῶν πρακτικῶν ἢ  
πλείον ἢ ἔλαττον περιποιούμεθα παρὰ τὴν | πρᾶξιν. δοκεῖ  
5 τε ἢ εὐδαιμονία ἐν τῇ σχολῇ εἶναι· ἀσχολλούμεθα γὰρ ἵνα  
σχολάζωμεν, καὶ πολεμοῦμεν ἵνα εἰρήνην | ἄγωμεν. τῶν  
μὲν οὖν πρακτικῶν ἀρετῶν ἐν τοῖς πολιτικοῖς | ἢ ἐν τοῖς  
πολεμικοῖς ἢ ἐνέργεια· αἱ δὲ περὶ ταῦτα πράξεις | δοκοῦσιν  
ἄσχολοι εἶναι, αἱ μὲν πολεμικαὶ καὶ παντελῶς, | οὐδεὶς γὰρ  
10 αἰρεῖται τὸ πολεμεῖν τοῦ πολεμεῖν ἕνεκα, οὐδὲ παρρασκευ-  
άζει πόλεμον· δόξαι γὰρ ἂν παντελῶς μαιφόνος | τις εἶναι,  
εἰ τοὺς φίλους πολεμίους ποιοῖτο, ἵνα μάχαι καὶ | φόνος γί-  
νουντο. ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἡ τοῦ πολιτικοῦ ἄσχυλος, καὶ | παρ' αὐτὸ  
τὸ πολιτεύεσθαι περιποιουμένη δυναστείας καὶ τιμᾶς ἢ τὴν  
15 γε εὐδαιμονίαν αὐτῷ καὶ τοῖς πολίταις, ἕτεραν || οὐσαν τῆς  
πολιτικῆς, ἣν καὶ ζητοῦμεν δηλὸν ὡς ἕτεραν οὐσαν. | εἰ δὲ  
τῶν μὲν κατὰ τὰς ἀρετὰς πράξεων αἱ πολιτικαὶ καὶ | πο-  
λεμικαὶ κάλλει καὶ μεγέθει προέχουσιν, αὐταὶ δ' ἄσχυλοι  
καὶ τέλους τινὸς ἐφίενται καὶ οὐ δι' αὐτὰς αἰρεταί εἰσιν, |  
ἢ δὲ τοῦ νοῦ ἐνέργεια σπουδῆ τε διαφέρειν δοκεῖ θεωρη-

**b2** οὐδ[έν] deest L

**b3** [ἔλαττο]ν περι[ποιούμεθα] desunt L

**b4** [εἶ]ναι deest L

**b5–6** [εἰρή]νην ἄ[γωμεν] desunt L

**b7** δὲ deest L

**b10** [δόξ]αι deest L

**b11** [ἵ]να μάχαι

**b13** περιποιου[μένη] deest L

**b14–15** ἕτεραν οὐσαν desunt L

**b16** [π]ράξεων deest L

**b19** τε δια[φέρειν] desunt L

**b1** τ' K<sup>b</sup>P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>L<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup</sup>.V δ' L<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>M<sup>b</sup> | **b3** δὲ  
K<sup>b</sup>P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>L<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup</sup>.VM<sup>b</sup>: γὰρ O<sup>b</sup> | πρακτικῶν K<sup>b</sup>P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>M<sup>b</sup>Arab.  
(559.10: 'مِنْ ذَوَاتِ الْفِعْلِ' [min dawāti l-fi'li]—cf. Schmidt&Ul-  
mann [2011, p.92]): πρακτῶν LL<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup</sup>.V | περιποιούμεθα  
K<sup>b</sup>P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>LL<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup</sup>.V: περιποιούμεθα M<sup>b</sup> | παρὰ  
K<sup>b</sup>P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>L s.L<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup</sup>.V: περὶ L<sup>b</sup>M<sup>b</sup> | **b5** σχολάζωμεν  
K<sup>b</sup>P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>LL<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup</sup>.V: σπουδάζωμεν M<sup>b</sup> | **b6** πρακτικῶν  
K<sup>b</sup>P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>LL<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup</sup>.V: πρακτῶν M<sup>b</sup> | **b7** ἢ ἐν τοῖς  
πολεμικοῖςom. M<sup>b</sup> | ἐν om. L<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup</sup>.V | ἢ ἐνέργεια  
K<sup>b</sup>P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>LO<sup>b</sup>M<sup>b</sup>: αἱ ἐνέργειαι L<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup</sup>.V | **b9** αἰρεῖται τὸ  
πολεμεῖν K<sup>b</sup>P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>LL<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup</sup>.V: πολεμεῖν αἰρεῖται M<sup>b</sup> | **b9–10**  
παρασκευάζει K<sup>b</sup>LO<sup>b</sup>: παρασκευάζειν P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>L<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup</sup>.VM<sup>b</sup> ||  
**b12** φόνος K<sup>b</sup>P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>O<sup>b</sup> Arab. (559.15: 'حَتَّى تَكُونَ حُرُوبٌ وَقَتْلٌ'  
[hattā takūna hurūbun wa-qatlun]—'so that there are battles and  
slaughter'): φόνοι LL<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup</sup>.VM<sup>b</sup> Bekker Susemihl Bywater  
| γίνονται P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>LL<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup</sup>.: γίνονται K<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>: γίνονται M<sup>b</sup> | **b15**  
καὶ om. LL<sup>b</sup> | **b17–18** ἄσχυλοι καὶ P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>LL<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup</sup>.VM<sup>b</sup>:  
ἄσχυλοικαι (sic) K<sup>b</sup> (note that the accents in K<sup>b</sup> have been added  
by a later hand) | **b18** αἰρεταί εἰσιν K<sup>b</sup>P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>O<sup>b</sup>M<sup>b</sup>: εἰσιν  
αἰρεταί LL<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup</sup>.V

- 20 τικῆ οὔσα,|| καὶ παρ' αὐτὴν οὐδενὸς ἐφίεσθαι τέλους, ἔχειν  
τε ἡδονὴν | οἰκείαν (αὕτη δὲ συναύξει τὴν ἐνέργειαν), καὶ τὸ  
αὐτάρκες | δὴ καὶ σχολαστικὸν καὶ ἄτρυτον ὡς ἀνθρώπων  
καὶ ὅσα | ἄλλα τῷ μακαρίῳ ἀπονέμεται κατὰ ταύτην τὴν  
ἐνέργειαν | φαίνεται ὄντα· ἡ τελεία δὴ εὐδαιμονία αὕτη ἂν  
25 εἶη ἀνθρώπων, λαβοῦσα μῆκος βίου τέλειον. οὐδὲν γὰρ ἀτε-  
λές ἐστίν | τῶν τῆς εὐδαιμονίας. ὁ δὲ τοιοῦτος ἂν εἶη βίος  
κρείττων ἢ | κατ' ἀνθρώπων· οὐ γὰρ ἢ ἀνθρωπός ἐστίν οὐ-  
τως βιώσεται, ἀλλ' | ἢ θεῖόν τι ἐν αὐτῷ ὑπάρχει· ὅσον δὲ  
διαφέρει τοῦτο τοῦ συνθέτου, τοσοῦτον καὶ ἡ ἐνέργεια τῆς  
30 κατὰ τὴν ἄλλην ἀρετῆν. || εἰ δὴ θεῖον ὁ νοῦς πρὸς τὸν ἀν-  
θρώπων, καὶ ὁ κατὰ τοῦτον βίος | θεῖος πρὸς τὸν ἀνθρώ-  
πων βίον. οὐ χρὴ δὲ κατὰ τοὺς παραινοῦντας ἀνθρώπινα  
φρονεῖν ἀνθρώπων ὄντα οὐδὲ θνητὰ τὸν θνητόν, ἀλλ' ἐφ'  
ὅσον ἐνδέχεται ἀθανατίζειν καὶ πάντα ποιεῖν | πρὸς τὸ ζῆν  
1178a1 κατὰ τὸ κράτιστον τῶν ἐν αὐτῷ· εἰ γὰρ καὶ || τῷ ὄγκῳ

**b20–21** ἡδονὴν οἰ[κείαν] desunt L

**b22** ὡς ἀν[θρώπων] desunt L

**b23** ἐν[έργειαν] deest L

**b24–25** ὄντα ... ἀνθρώ[που](see critical note below) desunt L

**b25–26** [οὐ]δὲν ... ὁ δὲ desunt L

**b27** οὐ γὰρ ... ἀλλ' desunt L

**b28–29** τοῦ ... κατὰ desunt L

**b30–31** [κα]τὰ ... βίον desunt L

**b32–33** ὄντα ... ἀ[λλ'] desunt L

**b34** τὸ ζῆν ... κράτιστον desunt L

|| **b20** ante ἔχειν add. καὶ K<sup>b</sup> | τε P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>LL<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup</sup>.V: τὴν  
K<sup>b</sup> Bywater: τε καὶ M<sup>b</sup> || **b21** ante οἰκείαν add. τελείαν  
K<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>M<sup>b</sup> Susemihl: om. P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>L<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup</sup>.V Arab. (561.5-6: 'وَأَنَّ  
لَهَا حَاصِبَةً' [wa-anna lahu laddatan hāṣṣiygatan]—'and that it  
has its own pleasure') || **b22** δὴ K<sup>b</sup>P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>LL<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup</sup>.: δὲ O<sup>b</sup>M<sup>b</sup>  
Susemihl | ἀνθρώπων K<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>: ἀνθρώπων P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>LL<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup</sup>.V  
|| **b23** κατὰ P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>LL<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup</sup>.V: τὰ κατὰ K<sup>b</sup>M<sup>b</sup> Bywater ||  
**b24–25** ἀνθρώπων K<sup>b</sup>P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>: ἀνθρώπου LL<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup</sup>.V Bekker  
Susemihl Bywater || **b25** λαβοῦσα K<sup>b</sup>P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>LL<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup</sup>.V:  
λαβοῦσαν M<sup>b</sup> | βίου τέλειον K<sup>b</sup>P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>LL<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup</sup>.VM<sup>b</sup>: τέ-  
λειον βίου O<sup>b</sup> || **b24–26** ἀνθρώπου ... ἂν εἶη mg. V  
|| **b26** ἂν εἶη K<sup>b</sup>P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>LO<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup</sup>.VM<sup>b</sup>: εἶη ἂν L<sup>b</sup> | βίος  
κρείττων K<sup>b</sup>P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>O<sup>b</sup>M<sup>b</sup>: κρείττων βίος LL<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup</sup>.V || **b28**  
ὅσον K<sup>b</sup>P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>: ὅσω s.l.C<sup>c</sup>LL<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup</sup>.VM<sup>b</sup> Bekker Susemihl |  
δὲ K<sup>b</sup>P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>L<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup</sup>.V: δὴ L || **b29** τοσοῦτον K<sup>b</sup>P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>: το-  
σοῦτῳ s.l.C<sup>c</sup>L<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup</sup>.VM<sup>b</sup> Bekker Susemihl || **b31** οὐ χρὴ δὲ  
K<sup>b</sup>P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>O<sup>b</sup>: χρὴ δὲ οὐ LL<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup</sup>.V || **a33** ἀθανατίζειν K<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>M<sup>b</sup>:  
ἀπαθανατίζειν P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup> mg.O<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup</sup>.V: ἀποθανατίζειν (sic) LL<sup>b</sup> |  
πάντα K<sup>b</sup>P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>O<sup>b</sup>: ἄπαντα LL<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup</sup>.V

- μικρόν ἐστι, δυνάμει καὶ τιμότητι πολὺ μάλλον | πάντων  
ὑπερέχει. δόξειε δ' ἂν καὶ εἶναι ἕκαστος τοῦτο, εἴπερ | τὸ  
κύριον καὶ ἄμεινον· ἄτοπον οὖν γίνοιτ' ἂν, εἰ μὴ τὸν | αὐ-  
5 τοῦ βίον αἰροῖτο ἀλλὰ τινος ἄλλου. τὸ λεχθέν τε πρότερον  
ἀρμόσει καὶ νῦν· τὸ γὰρ οἰκείον ἑκάστῳ τῇ φύσει κράτι-  
στον καὶ ἡδιστόν ἐστιν ἑκάστῳ. καὶ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ δὴ ὁ κατὰ  
| τὸν νοῦν βίος, εἴπερ τοῦτο μάλιστα ἄνθρωπος. οὗτος ἄρα  
καὶ | εὐδαιμονέστατος. |  
10 8. δευτέρως δ' ὁ κατὰ τὴν ἄλλην ἀρετὴν· αἱ γὰρ κατὰ ||  
ταύτην ἐνέργειαι ἀνθρωπικαί· δίκαια γὰρ καὶ ἀνδρεία καὶ  
| τὰ ἄλλα τὰ κατὰ τὰς ἀρετὰς πρὸς ἀλλήλους πράττομεν  
ἐν | συναλλάγμασιν καὶ χρείαις καὶ πράξεις παντοίαις ἐν  
τε | τοῖς πάθεσι διατηροῦντες τὸ πρέπον ἑκάστῳ, ταῦτα δ'  
εἶναι | φαίνεται πάντα ἀνθρωπικά. ἕνα δὲ καὶ συμβαίνειν  
15 ἀπὸ || τοῦ σώματος δοκεῖ, καὶ πολλὰ συνωκειῶσθαι τοῖς  
πάθεσιν | ἢ τοῦ ἡθους ἀρετῇ. συνέζευκται δὲ καὶ ἡ φρόνη-  
σις τῇ τοῦ | ἡθους ἀρετῇ, καὶ αὕτη τῇ φρονήσει, εἴπερ αἱ  
μὲν τῆς φρονησεως ἀρχαὶ κατὰ τὰς ἠθικὰς εἰσιν ἀρετὰς,  
τὸ δ' ὀρθὸν | τῶν ἠθικῶν κατὰ τὴν φρόνησιν. συνηρημέ-

1178a1-2 [τι]μότητι ... πάν[των] desunt L

a3 [ἄ]μεινον ... γίνοι[τ] desunt L

a5 καὶ ... οἰ[κείον] desunt L

a9 τὴν ... ἀρ[ετήν] desunt L

a11 ἄλλα deest L

a12 καὶ πρά[ξεις] desunt L

a13-14 εἶναι φαίνεται desunt L

a15 συν[ωκειῶσθαι] deest L

a16 ἡ[θους] deest L

a18 [ε]ἰσιν deest L

1178a1 τιμότητι P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>LL<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup</sup>.VM<sup>b</sup> Arab. (563.1: 'بِالْقُوَّةِ وَالْكَرَمِ'  
[bi-l-quwwati wa-l-karami]—'in power and honourableness'):  
ποιότητι K<sup>b</sup>: τελειότητι O<sup>b</sup> | a2 πάντων ὑπερέχει K<sup>b</sup>LO<sup>b</sup>:  
πάντων ὑπερέχειν M<sup>b</sup>: ὑπερέχει πάντων P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>: ὑπερέχει  
L<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup</sup>.V | δ' om. K<sup>b</sup>M<sup>b</sup> | εἶναι ἕκαστος K<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>: εἶναι  
ἕκαστον M<sup>b</sup>: ἕκαστος εἶναι P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>LL<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup</sup>. | a3 post ἄμεινον  
add. μεινον K<sup>b</sup>P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup> | a7 τοῦτο μάλιστα K<sup>b</sup>P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>O<sup>b</sup>M<sup>b</sup>: μάλι-  
στα τοῦτο LL<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup</sup>.V | a9-10 κατὰ ταύτην K<sup>b</sup>P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>O<sup>b</sup>VM<sup>b</sup>:  
κατ' αὐτήν LL<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup</sup>. | a11 prius τὰ om. K<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>M<sup>b</sup> Bekker |  
a13 διατηροῦντες τὸ πρέπον ἑκάστῳ K<sup>b</sup>P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>O<sup>b</sup>M<sup>b</sup>: τὸ πρέ-  
πον ἑκάστῳ διατηροῦντες LL<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup</sup>.V | a14 καὶ om. L |  
a16-17 συνέζευκται ... ἀρετῇ om. Arab. (cf. Akasoy & Fidora [p.  
562n171] and Ullmann [2011-2012, vol. 2, p. 266]) | a17 αὕτη  
P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>LL<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup</sup>.VM<sup>b</sup>: αὐτῇ Arab. (563.10: 'بَعَيْنِهَا' [bi-'ayniḥā]):  
αὐτῇ K<sup>b</sup> | τῇ φρονήσει K<sup>b</sup>P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>LL<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup</sup>.VM<sup>b</sup>: ἡ σωφρο-  
σύνη Arab. (563.10: 'الْإِفْطَةُ' [al-'iffatu]—cf. Akasoy & Fidora [p.  
562n172]) | ante εἴπερ add. καὶ L | a18-19 τὰς ἠθικὰς  
... κατὰ om. Arab. (cf. Akasoy & Fidora [p. 562n173]) | a19  
συνηρημέναι δ' αὐται P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>LL<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>V Arab.: συνηρημένη δ' αὐ-  
ταῖς K<sup>b</sup>



- 20 ναι δ' αὐται καὶ || τοῖς πάθεσι περὶ τὸ σύνθετον ἂν εἶεν· αἱ  
δὲ τοῦ συνθέτου ἀρεταὶ ἀνθρωπικαί. καὶ ὁ βίος δὴ ὁ κατὰ  
ταύτας καὶ ἡ εὐδαιμονία. ἡ δὲ τοῦ νοῦ κεχωρισμένη· το-  
σοῦτον γὰρ περὶ αὐτῆς | εἴρηται· διακριβῶσαι γὰρ μείζον  
25 τοῦ προκειμένου ἐστίν. | δόξειε δ' ἂν καὶ τῆς ἐκτὸς χορη-  
γίας ἢ ἐπὶ μικρὸν ἢ ἐπ' ἔλαττον δεῖσθαι τῆς ἠθικῆς. τῶν  
μὲν γὰρ ἀναγκαίων ἀμφοῖν χρεία | καὶ ἐξ ἴσου ἔστω, εἰ καὶ  
μᾶλλον διαπονεῖ περὶ τὸ σῶμα ὁ | πολιτικός, καὶ ὅσα τοι-  
αῦτα (μικρὸν γὰρ ἂν τι διαφέρει)· | πρὸς δὲ τὰς ἐνεργείας  
πολὺ διοίσει. τῷ μὲν γὰρ ἐλευθερίῳ | δεήσει χρημάτων πρὸς  
30 τὸ πράττειν τὰ ἐλευθέρια, καὶ τῷ || δικαίῳ δὴ εἰς τὰς ἀν-  
ταποδόσεις (αἱ γὰρ βουλήσεις ἄδηλοι, | προσποιῶνται δὲ  
καὶ οἱ μὴ δίκαιοι βούλεσθαι δικαιοπραγεῖν), | τῷ ἀνδρείῳ  
δὲ δυνάμεως, εἴπερ ἐπιτελεῖ τι τῶν κατὰ τὴν | ἀρετὴν, καὶ  
τῷ σώφρονι ἐξουσίας. πῶς γὰρ δηλὸς ἔσται ἢ | οὗτος ἢ  
35 τῶν ἄλλων τις; ἀμφισβητεῖται τε πότερον κυριώτε||ρον τῆς  
1178b1 ἀρετῆς ἢ προαίρεσις ἢ αἱ πράξεις, ὡς ἐν ἀμφοῖν || οὔσης·  
τὸ δὴ τέλειον δηλὸν ὡς ἐν ἀμφοῖν ἂν εἴη· πρὸς δὲ | τὰς  
πράξεις πολλῶν δεῖται, καὶ ὅσῳ ἂν μείζους ὦσιν καὶ | καλ-  
λίους, πλειόνων. τῷ δὲ θεωροῦντι οὐδενὸς τῶν τοιούτων  
| πρὸς γε τὴν ἐνέργειαν χρεία, ἀλλ' ὡς εἰπεῖν καὶ ἐμπόδιά  
5 ἐστίν || πρὸς γε τὴν θεωρίαν· ἢ δ' ἀνθρωπὸς ἐστίν καὶ πλεί-  
οσι συζῆ, | αἰρεῖται τὰ κατὰ τὴν ἀρετὴν πράττειν· δεῖσεται  
οὖν τῶν τοιούτων πρὸς τὸ ἀνθρωπεύεσθαι.—ἡ δὲ τελεία

**a20** [πά]θεσι deest L

**a21** κατὰ deest L

**a33** [δη]λος ad finem desunt V<sup>1</sup>(saec. XI-XII)

**1178b1** [τ]ὸ deest L

**b7** [ἀν]θ[ρωπεύεσθαι] deest L

|| **a20** ante περὶ add. καὶ B<sup>95sup</sup>.M<sup>b</sup> || **a21** κατὰ ταύτας  
K<sup>b</sup>P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>O<sup>b</sup>M<sup>b</sup>: κατ' αὐτάς LL<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup</sup>.V Bywater ||  
**a22** γὰρ K<sup>b</sup>P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>LL<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup</sup>.V: δὲ M<sup>b</sup> || **a23** εἴρηται  
K<sup>b</sup>P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>LL<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup</sup>.VM<sup>b</sup> Arab. (563.12: 'وَأَقُولُ فِيهَا بِهَذَا الْقَدَرِ'  
[wa-l-qinwila fi-hā bi-hādā l-qadri]—'so much is said about  
it'): εἰρήσθω Aretinus Bekker Bywater | διακριβῶσαι  
L<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup</sup>.VM<sup>b</sup>: ἀκριβῶσαι K<sup>b</sup>P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup> | post γὰρ add.  
περὶ L<sup>b</sup> || **a24** prius ἢ K<sup>b</sup>P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>M<sup>b</sup>: om. LL<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup</sup>.V  
Bekker | post alterum ἢ add. ὡς B<sup>95sup</sup>. || **a26** ἔστω K<sup>b</sup>P<sup>b</sup>  
s.l.C<sup>c</sup>LL<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup</sup>.VM<sup>b</sup>: ἐκάστῳ C<sup>c</sup> | διαπονεῖ om. M<sup>b</sup> ||  
**a27** διαφέρει M<sup>b</sup>: διαφέρειν K<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>: διαφέρει P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>: διαφέρη  
LL<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup</sup>.V || **a28** διοίσει P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>LL<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>VM<sup>b</sup>: συνδιοίσει K<sup>b</sup>  
|| **a31** μὴ om. M<sup>b</sup> || **a32** τὴν om. LL<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup</sup>.VM<sup>b</sup> || **a33**  
δηλὸς ἔσται K<sup>b</sup>P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>LL<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup</sup>.V: ἔσται δηλὸς M<sup>b</sup> | ἢ  
om. O<sup>b</sup>M<sup>b</sup> || **a34** ἀμφισβητεῖται K<sup>b</sup>P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>O<sup>b</sup>M<sup>b</sup>: ζητεῖται  
LL<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup</sup>. | τε K<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>M<sup>b</sup>: δὲ P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>L<sup>b</sup>: δὲ τι LB<sup>95sup</sup>. **1178b3**  
καλλίους K<sup>b</sup>P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>LL<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup</sup>.V καλαὶ M<sup>b</sup> || **b3** τῷ δὲ  
θεωροῦντι K<sup>b</sup>P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>LL<sup>b</sup>i.r. O<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup</sup>.VM<sup>b</sup>: τῶν δὲ θεωρούντων  
L<sup>b</sup>a.r. | οὐδενὸς K<sup>b</sup>P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>LL<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup</sup>.: οὐδέν M<sup>b</sup> || **b5** συζῆ  
K<sup>b</sup>P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>LO<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup</sup>.M<sup>b</sup>: συζῆν L<sup>b</sup> || **b6** τὰ K<sup>b</sup>P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>LL<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup</sup>.:  
τὸ M<sup>b</sup> | τὴν om. L<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup</sup>.M<sup>b</sup>

εὐδαιμονία ὅτι θεωρη|τική τίς ἐστὶν ἐνέργεια, καὶ ἐνθεῦθεν  
ἂν φανείη. τοὺς θεοὺς | γὰρ μάλιστα ὑπειλήφμεν μακα-  
10 ρίους καὶ εὐδαίμονας εἶναι· || πράξεις δὲ ποίας ἀπονεῖμαι  
χρεῶν αὐτοῖς; πότερα τὰς δι|καίας; ἢ γελοῖοι φανοῦνται  
συναλλάττοντες καὶ παρακατα|θήκας ἀποδιδόντες καὶ ὅσα  
τοιαῦτα; ἀλλὰ τὰς ἀνδρείους; | <ἦ> ὑπομένοντες τὰ φο-  
βερὰ καὶ κινδυνεύοντες ὅτι καλόν; ἢ | τὰς ἐλευθερίους; τίνι  
15 δὲ δώσουσιν; ἄτοπον δ' εἰ καὶ ἔσται || αὐτοῖς νόμισμα ἢ τι  
τοιούτου. αἱ δὲ σώφρονες τί ἂν εἶεν; | ἢ φορτικὸς ὁ ἔπαι-  
νος, ὅτι οὐκ ἔχουσιν φαύλας ἐπιθυμίας; | διεξιούσι δὲ πάντα  
φαίνουτ' ἂν τὰ περὶ τὰς πράξεις μικρὰ | καὶ ἀνάξια θεῶν.  
ἀλλὰ μὴν ζῆν τε πάντες ὑπειλήφασιν | αὐτούς, καὶ ἐνε-  
20 γεῖν ἄρα· οὐ γὰρ δὴ καθεύδειν ὥσπερ τὸν || Ἐνδυμῖωμα.  
τῷ δὴ ζῶντι τοῦ πράττειν ἀφαιρουμένου, ἔτι δὲ | μᾶλλον  
τοῦ ποιεῖν, τί λείπεται πλὴν θεωρία; ὥστε ἢ τοῦ θεοῦ | ἐν-

**b12–13** καὶ ... ὑπο[μένοντας] desunt L

**b13–14** [κινδυνεύ]οντας ... δώσουσιν desunt L

**b15–16** τοιούτου ... φορτικὸς desunt L

**b17** [διεξ]ιούσι ... περὶ desunt L

**b18–19** πάντες ... αὐτούς desunt L

**b20** τῷ ... ἀ[φηρημένῳ] desunt L

**b21–22** [ὥστ]ε ... μα[καριότητι] desunt L

|| **b8** τίς ἐστὶν K<sup>b</sup>LO<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup</sup>.M<sup>b</sup>: ἐστὶν τίς P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>L<sup>b</sup> ||  
**b8–9** τοὺς θεοὺς γὰρ K<sup>b</sup>P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>LO<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup</sup>.M<sup>b</sup>: τοὺς γὰρ θεοὺς  
L<sup>b</sup> | **b11** ἢ om. K<sup>b</sup> | **b12** ante τοιαῦτα add. ἄλλα  
L<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup</sup>. | τὰς K<sup>b</sup>P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>LL<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup</sup>.M<sup>b</sup>: τοὺς Ald. | ἀνδρείους  
K<sup>b</sup>P<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup</sup>.M<sup>b</sup>: ἀνδρείας C<sup>c</sup>L<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup</sup>.1: ἀνδρείου conj. By-  
water (cf. *Contrib.* p. 69) || **b13** <ἦ> scripsi: om. codd.  
| ὑπομένοντες K<sup>b</sup>: ὑπομένοντας P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>LL<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup</sup>.M<sup>b</sup> Bekker  
Susemihl Bywater: ὑπομενοντος conj. Bywater: ὑπομενοντοῖς  
conieci | κινδυνεύοντες conj. Burnet (p. 465): κινδυνεύοντας  
K<sup>b</sup>P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>LL<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup</sup>.M<sup>b</sup> Bekker Susemihl Bywater: κινδυνεύον-  
τος conj. Bywater: κινδυνεύοντοῖς conieci || **b15** αἱ P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>L<sup>b</sup>: εἰ  
K<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup</sup>.M<sup>b</sup> Arab. (565.15: 'وَإِنْ نُسِبَ إِلَيْهِمُ الْأَفْعَالُ الْعَفِيَّةُ' [wa-in  
nusiba ilayhim al-af'ālu l-'affiyatu]—'and if temperate actions  
are attributed to them,' see the discussion below in the next sec-  
tion) || **b18** ζῆν τε K<sup>b</sup>P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>LL<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup</sup>.: ζῆν γε Coraes Bywa-  
ter: ζῆν O<sup>b</sup>: ζητεῖται M<sup>b</sup> | πάντες K<sup>b</sup>P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>L<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>: πάντες γὰρ  
M<sup>b</sup>: πάλιν B<sup>95sup</sup>. || **b19** ante αὐτούς add. εἶναι M<sup>b</sup> | οὐ γὰρ  
δὴ K<sup>b</sup>P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>L<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>M<sup>b</sup>: οὐ γὰρ δεῖ L<sup>b</sup>: οὐ δὴ γὰρ B<sup>95sup</sup>. || **b20**  
δὴ K<sup>b</sup>P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>LL<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup</sup>.VM<sup>b</sup>: δὲ Susemihl | ἀφαιρουμένου  
K<sup>b</sup> Arab. (567.1: 'إِذْ نُفِيَ عَنْهُمْ فِعْلُ الْأَحْيَاءِ' [id nufiya 'an-hum  
fi'lu l-ahyā'i]—'since the action of the living is removed from  
them'—although the ancient translator misconstrues the Greek,  
as emphasised by Akasoy & Fidora [p. 566n187], this transla-  
tion suggests that the original it is translating had the genitive  
absolute): ἀφαιρουμένῳ P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>: ἀφηρημένῳ LL<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup</sup>.: ἀφη-  
ρημένου M<sup>b</sup>i.r. || **b21** τοῦ P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>LL<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup</sup>.M<sup>b</sup> Arab. (567.1:  
'مِنَ الْفِعْلِ' [mina l-fi'li]—'of the activity'): τοῦτο K<sup>b</sup> | θεωρία  
K<sup>b</sup>P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>O<sup>b</sup>M<sup>b</sup>: θεωρίας LL<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup</sup>.

έργεια, μακαριότητα διαφέρουσα, θεωρητικὴ ἂν εἴη. καὶ |  
τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων δὴ ἢ ταύτη συγγενεστάτη εὐδαιμονικω-  
τάτη. |—σημεῖον δὲ καὶ τὸ μὴ μετέχειν τὰ λοιπὰ ζῶα εὐδαι-  
25 μονίας, || τῆς τοιαύτης ἐνεργείας ἐστερημένα τελείως. τοῖς  
μὲν γὰρ | θεοῖς ἅπας ὁ βίος μακάριος, τοῖς δ' ἀνθρώποις,  
ἐφ' ὅσον | ὁμοίωμα τι τῆς τοιαύτης ἐνεργείας ὑπάρχει· τῶν  
δ' ἄλλων | ζώων οὐδὲν εὐδαιμονεῖ, ἐπειδὴ οὐδαμῆ κοινωνεῖ  
θεωρίας. ἐφ' ὅσον δὴ διατείνει ἢ θεωρία, καὶ ἢ εὐδαιμο-  
30 νία, καὶ οἷς μᾶλλον ὑπάρχει τὸ θεωρεῖν, καὶ εὐδαιμονεῖν,  
οὐ κατὰ συμβεβηκὸς ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὴν θεωρίαν· αὕτη γὰρ  
καθ' αὐτὴν τιμία. ὥστ' εἴη ἂν ἢ εὐδαιμονία θεωρία τις. |

9. Δεήσει δὲ καὶ τῆς ἐκτὸς εὐημερίας ἀνθρώπῳ ὄντι·  
οὐ γὰρ | αὐτάρκης ἢ φύσις πρὸς τὸ θεωρεῖν, ἀλλὰ δεῖ καὶ  
35 τὸ σῶμα || ὑγιαίνειν καὶ τροφήν καὶ τὴν λοιπὴν θεραπείαν  
1179a1 ὑπάρχειν. || οὐ μὴν οἰητέον γε πολλῶν καὶ μεγάλων δεήσε-  
σθαι τὸν εὐδαιμονήσοντα, εἰ μὴ ἐνδέχεται ἄνευ τῶν ἐκτὸς  
ἀγαθῶν μακάριον εἶναι· οὐ γὰρ ἐν τῇ ὑπερβολῇ τὸ αὐ-  
ταρκες οὐδ' ἢ κρίσις, οὐδ' αἱ πράξεις, δυνατὸν δὲ καὶ μὴ  
5 ἄρχοντα γῆς καὶ θαλάττης πράττειν τὰ καλά· καὶ γὰρ  
ἀπὸ μετρίων δύναται ἂν τις πράττειν | κατὰ τὴν ἀρετὴν.  
τοῦτο δ' ἔστιν ἰδεῖν ἐναργῶς· οἱ γὰρ ἰδιῶται τῶν δυνα-  
στῶν οὐκ ἦττον δοκοῦσι τὰ ἐπιεικῆ πράττειν, | ἀλλὰ καὶ

b23 δὴ ... συγγενεστά[τη] desunt L

b24–25 εὐδαιμονίας ... τοιαύτης desunt L

b26 τοιαύτης ... ἐνεργείας desunt L

b27–28 δ' ... ζώων desunt L

b29 [διατεί]νει ... θεω[ρία] desunt L

b30–31 κατὰ συμβε[βηκὸς] desunt L

b32 [ἄ]ν ... εὐ[δαιμονία] desunt L

b34 ἢ φύσις πρὸς desunt L

b35 [θεραπ]είαν deest L

1179a2 [ἐν]δέ[χεται] deest L

a3 ἢ κρίσι[s] desunt L

a5 [κα]λά deest L

a6 ἐναργῶς deest L

a8 [ἀλ]λά καὶ desunt L

|| b23 ante ἢ add. ἂν εἴη K<sup>b</sup> | εὐδαιμονικωτάτη s.l. P<sup>b</sup> ||

b26 post μακάριος add. τοιαύτης οὔσης τῆς ἐνεργείας LO<sup>b</sup>M<sup>b</sup>

|| b28 οὐδαμῆ K<sup>b</sup>P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>O<sup>b</sup>M<sup>b</sup>: οὐδαμῶς LL<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup</sup>. || b31 καθ'

αὐτὴν LL<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup</sup>.M<sup>b</sup>: κατ' αὐτὴν K<sup>b</sup>P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup> || b32 ἢ om.

M<sup>b</sup> 1179a3 οὐ K<sup>b</sup>P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>LL<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup</sup>. οὐδὲ M<sup>b</sup> || a3–4 οὐδ'

ἢ κρίσις, οὐδ' αἱ πράξεις O<sup>b</sup>M<sup>b</sup>Arab. (567.12: وَلَا الْقَضَاءُ وَلَا

الْأَعْمَالُ [wa-lā l-qadā'u wa-lā l-a'mālu]): οὐδ' ἢ κρίσις, οὐδ' ἢ

πρᾶξις P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>LL<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup</sup>.: οὐδ' ἢ πρᾶξις K<sup>b</sup> Aver. (cf. Woerther,

p.219n335) Bekker Susemihl Bywater: οὐδ' ἢ χρῆσις, οὐδ' ἢ πρᾶ-

ξις Coraes || a4 ἄρχοντα K<sup>b</sup>P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>O<sup>b</sup>: ἄρχοντας LL<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup</sup>. |

θαλάττης K<sup>b</sup>P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>LO<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup</sup>.: θαλάσσης L<sup>b</sup>M<sup>b</sup> || a6 ante κατὰ

add. τὰ O<sup>b</sup>M<sup>b</sup> | οἱ K<sup>b</sup>P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>LL<sup>b</sup>M<sup>b</sup>: οὐ O<sup>b</sup>

- μαλλον. ἰκανὸν δὲ τοσαῦθ' ὑπάρχειν· ἔσται γάρ | ὁ βίος εὐ-  
10 δαίμων τοῦ κατὰ τὴν ἀρετὴν ἐνεργούντος. καὶ Σόλων || δὲ  
τοὺς εὐδαίμονας ἴσως ἀπεφαίνετο καλῶς, εἰπὼν μετρίως |  
τοῖς ἐκτὸς κεχορηγημένους, πεπραγότας δὲ κάλλισθ', ὡς |  
ᾤετο, καὶ βεβιωκότας σωφρόνως· ἐνδέχεται γὰρ μέτρια |  
κεκτημένους πράττειν ἂν δεῖ. ἔοικε δὲ καὶ Ἀναξαγόρας οὐ |  
15 ὅτι || οὐκ ἂν θαυμάσειεν εἴ τις ἄτοπος φανείη τοῖς πολ-  
λοῖς· οὗτοι | γὰρ κρίνουσι τοῖς ἐκτός, τούτων αισθανόμενοι  
μόνον. συμφω|νεῖν δὴ τοῖς λόγοις εἰκάσιν αἱ τῶν σοφῶν  
δόξαι. πίστιν | μὲν οὖν καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα ἔχει τινά, τὸ δ' ἀλη-  
θὲς ἐν τοῖς | πρακτοῖς ἐκ τῶν ἔργων καὶ τοῦ βίου κρίνεται·  
20 ἐν τούτοις γὰρ || τὸ κύριον. σκοπεῖν δὴ τὰ προειρημένα χρῆ  
ἐπὶ τὰ ἔργα | καὶ τὸν βίον φέροντας, καὶ συναδόντων μὲν  
τοῖς ἔργοις | ἀποδεκτέον, διαφωνούντων δὲ λόγους ὑπολη-  
πτέον. ὁ δὲ κατὰ | νοῦν ἐνεργῶν καὶ τοῦτον θεραπεύων καὶ  
διακεείμενος ἄριστα καὶ | θεοφιλέστατος ἔοικεν· εἰ γὰρ τις  
25 ἐπιμέλεια τῶν ἀν|θρώπων ὑπὸ θεῶν γίνεται, ὥσπερ δοκεῖ,  
καὶ εἴη ἂν εὐλο|γον χαίρειν τε αὐτοὺς τῷ ἀρίστῳ καὶ συγ-  
γενεστάτῳ (τοῦτο | δ' ἂν εἴη ὁ νοῦς) καὶ τοὺς ἀγαπῶντας

**a11** [κεχορηγη]μένους deest L

**a14** [ὑπο]λαβεῖν deest L

**a19** γὰρ deest L

**a21** [ἐπιφέρον]τας deest L

**a24** [θε]οφιλ[έστατος] deest L

**a25** [ὡσπ]ερ deest L

**a26** συγγενεσ[τά]τῳ deest L

|| **a8** ἔσται K<sup>b</sup>P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>LL<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup.</sup>: ἔστι M<sup>b</sup> || **a9** κατὰ τὴν ἀρετὴν  
K<sup>b</sup>P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>LL<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup.</sup>: κατ' ἀρετὴν M<sup>b</sup> || **a10** post εὐδαίμονας  
add. εἶναι B<sup>95sup.</sup> || **a11** κεχορηγημένους P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>LL<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>M<sup>b</sup> Arab.  
(569.1: 'الَّذِينَ قَدْ رَزَقُوا الْقَصْدَ مِنَ الْأَشْيَاءِ الْخَارِجَةِ' [*alladīna qadda  
ruziqū l-qaṣda mina l-aṣyā'i l-hāriḡati*])—'those provided with  
a moderate quantity of the external things'): κεχορηγημένους  
K<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup.</sup> | ante κάλλισθ' add. τὰ L<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup.</sup>VM<sup>b</sup> Bekker  
Sussemihl Bywater | ὡς om. K<sup>b</sup> || **a16** μόνον K<sup>b</sup>P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>B<sup>95sup.</sup>:  
μόνων LL<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>M<sup>b</sup> || **a17** δὴ K<sup>b</sup>P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>LL<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup.</sup>M<sup>b</sup>: δὲ O<sup>b</sup> ||  
**a18** τὰ s.I.K<sup>b2</sup>P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>LL<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup.</sup>M<sup>b</sup>: om. K<sup>b</sup> | τὸ δ' ἀληθὲς  
K<sup>b</sup>P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>O<sup>b</sup>L<sup>b</sup>M<sup>b</sup>: τὸ ἀληθὲς δ' LB<sup>95sup.</sup> || **a19** πρακτοῖς  
P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>LL<sup>b</sup> B<sup>95sup.</sup> Arab. (569.5-6: 'فِي الْأَعْمَالِ' [*fī l-a'māli*])—cf.  
1179 a3-4, where 'الْأَعْمَالُ' translates αἱ πράξεις): πρακτικοῖς  
K<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>M<sup>b</sup> | ἐκ om. Li.r. || **a20** τὸ κύριον. σκοπεῖν δὴ P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>:  
τὸ κύριον. σκοπεῖν δὲ LL<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup.</sup>M<sup>b</sup>: τὸ κύριον δὴ σκοπεῖν  
K<sup>b</sup> || **a21** φέροντας K<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>M<sup>b</sup>: ἐπιφέροντας P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>LL<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup.</sup>  
Bekker || **a24** post ἔοικεν add. εἶναι P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>LL<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup.</sup> Bekker  
|| **a24–25** ἀνθρώπων K<sup>b</sup> Arab. (569.9: 'لِلنَّاسِ' [*li-l-nāsi*])—cf.  
Akasoy & Fidora [p. 568n200]) Aver. (*et si quidem cura sit  
Deo de hominibus*): ἀνθρωπίνων P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>LL<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup.</sup>M<sup>b</sup> Bekker  
Sussemihl Bywater || **a26** post καὶ add. τῷ P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>LL<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup.</sup>  
Bekker Sussemihl | post τοῦτο add. ἦγουν τὸ χαίρειν τῷ ἀρίστῳ  
καὶ συγγενεστάτῳ M<sup>b</sup>

30 μάλιστα τοῦτο καὶ τιμῶντας ἀντευποιεῖν ὡς τῶν φίλων  
αὐτοῖς ἐπιμελουμένους | καὶ ὀρθῶς τε καὶ καλῶς πράτ-  
τοντας. ὅτι δὲ πάντα ταῦτα || τῷ σοφῷ μάλισθ' ὑπάρχει,  
οὐκ ἄδηλον. θεοφιλέστατος ἄρα. | τὸν αὐτὸν δ' εἰκὸς καὶ  
εὐδαιμονέστατον· ὥστε κὰν οὕτως εἴη | ὁ σοφὸς μάλιστ'  
εὐδαίμων. |

---

**a27–28** τιμῶν[τας] deest L

**a29** [κα]λῶς deest L

**a30** ἄδ[ηλον] deest L

---

|| **a28** φίλων K<sup>b</sup>L<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>M<sup>b</sup> Arab. (569.11: 'كَأَلِ صَدِيقَاءٍ' [ka-l-aṣḍiqā'i] —'like friends'): φιλουμένων P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>: φιλούντων L || **a29** καὶ om. M<sup>b</sup> | πάντα ταῦτα K<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>: ταῦτα πάντα P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>LL<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup</sup>.M<sup>b</sup> || **a30** θεοφιλέστατος P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>L<sup>1</sup>L<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup</sup>. Arab. (569.12-13: 'مُحِبٌّ لِلَّهِ جِدًّا' [muhibbun li-l-ilāhi ḡiddan])—cf. 1179a24 [569.9] where the ancient translator gives the accusative 'مُحِبًّا لِلَّهِ جِدًّا' [muhibban li-llāhi ḡiddan]): θεοφιλέστατον K<sup>b</sup>LM<sup>b</sup> | ἄρα K<sup>b</sup>P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup> s.l.L<sup>2</sup>L<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup> B<sup>95sup</sup>.: εἶναι L || **a31** δ' om. K<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>M<sup>b</sup> | post εὐδαιμονέστατον add. εἶναι s.l.L | ante κὰν add. καὶ M<sup>b</sup>

#### 4. *Notes on the text*

##### 1176b17: ἀπασχολάζειν

I print here the text of L<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup</sup>.VM<sup>b</sup>, which is ἀπασχολάζειν; P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>L, in turn, read ἀποσχολάζειν.

The Arabic translation gives ‘يَشْتَغِلُونَ’ (*yaštaḡilūna*), which may, at first, seem to be ambiguous between the idea of ‘busying oneself completely with something’ (i.e., being busy with something so as to be diverted from other things) and the idea of ‘devoting oneself to something’ (i.e., devoting one’s free time to something). However, later on, in 1177b4-5, the Arabic version renders ἀσχολούμεθα with the same verb, i.e., ‘نَشْتَغِلُ’ (*naštaḡilu*) (cf. 559.11), which makes a strong case for thinking that ‘يَشْتَغِلُونَ’ (*yaštaḡilūna*) is translating ἀπασχολάζειν and not ἀποσχολάζειν.<sup>38</sup>

Notwithstanding this, one may think that it is unclear whether ἀποσχολάζειν is a correction of the much rarer ἀπασχολάζειν or if ἀπασχολάζειν is the result of an error of copy. In fact, according to the entry on ἀπασχολάζω in the *DGE*, ἀπασχολάζοντι is reported as a variant in the *apparatus* of a passage from Gregory of Nyssa’s *de vita Mosis*, where the editor prints ἀποσχολάζοντι instead.<sup>39</sup>

In his commentary to 1177b17, Michelet (1848, vol. 2, p. 329) compares the variant readings we find here to those from 1177b33, a passage in which there are three variants: ἀθανατίζειν (attested in K<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>M<sup>b</sup>), ἀπαθανατίζειν (attested in P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup>B<sup>95sup</sup>.V and in the margin of O<sup>b</sup>), and ἀποθανατίζειν (attested in LL<sup>b</sup>). In 1177b33, ἀποθανατίζειν is clearly due to an error of copy by L and L<sup>b</sup>. However, this is still not enough to decide whether we should accept ἀπασχολάζειν, for it would be a *hapax legomenon*.<sup>40</sup>

Despite this difficulty, the agreement between the Arabic translation and the majority of the witnesses of the  $\beta$  family tells strongly in favour of ἀπασχολάζειν. The fact P<sup>b</sup> and C<sup>c</sup> have

<sup>38</sup> Besides, Dunlop translates ‘يَشْتَغِلُونَ’ (*yaštaḡilūna*) as ‘are occupied with.’ Similarly, see Lane and Lane-Poole (1863-1893, s.v. شغل, pp. 1567-1568) (يَشْتَغِلُونَ [*yaštaḡilūna*] and نَشْتَغِلُ [*naštaḡilu*] come from the Form VIII of this root) and the list of uses of words from the root شغل in the Arabic version of the *EN* made by Ullmann (2011-2012, vol. 1, p. 190).

<sup>39</sup> However, according to the *apparatus* of Musurillo’s edition, ἀπασχολάζοντι is the text printed by Migne in his 1863 edition and by Fronton le Duc in his edition from 1638, while all other relevant mss. for Musurillo’s edition have ἀποσχολάζοντι. It is possible, however, that ἀπασχολάζοντι is a reading found in *recentiores* whose reading is not reported by Musurillo in his *apparatus*.

<sup>40</sup> Unless, of course, it turns out that this is the correct reading for the passage from Gregory of Nyssa I mentioned, in which case there would be at least two occurrences of the verb ἀπασχολάζω in the whole Greek *corpus*.

ἀποσχολάζειν, in turn, could be explained as a correction they adopted from L (see footnote 30 on this). Moreover, it should be noted that there are no occurrences of the verb ἀποσχολάζω in the extant Greek *corpus* before Aristotle. As a result, although ἀποσχολάζω is also used in some instances indicate that one is devoting oneself to something in a way that implies abandoning some serious pursuit,<sup>41</sup> this use of the verb comes from quite late Greek,<sup>42</sup> and is inconclusive about how Aristotle could be using the word. For these reasons, I have opted for printing ἀπασχολάζειν.<sup>43</sup>

### 1177b3: πρακτικῶν

Rassow (1874, p. 70) proposes that one should read *πρακτῶν* here, which is clearly the reading of the  $\beta$  family. There is of course some plausibility in reading *πρακτῶν*, for Aristotle's idea in this passage is certainly not that, from practical matters (ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν πρακτικῶν), something is produced beyond the action, but rather that when we act, we produce something over and above our own action, an idea that can indeed be made explicit by reading *πρακτῶν*. However, not only *πρακτικῶν* is indisputably the reading of the  $\alpha$  family, but also it can be made sense of very easily if one supplies *ἐνεργειῶν* with 'ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν πρακτικῶν,' so that Aristotle would not be talking in general of practical matters, but more specifically about *practical activities*.

Moreover, supplying *ἐνεργειῶν* here is perfectly justified, since Aristotle was talking about the theoretical activity two lines above, in 'δόξαι τ' ἂν αὐτῇ μόνη δι' αὐτήν ἀγαπᾶσθα.' As Rassow himself acknowledges, the referent of *αὐτῇ* and *αὐτήν* in this phrase is something

<sup>41</sup> I thank one of the anonymous referees for this objection.

<sup>42</sup> According to a search in the LSJ, ἀποσχολάζω is used in this way by Claudius Aelianus, who, according to a search in the TLG, would be the first author to use this verb after Aristotle.

<sup>43</sup> A further consideration that should be made in this discussion, but which I cannot get into here, concerns Aristotle's conception of leisure and his use of the verb *σχολάζειν*. If it turns out that pastimes such as pleasant amusements are not leisurely on Aristotle's account (that they are not leisurely is suggested by the fact that pastimes consist in *ἀνάπαυσις*, which is not an end—cf. 1176b35ff), and if Aristotle is consistent in using the verb *σχολάζειν* to convey the idea that one is not only devoting one's free time to something (in which case the same could be said of ἀποσχολάζειν), but is also engaging in an activity that is leisurely, then ἀπασχολάζειν would seem to give the better reading due to philosophical reasons as well. As a matter of fact, on this scenario, in saying ἀπασχολάζειν, Aristotle would be making a pun. He would be saying that the reason why pastimes such as pleasant amusements are thought (presumably by the many) to be productive of happiness (*εὐδαιμονικά*) is the fact that people in positions of power spend all their time in activities that turn out to be un-leisurely. In other words, Aristotle would be saying that the many think that pastimes such as pleasant amusements are productive of happiness because people in positions of power are un-leisurely occupied (ἀπασχολάζειν) with such things (and as Aristotle will go on to say in 1177b4: happiness seems to depend on leisure [*δοκεῖ τε ἡ εὐδαιμονία ἐν τῇ σχολῇ εἶναι*]).

like ‘ἡ θεωρητικὴ ἐνέργεια.’

As a result, supplying ἐνεργειῶν with ‘ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν πρακτικῶν’ marks a neat contrast between the activity Aristotle was just talking about, which is loved for its own sake alone in that it does not produce anything beyond itself, and the practical activities, which produce something beyond themselves, and thus are not loved for their own sakes alone.

**1177b12:** φόνος

The reading of the *a* family here is undisputedly the singular φόνος, which is the *lectio difficilior*. One can make sense of the singular if it is not taken as making reference to the killing of a particular person, but as having the more general sense of bloodshed or slaughter, which works well in the context.

**1177b20-21:** ἔχειν τε ἡδονὴν οἰκείαν

I print here the text transmitted by members of the *β* family and by P<sup>b</sup> and C<sup>c</sup>: ἔχειν τε ἡδονὴν οἰκείαν. It is reasonable to assume that this is also the text the Arabic version of the *EN* translates. As a matter of fact, the Arabic translation has the indefinite ‘لَدَّةٌ’ (*ladḍatan*) rendering ‘ἡδονήν.’<sup>44</sup> In that case, the reading we find in K<sup>b</sup> could be a corruption.

The addition of τελείαν (that is found in K<sup>b</sup>O<sup>b</sup>M<sup>b</sup>)<sup>45</sup> can be easily explained as a gloss that got into the text: the reference to *EN* X.5 1175a30-31 makes it clear that what Aristotle

<sup>44</sup> I am following here the proposal made by Ullmann (2011-2012, vol. 2, p. 265), according to which, in 561.5-6, we should read ‘وَإِنَّ لَهُ لَدَّةٌ’ (*‘wa-anna lahu ladḍatan’*) instead of ‘وَإِنَّ لَهُ لَدَّةٌ’ (*‘wa-ina lahu ladḍatun’*), which is the reading printed in Akasoy and Fidora (2005) (they print: ‘وَإِنَّ لَهُ لَدَّةٌ’). Although on both readings we have here a nominal phrase (a pleasure <is> proper to them), reading the conjunction ‘وَإِنَّ’ (that) instead of ‘وَإِنْ’ (if), makes the Arabic version more accurate in that it would be correctly interpreting ‘ἔχειν τε ἡδονὴν οἰκείαν’ as an infinitive clause that depends on δοκεῖ (if one reads ‘وَإِنْ’ instead, ‘ἔχειν τε ἡδονὴν οἰκείαν’ would be translated as a conditional). Now, although Ullmann (2011-2012, vol. 2, p. 265) does indeed give ‘καὶ ἔχειν τὴν ἡδονὴν κτλ.’ as the lemma ‘وَإِنَّ لَهُ لَدَّةٌ’ would be translating, a quick look at his vocabulary of the Arabic translation (cf. Ullmann, 2011-2012, s.v. لَدَّةٌ, p. 355) shows that, in general, both Eusthatius (*Uṣṭāt*) and *Ishāq ibn Hunayn* employ the definite ‘اللدة’ to translate occurrences of ἡδονή with the definite article and the indefinite ‘لدة’ to translate occurrences of ἡδονή without the definite article, which is further reason for thinking that the Arabic version is translating here ἡδονή without the definite article.

<sup>45</sup> One could argue that, given that the relevant part of the text here is missing in L due to physical damage, it could also have had τελείαν. Yet note that the damage begins immediately after ‘ἔχειν τε’, and that the next line in the ms. begins with ‘-κείαν’ from οἰκείαν. Besides, while ‘ἡδονὴν οἰ-’ is roughlyly the same size of the text that is missing in other lines in which we have about the same amount of damage, ‘ἡδονὴν τελείαν οἰ-’ is perhaps too long for the part of L that is missing, unless, of course, τελείαν was written above the line. As I take it, all this makes it plausible to assume that L did not have τελείαν originally. I thank one of the anonymous referees for pressing me on this issue.



has in mind here is the pleasure proper to an activity that enhances that activity. Yet, because it would be reasonable to assume that the pleasure proper to perfect happiness is perfect as well, it is reasonable that a gloss qualifying the proper pleasure Aristotle is talking about here as ‘τελείαν’ got into the text at some point. No doubt Aristotle admits the possibility of describing a pleasure as complete or perfect, as is made clear by *EN* X.3 [=Bywater X.4] 1174a14-17. Yet, as the following lines of this passage make clear, Aristotle is not distinguishing between different sorts of pleasure in regard to their completeness or perfectness, but is only pointing out that *every pleasure* is complete in that it is a whole and is not made complete in a stretch of time, so that it is not a *κίνησις*. Accordingly, in the context of 1177b20-21, it would be unclear why Aristotle would be stressing that the pleasure proper to perfect happiness is complete in the sense of 1174a14-17, for every pleasure, even those that are actually base, are also complete in this sense. As a result, we have no instance in which Aristotle calls a pleasure *τελεία* meaning to contrast it with other pleasures that fail to be perfect in that they are not proper to activities that are perfect.<sup>46</sup>

To conclude, although ‘τε ... καὶ ... τε’ is rare in prose (cf. Kühner-Gerth, 2. T., 2. Bd., §522 Anm. 1, p. 251), it is by no means impossible, and the fact that this is rare adds further plausibility to the hypothesis that the version of the text we find in K<sup>b</sup> is corrupted. Perhaps a copyist bothered by the ‘τε ... καὶ ... τε’ and by the absence of the article with *ἡδονήν* added a *καί* before *ἔχειν* (so that we would have ‘τε ... καὶ ... καί,’ which is much more common) and changed the *τε* in ‘ἔχειν τε ἡδονήν’ into the article *τήν* that *ἡδονήν* was allegedly missing.

### **1178a23:** *εἶρηται*

There is no palaeographical justification for printing *εἰρήσθω* instead of *εἶρηται* as Bekker and Bywater do. The reasons for emending *εἶρηται* into *εἰρήσθω* are purely interpretative: its plausibility is derived from the fact that nowhere in the *EN* Aristotle has talked about the fact that the virtue of *νοῦς* is separate.<sup>47</sup> But if *εἶρηται* is taken as making reference to something

<sup>46</sup> I thank one of the anonymous referees for pressing me about *EN* X.3 [=Bywater X.4] 1174a14-17.

<sup>47</sup> This is not the only way of construing the phrase ‘ἡ δὲ τοῦ νοῦ.’ It is also possible to supply *ἐνέργεια* (as is done by Broadie and Rowe in their translation, for instance) or *εὐδαιμονία* (as is done by the Arabic translation, and, more recently, by Rackham in his translation). The latter expression (i.e., ‘ἡ δὲ τοῦ νοῦ <εὐδαιμονία>’) is unheard of. Nowhere Aristotle talks of the happiness of *νοῦς*. The closest he comes to that is in 1178a6-7, in which he talks of ‘ὁ κατὰ τὸν νοῦν βίος’, and in 1178a21-22 (immediately before Aristotle says ‘ἡ δὲ τοῦ νοῦ’), in which he talks about the life and the happiness on the basis of the human virtues (καὶ ὁ βίος δὴ ὁ κατὰ ταύτας καὶ ἡ εὐδαιμονία). Alternatively, one could take their cue from Michael of Ephesus, who paraphrases ‘ἡ δὲ τοῦ νοῦ’ as ‘ἡ νοερά ζωή’ (*CAG*. XX, p. 595.21ff), and argue

that Aristotle says in another work, then this reading becomes perfectly justifiable from the interpretative point of view.

Earlier in *EN* X, in 1177a18, Aristotle says that ‘it was said [εἴρηται] that <this activity> [sc. the activity with which perfect happiness is identified] is theoretical,’ but nowhere in the *EN* one can find an explicit claim to this effect—although of course *EN* VI.13 may give one some elements necessary to draw this conclusion. A way out of this difficulty consists in taking the εἴρηται from 1177a18 as also making reference to some work different from the *EN* (and the most plausible candidate here is the *Protrepticus*, where Aristotle does indeed offer us an argument in defence of contemplation as our best and most authoritative activity).

If this is correct, when in 1178a23 Aristotle justifies the explanation he gave to the claim that the virtue of νοῦς is separate (which explanation consisted in saying that ‘so much was said about it [sc. about the virtue of νοῦς]’) by saying that ‘διακριβῶσαι γὰρ μείζον τοῦ προκειμένου ἐστίν,’ he means that it suffices to say here that this claim was established elsewhere because grounding this claim lies outside the scope of the present treatise. In other words, he would not be explaining why so much was said elsewhere about the virtue of νοῦς, but would be providing us with an explanation for why *this* (sc. the claim that so much was said elsewhere about the virtue of νοῦς) is all he has to say here to justify the claim that the virtue of νοῦς is separate.<sup>48</sup> To put it differently, the γάρ here is not explaining what has been said, but is conveying ‘the motive for saying that which has just been said’ (cf. Denniston, 1954, s.v. γάρ, III.(1), p. 60).

---

that one should rather supply ζωή with ‘ἡ δὲ τοῦ νοῦ’. Now, although I concede this would make better sense (since there is nothing weird in talking of a life of the νοῦς), nothing in the context suggests that ζωή should be supplied here. As I take it, ‘ἡ δὲ τοῦ νοῦ <ἀρετή>’ works better. Now, one may still argue that supplying ἐνέργεια (which is indeed possible given the context) has the advantage of establishing a clear contrast with the activities Aristotle was talking about at the beginning of the chapter: the activities on the basis of the other virtue, which were said to be human in 1178a9-10 (αἱ γὰρ κατὰ ταύτην ἐνέργειαι ἀνθρωπικαί). In that case, Aristotle would be contrasting merely human activities, which are necessarily connected to the body, with the activity of νοῦς, which is separate. However, if we supply ἀρετή with ‘ἡ δὲ τοῦ νοῦ’, we have an even clearer contrast: ‘ἡ δὲ τοῦ νοῦ <ἀρετή>’ would be contrasted with ‘αἱ δὲ τοῦ συνθέτου ἀρεταί’ from 1178a20-21. Moreover, supplying ἀρετή allows us to understand without difficulties the contrast made in 1178a24-25, a passage in which ‘ἡ δὲ τοῦ νοῦ’ [which must be supplied] is said to need external goods to a smaller extent than ‘τῆς ἡθικῆς,’ which is presumably ‘τῆς ἡθικῆς <ἀρετῆς>.’

<sup>48</sup> In the face of this, one may argue that it is after all better to supply ἐνέργεια with ‘ἡ δὲ τοῦ νοῦ,’ since Aristotle never talks explicitly of the virtue of νοῦς as being separate from the body in other places. However, if it is uncontroversial that νοῦς and its activity are separate from the body, it is reasonable to assume that its virtue too would be separate. Accordingly, the claim that the virtue of νοῦς is separate may count as something that was said elsewhere in that it is a corollary of things Aristotle says elsewhere about νοῦς and its activity.

**1178a23:** διακριβῶσαι

The agreement between K<sup>b</sup>, P<sup>b</sup>, and C<sup>c</sup> suggests that the reading of the *a* family is ἀκριβῶσαι. However, as was already made clear by Stewart (1892, vol. 2, p. 453), it is probable that K<sup>b</sup> (and thus also P<sup>b</sup> and C<sup>c</sup>) omit ‘ΔΙ-’ (from διακριβῶσαι) due to the immediately preceding ‘-ΑΙ’ from εἴρηται, which, as we saw, is attested by all extant mss. Accordingly, here we have a clear case in which the text from witnesses of the *a* family is corrupt, and in which P<sup>b</sup> and C<sup>c</sup> share an error with K<sup>b</sup>.<sup>49</sup>

**1178b12-13:** ἀλλὰ τὰς ἀνδρείους ... ὅτι καλόν;

These lines have for long caused discomfort.

A first source of worry is the adjective ἀνδρείους (nom. sg. ἀνδρείος), which is not clearly attested as a two ending adjective, but only as a three ending adjective. It is used as a two ending adjective in the anonymous scholia to *EN* III.11 [=Bywater III.8] 1116b30ff, in which one reads ‘εἰπὼν ὅτι καὶ αἱ ἀνδρείοι θυμοειδεῖς κτλ.’ (*CAG*. XX, p. 166.13), which seems to be a claim about courageous actions. Yet this could be a mistake in Hayduck’s edition, since in the sequence it seems clear that Michael of Ephesus is explaining how exactly θυμός is involved when courageous agents act (their performance of courageous actions is not motivated by θυμός), in which case one could think that ‘εἰπὼν ὅτι καὶ αἱ ἀνδρείοι θυμοειδεῖς κτλ.’ should be rather ‘εἰπὼν ὅτι καὶ οἱ ἀνδρείοι θυμοειδεῖς κτλ.’ In any case, the fact that in the lines following 1178b12-13 Aristotle uses the adjective ἐλευθέρους (nom. sg. ἐλευθέριος), which is well attested as a two ending adjective, makes it plausible that Aristotle is using the adjective ἀνδρείους as a two ending adjective here.

A second, and more concerning, source of worry are the participles in the masculine accusative plural that are attested by almost all mss., with the exception of K<sup>b</sup> (which gives the first participle in the nominative, and the second one in the accusative, which clearly does not make much sense). If we read the participles in the accusative, then it seems that the only explanation one could give is to say that they were attracted from the dative to the accusative. In that case, Aristotle would mean something like: ‘ἀλλὰ <ἀπονείμμαι χρεῶν αὐτοῖς> τὰς ἀν-

<sup>49</sup> What the Arabic translation is translating here is unclear. It reads ‘to examine’ (أَفْحَصَ), which could be translating either ἀκριβῶσαι or διακριβῶσαι (for the uses of words from the root فحَص by the translators of the Arabic version to render words from the same semantic field—such as σκέψασθαι, σκεπτόμενος, ἐπισκεψώμεθα, ἐπιβλέψειε etc.—, see Ullmann [2011-2012, vol. 1, s.v. فحَص, pp. 271-272]). In any case, it is probable that the omission of ‘ΔΙ-’ only took place when the majuscule was transcribed into miniscule, in which case the original the Arabic version is translating would be free of this error.

δρείους, ὑπομενόντοις τὰ φοβερὰ καὶ κινδυνεύοντοις ὅτι καλόν;’ but the participles ended up the accusative due to some sort of case attraction (ἀλλὰ <ἀπονείμμαι χρεῶν αὐτοῖς> τὰς ἀνδρείους, ὑπομένοντας τὰ φοβερὰ καὶ κινδυνεύοντας ὅτι καλόν;). This could make good sense of the text if the participles are read as conveying the false assumption that may lead one to attribute courageous actions to the gods (so read, the text could be rendered as ‘or <should we assign them> courageous actions, under the assumption that they withstand fearful things and face danger because it is fine?’)

No doubt cases of attraction of the participle are somewhat common with copulative verbs (cf. Kühner-Gerth , 2. T., 1. Bd., §369 3.b), pp. 75-76) and occur a couple of times in Aristotle.<sup>50</sup> However, not only ἀπονέμω is not being used here as a copulative verb, but also the participles in this phrase would be attracted in case only, something different from what we see in cases where a participle is attracted by a predicate of its subject (where it is attracted in gender as well).

In the face of this, there seem to be three reasonable alternatives:

The first one is to follow Bywater (1892, p. 69) and to emend the whole passage. Bywater proposes changing ἀνδρείους into the genitive ἀνδρείου, and then changing the participles to the genitive accordingly. In that case, Aristotle would be giving another unsatisfactory answer to the question about what actions we should attribute to the gods by asking: ‘should we attribute to them the actions of the courageous person, who withstands fearful things and faces danger because it is fine to do so?’ (ἀλλὰ τὰς ἀνδρείου ὑπομενόντου τὰ φοβερὰ καὶ κινδυνεύοντος ὅτι καλόν;).

<sup>50</sup> The clearest case of this is perhaps *Pol.* II.5 1263b36-37, a passage in which Aristotle writes ‘ἀλλὰ δεῖ πλῆθος ὃν ὥσπερ εἴρηται πρότερον, διὰ τὴν παιδείαν κοινήν καὶ μίαν ποιεῖν’ and the subject of the participle ‘ὃν’ that is being here identified with a multitude is clearly πόλις, which is also object of the infinitive ποιεῖν. In fact, earlier, in *Pol.* II.2 1261a18, Aristotle said that the city is, in its nature, a sort of multitude. As a result, Aristotle is here saying that, because the city is a multitude, it must be made common and one by means of education (on this use of διὰ + acc., see Eucken [1868, p. 39]). A more controversial example of this sort of attraction is *EE* II.6 1222b18, where (reading the text of the mss.) Aristotle writes ‘καὶ ζῶον ὃν ὅλως ζῶα,’ and the context makes clear that the subject of the neuter participle ὃν must be ἄνθρωπος. Albeit this passage is emended by all editors of the *EE*, it can be made sense of without any emendation if ὃν is in the neuter due to being attracted by ζῶον, which would be a predicate of the subject ἄνθρωπος (pace Rowe [2023, p. 41], who thinks that ‘[t]he MSS’ ὃν has no observable function’). Accordingly, in its context, the text could be rendered as: ‘a man <begets> men (and in so far as <man> is, in general [i.e., in regard to its genus], an animal, <he begets> animals) and a plant <beget> plants’ (ἄνθρωπος ἀνθρώπους καὶ ζῶον ὃν ὅλως ζῶα καὶ φυτὸν φυτά). Although this is a bit harsh in that ‘καὶ ζῶον ὃν ὅλως ζῶα’ would be somehow interrupting the argument (since ‘καὶ φυτὸν φυτά’ could hardly be taken as saying that ‘in so far as <man> is a plant <he begets> plants’), I would like to argue that this reading is nevertheless grammatically possible. I thank one of the anonymous referees for pressing me on this.

The problem with this first alternative is that it construes Aristotle's claim in such a way that he would be offering us no reason for rejecting this answer. Yet all other possible answers Aristotle gives us in his argument are accompanied by the reasons for rejecting them.<sup>51</sup>

The second alternative would be to change the participles to the dative and to understand them in the same way I proposed above (i.e., as conveying the false assumption that may motivate one to attribute courageous actions to the gods). This makes perfect sense of the text and is justifiable if indeed we got the accusatives due to assimilation with the accusative *ἀνδρείους* (which a copyist may have taken as a masculine accusative). However, this does not explain how we got the text from K<sup>b</sup>, which has a nominative participle and an accusative participle.

This leads me to my third alternative, which is the one I favoured. It consists in reading the nominative *ὑπομένοντες* that is attested in K<sup>b</sup> (instead of *ὑπομένοντας*, which is attested by all other mss.) and emending *κινδυνεύοντας* into *κινδυνεύοντες* (cf. Burnet, 1900, p. 450). In that case, if one reads what Aristotle is saying here in light of what he just said about just actions, it seems that there is clearly something missing between 'ἀλλὰ τὰς ἀνδρείους' and 'ὑπομένοντες τὰ φοβερὰ καὶ κινδυνεύοντες ὅτι καλόν;'. Whether we should insert 'ἢ γελοῖοι φανοῦνται' or merely 'ἦ' (in which case one could easily supply 'γελοῖοι φανοῦνται') is not so clear at first. However, the latter alternative (inserting 'ἦ') is not only more economical, but also quite easy to explain. In fact, not only K<sup>b</sup> omitted the 'ἦ' before 'γελοῖοι φανοῦνται' in Aristotle's previous example (the one concerning just actions), but also 'ἦ' and the 'ύ-' from *ὑπομένοντες* would be pronounced in the same way as a result of iotacism, which makes it even more plausible to think that a 'ἦ' between 'ἀλλὰ τὰς ἀνδρείους' and 'ὑπομένοντες ... ὅτι καλόν;' was omitted, and that we must emend the text adding it back (as I did).

In that case, just like he did in the case of just actions, Aristotle would be first asking whether we should assign courageous actions to the gods, and would then give us a reason for rejecting this: the gods would appear ridiculous withstanding fearful things and facing danger because it is fine to do so.

**1178b15:** *αἱ δὲ σώφρονες τί ἂν εἶεν;*

K<sup>b</sup>, which reads *εἶ* here, seemingly agrees with the Arabic translation, which is perhaps reason for thinking that *εἶ* is the reading of the *α* family. With this text, Aristotle would mean

---

<sup>51</sup> The only exception to this pattern would be 1178b15 '*αἱ δὲ σώφρονες τί ἂν εἶεν;*', where, on my reading, Aristotle is just giving us a reason for not attributing temperate actions to the gods, without first asking whether we should attribute temperate actions to them. See below the discussion of 1178b15.

something like: ‘εἰ δὲ σώφρονες <πράξεις ἀπονεῖμαι χρεῶν αὐτοῖς> τί ἂν εἶεν;’, which could be rendered as ‘and if one must assign them temperate actions, what would <these actions> be?’, which is reasonably intelligible, despite breaking the pattern set by the previous answers, in which Aristotle always used definite articles (cf. 1178b10-11 ‘τὰς δικαίας’; 1178b12 ‘τὰς ἀνδρείους’; and 1178b14 ‘τὰς ἐλευθερίους’).

However, although it is true that the Arabic translation does render this sentence from 1178b15 as a conditional—it renders it as ‘and if temperate actions are attributed to them’ (565.15: *وَإِنْ نُسِبَ إِلَيْهِمُ الْأَفْعَالُ الْعَفِيفَةُ*)—, it not only has a definite article with ‘temperate actions’ (*الْأَفْعَالُ الْعَفِيفَةُ*), but it also rendered the other answers Aristotle gave previously in the form of conditional clauses. In 1178b10-11, ‘πότερα τὰς δικαίας;’ is rendered as ‘if just acts are attributed to them’ (565.11: *إِنْ نُسِبَ إِلَيْهِمُ الْعَدْلِيَّةُ*); and in 1178b12, ‘ἀλλὰ τὰς ἀνδρείους’ is rendered as ‘and if courageous actions are attributed to them’ (565.12-13: *وَإِنْ نُسِبَ إِلَيْهِمُ الْأَفْعَالُ الشَّجْدِيَّةُ*).<sup>52</sup> Thus, it would also be plausible to think that the original that the Arabic version is translating has rather ‘αἰ δὲ σώφρονες τί ἂν εἶεν;’ and that this is being read in light of Aristotle’s previous examples, so that although we have a nominative here (and not an accusative), this phrase is understood as conveying the same thought as Aristotle’s previous answers.<sup>53</sup>

Now, given that the Arabic translation cannot be decisive here, and that, if we read ‘εἰ δὲ σώφρονες κτλ.’, the absence of the definite article may indeed cause some concern, I chose to print ‘αἰ δὲ σώφρονες τί ἂν εἶεν;.’ With this text, Aristotle would be using a construction different from the ones he used in his previous answers. He would not be explicitly considering the option according to which one should assign to the gods temperate actions, but would be directly asking what their temperate actions would be (the nominative here would be an ‘independent nominative,’ which is expected given that it functions as the theme of the sentence).

Alternatively, one could follow Michelet (1848, vol. 2, p. 334) and argue that ‘εἰ δὲ σώφρονες κτλ.’ is talking about the gods themselves, and not about their actions. This gains some plausibility if one also follows the *editio Aldina* in changing the feminine accusative plural article τὰς from 1178b12 (ἀλλὰ τὰς ἀνδρείους) into the masculine accusative plural τούς (as Michelet himself does). Albeit this reading would make better sense of the absence of the article

<sup>52</sup> The Arabic translation does not translate ‘ἢ τὰς ἐλευθερίους’ in the same way because it misconstrues ‘ὅτι καλόν; ἢ τὰς ἐλευθερίους; τίνοι δὲ δώσουσιν;’, taking ‘ὅτι καλόν ... δώσουσιν’ as a single phrase (on this, see Akasoy & Fidora [p. 564n186]). Yet even so it construes this phrase as a conditional: ‘and if it is good that etc.’ (565.13: *وَإِنْ كَانَ جَيِّدًا أَنْ*).

<sup>53</sup> The fact that the Arabic translation renders all Aristotle’s answers here in the passive voice may be taken as adding further plausibility to this alternative.

with *σώφρονες*, it is far from clear, in the context, what should be supplied with ‘*εἰ δὲ σώφρονες κτλ.*’, since Aristotle has been talking of attributing actions to the gods in all his previous answers (the only exception would be 1178b12 read as Michelet wants to read it). The only plausible candidate is the verb *ὑπειλήφραμεν*, which appears in 1178b8-9, right before Aristotle introduces his question about what sorts of actions we should attribute to the gods. In that case, ‘*εἰ δὲ σώφρονες τί ἂν εἶεν;*’ could be construed as asking: ‘But if <we consider the gods to be> temperate, why would they be <so>?’

Notwithstanding this, unless one emends the whole passage from 1178b10-16—so that Aristotle would be talking of considering the gods to be just, courageous, generous, and, finally, temperate<sup>54</sup>, in which case it would be natural to supply *ὑπειλήφραμεν* in all his questions—, it seems much more plausible to think that, throughout lines 1178b10-16, Aristotle is testing possible answers to the question he raised in 1178b10 (*πράξεις δὲ ποίας ἀπονείμμαι χρεῶν αὐτοῖς;*), and that, in doing so, he is showing that all these answers turn out to be unsatisfactory (as the generalization from lines 1178b17-18 suggests).

#### **1179a3-4:** οὐδ’ ἡ κρίσις, οὐδ’ αἱ πράξεις

The text printed by Bekker, Susemihl and Bywater here is the one attested by K<sup>b</sup>: ‘οὐδ’ ἡ πρᾶξις.’ Similarly, in Averroes’s *Middle Commentary*, one reads something that supposes the original ‘οὐδ’ αἱ πράξεις’<sup>55</sup>, also without ‘οὐδ’ ἡ κρίσις.’ The text I printed, in turn, is ‘οὐδ’ ἡ κρίσις, οὐδ’ αἱ πράξεις,’ which is attested by O<sup>b</sup>M<sup>b</sup> and by the Arabic translation. There is another variant here, attested by P<sup>b</sup>C<sup>c</sup> and by LL<sup>b</sup>B<sup>95sup</sup>: ‘οὐδ’ ἡ κρίσις, οὐδ’ ἡ πρᾶξις.’ There are two separate questions to be addressed here, then. First, whether we should read ‘ἡ κρίσις’ or not. Second, whether we should read the plural ‘αἱ πράξεις’ or the singular ‘ἡ πρᾶξις.’

Let me begin with the first question.

Now, ‘ἡ κρίσις’ is clearly the *lectio difficilior*, since it is far from clear what it means, and

<sup>54</sup> As the *editio Aldina* seems happy to do, since, as a matter of fact, it changes all feminine accusative plural articles in this argument into masculine accusative plural articles.

<sup>55</sup> *Pace* Woerther (2018, p. 219n335), who considers the possibility that Averroes ‘*ait dépendu d’une version arabe qui traduisant uniquement la leçon πρᾶξις (dépourvue de la mention d’une ou des actions)*’, despite the fact that *in operationibus* seems to translate a plural. Perhaps Woerther was led to say this because the text of Averroes agrees with the manuscript tradition that has the singular ‘οὐδ’ ἡ πρᾶξις’ in that his text also does not mention ‘οὐδ’ ἡ κρίσις.’ However, if, as I shall suggest below (cf. footnote 62), we take Averroes’s text as either depending on a copy of the same Arabic translation we have in the Fez ms., but which has a corruption here or as being itself corrupted here (so that the version that was translated into Latin was already corrupted), there is no need to assume that the Arabic version of Aristotle’s text Averroes’s depends on had something equivalent to the singular ‘οὐδ’ ἡ πρᾶξις.’

it could hardly be explained as gloss that got into the text.<sup>56</sup> Michael of Ephesus understands this as spelling out the sense in which self-sufficiency (*τὸ ἀντάρκες*) does not depend on excess. On his reading, the idea is that it does not depend on excess in that neither the judgment to the effect that one is self-sufficient nor the actions expressive of self-sufficiency depend on excess (*CAG*. XX, p. 601.16-20). But this is perhaps a bit far-fetched.<sup>57</sup>

A more plausible alternative would be to take *οὐδ' ἢ κρίσις, οὐδ' ἢ πράξις* or *οὐδ' ἢ κρίσις, οὐδ' αἱ πράξεις* as covering two domains in which self-sufficiency does not depend on excess. Yet the question concerning the meaning of *ἢ κρίσις* remains.

A first way of making sense of *ἢ κρίσις* on this reading is to say that it refers to theoretical thinking<sup>58</sup>, in which case it is being contrasted with *ἢ πράξις* or *αἱ πράξεις*, which clearly makes reference to the practical domain. Yet I think it would be somewhat surprising if *ἢ κρίσις* is picking up only theoretical judgments. In fact, if this were the point Aristotle wants to make, one would expect him to have written *ἢ γνῶσις* instead, like in 1095a5-6, where he says that the end of ethics is not knowledge, but action (*τὸ τέλος ἐστὶν οὐ γνῶσις ἀλλὰ πράξις*).

A second way of making sense *ἢ κρίσις* is suggested by *EE* VII.12 1244b19-20, where Aristotle says that 'we have better judgment when we are self-sufficient than when we are in need' (*ἀμείνω δ' ἔχομεν κρίσιν ἀντάρκεις ὄντες ἢ μετ' ἐνδείας*). In the context of this passage, Aristotle clearly has practical judgment in mind, since the idea is that when we are self-sufficient our judgments about the choiceworthiness of our friends are not distorted.

Accordingly, a better way of making sense of *οὐδ' ἢ κρίσις, οὐδ' ἢ πράξις* or *οὐδ' ἢ κρίσις, οὐδ' αἱ πράξεις* would be to say that Aristotle's claim is that self-sufficiency does not depend on excess, and thus that neither our judgment (presumably our *right* judgment *in practical matters*)<sup>59</sup> nor our action(s) (presumably our *right* action[s]) depend on excess, which would be something expected if self-sufficiency depended on excess, since the rightness of both

<sup>56</sup> Pace Woerther (2018, p. 219n335), who considers the possibility that the fact that the Arabic version found in the Fez ms. has something translating *οὐδ' ἢ κρίσις* may be due to contamination from a gloss.

<sup>57</sup> No doubt Aristotle will talk of 'judging by means of the external goods' below in 1179a15-16. Yet not only this is meant as a critique of the many, but also the point in this passage is that, to the many, the person who is happy according to Anaxagoras's standards would seem to be strange because the many judge what people are like by reference to their external goods, which is the only thing they see. Accordingly, 1179a15-16 seems to strengthen the assumption that the kind of judgment Aristotle has in mind in the argument from lines 1179a1ff is a judgment about practical matters, as I shall suggest below.

<sup>58</sup> On this reading, it *ἢ κρίσις* would be picking up *τὸ θεωρεῖν* from 1178b34.

<sup>59</sup> Alternatively, one could argue that *ἢ κρίσις* can refer to judgments that are either practical or theoretical. However, given that Aristotle contrasts the claim he makes about self-sufficiency here with a claim about the possibility of doing fine things without ruling the land and the seas, there is good reason for thinking that with *ἢ κρίσις* he has in mind judgments about practical matters.



our practical judgment and of our action(s) is dependent upon self-sufficiency.

It may be objected that there is no room for practical or theoretical judgment in the argument from 1179a3-5 in so far as Aristotle's point here is merely that one does not need to rule over land and sea in order to perform fine actions.<sup>60</sup> Yet not only, as we saw, there are strong textual reasons for reading the text with 'οὐδ' ἢ κρίσις' (which could hardly be explained away as a gloss, and is thus the *lectio difficilior*), but also if 'ἢ κρίσις' is taken as making reference to practical judgment, its mention may not be out of place after all. Aristotle explains the claim that it is possible to perform fine actions without ruling land and sea by saying that one can act on the basis of virtue (*κατὰ τὴν ἀρετήν*) with moderate resources. Accordingly, although he is not talking explicitly about right judgment (be it practical or theoretical), it may nevertheless be the case that practical judgment is also in question in his argument, since acting on the basis of virtue depends on right reason.

Moreover, it is reasonable to assume that 'οὐδ' ἢ κρίσις' is absent from the text of K<sup>b</sup> either due to homeoteleuton or due to homeoarcton. Similarly, one could argue that the Arabic version of the *EN* Averroes is using (or that the original Arabic text of Averroes that his Medieval translators had access to) did not have something translating 'οὐδ' ἢ κρίσις' due to the latter phenomenon: i.e., the original 'وَلَا الْقَضَاءُ وَلَا الْأَعْمَالُ' (*wa-lā l-qaḍā'u wa-lā l-a'mālu*) was corrupted into 'وَلَا الْأَعْمَالُ' (*wa-lā l-a'mālu*).<sup>61</sup> Besides, the absence of vocalizations probably led what was meant to be the nominative 'وَلَا الْأَعْمَالُ' (*wa-lā l-a'mālu*) translating 'αἱ πράξεις' to be read as a genitive (i.e., 'وَلَا الْأَعْمَالِ' [*wa-lā l-a'māli*]) governed by the preposition 'فِي' (*fī*) from 'فِي الْإِسْرَافِ' (*fī l-isrāfi*), which immediately precedes 'وَلَا الْقَضَاءُ وَلَا الْأَعْمَالُ' (cf. 567.12) in the Arabic translation (which would explain why the Latin version of Averroes's text has '*in operationibus*').<sup>62</sup>

<sup>60</sup> I thank one of the anonymous referees for this objection.

<sup>61</sup> On omissions as the most frequent errors in Arabic mss., see Gacek (2007, p. 222).

<sup>62</sup> This suggests that Averroes may perhaps be using a different version of the same text we have in the Fez ms. or that Averroes's own text was corrupted before being translated. As a matter of fact, as Woerther (2018, p. 319n335) shows, Averroes paraphrases what we would expect to be 'ἐν τῇ ὑπερβολῇ' as '*in honoribus*,' which supposes the original 'فِي الْإِسْرَافِ' (*fī l-ašrāfi*), which, as she argues, can be easily explained as being due to a mistake in reading 'فِي الْإِسْرَافِ' (*fī l-isrāfi*). Besides, although Akasoy & Fidora print 'فِي الْإِسْرَافِ' (*fī l-isrāfi*) in 567.12 (which would be an accurate translation for 'ἐν τῇ ὑπερβολῇ'), this is, as their *apparatus* makes clear, a correction due to Badawi and that can be supported on the basis of Dunlop's translation. In fact, according to the *apparatus* from Akasoy & Fidora, the Fez ms. actually reads 'فِي الْإِسْرَافِ' (*fī l-išrāfi*) (see Ullmann [vol. 1, p. 187] for other occurrences of words from the root (شرف), which is even easier to mistake for 'فِي الْإِسْرَافِ' (*fī l-ašrāfi*). Moreover, as Woerther (2018, p. 97) observes, there are instances in which it seems that Averroes is using a version of the Arabic translation that preserves things that are absent from the text in the Fez ms. (as in 1155a16-20, where the Arabic

The second question, namely whether we should read ‘ἡ πράξις’ or ‘αἱ πράξεις,’ is not as pressing. In any case, it is hard to decide which one is the original here, since corruption would be possible in either direction.<sup>63</sup> But because the plural ‘αἱ πράξεις’ makes better sense of the argument, I have given preference to this reading. However, the argument can be construed in the same way if one reads the singular ‘ἡ πράξις.’

Victor Gonçalves de Sousa  
*Universidade de São Paulo*

### References

- Akasoy, A. A., & Fidora, A. (2005). *The Arabic Version of the Nicomachean Ethics*. Brill.
- Allen, W. S. (1987). *Vox Graeca. A guide to the pronunciation of Classical Greek*. Cambridge University Press.
- Arberry, A. J. (1955). The Nicomachean Ethics in Arabic. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, 17(1), 1–9.
- Ashburner, W. (1917). Studies in the text of the Nicomachean Ethics (part II). *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 37, 31–55.
- Baldi, D. (2011). Nuova luce sul Riccardiano 46. *Medioevo greco: rivista di storia e filologia bizantina*, (11), 13–22.
- Bekker, A. I. (1831). *Aristoteles graece* (Vols. 1-2). Georg Reimer.
- Broadie, S. W., & Rowe, C. J. (2002). *Aristotle. Nicomachean Ethics*. Oxford University Press.
- Brockmann, C. (1993). Zur Überlieferung der aristotelischen Magna Moralia. In F. Berger, C. Brockmann, G. de Gregorio, M. I. Ghisu, S. Kotzabassi, & B. Noack (Eds.), *Symbolae Berolinenses: für Dieter Harlfinger* (pp. 42–73). Adolf M. Hakkert.
- Busse, A. (1883). Zur Textkritik der Nikomachischen Ethik. *Hermes*, 18(1), 137–147.

---

version does not have anything translating ‘καὶ τοῖς πλείστοις τῶν ζώων,’ while Averroes’s text has ‘sed etiam in pluribus animalium’). On the *lacunae* of the exemplar of the Fez ms., see also Ullmann (2011-2012, vol. 2, p. 124). Thus, nothing hinders the possibility that the Arabic version of the text used by Averroes has corruptions that are absent from the text of the Fez ms. (and vice versa), or maybe also that the original Arabic of Averroes commentary was corrupted before being translated (which would also explain why its Hebrew translation commits the same mistake as its Latin version in translating ‘ἐν τῇ ὑπερβολῇ’, as Woerther reports).

<sup>63</sup> According to Allen (1987, pp. 69-75, 78–79), after the 3th century CE, both ‘η’ and the diphthong ‘ει’ were pronounced as iota (i.e., [i]), and the diphthong ‘αι’ was pronounced as a close-mid ‘e’ (i.e., [e]). In that case, it seems that it would not be difficult to mistake ‘ἡ πράξις’ for ‘αἱ πράξεις’ or to mistake ‘αἱ πράξεις’ for ‘ἡ πράξις’ when these words were read aloud, since they would only differ in how the definite article was pronounced.

- Bywater, I. (1892). *Contributions to the Textual Criticism of Aristotle's Nicomachean Ethics*. Clarendon Press.
- Bywater, I. (1894). *Aristotelis Ethica Nicomachea*. Clarendon Press.
- Corpus dei papiri filosofici greci e latini* (Vols. 1-16). (1989-2023). Olschki.
- Denniston, J. D. (1954). *The Greek Particles* (2nd ed.). Clarendon Press.
- Diccionario Griego-Español*. (2011). Instituto de Lenguas y Culturas del Mediterráneo y Oriente Próximo.
- Dunlop, D. M. (1962). The Nicomachean Ethics in Arabic, Books I-VI. *Oriens*, 15, 18–34.
- Eucken, R. (1868). *Ueber den Sprachgebrauch des Aristoteles. Beobachtungen ueber die Prae-positionen*. Weidmannsche Buchhandlung.
- Gacek, A. (2007). Taxonomy of scribal errors and corrections in Arabic manuscripts. In J. Pfeiffer & M. Kropp (Eds.), *Theoretical Approaches to the Transmission and Edition of Oriental Manuscripts. Proceedings of a symposium held in Istanbul March 28-30, 2001* (pp. 217–235). Orien-Institut Beirut/Egon Verlag.
- Gauthier, R.-A., & Jolif, J. Y. (1970). *L'Étique à Nicomaque. Introduction, traduction et commentaire* (2ème ed., Vols. 1-4). Éditions Peeters - Éditions Nauwelaerts.
- Harlfinger, D. (1971). Die Überlieferungsgeschichte der Eudemischen Ethik. In P. Moraux & D. Harlfinger (Eds.), *Untersuchungen zur Eudemischen Ethik: Akten des 5. Symposium Aristotelicum (Oosterbeek, Niederlande, 21.-29. August 1969)* (pp. 1–50). de Gruyter.
- Heylbut, G. (1892). *Eustratii et Michaelis et Anonyma in Ethica Nichomachea Comentariorum*. Georg Reimer.
- Jackson, H. (1876). On a MS. of the Nicomachean Ethics. *The journal of Philology*, 6(12), 208–211.
- Jackson, H. (1879). *ΠΕΠΙ ΔΙΚΑΙΟΣΥΝΗΣ. The Fifth Book of the Nicomachean Ethics of Aristotle*. Cambridge University Press.
- Κοραΐς, Α. (1822). *Ἀριστοτέλους Ἠθικὰ Νικομάχεια*. F. Didot.
- Kühner, R., Gerth, B., & Blass, F. (1890–1904). *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache* (3. Aufl., Vols. 2). hantsche Buchhandlung.
- Lane, E. W., & Lane-Poole, S. (1863–1893). *An Arabic-English Lexicon* (Vols. 8). Williams; Norgate.
- Loungi, P.-V. (2022). *Die Manuskripte und die Überlieferung der Nikomachischen Ethik des Aristoteles (Buch I)*. Hêrodotos.
- Martinelli Tempesta, S. (2016). Alcune osservazioni sul Riccardiano 46 e la tradizione dell'Etica Nicomachea e della Poetica di Aristotele. In F. G. Hernández Muñoz (Ed.), *Manuscriptos griegos en España y su contexto europeo. Greek Manuscripts in Spain and their European Context* (pp. 201–250). Dykinson, S.L.
- Michelet, K. L. (1848). *Aristotelis Ethicorum Nicomacheorum libri decem* (editio altera, Vol. 2). Schlesinger.
- Mioni, E. (1958). *Aristotelis codices graeci qui in bibliothecis Venetis adservantur*. Padova.

- Musurillo, H. (1964). *Gregorii Nysseni de vita Moysis*. Brill.
- Oskvig, K. (2018). Observations on Vat. Barb. Gr. 75, A Neglected MS of the Nicomachean Ethics. *Classical Philology*, 113(3), 340–352.
- Panegyres, K. (2020). The text of Aristotle's *Ethica Nicomachea* in Laurentianus 81.18. *Prometheus*, 46, 3–22.
- Rackham, H. (1934). *Aristotle. Nicomachean Ethics*. Harvard University Press.
- Ramsauer, G. (1878). *Aristotelis Ethica Nicomachea*. B.G. Teubner.
- Rassow, H. (1874). *Forschungen über die Nikomachische Ethik des Aristoteles*. Hermann Böhlaus.
- Rowe, C. (2023). *Aristotelica. Studies on the Text of Aristotle's Eudemian Ethics*. Oxford University Press.
- Schmidt, E. A., & Ullmann, M. (2012). *Aristoteles in Fes. Zum Wert der arabischen Überlieferung der Nikomachischen Ethik für die Kritik des griechischen Textes*. Universitätsverlag Winter.
- Stewart, J. A. (1882). *The English Manuscripts of the Nicomachean Ethics*. Clarendon Press.
- Stewart, J. A. (1892). *Notes on the Nicomachean ethics of Aristotle* (Vols. 1-2). Clarendon Press.
- Susemihl, F. (1878). Die Bekkerschen Handschriften der Nikomachischen Ethik. *Jahrbücher für classische Philologie*, 24, 625–632.
- Susemihl, F. (1887). *Aristotelis Ethica Nicomachea*. Teubner.
- Susemihl, F., & Apelt, O. (1912). *Aristotelis Ethica Nicomachea*. Teubner.
- Ullmann, M. (2011-2012). *Die Nikomachische Ethik des Aristoteles in arabischer Übersetzung* (Vols. 1-2). Harrassowitz Verlag.
- Vuillemin-Diem, G., & Rashed, M. (1997). Burgundio de Pise et ses manuscrits grecs d'Aristote: Laur. 87.7 et Laur. 81.18. *Recherches de théologie et philosophie médiévales*, 64(4), 136–198.
- Wartelle, A. (1963). *Inventaire des manuscrits grecs d'Aristote et de ses commentateurs*. Les Belles Lettres.
- Wilson, N. G. (1983). A mysterious Byzantine scriptorium: Ioannikios and his colleagues. *Scriptura e civiltà*, 7, 161–176.
- Burnet, J. (1900). *The Ethics of Aristotle*. Methuen & CO.
- Woerther, F. (2018). *Le plaisir, le bonheur, et l'acquisition des vertus. Édition du Livre X du Commentaire moyen d'Averroès à l'Éthique à Nicomaque d'Aristote*. Brill.
- Zell, K. (1820). *Aristotelis Ethicorum Nicomacheorum Libri Decem* (Vols. 1-2). Sumtibus Mohr et Winter Bibliopolarum.