

THE ANCESTOR OF THE ARABIC TRANSLATION OF THE *DE GENERATIONE ANIMALIUM* OF ARISTOTLE

The Arabic translation of the *De Gen. Anim.*, made at the beginning of the ninth century by Yahyā ibn al-Bitriq from a Syriac version, contains seven long omissions, noted by Drossaart Lulofs in his edition. Six of these represent approximately 110 letters or a multiple thereof in the Greek:¹ 728^b33–729^a2 (226, or 224 with Z), 761^a9–25 (658, or 661 with Z), 762^a6–8 (112, or 106 with Z), 762^b34–763^a2 (107, or 101 with Z), 768^a18–20 (110) and 781^a7–12 (225, or 223 with Z). The seventh omission (787^b22–788^b30) is too long to be useful, as the scope for accidental errors is too great.

The most likely explanation of these omissions is that the Syriac version was based on a single manuscript, or possibly several manuscripts derived from a single ancestor, which was a copy of a set of papyrus rolls with columns of about 110 letters—either ten lines of eleven letters or eleven lines of ten letters. Columns of 10–12 letters in width were common from about A.D. 125 for about a century.² Omission of a column would have been made easier by homoeoteleuton at 762^b, by homoeoarcton at 768^a, and by both homoeoarcton and homoeoteleuton at 728^b. At 781^a something similar may also have happened. At 781^a7 the last word before the omission is ὁρᾶν, followed by ὁμοίως γὰρ ἀνάγκη in the omitted section, which itself ends, in Z, with ὁρᾶν ἀνάγκη at 781^a11. There is also a different order of words, found in several other good manuscripts and also probably reflected in the Latin translations, in which the omitted passage actually ends with ὁρᾶν.³

It seems probable, then, that when Syriac scholars began to take an interest in Aristotle after the Arab conquest, and searched for manuscripts of his works, for the *De Generatione Animalium* at least they could discover very little material.

University of Liverpool

PAMELA M. HUBY

¹ For counting purposes I have included iota subscript as one letter, and since in both books where these omissions occur, A and Γ, the Arabic text is close to that of manuscript Z (Oxon. Corp. Christi 108), I have given the figures for Z's readings as well as Lulofs's printed text where these differ.

² It has however been pointed out to me that a column of only ten or eleven lines is improbably short. That is true, and I have failed to find a relevant parallel, but the

variation in column length in the material we have is very great and there were clearly no hard-and-fast rules about it. It seems to depend on the space available, and one could imagine, for instance, that someone reusing a tattered roll might trim it down and then write short columns.

³ Further evidence of the effect of papyrus ancestors on the manuscript tradition is given by Lulofs in his preface, p. xviii.

CALLIMACHUS, IAMBUS IV, FR. 194, 100 (PFEIFFER)

ἀλλὰ ταῦτα γ' . β . . μ .

I have not seen the papyrus, but if β and μ are correctly reported, and if the space between would admit three letters, I tentatively suggest ὕβρισμα: *sed haec quidem (sunt) uituperatio*.

Delamere, Hurst Grove, Bedford.

G. M. LEE

Editors' note. Recent inspection of the papyrus suggests that β is not altogether secure and that the space between it and the μ may not be large enough for the restoration, but that the letter after the β(?) could well be ρ.

ON ACHILLES TATIUS 6.6.3

Ach. Tat.¹ 6.6.3 ὡς οὖν ἤκουσεν ἡ Λευκίππη ἀνοιγομένων τῶν θυρῶν, ἦν δὲ ἔνδον λύχνος, ἀνανεύσασα μικρὸν αὐτὴς τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς κατέβαλεν. ἰδὼν δὲ ὁ Θέρσανδρος τὸ κάλλος ἐκ παραδρομῆς ὡς ἀρπαζομένης ἀστραπῆς (μάλιστα γὰρ ἐν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς κάθηται τὸ κάλλος) ἀφῆκε τὴν ψυχὴν ἐπ' αὐτὴν κτλ.

(1) There are three things to be noticed with regard to ἤκουσεν ἡ Λευκίππη ἀνοιγομένων τῶν θυρῶν: (a) the hiatus; (b) the fact that in every other place where Achilles Tatius uses ἀκούω with the genitive of the source of the sound and an appended participle the participle always belongs to a verb of speaking used literally (λέγοντος 1.8.2.16; 2.36.3.8; εἰπόντος 3.21.6.13; λαλούσης 3.18.1.12 (sc. ταύτης); διαλεγομένων 2.26.1.15; ποτινωμένης 6.15.4.28; ὑποκρυνομένου 7.11.1.6) or metaphorically (2.14.8.15 ἀκούσαι . . . τοῦ ὕδατος λαλοῦντος); (c) 2.23.6.11–12 τὸν φόρον ἀκούσας ἀνοιγομένων τῶν θυρῶν.

The combination of these three phenomena means, I believe, that we should read ἤκουσεν ἡ Λευκίππη (τὸν φόρον) ἀνοιγομένων τῶν θυρῶν.

(2) What is the syntax of ἰδὼν τὸ κάλλος ἐκ παραδρομῆς ὡς ἀρπαζομένης ἀστραπῆς? How is the genitive ἀρπαζομένης² ἀστραπῆς to be taken?

(a) It should not be seen as a subjective genitive dependent on παραδρομῆς. παραδρομή is hardly a suitable word to use of the movement of a bright flash, and the ideas in παραδρομῆς and ἀρπαζομένης do not combine well. Besides, in the first part of the comparison the agent in the figurative παραδρομῆς is naturally the one who sees, i.e. Thersander, and not what is seen, and even the hint of a comparison between Thersander and ἀρπαζομένη ἀστραπή would be ludicrous.

(b) Nor is it a possessive genitive dependent on τὸ κάλλος understood. The primary point of the comparison is speed, not beauty. While beauty may be thought of as brilliant and dazzling, as it is in Achilles Tatius (see below), it is entirely unlikely that ἀστραπή itself would be regarded as being a special paradigm of beauty, and there is in fact no trace of such an idea in the author.

(c) To take it as a genitive absolute would not yield complete, acceptable sense; and there is the more objective point that such a genitive absolute after comparative ὡς³ would be unparalleled in Achilles Tatius.

Achilles Tatius is a straightforward writer and here he wrote ἰδὼν . . . τὸ κάλλος ἐκ παραδρομῆς ὡς ἀρπαζομένην ἀστραπήν. The genitive was introduced by assimilation to παραδρομῆς, perhaps with further provocation from ὡς.

¹ Ed. E. Vilborg (Stockholm, 1955). In four-number references to the text the fourth number refers to the line on Vilborg's page.

² ἀρπαζομένης clearly must be regarded

as passive like the instances of ἀρπάζομαι cited later.

³ The same holds good for ὥσπερ, as one might expect, and this tells against Carney's unnecessary ἀποιδούντος at 3.11.1.