

## **Simplicius' Commentary on Aristotle, *De caelo* 2.10–12: An Annotated Translation (Part 2)**

Alan C. Bowen

*Institute for Research in Classical Philosophy and Science, Princeton*

*bowen@IRCPS.org*

### **Introduction**

This completes my translation of the narrowly astronomical sections of Simplicius' commentary on Aristotle's *De caelo* that first appeared in *SCIAMVS* 4 (2003) 23–58. Its aim, as before, is to supply the reader with a suitably annotated rendering of Simplicius' text that will facilitate addressing the critical questions of the nature, construction, and historical value of Simplicius' commentary, especially as it bears on the history of earlier Greek astronomical theorizing.

In completing this project, I have relied strictly on modern editions of Aristotle's *De caelo* in presenting the *lemmata* in full and have relegated comments about any differences with Simplicius' abbreviated *lemmata* to footnotes. After all, given that we have only Simplicius' *lemmata* and not the full text of the *De caelo* that he used, there seems little sense when presenting Aristotle's text in full to combine it with readings from Simplicius' and thus to imply a text that does not exist.<sup>1</sup> At the same time, I have preserved the fact that the text quoted or paraphrased in the commentary proper sometimes differs from the text found in the *lemmata*.<sup>2</sup> Thus, the *lemmata* presented here differ from those offered by Ian Mueller [2005], since he revises the received text of the *De caelo* in the light of Simplicius' text and removes any differences between Simplicius' *lemmata* and his quotations and paraphrases.

For the modern text of Aristotle's *De caelo*, my primary source is Paul Moraux's edition since it makes extensive use of the indirect tradition in establishing Aristotle's

---

<sup>1</sup> See Moraux 1965, clxxxiv–clxxxvi: cf. 1954] on the complex relation between the text of Simplicius' commentary and the medieval manuscripts of Aristotle's *De caelo*.

<sup>2</sup> Moraux concludes that the *lemmata* were taken from a different text of the *De caelo* than the one which Simplicius used in writing his comments and paraphrases, and that they were entered at some unknown date after the comments and paraphrases were completed [cf. Moraux 1954, 151–154, 179]. As Heinrich von Staden, however, has suggested in conversation, it would perhaps be better to say that the Simplicius' original *lemmata* were revised by a later copyist unconcerned with the quotations and paraphrases in the comments proper.