

# Oxford Bibliographies

Your Best Research Starts Here



## Alexander of Aphrodisias

Silvia Fazzo, Luca Gili

LAST MODIFIED: 26 APRIL 2018

DOI: 10.1093/OBO/9780195389661-0294

### Introduction

The Greek Aristotelian commentator par excellence, Alexander of Aphrodisias (fl. c 200 CE) shaped the reception and *fortuna* of Aristotle's corpus for centuries to come, summing up centuries of Aristotelian tradition before him. Alexander is the first who is known to have composed running commentaries on whole works, dealing with most of Aristotle's corpus as it stands now. He is also the last distinctively Aristotelian commentator, bridging the legacy of Aristotle's ancient school to other schools in late Antiquity and to Middle Age Scholastics, whether in Greek, Syriac, Arabic, or Latin. His running commentaries on Aristotle's works in logic, physics, and metaphysics have been a source, a model, and a starting point for subsequent Aristotelian scholarship as a whole. Studies on Alexander traditionally developed firstly on a narrower set of topics, including themes in noetics and in logic (see Latin Reception). They then developed on Alexander's independent treatises. Among his alleged works, *On Fate*, *On Providence*, *On the Soul*, *On the Principles of the Universe*, and *On Mixture*, are certainly his; all of them were meant to rebuild the missing parts of Aristotelianism as an all-comprehensive system, and to contrast concurrent Stoic theories (see also Studies of Alexander's Independent Works). Yet Alexander's normalizing impact on Aristotle's system largely escaped attention until the second half of the 20th century, embedded as it is in the whole reception of Aristotle's works (see Bibliographies). Only recently has scholarship focused on how Alexander's commentaries, even if lost, still provide the standard understanding for Aristotle's *Organon* and theoretical philosophy. They indirectly survive through later Aristotelian literature, mostly without being directly acknowledged; Alexander is quoted in a minority of the cases (see Lost Commentary On *On Generation and Corruption*). This makes reconstruction of his lost work an open field for research. Furthermore, scholarly attention focused on Greek preserved opuscula, namely Alexander's *Aporiai kai lyseis*. Mixed up with other short school texts, *aporiai stricto sensu* are made of exegetical puzzles and solutions (edited as *Quaestiones*, Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca [CAG] Supplement 2.2), thus offering standard samples of Alexander's Aporetic Method; further minor texts are collected in the so-called *Mantissa*, and some of these as well have received recent scholarly interest. Other works, by contrast, are lost but preserved in Arabic translation, often via Syriac (see Arabic Reception). Still others were translated but then lost in Arabic as well; fragments only survive. Arabic and Greek texts may raise authenticity problems, which are not easily solved (see Spuria and Questioned Attributions). Recent scholarship has detected Common Features of Alexander's Writings, leading to a possible criterion in the cases of doubt: Alexander strengthens the demonstrative character of Aristotle's arguments, reshaping them into more recognizable forms, for example, syllogisms; he rephrases conceptual oppositions as form (*eidōs/εἶδος*) versus matter (*hylē/ύλη*), thus paving the way to Hylomorphism as a major stream in scholasticism; he selects and fixes a much narrower, albeit Aristotelian lexicon; he harmonizes different texts in the corpus, and Aristotelian scholars in previous decades paved the way. As a result, Alexander's legacy is a well built and coherent Aristotelian system.

### General Overviews

In the last three decades, many scholars devoted important studies to Alexander's philosophy. However, there is no general monograph covering all of the main features of his writing and all of his works. As a main reference, Paul Moraux's long-awaited volume of *Der Aristotelismus bei den Griechen* came out posthumously as Moraux and Sharples 2001 (cited under Bibliographies). It far from covers the whole of Alexander's *corpus*, but Sharples added a substantial section on ethics and a major bibliography. Recommended readings on Alexander's style and works include Sharples 1987 (cited under Bibliographies) and several large introductions to some of his edited or translated works, for example, Thillet 1984 and Thillet 2003 (cited under *On Providence*). Goulet and Aouad 1989 is a fundamental introduction to the relevant sources; it has been integrated into Fazzo 2003. Frede 2013 includes entries on Alexander's philosophy and

Falcon 2013 on the ancient commentators. Different overviews include Tuominen 2012 (cited under Bibliographies), Adamson 2012, and Rashed 2007 (cited under Hylomorphism). More focused reviews are Botter 2009, Cerami 2016, Fazzo 2017.

**Adamson, Peter. 2012. History of Philosophy Podcast, Episode 83: Not written in stone: Alexander of Aphrodisias.**

Part of Adamson's podcast series "History of Philosophy without Any Gaps." This is a clear introduction to Alexander of Aphrodisias as the greatest ancient commentator on Aristotle and as the main opponent to the Stoic teaching on fate.

**Botter, Barbara. 2009. El aristotelismo de Alejandro de Afrodísia en la cultura del comentario. *Estudios de Filosofía*, n. 40:109–133.**

An inquiry into the "culture of commentary": Alexander aims at clarifying Aristotle through Aristotle, by means of an exhausting philological work. Alexander parallels each single phrase with the entire Corpus Aristotelicum and with its previous interpretations, in "a never-ending research of the original meaning of the text."

**Cerami, Cristina. 2016. Alexander of Aphrodisias. In *Brill's companion to the reception of Aristotle in Antiquity*. Edited by Andrea Falcon, 160–182. Leiden, The Netherlands, and Boston: Brill.**

Taking into account the wide context of Alexander's writing, Cerami narrows his distinctive "Neo-Aristotelianism"—as she calls it: an all-embracing philosophical system, seeking for internal coherence, responding both to concurrent theories and to previous Aristotelian interpretations. This form of "Neo-Aristotelianism" was later transmitted to and adopted by Arabic philosophers as well.

**Falcon, Andrea. 2013. Commentators on Aristotle. *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Edited by Edward N. Zalta. Stanford, CA: Stanford Univ.**

Includes a detailed section on Alexander.

**Fazzo, Silvia. 2003. Alexandros d'Aphrodise. In *Dictionnaire des Philosophes Antiques, Supplément*. Edited by Richard Goulet, 61–70. Paris: CNRS.**

The supplement updates Goulet and Aouad 1989 especially in bibliography, which largely evolved during the 1989–2003 period, and revises into detail the complicated state of the art about the translations into Arabic of Alexander's texts.

**Fazzo, Silvia. 2017. Alessandro di Afrodísia e il sistema aristotelico in età imperiale: stato dell'arte e prospettive di ricerca. In *Studi su ellenismo e filosofia romana. Acts of the 2016 Conference of the Società Italiana di Storia della Filosofia Antica*. Edited by F. Alesse, A. Fermani, and S. Maso, 123–151. Rome: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura.**

While focusing on Italian studies for the sake of the 2016 SISFA conference, the papers offer a complement to the present bibliography. It surveys contributions and general achievements on Alexander's exegetical technique, on his way of turning Aristotle into a system, on the *Metaphysics* as a case study.

**Frede, Dorothea. 2013. Alexander of Aphrodisias. *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Edited by Edward N. Zalta. Stanford, CA: Stanford Univ.**

A clear overview of standard opinions on Alexander's thought, with a bibliography. The analytical approach does not allow emphasis on Alexander's role in turning Aristotelianism as a whole into a system. Good section on Alexander's theory of fate and free will, and its Aristotelian background.

**Goulet, Richard, and Maroun Aouad. 1989. *Alexandros d'Aphrodise*. In *Dictionnaire des Philosophes Antiques*. Edited by Richard Goulet, 125–139. Paris: CNRS.**

A concrete and fundamental introduction to Alexander's extant works in Greek, in Arabic translation, and in the indirect tradition. Revised and updated in Fazzo 2003 (see Bibliographies).

**Thillet, Pierre. 1984. *Alexandre d'Aphrodise. Traité du destin*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.**

An edition of Alexander's *De fato* (based on Greek manuscripts and on William of Moerbeke's Latin translation). The preface includes an overview of Alexander's writings with detailed references to Arabic lists of works attributed to Alexander, which is a good starting point but needs to be checked against Goulet and Aouad 1989 and Fazzo 2003.

---

## Bibliographies

A pioneer since 1983 of a new interest in Aristotle's Greek commentators, Robert Sharples is also the author of two different bibliographies on Alexander: Sharples 1987, a user friendly introductory tool, and the wider Moraux and Sharples 2001. Wider bibliographies, including Sellars 2004 and Tuominen 2012 are devoted to the ancient commentators of Aristotle and have sections on Alexander.

**Moraux, Paul, and Robert W. Sharples. 2001. *Der Aristotelismus bei den Griechen. Von Andronikos bis Alexander von Aphrodisias. Dritter Band. Alexander von Aphrodisias*. Edited by Jürgen Wiesner. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter.**

Moraux writes in German on Alexander's logics (Part 1), physics (2), psychology (3), metaphysics (4). Sharples writes in English on ethics (Part 5) and adds a bibliography at pp. 619–650 (see Sharples 1987).

**Sellars, John. 2004. *The Aristotelian commentators: A bibliographical guide*. In *Philosophy, science and exegesis in Greek, Arabic and Latin commentaries*. Edited by Peter Adamson, Han Baltussen, and Martin Stone. London: Institute of Classical Studies, School of Advanced Study, University of London.**

The standard bibliography on the commentators until 2004.

**Sharples, Robert W. 1987. *Alexander of Aphrodisias: Scholasticism and innovation*. In *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt. Part 2, Vol. 36*. Edited by Wolfgang Haase, 1176–1243. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter.**

Partly out of date, it still remains a recommended introduction to Alexander's life and works. Sharples dwells at length on the literary genre of the commentary. The paper includes an extensive and well-organized bibliography, the first which has been available on Alexander; it was later updated by Sharples 2001.

**Sharples, Robert W. 2001. *Bibliographie*. In *Der Aristotelismus bei den Griechen. Von Andronikos bis Alexander von Aphrodisias. Dritter Band. Alexander von Aphrodisias*. Edited by Jürgen Wiesner, 621–652. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter.**

Given as a reference for the whole of Moraux and Sharples 2001, this 11,400-word bibliography is the most extensive and detailed bibliography ever collected on Alexander. A few gaps remain and so do some non precisely pertinent material. Conveniently prefaced by an Index to Bibliography: the force of Sharples is the classification.

**Sharples, Robert W. 2008. *L'accident du déterminisme: Alexandre d'Aphrodise dans son contexte historique*. *Les Études philosophiques* 86:285–303.**

An overview of Alexandrian research in recent decades. Sharples surveys the scholarly debate on Alexander's discussion of determinism.

**Tuominen, Miira. 2012. *Philosophy of the ancient commentators on Aristotle*. *Philosophy Compass* 7.12: 852–895.**

This survey is a recommended reading for those who are approaching the philosophy of the ancient commentators on Aristotle. It includes a rich bibliography.

## Collections of Papers

Well-known groundbreaking collections on Aristotle's reception and commentary tradition cannot be overlooked when starting research on commentators, including Alexander; see Wiesner 1985–1987; Sorabji 1990; Adamson, et al. 2004. The wide-ranging Sorabji 2016 has four essays related to Alexander and 170 quotes from his works. Collections devoted to Alexander have been either quite general, see Boeri 2009, Rashed 2008, or focusing on special themes. So do two Conference acts on Alexander's commentary on the *Metaphysics*, Movia 2003, and Balansard and Jaulin 2017 (from within the French ANR project "Didaskalos") and D'Ancona and Serra 2002, on the transmission of his works from Greek into Arabic. Some of the essays collected in Donini 2010 and Rashed 2016 deal with Alexander and his working method.

**Adamson, Peter, Han Baltussen, and Martin Stone, eds. 2004. *Philosophy, science and exegesis in Greek, Arabic and Latin commentaries*. Proceedings of a conference held at the Institute of Classical Studies on 27–29 June 2002 in honor of Richard Sorabji. 2 vols. Supplement to the *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 83. London: Institute of Classical Studies, Univ. of London.**

A volume in honor of R. R. Sorabji. It includes papers on the ancient commentators.

**Balansard, Anne and Jaulin, Annick 2017. *Alexandre d'Aphrodise et la Métaphysique aristotélicienne*. *Aristote. Traductions et études*. Leuven, Belgium: Peeters.**

Actes du colloque du projet "Didaskalos" founded by the French ANR (n ANR-13-BSH3-002-03). Contributions by Silvia Fazzo (9-24, on Alexander as a most relevant witness of the text of the *Metaphysics*), by Claire Louguet (25-82, on Alexander depending mostly on Aristotle in his knowledge of Presocratics fragments), by Gweltaz Guyomarc'h (83-112, on the unity and composition of his notion of *Metaphysics*), Michel Crubellier (113-130, on the status of the PNC in Alexander), Annick Jaulin (131-156 on his notions of being and of one), Riccardo Chiaradonna (157-180, on his interpretation of *Categoriae* ch. 5), Marwan Rashed (181-215, on the notion of *πρᾶγμα* in Alexander and Averroès), Pantelis Golitsis (217-236, on Alexander as a source for Simplicius's theory of the cosmic principle), Cristina Cerami (237-280, on εἶδος as δύνاميς and as ἔξις, and on the relevant implications in Alexander's physics).

**Boeri, Marcelo, ed. 2009. *Special issue: Alejandro de Afrodísia como lector de Aristóteles*. *Estudios de Filosofía* 40.**

Contributions by Giampaolo Abbate (Alexander *In Metaphysics* 5, 8, 1017b 23–26), Paolo Accattino (On Aristotle's *On Soul*), Marcelo Boeri (Noetics) Barbara Botter (Exegetical Culture and Method), Jorge Mittelman (the Soul's Causality), Carlo Natali (Cause of Human Action in *Mantissa* 23 and *De fato* 15), Alberto Ross (the Theory of Chance), Ricardo Salles (on Logics as Organon, see Salles 2009, cited under Logic), Alejandro G. Vigo (Soul, Impulse, Movement), Marco Zingano (Sensitive Alteration in *Quaestiones* 3.2 and 3.3).

**D'Ancona, Cristina, and Giuseppe Serra. 2002. *Aristotele e Alessandro di Afrodísia nella tradizione araba*. Padua, Italy: Il Poligrafo.**

A collection of essays on Arabic transmission of Alexander's works. As an appendix to his contribution, Endress edits the Arabic translation of the treatise *On the First Cause* (see especially pp. 62–74, "The 'Arabus Alexander': The Lists of Works").

**Donini, Pierluigi. 2010. *Commentary and tradition: Aristotelianism, Platonism, and Post-Hellenistic philosophy*. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter.**

Several reprinted (not updated) articles by Donini on Hellenistic and late antique philosophy, with a few previously unpublished additions. Seven papers are devoted to Alexander, to his understanding of fate and to his method.

**Movia, Giancarlo, ed. 2003. *Alessandro di Afrodizia e la "Metafisica" di Aristotele*. Milan: Vita e Pensiero.**

Essays in the volume focus on Alexander's exegesis of Aristotle's *Metaphysics*.

**Rashed, Marwan, ed. 2008. *Special issue: Alexandre d'Aphrodise Commentateur d'Aristote et Philosophe. Les Etudes Philosophiques* 3.86 (Juillet).**

Essays in this volume especially focus on the notion of form/essence (εἶδος) in Alexander.

**Rashed, Marwan. 2016. *L'Héritage aristotélicien. Textes inédits de l'Antiquité*. 2d ed. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.**

The collection devotes to Alexander one of five sections of articles dealing with edited and unedited texts from the Aristotelian tradition in Roman times, in late antiquity, and the Middle Ages. A fairly good number of texts are newly discovered in indirect tradition, either as Greek fragments and glosses or as Arabic translations of lost Greek originals. With supplements.

**Sorabji, Richard. 1990. *Aristotle transformed*. London: Duckworth.**

This is a ground-breaking collection of articles on the Aristotelian commenters.

**Sorabji, Richard. 2016. *Aristotle re-interpreted: New findings on seven hundred years of the ancient commentators*. London and New York: Bloomsbury.**

Upgrading Sorabji 1990, includes twenty-three papers with a much wider subject range. The section devoted to Alexander has contributions concerning universals versus particulars in Alexander (Rashed 2016; and Sorabji 2016, cited under Universals). Bobzien 1998b (cited under *On Fate*, Determinism, and Free Will) is reprinted, Hasnawi 1994 (cited under Spuria and Questioned Attributions), and Golitsis 2014 (cited under the Tradition of Alexander's Commentaries) are translated into English.

**Wiesner, Jürgen, ed. 1985–1987. *Aristoteles, Werk und Wirkung. Paul Moraux gewidmet*. 2 vols. Berlin: De Gruyter.**

Volume 2 is devoted to Aristotle's commentary tradition ("Kommentierung, Überlieferung, Nachleben"). It includes papers on Alexander von Aphrodisias by Donini (pp. 72–89), Blumenthal (pp. 90–106), and Thillet (pp. 107–119).

---

## Life

We know little of Alexander's life. His *De fato* is dedicated to Septimius Severus and Caracalla (164.3–165.13 in Bruns 1892, cited under Independent Works). On the basis of this unique internal evidence, the text can be dated between 198 and 211, or even just between 198 and 209 (Todd 1976, cited under Other Translations; Fazzo and Zonta 1998, cited under *On Providence*; and Thillet 1984, cited under General Overviews). Sharples 2008 (cited under Updated Critical Editions) proposes further use of Alexander's works as a source about his school. Gottschalk 1987 collects hints on his teachers. Newly discovered Epigraphic Evidence must be taken into account. It shows that Alexander's father was also a philosopher and a Roman citizen. Arabic sources from the late 9th century onward have Alexander involved in a polemical debate against Galen. These sources are critically discussed in Fazzo 2002: the alleged information, indirectly transmitted

and adapted as it is, calls for investigation by comparison with the Greek direct tradition. Rashed 2007 (p. 113, n. 355; cited under Hylomorphism) maintains that the data provided by late Arabic biographers need not to be trusted.

**Fazzo, Silvia. 2002. Alexandre d'Aphrodise contre Galien: la naissance d'une légende. *Philosophie Antique* 2:109–144.**

The alleged contrast of Alexander with Galen among Arabic biographers and literature from the 10th century onward provide valuable hints on an open debate in Arabic culture, where the philosophers' reaction against the primacy of medical wisdom seems to be retrospectively staged to Galen's and Alexander's times.

**Gottschalk, Hans B. 1987. Aristotelian philosophy in the Roman world. In *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*. Edited by Wolfgang Haase, 1079–1174. Vol. 2.36.1. Berlin: De Gruyter.**

This is a survey on Aristotelianism at the time of the Roman Empire. It is a reference work. But one has to consider that information on Alexander's teachers, as collected at pp. 1158–1162, partly relies on the treatise *De intellectu*, the authenticity of which is questioned (see under Psychology (De anima and Mantissa)).

---

## Epigraphic Evidence

An inscription concerning Alexander, probably an epigraph from him in memory of his father, was discovered in 2001 in Karakasu, near Aphrodisias in Caria (full text: ψηφισαμένης τῆς βουλῆς καὶ τοῦ δήμου Τίτος Αὐρήλιος Ἀλέξανδρος φιλόσοφος τῶν Ἀθήνησιν διαδόχων Τ. Αὐρήλιον Ἀλέξανδρον φιλόσοφον τὸν πατέρα). The finding is discussed by Chaniotis 2004, Sharples 2005, Fazzo 2005 (in the Appendix: pp. 283–295), Groisard 2013 (xi–xiv; cited under Updated Critical Editions). The evidence, albeit short, is entirely coherent with the few hints we get about Alexander's Life from his treatise *De fato* (164.3–165.13). It shows that Alexander taught in Athens as a *diadochos* on a philosophy chair and that he was from Aphrodisias in Caria (Asia Minor, modern Turkey). It also states that his full (Roman) name was Titus Aurelius Alexander, the same as his father's, due to his Roman citizenship (Chaniotis 2004). This must have been bestowed upon the whole family, probably by Antoninus Pius in 135/136 CE, through Alexander's father (Chaniotis 2004) or grandfather (Fazzo 2005). Alexander's father is likely to have been an Aristotelian too (see Groisard 2013, cited under Updated Critical Editions, and Fazzo 2005).

**Chaniotis, Angelos. 2004. Epigraphic evidence for the philosopher Alexander of Aphrodisias. *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 47:79–81.**

Epigraphic evidence confirms that Alexander was from Aphrodisias in Caria and was appointed to Peripatetic teaching in Athens.

**Fazzo, Silvia. 2005. Aristotelismo e antideterminismo nella vita e nell'opera di Tito Aurelio Alessandro di Afrodisia. In *La catena delle cause: determinismo e antideterminismo nel pensiero antico e in quello contemporaneo*. Edited by Stefano Maso and Carlo Natali, 271–297. Amsterdam: Hakkert.**

Alexander's anti-determinism is seen against its cultural background, where astrology plays a strong role. Appendix pp. 283–297, "Alessandro di Afrodisia nell'epigrafe di Karakasu e nella dedica del De fato," deals with the new epigraphical evidence on Alexander's life.

**Sharples, Robert W. 2005. Implications of the new Alexander of Aphrodisias inscription. *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 48:47–56.**

The paper suggests that writings that belong to Alexander's corpus are likely to be by Alexander's father.

---

## Common Features of Alexander's Writings

Works of undisputed attribution to Alexander share distinctive features. While producing paraphrases of Aristotle's texts, Alexander rephrases Aristotle's arguments as syllogisms (Abbamonte 2004, Bonelli 2001) thus reshaping particular sciences according to the theory of syllogism and demonstration in Aristotle's *Analytics* (see Rashed 2007, cited under Hylomorphism). Alexander reduces conceptual oppositions to the basic opposition between matter and form or between particulars and universals (Hylomorphism, Universals). As a result, Alexander simplifies Aristotle's philosophical vocabulary (Abbamonte 1995; Fazzo 2002, cited under *Quaestiones (Aporiai kai lyseis)*) and often paraphrases the texts that he discusses (Abbamonte 2004) and examines difficulties arising from the interpretation of Aristotle's text. Alexander's exegesis has been found both conservative and innovative, paving the way to later scholasticism as a main character of subsequent Aristotelianism (Turning Aristotle into a System).

**Abbamonte, Giancarlo. 1995. Metodi esegetici nel commento In Aristotelis Topica di Alessandro di Afrodisia. In *Seconda miscellanea filologica*. Edited by Italo Gallo, 249–266. Naples, Italy: Arte Tipografica.**

Analysis of Alexander's exegetical strategy in his commentary on the *Topics*.

**Abbamonte, Giancarlo. 2004. Tipologie esegetiche in Alessandro di Afrodisia, la parafrasi. In *L'ultima parola. L'analisi dei testi: teorie e pratiche nell'antichità greca e latina*. Edited by Abbamonte-Conti Bizzarro-Spina, 19–34. Naples, Italy: Arte Tipografica.**

The article dwells on the literary genre of paraphrase as a mean to reshape Aristotle's philosophy into a system.

**Bonelli, Maddalena. 2001. *Alessandro di Afrodisia e la metafisica come scienza dimostrativa*. Napoli: Bibliopolis.**

Alexander's commentary on *Metaphysics* Gamma turns ontology into a demonstrative science. Accordingly, whenever possible, and as much as possible, Alexander reshapes Aristotle's arguments in syllogistic form.

## Turning Aristotle into a System

Alexander's systematic presentation of Aristotelianism had as core principle the theory of science expounded by Aristotle in his *Posterior Analytics* (see Bonelli 2001, cited under Common Features of Alexander's Writings, Bonelli 2010, and Rashed 2007, cited under Hylomorphism). Such a typical feature of his exegesis has been detected, for example, by Abbamonte 1995 (see Common Features of Alexander's Writings) and Donini 1994. More generally, Alexander puts emphasis on the use of division (*diarsis*) and of syllogistic as a base of Aristotle's reasoning (see Fazzo 2002, and Rescigno 2004 and Rescigno 2008 under Fragment Collections). Aporetic and dialectical method has to be seen as a mean for the sake of a more coherent Aristotelian system (Fazzo 2002, cited under *Quaestiones (Aporiai kai lyseis)*). As other means in the same direction, relevant aspects of Alexander's technique are described by Donini 1995; on Alexander's paraphrases see Abbamonte 2004 (cited under Common Features of Alexander's Writings).

**Bonelli, Maddalena. 2010. Alexander of Aphrodisias on the science of ontology. In *Interpreting's Aristotle's Posterior Analytics in late Antiquity and beyond*. Edited by Frans A. J. de Haas, Mariska Leunissen, and Marije Martijn, 101–121. Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill.**

An English summary of Bonelli 2001 (cited under Common Features of Alexander's Writings).

**Donini, Pierluigi. 1994. Testi e commenti, manuali e insegnamento: la forma sistematica e i metodi della filosofia in età postellenistica. In *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt. Part 2, Vol. 36*. Edited by Wolfgang Haase, 5027–5100. Berlin and New York: De Gruyter.**

A useful introduction to the literary genre of the commentary. Donini provides a most detailed account of Alexander's exegetical methods against the wider background of post-Hellenistic exegetical works. Reprinted in Donini 2010 (cited under Collections of Papers), pp. 211–282.

**Donini, Pierluigi. 1995. Alessandro di Afrodisia e i metodi dell' esegesi filosofica. In: Moreschini: 107–129.**

Alexander's intention to be faithful to the *littera* of Aristotle is contrasted with later commentators' promptness to go beyond Aristotle's intention (cf. Syrianus's CAG 6.1.11.11–13; see CAG Editions (Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca)). Alexander holds as a principle explaining Aristotle through Aristotle, as shown by his wide recourse to textual parallels. Reprinted in Donini 2010, pp. 87–106.

**Fazzo, Silvia. 2002. Alessandro di Afrodisia sulle “contrarietà tangibili” (De gen. et corr. II.2): fonti greche e arabe a confronto. In *Aristotele e Alessandro di Afrodisia nella tradizione araba*. Edited by Cristina D'Ancona and Giuseppe Serra, 151–189. Padua, Italy: Il Poligrafo**

Far beyond explicit quotations, Alexander is the source of Philoponus, Averroes, and pseudo-Jâbir on Aristotle's *On Generation and Corruption* 2.2 on wet-dry and hot-cold as basic “tangible contrarities” underlying every physic change. Through such later commentaries Alexander is shown to be the hidden source of current interpretation as well.

## Hylomorphism

Standard philosophical vocabulary is fixed by using a comparatively narrow selection of terms already in use in Aristotle. Most of Aristotle's polarities and oppositions are translated into the basic opposition of form (*eidos*/εἶδος) and matter (*hylê*/ύλη). Whatever may be known is an *eidos* in Alexander's lexicon. On the relevance of *eidos* in Alexander see the substantial contribution Rashed 2007, thoroughly discussed by Kupreeva 2010, and Rashed 2008 (cited under Collections of Papers) including other relevant papers such as Cordonier 2008, and Chiaradonna 2008—a comparison with Plotinus. On Alexander's hylomorphism as applied to his theory of soul see Vigo 2009 (cited under Psychology (*De anima* and *Mantissa*)). On hylomorphism as a key process in Alexander's aporias see Fazzo 2002, cited under *Quaestiones* (*Aporiai kai lyseis*). On Alexander's notion of matter see Bonelli 2009. Ellis 1994 (cited under Logic) connects Alexander's hylomorphism with his defense of Aristotle's *Categories*.

**Bonelli, Maddalena. 2009. Alexandre d'Aphrodise et la cause matérielle. *Journal of Ancient Philosophy* 3.2:1–17.**

A comparison between different Aristotelian passages that are likely to be the source of Alexander's notion of matter.

**Chiaradonna, Riccardo. 2008. Hylémorphisme et causalité des intelligibles. Plotin et Alexandre d'Aphrodise. In *Essentialisme. Alexandre d'Aphrodise entre logique, physique et cosmologie*. Edited by Marwan Rashed, 379–397. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter.**

A parallel between Plotinus's Platonism and Alexander's Aristotelianism, both of which imply systematic readings of their masters' works. Analogies and differences are sought for concerning hylomorphism in Alexander, and the causality of intelligible beings, which stays at the middle of Plotinus's philosophy.

**Cordonier, Valérie. 2008. Corps, Matière, Contact. La cohérence du sensible selon Alexandre d'Aphrodise. In *Rashed (Les études philosophiques)* 86.3: 353–378.**

Alexander's hylomorphism introduces a hierarchy between corporeal and incorporeal: εἶδος (*eidos*) of sensible beings is always connected to matter yet it can not be reduced to the characters of its substrate. Alexander thus inscribes Aristotle's φύσις (*physis*) in a metaphysical perspective, making of sensible bodies a coherently structured whole.

**Kupreeva, Inna. 2010. Alexander of Aphrodisias on form: A discussion of Marwan Rashed, *Essentialisme*. *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy* 38:211–249.**

An in-depth review of Rashed 2007.

**Rashed, Marwan, ed. 2007. *Essentialisme. Alexandre d'Aphrodise entre logique, physique et cosmologie*. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter.**

The overview focuses on *eidōs* in the sense of form or essence as the crucial concept throughout Alexander's philosophy. Alexander's ontology, as opposed to previous Peripatetics, is seen as marking the beginning of medieval Aristotelianism. Texts preserved in Arabic only are used and discussed, in particular the *De differentia*, the Greek *Quaestio* 1.1 is fully translated and commented upon. Rashed suggests that Alexander's thought emerged as a reaction to the interpretation of Aristotle offered by Boethus of Sidon (1st century BCE).

## Aporetic Method

Setting aporias is a part of Alexander's dialectical method, as shown by Kupreeva 2017. It is typical of Alexander to settle aporias and produce solutions, one or more for a single aporia. Multiple solutions can be found either in the *Aporiai kai lyseis*, printed by Bruns 1892, cited under Independent Works, as *Quaestiones* (see especially I.7, 8, 10, 20, II.3, translated and discussed by Sharples 1992), or within Alexander's commentaries, where relevant aporias are raised and one or more than a single interpretation is recorded for a single lemma or theoretical problem. Moraux 1942 points out that among more solutions Alexander seems to prefer the last one, usually more simple and convincing; the view is further argued for by Fazzo 2002 (see *Quaestiones (Aporiai kai lyseis)*).

**Kupreeva, Inna. 2017. Aporia and exegesis: Alexander of Aphrodisias. In *The aporetic tradition in ancient philosophy*. Edited by George Karamanolis and Vasilis Politis. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Univ. Press.**

Taking into account the relevance of aporia in Alexander's dialectical method, Kupreeva seeks for a relevant definition of aporetic method, which she regards as a common tool between Aristotle and Alexander, but this can not be found as such. Based on Alexander's commentary on relevant passages by Aristotle.

**Moraux, Paul. 1942. *Alexandre d'Aphrodise, exégète de la noétique d'Aristote*. Bibliothèque de la faculté de philosophie et lettres de l'université de Liège 99. Liège, Belgium, and Paris: E. Droz.**

The pioneer work of the young Paul Moraux shows for the first time in the 20th century scholarship of the independent interest of Alexander's writings other than Aristotle's commentaries. It deals with *De intellectu* but goes far further in analyzing, for example, the structure of multiple solutions. Nicely written.

**Sharples, Robert W. 1992. *Alexander of Aphrodisias. Quaestiones 1.1–2.15*. Translated by R. W. Sharples. London: Duckworth.**

A careful translation with annotations throughout of the first part of Alexander's *Quaestiones* on natural philosophy (covering books 1 to 3). With comprehensive bibliography. See also the other two volumes in the ACA series: Sharples 1990, "Ethical Problems," Sharples 1994, "Quaestiones 2.16-3.15" (both cited under *Quaestiones (Aporiai kai lyseis)*).

---

## Manuscript Tradition and Textual Reconstruction

When the way of transmission is concerned, Alexander's texts can be divided in at least three groups: commentaries, independent works which are preserved in Greek, and lost works, parts of which survive through indirect tradition, namely in Arabic translations: these latest are usually made out of independent treatises, fragments, and minor works. Greek manuscripts of Alexander's works are listed by Wartelle 1963. Information of this kind is occasionally included in Goulet and Aouad 1989 (cited under General Overviews).

**Wartelle, André. 1963. *Inventaire des manuscrits grecs d'Aristote et de ses commentateurs: contribution à l'histoire du texte d'Aristote*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.**

Lists of manuscripts of Aristotle, Alexander, and other commentators. Mostly based on manuscript catalogues which may contain errors. For example, manuscripts of Alexander's *Quaestiones* are mixed and confused with manuscripts of spurious *Problemata*, see on these latter Kapetanaki and Sharples 2006 (see under Spuria and Questioned Attributions).

## The tradition of Alexander's Commentaries

Editing Aristotle's commentators is always a sophisticated issue. The *Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca*, referred to as the CAG editions, could use an updated edition but their Praefationes still deserve attention, especially when description of manuscripts is concerned. CAG 1 (cited under CAG Editions (*Commentaria in Aristoteles Graeca*)), on Alexander's commentary on the *Metaphysics*, distinguished two main branches of the tradition, *recensio vulgata* and *recensio altera*. For a reaction see Harlfinger 1975, pointing out a further manuscript of the *recensio vulgata*, the so-called "Oceanus" (i.e., ms. O, Laur. 85.1) Golitsis 2014 suggests that Hayduck's *recensio altera* should be entirely left aside. See contra Fazzo 2017. Golitsis 2016 draws a new stemma codicum for Alexander's commentary in *Metaphysicam* where only Hayduck's *recensio vulgata* is taken into account. A discussion of the relevant literature is in Calvié 2015 and in Calvié 2016.

**Calvié, Laurent. 2015. À propos de l'édition Hayduck du Commentaire d'Alexandre d'Aphrodise à la Métaphysique d'Aristote, Carnet de recherché. *DIDASKALOS: Alexandre et la métaphysique aristotélicienne* (28 septembre 2014) revu, 18 Juin 2015.**

Analysis and discussion of Hayduck's rationale in the choice of Greek manuscripts and in their use for the sake of the Berlin edition of Alexander's In *Metaphysicam* commentary, CAG 1.

**Calvié, Laurent. 2016. Le Paris. gr. 1878 [Pb]: recentior, non deterior?.**

Analysis and substantial discussion of the proposal in Golitsis 2016 concerning ms. Pb as an independent branch of the tradition of Alexander's commentary.

**Fazzo, Silvia. 2017. Alexandre d'Aphrodise comme témoin du texte de la Métaphysique d'Aristote. In *Aristote. Traductions et études 9–24*.**

Both manuscript families—the so called (since the 19th century) "recensio vulgata" and "recensio altera"—need to be taken into account for the reconstruction of Alexander's commentary on the *Metaphysics* and of its contribution as a witness of the final stages of the emergence of Aristotle's *Metaphysics*.

**Golitsis, Pantelis. 2014. La recensio altera du Commentaire d'Alexandre d'Aphrodise à la Métaphysique d'Aristote et le témoignage des manuscrits byzantins Laurentianus plut. 87,12 et Ambrosianus F 113 sup. In *Textual Transmission in Byzantium: Between textual criticism and Quellenforschung*. Edited by J. Signes Codoñer and I. Pérez Martin, 199–230. Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols.**

In Golitsis view, the CAG 1 commentary on book E, which scholars currently ascribe (with some manuscripts, and Georgios Pachymeres) to Michael of Ephesus, belongs in fact to a 7th-century commentator, Stephen of Alexandria, and so does the so called *recensio altera* of the commentary to the previous five books (A-D) printed in CAG 1 (cited under CAG Editions (*Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca*)) along with the *recensio vulgata* of Alexander's commentary.

**Golitsis, Pantelis. 2016. The manuscript tradition of Alexander of Aphrodisias' commentary on Aristotle's *Metaphysics*: Towards a new critical edition. *Revue d'histoire des textes*, n.s. 11:50.**

Based on Golitsis 2014, that is, on the atethesis of the *recensio vulgata*, Golitsis proposes a stemma codicum of Alexander's remaining manuscripts, including O, neglected by Harlfinger and put into value by Harlfinger 1975, and Pb.

**Harlfinger, Dieter. 1975. Edizione critica del testo del "De ideis" di Aristotele. In *Il "De ideis" di Aristotele e la teoria Platonica delle idee*. Edited by Walter Leszl. Accademia Toscana di scienze e lettere "La colombaria", Studi /2. Florence: Leo S. Olschki.**

Edition of the fragments of Aristotle's *De ideis* as quoted by Alexander in his commentary on the *Metaphysics*. The edition improves Hayduck's relevant sections by adding new evidence. A point of reference for further studies on the text of Alexander's commentary on the *Metaphysics*.

## Independent Works

True milestones for textual criticism on Alexander's independent works, Bruns praefationes to his edited volumes, *Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca* (CAG) Supplement 2.1 and 2.2, that is, Bruns 1889 and Bruns 1892, are still not superseded. Partly in the first, partly in the second volume, Bruns gives among others the first description of ms. Venetus 258, which is the fundamental source for Alexander's so-called *Scripta Minora* (as opposed to Alexander's running commentaries on Aristotle's works): it includes, in order: *Quaestiones* Book 4, *Quaestiones* Book 1, *De Anima*, *Mantissa*, *De fato*, *Quaestiones* books 2 and 3 (whereas *De mixtione* is not included; it is found in ms. Ven. 257). Owned in the 13th century by William of Moerbeke, who translated *On Fate* into Latin, the Venetus 258 has been classified within the so-called "philosophical collection," including 9th-century manuscripts of Greek philosophical texts. But Thillet 1982 assigns the main hand at work to the latest third of the 9th century. Valuable critical contributions have been offered since Apelt 1894. Yet the tradition of *De fato* is especially corrupted: see not only Thillet 1984 (General Overviews) and Sharples 1983 (cited under Translations of *On Fate*) but also the textual notes in Hackforth 1946, Lucarini 2007, Zago 2012a, and Zago 2012b. When *Quaestiones* are concerned, Fazzo 2002, pp. 37–42 (see under *Quaestiones (Aporiai kai lyseis)*) considers anew the status of the art: it is not clear that later manuscripts used by Bruns are independent from Ven. 258; hence the relevance of textual sources unexplored so far, that is, of the 16th century notes by Ottaviano Ferrari (in the margins of the *editio princeps* exemplar held in Milan, National Braidense Library, B XVI 6.078), who could have used in his turn a manuscript source which is nowadays lost, and even more, of a further manuscript unexplored by Bruns, Ven. 194, an independent source for *Quaestiones* (in the order) 1.1, 1.25, 1.10, 1.15, 2.2, and 2.3. See furthermore a dedicated section about the troublesome transmission and the sources for the reconstruction of Alexander's *On the Principles of the Universe*.

**Apelt, Otto. 1894. Die kleinen Schriften des Alexander von Aphrodisias. *Rheinisches Museum* 49:59–71.**

A still valuable list of suggested emendations on the text of Alexander's *scripta minora*, integrated by relevant hypotheses concerning the way errors could have been introduced in the manuscript tradition starting from an uncial manuscript, the likely exemplar of the Venetus 258.

**Bruns, Ivo. 1889. CAG Supplementum Aristotelicum. In *Alexandri Aphrodisiensis praeter commentaria scripta minora. 2.1. De anima cum Mantissa*. Edited by Ivo Bruns. Berlin: Reimer.**

Bruns gives among others the first and partly still valuable description of ms. Venetus 258 (just slightly misdated, see Thillet 1982). The Prefatio of Suppl. 2.1 firstly labels "Mantissa" the collection of small pieces, which were unappropriately transmitted as second book *De anima* ("De anima liber alter").

**Bruns, Ivo. 1892. CAG Supplementum Aristotelicum. In *Alexandri Aphrodisiensis praeter commentaria scripta minora. 2.2. Quaestiones, De fato, De mixtione*. Edited by Ivo Bruns. Berlin: Reimer.**

Further description of ms. Venetus 258 and of other witnesses including the Byzantine hand on it which was later identified as Bessarion's (a former owner, see Thillet 1982, and Thillet 1984, cited under General Overviews) and the 16th-century notes attributed to Pietro Vettori. Bruns firstly classifies the various kinds of texts included within Alexander's so called *Quaestiones (Aporiai kai lyseis)*.

**Hackforth, R. 1946. Notes on some passages of Alexander Aphrodisiensis De Fato. *The Classical Quarterly* 40:37–44.**

Some textual emendation to Bruns's edition of Alexander's *De fato*. Although the last editions already took this into account, it is still a valuable reading because it succeeds in giving the common reader an idea of the bad conditions of Alexander's transmitted text.

**Lucarini, Carlo Martino. 2007. Per il testo di Alessandro di Afrodizia e di Proclo. *Orpheus* 28:128–137.**

Some emendations to the text of Alexander's *De fato*.

**Thillet, Pierre. 1982. Elements pour l'histoire du texte du De fato d'Alexandre d'Aphrodise. *Revue d'histoire des textes* 12:13–56.**

Thillet dates the main hand at work in the Venetus manuscript 258 (the likely extant archetype of Alexander's *De fato* and of most of his *scripta minora* according to Bruns 1889, Bruns 1892) to the last third of the 9th century CE. The second hand at work in the revision is Bessarion's (15th century), as firstly detected by Elpidio Mioni.

**Zago, Giovanni. 2012a. Contributi critici al testo del "De fato" di Alessandro di Afrodizia. *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 155:364–388.**

Some emendations to the text of Alexander's *De fato* and criticism on Thillet edition of it. In Zago's view Thillet, who uses William of Moerbeke's Latin translation to improve the vulgate (ms. Ven. 258), omits obvious conjectures for emendation. He has remarks on punctuation as well.

**Zago, Giovanni. 2012b. Congetture al De fato di Alessandro di Afrodizia. *Prometheus* (2012):248–254.**

Some emendations to the text of Alexander's *De fato*.

## Arabic Translations

The treatise *On Providence* is preserved only in Arabic (see Thillet 2003 and Fazzo and Zonta 1998 both cited under *On Providence*). Alexander's *On the Principles* is lost in Greek but preserved by several different sources. The textual history is complex (Fazzo and Zonta 2014, King 2010). Genequand 2001 edits, translates, and comments upon what is labeled "Text A," that is, the longer and the more recent (by Ibrahim or by Hunayn) of two Arabic extant translations ("Text B" being by al-Dimashqi). The longer version was formerly circulated in the French translation by Badawi 1968. A Syriac version is translated into French by Fiori 2010 in Furlani 1923 footsteps.

**Badawi, Abdurrahman. 1968. *La transmission de la philosophie grecque au monde arabe. Études de philosophie médiévale* 56. Paris: Vrin.**

Badawi translates into French a number of texts from the *Arabus Alexander*, including the treatise *On the Principles*. The translations are based on Badawi's (noncritical) editions of the Arabic texts, published in *Arista 'inda l-'Arab* (Dirâsât islâmiya, 5), in Cairo in 1947.

**Fazzo, Silvia, and Mauro Zonta. 2014. Towards a textual history and reconstruction of Alexander of Aphrodisias' treatise *On the Principles of the Universe*. *Journal of Semitic Studies* 59.1: 91–116.**

Two extant Arabic translations and the Syriac version of Sergius of Resh'ayna are studied in order to reconstruct the lost Greek treatise. The comparison among extant Arabic and Syriac sources of the indirect tradition of Alexander's *De principiis* leads to a stemma *translacionum* (p. 116).

**Fazzo, Silvia, and Mauro Zonta. 2015. Towards a “critical translation” of Alexander of Aphrodisias’ *De principiis*, based on the indirect tradition of Syriac and Arabic sources, Chôra. *Revue d’Etudes Anciennes et Médiévales* 13:63–101.**

A follow up to Fazzo and Zonta 2014. The method of a “critical translation” is proposed in order to offer the reader the closest possible translation gathered by critical comparison among extant sources of the indirect tradition of Alexander’s *De principiis*.

**Fiori, Emiliano. 2010. L’épitomé syriaque du Traité sur les causes du tout d’Alexandre d’Aphrodise attribué à Serge de Res’ayna. *Le Muséon* 123:127–158.**

A French translation of Sergius’s version of the treatise from the Syriac, partly modelled on Furlani 1923.

**Furlani, Giuseppe. 1923. Il trattato di Sergio di Rêsh’aynâ sull’universo. *Rivista trimestrale di studi filosofici e religiosi* 4:1–22.**

An Italian translation of Sergius’s version of the treatise from the Syriac. Since Sergius does not spell out his sources, Furlani is not aware that the treatise is in fact an adaptation from Alexander of Aphrodisias.

**Genequand, Charles. 2001. *Alexander of Aphrodisias On the Cosmos*. Leiden, The Netherlands, and Boston: Brill.**

An annotated edition and English translation with introduction of “Text A,” i.e., of one and the longer of two main Arabic versions of Alexander’s treatise *On the Principle*. Appendices offer further textual sources.

**King, Daniel. 2010. “Alexander of Aphrodisias” On the Principles of the Universe in a Syriac Adaptation. *Le Muséon* 123:159–191.**

An interpretation of Alexander’s treatise *On the Principles*. As a general attitude, in the case of divergences between Sergius’ Syriac and the Arabic, King takes the Arabic to correspond more closely to the lost Greek original.

---

## CAG editions (Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca)

Alexander’s extant commentaries and minor works have been published by the Berlin Academy in the CAG series (Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca, 1882–1909) promoted by Eduard Zeller and directed by Hermann Diels. CAG texts are printed in Berlin by Reimer. Alexander’s works can be found in CAG 1, CAG 2.1, CAG 2.2, CAG 2.3, CAG 3.1, and CAG 3.2 and the two volumes of the *Supplementum Aristotelicum*, CAG Suppl. 2.1 and CAG Suppl. 2.2, edited by Bruns. These contain Alexander’s *scripta minora*, that is, writings different from commentaries. The CAG volumes will be listed here below according to their serial number.

**CAG 1 *In Metaph.* 1891. *Alexandri Aphrodisiensis in aristotelis metaphysica commentaria*. Edited by M. Hayduck. Berlin: Reimer.**

Alexander’s extant commentary on Aristotle’s A-Δ at pp. 1–439. Scholars agree in maintaining that the commentary on E-N (pp. 440–837) is a later work, most probably by Michael of Ephesus (12th century), who did not know Alexander’s commentary, see Sharples 2003 and Luna 2001 (both cited under Spuria and Questioned Attributions); Golitsis 2014 (cited under the Tradition of Alexander’s Commentaries) maintains that the commentator on Book E is not Michael.

**CAG 2.1 *In An. Pr. I.* 1883. *Alexandri in Aristotelis Analyticorum Priorum librum I commentarium*. Edited by Max Wallies. Berlin: Reimer.**

Alexander’s commentary on *Prior Analytics*, Book A. Alexander’s commentary on *Prior Analytics*, Book B, is lost.

**CAG 2.2 *In Top.* Wallies, Max. 1891. *Alexandri Aphrodisiensis in Aristotelis Topicorum libros octo commentaria.* Edited by Max Wallies. Berlin: Reimer.**

Alexander's commentary on Aristotle's *Topics*.

**CAG 3.1 *In De sensu.* 1901. *Alexandri in Aristotelis librum De sensu commentarium.* Edited by P. Wendland. Berlin: Reimer.**

Alexander's commentary on Aristotle's *De sensu*.

**CAG 3.2 *In Meteorologica.* 1899. *Alexandri in Aristotelis Meteorologicorum libros commentaria.* Edited by Michael Hayduck. Berlin: Reimer.**

Alexander's commentary on Aristotle's *Meteorologica*.

**CAG Suppl. 2.1 *De anima cum Mantissa.* 1889. *Supplementum Aristotelicum. Alexandri Aphrodisiensis praeter commentaria scripta minora. 2.1. De anima cum Mantissa.* Edited by Ivo Bruns. Berlin: Reimer.**

*De anima* and *Mantissa*. The title "Mantissa" was made by Bruns himself.

**CAG Suppl. 2.2 *Quaestiones, De fato, De mixtione.* 1892. *Supplementum Aristotelicum. Alexandri Aphrodisiensis praeter commentaria scripta minora. 2.2. Quaestiones, De fato, De mixtione.* Edited by Ivo Bruns. Berlin: Reimer.**

This second volume of Bruns's edition of Alexander's *scripta minora*. It includes *Quaestiones* (four books), *De fato*, *De mixtione*.

## Indirect Tradition of Alexander

Alexander influenced many other Aristotelian commentators, whose works were published in the CAG series. This especially applies to Simplicius's *On Aristotle's Physics*, CAG 9 and CAG 10, edited by Diels, and *On Aristotle's Treatise On Heavens*, CAG 7, edited by Heiberg, both of which preserve hundreds of open quotations from Alexander. All of these CAG volumes are distinguished for carefully prepared indexes, placed at the end of CAG 7 and CAG 10. These are a fundamental tool for those seeking for fragments of Alexander's lost commentaries *On Aristotle's On Heavens* and *On Physics* respectively. See the collections Rescigno 2004 and Rescigno 2008 under Fragment Collections.

**CAG 7 Simplicius. *In De caelo* = Heiberg, I. L. 1894. *Simplicii in Aristotelis De caelo commentaria.* Edited by I. L. Heiberg. Berlin: Reimer.**

This fundamental source for the history of Greek astronomy preserves hundreds of quotes from Alexander's lost commentary on Aristotle's *On Heavens* (see now Rescigno 2004 and Rescigno 2008, both cited under Fragment Collections).

**CAG 9 Simplicius. *In Phys.* 1–4 = Diels, Hermann. 1882. *Simplicii in Aristotelis physicorum libros quattuor priores commentaria.* Edited by Hermann Diels. Berlin: Reimer.**

The first published volume in the CAG series and a fundamental source for the history of Greek physics and early philosophy. It preserves some six hundred quotes from Alexander's lost commentary.

**CAG 10 Simplicius. *In Phys.* 5–8 = Diels, Hermann. 1895. *Simplicii in Aristotelis physicorum libros quattuor posteriores commentaria*. Edited by Hermann Diels. Berlin: Reimer.**

The follow-up to Diels's 1882 work (CAG 9), Simplicius's commentary *On Physics* 5–8.

## Updated Critical Editions

Virtually all texts of the CAG series call for revision. It seems that newly edited texts include the following treatises only: *On fate*, Thillet 1984 (see General Overviews); the *Mantissa* (*De anima liber alter*), Sharples 2008; and *On Mixture*, Groisard 2013. *Quaestiones* 1.25, 2.3, 2.19, 2.21 can be found in Fazzo and Zonta 1998: 181–225 (cited under *On Providence*), 2.3 is further revised, and 1.10 and 1.15 are edited in Fazzo 2002 (cited under *Quaestiones (Aporiai kai lyseis)*).

**Groisard, Jocelyn, ed. 2013. *Alexander d'Aphrodise. Sur la mixtion et la croissance*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.**

A new critical edition of Alexander's *De mixtione*.

**Sharples, Robert, ed. 2008. *Alexander Aphrodisiensis De anima libri mantissa. A new edition of the Greek text with introduction and commentary by R. W. Sharples*. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter.**

Alexander's *Mantissa*, that is, a collection of short treatises, which were formerly taken to be an appendix to Alexander's *De anima*. This collection includes the treatise *De intellectu*, of disputed authenticity (see Schroeder and Todd 1990, cited under *Psychology (De anima and Mantissa)*). A review by Teun Tieleman is in *Aestimatio* 7, available online.

---

## Translations

Many of Alexander's extant commentaries are now translated in English in the series *Ancient Commentators on Aristotle* (ACA).

### The ACA Series

Many of Alexander's extant texts already appeared in the *Ancient Commentators on Aristotle* (ACA) series, edited by Richard Sorabji (with Michael Griffin as co-editor since 2013), published by Duckworth from 1987 to 2010, and by Bloomsbury since 2011. Some of them took several volumes: Alexander's *Commentary on Metaphysics* (CAG 1, cited under *CAG Editions (Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca)*) is translated and commented upon in Dooley 1989 (Book 1), Dooley and Madigan (1992) "On Aristotle's *Metaphysics*" (books 2 and 3), Madigan (1993) "On Aristotle's *Metaphysics* 4" (Book 4), and Dooley (1993) "On Aristotle's *Metaphysics* 5" (Book 5). Alexander's *Commentary on Prior Analytics* 1 (CAG 2.1, cited under *CAG Editions (Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca)*) is translated and commented upon in Barnes, et al. 1990 (1.1–7), Mueller and Gould 1999 (1.8–13), Mueller and Gould's "On Aristotle *Prior Analytics* 1.14–2" (1999), Mueller (2006) "On Aristotle *Prior Analytics* 1.23–31", and Mueller (2006) ("On Aristotle *Prior Analytics* 1.32–46"). Additional installments in the ACA series appear elsewhere in this article where they are more relevant; see Caston 2013 under *Other Translations*, Gannagé 2005 in *Lost Commentary on On Generation and Corruption*, and Sharples 1990 and Sharples 1994 in *Quaestiones (Aporiai kai lyseis)*.

**Barnes, Jonathan, Suzanne Bobzien, Kevin Flannery, and Katarina Ierodiakonou. 1990. *Alexander of Aphrodisias. On Aristotle Prior Analytics 1.1–7*. Translated by J. Barnes, S. Bobzien, K. Flannery, and K. Ierodiakonou. London: Duckworth.**

The work is brilliantly prefaced by Jonathan Barnes, who has also remarks on Alexander's works, style, and way of exegesis on Aristotle's *Analytics*.

**Dooley, William E. 1989. *Alexander of Aphrodisias. On Aristotle's Metaphysics 1*. London: Duckworth.**

The first of a series of four ACA volumes offering annotated translations of books from the authentic part (books 1–5) of Alexander's commentary on the *Metaphysics*. See also other volumes in the series: William E. Dooley and Arthur Madigan, 1992. "On Aristotle's *Metaphysics*" 2 (Dooley) and 3 (Madigan); Madigan (1993) "On Aristotle's *Metaphysics* 4"; Dooley (1993) "On Aristotle's *Metaphysics* 5."

**Mueller, Ian, and Josiah Gould. 1999. *Alexander of Aphrodisias. On Aristotle Prior Analytics 1.8–13*. Translated by I. Mueller and J. Gould. London: Duckworth.**

Introduction, notes and appendices by I. Mueller. The second (after Barnes, et al. 1990) of a series of five ACA volumes offering annotated translations of Alexander's extant commentary on the first book of Aristotle's *Prior Analytics*, which is divided into forty-six chapters. See also other volumes in the series: Mueller and Gould's "On Aristotle Prior Analytics 1.14–22"; Mueller (2006) "On Aristotle Prior Analytics 1.23–31"; Mueller (2006) "On Aristotle Prior Analytics 1.32–46."

## Other Translations

Translation movements show the interest raised in the late 20th century and early 21st by Alexander's independent treatises: *On Soul* (Bergeron and Dufour 2008 in French; in English Fotinis 1980 is partly superseded by Caston 2013; Accattino and Donini 1996 in Italian, cited under Psychology (*De anima* and *Mantissa*)); *On Providence* (from the Arabic, see Fazzo and Zonta 1998 and Thillet 2003, both cited under On Providence), *On Mixture* (Todd 1976, Groisard 2013 cited under Updated Critical Editions). Movia 2007 translates the whole of CAG 1 (cited under CAG Editions (Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca)). See also Translations of *On Fate*.

**Bergeron, Martin, and Richard Dufour. 2008. *Alexandre d'Aphrodise. De l'ame. Texte grec introduit, traduit et annoté*. Paris: Vrin.**

A French annotated translation of *De anima*.

**Caston, Victor. 2013. *Alexander of Aphrodisias On the Soul Part I: Soul as Form of the Body, Parts of the Soul, Nourishment, and Perception. Ancient Commentators on Aristotle*. Bristol, UK: Bristol Classical Press.**

A careful, annotated ACA translation of Alexander's *De anima*, with introduction and notes. It constantly takes into account Accattino and Donini 1996 (cited under Psychology (*De anima* and *Mantissa*)) and Bergeron and Dufour 2008. Introduction (pp. 9–12) sums up the emergentist reading of Alexander's psychology expressed in Caston 1997 (cited under Psychology (*De anima* and *Mantissa*)). Beyond psychology, the thorough bibliography covers works of general interest.

**Fotinis, Athanasios P. 1980. *The De anima of Alexander of Aphrodisias*. Washington, DC: Catholic Univ. Press of America.**

The available English translation of Alexander's *De anima*. It is going to be superseded by the completion of Caston 2013.

**Movia, Giancarlo. 2007. *Alessandro di Afrodizia. Commentario alla Metafisica di Aristotele, a cura di G. Movia*. Milan: Bompiani.**

The whole of CAG Volume 1 available to Italian readership, along with a reprint of Hayduck's main text.

**Todd, Robert. 1976. *Alexander of Aphrodisias on Stoic Physics*, R. B. Todd. Leiden, The Netherlands and New York: Brill.**

Revised text and translation of *De mixtione*, with a pioneer study on Alexander's attack on the Stoics' physical theory.

## Translations of *On Fate*

The treatise now has several translations with commentaries in modern languages; see Sharples 1983, Thillet 1984 (in French, cited under General Overviews), Magris 1995 and Natali 2009 (in Italian), and Zierl 1995 and Hahmann 2005 (in German). This testifies to interest in the free will problem, a concept which some think Alexander expressed for the first time; see *On Fate*, Determinism, and Free Will.

**Hahmann, Andree. 2005. *Was ist Willensfreiheit? Alexander von Aphrodisias über das Schicksal*. Marburg, Germany: Tectum.**

A German translation of Alexander's *On Fate*.

**Magris, Aldo. 1995. *Alessandro di Afrodizia. Il destino. Il più importante classico dell'antichità sul rapporto tra fato e libertà di scelta nella vita umana*. Florence: Ponte alle Grazie.**

The volume is a part of Magris's wide-ranging project focused on history of ethics and of religion, with special reference to the history of the very concept of fate from Homer to late Antiquity.

**Natali, Carlo. 2009. *Alessandro di Afrodizia. Il destino*. Edited by Carlo Natali. Sankt Augustin, Germany: Academia.**

Natali's introduction firstly draws the history of the concepts of fate, with special reference to the Stoic theory contrasted by Alexander. He then analyzes the treatise in three sections (chs. 1–6, 7–21, 22–38), showing their logical consistence and their parallels with Aristotle's writings. An appropriate reading for undergraduates as well.

**Salles, Ricardo, and José Molina. 2009. *Alejandro de Afrodizia, Sobre el Destino*. Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Mexicana. Mexico City: UNAM.**

Introduction, translation, and notes. The Castellan translation of Alexander's *De fato* appears in the rewarding context of the standard Mexican series of classical texts. In the introduction, analysis of Alexander's theory and of his criticism of Stoic arguments is distinctively oriented in a theoretical perspective. Based on text revised by Zierl 1995.

**Sharples, Robert W. 1983. *Alexander of Aphrodisias. On Fate*. London: Duckworth.**

Text, translation, and commentary. A groundbreaking volume, pioneering in the field, a model for the Duckworth Ancient Commentators on Aristotle (ACA) series which started thereafter. It covers not only the major treatise *On Fate* but also the shorter text *On Fate* (Mantissa 25) and minor writings on associated subject matters, namely on human responsibility (*Peri tou eph' hēmin*, Mantissa 22 and 23) and chance (*Peri tychēs*, Mantissa 24).

**Zierl, Andreas. 1995. *Alexander von Aphrodisias: Über das Schicksal. Übersetzt und kommentiert*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.**

The first German translation since 1782. The commentary is oriented in an ethical perspective, with emphasis on Alexander's theory as a response to Stoic determinism and as a defense of human free will. Zierl revises the Greek text. His text is taken as a basis by Salles and Molina 2009.

---

## Fragment Collections

Some of Alexander's commentaries were sometimes superseded by other commentaries and henceforth lost. Fragments from some of his lost works have been collected, but many other fragments from lost works are still in need of being edited and collected. Freudenthal and Sigmund 1885, based on indirect tradition, remains the pioneer case study. Moraux 1979, Rescigno 2004, Rescigno 2008, and Rashed 2011 are based on CAG Editions (Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca).

**Freudenthal, Jacob, and Fränkel Sigmund. 1885. *Die durch Averroes erhaltenen Fragmente des Alexanders zur "Metaphysik" des Aristoteles untersucht und übersetzt von J[acob] Freudenthal. Mit Beiträgen zur Erläuterung des arabischen Textes von S[iegmond] Fränkel.* Berlin: Könogliche Preussische Akademie der Wissenschaften**

The fragments of Alexander's lost commentary on *Metaphysics* 12. Freudenthal collects them working on a Hebrew version of Averroes's Grand Commentary. Fränkel contributes a description of the Arabic text and of its codex unicus Cod. Leid. 2074.

**Morax, Paul. 1979. *Le commentaire d'Alexandre d'Aphrodise aux Secondes Analytiques d'Aristote.* Edited by Paul Morax. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.**

Alexander wrote a commentary on the two books of *Posterior Analytics*, which has been lost. Morax offers a collection of its fragments.

**Rashed, Marwan. 2011. *Alexandre d'Aphrodise, Commentaire perdu à la Physique d'Aristote (Livres IV-VIII). Les scholies byzantines. Édition, traduction et commentaire.* Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter.**

An edition with analysis and original commentary of 826 newly discovered Byzantine scholia, whose author uses and partly quotes Alexander's lost commentary on Aristotle's *Physics*.

**Rescigno, Andrea. 2004. *Alessandro di Afrodisia. Commentario al De caelo di Aristotele. Frammenti del primo libro.* Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert.**

Virtually all extant fragments from Alexander's commentary on Aristotle's *De caelo* 1.

**Rescigno, Andrea. 2008. *Rescigno, Andrea. Alessandro di Afrodisia. Commentario al De caelo di Aristotele. Frammenti del secondo, terzo e quarto libro.* Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert.**

This volume is devoted to fragments from books 2, 3, 4 of Alexander's commentary on Aristotle's *De caelo*.

## Studies of Alexander's Independent Works

Scholarly literature first concentrated on *On Fate*, which has now several translations and a whole dedicated debate; and secondly on *On Soul*, and on minor writing on the same subjects, that is, *On Fate*, Determinism, and Free Will and Psychology (*De anima* and *Mantissa*). These remain among the most circulated texts of the whole *Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca* series. The two major treatises *On Providence* and *On the Principles of the Universe* are preserved only in Arabic. These treatises are now translated into modern languages in Thillet 2003 and Fazzo and Zonta 1998 (both cited under *On Providence*), and Genequand 2001 and Badawi 1968 (both cited under Arabic Translations), but dedicated scholarly work is comparatively little. Still, it has been possible to detect that three treatises—*On Fate*, *On Mixture*, *On Providence*—share the same kind of introductory way of arguing via the so-called *diaphōnia*, that is, the disagreement among the opinions of other philosophers (on this method see Mansfeld 1988, cited under *On Fate*, Determinism, and Free Will). Moreover, all of these treatises share anti-Stoic intention; see the list of their subject matters as an anti-Stoic agenda in *De mixtione* 227.1–10, as pointed out by Fazzo 2005: 272f (cited under Epigraphic Evidence). On some themes, Aristotle has given no systematic account, and Alexander makes one from Aristotle's scattered hints, and connects different Aristotelian passages from different writings, so in a sense Alexander even creates his theories anew—a phenomenon which obviously attracts scholarly attention (see *On Fate*, Determinism, and Free Will and *On Providence*).

### *On Fate*, Determinism, and Free Will

Alexander's treatise *On Fate* (*Peri heimarmenês*) is a discussion on fate, determinism, and human responsibility. Since Sharples 1983 (cited under Translations of *On Fate*), it has become one of the most studied texts from the CAG Editions (*Commentaria in Aristotelem*

Graeca). Along with the main treatise *On Fate*, Sharples 1983 also translates minor writings from the “Mantissa,” “On Fate,” “On Chance,” “On What Depends on Us,” which are fully relevant to the main issue here: how can it be maintained that moral responsibility for human actions escapes fate, that is, destiny. A reference point is Aristotle *On interpretation* 9; for an overview see Natali 2009. The vast literature on Alexander’s concept of *De fato* (“On what depends on us”) includes not only the published editions and commentaries, but also a wide range of articles about the treatise. Among these, Mansfeld 1988, Gaskin 1993, Natali 2006, Ross 2009, Strobel 2010, and the pioneering Donini 1974 and Donini 2010 (cited under Collections of Papers). The notion of cause is crucial (see Natali 2003, and for an overview on Alexander’s arguments against stoic determinism Natali 2009, cited under Translations of *On Fate*). On free will, see Bobzien 1998a and Bobzien 1998b. Fazzo 1988 and Fazzo 2005 (cited under Epigraphic Evidence) connect Alexander’s theory of fate, seen as the effect of heavenly configuration on earth, with the rise of Ptolemy’s astrology in age of Severian. These much-debated issues aside, Alexander is not known to have commented upon Aristotle’s ethics. Hence the interest of the Ethical Problems (see Madigan 1987 under *Quaestiones (Aporiai kai lyseis)*).

**Bobzien, Susanne. 1998a. *Determinism and freedom in Stoic philosophy*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press.**

Bobzien (see esp. ch. 8, pp. 358–378) contrasts the general tendency, well represented by von Arnim, to identify Chrisyppus with the determinist opponent in Alexander’s *De fato*. Alexander’s fighting the determinist position is the first account which directly connects determinism with the later much developed issues of responsibility and free will.

**Bobzien, Susanne. 1998b. The inadvertent conception and late birth of the free-will problem. *Phronesis* 43:133–175.**

On Verbeke and Long’s footsteps, Bobzien credits Alexander’s *On fate* with introducing a strong notion of free will. Alexander’s notion is based not only on the Aristotelian concepts of deliberation (e.g., in *Nichomachean Ethics* 3) and possibility (*De interpretatione* 9, see also Gaskin 1993) but also on Plato, with possible interferences from Middle Platonists and Epictetus. Reprinted in Sorabji 2016 (cited under Collections of Papers), pp. 125–159.

**Donini, Pierluigi. 1974. Psicologia ed etica in Galeno e in Alessandro di Afrodizia: il problema del determinismo. In *Tre studi sull’Aristotelismo nel secondo secolo d.C.* By Pierluigi Donini, 127–186.**

Alexander’s *De fato* finds in Galen’s *Quod animi mores* the physiological support for a non entirely deterministic theory of moral action: attitude (*hexis/ἕξις*) to act depends on individual constitution (*φύσις, σύστασις*), yet we have “in our power” (*ἐφ’ ἡμῖν*) the capacity of making an effort and doing the opposite action to our most connatural one.

**Fazzo, Silvia. 1988. Alessandro di Afrodizia e Tolomeo: Aristotelismo e astrologia fra il II e il III secolo d.C. *Rivista di storia della filosofia* 43:627–649.**

A comparison between Ptolemy’s *Tetrabiblos* and Alexander’s *scripta minora* that shows similar theories both about the value of divination, and about fate and man’s capacity to react against it; Alexander was probably aware of Ptolemy’s work.

**Gaskin, Richard. 1993. Alexander’s sea battle: A discussion of Alexander of Aphrodisias *De Fato* 10. *Phronesis* 38:75–94.**

A discussion of the problem of future contingents.

**Mansfeld, Jaap. 1988. Diaphonia: The argument of Alexander *De Fato* Chs. 1–2. *Phronesis* 33:181–207.**

A standard reference contribution. Careful analysis of the (originally) skeptical argument by *diaphonia* at the incipit of Alexander’s *De fato*, *De mixtione*, and *De providentia*.

**Natali, Carlo. 2003. Causa finale e causa motrice in Alessandro di Afrodisia. In *Alessandro di Afrodisia e la "Metafisica" di Aristotele*. Edited by Giancarlo Movia, 153–165. Milan: Vita e Pensiero.**

Alexander's notion of cause partly echoes the Stoic notion of cause. It is a further step in the development toward a not entirely Aristotelian concept of cause in late Antiquity.

**Natali, Carlo. 2006. La deliberazione del "De fato" di Alessandro di Afrodisia. *Elenchos* 28:73–99.**

The concept of deliberation which Alexander's *On fate* 11–15 holds against Stoic determinism is connected to Aristotle's theory of *On Interpretation* 9. It involves a discussion of Bobzien 1998a.

**Natali, Carlo. 2009. The cause of human action according to Alexander of Aphrodisias, Mantissa 23 and De Fato 15. *Estudios de Filosofía* 40:159–181.**

On Alexander's debate with the determinists and on the crucial role of deliberation in his account of action, with special reference to Aristotle *On Interpretation* 9 as Alexander's starting point. Alexander's incorporation of Stoic notions aims to fight against the Stoic determinists in their own ground.

**Ross, Alberto. 2009. La recepción de la teoría aristotélica del azar en el De Fato de Alejandro de Afrodisia. *Estudios de Filosofía* 40:183–198.**

Ross deals with the reception and transformation of Aristotle's theory of chance and causality in Alexander's *On Fate*, and points out some significant differences between the two: Alexander introduces such notions as "fate" and "providence," and diverge from Aristotle more than once while attributing his own doctrine to him.

**Strobel, Benedikt. 2010. Zur Konzeption von τὸ ἐφ' ἡμῖν bei Alexander von Aphrodisias. In *Wille und Handlung in der Philosophie der Kaiserzeit und Spätantike*. Edited by Jörn Müller and Roberto Hofmeister Pich, 131–174. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter.**

Strobel explores the meaning of the expression *eph'hemin* among the contemporaries of Alexander, and underlines the differences between Alexander's and the Stoics' conceptions of *eph'hemin*.

## On Mixture

Among treatises extant in Greek, the one *On Mixture* (*De mixtione*) is the worst preserved and has no incipit. A point of great interest is the attack on Stoic physics (whose traces it polemically preserves, to the extent that it plays a relevant role in von Arnim's collection of Stoic fragments: this is the focus of Todd 1976 (cited under Other Translations). See Kupreeva 2004. New critical edition and thorough introduction in Groisard 2013 (cited under Updated Critical Editions). See also Mansfeld 1988 (cited under *On Fate*, Determinism, and Free Will) about common polemical features with other Alexandrian treatises.

**Kupreeva, Inna. 2004. Alexander of Aphrodisias on mixture and growth. *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy* 27:297–334.**

On Alexander's theory of mixture, which responds to Stoic coextension, and of growth, which elaborates on Aristotle's *On Generation and Corruption* (GC) 1.5 thesis of the persistence of the form. Based on *De mixtione*, *Quaestio* 1.5 and on its Arabic version (transl. in Appendix, pp. 329–331) and on the lost commentary in GC, whose means of reconstruction Kupreeva discusses (pp. 314–318).

## On Providence

The main treatise *On Providence* is lost in Greek, except fragments in Cyril of Alexandria, but survives in two Arabic versions (D15, D 18). The first is an adaptation made in the Kindī circle (see Arabic Reception). D18, a more literal translation, is critically edited and commented upon with large introduction in Thillet 2003 (see Other Translations). The dialectical character of the exordium by *diaphōnia* was pointed out by Mansfeld 1988 (cited under *On Fate*, Determinism, and Free Will). Moreover, several shorter texts on *On Providence* are preserved among Alexander's *Quaestiones*. *Quaestio* 2.3 especially testifies for different solutions from within the school; see Fazzo and Zonta 1998 and Fazzo 2002: 175–212 (cited under *Quaestiones (Aporiai kai lyseis)*) but Donini 2010: 125–138 (Collections of Papers) for a contrasting view. Collection, edition, and Italian translation of all of the Greek and Arabic texts in Fazzo and Zonta 1998 (with Fazzo's monographic introduction "La dottrina della provvidenza in Alessandro di Afrodisia", pp. 5–82, which contains the first running analysis of the major treatise *On Providence*, pp. 42–52).

**Fazzo, Silvia, and Mauro Zonta. 1998. *Alessandro di Afrodisia. La provvidenza, a cura di S. Fazzo, traduzione dal greco di S. Fazzo, traduzione dall'arabo di M. Zonta*. Milan: Rizzoli (BUR).**

Alexander's writing on providence collected. Zonta's work on the Arabic versions of the lost treatise, along with Fazzo's on *Quaestiones* 1.21, 1.25, 2.3. The two Arabic versions—see Dietrich 1964 (cited under Arabic Reception), n. 18 and D15—collated with each other, and with Greek fragments. Running analysis of D18 in Fazzo's introduction.

**Sharples, Robert W. 1982. Alexander of Aphrodisias on divine providence: Two problems. *Classical Quarterly* 32:198–211.**

Problems of Alexander's theory of providence: (1) whether providence is a primary or an accidental concern of divine being toward the sublunary (cf. *Quaestio* 2.21); (2) the extension, the agent, and the object of providence: whether unmoved mover provides on heavens only, or heavens on the sublunary, or both.

**Thillet, Pierre. 2003. *Traité de la providence*. Lagrasse, France: Verdier.**

A carefully prefaced critical edition of the Arabic version D18 of Alexander's lost treatise of Alexander *On Providence*, based on two Arabic manuscripts (Escorial and Istanbul, Carullah), with a French translation.

## On the Principles of the Universe

Alexander's treatise *On the Principles of the Universe* gives a unified account of Aristotle's most influential doctrine of the prime unmoved mover. The theory is found in the treatise, first as a synopsis (§§ 3–63, made out of parts of *Physics* 8 as well), then again as a running textual paraphrase (§§ 64 ff.) of *Metaphysics* Lambda (i.e., 12) chapters 6ff. This was first detected by Fazzo 2008; see also Genequand 2001 (cited under Arabic Translations). On the same subject, *Quaestio* 1.1 is a shorter, parallel text; see Rashed 2007 (cited under Hylomorphism) and Fazzo 2008. By contrast, Alexander's commentary on *Metaphysics* Lambda survives in fragments only, that is, in quotations by Averroes's great commentary on *Lambda*. Freudenthal and Sigmund 1885 (cited under Fragment Collections) has not been replaced yet. The text is translated into English (along with Averroes's commentary) by Genequand 1984. On Alexander's interpretation of Aristotle's unmoved mover see also Berti 2000 (cited under Alexander's Commentaries on *Physics* and *On the Heavens*) and Sharples 1983.

**Bodnár, István. 2014. Alexander's unmoved mover. In *Nature et sagesse. Les rapports entre physique et métaphysique dans la tradition aristotélicienne. Recueil de textes en hommage à Pierre Pellegrin*. Edited by Cristina Cerami, 387–416. Louvain, Belgium: Peeters.**

Based on Alexander's *De principiis*, *Quaestiones*, and on the indirect tradition, Bodnár aims to reconstruct the main features of Alexander's lost commentary on Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, Lambda 8, concerning Aristotle's theory of the plurality of heavenly spheres. Alexander introduced only a single separate unmoved mover, the object of desire for the spheres' souls.

**Fazzo, Silvia. 2008. L'exégèse de *Métaphysique Lambda* dans le *De principiis* et dans la *Quaestio* I.1 d'Alexandre d'Aphrodise. *Laval théologique et philosophique* 607–626.**

Alexander's *De principiis* and the shorter *Quaestio* 1.1 are an almost running paraphrase of Aristotle's *Metaphysics* Lambda (central chapters).

**Genequand, Charles. 1984. *Ibn Rushd's Metaphysics: A translation with introduction of Ibn Rushd's commentary on Aristotle's Metaphysics, Book Lam*. Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill.**

A clear and reader-friendly English translation, based on Bouyges's critical edition of the Arabic manuscript. Freudenthal's fragments from Alexander's commentary (see Freudenthal and Sigmund 1885) are put into evidence.

**Sharples, Robert W. 1983. The unmoved mover and the motion of the heavens in Alexander of Aphrodisias. *Apeiron* 17:62–66.**

Alexander identifies the Heavens' soul and the Heavens' nature. He thus conflates two Aristotelian hints: that heavens move in circle by nature (*On Heavens*) and that they are moved by desire of the unmoved mover—which implies them to be ensouled (*Metaphysics* Lambda, in Alexander's interpretation).

## Psychology (*De anima* and *Mantissa*)

Alexander's psychology and noetics, for which Moraux 1942 (cited under Aporetic Method) has been a suggested starting point, have been so widely studied in the last decades that they can be hardly covered by a selective list. Ground-breaking studies are by Donini, starting with Donini 1971. On the treatise *De anima* see especially Accattino and Donini 1996. The authors' substantial introduction is a reference not only for this treatise but also for Alexander's method and way of dealing with Aristotle's texts; Caston 1997, De Haas 2014, and Sharples 2001 (with critical edition, cited under Bibliographies). The complexity of Alexander's relation to the Stoic positions is shown by Kupreeva 2003. On Alexander's interpretation of the active intellect and passive intellect as in Aristotle's *De anima* 3.5, and his identification of the former with the "intellect from outside" are much debated issue. Boeri 2009 (cited under Collections of Papers), challenges Alexander's position. On the moving role of the soul see Mittelman 2009; on the hylomorphic structure of Alexander's psychology see Vigo 2009. Zingano 2009 contrasts *Quaestio* 3.3 with Aristotle concerning sense perception. For a reading of Alexander's potential or "material" intellect see Tuominen 2010. On Alexander's so-called *Mantissa*, see Accattino 2001. Accattino 2009 offers a tripartite overview on most crucial themes in Alexander's psychology. The authenticity of the short and famous *De intellectu* (*Mantissa* 106.18–113.24) is strongly challenged by Schroeder and Todd 1990, Schroeder and Todd 2008. Criticism against Alexander in Boeri 2009.

**Accattino, Paolo. 2001. Accattino, Paolo (a c. di) Alessandro di Afrodisia. *De anima II (Mantissa)*. Testo greco a fronte. Thélème. Turin, Italy.**

Careful, annotated translation of the collection of short writings on soul (mostly), labeled "Mantissa" by Bruns the editor (edita in Suppl. Ar. 2.1, Bruns 1889, cited under Independent Works).

**Accattino, Paolo. 2009. Alexander of Aphrodisias as an interpreter of Aristotle's *De anima*. *Estudios de Filosofía* 40:53–77.**

Part 1 shows the conception Alexander had of his own psychology. Part 2 explains why the soul is mortal, insofar as it is the form of the body. Part 3 deals with Alexander's identification of the active intellect with the Aristotelian god of *Metaphysics* Lambda.

**Accattino, Paolo, and Pierluigi Donini, eds. 1996. *Alessandro di Afrodisia. L'anima*. Rome and Bari, Italy: Laterza.**

A careful Italian translation with a thorough introduction and commentary of Alexander's *De anima*.

**Boeri, Marcelo D. 2009. Alejandro de Afrodísia como intérprete de la noética aristotélica. *Estudios de Filosofía* 40:79–107.**

Boeri strongly argues against Alexander's interpretation of Aristotle's agent intellect (the intellect that Alexander identifies with god) as contrasting basic Aristotelian premises, both ontological and psychological. Boeri instead sides with Pseudo Philoponus's criticism.

**Caston, Victor. 1997. Epiphenomenalism, ancient and modern. *Philosophical Review* 106.3:309–363.**

The paper claims that Alexander states the supervenience of mental events with respect to bodily changes. Caston's distinctive emergentist reading of Alexander's psychology has proved seminal for references to Alexander in contemporary discussion among philosophers of mind.

**De Haas, Frans A. J. 2014. Presuppositions of moral action in Aristotle and Alexander of Aphrodisias. In *Providence, fate and moral responsibility in ancient, medieval and early modern thought: Collected studies in honour of Carlos Steel*. Edited by Pieter d'Hoine and Gerd Van Riel, 103–116. Leuven, Belgium: Leuven Univ. Press.**

Alexander's theory of action has two core goals, that is, to state that every action has a cause and to reject the Stoics' deterministic account of human action. Alexander argues for human freedom by appealing to Aristotle's texts.

**Donini, Pierluigi. 1971. L'anima e gli elementi nel De Anima di Alessandro di Afrodísia. *Atti dell' Accademia delle Scienze di Torino, classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche* 105:61–107.**

A reaction to the view in Moraux 1942 (cited under Aporetic Method) on Alexander's theory of intellect. Alexander's alleged materialism is paralleled with traces of the 2nd century CE Aristotelianism in Galen. See Zorzetti 1971.

**Kupreeva, Inna. 2003. Qualities and bodies: Alexander against the Stoics. *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy* 25:297–344.**

Based on analysis of DA 17.9–20.26, and on careful presentation of Stoic concurrent thesis, Kupreeva links the most important thesis of Alexander's theory of soul, the incorporeality of soul and its inseparability from body, in a strong sense, to Alexander's criticism of the Stoic theory that qualities, and soul, are corporeal.

**Mittelmann, Jorge. 2009. Alejandro y Aristóteles en torno de la causalidad motriz del alma. *Estudios de Filosofía* 40:135–157.**

A parallel reading of Alexander's and Aristotle's treatise *On Soul*: Alexander's successfully faces a most compelling challenge for Peripatetic psychology, that is, keeping the causal relevance of the soul without it being in contact with its moved organism. Aristotle's "dispositional states" offer the paradigm for a proper solution.

**Schroeder, Friederich M., and Robert B. Todd. 1990. *Two Aristotelian Greek commentators on the intellect: The De Intellectu attributed to Alexander of Aphrodisias and Themistius' paraphrase of Aristotle De Anima 3.4–8*. Toronto: Pontifical Institute for Medieval Studies.**

Authors introduce (pp. 1–45) and translate (pp. 46–58) the *De intellectu* (*Mantissa* 106.18–113.24), the most influential Alexandrian text in Latin and Arabic during the Middle Ages and the Renaissance, whose attribution they strongly challenge (pp. 6–22) based on thorough analysis (pp. 1–45, 59–74).

**Schroeder, Friederich M., and Robert B. Todd. 2008. The De intellectu revisited. *Laval théologique et philosophique* 64.3: 663–680.**

The author of *De intellectu* is well acquainted with Alexander's *De anima*, yet his interpretation of Aristotle *De anima* 3.5 is no way committed with philological faithfulness. Based on some typical Neoplatonic features he can be dated two to four centuries after Alexander

of Aphrodisias.

**Tuominen, Miira. 2010. Receptive reason: Alexander of Aphrodisias on material intellect. *Phronesis* 55.2: 170–190.**

Potential intellect is a purely receptive capacity so the question arises: how can it abstract enmattered forms from matter? Tuominen shows that Alexander's way of dealing with the problem succeeds in explaining how human beings come to grasp universal aspects of reality.

**Vigo, Alejandro. 2009. Alma, impulso y movimiento según Alejandro de Afrodisia. *Estudios de Filosofía* 40:245–278.**

Vigo discusses Alexander's view on the impulsive capacity of the soul, seen as a form of the body, within the context of Alexander's hylomorphism. Alexander develops a "terraced model" of hylomorphic composition.

**Zingano, Marco. 2009. The Quaestiones III 2 and 3 of Alexander of Aphrodisias and the problem of the sensitive alteration. *Estudios de Filosofía* 40:279–298.**

Alexander's *Quaestio* 3.3 explains what sort of alteration sensation is, based on Aristotle's *De anima* 2.5, saying that sensation is a kind of affection. Yet in Alexander's view, "being affected" has little relevancy in perception as a discriminating faculty. *Quaestio* 3.3 became influential through its Arabic into Latin version by Gerard of Cremona

**Zorzetti, Nevio. 1971. Review of Donini 1971. *Studi Medievali* 12:263–268.**

Donini's review is framed in previous scholarship: accounts about Alexander being usually based on noetics, for example, in Zeller, Alexander's alleged materialism (which Donini parallels to Galen) were criticized by Moraux 1942 (cited under Aporetic Method) as a part of a neo-Thomist revival—hence Merlan's reaction prompted by Bréhier's edition of Plotinus.

### *Quaestiones (Aporiai kai lyseis)*

See also Common Features of Alexander's Writings: as a general tendency, Alexander's exegesis harmonizes different texts in the corpus; hence Fazzo 2002 points out that many of Alexander's *Aporiai kai lyseis* (printed by Bruns 1892 as *Quaestiones*, see Independent Works) are connected to issues raised through this main exegetical process, which aims to make a coherent system out of various writings in Aristotle's philosophy. Full bibliography and detailed analysis on each of the *Aporiai kai lyseis* in the rich footnotes to the relevant ACA translations volume Sharples 1992 (cited under Aporetic Method) and Sharples 1994. On the fourth book of *Quaestiones*, that is, Alexander's ethical problems, see Madigan 1987 and Sharples 1990.

**Fazzo, Silvia. 2002. *Aporia e sistema. La materia, la forma, il divino nelle Quaestiones di Alessandro di Afrodisia. Pubblicazioni della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia dell'Università di Pavia, 97. Pisa, Italy: Edizioni ETS.***

An introduction to Alexander's Aristotelianism, focused on systematic arrangement and aporetic questioning. This method is detected in the *Quaestiones* that deals with matter (*hylé*) and form (*eidos*), as key concepts in Alexander's system. It includes an inquiry on textual sources and critical edition of *Quaestiones* 1.10, 1.15, and 2.3.

**Madigan, Arthur. 1987. Alexander of Aphrodisias: The Book of Ethical Problems. In *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt. Part 2, Vol. 36. Edited by Wolfgang Haase, 1260–1279.***

A thorough discussion on Alexander's *Ethical Problems* about virtue, responsibility, and pleasure.

**Sharples, Robert W. 1990. *Alexander of Aphrodisias: Ethical Problems*. London: Duckworth.**

A careful translation with annotations throughout Alexander's fourth book from the *Quaestiones*, which is devoted to moral philosophy. With comprehensive bibliography. Part of The ACA Series.

**Sharples, Robert W. 1994. *Alexander of Aphrodisias. Quaestiones 2.16–3.15*. Translated by R. W. Sharples. London: Duckworth.**

A careful translation with thorough annotation of the second part of Alexander's *Quaestiones* on natural philosophy (covering books 1 to 3). With comprehensive bibliography. Part of The ACA Series.

---

## Logic

Flannery 1995 is an introduction to Alexander's logic. Lee 1984 deals with logical issues in Alexander's works. Gili 2011a focuses on the categorical and on modal syllogistic. Several parts of Rashed 2011 deal with logic. Among Alexander's commentaries on Aristotle's *Organon*, *On Topics* is studied in Abbamonte 1995 (Common Features of Alexander's Writings), Castelli 2013, and Militello 2017. Ellis 1994, a recommended paper, connects Alexander's discussion of the hylomorphic problem with his role in the defense of Aristotle's *Categories*. Salles 2009 deals with Alexander's commitment in settling logic as an instrument (in Greek, *organon/ὄργανον*), rather than as a part of Aristotle's philosophy. Some fragments of Alexander's commentary on the *Categories* have been published in Schmidt 1966. Alexander's lost commentary on *De interpretatione* was known to some ancient commentators. Their testimonies have been gathered and commented upon by Moraux in Moraux and Sharples 2001 (cited under Bibliographies): 16–28; Bonelli 2009 deals with the relation of Alexander's lost commentary to Boethius's commentaries. For further aspects see Barnes 1990, Gili 2011b, Gili 2012, and Bobzien 2014.

**Barnes, Jonathan. 1990. Logical form and logical matter. In *Logica, mente e persona*. Edited by Antonina Alberti, 1–119. Florence: Olschki.**

A survey on the distinction between form and matter in logic. At pp. 53–65 it dwells with Alexander's treatment of the topic, especially with Alexander's distinction between the formal validity and material validity among syllogisms. For "things are often proved because of their matter, although they are not syllogistic" (in *An Pr.* 379.20–21).

**Bobzien, Suzanne. 2014. Alexander of Aphrodisias on Aristotle's theory of the Stoic indemonstrables. In *Strategies of argument: Essays in ancient ethics, epistemology and logic*. Edited by Mi-Kyoung Lee, 199–227. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press.**

The paper explores Alexander's role in the transmission of hypothetical syllogistic and Stoic propositional logic.

**Bonelli, Maddalena. 2009. Alexandre d'Aphrodise et le *De interpretatione*. In *Interpréter le *De interpretatione**. Edited by Suzanne Husson, 51–67. Paris: Vrin.**

This paper shows that Boethius's commentaries on the *De interpretatione* are important sources for the reconstruction of Alexander's lost commentary.

**Castelli, Laura. 2013. Collections of topoi and the structure of Aristotle's Topics: Notes on an ancient debate (Aristotle, Theophrastus, Alexander and Themistius). *Antiquorum Philosophia* 7:65–91.**

A detailed article on an ancient debate on the structure of Aristotle's *Topics*. Alexander's commentary on the *Topics* is analyzed at length.

**Ellis, John. 1994. Alexander's defense of Aristotle's Categories. *Phronesis* 39:69–89.**

Alexander deals the hylomorphic problem with special reference to the definition of “being in a substrate” in *Categoriae* 1a24–25: matter does not exist independently, but only as a ‘constituent condition’ of substance (Ellis quotes here Mario Mignucci). Scrutinized texts, as *Mantissa* 5, *Quaestiones* 1.8, 1.17, 1.26 build a background for Porphyry, “making the Categories palatable for Platonists.”

**Flannery, Kevin. 1995. *Ways into the logic of Alexander of Aphrodisias*. Leiden, The Netherlands, and New York: Brill.**

Flannery dwells on three core issues of Alexander’s logic: expository proofs, mixed modal syllogisms, and the issue of logical matter and of logical form.

**Gili, Luca. 2011a. *La sillogistica di Alessandro di Afrodisia. Sillogistica categorica e sillogistica modale nel commento agli Analitici Primi di Aristotele*. Hildesheim, Germany, and New York: Georg Olms.**

Gili aims at presenting Alexander’s syllogistic, as it is expounded in the commentary on the *Prior Analytics*. The book deals with Alexander’s sources, with the status of logic, with the definitions of proposition and of syllogism, with the rules of conversions, and with the systematic section devoted to categorical and to modal syllogistic.

**Gili, Luca. 2011b. Boeto di Sidone e Alessandro di Afrodisia intorno alla sillogistica aristotelica. *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 154:375–397.**

Boethus of Sidon and Alexander had opposite views concerning complete syllogisms.

**Gili, Luca. 2012. Alexander’s solution to the puzzle of the two modal Barbaras: A semantic approach. *Documenti e studi sulla tradizione filosofica medievale* 23:35–64.**

On Alexander of Aphrodisias’s reconstruction of a famous puzzle of Aristotle’s modal logic. Aristotle’s claim that a LX-L Barbara is a valid syllogism, while a XL-L Barbara is an invalid formula within the syllogistic system, was controversial among ancient Peripatetics.

**Lee, Tae-Soo. 1984. *Die griechische Tradition der aristotelischen Syllogistik in der Spätantike. Eine Untersuchung über die Kommentare zu den Analytica Priora von Alexander Aphrodisiensis, Ammonius und Philoponus*. Göttingen, Germany: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht.**

This monograph deals with the commentaries on Aristotle’s *Prior Analytics* by Alexander, by Ammonius, and by John Philoponus. Lee dwells on the status of logic (is it an instrument, or a part of philosophy?), on the definitions of proposition, and of syllogism, on the rules of conversions. Lee compares the commentaries, and makes several insightful observations. His monograph, however, does not have Alexander’s logic as a primary focus.

**Militello, Chiara. 2017. *Dialettica, genere e anima nel commento di Alessandro di Afrodisia al quarto libro dei Topici di Aristotele*. Milan: Vita e pensiero.**

An Italian translation of Alexander’s commentary on Aristotle’s *Topics* Book 4 with a collection of essays on relevant passages and themes: dialectics as the subject matter of topics; genus, as the subject of the fourth book; soul, a subject around which the most recurrent examples of dialectical topoi are constructed.

**Rashed, Marwan. 2011. Un corpus de logique anti-platonicienne d’Alexandre d’Aphrodise. In *Plato, Aristotle, or both? Dialogues between Platonism and Aristotelianism in Antiquity*. Edited by Thomas Bénatouïl, Emanuele Maffi, and Franco Trabattoni, 85–94. Hildesheim, Germany, and New York: Georg Olms.**

In Rashed’s hypothesis, titles in Arabic catalogues of Alexander’s works—by al-Nadīm, by Ibn Abī Uṣaybi’a, by al-Qifṭī drawing from al-Nadīm’s, come from a lost logical corpus, dealing among others with division, genus, and species.

**Salles, Ricardo. 2009. Alejandro de Afrodísia y el problema de la instrumentalidad de la lógica. Notas sobre in A. Pr. 2, 22–33. *Estudios de Filosofía* 40:223–243.**

Against Stoics, Alexander settles logic not as a part of Aristotle's philosophy, seen as the top level in the hierarchy of knowledge, but as an instrument of it. Alexander bases his argument on premises Stoics would not have accepted. This Salles regards as a weakness of Alexander's criticism of Stoic inconsistencies.

**Schmidt, Ernst Günther. 1966. Alexander von Aphrodisias in einem altarmenischen Kategorien-Kommentar. *Philologus* 110:277–286.**

Alexander's commentary on the *Categories* is lost. A few fragments of it have been preserved in Old Armenian, in a later commentary on the *Categories*. Schmidt collected these fragments and translated them into German (other traces are preserved by Simplicius *In Cat.*, see Moraux in Moraux and Sharples 2001: 3–15, cited under Bibliographies).

## Universals

Recent studies mark a full renewal of traditional disputes about the alleged nominalism of Alexander's conception of universals. When the universals' ontological status is concerned, the Aristotelian tradition has regarded Alexander as a nominalist. This means that Alexander was referred to as holding that universals are posterior to individuals and depend on them for their existence. The issue was a subject for debate from Porphyry (drawing from Alexander, see Guyomarc'h 2013) and Boethius to the Latin and Arabic scholasticism, and Alexander's position was often mentioned this way. For a summary see Sharples 1987 under Bibliographies, pp. 1199–1202. Part of such a reading of Alexander's position is already challenged by Tweedale 1984. Rashed 2007 (cited under Hylomorphism) states that for Alexander forms are eternal insofar as species are common and not perishable; but they perish in number when individuals perish and lose their form. Still, Sirkel 2011 emphasizes the difference between form and universals in Alexander's view. Sorabji 2016 sums up and newly establishes the status of the art in the frame of the whole Greek commentary literature. Sorabji thus explains the low status of Alexander's universals as common features: they exist out of the mind and have any explanatory role only through the accident of having more than one instance. Concerning particulars by Alexander, Rashed 2016 finds in the indirect tradition a contrast between form as species and individual form: unlike the former, the latter perish when Socrates is corrupted.

**Guyomarc'h, Gweltaz. 2013. Les sources post-hellénistiques du questionnaire de Porphyre. *Methodos: Savoirs et textes*.**

Alexander is found to be an illuminating source of Porphyry's *Isagoge* (i.e., introduction to Aristotle's *Categories*), which is commonly held as a milestone of the medieval debate on universals.

**Rashed, Marwan. 2016. Alexander of Aphrodisias on particulars and the Stoic criterion on identity. In *Aristotle re-interpreted: New findings on seven hundred years of the ancient commentators*. Edited by Richard Sorabji, 161–177. London and New York: Bloomsbury.**

Based on distinctive common features of Philoponus's and Averroes's commentaries in Aristotle's *On Generation and Corruption* 2.11, an explanation made by Alexander in his lost commentary is reconstructed. Socrates as an individual form (ἄτομος εἶδος/*atomos eidos*) can not arise twice in world history because stars' configurations never come twice exactly to the same point.

**Sirkel, Riin. 2011. Alexander of Aphrodisias' account of universals and its problems. *Journal of the History of Philosophy* 49:297–314.**

Alexander distinguishes the notions of "form" and of "universal." "Universal" is something which is actually predicated of many. If there is only a single individual which has a certain nature, there will not be any corresponding universal for its form.

**Sorabji, Richard. 2016. Universals Transformed in the Commentators on Aristotle. In *Aristotle Re-Interpreted. New Findings on Seven Hundred Years of the Ancient Commentators*. By Richard Sorabji, 291–312. Bloomsbury.**

Includes critical surveys on Alexander. Alexander's requirements are shown to be stronger than Aristotle's: universals have to be "common," that is, not only shareable but actually shared by more than one individual. The sun's form is not such. With references to Alexander's *Quaestiones* 1.11 and *In Top.* 355.18–24.

**Tweeddale, Martin. 1984. Alexander of Aphrodisias' views on universals. *Phronesis* 29:279–303.**

Alexander distinguishes two conceptions of universal: either they are caused by the abstracting mind, or they exist in particulars as form (=species) does. Genera are universal and are posterior to the forms of individuals falling under them. Sorabji 2016 refers to this pioneering article.

## Alexander's Commentaries

### Alexander's Commentaries on *Physics* and *On the Heavens*

Alexander's philosophy of nature is one of the most studied sections of his philosophy. This is due to the fact that Alexander wrote original treatises in this field, and those treatises have been largely studied. Alexander commented on Aristotle's *Physics*, *On Generation and Corruption*, and *On Heavens*. Those commentaries are lost, but they were known to later commentators and to Byzantine scholiasts. The available sources on Alexander's commentary on the *Physics* have been gathered and commented upon in Rashed 2011, Rescigno 2004, and Rescigno 2008 (all cited under Fragment Collections). Alexander's theory of the motion of the sky is dealt with in Bodnár 1997 and Berti 2000.

**Berti, Enrico. 2000. Il movimento del cielo in Alessandro di Afrodisia. In *La filosofia in età imperiale. Le scuole e le tradizioni filosofiche*. Edited by Aldo Brancacci, 225–243. Naples, Italy: Bibliopolis.**

Alexander maintained that the heavenly spheres are moved by their desire of the unmoved mover, which moves them as an object of their love. But Aristotle never says this. Berti traces the idea back to the interpretation of *Metaphysics* Lambda 7 within the ancient Peripatos, with special reference to Theophrastus' *Metaphysics*.

**Bodnár, István. 1997. Alexander of Aphrodisias on celestial motions. *Phronesis* 42:190–205.**

A recommended paper on Alexander's theory of planetary motion. Unlike Hellenistic astronomers, especially Ptolemy, Alexander is likely to have dealt with homocentric spheres, like his master Sosigenes.

### Lost Commentary on *On Generation and Corruption*

Arabic fragments of Alexander's lost commentary *On Generation and Corruption* have been found and detected in the late 20th century by a joint project of Gannagé and Fazzo working in London at the Warburg Institute (compare Gannagé 1998, n. 1; Fazzo 1999, n.1). These fragments were hidden within an alchemical treatise from the Jabīrian corpus, ms. Paris. Arabus 5099 of the Bibliothèque Nationale de France, drawing from an Arabic version (via Syriac) by Abū Bishr Mattā ibn Yūnus; a first, albeit conjectural, English version is available in Gannagé 2005. For a series of caveats, see Fazzo 1999. A peculiar problem when using ms. Paris. Arabus 5099 is that the main source, that is, pseudo-Jābir's Book of Balances, appears severely out of order and we are not told what the original position of the displaced parts is. Fragments from Alexander's commentary and Aristotelian quotes are thus mixed with different kinds of glosses and remarks on pseudo-Jābir's part. Fazzo 2002 (cited under Turning Aristotle into a System) shows that sections of Philoponus in *On Generation and Corruption* (GC) and Averroes in GC collapse and coincide verbatim with pseudo-Jābir, far beyond explicit quotation, so that they may be seen as a

path for a safe identification and reconstruction of Alexander as their common source. On further case samples (in GC 1.5, 2.11) see Kupreeva 2004 (cited under *On Mixture*) and Rashed 2016 (cited under *Universals*).

**Fazzo, Silvia 1999. Frammenti da Alessandro in De generatione et corruptione nel Kitab al-Tasrif. *Problemi di riconoscimento e di ricostruzione. Documenti e studi sulla tradizione filosofica medievale* 10:195–203.**

Context analysis and problems to be dealt with when identifying the extracts from Alexander of Aphrodisias's commentary in *De gen. et corr.* 2.2–5 within the pseudo-Jābirian Kitab al-Tasrif.

**Gannagé, Emma. 1998. Alexandre d'Aphrodise in De generatione et corruptione apud Gābir ibn Hayyān, Kitāb al- Tasrif. *Documenti e studi sulla tradizione filosofica medievale* 9:35–86.**

Fragments from Alexander's *De gen. et corr.* pointed out in the pseudo-Jābirian Kitab al-Tasrif. Part of The ACA Series.

**Gannagé, Emma. 2005. Alexander of Aphrodisias on Aristotle's coming-to-be and perishing 2.2–5. London: Duckworth.**

Partly a translation, partly a reconstruction (see esp. p. 101, n. 63; p. 98, n. 50), of traces of Alexander's commentary on *De gen. et corr.* 2.2–5.

## Metaphysics

Alexander's commentary on the first five books of Aristotle's *Metaphysics* is printed in *CAG 1* (cited under *CAG Editions* (*Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca*)). The remaining books published by Hayduck were written by the Byzantine scholar Michael of Ephesus: see Luna 2001 (cited under *Spuria and Questioned Attributions*). According to Fazzo and Zonta 2016 and Fazzo 2012, a fragment of Alexander's lost commentary on *Metaphysics* Lambda, preserved by Averroes, is the first presentation of Aristotle's *Metaphysics* as a text divided into fourteen books. On the cultural profile of the commentator, see Sharples 2003 (cited under *Spuria and Questioned Attributions*).

Alexander's metaphysics has been studied in Bonelli 2001 (cited under *Common Features of Alexander's Writings*); see also extracts and summaries in Bonelli 2010 (cited under *Turning Aristotle into a System*) and in papers collected in Movia 2003 (cited under *Collections of Papers*). See also Donini 2003 with the reaction of Bonelli 2012, along with Rashed 2008 (cited under *Collections of Papers*) and Guyomarc'h 2015, which offers an interpretation of Alexander's commentary on the *Metaphysics* as a whole. See also Sharples 1987 and Sharples 2001 under *Bibliographies*; and Tweedale 1984 and Sirkel 2011 under *Universals*. Alexander's commentary on the *Metaphysics* contains fragments of Aristotle's lost works (see Alexander as a Textual Source). Commentary on book Lambda is lost, but see traces and fragments under *On the Principles of the Universe*.

**Bonelli, Maddalena. 2012. Alexandre d'Aphrodise et la philosophie première. In *Physique et Métaphysique chez Aristote*. Edited by Maddalena Bonelli, 259–275. Paris: Vrin.**

Bonelli discusses Donini's thesis and proposes a simpler textual analysis, which presents a single first philosophy (theology) and a single universal philosophy (ontology).

**Donini, Pierluigi. 2003. Unità e oggetto della metafisica secondo Alessandro di Afrodisia. In *Alessandro di Afrodisia e la "Metafisica" di Aristotele*. Edited by Giancarlo Movia, 15–51. Milan: Vita e Pensiero**

Donini focuses on Alexander, in *Metaphysics* 245, 33; 246, 13. In his reading, Alexander sees theology and ontology as first and universal in two different senses. The article responds to Bonelli 2001 (cited under *Common Features of Alexander's Writings*). See also Bonelli 2012 as a counter-response. Reprint of the French translation in Donini 2010: 107–124 (cited under *Collections of Papers*). French translation: L'objet de la Métaphysique selon Alexandre d'Aphrodise. In *La Métaphysique d'Aristote: Perspectives contemporaines*. Edited by Michel Nancy and Alonso Tordesillas, 81–98. Paris: Vrin, 2005.

**Fazzo, Silvia. 2012. The “Metaphysics” from Aristotle to Alexander of Aphrodisias. *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies of the University of London* 55:51–68.**

The survey discusses sources and literature about alleged evidence of the circulation of the *Metaphysics* in fourteen books as we know it now in early Roman times (Eudorus and Nicolaus of Damascus among others). It is suggested that Alexander be regarded as the first safe terminus post quem for our *Metaphysics* to be collected and circulated in its present shape.

**Fazzo, Silvia, and Mauro Zonta. 2016. The first account of Aristotle’s *Metaphysics* in fourteen books: Alexander of Aphrodisias’ fragment Zero. *Rivista di Filosofia Neo-Scolastica* 4: 985–995.**

Article shows that Averroes’s introduction to *Metaphysics* Lambda partly draws from the Syro-Arabic translation of Alexander of Aphrodisias’s introduction, whose content was adjusted to Averroes’s *Metaphysics* (starting with book Alpha Elatton). This fixes Alexander as the first source and terminus ante quem for the assemblage of our fourteen books of *Metaphysics*.

**Genequand, Charles. 1979. L’objet de la Métaphysique selon Alexandre d’Aphrodise. *Museum Helveticum* 3:48–57.**

Genequand challenges Merlan’s view which identifies Alexander’s first science with science of being qua being, and being qua being with first substance. Alexander introduces a first series of hints pointing to the late distinction between general and special metaphysics.

**Guyomarc’h, Gweltaz. 2015. *L’Unité de la métaphysique selon Alexandre d’Aphrodise. Textes et traditions* 27. Paris: Vrin.**

Guyomarc’h’s thesis, directed by Michel Crubellier and Annick Stevens, is a rare attempt to cover this wide subject as a whole. As Guyomarc’h shows, Alexander aims to make of the *Metaphysics* a unified science, while allowing for a plurality of included programs: science of being qua being, theory of substance, the first cause.

---

## Spuria and Questioned Attributions

Because of Alexander’s influence, both Greek and Arabic scholars produced several texts that were attributed to him. Some of the attributed commentary, however, is not by Alexander. The most obvious case is made for the commentary on *Metaphysics* 6–14 published by Hayduck in CAG 1 (cited under CAG Editions (Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca)) after Alexander’s commentary on *Metaphysics* 1–5. Concerning its attribution to Michael of Ephesus see Luna 2001: 1–71, and Sharples 2003. An Italian translation of Book 12 with commentary is offered by Salis 2005. For doubts on other commentaries (e.g., on Aristotle’s *Sophistical Refutations*) see Goulet and Aouad 1989 (cited under General Overviews). Other Greek spuria include the physical and medical *Problemata* in Kapetanaki and Sharples 2006 and the spurious *On Fevers*. The authenticity of the treatise *De intellectu* is controversial (see Schroeder and Todd 1990 (cited under Psychology (*De anima* and *Mantissa*)). Some scholars consider the whole of the *Quaestiones* to be of doubtful attribution. Against the authenticity of *Quaestio* 2.21 see Fazzo and Zonta 1998 (cited under *On Providence*): 257–259; Sharples 2000 states that neither the authenticity nor the inauthenticity of the *quaestio* can be easily proven. Alexander’s undisputed writings are distinguished by their theoretical and terminological consistency. The authors of some spurious texts have been detected (see Endress 1972, Zimmermann 1994 (cited under Arabic Reception), and Hasnawi 1994).

**Endress, Gerhard. 1972. *Proclus Arabus. Beirut Texts and Studies* 10. Wiesbaden, Germany: F. Steiner.**

Endress detects parts of Proclus *Elementa Theologiae* as a source of parts D29 (see Dietrich 1964, cited under Arabic Reception) and of other Arabic texts attributed to Alexander; he further analyzes Greek texts. Follow up in Zimmermann 1994 (cited under Arabic Reception).

**Hasnawi, Ahmed. 1994. Alexandre d’Aphrodise vs Jean Philopon: notes sur quelques traités d’Alexandre “perdus” en grec, conservés en arabe. *Arabic Sciences and Philosophy* 4:53–109.**

Hasnawi identifies Philoponus *De aeternitate mundi* as the actual source of the Arabic text D16 attributed to Alexander on creatio ex nihilo.

**Kapetanaki, Sophia, and Robert W. Sharples. 2006. *Pseudo-Aristoteles (Pseudo-Alexander), Supplementa Problematorum*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.**

The first edition of a collection of the whole of the spurious *Problemata* transmitted as Alexander's in at least a part of the manuscript tradition.

**Luna, Concetta. 2001. Les commentaires de Syrianus et du Ps. Alexandre sur la Métaphysique. Essai de mise au point. In *Trois études sur la tradition des commentaires anciens à la Métaphysique d'Aristote*. By Luna Concetta, 1–71, 197–112. Leiden, The Netherlands, and Boston: Brill.**

Further developing on a contribution by Karl Praechter, Luna identifies Michael of Ephesus as the author of the commentary by the so-called pseudo-Alexander *On Metaphysics* books 6–14, printed in CAG 1.440–837. Appendix III offers a relevant tool, pointing out recurrent features in Michael's lexicon.

**Salis, Rita. 2005. *Il commento di pseudo-Alessandro al libro Lambda della «Metafisica» di Aristotele*. Soveria Mannelli.**

Italian translation and analysis of the CAG 1 commentary (see CAG Editions (Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca)) on Aristotle's *Metaphysics* Lambda, probably the work of Michael of Ephesus.

**Sharples, Robert W. 2000. Alexander of Aphrodisias Quaestio 2.21: A question of authenticity. *Elenchos* 21:361–379.**

Based on some statistic tools introduced by Sharples, the authenticity of the *Quaestio* 2.21 can not be either disproven or proven.

**Sharples, Robert W. 2003. Pseudo-Alexander on Aristotle, "Metaphysics" Λ. In *Alessandro di Afrodísia e la "Metafisica" di Aristotele*. Edited by Giancarlo Movia, 187–218. Milan: Vita e Pensiero.**

Without rejecting the identification of pseudo-Alexander with Michael of Ephesus (see Luna 2001) Sharples denies that the author had at his disposal either Alexander's commentary or his *scripta minora* in their whole, showing that he must be later than Simplicius; he is influenced by Platonism but does not regard himself as Platonist. He is more neo-Aristotelian than neo-Platonist.

---

## Alexander's Reception

Alexander's commentaries and his independent works, all of which are closely related to Aristotle's texts, were transmitted and translated at every major step in Aristotle's transmission and translation, from late Antiquity, through Syriac translations and Byzantine renaissance, until the Arabic Middle Ages and Italian Renaissance. Especially striking case studies of Alexander's commentary among later commentators are discussed under Lost Commentary On *On Generation and Corruption*; on Alexander as a source of Asclepius's commentary *On the Metaphysics* see Luna 2001. Alexander's positions concerning Universals was repeatedly questioned. The immortality of the soul was probably the most debated issue, holding as reference a short and controversial Greek text *De intellectu* (*Mantissa* 106.18–113.24) attributed to Alexander. Its reception deeply affected Latin Reception and Arabic Reception. Here as in many other cases, transmission of writings attributed to Alexander is complicated, and their authenticity often uncertain (see Spuria and Questioned Attributions).

**Luna, Concetta. 2001. Alexandre d'Aphrodise et Syrianus comme sources du commentaire d'Asclepius (with Appendixes VI-VI). In *Trois études sur la tradition des commentaires anciens à la Métaphysique d'Aristote*. 99–190 (in part. 99–141). By Concetta Luna, 218–223. Leiden, The Netherlands, and Boston: Brill.**

Alexander's commentary is shown to play a substantial role contributing at least one-third of Asclepius's commentary; this happened by way of two paths: Alexander is a source both for Ammonius's oral teaching on the *Metaphysics*, as recorded by Asclepius; and for verbatim sections extracted by Asclepius.

## Arabic Reception

Thanks especially to Common Features of Alexander's Writings, Alexander was first intensely translated into Syriac (6th century, remarkably by Sergius of Resh'ayna, see the debate about the text of Alexander's *On the Principles of the Universe*), then more widely into Arabic. The movement began in the 9th century within the circle of the philosopher al-Kindī, when the first adaptation into Arabic of Greek philosophy took place (see Endress 1972, cited under Spuria and Questioned Attributions). Alexander's writing, like Proclus's writing (see Zimmermann 1994), was subject to a process of revision for the sake of al-Kindī's own philosophical agenda (see Fazzo and Wiesner 1993). Arabic translations from Alexander greatly contributed to fix a standard Greek-into-Arabic lexicon and a trend in translation (see Gutas 1998). To the extent Syriac versions, or reconstructions of them, can contribute to the establishment or reconstruction of the Greek exemplar is an open issue (see Fazzo and Zonta 2014 cited under Arabic Translations). The Syrio-Arabic version of Alexander's lost commentary on *Metaphysics* 12 is the source of Averroes's Grand Commentary to that book (see Primavesi and Di Giovanni 2016, and Fazzo and Zonta 2016 cited under Metaphysics). Arabic translations of works by Alexander, or attributed to him, are listed by Dietrich 1964 and van Ess 1966. Thillet 1984 (cited under General Overviews) is out of date but still useful. Free adaptations from the Greek Alexander together with misattributed theories and texts concur to shape the "Arabus Alexander" as a distinctive philosophical authority (see Fazzo 1997; and Fazzo 2002 (cited under Life).

**Dietrich, Albert. 1964. Die arabische Version einer unbekanntenen Schrift des Alexander von Aphrodisias über die Differentia specifica. *Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen Philologisch-historische Klasse*:85–148.**

Provides the first available list of preserved Arabic translations of works by Alexander, or attributed to him. Supplemented by van Ess 1966. Items are henceforth labeled as "D1," "D2," "D3" and so on, according to their numbering and position in Dietrich's list. Notice that some of the writings turned out to be misattributed, and not by Alexander; some turned out to split in different original texts—see, for example, Zimmermann 1994—some have been shown to be rather adaptations than entirely literal translations of the corresponding Greek text.

**Endress, Gerhard. 2002. Alexander Arabus on the first cause: Aristotle's first mover in an Arabic treatise attributed to Alexander of Aphrodisias. In *Aristotele e Alessandro di Afrodizia nella tradizione araba*. Edited by Cristina D'Ancona and Giuseppe Serra, 38–41. Padua, Italy: Il Poligrafo.**

Endress has comments on the overall meaning and interpretation of the corpus of writings in Arabic attributed to Alexander, including the alleged writings against Galen. Critical edition and analysis of the Arabic text *On the First Cause* (vE 35, see van Ess 1966) at 62–74, 49–54.

**Fazzo, Silvia. 1997. L'Alexandre Arabe et la génération à partir du néant. In *Perspectives arabes et médiévales sur la tradition scientifique et philosophique grecque. Actes du Colloque de la SIHSPAI, Paris, 31 mars – 3 avril 1993*. Edited by Hasnawi, Elamrani, Jamal, and Aouad, 277–287. Paris and Leuven, Belgium: Peeters.**

The authenticity of D16 on creatio ex nihilo questioned (see further developments in Hasnawi 1994, cited under Spuria and Questioned Attributions). Label "Arabus Alexander" first introduced, with reference to distinctive features of Alexander's alleged writings in Arabic: defense of Aristotle and of philosophy as a whole. A paper presented at the 1993 SIHSPAI Conference in Paris.

**Fazzo, Silvia, and Hillary Wiesner. 1993. Alexander of Aphrodisias in the Kindī-circle and in al-Kindī's cosmology. *Arabic Sciences and Philosophy* 3:119–153.**

The paper detects, in the most ancient versions of Alexander's texts, a sort of typical circularity: Alexander's versions are adapted to the interests of the al-Kindī circle (especially in astrology), while al-Kindī's own writings freely incorporated material drawn from this Arabic (that

is, Arabized) Alexander.

**Gutas, Dimitri. 1998. *Greek thought, Arabic culture: The Graeco-Arabic translation movement in Baghdad and early 'Abbasid society*. London and New York.**

A standard reference work on the transmission of Greek culture into Arabic.

**Primavesi, Oliver, and Matteo Di Giovanni. 2016. Who wrote Alexander's Commentary on *Metaphysics* Λ? New light on the Syro-Arabic tradition. In *Aristotle's "Metaphysics" Lambda: New Essays*. Proceedings of the thirteenth conference of the Karl and Gertrud-Abel Foundation Bonn, November, 28th–December 1st, 2010. Edited by Christoph Horn, 11–66. Berlin and New York: De Gruyter.**

Article argues that Averroes's introduction to *Metaphysics* Lambda while ultimately drawing from the Syro-Arabic translation of Alexander of Aphrodisias's introduction, had an intermediate source, different from Alexander, who adjusted its content to the Arabic *Metaphysics* as circulating before Averroes's times (starting with book Alpha Elatton). For a different reading see Fazzo and Zonta 2016 (cited under *Metaphysics*).

**van Ess, Joseph. 1966. Über einige neue Fragmente des Alexander von Aphrodisias und des Proklos in arabischer Übersetzung. *Der Islam* 42:148–168.**

A supplement to the list in Dietrich 1964 of preserved Arabic translations of Greek works by Alexander, or attributed to Alexander. Items are henceforth labeled as "vE1," "vE2," "vE3," and so on. Both lists are reviewed in Goulet and Aouad 1989 (cited under General Overviews) and Fazzo 2003.

**Zimmermann, Friederich W. 1994. Proclus Arabus rides again. *Arabic Sciences and Philosophy* 4:9–51.**

Zimmermann detects Proclus, *Elementa Theologiae*, as a source of D29 (see Dietrich 1964) and Arabic texts attributed to Alexander, following Endress 1972 (cited under Spuria and Questioned Attributions). Zimmermann analyzes the way Greek texts underwent Arabic adaptation among the al-Kindī circle of translators.

## Latin Reception

Most of Alexander's extant commentaries and independent works were translated into Latin, and published more than once. *De intellectu* was firstly translated into Arabic and underwent its own *fortuna* in the Middle Ages and in the Renaissance. Latin versions from Alexander or attributed to him are overviewed in Cranz 1960 and in Cranz 1971. Verde 2015 shows that Alexander is one of Macrobius's sources.

**Cranz, Ferdinand E. 1960. Alexander of Aphrodisias. In *Catalogus Translationum et Commentariorum*. Vol. 1. Edited by Paul Oskar Kristeller, 77–135. Washington, DC: The Catholic Univ. of America Press.**

A learned companion to Latin Aristotelian literature in the Middle Ages and in the Renaissance, insofar as it arose from Alexander's works.

**Cranz, Ferdinand E. 1971. Addenda et Corrigenda. In *Catalogus Translationum et Commentariorum*. Vol. 2. Edited by Paul Oskar Kristeller, 411–422. Washington, DC: The Catholic Univ. of America Press.**

A substantial supplement to Cranz 1960.

**Verde, Francesco. 2015. "Kepos" e "Peripatos" a partire dal II libro "Sulla natura" di Epicuro: la testimonianza di Macrobio. In *Epicurus on eidola. Peri phuseos book II Update, proposals, and discussions*. Edited by F. Guadalupe Masi and S. Maso, 151–170. Amsterdam: Hakkert.**

Macrobius's account on Epicurus's theory of vision is shown to rely on Peripatetic sources, with special reference to Alexander's *Mantissa* and commentary *In De sensu* and to pseudo-Alexander *Problemata* edited as *Supplementa problematorum* in Kapetanaki and Sharples 2006 (cited under Spuria and Questioned Attributions).

---

## Alexander as a Textual Source

Alexandrian materials are in use in reconstruction of lost works, either by Aristotle or from the philosophical tradition, by Presocratics, Stoics, and Peripatetics; and also in editions of Aristotle's works, where Alexander complements direct manuscript sources. Method is often an open issue (see Bloch 2003), where priority is given to Alexander's discussed variant readings, as opposed to other parts of his commentary, which do not spell out the extent of the quotation. Kotwick 2016 and Primavesi 2012 show that Alexander may have had an influence on the manuscript tradition of Aristotle's *Metaphysics*. This is strongly suggested by Fazzo 2017 as well (cited under the Tradition of Alexander's Commentaries). Based on Alexander, the reconstruction of Aristotle's lost *De ideis* is dealt with by Harlfinger 1975 (cited under the Tradition of Alexander's Commentaries). Skepticism on Alexander as a source of Aristotle's lost *De bono* is discussed in Isnardi Parente 2000.

**Bloch, David. 2003. Alexander of Aphrodisias as a textual witness. The commentary on the De Sensu. *Cahiers de l'Institut du Moyen-Âge grec et latin* 74:1–38.**

For a planned edition of Aristotle's *De sensu*, Alexander's commentary is a source especially when commenting on variant readings.

**Isnardi Parente, Margherita. 2000. Alessandro di Afrodisia e il ΠΕΡΙ ΤΑΓΑΘΟΥ di Aristotele. In *La filosofia in età imperiale*. Edited by Aldo Brancacci, 245–270. Naples, Italy: Bibliopolis.**

According to Cherniss and Moraux, Alexander still could use Aristotle's *De bono* (περί ἀγαθοῦ) (as he used the *De ideis*) in order to clarify passages from the *Metaphysics*. In fact, according to Isnardi Parente, Alexander was possibly based on a late Neopythagorean version of Aristotle's original text περί ἀγαθοῦ.

**Kotwick, Mirjam. 2016. Alexander of Aphrodisias and the text of Aristotle's Metaphysics. *California Classical Studies* 4.**

A milestone concerning the use of Alexander for the sake of Aristotle's critical edition. Aristotle's manuscripts apparently splitting in two branches, Kotwick shows that these do not antecede Alexander, and that his commentary affected the entire manuscript tradition of the *Metaphysics*.

**Primavesi, Oliver. 2012. Aristotle, Metaphysics A. A new critical edition with introduction. In *Aristotle's Metaphysics Alpha: Symposium Aristotelicum*. Edited by Carlos Steel, 387–516. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press.**

An edition of *Metaphysics* Alpha which takes into account Alexander's commentary as a possible source for variant readings. Primavesi gives full reference of Alexander's referred passages and a comprehensive list of them (p. 407).

back to top

4/27/2018

Alexander of Aphrodisias - Classics - Oxford Bibliographies

You are browsing courtesy of: **OUP-USA Mirror**

Copyright © 2018. All rights reserved.