the human constitution (chapter 9); the use of wine as a remedy by physicians from the Hippocratics until late antiquity (chapter 10); the connection between the nature of man and the nature of the universe (chapter 11); and melancholy and the humoral theory (chapter 12). As a whole, these six essays locate central Hippocratic notions in the context of Greek philosophy from the pre-Socratic to late antiquity. The influence, so J. J. explains, was reciprocal and often unexpected.

The first chapter of the third section discusses the adaptation of Hippocratic medical ethics by Galen. J.J. pursues two avenues: the first concerns the presence of ethical notions in Galen's commentaries of Hippocratic treatises; the second looks into the impact of Hippocrates in shaping Galen's image of an ideal physician.The second chapter relates to Galen's concept of nature. Here J.J. undertakes a philological examination of Galen's use of the term *fusis* or *kata fusin*. The second part of this chapter deals with Galen's attempts to retrace the evolution of the concept of nature to his own day. The chapter concludes with an explanation of Galen's use of the term *fusikos*, as an observer of the works of nature.

The final two chapters discuss the legacy of the Hippocratic treatise *The Nature of Man*. The first (chapter 15) does so through the prism of Galen's commentary; the second examines the legacy of the theory of the four humours more broadly.

To conclude, these sixteen articles offer a considerable addition to the English-reader interested in Hippocratic medicine. The translations read well. The *indices* (one for general names and one for passages cited) are well-organized and useful. The editor's choice of the articles included has resulted in a comprehensive, but focused volume. At its core stands the Hippocratic corpus and throughout the overall theme of setting this corpus in its intellectual context is never lost.

Ido Israelowich Tel Aviv University

Leonardo Tarán and Dimitri Gutas, *Aristotle* Poetics *Editio Maior of the Greek Text with Historical Introductions and Philological Commentaries*, Leiden: Brill, 2012. xii + 519 pp. + indices. ISBN 978-90-04-21740-9.

Harboured between the lines of the innocent-looking list of sigla on page 161 of the 2012 *editio maior* of the Greek text of Aristotle's *Poetics* (hence Ari. *Po.*) is a universe of learning, an exemplary collaboration between the Classicist Leonardo Tarán and the Arabist Dimitri Gutas, and the fruits of their herculean untangling and rearranging of the threads of the Greek text of the *Poetics*. Behind the scenes of this list of sigla is a fascinating net of narratives recounting the circumstances of the production and transmission of the primary witnesses to Ari. *Po.* and their relations with other manuscripts and testimonies, all within a bewildering array of historical, cultural and philological contexts. This volume is not only highly learned, but also highly instructive, two qualities which one often meets in mutually exclusive scholarly settings, two qualities here successfully blended to produce a volume accessible and illuminating first and foremost to scholars and students of Greek, of Arabic, of textual transmission and of translation technique, but also to those of the Aristotelian corpus, of poetics in antiquity, of the revival of classics in the Renaissance, and of the transfer of cultural materials.

Although I deliberately avoid reproducing an extended table of contents, it is necessary to say at the outset something about the structure of the volume, in order to clarify that the review will focus almost entirely on the introductory part, and within it only on selected points. The volume has three major parts: (1) the bulk is taken up by a 160-page Introduction divided into three chapters on the history of the work in the West, in the East, and a very detailed account of the manuscripts, culminating in the stemma codicum and sigla (there is also a stemma codicum of the

Syro-Arabic tradition tucked away on p. 110); (2) the Greek text based on renewed readings taking all of the scholarship and sources available into account, and well documented in the running critical apparatus; and (3) an exegetical part, with about 80 pages of notes prepared by Tarán and about 170 by Gutas which are accompanied by a critical apparatus. At the end of this part is an appendix with an interlinear analysis of the opening lines of the Arabic *Poetics* comparing the version in manuscript Ar., in Badawi's text of Avicenna's interpretative paraphrase in his *Cure* (Doc. 3, discussed by Gutas, 103-104, and by Tarán, 148), and in Salīm's text of Averroes' *Middle Commentary*. These are supplied with an English translation, and the Greek wording (perhaps the first time in the history of edition of the Greek [or Arabic] text of the Ari. *Po.* that we are offered an interlinear Greek and Arabic, albeit of a small passage only) and a discussion by Gutas: this may be a good place for the Classicist to take his first bite of the *Poetics* as it evolved in the Arabic *Nachleben*, so he or she may get a taste, through the texts, of what happens to terms such as μῦθος and ποίησις. The reference section includes a very full bibliography and is rich with indices (about 25 pages of Greek words in the Ari. *Po.*, and somewhat shorter indices of names, subjects, Greek and Latin mss, and Arabic and Syriac mss.).

Aristotelian scholars are invited to enter into the fray and take a stand on the arguments promoted or refuted by Tarán in the 'History of the Text of the *Po.*' (3-76), where, among other things, he sets out the taxonomy of texts within Aristotle's *oeuvre*, or where he opts for a certain path of survival of Aristotle during different periods in a range of cultural spheres, and certain stations in his retrospective of Aristotle's *Nachleben*. Experts in the historical and cultural sources in Late Antiquity and the Medieval East are beckoned to analyze Gutas' cutting-edge presentation of the Syriac and Arabic testimonies and documents which inform his narrative of the genesis and evolution of Ari. *Po.* in the East. I cannot overemphasize the importance, for the establishment of the Greek text, of Tarán and Gutas' presentation, in the excursive, detailed, and informative manner which they have adopted; their presentation is not only important for the establishment of the *editio*, but also for equipping readers of this *editio* with a trustworthy account of the evidence leading them to accept the readings of the two editors or to make informed active readings and assessments of these and other *lectiones* of this difficult text.

The primary witnesses

There are four primary witnesses — each being an 'extant manuscript or translation that does not depend on any other extant manuscript or translation' of Ari. *Po.*, as confirmed by Tarán and Gutas (4, n. 2, with *caveats*). Two of the primary witnesses are Greek manuscripts, (1) *codex Parisinus Graecus* 1741 (= A), from the second half of the tenth century, and (2) *codex Riccardianus* 46 (= B), generally — and including Rudolf Kassel — dated to the fourteenth century; Tarán adopts the early dating very recently proposed by Davide Baldi, to the middle of the twelfth century on paleographical grounds (detailed discussion in Tarán's prolegomena, 141).[1] The other two witnesses are translations, whose Greek *Vorlagen*, due to the literal nature of the translations, are sometimes identifiable — even through the added filter of an intermediary language — to the extent that they may reflect and testify to a reading in the Greek manuscript from which the translation was made: (3) the Latin translation completed by William of Moerbeke in 1278 and preserved in two manuscripts from the end of the thirteenth and the cusp of the fourteenth century (= Lat.), and (4) the Arabic translation by Abū Bišr Mattā b. Yūnus (dated mid-tenth century) of an earlier (ninth century), non-extant Syriac version of the original Greek,

1 Davide Baldi, 'Il catalogo dei codici greci della Bibliotheca Riccardiana', *Studi e ricerche del Dipartimento di Filologia e Storia* 1 (2010), 1139-175. Idem, 'Nuova luce sul Riccardiano 46', *Medioevo Greco* 11 (2011), 13-22.

preserved in *Parisinus Arabus* 2346 from the eleventh century (= Ar.). In his chapter of the Introduction, Gutas gives a very full report of this primary witness and of its relation to the other four documents which he takes into account; he concludes (100) that Abū Bišr could not be translating into Arabic from the Syriac version of which there is a surviving fragment (Doc. 1), and (102) that the primary witness itself, Ar. (Doc. 2), is a corrupt copy of a much cleaner one Abū Bišr prepared a century earlier. Gutas offers a full description of his proposed scenario of the transmission of Ar. and its stemmatic interrelations (108-109), with references (108, n. 70) to the scenarios of Margoliouth, Tkatsch, Heinrich, Dahiyat and Hugonnard-Roche, and the stemma (110).

Witnesses A and B have been part of the modern tradition since the revival of the Ari. *Po.* in the West, and the witness dubbed Ar. has been referred to since the mid-nineteenth century — when it was still identified as *Bibl. Royale* no. 882 A (the *prōtos heuretēs* is reinstated by Gutas in his introductory chapter (111) as Johannes Wenrich, in a noteworthy mention of this scholar)[2] and was recognized by the best modern editions of the Greek text, who relied, however, on the modern Latin renditions of David Margoliouth and Jaroslav Tkatsch, as well as on Arabist colleagues as ad hoc informants, such as Johannes Vahlen featuring Eduard Sachau, or Rudolf Kassel ft. Richard Walzer, to name only two such duos. The problems and pitfalls of these partnerships and the second-hand reliance by Classicists such as Samuel Butcher and Ingram Bywater in their editions are described by Gutas in scholarly detail as well as with pathos, clemency, and literary panache (see e.g. 111-114). In a key passage (120) Gutas champions the necessity and importance of the Syro-Arabic transmission to the establishment of the best Greek text of Ari. *Po.*

Translations, language variation, and establishment of texts

Tarán and Gutas, when speaking of the witnesses Lat. or Ar., are the first to remind the reader of the fact that the translations of the Ari. *Po.* are 'not equivalents to Greek manuscripts' (5) — a *caveat* each of them repeats on a number of occasions throughout the work. Just one such occasion is part of the exemplary and cautious discussion by Tarán (136) of the relationship between Moerbeke's Latin and the underlying Greek: 'although Latin is grammatically and syntactically close to Greek, it is not the same as having a Greek manuscript.' I would add that the grammatical and syntactic differences in fact are generally underrated, and there is much to learn from studies of the subtleties of Greek-into-Latin translation technique; and in the case of Syriac and Arabic, too, Semitists and experts in translation technique have taught about distinctions and *differentiae* which would somewhat temper Tarán's emphasizing that they are 'very close to one another' (146). Even internally there are diachronic and synchronic distinctions in Greek and Arabic: within Greek, Gutas mentions (120) the gap between seventh-century Greek spoken by agents of the transmission and between Classical Greek, as well as making passing references to the varieties of Arabic, and more extensive reference to 'translation grammar' and the features of the translators' Arabic, and on possible fallout for the transmission of the text.

Finally, there are lessons the reader of this volume may learn from Tarán (e.g. 135-139, especially 138-139) and from Gutas (egg. 120 and 121 n. 84), on the value of "the good, the bad and the ugly (or the literal)" in the translations of Moerbeke and Abū Bišr, respectively.

---

2 Johann Georg Wenrich, 1842. *De auctorum graecorum versionibus et commentariis syriacis, arabicis, armeniacis persicisque commentatio*, Leipzig: F.C.G. Vogel. Gutas is right to put Wenrich before the more famous Ernst Renan, who may have received more credit for this innovation (for whose distribution he was indeed more responsible).

Recovering the lost underlying texts

Tarán (in chapter 3, 'Prolegomena to the Edition of the Text') walks the reader through Minio-Paluello's scholarship and his own (see below) to tease out the Greek *Vorlage* Φ through the filter of Moerbeke's Latin; Gutas likewise (in chapter 2, 'The Poetics in Syriac and Arabic Transmission') navigates the reader through the Syriac and Arabic layers back to what they may reveal of the lost Greek *Vorlage* Σ, with Ar. thus leading, albeit through two intermediary languages and copy revisions, to readings from the earliest witness (antedating the mid-ninth century, when the Syriac translation was probably made).

The symbiotic relationship between the Greek Ari. *Po.* and its Arabic tradition may be seen to be reflected not only in the fact that the primary witness possibly leading to the earliest Greek *Vorlage* so far, Σ, is one that survives in Arabic, Ar. Another expression of this symbiosis may be seen in the fact that the Western world's scant familiarity with the Ari. *Po.* until the Renaissance revival was derived from the Latin version of Averroes' *Middle Commentary* made by Hermanus Alemannus in 1256 (e.g. 37, 39).[3] Yet another expression is incarnated in the volume under review: the *editio maior* of 2012 could not have been produced without the active collaboration between a Classicist and an Arabist.

In addition to the four primary witnesses, which are those already recognized by Kassel in his 1965 edition of the Greek text, there are other important witnesses, some already in the sigla of Kassel (including the lost Greek manuscripts from which the translated witnesses Lat. and Ar. were made — Φ and Σ respectively). Tarán and Gutas include *Parisinus Graecus* 2038 from the fifteenth century, as well as inferred readings from a later Arabic paraphrase by Avicenna which Gutas shows comes from a Greek manuscript (labeled Ψ by Gutas), distinct from Σ on which primary witness Ar. stands, as well as evidence from the thirteenth century Syriac paraphrase based on Avicenna's eleventh century Arabic paraphrase *Cure*, Nicolaus the Damscene, and other sources, namely the *Cream of Wisdom* by Barhebraeus.

In the simplified and selective outline of the life and times of the text of Ari. *Po.* I have tried to sketch in this review the reader is introduced to a very partial dramatis personae of the complex web of agents in the narrative which Tarán and Gutas set out in a learned, thorough, judicious, and readable form.

The 2012 *editio* in context

Most uninitiated readers of Ari. *Po.* are familiar with the text, in the good case, through the 1965 edition of Kassel, the first to take account of all four of these primary witnesses, even if such readers have followed Kassel in privileging witness A (as described in detail by Tarán [153], and which I would add is confessed by Kassel in the *incipit* of his own description of A in the *praefatio* of his edition: *Parisinus … amissa tyrannide principatum retinet*). Kassel nonetheless heeded the readings suggested through Moerbeke's Latin, accepting it as a witness for readings in the lost Greek model Φ, a 'Greek minuscule manuscript from which Moerbeke translated'. Kassel was at an advantage over previous editors, being in a position to profit from the 1953 edition of Lat. by Lorenzo Minio-Paluello, who also reported elaborately (already in 1947 prior to the

3 Studied and contextualized by Lorenzo Minio-Paluello in a volume edited by E. Valgimigli which he revised, appearing in the volume's bibliography under the entry for Moerbeke (1968): *Aristoteles Latinus*, XXXIII. *De Arte Poetica*.

edition of Kassel)[4] on the identity of the translator, and on his translation technique, thus clearing the path for making the most of this Latin version in order to evince readings of the lost Greek.

The Ari. *Po.* is a challenging text philologically as well as taxonomically; one of the important contributions of this new edition is the presentation of these problems. On other occasions, Dimitri Gutas has written about the ongoing open problems of editing Aristotle,[5] as well as an excursus on editorial techniques for Graeco-Arabic texts in the context of his *editio* of Theophrastus' *On the First Principles*.[6] Gutas refers to these programmatic pieces in the volume under review, and both he and Tarán include many reflective passages throughout the volume, which any philologist intending to prepare an *editio* or to read one critically would do well to heed.

A rewarding bounty the reader is offered is the narrative exposition of the history of the text of Ari. *Po.*; Tarán's introduction begins with the place of *Po.* in the Aristotelian corpus and the post-Aristotelian scholarly setting up until the archetype of the text (4-34), then all the way up to modern editions (35-66). The readers, both students and scholars, have much to learn, and ample evidence and arguments are provided for the reader to further pursue questions such as archetype vs. open text (7),[7] formation, organization, formal features and pagination of the corpus (8-11), the fate of Aristotle's library (25-27) and its availability in the Hellenistic age (28-29), the contents of the Organon and other parts of the corpus, their nature (published and notes) and its relation to the vagaries of the biodoxographical tradition in both its Greek and Arabic transmissions (12-21), and the archetype (35) for which Tarán supports a possibly much earlier date than Irigoin's sixth century.[8] The evidence and arguments given here are very detailed and at the same time perspicuous to the student; it is however the mandate of experts of Ari. to assess Tarán's stand on Düring's interpretations of Ari.'s biography (12),[9] on the extant evidence of the typology within Ari.'s *oeuvre* (13-17), and, most saliently, an inventory and analysis of Ari.'s cross-references to his own works (17-21)[10] and in particular to the *Po.* (20), for example with recourse to the use of the perfect tense (which raises the incidental but interesting question whether the perfect is already a narrative tense in the time of Ari.) and to the style (21-23).

As Tarán leads us, in a breathtaking read, through the history and fate of the *Po.* in the West until the present, he folds in much more than the data essential for establishing the text which other editors sometimes provide in a sterile and mechanical way; following the path of true Classical philology, aspects ostensibly included for added value ought to be considered vital for the full picture. There is much here to benefit students of classics, philosophy, renaissance studies,

---

4 Lorenzo Minio-Paluello, 'Guglielmo di Moerbeke traduttore della Poetica di Aristotele (1278)', *Rivista di Filosofia Neo-Scolastica* 39 (1947), 1-17.

5 Dimitri Gutas, 2012, 'The Letter before the Spirit: Still Editing Aristotle after 2,300 Years', in: *The Letter Before the Spirit*, ed. Aafke von Oppenraay, Leiden: Brill, 11-36.

6 Dimitri Gutas, *Theophrastus on the First Principles (known as his Metaphysics). Greek Text and Medieval Arabic Translation, Edited and Translated*, ... Leiden: Brill, 2010, 93-101.

7 Following the definition of an archetype (7, n. 25) as 'a MS, extant or not, from which, directly or indirectly, all etant MS, relevant translations, etc. depend'.

8 Significant mistakes common to all four primary witnesses show that the archetype, dubbed Ω (= Λ in Kassel) was majuscule, *scriptio continua*, with no word spaces, accents, and almost no punctuation. Tarán antedates this archetype, possibly to a period as early as the fourth century, not necessarily in codex form, but probably already severed from the transmission of the rest of the Aristotelian corpus.

9 Although it is important to be informed of Düring's and Moreaux' lack of awareness of the Arabic version of Ptolemy's *Life of Aristotle* (14).

10 With an interesting discussion of the term πραγματεία (18-19), and a sensitive interpretation (21) of κείσθω at 1456a34-6 in a polemical rather than temporal use.

literary theory, poetics, and translation technique. As a case in point, I pause over section 5 'From the Fifteenth to the Eighteenth Century' (38-61). The reader is introduced to the para-Aristotelian conception of poetics, and in this Tarán ensures that the reader who does not approach Ari. *Po.* from the aspect of poetic theory does not lose sight of the importance of this work for the tradition of that theory and its terminological apparatus. In particular, the reader is introduced to the scholarship of Weinberg on poetics in the Renaissance, which I found vital.[11] This may seem to be "peripheral" to the hard core of background data essential for establishing a text based on primary witnesses through digging back as early as possible, as well as "peripheral" to the 'absolutely essential' contribution of Graeco-Arabic, and Syriac, philology. But time and again both Tarán and Gutas show us how late and indirect testimony, and how meta-textual information also contribute to the establishment of the text. I do agree that the *pièce de résistance* of this state-of-the-art edition is the Syro-Arabic tradition and its expert application through reciprocal and active collaboration of the two editors and I concur with Gutas' dictum at the close of his introduction (128): 'The medieval Arabic translations of Ancient Greek texts represent the last untapped resource in the continuing quest, since the Renaissance, for their ever more critical editions.' It is also true that the whole picture demands a deeper and broader understanding (not only by Arabists, but by Classicists as well) of the itinerary made by the text in the Western tradition, and the cultural and scholarly landscape in which Ari. *Po.* wandered and erred until it slowly confined itself within the cozy comforts of an exclusive loyalty to witness A, so that not only Vahlen was left 'groping about in the fog' vis-à-vis the Arabic witness, but even Kassel, who incorporated all four primary witnesses, still privileged the testimony of A. Thus, it is the contribution of both experts which make this integrative project so rewarding.

Featured episodes

By walking the contemporary reader — whether he or she be more a philosopher or a literary theorist — through the millennia-deep multi-lingual tradition, each of the co-authors, in discussing the materials of his expertise as well as integrating those of his collaborator, complements the presentation of his partner in the concerted effort to build a fuller picture. I will bring three instances from many thought-provoking and stimulating sections of this rich canvas: (1) In chapter two of the introductory part, Gutas translates and contextualizes eighteen Testimonies, passages which refer to Ari. *Po.*, most of them in Arabic, but including two epistolary passages in Syriac written by the eighth-ninth centuries Baghdad Patriarch Timothy I. Testimonies 4 and 5 are presented to the readers — Classicists and many Arabists — to whom they are otherwise inaccessible, with enough background and philological argument[12] in order to contribute to the readers' understanding of evidence about the components of the Organon and context theory; about the lost book on poetics (81); and about the second part of Ari. *Po.* on Comedy (83). All of the testimonies, including the well-known Arabic ones, merit a rereading, and aside from Gutas' convenient listing, the presentation of these sources in a manner user-friendly to Classicists is an important one. Gutas has much to offer in his analyses: just an example may be

---

11 Bernard Weinberg, 1961. *A History of Literary Criticism in the Italian Renaissance*, vol. I, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, especially chapter 9, 'The Tradition of Aristotle's *Poetics*: Discovery and Exegesis', 349-423.

12 Gutas introduces to the non-initiated reader important subtleties in the wording of the original, thus equipping him or her with tools to reassess the issue at hand (two examples: discussion [84] the difference between what I would call the unmarked term *me'mrā* ['chapter' and 'treatise'] vs. *ktābā* ['treatise']; or *aulētrides* in Timothy's Syriac epistle (87) and its bearing on chronology and knowledge of Greek).

furnished by what the classicist may learn from his discussions of Testimonies 8 and 9, that Ḥunayn b. Isḥāq was 'completely unaware of the definition of tragedy in the *Po.* in either Greek or Syriac', and, following Schreier, attributing Ḥunayn's conception of these notions to the Galenic channel rather than to that of Ari. *Po.*[13] Isḥāq b. Ḥunayn, for his part, not only was aware of the Aristotelian definition, but was one of its translators. This discussion by Gutas of these two testimonies in tandem should be kept in mind by the professional Classicist and the intellectual alike when reading the famous — and perhaps most popularly familiar — modern reference to the *Po.*, which as it so happens discusses its Arabic version, namely the playful tale told by Jorge Luis Borges. (2) In this same chapter, in the section 'Documentary Evidence' (91-106), the reader is served much learning; scholars of classics and Semitists alike are in for one of the many philological treats offered by Tarán and Gutas throughout the volume, in the discussion of document 1 (a lone passage of the Syriac translation — on the definition of tragedy — surviving in a fragment embedded in a thirteenth-century work); here (99-100) Gutas analyzes and compares the renditions of ὄψις at 1449b33 in order to add evidence to the argument that this Syriac version is not the same as that on which the primary witness Ar. rests; the reader learns (104) from document 3 (an interpretive paraphrase of *Po.* by Avicenna from the eleventh century) about an additional lost Greek source named Ψ by Gutas, about the layers of revision of the Arabic rendition, and that although in this document, the *Cure*, Avicenna did have access to the Arabic of Ari. *Po.*, he did not have it in the earlier stages when he also wrote about poetics. (3) Tarán in chapter 3 of the Introduction opens a window for the reader into the thick of the activity in the philologist's workshop, taking us by the hand as he works his way back from witness A (described in 129-135) to its precursors: the Greek model Φ of Moerbeke's Latin version (135-139) — staunchly defending Minio-Paluello's evaluation and linguistic acumen against Irigoin (136 n. 34 says it all!), and capping the section with such a stimulating précis of Minio-Paluello's analysis of Moerbeke's translation technique that I rushed to read the article (quoted in n. 4 of this review). Tarán includes (138-139) four beautiful cultural "mis"-translations which, as one discovers, only after reading Minio-Paluello, are Tarán's own additions, contributed with modesty. Tarán's step-by-step exposition of readings shared by A and Φ lead us to family Π, contrasted with readings in ms. B, lead even the philologically uninitiated in a very convincing manner back to the predecessor Ξ, and in a richly argued stepwise process all the way back to the archetype. This section may be a showpiece of how to establish a text in a sobre yet stimulating way.

Open questions

A review of the readings and their exegesis, as set out in the second and third parts of this volume, demands discussion which perhaps is outside the scope of the review genre, each passage of this pivotal text raising so many questions on different levels. Some of these return to recurring aspects of a broader nature. One such aspect which recurs in the discussions of both co-authors in the Introduction (e.g. 32, 35, 103) is the importance of the "linguistic" sections of the Ari. *Po.*, chapters 20 and 21: this is only one of a collection of questions raised in this volume, which deserve studies of their own, launched by the state-of-the-art introduction, text, and notes, and in this particular instance, the readers would be helped along by references to linguistics-based readings of the text, such as those of Haiim B. Rosén.[14] Another aspect alluded to (17) and

---

13 O.J. Schreier, 'Ḥunayn ibn Isḥaq on Tragedy and Comedy: A New Fragment of Galen', *Mnemosyne* 48 (1995), 344-348.

14 Haiim B. Rosén, 1974. 'Some Thoughts on Aristotle's Classification of Phonemes'. In: *Proceedings of the 11th International Congress of Linguists (Bologna 1972)*, vol. I, Bologna: Il Mulino, 113-116. Idem, 1990. 'Zu Text und Interpretation der grammatischen Abschnitte in Aristoteles' Poetik und zur

mentioned not seldom (e.gg. 32, 81, 91) and deserving elaboration, especially but not only for classicists, is the place of the Ari. *Po.* in (and out of) the Organon both in the Greek and Latin traditions in Late Antiquity, and, in particular, in its Arabic translations and subsequent acculturation into *falsafa*, and referred to in the literature as "context theory".[15]

One of the many merits of this volume is that its authors have gone the extra mile to contextualize and set out the evidence in a form that makes it accessible, often for the first time, to readers of Ari. *Po.* in the Greek, as well as those who have other interests in Aristotle, in non-textual aspects of the *Poetics*, in poetic theory, in translation technique, in philological procedure, and more. The Greek text in this new *editio*, with its introduction, apparatus, and philological commentary will stimulate the reader to take in the possibilities and invite him or her to think about the evidence and be an informed, actively critical reader.

Donna Shalev Hebrew University of Jerusalem

René Bloch, *Moses und der Mythos: Die Auseinandersetzung mit der griechischen Mythologie bei jüdisch-hellenistischen Autoren*, Supplements to the *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 145, Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2011. x + 298 pp. ISBN 978-90-04-16501-4.

This book is a revision of Bloch's (henceforth, B.) Habilitationsschrift, submitted in Jewish Studies and Classical Philology to the Philosophical-Historical Faculty of Basel University in 2008. It consists of an Introduction (pp. 1-16), followed by chapters on '"Disgraceful Mythology": Flavius Josephus' Condemnations of Myth' (17-50); '"Mythless Rome" and "Mythless Judaism"' (51-70); 'Greek Mythology in Palestine and Rome at the time of Flavius Josephus' (71-88); 'The word-field *mythos* in Flavius Josephus' (89-104); 'The Life of Moses in Flavius Josephus: An Example of Ancient Mediterranean Hero-Literature' (105-120); 'Greek Myth in Hellenistic-Jewish Authors Other Than Josephus' (121-190); 'Greek Myths in Flavius Josephus' (191-230); 'The Limits of Apologetic: Concluding Remarks' (231-242). An Appendix of theophoric or "mythophoric" names from the Jewish catacombs in Rome, a bibliography, and an index of ancient sources conclude the volume, although a subject index is missing.

The title of the book suggests that it is comprehensive and that it covers Hellenistic Jewish literature in general, but the focus is on Josephus. Even when the discussion concerns another Jewish-Hellenistic author, it always treats Josephus' use of that other author, and includes a comparison and contrast between that author and Josephus.

The heart of the book is a comparison between Josephus' programmatic statements condemning Greek myth and his actual practice as a historian. In fact, Josephus was familiar with

---

Umdeutung und Umformung der Redeeinteilung bis ins orientalische Mittelalter'. In: H.-J. Niederehe – K. Koerner (eds.), *History and Historiography of Linguistics. Proceedings of the IVth International Congress on the History of Language Sciences, Trier 1987*, Amsteram: Benjamins, 111-121. Idem, 1994. 'Aristotle's Thoughts on Language — An Outgrowth of an "Intellectual Climate"'. In: J. De Clercq – P. Desmet (eds.), *Florilegium Historiographiae Linguisticae*, Leuven: Peeters, 87-96.

15 Some discussion of this in the Greek tradition may be found in Richard Walzer's 1934 article on the history of the tradition of the Po. and in the Arabic tradition in I.M. Dahiyat's 1974 book on Avicenna's commentary of Ari. *Po.* — both items referred to in the very rich bibliography in Tarán and Gutas. I would add, for the Latin tradition, Friedrich Solmsen, 'Boethius and the History of the Organon', *AJP* 65 (1944) 69-74, and for the whole gamut, with special reference to the Arabic tradition and to *falsafa* and its tackling of the poorly translated text of Ari. *Po.*, Deborah L. Black, 1990. *Logic and Aristotle's "Rhetoric" and "Poetics" in Medieval Arabic Philosophy*. Leiden: Brill, esp. chapters 6 and 7.