

it is too well known that *πνεῦμα* has different meanings (cf. Bonitz, *Ind. Ar.* 605^b21 ff.).

Mr. Balme wonders how I can say that the text 466^b1-10 'seems to me very clear'. Probably he did not read my two preceding notes (at 465^a20 and at 465^a27), where I tried to explain the difference between *φθορά ἀπλῆ* (*corruptio per se*), and *φθορά τῆς* (*corruptio secundum quid*); nor did he consult the author to whose commentary I referred the reader. Balme does not understand what my 'obscure' assertion can mean: 'Accidentia, quae talia, non habent contraria; ideo non possunt *per se* corrumpi'. I hope that he will change his mind if he reads the passage carefully, in which Aristotle says: τῶν δὲ κατὰ συμβεβηκὸς ὄντων οὐκ ἔστι [γένεσις καὶ φθορά] (*Met.* 1026^b23). (He can also consult the brief commentary to this text made by Sir David Ross.)

When explaining the text 452^b17-22, I reproduced the diagram which I found in the manuscript *E* (*Paris.* 1853). The same diagram, let us add, is to be found in some other manuscripts, namely *L* (*Vat.* 253), *O^d* (*Marc.* 209), *V* (*Laur. Plut.* 87, 20). This diagram here, however, has but little importance for us. Indeed, in the intention of Aristotle, its finality is not to *explain* his doctrine, but merely to *illustrate* it by means of some very simple geometrical principle, well known to students of philosophy. As it is known, in similar circumstances, Aristotle frequently makes recourse to mathematics. Precisely how Aristotle arranged the letters of his diagram will always remain a mystery to us. The sixty-five manuscripts (consulted by me) only increase our perplexity. Fortunately, we do not lose much by this unfortunate event. We do not study Aristotle, indeed, to learn mathematics (this science appears in a very

elementary form in his writings), but philosophy; and the philosophical point which he wishes to illustrate here is very simple: by means of little images of exterior things, which our mind possesses, we can judge indubitably their actual spatial and temporal 'magnitude', precisely, as by small lines we can learn accurately the magnitude of great lines in geometrical figures. Certainly, there exists the same proportion (*ἀνάλογον*) between exterior things and their images as between long and short lines in similar geometrical figures.

In his review of my book Professor Balme quotes some 'misprints and incomplete editing'. He does so, he says, 'in the hope of assisting towards a second edition'. I am sincerely grateful to him for this. I also found some mistakes, but fortunately they are of little importance; and as Professor Balme has pointed out, they are mostly in disagreement with my own Latin translation or notes. In these circumstances, any reader will be able to correct the mistakes himself. If, however, I find more mistakes or more important ones, I shall not wait for the next edition, but shall have them printed at once and added to the copies of my first edition.

PAUL SIWEK, S.J.

Pontificia Università Lateranense, Rome

Professor Balme writes:

I am sorry if I have provoked Professor Siwek to the further defence of these opinions. They still seem to me quite mistaken. But let other students of Aristotle now judge for themselves.

D. M. BALME

Queen Mary College, London

NOTES AND NEWS

ATHENÆUM, 'Studi Periodici di Letteratura e Storia dell'Antichità', was founded in 1913 by Carlo Pascal, Professor of Latin at Pavia. At his death he bequeathed the journal to his pupil Dr. Enrica Malcovati, who in 1927 entrusted the direction of it to Plinio Fraccaro, herself acting as secretary. In 1957 they became joint directors: three years later, on Fraccaro's death, his successor, Dr. Gianfranco Tibiletti, was assumed as co-director. Dr. Malcovati has thus been concerned with the journal for the greater part of its life and it is appropriate that volume lxii, appearing in 1965 but dated 1964, should be devoted to a series of articles in her honour on her retirement from teaching.