



# Authorship in the Popular "Problemata Aristotelis"

## Citation

Blair, Ann. 1999. "Authorship in the Popular 'Problemata Aristotelis.'" *Early Science and Medicine* 4 (3) (January 1): 189–227. doi:10.1163/157338299x00148.

## Published Version

doi:10.1163/157338299X00148

## Permanent link

<http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:HUL.InstRepos:29669455>

## Terms of Use

This article was downloaded from Harvard University's DASH repository, and is made available under the terms and conditions applicable to Other Posted Material, as set forth at <http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:HUL.InstRepos:dash.current.terms-of-use#LAA>

## Share Your Story

The Harvard community has made this article openly available.  
Please share how this access benefits you. [Submit a story](#).

[Accessibility](#)

final manuscript for

Ann Blair, "Authorship in the popular 'Problemata Aristotelis,'" Early Science and Medicine 4, 1 (1999), pp. 1-39.

Ann Blair, Dept of History, Harvard University

### Authorship in the popular "Problemata Aristotelis"

Why does red hair turn white sooner than other hair? Why does a man yawn when he sees another yawn? Why is it a good custom to eat cheese after dinner? Why is there such delight in the act of venery? Why do birds not piss? These and some 380 other questions, divided into 34 topical sections and complete with causal explanations, circulated widely in over one hundred editions in early modern Europe, under the title (and its vernacular equivalents) of "Problemata Aristotelis ac philosophorum medicorumque complurium."<sup>i</sup> As I have argued elsewhere, this text is the most popular (both in the kind and in the size of its circulation) in what can be identified as a long-lived natural philosophical genre imitated from ancient models attributed to Aristotle and Alexander of Aphrodisias and that consisted in a collection of causal questions and answers, mostly about natural and medical topics.<sup>ii</sup> Despite its having been confused with the ancient pseudo-Aristotelian problems, perhaps in its own day and certainly since, these "problemata Aristotelis" have nothing in common with the 900-odd problems found in classical editions of Aristotle's Problems beyond the form of the "problema" and the short title that they share.<sup>iii</sup> These problems were composed anonymously in the fourteenth or fifteenth centuries and circulated in manuscript before being more widely diffused through print. Following Brian Lawn, who first

discussed this text as a separate work, I will also designate it by its incipit: "Omnes homines," from the Aristotelian tag "all men naturally desire to know" with which its preface begins.<sup>iv</sup>

The rich print fortuna of the "Omnes homines" spanned four languages (Latin, German, French and English) and almost as many centuries, from incunabula in Latin and German to an afterlife in English editions, which lasted through the nineteenth and probably into the twentieth century. Although the text of the "Omnes homines" remained identifiable throughout the different editions and translations, it was constantly subject to editorial intervention. Given the loosely topical organization and cumulative structure typical of the genre, problems could easily be added or removed, combined or separated; the number, heading and contents of the topical sections into which they were grouped could be modified; prefaces and title-page illustrations or frontispieces were also added. Above all, the "Omnes homines" was frequently published in combination with other works--these included other collections of problems, such as an abridged version of the problems of Alexander Aphrodisias or problems by recent authors like Marc-Antonio Zimara, J. C. Scaliger or Jean Bodin, but also texts on secrets or midwifery and childbirth. Although most of the people implementing these editorial changes remain anonymous or otherwise unknown, a study of the editions of the Problemata Aristotelis they produced can cast some light on the motivations and practices of editors and publishers as they strove to attract new buyers and readers. In particular, the uses of "Aristotle" in the title, text and frontispieces of different editions illustrate on the one hand the late persistence of a "medieval" conception of authorship in which collective authority counted more than specific authorial authenticity, and on the other hand, a shift, over the course of the seventeenth century, and particularly in England, to bolder claims about the authorial authenticity of the "Omnes homines."

Two notions of authorship:

From the first incunabulum edition ca. 1475 to the last learned commentary in 1632, the genuine pseudo-Aristotelian problems also circulated in early modern Europe, in some 20 editions, alongside the more abundant editions of the "Omnes homines," but in a very distinct tradition. Like the "Omnes homines, the pseudo-Aristotelian problems were often published with other collections of problems, but these comprised exclusively ancient problems--those of Alexander of Aphrodisias, in two sections of 151 and 130 problems, and a variable number of problems attributed to Plutarch.<sup>v</sup> One Greek edition of the problems of Aristotle also included the problems of Cassius, a iatrosophist of the 2nd or 3rd century.<sup>vi</sup> By contrast, the "Omnes homines" appeared with collections of ancient problems in abridged form: a single section of 151 problems of Alexander added in Latin editions after 1541, then in French and English but not German translations, and four problems selected from the larger learned collections of the problems of Plutarch. These were first added in a Latin edition of 1548, "both in order to make our [problems] more numerous from all sources and so that many pages are not left blank," but then became so standard in Latin editions that the four problems and the explanation continued to be reprinted even when blank pages still remained at the end of the work.<sup>vii</sup> In a further difference with the learned tradition, only the "Omnes homines" appeared with works of medieval or modern origin, and in vernacular translations, as I discuss in more detail below.

In the learned editions of the pseudo-Aristotelian problems, prefaces and commentaries displayed a notion of authorship which seems quite familiar--one might call it "modern" if one remembers that it is very old. Humanist scholars discussed, as their successors have since, the authenticity of the work. This was hardly a new topic in the Renaissance either: "authenticity" was one of the seven topics standard in the prolegomena to a commentary on a work of Aristotle

as taught in late antiquity.<sup>viii</sup> Commentators on the Problems--from Pietro d'Abano (whose Expositio of 1310 was reprinted in a number of early editions) to his two early modern successors, Julio Guastavini and Ludovico Settala, both Italian medical doctors active independently of one another in the early seventeenth century--adduced arguments for and against Aristotle's authorship which are still current today.<sup>ix</sup> Developing d'Abano's points, Guastavini counters doubts concerning Aristotle's having composed the Problems by reviewing each of the references to them contained in undisputed works of Aristotle's and in other ancient writings, notably by Plutarch, Athenaeus, Aulus Gellius, and Diogenes Laertius.<sup>x</sup> At the same time Guastavini notes that the order and number of the Problems were not original with Aristotle: the arrangement in the 38 books is confusion rather than order, with a plethora of examples in one place and a dearth in another, not to mention repetitions within and between sections.<sup>xi</sup> Furthermore, he concedes that not all the problems were composed by Aristotle: some were patched together by a third party from the works of Aristotle or of his pupil Theophrastus, whose discussions of the winds for example are recognizable in the Problems. A few problems are included which contain "futile weaknesses unworthy of [either of] these philosophers; [nonetheless] I think it impious to condemn all the others on account of them. Certainly those taken from Theophrastus are Peripatetic and the doctrine of the pupil is in agreement with that of the master."<sup>xii</sup>

Other scholars were less sanguine in their evaluation of Aristotle's contribution; thus Ludovicus Vives, in his preface to a 1554 edition, concluded: "it appears that this work was not written by Aristotle but compiled and collected from his disputations by those who heard them." He too points to the repetitions, the lack of order, and the "many cold, light and feeble reasons, foreign to the gravity and sharpness of Aristotle's character, while still others are obscure and

unpleasant. Indeed everything is left in doubt, nothing is affirmed."<sup>xiii</sup> Whatever their assessment, learned editors and commentators were clearly concerned to distinguish what Aristotle himself composed from the contributions of others--whether noted Peripatetics like Theophrastus, students compiling material garnered from the disputations they heard, or still other, less worthy sources. Similarly, scholars were concerned about the corrupt transmission of the text. As early as 1300 Jean of Jandun, professor in the Faculty of Arts at Paris, complained that "the Problems are commonly found corrupt and incorrect."<sup>xiv</sup> In the introduction to his fourteenth-century French translation of the problems (which was never printed) Evrart de Conty noted that both scribes and translators had contributed errors to the tradition.<sup>xv</sup> In 1632 Settala carped especially about the existing Latin translations which preferred elegance to faithfulness; he announces that his new translation, provided with the Greek original, is written in a simple style, "faithful, almost to the word (as far as the language would allow)"; he follows the Greek text of the Wechel edition, with the excellent emendations of Sylburg, to which he has added corrections of his own.<sup>xvi</sup> Guastavini, too, is conscious of the variety of readings of the Problems, and explains the superiority of his source: he used a copy of a Basel edition annotated by a learned doctor who made many emendations from manuscript codices which were frequently preferable to the readings used by Gaza, although the latter's text is more widespread.<sup>xvii</sup>

These efforts to provide the most faithful translation of the most correct text correspond to that scholarly concern (most famously, but not exclusively, associated with the humanists) to recover and transmit the "authentic" text as well as possible. The ultimate goal of these, and more recent, scholarly concerns with authorship and emendation is to recapture what an individual named Aristotle personally contributed to the text that we have before us. The underlying assumption is that what Aristotle himself wrote is important--to understanding his

thought and methods, and/or to reaching the truth of the matters discussed, depending on what other views one harbors about Aristotle and his authority. In any case, on this conception of authorship, what Aristotle did not write himself is of less interest or importance. This notion of authorship could certainly bear more analysis,<sup>xviii</sup> but since it has become generally dominant, in academic and more general circles, I will focus instead on the noticeably different conception of authorship at work in the "Omnes homines" text.

Judging from the one manuscript I have been able to see, the "Omnes homines" was known already in the middle ages under the complete title "Aristotelis problemata."<sup>xix</sup> The first Latin edition I have found to mention "other philosophers and doctors" in the title is an edition of Basel, 1541 (although it calls itself a third edition), which also includes the problems of Zimara for the first time--the addition of Zimara's problems, although it is also mentioned separately, may have prompted the expansion of the title.<sup>xx</sup> From the very beginning, on the other hand, German editions containing only the "Omnes homines" boast of the opinions of the "natural masters Aristotle, Avicenna, Galen, Albert and others."<sup>xxi</sup> In any case, the notion that the work contains text composed by Aristotle himself becomes problematic as early as the preface (which is present in the Latin and French versions):

All men naturally desire to know, as Aristotle prince of the philosophers writes in the first book of the Metaphysics. Of which the cause can be brought back to this, that each being naturally seeks its perfection and strives to become similar to the first Being, divine and immortal, insofar as it can. ... And another reason is that each being naturally seeks the good so that it can preserve itself in nature. But all knowledge that produces scientia ranks among the honorable and good things, as is clear from the first book of De anima. Therefore every man naturally desires to know, and as a consequence every scientia is to

be desired (insofar as it can be apprehended by the human intellect). Although therefore any scientia is worth examining, nonetheless that one is more worthy of study which is more noble and more common than the other sciences. But the philosophical science confers the greatest pleasures, as is clear from the tenth book of the Ethics.<sup>xxii</sup>

The authority of Aristotle is invoked three times in one paragraph to justify the inquiry into the causes of natural and familiar phenomena that constitute the text. But this is clearly not the voice of Aristotle or what we might envision as a "pseudo-Aristotle," someone other than Aristotle trying to pass as him.

The answers to the problems continue in this vein (in all languages), regularly featuring Aristotle and a number of post-Aristotelian authorities:

Question. Why is the head of beastes hayrie? Answer. The answer according unto the opinion of Constant [Constantine, the 11th-century doctor] is, that the hayres are an ornament of the head, and of the brayne, and the brayne is purged and evacuated of grosse humors, by the growing of the hayre. ... This appeareth to be true, because that in all mans body there is nothing drier then the hayres, for they are drier then the bones, as Albertus Magnus doth affirme. [italics in the original]<sup>xxiii</sup>

Here again, there can be no pretense that the text is by, or even contemporary with, Aristotle. The genitive "of Aristotle" in the title which is reproduced in all the vernacular translations, does not mean "by Aristotle," as it signals to us and, I would argue from the foregoing analysis of scholarly conceptions of authorship, to learned readers of this period too. Instead it fits a medieval use of the genitive in titles which was very flexible, designed above all to associate a text with a respected figure, whether an authority who served as the model inspiring an imitation or as the actual author of the text, or even simply the owner or patron of the work.<sup>xxiv</sup>



The references to authorities in the "Omnes homines"--to Aristotle and Albert, Constantine, Galen and Hippocrates, whose names are often highlighted typographically when they appear--do not include specific quotations or locations to authenticate the opinions attributed to them. The refrain that the answers are "in accordance with the opinion of" such authorities serves rather to guarantee the truth of a kind of timeless collective knowledge of many authorities, which also undergirds all those answers in which no specific authorities are named. Only in one instance does the "Omnes homines" in its various versions introduce the voice of an authority more directly:

These are Albertus' words:

We saw that their two bodies were ioyned in nothing but in the back, they had two heads, foure feete, foure hands, and did go which way they lusted. And he saith, they reported unto us that there were two men ioyned in the backe, and were of a contrary complexion.... I aske how can this bee? It is answered thus: because the seede is cast unto the cels or receptacle of the wombe, which seede was enough for two children, and then by chance it dooth sometime happen, that the skinne or distance betwixt the two cels or receptacles is broken and they knit and ioyne in the back, and have two heads.<sup>xxv</sup>

This unique description of a monstrous birth called for the extra force of a testimony in direct discourse, which was common to such accounts.<sup>xxvi</sup> But the causal explanation is reported in the usual impersonal voice ("it is answered thus"). Another voice occasionally heard and equally impersonal is that of common sayings introduced to corroborate the explanations, such as a few Latin verses calling for moderation in eating to stay healthy. Curiously, these verses are omitted in the English, but included in the other versions.<sup>xxvii</sup>

The "Omnes homines" served to justify and satisfy a natural and healthy curiosity, as its

preface emphasized. It was part of its textual strategy to have no personal voice, which could be condemned for excessive and at times salacious inquisitiveness; instead the text effaces the authorial work of formulating questions and finding answers behind the unified authority of Aristotle and other greats who offer the collective wisdom of received authorities, corroborated by a few traditional sayings. No bold claims were made to bolster an image of Aristotelian "authenticity" until the English editions introduced new prefaces, first in 1595, then, more forcefully, in the eighteenth century. In the other languages, down to the last editions in French in 1620 and in German in 1679, and in Latin down to 1623 (when a medallion portrait of Aristotle was first added to the title page, as I discuss below), the many 16th- and 17th-century editions of the "Omnes homines" perpetuated quite successfully a distinctly non-modern conception of authority little concerned with authentication. The "Aristotle" in the title advertised authoritative natural philosophical explanations from many different sources, just as the "Democritus ridens," in the title of another popular early modern genre, signaled a book containing jokes, which were equally timeless and without specific authorship.<sup>xxviii</sup>

The two parallel versions of the "Problems of Aristotle" perpetuated their divergent conceptions of authority among readers separated by social and intellectual, although, interestingly, not always linguistic differences. The genuine pseudo-Aristotelian problems were mostly published in expensive folio volumes with the long version of the problems of Alexander of Aphrodisias and the costly trappings of learned editions, such as alphabetical indexes and commentaries; by contrast the shorter "Omnes homines," even with the usual problems added on, required only a thin octavo or duodecimo volume and never offered any of the trappings of learned editions, even when it was produced (as late as 1686) in the language of learning. I have only found one exceptional edition in which the two traditions were juxtaposed in the same

volume. The title page of a very thick in-24 announces the entire contents of the work: Aristotelis, Alexandri Aphrodisei, Marciantonii Zimarae ac Philosophorum medicorumque complurium problemata. Quibus adiectus est copiosissima index. The volume begins with the alphabetical index and contents to the 38 books of Aristotle. Then a second title page (complete with identical publication information) announces the remaining texts; although they are thus separated from Aristotle's problems, these texts are still unique in juxtaposing the longer, learned version of the problems of Alexander, including an alphabetical index, with texts otherwise associated only with the "popular" tradition--the problems of Zimara, the "Omnes homines" and the four problems of Plutarch (in an inversion of the usual order). The pattern of signatures indicates that the genuine Aristotle, the learned Alexander and the remaining texts were printed in three separate print runs; but they were sold under a single title page which announced the entire mix of contents, although, given the second title page, probably in two instalments in the same year.

Significantly, in this association of the two generally separate traditions of problemata, the "Omnes homines" text is not called "Problems of Aristotle and other philosophers and doctors" as it was in other title pages, but only "Problems of other philosophers and doctors." "Aristotle," placed (as was usual) at the head of the title on the first title page, thus appears as the author of the "genuine" pseudo-Aristotelian problems and is omitted from the second title page which covers the remaining texts--Alexander, Zimara and the "Omnes homines". In this way the blatant contradiction underlying the circulation of two different texts of the same title under the same author "Aristotle" is averted. Within the text, however, the opening heading of the "Omnes homines," as well as the running heads throughout the text, revert to the usual appellation: "Aristotelis ac philosophorum medicorumque complurium Problemata." In combining texts

generally published separately, this edition (to my knowledge, unique) tacitly confronted the existence of two different "Aristotelis problemata," and compromised by removing the "Aristotle" of the "Omnes homines" from the two title pages, while retaining it in a less prominent location within the text.<sup>xxix</sup> One can recognize a pragmatic printer's solution to a deep and quite intractable problem arising from the conflicting meanings of "Aristotle" in two works circulating at the same time with different conceptions of authorship embedded in their almost identical titles.

### The "middlemen"

This ingenious and innovative printer has remained anonymous, providing only his address in Venice to guide potential buyers. Similarly, the generations of editors, translators and printers who made possible the long career of the "Omnes homines" are mostly anonymous or unknown, yet they left many traces of their work on the editions they produced. Although the printers involved can often be identified, existing reference tools shed only a general light on internal editorial decisions and practices, and reveal above all that printers were often active in a wide range of publications, from the learned to the more popular.<sup>xxx</sup> Our best source for studying the evolution of the genre remains the extant editions themselves. Almost every edition introduced changes, which were unique to it or survived into later ones. Questions were omitted, e.g. "why are there no donkeys in Scythia?" from a Latin edition of 1643 of the problems of Zimara.<sup>xxxi</sup> Sections were subdivided in different ways: thus "on marrow" and "on hemorrhoids" were separated out from a single section "on breasts" in early editions of the "Omnes homines" and further subdivisions added in an edition of 1609.<sup>xxxii</sup> Answers were shortened in translations, spellings changed and printing errors introduced. Some changes (omissions, changes in order or

numbering, for example) were no doubt unintentional; others were not. Most noticeable are the differences between the vernacular translations, ranging from the omission or inclusion of proverbial verses, as mentioned above, or the emphasis in translation given to naturalistic versus theological explanations.

In particular, the exceptionally complex answer to the first question of the "Omnes homines" about why humans alone among the animals stand upright, generated distinctions among the different versions, including two different German versions. In the earliest German translation (ca. 1492 to 1546), which I called "shortened," because it generally simplified the answers found in the Latin original, the answer to this first question actually departs completely from the Latin: a short paragraph invokes Boethius' statement in the last book of the De consolatione that humans alone are destined to heaven.<sup>xxxiii</sup> By contrast, the Latin and other vernacular versions (including the German editions after a new translation of 1551) offer an elaborate six-part answer (the only one of its kind in the text) in which initial religious explanations (the will of the Creator; the greater perfection of humans over animals in the Creation; that man alone is ordained to heaven; that his soul is "like unto Angels"; that he commands all the other creatures) culminate in a "natural" explanation: each thing is naturally endowed with the form that suits its motion--having two feet, humans stand upright. While the French version follows the Latin in clearly distinguishing this "physical answer" from the earlier ones (although it too refers back to the religious purpose of the human form in an additional concluding sentence), the English omits the reference to two feet altogether and simply concludes that "man hath his face up to Heaven, to behold and wonder at Gods worke." Each translation modulated its rendition of the Latin original, and the extent of the naturalistic component of the answer, with the English most noticeably sacrificing the naturalistic conclusion

in favor of yet another religious explanation.<sup>xxxiv</sup>

The first German translation also differs from the Latin and the other more faithful translations in its way of adducing authority. Instead of following the Latin formulations in "secundum" ("according to the opinion of"), it attributes quotations in indirect discourse to the authorities in this way: "Hippocrates (or Aristotle or Constantine or Albert) speaks. ... Milk can become poisonous in the stomach....<sup>xxxv</sup> Although there are no quotation marks, the text is more directly attributed to the authority named. A second German translation, by M. Eowaldus Otto Sylvius in 1551, following the Latin closely, reverted to the original "according to" formulation. The translator is named exceptionally in the title page of 1551 which boasts that the text has been "newlich ins teutsch gebracht." Unfortunately the name helps little, because nothing else is known of or about this author. By the next edition of 1553, Sylvius' translation appeared with the problems of Zimara, published for the first time in German (they had appeared with the Latin "Omnes homines" in 1541). On this title page Sylvius' name is omitted (now that his translation is no longer "new"), but a privilege (which I have otherwise only rarely found) is a clear indication of the desire to protect what was perceived as a significant innovation in the genre.<sup>xxxvi</sup>

The early German translations were also responsible for the first linking of the "Omnes homines" with childbearing literature, an association that reached its height in the English editions of the eighteenth century. In 1512 three paragraphs and in 1515 another two were added onto the end of the translation of the "Omnes homines," which briefly describe the stages of birth and recommend Eucharius Rösslin's "pretty booklet" on the subject, "called the Rosegarten of pregnant women and midwives."<sup>xxxvii</sup> In a 1540 German edition the title page announces that one "Quintus Apollinaris" has augmented and improved the text and culled the useless parts. Acting under this pseudonym was Walter Ryff, a well-known writer of popular medical handbooks

active in Strasbourg: in revising the German "Omnes homines" he indeed removed a number of questions (about one in five), changed the prose and order of a few questions, and introduced some new sentences.<sup>xxxviii</sup> Most noticeably, he elaborated still further on the final paragraphs on childbirth, adding two more in which he ends by recommending his own recent edition of Albertus Magnus' work on the subject.<sup>xxxix</sup> The changes were announced in the title page of the first of the three editions bearing Ryff's modifications (presumably in an attempt to attract buyers to a "new and revised edition"), but they are detectable only through a close textual comparison. Other anonymous German editors pursued the link with childbirth after Sylvius' new translation had eliminated Ryff's modifications, by publishing the "Omnes homines" with various works of Albertus Magnus, including his "secrets of women."<sup>xl</sup>

The anonymous translation of the "Omnes homines" into English remained entirely silent about the considerable additions made to the Latin original: a new preface was introduced, unrelated to the Latin preface (which was never translated into English); and 44 and, starting with the second edition of 1597, another 32 wholly new problems (the latter distinctly more terse than the traditional ones) were appended to and continuously numbered with the problems of the "Omnes homines" and of Alexander respectively, without any mention being made of these changes in the title page or elsewhere.<sup>xli</sup> In French the quite faithful translation has been attributed to Georges de la Bouthière, but probably without good reason.<sup>xlii</sup>

Like all texts, but perhaps especially those designed for a broader readership in the early modern period, each new edition of the "Omnes homines" was a composite text, the product of a textual tradition worked over by those on hand at the printer's shop to prepare a new edition.<sup>xliii</sup> With the exception of Walter Ryff, these editorial figures remain completely obscure, as is generally typical of those involved in the writing, translating and editing of popular works; they

were often employed by printers for hack work of many kinds and, for lack of learned publications, were omitted from the early modern biographical dictionaries which remain one of our main sources of information. One can surmise nonetheless that they performed the same kinds of services, probably in even less favorable circumstances, as the better-known editors of learned works--from establishing and even choosing the texts to be printed, to writing prefaces if necessary, to proof-reading and correcting the work in press.<sup>xliv</sup> This kind of potentially wide-ranging editorial intervention was no doubt also involved in the publication of the three collections of *problemata* attributed to learned men of the sixteenth century--Zimara, Scaliger and Bodin.

Marc-Antonio Zimara (1475/76-1537 at the latest) taught various branches of philosophy in various Italian universities, including Salerno and Naples. He is well known for his learned Latin commentaries on Aristotle.<sup>xlv</sup> His problems are found in a manuscript dated to before 1514, and first published, probably posthumously, in 1537 with the Dicta notabilia Aristotelis et aliorum quam plurimum; they first appeared in 1541 with the "Omnes homines," with which they were always published thereafter.<sup>xlvi</sup> These problems come complete with a dedication, present in the Latin and French editions, to Ioannes Castriota, duke of Ferrandina.<sup>xlvii</sup> In it Zimara conventionally weaves classical references, from Hercules to Alexander the Great and his tutor Aristotle, into fulsome praise for his dedicatee's virtues and splendor, for his courage, prudence and generosity. Only in closing does Zimara allude to this "small book of ours, on certain questions concerning both kinds of philosophy [natural and moral] and published extemporaneously"--it is, he promises, only a small token of his gratitude, in anticipation of weightier tomes to come.<sup>xlviii</sup> Probably an early composition, given the promises of the preface and the early surviving manuscript, Zimara's problemata have the trappings (dedication, marginal



summaries and references) of an authentic work by a learned author. A first editorial decision involved locating and culling the work from the Dicta Aristotelis with which it was first published to juxtapose it with the "Omnes homines." Later editors variously decided to leave or to cut the dedication and marginal notes.<sup>xlix</sup>

The Problemata gelliana of Julius Caesar Scaliger first appeared in 1620 well after the author's death in 1558. To guarantee the authorial authenticity of the text, it was accompanied by an excerpt from a letter of Johannes Wower encouraging Scaliger's son to publish the manuscript, and by a note from the publisher apologizing for the uncorrected errors in the work, but hailing this legitimate offshoot of a great oeuvre: better to have the text, even if faulty, than not at all.<sup>l</sup> As a result, these problemata too are considered authentic, although their relationship to "Julius Caesar Scaliger's books of familiar exercises" from which they are drawn (according to the subtitle) is unclear; there is certainly no easy correspondence between Scaliger's famous Exotericarum exercitationum liber XV and the Problemata gelliana.<sup>li</sup>

Whereas in the cases of the problems of Zimara and Scaliger the editorial intervention may have consisted principally in the selection of the text to append to the "Omnes homines," the Problemata Bodini show us the work of an editor who radically transformed a learned original, the Universae naturae theatrum (1596) of Jean Bodin, best known as the author of the Six Livres de la République.<sup>liii</sup> The first edition of 1602 names one Damian Siffert of Lindau (otherwise unidentified) who explains in a closing paragraph that he "brought into German for the common man this much from the learned Theatrum naturae of Bodin."<sup>liiii</sup> Later editions of 1622, 1666 and 1679 incorporated the Problemata Bodini into German editions of the Problemata Aristotelis.<sup>liiii</sup> Siffert reduced Bodin's 633 pages rife with learned references and abstract concepts to questions of a much more concrete type in which the causal explanations and the general thrust of the

conclusions (notably to praise divine providence in the natural world) are nonetheless respected. Even though the Problemata Bodini seems to have nothing to do with Bodin's original on first view, the Problemata are entirely drawn from Bodin's text; Siffert typically picks out new questions from within Bodin's answers, and they follow the order of the Latin original. In Bodin's Theatrum, for example, the pupil Theorus asks whether the earth does not yield fruit for men without cultivation--yes, the master replies, to one who is frugal, indeed "before the floods they lived of acorns and apples and an abundance of milk without eating meat." While Bodin goes on to explain how nature follows an "art," Siffert, who had neglected Bodin's discussion until this point, latches onto an issue of interest to anyone with a basic knowledge of the Bible:

What did men who lived before the Flood eat? They ate acorns and apples and milk.  
They ate no meat.<sup>lv</sup>

Siffert also highlights Bodin's emphasis on divine providence, which he summarizes perfectly in a succinct version of Bodin's long explanation of why different plants grow in different places (e.g. aromatic plants in the South where human nature is colder, following Bodin's famous theory of climates):

Why is it that not everything grows in all places? God the wise creator ordered things so that plants would grow that are appropriate to each country according to the nature of the men and what is useful or not useful to them.<sup>lvi</sup>

Siffert avoids abstract terms like "providence" in favor of the actions of "God the wise creator." When Bodin lists and explains the features of various categories of plants--wild and domestic, male and female, and so on, Siffert finds nothing of interest. Bodin had garnered these categories and "facts" from his reading of ancient sources, a bookish type of experience that Siffert's audience would not share.<sup>lvii</sup> But Siffert joins Bodin again in questions about concrete

phenomena:

Why is it that leaves fall so soon? ... Why is it that some trees freeze from great cold [and others do not]? ... Why [is it] that the fruit from old trees taste better than those from young ones?<sup>lviii</sup>

With his practical orientation, Siffert exploits the recipes that are tucked away in Bodin's more theoretical concerns. When Bodin discusses the antipathies between plants, and mentions the example of the cabbage and the vine, Siffert focuses on the useful tip: "How can one dispel drunkenness? Take cabbage juice at the pharmacy and you will become sober again."<sup>lix</sup>

This rare example of a learned original and its adaptation to a popular genre like the Problemata offers a unique view of the work of a cultural intermediary like Siffert, who mastered both Bodin's complex and learned original and the expectations of a broader audience already keen on the problemata genre. One can speculate that others like Siffert--whose name appears only in the edition of 1602, of which no more than two copies have been located so far--were the translators, adaptors and cultural intermediaries who shaped the vernacular fortuna of the Latin "Omnes homines".

Title page illustrations and the shift toward bolder claims about authorship:

A final editorial decision involved the use of illustrations, which are present in the earliest Latin and in a few German editions of the "Omnes homines," then, with a new emphasis on authorial authenticity, in the late Latin editions and in the English editions of the 18th century. The early illustrations all reinforce the generic kind of authority of the "most famous Aristotle and other natural philosophers" which is proposed in the title and text of the "Omnes homines." Crude woodcuts, often recycled from other title pages, depict generic scenes of the teacher or

scholar at work: the master lecturing, surrounded by students (Figure 1), the master and his pupil (Figure 2), or the learned man in his study, with books (Figure 3) or with globe and mathematical instruments (Figure 4). These figures are depicted without names or distinguishing personal characteristics: instead of specific individuals they represent the collective, impersonal authority of the greats on which the credibility of the "Omnes homines" relies.

Starting in 1623, however, the title pages of the last Latin editions (1633, 1643, 1650, and 1686) feature a medallion portrait inscribed "Aristotle the Stagyrice" on the title page, establishing discreetly and by that image alone a link between the text and a particular historical individual named Aristotle (Figure 5). These tacit pictorial claims for a direct authorship of the "Omnes homines" by an individual named Aristotle are made verbally explicit in the preface to the English editions (from 1595 on) and become bolder still in English editions of the eighteenth century. The preface introduced in the first English edition opens by hailing the wonders of the human body, which are too often neglected in favor of the wonder reserved for "novelties"--from a shooting star to a skillful painting.

And therefore the bodie of man is made of a complexion most pure and delicate, and in shape comely and beautifull; and yet notwithstanding all these perfections which man hath in himselfe, few or none take delight in the studie of himselfe, or is carefull to know the substance, state, condition, quality and use of the parts of his owne bodie, although he be the honour of nature, and more to be admired than the strangest and rarest woonder that ever happened. The cause of this is no other, but bicause mans nature delighteth in novelties, and neglecteth to search out the causes of those things which are common.

I have therefore thought good, to give thee in a knowne tongue, this little booke, written by the deepest of all Philosophers, who teacheth the use of all the parts of mans bodie,

their nature, qualitie, propertie and substance, which may bring thee in reading of it, if reade it thou wilt, no lesse delight than profit, nor no lesse profit than delight.<sup>lx</sup>

The anonymous writer of the preface simply states as if it were obvious, for example from the title, that this "little book" was "written by the deepest of all Philosophers." Nowhere does he address the problems raised by the contents of the text when it is attributed to a specific ancient author.

While English editions with this preface continued to appear through the end of the seventeenth century,<sup>lxi</sup> it is in the eighteenth century that the English afterlife of the Problems of Aristotle became truly remarkable. The same old "Omnes homines" text (augmented as per 1597) entitled Aristotle's Problems or Aristotle's book of problems with other astronomers, astrologers, physicians and philosophers was abundantly reprinted, starting as early as 1710 in London and 1766 in North America, as the third in a series of four works "of Aristotle"--the other three being of even more recent composition (known in English only, probably composed in late seventeenth century): Aristotle's Masterpiece, which became probably "the most widely read book about sex and reproduction in eighteenth-century England and America,"<sup>lxii</sup> Aristotle's compleat and experienced midwife and Aristotle's last legacy, unfolding the mystery of nature in the generation of man.<sup>lxiii</sup> An edition of Edinburgh, 1784, may be the first to use a collective title page announcing these four texts as The Works of Aristotle, the Famous Philosopher, in addition to internal title pages for The Problems and The Last Legacy, indicating that they were published in London in the same year.<sup>lxiv</sup>

The fascinating afterlife of the "Omnes homines" is unfortunately particularly difficult to map, given that most editions appeared without dates or publishers (typically "printed for the booksellers"). It is also likely, as Brian Lawn points out already for the seventeenth-century

English editions, which we know in many cases only through one surviving copy, that many editions have been completely lost (especially in library collections).<sup>lxv</sup> The latest editions of these Works of Aristotle that I have been able to locate so far date from London, 184? and New York, 1849.<sup>lxvi</sup> But there is every reason to believe that publication continued into the 20th century--one author attests to editions of 1922 and 1930<sup>lxvii</sup>; and a British censorship statute of 1954 explicitly exempts Aristotle's Masterpiece from seizure on grounds of obscenity because it is among those works which are "recognised throughout the civilised world as established classics"--the title thus continued to succeed in its purpose of legitimating the work's dubious contents.<sup>lxviii</sup>

Boosted to new popularity through its publication with the other "Works of Aristotle," the Problems also spawned a new eighteenth-century imitation: Aristotle's new book of problems set forth by way of question and answer to which are added a great number from other famous philosophers, astronomers, astrologers and Physicians, first attested in an edition of London, 1725 (which claims to be the sixth) and in at least three more editions to 1776. This work applies the usual form to a long and disparate list of topics, with a special emphasis on marvelous and occult phenomena (including divination from dreams, ghosts, or eclipses and earthquakes), which were relatively less prominent in earlier collections of problemata. The preface makes little claim to Aristotelian authenticity, however, but praises the work's orderly compilation of authoritative knowledge from many sources:

[This elaborate work] is partly gathered from the most learned of the Ancients and justly celebrated Writers of later Times, as it lay scatter'd (or rather bury'd) among vast heaps of tedious Matter; being form'ed, as it were, out of a Chaos and Confusion, and digested into a Method so plain and easy that all rational capacities may understand and greatly

improve by it.<sup>lxix</sup>

The frontispiece to the New book of problems is similarly a generic depiction of a scholar surrounded by books, globe and skeleton, without any caption claiming it as a depiction of Aristotle.

The late English-language editions of the "Omnes homines," on the contrary, sport a new preface (unrelated both to the traditional Latin preface and to the English preface of the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries), present from the [1710] edition down to at least 1849, which make new, much stronger claims about authorial authenticity in the "problems of Aristotle":

These problems have been printed very often, and finding so general an acceptance, divers books have been hoisted into the World under the Name of Aristotle, so that many People have bought them, thinking they had the right sort, by which the Public has been injured as well as the Proprietors.<sup>lxx</sup>

The implication is reinforced by the caption of the frontispieces to the Problems found in some mid-eighteenth-century editions, in which, in one case, the philosopher is seen riding on a chariot, with rays emanating from his head and the caption reads: "great Aristotle's picture view, all others false, this only true" (Figure 6). The same exclusivist claim is made in a slightly later edition of a rather different frontispiece featuring the philosopher in his study, with globe, skeleton and books (Figure 7). Which rival editions the anonymous author of the preface has in mind in complaining of those who bring injury to the "Public and the Proprietors" I do not know—the "genuine" pseudo-Aristotelian problems in any case had not been reissued since Settala's commentary in 1632; perhaps the comment was targeted at the New Problems of Aristotle, but this presumes the existence of editions of that work prior to 1725. Roy Porter suggests in his

study of Aristotle's Masterpiece that the various claims of its editions to being the 26th or 31st could have been exaggerations designed to heighten the desirability of the book.<sup>lxxi</sup> Similarly, it seems to me that in any case this rhetoric defending the authenticity of these "Problems of Aristotle" is a useful marketing ploy. The commercialization of the trade in these no doubt very profitable books is also evident from the price printed on the title page (1 s. for a bound copy) and the advertisement for other works for sale at the same shop, including chapmen's books, broadsides, bibles, commonprayers, schoolbooks and "all sorts of stationary wares" from tax-receipts to lottery tickets.<sup>lxxii</sup>

I will not venture here into the difficult question of who read these works and how. Certainly the low price made them accessible to almost any reader, which does not indicate, however, that only the lowest social strata would have read them--there is good evidence for example that schoolboys from privileged backgrounds were avid readers of chapbooks of many types.<sup>lxxiii</sup> The external evidence for readership is virtually non-existent: these were books precisely of the kind never to be mentioned in library inventories, letters or printed works--not one contemporary comment on any of these Aristotle titles has yet been found.<sup>lxxiv</sup> Working from the evolution of the text and its presentation, one can nonetheless conclude that in addition to various other strategies, the marketing of Aristotle in the eighteenth century and beyond was well served by new, strong claims about direct authorship of the Problems. The anonymous editor of the eighteenth-century Problems continues:

I have therefore published this little book, wrote by Aristotle and the deepest philosophers who teach the use of all parts of the body, their nature, quality, property, and substance; and question not but it will afford both innocent, necessary and useful knowledge and prove profitable to both sexes.<sup>lxxv</sup>



Aristotle's Masterpiece too is said to have been "stiled by Aristotle," so that "in this book alone the reader may satisfy himself that he has the great Aristotle's complete Master Piece"<sup>lxxvi</sup>--the claim in this case is made of a work first published at most a few decades earlier, while the origins of the "Omnes homines" at least reached back into the mists of the middle ages. The declarations of authorship are bolder and more obviously deceptive than in earlier editions of the "Omnes homines," presumably driven by the need to advertise authority more forcefully in an increasingly competitive book market.

Whereas the "Omnes homines" relied on a conception of the author as a collective of timeless, faceless (although not always nameless) authorities, the eighteenth-century preface of the Problems of Aristotle claims a direct, authenticated authorship for a text (and a set of works) that certainly could not meet the criteria for authenticity in learned circles. The extra prefatory boasting had become useful, it would seem, to counter rival projects and to sell a traditional text in an environment in which access to collective wisdom had become less attractive to readers than the promise of having before them what that deepest of philosophers, Aristotle, had genuinely written himself. Although clearly neither the printers, nor the editors, nor the buyers and readers in this transaction subscribed to a recognizably "modern" notion of authenticity and authorship, given the texts that they settled for, nonetheless they all felt they stood to gain from claiming direct access to Aristotle's real writings. The demand for authenticated authorship over traditional wisdom, although readily satisfied by simple marketing ploys, had spread beyond the narrow circles of the learned to the readers of these other "problems of Aristotle."

## BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTE

In lieu of a thorough bibliography of the very complex fortuna of the "problems of Aristotle" I offer a schematic outline of the main branches of the tradition which I have found so far. For lists of known editions see Lawn, The Salernitan Questions, 99-100 and my own piece on "The problemata as a natural philosophical genre."

Pseudo-Aristotelian problems: ca. 10 incunabula and ca. 10 editions after 1500

1. Rome, 1475.
2. With the Problemata Alexandri, tr. Giorgio Valla, 1488, 1495, 1500 and in 6 other editions without date.
- 2a. #2, with the commentary by Pietro d'Abano in 5 editions, 1501-20.
3. With the Problemata Alexandri, tr. Gaza in 6 editions, 1524-40.
4. In Opera omnia: ca. 5 editions 1498-1590.
5. In Greek, ed. Fridericus Sylburg (1585).
6. In Renaissance commentaries: Guastavini (1608) and Manelfi (1630) partial; Settala (1632), complete (see note 9)
7. From mid-19th century in classical editions: e.g. Teubner, Loeb, Belles-Lettres.

"Omnes homines":

I. **Latin**: ca. 20 incunables and ca. 45 editions after 1500

1. "Omnes homines" (no preface): 1488 [possibly 1483]-1537, including ten editions after 1500.
- 2a. "Omnes homines" with preface, plus problems of Zimara: first published (Basel: Robert

Winter, 1541), although this claims to be a third edition. Also 1544.

2b. "Omnes homines" with preface, problems of Zimara, and abridged problems of Alexander of Aphrodisias and four problems of Plutarch: ca. 25 editions 1548-1680; first found (Frankfurt: Brubach, 1548).

3. Texts of #2b, with other extras: e.g. works of Albert (1554, 1568, 1609, see note 40); and J.C. Scaliger, Problemata gelliana (1643, 1650, 1686).

An exceptional conjunction of the two traditions in Aristotelis, Alexandri Aphrodisei, Marciantonii Zimarae ac Philosophorum medicorumque complurium problemata, Venice, 1554 (see note 29).

II. **German** (no preface to "Omnes homines" included): ca. 6 incunables and ca. 20 editions after 1500

1. shortened "Omnes homines": ca. 11 editions, 1492 to 1546

1a. shortened "Omnes homines" with modifications by Walter H. Ryff: first published (Strasbourg: J. Cammerland, 1540), then in 2 more editions: 1543, 1545.

2. new, quite faithful translation of Latin "Omnes homines" by M. Eowaldus Otto Sylvius, first published (Frankfurt: Curiacus Jacobi, 1551), with privilege; adding problems of Zimara, 1553, followed by at least 7 editions to 1604; adding, after Zimara, Problemata Bodini in 1622, 1666 and 1679 (see note 54).

No problems of Alexander or Plutarch in German, despite the presence of running heads reading "Problemata Alexandri" across pages devoted to the Problems of Zimara in some editions (e.g. those of Frankfurt, 1553, 1568, 1580, 1593).

III. **French:** ca. 8 editions.

anonymous translation, including the preface, fairly faithful (attributed without good reason to George de La Bouthière, see note 42), with problems of Zimara and Alexander, first published (Lyon: de Tournes 1554), with privilege, then in ca. 5 editions to 1613; in 1617 and 1620, with problems of Zimara only.

No problems of Plutarch in French.

IV. **English:** ca. 12 editions + in numerous editions of the Works of Aristotle

1. anonymous translation, with new English preface and 44 extra questions, with problems of Zimara and Alexander, 1595; from 1597 includes 32 extra questions of Alexander, then at least 10 editions to 1696.

no problems of Plutarch in English.

2. same translation ("Omnes homines" and extra questions only), with another English preface, published, with Aristotle's Masterpiece, Aristotle's Compleat and Experienced Midwife and Aristotle's Last Legacy, from ca. 1710 to at least 1849 (at least 20 editions unambiguously identified) and probably into the 20th century (down to 1930, see note 66).

3. Aristotle's New Book of Problems, London, 1725 (a "6th edition"), then 1741, 1760 and 1776.

V. **Italian and Spanish**

Some of the questions of "Omnes homines" are incorporated into works by Ortensio Landi, Bartolomeo Paschetti and Girolamo Manfredi in Italian; and by Hieronymus Campos in Spanish (see Lawn, The Salernitan Questions, p. 112). But no publication of the "Omnes homines" or of

any works entitled Problemata Aristotelis in Italian or Spanish.

## NOTES

I am grateful for valuable suggestions to respondents to papers given at the Department of History of Johns Hopkins University, the British Society for the History of Science meeting in Edinburgh, the IRHT and the Centre Koyré, Paris, to David Hall, Mary Fissell and to the editors of the journal. Part of this research was supported by an NEH grant.

---

i

Questions (modernized in their prose and spelling) from The Problemes of Aristotle with other Philosophers and Phisitions (Edinburgh: Robert Waldgrave, 1595) (National Library of Scotland, Edinburgh), sigs. [A7v] (#14, in a first untitled section), [B8r] (#69, section on the mouth), E3r (#213, section on the stomach), [E8v] (#249, section on carnal copulation), [F5v] (#330, section on divers matters). Since these editions are often hard to find, I will specify in the first reference where I consulted them; if no library is specified, I used the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris. In this case, I have supplied the problem numbers consecutively throughout the text for convenience. In brief, the answers to these questions explain: red hair is weaker than other hair and therefore whitens sooner; yawning at the sight of another person yawning proceeds from the imagination; cheese, because of its thickness, brings the meat consumed earlier in the meal down to the bottom of the stomach; the act of love is so contemptible that beasts and men would naturally abhor it if there were no pleasure in it--nature therefore makes it pleasurable so that by it living things can be maintained; in birds the superfluity that would ordinarily be converted into urine is turned instead into feathers, so they do not urinate.

ii See Ann Blair, "The problemata as a natural philosophical genre," in Natural Particulars: Nature and the Disciplines in Renaissance Europe, ed. Anthony Grafton and Nancy Siraisi (forthcoming MIT Press). There I present more fully the different meanings of "problema," the learned origins of the genre, and the numerous early modern contributions to it.

iii The two texts are not distinguished, for example, in F. Edward Cranz, A Bibliography of Aristotle Editions 1501-1600 (Baden-Baden, 1971), 161 or in Pierre Louis, tr. and intr. Aristote. Problèmes, 3 vols. (Paris, 1991), liii. Although I have found no specific discussion in early modern editions of the discrepancy between the two texts, there are many complaints among the learned about poor translations and the corruptness of the tradition; for one instance of the juxtaposition of the two works, see below.

iv "Omnes homines naturaliter scire desiderant scribit Aristoteles philosophorum princeps primo metaphysicae." See Brian Lawn, The Salernitan Questions: An Introduction to the History of Medieval and Renaissance Problem Literature (Oxford, 1963), 99-103. The reference to Aristotle, Metaphysics, I is correct. I quote from the preface more extensively below.

v Although classicists today know of no such work, these problems are selected from texts known as Plutarch's Roman, Greek and physical Questions or Aitia. There are, for example, 31 problems of Plutarch in Problemata Aristotelis (Valencia: J. Mey, 1554) (Bodleian Library); and 167 problems in the edition of Paris: Boucard, 1520.

vi Aristotelis, Alexandri et Cassii problemata..., ed. Fridericus Sylburg (Frankfurt: Wechel, 1585). See also the freestanding Latin edition that had appeared earlier: Cassius, Naturales et medicinales quaestiones lxxxiii, Conrado Gesnero interprete (Zurich, 1562).

- 
- vii The problems of Plutarch and this explanation first appear in Problemata Aristotelis ac philosophorum medicorumque complurium (Frankfurt: Brubach, 1548).
- viii See Jaap Mansfeld, Prolegomena: questions to be settled before the study of an author or text (Leiden, 1994). I am grateful to Vivian Nutton for this reference.
- ix Julio Guastavini, Commentarii in priores decem Aristotelis Problematum sectiones (Lyon, 1608); Ludovico Settala, In Aristotelis Problemata commentaria, first vol. (Frankfurt, 1602), and complete in 3 vols. (Frankfurt, 1632). See also the commentary on book I by Ioannes Manelfi of Monterotondo, near Rome, professor of "first philosophy" at the gymnasium of his hometown: Urbanæ disputationes in primam problematum Aristotelis sectionem (Rome, 1630). For an edition containing d'Abano's commentary, see Problemata Aristotelis cum commento, et duplici translatione videlicet et nova Theodori Gazes ... cum Petri de Apono commentariis (Paris, 1520); in discussing this commentary I have relied mostly on Nancy G. Siraisi, "The Expositio Problematum Aristotelis of Peter of Abano," Isis 61 (1970), 321-39. For evidence of another medieval commentary, see Lynn Thorndike, "Peter of Abano and another commentary of the problems of Aristotle," Bulletin of the History of Medicine 29 (1955), 517-23. There are no doubt partial or complete manuscript commentaries to be found, like the commentary begun by one Robert Titius, ca. 1600, in Bodleian Ms d'Orville 54. For modern discussions of the authenticity of the Problems, see Hellmut Flashar tr., Aristoteles: problemata physica (Berlin, 1962); W.S. Hett tr., Problems, 2 vols. (Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge, Mass., 1936-37); E. S. Forster, "The Pseudo-Aristotelian problems: their nature and composition," Classical Quarterly 22 (1928), 163-65; W. Prantl, "Über die Problemata Aristotelis," Abhandlungen der philosophisch-philologischen Classe der königlich Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften 6 (1850): 339-77.
- x Guastavini, Commentarii, sig. 3r.
- xi "Haud vero mihi facile persuadeat quispiam, eos esse triginta illas octo sectiones, quam nos habemus: cum eas ab Aristotele, eo quidem ordine aut numero fuisse collocatas, non sit, puto, qui affirmare audeat, quae potius confusio, quam ordo est: cum pro varietate exemplarium, alia alibi plura, alibi pauciora: et alia alibi priora, alibi posteriora existente. Ut omittam quae saepius iterantur, tum in eadem, tum in varijs sectionibus: Argumento, ordinem illum, ac numerum non esse ab Aristotele." Guastavini, Commentarii, sig. 3v. On the contradictions in the pseudo-Aristotelian problems, see Flashar, Aristoteles: problemata, 323-35.
- xii "Unde subdit Vicomercatus, Problemata illa ab aliquo ex Theophrasti et Aristotelis libris esse consarcinata, quod ut facile concesserim; sicuti etiam aliqua esse his sectionibus immista, quae nec in Theophrastum, nec in Aristotelem sint conferenda; quippe futiles dissolutiones et illis Philosophis indignas, quae contineant; ita horum causa reliqua omnia condemnare, impium existimem. Sane quae ex Theophrasto sunt, illa Peripatetica sunt, et discipuli doctrina, magistri doctrinae consentanea." Guastavini, Commentarii, sig. 3v.
- xiii "Apparet autem opus hoc non esse ab Aristotele conscriptum, sed ex disputationibus illius, ab auditoribus collectum et congestum. Multae insunt in eo repetitiones, quas nunquam reliquisset autor ipse, si in ordinem digessisset quae disputarat, et consignasset monumentis literarum. Reliquit autem studiosus coacervator, dum maiorem diligentiam adhibet in cogendo, quam iudicium in disponendo. Multae insunt in eis rationes frigidae, leves, dilutae, alienae ab Aristotelici ingenij gravitate, atque acrimonia, aliae obscurae, et molestae. Sunt enim dubitata omnia, nihil affirmatur." Vives, "Iudicium de problematis Aristotelis," in Problemata Aristotelis (Valencia: Johannis Mey, 1554), sig. A2r. Vives complains in closing about the answers, which are often themselves phrased as questions; for more discussion of this form, see my "Problemata

---

as a natural philosophical genre."

xiv "Et scias quod liber ille de problematibus communiter invenitur corruptus et incorrectus, et non est multum expositus ab aliquo noto aut famoso, et ideo pauci student in eo, et pauciores intelligunt eum sufficienter: quanquam multa et pulcherrima theoremata mirabilis delectationis sunt in eo congregata. unde indubitanter ei qui illum librum bene corrigeret et exponeret competenter multas et magnas gratias deberent reddere studiosi." Jean of Jandun, Questiones super de physico Aristotelis (Venice, 1560), sig. 8b, as quoted in Lawn, The Salernitan Questions, 94; my translation.

xv Françoise Guichard-Tesson, "Le métier de traducteur et de commentateur au XIVe siècle d'après Evrart de Conty," Le Moyen Français 24-25 (1989), 131-67, p. 137.

xvi "In parte ego laborem hunc aggressus et emolitus sum, Problemata illustrando, quorum Septem primas sectiones (foelix a nomine meo omne sit) Latinas velut carbone feci, simplici, sed fideli stilo et pene (quantum linguae ratio passa fuit) ad verbum. Tu, o bone Lector, vide, confer, iudica. Nam et meam interpretationem et Graecum **prôtotupon** simul habes. Wechelium inquam a doctissimo Sylburgio emendatum tanquam optimum et purissimum, alibi tamen a correctione quoque nostra adiutum." Settala, In Aristotelis problemata, sig. 4r. He is referring to the Greek edition by Sylburg, Aristotelis, Alexandri et Cassii problemata... (Frankfurt, 1585).

xvii "Nactus eram problematum exemplar satis bonum, quod fuerat Alexandri Iustiniani Chii Medici, et Patricij Genuensis: Is liber erat ex editione Basiliensi: sed ad cuius oram, vir ille eruditissimus, ex manuscriptis codicibus multas adscripserat lectionem varietates et castigationes; in quas cum accurate inspicerem, Theodorique simul eorum problematum translationem, illa occasione considerarem, hanc permultis locis non fidelem, eas autem lectiones saepius meliores, quam vulgatas dignoscere mihi visus sum." Guastavini, Commentarii, sigs. 4r-v. On Gaza's translation, which involved considerable adjustments to the text, and which Settala too probably aims with his complaints, see John Monfasani, "Aristotle's Problemata and De animalibus in the Renaissance," in Natural Particulars: Nature and the Disciplines in Renaissance Europe, ed. Anthony Grafton and Nancy Siraisi (forthcoming MIT Press).

xviii See the reflections by Michel Foucault, "Qu'est-ce qu'un auteur?" in Dits et écrits 1954-1988 (Paris, 1994), vol. I (1954-69), 789-821.

xix Bibliothèque Mazarine, Paris, Ms 991, ff. 116-149: "incipiunt Problemata Aristotelis. Omnes homines...." compare with incipit of a medieval manuscript of the "genuine" pseudo-Aristotelian problems: "Incipit liber Problematum Aristotelis." Bibliothèque Mazarine Ms 774, ff. 222-60.

xx Some examples of earlier titles include: Probleumata Arestotilis (Leipzig: Conrad Kachelofen, 1490) (British Library); Probleumata Arestotilis determinantia multas questiones de varijs corporum humanorum dispositionibus valde audientibus suaves (Cologne: Quentell, 1493) (Bibliothèque Nationale et Universitaire, Strasbourg); Probleumata Arestotilis determinantia multas questiones de varijs corporum humanorum disputationibus valde audientibus suaves (n. pl. [1510]) (British Library); Probleumata Aristotelis varias quaestiones cognosci admodum dignas et ad naturalem philosophiam potissimum spectantes discutientia (Paris: Colaeus de la Barre, 1515) (British Library). The standard title after the addition of the problems of Zimara is: Aristotelis ac philosophorum medicorumque complurium problemata ad varias quaestiones cognoscendas admodum digna, et ad naturalem philosophiam discutiendam maxime spectantia. Marci Antonii Zimarae Sanctipetrinatis problemata his addita ... Omnia iam tertio edita (Basel: Robert Winter, 1541) (Bibliothèque Sainte-Geneviève, Paris).

xxi For some examples of early German titles see: Ein tractat mancherley frag menschlicher



---

und thierlicher natur und geschicklichkeit zu latein genant propleumata arestotiles und ander naturelich meister als jeder hernach finden werdet [1492] (Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Göttingen); Ein büchlin das durch die natürlichen maister Aristotilem, Avicennam, Galenum, Albertum und andern natürlichen maistern von mancherley seltsamen wunderlichen fragen beschriben. und der menschlichen natur gar nutzlich zu wissen ist. und hayst propleumata aristotiles (Augsburg: Hansen Froschauer, 1512) (Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Göttingen); also a close variant: Ein hübsch biechlein das durch die natürlichen meister Aristotelem, Avicennam, Galienum, Albertum und andern natürlichen meistern von mancherley seltsamen fragen beschriben unnd der menschlichen natur gar nutzlichen zu wissen. Propleumata Aristotiles (Strasbourg: Hüpfuff, 1515) (Herzog August Bibliothek, Wolfenbüttel); Problemata Fragstück Aristotelis Avicenne, Galeni unnd Alberti Magni. Darinn menschlicher und thierlicher natur eygeschafften durch frag und antwort auch mancherhandt artzneien den menschen zu gut kurtz angezeygt werden. Iztunt von newem gemert gebessert und das onnutz herauss getilckt durch O. Apollinarem (Strasbourg: Jacob Cammerland, 1540) (Herzog August Bibliothek, Wolfenbüttel). The standard title in later editions containing the problems of Zimara is: Problemata Aristotelis Mancherley zweifelhafter Fragen gründtliche erörterung und ausslosung des hochberhumpten Aristotelis und viel anderer bewerten Natur erkundiger fast nutzlich und kurzweilig allerley furgebrachte fragen eygendtlich und scheinbarlich zu entscheyden, e.g. in the first edition (Frankfurt am Main: Curiacus Jacob, 1551) (Bodleian Library).

xxii "Omnes homines naturaliter scire desiderant, ut scribit Aristoteles princeps Philosophorum, primo Metaphysicae. Cuius causa potest reddi talis, quia omne ens naturaliter appetit suam perfectionem et similiter conatur simile fieri primo Enti, divino et immortalis, in quantum potest. ... Rursus et alia ratio est: nam quodcunque ens naturaliter appetit bonum, ut se conservare possit in rerum natura. Sed omnis notitia scientiam progignens est de numero bonorum honorabilium, ut patet primo de Anima. Ergo naturaliter omnis homo desiderat scire, ex consequenti omnis scientia (in quantum intellectui humano capi potest) est appetenda. Quamvis igitur quaelibet scientia sit perscrutanda, magis tamen illa, quae est nobilior et communior aliis scientiis. Sed philosophica scientia confert maximas delectationes." Problemata Aristotelis (Lyon: Paganus, 1569), sig. A2r-v. The preface is substantially the same across different editions: a comparison of this edition with that of Leipzig, 1490 reveals a few explanatory elaborations in the incunabulum which are not present in the later edition. But this preface was never translated into English--the English editions contained a new preface, discussed below.

xxiii The Problemes of Aristotle (Edinburgh, 1595), sig. A4v-A5r (#2, first, untitled section).

xxiv Rudolph Hirsch, Printing, selling and reading, 1450-1550 (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1974), p. 8. As Hirsch explains, a title like "sermones Bonaventurae" could mean anything from sermons composed by Bonaventure to sermons copied or preached by an anonymous Bonaventuran friar or which once belonged to some such friar, or to one named Bonaventure.

xxv The Problemes of Aristotle (Edinburgh, 1595), sig. E8r (second quire with this signature), #294 (section on monsters). The Latin also uses the first person plural, "vidimus," an authorial "we" which diminishes the individuality and singularity of the author.

xxvi On this genre, see Lorraine Daston and Katharine Park, Wonders and the Order of Nature, 1150-1750 (New York: Zone Books, 1998), ch. 5.

xxvii E.g. on the question of why one should be moderate in eating, the answer concludes: "Unde versus [*italicized*] *Esse cupis sanus, sit tibi parca manus/ Pone gulae metas, aetas ut sit*

---

tibi longa." Problemata Aristotelis (Amsterdam: Janssonius, 1650), 73-4. Compare with an earlier Latin version: "Si vis esse sanus sit tibi parca manus. pone gule metas ut sit tibi longa etas." Probleumata Arestotilis (Leipzig, 1490), sig. Cv verso; with a German edition of 1580: "Daher wirt in dem Reymen gesagt: Stell deinm Halss ein mass und ziel/ So wirst du leben lang und viel./ Begerestu zu haben gesundes Leben/ So halt an dich dein Hand und iss gar eben." Problemata Aristotelis Gründliche Erörterung... (Frankfurt am Mayn: durch Johannem Spies in verlegung Hartmanni Hahns, 1580), f. 64r; and a French edition: "par quoy c'est chose tres-salubre et profitable d'estre modeste en son manger, beuvant et mangeant temperament, comme disent ces vers: esse cupis sanus, sit tibi parca manus. pone gulae metas, aetas ut sit tibi longa. Si tu veux avoir vie prospere et saine/ Par trop manger ne soit ta gorge pleine/ Si vivre veux longuement en ce monde./ Ta gueule soit par sobriete munde." Problèmes d'Aristote (Paris: Veuve Jean Regnoul, 1617), ff. 63v-64r. These editions were used because they could all be consulted simultaneously at the British Library. By contrast see The Problemes of Aristotle (Edinburgh, 1595), sig. E3r (#210, section on the stomach).

xxviii For a study of this genre, among other uses of the authority of Democritus, see Christoph Luethy, "The Four Conflated Democriti and the Problem of Early Modern Corpuscularianism," forthcoming Finis Terrae 1 (1999).

xxix Aristotelis, Alexandri Aphrodisei, Marciantonii Zimarae ac Philosophorum medicorumque complurium problemata. Quibus adiectus est copiosissima index (Venice: in vico Sanctae Mariae Formosae, 1554) (Houghton Library, Harvard University). The second title page reads: Alexandri Aphrodisieii problemata, cum indice locupletissimo. Problemata Marciantonii Zimarae. Philosophorum medicorumque complurium problemata (Venice: in vico sanctae Mariae Formosae, 1554). Inside the work, the "Omnes homines" opens with: "Aristotelis ac philosophorum medicorumque complurium problemata praefatio: Omnes homines..." and the running heads at the tops of the pages read: "Arist. et aliorum problemata."

xxx See Josef Benzing, Die Buchdrucker des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts im deutschen Sprachgebiet, 2nd ed. (Wiesbaden, 1982), 37 (Robert Winter, Basel), 45-46 (König, Basel), 121 (Cyriacus Jacob, Frankfurt), 122 (Brubach, Frankfurt--noted for his publications of the classics), 126-27 (Johan Spiess, Frankfurt--active in vernacular publication), 128 (Wendel Hommen or Homm, Frankfurt), 233 (Quentell, Cologne), 249 (Antonius Hierat, Cologne--noted for his theological publications), 276 (Kachelofen, Cologne--noted for his liturgical works and some works in low German), 311 (Johann Francken, Magdeburg), 439 (Martin Flach, Strasbourg), 444 (Cammerland, Strasbourg--noted for his publications for a popular readership). Not mentioned in Benzing despite their German locations are: Elias Rehefeld and Johann Grosius, Leipzig (Latin editions of 1623 and 1633); Frobenius, Hamburg (German edition of 1604), David Zäpflinn (Frankfurt, German edition of 1553). For the Lyonnais printers, see Henri-Louis Baudrier, Bibliographie lyonnaise (Paris, 1964-65), although he does not mention any editions of the "Omnes homines" in his list of their publications: for Thibaud Payen (Paganus) (editions of 1561 and 1569), see IV, 206-70; for Louis Cloquemin (editions of 1573 and 1579), see IV, 39ff.

xxxi Compare Problèmes d'Aristote (Lyon: de Tournes, 1587), Zimara's problem #45 with Problemata Aristotelis (Amsterdam: Janssonius, 1643).

xxxii Compare Probleumata Arestotilis (Leipzig, 1490) 'de mamillis' (32 questions); Probleumata Arestotilis (Magdeburg: Simon Koch, 1488) (Herzog August Bibliothek, Wolfenbüttel), 'de mamillis' (30 questions) and 'de hemorrhoidis' (2 questions); and Aristotelis ac philosophorum medicorumque complurium problemata in Trinum magicum sive secretorum naturalium coelestium, infernalium opus admirandum ac plane novum (Frankfurt: ex officina

---

Johannis Spiessi, sumptibus vero Antoni Hummii, 1609) (British Library), 'de mamillis' (23 questions), 'de dorsis' (6 questions); 'de medulla' (1 question); 'de fluxu ex haemorrhoidum' (2 questions). The same number and content of questions are redistributed among different subdivisions in these editions.

xxxiii "Zum erstem mal wirt gefragt/ Warumb das sei als Galenus spricht/ das under allen thierlein allain der mensch das antlitz gegen himel geschickt und gewendt hat. Boetius im letzten Buch de cons. Philosophie antwort/ Under allen thierlein so ist der mensch alleyn zu dem himelreich geschickt das erzeygt er mit seinem auffereckten antlitz da mit der Gott emsiglichen soll erkennen." Problemata Fragstuck Aristotelis Avicenne, Galeni unnd Alberti Magni (Strasbourg, 1540). I have found this version of the text in the editions from Ein tractat [1492] to Propleumata Arestotiles (Frankfurt, 1546) (Herzog August Bibliothek, Wolfenbüttel), including those modified by Walter Ryff. There is a slight chance that this German translation was based on a vernacular manuscript tradition that was possibly as old as the Latin; I not aware, however, of the existence of any German manuscripts of the "Omnes homines," but there would be many places to look.

xxxiv "Sexto respondetur, et ultimo, quod naturaliter cuilibet rei et operi talis figura est computanda quae suo motui fiet apta. Ut Coelo competit rotunditas, igni autem competit figura pyramidis, quae motui sursum est apta. Ergo rei bipedali, ut est homo figura diametrica, et figura pyramidis est aptissima. Ergo inter omnia animalia solus homo capite est elevatus." Problemata Aristotelis ac philosophorum medicorumque complurium (Lyon: Paganus, 1569), first question. Compare with the English version: "Sixtly, it is answered that naturally, there is unto every thing, and every worke, that forme and figure given, which is fit and proper for his motion; as unto the Heaven roundnes, to the fire a pyramidall forme, that is broade beneath and sharpe toward the top, which forme is most apt to ascende: and so man hath his face up to Heaven, to behold and wonder at Gods worke." The Problemes of Aristotle (Edinburgh, 1595); with the French: "Finalement on baille telle reponse physique: il est requis donner à chacune chose telle forme et figure qu'elle soit selon sa nature propre et convenable à son mouvement: comme au ciel rondeur: au feu, forme pyramidale: l'une estant commode à virer et tourner, l'autre à monter en haut. Dont s'ensuit que à ce qui est bipedal, c'est à dire ayant deux pieds, la figure pyramidale et diametrale, qui est à dire droite et eslevee est tresapte et convenable." Problèmes d'Aristote et autres philosophes (Lyon: de Tournes, 1587); and with the German translation of Sylvius: "Zum sechsten und letzten wird geantwortet: Dass von Natur eim jeglichen Ding und Werck eine solche Gestalt und Form soll zugemessen und zugethan werden, die zu desselben bewegung dienlich mög seyn. ... Daher auch eim zweyfüssigen Thier, wie der Mensch ist, die starcke und in die spitze auffgerichte Gestalt am aller bequemesten und förmlichsten ist. Derhalben von wegen dieser Ursachen aller ist under allen Thieren der Mensch allein mit dem Haupt auffgerichtet." Aristotelis problemata. Das ist gründliche erörterunge... (Basel: Emmanuel König, 1666).

xxxv Problemata Fragstuck Aristotelis Avicenne, Galeni unnd Alberti Magni (Strasbourg, 1540), sig. B4r (section on the breast).

xxxvi Problemata Aristotelis. mancherley zweiffelhafftiger fragen grundtliche erörterung... Newlich auss dem Latein ins Teutsch gebracht. Cum privilegio imperiali. (Frankfurt: David Zäpflinn, 1553) (Herzog August Bibliothek, Wolfenbüttel). On the privilege found in some French editions, see below note 42; the title pages of the Latin editions of Leipzig, 1623 and 1633 also mention a privilege (see Figure 5).

xxxvii "Nun mocht man fragen. Wie geschieht die geburt oder wie sol man sich darinn halten. Soll ichs zu wissen und zu erfaren. Liess hievon Eucharium Rösslin Doctor der artzney. Der gar

---

ein hübsch büchlin darvon auss hat lassen gehen im truck. Der Schwangern frawen und Hebammen Rosegarten genant." Ein hübsch biechlein... (Strasbourg, 1515), final paragraph; also present in editions down to 1546 (in editions of Strasbourg, 1540-45, with further additions by Ryff). The reference is to Eucharius Rösslin, Der Swangern Frauwen und Hebammen Rosegarten (Strasbourg, 1513); for some discussion and an English translation of this work, see Wendy Arons, When Midwifery Became the Male Physician's Province: The Sixteenth Century Handbook The Rose Garden for Pregnant Women and Midwives, Newly Englished (Jefferson, North Carolina, 1994).

xxxviii On Ryff, see Miriam Usher Chrisman, Lay Culture, Learned Culture: Books and Social Change in Strasbourg, 1480-1599 (New Haven, Conn., 1982), 179-81; and Josef Benzing, Walther H. Ryff und sein literarisches Werk, eine Bibliographie (Hamburg, 1959).

xxxix "Solches zuwissen und erfaren liss hievon den newen Albertum Magnum durch Q. Apollinarem aussgangen." Problemata Fragstuck Aristotelis Avicenne, Galeni unnd Alberti Magni. ... Iztunt von newem gemert gebessert und das onnutz herauss getilckt durch Q. Apollinarem (Strasbourg, 1540), final paragraphs; this modified version is probably the same as the Strasbourg editions of 1543 and 1545, although I have not been able to verify this; see the bibliographical entries in François Ritter, Repertoire bibliographique des livres du XVIe siècle qui se trouvent à la Bibliothèque Nationale et Universitaire (Strasbourg, 1945), vol. III, 1232-35 (unfortunately the editions of 1543 and 1545 described there are no longer to be found in the BNU of Strasbourg).

xl See the Problemata Aristotelis ac philosophorum medicorumque complurium (n.pl., 1554) (Bibliothèque Publique et Universitaire, Geneva), (n.pl., 1558) (Bibliothèque Nationale et Universitaire, Strasbourg) and the Trinum magicum sive secretorum naturalium coelestium (Frankfurt: Johann Spiess, 1609) (British Library), which all include, after the "Omnes homines" and the problems of Zimara and Alexander: Albert's De secretis mulierum, De virtutibus herbarum, lapidum et animalium and De mirabilibus mundi.

xli See The Problems of Aristotle (Edinburgh, 1595) and (London: Arnold Hatfield, 1597) (Bibliothèque Mazarine, Paris).

xlii For the attribution see Cioranescu, Bibliographie de la littérature française du seizième siècle (Paris, 1959), 388. A privilege dated 1553 at the back of some French editions, e.g. in Problèmes d'Aristote et autres philosophes et medecins (Lyon: de Tournes, 1570) (Bibliothèque Mazarine, Paris) covers two separate works, the Problèmes d'Aristote and a book of prodigies by Jules Obsequens with the dialogues of Polydore Vergil, "traduit nouvellement par George de la Bouthiere." This passage is probably the source of the attribution, although in it La Bouthière is only mentioned as having translated Jules Obsequens and Polydore Vergil (in a work which appeared in 1550), not the Problèmes.

xliii For an example of how one might explain such changes, taken from a comparison of two editions of Girolamo Manfredi's Il perche from before and after the Council of Trent (Ancona, 1512) and (Venice, 1588), see Olivio Galeazzi and Gian Luigi Zigiotti, "Due cinquecentine del Libro del perche: annotazioni su un itinerario culturale," Medicina nei Secoli. Arte e scienza 1 (1989), 49-63. In this project, I have had little success, so far, finding patterns in the modifications made, for example by Walter Ryff, or between the 1666 and 1679 editions of the Problemata Bodini, when several problems were omitted in the later edition. Similarly, in studying the fortuna of another anonymous compilation of medical knowledge published as Aristotle's Masterpiece in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, Roy Porter has found, on the one hand, that a number of substantially distinct versions were in circulation, and, on the other

---

hand, that little attempt was made to adjust the work to new readers. See Roy Porter and Lesley Hall, The Facts of Life: The Creation of Sexual Knowledge in Britain, 1650-1950 (New Haven, Conn., 1995), 37 and 51.

xliv For a discussion of the emergence of the editor in the publication of high quality vernacular imprints, see Brian Richardson, Print Culture in Renaissance Italy: the Editor and the Vernacular Text 1470-1600 (Cambridge, 1994).

xlv Including: Apostillae (Pavia, 1521); Contradictiones et solutiones in dictis Aristotelis et Averrois (Venice, 1508); Tabula dilucidationum in dictis Aristotelis et Averrois (Venice, 1537); posthumously published: Contradictiones et solutiones in dictis Thesmistii (Venice, 1542). Of doubtful authenticity: Antrum magico-medicum (Frankfurt: J. F. Weisius, 1525). See Charles Lohr, "Renaissance Latin Aristotle Commentaries, authors So-Z," Renaissance Quarterly 35 (1982), pp. 164-256, pp. 245-54 on Zimara.

xlvi Lohr, "Renaissance Latin Aristotle Commentaries," pp. 252-53.

xlvii Ad Ioannem Castriotam, Ferrandinae ducem illustrissimum, problematum liber. Ioannes Castriota (ca. 1450-ca. 1517), like his father Georgios Castriota Scanderbeg, an Albanian nobleman, allied himself with Venetian and South Italian powers in the Christian alliance against the Ottomans; Castriota became count of Soleta and San Pietro in Galatina, where Zimara taught at one point, then duke. Ferrandina is a city near Matera in Southern Italy, not far from Otranto, where he fought in a major battle against the Ottomans. I am grateful to Christoph Luethy for this information.

xlviii "Verum ne opusculum nostrum in caput (ut aiunt) excrescat, libellum nostrum, de quibusdam quaesitis, ad utramque Philosophiam spectantibus, extempore editum, ob immensum beneficiorum tuorum erga me relatorum cumulum gratitudinis, erga te meae argumentum, in praesentia suscipias, severiora in posterum suscepturus." Problemata Aristotelis ac philosophorum medicorumque complurium (Lyon: Paganus, 1569), 142-3.

xlix The preface and marginal notes are regularly included in Latin editions and omitted in English and German editions; included in most French editions, they were omitted from a late edition (Rouen: Adam Mallassis, 1620) (British Library).

l "Ita non frustra sperabo editionem meam luce ingenii tui illustratam inter omnes alias eminere posse. Problemata Gelliana patris tui Herois incomparabilis lubens adjicerem, si scirem illorum editionem ad ipsius honorem pertinere. Non defugies indicare sententiam tuam. Nihil enim temere te invito suscepero. Johannes Woverus Cent. 2. Epistol. 67 pag 343." The reference is accurate; see Ioannes Wower, Epistolarum centuriae ii (Hamburg, 1609), 343, letter 67 to J. J. Scaliger. To the reader from the printer: "Maluimus haec qualicumque modo superesse quam omnino non esse: et certe melius semper esse quocumque modo sis, quam non esse. Peccata multa hic invenies, fateor, sed tamen legitimum operis magni **apospasmation** hactenus ineditum habebis." Problemata Aristotelis (Amsterdam: Janssonius, 1643), last page.

li "Problemata gelliana ex Iul Caesar. Scaligeri familiarium exercitationum libris" in Iul. Caes. Scaligeri adversus Desid. Erasmus orationes duae, eloquentiae romanae vindices (Toulouse, 1620). I am grateful to Michel Magnien for this reference and to him and to Pierre Lardet for their assessments of the Problemata gelliana; they will perhaps be more successful than I in finding sources for these problems in Scaliger's other works. The adjective 'gelliana' is an allusion to Aulus Gellius which signals the miscellaneous nature of the collection; on Gellius' role as a model for the miscellany in the Renaissance, see Jean Céard, "Les formes du commentaire," in Précis de littérature française du seizième siècle, ed. Robert Aulotte (Paris, 1991), 177-92.

- 
- lii For a more detailed discussion of the Problemata Bodini and more generally of Bodin's Theatrum and its reception, see Ann Blair, The Theater of Nature: Jean Bodin and Renaissance Science (Princeton NJ, 1997), 212-24.
- liii "So viel ist für guth angesehen worden auss dem Theatro Philosophiae Bodini, dem gemeinen Manne ins Teutsch zubringen. Gelehrte können genantes Buch selbst lesen da sie denn Argumenta und Demonstrationes aller erzeleten dinge finden werden. Mit diesem wolle ihme der Teutsche Leser etwas lassen gedienet sein zur Lust und zu nutze fürnemlich dass Gott der Schöpffer und seine wunderliche Werck erkant und er gelobet und gepreiset werde." Problemata Bodini (Magdeburg: Johan Francken, 1602), last page [p. 173, following the pagination I have supplied]. I have worked from a flow-copy of a microfilm of the copy at the Marienbibliothek, Halle, generously made available to me by Marie-Thérèse Isaac, director of the Séminaire de Bibliographie Historique, Université de l'Etat à Mons, Belgium.
- liv Aristotelis Problemata. Das ist Gründliche Erörterunge... Problemata Johannis Bodini (Basel: Johan Schröter, 1622), then (Basel: Emmanuel König, 1666 and 1679). For a detailed description of these editions, see Roland Crahay, Marie-Thérèse Isaac and Marie-Thérèse Lenger, Bibliographie critique des éditions anciennes de Jean Bodin (Brussels, 1992), 304-11.
- lv "Was haben die Menschen so für der Sundfluth gelebet gessen? Sie haben Eicheln und Epffel gessen und Milch. Haben kein Fleisch gessen." Problemata Bodini, [65]; cf. Jean Bodin, Universae naturae theatrum (Frankfurt: Wechel, 1597--hereafter UNT), 273.
- lvi "Wie kompts das nicht alles an allen orten wechset? Das hat Gott der weise Schöpffer also geordnet das wachsen solle was einem jeden Lande zutreglich were nach der Natur der Menschen was denselben nützlich oder nicht dienstlich ist." Problemata Bodini, [65]; cf. UNT, 274.
- lvii For a development of this point, see my "Humanist Methods of Natural Philosophy: the Commonplace book," Journal of the History of Ideas 53 (1992), 541-51.
- lviii "Wie kompts das die Bletter so balde abfallen? ... Wie kompts wenn man eine Wunde in Bawm hawet das es inne nicht schadet? ... Wie kompts das etliche Bewme von grosser kelte erfrieren? ... Wie das [sic] von Alten Bewmen die Früchte besser schmecken als von Jungen Bewmen?" Problemata Bodini, [65-66]; cf. UNT, 277, 279.
- lix "Wie sol einer die Trunckenheit vertreiben? Nim succum Brassicarum in der Apoteca, so wirstu wider nüchtern." Problemata Bodini, [73]; cf. UNT, 294.
- lx The Problemes of Aristotle (Edinburgh, 1595), sig. A3r.
- lxi See Lawn, The Salernitan Questions, 100, for evidence for editions of 1684, 1696 and 1704; the latest edition I have seen dates from 1666.
- lxii A conclusion reached by Mary Fissell after an extensive bibliographical survey, in "Making Aristotle's Masterpiece: Popular Medical Books as Cultural Bricolage," unpublished manuscript, which I am most grateful to the author for sharing with me.
- lxiii An edition of the Problems appears for example with an edition of the Masterpiece dated to 1710 (British Library); this edition of the Masterpiece includes a poem by William Salmon, who is presumed to be one of the writers of the work. On this point, and on the North American career of these texts and of Aristotle's Masterpiece in particular, which begins with an edition published in "America, 1766" (American Antiquarian Society, Worcester, Mass.), see Otho T. Beall, Jr. "Aristotle's Master Piece in America: A Landmark in the Folklore of Medicine," William and Mary Quarterly 20 (1963), 207-22.
- lxiv The Works of Aristotle (Edinburgh, 1784) (Countway Library of Medicine).
- lxv Lawn, The Salernitan Questions, p. 100, note 5.

---

lxvi The Works of Aristotle in four parts (London: printed for Cocker, Harris and Finn and sold by all booksellers, 184?) and (New York: published for the trade, 1849) (both at the Countway Library of Medicine, Boston). Harvard University Library also owns editions of Works of Aristotle published in 1792, 1798, 1802, 1806, 1812, 1813, 1820, 1828, 1829, 1830, 1831. The English printings have been traced down to 1796 by Porter and Hall, The Facts of Life, 33-64, esp. p. 55.

lxvii D'Arcy Power, The Foundations of Medical History (Baltimore, 1931), p. 176.

lxviii See Jill Kraye, "The printing history of Aristotle in the fifteenth century," Renaissance Studies 9 (1995), 189-211, p. 211; I am grateful to the author this remarkable reference.

lxix Aristotle's new book of problems set forth by way of question and answer to which are added a great number from other famous philosophers, astronomers, astrologers and Physitians shewing the secrets of nature and art together with the interpretation of dreams, signification of moles in any part, the nature of ghosts, the reason of eclipses of the sun and moon; also, wonders in the creation, as Earthquakes, ebbing and flowing of the sea etc. "6th edition" (London: printed for John Marshall, 1725) (British Library), "to the reader."

lxx Aristotle's book of problems with other astronomers, astrologers, physicians and philosophers wherein is contained divers questions and answers touching the state of man's body together with the reasons of divers wonders in the creation: the generations of birds, beasts, fishes and insects; and many other problems on the most weighty matters by way of question and answer, 26th ed. (London: printed for and sold by J.W.J.K.D.M. A.B.E.M. R.R.T.L.B.M. and A.W., [1764]) (British Library). The text is also available in the facsimile of a London, 1776 edition in Aristotle's Master-Piece, etc. (New York and London: Garland Publishing, 1986).

lxxi Porter and Hall, The Facts of Life, 55.

lxxii Aristotle's new book of problems, title page and at back of the book: a list of 102 titles, followed by a general summary of John Marshall's business. "Shopkeepers in city or chapmen in country who sell bibles, common prayers, testaments, psalters, spelling books, primers and all sorts of schoolbooks etc may be furnished with all sorts of chapmens books, broadsides or halfsheets, lottery pictures as birds, beasts ... etc by the gross or dozen. also labels for surgeons chests, ... bills, funeral tickets, affidavits for burials in woollen, receipts for land-tax, and window lights etc wholesale or retale at the very lowest prices."

lxxiii For a careful discussion of the readership of works of this kind, see Mary E. Fissell, "Readers, texts and contexts: vernacular medical works in early modern England," in The popularization of medicine 1650-1850, ed. Roy Porter (London and New York, 1992), 72-96, e.g. 74-75.

lxxiv Beall, "Aristotle's Master Piece," 219. Occasional external evidence as to how the "Omnes homines" was read can be garnered from marginal annotations left by readers (which I have found so far only in Latin editions) and from the other books with which it was sometimes bound, which presumably seemed to one owner at least to be similar in kind. For discussion of the few such cases I have found, see the final section of my "Problemata as a natural philosophical genre." One additional example has since come to my attention, of a 1549 Latin edition of the "Omnes homines" (Frankfurt: Cyriacus Jacob) bound with a textbook of natural philosophy, Philip Melanchthon's Initia doctrinae physicae (Wittenberg: Johann Lufft, 1550), which is a reminder of the respectable pedagogical nature of the "Omnes homines" near the beginning of its career.

lxxv Aristotle's book of problems (London, [1764]), "to the reader."

lxxvi Aristotle's compleat master-piece in three parts, displaying the secrets of nature in the

---

generation of man, 31st ed. (London: printed and sold by the booksellers, 1776), "to the reader."