

BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR A STUDY OF ARISTOTLE

SUNY/Purchase

K.R. Dove

Fall 1993

It will be evident that the following list of texts, including comments, exceeds the needs of any undergraduate student. You are therefore advised to use the listings selectively. Over the past two decades a certain number of Purchase students have nevertheless proved to have an extraordinary range of curiosity in specific areas of Aristotle. Some of these same students have indicated an interest in the sources of direction for their instructor's study of Aristotle. Hence this bibliography.

A. MAJOR EDITIONS

The modern critical edition of the Greek text which (though largely superseded for individual texts by subsequent editions) supplies the pagination for all subsequent editions and good translations of Aristotle, is the 'Bekker' or 'Berlin' edition of the *Corpus Aristotelicum*:

1. I. Bekker, ed., *Aristotelis Opera*, Berlin: Academia Regia Borussica, 1831–70. Vols. I–II, text; III, Latin Renaissance translations; IV, Scholia; V, Fragments and H. Bonitz, *Index Aristotelicus* (many subsequent reprints and revisions).

Students interested in the story of how the modern world came upon its texts of Aristotle may wish to consult:

1a. Richard Shute, *On the History of the Process by Which the Aristotelian Writings Arrived at Their Present Form*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1888.

1b. Richard Walzer, *Greek into Arabic*, Oxford: B. Cassirer, 1962.

1c. Franz Rosenthal, *The Classical Heritage in Islam*, E. and J. Marmorstein, trs., Berkeley: U of California P, 1975.

1d. Majid Fakhry, *A History of Islamic Philosophy*, New York: Columbia UP, 1970.

The most widely used English translation of Aristotle in the 20th century has been the 'Oxford Aristotle':

2a. J.A. Smith and W.D. Ross, eds., *The Works of Aristotle Translated into English*, 12 volumes, Oxford: Oxford University Press [OUP], 1908–52.

For much of this century American students of Aristotle have been guided by McKeon's two extremely popular editions selected from the Oxford Translation:

2b. [selections]. Richard McKeon, ed., (i.) *The Basic Works of Aristotle*, New York: Random House, 1941 and (ii.) *Introduction to Aristotle*, New York: Modern Library, 1947 [inadequate for serious study but currently available in a PB edition].

A two-volume compact edition of the Oxford Translation, all texts revised to accord with the most recent critical editions of the Greek texts, some translations supplanted by selections from the Clarendon Aristotle [see 2e. below], and enlarged to include the *Constitution of Athens*, Fragments, and a helpful index:

2c. [revision and expansion]. J. Barnes, ed., *The Complete Works of Aristotle*, two volumes, Princeton: PUP, 1984.

Three other sources of good English translations (each with special features) are to be found in:

2d. The Loeb Classical Library (complete; with facing Greek text), Cambridge: Harvard UP.

Selected texts of interest to British analytic philosophers; with very literal translations and sometimes helpful commentaries:

2e. J.L. Ackrill, ed., *Clarendon Aristotle Series*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963 ff.

Derived mostly from the above translations [2e.], and with a title intended to supplant the McKeon anthologies:

2f. [selections]. J.L. Ackrill, ed., *A New Aristotle Reader*, Princeton: PUP, 1987 [PB].

Astonishingly good translations, largely unrecognized because unsupported by an established press, with excellent apparatus (arguably the most ‘scientific’ of all Aristotle translations into English):

2g. Hippocrates G. Apostle, tr. (in order of first publication), *Metaphysics* (Indiana UP, 1966), *Physics* (Indiana UP, 1969), *Nicomachean Ethics* (D. Reidel, 1975), *Categories and Propositions* (1980), *Posterior Analytics* (1981), *On the Soul* (1981)—plus a volume of selections translated, with L.P. Gerson, from seventeen works (including the *Poetics* entire, 1982)—Grinnell, Iowa: Peripatetic Press, 1979 ff.

All good translations into modern languages incorporate page, column (‘a’ or ‘b’), and line references (usually placed on the outside page margins) from the first great modern edition of the Greek text, by Immanuel Bekker, item 1. above. Hence the frequent scholarly references to the ‘Bekker’ or ‘Berlin’ pagination. *Please develop the habit of using this form of page reference in class discussions and in your papers.* The 1870 volume of the Bekker edition, the term index edited by H. Bonitz, *Index Aristotelicus*, has been supplemented in our electronic age by at least two data bases containing all of Aristotle, which you may search in digital format (all you need is a computer, appropriate software, a modem, an account number, and a search procedure).

B. GENERAL

Much of philosophy over the past 2,000 years has consisted in the interpretation and criticism of Aristotle. The interpretations exhibit four main directions: (a.) **Formalist**, (b.) **Developmental**, (c.) **Aporetic**, and (d.) **Immanent**. The first has been the most pervasive and the others are most readily understandable as modifications or rejections of it. It may be called ‘**Formalist**’ because it takes the ideal of an axiomatized formal system—first stated in Aristotle’s *Posterior Analytics*—as the basic framework in which all other parts of Aristotle’s corpus are assigned their places. This point of view was established in the Hellenistic age, largely governed by the Stoic conception of ‘systematic’ philosophy, and is implicit in the structure imposed upon the *Corpus Aristotelicum* (*Organon*, *Physica*, *De Caelo*, etc.—titles in Latin because the works we know were first published in Rome) by his first editor, Andronicus of Rhodes (fl. 60–50 B.C.), and retained by Bekker and the Oxford editors. Its best known contemporary exponent is Barnes [12a.]. Despite its appealing simplicity, a Formalist reading is

objectionable because it rigidifies Aristotle's philosophy and because Aristotle himself did not use the formal logic he invented in the formulation of his theoretical arguments. The chief merit of the (b.) **Developmental** interpretation, especially in Jaeger [5.], is to have loosened the late 19th century stranglehold achieved by the Formalist reading. Its deficiency has been to direct scholarly attention away from Aristotle's philosophy and toward philological questions of 'earlier' and 'later' books, chapters, or even sentence fragments. After a half century, such work came to appear unprofitable. The most widely accepted interpretation today may be called anti-systematic or (c.) **Aporetic** because it stresses Aristotle's tendency to pose a large number of particular problems or *aporiai* and work out particular solutions to them. This accords well with the predispositions of contemporary Anglo-American 'analytical' as well as Continental 'hermeneutic' philosophers. But it leaves entirely unsatisfied the desire for that comprehensive insight which Aristotle repeatedly stresses as the highest form of human self-realization. It seems that the only thinkers capable of formulating an (d.) **Immanent** interpretation of Aristotle are those comparable with him in stature. Such interpretation is called 'immanent' because it is like a conversation between equals, with no need to import extraneous (formalistic or developmental) interpretative devices. There is some evidence of an immanent reading of Aristotle in Alexander of Aphrodisias [see, for example, his *On Aristotle's Metaphysics 1*, W.E. Dooley, tr., Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1989; and *The De Anima of Alexander of Aphrodisias*, A.P. Fotinis, tr., Washington, DC: UP of America, 1979], Aquinas, and Leibniz but, so far, the best examples are the discussions of Aristotle in Hegel—most importantly in his *Logic* and *Encyclopedia* and most explicitly in his lectures on the history of philosophy:

3a. G.W.F. Hegel, *Hegel's Lectures on the History of Philosophy* (1st. ed., Berlin, 1833), E.S. Haldane and Frances H. Simson, trs., London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co., 1894 [reprinted 1955 and 1963 by Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, and Humanities Press, New York], Vol. II, pp. 137–231.

New editions of the German text, together with English translations, are underway—see:

3b. Hegel, *Lectures on the History of Philosophy: The Lectures of 1825–26*, Vol. III, Medieval and Modern Philosophy, R.F. Brown, ed., Berkeley: U of California P, 1990. [Vol. II, which should include Aristotle, is scheduled for publication in 1993.]

Hegel's influence upon subsequent study in the history of philosophy has been enormous: he defined the subject and gave it the shape it has retained till today. But shortly after the posthumous publication of his lectures the school he founded fell into disarray, his writings went unread, he became 'famous' for a 'philosophy of history' which he never published (and which misreads his philosophy), and his interpretation of Aristotle was forgot. In the meanwhile the study of Aristotle has become a specialized academic discipline, largely pursued by classical scholars, rather than as a stimulant for independent philosophical thinking, which it was for Hegel. No scholar has even come close to Hegel in the formulation of interpretive arguments with a clarity and depth comparable to the works of Aristotle himself. Next to reading these works, a beginning student of Aristotle will find most rewarding the time spent with Hegel's lectures—even in their present condition.

On the topic of Aristotle and Hegel, remarkably little has been written. Some items worth considering are:

Aristotle Bibliography, Fall 1993

Page 4

3c. Nicolai Hartmann, "Aristoteles und Hegel," *Beiträge zur Philosophie des deutschen Idealismus*, III, 1 (Erfurt), 1923, 1–36.

3d. Erich Frank, "Das Problem des Lebens bei Hegel und Aristoteles," *Deutsche Vierteljahrschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Geistesgeschichte*, V (1927), 609–43.

3e. Herbert Marcuse, *Hegel's Ontology and the Theory of Historicity* [originally published in 1932 as *Hegels Ontologie und die Grundlegung einer Theorie der Geschichtlichkeit*], S. Benhabib, tr., Cambridge: MIT Press, 1987 [review by your instructor, *The Philosophical Review*, XCVIII, 3 (1989), 419 ff., which points out that all of Marcuse's work has been informed by a thinking of Hegel with Aristotle, even when the two are not mentioned. See: *Reason and Revolution*, 1941; *Eros and Civilization*, 1955; *Soviet Marxism*, 1958; *One Dimensional Man*, 1964].

3f. J. Glenn Gray, *Hegel's Hellenic Ideal*, New York: King's Crown Press, 1941; republished as *Hegel and Greek Thought*, New York: Harper & Row, 1968.

3g. Carl L.W. Heyder, *Kritische Darstellung und Vergleichung der Aristotelischen und Hegel'schen Dialektik, mit Berücksichtigung der Dialektik der Vorangegangenen Systeme*, Erlangen: C. Heyder, 1845.

3h. Gerhard Funke, "Gewohnheit," *Archiv für Begriffsgeschichte*, III (1961).

3i. Joachim Ritter, *Metaphysik und Politik: Studien zu Aristoteles und Hegel*, Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1969.

3j. Frederick G. Weiss, *Hegel's Critique of Aristotle's Philosophy of Mind*, preface by G.R.G. Mure, The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1969.

3k. Ernst Vollrath, *Die These der Metaphysik: Zur Gestalt der Metaphysik bei Aristoteles, Kant und Hegel*, Wuppertal: Alois Henn, 1969.

3l. Walter Kern, "Die Aristotelesdeutung Hegels. Die Aufhebung des Aristotelischen *Nous* in Hegels 'Geist,'" *Philosophisches Jahrbuch*, 78 (1971), 237–59.

The most recent book-length (254 pp.) study; reviewed in *The Owl of Minerva*, 24, 1 (Fall 1992), 94–96:

3m. Alfredo Ferrarin, *Hegel interprete di Aristotele*, Pisa: ETS Editrice, 1990.

3n. Liberato Santoro-Brienza, "Aristotle and Hegel on Nature: Some Similarities," in *Bulletin of the Hegel Society of Great Britain*, 26 (1992), 13–29.

3o. James H. Wilkinson, "A Theory of the Family: Critical Appropriations of Hegel and Aristotle," *The Owl of Minerva*, 24, 1 (Fall 1992), 19–40.

Each of the following studies can fill a specific need.

For the 'platonic' case against Aristotle:

4a. A.E. Taylor, *Aristotle*, London: Constable & Co., 1919 [reissued in PB, New York: Dover, 1955].

Aristotle Bibliography, Fall 1993

Page 5

For the most succinct résumé of Aristotle's works in English:

4b. W.D. Ross, *Aristotle: A Complete Exposition of His Works and Thought* (1st. ed., London, 1923), 5th. ed., New York: Meridian Books, 1959 [PB].

The book which has, unfortunately, dominated scholarship for most of this century is the brilliantly executed philological study:

5. Werner Jaeger, *Aristotle: Fundamentals of the History of His Development* (1st. ed., Berlin, 1923), Richard Robinson, tr., Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1934 [1962 PB].

The 'developmental' interpretation did not originate with Jaeger; an earlier and excellent statement may be found in Thomas Case, "Aristotle," the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, Eleventh Edition, 1911, Vol. II, 501–22. (Responding to Jaeger's book, Case makes a good claim to his priority in "The Development of Aristotle," *Mind*, ns 34, 1925, pp. 80–86.) Nevertheless, most 20th-century studies of Aristotle have been written in the shadow of Jaeger. A helpful orientation to how 'developmentalism' came to dominate Aristotle studies has been formulated by David R. Lachterman, "Did Aristotle 'Develop?': Reflections on Werner Jaeger's Thesis," *Revue de Philosophie Ancienne*, Vol. VIII, 1 (1990) 3–40.

For a 'British hegelian' (i.e., 'spinozist') reading:

6. G.R.G. Mure, *Aristotle*, Oxford: OUP, 1932 (compare his *An Introduction to Hegel*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940, the first six chapters of which focus upon Aristotle).

Within the Jaeger-context, a balanced and brief account by a British classicist:

7. D.J. Allan, *The Philosophy of Aristotle* (1st. ed., London, 1952), 2nd. ed., London: OUP, 1970 [PB].

One of the more philosophical interpretations in the age of Jaeger, which assimilates Aristotle into the tradition of American naturalism (esp., John Dewey):

8a. J.H. Randall, Jr., *Aristotle*, New York: Columbia UP, 1960 [PB].

For Aristotle's biology as a clue to his philosophy:

8b. Marjorie Grene, *A Portrait of Aristotle*, Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1963 [1979, PB].

An assimilation of Aristotle into the British tradition of analytic philosophy:

9. J.L. Ackrill, *Aristotle the Philosopher*, Oxford: OUP, 1981 [PB].

The culminating volume—somewhat truncated by Guthrie's illness—of this century's most comprehensive study of Greek philosophy:

10. W.K.C. Guthrie, *A History of Greek Philosophy*, Vol. 6, *Aristotle: An Encounter*, Cambridge: CUP, 1981.

A comprehensive, nearly 500-page, American interpretation:

11. Abraham Edel, *Aristotle and His Philosophy*, Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 1982.

For Aristotle's axiomatic logic as the clue to his philosophy, a very short book:

- 12a. Jonathan Barnes, *Aristotle*, Oxford: OUP, 1982 [PB].

Two further books address the problem of logic and methodology, the first proposing that the *Organon* constitutes a 'system' entirely independent of the other writings:

- 12b. Daniel W. Graham, *Aristotle's Two Systems*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987 [PB].

The second considers, at great length, the contrast between a 'dialectical' or opinion-based method of arriving at first principles and an 'objectivist' or opinion-independent method of arriving at conclusions about reality:

- 12c. T.H. Irwin, *Aristotle's First Principles*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988 [PB].

The most recent general introduction to Aristotle, which takes the opening line of the *Metaphysics* as its point of departure, is:

13. Jonathan Lear, *Aristotle: The Desire to Understand*, Cambridge: CUP, 1988 [PB].

There are several useful anthologies of articles. The most comprehensive, with detailed bibliographies, is:

- 14a. J. Barnes, M. Schofield, and R. Sorabji, eds., *Articles on Aristotle*, 4 vols., London: Duckworth, 1975–9 [later, PB].

An earlier one-volume anthology from the heyday of analysis:

- 14b. J.M.E. Moravcsik, ed., *Aristotle: A Collection of Critical Essays*, Garden City: Doubleday, 1967 [PB, reissued by University of Notre Dame Press, 1968].

Thirteen papers by the most influential English interpreter of Aristotle are gathered in:

- 14c. G.E.L. Owen, *Logic, Science and Dialectic: Collected Papers in Greek Philosophy*, Martha Nussbaum, ed., Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1986.

The contemporary thinkers on Aristotle who have proved to be most stimulating for your instructor have been Rulon Wells (who effectively introduced your instructor—who had first encountered the texts in 1955—to Aristotle in 1958, and whose conversations on metaphysics, physics, and logic, from 1965 through 1982, were sustaining), Herbert Marcuse (mostly in conversations and correspondence on metaphysics, ethics, and politics, from 1961 till his death in 1982; see publications under 3e. above), Hannah Arendt (mostly in conversations on *sophia* and *phronesis*, from 1968 till her death in 1975), David R. Lachterman (in conversations on metaphysics, physics, mathematics, ethics, and poetics, from 1974 till his death in 1991), and L.A. Kosman (with whom conversation on metaphysics began in 1977). Wells lectured at Purchase in 1987; Lachterman and Kosman have each presented three public lectures at SUNY Purchase over the past decade (Kosman is scheduled to reappear at Purchase in December 1993); in the 1960's your instructor introduced Marcuse twice and Arendt once to lecture

audiences at Yale. Wells' and Lachterman's knowledge of Aristotle and the history of Aristotle scholarship was encyclopedic; neither published extensively on Aristotle (the two most important MSS by Lachterman are unpublished lectures first given in 1977, "The 'Methods' of Aristotelian Discourse," and in 1980, "The Unities of Aristotle's *Metaphysics*: Prolegomena"). Arendt's thoughts on Aristotle are most amply developed in her *The Human Condition* [listed below under 'Ethics-Politics']. Kosman's work on Aristotle has yet to achieve book-form presentation, but his published articles are too important not to be cited in this context (see under appropriate headings below).

C. THE THEORETICAL SCIENCES I: FIRST PHILOSOPHY (WISDOM = THEOLOGY = 'METAPHYSICS')

For students with some Greek, the most useful companion is *The Metaphysics*, Hugh Tredennick, tr., Cambridge: Harvard UP, the Loeb Classical Library Aristotle in Twenty-three Volumes (Vols. XVII and XVIII), 1933 and 1935. Perhaps the most generally satisfactory translation is by Hippocrates G. Apostle [Grinnell, Iowa: Peripatetic Press, 1979, PB]. The Greekless student who wishes to see Greek syntax imposed upon English may wish to see Montgomery Furth's extraordinarily literal translation of the central books, VII-X (Books Zeta, Eta, Theta, Iota), Indianapolis: Hackett, 1985, PB. An avowedly non-literal, and eccentric, translation of the *Metaphysics* has been done by Richard Hope [New York: Columbia UP, 1952; PB ed., Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 1960].

Though too difficult for study within the context of a course on Aristotle, the most comprehensive modern reappropriation of Aristotle's first philosophy is to be found in Hegel's *Science of Logic* [1812–1816], A.V. Miller, tr., New York: Humanities Press, 1969 [PB]; a more concise version is to be found in the first part, 'Logic,' of Hegel's *Encyclopedia of the Philosophical Sciences* [published in three editions: 1817, 1827, 1830]: *The Encyclopaedia Logic*, T.F. Geraets, W.A. Suchting, and H.S. Harris, trs., Indianapolis: Hackett, 1991.

The 19th-century scholar who most effectively diverted attention from Hegel's reading of Aristotle (and from Hegel as a philosopher) was Adolph Trendelenburg (esp. in his *Logische Untersuchungen*). Trendelenburg's principal student was Franz Brentano (the teacher of Ernst Mach and Sigmund Freud), who, in 1862, published *On the Several Senses of Being in Aristotle* (dedicated to Trendelenburg and available in an English edition translated by Rolf George, Berkeley: U of California P, 1975), which was, by his own account, the principal stimulus for the distinctive thought of Martin Heidegger (i.e., 'ontological difference'—in Derrida, *différance*).

Since 1888 Aristotle scholarship has been systematically misled by the presumption that there is "an unsupportable contradiction" between what Christian Wolff had called 'ontology' ('general metaphysics') and 'theology' (a branch, together with physics and psychology, of 'special metaphysics,' according to Christian Wolff's division) in Aristotle's metaphysics: Paul Natorp, "Thema und Disposition der aristotelischen Metaphysik," *Philosophische Monatshefte*, XXIV(1888), 37–65; 540–574. Natorp's critical question for an interpretation of Aristotle's metaphysics has been posed, most explicitly, by Philip Merlan: "*Metaphysica Generalis* in Aristotle?" See his *From Platonism to Neoplatonism*, The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1953 (esp. pp. 132–84). Compare Michael Frede, "The Unity of General and Special Metaphysics: Aristotle's Conception of Metaphysics," in his *Essays in Ancient Philosophy*,

Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1987 (pp. 81–95). Much important work on the question of being in Aristotle has been done by French scholars, e.g., Pierre Aubenque, *Le problème de l'être chez Aristote: Essai sur la problématique aristotélicienne*, Paris, 1962. On the critical distinction between 'actuality' [*energeia*] and 'motion' [*kinesis*] see (a.) L.A. Kosman, "Substance, Being and *Energeia*," *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy*, II (1984), pp. 121–49 and (b.) J.L. Ackrill, "Aristotle's Distinction between *Energeia* and *Kinesis*," in R. Bambrough, ed., *New Essays on Plato and Aristotle*, London: Routledge, 1965, pp. 121–141.

The indispensable work on Aristotle's *Metaphysics* is:

15. Joseph Owens, *The Doctrine of Being in the Aristotelian Metaphysics*, Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1951 [3rd. ed., 1978].

Those who find Owens' general approach to Aristotle attractive may wish to consult his placement of Aristotle within the tradition of Greek philosophy in *A History of Ancient Western Philosophy*, New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1959 and his many excellent papers on Aristotle, edited by J.R. Caton, as *Aristotle: The Collected Papers of Joseph Owens*, Albany: SUNY P, 1981.

Also helpful on the *Metaphysics* are:

16a. J.A. Smith, "Tode ti in Aristotle," *Classical Review*, 35 (1921), p. 19—the best one-page article on Aristotle—, and:

16b. Giovanni Reale, *The Concept of First Philosophy and the Unity of the Metaphysics of Aristotle* [originally published as *Il Concetto di "Filosofia Prima" e l'Unità della Metafisica di Aristotele*, Milan: Vita e Pensiero, 3rd. ed., 1967], John R. Catan, ed. and tr., Albany: SUNY P, 1980 [PB].

16c. G. Patzig, "Theology and Ontology in Aristotle's *Metaphysics*" [originally in *Kant-Studien*, 52 (1960–61)], J. and J. Barnes, trs., in [14a., Vol. 3].

17a. G.E.L. Owen, "Logic and Metaphysics in Some Earlier Works of Aristotle" [originally published in Göteborg, 1960], reprinted in [14a., Vol. 3, and 14c.].

17b. L.A. Kosman, "Aristotle's First Predicament," *The Review of Metaphysics*, XX, 3 (March 1967); reprinted in *Substances and Things*, M.L. O'Hara, Washington, DC: UP of America, 1982.

17c. L.A. Kosman, "Substance, Being and *Energeia*: the Argument of *Metaphysics Theta*," *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy*, II, 1984.

17d. L.A. Kosman, "Divine Being and Divine Thinking in *Metaphysics Lambda*," in *Proceedings of the Boston Area Colloquium in Ancient Philosophy*, III, Lanham, MD: UP of America, 1987.

17e. L.A. Kosman, "The Activity of Being in Aristotle's *Metaphysics*," in T. Scaltsas, D. Charles, and M.L. Gill, eds., *Unity, Identity, and Explanation in Aristotle's Metaphysics*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994 [lecture at SUNY Purchase, 1989].

17f. M. Frede, (a.) “Individuals in Aristotle” [original German ed., 1978], (b.) “Substance in Aristotle’s *Metaphysics*?” [1985], and (c.) “The Unity of General and Special *Metaphysics*: Aristotle’s Conception of *Metaphysics*,” in *Essays in Ancient Philosophy*, Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1987 [PB].

D. THE THEORETICAL SCIENCES II: SECOND PHILOSOPHY = PHYSICS

D.1. THE SCIENCE OF BEING *QUA* KINETIC

Physics is the topic which embraces, by far, the largest quantity of Aristotle’s writings. The topic is being *qua* kinetic and the text which lays out its principles is the *Physics*. Despite its peculiarities, the most useful companion to a study of the text is Aristotle, *The Physics*, P.H. Wicksteed and F.M. Cornford, trs., Cambridge: Harvard UP, the Loeb Classical Library, Vol. I, 1929 and 1957, and Vol. II, 1934. Also useful are: *Aristotle’s Physics*, with commentaries and glossary, H.G. Apostle, tr., Grinnell, Iowa: Peripatetic Press, 1980 (1st. ed., 1969); and *Aristotle’s Physics: Books I and II*, with introduction and notes, W. Charlton, tr., Oxford: Clarendon Press, Clarendon Aristotle Series, 1970; and *Aristotle’s Physics: Books III and IV*, with notes, E. Hussey, tr., Oxford: Clarendon Press, Clarendon Aristotle Series, 1983.

The most comprehensive modern reappropriation of Aristotle’s second philosophy is to be found in the second part of Hegel’s *Encyclopedia of the Philosophical Sciences* [published in three editions: 1817, 1827, 1830]: *Hegel’s Philosophy of Nature*, M.J. Petry, tr., New York: Humanities Press, 1970, 3 vols.

The best one-page statement of the issues:

18. Rulon Wells, “[Change, Motion, and Actuality in Aristotle](#),” 1958 [handout].

The most respected recent studies of the *Physics* are in French and German: (a) Auguste Mansion, *Introduction à la Physique Aristotélicienne*, Paris: Vrin, 1946 and (b) Wolfgang Wieland, *Die aristotelische Physik*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1962 (2nd. ed., 1970); it remains untranslated.

The basic argument can be had from:

19a. W. Wieland, “Aristotle’s *Physics* and the Problem of Inquiry into Principles” [originally in *Kant-Studien*, 52 (1960–61)], M. Schofield, tr. [14a., Vol. 1].

The 16th chapter of Wieland’s book is also available:

19b. W. Wieland, “The Problem of Teleology,” M. Schofield, tr. [14a., Vol. 1].

The monumental history of Greek science in English, comparable only to Pierre Duhem’s *Le Système du Monde*, 10 vols., 1913 ff. (for a sense of Duhem’s argument in English see his *To Save the Phenomena: An Essay on the Idea of Physical Theory from Plato to Galileo* [original French ed., 1908], E. Dolan and C. Maschler, trs., Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1969 [1985, PB]):

20a. S. Sambursky, “The Cosmos of Aristotle,” ch. IV of *The Physical World of the Greeks* (1956) conceived (after the fact, but no worse for all that) as a Part One of a trilogy including, Pt. II, *Physics of the Stoics* (1959) and Pt. III, *The Physical World of Late Antiquity* (1962), Princeton: PUP, 1987 [PB].

A follower of Jaeger has written one of the more detailed studies in English:

20b. F. Solmsen, *Aristotle's System of the Physical World*, Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1960.

20c. J.L. Ackrill, "Aristotle's Distinction between *Energeia* and *Kinesis*," in R. Bambrough, ed., *New Essays on Plato and Aristotle*, New York: Humanities Press, 1965.

20d. L.A. Kosman, "Aristotle's Definition of Motion," *Phronesis*, XIV, 1, 1969.

20e. J. Lennox and M.L. Gill, eds., *Self-motion: From Aristotle to Newton*, Princeton: PUP, 1994.

20f. L.A. Kosman, "Aristotle's Prime Mover" [lecture at SUNY Purchase, 1992, in 20e.].

20g. A.L. Peck, "Aristotle on κίνησις," in J. Anton and G. Kustas, eds., *Essays in Ancient Greek Philosophy*, Albany: SUNY P, 1971.

It is conventional wisdom that Aristotle's physics was 'refuted' in the course of the 'Copernican Revolution.' Aristotle's physics involved two principal contrasts: (a) *energeia/kinesis* and (b) superlunary/sublunary. The conventional refutation focuses upon (b), which indeed has proved to be unsupportable. The critical question is whether Aristotle's physics is principally based upon (a) or (b). One of the most controversial aspects of Aristotle's physical theory is the question whether it was essentially superseded with the complete mechanization (mathematization) of physics in the 17th century, especially by Newton. Hegel [3a.], Randall [8a.], and Wieland [19a.–b.] have challenged the prevailing view that it was. For helpful orientations in this debate:

21a. H. Carteron, "Does Aristotle have a Mechanics?" [1923, in 14a., Vol. I].

21b. Alexandre Koyré, *Galileo Studies* [1st. French ed., 1939], J. Mepham, tr., New Jersey: Humanities Press, 1978.

21c. John Wild, "The Cartesian Deformation of the Structure of Change and Its Influence on Modern Thought," *The Philosophical Review*, L (January 1941).

21d. D.M. Balme, "Greek Science and Mechanism," *Classical Quarterly*, 33 (1939), 129–38; 35 (1941), 23–8.

21e. G.E.L. Owen, "Aristotelian Mechanics" [1986, in 14c.].

The most recent book-length study of Aristotle's physics in English; it examines Aristotle vis-à-vis Newtonian physics:

22. Sarah Waterlow, *Nature, Change, and Agency in Aristotle's Physics*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982 [1988, PB]; and *Passage and Possibility: A Study of Aristotle's Modal Concepts*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982.

Good background studies:

23a. E.J. Dijksterhuis, (a.) "The Origins of Classical Mechanics from Aristotle to Newton," in Marshall Clagett, ed., *Critical Problems in the History of Science*, Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1969 [PB]

and (b.) *The Mechanization of the World Picture: Pythagoras to Newton* [Dutch, 1950], C. Dikshoorn, tr., Princeton: PUP, 1986 [PB, see pp. 17–42, “Aristotelianism”].

23b. D.R. Dicks, *Early Greek Astronomy to Aristotle*, Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1970 [1985, PB].

The classic American study that puts Aristotle in context:

23c. George Sarton, *Ancient Science: Through the Golden Age of Greece* (1952), New York: Dover, 1993 [PB].

D.2. THE SCIENCE OF BEING *QUA* KINETIC AND LIVING: BIOLOGY

In Aristotle’s thought ‘physics’ also embraces what we call biology and psychology. Aristotle’s principles for this dimension of physics are laid out in his *De Anima*. The most useful text is Aristotle, *On the Soul, Parva Naturalia, On Breath*, W.S. Hett, tr., Cambridge: Harvard UP, the Loeb Classical Library, 1936. Compare: *Aristotle’s On the Soul*, H.G. Apostle, tr., Grinnell, Iowa: Peripatetic Press, 1981; and *Aristotle’s De Anima Books II and III*, D.W. Hamlyn, tr., Oxford: Clarendon Press, Clarendon Aristotle Series, 1968.

For help toward the reorientation needed by a modern student reading Aristotle, see J.I. Beare, *Greek Theories of Elementary Cognition*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1906 and Bruno Snell, “The Origin of Scientific Thought” (1929), in *The Discovery of the Mind*, T.G. Rosenmeyer, tr., New York: Dover, 1982. A significant recent addition to the interpretation of Aristotle’s physics is Martha Nussbaum’s edition, translation, and commentary on Aristotle’s much neglected work on the motion of animals, *Aristotle’s De Motu Animalium*, Princeton: PUP, 1978. For more general interpretations, in addition to Grene [8b.], an excellent study is:

24a. D’Arcy W. Thompson, *On Aristotle as a Biologist*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913.

There is also a recent and fascinating attempt to show that Aristotle’s biology of man is compatible with modern science:

24b. Stephen R.L. Clark, *Aristotle’s Man: Speculations upon Aristotelian Anthropology*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975 [1983, PB].

Some of the best recent essays are included in:

25a. Allan Gotthelf and James G. Lennox, eds., *Philosophical Issues in Aristotle’s Biology*, Cambridge: CUP, 1987,

and:

25b. A. Rorty and M. Nussbaum, eds., *Essays on Aristotle’s De Anima*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992.

25c. L.A. Kosman, “Perceiving that We Perceive: *On the Soul* III, 2,” *The Philosophical Review*, LXXXIV, 4, October 1975.

25d. L.A. Kosman, “Animals and other Beings in Aristotle” [in 25a.].

25e. L.A. Kosman, “What Does the Maker Mind Make? The Role of Aristotle’s *Nous Poetikos*” [in 25b].

A recent study of *De Anima* is:

26. Michael V. Wedin, *Mind and Imagination in Aristotle*, New Haven: Yale UP, 1988.

E. THE THEORETICAL SCIENCES III: MATHEMATICS

This aspect of the theoretical sciences is largely contained in the last two books of the *Metaphysics*, XIII and XIV. For texts see C. In addition you may wish to consider an edition specifically devoted to these texts: *Aristotle’s Metaphysics, Books M and N*, with introduction and notes, Julia Annas, tr., Oxford: Clarendon Press, Clarendon Aristotle Series, 1976. These texts are at the heart of the conflict between Aristotle and Plato—and the major source of evidence for those who argue that Plato had an ‘unwritten doctrine.’ As one might guess, the literature on the subject is enormous. Some major studies include: L. Robin, *La théorie platonicienne des idées et des nombres d’après Aristote*, Paris, 1908; W.D. Ross, *Plato’s Theory of Ideas*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1951; and J.N. Findlay, *Plato: The Written and Unwritten Doctrines*, New York: Humanities Press, 1974. A succinct account of Aristotle on mathematics may be had from Stephan Körner, *The Philosophy of Mathematics*, London: Hutchinson U Library, 1960, pp. 18–21.

For the received (Kantian) view of Aristotle’s mathematics, together with a collection and translation of texts:

27a. T.L. Heath, *Mathematics in Aristotle*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1949.

A radically different view, stressing the break between ancient and modern arithmetic, can be found in:

27b. Jacob Klein, *Greek Mathematical Thought and the Origin of Algebra* [original German ed., 1934–6], Eva Brann, tr., Cambridge: MIT Press, 1968.

Klein’s argument is amplified in:

27c. David R. Lachterman, *The Ethics of Geometry: A Genealogy of Modernity*, New York: Routledge, 1989 [PB].

F. THE PRACTICAL SCIENCE: ETHICS-POLITICS

Alternatives to the Oxford translation (by W.D. Ross) of the *Nicomachean Ethics* have been made by H. Rackham for the Loeb Classical Library [Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1926]; Martin Ostwald for The Library of Liberal Arts [Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1962]; a revision of Ross by J.L. Ackrill and J.O. Urmson, Oxford: OUP, 1980; by Hippocrates G. Apostle for the Peripatetic Press [Grinnell, Iowa, 1984]; and by Terence Irwin [Indianapolis: Hackett, 1985]. The best translation of the *Politics* is by Ernest Barker [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1946]; you may wish to compare translations by H. Rackham for the Loeb Classical Library [Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1932], and Carnes Lord [Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1984]. All but the Loeb’s are available in PB editions.

For a highly controversial interpretation of the critical notion of virtue (*arete*) in Greek ethics (and metaphysics): H.J. Krämer, *Arete bei Platon und Aristoteles: Zum Wesen und zur Geschichte der platonischen Ontologie*, Heidelberg: Abhandlungen der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, C. Winter, 1959.

Some of the most warmly received recent studies of the *Nicomachean Ethics* are:

28. W.F.R. Hardie, *Aristotle's Ethical Theory*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968 [2nd. ed., with extensive bibliography, 1980, PB],

and:

29. R.-A. Gauthier, *La morale d'Aristote*, Paris, 1958,

whose main argument can be had from a translation of selections, "On the Nature of Aristotle's Ethics," by J.J. Walsh and H.L. Shapiro, eds., *Aristotle's Ethics: Issues and Interpretations*, Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1967.

On the relation between the *Nicomachean* and the *Eudemian Ethics*:

30. A.J.P. Kenny, (a.) *The Aristotelian Ethics*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978 and (b.) [the perversely entitled] *Aristotle's Theory of the Will*, New Haven: Yale UP, 1979.

The best anthology of recent papers:

31. A.O. Rorty, ed., *Essays on Aristotle's Ethics*, Berkeley: U of California P, 1980 [PB].

The most influential reappropriation of Aristotle's practical philosophy has been by Hans-Georg Gadamer, who generalizes the approach of Aristotle's ethics into a universal theory of interpretation called 'hermeneutics.' This theory, which has been most effective in the field of literature, is formulated in:

32a. H.-G. Gadamer, *Truth and Method* [1st. ed., Tübingen, 1960], G. Barden and J. Cumming, trs., New York: Seabury, 1975. [Unfortunately, a rather poor translation]; see also his:

32b. H.-G. Gadamer, *The Idea of the Good in Platonic-Aristotelian Philosophy*, P.C. Smith, tr., New Haven: Yale UP, 1986.

And compare:

32c. L.A. Kosman, "Predicating the Good," *Phronesis*, XIII, 2, 1968.

32d. L.A. Kosman, "Being Properly Affected: Virtues and Feelings in Aristotle's Ethics" [in 31.].

For particular emphasis upon habit in Aristotle:

32e. M.F. Burnyeat, "Aristotle on Learning to Be Good" [in 31.].

The standard commentary on the *Politics* is:

33. W.L. Newman, *The Politics of Aristotle*, 4 vols., Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1887–1902.

Aristotle Bibliography, Fall 1993

Page 14

On a par with the question whether Aristotle's physical theory (based on a notion of teleological *eros*) was superseded by Galileo and Darwin [22–25] is the question whether the concept of friendship (*philos*) central to his practical philosophy has been undermined by the Christian idea of love, in Greek, *agape*, and the establishment of modern civil, or 'bourgeois,' society. These respective questions are explored most insightfully—and with radically opposed assessments—by:

34. Anders Nygren, *Agape and Eros* [1st. Swedish edition of Part I, 1930, Part II, 1936], P.S. Watson, tr. [1st. one-volume ed., 1953], New York: Harper & Row, 1969 [PB],

and:

35. Hannah Arendt, *The Human Condition*, Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1958.

These themes have been provocatively developed into a debate on the nature of 'modernity' by:

36a. Jürgen Habermas, "The Classical Doctrine of Politics in Relation to Social Philosophy" (1963), in *Theory and Practice*, J. Viertel, tr., Boston: Beacon Press, 1973 [PB],

with which compare:

36b. Jürgen Habermas, *The Philosophical Discourse of Modernity: Twelve Lectures*, F. Lawrence, tr., Cambridge: MIT Press, 1987,

and:

36c. Hans Blumenberg, "The 'Trial' of Theoretical Curiosity" [i.e., Aristotle's 'intellectual virtue'], in *The Legitimacy of the Modern Age* [1st. German ed., 1966], R.M. Wallace, tr., Cambridge: MIT Press, 1983 [PB],

and:

36d. Alasdair MacIntyre, *After Virtue: A Study in Moral Theory*, Notre Dame: U of ND P, 1981 [PB],

and:

36e. Bernard Williams, (i.) *Moral Luck: Philosophical Papers 1973–1980*, Cambridge: CUP, 1981 [PB], (ii.) *Ethics and the Limits of Philosophy*, Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1985,

an excellent critique of modern moral philosophy, especially Kantian and utilitarian, with promissory references to doing better in the modern world (aristotelianly) [PB], and:

(iii.) *Shame and Necessity*, The Sather Classical Lectures (1989), Berkeley: U of California P, 1993,

seen by your instructor only in a pre-publication MS; a weak book which, in its explicit treatment of Aristotle, utterly fails to deliver on the promise of (ii).

Largely inspired by Williams on Greek 'luck,' and augmented by her earlier work on Aristotle's *De Motu* [see above], a most comprehensive reading of Aristotle's practical philosophy, within a context defined by Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Plato:

36f. Martha Nussbaum, *The Fragility of Goodness: Luck and Ethics in Greek Tragedy and Philosophy*, Cambridge: CUP, 1986 [PB].

Nussbaum's student has published a more narrowly focussed study:

36g. Nancy Sherman, *The Fabric of Character: Aristotle's Theory of Virtue*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989.

37. John M. Cooper, *Reason and Human Good in Aristotle*, Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1975 [reissued, Indianapolis: Hackett, 1986 [PB]].

38. Richard Sorabji, *Necessity, Cause, and Blame: Perspectives on Aristotle's Theory*, Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1980.

39. Troels Engberg-Pedersen, *Aristotle's Theory of Moral Insight*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983.

40. David Charles, *Aristotle's Philosophy of Action*, Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1984.

Economics is yet another science invented by Aristotle. The most illuminating brief account is:

41a. Karl Polanyi, "Aristotle Discovers the Economy," in K. Polanyi, C.M. Arensberg, and H.W. Pearson, eds., *Trade and Market in the Early Empires*, Chicago: Henry Regnery, 1971 [PB].

One of Polanyi's most prolific followers has been M.I. Finley; see, for example:

41b. M.I. Finley, *The Ancient Economy*, Berkeley: U of California P, 1973 [PB].

There is controversy over the question whether *The Athenian Constitution* is an authentic work by Aristotle. For translations, with apparatus, see:

42a. Aristotle, *The Constitution of Athens and Related Texts*, K. von Fritz and E. Kapp, trs., New York: Hafner, 1950.

42b. Aristotle, *The Athenian Constitution*, tr. with Introduction and Notes by P.J. Rhodes, Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1984 [PB].

G. PRODUCTIVE SCIENCE: POETICS

Of the many translations of the *Poetics*, the least misleading is by Kenneth Telford, *Aristotle's Poetics*, Chicago: Henry Regnery, 1961 [PB]; the most popular edition, with Greek and English texts, is S.H. Butcher, tr., *Aristotle's Theory of Poetry and Fine Art*, New York: Dover, 1951 [PB, original ed., 1895]; compare: *On Poetry and Style*, G.M.A. Grube, tr., Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1958 [PB], and *Poetics*, R. Janko, tr., Indianapolis: Hackett, 1987 [PB].

The most elaborate English commentary is:

43. Gerald F. Else, *Aristotle's Poetics: The Argument* [with Greek text and translation], Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1963.

A stimulating challenge to the traditional reading of the *Poetics*, especially with reference to the so-called ‘tragic hero,’ is:

44. John Jones, *On Aristotle and Greek Tragedy*, New York: OUP, 1962 [PB; reissued by Stanford UP, 1980].

A good selection of recent papers:

45a. A.O. Rorty, ed., *Essays on Aristotle’s Poetics*, Princeton: PUP, 1992.

45b. L.A. Kosman, “Acting: Drama as the Mimesis of Praxis” [in 45a.].

H. ORGANON: LANGUAGE AS INSTRUMENTAL: TO PROVE VIA VARIABLES (‘LOGIC’) AND TO PERSUADE VIA TIME (RHETORIC)

In Aristotle a science is ‘instrumental’ if it is governed by the use of language. The two principal uses of language are as a means of preserving ‘truth’ as locus of ‘variables,’ i.e., ‘logic,’ or as a means of achieving persuasion, i.e., ‘rhetoric.’ The texts which concern the achievement of these instrumental ends must not be confused with the topics of texts that are theoretical or practical (though this confusion has been the mark of philosophy since the Stoics). The texts in question are: *Categories*, *De Interpretatione*, *Prior Analytics*, *Posterior Analytics*, *Topics*, *On Sophistical Refutations*, and *Rhetoric*. Consult editions of each in the Loeb Classical Library, plus: *Aristotle’s Categories and Propositions*, H.G. Apostle, tr., Grinnell, Iowa: Peripatetic Press, 1980; *Aristotle’s Categories and De Interpretatione*, J.L. Ackrill, tr., Oxford: Clarendon Press, Clarendon Aristotle Series, 1963; *Prior Analytics*, with introduction, commentary and notes, Robin Smith [based upon W.D. Ross, *Aristotle’s Prior and Posterior Analytics*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1949], tr., Indianapolis: Hackett, 1989; *Aristotle’s Posterior Analytics*, with notes, J. Barnes, tr., Oxford: Clarendon Press, Clarendon Aristotle Series, 1975.

Aristotle is universally celebrated as the founder of ‘logic,’ which term he did not use. The role of ‘logic’ in his philosophy as a whole is one of the most difficult questions for any interpreter of his thought. A radical statement of the received view is in Barnes [12a.]. It has been most effectively challenged in:

46. Eric Weil, “The Place of Logic in Aristotle’s Thought” [originally in *Revue de métaphysique et de morale*, 56 (1951)], J. and J. Barnes, trs. [14a., Vol. 1].

That Aristotle invented ‘logic’ by discovering ‘variables’ is brilliantly spelled out by:

47a. Jan Łukasiewicz, *Aristotle’s Syllogistic from the Standpoint of Modern Formal Logic*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1951 [2nd. ed., 1957].

Łukasiewicz’s argument has been altered and extended by:

47b. G. Patzig, *Aristotle’s Theory of the Syllogism* [1st. German ed., 1959], J. Barnes, tr., Dordrecht, Holland: D. Reidel, 1968.

Major challenges to the Łukasiewicz-Patzig view have been formulated in:

Aristotle Bibliography, Fall 1993

Page 17

48a. Timothy Smiley, "What is a Syllogism?," *Journal of Philosophical Logic*, 2 (1973) 136–54,

and:

48b. John Corcoran, "Aristotle's Natural Deduction System," in John Corcoran, ed., *Ancient Logic and its Modern Interpretations*, Dordrecht, Holland: D. Reidel, 1974.

Other important interpretations include:

48c. L.A. Kosman, "Aristotle on Inconvertible Modal Propositions," *Mind*, LXXIX, ns 314, April 1970.

48d. L.A. Kosman, "Understanding, Explanation, and Insight in the *Posterior Analytics*," in *Exegesis and Argument: Studies in Greek Philosophy Presented to Gregory Vlastos*, Lee, Mourelatos, and Rorty, eds., Assen, Holland: Van Gorcum, 1973.

48e. L.A. Kosman, "Necessity and Explanation in Aristotle's *Analytics*," in *Biologie, Logique et Métaphysique chez Aristote*, Séminaire CNRS-N.S.F. 1987, Pierre Pellegrin, ed., Paris: Éditions du CNRS, 1990.

48f. Jonathan Lear, *Aristotle and Logical Theory*, Cambridge: CUP, 1980.

The most recent interpretation of Aristotle's *Posterior Analytics*:

49. Michael Ferejohn, *The Origins of Aristotelian Science*, New Haven: Yale UP, 1991.

For a supplement to Weil [46.] on the importance of the *Topics* in Aristotle's *Organon*, see:

50. J.D.G. Evans, *Aristotle's Concept of Dialectic*, Cambridge: CUP, 1977.

Modern formal logic has been directly challenged, from an Aristotelian point of view, in:

51a. Fred Sommers, *The Logic of Natural Language*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982.

51b. G. Englebretsen, *Three Logicians: Aristotle, Leibniz, and Sommers and the Syllogistic*, Assen, Holland: Van Gorcum, 1981 [beware of numerous typographical errors].

Two important essays on the use of language in Aristotle:

52a. A.C. Lloyd, *Activity and Description in Aristotle and the Stoa*, Proceedings of the British Academy, LVI, London: OUP, 1971.

52b. A.C. Lloyd, *Form and Universal in Aristotle*, Liverpool: Francis Cairns, 1981.

For accounts of Aristotle's place in the history of logic:

53a. W. and M. Kneale, *The Development of Logic*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962.

53b. I.M. Bochenski, *A History of Formal Logic*, I. Thomas, tr., Notre Dame: U of ND P, 1961.

Arguably, as by D.W. Graham and others, Aristotle's *Rhetoric* is to be reckoned among his 'instrumental' sciences (i.e., *Organon*); clearly Aristotle himself regarded rhetorical discourse as

Aristotle Bibliography, Fall 1993

Page 18

instrumental toward persuasion regarding the past (forensic), the present (celebratory), or the future (legislative). A compelling account that 'logic' and rhetoric are on a par in Aristotle:

54. Gilles-Gaston Granger, *La Théorie Aristotélicienne de la Science*, Paris: Aubier Montaigne, 1976.

For the most recent translation, with apparatus:

55. Aristotle, *On Rhetoric: A Theory of Civic Discourse*, George A. Kennedy, tr. [with extensive bibliography], New York: OUP, 1991.

A recent attempt to update Aristotle:

56. Ch. Perelman and L. Olbrechts-Tyteca, *The New Rhetoric: A Treatise on Argumentation*, Notre Dame: U of ND P, 1969.

Most of the above items should be available in the SUNY Purchase Library; some have been placed on reserve. You will not be expected to read any beyond those on the syllabus. This bibliography has been prepared to give a sense of the Aristotle literature and for those in need of further reading or curious to know where their instructor has come by some of his interpretations and criticisms. For a more complete bibliography of works published to 1966, see Ingemar Düring, *Aristoteles*, Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1966.