

Zeitschrift: Museum Helveticum : schweizerische Zeitschrift für klassische Altertumswissenschaft = Revue suisse pour l'étude de l'antiquité classique = Rivista svizzera di filologia classica

Herausgeber: Schweizerische Vereinigung für Altertumswissenschaft

Band: 76 (2019)

Heft: 1

Artikel: New witnesses to Plat. Smp. 191e2 and Leg. 7, 819d2-3

Autor: Moseley, Geoffrey

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-846869>

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften auf E-Periodica. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen sowie auf Social Media-Kanälen oder Webseiten ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. [Mehr erfahren](#)

Conditions d'utilisation

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. La reproduction d'images dans des publications imprimées ou en ligne ainsi que sur des canaux de médias sociaux ou des sites web n'est autorisée qu'avec l'accord préalable des détenteurs des droits. [En savoir plus](#)

Terms of use

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. Publishing images in print and online publications, as well as on social media channels or websites, is only permitted with the prior consent of the rights holders. [Find out more](#)

Download PDF: 24.01.2026

ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, <https://www.e-periodica.ch>

New Witnesses to Plat. *Smp.* 191e2 and *Leg.* 7, 819d2–3

Geoffrey Moseley, Nashville, Tennessee (USA)

Abstract: I present new support from an Arabic *Symposium* adaptation and the Arabic version of Pappus' commentary on Euclid's *Elements* X for, respectively, a reading in Plato's *Symposium* and a pair of readings in Plato's *Laws*.

Key-words: Plato, Pappus, Euclid, textual criticism, Arabic transmission, Abū 'Utmān al-Dimašqī, al-Kindī, Stobaeus.

Below, I present new evidence for three readings in *Plato's Symposium* and *Laws*: (1) γυναικὸς at *Smp.* 191e2, (2) Ast's conjecture ἄγνοιαν at *Leg.* 7, 819d2, and (3) ταύτης at *Leg.* 7, 819d3. Evidence for the first reading derives from the philosopher al-Kindī's (ca. 800–870 C.E.) Arabic adaptation of the *Symposium*, as quoted in a later medico-philosophical work. Evidence for the second and third readings derives from the mathematician Pappus' (ca. 290–350 C.E.) commentary on Euclid's *Elements*, the tenth book of which is preserved in an Arabic version attributed to Abū 'Utmān al-Dimašqī (d. after 914 C.E.). This Arabic evidence enriches the indirect tradition of (1) with a new witness to the superior reading (as against γυναικῶν) attributed to a ninth-century source. It lends qualified support to (2): it is likely that the translator's Greek exemplar read ἄγνοιαν rather than ἀνοιαν, the reading of the extant Greek MSS. Finally, it provides valuable early testimony to a unanimously transmitted reading (3) that several critics have rejected.

Plat. *Smp.* 191e2

At *Smp.* 191e2, two of the three MSS families, the family of B and D and the family of T, along with Stobaeus (4.450.18–451.17, ed. Wachsmuth-Hense), read γυναικὸς, against γυναικῶν, the reading of the remaining family (W)¹:

ὅσαι δὲ τῶν γυναικῶν γυναικὸς τμῆμά εἰσιν, οὐ πάνυ αὔται τοῖς ἀνδράσι τὸν νοῦν προσέχουσιν.

γυναικὸς BD T Stob.: γυναικῶν W

“All of the women who are a section of (a) woman [woman BD T Stob.: women W] do not pay much attention to men.”

* I would like to thank Aaron Butts (The Catholic University of America), Dimitri Gutas (emeritus, Yale University), Mark Joyal (University of Manitoba), and the editors of the *MH* for their helpful comments and criticisms.

¹ I use the standard *sigla*: B is the Bodleianus Clarkianus 39, D the Marcianus gr. 185 (coll. 567), T the Venetus Append. Class. 4, cod. 1, and W the Vindobonensis 54 suppl. Phil. Gr. 7.

Although both the *stemmata* constructed by critics and the horizontal transmission – or ‘contamination’ – pervasive in the tradition of Plato prevent an editor from selecting γυναικός mechanically, the reading stands on its merits.² First, γυναικός τμῆμα is neatly parallel to ἄρρενος τμῆμα at *Smp.* 191e6.³ Second, γυναικός is preferable according to the criterion *utrum in alterum abiturum erat*: it can be explained as an error of assimilation induced by the preceding γυναικῶν.

Further support for γυναικός comes, as I have mentioned, from an early source: an adaptation of the Aristophanic myth (*Symp.* 189d–192e) composed by the 9th-century philosopher al-Kindī and quoted by the 11th-century physician Abū Sa‘īd ibn-Baḥtišū‘ (or ibn-Buḥtišū‘) in a discussion of love as a sickness of the soul.⁴ Kindī’s adaptation, as Dimitri Gutas has noted, seems to have hewed

² On the textual tradition of the *Smp.*, see most recently C. Brockmann, *Die Handschriftliche Überlieferung von Platons Symposium* (Wiesbaden, 1992). Brockmann agrees with earlier scholars in dividing the tradition into three families. One family is headed by MS B, from which Brockmann argues that D derives; another is headed by MS T, from which Brockmann argues that the MS Palatinus Vaticanus gr. 173 (P), which contains only about a third of the dialogue, derives; a third is headed by the Vindobonensis (W). Further, Brockmann constructs a bipartite stemma, such that the readings of one family (that of B and D) and those of the hyparchetype of the remaining two families have equal weight in the reconstruction of the archetype’s readings. Against Brockmann’s assessment of MS D, see J. Irigoin, ‘Traces de livres antiques dans trois manuscrits Byzantins de Platon (B, D, F)’, in M. Joyal (ed.), *Studies in Plato and the Platonic Tradition* (Aldershot, 1997) 229–244, at 229–232, who argues that ‘B et D ... sont des témoins descendant indépendamment d’un ancêtre commun’ (I thank Mark Joyal for the reference). For discussion and criticisms of some of the details of Brockmann’s reconstruction of manuscript relations, especially the relationship between B and D within their family and the affiliation of MS P, see the reviews of D. Murphy in the online *Bryn Mawr Classical Review* 94.01.07 (accessible at the following address: <http://bmcr.brynmawr.edu/1994/94.01.07.html>), F. Vendruscolo in *Gnomon* 68 (1996) 200–206, M. Joyal in *Échos du monde classique/Classical Views n.s.* 15 (1996) 432–439, and B. Vancamp in *Scriptorium* 47 (1992) 117f. For the indirect tradition of the *Smp.*, which Brockmann does not survey, see L. Robin, P. Vicaire (ed. and tr.), *Platon, Œuvres complètes, Tome IV, 2e partie: Le Banquet. Notice de Léon Robin, Texte établi et traduit par Paul Vicaire, avec le concours de Jean Laborderie* (Paris, 1989).

³ See A. Hug (ed.), *Platons Symposium* (Leipzig, 1876) *ad loc.*, followed by R. G. Bury (ed.), *The Symposium of Plato* (Cambridge, 1932), on the singular forms of γυνή and ἄρρεν here as referring, respectively, to an original ‘double female’ (*Doppelweib*) and ‘double male’ (*Doppelmann*).

⁴ ibn-Baḥtišū‘s work was first edited from the unique Leiden MS and translated into German by F. Klein-Franke as *Abū Sa‘īd ibn Baḥtišū‘. Über die Heilung der Krankheiten der Seele und des Körpers* (Beirut, 1986), at 52.6–11. The passage was edited anew, translated into English, and analyzed by D. Gutas in his ‘Plato’s Symposium in the Arabic Tradition’, *Oriens* 31 (1988) 36–60, at 37–47 (translation and analysis) and 56f. (edition). From ibn-Baḥtišū‘s attribution of the myth to Kindī and the list of Kindī’s works preserved in the bio-bibliographical *Catalogue (Fihrist)* of ibn-al-Nadīm (fl. mid-10th c.), Gutas infers that the passage derives from a lost Kindian treatise entitled *The Philosophers’ Agreement about the Allegories of Eros (Iğtimā‘ al-falāsifa ‘alā l-rumūz al-‘isqiyā)*, an apparent adaptation of Plato’s *Symposium* (for a possible emendation to the title see Gutas 1988, 38 n. 11). Kindī died in the late 860s, three decades before the copying of the Bodleian MS (B), the earliest extant Greek MS witness to the text (on the date of Kindī’s death, see G. Endress, P. Adamson, ‘Abū Yūsuf al-Kindī’, in U. Rudolph *et al.* (eds.), *Philosophy in the Islamic World. Vol. I: 8th–10th centuries* [Leiden, 2017] 143–220, at 154. I thank Dimitri Gutas for this reference).

very closely to its ultimate Greek source.⁵ Although the four kinds of human beings produced by Zeus' bisection of the original humans are here listed in the opposite of the original order (i.e. men attracted to men, women attracted to women, women attracted to men, and finally men attracted to women), Kindī's Arabic mirrors its Greek source in a remarkable way: when (Plato's) Aristophanes uses a partitive genitive construction to specify members of one sex, the Arabic version uses an analogous partitive construction, but when Aristophanes does not, the Arabic likewise omits the construction and mirrors the Greek through morphological gender marking.⁶ For instance, at the place corresponding to *Smp.* 191e2, the Arabic reads: *wa-man kāna mina l-inātī multaṣiqatan bi-unṭā*, lit. 'those among the females who were attached to a female',⁷ i.e. ὅσαι τῶν γυναικῶν γυναικός τμῆμά εἰσιν. The early source adapted by al-Kindī, then, must have read γυναικός, with MSS BD and T and Stobaeus and in agreement with all modern editions of the text, against W's γυναικῶν.

⁵ Although ibn-Baḥtišū' states that he is providing 'the essence' or 'the gist' of al-Kindī's work, the fidelity of his quotation to the Platonic text suggests either that al-Kindī quoted from a (nearly) verbatim *Symposium* version (see Gutas 1988 [note 4 above] 38, with n. 9) or that ibn-Baḥtišū's statement refers to *excerpting* rather than paraphrasing or summarizing.

⁶ The analogous Arabic partitive construction employs the preposition *min* 'from (among)'. At 191d6 ὅσοι ... τῶν ἀνδρῶν is therefore translated as *man kāna min al-dukūr*, just as at 191e2 ὅσαι ... τῶν γυναικῶν is translated as *man kāna min al-ināt*. At 191e6 ὅσοι alone, however, is translated as *man kāna* (3ms suffix). (Gutas supplies the partitive construction *min al-dukūr*, but my analysis of the translation grammar suggests that the transmitted text should stand). Likewise, at 191d9 ὅσαι (... γυναικες) is translated as *man kānat* (3fs suffix). (It is worth noting that at least one early critic, Friedrich Jacob Bast, suggested reading ὅσοι δὲ ἄρρενες for the sake of parallelism, an emendation which Stallbaum rejected as unnecessary and which has failed to win support among editors: see F. J. Bast, *Kritischer Versuch über den Text des platonischen Gastmahl* [Leipzig, 1794] 126. To my knowledge, no critic has suggested the converse emendation, i.e. the seclusion of γυναικες for the sake of parallelism.) As H. Reckendorf, *Arabische Syntax* (Heidelberg, 1921) 432–3 [§210.2.a], has shown, when *man* refers to a group of women, it sometimes governs a feminine singular verb (e.g. *man gā'at*, *man duriba 'alayhā*). The translator of Kindī's *Symposium* source seems to have exploited this feature of the governance of *man* in order to mirror the structure of Plato's Greek.

⁷ The text's editor, F. Klein-Franke, seems to have misread *unṭā* 'female' as *inātī* 'females, women' due to the word's earlier occurrence, making a mistake analogous to the one that some Greek scribe(s) apparently made centuries early in assimilating the singular γυναικός to the preceding γυναικῶν. Gutas 1988 (see n. 4 above) correctly prints the MS reading. His translation 'a female who was attached to another female' (Gutas 1988, 37) is accurate, but does not reveal the underlying partitive construction and renders the pronoun *man* 'whoever, those who' in the singular rather than the plural. Although in standard Arabic *man* is the subject of singular verbs, it commonly refers to groups of people ('whoever' = 'those who') and can even serve as the antecedent of masculine plural pronouns in a *constructio ad sensum*. On the 'collective' meaning of *man*, see W. Wright, *A Grammar of the Arabic Language*, vol. I³ §348; on masculine plural agreement with *man*, see J. Blau, *Grammar of Christian Arabic, Based Mainly on South-Palestinian Texts from the First Millennium* (Louvain, 1966–67) 560 [§544] n. 44.

Plat. *Leg. 7, 819d2*

At *Leg. 7, 819d2*, Friedrich Ast conjectured ἄγνοιαν ‘ignorance’ for the transmitted ἀνοιαν ‘foolishness, folly’, an emendation which found favor in subsequent editions. I print the text without punctuation and translate literally so that the knotty syntax of the transmitted text is evident:⁸

μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα ἐν ταῖς μετρήσεσιν ὅσα ἔχει μήκη καὶ πλάτη καὶ βάθη περὶ ἄπαντα ταῦτα ἐνοῦσάν τινα φύσει γελοίαν τε καὶ αἰσχρὰν ἄγνοιαν ἐν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις πᾶσιν ταύτης ἀπαλλάττουσιν.

ἄγνοιαν Ast: ἀνοιαν codd. | ταύτης codd.: ταύτη Bernhardy, ταύτην dub. Stallbaum

“Afterwards in measurements all things which have lengths and widths and depths, about all these things a certain by nature laughable and shameful ignorance [ignorance Ast: foolishness codd.] inherent in all human beings – *from this* [from this (gen.) codd.: *by means of this* (dat.) Bernhardy, *this* (acc.) Stallbaum] they (sc. teachers) release (sc. human beings).”

An overlooked indirect witness to the text of the *Laws*,⁹ a commentary by Pappus of Alexandria (ca. 290 C.E.–ca. 350 C.E.) on Euclid’s *Elements X* translated into Arabic by Abū ‘Uṭmān al-Dimāšqī (d. after 914 C.E.), preserves a text that provides potential support for Ast’s emendation. The Arabic reads:

وبعد هذه الأشياء قد يوجد في جميع الناس جهل قبيح بالطبع يضحك منه بجميع الأشياء
التي لها أطوال وعروض وأعمق عند المساحة ومن البين أنه يخلصهم من هذا الجهل
التعاليم

wa-ba’da hādīhi l-ašyā’i qad yūgadu fī ḡamī’i l-nāsi ḡahlun qabīhun bi-l-ṭab’i
yuḍḥaku minhu bi-ḡamī’i l-ašyā’i llatī lahā aṭwālun wa-‘urūḍun wa-a’māqun ‘inda
l-masāḥati wa-mina l-bayyini annahū yuḥallīṣuhum min hādā l-ḡahlī l-ta’ālīmu

⁸ The OCT of Burnet, E.B. England (ed.), *The Laws of Plato* (Manchester, 1920), the Loeb of Bury (which does not indicate that the form is a conjecture), and the Budé of Diès all print Ast’s emendation.

⁹ A clear guide to the complex Arabic transmission of the *Laws* can be found in D. Gutas, ‘Platon: tradition arabe’, in R. Goulet (ed.), *Dictionnaire des philosophes antiques. Vol. Va: de Paccius à Plotin* (Paris, 2010) 845–863, at 852–853. On the textual tradition of the *Laws*, see F. L. Lisi, ‘El texto de las Leyes’, in *idem* (ed.), *Plato’s Laws and its Historical Significance* (Sankt Augustin, 1998) 277–288. On the relatively limited indirect tradition of *Laws VII*, see E. des Places, ‘La tradition indirecte des *Lois de Platon* (Livres VII–XII)’, in *Studia Patristica V* (Berlin, 1962) 473–479, at 474–475, reprinted in *idem*, *Études platoniciennes: 1929–1979* (Leiden, 1981) 213–219, at 214–215. Des Places surveys the indirect tradition represented by Stobaeus, Clement, Eusebius, Theodoret, Athenaeus, Proclus, and the *Suda*, but was apparently unaware of the Arabic version of Pappus’ commentary, which uniquely preserves 819c7–d3 and 819d7–e1 and summarizes 819e–820b, the following exchange between Socrates and Clinias about incommensurable magnitudes.

“And after these things, there is found in all people a naturally shameful (and) laughable ignorance of (*ğahlun* ... *bi-*) all those things which have lengths and widths and depths upon being measured (*‘inda l-masāha*, tr. ἐν ταῖς μετρήσεσιν). It is clear that mathematical instruction (*al-ta‘ālīm*) releases them from this ignorance.”¹⁰

In the Graeco-Arabic corpus, the standard translation of ἄγνοια is *ğahl* (*bi-*) ‘ignorance (of)’, just as one common translation of the verb ἀγνοέω is *ğahila* (*bi-*) ‘to be ignorant (of)’.¹¹ In the Arabic version of Galen’s *That the Powers of the Soul Depend on Those of the Body* (*Quod animi virtutes corporis temperamenta sequantur*), for instance, *ğahl* is reserved for ἄγνοια, while ἄνοια is consistently rendered with the calque ‘*adam al-‘aql* ‘lack of intellect’, just as the adjective ἄνους is calqued by the analogous construction ‘*adīm al-‘aql* ‘lacking intellect, intellect-less’.¹² *ğahl* is likely to translate an underlying ἄνοια

¹⁰ G. Junge, W. Thomson (eds.), *The Commentary of Pappus on Book X of Euclid’s Elements* (Cambridge, MA 1930), 201.ult.–202.2 (tr. 75), with notes. On the commentary and its Arabic translation, see the introduction of Junge, Thompson 1930 and that of A. R. Jones (ed. and tr.), *Pappus of Alexandria. Book 7 of the Collection, Vol. I-II* (Berlin/Heidelberg/New York, 1986); for a fragment of an Arabic-Latin version of the work, which does not include the passage under discussion, see G. Junge, ‘Das Fragment der lateinischen Übersetzung des Pappus-Kommentars zum 10. Buche Euklids’, in *Quellen und Studien zur Geschichte der Mathematik, Astronomie und Physik* [Abteilung B: Studien] 3 (1936) 1–17. On the work’s translator, see G. Endress, art. *Abū ‘Uthmān al-Dimashqī* in *EJ*³.

¹¹ See the online Bochum *Glossarium Graeco-Arabicum* [GGA], accessible at <http://telota.bbaw.de/glossga>, Greek search terms ἄγνοια and ἀγνοέω. Negated verbs of knowing (e.g. ‘alima, ‘arafa) are also attested as translations of ἀγνοέω, and the calque *lā ‘ilm* ‘non-knowledge’ and the doublet *ğahl wa-qillat ma‘rifa* ‘ignorance and paucity of knowledge’ as translations of ἄγνοια. See also M. Ullmann, *Wörterbuch zu den griechisch-arabischen Übersetzungen des 9. Jahrhunderts* [WGAÜ]. *Supplement. Band I: A–O* (Wiesbaden, 2006) s.vv. ἄγνοια and ἀγνοέω.

¹² The GGA (see n. 11 above) lists seven occurrences of ἄνοια in *An. virt. corp. temp.*, with references to the edition of I. Müller (Leipzig, 1891), now superseded by that of A. Μπάζου [Bazou] (Athens, 2011), and to H.H. Biesterfeldt’s edition of the Arabic version, *Galens Traktat Dass die Kräfte der Seele den Mischungen des Körpers folgen* (Wiesbaden, 1983). Of these seven occurrences, four, translated as ‘*adam al-‘aql* ‘lack of intellect’, doubtless render an underlying ἄνοια (see 25.6 Bazou/43.15 Müller = 18.3 Biesterfeldt; 25.13 Bazou/44.2 Müller = 18.9 Biesterfeldt; 32.11 Bazou/48.9 Müller = 21.17 Biesterfeldt; 32.15 Bazou/48.13 Müller = Biesterfeldt 21.21). For ἄνους rendered as ‘*adīm al-‘aql* ‘lacking intellect, intellect-less’ see 24.2 Bazou/43.1 Müller = 17.8 Biesterfeldt). Two occurrences of *ğahl* ‘ignorance’, listed as translations of ἄνοια by the GGA, probably render a variant reading ἄγνοια (cf. Latin *ignorantia*) rather than ἄνοια (see Bazou 25.3/43.13 Müller = 18.1 Biesterfeldt and Bazou 25.5/Müller 43.14 = Biesterfeldt 18.2). The final GGA attestation of ἄνοια, at 32.13 Bazou/48.10 Müller = 21.19 Biesterfeldt = Ullmann, *WGAÜ. Supplement. Band II: Π–Ω* (Wiesbaden, 2007) s.v. παραφροσύνη, is based on a mistaken analysis of the translation: the Greek MSS of Galen list four states, παραφροσύνην ἡ μανίαν ἡ ἐπιλησμοσύνην ἡ ἄνοιαν, the last of which (ἡ ἄνοιαν) both Müller and Bazou seclude. The Arabic, however, lists only three conditions: *ğunūn* ‘madness’, *nisyān* ‘forgetfulness’, and *iħtilāt* ‘confusion’. It seems clear that the Arabic renders only the first three of the Greek terms in a different order, omitting the phrase ἡ ἄνοιαν (which, had it been read, would likely have been translated as ‘*adam al-‘aql* here as elsewhere in the work’). *iħtilāt* ‘confusion’ here translates παραφροσύνη, paralleling two translations of the term, *iħtilāt al-dīhn* ‘confusion of the mind’ and *iħtilāt al-‘aql* ‘confusion of the intellect’, widespread in other medical translations

in only a single text of which I am aware, Galen's *Synopsis of the Timaeus*.¹³ Although *ğahl* (*bi-*) 'ignorance (of)' cannot be ruled out as a translation of the transmitted ἄνοιαν, then, it lends tentative support to Ast's emendation ἄγνοιαν.

Finally, the phrase *wa-mina l-bayyini annahū yuḥallishuhum min hādā l-ğahli l-ta'ālīmu* 'It is clear that mathematical instruction releases them from this ignorance' almost certainly renders the transmitted reading ταύτης (sc. ἄ(y)νοίας). Against the conjectures of Bernhardy and Stallbaum (ταύτη and ταύτην, respectively), we have here a likely fourth-century witness to the genitive.¹⁴ In fact, the addition of the unnecessary 'wa-mina l-bayyini annahū' 'it is clear that' suggests an attempt – perhaps by a Greek redactor or more likely the Arabic translator – to smooth out the rough syntax of Plato's Greek, eliminating anacoluthon while retaining ταύτης as a genitive of separation. If ταύτης, then, is indeed corrupt, the corruption had probably occurred by Pappus' time, over a half millennium before the production of the earliest Greek MSS of Plato.

Correspondence:

Geoffrey Moseley
760 Wedgewood Park
Unit 307
Nashville, TN 37203
USA
geoffreyjmosley@gmail.com

made by the Ḥunayn circle (see Ullmann, *WGAÜ* [Wiesbaden, 2002] and the *GGA* [n. 11 above] s.v. παραφροσύνη). The Arabic version thus provides unique textual support for the seclusion of ἄνοιαν.

¹³ For *ğahl* = ἄνοια, see R. Arnzen, 'Plato's *Timaeus* in the Arabic Tradition. Legends – Testimonies – Fragments', in F. Celia, A. Ulacco (eds.), *Il Timeo. Esegesi greche, arabe, latine* (Pisa, 2012) 181–267, at 250 [Fr. 33] = P. Kraus, R. Walzer (eds.), *Galeni Compendium Timaei Platonis* (London, 1951) 1. Given the translation of the adjective ἄνοια as *bi-lā 'aql* 'intellect-less' rather than *ğāhil* 'ignorant' within the same work (see Kraus-Walzer's *Index Graeco-Arabicus*), it is possible that the translator read, or interpreted, ἄγνοια rather than ἄνοια.

¹⁴ For ταύτη, see G. Bernhardy, *Wissenschaftliche Syntax der griechischen Sprache* (Berlin, 1829) 133 (I owe the reference to Stallbaum's note *ad loc.*). Bury in his *Loeb* prints this form without crediting Bernhardy with the conjecture. Stallbaum prints ταύτης reluctantly, noting: 'Mox ταύτης ... nisi accusativus ἐνοῦσαν γελοίαν ἄγνοιαν per anacoluthon excusandus sit, in ταύτην commutari malim'. Diès and England also print ταύτης; see England's note *ad loc.* in defense of the reading of the MSS. Incidentally, England also argues that the antecedent of the demonstrative pronoun ταύτης is ἄγνοιαν, against Schneider's view that its antecedent is φύσεως; in the Arabic version, the expansion *min hādā l-ğahli* 'from this ignorance' indicates that the antecedent was understood as ἄ(y)νοίαν.