In *Metaph.* A 4, 985b4 ff. Aristotle speaks about the atomists Leucippus and Democritus. For them, he says, the void (κενόν) is by no means less than the full (πλήρες, σωμα). The text runs as follows:

Λευκίππος δὲ καὶ ὁ ἕταρχος αὐτοῦ Δημόκριτος στηρίζει μὲν τὸ πλήρες καὶ τὸ κενόν εἶναι φασιν, λέγοντες τὸ μὲν δὲν τὸ δὲ μὴ δὲν, τούτων δὲ τὸ μὲν πλήρες καὶ στερεόν τὸ δὲν, τὸ δὲ κενόν τὸ μη δὲν (διὸ καὶ οὐδὲν μᾶλλον τὸ δὲν τοῦ μῆ δὲν τοῦ εἶναι φασιν, ἐν τι οὐ δὲ τὸ σεν ὁ τὸ σὲ μ αὐτοῦ, αὐτίκα δὲ τῶν δυτικών ταύτα ὡς ψιλλην.

The difficulty lies in the words ὁ οὐδὲ (καὶ μᾶλλον) τὸ κενὸν τοῦ σωματος. We should expect οὐδὲ τοῦ κενοῦ τὸ σῶμα. In fact Fonseca made the conjecture ὅτι οὐδὲ τὸ σῶμα τοῦ κενοῦ. Palaeographically this reading is as indefensible as that of Schwegler, followed by Ross (τοῦ κενοῦ τὸ σῶμα) because the question arises how such a mistake could have come into being. Zeller inserts after κενὸν <ἐλαττον>, which makes very good sense and is palaeographically quite justified. Yet this is too verbose for Aristotle’s concise style 1). W. Jaeger 2) is right, in maintaining the reading of all the MSS. His interpretation however of the expression οὐδὲν μᾶλλον ...... ξ) does not seem quite successful to me; nor do the greater part of the passages he cites in support of his view. Let us begin by treating these passages.

The first instance of this use he quotes is *Metaph.* A 8, 990a14 ff. ...... εὔ δὲν γὰρ ὑποτίθενται καὶ λέγουσιν, οὐδὲν μᾶλλον περὶ τῶν μαθηματικῶν λέγοσι σωμάτων ἢ τῶν αἰσθητῶν: διὸ περὶ πυρὸς ἢ γῆς ἢ τῶν ἄλλων τῶν τοιούτων σωμάτων οὐδὲν ὅτιον εἰρήκασιν, ἀτε οὐδέν περὶ τῶν αἰσθητῶν οὐμαί λέγοντες ἰδιον.

1) This verbosity fits in better with the paraphrasis of Asclepius, who therefore cannot be cited in support of this insertion.
2) Hermes 52 (1917), 486f.
3) According to him οὐδὲν μᾶλλον = οὐδὲν ἔλλαττον. For my own interpretation vid. infra.
This passage however is to be explained otherwise. The words οὖθεν μᾶλλον κτλ.... ἡ τῶν αἰσθητῶν must be connected directly with what precedes: the starting-point of the Pythagoreans explains that they do not speak about mathematical things any more than about the sensibilia.

The second passage is *Metaph. B2*, 996b26 ff. Here Ar. deals with the question whether studying the general principles is the special business of one science or of more than one. The question is, he says, whether the same science deals with them as with substance, or a different science, and in case it is not one science—he asks—which of the two must be identified with that which we now seek? The first case he thinks unlikely: μᾶς μὲν οὖν οὐκ εὐλογον εἶναι· τι γὰρ μᾶλλον γεωμετρίας ἡ ὑπομασθήν περὶ τοῦτων ἑστίν ήδιον τὸ ἑπατείν (I.e. b33—34). According to Jaeger Aristotle means to say that studying the common principles should be the special business of geometry no less than of any other science. This interpretation however is false. With Bonitz and Ross one has to interpret: as geometry in this respect does not prevail over the other sciences, so πρώτη φιλοσοφία does not prevail over them. That this is the right sense may appear from what follows: εἰπερ οὖν ὁμοίως μὲν ὑπομασθήν ἑστίν, ἀπασών δὲ μὴ ἐνδέχεται, ὡσπερ οὖθε τῶν ἐλλών οὕτως οὖθε τῆς γνωρίζουσης τὰς οὐσίας ἠδίον ἑστι τὸ γιγνώσκειν περὶ αὐτῶν (996b35-997a2). Therefore this passage too falls away as a parallel.

Finally Jaeger calls attention to *Meteor. B 2*, 356a16. In B 2, 355b33 ff. Ar. criticizes Plato’s theory about rivers and the sea (*Phaedo* 111 C ff.). On this theory, he says 356a14ff., rivers do not always flow in the same sense. For because they flow to the centre (viz. of the earth) from which they issue forth they will not flow down any more than up. The text runs as follows: ἐπεὶ γὰρ εἰς τὸ μέσον εἰσφέρουσιν, ἀρ’ οὖπερ ἐκφέρουσιν, οὔ δὲ ν ὁ ἄλλον ρέωσονται κάτωθεν ἡ ἀνωθεν. That Ar. really considers the ἀνωθεν φορά of water as the most natural movement, appears from a17 f.: καλτο τοῦτο συμβαίνοντος γένοιτ’ ἐν τὸ λεγόμενον "ἀνω-ποταμῷ".

This last passage supports the MSS.-reading in *Metaph. A 4*, 985b9. In Greek I could not find any more examples of this use. In Latin however they are numerous.

Cicero, *de Inv. I* 90: commune est (sc. hoc genus argumentationis)