

EUDEMIUS OF RHODES

RUTGERS UNIVERSITY STUDIES IN
CLASSICAL HUMANITIES

VOLUME
XI

EDITORS

ISTVÁN BODNÁR
WILLIAM W. FORTENBAUGH

EUDEMUS
OF
RHODES

**Rutgers University Studies
in Classical Humanities**

Series Editor: William W. Fortenbaugh

Advisory Board: Dimitri Gutas
Pamula M. Huby
David C. Mirhady
Eckart Schütrumpf
Robert W. Sharples

On Stoic and Peripatetic Ethics: The Work of Arius Didymus,
volume I

Theophrastus of Eresus: On His Life and Work, volume II

*Theophrastean Studies: On Natural Science, Physics and Metaphysics,
Ethics, Religion and Rhetoric,* volume III

Cicero's Knowledge of the Peripatos, volume IV

*Theophrastus: His Psychological, Doxographical, and Scientific
Writings,* volume V

Peripatetic Rhetoric After Aristotle, volume VI

*The Passionate Intellect: Essays on the Transformation of Classical
Traditions presented to Professor I.G. Kidd,* volume VII

Theophrastus: Reappraising the Sources, volume VIII

Demetrius of Phalerum: Text, Translation and Discussion, volume IX

Dicaearchus of Messana: Text, Translation and Discussion, volume X

Eudemus of Rhodes, volume XI

EUDEMIUS OF RHODES

RUTGERS UNIVERSITY STUDIES IN
CLASSICAL HUMANITIES

VOLUME
XI

EDITORS

ISTVÁN BODNÁR

WILLIAM W. FORTENBAUGH

 **Routledge**
Taylor & Francis Group
LONDON AND NEW YORK

First published 2002 by Transaction Publishers

Published 2017 by Routledge

2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN

711 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10017

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor and Francis Group, an informa business

Copyright © 2002 by Taylor & Francis.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

Notice:

Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

Library of Congress Catalog Number: 200202047

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Eudemus of Rhodes / edited by István Bodnár and William W. Fortenbaugh.

p. cm.—(Rutgers University studies in classical humanities ; v. 11)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 0-7658-0134-5 (cloth : alk. paper)

1. Eudemus, of Rhodes. I. Bodnár, István M. II. Fortenbaugh, William W.
III. Series.

B577.E54 E93 2002

185—dc21

2002020470

ISSN: 0732-9814

ISBN 13: 978-0-7658-0134-0 (hbk)

Contents

Preface	vii
Contributors	ix
1. Eudemus in the Arabic Tradition <i>Dimitri Gutas</i>	1–23
2. Eudemus and the Peripatos <i>Hans B. Gottschalk</i>	25–37
3. Qualche Aspetto Controverso della Biografia di Eudemo di Rodi <i>Tiziano Dorandi</i>	39–57
4. Eudemus' Work <i>On Expression</i> <i>William W. Fortenbaugh</i>	59–83
5. Did Aristotle Reply to Eudemus and Theophrastus on Some Logical Issues? <i>Pamela M. Huby</i>	85–106
6. Eudemus' <i>Physics</i> : Change, Place and Time <i>Robert W. Sharples</i>	107–126
7. Wehrli's Edition of Eudemus of Rhodes: The Physical Fragments from Simplicius' Commentary <i>On Aristotle's Physics</i> <i>Han Baltussen</i>	127–156
8. Continuity and Coherence in Early Peripatetic Texts <i>Sylvia Berryman</i>	157–169
9. Eudemus' Unmoved Movers: Fragments 121–123b Wehrli <i>István Bodnár</i>	171–189

10. <i>Phantasia</i> , Thought and Science in Eudemus <i>Deborah K. W. Modrak</i>	191–206
11. Eudemus the Naturalist <i>Stephen A. White</i>	207–241
12. Eudemus and the History of Science <i>Jørgen Mejer</i>	243–261
13. Eudemus' History of Mathematics <i>Leonid Zhmud</i>	263–306
14. Eudemus' History of Early Greek Astronomy: Two Hypotheses <i>Alan C. Bowen</i>	307–322
15. Eudemus Fr. 145 Wehrli and the Ancient Theories of Lunar Light <i>Dmitri Panchenko</i>	323–336
16. On Eudemus Fr. 150 (Wehrli) <i>Gábor Betegh</i>	337–357
Index of Ancient Sources	359–383

Preface

This volume of Rutgers University Studies in Classical Humanities, no. XI in the series, is the third devoted to Theophrastus' colleagues, pupils and successors, i.e., those Peripatetic philosophers, whom Fritz Wehrli brought together under the label *die Schule des Aristoteles*. Volume IX focuses on Demetrius of Phalerum, who was Theophrastus' pupil and for ten years the ruler of Athens. Volume X has Dicaearchus of Messana, Theophrastus' fellow-pupil within the Aristotelian Peripatos, as its subject. The present Volume, no. XI, concentrates on Eudemus of Rhodes, who, like Dicaearchus, studied under Aristotle and alongside Theophrastus. This concern with *die Schule des Aristoteles* will continue with the next two volumes: Lyco of Troas and Hieronymus of Rhodes will be the subjects of Volume XII, and Aristo of Ceos will be featured in Volume XIII. All three belong to the post-Theophrastean Peripatos. Like Volumes IX and X, so Volumes XII and XIII will present the ancient sources with translation as well as discussion by various scholars. Volume XI is different in that it is entirely composed of articles which discuss Eudemus from differing points of view.

Many of the papers within this volume were originally presented at a conference on Eudemus held in Budapest, Hungary. The conference was long in the planning stage. Preliminary discussions began in 1993 and continued into 1995 when a firm decision was reached to make Eudemus the topic and Budapest the site of the 1997 biennial conference sponsored by Project Theophrastus. István Bodnár accepted responsibility for making arrangements in Budapest: he reserved rooms in the Guest House of the Eötvös University and booked the Faculty Hall of the University for meetings. Nevertheless his efforts would be undone by the Rector of the University. Six months before the meeting was scheduled to begin, all reservations were canceled to make room for a conference that the Rector decided to sponsor. That was a rude jolt, but not a knockout blow. Thanks to Mr. Csaba Szabó, Director of Inter-

national Programs at the Gáspár Károli University of the Hungarian Reformed Church, dormitory space and lecture rooms were made available at Károli University. We express our gratitude to Mr Szabó for making possible at short notice a fine conference in a delightful city. For financial and organizational assistance, we are grateful to the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, the Hungarian National Fund for Scientific Research, the Hungarian National Committee for Technical Development, the Division of History of Science of the International Union of History and Philosophy of Science, the Departmental Group of Philosophy and the Department of Symbolic Logic and Methodology of Science of the Eötvös University. For financial support we also wish to express our thanks to the Research Council of Rutgers University.

IB and WWF

Contributors

- Han BALTUSSEN, Department of Philosophy, King's College London, Strand, London WC2R 2LS, UK
- Sylvia BERRYMAN, Department of Philosophy, Ohio State University, 230 North Oval Mall, Columbus OH 43210-1365, USA
- Gábor BETEGH, Department of Philosophy, Central European University, Nador u. 11, 1051 Budapest, Hungary
- István BODNÁR, Elte BTK Filozófia, Budapest 4, Pf 107, 1364 Hungary and Department of Philosophy, Central European University, Nador u. 11, 1051 Budapest, Hungary
- Alan C. BOWEN, Institute for Research in Classical Philosophy and Science, 3 Nelson Ridge Road, Princeton NJ 08540-7423, USA
- Tiziano DORANDI, UPR 76, CNRS, 7 rue G. Moquet, BP 8, 94801 Villejuif Cedex, France
- William W. FORTENBAUGH, Department of Classics, Rutgers University, 131 George Street, New Brunswick NJ 08901-1414, USA
- Hans B. GOTTSCHALK, Department of Greek and Latin, University of Leeds, Leeds LS2 9JT, UK
- Dimitri GUTAS, Department of Near Eastern Languages and Civilization, PO Box 1504A Yale Station, New Haven CT 06520, USA
- Pamela M. HUBY, 33A Barton Road, Harlington, Beds LU5 6LG, UK
- Jørgen MEJER, Københavns Universitet, Institut for Graesk og Latin, Njalsgade 92, DK 2300 København, Denmark
- Deborah K. W. MODRAK, Department of Philosophy, University of Rochester, Rochester NY 14627-0078, USA
- Dmitri PANCHENKO, Bibliotheca Classica, Malyj pr. P.S. 9/6, 197198 St. Petersburg, Russia
- Robert W. SHARPLES, Department of Greek and Latin, University College London, Gower Street, London WC1E 6BT, UK
- Stephen A. WHITE, Department of Classics, University of Texas, Austin TX 78712, USA
- Leonid ZHMUD, Institute for the History of Science and Technology, Russian Academy of the Sciences, Universitetskaja emb. 5, 199034 St. Petersburg, Russia



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

1

Eudemus in the Arabic Tradition¹

Dimitri Gutas

I. Introduction

The information on Eudemus of Rhodes that can be recovered in Arabic sources falls into three categories: there is a full collection of sayings (Section II below and Appendix), some incidental biographical notices that mainly state his relation to Aristotle and Theophrastus (Section III), and a number of references to his views on logic which he held in common with Theophrastus (Section IV). No work of his is reported to have been translated into Arabic or is known to be extant. Apart from the sayings, therefore, Eudemus has no independent persona or presence in Arabic but rides on the coattails primarily of Theophrastus. This is hardly surprising, given the little information on Eudemus that was available even in Greek at the time of the rise of Islam.

¹ An initial draft of this paper was delivered at the Theophrastus Conference in Budapest, July 1997. I wish to thank the participants for a number of helpful comments and suggestions. I am also grateful to Franz Rosenthal for sharing with me, on this as on previous occasions, some of his insights and vast knowledge of matters gnomological.

What is surprising is the collection of sayings. It is found only in the major Arabic gnomologium known as the *Ṣiwān al-ḥikma* (*Depository of Wisdom Literature*), compiled around 1000 A.D. from material translated from Greek in the previous two centuries. As reconstructed below (see the edition in the Appendix and the translation in Section II), it contains 29 sayings,² though the original entry may have been longer. Even so, 29 sayings is a goodly number for a philosopher who survived so poorly in late antiquity and who was virtually unknown in Arabic. Now this collection is unique when viewed both from the Arabic and Greek side. That no other Arabic gnomologium has any section on Eudemus or even a saying attributed to him is quite remarkable, given that he is introduced in the *Ṣiwān* as a prominent student of Aristotle. On the Greek side, it is even more astonishing that, as far as I am aware, none of the very extensive Greek gnomologia has any sayings by Eudemus. The question of the sources of the *Ṣiwān* for the entry on Eudemus thus imposes itself.

Certain considerations limit the parameters within which the answer is to be sought. In the first place, the section on Eudemus in the *Ṣiwān* is so located as to make it certain beyond a reasonable doubt that the source was a Greek gnomologium. It comes right after the entries on Aristotle and Theophrastus, and it is followed by that on another, unidentified, philosopher (ʿshwłws), who is also said to have been a student of Aristotle and a close colleague of Theophrastus and Eudemus (see n. 22 below). There is thus absolutely no doubt that the Eudemus in this part of the *Ṣiwān* is indeed Eudemus of Rhodes and not another person whose name, in the complicated history of the transmission of these sayings within Greek, from Greek into Arabic, and within Arabic, was mistaken for or transformed into his.

Second, since Eudemus was almost completely unknown in Arabic, as already mentioned, there would have been no incentive to attribute to him forged sayings or sayings by others. Not only was he unknown in philosophy, but what is even more important when considering possible cases of pseudepigraphous literature in Arabic, he was unknown even in alchemical and magical literature, which contained a long list of names of famous Greeks, including Theophrastus, who allegedly wrote on alchemical and magical subjects. Thus the entry on Eudemus in the *Ṣiwān* cannot but ultimately be of Greek origin.

² Or possibly, in a conservative count, 27. See below in Section II, note to saying 28.

The compiler of the *Ṣiwān* may have been drawing here also, as in the preceding section on Theophrastus,³ upon different Greek sources in Arabic translation. This is partially substantiated by the disparate nature and contents of the sayings. There are sayings that are both *apophthegmata* and *chreiai* in form, as well as *homoiomata* (nos. 2, 4), and in one case (no. 9) we have what appears to be a double transmission of the same saying. There are sayings on the usual subjects of ignorance (nos. 2–3), the ethos theory of music (no. 8), death (nos. 11–12, 29), good fortune (nos. 15, 23), rulers (no. 28), etc. There is also, however, misogyny (nos. 9–10), a subject concerning which it is not clear whether it was prevalent outside Cynic circles and the ancient philosophers they idolized (like Socrates); and although Eudemus was not among them, it may be significant that two of the sayings by Eudemus (nos. 13 and 26) are also attributed to Socrates in the Arabic gnomologia. There are, furthermore, some relatively extensive didactic passages (nos. 5, 7, 14) which appear like quotations from longer works. The one from Herodotus (no. 5) could easily be ultimately derived from one of Eudemus' *Historiai*, in which he demonstrably included material from the ancient Near East.⁴ Finally, assuming the compiler to have worked from different sources, misattribution cannot be ruled out either: sayings under a different original name could have been mistaken or misread for those by Eudemus. None of this, however, can be established with any certainty; there is simply not enough evidence to help decide whether this selection from various sources was made by the compiler of the *Ṣiwān* himself or it had already been made by his source, a translated gnomologium which included this section on Eudemus.

The absence of Eudemus from any extant Greek gnomologium makes impossible even an educated guess about the Greek source of the *Ṣiwān*. One immediately thinks of the *Eudemian Ethics*, but there are no specific correspondences between any of the 29 sayings and Aristotle's work, despite the superficial overlap between some of the topoi of the sayings and the *Eudemian Ethics*—one would like to compare, for example, saying number 12 with 1229b34–1230a4, or number 19 with 1238a14–26. One would thus have to postulate one or more Greek gnomologia with some sayings attributed to Eudemus, which

³ See the discussion in Gutas (1985) 83.

⁴ Cf., e.g., the comments by Wehrli (1969) 119–20 on some of the sources of Eudemus for his astronomical information.

eventually found their way into Arabic. The origins of this gnomologium (or gnomologia), its transmission and disappearance in Greek, and the particulars of its reappearance in Arabic are problems that still need to be investigated.

II. Sayings by Eudemus from *The Depository of Wisdom Literature*

EUDEMUS. He was also one of Aristotle's students who taught his knowledge and philosophy and wrote books on the strength of Aristotle's works, in the manner of his composition, and in his tradition.

1. He was asked, "Why do you <never> refuse those who ask you?" "So that," he replied, "I will never have to ask anyone who may refuse me."⁵
2. He said: That which prevents a drunk from feeling the prick of the thorn stuck in his hand also prevents an ignorant man from experiencing the pain of folly lodging in his heart.
3. He said: Do not confide anything to an ignorant man because he cannot keep it secret; only a wise man⁶ can keep a secret.
4. He said: Just as an arrow that hits a stone is deflected from it, so also an evil word shot at a good man has no effect on him but the fault reverts to the shooter.
5. He urged his students to be generous in dispensing philosophy. He said: "Take as model the practice prevailing in Assyria:⁷ The practice there is

⁵ The addition of the negative by Dunlop in his Arabic edition, absent from all the manuscripts, may be required for the sense: a person who has a reputation of never refusing to give (more likely money than advice) can safely expect his fellow citizens to return the favor when he does the asking. Without the negative, however, the saying becomes sharper, if the sense could be elicited that one should never give (money) lest he becomes impoverished (because of excessive philanthropy) and finds himself in the position of having to ask and not being given:

⁶ Or, "a philosopher," *ḥakīm*.

⁷ The text has Assos, but this story from Herodotus 1.196 clearly refers to Assyria. Assos is the most likely reading of the spelling of the name (ʿsws) in the unique manuscript (Fatih 3222) of the *Muḥtaṣar Ṣiwān al-ḥikma* where this saying occurs. A parallel passage in another recension of the *Ṣiwān*, in which this saying is attributed to Plato, has "as-Sūs al-Aqṣa," "the Farthest Sūs;" this refers to the Moroccan Sūs near the Atlas and is clearly a scribal "emendation"; for this version see Gutas (1975) 119–21, 336–37. In Herodotus (1.196), however, the custom described here is attributed to the Assyrians, thus almost certainly making Assyria the reading of the proper name (see Gutas, *ibid.*). It is tempting to read the name as Assos in the Troad and thus put Eudemus also among the group of philosophers around Hermias, as W. Jaeger (1948) would seem

that the beautiful daughters of its inhabitants send their dowries to the ugly ones so that these can be in demand for their wealth just as the beautiful ones are in demand for their beauty. You, my students, are in demand for [your] philosophy; give, then, liberally some of it to the ignorant so that they can benefit from it and so that your excellence become manifest and your philosophy bear fruit among them!”

6. He said: The vocable is matter, the meaning form; speech is appearance, and style the beauty of appearance.
7. He was asked, “How far has your thought reached?” “It has reached,” he replied, “a level encompassing the entire extent of the thoughts of my contemporaries. Whenever I examine the extent of a thought by reflection, I acquire a comprehensive knowledge of its extent, not having failed to gain cognizance of it, and I know that I have surpassed it.

A man knows more than someone else only when he acquires a comprehensive knowledge of the sum total of his [the other person’s] thought—I mean the farthest point to which his thought has reached, and the sum total of the paths it has become aware of and followed in accordance with the level it has reached in proceeding along the right way.⁹ One then exercises his thought as if there were a limit[ed scope] in everything that his thought concentrated on; and when a man knows the way to proceed, he is safe from erring and slipping.”

8. He said: The true and clear melody is that which expresses fully the high-mindedness of the soul. Any craftsman who can reveal, to the highest possible degree, the form which is in the soul so that it comes out until it becomes perceptible, is wise.
- 9.1 He said: The most vicious predator is a stepmother.⁹
- 9.2 He was asked, “What can detract from [the viciousness of] a predatory animal?” “I don’t know,” he replied, “any predatory animal more vicious than a stepmother.”¹⁰

to believe (see p. 110 n. 2 of the preceding page), though K. Gaiser does not mention him at all in this context. On the other hand, it seems more plausible that the story itself about Assyrians was retold by Eudemus, on the basis of Herodotus, in one of his cultural histories, and from there adapted, with the moral attached, for the *gnomologia* (this hypothesis, which I now consider more likely, I did not entertain in my study cited above.)

⁸ There is a slight textual uncertainty here. With a different emendation of the text (preferred by Badawī), the phrase “in accordance with” could be read with the following sentence. The general meaning, though, seems to be clear: when one knows how to proceed, the thoughts that need to be considered become circumscribed and thus more amenable to analysis.

⁹ For *imraʿatu l-ab* = μητρυνία, see *GALex* p. 17, s.v. ‘abun’ 6.

¹⁰ Apparently this saying was transmitted in two forms, as an ἀπόφηνεγμα (9.1) and as a χρεία (9.2); the author or a redactor of the *Ṣiwān* put both together.

6 Eudemus of Rhodes

10. He was told, “So-and-so, your enemy, has died.” “I wish,” he replied, “you had said that he got married.”
11. He looked at a dead man and said, “Here is a warner who, soundless, is calling out to the heedless; motionless, is moving those looking at him; and insentient, is arousing the senses.”¹¹
12. He said: Just as death is something bad for those for whom life was good so also is it good for those for whom life was bad. So death is not an absolutely bad it is <also> good <—no, rather death is neither good nor bad but> it becomes good or bad only with reference to something [else].¹²
13. Asked whether there was anyone in the world that is faultless he replied, “No, because someone faultless is immortal.”¹³
14. He was asked about the amount of benefit people derive from philosophy. He said: “When a person brings together all [parts of] philosophy and is both surrounded by and encompasses them, he becomes like someone who, having completed his crossing of the sea and reached the destination of his journey, looks back at the others who are beset by encircling waves and raging winds.”¹⁴
15. He said: It is good fortune for a man that his appetites pass away; it is also good fortune for him to be obliged to serve philosophy and its adherents.
16. He also said: Be content with just enough [for a living];¹⁵ for anything beyond that has disastrous outcome and grave consequences.
17. He said: Beware of discord because it cultivates evil just as rain cultivates seed.
18. He said: Undertaking the unbearable is foolishness; pursuing the unattainable is distressing; promising the unrealizable is shameful; spending uselessly is mismanagement; and attaining undeservedly a high position is standing on the brink of disaster.
19. He said: Fate¹⁶ subdues time, and the vicissitudes [of fate] subdue generated beings.

¹¹ This saying is similar, though not exactly parallel, to numerous sayings uttered by philosophers at Alexander’s tomb. For a general orientation see Brock.

¹² This saying, in exactly the same wording, is attributed to Anaxagoras by Mubaššir (p. 317 Badawī) and by Tawhīdī in his *Risālat al-Ḥayāt* (p. 68 Kaylānī). Šahrazūrī’s lacunose text above is completed from Tawhīdī.

¹³ Cited under the name of Socrates by Ibn-Abī-ʿAwn 50/714 in Rosenthal.

¹⁴ Šahrazūrī alone adds a final phrase “while he is at rest and calm,” which would appear to be an addition in the Arabic transmission either by Šahrazūrī himself or his immediate source.

¹⁵ For the concept and cultural context of “sufficiency” (*kafāf*), see the passages cited by Ullmann in *WKAS I* 244b30–245b14.

¹⁶ Fate in the sense of eternal time, *dahr*, which most likely renders here the Greek αἰών (cf. *GALex* p. 10; s.v. “abadiyyun” 4.1), while “time,” *zamān*, would be a translation of χρόνος.

20. He said: A tongue that is used in mentioning the first creator ought not to engage in obscenities.
21. He said: The person who sees people's defects most clearly is he who is blinded by his own flaw.
22. He said: God alone is perfect; he did not exempt any of his creatures from defect.
23. He said: The fortune of someone endowed with reason is a spiritual¹⁷ [good] fortune, while the fortune of someone endowed with ignorance is his [ill] fate.
24. He said: Success comes through determination, determination through pondering over [matters], and pondering through safeguarding secrets.
25. He was asked, "When is simple-mindedness praised?" "When it is connected with nobility," he replied. "And when is intelligence blamed?" "When it is associated with lowliness."¹⁸
26. He said: Nothing is more precious than life, and no fraud graver than spending it for any [purpose] other than [the pursuit of] eternal life.¹⁹
27. He was asked what the impossible²⁰ is and he replied, "What has no form in the soul."
28. He said: When a ruler favors you, be with him like a spearhead even if he is friendly with you, for you cannot be sure that he will not turn against you; treat him gently as you would a child, and talk to him as he pleases.²¹
29. He said: That which consoled you for [the death of] your father will also console your sons for you[r death].

¹⁷ "Spiritual," *rūḥānī*, may be translating θείος, "divine," here; see *GALex* p. 10; s.v. "abadiyyun" 3.2.

¹⁸ Apparently here nobility and lowliness of birth are intended. Cf. F. Rosenthal *Ibn-Abī-ʿAwn* 66/730, for a similar set of questions asked of an anonymous philosopher.

¹⁹ This saying is attributed in the *Muḥtaṣar* also to Socrates (f. 6a) and to an anonymous companion of Aristotle (f. 16a).

²⁰ Arabic *muḥāl*, the logically impossible or absurd.

²¹ This and the following saying occur in the *Muḥtaṣar* only, represented by the unicum MS Fatih 3222. In this MS, the end of the section on Eudemus is not marked by the name of the following philosopher whose sayings are recorded (ʿshwłws); the name of ʿshwłws is missing, as are the brief biographical sentences about him (see below, no. 1.2 in Section III). The sayings of ʿshwłws follow uninterruptedly after those of Eudemus. The saying which comes after no. 29 here is attributed to ʿshwłws in the *Muntaḥab*, and this is how we can tell that the Eudemus section has actually ended in the *Muḥtaṣar*. But since nos. 28 and 29 occur only in the *Muḥtaṣar*, we cannot tell whether they were attributed to Eudemus or ʿshwłws in the original *Šiwān*. If they were sayings by ʿshwłws, then the Eudemus section in the *Šiwān* would contain twenty-seven sayings.

III. Biographical References to Eudemus

1. *Depository of Wisdom Literature (Muntaḥab Šiwān al-ḥikma, ll. 1172–75, 1231–32 Dunlop):*

1.1 [From the life of Theophrastus, FHS&G 4A]: [Theophrastus] was assisted in the instruction of the students of philosophy and of beginners, and in the performance of the tasks entrusted to him, by Eudemus and ‘šḥwlws,²² both of whom were also among the eminent pupils of Aristotle.

1.2 [From the life of ḥšḥwlws]: ḥšḥwlws was also one of the major companions of Aristotle the philosopher. He was equal in importance to Theophrastus and Eudemus, which we mentioned earlier. Alexander [the Great] thought very highly of him and counted him among his peers.

2. Ibn-an-Nadīm, *Index (al-Fihrist, p. 255.15 Flügel = Gutas (1985) p. 82, no. I):*

I found on the flyleaf of a volume written in an old hand the names that have reached us of the commentators on the logical and other philosophical books by Aristotle. They are Theophrastus, Eudemus, Herminus (?),²³ Boethus, Iamblichus, Alexander, Themistius, Porphyry . . .

3. Mubaššir ibn-Fātik, *Choicest Maxims and Best Sayings (Muḥtār al-ḥikam, 183.6–11 Badawī = Gutas [1985] p. 78–9, nos. IV.1, 3), in the life of Aristotle:*

Aristotle had many students among kings, princes, and others.

²² The name remains unidentified; see Gutas (1985) 74 note b. One would expect Clearchus and Dicaearchus, the two closest colleagues of Theophrastus and Eudemus in the Peripatos, but the skeletal form of the name could not support such a reading. What it could support is Antigonus, possibly Antigonus the Great, especially since in the brief biographical notice on him in the *Šiwān* he is said to have been highly respected by Alexander the Great, and confused in the Greek sources with Antigonus Gonatas, the great patron of philosophers in Athens. But all this is speculation.

²³ This is either a doublet for Eudemus (the two names in Arabic transcription look very similar) or a reference to Herminus, the teacher of Alexander of Aphrodisias (cf. Gottschalk 1987. 1158). The context in which this name is found in the *Fihrist* would lend support to the former alternative, although the re-occurrence of the doublet in Mubaššir and Ibn-al-Qiftī in items 3 and 5 below would indicate the latter.

The following are some of the most excellent ones among them who were famed for their knowledge, distinguished in philosophy, and known for their noble descent: Theophrastus, Eudemus, Alexander the King, Eudemus,²⁴ ḡshwłws, and others. . . . Helping and assisting Theophrastus in this [task, i.e., in his professorial duties] were two men, one of them called Eudemus and the other ḡshwłws. They all wrote books on logic and philosophy.

4. Masʿūdī, *at-Tanbīh* (121 de Goeje = Gutas [1985] p. 82. no. II):

We mentioned in the book *Varieties of Knowledge* the reason why political philosophy began with Socrates and then [continued with] Plato, then Aristotle, then his maternal aunt's son, Theophrastus, then Eudemus, and those who came after him, one after the other.

5. Ibn-al-Qifṭī/Zawzanī, *History of the Philosophers (al-Muntaḥabāt min Aḥbār al-ḥukamāʾ)*, p. 59.18–60.3 Lippert):

5.1 Eudemus. One of the Byzantine philosophers who became pre-eminent in his time in instruction in this field. He was an authority on the philosophy of Aristotle and wrote works commenting on some of his books.

5.2 Eudemus.²⁵ Byzantine philosopher who engaged in this field. He instructed his contemporaries and commented on some of the books by Aristotle.

IV. Logic

1. Ibn Buṭlān, *Against Ibn Riḍwān* (= Gutas [1985] p. 90–1):

On the causes why he who learns from oral instruction by teachers learns better and more easily than he who learns from books: ...

²⁴ Mubaṣṣir's text has ḡrmīnūs, but this would appear to be a doublet for Eudemus rather than a reference to Herminus. The context here would hardly justify a reading of Herminus; see the note to the preceding entry.

²⁵ Ibn-al-Qifṭī's text has actually ḡrmīnus, though this is possibly a doublet for Eudemus; see the preceding two notes. Alternatively, both entries 5.1 and 5.2 in Ibn-al-Qifṭī could refer to Herminus, rather than to Eudemus, since the person is described as a "Byzantine" (*Rūmī*), which is Ibn-al-Qifṭī's designation for scholars who lived in Imperial times, as opposed to "Greek" (*Yūnānī*) for authors of the classical and Hellenistic periods.

[Another argument in support of this is] that which the commentators have said about the substitution of the simple negative [proposition] by the modified [/equivalent] affirmative [proposition]; for they agree that this section would have never been understood by a reading of the book had not Aristotle's disciples, Theophrastus and Eudemus, heard it explained by their master. If this is so, then understanding from a teacher is better than that from a book.

2. Fārābī, *On Aristotle's De Interpretatione* 4, 17a6–7 (53.6–12 Kutsch and Marrow = FHS&G111C):

[Aristotle] does not examine the composition of hypothetical [statements] at all in this book, and only slightly in the *Prior Analytics*. The Stoics, on the other hand, Chrysippus and others, examined it thoroughly to the point of excess, made a thorough study of hypothetical syllogisms—as Theophrastus and Eudemus had done after Aristotle's time—and claimed that Aristotle wrote books on hypothetical syllogisms.

3. Averroes on *Prior Analytics* 1.8 (29b26–30a2):

- 3.1 Averroes, *Quaesita* 4 (*Masā'il* 4, p.114.10 ᶜAlawī = FHS&G 98B):

Our purpose in this essay is to enquire into the premise which is called existential and absolute: what it is and what Aristotle's doctrine about it is, for the commentators have disagreed about this matter. . . .

The doctrine of Theophrastus [and of Eudemus and Themistius] is the following: an absolute and existential premise is one from which have been omitted both the mode of possibility and the mode of necessity, neither one having been explicitly stated in it, while the matter in itself is either necessary or possible.

- 3.2 Averroes, *Quaesita* 7 (*Masā'il* 7, p.156.14 ᶜAlawī = FHS&G 98D):

Some of them [the commentators] said that what is meant by the existential premise is that the predicate belongs to the subject absolutely, and that this [premise] subsumes the necessary, the possible, and the actually existent. Al-Fārābī related that this is the doctrine of Theophrastus and Eudemus and of those who professed their view.

4. Averroes on *Prior Analytics* 1.9, 30a33–30b64.1 Averroes, *Quaesita* 5 (*Masāʾil* 5, p.127.7 ʿAlawī = FHS&G 105):

Theophrastus, Eudemus and many of the ancient Peripatetics, and Themistius among the later ones, charged Aristotle emphatically with having committed an error when he said about syllogisms containing a mixture of existential and necessary premises that the mode of their conclusion follows the mode of the major premise. They said that on the contrary the mode of the conclusion follows in every kind of mixture the inferior of the two modes posited in the premises.

4.2 Averroes, *Quaesita* 8 (*Masāʾil* 8, p.176.13 ʿAlawī = FHS&G 106I):

All commentators agree that Aristotle held that the mode of the conclusion follows the mode of the major premise in the first, second, and third figure. . . . No one among the ancients, like Theophrastus and Eudemus, nor Themistius among the later authors, supported him in this view. They said that the mode of the conclusion follows the mode of the inferior premise, i.e., that in this sort of mixture it follows invariably the absolute premise and not the necessary in any way.

4.3 Averroes, *Talḥīṣ* of *Prior Analytics* (p.179.8 Jéhamy = FHS&G 106H):

Theophrastus and Eudemus among the ancient Peripatetics, Themistius among the later ones, and those who followed them are of the opinion that the mode of the conclusion follows the inferior of the two modes, that is, that in such a combination it is found invariably to follow the absolute premise, since absolute existence is inferior to necessary existence.

4.4 Averroes, *Talḥīṣ* of *Prior Analytics* (p.211.22 Jéhamy = FHS&G 106H app. font.):

This is what appeared to be the case to Theophrastus and Eudemus among the ancient Peripatetics, that the mode of the con-

clusion in mixed [syllogisms] always follows the inferior of the two modes of the premises.

Bibliography

- Abū-Ravvān = Abū-Rayyān. M.ᶜA. Al-Shahrazūrī, *Nuzhat al-arwāḥ wa-rawḍat al-afrāḥ* “*Tawārīḥ al-ḥukamāʿ*,” Alexandria: Dār al-Maʿarif al-Ġāmiʿiyya, 1414/1993.
- Abū-Šuwayrib = Abū-Šuwayrib, ᶜA. Al-Shahrazūrī, *Taʿrīḥ al-ḥukamāʿ* “*Nuzhat al-arwāḥ wa-rawḍat al-afrāḥ*.” Tripoli, Libya: 1398/1988.
- Ahmed = Ahmed, Syed Khurshid. Al-Shahrazūrī, *Nuzhat al-arwāḥ wa-rawḍat al-afrāḥ fī taʿrīḥ al-ḥukamāʿ wa-l-falāsifa*, 2 vols., Hyderabad: Dāʿirat al-Maʿarif al-ʿUṭmāmīya, 1396/1976.
- Badawī = Badawī, ᶜA. *Šiwān al-ḥikma wa-talāt rasāʿil*, Tehran, 1974.
- Brock = Brock, S.P. “The Laments of the Philosophers over Alexander in Syriac,” *Journal of Semitic Studies* 15 (1970) 205–18.
- Daiber = Daiber, H. “Der Šiwān al-Ḥikma und Abū Sulaimān al-Manṭiqī as-Siġistānī in der Forschung,” *Arabica* 31 (1984) 36–68.
- Dunlop = Dunlop, D.M. *The Muntakhab Šiwān al-Ḥikmah of Abū Sulaimān as-Sijistānī*. Near and Middle East Monographs, 4. The Hague: Mouton, 1979.
- FHS&G = W.W. Fortenbaugh, P.M. Huby, R.W. Sharples, and D. Gutas, *Theophrastus of Eresus. Sources for His Life, Writings, Thought and Influence*. *Philosophia Antiqua* 54. Leiden: Brill, 1992.
- Gaiser = Gaiser, K. *Theophrast in Assos*. *Abhandlungen der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-hist. Kl.*, 1985/3. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1985.
- GALex = Endress, G., and Gutas, D. *A Greek and Arabic Lexicon (GALex). Materials for a Dictionary of the Mediaeval Translations from Greek into Arabic*. *Handbuch der Orientalistik*, XI. Leiden: Brill, 1992ff.
- Gottschalk = Gottschalk, H.B. “Aristotelian Philosophy in the Roman World from the Time of Cicero to the End of the Second Century,” *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt*, ed. W. Haase, Vol. II.36.2, Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1987, pp. 1079–1174.
- Gutas (1975) = Gutas, D. *Greek Wisdom Literature in Arabic Translation*, New Haven: American Oriental Society, 1975.

- Gutas (1982) = Gutas, D. "The *Şiwān al-ḥikma* Cycle of Texts," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 102 (1982) 645–50.
- Gutas (1985) = Gutas, D. "The Life, Works, and Sayings of Theophrastus in the Arabic Tradition," in *Theophrastus of Eresus. On His Life and Work*, ed. W.W. Fortenbaugh. Rutgers University Studies in Classical Humanities, 2. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books, 1985, pp. 63–102.
- Ibn-al-Qifū = *Ibn al-Qifū's Taʾriḥ: al-Ḥukamāʾ*, ed. J. Lippert, Leipzig: Dieterich, 1903.
- Jaeger = Jaeger, W. *Aristotle. Fundamentals of the History of His Development*, tr. R. Robinson, 2nd ed., Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1948.
- Mubaššir = al-Mubaššir b. Fātik, *Muhtār al-Ḥukamāʾ*, ed. ʿA. Badawī. Madrid: Instituto Egipcio, 1958.
- Muḥtaṣar Şiwān al-ḥikma* = MS Istanbul, Fatih 3222.
- Muntaḥab Şiwān al-ḥikma* = see Badawī, Dunlop.
- Rosenthal = Rosenthal, F. "Witty Retorts of the Philosophers and Sages from the *Kitāb al-Ajwibah al-muskitah* of Ibn Abī ʿAwn," *Graeco-Arabica* 4 (Athens, 1991): 179–221.
- Şahrazūrī = see Ahmed, Abū-Rayyān, Abū-Şuwayrib.
- Şiwān al-ḥikma* = see *Muḥtaṣar* and *Muntaḥab*
- Tawḥīdī = Abū-Ḥayyān at-Tawḥīdī. *Risālat al-Ḥayāt in Talāt Rasāʾil*, ed. I. al-Kaylānī, Damascus, 1951.
- Wehrli = Wehrli, F. *Die Schule des Aristoteles*. Vol. 8, *Eudemos von Rhodos*, 2nd ed. Basel/Stuttgart: Schwabe & Co., 1969.
- WKAS = Ullmann, M. *Wörterbuch der Klassischen Arabischen Sprache*, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1970ff.

Appendix
Text of Eudemus' Sayings from the
Şiwān al-Ḥikma

The sayings of Eudemus in Arabic are to be found only in the famous gnomologium *Şiwān al-ḥikma* (*The Depository of Wisdom Literature*), compiled around 1000 A.D. from material translated in the previous two centuries. This gnomologium has not survived intact in directly transmitted manuscripts but indirectly, in two ways: in three separate abridgments and in quotations by later anthologists.²⁶ The original entry on Eudemus in the *Şiwān* (*Depository*) can thus be reconstructed on the basis of the selection of Eudemus' sayings offered in two of the three abridgments, the *Muḥtaşar* and the *Muntaḥab Şiwān al-ḥikma* (*Abridgment of and Selections from the Depository of Wisdom Literature*), and in the work of one anthologist, Şahrazūri's *Nuzhat al-arwāḥ wa-rawḍat al-afrāḥ* (*Spiritual Entertainment in the Garden of Delights*). The other recensions of the *Şiwān* or anthologies drawing on it do not cite Eudemus. In addition, none of the other great Arabic gnomologies of the 9th–11th centuries (those by Ḥunayn, Ibn-Hindū, and Mubaşşir), has sections on Eudemus. The reconstruction of the Eudemus entry in the original *Şiwān* can only be partial; we cannot know that the three sources we have (the *Muḥtaşar*, the *Muntaḥab*, and Şahrazūri) among them selected all the sayings it contained. Nevertheless, the sayings are given in identical sequence in all three sources, and their total number, twenty-nine, is high enough for a philosopher of Eudemus' rank as to generate the impression that we have recovered, if not the entire entry in the lost *Şiwān*, then definitely a very large part of it.

The Arabic edition of the sayings of Eudemus for the purposes of this paper has presented some particular problems, all having to do with the nature of the Arabic gnomologia and the state of the available editions. Of the three sources mentioned above, the *Muḥtaşar* is the least problematic. It is extant in a single manuscript preserved in Istanbul in the Fatih collection, no. 3222, to which I have access in the form of a microfilm. Its readings are accordingly fully recorded in my text and apparatus.²⁷

²⁶ For details see Gutas (1982) 646–47; 1985, 68–69.

²⁷ The text of the *Muḥtaşar* from this manuscript was printed as part of a University of Chicago doctoral dissertation by R. Mulyadhi Kartanegara, *The Mukhtaşar Şiwān*

The *Muntaḥab* presents a more complicated picture. It is extant in four manuscripts, three in Istanbul and one in the British Museum. I have a microfilm of one of the Istanbul MSS only, Murad Molla 1408. There are also two independent editions, one by D.M. Dunlop and the other by ʿAbdurrah«mān Badawī. Dunlop's edition, which is based on all four MSS, is essentially a collation copy of the readings of three MSS against the fourth, and its relatively full documentation of variant readings is useful. Badawī's edition, on the other hand, although based on the three Istanbul MSS, has spotty and occasionally inaccurate documentation of variant readings.²⁸ For this reason I have used the text edited by Dunlop and Badawī as controlled by my reading of Murad Molla 1408 on the few occasions of their divergence. For the apparatus I recorded the variants of the other MSS as recorded by Dunlop, but not by Badawī, for the reasons given in Gutas (1982) 649. In order to indicate the derivative nature of my information about the readings of MSS to which I did not have access, I marked the sigla of the MSS with a raised letter, the editor's initial.

The situation is similar with the text of Šahrazūrī. There are numerous MSS and three editions that I know of, by Ahmed, Abū-Rayyān, and Abū-Šuwayrib, all quite poor. The text on Eudemus in Šahrazūrī is quite short, however, and a measure of control over the editions has been gained by my recourse to the London MS British Museum Add. 25738. Variant readings recorded in Ahmed's edition have also been indicated by a raised initial letter marking the MS sigla.

Two other factors complicate the process of editing the sayings of Eudemus. One is the uniqueness of the *Šiwān* entry on Eudemus. As mentioned earlier, there are no traces whatsoever in the Greek tradition of any sayings ascribed to Eudemus; the edition of the Arabic sayings can thus expect no help from the Greek. The second is that some of the sayings ascribed to Eudemus in the *Šiwān* may appear elsewhere in the voluminous Arabic gnomologia under different names.²⁹ A proper

al-Ḥikma of ʿUmar b. Sahlān al-Sāwī, Chicago 1996. It offers no improvement on the text of the manuscript but rather adds mistakes of its own. It has not been taken into account.

²⁸ See my comparative review of these editions in Gutas (1982) 648–49. Cf. also Daiber (1984) on Dunlop's edition.

²⁹ The few instances that I have noticed have been cited in the notes to the translation.

evaluation of the text of the Arabic sayings is thus feasible only in the context of the entire corpus of Arabic gnomologia, something which could not be undertaken for the purposes of this paper.

Under these circumstances, it seemed best to provide an apparatus criticus that would present the documentation completely, i.e., a positive apparatus. All variants in the MSS of all the works accessible to me have been fully recorded. The procedure with the *Muḥtaṣar* I have mentioned above. For the *Muntaḥab* I recorded fully the readings of MS Murad Molla 1408, and for the rest I used the variants recorded by Dunlop. However, Dunlop's apparatus is negative, so although theoretically every time the reading of a MS is not recorded in the apparatus the inference is that it is identical with that accepted in the main text, I have refrained from drawing the inference and adding these supposed readings in my apparatus. The reader should keep in mind that for the *Muntaḥab* variants, the absence of a reference to some of the MS readings is due to Dunlop's negative apparatus. For the text of Šahrazūri, finally, given the paucity and unreliability of the documentation of the variants in the three editions, I have drawn primarily on the British Museum MS, whose readings are fully recorded, and gave the variants listed by one of the editors, Ahmed, only in circumstances where they were of obvious merit.

In the apparatus fontium, the numbers following the name of the sources refer to the relative sequence of the sayings in each source.

Abbreviations

add.	added in; added by (for material missing in the mss and added by editors in angular brackets < >)
app.	apparatus criticus
appar.	apparently (<i>ut videtur</i>)
codd.	codices, when all the mss agree on a reading
conj.	conjecture(d) by
corr.	corrected by or in, of a miswritten skeleton (<i>rasm</i>), in cases of <i>taḥrīf</i>
mrg.	margin
om.	omitted by or in

- read. reading by or in, in cases of unpointed or wrongly pointed skeleton (*taṣḥīf*)
- secl. secluded by (an editor in square brackets [] for material in the mss that is to be deleted)

Sigla

Muḥtaṣar Ṣiwān al-ḥikma

F MS Istanbul, Fatih 3222, ff. 34r–v

Muntaḥab Ṣiwān al-ḥikma

A MS Istanbul, Murad Molla 1408, ff. 31r–v

B^d MS London, British Museum Or. 9033, readings as recorded by Dunlop

C^d (ع in Badawī) MS Istanbul, Beṣir Aḡa 494, readings as recorded by Dunlop

D^d (د in Badawī) MS Istanbul, Köprülü 902, readings as recorded by Dunlop

Badawī Badawī edition, pp.178–81

Daiber Daiber (1984), pp.48–67

Dunlop Dunlop edition, lines 1200–29

Mḥb Agreement of all MSS and editions of the *Muntaḥab*

Šahrazūrī

Z MS London, British Museum Add. 25738

J^a (ج in Ahmed) MS Manchester, John Rylands, readings as recorded by Ahmed

L^a (س in Ahmed) MS Salar Jung, Taʿrīḥ 10, readings as recorded by Ahmed

V^a (اصل in Ahmed) MS Ās«afīya, Taʿrīḥ 686, readings as recorded by Ahmed

Ahmed Ahmed edition, pp.303–4

Abū-Rayyān Abū-Rayyān edition, pp.314–15

Abū-Šuwayrib Abū-Šuwayrib edition, pp.175–76

Šz Agreement of all MSS and editions of Šahrazūrī

السوء إذا رُمى بها الرجلُ الصالح لم تنجع فيه فيرجع العيبُ إلى الرامي
 (٥) وحثّ تلامذته على بذل الحكمة فقال امتثلوا السنّة التي في
 اسوس فإنّ السنّة هناك أنّ الحسان من بنات أهلها يبعثن بمهورهنّ إلى
 القباح منهنّ لينفقن بالمال كما نفقت الحسان بالجمال وأنتم معاشر
 التلامذة فقد نفقتم بالحكمة فجدودوا على الجهال ببعض حكمتكم
 لينتفعوا بذلك فيتبين فضلكم وتثمر حكمتكم عندهم

(٦) وقال اللفظة هيولى والمعنى صورة والنطق منظر والبلاغة جمال

المنظر

(٧) وقيل له أين بلغت فكرتُك فقال بلغت الدرجة التي تحيط بمبالغ
 فِكر أهل دهرى فمتى تصفّحتُ مبلغ فكرة مفكراً أحطتُ بمبلغها علماً
 ولم أقصّر عن معرفتها وعلمتُ أنّي تجاوزتها وإنّما يكون المرء عالماً
 أكثرَ علماً من غيره إذا أحاط علماً بمقدار فكرته — أعنى إلى أى مبلغ
 انتهت فكرته وما مقدار ما عرفت من المسالك وتوجّهت إليه [ف]على
 حسب الدرجة التي انتهت إليه من طريقة السلوك الصحيحة — فيروض
 فكرته كأنّ في كلّ ما تصرّفت فيه فكرته مقصراً وإذا علم المرء طريقة

(5) *Muḥtaṣar* 3

(6) *Muntaḥab* 3

(7) *Muntaḥab* 4.

(4) 2 read. Abū-Rayyān : ينجع : Z : نجع : Ahmed Abū-Šuwayrib |
 Abū-Rayyān | ويرجع : Ahmed Abū-Šuwayrib : ورجع : Z J^a فيرجع |
 Ahmed V^a الذى عابه : Abū-Šuwayrib Abū-Rayyān : Z J^aL^a الرامى
 Badawī : فكرة 2 (7) *Mḥb* والنظر : conj. Dunlop in app. (6)
 A : اسهت : Dunlop Badawī : read. Dunlop : انتهت 6 || Gutas 5 || Dunlop A : فكره
 Dunlop : فيروض | اليها : *Mḥb* instead of sic اليه | C^d انتهت :
 Dunlop Badawī : مقصراً : A : مقصراً : Gutas : مقصراً 7 || Badawī يروض

السلوك أمِن عليه الزيغ والزلل

(٨) وقال اللحن الصحيح المفصح هو المستوفى لهمة النفس وأيما صانع أظهر الصورة التي فى النفس حتّى تخرج إلى أن يقع عليها الإحساس على أقصى ما يمكن إظهارها فهو حكيم

(٩) وقال أخبث السباع امرأة الأب

(٩.١) ف قيل له أيما يسلب عن السباع فقال أنا لا أعرف من السباع

سبعاً أخبث من امرأة الأب

(١٠) وقيل له مات فلان عدوك فقال وددت أنكم قلت إنّه تزوج

(١١) ونظر الى ميت فقال هذا نذير ينادى الغافلين بلا صوتٍ ويحرك

الناظرين إليه بلا حركة وينبه الحواسّ ولا حسّ له

(١٢) وقال كما أنّ الموت ردىء لمن كانت الحياة له جيّدة كذلك

هو جيّد لمن كانت الحياة له رديئة فليس الموت رديئاً مطلقاً بل جيّد

> أيضاً لا بل ليس الموت جيّداً ولا رديئاً لكنّه < بالإضافة إلى شئ

يكون جيّداً أو رديئاً

(8) *Muntaḥab* 5 (9) *Muntaḥab* 6 (10) *Muntaḥab* 7, *Muḥtaṣar* 4

(11) *Muntaḥab* 8, *Muḥtaṣar* 5 (12) Šahrazūrī 3; cf. Tawḥīdī p. 68.

(8) A Dunlop Badawī صانع 2 || AB^dC^d وانما : D^d Dunlop Badawī وايما 1 (9) 2 A صخرج : B^d يخرج : read. Dunlop Badawī | C^d الصانع : A أنا | Badawī من : A Dunlop | عن A Dunlop : om. Badawī : om. Badawī (10) Mḥb : om. F (11) F Dunlop فقال (12) 1 كما B^d يريد : F A Dunlop Badawī نذير | A Dunlop Badawī : om. A V^a Šz eds. : om. Z J^aL^a || 2 جيّدة ... الحياة له 1-2 || Šz eds. : om. Z ان second جيد Z Ahmed Abū-Šuwayrib : Abū-Rayyān || 3 add. Gutas from Tawḥīdī | فى الاضافة : Z Ahmed بالإضافة | Abū-Rayyān Abū-Šuwayrib جيّد أو 4 || Z Ahmed : Abū-Šuwayrib جيّد أو 4 ||

(١٣) وقيل له هل يوجد في الدنيا من لا عيب فيه فقال لا لأن من لا عيب فيه لا يموت

(١٤) وسئل عن قدر انتفاع الإنسان بالحكمة فقال إن الإنسان إذا حوى الحِكم كَلَّها والتحف بها واشتمل عليها كان مثله مثل الإنسان الذي بلغ بسيره في البحر إلى مقصده في سفره فهو ينظر وراءه إلى غيره مكروباً بالأموج المُحدِّقة به والرياح المُختَرقة عليه

(١٥) وقال من حُسن جَدِّ الإنسان أن تفوته شهوئته ومن حسن جدّه أن يضطرَّ إلى خدمة الحكمة وأهلها

(١٦) وقال أيضاً اقنع بالكفاف فإن ما فوقه عاقبته وخيمةٌ والتبعة فيه عظيمةٌ

(13) *Muntaḥab* 9 (14) *Muntaḥab* 10, *Muḥtaṣar* 6, Šahrazūri 4 (15) *Muntaḥab* 11 (16) *Muntaḥab* 12 (17) *Muntaḥab* 13, *Muḥtaṣar* 7

(13) *Mḥb* Šz : الإنسان 1 first C^d Badawī له : Dunlop A فيه 1 (13) إذا حوى الإنسان : Badawī إذا حوى : Dunlop A F إن الإنسان إذا حوى | F الناس | Šz : om. *Mḥb* F والتحف بها | Šz الحكمة : *Mḥb* F الحكم كلها 2 || Šz | F بسيره 3 || Šz الواصل : *Mḥb* F الإنسان الذي بلغ بسيره 2-3 || Badawī om. مثله في | D^d om. Šz : Dunlop Badawī F البحر إلى | A سيره : Dunlop Badawī F وراءه | Z J^aL^a ينظره : *Mḥb*, Šz editions F ينظر | Šz : om. *Mḥb* F سفره Dunlop Badawī : om. A Šz || 4 به F A Dunlop J^aL^a Šz editions : om. V^a Badawī | read. Dunlop Abū-Šuwayrib Abū-Rayyān : Ahmed | المخترقة : Badawī المجترقة : C^d المخترقة : F AB^dD^d J^a Z | وهو مطمئن وادع add. عليه after Z Ahmed : add. وهو مطمئن وادع. (15) first من read. Badawī من : A | حزنه read. Badawī : يفوته : Dunlop A يفوته : sic codd. عاقبته (16) وفجرأء | *Mḥb* وياك : F اياك (17) فعاقبته instead of and editions Dunlop Badawī : المرء : A.

(١٧) وقال إِيَّاكَ وَالْمِرَاءَ فَإِنَّهُ يَرَبِّي الشَّرَّ كَمَا يَرَبِّي الْمَطْرُ الْحَبَّ
 (١٨) وقال تَكَلَّفُ مَا لَا يُطَاقُ سَفَهُ وَالسَّعْيُ فِيمَا لَا يُدْرَكُ عَنَاءٌ وَعِدَّةٌ
 مَا لَا يُنَجِّزُ فُضُوحٌ وَالْإِنْفَاقُ مِنْ غَيْرِ فَائِدَةٌ خُرْقَةٌ وَبِلُغِ الْمَنْزِلَةِ الرَّفِيعَةِ
 مِنْ غَيْرِ اسْتِحْقَاقٌ إِشْفَاءٌ عَلَى الْهَلَكَةِ

(١٩) وقال الدهر يستخدم الزمان والحدثان يستخدم أصحاب

الأكوان

(٢٠) وقال لسانٌ يُذَكِّرُ بِهِ الْمُبْدِعُ الْأَوَّلُ لَا يَنْبَغِي أَنْ يَجْرِيَ بِالرَّفْثِ

(٢١) وقال أَبْصَرَ النَّاسَ بِعَوَارِ النَّاسِ الْمُعَوَّرُ بِعَيْبِ نَفْسِهِ

(٢٢) وقال إِنَّ اللَّهَ تَعَالَى تَفَرَّدَ بِالْكَمَالِ وَلَمْ يُعْرَ أَحَدًا مِنْ خَلْقِهِ مِنْ

النقصان

(٢٣) وقال حَظُّ الْمَرْزُوقِ بِالْعَقْلِ حَظُّ رُوحَانِيٍّ وَحَظُّ الْمَرْزُوقِ بِالْجَهْلِ

قَدَرٌ جَرَى بِهِ

(٢٤) وقال الظفر بالحرص والحرص بإجالة الرأي وإجالة الرأي

بتحصين الأسرار

- (18) *Muhtaşar* 8 (19) *Muntaḥab* 14 (20) *Muntaḥab* 15, *Muhtaşar* 9
 (21) *Muntaḥab* 16, *Muhtaşar* 10 (22) *Muntaḥab* 17 (23) *Muntaḥab* 18
 (24) *Muntaḥab* 19.

(18) 2 *فضوح* read. Gutas : فصوح F | خرقه appar. corr. from خرق F
 (20) به F A Dunlop : om. Badawī (21) بعوار sic F A Dunlop : بعوار F
 with المعور : A Dunlop : المعور : Badawī : المعور read. Rosenthal : المعور
 written underneath by a second hand F | يعيب نفسه A Dunlop : يعيب
 نفسه Badawī : om. F (22) يعر A : يعر read. Dunlop : يعر read.
 Badawī.

- (٢٥) وقيل له متى تُحَمَّد الغباوةُ فقال إذا اتَّصلت بكرم قيل فمتى
تُذمُّ الفِطنة فقال إذا اقترنت بلؤم
- (٢٦) وقال لا شيء أنفس من الحياة ولا غيب أعظم من إنفادها لغير
حياةٍ أبدٍ
- (٢٧) وسئل عن المحال فقال ما لا صورة له في النفس
- (٢٨) وقال إذا قربك السلطان فكن منه على حدِّ السنان وإن استرسل
إليك فلا تأمن من انقلابه عليك وارفق به رفقك بالصبي وكلمه كما يشتهي
- (٢٩) وقال يُسلى عنك بنيك ما أسلاك عن أبيك

(25) *Muntaḥab* 20, *Muḥtaṣar* 12 (26) *Muntaḥab* 21, *Muḥtaṣar* 11 (27)
Muntaḥab 22, *Šahrazūri* 5 (28) *Muḥtaṣar* 13 (29) *Muḥtaṣar* 14.

(25) قال A Dunlop : F فقال 2 || F العبادَة : A Dunlop Badawī | الغباوة 1 (25)
Badawī | بلؤم read. Badawī Daiber : بلوم A Dunlop : originally written
and corr. to بلوم by the scribe F (26) 1 انفاذها A Dunlop :
انفاذها F Badawī Daiber || 2 حيوة F : حيوة read. Dunlop : without vowel
A Badawī (27) وسئل عن *Mḥb* : وقيل له ما : *Šz editions*, first version in Z
قال : *Mḥb* Z Ahmed : فقال | second version in Z وقيل له بـ :
Abū-Šuwayrib : من : *Mḥb* Z Ahmed Abū-Šuwayrib | Abū-Rayyān
Abū-Rayyān : من : *Mḥb* Z Ahmed : من : *Mḥb* Z Ahmed : من :
F. Gutas : بعد : (29) corr. عن



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

2

Eudemus and the Peripatos

Hans B. Gottschalk

Aristotle the philosopher, being sixty-two years of age, became sick and weak in body, and there remained little hope of his life. The whole band of his followers then waited upon him, requesting and entreating that he would himself appoint a successor to his office and school to whom, after his decease, they might apply themselves as to himself, in perfecting those studies in which they had hitherto been instructed by him. There were at that time many in his school who were very accomplished, but two of particular merit, Theophrastus and Eudemus. In talents and learning these exceeded the rest. Theophrastus was from the island of Lesbos, Eudemus from Rhodes. Aristotle replied that he would comply with their request, as soon as an opportunity presented itself. A short time after, when all those were present who had consulted him about their future master, he said that the wine he was drinking did not suit his health; it was disagreeable and harsh; he must therefore look out for some foreign wine, from Rhodes or from Lesbos. He begged they would provide him with some of each sort and said that he would use that which agreed with him best. They hasten to find, procure and bring him these wines. When Aristotle, calling for the Rhodian, tastes it, "This," says he, "is a strong wine, and palatable." He next asks for some Lesbian and tasting that too, "Each," says he, "is certainly a good wine, but the Lesbian has the sweeter flavour." When he said this, it was evident to all that, with ingenuity and modesty, he had fixed not upon his wine, but his successor; namely, Theophrastus the Lesbian, a man equally remarkable for the charms of his eloquence and his good conduct. Not long after, Aristotle dying, they all became the followers of Theophrastus.¹

¹ Aulus Gellius 13.5 = Eud. fr. 5W = Theophr. 8 FHS&G; tr. W. Beloe (1795) slightly

This pleasant tale was told by Aulus Gellius, writing about the middle of the second century AD, and is quite unhistorical: Aristotle died in Chalcis, where he had fled to escape from the political upheavals in Athens following the death of Alexander the Great; his school was in abeyance and his will contains no hint that he expected it to revive.² But it seems to have exercised considerable influence on the nineteenth-century view of Eudemus which is basically the one still current: Eudemus as the faithful follower of Aristotle who loyally performed the tasks assigned to him during his master's lifetime and continued his teaching after his death. There is a good deal of truth in this, but in many ways Eudemus' work and career were different from those of most members of the school. He may have been a German professor's ideal of a Peripatetic, but he was not a typical one. In what follows I shall first discuss our knowledge, or perhaps I should say, our ignorance of his career, then his writings, and lastly I shall try to determine what we can say about the character of his work and his contribution to the school.

I

Very little is known about Eudemus' life. We are not told that he belonged to Plato's Academy, but he must have been a member of Aristotle's school for quite a long time; if he joined it soon after Aristotle's return to Athens in 336 BC, he must have been born some years before 350. Presumably he stayed until Aristotle left Athens in 323 and then returned to Rhodes, where he would have enjoyed the security of a citizen and presumably had some property. There he seems to have founded a school, if that is not too grand a title for what must have been virtually a one-man band. We hear that a nephew, Pasikles, may have compiled the essay which later became the second book (*Alpha Elatton*) of Aristotle's *Metaphysics*, but even this is not certain and none of Eudemus' pupils seem to have attained much distinction. Two Rhodian Peripatetics are known in the third century, Praxiphanes and Hieronymus, but there is no positive evidence that either attended his school; both had different interests from his and Hieronymus lived considerably later. Probably Eudemus' school did not survive him. The only relevant piece of evidence we possess, a report in Athenaeus that

altered. The story is repeated by Walter Burleigh, *Vita Arist.* p. 246 Knust.

²D.L. 5.11–16; cf. Gottschalk (1972) 314–42, esp. 317.

the kings of Egypt acquired valuable Aristotelian manuscripts for their library from Rhodes as well as Athens, suggests that Eudemus' collection became available during the second or third decade of the third century, just when one would expect him to have died (we have no direct information about the date of his death.³ But Athenaeus is not a reliable witness; the most we can say is that his assertion shows what he, and presumably his readers, were prepared to believe.

Our ignorance about the circumstances of Eudemus' life is connected with one of the few facts about him which can be firmly established: he seems to have been virtually unknown in the Hellenistic era. Neither Cicero nor Sextus Empiricus, who relied on Hellenistic sources for his knowledge of the Peripatetics, mention his name. The doxographers, including Arius Didymus, say nothing about his teaching.⁴ Diogenes Laertius (1.9, 1.22 = Eud. fr. 89, 144W) cites him twice as an authority for the doctrines of earlier thinkers, but has no biography of him and does not refer to him in the *Life of Aristotle* (his name is included in the list of Aristotle's pupils in the *Vita Latina* and conjecturally in the *Vita Marciana*,⁴ as well as the Arabic tradition). Clement of Alexandria cites his *Astrologikai Historiai* once (fr. 143W), but has nothing to say about his doctrines. It was only after the revival of Aristotelian studies initiated by Andronicus that the "Peripatetic scholastics" rediscovered Eudemus' systematic works and came to appreciate their usefulness for understanding Aristotle. It could have been Andronicus himself who found copies in some neglected corner of his home town, perhaps in the possession of Eudemus' descendants, but again we are not told that he edited them.

However it came about, three systematic works by him, the *Analytika*, *Peri Lexeos* and *Physika*, circulated in the first two centuries AD. Alexander quoted them freely and Galen wrote a commentary on the *Peri Lexeos*.⁶ Of the later commentators, who are our primary

³ Cf. Gottschalk (1972) 339f.

⁴ Eudemus' name only occurs once in Diels' *Doxographi Graeci* (p. 492.3 = Simpl. *In Phys.* 700.16 = Theophr. *Phys. Op.* fr. 15 [150 FHS&S] = Eudemus fr. 82aW). This fragment, dealing with Plato's explanation of time, came to Simplicius from Alexander, who will have taken it from Eudemus' *Physika*.

⁵ See Düring (1957) 157 and 106. The *Vita Marciana* is corrupt at this point and has been restored from the *V.Lat.* For the Arabic tradition see Düring (1957) 188, 200, 218.

⁶ Galen, *Libr. Prop.* p. 118 M; the text is corrupt and has been restored by Müller

sources of the *Analytika* and *Physika*, Simplicius appears to have read the *Physika* for himself (see fr. 43–4W), but the rest probably derived their quotations from Alexander, directly or through intermediaries. Simplicius regularly refers to Eudemus by name, while Themistius and Philoponus frequently quote him without naming him, and occasionally include some detail omitted by Simplicius. In the same period the *Eudemian Ethics*, now generally accepted as a genuine work of Aristotle, was often attributed to Eudemus, e.g., by Aspasius,⁷ and this may be the reason why we have no ethical fragments under his name. Aelian and Apuleius refer to animal stories supposedly written by him; some modern scholars have regarded them as spurious, but there is no real evidence as to this (I shall come back to this). The only works of Eudemus occasionally quoted by writers dependent on the Hellenistic tradition are his *Histories of Arithmetic*, *Geometry* and *Astronomy*, but most of the longer fragments even of these have come to us from the Neoplatonist commentators on Aristotle or on mathematical writers.

Looking at the list of Eudemus' works, one thing strikes us immediately: the absence of the popular, "exoteric" writings on ethics and literary history which bulked large in the output of most Peripatetics and became the hallmark of the school in the Hellenistic period. Eudemus concentrated on the hard core of Aristotle's philosophy, and most of his writings, like the *pragmateiai* of Aristotle and Theophrastus, were closely connected with his teaching. This may account for his failure to make any impact on a wider public; on the other hand, he was the only pupil of Aristotle, other than Theophrastus, known to have taken an active part in the propagation and development of the doctrines found in Aristotle's school treatises.

II

Those works of Eudemus of which we have any real knowledge fall into two groups: systematic and historical. The second group, containing the histories of arithmetic, geometry, astronomy and perhaps the-

(1891) I.LXXXV. Wehrli did not include this testimonium among Eudemus' "fragments," but cites it (p. 89) in his commentary on fr. 25–9. We also have an isolated fragment of a work Περὶ γωνίας, transmitted by Proclus (= fr. 30W). The attribution of a *Catagories* to Eudemus by some late authors is baseless; see Gottschalk (1987) 245ff.

⁷ Aspasius *In Eth. Nic.* 151.24 et passim (see the index in Heylbut's edition); cf. Gottschalk (1987b) 1101, 1157f., with references.

ology, is generally assumed to have been conceived as part of a greater project, initiated by Aristotle himself: a series of surveys covering all the philosophically interesting fields of knowledge, which included Theophrastus' *Physikai Doxai* and Menon's *Iatrika*, as well as those of Eudemus. They will have been compiled during Aristotle's lifetime at Athens, the only place where Eudemus could easily have got hold of the necessary research materials.

This raises the question whether, or to what extent, his reading of his sources was affected by Aristotelian preconceptions, a question which has long bedevilled our understanding of Theophrastus' historical works. But it looms less large in connection with the history of mathematics, since in most respects Aristotle's teaching was in accord with the assumptions of mainstream mathematicians, e.g., in accepting the "Euclidean" notion of space, if you will allow the anachronism. The only point on which there was a fundamental disagreement between him and any major group of mathematicians was the existence of indivisible lines, and here Eudemus adopted the Peripatetic position. Thus he agreed with Aristotle in rejecting Antiphon's attempt to square the circle as contravening a basic principle of geometry, the infinite divisibility of magnitudes.⁸ In general, however, these works seem to have contained more straight reporting, and less criticism, than the *Physikai Doxai*. In particular, many of the extant fragments make a point of determining who first discovered a phenomenon or theorem, but then such observations are easier to make and more illuminating in connection with the special sciences than the history of philosophy.

When we turn to Eudemus' systematic writings, the situation is more complicated. We have fairly extensive fragments of three: the *Analytika* (fr. 9–24W), the *Peri lexeos* (fr. 25–9) and the *Physika* (fr. 31–123). Like the corresponding works of Aristotle and Theophrastus, they reflect Eudemus' lectures closely (see in particular fr. 88), even if they were more than lecture notes in the ordinary sense. Yet there are differences between them which are not only due to the differences of their subject-matter. The *Physika*, of which we have by far the fullest reports, was based on a course of lectures covering the same subjects as Aristotle's *Physics* in the same order (see especially fr. 98), except that it contained nothing corresponding to Book 7 of our version. The ex-

⁸ Fr. 140W. But the sentence near the beginning of the extract printed by Wehrli (1969, 57.27f.) which contains a verbal echo of Aristotle (*Phys.* 185a18), is the work of Simplicius; he only refers to Eudemus later, at 59.11.