



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

## Edinburgh Research Explorer

**Aristotelian texts (M.) Rashed L'Heritage aristotelicien. Textes inedites de l'Antiquite. Pp. xiv+ 601, ill. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2007. Paper,} 60. ISBN: 978-2-251-18105-9**

**Citation for published version:**

Kupreeva, I 2008, 'Aristotelian texts (M.) Rashed L'Heritage aristotelicien. Textes inedites de l'Antiquite. Pp. xiv+ 601, ill. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2007. Paper,} 60. ISBN: 978-2-251-18105-9', *The Classical Review*, vol. 58, no. 2, pp. 428-431. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009840X08000504>

**Digital Object Identifier (DOI):**

[10.1017/S0009840X08000504](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009840X08000504)

**Link:**

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

**Document Version:**

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

**Published In:**

The Classical Review

**Publisher Rights Statement:**

© The Classical Association, 2008. Kupreeva, I. (2008). Aristotelian texts (M.) Rashed L'Heritage aristotelicien. Textes inedites de l'Antiquite. Pp. xiv+ 601, ill. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2007. Paper,} 60. ISBN: 978-2-251-18105-9. The Classical Review, 58(2), 428-431doi: 10.1017/S0009840X08000504

**General rights**

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

**Take down policy**

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact [openaccess@ed.ac.uk](mailto:openaccess@ed.ac.uk) providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



## The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)



---

**Aristotelian texts (M.) Rashed *L'Héritage aristotélicien. Textes inédits de l'Antiquité*. Pp. xiv + 601, ill. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2007. Paper, €60. ISBN: 978-2-251-18105-9.**

Inna Kupreeva

The Classical Review / Volume 58 / Issue 02 / October 2008, pp 428 - 431  
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X08000504, Published online: 02 December 2008

**Link to this article:** [http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract\\_S0009840X08000504](http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X08000504)

**How to cite this article:**

Inna Kupreeva (2008). Review of (M.) Rashed 'L'Héritage aristotélicien. Textes inédits de l'Antiquité' The Classical Review, 58, pp 428-431 doi:10.1017/S0009840X08000504

**Request Permissions :** [Click here](#)

collecting, if only to give neophytes a sense of the texture of scholiastic Greek. But perhaps not yet: D. reasonably omits them on account of the inadequate state of scholarship on grammatical terminology (p. 219).

Wayne State University

KATHLEEN MCNAMEE  
aa2046@wayne.edu

## ARISTOTELIAN TEXTS

RASHED (M.) *L'Héritage aristotélicien. Textes inédits de l'Antiquité*. Pp. xiv + 601, ills. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2007. Paper, €60. ISBN: 978-2-251-18105-9.

doi:10.1017/S0009840X08000504

All but one of the nineteen papers in this impressive volume have been published in different journals and article collections during the past decade. None the less, the publication is warranted because practically every article contains new material – textual, interpretative, analytical – which many students of Aristotle will like to have collected in one place. The volume opens with a programmatic introduction. R. rightly emphasises the mutual importance of textual and doctrinal analysis in Aristotelian studies, drawing attention to the relevance of the socio-cultural context of transmission in the history of ideas. The collection has three large sections: ‘New Texts by Alexander of Aphrodisias’, ‘Alexandrian Neoplatonism’ and ‘Philosophical Texts between Byzantium and Southern Italy’.

‘Aggregate or *vinculum substantiale*?’ (outside the division) suggests a reconstruction of the order of composition of the biological part of the Aristotelian corpus on the basis of a thorough study of prooemia and manuscript evidence. R. argues that the last redaction of the corpus, with the inclusion of *MA*, might reflect a tension between hylomorphism and a ‘moriological’ approach in Aristotle’s biology, along the lines suggested by Nuyens. Nuyens’s thesis was rather stronger (with hylomorphism chronologically superseding the ‘organic’ approach), but R. is right not to draw strong developmentalist conclusions from this observation.

In ‘Priority of EIDOS vs GENUS vs Andronicus and Alexander’ (*ASP* 2004), R. discusses the problem on the basis of new or rare textual evidence: the second of five short treatises by ‘Abd al-Laṭīf al-Baghdādī (MS Bursa, Hüseyin Çelebi 823), which, he argues, is a paraphrase of a lost treatise by Alexander (the edition of all five is appended); parallels in Boethius’ *De diuisione* and citation in the Par. sup. gr. 643 scholion to *Phys.* 4.3. R. suggest that Andronicus is Alexander’s source for treating genus as in a way a part of species (but not vice versa), while the immediate basis of Alexander’s position is his own view on species and form. R.’s view (based on the *Phys.* scholion) that Alexander thought that theory of form-substance must involve a revision of the *Categories*’ definition of substance, would need to deal more closely with the argument in *mant.* 5 designed to show that there is no contradiction between the two. In T1 (73, l. 19), *al-ladhī yakūnu al-dahra*, translated by R. as ‘la chose qui est sempiternellement’, probably should be ‘that which is permanently *coming to be*’ (possibly *yukawwanu*, cf. 73.18, 81.2). Boethius is cited from Migne’s *PL* instead of Magee’s new critical edition, which is useful also for discussion of Andronican traces. ‘Alexander of Aphrodisias and the *magna quaestio*’ (*LEC* 1995) signals the scholia to Aristotle’s *Physics* 4–8 in MS Par. sup. gr. 643 as derived from a lost commentary by Alexander (scholia to *Phys.* 4.5 published

with a study of sources; full edition forthcoming). R. discusses the scholion to 212b1 ('rotating sphere does not change place as a whole, but with respect to parts'). Alexander treats 'parts' as planetary and sublunary spheres against the theory of 'some' (earlier Peripatetics according to R.) that continuous parts of the outermost sphere move with respect to the sphere of Saturn. R. argues that Alexander's position was formulated in polemic with Galen's criticisms of Aristotle's theory of place and time (in the lost 'On demonstration') which occupied Alexander's lost treatise 'Against Galen on time and place' (title in *Fihrist*). 'A "New" Text of Alexander on the Soul's Motion' (*BICS* Suppl. 1997) discusses a Par. gr. 643 scholion on *Phys.* 6.4 (argument that a thing which moves is divisible), which contains a refutation of the position R. identifies as Atticus' (otherwise unknown) doctrine of soul-vehicles. Comparing replies to Atticus-style argument with the theory of agent intellect in *mant.* 2, R. concludes that the author of these replies is not the author of the *Physics* commentary. While this conclusion is not implausible in itself, it has to be noted that in Alexander's *De anima* the question of soul's movement is treated separately from that of the operation of the intellect: argument *ex silentio* should be pursued with caution. 'Textes inédits transmis par l'Ambr. Q 74 Sup.\*: Alexandre d'Aphrodise et Olympiodore d'Alexandrie' draws attention to the two short texts with title references to Alexander, *On ideas* containing a short argument against the Forms of eternal things (which construes well with the reported fragments of *Peri ideôn* in Alexander's *Metaphysics* commentary) and a difficult passage which, as R. plausibly suggests, may be a part of a cento of some sort (cf. Bruns's *epidromai*); and *On universals* which, R. hypothesises, could be a part of a lost *De anima* commentary by Olympiodorus, a hypothesis worth exploring. 'Alexander d'Aphrodise lecteur du Protréptique' analyses parallels between the fragments of the *Protrepticus* and the proem of Alexander *In An. Pr.* and gives an insightful discussion of the role of the lost work in the structure of Alexander's exegesis of Aristotle.

Part 2 opens with 'Vestiges d'un commentaire alexandrin au *De caelo* d'Aristote', where R. argues convincingly that the scholia to the *Cael.* in Laur. 87.20 come from a lost commentary composed in the school of Alexandria. R. points out that the lost commentary cites Alexander and was possibly known to Simplicius, interprets the Chaldaic Oracle similarly to Olympiodorus in *In Alc.*, and gives an original interpretation of Aristotle's criticism of Pythagoreans; the author's interest in exact sciences is most germane to that cultivated in Ammonius' circle. R.'s remark that the 'Babylonian' order of planets could be characteristic of Alexandrians is correct (cf. Philoponus in *meteor.* 30, 12–13). In 'The Problem of the Composition of the Heavens (529–1610): a new Fragment of Philoponus and its Readers' (*BICS* Suppl. 2004), R. reconstructs Philoponus' argument from *Contra Aristotelem* (fr. 59 Wildberg) according to which everything visible is tangible, with the help of new texts (appended), al-Antâkî *K. al-Minfâ'a* (Univ. St. Joseph, Beirut, MS Ar. 342) and Psellus' *Syllogisms on the Soul* (Par. gr. 1854), neither of which directly mentions Philoponus. He adduces a response to a similar argument from Avicenna's *Shifâ'*, and discusses the Arabic tradition concerning the sunspots in connection with Galileo. It might be worth pointing out that the starting point of the discussion is *Tim.* 31b4 (cf. Proclus ad loc.); Philoponus' contribution seems to depend on his use of the Aristotelian rather than the Platonic theory of elements. In 'Menas, préfet du prétoire (528/9) et philosophe: une épigramme inconnue' (*Elenchos* 21 [2000]), R. edits and discusses an epigram from Paris. Gr. 1116 which refers to Menas, a philosophically minded politician. R. argues that this could be the prefect of 528/9 who took an active

part in the edition of the Justinian code, and makes a number of suggestions about the role of the Platonic legacy in early Byzantine political ideology. ‘La Classification des lignes simples selon Proclus et sa transmission au monde islamique’ discusses the classification of three types of line (straight, circular and helicoidal) by Proclus (who treats the third type as ‘mixed’) and their use by Christian Platonists (from the Areopagitics on) to describe divine motion. R. finds this use in the little known treatise by al-Anṭākī (an eleventh-century Melkite theologian) and identifies its Greek source in the unedited commentary by Basil (the Minor), Bishop of Caesarea. ‘Les Marginalia d’Arethas, Ibn al-Ṭayyib et les dernières gloses alexandrines à l’*Organon*’ gives a reconstruction of a common source of Arethas’ and Ibn al-Ṭayyib’s glosses to the *Categories* based on a comparison between the two texts; R. argues the common source to be a late Alexandrian philosopher. ‘Un texte proto-byzantin sur les universaux et la Trinité’, a previously unpublished piece, contains the *editio princeps* of the anonymous treatise on the universals and the Trinity (from MS Coisl. 387) and a discussion of the incarnation of Christ and the divinity of the three persons of the Trinity in terms of the ‘essentialist’ approach developed in the Aristotelian commentaries of late antiquity (Alexander and John Philoponus).

In ‘Traces d’un commentaire de Simplicius sur la *Métaphysique* à Byzance?’ R. argues that the thirteenth-century scholia in E (Par. gr. 1853) showing some Neoplatonic influences (signalled by I. Hadot) cannot be evidence for Simplicius’ *Metaphysics* commentary. The issue has some importance in the discussion of the authorship of the *De anima* commentary attributed to Simplicius (which R. is inclined to ascribe to Priscian). ‘Burgundio de Pise et ses manuscrits grecs d’Aristote: Laur. 87.7 et Laur. 81.18’ (*RTPM*), a paper written in collaboration with G. Vuillemin-Diem, offers a meticulous, richly documented philological and palaeographical study of the Greek ‘Vorlagen’ of the *translationes ueterae* of *GC* and *EN* and concludes that Burgundio is the author of both (in the latter case, of Gauthier’s ‘*Ethica Vetus*’ and ‘*Ethica Noua*’), and that much of the annotation in both MSS in the title is made by his hand. The paper explores the possible relation between Burgundio and the Aristotelian edition of Ioannikios. In ‘De Cordoue à Byzance: sur une “prothéorie” inédite de la Physique d’Aristote’, R. studies two *προθεωρίαι* preceding the texts of *Physics* and *GC* in Paris. suppl. gr. 643 which treat of the division of parts of philosophy and parts of the Aristotelian corpus and a brief intervening text of medical problems. R. suggests, on the basis of doctrinal and linguistic study, that they might be translations from the Latin (which itself reflects an Arabic source) made in southern Italy or Sicily in the second half of the thirteenth century. ‘Sur deux témoins des œuvres profanes de Théodore II Lascaris et leur commanditaire (Par. suppl. gr. 472; Par. suppl. gr. 460)’ argues that both collections (containing respectively the secular speeches of the emperor and a copy of *Phusikê koinônia*) could have been commissioned by the circle of the emperor himself. ‘Nicholas d’Otrante, Guillaume de Moerbeke et la “Collection philosophique”’ discusses the provenance of Marc. Gr. 226 used by William Moerbeke, and shows (on the basis of the palaeographical study of an appended biography of Aristotle) that it was in the possession of Nicholas of Otranto, who possibly acquired it during his stay in Constantinople in 1205. On the basis of codicological analysis, R. hypothesises that the whole collection was commissioned by Bardas, and that its textual basis might have links with the Alexandrian school through the activity of Stephanus of Alexandria, who moved to Constantinople in the seventh century. ‘La Chronographie du système d’Empédocle: documents byzantins inédits’ suggests a new reconstruction of the Empedoclean cycle on the basis of the twelfth-century scholia to *Phys.* 8.1 and

GC 1.1 in MS Laur. 87.7. 'L'Averroïsme de Lauro Quirini' shows the use made of Averroist metaphysics in the fifteenth-century debate about nobility of virtue vs nobility by birth.

It is impossible to take up each discussion in a brief review, but the scope and depth of R.'s research project should now be clear. The volume makes demanding reading: its author is a skilled editor and textual critic, excellent linguist, rigorous thinker and erudite scholar; the reader will be rewarded with a fresh and subtle picture of the tradition, and numerous insights for new research. The volume has no bibliography, but the four indexes (ancient and modern authors, geographical and of manuscripts) do the job. Unfortunately, all the old typographical errors are preserved in the reprint (some could have been corrected in the index: Eusebius is rather startlingly called 'Eudemus', pp. 152, 155), including a number of misprints in the Greek and old pagination removed but preserved in cross-references.

*University of Edinburgh*

INNA KUPREEVA  
ikupreev@staffmail.ed.ac.uk

## LIBANIUS

CRIBIORE (R.) *The School of Libanius in Late Antique Antioch*. Pp. xiv + 360, map. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2007. Cased, £29.95, US\$45. ISBN: 978-0-691-12824-5.

doi:10.1017/S0009840X08000516

Recent decades have witnessed the heyday of Late Antiquity studies. Leaving aside polemics concerning how this period should be interpreted (decadence, acculturation, transformation?), the paulatine process of laicization and the loosening of the paganism vs Christianity polarity can be regarded as two major improvements in the development of these studies. The present book is a clear example of this trend as it confirms that the current view of Libanius of Antioch (314–393 A.D.) has finally overcome the religious and stylistic prejudices that traditional historiography inherited from Christian authors from the fourth century A.D. onwards. As C. states, 'The negative aspects of Libanius have attracted much attention, largely because of the nature of his writings' (p. 22).

In this context, C.'s book helps to deconstruct these aprioristic assumptions by adopting an aseptic view of Libanius' works. Their rhetorical nature plays a relevant role as a hermeneutic tool, and his supposed religious involvement (the core of most of the bibliographical items on Libanius) only matters in terms of cataloguing his students as Christian, pagan or Jewish. Although there have been other scholars, notably Malosse, Norman and Festugière, working on the relationship of Libanius and his students, C. resurrects the work of Paul Petit (especially *Les Étudiants de Libanius* [Paris, 1956]) and argues against two fundamental issues: the rigid pattern of schooling proposed by Petit, and his tendency to treat Libanius' letters as objective documents.

C. rarely deals with the corpus of Libanius in terms of literary criticism, but uses it instead as a vast database for her prosopographical study. In fact, delving into Libanius' historical background constitutes the methodology of this book, as its framework is formed by the personal and professional relations the pagan sophist established with his colleagues and students. By adopting a narrative form, C. goes