Eos CV 2018
ISSN 0012-7825

**Andrea Falcon (ed.), *Brill's Companion to the Reception of Aristotle in Antiquity*,** Leiden–Boston: Brill, 2016 (Brill's Companions to Classical Reception 7), 512 pp., ISBN 978-90-04-26647-6, €182.00.

Comprising twenty three essays on Aristotle's ancient *Nachleben* arranged in a largely chronological sequence, the massive volume edited by Andrea Falcon constitutes an exhaustive guidebook to the survival of Aristotelian philosophy (not to mention Aristotle the philosopher) from the Hellenistic era to the late Neoplatonist period. To achieve its purpose, it necessarily combines the study of interactions between Peripatos and other philosophical schools with enquiries into the individual reworkings of the Aristotelian legacy. This in turn means that while the exposition is governed by a simple unifying principle, the volume is also possessed of certain variety. Thus, the chapters vary in character: one finds systematic enquiries into the largely fragmentary legacy of Stoic and Epicurean thinkers, forays into biographic and doxographic traditions, considerations of the more extensive testimonies of Cicero and Galen, or, for that matter, brief overviews of the prolific output of the Neoplatonists Philoponus and Simplicius. Taken together, the essays reflect the multifaceted nature of individual authors' engagement with Aristotelian thought, portraying diverse and sometimes contrasting attempts to organise the known *corpus* (Andronicus, Iamblichus), to counter the individual arguments of the philosopher (Plotinus), or, to reconcile the thought of the *palaioi* (Porphyry, Simplicius). They also reflect the importance and the fertility of the Aristotelian legacy, which – as abundantly illustrated in the volume – came to exercise an impressive sway even over philosophers openly adverse to the philosopher's ontological or cosmological concepts.

After the brief introduction focused on problems of periodisation and, hence, on the internal organisation of the work, the collection opens with a section on the Hellenistic posteriority of the Stagirite (pp. 11–75). Beginning with D. Lefebvre's outline of the fortunes of Aristotle's own school ("Aristotle and the Hellenistic Peripatos", pp. 13–34), the section discusses the Epicurean and Stoic engagement with Aristotelian thought (F. Verde, "Aristotle and the Garden", pp. 35–55; Th. Bénatouïl, "Aristotle and the Stoa", pp. 56–75). Lefebvre seeks to revise the traditional view of the Lyceum's philosophical and institutional decline by providing a much more nuanced image of the immediate successors of the great Stagirite. In his account, their focus on history, politics, and psychology is reflective of more general, continuous striving to continue and develop the master's immense legacy. Meanwhile, Verde and Bénatouïl aim to reconstruct the nature of largely lost philosophical debates of the Hellenistic era: starting from the accounts of Cicero (in the *De natura deorum*, *De officiis*, and *De finibus*) they attempt to reconstruct the interaction between Aristotelianism and the two Hellenistic schools as manifest in the respective fields of physics, logic, and ethics. The resulting image of Hellenistic reception is striking due to the relative lack of interest in logic and 'hard' ontology, i.e. subjects at the heart of many later enquiries, and for the focal importance of Aristotle's lost works.

As for the next section, no less than twelve chapters focus on what is quite rightly defined as the post-Hellenistic rather than the imperial reception of Aristotle: these are divided into studies of the straightforward Aristotelian tradition (from Andronicus to Alexander), of Aristotle's reception beyond the latter (from Antiochus to Plotinus) and are supplemented with two chapters outlining the Stagirite's presence in doxographic and biographical literature. Made for the sake of clarity, the Peripatetic/non-Peripatetic division works beautifully, allowing the reader to appreciate both the continuity and the vagaries of reception in different philosophical contexts.

As for the Peripatos, the overview begins with M. Hatzimikali's review of the importance of Andronicus ("Andronicus of Rhodes and the Construction of Aristotelian corpus", pp. 81–100) and continues with two studies on first-century Aristotelian thought (A. Falcon, "Aristotelianism in the First Century BC", pp. 101–119, and G. Tsouni, "Peripatetic Ethics in the First Century

BC: The Summary of Arius Didymus", pp. 120–137). The first reflects on the actual nature of Andronicus' contribution to Aristotelian reception (the traditional tale of the rediscovery of long-lost and hitherto unknown manuscripts of the esoteric writings being nowadays generally rejected), recognising the importance of the Rhodian's organisational principle (logical writings at the very beginning of the corpus). The chapter's importance lies largely in the revision of many persistent myths concerning Aristotle's presence at the turn of the eras and in its attempt to locate the actual novelty and merit of Andronicus' work. By contrast, the respective chapters by Falcon and Tsouni centre on the actual presence of Aristotelian thought as well as on its interactions with other late philosophical currents of the first century AD, thus contributing to the overall vision of the cultural and intellectual climate of the era. While Falcon devotes more or less equal space to all three divisions of philosophy, Tsouni's focus (as duly indicated in the title), rests firmly on a very specific case of reception, namely Arius' ethical doxography. The work in question is of particular interest due to its heavy contamination by Stoic influences: manifesting themselves in both the language and the conceptual framework, these influences reveal the mechanisms of assimilation and appropriation as well as points of dissent and controversy.

Finally, the last chapter of the subsection focuses on possibly the best known Aristotelian of the imperial era, and the iconic exegete of corpus, namely Alexander of Aphrodisias (C. Cerami, pp. 160–179). In emphasising his contributions to metaphysics and logic, Cerami makes a convincing case for a re-evaluation of Alexander's standing within the history of philosophy. Highlighting the originality of the essentialist interpretation and the importance of the *nous thyrathen* theory, the scholar stresses the revolutionary nature of Alexander's contribution while hinting at the sway it exercised over the next centuries of Aristotelian interpretations. In her opinion, Alexander's philosophical innovations put him on a par with those of the Neoplatonist Plotinus, the view which reinforces the Aphrodisian's importance within the history of philosophy: not only the greatest Aristotelian of the imperial era, he also stands out as an innovator and reformer of theories of substance, soul, and mind.

Starting with the Academic Antiochus of Ascalon and, the overview of Aristotle's reception beyond his faithful successors, the other subsection concludes (chronologically speaking) with the pivotal figure of Plotinus. As for Antiochus, John Dillon provides a short, but highly illustrative outline of problems related to the issue of Aristotelian presence in the thought of the Ascalonian as it is attested in Cicero ("The Reception of Aristotle in Antiochus and Cicero", pp. 184–201). Drawing on the earlier work by Barnes[1], Dillon highlights the gap between the Aristotle known to the Arpinate and the Aristotle known today – he also emphasises the need for extreme caution in approaching the subject of Antiochus' acquaintance with the great philosopher of Stageira. Next comes A. Ulacco's account of the Pseudo-Pythagoreans and their attitude toward the Aristotelian tradition ("The Appropriation of Aristotle in Ps.-Pythagorean Treatises", pp. 202–217): in contrast with the former essay, it is physics that comes to the fore in her study. It is within this particular context that issues such as the creation/eternity of the world, the structuring of the cosmos, the number of elements, and the nature of movement are of paramount importance (which in turn emphasises the sway of the *Physics*, *On Generation and Corruption*, *On the Heavens*, and *Metaphysics* Lambda). In turn, A. Michalewski ("The Reception of Aristotle in Middle Platonism: From Eudorus of Alexandria to Ammonius Saccas", pp. 218–237) outlines some important features of Middle Platonist reception: the ontological interpretation of the *Categories* proposed by Eudorus, the impact of the hylomorphism on Plutarch's physical theories in the *De generatione animae* or *Quaestiones Platonicae* 8, debates on the sense of *genetos*, or Alcinous' noetics in the *Didascalicus*. Regardless of the necessary conciseness, her contribution provides not only an

[1] J. Barnes, *Roman Aristotle*, in: J. Barnes, M. Griffin (eds.), *Philosophia Togata II: Plato and Aristotle at Rome*, Oxford 1997, pp. 1–69.

excellent starting point for any further exploration of Aristotelian presences, but also a brief insight into the very nature of Middle Platonism as such.

Given the sheer size (not to mention the focus) of his literary output, it seems logical that a separate chapter is devoted to the study of Galen. A brief sketch of Aristotle's presence in this particular author is provided by R.J. Hankinson ("Galen's Reception of Aristotle", pp. 238–257). The very importance of soul–body relations for many medical theories, such as the theory of temperaments, results in the strong interest the Pergamene had in hylomorphic theory; yet, his attitude toward Aristotle (and Aristotelian thought in general) is complicated by his strong rejection of any claim to the hegemonic position of the heart, an assumption central to Aristotle's concept of human life.

Plotinus' complex relationship with the Aristotelian legacy (while accepting many fundamentally Aristotelian terms, he disagreed with the great Stagirite on a number of important metaphysical issues such as the theory of substance, the theory of the cosmos, etc.) is briefly outlined by S. Magrin ("Plotinus' Reception of Aristotle", pp. 258–276). Developed against the background of the Strange–Chiaradonna[2] debate, her argument demonstrates the need for a nuanced and careful approach to the text of the *Enneads*, insisting that a correct assessment of Plotinus' reception of Aristotelian thought needs to account for the entirety of Plotinus' legacy instead of focusing on its ontological aspect. Thus, while Chiaradonna's work remains the most detailed exploration of *Enneads* VI 1–3, Magrin's essay not only provides the basic outline of the issue and existing interpretations, but also points toward the possible weaknesses of existing studies.

The subsection closes with two chapters devoted to the reception beyond the straightforward philosophical tradition, namely Aristotle's biographical tradition (T. Dorandi, "The Ancient Biographical Tradition on Aristotle", pp. 277–298) and the philosopher's presence in doxographic sources related to the Aetian *Placita* (J. Mansfeld, "Aristotle in the Aetian *Placita*", pp. 299–318). Relying on the recently concluded study of the Aetian collection[3], Mansfeld's study reflects the thoroughness of the respective investigation, providing a glimpse of Aristotelian thought as present in a wider cultural context – given the didactic character of the doxography, it is only natural to assume that for some less assiduous members of the public Aristotle would be known primarily through *Placita*-like sources. As for the biographic tradition, Dorandi does an admirable job of not only numbering the existing sources, but also accounting for their complex character. Limited by historical truth, but subject to multiple pressures stemming from rhetorical as well as philosophical demands, and riddled with questions of authenticity, the biographical genre remains particularly challenging study matter – and in the case of Aristotle, the situation is compounded by the scarcity of actual historical data.

Focused on late antiquity, the third and final section of the volume (pp. 319–479) comprises eight essays and provides the reader with a competent overview of Aristotle's reception in Neoplatonic thought from Porphyry to Simplicius, as well as an introduction to the problems related to the primarily didactically oriented philosophical output of Themistius. At the very close of the collection, two chapters dealing respectively with the Latin reception and the presence of Aristotle in Early Christianity provide an insight into the foundations of Aristotle's afterlife in the Latin Middle Ages.

While R. Chiaradonna ("Porphyry and the Aristotelian Tradition", pp. 321–340) highlights Porphyry's somewhat cunning elimination of the major obstacle on the way to the full union of Plato and Aristotle, Jan Opsomer stresses the importance of Pythagoreanism (or 'Pythagoreanism') in the parallel efforts of Iamblichus. In his study ("An Intellective Perspective on Aristotle: Iamblichus

---

[2] R. Chiaradonna, *Sostanza movimento analogia. Plotino critico di Aristotele*, Napoli 2002 (Elenchos Suppl. 37); S.K. Strange, *Plotinus, Porphyry and the Neoplatonist Interpretation of the Categories*, *ANRW* II 36, 2 (1987), pp. 955–974.

[3] Up to now, the project, coordinated by J. Mansfeld and D.T. Runia has produced the four volumes of *Aetiana. The Method and Intellectual Context of a Doxographer* (Leiden 1996–2018).

the Divine", pp. 341–357), he emphasises the importance of Iamblichus' decision to attribute major concepts of his philosophy to Pythagoras, which on one hand demotes Aristotle to a minor position, but on the other allows a Platonic philosopher certain freedom in exploiting Aristotelian concepts. After these two strongly philosophical chapters, A. Zucker's essay on Themistius (pp. 358–373) provides a somewhat welcome change of pace: his focus lies at least in part on more formal aspects of Themistian paraphrasis[4]. It also strives to account for the apparent duality of the scholar's intellectual legacy (speeches vs. philosophical works), which considerably widens the perspective and serves to provide the reader with an excellent introduction to Themistius' intellectual and didactic activities.

Returning to 'hard' philosophy, P. d'Hoine discusses a further shift in the reception as attested in the surviving writings of Syrianus and Proclus ("Syrianus and Proclus on Aristotle", pp. 374–393). In emphasising the importance of the former, he highlights the original nature of his re-interpretation of the *Metaphysics,* which appears to have had a formative influence on the reception of Proclus. The essay clearly shows that despite the better fortunes of the Lycian's writings, the surviving works of his teacher (most importantly his commentary on *Metaphysics* M) are of far more interest to the study of Aristotle's reception, providing an important background to the later theories of Simplicius and the school of Athens[5]. Next, M. Griffin ("Ammonius and the Alexandrian School", pp. 394–418) outlines the approach to the Aristotelian legacy attested in the known teachings of the philosophical school of Alexandria (from Hermeias to 'Stephanus'), paying particular attention to its two best known representatives i.e. Ammonius (with his alleged betrayal of his true philosophical vocation, interestingly manifested by limiting his teaching to the writings of Aristotle) and Olympiodorus. Then, an outline of the Simplicius–Philoponus controversy concerning Aristotle is provided by P. Golitsis ("Simplicius and Philoponus on the Authority of Aristotle", pp. 419–438): as an enquiry into the late Neoplatonic debate on the generation of the world gained some momentum with the re-evalution of Philoponus' physical theories[6], the attitude these two disciples of Ammonius display with respect to Aristotle becomes a reflection of an impressively vast spectrum of philosophical problems.

As it was with the previous section, the two final chapters of this one, tracing first the reception of the Stagirite in the Latin-speaking world and his presence in the works of Early Christian writers, appear somewhat separate from the others. Ch. Erismann's discussion of the Latin reception ("*Aristoteles Latinus*: The Reception of Aristotle in the Latin World", pp. 439–459) demonstrates, to some degree, how closely the two traditions are linked, with the *Categories* becoming a focus of translatory and interpretative effort in the Latin world. Meanwhile G. Karamanolis ("Early Christian Philosophers on Aristotle", pp. 460–479) begins by stressing the major shift occurring in the Christian reception of the Stagirite: from general condemnation and absence in the earlier period to the widespread use from the late antiquity onward (Boethius, Philoponus, Scholarius). Starting with Clement of Alexandria and concluding with the Cappadocian Fathers, he provides

---

[4] It is worth noting that the generic issues of paraphrasis are of considerable interest to Zucker, cf. his *Qu'est-ce qu'une paraphrasis? L'enfance grecque de la paraphrase*, Rursus-Spicae VI 2011 (URL: http://journals.openedition.org/rursus/476; DOI: 10.4000/rursus.476; consulted on 5.8.2018).

[5] When reading d'Hoine one is frequently reminded of the somewhat bitter observations on the survival of exegetical literature made by Silvia Fazzo in her *Aristotelianism as a Commentary Tradition*, in: P. Adamson, H. Baltussen, M.W. Stone (eds.), *Philosophy, Science and Exegesis in Greek, Latin and Arabic Commentaries*, vol. I, London 2004, pp. 1–19.

[6] Cf. R. Sorabji, *Philoponus and the Rejection of Aristotelian Science*, Ithaca 1987 (2nd edn. London 2011); F. de Haas, *John Philoponus' New Definition of Prime Matter*, Leiden 1997. One also notes that Golitsis himself is the author of the much more detailed *Les commentaries de Simplicius et de Jean Philopon à la Physique d'Aristote. Tradition et innovation*, Berlin–New York 2008.

a basic introduction to what of necessity is a much larger issue (witness, e.g., the problems related to the presence of Aristotelianism in the eastern confines of the empire, i.e. among the Syrians).

To summarise: despite the necessary conciseness of the individual essays (one notes the impressive discipline manifested by the near identical length of all the contributions), this well edited volume manages to furnish a comprehensive and up-to-date overview of Aristotle's afterlife from the third century BC to the sixth century AD, while at the same time providing the reader with basic tools for further research. Though paying particular attention to the 'other', 'lost' visions of Aristotle, it illustrates the slow emergence of what became a towering figure in Western philosophy – the author of the *Organon* (and most prominently the *Categories*) and the *Metaphysics*. This is not exactly the honey-tongued Aristotle celebrated by Cicero: it is, however, a product of centuries of scholarly debate, whose form owes much to the editorial efforts of Andronicus, to the essentialist Alexander, and to the conciliatory Porphyry; it is also, in a manner of speaking, the Aristotle whom Western culture knows best. It is precisely its portrayal of this formative process that makes this volume worth reading in its entirety. While the individual essays provide either introductions or overviews of more particular problems, the internal arrangement of the volume and the discipline of the exposition resulted in a convincing, multifaceted portrayal of the dynamics of reception as well as the various factors that influenced the 'final' result.

*Joanna Komorowska*
*Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University in Warsaw*