

ARISTOTLE, ARISTOTELIANISM(S), AND NEO-ARISTOTELIANISM¹ – WISDOM THERAPY FOR THE AILING POST-MODERN CIVILIZATION

Anna MAKOLKIN²

ABSTRACT. *This essay will attempt to accomplish two things. First, it will justify the 21st-century recourse to Aristotle and relevance of his knowledge and wisdom in the post-modern era. Second, we shall chart the plausible pathway for the post-modern neo-Aristotelianism upon examining the vicissitudes of the interest in Aristotle and Aristotelian studies through millennia. In the process, we shall also expose the historical myth about the alleged transmission of Aristotle's legacy from Arabic into Latin, restoring the real narrative about the life of Aristotle's text – in translations from Greek into Latin, re-translations from Greek into Syriac, Hebrew or Arabic, and numerous blind acceptances of the retelling from various languages rather than actual equivalents of the original. We shall also explain the reasons of the peculiar **cultural amnesia** or the causes of 'forgetting' Aristotle in many historical periods while remembering Plato and others in his stead. Finally, we shall argue why Aristotle, the **proto-scientist** of antiquity and modernity is the best suitable analyst, therapist and adviser for the ailing post-modernity which has regrettably lost her **intellectual, moral and cultural compass**.*

KEYWORDS: *Aristotelianism(s), cultural amnesia, cultural compass, existential compass, secular(ism), poetic proto-base, true and false signs, cosmos, cosmic(sm), cosmology, cultural detour, wisdom therapy*

¹ The formation of the Biocosmological Association and the foundation of the Journal of *Biocosmology - Neo-Aristotelism* is a very significant first step in setting the trend in the post-modern Aristotle studies. It opens an international forum on Aristotle for the common benefit of the society-relevant science. The present essay, dedicated to the 4th anniversary of the foundation of the Biocosmological Association, has been inspired by the discussions about Aristotle and Aristotelianism with Prof. K.Khroutski, for which the author wishes to express gratitude. Notably, the Biocosmological Association (BCA) has introduced the neologism "Aristotelism" instead of the commonly used "Aristotelianism". The reason is that BCA treats the Aristotelian philosophy as the autonomic (super)system of rational scholarly knowledge (and which truly is the foundation of the entire modern scientific edifice). In other words, Biocosmology (neo-Aristotelism) means a kind of "cosmology" or "kosmology" (if to refer to the Ancient "Kosmos" – the notion of the world-whole and the Organicist world order).

In this approach, Aristotle's philosophy evidently stands as a rational supersystem of knowledge that is fundamentally autonomic – fully reducible to Aristotle's Biocosmist – *Hylomorphist* – world outlook; Organicist physics and metaphysics; Four-causal-aetiology (with the leading role of teleodrive causes); Functionalist telic methodology; bio-socio-Kosmist anthropology and universalizing Bio-sciences (of all types: natural, social, formal and human); and Noospheric global sociocultural development and co-evolution. In fact, this is Aristotle's original, but a radically new approach in the contemporary scientific milieu. A reason is, therefore (as it was considered in the BCA) – to distinguish it (from the commonly accepted variants) by the use of the neologism "neo-Aristotelism".

² University of Toronto, CANADA.

Contents

Introduction

1. Paradox of the Collective Memory: Plato versus Aristotle
2. Who is Afraid of Aristotle Today?
3. Aristotle – a Public Intellectual, Free Thinker and an Impious Citizen
4. The Vicissitudes of Aristotelianism through History
5. *Corpus Aristotelicum* and *Aristoteles Arabus*: Fact and Fiction
6. The Myth of Cordoba and Re-Written Cultural History
7. Aristotle and Challenges to Modern Science

Conclusions

*It is Aristotle's special glory that every thinker is his pupil,
even when he does not know it.*

John Leofric Stocks, Aristotelianism.

Introduction

Ours is the most desperate century, standing at the crossroads of destruction and survival of humanity and its civilization. The greatest tragedy of it all is that we have lost our **cultural** and **existential compass**, the wisdom of Being, the joy of rational thinking and the ability to choose what is actually best for our Health and Happiness.

Ours is the age, dominated by mad senseless multiple activities, pointless strive for speed, endless computation, reckless conquest of Nature and the Natural (be it Man, animal, plant or cosmos itself) and the tyranny of the Machine (be it electronic gadgets, digital equipment or automobile). We are, at present, regrettably, ruled by the semi-literate, narrow-minded technocrats, whose troubled imagination ultimately and subconsciously leads to the destruction of the millennia-old Culture and Civilization. The ideas of creating artificial intelligence, the genome research or space exploration projects, and even (quite serious, publicly expressed!!) plans to colonize the moon or Mars – are just the few of the propositions of the post-modern maniacs whom Reason has abandoned and who, essentially, detesting humanity and civilization, could turn existence into Nothingness.

The troubled humanity of the post-computer, post-space exploration period is in a desperate need of an effective **cure** from **existential madness**. The ailing body of the planet, the confused minds and souls of humans, the face-book and cyberspace generation suffer from the serious malaise and urgently need the **wisdom therapy**. Somehow, it is only Aristotle, the semi-forgotten sage of the late Greek antiquity, who could provide the much needed cure. It is Aristotle, with his serene, utterly simple and elegant logical elucidation of the laws of the universe, cosmos, nature and human habitat, who can help humanity to find the lost **moral and intellectual compass**, and

retrieve the forgotten analytical skills.

1. Paradox of the Collective memory: Plato versus Aristotle

Despite the fact that Aristotle had surpassed his contemporaries and his mentor Plato on so many levels, having offered the most profound insights into nearly every branch of science, and having intuitively anticipated many future discoveries, by the irony of history, Aristotle has been often portrayed in the shadow of Plato. Partly, the answer was given by Jonathan Barnes, one of his best modern translators and commentators:

A controversial public figure who lived a turbulent life in a turbulent world. No man before him had contributed so much to learning. No man after him could hope to rival his achievements (1982:1).

Not only his age failed to appreciate him fully nor understand him, but even centuries after his death, Aristotle was not given full credit. Even Bertrand Russell omitted Aristotle from his 20th-century collection on history of philosophy. The post-modern Western European philosophical tradition, influenced by the Judeo-Christian ideology and mythology, continued to emphasize Plato, regardless of the more logical relevance of Aristotle to the time and **cultural space**. Despite Aristotle's towering metaphysics, ethics, analytical apparatus, logic, theory of cognition, insights into the natural sciences and medicine, and his statue as a the **proto-scientist**, he is less quoted and studied than his less significant mentor Plato. Even the contemporary Anglo-Germanic-American presentment substantially favors Plato.

The Platonic utopian state concept, the ideas-model and his overall social and ethical orientation are more compatible with the **para-secular** and **anti-intellectual** societies of modernity, committed to the system, relying upon and exploiting all the primitive animalistic instincts and desires. In his imagined blissful republic, the poets, the pioneers of discoveries, who ask the "why question," so important to Aristotle, had no place. Despite its basically anti-intellectual and dictatorial essence, Plato's doctrine and utopia, have been partly embraced by the late modern Western state, having found a permanent and prominent place in the University curriculum. The reason is simple – his utopian dogma included God, the wise tutor of the obedient unquestioning citizens while Aristotle's daring **secularism**, his metaphysics and cosmology have been more problematic for the society, paying only lip service to secularism, while actually making room for the more useful Belief. If Aristotle elevated Reason, asking humanity to doubt and debate, Plato kept humanity in a passive and convenient prayer phase. Nearly all modern societies, even those advocating secularism and separation of the Church and State, are more inclined to accept Plato. Aristotle's world view is deemed much more problematic, if not even dangerous. (After all, Aristotle was much studied in the Communist bloc and Marxists never 'forgot' him.)

The post-modern societies currently suffer from actually not accepting

Aristotle's secular wisdom. Religions tear the modern world apart due to the insufficient immunity against the Religious. The designers of the post-modern existential hell, if ever tutored in philosophy at all, having a very limited exposure to Plato, are absolutely unaware of Aristotle who could have guided them differently. Plato was more compatible with the general post-modern ethos of the techno and machine -driven age. After all, the main focus of studies at Plato's Academy was Mathematics. In contrast, Aristotle, respectful of the Euclidean and Pythagorean theories, cautioned against fixation on computation and Number, proposing instead to concentrate on Life and living in Cosmos. But Plato's fantasy and utopia had been partially realized by the post-modern **number fixated technocrats** – a single mode of existential rhythm, one preferred existential purpose, revolving around the digital number and one single primitive cultural signification. Plato, rather than Aristotle, is the actual ideological guide of the post-modern technocrats, the designers of robot(ics), cyberspace reality and culture. The electronic republic of post-modernity, a certain actualization of Plato's utopia, has already turned *homo sapiens* into a model citizen, a passive recipient of electronic signals, void of *sapientia*, Reason and reasonableness.

2. Who is Afraid of Aristotle Today?

Ours is the age, dominated by the closed-minded scientists and technocrats, who view the world through the prism of the digital screen. We daily see the triumph of the Machine and the defeat of Reasonable Man. The prediction of Thomas Carlyle (1795-1881) that one day man would become the "addendum to the Machine" has been fully materialized. Millennia prior, in the distant antiquity, the proto-scientist and wise philosopher Aristotle had also anticipated the same phenomenon. A man, who had contributed to nearly every sphere of knowledge, art, science and learning, cautioned about the harmful infatuation with the abstract, Number, computation and the overall dangerous **detachment from the Real**. He saw human mind and patterns of thought locked into the metaphor-based and metaphor-free discourses, the dichotomy of the poetic Logos and poetry-barren one, one censoring or checking the other.

Aristotle (384–322 BC) had exposed the intellectual impotence of the future all-knowing scientist, the precursor of the post-modern technocrat, the creator of the virtual space, the arrogant Emperor of scientific endeavors, walking actually naked, without the "clothes of culture." A naked barbarian of today is capable of twitting some 135-7 characters on any topic, but not remembering a single poetic line. Aristotle, a man relying on experience and observation, an avid student of Cosmos, was no less interested in Hesiod or Homer, believing that poetic explanations of the Universe are no less reliable in their metaphoric veil. Moreover, in his view, poetry preceded science and the poetic judgement was as valid as a solid analytical instrument in accessing the world, often better than the metaphor-free dry scientific reasoning. His explanation of Cosmos, and Humans in it, is inseparable from the poetic proto-base of Hesiod, Euenus/Euenus, Homer or Epicharmus. The proto-

scientist Aristotle could not imagine scientific inquiry in the barren art- and poetry-free universe, but modern poets, who have virtually destroyed the innate music of the poetic line, would not have liked Aristotle and his definition of poetry and music. Neither would modern abstract painters who rejected the importance of mimesis and verisimilitude. Modern musicians, with their cacophony of sounds (pseudo-music in Aristotle's view), would dismiss Aristotle. Aside from aesthetics, Aristotle, following the ancient musician and grammarian Coriscus, established the beneficial role of music even for human health, regarding it one of the great wonders produced by human imagination.

A post-modern detached scholar, obsessed with the never-ending incomprehensible exegesis of the discourse of his colleagues and preoccupied with the irrelevant to society issues, would detest Aristotle. Unable to compete with the terse, pithy and profoundly clear style of the ancient sage, the modern pseudo-thinkers prefer to engage in finding flaws in his arguments, as apart of the general outrage against the **cultural parents**. All priests, of numerous shades and colors, and religious persuasions are afraid of the **perfect analytical knife** of Aristotle. He destroys their peaceful reign in society, exposing the falsehood of their teaching and reminding them of the false ground of their mythological message and the ultimate indecency of their propaganda.

Historians, who claim to be the writers of the definitive accounts, have also been exposed by Aristotle, who reminded them that in his *Posterior Analytics* "opinion is unstable" and in his *Metaphysics*, that "man begets man" (1984, vol.1:146; 1984, vol.2:1691).

The rulers of the openly religious and weak secular (or **para-secular**) states would be intimidated by Aristotle for whom the border between the Religious and the Secular was clear cut even in the remote antiquity! He had the courage to define NOUS not as a deity, but as Cosmic Intelligence in the presence of over 30,000 Greek gods.

The genome-projects participants, euthanasia advocates, nuclear scientists and electronic machinery producers, the industrialists and big banks – all would be angered by Aristotle and his simple proverbial "Why" or "What for." In his immortal and eternally relevant *Metaphysics*, he insisted that only "men of art know the 'why' of it" (1966:3).

Despite the decades of being in the company of Plato and the Platonists at the Academy, Aristotle never accepted his master's idea about the destructive or negative role of poetry. Plato deemed poets dangerous for his utopian state, while Aristotle gave primacy to a poet whom he placed ahead of a scientist (A.Makolkin, 2008, 2009).

But the greatest fear of Aristotle has been in the minds of the defenders of the capitalist state. The post-Marxist political scientists were aware of the essentially socialist ideological motifs in Aristotle's *Politics* which made it clear that he supported public funding of cultural institutions, free education and active involvement of intellectuals in public life. They were also aware of the fact that Marx

himself widely relied on Aristotle's teaching. The famous Marxist postulate about religion, being the "opium of the people," directly originates from Aristotelian secularism and his theory of "**false signs**," false assumptions about the universe and reality. Upon the victorious realization of Marxist utopia in Russia, the spread of Marxism and the installation of the socialist order in Eastern Europe, Aristotle became the core item in the university curriculum within the framework of the subject of Marxism-Leninism. In contrast, the West continued to drill Plato and Platonism, and the sophists of antiquity as the ideological antidote and a part of the general ideological war. Thus, Aristotle got caught in the war between the two super powers, two warring ideologies. Embraced by the Marxists, Aristotle became a *persona-non grata* in the states, advocating market economy and free enterprise, particularly in the country-paragon of classical capitalism, such as the USA. As Charles Schmitt described it, "philosophy and Aristotle had been purged from the Anglo-American university curriculum" (1973:12).

3. Aristotle – a Public Intellectual, Free Thinker and an Impious Citizen

Aristotle was born in 384 BC, in the town of Stagirus, Thracian Chalcidice, into the family of a Court Physician Nicomachus serving Father of Philip of Macedon. At the age of 18 Aristotle moved to Athens where he would spend the next 20 years at Plato's Academy. In 347 BC, after Plato's death, he left Athens. Alfred Edward Taylor discloses the reason: apparently, the vacant position of Academy President was not given to Aristotle, but to his fellow scholar Xenocrates of Chalcedon, which may have caused Aristotle "feel injured" (Taylor, 1919:15). Yet, Aristotle never completely severed his ties with the Academy. In 335 BC, "he opened a rival institution, the Lyceum or Gymnasium, attached to the Temple of Apollo Lyceus. The name "Peripatetic" given to the school derives from the **PERIPATOS** or covered portico where lectures were conducted" (Taylor, *ibid.*).

In between the departure from Athens and opening" the rival institution" with the alternative curriculum, with the emphasis on Biology and History rather than Mathematics, Aristotle spent 3 years in Asia Minor, conducting marine biology research along the Aeolic coast. His old friend from the Academy Hermeias, the monarch of the city of Atarneus in Aeolis, standing against the Persian king, offered him his hospitality. His niece Pythias became Aristotle's wife during his voluntary 3-year exile period. In 343 BC, Hermeias was assassinated by the Persians and Aristotle moved to Macedonian Court, becoming the tutor to the future Alexander the Great, then only 13 (Taylor, 1919:12). Despite the powerful influence and the relationship between the student and tutor, the future famous commander and the no less famous philosopher, Alexander would eventually become Aristotle's foe. A. Taylor retells an interesting little known episode: Callisthenes, Aristotle's relative and official historiographer, who even followed Alexander the Great in his military campaigns, would be eventually killed, after being accused of orchestrating the assassination plot against Alexander and "for that Aristotle would be held responsible for treason as well" (1919:13).

When Alexander the Great died in 323 BC, Aristotle would suffer political persecution due to the anti-Macedonian mood in Athens. “Like Socrates, he was indicted on the capital charge of impiety,” the charge provoked by his poem on the death of his friend Hermeias, written 20 years prior, as well as his ties to the Macedonian ruler Antipater. The fears of punishment caused Aristotle to move back with his disciples to the native Stagirus where he would die a year later at the age of 62. (Taylor, 1919:16). One could see from the scant available recollections that his life was not an even glory-leading journey. He was affected by the political circumstances, which he did not personally orchestrate, but was often the victim of. Nor was he a stranger to injustice, slander, envy, persecution despite his connections and fortune.

Philosophy of antiquity was not isolated from politics and daily life. Philosophers not only regularly followed the political events, but were also actively involved in public life and government. Plato, for example, was known to intervene into public affairs of Sicily and his Academy was viewed as the ancient centre for the study of politics and jurisprudence (Taylor, 1919:14). Aristotle’s Lyceum, the rival institution to that of his master, became the leading center for disseminating free thought, life-relevant pioneering interdisciplinary scholarship, and ethics, as well as a plausible model for another perfect society.

4. The Vicissitudes of Aristotelianism through History

The fate of Aristotelian teaching is the best illustration of the overall vicissitudes of human culture and a rather precarious pathway of human advancement – one step forward into some discovery or knowledge is followed by the dozens of returns and wanderings in the dark labyrinth of ignorance. The peripeteia of the social, moral, political and cultural upheavals over the last two millennia – wars, revolutions, rise and fall of empires, battles for the mind and souls of humanity – all had occurred in the presence of Aristotle undying wisdom. The waves of history would periodically bring to the shores of Culture his lucid, strikingly simple, and wise thoughts- existential formulas, only to be condemned or discarded in anger, or used for one’s own particular needs. But nobody in two thousand years has ever abandoned Aristotle completely.

The grand monument of Aristotelianism, the anti-thesis to Platonism, was erected fully by Aristotle himself, in his own life time within the walls of the Lyceum founded in 335 BC. During the first 12 years of operation, Aristotle himself laid down the firm principles of his revolutionary inquiry into nearly every branch of knowledge, a unique broad interdisciplinary curriculum for conducting socially-relevant applied research in life sciences and humanities. Unlike Plato’s Academy, focusing on Mathematics, Aristotle’s unique Lyceum had emphasis on Life, Nature, Man and his place in Cosmos. His Lyceum functioned until 529 AD, having survived the fall of Athens, rise and fall of Rome, her shameful surrender to Christianity, the first major detour of the advancing European civilization in face of the rising Islam and Arabic appearance on the world stage. Aristotle’s Lyceum was the exemplary seat

of public learning in Europe, with the first modern research Library, the prototype of the future Alexandria Library.

The Lyceum not only conducted the groundbreaking research, but it also attracted large, interested in learning, public audiences. The functioning of the Lyceum did not deteriorate in the Roman times – on the contrary, having attached the Hellenic world to the thriving Roman Empire, the Romans were eager to spread and support this new temple of knowledge. Not only did Romans appoint professors at Athens and in the Lyceum, but they often themselves traveled to Athens to study philosophy. For instance, in 79 AD, Cicero himself listened to the lectures by Antiochus whom he regarded in awe as “*nobilissimus et prudentissimus philosophus*” (Barnes, 1989:57). Travels of the Roman senators, political figures and scholars to Athens were constant and ongoing. The greatest paradox of all was, even after adoption of Christianity by Emperor Constantine (303-337 AD), the Lyceum continued to promote secular knowledge. The next ten long centuries, up until the Renaissance, would be the battles for and against Aristotle, or the most difficult **post-Christian phase of Aristotelianism**.

The adoption of Christianity forced Europe, the final product of the cultural synthesis of the ancient Sumer, Egypt, Phoenicia, Babylonia, Assyria, Etruria, and other ancient advanced civilizations, to return to the cave of the primitive mythology of the Judean shepherds. This **cultural detour** which would last centuries was started by Constantine. From then on, the creative imagination of poets and thinkers would be censored by the priests, monks and servile believers of what Aristotle called as “false signs,” and the entire *corpus Aristotelicum* would be hijacked by them.

The dramatic turn in the social and cultural history of Rome would not only alter the cultural pathway of Europe, but it would also affect the studies of Aristotle. The failed battle of Rome against Judea would turn out to be the historic nightmare for the Romans and the entire Europe for centuries to come. The wheel of civilization and Aristotelian secularism would have to be re-invented much later. Niccolo Machiavelli (1469–1527) would openly blame Emperor Constantine for ruining the Roman Empire and changing the developmental course for the entire future European continent. Half a century before the trial of Giordano Bruno and Galileo, Machiavelli dared to inform the fellow Florentines and the wide public of all Italian States about the harm of religion and the cultural sacrifices, made in the name of accepting the clone of the Hebraic mythology. The primitive mythopoesis and cosmology of the pious shepherds from Judea replaced the ancient proto-scientific models of thinking, arresting the working of human mind and the recall of Aristotelianism. (A. Makolkin, 2008; 2009). The victorious parade of what Aristotle had defined “false signs” – Religion – coincided with the persecution of thinkers, scientists and overall obscurantism. The battle for the souls began with the attack on the Mind. Byzantine historian Zosimus (? 500 AD) tells of the execution of philosopher and rhetorician Longinus by Emperor Aurelian, Valentine’s anger at the philosopher Maximus and “Valen’s suspicion of all learned men” (R.Penella, 1990: 14;16). Despite the persecution, not all the philosophers could be exterminated, not all the works

perished, including Aristotle's texts.

Aristotle's works continued to live in Greece for centuries after his death, before and after the installation of Christianity, be translated into Latin and transported into Rome, made available within the Roman Empire, then travel to Constantinople, Alexandria, Damascus, Isphahan, London, Paris, Copenhagen, Berlin, Krakow, Cologne, Warsaw, Riga, Moscow, Kiev, Kazan', Odessa among many other parts of the world. Aristotle's works in Greek and Latin versions continued to co-exist with the sacred text of the Bible and in the presence of the religious censor who periodically would shift their attitudes towards the wisdom of the ancient sage. The post-Christian Aristotelianism would oscillate between the placing his works on the pedestal, and banning them. Yet, Christian theology never separated itself from Aristotle. Monasteries were the storehouses of his works which were read and re-read constantly. St. Augustine (354-430 AD) read Aristotle's *Categories* and the *Posterior Analytics*, translated into Latin by the Roman Senator Vettius Agorius around the same time (J.Stocks, 1933:122-3). He was not alone.

In fact, the entire edifice of the Medieval scholasticism and theology had been organically tied to his thought. But for centuries, the interpretation and readings of Aristotle were highly selective. "In 1210, Paris banned public and private readings of Aristotle's texts on natural philosophy," while allowing his works on logic. The Papal Legate banned his *Physics* and *Metaphysics*. (J.Stocks, 1933:127). For centuries, Aristotle's works were taught in Latin translations at all major European Universities. Dante Alighieri (1265–1321), who knew no Greek at all, makes numerous references to Aristotle throughout his *Divine Comedy* and his *Monarchia*, banned by the Church for three hundred years, from 1554–1881, was also heavily influenced by Aristotle (G. Sorensen, 2001:25). In fact, Aristotle survived in the post-Christian era because the Church found his teaching useful for the Christian indoctrination. Aristotle's cosmology was intentionally misinterpreted in the light of the Religious and appropriated by the Church in order to spread the myth about the creator of the universe. Aristotle's prime mover was made the creator. During 1100–1400, an attempt was made to challenge the Church, religious mythology and restore the Graeco-Roman cultural legacy.

The year of 1453 marks a new phase of Aristotelianism – Greek language and the Hellenic cultural legacy celebrate a second life at the Italian Universities as a part of the High Renaissance movement. The University of Padua, founded in 1222, with its traditional emphasis on medicine and natural sciences, becomes the leading Centre of Aristotelianism in Europe. The entire period of the Italian and European Renaissance, from Dante, Petrarch, up to Machiavelli, Giordano Bruno and Galileo, is inseparable from Aristotle when the complete *corpus aristotelicum* is already known to scholars and interested intellectuals. But the debate around his legacy is uneven – Bruno argues passionately against some points, Petrarch dislikes him, so does Galileo, one of many anti-Aristotelians. In 1536, Peter Ramus of Paris claims that "all the doctrines of Aristotle are false" (J. Stocks, 1933:133). In 1624, Paris passed a Decree in defense of Aristotle's doctrines, prohibiting their criticism, totally

in contrast with the past treatments and labels of “heresy”.

Europeans forever embraced Aristotle, but in variety of coats, depending on the prevalent opinions, dominant beliefs, scientific trends and even political movements. Despite the emergence of the new natural scientific concepts and formulas, Aristotle still had a lot to offer. His works also provoked even anger of some, like Thomas Hobbes (1588–1679), who criticized Aristotle copiously and freely, sneering at his terms while making references to him in other instances. Locke (1632–1704), who had a very superficial knowledge of many things except the Bible, was rather indignant upon his arrival in Oxford because “Aristotle still determined studies of the place” (J. Stocks, 1933:140). He erroneously assumed that his age was the “all-knowing one” and that Aristotle was out of date. Francis Bacon (1561–1626), who had very little actual knowledge of philosophy, accused Aristotle of “enslaving natural philosophy” and dismissed it as “**aristotelity**” (J. Stocks, 1933:154). Oxford Aristotelian studies were conducted under the watchful eye of the Church and God ruled very strictly in this, remote from the continent, temple of knowledge.

Despite the fact that Aristotle studies were revived during the Renaissance in the whole of Europe, Italy, the seat of the Roman Empire and the founder of the most distinguished civilization, became the leader. The country, with the first Universities in Europe, first Learned Societies, also pioneered the neo-pagan Renaissance Aristotelianism in the post-Christian era. New Aristotle resurfaced on the cultural scene of the entire continent when the neo-pagan art of Italy blossomed and when secularism was given a second life. The thriving Italian Universities – Bologna, Florence, Rome, Padua, Pisa, Naples, Venice, Ferrara, – were the connecting thread of new European Aristotle studies in the atmosphere of the recovered secular aesthetics, ‘blasphemous’ secular materialist philosophy and dismissal of the Judeo-Christian ideology.

However, among all the Italian Universities, the University of Padua, “the *alma mater* of Galileo, Vesalius, Copernicus, Pomponazzi and Harvey” would be destined to lead thinkers and scientists towards the recovery of Aristotle studies. The University of Padua, founded in 1222, on the basis of the scattered *studi*, will be the leading Centre of the new Renaissance Aristotelianism, with the interdisciplinary ties not only to medicine, but also to physics, law, natural sciences and ethics. Long before the *Corpus Aristotelicum* would permanently enter the curriculum, the Paduan scholars had owned and studied Aristotle in Latin translations from Greek which came to Padua via Athens, Rome, Alexandria, Constantinople, Crete, Rhodes and former provinces of the Roman Empire. Nearly all major Aristotle’s works were available to Paduan students and professors, who had been conducting the discourse on Aristotle long before Padua had acquired the glorious reputation of the Centre of Aristotelianism. Peter of Abano (1251? –1316) who taught for many years at Padua believed that “medicine and philosophy were sisters” and this concept was the guiding principle in the delivery of knowledge at this leading University (N. Siraisi, 1973:62). Aristotle was at the centre of all subjects taught there, even among Paduan musicologists most frequently cited him (1973:62).

Italy, the seat of the former Roman Empire, the transmitter of the Hellenic culture and the founder of Europe, was not the only country where Aristotle was recovered in the post-Christian era. The study of Aristotle spread in Northern Europe where Church faced the challenges of modern scientific views and institutional transformation. Caspar Bartholin (1585–1629) was a leading Danish Aristotelian. Copenhagen became the centre of Aristotelian studies, next to Upsala, and Stockholm, Sweden and Germany where the so-called “elementary political Aristotelianism” became popular. Aristotle’s *Politics* would occupy the minds of these scholars who would wish to see secular handling of contemporary political affairs. Bo Lindberg informs that these new Aristotelians “wished to distance themselves from the scholastic Aristotelian tradition with regard to relation of politics to theology” (2001:246).

After the refreshing Renaissance, there came to Europe the brisk striking Enlightenment, the age of Light and Reason. Machiavelli would be resurrected by Montesquieu. The French Encyclopaedists and Voltaire would openly and vigorously attack the Church, religion and the mythological Christian cosmology, including the hypocrisy of the institution and its repression of the Mind. Aristotle would be placed on the high pedestal again. The discourse on the method of scientific inquiry would be at the centre of the debates.

In the 19th century, new Aristotle would indirectly permeate the discourse about man, nature and society – he would live invisibly in the theories of Mendel, Marx and Darwin. It is absolutely unbelievable that Aristotle anticipated the future genetics and laws of hereditary transmission of biological characteristics among his other intuitive discoveries in various fields. In his *History of Animals*, Aristotle mentions in passing the story of a woman of Elis who had an affair with black man, but whose child did not inherit any characteristics of the foreign race, while the grandchild did. Millennia before Mendel, Aristotle came to a conclusion about the pattern of genetic transmission and, what would eventually be known as the gene phenomenon (1984, vol.1:918). Gregor Mendel (1822-84), the Austrian monk, whose work on heredity would become the base of modern genetics, actually repeated the Aristotelian elegant guess on the dominant gene. Marxist theory of the state and politics, and Darwin’s theory of natural selection also would reinforce the marvelous surprising insights of Aristotle, made in distant antiquity, having reinvented the ancient wheel, so to speak. Nietzsche’s exposure of the negative impact of Christianity, defining it as a “sacrifice of all freedom, all pride, enslavement and self-mutilation” is nothing but the echo of Aristotle’s rejection of the divine. The Hegelian dialectics stemmed from the Aristotelian changes while the Kantian *sensus communis* echoes Aristotle’s “universal is common”. In general, the Hegelian and Kantian discourses would be mere extensions of the ancient debates in Plato’s Academy and Aristotle’s Lyceum. None of the modern and post-modern thinkers could rival the depth of their wisdom.

5. *Corpus Aristotelicum* and *Aristoteles Arabus*: Fact and Fiction

The 21st century, marked by the resurgence of the Religious and the active

intrusion of the Abrahamic religions into the daily life of millions, is also the period of the widely spread mythology around the transmission of Aristotle's texts in history. Granted, the vicissitudes of cultural and political history went parallel with the changing interest and popularity of Aristotle's teaching. True, some of his texts were lost, some were re-discovered unexpectedly in different places and in different times. But the Greek originals of his major corpus had never been lost, contrary to what the modern mass media, TV and social media erroneously assert – the alleged gift of the Arabs to Europe in the form of translations from Greek. The mass of historical evidence and true chronology of the events are unknown to the post-moderns.

First of all, the Arabic literacy on the basis of Aramaic script was acquired only in 300–400 AD, while the Aristotle's Lyceum functioned from 335 BC up until 529 AD! This remarkable seat of learning and unique Library survived the defeat of Athens, the victory of the Roman Empire and did not cease to exist when Athens became another province of Rome. Romans, very intelligent colonizers at this stage of their history, were willing to partake the Hellenic wisdom. Unlike the Greeks who had stamped out from their collective consciousness *the* debt to the more advanced Phoenicians, their **cultural mentors**, in all areas of knowledge and even the alphabet, the Romans treated the Greek art and philosophy with utmost respect.

They asked many Greek philosophers not only to lecture in Rome, but many political figures went to Athens to study philosophy. The cultural exchanges between Athens and Rome were intense and regular. The evidence about the Greek philosophers could be found in Cicero's correspondence, Seneca's letters, essays by Arius Didymus and Albinus (J. Barnes, 1989:37). Moreover, Aristotle legacy preserved in Rhodes, Crete, Alexandria, etc. Greek language was widely spread throughout the entire Roman Empire and was regarded indispensable part of education. To annex Greece intelligently, the Romans took the effort learning their philosophy and emulating their art. The Roman Emperors supervised the activity of the Lyceum, its curriculum and appointed Professors all over Greece. In the 200 AD, Marcus Aurelius is known to have personally supervised those appointments. Ambassadors from Rome used to come to Athens to inspect the schools and were familiar with Aristotle's texts. Aristotle's Lyceum did not vanish after his death in 384 BC. Moreover, the School continued to flourish longer than most of the European Universities. After Aristotle's death the Lyceum was run by his pupil Theophrastos, later succeeded by Strato of Lampsacus, then by Lycon of Troas, Ariston of Keos, Kritalaos of Phaselis, Didorus of Tyre, Andronikos of Rhodes etc. Among other important scholars at the Lyceum were Eudemus, Dikaiarchos of Messenia, historian Menon, musicologist Aristoxenus and Demetrios of Phaleron, one of the future co-founders of the famous museum in Alexandria (K.Boudouris and K.Kalemtzis, August, 2013). Strato(n) provided many commentaries on Aristotle's works and generally continued his tradition for many years after Theoprastus' death in 287 BC.

Aristotle's pupil Neleus took Aristotle's works to the Troyad, Scepsis where they were allegedly kept for 150 years. Then Apellicos of Teos brought them back to Athens. But in 1st BC, Andronicus of Rhodes compiled Aristotle's works, edited them

and revived the serious Aristotelian studies across the Roman Empire. Alexander of Aphrodisias (circa 200 AD) was regarded one of the best commentators of Aristotle. Upon the suppression of philosophical studies by Justinian in 529 AD, many Greek professors migrated to Persia, then Alexandria, from where both scholars and researchers migrated to Constantinople and Syria. The Greek texts had a second life in Syriac, a literary language based on Aramaic and used in the Christian churches. The post-moderns would later confuse it with Arabic, a younger Semitic language with the much later acquired Aramaic-based alphabet. Translations from Greek, like all translations from antiquity up to the 18th century, had a bare resemblance with the original, being often mere liberal renditions.

The Spanish-born Averroes (1126–1198), apparently, knew neither Greek, nor Syriac, and, according to Renan, simply gave “a Latin version of a Hebrew commentary, written on an Arabic version of the Greek” (Stocks, 1933:126). Many educated Moslems and Jews of Spain actually knew neither Arabic, nor Hebrew, having preserved a symbolic memory of their respective heritage via the artificially introduced Semitic alphabet of their Spanish-spoken dialects. The Moors/Arabs and Hebrews of Spain were deeply assimilated into the Spanish culture. They had opportunity to read Aristotle in Spain since the Roman Emperors made sure that libraries of all their provinces had Greek and Latin versions of the Greek and Roman philosophical texts. Spain and Portugal had vast collections of Hellenic literature prior to the acquisition of the literacy by the Arabs around 300–400 AD and prior to the Moorish invasion around 650-700 AD. Strabo, Plutarch, Pliny and many others had a record of the regular intellectual exchanges between Athens and Rome. In 155 BC, the Athenian Embassy of Rome “was composed by three leading philosophers, the Stoic Diogenes, the Peripatetic Critolaus, and Carneades, the brilliant sceptic who headed the Academy (M.Griffin, 1989:3). Cicero knew very well both works of Plato and Aristotle whom he had a chance to study in Greek in Athens. His work *On the Nature of Gods* breathes the Aristotelian pagan secular spirit. Cicero was even familiar with Aristotle’s *Dialogues*, later lost for the post-Roman generation of scholars.

Even upon adoption of Christianity by Emperor Constantine, the Greek philosophers were used to transform the neo-Platonism into the ideological support of the new religion. The Asian provinces of the Roman Empire were also the traditional seats of Greek learning, centres of the preservation of the Greek language, culture and philosophy and spread of Aristotelianism and Romanness. The cultural exchanges between the European and Asian provinces never seized. Moreover, there was a long tradition of using philosophers as advisers to the political leaders. “Themistus in the 4th century AD was honored by every Emperor, from Constantinus II to Theodosius I who made him City Prefect and tutor to his son, the future Emperor Arcadius” (E.Rawson, 1989:237). The ties between Athens, Crete, Alexandria, Rome, Cordoba, Toledo, Coimbra are well documented and attest to the availability of the Greek and Latin sources on Aristotle and Greek philosophy since the early days of the Roman Empire. The Hellenic cultural world had not been destroyed in the new geopolitical

circumstances, nor with the advent of Christianity or Islam.

The authors of the *Aritoteles Arabus*, published in 1968 in the Netherlands, stated that “certain Proba of Antioch in 450 AD introduced Aristotle’s texts to the Semites, in their own tongue, the Western Syriac” (F.Peters, 1968:3). Then, the same scholar informs about the translation by James of Edessa dd 708 AD, later by George the Bishop of Arabs dd 724 AD, and by Job of Edessa in 800 AD, who also mentions Sergius of Rishayana in 536 AD, who had stumbled upon the commentaries on Aristotle by Porhyrius, Stephanus of Alexandria, Ammonius, Allius Themishes, Theopastus Simplicus etc. (Peters, 1989:7). The birth of another Abrahamic religion stimulated the deployment of the pagan Hellenic legacy and new attention to the *Corpus Aristotelicum* which always encouraged theologians for developing their own theology and para-religious cosmology. The Arab commentators of Aristotle were numerous (Al-Kindi and Humayan in 873 AD; Al-Kazi in 923 AD; Abu-Bishk in 940 AD; Aba-al Faraj ibn al-Tayyib in 1043 AD, just to name a few). Islam, the late derivative religion of Judaism, tried to appropriate pagan and Judaic cosmology just the same way the Christians did for their own theology. Numerous re-translations or actual paraphrasing, retelling of Aristotle’s texts which came to the Arabs via Syriac/Aramaic, Persian, Hebrew, Greek and Latin served the needs of the evolving Islamic world, rather than the descendants of Greece and Rome. Rome, Athens, Venice, Padova, Naples, Ferrara, Bologna, Coimbra, Paris, Cologne, Copenhagen, Upsala, Warsaw, Krakow and others did not need Baghdad, Damascus, or Jerusalem to recover Aristotle, whom they always had in their possession and in the curricula of their Universities. The post-modern radical Islam now distorts the global cultural history for their own geopolitical and ideological purposes, spreading the myth of the glorious *Al-Andaluz*, the alleged **cultural mentor** of the entire Renaissance Europe and the pseudo- re-discoverer of Aristotle and Aristotelianism.

6. The Myth of Cordoba and Re-Written Cultural History

Cordoba, the capital city of the province of Andalusia (Al-Andalus, in Arabic) indeed played a vital role in the history of Europe for centuries, and it would become the mythical place of the alleged return of Aristotle, presumably exercised by the Moors. The truth though was different. Since the foundation of Cordoba by the Romans in 151 AD, at the site of their old encampment of Colonia Patricia, the city had been one of the most prominent centres of the Roman Empire. It was the place of birth of such famous and culturally significant Romans as the two Senecas and their nephew, Lucan. Seneca Annius Lucius (55 BC – 39AD) a famous rhetorician, who was also born and educated in Cordoba. He later came to Rome after Cicero’s death (43 BC) to study under the fellow Spaniard, Marullus, whose life was tied to Cordoba afterwards. While his son, his complete onomastic double, Seneca Annius Lucius (4 BC –65 AD), also a native of Cordoba, never set foot there again, having subsequently made his political career in Rome. Seneca, junior, once a tutor to the “youthful Nero,” was in Francis Wiseman’s view, “an orthodox stoic and the most popular of pagan philosophers with the early Christians” (Wiseman 1956: 209).

Spain, as a province of the Roman Empire, had been destined to transmit her Phoenician- Graeco- Roman and Byzantine heritage and overcome the Gothic intrusive presence and the subsequent Muhammadan destructive invasion, which lasted from 711 up to 1492. Despite the centuries of the cultural and religious battles, Spain had preserved her Romanness and presented the cultural continuum. The Roman conquest in 218–201 BC as a triumphant cultural colonization of Iberian Europe had been forever immortalized in Spanish, a Romance language, one of many productive branches of the Vulgar Latin, and one of the cementing layers of the same foundation of the continental European cultural edifice. Latin became the most efficient instrument in unifying the Empire and disseminating one of the most advanced civilizations, remaining the *lingua franca* of scholarship even in the Middle Ages, used even by Spinoza and Erasmus centuries after the Roman conquest.

As elsewhere in Europe, Asia and Africa, the Romans brought to the Pyrenees urban progress and advancement, with “the colonized being mere spectators” of the massive and aggressive infra-structure building (Wolff, 1988:125). It is during the Roman period, that Hispania had also received Democritus, Pythagoras, Epicurus, Thales, Socrates, Anaxagoras, Euripides, Sophocles, Durius, Plato, Aristotle, Appolonius, Ptolemy, Zeno, Pindar, Ennius, the Twelve Tables, Virgil and Ovid,... among many others. The Roman triumph, self-evident even in the 21st century, has been immortalized in the monumental, solid, technically perfect, and inimitable enduring structures, still standing strong – the arches, bridges, castles, temples, aqueducts, theatres, be it in Tarragona, Segovia, Merida, Saguntum, Cabanes or Medinaceli. The Romans introduced the Doric, Ionic and Corinthian columns in the peninsula, decorating new and old temples.

Marcus Ulpius Trajanus, a native of Italica, near Seville, born in 52 AD, became even Emperor. In 256 AD, Hosius, a native of Cordoba, became advisor to Emperor Constantine on the matters of religion and, eventually, Bishop of Cordoba. The Roman citizenship was bestowed upon all the willing who had been instantly regarded as Romans. Emperors Hadrian and Trajan “were Romans first and Spaniards second” (Wiseman, 1956: 67). The period since 205 BC (the time of establishing the first Roman encampment at Italica near Seville) till the Byzantine European phase, marks a steady process of cultural and political advancement, the creation of the national language, literature, scholarship, architecture, theatre, art and education system, as well as the civic urban society. The Romans had established the political and cultural unity in Hispania that could not be destroyed even by barbaric Goths, with Spain remaining “patria,” a homeland, even for “the gens Gothorum,” as Roger Collins convincingly argues in his Visigothic Spain (Wiseman, 1956:246).

Since 409 AD, the time of the Gothic invasion, up to the Muhammadan crusade in 711 AD, Spain or Hispania had been still living under the watchful eye of the Byzantium. The Gothic kings and bishops had contacts with Constantinople, Carthage, Alexandria, Athens and Syracuse. The Gothic architecture still followed Byzantine tradition (Collins 194). Toledo, the metropolitan see of the province of Carthagenesis, was the seat of numerous Christian Councils. Despite some

destruction (some Roman theatres had been displaced by housing quarters and warehouses), generally, even the Gothic Hispania continued to be influenced by Constantinople and evolve within the predominant European Christian paradigm, i.e. re-deploying the Graeco-Roman pagan art for the needs of the Christian society. The Gothic Spain continued to produce the monastic historic chronicles, medical, theological, geographical, and philosophical treatises. For instance, Isidorus' *De Virio Illustribus* ("On Famous Men" or *Etymologiae sive Origenes* ("On Etymology of Origins") by Barulio of Zaragoza, or *On the perpetual Virginity of the Virgin Mary* by Ildefonsus (657-67) "became quickly known outside Spain" (Collins 164). The Christian Spain, even under the Goths, maintained some debates on the existence of God, theological methods and religious practices, disseminating the existing and newly acquired knowledge between Athens, Alexandria, Rome, Carthage, and Seville, Cordoba, Toledo and Zaragoss, as well debates with Aristotle.

Contrary to the popular historiographic modern mythology, it was not the Muhammadans who had allegedly reintroduced Hispania and Europe to Aristotle, Pythagoras, Thales, and Galen but rather vice versa – the Byzantine and pre-Renaissance Spanish culture was absorbed by the Islamic invaders. The Islamic warriors, who had occupied southern Hispania in 711 (due to the lack of unity between the Gothic and Spanish kings, and weak strategy of the Byzantines) had found a flourishing, utterly foreign to them, but superior civilization – "Claudio Marcello had built Cordoba in the style of Rome, with great monuments and ramparts," writes Rafael Castelion, and what appeared to them as real paradise (1974: 4). Cordoba, like Toledo, Seville and Zaragossa, was the seat of Greek schools and academies, and the centre for "mixing and mingling" for Roman patricians and native Iberian aristocracy, the capital of Hispanic Romanization, as well as long after the fall of Rome. The Muhammadans or Moslem invaders, who had gradually conquered Spain (711–756), were the recent converts to a young derivative religion, a revised Judeo-Christian mythology, having adjusted it to their nomadic tribal societies, at the pre-sex-organized and sexuality-regulated stage. By the time of their Iberian military expedition, they had already conquered Egypt, Syria, parts of Africa, Asia and Persia. The Spanish invaders were not racially and linguistically homogeneous – among them, there were Berbers, Mauritians, inhabitants of Yemen, Syria, Egypt and even slaves from the Slavic regions of Southern Europe in their midst. But the sole unifying factor was their young and newly acquired faith – Mohammedanism, later known as Islam, or the teaching of prophet Mohammed (570, Mecca -632).

Islam (which means "to surrender to the will of God," in Arabic), being a quite recent derivative of the two respective popular religious doctrines (Judaism and Christianity), became the faith of the people, who had found themselves in the unfortunate position of the societal cultural and political chaos, and economic devastation. To acquire wealth, knowledge and prosperity, the formerly obscure sect of seventy, founded by Mohammed, in what is presently Saudi Arabia, eventually evolved into a powerful ideological doctrine of the millions in Asia, Africa and even the Pacific region and Malay Archipelago, reaching 800 million in the post-

modernity. The popularity of Mohammed's teaching could be explained by its liberal sexual politics, favoring male sexuality and promiscuity. Many Spanish kings of Gothic and Spanish origins embraced Islam with the Arab conquest precisely for this simple reason: the Judeo-Christian ethics was too confining and demanding (Makolkin, *The Genealogy of Our Present Moral Disarray*, 2000: 71). The spread of Islam started by Mohammed himself was followed by the aggressive military missions of his deputies, caliphs. Koran /*Qur'an*, the sacred book of the Moslems, allegedly written by Mohammed himself, actually was composed in the script, exemplifying that of the ancient Nabateans, whose, related to the Aramaic, tongue is still spoken on the territory of the present Jordan. The Moslem historians and scholars have different legends as to *Qur'an*'s origins, some of whom even state that the sacred narrative had been reproduced on "a parchment made from the skin of the ram that appeared to Abraham" (.Rainsford Boag, 1945). The *Qur'an*'s legends emphasize the alleged cultural relatedness and kinship between the writers of the Bible and the Muhammadans, revealing the anxiety of the younger civilization, deprived of the ancient history and culture. During the successive military campaigns and cultural raids, the Arabic script, acquired only in the third-fourth century of this millennium, much later after the other writing systems in the Mediterranean region, had ironically replaced the more ancient Egyptian, Syriac, Coptic and Farsi. The spread of Islam was intertwined with the political ambitions and simple appropriation of wealth, knowledge, art, skills and artifacts of the conquered or colonized, be it Egypt (where Arabic displayed the Old Egyptian and Coptic), Syria, Africa, Carthage, Asia, or Gothic Spain.

Islam was an ideological necessity of a culture-challenged new Arabic speaking civilization, striving to make a leap into modern post-Assyrian-Sumerian-Babylonian-Phoenician-Etruscan-Greco-Roman and Hebrew historical reality. The first Moslem conquests in Egypt in 640 AD followed the universal pattern – the written word of the conquered symbolized danger, and it was ruthlessly destroyed. The ancient Alexandrian library, the repository of the wisdom of the ancients in over 400,000 manuscripts and papyri, had been nearly completely demolished and purged. According to the anonymous chroniclers, when the Arab caliph was asked whether to preserve the library, his alleged response was: "if the books contained only what was in the Koran, they were unnecessary; if they contained anything else, they were false and had to be destroyed" (Rainsford Boag, 1945: 35). The Moslem crusade in Spain was no different: the invaders ruthlessly sacked and burnt Burgos, Leon, Pamplona, Catalonia, Santiago and Toledo.

But Cordoba, the capital of the future glorious Al-Andalus, was spared. It was chosen as the site for their Moslem paradise on Earth, so beautiful and grand it appeared to the invaders. In 712 AD, half of the largest Cordoba Gothic St. Vincent Cathedral was turned into a mosque, and in 756, the entire complex was owned by the Moslems. The historic Cordoba Mosque, now a museum, started by Abd-er-Rahman in 786 and completed by his son and later successors, contains the "forest of porphyry and jasper columns," essentially Roman-Hittite-Gothic columns. "The

mosaic work was done by tilesmen from Byzantium, using 16 tonnes of tesserae (Seminario, 1975:89). Incidentally, the official ties with Byzantium had been established in 840, “in search of the allies against the Eastern caliphate” (Atkinson, 1970:49). What would be later treated as the Moorish wonder in Spain was a very successful hybrid of the Byzantine-Gothic-Roman-Egyptian-Babylonian and Persian architecture, executed by the hired and slave labor from the colonized regions of the Muhammadans/Moslems and from the detested Byzantium. The mosques of Cordoba, Toledo and Zaragoza were actually reworked transplanted architectural designs, whose main feature was the climax of Repetition of the Same, be it the intricate entanglement of the script or its architectural double of the mosque interior, or the series of the Egyptian-Dorian-Corinthian-Romano-Etruscan columns (the Cordoba Mosque, Alhambra), or the Hittite-Etruscan-Phoenician-Roman arches.

The Spanish conquest gave the Muhammadans the illusion of the found paradise which they did not have to build, but just to re-design according to their eclectic taste, acquired during the military expeditions in Egypt, Syria, Jordan, Yemen, Anatolia, Afghanistan, Turkestan, and Persia. Never again, after the Spain conquest, did Moslems flourish as much and to the degree of their life in Al-Andalus. The popular today myth of Al-Andalus, both in scholarship and popular media, had been created by the Arab 9th-century chroniclers, long after the successful assimilation of the Arabs, Berbers, Mauretians, Sudanese and Ghanians and their ancestors into the Spanish society, and their Latinization, based on the first elaborated by Ibn-abd-al Hakim in 900 (Collins, 2004: 137). Then it was perpetuated by the exoticism and Orientalism-hungry romantics, mesmerized by the wonders of the Oriental Other and the otherness of the Al-Andalus.

7. Aristotle and Challenges to Modern Science

Alexander Herzen (1812-70), a prominent Russian/European 19th-century thinker, a contemporary of Hegel and Feuerbach, concluded in his *Letters on Studying Nature*: “Aristotle had left behind not only most Greek philosophers, but also nearly all modern ones” (1845:63). And indeed, without any hesitation, one cannot name a single thinker in the last two millennia who could rival Aristotle in magnificence, elegance, clarity, profound wisdom, common sense and encyclopedic horizon. The most remarkable phenomenon is that Aristotle poses new challenges to even our all-knowing age, and is able to teach something to our self-assured scientists.

Later, in 1987, Soviet scholars Konstantin Sergeev and Yaroslav Slinin pointed out in their study of Aristotle’s cosmos to the still numerous unexplored territories within the ancient *Corpus Aristotelicum*. For instance, hardly any scholar acknowledges that Aristotle’s concept of primary matter anticipated the law of preservation of matter formulated only in the 19th century. In their view, Aristotle was the first to formulate the phenomenon of inertia. They believe that Aristotle’s hierarchy of changes, his theory of anisotropic space, concept of inertia, types of movement in cosmos and on earth, the acceleration and rotation phenomena, the

relationship between mass and acceleration are just a few lacunas of the many unexplored problems. Of interest is Aristotle's concept of the circular movement, which he regarded as perfect and which is absolutely the opposite to that of by Galileo, Newton or Descartes. In the cosmos of Galileo and Newton only the forced movement could be accelerated, while the Aristotelian cosmos has two varieties of the linear accelerated movement- the imposed and natural one (1987: 4) The scholars pointed out the absolutely neglected law of Aristotle, far more sophisticated than the second law by Newton for whom

$$F=M \times A$$

M – mass; A – acceleration. In Aristotle's law,

$$A=M/R \quad R=M/A$$

and R is the coefficient of the degree of proportionality while M is the measure of the active body striving to arrive at its own locus. According to Aristotle, the environment poses resistance to the moving body, and in the void $R=0$ since there is no environment (1987:75). The Aristotelian field of gravity is bipolar while the post-Galilean physics deals only with the monopolar fields (1987:83). Also, Aristotle's cosmos mass is active while in the post-Copernican cosmos mass is passive (1987:84). The scholars mention that Newton's bodies gravitate only to each other, while in Aristotle's physics, the light ones gravitate towards the periphery (1987:83). Thus, there are still many areas of science which could benefit from Aristotle's "naive" guesses and lacunas in his teaching.

Conclusions

Aristotle is more than relevant to our modern existence, culture, scientific endeavors and vision of ourselves. Aristotle's cosmos and cosmology, as well as his encyclopedic philosophy, embody the much needed common-sense attitude to nature, human life, human body and mind. His is the antithesis to the reckless and senseless post-modernity. One wonders what would Aristotle have said about the planned missions to Mars amidst the havoc on Earth? About plans to colonize the Moon? The genetic tampering for the sake of unknown medical benefits? The artificial intelligence project? The nuclear weapons? Would Aristotle have twittered Theophrastus or met him around the Lyceum? His unique common sense and wisdom are urgently needed to return us onto the right existential pathway before its too late.

The last two centuries, obsessed with Difference and Division, have demonstrated how humans have forgotten Aristotle's "Universal is common-Principle" and how we desperately need to apply it to our co-existence among the different. Even more so, Aristotle is needed in our times of the new religious crusades and virtually defeated secularism. To become truly civilized humans, we need to restore Aristotle's belief in Reason and triumph of the common sense. The post-modernity, torn apart by the religious mythologies and religion as an instrument of aggression, has totally forsaken reasonableness and lost her cultural compass. To re-

discover it, humanity has to re-discover Aristotle or to engage in the new studies of *Corpus Aristotelicum*, which could be defined as **Neo-Aristotelianism**.

The plausible pathway for the Neo-Aristotelianism (or the post-modern close collective studies of Aristotle in their applicability to the changed cultural circumstances of the 21st century) should start with the recovery and re-reading of the Greek original of Aristotle's texts, as well as their more faithful rendition into English, the modern global *lingua franca*, securing the global dissemination of Aristotle's works. This is impossible without the engagement of the Greek scholars, the native speakers of Aristotle's language. So far, we have been relying on the paraphrasing of the Greek original by the Oxford establishment since 1885.

But in 1981, Jonathan Barnes, who accomplished the revision of the available Oxford translations, pointed out the need to obtain authentic rendition of the entire *Corpus Aristotelicum*. In his view, the current English versions do not actually represent the "terse, compact, abrupt and condensed" Aristotle, but rather contribute to the false notions about Aristotle's style, i.e the shape his wisdom takes. This start is paramount for the students of Aristotle to see the unique pithiness of his thought within the minimum of the verbal delivery.

Next, the new re-translated Aristotelian text should become the universal item of the university curricula world wide, not overshadowed by Plato, sophists and post-modern verbal gymnastics in philosophy. Aristotle should become a prerequisite subject for all the studies in humanities and sciences.

Aristotelian ethics and concern for human health and well being should be a guiding principle in all the global political affairs. We need to re-possess Aristotle's analytical apparatus and his ability to ask his proverbial "WHY" and "WHAT FOR". It is imperative to create a rival paradigm to the currently existing ones, obsessed with Number and Computation which cannot resolve human problems, so obvious to Aristotle millennia prior. The post-modern barbarian, equipped with the most destructive tools of observation and interference into nature, but deficient in the rudimentary Knowledge, needs to come back to Aristotle.

Aristotle's teaching is now at the culminating point of its relevance to Man and Life. Prior to plunging into the New Stone Age and losing our collective memory and heritage at the push of the button, let us embark on the gratifying and vital voyage through the *Corpus Aristotelicum*.

References

- Aristotle (1984). *Complete Works*, ed by Jonathan Barnes, 2 vols. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- (1966). *Metaphysics*, tr. by Hippocrates G. Apostle. Grinnelli, Iowa: The Peripatetic Press.
- (1984). "Categories," in Aristotle, *Complete Works*, J.Barnes ed. 1984, pp. 3–24.

- . “Posterior Analytics”, tr. by J.Barnes, pp. 114–166, vol.1 in *ibid.*
- . “Prior Analytics”, tr. by A.Jenkinson, in *ibid.*, pp. 39–113, vol.1.
- . “Physics,” tr. R.P. Hardies & R. K. Gaye, pp. 314–446, in *ibid.*, vol. 1.
- . “On the Heavens,” tr. by J.L. Stocks, pp. 447–511, in *ibid.*, vol.1.
- . “On the Universe,” tr. by E.S. Forster, in *ibid.*, pp. 626–640, vol. 1.
- . “History of Animals.” tr. by d’A.W. Thompson, in *ibid.*, pp. 774–993, vol.1.
- . “Metaphysics” tr. by W.Ross, pp. 1552–1728, in *ibid.*, vol.2.
- . “Nicomachean Ethics,” tr. by W.Ross, pp.1729–1867, in *ibid.* Vol.2.
- . “Politics,” tr. by B.Jowett, in *ibid.*, vol.2, pp. 1986–2129.
- . “Rhetoric to Alexander”, tr by E.Forster & J.Barnes, in *ibid.*, pp. 2270–2315, vol.2.
- Aristotles Arabus* (1968). F.E. Peters. Leiden: E. Brill.
- Atkinson, William (1970). *A History of Spain and Portugal*. London: Penguin.
- Barnes, Jonathan (1989). “Antiochus of Ascalon” in *Philosophia Togata*, ed by M.Griffin & J. Barnes. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 51–97.
- . (1982). *Aristotle*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Boudouris, Konstantinis & K.Kalemztis (2013). “On the Aristotle Lyceum” in *Materials for the Int’l 2013 Conference of Philosophy, University of Athens, August*.
- Burckhardt, Titus (1974). *The Moorish Culture of Spain*. Tr. By Alisa. Lahore: Suhail Jaffa Academy.
- Castejon, Rafel, ed. (1974). Cordoba. Leon: L’editorial Forest.
- Collings, Roger (1989). *The Arab Conquest of Spain*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell Publishing.
- . (2004). *The Visigothic Spain*. Cornwall: Balckwell Publishing.
- Hertzen, Alexander (1944). *Pis’ma od izuchenii prirody*. (Letters on the Study of Nature). Moscow: OGIZ.
- Griffin, Miriam (1989). “Philosophy, Politics, and Politicians at Rome” in *Philosophia Togata*, ed. by M.Griffin & Jonathan Barnes, pp. 1–38. Oxford : Clarendon Press.
- Laertius, Diogenes (1991). *Lives of Eminent Philosophers*. 2 vols. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.
- Lindenberg, Bo (2001). “Political Aristotelianism in the 17th century” in *Renaissance Readings of the Corpus Aristotelicum*, ed. by M.Pade. pp. 241–254. Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum, UCP.
- Machiavelli, Niccolo (). *History of Florence*. New York: Dunn.
- . (1956). *Prince & Discourses*. Intr. by Max Lerner. New York: Random House.
- Makolkin, Anna. (2008). “Machiavelli & His Critique of Christianity” E-Logos: Electronic Journal for Philosophy. URL: <http://e-logos.vse.cz/index.php>
- . (2008). “Aristotelian Cosmos and Its Poetic Origins” E-Logos: Electronic Journal for Philosophy. URL: <http://e-logos.vse.cz/index.php>

- . (2008). “Biocosmology as a New Sign and Its Possible Meanings”
E-Logos: Electronic Journal for Philosophy. URL: <http://e-logos.vse.cz/index.php>
- . (2009). “Machiavelli’s Roman Nostalgia and His Critique of Christianity” in her *Wisdom and Happiness, with or without God*, pp. 35–65. Toronto: Anik Press.
- . (2009). “Happiness & Poetic Vision in Aristotle’s *Metaphysics*” in *Wisdom and Happiness, with or without God*, pp.11–29. Toronto: Anik Press.
- . (2013). “False & Dangerous Signs in Contemporary New Media” in *Bioscosmology – Neo-Aristotelism*. Vol.3., No.1. URL: <http://en.biocosmology.ru/electronic-journalbiocosmology---neo-aristotelism>
- . (2012). “Aristotle’s and Lucretius’s Cosmology & Paradoxes of Giambattista Vico’s Poetic Cosmography” in *Bioscosmology – Neo-Aristotelism*. Vol.1, No.4, pp. 15–26. URL: <http://en.biocosmology.ru/electronic-journalbiocosmology---neo-aristotelism>
- . (2011). “Vicissitudes of Cosmology & Giordano Bruno’s Discourse with Aristotle” in *Bioscosmology – Neo-Aristotelism*. Vol.1. N.4, pp 395–406. URL: <http://en.biocosmology.ru/electronic-journalbiocosmology--neo-aristotelism>
- . (2000). ”Romantic Ruminations about Judaism, Christianity and islam” in *Mazzoni*, ed. By Salvatore Bancheri, Ottawa: Legas, 2009, pp.179–199.
- Oxford Dictionary of Classical World*, ed. By John Roberts. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Pade, Marianne, ed. (2001). *Renaissance Readings of the Corpus Aristotelicum*. Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press.
- Pinella, Robert (1990). *Greek Philosophers and Sophists in the 11th Century AD* Leeds: Francis Caicus.
- Plato (1963). *Republic*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.
- Rawson, Elizabeth (1989). “Roman Rulers and the Philosophic Advisers” in *Philosophia Togata*, ed by J.Barnes Oxford Clarendon Press, pp 51–97.
- Lucia Rossetti (1983). *The University of Padua*. Trieste: Edizioni Zint.
- Stocks, John Leofric (1933 [1925]). *Aristotelianism*. New York: Longman Green &cO.
- Schmitt, Charles (1983). *Aristotle and the Renaissance*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard UP.
- Seminario, Lee.Anne Druhan (1975). *The History of the Blacks, the Jews and the Moors in Spain*. Madrid: Coleccion Plaza Mayor Scholar,.
- Nancy Siraisi. (1973). *Arts and Sciences at Padua*. Toronto : Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies.
- Taylor, Alfred Edward (1919). *Aristotle*. London: Jack Ltd /T.Nelson & Smith Sons, Ltd.
- Sorensen, Gert (2001). “The Reception of the Political Aristotle in the Middle Ages”

in *Renaissance Readings of the Corpus Aristotelicum*, ed by M.Pade.
Copenhagen: MT Press, pp.9–26.

Wiseman, Francis (1956). *Roman Spain*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.

Wolf, Greg (1956). *Becoming Roman*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.

