

ON EUDOXUS' *ΚΥΝΩΝ ΔΙΑΛΟΓΟΙ*

With a view to shed light on a questionable reference to Eudoxus' *Κυνῶν διάλογοι*¹, G.C. Harles, L. Ideler and G. Parthey approved of J. Semler's emendation *Νεκύων διάλογοι*² and explained that the emended title would suit spells in the Egyptian *Book of the Dead*, where the dead are sometimes made to speak. Far from approving of the above-mentioned emendation, R. Hirzel, F. Hultsch and W. Speyer emended *Κυνῶν διάλογοι* to *Γυμνῶν διάλογοι*³ and put forward the opinion that the emended title would be appropriate for a course of lectures given by the lightly clad priests of Egypt, who were on friendly terms with Eudoxus. On the other hand, taking into account that the term *Γυμνοὶ* had to do with the so-called naked philosophers of India, F.W.F. von Bissing approved of A. Rehm's emendation *Κυνοκεφάλων διάλογοι*⁴ and put forward the opinion that the emended title would be appropriate for some dialogues related to dog-faced baboons, which were sacred animals in Egypt. With a view to retain the reading *Κυνῶν διάλογοι*, G. Huxley and J. Gwyn Griffiths, who were favourable to a suggestion made by R. Hirzel⁵, considered that the Egyptian dog-faced god Anoubis might have appeared in Eudoxus' *Κυνῶν διάλογοι*, whereas H. Künssberg, J.P. Schneider and C. Macris found it difficult to elicit the truth⁶.

1. Cf. EUDOX., F374 Lasserre.

2. Cf. J.A. FABRICIUS, *Bibliotheca Graeca*, vol. 4, Hildesheim, Olms, 1966⁵, p. 13; L. IDELER, *Über Eudoxus, Abhandlungen der königlich preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Historisch-philologische Klasse*, 1828, p. 202; G. PARTHEY, *Plutarch über Isis und Osiris*, Berlin, Nicolai, 1850, p. 164.

3. Cf. R. HIRZEL, *Der Dialog*, vol. 1, Hildesheim, Olms, 1963², p. 339; F. HULTSCH, *Eudoxos von Knidos, Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, vol. 6, Stuttgart, Metzler, 1909, p. 949; W. SPEYER, *Die literarische Fälschung im heidnischen und christlichen Altertum*, München, Beck, 1971, p. 158.

4. Cf. F.W.F. VON BISSING, *Eudoxos von Knidos Aufenthalt in Ägypten und seine Übertragung ägyptischer Tierfabeln, Forschungen und Fortschritte*, 25, 1949, p. 227.

5. Cf. R. HIRZEL, *op. cit.*, p. 339; G. HUXLEY, *Studies in the Greek Astronomers, Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies*, 4, 1963, p. 86; J. GWYN GRIFFITHS, *A Translation from the Egyptian by Eudoxus, The Classical Quarterly*, 59, 1965, pp. 77-78. As a matter of fact, A. VON GUTSCHMID, *Kleine Schriften*, vol. 1, Leipzig, Teubner, 1889, p. 200, asserted that Eudoxus' *Κυνῶν διάλογοι* were based upon some Egyptian fables, and F.W.F. VON BISSING, *op. cit.*, p. 229, insisted that these fables were of great antiquity. Far from falling in with A. von Gutschmid's and F.W. F. von Bissing's views, we consider that, if Eudoxus had primarily concerned himself with the historical background of Egyptian fables, he would not have declared that the Magi were more ancient than the Egyptians (cf. EUDOX., F341 Lasserre).

6. Cf. H. KÜNSSBERG, *Der Astronom, Mathematiker und Geograph Eudoxos von Knidos*, part 1,



Keeping in mind that the matter in dispute was the authorship of *Κυνῶν διάλογοι*, F. Lasserre⁷ did not neglect the possibility that Eratosthenes was the first to give reasons in support of the Eudoxean authorship of *Κυνῶν διάλογοι*, whereas some anonymous compilers stated that Eudoxus translated *Κυνῶν διάλογοι* from Egyptian into Greek. Far from falling in with F. Lasserre's views, C.I. Balmuş⁸ contended that we have not yet learned whether Eudoxus familiarized himself with the form of language used by the Egyptians. As a matter of fact, Diodorus of Sicily maintained that, according to the priests of Egypt, «Eudoxus worked with the keepers of the libraries...of Heliopolis»⁹, but we cannot take Diodorus too seriously, because the priests of Egypt had an exaggerated sense of their own importance¹⁰. In our opinion, it stands to reason that Eudoxus was regarded as a specialist in the language of Egypt because he was an advocate of Pythagoras, who had the reputation of being a philosopher deeply read in the classics of Egypt¹¹. On the other hand, taking into account that Eudoxus in his *Voyage round the World* studied almost every aspect of Egyptian religion¹², we are inclined to think that he was not willing to refer to this matter again by undertaking a translation from Egyptian into Greek.

With a view to facilitate research, G. Bernhardt¹³ stressed the point that there is no reason

Dinkelsbühl, Fritz, 1888, p. 18; J.P. SCHNEIDER, Eudoxe de Cnide, in R. GOULET, *Dictionnaire des philosophes antiques*, vol. 3, Paris, Éditions du C. N. R. S., 2000, p. 302; C. MACRIS, *Porphyry's Life of Pythagoras* (in Greek), Athens, Katarti, 2001, p. 182. It is perhaps worth recalling that, according to F. LASSERRE, *Die Fragmente des Eudoxos von Knidos*, Berlin, de Gruyter, 1966, p. 268, in all probability Callimachus in his *Tables* did not make mention of Eudoxus' *Κυνῶν διάλογοι*. On the other hand, F. LASSERRE, *op. cit.*, p. 143, put forward the opinion that Hermippus' phrase ἕτερ' ἄττα ἀξιόλογα may go back to Callimachus. To our way of thinking, the natural interpretation here is to understand the phrase ἕτερ' ἄττα ἀξιόλογα as an indirect reference to the Eudoxean authorship not only of a work entitled *Γῆς περίοδος* (cf. EUDOX., F339 Lasserre) but also of a work entitled *Κυνῶν διάλογοι* (cf. EUDOX., F374 Lasserre).

7. Cf. F. LASSERRE, *op. cit.*, p. 268.

8. Cf. C.I. BALMUS, *Diogenes Laertius: Lives and Opinions of Those Who Were Distinguished in Philosophy* (in Rumanian), Bucuresti, Editura Academiei Republicii Populare Romine, 1963, p. 720. In this connexion we may note that, according to J.E. DUGAND, *Du voyage d'Eudoxe de Cnide en Égypte, Annales de la Faculté des Lettres et Sciences Humaines de Nice*, 50, 1985, p. 108, Eudoxus, who stayed in Heliopolis for sixteen months, did not spend time in learning the form of language used by the Egyptians. Granting this to be true, we take into consideration that, if Eudoxus had familiarized himself with the hieroglyphic and demotic writings of the name Ψαμμήτιχος (cf. J. GWYN GRIFFITHS, *Plutarch's De Iside et Osiride*, Cardiff, Univ. of Wales Press, 1970, p. 275), he would not have used the phrase λέγεσθαι οὕτως ὑπὸ τῶν ἱερέων (cf. EUDOX., F300 Lasserre).

9. Cf. H. BAKER, Eudoxus of Cnidus, *The Sewanee Review*, 1973, p. 240.

10. Cf. E. ZELLER-R. MONDOLFO, *La filosofia dei Greci*, part 1, vol. 1, Firenze, La Nuova Italia, 1951³, p. 40.

11. Cf. R. GOULET, Antiphon, in *Dictionnaire des philosophes antiques*, vol. 1, Paris, Éditions du C. N. R. S., 1989, p. 225.

12. Cf. F. GISINGER, *Die Erdbeschreibung des Eudoxos von Knidos*, Amsterdam, Hakkert, 1967², p. 36.

13. Cf. G. BERNHARDY, *Eratosthenica*, Osnabrück, Biblio Verlag, 1968², p. 202. With a view to emend a passage in Philodemus' work *On gods*, H. DIELS, *Philodemos über die Götter. Erstes Buch, Abhandlungen der königlich preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch- historische Klasse*, 1915, p. 84, maintained that Diogenes of Sinope criticized Eudoxus for being a polymath,

to emend the title *Πρὸς Βάτωνα*, which, according to Diogenes Laertius, has to do with a work written by Eratosthenes and related to the authenticity of Eudoxus' *Κυνῶν διάλογοι*. Now R. Hirzel, G. Knaack and P.P. Fuentes González asserted that Eratosthenes' work *Πρὸς Βάτωνα* was a work dealing with the comic poet Bato of Athens¹⁴, whereas U. von Wilamowitz, F. Susemihl and F. Jacoby declared that Eratosthenes' work *Πρὸς Βάτωνα* was a work dealing with the historian Bato of Sinope¹⁵. Keeping in mind that Callimachus exerted influence upon Bato of Sinope¹⁶, it seems probable that Bato of Sinope had doubts about the Eudoxean authorship of *Κυνῶν διάλογοι*, which had not been clearly proved by Callimachus. This being so, we are inclined to think that the Eudoxean authorship of *Κυνῶν διάλογοι* was clearly proved by Eratosthenes, who realized that Eudoxus had been the first to use the term *Κύνες* with reference to the quasi- Cynic followers of Diodorus of Aspendus¹⁷. From this point of view it may be inferred that Eudoxus, who did not disregard the fact that Archytas used to take part in discourses consisting of question and answer on a wide variety of philosophical topics¹⁸, wrote a work entitled *Κυνῶν διάλογοι* in order to refute some moral views expressed by the quasi- Cynic Acousmatics.

Christopher N. POLYCARPOU
(Athens)

whereas R. GIANNATASIO ANDRIA, *Diogene Cinico nei Papiri Ercolanesi, Cronache Ercolanesi*, 10, 1980, p. 149, contended that Diogenes of Sinope criticized Eudoxus for being a sophist. As a matter of fact, A. ANGELI, *I frammenti di Idomeneo di Lampsaco, Cronache Ercolanesi*, 11, 1981, p. 53, proved that the above- mentioned passage has nothing to do with Eudoxus.

14. Cf. R. HIRZEL, *op. cit.*, p. 410; G. KNAACK, *Eratosthenes von Kyrene, Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, vol. 6, Stuttgart, Metzler, 1909, p. 386; P.P. FUENTES GONZÁLEZ, *Ératosthène de Cyrene*, in R. GOULET, *Dictionnaire des philosophes antiques*, vol. 3, Paris, Éditions du C. N. R. S., 2000, p. 233.

15. Cf. U. VON WILAMOWITZ, *Antigonos von Karystos*, Berlin, Weidmann, 1881, p. 28; F. SUSEMIHL, *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur in der Alexandrinerzeit*, vol. 1, Leipzig, Teubner, 1891, p. 422; F. JACOBY, *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*, vol. 2, part 4, Berlin, Weidmann, 1930, p. 713. In this connexion we may note that, far from affirming that there had been two Batos, Diogenes Laertius made mention of Bato of Sinope (cf. DIOG. LAERT., V. P., VI, 99).

16. Cf. F. JACOBY, *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*, vol. 3, part 1, Leiden, Brill, 1943, p. 203.

17. Cf. B. CENTRONE, *Diodoros d' Aspendos*, in R. GOULET, *Dictionnaire des philosophes antiques*, vol. 2, Paris, Éditions du C. N. R. S., 1994, p. 783. Taking into account that Diodorus of Aspendus was regarded as a mentor of the Acousmatics (cf. A. DELATTE, *Études sur la littérature pythagoricienne*, Paris, Champion, 1915, pp. 309-310), who found themselves in opposition to Archytas on the question of genuine Pythagoreanism (cf. H. THESLEFF, *Pythagoreanism, The New Encyclopaedia Britannica*, vol. 15, Chicago, Encyclopaedia Britannica Inc., 1980, p. 325), we consider that Eudoxus, who was a disciple of Archytas (cf. EUDOX, T7 Lasserre), did not sympathize with Diodorus of Aspendus.

18. Cf. G. ZECCHINI, *Una nuova testimonianza sulla translatio imperii (ARISTOSSENSO, Vita di Archita, fr. 50, Wehrli), Klio*, 70, 1988, p. 365. In our opinion, it deserves to be noted that Pythagoras' approach to *διαλέγεσθαι* exerted influence upon Eudoxus. In point of fact, Porphyrius implied that Dicaearchus had made use of the term *διαλεχθεῖς* in a fragment related to Pythagoras' intellectual and emotional characteristics (cf. DICAEARCH., F33 Wehrli). This being so, one should particularly mention that, in spite of the Peripatetic background of this fragment (cf. F. WEHRLI, *Dikaiarchos*, Basel, Schwabe, 1967², p. 52), Dicaearchus' narrative may go back to Eudoxus (cf. F. GISINGER, *op. cit.*, p. 120).