Ancient Commentators on Aristotle

GENERAL EDITOR: RICHARD SORABJI

PHILOPONUS: Against Proclus On the Eternity of the World 6–8

Translated by Michael Share

BLOOMSBURY

PHILOPONUS

Against Proclus On the Eternity of the World 6-8 This page intentionally left blank

PHILOPONUS

Against Proclus On the Eternity of the World 6-8

> Translated by Michael Share

B L O O M S B U R Y London • New Delhi • New York • Sydney

Bloomsbury Academic An imprint of Bloomsbury Publishing Plc

50 Bedford Square London WC1B 3DP UK 1385 Broadway New York NY 10018 USA

www.bloomsbury.com

Bloomsbury is a registered trade mark of Bloomsbury Publishing Plc

First published in 2005 by Gerald Duckworth & Co. Ltd. Paperback edition first published 2014

 $\label{eq:preface of the state of the stat$

Richard Sorabji and Michael Share have asserted their rights under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act, 1988, to be identified as the Authors of this work.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or any information storage or retrieval system, without prior permission in writing from the publishers.

No responsibility for loss caused to any individual or organization acting on or refraining from action as a result of the material in this publication can be accepted by Bloomsbury Academic or the author.

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

ISBN HB: 978-0-7156-3234-5 PB: 978-1-4725-5771-1 ePDF: 978-1-4725-0123-3

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data A catalog record for this book is available from the Library of Congress.

Acknowledgements

The present translations have been made possible by generous and imaginative funding from the following sources: the National Endowment for the Humanities, Division of Research Programs, an independent federal agency of the USA; the Leverhulme Trust; the British Academy; the Jowett Copyright Trustees; the Royal Society (UK); Centro Internazionale A. Beltrame di Storia dello Spazio e del Tempo (Padua): Mario Mignucci: Liverpool University: the Leventis Foundation; the Arts and Humanities Research Board of the British Academy: the Esmée Fairbairn Charitable Trust: the Henry Brown Trust: Mr and Mrs N. Egon: the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO/GW); the Cultural Attaché of the Greek Embassy in London. The editor wishes to thank Frans de Haas. James Wilberding, and Andrea Falcon for their comments and John Bowin, Devin Henry and Inna Kupreeva for preparing the volume for press. A special grant for the preparation of this volume for press was

provided by the Council of Gresham College, to which the series editor is very grateful.

> Typeset by Ray Davies Printed and bound in Great Britain

Contents

Preface	vii
Introduction	1
Departures from Rabe's Text	7
Translation	11
Chapter 6	13
Chapter 7	87
Chapter 8	116
Notes	129
Select Bibliography	155
English-Greek Glossary	157
Greek-English Index	166
Subject Index	191
Index of Passages Cited	

This page intentionally left blank

Preface

Richard Sorabji

This volume continues the translation of Philoponus' work in 18 chapters, which is one of the most interesting of all post-Aristotelian Greek philosophical texts. It was written at a crucial moment in the defeat of paganism by Christianity. In 529 AD, the Emperor Justinian put an end to teaching in the pagan Neoplatonist school in Athens, where Proclus had in the fifth century AD been the most devout pagan teacher, St Benedict is thought to have founded the monastery in Monte Cassino, and, again on behalf of Christianity, Philoponus in Alexandria attacked Proclus' arguments that the universe had no beginning in his *Against Proclus On the Eternity of the World*. Philoponus was one of the cleverest of the Neoplatonist philosophers, a pupil of Ammonius in Alexandria, but he was a Christian, and he used his profound knowledge of the Neoplatonist and Aristotelian traditions to turn the pagans' own views against themselves.

Our text records, and replies to, the 18 arguments of Proclus' *Against* the Christians on the Eternity of the World, as well as quoting a little of Proclus' Examination of Aristotle's Objections to Plato's Timaeus. It will suffice to indicate just a few of the original arguments and ideas in chapters 6 to 8, and I shall select two issues from the longest chapter, 6.

In VI.29, 238,3-240,9; and VIII.1, 297, 21-300,2, Philoponus reports that Proclus had adapted an argument from Aristotle's *Physics* 8.10. Since bodies are finite in size, the largest body, the universe, cannot house the infinite power needed to maintain it in existence (Aristotle had only said 'in motion') for ever. That power must therefore be housed in something incorporeal and external to it, God. Proclus in Athens laments Aristotle's failure to apply the argument to existence as well as to motion. But Proclus' pupil Ammonius in Alexandria claimed that this was what Aristotle had intended (so Simplicius *in Phys.* 1363,4-12), and this interpretation of Aristotle was to prevail.

Philoponus now infers from Proclus' view that the world is perishable so far as its own nature is concerned and that hence God has to override its nature. The imperishability it acquires from God is therefore above its nature or super-natural (*huper phusin*), 237,10-15; 240,22. Conse-

Preface

quently, Philoponus infers, 242,15-22, since it is perishable so far as its own nature is concerned, it is also subject to being generated with a beginning. As Lindsay Judson has pointed out, there is a tacit assumption here that God could not override its natural generability in the way he overrides its natural perishability.¹ The argument is set out more clearly in the Arabic summary of a lost longer exposition by Philoponus.²

At VI.7-8, Philoponus makes much of Plato himself having described the universe in *Timaeus* 27C, 28B-C, 37D-38C as 'generated'. His discussion reveals the techniques of interpretation applied to Plato's text by others. In VI.8, 145,13-147,25, we learn that the Middle Platonist Taurus had tried to evade the most obvious implication of 'generated' by distinguishing 4 alternative senses of 'generated', and the Neoplatonist Porphyry had tried to add others. Two of Taurus' meanings had been exploited by Proclus. Taurus had also, as we learn in VI.22, 191,15ff., interpreted Plato's question at *Timaeus* 27C whether the universe has come to be, or is ungenerated, as if the 'or' meant 'if'. Others had emended Plato's text. Alexander is said at VI.27, 214,10-20, to have reported others as emending 'or' to 'even though', while others again, according to Philoponus at VI.22, 193,9-11, had emended 'ungenerated' (agenês) to 'ever in process of generation' (aeigenês). Aristotle had already recorded that some people took Plato's talk of the universe having been generated to be a fiction like that used by geometers drawing diagrams, to clarify the structure of something by showing it being built up in sequences, when it was never really so built. On the Heavens 279b32 - 280a10. Here we have a window onto ancient techniques of textual criticism.

*

A new introduction to the Commentators will appear in R.R.K. Sorabji, *The Philosophy of the Commentators, 200-600 AD: A Sourcebook*, London, Duckworth, 2004.

Notes

1. Lindsay Judson, 'God or nature? Philoponus on generability and perishability', in Richard Sorabji (ed.), *Philoponus and the Rejection of Aristotelian Science*, London & Ithaca, NY 1987. See also Richard Sorabji, *Matter, Space and Motion*, London & Ithaca, NY 1988, ch. 15.

2. Translated by S. Pines, 'An Arabic summary of a lost work of John Philoponus', *Israel Oriental Studies* 2, 1972, 320-52, at 323-4, and reproduced in Sorabji *Matter, Space and Motion*, London & Ithaca, NY 1988, ch. 15.

Introduction

This translation is made from Rabe's 1899 Teubner edition,¹ the only modern critical edition of the Greek text. Departures from Rabe's text, many of which are based on Rabe's own suggestions in the critical apparatus, are mentioned in the notes as they occur and listed separately in front of the translation. Words in square brackets in the translation do not occur in the Greek but have been inserted to clarify the sense. Greek words are occasionally given in transliteration when it is thought their presence may help the reader.

The single manuscript on which our knowledge of the Greek text of Philoponus' work is based is incomplete at either end, and the original title of the work is quite uncertain. I discussed the ancient references to the work and the status of Rabe's Latin title, on which the English title on the title-page of this volume is based, in the introduction to my translation of its first five chapters in this series, to which I refer the reader. In this introduction and in the notes I shall refer to Philoponus' work as *Aet.*, an abbreviation based on the Latin title.

Proclus' proofs have recently been re-edited and translated into English by Helen S. Lang and A.D. Macro and there is an earlier English translation of them by the English Neoplatonist Thomas Taylor and a German one by Matthias Baltes.² In contrast, only small portions of Philoponus' refutations of them have ever been translated into any modern language.

Since they also apply here, it is probably worth repeating the remarks I made in the introduction to my translation of chapters 1-5 of *Aet*. on some of my translation decisions.³

In Plato's *Timaeus*, from which much of the terminology used in *Aet*. and in the creation debate in general derives, the world, or universe, is variously referred to as *ho kosmos*, *ho ouranos* or *to pan*.

kosmos originally meant 'order' and, secondarily, 'adornment', and it never lost these connotations, but by Plato's day the meaning 'worldorder' or simply 'world' was well-established. Common English equivalents are 'cosmos' and 'world' and I have opted for the latter.⁴

ouranos literally means 'heaven' but in the *Timaeus* Plato uses it interchangeably with kosmos (cf. *Tim.* 28B) and Aristotle at *Cael.* 278b ff. says that it may be used of (a) the outermost circumference of the universe, (b) the heavens as a whole, including the stars, the sun, the moon and the planets (c) the universe as a whole. In *Aet*. it normally seems to be used in the second of Aristotle's three senses, but it is not always easy to see what is intended. I translate 'heaven'.

My rendering of *to pan*, which literally means 'the all', is 'the universe'.

I have thought it important to distinguish clearly between *aiônios* ('eternal'), aidios ('everlasting') and aei ('always', 'for ever', etc.) in the translation. Proclus always reserves *aiônios* for entities which are outside of time, such as God or transcendental form, but uses *aïdios* or aei either of these same entities or of things which endure for ever in time, which, for him, include the world, matter, imminent form, generation and time itself. For Philoponus in Aet. things are a little more complicated. In reporting and refuting Proclus' arguments he observes the same distinctions; for example, he nowhere claims that Proclus is saving that the kosmos is *aiônios*. However, for him only eternal things are in fact *aïdios* and in one fairly lengthy passage (114,19-116,1) he can use *aiônios* and *aïdios* interchangeably to distinguish eternal things from those which exist in time. (In his earlier commentaries, where he acts primarily as a reporter of Ammonius, he was, of course, quite prepared to use *aïdios* of things which exist in time; at *in GC* 1.9-16, for example, he used it of the heavenly bodies and the four elements. Surprisingly, however, apart from two occasions in Opif., he uses aiônios only in Aet.).⁵

Using 'everlasting' for *aïdios* entails using 'everlastingness' for *aïdiotês* (although I retain the by now traditional 'eternity' in the volume title) and I have even thought it best to use the unlovely coinage 'co-everlasting' rather than 'co-eternal' to translate *sunaïdios*.

Like Plato in the *Timaeus*, Proclus and Philoponus most commonly refer to the maker of the kosmos as *ho theos* or *ho dêmiourgos*. (Although Proclus does not use the former before Argument 8, and only once there).

Common translations of *dêmiourgos* are 'demiurge', 'craftsman' (a more or less literal rendering of one of the senses of the Greek word) and 'creator'. In translating the *Timaeus* I would use either 'demiurge' or 'craftsman', but in Proclus and Philoponus the term has, I think, lost much of its original force and I have opted for 'creator', partly because doing so makes it easier to find English equivalents for the related words *dêmiourgein* ('to create'), *dêmiourgêma* ('a creation'), *dêmiourgia*, ('creation') and *dêmiourgikos* ('creative').

It is still common to translate *theos* 'God' rather than 'god' when it occurs in a Christian author, whereas one is often torn between 'God', 'god' and 'the god' when it occurs in Plato or one of the Neoplatonists. Because Philoponus is clearly writing as a Christian,⁶ I have thought it best to translate it 'God' when Philoponus uses it in one of his own arguments, and I have, for ease of application as much as anything, but also because I think he often reads *theos* as 'God' in such cases (indeed, he often writes as if he were debating a fellow monotheist),⁷ extended this to passages that he quotes from Plato, Aristotle, Proclus and other authors and to the single instance in which Proclus uses it in this volume. I have not, on the other hand, as a rule capitalised pronouns or other words which refer to God.

Both creationists and anti-creationists were eager to enrol Plato on their side and Philoponus' debate with Proclus and other creationists is in part over the correct interpretation of the *Timaeus*. In this debate one of the key issues was the correct interpretation of the verb *ginesthai* and related words when applied to the *kosmos*.

The LSJ article on *ginesthai* (which is there listed under its earlier spelling *gignesthai*) is organised into two main sections. The first is headed 'abs. [sc. without a predicate], come into being', and includes, amongst others, subsections headed 'to be born', and 'to be produced'. The second is headed 'folld, by a Predicate, come into a certain state, become, and (in past tenses) to be'. There is no doubt that Plato often uses ginesthai of the physical world to express the idea that it is in perpetual flux, always changing and 'becoming' different (a usage which, although he commonly uses the verb without a predicate, would fall under LSJ II), and this is not a matter of dispute between Proclus and Philoponus (see especially VI.15-16). The question at issue between them is whether he also applies the verb to the kosmos as a whole in a sense that would fall under LSJ I. Philoponus claims that he does, at *Tim.* 28B for example, where he understands gegonen in the sense 'it has come into being' (or perhaps even 'it has been generated', or 'it has been created'), while Proclus argues that he does not, unless perhaps in a very attenuated sense. This, of course, means that the same words will often mean something different to Proclus and Philoponus, which makes life difficult for the translator. One popular solution, which I shall adopt, is to translate ginesthai 'to come to be', which can, with charity, be understood as embracing both 'to come into being' and 'to become', and as therefore adequately covering most relevant senses of ginesthai. (This only applies to contexts where the creation of the kosmos is at issue. ginesthai is something of a portmanteau word and I translate it in many different ways in other contexts).

The choice of 'come to be' for *ginesthai* raises the possibility of something like 'coming-to-be' and 'admitting of coming-to-be' (or, on a different view of the word, 'having-come to-be') for the related words *genesis* and *genêtos*, as used by Hussey in his translation of the third and fourth books of Aristotle's *Physics*.⁸ However, the two words are both very common in *Aet*. and in some passages, especially in the case of *genêtos*, this would become intolerably cumbersome, so I have, rather illogically, opted for 'generation' for *genesis* and 'generated' for genêtos.

The choice of 'generated' for *genêtos* raises another issue. Verbal adjectives in *-tos* (of which *genêtos* is one) may express possibility or have the force of a perfect passive participle. Some display only one of

Introduction

these possibilities, others, including *genêtos*, as the entries in LSJ and Lampe when taken together show, both. Of course, when an adjective is capable of either signification, it is not always clear which is intended. In fact, one suspects that the writer would often not have found it easy to say. This being so, it is not surprising that *genêtos* in *Aet*. has been read either way. To take only two examples, Dillon,⁹ when translating the excerpts from Taurus in *Aet*. VI, renders it 'created', while Judson, in his article on generability and perishability in Philoponus,¹⁰ prefers 'generable'. My own view is that the 'perfect passive' sense of the word is usually uppermost in the minds of both Proclus and Philoponus and it is for that reason that I have preferred 'generated' to 'generable'. (In fact, it seems to me that in VI.9, in the course of dismissing the first of the various meanings that Taurus had proposed for *genêtos*, Philoponus comes close to rejecting the meaning 'generable' altogether).

In philosophical texts, including *Aet.*, ginesthai, genesis and genêtos are often opposed to phtheiresthai, phthora and phthartos. phtheiresthai is the passive of phtheirein ('to destroy') and so can be rendered 'to be destroyed', but 'to perish', 'to pass away' and 'to cease to be' are all commoner. I usually (but not, as the Greek-English Index shows, always) use 'perish' for phtheiresthai and 'perishable' for phthartos. For phthora, because 'perishing' does not always work well, I usually use 'passing out of existence'.¹¹

I discuss the translation of a number of other words in the notes, usually at their first occurrence.

My translation of chapters 1-8 of *Aet.* was originally to have been published in one volume, but at a late stage it became apparent that it could not be kept within the volume-size limit for the series. In dividing the material between the two volumes we have decided to repeat some of the notes from the earlier volume in this volume and an attentive reader may detect other effects of splitting of the original volume, particularly in the indexes.

The early stages of the preparation of this translation were supported by a grant from the Australian Research Council. I would like to thank David Furley, Donald Russell, Alan Lacey, Edward Watts, and Teun Tieleman who each read part of a draft of the translation and made many valuable suggestions, the Ancient Commentators on Aristotle Project editorial team for assistance, patience and support, and Richard Sorabji for his advice and encouragement.

Notes

1. H. Rabe (ed.), *Ioannes Philoponus de Aeternitate Mundi contra Proclum* (Leipzig, 1899) (reprinted Hildesheim, etc., 1984).

2. H. Lang and L. Macro (eds.), On the Eternity of the World (De Aeternitate Mundi), Proclus (Berkeley, etc., 2001). Thomas Taylor, The Fragments That Remain of the Lost Writings of Proclus, Surnamed the Platonic Successor (San Diego, 1988) [originally published 1825], 35-92. M. Baltes, Die Weltentstehung

Introduction

des platonischen Timaios nach den antiken Interpreten (Leiden, 1976), vol. 2, 134-64. Lang and Macro's edition includes a Greek text based on Rabe's, with their translation of it, a text and translation of Ishâq ibn Hunayn's Arabic version of Proclus' first proof by Jon McGinnis, the Latin version of Proclus' proofs from the earlier of the two surviving sixteenth-century Latin translations of *Aet.*, a substantial introduction and useful notes.

3. Lang and Macro have a useful section describing some of the difficulties of translating Proclus and documenting some of their translation decisions. (op. cit., 28-33).

4. For more on the history and meaning of *kosmos*, see W.K.C. Guthrie, *A History of Greek Philosophy*, vol. 1 (Cambridge, 1967) 110-11 and 208 n. 1.

5. For an overview of the use of *aïdios*, *aei* and other time words in antiquity see R. Sorabji, *Time, Creation and the Continuum*, 112-17. Proclus elsewhere explicitly distinguishes temporal and non-temporal uses of *aïdios* and *aei* and Philoponus too finds room for a non-temporal use of *aei* both in *Aet*. (104-7) and in other works; references ibid., 115, nn. 66, 67 and 74.

6. I demonstrated this in the introduction to *Philoponus: Against Proclus* On the Eternity of the World 1-5 (London, 2004) in this series.

7. cf. my remarks at ibid., p. 12 n. 40.

8. Hussey, E. (tr.), Aristotle's Physics Books III and IV (Oxford, 1983).

9. J. Dillon, *The Middle Platonists: a Study of Platonism, 80 BC to AD 220* (London, 1977), 242-3.

10. L. Judson, 'God or nature? Philoponus on generability and perishability', in R.R.K. Sorabji (ed.), *Philoponus and the Rejection of Aristotelian Science* (London & Ithaca, NY, 1987).

11. There is a good discussion of possible translations of *ginesthai* and *phtheiresthai* in the introduction to C. Williams, *Aristotle's* de Generatione et Corruptione (Oxford, 1982).

This page intentionally left blank

Departures from Rabe's Text

Emendations other than my own are credited. Those attributed to Rabe and the two attributed to Brinkmann and Kroll are based on suggestions printed in Rabe's apparatus. All departures from Rabe's text are also recorded in the footnotes, in the case of my own emendations often with a brief justification. I do not indicate Rabe's own departures from the manuscript tradition either in the translation or in the notes.

119 21-22	Punctuating with a comma instead of a full stop in 21 and
110,21 22	a full stop instead of the first color in 22
119.22	Adding arg after adunaton (Rabe)
120.6	Adding and before panti
120,0	Deloting <i>singn</i>
120,7	Adding hai before heti (Pebe)
120,20	Adding tôi hoforo ouh
124,20	Adding tot before ouk.
124,24	Character d'and the traditie
125,21	Changing alamater to tanater . $(\mathbf{D}_{1}\mathbf{h}_{1}\mathbf{h}_{2}\mathbf{h}$
127,1	Changing <i>eknei</i> to <i>elkhen</i> (Kabe).
131,9	Adding dialusai after bouletheie (Rabe).
136,2	Changing <i>teleutaion</i> to <i>teleutan</i> .
142,23	Changing <i>hote</i> to <i>tote</i> (Rabe).
147,5	Changing <i>legoito</i> to <i>legetai</i> and omitting <i>de</i> .
150,1	Changing tou genêtou to tôn genêtôn (Rabe).
150, 11-12	Changing ginomenon to genomenon (Rabe).
155,2	Adding on after diastaton (Rabe).
156,13	Changing the second <i>kai</i> to <i>ei</i> (Rabe).
157,1	Changing <i>gar</i> to <i>kai</i> (Rabe).
159,1	Changing <i>onta</i> to <i>onti</i> .
161,16	Changing <i>elaben</i> to <i>estin labein</i> .
167,7	Changing <i>eipômen</i> to <i>eipomen</i> .
170,14	Changing ta to to (Rabe).
170,28	Adding <i>ei</i> before <i>en</i> and changing <i>ekhein</i> to <i>ekhei</i> (Rabe).
180,16	Changing <i>monôi</i> to <i>monon</i> .
180,23	Adding <i>ou</i> before <i>ta men</i> .
182,10	Changing genomenôi to ginomenôi (Rabe).
182,19	Changing genomenon genomenon to ginomenon
·	ginomenon (Rabe).

8	Departures from Rabe's Text
187,18	Punctuating with a full stop rather than a comma after ginomena
189.3	Changing <i>autôi</i> to tôi
189.25	Adding <i>khreig</i> after <i>ên</i> (Brinkmann)
193 11	Changing metalambanontes to metalambanousin (Rahe)
196.1	Changing <i>autêi</i> to <i>autê</i>
196.3	Changing <i>en têi</i> to <i>en hêi</i>
204 21	Deleting ou
204.22	Changing all' to kai ouk.
206.10	Adding to before khronikês (Rabe).
207.15	Changing pros to pôs (Rabe).
207.27	Adding <i>aei</i> before <i>ontôn</i> .
208.14	Adding <i>de</i> after <i>lêthês</i> (Rabe).
208.15	Changing autôi to autêi.
208.23	Changing horasthai to orthais einai (Rabe).
210,19-20	Deleting to khrômasin einai.
212,24	Changing <i>tinôn</i> to <i>sunistamenôn</i> .
213,3-4	Deleting tautês de phêsin tês doxês kai tous Stôïkous gegonenai.
214.19	Adding tois eis after dôsei (Rabe).
215,3	Changing gignesthai to einai (Rabe).
215,7	Changing ginesthai to ginetai.
215,12	Changing toioutos to toioutôs.
215,14	Changing ekeinos to ekeinôs.
215,24	Adding <i>hôste</i> before <i>dêlonoti</i> (Rabe).
$215,\!25$	Changing auton to autou or autôi.
216,6	Changing antitithêsin to anatithêsin.
217,9	Punctuating with a comma rather than a full stop after <i>tauton</i> .
218,1	Adding ho ton kubon before pher' (Rabe).
218,22	Adding <i>ti</i> before <i>ex</i> .
222,13	Changing <i>gar</i> to <i>de</i> (Rabe).
222,19	Changing <i>ex aiônos</i> to <i>exô henos</i> .
226, 19	Adding <i>hoti</i> before the first <i>to</i> .
$226,\!25$	Deleting phêsin.
239,14	Changing apolabonta to apolabon.
243,10	Adding arkhê ouk an eiê after kinêseôs.
$244,\!17$	Changing <i>kinei</i> to <i>ekhei</i> .
$245,\!17$	Changing <i>huph' heautês</i> to <i>hup' autês</i> (Rabe).
$245,\!25$	Changing to to tôi (Rabe).
$245,\!26$	Changing <i>kinêton</i> to <i>akinêton</i> .
246, 12	Adding <i>einai</i> after <i>thaterois</i> (the reader).
264,28	Changing <i>legein</i> to <i>legei</i> (Rabe).
265,12	Deleting zôiôn (Rabe).
267,9	Adding einai after sôma.
274,17	Addıng <i>e</i> before <i>kınoumenon</i> (Rabe).

- 275,11 Punctuating with a full stop rather than a semicolon after *dunamei*.
- 276,19 Removing the semicolon and enclosing *legô de tropon kinêseôs* in parentheses.
- 279,26 Changing *ei oun allo ê palin* to *ê oun allo palin* (Rabe).
- 281,4 Changing \hat{e} to $h\hat{e}mas$.
- 283,3-5 Deleting endekhetai ... megethos.
- 289,22 Changing *henoutai* to *henountai* (Rabe).
- 290,24 Changing *epikheirountes hôs phasin helikoeidôs auto* to *epikheirountes helikoeidôs phasin auto* (Rabe).
- 294,7 Deleting \hat{e} (Rabe).
- 294,23-295,1 Changing dioti sterêsis estin, hai de sterêseis eis hexin to dioti sterêseis eisin tines eis hexeis.
- 295,24 Changing to to te and hômologêmenon to hômologêmenôn (Rabe).
- 300,20 Changing *astheneian* to *athanasian*.
- 302,19 Adding ôn after ara (Kroll).
- 302,20 Changing *aiônôn* to *autou ontôn* (Rabe).
- 302,25 Changing *phtheiresthai* to *phtheiretai* (Rabe).
- 304,15 Adding to before pan and changing genesthai to ginesthai (Rabe).
- 304,18 Adding *ou* before *têi Platônos*.
- 308,12 Deleting *kai* before *hêi* (Rabe).
- 309,21-22 Changing *ek tou psukhrou to thermon* to *ek tou thermou to psukhron*.
- 310,3 Punctuating with a full stop rather than a comma after *kosmon*.
- 311,17 Adding a question mark after *oun*.

This page intentionally left blank

PHILOPONUS

Against Proclus On the Eternity of the World 6-8

Translation

This page intentionally left blank

<John Philoponus the Alexandrian's Against the Arguments of Proclus Concerning the Everlastingness of the World>

The Sixth Argument¹ of Proclus the Successor²

The sixth [argument]: if the creator alone bound the world together,³ he alone may unbind it. For, he⁴ says, it is in every way indissoluble 119.15except for the one who bound it together; for it belongs everywhere to the one who knows a bond to know also the unbinding of what he has bound together; and it belongs to the one who knows how to unbind [something] to unbind [it].

But the creator would not unbind the world. It is he himself who says⁵ 'it is the act of an evil being to wish to unbind what has been well put together and is in a good state', and it is inconceivable that a truly good being should become evil. Therefore⁶ it is not possible for the world to be unbound; for it will not be [unbound] by anyone else because only its creator can unbind it, nor by him who created it because 'it is the act of an evil being to wish to unbind what has been well put together'.⁷ So either he did not put it together well and is not an excellent creator,⁸ or he did put it together well and will not unbind it unless he becomes evil, which is impossible. And so the universe is indissoluble. And so it is imperishable.

And if it is imperishable, it is ungenerated; 'since⁹ for everything that has come to be there is a passing out of existence', says¹⁰ Socrates on the eve of Timaeus' discourse, not speaking for himself but claiming that it is the Muses that are speaking; and Timaeus did not, we can be confident, immediately assume that this doctrine of the Muses was irrelevant and make something that had come to be imperishable. So if this¹¹ is true, anything for which there is no passing out of existence is ungenerated. But there is no passing out of existence for the world. And so it is ungenerated. And so the world, if uncreated and imperishable, is everlasting.¹²

The Sections of the Refutation of the Sixth Argument

1. That they argue unfairly, forcing Plato's clear statements in regard to the generation of the world into conformity with their own view.

2. A description of the approach¹³ [taken] in the sixth proof. And¹⁴

15

120.1

20

10

 $\mathbf{5}$

Chapter 6

that even were it valid it would not harm the truth¹⁵ since it sets out 20not from the nature of things but from Platonic hypotheses.

3. A preliminary statement of the order and arrangement of the argument.

4. That Plato's statement¹⁶ that 'it is the act of an evil being to 121.1wish to unbind what has been well put together and is in a good state' is false and absurd. And that just as God's goodness is the cause of the formation of the world, so is this same [quality] the cause of its 5 unbinding.

5. That if, as they too believe, God has the power of unbinding the world, he will certainly also unbind it; but if he does not unbind it, either he does not even have the power of unbinding the world, and therefore not the power of binding it together either, or else, on their reasoning, he will be imperfect, having only the power of unbinding

10 without the actuality.

14

6. That if it really is the act of an evil being to wish to unbind what has been well put together, and if God has the power to unbind the world, he will have the power to perform evil acts and to cause harm.

7. A selection¹⁷ of Platonic passages [which show] that he means 15that the world is generated with respect to time¹⁸ and a brief review of their sense.

8. The number of senses in which the Platonic commentators Taurus, Porphyry and Proclus claim 'generated' is used, and the 20sense in which each of them supposes that the world is so described by Plato.

9. A refutation of the first of the [above] senses of 'generated', [namely,] that the world can be said to be generated as being in the genus of things which are generated even though it has not come to be.

10. That Porphyry states that the world is described as generated by Plato on the ground that it is notionally composite even though it was not put together with respect to time, and the arguments he advances for this view.

11. That this sense of 'generated' is unusual both among the Hellenes¹⁹ and in common usage. And that they are bringing²⁰ a very serious charge against Plato, that of having used ambiguous terms. And that even if he describes the world as generated in this sense, he

 $\mathbf{5}$ still assigns a beginning to its existence. 10

12. That it is not possible to understand Plato's statement that the world began from a beginning of some kind in relation to one of the six beginnings,²¹ I mean matter, form, instrument, efficient cause, paradigmatic [cause], final [cause].

13. That in these [passages] Plato meant a temporal beginning.

14. That it would not be in keeping with Plato's sagacity to ask whether the world is composed of matter and form or simple. And

122.1

25

that Porphyry himself, constrained by Plato's statements, has invalidated his own supposition as to [the meaning of] 'generated'.

15. That Proclus claims that the world is said by Plato to be 20generated in the sense that it has its being in coming to be and in the sense that it is generated with respect to causation.

16. That Plato does hold that the world has its being in coming to be but assigns a beginning to this generation. And that he is again referring to a beginning with respect to time and not some other kind.

17. That even Porphyry says that the world is described as generated by Plato not just as being composite but also as having come to be through the agency of God. And that [their] shifting between the various senses of 'generated' is an indication that they are doing violence to Plato's meaning.

18. That it is not possible that Plato was asking whether the 5 world is generated with respect to causation when he wrote²² the words 'whether it has always been, having no beginning [to its] generation²³ and other similar things.

19. That it is not possible to understand Plato to mean by 'gener-10 ated' 'generated with respect to causation' but by 'ungenerated' 'ungenerated with respect to time' and not 'ungenerated with respect to causation'.

20. That Plato himself clearly distinguished between his teaching about the generation of the world with respect to time and his teaching about its generation with respect to causation.

21. That it is not, as they claim, the case that Plato is hypotheti-15cally representing the world as coming to be by reason of piety or as an aid to exposition; and that, by claiming that it is, they are undermining the previous senses of 'generated'.²⁴

22. That Taurus is wrong to alter the disjunctive or interrogative conjunction 'or' in the [passage] 'we who are about to discuss with regard to the universe whether it has come to be or is ungenerated 20 $(agen \hat{e}s)^{25}$ to 'if' and to write 'even if it is ungenerated'; and that neither is it possible to read²⁶ 'is always coming to be' [instead of 'is ungenerated'].27

23. That nor is it because the heavenly bodies are in continuous 25movement that Plato describes the world as generated.²⁸

24. That in the *Timaeus* Plato is not predicating generation of the 124,1substance of soul but explaining by means of [an account of] the $\mathbf{5}$ generation of soul the relation in which the heavenly bodies stand towards one another and the kind of movement that they exhibit as a result of the soul that is within them. Including a brief recounting of the generation of the soul in Plato.

25. That Plato cogently infers from the fact that the world is visible and tangible, or, in a word, perceptible, that it is also generated with respect to time. Including [a demonstration] that the elements themselves, both in their particular manifestations (kata

15

25

123.1

merê) and taken as a whole, and the world, which is composed of them, are generated and perishable.

26. That when Plato states that the things which always are have no generation, the one and only kind of generation he is denving of them is generation with respect to time.

27. Testimonies of philosophers that Plato means that the world is generated with respect to time and that he is stating that it has come to be neither [purely] hypothetically nor on the ground that it has its being in generation.

28. That given that Plato says that the world is by nature dissol-20uble and mortal it was consistent of him to declare that it has also

25come to be. And that ungenerability as Plato conceives of it is something which is associated with a thing that is immortal according to the definition of its own nature and not a thing which has an immortality which is acquired from another and [constantly] restored.²⁹

29. That by the very words he uses when describing³⁰ the world as free of disease and ageless Plato shows that he does not believe 125that it is so by nature. And that even though there is nothing outside the world that could destroy it, it is none the less perishable because of the finite [nature] of its own power. And that Proclus has elsewhere 5

explicitly accepted this very point.

The Refutation of the Sixth Argument

1. Although Plato nowhere declares³¹ that the world is in any way ungenerated, but on the contrary everywhere loudly and clearly proclaims that it has come to be and is generated, not representing it 10 as having come to be in one respect and not in another but simply and without any qualification representing it as having come to be, those who always prefer speciousness to the truth and are overmuch in love 15with the everlastingness of the world do not produce a refutation [of these positions] from their own perspective³² but muddy the waters, twisting Plato's words to make them conform to their own position. But the very cleverness and subtlety of their arguments at once makes obvious to anyone with any wit the violence that they are doing to Plato's words:

For the language of truth is simple, and just [claims]³³ do not 20need subtle explanations. They have the proper measure all by themselves. But the unjust argument is sick to its bones and needs ingenious remedies.34

If Plato really did believe that the world is ungenerated with respect to time, that is, that it had no beginning to its existence, they would 25have to be able to adduce at least one piece of evidence from his 126.1writings that clearly spells this out. But they cannot in fact do this

16

but, revelling in their extreme verbal ingenuity, try to convince us that although we have heard Plato say that the world has 'come to be', we should understand [him to mean] 'not come to be', and that, although the man says that the heaven had a beginning [to its] generation and did not exist before it came to be, we should not understand him to mean that it had a beginning [to its] generation or that it once did not exist but that it has co-everlasting existence with him who created it.

2. It is with this intention, then, that Proclus has composed the sixth of his proofs, or rather in it too has once more transcribed the words of Porphyry for our benefit; for in his commentary on the *Timaeus* the latter quite clearly uses this same proof with a view to establishing that Plato too holds that the world is everlasting. For, assuming that the world is in Plato's view imperishable, he concludes that it must also be ungenerated; for if, as Plato himself says in the *Phaedrus*,³⁵ for anything that has come to be there is of necessity a subsequent passing out of existence, it no doubt in every case follows by conversion by negation³⁶ that if a thing does not perish it has not come to be. So if Plato clearly states that the world is imperishable, it is no doubt absolutely clear that it is also ungenerated.³⁷

So since the present argument seeks in this way to establish an original situation from a later one,³⁸ concluding from the fact that the world is in Plato's view imperishable that it is also in his view ungenerated, perhaps we need not have gone to the trouble of exposing the sophistical nature of the reasoning. For even if all of this were³⁹ true, and Plato, as they claim, believed that the world is ungenerated, the true account⁴⁰ would not in any way be harmed by it. For the [supposed] refutation is not based on the facts, and the facts are not necessarily in accord with Plato's notions. But 5 since it is good to come to the aid of the truth whenever it is harmed, it is, I believe, right [for us], as far as is possible, to vindicate Plato, who is being misrepresented.

10 3. It makes sense, I think, to begin by examining the arguments by which Plato sought to establish that the world will not perish [to determinel whether they have any cogency or not. For in the present [context] there is only one proof that is germane, I mean [the one to the effect] that the creator, being good, will not unbind the world, which has been well put together, if to wish to unbind what has been well put together and is in a good state is the act of an evil being and 15if it is impossible for the creator to become evil.⁴¹ And second would follow the investigation of Plato's intention, [with a view to determining] whether he means that the existence of the world has no beginning or whether he concedes that it had a beginning to its existence and did not exist before it came to be. And third, and after these, [would come] showing that when Plato hypothesised that 20the world has come to be and is imperishable, he was advancing

hypotheses that are in no way in conflict with one another, and that, in the form in which Plato advanced it, [the hypothesis that] the world will not perish does not, as Proclus here concludes, indicate that Plato believed that it is also ungenerated.⁴²

As a preliminary to the examination of the first of these questions we must quote the following passage from Plato.

128,1 Gods, offspring of gods, works of which I am the creator and father, which came to be through me and are indissoluble if I so will.⁴³ All that has been bound is dissoluble, but it is the act of an evil being to wish to unbind what has been well put together and is in a good state.⁴⁴

5 Thus Plato. 'So if', says Proclus,⁴⁵

> it is inconceivable that a truly good being should become evil, it is not possible for the world to be unbound; for it will not be [unbound] by anyone else because only its creator can unbind it, nor by him who created it because 'it is the act of an evil being to wish to unbind what has been well put together'. So either he did not put it together well and is not an excellent creator, or he did put it together well and will not unbind it unless he becomes evil, which is impossible. And so the universe is indissoluble. And so it is imperishable.

That the universe *has* been well put together mere observation of the things mentioned above⁴⁶ will attest, not to mention Holy Scripture, which says 'And God looked at all that he had made and behold it was all⁴⁷ very beautiful'.⁴⁸ And that the creator of what has been well put together is an excellent [creator] and that it is inconceivable that a truly good being should become evil the conceptions of God that are innate to all of us loudly proclaim.

- 20 But even though these things are so, I do not see the logical necessity whereby it is the act of an evil being to wish to unbind what has been well put together and is in a good state. No doubt everyone would agree that our bodies and those of all the animals and plants
- 129,1 have been well put together and that the varied structures of animals and plants neither lack anything nor have anything that is superfluous but each part independently fulfils its own need and all of them [together] cooperate to achieve the survival of the whole. But it has already been shown by us in the fourth chapter⁴⁹ that the creator
 - 5 nevertheless wishes that each individual should be unbound and not have everlasting existence. For if he wanted each individual to be everlasting, it certainly would be everlasting. For it is absolutely

necessary that the creator should either want or not want individual 10 creatures to be perishable. If, therefore, it is false that he does not want it (for if he did not want them to be perishable, they would certainly have remained indissoluble), then it is true that the creator wants them to be perishable. And if God wants individuals to be perishable, and they have been well put together, then he wants 15things that have been well put together to be unbound again. Therefore, in the opinion of these learned men, either these things were not well put together, which is absurd, or, if they were well put together, their creator, since he wishes to unbind what has been well put together, must have become evil, if, as they maintain,⁵⁰ it is the act of an evil being to wish to unbind what has been well put together and 20is in a good state.

And the same absurdity would be revealed in no lesser measure if one were to deploy this argument not, as they do, in relation to the first creator but in relation to the heavenly gods whom the first creator instructed to turn to the creation of mortal creatures.⁵¹ There²⁵ is every necessity that they too, in carrying out their task of generation and destruction, will either not put [their handiwork] together well or will become evil by unbinding what has been well put together. For a thing which is good in inferior measure is not evil. If this were so, the sensible world would not be good either since it is greatly inferior to the intelligible. (I make this point so that nobody will say that, because the goodness found in particular creatures is inferior as compared to that of the whole world, they are not well put together.)

And we have already shown in the thirteenth section of the fourth chapter that even though the generation and destruction of mortal creatures comes about through intermediary causes, whether heavenly or otherwise, the first creator is nevertheless more their cause than are their proximate efficient causes; for it is he who also furnishes causes later in the chain with the power to be causes. Therefore the first creator would have the chief responsibility for the generation and destruction of perishable things, and will either be the creatures too have been well put together, or, if particular creatures too have been well put together, as the very structure of a living creature shows it has, God must become evil since he is primarily and chiefly responsible for their destruction.

So since it is the case both that all particular [creatures] have been put together well, and that God wishes them to be unbound, and it is inconceivable that a good being should become evil, by the same reasoning, one supposes, even though God should wish to unbind the whole well-constructed world, there is no necessity that a good being should on that account become evil. For it will assuredly, one supposes, be on account of that same goodness through which he originally put the universe together that he will, if he wishes, unbind it. When the person who tuned⁵² a well-tuned lyre has put it out of

130.1

tune again once it has served the purpose for which he, its tuner, tuned it, no one with any sense will say that to wish to untune a well-tuned lyre is characteristic of an evil person and that it is only because he has first become evil that the musician has undone this

- 5 perfectly good tuning; on the contrary, it is, I think, clear to everyone that, just as he previously did well to tune it, so too did he do well to untune what he had tuned. Much more, then, is it the case that he who is truly good both originally put the world together because of his goodness, and will, if he wishes to unbind⁵³ it again, again have his
- 10 goodness as the cause of the unbinding, even if the reason for the unbinding is unknown to us. For we should not invariably assume that those things whose causes we do not know (and the reasons for many things, perhaps all, elude us) take place at random or for an evil purpose.

In my opinion, it is characteristic of young men and of those who are all agape for sensual [experience] that they suppose that when

- 15 visible beauty is undone, its undoer is on that account automatically evil. That is what might have been said by a man who, out of desire for her, was overwhelmed by the beauty of Helen and smitten by the peerless regularity and bloom of her [physical] features but had no
- 20 philosophical training in the science of the soul or any grasp of the laws of providence that relate to it. This, in my opinion, is the condition in which those who attend only to the visible beauty of the universe and have not been able to catch a glimpse of the most
- 25 excellent laws of providence, which God has devised for the salvation and perfection of rational beings in the universe, likewise find themselves.

5. We should also look at the question under discussion from another point of view.

- 'For [the world] is indissoluble', says⁵⁴ [Plato], 'by others than him
 132,1 who bound it together'. And Proclus agrees with this, for he says:⁵⁵ 'It
 belongs everywhere to the one who knows a bond to know also the
 unbinding of what he has bound together; and it belongs to the one
 who knows how to unbind [a thing] to unbind it'.
 - If these are the views of Plato and Proclus, and only the creator is able to unbind the world but he will not unbind [it], then he will always have the ability to unbind [the world] as a mere ability and not in actuality. And therefore, at any rate if all potentiality is, as these learned men believe, imperfect, he is imperfect. And I would
 - 10 add that he will have the power of unbinding [the world] to no good purpose if, as they claim, he has it for an infinite time but will never bring it to actuality.

But, as Aristotle says,⁵⁶ nothing numbered among everlasting things is merely potential; for it will exist to no purpose if it is never brought to actuality. So either [1] not even the creator is able to unbind the world, and thus the world will not be dissoluble even for

 $\mathbf{5}$

the creator and not even the creator would know its unbinding (for it is not possible to know [its] unbinding and be unable to unbind [it]; and if he does not know its unbinding and is unable to unbind it, neither will he know its bond nor have the power of binding the universe together; for it is true that knowledge of a bond and of its unbinding belong to the same person and that he who is able to bind is also without doubt the more easily able to unbind); or, [2] if, because he bound it together, he is able to unbind the world but will never unbind it, he will always for that reason be imperfect and pointlessly possess the mere power of unbinding without the actuality; or, [3] if these alternatives are, on their own principles, absurd, and God is able to unbind the world, he will assuredly unbind it.⁵⁷

6. Come now, if you will bear with me, to the height of absurdity 133.1to which this fine-sounding statement that 'it is the act of an evil being to wish to unbind what has been well put together'58 leads us. For if the creator can unbind the world but would not unbind it unless he became evil, then to unbind the world is evil; for if to unbind it is $\mathbf{5}$ not evil, he would not become evil by unbinding it. And if to unbind it is evil, and if God has the power to unbind the world, then God, since he has the power to do evil, also has the power to become evil. So if to unbind is evil, and God has the power to unbind, then God also has 10the power both to do evil and to become evil. If then to unbind it is evil and he has the power to unbind it, then God has the power both to do evil and to become evil. And what could be worse than this unholy conception? So if it is impossible for goodness to become evil, if, on the one hand,⁵⁹ unbinding the world is an evil thing. God will 15not even have the power to unbind the world, and if he does not have the power of unbinding it, nor will he have the power of binding it together or have [actually] bound the world together; for they too rightly believe that it is everywhere he who knows the bond who knows how to unbind what he has bound together. So if he who knows the bond also knows how to unbind it, then he who does not know how 20to unbind it will not know the bond either. So if God did bind the universe together and knows the bond of that which he bound together, then he will also know the unbinding of it and will be able to unbind the universe. And if God, because he has bound it together and it is he who knows the unbinding of a thing who can unbind it. 25can unbind the world, then the unbinding of the world is not an evil thing. For there is no potential for evil in God, for he who has the potential for evil would also become evil, but light would no sooner 134,1become darkness than goodness become evil. But if, on the other hand, the unbinding of the world is not an evil act, and the world has been well put together, then to wish to unbind what has been well put together and is in a good state so far as harmony is concerned is not $\mathbf{5}$ the act of an evil being,⁶⁰ and God would not become evil by unbinding the world.

So it is worth considering who has produced theories of the nature of the world that are more consistent with common [human] conceptions about God: we who hold that the universe is both put together and unbound again because of God's goodness, or they who are constrained by [our] common conceptions to say that God is able to unbind the universe but add that he would not unbind it unless he became evil – [a view] which has been shown to be tantamount to saying that God can do evil and become evil, and everyone would agree that this goes beyond all [other forms of] impiety.

I shall, God permitting, set out the most natural⁶¹ causes of the unbinding of the world elsewhere⁶² since at present we have only undertaken to solve Proclus' puzzles. As far as these [puzzles] are

- 20 concerned, we shall now bring [our presentation of] the main objections to Proclus' sixth proof⁶³ to an end.⁶⁴ From here on, switching to the second of the topics announced at the beginning of the present
- 25 chapter,⁶⁵ I shall, as I promised earlier,⁶⁶ try to show how those who foist upon Plato the view that the world is everlasting utterly misrepresent him, and, both because I myself am keen to present Plato's
- 135,1 thought in his own words and because I shall be attempting to refute those who misinterpret him, I shall be compelled to write at considerable length. So if any reader is interested in an exact knowledge of
 - 5 these matters, let him follow the argument through, but if anyone is not greatly concerned with Plato's opinion in regard to the present question and is keen to rely only on proofs drawn from the facts,⁶⁷ let him skip straight to the chapters which follow.⁶⁸
 - **7.** Both the majority of those who have adhered to the views of Plato⁶⁹ and those who have been admirers of the philosophy of Aristotle, beginning with Aristotle himself,⁷⁰ have joined in asserting that Plato states that the world is generated with respect to time, that is to say, that it has had a beginning to its existence and did not
 - 15 previously exist. But before setting forth the testimony of others, (which clearly shows us what Plato's views were on the generation of the world), it is appropriate to set forth first the actual words that Plato uses to affirm that the world is generated and has a beginning
 - 20 and then examine the arguments which attempt to force these so clearly-expressed statements of Plato into conformity with [our opponents'] own views.

Well then, Plato's whole objective in the *Timaeus* is to teach about the generation and nature of the world. Listen to how he defines the objective he is setting himself in the passages which follow. This is what he says:

> Here, then, for your consideration, Socrates, is the programme of entertainment we have prepared for you. We decided that Timaeus, since he's the best astronomer among us and has taken particular pains to inform himself about the nature of the

15

10

0 . .

136,1

universe, should speak first, starting with the generation of the world, and ending⁷¹ with the nature of man.⁷²

And again a few sentences later he adds this:

Yes, Socrates, everyone with any sense at all certainly always 5 invokes the gods at the outset of any undertaking, however small it may be. So if we aren't completely out of our minds, we who are about to discuss with regard to the universe whether it has come to be or is ungenerated must invoke the gods and 10 goddesses and pray that all that we say shall above all be pleasing to them, and secondly to ourselves.⁷³

In these passages Plato himself has clearly stated what his objective is, namely, to write about the generation of the universe. Then, so that no one will think that he has taken it for granted that the world has come to be too readily and without any proof, he repeats his 15original statement, recasting it as a problem,⁷⁴ and says that what he proposes is to teach [us] whether the universe, that is the world, has come to be or is ungenerated, after first carrying out a division of existing things; for of these he says that some always exist and are ungenerated, while others are generated and come to be. Dealing with this first will help him come to grips with the [matter] under investigation.

The passage immediately after the one we quoted above goes as follows:

As far as the gods are concerned, let that be our invocation. But we must also invoke our own abilities too, so that you may understand with as little difficulty as possible and I expound my thoughts on the matters before us as accurately as possible. We must in my opinion begin by making a distinction between that which always is and has no generation and that which comes to be but never is. The former, being always in the same state, may be grasped by thought with the aid of reason, the latter, which comes to be and perishes but never truly is, may be conjectured by belief along with irrational sensation. Further, everything that comes to be necessarily comes to be through the agency of some cause; for it is impossible for anything to have a generation without a cause.⁷⁵

Here one should observe how Plato says that everything that may be grasped by thought is ungenerated and always remains the same and unchanging but states that everything that may [only] be conjectured by belief and perceived [by the senses] - of this kind are all bodies and the things that exist in bodies, for these alone are the subject of

23

20

137.1

10

15

sensation - comes to be and perishes but never really is; for everything of a bodily nature is observed to be in a state of change and alteration, never remaining in the same condition but being continu-

- 20ally restored, so to speak, by the replacement of what has been lost. So it is immediately clear just from this division of existing things, and before he has said anything about the world, that Plato believes that the world is [in the class] of things which are generated; for he has divided these existing things into two, into those that are ungen-
- 25erated and those that are generated, stating that those that are ungenerated are apprehended by thought and those that come to be
- are conjectured [by belief] and perceived [by the senses]. If, then, 138.1everything corporeal in the world is perceived [by the senses], it is clear that Plato does not intend [the world] to be [in the class] of things which are ungenerated but [in the class] of things which come
 - $\mathbf{5}$ to be and perish and never really are. For just as each particular thing, for instance this animal or this plant, is, on account of the continuity, so to speak, of its alteration, restored and repaired⁷⁶ by the nature which has immediate governance of them, even so, says⁷⁷ Plato (who believes that the heaven and the whole world are con-
 - 10 structed from the same elements from which particulars have been framed) is it (even though he supposes that it *is* immortal) a restored immortality which accrues to [the world] since the power of the creator continuously repairs it on account of all bodily nature invariably being in a state of change and alteration. This will be demon-15strated a little later.⁷⁸

20

But perhaps it has not vet been made clear to us from what has been said so far whether Plato gives the world a beginning to its existence or not. For Proclus himself, in the work he has entitled An Examination of Aristotle's Criticisms of Plato's Timaeus,⁷⁹ says, when commenting on the passage of Plato that has just been quoted, that

- while being has a single sense in Plato (it refers to the eternal and supertemporal), that which comes to be has two. It can refer either to that which is always coming to be or to that which [comes to be] at a 25[particular] moment. Separate, or particular, things come to be at a [particular] moment, everything that is universal⁸⁰ and the world as a whole are always coming to be. For whilst, [he holds], intelligibles
- 139,1always *are*, the world is always coming to be. So it is appropriate that, setting out Plato's own statements about the world, we consider whether it is Plato's belief, as Proclus claims, that the world is in an everlasting [process of] generation, never having had a beginning to its coming to be or its existence, or whether he assigns a beginning to
 - its being and its generation. For having stated that he is going to $\mathbf{5}$ discuss whether the universe has come to be or is ungenerated, and having judged it appropriate to first teach us which things always are
 - 10 and have no share in generation and which come to be but are deprived of being, on the ground that this will help us grasp to which

of these types the world itself belongs, once he has given us this information, he next, in due order, moves to the question of whether the world has come to be or is ungenerated, the question that he had originally undertaken to examine. This is what he says:⁸¹

As for the whole heaven – or let us call it the world or whatever else is most acceptable to it – about it we must first ask the question which one should begin by asking about anything: whether it has always been, having no beginning [to its] generation, or has come to be, having started from some beginning. It has come to be; for it is visible and tangible and has body, and, [as we have seen], all such perceptible things, since they may be grasped by belief along with sensation, clearly come to be and are generated. And, once more, we say that what has come to be must come to be by the agency of some cause. Now, to find the maker and father of this universe is a [hard] task, and having found him it would be impossible to declare him to all.

So Plato here, having loudly and clearly stated that one should first ask about the world the question that one should begin by asking about anything, [that is,] whether it always is, having no beginning [to its] generation, or whether it has come to be and has some $\mathbf{5}$ beginning to its being, has decided that it has come to be and has started from some beginning; for if, he says, it is visible and tangible and has body, and all such things have been seen to come to be and be generated, it too, since it is generated, must have come to be, having started from some beginning. And so, when he spoke⁸² of 'that 10 which has come to be⁸³ but never is', he was not then either attributing *beginningless* generation to perceptible things. So if the world has come to be and had a beginning to its being, it is clear that it would not be, contrary to this, either ungenerated or beginningless for Plato.

And, indeed, a little further on, Plato himself says:⁸⁴

For there were no days or nights or months or years before the heaven came to be, but he contrived their generation at the same time as it was put together. All these are parts of time, and 'was' and 'will be' are forms of time that have come to be, which we incorrectly apply without thinking to everlasting being. For we say that it was or is or shall be, although on a true reckoning only 'is' belongs to it and both 'was' and 'shall be' should properly be said of generation which takes place in time; for this is movement, but it is not a characteristic of that which is always in the same state without any movement to become older or younger.

140.1

25

15

20

25

20

And a few words later:85

But perhaps this is not the right time to go into these matters in detail. Time, then, came to be along with the heaven, in order that, having been generated together, they may also be dissolved together, should a dissolution ever come to pass; and [it was made] after the pattern of the eternal nature, so that [the heaven] might be as similar as possible to [the pattern]. For the pattern will be for all eternity, while [the heaven] has been and is and shall be throughout the whole of time. As a result of this plan and purpose of God for the generation of time, in order that time might come to be, the sun and the moon and the five other stars which go under the name of planets came to be to define and preserve the numbers of time.

Thus Plato. And I at least believe that no commentary could present Plato's meaning as clearly as he has made himself. He says that days and nights and months and years, which are parts of time, did not exist before the heaven came to be – [and] plausibly, for time is the measure of the movement of the heaven. But if a 'before'⁸⁶ pre-exists the framing of the heaven, how could the heaven and time be without beginning? Moreover, to say that God contrived the generation of time and its parts along with the framing of the heaven is indicative of their having had a beginning of some kind and an initial coming into existence. For how could something that has existed from eternity and always exists be said to have been contrived by the

- 142,1 creator at the same time as the heaven was being put together and not to have existed before it came to be? For something that did not exist before it came to be was in a state of non-existence prior to its existence. And Plato certainly shows an exact knowledge of what things 'before' and 'then' and similar time words should be used of
 - when he immediately goes on to rebuke those who apply these time words – I mean 'was' and 'shall be' and the like, to which 'before' and 'then' are related – to the divine nature. Only 'is', he says, should be said of God, stating this Mosaic [rule] quite explicitly. (For, appearing
 - 10 to the prophet, God declared 'I am He who is'.⁸⁷) If Plato thought that it is brought⁸⁸ into existence by God from everlasting, without a beginning to its being, how is it that, in the same breath as he rebukes
 - 15 others for applying 'was' and 'shall be' to God, he falls foul of his own charge? For if God *brings* the heaven and time into existence from everlasting, the heaven and time are, I presume, *brought* into existence from everlasting; and, if this is so, there was not a time when they were not being brought into existence. How is it, then, that he says that there was no time before the heaven came to be?
 - 20 And if it is appropriate to talk of a time before it came to be in the case of the heaven, it will also be appropriate to talk of a time before

26

 $\mathbf{5}$

he made [it] in the case of God. As Proclus himself says,⁸⁹ it is when the maker makes that what comes to be comes to be. And the same applies in the case of 'then'.⁹⁰

If, then, time had always existed, and if Plato understands the 25correct usage of time words and has just explained their correct usage, he would never have ventured to use the words 'before the heaven came to be', nor indeed the words 'but he now contrived their 143,1generation at the same time as the heaven was put together' if he believed that the existence of the world is without a beginning. For what was then bringing the heaven into existence for the first time, was not, I presume, bringing it into existence earlier. And if the $\mathbf{5}$ heaven and time did not exist before they came to be, and the maker of these things was not making them before they came to be, then, as I said,⁹¹ Plato would not, if he really believed that God brings them into existence from everlasting, have spoken in this way. For just as God's being, which is always the same and unchanging, is not accept-10 ing of the words 'was' or 'shall be' but only of the word 'is', so is an everlasting production of the world not accepting of the words 'before' or 'then'. But Plato has in fact used just these words of the generation of the world; therefore he did not believe that it is brought into 15existence from everlasting.

And if anyone should claim that just to say that God at first did not bring [things] into existence but later brought [them] into existence is to predicate change and movement of God (which is neither true nor the opinion of Plato), let him return to what we said in the fourth chapter;⁹² for this kind of puzzle received a fitting solution there.

And surely all but the hopelessly contentious will be convinced by the words 'time came to be along with the heaven, in order that, having been generated together, they may also be dissolved together, should their dissolution ever come to pass'.⁹³ For in order to show 144.1[that this was] the very beginning (prôtên arkhên) of their formation, he did not say 'time comes to be together with the heaven' but '[time] came to be along with the heaven'. And he has shown that this is his meaning by adding the words 'having been generated together, they may also be dissolved together'. For, as far as its own nature is concerned, for anything that has come to be and had a beginning to its existence there is in every case a subsequent perishing; for Plato himself says in the *Phaedrus* that 'a passing out of existence of necessity comes to everything that has come to be'.⁹⁴ So, just as, in his $\mathbf{5}$ view, endlessness always attends upon anything that has had no beginning to its existence (for anything that has not commenced being will not cease being), [so], according to Plato, has the world had a beginning, and [so], as far as the law of its nature is concerned, will 10 [it] definitely cease being. Since, then, Plato assigns a beginning of its being to the world, he also, with reason, accepts the consequences of natural law, even though he supposes that it remains indissoluble 15
because of a bond that is stronger than its own nature, the will of $\mathrm{God.}^{95}$

8. But those who are concerned to force everything into agreement with their own views and have not schooled their minds to follow the truth, when they should, if it seemed to them that Plato was here at least mistaken, have, begging his pardon, recited that much-used mantra of theirs that 'Plato is dear but the truth is dearer^{'96} (as Plato's own pupil, Aristotle, amongst others, has done⁹⁷), have instead, taking little thought for their own consciences or the truth, grasped, as the proverb has it, at every straw⁹⁸ in their eager-

- 145,1 ness to enroll the [great] man's reputation on behalf of their own fraud. For some of the earlier commentators on Plato, including the Platonist Taurus and Porphyry the Phoenician, whom Proclus too has
 - 5 followed, agree that Plato says that the world is generated, but not generated in the sense that it had a beginning to its being but in accordance with another kind of generation; for they say that 'generated' has a number of meanings. To avoid making their case for them and so as not to omit any of the senses of 'generated', I shall quote the
 - 10 Platonist Taurus' own words, for this fellow has thought up many senses for 'generated'. Here, then, to quote his exact words,⁹⁹ is what he says in his commentary on the *Timaeus*:

There being a question as to whether the world is in Plato's view 15ungenerated, philosophers have had different opinions on the matter. Aristotle states¹⁰⁰ that the *Timaeus* describes the world as generated since Timaeus says¹⁰¹ 'it has come to be'. And, indeed, there is a work of his [sc. of Timaeus] in circulation on the universe as [something that is] generated.¹⁰² And perhaps Plato's Timaeus means much the same thing when he says that the world is generated.¹⁰³ Theophrastus, on the other hand, in On Physical Opinions¹⁰⁴ says that the world is in Plato's opinion 20generated and criticises him on that basis, but adds that he may be hypothesizing it as generated for the sake of clarity [of exposition].¹⁰⁵ And some others have likewise been of the opinion 25that it is in Plato's view generated, although others [have thought that he held that it is] ungenerated.

Since those who claim that it is generated have, amongst many other passages, seized upon the one where he says¹⁰⁶ 'It has come to be; for it is visible and tangible', we must distinguish the various senses of 'generated'. And in this way we shall learn that Plato is not using 'generated' in the sense in which we describe as 'generated' things that have come into existence from any temporal beginning. As a matter of fact, it is falling back on this sense whenever the word 'generated' is used that has led the majority of people astray.

[1] Amongst things that are said to be 'generated', then, are

things which have not come to be but which are in the same genus as things which are generated.¹⁰⁷ In this same way we describe as visible things which have not, are not, and will not be seen, but which are in the same genus as visible things, as if there were, for example, a body of some kind at the centre of the earth.

[2] Also described as 'generated' are things that are notionally composite, even if they have not [actually] been put together. In this sense the middle note [of the scale] is composed of the highest and the lowest;¹⁰⁸ even though it has not [actually] been put together [from them], we detect in it the value that they have relative to each other. And the same applies to flowers and animals. In the case of the world, composition and blending can be seen to the extent that we can reduce it to the first substratum [sc. prime matter] by removing and separating off its qualities.

[3] The world is said to be 'generated' because it is always in [the process of] coming to be, changing, like Proteus, into all sorts of shapes. Accordingly, earth and the [other components] of the world below the moon are continuously changing into each other, while the [parts] above the moon, although they are more or less unvarying in their matter and undergo very little change, change in their outward appearance, just as a mime, while remaining one and the same person, takes on many different appearances¹⁰⁹ according to the nature of his gestures. Thus even the heavenly [regions] change and form different patterns with the movements of the planets relative to the fixed stars and of these relative to the planets.

[4] And [the world] is said¹¹⁰ to be 'generated' because its being is [derived] from another source, namely from God, through whom it is ordered. In this way, even for those for whom the world is quite definitely everlasting, the light that the moon gets from the sun is generated, even though there has never been a time when it has not been illuminated by it.¹¹¹

If anyone wishes to say that it is in [any of] these senses that the world is generated according to Plato, let him, but not if a time [of generation] is intended and [they mean] that it originally did not exist but later came to be. [Plato] himself shows how he should be understood when he says¹¹² '[whether it has always been,] without a beginning, or has come to be, having started from some beginning'. The words 'without a' and 'some' make it clear that he does not mean us to understand a beginning with respect to time in the way that we say that Ephorus¹¹³ began his *History* with the Return of the Heraclidae. (Some claim that the beginning that is associated with creating (*kata to dêmiourgoun*) is of a different kind; the creator, the pattern 15

20

10

25



 $\mathbf{5}$

15

and matter are, [they hold], beginnings.¹¹⁴ But these cannot properly be called beginnings.¹¹⁵) Moreover, he does not say¹¹⁶
'and is body' but 'and has body', indicating that it can be described as generated because its nature is of a kind, [namely,] corporeal, whose being consists in coming to be.

Thus the aforesaid gentleman.

- Proclus subscribes to the third and fourth [of these] senses [of 'generated']. He too claims that Plato says that the world is generated not on the ground that it has had a beginning to its existence but [1]
- 5 on the ground that it has its being in coming to be^{117} and also [2] that it is generated in that it has come to be through the agency of God and is not the cause of its own being – that is, that it is generated with respect to causation.

And Porphyry adds other senses of 'generated' to those enumerated by Taurus. He says that a thing which is described as [subject to] generation¹¹⁸ is said to be generated even though it has never

- 10 to] generation¹¹⁸ is said to be generated even though it has never [actually] come to be; examples are words and syllables, because they can be analysed into letters and are composed of letters, and diagrams, [among which] rectilinear figures, for example, are notionally
- 15 divided into triangles and constructed from triangles. It is, I presume, clear that this comes to the same thing as being composed of matter and form, for things which are generated in the sense that they are not simple but composed of matter and form are said to be generated on the same basis as diagrams are [said to be]: because things simpler
- 20 than either,¹¹⁹ out of which their composition and into which their dissolution notionally (*theôreitai*) take place, are conceived of as having prior existence, they are, in contrast to things that are simple from every point of view and carry with them no notion of composition, referred to as generated. Therefore these two [senses] should be
- 25 regarded as one.¹²⁰ And perhaps this is why the other of [our two] commentators¹²¹ [sc. Taurus] has not even mentioned this sense. In addition, Porphyry says that things which derive their existence
- 149,1 from a [process of] generation and coming to be, for example a house or a ship or a plant or an animal, are also said to be generated. For this reason we do not describe a flash of lightning or a snapping of the fingers or anything else that exists and ceases to exist in an instant
 - 5 as generated; as Aristotle also says,¹²² all such things come to be without [a process of] generation and switch to non-existence without [a process of] decay.¹²³ It is clear that nobody would hold that the world is generated in the sense of having come to be through a [process of] generation, for God brought all things into existence together with the thought. This being so, we shall have no need of this sense [of 'generated'] in our investigation of Plato's meaning.¹²⁴
 - Finally, Porphyry says [that things which are called generated in the] familiar, everyday sense, things that have had a beginning from

30

148,1

a [point of] time¹²⁵ without previously having existed, a sense in which he claims Plato did not describe the world as generated, are said to 15be generated.¹²⁶

And so this leaves the remaining four senses in the field, that is, [1] things which are in the genus of things which are generated even though they have not [themselves] come to be, [2] things which are generated in the sense that they are composed of matter and form (the sense which has Porphyry's vote), [3] things which have their 20being in coming to be, and [4] things which are generated with respect to causation. I think that we should take each of these [senses] in turn and ask whether it can be shown to be in accord with Plato's intentions. For once they have all been invalidated, the only alternative left, whether they like it or not, is that Plato described the world as 25generated with respect to time.

9. The first hypothesis [as to the meaning] of 'generated' [in relation to the world] (that is, that it belongs in the genus of things 150,1which are generated¹²⁷ even though it has not [itself] come to be) seems to me to be rather as though one were to say that a thing is in the genus of corporeal things even though it is not a corporeal thing, or in the genus substance even though it is not a substance. And what 5 could be more ridiculous than that? Genera are predicated synonymously of what falls under them. So just as man, since it belongs to the genus of animals, is an animal, and stone, being in the genus of corporeal things, is a corporeal thing, so must anything in the genus of visible things be a visible thing and anything in the genus of things 10which are generated be generated. And if it is by any means possible for a thing which has not come to be¹²⁸ but actually exists to be in the genus of things which are generated, as they say the world is, then by conversion by negation¹²⁹ it is also possible for a thing to have come to be although it is not in the genus of things which are generated. 15But a thing which is not in the genus of things which are generated must, one imagines, be ungenerated. So there will be an ungenerated thing which has come to be. If these things are impossible (for one and the same thing will be opposite things at the same time and in the same respect), then it is also impossible for anything which has not come to be to be in the genus of things which are generated; for the 20one follows from the other.

And there is another way in which the argument can be brought to the same absurd conclusion. If Plato when inquiring whether the world belongs to the class of things which are generated or of things which are ungenerated, opposed 'generated' and 'ungenerated', and if when conceding that it is generated, he meant, as the philosophers believe, that it is generated in such a way that it is in the genus of things which are generated even though it has not come to be, then for him 'ungenerated' likewise signifies something that is in the genus of things which are ungenerated even though it is not [actually]

25

151,1

ungenerated. Therefore the same thing will both be ungenerated because it is in the genus of things which are ungenerated and also not ungenerated because it has come to be. [And] therefore [both sides

 $\mathbf{5}$

of] a contradiction will be true of the same thing in the same way at the same time.

But in my opinion, these [arguments] are more deserving of ridicule than of rebuttal. Even body¹³⁰ below the centre [of the universe¹³¹], since it belongs to the genus of visible things, will certainly, I presume, be visible by nature. If it is never seen, it is not because it is not visible by nature that it is not seen but because there

- 10 are solid bodies in the way [and] our sight cannot penetrate things which are not transparent. If the obstructing [bodies] were removed it would certainly be seen like anything else – and if there really had been anyone with eyes which, like those of Lynceus¹³² in the myth,
- 15 could 'easily see beneath the surface of the earth',¹³³ he would even have been able to see objects contained [in the regions] below the centre of the earth.¹³⁴ And so if the world too actually exists and is in the genus of things which are generated, it must also of necessity
- 20 have come to be; [for] even though the origin of its generation has not come down to us, [this is] not because it is by nature ungenerated (in that case it would belong in the genus of things which are ungenerated rather than in that of things which are generated) but because our knowledge can only grasp things that currently exist.

And besides, a visible thing does not possess visibility by virtue of being seen¹³⁵ but by being of a nature to be seen; being seen is something that happens to it through a relation to seeing agents (*ta horônta*). For this reason, even if there is a visible thing that has

- 152,1 *horônta*). For this reason, even if there is a visible thing that has never been seen because it is contained [in the regions] below the centre of the universe, it will none the less possess [the property of] being visible. It remains unseen because there are things in the way,
 - 5 not because it is not of a nature to be seen. Hence, if the obstacles were removed and something to see it were present, it would be seen straight away. And so a thing may be visible but never be seen, for to be seen is not the same as to be visible. But it is not possible for a thing that has never come to be and never will come to be to be
 - 10 generated; a thing that is generated does not possess the [characteristic of] being generated just by being of a nature to come to be but by the certainty that it has either come to be or is going to come to be; for generation is its path into existence. And it is impossible for something that has not yet come to be, is not now coming to be and is not of a nature to come to be at some time in the future either to be
 - 15 generated or to be described [as generated]. So, in whatever sense the world is said to be generated, there is every necessity that it have come to be in exactly that sense. It is not possible for it to be generated and not either have come to be, or be in the process of coming to be, or be going to come to be [in the sense] in which it is [described as]

generated; otherwise it would not be generated at all. So if the world has not come to be [in the sense] in which it is generated, then it must 20certainly be the case that it is neither coming to be now nor going to come to be [in that sense], for the world would not be in one state now and another at another time. And so, if it has not come to be [in the sense] in which it is generated, it will not come to be at all. And if it has neither come to be nor will come to be, it is not generated. And so it is not possible for something that has not come to be [in the sense] 25in which it is generated to be generated.

Finally, in addition to what has been said already, it is worth noting that Plato does not simply say that the world is 'generated' but 153.1everywhere uses 'has come to be' of it. In one place he says¹³⁶ 'we who are about to discuss with regard to the universe whether it has come to be or is ungenerated (agenês)', in another¹³⁷ 'whether it has always been, having no beginning [to its] generation, or has come to be, 5 having started from some beginning. It has come to be; for it is visible and tangible and has body', in yet another,138 'time, then, came to be along with the heaven, in order that, having been produced together, they may also be dissolved together', and [he uses] such [language] throughout. And if Plato explicitly refers to it as 'having come to be' 10 and not just simply as 'generated', then surely those who say that it is generated because it is in the genus of things which are generated but that it has never yet come to be are, guite apart from the fact that this hypothesis, as we have shown, issues in absurdity, in open 15contradiction of him.

This, then, is our refutation of their first [supposed] sense of 'generated'.139

10. Second came things that are notionally composite even though they have not [actually] been composed with respect to time. For although all bodies are composed of matter and form, they have not been composed with respect to time as a result of the coming together of matter and form. Matter can never be observed free of 20forms or be discovered [in that condition], nor indeed can enmattered forms existing alone apart from matter; uncombined¹⁴⁰ (ta hapla) they can be known only in thought. Only by it [sc. thought] are bodies resolved into substratum and form and composed once more out of 25these. They claim, then, that the world too is generated in the sense that we can notionally resolve it into its components, that is, the first 154.1substratum and the qualities stamped upon it. It is this sense of 'generated' that Porphyry above all subscribes to. Here, at any rate, $\mathbf{5}$ to quote his exact words, is what he says in the second book of his commentary on the *Timaeus*:

Those who claim that [Plato believes that] the world is ungenerated with respect to time and that it is in some other sense that he describes the world as generated must be ready, after

[first] enumerating the senses of 'generated', to determine which
of these senses the argument he advances for its having come to
be fits. For if it were not the case that he *demonstrated* that it
has come to be, it would be unclear in what sense he has
predicated 'having come to be' of the world, but if he does
advance a demonstration of this point, it is clear that he will be
describing the world as generated in whichever of the senses of
'generated' this demonstration fits and evident that any sense it
does not fit is eliminated. For Plato was by no means so witless
as to make assumptions that were invalid and in no way calculated to establish his conclusion.¹⁴¹

20 After these remarks, and after enumerating the senses of 'generated' which were listed above,¹⁴² Porphyry states that the world is described as generated by Plato in the sense that it is composed of matter and form. The passage runs as follows:

I say, then, that [it is] in what we have shown to be the proper sense of 'generated', that is, that which is composed of matter and form; after first explaining that the demonstration fits this meaning, we shall show that the demonstration is in accord with it and that he has selected its axioms appropriately. For, if a thing is 'visible and tangible and has body',¹⁴³ since [this means that] it will be¹⁴⁴ three-dimensional and resistant [to touch] and with bulk, it will not be simple but composed of matter and form.¹⁴⁵

Thus Porphyry.

- 5 **11.** In reply to all of these people, one can in the first place point out that to use words that [normally] have one meaning in another, rejecting customary terminology, is an act of great license and wilful-
- 10 ness. If what they say were true, they should be able to point to a place in the dialogues where Plato clearly substitutes 'generated' for 'composed'. But neither has the common usage of mankind ever yet substituted 'generated' for 'composed' when it has wanted to describe something as composed, for usage knows that 'generated' means one thing, 'composed' another, nor, if anyone [at all] has anywhere clearly substituted 'generated' for 'composed', can [Porphyry], to my know-
- 15 ledge, provide us with evidence of this from any other early [philosopher] or prose-writer. As we shall show when examining his views¹⁴⁶ in another place,¹⁴⁷ when Aristotle enumerates the senses of 'gener-
- 20 ated' and 'ungenerated' in the first book of *On the Heaven*,¹⁴⁸ he nowhere distinguishes being composed of matter and form as a sense of 'generated' or being simple and incomposite as a sense of 'ungenerated'. How, then, could it be anything but absurd for Plato himself or

156,1 anyone else to so lightly replace normal word-usage by the novel and

unfamiliar? And, in particular, if he is really not employing the everyday sense but one that is unusual and unfamiliar, they are bringing a very serious charge against Plato, [namely], that of not first distinguishing the senses of 'generated' and then indicating which sense he is writing about. We have already shown¹⁴⁹ that this kind of practice is sophistical in the extreme.

But even if one were to overlook all of these considerations and concede to them that, in addition to its other senses, 'generated' may mean 'composed of matter and form', [problems would remain]. [For then] it would, I imagine, be perfectly obvious that if¹⁵⁰ in the [passage] at the outset where he defines the problem he is setting himself (when he says¹⁵¹ that he is going to consider 'whether the universe 15has come to be or is ungenerated (agenês)') he is saying nothing other than that he is going to ask whether the world is simple or composed of matter and form (for if 'generated' means 'composed' in this passage for Plato, 'ungenerated' will clearly mean 'incomposite'), then 20when he subsequently states the actual problem [in the words] 'whether the world has always been, having no beginning [to its] generation, or has come to be, having started from some beginning', ¹⁵² he is without a doubt asking what he indicated at the outset, [that is], whether the world is simple or composed of matter and form. And so, 25thanks to this great license in the substitution of words, [the words] 'has always been' will also be employed as the equivalent of 'simple'; for when in the sequel he asks¹⁵³ 'whether [the world] has always been or has come to be', he is (substituting 'has always been' for '[is] ungenerated') posing the question that he said he intended to pose at the outset,¹⁵⁴ that is, whether the world has come to be or is ungener-157.1ated. So if 'generated' means 'composed' and, as a result of this, $\mathbf{5}$ 'ungenerated' necessarily means 'incomposite and simple', and Plato has substituted 'always is' for 'ungenerated', then, according to him, 'always is' also means 'incomposite'.155 And why did Plato have to resort to such extreme misuse of words when he should have conveyed his meaning concisely and in everyday language and said 10 'whether the world is simple or composed of matter and form'? For who ever substituted 'always is' for 'simple and incomposite'?

But let that too be conceded to them. If we substitute 'incomposite 15and simple' for 'always is' and 'is composed' for 'comes to be', as has been decreed by these latter-day linguistic lawgivers, the whole passage will read something like this: 'whether the world is simple, having no beginning to its composition, or whether it is composed, having started from some beginning'. But once again they are unable 20to conceal the truth. For if Plato is solely concerned with the question 'whether the universe is simple or composite', what does he mean by the addition 'having no beginning [to its] generation'? And, moreover, why does he add 'having started from some beginning' after 'has come 25to be?? It would have been enough just to say 'whether it has always

 $\mathbf{5}$ 10

been or has come to be'. So by asking 'whether, always being (that is,

- 158,1 "being simple"), it has no beginning to its generation (that is, according to them, to its composition), or whether it has come to be (that is, "has been composed"), having started from some beginning', and deciding that it has come to be (for he says: 'It has come to be'), he is
 - 5 clearly stating that the world has been composed, having started from some beginning; for the whole of what he is asking is 'whether it has come to be, having started from some beginning', and he decides that it *has* come to be, having started from some beginning.

And so Plato is acknowledging that the composition of the world had a beginning, which is again to say that its being and existence did. For it was stated¹⁵⁶ that in the case of things that are composed of matter and form it is only in thought that the simple [elements] are conceived of as prior to the composites. The creator did not first bring matter and form into existence separately and combine them later,

- 15 but brought that which is composed of them into being at the same time as the simple [elements]. For matter and form are relatives and the one cannot exist without the other. So if he states that the composition of the world had a beginning and that God brought the simple [elements] and the composites formed from them into being at
- 20 the time of this composition, then, in assigning a beginning to the composition of the world, Plato also provides it with a beginning to its existence. For the existence of the world and its composition are not different things; it exists and is composite at the same time.
- 12. If one does not understand 'beginning' and 'having started' in this passage¹⁵⁷ temporally (by a temporal beginning I mean, as has been repeatedly stated,¹⁵⁸ not one that has taken place within a part of time, time already being in existence, but [for a thing] to begin existing along with time, which had not previously existed¹⁵⁹), one must, I imagine, understand 'beginning' causally.¹⁶⁰ If there is some
 - other sense of 'beginning', it will not help us with the present inquiry,
 so to go into it needlessly would be a waste of time.
 According to Plato, everything that comes to be has six causes: the material, the formal, the efficient, the paradigmatic, the instrumen-

tal, the final.¹⁶¹ (In the case of a house, the builder is the efficient cause; the pattern is the plan in his head (*en autôi*) after which he builds the house; the matter is the stones and timbers; the form, its

- shape; the instrument[s], the straight-edge, the plumbline, the chisel, and the rest; the end, the purpose for which it is made, [namely,] to shelter us from rain and heat). In my opinion, it is not possible to understand 'beginning' in the present context in any of these senses.
- 15 For [Plato] writes 'whether it has always been, having no beginning [to its] generation', adding 'having no beginning [to its] generation' after writing 'has always been' because if a thing always exists it follows that it has no beginning [to its] generation. So if 'generation'

20 is being substituted for 'composition' and 'always is' for 'is simple and

incomposite', and if 'beginning' is not to be understood temporally but as referring to the efficient cause or the form or one of the other [causes], it will follow that nothing simple and incomposite has any of the beginnings of composite things. (The beginnings of composite things are the six mentioned above.) Therefore nothing that is simple will have a form or a pattern or a final or efficient cause. Therefore God is the maker only of perceptible things, and forms can be seen only in them. Therefore no rational soul, or any of the other intelligibles, is a form or will have a pattern or an efficient or final cause.

And, further, if by 'beginning' he means one of [the six] mentioned $\mathbf{5}$ above, what does he mean when he writes 'or has it come to be, having started from some beginning? Why [, I mean,] does he write 'having started from some beginning', in the singular? If he intends 'beginning' to refer to the causes of composite things, and if these are many, (and in the case of the world according to Plato himself those enumer-10ated [above] with the exception of the instrumental; for God does not need an instrument to bring anything at all into being), why ever, after using the plural when denying a beginning to that which always is (by writing that 'that which always exists has no beginning [to its] generation'), does he use the singular when asserting that that which 15comes to be has a beginning, and add the indefinite adjective 'some' as well, when he writes 'or has it come to be, having started from some beginning', when he should have used the plural, and written 'having started from a number of beginnings', if, as Plato himself holds, the causal beginnings of composite things (which we have listed above¹⁶²) are indeed multiple? And even so it would be ridiculous to take 20'having come to be' as equivalent to 'being composed' and ask whether something that is composite is composed of a number of simple [elements], since this would be like asking whether something composite is composite rather than simple.

And, moreover, what does 'having started' signify? If 'having started' is not temporal in the present context, the only remaining alternative is to take it too as equivalent to 'having been composed', so that the whole of what Plato writes reads like this: 'or is composite, being composed from some beginning'. (For, it seems to me, they will prefer to spout any nonsense rather than accept Plato's plain and true meaning.) But nothing composite is composed of some [one] thing but rather of a number. So why does he write 'having started (i.e. having been composed) from some beginning'?

And if anyone wants to take 'beginning' in this passage to mean just the efficient [cause], clearly we shall also take it to mean the efficient cause when he writes '[whether] it always was, having no beginning [to its] generation'. [And], as before¹⁶³ (*palin*), taking it as a consequence for things that always exist that they have no efficient cause (*poiêtikên arkhên*), Plato is stating that only perceptible things come to be through the agency of an efficient cause and that none of

37

25

160.1

25

161.1

 $\mathbf{5}$

the intelligibles does. And so God is the creator of perceptible things only and all intelligibles, of which our soul is one, are without a causal origin.

- 15 If this is absurd, then it is not possible to understand¹⁶⁴ 'having started from some beginning' in terms of any of the six causes. And so Plato means that the world started its existence from a [point of] time. For if, as Porphyry rightly holds,¹⁶⁵ no one is so devoid of wit as
- 20 to claim that Plato used invalid premisses, then anyone who believed that Plato makes hypotheses that lead to innumerable conclusions that are either worthy of ridicule or are absurdities of the grossest kind and who claimed that he employs incorrect words and uses
- 25 ambiguous terms without distinguishing their proper senses and that he is careless of the normal meanings of words and uses words in novel $(all \hat{o}n)$ senses unknown to the Hellenes,¹⁶⁶ would, I presume, be even more bereft of wits. But this is what these extraordinary
- 162,1 hypotheses¹⁶⁷ reduce Plato to. So neither, then, does 'generated' mean 'composed of form and matter' for Plato, nor in the present context can 'a beginning [to its] generation' mean anything other than one with respect to time.
 - 5 **13.** That the word 'beginning' means a beginning with respect to time for Plato in the present context may also be gathered from what he says elsewhere in aporetic vein about the formation of the world. Here, to quote his exact words, is what he says in the sixth book of the *Laws:*¹⁶⁸
 - Every man should be well aware of this much at least. Either the human race had no beginning at all and will never have an end but always was and ever is and will be, or else the passage of time since its beginning must have been immeasurably long.¹⁶⁹
 - 15 And in the $Epinomis^{170}$ the same [Plato] says this of all of the inhabitants of the heaven:

And we must consider all the inhabitants of the heaven to be kinds of living creatures, which we must surely call the divine race of stars, which has been allotted the fairest of bodies and the happiest and best of souls. And we are pretty much bound to assign to it conjecturally one of two lots. Either each of them is utterly and of absolute necessity imperishable and immortal and divine, or each has a lengthy and adequate term of life beyond which it would need nothing more.

25 So if, in aporetic mode, he says in these passages: 'We must hold one of two opinions about the lot of the human race and of all the 163,1 inhabitants of the heaven. Either they had no beginning [to their]

generation at all, and for this reason will have no end either, but always were and will be, or it is a great time since they first came to be and they have existed for an immeasurable age, the heavenly $\mathbf{5}$ bodies having a lengthy span of life',¹⁷¹ and if he leaves the puzzles that he raises unresolved because it is not part of the task he had set himself in the $Laws^{172}$ to write about the generation of the world as a natural scientist would, but again raises the very same question for consideration in the *Timaeus*, [where he writes] 'whether the world has always been, having no beginning [to its] generation, or whether 10 it has come to be, having started from some beginning',¹⁷³ and [there] decides that the world has come to be and has a beginning [to its] generation, it is surely clear to everyone that, by puzzling once more in the *Timaeus* over the same beginning that he had puzzled over in the Laws, he is making it clear that this beginning is the generation 15of the universe. And if in the Laws he is clearly puzzling over whether the heavenly bodies and the human race have a temporal beginning or not, then in the *Timaeus* too he is declaring that it is by having started from some temporal beginning that the world has come to be. And that Plato is not, as Porphyry believes,¹⁷⁴ arguing from invalid premisses when he states that the world has a temporal beginning 20will be demonstrated a little later.¹⁷⁵

14. And how could it be in keeping with Plato's sagacity to agonise over a theory which is so obvious and which is familiar to everybody 25 who has as much as dabbled in natural science and which was, moreover, accepted by all natural scientists who preceded him, [namely, the theory] that every corporeal object is composed of substratum and form (even though [these scientists] did differ over what each of these is), as though he were about to solve some new problem for us, and to call upon the gods and goddesses to be his co-workers in discovering whether the world is a composite thing, being composed of matter and form, or whether it is, on the contrary, simple, that is to say, incomposite?¹⁷⁶

And why does he conduct his investigation as though it relates [only] to the universe as a whole? The problem as to whether it is constructed of matter and form is not one that is peculiar to the 10 universe (that is, the world) *qua* universe but one that arises in relation to any and every individual corporeal object that is generated and perishable, as for instance a particular volume of water or earth. Porphyry himself is a witness that this is true. Although he has previously stated that the world is said to be generated in that it is composed of matter and form, later, when commenting on the words 15 'the god, taking over all that was visible, not at rest but moving in a discordant and disorderly manner',¹⁷⁷ he, to quote his exact words, writes this:

The making of the world and the creation of body are not the

20same thing, nor are the beginnings of body and of the world the same. For the world to come to be, both bodies and God must exist, for bodies to, there must be matter, God, and supervening [form]¹⁷⁸ (one lot so that the matter may become body, and another to give order to the things that have become body). All 165.1of these always come into existence at once and not separately over time, but instruction necessarily separates them so as to be able to explain that which comes to be accurately. The beginnings of body are God, who is the begetter, matter, and the shapes that [Plato] will tell us about later, the things from which bodies are composed being begotten of God; those of the world 5 are bodies, which already exist through the agency of God, and God, who gives them order.¹⁷⁹

And a bit later:

10

15

20

It should be taken as evidence that the framing of body and that of the world are not in Plato's view the same thing and that at this point [the creator] takes over not matter but bodies that have been produced from matter, that he says that what is taken over is visible – and what could visible things be other than bodies? Matter in his view is invisible and formless, being apprehended only with difficulty by [a kind of] spurious reasoning¹⁸⁰ – and that he goes on to show the generation of bodies even though he has [already] shown the framing of the world in this passage. After the generation of the world he *returns* to the generation of body.¹⁸¹

Now, if Porphyry can write this, which is both true and [an accurate account of] Plato's position, why is it that earlier, when he was claiming that the world is generated as being composed of matter and form, he lost sight of the fact that the beginnings for the composition of the world are not matter and form but bodies already composed of matter and form, and that it is the composition and ordering of these

- that have made the universe? And if matter and form are not the beginnings for the world, then when Plato asks whether the world has come to be and has a beginning to its existence, he is not asking whether it is composite, being composed of matter and form. As Porphyry himself says, this is the [mode of] generation of bodies, not
 - 5 of the world, and Plato has undertaken to investigate the generation of the world first with the intention of investigating the generation of bodies afterwards. Porphyry himself, then, constrained by Plato's express words, has handed us a concise refutation of the present hypothesis [as to the meaning of] 'generated', but either he has not
 - 10 seen that these matters are relevant to each other and that a contra-

diction is escaping his notice, or he has seen this but thought that he can keep quiet and so cheat the reader.

Nor, in my opinion, would anyone with any sense claim that even though it is not, for the reasons that have just been given, possible that the world was described as generated by Plato as being composed of matter and form, it can nevertheless be so described as being composed of more than one body. No one with eyes and [any powers of] observation¹⁸² would ask whether the world is a single, simple body or whether it is constituted of more than one. Nobody puzzles over things that can be clearly grasped by our senses.

Those, then, who have foisted¹⁸³ these stupid hypotheses onto Plato are themselves completely stupid and truly devoid of wit. But this hypothesis too has now been adequately refuted and we shall move on to the examination of those that remain.

15. The third sense of 'generated' was that according to which the world has its being in coming to be. It is this sense above all that Proclus endorses in his comments on the passages under discussion. 167.1At any rate, in the work that we mentioned earlier¹⁸⁴ entitled AnExamination of Aristotle's Criticisms of Plato's Timaeus, when argu- $\mathbf{5}$ ing against Aristotle, who himself supposes that the world is everlasting but charges Plato with making it generated from a [point of] time (we have explained¹⁸⁵ in what sense 'from a [point of] time' is used in the case of the world), he endorses what Aristotle says about 10 the everlastingness of the world but claims that his accusations against Plato are unjust. In [Plato, he claims,] 'to have come to be' does not mean 'to have a beginning of being' but 'to be always coming to be'; supertemporal and eternal things have their being and their power and the perfection of their activity present to them all at once, 15but nothing that exists in time has its own life present to it all at once. For if, he says,

something is in time, even if it lasts for an infinite time, it exists at some [particular] time (for as much of it as there is [at a given time] is in a particular [part of] time, for time does not exist all at once), but it comes to be *ad infinitum*, not at some [particular] time.¹⁸⁶

So he states that the universe is generated in the sense that it does not exist in the same way as things that always are but comes to be throughout the whole of time, always existing at each present moment.¹⁸⁷ And he further states that the universe is generated in the sense that it is not the cause of its own being but exists through the agency of another, which is the fourth sense of 'generated', namely, that which is generated with respect to causation. Thus Proclus too claims that Plato describes the world as generated in two senses – the last two – of 'generated'.

16. I myself agree that Plato posits that all perceptible things 5

25

20

25

168.1

have their existence in coming to be; he does, after all, say,¹⁸⁸ with reference to all perceptible things, that 'the latter, which comes to be and perishes but never truly is, may be conjectured by belief along with irrational sensation'. He holds, however, that this generation is not beginningless but has had a beginning to its being,¹⁸⁹ [before which] it did not previously exist – which is precisely what Aristotle objects to;¹⁹⁰ for his saying that the world has its being in coming to be is not automatic proof that Plato does not [also] say that this generation originates from some beginning. Individual things, all of which likewise have their being in coming to be, have one and all had a beginning to their being. In fact Plato's own words will show that he does not believe that the world is beginningless. 'Whether', he says,¹⁹¹ '[the world] has always been, having no beginning [to its] generation, or has come to be, having started from some beginning'. Observe that the question he puts to himself is whether [the world] has no beginning [to its] generation or whether it has come to be, having started from some beginning. It follows that he is seeking the beginning of the generation of the world. If by 'has come to be' he had simply meant that it has its being in coming to be, it would have been enough to say 'whether it has always been, exempt from generation, or has come to be'. (Although it would have been even more appropriate to say 'or is coming to be'). But he actually says 'having no beginning [to its] generation' and, again, 'or has come to be, having started from some beginning', always linking [the idea of] beginning with [that of] generation. [And whereas] a thing that is everlastingly coming to be 'has no beginning [to its] its generation', he actually says that the world 'has come to be, having originated from some beginning'. For because [the words] 'has come to be' would perhaps have seemed to some to indicate that the world [not only] exists through the agency of the creator but has received its existence from everlasting (as Plato says is the case for eternal things, which have received their being from God but exist eternally without [having originated] from any beginning), he rules out this notion as far as the world is concerned by adding 'having started from some beginning' after [the words] 'has come to be'. Observe how he is clearly telling us two things, namely, that the world has its being in generation and that this generation has had a beginning to its being. On the one hand, by means of [the words] 'it has come to be, having started from some beginning' he indicates that its generation is not everlasting but has

had a beginning; on the other hand, by going on to say 'for it is visible and tangible and has body, and, [as we have seen], all such perceptible things, since they may be grasped by belief along with sensation, clearly come to be and are generated'¹⁹² after [the words] 'it has come to be', he indicates the continuity of the generation of perceptible

20 things given that they have their being in coming to be. For it is no accident that in this passage, in writing '[as we have seen], [all such

10

15

20

25

169,1

 $\mathbf{5}$

10

perceptible things] clearly come to be and are generated', he adds 'generated' to 'come to be' again; [he does so] in order to show once more that the coming to be that he is referring to is not that of things that have existed from everlasting without any beginning but of things that have a beginning to their being. He is, then, as I have said, putting forward both of these positions. And he assigns the appropriate tense to each. To the beginning of being [he assigns the perfect tensel 'to have come to be', writing '[whether] it has come to be, having started from some beginning'; to the unbroken generation and change [which continues] unceasingly thereafter, [the present tense] 'to come to be', writing '[as we have seen, all such perceptible things] clearly come to be and are generated'. 'To come to be' is indicative of continuance in the present, which fits the continuous generation and alteration of the world; 'has come to be' signifies completed action in the past, which accords with the first beginning and origination of the generation of the world.

But seeing that Plato, if anyone, was well-versed in the correct use of words and used them correctly himself and would never have dashed anything off at random, why should I digress to argue what is obvious and well-known to everyone? But if anyone *does* hold Plato guilty of a lack of discrimination in his use of words and takes 'has come to be' as equivalent to 'comes to be',¹⁹³ what is there to prevent us from imitating their self-willed license and understanding 'is coming to be' as equivalent to 'having come to be'?

And how can 'having started from some beginning' be in accord with [their interpretation]? Something that is always coming to be cannot have started from some beginning of its coming to be. What can he mean by this beginning with which he says the generation of the world commenced other than a beginning to its existence and a 20temporal beginning? It is not possible to think of matter or form or any other kind of beginning in the present passage. What could it mean to say that the world has come to be (i.e. has its being in coming to be) by originating from matter or form or any of the other [causes]? For what does it mean to say that the world, although it comes to be 25for ever, began its generation from matter, unless they change the meaning of 'began' here as well? But then he would once more be asking whether the world is composite, not whether it has its being in coming to be.¹⁹⁴ But we have [already]¹⁹⁵ refuted this. 171.1

That it is also impossible for 'beginning' in this passage to mean 'efficient cause' is clear from [a consideration] of things that always are and do not come to be. He states¹⁹⁶ that these 'have no beginning of generation'. And so it would follow that, as far as Plato is concerned, none of the intelligibles has an efficient cause, which is false, and absurd as well. If that *were* the case, it would be necessary to introduce many beginnings and not just one; as many in fact as there are intelligibles. But it is agreed that all things have a single origin.

25

170.1

10

 $\mathbf{5}$

15

 $\mathbf{5}$

- 10 And, moreover, if this was what he was asking (I mean whether the world has its being in coming to be), why did he answer 'it has come to be' and not 'it is coming to be'? And, again, why did he not write '*starting* from some beginning' rather than 'having started'?¹⁹⁷ To say 'always coming to be' is to encompass the origins of coming to
- 15 be in the present, and a thing of this kind is always beginning to come to be, and has not *begun* to come to be. And why does he write in the singular and without making distinctions when there are, as we have said,¹⁹⁸ a number of distinct beginnings of things that come to be?

It would seem, then, that in the present context 'beginning' can only mean a beginning of being and existence. This should suffice as a refutation of the third [alleged] sense [of 'generated'].

17. It remains to consider in connection with the fourth category of the 'generated', which is the generated with respect to causation, whether when Plato says that the world has come to be, he means that it has come to be only with respect to causation; for, as I said,¹⁹⁹ Proclus subscribes to this opinion as well, claiming that the universe

- 25 Proclus subscribes to this opinion as well, claiming that the universe is described as generated by Plato on the ground that it is not like 72.1 that which always is and is not the sole cause of its own being but
- 172,1 that which always is and is not the sole cause of its own being but exists through the agency of another. And so he takes it that 'generated' is also used by Plato on the ground that the world is not the cause of its own being but has received the cause of its existence from
 - God. And Porphyry too, even though he has stated that the world is described as generated by Plato because it is composite and 'most truly'²⁰⁰ [for that reason] at that nevertheless goes on to say that it is described as generated with respect to causation. At any rate, commenting on the words 'this is in the truest sense²⁰¹ [its] cause according to wise men, etc.',²⁰² he writes as follows:

If this is the beginning of the world in the truest sense²⁰³ and it did not begin to come to be of itself and was not self-sufficient but arrived on the scene through the agency of God, coming to be through the agency of being,²⁰⁴ and if the being of God is his goodness, [then] God would in the true sense be its cause. And what is more, when he puzzles over 'whether [the world] has always been, having no beginning to its generation, or whether it has come to be, having started from some beginning',²⁰⁵ we must understand him to be in doubt as to whether it exists as it is independently, without a maker, or came to be through the agency of another and owes the beginning of its being to another.²⁰⁶

Well, in the first place I am at a loss as to how the same Plato asking in regard to the same world in the self-same [piece of] teaching 'whether it has always been, having no beginning to its generation, or whether it has come to be, having started from some beginning'

20

25

15

could be asking at the same time whether it has come to be with respect to causation, whether it is composite, whether it has its being in coming to be, and [whether it has come to be] in any of the other 173.1senses of 'generated' that they add [to these]. In my opinion at least, the manner in which they pass so easily from one sense [of 'generated'] to another on different occasions is a very strong indication that they are giving a forced interpretation to Plato's words. Being unable $\mathbf{5}$ to agree among themselves on a single sense of 'generated' [that holds good] for Plato throughout, they assume the one that suits them best in each passage.

[And], secondly, if [his use of the words] 'has come to be' does not indicate that the world has a beginning to its existence but that it has 10 its existence from God and is not itself the cause of its own existence, Plato should have asked in so many words whether the world has its existence from God or not, and avoided the ambiguity of the word 'generated' so as not to leave his intention in any doubt. The greatest criticism that can be levelled at a dialectician is that he has used 15ambiguous terms [in framing] his questions or propositions without any qualification or distinction between the various senses of the terms.

18. And that it is not even possible to see a reference to coming to 20be with respect to causation alone in the words 'whether it has always been, having no beginning [to its] generation, or has come to be²⁰⁷ is clear from the following considerations.

If [the statement] that the world has come to be means for Plato that its existence has an efficient cause, and if he opposes 'having come to be' and 'not having come to be' (for he says²⁰⁸ 'we who are about to discuss with regard to the universe whether it has come to 25be or is ungenerated (agenês)', and again,²⁰⁹ 'whether it has always been, having no beginning [to its] generation, or has come to be'), it is clear that since [the words] 'it has not come to be' are being used as 174.1[they would be] in a [dialectical] problem,²¹⁰ they mean the opposite of 'it has come to be', that is, that its being has no efficient cause. So if we take 'it has not come to be' as equivalent to 'its being has no $\mathbf{5}$ efficient cause' and 'it has come to be' to the opposite of that, we get something like this: 'We who are about to discuss with regard to the universe whether it exists through the agency of some efficient cause or not', and again, [in the other passage], 'whether the world has always been, having no creative cause of its existence, or whether it 10 was brought into being through the agency of some efficient cause'. But I do not really imagine that Plato believed that [our] conception of the creator is so ambiguous as to think that we need to consider 15right at the outset, not just in regard to the world but in regard to everything - for he says²¹¹ 'about it we must first ask the question which one should begin by asking about anything' - whether its existence depends on God or whether the contrary is the case and

each thing has independent existence (*automaton huparxin*). What is obvious is not made the subject of a [dialectical] problem. Aristotle says²¹² that 'Whether the gods should be honoured' is not a dialectical
problem, for those who do propose such [topics as problems] are in need of chastisement rather than [dialectical] argument. I strongly reject the idea that [Plato] believes that one should ask in regard to anything and everything whether it exists thanks to the creator or independently and without an efficient cause. As Aristotle says²¹³ in his work *On the World*:

- 25 It is an ancient and ancestral tradition among all men that all 175,1 things come from God and that it is thanks to God that they exist for our benefit, and that there is nothing in nature that is independent and self-sufficient and entirely without the maintenance he provides.
 - So how could anyone with any sense at all fail to respect even [our] 5 common conception of God and make the question whether each thing that exists owes its existence to God as its creator or is the cause of its own existence the subject of a dialectical problem?

On the other hand, in the case of things of which it is not clear whether they have had a beginning to their existence or not, as with the human soul and the world and some other things, Plato does think it makes sense that the first question of all asked about them should be whether they have had a beginning or not. It is because he was aware that this is a matter of doubt for most people as far as the human soul is concerned that he states²¹⁴ clearly in the *Timaeus*:

15 We are currently endeavouring to talk of the soul as later, but God did not make it junior to [the body]; having joined them together, he would not have allowed the elder to be ruled by the younger. It is, I suppose, because there is so much of the chance and random in our make up that we speak pretty much in that vein. Accordingly, since the soul was to be the mistress and to rule [the body] as her subject, he constructed the soul prior and senior to the body in both birth and excellence from the following materials and employing the following method.

He is aware, then, that it is the common view that the human soul is later [in origin] than the framing of body. So in the case of things of which it is doubtful whether there was a beginning to their being or not he holds that the first problem of all that should be investigated when considering them is whether they have always been, having no beginning to their generation and their existence, or whether they have had a beginning to their being, not having existed previously. Therefore, since there are those who suppose that the world has

176,1

existed indefinitely and is without a beginning and those who suppose that it has had a beginning, not having existed previously, Plato has with reason undertaken to look into this ahead of the other questions that arise in connection with it.

And if one thinks that it is doubtful in the case of the entire world whether it has its existence from God or not, and if the same applies to each individual [part] as to the whole, then surely one would have to suppose that it applied a *fortiori* to intelligibles. So Plato would be inquiring in the passage under discussion (en toutois) whether any-10 thing that exists at all has come to be through the agency of God rather than each thing being the cause of its own existence. This is equivalent to asking whether God is a creator at all or whether he is entirely devoid of any such power. For anyone who thought it appropriate to ask in regard to everything there is whether it has its 15existence from God would in effect be treating it as an open question whether God has the power to create at all.

Unless, then, Plato, matching the godlessness of the Epicureans, 20has decided that there is so much doubt in regard to God's creative activity that he thinks it appropriate to ask about each thing that exists whether it has God as the cause of its existence or not, and whether God is a creator at all or not, [the words] 'whether it has come to be or is ungenerated $(agen \hat{e}s)^{215}$ (which are cast in the form of a [dialectical] problem) are not asking whether the [world] has come to be or not come to be with respect to causation. 25

Here is another argument. How could it be other than irrational to invoke God as a co-worker in one's investigation of the world on the ground that he is the cause of all good things, even the most insignificant, and then express doubt and puzzlement as to whether the universe has received its existence from God? For at the outset of his discourse on the world Plato's Timaeus speaks²¹⁶ as follows:

Yes, Socrates, everyone with any sense at all certainly always invokes the gods at the outset of any undertaking, however small it may be. So, if we aren't completely out of our minds, we who are about to discuss with regard to the universe whether it has come to be or is ungenerated must invoke the gods and goddesses and pray that all that we say shall above all be pleasing to them, and secondly to ourselves.

So if it is usual for everyone, however little sense they may have, to invoke God at the outset of every undertaking, however small, and if this very act of supplicating God and seeking his assistance in all 15things is that of one who accepts his mastery and dominion over all things and that it is from him that being and well-being flow for all things, how could it be other than irrational and a lapse into grossly contradictory statements in regard to the same subject for Plato to

47

 $\mathbf{5}$

177.1

5

say that God should be invoked [to assist in] investigating whether the universe has received its existence from God or whether, on the

- 20contrary, the world is the cause of its own being? This would be tantamount to saving that one should invoke him who is the cause of the universe to assist in an investigation of the universe [which will consider] whether he is the cause of the universe or not. Therefore
- [the words] 'whether the world has come to be or is ungenerated'217 do 25not mean for Plato that it has either come to be or is ungenerated with respect to causation.
- And here is another consideration that shows the impossibility [of their reading]. Plato writes:²¹⁸

We must in my opinion begin by making a distinction between that which always is and has no generation and that which comes to be but never is. The former may be grasped by thought using reason, the latter may be conjectured by belief along with irrational sensation.

Now since the generated with respect to time and the ungenerated with respect to time are opposed to each other, as too are the generated with respect to causation and the ungenerated with respect to causation, and since Plato opposes the generated to the ungenerated

- (he writes 'we must first make a distinction between that which 10 always is and has no generation and that which comes to be but never is') and says that everything perceptible is generated and everything intelligible is ungenerated, there is every necessity that if by that which comes to be he means that which comes to be only with respect
- 15to causation, then by that which does not come to be he likewise means that which does not come to be with respect to causation. But he says that everything intelligible is ungenerated. Therefore he means that everything intelligible is ungenerated with respect to causation. And therefore, according to them, Plato holds that God is not the cause of any of the intelligibles. And therefore God will be the
- 20creator only of perceptible things. And if this were so, there would no longer be a single origin $(arkh\hat{e})$ for all things but each intelligible will itself be the cause of its own existence and there will be as many origins $(arkh\hat{e})$ as there are intelligibles. So, [as we have seen.] it is

25worth looking [closely] at the absurdity they foist upon the philosopher as a result of this extraordinary hypothesis of theirs. Not that these are [really] the views of Plato. On the subject of the cause of all things he writes²¹⁹ in his letter to Dionysius:

179,1All things exist in relation to the king of all, and all things exist on his account, and that is the cause of all beautiful things.

and again, in the fourth book of the Laws:²²⁰

178.1

God, as the ancient account has it, holding the beginning, the end and the middle of all things that exist, completes his unswerving course, revolving according to nature['s laws],

the ancient account that he refers to being either that of Orpheus, who writes:

Zeus was first, Zeus of the bright lightning is last, Zeus is the head, Zeus is the middle, through Zeus all things are wrought,²²¹

or the notion that all men hold in common of the god that presides 10 over all things, inasmuch as he is the cause of all things. At all events Aristotle, as we mentioned a little earlier,²²² says²²³ in the book that he has written about the world that:

it is an ancient and ancestral tradition among all men that all 15 things come from God and that it is thanks to God that they exist for our benefit, and that there is nothing in nature that is independent and self-sufficient and entirely without the maintenance he provides.

And again the same [Aristotle], in book twelve of his *Metaphysics*,²²⁴ having demonstrated that the cause and beginning of all things is 20 one, repeats Homer's apophthegm that:

the rule of many is not a good thing; let there be one ruler.

But what need is there to adduce further evidence from these [philosophers] when the matter is clear to all [and] when [Plato] shows God as the creator of both the soul of the world, which is intelligible, and of all rational souls in the *Timaeus*?²²⁵

So if Plato actually believes that God is the cause of all things, of those that are first, of those in the middle, and of those that are last, then when he says that intelligibles have not come to be, he does not mean that they have not come to be with respect to causation, but that they have not come to be with respect to time. And if he has acknowledged that intelligibles do not come to be and that perceptible things, which he has set in opposition to them, do come to be, and if he has set the generated in opposition to the ungenerated in the same way as he has the perceptible to the intelligible, then he is also saying here that perceptible things have come to be with respect to time and not [that they have come to be] with respect to causation; he will talk about their efficient cause a little later.

19. If, in reply to the above, someone were to claim that by 'that which comes to be' Plato means 'that which comes to be with respect to causation' but by 'that which does not come to be' not 'that which

25

5

10

is ungenerated with respect to causation' but 'that which is ungenerated with respect to time', he would, through his own lack of education, be accusing the philosopher of a profound ignorance of the

- 15 technique of division since that which is ungenerated with respect to time is encompassed by that which is generated only with respect to causation but not with respect to time. And indeed, according to them, the world, being generated only²²⁶ with respect to causation, is
- 20 ungenerated with respect to time; and rational souls likewise. But [in carrying out a division] nobody opposes an including [class] to an included. Rational [creature], for example, is not opposed to living creature. One will not²²⁷ say that of animate creatures with the faculty of reason, some are living creatures, others rational [crea-
- 25 tures], for rational [creature] is included in living creature. And nor [will one say] that of things there are, some are substances, others bodies. In this case body is included in substance. What we actually say is that of living creatures, some are terrestrial, others aquatic
- 181,1 (neither of these is included in the other), and, again, of things there are, some are substances, others accidents. And no more, therefore, will that which is ungenerated with respect to time be opposed to that
 - 5 which is generated with respect to causation because, as I said,²²⁸ that which is ungenerated with respect to time is encompassed by that which is generated only with respect to causation.

But why should I waste words attempting to prove what is obvious [to everyone, namely,] that Plato was the first and almost the only [philosopher] to observe the [full] rigour of the technique of division, that he continually sings its praises and dubs it the coping-stone of philosophy,²²⁹ and that he finds fault with those who, like bad butchers, divide things up without taking their joints into account?²³⁰ Plato explicitly tells us in the text [of the *Timaeus*] that he opposes the intelligible

- and the perceptible and being and non-being. His words are:
- We must in my opinion begin by making a distinction between that which always is and has no generation and that which is always coming to be but never is. The former may be grasped by thought with the aid of reason, the latter may be conjectured by belief along with irrational sensation.²³¹

And so Plato would not have botched the division into generated and ungenerated by opposing that which is ungenerated with respect to time but not ungenerated with respect to causation to that which is generated only with respect to causation but not with respect to time. Observe, at any rate, how in this passage too the antithesis that he constructs is between things that are opposed in all respects, for he sets not-being in opposition to being and 'never' to 'always'. And since

25 the being he is referring to is not the being which is opposed to 182,1 complete not-being (to that kind of not-being is opposed that which is

20

in existence in any way at all) but that which is in the sense that it is always completely the same and unchanging and is never observed to undergo change or alteration, in order to oppose its opposite to *that* kind of being, he sets in opposition to it not that which is not through non-existence but that which is never completely the same because it is observed to be in continuous alteration. So just as the opposition that he constructs in this passage is between things which are opposed in all respects and are unable to coexist, so, surely, when he sets that which comes to be in opposition to that which does not come to be,²³² is he [quite] consistently constructing a division into contradictories, for that which comes to be and that which does not come to be are unable to coexist with one another.

And so if 'not having a generation' does not mean 'not coming to be with respect to causation', but 'not having a temporal beginning to its being', it is certainly necessary that 'coming to be' should likewise mean the opposite of that, that is to say, 'having had a temporal beginning to its being'; and, conversely, if 'coming to be' means 'coming to be with respect to causation' and not with respect to time, then 'not coming to be' likewise means 'not coming to be with respect to causation'.²³³

But we have shown²³⁴ that this verges on impiety and is false, for Plato everywhere states it as a philosophical principle (*pantakhou pephilosophêken*) that the cause of all things is one. So if this is false, 'always being and having no generation' must mean 'ungenerated with respect to time'. And therefore the 'generated' which is opposed to this means 'generated with respect to time'.

20. But what need is there to deal with these matters at length when it is possible to provide concise proof that Plato does not use 'comes to be' or 'has come to be' to describe generation with respect to causation anywhere in the passages we have been considering (en 183.1toutois)? For having talked of generation and beginning with respect to time in the passage where he says 'it has come to be; for it is visible and tangible and has body',²³⁵ because he is aware that certain of the $\mathbf{5}$ natural philosophers²³⁶ who preceded him believed that the world has come to be from some beginning and is not everlasting, but almost all of them save one were ignorant of its efficient cause and only gave an account of its material causes, as though the production of form and [the advent of] order take place spontaneously, and only [this man,] 10Anaxagoras, as though awaking from a dream, as Plato himself says,²³⁷ set mind over the universe and credited it with being the creative cause, Plato himself, after arguing that the world has come to be and has had a beginning to its being, immediately goes on 15without a break to tell of its efficient cause,²³⁸ saying 'and, once more, we say that what has come to be must come to be by the agency of some cause; for it is impossible for anything to have a generation without a cause'.²³⁹ [And] he does not put this forward in the form of

51

- 20 a problem but as one who draws a conclusion that follows from previously accepted [premisses]; for once it is agreed that a thing is generated it is immediately and self-evidently also implied that there is an efficient cause of this generation. So without a doubt either
- 184,1 nature or art is the efficient cause of each thing that has come to be. The natural philosophers who came before him, once they had agreed that the world has come to be, should have drawn the same conclusion and at once found their way back to²⁴⁰ its efficient cause. Aristotle too
 - 5 rebukes them for [failing to do] this in the second book of the *Physics*.²⁴¹ It is a matter for amazement, he says, that, although they said that in the case of animals and plants nothing either exists or comes to be by chance and held nature or mind responsible for everything that comes to be in these spheres, they claimed that the heaven and
 - 10 the most divine of visible things [i.e. the heavenly bodies] have arisen spontaneously, and this although order is inescapable in the universe and nothing has come about²⁴² by chance in the heaven. So for this
 - 15 reason Plato too, having shown that the world is generated, deduced from this its efficient cause.

But if, as [these] learned men believe, he has already told us about the efficient cause in the passage where he says²⁴³ that the world has come to be, having started from some beginning, how is it that, as though he has not previously mentioned it, he now adds 'and, once more, we say that what has come to be must come to be by the agency

20 more, we say that what has come to be must come to be by the agency of some cause; for it is impossible for anything to have a generation without a cause?²⁴⁴

The matter can also be looked at in this way. If 'to have come to be, having started from some beginning' meant to have come to be with respect to causation, that is to say, to have an efficient cause of its existence (and if, after saying 'It has come to be', he had continued 'and, once more, we say that what has come to be must come to be by the agency of some cause'), he would have been saying something like this: 'and, once more, we say that what has come to be from some

- 185,1 cause must come to be by the agency of some cause'. And this would amount to saying that something that comes to be through the agency of a cause comes to be through the agency of a cause, which is ridiculous.
 - 5 But even earlier, in the passage where he writes 'that which always is and has no generation and that which is always coming to be but never is',²⁴⁵ Plato has once more made it clear that there too he is not referring to generation with respect to causation but to generation with respect to time, all but saying 'of things there are, some
 - 10 always are, while others have had a beginning to their being and to their coming to be'. For after distinguishing between 'what always is and has no generation and what is always coming to be but never is', because he has been teaching [us] about things that either always are or come to be with respect to time, he at once adds [a reference to] the

efficient cause of those that come to be when he writes²⁴⁶ 'but every-15thing that comes to be necessarily comes to be through the agency of some cause; for it is impossible for anything to have a generation without a cause'. [And] he obviously talks throughout of generation and of the efficient cause separately because, as far as he is concerned, [a thing's] coming to be does not indicate [the operation of] an 20efficient cause; for [otherwise] the addition of 'but everything that comes to be necessarily comes to be through the agency of some cause' would be superfluous. For if when he says²⁴⁷ 'it has come to be; for it is visible and tangible and has body', he means by 'having come to be' not 'having a beginning to its being' but 'having come to be through 25the agency of some efficient cause', why does he also add 'but everything that comes to be necessarily comes to be through the agency of some cause?? This would again be equivalent to saying 'everything 186.1that comes to be through the agency of an efficient cause comes to be through the agency of an efficient cause', which is ridiculous.

Therefore for [Plato] 'having come to be' means not 'having come to $\mathbf{5}$ be with respect to causation' but 'having a beginning to its being'.

21. It is a matter for amazement how these learned Platonic commentators [first] muddy the waters by dreaming up a host of meanings for 'generated' and then, so as not to seem to be contradicting the doyen of all philosophers when he puts forward the hypothesis that the world is generated with respect to time, concede, as though 10 losing heart in the face of the refutation provided by the truth and forgetting about their own arguments, that the world is indeed described by Plato as generated in the sense that it has come to be from some beginning without having previously existed but claim that these things are being said [purely] hypothetically by the 15philosopher for the sake of clarity of exposition and not because the nature of things is really thus. For instance, the previouslymentioned²⁴⁸ Platonic commentator Taurus, commenting in his commentary on the *Timaeus* on the lemma 'we who are about to discuss with regard to the universe whether it has come to be or is ungener-20ated',²⁴⁹ writes, to quote his exact words, as follows:

Even though it is ungenerated. And the Poet²⁵⁰ [likewise] 'even though it were²⁵¹ later in birth'. And [this is] proof that the world is ungenerated. At any rate he is saying that he will 'say²⁵² that it has come to be, even though it is ungenerated'; for even in the case of things that are ungenerated accounts (logoi) [which treat them] as generated are produced as an aid to exposition.²⁵³

And again, a little later, the same man writes:

What then are the reasons for his hypothesising that the world is generated when it is ungenerated? They are two, both philo-

25

187.1

sophical. The first exhorts to piety, the second is employed for the sake of clarity.²⁵⁴

Because he is aware that most people only think of something that is prior in time as a cause and believe that otherwise $(all \hat{o}s)$ there is no cause, and there is a danger that they will as a result start looking closely at the existence of providence, and because he wishes to implant the belief that the world is governed by providence, for the sake of those who are capable of understanding that this is so even otherwise $(all \hat{o}s)^{255}$ he provides a subtle hint that the world is ungenerated with respect to time, but for the sake of those who cannot²⁵⁶ [grasp this] he describes it as generated and prays that they believe what he says in the hope that they will at the same time be persuaded about providence.

And the second reason is that an account [of something] is clearer when we encounter it as though it is actually taking place. In this way people construct diagrams that have not [really] been constructed as though they are [in the process of] being generated.²⁵⁷ Euclid, [for example,] because it was [a] simpler [figure], defined the circle as 'a figure circumscribed by a single line [such that] all of the straight lines meeting it from [just] one of the points within it are equal to each other',²⁵⁸ but because he wanted to show the sphere as though [in the process of being generated, defined it as 'a semicircle rotating, while its diameter remains stationary, until it returns to the same point', although if he had wanted [to describe] one already in existence, he would have defined it as 'a figure circumscribed by a single surface [such that] all of the straight lines meeting it from [just] one of the points within it are equal to each other'.²⁵⁹ And it was Plato's practice to present things in the process of development for the sake of exposition. In this way in the *Republic*,²⁶⁰ for example, he shows the city as it develops so that the origins of justice will become clearer during its establishment.

10 [It is true that] Theophrastus, after remarking that 'perhaps he describes it as generated for the sake of clarity, in the way that we follow diagrams as they develop', continues 'but perhaps [its] generation is not of the same nature as that of diagrams'.²⁶¹ And Aristotle says²⁶² the same thing. For he too asserts that in the case of diagrams it is possible to postulate [the presence of] 15contraries at the start but that it is not possible in the case of the generation of the world, as though one were postulating [the presence of movement and rest, and order and disorder [at the same time].²⁶³ But rather than demanding that all of these models be exactly alike, let them show that the world is not more 20easily understood if it is assumed to be in the process of coming to be than if he had described it as ungenerated. And how *can*

10

15

20

188.1

5

 $\mathbf{5}$

[the presence of] contraries be postulated even in diagrams? How could one postulate that a triangle is at rest and in movement at the same time?

So the world is in [Plato's] view ungenerated. And nobody should bother trying to show that it is generated from the *Atlantikos*²⁶⁴ or the *Statesman*.²⁶⁵ He will not find anything in his other writings able to serve as evidence that it is generated in the²⁶⁶ *Timaeus*; the world is no less ungenerated in them.

How [the world] is [in fact] ungenerated and the reasons why [Plato nevertheless] describes it as generated has [now] been stated. So in so far as he hypothesises that it is generated it will be imperishable on account of God, but in so far as he [really] knows it to be ungenerated it will be imperishable on account of its own nature, just as all other ungenerated things are imperishable.

That is what the man says. And Porphyry,²⁶⁷ and all who have 10 come after him down to the present day, claim that the world is described by Plato as generated with respect to time [purely] hypothetically for the sake of clarity of exposition.

And let nobody accuse us of idle chatter because we are spending time on the refutation of views of this kind. If any of the arguments recorded above seem worthy of credence to anyone, then, I imagine, our refutation [of them] will certainly also seem in order (*akolouthos*). But should anyone have considered [their] hypothesis unconvincing, then it is assuredly not the person who reaps the corn but the one who has sown the seed who is responsible for the harvest. And what has seemed an unconvincing position to one person often strikes the mind of another as convincing. We must proclaim the truth free of all obstruction.²⁶⁸

Well then, if Plato (whatever his reasons may be for so hypothesis-25ing) hypothetically describes the world as having come to be with respect to time 'even though it is ungenerated',²⁶⁹ what need²⁷⁰ was there for them to waste words on the enumeration of the many senses of 'generated'? If Plato hypothesises a beginning to the generation of 190.1the world for the sake of piety or exposition, then it could no longer be true that the world is described by him as generated in one of the senses listed above.²⁷¹ In that case, both the 'objective of piety' and the 'method of exposition' will have gone by the board. For it is not $\mathbf{5}$ possible at one and the same time to describe the world both as generated in [one or more of] those senses and, for the sake of either piety or didactic method, as having a beginning to its being. For if when he describes the world as generated he means that it is generated with respect to causation or in the sense that it is composite and 10 not [that it is generated] with respect to time, how can they claim that it is being hypothesised to come to be and have a beginning to its

189,1

55

 $\mathbf{5}$

being for the sake of piety or exposition? The former position is destructive of the latter.

- Besides, if Plato, as they claim, hypothesises that the world is generated with respect to time for the sake of clarity of exposition, then he would certainly have said in so many words 'it is by nature ungenerated', but for the sake of clarity let us think of it as coming to be', so that nobody would take what was being put forward hypothetically for plain truth.
- 20 Moreover, to believe that Plato for piety's sake assigns a beginning of generation to the world even though it is ungenerated so that God's providence in regard to it will be believed is silly in the extreme. In the first place, he teaches this clearly everywhere in that he puts God
- 25 in control of the creation of the universe and explains the reasons for God's having made each thing the way it is. What need would he have had of a false hypothesis to teach what he had been teaching without
- 191,1 it? And, secondly, their hypothesis will involve his leading men into the worst kind of impiety. For if God must, if the world has not existed from everlasting, have, as they hold, of necessity been neither perfect
 - 5 nor good before the world existed, and if Plato, as they claim, adopts the hypothesis that the world has come to be from some beginning, and indeed prays that this will be believed, without anywhere indi-
 - 10 cating his reasons for doing so, then, by refraining from saying in any of the dialogues that the world is ungenerated but on the contrary everywhere loudly proclaiming its generation, he is persuading those who believe him to accept impious notions. And, moreover, although he also wishes rational souls to be governed by God's providence, he loudly and clearly proclaims in the *Phaedrus*²⁷² that they are ungenerated without the least fear that they will be deemed to be bereft of it.
 - 15 **22.** Moreover, it is extremely audacious to alter the meanings of²⁷³ words so readily. For in fact [this] Platonic commentator²⁷⁴ thinks that the disjunctive or interrogative conjunction 'or' is being used for²⁷⁵ the hypothetical conjunction 'if' in accord with a poetic usage.
 - 20 Later²⁷⁶ I shall quote a passage in which the Aristotelian commentator Alexander [of Aphrodisias] refutes [the claim that there is] such a substitution of conjunctions,²⁷⁷ and in my opinion its absurdity is self-evident. In the first place, to accept poetic substitutions as a feature of Platonic²⁷⁸ prose²⁷⁹ is one of the most absurd things imag-
 - 25 inable, especially when the Poet [sc. Homer] used such substitutions of conjunctions rarely or even just once, as those who have scrutinised his writings indicate.²⁸⁰ And besides, even though this violent substitution of conjunctions would have been possible in the present
- 192,1 passage, what follows could not be treated in the same way. For just as Plato opposes the ungenerated to the generated in the present passage when he says,²⁸¹ defining the goal he has set himself, that he is going to consider whether the universe has come to be or is

ungenerated, so does he immediately afterwards express this [same $\mathbf{5}$ question] in the form of a [dialectical] problem²⁸² when he asks²⁸³ 'whether it has always been, having no beginning [to its] generation, or has come to be, having started from some beginning'. So if in this latter passage he is clearly stating that he is considering whether the world always is, having no beginning [to its] generation, or has come 10 to be, having started from some beginning, expressing these alternatives in the form of a puzzle without subscribing to the view that the world is ungenerated, then even more surely is it the case that in the earlier passage, where he gives notice that he is going to investigate in this work 'whether the universe has come to be or is ungenerated', 15he is not using 'or is ungenerated' for 'even though it is ungenerated' and the conjunction 'or' has the sense that it properly bears in a puzzle²⁸⁴ and disjoins ungenerated and generated, so that only one of them, and not, as Taurus believes, both, is being hypothesised of the 20world.

And besides, if one were to take 'it has come to be'285 in one of the senses listed by Taurus, one would, I assume, also have to take 'not having come to be' as the negation of that same sense; for a negation denies what an affirmation asserts. So if they take 'it has come to be' 25as equivalent to 'it has come to be with respect to causation', then 'not having come to be' ('not having come to be' is equivalent to 'ungenerated') must be understood to mean 'not having come to be with respect to causation'. The whole sentence would then read 'we who are about to discuss with regard to the universe whether it has come to be with 193,1respect to causation or is ungenerated with respect to causation'. And the same [would apply] in the case of the other senses [so that we would get] 'whether it is composite or is not composite', [or] 'whether it has its being in coming to be or does not have its being in coming to 5 be'. But what could be more ridiculous than this? The man has, without due consideration, changed the [meaning of the] phrase²⁸⁶ straight off,²⁸⁷ without first checking to see whether his interpretation is going to be in every respect consistent in what is said by Plato later as well.

And those who alter²⁸⁸ 'or is ungenerated' to 'or is always coming 10 to be' involve themselves in the same absurdity. For by changing 'ungenerated' to 'always coming to be' they too are in their turn introducing something that is not present [in the text].²⁸⁹ But, ironically, as a result of this addition, they are unwittingly advocating something closer to the truth and arguing the opposite of what they 15 intend. If the question that Plato is putting is 'whether the universe has come to be or is perhaps always coming to be', there is every necessity that when he opposes 'having come to be' and 'always coming to be' he means by 'having come to be' having come to be from a [point of] time and not always existing. So when, in what [immediately] follows, Plato looks at this problem and determines that the world has come to be (he says²⁹⁰ 'it has come to be; for it is visible and tangible, etc.'), it is clear, even after their shameless tampering with the text, that he is denving the continuous becoming of the world.

2523. To the senses of 'generated' enumerated [above] some add the following [additional one]. They say that the universe is described as 194.1generated by Plato because it is in everlasting movement. Hence, they say, he describes it as coming to be and perishing but never truly being²⁹¹ for none of the heavenly bodies ever remains in the same place.

The reply to this is brief.

- In the first place, Plato is concerned with the whole world and not 5 just the heavenly bodies, and the universe, as long as it is in existence, does not move or change in any way at all as a whole but remains in the same place. And so Plato is not using 'come to be' instead of 'be in movement'.
- Secondly, the fact that the heavenly bodies are in continuous 10 movement is recognised by our senses and we need nothing but our eyes to grasp it. Surely Plato is making himself ridiculous if he says,
- as though about to tell us of secrets that have neither been compre-15hended by nor revealed to any of his predecessors, that he must invoke the gods and goddesses to join him in investigating the universe in order to determine whether the heavenly bodies exhibit local movement or are motionless,²⁹² being so unobservant that he makes things which, because they are known through sense-perception,
- 20have stronger warrant than any deductive proof [can provide] the subject of a [dialectical] problem. Who with any sense would ask whether fire burns or if white lead is white? And so Plato is not describing the world as generated in this sense either. So, since all of [their] hypotheses as to [the meaning of] 'generated' have been re-
- futed, and the only one that is left is the normal, everyday one, I mean 25195.1[that it is] generation with respect to time, and since Plato explicitly declares that the world is generated and has come to be, the only remaining possibility is that Plato describes it as generated with respect to time, that is, as having had a beginning to its being – for
 - this, as we have often stated, is what '[generated] with respect to 5 time' means in the case of the world.

24. Since they advance as a factor which is strong evidence²⁹³ that the world is not [really] being said by Plato to be generated with respect to time but [only] hypothetically the fact that in the Timaeus²⁹⁴ soul is similarly represented as coming to be but in the *Phaedrus*²⁹⁵ is clearly affirmed to be ungenerated. I consider it reasonable to devote a few words to the dismantling of this ingenious [fabrication] of theirs as well.

Now, it is plain to everyone that the rational soul is part of intelligible substance and therefore has a being (ousian) which is separable from all body; when it submits to a relation with body, it is

58

10

potentially intellect, but the status and name of soul accrue to it through its relation to body - for it is called soul because it animates²⁹⁶ body and gives it life; but when it has been separated from the body, 20whether through [an acquired] capacity²⁹⁷ or through being unyoked from the physical bond²⁹⁸ at the same time, and thereafter operates on the intellectual plane and grasps the nature of things by direct apprehension, it is from that very moment intellect in actuality and referred to as such. And so it is soul in one respect, intellect in 25another, and at one time exists in relation with body, at another by itself, without any relation and freed from the body, just as, for 196,1instance, the same person is both a man and a helmsman, but the former in his own right, the latter through the relation that he has to a ship.²⁹⁹ This being so, if the *Timaeus* teaches the generation of soul in so far as it is intellect and without relation to body, we shall, since $\mathbf{5}$ he declares in the *Phaedrus* that this is ungenerated, concede that he is describing it as having come to be [purely] hypothetically. But if, in the *Timaeus*, he is explaining the nature of the relation that it has to 10 body qua soul, in virtue of which it orders and moves the heavenly bodies in this way or that, what need is there in that case for him to be speaking hypothetically when, in the *Timaeus*, he describes it as coming to be, if, as we have shown,³⁰⁰ Plato assigns a beginning of being to the whole world? As soon, then, as the bodily element in the universe came into existence the soul entered into a relation with it; 15for even when they talk of our soul coming to be in the body they are not, I assume, predicating generation of its substance but of the relation within the body, which takes its beginning from a [point] of time.

And that what is written in the *Timaeus* about the generation of 20the soul is doing nothing else but teaching the movements of the heavenly bodies and the relations to one another which they derive (if they are indeed, as Plato believes, animate) from soul, can be proved from the words of the *Timaeus* itself. For Plato says there³⁰¹ 25that God, taking the being that is midway between the being which is indivisible and is always in the same state and the being which is divisible in the region of bodies and along with it sameness and otherness, mixed these three together and stretched them out into a 197,1straight [strip] and then, cutting this [strip] up according to harmonic ratios, split it lengthwise into two, then having joined these two strips together to form a cross, bent [each of] them round and joined their ends together to make two circles, an outer one and an inner one, $\mathbf{5}$ joined to each other at two points, and then started the outer circle moving to the right, the inner to the left and, he says, called the outer one the revolution of the Same, the inner [the revolution] of the 10Other, and left the outer circle unsplit but split the inner at six places to make seven unequal circles, exceeding each other by the double and triple intervals, making three of them equal in speed (tôi takhei

- 15 *tês kinêseôs*) but the other four unequal in speed (*têi kinêsei*) both to each other and to the three. Given that this is what Plato has to say in the *Timaeus* about the generation of the soul, is anyone so inept at distinguishing the truth that they will not concede from [these] words alone³⁰² that Plato is here teaching the movement of the heavenly
- 20 spheres and their relations to one another, which he believes derives from soul which is mounted upon them – especially when in other living creatures both movement and the arrangement and relation to
- 25 one another of the parts of the body originate from the soul within them? So Plato is, in the riddling manner of the Pythagoreans, referring everything in the effect that comes about through the agency of the cause back to the cause, just as we often say that the 198,1 soul hungers or thirsts, referring the awareness of a lack which arises
 - in the body through the agency of the soul back to the soul itself.

For those who are interested, a more detailed examination of these matters may be found in the earlier commentators we mentioned above.³⁰³ They too, even though they claim that the world is everlasting and that it is [morely] hypothetically that Plate teaches the

- ing and that it is [merely] hypothetically that Plato teaches the generation of the soul, nevertheless understand the outer circle in this passage as the sphere of the fixed stars and the inner, by splitting which at six points [God] made the seven circles of the planets, as
- 10 those of the planets.³⁰⁴ (Some understand the outer circle as the celestial equator and the inner as the zodiac, which, cutting each other crosswise, touch at two points [in] Aries and Libra. This is
- 15 because the sphere of the fixed stars has the same axis as the celestial equator and moves around its poles while the planetary spheres move around those of the zodiac). The outer of these circles, namely, the sphere of the fixed stars, God, says Plato, set in movement to the
- 20 right, and the inner, that is to say, the planetary spheres, to the left, calling the eastern parts the right and the western the left as does Homer, who for his part writes:

whether they go to the right, towards the east and the sun, or to the left, towards the murky gloom. $^{\rm 305}$

- 25 For the sphere of the fixed stars does move from east to west and the planetary spheres vice versa. He calls the movement of the outer circle that of the Same because of the sameness of the movement of
- 199,1 the fixed stars; for all of the fixed stars carry out movements of equal duration and travel around the same circle, always rising from the same points and setting at the same points. The inner movement, on
 - 5 the other hand, that is to say, that of the planets, [God] called, says [Plato], that of the Other, evidently because of the differences in the movements of the planets. Their movements are not of equal duration and not the same for each. They do not each travel around one and
 - 10 the same circle nor does a given planet always have its risings and

 $\mathbf{5}$

settings at the same points. He says that of the seven inner circles three are equal to each other in speed (he means that of the sun, that of the morning star, and the one that is named for Hermes; for these planets, keeping pace [with one another], travel around the whole 15 circle in a year) and the remaining four (that is the spheres that are named for Kronos and Ares and Zeus and that of the moon) unequal both to each other and to these [sc. the three], that of Kronos traveling around its circle in approximately thirty years, that of Zeus in almost twelve, that of Ares, for its part, in approximately two and that of the moon in a month.

They need, then, to take care that they are not creating difficulties for Plato in regard to his account of the generation of the soul when they persist in trying to persuade us that Plato believes that the world is ungenerated and is giving us a [merely] hypothetical account of its generation. And besides, if this were true, why has he not, just as he elsewhere explicitly declares the soul to be ungenerated,³⁰⁶ brought himself to tell us in one or other of his works that the world too is ungenerated, but on the contrary everywhere loudly declared that it is generated and has come to be and is by nature dissoluble?

25. Since Porphyry claims that Plato's proofs relating to the coming to be of the world are not such as to prove that the world has come to be with respect to time and from this draws the conclusion that Plato does not in fact mean that it has come to be with respect to time, I think it makes sense to consider this question too, beginning by quoting Porphyry's own words. This is what he says:

Further, let us see which sense [of 'generated'] Plato predicates of the world and what his question is and which [sense of 'generated'] it best fits. [For argument's sake,] let us suppose that he is employing [the sense] that indicates generation from a [point of] time, that the question he is asking is 'whether [the world] has always existed, never having come to be from a [point of] time, or has come to be, having started from some beginning',³⁰⁷ and that his answer is that it has, on account of the proofs he provides, come to be from some temporal beginning. What, then, are these [proofs]? 'For it is visible and tangible', he says, 'and has body, and, [as we have seen], all such perceptible things, since they may be grasped by belief along with sensation, clearly come to be and are generated'. What could be more ridiculous than this? How does it necessarily follow that if it is visible and tangible and has body, it came to be with the beginning of time?

Self-evidence constitutes the strongest necessity of all, stronger than any deductive proof. Tell me, my fine fellow (ô *thaumasie*), how you establish the necessity of *your* argument when you claim that

25

5

10

15

20

200.1

Plato holds that the world is generated in that it is composite and assert that he offers as proof of this the fact that it is visible, tangible

 $201,1 \\ 5$

25

and has body? By what necessity is everything visible immediately also composite? Surely you invoke the senses as your witnesses, which for us human beings are certainly more to be relied upon than any argument? But we too agree that anything visible is composite. But just because visibility implies composition and, moreover, according to Plato everything that is visible is also generated, it does not necessarily follow that Plato uses 'generated' as a synonym for 'composite'. Anything that is visible and tangible and corporeal will also

- 10 as a consequence necessarily be three-dimensional, of finite size, always have shape, whether that shape be regular or irregular, and be continuous, and nobody would on that account believe that Plato
- 15 uses 'generated' to mean any of these. For why should one use 'generated' to mean 'composite' any more than 'finite' or 'continuous' or 'having shape' or any of the other necessary attributes of every
- 20 thing that has body? Each of these other things follows from being perceptible just as much as does being composite.

And we have only recently³⁰⁸ demonstrated that the world cannot possibly be described as generated by Plato on the ground that it is composite.

And we also affirm that Plato drew his evidence that not only composition but generation with respect to time as well is invariably associated with visibility and perceptibility in general from the observed facts. For Plato expressly states³⁰⁹ that the whole world is composed of the four elements – and Porphyry himself agrees with

- 202,1 this, as we shall show³¹⁰ when we get to the thirteenth proof³¹¹ of
 5 Proclus. For those with eyes, simple observation provides proof that all of the elements in all of their particular manifestations are generated and perishable. Any part of water or fire or earth or air that one cares to consider has invariably come to be in time and had a beginning to its being. And if all of the parts of water have come to be
 - 10 in time, and if the whole is nothing other than all its parts, then the whole too has come into existence at some point in time, with the result that the elemental masses³¹² are numerically different at different times. [It is true that] the transition of the elements into each other, which, because of the stability of the universe, takes place by
 - 15 replacement of what is lost, always seems to keep the elemental mass numerically the same: as water perishes it changes into, say, air, and air as it perishes in turn changes to water and restores the deficit of water, and the same applies to all [such alterations]. But just as a
 - 20 shipwright may from time to time replace damaged planking on a ship until he has eventually replaced the whole ship and turned it into a numerically different whole, so is it with an elemental mass; one part or other is always perishing and another coming to be in its

25 place, with the result that over a long period of time the whole

elemental mass changes. So if not even the elemental masses remain numerically the same, and if that which does not remain numerically the same has both begun to exist in time and perishes in time, it is clear that the elemental masses are, along with their parts, generated and perishable with respect to time.

And if we do not have knowledge of the original formation of the elements, that does not make it reasonable for us to think that they $\mathbf{5}$ have not had a beginning to their existence; the fact that they are currently subject to passing in and out of existence in their individual parts constitutes very adequate evidence that they have also had a beginning to their existence. And, further, everything which is, like plants, animals, minerals or anything else corporeal, composed of the elements both comes to be and perishes in time. Therefore if every visible and tangible (or, [to put it more] generally, perceptible) corpo-10 real entity is either an element or [formed] from the elements, and if these have been shown to be generated with respect to time, then every perceptible corporeal entity is generated with respect to time. So if the heaven, which, according to Plato, consists of these same elements, is a visible and tangible corporeal entity, then the heaven too should be generated with respect to time; for [the nature of] what is hidden becomes clear through [observation of] what is visible.

And for the same reason it will, according to Plato, also be, as far as the law of nature goes, perishable.

And, besides, it would seem to be irrational that, whereas the 20elements of the universe always have a temporal beginning and are numerically different at different times, the heaven, which is composed of them, should never have had a beginning to its existence, never have an end to it, and in between never undergo any change or alteration to its substance. It is on the basis of this [logical] necessity 25that Plato says that being generated with respect to time follows from being visible and from this infers that the world, being visible, is also generated.

And Plato could have reached this same conclusion by induction. If 204.1each individual perceptible thing (an animal, say, or water, or fire) is generated with respect to time, and after it another and another [of the same kind], and if all particular instances of the elements and their masses [behave] in this way, then all visible things are gener- $\mathbf{5}$ ated. But the world too is visible. Therefore it too must be generated with respect to time.

Another argument: If we have shown³¹³ that Plato does not employ 'generated' in any of the senses that they have come up with (for he is referring to generation with respect to time), and if he defines all things that have not come to be (that is, have not come to be with 10 respect to time), as capable of being grasped by thought with the aid of reason, then it follows by conversion³¹⁴ by negation that everything that is not intelligible undergoes generation with respect to time. And

203.1
15 everything that is not intelligible is perceptible and tangible. Therefore everything that is perceptible and tangible is generated with respect to time. And therefore in what comes next Plato is arguing consistently with his initial hypothesis; for having said that everything that does not come to be with respect to time is intelligible, he [quite] consistently says that everything that is perceptible rather than intelligible is generated with respect to time.

Therefore one must either refute the above [arguments] (I mean [those to the effect] that the generation which he denies to things that always exist is generation with respect to time and not some other kind,³¹⁵ a point which we have proved³¹⁶ by many arguments), or, should they remain unrefuted, if he says that a thing which is ungenerated with respect to time is intelligible, then it will certainly follow that everything that is perceptible rather than intelligible is generated with respect to time.

Therefore it is [quite] cogently and not [at all] invalidly that Plato concludes from the fact that the world is perceptible that it also has a temporal beginning.

- 205,1 **26.** It was adequately demonstrated earlier that when Plato states that that which always is has no generation, the generation that he is denying to it is none other than generation with respect to time, but one might reach the same conclusion equally well from what follows.
 - 5 I imagine that it is clear to everyone that it is that which is absolutely unchanging because it always remains exactly the same³¹⁷ that Plato refers to as 'always being'. Anything that is observed to undergo change or alteration he refers to as 'never being'. For a thing
 - 10 that is changing is no longer what it is changing from and not yet what it is changing into. So if a thing is observed in a state of continuous change, it will never be but always be coming to be. That this is what 'that which always is' means in Plato he explicitly tells us himself when defining it. His words are '[the former], always remaining the same and unchanging, may be grasped by thought
 - 15 with the aid of reason'.³¹⁸ And it is also clear from the passage where he says that that which comes to be never is; 'What', he [there] asks, 'is that which comes to be but never is?'³¹⁹ So, if 'that which comes to be' (i.e. that which is in [a state of] change) 'never is', then 'that which
 - 20 always is' is in every way unchanging. This means that [the phrase] 'and has no generation' is a clarification of 'that which always is', just as 'but never is' [is a clarification] of 'that which comes to be'.

This being the case, we should ask what kind of generation it is that Plato denies of that which always is. My answer is that it is generation with respect to time. A thing which is in every regard devoid of temporal origin $(arkh\hat{e})^{320}$ is in every way unchanging, and, conversely, if a thing has had a temporal origin with respect to 206,1 anything seen to be connected with it,³²¹ it is not absolutely unchang-

ing: in so far as it has had a beginning it has to that extent changed from not being to being. And so anything which is absolutely unchanging must be without a beginning with respect to time, for all change both takes place in time and takes its beginning from a [point $\mathbf{5}$ of time. And so anything which is without temporal origin is also devoid of all change. These terms, then, are convertible, and if something is completely unchanging, it is also above all temporal origin, and what³²² is devoid of all temporal origin is in all respects unchang-10ing.

It is with reason, then, that he says that that which always is (i.e. that which is in every way unchanging) has no generation with respect to time. And if someone should take 'having no generation' to mean 'lacking composition', let him explain by what logic someone 15who has asked 'what is that which always is' (that is, that which always remains the same and unchanging) would add 'and lacks composition'. Even if one were to concede a thousand times over that that which always is (i.e. that which always remains the same and unchanging) is simple and incomposite, it will still not be the case 20that everything simple and incomposite always remains the same and unchanging. The primary components of corporeal things are simple, namely, matter and form - for the analysis of composite [entities] does not proceed ad infinitum, but in analysing anything we of necessity always descend to simple [entities] - and one would not claim that these simple [entities] are in the class of things which 25always remain the same. For enmattered forms, as we shall show a little further on,³²³ dissolve into non-being and come back into existence again out of non-being, while matter takes on and casts off different forms at different times; so matter and form, although simple, are not in the class of things which always remain the same and unchanging. And even if enmattered forms were everlasting (which is impossible), because they appear in different substrata at different times (just as matter takes on different forms at different $\mathbf{5}$ times), they still would not, any more than does the human soul, have the characteristic of always remaining the same and unchanging. And colours too are simple but do not always remain the same and unchanging. So if Plato takes 'always being' and 'having no generation' as equivalent and meaning the same thing (for if a thing is 10 altogether without generation, and if 'simple and incomposite' is not equivalent to 'always being' - since not all things which are simple are things that always are - then 'always being' is not in every case 15consequent upon being simple and is not in a sense³²⁴ convertible with it as 'always being' is with 'ungenerated'), then when he writes 'having no generation' he does not mean 'having no composition'.

And that it does not refer to generation with respect to causation we have adequately demonstrated earlier.³²⁵ For Plato states that the first cause is [the cause] not only of perceptible things but of all 207.1

- 20 intelligibles as well, for the cause and origin $(arkh\hat{e})$ of all things is one; so if that which always is does not have a generation with respect to causation, and if he says that everything intelligible and free of generation always is, the first cause will not be [the cause] of all
- 25 things and the origin $(arkh\hat{e})$ of things will be not one but many, which is absurd. Therefore neither is it generation with respect to causation that he is denying of things which always³²⁶ are.
- 208,1 And that he does not by 'having no generation' mean 'having its being in coming to be' is clear from his not saying 'not coming to be' rather than 'having no generation' – for he refers to things that are in continuous generation and change as coming to be rather than as having generation, writing: 'What is that which comes to be but never
 - 5 having generation, writing: What is that which comes to be but never is?

And besides, it is not the case that if something began its existence from a [point in] time, it always has its being in coming to be and in continuous change. Take, for example, the centre of a [geometrically] constructed sphere or of a [geometrically] constructed circle. This has

- 10 had a beginning to its existence, but as long as it remains a centre is qua such (*hêi toiouton estin*) completely motionless and unchanging. Again, the knowledge that the three angles of a triangle are equal to two right angles has a beginning to its existence in a particular mind,
- 15 in the mind of Plato, for example, and, as long as loss of memory does not occur, remains the same and does not undergo change of any kind.³²⁷ And the particular triangle itself ([in] wood, for example, or one drawn on the board [by the geometer]) with its three angles equal to two right angles has similarly had a beginning to its existence, but
- 20 as long as it exists does not change *qua* triangle or in having its three angles equal to two right angles. And so a triangle does not have its being (that is, its [having its] three angles equal to two right³²⁸ angles) in coming to be. And the same could be shown of many other things. Therefore it is not the case that everything which has a beginning to 25 its existence always has its being in continuous generation and
- 209,1 change. However, if a thing is completely *without* temporal origin, it is also, as we have recently shown,³²⁹ above all change.

Given [all of] this, if when he says that that which always is has no generation, Plato means by denying generation of it to deny all

- 5 alteration and change of it, and if it is possible for a thing not to have its being in coming to be and not to be in continuous alteration but nevertheless have a beginning and an end to its existence and in that respect not be inalterable, and if such a thing is not in the class of
- 10 things that always are or of things that always remain the same and unchanging, then it was not this kind of generation (I mean [the kind whereby a thing] has its being in coming to be) that Plato denied of things that always are. So if, when he says that that which always is has no generation, Plato is not denying generation of it in any of its

15 other senses, [the only alternative that] remains is that he is denying

generation with respect to time of it, which is what we set out to prove.

It is so as to rule out *a fortiori* all thought of change in regard to eternal things that he rules out a temporal origin for them. We observe that all change takes place in time and begins from some 20point in time. So a thing which is outside all temporal origin is also outside all time, and a thing that is outside all time is also excluded from all change, since all change is with respect to time. So if [1] that which always is, is intelligible, and is eternal has no generation, while that which is perceptible, never is, and is not eternal is generated, 25and if [2] the following [pairs] are opposed to one another: the intelligible to the perceptible; the non-eternal to the eternal; that which never is to that which always is; that which is ungenerated in any given sense to that which is in that same sense generated, and if 210.1[3] the intelligible and the eternal do not have a generation with respect to time, then the perceptible and the non-eternal do have a generation with respect to time. For, as was shown in the Topics, ³³⁰ opposite [qualifications] belong to [each of a pair of] opposites in so 5 far as each is such. For example, if combining is a feature of black, separating is of white; if ruling is of a master, being ruled is of a slave; if seeing is of the possession of vision, not-seeing is of the lack of it; if unimpeded natural functioning is of being in good health, the failure 10to perform natural functions in an unimpeded manner is of not being in good health. I said 'in so far as each is such' so as to include things [only] qua opposites. Master and slave are opposed as relatives, but each of them breathes and lives and is sentient not qua slave or qua 15master but qua man; ruling, on the other hand, is a feature of being a master qua master, and being ruled likewise of a slave qua such. And being a quality³³¹ is associated with being white or black al-20though not by virtue of their being opposites. Separating and combining [are the features which belong to them] by virtue of their being opposites. Similarly, if loving is [characteristic] of a father, being loved is [characteristic] of a son. Father and son are not contraries but relative terms and so it is not the contraries that follow upon them but the relative terms. But loving and hating are opposed as contraries, loving and being loved as relative terms. And so if 25loving follows upon [being] a father, being loved will follow upon [being] a son. And the same applies in all other cases. Thus if that which changes and is never the same and is perceptible is opposed³³² to that which is unchanging and is always the same and is intelligible. 211.1and if the unchanging, qua unchanging, is without a beginning with respect to time, then that which changes as such will not be without $\mathbf{5}$ a beginning with respect to time.

27. Since, then, our argument has adequately demonstrated that Plato's meaning is that the world has come to be with respect to time, that is, that it has a beginning to its existence and did not exist before

it came to be, it may now (*loipon*) be the appropriate time to bring forward the evidence of the philosophers in regard to him. 10

I shall pass over the circle of Plutarch and Atticus, who are agreed by all to have explicitly affirmed that Plato believed the world to be generated with respect to time and to have taken issue with those of the contrary opinion. Past teachers of our gospel,³³³ among them Eusebius, who led the Church in Caesarea, have already cited

- 15lengthy extracts from them in their own works.³³⁴ This being so, I shall pass them over on this occasion and produce Plato's [own] pupil
- as a witness [in favour of] our argument. And who could be a more 20credible witness to Plato's views than Aristotle, who is said to have been Plato's student for some twenty years, who surpassed all earlier Greeks in sagacity, and whom Plato so admired for that sagacity that
- 25he used to call him the Brain of the School? When I cite his words I shall at the same time cite Alexander of Aphrodisias' explanatory comments on them. By doing so I shall be at once clarifying Aristotle's
- meaning. [which is necessary] because of the convoluted nature of the 212.1man's style, and bringing on another witness to the matter in hand. From Aristotle. On the Heaven. Book 1:³³⁵
 - 5 Now that these distinctions have been established, let us, after first reviewing the ideas of other thinkers, go on to ask whether the heaven is ungenerated or generated, imperishable or perishable.

And a few lines later:³³⁶

All agree that it was generated, but some say that, once gener-10 ated, it is eternal, others that, like everything else which is composite by nature, it is perishable, yet others, including Empedocles of Acragas and Heraclitus of Ephesus, that it is by turns as it is now and in a different condition when it perishes. and that this continues for ever.

15From Alexander of Aphrodisias' comments on the [above] passages:³³⁷

He states that all parties, theologians and natural philosophers alike, are of one mind as far as the generation (tou gegonenai) of the world is concerned and that it is in regard to what happens subsequently that there is discord among them. Some of those who hold that it has been generated assert that it is everlasting. Orpheus and Hesiod and most of the theologians were of this opinion and following them Plato.³³⁸ But some of those who hold that it has been generated at the same time declare that it is perishable, as is everything else that is composite;³³⁹ for all things are seen to come to be and to perish. Others, such as

20

Empedocles and Heraclitus, say that it by turns comes to be in the same form and perishes, and that it comes to be and perishes again and again according to certain cycles and that this [alternation] is everlasting and goes on for ever.³⁴⁰

And a little further on:

Those who hold that it is generated and perishable like anything 5 else that is composite will be Democritus and his followers. For just as everything else comes to be and perishes in their view, so does each of the infinite worlds.

From Aristotle (the continuation of the previous passage):

To assert that it has come to be but is nevertheless everlasting is an impossibility. We can only reasonably assume those characteristics which we see to be present in many or all instances [of a phenomenon], but in regard to this [phenomenon] the opposite is the case: everything that comes to be clearly perishes.³⁴¹

Alexander's comment:

Having expounded the views of his predecessors on the world, he [now] enquires which of their assertions are correct and which incorrect. He begins by arguing against those who make it generated but imperishable. In this group were, as I said [earlier], the theologians and Plato, and theirs was the position he described first.

That Plato is indeed of this persuasion, and that the world is not, as some of the Platonists claim, being described as generated on the ground that it has its being in coming to be, despite being in his view ungenerated, the reader may ascertain from Plato's own words in the *Timaeus*. Anything that is generated in the sense in which they understand him to be describing the world as generated is [continually] coming to be and ceasing to be but has not ever come into existence. At any rate, when carrying out a division of existing things, he asks 'what is that which always is and has no generation and what is that which comes to be but never is?³⁴² But [when talking] of the world he does not use [the present tense] 'comes to be' but [the past tense] 'has come to be', and at the outset [of the inquiry] the question he poses is not whether it comes to be but whether it has come to be or is ungenerated. His actual words are 'we who are about to discuss with regard to the universe whether it has come to be or is ungenerated,³⁴³ [clearly] the question he is posing is not

69

213.1

10

15

20

214.1

whether it *is* coming to be but whether it *has* come to be or is ungenerated.

Those³⁴⁴ who attempt to alter (*metagraphein*)³⁴⁵ 'or' to 'even though'³⁴⁶ [in this last passage] and to read 'whether it came to be even though it is ungenerated' are [making themselves] ridiculous. Quite apart from the absurdity of writing (metagra*phein*) what is not the case,³⁴⁷ their suggestion is nonsensical and totally fails to square with what follows, for soon afterwards, in the course of further defining the same question, he writes³⁴⁸ 'whether it has always been, having no beginning [to its] generation, or has come to be, having started from some beginning'. [Here] the words 'having started from some beginning' will no longer leave room for those³⁴⁹ who [would] write (metagraphousin)³⁵⁰ 'even though it is ungenerated'.³⁵¹ And no sooner has he set himself the task of investigating this question than he goes on to show that it has come to be, evidently [meaning] 'having started from some beginning' (for that was the question being posed), [a beginning] which could not be any other than a beginning with respect to time. And indeed if that which is still coming to be has not yet come to be, it is clear that that which has come to be is no longer coming to be. But he states that the world has come to be. Therefore it is not, in his view, [in the process of] coming to be. For since it has come to be, it has started upon its existence³⁵² and already come to the end of its generation.

And even if he had described the world as being generated in $\mathbf{5}$ the sense that it has its being in coming to be, he would have had to accept that it is also perishable. It is the lot of a thing that comes to be in that sense to perish in the same way as it comes to be,³⁵³ and by claiming that it is generated he leaves no room (ouketi sunkhôrei) for it to be at the same time imperishable. For 10 in what way is it that they claim that he describes it as imperishable? If they claim that it is in not having its being in perishing, perhaps one who claims that it is imperishable in a way that³⁵⁴ involves denving that it has its being in perishing would also deny that it comes to be on that basis;³⁵⁵ for a given kind of generation goes hand in hand with a like kind of passing 15out of existence. And should he be describing it as imperishable with respect to time, it is clear that he would also be using 'generated' with respect to time, for that is the kind of generation that must be opposed to that kind of imperishability. 20Further, it is out of a desire to eliminate the perishability that appears to follow for something that is generated that he describes [the world] as imperishable. And if he describes it as imperishable with respect to time, he is assuming that that [kind of perishability] follows for something that is generated.

10

15

20

215.1

But it does not follow for something that is generated in the sense that it has its being in coming to be but for something that has come to be from a temporal beginning. And so³⁵⁶ clearly this world has, in his opinion, come to be.

But even to seek a reason for its³⁵⁷ imperishability, as Plato does, is the act of one who agrees to describe it as having come to be from a temporal beginning. For if it were ungenerated, it would have the cause and origin $(arkh\hat{e})$ of its imperishability within itself, since it is conceded by him that that which is ungenerated is of its own nature imperishable. But since the world is not of its own nature imperishable, he attributes³⁵⁸ its imperishability to the will of God.³⁵⁹

Moreover, the fact that he frequently uses [the verb] 'is' of the world is a sign that he is not describing it as having come to be in the sense that it has its being in coming to be. If it 'was not' before it came to be but 'is' once it has come to be, it is not being said to have come to be in the sense that it has its being in coming to be.

Nor is it consistent with Plato's position to claim that its generation is being hypothesised for the sake of clarity on the ground that we shall understand its precise nature more readily as a result of this imaginary generation. [Had this been so], he would not have immediately stated this problem at the outset, as though he would be inquiring into it as his first priority, and would not have omitted to explain why he describes it as generated when it is ungenerated; in the *Republic*,³⁶⁰ when he gives an account of the formation of the state and its government because it contributes something to his account of justice, he begins by telling us why he is talking about such matters, and he would have done the same in the case of the world.

From the same [work] of Aristotle, shortly after the previous 25 passages:

[The parallel] which some of those who claim that [the world] is imperishable even though it has come to be adduce in an attempt to support their position is not a genuine one. They say that they speak of [its] generation in the same way as those who draw [geometrical] diagrams; they are not saying that it ever came to be but, for the sake of exposition [and] to advance understanding, viewing it under construction (*ginomenon*) like a diagram. But this is not in my opinion the same. In the constructing of diagrams, once all [the lines] have been added, what at once emerges is identical [with the lines],³⁶¹ but in their demonstrations it is not something identical but an impossibility.³⁶² The initial and subsequent states which are assumed are

71

216,1

25

5

10

15

20

 $\mathbf{5}$

Chapter 6, Section 27

incompatible (*hupenantia*). They claim that ordered things arose from unordered, and [something] cannot be unordered and ordered at the same time; there must be [a process of] generation and [a lapse of] time separating [these states]. In diagrams, on the other hand, nothing is separated by [a lapse of] time.³⁶³

Alexander's comment:

He will be directing this at certain followers of Plato on the ground that they too saw the absurd consequences of describing the world as generated but imperishable and therefore sought to provide a charitable interpretation (boêtheian tina) of what Plato and they themselves had written, denying that he describes the world as having come to be in the sense that [it had] a temporal beginning and once did not exist, but [only] as an aid in the instruction of learners and in demonstrating its essence and nature. For they claim that he is carrying out a kind of analysis of its essence and showing how it would have come to be if it had come to be, as mathematicians do by means of their diagrams. For amongst them too, when someone says, to take an instance, that a cube³⁶⁴ is constructed from six squares and analyses it and shows how its construction [derives] from them, he is not claiming that it ever did come to be or was ever put together, but that he is showing by means of this hypothetical generation that its existence depends on them, because if it had come to be, it would have come to be from them in just this way. They claim, then, that the world is being spoken of in the same way; it is not that it has come to be but that its being depends on these [components], and if it had come into existence it would, they claim, have come to be in this manner [and] from these [components].

But [Aristotle] says that they do not explain the text successfully and that those who take this position cannot successfully avoid the absurdity to which their interpretation is doomed by means of this parallel. The case cannot be the same. The mathematician who states that a cube consists of six squares and that it is generated from the components from which he says it has arisen, or that a triangle [consists of] three lines, is assuming entities that coexist with that which is being said to be generated from them and that exist in it, but things that have a separate existence have not been brought together. And analysis demonstrates this clearly. For analysis is into internal components, and things with separate existence or things that need to undergo some change for something³⁶⁵ to emerge from them do not result [from it]. For how do they claim [the world] would be generated, had it been generated, out of its present

72

15

20

25

 $\mathbf{5}$

10

15

20

219,1

218,1

(toutôn) internal components? For the mathematician takes things all of which exist at the same time and tries to show that some of them are composed of others which are their internal [components]. A cube, for example, is not destructive of the squares [of which it is composed] by coming to be as a result of a change in them; they are internal to it. Nor is it necessary that the squares themselves exist ahead of the construction of the cube; as we said, they are coexistent with it and exist within it. For anyone selecting [materials] for a hypothesis rather than for the genuine generation of something selects them from among things which that which is said to have emerged from them does not destroy [by being generated].³⁶⁶ When we make use of things in the generation of something else, they cannot produce the thing [which is generated] from them while remaining unchanging and intact; it is through a change in them that the thing that is said to be [generated] from them comes to be. In such a case something has come to be and this kind of generation is not just being assumed for the sake of a hypothesis. For such generation is of things that really come to be and it is in this manner that things that come to be in nature come to be. Nor would the mathematician any longer be conceiving of things as coming to be for the sake of a hypothesis if he hypothesised that they came to be from the sort of things that had to change in either quality or arrangement to produce such things; things that are being displayed as in the process of coming to be for the sake of a hypothesis do not have the things from which they have come to be hypothetically and [only] seemingly but, since these really do exist and are present in the things which are being displayed as emerging from them, have only the notional synthesis added [as a result of the hypothesis]. Such is the nature of analysis and of the entities with which it deals.

The situation is different in the case of things that really come to be. Neither the menses and the embryo, nor a disordered heap (*ataxia*) of bricks and stones and the house that is built from them, exist at the same time. And it is from such components that [Plato and his followers] generate the world. And one who generates the world out of the change of a disordered confusion (*ataxias*) of bodies into orderly movement is saying that it has come out of something whose [continued] existence would make it impossible for the world to exist:³⁶⁷ disorder is the contrary of order and disorder must be eliminated if order is going to exist. Therefore there is need of genuine change and generation if one is to posit the existence of disorder at all; for disorder must have changed into order by means of [a process] of generation and change. But this is not how it happens with diagrams. Since the elements from which [mathematicians] hypothesise their gen-

73

10

15

20

- 220,1
- $\mathbf{5}$
- 10

eration are internal to them, they demonstrate their generation without disturbing any of their components. And indeed it is an indication that they are not speaking soundly or, despite what they claim, producing an analysis in the manner of the mathematicians, but on the contrary describing a [process of real] generation, that the elements from which they describe the world as having emerged cannot exist at the same time as it does but must pre-exist it in time, as is the case with all things that come to be; things that are destructive of each other cannot also at the same time coexist even hypothetically.

And so the mathematicians for their part are talking reasonably when they say that they do not attribute generation to diagrams but only employ it as a hypothesis for the sake of clarity and exposition; their kind of generation is not out of contraries or from elements that are in any way separate [from the end result]; and accordingly the elements from which [the end results] are derived and of which they are comprised coexist with the [end results] that are said to emerge or have emerged from them. This is why they also say that it is impossible for there to be generation of [mathematical] shapes; but this does not at all mean that they cannot [generate them] even hypothetically.³⁶⁸ But the [scenario] described by those who generate the world is not even hypothetically possible. The same things cannot be in a state of disorder and of order at the same time. And so for them disorder, if it existed at all, must have preexisted the world; for when there was [disorder], it was not possible for there to be a world. So for them the world has really come into existence through a [process of] generation and from a temporal beginning and out of a kind of (tinos) alteration and passing out of existence. For the things from which they say the world has come to be can neither exist within it nor coexist with it. Otherwise that which comes to be would be an analysis; for analysis is [found] in things which can coexist in this way.³⁶⁹ But it is not possible for the causes of the generation and existence of the world to coexist with it and to undergo change while still coexisting. If the disordered confusion (ataxia) of bodies from which they generate the world neither exists within it nor coexists with it but pre-existed it, and if the generation of the world [took place] as the result of an alteration to them, and not as it does among the mathematicians, [then] the generation should be described as real and not as an analysis of the kind carried out by mathematicians. One who hypothesises the gen-

carried out by mathematicians. One who hypothesises the generation of something out of [elements] from which the thing hypothesised could not emerge unless they altered is assuming a real generation and not a merely verbal one.

20

25

221.1

 $\mathbf{5}$

10

15

20

From the same [work] of Aristotle:

For there are some who believe that it is possible both for what is ungenerated to perish and for what has come to be to remain unperishing, as is the case in the *Timaeus*; for Plato says there that the heaven has come to be but will nevertheless exist throughout the rest of time (ton loipon aei khronon).³⁷⁰

Alexander:

It is not that the statements that there is something ungenerated which will perish and that there is something which has been generated which remains everlasting both occur there – in fact, as [Aristotle] himself indicates, only the second, [namely], that the world has come to be but is everlasting, $does^{371} - but$ that once the second is made the first also follows for the person who makes it; for to say that something which has come to be is imperishable and that something ungenerated is perishable are part of the same way of thinking. Besides, for someone who says that the world has come to be but will not perish it also follows that he destroys³⁷² something that is ungenerated; for the disorder from which, on their view, the world has come to be was, in spite of being ungenerated, destroyed in [the process of] changing into order and the world. [Aristotle]³⁷³ himself makes it clear that only the second statement appears in the *Timaeus* by indicating what is actually said there; 'for Plato', [he writes], 'says there that the heaven has been generated but will nevertheless exist for the rest of time'.

Aristotle, from Book 8 of the *Physics*:³⁷⁴

But as far as time is concerned all with one exception³⁷⁵ are in 20clear agreement. They hold that it is ungenerated. Indeed, it is on this account that Democritus shows that it is impossible for all things to have come to be, time being [in his opinion] ungenerated. Plato alone generates it. He holds that it came to be along with the heaven and that the heaven [itself] came to be.³⁷⁶

This, then, is what Aristotle and the man who, in his commentaries 223,1on Aristotle, has better than anyone come to grips with his thought, [namely,] Alexander, have to say. And although it was made clear earlier in the passages we quoted from the commentary on the *Timaeus* of the Platonist Taurus that many other philosophers have $\mathbf{5}$ taken the same view of Plato['s position], perhaps it will do no harm to quote the same passages again.³⁷⁷

This is what Taurus says:

222.1

25

5

10

There being a question as to whether the world is in Plato's view something ungenerated, philosophers have had different opinions on the matter. Aristotle states that the *Timaeus* describes the world as generated since Timaeus says that it has come to be. And, indeed, there is a work of his [sc. of Timaeus] in circulation on the universe as [something] generated. Theophrastus, on the other hand, in *On Physical Opinions*, says that the world is in Plato's opinion generated and criticises him on that basis, but adds that he may be hypothesizing it as generated for the sake of clarity [of exposition].³⁷⁸ And some others have likewise been of the opinion that it is in Plato's view generated, although others [have thought that he held that it is] ungenerated.³⁷⁹

20 We learned, then, from this passage that many other philosophers, including Theophrastus, have said the same things about Plato [as Aristotle and Alexander did]. Admittedly Theophrastus, as [Taurus] states, attempted to defend Plato on the ground that he may have hypothesised that [the world] is generated for clarity's sake. But this same Taurus later shows us Theophrastus demolishing such a hypothesis. Here is what he says soon after the passage quoted above:

It was Plato's practice to present things in the process of development for the sake of exposition. In the *Republic* too he shows the city as it develops so that the origins of justice will become clearer during its establishment. Theophrastus, after remarking that 'perhaps he describes it as generated for the sake of clarity, in the way that we follow diagrams as they develop', continues 'but perhaps generation is not of the same nature in the case of diagrams'.³⁸⁰ And he is saying the same thing as Aristotle, for he too asserts that in the case of diagrams it is possible to postulate [the presence of] contraries at the start but that it is not possible in the case of the generation of the world, as though one were postulating [the presence of] movement and rest, and order and disorder [at the same time].³⁸¹

15 In the circumstances I think that both [our own] argument and the testimony of philosophers as to Plato's position have adequately demonstrated to all, save those who are irremediably contentious and put the truth second to their own desires, that Plato did not mean to say that the existence of the world was without a beginning but on the contrary assigned a beginning to its existence.

As for the [arguments] which, again transcribing from Porphyry, Proclus adduces in the work we have [already] cited on a number of occasions in defence of the *Timaeus* against Aristotle in an attempt to demonstrate in a roundabout way that Plato, since he both states

76

5

10

that the pattern for the world is eternal³⁸² and claims that the goodness of God is the cause of the existence of the world, believed 25that the generation of the world is without a beginning – Plato says for he was good, and in the good no envy ever arises in regard to 225,1anything',³⁸³ from which Proclus concludes that if the pattern for the world always exists, the copy of that pattern, the world, must also $\mathbf{5}$ always exist, and that if God is always free of envy, [then,] since he is also always good, the world too will always exist, or if the world does *not* always exist, then its creator is only potentially [a creator] and therefore imperfect and in need of time - these and other similar [arguments] I pass over now as having been adequately dealt with earlier.³⁸⁴ It is clear that, having been refuted, they too will not 10 support the view that Plato held the world to be everlasting.

28. It will be in accord with our undertakings at the beginning of the present chapter³⁸⁵ to consider next whether Plato can be caught contradicting himself. If, as he says, there is necessarily a passing out of existence for everything that has come to be,³⁸⁶ and if it follows from this by conversion by negation³⁸⁷ that everything that does not perish has not come to be, how can the same person hypothesise that the 20 world is both imperishable and generated at the same time?

The reply to this is brief. If what is ungenerated with respect to time is also imperishable by nature, then if something is not imperishable by nature, it is not ungenerated with respect to time. But Plato does not hypothesise that the world is imperishable by nature. On the contrary, he says that it is perishable by nature; for, [he argues,] everything that has been bound can be unbound.

'For since you have come to be', he says,³⁸⁸ 'you are not immortal nor altogether indissoluble. But you shall certainly not be dissolved nor meet with the fate of death since you have in my will a greater and more authoritative bond than those with which you were bound when you came to be.'

If, then, the world is in Plato's view mortal and dissoluble by nature, and [if he also holds that] its indissolubility arises from the will of the Creator (for he says³⁸⁹ that [his creations] are indissoluble not by nature but 'as long as I will it'), it clearly would be generated with respect to time. So Plato is revealed to be entirely consistent throughout. If he had thought that the world was generated by God so as to be immortal and indissoluble, as he says the intelligibles are, it would have been consistent for him to hypothesise that it was also ungenerated with respect to time. But if it is dissoluble by nature, and if nothing that is ungenerated with respect to time; indeed, for this very reason Plato says that because the world is generated it is

77

25

226,1

therefore also dissoluble. And so he reaches conclusions which are consistent with his premisses.

- 20 That the words 'you are not indissoluble nor altogether immortal' do not, as some imagine, mean 'you are not simple, but it is notionally possible to analyse you into your components and you are for that reason mortal', but rather 'you are of a nature that is receptive of death and dissolution', is clear from the opposing [statement] 'you shall certainly not be dissolved nor meet with the fate of death, since
- 227,1 you have in my will a greater and more authoritative bond than those with which you were bound when you came to be'.³⁹⁰ So if he is referring to a notional dissolution and death and saying that they are
 - 5 mortal as a result of this, then he would, by saying that they will not be dissolved or meet the fate of death, mean that they will not endure these things notionally; for what an affirmation asserts its negation
 - 10 necessarily denies, [and] it is that same dissolution and death which he has said belongs to them of their nature that he later states will not, by God's will, be theirs. So if they have from nature the [attribute of] being *notionally* dissoluble and mortal, then they will also be *notionally* immortal and indissoluble through the will of God. So the
 - 15 gist of the passage will be: 'You will not be notionally indissoluble or immortal, [but] neither will you die.' So the same thing will be both notionally dissoluble and notionally not dissoluble and [both sides of] this contradiction will be true at the same time. So if this is silly and if it makes no sense to say that the same thing is both notionally 20 analysed and notionally not analysed into simples, he is clearly
 - saying that the heavenly bodies are dissoluble and mortal not notionally but by their nature.
 - But since, even though this is the nature allotted to them, Plato is nevertheless of the opinion that they remain indissoluble and immortal in perpetuity, being held together not by a physical bond but by the will of God, he says that they are not wholly indissoluble and immortal but mortal and dissoluble as far as their own nature goes
- 228,1 (because this is the nature of the corporeal and all that has come to be is dissoluble and mortal), but that through the will of the creator, which is stronger than any physical bond, they have obtained an
 - 5 immortality contrived for them in perpetuity by him who created them. For just as a man may, by continually restoring a house or a ship and replacing its worn out parts, maintain it so that it lasts
 - 10 indefinitely, so, says Plato, does God bestow a restored immortality upon the world.

Listen to his further philosophical speculations on this topic in the *Statesman*.³⁹¹ Here is what he says:

[Eleatic Stranger:] At times God himself joins in guiding this universe as it moves and assists its revolution, at other times, when its circuits have completed the measure of time assigned

<u>لا</u> ممر

to it, he lets it go. It then revolves of its own accord in the opposite direction, for it is a living creature that has been endowed with intelligence by its framer from the beginning. This movement in reverse is, for the following reason, of necessity innate to it.

[Young Socrates:] What is this reason?

[Eleatic Stranger:] Always to be the same and unchanging and to remain identical belongs only to the most divine of all beings. The nature of body is not of this order. That which we have been calling 'the heaven' or 'the world' has certainly received many fine gifts from its begetter, but it has nevertheless been made to partake of body, and for this reason it is impossible for it to be entirely exempt from change.

So here too, then, Plato, in conformity with the statements that we 229.1have cited from the *Timaeus*, ascribes inalterability and remaining the same and unchanging to intelligible and divine substance alone and says that the whole sphere of the bodily is not of this order, 5 whence too he states that it is entirely impossible for the corporeal element in the universe not to share in change, but, 'when its circuits have fully completed the measure of time assigned to it', the universe then undergoes alterations and changes. And this too, as some of our 10 [Christian writers] have correctly pointed out, he derived from the Holy Scriptures.³⁹² For what else is 'assisting the revolution' of the heaven and then 'letting it go' 'when its circuits have fully completed the measure of time assigned to it' than for 'the heavens to be rolled 15up and changed like a cloak'?³⁹³

And listen to how Plato, once he had decided, again after hearing [the biblical words] 'for God did not make death', and 'he created all things that they might exist',³⁹⁴ that the universe must remain immortal, states, again in this same Statesman,³⁹⁵ that immortality does not belong to the world by nature but comes to it newly acquired 20from the Creator:

For all these reasons we must not say either that the world always turns itself, or that it is turned in its entirety in two contrary revolutions by a god, or, again, that two gods with contrary intentions turn it, but rather [must we affirm] the only remaining possibility, the one which I just now stated, that at times it is guided by an external, divine, agency, acquiring renewed life and receiving a restored immortality from its creator, while at other times it is released, being let go by that same [creator] at the right moment to be able to revolve in the opposite direction through a countless number of revolutions.

Here he clearly states that inasmuch as the heaven, owing to the mutability of all corporeal nature, does not possess immortality of its 20

25

25

 $\mathbf{5}$

230.1

10 own nature, it acquires renewed life and a restored immortality comes to it from its creator.

So if Plato believes that the heaven is a living creature, and if the being and substance of every living creature exists in accordance with the form of the life within it, then the heaven as well will possess being and substance in the form of its own life. But he says that the heaven acquires this life again and again and that a restored immortality comes

acquires this life again and again and that a restored immortanty comes to it from its creator. Therefore Plato does not believe that the substance of the heaven is of its own nature indissoluble and immortal. Nor therefore does he hypothesise that its existence is without a beginning;
20 for there is every necessity that everything without a beginning should

also be of its own nature imperishable and that everything which is by nature perishable should also of necessity be generated.

- 29. If Plato elsewhere³⁹⁶ describes the world as self-sufficient, in need of nothing, free of disease and ageless, he does not describe it in these terms because its own resources are adequate for its everlasting continuance, but because it does not undergo destructive attacks from outside agencies as our bodies do. For there is no body outside the world at whose hands it could suffer anything of the kind that each and every separate thing [within it] does from its environment. The heaven is certainly not like our bodies and all other particular
 - things, [which are] depleted by their environments and [need to] take in replacements for what is lost in the form of [supplementary matter] coming in from outside. There *is* nothing outside it either to deplete
 it or to nourish it. 'It uses', says³⁹⁷ Plato, 'its own waste for food'. For
 - 10 it or to nourish it. 'It uses', says³⁹⁷ Plato, 'its own waste for food'. For the waste from one thing becomes another's nourishment; the passing out of existence of, say, air becomes the generation of water or fire, and similarly with everything else. It is in this way, then, that it is said to be in need of nothing from outside, and it is [said to be] free of disease and ageless because it has nothing outside it at whose hands
 - 15 it might suffer,³⁹⁸ not because it is naturally self-sufficient and immortal; for he has stated³⁹⁹ that [the property of] always remaining the same and unchanging belongs to intelligible substance alone and that corporeal nature is not of that order but belongs in its entirety to
 - 20 [the order] of things that come to be and perish and never truly are. So, again, in what sense other than the one I have stated⁴⁰⁰ would he call this same [corporeal nature] self-sufficient and in need of nothing?

There is nothing like listening to the philosopher's own words [to convince one] that this is what he has in mind when he says such things of the world. Here is what he says in the *Timaeus*:⁴⁰¹

From such elements, four in number, the body of the world came to be, achieving harmony through proportion, and received [the spirit of] friendship from them, so that, having come together, it was indissoluble by others than him who had bound it together. And the framing of the world took up the whole of each of the

15

232.1

Chapter 6, Section 29

four [elements], for its framer framed it from all the fire and water and air and earth, leaving no portion of any of them nor any of their powers outside of it. [In this] his intention was first that it should be in the highest degree a whole living creature, complete [and formed] from complete constituents, and in addition to this be one, there being nothing left over from which another such as it might come to be, and also that it should be ageless and free of disease. For he was aware that when things that are hot or cold, or have [other] powerful [corrosive] properties, surround and assail a composite body from the outside, they break it up before its time and cause it to waste away by afflicting it with diseases and old age. It was for this reason and on these grounds that he fashioned it to be a whole, out of [constituents] all of which were wholes, [and therefore] perfect, ageless and free of disease.

In this passage Plato gives three reasons why the creator has left no aspect of the elements, neither any portion nor any power, outside of the heaven. (By a portion he means a body, as, for instance, a portion of fire or water or of the other [elements] - for portions of bodies are 20[themselves] bodies, - and by a power the formative qualities of the elements, I mean heat and cold, moisture and dryness, heaviness and lightness and the rest.) The first [reason] is so that the world might be complete, having come to be as a whole [formed] from wholes and 25a complete thing formed from complete things, [namely,] the elements; the second so that there might be one, single world and not, as Democritus and others held, several or even an infinite number of 233.1worlds, for if the world is, as Plato holds, a living creature fabricated from the four elements, and no portion of an element was left outside the world, then it is not possible for another world to exist, since all $\mathbf{5}$ of the world-creating elements have been included in this one; and the third [reason is] so that the world might be free of disease and ageless. there being nothing outside at whose hands it might also suffer, for just as our bodies, when they are chilled or heated, or moistened or 10dried overmuch by their environment or suffer other [such] afflictions, lose their correct temperament and because of this age and decay, in the same way, he says, if portions or powers of the elements had been left outside of the heaven to assail the heaven from without, 15they would, because of the active nature of their power, have had the same effects on it as befall our bodies at the hands of the environment; so, in order that the universe might be free of these afflictions, the creator, he says, enclosed the entire nature of the elements inside it. 20

And yet, if the heaven were not by nature subject to old age and dissolution, it would not, even though the entire nature of the elements existed outside of it and attacked it, ever have suffered from them anything of which its nature was not receptive; for what would

81

 $\mathbf{5}$

10

the *rational* substances in the world for their part suffer from the active power in bodies? He does not, then, hypothesise that the 25234.1heaven is unageing and free from disease through its inalterability and natural immortality. On the contrary, what I said earlier⁴⁰² is shown to be the case by the present passage: because the world was (since it was also, by virtue of being body, generated) dissoluble and mortal by nature, and because he wishes it to last for ever, the creator $\mathbf{5}$ has, so that it will not be subject to destructive changes of any kind, left nothing that is of a nature to dissolve it outside of it. But in the case of a thing which is naturally indissoluble there is nothing through whose agency it could ever be dissolved. For that reason 10 Plato's creator did not take any such precaution in the case of the soul of the world but, weaving it throughout, from the centre to the heaven on the periphery, had no apprehension that it would undergo any change or alteration as a result of its association with heating and

- 15 cooling agents, for it belonged to the [sphere of] nature that is intelligible and always remains the same and unchanging. But why do I talk of the soul of the world? Even when he bound *our* souls to bodies and interwove the mortal with the immortal he took no precaution against their suffering from any destructive force, for he
- 20 claims that they too are of an immortal nature. That which is immortal by nature, then, can suffer nothing from the [four] elements; for these, in that they share with one another the same matter and have a nature that is affected in the same way, are alone by nature able to suffer at each other's hands. And so the heaven too, if it did not consist
- 25 of the same matter as the elements, or rather had not been, as Plato says, composed of them, would, even if the entire might (*phusis*) of the elements were assailing it from without, undergo nothing at their hands; but as it is, since its nature is such that it can suffer at the
- 235,1 hands of [the materials] of which it is composed, to prevent it from suffering the creator has, he says, left nothing outside of it. But even if there is nothing outside through which the world can
 - 5 suffer, even so, because Plato knows that every body is controlled by a finite power and that no body possesses an infinite power (as Plato's pupil Aristotle shows towards the end of the eighth book of the *Physics*⁴⁰³) and nothing that does not possess an infinite power can
 - 10 last in perpetuity, and for this reason both the heaven and the whole world, being body and possessing a finite power, would not on their own, even were there nothing damaging them from outside, have the resources for an everlasting continuance (for a finite power must,
 - 15 because of the very fact that it is finite, eventually become exhausted and perish), and because he believes that the world [nevertheless] remains indissoluble, he for this reason sets the creator himself over it to [continually] renew its life and immortality so that it may thus endure for ever.⁴⁰⁴ For if Plato did think that it was inalterable and

20 immortal by nature (as he claims the nature of intelligibles is), how,

Chapter 6, Section 29

again, is it that he hypothesises that its immortality is restored? These [positions] are incompatible. Or how is it that he leaves nothing outside of it so that it will not age or decay through being affected by it, thereby also indicating that it gets its freedom from want not from 25the self-sufficiency of its own nature but by having need of nothing outside of itself to fill or repair any deficiency it might have by the addition [of new material]? Listen to what he says on this subject in 236,1the Timaeus:405

He made the whole of it perfectly smooth on the outside for a number of reasons. It had no need of eyes, for nothing was left outside of it [for it] to see, nor of hearing, for there was nothing [for it] to hear. There was no surrounding air that it had to breathe, nor did it have need of any organ with which to take nourishment into itself or to discharge it again once it had been digested; nothing left it or entered it from anywhere else, for there *was* nothing. It was designed to use its own residue[s] as food and to act and be acted upon by itself and within itself, for its framer thought that it would be better for it to be self-sufficient rather than dependent on others.

He is saying, then, that even its absence of need is not the result of its being naturally free of need but of its not needing anything extra 15from outside of itself. The world as a whole does not, like our bodies. have its losses replaced from outside but is acted upon by itself and acts upon itself (that is to say, one part of it acts, another is acted upon), and the decay of one part becomes nourishment and growth for 20another. When the parts of a thing are subject to breakdown and alteration, the whole of it must, if the whole is nothing other than all its parts, undergo the same [processes]. Hence it has need of a restorer and repairer. Therefore the world is not impassible or free of 25need but, although it needs nothing outside of itself and is affected by 237.1nothing outside of itself, since there is nothing outside of it, is nevertheless acted upon by itself and decays. Something of this kind is neither impassible nor immortal by nature. For nothing that is naturally immortal, like, for example, rational beings, is of a nature to be affected in any way or to decay even in its parts, since everything $\mathbf{5}$ that really is naturally immortal is of an indivisible and simple nature. If, therefore, the world is not naturally immortal but receives an acquired and restored immortality from outside [itself], it is, one assumes, mortal by nature. And if it is, as Plato holds, mortal, he with 10 reason assigns a beginning to its existence. And thus in the passages under discussion Plato is hypothesising nothing that conflicts with his position when he says that the world is generated and mortal by nature and that its immortality is communicated [to it] and comes to it supernaturally from him who created it. 15

 $\mathbf{5}$

And that this did not escape Proclus, and that he too knew perfectly well that the world does not possess everlasting existence as far as its own nature goes because all bodily nature is held together by finite power, and that everlasting existence comes to it as something that is acquired from somewhere else, and that he is now deliberately misleading us by means of fallacious argument when he starts from the assumption that it is Plato's view that the world does not perish without qualification and does not further define the sense in which Plato says this and then concludes from this that he also believes that

the world is ungenerated with respect to time, will be clear to us once 25we have cited a few out of many⁴⁰⁶ [relevant] passages⁴⁰⁷ from his [writings].

In the course of defending Plato because he says that it is only the intelligible that always is and that everything perceptible comes to be and perishes but never is. Proclus. after much else, adds this:

Proclus, from the work entitled An Examination of Aristotle's Criticisms of Plato's Timaeus:

This assumption, then, should only be made if the body of the heaven too, and the whole world as well, must be described as coming to be. And how can it be other than necessary to so describe it on the basis of the information he gives us? For he 10 states that no finite body has infinite power, and has shown it to be so in the eighth book of the *Physics*.⁴⁰⁸ So if the world is finite (and he has shown this to be so as well), it necessarily does not have infinite power. But we have demonstrated that eternity is infinite power in our earlier arguments.⁴⁰⁹ Therefore the 15world, not having infinite power, does not have eternal existence. And if it does not have eternal existence (for a thing that does has a share in eternity, and a thing which has a share in eternity shares in infinite power), the world necessarily does not exist for ever. For he states himself⁴¹⁰ that to exist for ever is the 20property of eternity and says that eternity even gets its name from this fact.411

Having thus shown that Aristotle's own positions prove that the world is not among those things that are for ever, he next shows that 239.1it has the property of for ever coming to be from another source and not of its own nature. Here is what he says:

> Nor is what is true of that which always is also true of that which is always coming to be: [it is not the case that] infinite power belongs to the latter on account of its always coming to be in the way that it does to the former on account of its always being. But it does [belong] to its maker, and on that account it too is always coming to be, gaining [the property of] always

84

20

238.1

5

Chapter 6, Section 29

being thanks to (*dia*) that which always is by the terms of its own existence, and not having the 'always' in its own right. And so the definition of that which comes to be would also fit the world.

And a little further on:

Everything, then, which comes to be is always in its own right 10 also perishing; but, as a result of having been bound by that which is, this whole [universe] remains in [a state of] becoming [and] comes to be [but] does not perish because of the being it has drawn off from that which is. Therefore, because, in its own right, that which comes to be qualifies⁴¹² for the definition, he also refers to it as perishing, since by its own nature it is such. 15

And the same [writer] in what follows:

For since the universe is finite, and what is finite does not, as he has shown, have infinite power, and that which initiates infinite movement initiates it by infinite power, it is clear that the motionless cause of infinite movement for the universe has infinite power itself. And so, if one separates the universe from that [cause] in thought, it will not, since it does not have infinite power, keep moving *ad infinitum* but will experience a cessation of its movement; but if one connects it to that [cause] once more, it will, thanks to it, keep moving *ad infinitum*. And indeed there is nothing inappropriate about notionally separating things that are joined so as to see what each has from the other, and so as to know, once this has been observed, what it is that the inferior [partner] possesses of its own nature and what from its association with the superior.

And soon after:

For, generally, since even in this world perishing occurs as a result of lack of power and preservation as a result of power, all the more so is it the case that amongst imperishable things imperishability [holds sway] as a result of power. And this power is obviously something infinite, for all finite [power] perishes.

Now if, as Proclus himself also believes, it necessarily follows from 10 the world's not having infinite power that it does not exist for ever but acquires (*epiktêton ekhei*) everlasting being (or rather, everlasting becoming) from that which always is, [and] does not have everlasting being in its own right but is something that comes to be and perishes, 15

 $\mathbf{5}$

20

25

240.1

and that, as a result of this, if one were to separate from it the cause of its continuous becoming and of its everlasting movement, it will on account of not itself possessing infinite power experience a cessation of movement and therefore also of existence, since every finite

- 20 power perishes if, then, Proclus accepts these Platonic positions, he is clearly saying that the world is naturally perishable and that imperishability belongs to it supernaturally, being furnished by some superior power.
- 25 And if, as Proclus has demonstrated in the preceding argument, the world is naturally perishable and therefore of necessity also generated, the philosopher is clearly deliberately misleading us at this point by omitting to mention the manner in which Plato says that the world is imperishable; for if something belongs to a thing in excess
- 241,1 of its own nature,⁴¹³ this does not cause it to depart from its own nature and make it of the same nature as the thing from which it has this power. The ether too, which extends above the mountain tops and is carried around with the heavenly element, and which, in Aristotle's
 - 5 opinion, is going beyond its own nature by moving in this way, is nonetheless [formed] of those substances which move in a straight line and will not have [this] movement [as a] characteristic of its own
 - 10 substance and so itself be said to be of the same species as the heavenly element.⁴¹⁴ Indeed, we would not even describe those divinely inspired souls who, transcending their own nature, know what is, what will be, and what has gone before'⁴¹⁵ as beings different from others on account of a power which has come to them from God. And
 - 15 in our own times there are some among the Hellenes, people whom they would describe as divinely inspired but whom I would say were possessed by evil spirits, who, as rumour has it, pierce their own bodies with swords and walk through fire but incur, it is said, none of the injuries that bodies normally suffer from fire and iron. But I do
 - 20 not imagine that they would for that reason claim that their bodies are of a different nature and not corporeal or that they are on that account possessed of impassability and imperishability. Thus, even if this universe is, as Plato holds, endowed with indissolubility by some superior power, it will not on that account immediately share in the nature of things that are imperishable and exist for ever; but, since it
 - is naturally perishable, it will of necessity be generated as well.
- As for the arguments directed against Aristotle, who had criticised Plato for claiming that the world is naturally perishable but is imperishable through the will of God, which Proclus includes in the thirteenth section of the previously-mentioned work⁴¹⁶ Proclus tries to persuade us that the world possesses imperishability both by its own nature and through the will of God since they have nothing cogent about them and show him contradicting himself and Plato and the truth, I refrain from stating them so as not to introduce excessive complication into the argument; there is no argument [available] to

refute [the positions] that all body has finite power and that a finite 10 [power] is necessarily perishable and cannot last in perpetuity.

Such, then, being the nature of the power of the world, there is every necessity that it should be perishable as far as concerns the power of its own nature. And so it is also of necessity generated, if indeed everything perishable is also of necessity generated. It is, therefore, possible for the world, while being generated with respect to time and therefore dissoluble and mortal, to receive an acquired and [continually] restored immortality from a power that is higher than that which belongs to its own nature – and it will not because it does not perish have to be ungenerated as well, since it does not possess imperishability by the law (*kata ton logon*) of its own nature.

The End of the Refutation of the Sixth Argument

The Seventh Argument of Proclus the Successor

The seventh [argument]: If the soul of the universe is ungenerated and imperishable, the world too is ungenerated and imperishable. For the definition [of the soul of the universe], as of all soul, is 'that which moves itself'; and everything which moves itself is a fount and source⁴¹⁷ of movement.⁴¹⁸ So if the soul of the universe is everlasting, the universe must always be being moved by it. For, despite always being a source of movement and being unable not to be a source of movement (for it is by its essence self-moved and therefore a source of movement), it would not be a source for movement should the universe either previously or subsequently not exist.⁴¹⁹ But soul is, by virtue of this very self-movement,⁴²⁰ ungenerated and imperishable. Therefore the universe too is ungenerated and imperishable. [And] from this it is guite clear that all soul is in the first instance mounted upon everlasting body⁴²¹ and moves it for ever and that whenever it is present in perishable bodies, it moves them through the agency of those [sc. the everlasting ones] which are for ever moved [directly] by it.

The Sections of the Refutation of the Seventh Argument

1. A description of the approach taken in the seventh proof.

2. That the present proof is not based on the facts but derives from an unproved Platonic hypothesis.

3. That if soul has its essence in being⁴²² the source of movement, 25 it is impossible for its essence to exist apart from body.

4. That if the essence of soul is agreed to be separate from⁴²³ all 244,1 body, it is impossible for it to have its essence in being the source of movement. And that Proclus himself is aware that it is in one way

243,1

 $\mathbf{5}$

10

15

 $\mathbf{5}$ that soul has its being and essence but in another that it has [the property of being the source of movement.

5. That it is impossible for the forces in soul which are responsible for moving⁴²⁴ body to be everlasting and for this reason it cannot move body everlastingly and no everlasting body can be for ever attached to it.

6. That no movement or change in body is ungenerated and imperishable, and for this reason there is no body that is moved everlastingly by soul, even should soul be, as Plato believes, ungenerated.

- 157. That Plato is not saying that self-movement is the source of circular movement. Including [a demonstration] that no living creature in the sublunary sphere has⁴²⁵ a naturally rotating body and that
- 20the local movement of animate bodies does not take place involuntarilv but at the initiative of souls.426

8. That even if it is agreed that soul is, as Plato holds, ungenerated and the source of all movement, there is no necessity that once soul exists everlasting body should coexist along with it.

- 9. That even though soul, in so far as it endows bodies with life, is 25said by Plato to be the source of movement, it still does not follow that someone who claims that soul is ungenerated should also suppose the 245.1world to be ungenerated. Including [a demonstration] that the life of bodies qua capacity⁴²⁷ is rest rather than movement.
 - **10.** That it is not the rational soul but the irrational that is the cause of all bodily life and movement; the rational soul only controls $\mathbf{5}$ and orders the irrational movement of the passions. Hence it is not necessary that as soon as there is a source and cause of this kind of movement (i.e. of rational movement) there should at once also be something which is moved [by it].

11. That by the affirmation [of the existence] of soul the affirma-10 tion of body moved by it is not also implied, but, by the rules of logic and according to Platonic doctrine, with the denial [of its existence the existence of animate body qua animate is simultaneously denied.

12. That even if soul were involuntarily the cause of life and movement for bodies just by being,428 there would even so be no 15necessity that once soul exists body moved by it⁴²⁹ should also exist.

13. That in the *Phaedrus* itself, just as in the *Timaeus*, Plato clearly states that every body experiences a cessation of movement and life and that nothing that is perishable is ungenerated.

14. That the hypothesis of the Hellenes in regard to an everlasting body, which they also refer to as the luminous [body and] upon which they say rational souls are in the first instance mounted and 25in addition to⁴³⁰ moving it also move perishable bodies by means of it, is an implausible fiction. Including [a demonstration] that it is impossible for everlasting body to move perishable body by some natural

88

20

force as a magnet does iron while [itself] remaining free of local movement. $^{\rm 431}$

15. That it is impossible for everlasting body to impart rectilinear 246,1 movement to perishable body while itself undergoing circular movement.

16. That if it imparts movement to perishable bodies while itself undergoing rectilinear movement, it undergoes rectilinear movement 5 either naturally or contrary to nature, and in either case it will be generated and perishable, not everlasting.

17. That however it is that one assumes that this everlasting body which they have invented moves, it will not be able to impart movement to perishable [body], whether it be outside it or inside it, and 10 whether [in the latter case] it be in the whole of it or in a part of it. Including [a demonstration] that no body, whether celestial or sublunary, can permeate [another] body, nor can [bodies] be⁴³² inside one another.

18. That it is not possible for the body which is always being said 15 by them to be everlastingly attached to soul to be different both from bodies which move in a straight line and from those which move in a circle.

19. That it is not possible, if it is indeed everlasting, for it to be one of the bodies which move in a straight line.

20. That neither can it be one of the bodies which move in a circle, that is, one of the heavenly bodies.

21. That neither is it possible for this body to be a mixture compounded of the bodies which move in a straight line and those which move in a circle, or, as some claim, for it to naturally move spirally. And that there is no body at all which naturally exhibits 25 spiral movement.

The Refutation of the Seventh Argument

1. In the *Phaedrus*⁴³³ Plato states that soul is ungenerated and imperishable, defines its essence as self-movement and postulates 247,1that the self-moved is the source of movement, and our philosopher [sc. Proclus] for his part attempts to prove that if these things are so, it is necessary that the world too should be ungenerated and imper-5 ishable, or if the world is not ungenerated and imperishable, that the soul of the universe too should not be ungenerated and imperishable, since soul and the body which is moved by it necessarily exist and perish together. For, since, he says, soul is self-moved and the source 10 of movement just by being and not through choice, and is everlasting, the universe too must be everlastingly moved by it, or if the universe were not everlastingly moved by it because the world is not everlasting, then it would not be everlasting itself. For it is the source of movement just by being. And so if it were not everlastingly the source 15

of movement, neither would it be everlasting. But if it *is* everlastingly the source of movement, there must also be body which is everlastingly moved by it. And so, he says, if the soul of the universe is in Plato's view ungenerated and imperishable, then the world too is necessarily in his view ungenerated and imperishable.

And then, since our souls too are in Plato's view self-moved and these are what Plato is chiefly talking about in the *Phaedrus*, because they are self-moved and the self-moved is the source of movement and

- 25 the bodies moved by them (I mean *our* bodies) are clearly generated and perishable, Proclus, in an attempt to get around the refutation [of his position] that emerges from [these] facts, joins not thread to thread, as the proverb has it, but fiction to fiction.⁴³⁴ For, because the
- 248,1 rational soul, being everlasting, must in his view everlastingly move body of some kind, he claims that all soul is in the first instance mounted upon everlasting body and moves this for ever, and if it is in perishable bodies, moves the perishable [bodies] by means of the everlasting [body].
 - 5 Such, then, is the approach taken in the present argument, or, rather, in the present piece of sophistry.

2. I imagine that it is clear to everyone that the present proof is not based on the facts and that the demonstration of the everlast-

- 10 ingness of the world in this argument (*en toutois*) is not based on generally accepted premisses but, if on anything, on the opinions of Plato. And for this reason we ought perhaps to have absolutely refused⁴³⁵ assent of any kind to the unproved statements of Plato – for, as Plato's pupil [Aristotle] says,⁴³⁶ 'although both [Plato and the
- 15 truth] are dear, it is pious to everywhere give precedence to the truth' -[and], even if it really is a logical consequence of Plato's views about soul that the world is ungenerated and imperishable, ought not have given much weight to this until someone should establish by clear
- 20 proofs the truth of [his] premisses. For I at any rate would never consider self-movement the essence and definition of soul. And, except that I would have been getting off the subject, I would have cited what Proclus has said in his commentary on the *Phaedrus* in advo-
- 25 cacy of the position that self-movement is the essence of soul and, I believe, shown quite clearly that there is nothing sound or cogent about the argument.

But we shall let that pass on this occasion. Let us accept the 249,1 Platonic doctrine which states that self-movement is the definition and essence of soul and the one [which states that] self-movement is the source of movement and let us see whether they give rise to any necessity for Plato, when he says that soul is ungenerated and imperishable, to hold that the world too is ungenerated and imperishable. And, since the entire fabric of this piece of sophistry has its origin in Plato's saying that self-movement is the source of movement, it is proper to investigate what is meant by this statement itself

~-

and whether the everlastingness of the world necessarily follows from this hypothesis. For if it is shown that there is no necessity for the 10one to follow from the other,⁴³⁷ it is clear that nothing will prevent Plato from hypothesising that soul is ungenerated and self-movement the source of movement but that the world is generated.

3. For soul, then, being the source of movement is either identical 15with its being and essence,⁴³⁸ on the basis that soul has its essence in being the source of movement, or it has its being and essence in one way, whether it is self-movement that is the essence of soul or something else, while it is in another that it is the source of move-20ment, just as a builder has his being and essence in one way and his being the source and cause of building in another, and a teacher has his being in one way and his ability to affect the pupil in another. 25

Now, if it is the same thing for soul to be soul and to be the source of movement, and for that reason as soon as there is soul it is in every case necessary that there also be body that is moved by it [and] of whose movement it is the source (for a source is the source of 250.1something), then, since it is not possible either for body moved by soul, to the extent that it is moved by soul, to exist without the soul which moves it (for, as Aristotle shows in his writings on movement,⁴³⁹ everything which moves is moved by something which moves $\mathbf{5}$ it), soul and the body which is moved by it, to the extent that it is moved by it, either exist or do not exist together. Therefore soul cannot exist without body which is moved [by it]; for if it is the source 10 of movement for [such body], and if being the source of movement is the essence of soul, and if the essence of soul, as long as it is in existence, is what it is actually and not potentially, then soul is the source of movement actually and not potentially. But it is impossible to be an actual source of movement without something which is being 15moved. Therefore it is impossible for soul to exist without body which is being moved by it.

And so it has turned out that the being of soul lies in its relation to body; for if someone were to say that soul can also exist on its own apart from body and [still] be the source of movement, it is clear that 20he will agree that soul has actual existence but suppose that it is [only] potentially [that it is] the source of movement. And if this is so, soul will have its being and essence in one way but be the source of movement in another; for if it were the same thing for soul to be and 25[for it] to be the source of movement, if either of these were actualised, the other would necessarily be actualised as well. But if soul does not have its being in being the source of movement, there will be no necessity for someone who claims that soul is everlasting to at once 251,1hold that the world too is everlasting.

If, then, soul has its essence in being the source of movement, it could never exist alone without body which is moved [by it]. For just as it is impossible for the enmattered life of bodies to exist apart from

 $\mathbf{5}$

body because it has its being in being the life of *body*, and, speaking generally, impossible for the irrational soul, which is itself self-moved and the source of movement in the view of Plato ([a view] to which

- 10 Proclus himself subscribes in his commentary on the *Phaedrus*), to exist apart from body because it has its essence in being the source of life and movement ($z \hat{o} tik \hat{e}n$ te kai kin $\hat{e} tik \hat{e}n$) for body, so, one assumes, is it impossible for the soul of the world,⁴⁴⁰ if it has its essence in being
- 15 the source of movement of body, either to exist apart from body or to engage in any activity which is separate from body. For if its essence could not exist apart from body, it would, one assumes, be much more impossible for its activities to exist apart from body; for it has been
- 20 well demonstrated by Aristotle in *On the Soul*⁴⁴¹ and is accepted by all that should there be an essence which is separate from body, it will in every case also have an activity which is separate from body (for an essence which has been separated [from body] will exist to no good purpose if it is deprived of all activity) and that should there be any activity which is separate from body, then the essence from which
- 25 such an activity proceeds will in every case be separate from body as well. For it is not possible for an activity to be superior to the essence [which gives rise to it]. But it *will* be superior should it be separate from body while the essence is not separate. And it is agreed that
- 252,1 things which have an existence separate from bodies are superior to those which are not separate. So if an essence is a cause but [its] activity an effect, and if it is impossible for an effect to be superior to its cause and for a thing which is brought into being to be superior to
 - 5 that which brings it into being, then it is impossible, in the event that an activity is separate from body, for the essence not to be in every case separate from body as well. There is, therefore, every necessity that if the essence of the soul is not separate from body, every activity of soul should also not be separate from body; but this is clearly false.
 - 10 4. For souls are clearly still in the body when they free themselves of their relation and passionate attachment to it by engaging in intellectual activities which are separate from and unrelated to all body; 'for', says Aristotle,⁴⁴² 'it is hard even to imagine what kind of part [of the body] thought will hold together or how it will do it'.
 - 15 part [of the body] thought will hold together or how it will do it'. Therefore there is every necessity that the essence of soul, from which such activity proceeds, should also be separate from and unrelated to all body, as indeed Plato and all the best philosophers have
 - 20 believed. For it is from this that Plotinus inferred its immortality as well, showing from its separate activities that its essence is necessarily separate as well, and on that account immortal.⁴⁴³ And if the essence of soul is separate from and unrelated to all body, then it does
 - 25 not have its essence in being the source of movement. For this, as we have shown,⁴⁴⁴ is nothing other than for soul to have its being and existence in its relation to body.

And besides, it would be absurd to hold that body qua body has its

being outside of any relation to soul (if, that is, even for animate 253,1 bodies, being bodies is one thing and being animate another, and they have no need of a relationship to soul to be bodies), but that incorporeal – and intellectual and immortal – soul cannot, since it has its existence in being the source of movement, exist apart from body. This is nothing else than to make the intellectual essence of soul inferior even to bodies.

And that Proclus himself knows that soul has being and essence in 10 one way but is the source of movement in another and that whether it is engaged in contemplation or is endowing body with life or moving it in some other fashion, these are all activity of soul and not its essence, could be proved from many of his works, but it will suffice to 15 quote a single passage from his commentary on the *Phaedrus*; for in commenting on the present (sc. Plato's⁴⁴⁵) argument about the soul he expresses himself, to quote his exact words, as follows:

One should be aware that in the *Phaedo* he was attempting to establish that soul is immortal by means of arguments from recollection, from its likeness to divine things and from its provision of life to other things. But these are all activities of soul. And so in the *Phaedo* the proof was drawn from the activities of soul. Here, on the other hand, he takes his proof from the essence of soul. So, to the degree that the essence of soul is more perfect than and superior to its activity, to that degree is the proof of the immortality of soul in this work superior to and more exact than that in the *Phaedo*, for the argument proceeds from the essence of soul, that is, from selfmovement.

If, then, Proclus states that the provision of life to other things (namely to bodies) – from which life all activity and all movement in animate bodies arises – is an activity of soul rather than its essence and that its essence is self-movement, then the essence of soul and its being the cause and source of movement are not the same thing, but self-movement is, as Plato says, the essence of soul and being the source of movement is a power of soul from which the vital and motor activity of bodies proceeds.

The above arguments, then, have shown that it is not possible to say that soul has its essence in being the source of movement. And so even if someone claims that the essence of soul is ungenerated and imperishable it is not implied that he holds that the world too is ungenerated and imperishable.

5. But if soul has its being and essence in one way and its being 20 the source of movement in another, [then] it is certainly an activity or a power of soul that leads to its being the source of movement, just as the teacher, who is the source of change (*kinêseôs*) in the pupil, is

254,1

20

- 25 not the source of such change *qua* man (for, if this were so, every man the moment he was a man would immediately also be a teacher) but in consequence of one of the powers or activities associated with his essence. Given that this is so and it has been shown that it is in consequence of a power or an activity of soul that⁴⁴⁶ it is the source of
- 255,1 movement, if someone is able to show that every power of soul is at once attended by its actualisation or, at any rate, that all of the activities of soul are everlasting, we shall concede that soul is also, to the extent that it is the source of movement, everlastingly active, that
 - 5 is, that it everlastingly moves body of some kind; but if the activities of soul, whether cognitive or practical, are not everlasting and it moves from ignorance to knowledge and back from knowledge to forgetfulness and ignorance, and from vice to virtue and from virtue
 - 10 back to vice, what obvious necessity is there still that the power of soul which moves bodies should be everlastingly active? It will, then, sometimes be potentially rather than actually the source of movement, just as it is sometimes potentially rather than actually possessed of a skill.
 - 15 In particular, it is clear to everyone that the self-reflexive activities of soul, and still more those which are more intellectual and elevate it towards the divine, excel beyond comparison those of its activities which are associated with body, perhaps even as much as soul excels body, or, better, as much as intelligibles and mind, not to say even
 - 20 God himself, transcend in their incomparable superiority the nature of bodies, if, as is the case, the intellectual activities of soul connect it to God but its other [activities] to bodies. If, then, the superior activities of soul (I mean those which are intellectual and elevate it)
 - 25 are not everlasting, the inferior and debasing ones, one supposes, would *a fortiori* not be everlasting. For if the better necessarily belongs to the better and not, contrariwise, the better to the worse, and if everlastingness is better than perishability, [then] it is, I assume, clear that if everlastingness does not belong to the intellec-
- 256,1 tual activities, everlastingness would *a fortiori* not belong to those activities of soul which move the body and are inferior to them. And besides, the intellectual activities of soul have, if it is indeed

both intelligible and mind, been agreed by all parties to belong to it even by nature, but those which move bodies are contrary to nature for reason and are not constitutive of the perfection of its essence; for

- 10 the essential nature (*idiotês*) of reason is not characterised by the moving of bodies; for this is more a characteristic of nature and of irrational power than of rational and intellectual essence. If, then, the rational and perfective activities of our soul are not everlasting, one supposes that those which are bodily and contrary to [its] nature and foreign as it were would *a fortiori* not be everlasting.
- And if the activities of soul that are associated with body are not everlasting, then neither can everlasting body be fastened to soul.

 $\mathbf{5}$

6. It is also possible to argue the matter as follows.

All bodily movements, or indeed changes in general, are four in 20genus.⁴⁴⁷ In [the genus of] substance are generation and passing out of existence, in quantity are increase and diminution, in quality is alteration, in place is locomotion. Of this last, one kind is in a straight line, as for example that of the elements (some of which move upwards from below, others downwards from above), and the other kind is circular movement, as for example that of the heavenly bodies. If, 25then, soul is the source and cause of the movement of bodies and therefore, as Proclus believes, everlastingly moves bodies involuntarily and just by being, it is altogether necessary that it also be in accordance with one or all or several of these movements that soul 257.1everlastingly moves body. Therefore, if that which moves moves everlastingly and that which is moved is moved everlastingly, then the movement too will be everlasting and have no beginning or end to its existence. We must, then, consider whether any of the movements enumerated [above] is everlasting. For, if none of them is $\mathbf{5}$ everlasting, that which is moved will not be moved everlastingly and the soul which moves [it] will not move [it] everlastingly.

That no case of either generation or passing out of existence is beginningless or endless is clear to everyone. A thing which is coming to be ceases to at a limit, [namely when it attains its] form. The 10 generation of a house, for example, has as its beginning the [beginning] of the foundations and as its limit the shape of the house. And, similarly, in the case of things which come to be in nature, the beginning of their generation is the sowing of the seed and its limit the perfection of their natural form, for instance, human form. And 15in the same way something that is perishing stops [perishing] at a limit, [namely] privation and not-being. In brief, if generation is the path from not-being to being, and passing out of existence is the path from being to not-being, it is impossible for generation and passing out of existence to be beginningless and endless, since they are 20limited by being and by not-being.

Nor, moreover, can anything alter everlastingly. Rest and definition are present in things and all things are *not*, as Heraclitus held,⁴⁴⁸ in movement. Further, alteration too, being movement, is embraced 25 by two forms, the one from which it is [moving] and the one towards which [it is moving]. Growing white, for example, is the path from black to white, and, when the thing which is altering has got there and become white, it remains in that state thereafter. And, indeed, it is plain that actual sensation, since it is a kind of alteration of the senses, of its nature commences and ceases. For we neither see nor hear nor employ any other sense continuously and sleep is nothing 5 other than the resting of the senses.

And we say the same things in regard to increase and diminution. Bodies do not increase [in size] indefinitely but remain at a pre-estab258,1

lished natural size; and, consequently, diminution too, the contrary of increase, is also limited.

It remains, then, to ask whether one of the [two] types of local 10 movement is everlasting.

Aristotle has adequately demonstrated⁴⁴⁹ that things which move 15in a straight line have a beginning and an end to their movement and that they are bracketed by rest on either side of these - I mean before the beginning and after the end [of their movement]. For if movement is in magnitude and infinite magnitude does not exist, movement in a straight line will not be infinite. And nor can objects which are moving in a straight line reverse direction smoothly (kata sunekheian) without coming to rest. For example, if an object which has been moving downwards from above reverses direction and moves back up from below, there will in every case be [a period of] rest

20between these two contrary movements. Aristotle has also demonstrated this.

In regard to the circular movement which the heavenly bodies exhibit, it will be shown more fully, if God permits, in Objections

- Against Aristotle On the Everlastingness of the World, 450 that it too is 25not everlasting; for we shall need to produce additional arguments
- against this position. However, if it has been adequately demon-259.1strated in the first chapter that it is impossible for the generation of the world to be everlasting (something, indeed, which will be demonstrated even more fully [and] in detail when we have got rid of the obstruction⁴⁵¹ arising from all of the puzzles⁴⁵²), it is clear that circu- $\mathbf{5}$
 - lar movement cannot be everlasting either.

So, if no kind of bodily movement is everlasting, there will be no body that is moved everlastingly and soul does not move an everlasting⁴⁵³ body. Therefore it is possible for the soul of the world to be, as Plato holds, everlasting but for the world not to be everlasting.

7. But nor is there any very pressing need for us to give an account of circular movement at this point. It was in the course of discussing our souls in the Phaedrus⁴⁵⁴ and out of a desire to prove their immortality that Plato defined the essence of soul as self-movement and self-movement as the source of movement in bodies. But it is, I assume, clear to everyone that no body in us is observed to move with a circular movement. Every living creature moves from place to place

- but none of the bodies that rotate changes its position entirely; they 20all rotate about their own centres, which [themselves] remain motionless. Therefore no living creature contains any body which moves with a circular movement. Therefore, when Plato says that self-movement is the source of movement, he does not mean that it is the source 25of circular movement. For he says that self-movement is the defini-
- 260.1tion of all soul. But not every soul moves a body which rotates; for nothing below the moon naturally moves with a circular movement.

10

Therefore Plato is not saying that self-movement is the source of circular movement [alone].

And besides, Proclus states that soul is the source and cause of 5 movement involuntarily and just by being, but soul clearly does not cause bodies to move locally involuntarily and just by being but through desire and choice. For if soul moved bodies from place to place merely by existing, their movement would be continuous and the 10 bodies of animals would never be at rest in one place, if soul always possesses the power to move [things] and were it to move [them] through an unconscious natural power. But in fact all movement in a straight line begins from rest and ceases in rest. Therefore soul does not impart rectilinear movement to bodies involuntarily and just by 15being. And if rectilinear movement, being local movement, takes place as a result of desire and choice on the part of soul, and not involuntarily just by [its] being, it would follow that if there were some kind of circular movement arising from soul, it too [would be] at 20the initiative and choice of soul, since circular movement too is local movement. And surely it would be nothing short of irrational if each individual soul imparted local movement to the body subordinated to it through initiative and choice, while the soul of the universe alone 25was the source and cause of the movement of the world involuntarily, like irrational nature. But if local movement takes place through choice on the part of soul, and if Proclus states that soul is self-moved and the source of movement not by choice but just by being, then Plato is not claiming that soul is the source of local movement. But circular movement is a local movement. Therefore it has been shown from 5 Proclus' own words that Plato is not claiming that self-movement is the source of circular movement.

But it is agreed by all that none of the other types of movement is everlasting. Therefore Plato is not claiming that self-movement is the source of everlasting movement. And so even if the definition of our souls should fit the soul of the universe, it is not on that account at once necessary that, because soul is said to be ungenerated and imperishable by Plato, the world which is moved by it should also be ungenerated and imperishable.

8. But even should we regard self-movement as the source of all movement, including local movement, even then there is no obvious necessity that once there is soul there should also be body moved by it. When Plato claims⁴⁵⁵ that soul, being the source of movement, is ungenerated, on the ground that a source is ungenerated, he does not, it seems to me, express himself correctly. Irrational souls too are sources of movement for irrational bodies, since they also are, as Plato says, self-moved and therefore each a source of movement, but they are nevertheless not ungenerated. The natural constitution (*phusis*) of a stone is the cause and source of its natural downward movement 25

261.1

claim that the natural constitution of individual bodies is ungenerated.

But even should it be conceded that soul is, as Plato holds, ungenerated and the source of movement, there is no obvious necessity that as soon as there is a source, the things of which it is the source should also exist, since, as has been shown,⁴⁵⁶ soul does not have its essence in being the source of movement for body. The builder is responsible

- 5 for and the source of the movement involved in building, and the teacher for the movement of the pupil in learning, but there is not at once something under construction or something being taught the moment there is a builder or a teacher, because the builder and the
- 10 teacher do not derive their being from being the source of movement. Similarly, God is the very first cause and source of all things that are and will be, but all things have not [always] coexisted along with God, since there are also generated and perishable things in the universe. And even more to the point, it is, I suppose, altogether necessary
- 15 that soul should also be the source and cause of the movement of generated and perishable bodies as well,⁴⁵⁷ for movement in living creatures originates with soul. Therefore if soul is also the source of
- 20 the movement of generated and perishable body, and if, as Plato holds, soul is ungenerated but this body is not ungenerated, then there is no necessity that once the source and cause of the movement of body exists, body moved by it should also of necessity exist. Even should it be agreed that perishable body is not moved by soul imme-
- 25 diately but, as Proclus states, through the mediation of everlasting [body], there is every necessity that these people should hold either that soul itself is the source of movement in perishable body as well,
- 263,1 or that everlasting body is, or that both of them are. Whichever [of these positions] one holds, one must concede that the source and cause of movement in perishable body is, in the view of these people, everlasting while the thing which actually moves is generated and perishable.
 - 5 There is, then, no necessity that if the source of a thing is ungenerated, it too should be ungenerated.

9. But if they will claim that soul is said by Plato to be the source of movement because it gives life to bodies, and that it therefore gives

10 life to body involuntarily and just by being present in it, and that therefore there must in every case be something which is everlastingly being given life by it, it is worth asking first what kind of life it is that soul confers upon body and then whether it is possible for that kind of life to be everlasting.

There is, one supposes, every necessity that the life conferred upon bodies by soul is that by virtue of which living bodies differ from those which have no share in life. Living bodies differ from those without life by being sentient and taking nourishment and growing and

20 reproducing themselves, as well as by [experiencing] desire and by

262.1

[engaging in] local movement on the initiative of soul. And so all bodily life is encompassed in these. Each of them is observed [to be present] in living bodies either potentially or actually (potentially, clearly, through capacity⁴⁵⁸).

Now, that no such activity of soul (neither sensation, that is, nor 25local movement; not growth, not diminution, nor any other of those enumerated earlier) is everlasting has recently been proved by us⁴⁵⁹ by means of [arguments based on] self-evident fact. And so soul is not 264.1the source and cause of the actual life of bodies just by being. And if he claims that soul is from [time] everlasting the source and cause of the capacity for life⁴⁶⁰ and that it confers this upon bodies as soon as it exists,⁴⁶¹ in the first place⁴⁶² no capacity, nor any potentiality at all, 5 is a movement. For if actual sensation and growth are movements, clearly [sensation and growth] as capacity, and potential [sensation and growth] in general, would be rest from sensation and growth. For the [kind of] change that occurs in things which move in a straight 10 line is not a change from one movement to another but a change from rest to movement – just as there is also change from movement to rest. And the same applies to the other [types of movement]. The potential life of bodies, then, is not movement but rather rest. And so when Plato says that self-movement is the source of movement, he 15will not be claiming that the potential life of bodies is movement.

Therefore, if the capacity for life in bodies is not movement, and if 20 the actual movements through which their life is expressed (*hai zôtikai autôn kinêseis*) are not everlasting, Plato will not, as a consequence of saying that self-movement is the source of movement and that self-movement is ungenerated and imperishable, be compelled to say that the world too is ungenerated and imperishable.

And so it is because soul is sometimes able to move body that he calls it the source of movement, not because it moves it everlastingly. Otherwise, as we have shown, the hypothesis of Plato cannot be in accord with the nature of things. And so, if Plato is not to be drawing invalid conclusions, he means⁴⁶³ that self-movement is always potentially the source of movement, but not always actually.

10. And even should one concede that the capacity for life in 265,1 bodies either is or is said to be, as Proclus believes, a [form of] movement, we can go back to the beginning and simply say that it is obvious that the rational soul is not the cause of this kind of bodily 5 life at all, whether as capacity or actual, for bodies. For if sensation or movement or any of the other vital powers or activities observed in bodies, on the basis of which bodies are said to have life, came to bodies from [the rational soul], nothing would be alive that did not partake of the rational essence. But in fact even those animals which are irrational and have no share of rational soul are seen to share in all of the above-mentioned⁴⁶⁴ [vital powers or activities] both in capacity and actually, and many of them have sharper and more
- 15 accurate senses and share in the other powers of soul [to a greater degree than we do]. So it is clear that such life does not come to bodies from the rational essence of the soul. All that has passed from the
- 20 rational soul to the things which have a share in it is the patterning and ordering of irrational life by it, and rational life consists precisely in the orderly movement of the emotive faculties of the irrational soul according to [the principles of] reason. And just as in the case of a team of two horses (which Plato in fact used as an image of our soul⁴⁶⁵)
- 25 the horses are the cause of the body simply moving while the charioteer in charge of them is responsible for their trained (*tekhnikês*) and coordinated movement, so in us, one supposes, is it the role of the irrational soul to be the cause of our bodies simply having life while 6,1 reason is responsible for order and harmony in the movements of our
- 266,1

emotive faculties. And if in individual living creatures the rational soul does not associate immediately with the body, there being need of the irrational faculty as a kind of link [between them] through which the body

- 5 tional faculty as a kind of link [between them] through which the body is given life and becomes fit for the reception of the rational soul, then there is, one supposes, every necessity that even if some rational soul really is set over the heaven, it will *a fortiori* not associate immediately with heavenly body but use the irrational faculty as an
- 10 intermediary through which illumination from the rational soul may come to the heavenly body. For bodies by themselves, without a share in life and perception, cannot be immediately illuminated by the
- 15 rational soul, just as our eyes cannot take in the sun's rays without the intermediate transparent [medium]. What we have said so far will meet with the approval of even the pagan philosophers.⁴⁶⁶

Now, if the irrational soul is the cause of life in bodies, it is clear that even if self-movement, that is to say, the rational soul, is a source of movement, it is not the source of all movement but only of that which is subordinated to it and associated with reason. [This is clearly so] since even in inanimate things nature is a source of movement in them, if indeed, as Aristotle holds,⁴⁶⁷ nature is a source of movement and rest. For nature [present] in fire is the source and

- 25 cause of the upward movement of fire and nature in water of its downward movement. And I suppose it is obvious to everyone that inanimate things are not moved by rational soul given that even those living creatures which are rational are not. So just as the charioteer
- 267,1 is the source of the skilled movement of the chariot, and the helmsman likewise of that of the ship, while neither is responsible simply for their movement, and there need not be any chariot or ship just
 - 5 because there is a charioteer or helmsman (for there can be someone who possesses the skill to be a helmsman or charioteer⁴⁶⁸ without there being a ship or a chariot), in the same way, since the rational soul is a source not of all movement but of the kind that is appropriate

to reason, there will be no necessity that once there is rational soul, there must also be⁴⁶⁹ body moved by it.

11. The necessity is in fact the other way round. With the elimi-10 nation of soul, bodies moved by it are also eliminated, since where animate bodies are present there must also be soul; [but]⁴⁷⁰ animate [body] does not in every case accompany soul, for while the soul is believed to be immortal, animate bodies clearly come to be and perish. 15For this reason Plato does not say in the *Phaedrus* that because of the existence of soul the heaven of necessity also exists, but [rather] that with its elimination the order that has flowed from it to the universe 20is at once thrown into confusion. This, at all events, is, to quote his exact words, what he says in that dialogue:

The self-moved, then, is [the source] of movement. And it is not possible for it either to perish or to come to be, or the whole heaven and the whole earth would collapse and remain immobile and never again have a source of movement to bring them [back] into being.471

It is important to note that when he says that it is not possible for 268.1self-movement to either perish or come to be, he does not go on to talk about the consequences of the generation of self-movement but about those of its passing out of existence. The result will be, he says, that the whole heaven and the whole earth will collapse and remain immobile and never again have a source of movement to bring them $\mathbf{5}$ [back] into being. This does not follow from the generation of selfmovement (for when self-movement comes into existence, it in turn provides a source of movement to things which are moved [by it], so that, having been moved, they may come to be), but if self-movement should perish, the things which get their existence from it will have nothing from which to derive their existence because the source [of 10movement] will have perished. This is clear not only from Plato's statement but by logical entailment and the very nature of the facts; as we said earlier,⁴⁷² although soul is believed to be immortal, there is no necessity that our bodies also be immortal. And so it is by no 15means necessary that because of the existence of soul, body moved by it should also exist. And if [the existence of] soul necessarily follows from the existence of animate body, what will assuredly follow by conversion by negation⁴⁷³ under the rules of logic is not the existence 20of soul from the existence of body but the non-existence of body from the non-existence of soul. There is, therefore, no need for someone who claims that soul is ungenerated to claim that the world too is ungenerated.

12. But, since Proclus, as though wishing to add a kind of neces-25sity to his argument, claims that soul is by its very being involuntarily the source and cause of life and movement in bodies, let

us examine this [idea] as well. And let it be conceded by us, even if this is not what Plato says, that rational souls are by their very being involuntarily the sources of life and movement in bodies. [When I say]

- 5 'by their very being' I do not mean that souls have their being and essence in being sources of movement (this hypothesis has already been refuted; our current position is that soul has its being in one way and is the source of movement in another), but that I am proposing that we assume that (*hupokeisthô*), just as the sun involuntarily
- 10 illuminates the moment it appears and fire heats the moment it is present (obviously, that is, provided that things capable of being heated or illuminated are present; for fire does not have its essence in heating nor the sun in illuminating, but fire and the sun involun-
- 15 tarily illuminate and heat if receptive objects are present), so in exactly the same way too does the rational soul by its very being involuntarily confer life and movement upon the things to which it is present. This being so, what necessity would there be, should soul be
- 20 ungenerated, for body moved by it also to be ungenerated? Light too has the property of setting a potentially transparent [medium] in motion the moment it is present, but light assuredly does not, the moment it exists, light up everything that is potentially transparent but obviously only what is in existence, and not all of that but [only]
- 25 what stands in the [required] relation to the source of illumination. For when the sun is above the earth, all of the air and water beneath the earth are shielded from it by the earth, and because they do not stand in the [required] relation to the source of illumination, they
- 270,1 derive no movement from the light and their potential transparency is not activated. And, moreover, colours too are by their very being involuntarily such as to stimulate vision, and sounds hearing, and
 - 5 every other perceptible thing is by its very being such as to stimulate one or other of the senses, but there is no necessity that as soon as there is a colour an act of seeing should immediately be stimulated by it, nor any necessity that as soon as there is a sound an act of hearing should be caused by that sound; and the same goes for the
 - 10 rest [of the senses and their objects]. For colours hidden at the bottom of the sea or under the earth, and equally those shrouded in darkness, are by nature such as to give rise to acts of seeing and give rise to [these] acts of seeing by their very being and not by conscious decision, but even so no act of seeing is caused by them. For the essence
 - 15 of colours does not lie in their being such as to give rise to an act of seeing. On the one hand, they exist and have being by virtue of being colours (hence they are every bit as much colours even if they are never seen), on the other, it is an essential property of theirs to be able to stimulate vision – provided, of course, that it falls upon them and
 - 20 stands in the same relation to them as [any] passive principle does to an active one. So just as an active principle is [only] potentially active until a passive principle is present (I mean potentially in [the sense

of possessing a] capacity), so are colours [only] potentially able to stimulate vision as long as it [sc. vision] is not present. Sounds too, although involuntarily able to stimulate hearing, are [only] potentially able to stimulate hearing if they occur in an isolated place where there is no sentient creature. And an object of desire (such as, for example, the beauty of a beloved [youth]⁴⁷⁴) is by its very being such as to arouse desire, but it is not the case that, the moment an object of desire exists, desire must in every instance be aroused by it, but [only] when [desire] comes into contact with it and comes to stand in [the required] relation to it.

If, then, the thing that is of a nature to be moved by it does not in 5 every case coexist with everything that is capable of moving something else, even if it moves [things] involuntarily and just by being, then it was wrong of Proclus, having reached the conclusion (*labôn*) that self-movement is ungenerated and imperishable and the source of movement in bodies and that it is such as to move bodies just by existing and not by conscious decision, to claim that it follows from this that the world too is ungenerated and imperishable on the 10 ground that once there is a moving cause, the thing that is of a nature to be moved by it of necessity coexists with it. That this is not true we have shown from the facts themselves.

13. And Plato himself states in the Phaedrus that being ungenerated and imperishable are consequences of self-movement and of that alone and declares that everything which is externally moved under-15goes cessation⁴⁷⁵ of movement and of life. The passage goes as follows:

All soul is immortal, for that which is always in movement is immortal. But that which moves something else and is itself moved by something else undergoes cessation of movement and therefore undergoes cessation of life. Only a thing which moves itself never ceases moving because it does not abandon its own nature, and, moreover, this is the fount and source of movement for everything else which moves.⁴⁷⁶

If, then, it is actually only that which moves itself which, since it cannot depart from its own nature, never ceases moving and is therefore immortal, and everything which is moved by something else, on the other hand, undergoes cessation of movement and life, and if, as Aristotle has shown⁴⁷⁷ and Plato had earlier declared,⁴⁷⁸ no body is self-moved but each and every one of them is moved by something else, and if the heaven and world, since they are not self-moved but are moved by self-moved soul and move other things as a result of being moved by it, are body, then, according to Plato, the world too will undergo cessation of movement and life. And this is in agreement with the words 'since you have come to be, you are not indissoluble nor altogether immortal' in the *Timaeus*.⁴⁷⁹

103

271.1

25

20

5

But it is impossible for a thing which undergoes cessation of life to be ungenerated. Nothing which is perishable (even if it is not destroyed by being overwhelmed by a power which is stronger than its own nature) is ungenerated, since it is not even possible for a thing which is ungenerated to be perishable. For if something perishable were ungenerated, then, of necessity, something ungenerated will be

perishable, which is impossible.

Therefore the heaven is not ungenerated according to Plato, since [according to him] it is not imperishable by nature either. And it is not imperishable because, undergoing cessation of movement, it undergoes cessation of life. It undergoes cessation of life and movement because it is not self-moved but moved by another thing, soul, and something else moves everything within it. It is for this reason that he says that, in order that it may remain immortal and indissoluble, a [constantly] restored immortality comes to it from the creator because it does not have immortality from its own nature, as has been

shown by many proofs in the sixth [chapter].⁴⁸⁰

14. But, as I said at the outset,⁴⁸¹ Proclus claims that it follows from soul's being self-moved that body moved by it is co-everlasting 273.1with it. In this he flies in the face of the facts, since all bodies which

- are moved by souls are clearly generated and perishable. He should $\mathbf{5}$ have argued from the agreed to the unknown. In other words, starting from the fact that all bodies that are moved by souls are seen to come to be and perish, he should have concluded that not even the body of
- 10 the world could be ungenerated and imperishable. [Instead,] he^{482} perverts the nature of demonstration and argues from the non-evident to the non-evident. Assuming without proof that as soon as there is soul there must necessarily also be body which is moved by it, [an assumption] which is not warranted either by the facts or by logic, he
- claims on this basis that it is clear that every soul is in the first 15instance mounted upon an everlasting body and everlastingly moves this body, and should it find itself in perishable bodies, moves the perishable ones by means of the everlasting one.

Now, perhaps it is clear to everyone [in view of the above] that, since the antecedent has been refuted, the consequent has been refuted along with it; for if we have shown that there is no necessity 20that as soon as there is soul there should also be body which is moved by it, then clearly no further argument will render it necessary for souls to be in the first instance mounted upon an everlasting body.

But perhaps, on the other hand, it will do no harm to examine this 25last hypothesis in its own right [and determine] whether [the theory] that there must always be a kind of everlasting body attached to souls and existing alongside them throughout their existence and that souls are in the first instance mounted upon this and move perishable bodies by means of it has any claim to be in conformity with natural or [logical] necessity.483

15

20

Let us, then, begin our investigation. Local movement in bodies is 274.1of two kinds: either circular or rectilinear. (The mixed movement which is referred to as a spiral is not natural. There is no body in nature that moves with a spiral movement, a fact which, obvious $\mathbf{5}$ though it is, will be demonstrated below.) Now, guite apart from its being self-evident, all the pagan philosophers⁴⁸⁴ have clearly stated that bodies which move in a straight line are generated and perishable, for it is impossible to discover a body that moves in a straight line which is not completely subject to generation and passing out of 10existence. If, then, there is any body at all which is ungenerated and imperishable, it will either be entirely motionless or exhibit circular movement if any at all. (Let us concede for the time being that it is an open question whether those bodies which move in a circle are ungenerated and imperishable.) This being so, if there is, as [our 15opponents] claim, another, everlasting, body upon which soul is in the first instance mounted [and] by means of which it moves perishable bodies, then either⁴⁸⁵ this moves perishable body by moving locally itself, as a mule moves when it moves a wagon and a hand moves 20when it moves something other [than itself], or it moves perishable bodies by means of a natural power while remaining free of local movement itself, as a magnet imparts local movement to iron, or amber to straw, while remaining still itself.

Now, if it imparts movement by means of a natural force while itself remaining motionless, it will not impart movement at one time 25and not impart it at another but always impart it as long as body which is moved by it is present and stands in the [required] relation to it. That is how active natural powers in bodies work; a magnet always attracts nearby iron as long as the natural force within it is 275.1not exhausted and remains intact, and amber likewise straw, and the hot always draws up moisture and the cold always causes things in its vicinity to contract. And if [imperishable body] is always impart- $\mathbf{5}$ ing movement, perishable bodies will always be moved; for a thing which is moved must always move in the same way as the thing which moves it does. But perishable bodies are not always in movement. So if perishable bodies are not always in movement but sometimes move and sometimes are at rest, then clearly [imperishable body] does not 10always impart movement. But if it does not always impart movement, it does not [impart it] by a natural power. And besides,⁴⁸⁶ soul would no longer be imparting movement through the agency of this [everlasting] body if it [sc. the body] really did move perishable bodies by a natural power while itself remaining motionless; [the body] by itself would be the primary cause of the movement of perishable bodies, 15just as the magnet is primarily the cause of movement in the iron and does not itself move through being moved by soul.

And if it does not impart movement by means of a natural power, the only remaining possibility is that it is moved locally by soul and 20 moves perishable body in the same way, just as a mule is moved by soul and moves a wagon or some other object [as a consequence]. And if it imparts movement through being moved itself, it imparts this movement by being moved either in a straight line or in a circle by soul.

Now, it is not possible for this body to be moved in a circle and to move perishable [body] in a straight line as a consequence. If it imparts movement by moving [itself], it obviously imparts movement by thrust and force. By moving in a circle, it moves about its own centre, which remains unmoving, and so does not completely change position. So how does it impart movement to a perishable body in such a way as to cause it to move in its entirety in a straight line from one position to another? A thing which moves another by means of its own

- movement and carries it from one position to another by itself passing from one place to another, as this [imperishable body] does, is changing [the position of the other body] along with its own. At any rate, it is by changing their own position that horses change the position of
 - the chariot and of the charioteer as well. Moreover, a thing which moves something else communicates to it the same kind of movement as it exhibits itself. The heaven, for instance, which carries the ether which lies beneath it around with it by means of its own movement,
 - 10 carries it too around in a circle. (It communicates the movement involved in alteration and generation to things here [on earth] not simply through its rotation alone but more by means of the power and particular relation to them of the heavenly bodies. The sun, for example, heats things by coming close to them and, conversely, cools
 - 15 them when it moves away. But at present we are only concerned with local movement). And again, the air, which moves in a straight line, imparts the same kind of movement to a ship, and a mule likewise to a wagon. For [in this latter case] the kind of movement [imparted] is the same even though the manner is different (I mean the manner of the movement) because a mule moves by means of legs and a wagon
 - by means of wheels.⁴⁸⁷

25

15. And in any case, the movement of wheels is not, as one might suppose, of a different kind. The movement of wheels is rolling, not circular movement, and rolling too is a mode of rectilinear movement. [It is] as though one were to imagine a round stone travelling down an inclined [surface]; the shape is the cause of the different mode of movement, not a difference in the kind of the movement. At any rate,

- 277,1 if one were to change the shape of the wheels, the mode of the rectilinear movement would be changed along with it. And it is clear that the plane (*megethos*) upon which rolling occurs is extended rectilinearly. And so rolling objects move in a straight line. And so
 - 5 rolling too is a rectilinear movement, differing only in the mode of movement involved, just as creatures that go on foot differ from those

that slither or crawl only in their mode [of locomotion]. And, indeed, none of the bodies that naturally rotate rolls.

And so if perishable body exhibits rectilinear movement, and if, as [our opponents] claim, perishable [body] is moved by the movement of ungenerated and imperishable body, then it is impossible for the 10 latter, while itself rotating, to impart rectilinear movement to perishable body; for that which rotates does not completely change its position.

And since a perishable body moves not only as a whole but also in 15its parts, as when someone moves just their hand or just their finger or foot or head, let these learned men tell us what the mode of movement of a part is; for if an everlasting body, while rotating, moves a perishable body as a whole by means of its own movement, what is the explanation of the movement of a part [of a perishable 20bodyl? For a whole and a part do not move from the same cause. It seems plausible, even necessary, that, just as the rotation of the whole [of an everlasting body] moves the whole [of a perishable body]. so must this or that part of the everlasting [body] move this or that 25part of the perishable one by moving itself. But it is not possible for any part of bodies that rotate to move by itself separately from the whole. So what is the source of the movement of the parts of a perishable body? It is not possible for a part of a perishable [body] to be moved [separately] by the movement of the whole [of an everlasting body]. For if a perishable body is moved by the movement of the whole of an everlasting [body] as though pushed by it, and if the 30 perishable body is a continuous whole (sunekhes ... auto heautôi), there is every necessity that the perishable body should when pushed move as a whole along with the movement of the [everlasting body]. 278.1So [our opponents] will not be able to explain how a part of a perishable body moves while [the body as a] whole remains motionless.

So if it is necessary that a part be moved by a part in the same way that the whole is moved by the whole, and if it is impossible for a part $\mathbf{5}$ to be moved by a part because it is not possible for any part of bodies that rotate to move in a circle on its own while the whole is stationary, then neither does the rotation of the whole [of an everlasting body] move a perishable [body] as a whole.

And so it is not possible for this [everlasting body of theirs] to move 10 a perishable body rectilinearly by itself rotating.

16. The only remaining possibility, then, is that, if this body exists at all, it too moves in a straight line. And if it too moves in a straight line, movement in a straight line will either be natural to it or not 15natural to it.

Now, if movement in a straight line is natural to it, since no body which moves in a straight line is ungenerated and imperishable, neither will this one be ungenerated and imperishable. If, on the

other hand, it does not move in a straight line naturally, it moves in a straight line either supernaturally⁴⁸⁸ or contrary to its nature and by force.

Now, it is impossible for it to do so supernaturally. [Qualities] which belong to things supernaturally belong naturally to [other] things which are superior to them, as circular movement, which belongs to ethereal body supernaturally, belongs naturally to a superior [body], namely heavenly [body]. Such [qualities] are said to belong to certain things supernaturally precisely because they belong naturally to substances which are superior to those things. For this reason we say that those souls that are divinely-inspired and those

- 277,1 reason we say that those souls that are divinely-inspired and those that receive foreknowledge of the future or acquire insight into other secret matters are supernaturally active because such activity is
 5 characteristic of superhuman natures. So if rectilinear movement
 - belongs to perishable bodies naturally, it would not also belong supernaturally to this body upon which they claim soul is primarily
 - 10 mounted, since it is superior to [perishable body]; for they assert both that what is everlasting is superior to what is perishable and that this [body of theirs] is everlasting.

If, then, this body exhibits rectilinear movement neither naturally nor supernaturally, it evidently must do so contrary to its nature and by force. But no body which moves contrary to its nature and by force is ungenerated and imperishable. Both all bodies which move in a

- 15 straight line (i.e. particular things, [by which] I mean a particular instance of fire or a particular instance of water or of anything else) and everything which moves contrary to nature (as, again, particular things; for fire is [only] carried downwards, or a clod of earth or some water, say, upwards, by force and contrary to their nature), and,
- 20 [speaking] generally, all things that are receptive of movement which is contrary to their nature, are observed to come to be and to perish, and nothing of this sort is ungenerated and imperishable. And so this body too, if it moves in a straight line contrary to its nature, will not be ungenerated and imperishable. For the very path towards [a condition that is] contrary to [their] nature – in fact even the cause of
- 25 a movement that is contrary to their nature is a cause and source of passing out of existence for bodies.

Therefore either let [our opponents] search for yet another $^{\rm 489}$ ungenerated body which will move this one, and we shall once more

- 280,1 raise the same puzzles in regard to it, and in this way the argument will proceed *ad infinitum*, or else let them concede⁴⁹⁰ that soul is of necessity mounted immediately upon perishable body and moves it directly. (By 'immediately' I mean without there being another, ever-
 - 5 lasting, body between them; for we ourselves concede that nature and the irrational powers, which are themselves generated and perishable, lie between rational soul and body).

17. And besides, if this ungenerated and imperishable body,

20

through being moved, as [their] hypothesis has it, by soul (whether one would have this to be in a straight line or in a circle), in its turn moves perishable bodies, and if every body which moves another body through its own movement moves it by touching and being in contact with it, then this everlasting [body] also moves perishable [body] by touching it and being in contact with it. There is, therefore, every necessity that everlasting body should be in external or internal contact with perishable [body].

But if it moved it by touching it externally, the cause of movement would be seen to be external too. But we do not in fact observe anything imparting movement externally; on the contrary, the sinews which move the body are agreed to be inside it. Nor would the air 20be in continuous external contact with our bodies at every point if there were another body external to it that was in contact with the mortal body and moved it. And moreover, when some [other] body was in external contact with us at all points – this can happen, as it does when a person is swimming entirely under the water – this 25[everlasting] body would have been separated from us and would not be imparting movement [to us] because it would not be touching us externally. [This would be so] because it is not possible for both water and some other body to be in contact with us at all points at the same time. [In such a case] body would be permeating body, which is agreed to be impossible and which we shall shortly⁴⁹¹ demonstrate to be so. Therefore when we swim we must be moved directly by soul and not $\mathbf{5}$ as a result of this [everlasting] body being in external contact with us and imparting movement [to us].492 So this hypothesis should be avoided as transparently false.

But if the everlasting [body] is in contact with the generated body through being within it, there is every necessity that either the whole of the everlasting [body] should permeate the whole of the perishable one, or that they should [only] be in partial contact with one another – more specifically, [only] at the surfaces (*perata*) of the touching parts, which is how all touching bodies actually do touch one another.

Now, it is impossible for a whole to permeate a whole, for it has been shown by the natural philosophers that for one body to permeate 15another is an impossibility. Otherwise, the sea could be contained in a wine ladle. For if it were possible to hold two equal ladlefuls in the same [ladle], why not three, or an infinite number? Because everything that is finite may be measured out by everything [else] that is finite, it would be possible, if the greater [quantity] were measured 20out by the lesser, to hold the whole sea in a wine ladle. So if this is absurd and impossible, it is impossible for body to permeate body. Nor is it any more the case that it is impossible for this particular body to permeate that but possible for others to permeate another [body].⁴⁹³ None of them can permeate any other, if even the heavenly bodies 25clearly do not permeate⁴⁹⁴ one another but are only in contact with

281,1

one another. It is for this reason that the stars eclipse one another. 282,1 Not only are their bodies unable to permeate one another but neither can the light of the higher stars permeate the lower ones because the bodies of stars are not transparent. If their bodies had been equipped

- 5 by nature to permeate one another, they would not eclipse one another, since the light within them would illuminate their entire interiors as well as their external shape ($s\hat{o}masin$). If, then, it is impossible for light to permeate them, it is yet more impossible for their bodies to permeate one another. For even though it has been
- 10 proved that a hemisphere of the moon is always illuminated by the rays of the sun, the light that falls upon that hemisphere of [the moon] does not have the power to permeate its interior and illuminate its
- 15 other hemisphere. At any rate, when it is five to seven days old, and the part of it which is facing towards the sun, which is the part that the sun's rays are able to touch, is illuminated, and [this] lighted part of it is illuminating everything transparent within range, [the moon] cannot light up the rest of its body because the light which is on [one]
- 20 part of it cannot permeate its interior. So if not even the brightest and most penetrative light can permeate the bodies of the stars, this constitutes a much stronger demonstration that their bodies will not be able to permeate one another. For if their bodies had been nat-
- 25 urally equipped to permeate one another, the light in them would also be able to permeate their bodies – if, at any rate, this light has them
- 283,1 as its substratum⁴⁹⁵ and must itself be wherever its substratum is. But if light cannot permeate them, much less can bodies, for the above argument will apply to all cases.⁴⁹⁶

5 And so if it is not possible for the [whole] extent of the heaven to fit into a smaller [space], for example, the space filled by the sun, then nor is it possible for the heavenly bodies to permeate one another.

- 10 Least of all could the heavenly bodies permeate any of the sublunary bodies, since no sublunary body is able to contain another body because they are denser and more earthy. And so neither will this ungenerated body [of theirs] be able to completely permeate perishable body. Therefore, if they have entered one another, each must be
- 15 itself separated into particles and separate [the other into particles], as liquids do when mixed. Therefore neither of them – not the everlasting one nor the perishable – will be continuous with itself. So if this is both false and absurd and all perishable body is continuous
- 20 with itself, since, as Hippocrates says,⁴⁹⁷ 'there is one concord,⁴⁹⁸ one conflux, all things are in sympathy', then it is not possible for the imperishable body to be in the whole of the perishable in such a way that they are separated into particles by each other like liquids when they are mixed.

But if anyone wants it to be possible for everlasting body to 25 completely permeate perishable body, even though this has been shown to be impossible, [for argument's sake] let it be so. In that case Chapter 7, Sections 17-18

the everlasting [body] will certainly have to shape itself to the perish-284.1able one in the way that liquids entering a container shape themselves to those that receive them. And so the everlasting [body] will have the same set of organs as the perishable one. In that case, among other things, what use will the everlasting body make of the reproductive organs and the like? It will be departing from the shape $\mathbf{5}$ that is its own and natural to it. In my opinion such a hypothesis transcends all nonsense. A thing which is ungenerated and imperishable must of necessity be resistant to [any] change towards a condition contrary to its nature. So how could this [body], which abandons its natural shape and takes on one which is contrary to nature, be everlasting? And so, even were it a possibility for one body 10 to permeate another, it has been shown that it is impossible for the hypothesised everlasting body to completely permeate perishable body.

And if everlasting [body] has not completely permeated perishable 15[body] but is situated in some part of it, first let them say in which this is, for one cannot easily picture this. But let the everlasting body be situated in some part [of the perishable body], if that is what you want, in the brain, say. Here too the question of how it is in it arises.⁴⁹⁹ 20Is it adjacent to it and in contact with it or has it permeated right through it? It will be pertinent to pose the same puzzles in regard to the part as we posed in regard to the whole. And, moreover, how does it bring about the separate movement of the other parts? As has been stated,⁵⁰⁰ it moves the parts even when the whole remains at rest. So 25how, if it is situated in the brain, does it move a toe? For either it will, because of their continuity, move the whole by pushing on the part, and there will be no separate movement of the part, or it will only move the part it touches, and if the whole is not moved, neither will any of the other parts be.

18. And further, there is, one supposes, every necessity that this body should either be of the [same] substance as bodies that travel in 5 a straight line or those that travel in a circle or be of some other substance over and above these.

Now, should it be of another [substance], yet another, sixth, kind (phusis) of body has revealed itself to us after the fifth. And if all of the bodies that are everlastingly attached to rational souls are of the same substance, let them show to which [elemental] mass (holotês) they belong; for each particular and separate body is drawn from an [elemental] mass, an individual clod, for example, from the mass of earth and a particular [volume of] water from that of water. But they will not be able to point to any other corporeal (sômatos) mass over and above the four elements familiar to us and the heavenly one.

And if [these bodies] are not all of the same substance, they will, rather like story-tellers (*muthôdesteron*), be introducing many kinds of bodies (sômatôn phuseis) into the universe. How on earth will these 285.1

10

15

differ [from one another]?⁵⁰¹ If every physical body is distinguished by
 sense, either by all [the senses] or by a number or at least by one of
 them, [namely] touch – at all events, even the heaven, which [our
 opponents] claim is ungenerated and imperishable, is, as Plato
 says,⁵⁰² visible and tangible – if, then, [as we were saying], every body
 is distinguished by sense, and if we have no perception of these bodies

- 25 [of theirs] through sense, by what means can they distinguish the peculiar nature of each of them or its difference from the others? For even though mind is able to distinguish the substance of [different]
- 286,1 bodies, it cannot do so apart from sense-perception. Hence Aristotle shows in his writings on demonstration⁵⁰³ that where sensation reaches its limit, knowledge⁵⁰⁴ must also reach its limit. At all events, a person deprived from birth of the means of distinguishing afforded by hearing is also deprived of knowledge in regard to musical harmo-
 - 5 nies. [And], similarly, a person deprived from birth of visual images is barred from knowledge in the area of colours. So if there has not as yet been any perception of these bodies through sense even though, according to [our opponents], they are not separate but interwoven
 - 10 with mortal bodies and in contact with them, there is every necessity that there should also be no knowledge of them. So on what basis can anyone demonstrate that there is any such additional kind (*phusis*) of body over and above the bodies known to us if they have gained knowledge of them neither through sensation nor (since not through sensation) through science? For knowledge of bodies does not arise

without sensation.

Therefore these bodies cannot be of a constitution (*phuseôs*) other than [that of] the four [elements] that are familiar to us and the heavenly one.

19. But if [these bodies] are not of a different constitution, theymust by all accounts either be of the same constitution as the four [sublunary elements] or of that of the heavenly bodies.

- But if they are either [composed] of one of the four [elements] or composed of [all four of] them, they must of necessity be perishable; for every body that has been detached from the mass of the four [elements] is, whether it be simple or compound, definitely perishable, for nothing that is particular is everlasting. And so these [bodies] too will of necessity be generated and perishable. And neither, therefore, can they be everlastingly attached to souls. Therefore, if these bodies are everlasting, it is impossible for them to be of the constitution of the elements.
- 287,1 **20.** And if [these bodies] are of the same substance as the heavenly bodies, they will still be perishable because they will have been detached from their own [elemental] mass; [for] although the Hellenes⁵⁰⁵ hold that the elemental masses are everlasting, detached
 - 5 portions of them are nevertheless fated to undergo generation and passing out of existence in the course of time. And so even if the

heaven were everlasting, detached portions of it would not be everlasting.

And besides, if these bodies were of the same substance as the heavenly bodies, circular movement would obviously be natural to 10 them, for this is the nature of all of the heavenly bodies. And if this is so, their natural shape will necessarily be spherical, for it is not possible for non-spherical [bodies] to naturally show circular movement. And if they are spherical, when they enter perishable bodies, they must either retain or not retain their natural shape. If, on the 15one hand, they have not retained it, they must have degenerated into an unnatural shape. How, in that case, can they still be everlasting? None of the bodies that are held to be everlasting – I mean, of course, none of the heavenly bodies - changes its natural shape at any stage of its existence. [But] if, on the other hand, they do retain [their natural shape], in view of the fact that it has been shown⁵⁰⁶ that it is 20impossible for one body to permeate another, a kind of empty spherical space has to be imagined in the perishable body to receive this everlasting body. But there is no empty space in our perishable body of a spherical shape, or, indeed, any empty space of any kind at all in 25the solid body (in our tissues, for instance, or bones, or blood) which is not completely filled with air or breath. And so it would once more be necessary for one body to permeate another.

And the same goes for circular movement. If these bodies are 288,1 among those which rotate, they will surely exhibit continuous and uninterrupted circular movement, for all things which rotate do. So if any circular movement takes place in us, let them identify it; for all 5 perceptible movement in living creatures takes place in a straight line, as does, for example, that associated with the heart and the arteries, since systole and diastole are rectilinear movement. And the psychic pneuma⁵⁰⁷ too, since it travels along channels (*neurôn*) of its 10 own which are pierced in straight lines, itself exhibits linear movement. ⁵⁰⁸ So on what evidence (*pothen*) could they show that there is a body in us which moves in a circle?

And if an everlasting [body] has ceased its circular movement upon entering a perishable one, it has obviously abandoned what is natural [to it]. So how will it be everlasting? Anything which undergoes a cessation of movement undergoes a cessation of life, as we have heard Plato state in the *Phaedrus*.⁵⁰⁹ And so if the luminous [body] has ceased its natural movement upon entering mortal [body], it has also ceased its life and existence.

And if all rotating bodies exhibit continuous and uninterrupted 20 circular movement both as wholes and in their parts, and if this body invented by [our opponents], if it has indeed ceased moving in a circle, does not, then it does not belong to the class of bodies which rotate. And consequently neither is it everlasting.

And in addition to the above it is worth considering this. Nature 25

- 289,1 has determined a proper place for each body. It has installed earth in the centre of the universe, water above it, next air, after it fire, and outside of all the rest it has wrapped around the body that moves in
 - 5 a circle, that is, heavenly [body]. But the same place is natural to a whole and to its part; the natural place of earth as a whole, namely the centre, is also naturally that of a clod of earth, and the proper place of the whole heaven is also naturally that of a part of it. And the same goes for the rest [of the elements]. So if this so-called everlasting body of theirs, upon which, according to Proclus, every soul is in the
 - 10 first instance mounted, is [composed] of the substance of the bodies which rotate, in other words of the substance of the heavenly bodies, then, one supposes, the place which is natural to every heavenly body, namely, the periphery, will also necessarily be so for it. Therefore, if
 - 15 soul now dwells on the earth's surface⁵¹⁰ and while here controls perishable body, it must be that this everlasting body, having assumed a relation with the perishable one, now also dwells, contrary
 - 20 to its nature, on the earth's surface. Will, then, these bodies ever return to their own [elemental] mass and attain their proper place, or not? If, on the one hand, they⁵¹¹ are never united with their own mass and never attain their proper place, they will be in a state which is contrary to their nature for an infinite time. But it is impossible for
 - 25 anything to be in a state which is contrary to nature for an infinite time, for not to exist is better than to be for ever in a state contrary to nature. Therefore they will at some time attain that position and occupy the same region as the heavenly bodies. And so even before
- 290,1 soul had come into this world and assumed a relation with perishable body, this everlasting body was clearly also in existence. And, to speak generally, if souls receive a different lot depending on the life
 - 5 [they have led] and, just as those who have lived badly are dispatched to the nether regions, so do those who have achieved purification escape from the earthly sphere altogether (some of their religious thinkers, at any rate, have declared that the so-called Milky Way is the allotted abode and place of rational souls) – if, then, these are the
 - 10 views of the Hellenes,⁵¹² and if soul is in the first instance mounted upon some kind of everlasting body and this is everlastingly attached to it, there is every necessity that at the time when [a soul] is descending to earth (*entautha*), when it is about to put on a mortal
 - 15 body in addition [to the everlasting one], this everlasting body should move in a straight line on the way down to earth from [its abode] above. The soul itself when apart from body transcends both place and movement, but no body, even if it is immortal, can exchange one place for another without movement. But movement from above to below is rectilinear movement. And so, even without any relation to 20 this solid body [of ours], this [everlasting body] will, all by itself, move
 - in a straight line. And, as was shown earlier,⁵¹³ nothing that moves in a straight line is everlasting.

21. Some people, in a rather naive attempt at finding a way to refute this argument, assert⁵¹⁴ that [this body] moves down from 25above with a spiral movement. [They do so] so as to disassociate it as far as possible both from the substance of those bodies which move in 291.1a circle and from that of the elements. But, if this is so, given that, according to them, bodies that rotate are everlasting and those that move in a straight line mortal, and, given that spiral movement is a $\mathbf{5}$ kind of blend of a straight line and a circle, there is every necessity that if moving spirally belongs naturally to this body, it must be composed of everlasting and perishable body. (It is agreed that spiral movement is a blend of a straight line and a circle). But if this is so, 10it will either fall somehow between the two and be neither everlasting nor perishable, which amounts to saying that it will be neither perishable nor not perishable and neither everlasting nor not everlasting, and [both sides of] a contradiction will be true at the same time; or part of it will be perishable, part imperishable, and so once more the whole will not be everlasting, since one of the components 15will have perished and destroyed the integrity of the whole.

But this is tedious nonsense and a baseless fabrication of the imagination. There is no body in nature that moves with a spiral movement. Since all things in the sublunary sphere are either heavy 20or light, some of them – the heavy ones – travel from high to low, and others – the light ones – from low to high, while all heavenly things, on the other hand, both collectively and as individual [bodies] (by individual [bodies] I mean the sun and the moon and so on), revolve in perfect circles. So what other body over and above these can they 25point to that naturally moves spirally? For even though the movement of the sun, or of some other planets, is said to trace out a spiral, it is nevertheless clear to everyone who studies these phenomena that it is the human mind that makes up this figure by combining the 292.1various movements of the heavenly bodies. For the movement of the planets is twofold. All of them are carried around with the sphere of the fixed stars as it moves in the plane of the celestial equator, and each of them revolves with its own movement in the plane of the $\mathbf{5}$ ecliptic and the so-called zodiac. The human mind combines these two movements (that is, the diurnal revolution of the sun along with the whole [universe] as well as the slight oblique movement of the same 10 body to the north or south of the celestial equator) and, even though each of the heavenly bodies in its own right clearly revolves in a perfect circle, makes up an imaginary spiral.

And even if some sublunary body should move in a spiral because of the shape of the object (*megethos*) on which the movement takes place, as happens on so-called spiral staircases, or should move in this way even without such aids (*kai allôs*) on its own initiative, nobody would have the effrontery to claim that such movement is natural to these bodies. Even trumpet shells and the purple fish and other

Chapter 7, Section 21 – Chapter 8

similar creatures do not produce spiral movement through a natural propensity of the body but by means of a faculty of the soul reacting to (*dia*) the shape of the shell which encloses them. If an ant were moving on a sphere, no one would claim that its circular movement was natural, and nor do we claim that the sideways movement of

- 25 living creatures is natural to their bodies for nature moves heavy bodies downwards. It is their shape or an impulse of the soul that is
- 293,1 the cause of such movement. And, consistently with this, if the shape of the object on which the movement [is taking place] or an impulse of the soul should become a cause of spiral movement for some [creatures], we do not claim that this kind of movement is natural to bodies.
 - 5 And so no body moves with natural spiral movement. And therefore nor can this body move naturally in a spiral as it travels down from on high.
 - It would have been possible to produce countless other arguments in refutation of this fictional body; but, since what has been said will suffice and it has been demonstrated that it is impossible for an everlasting body to be attached to the soul (since it cannot be one of the bodies that travel in a straight line or one of those that rotate or a combination of these or of a different nature from these, and, since
 - 15 Plato nowhere delivers an opinion on such bodies), there remains no necessity that just because the soul of the world is in Plato's opinion ungenerated and imperishable, the world should therefore immediately be ungenerated and imperishable as well; for, even though the bodies that are moved by them have a beginning and an end to their existence, he wants our souls too to be ungenerated and imperishable.

The End of the Refutation of the Seventh Argument

294,1

116

The Eighth Argument of Proclus the Successor

The eighth [argument]: If everything that perishes perishes as a result of something else⁵¹⁵ attacking it from outside and [perishes] into something else, and if there is nothing outside of the universe nor anything other [than it], but, coming to be as a whole [made up] of wholes and a perfect thing [made up] of perfect things,⁵¹⁶ it has encompassed everything, then neither would there be anything other than the universe nor would it perish into anything else or through the agency of anything else.⁵¹⁷ And so it is imperishable.

And for the same reason it is also ungenerated. For everything generated comes to be from something previously other [than itself]. And so there would be something other than the universe. And this would be outside what comes to be. And so there will be something outside of the universe before the uni-

5

Chapter 8

verse comes to be which is other than the universe. And if this were so, there would be something contrary to the universe out of which it has come to be. But contraries derive from one another and change into one another, and since they occur in pairs, there are, as is established by many [examples] in the *Phaedo*, two paths between them to return each contrary to the other so that nature will not be defective.⁵¹⁸

Now, that the disorderly (to atakton) and the ordered (to tetagmenon) are opposed is clear. But if, on the one hand, this is as privation and possession, and if they change from privation to possession, much more do they also change from possession to privation;⁵¹⁹ for the former [change] is more impossible because there are some privations that cannot change into possessions.⁵²⁰ So if the former [change], although it was more impossible for it to take place, has occurred, much more so will the more possible take place, and the ordered changes into the disorderly, and this will be in accord with nature and with the will of God; for one who has done what is less possible will [all the] more do what is more possible.

And if, on the other hand, these are contraries, governed by the law of contraries, then the universe too changes into the contrary from which it came to be.

But the universe has been shown to be imperishable. Therefore it does not change into a contrary. And so neither has it come to be.

And so the universe is everlasting; for it is not possible that when there are two contraries, there should be a path from the first to the second but not from the second to the first, nor that when there is privation and possession, there should be a path from privation to possession but not from possession to privation; for some things there is no path from privation to possession, and for contraries there is, as Socrates says in the *Phaedo*,⁵²¹ [a path] from each to the other.

And so, whether the disorderly and the ordered are contraries 20 or the disorderly is the privation of the ordered, either the universe is not imperishable or the case for its being ungenerated is stronger than that for its being imperishable.⁵²²

The Sections of the Refutation of the Eighth Argument

1. That the statement 'everything that perishes perishes as a result of something else attacking it from outside' is shown to be false 296,1 from doctrines held by Proclus himself and professed [by him] both elsewhere and here.⁵²³ And that the world is perishable by nature even if there is nothing outside of it.

2. That, even if it be agreed that it is true that everything that 5

117

295.1

 $\mathbf{5}$

15

20

10

comes to be does so from something that was previously other [than it], and, further, that there is nothing outside the world or other [than it], nothing stands in the way of the world having come to be. And that the hypothesis which states that if the world has come to be there either is or was something other than it and outside of it is a silly one.

3. That not everything that comes to be necessarily comes to be from a contrary. And so neither has the world, if it has come to be, necessarily come to be from a contrary.

4. That, even though it is possible for possession to turn into privation, Proclus is none the less expounding a position opposed to Plato's when he says that if the world has indeed, as Plato holds, come to be out of the disorderly, it will inevitably follow, both in the natural course of events and by the will of God, that it changes back into the disorderly, that is to say, into its own privation, from which it has

come to be.

The Refutation of the Eighth Argument

 Of refutations those seem best which have proceeded from premisses that are both credible in themselves and accepted beforehand by one's opponents. Accordingly, we shall refute the source and root of the present proof (which is the making of the assumption that everything that perishes perishes as a result of something else attacking it from outside – from which he infers that the world may not perish because there is nothing outside of the world and nothing other

5 [than it]) using no other premisses than those correctly accepted beforehand by Proclus himself.

I shall cite the passages from Proclus that I earlier cited in the sixth chapter.⁵²⁴ For, Plato having stated⁵²⁵ that everything perceptible comes to be and perishes, and Aristotle having objected that this

- 10 is not true, [arguing that] although the heaven and the whole world are perceptible, they neither come to be nor perish,⁵²⁶ Proclus [there] defends Plato's position with, amongst others, arguments accepted by Aristotle himself, [and] establishes [its truth]. [For] it is Aristotle's
- 15 view that no body possesses infinite power, but that each [of them] is maintained by a finite power, and from this Proclus, on the basis that a finite power is necessarily perishable, infers that every body, by the
- 20 law proper to its nature, comes to be and perishes.⁵²⁷ Proclus' words are, to quote them exactly, as follows.⁵²⁸

Proclus, from the work entitled An Examination of Aristotle's Criticisms of Plato's Timaeus:

This assumption, then, should only be made if the body of the heaven too, and the whole world as well, must be described as coming to be. And how can it be other than necessary to so describe it on the basis of the information he gives us? For he

10

Chapter 8, Section 1

states that no finite body has infinite power, and has shown it to be so in the eighth book of the *Physics*. So if the world is finite (and he has shown this to be so as well), it necessarily does not have infinite power. But we have demonstrated that eternity is infinite power in our earlier arguments. Therefore the world, not having infinite power, does not have eternal existence. And if it does not have eternal existence (for a thing that does has a share in eternity, and a thing which has a share in eternity shares in infinite power), the world necessarily does not exist forever. For he states himself that to exist forever is the property of eternity and says that eternity gets its name from this fact.

Having thus shown that even Aristotle's own positions prove that the world is not among those things that are forever, Proclus next 15 shows that it has the property of existing forever from an outside source and not of its own nature. Here is what he says:

Nor is what is true of that which always is also true of that which is always coming to be: [it is not the case that] infinite power belongs to the latter on account of its always coming to be as it does to the former on account of its always being. But it does [belong] to its maker, and on that account it too is always coming to be, for ever gaining [the property of] being⁵²⁹ thanks to (*dia*) that which always is by the terms of its own existence, and not having the 'always' in its own right. And so the definition of that which comes to be would also fit the world.

And a little further on:

Everything, then, which comes to be is in its own right always also perishing; but, as a result of having been bound by that which is, this whole [universe] remains in [a state of] becoming [and] comes to be [but] does not perish because of the being it has drawn off from that which is. Therefore, because in its own right that which comes to be qualifies for the definition, he also refers to it as perishing, since by its own nature it is such. 299,1 299,1 299,1 5

And the same writer in what immediately follows:

For since the universe is finite, and what is finite does not, as he has shown, have infinite power, and that which initiates infinite movement initiates it by infinite power, it is clear that the motionless cause of infinite movement for the universe has infinite power itself. And so, if one separates the universe from that [cause] in thought, it will not, since it does not have infinite power, keep moving *ad infinitum* but will experience a cessation

119

10

 $\mathbf{5}$

20

Chapter 8, Section 1

15of its movement; but if one connects it to that [cause] once more, it will, thanks to it, keep moving ad infinitum. And indeed there is nothing inappropriate about notionally separating things which are joined so as to see what each has from the other, and so as to know, once this has been observed, what it is that the inferior [partner] possesses of its own nature and what from its 20association with the superior.

And soon after:

For, generally, since even in this world perishing occurs as a result of lack of power and preservation as a result of power, all the more so is it the case that amongst imperishable things imperishability [holds sway] as a result of power. And this power is obviously something infinite. for all finite [power] perishes.

If, then, because the world, being body, does not partake of infinite power, and all finite power is perishable, since it eventually perishes 5 through weakness (for if [power] is not infinite, it [must be] weak), the world must on that account cease to exist and be perishable and not last for ever, and if this [susceptibility] belongs to it as a consequence of its own nature, whereas everlasting existence comes to it

- as a result of its participation in being, since its immortality is 10 acquired, - if this is how things are, and how Plato and Proclus believe they are, how could it still be true that everything that perishes perishes as a result of something else attacking it from outside? For
- 15even should there be nothing to attack the world and destroy it, the very finite [nature] of its power, which grows weak on account of the very circumstance of its being finite, becomes the cause of its passing out of existence; for if the world does not perish (and let one concede
- this too to them), it is not on account of there being nothing else 20outside of it that it does not perish but because immortality⁵³⁰ comes to it from that which always is.

So if Proclus, rightly, believes that 'there is nothing inappropriate about notionally separating things which are joined so as to see what each has from the other, and so as to know, once this has been

25

300.1

- observed, what it is that the inferior [partner] possesses of its own nature and what from its association with the superior',⁵³¹ let the immortality which comes to the world from that which always is, and, 301,1
 - indeed, even that which furnishes it with this [immortality], be separated [from it] in thought. Once this is done, will the world perish on account of the weakness of its own power, which is finite, or not $\mathbf{5}$ perish because there is nothing else outside [of it]?

Should the second [of these alternatives] be the truth, it is no longer the case that its everlasting existence is acquired from that

which always is. At all events, if that which always is is separated off in thought, the world is, on Proclus' [present] hypothesis, every bit as imperishable by virtue of having nothing outside it to destroy it. And 10 if it is imperishable, it exists for ever. And, moreover, if the power of the world is finite but it is nevertheless imperishable on account of there being nothing outside of it, not even finite power will be perishable.

But if it is true that finite power is perishable, the second [alternative] – I mean that the world does not perish because nothing else attacks it from outside – is necessarily false, if, that is, even though there is nothing outside the world, it must perish on account of the finite [nature] of its own power once that which always is has been separated from it. And so it is not true that everything that perishes perishes through something else attacking it from outside.

Further, if it were the case that the world, having come to be as a whole [composed] of wholes and a perfect thing [composed] of perfect things and encompassing all things within itself, does not perish 25because nothing else attacks it from outside,⁵³² imperishability clearly belongs to it of its own nature; for, by encompassing all things within itself, it has left none of the causes of destruction outside [of itself]; so, if there is nothing able to destroy it, nor will it be able to perish of itself; and what cannot perish because nothing exists that 302.1could destroy it is imperishable by nature; and so the world is imperishable by nature. But again, if the world, because it is body, is $\mathbf{5}$ of naturally finite power, and if finite power is perishable, the world would be perishable by nature. So one and the same thing will be both naturally perishable because it is of finite power and naturally imperishable because it has nothing else outside [of itself] to attack and 10 destroy it. So if it is impossible for [both sides of] a contradiction to be true at the same time, and if it is true that the world is of finite power, then it will be naturally perishable. But if it is naturally perishable, it will be false that it is naturally imperishable. But it would be naturally imperishable if everything that perishes perished as a 15result of something else attacking it from outside. If, then, it is not naturally imperishable, and if there is nothing apart from it that could destroy it, since it contains everything within itself, then, although perishable,⁵³³ it will not be destroyed by things that are outside of it.⁵³⁴ Therefore it is not true that everything that perishes 20is destroyed by something else attacking it from outside.

Also, right at the beginning of the next proof, the ninth of the treatise as a whole, Proclus says that everything that perishes perishes⁵³⁵ through its own defect. But what could the defect of each thing that perishes consist in other than a deviation of each thing towards what is contrary to nature that occurs on account of a weakness of its natural power, which is finite? No thing possesses a natural power which is destructive of it. Natural powers are preserv-

121

25

 $\mathbf{5}$

303,1

ative of the subjects [in which they exist], for all things strive after existence, and if a subject is preserved, the natural power in it is also preserved. But if everything that perishes perishes through its own defect, which is to say, by its own natural weakness, then it is possible

- 10 for the world, even though there is nothing else attacking it from outside, to perish by perishing through its own defect, that is, through its natural weakness; for nothing has as a defect something that is outside of it and other [than it]; for even agencies that attack and destroy [things] from outside, whether it be the discordance of the environment that is the cause of destruction or what is taken in
- 15 through the mouth or something else again, become the cause of their destruction by putting them in a condition that is contrary to their nature. So, even if there is nothing present outside, if a subject's own
- 20 natural and preservative power cannot, because it is finite, last for ever, it eventually allows the subject to go to its destruction and perishes along with it, like a helmsman who is unable to remain [at his post] while his ship sinks under him as a result of his having lost control of the rudder through exhaustion, not because he has been overcome by the storm but because his strength has given out 25 through prolonged exertion.
- 304,1 So, now that we have refuted this argument, and given that Plato asserts that the world is not imperishable naturally but [only] by the will of the creator and holds that naturally it comes to be and perishes, one may no longer conclude that the world is in Plato's view
 - ⁵ ungenerated; for being ungenerated is not a [logical] consequence of being in possession of an acquired imperishability, but, if of anything, of being naturally imperishable, as indeed we have shown in the sixth chapter.⁵³⁶ So if the world is by the law of nature perishable, it is also of necessity generated.
 - 10 **2.** But [Proclus] says:

Everything generated comes to be from something previously other [than itself]. And so there would be something other than the universe. And this would be outside what comes to be. And so there will be something outside of the universe before the universe comes to be which is other than the universe.⁵³⁷

Even should we concede that it is true that everything generated comes to be⁵³⁸ from something previously other [than itself], and that there was something outside the universe and other than it before it came to be out of which it came to be, this is not⁵³⁹ in conflict with Plato's doctrine that there is nothing outside the world,⁵⁴⁰ which – rejecting [the claim] that the world did not in Plato's view come to be as conflicting [with it] – [I suggest] we should accept; for Plato states that there is nothing outside the world or other than it once it is in existence, and that which we have conceded⁵⁴¹ was other than [the

world] before the world came to be, whether it was imbued with form or formless and [mere] matter, is, once the world has come to be, no longer other than it or outside of it. For if, on the one hand, it was imbued with form, it is, by casting off its previous form and making its own underlying [substance] available as matter for the world which has come to be, no longer something other than the world once it has come into existence, either in respect of its underlying [substance] (for a thing's own matter, from which it derives its being, is never something other [than it]), or in respect of its previous form, which has already perished and departed into non-being.

To illustrate this (hoion), imagine that there is a bronze horse and let it be recast into the statue of a man. The form of the horse will certainly be something other than the envisaged statue of a man, but when the horse has been melted down and become a statue of a man, 10the shape of the horse has perished into non-being, and what does not exist can no longer be something other than that which has come to be. And nor is the matter of the horse, [that is,] the bronze, which has become the underlying [material] of the statue of a man, something other than it, but rather a component (stoikheion) of it. In the same 15way, then, even if there was previously something imbued with form from which, as it changed, the world came to be, its form, having perished and no longer existing, would no longer be said to be [something] other than the world once [the world] exists; for how can a thing that is already non-existent and nothing [at all] be described as outside something or other [than it]? For a thing that is outside 20something or other [than it] is clearly outside of and other than something which has existence, and [clearly] exists itself.

And should, on the other hand, that from which the world came to be be formless and [mere] matter, even less would it be described as [something] other than the world, since it would be a part or component of it. And when Plato says that there is nothing outside of the universe or other [than it], he means that nothing bodily was left outside it.

And surely it is quite obviously silly to say that if the world came 306,1to be out of something else, there will [have been] something other than the universe outside the universe before the universe came to be. For how could anything be said to be outside of, or for that matter, other than, a universe that does not yet exist? And so neither is it possible to refer to anything as being outside [the world] or other than $\mathbf{5}$ it before the world came to be – for a thing that is 'other' is other than something that exists - nor, on the other hand, reasonable, once the world has come to be, to refer to a form which has already perished as 'other than' the presently existing world, unless one could describe non-being as other than being on the grounds that it is the opposite 10and the privation of being; for privation is other than form and thus outside [of it]. But it is not in this sense that Plato states that there

is nothing outside of the universe, but in the sense that there is nothing of a corporeal nature outside of the convex surface of the heaven. Listen to what Plato himself has to say on this topic in the *Timaeus*. Here is the passage:

From such elements, four in number, the body of the world came to be, achieving harmony through proportion, and received [the spirit of] friendship from them, so that, having come together, it was indissoluble by others than him who had bound it together. And the framing of the world took up the whole of each of the four [elements], for its framer framed it from all the fire and water and air and earth, leaving no portion of any of them nor any of their powers outside of it.⁵⁴²

And so the statement that there is nothing outside of the universe 25clearly means that there is no body and no bodily power outside of the heaven. But to say that non-being is both outside of the universe and 307.1other than being is both true and necessary and not in conflict with Plato's hypotheses; for one who says that there is nothing, whether it be a portion or a power of an element, outside of the universe, is not denying that privation is, in a non-spatial sense, by [its] nature⁵⁴³ other than form and external to that which is imbued with form -I $\mathbf{5}$ say 'spatial sense' because non-being is in a spatial sense neither inside nor outside being. And privation is non-being. But portions or powers of elements are not a privation of the world; for a portion or a natural power of anything is not its privation. 10

3. And, indeed, even if there was, as we have conceded,⁵⁴⁴ something before the generation of the world from which the world came to be, there was no need for this to be contrary to the world, for it is not true that everything that comes to be invariably comes to be from its contrary. For if there is generation not only of accidents but of substances as well, and if everything that comes to be comes to be from its contrary, then there will be a contrary to every generated

- substance. But, as Aristotle has shown in the *Categories*,⁵⁴⁵ there is no contrary to a substance; a substance is that which is self-subsistent, and to that which is self-subsistent, *qua* such, there is no contrary. For what is the contrary of man *qua* man? Or of dog or horse? Or fig tree or grapevine or the like? For it is of the nature of
- 25 contraries to be present in the same subject by turns, as white and black and hot and cold are in body. No substance is in a subject. And
- 308,1 so there is no contrary to any substance. So, if a substance comes to be, it will not come to be out of its contrary. I have added the words 'qua such'⁵⁴⁶ because it is possible for contraries to exist *in* substances;
 - 5 for instance, hot and wet are in blood and cold and dry in bone, and hot is contrary to cold and wet to dry, but bone is not contrary to blood; each of them is a substance and their matter the same (*koinê*), and each of

15

20

them comes to be not simply by virtue of being dry or by virtue of being wet but by virtue of being bone or by virtue of being blood.

If, then, each substance comes to be by virtue of being a substance of this or that kind and not accidentally (for a man comes to be by virtue of being a man and flesh by virtue of being flesh⁵⁴⁷), and if there is nothing that is in itself contrary to these and their like, then a generated substance does not, because it is generated, have its gen-15eration from a contrary, but this is seen, if anywhere, among accidents; for when hot comes to be, it has in every case differentiated itself from cold simply by being hot and not in any other respect; and the same applies in other similar cases. But nor is the generation of 20all accidents invariably out of their contraries, for contrariety is not observed in all accidents. The triangle and the circle and the other shapes come to be, but none of them has its generation from a contrary; for shapelessness is not the contrary of shape but the privation of shape, just as the disorderly is the privation of the 25ordered. Again, since relatives are opposed to contraries, a thing does not come to be 'on the right' out of a contrary, but simply out of its 309.1privation, that is, out of what is not on the right. Moreover, one becomes knowledgeable after [previously] being ignorant. But if he changes from a contrary condition, the genesis of the knowledgeable person is out of a contrary, but if from [a state of] pure ignorance, out $\mathbf{5}$ of a privation. For example, if one, previously believing that air is heavy, were to learn better and come to believe that it is light, the genesis of this knowledge would be out of a contrary, but if, not knowing whether it is heavy or light, one were to learn that it is light, its genesis is out of privation into form. And so not even the generation of accidents 10 is in all cases out of a contrary. So not everything that comes to be comes to be out of a contrary.

But if not everything that comes to be comes to be from a contrary, and if, as Plato holds, the ordered has come to be out of the disorderly, and if the disorderly is the privation and not the contrary of the 15ordered, there will be no necessity for the ordered to turn back again into the disorderly as Proclus' argument would have it – which is, moreover, a position that is not held by Plato, who supposes that the world is imperishable. For in the Phaedo⁵⁴⁸ Plato says that the 20contraries emerge from one another and turn back into one another (for just as hot emerges from cold, so, in order that nature will not, as a result of destroying just one of each pair of contraries, become defective, does cold subsequently from hot;⁵⁴⁹ and likewise with all pairs of contraries), but does not also say that just as form emerges from privation, so does form in every case subsequently turn back to 25privation. Plato quite clearly nowhere says this; on the contrary, when he says that everything ordered has emerged from the disor-310.1derly and that the disorderly is the privation of the ordered, he says that the ordered, that is to say, the world, is imperishable.⁵⁵⁰ There-

125

5 fore he does not claim that form invariably turns back to privation. Therefore it is Plato's view that the world has come to be but does not perish.

4. 'But', says⁵⁵¹ Proclus,

even if the disorderly is the privation of the ordered and it has
changed from privation to possession, much more will it also change from possession to privation;⁵⁵² for the former [change] is more impossible because there are some privations which cannot change into possessions. So if the former [change], although it was more impossible for it to take place, has occurred, much more so will the more possible take place, and the ordered will change into the disorderly, and this will be in accord both with nature and with the will of God; for one who has done what is less possible will [all the] more do what is more possible.

That Plato too believes that the ordered can, in the natural order of things, change into the disorderly, is clear from Plato's own [words], for he would have it that everything that has been bound may be undone, and says 'since you have come to be, you are not indissoluble nor altogether immortal'.⁵⁵³ But when Proclus says that it is also in accordance with God's will that what comes to be also invariably perishes, what he says is no longer in conformity with the beliefs of

- Plato. For Plato's creator declares the exact opposite to the heavenly
- 311,1 bodies. For, having first stated what befalls the world in the natural order of things 'since', he says, 'you have come to be, you are not indissoluble nor altogether immortal' the creator next adds what
 - 5 accrues to it through his will: 'you shall not', he says, 'be dissolved nor meet with the fate of death, since you have in my will a greater and more authoritative bond than those with which you were bound when you came to be'.⁵⁵⁴ And so Plato too acknowledges that, as far as nature is concerned, their dissolution follows as a consequence of
 - 10 their generation, but, aware that the will of God is stronger than any physical bond, he bound the immortality of the world by means of it; for he does not say that it is because he cannot that God does not undo the world, which is indeed dissoluble even in the course of nature, but
 - 15 because he does not so will. It is for this reason that he says, as we indicated above,⁵⁵⁵ that its existence is acquired and its immortality [continually] restored.

So, does Plato's commentator and successor contradict Plato?⁵⁵⁶ [Yes.] Plato says that the ordered has emerged from the disorderly (in 20 the present context the disorderly refers, as I have said,⁵⁵⁷ to the privation of the ordered, not to its contrary), and that the ordered is on that account in the natural course of events dissoluble, but certainly not also that God wants the ordered to revert to the disorderly. Proclus, in contrast, says that, if the ordered has indeed emerged from the disorderly, it will inevitably (*pantôs*) follow, both in the 25 natural course of events and by the will of God, that the ordered will change back into the disorderly. So he contradicts Plato on two counts: 312,1 by denying that the ordered has emerged from the disorderly, although Plato explicitly proclaims this, and by stating that, if it has so emerged, God will wish the ordered to revert once more to the disorderly, even though here too, as we have shown from Plato's own text, he specifically denies that God wills this.

And so we [Christians] when we profess that the world has come to be and will perish again, have on our side, along with the truth, the vote of Plato for its having come to be, and [in support of our belief] that, having come to be, it will certainly perish – and not, as Plato holds, be indissoluble and immortal because an acquired immortality has accrued to it through the will of God even though it is by nature dissoluble – we have Proclus himself as witness when he says that 'this is [so] both in the natural course of events and by the will of God'.

But Plato has not completely departed from right thinking on these issues. [I don't mean] in that he believes that the world is imperishable, but in that, having come to the view that it must be imperishable, he does not claim that it is the unlimited power of the world's nature that is the cause of its imperishability but that it is the will of the creator. For, if it were absolutely necessary for something corporeal to last for ever, it could not be imperishable unless the power of the creator provided it with everlasting continuance, since, as far as the law of nature goes, no body has everlasting existence (to *aei einai*).

That the disorderly is not the contrary of the ordered is clear even from [the concepts] themselves. And if Plato says that the ordered is nothing other than the world, and if the world is a substance, and if, as has been shown,⁵⁵⁸ a substance does not have its genesis out of a contrary, then the ordered and the disorderly are not opposed as contraries but as form and privation.

The End of the Refutation of the Eighth Argument

 $\mathbf{5}$

This page intentionally left blank

Notes

1. Something needs to be said about the terminology used to describe the various divisions of *Aet*. In the preserved headings for chapters 2-18, which may or may not be Philoponus' own, Proclus' arguments are logoi, Philoponus' replies are *luseis* and the sections into which they are divided are *kephalaia*. In the work itself Philoponus' terminology is less consistent. An argument of Proclus is frequently an epikheirêma (26,20, etc.), a logos may be either an argument of Proclus (126,23, etc.) or Philoponus' reply (69,5, etc.), and a kephalaion may be an argument of Proclus (94,22, etc.), a reply of Philoponus (70,9, etc.), or a section of the last (130,11, etc.), in which case it is always a *kephalaion* of a logos. In the chapter headings I translate logos 'argument', kephalaion 'section' (a good case could be made for translating kephalaia 'Summaries of the Main Points' in these headings - see H.D. Saffrey and L.G. Westerink, Proclus, Théologie platonicienne (Paris, 1968-94), vol. 1, Notes complémentaires, p. 1, n. 2 – but I have been influenced by Philoponus' usage in the text, which I have outlined above) and lusis 'refutation'. In the work itself I translate epikheirêma 'proof', logos 'argument' when it refers to one of Proclus' arguments, but 'chapter' when it refers to one of Philoponus' replies, and use 'proof', 'chapter' or 'section' for kephalaion depending on whether the reference is to an argument of Proclus, a reply of Philoponus or a section of such a reply.

2. Proclus had the title Successor (*Diadokhos*) as head of the Academy at Athens in the line of succession from Plato.

3. Lang and Macro do not accept Rabe's insertion of *sunedêsen monos* at this point, but without it the earlier *monos*, which they ignore in their paraphrase of the sentence in n. 2, is difficult.

4. sc. Plato – at *Tim.* 32C.

5. *Tim.* 41A-B.

6. Adding *ara* after *adunaton* at 119,22, as suggested by Rabe in the critical apparatus. (Baltes reports that this has the support of Ishâq ibn <u>H</u>unayn's Arabic translation.)

7. Punctuating the Greek with a comma instead of a full stop in line 21 and a full stop instead of the first colon in line 22.

8. Literally 'the best creator'. The phrase is probably motivated by *Tim.* 29A, where the creator is described as *ho aristos tôn aitiôn* ('the best of causes').

9. Reading *<epei> panti* at 120,6 and deleting *eipen* in the next line. (The Republic has *all' epei panti* ... and the redundant *eipen* could stem from a misplaced *epei*. In his critical apparatus Rabe suggested *panti <gar> genomenôi phthora estin <kata> phusin, hôs Sôkratês*, and Baltes reports that *<gar>* has the support of Ishâq ibn Hunayn's Arabic translation, but I imagine that that would also be compatible with *epei*.)

10. Plato, *Rep.* 546A. Proclus clearly assumes (as he likewise does at *in Tim.* 1.8), that we are to understand that the discourse on the institutions and social

organisation of an ideal state delivered by Socrates on the eve of the conversation reported in the *Timaeus* (see *Tim.* 17B-19A) is identical with the conversation reported in the *Republic*. For reasons why this cannot be so, see, for example, Cornford, *Plato's Cosmology* (London, 1937), 4-5.

11. sc. the 'doctrine of the Muses'.

12. On the translation of *aïdios* as 'everlasting', see the introduction. On this argument and Philoponus' reply, see L. Judson, 'God or nature? Philoponus on generability and perishability' in R. Sorabji (ed.), *Philoponus and the Rejection of Aristotelian Science* (London & Ithaca, NY 1987), ch. 10.

In the notes to this translation I normally do no more than identify direct quotations and obvious references, often merely repeating Rabe's identifications from his critical apparatus. In the case of Proclus' arguments, a wider range of comparative material can be found in the notes to H.S. Lang and A.D. Macro (eds.), *On the Eternity of the World* (De Aeternitate Mundi), *Proclus* (Berkeley, etc., 2001).

13. Or 'line of attack'. In military parlance the word means 'assault', whence it is used figuratively of arguments (see H.D. Saffrey and L.G. Westerink, *Proclus, Théologie platonicienne*, vol. 2, Notes complémentaires, p. 1, n. 1).

14. Adding *kai* before *hoti* at 120,20, as suggested by Rabe in the critical apparatus.

15. The 'truth' referred to here and at 127,3 may be Christian doctrine, as it clearly is at 57,7 and 75,7-9. Other instances of *alêtheia* of which this may be so occur at 59,24; 61,8; 98,20; 117,16; 312,10.

16. *Tim.* 41A-B.

17. More literally, 'an exhibiting'.

18. Although the world exists in time (*en khronôi*; cf. 99,25), it cannot be said to be generated in time since time itself only came to be with the world. For this reason Philoponus speaks of it, as here, as generated 'with respect to time' (*kata khronon*) or 'from a [point of] time' (*apo khronou*; first at 149,14). Both phrases first occur in Chapter VI, are used most frequently there (*kata khronon* 86 of 94 occurrences, *apo khronou* 10 of 13), and are for the most part used of the generation of the world. Philoponus probably took both of them from Porphyry, who used them in his commentary on the *Timaeus* (cf. 154,7 for *kata khronon* and 149,14 for *apo khronou*).

19. It is often appropriate to translate *Hellênes* 'Greeks' and in a number of passages in *Aet*. I do, but for Jews and Christians alike, including those of Greek culture like Philoponus himself, the word is often equivalent to 'heathen' or 'pagan', and in contexts where it seems to have that connotation I translate 'Hellenes' rather than 'Greeks'. (For this expedient, cf. L.G. Westerink (ed.), *Anonymous Prolegomena to Platonic Philosophy* (Amsterdam 1962), xiii.) In the present passage, the contrast with 'common usage' suggests that Philoponus has in mind the pagan philosophers and not simply the Greeks or pagans at large.

20. At 156,4 the manuscript reading is *prosaptousin* and perhaps that should be read here.

21. See the note at 159,2 for an explanation of these 'six beginnings'.

22. Tim. 28B.

23. More literally 'no beginning of generation'. For Philoponus' interpretation of the phrase, see Section 16, especially 168,16-169,3.

24. i.e. they cannot argue both that 'generated' does not mean generated in time in the *Timaeus* and that it does have this meaning there but Plato does not intend the dialogue to be taken literally.

25. Plato, Tim. 27C.

26. Literally 'to write'.

27. The first of these substitutions would involve reading ei for \hat{e} and the second *aeigenes* for *agenes*.

28. The full stop after *ourania* in Rabe is clearly a misprint.

29. Deleting $t\hat{o}i$ before $t\hat{e}n$ at 124,24 and reading $\langle t\hat{o}i \rangle$ ouk at 124,23. (In the critical apparatus Rabe suggests either deleting $t\hat{o}i$ altogether or emending it to *autôi* but on balance it seems more likely that it has been displaced.)

30. *Tim.* 33A.

31. Philoponus sometimes puts verbs introducing quotation or report in the present tense and sometimes (as here) in a past tense. In either case I normally use the present tense in the translation.

32. *oikothen* is similarly used at 117,19 and 555,6.

33. Translating *tandikh*', the reading of some manuscripts of Euripides, rather than *diandikh*' as printed by Rabe.

34. Euripides, Phoenissae 469-72.

35. Rabe compares *Phdr*. 245C-246A, but Proclus (at 120,6), and presumably Porphyry before him, is referring to *Rep.* 546A.

36. kata tên sun antithesei antistrophên. 'Conversion by negation' is the term preferred by e.g. Joseph (*An Introduction to Logic* (Oxford, 1906), 215). A more literal translation would be 'conversion with opposition', or perhaps 'conversion [with substitution of] the contradictory'. M.J. Edwards (*Philoponus: On Aristotle Physics 3* (London & Ithaca, NY, 1994), 'Greek-English Index' under antistrophê) prefers 'inversion with negation'. In conversion by negation a proposition is obverted and the result converted. If the resulting proposition is then obverted, the contrapositive of the original proposition is obtained.

37. 126,10-23 = Sodano 2,39.

38. In other words, commits the fallacy of the Consequent.

39. Changing *ekhei* to *eikhen* at 127,1, as suggested by Rabe in the critical apparatus.

40. More literally 'the account [or word] of truth'. The phrase was sometimes used to refer to the Christian gospel and that may be the intention here.

41. Tim. 41A-B.

42. The first part of this programme is fulfilled in Sections 1-6, the second in Sections 7-27, and the third in Sections 28-9.

43. The meaning (and, consequently, the correct translation) of the words translated 'Gods, offspring of gods, works of which I am the creator ...' is far from clear. The rendering adopted here is unlikely to represent Plato's intention but has a better chance of reflecting Philoponus' understanding of it. (Anyone interested in the issues involved should consult Cornford, *Plato's Cosmology*, 367-70.)

44. Tim. 41A-B.

45. cf. 119,21-120,5 and notes there.

46. $t \hat{o} n \ eir \hat{e} m en \hat{o} n$ is difficult; it presumably refers back to the gods in the quotation from the *Timaeus* at 128,1, who are probably to be identified with the universe as a whole and the heavenly bodies, so that the whole passage will mean that observation of the world is by itself enough to attest that it has been well put together. Rabe, perhaps rightly, suspects that $eir\hat{e}men\hat{o}n$ is corrupt (he writes 'eir $\hat{e}men\hat{o}n$ suspectum' in the critical apparatus). If it is, it may have replaced something like *phainomenôn*, which would give 'observation of the phenomena alone'. Another possibility is that $t \hat{o}n \ eir \hat{e}men\hat{o}n$ was originally a marginal or interlinear gloss, supplied by a reader who understood $aisth \hat{e}sis$ in the sense 'observation' and asked 'observation of what?' whereas Philoponus had actually intended it to mean 'sense-perception'. We could then delete $t \hat{o}n \ eir \hat{e}men\hat{o}n$ and translate the phrase $aut\hat{e} \ h \hat{e} \ aisth \hat{e}sis$ by something like 'our senses alone', which

would be in accord with Philoponus' usage elsewhere (see Rabe's index under *aisthêsis*, especially 201,3 and 416,17).

47. This second 'all' (panta) does not appear in the text of Genesis.

48. Genesis 1, 31.

49. In Section 10.

50. cf. Plato, *Tim.* 41A-B.

51. cf. Plato, *Tim.* 41C.

52. The comparison which follows is neater in the original because in Greek 'put together' and 'tune' are the same verb (*harmozein*).

53. Adding *dialusai* after *boulêtheiê* at 131,9, one of two possible emendations suggested by Rabe in the critical apparatus.

54. Tim. 32C.

55. At 119,16-18.

56. *Metaph*. 1050b7.

57. Because neither 'power' nor 'potentiality' seems to do justice to every occurrence of dunamis in this section, I use whichever seems to work best in the immediate context.

58. Plato, Tim. 41A-B.

59. We have to wait until 134,2 for the 'on the other hand'.

60. The phrase *hoson epi harmoniâi* ('as far as harmony is concerned'), occurring as it does in the middle of a quotation from *Tim.* 41A-B, is unexpected and adds nothing to the argument and may be a gloss on *kai eu ekhon* ('in a good state') which has found its way into the text.

61. sc. those that the physicist or natural scientist rather than the metaphysician would deal with. ('More natural' would be easier, but cf. 7,25 and 12,7.)

62. The reference, like others at 155,19-24; 258,22-6; 396,24; 399,20-24; 461,1-2; 483,20 (of which the one at 258,22-6 is the most explicit), appears to be to Philoponus' *Against Aristotle on the Eternity of the World*, which seems to have been written soon after *Aet*. The substantial fragments of this work, most of them extracted from Simplicius' commentaries on *Cael*. and *Phys.*, have been translated by C. Wildberg in this series (*Against Aristotle on the Eternity of the World* (London & Ithaca, NY 1987)).

63. For this rendering of *kephalaion* see note 1.

64. This signals the end of the first part of the programme outlined in Section 3.

65. At 127,16-20.

66. At 127,7.

67. Or perhaps 'is only interested in attending to ...'.

68. i.e. to Chapters 7-18.

69. One could perhaps substitute 'very many' for 'the majority' but Philoponus would still be guilty of exaggeration, since in reality only a small minority of Platonists interpreted Plato in this way.

70. cf. Phys. 251b19 and Cael. 280a30-1.

71. Translating *teleutan*, the reading of the manuscripts of Plato, rather than *teleutaion* (last).

72. *Tim.* 27A.

73. *Tim.* 27C.

74. In Aristotelian dialectic a 'problem' is a question as to whether something is the case or not. (At *Top.* 102b32-3 Aristotle gives as an example of a problem 'Is two-footed terrestrial animal the definition of man or not?')

75. Tim. 27C-28A.

76. Literally, 'rewoven'. The word (which occurs again at 138,13; 235,28 and 236,25) is not particularly common and Philoponus may have in mind *Phaedo* 87D, where Cebes uses it of the soul repairing wear and tear to the body.

77. Pol. 270A.

78. In VI.28.

79. This work is not extant. Philoponus quotes from it or refers to it some twenty times in *Aet.*, Proclus himself refers to it in his commentary on Plato's *Timaeus* and Simplicius probably draws on it in a number of his commentaries. The quotations in *Aet.* and some probable quotations in Simplicius' *in Cael.* are translated by Thomas Taylor in *The fragments That Remain of the Lost Writings of Proclus, Surnamed the Platonic Successor,* 2-31 and the work is discussed in L. Siorvanes, *Proclus: Neo-Platonic Philosophy and Science* (New Haven and London 1996), 216-23. Philoponus' citations are listed in Rabe's index of proper names under 'Proclus'.

80. e.g. species as opposed to individuals, and perhaps the elemental masses (fire, air, water, earth) as opposed to things composed of the elements.

81. Tim. 28B-C.

82. Tim. 27D.

83. Plato has 'comes to be', and perhaps that is the correct reading here.

84. Tim. 37D-38A.

85. Tim. 38B-C.

86. The translation assumes that the article to is present to nominalise the adverb *prin*, which is the subject of *prouparkhei*, and that *tês sustaseôs* is in the genitive after the same verb. (Philoponus is taking the phrase *prin ouranon genesthai* at 140,16-17 as evidence that Plato believed that there was a 'before' the creation of the universe and time.) Rabe found to *prin* unacceptable. (He writes 'fort. *ti prin* (vix to *prin*)' in the critical apparatus). Presumably he took *prin* with *tês sustaseôs*, which would make to a problem. (His conjecture *ti* would make the sentence read 'And if something exists prior to the framing of the heaven, how could the heaven and time be without beginning?', acceptable Greek but hardly acceptable sense in the context.)

87. Exodus 3,14.

88. The (unexpressed) subject of 'brought' is unclear. What precedes suggests that it should be 'time', but 'the heaven and time' or 'the heaven' would better suit what follows.

89. cf. 42,10-12.

90. Changing *hote* to *tote* at 142,23, as suggested by Rabe in the critical apparatus.

91. At 142,23-143,5.

92. In IV.3.

93. Tim. 38B.

94. The phrase actually derives from Rep. 546A. (cf. the note at 126,19).

95. cf. Tim. 41A-B.

96. The saying also occurs at 30,20-1. For Philoponus' part in the development of the topos see L. Tarán, 'Amicus Plato sed magis amica veritas, from Plato and Aristotle to Cervantes', *Antike und Abendland* 30 (1984), 112-15. Verrycken also discusses Philoponus' use of it in 'Philoponus' Interpretation of Plato's Cosmogony', *Documenti e Studi sulla Tradizione Filosofica Medievale* 8 (1997) 274-7.

97. EN 1096a16.

98. 'Shaken out every reef' would be rather more literal.

99. The expression *epi lexeôs*, which literally means something like 'verbatim' or 'word for word' and which I here translate 'to quote his exact words', was one method used to mark direct quotations in the absence of typographic indications and a case could be made for not translating it at all.

100. Perhaps he is thinking of *Cael*. 280a30-1.

101. At *Tim.* 28B.

102. Plato's Timaeus, who may well be his own creation, is a Pythagorean from Locri in southern Italy. The work referred to here is presumably the *On the Soul of the World and On Nature*, a late (first-century AD?) fabrication, largely based on the *Timaeus* itself, that circulated under Timaeus' name.

103. This sentence is omitted when Philoponus quotes the first part of this passage again at 223,8-19.

104. cf. Diels, Doxographi Graeci, 485.

105. 145,20-4 = Fortenbaugh, fr. 241A.

106. *Tim.* 28B. The sentence continues: 'and has body, and, [as we have seen], all such perceptible things, since they may be grasped by belief along with sensation, clearly come to be and are generated' and what follows is in effect an attempt to defuse what it seems to say.

107. Although I have translated both instances of *genêtos* 'generated' there appears on the face of it to be a play on the ambiguity of the word: the *kosmos* is *genêtos* in the sense that it is, *qua* perceptible, generable by nature, even though it has not actually been generated, while other perceptibles are *genêtos* in that they have actually been generated – or perhaps one should say that they are both generable and generated. However, in *Tim.* 28B (see the previous note) the shared genus is 'perceptible things' and the contention may be simply (if unconvincingly) that all perceptible things are described as 'generated' whether they have come to be or not just as they (or at any rate many of them) are described as 'visible' whether they are seen or not.

108. The *mesê*, *netê*, and *hupatê* (literally, 'middle', 'lowest' and 'highest') were physically the middle, *lowest and highest* strings of the lyre but in musical theory the middle, *highest and lowest* notes in a scale or attunement. The latter usage seems to be the relevant one here and I have translated accordingly. (The use of these three terms in musical theory is actually more complex than the above suggests. More detail can be found in the entry 'Music' in the third edition of the *Oxford Classical Dictionary*.)

109. More literally 'while being one at bottom [or "in his substratum"] changes into many forms'.

110. Changing *legoito* to *legetai* and omitting *de* at 147,5 (cf. 146,13 and 146,20; Rabe writes *'legoito de* suspecta' in the critical apparatus).

111. 145,24-147,9 are translated and discussed in J. Dillon, *The Middle Platonists: a Study of Platonism, 80 BC to AD 220* (London 1977), 242-4.

112. *Tim.* 28B.

113. The *History* of Ephorus (*c.* 405-330 BC), a 'universal' history in thirty books, has not survived and is only known at second hand. The story of the return of the Heraclidae, or descendants of Heracles, to the Peloponnese served as a charter myth for the division of the Peloponnese between the three Dorian states of Messenia, Argos and Sparta (For more information, see the articles 'Ephorus' and 'Heraclidae' in the *Oxford Classical Dictionary*.)

114. Or 'principles'; cf. the note at 159,2.

115. I have assumed that the words I have bracketed are parenthetic, dismissing an incompatible view of the words under discussion, and that the next sentence is intended as further evidence that Plato is rejecting a 'beginning with respect to time'.

116. Tim. 28B.

117. en tôi ginesthai to einai ekhonta. The phrase, which is common in Philoponus and Simplicius and is used by a number of the other commentators, goes back at least to Alexander (*Mixt.* 227,22; *in Sens.* 50,25; 154,16; *in Meteor.* 73,1; 83,1). At *in Phys.* 465,25 Philoponus uses it to distinguish processes or events, such as a day or a contest, which unfold little by little and are never

present as a whole, from substances such as a man or a horse. However, in the Platonic tradition such substances, and indeed the world as a whole (see *Tim.* 27E ff.), are regarded as ever-changing entities and in *Aet*. the phrase is most commonly used to distinguish the physical from the intelligible and the temporal from the eternal.

118. More literally 'bears the description of [a] generation'.

119. sc. matter and form in the case of things composed of them and other diagrams, it seems, in the case of diagrams.

120. 148,9-23 = Sodano 2,37.

121. sc. Taurus.

122. Aristotle discusses lightning in *Meteor*. 2.9 and the author of the pseudo-Aristotelian *Mund.* at 394a10-28, but neither account contains any suitable statement. The reference must be to *Cael.* 280b6-9, where Aristotle says that 'ungenerated' can be used of things which come into existence without any process of generation (*aneu geneseôs*; cf. same phrase at 149, 5) or change. (His examples are touch and motion.)

123. 'Passing out of existence', my usual rendering of *phthora*, does not work well here.

124. Which shows that Philoponus is no more inclined than Proclus to take the *Timaeus* myth at face value.

125. See note to 121,15.

126. 148,25-149,16 = Sodano 2,36.

127. Changing *tou genêtou* to *tôn genêtôn* at 150,1, as suggested by Rabe in the critical apparatus.

128. Changing *ginomenon* to *genomenon* at 150,11-12, as suggested by Rabe in the critical apparatus.

129. For 'conversion by negation', see the note at 126,20.

130. i.e. anything corporeal, and therefore visible.

131. cf. 152,1; but 'of the earth' is another possible supplement (cf. 151,16). In Philoponus' cosmology the centre of the universe and the centre of the earth of course coincide. The point is that anything 'beneath' the centre is invisible to us.

132. A Greek hero who sailed with Jason and the other Argonauts on the expedition to recover the Golden Fleece. Lynceus was famed for his unnaturally keen eyesight and euhemeristic mythographers explained this on the hypothesis that he was the first miner and that his activities gained him the reputation of being able to see underground. (P. Grimal, *The Dictionary of Classical Mythology* (Oxford, 1996), 266.)

133. Apollonius, Argonautica 1.155.

134. Presumably the centre of the earth rather than the centre of the universe is referred to here because of the allusion to Lynceus and his ability to see beneath the surface of the earth.

135. More literally, '... does not have its being visible in this, in being seen'. Philoponus uses expressions of this form very frequently both in *Aet.* and elsewhere when stating a thing's essence. Outside Philoponus they are not very common (a TLG search turns up four in Alexander, two in Porphyry, eight in Simplicius – one of them in a quotation from Philoponus – and a handful in other later commentators), and I cannot account for the mannerism. I have not made any attempt to preserve the construction in translation.

136. *Tim.* 27C.

137. *Tim.* 28B.

138. Tim. 38B.

139. sc. of the first of Taurus' suggestions as to possible senses in which *genêtos* might be applied to the world.
140. Or perhaps: 'simple [sc. non-complex] things ...'.

141. = Sodano 2,35.

142. Depending on how 148,7-9 is to be read this could mean either the three attributed to Porphyry at 148,7-149,16, or these together with those cited from Taurus at 146,8-147,9.

143. cf. Tim. 28B.

144. Adding on after *diastaton* at 155,2, as suggested by Rabe in the critical apparatus.

145. = Sodano 2,38.

146. Literally 'the [views] of the man'.

147. sc. in his Against Aristotle on the Eternity of the World, on which see the note at 134,17.

148. *Cael.* 280b1-20. (In the translation I translate all titles into English, but in the notes I normally use the traditional abbreviations, which are frequently formed from the Latin versions of titles).

149. At 52,15-26.

150. Changing the second kai to ei at 156,13, as suggested by Rabe in the critical apparatus.

151. Tim. 27C.

152. Tim. 28B.

153. *Tim.* 28B.

154. sc. at Tim. 27C.

155. Changing gar to kai at 157,1, as suggested by Rabe in the critical apparatus.

156. At 153,17-25.

157. i.e. at *Tim.* 28B.

158. This claim is a little puzzling. Perhaps he has in mind 140,2-144,15, where he discusses the passage in the *Timaeus* in which Plato says that time came into being together with the heaven.

159. Changing onta to onti at 159,1, as suggested by the reader.

160. The word I have been translating 'beginning' $(arkh\hat{e})$ is used interchangeably with the word 'cause' (aition or aitia) by Aristotle to describe his famous four causes (form, matter, efficient cause, final cause), the four factors we must take into account when explaining change in the universe. In this context $arkh\hat{e}$ is commonly rendered 'principle', or even 'cause', but in what follows I shall retain the translation 'beginning' in spite of the occasional awkwardness this produces rather than alternate between 'beginning' and 'principle'. (I shall draw attention to the few cases in which I depart from this practice.)

161. Philoponus and Simplicius both attribute the identification of these six causes to Plato in their commentaries on Aristotle's *Physics* (at 5,7-6,8 and 3,13-19 respectively). They are, of course, the four Aristotelian causes plus the paradigmatic and instrumental causes. (Philoponus offers an explanation for the absence of the last two in Aristotle but the details need not concern us here). The six-cause scheme was standard for the late Neoplatonists. For its occurrence in Proclus, see R.J. Hankinson, *Cause and Explanation in Ancient Greek Thought* (Oxford, 1998), 326 and 435, and for the earlier history of the paradigmatic and instrumental causes, follow the references under 'Cause – instrumental' and 'Cause – paradigmatic' in the index to Hankinson.

162. At 159,6-7.

163. At 159,16-18.

164. Changing elaber at 161,16 to estin labein.

165. cf. 154,17-19.

166. At first sight Hellênes here could simply mean 'the Greeks' and the

phrase be equivalent to 'unknown to the Greek language', but in the section summary at 122,3 I think the word must refer to the pagan philosophers, which should fix its meaning here.

 $167.\,$ i.e. the extraordinary hypotheses which Porphyry and others attempt to foist upon him.

168. 781E.

169. Editors of the *Laws* agree that the last part of this sentence is not satisfactory Greek, but the general sense is clear.

170. 981E.

171. This material between inverted commas is actually a conflation of the passages that have just been quoted from the *Laws* and the *Epinomis*.

172. Here and in the next sentence Philoponus treats the Epinomis, which was regarded as a kind of appendix to the Laws, as part of the Laws.

173. 28B.

174. cf. 154,18.

175. In VI.24.

176. cf. Tim. 27C.

177. *Tim.* 30A.

178. It is tempting to read *epiginomenon <eidos>*, or, in view of *skhêmata* ('shapes') at 165,3, *epiginomenon <skhêma>* but perhaps *to epiginomenon* ('something which supervenes') can stand on its own.

179. = Sodano 2,47.

180. cf. *Tim.* 52B.

181. = Sodano 2,49.

182. Or perhaps 'eyes and the ability to use them'. For the phrase cf. 202,3-5.

183. More literally 'who have diverted Plato into these stupid theories'.

184. Half a dozen times in fact, most recently at 138,20.

185. Emending *eipômen* to *eipomen*. The reference is to 149,12-16.

186. These lines were quoted at 96,7-11, though not in the same sequence. On that occasion Philoponus' paraphrase of the words in parentheses (*hoson gar* ... *ho khronos*) at 96,20-1 shows that he understands them as I have translated them, but I think that Proclus intended something like 'for whatever is there [sc. in time], is in a particular [part of] time'.

187. More literally 'always existing at a particular moment, [namely,] in the [or: 'at each'] present part of time'. The phrase is a little awkward and it may be that *kata to enestêkos tou khronou meros* ('in the present part of time') is a gloss on *pote* ('at a particular moment') that has found its way into the text.

188. Tim. 28A.

189. cf. Tim. 28B.

190. Aristotle argues that the universe is ungenerated and imperishable at *Cael.* 279b1-284b5. The only specific reference to Plato is at 280a28-32, which Philoponus quotes below at 221,24-8.

191. *Tim.* 28B.

192. The MSS of Plato have *gennêtos* rather than *genêtos*, but the two words are frequently confused in manuscripts and, at least by Philoponus' day, were probably not clearly distinguished by the Greeks themselves.

193. Changing ta to to at 170,14, as suggested by Rabe in the critical apparatus.

194. Adding *ei* before *en* and changing *ekhein* to *ekhei* at 170,28, as suggested by Rabe in the critical apparatus.

195. In IV.14.

196. cf. *Tim.* 27D-28B.

197. *Tim.* 28B.

198. At 159,5-7.

199. At 167,24-7.

200. 'Most truly' (*kuriôtata*) looks forward to 'in the truest sense' (*kuriôtatên*) in the quotation at 172,9.

201. Although translators commonly translate along these lines, something like 'this is [its] most supreme ["principal", "ultimate", etc.] cause' would also be possible, but it would then be more difficult to make good sense of *kai tauta kuriôtata* at 172,6.

202. Tim. 29E.

203. Or 'If this is the ultimate origin ...' (cf. the note at 172,9).

204. Both here and earlier in the sentence one could translate 'from' rather than 'through the agency of'.

205. Tim. 28B.

206. = Smith 172F (omitted by Sodano).

207. Tim. 28B.

- 208. Tim. 27C.
- 209. Tim. 28B.

210. sc. in a question as to whether something is the case or not (cf. the note at 136, 16).

- **211.** *Tim.* 28B.
- 212. Top. 105a3-7.
- **213.** Mund. 397b13-16.
- **214.** 34B-C.
- 215. Tim. 27C.
- 216. Tim. 27C.

217. Actually paraphrase rather than quotation of *Tim.* 27C, but it seems reasonable to retain Rabe's quotation marks.

218. *Tim.* 27D-28A.

219. Epist. 2, 312D-E.

- **220.** 715E.
- **221.** = Kern fr. 168; but this passage is not cited there.
- **222.** 174,27-175,2.
- 223. Mund. 397b13-16.

224. The argument that the cause and beginning of all things is one runs from 1070a3 to 1076a4. The Homeric quotation (*Il.* 2.204) constitutes its last line.

225. 34B ff.; 41C.

226. Changing monôi at 180,16 to monon. (cf. 181,4).

- **227.** Adding *ou* before *ta men* at 180,23.
- **228**. 180,16-18.
- 229. Rep. 534E.
- **230.** *Phdr.* 265E.
- **231.** 27D-28A.

232. Changing genomenôi to ginomenôi at 182,10, as suggested by Rabe in the critical apparatus.

233. Changing genomenon ... genomenon to ginomenon ... ginomenon at 182,19, as suggested by Rabe in the critical apparatus.

- **234.** VI.18.
- 235. Tim. 28B.
- **236.** sc. the Presocratics.

237. cf. *Phd.* 97C ff. and Diels-Kranz, 'Anaxagoras' A57 with Diels note. (The phrase 'as though waking from a dream' does not occur in Plato.)

238. That is, that it has an efficient cause.

239. This quotation, which is actually an amalgam of two different passages

in the *Timaeus*, occurs again at 184,18-21. The words before the semicolon are from 28C, where, as Philoponus states, they immediately follow the quotation earlier in the sentence, but the words following the semicolon are from 28A. The misquotation is not critical for the argument and may be accidental, having arisen because the words from 28A are there preceded by words that are similar to those from 28C.

240. Literally 'run back to'. For the usage, cf. the passages cited at LSJ *anatrekhein* 1.3, and Olympiodorus, *in Gorg.* 161,35 (Westerink).

241. 196a28-b5.

242. Aristotle has 'comes about' (*ginomenon*; 196b3) and Rabe's suggestion in the critical apparatus that 'has come about' (*genomenou*) may have replaced 'comes about' (*ginomenou*) is plausible.

243. Tim. 28B.

244. cf. 183,17-19 and note there.

245. Tim. 27D.

246. Tim. 28A.

247. Tim. 28B.

248. 145,2, etc.

249. Tim. 27C.

250. Homer, Il. 3.215.

251. The manuscripts of Homer have *êen* ('he was').

252. When translating the *Timaeus* passage it is natural to render *poieisthai logous* by something like 'to discuss' (as I have a few lines earlier) or 'to engage in dialogue' (cf. LSJ *logos* VI.3.c), but here, where the subject of the infinitive appears to be singular (Plato?) and the phrase is followed by $h\hat{os}$ ('that'), it makes sense to treat the phrase as periphrastic for the simple verb *legein*, 'to say' (cf. LSJ *poieô* II.5). Alternatively, one might perhaps translate 'will discuss how it has come to be, even though it is ungenerated', but this seems a less natural interpretation of the Greek and less in accord with what Taurus goes on to say.

253. This passage is, as Philoponus says, a comment on the lemma 'we who are about to discuss with regard to the universe whether it has come to be or is ungenerated', and in particular on the words 'or is ungenerated'. Is the first sentence ('Even though it is ungenerated.') intended as (a) a statement that Plato wrote *ei kai* rather than the \hat{e} *kai* of the lemma (Verrycken, 'Philoponus' Interpretation of Plato's Cosmogony', 310-17), or (b) a statement that \hat{e} *kai* is here synonymous with *ei kai* (Baltes, *Die Weltentstehung des platonischen Timaios nach den antiken Interpreten* (Leiden, 1976), 1,112-115)? The issue is a complex one and any attempt to resolve it must take into account not only the present passage from Alexander which he quotes at 214,10 ff., on which those comments are clearly in part based. I cannot go into the matter thoroughly here, but at certain points the translator must (at least implicitly) take a position, so I shall first give a brief indication of the views of Baltes and Verrycken and then, equally briefly, state the position I shall take.

Baltes believes that Taurus read \hat{e} kai in Plato but interpreted it as equivalent to ei kai. Alexander, misunderstanding Taurus' highly abbreviated comment on the *Timaeus* passage, believed that he was changing Plato's \hat{e} kai to ei kai and, in his commentary on Aristotle's de Caelo (in the passage quoted below at 214,10ff.), criticised him on that basis. Porphyry, on the other hand, understood Taurus' intention correctly but, in his own commentary on the *Timaeus*, argued that he had misinterpreted Plato. Philoponus, who was familiar with the criticisms of both Alexander and Porphyry, combines them rather awkwardly in his own criticism of Taurus at 191,15-193,9, with the result that, although he clearly believes that Taurus altered the transmitted text of Plato from \hat{e} kai to ei kai, he also accuses him of misinterpreting Plato's \hat{e} kai.

Verrycken believes that Taurus reads $ei \ kai$ in Plato, either regarding it as one possible solution of an ambiguous unaccented \hat{e} (Verrycken's preferred position) or as a correction of the transmitted reading. Alexander believed that Taurus had illegitimately changed the transmitted text and criticised him on that basis. Philoponus, like Alexander, believes that Taurus changed the transmitted text and criticises him on that basis. Some of his arguments are taken from Alexander, but those which accuse Taurus of misinterpreting $\hat{e} \ kai$ are his own. He is not, as Baltes argues, illegitimately combining incompatible arguments. His position is that it is just because Taurus thinks that $\hat{e} \ kai$ is to be understood in the same sense as $ei \ kai$ that he substitutes ei for \hat{e} .

My own belief is that Taurus was, as Baltes holds, interpreting $\hat{e} kai$ rather than emending it. Philoponus understood this perfectly well and nothing he writes is intended to suggest anything else; in fact, he also seems to believe that Alexander too is criticizing the misinterpretation of $\hat{e} kai$, not its emendation. (I am not sure that he was correct in this last belief, but nor am I certain that Alexander's criticism was directed at Taurus.)

Whichever was Taurus' position, he is clearly quoting the line from the Iliad to bolster it. The manuscripts of Homer (see M.M. Willcock (ed.) The Iliad of Homer (Houndmills & London, 1978-84), 1,85) are divided between \hat{e} (accented in two different ways) and *ei* and the ancient scholia (see H. Erbse (ed)., Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem (Berlin, 1969-83), 1,398-9) show that some commentators read \hat{e} but argued that it was synonymous with ei. If Taurus is proposing emendation, he is adducing the Homeric passage as another case where *ei* should be restored even though (many of) the manuscripts read \hat{e} , if merely a particular interpretation of \hat{e} kai, as another case where \hat{e} is supposedly synonymous with ei. To my way of thinking Taurus' quotation of Homer favours the second alternative, since, as far as we can see from the scholia, the scholarly debate was concerned with how \hat{e} should be understood rather than with whether \hat{e} or $e\hat{i}$ should be read, and a possible expansion of Taurus' rather cryptic first two sentences would be (retaining ei kai at 186,22 rather than emending to $\hat{e} kai$ as Baltes (113, n. 135) suggests): '[The words \hat{e} kai agenes estin have here the rather unusual meaning] "even though it is ungenerated". The Poet [likewise means] "even though it were later in birth" [when he writes ê kai genei husteron eien]."

254. As the text stands, the subjects of the verbs in this sentence are the two reasons (*aitiai*) mentioned in the previous sentence. This is awkward and there may be something wrong with the text. The sense required seems to be something like 'the first is [that] he is exhorting [us] to piety, the second [that this expedient] is employed for the sake of clarity'; but something more complicated may have gone wrong.

255. i.e. even without a temporally prior cause. (This '*allôs*' looks back to the one in line 7).

256. For this sense of *khôrein* see Lampe C.5.

257. This strikes me as a rather odd thing to say and I am tempted to change *suntethenta* at 187,17 to *suntethentôn* and *ginomena* in the following line to *ginomenôn* and translate '... construct diagrams of things that have not [really] been constructed as though they are in the process of being generated', or to omit *diagrammata* as a gloss and translate '... construct things that have not [really] been constructed as though they are in the process of being generated', but the first part of the sentence is, I think, against it. (Perhaps Taurus would have done better to write 'describe' rather than 'construct'.)

258. Elements I, def. 15.

259. Punctuating with a full stop after ginomena at 187,18.

260. 369B ff.

261. = Fortenbaugh, fr. 241B.

262. cf. *Cael*. 279b33-280a11.

263. Compare this report of the views of Theophrastus and Aristotle with the earlier one at 145,15-24.

264. sc. in the *Critias*. (For the title *Atlantikos*, cf. Diogenes Laertius 3.51,1 and 3.60,6; Stobaeus 2.28,1; Proclus, *in Tim.* 1.201,14ff.). Another possibility, although I think it is a slim one, is that the reference is, as Verrycken assumes (see 'Philoponus' Interpretation of Plato's Cosmogony', 312), to the summary of the Atlantis story at *Tim.* 20D-25D, in which case I would translate 'from the Atlantis [myth]'.

265. Those who ignored Taurus' advice could in the case of the *Statesman* have pointed to the passage in the myth where it is said that a creator god brought the universe into its present state of order out of a state of disorder (273B-D). It is less clear what evidence they could have found to support their position in the Atlantis myth; perhaps they might have argued that the reference to the division of the earth among the gods at *Critias* 109B (also hinted at at *Timaeus* 23D-E) implies a finite age for the earth, and therefore the world, and that the chronology outlined by the Egyptian priest at *Timaeus* 41E even gives some idea of its age.

266. Rabe writes '*autôi* suspectum' in the critical apparatus, and I have changed *autôi* to *tôi*. Another possibility would be *autôi* <*tôi*>, a suggestion of the reader.

267. cf. 164,24-165,2.

268. Or 'distraction', perhaps. LSJ glosses *okhlêsis* 'disturbance, annoyance, distress', none of which quite works here. The word is used in a similar context at 259,5.

269. *Tim.* 27C, as emended, or interpreted, by Taurus 186,21.

270. Adding *khreia* after $\hat{e}n$ at 189,25, a suggestion of Brinkmann reported by Rabe in the critical apparatus.

271. At VI.8.

272. 246A.

273. Both Baltes and Verrycken base their cases that Philoponus believed that Taurus was proposing to emend \hat{e} kai at Tim. 28C to ei kai largely on certain phrases in this section and in the section summary at 123,19-24. The key phrases are *metapherein tas lexeis* (here), which they (on the face of it quite plausibly) take to mean something like 'to alter manuscript readings', the roughly equivalent phrase metethêke tên lexin at 193,6, and the phrase metethêke eis ('change to') in the section summary, to which Baltes would perhaps add *metalambanesthai* at 191,17 (cf. Baltes, 113, n. 133) and, presumably, other related words in this section, although this would leave it unclear how he would draw the line between Philoponus' criticism of the misinterpretation of \hat{e} kai and his criticism of its emendation. My own view is that *metapherein* (or *metatithenai*) tên lexin, which I take to mean something like 'altering the meaning (cf. LSJ metapherein 3) of a word [or phrase]', or perhaps 'altering the literal meaning' (cf. Lampe lexis 9), are merely generalised descriptions of the specific crime of which Philoponus is accusing Taurus, sc. claiming that $\hat{e} kai$ is equivalent to ei kai. This has the great advantage that it gives Philoponus' argument a coherence that it lacks as either Baltes or Verrycken understand it. What is required is evidence that the phrases in question are likely to mean what I want them to and that is, I believe, provided by VI.11 above. There Philoponus is attacking an alleged attempt to take genêtos ('generated') as equivalent to sunthetos ('composite'), or, as Philoponus puts it, to claim that Plato has substituted 'generated' for 'composite'. There is clearly no

hint of any proposal to emend the text; the question is purely a semantic one. The verbs used to describe the alleged substitution are *metalambanein anti* (155,11.13; 156,26; 157,3.6.13), and, as in the present section, *metalambanein eis* (155,19; 157,14), and at 156,1 such substitutions are described as *metapherein tên* sunêthê tôn onomatôn epi to atribes kai asunêthes ('changing normal word-usage to the novel and unfamiliar') and at 157,14 as a *metathesis* (the noun is from the same root as *metatithenai*) tôn onomatôn ('a substitution [or "interchanging"] of nouns').

274. sc. Taurus.

275. For *metalambanein* in this sense, though in a different construction, cf. LSJ s.v. IV.3.

276. At 214,10-20.

277. If, as I believe, and as Verrycken presumably, and Baltes possibly, would agree, *tên toiautên tou sundesmou metalêpsin* ('such a substitution of conjunctions') refers to the proposal to understand \hat{e} kai in the sense of ei kai, it seems that Philoponus believes that Alexander's criticism, like his own, is directed at the misinterpretation of \hat{e} kai and not, as Baltes and Verrycken hold, at its emendation.

278. Changing *Platônikas* to *Platônikês* at 191,23, as suggested by Rabe in the critical apparatus.

279. Literally *kuriologia* is either the use of literal rather than figurative language or the precise use of words.

280. The ancient scholia on the *Iliad* (see note at 186,3) do not contain any statement about the frequency of the alleged usage.

281. *Tim.* 27C.

282. On dialectical problems see the note at 136,16.

283. Tim. 28B.

284. Here and above in line 11 *en aporiâi* ('in a puzzle') seems to be used synonymously with the technical term *en problêmati* ('in a dialectical problem'), which was used in line 5 and reappears at 193,19. This is a little surprising and a case could be made for emendation.

285. sc. in 27C.

286. Or possibly: 'altered the literal sense'. The phrase (*metethêke tên lexin*) is, I believe, equivalent to *metapherein tas lexeis* ('alter the meanings of words') at 191,15.

287. Although I have retained it in the translation, hama at 193,6 looks rather like a gloss on *aperiskeptôs* that has found its way into the text, perhaps at the expense of a particle, whether ara, as Rabe suggests, or something else.

288. Changing *metalambanontes* to *metalambanousin* at 193,11, one of two possible corrections suggested by Rabe in the critical apparatus.

289. If this, as it may at first appear, refers specifically to their addition of the letters ei to the text of Plato to change *agenes* to *aeigenes*, the parallel with Taurus does not hold up, since his activity, even if it amounted to emendation, could not be described simply as the addition of something. However, the phrase is almost certainly inspired by Alexander's *metagraphein ta mê houtôs ekhonta* at 214,3, which seems to mean something like 'transcribe incorrectly', and probably has much the same meaning. (In fact, I suspect that when Philoponus wrote *palin kai houtoi* ('they too in turn'), he thought that he had, following Alexander, earlier used some such phrase to describe Taurus' activity – and indeed may have in an earlier draft.)

290. Tim. 28B.
291. Tim. 28A.
292. cf. Tim. 27C.

293. More literally 'as something strong towards proof'.

294. 34C ff.

295. 246A.

296. The word translated 'animates' (psukhoun) has the same root as the word translated 'soul' $(psukh\hat{e})$.

297. It is difficult to know how best to translate *kath'hexin* here but a passage from his *in DA* (2,7-15) shows what Philoponus has in mind. 'The function of intellect is to apprehend things better than [is possible] through demonstration by acts of pure intuition. This activity of intellect only takes place in those who have reached the pinnacle of purification and knowledge, in those who through [the practice of] the purificatory virtues have habituated themselves to engaging in [mental] activity without imagery and quite apart from sense perception. For intellect is, as it were, the most perfect condition (*hexis*) of the soul.' (A scholiast put it more economically when he glossed *kath'hexin* 'i.e. philosophically' in the main manuscript of *Aet*.)

298. sc. by dying.

299. Changing *autêi* to *autê* at 196,1 and *en têi* to *en hêi* at 196,3. *autêi* and *tê* may both have arisen under the influence of the phrase *en skhesei têi pros to sôma* at 195,26-7. (In 196,3, one might, as an alternative, delete *ekhei*.)

300. In VI.7.

301. 35A-36D. Cornford's commentary on the *Timaeus* passage will also serve to elucidate Philoponus' paraphrase of it.

302. More literally 'out of the bare text itself' (i.e. without further commentary).

303. i.e. Taurus, Porphyry, and perhaps Proclus himself (cf. 146,1-7).

304. Here and in what follows 'the planets' translates *hoi planômenoi* (sc. *asteres*; for the gender cf. *Aet.* 579,16, for the complete phrase e.g. [Philop.] *in GA* 218,22), and 'the planetary spheres' *hai planômenai* (sc. *sphairai*; for the complete phrase cf. *Aet.* 537,6).

305. Il. 12.239-40.

306. e.g. at *Phdr.* 246A.

307. cf. *Tim.* 28B-C.

308. In VI.11.

309. cf. Tim. 32C.

310. 521,25-522,22.

311. For this rendering of *kephalaion* see note 1.

312. i.e. the total amount of each of the four elements. (In fact, a more literal rendering of the phrase would be 'the totalities of the elements').

313. VI.9-23.

314. For 'conversion by negation', see the note at 126,20.

315. Deleting *ou* at 204,21 and changing *all*' at 204,22 to *kai ouk*.

316. VI.7-23.

317. I would normally translate the phrase *aei kata ta auta kai hôsautôs ekhein* 'always remains the same and unchanging', but I have used 'unchanging' earlier in the sentence to render *ametablêton*.

318. A slightly inaccurate quotation of *Tim.* 27D-28A, probably under the influence of 29A.

319. Tim. 27D.

320. Here and in the rest of this section 'temporal origin' translates $khronik\hat{e}$ arkh \hat{e} .

321. *kath' hotioun tôn peri auto theôroumenôn.* More literally 'with regard to anything at all observed around it [or perhaps "in it"]'. This is awkward and I am

tempted to think that *tôn peri auto theôroumenôn* is a gloss on *kath'hotioun* which has found its way into the text.

322. Adding *to* before *khronikês* at 206,10, as suggested by Rabe in the critical apparatus.

323. Actually almost a hundred pages later in IX.11.

324. Changing pros to $p\hat{o}s$ at 207,15, as suggested by Rabe in the critical apparatus.

325. VI.18-20.

326. Adding aei before ontôn at 207,27.

327. Adding *de* after *lêthês* at 208,14 and changing *autôi* to *autêi* in the following line. (In the critical apparatus Rabe suggests the former change and casts doubt on *autôi*.)

328. Changing *horasthai* to *orthais einai* at 208,23, one of two possible corrections suggested by Rabe in the critical apparatus.

329. 205,25-206,7.

330. 113b15-114a25.

331. Omitting the words to khrômasin einai, which look like a gloss on to poiotêsin einai. (Rabe writes 'to khrômasin einai vix sana' in the critical apparatus.)

332. The verb (*antikeintai*) is plural, and the sentence could also be translated: 'Thus if that which changes and that which is never the same and that which is perceptible are opposed to that which is unchanging and that which is always the same and that which is intelligible ...'

333. For this sense of *logos* see Lampe s.v. A.12.b. *logos* could, of course, be rendered by something more neutral, say 'position'.

334. Atticus (c. AD 150-200) and Plutarch (before AD 50-after AD 120) were both notorious for having supported the literal interpretation of the *Timaeus*. Eusebius quotes them both at length in his *Praeparatio Evangelica (Preparation for the Gospel*), although in the case of Plutarch not on creation. The most important work of Plutarch in that connection is his *de Animae Procreatione in Timaeo (On the Generation of the Soul in the Timaeus)* and the fragments of Atticus are collected in E. Des Places (ed.), *Atticus: fragments* (Paris 1977), which also has a useful introduction. As I remarked in the introduction to my translation of *Aet.* 1-5, the fact that Philoponus feels able to direct his readers to Christian authors for information about Plutarch and Atticus suggests that he is writing primarily for a Christian audience.

335. 279b4-6.

336. 279b12-17.

337. Alexander's commentary on Cael. has not survived.

338. Aristotle attributes this view to Hesiod at *Cael*. 298b25-9 and to Plato at *Cael*. 280a28-32.

339. Changing *tinôn* to *sunistamenôn* at 212,24. (Rabe suggests emending it to *ginomenôn*, but 212,10 and 213,6 seem to favour *sunistamenôn*).

340. As Rabe indicates, the words *tautês de phêsin tês doxês kai tous Stôikous gegonenai* ('He says that the Stoics too were of this opinion') at 213,3-4 cannot stand. It seems probable that they were originally a marginal gloss with 'he' referring to Alexander, and I have deleted them.

341. Cael. 279b17-21.

343. Tim. 27C.

344. Although Philoponus' earlier criticism of Taurus' treatment of *Tim.* 27C at 191,15-193,9 is in large measure based on what Alexander says in this passage,

^{342.} *Tim.* 27D.

it is not necessarily the case that Taurus, whom he does not mention elsewhere in his writings, is one of those Alexander has in mind here.

345. Although, if I am right (cf. the note at 191,19), Philoponus believed that Alexander is attacking an incorrect interpretation of \hat{e} kai rather than a proposal to emend it, I doubt that this is really the case. A TLG search for the verb *metagraphein* (the key word for present purposes) turns up numerous passages, including the only other one in which Alexander seems to use it (*in Metaph.* 59,7), in which it clearly means 'to emend', and that seems most likely to be its meaning here. However, the verb can be used of various kinds of translation or rewriting, and Philoponus, prompted perhaps by the belief (correct or not) that Alexander's comments were directed at Taurus and by his own understanding of Taurus' intention, seems to have thought that in this case it described (as do, if I am correct, his own phrases *metapherein tas lexeis* and *metethêke tên lexin*) the process of producing an interpretative gloss or paraphrase. (Here, and later in the paragraph, I have tried to render *metagraphein* in a way that is compatible with either 'emendation' or 'interpretation'.)

346. Or, transliterating rather than translating, 'to alter \hat{e} to $e\hat{i}$ '.

347. Or perhaps: 'copy what is not there'.

348. Tim. 28B.

349. Adding to is e is after $d\hat{o}sei$ at 214,19, one of two possible emendations suggested by Rabe in the critical apparatus.

350. Literally 'rewrite to'.

351. Although what Philoponus writes at 191,26 in close dependence on the present passage shows that he took the contrary view, it seems to me that Alexander is arguing that what Plato says rules out rewriting 27C rather than that it offers no opportunity for similar rewriting here.

352. Changing *gignesthai* to *einai* at 215,3, as suggested by Rabe in the critical apparatus.

353. Emending *ginesthai* to *ginetai* at 215,7. (Rabe writes 'hôs ginesthai suspecta' in the critical apparatus.)

354. Emending *toioutos* at 215,12 to *toioutôs* and *ekeinos* at 215,14 to *ekeinôs* and retaining *anairein* at 215,13. (Rabe writes 'fort. *anairôn*' in the critical apparatus.)

355. i.e. on the basis that it has its being in perishing.

356. Adding $h\hat{o}ste$ before $d\hat{e}lonoti$ at 215,24, as suggested by Rabe in the critical apparatus.

357. Emending *auton* to *autou* or *autôi* at 215,25.

358. Emending *antitithêsin* to *anatithêsin* at 216,6. (Rabe writes '*antitithêsin* suspectum' in the critical apparatus.)

359. At *Tim.* 41A-B.

360. 368C-369B.

361. In other words, the final figure is complete as soon as the last line has been drawn and is identical with the lines that have entered into its construction.

362. Punctuating with a comma rather than a full stop after *tauton* at 217,9.

363. Cael. 279b32-280a10.

364. Adding *ho ton kubon* before *pher*' at 218,1, as suggested by Rabe in the critical apparatus.

365. Adding *ti* before *ex* at 218,22.

366. Literally 'of which that which is said to have emerged from them is not destructive'.

367. Since the literal meaning of *kosmos* is 'order', the point is to a degree a verbal one.

368. They' are presumably the mathematicians. It was, of course, an issue

whether Plato intended the generation of the five regular solids at Tim. 53C-56C to be taken literally.

369. The clause is rather awkward and it is possible that the words *sunuparkhein dunamenois* ('[in] things which can coexist') are a gloss on *en toioutois*, in which case I would translate: 'for analysis is [found] in things of this kind'.

370. Cael. 280a28-32.

371. cf. *Tim.* 29B ff.; 41A-B.

372. As Rabe points out in the critical apparatus, we might have expected *phtharênai* (which occurs at 221,25 in the passage quoted from *Cael.*) rather than *phtheirein* at 222,11. The last part of the sentence would then read 'that anything which is ungenerated perishes'.

373. Changing gar to de at 222,13. (Rabe writes 'expectes de' in the critical apparatus.)

374. 251b14-19.

375. Translating Aristotle's *exô henos* at 222,19 rather than the *ex aiônos* ('from eternity') of the manuscripts of *Aet*. (Although the manuscripts also had *ex aiônos* when the passage was quoted at 117,27, the substitution seems more likely to be due to a copyist than to Philoponus.)

376. As Rabe suggests, Alexander's comment on this passage may have been lost at this point. (Like his commentary on *Cael.*, Alexander's commentary on *Phys.* has not survived.)

377. Page references to these earlier citations are given at the end of each extract. Notes and references associated with them are not repeated.

378. = Fortenbaugh, fr. 241A.

379. = 145,13-25.

380. = Fortenbaugh, fr. 241B.

381. = 188,6-18.

382. Tim. 29A.

383. Tim. 29E.

384. 224,18-225,10 = Smith 456aF. The title of Porphyry's work is not known.

385. 127,20-6. (For *kephalaion* = 'chapter' see note 1.)

386. cf. *Phdr.* 245C-246A.

387. For 'conversion by negation', see the note at 126,20.

388. Tim. 41A-B.

389. Tim. 41A.

390. As Rabe sees, there is something wrong with this sentence. His solution is to insert $h\hat{o}s$ before $d\hat{e}lon$ at 226,24 and he also suggests in the apparatus that one might have expected to d' at the beginning of the sentence (226,19). I would prefer to add *hoti* before to at the beginning of the sentence and have translated accordingly. (I have also omitted *phêsin* at 226,25, which seems equally awkward in either case.)

391. 269C-E.

392. The idea that Plato drew his inspiration from Moses and the Bible is a constant theme of Eusebius' *Praeparatio Evangelica*, which Philoponus clearly knew (cf. the note at 211,18).

393. A paraphrase of *Hebrews* 1,12, which is itself an adaptation of *Psalms* 102, 27. (The occurrence of the verb *heilittesthai* ('to be rolled up') shows that Philoponus is citing the *Hebrews* version.) In *The New Oxford Annotated Bible* the whole passage reads: 'In the beginning, Lord, you founded the earth, and the heavens are the work of your hands; they will perish, but you remain; they will all wear out like clothing; like a cloak you will roll them up, and like clothing they will be changed. But you are the same and your years will never end.' (The second 'like clothing' is omitted in some ancient versions, including it seems the one used

by Philoponus.) There does not actually seem to be any reference to the revolution of the heavens in the biblical passage.

394. Wisdom of Solomon 1, 13 and 14.

395. 269E-270A.

396. cf. Tim. 33A; 33D.

397. *Tim.* 33C.

398. *pêsetai* here and at 233,8 seems to be a variant of *peisetai*, the usual future of *paskhô*. Although LSJ does not list *pêsetai*, it does give *pêsis* (which occurs at 62,5) as a late variant of *peisis*, a noun formed from the same root.

399. Tim. 27D-28A.

400. 230,23-231,1.

401. 32B-33A.

402. 230,27 ff.

403. 266a24-b24.

404. For a discussion of the role of 'infinite power' arguments in the creation debate in ancient and mediaeval philosophy with references to earlier literature, see R. Sorabji, *Matter, Space and Motion* (London & Ithaca, NY, 1988), ch. 15. For Philoponus' contribution in *Aet.* and elsewhere, see especially pp. 254-9. (The same material appears in abbreviated form in R. Sorabji (ed.), *Aristotle Transformed* (London & Ithaca, NY, 1990), ch. 9.)

405. 33B-D.

406. For the phrase cf. 523,7-8.

407. Or perhaps 'examples'.

408. 266a24-b24.

409. Or perhaps: 'in earlier chapters'.

410. Cael. 279a25-8.

411. The reference is to the supposed derivation of $ai\hat{o}n$ (eternity) from $aei \hat{o}n$ ('always being').

412. Changing *apolabonta* to *apolabon* at 239,14. (Perhaps the copyist unthinkingly took *apolabonta* with *ton horismon*, or even, at least fleetingly, with *'to ginomenon kai apollumenon'*, construing the phrase as plural. Alternatively, Philoponus may have written *tou ginomenou apolabontos*, which would make the otherwise seemingly otiose *auto* in the next line easier).

413. *huper tên hautou phusin*. I have until now translated *huper phusin* by 'supernaturally' but the presence of *hautou* makes that impossible here and in the next few lines.

414. The development of Philoponus' ideas on this question of the nature of the rotation of the fire belt is outlined in Sorabji, *Matter, Space and Motion*, 240-1.

415. Homer Il. 1.70.

416. sc. An Examination of Aristotle's Criticisms of Plato's Timaeus.

417. In the previous chapter I usually translated $arkh\hat{e}$ 'beginning' (see the note at 159,2), but in this one 'origin' or 'source' works better, and I have opted for the latter.

418. At this point the Arabic translation of $Ish\hat{a}q$ ibn <u>H</u>unayn has words which Badawi translates 'Car il n'est pas un principe de mouvement par choix, mais dans le sens de ce qui se meut par soi' (A. Badawi, 'Un Proclus perdu est retrouvé en arabe', in *Mélanges L. Massignon I* (Damascus 1956), 150; citation from Baltes), and Baltes, inspired by this but influenced by the phrasing of Philoponus' paraphrase at 247,9-11 (which I translate 'For, since, he says, soul is self-moved and the source of movement just by being and not through choice'), includes the words 'denn es ist nicht aus eigenen Entschluß selbstbewegt und Prinzip der Bewegung, sondern durch sein Sein selbst'. This, or something similar, would fit well enough at this point, and Philoponus certainly appears to

attribute some such statement to Proclus on a number of occasions (in addition to 247,9-11, cf. 256,25-8; 260,4-5; 260,28-261,1; 268,25-8). However, the words are not necessary to Proclus' argument and when they first appear at 247,9-12 they look like an interpretative paraphrase of what Proclus says at 243,4-7, designed to introduce terminology (sc. *autôi tôi einai* and *ou proairetikôs*) which Philoponus will use later in the refutation and I am inclined to think that they have been imported into the text of Proclus by someone who felt that Philoponus' language mandated their presence there. (If this were the case, it would suggest that the Arabic text of Proclus is ultimately derived from the tradition of *Aet.*, which, as far as I can see, is perfectly possible.)

419. The sentence is unsatisfactory as it stands, but I am not sure how best to repair it. Baltes, apparently with the support of the Arabic translation, changes the \hat{e} before proteron to \hat{me} and translates 'denn für die Bewegung des Alls, das nicht vorher oder nachher existiert, ist die immer seiende Seele Ursprung der Bewegung; sie kann gar nicht Ursprung der Bewegung sein, da sie aufgrund ihres Wesens selbstbewegt und eben deshalb Ursprung der Bewegung ist'. But (1) apart from $m\hat{e}$ proteron ouk ontos \hat{e} husteron (not not existing previously or subsequently') being strangely convoluted Greek, the phrase dia to mê einai ton kosmon aidion (because the world is not eternal) in Philoponus' paraphrase of this passage at 247,13-14 seems to show that he read \hat{e} rather than $m\hat{e}$, and (2) the resulting sentence (the syntax of which would still, as far as I can see, be defective) would leave the adversative $alla \ m\hat{e}n$ at the beginning of the next sentence unmotivated. One could go some way towards repairing the syntax of the sentence by changing the participles *ousa* and *dunamenê* in line 10 to finite verbs and translating for it is always the origin of movement for the movement of the universe, even if it [sc. the universe] did not previously exist or will not subsequently, and it cannot not be an origin of movement, since it is by its essence self-moved and therefore an origin of movement', but the phrase \hat{e} proteron ouk ontos ê husteron would then be rather awkward (tou pantos ê proteron ouk ontos *ê husteron* actually looks like a genitive absolute) and Philoponus' paraphrase is, again, against it. I have opted, very tentatively, for inserting $arkh\hat{e}$ ouk an $ei\hat{e}$ after kinêseôs at 243,10, which at least produces something closer to Philoponus' paraphrase (cf. 247,14), but I doubt whether the solution is so simple.

420. If the word existed, 'self-movedness' would be more literal.

421. On the significance and history of these bodies, which are variously called 'astral', 'luminous', 'ethereal' or 'pneumatic', see Dodds, *Proclus, The Elements of Theology*, App. 2 and Siorvanes, *Proclus: Neo-Platonic Philosophy and Science* (New Haven and London 1996), 131-3. (Siorvanes cites some more recent literature in n. 27.)

422. A closer rendering would be 'if soul has its essence in this, in being ...'. Similar phrases occur later in the chapter, when I also telescope the construction.

423. i.e. 'independent of'. *khôristos* may mean either 'separate(d)' or 'separable' and there are passages in Sections 3 and 4 where a case could be made for the latter rendering. However, Philoponus is not just arguing that soul can exist separately from body (i.e. that it is 'separable'), but that it is at all times essentially independent of body, and I have decided to stick to 'separate' throughout – and to 'not separate' rather than 'inseparable' for *akhôristos*.

424. I have been unable to find one or even a small number of suitable equivalents for $kin\hat{e}tikos$ ('responsible for moving') in this chapter. The relevant glosses in LSJ ('of or for putting in motion') and Lampe ('setting in motion, causing to move') are of little help, since not only do they fail to acknowledge that the word, like many other adjectives formed with the suffix *-iko-*, often conveys the idea of fitness or ability to carry out the action expressed, but, as with cognate

words such as *kinêsis* ('movement') and *kineô* ('move'), moving or setting in motion is not always the best description of that action. I have opted for looking for a reasonable rendering in each separate context and listing the results in the Greek-English word index.

425. One would expect *ekhei* (from 259,22) rather than *kinei* (from 259,27) at this point. Either the summariser, whether Philoponus himself or someone else, has been careless, or the transmitted text is corrupt. I have assumed that the latter is the case and changed *kinei* to *ekhei*.

426. Or perhaps: 'through appetition in souls'.

427. sc. conceived as a potential (cf. 263,13-24, especially 22-24).

428. For Neoplatonists from Plotinus onwards the three hypostases One, Intellect and Soul exercise causation while themselves remaining absolutely immutable. They give rise to the things that participate in them without deliberation or action on their part just by being what they are. The present phrase (*autôi tôi einai*) was probably first used to express this mode of causation by Syrianus and became a stock formula with later Neoplatonists, being a favourite with Proclus, who uses it in the second, fourth and sixteenth arguments (see 24,5; 56,2; 560,22; 561,25.26), and occurring 27 times in *Aet.*, mostly in the present chapter, where the manner in which soul initiates life and movement is at issue. (For the Plotinian background and the meaning and employment of *autôi tôi einai* see C. D'Ancona Costa, 'Plotinus and later Platonic philosophers on the causality of the First Principle' in *The Cambridge Companion to Plotinus*, ed. L.P. Gerson (Cambridge, 1996), 356-68.)

429. Changing *huph' heautês* to *hup' autês* at 245,17, as suggested by Rabe in the critical apparatus.

430. Changing to to $t\hat{o}i$ at 245,25, as suggested by Rabe in the critical apparatus.

431. Changing *kinêton* to *akinêton* at 245,26 (cf. 274,20).

432. Adding *einai* after *thaterois* at 246,12, as suggested by the reader.

433. *Phdr.* 245C-246A.

434. This proverb, which appears to mean to join like to like or to deal with matters of a similar kind, is used by Plato (*Euthyd.* 298C) and Aristotle (*Phys.* 207a17).

435. For *ouk anekhesthai* in the sense 'refuse', see Lampe s.v. B.2.

436. *EN* 1096a16-17.

437. More literally, 'for the second [sc. latter] to follow from the former', but my translation has changed the order of the two items in the previous sentence.

438. *tôi einai autês kai têi ousiâi. ousia* could equally well be translated 'being' or 'substance'. 'Being' is not available in this section because I have opted to use it to translate *einai*. The choice between 'essence' and 'substance' was more difficult. The former fits best early in the argument, where the intrinsic nature of soul is what is at issue, the latter later, where the possibility of its separate existence is being discussed. In view of the fact that essence can, if infrequently, mean a 'spiritual or immaterial entity' (*New Shorter Oxford English Dictionary* s.v. 6.), I have decided to retain 'essence' throughout.

439. *Phys.* 241b24-242a15.

440. The argument seems to require a reference to [rational] soul in general at this point, not just to the world-soul, and *tou kosmou* may be an interpolation.

441. cf. *DA* 403a3-12. Philoponus' remarks here are closely related to the exegesis of the same passage in the introduction to his commentary on *DA* (*in DA* 15,9-26) and ad loc. (*in DA* 46,18-49,14).

442. *DA* 411b18-19.

443. He probably has in mind $Enn. 4.7.8^5$, but other material in 4.7, especially in sections 8, 10, 12 and 13, may also be relevant.

444. 249,25-250,22.

445. Although I have translated it, ton Platônos looks like a gloss.

446. Or perhaps: 'that there is a power or activity of soul in accordance with which \dots '.

447. The classification of *kinêsis* ('movement') or *metabolê* ('change') which follows is Aristotle's. In Aristotle *kinêsis* sometimes covers all four types, sometimes only the last three, when *metabolê* is used as the more general term. In English neither 'movement' nor 'change' is wholly satisfactory as the blanket term and I shall continue to translate *kinêsis* 'movement' and *metabolê* 'change'.

448. cf. 28,16-18.

449. This and the next reference are presumably, as Rabe indicates, to the part of *Physics* 8 in which Aristotle argues that rectilinear motion must be finite. (See especially 262a12-263a3).

450. On this work see the note at 134,17.

451. cf. the note at 189,21. It may not be a coincidence that the phrase *aposkeuazesthai ta enokhlounta* can mean to empty the bowels (see LSJ s.v. II.2).

452. Probably in a non-polemical work to be written after *Aet.* and the *contra Aristotelem.* Other possible references to this work occur at 9,20-26; 11,16; 117,20-21 and at *in Phys.* 430,9-10. (References from Verrycken, 'The Development of Philoponus' Thought and Its Chronology' in Sorabji (ed.), *Aristotle Transformed*, 254.) Although it has not survived in its own right, it may be the work known through an Arabic summary translated into English by Pines (S. Pines, 'An Arabic Summary of a Lost Work of John Philoponus', *Israel Oriental Studies* 2, 1972, 320-52) and, according to Wildberg, possibly also the work attacked by Simplicius at *in Phys.* 1326,38-1336,34. (See C. Wildberg, 'Simplicius: Against Philoponus on the Eternity of the World', in *Place, Void and Eternity* (London & Ithaca, NY, 1991), 100; but Wildberg also cites evidence from Arabic bibliographies which suggests that this may be yet another work on the perishability of the world.)

453. In view of *aïdiôs* at 257,7, perhaps *aïdion* ('everlasting') should be emended to *aïdiôs* ('everlastingly') here, in which case the last part of the sentence would read 'and soul does not move body everlastingly'.

454. *Phdr.* 245C-246A.

455. Phdr. 245C-E.

456. 252,10-256,17.

457. *autês* at 262,15 is a little odd and perhaps a case could be made for changing it to *tês* rather than adding $\langle t\hat{e}s \rangle$ after it.

458. Philoponus explains 'potentiality though capacity' in III,2.

459. 254,19-256,17.

460. More literally 'of life in capacity'.

461. sc. throughout the course of its existence, and therefore everlastingly. For the phrase, cf. 267,2 and 8.

462. This 'in the first place' (*prôton men*) seems to be answered by the 'and' (*de*) at the beginning of the next section (265, 1).

463. Changing *legein* to *legei* at 264,28, as suggested by Rabe in the critical apparatus.

464. Deleting $z\hat{o}i\hat{o}n$ at 265,12, one of several possible emendations suggested by Rabe in the critical apparatus.

465. In the myth at *Phdr*. 246 ff.

466. More literally, 'the wise [or learned] among the Hellenes'.

467. Phys. 192b20-2. The Neoplatonists followed Aristotle in calling the

principle of change in material bodies *phusis*, or 'nature' (cf. the remarks of Siorvanes in *Proclus: Neo-Platonic Philosophy and Science* (New Haven & London, 1996), 136-7).

468. More literally 'someone who is by capacity [sc. potentially] a helmsman or charioteer'.

469. Supplying *einai* after *sôma* at 267,9. (In the critical apparatus Rabe suggests supplying *suneisagein* in the previous line, but it seems to me that 245,8, where *einai* occurs, is a more relevant parallel than the two he adduces.)

470. I would like to insert *all* before *ou* at 267,13, but perhaps I am not construing the sentence correctly.

471. *Phdr.* 245D-E.

472. cf. 267,14-16.

473. For 'conversion by negation', see the note at 126,20.

474. Since *erastos* can mean either 'beloved' or 'lovely' and the form in the text could be either masculine or neuter, the phrase could also be rendered 'the beauty of a lovely object', and a case could certainly be made for such a rendering in a late Christian author like Philoponus. However, in other similar contexts (e.g. Sophonias *in DA* 16,29; Suda *kappa* 1640, 6) it is the effect of beauty on a lover that is in question, and Philoponus himself uses the example of the effect of a portrait on a lover at *in DA* 66,28 and *in Phys* 371,2-3 (and perhaps at *in Phys*. 355,26-7 and 875,4, although in both cases there is some doubt about the text), and so it seems likely that it is here as well.

475. 'Undergoes cessation' (more literally 'has cessation') translates *paulan ekhei*, which is, I think, merely periphrastic for *paueto*, or 'ceases'. (For such periphrastic phrases, see LSJ *ekhô* A.I.9.)

476. Phdr. 245C-D.

477. cf. Phys. 241b24-242a15.

478. cf. Phdr. 245C-E.

479. Tim. 41B.

480. 225,13-242,22.

481. 246,27-247,21.

482. Or, perhaps: 'he perverts the nature of demonstration and *all on his own* argues ...'.

483. More literally 'lays claim to [or "partakes of"] any natural and necessary conformity [or "consequentiality"]'.

484. More literally 'the wise men of the Hellenes'.

485. Supplying \hat{e} before kinoumenon at 274,17, as suggested by Rabe in the critical apparatus.

486. Punctuating with a full stop rather than a colon after *dunamei* at 275,11.

487. Removing the semicolon in 276,19 and enclosing $leg\hat{o} de tropon kin\hat{e}se\hat{o}s$ in parentheses.

488. More literally 'beyond its own nature'.

489. Changing ei oun allo \hat{e} palin to \hat{e} oun allo palin at 279,26, as suggested by Rabe in the critical apparatus.

490. Assuming that the future *sunkhôrêsousin* (280,1) is either an error or another of the many instances in which Philoponus has used an indicative where one would expect a subjunctive. (For other instances, see 'indicativus pro coniunctivo' in Rabe's grammatical index, p. 698.) Another possibility, although it seems less likely, is that the subjunctive $z \hat{c} t \hat{c} s \hat{o} s i n$ at 279,27 has, as a late copyist and the first modern editor seem to have assumed, replaced a future.

491. 281,13-283,8.

492. Rabe notes that this sentence needs correction but makes no suggestions. If \hat{e} is to be retained at 281,4, a second \hat{e} clause will need to be supplied.

Alternatively, \hat{e} might be emended to $h\hat{e}mas$, or perhaps *tous*. I have opted for the switch to $h\hat{e}mas$.

493. alla de di' allou dunaton (281,24) is awkward, and Rabe suggests correction to either allo de di' allou or alla de di' allôn ('while another can permeate another' or 'while others can permeate others') in the critical apparatus. Another possibility, which tempts me, would be to accent alla on the second syllable and delete de, which would give 'Nor is it any more the case that this body cannot permeate that but can permeate another'. I have, however, translated the text printed by Rabe.

494. In what follows 'pass through' would often be a more natural rendering of *khôrein dia*, but for the sake of the argument I have thought it best to stay with 'permeate'.

495. More literally, 'subsists in them as substrata'.

496. The next sentence in Rabe's text reads: 'For the might of the heaven (reading *ouranou* for *ouraniou*, as suggested by Rabe in the critical apparatus) can be packed into the smallest compass, or into the extent of the proverbial grain of millet'. This looks like a gloss that has found its way into the text (Rabe describes it as 'suspect') and I have excluded it from the body of the translation.

497. Alim. 9.106,23 (Littré).

498. Literally 'breathing together'.

499. More literally 'How, then, is it in this too?'

500. 277,14-17.

501. More literally 'What then [will be] the differences of these?'

502. Tim. 28B.

503. An. Post. 81a38-9.

504. The Greek word $(epist \hat{e}m\hat{e})$ could also be translated 'science' or 'scientific knowledge', and I use 'science' to render it later in this section at 286,14.

505. Literally, 'the children of the Hellenes', but the phrase is merely periphrastic for 'the Hellenes' or 'the pagans'. (For the usage, see LSJ *pais* I.3.)

506. 281,13-283,8.

507. The mention of *neura* (here translated 'channels' but actually the nerves, though not understood as such) suggests that the theory presupposed is that of Erasistratus, an eminent physiologist active in the first half of the third century BC, or one closely resembling it. For Erasistratus, inspired air, or *pneuma* (*pneuma* may be either air in motion or breath), is first refined into the vital, or life-sustaining, *pneuma* in the left ventricle of the heart and then, after travelling around the body in the arteries, in part further refined into psychic pneuma, the seat of consciousness and mental life, in the brain, whence it travels around the body by way of the nerves. (Further detail may be found in the entry on Erasistratus in the third edition of the *Oxford Classical Dictionary*.)

508. Adding *kinêsin* after *kineitai* at 288,11, as suggested by Rabe in the critical apparatus.

509. *Phdr.* 245C; previously quoted at 271,19-20.

510. Both here and in line 18 a more literal translation would be 'in regions around the earth'.

511. Changing *henoutai* to *henountai* at 289,22, as suggested by Rabe in the critical apparatus.

512. Literally 'of the children of the Hellenes', but see the note at 287,4.

513. 278,12-279,26.

514. Changing *epikheirountes hôs phasin helikoeidôs auto* to *epikheirountes helikoeidôs phasin auto* at 290,24, as suggested by Rabe in the critical apparatus.

515. allotrios may, in different contexts, be rendered 'belonging to another', 'foreign', 'strange', 'hostile', 'alien' (See LSJ s.v.). Here, although there is a

secondary connotation of hostility, the primary connotation of the word is otherness or separateness. I have been unable to find a single neat English equivalent and have settled for 'else' where that works (primarily in the first paragraph of the argument and in Philoponus' comments on it) and on 'other [than]' and similar phrases elsewhere.

516. cf. Tim. 33A.

517. As Rabe indicates, there seems to be something wrong with the text he prints at 294,8. Rabe himself, in the critical apparatus, suggests deleting \hat{e} at 294,7 and inserting *allotrion* after *allotriou* at 294,8, which would give 'nor would it perish into anything else, becoming other [than itself] through the agency of something else'. I would rather retain \hat{e} and either change *ginomenon* at 294,8 to *phtheiromenon*, or perhaps *prosballomenon* (cf. 294,1-2 and, for example, 302,15-16), or delete it altogether. In the translation I have adopted the latter alternative. (Baltes would change \hat{e} at 294,7 to $m\hat{e}$, and, possibly, *hupo* in the next line to *apo*.)

518. cf. *Phd.* 70D-72E, especially 71Å (for the two 'paths' – although Plato speaks of *geneseis*, or 'processes of generation', rather than paths), and 71E (for the need of a two-way process so that nature will not be defective).

519. In Philoponus' rather free paraphrase of this sentence at 310,7-10 the subject of the two verbs is *to atakton* ('the disorderly'), but here it seems more likely that it is *to atakton kai to tetagmenon* ('the disorderly and the ordered') and I have translated accordingly. (In his paraphrase Philoponus twice has the future *metabalei* (310,9.13) where the text of Proclus has the present *metaballei* (294,22; 295,3), and the futures would certainly be easier. However, there are similarly 'difficult' instances of *metaballei* at 295,7.9, and I have resisted the temptation to amend.)

520. If ekeino at 294,23 means, as I think it must, 'the former [change]', it is difficult to make satisfactory sense of *dioti sterêsis estin* (perhaps 'because [that which changes] is a privation'?), and, in any case, the whole clause is in contradiction with what Proclus goes on to say at 295,16-17. When Philoponus quotes (or perhaps paraphrases) this passage at 310,11-12 he writes *dioti sterêseis eisin tines eis hexeis ametablêtoi*, of which the manuscript reading here could easily be a corruption, and I have translated that rather than the manuscript reading. (Baltes would simply add *tines* – presumably in place of *ai* – which he reports is supported by the Arabic version, or *estin hoti*, which his translation seems to presuppose.)

521. Phd. 70E-71B.

522. More literally, 'either the universe is not imperishable or much more ungenerated than imperishable'.

523. Changing to to te and hômologêmenon to hômologêmenôn at 295,24, as suggested by Rabe in the critical apparatus.

524. See note 1 for this rendering of *kephalaion*.

525. Tim. 28A.

526. Cael. 279b4-284b5.

527. For references on 'infinite power' arguments see the note at 235,18.

528. 297,21-300,2 = 238,3-240,9 (with minor textual variants). I have not repeated the footnotes that occur there.

529. At 239,6 the word order was slightly different and I translated 'gaining [the property of] always being'. As far as I can see, either version could be correct.

530. Changing *astheneian* to *athanasian* at 300,20. (cf. 300,9-11; 300,27-301,1).

531. 299,16-20.

532. cf. 294,2-8.

533. Adding $\hat{o}n$ after *ara* at 302,19, a suggestion of Kroll which Rabe reports in the critical apparatus.

534. Changing *aiônôn* to *autou ontôn* at 302,20, as suggested by Rabe in the critical apparatus.

535. Reading *phtheiretai* for *phtheiresthai* (one of two possible corrections suggested by Rabe in the critical apparatus) at 302,25.

536. VI.28.

537. 294,9-13.

538. Adding to before pan and changing genesthai to ginesthai at 304,15, as suggested by Rabe in the critical apparatus.

539. Adding ou before têi Platônos at 304,18.

540. cf. Tim. 32C.

541. At line 14 above.

542. *Tim.* 32B-C.

543. There is probably, as Rabe suggests ('haec vix sana'), something wrong with the text here, but I do not think that the general sense has been affected.

544. 304,14-17.

545. 3b24-7.

546. 307,21.

547. Deleting kai before $h\hat{e}i$ at 308,12, as suggested by Rabe in the critical apparatus.

548. 70E-71C; 72A-C.

549. Changing *ek tou psukhrou to thermon* to *ek tou thermou to psukhron* at 309,21-22. (Perhaps the error is Rabe's in this case.)

550. Punctuating with a full stop rather than a comma after kosmon at 310,3.

551. At 294,20-295,6.

552. This first sentence is a rather loose paraphrase of what Proclus actually says.

- 553. Tim. 41B.
- **554.** *Tim.* 41B.
- 555. VI.28.
- 556. Adding a question mark after oun at 311,17.
- **557.** 308,25-26; 309,14-15.
- **558.** 307,15-308,2.

Select Bibliography

The following is a list of the principal works cited in the notes.

- Badawi, A., 'Un Proclus perdu est retrouvé en arabe', in *Mélanges L. Massignon I* (Damascus, 1956).
- Baltes, M., Die Weltentstehung des platonischen Timaios nach den antiken Interpreten (Leiden, 1976).
- Cornford, F.M. (tr.), Plato's Cosmology: the Timaeus of Plato (London, 1937).
- D'Ancona Costa, C., 'Plotinus and later Platonic philosophers on the causality of the first principle', in L.P. Gerson (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Plotinus* (Cambridge, 1996).
- Des Places, E. (ed.), Atticus: fragments (Paris, 1977).
- Diels, H. (ed.), Doxographi Graeci (Berlin, 1879).
- Diels, H. and W. Kranz (eds), *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*, 6th ed. (Berlin, 1951-2).
- Dillon, J., *The Middle Platonists: a Study of Platonism, 80 BC to AD 220* (London, 1977).
- Dodds, E.R. (ed.), Proclus, The Elements of Theology (Oxford, 1963).
- Edwards, M.J. (tr.), *Philoponus: On Aristotle's* Physics 3 (London & Ithaca, NY, 1994).
- Erbse, H. (ed.), Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem (Scholia Vetera) (Berlin, 1969-83).
- Fortenbaugh, W.W. et al. (eds), Theophrastus of Eresus: Sources for His Life, Writings, Thought and Influence (Leiden, 1992).
- Grimal, P., The Dictionary of Classical Mythology (Oxford, 1996).
- Guthrie, W.K.C., A History of Greek Philosophy, vol. 1 (Cambridge, 1967).
- Hankinson, R.J., Cause and Explanation in Ancient Greek Thought (Oxford, 1998).
- Hussey, E. (tr.), Aristotle's Physics Books II and IV (Oxford, 1983).
- Joseph, H.W.B., Introduction to Logic (Oxford, 1906).
- Judson, L., 'God or nature? Philoponus on generability and perishability', in R.R.K. Sorabji (ed.), *Philoponus and the Rejection of Aristotelian Science* (London & Ithaca, NY, 1987), 179-96.
- Kern, O. (ed.), Orphicorum fragmenta (Berlin, 1922).
- LSJ, see Liddell, H.G.
- Lampe, G.W.H. (ed.), A Patristic Greek Lexicon (Oxford, 1961).
- Lang, H.S. and A.D. Macro (trs.), On the Eternity of the World (De Aeternitate Mundi), Proclus (Berkeley, LA & London, 2001).
- Liddell, H.G. and R. Scott (comps.), *A Greek-English Lexicon*, rev. H. Jones; with a New Supplement (Oxford, 1996).

- The New Oxford Annotated Bible, (eds) B.M. Metzger and R.E. Murphy (New York, 1994).
- The New Shorter Oxford English Dictionary on Historical Principles, (ed.) L. Brown (Oxford, 1993).
- The Oxford Classical Dictionary, 3rd ed.; (eds) S. Hornblower and A. Spawforth (Oxford 1996).
- Pinès, S., 'An Arabic summary of a lost work of John Philoponus', Israel Oriental Studies 2 (1972), 320-52; repr. in S. Pinès, Studies in Arabic Versions of Greek Texts and in Medieval Science, vol. 2 (Leiden & Jerusalem, 1986), 294-326.
- Rabe, H. (ed.), Ioannes Philoponus de Aeternitate Mundi contra Proclum (Leipzig, 1899) (repr. Hildesheim, etc., 1984).
- Saffrey, H.-D. and L.G. Westerink (eds.), *Proclus, Théologie platonicienne* (Paris, 1968-94).
- Share, M. (trans.), *Philoponus: Against Proclus On the Eternity of the World 1-5* (London & Ithaca, NY, 2005).
- Siorvanes, L., *Proclus: Neo-Platonic Philosophy and Science* (New Haven & London, 1996).
- Smith, A. (ed.), Porphyrii Philosophi fragmenta (Stuttgart & Leipzig, 1993).
- Smith, J.A. (tr.), On the Soul, in J. Barnes (ed.), The Complete Works of Aristotle: the Revised Oxford Translation (Oxford, 1984).
- Sodano, A.R. (ed.), Porphyrii in Platonis Timaeum Commentariorum fragmenta (Naples, 1964).
- Sorabji, R.R.K. (ed.), Aristotle Transformed: the Ancient Commentators and Their Influence (London & Ithaca, NY, 1990).
- Sorabji, R.R.K., Matter, Space and Motion: Theories in Antiquity and Their Sequel (London & Ithaca, NY, 1988).
- Sorabji, R.R.K. (ed.), *Philoponus and the Rejection of Aristotelian Science* (London & Ithaca, NY, 1987).
- Sorabji, R.R.K., Time, Creation and the Continuum: Theories in Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages (London & Ithaca, NY, 1983).
- TLG, see Thesaurus linguae graecae.
- Tarán, L., 'Amicus Plato sed magis amica veritas, from Plato and Aristotle to Cervantes', *Antike und Abendland* 30 (1984), 93-124.

Taylor, T. (tr.), The Fragments That Remain of the Lost Writings of Proclus, Surnamed the Platonic Successor (London, 1825) (repr. San Diego, 1988).

Thesaurus linguae graecae [CD ROM].

- Verrycken, K., 'The development of Philoponus' thought and its chronology', in R.R.K. Sorabji (ed.), Aristotle Transformed: the Ancient Commentators and Their Influence (London & Ithaca, NY, 1990).
- Verrycken, K., 'Philoponus' interpretation of Plato's cosmogony', Documenti e Studi sulla Tradizione Filosofica Medievale 8 (1997), 269-318.
- Wildberg, C. (tr.), *Philoponus: Against Aristotle on the Eternity of the World* (London & Ithaca, NY, 1987).
- Wildberg, C. (tr.), 'Simplicius: Against Philoponus on the Eternity of the World', in *Place, Void, and Eternity* (London & Ithaca, NY, 1991).
- Willcock, M.M. (ed.), The Iliad of Homer (Houndmills & London, 1978-84).
- Williams, C.J.F. (tr.), Aristotle's de Generatione et Corruptione (Oxford, 1982).

English-Greek Glossary

absurd: atopos absurdity: *atopia* accept: homologein, sunkhôrein accepted premiss: homologêma accident: to sumbebêkos account: logos accuse of: katêgorein acquired: epiktêtos acted upon, be: paskhein active, be: energein activity: energeia actual: energeiâi, kat' energeian actuality: energeia actually: energeiâi, kat' energeian ad infinitum: eis apeiron, ep'apeiron add: epagein advocacy: sunêgoria affected, be: paskhein affirm: apophainesthai affirmation: kataphasis, thesis affliction: pathos agree: homologein, sunkhôrein air: *aêr* all at once: athroos already in existence, be: proüphistasthai also belong: sunuparkhein also exist: sunuparkhein alter (trans.): metalambanein, metapherein, metatithenai alter (intrans.): alloiousthai alteration: alloiôsis always: aei always coming to be: *aeigenês* always in movement: aeikinêtôs ambiguous: homônumos analyse: analuein analysis: analusis animal: zôion animate (a.): empsukhos animate (v.): psukhoun

antecedent: to hêgoumenon appear: phainesthai appearance: *eidos* apprehend: noein apprehended by intellect: noêtos argue: kataskeuazein, sullogizesthai, sunagein argue unfairly: kakourgein en tois logois argument: kataskeuê, logos, sullogismos arrangement: oikonomia, taxis ask: skopein, zêtein assert: apophainesthai, kataphanai assist the revolution of: sunkuklein association: suntaxis assume: hupotithenai, lambanein at all: holôs at rest, be: êremein attach: exaptein attach to: exartan attack (v.): prosballein awareness: sunaisthêsis axiom: axiôma

bad: kakos basis: logos be: huphistasthai become: ginesthai become body: sômatousthai become evil: kakunesthai begetter: ho gennêsas, ho gennôn beginning: arkhê beginningless: anarkhos being: ousia, ousiôsis belief: dogma, doxa believe: *pisteuein* belong: huparkhein better: kreittôn bind (to, together): sundein binding together: sundesis

English-Greek Glossary

birth: genesis, genetê, genos bodily: sômatikos body: sôma body, become: sômatousthai bond (n.): desmos, sundesmos book: logos, stoikheion brain: nous bring: *paragein* bring into existence: huphistanai, paragein bringing into being: ousiôsis build: oikodomein builder: oikodomos building (sc. the process): oikodomia by choice: proairetikôs by itself: kath' hauto call: onomazein can: endekhesthai capacity: hexis carry around (with): sumperiagein, sunkuklein carry out a division: diairein causal: aitiôdês cause: aitia. to aition cause of: aitios cease: pauesthai cease to exist: phtheiresthai cessation: paula change (n.): kinêsis, metabolê change (v.): metaballein, metatithenai change the meaning of: metalambanein changeable: metablêtos chapter: logos characteristic of: kharaktêristikos characterise: kharaktêrizein choice: proairesis circle (n.): kuklos circular: kata kuklon, kuklikos, kuklôi circular movement: kuklophoria, periphora cite: paratithesthai clear (a.): enargês clearly: enargôs co-everlasting: sunaïdios coexist (with): suneinai, sunuparkhein, sunuphistasthai coexistent with, be: sunuparkhein cogent: anankaios cogently: anankaiôs cognitive: gnôstikos colour (n.): khrôma

combine: suntithenai come into existence: huphistasthai come to be: ginesthai comment (n.): exêgêsis comment on: exêgeisthai commentary: hupomnêmata, hupomnêmatika suntagmata commentator: exêgêtês, hupomnêmatistês comments: exêgêtika hupomnêmata common: koinos common sense: nous compel: anankazein complete (a.): teleios completed action: sunteleia component: stoikheion compose: suntithenai composed: sunthetos composed, be: sunkeisthai composite: *sunthetos* composition: sunthesis compounded, be: sunkeisthai concede: homologein, sunkhôrein conception: ennoia, hupolêpsis conclude: sullogizesthai, sunagein conclusion: sumperasma concord: sumpnoia condition: hexis conformity: akolouthia conjunction: sundesmos connect: sunaptein consequence: to hepomenon consider: skopein consist: sunkeisthai consistent (with): akolouthos constitutive: sumplêrôtikos construct (v.): sunistanai, suntithenai constructed, be: sunkeisthai construction: sustasis contentious: philoneikos continuance: diamonê, paratasis continuity: sunekheia continuous: sunekhês continuous becoming: to aeigenes, aeigenesia contradiction: antiphasis contrariety: enantiotês contrary (a.): enantios contrary (n.): to enantion contribute to: suntelein conversion by negation: hê sun antithesei antistrophê convertible, be: antistrephein

158

copy (n.): eikôn corporeal: sômatikos, sômatoeidês corporeal thing (entity, object): sôma create: dêmiourgein creation: dêmiourgia, hupostasis creative: dêmiourgikos creative activity: dêmiourgia creator: ho dêmiourgêsas, dêmiourgos creature: zôion criticise: apelenkhein

darkness: skotos death: thanatos debasing: katagôgos decay (v.): phthinein decay (n.): phthora declare: apophainesthai deduce: sullogizesthai defect (n.): kakia define: aphorizein, horizesthai define further: prosdiorizesthai definition: horismos, horos, logos demolish: anairein demon: daimôn demonstrate: apodeiknunai, deiknunai demonstration: apodeixis, kataskeuê denial: anairesis deny: anairein, apophanai, apophaskein deny simultaneously: sunanairein deplete: diaphorein deprived of, be: stereisthai describe as: onomazein desire: orexis destroy: phtheirein destruction: phthora destruction, of: phthoropoios destructive: anairetikos, phthartikos, phthoropoios determine: aphorizein deviation: parektropê devoid of. be: stereisthai dialectical: dialektikos dialectician: dialektikos didactic: didaskalikos difference: diaphora, heterotês different: diaphoros diminution: phthisis discordance: ametria disjoin: diazeugnunai disjunctive: diazeuktikos disorder: ataxia

disorderly, the: to atakton dissolution: analusis, lusis dissolve: luein distinct: *hôrismenos* distinction: diairesis distinguish: aphorizein, diairein, prosdiorizesthai divide: diairein divine: theios divinely inspired: theophorêtos divisible: meristos division: antidiairesis. diairesis division, of: diairetikos do: poiein do evil: kakopoiein doctrine: dogma, doxa draw a conclusion: sullogizesthai earlier commentators: hoi proüpomnêmatisamenoi earth: gê eclipse (v.): epiprosthein effect (n.): pathos, to aitiaton efficient: poiêtikos element: stoikheion elemental masses: tôn stoikheiôn holotêtes eliminate along with (also): sunanairein elimination: anairesis else: allotrios emotive: pathêtikos encompass: sumperiekhein end (n.): peras, telos endless: ateleutêtos endlessness: to ateleutêton endow with life: zôopoiein endure: diamenein, hupomenein enmattered: enulos entailment: akolouthia enumerate: aparithmein environment: to periekhon envy (n.): phthonos equivalent, be: isodunamein essence: ousia essence. of the: ousiôdês

essence, of the outsides essential: ousiôdês establish: kataskeuazein, sunistanai establishment: kataskeuê eternal: aiônios eternally: aiôniôs eternity: aiôn ether: aithêr

English-Greek Glossary

etherial: aitherios ever: pote everlasting: aïdios everlasting motion: aeikinêsia everlastingly: aïdiôs everlastingness: aïdiotês evidence: pistis evil: kakos, ponêros exact knowledge: akribologia excluded from. be: stereisthai exhausted, be: exasthenein exist: huparkhein, huphistasthai exist alongside: sumparateinesthai exist together: sunuparkhein existence: huparxis, hupostasis explain: didaskein, exêgeisthai explanatory: hupomnêmatikos explicitly: epi lexeôs exposition: didaskalia

fabric: sustasis fabrication: anaplasma facts, the: ta pragmata fall upon: prosballein figure (n.): skhêma final: telikos finger: daktulos finite: peperasmenos finite, be: perainesthai fire: pur fit: epitêdeios follow: akolouthein follow from (upon): hepesthai follow upon: hepesthai for ever: *aei* foreknowledge: prognôsis form (n.): eidos formation: sustasis formative: eidopoios formless: aneideos fount: pêgê frame (v.): sunarmozein, sunistanai framing: kataskeuê, sustasis free of envy: aphthonos free of need: anendeês freedom from want: to aprosdees from everlasting: ex aïdiou furnish: khorêgein future (n.): to mellon

generally: *haplôs* generate: *gennan* generated: *genêtos* generation: genesis generation of the soul: psukhogonia genus: genos get existence: huphistasthai give life to: zôopoiein go on to talk about: epagein goal: skopos god: theos God: theos godlessness: atheotês good (n.): to agathon goodness: agathotês gospel: logos grow (intrans.): auxesthai grow weak: exasthenein growth: auxêsis

happy: eudaimôn harmonic: harmonikos harmony: harmonia have (its) essence: ousiousthai have a share (in): *metekhein* have existence: huphistasthai have life: zên heaven: ouranos heavenly: ouranios hold: *hupotithenai* hold together: sunekhein holy: theios house: oikia human: anthrôpeios, anthrôpos hypothesis: hupothesis hypothesise: hupotithenai hypothetical: sunaptikos

idea: hupolêpsis ignorance: agnoia ignorant, be: agnoein illumination: *ellampsis* illuminate: katalampein, phôtizein image (n.): eikôn imagination: phantasia imagine: anaplattein imbue with form: eidopoiein immediately: amesôs immortal: athanatos immortality: athanasia, to athanaton impassible: apathês imperfect: atelês imperishability: aphtharsia imperishable: aphthartos impiety: asebeia, atheotês impious: asebês

160

imply also: *suneisagein* impossible: adunatos in a circle: kuklikôs in a spiral: *helikoeidôs* in a word: haplôs in contact, be: haptesthai in existence, be: huphistasthai in existence, be already in: proüphistasthai in general: haplôs, holôs in (its) own right: kath' hauto in need of nothing: aprosdeês in thought: di'epinoias, tôi logôi inalterable: analloiôtos inanimate: apsukhos inappropriate: atopos incomposite: asunthetos incorporeal: asômatos increase (n.): auxêsis increase (v.: intrans.): auxesthai indefinite: aoristos indefinitely: ep'apeiron, ex apeirou indicate: sêmainein indicative: dêlôtikos indissoluble: adialutos, alutos individual: merikos indivisible: ameristos induction: epagôgê inescapable: aparabatos infer: sullogizesthai, sunagein infinite: apeiros ingenious: sophos ingenuity: deinotês initiative: hormê innate: *sumphutos* inquire: zêtein instruction: didaskalia instrument: organon instrumental: organikos integrity: sunekheia intellect: nous intellectual: noeros intelligible (a.): noêtos intelligible (n.): to noêton intention: dianoia, nous, skopos intermediary: mesotês interrogative: diaporêtikos interval: diastasis invalid: asullogistos investigate: zêtein, skopein investigation: zêtêsis involuntarily: aboulêtôs, aproairetôs irrational: alogos

irregular: ataktos join (v.): sunaptein king: basileus knowledge: epistêmê kind (n.): eidos, genos know: ginôskein lack (n.): sterêsis lack of power: adunamia last (v.): diamenein, exarkein law: logos learn: manthanein learned : sophos letter: *stoikheion* licence: exousia life: bios, zôê light (a.): kouphos light (n.): phôs light up: katalampein, phôtizein lightness: kouphotês likeness: homoiôsis limit (n.): peras limit (v.): peratoun limited, be: perainesthai link (n.): sundesmos live: bioun. zên living creature: zôion local: kata topon, topikos luminous: augoeidês magnet: magnêtis, magnêtis lithos maintenance: sôtêria make: poiein make up: anaplattein maker: ho poiêsas, poiêtês, to poioun making: poiêsis man (sc. human being): anthrôpos manifestly: enargôs manner: tropos mass: holotês material (a.): hulikos mathematician: mathêmatikos matter (n.): hulê mean: noein, sêmainein meaning: dianoia, sêmasia, to sêmainomenon measure (n.): metron measure out: katametrein method: tropos Milky Way: galaxias kuklos

English-Greek Glossary

mind (n.): dianoia, epinoia, nous, psukhê mislead by fallacious arguments: paralogizesthai misrepresent: sukophantein mode: tropos model: paradeigma moon: selênê mortal: thnêtos motionless: akinêtos mount: epibainein move (intrans.): kineisthai move (trans.): kinein move in a circle: kuklophoreisthai move (travel) in a straight line: euthuphoreisthai movement: kinêsis movement, be in: kineisthai mutability: to rheuston

natural: phusikos natural philosophers: hoi phusikoi naturally: kata phusin, phusei nature: idiotês, phusis necessarily: anankaiôs necessary: anankaiôs negation: apophasis non-existence: anuparxia not possible: adunatos notion: epinoia, hupolêpsis, huponoia notionally: di' epinoias, epinoiâi, kat' epinoian number (n.): arithmos

object of desire: to orekton objection: enstasis objective (n.): skopos observe: horan observed facts: enargeia obvious: enargês of any kind at all: holôs of the same matter: homoülos of the same nature: homophuês of the same species: homoeidês of the same substance: homoousios on the intellectual plane: noerôs opinion: doxa oppose: antidiairein, antidiastellein, antitithenai opposed, be: antikeisthai opposite (thing): to antikeimenon opposition: antidiastolê order (v.): kosmein

order (n.): taxis orderly: eutaktos organ: organon origin: arkhê origination: hupostasis other: allotrios otherness: heterotês

paradigmatic: paradeigmatikos part (n.): meros partake of: koinônein, metekhein particular: merikos passage: khrêsis, lexis passing out of existence: phthora pattern (n.): paradeigma, skhesis peculiar nature: *idiotês* perceptible: aisthêtos perception: antilêpsis perfect (a.): teleios perfection: teleiôsis, teleiotês perfective: teleiôtikos perform evil acts: kakunein periphery, the: perix topos perish: phtheiresthai perish along with: sunapollusthai perish together: sumphtheiresthai perishable: *phthartos* permanence: diamonê permeate: khôrein dia philosopher: philosophos, ho sophos philosophical: *philosophos* philosophy: philosophia physical: organikos, phusikos piece of sophistry: paralogismos piety: eusebeia, to eusebes place (n.): topos plant (n.): phuton point (n.): sêmeion portion: meros position (n.): doxa, thesis, topos possession: hexis possible, be: endekhesthai potential: dunamei, dunamis potentiality: dunamis potentially: dunamei, dunamis power: dunamis predicate of: katêgorein premiss: arkhê, to hêgoumenon, lêmma present, be: huparkhein, pareinai present in, be: enuparkhein preservation: to sôizesthai preservative: sôstikos

preserve: sôizein prevent: kôluein privation: sterêsis problem: problêma produce (v.): apotelein, poiein production: paragôgê production of form: eidopoiia pre-exist: proüparkhein proof: apodeixis, epikheirêma, epikheirêsis proposition: protasis prove: apodeiknunai, sullogizesthai providence: pronoia psychic: psukhikos pupil: mathêtês put out of tune: dialuein put together: harmozein, sunarmozein, sunistanai, suntithenai puzzle (n.): aporia puzzle over: aporein

qualification: prosdiorismos quality: to poion, poiotês question (n.): problêma, zêtêsis

race (n.): genos raise a puzzle: aporein rational: logikos ray: aktis, augê reason (n.): aitia, logos reasoning: epikheirêsis rebuttal: antilogia receive: lambanein receptive: dektikos rectilinear movement: euthuphoria refer to: sêmainein refutation: anaskeuê, elenkhos, lusis refute: apelenkhein, elenkhein, luein refute along with: sunapelenkhein region: topos relation: skhesis relative terms: ta pros ti relatives: ta pros ti religious thinker: theologos remain: diamenein. menein remain intact: sôizesthai remove: aphairein renew: episkeuazein repair: anuphainein replace: metapherein represent: kataskeuazein responsible for: aitios

rest (n.): êremia, stasis restore: episkeuazein restored: *episkeuastos* reveal: deiknunai revolve: ekperierkhesthai, periagesthai ridicule (n.): gelôs ridiculous: geloios rigour: akribeia rotate: kuklophoreisthai, peripheresthai rotation: kuklophoria, peridinêsis rule out: aphairein sagacity: ankhinoia salvation: sôtêria sav of: katêgorein science: mathêma scripture: logion scriptures: grammata section: logos see: horan seek (out): zêtein seem: phainesthai seen, be: phainesthai self-evidence: enargeia self-evident fact: enargeia self-moved: autokinêtos self-movement: autokinêsia, to autokinêton self-sufficiency: autarkeia self-sufficient: autarkês sensation: aisthêsis sense: aisthêsis sense (sc. meaning): dianoia, khrêsis, nous, to sêmainomenon, tropos sensible: aisthêtos separate (a.): kekhôrismenos. khôristos separate (v.): khôrizein shape (n.): morphê, skhêma shapelessness: to askhêmatiston share (in): koinônein. metekhein show: deiknunai sight (n.): opsis sign: sêmeion signify: sêmainein simple: haplous simply: haplôs sometimes: pote sophistical: sophistikos soul: psukhê soul, of the: psukhikos sound (a.): hugiês

English-Greek Glossary

soundly: hugiôs source: arkhê source of illumination: to phôtizon speciousness: to pithanon sphere: sphaira spherical: sphairikos, sphairoeidês spiral (n.): helikoeidês, helix, kokhlioeidês spirally: helikoeidôs spirit: daimôn stability: diamonê state as a philosophical principle: philosophein statement: apophansis, lexis, logos stronger: kreittôn structure: diakosmêsis student, be a: mathêteuein subject: skopos, to hupokeimenon subject to, be: paskhein substance: ousia substitute (v.): metalambanein substitution: metalêpsis, metathesis substratum: to hupokeimenon successor: diadokhos suffer: paskhein, hupomenein sun: hêlios sun's: hêliakos superior: kreittôn supernaturally: huper phusin supertemporal: huperkhronos suppose: hupotithenai surface: peras, periphereia survival: sôtêria synthesis: sunthesis

take: lambanein take as equivalent: metalambanein teach: didaskein teacher: didaskalos teaching: didaskalia temporal: khronikos temporally: khronikôs tense: khronos text: lexis theologian: theologos theory: theôrêma thing: pragma think about (of): noein thought: dianoia, ennoia, epinoia, noêma, noêsis, nous three-dimensional: trikhêi diastatos time: khronos time, at some: pote

to quote his exact words: epi lexeôs toe: daktulos touch (v.): haptesthai transcend: huperanabainein, huperekpiptein transcribe: metagraphein transparent: diaphanês travel around: ekperierkhesthai, ekperipolein travel in a circle: kuklophoreisthai treatise: logos, pragmateia true: alêthês true at the same time (at once), be: sunalêtheuein truth: alêtheia tune (v.): harmozein tuning: harmonia

unable to change: ametablêtos unable to coexist: asunuparktos unbind: luein unbinding: lusis unchanging: ametablêtos uncombined: haplous unconscious: aproairetos undergo: paskhein, hupomenein undermine: anaskeuazein undertaking: hormê undo: dialuein, luein ungenerated: agenêtos unholv: asebês universal: holikos universe: to pan unlimited power: to apeirodunamon unmoving: akinêtos unordered: ataktos unrefuted: anelenktos unrelated to: askhetos untune: dialuein, luein usage: khrêsis use (n.): khrêsis use of: katêgorein

valid: anankaios various: diaphoros vice: kakia view (n.): doxa visibility: to horaton visible: horatos visible, be: phainesthai vision: opsis visual image: opsis vital: zôtikos

164

waste: phthisis waste away: phthinein way: tropos weak: asthenês weakness: astheneia whole (a.): holos whole (n.): to holon will (n.): boulêsis will (v.): ethelein wish (v.): boulesthai, ethelein

wit: nous

with a spiral movement: *helikoeidôs* without any relation: *askhetôs* without beginning: *anarkhos* without qualification: *adioristôs* without relation: *askhetos* word: *lexis*, *onoma*, *prosrhêma* work: *logos* world: *kosmos* world-creating: *kosmourgos*

Greek-English Index

This index lists a selection of more important words from the Greek text together with my translations of them. I have not attempted to distinguish between Philoponus' own words and those of Proclus and other authors he quotes. The rubric 'other tr[anslation(s)]' covers cases where a word has been translated in such a way that there is no one-to-one correspondence between the Greek and the English. The page and line references are to Rabe's Greek text and the occurrence of 'etc.' at the end of a listing of such references means that it is incomplete.

abakion, board, 208,17

- *aboulêtôs*, involuntarily, 260,18; 269,17
- *adêlos*, non-evident, 273,11; unclear, 154,12
- adiakopos, uninterrupted, 288,3.21
- *adialutos*, indissoluble, 129,12; 144,14; 227,24; 230,18; 272,23; *[to] adialuton*, indissolubility, 241,24
- *adiaphoria*, lack of discrimination, 170,11
- *adioristôs*, without qualification, 171,16
- *adunamia*, lack of power, 240,6; 299,21
- *adunatein*, cannot, 282,19; to be unable, 132,18.19; 282,1; to not be able, 131,23;
- *adunatos*, impossible, 120,4.5, etc.; not possible, 119,22; 122,10; 123,5, etc.; *adunatos [einai]*, cannot be, 217,12.13; *[to] adunaton*, impossibility, 178,1, etc.; *adunatôs ekhein*, cannot, 302,1
- *aei*, always, 123,7, etc.; for ever, 238,19.24, etc.; *eis (es) aei*, everlasting, 312,24; for ever, 213.2; 234,5; 235,18; 303,19; 312,22
- *aeigenês*, always coming to be,
- 123,23; 193,10.12.16.17; **[to]** *aeigenes*, continuous becoming, 193,22

- *aeigenesia*, continuous becoming, 240,16
- *aeikinêsia*, everlasting motion, 240,16
- *aeikinêtôs*, always in movement, 271,18
- *aêr*, air, 202,6-16; 231,11; 232,4; 269,26; 280,20; 287,27; 289,2; 306,23; 309,6
- *agathos*, good, 119,22, etc.; *[to] agathon*, good thing, 179,21
- *agathotês*, goodness, 121,4; 130,25; 131,7.9; 133,13; 134,2.9; 172,14; 224,25
- *agein*, to bring, 132,12; to throw, 267,20; other tr., 164,16; 178,25; 270,1
- agenêtos, ungenerated, 120,12, etc.
- *agnoein*, to be ignorant, 183,8; to not know, 131,11; 132,19; 133,20; *agnoeisthai*, to be unknown, 131,10; 273,6
- *agnoia*, ignorance, 180,14; 255,7.8; 309,5
- agnômôn, 197,18, inept
- *aïdios*, everlasting, 120,13, etc.; *ex aïdiou*, from everlasting, 143,14, etc.; *aïdiôs*, everlastingly, 169,1, etc.
- *aïdiotês*, everlastingness, 125,15; 167,9; 248,10; 249,9; 258,25
- *aiôn*, eternity, 141,5, etc.

- *aiônios*, eternal, 138,23, etc.; *aiôniôs*, eternally, 169,8
- *aisthanesthai*, to be sentient, 210,15; 263,18; to employ [one's senses], 258,4; to have senses, 265,14; to observe, 280,18
- *aisthêsis*, observation, 166,17; 202,4; sensation,137,7.16; 139,23; 168,6; 169,18; 178,5; 258,1; 263,25; 264,6.8; 265,7; 266,12; 285,28; 286,1.13.14.15; sense, 166,21; 194,10; 258,2.4.5; 270,4; 285,19.23.24; 286,7; *[to] aisthêseôs metekhon*, sentient, 270,26
- aisthêtikê antilêpsis,
- sense-perception, 194,19
- *aisthêtos*, perceived, 137,14; 138,1.2, etc.; perceptible, 124,8, etc.; sensible, 130,2; *[to] aisthêton*, perceptibility, 201,23; sensual thing, 131,14
- *aithêr*, ether, 241,4; 276,9
- aitherios, etherial, 278,24
- *aitia*, cause, 121,3, etc.; reason, 187,2-191,6; 203,18; 215,25; 232,14.16; *kat' aitian*, with respect to causation, 122,22-123,14; 148,7; 149,20; 167,27; 171,22-173,19; 176,24-178,15
- aitiasthai, to hold responsible, 184,9
- [to] aitiaton, effect, 197,25; 252,2.3
- *aitiôdês*, causal, 160,19; causally, 159,2
- *aitios*, cause 130,9, etc.; responsible for, 189,19; 262,5; 266,2; 267,2; *[to] aition*, cause, 122,12, etc.
- *akhôristos*, not separate, 251,28; 252,8.9
- akinêtos, free of movement, 274,20; motionless, 194,17, etc.; unmoving, 275,26; akinêtôs, without any movement, 140,25

akoê, act of hearing, 270,7; hearing, 236,4; 270,3.24.27

- *akolouthein*, to follow, 150,20; 204,24; 268,19; 296,17; 311,25
- *akolouthia*, conformity, 273,26; entailment, 268,12; other tr., 200,22
- *akolouthos*, consistent (with), 134,7; 226,12.18; appropriate, 168,25;

akolouthon einai, to follow, 126,19; 127,16; 183,20; 189,16; 260,19; *kata to akolouthon*, as a consequence, 311,9; consistently, 182,9; 293,1; *akolouthôs*, consistently, 124,21; 204,17.18; in

due order, 139,13; other tr., 216,12 **koustikos**, afforded by hearing.

- *akoustikos*, afforded by hearing, 286,2
- akribeia, rigour, 181,6
- akribologia, exact knowledge, 142,3
- aktis, ray, 266,15; 282,16

akurologia, misuse of words, 157,9

- akuros, incorrect, 161,23
- alêtheia, truth, 120,20, etc.; kat' alêtheian, really, 125,24; pros alêtheian, real, 219,10; meta tês alêtheias, correctly, 297,4
- *alêthês*, genuine, 217,2; 220,8; true, 120,11, etc.; real, 221,18; the truth, 301,5; *alêthôs*, really, truly, 219,17.28; 221,6; other tr., 165,17; 190,19
- alloiôsis, alteration, 137,19, etc.
- *alloiousthai*, to alter (intrans.), 257,22.27
- *allotrios*, else, 294,2-305,27; foreign, 256,14; other, 294,5-307,4
- alogos, irrational, 137,7, etc.
- *alutos*, indissoluble, 119,15, etc.; unresolved, 163,6; *[to] aluton*, indissolubility, 226,6
- *ameibein*, to change, 259,20; to replace, 202,20; to exchange, 290,18
- *amêkhanos*, immeasurable, 163,4; inconceivable, 119,21; 128,5.18; 130,21; other tr., 162,13
- ameristos, indivisible, 196,26
- *amesôs*, directly, 281,4; immediately, 262,23; 266,3.8.12; 280,2.4
- *ametablêtos*, unable to change, 295,1; 310,11; unchanging, 205,6-211,3; 219,13; *[to] ametablêton*, that which is unchanging, 210,28
- ametria, discordance, 303,15
- ametrôs, overmuch, 233,9
- ampelos, grapevine, 307,23
- *amphiballein*, to express doubt, 176,28
- amphibolia, doubt, 176,18
- amphibolos, ambiguous, 174,12;

doubtful, 175,24; 176,6; in any doubt, 173,14

- *amphidoxoumenos*, a matter of doubt, 175,13
- *amphisbêtêsimos*, an open question, 274,13
- anadeiknunai, to proclaim, 189,22
- *anadekhesthai*, to assume, enter into, submit to, stand in, 195,16; 269,25.27; 270,19.20; 271,2; 289,17; 290,2
- *anagein*, to refer, 197,27
- anaginôskein, to read, 214,12
- anagôgos, elevating (paraphrase used), 255,16.24
- *anairein*, to demolish, 223,25; to deny, 192,24; 204,21; 209,4.5.14; 227,7; 307,3
- *anairesis*, denial, 245,10; elimination, 267,10.19; other tr., 160,12
- *anairetikos*, destructive, 190,13; 219,5.11; 220,19
- *anakamptein*, to reverse direction, 258,17.19: to turn back, 309,16.20.26; 310,4
- *analambanein*, to go back, 265,3; to derive, 196,23; to enter into 196,16
- *analloiôtos*, inalterable, 209,8; 235,19; *[to] analloiôton*, inalterability, 229,2; 233,27
- *analuein*, to analyse, 148,12; 154,1; 206,24; 218,2; 226,22; 227,19.20; to exclude, 146,19; to resolve, 153,24; to depart (metaph.), 305,6
- *analusis*, analysis, 206,23; 217,25; 218,20; 219,27; 220,15; 221,10.11.18; dissolution; 148,21
- *anankaios*, cogent, 242,6; 248,26; necessary, 219,7; 267,10; 277,22; 307,1; valid, 120,20; other tr., 127,11.28; 273,25; *[to] anankaion*, necessity, 267,11; *anankaiôs*, cogently, 124,7; 204,26; necessarily, 165,1; other tr., 154,8
- *anankazein*, to compel, 134,27; 264,16; to render necessary, 273,22
- anapherein, to refer back, 198,2
- anaphônein, to express, 135,20
- anaplasma, fabrication, 291,17
- *anaplattein*, to make up, 292,1.10; to imagine, 287,22

- *anaplêrôsis*, replacement, 137,21; 202,13; 231,6; other tr., 236,16
- *anaplêroun*, to fill, 235,27; to restore, 202,17
- anapnein, to breath, 210,14
- anapodeiktos, unproved 243,23; 248,12; anapodeiktôs, without proof, 273,12
- *anarkhos*, beginningless, 140,11.14; without beginning, 141,19; without an origin, 161,13; other tr., 127,18; *anarkhôs*, without any beginning, 169,24
- anaskeuazein, to undermine, 123,17
- anaskeuê, refutation, 293,8
- *anatithenai*, to credit with being, 183,13
- *anatolai*, rising, 199,9; the east, 198,25; other tr., 199,2
- anatolikos, eastern, 198,21
- *anatrekhein*, to find one's way back, 184,3; to return, 143,19; 165,16
- *andrias*, statue of a man, 305,7.9.10.13
- aneideos, formless, 304,24; 305,22
- anelenktos, unrefuted, 204,23
- *anendeês*, free of need, 236,14.26; other tr. 236,26; *[to] anendees*, absence of need, 236,13
- anepidektos, resistant, 284,8
- anepistêmôn, ignorant, 309,2
- angeion, container, 284,1
- anistanai, to awake, 183,11
- *ankhinoia*, sagacity, 122,15; 163,23; 211,23.25
- *[to] ankulon*, convoluted nature, 212,2
- antemphasis, contrast, 148,22
- anthrôpeios, human, 257,15
- *anthrôpos*, human (adj.), 162,25; 163,17; man (sc. human being), 136,3, etc.; mankind, 155,12; other tr., 156,3; 157,12; 174,25; 279,4
- *antidiairein*, to oppose, 178,6.8; 180,21; 181,3.11.24; 308,27
- antidiairesis, division, 181,18
- *antidiastellein*, to oppose, 150,23; 180,22; 182,4
- antidiastolê, opposition, 182,7
- *antikathistasthai*, to take issue, 211,14
- antikeisthai, to be opposed, 181,26,

etc.; *[to] antikeimenon*, opposite, 174,2, etc.

- antilambanesthai, to grasp, 151,23
- *antilegein*, to argue against, 167,4; other tr., 296,24
- *antilêpsis*, perception, 194,19; 285,24; 286,7
- antilogia, rebuttal, 151,6
- *antimetaballein*, to revert, 311,23.27; to turn into, 296,14.19
- *antiphasis*, contradiction, 151,4; 227,18; 291,13; 302,10
- *antiphatikos*, into contradictories, 182,11
- *antistrephein*, to be convertible, 206,7; 207,15
- [hê sun antithesei] antistrophê, conversion by negation, 126,20; 150,14; 204,12; 225,18; 268,20
- antithesis, antithesis, 181,22; for other occurrences see antistrophê
- *antitithenai*, to oppose, 173,24; 181,19.23; 192,3; 193,17; to set in opposition, 180,5.6; 182,4.10
- *anuparxia*, non-existence, 142,2; 182,5; 268,21.22
- *anuphainein*, to repair, 138,7.13; 235,28; 236,25
- aoristos, indefinite, 160,15
- *apagein*, to bring, 150,21; to reduce, 161,28
- aparabatos, inescapable, 184,11
- aparallaktos, exactly alike, 188,18
- *aparithmein*, to enumerate, 160,9; 193,25; 257,5; 263,27
- *apathês*, impassible, 236,25; 237,1; other tr., 237,3; *[to] apathes*, impassibility, 241,21
- *apeirodunamon*, *[to]*, unlimited power, 312,19
- *apeiros*, infinite, 132,11; 167,17; 213,8; 233,1; 235,6.8; 238,10-240,17; 258,16.17; 281,17; 289,23; 25; 297,15; 298,1-300,6; *eis apeiron*, *ad infinitum*, 239,25; 299,13; *ep' apeiron*, *ad infinitum*, 167,20; 206,22; 280,1; indefinitely, 258,7; *ex apeirou*, indefinitely, 176,2
- *apelenkhein*, to criticise, 191,21; to expose, 126,28; to refute, 135,2; 166,24; to vindicate, 127,7; other tr., 153,16; 171,20

- *aphairein*, to remove, 146,18; 151,12; to rule out, 209,17.18
- *aphanês*, hidden, 203,17
- *aphistanai* (intrans. forms), to move away, 276,14
- *aphorizein*, to define, 156,14; 192,2; to determine, 135,25; 288,26; to distinguish, 185,11; to indicate, 156,5.24
- *aphtharsia*, imperishability, 216,3.6; 240,8.22; 304,6; 312,20
- *aphthartos*, imperishable, 120,5-14; 126,22-128,13; 189,7-9; 212,6, etc.
- aphthonos, free of envy, 225,5
- [hê] aplanês [sphaira], sphere of the fixed stars, 198,9.15.19.25; 292,2; [ta] aplanê, the fixed stars, 147,4; 198,28
- *apodeiknunai*, to demonstrate, 154,11, etc.; prove, 259,14; 263,28; 282,11; reveal, 194,15, show, 127,20; 130,11; other tr., 282,23
- *apodeixis*, demonstration 154,13, etc.; (deductive) proof, 135,7, etc.
- apodekhesthai, to endorse, 167,2.10
- *apodidonai*, to assign, 169,26; to give, 183,9; to return, 294,17
- apodosis, interpretation, 193,8
- apôleia, destruction, 268,2
- *apophainesthai*, to affirm, 135,19, etc.; assert, 135,12; declare 124,22; say, 223,21, etc.; state, 142,11, etc.; other tr., 200,16
- apophanai, to deny, 193,23; 209,12
- *apophansis*, statement, 248,13; 268,11
- *apophasis*, negation, 192,22.24; 227,7
- *apophaskein*, to deny, 124,14; 205,23; 209,15
- *aporein*, to introduce as a puzzle, puzzle over, raise a puzzle, other tr., 162,24; 163,6.13.14.17; 166,20; 172,15; 176,16.28; 279,28; 284,22.23
- aporêtikôs, in aporetic vein, 162,7
- *aporia*, puzzle, 134,18; 143,20; 192,11.17; 259,4
- *[ta] aporrhêta*, secret matters, 279,2; secrets, 194,13
- aposkeuazein, to deal with, 259,5
- *apotelein*, to produce, 165,9; to perform, 210,11

- *aproairetos*, unconscious, 260,12; *aproairetôs*, involuntarily, 244,18-271,3
- *aprosdeês*, in need of nothing, 230,24; 231,13.21; *[to] aprosdees*, freedom from want, 235,25
- apsukhos, inanimate, 266,21.27
- *Arês*, Ares (sc. the planet Mars), 199,17.21
- *aretê*, excellence, 175,19; virtue, 255,9
- *aristeros*, left (opp. right), 197,8; 198,20.21.24
- *arithmos*, number, 141,10, etc.; *kat' arithmon*, numerically, 202,11-203,22
- *arkhê*, beginning, 146,5, etc., (esp. ch. 6); origin, 178,21, etc.; premiss, 296,23; source, 243,10, etc., (esp. ch. 7)
- artêria, artery, 288,7
- *asebeia*, impiety, 182,20; 191,1 *asebês*, impious, 191,7; unholy,
- 133,12 [to] askhêmatiston, shapelessness,
- **[to] asknematiston**, shapelessness, 308,24
- *askhetos*, unrelated to, 252,12.17.23; without relation, 196,5; *askhetôs*, without any relation, 195,27
- askhistos, unsplit, 197,10
- asômatos, incorporeal, 253,5
- *astheneia*, weakness, 300,5.20; 301,3; 303,1.8.12
- asthenês, weak, 300,6
- astrapê, flash of lightning, 149,2
- astron, star, 141,9; 281,27
- astronomikos, astronomer, 135,28
- *asullogistos*, invalid, 154,18; 161,19; 163,21; 264,26; *asullogistôs*, invalidly, 204,26
- asumbatos, incompatible, 235,22
- asunêthês, unfamiliar, 156,2.8; unusual, 122,3
- asunkritos, incomparable, 255,19; asunkritôs, beyond comparison, 255,16
- *asunthetos*, incomposite, 155,23; 156,20; 157,5.7.13.15; 159,20.23; 164,6; 206,19.20; 207,13
- *asunuparktos*, unable to coexist, 182,11
- *ataktos*, irregular, 201,13; unordered, 217,11.12; *[to]*

atakton, the disorderly,

294,19-313,3; **ataktôs**, disorderly, 164,17

- *ataxia*, disorder, 188,18, etc; disordered confusion, 220,3; 221,14; disordered heap, 219,29
- *atelês*, imperfect, 121,9; 132,8.9.25; 225,8

ateleutêtos, endless, 257,9.20; [to] ateleutêton, endlessness, 144,8

athanasia, immortality, 124,24, etc.

athanatos, immortal, 124,23, etc.; [to] athanaton, immortality, 230,6; 272,25

- *atheotês*, godlessness, 176,19; impiety, 134,15
- athroos, all at once, 167,16

atopia, absurdity, 129,21; 133,2; 161,23; 178,24; 193,9; 218,13

- *atopos*, absurd, 121,1, etc.; inappropriate, 239,25; 299,16; 300,22
- *augê*, ray, 282,10
- augoeidês, luminous, 245,23; 288,18
- autarkeia, self-sufficiency, 235,26

autarkês, self-sufficient, 175,2; 179,17; 230,23; 231,15.20; 236,12; *autarkôs*, independently, 129,2

authis, again, 223,7; 267,25; 268,4; back, 258,19; once more, 309,16; subsequently, 309,21.25

autokinêsia, self-movement, 254,3.7.9

autokinêtos, self-moved, 243,10-273,1; *[to] autokinêton*, self-movement, 243,12-271,15

- *automatos*, independent, 174,16; of its own accord, 228,15
- autonomia, licence, 155,8
- autonomos, self-willed, 170,13
- auxesthai, to grow (intrans.),
 - 263,19; to increase (intrans.), 258,7
- *auxêsis*, growth, 236,20; 256,21; 264,6.8; increase, 258,6.9
- axiôma, axiom, 154,27
- axiopistia, reputation, 144,26
- axiopistos, credible, 211,20
- *axios*, deserving of, 151,6; worthy of, 161,23; *axion (esti)*, it is appropriate, 135,8; proper, 249,8;

worth, 134,6, etc; other tr., 186,6

axôn, axis, 198,15

baros, heaviness, 232,23

- *barus*, heavy, 291,20; 292,26; 309,6.8
- *basileus*, king, 178,27
- *bathos*, interior, 282,7.12.20
- *bia*, force, 275,25; 278,21;
- 279, 11.13.18
- *biaios*, violent, 191,27; *biaiôs ekdekhesthai*, to give a forced interpretation, 173,4
- *biazesthai*, to do violence to, 123,3; to overcome, 303,24; to persist, 199,23
- *biblion*, book, 179,13
- bios, life, 162,22; 163,5; 290,3
- *bioun*, to live, 290,5
- *blaptein*, to harm; 120,20; 127,3 *bôlos*, clod, 285,12; clod of earth,
- 279,18; 289,6
- [ta] boreia, the north, 292,9
- boulêsis, will, 144,14, etc.
- boulesthai, to wish, 144,14, etc.
- *buthos*, bottom of the sea, 270,9
- daimôn, evil spirit, 241,16
- *daktulos*, finger, 277,16; toe, 284,26
- *dei*, must, 162,15, etc.; ought, 248,11; should, 139,19, etc.; to be necessary, 238,8; 297,26; 312,22; to have to, 125,26; 215,6; to need (to be), there is need, etc. 126,27; 174,14; 179,22; 182,26; 190,26; 194,11; other tr., 264,26
- *deiknunai*, to demonstrate, 138,16; 163,22, etc.; to display, 219,22.25; to identify, 288,4; to indicate, 311,16; to point to, 155,10; 285,14; 291,24; to prove, 181,10; 204,23; to reveal, 129,21; 226,10; to show, 124,28, etc.; other tr., 254,22
- *dein*, to bind, 132,22
- *deinotês*, ingenuity, 126,4
- *deisthai*, to be in need of, 225,8; to have need of, (there is) need of, 149,11, etc.; to need, 125,21, etc.
- *dekhesthai*, to accept, 215,6; 304,20; to receive, 284,2; to take (on), 207,1.5; 236,6; other tr., 139,17; 236,17
- *dektikos*, receptive, 226,23; 233,24; 269,14; 279,19
- *dêlôtikos*, indicative, 141,23, etc.; other tr., 147,16; 169,3
- dêmiourgein, to create, 126,9, etc.;

[ho] dêmiourgêsas, creator, 120.1; 230.10

- *dêmiourgia*, creation, 129,25; 190,24; creative activity, 176,18
- *dêmiourgikos*, creative, 174,9.10, etc.
- dêmiourgos, creator, 119,14, etc.
- *desmos*, bond, 119,17; 132,2.20.21; 133,18.19.21.22; 144,14; 226,3; 227,1.25; 228,3; 311,6.11
- despoteia, mastery, 177,15
- despotês, master, 210,7.13.15.16
- despotis, mistress, 175,20
- dexios, on the right (hand side), right, 198,20; 308,26; 309,1; epi (ta) dexia, to the right, 197,8; 198,18.23
- *diadokhos*, successor, 119,13; 243,1; 294,1; 311,18
- *diairein*, to carry out a division, 214,2; to distinguish, 156,4; to divide, 137,24; 148,14
- *diairesis*, distinction, 173,18; division, 136,18; 137,22; 182,11; other tr., 161,25
- *diaireteon*, we must make a distinction, distinctions, 137,4; 178,2.10; 181,14
- *diairetikos*, of division, 180,14; 181,6
- diakosmêsis, structure, 130,17
- *diakribologeisthai*, to go into in detail, 141,1
- diakrinein, to separate, 210,7.21
- dialektikos, dialectical, 174,19; dialectician, 173,15
- *dialuein*, to put out of tune, 131,1; to undo, 131,4; to untune, 131,6
- *dialutos einai*, can be unbound, 225,27
- diamartanein, to botch, 181,19
- *diamenein*, to endure, 235,18; to last, 234,5; 312,22; to remain, 202,27; 222,4; 227,24; 229,18; 235,16
- diametros, diameter, 188,1
- *diamonê*, continuance, 230,25; 235,12; 312,24; stability, 202,13
- *dianoia*, intention, 127,17; 149,23; meaning, 123,4; 141,13; 149,11; 157,10; 161,3; mind, 144,18; 189,20; purpose, 141,7; sense, 121,17; thought, 134,27; 223,2;
way of thinking, 222,7; other tr. 170,22dianoein, to intend, 232,6; other tr., 137.2diaphanês, transparent, 151,11; 266,14; 269,21-270,1; 282,3.18 *diapherein*, to differ, 164,2; 263,15.17; 277,5.6 to have different opinions, 223,10 diapheugein, to elude, 131,12 diaphora, difference, 285,26; other tr., 285,18 diaphorein, to deplete, 231,4.8 diaphoros, different, 147,2; 276,19.23.27; 290,4; various, 173,16; 291,29; other tr. 276,28; 285,18; *diaphorôs*, differently (paraphrases used), 145,14; 223,9 diaporêtikos, interrogative, 123,21; 191,17 diastasis, interval, 197,12 diastatos, see trikhêi diastatos diastolê, diastole, 288,8 diatattesthai, to expound, 296,15 diatemnein, to pierce, 241,17 diathesis, programme, 135,26 diatithenai, to prepare, 135,27; to put in a condition, 303,14 diatribê, school, 211,26 *diazeugnunai*, to disjoin, 192,17; to unyoke, 195,21 *diazeuktikos*, disjunctive, 123,21; 191.16didaskalia, exposition, 123,16, etc.; instruction, 165,1; 217,23; teaching, 123,13 didaskalikos, didactic, 190,7 didaskalos, teacher, 211,16, etc. didaskein, to explain, 124,5, etc.; to show 168,17; to teach 135,24, etc; to tell (about, of), 169,11, etc. *didonai*, to assign, 122,8.25; 139,4; 144,12; 158,20; 190,21; 196,13; 224,14; 237,11; to give, 138,18; 238,8; 297,27; to leave, 214,19; to permit, 134,17; 258,26; to provide, 268.7diekpheugein, to avoid, 173,13 dielenkhein, to refute, 171,1

diênekês, continuous, unbroken, 170,1; 182,6; *[to] diênekes*, continuity, 138,6; 169,19; *eis to diênekes*, in perpetuity, 227,24; 235,9; 242,10; *diênekôs*,

continually 137,20; in perpetuity, 228,4.6

- *diexerkhesthai* (incl. *diexienai*), to follow through, 135,4; to review, 212,7
- diitikos, penetrative, 282,21
- *dioikein*, to control, 235,5; 289,16; to govern, 187,10; 191,12; to have governance of, 138,7; to maintain, 297,15
- *diorganôsis*, structure, 129,1; set of organs, 284,3
- *diorizesthai*, to distinguish, 155,22; other tr., 212,5
- *dogma*, belief, 187,9; doctrine, 120,10; 248,28
- *dokountôs*, in conformity with the beliefs of, 310,24
- *doulos*, slave, 210,7.14.15.17
- doxa, belief, 137,7; 139,22; 168,6; 169,17; 178,5; 181,17; 200,19; doctrine, 304,18; opinion, 135,6; 137,3; 145,21; 171,25; 181,14; 212,22; 223,14; 293,15; position, 189,20; 211,21; 213,22; 216,12; 224,16; 297,12; view, 134,26; 213,3.17; 223,7; 248,16; doxêi, conjecturally, 162,19
- *doxastos*, conjectured, 137,26; may be conjectured, 137,7.14; 168,6; 178,5; 181,17

doxazein, to adhere to a view, 135,9; to be of an opinion, 211,14; to hold (a view), 162,24; 225,12

dran, to act, 236,11.18

drastêrios, active, 233,26; 274,28; *[to] drastêrion*, active nature, 233,16

- *dunamis*, potential, 133,27, etc.; potentiality, 264,5, etc.; power, 121,6, etc.; *dunamei*, potential, 132,13, etc.; potentially, 195,17, etc.; *[to] dunamei*, potentiality, 132,8, etc.
- dusis, setting, 199,9; other tr., 199,3
- *dusmai*, the west, 198,26
- dutikos, western, 198,22

eidikos, formal, 159,6

eidopoiein, to imbue with form, 304,24.26; 305,15; 307,5

eidopoiia, production of form, 183,10

- eidopoios, formative, 232,21
- *eidos*, appearance, 146,26; 147,1; form, 122,11, etc.; kind, 208,16; 276,7-28
- eikôn, copy, 225,4, etc.; image, 265,23
- einai, to be, 119,15, etc.; to exist, 126,7, etc.; [to] einai, being, 122,21, etc.; existence, 122,8, etc.; [to] on, being, 121,24, etc.; [to] mê on, non-being, 181,12, etc.; [ta] onta, (existing) things, 136,19, etc.
- eisagein, to show (as), 179,25; 188,8
- *eisdekhesthai*, to receive (into), take in, 231,6; 237,9; 266,15; 279,1
- *ekdekhesthai*, to accept, take [in a given way], 172,3; 190,19; 191,23; 192,20.23; other tr., 173,4
- ekdidaskein, to explain, 155,1
- *eklambanein*, to understand, 192,28; 198,9
- *ekperierkhesthai*, to revolve, 291,23; 292,12; to travel around, 199,1.8.14
- *ekperipolein*, to travel around, 199,19
- *ekpheresthai*, to involve oneself, 193,9
- ekpheugein, to escape, 166,11
- *ekpiptein*, to be debarred from, 286,6; to degenerate, 287,16; to depart from, 284,6
- ekthesis, description, 120,19; 243,19
- *ektithesthai*, to list, 192,21; to set out, 134,17; 139,6
- elattôn, lesser, 281,18; smaller, 283,6
- *êlektron*, amber, 274,23; 275,2
- *elenkhein*, to invalidate, 122,19; 149,24; to refute, 194,24, etc.
- *elenkhos*, refutation, 121,11, etc.; other tr., 125,13; 273,3
- ellampsis, illumination, 266,11
- *embruon*, embryo, 219,29
- emmeleia, harmony, 265,28 emphilosophein, 131,19
- (paraphrase used) **empsukhos**, animate, 180,23; 196,23; 244,19; 245,11; 253,1.3; 254,5;
- 267,12.14.15; 268,18 enantios, contradictory, 177,17;
- contrary, 220,5, etc.; opposite, 193,15; other tr., 225,16; *[to] enantion*, contrary, 188,15.22;

210,22.24.25; 220,5.23; 224,10; 294,15-296,12; 307,13-313,3; *ek*

- tou enantiou, conversely, 182,17
- enantiotês, contrariety, 308,21
- enargeia, (observed) facts, self-evidence, self-evident fact; 200,24; 201,25; 263,28; 273,14; other tr., 274,7; ek tês enargeias, self-evidently, 183,22
- enargês, clear, obvious, 163,24; 274,5; enargôs, clearly, manifestly, 135,20; 141,12; 155,18; 166,20; 247,25; 248,25; 252,9
- *endeiknunai*, to expound, 137,2; to indicate, 191,7; to show, 144,1
- endeixis, demonstrating, 217,24
- *endekhesthai*, to be possible, 123,24, etc.; can, 162,3, etc.
- endiaitasthai, to dwell, 289,18
- endiatribein, to spend time, 189,14
- *energeia*, activity, 167,15, etc.; actuality, 121,11, etc.; force, 244,7; function, 210,11; *energeiâi*, actualised, 250,25.26; actually, 250,11, etc.; *kat' energeian*, actual, 250,14, etc.; actually, 150,12, etc.
- *energein*, to be active, 255,5.11; 279,3; to engage in, 251,15; to function, 210,10; to operate, 195,22
- enistanai, (intrans. forms) to object, 297,9; enestêkôs, present, 167,23
- enginesthai, to arise, 198,1; 225,2; to come to, 230,17; to occur, 208,15
- enkephalos, brain, 284,19.26
- *ennoia*, conception, 128,19; 133,2; 134,7.11; intention, 126,10; meaning, 212,1; thinking, 312,17; thought, 209,17; other tr., 231,22
- *enstasis*, objection, 134,20; other tr., 145,22; 168,10
- *enthousian*, to be divinely inspired, 241,10; 278,28
- enudros, aquatic, 180,28
- *enulos*, enmattered, 153,22; 206,26; 207,3; 251,4
- *enuparkhein*, to be present in, 219,24; to (be) internal (to), 218,20; 219,1.3.6; 220,11; to exist within, 219,8; 221,8.14
- *epagein*, to add, 144,2; 159,17; 169,16; to advance, 154,9.13; to

afflict with, 232,13; to continue,

- 184,24; to go on to talk about, 268,2
- epagôgê, induction, 204,1
- epanagein, to return, 289,19
- epanalambanein, to repeat, 136,15
- epanorthoun, to replace, 228,7
- epexêgêsis, clarification, 205,20
- ephaptein, to seize upon, 146,1
- *ephistanai*, (trans. forms) to look closely at, 187,8; to note, 267,25; to put in control, set over, 183,12; 190,24; 235,17; (intrans. forms) to be in charge, 265,26; to be set over, 266,7
- *ephodos*, approach, 120,19; 243,19; 248,4
- *epibainein*, to mount, 197,21; 243,15; 245,24; 248,2; 273,16.23.28; 274,16; 279,7; 280,3; 289,12; 290,11
- *epiballein*, to be within range, 282,18
- epideiknunai, to show, 165,14
- *epidekhesthai*, to be accepting of, 143,11.13
- *epidiorizein*, to further define, 214,16
- *epiginesthai*, to come (to), 230,10; 237,15; 265,17; 272,24; 300,10.21.27; to occur, 303,1; to originate, 197,25; to supervene, 164,22; other tr., 300,6
- *epigraphein*, to entitle, 138,19; 167,3; 238,3; 297,21
- *epikheirein*, to argue, 256,18; to attempt, 247,3; to endeavour, 175,15; to try, 126,4; 242,3; other tr., 216,26; 290,24
- epikheirêma, proof, 120,19, etc.
- epikheirêsis, proof, 248,8;
- reasoning, 121,10; 126,28
- epikhorêgein, to endow, 241,23
- *epikrinein*, to decide, 140,7; 158,3.7; 163,12; to determine, 193,21
- *epiktêtos*, acquired, 124,23; 229,20; 237,8.20; 240,13; 242,18; 300,10; 301,6; 304,5; 311,15; 312,12
- epiluesthai, to solve, 195,13
- *epinoein*, to come up with, 204,8; to contrive, 228,5; to dream up, 186,8; to imagine, 276,26; to think up, 145,11
- epinoia, mind, 291,28; 292,6; notion,

148,22; 158,11; thought, 153,23; 158,11; *epinoiâi*, notionally, 121,27; 146,13; 153,17; 154,1; 226,21; *di' epinoias*, in thought, 301,7; notionally, 239,25; 299,16; *kat' epinoian*, envisioned, 305,9; in thought, 301,7; notional, 227,6.12.13.20.21; notionally, 227,3; 300,26

- *epipherein*, to add, 136,3; 206,16; to confer upon, 263,13.17; 264,4; 269,17; to indicate, 222,5.15; to provide, 200,17
- *epiprosthein*, to be in the way, 151,10; 152,4; to eclipse, 281,27; 282,5; to obstruct, 151,12; to shield, 269,26
- *episkeuastos*, restored, 124,24; 138,11; 228,9; 230,3.9.16; 235,21; 237,8; 242,18; 272,23; 311,15
- *episkeuazein*, to renew, restore, 137,20; 138,7; 228,6; 235,18; 236,24
- *epistasthai*, to understand, 142,25; other tr., 142,3
- epistêmê, knowledge, 208,12, etc.
- epistêmôn, knowledgable, 309,2.4; possessed of skill, 255,13; well versed in, 170,8
- episunaptein, to join, 247,28
- epitêdeios, fit, 266,5
- *epitithenai*, to add, 268,26; to use, 155,7
- *êremein*, to be at rest, 260,10; 275,9; to be stationary, 278,8; to remain, 258,8; to remain at rest, 284,25; to remain still, 274,22
- *êremia*, rest, 245,1, etc.; resting, 258,5
- *ethelein*, to want, 187,22; to will, 128,2; to wish, 119,21, etc.
- ethos, practice, 188,6; 224,1
- *eudaimôn*, happy, 162,18
- eukhroia, bloom, 131,18
- *eulogos*, making sense, plausible, reasonable, 127,9; 175,10; 195,12; 200.8; 203,5; 277,22; *eulogôs*, reasonably, 213,12; with reason, 144,12; 237,10
- euruthmos, coordinated, 265,25
- *eusebeia*, piety, 123,15; 187,4; 189,27; 190,4.12.20
- [to] eusebes, piety, 190,7
- eutaktos, orderly, 220,3; 265,22

- *euthugrammon*, rectilinear figure, 148,13
- *euthuphoreisthai*, to move (travel) in a straight line, 241,7; 246,13.17; 274,9; 278,17; 285,4; 293,12
- *euthuphoria*, rectilinear movement, 276,25; 277,1.4; 288,8; 290,19
- *euthus*, at once, 125,17, etc.; immediately, 137,22, etc.; right, 174,14; 302,23; straight away, 152,4
- exagein, 166,23 (paraphrase used); exagesthai, to issue in, 153,14
- *exaptein*, to attach, 244,10; 246,15; 256,16
- *exarkein*, to be adequate, 230,26; to have the resources, 235,12; to last, 235,9; 303,19
- *exartan*, to attach to, 273,27; 285,9; 286,27; 290,12; 293,11
- *exasthenein*, to be exhausted, 275,2; to become exhausted, 235,15; to grow weak, 300,16
- *exêgeisthai*, to comment on, 138,22; 164,15; 172,9; 186,21; 218,11; to explain, 190,26; to expound, 253,18; other tr., 141,13
- *exêgêsis*, comment, 211,28; 213,16; 217,16
- *exêgêtês*, commentator, 121,19; 186,7.18; 191,18.19; 311,18
- exêgêtika hupomnêmata, see hupomnêmata
- *exetasis*, examination, 198,3; investigation, 149,11
- *exetazein*, to ask, 149,22; to deal with, 225,10; to examine, 127,9; 155,24; 273,25; to look at, 193,20; to scrutinise, 191,26; other tr., 127,17.27
- *existanai*, (intrans. forms) to abandon, 284,10; to lose, 233,12; other tr., 154,17; 161,19
- *exousia*, licence, 155,9; 156,27; 170,14
- *galaxias kuklos*, Milky Way, 290,8 *gê*, earth, 146,13, etc.
- geloios, ridiculous, 160,20; 185,4;
- 186,3; 194,12; 200,21; 214,10
- gelôs, ridicule, 151,5; 161,22
- *genesis*, birth, 175,19; 286,5; generation, 120,16, etc.

genetê, birth, 286,2

- *genêtos*, generated, 121,16, etc. (esp. ch. 6)
- gennan, to generate, 141,2, etc.; [ho] gennêsas, begetter, 228,23; [ho] gennôn, begetter, 165,3
- *genos*, birth, 186,22; genus, 121,24; 146,9.11; 149,17-151,21, etc.; kind, 162,16; race, 162,17
- *geôdês*, earthy, 283,12
- *gêras*, old age, 232,13; 233,20
- *gêraskein*, to age, 233,12; 235,24

ginesthai, to be produced, 153,8, etc; to be generated, 121,16, etc.; to become, 119,21, etc.; to come to be, 120,6, etc.; to occur, 264,9, etc.; numerous other translations

- *ginôskein*, to know, 161,28; 194,20; 241,11; 309,8
- *gnôrimos*, familiar, 149,13; 163,24; well-known, 170,10
- gnôstikos, cognitive, 255,6
- *gônia*, angle, 208,12.18.21.22
- grammata, scriptures, 229,10
- grammê, line, 187,19
- *graphein*, to draw, 217,3; to trace out, 291,26; to write, 123,23; 179,13; other tr., 222,2.4
- haima, blood, 287,26; 308,4.6.10
- *hama*, (all) at once, 167,13, etc.; along with, 141,20, etc.; together (with), 143,25, etc.; as soon as, 267,8, etc.; at (one and) the same time, 280,27; immediately, 183,21, etc.; once, 183,21; 245,16; 261,16; straight off, 193,6; the moment, 254,25; other tr., 140,17; 141,24, etc.
- *hamaxa*, wagon, 274,19; 275,20; 276,18.21
- *haphê*, touch, 285,20
- haplous, direct, 195,22; plain, 161,2; pure, 309,5; simple, 122,16; 125,20; 148,17.20.22; 155,3-166,18; 187,18; 206,19-207,14; 226,21; 227,20; 237,6; 286,24; uncombined, 153,23; haplôs, generally, 203,11, etc.; in a word, 124,8; in any way at all, 181,26; in general, 201,22; 256,19; simply, 125,11, etc.; without qualification, 237,22
- haptesthai, to be in contact, touch,

198,14; 280,12.14; 281,1-26; 284,20; 285,1; other tr., 131,20 harma, chariot, 266,28; 267,3.5; 276.6*harmonia*, harmony, 134,5; 286,4; tuning, 131,4 harmonikos, harmonic, 197,2 harmozein, to apply to, 283,3; to be appropriate; 142,20; to be pertinent, 284,22; to put together, 119,20-134,4; to tune, 130,27-131,6 hêgeisthai, to lead, 211,18; to think, 236,11; [to] hêgoumenon, antecedent, 273,19; premiss, 248,19hêliakos, sun's, 266,14; 282,16 *helikoeidês*, spiral, 246,25; 274,5; 291,4.8.18; 292,20; 293,2.5; *helikoeidôs*, in a spiral, spirally, with a spiral movement, 246,23; 290,24; 291,7.25; 292,14 *hêlios*, sun, 141,9, etc. *helix*, spiral, 274,4; 291,26; 292,10; 293.7*helkein*, to attract, 275,1; to twist, 125.16helktikos estin, draws up, 275,4 hêmikuklion, semicircle, 188,1 *hêmionos*, mule, 274,19; 275,19; 276, 17.20*hêmisphairion*, hemisphere, 282,10.11.13 henikôs, in the singular, 160,6; 171,16; 'use the singular', 160,14 hêniokhos, charioteer, 265,26; 266,29; 267,2.4; 276,6 *henousthai*, to be united with, 289,22 *heôsphoros*, morning star, 199,12 hepesthai, to accompany, 267,14; to attend upon, 144,7; to be a consequence (of), 271,15; 304,6; to be associated with, 124,24; 201,24; to be consequent (upon), 207,14; 273,19; to be in accord (with), 127,5; 225,13; to follow, 159,16, etc.; to follow from, 203,26; 215,23, etc.; to follow upon, 210,24, etc.; other tr., 126,18; 144,3; 161,23; [to] hepomenon, consequence, 144,13, etc.; *hepomenôs*, secondly, 136,11; 177,9 hermêneuein, to convey, 157,10

herpein, to slither, 277,7

heterokinêtos, externally moved, 271.16

heterotês, difference, 199,5; otherness, 196,28

hexis, capacity, 195,21, etc. (esp. 263,24-270,22); condition, 309,3; faculty, 180,23; possession, 210,8; 294,21-296,14; 310,9.10.11; practice, 195,21; other tr., 245,1

hippeios, of the horse, 305,11

- *hippos*, horse, 265,23, etc.
- *histanai*, (intrans. forms) to remain (immobile), stay, 257,28; 267,24; 268,4; 303,22
- holikos, universal, 138,27
- *holos*, all, 167,13; 283,18; 277,19; 278,9; 289,5; completely, 277,13; entire(ly), 280,25; 282,7; in its entirety, 229,22; whole, 232,2, etc.; other tr., 259,19.20; 275,27; di' holôn, in all respects, 193,7; di' *holou*, completely, 283,13.24; 284,14.15; right through, 284,21; [to] holon, whole, 277,21; 278,3, etc.; *holon hôs holon*, as a whole, 194,7; holon kath' holon, in its entirety, 275,28; holôs, absolutely, 312,22; at all, 152,19, etc.; by any means, 150,11; generally, 240,5; 299,20; in any way (at all), 194,7; 220,24; in general, 264,5, etc.; of any kind at all, 287,25; speaking generally, 251,7
- *holotês*, mass, 202,11-26; 203,2; 204,5; 285,10-14; 286,23; 287,3; 289,20.22

homoeidês, of the same species, 241,9

- *homognômonein*, to be of one mind, 212,17
- *homoiopathês*, affected in the same way, 234,23
- homoiôsis, likeness, 253,21

homologein, to accept, 177,14; 240,20; 295,24; to achieve, 231,27; 306,18; to acknowledge, 158,8; 180,6; 311,9; to agree, 128,23, etc.; to concede, 186,13; 197,19; 216,3; to profess, 312,8; to recognise, 194,11

homologêma, accepted premiss, 248,9

hermêneuma, explanation, 125,21

- *homônumos*, ambiguous, 122,6; 161,24; 173,15
- *homoousios*, of the same substance, 285,8.16
- *homophuês*, of the same nature, 241,1
- homoülos, of the same matter, 234,24
- *horan*, to observe, 168,19, etc; to see, 128,20, etc.; *horasthai*, to be visible, 131,14
- *horatos*, visible, 124,7-204,5; 285,21; *[to] horaton*, visibility, 151,24; 201,6.22
- *horismos*, definition, 239,8.14; 248,20; 261,10; 298,23; 299,4
- horizesthai, to define, 187,19.22; 188,3; 204,11; 205,14; 247,1; 259,14; hôrismenos, distinct, 171,17
- *hormê*, impulse, 293,2; initiative, 244,18; 260,20.23; 263,20; 292,16; propensity, 292,20; undertaking, 136,6; 177,4.10
- *horos*, definition, 248,28; 257,23; 259,26
- *hudôr*, water, 164,12, etc.
- *hugiainein*, to be in good health, 210,9.10
- *hugiês*, sound, 248,25; *hugiôs*, soundly, 220,14
- hugrainein, to moisten, 233,10
- *[to] hugron*, liquid, moisture, wet; 275,3; 283,16.23; 284,2; 308,4.6.9
- hugrotês, moisture, 232,23
- huios, son, 210,22.23.27
- *hulê*, matter, 122,11.16; 147,20; 148,16.18; 149,18; 153,19-166,15; 170,20.23.25; 206,22-207,5; 234,23; 304,25-305,22; 308,8
- hulikos, material (adj.), 159,6; 183,9
- *huparkhein*, to be, 161,14; 170,9, etc.; to be associated with, 210,19; to be present, 213,13; to be the case, 301,23; to belong, 150,1.8, etc.; to consist, 234,2.5; to exist, 196,1, etc.; to last, 300,8; to occur, 299,22; other tr., 201,18; 205,11, etc.
- huparxis, existence, 125,28, etc.
- *hupatê*, lowest [note of a musical scale], 146,15
- *huperanabainein*, to transcend, 255,20
- huperekpiptein, to transcend, 284,7

- *huperkhronos*, supertemporal, 138,23; 167,13
- *huperteros*, above, 206,9; 209,2; higher, 241,23; 242,17
- *hupheimenôs*, in inferior measure, 130,1
- huphiesthai, to be inferior, 130,3.4
- *huphistanai*, (trans. forms) to bring into existence, 158,12; (intrans. forms) to be, 138,15; 308,20; to come into existence, 206,27; to derive existence, 268,10; to exist, 141,23.24; 149,3, etc.; to have existence, 173,12; 176,7.16; other tr., 174,15; 175,6; 282,28
- hupnos, dream, 183,11; sleep, 258,5
- hupodekhesthai, to receive, 287,22
- hupodokhê, reception, 266,5
- hupographein, to describe, 220,15
- hupokeisthai, to be [one's] position, 269,7; to be subordinated to, 260,24; to lie beneath, 276,9; to undergo, 236,22; other tr., 139,18; 147,1; 269,16; hupokeimenos, lower, 282,2; underlying, 305,2.3.13; [to] hupokeimenon, subject, 303,4-21; 307,24.27; substratum, 146,20, etc.; matter 146,24
- *hupolambanein*, to assume, 120,10; to suppose, 176,3; to think of as, 187,6
- *hupoleipein*, to leave, 232,6; 306,24; *hupoleipesthai*, to be left (over), remain, 232,8; 233,4.14; 236,3
- *hupolêpsis*, conception, 174,13; idea, 212,7; notion, 179,11; 191,8
- *hupomenein*, to be subject to, 233,21; to endure, 227,6; to incur, 241,19; to suffer, 233,11; to undergo, 203,25, etc.; other tr., 194,13
- hupomnêmata, commentary, 126,14; 145,13; 154,6; 186,19; 223,2.5; 251,10; 253,16; exêgêtika hupomnêmata, comments, 167,2; 212,15
- hupomnêmatikos, explanatory, 211,27; hupomnêmatika suntagmata, commentary, 248,23
- *hupomnêmatistês*, commentator, 148,25
- hupomnêsis, review, 121,17

- huponoein, to suppose, 176,9
- huponoia, notion, 127,5; 169,9
- *hupopiptein*, to be subject to, 236,22; 274,10; to be the subject of, 137,16
- *hupostasis*, creation, 164,19; existence, 135,13, etc.; origination, 170,6
- hupothesis, hypothesis, 149,27, etc.;
 en têi hupothesei, hypothesised, 284,13; ex hypotheseôs, hypothetically, 189,11; [hôs] en hupothesei, hypothetically, 124,18; 186,15; 189,22; 190,19; 195,9; 196,6.11; 198,6; kath' hupothesin, hypothetical, 199,25; hypothetically, 123,15; pros hupothesin, hypothetically, 220,28; 221,2
- *hupotithenai*, to advance, 127,23, etc.; to assume, 188,17, etc.; to hold, 122,24; 134,10, etc.; to hypothesise, 189,6, etc.; to put forward, 169,25; to suppose, 121,21, etc.
- *idiotês*, nature, 256,9; peculiar nature, 285,25
- *isêmerinos, isêmerinos kuklos,* celestial equator, 198,11.15; 292,3.9
- isodromos, equal in speed, 199,13
- *isodunamein*, to be equivalent, 207,9.12
- *isokhronos*, of equal duration, 198,28; 199,6
- isotakhês, equal in speed, 199,11
- *kakia*, defect, 302,25.26; 303,7.11.12; vice, 255,8.9
- *kakopoiein*, to do evil, 133,9.11; 134,13
- kakos, evil, 119,21-134,5; bad, 181,8
- *kakourgein en tois logois*, to argue unfairly, 120,16
- *kakunein*, to perform evil acts, 121,14; *kakunesthai*, to become evil, 120,4-134,14
- kanôn, straight-edge, 159,11
- kardia, heart, 288,7
- karphê, straw, 274,23; 275,3
- katabolê, sowing, 257,13
- katadekhesthai, to accept, 161,3

katagôgos, debasing, 255,25

- katagraphein, to draw, 208,17
- *katalampein*, to illuminate, 266,13; 282,7.14.18; to light up, 269,23
- kataleipein, to leave, 173,14; 234,7; kataleipesthai, to come down, 151,20
- *katametrein*, to measure out, 281,17.19
- *katanoein*, to be aware, 232,10; to understand, 187,11
- katantan, to descend, 206,24
- katantês, inclined, 276,26
- kataphanai, to assert, 160,15
- *kataphasis*, affirmation, 192,24; 227,7
- katapheresthai, to fall back, 146,8
- kataphôros, obvious, 125,18
- *kataskeuastikos*, calculated to establish; 154,18; such as to prove, 200,6
- *kataskeuazein*, to argue, 170,10.11, etc.; to establish, 126,24.25, etc.; to represent, 125,12, etc.
- kataskeuê, argument, 154,9;
 demonstration, 248,9;
 establishment, 188,8; 224,3;
 framing, 175,23; eis kataskeuên,
 with a view to establishing, 126,14
- katatemnein, to cut up, 197,2
- *katêgorein*, to accuse, 180,16; to predicate of, 124,2; 143,17; 150,6; 154,12; 196,18; 200,11; to say of, 216,11; to use of, 153,2; 216,7
- katêgorêma, charge, 156,4
- kathaptein, to strike, 189,20
- katharsis, purification, 290,6
- *kath' hauto*, by itself, 277,25; 290,20; in [its, etc.] own right, 196,3; 239,10.14; 292,11; 298,24; 299,4; in itself, 308,14; separate, 284,24; other tr. 270,17; 276,1; 277,14
- *kathistanai*, (intrans. forms) to be, 265,28; 268,13; to become, 203,17
- katokhos, possessed, 241,16
- kauma, heat, 159,13
- *kenkhros*, grain of millet (see note at 283,4)
- *kenos*, bereft of, devoid of, 161,20; 166,21; 191,14; empty, 287,21.24.25
- kentron, centre, 146,12; 151,7.16;

152,1; 208,9.10; 259,21; 275,26; 289,7 *phalaion* aboptor 135 8: 225 1

- *kephalaion*, chapter, 135,8; 225,14; 297,6; proof, 134,20; 202,1; section, 120,15, etc.
- kephalê, head, 179,8; 277,17
- kêrukion, trumpet shell, 292,18
- *kêruttein*, to proclaim, 191,11
- khalkos, bronze (noun), 305,13
- *khalkous*, bronze (adj.), 305,7
- *kharaktêristikos*, characteristic of, 241,7
- *kharaktêrizein*, to characterise, 256,10
- *kharizein*, to bestow, 228,9
- *kheimôn*, storm, 303,23
- *kheir*, hand, 274,19; 277,16
- kheironomia, gesture, 147,2
- *khioeidôs*, crosswise, 198,13; to form a cross, 197,3
- *khôleuein*, to become defective, 309,23
- *khôlos*, defective, 294,19
- *khôra*, room, 214,19; space, 287,21.24.25; 290,9; *khôran ekhein*, to be possible, 191,27
- *khorêgein*, to furnish, 240,23; other tr., 253,22; 254,3
- *khôrein*, can, 187,13; to contain, 281,15; to hold, 281,17.21; *khôrein dia*, to permeate, 246,11-287,28
- khôrêtikos, able to contain, 283,10
- *khôristos*, separate, 244,1; 251,15-252,23
- khôrizein, to separate, 195,20;
 217,13.15; 239,21; 240,1.15;
 251,22; 299,12.17; 300,23.26;
 301,18; to separate off, 146,19;
 301,7; kekhôrismenos, separate, 218,19.21; 220,24; 286,8
- *khrêsis*, passage, 223,4; 237,26; sense, usage, use, 122,4; 142,24.26; 155,12; 156,2; 170,8.11
- *khrôma*, colour, 207,8; note at
- 210,19; 270,2.6.9.14.16.17.23; 286,5 *khronikos*, temporal, 122,13, etc.;
- time (adj.), 142,4, etc.; *khronikôs*, temporally, 158,25; 159,20
- *khronos*, tense, 169,26; time, 121,15, etc. (esp. ch. 6)
- *kinein*, to arouse, 271,1; to cause, 270,8.13; to cause to move, 260,7;

to change, 299,22; to disturb, 220,12; to give rise to, 270,10; to impart (movement), 246,4.9; 260,15; to initiate, 239,18.19; 299,9.10; to move, 196,10, etc.; to set in movement, 198,19; 275,17; to start moving, 197,7; to stimulate, 270,6; *kineisthai* (intrans.), to be in movement, 188,23, etc.; to exhibit (movement), 258,23; to keep moving, 239,22.25; 299,13.15; to move, 164,17, etc.; to undergo (movement), 246,1; *kuklôi kineisthai*, to have rotary movement, 287,12; to move in a circle, 288,23; to roll, 277,11.13; to rotate; 277,18.26; 278,7.10; 288, 4.20

- *kinêsis*, change, 254,23.24; movement, 123,25, etc.
- kinêtikos, able to stimulate, 270,18.24.25.26; capable of moving, 271,3; (having) the property of setting in motion, 269,21; motor, 254,12; moving, 271,11; responsible for moving, 244,8; source of movement, 251,12; such as to arouse, 270,27; such as to give rise to, 270,3.10; such as to move, 271,8; such as to stimulate, 270,5; which move(s), 255,10; 256,2.6; 280,19; other tr., 249,24; 260,11
- *kleptein*, to cheat, 166,12
- klimax, staircase, 292,15
- *koinônein*, to partake of, 228,24; to share, 234,23
- *koinos*, common, 122,3; 134,7.11; 155,12; 175,4; generally held, 248,9; in common, 179,10; the same, 308,8
- kokhlioeidês, spiral, 292,15
- *kôluein*, to prevent, 170,13; 249,11; to stand in the way of, 296,7; other tr., 281,17; *[to] kôluon*, obstacle, 152,4
- koruphaios, doyen, 186,8
- [to kata] koruphên, zenith, 241,3
- *kosmein*, to order, 147,6; 196,10
- kosmos, world, 119,15, etc.
- kosmourgos, world-creating, 233,5
- kouphos, light, 291,20.21; 309,6.8.9

- kouphotês, lightness, 232,23
- *krasis*, blending, 146,18;
- temperament, 233,12
- *kratein*, to overwhelm, 272,13
- *kreittôn*, better, 255,26-8; 289,25; superior, 240,4.23; 251,26-254,1; 278,22-279,9; 299,20; 300,26; stronger, 144,13; 194,19; 272,13; other tr., 279,3
- *krinein*, to distinguish, 285,19.23.25; to judge, 139,8
- krios, Aries, 198,14
- krisis, distinguishing, 197,17
- *kritêrion*, means of distinguishing, 286,3
- kritikos, able to distinguish, 285,27
- *krotos*, snapping of the fingers, 149,2
- *kuathion*, ladleful, 281,16
- *kuathos*, wine ladle, 281,15.20
- *kubernêtês*, helmsman, 196,2; 267,1.3.4
- kubos, cube, 218,14; 219,5.8
- *kuklikos*, circular, 259,18; 260,1; *kuklikôs*, in a circle, 246,22
- *kuklophoreisthai*, to move in a circle, rotate, travel in a circle, 244,17; 246,14.19; 259,20.27; 274,14; 277,8; 285,5; 288,1.23; 289,3.10; 291,1.3; 293,13; other tr., 292,23
- *kuklophorêtikos*, moving in a circle (paraphrase used), 287,9
- *kuklophoria*, circular movement, 276,24; rotation, 277,23; 278,9
- kuklos, circle, 187,18; 197,5-199,20; 208,9; 291,5-292,12; 308,22; plane, 292,4.5; kuklói, circular, 244,15; 246,1; 259,11-261,5; 274,12-278,23; 287,12-288,23; in a circle, 259,5; kata kuklon, circular, 258,22; 259,25; 260,21; 274,2; 280,10; 288,5.12; galaxias kuklos, Milky Way, 290,8
- kuliein, to roll, 277,3.8
- kulisis, rolling, 276,23.24; 277,2.4
- kuriologia, prose, 191,23
- kurios, authoritative, 226,4; 227,1; everyday, 157,10; in the true sense, 172,9.11; valid, 172,6; kuriôs, in the proper sense, 154,24; properly, 147,21; 192,17; in the true sense, 172,15; kuriôtaton, chiefly, 130,19

kurtos, convex, 306,14

- *lambanein*, to apprehend, 165,13; to assume, 126,16; 173,7, etc.; to begin, 159,1; to come to, 215,3; to complete, 228,14; 229,8.13; to conceive, 219,19; to consider, 202,5; to derive, 149,1; to draw, 201,25; to draw a conclusion, 204,1; to have (sc. the auxiliary), 125,26; 126,6; 135,14, etc.; to include, 210,13; to make, 161,21; to make an assumption, 154,19; 296,26; to make use of, 219,12; to reach a conclusion, 271,5; to receive, 169,6; 172,5, etc.; to select, 219,10.11; to take, 160,21, etc.; to take for granted, 136,15; to take up, 232,3; 306,21; to understand, 147,16; 161,16; 170,15; other tr., 147,17; 228,16; 237,22; 238,6
- *lêmma*, premiss, 161,19
- lêthê, forgetfulness, 255,8; loss of memory, 208,14
- *leukainesthai*, to become white, 257,28
- leukansis, growing white, 257,26
- *leukos*, white, 194,22; 210,6.18; 257,27; 307,25
- *lexis*, language, 157,10; passage, 127,28; phrase, 193,7; statement, 122,17; text, 136,22; 181,13; 193,24; 197,19; 312,7; word(s), 135,17, etc.; *epi lexeôs*, explicitly, 312,5; to quote his exact words (see note at 145,13), 145,13; 154,6; 162,8; 164,18; 186,21; 253,19; 267,21; to quote verbatim, 297,19
- *linon*, thread, 247,28
- lithos, stone, 150,8, etc.; magnêtis lithos, see magnêtis
- *logikos*, logical, 268,12; of logic, 245,12; 268,19; of reason, 180,22; rational, 131,24; 160,1; 179,24; 180,20-4; 191,11; 195,14; 237,4; 245,3-24; 248,1; 256,11.12; 266,5-269,16; 280,5; 285,9; 290,9
- logion, [Christian] scripture, 128,15
- *logismos*, grounds, 232,14; reasoning, 165,13
- logographos, prose-writer, 155,17
- *logos*, account, 127,3, etc.; argument, 119,13, etc.; basis, 148,18; book,

- 184,5, etc.; chapter, 129,7, etc.; definition, 124,22; 243,4; discourse, 120,8; explanation, 277,20; gospel, 211,16; interpretation, 218,13; law, 131,20.23; 144,11.13, etc.; logic, 206,14; plan, 141,7; 159,9; ratio, 197,2; reason, 131,10, etc.; reasoning, 130,22; reckoning, 140,22; rumour, 241,16; statement, 120,16, etc.; tradition, 174,25; word, 135,1.19; work, 138,19, etc.; other translations; [tôi] logôi, in thought, 239,21, etc.; notionally, 148,14; kata logon, rational, 245,8; kata ton logon, notional, 219,26; mekhri *logou*, merely verbal, 221,22; *[ho] autos logos*, the same applies, 202,23, etc.; *logon (logous)* poieisthai, to discuss, 123,20, etc.; to write, 156,6 *loipos*, else, 151,13; 203,10; like,
- *loipos*, else, 151,13; 203,10; like, 284,5; remaining, 149,16; 199,15; 229,25; rest, 159,11; 222,17, etc.; other tr., 166,24; 192,5; *kai ta loipa*, and so on, 291,23; and the rest, 159,11; *[to] loipon*, eventually, 303,20; next, 225,15; 311,3; (no) longer, 304,25; 305,3; now, 211,9, etc.; on, 134,21; subsequently, 156,21; thereafter, 169,28; 195,22; 257,28
- *loxos*, ecliptic, 292,5
- *loxôsis*, oblique movement, 292,10
- *luein*, to destroy, 291,16; to dissolve, 141,2; 143,22; 144,2; 153,8; 226,25; 227,5; 311,5; to refute, 290,23; to solve, 164,2; to unbind, 119,15-134,18; to undo, 131,15; 311,13; to untune, 131,3
- *lura*, lyre, 130,27; 131,2
- *lusis*, dissolution, 141,3; 143,23; 226,24; 227,3.8; 233,21; 311,8; refutation, 120,15, etc.; solution, 143,21; unbinding, 119,17-134,16; other tr., 119,18; 132,4; 133,19.20
- *lusitelein*, to help, 159,4; to suit best, 173,7
- magnêtis, magnêtis lithos, magnet, 245,28; 274,22.28; 275,15 makhesthai, to be in conflict,

- 127,22; 304,18; 307,1; to be opposed, 181,22; 182,8; to conflict, 237,11; 304,19; to contradict, 242,7; **[to]** makhomenon, contradiction, 166,10; opposite, 182,3
- *manthanein*, to find, 198,5; to gather, 162,5; to learn, 217,24; 223,19; 262,6; 309,9; other tr., 205,4
- *mathêma*, science, 131,19
- *mathêmatikos*, mathematician, 217,27; 218,14; 219,2.19; 220,15.20; 221,17.19
- *mathêtês*, pupil, 144,22; 235,6; 248,14; 249,25; 254,23; 262,6
- *mathêteuein*, to be a student, 211,22
- *megethos*, extent, 283,5; magnitude, 258,15; object, 292,13; 293,1; plane, 277,2; size, 201,12
- *meignunai*, to combine, 292,6; to mix, 283,15.23
- meiôsis, diminution, 263,26
- melas, black, 210,6.19; 257,27; 307,26
- mellein, to be about to, 123,20; 136,8; 153,3, etc.; to be going to, 139,7, etc.; would, 248,22; [to] mellon, the future, 279,1; mellôn, with the intention of, 166,5
- *menein*, remain, 129,12; 144,15, etc.
- *merikos*, individual, 129,10; 164,11; 176,7; 261,27; particular, 28,6; 107,7; 134,4.17.20; 204,4; 208,16; 285,11; 286,25; *[to] merikon*, individual, 129,5.7.14.17; particular (thing), 138,4.9.26; 231,4; 279,15.17
- meristos, divisible, 196,28
- *meros*, constituent, feature, 131,18; 232,7; part, 131,18, etc.; portion, 232,5-233,13; 287,5; 306,23; 307,3.9; other tr., 167,24; 202,3; 291,22; *ana meros*, separately, 158,13; *kata meros*, individual, 260,23; partial, 281,10; *para meros*, by turns, 307,25
- *mesê*, middle [note of a musical scale], 146,14
- *mesiteuein*, to be (lie) between, 280,4.5
- mesotês, intermediary, 266,9
- *metabainein*, to change, 277,13; to

move on, 166,25; to pass, 173,3; to shift, 123,2; to switch, 134,23

- *metaballein*, to change (intrans.), 146,21, etc.; to change (trans.), 275,27; 276,29; 287,19; to move (intrans.), 255,7; to switch (intrans.), 149,6; to undergo change, 208,16; other tr., 147,1; 221,20
- metablêtos, changeable, 211,2.4
- *metabolê*, change, 138,14.15, etc.
- metadidonai, assign, 162,19

metagraphein, to transcribe, 126,12; 224,20

metalambanein, to alter (to), 193,11; to change the meaning of, 170,26; to receive, 228,23; to substitute, 155,11.13.19; 156,26; 157,3.6.13.14; 159,19; to take as equivalent (to), 160,26; 174,4; 192,25; to use (for), 191,17; to use to mean, 201,15.16

metalêpsis, substitution, 191,20.22.25.28

- metallon, mineral (noun), 203,9
- *metapherein*, to alter, 191,15; to replace, 156,1
- metathesis, substitution, 156,27

metatithenai, to alter, 123,22; to change, 193,6

metekhein, to have a share (in), 238,18; 265,19; 298,9; to partake, 265,10; 300,3; to share (in), 238,18, etc.; other tr., 136,5; 175,18; 177,4.12; 180,22; 270,26

meterkhesthai (incl. *metienai*), to skip straight (to), 135,8; to move (to), 139,13; to move (from), 259,19

- *methistanai*, (trans. forms) to cause to depart from, 241,1; to cause to move, 275,28; (intrans. forms) to change 276,4; to take on, 284,11
- *methodos*, rule, 245,12; 268,19; technique, 180,15; 181,6
- metiteon, [we] should look at, 131,26
- *metron*, measure, 141,16; 228,14; 229,8.13; size, 258,8
- *monakhôs legesthai*, to have a single sense, 138,22
- *morphê*, shape, 146,22
- mousikos, musician, 131,3
- *murmêx*, ant, 292,23

naupégos, shipwright, 202,19

naus, ship, 202,20; 228,6; 276,17

nêkhesthai, to swim, 280,25; 281,4

- *nêtê*, highest [note of a musical scale], 146,14
- neuron, channel, 288,9; sinew, 280,19
- *noein*, to apprehend, 137,12; to know, 299,18; to think (about, of),170,21, etc.; to mean, 162,3, etc.
- noêma, thought, 149,9
- *noeros*, intellectual, 252,13; 253,5.8; 255,15.21.23.28; 256,4.11; *noerôs*, on the intellectual plane, 195,22
- *noêsis*, thought, 137.6.12; 178,4; 181,16; 204,11; 205,14
- *noêtos*, apprehended by intellect, 137,26; intelligible, 130,3, etc.; *[to] noêton*, the intelligible, 138,28, etc.
- [ta] notia, the south, 292,9
- *nous*, brain, 211,25; (common) sense, 131,2, etc.; intellect, 195,23.26; 196,4; mind, 183,12, etc.; thought, 252,14; wit, 125,18
- *nun*, at present, 134,18; at this point, 165,8; 259,11; currently, 175,15; in the present context, 311,20; just, 166,15; now, 142,13.21; on this occasion, 211,19; 248,27; present, 234,2; presently, 306,8; *nun de*, actually, 168,26; 169,2; as it is, 234,28; at present, 276,14; in fact, 126,2; 260,12, etc.
- *nux*, night, 140,16; 141,14
- *oikeios*, his, its, their, 157,10; 199,28; 226,18; 233,16; own, 129,2, etc.; proper, 161,25; 289,8; 297,17; *oikeiôs*, appropriately, 154,27
- oikhesthai, to go by the board, 190,5; to perish, 235,15
- *oikia*, house, 149,1; 159,7.9; 220,1; 257,10.12
- oikodomein, to build, 262,8, etc.
- *oikodomia*, building (sc. the process), 249,23; 262,4
- *oikodomos*, builder, 159,8; 249,21; 262,4.7
- *oikonomia*, arrangement, 120,24; 197,23
- okhlêsis, obstruction, 189,21; 259,5
- ombros, rain, 159,12

omma, eye, 236,2; 266,14 onkos, extent, 283,4 and note there; 283,6; space, 283,7 onoma, word, 148,11; 155,6; 156,1.27; 157,9; 162,4; 170,8.11; other tr., 157,17 onomazein, to call, 139,17; to describe as, 238,7; 297,25; other tr., 139,16 ophthalmos, eye, 151,14; 166,17; 194,11; 202,4 opsis, act of seeing, 270,6.11.12.13.15; sight, 151,11; vision, 210,8; 270,3.18.23; visual image, 286,4 [to] orekton, object of desire, 270,27.29 orexis, desire, 260,7.17; 263,20; 270,28;271,1organikos, instrumental, 159.7; 160, 10organon, instrument, 122,11; 159,10; 160,10; organ, 236,6 orthos, correct, 170,8; right, 312,17; orthê [gônia], right angle, 208,13.18.21; orthôs, correctly, 140.21ôsis, pushing, 284,27; thrust, 275,24 [to] ostoun, bone, 287,26; 308,4.7.9 ostrakon, shell, 292,21 ôthein, to push, 277,30; 278,1 ouranios, heavenly, 123,26, etc. ouranos, the heaven, 126,6, etc. ousia, being, 131,24, etc.; essence, 217,24.26; 243,10-269,5; existence, 221,13; substance, 124,1, etc. ousiôdês, essential, 256,9; of the essence, 256,8 ousiôsis, being, 149,9; other tr., 160.11ousiousthai, to have [its] essence, 243,24; 244,3; 249,17; 251,2.11.13; 252,24; 254,14; 262,2; 269,12; oxus, bright, 282,21 paidagôgein, to school, 144,18 paidourgos, reproductive, 284,4 paides Hellênôn, Hellenes, 287,4; 290.10pakhus, dense, 283,11; solid, 290,20 [to] pan, universe, 120,5; 123,20; 128,12.13; 130,25, etc.

pantelôs, completely, 166,21; entirely, 176,13

- *pantôs*, absolutely, 126,23, etc.; certainly, 121,7, etc.; in every case, 126,20, etc.
- *paradeigma*, model, 188,19; pattern, 141,3.5; 147,20; 159,8-160,2; 218,12; 224,23-225,4
- *paradeigmatikos*, paradigmatic, 122,12; 159,7

paradidonai, to hand, 166,9; to present, 188,7; 224,2; to teach, 196,6.22; 197,21; 198,7

paragein, to bring, 158,15.19; 252,4; to bring into existence, 142,11, etc.; to invoke, 201,4; to offer, 200,27

paragignesthai, to be present, 269,17; to come, 149,5.8

- paragôgê, production, 143,12
- *parakeisthai*, to be adjacent, 284,20; to be nearby, 275,1
- *parakolouthein*, to follow, 188,11; 224,6

paralambanein, to employ, 156,8; 187,5; 200,13; 204,9; to take, 170,13; 207,10; to take over, 164,16; 165,9.11; to use, 194,9; 201,9; 265,24

- *parallatein*, to be out of one's mind, 136,9; 177,7
- *paralogismos*, piece of sophistry, 248,5; 249,5

paralogizesthai, to mislead (by fallacious arguments), 237,21; 240,27

- paratasis, continuance, 170,3
- *paratithesthai*, to cite, 179,22; 211,27; 223,24
- pareinai, to be present, 152,5, etc.; to currently exist, 151,22; other tr., 141,1; 166,21; 171,14; 240,2; 270,25; 299,18; 300,24; parôn, present, 159,4; 167,13.16
- *parekbainein*, to digress, 170,10; to get away from, 248,21
- *parektropê*, deviation, 303,1
- parenkheirein, to tamper, 193,23
- *parerkhesthai*, to arrive on the scene, 172,13
- *parexêgeisthai*, to misinterpret, 135,2
- *paristanai*, (trans. forms) to present, 135,1; 141,13; to produce,

211,20; to provide, 182,27; to show, 248,25; (intrans.) to defend, 297,12

pariteon, should be avoided, 281,7

- *paskhein*, to be acted upon, 236,11.18; to be affected, 235,23; 237,2.5; to be subject to, 234,6; to find oneself in [a condition], 131,20; to suffer, 233,23.25; 234,21.22.28; 235,1.3; 241,18; to undergo, 231,2; *[to] paskhon*, passive principle, 270,20.21
- *patêr*, father, 128,1, etc.
- *pathêtikos*, emotive, 265,21; 266,1
- *pathos*, affliction, 233,11.18; change, 234,6; effect, 233,15; passion, 245,5
- *patrios*, ancestral, 174,25; 179,14
- *pauesthai*, to cease, 144,9.10; 149,3; 257,10; 288,13.18.19.22
- *paula*, cessation, 239,23; 240,18; 245,19; 271,16.20; 272,1.7.11.18.19.20; 288,15; 299,14
- *pêgê*, fount, 243,5; 271,23
- *perainesthai*, to be finite, 201,11; 235,14; 238,12; 298,3; 300,17; 303,19; to be limited, 258,9; *peperasmenos*, finite, 125,3; 201,17; 235,5-242,10; 281,19; 297,15-303,2
- *peras*, end, 134,21; 197,4; 258,12; limit, 257,10.11.14.16; surface, 281,11
- *peratoun*, to limit, 257,20
- *periagesthai*, to revolve, 228,15; 292,4
- *periaptein*, to bring against, 122,5
- periballein, to wrap around, 289,4
- peridinêsis, rotation, 276,12
- *periekhein*, to bracket, 258,14; to circumscribe, 187,20; 188,4; to contain, 151,16; 152,2; to embrace, 257,25; to enclose, 292,22; to encompass, 301,25.26; 302,19; to include, 180,20.21.28; to shroud, 270,10; *[to] periekhon*, environment, 231,3.5; 233,9.17; 303,15
- perigeios, earthly, 290,6
- *periistanai*, surround, 232,11
- perilambanein, to encompass, 294,5
- *periodos*, circuit, 228,13; 229,8.13; cycle, 213,1; revolution, 230,5;

292,8; *ek periodôn*, in a round about way, 224,21

periphereia, surface, 306,14

- peripherês, round, 276,26
- peripheresthai, to rotate, 188,1
- *periphora*, circular movement, 197,9; 256,25
- *peripiptein*, to fall foul of, 142,15; other tr., 177,18
- peritithenai, to foist upon, 134,26
- perix topos, the periphery, 289,14
- phainesthai, to appear, 269,10; to be seen, 140,9; 265,13; 280,17; to be shown, 149,23; to be visible, 131,21; 184,10; to seem, 150,2, etc.; other tr., 222,20; 261,16; 262,1 (+ participle), clearly, 126,16, etc.
- *phaneros*, clear, 243,14; visible, 203,17; *phanerôs*, clearly, 218,20
- *phantasia*, imagination, 291,17; other tr., 292,10
- pharmakon, remedy, 125,23
- pherein, to adduce, 216,26; to apply, 140,20; 142,6.14; to carry, 279,17; to produce, 125,13; to use, 161,27; pheresthai, to be in circulation, 145,17; 223,12; to be of an opinion, 145,24; 223,18; to have an opinion, 145,15; to move, 198,25; 278,8; to travel, 276,26; 288,9; 291,21; 293,7; phere, say, 284,18; not translated, 268,28; 282,14; phere eipein, to take an instance, 218,1
- *philoneikos*, contentious, 143,24; 224,17
- *philosophein*, to state as a philosophical principle, 182,21; other tr., 228,11
- philosophia, philosophy, 135,10
- *philosophos*, philosopher, 124,16, etc.; philosophical, 187,4
- phora, locomotion, 256,22
- *phôs*, light, 134,1, etc.
- phôtizein, to illuminate, 147,9; 269,10-14; 282,11.17; to light up, 282,19; [to] phôtizon, source of illumination, 269,24.27
- *phronein*, to understand, other tr., 229,24
- *phthartikos*, destructive, 231,1; 234,18; 303,3

- *phthartos*, perishable, 124,11; 125,2; 129,9-130,14; 164,11; 202,3, etc.
- *phtheirein*, to destroy, 125,2; 222,11.12; 272,12; 300,15-309,24; *phtheiresthai*, to cease, 258,2; to perish, 126,21, etc.
- *phthinein*, to decay, 233,12; 235,24; 237,2.5; to waste away, 232,13
- *phthisis*, diminution, 258,6.9; waste, 231,9.10; 236,10
- *phthonos*, envy, 225,2
- *phthora*, decay, 149,6; destruction, 129,26; 130,8.15.18; 303,14.16; passing out of existence, 120,6, etc.
- *phthoropoios*, destructive, 234,5; of destruction, 301,27
- phusikos, natural, 134,17; 143,13, etc.; physical, 195,21; 227,25; 228,3; 285,19; 311,10; [hoi] phusikoi, natural philosophers, 183,5; 212,18; 281,14
- *phusiologein*, to produce theories of the nature [of a thing], 134,8; to write [about something] as a natural scientist, 163,8
- phusis, nature, 120,21, etc.; phusei, naturally, 234,8; 237,7; 240,21.24; 241,26; 242,1; 244,17; 260,1; huper phusin, supernaturally, 237,14; 240,22; 278,21-279,10; kata phusin, naturally, 237,4.7; 246,4.24.25; 277,8-279,10; 287,13-304,7
- *phuton*, plant, 128,23; 129,1; 138,5; 149,2; 184,6; 203,9
- *pisteuein*, to believe, 187,13; 190,22; 191,6.8; 267,15; 268,14
- *pistis*, evidence, 155.17; 195,8; 201,25; 203,7
- *pistousthai*, to prove, 196,24; 253,15
- [to] pithanon, speciousness, 125,13
- [epi ta] plagia, sideways, 292,24
- *planês*, planet, 141,10; 147,4.5
- [hai] planômenai, planetary spheres, 198,16.20.26
- *[hoi] planômenoi*, planets, 198,9.10; 199,4.6.13
- *plêroun*, to fill, 287,27
- *plêthuntikôs*, using the plural, 160,12.17
- *ploion*, ship, 149,1; 196,3; 266,29; 267,3.5

- **pneuma**, air, 236,4; pneuma, 288,9, wind, 276,16
- poiein, to act, 236,19; to bring about, 284,24; to build, 159,9; to carry out, 136,19; 199,1; 217,25; to cause, 232,13; to construct, 181,23; 182,9.11; to do, 126,2; 191,7; 215,26; 216,23; 295,5; 310,16; to engage in, 252,13; to have, 199,10; to make, etc.; to perform, 121,14; to produce, 186,24, etc.; to recast, 136,16; to turn into, 202,21; other translations, incl. with a noun as periphrasis for a verb (cf. LSJ II.5); [ho] poiêsas, maker, 143,6; [to] poioun, maker, 142,21; 239,5; 298,20
- *poiêsis*, constructing, 217,7; making, 164,18
- *poiêtês*, maker, 139,25; 159,27; 172,19; the Poet (sc. Homer), 186,22; 191,24
- poiêtikos, efficient, 122,11; 130,10; 159,6-161,11; 171,1.5; 173,23-174,24; 180,10; 183,8-186,3; poetic, 191,18.22
- poikilia, subtlety, 125,18
- *poikilos*, subtle, 125,21; varied, 128,24
- *[to] poion*, quality, 256,21
- *poiotês*, quality, 146,19; 154,3; 210,19; 219,21
- *polos*, pole, 198,16
- *ponêros*, evil, 241,16
- porphura, purple fish, 292,19
- [to] poson, quantity, 256,21
- pote, at a moment, 138,25; at some time, 152,14; 167,18.20; 289,27; eventually, 235,15; ever, 139,16; 141,3; 142,26, etc.; once, 126,8; 217,23; sometimes, 255,11; 264,22; 275,9; pote ... pote, at one time ... at another, 274,24, etc.
- *pous*, foot, 277,16; other tr., 284,26; *para podas*, irrelevant, 120,9
- *pragma*, thing, 120,21; 181,9, etc.; trouble, 126,28; undertaking, 136,6; 177,5; other tr., 188,24; 194,13; 199,23; *[ta] pragmata*, the facts, 127,4; 135,7, etc.
- pragmateia, treatise, 302,23
- pragmateiôdês, based on the facts,

243,21; 248,7; germane, 127,12; main, 134,19

- praktikos, practical, 255,6
- *proagein*, to bring, 132,14; to draw, 253,24
- *proagoumenôs*, as a first priority, 216,16
- *proairesis*, choice, 260,8.17.21.23.27; 270,12; 271,8
- *proairetikôs*, by choice, 247,10; 260,29
- *problêma*, problem, 136,16; 156,14.21; 164,3.8; 174,1.18.19; 175,26; 176,23; 183,19; 192,5; 193,19; 194,20; 216,17; question, 135,6; 168,20; 173,16; 214,17
- *proektithenai*, to quote above, 136,23; to quote as a preliminary, 127,28
- *proepinoein*, to conceive of as, 148,19; 158,11
- proerkhesthai (incl. proienai), to go on, 165,13; 172,8; to proceed, 206,22; 251,24; 252,17; 254,12; proelthôn, afterwards, 214,16; later, 164,15; 191,19; proïôn, below, 274,5; in the sequel, 157,2; later, 165,4; 191,19
- prognôsis, foreknowledge, 279,1
- *prokeisthai*, to be proposed, 136,17; other tr., 122,4; 156,28; 163,7; 248,21; *prokeimenos*, present, 126,24; 127,12, etc.; previous, 213,10; 215,25; set, 135,24; under discussion, 167,1; *[to]*
 - *prokeimenon*, matter (before us, in hand), 137,2; 212,2; 256,18; question being posed, 214,23; question under discussion, 131,26
- *prokheirizesthai*, to take in turn, 149,21
- prokrinein, to prefer, 125,14
- *pronoia*, providence, 131,20.23; 187,9-191,12
- [*ta*] *pros ti*, relative terms, 210,23.24.25; relatives, 210,13; 308,27
- *prosaptein*, to ascribe, 229,4; to bring against, 156,4; to add, 157,25; to link, 168,28
- *prosballein*, to attack, 233,22; 294,3; 296,1.27; 300,14; 301,16.21.22;

302,9.16.21; 303,10.13; to fall upon, 270,18

- prosdiorismos, qualification, 125,12; 173,17
- *prosdiorizesthai*, to define further, 237,23
- *prospatheia*, passionate attachment, 252,11
- *prospheresthai*, to be taken in, 303,16
- *prospiptein*, to assail, 232,12; 233,14; 234,27; to meet, 187,21; 188,5
- prosrêma, word, 142,5.6.24
- *prostithenai*, to add, 132,9; 134,12, etc.; to introduce, 193,12
- protasis, proposition, 173,16
- *protithesthai*, to pose [a question], 214,6.9; to set oneself the task of, 214,20; to set out to, 209,16; to undertake, 134,18; 139,15; 166,5; 176,5; other tr., 127,27; 134,22
- *proüparkhein*, to pre-exist, 141,18; 220,18; 221,3.16
- *proüphistasthai*, to be already in existence, 158,26
- [hoi] proüpomnêmatisamenoi, earlier commentators, 145,1; 198,4
- *psilos*, alone, 276,13; without any commentary, 197,18
- psimuthion, white lead, 194,22
- psophos, sound, 270,3.7.8.24
- psukhê, mind, 208,13.14; soul, 175,9-23; 179,25; 180,20; 191,12; 195,10-199,26; 234,16.17; 241,10; 243,2-293,19
- *psukhein*, to chill, 233,9; to cool, 234,13; 276,14
- *psukhikos*, of the soul, 292,21; psychic, 288,9
- *psukhogonia*, generation of the soul, 124,4.5; 196,20; 197,16; 199,22
- psukhoun, to animate, 195,19
- psukhros, cold, 232,11; 275,4;
- 307,26; 308,5.6.18; 309,21.22 *psuxis*, cold, 232,22
- *puknoun*, to cause to contract, 275,4 *pur*, fire, 194,22, etc.

[to] rheuston, mutability, 230,7

sanis, planking, 202,19 *sarx*, flesh, 308,13; tissue, 287,26

- *selênê*, moon, 141,9, etc.
- sêmainein, to indicate, 185,20; to intend, 147,12; to mean, 155,15, etc.; to refer to, 185,8; 227,3; 311,21; to signify, 170,5; other tr., 144,1; [to] sêmainomenon, meaning, 155,6.7; sense, 121,20.22, etc.
- sêmasia, meaning, 161,26; 186,8
- *sêmeion*, point, 187,20; 188,2.5;
- 197,7; 198,13; 199,2.9; sign, 216,8 [to] sesophismenon, sophistical
- nature, 126,28
- *sidêros*, iron, 241,18; 245,28; 274,22; 275,1.16
- *skelos*, leg, 276,20; *dia skelôn*, on foot, 277,6
- skhêma, figure, 148,14; 187,19; 188,3; 292,1; shape, 159,10; 165,3; 201,13; 220,27; 257,12; 276,27.29; 284,6.11; 287,14.16.19; 292,13.21; 293,1; 305,11; 308,22.24.25
- *skhesis*, pattern, 147,3; relation, 151,26, etc.
- *skopein*, to ask, 139,19; 140,3; 174,18; 192,8; 200,14; 258,10; to consider, 134,6; 135,26; 156,15; 174,15; 177,26; 225,15; 288,24; to investigate, 192,14; to look at,178,23
- *skopos*, goal, 192,2; intention, 173,14; objective; 135,23.25; 136,12; subject, 248,21
- *skotos*, darkness, 134,1; 270,10
- *smilê*, chisel, 159,11
- sôizein, to preserve, 303,6;
 sôizesthai, to remain intact, 219,13; 275,2; [to] sôizesthai, preservation, 240,6; 299,22
- sôma, body, 139,21, etc. (esp. chs. 6 & 7); bodily, 259,7; 265,4; 305,25; 306,26; corporeal thing (entity, object), 150,3-9; 163,27; 164,11; 203,15
- sômatikos, bodily, corporeal, 137,18; 138,14; 147,24; 196,14; 227,28; 229,4; 230,8; 231,18; 237,18; 245,4; 256,19; 263,21
- *sômatoeidês*, corporeal, 138,1; 229,6
- *sômatousthai*, to become body, 164,22.23
- sophistikos, sophistical, 156,9
- sophizein, see sesophismenon

- sophos, ingenious, 125,23; learned, 129,16; 132,9; 184,15; 186,6; 277,17; [ho] sophos, philosopher, 266,16; 274,8
- sôstikos, preservative, 303,4.19
- *sôtêria*, maintenance, 175,2; 179,17; salvation, 131,23; survival, 129,4
- *speirein*, to sow, 189,18
- *sperma*, seed, 257,13
- *sphaira*, sphere, 187,2; 197,19; 199,17; 208,8; 292,3.22
- sphairikos, spherical, 287,12.13.24
- sphairoeidês, spherical, 287,11.22
- stakhus, corn, 189,18
- *stasis*, rest, 188,17; 224,11; 257,22
- *stathmê*, plumbline, 159,11
- stereisthai, to be deprived of, 139,10; 251,23; 286,3.4.5; to be devoid of, 176,13; 205,25; 206,7.10; to be excluded from, 209,22; to be without, 206,6; 207,12; 209,1
- *stereos*, solid, 151,10; 287,25
- *sterêsis*, lack, 210,8; privation, 257,16; 294,20-296,20; 306,10-313,4
- stoikheion, book, 179,18; component, 206,21; 218,20; 305,14.24; element, 124,10; 138,9; 201,26-204,4; 232,17-234,26; 256,23; 285,15; 286,29; 307,3-8; letter, 148,12; [tôn] stoikheiôn holotêtes, elemental masses, 202,11-203,2; 287,3
- stoma, mouth, 303,16
- *sukê*, fig tree, 307,23
- *sukophantein*, to misrepresent, 127,8; 134,24
- sullabê, syllable, 148,11
- *sullogismos*, (logical) argument, 248,5
- sullogizesthai, to argue, 163,21; 184,2; 204,17; 273,11; to conclude, 204,28, 273,8; to draw a conclusion, 183,20, etc.; deduce, 184,15, etc.; infer, 124,9, etc.; prove, 200,7; other trans. 122,1
- *sumbainein*, to be a property, 270,17; to befall, 233,17; 311,1; to come about, 197,26; to emerge, 217,9; to follow, 159,22; 171,4; to happen, 151,26; 292,15; to involve, 190,28; to turn out, 250,18; other tr., 202,22.24; 268,3; *[to]*

- *sumbebêkos*, accident, 181,1; 307,15; 308,16.19.21; 309,10; *kata*
- sumbebêkos, accidentally, 308,11
- sumballein, to be relevant, 166,10 summetaballein, to change along
- with, 276,4; 277,1 *summethistan*, to change as well,
- 276,5
- summetria, regularity, 131,18
- summetros, correct, 233,11
- *sumparateinesthai*, to exist alongside, 273,27
- sumperasma, conclusion, 154,19
- *sumperiagein*, to carry around (with), 276,8.9; 292,3
- *sumperiekhein*, to encompass, 180,17; 181,4
- *sumperilambanein*, to include, 180,24.26
- *sumpêxin ekhein*, to be framed, 138,10
- *sumpherein*, to help, 136,21; 139,11
- *sumphônein*, to be in accord (with), 170,15; 264,24; to agree, 173,5
- *sumphônos*, consistent, 193,7; 226,9; in accord, 149,23; in agreement, 272,8; *sumphônôs*, in conformity with, 229,1
- *sumphtheiresthai*, to perish together, 247,8
- *sumphutos*, innate, 128,18; 228,18
- *sumplêrôtikos*, constitutive, 256,7 *sumpnoia*, concord, 283,19
- sunagein, to conclude, 126,17.26; 127,26; 225,3; 237,24; 304,4; to infer, 297,1.16
- *sunaïdios*, co-everlasting, 126,9; 273,2
- sunaisthêsis, awareness, 198,1
- *sunalétheuein*, to be true at the same time (at once),151,5; 227,18; 291,13; 302,10
- *sunanairein*, to deny simultaneously, 245,11; to eliminate also, 267,11
- sunapelenkhein, to refute along with, 273,19
- sunapollusthai, to perish along
 with, 303,21
- *sunapophainein*, to declare at the same time, 212,23
- *sunapophthengesthai*, to repeat an apophthegm, 179,20

- sunaptein, to connect, join, 197,4.5.6; 239,24; 240,1; 255,22; 281,8; 299,15.16; 300,23;
 sunaptesthai, to be in contact with, 280,23
- sunaptikos, hypothetical, 191,17
- *sunarmozein*, to put together, 130,25; to frame, 134,8; 228,16
- *sundein*, to bind, bind to, bind together, 119,14.16.17; 131,27; 132,3.20.24; 133,16.17.19.21.22.23; 311,12
- sundesis, binding together, 121,9
- *sundesmos*, bond, link, 195,22; 266,4; conjunction, 123,22; 191,16.20.25.28; 192,17
- sunêgoria, advocacy, 248,22
- suneinai, to coexist with, 271,4.11
- *suneisagein*, to imply also, 183,22; 245,10; 254,17
- sunekheia, continuity, 284,27; integrity, 291,16; other tr., 208,3; kata sunekheian, continuously, 258,3; smoothly, 258,17; without a break, 183,15
- *sunekhein*, to hold together, 227,26; 237,19; 252,15
- sunekhês, continuous, 201,13.17; 205,10; 208,7.25; 209,6; 260,9; 277,30; 280,20; 283,16.18; 288,2.20; kata to sunekhes, continuously, 138,13
- sunepesthai, to attend, 255,1
- *sunergos*, co-worker, 164,4; 176,26
- *sunerkhesthai*, to coalesce, 232,1; come together, 153,19; 306,19
- sunienai, to observe (paraphrase
 used), 194,18
- sunistanai, (trans. forms) to construct, 175,21; to establish, 297,13; to frame, 232,4.5; to put together, 131,8; (intrans. forms) to be, be composed, be constructed, be fabricated, be framed, be in existence, be put together, come into existence, consist, derive from, exist, 138,10; 140,17; 141,25; 143,2; 146,5; 165,4.22; 175,1; 179,15; 201,27; 203,15.22; 212,10; 213,6; 219,4; 233,3; 234,25; 235,1; 243,22; 304,21; 305,3
- sunkatatithenai, to agree with,

201,28; to subscribe to, 148,2; 154,4; 192,12; 251,9

- sunkeisthai, to be composed, 124,11; 148,17; 154,23; 157,16.19; 158,11.15; 160,22; 161,4.5; 162,1; 164,5; 165,20; 166,3.16; 203,8; to be constructed, 148,15; to be compounded, 246,23; to consist, 218,15; *[ta ex hôn] sunkeitai*, [a thing's] components, 154,2; 226,22
- *sunkhôrein*, to accept, 144,13; 248,27; to agree, 183,21; 184,2, etc; to concede, 127,19; 150,24, etc.; to leave room, 215,9; other tr. 248,12
- sunkhusis, confusion, 267,20
- *sunklêrousthai*, to be the lot of, 215,7
- sunkrinein, to combine, 210,6.21
- *sunkuklein*, to assist the revolution of, 228,13; to carry around with, 229,12; 241,4
- sunônumôs, synonymously, 150,6
- *sunoran*, to grasp, 139,11; to note, 152,26; to see, 166,10.11; other tr., 165,18
- *suntaxis*, association, 240,4; 299,20; 300,26
- sunteleia, completed action, 170,5
- suntelein, to contribute to, 216,20
- *sunthesis*, composition, 146,17; 148,20.23; 157,19; 158,1.8.18.20.22; 159,18;
 - 165,21.22; 206,14.16; 207,17; synthesis, 219,26
- sunthetos, composed, 122,16; 146,14-166,15; 286,21; 291,7; composite, 122,27; 146,13-172,26; 190,9; 193,3; 200,25; 201,3-23; 206,23; [to] suntheton, component, 291,15
- *suntithenai*, to combine, 158,14; to compose, 126,11; 148,12; 153,25; 158,2.5; 160,25; 291,29; to construct, 187,17; to put together, 122,1; 146,14.15
- *[eis tauto] suntrekhein*, to come to the same thing, 148,16
- *sunuparkhein*, to also belong, 279,6; to also exist, 267,17; 268,16; to be coexistent with, 219,8, etc.; to coexist, 182,8; coexist with, 218,17, etc.; to exist together, 247,7

- sunuphistanai, (intrans. form) to coexist, 262,13
- suresthai, to crawl, 277,7
- *suskhêmatizein*, to shape to, 283,26; 284,2
- sustasis, construction, 218,3; 219,7; fabric, 249,6; formation, 121,4; 143,26; 162,6; 203,3; 216,21; framing, 141,18.20; 165,8.15; ekhein tên sustasin, to be constituted, 166,19; to be constructed, 164,10; 218,1
- *sustellein*, to pack into, note at 283,5
- sustolê, systole, 288,8
- tautotês, sameness, 196,28; 198,27
- *taxis*, arrangement, 219,21; order, 120,23; 183,10, etc.; ordering, 165,23
- tekhnê, art, 183,24; other tr. 236,11
- tekhnêtos, man-made, 208,8
- *tekhnikos*, skilled, 266,28; trained, 265,25
- *tekmêrion*, evidence, 165,7; 186,23; indication, 123,3; 173,3; 220,13
- *teleios*, complete, 232,24.25; perfect, 191,3; 253,26; 294,6; 301,24
- teleiôsis, perfection, 131,24; 257,14
- *teleiotês*, perfection, 167,15; 256,8
- *teleiôtikos*, perfective, 256,12
- *telikos*, final, 122,12; 159,7.26; 160,3
- *telos*, end, 159,11, etc.; *dia telous*, throughout, 141,6
- *temnein*, to cut, 198,13
- *[to] tetragônon*, square, 218,2.15; 219,5.7
- thalassa, sea, 281,16.20
- *thanatos*, death, 226,3.23.25; 227,3.5.8; 229,16
- *thaumasios*, fine fellow, 200,25
- *thaumastos*, extraordinary, 161,29; 178,24
- *thaumazein*, to be at a loss, 172,21; *axion thaumasai*, to be a matter for amazement, 184,5; 186,6
- *theios*, divine, 142,6; 162,16, etc.; holy 128,15
- thelein, see ethelein
- themelia, foundations, 257,11
- *theologos*, religious thinker, 290,7; theologian, 212,17.21; 213,20
- *theophorêtos*, divinely inspired, 241,15

- *theôrein*, to observe, 137,19; 182,3.7; 205,8.11; 263,22; 308,21; to see, 160,1; 206,1; to think of, 190,18; other tr. 148,21; 253,12
- theôrêma, theory, 163,24
- *theôria*, theory, 163,25; other tr., 175,26; 279,2
- theos, god, God, 121,4, etc.
- *therizein*, to reap, 189,18; to harvest (paraphrase used), 189,19
- *thermainein*, to heat, 233,10; 234,13; 269,10.11.13.15; 276,13
- *thesis*, affirmation, 245,9.10; position, 289,27
- thnêtos, mortal, 124,20, etc.
- *tithenai*, to add, 217,8; to adduce, 224,21; to assert, 192,24; 227,7; to consider, 248,20; to describe, 213,22; to hold, 249,5; 304,4; to make, 120,10; to make the subject, 174,19; 175,5; 194,21; to posit, 168,4; to postulate, 241,28; 220,8; to put, 224,17; to state, 249,1; to subscribe to, 171,25; other tr., 149,19
- *tomên poieisthai*, to divide up, 181,9
- *topikos*, local, 260,28; 263,20; *topikôs*, from place to place, 260,8; in a spatial sense, 307,5.6; locally, 260,24
- *topos*, passage, 173,7; place, 256,22, etc.; position, 259,20; 275,27; 276,3.5; 277,13; region, 290,5; shape, 287,24; sphere, 290,6; topic, 210,5; other tr., 275,28; 276,3; 289,15.19; *kata topon*, local, 194,17; 244,19; 245,27; 258,10; 260,16-261,15; 263,26; 274,2-275,18; 276,15; locally, 260,5; 274,18
- *trephein*, to nourish, 231,8; *trephesthai*, to take nourishment, 263,18
- *trigônon*, triangle, 148,14.15; 188,23; 208,12.17.20.22; 218,16; 308,22
- *trikhêi diastatos*, three-dimensional, 155,2; 201,10 *trokhos*, wheel, 276,20.22.24.29 *tropê*, change, 137,18; 203,24; 284,9

trophê, food, 231,10; 236,9; nourishment, 236,6

tropikos, see therinos tropikos

- *tropos*, form, 127,24; manner, 197,27; 240,227; method, 175,22; 190,5.8; mode, 276,25.27.29; 277,5.6.17; sense, 145,7; 171,21; 204,8; 231,22; usage, 191,18; way, 125,7; 218,7; 269,16; other tr., 181,8; 260,26
- xenia, entertainment, 135,26
- *xenos*, unusual, 156,8
- xêrainein, to dry, 233,10
- xêros, dry, 308,5.6.9
- *xêrotês*, dryness, 232,23
- xulon, timber, 159,10; wood, 208,17
- *xumpiptein*, to collapse, 267,24; 268,4
- xunnoein, to be aware of, 162,9
- zên, to have life, live, 210,15; 263,15.17.23; 265,10.27; other tr., 230,2.8; 263,18
- *zêtein*, to ask, 122,15, etc.; to demand, 188,18; to examine, 139,15; to inquire, 150,23; 176,10; 213,18; 216,17; to investigate, 166,6.18; to search for, 279,27; to seek (out), 168,22, etc.; (pass.) to be under investigation, 136,22; other tr., 145,13; 175,11; 176,4.16; 214,6.9.21; 223,8
- zêtêsis, investigation, 164,7; 176,26; question, 156,28; 157,22; other tr., 176,15
- zêtêteon, [we] should ask, 205,23
- **zôê**, life, 162,22; 167,16; 230,13-272,19; 288,16.19
- *zôidiakos, zôidiakos kuklos,* zodiac, 198,12.17; 292,5
- *zôion*, animal, 128,22, etc.; creature, 129,10.25; 130,4.8.17; living creature, 130,17; 162,16, etc.
- *zôopoiein*, to endow with life, give life (to), 195,19; 244,25; 253,12; 263,7.10.11; 266,5
- *zôtikos*, vital, 254,11; 265,9; other tr., 251,12; 264,21
- *zugon*, Libra, 198,14

Subject Index

For the most part I index topics rather than attempt to summarise arguments, but I have included extremely brief summaries of the arguments of Proclus under the entry for Proclus. (Summaries of the sections of Philoponus' refutations of these, perhaps by Philoponus himself, appear in the translation.) I have also included all proper names that occur in the translation with a full list of occurrences or, in a few cases, an indication of the number of times they occur. References are to the page and line numbers of Rabe's Greek text, which are printed in the margins of the translation, those to Proclus' arguments, or to substantial quotations from other works of his, being in bold.

accidents

generation of, 307,15; 308,14-309,12 Acragantine, 212,13 activity relation to essence, 251,16-252,7 Alexander, of Aphrodisias, 191,20; 211,28; 212,14; 213,16; 217,16; 222.1:223.3best commentator on Aristotle, 223.1on the interpretation of the Timaeus, 213,18-216,23; 217,16-221,22 ambiguity, see meanings – need to define and distinguish analysis into components, notional, 148,11-23; 226,21-227,22 words and syllables into letters, 148,11 rectangles into triangles, 148,11 into matter and form, 148,16; 153,18-25; 158,10 Anaxagoras only Presocratic to give generation of world an efficient cause, 183,11 Ares (sc. the planet Mars), 199,17.21 Aristotle, 132,13, etc. (mentioned 49 times) best witness for views of Plato. 211,20; believes that he held that world created, 135,11; 145,15;

167,6; 168,10; 211,19; 211,24-8; 222,16; 223,10; and that he alone generated time, 222,23 on senses of 'generated', 155,19 criticises those who describe the world as created for didactic purposes, 188,14; 216,26-217,15 held that world neither comes to be nor perishes, 297,10 held no body possesses infinite power, 297,4 difficulty of his style, 212,1 Atticus, see Plutarch and Atticus, circle of beings, rational salvation and perfection of, 131,23 bodv always changing, 137,18 perishable by nature, 297,16; 312.25needs constant restoration, 137,20 relation to soul non-essential, 252.28has finite power, 235,4; 238,9; 242,9; 297,14.27 rectilinear movement proper to perishable, 274,6; circular or none to imperishable, 274,10 capacity for life in, 264,2-16; 265,1 life of cannot exist apart from, 251,4 body, everlasting, see body, luminous body, heavenly, see elements body, luminous, 273,11-293,22 its existence, 273,18-23 its movement natural, supernatural or forced?, 278, 12-279, 26 its own movement: spiral?, 274,3-6; 290,23-293,7; rectilinear?, 274,6-10; 290,9-22; motionless?, 274,11; 278,12-279,26; circular?, 274,12-15; 275,22-278,11; 287,28-288,24 perishable body moved by soul through it, 262,23-263,4; 275,17 way in which moves perishable body: through its own local movement?, 274,17-20; without itself moving?, 274,20-275,17; through being moved locally by soul?, 275.17-20 location relative to perishable body, 280,8-285,2 composition, 285, 3-288, 24 shape, 287, 10-28 not found in Plato, 293,14 Caesareans (sc. inhabitants of Caesarea in Palestine), 211,17 cause(s) superior to effect, 251,25 proximate, 130,9 efficient, 130,10 the six Platonic, 159,5-13; not in question at Tim. 28B, 159,13-162,3 cause of all things one, 178,20-179,25; 182,21; 207,21 the first cause the cause of all things, 207,20 reasons for many things, perhaps all, elude us, 131,11 Christian writers, 229,11 colours stimulation of vision as parallel to soul's movement of body, 270,2-24 coming to be, see generation common conceptions, etc., concerning God cause of all things, 179,10 creator of world, 126,20; 174,11-175,7 best of creators, 128,17

cannot become evil, 128,18 contradictions both sides of cannot be true, 151,4; 227,18; 291,13; 302,10 contraries (enantia) always able to change into one another, 294,14-19; 295,6-18 generation from the contrary, 307,14-309,12 conversion by negation, 150,14; 204,12; 225,18; 268,20 creator. see God Cronus (sc. the planet Saturn), 199,17.18 Democritus, 213,6; 222,21; 233,1 desire, object of its stimulation of desire as parallel for soul's movement of body, 270,27-271,2 dialectic the coping-stone of philosophy, 181.7Dionysius, II, Tyrant of Syracuse, 178.26disorderly, the, and the ordered, 294,19-295,21 as privation and possession (or form), 294,20-295,6; 295,13-18; 309,14; 311,20; 312,2 as contraries, 295,6-13; 312,26 division, technique of must follow natural divisions, 181,8 error of dividing into an included and an including class, 180,14-181,5 elements the four earthly, 201,26-203,17; 285,4; 286,17.21-9 the fifth, or heavenly, 241, 4.9; 278,25; 281,25; 285,7; 286,18; 287,1-10; 289,4.9; 291,21 a sixth (hypothetical), 285,7 proper place, 288,25-289,28; 291,19 elemental masses, 202,11-203,2; 285,10; 286,23; 287,3 Empedocles, 212, 12; 213, 3 Ephesian, 212,13 Ephorus, 147,17 Epicureans, 176,19 essence relation to activity, 251,16-252,7

eternity, 298,4-13 is infinite power, 238,14; 298,5 eternal things are unchanging, 209, 16-23eternal things are outside of time, 209.16-23eternal things possess being, power, perfection of activity 'all at once', 167,13 ether, 241,3-10; 276,9; 278,24 Euclid, 187,19 Eusebius, 211,18 evil spirits, 241,16 form, see matter and form generated (genêtos) meaning of word, 145,1-147,9; 148,7-149,16; 193,25 sense that applies to the world, 147,9-25; 147,25-148,7; 149,6.11.15; 149,27-182,25; 193,25-194,22 what is generated perishes, **120,6**; 126,18; 144,3; 225,23 generation (genesis) the path from non-being to being, 257,17continuous, 138,16-144,15 out of a contrary, 307,14-309,12 out of a privation, 308,19-309,12 genus predicated synonymously, 150,6 God no potentiality in, 132,4-28 always actual creator so always creates, 225,6 without envy, 225,2.5 always good so always creates, 225.5cannot become evil, **119,21**; 128,17; 129,17.25; 133,1-134,16 cause of all things, 178,25; 262,10 source of being and well-being for all things, 177,16 creates instantaneously and by thought alone, 149,9; uses no instrument in creating, 160,10 creating does not involve him in movement or change, 143,15 creates soul, 179,23 will, 310,23-312,7.21

does not wish individuals to be everlasting, 129,4-13 only he could dissolve world, 119,14-18 dominion over all things, 177,15 gods, heavenly, 129,23 goodness cannot become evil, 133,13 truly good being cannot become evil, 119,21; 128,18 Greek, 211,24; see also Hellene heaven (see also world) as cause of change on earth, 276,10 heavenly bodies not everlasting, 258,22-259,6; 274,13-15; 287,17 circular movement natural to, 287.8planetary motions, 196,19-199,22; 291,25-292,12 Helen, of Troy, 131,17 Hellenes (sc. pagans; see note at 122,3), 122,3; 161,28; 241,14; 245,23; 266,16; 287,4; 290,10 Heraclidae, (sc. the descendants of Heracles), 147,8 Heraclitus, 212,13; 213,3; 257,23 Hermes (sc. the planet Mercury), 199.12Hesiod, 212,20 Hippocrates, 283,19 Homer, 179,20 (cf. 186,22; 191,24; 198,21)imperishable things preserved by infinite power, 240,7 ungenerated, 120,6.11; 126,20 impiety, 133,12; 134,15; 182,20; 191,7 individuals inferior to world in goodness, 130,4 have being in coming to be, 168,14 continually restored by nature, 138.4God does not wish them to be everlasting, 129,4-13 induction, 204,1 innate ideas, see common conceptions inspiration and possession, supernatural, 241,10-22 intelligibles have single efficient cause, 171,4-9 created by God, 176,8; 177,26-180,4

ungenerated, 137,12

light

illumination of a medium as parallel for soul's movement of body, 269,20-270,1

Lynceus, 151,14

lyre-player

- untuning of lyre by as parallel for God's dissolving world, 130,27-131,13
- matter and form, 206,26-207,7; 304,24-305,26 cannot exist apart, 153,20; 158,15 meanings
- need to define and distinguish, 156,4; 161,24; 173,14

Milky Way

as abode of rational souls, 290,8 Mosaic (adj. of 'Moses'), 142,9

movement

- four kinds of, 256,19-25; none of them everlasting, 256,25-259,10
- of local movements only rectilinear and circular natural, 274,1; spiral mixed and unnatural, 274,3
- circular natural to heavenly bodies, 287,8; not to sublunary sphere, 287,8

nature

- source of movement for inanimate things, 261,25; 266,21
- negation (*see also* conversion by negation) what an affirmation asserts its
- negation denies, 227,7 non-being, 306,8-307,10
- observation, the evidence, the facts, etc., appeals to, 155,11.24; 166,17-21; 194,9-22; 200,23-201,5; 201,24-203,17; 248,7; 263,27; 264,25; 268,12; 273,3-18; 274,9; 280,17; 285,18-286,16 opponents, unnamed not interested in truth, 144,17 cleverness, verbal ingenuity, etc. 125,16; 126,3 stupidity, 166,21
 - contentiousness, 224,17

subordinate truth to their desires, 224.17wish to enrol Plato on their side, 144.26twist Plato's words, 125,7-126,9; 134,24; 135,20; 144,16; 177,3 tamper with text of Plato, 193,9 unwittingly accuse Plato of changing meanings of words, 155.6; 156,7; 157,10 foist silly hypotheses onto Plato, 166,22; 178,23 opposites (antikeimena) are oppositely qualified, 210,4-27 Orpheus, 179,6; 212,20 pattern for world existence implies everlasting world, 225.3perceptibles come to be and perish, 137,14 have being in coming to be, 168,3 perishing through attack from outside, 294,2; 296,22-303,25 through lack of power, 297,14-19; 297,27-298,10; 299,20 through own defect, 302,24-303,25 through entering into a state contrary to nature, 302,26; 303,14 everything perishes into something else, 294,3 perishable things are also generated, 230,21 Phoenician, 145,3 piety, see Plato – described world as perishable for piety's sake Plato, 120,17, etc. (mentioned 379 times) held world generated in time, 125,7-126,9; 134,25; 272,11-18; 304,4; 310,5; 312,9; this demonstrated from Timaeus, 135,14-144,15; asserted by Aristotle, 145,15; 221,26; 223,10; and Timaeus of Locri, 145,17; 223,12; and Theophrastus, 145,20; 223,13; 223,19-224,12; and Plutarch and Atticus, 211,10-19; and Alexander, 222,2-17; but denied by Taurus, 145,2; 145,13-147,25; Porphyry,

145,3; 148,7-149,16; and Proclus, 148, 1-7held world generated in sense that always coming to be, 213,22 (Platonists); did not, 213,22-216,12 (Alexander) described world as generated for piety's sake, 187,4-15; 189,22-190,13; 190,19-191,14; or for didactic reasons, 186,16; 187,5; 187,15-188,24; 189,12; 189,22-190,19; 217,17-218,10; did not, 216,12-23 (Alexander); 216,26-217,15 (Aristotle); 217,17-221,22 'being' always refers to the eternal in, 138,22 'coming to be' may be continuous or at a particular time in, 138,24 believes the ungenerated is imperishable, 216,3 implies the ungenerated can perish, 222,2-17 held world imperishable, 126,16; 221,27; 222,2-17; 309,18; 310,6 held world naturally perishable, 216,4; 225,24-242,22; 304,1 views on soul do not imply world ungenerated and imperishable, 247,20; 248,16; 249,4; 261,13; 264,19; 293,18 did not hold heaven ungenerated and imperishable, 272,18 held world imperishable through agency of God (creator, being), 216,5; 226,6-242,22; 304,2;312,11.18 on efficient cause of world, 183,2-185,4 first to claim time generated, 222, 19-24teaching on providence, 190,20-191,14 not always right, 127,4 'Plato is dear but the truth dearer', 144,21; 248,13 positions not based on facts in, 127,3;135,4inconsistency in, 261,17-24 fallacious arguments in, 126,24 speaks in 'riddling manner of the Pythagoreans', 197,26 foremost among philosophers, 186,8

makes appropriate assumptions, 154.17uses words correctly, 170,7 skilled in division, 181,5-11 influenced by Bible, 229,9-21 Plato, followers of described world as generated for didactic reasons, 216,26-217,15; 217,17-218,10; this unsatisfactory, 216,26-217,15; 218,10-221,22 Platonists, 145,2 (= Taurus); 213,23; 223,4 (= Taurus) Plotinus, 252,20 Plutarch and Atticus, circle of held world created in *Timaeus*, 211,11Porphyry, 121,19.27; 122,17.27; 126,12; 145,3; 148,7.26; 149,12.19; 154,4.20; 155,4; 161,18; 163,21; 164,13; 165,18; 166,4.7; 172,5; 189,10; 200,4.10; 201,28; 224,20 on the senses of 'generated' (genêtos), 145,3; 148,7.25; 149,12.19; 154,3-155,4; 172,2-20; 189,10; 200,10-20 potentiality always imperfect, 132,8 none in God. 132.4-28 none among everlasting things, 132, 12power, finite perishes, 240,19; 297,18; 300,1 nothing with it lasts for ever, 235,8 body has, 235,4; 242,9 what is always coming to be has, 239.4world has, 235,10; 239,16 power, infinite preserves things that do not perish, 240.7that which always comes to be dependent on something with it, 239.5no finite body has, 238,9; so world does not, 238,13 power, natural always preservative, 303,2-7.19 power, supernatural, 240,22-241,27 Presocratics some knew world had a beginning, 183.5

all save Anaxagoras ignorant of its efficient cause, 183,7; 184,1 privation(s), 306,10; 307,4-10; 308, 19-309, 12 some cannot change to possession, 294,23; 295,15 not all form reverts to privation, 309,12-310,15; 311,18-312,1 Proclus (see also opponents, unnamed), 121,19, etc. (mentioned 67 times) Platonic commentator and Successor, 311,8 fallacious, sophistical, etc., arguments, 126,28; 237,21; 240,27; 248,5; 249,50 misrepresents Plato, 127,8 contradicts Plato, 310,24; 311,17-317,7 copies from Porphyry, 126,12; 145,3; 224,20 arguments for the everlastingness of the world: (VI) Only the creator could dissolve the world but his goodness prevents him. But if it will not perish, it is ungenerated. And so it is everlasting, 119,13 (VII) Since the soul of the world is everlasting and always the source of movement, the world too must be everlasting, 243,1 (VIII) There is nothing to attack the universe or for it to perish into, and there can have been nothing for it to be generated from. Therefore it is everlasting, 294,1 view of meaning of 'generated' in Timaeus, 148,1; 166,26-168,2; 171,24on finite and infinite power and perishability, 238,3-241,11; 297,21-300,2 Proteus, 146,21 providence, laws of, 131,23 Pythagorean, 197,26 relatives

generated out of their privation, 308,26-309,9

self-evidence, see observation, the evidence, the facts, etc., appeals to self-movement, 268,2 essence of soul, see soul - essence of source of movement in other things, 243,5; 247,2; 249,1.7; 259,15; 261,14-28; 264,14; 268,7; 271.6senses underpin knowledge and science, 285,18-286,16 Socrates, 120,7; 135,26; 136,4; 177,3; 295,18 soul derivation of word, 195,19 essence of, 248,19; 249,15-254,18; 259.15:262.2is intellect when disembodied, 195,13-196,4; soul when animating body, 195,14 relation to body, 249,25-253,9 existence does not imply existence of body, 267, 10-268, 24 activities, 251, 15-252, 27; 253,11-254,12; 254,19; 256,17 powers, 254, 19-255, 13 ungenerated in *Phaedrus*, where described qua intellect, 191,11; 195,11; 196,17; generated in *Timaeus*, 195,10; 196,12; where relation to body (196,4-14) and movements of heavenly bodies (196,19-25) in question psychogony of *Timaeus*, 196.19-199.22 self-moving, 243,3; but not essentially so, 248,19 movement not always circular, 259,12-261,6 source of movement, 243,5; 261,17; 261,28-263; but only potentially, 264,27 source of life, 263,7-264,2; or capacity for life, 264,2-16 source of life and movement just by being, 268, 25-271, 13 not the cause of bodily life, 265,1; 266.2orders irrational life, 265,17-266,2 mounted upon everlasting body, **243,14**; 273,15.22-29; 274,15;

through which moves perishable body, 243,16 moves body just by being, 268,25-271,13 moves body by choice, 260,3-261,3 soul, human (see also topics under 'soul') unclear whether had beginning, 175,7-176,1 immortal, 234,16; 252,19; 259,17 its activities, 255, 6-256, 17 activities not everlasting, 255,2-256,17; 263,24 powers not always actualised, 255,1 free of body in intellectual activity, 252, 10-15eschatology, 290,3-10 soul, irrational generated, 261,23 self-moving and source of movement, 251,7; 261,20 cause of life in bodies, 265,1-266,2 cannot exist apart from body, 251.10soul. rational only causes rational movement, 266,16-267,9 soul of world ungenerated and imperishable, 243,2-12 self-moving, 243,3-13; essentially so, 243,10 moves world everlastingly, 243,6-11 moves world just by being, 247,9 moves world by choice, 260,22-27 rational and irrational aspects, 266, 2-15Stoics, 213,4 substances generation of, 307,15-308,16; 313,1 have no contrary, 307,15-308,1 self-subsistent, 307,19 Taurus, 121,19; 123,19; 145,2.10; 148,8; 186,18; 192,20.21; 223.4.8.24 on the senses of 'generated' (genêtos), 145,1-12; 146,2-147,9 on the interpretation of the Timaeus, 145,13-25; 146,3; 147,9-25; 186,17-189,9 changes meanings of words, 191,15 Theophrastus, 223, 20.22.25

on the interpretation of the Timaeus, 145,20; 188,9; 223,14; 224.4thought experiments, 299,17-20; 300,21-301,21 Timaeus, of Locri, 145,16 time creation of, 140,15-143,21 is measure of the movement of the heaven, 141,16 time words, meaning and use of 'before', 141,17-143,14 'then', 142,4.23 tenses of 'to be', 142,7 truth, the Christian (see note at 120,20), 120,20; 127,3; 312,10 ungenerated (agenêtos), the imperishable, 144,6; 225,22 unchanging, 208,26 universe, see world visibility nature of, 151,23-152,7 world (see also Proclus – arguments for the everlastingness of the world: Plato) well-constructed, 119,20-120,5; 128,23-129,4; as observation (128,14) and Scripture (128,15) show ungenerated, 120,6.13; 243,2.13; 247,4; 268,23; **294,8-295,10**; 295,19; 297,11 generated, 304,9; has come to be, 312.8came to be out of something else, 294,9-12; 304,16; 307,12; out of informed matter, 304,26-305,21; formless matter, 305,21-6; its contrary, 307,9-310,6; its privation, 309,12; 310,6 the disorderly its contrary, 294,10-295,18 a substance, 313,1 is (always) coming to be, 297,25; 298,17 beginning (arkhê) of: causal, 159,2-163,22; creator, pattern and matter as, 147,20; bodies rather than matter and form as,

164,13-165,23; temporal, 158,25

197

nothing to destroy it, **294,2-8**; nothing outside it, **294,4.11**; 304,14-307,10; a closed system, 236,15

- imperishable, 120,5.12; 243,3.13; 247,5; 294,8; 295,9.18; 297,1; 300,18; 301,8ff.; is so of own nature, 301,26; 302,3.14.17; indissoluble, 120,5; 128,13-134,19
- naturally perishable, 144,9; 239,9; 271,23-272,22; 298,16; **298,17-299,20**; 300,3; 302,6.12; 304,8
- will perish, 301,13; 312,8
- is finite, **298,2**
- has finite power, 235,10; **238,13**; 239,16; **298,4**; 299,7; 300,3; 301,3.19
- not self-sufficient in own right, 235,2; 240,10-23
- imperishable through agency of

God (creator, being), 144,14; 298,15; 298,17-299,20; 300,9.20.26; 310,22-311,17 its immortality acquired, 229,20; 237,8; 240,7; 242,18; 300,10.20.27; 311,15; restored, 138,8-15; 228,9; 230,9.16; 235,21; 237,8; 239,11; 242,18; 272,22-6; supernatural, 237,14 does not have eternal being, 238,15 if parts perishable, whole must be, 236,21 only creator could destroy, 119,14-18; 131,26-134,16 would be evil to destroy, 119,20; 128,20-131,13; 133,1-134,16

young, the overvalue physical beauty, 131,13-20

Zeus (the Olympian god), 179,7.8 Zeus (sc. the planet Jupiter), 199,18.20

Index of Passages Cited

Numbers in bold type refer to the notes.

ALEXANDER in Cael. 253 337 376 in Metaph. 59,7 345 in Meteor. 73,1 117; 83,1 117 in Phys. 376 in Sens. 50,25 117; 154,16 117 Mixt. 227,22 117 ANAXAGORAS Diels-Kranz A57 237 APPOLONIUS Argonautica 1.155 **133** ARISTOTLE An.Post. 81a38-9 503 Cael. 279a25-8 410; 279b1-284b5 190; 279b4-6 335; 279b4-284b5 **526**; 279b12-17 **336**, **341**; 279b32-280a10 363; 279b33-280a11 262; 280a28-32 190 338 370; 280a30-1 70 100; 280b1-20 148; 280b6-9 122; 298b25-9 338 Cat. 3b24-7 545 DA 403a3-12 441; 411b18-19 442 EN 1096a16 97; 1096a16-17 436 Metaph. 1050b7 56; 1070a3-1076a4 224 Meteor. 2.9 122 *Phys.* book 8 **449**; 192b20-2 **467**; 196a28-b5 241; 207a17 434; 241b24-242a15 439 477; 251b14-19 374; 251b19 70; 262a12-263a3 449; 266a24-b24 403 408 Top. 102b32-3 74; 105a3-7 212; 113b15-114a25 330

[ARISTOTLE] Mund. 394a10-28 122; 397b13-16 213 223 ATTICUS Fragments (Des Places) 334 BIBLE Exodus 3,14 87 Genesis 1,31 48 Hebrews 1,12 393 Psalms 102.27 393 Wisdom of Solomon 1,13-14 394 DIOGENES LAERTIUS 3.51,1 264; 3.60,6 264 EUCLID Elements I, def. 15 258 EURIPIDES Phoenissae 469-72 34 EUSEBIUS Praep. Ev. 334 392 HIPPOCRATES Alim. 9.106,23 (Littré) 497 HOMER Iliad 251; 1.70 415; 2.204 224; 3.215 250; 12.239-40 305 **OLYMPIODORUS** in Gorg. 161,35 (Westerink) 240 ORPHICA Fr. 168 (Kern) 221

PHILOPONUS contra Aristotelem 62 147 452 in DA 2,7-15 297; 15,9-26 441; 46,18-49,14 441; 66,28 474 in Phys. 5,7-6,8 161; 355,26-7 474; 371,2-3 474; 430,9-10 452; 465,25 117; 875, 4474 [PHILOPONUS] in GA 218,22 304 PLATO Crit. 264; 109B 265 *Epin.* 981E 170 Epist. 2,312D-E 219 Euthyd. 298C 434 Laws 715E 220; 781E 168 Phd. 70D-72E 518; 70E-71B 521; 70E-71C 548; 72A-C 548; 87D 76; 97C ff. 237 Phdr. 245C 509; 245C-D 476; 245C-E 455 478; 245C-246A 35 386 433 454; 245D-E 471; 246ff. 465; 246A 272 295 306; 265E 230 Pol. 269C-E 391; 269E-270A 395; 270A 77; 273B-D 265 Rep. 9; 368C-369B 360; 534E 229; 546A 10 35 94 Tim. 17B-19A 10; 20D-25D 264; 23D-E 265; 27A 72; 27C 25 73 136 151 154 176 208 215 217 249 269 281 285 292 343 344 351; 27C-28A 75 27D 82 245 319 342; 27D-28A 218 231 318 399; 27D-28B 196; 27E ff. 117; 28A 188 239 246 291 525; 28B 22 101 106 112 116 137 143 152 153 157 173 189 191 197 205 207 209 211 235 243 247 283 290 348 502; 28B-C 81 307; 28C 239 273; 29A 8 318 382; 29B ff. 371; 29E 202 383; 30A 177; 32B-C 542; 32B-33A 401; 32C 4 54 309 540; 33A 30 396 516; 33B-D 405; 33C 397; 33D 396 34B-C 214; 34B ff. 225; 34C ff.

294; 35A-36D 301; 37D- 38A 84; 38B 93 138; 38B-C 85; 41A 389; 41A-B 5 16 41 44 50 58 60 95 359 371 388; 41B 479 553 554; 41C 51 225; 41E 265; 52B 180; 53C-56C 368 PLOTINUS $Enn. 4.7 \ \mathbf{443}; 4.7.8^5 \ \mathbf{443}$ PLUTARCH de An. Proc. 334 PORPHYRY Smith 456aF 384 in Tim. 18 253 in Tim. (Sodano) 2,35 141; 2,36 126; 2,37 120; 2,38 145; 2,39 37; 2,47 179; 2,49 181 in Tim. (Smith) 172F 206 PROCLUS in Tim. 79; 1.8 10; 1.201,14 ff. 264 SIMPLICIUS in Cael. 62 79 in Phys. 62; 3,13-19 161; 1326, 38 - 1336, 34 **452** SOPHONIAS in DA 16,29 474 STOBAEUS 2.28,1 264 SUDA kappa 1640,6 **474** THEOPHRASTUS Fortenbaugh Fr. 241A 105 378; Fr. 241B 261 380 [TIMAEUS LOCRUS] 102

200