Ancient Commentators on Aristotle

GENERAL EDITOR: RICHARD SORABJI

PHILOPONUS: Against Proclus On the Eternity of the World 12–18

Translated by James Wilberding

BLOOMSBUR

PHILOPONUS

Against Proclus On the Eternity of the World 12-18 This page intentionally left blank

PHILOPONUS

Against Proclus On the Eternity of the World 12-18

> Translated by James Wilberding

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 2006 by Gerald Duckworth & Co. Ltd. Paperback edition first published 2014

© 2006 by James Wilberding

James Wilberding has asserted his right under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act, 1988, to be identified as the Author 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:	978-0-7156-3410-3
PB:	978-1-4725-5770-4
ePDF:	978-1-4725-0141-7

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); Dr Victoria Solomonides, the Cultural Attaché of the Greek Embassy in London. The editor wishes to thank Pamela Huby, Ian Crystal, Barrie Fleet, Sylvia Berryman, Johannes Van Ophuijsen, and Peter Lautner for their comments, Inna Kupreeva and John Sellars for preparing the volume for press, and Deborah Blake at Duckworth, who has been the publisher responsible for every volume since the first.

> Typeset by Ray Davies Printed and bound in Great Britain

Contents

Conventions	vi
Introduction	1
Departures from Rabe's Text	11
Translation	13
Chapter 12	15
Chapter 13	22
Chapter 14	54
Chapter 15	60
Chapter 16	66
Chapter 17	83
Chapter 18	92
Notes	117
Select Bibliography	141
English-Greek Glossary	143
Greek-English Index	155
Subject Index	181
Index of Passages	189

Conventions

[...] Square brackets enclose words or phrases that have been added to the translation or the lemmata for purposes of clarity, as well as those portions of the lemmata which are not quoted by Philoponus.

<...> Angle brackets enclose conjectures relating to the Greek text, i.e. additions to the transmitted text deriving from parallel sources and editorial conjecture, and transposition of words or phrases. Accompanying notes provide further details.

 (\dots) Round brackets, besides being used for ordinary parentheses, contain transliterated Greek words.

In chapters 12-18 of *Against Proclus On the Eternity of the World* Philoponus continues to do battle against Proclus' arguments for the beginninglessness and everlastingness of the ordered universe.¹ In this final section there are three notable issues under discussion.

First, in chapter 13, Philoponus is concerned to explain the composition of the heaven and its manner of movement. Some background is helpful here. Both Plato and Aristotle described the universe as a series of concentric elemental spheres, with earth at the centre and the heavens rotating in a circle at the periphery. Plato's universe, as described in the *Timaeus*, is constituted entirely of the four Empedoclean elements: earth, water, air and fire. Moreover, these are not merely the only elements in the universe; Plato seems to say something stronger, namely that everything in the universe (i.e. every sensible thing) is itself made up of all four elements. This is because in order to be visible a thing must contain fire, and in order to be tangible it must contain earth, and in order for earth and fire to be co-present in the same body, water and air are required to mediate between them.² The important consequence of this stronger thesis is that the celestial bodies are constituted of the same four elements as sublunar things are, with fire predominating to account for their brightness.³ While accounting for the superlunar region by means of the same elements as the sublunar region is economical, it raises two major questions: (1) why do superlunar bodies move in a circle around the Earth, whereas sublunar bodies seem to move up, e.g. fire, and down, e.g. earth? And (2) why are sublunar beings constantly being destroved and going out of existence, while superlunar bodies are apparently free of such destruction?

(1) Unlike Aristotle, Plato does not frame his discussion of elemental motion around the natural/unnatural dichotomy.⁴ Instead, it is the opposition between necessity and reason upon which he constructs his theory. The upward and downward motions of the elements, and consequently the rough division of the universe into four concentric spheres, is due to a pre-cosmic shaking that causes the large and dense material to go toward the centre of the universe and rare and light material to go to the periphery.⁵ Hence, this rectilinear motion is due to necessity, and not reason.⁶ By contrast, Plato attributes the circular

celestial motion to reason *via* the World-Soul, which has two primary parts: the 'circle of the different' accounts for the eastward planetary motion, and the 'circle of the same' accounts for the westward motion of the fixed stars.⁷

(2) For Plato the question of whether a given body will perish is determined not by its constituent parts but by its maker. Although in general it is true that whatever is generated is also liable to destruction,⁸ the *Timaeus* distinguishes between those things that are made directly by the Demiurge, i.e. the celestial gods (stars and planets) as well as the mythical gods, and those things that are made only indirectly by the Demiurge by means of these generated gods. Although both products are strictly speaking subject to destruction, only the latter will in fact suffer destruction, while the former will be preserved 'by the will of God'.⁹ This solution, which is echoed in the *Statesman* myth,¹⁰ gave rise to a debate as to whether God's will is in fact capable of forever deterring what is natural.¹¹

Aristotle considered Plato's answers to both of these questions unsatisfactory¹² and argued that there must be a fifth element, aether, that comprises the celestial region and accounts for both its distinctive motion and its everlastingness. His primary argument for this conclusion is that for each simple motion there naturally corresponds a simple body, and since circular motion is simple, there must be a simple body that naturally moves in a circle.¹³ Other considerations showed that this element must be ungenerated and indestructible. In GC Aristotle defines each of the four sublunar elements in terms of two sets of contrary qualities – the hot and cold, and the moist and dry: fire is hot and dry, air is hot and moist, water is cold and moist, and earth is cold and dry. This allowed Aristotle to define elemental destruction as one guality being replaced by its contrary (Cael. 270a14ff.).¹⁴ It would seem to follow, then, that whatever element is characterized by these four contrary gualities is susceptible to destruction. Since all four possible combinations of the hot/cold and moist/dry pairs are exhausted by the four sublunar elements, the fifth element must not be characterized by them. It is rather beyond all contrariety and consequently beyond generation and destruction.

The attitude of later Platonists on this issue is complicated. As Platonists they of course wanted to stay as close to Plato's teaching as philosophically allowable, but they also thought there was something objectionable about saying that ordinary earth and water elements are floating around the heavens. This is due in part to the problems listed above, and in part to Aristotle's arguments, though they tended to see Aristotle's own solution of introducing another element as being of the *deus ex machina* variety.¹⁵ Reconciliation was achieved by taking the heavens to be constituted – not of ordinary specimens of the four elements. This interpretation of the *Timaeus*' elemental theory was taken to different

lengths by different thinkers,¹⁶ and Proclus and Philoponus offer a case in point. Proclus uses this line of interpretation to establish Plato's theory of the heavens as anticipating Aristotle's fifth element.¹⁷ Philoponus, too, wants the heavens to consist of the pinnacles of the four elements, but he maintains a more considerable distance from the Aristotelian view by, for example, insisting that these celestial pinnacles are still characterized by contraries and so subject to destruction and that their circular motion is due entirely to soul rather than nature.¹⁸

As we saw above, Plato's offer of God's will as an explanation of why the heavens and the universe as a whole will never be destroyed set off a wave of debate on the limitations of God's will. In chapter 16 of *Contra Proclum* we find Philoponus' own views on the nature and scope of God's will. Here he addresses issues that become central to medieval philosophical and theological discussions, including the unity, timelessness and indivisibility of God's will and how these features are not at odds with His willing and knowing the many particulars that exist in time. Proclus argues that saying that God created the world in time compromises the uniformity of God's will, since His will at first – prior to the creation – must not be directed at creating the world but then changes when He decides to create the world. Any way you look at it, says Proclus, this subjects God's will to change and time.

Philoponus agrees with Proclus that God's will cannot be subject to change and time, but he attacks Proclus' claim that this necessarily follows from a temporal creation of the world. His strategy is simply to point out that the very problem that Proclus raises here about God's will turns up again when one considers His knowledge (and providence). The problem here derives from two principles that are common to both Plato and Aristotle: (i) knowledge is divine and is the proper possession of divinity;¹⁹ and (ii) true knowledge is only of universals and is not subject to change.²⁰ The apparent consequence is that there is quite generally no knowledge of individuals and more specifically that God is unaware of human affairs.²¹ Philoponus begins his reply with an ad hominem attack on Proclus: since Proclus in other writing concedes that it is possible for God to know individuals without sacrificing God's unity, consistency demands that Proclus acknowledge that it is also possible for individual, temporal events to be objects of God's will without depriving His will of unity.²² He then offers his own positive argument in two parts for the possibility of quasi-temporal mental processes in atemporal substances, first considering created intellects and then the creative intellect itself, God. Regarding created intellects, Philoponus' argument consists in the defence of two claims: thinking for them proceeds discursively, and yet they are beyond time. He concludes that even though intellective thinking proceeds sequentially, the sequence in question is not strictly speaking temporal.²³ This is meant to provide a generic argument for the possibility of atemporal

substances performing mental activities that *seem* to proceed in time. Philoponus then goes on to argue that the creative intellect is no exception to this rule, even though its thinking proceeds in a non-discursive manner. The crucial premise of his argument here is that the creator must know the product of His act of creation, and he supports this premise with both textual and philosophical evidence. With this premise in hand, since God is the creator of order and in particular of the order of the heavenly bodies, Philoponus can conclude:

He knew it moving [and] for this reason He necessarily knew *when* each revolution returned to the same point – that is to say: First, He knew that the sphere of fixed stars returned; second, that the moon returned; third, the sun; fourth, the star of Jupiter, and the rest in turn.²⁴

Philoponus has effectively reduced this to the previous case. The example illustrates that God engages in a kind of quasi-temporal sequential thinking just as discursive, created intellects do, and here again the sequence is found to be not strictly speaking temporal.²⁵

Finally, throughout chapters 12-18 Philoponus offers many exegetical insights into Plato's *Timaeus*. To give only a couple of examples, in chapter 14 we find a detailed investigation into the proper understanding of the pre-cosmic state of disorderly motion. Plato's description of the pre-cosmic state is certainly hard to pin down, and chapter 14's dialogue between Proclus and Philoponus can help us sift through some of the difficulties. In the *Timaeus* we are told that when the creator ordered the universe

He took everything that was visible, not at peace but rather moving in a discordant and disorderly manner, and brought it out of disorder into order.²⁶

This seems to reveal two features of the pre-cosmic state: it was visible and in motion, albeit in a disorderly motion. Each of these features is hard to reconcile with other statements in the *Timaeus*. Visibility is a problem because at *Tim*. 31B5 we are told that nothing is visible without fire and at 31B6-8 that fire is introduced by the creator when He orders the universe. Moreover, any kind of motion – even disorderly motion – in the pre-cosmic state is problematic because Plato (at least in the *Laws*) believes that soul is the source of motion²⁷ and the World-Soul is likewise produced by the creator during the ordering of the universe.²⁸ In addition, when Timaeus takes a fresh start to his account at *Tim*. 48E2ff. he seems to describe the pre-cosmic state as containing 'traces' of the forms²⁹ and being shaken by necessity.³⁰ Proclus is quick to connect these passages and say that the pre-cosmic state of disorder is one where the receptacle (which Proclus and Phi-

loponus both gloss as 'matter') is characterized by the traces of the forms which presumably then account for its visibility and disorderly motion. Proclus' reading might indeed seem intuitively correct, but Philoponus is no doubt right to emphasize that 'Plato did not clearly articulated what it is that is moving in a discordant and disorderly motion'.³¹ Philoponus, following Porphyry, questions whether the presence of traces is sufficient to account for the visibility and potential mobility of the disordered state. The alternative interpretation he offers is that it is bodies, i.e. matter and *form* rather than *traces* of form, that move in a disorderly manner. One might raise objections against this interpretation as well - in particular that this interpretation blurs the distinction between the pre-ordered and the ordered states by attributing forms to both. Philoponus, again following Porphyry, is prepared for this objection, insisting that Plato is interested in illustrating the distinction not between formless matter and bodies but between 'what these bodies per se have from their own nature [...] and what is added by the God who ordered them'.³²

At times the keen exceptical ingenuity that Philoponus brings to the *Timaeus* comes through most strongly in short off-hand remarks. Consider, for example, the *Timaeus*' puzzling claim that the generated gods, i.e. the stars and planets, are responsible for creating the bodies of mortal creatures.³³ Obviously, this claim cannot be taken entirely literally, but it is far from obvious what the intended meaning behind it is. Taylor seems to think that Plato's meaning has little to do with the celestial bodies *per se*. Rather, the point is entirely that there must be *some* ontological intermediate which is generated but immortal to mediate between the ungenerated and immortal creator and the generated and mortal creatures.³⁴ Cornford, by contrast, thinks there is more to it than this and cautiously suggests that

This delegation of the rest of the work to the celestial gods may perhaps be connected with the notion that the heavenly bodies, especially the Sun, are active in generating life on Earth.³⁵

Philoponus rather casually offers his own – to my knowledge completely original – interpretation of the passage:

At any rate, according to Plato in the *Timaeus*,³⁶ God orders the celestial gods to turn to the creation of mortal living things. But that is to say that He wills each particular thing to exist when it is necessary and natural that it come to be.³⁷

The celestial bodies are the makers of time. Hence, to say that a mortal creature's birth depends on the celestial bodies is in effect to say that its generation depends on time, i.e. that there is an appropriate time at which it will happen. In this way Philoponus provides a novel and

tenable reading of a difficult passage and simultaneously finds support for a principle that he takes to be central to the *Timaeus*' doctrine of creation: although God is always uniformly willing the generation of mortal creatures, He wills them to come to be *when it is good* for them to come to be.³⁸

Certainly, the broadest and most interesting exegetical topic that Philoponus considers concerns Plato's use of poetic myth in the dialogues. There are two principal questions here: why does Plato in some passages denigrate myth? And why does he nevertheless seem to employ myths as a philosophical tool in other passages? Concerning the former question, Philoponus delivers a shocking verdict. The traditional Greek myths are the playground of immorality by giving expression to 'the unlawful marriages, the swallowings, the manglings, the insurrections against one another and those who begot them, and whatever else was done to corrupt human life, which the poets attached to the beings they honour'.³⁹ From this he concludes that there is a *daimon*:

who operates through the poets [and who] does *not* care about what is advantageous to human life. Therefore, the work of wicked *daimons* introduced poetic myths into our lives in order to destroy mankind, and since Plato knew precisely this he banished these myths from his own city.⁴⁰

Of course, this wholesale condemnation increases the urgency of the second question, and Philoponus' response to this is more nuanced. Sometimes Plato is appropriating mythological terminology and using it sincerely albeit not in the straightforward, traditional sense. An example of this practice can be seen in Plato's characterization of the celestial bodies and the cosmos as 'gods'. There is a sense in which these sensible substances can be called 'gods', but it is not the usual sense which applies to incorporeal beings. Rather, Plato uses 'god' homonymously.⁴¹ When Plato calls the celestial bodies 'gods' (*theous*), he has in mind the etymological connections this term has to 'running' (*thein*) and perhaps to 'sight' (*thea*).⁴² At other times, Plato's intention is less than sincere. As a case in point Philoponus points to *Timaeus* 40D6-41C3:

But concerning the other *daimons*, to talk and know about their generation is too great a task for us. Yet, one must believe those who have discoursed about this before us since they are offspring of the gods, as they say, and they no doubt have clear knowledge of their ancestors. For one can't disbelieve the children of gods even though they speak without reasonable and compelling proofs, rather we must follow custom and believe those who claim to be reporting on their own kin. Let, then, our generation of these gods be as they say and be told thus: From Gê and Ouranos the

children Ôkeanos and Têthus were generated; and from these Phorkus, Kronos, Rhea and all the subsequent gods; and from Kronos were generated Zeus, Hera and all the ones we know to be called their brothers; and further, from these there are other offspring.⁴³

This passage is presumably ironical and to some extent supports Philoponus' claim about Plato's sincerity. Philoponus then goes one step further and explains why Plato would include mythological dogma to which he does not subscribe:

Plato frequently used myths, either in order to pay lip-service to the inherited custom [...] or because he was wary of the danger stemming from the masses [...] lest he also [i.e. like Socrates] be thought to abolish the established gods and to teach about new *daimonia* (for he knew that this was the cause of Socrates' death).⁴⁴

Philoponus backs up this proto-Straussian reading of Plato by pointing to an interesting passage in *Epistle* 13 (which is considered by many scholars today to be spurious) in which Plato apparently acknowledges that not all of his letters are written in earnest and that a letter's earnestness is indicated by its manner of greeting, where '"God" is the beginning of a serious letter, but "gods" is the beginning of a less serious letter'.⁴⁵ To Philoponus this not only supports his general theory concerning Plato's 'art of writing' but also confirms his belief that despite the presence of some passages that might suggest otherwise, Plato's earnest approach to religion is monotheistic just as Philoponus' own is.

*

This translation of Philoponus' Against Proclus On the Eternity of the World 12-18 is based on Rabe's 1899 Teubner edition of the text. Departures from this text are marked with angle brackets and have been collected in a list at the front of the translation. Regarding almost all of the terms discussed by Share in his introduction to chapters 1-5 I have (independently) made the same decisions as he. These are: theos, kosmos, ouranos, (to) pan, aiônios, aïdios, aïdiotês, sunaïdiotês, aei, dêmiourgos, dêmiourgein, dêmiourgêma, dêmiourgia, dêmiourgikos, ginesthai, genesis, genêtos, phtheiresthai, phthora, and phthartos, and the reader should consult his introduction for a fuller discussion of some of the issues surrounding these terms. Regarding these terms there are only several instances where my practice diverges from Share's. Whereas both Share and I capitalize the singular 'God' but not the plural, I extend this practice to pronouns, though not to other words (e.g. creator) that refer to God. And for phtheiresthai, phthora, and

phthartos I for the most part translate with 'to be destroyed', 'destruction', and 'destructible' rather than Share's 'to perish', 'passing out of existence', and 'perishable'. Since, as Share points out, *ouranos* can mean both 'heaven' and 'universe', there are passages – in particular when Philoponus is citing a passage of Plato containing this term⁴⁶ – where I translate *ouranos* with 'universe', although I agree with Share that for the most part *ouranos* should be translated with 'heaven'. I mark those instances where 'universe' translates *ouranos* by putting *ouranos* in parentheses after 'universe'. Likewise, *to pan* raises some difficulties. Generally, both Share and I translate it with 'the universe'. However, it also has a more literal meaning of 'the entirety', and sometimes a single argument will employ both meanings. In these instances, I translate accordingly.⁴⁷ Further translation decisions are discussed individually in the notes.

I would like to thank Sylvia Berryman and a number of anonymous vetters who each read and made valuable suggestions on part of the translation, the Ancient Commentators on Aristotle Project editorial team, and in particular Richard Sorabji. Special thanks for support and encouragement should go to Ian Mueller who read and commented on an early draft of the entire translation.

Notes

1. Consult Share's Introduction to Philoponus, Against Proclus On the Eternity of the World 1-5.

2. *Timaeus* 31B4-32B8. For Philoponus' interpretation of these lines, see 514,13ff. Note that the stronger thesis seems to entail that no pure element can exist all by itself. This conclusion is not drawn explicitly in the *Timaeus*. Indeed, at *Tim.* 54D6 we are told that some air contains no fire. However, this was a conclusion that was drawn on Plato's behalf by later thinkers, including Numenius (Proclus *in Tim.* 2.9.4-5 = fr. 51 Des Places) and Philoponus (*in GC* 228,8-19). Other thinkers were opposed to this interpretation of Plato, notably Plotinus (2.1.6,21ff. and see Wilberding, *Plotinus' Cosmology*, ad loc.).

3. *Tim*. 39E10-40B8.

4. Nevertheless, some scholars insist on posing and answering the question of what Plato considered to be the natural motion of the elements. Cf. Cornford, *Plato's Cosmology*, 246; Skemp, *Plato's Theory of Motion*, 82-3; Solmsen, *Aristotle's System of the Physical World*, 266-74; Taylor, *A Commentary on Plato's Timaeus*, 390-2. If one does insist on pressing the question of which motion – the rectilinear or the circular – is natural to the elements, I believe the more Platonic answer would be the circular motion, since this motion is produced by soul and soul is 'preeminently natural' (Laws 892B).

5. Tim. 30A3-5, 53A2-B5. Cf. Solmsen, 267.

6. Cornford is wrong to attribute these motions to reason (246). The sifting motion is clearly ascribed to 'the motion of the receptacle' (57C3) which is the shaking motion of necessity. Cf. Taylor, 390-2.

7. In addition each of the fixed stars is said to rotate around its own axis, and this motion is presumably due to the star's individual soul.

8. Tim. 41B2-3 and cf. Philoponus 592,13ff.

9. *Tim.* 41B4-6. This hierarchy of producers and its corresponding hierarchy of products roughly parallels the hierarchy of craftsman and poet in *Republic* 10.

10. Statesman 269C4-274E1.

11. Those who thought that God's will is up to this task include Alcinous (*Didask*. 15.2,2-3), Ammonias Saccas (Photius *Bibliotheca* 461b8-9), Origen (*De Principiis* 3.6,6 and *Contra Celsum* 5.23,22), as well as Plutarch, Atticus, and Severus (Proclus *in Tim.* 3.212,6ff.). On the other side of the issue were Alexander (*Problems and Solutions* 2,5-6 and 30,25-32,19), Plotinus 2.1 *passim*, Simplicius (*in Cael.* 369,26-8 and *in Phys.* 1334,25) and Proclus (*in Tim.* 3.212,6ff. and *in Crat.* §185). See Wilberding *ad* 2.1.1,2.

12. In the spurious *De Mundo*, however, the cosmos is said to be 'preserved by and through the gods' (391b11-12) though even here there is no talk of divine *will*.

13. This argument is attacked by Xenarchus, cf. Simplicius *in Cael.* 20,10-25,23.

14. Cael. 270a14ff.

15. See Plotinus 2.1.2,13 and Wilberding, ad loc.

16. Compare, for example, Plotinus' version in 2.1.7 and Proclus' in *in Tim*. 2.42,9-44,24 and 3.112,19-133,10.

17. See n. 192 to the Translation.

18. 484,18ff. and 527,11-531,21.

19. Aristotle, e.g. *Metaph.* 1072b18; *EN* 1177b26-1178a8; *MM* 1212b39-1213a7; Plato, e.g. *Soph.* 265C8-9 and *Parm.* 134C10-D6, as well as the relation of divinity to the Forms: *Rep.* 597B5-7 and *Tim.* 28E5-29B1.

20. Aristotle: An. Post. 71b12; 73a21-3; 77a5-10; Metaph. 999a24-b24; 1003a13-15; 1060b20-21; 1086b14-1087a25. For Plato see his distinction between knowledge and opinion (e.g. Rep. 478E7-479E5) and the connection between Forms and universals (e.g. Rep. 596A5-8).

21. This problem is raised by Plato in *Parm*. 134C10-D6.

22. 569,22-574,12.

23. 575,3-578,6.

24. 579,26-580,3.

25. 578,6-580,9.

26. Tim. 30A3-5.

27. Laws 896A.

28. *Tim.* 34Aff. This latter problem, together with *Laws* 896E, leads Plutarch to posit an irrational soul that rules the pre-cosmic state and is responsible for the disorderly motion (see, e.g., *Moralia* 1015E and Dillon, *The Middle Platonists*, 202-6).

29. *Tim.* 53B2.

30. *Tim*. 52E4.

31. 541,23-4.

32. 547,25-548,1.

33. *Tim.* 41C4-5.

34. 'Hence, the "mortal" has to be got into the system somehow and cannot be got in if the Demiurge directly makes everything Himself' (253-4).

35. Cornford, 141.

36. *Tim.* 41C4-5.

37. 567, 19-23.

38. 566,8-568,5 and see 'nature' in the Subject Index.

39. 635, 10-14.

40. 643,13-644,6.

41. 637,5. **42.** 635,25-636,3. **43.** *Tim.* 40D6-41C3.

44. 640,1-8. While both Cornford (139) and Taylor (ad loc.) agree with Philoponus that *Tim.* 40D6-41C3 is ironical, both also object to Philoponus' explanation of Plato's motive: 'The remarks about deference to the established *nomos* are not really necessary to protect [...] Plato from a prosecution for "impiety". It was no part of "popular" religion in a *polis* of the fifth century to believe the tales told by the poets about the gods [...] The leading figures whom he specifies, Gaia, Ouranos, Tethys, Cronos, Phorcys, were not being worshipped in the Greek *poleis*' (Taylor, 246).

45. *Epistle* 13, 363B5-6 = 644,25-645,1. **46.** e.g. 552,9 and 601,19.

47. e.g. 510,11-16.

Departures from Rabe's Text

- 466,4-5 Adding *ouk* before *estin* (Rabe).
- 478,19-20 Deleting kai ta genê tôn poiountôn.
- 485,25 Adding $h\hat{e}$ before epi (Rabe).
- 485,25 Adding *kinêsis* before *ou* (Rabe).
- 497,23 Adding *aei* before *kata* (Rabe).
- 498,14 Adding to before pan (Rabe).
- 501,12 Changing *epi* to *esti* (Rabe).
- 504,25 Changing question mark to full stop.
- 508,25 Adding *loipa* before *tria*.
- 524,6 Changing *themenos* to *themenous*.
- 524,20 Changing *eiper* to *hôsper*.
- 529,15 Changing $aut\hat{o}(i)$ to auto.
- 534,20 Changing *an pherei* to *anapherei*.
- 541,3 Deleting the period after *kineisthai*.
- 541,10 Changing $homologoumen\hat{e}(i)$ to $homologoumen\hat{e}s$.
- 542,11 Changing gar to de (Rabe).
- 550,4 Adding kai to hômoiômenon before oukh.
- 553,23 Changing *diakosmon* to *diakosmôn*.
- 560,9-10 Adding *drastikê* before *estin* (Rabe)
- 560,13 Changing gar to to gartoi (Rabe)
- 571,13 Adding *mêde* before *pote*.
- 575,25 Changing semicolon to comma.
- 576,2 Changing semicolon to full stop.
- 579,25 Adding a comma before *kai*.
- 602,8 Adding *hôs* before *legetai* (Rabe).
- 603,16 Adding on after phtharton.
- 606,23 Changing theômenos to themenos (Kroll).
- 608,24 Changing *hoti* to *esti* (Rabe).
- 609,1 Changing *oun* to *kai*.
- 609,18 Deleting *ou* before *parôn* (Rabe).
- 616,23 Changing kan to ka(i)ta.
- 618,6 Changing *auton* to *autou*.
- 623,13 Changing *auto* to *auton*.
- 624,3 Adding *legei* before *einai*.
- 624,18 Changing *autou* to *hautou*.

Departures from Rabe's Text

- 638,25-6 Changing parakrouesthai to parakouesthai.
- Changing genêtous to agenêtous. 639,2
- 640,9
- Changing *agagein* to *anagein*. Changing semicolon to question mark. 640,16

PHILOPONUS Against Proclus On the Eternity of the World 12-18

Translation

This page intentionally left blank

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

The Twelfth Argument of Proclus the Successor¹ 466,1

Twelfth Argument: Everything that is generated requires matter and a maker. Therefore, if what is generated does not always exist, but only exists at some time, either it does not $<always>^2$ exist because the matter is unsuitable or because the maker is deficient at making or $\mathbf{5}$ because of both of these things – because neither is the matter suitable nor is the maker self-sufficient. Thus, if the cosmos did not exist before or will not exist later, it is in this predicament either because of its matter or because of the one Who made it a cosmos. But this maker is always self-sufficient at making since it is always the same and does 10 not differ over time. Thus, either this maker is not even now competent to establish cosmic order, or it is competent now as well as in the past and in the future. And similarly, the matter was either always suitable to be ordered just as it is now, or even now it likewise is not suitable since it is always the same. For matter is unalterable, just as the maker 15is unchangeable. So if everything that exists at one time and does not exist at another is of this sort either because the maker is not sufficient or because the matter is not serviceable, and if the maker of the cosmos is not at one time sufficient for making and at another time not sufficient, and if the matter is not at one time serviceable and at 20another time not serviceable, then the cosmos will not exist at one time and not exist at another. Therefore, it is for all time that the creator makes and the matter is ordered and the cosmos exists.

The Main Points of the Refutation of the Twelfth Argument

1. That it is false that 'everything that comes to be requires matter'. 25

2. That even some of the things that according to them are always coming to be require matter. Under this heading I also show that not everything that comes to be requires matter.

3. That not even things which come to be at some time absolutely require matter.

4. As a sort of corollary, that not everything that comes to be comes to be out of something that exists.

5. That even if it were true that the things that exist at some time

5

467,1

and not always do not always exist either because their matter is
unsuitable or because the maker is deficient at making, it would still not be necessary that the cosmos be everlasting.

6. That it is false that the things that do not always exist do not always exist solely on account of their matter or their efficient cause or both; rather, it is possible for something not always to exist on account of some other cause beyond these. Under this heading I also show that

15 it is prior to being generated that matter must be serviceable and suitable for generation.

Refutation of the Twelfth Argument

1. We have shown in the preceding book³ that even though matter comes to be and admits of a beginning to its existence, it will not require matter for its coming to be. Therefore, not everything that comes to be requires matter (as the philosopher⁴ says); some things, rather, that come to be require only a maker ('for it is impossible for anything to have a generation without a cause', as Plato says).⁵

- 25 And to show this another way, if matter is not a thing of chance, as 468,1 Proclus himself believes,⁶ neither did it come into existence without a cause⁷ because the cause of all things is one and the principle is one. But God is the creator even of this matter. For He is the creator of the entire cosmos, and matter is either a part or an element of the cosmos.
 - 5 Clearly, then, matter, too, comes to be by the agency of God even if it does not come to be at some time, but does so always (for let this be agreed to for the time being).⁸ For the maker and creator of something is invariably an efficient cause of what is being created and what is coming to be. If, then, God creates matter, too, I suppose even matter
 - 10 invariably comes to be by the agency of God. Therefore, if absolutely everything that comes to be requires matter [viz. as Proclus asserts], and if matter comes to be, then even matter will require matter. And this matter, if it comes to be by the agency of God, will require another matter. Then, we will either come to a stop at some matter which does
 - 15 not come to be by the agency of God and of whose being God is not the cause or we will proceed *ad infinitum* in our search for the matter of matter. Therefore, since these alternatives are absurd,⁹ not everything that comes to be requires matter.

But we could say the same thing about the rational soul and all the things like it. For God is the creator of these things, too, even if He

20 brought them forth from the beginning of time. And surely the rational soul which comes to be by the agency of God will not require matter either since it is simple and immaterial.

2. Proclus says: But we say that the things which come to be and which do not always exist but exist only at some time, require matter in order to come to be. Matter and soul, however, are everlasting and have not taken the beginning of their existence in time.¹⁰

First, it is unclear, to mention just this much for now, whether each of the things just mentioned [viz. matter and soul] does not admit a beginning to their existence.¹¹ For there is no argument, as far as I know, that necessitates that these things are without beginning. And 469.1in fact we have rehearsed this sufficiently in another argument¹² that showed that no nature that is receptive of evil (and our soul is of this sort) can have a beginningless existence (huparxis).¹³ And it was also shown in the first chapter¹⁴ that it is impossible for the cosmos to be $\mathbf{5}$ without beginning. But since the cosmos does not have a beginningless existence, neither can matter be without beginning. For matter and generation are both relatives,¹⁵ and it is necessary for matter and the generation of the cosmos to exist alongside of one another, as even Proclus himself explained in the preceding chapter.¹⁶ 10

However, let it have been granted that, as I said.¹⁷ both matter and our soul have an existence without beginning. Since presumably God is invariably the maker and creator of these things. He either makes them at some time or is always making them. For anything that makes some-15thing is either always making it or makes it at some time. And since they do not want these things to come to be at some time, clearly these things are [viz. according to them]¹⁸ always coming to be by the agency of God.

What, then, is the reason for its being the case that the things that come to be at some time require matter for their coming to be whereas the things that are always coming to be do not require any matter? We will, at any rate, certainly not be convinced by their bare assertions. For 20if everything that comes to be requires matter, as Proclus says in this argument,¹⁹ it is presumably reasonable for what is always coming to be always to require matter just as what comes to be at some time requires matter at some time. Or else, if this is not the case, then not everything that comes to be requires matter.

And to put the point another way, if only what comes to be at some 25time requires matter and if according to them the cosmos is always coming to be and does not come to be at some time, then the cosmos will not require matter since it is *always* coming to be by the agency of God. 470.1And so, the generation of the cosmos would be immaterial. And yet just as each of the things that come to be at some time (I mean the particular things) are composed of matter and form, so too is the whole cosmos as a whole composed of matter and form; and as some particular matter 5 is related to a particular form, so too is matter *simpliciter* related to the whole, i.e. the universe. Either, then, the cosmos, which is always coming to be, will not require any matter, if only the things that come to be at some time require matter, and since it does not require matter, it will be simple and immaterial (and this is false); or else if, seeing that 10 it is always coming to be and is enmattered, it will always require matter, then the things that come to be at some time are not the only things that require matter to come to be; rather, even some of the things that are always coming to be require matter.

Further, if it is true that everything that comes to be requires
matter, one of these two statements has to be granted: Either God is not the cause and creator of matter, and in this way the principle of all that exists is not one, rather there will be two things which are without beginning and have the cause of their being from nothing, namely God and matter, as the nonsense of the Manicheans has it; or else, if God is
the creator of matter as well,²⁰ even matter, since it comes to be, will have to require matter for its coming to be. So if both of these options are absurd, and there cannot be matter of matter, and if the true belief that the principle of all things is one implies that God is the cause of all things, then it is false that everything that comes to be requires matter for its coming to be.

3. Proclus says that the things that are always coming to be do not invariably require matter, whereas the things that come to be at some time and admit a beginning to their existence do invariably require matter. But this, too, has virtually already been sufficiently examined for us in the preceding chapter.²¹ For there we showed that although matter comes to be at some time it will in no way require matter for the

- following reasons. The things that are now coming to be by the agency of nature come to be according to form, and the form is not self-substantial²² and therefore reasonably requires matter in order to exist. But matter is opposed to form, and opposite is consequent upon opposite; I mean that not requiring matter is consequent upon the fact that matter is generated because matter does not require a substratum for its
- 10 existence because it is itself the substratum of all natural things.²³ Therefore, not even what comes to be at some time invariably requires matter. For the proximate matter of particular things comes to be at some time, as even Proclus himself said in the previous argument;²⁴ and we have shown there by several arguments²⁵ that whenever something
- 15 comes to be *qua* matter it does not come to be from matter. Therefore, not even what comes to be at some time invariably requires matter for its generation.

And here is another argument. If according to them the cosmos is always coming to be by the agency of God, clearly even now it is coming to be. For if it is not coming to be now, it is not always coming to be but is rather coming to be only at some time. Thus, the matter of the cosmos, too, either is always coming to be by the agency of God or only

- sometimes or never. But since it was shown to be impossible for matter never to come to be by the agency of God (since God is the maker and creator of all things and nothing that exists is the cause of its own existence; rather, all things exist from the cause of all things), and since
- 25 existence; rather, all things exist from the cause of all things), and since they agree that matter did not come to be at some time and temporally, clearly it is always coming to be. Accordingly, if matter is always coming to be, clearly it is even now coming to be. For if it were not

472,1 coming to be now but did nevertheless come to be, it would not always be coming to be but only at some time. For what comes to be at some

471,1

time is not invariably and always coming to be (consider, e.g., Plato, this plant and each individual thing), but as for what is always coming to be and has its being in time and whose manner of always existing is temporal and not eternal, it is always necessary for such a thing to be in the process of coming to be at any given moment. For what is coming to be over all time also invariably comes to be at some particular time, and we clearly showed this very thing in the fifteenth section of the fourth chapter.²⁶

Thus, matter, which is presently coming to be by the agency of God, 10 either requires matter or does not. If it requires matter, that matter will in turn require another matter and so on *ad infinitum*. If it does not require matter, then not even what comes to be at some time invariably requires matter for its generation. And I have said several times²⁷ that by 'generation' I shall mean this very mere introduction of things into being and their substantiation, even if a thing gets its existence all at once and in the indivisible present as the transparent body is timelessly illuminated by the sun and does not require a temporal extension in the way that any given ship and the things that are assembled or grow get their introduction into being in some extended period of time.²⁸

4. Therefore, I think it is clear that not everything that comes to be comes to be out of something that exists. For if the cosmos, which is always coming to be by the agency God, is coming to be right now (since 'always' in the case of the cosmos is temporal), and if right now it is 25coming to be out of something that exists, then clearly what it is coming to be from is other than it. And does this other thing, then, come to be by the agency of God or not? If it does not come to be by the agency of God, God will not be the creator of everything nor will He wholly create the things He does create, since He does not Himself make that out of which He creates the cosmos. If, however, it does come to be by the agency of God,²⁹ clearly it comes to be out of something that exists, since everything that comes to be comes to be out of something that exists; and that, too, will come to be out of something else that exists and so 5 on ad infinitum. So if this is impossible, then the cosmos does not come to be out of something that exists. Therefore, not everything that comes to be comes to be out of matter or absolutely out of something that exists, regardless of whether it is always coming to be over all time or whether it comes to be at some time.

5. If, then, there were some argument that established matter to be 10 everlasting, one would have to concede that the cosmos, too, is everlasting because (i) matter, since it is everlasting, is always suitable to be ordered, (ii) God is always self-sufficient at making, and (iii) matter and form are relatives and thus both are destroyed and come into existence 15 together. But if there is no argument that establishes that matter is everlasting (those who think to establish this were refuted in the preceding arguments),³⁰ it is clearly possible, since God is always in the

473,1

- 20same state [viz. He is always sufficient at making], for the cosmos not to be eternal not because the maker is deficient in creative power but because things that come to be are not of a nature to exist for all time. For we do not see anything that comes to be come into existence
- simultaneously with its own efficient cause, rather everything that 25comes to be exists after its maker. And it was sufficiently shown in the first chapter³¹ that it is not due to the inability of the maker but to the nature of the things that come to be that the cosmos is not everlasting, and whoever so desires can read through what was said there. If, then,
- what exists at one time and does not exist at another time does not 474,1always exist either because the maker is deficient at making or because what comes to be cannot always exist³² or for both of these reasons, as Proclus rightly said in these lines,³³ and if it was shown in the first
 - chapter³⁴ that the very nature of the things that come to exist does not $\mathbf{5}$ admit of existence from the beginning of time (for the reasons we mentioned in those lines), then it is possible that the cosmos not always exist even though God is always in the same state.
 - 6. But regarding what exists at one time and does not exist at 10 another time, perhaps it is not even universally true that the reason that it exists at one time and not at another is either that the maker is not self-sufficient at making or that the matter is not always serviceable. For I think it is possible for the maker to be self-sufficient at making (by 'self-sufficient at making' I mean nothing more than that it
 - is within His creative power and expertise) and for the matter to be 15suitable according to its own nature (logos) for coming to be and nevertheless for what is of a nature to come to be not always to exist. For even when stones have been made smooth (for this is what it means for the matter of a house to be serviceable) and the rest of the matter is
 - 20suitable for the generation of a house, and further when even the builder is present and is self-sufficient as far as the proper expertise for making a house is concerned, nevertheless, what prevents the house from not yet having come to be or from not coming to be? Further, when
 - 25wax is suitable for receiving letters and the scribe is competent at writing what prevents the letters from not yet being written? Some
- other cause prevents the generation of the letters and the house, e.g. 475,1the good because of which each of them comes to be. And the same argument applies to all cases.

But if Proclus says that stones that are already smoothed are not matter suitable for a house until they have been assembled and at-

- tached to one another, he would be saying nothing other than that $\mathbf{5}$ matter is unsuitable to receive the form unless the form has already been imposed on the matter. For the fitting-together of the stones to the rest of the parts that are going to come together in a house's generation just is the generation of the form of the house. Therefore, whenever the
- 10 stones have been fitted together and have already become a house, they are no longer said to be suitable for the generation of a house; they are

rather said to have already become a house in actuality. For 'suitable for becoming something' is said of what is still that thing potentially and has not yet actually become it, as water is said to be suitable for being heated when it is cold. For whenever it is already heated, it is 15then said to be actually hot and not to be suitable for being heated. And whenever wax has already received the letters, it is not simply said to be suitable for being written on, but to have actually been written on. For is wax which is not deficient in its suitability for something's being 20written on it more fit for being the matter of letters after being written on, or before? Similarly, are the stones that have been made smooth in the right way better suited matter for a house after they have already 25been fitted together and have received the form of house or before they have been fitted together? For combining and fitting-together the stones and wood is nothing other than the generation of the form of the house. For the builder who assembles the wood and stones does not 476.1make the matter, rather he imposes the form itself of house on them. Therefore, the stones that have not yet been assembled but which are nevertheless smooth, these are then matter suitable to the coming to be of a house.

In terms of the cases just mentioned, then, what is to prevent it from 5 being the case that although the matter of the cosmos is always suitable to the production of the cosmos (if in fact someone agreed that the matter is everlasting) and the creator is self-sufficient at creating the cosmos, the cosmos does not always exist because of some other cause, if it happened that the creator knew well that coming to be at some time 10 is good for the things that come to be?

But when I say this I do not think that matter itself ever existed *per* se separately from forms (for the creator did not introduce the matter of the cosmos and the form of the cosmos separately; rather, He created the composite simultaneously and timelessly, as we said many times in 15the preceding arguments).³⁵ Rather, I wanted to show that even if someone should agree that the matter is everlasting and its existence preceded that of the cosmos, the argument of Proclus just discussed, 20taken by itself, that means to show that the cosmos is everlasting, has no force. For the not coming to be of the things that come to be is not only due to the matter being unsuitable or the maker alone being not sufficient as far as being capable of making is concerned. Rather, it is possible that what can come to be does not come to be because of some 25other causes. Therefore, if the efficient cause and the matter are not the only causes of the things that come to be, if in addition to others there is also above all the final cause (i.e. the advantage and good of the thing that comes to be because of which it does come to be), then the not 477.1coming to be of the things that come to be is not only due to the matter alone being unsuitable or the maker alone being deficient at making nor even is it due to both; rather, this can also occur because of what is good for the thing that is to come to be, if coming to be now were not

- 5 good for it, but coming to be later were. What is natural for each thing is good for it. Therefore, the philosopher's present argument, when exercised all by itself, has no real force, unless someone infers from the fact that matter is relative and everlasting that coming to be is also everlasting. But 10 we have sufficiently examined this in the preceding chapter.
- 10 We have sufficiently examined with in the proceeding enapte

End of the Refutation of the Twelfth Argument

The Thirteenth Argument of Proclus the Successor

Thirteenth Argument:³⁶ Plato says³⁷ that God allots to the cosmos the 15 motion that is proper to its body which is sphere-shaped – the circular motion which is especially connected with intellect and intelligence. So if Plato agrees that this motion is proper to the cosmos, he should also further agree that the heaven moves in a circle by nature. But if the

- 20 heaven has this motion naturally, we should say that neither upward motion nor downward motion is suitable to it, and these are the motions of the sublunar³⁸ elements. Therefore, the heaven must transcend the
- 478,1 bodies that move in a straight line. Thus, the celestial body is neither fire nor earth nor any of the intermediate bodies between these; nor is it light or heavy, if the body that moves downwards is heavy and the one that moves upwards is light. But if it is not any of these elements,
 - 5 the body that naturally moves in a circle is something else besides these.

If, then, generations and destructions belong to things which are contrary to each other, and if contraries are those things that have contrary natural motions, and if one thing is contrary to one (for this Platonic account is stated in the *Protagoras*³⁹), then these things should perish and come to be; but the celestial body should be ungenerated and

10 perish and come to be; but the celestial body should be ungenerate indestructible.

But even if these things are generated and destroyed as far as the parts are concerned and the wholes are always in a natural state and remain in their own places,⁴⁰ and the cosmos is made up of these, i.e. of

- 15 the heaven and each of the four wholes [of elements], then it too should be ungenerated and indestructible. Now these [viz. the things that
- 20 come to be and perish in any way whatsoever], too, *appear* to be parts of the universe since they are contained in it, but in fact all products are contained in their respective causes and held together by them.⁴¹ (At any rate, the things that come to be and perish in any way whatever are products of the cosmos and not parts since the gods in the cosmos borrow pieces from the cosmos on the condition that the loan will one day be repaid,⁴² as Plato says.)⁴³

If, then, the cosmos is composed out of ungenerated and indestructi-

25 ble things, then it is even much more ungenerated and indestructible.

479,1 For the whole would be worse than the parts if it had a generation and a destruction when the parts were on the contrary ungenerated and

indestructible. However, Plato is the one who says that the whole is better than the parts since he says that the whole does not exist for the sake of the parts, but the parts exist for the sake of the whole.⁴⁴ But that for the sake of which is better than the things that are for the sake of something else. And the elements are parts of that which is composed out of them. Therefore, what is composed out of the elements is better than its own elements.

If, then, the universe (ouranos)⁴⁵ is composed out of ungenerated and indestructible elements, then the universe itself is ungenerated and indestructible, and this, too, is shown from Platonic principles.

The Main Points of the Refutation of the Thirteenth Argument

1. As in the preface,⁴⁶ that Proclus contradicts both himself and Plato when he says that Plato thinks that the heaven is made out of some different substance besides the four elements.

2. That Plato wants the heaven to move in a circle *qua* living thing, and this motion arises in it by the agency, not of nature, but of soul. And that in the case of all living things, the motion that is implanted in them qua living things by the agency of soul is not natural. And that neither 20the difference in figure of living things nor the difference in motion forces us to say that their bodies are composed out of different and not the same elements.

3. That from things which Proclus agreed to, in accordance with 25nature, there is no necessity for the heaven to move in a straight line, even if according to Plato it is mostly of fire; rather, regardless of whether one says that it moves in a circle by the agency of soul, or 480.1that like a lifeless body it moves by the agency of nature, it moves in a circle in accordance with its account since it is of the nature of the elements.

4. That Proclus also contradicts himself by saying that the heaven is of a different substance because it moves in a circle.

5. That it is impossible for the heaven to move in a straight line even if, as Plato says, it is mostly of fire.

6. That there is no necessity, just because the celestial body moves in a circle, for it to be different from the nature of the elements.

7. That from Plato's principles and those admitted by Proclus, it is necessary for the celestial body to be generated and destructible naturally.

8. That it is false that the things that come to be and are destroyed 15are not parts of the cosmos. Under this heading I also show that the part of a part must also be a part of the whole.

9. That Proclus falls utterly into contradiction by saying that the things that come to be and are destroyed in any way whatever are not 20parts of the cosmos but products. Under this heading I show that Plato

23

 $\mathbf{5}$

10

15

5

also says that the parts of the elements, although they are generated and destructible, are pieces of the entire cosmos.

- 10. That a whole whose parts are generated and destructible mustitself be generated and destructible, and therefore both the ensembles of the elements and the entire cosmos must be generated and destructible.
- 11. (Taking up again what has been said) that it is false that the 481,1 things that come to be and are destroyed in any way whatever are not parts of the cosmos. And that the parts of the elements are also parts of the entire cosmos.
 - 12. That animals, plants and the rest of the composite bodies areparts of the whole cosmos both according to reason and according to Plato.

13. According to Plato from Timaeus, that the whole cosmos is constituted exclusively of four bodies, but the heaven is mostly of fire.

10 **14.** That Aristotle's attempt in the first book of the *Meteorology* through which he seems to establish that the heavens are not fiery is not compelling.

15. Passages from Taurus the Platonist, Porphyry, Proclus and Plotinus to the effect that Plato wants the cosmos to be constituted out

15 of the four elements exclusively and did not recognize the so-called fifth body in Aristotle of which the latter said the heaven is constituted.

16. That Plato says that the heaven is qualified by the same qualities (I mean heat, coldness, etc.) by which the elements down here are given form.

17. That Plato says it is not even possible for there to be another simple body beside the four elements.

18. By what arguments, given that there are five solid and simple
bodies (the cube, pyramid, octahedron, dodecahedron and icosahedron)
Plato allotted four of them to the four elements, but allotted the dodecahedron to the total cosmos. And that not even from this is it
obvious that he adopts the fifth substance.

Refutation of the Thirteenth Argument

There is no measure of shamelessness that men's nature would not exceed, if although Plato so clearly proclaims that the total cosmos is
 constituted out of fire, earth, water and air, and not least that both the heaven and all the things throughout heaven are composed of these same bodies but partake in a greater part of fire, there have been some men who professed the august facade of philosophy, would-be teachers

15 of Plato's doctrines, who went to such an excess of senseless pride (and they should be the last ones to be doing this) that they dared to say (but not to think, as it seems to me) that Plato wanted heaven to be of a different substance besides the four elements, being neither earth nor

20 fire nor any of the intermediates,⁴⁷ but also not a composite of these.

And yet our very own exegete of Plato, in those writings where he rose up against Aristotle concerning the things said by him [viz. Aristotle] against Plato's Timaeus⁴⁸ (Aristotle having charged Plato with having composed the heaven out of the four elements) was grand enough to try 25to convince us that the nature of the celestial body is not anything foreign or alien to the four elements from which the total cosmos is constituted (like the nature of the fifth body that Aristotle introduced to the universe), but rather that the purest part of them produces the $\mathbf{5}$ celestial compound. So how can he now show us the power of both sides of the arguments – on the one hand criticizing his client Plato, and on the other hand himself backing water in the arguments and singing a recantation?49

But a little later we will show these things from Plato himself, from 10 his commentators, from the testimony of other philosophers concerning him, and from Proclus himself, by presenting evidence that Plato wants all of heaven to be composed out of the four elements.

But now we must first carefully examine whether the argument at 15least has some plausible starting point: Must one who says that the heaven moves circularly also suppose that it is of a substance different than the four elements? We will examine Aristotle's arguments that the heaven is some fifth body⁵⁰ in the sections directed against him (let it 20be said with God). But right now the argument will only consider whether Plato assumed something inconsistent when he said that the heaven is mostly fire⁵¹ while granting that it has a spherical figure⁵² and a circular motion proper to it.⁵³ So even if on the basis of the 25argument there appears to be some necessity for one who says that the 484.1heaven moves in a circle also to assume that it is different from the substance of the four elements, nevertheless it is not reasonable, as I have said many times, to evade by means of unclear guesswork what has expressly been said without any concealment by Plato as if it had 5 not even been said. Rather, if anything at all is reasonable, it would be only to give sincere attention to the conflict among the hypotheses. Nevertheless, it is excusable for Plato enthusiasts to fine-tune his thought even if they lead one away from the truth. But if it is clearly possible for the heaven both to be composed from the four elements 10 and to move naturally in a circle, then one should know that the man who attacked Plato is an outright sophist who forced the arguments only with a view to appearance and not to the truth. For I think that whoever is talented enough to make what is clear obscure in this way is not ignorant of the truth. So the attack on Proclus proceeds in this 15manner.

2. Plato says that God allots to the cosmos the motion that is proper to its sphere-shaped body – the circular motion which is especially connected with intellect and intelligence. So if, Proclus says, the heaven 20moves in a circle, it is different from the bodies that go straight - fire, air, water and earth. For of these, the heavy ones move downward and

25

483.1

the light ones move upward. Therefore, he says, Plato thought that the celestial body is neither light nor heavy.⁵⁴

- But if Plato assumed that the heaven is a simple or lifeless body, we 485,1 might perhaps agree that it is be plausible, even if it is not correct, to reason that the heaven is a composite of the elements although it partakes in a greater part of fire, but it is nevertheless ensouled and a
 - 5 living thing and moves by the agency of soul. I think it is clear to everyone that Plato says that the circular motion is proper and naturally belongs to the heaven, not insofar as the heaven, conceived separately from the soul set over it, is *per se* a body, but insofar as it is a living thing and the motion comes to be in it by the agency of soul. But
 - 10 the upward motion of light things and the motion of heavy things in the opposite direction is not the motion of ensouled bodies but of lifeless bodies moving without choice solely by their inborn inclination. And besides, oftentimes it happens that the motion that naturally belongs
 - 15 to something qua animal does not naturally belong to the underlying body. For even the living things down here when they move horizontally, move naturally qua living things, although horizontal motion is not natural for any of the elements out of which their bodies are composed nor for the composite itself. For composites, whenever they
 - 20 move *qua* lifeless and not *qua* living things, move in accordance with the simple body in them that predominates. For when there is an excess of the heavy elements, earth and water, in the sublunar composite bodies, they naturally have a downward movement. Thus, the horizon-
 - 25 tal motion of living things that comes to be by the agency of soul is not natural for the living things' bodies. And both the ensouled bodies that
- 486,1 grow and move upward by growth, and the winged creatures shifting from below upwards as wholes affect this sort of motion naturally qua ensouled things, but unnaturally qua earthy and heavy things. And what would one say concerning the plants that revolve with the revolu-
 - 5 tion of the sun (the ones which are called 'heliotropes' eponymously from that motion)? For let them tell us what sort of simple body this sort of motion belongs to naturally! So either these plants, too, must be
 - 10 foreign to the nature of the elements due to the difference in motion, or else since the motion of each body by its own nature qua lifeless thing is different from the motion of a body qua ensouled that comes to be in it by its psychic power and Plato wants the heaven, too, to be ensouled
 - 15 and to move by the agency of soul, therefore, it is clear that Plato grants the circular motion to the heaven naturally *qua* animal. For if Plato says that the circular motion is especially connected with the intellect,⁵⁵ just as Plotinus says that it moves in a circle because it imitates intellect,⁵⁶ clearly he wants circular motion to have come to the heaven by the agency of soul in imitation of the intellective activity that moves
 - its proper body. For one could not reasonably suppose that a lifeless body would, without soul and exclusively by the irrational and natural impulse of motion, imitate intellect.

But Plato says reasonably that the circular motion is proper to the figure.⁵⁷ For each figure of living thing is given a fitting motion from the 25inherent soul. Hence, there is one motion for winged creatures, another for land creatures, and another for aquatic creatures. And both the winged and aquatic creatures equally move up and down and horizon-487.1tally, whereas of the land creatures the footed ones move differently than the footless ones. Why, then, is it surprising if the heaven, too, is moved by the agency of soul in correspondence with its body, since it has been modelled and moves more in correspondence with the soul's 5 impulses and powers, just as with all the other living things the modelling and organization of the bodies was not pre-arranged by the nature of the creator by reference to the different substance of the simple bodies of which the living things are composed, but by reference to the different powers of the souls in them that are going to act, as we 10 showed through several arguments in the sixth book.⁵⁸

So if the difference in the figure does not produce variety of substance (I mean substance in the sense of the elements of which the living things are composed), then not even the motion of ensouled things that 15 has come to be because of the figure will force us to say that their bodies are of a different nature. Therefore, it is possible for Plato both to say that the celestial body naturally moves in a circle *qua* ensouled and to assume that it is of the nature of the common elements.

Further, if every animal⁵⁹ has some local motion from soul (for flying 20comes to winged creatures by the agency of soul, and swimming to aquatic creatures, and crawling and moving by one's legs comes to the land creatures), and if Plato says that the heaven is an animal, then clearly he will grant that local motion comes to it by the agency of soul. 25For every animal has some local motion by the agency of soul and no animal is deprived of this. But the heaven has no local motion other than the circular one. Therefore, according to Plato the heaven will 488.1have this motion by the agency of soul. But if it moves in a circle by the agency of soul and the motion that comes to animals by the agency of soul is different from the motion implanted in their bodies qua lifeless $\mathbf{5}$ things by inborn inclination, then Plato does not think that the circular motion of the celestial body is natural but rather that it comes to be in it by the agency of soul. Hence, Plato himself in the psychogony⁶⁰ attached the motions of the celestial spheres to the body's soul as one 10 can ascertain from the very words of Plato.⁶¹ For he says that the World-Soul has the motion of the fixed sphere which he calls 'of the same' and the motion of the seven interior wandering spheres which he labels 'of the other' and that the movements of the heaven are motions 15of soul, which is precisely what Aristotle says.⁶² Accordingly, if Plato clearly says that the World-Soul is intellective and incorporeal; if, having woven the soul onto the heaven, he says that the soul has the celestial body's motions which are local motions; and if the soul, being incorporeal, is unable to move locally; then I think it is clear even to a 20

blind man that Plato is teaching symbolically when he says that the cause of motion for the heaven [viz. the soul] itself moves.⁶³ For the things that exist in the product as copies exist beforehand in the cause as paradigms, just as the form of house in the soul of the builder is a paradigm and cause of the house built of stones. For on the basis of this consideration Plato assumed that there are forms of all things.⁶⁴

3. But Proclus says, if indeed the heaven moves in a circle not by nature but by the agency of soul, what is the natural motion of the celestial *body*? For if it is made of the bodies that go straight, it will move either up or down although it transcends each of these motions.⁶⁵ Proclus himself solved the objection for us. For in the tenth argument he says, as we already learned, that each of the cosmic elements in its

- 10 proper place either rests or moves in a circle: 'For', he says, 'each of the cosmic elements moves in a straight line whenever it is not in its proper place, hastening to get there'.⁶⁶ Accordingly, if each of the cosmic elements, when it exists in its proper place, either remains motionless like earth or moves not in a straight line but in a circle like the
- 15 *hupekkauma*⁶⁷ and the air above the mountain peaks; and if each of the composite bodies occupies the place of that element of which it most partakes just as our bodies, being earthy, are in the same place as the
- 20 earth; and if the heaven according to Plato is constituted mostly of fire and of the rarest and purest fire; and if fire's natural place is the outermost one; and if the heaven is in this place; then the heaven occupies its proper place and being settled there moves in a circle. Therefore, either the circular motion has come to the heaven by the
- 25 agency of soul and the heaven does not itself have any motion from its own nature, and clearly naturally rests and does not move in a straight line since it is occupying its proper place, and the circular motion naturally belongs to it qua animal; or else the heaven moves in a circle
- 490,1 not by the agency of soul but by the agency of nature, even if it is made of bodies that go straight, because it exists in its proper place. (This is because none of the bodies that go straight is able to move in a straight 5 line when it is in its proper and natural place.)

4. How, then, does Proclus in his dealings with Plato's statements again put forth in these arguments assertions contrary to his own statements that were correctly made? For if the celestial body must be different from the substance of the bodies that go straight solely be-

- 10 cause it moves not in a straight line but circularly, then clearly, if it were made of the bodies that go straight and was in its proper place, he [i.e. Proclus] should expect it to move in a straight line. So how will the
- 15 view that none of the elements, when in its proper place, moves straight but rather each either remains motionless or moves in a circle still be true for Proclus? But if he agrees to this, as is natural (for neither earth, nor water, nor fire, nor air, when holding their proper place, move in a
- 20 straight line unless it is displaced from there by force), then neither

489.1

25

 $\mathbf{5}$

must the heaven go straight when it holds its proper place even if it is of the nature of the bodies that go straight.

5. But it is not only not necessary, but even impossible for the heaven to move in a straight line, even if it is of the nature of the elements. For 25evidently none of the elements - neither any whole nor part - when it is in its proper and natural place moves in a straight line. For bodies do not move in a straight line by their inborn impulse except when they are displaced from their natural place. For each wishes to remain in its 491.1 natural place since in this place it is preserved, and it requires force to remove bodies from their natural place (just as water and earthy bodies doubtless move up from below when forced out by some machines or a $\mathbf{5}$ mightier power; and the fiery breath enclosed in clouds, too, when squeezed together by compression is launched into the lower, unnatural place).⁶⁸ However, when the bodies are nonetheless displaced from their proper place, they then go straight to their proper place by the inborn impulse since they are preserved in this place. Accordingly, if 10 the heaven is in its natural place and is, according to Plato,⁶⁹ made of fire (and in particular of the rarest and purest fire possible – in what follows we will exhibit that even Proclus agrees with these points) and 15for this reason occupies the outermost place, then it is impossible for it to move in a straight line by an inborn impulse. For it is impossible for it to move in a straight line upwards (since even the wise thinkers among the Greeks⁷⁰ agree that there is nothing outside the heaven),⁷¹ 20and if it were to move downwards, it would have to be displaced from its natural place. But no body is displaced from its natural place by any natural power (for all things naturally strive to exist, and each thing exists and is preserved above all when it is in its natural place), rather 25it requires external force, as I said,⁷² to displace any body from its natural place. Therefore, neither can the heaven, if it is fiery, move downward without some external force. But it was shown that it cannot move upwards either. Therefore, it is entirely impossible for the heaven to move in a straight line even though according to Plato it does mostly partake in the nature of fire.

6. In general, what sort of necessity is there for one immediately to $\mathbf{5}$ assume that the heaven is of a different nature than the four elements solely because the heaven moves in a circle? For if the ensemble of fire (I mean the ethereal body that Aristotle called 'hupekkauma') clearly moves in a circle and not in a straight line, as the phenomena that occur 10 in it show (I mean comets and the like; for they are seen to rise and set and revolve in a circle with the heaven)⁷³ – and no one would exclude it from the nature of the elements because of this (for it is the ensemble 15of elemental fire) – then it is also unreasonable to suppose that the heaven is of a different substance and not of the substance of the elements just because it moves in a circle and not in a straight line, regardless of whether one wants this sort of motion to belong to the body itself or to come to be in it from the soul in it. So, just as the 20

492.1
ensemble of fire does not undergo circular motion by the agency of a natural impulse but is rather led around by the surrounding heaven (just as water inside machines is surely whirled around in a circle together with the machines)⁷⁴ and this sort of motion belongs to the *hupekkauma* itself in a way that is above its nature,⁷⁵ so too the heaven.

- 25 hupekkauma itself in a way that is above its nature,⁷⁵ so too the heaven, carried around in a circle by a mightier and incorporeal power and
- having this sort of motion in a way that is above the nature of its body,
 493,1 will not necessarily for this reason have to be of a different substance than the four elements except that the heaven enjoys this sort of motion immediately by the agency of an incorporeal nature⁷⁶ whereas the interior things that move in a circle [viz. the *hupekkauma* and upper air] enjoy this sort of motion by means of the heaven. And this is reasonable. For if, in fact, a single kind of matter (I mean the four
 - elements) underlies all composite bodies, but then, since one form⁷⁷ is better than another (e.g. take the form of gold or of iron, and the form of composite man or dog), and the nature⁷⁸ selects by reference to the
 - 10 superiority of the forms the purer portion of the elements for the generation of composites, and if the form of the celestial body transcends all the other bodies, then it is presumably necessary that the most unmixed form of the elements, their effervescence as it were,
 - 15 underlies as matter the form of celestial body. Since, then, the celestial body is better than all the interior bodies in both matter and form and is thus the most long-lived and as impassive as possible, it is reasonable that it partake in circular motion in a more primary manner than the
 - 20 interior bodies (I mean the ensemble of fire and the air over the mountain peaks). And because of that neither the interior nor even the exterior things⁷⁹ would be of a fifth nature⁸⁰ on account of their circular motion, and neither is the heaven.
- 7. Further, the following has been shown: (i) there is no necessity on account of the circular motion to suppose that the celestial body is foreign and alien to the nature of the four elements; (ii) the heaven is constituted out of these very elements according to Plato; (iii) the contraries are observed in the elements hot and cold, dry and moist and the other contrarieties;⁸¹ (iv) generation and destruction, as Proclus
 - has said in these lines,⁸² belong to contraries. Therefore, the celestial
 body must by the Platonic principles and those admitted by Proclus –
 be naturally generated and destructible, just as we demonstrated
 - through several arguments in the sixth book⁸³ that Plato thinks this although he assumed that it remains undissolved, gaining restored
 - 10 although he assumed that it remains undissolved, gaining restored immortality, by the will of God.⁸⁴

8. It is also important to consider the next part of the argument:⁸⁵ How can Proclus, forced by the self-evidence of the proposition, first agree that the elements of the cosmos are generated and destroyed in their parts where he says 'although these elements are generated and destroyed in their parts',⁸⁶ and then, having perceived that it necessarily follows that a thing whose parts are generated and destructible

must itself be generated and destructible, a little further down refuted his own thesis? For he says 'the things that come to be and are 20destroyed in any way whatever are products of the cosmos and not parts since the gods in the cosmos borrow pieces from the cosmos on the condition that the loan will one day be repaid, as Plato says'.⁸⁷ So if the things that come to be and are destroyed in any way whatever are not parts of the cosmos, then neither are the parts of the elements parts of 25the cosmos, since they are things that come to be and are destroyed. But if the parts of the elements, being generated and destructible, are not 495.1parts of the cosmos, and if there is no part of an element [i.e. of an element ensemble] that is not generated and destructible, then no part of an element [i.e. of an element ensemble] is a part of the whole cosmos. But yet each element as a whole is nothing other than all of its parts $\mathbf{5}$ existing together. Thus, not even the whole elements [viz. ensembles] are parts of the cosmos.

And yet even Proclus himself in this argument, drawing on Plato, agreed that the elements [viz. ensembles] are parts of the cosmos.⁸⁸ So if the elements are parts of the cosmos, the parts themselves of the 10 elements are pieces of the whole cosmos. For just as the whole hand is a part of the man, so too is the part of the hand, the finger, clearly a part of the whole man. Surely with one finger missing the man's body is mutilated and not whole. And yet if the part of the part were not a part of the whole, the whole body would not be deficient with one finger missing. Therefore, in the case of the cosmos, too, since the elements [viz. the ensembles] are parts of the cosmos, then the parts of the elements are also parts of the whole cosmos.

Putting it in a different way, if each of the elements [viz. the 20ensembles] is completely filled by its own parts, and again if the entire cosmos is in turn completely filled by the whole elements [viz. the ensembles], then the parts of the elements completely fill the whole cosmos. But the things that completely fill each whole are its parts. Therefore, the parts of the elements are parts of the whole cosmos. For 25parts are not judged in terms of largeness and smallness. For just as, let's say, ten cubits of stone⁸⁹ is a part or element of the house, so too is a foot of stone a part or element of the house; and just as the twenty 496.1cubits of wood is a part of the ship, so too the foot of wood. And in the case of the cosmos itself just as the whole fixed sphere is a part of the cosmos, so too is the part of the fixed sphere, e.g. the dogstar or any other of the stars in it, a part of the entire cosmos. So if the whole earth 5 is also a part of the cosmos, then the part of the earth, e.g. Mount Olympus, is also a part of the cosmos, so that the part of the Olympus is also a part of the cosmos. And the same argument applies to the other elements. If, then, the parts of the elements are parts of the cosmos, 10 and if all the parts of the elements [viz. of the ensembles] are generated and destructible, then there are some parts of the cosmos which are generated and destructible. But if this is the case, then it is not the case

15 that the things that come to be in any way whatever and are destroyed are products of the cosmos and not parts, as Proclus says.

9. Once these things have been shown, it is clear to all that Proclus has just now assumed things that are contrary and fallen into contra-

- 20 diction.⁹⁰ And it is important to observe how, similar to the Euripus,⁹¹ he is as it were hammered together by contrary winds and surges back against his own arguments, and how, in his search to complete the false goal he set before himself, he goes on to deny the very things that truth
- 25 forced him to agree to. For he says that the celestial body is foreign to the nature of the elements because it moves neither up nor down,⁹² and he wants to show that because of this it is ungenerated and indestructible.⁹³ He has to agree that generation and destruction are processes
- 497,1 by which the contraries pass into each other and that contraries such as fire and water have contrary natural motions. For these have contrary motions and are characterized by qualities that are contrary
 - 5 to and destructive of each other. For fire, being light and ascending, is hot and dry, whereas water, being heavy and weighed down, is cold and moist, and the generations and destructions among natural things result from these contraries – hot and cold and dry and moist. Since,
 - 10 then, the elements are contrary in the sense that they partake in contrary powers, Proclus says that for this reason 'these things should perish and come to be; but the celestial body should be ungenerated and indestructible'⁹⁴ seeing that it is foreign to the nature of these elements and has no contrariety.
 - 15 But after he said all these things and was practically dizzied by having seen what necessarily follows (for if the parts of the cosmos, I mean the elements, are generated and destructible, the cosmos must be generated and destructible) he destroyed his own thesis on the spot. For
 - 20 he directly proceeds to say that these elements, which he has agreed come to be and perish, come to be and perish as far as the parts are concerned while the wholes are <always> in a natural state;⁹⁵ and thereupon he clearly says that the wholes are ungenerated and indestructible, rescinding the very things he correctly conceded beforehand.
 - 25 And yet he delivered a completely sufficient reason for their being generated and destructible, namely because they are qualified by con-
- 498,1 trary qualities (which are the causes of generation and destruction), whereas he did not mention any plausible reason as to why the wholes should be ungenerated and indestructible and generation and destruction should only take place as far as the parts are concerned (because he did not have any plausible reason).
 - But he has not grasped what is credible on the basis of what is clear, 5 i.e. the appearances. For it is not necessary that what at present has not been destroyed is thereby also indestructible. Later we will show that the elements themselves are generated and destructible not only with respect to their pieces but also with respect to their wholes. But at present our wise Proclus, in order to be able to show that the cosmos is

ungenerated and indestructible, takes it on the basis of the appear-10 ances that generations and destructions are of contraries and for this reason the elements should come to be and perish, but the heaven should not, seeing that it [according to Proclus] contains no contrary. But once he perceived that in this way generation and destruction also come round to the universe⁹⁶ (for if the parts of the universe are 15generated and destructible, the universe, too, must be generated and destructible), he immediately denies what was assumed by saying that the elements come to be and perish only with respect to their pieces while each of their wholes is ungenerated and indestructible even though the cause of generation and destruction (I mean the contrary 20qualities which are destructive of one another) is observed both among the parts and among the whole elements alike. But since even thus the destructibility of the cosmos was no less implied (for if no part of an 25element is ungenerated and indestructible and each whole element as well as the entire cosmos is constituted by these very things, then not even the cosmos should be ungenerated and indestructible), again he at once virtually denies that the things that come to be and perish are 499.1the parts of the elements. For he says that the things that come to be in any way whatever and perish are products of the cosmos and not parts. So it is clear that he wants the parts of the elements, which following the appearances he has agreed to be generated and destruc- $\mathbf{5}$ tible, themselves to be products of the cosmos and not parts. So if no part of an element is a part of the whole cosmos, because all parts [viz. of the elements] are generated and destructible, then there must be two possibilities. Either not even the elements [i.e. ensembles] are parts of the cosmos (for the whole of water or the whole of earth is nothing other 10 than the sum of their respective parts existing together, and similarly with air and fire; and it will turn out that whatever he agreed to be parts of the cosmos, he will be forced by his own hypotheses to say that these things are again not parts). Or else, if the wholes of the elements 15are parts of the cosmos, and if it has been shown that the parts of parts are parts of the whole, and if nothing that comes to be and perishes is a part of the cosmos, then not even the parts of the elements are parts of the cosmos. But if they are not parts of the cosmos, neither will they 20be parts of the parts of the cosmos. For if they were parts of the parts of the cosmos, they would be parts of the whole cosmos. Therefore, the parts of the elements are not parts of the elements.

And this sort of falsehood is refuted as being trapped in its own snares, so what need is there of long arguments? For after Proclus said that the things that come to be in any way whatever and perish are products of the cosmos and not parts, he immediately added the phrase that he appropriated from Plato which reads 'the gods in the cosmos borrow pieces from the cosmos on the condition that the loan will one day be repaid, as Plato says'.⁹⁷ If, then, the things that are taken for the generation of composite bodies by the gods in the cosmos are pieces of

the cosmos, and if these things are the parts of the elements which

- 5 Proclus agreed on the basis of the plain evidence to be generated and destructible, then the parts of the elements, being generated and destructible, are pieces of the cosmos, as Plato said and Proclus accepted. But if the things that come to be and perish in any way
- 10 whatever are products of the cosmos and not parts, then the parts of the elements, too, are products of the cosmos and not parts. But these and the pieces of the cosmos were the same. Therefore, the parts of the elements are both pieces of the cosmos and again not parts but products.
- 15 But it is not even possible that one thing be both a piece and a product of the same thing at the same time and in the same respect. For the piece is what fills out⁹⁸ that of which it is a piece as the finger fills
- 20 out the human body, whereas the product does not fill out the substance of what produces it. For the house does not fill out the builder nor does what is begotten fill out the begetting nature; e.g. the son does not fill out the father's substance (that is, the father *qua* man, not *qua* father).⁹⁹ And with continuous things the piece is united with the whole
- 25 (for the finger is united with the whole man), whereas the product is certainly separate from what produced it once it has been produced, just as the door is separate from the carpenter and what is begotten
- 501,1 from the begetting nature. Therefore, it is not possible that a piece of something at the same time and in the same respect be a product of that very thing.

I added 'at the same time and in the same respect' because the matter received from the father or mother in the generation of the

- 5 embryo, e.g. the sperm and the menses, might perhaps be a piece of the begetters, but is not at the same time and in the same respect also a product; rather it is a product of the begetter, only when it has been transformed and altered. So, it is neither a product when it is sperm or menses, nor is it a piece of the producer any longer when it has become
- 10 a part of the embryo, having been destroyed and changed into that thing's nature. Therefore, if the parts of the elements are pieces of the cosmos,¹⁰⁰ they should not also be products of the same thing. But surely the things that come to be and perish in any way whatever are products
- 15 of the cosmos, as Proclus thinks. Thus, the parts of the elements are both products of the cosmos and are again not products of it. Moreover, even if someone were to agree that with some things it is

possible for the same things to be both parts and products of the same thing, nevertheless even so Proclus falls into a contradiction. For if the

- 20 thing, nevertheless even so Proclus falls into a contradiction. For if the parts of the elements are also pieces of the whole cosmos, and if it has been agreed that they are also products of the cosmos, clearly then
- 25 insofar as they are pieces Proclus' assertion that the things that come to be in any way whatever and perish are not parts of the cosmos will be false. Therefore, using the text of Plato which he cited¹⁰¹ he agreed that the same things are also pieces of the cosmos but then by his own

assertion denied that these same things are pieces of the cosmos. How, then, can the philosopher not realize that he immediately got turned around in contradictions? Is it because fraudulence is blind and unable to regard either itself or the truth?

10. It is obvious by the very act of his steering clear of declaring the things that come to be and perish to be parts of the cosmos that Proclus knows well that a thing whose parts are generated and destructible must itself be generated and destructible. And it would be possible to 10 cite many other of the clearest thinkers in philosophy saying precisely this very thing, namely that a thing whose parts are generated and destructible must itself be generated and destructible, but I think an argument will do for establishing sufficient assurance of this, and in this way we might avoid giving a lengthy account.

Now, if there is no part of water which is neither generated nor destructible, and if the whole is nothing other than all the parts together, then how can what has no ungenerated and indestructible part itself be ungenerated and indestructible? For what is properly 20ungenerated and indestructible must be numerically the same, but no element [i.e. no ensemble] can remain numerically the same over an extended period of time since all of its parts are being destroyed while some other parts come to be. For this is just what we were saying earlier:¹⁰² just as the ship which is changed plank by plank is not 25numerically the same ship but is rather entirely changed over time and is a different ship than the one it came from, so too, what is presently water [i.e. the ensemble of water] is not numerically the same as the [ensemble of] water that existed, let's say, three thousand years ago Nor again is it the same as the [ensemble of] water that will exist a long 503.1time from now since all the parts of the previous [ensemble of] water would now be destroyed and all the parts of the current [ensemble of] water will in turn be destroyed. And the same argument applies to the rest of the elements, too. So how can we say that the ensembles of the $\mathbf{5}$ elements are ungenerated and indestructible when they are not always numerically the same?

But not even the fact that the elements taken as wholes presently do not perish all at once but remain the same in form, is proof that the wholes of the elements will absolutely never be destroyed. For as long 10 as the cosmos exists, each whole of the elements of the cosmos from which the cosmos has its being, must as a whole be preserved in form. For even as long as a house remains a house, it is necessary that things out of which it is composed remain as wholes the same in form, I mean 15stones, wood, etc., even if the stones and the wood should be destroyed with respect to their parts, as we showed in a previous chapter.¹⁰³ And as long as Socrates was among the existing things, his parts also had to be preserved in form, I mean the flesh, blood, bones and the rest of 20the pieces, even if some were destroyed with respect to their parts while others came to be, since we men have our existence in generation and

35

 $\mathbf{5}$

502.1

destruction. Thus, the fact that the ensembles of the elements are not presently being destroyed in form is no proof that the cosmos is indestructible, but it would be a proof if the cosmos were shown by argument to have no principle of generation and destruction.

- But as things stand, the destruction and generation of all the parts. 504.1the variation in number of the ensembles, and their being characterized by contrary qualities which are destructive of each other, forces us to say that each of the elements and the cosmos constituted out of them are generated and destructible. For if generations and destructions are
 - of contraries, and if the things that have contrary qualities are contrar- $\mathbf{5}$ ies, and if the ensembles of the elements are characterized by contrary qualities, then the ensembles of the elements are also subject to generation and destruction. For the ensembles of the elements have the
 - 10 same form as their respective parts. For of whatever substance the whole water *qua* water is, the component water is of the same substance. For both the whole water and the part are moist and cold; and similarly, both air as a whole as well as a part of it is naturally hot and
 - moist; fire is hot and dry, and earth is in the same way dry and cold. So 15if these very qualities, being contraries, are causes of generation and destruction as far as the parts of the elements are concerned, and if these same qualities give form to the rest of the ensembles of the elements in precisely the same way, just as they do the parts, then the 20ensembles of the elements should be generated and destructible just as
 - the parts surely are.

For since the cause of destruction (I mean the contrary powers) is observed similarly both in the parts and in the wholes, what is the arbitrary principle that says that the parts come to be and are destroyed, but the wholes do not? Why is it not necessary that the wholes suffer the same thing as the parts when the cause of generation and destruction is observed in both? But since it has been demonstrated that the wholes of the elements are generated and destructible, the cosmos composed of them must also be generated and destructible. For it is impossible for the cosmos composed out of them to be preserved if

- they are destroyed. For if the elements out of which each of the beings are composed are destroyed, the thing itself must also be destroyed.
- 5 Thus, it has been shown by what has been said that a thing whose parts are generated and destructible must itself be generated and destructible and that both the ensembles of the elements and, consequently, the cosmos composed out of them are generated and destructible. 10

11. We have already shown a little while ago,¹⁰⁴ that Proclus ridiculously claims that the things that come to be and are destroyed in any way whatever are not parts of the universe, and now taking up the argument again, we argue in this way. First, let us grant him that the bodies of living things composed of the elements are products of the

15cosmos and not parts. For Plato says¹⁰⁵ that these come to be by the

25

25

505.1

agency of the celestial gods who borrowed pieces from the cosmos on the condition that the loan will one day be repaid. But even he agrees that the elements [i.e. ensembles] are parts of the cosmos, and one must 20keep in mind what I said even before, ¹⁰⁶ that Proclus, drawing on Plato, says that the parts of the elements that are borrowed for the generation of the living things are themselves pieces of the cosmos. If, then, the composites were the only things that come to be and are destroyed, the 25argument would perhaps be able to deceive the more simple-minded into thinking that all things that are generated and destructible are products of the cosmos and not parts. But if the parts themselves of the 506.1composites, i.e. the elements, come to be and are destroyed (since they change into each other – air comes to be when water is destroyed, and fire and water come to be from air, and all elements come to be from all elements),¹⁰⁷ clearly even the parts of the elements [i.e. of the ensem-5 bles] come to be and are destroyed.¹⁰⁸ Thus, if the parts of the elements, which are generated and destructible, are also pieces of the whole cosmos, as Plato and Proclus say, then it is not the case that the things that come to be and are destroyed in any way whatever are products of the cosmos and not parts.

Especially in the case of the homoiomerous things, the piece of the 10 part differs from the part solely in quantity and not in form. But no one with any sense, I think, would determine on the basis of quantity whether one thing is a part of another or not. For if this plank is a part of the door, then the part of the plank is also a part of the door. For the 15small piece of wood has the same form as the greatest piece of wood insofar as they are wood. But it was agreed that the elements, too, are homoiomerous. For some particular air, owing to the very nature of air, differs from the whole of air solely in quantity and not in substance, and similarly with the elemental fire – the whole of it partakes of the same 20nature as its part, whereas the quality that supervenes on the elements from the outside due to their mixture with one another is not referred to in the definition of their substance. For even if each part of water has a different quality admixed to it (for some water is sweet, some is bitter, 25and some is salty), these still come to the water from the outside from 507,1the underlying earth and do not produce a difference in the substance of water. And flame was agreed to be a sort of excess of fire and not the elemental fire, and similarly for the rest of the elements. If, then, the whole elements have the same form as their respective current parts, $\mathbf{5}$ and if the elements completely fill the whole cosmos as its parts, then the parts of the elements, since they completely fill their respective ensembles, also completely fill the whole cosmos as its parts or pieces. But if the parts of the elements, being generated and destructible, are 10 parts of the whole cosmos, then not all the things that come to be and are destroyed are products of the cosmos and not its parts.

But perhaps someone who more carefully rehearses these sorts of arguments will find Proclus' argument entirely false. For if the parts of 15

the elements are parts or pieces of the whole cosmos, and if all the composite bodies are constituted out of these, how is it not necessary that all the composite bodies also are parts or pieces of the cosmos? For

- 20 I think it would be extraordinary if each element that composes the bodies of the animals and plants (I mean the particular fire and particular water, and earth and air) were a piece of the cosmos and yet the things composed from the pieces of the cosmos were not pieces of
- 25 the cosmos. For just as the part of the door, I mean this wood, is a part of the whole wood, let's say of the tree from which it was cut, and for this reason the whole door insofar as it is wood must also be a part of
- 508,1 the same tree, so too it presumably follows that if the elements out of which the composite bodies are composed are parts of the entire cosmos, then the composite bodies composed out of these must also be parts of the same cosmos.
 - 5 **12.** Moreover, if Plato intended the composite bodies and in general the things that come to be and are destroyed not to be *parts* but rather *products* of the cosmos, why does he say in the *Timaeus* that without the mortal kinds of animals the cosmos will be incomplete? For what is
 - 10 incomplete is incomplete because something that helps complete its substance is missing. For, as we have shown many times, the products, by their existing or not existing, do not make their producer complete or incomplete – neither with respect to its substance nor with respect to the capacity to make. For the student does not complete the teacher,
 - 15 nor the ship the shipmaker who has the complete capacity to build ships. And it is possible to discern from this very passage of Plato that even if the producer is completed by the product, Plato says that when the mortal animals are missing the cosmos is incomplete not in the sense of [the creator's] being an incomplete efficient cause but in the sense that not all the parts which complete the cosmos and from which it has its being are present. When the creator in the *Timaeus* is conversing with the seen and unseen celestial gods that had already been generated, He says:

Thus, learn what I now declare and show you. There are still three kinds of mortals <left>¹⁰⁹ ungenerated. But if these do not come to be, the heaven is¹¹⁰ incomplete. For it will not have the entire collection of kinds of animals in itself, but this is necessary if it is to be sufficiently complete. But if these things come to be and partake in life through me they would be equal to gods. Thus, in order that they be mortal and that this universe be truly a universe, turn in accordance with nature to the creation of the mortal animals¹¹¹ by imitating my power in your generation.¹¹²

It is important to consider that Plato says that if the mortal animals do not come to be, that is, the aquatic, land, and aerial creatures (for these are the three kinds) the heaven is incomplete. As is usual Plato

5

509.1

calls the cosmos 'heaven'. For this is what he said at the start: 'the 10 entire heaven or cosmos or what have you – whatever name it best admits of, let us call it that!'¹¹³ And again in the *Statesman*¹¹⁴ he said, 'which he named "heaven" or "cosmos" '. If, then, that is complete for which no part is missing, and the cosmos is incomplete when the mortal animals are missing, then the mortal animals are parts of the cosmos. For if the mortal animals were not parts of the cosmos, clearly no part would be missing from the cosmos even if they hadn't come to be. How, then, if no part is missing, would the cosmos have been incomplete if 20 the mortal animals had not come to be?

Again, it is important to observe how Plato does not say 'if these [mortal animals] do not come to be, you who create them will be incomplete because the producer is incomplete if there is no product'; rather he says 'heaven will be incomplete', i.e. the cosmos. For it will 25still not encompass the entire collection of animals in itself, since the parts are encompassed by the whole and entirety. But a whole and 510,1entirety is that which is composed of all of its parts. If one of the parts is missing, the whole is no longer a whole and the entirety is not an entirety any more. For if the foot is missing from a statue, it will no $\mathbf{5}$ longer be a whole statue. And if some people are taken away from the populace of, let's say, Athens, the Athenian populace is no longer whole. Thus, if the creator orders the generation of the mortal animals so that this universe might truly be a universe, then it is clear that if the 10 mortal animals had not come to be this universe would no longer be a true universe. Thus, if the entirety (to pan) is not an entirety (pan) any more when one of the parts is missing, as we have shown, and if this universe (tode to pan) would not truly be a universe (pan) if the mortal animals had not come to be, as Plato says, then clearly Plato wants the 15mortal animals to be a part of the universe (tou pantos).

And what need do I have of deductive arguments when it is possible to cite Plato explicitly proclaiming that all the living things in the cosmos are parts of the cosmos, both each individually and in kind, and all the rest of the visible bodies, too? For in that same *Timaeus*, prior to the passage now before us, Plato says¹¹⁵ this *verbatim* about the cosmos and the paradigm in conformity to which it came to be:

This being the case, we must again state what comes next after these things: In likeness to which of the living things did the composer compose it? Let us, then, not degrade it by likening it to any of the things that are of a nature to be in the form of a *part*. For nothing resembling the incomplete could ever be noble. But that of which the other living things both singly and in kind are *pieces*, let us suppose that it of all things is most like this. For that cosmos contains the intelligible living things,¹¹⁶ having embraced them in itself, just as this cosmos contains us and however many other of the visible creatures He constituted. For as God wanted

511.1

5

it to resemble the most noble and in all ways most complete of the objects of thought, He constituted it as a single, visible living thing containing within itself all the living things¹¹⁷ that are naturally akin to itself.

- 10 If the cosmos encompasses us and however many other visible creatures that He constituted in the same way that the paradigm of the cosmos contains all the intelligible living things, having embraced them in itself, and if the intelligible living things are pieces, both singly and in kind, of that living thing in conformity to which as a paradigm the
- 15 cosmos came to be, then both we and the rest of the visible living things are, according to Plato, parts, both singly and in kind, of the cosmos that encompasses us. For if the intelligible living things encompassed by the paradigm are related to the perceptible living things encompassed by
- 20 the image, i.e. the cosmos, in the same way that the whole paradigm is related to the whole image, then by alternation it is also true that the perceptible living things encompassed by the cosmos are related to the cosmos in the same way that the intelligible living things encompassed by the paradigm are related to the paradigm. Thus, if the intelligible
- 25 living things encompassed by the paradigm are *parts* of it, both singly and in kind, then the living things encompassed by the image, I mean
- 512,1 the cosmos, are also parts of it [viz. the cosmos], both singly and in kind. And notice that Plato does not say that only the kinds of the living things are parts of the entire cosmos, rather he says that every single
 - 5 individual is as well, e.g. Socrates, Plato, this horse, this stone;¹¹⁸ and they are parts that are *naturally akin* to it, as we heard Plato say, and
 - 10 not foreign or alien to the nature of heaven (*ouranos*) (as if the heaven were something else apart from the nature of the elements out of which all the visible living things are constituted), as Proclus now misleads us (while appearing to guide us), introducing what is in reality foreign to Plato and alien to his teaching and insulting him by rejecting his doctrines. For he was not able to overshadow the truth, and by the very
 - 15 fact that he is obviously displeased with what has been stated by Plato, he clearly insults him.

13. So much for these topics. Next it is time to read, as I promised I would do, Plato's own words by which he without any ambiguity or encryption constitutes the celestial body out of the four elements, and then to cite the testimonies of other philosophers regarding him. Plato says in the *Timaeus* that the heaven and the whole cosmos are constituted and the same to find the four elements.

25 tuted exclusively out of the four elements.¹¹⁹

For these reasons the maker made neither two nor infinitely many *kosmoi*; rather, this heaven¹²⁰ is and will remain¹²¹ one and the only one of its kind. What comes to be must be bodily in form – visible and tangible. But if it is separated from fire it could never become visible,¹²² nor could it become tangible without something

513,1

solid, but what is solid is not without earth. Therefore, when God begins to put the body of the universe together, He makes¹²³ it out $\mathbf{5}$ of fire and earth. But it is not possible for two alone to be composed well without a third. For there must be some bond in the middle that brings the two together. But the best bond is the one that makes itself and the things bound together as much as possible into one, and proportion is of a nature to complete this best. For 10 whenever among any given numbers¹²⁴ which are either solids or powers there is a mean such that whatever the first is to it, it is to the last, and the other way too, what the last is to the mean, the mean is to the first; the¹²⁵ mean becomes first and last, and the 15last and the first are both means. They all in this way necessarily turn out to be the same, and if they are the same as one another, all of them will be one. Now, if the body of the universe were to be a plane, having no depth, a single intermediate would suffice to bind together itself and the things being combined with it. But as 20it is, since the body of the universe appropriately has the form of a solid, and since one intermediate can never combine solids, it is always two intermediates that fit it together. Thus, having placed water and air in the middle of fire and earth and made them be as much as was possible in the same proportion to one another so 25that what fire is to air,¹²⁶ this is what air is to water; and what air 514.1is to water, this¹²⁷ is what water is to earth, God bound together and constituted the visible and tangible heaven. And this is why the body of the cosmos, having been brought into concord through proportion, was begotten out of these bodies, and out of these sorts $\mathbf{5}$ of bodies, being four in number, and from these had an amity so that having come together into uniformity with itself it became indissoluble by any others¹²⁸ save by Him Who bound it together. And the constitution of the cosmos received the whole of each one of the four 10 elements. For He Who composed it composed it out of all the fire and water and air and earth, leaving outside of it no part nor power.¹²⁹

Thus, we clearly hear Plato saying that both the heaven and the entire cosmos are constituted out of four and only four elements and precisely relating the reason why. For since the cosmos is constituted out of the 15extreme contraries fire and earth which are divided by both nature and their places, and since Plato says contraries are not of a nature to unite with each other, some intermediate was required to bind them together and to lead the universe together into a single union and coalition. 20However, since these [viz. fire and earth] are solids and not planes, he savs it is impossible for them to be bound together by a single intermediate. This is the reason, then, he says, why the union required two intermediates – air and water. Let others pronounce the more mathe-25*matical* interpretation of these lines; when we say that air and water are the intermediates for fire and earth, we are setting forth the more

515.1

physical interpretation: Although fire is opposed to air insofar as the former is dry and the latter is moist, they are still bound to one another by joint ownership of the hot, since both are naturally hot. And again,

- 5 air, being hot, contends with water which is cold but owns the moist quality jointly with it, and through itself as a mean air grants water a union with fire. Similarly, water, being moist, is at war with earth,
- 10 which is dry but by the sameness of their cold quality embraces amity towards earth, and through itself it joins the earth to air, and through the air to fire. And earth itself, being cold, is by virtue of this quality opposed to and at war with fire, which is hot but is united with the fire by joint ownership of the dry power and through itself as a mean joins
- 15 to the fire both water and air, which insofar as they are moist contend with the fire which is dry. And whatever the means are to the extremes, this is what the extremes become in turn to the means. For air, being hot, binds together through itself as a mean the earth which is cold to
- 20 the heat of the fire and is itself joined to the earth by the mean of water (for both air and water are moist); again air itself, being moist, harmonizes with the dryness of fire by the mean of earth (for fire and earth
- 25 are dry). In addition, water, being cold and moist, is intertwined with fire with respect to the heat through air as a mean and with respect to the dryness through earth as a mean. And in this way, as if in a dance, both the extremes are intertwined with each other through the means and the means are joined through the extremes; and the means 6.1 become extremes and the extremes means; and a single accord and
- 516,1 become extremes and the extremes mean concordance is produced out of all of them.
 - But if any of the means is missing, it would no longer be possible to 5 produce the said bond. For let, say, air be missing and let water be the only mean for fire and earth. How would fire, being simultaneously hot and dry, be able to be intertwined and achieve harmony with moist and cold water? For it is not feasible to bind things together that are absolutely at odds with one another and have nothing in common. For
 - 10 even if fire were united with water by the mean of earth with respect to the dryness common to fire and earth, it will still be hostile to and at variance with both earth and water with respect to its heat. Or, once more, let the substance of water be missing and let only air be between
 - 15 fire and earth. How would, then, the air, being simultaneously hot and moist, coalesce with the earth, which is cold and dry? For owing to its own moistness it will be hostile to the fire and earth which are dry. Therefore, when there are two extremes, fire and earth, there is every necessity, as Plato says, that there also be two intermediates binding 20 them together, air and water.
 - 20 them together, air and water.

Thus, in this way Plato gave a general physical theory on the composition of the entire cosmos, namely that it is exclusively out of the four bodies, and following this he further says more specifically that the celestial things partake mostly of the fiery substance. For he says that

25 there are four species of living thing:

One is the class of the celestial gods, another is that of winged creatures and air travellers, a third is the aquatic species, and fourth that of the footed and land animals. And He made the form of the divine class mostly out of fire so that it might be as bright and beautiful as possible to behold, and He assimilated it to the universe and made it well-rounded, and placed it in the intelligence of the dominating circle to follow it, and dispensed it in a circle throughout the entire heaven, to be a true adornment (*kosmos*) embroidered on it.¹³⁰

14. Plato clearly said that the celestial bodies are mostly constituted out of fire, and what Aristotle says in the first book of the Meteorology¹³¹ when he is trying to deny that the celestial bodies are constituted out 10 of fire does not seem to me to have any force. For he says that if the celestial bodies are fiery, everything within them would have been consumed long ago because the celestial bodies greatly outsize all the things within them [i.e. the sublunar things]. For due to the efficacy of 15its power, the nature of fire even in a small mass is to burn completely things that greatly outsize it, not to mention if it happens to be in a much larger mass. And the astronomers would have the sun all by itself and many of the fixed stars be much larger than the earth, not to mention all the stars together with the spheres in which they are 20seated. The heaven, then, incomparably exceeds the things within it. So how, Aristotle asks, could the things within it have endured if the celestial bodies were fiery?

But it is possible to say to him, first: (1) Not even you yourself 25escaped this difficulty. For when you would have the ensemble of fire, which you call the *hupekkauma*, surround the rest of the elements, you must assume that it is by all means larger than the things within it. For what surrounds is larger than what is surrounded.¹³² So why haven't the things within burned up when the fire in fact exists in a much greater excess than all the rest together? And second: (2) You yourself say that flame is not the natural fire but an excess of fire, just $\mathbf{5}$ as snow is an excess of cold.¹³³ For the natural fire is rather vital and not caustic (just as the so-called inborn heat in us and in general the fire from which the combination of one's composite body is constituted). And you say that the *hupekkauma* is also of this sort [i.e. not flame].¹³⁴ 10 Accordingly, the celestial fire is also rather of this vital sort and not caustic. Therefore, there is no danger that all the things within be completely consumed.

Moreover, (3) Plato does not say that the heaven is constituted simply of fire, but that it partakes mostly of fire in proportion to the rest of the elements or to the rest of the composite bodies. Therefore, the pinnacle of fire is kept in check by the mixture.¹³⁵

And I should add a further, fourth objection, namely that (4) the nature of that fire is extremely pure and rare. And we see that even 20

43

517,1

 $\mathbf{5}$

518,1

flame itself – which is an excess of fire and not the vital and natural fire – when it exists in a rarer form does not partake of the caustic at all or at worst very little (lightning is of this sort). And the fire around us, since it takes hold of more solid matter and is denser, is more caustic.

- since it takes hold of more solid matter and is denser, is more caustic.
 For the flame from, say, burning hemp or from a burning papyrus does not burn in the same way as the flame from wood burns, and the flame from oak-wood burns more than these. Moreover we can repeatedly lead our hand through flame itself, but cannot lay hold of charcoal. And
 - 5 it is still less possible to touch the charcoal made from more solid matter. For we are better able to touch charcoal made from plantain or papyrus than those made from wood, and again we are better able to touch these than a fired cautery-iron – we almost cannot even bring our
 - 10 hand near this. So if denser fire burns more, and if celestial fire is as rare and pure as possible and is neither an excess of fire nor flame but the elemental and vital fire itself, how could it not fall far short of
 - burning and destroying? The ethereal fire should rather be vitalizing and of the same sort as the so-called inborn heat in living things. **15.** As for knowing Plato's meaning,¹³⁶ namely that he thinks the

universe and heaven itself is constituted out of the four elements, these

- 20 remarks suffice. Next, several passages of the philosophers who have written commentaries on Plato deserve to be cited. Now then, let Atticus and Plutarch be put aside, as well as anyone else who asserted that the cosmos was said by Plato to be generated in time.¹³⁷ Let only 25 those men be our witnesses of the fact that Plato wants the entire
- 520,1

10

15

20

1 cosmos to be constituted out of the four elements who were of the opinion that according to Plato the cosmos is everlasting.

Here is some of the first book of the Platonist Taurus'¹³⁸ commentary on
the *Timaeus*, on the section of Plato in question that we just expounded, namely 'what comes to be is bodily in form – visible and tangible' and so on:¹³⁹

The creator began the composition of the cosmos out of fire and earth, but what is to have a bodily form must be resistant and visible. Being visible comes to it from fire, and tangible from earth. For there is a perception by each element: vision by fire (vision is of what is visible, and what is visible is colour); touch by earth (touch is of what is tangible); taste by water (taste is of the tasteable), and hearing by air (hearing is of the audible). Well, then, what sort of element shall we allot to smell? That which is between water and air, as we will say when we get to that topic. Theophrastus says 'if what is visible and what is tangible is made of earth and fire, the stars and the heaven will be made of these. But that is impossible.' He says this and introduces the fifth body that moves in a circle. So whenever he shows that that body exists, let him then object to these remarks.¹⁴⁰

It deserves to be examined (i) how Taurus, the exegete of this passage, 25not only correctly thinks that Plato says that the cosmos is composed exclusively out of the four elements but also contends with Theophrastus who says that the heaven is not made of these elements (for 521.1Theophrastus is a member of Aristotle's school), and (ii) that this exegete of Plato does not think that the fifth element has been demonstrated by Aristotle to exist. For he says, 'So whenever he shows that that body exists, let him then object to these remarks.' He says that $\mathbf{5}$ vapour is what is between water and air.¹⁴¹ For this is the path from water to air and from air to water. For when it becomes dense it becomes water, and when it is rarefied it becomes air. So vapour belongs to smell. For the vapours have somehow been made scented by 10 the scented qualities.

And again a little later the same Taurus adds this as well:

He took two extremes that were opposed to one another, fire and earth, and wants to fit these together by some intermediates that are proportionate to one another and to each of the extremes; he places water and air according to the aforementioned powers so that they join themselves to one another, and the extremes to themselves and to each other; and he says that the God placed air and water in the middle of the extremes, fire and earth, and joined them to one another insofar as that was possible, binding them to the intermediates proportionally. And so the heaven came to be, tangible and visible, composed out of these. He derived the perceptibles from the extremes (vision and touch from what is visible and tangible); of these there is vision owing to fire, and touch owing to earth.

This is what Taurus says.

Porphyry,¹⁴² expounding on the above-mentioned passages of Plato 25 in his commentary on the *Timaeus*, says much concerning the constitution of the cosmos out of only four elements, and adds these words 522,1 *verbatim*:

To say that the celestial things are not constituted out of the four elements is therefore not in accordance with the doctrine that follows Plato; rather, whoever says this is following their own doctrine, since Plato certainly says that even the celestial things are mostly of fire, while the other elements are present in lesser quantity and are purer and more unmixed. According to Plato, there are two primary elements, earth and fire, the others were provided for the sake of bonding and coherence.¹⁴³

And again after some other remarks, the same Porphyry, while expounding on the passage of Plato in which he says 'and this is why the

body of the cosmos was begotten out of these bodies, being four in number',¹⁴⁴ says this *verbatim*:

He says the bodies are only four, since beyond these no other body is discovered among the things that exist, save the things bound together out of these four.¹⁴⁵

Then, after Porphyry establishes through many arguments that there is no other body besides the four and adds again the aforementioned phrase¹⁴⁶ of Plato, he adds this:

He clearly says the cosmos is constituted out of the four elements. Therefore, it is clear that he does not believe in the fifth body introduced by Aristotle and Archytas.¹⁴⁷ Next, we will see this more precisely.¹⁴⁸

This is what Porphyry says.

Not even Proclus himself – at least when he wasn't arguing eristically or undertaking to accomplish his own aim under the pretext of what seemed right to Plato – was an outsider with respect to this opinion regarding Plato. For in his book which we have often mentioned

- 523,1 opinion regarding Plato. For in his book which we have often mentioned entitled An Examination of Aristotle's Criticisms of Plato's Timaeus¹⁴⁹ he is a great supporter of Plato's doctrine and establishes that the
 - 5 nature of the heaven is not alien to the sublunar elements, as Aristotle claims,¹⁵⁰ rather it, too, is constituted out of them. And from this source I will cite a few of the many supporting passages from which one can see that Proclus was not even consistent with himself when he in the
 - 10 present treatise set out the content of Plato's doctrine. For in the book we have mentioned he says this *verbatim*:

The celestial fire is not caustic but, as I would say, vitalizing, just like the inborn heat in us. And he [viz. Aristotle] says in *On the Generation of Animals* that there is a radiation such that when it is present each mortal living thing is alive.¹⁵¹ And surely the whole heaven¹⁵² is of this sort of fire, whereas the stars possess mostly this element but also have the pinnacles of the other elements.

And a little later he says:

But surely if we suppose that earth¹⁵³ throws darkness over all the light-bearers and produces shadow (the means between earth and fire are transparent by their own nature and are receptive of both, darkness and light, and cause neither of them in bodies; rather, only fire is able to cause light, just as only earth is able to cause darkness – and these are most distant from one another), we would understand how the bodies in the heavens are fiery by

46

15

nature. For it is clear that they bear light, just as sublunar fire does. But if this is common to both of them, the sublunar fire is 524,1 presumably akin to the form of the celestial bodies.

After saying this and then establishing the kinship of heaven to the elements by several other arguments, Proclus concludes:

Therefore, one must not introduce the celestial nature to the universe as if it were an alien nature. Rather, having placed¹⁵⁴ there [viz. in heaven] the pinnacle of the nature of the sublunar elements, one should also give generation to the sublunar elements from that pinnacle because of their kinship to it.

If, then, the nature of heaven is not alien to the sublunar elements, as even Proclus thinks, if rather the pinnacle of the sublunar elements is 10 in them [viz. the celestial bodies] (since the celestial bodies are by nature fiery but also have the pinnacles of the other elements), if the exegete of Plato will declare that he agrees with Plato's doctrine on these points, how can he in the treatise now before us, as if having forgotten his own statements, give off contradictory statements by 15 saying that heaven transcends the elements that move in a straight line and that it is none of the sublunar elements – neither earth, nor fire, nor either of the means?

And where shall we place the great Plotinus who – if anyone claimed to be a member of the Platonic school – does not advance the fifth body, 20 which is additionally brought into the universe by Aristotle and from which Aristotle constitutes the celestial bodies, but he speaks consistently with Plato's position in that he also constitutes the celestial bodies from the four elements and declares this to be Plato's position? At any rate he says this in the treatise *On the Universe* (2.1):¹⁵⁵

And yet156 the nature of body is in the same way always flowing.525,1This seems right to many who addressed the topic of physics and525,1in particular to Plato himself – not only for the other bodies, but5even for the celestial bodies themselves. For how, Plato asks,5could 'things which are157 bodies and are visible be undisturbed5and the same?'158 On these issues Plato clearly agrees with Heraclitus who said that even the sun is always coming to be.5

For Aristotle there would¹⁵⁹ not really be any difficulty – if anyone else were to accept his¹⁶⁰ assumptions concerning the fifth body.¹⁶¹ But for those who do not postulate this body, since the body of the heaven must be composed out of the same elements that the sublunar living things are composed of, how could the heaven possess individual permanence?¹⁶²

And after saying some other things he writes:

47

It seems to follow from Timaeus' first having made the body of the universe out of earth and fire so that it will be visible due to the fire and solid¹⁶³ due to the earth,¹⁶⁴ that he also makes the stars not completely but *mostly* of fire, since¹⁶⁵ the stars obviously possess solidity.¹⁶⁶ And Timaeus might, perhaps, be right, since Plato also judges this view to be likely.¹⁶⁷ For perception, both in the sense of sight and in the sense of the apprehension that belongs to touch, makes it evident that either the majority¹⁶⁸ or the entirety [viz. of the heaven] is made of fire, and to those who consider the matter with reason, if there could be no solidity without earth, the heaven should partake of earth, too.

But why would the heaven require water and air? For it would be¹⁶⁹ absurd for any water to exist in so much fire; and as for air, if it should exist in so much fire¹⁷⁰ it [viz. the air] would change into the nature of fire. But even if two mathematical solids that have the feature of being extremes do require two means,¹⁷¹ one might doubt whether this is also the case with physical solids.¹⁷²

Even Plotinus, therefore, clearly renounced Aristotle's assumption concerning the fifth body and judged that Plato's view got it right, namely that the heaven is composed from the same elements that the sublunar living things are constituted of. And in the text that follows Plotinus again teaches that we must neither consider the celestial bodies to be

- 10 made of anything other than fire and the rest of the elements nor should we upon hearing that earth is in them, take that as referring to the worse kind of earth nor should we consider that fire to be flame. For Plotinus says in accordance with Aristotle¹⁷³ that the latter is a 'boiling' and, as it were, a fire that 'runs wild because of its excessiveness' and
- 15 not the elemental and vital fire.¹⁷⁴ But he says that the fire in heaven is uniform and gentle and becoming to the nature of the stars and mildly hot.¹⁷⁵ For the very purest and most unmixed portion of the elements has been separated off into the composition of the celestial
- 20 body so that the nature of the celestial body is neither foreign nor alien to the sublunar elements; nor is the fire in heaven of precisely the same sort as the sublunar fire, and this goes for earth and each of the others, too. Rather, the thick portion and, as it were, the sediment of the
- 25 elements have flowed out into the sublunar regions while the rarest and better portion of them has been separated off into the heavens. For even in other living things, Plotinus says, nature selects above all the better
- 527,1 in other living things, Plotinus says, nature selects above all the better elements for their most sovereign parts.¹⁷⁶ Much other evidence could be set out by someone arguing that the position in question is Plato's since Plato's own student Aristotle, as we agreed, bears additional
 - 5 witness to these things and objects to Plato on account of this very thing.¹⁷⁷ For Aristotle seems to be the very first to introduce the doctrine of the fifth body. But I think that the preceding remarks are

25

15

20

526,1

sufficient to convince completely those with good sense, so that we should not prolong the discussion of this problem more than necessary. 10

16. Plato not only thinks that the celestial body is constituted out of the four elements but also characterizes the elements in heaven by the qualities we recognize – I mean heat and coldness, moistness and dryness, lightness and heaviness – since in substance they do not differ 15 at all from the sublunar elements except in rarity and purity. Plato himself again wrote this clearly in the *Timaeus*:

For¹⁷⁸ this is why the body of the cosmos was begotten out of these bodies and out of these sorts of bodies, four in number,¹⁷⁹ being brought to a harmony by proportion, and from these had an amity so that having come together into uniformity¹⁸⁰ with itself it became indissoluble by any others save by Him¹⁸¹ Who bound it together. And the constitution of the cosmos received the whole of each one of the four elements. For He Who composed it composed it out of all the fire and water and air and earth, leaving outside of it no part or power of anything, with the following reasons in mind. First, so that being as whole as possible it might be a complete living thing out of complete parts, and in addition that it might be one, seeing that there are no parts left over out of which something else of this sort could come to be: further, so that it might be ageless and immune to illness, since the creator observed that whenever hot and cold things and anything that possesses violent powers surround a composite body from the outside, they attack it and introduce it to untimely dissolutions¹⁸² and illnesses and old age, making it perish. And on account of this cause and this reasoning. He built it to be a complete whole¹⁸³ out of all the wholes and ageless and immune to sickness.¹⁸⁴

If, then, He Who composed it composed it as a whole out of wholes – hot wholes and cold wholes and any others that have violent powers – and if He left no part or power of these outside so that it would not suffer their unseasonable attack from the outside, then it is clear to everyone that Plato wants the elements composing the heavens to be charac-15terized by the same qualities that inform the sublunar elements. For if the celestial elements didn't have the same form and matter as the sublunar ones, they would not even have been of the nature to suffer from their attack from the outside. But since they are in fact of a nature 20to suffer at the hand of these active powers, Plato says that God left no part or power of any element outside of the heaven so that it might not suffer. It is, however, impossible for things that are not of the same matter nor of the same nature to be affected by each other, as is demonstrated by the natural philosophers.¹⁸⁵ But we already said this 25more precisely in the sections on the sixth argument, and the reader should draw everything from there.¹⁸⁶

49

20

25

528.1

 $\mathbf{5}$

529,1 **17.** Further, one can understand Plato as meaning that it is not even possible for there to be any simple body other than these four. For, again, in the *Timaeus* he says this:

Indeed, one must say which things could be the four most noble
bodies. They are to be dissimilar to each other, but capable, some of them, of dissolving into and coming to be out of each other. For once we get this right we possess the truth concerning the generation of earth and fire and the bodies situated proportionally in the middle of these. For this we will grant no one, that there are anywhere visible bodies fairer than these, each corresponding to a single kind. We must proceed eagerly, then, to fit together the four kinds of bodies that excel in beauty and to declare that we have sufficiently grasped their nature.¹⁸⁷

If, then, Plato says that he will not concede to anyone and say that there
is anywhere a simple body fairer than these four ('each corresponding to a single kind' makes this very thing¹⁸⁸ clear, lest anyone bring forward the celestial body as excelling the elements in beauty. For this celestial body is according to him not simple but composite,¹⁸⁹ constituted out of the four elements), then from this it is clear to all, I think, not only that he wants there to be exactly four bodies out of which the
whole cosmos is constituted, but also that he, as it were, prophetically anticipates and refutes the nature of the fifth body that will be intro-

- duced into the world by Aristotle. One could perhaps say more correctly that Plato anticipates his own student [Aristotle], who in common study sessions brought against him the views that he favoured; not agreeing that the heaven is constituted by the four elements, this student had
- 530,1 already introduced before the assumption of the fifth body, from which, he claimed, the celestial region is composed, on account of the difference in motion and because the celestial bodies obviously are not affected by
 - 5 these sublunar bodies; and Plato opposed his position when he said that he will not concede to anyone that there are anywhere visible bodies more beautiful than the four elements such that each corresponds to a single kind. He all but says that although the celestial body is more beautiful than the elements on account of the singular powers in it, it
 - 10 is not of this sort because it is of a nature different from that of the simple bodies but rather because it is constituted of the purest and rarest portion of them and on account of the inexpressible everlastingness of the best mixture. For much which is worthy of wonder comes to be by nature even in the sublunar composite bodies which are
 - 15 admittedly constituted of these elements, and obviously none of these wonderful things is inherent in the simple bodies. For countless powers beyond description are produced in composite bodies by their distinct mixture, both corresponding and contrasting affections between bodies,

20 infinitely many differences in colour and quality, and different forms of

motion and transformation, as both experience itself shows and our writers of natural histories document, but now is not the right time to refresh our memories on them. What, then, is so amazing if in the celestial body, too, on account of the purity and rarity of the composing 25elements and on account of the elite balance of the mixture, some inexpressible properties which one cannot observe in the simple bodies have been produced in the celestial body just as this occurs in other composite bodies? This is the reason why Plato does not simply say 'we will not concede to anyone that there are visible bodies fairer than these anywhere' but with precision added 'each corresponding to a single kind', i.e. simple and unmixed with any other, so that no one might $\mathbf{5}$ bring forward as a refutation of his account the things composed out of these elements, one of which Plato wants to be the heaven.

Thus, given that these points have been demonstrated in this way and attested to by so many Platonist men, who would not be astonished at the excessive shamelessness (as I mentioned at the start of the 10 chapter¹⁹⁰) of those who either dared to say that Plato does not say that the heaven is composed out of the four elements, and that even he recognizes the nature of the fifth body conceived by Aristotle, or again 15who, although conceding that he says the celestial bodies are constituted out of the four elements, dare to say that Plato does not characterize the celestial fire by heat, nor the celestial water by cold, nor in general each of the elements in the heaven by those qualities 20which characterize the sublunar elements.

18. But lest we leave any of their cleverly invented attempts at a misinterpretation of Plato's thought unrefuted, I ask the readers to forgive us if we waste a little more time on this idle chatter. For there 25are five solid figures constituted of rectilinear planes that have the 532.1same form – the cube, the pyramid, the octahedron, the icosahedron, and the dodecahedron (for these were demonstrated to be the only simple solid figures by those who are skilled in these matters); and $\mathbf{5}$ Plato, who is very skilled in geometry and, not wanting his teaching on natural philosophy to be outside of the method used in geometry, generated the bodies of the elements out of planes rather symbolically, makes the cube the defining feature of earth, the pyramid of fire, the icosahedron of water, and the octahedron of air. But the figure of the 10 dodecahadron is still left, Plato says, and God used it for the universe.¹⁹¹ God used it for the universe – that is all that Plato says about this figure; but those who contrive to prove in every way, not the truth, but 15their own beliefs say that by the figure of the dodecahedron Plato is hinting at the fifth nature of the element of which the celestial bodies are constituted.¹⁹² Therefore, they say, Plato recognized the fifth ele-20ment before Aristotle. However, Plato does not say that God used the dodecahedron for the creation of the celestial bodies but that He used it for the universe, i.e. for the whole cosmos. For in the *Timaeus* he says this *verbatim*:

51

531,1

- There was still one formation, the fifth one, and God used it for 25the universe, broidering figures on it. Now if one, considering all of this, should rightly be at a loss as to whether he should say that there are infinitely many *kosmoi* or whether they have a limit to their number, one¹⁹³ should judge that to say that they are infinite 533.1is truly the opinion of someone inexperienced¹⁹⁴ in matters he should be experienced in; rather, he would be more reasonably
 - caught in doubt¹⁹⁵ regarding whether it is appropriate to say that in truth there is naturally one or five kosmoi.¹⁹⁶ Our opinion declares that cosmos is of a nature to be a single god,¹⁹⁷ according 5 to the likely account, but someone else looking in some way at other considerations will form different opinions.¹⁹⁸
 - That Plato does not say that God used the dodecahedral figure for the 10 celestial bodies but rather for the universe, has become clear from his own words. But the heaven is not the universe; it is a part of the universe. And it has been clearly shown from what has been said that Plato wants the heaven to be a composite of the four elements and not to be different from the four. It is also possible for anyone who so desires
 - to get the more precise interpretation of the lines of Plato in question 15from the hands of the previous commentators as well, and we will set forth their understanding of the lines in question in a concise manner. Indeed, it is clear to everyone from this very text of Plato what the
 - 20symbolic teaching of the five figures means to Plato; it is not to show that this universe is constituted out of five simple bodies, as Aristotle's school supposed. For Plato already said, when he was discoursing on
 - 25the four elements, 'we will not concede to anyone that there are visible bodies more beautiful than these anywhere, each corresponding to a single kind', but since there was a huge inquiry among earlier thinkers on whether there is one cosmos or several or infinitely many and since
- Democritus' followers did suppose that there were infinitely many 534.1kosmoi,¹⁹⁹ Plato says that if someone should in general be at a loss about this issue, he should not be at a loss as to whether there are infinitely many kosmoi (for, he says, this would be the problem of a man who is
 - really inexperienced and uneducated), but rather as to whether per- $\mathbf{5}$ haps there are five *kosmoi* since there are five simple solid figures and each cosmos is characterized by one of the figures, just as Plato surely characterized this cosmos as dodecahedral. But this does not seem right
 - to Plato, either. For he wants the cosmos to be one and the only member 10 of its kind.

In addition, the previous commentators, instigated by Plato's actual writings, also correctly thought that the image of the five figures could

15even be adapted to this cosmos. For the cubical figure was symbolically made the defining feature of earth because of its stability and immobility; for the cube is of this sort since it has a base that is steady and not unstable: the cube is a solid figure contained by six square planes which

coincide with one another at their edges. The pyramid takes on²⁰⁰ the 20image of fire: this too is a solid figure composed out of four equilateral and equiangular triangles, having one of the triangles as its base and the rest of them as sides converging at a single point which is the vertex of the pyramid. Plato perhaps made this figure the defining feature of 25fire for several reasons: because of the cutting and penetrating 201 feature of fire's nature (for the pyramid starts from a flat surface at the 535,1bottom and stops very sharply at its vertex, and what is sharp cuts and penetrates), and perhaps because of the ascending nature of fire (for the vertex of the pyramid stretches upwards), and perhaps because the figure of fire that we use²⁰² is in a way pyramid-shaped. The icosa- $\mathbf{5}$ hedron, which is a solid figure contained by twenty triangles, he associated with water on account of the instability of the nature of water. For this figure is nearly a sphere, and the sphere, since it 10 touches the plane at only one point, is unstable. So of rectilinear figures too, the one which is closer to a sphere is more unstable than the others, and the figure with more angles is closer to a sphere. But the icosahedron has more angles than the other regular solid figures. For having several faces, even if it does not touch the plane at a single point, it 15touches less of the underlying space with a smaller part of itself than absolutely any of the other figures of equal perimeter, and for this reason is less stable than the others. The octahedron he assigned to air; let this figure be conceived in this manner: Let some square base be 20assumed, and from its four sides let four triangles extend upwards from the base, one from each edge, and converge at a single vertex, i.e. at one and the same point. And let the same thing be conceived to happen on the opposite side of the base. Thus, a solid figure will be constructed from 25them, composed of eight triangles such that in the middle the lower triangles have their bases fitted together with the bases of the upper triangles and at the ends have their vertices converging at a single point. four of them at one point and the other four at another. And this figure, 536.1regardless of the position it is placed in, has an upper arrangement which is similar to its lower arrangement, and this is also the case horizontally. And air is, in a way, of a nature intermediate between the heavy and light $\mathbf{5}$ bodies, since it is heavier than the lighter bodies, e.g. fire, and lighter than the heavier bodies, earth and water. And if there is empty space, it moves in both the upward and downward direction; similarly, it also moves horizontally back and forth. For this reason he assigned this figure to air. 10

Plato, then, made these the defining figures of the four elements for the reasons mentioned, but he associated the fifth figure, which is the dodecahedron, with the universe. This is a solid figure composed of twelve pentagons and having one of the pentagons as a base; from the five sides of this pentagon, five further pentagons extend upwards – for each side one pentagon; and again from these five pentagons, five other pentagons are erected – a single pentagon extending from each of the lower five pentagons – and they converge into each other; and in

addition to these, there is another pentagon lying in its seat on top of these upper five pentagons. This is the sort of figure that the dodeca-

25

hedron is. And just as with the other four figures we took the association of the elements to them from a certain analogy, we must fit the dodecahedron too to the universe in the same manner - from a certain analogy. First, the dodecahedron might be assimilated to the

- universe because it too proximates and in a way imitates a sphere and 537,1the universe is a single solid sphere. Secondly, just as the dodecahedron is composed out of twelve pentagons, so too is the entire cosmos consti
 - tuted of the twelve greatest parts: the four elements, the seven $\mathbf{5}$ wandering spheres and the one fixed sphere (for not even Plato knew of the ninth sphere which carries no star and was conceived by Ptolemy, but would have them be a total of eight, as we clearly showed from his
 - psychogony).²⁰³ And the commentators have given other causes of 10 Plato's having associated the dodecahedron to the entire cosmos.²⁰⁴ But lest we speak at length and over-abundantly on unnecessary topics, let
 - our discussion even on these topics reach its limit here; nor should any 15worry arise even from this that Plato constituted the bodies in heaven from the fifth element, since it has already been shown by several arguments that Plato both wants the celestial bodies to be composites of the four elements and thinks that it is not even possible for there to
 - 20be another simple natural body other than the four elements.

End of the Refutation of the Thirteenth Argument

The Fourteenth Argument of Proclus the Successor 538,1

Fourteenth Argument: Every craftsman either himself causes the matter of the product for which he is responsible to exist or he makes matter which already exists serviceable to the product. Further, even when he makes matter which already exists serviceable, he himself makes the

- matter. (By matter he means what is serviceable matter, not simply a 5 substratum. In any case, as long as it is unserviceable, it does not have the capacity of matter.) So, regardless of whether he causes the appropriate matter to exist or whether he makes matter which already exists as a substratum serviceable, he himself invariably makes the matter of
- his own work. But, if this is the case with each particular craftsman, it 10 is much more the case that the divine craftsman makes the appropriate matter, either by causing this itself, matter, to exist or by rendering it serviceable, lest the divine craftsman be less honourable than the craftsmen down here in that He will be borrowing matter which He will not pay back and not causing it to exist whereas the craftsmen who 15borrowed matter from Him for the generation of mortals do pay the borrowed pieces back.²⁰⁵ In fact, since He is a craftsman of the universe
 - which is generation,²⁰⁶ He Himself caused prime matter to exist, which [Plato] defines as a receptacle and nurse²⁰⁷ of generation, and He made

the receptacle of generation. For prime matter does not possess any 20 other being than being matter, since being the receptacle of generation is its definition. Consequently if the craftsman of the universe made matter serviceable, He Himself made the receptacle of generation (this is what it is to be matter), and if He directly caused matter to exist, He made matter. Therefore, every craftsman does one or the other of these 25 things, and whichever of these he does, he makes matter, as we said.

If, then, the craftsman of this universe Himself made the matter which is the receptacle of generation, either (i) He Himself also caused 539.1the traces of the forms to exist from which the receptacle, being per se immobile and completely without form, came to be moving discordantly $\mathbf{5}$ and in a disorderly manner, or (ii) we shall say that these came to the matter from some other source - from some other god who is also intelligible. And if (i) He Himself is responsible for these traces. wouldn't it be very absurd for Him, on the one hand, to make the matter serviceable for the receptacle of generation but, on the other, to give those traces from which matter was to be not serviceable for the 10 production of generation but unserviceable for it? For what is disordered is at odds with what has been ordered. But the receptacle of generation is not at odds with ordered generation. And if (ii) something else is responsible for these traces, wouldn't it be senseless if the craftsman made the matter serviceable, but this other god made it 15unserviceable; and for the craftsman to put up with matter, which He made serviceable, first having become unserviceable, so that He could then make that for the sake of which He made the matter serviceable [viz. the ordered cosmos] – as if it were impossible to make it suitable unless it had previously been unsuitable! For it would be absurd if He 20made it serviceable for receiving only the traces of the forms by themselves (since He would be making it serviceable for the coming to be of disordered generation); but if He made it serviceable for receiving ordered generation, why, if it is possible to cause this sort of [viz. ordered] generation to exist simultaneously with making the matter serviceable, did He put up with the other [viz. unserviceable] matter 25coming to be so that He might in this way instil order in the disordered, as if not being able to cause order to exist without disorder? If these alternatives are absurd and the traces of the forms are not prior to the 540.1order placed upon them, and if what underlies together with the traces is ungenerated, then the order placed upon them is also ungenerated and is nothing prior to nor later than these.

But surely it is not the case that there was first matter and then the 5 generation of the traces. For what it is for matter to be is to be the matter of generation. Thus, the traces, too, are in it, and it is as a result of this that it is matter, and not as being prior to the traces. For simultaneously matter is suitable to receive the traces and the giver implants the traces in its very being, as He gives. If, then, the matter is ungenerated and indestructible, existing for all time, it always 10

possessed the traces of the forms. But surely order, too, is simultaneous with these [viz. traces], as was shown. Therefore, order is ungenerated and indestructible and none of these three [viz. matter, traces, order] is first, second or third, except in thought alone. Thus, apart from in thought, they are all simultaneous – matter, the traces, order. But once

15 thought, they are all simultaneous – matter, the traces, order. But once there is order, there is also a cosmos. Therefore, the cosmos should be ungenerated and indestructible.

The Main Points of the Refutation of the Fourteenth Argument

- An exegesis of the meaning of the fourteenth argument.
 That the present argument is not at all serious. And that even if we should agree with everything said here and only object to matter's being everlasting, as having already been refuted,²⁰⁸ the everlastingness of the cosmos no longer follows.
- 541,1
 3. That Proclus did not really understand very well what Plato called 'discordant and disorderly motion.' And Porphyry's interpretation of this passage. And that not even in this way [viz. on Proclus' understanding of 'discordant and disorderly motion'] does it follow that according to Plato the cosmos is ungenerated.

Refutation of the Fourteenth Argument

1. The present and fourteenth argument is not at all serious, not even having a premise or starting point that one could grant as following from the agreed upon²⁰⁹ nature of things; rather, it was taken from 10 hypotheses that are entirely undemonstrated. Some of these Plato had assumed, but others Proclus himself, I presume, reasoned to be consistent with Plato's thought and then inferred that the cosmos is ungenerated from these hypotheses as if from Platonic principles. For 15Plato says that the ordered cosmos came to be out of what was moving in a discordant and disorderly manner ('For God', says Plato, 'wanted everything to be good and nothing to be bad as much as that is possible; so He took everything that was visible, not at peace but rather moving 20in a discordant and disorderly manner, and brought it out of disorder into order, believing that the latter is absolutely better than the former').²¹⁰ But Plato did not clearly articulate what it is that is moving in a discordant and disorderly manner. And further Plato says that the matter is without form but is nevertheless a receptacle and nurse of 25generation;²¹¹ and again the same man, Plato, assumes and says²¹² that 542.1whenever God was trying to create the universe, He *first* formed the

elements and gave them their figures, but before the elements came to
be, traces of them, disproportional and unmeasured, already existed.
From all of this, Proclus, as if having inferred from the fact that
everything that comes to be seems to come to be out of matter, says that

matter is what moves in a discordant and disorderly manner out of which God is said in Plato to have made what is ordered. Next, since Plato assumed matter to be completely without form, and²¹³ being 10 without form, it is absolutely immobile and is not capable of moving even in a discordant and disorderly manner (for what moves at all, even if it moves discordantly, necessarily has some form) - for this reason Proclus says that the matter is not completely without form and does 15move in a discordant and disorderly manner (for matter is per se absolutely immobile), but that it also not completely formed (for if the matter possessed complete forms²¹⁴ it would no longer move in a discordant and disorderly manner), rather Proclus says that the matter received the above-mentioned traces, which are vague precursors of the 20complete forms as if the future creation of forms was sketched out by them and that the matter moves in a discordant and disorderly manner just as if someone were to perceive embryos that are not yet articulately shaped but still have confused indications of their formation. Hence, on 25the one hand, he says that *matter* moves in a discordant and disorderly manner since it has already received the traces of the forms, but, on the other hand, he says that what moves is the incomplete and inarticulate precursor of the production of forms. For if what is disordered is 543.1opposed to what is ordered and what is incomplete and inarticulate to what is complete and articulated, and if the complete forms are causes 5 of ordered motion, then the inarticulate and incomplete forms – traces, as it were, of the complete forms – are causes of incomplete motion.

By making these assumptions, then, Proclus, who even before, at the start of his argument,²¹⁵ had shown both that the creator and craftsman of the cosmos also made the matter itself (since every craftsman 10 prepares his own appropriate matter for himself), and that the creator of the matter Himself caused the precursors of the forms, i.e. the traces from which matter came to be moving in a discordant and disorderly manner, next infers that it is impossible for these states to be tempo-15rally distinguished from one another so that the matter without form would exist first, and next the traces of the forms would then be placed in it, and thirdly what is disordered [viz. the matter plus the traces] would be ordered and arranged – unless, he says, one separates them from one another in thought. Thus, it having been shown²¹⁶ to be absurd 20to consider each of these individually and in turn (for the matter was never without form, nor did what is disordered precede what is ordered), there is every necessity that they all be simultaneous - the matter, the traces of the forms and the complete forms themselves. For simultaneously with its being, matter is suitable to receive the traces 25of the forms, since it is a receptacle of generation and has its being in this [viz. receiving], and these traces immediately come to be in it; and simultaneously with their being present, order and the complete forms immediately supervene. For even if these things are distinguished in 544.1thought, God still caused them to exist simultaneously just as body and

qualified body exist simultaneously even though quality is, by its own
account, different from body. Having made these inferences, Proclus again assumes that matter is ungenerated, i.e. has no beginning to its being (which Plato obviously never says) and then reasonably infers that since everything is simultaneous – the matter, the traces of the forms, and the order – and since the matter is ungenerated and indestructible, the order, i.e. the production of the cosmos, is also therefore

- 10 structible, the order, i.e. the production of the cosmos, is also therefore ungenerated and indestructible. The entire structure and method of the present argument goes something like this.
- 2. With all of Proclus' arguments prior to this, even if he assumed the principles and premises of the syllogisms simply because they seemed to be what Plato thought, nevertheless the hypotheses in a way also belonged to that class of propositions that are commonly thought to be right, e.g. (i) inferring from God's goodness by which He makes everything the everlastingness of the cosmos and (ii) inferring from the fact
- 20 that the paradigm of the cosmos eternally co-exists with the creator and that it is both said to be and is the paradigm with respect to an image the necessity of God's always in actuality being a creator, and (iii) similarly with each of the others. But since the present argument does
- 25 not depend on any hypothesis that has anything plausible or credible about it to begin with, it does not really motivate us to refute it by saying in what way it is correct and in what way the inference failed. Nevertheless, one should see that Proclus in the present argument took
- 545,1 his whole starting point, as well as the force of this inference that the cosmos is ungenerated, out of nowhere, unless it is again from his assumption that matter is ungenerated and indestructible. For even if
 - 5 we agree with all of his other hypotheses, not only that they seem right to Plato but also that they are true, and even with what Proclus himself had inferred from the hypotheses assumed by Plato, and if we would solely disagree that matter is everlasting because this
 - 10 doctrine doesn't conform to what Plato thought nor to the truth (the arguments which tried to establish that matter is everlasting were refuted in the eleventh book),²¹⁷ it will no longer follow from the rest of the hypotheses laid down that the cosmos is ungenerated. For simultaneously with matter's coming to exist, both the traces of the
 - 15 forms and order directly came to be in the matter, and none of these is prior or posterior to the others; rather, both order and the cosmos will have a beginning if matter has a beginning. Even we agree that if one assumes the above-mentioned hypotheses (that there is first
 - 20 matter without form; then, that the traces of the forms come to exist in the matter; that from these what moves in a discordant and disorderly manner comes to be; and that finally then what is disordered is brought into order), then one is assuming something false and Proclus would be using his refutations well. But refuting these
 - 25 hypotheses does not mean showing that Plato did not assume them in this way, nor does it mean showing that Plato did not say that the

cosmos came to be, originating from some principle and not existing 546.1prior to its generation.²¹⁸

3. But this is not even to accept outright that Plato said that what moves in a discordant and disorderly manner is matter that received $\mathbf{5}$ the traces of the forms. Porphyry, in any case, in his commentary on the Timaeus expounded on this very part of the Timaeus, and he does not say that it is matter together with the traces that moves in a discordant and disorderly manner, as Proclus maintains in these arguments; 10 Porphyry says rather that what moves in a discordant and disorderly manner are bodies of which the cosmos is constituted that have already come to be from matter and form. For matter and form are not principles of the cosmos – they are rather principles of body (for bodies are composed of matter and form); the principles of the cosmos are rather the bodies that are composed of matter and form. If someone pictures 15these bodies by themselves and apart from the one Who ordered them, he will surely see them (i) in motion on account of the fact that they are natural bodies and nature is a principle of motion and rest, and (ii) in an absolutely discordant and disorderly motion since accordant and well-ordered motion is imposed on them from God. For if one should 20consider the things which have come to be and exist but which have not been ordered and have not²¹⁹ received their appropriate position and relationship to each other, what is left other than for them to move in a discordant and disorderly manner, like a ship deprived of its steersman or a wagon of its driver? Porphyry says: 25

Plato says that it is the bodies and not matter that move in a discordant and disorderly manner, as is evidenced by his saying that what moves in a discordant and disorderly manner from which the creator made what is ordered, i.e. the cosmos, is *visible*. 547.1For Plato says, 'so He took everything that was visible, not at peace but rather moving in a discordant and disorderly manner, and brought it out of disorder into order'.²²⁰ What else could these visible things be than bodies? For matter is, according to Plato $\mathbf{5}$ himself, formless and shapeless and scarcely grasped by a bastard reasoning.²²¹ And even if the matter is understood to have already received the traces of the forms, still one must, since the traces of the forms are clearly not yet forms, suppose the matter to be 10 incorporeal and without form, just as both the traces and the sketch of Socrates' image are not yet an image of Socrates. But if the matter having received the traces is still incorporeal and for this reason invisible seeing that it has not vet been corporealized, and if Plato says that what moves in a discordant and disorderly 15manner is visible, then Plato does not mean that what moves in a discordant and disorderly manner is matter that has received the traces of the forms, but that what moves is rather the bodies that do not yet belong to their appropriate order.²²²

- If, then, Plato had said that these things are in this way temporally distinct I mean the bodies of which the cosmos is composed and the order placed upon them I don't think anyone with any sense would have accepted his statement. For God causes each thing to exist simultaneously with its appropriate order. If, however, Plato made this assumption for pedagogical reasons,²²³ as Porphyry says, so that one might comprehend simultaneously (i) what these bodies *per se* have from their own nature which was clearly furnished by God, and (ii) 548,1 what is added by the God Who ordered them, perhaps there will be nothing wrong with the argument; but one cannot infer from this, as one might have thought, that according to Plato the cosmos is without beginning since he clearly says²²⁴ (i) that it has a beginning of generation.
 - 5 tion, (ii) that prior to its coming to be it did not exist, and (iii) that since it did in fact come to be, it is neither completely indissoluble nor immortal, though it does receive an acquired and restored²²⁵ immortality from God. For it is possible for a city, too, to persist immortally by
 - 10 being restored. So, given that (i) Plato says these things about the generation of the cosmos all over the place and (ii) that the cosmos is naturally receptive of dissolution, and (iii) that he nowhere gives even the slightest indication that the cosmos might be ungenerated or that it does not have a beginning to its being or that it might be naturally
 - 15 indestructible or anything else like this, doesn't this offer a very great proof of Plato's meaning, namely that he thinks the cosmos is generated in time, i.e. began together with the generation of time, time not being everlasting? For Plato says that time came to be with heaven so that having come to be
 - 20 simultaneously they will also be dissolved simultaneously, if there should be a dissolution of them. For even if Plato, inasmuch as it was his intention to teach about the cosmos, assumed the cosmos' generation in the *Timaeus* for pedagogical reasons, as they say, and if he also says the same things about the generation of the cosmos in the *Statesman*²²⁶ and in all the other
 - 25 dialogues, why in the world didn't he teach anywhere in any way that the cosmos is ungenerated? But since we already said these things more
- 549,1 thoroughly in the sixth chapter,²²⁷ and since we are rather keeping to proof by facts and it is not our intention to examine only what Plato thought was right, we are concluding this account at this point so that we do not present the readers with an excessive bulk of material.

5 End of the Refutation of the Fourteenth Argument

The Fifteenth Argument of Proclus the Successor

Further, let this fifteenth argument be considered as follows: Plato himself praises the paradigm of the cosmos with these three terms: (1)
one of a kind,²²⁸ (2) eternal,²²⁹ and (3) complete.²³⁰ Of these, (3) being complete belongs to the universe alone. For no other thing is complete. Therefore, even Plato himself says that the whole cosmos alone resem-

bles the complete living thing.²³¹ As for (1) being one of a kind, not even this is present to all things, although it is present to all things in heaven. For each of these is one of a kind. And (3) everlastingness²³² is common to all of the species²³³ (if not even this is common we will not discover what common property does belong to all the species). If, then, every species must have everlastingness (for this is the image of eternity),²³⁴ consider what everlastingness is – whether (a) existing for an infinite time in both temporal directions, or whether (b) it includes 20 having a beginning or an end in one direction or the other.

For if the latter (b) should be everlastingness, (i) why in the world will it have been made like eternity? For eternity has no temporal 550,1 position nor extension nor priority and posteriority, but it does possess infinity in both directions; <and so does what resembles it>²³⁵ though its infinity is not simultaneous but rather comes to be. But if this is eternity, either nothing is like it, or the cosmos is above all else like it. But it is absurd to say that nothing is like it since the creator, being best, both wants to make things similar to the paradigm and does make them such. Therefore, the cosmos, being most similar to the paradigm, has everlastingness in both directions and not only in one.

Further, (ii) both the disordered state on account of its being ungen-10 erated and the ordered state on account of its being indestructible will likewise be similar to the paradigm. If, then, these things are impossible, and everything ungenerated must be indestructible and everything indestructible must be ungenerated in order that the composite of both might be similar to eternity, while what is infinite in one direction or 15the other is not such, and therefore the ordered state is not more like the paradigm than the disordered state, then what has come to be in conformance with the paradigm should be like the paradigm in both respects. But it is the cosmos that has come to be in conformance with the paradigm. Therefore, it is neither something generated yet inde-20structible nor could it be something ungenerated while having a destruction (for this would be infinite in one direction or the other); rather it is at once ungenerated and indestructible and has infinity in both directions so that it would be similar in all respects to the eternal paradigm, just as Plato himself says.

The Main Points of the Refutation of551,1the Fifteenth Argument

1. An exegesis of the meaning of the fifteenth argument.

2. That Proclus did not correctly understand the cosmos' likeness to the eternal paradigm. And how, according to Plato, the cosmos is like 5 the eternal paradigm while itself having a beginning to its existence.

3. That if we insist on a strict sense of the cosmos' likeness to the paradigm, it is impossible for the cosmos to be like the paradigm at all. And that the image must be like the paradigm as much as it can, just 10

as each existing thing is also said to have come to be like God as much as it can.

Refutation of the Fifteenth Argument

The present fifteenth argument is nearly the same as the second.
 For in both this argument and in that one,²³⁶ Proclus infers from Plato's saying the paradigm of the cosmos always exists that the image of the paradigm, the cosmos, also always exists. But in the second argument he inferred this from the fact that image and paradigm are relative and that it is not possible for the one to exist when the other does not exist (For he says that if the one, the paradigm, always exists, then the other, the image, must always exist, too); whereas in this argument he infers it from the necessity of the image's being like the paradigm *in all ways*,²³⁷ as Plato thought. Plato, he says, praises the paradigm of the

- 25 cosmos with these three names, calling it 'complete', 'one of a kind', and 552,1 'eternal.' So if, he says, it is like its own paradigm with respect to completeness, since the cosmos is something whole and total, encompassing in itself all things with nothing left outside, and if it is obviously
 - 5 both one and one of a kind ('For', Plato says, 'in order that this universe might be²³⁸ like the complete living thing with respect to its singleness, for this reason the maker made neither two nor infinitely many *kosmoi*; rather, this universe (*ouranos*), having been made one of a kind,²³⁹ is and will be²⁴⁰ one'),²⁴¹ then it is presumably necessary, says
 - 10 Proclus, for the cosmos to be like the paradigm in the third respect as well, I mean with respect to its always existing:²⁴² So how, he asks, could it be like the paradigm in this respect? Does it exist for an infinite time in both directions, or does it only go to infinity in one of the two directions – with respect to its end, as Plato says, but not
 - 15 with respect to its beginning? But if the paradigm subsists as eternal and has neither beginning nor end to its existence, then clearly what is infinite in one of the two directions won't be like it, but rather what is infinite in both directions will. Therefore, he says, if the cosmos is like the paradigm with respect to its always existing, then it will be
 - 20 infinite in both directions and have neither beginning nor end to its existence.

It has been said in the replies to the second argument²⁴³ that even if one agrees with Plato that there are Forms and paradigms, it is not necessary for their images either to exist or not to exist simultaneously

- 25 with the paradigms. But now our argument is directed not at facts, but at Plato's assumptions, since Plato says that the cosmos is a likeness of
- 553,1 the paradigm and that the paradigm is eternal. He must think, then, that the cosmos is without beginning and without end. For this seems to be the only way for the cosmos to be like its own paradigm with respect to always existing.
 - 5 2. But as I see it, if someone rigorously cross-examines both Plato's

words and what Proclus just said, he will discover that here, too, Plato is perfectly consistent, but that Plato's exegete [viz. Proclus] deceives us rather than making Plato's thought clear to us. And this will be clear 10 to those who first read Plato's own words on this issue. For in the *Timaeus* after composing the cosmos, placing soul in it, and moving it with the appropriate motion, he adds:

When the Father, Who had begotten it, regarded it in motion and 15living, a gift generated for the everlasting gods, He rejoiced and being glad. He thought to make it still more in accordance with²⁴⁴ the paradigm. Accordingly, just as it [viz. the paradigm] happens to be an everlasting living thing, so, too, did He try²⁴⁵ to render this universe to be as much as possible of this sort. Now the nature 20of the Living Thing was²⁴⁶ eternal, and it was impossible to attach this completely to what is generated.²⁴⁷ Yet. He thought to make something²⁴⁸ moving as an image of eternity, and simultaneously as He ordered²⁴⁹ the heaven. He made of that eternity which remains one²⁵⁰ an eternal image which is²⁵¹ in accordance with number.²⁵² This is what we call 'time'. For days and nights and 25months and years did not exist before the heaven came to be; 554,1rather, when the latter was being composed, He simultaneously contrived their generation. For these are all parts of time, and 'was' and 'will be'253 are forms of time which we have, without realizing it, incorrectly transferred to everlasting being. For we $\mathbf{5}$ say that everlasting being was, is and will be, but according to the true account only 'is' is appropriate to it.254

And a little further down he says:

It is perhaps not the appropriate moment to examine these things in detail at present. Time, then, came to be with the heaven, in 10 order that, as they were begotten²⁵⁵ together, they will also be dissolved together, if ever there is²⁵⁶ a dissolution of them, and time came to be in accordance with the paradigm of the eternal nature, in order that it might be as similar to it as possible. For²⁵⁷ the paradigm exists for all eternity,²⁵⁸ whereas the other [viz. the cosmos]²⁵⁹ always (*dia telous*) was and is and will be.²⁶⁰ 15

So if Plato says that the cosmos is like the paradigm because just as the latter exists for all of eternity so too does the cosmos exist through all time, then if someone is able to show that Plato wanted *time* to be 20infinite in both directions, we will agree that there is no other way for the cosmos to be like its own paradigm than to be infinite in each direction of time. For if time is infinite in each direction, the cosmos will not exist for all time if it has a beginning to its existence and no end.

25 For it is by assuming that time is infinite in both directions that Proclus easily weaves the fallacy. For, he says:

consider what this²⁶¹ is – whether (a) existing for an infinite time
 in both temporal directions, or whether (b) it includes having a
 beginning or an end in one direction or the other.²⁶²

Now behold how he readily accepts that time is infinite in both directions.
However, unless he would rather foist on Plato what he [Proclus] himself thought, just as he took over from Plato that the cosmos must be like the paradigm, so too must he show whether Plato wanted time to be infinite in both directions in order to infer the rest from Plato's

- 10 assertions in the following way: if the cosmos is like the paradigm in this way – by existing for all time just as the paradigm exists for all eternity, and if time according to Plato is infinite in both directions, then the cosmos, too, must be extended along with the infinity of time
- 15 in both directions. But in fact, since he is not able to show that this is Plato's opinion, he assumes on his own without proof that time is infinite in both directions.

But it is clear from the statements that Plato made in his physical theory on time that he did not think that time is infinite in both directions. For, he says:

20 Time came to be with the heaven, in order that, as they were begotten²⁶³ together, they will also be dissolved together, if ever there is²⁶⁴ a dissolution of them;²⁶⁵

and again:

For days and nights and months and years did not exist before the heaven came to be; rather, when the latter was being composed, He simultaneously contrived their generation.²⁶⁶

- 25 If, then, time came to be together with the heaven and did not exist before coming to be, and if he says that the heaven came to be, starting at some point and did not exist before it came to be, as was shown in
- 556,1 the sixth chapter,²⁶⁷ and also that it is immortal, having additionally gained restored immortality,²⁶⁸ then he wants time, too, to have a beginning to its being, but no end.

So, if (i) time began together with the heaven and is extended alongside of its entire existence and (ii) the cosmos is like its own paradigm because the former exists for all time just as the latter exists for all eternity, and (iii) time had a beginning to its being, it follows that the cosmos, too, had a beginning to its being and is thereafter extended

10 alongside the infinity of time and by existing for all time is like the eternal paradigm.

However, if Plato wanted the cosmos to be without beginning, why didn't he say 'just as the paradigm neither had a beginning to its being nor will have an end, neither did the cosmos have any beginning to its becoming, nor will it have any end? For in this way he would have 15better demonstrated the image's relation to its paradigm. But instead he says that just as the paradigm exists for all eternity, so too the cosmos came to be and is and will be for all time. So, if there is some *time* in which the cosmos does not exist, it must lose its likeness to the 20paradigm. But if it exists for all time and time has a beginning to its existence, then it is possible that in Plato's opinion the cosmos has a beginning to its existence and is like its eternal paradigm.

Let no one now stir up for us difficulties about time, wishing to show 25that time is infinite in both directions. For in the fifth chapter,²⁶⁹ we 557.1already solved the most troublesome of the difficulties by which time seemed to be infinite in both directions, and if there are any others we will examine them, too, when the time is right. For our present task is $\mathbf{5}$ not to examine the subject of time. Rather, we want only to show this much: that here, too, Plato is clearly consistent when he says both that the cosmos is like the eternal paradigm and that it begins its existence from some starting point. If, then, (as I already said)²⁷⁰ someone is able 10 to show that Plato wants time to be infinite in both directions, let him show it - not by proceeding from his own reasonings, but from Plato's writings – and that will be that. But if Plato says the opposite, that time began together with the heaven and does not exist prior to its genera-15tion, while Proclus assumes that it is Plato's opinion that time is infinite in both directions and in this way deduces consequences, then here, too, he has given a false account of Plato and is revealed as someone who has misled us.

3. But if someone says that there can be no other way for the cosmos 20to be like the eternal paradigm than for it to be infinite in both directions, being without beginning and end, then, first of all, this person is not reasoning in accordance with what Plato thinks. For the manner in which Plato says the cosmos resembles its paradigm has already been stated.²⁷¹

But if one in general wants to preserve a *strict* likeness of always 25existing (tou aei) in both cases [viz. the universe and the paradigm], then since the paradigm has an infinity of being that does not come to be but rather exists all at once, as even Proclus himself thinks,²⁷² it is necessary for the cosmos, too, to have an infinity that does not come to 558.1be but rather exists (huphestôsan). For what comes to be in time is not similar to what always exists. And if the paradigm has neither temporal position, nor priority and posteriority, nor any extension at all, then the cosmos cannot have any of them either, since it is similar to the $\mathbf{5}$ paradigm. So if the cosmos has temporal position and priority and posteriority and an infinity that does not exist all at once but rather comes to be (as even those men say who want the cosmos to be
10 everlasting), it is clear that it is not completely like the eternal paradigm.

But if the image of the paradigm must exist and preserve its likeness as far as possible, as even Plato himself said (for he says, 'just as it [viz. the paradigm] is an eternal²⁷³ living thing, so, too, did He try²⁷⁴ to render

- 15 this universe to be *as much as possible* of this sort');²⁷⁵ if, then, the image must resemble the paradigm as much as possible, then just as it differed from the paradigm in the properties mentioned above,²⁷⁶ let it differ in its manner of always existing (*kata to aei*) and, as Plato said, let it preserve the image to that paradigm not by being infinite in both
- 20 directions but by existing in the entirety of time, just as the paradigm exists in the entirety of eternity. For Plato does not only say that the cosmos is like the eternal paradigm, but also says that *all* beings are like God:
- 25 For He [viz. the creator] was good and no ill-will about anything ever comes to one who is good. And being free of this, He wanted *everything* to become as much like Himself as was possible.²⁷⁷
- 559,1 Is it, then, the case that because all things are said to be like God and God always exists and always remains the same and unchanging we should eliminate from all beings destruction and coming-to-be and in
 - 5 general change which none of the things in the cosmos is without share in? Or did each thing receive its likeness to its own first principle as much as is possible and natural for it? This is how in the case of the
 - 10 cosmos, too, we will reasonably understand its likeness to the eternally existing paradigm without doing away with what Plato clearly said: that time and the cosmos have a beginning; rather, as Plato himself said, we will say that the cosmos, by existing for all time – even if time
 - 15 has a beginning is like the paradigm that exists for all eternity. But we certainly showed above, in the sixth chapter²⁷⁸ that what has an acquired rather than an substantive indestructibility is not precisely because it is indestructible in *this* way automatically also ungenerated;
 - 20 on the contrary, since it is not indestructible by nature, it is generated.

End of the Refutation of the Fifteenth Argument

560,1 The Sixteenth Argument of Proclus The Successor

Sixteenth Argument: If (A) two wills are present in the creator – one that nothing exist that 'moves in a discordant and disorderly manner'²⁷⁹ (as Plato says 'for having willed that nothing evil exist, the creator

5 (as Plato says 'for having willed that nothing evil exist, the creator delivered it from disorder into order'²⁸⁰), and another that the universe be bound²⁸¹ ('For since you have obtained My will', he says, 'which is a bond greater than those by which you all were bound together when you came to be, you will in no way be dissolved'²⁸²) – and (B) each of these

wills is by its very existence <effective>²⁸³ – the one effects that what is 10 disorderly not exist, the other that what is ordered be preserved - then it must be the case that either (1) both of these wills are always in the creator, or (2) each of them is in Him at some time, or (3) the one is always in Him, but the other is only sometimes in Him. But it is false to say that He wills something only 'sometimes' [i.e. (2) and (3) are false]. For surely²⁸⁴ it is clear that willing at one time and not at another time is not something that always exists, regardless of whether He first 15did not will it but then later willed it or, on the contrary, first willed it and then later did not will it. For 'earlier' and 'later' and 'was' and 'will be' will be present in these wills and prohibitions. But Plato says that these are forms of time,285 and time is not in Him but from Him and 20posterior to Him. Therefore, (1) He always wills the discordant state not to exist and the ordered state to exist.

And since His will produces what it wills by its very existence, if each of them is always present in Him, each of them will always be producing its effect by its existence. But if each of them is always producing what it wills, the one presumably will always be removing what is disor-561.1dered, while the other will be preserving what is ordered. For in this way each of them will produce its own effect: the one removing what it wills not to exist, the other guarding what it wills to exist.

But since these wills produce in this way²⁸⁶ what is proper to each of $\mathbf{5}$ them, what is always being brought into being by each of them must exist. For the thing that is producing and the thing that is coming to be are simultaneous with each other, as Plato himself says in the Philebus: the one he calls 'the product' and the other 'the creator or producer', and he says that the one does not exist without the other.²⁸⁷ Therefore, the disordered state is always being destroyed because of the perpetual will 10 that it not exist, and the ordered state is always being preserved because of the will that it exist, since each of these wills always exists. But if each of them²⁸⁸ is *always* coming to be, it will not be first disordered and then ordered, just as it won't be previously ordered and then disordered. But if the disordered state is not prior to the ordered 15state, the ordered state does not have a beginning after the disordered state. And if the ordered state does not exist prior to the disordered state, it will not have an end before the disordered state. But if it neither begins after the disordered state nor ends before the disordered state, order is without beginning and without end and is itself not 20generated and not destroyed. But surely the cosmos is nothing other than order and the ordered state.²⁸⁹ Therefore, the cosmos is not generated and not destroyed.²⁹⁰

Furthermore, given that there are two wills in God, it is also absurd to say either that one is always producing while the other is not always 25doing so, or that the one acts by its very existence while the other does not, since both of them are of the same substance and are rational for the same reason. For the reason He wills that the disordered not exist 562.1

is that He is good, as Plato says,²⁹¹ while the reason He wills that the ordered exist is that He is not evil. Accordingly, however much more

- 5 being good befits God than does not being evil, by this much is willing the disordered state not to exist more divine than willing the ordered state to exist. For being good is more proper to God than not being evil. So it is completely absurd not to make the will which is more proper to Him more eternal, if one can say that, and more effective, seeing that
- 10 it is more divine. Therefore, if it is a consequence of the one will²⁹² that the cosmos is ungenerated, and a consequence of the other²⁹³ that it is indestructible, it might be more ungenerated than indestructible, since it has the one property through the more sovereign and divine will and the other through the inferior will. But surely the one will (that for 15 indestructibility) is evident to all. So, the other will (that for its ungen-
- eratedness) should be much more evident than this.

So, if the two wills are in fact one, the universe is similarly both ungenerated and indestructible. But if they are two, then the one which wills because of being good is more powerful than the one that wills

- 20 because of not being evil, and the universe will be more ungenerated than indestructible. But they would seem to be one rather than two wills; for it belongs to the same will both to remove the disordered state (regardless of whether it be before or after order), and to introduce the ordered state without beginning and to maintain it without end. For
- 25 nothing is more proper to any creator than order; every creator, at any rate, wishes to order his own creation. Therefore, insofar as He is a
- 563,1 creator, order is desirable to Him. But if what is desirable is one, then the desire for order, since it is a desire, is one.²⁹⁴ But if the desire is one, then, since it is a desire for what is willed, presumably the will, too, is one; this both always produces order prior to time and keeps it this way
 - 5 for all time. But if the will is one, it is absurd, or rather impossible, to divide it and give the one part, namely the less perfect, to God but not give Him another part, which is the more perfect. For it is what is more perfect that befits God, since it is greater than what is less perfect.

10

15

The Main Points of the Refutation of the Sixteenth Argument

1. That God's forever willing a thing and His willing that thing to exist forever are not the same thing. And that even if God did always will what is not generated to participate in being and the good, He does not will all things to do so uniformly but rather each thing in the way

it is its nature to participate in being and the good.

That the will of God is unitary, timeless, and indivisible, just like both God's knowledge and foreknowledge, even if the things that come
 to be and are known and enjoy divine foreknowledge are multiple and divided and sometimes exist and sometimes do not.

3. That with these present contentious remarks, Proclus has con-

futed the noble discourses about God that he made elsewhere concerning His indivisible knowledge and act of creation.

4. That even if one were hypothetically to agree that one of God's two wills was prior, the other posterior, this does not appear to provide a compelling reason to make God's wills subordinate to time. And that as far as Proclus' sophism goes, even if we were to agree that the cosmos is everlasting, it would be absolutely necessary that both all the intellective substances²⁹⁵ and the God Himself Who created time be subordinate to time. Under this heading I also show that God has knowledge of particulars.

5. That the ordered state neither came to be after the disordered state nor will it end before the disordered state, and yet this does not 10 make it necessary that the ordered state is without beginning and without end, as Proclus infers. And I will discuss what sort of order we are talking about.

6. That Proclus, having hypothetically assumed that there are two wills of God, the one willing the ordered state to exist, the other willing 15 the disordered state not to exist, incorrectly says that the will that the disordered not exist is better and more proper to God than the other will. And that, if it is necessary to divide God's will at all, the will that the ordered state exist is better than the other will. And that even Plato 20 wants both wills to be not two, but one.

Start of the Refutation of the Sixteenth Argument

1. We have said sufficiently in our remarks on the fourteenth argument what needed to be said about Plato's hypothesis²⁹⁶ that what is ordered comes to be out of what is in discordant and disorderly motion.²⁹⁷ So there is no need to speak again about the same things now.

Since the philosopher [viz. Proclus] takes from Plato the proposition that God wills the disordered state not to exist and wills the ordered state to exist, and in turn infers from this that the cosmos is ungenerated, someone might perhaps propose this to us all by itself and apart from the fact that Plato said these things concerning the will of God. [In other words someone might simply propose] that God wills the disordered state not to exist, and God wills the ordered state to exist. From these premises the same conclusion is reached, and it is right for us to work out the argument. For if this consideration investigated all by itself clearly does not force us into saying that the cosmos is ungenerated, it would surely not force Plato to say it either, just because he says that God wills both that the disordered state not exist and that the ordered state exist.

In the interest of agreement, we concede to the argument that God 15 *always* wills that what moves in a discordant and disorderly manner not exist. For that very reason there neither was nor is nor will be anything disorderly (by 'disorderly' I mean what is deprived of natural

25

565.1

- order and harmony). For surely it is not the case that God brings about
 something, but brings it about as discordant and disorderly. For
 being in an evil state is worse than not being at all.²⁹⁸ But we also
 won't grant that anything disordered substantially comes to be or
 exists either spontaneously or by any other principle. For it is agreed
 that spontaneity is the cause of nothing and that the principle of all
 things is one. So right when God brings each thing forth, He brings
 it forth with an appropriate arrangement.
- **F**00 1
- 566,1 Well then, we also say that God always wills the ordered state to exist. But we think it requires investigation whether He wills the ordered state to exist simultaneously with His existence, so that it would be co-everlasting with Him. For even if God always had the will
 - 5 that the ordered state exist, it does not immediately follow that He willed it to exist always. For although God causes all things to exist by willing alone, nevertheless, He also wills *when* they exist. But He wills them to exist when existing is good for each thing, and the existence
 - 10 that is possible and natural for each thing is good: for God always wills that the rational substances, too, cling to the good and never incline to what is worse (by 'worse' I mean of opinions the false ones and of actions the forbidden ones). For Plato says,
 - 15 Of goods one must allege as a cause no one other than God, but of evil things one must search for some other causes.²⁹⁹

And again Plato says

Responsibility (*aitia*) belongs to him who chooses; God is not responsible (*anaition*).³⁰⁰

The truth is He wills everything to be good and nothing to be bad as far as that is possible.³⁰¹ So, if (i) He is not responsible for evil things and (ii) He wills everything to be good and nothing to be bad and (iii) there are evil things, then not everything that He wills to exist will immediately exist simultaneously with God's existence. Rather, He clearly wills each thing to exist and to participate in the good in the way it

- 25 naturally exists and is good. For He wills each soul both to be good by a voluntary desire of the mind and to be completely without share in evil, since God is not responsible for evil things, as we have cited Plato as saying.³⁰²
- 567,1 If, then, it is necessary for something to exist in immediate simultaneity with God's will regarding it and without any further condition, as Proclus assumes, how did evil come to exist when God always willed that it not exist and always wished that everything be good? And how
 - 5 is it that not every soul always clings to the good, even though God always wills each soul to be good and to choose the good freely? For it is either necessary for Proclus to grant that God does not always will

the souls to be in a good state, in which case He would be the cause of evil; or, since this is absurd, it is necessary to say that He wills them 10 always to incline their own desires to the good and not to participate in evil in any way whatsoever, but that this state of affairs does not always come to be, and that consequently there is no necessity for a thing to exist always simultaneously with God's willing it (especially since God even wills all things to be like Himself, as Plato says³⁰³). But, clearly, 15each thing receives a likeness unto God in whatever manner its nature is capable of receiving it. It is in this way, then, that God wills each particular thing to come to be and to exist. At any rate, according to Plato in the *Timaeus*,³⁰⁴ God orders the celestial gods to turn to the 20creation of mortal living things. But that is to say that He wills each particular thing to exist when it is necessary and natural that it come to be.³⁰⁵ For before Sophroniscus³⁰⁶ had come to be, Socrates was not naturally constituted to come to be, yet even before Sophroniscus had 25come to be, God willed Socrates to come to be. However, He did not will him to come to be *simpliciter* or to come to be always; rather, He willed Socrates to come to be when he was able to come to be. In the same way, even before the ordered state came to be, God willed the ordered state to exist, but since it is generated He willed it to exist when it was able 568.1to exist. For none of the generated things are able to exist without beginning, as was shown in the first chapter.³⁰⁷ Therefore, it is not the case that if God always willed the ordered state to exist, that it is thereby also necessary that the ordered state be everlasting. 5

2. But if what God wills to exist exists at one time and at another time does not exist, we should not immediately for this reason say that God at this time wills this and at another time wills something else. For in God the will for the good is single and simple, and everything that exists participates in it entirely as much as is natural for it. So, just as 10 He wishes everything to be like Himself – though this likeness is not the same in all things, but depends on the type of substance – so too if He wishes all things to participate in being and the good, He only wills them to do so as each is able and as is natural for each to participate in being and the good. Therefore, He always wished the ordered state, i.e. the cosmos, to exist, but He wished it to exist in a way that was possible and natural for it. But it is natural, seeing that it is generated, for it to exist not without beginning but rather starting from some beginning.

In fact, the will of God concerning the existence of all things is 20 uniform, just as His foreknowledge and knowledge are uniform. But just as God's foreknowledge is not multiplied by the plurality of things He foreknows, and just as His knowledge, although it extends to the most individual things, is not divided or extended by the diversity of the 25 things that exist or by the dividedness of their substance (rather it knows divided things indivisibly and diverse things in a uniform manner and things in time timelessly), so too even God's will concerning the existence of all things is not extended together with the temporal

- 569,1 extension of the things brought into existence. For just because different things come to be and are at different times, it does not follow that God's will concerning the existence of these things becomes concerned with different objects at different times;³⁰⁸ rather, just as He always
 - 5 knows the future and what does not yet exist is always present to Him in His foreknowledge, so too He presumably always has the will that the future exist. For nothing is earlier or later for Him. For God the apprehension of the future is something other than the
 - 10 will that the future should be. (But let evil be excluded from my account. For even if He knows that evil will be, He wills it to be the case that evil will not be. For evil does not have any proper existence *per se*, rather it receives its apparent existence in the abandonment of natural activity.)
 - 15 If, then, the apprehension of the future is *always* in God and does not have temporal position, then the will that the future exist will not have temporal position, either. So just as God foreknows all things and knows all things without division or extension, in the same way He wills all things to be. Since this is how things are, there remains no necessity that the ordered state [viz. the cosmos] is everlasting just

because God always wills it to exist.

- **3.** Even Proclus himself clearly knows these things and says them in those writings where he closely examines the truth of things all by itself rather than arguing contentiously; we know this from the chapter of his book *On Ten Puzzles About Foreknowledge* that we have cited at other times.³⁰⁹ For he says:
- 570,1 We summarize, then, by saying that this One is productive of all things and sustains all things, having an existence truer than all substance and clearer than all knowledge, and not divided by its
 - 5 objects of knowledge nor moving among them. For the psychic and intellective knowledge of these objects involves these features. For every single intellect is many both in being and in thinking and every soul, being motion, even thinks with motion. But that [viz. the One] remains in unity, at once unchanging and indivisible and
 - 10 knowing all things in the same way not only that man and sun and everything is so and so but also that each particular is. For nothing escapes that One, regardless of whether you mean in being or in knowing.³¹⁰

And a little further on he writes:³¹¹

In this way even the unitary knowledge of foreknowledge, which is in the same indivisible entity, is knowledge of all the divided things, both of each of the most individual and of each of the most universal, and just as each thing derives its existence from the One, so too does it know each thing in accordance with the One.

If, then, (i) God's knowledge is not divided along with its objects of knowledge but rather while remaining unchangingly in unity it indivis-20ibly knows all things – not only the universals but also the particulars themselves and the ultimate individuals, and if (ii) God knows each thing in the same way that He causes each thing to exist, namely indivisibly and unchangingly – and this goes not only for universals but 25also for the most individual things that have their being in time and exist at one time but not at another – and without moving along with the motion of things that are coming to be (even if the things that come 571,1to be do exist at one time and not another), and if (iii) God's will brings into being what He wills by its very existence, as Proclus says,³¹² then God's will indivisibly and unchangingly causes all things to exist in a unitary manner without being divided along with the created things $\mathbf{5}$ and without moving among them. Rather it makes the multiplied things in a uniform manner, makes the things divided in parts indivisibly, and unchangingly makes the things that have their being in the changing of time. But if God's will indivisibly and unchangingly makes 10 the ultimate individual things without moving among them, and if the individual and most particular things exist at one time and not at another, then it is possible that even God's will that the cosmos exist at some time <*neither*>³¹³ exist at one time and not at another, *nor* have priority and posteriority, seeing that it is not moving among the things 15that it brought into being.

And in the preceding chapters³¹⁴ we have cited as evidence Plotinus expressing agreement with these views, and it would be helpful to reproduce them again now. Concerning the creative power of God Plotinus says:

Nevertheless, if each activity must be complete³¹⁵ and it is not 20permissible³¹⁶ to consider anything else³¹⁷ that belongs to God except the whole and everything, then all things must exist in whatever is His.³¹⁸ Therefore, what is forever must also exist in whatever is His, and so must the future exist there as³¹⁹ something already present. For there isn't anything later in Him; rather, what is already present there only³²⁰ comes to be in another later on. If, then, the future is already present, it must be 572,1present in such a way³²¹ that it was thought out beforehand, i.e. in such a way that it³²² won't be in need of anything, i.e. it is lacking³²³ nothing. Therefore, everything already existed and always existed and existed in such a way that later one could say $\mathbf{5}$ 'this because of³²⁴ that'. For when it is extended and, as it were, spread out, it is possible to show that this is after that, but when it is together it is all 'this', i.e. it has its cause in itself.³²⁵

If, then, according to the wise Plotinus, the future is always present to God and nothing is posterior to Him but rather what is posterior in 10

73

another is already present to God and indeed *always* present, then if we show that even Proclus expresses agreement with these views, even though the ordered state will exist at one time and not at another, the

15 will of God concerning its existence will not exist at one time and not at another. Thus, the will of God will admit of neither priority nor posteriority for this reason.

But surely it is also not the case that because God always possessed the will that the ordered state, i.e. the cosmos, exist, the cosmos automatically for this reason has to be without beginning, since its corporeal and generated nature is not receptive of beginningless existence. But if (i) it is because the ordered state, i.e. the cosmos, exists at one time and not at another that Proclus contends that the will of God

also exists at one time and not at another and for this reason is in time;
and if (ii) the will of God is capable of bringing all things into existence;
and if (iii) God knows all things in the same way as He causes them to exist (as Proclus again said);³²⁶ and if (iv) He knows all things – not

- 573,1 merely the universals but also the particulars and most individual things (as again we have cited Proclus as saying);³²⁷ and if (v) these are divisible and not everlasting but rather exist at one time and not
 - 5 another; then God's knowledge of the things that exist will also admit of priority and posteriority, exist at one time and not at another, be in time and apprehend the particular things, not in a uniform manner nor unextendedly, but rather multipliedly and extendedly. And God's fore-
 - 10 knowledge, too, will be divided together with the things that are foreknown; it will not be uniform but multiplied, just as they are, and it will admit of priority and posteriority, just as they do.
 - So let the philosopher reject whichever of his own assertions he desires. For both cannot be true; I mean both (i) that the first cause, in an individual manner and unchangingly, brings forth and knows and foreknows the most particular things which exist at one time and not at another, as he theorizes about God in his book on foreknowledge; and
 - (ii) that if the cosmos exists at one time and not at another, then God's will that it exist itself exists at one time and not at another (as he says here),³²⁸ and for this reason admits of priority and posteriority. But since in his book on foreknowledge, where he looks only at the subject matter itself, his theological account was very much in accordance with the correct
 conceptions of God, one must reject the second view [= (ii)] as being expressed rather more contentiously and not with an eye on truth.

If, then, the first account [= (i)] is true, i.e. if the cause of all the things that exist remains in unity, unchanging and indivisible, while at the same time bringing forth the ultimate individuals that have their being in time without itself moving among them, and if, as Plotinus says, the future is already present to God and nothing is posterior for Him, then it is possible, or rather it is *necessary*, even though the

5 ordered state, i.e. the cosmos, exists at one time and at another time does not exist, that God's will concerning its existence be everlasting

20

574.1

and that it not be in movement together with the cosmos nor become extended along with the extension of the cosmos' existence, since His will is always uniform and of the good alone. For He always wills the good to be, but only as each thing is naturally able to partake of the good. For the generated things and especially bodies have the nature not to exist always, as we have repeatedly shown.

4.³²⁹ But really, even if someone should hypothetically agree with these people that God now wills something to exist and now³³⁰ wills the 15same thing not to exist, or conversely that God now wills something not to exist and now wills the same thing to exist, and that for this reason one of the wills is prior and the other posterior - that is, even if one of the wills of God is said to be prior and the other posterior, what sort of necessity does there appear to be in that for bringing *time* into these 20wills? For it is sophistical, I think, and due to the homonymy of 'prior' and 'posterior', automatically on account of this to conceive of the priority and posteriority of God's wills in terms of time.³³¹ For not everything whatsoever called 'prior' or 'posterior' is invariably indica-25tive of time. For on this supposition, even if the cosmos were everlasting, we will either make both (i) every intellective substance (and these transcend all body) and (ii) the creator of time Himself subordinate to time, or grant that time exists in Him.

(i) It is clear from the following considerations that – as far as follows from this account – the intellective substances must be placed in time. For even if the immediate apprehension $(epibol\hat{e})^{332}$ of the intellect is 5 indivisible and unextended, they themselves will still concede to us that it does not simultaneously *think* all things at once, as Proclus, too, hinted in the lines excerpted from his book on foreknowledge, when he says

For every single intellect is also³³³ many both in being and in 10 thinking.³³⁴

For Proclus says that moving among the objects of knowledge is characteristic of intellective and psychic knowledge. But by 'intellect' we obviously mean, not the creative intellect,³³⁵ but the intellective substances that come after that and issue from that³³⁶ – whatever they are. An intellect of this sort, as even the Greeks³³⁷ would agree, cannot think [concepts] such as God and angel and soul and cosmos and eternity and time and everything else simultaneously; rather, it immediately apprehends each thing individually by moving from intellection to intellection, even if it does 'touch'³³⁸ each intelligible thing timelessly and unextendedly. For to understand all at once and indivisibly all things at the same time is characteristic of the creative intellect.

Intellect, then, thinks one thing as first, another thing as second, and yet another thing as third. So if time is in whatever in general has a priority and posteriority,³³⁹ then all the intellective substances, although they transcend bodies, will be subject to time, and time will be

575.1

in them, and somehow the things that are absolutely separate from
body and deprived of corporeal motion will be subject to time, which has its existence together with bodies. For time is in motion, and without motion there is no time (as Aristotle showed³⁴⁰ and as everyone believes³⁴¹), and motion is invariably in bodies.³⁴² Therefore, what is
absolutely separate from body both in terms of its existence and in terms of its relation, this is also separate from time. But every intellect is agreed to be separate from bodies in terms of its existence, since it has a substance separate from all body; but this is also true in terms of its relation. For as Aristotle correctly said in *De Anima*:

It is difficult even to imagine what sort of part the intellect would hold together or how it would do this. $^{\rm 343}$

If, then, every intellect is beyond time, and some or all of these intellects understand in a discursive manner,³⁴⁴ understanding one thing before and another after, then it is not the case that every instance of priority and posteriority is automatically indicative of time.

- 15 and posteriority is automatically indicative of time. Further, if even Plato says that time came to be together with the heavens so that, having been generated together, they will also be dissolved together, if ever their dissolution comes about, then it is clear that if one should theoretically assume that the cosmos did not exist,
- 20 neither would time exist. But it is possible, or rather it is necessary, that the intellective substances exist even if the cosmos does not exist. For they do not have their existence in relation to bodies in such a way that if the bodies were theoretically destroyed, the intellective substance would be destroyed as well. For even if someone agrees that all
- 25 things come to exist at once (I mean both the intellective substances and the bodies), there is nothing wrong with theoretically separating things that exist simultaneously (indeed, elsewhere³⁴⁵ we have seen
- 577,1 Proclus say this) in order to see, regarding each of these things, both what comes from the thing's own nature and what comes from its ordering and relation to something else.
 - 5 Indeed, let the cosmos be theoretically separated from the things that exist, and let remain the incorporeal and intellective substances, of which sort our own soul is. Then, even if the cosmos didn't exist, the intellect all by itself would still have discursive under-
 - 10 standing. For this is its nature: to understand one thing before and another after. For if it is from body or time that every intellect has discursive understanding, and if the substance of intellect is separate from bodies, then it is possible for intellect non-discursively³⁴⁶ and indivisibly to contemplate all by itself all things at the same time
 - 15 and all at once. For if its discursive contemplation derives from its relation to body, then its activity all by itself is naturally non-discursive.³⁴⁷ Therefore, at some time it will engage in this sort of activity, unless it has this substantive power in vain. However, if it engages

in this sort of activity and thinks simultaneously all things that exist, then it will not differ at all in this respect from the divine and creative 20 intellect. And this would be absurd.

If, then, even these men agree that the substantive activity of intellect is discursive and that for this reason there is priority and posteriority in understanding, and if, when the nature of bodies is theoretically removed, time – but not intellect – must be removed along with it, then, when time is theoretically removed, it is still possible to have priority and posteriority. If, then, all priority and posteriority 578,1 without qualification were indicative of time, then time could exist even when time does not exist – at least as far as Proclus' assumptions are concerned. So if this is absurd and impossible, then it is not the case that time is automatically and invariably to be found wherever there is 5 priority and posteriority.

For in this way all the intellective substances would be subject to time, as we have shown, and (ii) on this supposition we will make not only the intellective substances but also the creator of time Himself subject to time. For consider it this way: Each different celestial sphere 10 completes its own circular journey in a different amount of time. The revolution of the sphere of fixed stars happens to be the fastest, rotating all the way around to its starting point in twenty four hours; the moon goes completely around its own circle in a month; the sun and the stars 15that keep pace with it – both Venus and the star named after Mercury - execute their own revolution in a year; the one which is called the star of Mars takes nearly two years; the star of Jupiter takes twelve years, that of Saturn thirty. And presumably the creator of all is the immediate cause of this difference in the time it takes to rotate all the way 20around to the starting point for the celestial spheres, since He Himself caused the cosmos to exist, as Plato says³⁴⁸ – and Proclus thinks too. Let's assume, then, that all the wandering spheres simultaneously came to be at the same point, e.g. at the starting point of Aries³⁴⁹ or in some other 25sign of the Zodiac. For this is not out of the question; in fact, it is both possible and even *must* either have happened at some point or will happen at some point. Presumably, it is absolutely clear from this that the sphere 579,1of fixed stars will complete its revolution before all the others; the moon will be second; third, the sun and the stars that keep pace with it; fourth, the star of Mars; fifth, the star of Jupiter; and last, the star of Saturn. 5

It won't make any difference to the present proof if we should assume that all the wandering spheres are not in the same place but rather each one is somewhere else (however they happen to be). For the same argument about the revolution of each will be consistent with what we've said. It was for the sake of clarity that we assumed that all of them would begin their circuit from the same point – as must have happened in the past and will happen in the future most of all according to those who suppose the cosmos to be everlasting. For even now in our time (during the 245th year of the Diocletian era)³⁵⁰ the seven wander-

ing spheres came to be in the same zodiacal sign, Taurus, though they weren't all in the same degree of it. Therefore, it is possible for all of them to be at the same point.

So, did God, Who created and ordered them in this way, know the time it takes to complete each revolution, or did He not? If, on the one hand, He didn't know, then it will turn out that He didn't know the order of which He Himself was the cause. And yet in the *Timaeus* it is said:

When the Father, Who had begotten it, regarded it in motion and living, a gift generated for the everlasting gods, He rejoiced and, being glad, He thought to make it still more similar³⁵¹ to the paradigm.³⁵²

If, on the other hand, He knew it moving,³⁵³ then, again, for this reason He necessarily knew *when* each revolution returned to the same point – that is to say: First, He knew that the sphere of fixed stars returned;³⁵⁴ second, that the moon returned; third, the sun; fourth, the star of Jupiter,³⁵⁵ and the rest in turn. If, however, He knew that the one return was prior and the other posterior, then 'prior' and 'posterior'
5 exist in the thoughts of the creator, as do 'was' and 'will be.' But where there is 'prior' and 'posterior' and 'was' and 'will be', there is also time, according to what Proclus thinks.³⁵⁶ Thus, time will exist even in the creator of time.

And the creator will admit of priority and posteriority not only in His 10 knowledge of the revolutions of the celestial bodies but also to no lesser degree in His wills concerning them. For it is clear that when the sphere of fixed stars traversed its own circle, God willed it to have traversed it

- 15 in that time and willed the others not to have traversed their circles yet. For if He had willed the others to have traversed their own circle, why hadn't they traversed it? Hence, God's will will not make simultaneously with being, as Proclus thinks.³⁵⁷ And if God is always ordering the
- 20 universe, He is presumably always willing it to be ordered; and if He is always willing it to be ordered, He is always willing it to move in the manner of motion described above³⁵⁸ (for this is its order); and if He is doing this, He is presumably willing that the complete return of one
- 25 sphere be first, another second, another third, and the rest in succession in accordance with the order described. Then, when the first sphere returned to the same point, He willed the second not yet to have returned; and when the second returned, He willed the third not yet to
- 581,1 have returned;³⁵⁹ and similarly in the other cases. And if He did not will them all to return simultaneously, then He willed each sphere to return when it did return. And if this is the case and one returns first, another
 - 5 second, another third and fourth and so on, then 'before' and 'after' and 'was' and 'will be' are all in the wills and thoughts of God; and therefore time is in His wills and thoughts, too, as far as these inescapable

attempts at argument are concerned, even if one supposes the cosmos to be everlasting.

Further, does God know the future or doesn't He? For if, (i) on the one hand. He does not know the future, then He won't know the present either. For if He knows the present without knowing the future. He won't even be as good as men. For many men have known the future. Therefore, if He knows present particulars, He will also know future 15particulars, lest He be worse off than men – perhaps even worse than irrational beasts. For even many of these have perception of the future, such as cranes who flee winter and many others. But if He knows neither the present nor the future. He will be entirely ignorant of all 20things. For He will not know the past, either. For this was a previous present. And whoever does not know that what is the case *is* the case, will presumably be far from knowing whether what is no longer the case was the case. So He will not even know whether the cosmos He Himself created will exist. For the cosmos is currently present, and all 25things have their existence in the present. And the cosmos, being divided with the divisions of time, contains 'was' and 'is' and 'will be', 582.1as we have heard Proclus saying many times in those passages that we cited from his defence of the *Timaeus* against Aristotle.³⁶⁰ If, then, the cosmos has past, present and future and God doesn't know the future, 5 neither will He know in general whether the cosmos He created exists. For if He does not know now that it will be later, neither will He know later whether it is present.

But why am I talking about other things? He will not even know whether He Himself exists, if He does not know the present. For He, 10 too, exists. So He will not differ at all from nature. For nature, although it makes bodies, is ignorant both of itself and of the things that come to be.³⁶¹ Perhaps God will even be much worse than Nature, if nature in rational living things has shining reason in command which knows 15 both itself and nature and all things.³⁶² But what are we going to do with *this*:

I know the amount of sand and the limits of the sea and the deaf I hear, and to him who doesn't speak I listen?³⁶³

And what about

And gods know all things;³⁶⁴

and

All things are filled with God, and His ears are on every side, Through rocks and throughout the earth and through man Himself, what thought is hidden in their breasts.³⁶⁵

79

10

(ii) But if He does know the future, and if none of the universals are
in the future in the sense of not yet existing save in terms of everlasting generation, as Plato thinks; if, rather, the future consists in particulars that do not yet exist; then, God knows even the particulars, and it is not as some of the Greeks – not so much theorists of God as battlers against
583,1 God – impiously claim,³⁶⁶ namely that God is ignorant of individual

things. They are all but saying these comic lines:

Do you think the gods have so much leisure, That they dispense evil and good every day To each man? 367

A person who says that God has no knowledge of individuals clearly also destroys God's foreknowledge concerning them. For He will not foreknow what He does not know, as irrational nature does.³⁶⁸ But in

- 10 the above-mentioned passages³⁶⁹ of Proclus and Plotinus we get both that God knows the future and that God's knowledge and foreknowledge extends to the ultimate individuals. So, if God knows the future, I presume He knows that it is not yet present but rather will be. And whenever the future should become present, He invariably knows that
- 15 it is already present and is not in the future; and if the future should pass away since it has a beginning to its being. He again knows that it is no longer something that is. So the knowledge, by which He knows something will be and is not yet, will be prior to the knowledge by which
- 20 He knew that it already is present, and this in turn will be prior to the knowledge by which He knew that it passed away and is no longer among what is. Thus, 'before' and 'after' ('prior' and 'posterior') will again be present in God's acts of knowledge, and for this reason time will be present in it, too.³⁷⁰

Therefore, if, on the one hand, they suppose that wherever priority and posteriority in general (however they are meant) are found, there

- 25 time will invariably be found as well, then it will be utterly necessary that neither the intellective substances nor the creator of time Himself be severed from time, and further it will even be possible for there to be
- 584,1 time where there is no time. If, on the other hand, these results are simply absurd and impossible, then it is not the case that time will invariably be found wherever there is priority and posteriority. There-
 - 5 fore, there are two alternatives. Either one must consider God's will and knowledge, in accordance with the preceding statements about God, to be entirely unitary and indivisible and concern only one thing – the good – or rather they will *be* the good itself – and consider that they are not to be multiplied or extended along with what is created and known; and that nothing will be in the future for God, but even what does not yet
 - 10 exist is foreknown as existing, and so is always present, as Plotinus properly theorizes about God.³⁷¹ Or else, if because these are divided in time and time now exists and now does not, they expect us to make God

 $\mathbf{5}$

subject to time, willing being at one time and non-being at another, then, let them be aware that even if the cosmos is agreed to be 15everlasting, they are dismissed by their own flights of fancy,³⁷² since they fall victim not only to these same absurd results but to several others as well, as we have shown.

5. Further, since it was shown above³⁷³ that, (1) because of the uniformity and indivisibility of God's will, the ordered state must exist 20(though it was not shown to exist invariably). From this and (2) the view that, since the property of always existing (to aei) is in God's will, it is therefore also in things and (3) since it is true that God never wills what moves in a discordant and disorderly manner to exist, Proclus infers 25that the disordered state did not exist prior to the ordered state (and 585.1because of this that it is true that the ordered state did not begin after the disordered state since the disordered state didn't exist at all) and that the disordered state will not exist after the ordered state (and because of this the ordered state will not have an end that precedes $\mathbf{5}$ another period of the disordered state, since the disordered state will not exist after the ordered state). But surely it is not the case, just because the ordered state neither had a beginning after the disordered state nor an end prior to another period of the disordered state, that for this reason the ordered state did not have any beginning at all and will not have any end at all. For, on the one hand, if it were necessary that 10 the ordered state and the disordered state alternate in the sense that when the one does not exist the other surely does, then what Proclus infers would be correct: if the disordered state exists neither before the ordered state nor after it, then, since the disordered state never exists, the ordered state will always exist and have neither beginning nor end. 15If, on the other hand, it isn't possible for the disordered state to exist at all (because it exists neither spontaneously nor by any other cause, seeing that God at once brings each thing forth and brings it forth with the appropriate order), then the ordered state will not have a beginning after the disordered state, since the disordered state never even existed. 20Nevertheless, it is possible for the ordered state to have a beginning. And again the ordered state will not have an end before the disordered state (for the disordered state will not ever exist in any way at all); nevertheless, it is possible for the ordered state to have an end.

By 'disordered' (*atakton*) I mean the opposite of 'ordered', i.e. 'discor-25dant (plêmmeles)'. Just as 'voiceless (aphônon)' means 'of unpleasant voice' (kakophônon)' and 'shapeless (amorphon)' means 'poorly shaped (kakomorphon)', so too does 'disordered (atakton)' mean 'deprived of natural order', just as if someone imagined the universe's order to be confused. So it is in this way that I say 'disordered', and not in the sense 586.1of the complete privation of order as I say 'lifeless' (apsukhon) of what is deprived of soul or 'friendless' (*aphilon*) of what is deprived of friends. For nothing prevents what is called disordered in this [latter] sense, i.e. $\mathbf{5}$ not-being (to $m\hat{e}$ on), from being on both sides of the ordered state, since

what is ordered is naturally generated and destructible. But it is not invariably evil for something not to exist, as we showed in the sixth chapter.³⁷⁴ At any rate, not existing at all is more choiceworthy than being in an evil state. And it is not evil that at some time each of the particular things does not exist.

10

6. Let these things which I have said in response to the present sixteenth argument be sufficient. In the lines that follow this same argument,³⁷⁵ the philosopher correctly establishes that God's will that

- the disordered state not exist and His will that the ordered state exist 15is one and not two, but when he hypothetically assumes that they are two, he says that the will that the disordered state not exist is more perfect and more proper to God, whereas the will that the ordered state
- 20exist is inferior and more imperfect and less appropriate to God than the other will. And he tries to establish this because, he says, the objective of the will that the disordered state not exist is that the good exist. For Plato says:
- 25God willed that everything be good and nothing bad as far as possible. Thus, He took everything that was visible - not being at rest but rather moving in a discordant and disorderly manner and brought it out of disorder into order, believing that the latter is absolutely better than the former.³⁷⁶
- 587.1And Proclus says that the objective of God's will that the ordered state exist is that it not be evil, and willing the good to be is much more divine and proper to God than willing evil not to be. Therefore, he says, even
 - $\mathbf{5}$ God's will that the disordered state not exist, whose objective is that the good exist, is more perfect and therefore more appropriate to God than the other will.

Scrutinizing these things perhaps won't help us much, both because this Proclus is simply working out this argument hypothetically and

- because we have already refuted the present argument.³⁷⁷ Neverthe-10 less, we will say that the philosopher is obviously not speaking reasonably. For if we should hypothetically agree that God has two wills, then, by virtue of the very argument that Proclus himself deliv-
- 15ers, the will that the ordered state exist will be much more divine than the will that the disordered state not exist. For one must judge each thing rather by its own nature and not by its consequences.³⁷⁸ So if the disordered state is evil and the ordered state good, then the will that
- the ordered state exist chooses by itself the good, but has as a conse-20guence willing that the evil not exist. For it is not feasible that the good and the evil exist at the same time. And the will that the disordered state not exist involves of itself willing that the evil not exist, but as a
- consequence it involves willing that the good exist. Therefore, if each 25will must be characterized rather by its own nature and not by its consequence, then the will that the ordered state exist will by itself be

better and more divine than the other will that the disordered state not exist.

Moreover, even if each will should be judged by its consequences, 588.1even so it will be nevertheless established by inference that the will that the ordered state exist is better than the other will that the disordered state not exist. For if the objective of willing that the 5 disordered state not exist is that the good exist, and if we say that there is no other good among these [viz. things that come to be and perish] than the ordered state, and if the objective of willing that the ordered state exist is that evil not exist, then the objective of the will that the disordered state not exist is that evil not exist. Again, if the objective of 10willing that the ordered state exist is that evil not exist, and if Plato again says in this text that there is no evil other than the disordered state, and if the objective of willing that the disordered state not exist is that the good exist, then the objective of willing that the ordered state 15exist is that the good exist. Therefore, in this way, too, the latter will is shown to be better than the former.³⁷⁹

Moreover, even Plato said that the object of God's will that the disordered state not exist is not only that the good exist, as Proclus claims, but also that evil not exist. For he says:

God willed that nothing be bad and everything good $^{\rm 380}$ as far as possible. $^{\rm 381}$

But if the will that the disordered state not exist has been said to have both objectives, how can Proclus separate them and say it only has the former, that the good exist?

Therefore, even Plato himself united the two wills into one, since the 25 objective of willing that the disordered state not exist is not only that good, i.e. the ordered state, exist, but also that evil, i.e. the disordered 589,1 state itself, not exist. Therefore, even according to Plato, God's will is not two but one, though it is called by different names.

End of the Refutation of the Sixteenth Argument

The Seventeenth Argument of Proclus the Successor

Let the seventeenth be an argument that reminds us that the Aristotelian principles had long before been Platonic principles. These are 'Everything generated is destructible' and 'Everything ungenerated is indestructible'. The first of these Plato says in the *Republic*, the second 10 in the *Phaedrus*.

But since destruction comes to everything that has come to be,³⁸²

says Socrates in the role of the Muses; and:

5

since³⁸³ it is ungenerated, it³⁸⁴ must also be indestructible³⁸⁵.³⁸⁶

He says this when, having shown that every principle is ungenerated,

- 15 he insists that because it is ungenerated, it is also indestructible. For if all of this is true, it is necessary both that everything destructible is generated (for if a destructible thing were ungenerated, then what is destructible would be indestructible – which is impossible) and every indestructible thing is ungenerated (for if an indestructible thing were generated, then what is indestructible would be destructible). But since
- 20 all of this follows, it is necessarily the case that if the universe is indestructible (*aphtharton*) (and its indestructibility is clear from what has been assumed: For He is a creator, Plato says,³⁸⁷ of immortal things, and what is immortal (*athanaton*) is imperishable (*anôlethron*), as is said in the *Phaedo*: something else could hardly be imperishable, if
- 590,1 what is immortal were not of this sort,³⁸⁸ said Cebes, and Socrates agreed); if, then, the universe which has come to be by the agency of the creator is imperishable (*anôlethron*) (for what comes to be by Him is immortal, and that means imperishable (*anôlethron*)), it must also be
 - 5 ungenerated on account of what has been shown to follow from the two principles above, of which the first is 'Everything generated is destructible' and the second is 'Everything ungenerated is indestructible'. Therefore, it is not only in agreement with Aristotle but also in agreement with Plato that the cosmos is demonstrated by these two 10 assumptions to be neither generated nor destructible.³⁸⁹

For if the disordered state is ungenerated and the ordered state indestructible, then the disordered state will be better than the ordered state. For what is ungenerated is related to what is generated in the same way as what is indestructible is related to what is destructible.

- 15 Thus, alternately, too, what is ungenerated will be related to what is indestructible in the way that what is generated is related to what is destructible, and as what is generated is related to what is destructible, so too is genesis related to destruction. So, if genesis is better than destruction, then what is generated is *per se* better than what is destructible and what is ungenerated is *per se* better than what is indestructible.
- 20 If, then, the disordered state is ungenerated and destructible and the ordered state indestructible and generated, then the disordered state will be better than the ordered state, and He Who made the ordered state out of the disordered state would be making something worse out of something better, since He would be making something generated and indestructible out of something ungenerated and destructible.
 25 Therefore, it will not be the case that the one is ungenerated and
- 591,1 destructible, and the other is generated and indestructible, or *vice versa*.

But neither is the maker evil. Therefore, the ordered state is not destructible, and if the ordered state came from the disordered state,

then the disordered state is not indestructible. For it does not exist when the ordered state exists. Or else each of them is generated and 5 destructible. But the disordered state is generated, in which case it has been generated from [a previous period of] the ordered state, or alternatively, the ordered state is destructible, in which case either He Who destroys it has not fitted what was ordered together well, and in this case He is not good, or else He destroys what *was* fitted together well, and in this case He is evil. But all of this is impossible. Therefore, the disordered state is not prior to the ordered state, and thus, the ordered 10 state is ungenerated, and in the same way also indestructible.

The Main Points of the Refutation of the Seventeenth Argument

1. That the present seventeenth argument is the same as the sixth, and what makes this one different from that one. Also, what the line of 15 reasoning is in each of the arguments.

2. That the present argument was refuted together with the sixth one. And a brief summary of what was said in that response: that the property of being ungenerated is consequent upon the property of being *naturally* indestructible and not upon what has its indestructibility as 20 something *acquired*.

3. That as far as from Plato's texts go, one should have inferred from Plato's saying that the cosmos is generated that it is not indestructible but destructible, rather than concluding from his saying that it is not destroyed that it did not come to be either.

4. That Plato is consistent when he says both that everything generated is destructible and that the cosmos came to be and is not destroyed. And that not everything indestructible is ungenerated.

5. Testimony from Galen from his work on proof: that not everything 5 indestructible must invariably also be ungenerated. And that Plato is of this opinion.

6. That in the subsequent lines, too, Proclus neither draws his consequences correctly nor in accordance with Plato's premise.

Refutation of the Seventeenth Argument

This argument is also the same as the sixth. There, too, Proclus assumed as Platonic doctrine that everything generated is destructible and further that according to Plato the cosmos does not perish (For³⁹⁰ to wish to dissolve what is fitted together fairly and in a good state is 15 the mark of an evil person', says Plato³⁹¹), and from these two premises inferred by applying conversion by negation,³⁹² that if everything generated is destructible, then if something does not perish it is also not generated. Thus, if according to Plato, the cosmos is not destroyed, it clearly did not come to be according to him. This, then, is how it goes in

10

his sixth argument. But in the present argument, although he assumes the same premises again (that what is generated is destructible and

- 25 that the cosmos does not perish), he does not use conversion by negation to derive that what does not perish is also not generated (as he did in the sixth argument), but rather infers it from another Platonic princi-
- 593,1 ple. For Plato says that everything ungenerated is incorruptible,³⁹³ and from both this and [the proposition that] everything generated is destructible Proclus infers that what is destructible cannot be ungenerated, nor can what is indestructible be generated, converting
 - 5 each of these assertions, and that just as everything generated is destructible, so too is everything destructible generated, and again just as everything ungenerated is indestructible, so too is everything indestructible ungenerated. Proclus infers that everything destructible is
 - 10 generated by *reductio ad absurdum* in this manner: if not everything destructible were generated if rather someone should say it is possible for something destructible to be ungenerated, then, since everything ungenerated is indestructible, it is possible for something destructible to be indestructible according to the third mode of the first figure (= Darii) For the syllogism goes like this:

Some destructible thing is ungenerated.
 Everything ungenerated is indestructible.
 <Therefore, some destructible thing is indestructible>.³⁹⁴

And this conclusion is absurd. Therefore, it is not possible for something destructible to be ungenerated. But if nothing destructible is ungenerated, and if everything has to be either generated or ungenerated, then everything destructible is necessarily generated.

- Similarly, Proclus deduces that everything indestructible is ungenerated using the same mode. For if someone should say that it is possible for something indestructible to be generated, then since everything generated is destructible, something indestructible is destructible, which is absurd. If, then, this is absurd, then nothing indestructible is generated. For this absurdity was the consequence. Therefore, everything indestructible is ungenerated. Thus, it has been shown that everything destructible is generated and that everything indestructible is ungenerated.
- 594,1 ated. If, then, says Proclus, the cosmos is indestructible according to Plato, it is consequently clear that it is also ungenerated.

Thus, since the seventeenth and the sixth arguments are the same, and differ only in their syllogistic mode, the philosopher should not, having added the second principle – the one that he has in that argument added towards establishing that what is indestructible is

ungenerated – to the sixth argument, have needed the present argument. But I think it is because he wants to confuse his readers with the multitude of arguments that, through a few additions, he doubles the

10 number of arguments for us, as we have shown in other cases as well.³⁹⁵

2. If, then, this argument is the same as the sixth one, clearly this one was refuted together with that one. For it makes no difference whether what is destructible is shown to be ungenerated by conversion by negation or in the present manner. The source of the fallacy, as was 15said there, is homonymy, i.e. taking without qualification what Plato said with a qualification.

For 'immortal' and 'indestructible' have two senses: (i) what has immortality and indestructibility in accordance with the account (logos) of its own nature and does not have any principle (logos) of death 20or destruction; and (ii) what is receptive of destruction and dissolution but acquires immortality as something additional. 'Good' is similarly said in these two ways, and so are several other words, e.g. 'white' and 'hot'. In one sense, one of these means what is substantially joined to 25the substance of its possessor, just as the hot is substantially joined to fire. In the other, it is added by acquisition as in the case of heated water or fired iron. And this is true of blackness, too. In one case, it belongs to a thing substantially, as with ebony; in the other case it is added by acquisition, as in the case of dyed wool. Light, too, in one case exists substantially, like the light of the sun, and in the other case by 5 acquisition, even if it is *always* present to some things, as the light from the sun is always present to the spheres above the sun, yet it is present in a supervening manner. (Hence, if hypothetically we could remove the sun from them, the light in them would directly withdraw with it seeing that it does not belong to the account (logos) of their nature, even 10 though it is always present. Therefore, although they are always illuminated because the illuminating agent is always present, they are nevertheless utterly unlit according to their own natural account.) Thus, just as in these cases each of these terms is applied in two ways - the one way by being substantially joined to the subject by nature, 15and the other way by being added to it by acquisition - so too must 'indestructible' be applied in two ways: either as belonging to something substantially or as added to it additionally by acquisition rather than by the account (logos) of its own nature. For it is in the latter way that the ensembles of the elements, too, now possess indissolubility - not 20because their substance does not have a principle (logos) of dissolution (for, on the contrary, there is no part of an element that is not actually destroyed) but in the sense that they continually and uninterruptedly receive restoration. For in place of the destroyed fire, other fire 25promptly comes to be and fills up the ensemble of fire, and the portion of water that has evaporated is replenished by other water that comes to be; and similarly in the case of earth and air. 596.1

Given, then, that 'indestructibility' has two senses, if one can show that Plato says that the cosmos is *naturally* immortal and indestructible, it will necessarily follow by Plato's own hypotheses that it is also $\mathbf{5}$ ungenerated, even though he repeatedly says that it is generated. If, on the contrary, he declares that it is mortal and dissoluble by nature and

87

595,1

doesn't simply say it but reasons it out and proves it ('Since you all came

- 10 to be', he says, 'you are neither absolutely indissoluble nor immortal'),³⁹⁶ and if he inferred from the fact that it is visible and tangible and has a body that it came to be and further says that a restored and acquired immortality comes to it additionally from Him Who always is, why would it still be necessary for this acquired and unnatural immortality
- 15 to entail that it is ungenerated? We are forced to draw the completely opposite conclusion. For those things that have something by acquisition are receptive of that thing's opposite in accordance with the account (*logos*) of their nature, e.g. air and the lunar sphere, while having light by acquisition, are receptive of darkness and sometimes 20 participate in it.³⁹⁷

But we showed near the end of the first chapter³⁹⁸ that even if light is always present to the upper spheres, it is nevertheless by nature destructible. Our souls, too, which contain the branches of knowledge as acquisitions, are receptive of ignorance as well. Therefore, Plato, by saying that immortality is added to the cosmos by acquisition, reasonably says that it is by nature destructible and dissoluble.

- 597,1 3. How, then, is not villainous and foreign to a philosopher's character to opt for Plato's statement that 'everything generated is destructible' and despite seeing that Plato follows his own principles
 - 5 and proclaims 'since you all came to be, you are neither absolutely immortal nor indissoluble' deliberately to skip over this and in a simple manner to seize hold of the passage which speaks of the cosmos' not being dissolved when it does not even say this without qualification and from this to infer that it did not come to be even though Plato clearly said that it is generated and that it came to be?
 - However, if it was necessary to throw out one of the two, either that the cosmos is generated on account of its not being destroyed or that it is indestructible on account of its being generated, it would have been
 - 15 much more reasonable given that Plato says simply and without any further qualification that the cosmos came to be, while he adds some qualification when he says that it remains indissoluble (for he says that the cosmos does not have indissolubility by nature but by acquisition and that it is in fact dissoluble by nature) to rule out its indissolubility on the basis of its having come to be (since it is generally true that
 - 20 everything generated is destructible and Plato clearly says that since it came to be, it is neither indissoluble nor immortal) than to infer from its not being dissolved that it is not generated either.

For Plato doesn't appear to say anywhere that the cosmos is indestructible; on the contrary, he says that it is neither indissoluble nor
immortal. However, he does say that although it is dissoluble, it will
not be dissolved. But saying this is far from saying that. For 'indestructible' might mean 'what does not have a principle (*logos*) of destruction',
but it is not invariably the case that what will not be destroyed owes its
not being destroyed to its having no principle of destruction. For it is

also possible that something destructible is not destroyed because its 5 damaged parts are continually restored. And Plato clearly says that this is the sort of immortality that the cosmos has: it, too, being mortal by nature, is provided with an acquired and restored immortality from the creator.

4. We will not reject anything that Plato says in these writings, nor 10 will we misrepresent what he says in them and reduce him to inconsistency in order to establish claims that seem right to us but not to him. For it is completely consistent for him to claim both (i) that everything generated is destructible and that, for this reason, the cosmos too, since 15it is generated, is also destructible and that (ii) its immortality is secured not by its nature but by the will of God,³⁹⁹ since it is shown to be destructible by the very fact that it gets its immortality by acquisition. For if it didn't naturally slip into dissolution because of its 20generation, it wouldn't need to receive this restored and acquired immortality. Therefore, even if it persists undissolved forever, it is still a consequence of its being generated that it is dissolved little by little, yet it is repaired by the will of God. For if God were hypothetically to 25dispose of what supplies the cosmos with restoration and acquired immortality, it would vanish entirely, being unable to keep itself to-599.1gether forever. Thus, even if Plato says that what comes to be by the creator is immortal and imperishable,⁴⁰⁰ he means that it persists immortally in the manner stated, because, given that He Who created the universe maintains it through His will alone, there is every neces-5 sity – given that this will remains unchanged – for these things to remain immortal, having acquired immortality from the will of God and not from their own nature.

When we interpret Plato's thought, we have to say these things in 10 this way, unless we really want to reduce Plato to inconsistency. For, he first said 'you are not immortal nor absolutely indissoluble'.⁴⁰¹ And how can he say that the same things are both immortal and not immortal, both dissoluble and indissoluble, unless in the one case we 15 provide 'by nature' and in the other 'by the will of God'?

5. I think the argument has sufficiently demonstrated to those who are not entirely contentious and shameless in the face of the truth that neither is simply everything that is free of destruction⁴⁰² ungenerated but rather, if anything, what is naturally free of destruction is so; nor does Plato think that the cosmos is naturally free of destruction and therefore also ungenerated. Yet, if the testimony of trustworthy men is needed to buttress the argument, and if anyone thinks Galen's testimony on these things is trustworthy – a man who is a foremost natural philosopher and has thoroughly investigated the questions of philosophy to no lesser degree than his own science – then let him come forward as an advocate to our case.

For in the fourth chapter of the treatise on demonstration⁴⁰³ he has written, he says in these words:

600,1

The conception of the everlasting is composite – for it is both ungenerated and free of destruction. And each of these is a consequence of the other. 404

Clearly, he shows here if either of the two obtains, then the other obtains as a consequence; and now, by assuming this, he demonstrates the thesis that is our present concern:⁴⁰⁵

Further, if it has been correctly agreed by all that being free of destruction is a consequence of being ungenerated, then, when we considered this, we observed both that this is at once both an undemonstrated first principle, credible in itself, and that it is 10 confirmed by another clear principle which was just mentioned above and goes like this: 'If something has absolutely no principle of generation, neither will this sort of thing have a principle of destruction'. Thought readily accepts that everything ungenerated is automatically also free of destruction, and if any other one 15among the principles that are evident to thought is primary, then [thought readily accepts] such a [principle] also. However, that whatever is free of destruction is necessarily also ungenerated requires some qualification so that we can accept it readily. What, 20then, is this qualification? In determining in what way this thing (tode ti) is agreed to be free of destruction – whether in the way that it does not admit of the principle of destruction at all, e.g. what is completely simple and impassive, or in the way that it has gained a restored immortality, like something Plato seems to say 25about the gods in the *Timaeus*, where he made the first God converse with them. This is the speech:

Since you all came to be, you are neither absolutely indis-601,1 soluble nor immortal, and yet you will in no way be dissolved nor will you encounter the lot of death, since you have obtained a bond – of My will – that is still greater and more sovereign than those by which you were bound together when you came to be.⁴⁰⁶

And in the Statesman, too, he goes through this same problem concerning the entire universe (ouranos). For we can conceive of something that, even though it was generated, will nevertheless not be destroyed – like Sparta, perhaps. For it is possible that Sparta never be destroyed: Even though all of the individual buildings that belong to it have a nature to be destroyed, it is possible for the whole totality not to be destroyed because it can get restored little by little. And it is possible to imagine not only a city being free of destruction in this way but even a single building, if a part of it receives restoration each time it is damaged. It

90

is reasonable then that if something is ungenerated, it is also entirely free of destruction; but if it is free of destruction, it is not necessarily ungenerated.

Thus, this man, too, clearly says that being ungenerated does not follow for any thing free of destruction in any way whatsoever but only for what does not have any principle of destruction, and he agreed that this is the way that Plato assigns freedom from destruction to the universe (ouranos). But enough about these things for now.

6. In what comes next the philosopher again takes over from Plato that the ordered state came to be out of the disordered state, but adds himself that the disordered state is also ungenerated, although Plato says neither that it is generated nor that it is ungenerated. Then he infers that it is also destructible on the grounds that if the ordered state 25came to be out of the disordered state, and if when the ordered state exists the disordered state does not exist, then the disordered state will be destructible. Thus, the disordered state is ungenerated and destructible. So if, he says, the disordered state is ungenerated and 602.1destructible, and if the ordered state is generated and indestructible, and if being ungenerated is better than being indestructible, as he showed (for generation, too, is better than destruction), then, the creator made something worse, i.e. something generated and indestruc- $\mathbf{5}$ tible, out of what is better, i.e. ungenerated.

Plato's hypothesis has already been discussed.⁴⁰⁷ And if this hypothesis is pleasing <as>⁴⁰⁸ stated, it would have been more reasonable to infer from this that since everything destructible is generated, as he 10 himself showed, and since the disordered state is destructible according to Plato, then the disordered state is also generated. And if it is generated and destructible, it will be worse than the ordered state which is generated and indestructible.

But if the disordered state is generated, he says,⁴⁰⁹ it came to be out of the ordered state. First, this is not necessary, since we have 15repeatedly shown⁴¹⁰ that what comes to be does not invariably come to be from an existing thing. Secondly, even if this were so, we are now investigating not what follows from the hypothesis which says that the disordered state is generated, but rather what follows from the fact that by Plato's hypothesis the disordered state is destructible. If according to Plato being generated follows from being 20destructible, and if the disordered state is destructible according to him, then according to him it will also be generated. For nowhere does he say that it is ungenerated.

If, however, Proclus insists that the disordered state is necessarily ungenerated, and if Plato clearly wants it to be destructible (For he 25says, 'what moves in a discordant and disorderly manner⁴¹¹ He brought out of disorder into order'),⁴¹² then it is possible for something that is 603.1ungenerated to be destructible, at least if Proclus has granted that it is

20

ungenerated and Plato that it is destructible. What, then, prevents the ordered state, too, from being generated and yet indestructible?⁴¹³

Moreover, even if we should concede that being ungenerated is better than being indestructible and that the disordered state is ungenerated, nevertheless being indestructible is better than being destructible. Therefore, the ordered state, since it is indestructible according to

- 10 Plato, is in this respect better than the disordered state, which it is destructible. Thus, in one respect the generation of the ordered state is out of something better, what is ungenerated, but in another respect it is out of something worse, what is destructible, and it is not simply the case that what is worse came to be from what is better, as Proclus claims.
- And if being is better than not being, since generation, too, is better than destruction, as he himself says;⁴¹⁴ and if the disordered state were capable of not being destructible – though it is in fact destructible and has indeed been destroyed, while the ordered state, being indestructible, were incapable of not being; then the ordered state is also better without qualification than the disordered state. Therefore, the generation of the ordered state is out of something worse.
- 20 But I think the sort of dodginess that characterizes these arguments is only excessive ambition and that they have no serious use. Hence, we must rather quickly turn away from these kinds of arguments, and I think it was reasonable that the philosopher didn't even call these things into question to begin with. And we showed through several arguments in chapter 6⁴¹⁵ that the creator would not even be evil if He
- were to destroy the ordered state. And, on this supposition both the
- 604,1 cosmic gods will be evil for destroying the particulars that are ordered and the creator of these evil gods will be not good but evil. So if the creator is good, He made the cosmic gods good. And if He made them
 5 good, then they, too, do good and not evil. If, then, they destroy the particulars that are ordered (for they can't make anything without destroying something else, since the generation of one thing is the destruction of another), the destruction of the ordered state is not absolutely evil, but there is a way in which it is even good, since the
 - 10 pieces borrowed for the generation of composites will, according to Plato,⁴¹⁶ be paid back to the lenders.

End of the Refutation of the Seventeenth Argument

The Eighteenth Argument of Proclus the Successor

Eighteenth Argument: If it befits only the most divine things of all to be always the same and unchanging, as Plato says in the *Statesman*,⁴¹⁷ then if, on the one hand, the creator is among the most divine things, it is only fitting that He be the same and unchanging; if, on the other hand, He is not one of the most divine things, we should declare that He is neither a god who exists forever nor the most excellent of causes.

 $\mathbf{5}$

But surely we do say these things about Him, just as is written in the 20Timaeus.⁴¹⁸ Therefore, it befits Him to be the same and unchanging. For if it is not what always exists that is the same and unchanging, what does not always exist will be of this sort, and if it is not the most 605.1excellent cause, then it will be what is not the most excellent cause. Since this is absurd, it is necessary that the most excellent cause and He Who always exists be most divine, and that, being most divine, He be always the same and unchanging. But it befits what is always the $\mathbf{5}$ same and unchanging never to be different at different times. For this is contrary to being always the same and unchanging. And it does not befit what is not different at different times to be not making at one time and then making nor to be making at one time and then not making. For this is to be different at different times – making and in 10 turn not making and again making.

And what is not at one time not making and then making nor making and then not making must either always be making or always not be making. For apart from these there is no other possibility. For always making and always not making are extremes, whereas going from not 15making to making and going from making to not making are means.⁴¹⁹ But surely it is not feasible for the creator, being a *creator*, never to make. For it does not befit a creator always to be idle. For when would He be a creator if He never made anything? Therefore, it is necessary 20that the creator always be making and to be doing this very thing, creating.

And if the creator, Who is always creating, must make the cosmos, then it is necessary that the cosmos have neither a beginning to its being created nor an end. For if it had a beginning, it would not always have been ordered, and if it has an end, it will not always be ordered. But the cosmos must always be ordered, since the creator is always ordering it; and He must always be ordering it, since He is always making in the same manner; and He must always be making in the same manner, if He is always the same and unchanging. Therefore, it is necessary for the cosmos to be a cosmos that has neither beginning nor end, to be a cosmos without generation and without destruction; to be ungenerated and indestructible. Therefore, if the creator is always $\mathbf{5}$ the same and unchanging, the cosmos must be ungenerated and indestructible. Thus, if Plato clearly says the former, then it must be that the cosmos, too, is ungenerated and indestructible according to him.

If, then, Plato says in the Statesman⁴²⁰ that God is in turn absent from and present to the cosmos and in the Timaeus that God is first 10 absent and then present (for he says that the universe had the condition it was likely to have if God were absent from it),⁴²¹ and Plato says both [viz. presence and absence] equally take place and therefore the cosmos will both at one time change from disorder into order and at another time revert back from order to disorder, until God comes to be seated 15upon it and takes its oars in hand,⁴²² then those in Atticus' school⁴²³

25

606.1

should not look only at the material in the *Timaeus* which makes Him Who is [originally] absent present at some time to that from which He was absent; rather, they should also look at the material in the *States*-

- 20 man which makes Him Who is present absent at some time from that to which He was present; and just as on the basis of the former passage they postulate order *after* disorder, so too should they on the basis of the latter postulate disorder after order. But if he should say both, and notionally place⁴²⁴ both order and disorder prior to the cosmos, he would
- 25 see changes connected to God Himself that are impossible when one no longer considers the matter notionally. For he is not merely saying that
- 607,1 the cosmos is different at different times while God remains the same on account of the fact that the cosmos all by itself has this quality of being different at different times, as particular things do; rather he is saying that *because* God is different at different times the cosmos is either disordered or ordered. Therefore, if that is not feasible because
 - 5 God is always the same and unchanging, it is impossible that the cosmos be ordered and also disordered. And when Plato says that the cause of the order and disorder of the cosmos is the presence and
 - 10 absence of God, this, I would say, is a genuinely divine contrivance of his wisdom which ties together the ungeneratedness of the cosmos and its indestructibility in simultaneity through God's eternal activity. For if this is the only cause of the cosmos' being ordered and disordered in turn and doesn't obtain because it is not feasible that God is different
 - 15 at different times, then it is also not feasible to see both order and disorder connected to the cosmos.

If, then, God is always the same, then He is not at one time present to the cosmos and at another time absent. And if He is not at one time present and at another absent, then the cosmos is not at one time ordered and at another time not ordered. For the presence of God was

- 20 supposed to create order for the cosmos, and His absence disorder. But if there never was nor will be one time of order and another of disorder, it is always ordered. And if it is always ordered, it has been ordered for an infinite amount of time and will be ordered for an infinite amount of time to come. And this Plato himself, so as to make it clear even to the
- 25 dim-witted, said loud and clear: 'The paradigm is that which is for all eternity, whereas the cosmos always (*dia telous*) is for all time what has
- 608,1 come into being and what is and what will be'.⁴²⁵ Just as it is going to exist *ad infinitum*, so too has it existed *ab infinito*; and since Plato extended it in both directions so that it has been and will be in the same
 - 5 way, Plato's friends should not make the cosmos' past existence limited but its future existence infinite; rather, they should abide by his verdict. For in this way the cosmos will possess an imitation of eternity's everlastingness, with its temporal infinity not beginning halfway but going in both directions. His purpose was to make, on the one hand,
 - 10 time like eternity and, on the other, the cosmos, which exists for all time, like the eternal living thing.

The main point is that none of these men [viz. in Atticus' school] speaks of the cosmos in the reverent manner that Plato does since⁴²⁶ he [Plato] says that the cosmos is disordered if ever God is not the same, that is, if ever God is not an intelligible god. For it befits the intelligible 15gods to be the same and unchanging. Thus, either both - the cosmos and the creator – are gods or neither is. For what will make the one not a god is its disorder, and what makes the other not a god is His not being the same. The disorder of the cosmos would arise from the creator's not remaining the same, because there is no other way for the former to be 20disordered except by the latter's not being uniformly present, or by being absent. For the former must invariably be similar to the latter. So if the latter is conceivably present at some time and absent at some time, then the former, too, is conceivably disordered at some time⁴²⁷ and ordered at some time. For the thought experiment (epinoia) must apply 25to both, if being ordered is a necessary consequence of presence and not being ordered a consequence of absence. But if in truth the former is ordered at some time and disordered at another,428 then in truth there 609.1is an even stronger case that the latter is present at some time and absent at another. For it is not the case that the latter's presence or absence follows from the former's being ordered or disordered, but $\mathbf{5}$ rather vice-versa. Therefore, the latter's being present or absent will be true first and from that the former's being ordered or disordered had to follow. Thus, if the first is impossible because God is always the same and unchanging, it is also impossible for the cosmos to be ordered at some time and disordered at another. For what follows from an impossibility is necessarily impossible, since the laws of dialectic say that 10 what follows from a possibility is possible.⁴²⁹ So, if one supposes it is possible for the cosmos to be disordered at some time and ordered at some time, it will be possible for God to be absent from the cosmos at some time and again present at some time. So if the latter is impossible, the former is too. Therefore, the cosmos is always ordered and God is 15always present to the cosmos, and it is neither the case that the cosmos was ordered out of a state of disorder (for neither is it the case that God, not being present, is present in turn) nor that out of this state of order it will be disordered (for neither is it the case that God, being present,⁴³⁰ is not present in turn). And according to Plato there is equal necessity that the cosmos be generated and destructible and that the creator of 20the cosmos not belong to the most divine beings whom it befits to be the same and unchanging. So if one should be reverently disposed towards Him, one should also be so towards the cosmos, or else by being wrong about the latter, we will be in a more fundamental way wrong about the former – and not only about the former but about all divinity. For being 25the same and unchanging is common to all divine things, then we should, defending this in all cases, similarly defend it in connection 610,1 with the creator; or else by rejecting it in one case, it will not be credible in the other cases either.

The Main Points of the Refutation of the Eighteenth Argument

5 **1.** That in these lines Proclus is repeating himself by using the same proofs that he already used in the fourth, ninth, and fifteenth argument.

2. A concise reminder of what was said in the fourth and sixteenth arguments, namely, that the products of creation existing at one time

10 and not at another does not mean that there is motion or transformation in God.

3. A brief reiteration of what was said in a similar way in the fifteenth argument, namely that according to Plato the cosmos preserves the likeness to its eternal paradigm even though time has a

15 beginning to its existence, and that Plato, because he wanted both time and the cosmos to be destructible by their own principle of nature, quite naturally gave them a beginning to their existence.

4. That Proclus contradicts Plato himself when he says 'For Plato⁴³¹
20 is not even saying that the cosmos is different at different times while God remains the same'.⁴³²

5. That Proclus contradicts himself in his assumptions.

6. That an assumption of this sort is also in conflict with the nature of things.

7. That it follows from what both Plato and Proclus have conceded 611,1 that it is impossible for the cosmos to be a god. And that when Plato called the cosmos a god he was following the custom of the poets.

8. That in many places Plato intertwines his own teaching with poetic stories, and for whatever reason used them as arguments and 5 not as stories.

9. That when Plato says the cosmos is called a 'god' (*theon*) because it is always 'running' (*thein*),⁴³³ he is calling it a 'god' homonymously and not synonymously with the intelligible gods. From this it is inferred

10 that he wants the cosmos to be temporally and not merely causally generated and the intelligible gods to be only temporally and not causally ungenerated.

10. That although Plato believes that the poetic stories concerning the gods are causes of the greatest evils among men, for fear of the

15 Athenians he unwillingly lowered himself to their level. And it is in this spirit that he says that the cosmos is a god, even though he believes it is not ungenerated.

11. That the way in which Plato says order hypothetically comes to 20 be out of disorder in the *Timaeus* is not the way in which order hypothetically changes into disorder in the *Statesman*. And how one should think of the generation out of disorder into order. And that some reduce this position of Plato's to that of Empedocles.

25 **12.** An epilogue to the entire treatise and a preface to the sequel.

Refutation of the Eighteenth Argument

1. Once again he recycles the same arguments because he has nothing new to say and is not able to let what he said be, just like gluttonous little dogs whenever they snatch at a bone or men who, being engrossed by passionate pleasures, always fill up on the same ones but [in doing so] always bring their desire to a height as if they were in possession of fresher objects. For one would find next to nothing in what he says here that was not already said in the preceding arguments.

[Here are some of his repetitions:] Right at the beginning, that the 10 creator must always be the same and unchanging and for this reason must not at one time be making and at another time not be making but rather is either always making or never; and that since it is impossible for Him, being a creator, never to be making. He is always making and for this reason what comes to be, too, always exists; further, that unless 15the cosmos has the quality of being ungenerated and indestructible, the creator is not always the same, and that for this reason it is necessary for us to speak with equal reverence both about the creator and about the cosmos by saying that the former belongs to the most divine beings and is always the same and unchanging and that the latter is ungener-20ated and indestructible; or else if we blaspheme the cosmos by supposing it to be generated and destructible, then by the logic of the argument we are forced to blaspheme its creator as well and say that He is neither one of the most divine beings nor always the same. All of 25this is also said in the fourth argument with all but the same words. 613.1 For there he says that the creator is unmoving,⁴³⁴ and this is the same as what has been said here, namely that He is always the same and unchanging. And again in the fifteenth argument he clearly says⁴³⁵ that the image, I mean the cosmos, is similar to the paradigm in accordance $\mathbf{5}$ with which it has come to be and that since the paradigm is eternal the cosmos cannot be similar to it except by having an infinity of time in each direction. Further, in the ninth argument it already turned up⁴³⁶ that it is necessary that either both the creator and the cosmos are gods 10 or neither are, and if both are gods, then both must be equally unreceptive of change because the entire race of gods is of this sort and that the cosmos cannot be unreceptive of change if it has come to be out of disorder and will again come to be into disorder. 15

Therefore, there is hardly any new argumentation in the present argument. So why should we say the same things about these same points when we already confronted each of them as well as possible in the preceding arguments? Having thus far only produced a concise reminder here of what Proclus has said, let us, too, with God's help put an end to our argument.

2. Proclus says⁴³⁷ that if the creator is always the same and unchanging, it will never be the case that He is different at different times. But if He is never different at different times, then it will not be the case

97

612.1

- 25 that He is making at one time and not making at another. 'For this is to be different at different times making and in turn not making and
- 614,1 again making.^{'438} But it is not the case that if He is making at one time and not making at another, and if He *does* nevertheless make, since He is a creator, then He is necessarily always making. Thus, he says, what comes to be will always exist as well.

However, in the fourth chapter,⁴³⁹ it was shown by several arguments that those beings that have complete capacities with respect to

- 5 anything do not undergo any transformation by actualizing or not actualizing them. But if they don't undergo any transformation, they don't transform. And if they don't transform, they do not in this respect come to be different at different times.⁴⁴⁰ And if they don't come to be different at different times, then they will be the same when they do act
- 10 in accordance with these capacities or when they don't. For we showed that change subsists in what comes to be not in the maker.⁴⁴¹ And that those who produce activities from capacities undergo no transformation we showed by several other arguments and in particular by determin-
- 15 ing that if passing from capacity⁴⁴² to activity is a transformation, then there is every necessity either (i) to say that the transformation exists before the activity at the time when the capacity alone exists without the activity, or (ii) we will say that the activity itself (i.e. creating itself or teaching or whatever else) is the transformation, or else (iii) we will
- 20 assume that the transformation or change occurs between the capacity and the activity. For apart from these there is no other possibility. Further, it was shown there that (i) the capacity itself all by itself
- 25 apart from the act of creating cannot be transformation or in general motion. For a capacity is more like a static condition (*stasis*) and not like a motion or transformation, as we showed even Proclus himself to
- 615,1 say there⁴⁴³ and as he has said here as well. For he says it befits what is always the same and unchanging either never to be making or always to be making,⁴⁴⁴ because clearly not making is a static condition and not a motion. Therefore, what only has a capacity to make without actually
 - 5 making is not transforming. Moreover, if during the activity itself the capacity does not depart from the things that have the capacity, and if the capacity is motion, then the creator is always in motion since He always has the capacity to create. Therefore, if this is absurd, then no capacity is a transformation.
 - 10 (ii) But neither is activity itself transformation. For again on this supposition, since God is according to them always creating the cosmos, He will always be in transformation and motion.

(iii) But nor is any other state observed between capacity and activity which is a different one besides these two and which one could call
motion or transformation, since there is no time that passes between a thing's being inactive and its being active either; rather, the end of its inactivity is the beginning of its activity. And since no time passes, neither will there be any other state between inactivity and activity.

nor in general will there be any motion. For all motion and change are 20 in time.

If, therefore, one can observe no transformation prior to the activity, nor during the activity, nor between the capacity and the activity, then He Who produces the activity from the capacity does not undergo any transformation. Therefore, neither will any transformation be observed 25in God not creating and then creating from the manifold of what exists. But again we have also shown there⁴⁴⁵ that the semblance of motion and 616,1of a transformed state arising in us whenever we first have capacities and then we act in accordance with them (e.g. whenever we are first not teaching and then teaching, or not building and then building), does not $\mathbf{5}$ arise in connection with what has the capacity, namely the soul, but rather in connection with the instrument, i.e. the body. Given, then, that God merely by His willing produces everything, the process within us by which it comes about that the instrument [i.e. our body] is differently disposed also proceeds from there. And so, since in connection with God there is neither a capacity that is moved nor an 10 instrument that undergoes a motion, it is impossible for God to change in any respect and for Him to become different at different times. even if He is not always creating but rather allots a starting point to the process of creation.

And we have also shown⁴⁴⁶ that in God's case capacity and activity do not differ at all; rather, the creative power of God is something 15simple that is always the same and is able to bring all things into being by willing alone, with the nature of the things that are generated receiving both being and goodness. And we showed⁴⁴⁷ that God's will itself is something simple that is always the same (for He always wills 20the good both when He brings things into being and when He does not). And we showed⁴⁴⁸ that even if someone should concede that God wills something and then⁴⁴⁹ does not will the same thing, this is not motion or transformation. For if this is motion, then God will always be in 25motion, since at one time He wills each of the particular things to be and at another He wills them not to be, and since there are always some 617.1particular things coming to be, and others perishing. If, then, because the cosmos exists at one time and not at another, it is necessary for God's will concerning it also to be different at different times, and if willing differently over time concerning the same thing is to be in 5 motion and to undergo transformation; then we shall be forced to say that God is always undergoing transformation and moving, since at one time He wills each of the particulars to exist and at another He wills it not to exist.

But we have shown that God does not have to be like the things which come to be of which He is the creator. Rather, it is not the case 10 that since the things God knows or foreknows are divided in parts and multiple and exist at one time and not at another, therefore God's foreknowledge and knowledge of these things must be either divided in

- 15 parts or multiple or different at different times, but we have shown that regarding the things divided in parts He acts indivisibly, and regarding the multiple things [He acts] in a uniform manner, and regarding the things that are different at different times He acts while always remaining the same. In the same way it is necessary to say that God's will concerning the being and not-being of these things is not different at
- 20 different times; rather, one must say that it is always the same as it is always willing that what is good should be; and what is good is that each thing should be in the way that its nature dictates that it should be and at the time that its nature dictates that it should be. We showed this ourselves in the fourth and sixteenth chapters, and we cited Proclus himself and Plotinus saying this as well.⁴⁵⁰ And we employed
- 25 several other arguments in those chapters that the interested reader should read through concerning how no change arises in God even though the things that come to be exist at one time and not at another.
- 618,1
 3. Further, in the fifteenth chapter⁴⁵¹ by appealing to Plato's own statements we established that the cosmos, which is a generated image of an eternal paradigm, preserves according to Plato its likeness to the paradigm even though it has a starting point to its existence, and that he wants the cosmos to preserve its likeness to the paradigm not by virtue of the cosmos' being ungenerated but rather by virtue of the fact that just as the paradigm exists for all eternity, so too does the cosmos exist for all time. He says:

For the paradigm exists for all eternity, whereas the cosmos was and is and will be for all time until the end.⁴⁵²

Therefore, if someone were to claim that there is some time at which there is no cosmos, this person would not preserve the likeness of the image to the paradigm that Plato has in mind. But if time came to be together with the heaven in order that having been generated together, they will also be dissolved together (if ever their dissolution should

- come about), it is clear that even though the cosmos has a starting point to its existence it preserves its likeness to the paradigm by existing for all time just as that exists for all eternity. For it is not the case that, just as Plato wants the cosmos to exist for an infinite amount of future
- 20 time because he thinks it worthy of not being destroyed, so too he has said that it has existed for an infinite amount of past time, as Proclus here claims, giving us his own assumption and not that of Plato. Rather, Plato says loud and clear that it came to be, beginning at some starting
- 25 point, and did not exist prior to its generation; yet, using the theory of these things as a foremost natural philosopher would, he does not assign an end to its present or future being. For nothing prevents the
- 619,1 extension of time and the increase of number from going on *ad infinitum*, but it is impossible for an infinity actually to exist or to have existed. But time and number will have been actually infinite if time is

10

without beginning. But if time and number were actually infinite, then an infinity was traversed - for generation reached us by traversing over infinitely many units. But if an infinity was traversed and everything traversed is limited (for this is how what is infinite differs from what is 10 limited: the latter has a way of being traversed while the former does not), then infinity will be limited, and the members of a contradictory pair will be true together: what is infinite will not be infinite, which is absurd. Therefore, it is not possible for what is infinite to be traversed. 15If, then, infinity is not traversable, generation will not reach us over infinitely many units. And if generation does not reach us over infinitely many units but rather a limited number, and if the time of each of the generated things is limited, then all the time that has passed will be limited. For what is composed of limited parts is itself necessarily 20limited. Therefore, it is impossible for past or future time ever to be actually infinite. For in whichever direction it is taken to be (or have been) actually infinite - whether forwards or backwards - it will make what is infinite traversable.

And there will be something greater than infinity, and what is 25 infinite will not stop increasing and becoming greater than itself, since we could add to the moments that have already passed the moments 62 that are constantly coming to be now and in the future. Infinity will also be multiplied if we add the infinity in each kind to the rest, e.g. the infinity of horses to that of humans, and to these the infinity of oxen, 5 and to these the rest of the ensouled and lifeless things in the cosmos.

But each of these things is wholly impossible. Thus, it is quite natural for Plato, on the one hand, to have assigned a starting point to time, and on the other (since he wants the cosmos always to exist), to have said that time will always exist. For even if the cosmos is coming to be to infinity and time is increasing to infinity, the quantity of time that stretches to the present moment is always greater than the quantity of time that passed prior to the present moment. Nevertheless, any time which is taken and actually exists is limited. And the quantity of things which come to be in a limited quantity of time is necessarily similarly limited. For only in this way is it possible both that time never stop and that the infinite not have become actual, namely if time has a beginning to its existence, since everything that has come to be [viz. the quantity of things that have come to be] is always limited.

4. Moreover, even though Plato calls the cosmos a god, he does not 20 because of this grant that the cosmos is without change and always the same and unchanging. On the contrary, in the *Statesman* he determined the cosmos to be neither without share in change nor among the most divine beings. For he says:

Being the same 453 and unchanging 454 and being identical befits \$25\$ only the most divine beings, 455 but the nature of body is not of this order. 456

101

620.1
621,1 Hence, he says, since both the heaven and the cosmos share in body, it becomes wholly impossible for them to be without share in change. And Plato says again in the *Timaeus*:

What is that which is always existing and does not have a generation? And⁴⁵⁷ what is that which is always becoming and never existing?⁴⁵⁸ The former, being always the same and unchanging,⁴⁵⁹ is comprehended by understanding with reason (*noêsei meta logou*); the latter, as it comes to be and is destroyed but never really is, is opined by opinion with irrational perception.⁴⁶⁰

- 10 And he says that the cosmos, since it is perceptible, is generated and destroyed and never really exists. If, then, being always the same and unchanging befits only the most divine beings, and if the creator is among the most divine beings (as both Plato says and Proclus
- 15 thinks) and for this reason is always the same and unchanging; and if the cosmos, since it shares in body, is not of this order (i.e. is not one of the things that are always the same. For Plato says that this befits only the most divine beings, whereas everything visible is
- 20 generated and destroyed and never really exists. Hence, he declared it to be impossible for the cosmos to be always wholly without share in change), then, although the creator is always the same, Plato determined the cosmos not to be always the same. How, then, can
- 25 Plato's successor in⁴⁶¹ this passage voice opinions that are contrary to those of Plato? In this way he clearly gives a false account of Plato where he says:
- For he is not merely saying that the cosmos is different at different times while God remains the same on account of the fact that the cosmos all by itself⁴⁶² has this quality of being different at different times, as particular things do; rather he is saying that *because* God is different at different times the cosmos is⁴⁶³ either disordered or ordered.⁴⁶⁴

For even if it is only hypothetically that Plato says in the $Statesman^{465}$ that God is present to and absent from the cosmos, it is at any rate without resorting to any hypothesis that he defined what always is all by itself (*auto kath' hauto*) both in the *Timaeus* and in the *Statesman*

- 10 by saying that it is intelligible and that it is always the same and unchanging, and similarly that what is visible is generated and destroyed and that it is entirely impossible for it to be without share in change. Further, if he determined everything that is by its own nature
- 15 visible to have its being in change, then it is not because God is different at different times that Plato says that the cosmos is different at different times, as Proclus claims; rather, even though God is always the same, he says that the cosmos by its own nature – because

102

it shares in body - is something generated and destroyed, and it is 20wholly impossible for it to be without share in change.

However, it is remarkable that the philosopher either did not notice or intentionally omitted that even from these very things that he attributed to Plato in the *Statesman* it is clearly shown that the cosmos is said to be different at different times not because of God, as Proclus 25says, but because of its own nature. For if Plato assumed it were by the presence and absence of God that the cosmos is different at different times - ordered by His presence and disordered by His absence -623.1obviously Plato wants the cosmos to derive its remaining in the same order not from itself but from the presence of God. For if it had its remaining in the same state from itself, then even if the cosmos were 5 hypothetically absent from God it would nevertheless remain ordered in the same state. If, then, what is ordered is determinate and the same with respect to its being ordered for as long as it is ordered, whereas what is disordered, being indefinite, never remains in the same state (for it would not be disordered if it preserved its determination and identity), and if the cosmos derives its order from God's attention 10 and when deprived of this it sinks into disorder (not that God is the efficient cause of this disorder! Rather, He merely doesn't order it)⁴⁶⁶ then clearly, the cosmos derives its being the same from God (for this is the same as being ordered) whereas it derives its being different 15at different times from its own nature (for this, again, was shown to be the same as disorder). Therefore, the presence of God is the efficient cause of order and of its abiding in the same state, but His absence – if indeed He is ever absent – is only an accidental cause of 20its disorder; the real cause of disorder is the nature of the cosmos, or rather the nature of body. Similarly, the absence of the steersman is an accidental cause of the shipwreck, whereas the real cause is the nature of the rough water which is naturally not calm.⁴⁶⁷ Therefore, 25in the Statesman Plato established appropriate assertions regarding the cosmos' being naturally generated and destructible through this 624.1very hypothesis. For since Plato, observing the cosmos' nature by itself, <says>⁴⁶⁸ that the cosmos is something undergoing generation and destruction and never really exists (for it is wholly impossible for the cosmos, being a body, to be without share in change), but 5 since the cosmos appears to persist in the same everlasting order and neither to come to be nor to perish, Plato conceptually separated God from the cosmos in the Statesman and in this way observed it to be in both change and disorder, and inferred from this that the order of the cosmos and its abiding in the same state are not derived from the 10 nature of the cosmos itself but from its ordering⁴⁶⁹ with respect to the creator.

And what need is there of inferences when it is possible to hear Plato proclaiming in his very own words in the Statesman that the cosmos derives its disorder and its being different at different times from its

own nature and not from its relation to the creator. At least he says this 15*verbatim* there:

Then⁴⁷⁰ the Steersman of the universe as it were let go of the rudders' handle and stepped into self⁴⁷¹-contemplation,⁴⁷² and its allotted and innate appetite once again turned it back [in the opposite direction].473

He next describes its resulting disorder and shaking⁴⁷⁴ – the way it would be reasonable for the cosmos to remain when deprived of the God Who steers it, and he describes the cause of these things, saying:

- 25The cause of these things is the corporeal element in its composition - the ancient, congenital property of its nature - because of this element it partook of great disorder before arriving at its 625.1present ordered state. For from Him Who composed it the cosmos has received all things fair, whereas it is from its previous state that it derives and produces in living things whatever harsh and unjust things have come to be in the world.⁴⁷⁵ $\mathbf{5}$

Thus, we have heard Plato clearly say that the cosmos has received order and every fine thing from Him Who composed it, whereas from its corporeal composition and the state of its congenital nature it itself

- derives and allots to living things all that is harsh. Therefore, Plato 10 does not say that it is merely due to the hypothetical absence of God from the cosmos that disorder comes to it, as if God's absence were an efficient cause of the cosmos' disorder; rather, 476 he says that God, when
- absent, to this extent only does not give to the cosmos a share of the 15order that springs from Him, and that the corporeal remainder of the cosmos' congenital mixture exhibits the disorder that comes to it from its nature, just as when the steersman is absent it is the winds and the
- rough water that exhibit the innate tumult in connection with the ship. 205. Without being aware of it, the philosopher is in conflict not only with Plato but with his own assertions that were well made elsewhere.
- It is important, I think, to compare and contrast Proclus' own words in 25order that we might demonstrate clearly the clash and contradiction
- between them. For in the treatise entitled An Examination of Aristotle's 626,1Criticisms of Plato's Timaeus, 477 after proving through several arguments that Plato correctly says that the cosmos and everything visible
 - is undergoing generation and destruction and never truly is because $\mathbf{5}$ they do not have eternal existence on account of all body's having limited power, as even Aristotle himself demonstrated,⁴⁷⁸ Proclus then wants to prove in turn that everlasting existence comes additionally to
 - the cosmos from another source and not from its own nature, adding 10 this in these words:

20

For what is true of what always exists is not also true of what is always coming to be: [e.g. it is not the case that] an infinite power belongs to the latter on account of its always coming to be, as it does belong to the former on account of its always being. Rather, the latter has it on account of the maker. For this, too, is always coming to be by always receiving its being⁴⁷⁹ through what always truly exists and, if considered by itself, it does not have everlastingness. Therefore, the definition of what comes to be should apply to the cosmos as well.480

And a little later he writes:

Therefore, everything that comes to be is *per se* in destruction, but since it is bound by what is, this whole remains in becoming and 20is generated and not in destruction because of the being which it drew out of that which is. At least, Plato applies the definition which itself applies *per se* to what comes to be, to what is in destruction as well, since it is such by its own nature.⁴⁸¹

Again, the same man writes in what follows:

For since the universe is limited and what is limited does not have infinite power, as Aristotle showed,482 and since what causes an infinite motion does so by an infinite power, it is clear that the unmoved cause of the universe's infinite motion itself has infinite $\mathbf{5}$ power. Therefore, if in account you separated the universe from that cause, it would not be in motion ad infinitum because it would not have infinite power; rather, it will eventually cease to be in motion. And if you were to join the one to the other again in thought, through that cause the cosmos would be in motion ad *infinitum*. And there is nothing absurd about conceptually sepa-10 rating things that are combined in order that we might see what is present to the one thanks to the other, and that by seeing this we might understand what the lesser thing has from its own nature and what it has from its ordering with respect to the better, if considered by itself the cosmos does not have everlasting being, rather. since it is coming to be and being destroyed and never really is, it has its being in change and transformation. These things belong to it by its own nature, whereas everlasting existence is something that comes to it additionally from its ordering with respect to what is better and always exists. 20

If this is correctly said in agreement with both Plato and Proclus himself in the treatise mentioned above, why does he voice opinions contrary to this here, when he says:

105

15

627,1

15

For he is not merely saying that, while God remains the same, the cosmos is different at different times on account of the fact that the cosmos all by itself⁴⁸³ has this quality of being different at different times, as particular things do; rather he is saying that *because* God is different at different times the cosmos is disordered⁴⁸⁴ or ordered.⁴⁸⁵

For if it is not because of itself that the cosmos is different at different times, as is the case with particulars, but if rather it is always the same according to them since it is everlasting and always ordered, then, it will be because of itself that it is always the same. But surely Proclus already conceded in the treatise mentioned above that considered by itself it does not possess everlasting existence and that this [viz. not having everlasting existence] belongs to it by its own nature. Therefore,

10 the same cosmos by its own nature will both have everlasting existence and not have everlasting existence, which is impossible. For then the members of a contradictory pair will be true together.

Further, if this is said correctly and in agreement with Plato, namely that in accordance with its own nature the cosmos does not possess everlasting existence but has rather taken it on as something acquired

- 15 from the creator, then in the present treatise Proclus is wrong to say that being different at different times does not belong to the cosmos from itself. That Plato, too, assuming that it is by God's presence and absence that the cosmos is ordered or disordered, confirms again noth-
- 20 ing other than what was said in the *Timaeus*, namely that the cosmos receives from its own nature its being in change and its not always being the same, whereas being forever comes to it additionally from its ordering with respect to God, we just demonstrated from Plato's own statements. Therefore, the successor of Plato has been demonstrated to be truly at odds with both himself and Plato.
- 629,1 **6.** Further, this kind of assumption is absurd in itself. For if it is not because of itself that the cosmos is different at different times in the same way that particular things, even though God is always the same, have by their own nature the quality of being different at different
 - 5 times, but if rather the cosmos owes its being different at different times to its relation to God, then, does the cosmos itself, conceived in accordance with its own nature and without its relation to God, belong to the class of objects that are always the same or to the class of objects that change over time as particulars do? For even if it is never possible
 - 10 for God to be separated from the cosmos, as long as the cosmos should exist, it is not at all absurd – Proclus himself just said as much⁴⁸⁶ – to separate conceptually things that exist simultaneously in order to see what belongs to each thing from its own nature and what it owes to its ordering with respect to what is better. Plato himself did precisely this
 - 15 in the *Statesman*, conceptually separating God from the cosmos and observing what accedes to the cosmos by its own nature.

628.1

25

 $\mathbf{5}$

Since this sort of thing is not absurd, let's think of the cosmos all by itself without God. Is it always the same owing to its own nature or does 20it have the opposite property, being different at different times? Indeed, one must grant it one of the two as far as these wise⁴⁸⁷ assumptions are concerned. For if, as Proclus says, the particulars themselves are by their own nature different at different times, then in the case of the 25cosmos one must investigate which one of the contradictory pair (either being always the same or not being always the same but rather being different over time) belongs to it by its own nature. But since Proclus 630.1clearly states that the cosmos by its own nature is not different at different times in the way the particulars are, the cosmos clearly is always the same owing to its own nature. If, then, it derives the property of being always the same from its own nature and it derives $\mathbf{5}$ the property of being different at different times from its ordering and relation to God, then since it derives the better property from its own nature (I mean the property of being always the same) it will derive the worse property (of being different at different times) from its ordering and relation to God. And what could top this blasphemous thought, 10 even if this is all said hypothetically? If, then, this is absurd and blasphemous, then it is not from its own nature that the cosmos derives the property of being always the same; rather, this property accrues to it as something acquired from its relation to what always exists, since it would be agreed to be immortal, too; but it will not have everlasting 15existence owing to its own nature, as we have cited Plato as saving and also Proclus himself as saying elsewhere.

7. Further, if being the same and unchanging befits only the most divine beings, and if the cosmos, sharing as it does in body, is not of this 20 order but is rather coming to be and being destroyed and never really is, and if, as Proclus says at the end of the argument,⁴⁸⁸ being the same and unchanging is common to everything divine, and if the entire race of gods, being unreceptive of evil, is also unreceptive of change, as this same man asserted in the ninth argument;⁴⁸⁹ then, the cosmos is not a god either in Plato's opinion or according to Proclus' earlier concessions.

One of two things must be the case. Either Plato says the cosmos belongs to the class of things that are always the same and unchanging, since he thinks it is a god and the race of gods is unreceptive of change. Or since he does not say that it is one of the things that are always the same and unchanging but rather that it is coming to be and being destroyed and never really exists,⁴⁹⁰ and since he further says that its congenital nature is the source both of its own difficulties and of the production of difficulties for living things,⁴⁹¹ Plato is blaspheming against the other gods, as it seems to Proclus (who says that those [viz. remaining] gods are also such since he says⁴⁹² that being the same and unchanging is common to them all), since one must preserve this property in all cases or else, by rejecting it in one case, lose credibility in the other cases.

107

- 15 For one or the other must be the case: either Plato thinks the cosmos is not a god, or, since he both says it is a god and says that it is coming to be and being destroyed and never truly is, Plato must blaspheme against the entire race of gods, just as Plato's exegete established here.
- 20 If, then, it is clear that the cosmos exists in change and Plato explicitly said as much, then he thought that the cosmos is not a god unless Plato is to be shown to blaspheme against the race of gods. For he said loud and clear that being always the same and unchanging befits all of the most divine beings.⁴⁹³
- Therefore, even though he says that the cosmos is a god, Plato is 632,1 drawing from the Orphic tradition and is following the rather mythical custom of the poets when he calls it a 'god'. For the poets made gods of everything – not only fire and earth and the other elements but even
 - human affections and actions: war (polemos),⁴⁹⁴ strife (eris),⁴⁹⁵ fear (phobos),⁴⁹⁶ prayers (litê) ('for prayers, too, are great servants of Zeus'⁴⁹⁷), punishment (atê),⁴⁹⁸ oath (horkos),⁴⁹⁹ sleep (hupnos),⁵⁰⁰ joy (khara), appetite (epithumia),⁵⁰¹ love (erôs),⁵⁰² and in general everything both good and the worse, as whoever has gone through the works of
 - 10 the poets knows. Further, they present us with the generation of all the gods, but not of their demise. Is there any wonder that Plato, who says that the cosmos came to be but will not be destroyed, called it a god by poetic custom?
 - **8.** Whoever has read Plato's works knows that Plato frequently mixes in poetic stories with his own teaching, not only by inventing his own stories but also by employing, for whatever reason, the stories of the poets, but as arguments and not as stories. For in Plato's opinion⁵⁰³
 - 20 the children of Zeus judge souls down in Hades, 'two from Asia, Minos and Rhadamanthus, and one from Europe, Aiakos'. And it is not only in the *Gorgias* that he invents stories about these things, but also in the
 - 25 *Minos*.⁵⁰⁴ Here he does not fashion stories about law, rather while discoursing about law he follows the fictions of the poets by saying that Minos and Rhadamanthus are sons of Zeus and Europa, and that of the
- 633,1 law-makers of that time Minos was a good one. And in order to confirm that he was a son of Zeus and good, Plato cites the works of Homer:
 - $\mathbf{5}$

Among them Knossos was a great city. Here Minos ruled in the ninth season, a familiar friend of great Zeus.⁵⁰⁵

And he interprets the meaning of the words by saying⁵⁰⁶ that of those born of Zeus Minos alone was educated by his begetter, and that since he was an associate of Zeus he frequented Zeus' cave every nine years in order to learn some things and demonstrate the things he had

10 in order to learn some t learned nine years before.

Further, in the second book of the $Laws^{507}$ he refers to the story of Dionysus saying that he was robbed of his wits by his step-mother Hera.

And what need is there to give a lengthy account enumerating all the poetic stories that Plato mixes into his own teaching without using 15 them as stories? For in the *Timaeus* itself where he says that the cosmos is a god along with all the visible stars, I mean the sun, moon, and the rest, listen to how he added what follows upon that. For the text 20 reads:

But enough has been said for us in this way concerning the nature of the gods that are generated and visible to us^{508} – let this be an end of that.⁵⁰⁹ But concerning the other daimons, to talk and know about their generation is too great a task for us. One must believe those who have discoursed about this before us since they are offspring of the gods, as they themselves claimed, and they no doubt have clear knowledge of their ancestors. For one can't disbelieve the children of gods even though they speak without reasonable and compelling proofs, rather we must follow custom and believe those who claim to be reporting on things of their own concern. Let us accept their version of the generation of these gods and be told thus: From Earth and Heaven the children Ocean and Tethys were generated; and from these Phorcys, Cronos, Rhea and all the subsequent gods; and from Cronos⁵¹⁰ were generated Zeus, Hera and all the ones we know to be called their brothers: and further, from these there are other offspring.⁵¹¹

If, then, Proclus, hearing from Plato that the cosmos is a god, thinks it right to take 'god' so simply and without any examination and for this reason welcomes ungeneratedness to the cosmos as a god, even though 15Plato clearly said earlier [viz. in the passages quoted before] and now that it is generated, then let him simply listen to what follows; let him insist that we believe that there were sons and offspring of the gods whom the poets mythologized as heroes born of gods; consequently, let 20him say that those unholy matrimonies from which the so-called children of the gods were generated were brought about by gods, and let him think it right not to make a big deal about them but rather to accept their accounts of the gods as law and to believe them on the grounds that these men have clear knowledge of their own ancestors – gods and 25daimons - and one can't disbelieve them even though they speak without reasonable or compelling proofs since they are obviously reporting on their own family matters and not on something foreign to them. And Plato immediately adds which of the things the people whom it is not right not to believe (rather, one must believe them and think and speak about the gods in this way) taught about their own ancestors: $\mathbf{5}$

From Earth and Heaven the children Ocean and Tethys were generated, etc. $^{\rm 512}$

5

634.1

 $\mathbf{5}$

10

635.1

Either, then, let the philosopher insist that we also plainly accept these things just as they were spoken and believe them and all the other

- 10 things that the poets subsequently add to them. I mean the unlawful marriages, the swallowings, the manglings, the insurrections against one another and those who begot them, and whatever else was done to corrupt human life, which the poets attached to the beings they honour
- 15 (I don't know whether I should say these beings are wicked *daimons* or demonic humans who acquired notoriety for their immeasurable evil. Clearly the spirits of evil have by means of witchery joined in to destroy mankind on account of the fall from beauty that mankind intentionally
- 20 committed). As I was saying, either let him say that Plato also agrees with them without any elaboration, or else let him consequently agree that, since Plato was following the current authoritative opinion of the poets and said these things in a rather mythical manner (regardless of whether he assumed them to be said by the poets with covert meanings
- 25 or without), Plato accordingly attached the name 'god' (*theos*) to the cosmos in the same manner, whether because it was named always
- 636,1 'running' (*thein*)⁵¹³ or on account of 'sight' (*thea*)⁵¹⁴ (for it embraces all that is visible in itself) or on account of some other covert meaning along these lines.

9. And in general, Plato in the *Cratylus* says that the noun 'god' was applied by the ancient Greeks not to the incorporeal cause that creates beings but to the celestial bodies on account of their always 'running' (*thein*). For they did not yet know any other god than the visible bodies.

- 10 the sun, the moon and the rest, just as most of the savages assume even now. And he says that later when the Greeks came to the conception of the other, incorporeal gods, they referred to them, too, by the same name. Here are the exact words that Plato uses in the *Cratylus*:⁵¹⁵
- 15 Then isn't it right to begin with the gods, by investigating how in the world the gods were correctly called this very name?
 That is reasonable.

Well now, I suspect it happened in this manner: It seems to be that the first humans in Greece held only these things to be gods,⁵¹⁶ just as⁵¹⁷ many of the foreigners do even now, the sun, the moon, the earth, the stars and heaven. Because they observed that they⁵¹⁸ are always going and running (*theonta*) their course, they named them 'gods' (*theous*) on account of this nature of theirs to run (*thein*). Later, when they apprehended all the others, they immediately referred to them with this name. Does what I say seem like the truth⁵¹⁹ or not?

- Very much so.
- 637,1 If, then, Plato held that the word 'god' was applied by the ancient Greeks to the celestial beings on account of their always 'running' and later transferred it to other, intelligible, gods, once they were known,

 $\mathbf{5}$

then it is clear that Plato intends the word 'god' to apply homonymously to the incorporeal gods and to the cosmos. For if the heaven is called a $\mathbf{5}$ god on account of its always running, and if the intellective and incorporeal beings are above all motion, then, presumably no one with any sense - and certainly not Plato - would call the former 'gods' in the same 10 meaning.

Then, since the things indicated by this word are different, the mere commonality of the word is left remaining. But if the joint ownership concerns only the word, does there appear to be any compelling reason left to infer from the cosmos' being called a god by Plato that for this 15reason it is also naturally unchangeable and ungenerated because Plato clearly wants divine nature to be of this sort? For Plato says that the divine nature is intellective and incorporeal. Thus, as far as Proclus' arguments are concerned, when Plato says that the cosmos is a god he 20wants it to be intelligible and incorporeal.

And yet, Plato refers to the Forms, too, with the same names by which perceptibles are also called. For, Living Thing Itself and Man Himself and each of the rest - Plato says that these and the perceptibles 25things are called synonymously. So, shall we, on account of the sameness of their names, apply the property of being always the same or even the properties of being intellective and incorporeal to perceptible living things? Or don't we know precisely that just as these properties share the same names, so too do they stand far apart in reality. Just as the cosmos is presumably neither intelligible nor incorporeal even though it is called a 'god', so too, I should hope, will it be neither one of the unchangeable things that are always the same and unchanging nor $\mathbf{5}$ ungenerated. For just as Plato confirmed that these properties belong to the divine nature, so too did he say clearly that the cosmos is one of the things which come to be and are destroyed and never really are and for this reason he said that it came to be beginning at some starting 10 point and that, because it came to be, it is neither naturally indissoluble nor immortal, even though, having received a restored immortality through God's will it preserves its undissolved state.

Therefore, Proclus has been detected, as usual, hijacking the truth 15by means of homonymy, ignoring what Plato explicitly said about the nature of the cosmos, taking hold of the designation 'god' in a simple manner and in this way accomplishing his own project and not Plato's.

And yet, how is it not absurd, when Plato himself says that the 20cosmos is at once a god and generated (for he says, 'Regarding what has been thus said about the visible and generated gods, let this be the end of that').⁵²⁰ to take 'god' in the proper sense of 'god' but to give a tortuous gloss to 'being generated' and 'having come to be'? For in this passage 25one can't suppose that the cosmos is said to be generated only in cause.⁵²¹ For Proclus says that Plato in this passage was speaking of the nature of the visible and generated gods and that Plato clearly shows 639.1that he knows there are other gods that are intelligible and ungener-

638.1

ated.⁵²² Therefore, just as the intelligible is opposed to the visible, so too is the ungenerated opposed to the generated. If, then, Plato wants the

- 5 visible gods to be generated only in cause [but not in time], then he wants the intelligible gods, since they are ungenerated, to be causally ungenerated. For being causally ungenerated is opposed to being causally generated. But if the intelligible gods are causally ungenerated,
- 10 then no one is the cause of their being. It follows that they do not have their being from a single principle. Therefore, the principle and cause of all beings is not one; rather, there are as many principles as there are intelligible gods. If, then, this is both absurd and foreign to Plato's meaning, as we have shown many times by means of Plato's own
- 15 words, and if the cause and principle of all things is one and what is without principle and without cause is only one; then, the intelligible gods are not causally ungenerated. If, then, Plato opposed the intelligible gods to the visible, and if the intelligible, being ungenerated, are not
- 20 causally ungenerated according to Plato (since the first principle of all things is a single cause), then the perceptible gods that are said to be generated gods are generated not only causally but also temporally. For if Plato wants the intelligible gods to be ungenerated not in the sense of having no cause but in the sense of not having any beginning to their
- 25 existence, then he says that the visible gods are generated in the sense that they have a beginning of their being and their existence. In fact, we articulated this as well as we could also independently in the sixth chapter. 523
- 640,1 **10.** Although Plato frequently used stories, either in order to pay lip-service to the inherited custom, as I mentioned before,⁵²⁴ or because he was wary of the danger stemming from the masses, as we clearly
 - 5 showed in the fourth section of the ninth chapter, ⁵²⁵ lest he also [i.e. like Socrates] be thought to abolish the established gods and to teach about new *daimonia* (for he knew that this was the cause of Socrates' death), in other writings he dares to bring⁵²⁶ his opinions to light, ridicules
 - 10 stories and brings a great attack to bear against these formative poets. I will cite a little from Plato's own works to confirm this. Now then, in the second book of the *Republic*, when he shuts out the

followers of Homer, Hesiod, and a full list of other poets from his own city, you can hear what sorts of accusations he extends to them. Now in

15 city, you can hear what sorts of accusations he extends to them. Now addition to many other accusations he adds this in his own words:

It seems we must first oversee the makers of stories and whichever fine story they make up, we must let in, but whichever story is not fine, we must keep out. We shall persuade the nurses and mothers to tell their children the stories we let in and to form their souls with stories much more than their bodies with hands; but many of the stories they tell now must be thrown out.
Which sorts of stories, he asked.

25 – And I said, in the longer stories we shall see the shorter ones as

20

well. For the longer and the shorter ones must have the same mark and the same effect. Don't you think so?

- I do, he said. But I don't even understand what you mean by 641,1 longer stories.

- Those that, I suppose, Hesiod and Homer and the other poets told us. For I suppose these are the men who composed, told and are still telling the false stories to mankind.

– What sort of stories, he said, and what do you mean when you 5 censure them?

- The very thing, I said, that one must censure first and foremost, and especially if someone does not lie well.

– What's that?

- When< $ever^{527}$ someone does a poor job portraying in words what the gods and heroes are like, it is as if a painter paints things that bear no resemblance to the things he wanted to paint.

And indeed, he said, these sorts of things are rightly censured. But what sort of things do you mean and how are they censured?
First, I said, he who tells the greatest lie about the greatest things does not lie well in doing so, namely that Ouranos (Heaven) did the things Hesiod claims he did and again that Cronos took
15 vengeance upon him. Even if it were true, I would think one shouldn't speak in such a carefree manner about Cronos' actions and his sufferings at his son's hands to young people who lack sense. Rather, it is best to be silent, or if there is some need to speak, to have as few as possible hear them – in secret – after having sacrificed – not a pig – but some large and hard-to-find animal in order that the very smallest number of people would happen to hear.

- Indeed, such stories are hard to deal with, he said.

Adeimantus, I said, they must not be told in our city, and when
a young person is listening it should not be said that when
committing the ultimate injustices, by punishing to the utmost his
unjust father he would not be doing anything extraordinary, but
only doing the very thing that the first and foremost of the gods
did.

- By Zeus, he said, it doesn't seem to me that these stories are appropriate to tell, either.

-And it is, I said, not at all appropriate to say that gods are at war against gods and plot against each other and are in conflict with each other – this is also untrue – and particularly if the ones who are going to guard the city for us should consider this simple hatred for one another to be extremely shameful. And among the last things one wants is to tell them the stories of and portray to them the battles of giants and other many and various enmities of the gods and heroes with respect to their kin. But if we are to persuade them in some way that no one citizen should ever hate another and that hating is not pious, then this is rather the sort $\mathbf{5}$

10

10

of thing both elderly men and women and grown-ups [in general] must tell the children straight off, and the poets must be forced to keep their written productions close to these rules. Hera's being fettered by her son, Hephaistos' being hurled by his father because he wanted to help his beaten mother, and however many battles
among the gods that Homer made up must not be received into the city regardless of whether they were made with hidden meanings or without them. For a young boy is not able to judge what has some hidden meaning and what doesn't. But at this age whatever

25 he gets in his mind tends to become fixed and hard to rinse out. To this end, one should perhaps write about everything in such a way

643,1 that the first things they hear are most beautifully mythologized and lead them to virtue when they hear them.>

He <complete>ly excluded [such stories] from the city.⁵²⁸ He did not order some of the citizens to use them and others not to; rather, he completely thrust all of them aside from everybody as useless and

*

- harmful. But if, because such stories bring people more to injustice and elicit forbidden actions, it is not good to accept so many of them into the
 finest way of city education which Plato developed and in which only
- virtue and intelligence govern, then these stories should be least of all received in our cities in which most of the time what is sweet is preferred to what is good, and what is worse to what is better. Thus, however much Plato is committed to his own city and this only hypo-
- 644,1 thetically and as far as lies in words, and not only Plato but also however much anyone whosoever is committed to the moderation of those under him, that is the extent to which the *daimon* who operates through the poets does *not* care about what is advantageous to human life. Therefore, the work of wicked *daimons* introduced poetic stories into our lives in order to destroy mankind, and since Plato knew
 - 5 precisely this he banished these stories from his own city. If, then, Plato on the one hand gets rid of stories in this passage but on the other hand in the *Timaeus* says that one must believe the men who introduce us to these stories because they are the offspring of gods, as they say, and
 - 10 clearly know their own ancestors (for it's impossible to disbelieve the children of gods), and if both of these statements cannot be in agreement and harmonize with one another, then it should be obvious to everyone that in one place he is teaching from his own opinion his genuine students what he really thinks (for in the *Republic* he is giving
 - 15 an account of the education of men) whereas in the other place he pays lip-service to the masses and escapes the danger they pose. At least when he wrote to Dionysius, the tyrant ruling – not over Athens – but over Syracuse, he says that 'God' is the beginning of his serious letters,

20 and 'gods' of his less serious letters. The passage goes like this:

Regarding the sign that distinguishes the letters, however many I might write earnestly and however many not, I think you⁵²⁹ remember, but nevertheless reflect on that and keep it in mind. For many are those who demand a letter from me so that⁵³⁰ it is not easy to turn them away openly. Hence, 'God' is the beginning⁵³¹ of a serious letter, but 'gods' is the beginning of a less serious letter.532

And again in another letter to the same man he says that the creator and maker of all beings is one. For he savs:⁵³³

Everything⁵³⁴ is concerned with the King of all, everything is for His sake and He is the cause of all fair things.⁵³⁵

And in the fourth book of the Laws he says⁵³⁶ God, possessing the beginning, middle, and end of beings, goes to His goal in a straight line.

Therefore, both when he introduces a plurality of gods and when he says the cosmos is a god, Plato does not do so seriously nor is he introducing his own beliefs; rather, he is either making use of the common poetical custom of the time or else names 'god' (theos) from 10 'running' (thein) using the etymology, as he himself says. And it is not the case, just because he says the cosmos is a 'god', that for this reason he thinks it is ungenerated, since he not only clearly says that it came to be and has an end but also established the claim through proof.

11. But since Proclus also throws in the fact that in the *Statesman* Plato hypothetically separates God from the cosmos and by this separation of God he circles it back into disorder out of order as strong 20evidence to prove that Plato says that the cosmos is ungenerated, and because of this also insists that the generation of the cosmos recounted in the *Timaeus* and the change from the disordered into the ordered are said only hypothetically, you should know that even if one should agree that the material in the *Statesman* is said hypothetically, this doesn't 5 appear to provide any compelling reason to conclude that in the *Timaeus*, too, there is a generation of the cosmos only in a hypothetical sense. For in the Statesman he assumes this⁵³⁷

 $\mathbf{5}$

645.1

25

15

646.1

This page intentionally left blank

Notes

1. Around 435 Proclus (c. AD 410-85) succeeded Syrianus as head of the Academy in Athens, and for this reason is referred to by the title 'Diadochos' ('Successor'). For the sake of continuity I am adopting Share's translations for the headings and many similar words. On the Everlastingness of the World Against Proclus is divided into 18 chapters (usually logoi, but sometimes kephalaia), each of which consists of the following: An argument (logos, epikheirêma, kephalaion) of Proclus, a refutation (lusis) or reply (logos, kephalaion) by Philoponus which consists of numerous sections (kephalaia).

2. Following Rabe's suggestion: *ouk <aei> estin*.

3. Chapter 11, section 11 (455,26ff.).

4. i.e. Proclus at 466,2.

5. Philoponus probably means an efficient cause here. This is also a more accurate representation of Plato's *Timaeus* 28A4-6 which Philoponus is nearly quoting: 'Everything that comes to be necessarily comes to be by the agency of some cause, for it is impossible for anything to be generated without a cause'. cf. Taylor's commentary, 65-6.

6. cf. argument 11 (403,15ff.) and chapter 11, section 9 (445,28ff.).

7. Philoponus might have Aristotle's *Physics* 197a8ff. in mind. In his commentary on this passage in the *Physics*, he writes: 'We say chance is not the cause of anything, because we say that the things that come to be by chance are uncaused on account of their not having *per se* any definite cause; and if the things that come to be by chance are uncaused, then chance is not the cause of anything. For if it were the cause of anything, it would be the cause of the things that come to be by chance, and if it is not the cause of these things, then it is in general not the cause of anything' (276,31-277,4).

8. Philoponus in fact believes that matter did come to be at some time, cf. 468,26ff.

9. cf. Simplicius in Phys. 207,34-5.

10. Rabe does not put this in quotations nor does it seem to be an accurate representation of Proclus' views. cf. *in Tim.* 1.233,23-234,3.

11. cf. chapter 11, section 13 (458,27-459,24).

12. Chapter 9, section 6 (336,1-337,13).

13. This is one of the issues that scholars (e.g. Verrycken, 'The development of Philoponus' thought and its chronology', 271) have used in the past to distinguish Philoponus' earlier works from his later works. In Philoponus' commentaries *in DA 1-2* and *in DA 3.4-8*, he repeatedly says that our rational souls are immortal and always existed before our births (in fact, in his earlier works he even accepts that movement, time and the world itself are everlasting). This need not imply that Philoponus was not a Christian when he wrote these earlier treatises, as some earlier scholars (e.g. A. Gudeman) have concluded. In Egypt in the six century Christians probably had more freedom to hold unorthodox views; Origen, for example, also believed that souls existed

prior to birth. Cf. Charlton's Introduction to in DA 3.4-8 (Philoponus, On Aristotle On the Intellect), 20-2. Yet, Verrycken's theory of the stages of Philoponus' philosophical development has been much attacked, and Philoponus here might just be expounding Aristotle as a commentator should. See Scholten, Antike Naturphilosophie und christliche Kosmologie in der Schrift 'de opificio mundi' des Johannes Philoponos and Wildberg, 'Impetus theory and the Hermeneutics of Science in Simplicius and Philoponus'.

14. Chapter 1, section 3 (7,22ff.).

15. cf. 473,14f. and Plotinus 6.1.27,28.

16. Argument 11 (403,23).

17. 468,6.

18. 'according to them' is not in the Greek but seems to be the intended conclusion given the premises.

19. 466,2.

20. That is to say: if matter comes to be *simpliciter* (since everything that comes to be *simpliciter* is ultimately does so by the agency of God, cf. 467,19ff.).

21. Chapter 11, section 10 (449,6ff.) and section 11 (455,26ff.).

22. 'Self-substantial' translates *authupostaton*, a word found primarily in the commentators. The sense seems to be that what is *authupostaton* can exist by itself and does not require anything else for its existence, and for this reason is usually said of substance, cf. Olympiodorus *in Cat.* 43,14-15: 'substance, since it is *authupostatos*, is not in need of anything to exist'. Philoponus, in *in Cat.* 20,9-14, gives a more precise account of what sort of substance is *authupostatos*. On one meaning, it is what is distinguished from the accidental properties (the accidental properties have their existence in it, I mean in the substance). The other meaning, according to which he is now using the word "substance", including the accidental properties, too.'

23. The argument here runs as follows: Form requires matter for generation, and form and matter are opposites. Opposites should follow from opposites. Hence, since requiring matter follows from form, not requiring matter should follow from matter.

24. Argument 11, 404,7ff.

25. In Chapter 11 sections 10-11, 447,8ff.

26. Chapter 4, section 15 (99,24ff.).

27. cf. Chapter 9, section 13 (367,9ff.) and chapter 11, section 12 (458,10ff.).

28. According to Aristotle light is 'the presence of fire or something resembling fire in what is transparent'. Lightness and darkness are respectively positive (actualized) and negative (un-actualized) states of a transparent body that is found in air, water and the celestial body (*DA* 418a29-419b3). For this reason, going from darkness to lightness is a *qualitative* change that, unlike local change, does not necessarily require time (*Sens.* 446b27-447a3).

29. 'by the agency of God' is not in the Greek text but seems to be implied by the argument.

30. Chapter 11, section 12 (458,27-459,24).

31. Chapter 1, section 7 (17,24ff.).

32. This is not what Proclus says, but I take it that the expressions 'the matter is unsuitable' and 'what comes to be cannot always exist' are equivalent for Philoponus.

33. 468, 4-6.

34. Chapter 1, section 4 (14,6ff.).

35. e.g. Chapter 6, section 3 (367,9-11).

36. Some general background information is helpful here. Plato and Aristotle agreed that the earth was at the centre of a finite universe that consisted of concentric layers of elemental spheres (ensembles). The ensemble of water rests directly upon the earth, and this is followed by a sphere of air and then a sphere of fire. They disagreed, however, on whether the universe was exhausted by these four layers. Although both agree that the heaven is a sphere that rotates around the periphery of the universe, Plato identifies this sphere with the ensemble of fire, whereas Aristotle identified the ensemble of fire with the so-called *hupekkauma* – the outermost sublunar sphere which rotated together with the heaven (as could be witnessed by the movement of comets and meteors that Aristotle saw as taking place in the *hupekkauma*). Aristotle then distinguished a fifth element, aether, which made up the sphere of the heavens.

37. *Tim.* 34A2.

38. The Greek here is $t\hat{e}(i)de$ which in cosmological contexts often means 'sublunar'.

39. *Protagoras* 332C. Proclus is trying to attribute Aristotle's argument for the fifth body to Plato. All three of these premises are much more prominent in Aristotle than they are in Plato:

- (i) Generation and destruction belongs to opposites, cf. Cael. 270a22, 286a33; Phys. 192a22; etc.
- (ii) Opposites are what have opposite natural motions, cf. Cael. 270a18-20.
- (iii) One thing has one opposite, cf. Cael. 269a14; Metaph. 1055b30; Phys. 261b16ff.; etc.

This is the only instance I have been able to find of someone using the *Protagoras* to get this.

40. cf. 497,23.

41. cf. *Elements of Theology* where Proclus argues that every cause itself primitively possesses any nature that it gives to its products (§18) and in this sense every product can be said to be in its cause (§65).

42. Borrowing Taylor's translation in *A Commentary on Plato's Timaeus*, 266. Proclus seems to be interpreting this passage to say that if parts are to be returned, they cannot perish. Hence, what does perish is not a part.

43. *Tim.* 42E9-43A1 (cf. 494,20ff.). I delete *kai ta genê tôn poiountôn* (Rabe has: *poioun* [fin. vers.] *tôn* M, suspectum).

44. Laws 903C-D.

45. 'Universe' translates 'ouranos'. 'Heaven' seems out of place here. It is not the heaven but the universe that is composed of ungenerated and indestructible elements, i.e. the ensembles.

46. The preface to this work is lost.

47. Air and water are called 'intermediates' at *Timaeus* 31Bff., and it is also common in Aristotle (e.g. *Cael.* 276b1, 286a29, etc.).

48. This is probably a reference to a work of Proclus' that is now lost, entitled An Examination of Aristotle's Criticisms of Plato's Timaeus (cf. 31,11 and Share's note ad loc.; 82,14; 138,20; 167,4; 297,21f.). Simplicius cites this work extensively in his in Cael. 640,24-671,20. One can get some sense of how Proclus dealt with this issue from in Tim. 2.49,12ff. and 3.113,14ff.

49. Philoponus' point here is this: Sometimes, Proclus, like other imprudent philosophers, tries to argue that for Plato the celestial body is some fifth substance (and thereby criticizes Plato), but at other times Proclus recants and

says that according to Plato the heaven is made up of the (purest parts of the) four sublunar elements. It is probably fairer to say that Proclus is not *criticizing* Plato, but crediting Plato with foreseeing everything Aristotle had to say about the distinctiveness of the heaven.

50. Cael. 1.2-4.

51. *Tim.* 40A.

52. *Tim*. 33B.

53. *Tim*. 34A.

54. Despite the presence of more than one *phêsin*, I (following Rabe) have not used quotation marks here since Philoponus seems to be summarizing Proclus' argument at 477,14ff.

55. Plato Tim. 34A2.

56. Plotinus 2.2.1,1.

57. *Tim.* 34A1-2, cf. 477,15-16.

58. Chapter 6, section 4 (128,1ff.) and section 24 (195,7ff.)

59. Although I usually translate $z\hat{o}(i)on$ with 'living thing', here 'animal' is required since it is not true that all living things have some local motion from soul; e.g. plants (apart from heliotropes, perhaps) do not. It is, in fact, by local motion that Aristotle distinguishes animals from plants (*DA* 432b17-19).

60. i.e. Tim. 34B10ff.

61. cf. *Tim*. 36C.

62. Cael. 285a29 and 292a20.

63. Philoponus appears to be responding to Aristotle's criticism of Plato in the *De Anima* where he accuses Plato of having made the soul a magnitude (406b26ff., cf. Proclus *in Tim.* 2.278,31ff.). Philoponus contends that the soul's incorporeality entails that it cannot move and that Plato must therefore be speaking symbolically in the *Timaeus*. It is perhaps of interest that both Myles Burnyeat and Richard Sorabji have recently affirmed precisely what Philoponus is denying, namely that the soul is an extended but incorporeal moving thing (for Burnyeat, see 'Plato on Why Mathematics Is Good for the Soul', 57ff.; for Sorabji, see 'The Mind-Body Relation in the Wake of Plato's Timaeus'. Sorabji in turn credits David Sedley (' "Becoming like God" in the Timaeus and Aristotle') and Gabriela Carone (1996 London PhD dissertation, *Mind as the Foundation of Cosmic Order in Plato's Late Dialogues*). For the history of Proclus' disagreement see both Sorabji (above) and his *The Philosophy of the Commentators*, vol. 1: *Psychology*, chapter 6(a), texts 41-7.

64. In fact, the evidence at best only partially supports the claim that there is a form for every thing. cf. *Rep.* 523-5 and 596A6-7 as well as Aristotle's *Peri Ideôn* (= Alexander's *in Metaph.*) 79,22-80,7, and, e.g., Fine, *On Ideas*, 110-16 and Nehemas, 'Plato on the Imperfection of the Sensible World', 177.

65. Simplicius accuses Philoponus of plagiarizing Xenarchus, who also produced such an argument (*in Cael.* 21.33ff.), but Philoponus might have simply got the argument from Proclus. See Sorabji, *The Philosophy of the Commentators*, vol. 3: *Logic and Metaphysics*, 2a19.

66. Argument 10 (380,22-3).

67. The *hupekkauma* is the uppermost region of the sublunar world that borders directly on the heavens. For Aristotle the *hupekkauma* is the natural place for fire – the heavens being the natural place of the fifth element, aether. For this reason the *hupekkauma* was considered to be an extremely combustible area in which certain irregular phenomena occurred which today we understand to be celestial, e.g. shooting stars. See notes 68 and 73 below.

68. Perhaps a reference to Aristotle's account of shooting stars, see *Meteorology* 341b36-342a1.

69. Tim. 40A.

70. 'Greeks' here means pagans, so there is some irony in 'wise'.

71. cf. e.g. Plotinus 2.1.3,16-18.

72. 491,3.

73. Comets were generally held to be sublunar phenomena that occur in the *hupekkauma*. This view goes back to Aristotle's *Meteorology* 1.7. The idea is that comets appear for several consecutive days, and during this interval they rise and set at the same time as the stars seen around them. Thus, the *hupekkauma* must move in a circle. Simplicius (*in Cael.* 35,33ff.) uses this same observation to show that the circular motion belongs to the *hupekkauma* derivatively. 'The like' refers to other phenomena that were thought to occur in the *hupekkauma* and might include any of the following: burning flames, shooting-stars, 'torches', and 'goats' (cf. *Meteorology* 341b1ff.). See Gilbert, *Die Meteorologischen Theorien des Griechischen Altertums*, 597f.

74. Perhaps Philoponus is thinking of Heron of Alexandria's Aeolipile (also known as Barker's mill). For a diagram and discussion, cf. Neuberger, *The Technical Arts and Sciences of the Ancients*, 231. But he might rather have a machine in mind that is not powered by the water but by some external power.

75. This is also Simplicius' conclusion regarding the status of the circular motion of the *hupekkauma* (*in Cael.* 21,18-25). Just as the *hupekkauma*'s motion is due to something higher than it, namely the heaven, so too is the motion of the heaven's body due to something higher than it, namely its soul.

76. i.e. its soul.

77. In the following lines I translate both *idea* and *eidos* with 'form'.

78. viz. the nature of the creator, cf. 487,11.

79. That is, neither the *hupekkauma* and upper air nor the planets or their spheres.

80. The fifth nature is for Aristotle's fifth element, aether.

81. According to Aristotle, elemental destruction is a case of one quality being replaced by its opposite. His fifth element lacks opposed qualities, having only circular motion and being transparent, and so cannot be subject to destruction (cf. *Cael.* 270a14ff.)

82. 478,6.

83. Chapter 6, section 1 (125,7ff.).

84. cf. Tim. 32Cff. and Statesman 270A.

85. In what follows parts $(mer\hat{e})$ and pieces (moria) of an element are little bits of earth, air, fire, and water, as opposed to the totality, i.e. the ensemble, of each element. Philoponus does not seem to be drawing a real distinction between *merê* and *moria*, but I preserve this distinction by translating the former with 'parts' and the latter with 'pieces'.

86. 478,11-12.

87. cf. 478,16-19 (Tim. 42E9-43A1).

88. 478,13-15.

89. Asclepius gives the same example in his commentary on Aristotle's *Metaphysics* 5.25, where the different senses of 'part' are discussed (349,26ff.).

90. The contradiction is that Proclus wants to say that the individual elements are both parts and not parts of the cosmos.

91. The straight between Euboea and Boeotia, known for its violent currents. This is a common expression for indecision, cf. Caterus in Descartes' *Objections and Replies* (AT VII 92).

92. 477,14-478,6.

93. 478,6-11.

94. 478,9-11.

95. Following Rabe's suggestion and reading *ta de hola <aei> kata phusin ekhein* (cf. 478,12-13).

96. Following Rabe's suggestion and reading eis <to> pan at 498,14. **97.** cf. 478,17ff. and 494,20ff.

98. Elsewhere I have translated *sumplêrôtikon* as 'completely fill', but here that doesn't seem to work.

99. Philoponus is careful here. The son presumably does in some sense complete the father qua father insofar as a father is only a father with respect to a son or daughter, but the son does not complete the father qua man.

100. Following Rabe's suggestion of reading *esti* for *epi* at 501,2.

101. Tim. 42E9-43A1 which Proclus cites at 478,17-19.

102. cf. chapter 6, section 25 (202,19ff.) and chapter 9, section 10 (344,6ff.).

103. Chapter 11, section 2 (411,2ff.).

104. Chapter 13, section 8 (494,12).

105. Tim. 42E9-43A1.

106. Chapter 13, section 8 (495,7).

107. Plato denied that all elements came from all element, singling out earth as an element that cannot change into the other three (*Tim.* 54B-D). Aristotle disagreed (GC 331a12-14).

108. The idea is simply that the parts of the elements are identical to the parts of the composites.

109. Philoponus leaves out *loipa* in line 41B7.

110. Philoponus has *estin* for Plato's *estai* at 508,27. *Timaeus*: '... the heaven *will be* incomplete'. Cf. 509,25.

111. Philoponus adds *thnêtôn* at 509,4-5. *Timaeus*: '... to the creation of the animals'.

112. *Tim.* 41B6-C6.

113. Tim. 28B2-4.

114. Statesman 269D7-8.

115. *Tim.* 30C2-31A1.

116. Philoponus omits Plato's *panta* at 511,4. *Timaeus*: '... contains *all* the intelligible living things'.

117. *Timaeus* gives the same sense here (511,8) but a different word order (*panth' hosa autou* instead of Philoponus' *hosa autou panta*).

118. This is an important point, as Proclus has no objection to allowing the *genera*, which are everlasting, to be parts.

119. *Tim.* 31B1-32C8.

120. The Greek word *ouranos* can mean both 'heaven' and 'universe'. Plato intends the latter sense, but Philoponus seems to take it in the former sense (see 514,14).

121. Philoponus has *esti te kai estai* for Plato's *estin kai et' estai* at 512,27-513,1. *Timaeus: 'had become* and will *continue* to be ...'.

122. Philoponus has *ouk* for Plato's *ouden* at 513,2. *Timaeus*: 'but *nothing* excluded from fire could ever ...'.

123. Philoponus has poiei for Plato's epoiei at 513,5. Timaeus: 'God made ...'.

124. Philoponus has *tinôn* for Plato's *triôn* at 513,11. *Timaeus*: 'For whenever among any *three* numbers ...'.

125. Philoponus has to te meson for Plato's tote to meson at 513,14-15. *Timaeus: 'then*, since ...'.

126. Philoponus has *hoti* for Plato's *hotiper* at 514,1. *Timaeus*: 'so that *whatever* fire is to air ...'.

127. Philoponus adds *touto* at 514,2. There is no significant difference in sense.

128. Philoponus has *tôn allôn* for Plato's *tou allou* at 514,7-8. *Timaeus*: 'by any *other* ...'.

129. Philoponus omits Plato's *oudenos* at 514,12. He includes the *oudenos* at 527,26. *Timaeus*: 'no part nor power *of anything* (*oudenos*)'.

130. Tim. 39E10-40A7.

131. Meteor. 340a1.

132. This is, of course, not necessarily true. The radius and surface area of the *hupekkauma* are obviously greater, but what matters here is presumably the volume. And the ensemble of fire could be much thinner than the other sublunar ensembles.

133. Meteor. 340b21-3, 341b21-2.

134. GA 736b29-737a7. Cf. Meteor. 340b21-3.

135. That is to say, even if the celestial fire *were* caustic, still the proportions are not such that fire far exceeds the others because although the heavens are much larger, they are not constituted solely of fire.

136. *Ek men oun tou gnônai tên Platônos dianoian.* The *ek* seems awkward, and Rabe notes that one would rather expect *Eis men oun to gnônai* etc.

137. Since this is what Philoponus aims to show, these men would be unfair witnesses. Both Plutarch and Atticus (cf. 606,17) were known in antiquity as advocates of the literal interpretation of the *Timaeus* generation of the cosmos (cf. Proclus *in Tim.* 1.276,30f.). Plutarch composed a work entitled *On the Generation of the World According to Plato* which is now lost. Most of what we know about Plutarch's interpretation of the *Timaeus* comes from his *Platonic Questions (Moralia* 1002E-1003B, 1007D) and *On the Generation of the Soul in the Timaeus (Moralia* 1013D-1017C). Atticus (cf. 211,10ff.) is preserved only in the doxographers. See Baltes, *Die Entstehung des platonischen Timaios nach den antiken Interpreten*, 38-63.

138. A second-century AD Platonist. The Suda reports that he wrote many works, one of which was apparently a *Timaeus* commentary of which Philoponus has preserved some passages (145,13ff., 186,23ff. and here). cf. Baltes, 105-21.

139. Philoponus omits Plato's *dei* at 520,7. *Timaeus* 31B4: 'What comes to be *must be* bodily – visible and tangible ...'.

140. Taurus is responding to the argument for Aristotle's fifth body: since (i) to each sense there corresponds an element and (ii) there are five senses, there must be five elements; and the fifth element must be the one Aristotle attributes to the celestial regions. Tauros replies that the fifth element is vapour, perhaps based on the *Phaedo*.

141. Tauros takes vapour (*atmis*) as a fifth element. This might have its roots in Plato's *Phaedo* (108B-C) where mist (*homillê*) is treated as an element on a par with water and air. For Aristotle, vapour is sometimes described as a kind of air (*GC* 330b4) and sometimes as a sort of water, being moist and cold (*Meteor.* 340b27-9). Aristotle also explicitly denies that the five senses need to correspond to five bodies (*DA* 425a11-13; *Sens.* 437a22). Cf. Plutarch *The E at Delphi* 390Aff.

142. Neoplatonist, AD 234-305. He wrote, among much else, a commentary on Plato's *Timaeus* of which we have extensive fragments collected in Sodano, *Porphyrii in Platonis Timaeum Commentariorum Fragmenta*.

143. Sodano fr. 58 (pp. 43,9-45,2).

144. Philoponus has *toutôn ton arithmon tettarôn* for Plato's *toutôn toioutôn kai ton arithmon tettarôn* at 522,11. *Timaeus* 32B8-C1: 'out of these *kinds* of bodies, being four in number'.

145. Sodano fr. 59 (p. 45,6-7).

146. i.e. Tim. 32B8-C1.

147. A Pythagorean in the first half of the fourth century. There does not seem to be any solid evidence that the introduction of the fifth element should be credited to Archytas. Even Philoponus himself, who is aware of this passage from Porphyry, credits Aristotle alone (cf. 527,6-8 and 529,22-4).

148. Sodano fr. 60 (p. 45,8-11).

149. See note on 482,23.

150. Mund. 392a8; cf. Cael. 270b20.

151. Aristotle nowhere uses the term *ellampsis*. Rabe refers to [Aristotle] *Plant*. 815b33 where the term is found.

152. i.e. the celestial region minus the celestial bodies.

153. Namely, the earth elements that according to Plato are present in the celestial region.

154. Reading themenos for themenous at 524,6.

155. At this point a note in the margin of one manuscript correctly warns us that all of what follows is extremely loose (*holon touto muriosphalton*).

156. Philoponus starts citing Plotinus mid-sentence and changes the manuscripts' *kai to* into *kaitoi*. Plotinus writes: '[O]ne must show how the celestial things, even though they each have a body, will everlastingly possess individuality in what is strictly the same so that they will be particulars *and the same despite the fact that the nature of body is always flowing*' (2.1.2,4-6). Philoponus' reasons for not citing the previous lines should be clear.

157. Plotinus is closely paraphrasing *Republic* 530B2-3: '... and don't you think that he [viz. the guardian in training] would think strange the man who considers these things [viz. the celestial phenomena] to be always the same and never to change in any way, though they have body and are visible ...'. Philoponus deviates from both Plotinus and Plato who write 'things which *have* bodies ...'.

158. *to aparallaktôs hexei kai to hôsautôs.* Rabe reports that the former *to* is not in Plotinus, but Rabe is presumably looking at Creuzer's edition. It is in Henry-Schwyzer's text, which of course was not available to Rabe.

159. Philoponus omits the particle an in the Plotinus MSS, but there is no real difference in sense.

160. At 525,9 Philoponus has $aut\hat{o}(i)$ for the MSS autou, but the sense is the same.

161. Aristotle argued for the existence of the fifth body from certain first assumptions. Both Proclus (*in Tim.* 1.237,22-238,2) and Simplicius (*in Cael.* 12,6-16 and 115,30-116,2) give lists of what they take these assumptions to be. More recently, Leggatt (*Aristotle, On the Heavens I and II*, 14 n. 26) has produced an even more comprehensive, though admittedly non-exhaustive, list. 162. Enneads 2.1.2.5-16.

163. At 525,17 Philoponus has *stereon* for the Plotinus' *sterron*. There is no difference in sense.

164. *Tim.* 31B4-8.

165. At 525,17 Philoponus has epei for the Plotinus' $epeid\hat{e}$. There is no difference in sense.

166. *Tim*. 39E10-40A4.

167. Perhaps a reference to 29B3-D3.

168. At 525,21 Philoponus has *pleion* for Plato's *pleiston*. Plotinus: 'that *most* or all ...'.

169. At 525,24 Philoponus has *doxeien* for the Plotinus' *doxei*. There is no difference in sense.

170. At 525,25 Philoponus has *ho te aêr te ei enê*(*i*) for Plotinus' *ho te aêr ei eneiê*. There is no difference in sense.

171. Tim. 31B8-32A7.

172. 2.1.6,2-16. Plotinus responds to *Timaeus* 31B8-32A7 with the natural criticism that just because two solid numbers require two intermediates, this does not imply that two physical solids behave similarly.

173. Meteor. 340b21-3, 341b21-2.

174. 2.1.4,11-12.

175. 2.1.4, 12-13; 2.1.7, 25-6.

176. A paraphrase of 2.1.4,9-10; cf. 3.3.5,3-8. This thought is prominent in Aristotle (*PA* 665b20-21, *GA* 744b12-27) but also present in Plato (*Republic* 420C6-7).

177. Cael. 1.2.

178. Philoponus adds a *gar* at 527,18.

179. At 527,19 Philoponus has *toutôn kai tôn toioutôn kai tôn arithmô(i) tettarôn* for Plato's *toutôn toioutôn kai ton arithmon tettarôn*: '... out of these bodies, being of this sort and four in number, and ...'.

180. At 527,21 Philoponus has to auto for Plato's tauton. There is no difference in sense.

181. At 527,22 Philoponus has *tôn allôn* for Plato's *tou allou*: '... by *any other* save ...'.

182. At 528,7 Philoponus has *luseis* for Plato's *luei*: '... they attack it, *dissolve* it in an untimely manner, and make it perish by introducing illnesses and elderly conditions'.

183. At 528,9 Philoponus has *tonde holon ex holôn* for Plato's *tonde hena holon holôn*: '... built it to be a *single* complete whole of wholes ...'.

184. *Tim.* 32B8-33B1.

185. See Philoponus' in GC regarding 1.6, esp. 145,22ff.

186. See book 6, section 29 (230,23ff.).

187. Tim. 53D7-E8.

188. Reading *auto* for *autô(i)* at 529,15.

189. The celestial body does indeed surpass the four elements in fairness, but it does not 'correspond to a single kind', that is to say, it is composed of more than one element.

190. 482,7.

191. This sentence is a paraphrase of *Timaeus* 55C4-5. In the expression 'for the universe' Philoponus consistently replaces Plato's *epi* with *eis* (e.g. 532,14.22.23.25; 533,9).

192. Proclus does indeed infer from what Plato says about the dodecahedron that the elemental nature of the heavens is distinct from the sublunar elements. In this respect he sees Plato anticipating Aristotle's fifth element. Cf. *in Tim.* 2.42,9-44,24 and 3.112,19-133,10 and see also Steel, 'Why should we prefer Plato's *Timaeus* to Aristotle's *Physics*?', 176. Damascius, in *in Phaed.* (ii, $\S132$), also relates that Proclus held that the four elements assumed in the heavens the shape of the dodecahedron, since the dodecahedron is the 'common transitional element between the elements and the sphere' (though cf. *in Tim.* 2.49,29).

193. At 533,2 Philoponus supplies a second *tis* which is not in Plato and does not change the sense.

194. There is a play on words here between 'infinite' (*apeiros*) and 'inexperienced' (also *apeiros*).

195. Philoponus omits the *stas* at 533,5. Plato: '... if he *stopped here* he would be more reasonably caught in doubt, being at a loss ...'.

196. The above mentioned pun between *apeiros* ('infinite') and *apeiros* ('inexperienced') perhaps carries over to *aporein* ('to be at a loss').

197. At 533,7 Philoponus has *theon*. One MS tradition has *theos*, which gives roughly: 'In our opinion god reveals that the cosmos is of a nature to be one.' As Taylor notes ad loc.: 'The *theos* [...] will be due to a 'corrector' who supposed the creator to be meant.'

198. Tim. 55C4-D6.

199. DK 68A40.

200. Reading anapherei for Rabe's an pherei at 534,20.

201. Rabe sets *diitêtikon* for the manuscripts' *diêtêikon* at 534,27 and 535,2. Cf. Philoponus *in GC* 214,27.

202. i.e. the fires we witness in the world.

203. 197,9ff. This is the precession of the equinoxes, discovered by Hipparchus; see *Almagest* 7.2. Cf. Simplicius *in Cael.* 462,12ff.

204. Some commentators, for example, point to Plato's *Phaedo* 110B5-7 where the earth is compared to ball stitched out of 12 pieces of leather (cf. Plutarch *Platonic Questions* 1003C). Cf. also *Phaedrus* 246E-247A where Plato describes a procession of twelve gods.

205. A reference to *Tim.* 42E9-43A1.

206. One manuscript has a note in the margin that reads: 'he means the first substratum'.

207. Tim. 49A6.

208. Chapter 11, section 9 (446,13-447,7), section 13 (458,27-459,24), and section 15 (464,20-465,21). Cf. chapter 12, section 5 (473,10-474,8).

209. Reading homologoumenês with M for Rabe's homologoumenê(i) at 541,10.

210. *Tim.* 30A2-6.

211. Tim. 49A6. 'Without form' is not in Plato.

212. Tim. 53A8ff.

213. Reading *de* for *gar* at 542,11. Rabe suggests this in the critical apparatus.

214. That is to say, rather than just possessing *traces*.

215. 539,1ff.

216. 540,14.

217. Chapter 11, section 9 (446,13-447,7), section 13 (458,27-459,24), and section 15 (464,20-465,21).

218. Philoponus agrees with Proclus that there are no three temporal stages of matter, matter plus traces, ordered matter with complete forms. However, Proclus adds the hypothesis that matter has no beginning and from this concludes that the universe has no beginning. Philoponus thinks that all three of these 'stages' begin simultaneously when matter is brought into existence.

219. Taking the scope of *mê* at 546,21 to include *apheilêphota* at 546,22-3.

220. Tim. 30A2-5.

221. Tim. 51A7, 52B2.

222. Sodano fr. 59 and 60. Cf. 165,7-19.

223. See chapter 6, section 21 (186,6ff.). cf. Aristotle *Cael.* 279b32-280a2, which Philoponus cites along with Alexander's commentary on it in chapter 6, section 27 (216,26ff.).

224. *Tim.* 28Aff.; cf. 41A-B.

225. Statesman 270A.

226. 269Cff.

227. Chapter 6, section 7 (135,9ff.).

228. Tim. 31B3 and 92C9.

229. Tim. 37D3.

230. Tim. 31B1.

231. Tim. 31B1.

232. to aei. Proclus is clearly using this as a synonym for to aidion.

233. *tôn eidôn.* Lang and Macro translate this with 'forms', which is at best confusing. Proclus cannot have Platonic forms in mind since he is clearly describing something that is *everlasting*, i.e. *in* time. Platonic forms, by contrast, would be described as *eternal*. Cf. e.g. *in Parm.* 707,24-6 and 907,28-30.

234. cf. *Tim.* 37D6-7, though Plato here does not distinguish between eternal (*aiônios*) and everlasting (*aei*, *aïdion*).

235. Inserting kai to hômoiômenon before oukh in 550,4. There is clearly something wrong with the text as it stands. As 550,4 makes clear (ei de touto estin to aiônion), these lines (550,1-4) seem to be intended as a description of eternity. However, what one finds in part of this short passage, namely in 550,3-4, is not an account of eternity that Proclus would endorse. For as the text stands, 550,3-4 says that eternity possesses the kind of infinity that is not simultaneous but rather comes to be. However, it is in fact *time* that possesses the kind of infinity that comes to be. Eternity's infinity does not come to be but rather is (see in Remp. 2.11,17ff.). A marginal note marks the same worry: scrib. ou ginomenon de to apeiron all' hama on. For this reason it is best to break 550,1-4 into two descriptions, one of eternity and one of what resembles it, by inserting something like kai to hômoiômenon. Compare Lang and Macro's translation (which does not make any insertion): 'After all, the eternal in no way possesses temporality, since it has neither duration in time nor priority and posteriority, but rather is something unlimited in respect to both, and is not something at one and the same time unlimited but generated. Cf. 557,27-8.

236. 24,14-16.

237. Pantôs, referring to Proclus' kata panta at 550,23.

238. Philoponus has $ei\hat{e}$ for Plato's $\hat{e}(i)$. There is no significant difference in sense.

239. At 552,9 Philoponus has *gegonôs ouranos* for Plato's *ouranos gegonôs*. There is no difference in sense.

240. Philoponus omits Plato's *eti*. There is no significant difference in sense. **241.** *Tim.* 31A8-B3.

242. Although Proclus seemed to reserve *to aei* for everlastingness (as opposed to eternity), Philoponus seems to use it as an umbrella term to cover both.

243. Chapter 2, sections 4-5 (35,13ff.).

244. At 553,17 Philoponus omits Plato's *homoion*: 'still more *similar* to the paradigm'. The *homoion* is present at 579,25.

245. At 553,19 Philoponus has *epekheirêse* for Plato's *epekheirêsen*. There is no difference in sense.

246. At 553,20 Philoponus omits Plato's *ousa*. There is no difference in sense.

247. At 553,21 Philoponus has *genêtôi* for Plato's *gennêtôi*. There is no difference in sense.

248. At 553,22 Philoponus has *ti* for Plato's *tina*. Because of this we must take *ti* with *kinêton* as a second object of *poiein*. Plato's text would read: 'He thought to make some moving image ...'.

249. At 553,23 reading Plato's diakosmôn for Philoponus' diakosmon.

250. At 553,24 Philoponus has hen for Plato's en heni: 'remains in unity'.

251. At 553,24 Philoponus has *ousan* for Plato's *iousan*: 'an eternal image which *moves* in accordance with number'.

252. Thanks to an anonymous vetter for improvements made to the translation here.

253. At 554,4 Philoponus has *to te ên kai estai* for Plato's *to t'ên to t'estai*. There is no difference in sense.

254. *Tim.* 37C6-38A1.

255. At 554,11 Philoponus has *genêthentes* for Plato's *gennêthentes*. There is no difference in sense.

256. At 554,12 Philoponus has *genetai* for Plato's *gignetai*. There is no difference in sense.

257. At 554,14 Philoponus omits Plato's dê. There is no difference in sense.

258. At 554,14 Philoponus omits Plato's *on*: '... the paradigm is *existing* for all eternity'. The *on* is present at 607,26.

259. At 618,9 Philoponus inserts ho kosmos.

260. Tim. 38B3-C3.

261. At 554,27 Philoponus has tauta for Proclus' to aei at 549,19.

262. 549,18-21.

263. At 555,21 Philoponus has *genêthentes* for Plato's *gennêthentes*. There is no difference in sense.

264. At 555,22 Philoponus has *genêtai* for Plato's *gignêtai*. There is no difference in sense.

265. *Tim.* 38B6-7 = 554,10-12.

266. Tim. 37E1-3 = 553,25-554,3.

267. Chapter 6, sections 15 (168,3ff.) and 28 (225,23ff.).

268. cf. Tim. 32C2-4 and 41A7-8; Statesman 270A4.

269. Chapter 5, section 2 (105,17ff.).

270. 554,19.

271. 555,17ff.

272. 550,1-4. See note ad loc.

273. *aïdion*. Plato does not observe the distinction between *aïdion* and *aiônion* that is common in late antiquity. Aristotle probably didn't either, cf. *Peri Ideôn* 80,15 where he says that Platonic Forms are supposed to be *aïdion*. For that matter, neither did Plotinus, who uses *aei* for everlastingness and both *aïdion* and *aiônion* for eternity.

274. Philoponus has *epekheirêse* for Plato's *epekheirêsen*. There is no difference in sense.

275. *Tim.* 37D1-2.

276. The properties are having temporal position, priority, posteriority, and extension.

277. Tim. 29E1-3.

278. Chapter 6, section 28 (225,13ff.).

279. Plato, Tim. 30A4-5.

280. This is a concise paraphrase of *Timaeus* 30A2-5: '*For having willed* that everything be good, and *nothing bad* [*phlauron* instead of Philoponus', or rather Proclus', *kakon*] as far as that is possible, the god took up everything that was visible (since it was not at rest but was moving in a discordant and disorderly manner) and *delivered it from disorder into order*.'

281. i.e. that what is ordered – the universe – be preserved.

282. This, again, is a paraphrase and not a direct quote from the creator's speech at *Timaeus* 41B2-6: 'For which reason, seeing that you all came to be, you are neither immortal nor absolutely indissoluble, and yet you will in no way [ou ti men $d\hat{e} \dots ge$ (cf. 601,1) instead of Philoponus' oudamôs] be dissolved nor will you encounter the fate of death since you have obtained [lakhontes (cf. 601,3) instead of Philoponus' tukhontes] My will which is a bond still greater and more sovereign than those by which you were bound together when you came to be.'

283. Following Rabe's note at 560,9-10: exspectes auto(i) $t\hat{o}(i)$ einai $\langle drastik\hat{e} \rangle estin$ (cf. 560,22; 561,25).

284. Following Rabe's suggestion of reading *gartoi* for *gar to* at 560,13. **285.** *Tim.* 37E4.

286. i.e. at all times and by their very existence.

287. *Philebus* 26Eff., but here Plato does not quite say that the producer and the product are simultaneous. The closest he comes is saying that there is no product without a cause (26E2-4) and then identifying the cause with the producer and craftsman (26E6-8, 27B1-2), but he does not explicitly assert here that there cannot be a producer without a product.

288. i.e. both the destruction of disorder and the preservation of order.

289. The Greek word *cosmos*' primary sense is 'order' from which the sense of '(an ordered) universe' is derived.

290. Philoponus seems to think that Proclus' argument for the everlastingness of the cosmos ends here (cf. 586,11ff.). The rest of the 16th argument is devoted to showing that the wills are in fact one.

291. *Tim.* 29E1-30A6.

292. The will that disorder not exist.

293. The will to preserve order.

294. cf. Aristotle *EN* 1.1-2 and *DA* 433a21 with Themistius' paraphrase (119,6-7): hen dê ti to kinoun prôtôs to orekton, kai mia hê toutou horexis.

295. i.e. human souls, intellects, and angels.

296. Tim. 30A2-5.

297. Chapter 14, section 1 (541,7ff.).

298. Plato seems to agree at *Alcibiades* 115D8-11 and so does Proclus (*in Alc.* 144,4), but note Olympiodorus' (*in Alc.* 120,22-3) disapproval: 'Behold that the young man is in error here: for not existing is worse than being in a bad state (*idou entautha hamartanei ho neos: kheiron gar esti to mê einai tou kakôs einai*).' Cf. 586,7-8 and 128,1ff.

299. *Rep.* 2, 379C5-7. This diverges slightly from our text of the *Republic*. Philoponus adds \hat{e} ton theon and has hetera for Plato's all' in line 15, has $\hat{z}\hat{e}\hat{t}\hat{e}$ toon for Plato's *dei zêtein* in lines 15-6, and leaves out *ta aitia, all' ou ton theon* in line 16. Rabe reinserts this last deletion, but this hardly seems necessary given Philoponus' addition in line 15.

300. Rep. 10, 617E4-5. Cf. also Tim. 42D2-4.

301. Tim. 30A2-3.

302. Just above in lines 566,13-17.

303. *Tim*. 29E3.

304. *Tim.* 41C4-5.

305. Philoponus offers an interesting exegesis of a difficult feature of the *Timaeus*. Plato obviously does not intend us to take the generation of mortal creatures by the celestial beings literally, but it is far from clear what we should take away from this account. Philoponus draws on the connection between the celestial substances and time (*Tim.* 37D5ff.) and suggests that Plato's meaning is that everything comes to be at the right time.

306. Socrates' father.

307. This might refer to the (now lost) first section of the first chapter.

308. Rabe suggests that one might read *allê* for *allou* which would give: '...

it does not follow that God's will concerning the existence of these things become different over time.'

309. See chapter 2, section 5 (38,3-15) and chapter 5, section 13 (91,10-18).

310. Ten Puzzles 5,14-23.

311. Ten Puzzles 5,30-3. See 6,17-21; 38,16-20; 91,19-23.

312. 560,22-3.

313. Reading *boulêsin* <*mêde*> *pote* at 571,13. Cf. 572,14-15.

314. Chapter 2, section 5 (39,5-18) and chapter 4, section 16 (101,12-25).

315. At 571,20 Philoponus has *pantelê* for Plotinus' *mê atelê*: '... must be *not incomplete*'.

316. At 571,21 Philoponus has *themis tou theou* for Plotinus' *themiton theou*. There is no difference in sense.

317. At 571,21 Philoponus omits Plotinus' *hotioun on*. There is no difference in sense.

318. At 571,22 Philoponus omits Plotinus' t cn. There is no difference in sense.

319. At 571,24 Philoponus inserts a $h\hat{os}$. There is no difference in sense.

320. At 572,1 Philoponus inserts a *prôton*. There is no difference in sense.

321. At 572,2 Philoponus has *outôs* for Plotinus' *outô*. There is no difference in sense.

322. At 572,3 Philoponus has to for Plotinus' *mêden*: '... in such a way that *nothing* will be in need of anything'.

323. At 572,4 Philoponus has *elleipontos* for Plotinus' *elleipsontos*: '... it *will* be lacking nothing'.

324. At 572,5 Philoponus has *dia* for Plotinus' *meta*: 'this *after* that'. **325.** *Ennead* 6.7.1,45-57.

326. 570,17.

327. 570,16-17.

328. 561,6-7.

329. This section should be compared with fr. 121 (Wildberg) of Philoponus' *Against Aristotle on the Everlastingness of the World* = Simplicius *in Phys.* 1157,10-1158,29.

330. 'now ... now' translates *pote men ... pote de* which is elsewhere translated with 'at one time ... at another time'. The latter translation would make the present argument outrageous.

331. Eliminating *anankê* at 574,25 as Rabe suggests in the apparatus.

332. $epibol\hat{e}$ is an activity of intellect by which it apprehends epistemologically simple objects such as Forms or principles (Plotinus 6.7.35,21; [Alexander] *in Metaph.* 599,31-4; Sophonias *Paraphr. in DA* 128,5-6; Proclus *in Tim.* 1.438,28ff.). *Epibolê* is often contrasted with *metabasis* (Philoponus *in DA* 260,23-4) and *dianoia* (Proclus *in Tim.* 2.61,16-17). This activity of *epibolê* looks like an all or nothing affair, which seems to derive from Aristotle's likening the intellect's activity to 'contacting' (*thigein – Metaph.* 1051b24 and 1072b24; cf. Syrianus *in Metaph.* 4,32). Judging by what Philoponus says in the next lines it is clear that *epibolê* is of individual concepts, and *noein* involves putting several concepts together. Cf. some relevant passages on *epibolê* from Philoponus' *in DA*:

For intellect, because it knows the things by simple $epibol\hat{e}$, is indivisible; reason (*dianoia*) is a dyad; for it reasons along some path and travels from premises to conclusions; opinion is a tryad ... perception is the tetrad. (*in* DA 78,10ff.)

<Plato> believes that of what is, some things are intelligibles, others knowables, others opinables, and others perceptibles. By 'the One' he refers to intellect which is able to apprehend the intelligibles. For intellect is indivisible (*adiairetos*) and completely like itself, and it thinks the things at once and timelessly by primary *epibolê*. By 'the two' he refers to science. For scientific knowledge is composite – even if it is a sort of syllogism, it is generated in only one way and not in many different ways, i.e. it is not different over time but is always true and unchanging, since it leads through a single path of premises to a single end, the conclusion. (*in DA* 79,21ff.; cf. Proclus *in Parm.* 924,32-4)

333. Philoponus adds a *kai* which did not appear at 570,7 or 38,8. Our text of Proclus also does not have the *kai*, but cf. Plotinus 6.4.11,16.

334. 570,6-7 = Ten Puzzles 5,18-19.

335. i.e. God. In Neoplatonism, the hypostasis Intellect is often identified with the creator in the *Timaeus* (Numenius fr. 20; Plotinus 2.3.18,15; 4.4.10,1ff.; 5.1.8,5; 5.8.8,5ff.; 5.9.3,25-6; Iamblichus *Myst.* 8,3).

336. All other intellectual substances derive from Intellect. In the *Timaeus*, the creator makes the immortal part of our souls (41D) and the generated gods prepare the other parts (69C). Cf. Plotinus' interpretation 2.1.5,6ff.

337. In the context of early Christianity, 'Greek' is often synonymous with 'pagan'.

338. Aristotle Metaph. 1051b24, 1072b24 (cf. Syrianus in Metaph. 4,32).

339. Changing Rabe's punctuation from a semicolon to a comma at 575,25 and putting a period in 576,2.

340. *Phys.* 219a1ff. (Rabe refers to GC 337a23 where this is mentioned but not argued).

341. e.g. Themistius *in Phys.* 144,23; Simplicius *in Phys.* 706,34ff.; Proclus *in Tim.* 3.37,31-2. Cf. Sextus Empiricus *PH* 3.140. This thought is generally taken to be suggested at *Tim.* 37Cff. even though the universe is said to be in motion *prior to* the creation of time (*kinêthen,* 37C6).

342. cf. Cael. 279a15.

343. *DA* 411b18-19. Philoponus omits Aristotle's gar (411b18). Rabe does not punctuate this as a quotation.

344. noêsin metabatikên. This is what Philoponus calls dianoia at in DA 155,12.

345. Argument 14, 540,14.

346. 'non-discursively' translates '*ametabatôs*' which is elsewhere translated with 'unchangingly'.

347. 'non-discursive' translates '*ametabatos*' which is elsewhere translated with 'unchanging'.

348. The creator makes the cosmos at *Timaeus* 31Aff. (cf. chapter 4, section 17, 91,17ff.), and He explicitly creates the differences in speed at 36C-D.

349. The arrival of Aries was taken to be the spring equinox, and Aries was widely held by ancient astrologers to be the head of the Zodiac. Thus, many lists of the Zodiac begin with Aries. See Gundel, 'Zodiakos' in Pauly-Wissowa XA 472,32-44.

350. This occurred around 22 May 529. On the Diocletian era, cf. Ginzel Handbuch der mathematischen und technischen Chronologie, vol. 1, 229ff.

351. Philoponus here at 529,25 includes Plato's *homoion*, which he omitted at 553,17.

352. Tim. 37C6-D1. Cf. 553,14-17.

353. Inserting a comma after *kinoumenon* at 579,25.

354. The Greek here is: *dêlonhoti proteron men egnô hoti hê aplanês apekatestê, deuteron de hoti hê selênê.* This is surprising in that it seems to suggest that God's knowledge is indeed subject to time. For this reason one might try to translation the ordinals proleptically as follows: 'He knew that the sphere of fixed stars returned first; that the moon returned second; the sun third ...'. However, this would be not only far from the intuitive reading of the text; it would also spoil the overall argument. Philoponus has already argued

that (i) created intellects, because their manner of thought is discursive, think about things sequentially: first a, then b, then c, etc.; and that (ii) the sequence in question is not strictly speaking temporal (575,3-578,6). Here Philoponus is providing an analogous case for the creative intellect: Even though His manner of thinking is generally non-discursive, God's knowledge of the return of the celestial spheres is sequential: first a, then b, then c, etc. However, here again the sequence in question is not strictly speaking temporal. As Richard Sorabji suggests, Philoponus' thought here might perhaps be partially explained by his rather unusual view, put forth at 114,20-116,1, that eternity is a non-segmented duration (*paratasis*). Cf. Sorabji, *Time, Creation, and Continuum*, 117-19.

355. Philoponus omits Mars here, cf. 579,2-6 and 578,9-20. Perhaps *Dios* at 580,2 should be emended to *Areôs*.

356. 560,19.

357. 560,20.

358. 578,11-20.

359. These lines could also be translated thus: 'Then, when the first sphere returned to the same point, He had not yet willed the second to return; and when the second returned, He had not yet willed the third to return.'

360. Perhaps the fifth argument (103,2ff.). cf. 560,17-20, 580,6-8, and Proclus *in Tim.* 3.37,13ff. and 3.45,5ff.

361. cf. Plotinus 2.3.17,4-5 and 4.4.13,7-8. Philoponus in Phys. 12,19-21.

362. cf. Plotinus 2.3.17,6-9 and 3.3.4,8-9.

363. Herodotus 1.47 = Porphyry *VP* 22,6-7.

364. Homer Odyssey 4.379 and 4.468.

365. An anonymous poem also cited in Philoponus *in DA* 188,26-7 and Olympiodorus *in Alc.* 43,28-44,2.

366. The apparent conclusion of Plato *Parm.* 134D1-E8. This group does not include Proclus (cf. 570,16 and *in Parm.* 957,22 and 968,13ff.). Others (e.g. Asclepius (*in Metaph.* 21,1ff. and 74,5-10) and Nemesius (*Nat. Hom.* § 42)) agree. It was Alexander who most famously defended the thesis that God cannot know individuals.

367. Menander fr. 174 = *Epitrepontes* ll. 1084-6. The play continues:

Simikrines: What do you mean?

- Onesimos: I'll tell you exactly what I mean: There are, let's say, a thousand cities now and 30,000 men inhabit each one. Do the gods damn and save each of them individually?
- Simikrines: How could they? For you're implying that they live a toilsome life.
- Onesimos: So the gods don't care for us, you say?

368. cf. 582,12-13.

- 369. 570,14ff. and 571,20ff.
- 370. i.e. on Proclus' assumption that priority and posteriority entails time.
- 371. cf. 571,20ff.
- 372. Rabe notes the similarity to Aeschylus fr. 139.
- **373.** Chapter 16, section 2 (568,17ff.).
- 374. Chapter 6, section 4 (128,1ff.). Cf. 565,20-21 and note ad loc.
- 375. Philoponus seems to think that Proclus argument ends at 561,23.
- **376.** *Tim.* 30A2-6. Philoponus' text matches the OCT exactly.
- 377. In sections 1-5.
- 378. cf. chapter 6, section 29 (238,22ff.).

379. The argument is obviously sophistical and consists of two parts. (i). If the proximate objective of willing the non-existence of the disordered state is that good exist, and if this has as a consequence that the ordered state exist which in turn has as a consequence that evil not exist, then the ultimate objective or consequence of willing the non-existence of the disordered state is that evil not exist. (ii). If the proximate objective of willing the existence of the disordered state is that evil not exist, and if this has as a consequence that the disordered state is that evil not exist, and if this has as a consequence that the disordered state not exist which in turn has as a consequence that good exist, then the ultimate objective or consequence of willing the existence of the ordered state is that the good exist. Thus, even when judged by their ultimate ends, willing the existence of the ordered state is better than will that the disordered state not exist, since the existence of good is better than the non-existence of evil.

380. Philoponus reverses the word order here: *phlauron men mêden agatha de panta* for Plato's *agatha men panta phlauron de mêden*. cf. 586,23-5.

381. *Tim.* 30A2-3.

382. *Republic* 546A2.

383. At 589,12 Philoponus (Proclus) omits Plato's *de*. There is no difference in sense.

384. At 589,13 Philoponus (Proclus) adds *auto* which is only implicit in Plato.

385. At 589,13 Philoponus has *adiaphtharton* for Plato's *adiaphthoron*. There is no difference in sense.

386. Phaedrus 245D3-4.

387. Tim. 41C2-3.

388. Rabe punctuates this as a quote, though it is clearly just a paraphrase of 106D2-4. Compare Philoponus' *skholê gar an ti allo eiê anôlethron, ei to athanaton mê toiouton* with Plato's *skholê gar an ti allo phthoran mê dekhoito, ei to ge athanaton aidion on phthoran dexetai.*

389. The two assumptions in question are not the previously mentioned two principles. Rather, they are (1) God is a creator of immortal things, and (2) 'immortal' is synonymous with 'indestructible'.

390. At 592,15 Philoponus has *gar* for Plato's *ge mên*.

391. Tim. 41B1-2.

392. Regarding conversion by negation, see Alexander's *in An. Pr.* 26,16-18 with Barnes' note.

393. Phaedrus 245D3-4.

394. Rabe adds the conclusion to the text, but in contexts as formal as this, the conclusion is often omitted. Given that the premises are the premises of Darii, the conclusion was considered 'obvious'.

395. cf. chapter 15, section 1 (551,14ff.).

396. Tim. 41B2-3.

397. Note that if Plato is right to say that the heaven is made up mostly of fire, we should expect the *entire* heaven and not just the heavenly bodies to be bright and visible. Cf. Plotinus 2.1.7,46-9.

398. Chapter 1, section 7 (17,15ff.).

399. There was some debate in antiquity on whether God's will could make something that is naturally destructible immortal. Alcinous (*Didask.* 15.2,2-3) and Ammonias Saccas (see Photius *Bibliotheca* 461b8-9) both agreed it could, as did Origen (*De Principiis* 3.6,6; *Contra Celsum* 5.23,22). Importantly, the other known defenders of the literal interpretation of Plato (Plutarch, Atticus, and Severus) also held this view (see Proclus *in Tim.* 3.212,6ff.). But Alexander was very critical of this position (see the 18th problem in his *Problems and*

Solutions), and many followed his lead, including Plotinus (2.1.1), Simplicius (*in Cael.* 369,26-8 and *in Phys.* 1334,25), and Proclus (*in Tim.* 3.212,6ff. and *in Crat.* §185).

400. cf. Plato *Timaeus* 41A7-8; *Phaedo* 88B, 95B; Anaximander DK 12A15 (= Aristotle *Phys.* 203b6ff.); [Aristotle] *Mund.* 396a31.

401. Tim. 41B2-3.

402. Throughout *Against Proclus* there is a difficulty in translating *aphthar*tos since it can mean both 'indestructible' and simply 'not destroyed'. This problem is particularly acute in this section, and for that reason I have switched to translating it with 'free of destruction', which I think captures both of these senses, in order to avoid using two different translations within a single section.

403. This is perhaps a reference to Galen's now lost *Peri apodeixeôs* which consists of fifteen chapters on scientific demonstration. I. v. Müller has collected the relevant Greek fragments in *Abhandlungen der bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* (1895), 403-78. There are additional Arabic fragments in the Sulemaniye Library in Instanbul which have been studied by Lawrence Schrenk among others (thanks to Richard Sorabji for pointing this out to me).

404. The adjectives *sunthetos* (composite), *agenetos* (ungenerated), and *aphthartos* (free of destruction) are in the masculine and feminine form rather than the neuter. The latter two could be modifying *noêsis* (conception) which is feminine, but it seems likely that they are meant to modify *tou aidiou* (the everlasting) in which case this would not be a neuter ('what is everlasting') but masculine and something specific, e.g. god or the cosmos. Without the context of this passage, it is impossible to say for certain.

405. Rabe marks this line (*apodedeikhen an eiê*) as corrupt and notes that MSS pt offer *apodedeikhen hôs an eiê*. An anonymous vetter of this translation has suggested the following solution. The tradition varies between (i) the perfect tense finite verb form *apodedeikhen an* and the periphrastic perfect *apodedeikhôs an eiê*, and MSS pt have contaminated the two. As far as the sense goes, there is no difference. Yet the former is more likely what Philoponus himself wrote. This form was on the way out and more likely to be misunderstood and corrupted – especially with its *-en* ending followed by *an* – and then glossed in the margin and/or replaced by the more explicit and current form.

406. *Tim.* 41B2-6, cf. 560,6-8. Philoponus (Galen) has gegonate for Plato's *gegenêsthe* and *kai kuriôterou desmou* for Plato's *desmou kai kuriôterou*, and omits Plato's *ge* after *luthêsesthe*. These discrepancies make no significant difference in sense.

407. Chapter 17, section 3 (597,1ff.).

408. Following Rabe's suggestion of reading <*hôs*> before *legetai* at 602,8. **409.** 591,5.

410. Chapter 9, sections 10 (341,25ff.), 11 (344,27ff.), and 13 (367,1ff.); Chapter 12, section 4 (472,22ff.). Cf. 376,29-377,6, 378,1-10, and 380,10-17.

411. Philoponus has to gar plêmmelôs kai ataktôs kinoumenon for Plato's kinoumenon plêmmelôs kai ataktôs, which Philoponus also has at 586,26-7. There is no significant difference in sense.

412. Tim. 30A4-5.

413. An inference unacceptable to Proclus.

414. 590,17.

415. cf. Chapter 6, section 4 (128,20ff.).

416. *Tim.* 42E9-43A1.

417. Statesman 269D5-6.

418. Tim. 29A5-6 and 34A8.

Notes to pages 93-99

419. The means can be understood as composed of the extremes, e.g. going from making to not making is a process that has two parts, namely, making and not making, each of which is an extreme. Cf. Proclus *in Tim.* 1.235,26-32; 1.256,25-257,8 (= Porphyry *in Tim.* 2, fr. 31); 1.277,24-7. Here Proclus calls the Platonic principles of pure being and pure becoming (*Tim.* 27D6-28A1) 'extremes' so that a substance that partakes of both (e.g. soul) is a mean.

420. 272Eff.

421. A paraphrase of Tim. 53B3-4, where Timaeus is describing the precosmic state.

422. The reiteration of order and disorder is found in the *Statesman* (cf. *tote men* ... *tote de* 269C4-5), but not in the *Timaeus* where God's goodness prevents Him from letting the state of disorder return (32C2-4, 29E1-30A6). The oars are mentioned at *Statesman* 273E1-2.

423. Atticus was a second-century AD Platonist known for his literal interpretation of the *Timaeus*' creation story. See note on 519,22-5.

424. Reading themenos with Kroll for the theômenos of M, printed by Rabe.
425. Tim. 38C1-3. Philoponus (Proclus) omits Plato's gar dê before paradeigma, inserts a ton before panta aiôna, omits the te before the first kai

in 38C3, and has ho de kosmos ton hapanta khronon dia telous for Plato's ho de au dia telous ton hepanta khronon. The difference in sense is minimal: 'For the paradigm is existing for all eternity, whereas the other in turn always was for all time and is and will be.'

426. Reading ge for te in 608,13, as Rabe suggests.

427. Reading esti for hoti in 608,24, as Rabe suggests.

428. Reading pote kai for pote oun. Rabe notes haec suspecta.

429. It is true that what follows from a possibility must be possible, but it is certainly not the case that what follows from an impossibility is necessarily impossible. Consider $(p \bullet \neg p) \rightarrow p$, where p isn't impossible.

430. Following Rabe's suggestion of reading *oude gar ekeinos* for *oute gar ekeinos ou* in 609,18.

431. *ho Platôn* is omitted at 607,1.

432. 606, 26-607, 1

433. Cratylus 397D2-4. Cf. Aristotle's etymological explanation of aether from *aei* and *thein* (*Cael.* 270b22-3; cf. *Mund.* 392a5-9).

434. Argument 4, 55,25ff.

435. Argument 15, 549,7ff.

436. Argument 9 313,7ff.

437. 605,5ff.

438. 605,9-11.

439. Chapter 4, section 3 (61,23ff.).

440. The connection here is clearer in the Greek; 'to transform' translates the Greek verb *alloiousthai* (literally, to become different), and 'different' translates the related adjective *allos*.

441. Chapter 4, section 5 (65,27ff.).

442. 'Capacity' here translates *hexis* – a term with a narrower scope than *dunamis*. It refers to what in Aristotelian terms would be called a second potentiality (or first actuality) and could also be translated as 'disposition'.

443. Chapter 4, section 3 (62,24-63,1).

444. 605,13.

445. Chapter 4, section 5 (65,27ff.).

446. Chapter 4, section 9 (76,29ff.).

447. Chapter 4, section 10 (81,12ff.).

448. Chapter 4, section 9 (79,12ff.).

449. Reading *ka*(*i*)*ta* for *kan* at 616,23.

450. Chapter 16, section 1 (564,23ff.).

451. Chapter 15, section 2 (554,18ff.).

452. *Tim.* 38C1-3. cf. 141,5-7; 554,13-16; 607,25-608,1. Philoponus has to men gar paradeigma ton panta aiôna estin, ho de kosmos ton panta khronon dia telous gegonôs kai ôn kai esomenos for Plato's to men gar de paradeigma panta aiôna estin on, ho de au dia telous ton hapanta khronon gegonôs te kai ôn kai esomenos. The difference in sense is minor.

453. At 620,25 Philoponus has *ta auta* for Plato's *tauta*. There is no difference in sense.

454. At 620,25 Philoponus omits Plato's *aei*: 'Being *always* the same and unchanging ...'.

455. At 620,26 Philoponus omits Plato's *pantôn*: '... the most divine beings of all ...'.

456. Statesman 269D5-7.

457. At 621,5 Philoponus has de for Plato's kai. There is no difference in sense.

458. Rabe punctuates this as a statement, though it is clearly a question (as Burnet punctuates it in his editon of the *Timaeus*, and Diehl in his edition of Proclus' commentary).

459. At 621,6-7 Philoponus has *aei kata ta auta kai hôsautôs ekhon* for Plato's *aei kata tauton on*: '... being always the same ...'.

460. Tim. 27D6-28A4.

461. Following Rabe's suggestion of inserting en before toutois at 621,24.

462. Philoponus has *di heauton* for Proclus' *di hautou* at 607,1. There is no significant difference in sense.

463. Philoponus has \hat{e} atakton einai \hat{e} tetagmenon for Proclus' \hat{e} atakton \hat{e} tetagmenon einai at 607,3-4. There is no difference in sense.

464. 606,26-607,4.

465. *Statesman* 272E.

466. Reading *auton* at 623,13 for Rabe's *auto*. M has an unintelligible *ato*.

467. cf. Aristotle *Metaph.* 1013b13-15 (and Asclepius ad loc. 306,6-9, who also makes clear that it is an accidental *efficient* cause), *Phys.* 195a13-14 (and Simplicius ad loc. 319,10-11), and Alexander *in Top.* 232,6-10.

468. Inserting *legei* before *einai* at 624,3. This follows Rabe's suggestion of 'perhaps' inserting *eiden* 'or some such word' before *einai*.

469. *Suntaxis* ('ordering') seems to be Proclus' term, whereas Philoponus prefers *skhesis* ('relation'). He uses both terms synonymously.

470. At 624,17 Philoponus omits Plato's *dê*. There is no difference in sense.

471. Reading *hautou* (which Plato has) at 624,18 for *autou* which Rabe prints in his edition.

472. *Periôpê* seems to have this sense in Neoplatonism. Cf. [Alexander] in Metaph. 711,35; Numenius fr. 12; Hermias in Phaedrum 62,25 and 65,3 (tên noeran emautou periôpên); Syrianus in Metaph. 3,1; Proclus in Remp. 1.81,7 (tês noeras tôn ontôn periôpês). For Simplicius' reading of this, see in Cael. 306,25ff.

473. Statesman 272E3-6.

474. Statesman 273A3 and 6.

475. Statesman 273B4-C2. At 624,25-625,1 Philoponus has suntrophon phuseôs for Plato's phuseôs suntrophon at 273B5, but the sense is the same.

476. Following Rabe's suggestion of reading *all*' for *hoti* at 625,15.

477. See Share's note at 31,10.

478. Phys. 8.10 (266a23ff.).

479. In chapter 6, section 29 (239,6) (but not in chapter 8, section 1 (298,22)) the text runs *prosktômenon to aei einai* for *prosktômenon aei to einai*: '... because it is receiving its everlasting existence ...'.

480. This passage is also cited at 239,2-9 and 298,17-23.

481. This passage is also cited at 239,9-16 and 298,24-299,6.

482. Phys. 8.10 (266a23ff.).

483. At 627,5 Philoponus has di heauton for Proclus' di hautou. There is no significant difference in sense.

484. At 628,2 Philoponus here omits Proclus' \hat{e} from 607,3.

485. 606,26-607,4.

486. 627,10-11.

487. 'Wise' seems to be used ironically here, since the assumption of separation is false.

488. 605,26ff.

489. 313,25ff.

490. *Tim.* 28A.

491. Statesman 273B4-C2.

492. 609,26ff.

493. Statesman 269D5-6.

494. cf. Heraclitus DK 22A1, B53, and B80.

495. cf. e.g. Homer *Iliad* 4.440; Hesiod *Theogony* 225f. and *Op.* 16ff.; Heraclitus DK 22A1, B8, and B80; Empedocles DK 31A3.

496. cf. e.g. Homer Iliad 4.440; Hesiod Shield 144, 195.

497. Homer Iliad 9.502.

498. cf. e.g. Homer *Iliad* 19.91ff.; Hesiod *Theogony* 230. The translation of $at\hat{e}$ is difficult. Its senses seem to range from criminal folly and in particular moral blindness to the (divine) punishment that is consequent upon it.

499. Hesiod Op. 804.

500. Homer Iliad 14.213, 16.672, and 16.682; Hesiod Theogony 212.

501. cf. [Alexander] *Problemata* 1.87,40ff. where 'Aphroditê' is identified with 'Appetite'.

502. Empedocles generally speaks of *philia* rather than *erôs*, but see DK 31B27. Cf. Parmenides DK 28A13; Plato *Symposium passim*; Plotinus 3.5 *passim*.

503. Gorgias 523E8-524A1.

504. *Minos* 318D6-8. Scholars today generally consider this dialogue spurious.

505. Odyssey 19.178-9. Our manuscripts of the Odyssey have enthate for Philoponus' enthade. At Minos 319B5-6 Plato cites this passage, but he omits the initial $t\hat{e}(i)$ se d'.

506. Minos 319C1-E5.

507. Laws 672B3-5.

508. At 633,21 Philoponus has a *hêmin* that is not present in Plato.

509. At 633,21-2 Philoponus omits Plato's *te* at D3 and *ta* at D4. There is no significant difference in sense.

510. At 634,10-11 Philoponus omits Plato's *kai Rheas* and *pantes*. Plato: '... and from Cronos *and Rhea* were generated Zeus, Hera and *all* the ones ...'.

511. *Tim.* 40D3-41C3.

512. Tim. 40E5-6.

513. cf. Plato *Cratylus* 397C8-D6. 'Always running (*aei thein*)' is a common etymology for *aithêr*: Plato *Cratylus* 410B5-7; Aristotle *Cael.* 270b22-3; [Aristotle] *Mund.* 392a8.

514. This might be Philoponus' own etymological suggestion (cf. Tim. 58D2).
515. Cratylus 397C4-D8.

516. At 636,19-20 Philoponus has *tous theous* for Plato's *theous*. There is no difference in sense.

517. At 636,20 Philoponus has *hôsper* for Plato's *housper*: '... to be gods *which* many of the savages consider to be gods even now ...'.

518. At 636,22 Philoponus omits Plato's *panta*: 'Because they observed that *all* of them ...'.

519. At 636,26 Philoponus has $t\hat{e}(i) \ al\hat{e}theia(i)$ for Plato's $t\hat{o}(i) \ al\hat{e}thei$. There is no difference in sense.

520. *Tim.* 40D3-5. Here Philoponus has *tauta tautê(i) kai ta peri theôn horatôn te kai genêtôn eirêmena phuseôs ekhetô telos.* Compare this with the text at 633,21-3: *alla tauta hikanôs hêmin tautê(i) kai peri theôn hêmin horatôn kai genêtôn eirêmena physeôs ekhetô telos.* Both differ slightly from *Tim.* 40D3-5 (see note on 633,21-3).

521. To be generated in cause would be roughly equivalent to being a product of emanation and is compatible with not being (properly) generated in time.

522. Reading *agenêtous* for Rabe's *genêtous* at 639,2.

523. Chapter 6, section 18 (173,19ff.).

524. 631,25ff.

525. Chapter 9, section 4 (331,21ff.).

526. Reading anagein for Rabe's agagein at 640,9.

527. Republic 377B11-378E3 follows. Starting at 641,8 (= Republic 377E2) the manuscript is damaged, but Rabe believes that the citation continues until at least 378E3. In the critical apparatus he writes: 'This is the end of the page and others are missing. Hence, t (editio Veneta) fills in the lacuna in part by adding Plato's words all the way until page 643,2 – correctly in my judgement. For in the preserved inner margins of the following destroyed page we can still read the symbol '>' preceding 33 individual lines by which a scribe usually marks cited passages. Therefore, it is likely that Plato's words had been copied directly onto the page perhaps until 642,17-18 logopoiein. In the missing page the final letters of several lines are preserved.' At this point Rabe lists the letters and makes some guesses about which words they came from. Then his note continues: 'Space does not stand in the way of our judgement that everything had been copied out of Plato that is relevant here (the scribe usually writes between 40 and 44 characters per line). Further, for those lines that are missing. Philoponus talks at length about this copied passage – for 24 lines in the manuscripts (according to our edition, approximately 25 lines). The end of his explanation on the following page (643,3ff.) is preserved for us, though the initial characters are barely present.'

528. The manuscripts pick up here after a lacuna with words which Rabe construes as *pantelôs apêlasen poleôs*, and which he suggests should be supplemented with *<tous toioutous muthous tês idias pante>lôs*.

529. At 644,22 Philoponus has *oiomai se* for [Plato]'s *oimai men se*. There is no difference in sense.

530. At 644,24 Philoponus has *hôste* for [Plato]'s *hous*: 'For many are those who demand a letter from me and *who* are not easy to turn away openly.'

531. At 645,1 Philoponus has *arkhê* for [Plato]'s *arkhei*. There is no difference in sense.

532. *Epistle* 13, 363B1-6. The 13th letter is considered by many scholars to be spurious.

533. *Epistle* 2, 313E1-2. The 2nd letter is also generally considered spurious.

534. At 645,4 Philoponus has *ta panta* for [Plato]'s *panta*. There is no difference in sense.

535. At 645,5-6 Philoponus has *ekeinos aitios pantôn kalôn* for [Plato]'s *ekeino aition hapantôn tôn kalôn*. There is no difference in sense.

536. Laws 715E7-716A1.

537. The rest of Philoponus' *Against Proclus* is lost, including the final chapter which was an epilogue to the entire treatise and a preface to the sequel (cf. 611,25).

This page intentionally left blank

Bibliography

- Baltes, Matthias, Die Entstehung des platonischen Timaios nach den antiken Interpreten (Leiden, 1976)
- Barnes, J. et al., Alexander of Aphrodisias: On Aristotle Prior Analytics 1.1-7 (London & Ithaca, NY, 1991)
- Burnyeat, Myles, 'Plato on Why Mathematics is Good for the Soul', in T. Smiley, ed., Mathematics and Necessity in the History of Philosophy (Oxford, 2000)
- Charlton, William, *Philoponus: On Aristotle On the Intellect* (London & Ithaca, NY, 1991)
- Cornford, F.M., Plato's Cosmology (London, 1937)
- Dillon, John M., The Middle Platonists (London & Ithaca, NY, 1977/1996)
- Fine, Gail, On Ideas: Aristotle's Criticism of Plato's Theory of Forms (Oxford, 1993)
- Fine, Gail, ed., Plato 1: Metaphysics and Epistemology (Oxford, 1999)
- Gilbert, Otto, Die Meteorologischen Theorien des griechischen Altertums (Leipzig, 1907)
- Ginzel, F.K., Handbuch der mathematischen und technischen Chronologie (Leipzig, 1906)
- Gundel, H., 'Zodiakos', in G. Wissowa and W. Kroll, eds, Realencyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft XA coll. 462,14-709,55
- Lang, H.S. and H.D. Macro, Proclus, On the Eternity of the World (De Aeternitate Mundi) (Berkeley & London, 2001)
- Leggatt, Stuart, Aristotle: On the Heavens I and II (Warminster, 1995)
- Nehemas, Alexander, 'Plato on the Imperfection of the Sensible World', American Philosophical Quarterly 12 (1975), 105-17; repr. in G. Fine, ed., Plato 1: Metaphysics and Epistemology (Oxford, 1999)
- Neuberger, A., *The Technical Arts and Sciences of the Ancients*, trans. Henry L. Brose (London, 1930)
- Scholten, C., Johannes Philoponos, De Opificio Mundi (Über die Erschaffung der Welt), 3 vols (Freiburg, 1997)
- Sedley, David, "Becoming like God" in the Timaeus and Aristotle', in T. Calvo and L. Brisson, eds, *Interpreting the Timaeus-Critias* (Sankt Augustin, 1997)
- Share, M., Philoponus: Against Proclus On the Eternity of the World 1-5 (London & Ithaca, NY, 2004)
- Sharples, R.W. and A. Sheppard, eds, *Ancient Approaches to Plato's Timaeus*, BICS Supplement 78 (2003)
- Skemp, J.B., Plato's Theory of Motion in Plato's Later Dialogues (Amsterdam, 1967)
- Smiley, Timothy, ed., Mathematics and Necessity in the History of Philosophy (Oxford, 2000)
- Sodano, A.R., ed., Porphyrii in Platonis Timaeum Commentariorum Fragmenta (Naples, 1964)

- Solmsen, F., Aristotle's System of the Physical World (Ithaca, NY, 1960)
- Sorabji, Richard, Time, Creation and the Continuum (London, 1983)
- Sorabji, Richard, ed., Aristotle Transformed: The Ancient Commentators and Their Influence (London & Ithaca, NY, 1990)
- Sorabji, Richard, 'The Mind-Body Relation in the Wake of Plato's Timaeus', in G. Reydams-Schils, ed., Plato's Timaeus as Cutural Icon (Notre Dame, 2002)
- Sorabji, Richard, The Philosophy of the Commentators, 200-600 AD, 3 vols (London & Ithaca, NY, 2003)
- Steel, Carlos, 'Why Should We Prefer Plato's *Timaeus* to Aristotle's *Physics*? Proclus' Critique of Aristotle's Causal Explanation of the Physical World', in R.W. Sharples and A. Sheppard, eds, *Ancient Approaches to Plato's Timaeus*, BICS Supplement 78 (2003)
- Taylor, A.E., A Commentary on Plato's Timaeus (Oxford, 1928)
- Verrycken, K., 'The Development of Philoponus' Thought and its Chronology', in R. Sorabji, ed., Aristotle Transformed: The Ancient Commentators and Their Influence (London & Ithaca, NY, 1990)
- Wilberding, J., Plotinus' Cosmology. A Study of Ennead II 1 (40), Text, Translation and Commentary (Oxford, 2006)
- Wildberg, C., *Philoponus: Against Aristotle on the Eternity of the World* (London & Ithaca, NY, 1987)
- Wildberg, C., 'Impetus Theory and the Hermeneutics of Science in Simplicius and Philoponus', *Hyperboreus* 5 (St Petersburg, 1999), 107-24

abandonment: parakhôrêsis absence: apousia absolutely: haplôs, pantôs absurd: atopos absurdity: apoklêrôsis accept: apodekhesthai, lambanein accidental: sumbebêkos accomplish: sumperainein accord: sumphônia accordant: emmelês account: logos acquired / by acquisition: epiktêtos acquisition: epiktêsis act (v.): dran, energein action: ergon, praxis active: drastêrios activity: energeia actually: energeia(i), kat' energeian adapted to: harmozein add: epipherein, episunaptein, sunarithmein addition: prosthêkê additionally, come to: epiginesthai admit: epidekhesthai advance: proêkein advantage(ous): sumpheron advocate: sunêgoros aerial: aerion affected, be: paskhein affection: pathos agree: homologein, sunkhôrein agreement: sumphônos air traveller: aeroporos air: *aêr* alien: xenos alive, be: zên all at once: athroon allot: aponemein allow: sungignôskein alternately / by alternation: enallax always: aei ambiguity: amphibolia

analogy: analogia ancestor: progonos angel: angelos appear: phainesthai, phantazesthai appearing: proskhêma appetite: epithumia apprehend: antilambanein apprehension: antilêpsis, noêsis appropriate (adj.): oikeios appropriate (v.): oikeioun appropriate, be: prosêkei aquatic: enudron argument: epikheirêma, epikheirêsis, logos, sullogismos articulate: diarthroun articulately: diarthrômenôs ascending: anôphoros assemble: suntithenai, tiktein assertion: apophansis, protasis assign: prosnemein assimilate: proseikazein associate: prosoikeioun association: oikeiôsis assume: hupokeisthai, hupolambanein, hupotithenai, lambanein, prolambanein, tithenai assumption: hupolêpsis, hupothesis attach: periaptein, prosharmozein attempt: epikheirêsis attention to, give: *ephistanein* attention: epistasia attribute: paragein bad: phlauros

bad: phathros balance: summetria base: basis be: huparkhein, einai befit: prosêkein beget: gennan begin together with: sunarkhesthai beginning: arkhê

beginningless / without beginning: anarkhos and anarkhôs being: ousiôsis belief: doxa believe: doxazein, pisteuein belong: huparkhein better: kreittos between, what is: anameson bind: sundeein binding together: *sundetikos* bitter: pikros blaspheme: asebein blasphemous: asebês blind: *tuphlos* blood: haima bodilv in form: sômatoeidês body: soma bond: desmos, sundesmon bone: ostoun book: logos borrow: daneizesthai breath: pneuma brief: suntomos bring forth: paragein bring forward: propherein broider figures: diazôgraphoun build: oikodomoun builder: oikodomos building: oikia burn up: phlegein burn: exhaptein

cacophonous: kakophônos capacity: dunamis, hexis care about: phrontizein carpenter: tektôn cause: aitia. aitios cause, able to: parektikos cause, without: anaitiôs caustic: kaustikos celestial: ouranios chance: tukhê change (n.): metabolê change (v.): ameibeisthai. metaballein changing: *metabasis* chapter: logos characterize: eidopoiein, kharaktêrizein charcoal: anthrax choice, without: aproairetôs circle: kuklos

circle, be carried around in a: kuklophoreisthai circle, move in a: kuklophorêtikos circuit: periodos circular journey, complete a: ekperierkhesthai clash: makhê class: genos clear: enargês clear, what is: enargeia clearly: enargôs, phainesthai, phanerôs cleverly: kompsôs client: *sunêgoroumenos* cling to: antekhesthai coalition: homologia co-everlasting: *sunaidion* co-exist: sunuparkhein coherence: sunokhe cold: psukhros coldness: psuxis colour: khrôma combination: sunkrima combining: sunthesis come to be: ginesthai come to be in: engignesthai commentary: hupomnêmata commentate: hupomnêmatizesthai commentators, previous: proupomnêmatisamenoi committed to: antekhesthai common. have in: koinônein compelling: anankaios complete (adj.): panteles, sumplêrôtikos, teleios complete (v.): sumperainein, teleioun complete, help: suntelein completely: pantelôs, teleiôs: compose: sunistênai, suntithenai composed, be: sunkeisthai, sunthetos composite: sunamphoteron. sunthetos, sustatos composition: sunthesis, sustasis compound: sunkrama comprehended, be: *perilêpton* compression: pilêsis concealment: epikrupsis concede: khôrein, sunkhôrein concede beforehand: prohomologein conceive: epinoein, huponoein, noein conception: ennoia, noêsis concise: suntomôs conclude: perigraphein

conclusion: kataskeuê conclusion, reach a: sullogizesthai condition: prosdiorismos confirm: prosmarturein conflict: makhê conflict, be in: makhesthai confuse: sunkhein congenital: suntrophos consequence: akolouthos, parepomenos consequence, be a: akolouthein, hepesthai consequently: akolouthôs consider: epinoiein, episkopein, theôrein consideration: ennoia consistent(ly): sumphônos constituted, be: sunistênai constitution: sunkrasis, sustasis consume: kataphlegein contain: periekhein contemplation: theôrein continually: kata sunekheian, sunekhês continuous: sunekhês contradict: anteipein, makhesthai contradiction: antiphasis, enantiôsis contradictory: enantios contrariety: enantiôsis contrary, extreme: enantiôtatos contrary: enantios contrasting affection: antipatheia contrivance: mêkhanêma contrive: mêkhanasthai converge: sunneuein conversation: sunousia converse: dialegesthai conversion by negation: antistrophê sun antithesei convert: antistrephein convince: *peithein* corporeal: *sômatikos*, *sômatoeidês* corporealize: sômatousthai corresponding affection: sumpatheia cosmic: enkosmios cosmos: kosmos craftsman: tekhnitês create: dêmiourgein creation (act of): dêmiourgia creation (product of): dêmiourgêma creative: dêmiourgikos creator: to dêmiourgoun, dêmiourgos credible: pistos

criticize: anteirêsthai, sukophantein cube: kubos cubical: kubikos cutting: tmêtikos darken: suskiazein darkness: skotos death: thanatos deceive: parakrouein declare: endeiknusthai, mênuein, sunêgorein deduce: sullogizesthai deficient: elleipos define: horizesthai definition: horismos, horos degree: moira deliver: apodidonai demonstrate: apodeiknunai dense: pakhumerês dense, become: puknousthai deny: anairein depart: apoleipein depth: bathos derive: sterein deserve: axios desirable: *orektos* desire: orexis destroyed, be: phtheirein destroyed together, be: sunanaireisthai destructible: phthartos destruction: phthora destructive: *phthartikos* determine: horizesthai develop: diaplassein dialectical: dialektikos differ: *diapherein* difference (substantial): diaphora, diaphorotês different: alloios, exêllagmenos difficulty: aporia discordant(ly): *plêmmelôs* discourse : dialegesthai discursive: metabatikos disorder: ataxia disordered: ataktos disorderly manner, in a: ataktôs dispense: nemein displace: existanai disproportional: alogôs dissimilar: anomoios dissolution: dialusis. lusis dissolve: dialuein

distant, be: apekhein diversity: poikilia divide: merizein, sundiairein divided, be: summerizesthai divided, become: sundiistanai dividedness: meristos divine: theios division: tmêma do: dran doctrine: dogma dodecahedron: dôdekahedron dodginess: strophê dog: kunos dogs, little: kunidia dogstar: kuôn door: thura doubt: aporein doubtless: amelei draw: eklegesthai drive: hêniokhein dry: xêros dryness: *xêrotês* dye (v.): baptein ear: ako(u)ê earth: gê earthy: geêros, geôdês

ebony: ebenos education: agôgê effective: drastikos effervescence: apanthisma efficacy: drastêrios efficient: poiêtikos elaboration: epexergasia element: stoikheion elemental: stoikheiôdos eliminate: anairein embrace: aspazesthai, perilambanein embryo: embruon empty: kenos enclose in: *enapokleiein* encompass: *periekhein* end: telos end, without: ateloutêtos enjoy: apolauein enmattered: enulon ensemble: holotês ensouled: empsukhos entangle: *sumpodizein* entitle: epigraphein epilogue: epilogos eponymously: epônumôs equiangular: isogônios

equilateral: *isopleuros* erect: sunhistênai eristically: kat' erin escape: ekpheugein establish: kataskeuazein, pistousthai eternal: aiônios, diaiônios eternally: *aiôniôs* eternity: aiôn ethereal: aitherios evaporate: diapnein everlasting: aïdios, eis apeiron everlastingness: to aei, aidiotês evidence: marturia, pistis evil (adj.): kakos evil (n.): kakia, ponêria examination: episkepsis, exetasis examine: episkepsesthai, exetazein exceed: paradramein excess: huperbolê, huperokhê exegesis: exêgêsis exegete: exêgêtês exhibit: endeiknusthai exist: huparkhein, huphistenai exist in: enuparkhein exist, cause to: huphistenai existence: huparxis, hupostasis existence, capable of bringing into: hupostatikos existence, precede in: prouparkhein existence together, come into: sunuphistasthai experienced: empeiros expertise: tekhnê explicitly: diarrhêdên expound: *exêgeisthai* expound beforehand: proektithenai extend: *ekteinein*, *sumparateinein* extended: diastatos extended period: paratasis extended. be: sundiistanai extendedly: diastatôs extension: diastasis, paratasis extremes: akra

façade: proskhêma face: hedra fact: pragma fall: peripiptein fall (of Man): olisthos fall short: apodein fallacy: paralogismos false account, give a: katapseudesthai

146

fashion: eidopoiein father: *patêr* fear: phobos feasible, not: amêkhanon feature: *idiotês* fiery: purios, purôdês figure: schema fill completely: sumplêroun, sumplêrôtikos fill up: anaplêroun final: telikos finger: daktulos fire (n.): pur fire (v.): puraktoun fish: enhudron fit together: harmozein, sunarmozein fitting: prosphoros fixed: aplanês flame: phlox flesh: sarx flow out: *aporrein* fly (v.): hiptasthai follow: akolouthein, hepesthai, sunagein follows, what: akolouthos foot long: podiaios footed: hupopodos, pezos footless: apous force (n.): bia, iskhus force (v.): anankazein, sunelaunein force (out) (v.): ekbiazein force, have: anankaios force, have no: anankastikos foreign: allotrios, ekphulo foreknow: pronoein foreknowledge: pronoia, prognosis forever: eis apeiron forget: epilanthanein form: eidos, idea form, give: eidopoiein form, having same: homoeidês form, without: aneideos formation: diamorphôsis, sustasis forms, creation of: eidopoiia friendless: aphilos

generated: genêtos generation: genesis gentle: êremaion geometry: geômetria get: proslambanein give: apodidonai give off: aphienai go all the way around: ekperipolein god: theos God, theorist of: theologos God, theorize about: *theologein* gods, account of the: theologia gold: khrusos good: agathos goodness: agathotês grant: aphorizein, kharizesthai, sunkhôrein grant beforehand: proomologein grow: auxanein growth: auxêsis guesswork: stokhasmos guide: huphêgeisthai hammer together: sunelaunein hand: kheir hard to find: aporos harmonize with: sumphônein hasten: speudein have come to: *ephêkein* hear: akouein heat: thermotês heated, be: thermainesthai heaven: ouranos heaviness: barutês heavy: barus heliotropes: hêliotropia here: entautha horse: hippos hot: thermos hint at: ainittesthai hold together: sunekhein homoiomerous: homoiomerês homonymously: homônumôs homonymy: homônumia horizontally: epi ta plagia, kata ta plagia hostile: polemios hour: *hôras* house: oikia human: anthrôpinos hypothesis: hupothesis hypothetically: kat' hupothesin icosahedron: eikosahedron

identity: tautotês idle chatter: adoleskhia ignorance: anepistêmosunê ignorant, be: agnoein ill-defined: amudros illuminate: katalampein, photizein

image: eikôn imitate: *mimeisthai* imitation: *mimêsis* immaterial: ahulos immeasurable: ametrôs immediate(ly): amesôs, parakhrêma immobile: akinêtos immobility: ametakinêtos immortal: athanatos immortality: athanasia impassive: apathês imperfect: atelês imperishable: anôlethros impiously: atheôs implant: endidonai imply: sunagein important: axios impose: epitithenai impulse: hormê inability: adunamia inalterable: analloiôtos inarticulate: adiarthrôton inborn: emphutos incident: pathos inclination: rhopê incomparable: asunkritos incomplete: atelês inconsistency: antiphasis, asumphônia inconsistent, be: makhesthai incorporeal: asômatos incorruptible: adiaphthoros increase (n.): auxêsis increase (v.): auxanein indefinite: ahoristos indestructibility: aphtharsia indestructible: adiaphthartos, aphthartos indicative: dêlôktikos indissolubility: to adialuton indissoluble: adialutos individual: atomos indivisibility: amereia indivisible: adiairetos, amerês, ameristos indivisibly: adiairetôs, amerôs inescapable: aphuktos inexperienced: apeiros inexpressible: arrhêtos infer: sullogizesthai, sunagein inference: sullogismos infinite / infinitely many: apeiros infinity: apeiria, to apeiron

innate: sumphutos inquiry: zêtêsis instrument: organon, to organikon intellect: nous intellection: noêma intellective: noeros intelligence: phronêsis intelligible: noêtos intermediate: mesos, mesotês interpret: exêgeisthai, hupomnêmatizesthai interpretation: exêgêsis intertwine: sumplekein introduce: eisphrein, epagein, epeisagein, paragein, proballein introduce, anticipate and: proeisêgeisthai introduction: paragôgê, parhodos invariably: pantôs invent: anaplassein investigate: zêtein iron: sidêros irrational: alogos

join substantially: *sunousioun* join to: *sunaptein* join together: *episunaptein* joint ownership: *koinônein* joy: *khara* judge (v.): *krinesthai* just (adv.): *artiôs* just now: *parakhrêma*

keep together: *sunekhein* kin: *oikeios, sungenes* kind: *genos* kind, only member of its: *monogenês* king: *basileus* kinship: *sungeneia, sungenes* knowledge: *epistêmê, gnosis* knowledge, object of: *gnôstos*

land creature: khersaios largeness: megethos launch: exakontizein learn: manthanein leave: hupoleipein, kataleipein leg: skelos lend: daneizein letter (postal): epistolê letters (alphabetical): grammata life: bios lifeless: apsukhos

148

light (not heavy): kouphos lightness: kouphotês light: phôs light, bear: photizein lightning: astrapê like: paraplêsion like, make: exomoioun likeness: homoiôsis, homoiotês limited: *peperasmenos* line: rhêtos line of reasoning: agôgê listen: akouein little (very): brakhutatos living thing: $z\hat{o}(i)on$ local: topikos logic of the argument: *tês tou logou* akolouthias lose: ekpiptein loss, be at a: aporein lot: moira love: erôs lower (v.): katapherein lunar: selêniakos

machine: mêkhanê, mêkhanêma maintain: diakratein maintain earnestly: diateinesthai make: apergazesthai, poiein maker: poiêtês man: anêr, anthrôpos manner: tropos mark: *tupos* mathematical: mathêmatikos matrimony: gamos matter: hulê matter, having same: homoulês mean: mesos meaning: dianoia, huponoia menses: katamênia mention above: proekkeisthai method: *methodos* middle: mesos mildly: prosênôs misinterpretation: parexêgêsis mislead: paralogismos misrepresent: sukophantein missing, be: elleipein, leipein misunderstand: parakouein mix (v.): epimignusthai mixture: epimixia, krasis, mixis mode (syllogistic): tropos modelling: diaplasis moist: hugros

moistness: hugrotês moon: selênê mortal: thnêtos motionless: akinêtos move: drattesthai, kinein, metabainein move along with: sunkinein move back and forth: metarrhein move in a straight line: euthuporeisthai movement / motion: kinesis, phora multiple / multiplied, be: plêthunein multiply: sumplêthunein mutilated: kolobos

name (v.): eponazein natural: phusikos naturally: phusikôs, kata phusin nature: phusis nature, of a different: heterophuês nature, of same: homophuês necessary, be: anankaios necessitate: anankazein necessity: anankê next: ephexês non-discursive: ametabatos non-discursively: ametabatôs now: loipon now ... now: pote ... pote number: arithmos numerically: kat' arithmon nurse: tithênê. trophos

oak-wood: drus oath: horkos object (v.): enistenai objection: enstasis obscure: suskiazein observe: katanoein, theôrein obtain, not to: anupostatos obviously: phainesthai occupy: katalambanein octahedron: octahedron at odds, be: *polemein* old age: gêras opined: doxastos opinion: dogma opinion, form an: doxazein opinions, voice: apheinai phônas oppose: apokrouesthai opposed, be: antikeisthai opposite: antikeimenon, enantios order (n.): taxis

order (v.): kosmein, prostassein, tassein. diatassesthai ordered / the ordered state: to tetagmenon ordered. well: eutaktos ordering: suntaxis orderly arrangement: diakosmos organization: diorganôsis outright: antikrus own: idios, oikeios pace with, keep: isodromein papyrus: papuros paradigm: paradeigma paradigms, as: paradeigmatikôs part: meros. morion parts, divided in: *meristos* particular: merikos passage: khôrion, khrêsis, lexis, rhêsis, topos passage, supporting: marturia passionate: empathês particular (thing): atomos path: hodos pay back: apodidonai peak: koruphê pedagogical reasons, for: didaskalias kharin pedagogy: didaskalia penetrating: diitêtikos pentagon: pentagônon perceptible: aisthêtos perception: aesthesis perfect: teleios perish: phtheirein, phthinein persist: diamenein persuade: *peithein* philosopher: philosophos philosopher, foremost natural: phusikôtatos philosophy: philosophia philosophy, natural: ta phusika phrase: rhêsis physical: *phusikos* physical theory, give a: *phusiologein* piece: morion pinnacle: akrotês place (n.): khôra, thesis, topos place (v.): *tithenai*

place in: entithenai

plantain: thruallis

plane: *epipedon*

plant: phuton

Plato enthusiasts: philoplatônes plausible: *pithanos* pleased: areskesthai pleasure: hêdonê poetic: poiêtikos point (n.): sêmeion point (v.): akmazein portray: eikazein position: doxa, skhesis, thesis possible, as much as: hôs dunamis potentially: dunamei power: dunamis praver: *litê* prearrange: prooikonomein precede: proagein precursor: prodromos predominate: epikratein premise: protasis prepare: paraskeuazein present (adj.): entautha, prokeimenos present (v.): proagein present, be: pareinai preserve: sô(i)zein presumably: *dêpou* pretext: proskhêma principle : arkhê, axiôma, logos privation: sterêsis problem: problêma proclaim: boan produce: apotelein, ergazesthai produce in: engannan product: *apotelesma*, *aitiatos* productive: paraktikos profess: epangellein prohibition: aboulêsai prolong: *ekteinein* proof: apodeixis proof, without: anapodeiktôs proper: oikeios properly: kuriôs property: *idiotês* prophetically: mantikôs proportion: analogia proportionate: *analogos* provide (for): *parekhein*, *pronoein* prudent, be: phronein psychic: psukhikos psychogony: psukhogonia punish: kolazesthai punishment: atê purity: katharotês put forth: aphienai put up with: perimenein

puzzle: aporêma pyramid: *puramis* pyramid-shaped: puramoeidês qualification: diorismos, prosdiorismos qualification, without: aprosdioristôs qualified, be: pepoiôsthai quality: poiotês quantity: poson radiation: ellampsis rare: leptomerês rarefied, become: manousthai rarity: leptotês rational: logikos reader: entunkanôn reason (n.): aitia reason (v.): sullogizesthai reasonable / reasonably: eikotôs, eulogos reasoning: logismos receive: lambanein, paralambanein receptive: dektikos receptacle: hupodokhê reciprocate: amoibaios recognize: sungignôskein rectilinear: euthugrammos recycle: anakukloun reduce: apagein reductio ad absurdum: apagôgê eis atopon refer: anapherein, apopheresthai reflect: ennoiein refutation: elengkhos, lusis refute: apelenkhein, elengkhein refute, anticipate and: proanairein reject: athetein rejecting: athetêsis relation: skhesis relative: pros ti remain: *leipein* remaining: loipon reminder: hupomnêsis remove: *methistanai* renounce: apeirein repair: anuphainein rescind: diagraphein resemble: eikazein resistant: antitupêtikos respective: oikeios responsibility: aitia responsible: aitios

responsible, not: anaitios rest: *êremia* restoration: epanorthôsis, episkeuê restore: episkeuazesthai restored: episkeuastos return: apokathistasthai revert: *metapiptein* revolution: apokatastasis, periphora revolution, complete it: eis to auto sêmeion apokathistasthai revolve with: sumperithein rightly: emmelôs rise: anatellein rotate: epanastrephein rule: basileuein salty: halmuros sameness: tautotês savage: barbaros school: diatribê, hairesis science: epistêmê scribe: grapheus seated, be: kathidrusthai secret, in: di'aporrêton section: perikopê see: horan, sunoran seem: phainesthai seize hold: drattesthai select: eklegesthai self-evidence: enargeia self-substantial: authupostatos self-sufficient: autarkês sense: ennoia senseless: alogos senseless pride: agnômosunê separation: khôrismos separate (adj.): khôristos separate (v.): khôrizein separate off: diakrinein separated off: apokrinesthai serious: pragmateiôdês serviceable: euergos set (v.): dunein set forth: ektiteshtai set over: ephestêkuios shadow: skia shamelessness: anaideia shape (v.): morphoun shaped, poorly: kakomorphos shapeless: amorphous share: koinônein shift: methistanai

shine: epilampein

ship: naus, ploion shipmaker: *naupêgos* shipmaking: naupêgein show: deiknunai, epideiknunai, hupodeiknunai, paristanai side: pleura side with: epikrinein sight: opsis simple: haplous simultaneously: hama sing: aidein singular: exairetos sketch: skiagraphia sketch out: skiagraphein skilled: deinos sleep: hupnos slip: exolisthainein smallness: smikrotês smooth. make: xeein snow: khiôn solid: stereos solve: epiluein son: huios sophism: sophisma sophist: sophists sophistical: sophistikos sort: genos soul: psukhê source: aitios space: khôra speak at length: *mêkunein ton logon* species: eidos specifically: idikos speech: rhêsis sperm: sperma sphere: sphaira sphere-shaped: sphairoeidês spherical: sphairikos spirit: pneuma spontaneity: automaton spontaneously: *ex automatou* square: tetragônos squeeze together: sunthlibein stability: stasimos star: aster star, carrying no: anastros starting point: aphormê, arkhê state: diathesis, hexis statement: lexis, phone static condition: stasis statue: andrias steady: hedraios steer: kubernein

steersman: kubernêtês, nauagion stone: lithos story: *mythos* straight: euthus straight, go: euthuphoreisthai straight line, in a: ep'euthu straight line, move in a: euthuporeisthai stretch: neneukenai strife: eris strive: ephiesthai strong: iskhuros structure: oikonomia student: mathêtês subject: hupokeimenon, skemma subject to, be: hupopeptôkenai sublunar: entautha, têde substance: ousia substantive: ousiôdês substratum: hupokeimenon successor: diadokhos suffer: *paskhein* suffering: pathos suffice: exarkein sufficient: autarkês, hikanos sufficiently: hikanôs, metriôs suitable: epitêdeios suitable, be: prosêkein summarize: sullêbdên sun: hêlios supervene: epiginesthai, episumbainein supervening manner, in a: epigenêtôs support: paristanai suppose: ennoiein, huponoein, hupotithenai, tithenai surely: amelei, pantôs surge back again: *antimetarrein* surround: periekhein, periistasthai suspect: hupopteuein sustain: sôstikos sweet: glukus swim: nêkhesthai syllogism: sullogismos symbolic: sumbolikos synonymously: sunônumôs

take: lambanein, paralambanein take away: apoleipein take hold: drattesthai, epilambanesthai take on: anapherein take up again: epanalambanein taking up again: epanalêpsis talented: eumêkhanon teach: didaskein, ekpaideuein teacher: didaskalos, huphêgetês teaching: didaskalia temporal: khronikos testimony: marturia text: lexis then: *loipon* theory: theôria therefore: enteuthen thesis: thesis thick: trugôdes thing: pragma think: noein thought: dianoia, ennoia, epinoia, logos, noêma, noêsis thought, apart from: artheisês tês epinoias throw out: ekballein time: khronos time, at one ... at another: pote ... pote time, at some: pote time, at the same: hama time, since the beginning of: ex aïdiou timeless: akhronos together: hama topic: topos touch (n.): haphê touch (v.): ephaptesthai, thinganein trace: ikhnê transcend: exê(i)rêsthai, huperanabainein transform: alloioun transformation: alloiôsis transparent: diaphanês treatise: logos, pragmateia triangle: trigônon troublesome: karteros true: alêthes, alêthinon true to, be: pistousthai truth: alêthia trustworthy: axiopistis type: analogia

unchanged: *akinêtos* unchangeable: *atreptos* unchanging: *ametabatos* unchangingly: *ametabatôs* unclear: *adêlos* undemonstrated: *anapodeiktos* underlie: hupokeisthai underlies, what: hupokeimenon understand: akouein, ekdekhesthai, ennoiein, manthanein, noein understanding: dianoia, noêsis undertake: proupotithenai undissolved: adialutos unextended: adiastatos unextendedly: adiastatôs ungenerated: agenetos ungeneratedness: agenêsia unharmonious: aphônos uniform: henoeidês uniform manner, in a: henoeidôs uniformity: henoeidês uninterruptedly: adiakopon union: sumpnoia, henôsis unit: monas unitary: henaios unite: henousthai. sunenoun universal: katholou universe: *ouranos* unlit, utterly: aphôtistos unmeasured: ametros unmixed: amikton, eilikrinês unmoving / unmoved: akinêtos unreceptive: adektos unrefuted: anelenktos unseen: aphanês unserviceable: dusergos unstable: euolisthos, olisthos unsuitable: anepitêdeios

vague indication: tupos vapour: atmis variance with, at: *asumphônos* variety / variation: exallagê vary: sumpoikillesthai Venus: hesperos verbatim: epi lexeôs vertex: koruphê villainous: kakourgos violent: iskhuros virtually: dunamei virtue: arête visible: horômenos, horatos vision: horasis vital: zôtikos vitalizing: zôopoios

wagon: *harma* walk: *herpein* wandering: *planômenos*

war: polemos war with, be at: polemein waste time: endiatribein water: hudôr water, rough: kludôn wax: kêros way of life: agôgê weave: diaplekein white: leukos well, at all: pantokalôs wicked: ponêros will: boulêsis wind: pneuma winged: ptênos winter: kheimôn wise: sophos wish (v.): (e)thelein withdraw with: sunaphistasthai without: khôris wood: xulon word: lexis, rhêtos World-Soul: hê tou pantos psukhê worry: okhlêsis write: graphein write a letter: epistellein wrong: enklêma

Zodiac(al): zôdion

154

Greek-English Index

- aboulêsia, prohibition, 560,18
- *adektos*, unreceptive, 613,11.14; 630,25.26; 631,4
- *adêlos*, unclear, 468,27; 484,5
- *adiaireton*, indivisible, 570,9; 573,29
- adiairetôs, indivisibly, 570,20
- adiakopos, uninterruptedly, 595,23
- *adialutos*, undissolved, 494,10; 598,23; 638,14; indissoluble, 595,20; 597,16.25; *to adialuton*, indissolubility, 597,17.19
- *adiaphoron*, it makes no difference, 594,13
- *adiaphthartos*, indestructible, 589,13
- adiaphthoros, incorruptible, 593,1
- adiarthrôton, inarticulate, 543,1-5
- *adiastatos*, unextended, 575,6; *adiastatôs*, unextendedly, without extension, 569,17; 573,8; 575,20
- adiexitêton, not traversable, 619,15
- adoleskhia, idle chatter, 531,25
- adunamia, inability, 473,26
- aei, always, 466,3 and passim; to aei, everlastingness, 549,17-550,9; to aei, always existing, 475,2; 552,12.19; 558,18; 584,22.23
- $a\hat{er}$, air, 489,16; 490,19; 493,21; 499,12; 504,13; 506,3.4.18; 515,1ff.; 521,6ff.; 532,11; 536,5; 596,1.18
- aerion, aerial, 509,8
- aeroporos, air traveller, 516,27
- agathos, good, 475,1 and passim
- agathotês, goodness, 544,18
- *agenêsia*, ungeneratedness, 562,17; 607,8; 634,15
- *agenêtos*, ungenerated, 478,11 and *passim*

- *agnoein*, to be ignorant (of), not to know, 484,14; 579,21; 581,21; 582,10; 582,6.10.13; 583,1.6.8
- agnômosunê, senseless pride, 482,16
- *agôgê*, line of reasoning, 591,16; education, 643,7; 644,14
- ahoristos, indefinite, 623,8
- *ahulos*, immaterial, 468,22; 470,1.10
- *aidein*, to sing, 483,9

aïdios, everlasting, 467,11 and *passim; ex aidiou*, since the beginning of time, 468,20; 474,6

- *aidiotês*, everlastingness, 530,16; 608,7
- ainittesthai, to hint at, 532,18

aiôn, eternity, 553,23.24; 554,14.18; 555,12; 556,7.17; 558,21; 559,15; 575,17; 607,25; 608,7.10; 618,7.9.18

- *aiônios*, eternal, eternity, 472,5; 549,9-553,24; 556,11-559,9; 562,9; 608,10; 610,14; 613,6; 618,2; 626,6
- aiôniôs, eternally, 544,20
- *aisthêsis*, perception, 520,12; 525,20; 581,18; 621,8
- *aisthêtos*, perceptible, 511,21.24; 521,23; 621,10; 637,23.25.28; 639,21
- *aitherios*, ethereal, 492,8; 519,17
- *aitia*, cause, 467,14-470,18; 474,27; 476,9; 504,17; 528,8; 537,11; 585,17; 604,20-605,3; 607,10.12; 611,10.11; 623,20.24; 624,23; 636,5; 638,26-639,24; responsibility, 566,17; reason, 474,7; 497,26; 498,3; 514,15; 536,11.12; 561,27; 572,8; 611,5; 632,19
- aitiatos, product, 478,22; 488,24

- *aitios*, cause, 467,13-471,25; 473,24; 476,24-6; 478,22; 488,23-7; 498,1.21; 504,22.27; 508,17; 523,23; 543,4.6; 565,24; 566,16; 567,10; 573,16.28; 578,22; 579,22; 623,13-24; 624,25; 627,5; 639,10-640,8; 645,5; responsible, 538,3; 539,8.14; source, 594,15
- *akhronos*, timeless, 563,17; *akhronôs*, timelessly, 472,17; 476,15; 568,28; 575,20
- *akinêtos*, motionless, unmoving, 489,14; 613,2; 490,16; immobile, 539,5; 542,12.17; unchanged, 599,7; unmoved, 627,5
- akmazein, to point, 612,8
- akoê, ear (akouê), 582,21
- *akolouthein*, to follow, to be a consequence, 494,17; 525,15; 593,25; 608,27; 609,4.5.9; 611,1; 632,2; 632,27
- akolouthia, tês tou logou akolouthias, the logic of the argument, 612,25
- *akolouthos*, consequence, what follows, 508,1; 592,9; 633,20; 635,25
- *akolouthôs*, in turn, 580,3; consequently, 634,20; subsequently, 635,10
- *akouein*, to hear, 512,6; 514,15; 520,15; 526,11; 582,4; 624,13; 625,6; 634,13; 640,15; 641,20.22; 643,1.2; to listen, 582,19; 633,20; 634,17; 642,1; to understand, 529,3; 559,10; to see (in sense of understand), 597,3; to see (in sense of witness), 577,1; to take (in sense of understand), 634,14
- *akra*, extremes, 515,17-516,19; 521,12-22; 526,2; 605,14
- *akribôs*, (to know) well, 502,8; clearly, 514,16; precisely, 531,4; 638,1; carefully, 553,5; *akribês*, strict, 551,7; 557,25; *akribesteron*, more carefully, 507,13; more precise(ly), 522,22; 528,26; 533,16
- *akrotês*, pinnacle, 518,18; 523,18; 524,6.10.13
- alêtheia, truth, 484,9 and passim
- alêthes, true, 467,8 and passim
- alêtheuein, to be true, 490,14
- alêthinon, true, 517,5

alloios, different, 466,11; 616,2.8

- *alloiôsis*, transformation, 530,21; 610,10; 614,5-616,24; 627,17
- *alloioun*, to undergo transformation, to transform, 501,8; 614,7; 615,5; 617,6
- *allotrios*, foreign, 486,9; 496,25; 497,14; 597,2; 639,14; another's, 635,2
- *alogos*, irrational, 486,21; 581,17; 583,9; 621,8; senseless, 539,14; *alogôs*, disproportional, 542,5
- *alutos*, indissoluble, 514,7; 527,22; 548,6; 596,10; 597,5.22; 599,13; 601,1; 638,11
- ameibeisthai, to change, 502,26
- *amêkhanon*, not feasible, 516,10; 587,22; 605,18; 607,4-15
- *amelei*, doubtless, surely, 491,4; 492,23; 495,13; 504,21; 534,8
- amereia, indivisibility, 584,20
- *amerês*, indivisible, 472,16; 570,15; 563,23; 575,5.21; 584,4
- *ameristos*, indivisible, 563,17; 617,16
- *amerôs*, indivisibly, without division, 568,27; 569,17; 570,23; 571,4.7.9; 577,14
- amesôs, immediate, 578,22; immediately, 493,2
- *ametabatos*, unchanging, 570,9; 573,29; non-discursive, 577,16
- *ametabatôs*, unchangingly, 570,20-571,10; 573,16; non-discursively, 577,14
- *ametablêtos*, unchangeable, without change, 466,15; 620,21; 638,5
- ametakinêtos, immobility, 534,16
- *ametros*, unmeasured, 542,5;
- *ametrôs*, immeasurable, 635,16 *amikton*, unmixed, 531,5
- *amoibaios*, to alternate, 585,10
- amorphos, shapeless, 547,6; 585,26
- amphibolia, ambiguity, 512,19
- amudros, vague, 542,19
- anaideia, shamelessness, 482,7; 531,10
- *anairein*, to deny, 496,23; 498,17; 499,2; 502,1; 517,10; to eliminate, to do away with, to remove, 559,3.10; 561,3; 577,24.27; destroy, 576,23

anaitios, not responsible, 566,17.19.27; *anaitiôs*, without cause, 639,16

anakukloun, to recycle, 612,2

analloiôtos, inalterable, 466,15

analogia, proportion, 513,10; 514,6; 518,16; 527,20; analogy, 536,24.26; type, 568,13

analogos, proportionate, proportionally, 521,14.20; 529,8

anameson, what is between, 520,17; 521,6

anankaios, must, to be necessary, 467,11; 490,2; 505,5; 537,14; 574,4; 576,20; 578,27; 605,13; to have force, to be compelling, 477,7; 481,10; 517,11; 634,4; 635,1

anankastikos, ouden anankastikon ekhein, to have no force, 476,19

- *anankazein*, to necessitate, 469,1; to force, 479,24; 487,17; 496,22; 499,15; 504,4; 565,12; 612,25; 617,7; to contend, 572,23
- *anapherein*, to refer to, 506,24; to take on, 534,20
- anaplassein, to invent, 531,23
- anaplêroun, to fill up, 595,26

anapodeiktos, undemonstrated, 541,11; 600,9; anapodeiktôs, without proof, 555,16

- *anarkhos*, without beginning, beginningless, 469,2-13; 470,17; 548,3; 553,2; 556,12; 557,22; 561,20; 564,11; 568,2; 572,21; 619,5; *anarkhôs*, without beginning, 562,23; 568,20; 572, 10; without principle, 620,14
- 572,19; without principle, 639,16 *anastros*, carrying no star, 537,8
- *anatellein*, to rise, 492.12
- *andrias*. statue. 510.5.6
- aneideos, without form, 539.5;
- 541,25; 542,10-15; 543,16.22; 545,19; 547,10
- anelenktos, unrefuted, 531,24
- anepistêmosunê, ignorance, 596,24
- *anepitêdeios*, unsuitable, 466,4; 467,9; 476,22; 477,2; 539,19
- *anêr*, man, 531,9; 534,5; 599,23; Plato, 597,3
- angelos, angel, 575,16
- *anôlethros*, imperishable, 589,22.23; 590,2.4; 599,4

anomoios, dissimilar, 529,5

- anôphoros, ascending, 497,6; 535,3
- anteipein, to contradict, 529,26
- *anteirêsthai*, to criticize, 523,3; 626,3
- *antekhesthai*, to cling to, 567,6; to be committed to, 644,2
- anthrax, charcoal, 519,4.7
- anthrôpinos, human, 632,4
- anthrôpos, man, 482,8 and passim
- *antikeisthai*, to be opposed, 515,13; 521,12; 543,2; 639,3.8; 693,8; to *antikeimenon*, the opposite, 477,7; 477,8; 535,24; 596,17; 629,21; *antikeimenôs*, 477,6
- *antikrus*, outright, 484,12; 546,3 *antilambanein*, to apprehend,
- 573,9
- antilêpsis, apprehension, 525,21
- *antimetarrein*, to surge back against, 496,21

antipatheia, contrasting affection, 530,20

- *antiphasis*, contradiction, 480,18; 496,19; 501,20; 502,2; inconsistency, 599,11; (the members of a) contradictory pair, 619,13; 628,12; 629,26
- antistrephein, to convert, 593,5
- antistrophê, antistrophê sun antithesei, conversion by negation, 592,17.25; 594,14
- antithesis, hê sun antithesei antistrophê, conversion with negation, 592,17.25; 594,14
- antitupêtikos, resistant, 520,10
- *anuphainein*, to be repaired, 598,25
- anupostatos, not to obtain, 607,13
- *apagein*, to reduce, 611,24
- apagôgê, apagôgê eis atopon, reductio ad absurdum, 593,9
- apanthisma, effervescence, 493,15
- *aparallaktôs*, (in) precisely the same (way), 504,18; 526,22; *to aparallaktôs ekhein*, to be undisturbed, 525,6
- *apathês*, impassive, 493,19; 600,23
- *apeirein*, to renounce, 526,5
- apeiria, infinity, 613,8; 620,3
- *apeiros* (A), inexperienced, 533,2; 534,4
- apeiros (B), infinite, infinitely

many, 512,26 and *passim*; to apeiron, infinity, 550,3 and *passim*; eis apeiron, ep' apeiron, ad infinitum, 468,15 and *passim*; eis apeiron, forever 608,2;

everlasting, 608,6

- apekhein, to be distant, 523,25
- *apelenkhein*, to refute, 499,25; 544,26
- *apergazesthai*, to make, 513,25; 553,17; 579,26
- aphanês, unseen, 508,23
- *aphienai*, to put forth, to give off, 490,8, 524,16; 621,24; 627,23
- aphilos, friendless, 586,3
- aphônos, unharmonious, 585,25
- *aphorizein*, to grant, 483,25;
- 486,16; 532,9; 534,15.26; 536,11 *aphormê*, starting point, 483,1;
- 545,1
- aphôtistos, utterly unlit, 595,13
- *aphtharsia*, indestructibility, 559,16; 562,15; 591,20; 594,20; 596,2; 601,19; 607,9
- *aphthartos*, indestructible, 478,11 and *passim*; free of destruction, 599,19-601,20
- aphuktos, inescapable, 581,9
- *aplanês*, fixed, 488,11; 496,3.4; 517,18; 537,7; 578,12; 579,2; 580,1.13
- *apodein*, to fall short of, 519,14 *apodeiknunai*, to demonstrate,
- 494,9; 504,29; 521,3; 528,25; 531,8; 532,5; 590,9; 599,19; 600,6; 626,1; 626,7; 628,25.27; 633,10
- *apodeixis*, proof, 503,9.24; 548,16; 549,1; 579,6; 592,5; 596,9; 634,4; 635,1; 645,15.17
- apodekhesthai, to accept, 547,22
- *apodidonai*, to pay back (a loan), 478,18; 494,23; 500,1; 505,19; 538,14.16; 604,11; to deliver, 497,26; 587,15; to give, 537,11
- *apokatastasis*, revolution, rotating all the way around, 578,18.21; 579,9.20; *tên eis to auto sêmeion apokatastasin*, the complete return, 580,24
- apokathistasthai, eis to auto sêmeion apokathistasthai, to complete its revolution, 579,3, to return, 580,4; 580,28; 581,2.3.4

apoklêrôsis, absurdity, 504,24

- *apokrinesthai*, to be separated off, 526,19; *apokriteon*, one must keep out, 640,20
- apokrouesthai, to oppose, 530,5
- *apolambanein, to gigomenon apolabein ton horismon,* the definition applies to what comes to be, 626,23
- *apolauein*, to enjoy, 493,4; 563,20
- *apoleipein*, to take away, 510,7; to depart, 615,6
- *aponemein*, to allot, 477,14; 482,3; 484,18; 520,26
- *apophansis*, assertion, 469,20; 490,7; 501,25; 502,1; 573,14; 593,5; 597,2; 624,1; 625,23
- apopheresthai, to refer to, 526,12
- *aporein*, to doubt, 526,2; to be at a loss, 532,27; 534,3
- *aporêma*, puzzle, 569,27
- *aporia*, difficulty, 517,25; 556,26; 557,2
- aporos, hard-to-find, 641,21
- aporrhein, to flow out, 526,24
- *aporrhêtos*, *di' aporrêtôn*, in secret, 641,20
- *apotelein*, to produce, 483,5; 500,20-7; 501,12; 508,12; 508,16; 508,17; 509,24; 516,2; 523,20; 539,24; to complete, 513,10; to render, 538,12; 553,20; 558,15
- *apotelesma*, product, 478,17; 480,20; 494,21; 496,15; 499,3; 499,6; 499,27; 500,10-26; 501,2-23; 505,16.27; 506,9; 507,12; 508,11; 509,24
- apous, footless, 487,3
- *apousia*, absence, 607,11.20; 622,27; 623,1.19; 625,14; 628,18
- aproairetôs, without choice, 485,12
- *aprosdioristôs*, without qualification, 594,17; 597,8
- *apsukhos*, lifeless, 480,1; 484,26; 485,12.21; 486,11.22; 488,5; 586,2; 620,6
- *areskesthai*, to be pleased, 512,15 *aretê*, virtue, 643,2.8
- *arithmos*, number, 513,11; 514,5; 522,11; 527,19; 553,24; 619,2.5.6.27; *kat' arithmon*, numerically, 502,21-503,28; amount, 582,18

- arkhê, beginning, 467,20 and passim; principle, 468,2 and passim; starting point, 541,9 and passim
- arrhêtos, inexpressible, 530,13.28
- *artheisês tês epinoias*, apart from thought, 540,14
- artiôs, just, 628,24; 629,12
- *asebein*, blaspheme, 612,21.23; 631,10.18.23
- asebês, blasphemous, 630,10.12
- *asômatos*, incorporeal, 488,17.20; 492,27; 493,2; 547,10.13; 577,6; 636,5; 636,12; 637,5.8.19.22.28; 638,4
- aspazesthai, to embrace, 515,10
- *astêr*, star, 496,5; 517,19.20; 633,18 *astra*, stars, 520,19; 523,27;
- 525,16.17; 636,21
- $astrap\hat{e}$, lightning, 518,24
- asumphônia, inconsistency, 598,13
- asumphônos, at variance with, 516,12
- asunkritos, incomparable, 517,22
- ataktos, disordered, 539,12 and passim; ataktôs, in a disorderly manner, 539,4 and passim
- ataxia, disorder, 539,26 and passim
- atê, punishment, 632,7
- *atelês*, incomplete, 508,9-509,25; 511,1; 542,27; 543,3,5; 563,7.9; imperfect, 586,20
- *ateloutêtos*, without end, 553,2; 557,22; 561,20; 562,24; 564,12
- *athanasia*, immortality, 494,11; 548,8; 556,2; 594,20.23; 594,20.23; 596,12-600,24; 638,13
- *athanatos*, immortal, 548,7,9; 556,1; 589,21-590,4; 594,18;
- 596,3-600,27; 630,15; 638,11
- atheôs, impiously, 582,28
- *athetein*, to reject, 573,13.26; 598,11; 610,2; 631,13; to rule out, 597,19; to abolish, 640,6
- athetêsis, rejecting, 512,12
- athroos, all at once, 503,7; 577,14
- atmis, vapour, 521,7.9
- *atomos*, individual (thing), 472,4; 512,3; *atomôtata*, the most or ultimate individual (things), 568,24; 570,16-571,11; 573,16.29; 583,11
- atopos, absurd, 468,16; 470,22;

- 525,24; 539,8-27; 543,20; 550,6; 561,23; 562,8; 563,5; 567,10; 577,21; 578,4; 584,2.17; 593,16-25; 605,2; 615,9; 619,14; 627,10; 629,1-18; 630,12; 638,20; 639,13; ouden atopon, there is nothing wrong, 576,26; apagôgê eis atopon, reductio ad absurdum, 593,9
- atreptos, unchangeable, 637,16
- *autarkês*, self-sufficient, 466,7.10; 473,14; 474,11-21; sufficient, 502,14; 527,9; *autarkôs*, self-sufficient, 476,8.23; sufficient, 477,11; *hôs hêmin ên dunamis autarkôs*, as well as we could, 639,28
- *authupostatos*, self-substantial, 471,5
- *automaton*, spontaneity, 565,24; *ex tautomatou*, spontaneously, 565,22; 585,17
- *auxanein*, to grow, 485,27; to increase, 619,26; 620,11
- *auxêsis*, growth, 486,1; increase, 619,3
- *axiôma*, principle, 589,6; 590,6; 592,26; 594,5; 600,10.11.17
- axiopistos, trustworthy, 599,22.24
- *axios, axion (estin*), it is important, 494,12; 496,20; 509,6.21; 625,24; to deserve, 519,22; 520,23
- *baptein*, to dye, 595,4
- *barbaros*, savage, 636,10.20
- *barus*, heavy, 478,2.3; 484,24.25; 485,11.23; 486,4; 497,7; 536,5.7
- barutês, heaviness, 527,15
- basileuein, to rule, 633,5
- *basileus*, king, 645,4
- basis, base, 534,17.23; 535,20.24.27
- *bathos*, depth, 513,18
- *bia*, force, 491,3.26; 492,1
- *biazein*, *biasthenta exhistasthai*, to be displaced by force, 490,20
- *bios*, life, 509,2; 635,13; 644,4
- *boan*, to proclaim, 482,9; 510,17; 597,4; 624,13; to say loud and clear, 618,24
- *boulêsis*, will, 494,10; 560,2-574,24; 580,12-589,3; 598,18-601,2; 616,19; 617,4.19; 638,12

brakhutatos, very little, 518,23 brithos, katô brithos, weighed down, 497,7

- *daimôn*, *daimon*, 633,23; 634,26; 635,15; 643,15; 644,3
- daimonion, daimonia, 640,7
- *daktulos*, finger, 495,13.14.17; 500,18.25
- *daneizesthai*, to borrow 478,18; 494,22; 500,1; 505,18.23; 538,13-16; 604,9; *daneizen*, to lend, 604,10
- *deiknunai*, to show, 469,6 and *passim*
- *deinos*, skilled, 532,4
- *dekapêkhos*, ten cubits of, 495,28
- *dektikos*, receptive, 523,22; 548,12; 594,22; 596,18.20.25
- *dêlôktikos*, indicative, 574,27; 576,15; 578,1
- *dêmiourgein*, to create, 468,8.9; 473,1.2; 476,16; 509,23; 542,2; 579,19; 581,24; 599,6; 605,21.22.24; 614,19; 615,8.11.27; the act of creating,614,24; *to dêmiourgoun*, creator, 466,22; 468,7; 561,8
- *dêmiourgêma*, (product of) creation, 562,26; 610,11
- *dêmiourgia*, (act of) creation, 509,5; 532,21; 563,24; 567,21; creative activity, 616,13
- *dêmiourgikos*, creative, 473,21; 474,15; 571,19; 575,13.21; 577,21; 616,16; to create, 636,5
- *dêmiourgos*, creator, 468,3 and *passim*
- *dêpou*, presumably, 469,14.23; 493,14; 507,28; 524,1; 552,10; 565,19; 569,6; 578,20; 579,1; 580,19.23; 581,23; 637,9; 638,4
- *desmos*, bond, 513,7.8; 560,7; 601,3; bonding, 522,9; fettered, 642,18
- *diadokhos*, successor, 466,1 and *passim*
- diagraphein, to rescind, 497,25
- *diaiônios*, eternal, 554,12; 607,9
- *diakonikos*, that we use, 535,5
- *diakosmos*, orderly arrangement, 553,23
- *diakratein*, to maintain, 562,24; 599,5

- *diakrinein*, to separate off, 526,26; to distinguish, 543,15; 544,1; 547,19
- *dialegesthai*, to converse, 508,24; 600,26; to discourse, 533,25; 632,25
- dialektikos, dialectical, 609,10
- *dialuein*, to dissolve, 529,6; 597,22; 598,24
- *dialusis*, dissolution, 594,22; 595,21; 598,20
- *diamenein*, to persist, 548,9; 598,23; 599,5; 624,5
- diamorphôsis, formation, 542,24
- *dianoia*, meaning, 519,19; 540,19; 548,16; 551,2; 633,6; thought, 531,23; 541,1; 553,9; 599,10; 600,15; understanding, 533,18
- diaphanês, transparent, 472,17; 523,21; diaphanestatos, clearest, 502,11
- *diapherein*, to differ, 527,16; 558,18; 594,4; 616,14; to excel, 529,11.17
- *diaphora*, (substantial) difference, 487,13; 507,2; 530,21; 591,15
- *diaphoros*, different, 479,22; 487,8.10; 589,3; difference, 486,10; 530,3; 578,20; 594,13; distinct, 530,18
- diaphorotês, difference, 479,21
- *diaplasis*, modelling, 487,7
- diaplassein, to develop, 643,7
- diaplekein, to weave, 488,17
- diapnein, to evaporate, 595,26
- *diarrhêdên*, expressly, explicitly, 484,4; 510,17; 631,21; 638,16
- diarthroun, to articulate, 541,2; 543,2; 639,28; diêrthrômenôs, articulately, 542,23
- diastasis, extension, 568,29
- diastatos, extended, 574,7
- *diastatôs*, extendedly, 573,8
- diatassesthai, to order, 579,19
- *diateinesthai*, to maintain earnestly, 608,3
- *diathesis*, state, 615,13.18; 616,2.9
- *diatribê*, school, 521,2
- *diazôgraphoun*, to broider figures, 532,26
- *didaskalia*, teaching, 488,22; 512,12; 532,6; 533,21; 611,4; 632,15; 633,15; *didaskalias*

kharin, for pedagogical reasons, 547,24; 548,22

- didaskalos, teacher, 508,14
- *didaskein*, to teach, 614,19; 616,4; 640,7
- *diitêtikos*, penetrating, 534,27; 535,2
- diorganôsis, organization, 487,8
- diorismos, qualification, 600,19.20
- *dôdekahedron*, dodecahedron, 482,2.3; 532,3.11.17.22; 533,8; 534,9; 536,14.22.26; 537,3.12
- *dogma*, doctrine, 482,15; 512,13; 522,3.4; opinion, 533,2
- *doxa*, belief, 470,24; position, 524,26; 527,3.7; 530,5; 611,23; mind, 642,24
- doxastos, opined, 621,8
- *doxazein*, to form an opinion, 533,7; to believe, 635,5
- *dran*, to act, 561,25; to do, 641,15
- *drastêrios*, active, 528,21; efficacy 517,15
- drastikos, effective, 562,10
- *drattesthai*, to move (in a direction), 536,8; to seize hold of 597,7; to take hold of 638,18
- druinas, oak-wood, 519,2
- *drus*, tree, 507,26.28
- *dunamis*, power, 473,22 and *passim*; potentially, 475,13; capacity, 538,7; *dunamei*, virtually, 470,28; 498,28; *kata dunamin*, *hôs dunamis*, as much as possible, 541,19; 551,10.12; 553,19; 554,13; 558,15.16; 559,6; 566,19; 586,25; 588,22; 613,18; 639,27
- *dunein*, to set, 492,12
- *dusergos*, unserviceable, 539,11.15.16
- ebenos, ebony, 595,3
- *eidopoiein*, to give form, 481,20; 504,19; to characterize, 528,16; to fashion, 542,3; formed 542,17
- *eidopoiia*, creation of forms, 542,21; 543,1
- *eidos*, form, 470,3.5.6; 471,4.5.7; 475,6.7.10.26.28; 476,3.13.14; 488,26; 493,7.10.16; 503,8.13.15.19.23; 506,12; 510,26; 524,1; 530,22; 539,3.21; 540,1.10;

542,14.19.20.26;

- 543,3.11.17.24.25.28; 544,1.9;
- 545,15.20; 546,5.10.12.13.14;
- 547,8.9.17; 554,4; 560,19; species, 516,27; 549,15.17
- *eikazein*, to resemble, 549,12; 552,26; 557,24; 558,16; to portray 641,8
- eikôn, image, 511,18.20.26; 534,14.20; 544,21; 547,11.12; 549,18; 551,10.17.19.22.24; 552,24; 553,22.24; 556,16; 558,11.16.19; 613,4; 618,1.13
- eikonikôs, as copies, 488,24
- *eikosahedron*, icosahedron, 532,3.10; 535,5
- *eikotôs*, reasonably, reasonable, 471,6; 486,23; 493,5.19; 533,5; 544,8; 596,25
- *eilikrinês*, unmixed, 493,14; 522,7; 526,18
- eisphrein, to introduce, 483,4
- ekballein, to throw out, 597,11; ekblêteon, 640,24
- *ekbiazein*, to force, 484,14; to force out, 491,6
- *ekdekhesthai*, to take (understand), 638,24
- *eklegesthai*, to select, 493,12; 527,1; draw, 528,27
- ekpaideuein, to teach, 644,14
- *ekperierkhesthai*, to complete a circular journey, to traverse (a circle), 578,11; 580,13.14.16.17
- *ekperipolein*, to go all the way around, 578,15
- *ekpiptein*, to lose, 556,20
- *ekpheugein*, to escape, 570,12; 644,16
- *ekphulos*, foreign, 483,1; 493,26; 512,7.11; 526,20
- *ekteinein*, to prolong, 527,10; to extend, 572,6
- *ektithesthai*, to set forth, 514,26; 533,18
- elengkhein, to refute, 531,6
- elengkhos, refutation, 545,23
- ellampsis, radiation, 532,15
- *elleipos*, deficient, 466,5; 475,21; 477,3
- *elleipein*, to be missing, 508,9.18; 509,15.20; 510,12; 516,3.4.13; to lack 572,4

- embruon, embryo, 501,4.10; 542,23
- emmelês, accordant, 546,19; emmelôs, rightly, 532,27
- *empathês*, passionate, 612,6
- empeiros, experienced, 533,2
- *emphutos*, inborn, 485,13; 488,5; 490,29; 491,10.17; 518,9; 519,16; 523,13
- *empsukhos*, ensouled, 485,27; 486,2.12.14; 487,16.19; 620,6
- *enallax*, by alternation, 511,21; alternately 590,14
- *enantios*, contrary, 478,7.8; 490,8; 494,1.5; 496,18.21; 497,1.2.3.4.8.10.11.27; 498,11.13.22; 504,1.5.6.16.22; 514,18; 621,21; 627,23; contradictory, 524,16; opposite,
- 585,25; 605,6 enantiôsis, contrariety, 494,3; 497,15; contradiction, 625,26
- enantiôtatos, extreme contrary, 514,16
- enantiousthai, to be opposed, 515,2
- *enargeia*, self-evidence, 494,13; 500,6; what is clear, 498,4
- *enargês*, clear, 484,15; 600,11.16; 631,20
- *enargôs*, clearly, 482,9; 512,15; 533,12; 602,25; 621,25
- enapokleiein, to enclose in, 491,7
- endeiknusthai, to declare, 508,25; to exhibit, 625,21; pros endeixin, to show, 533,22
- *endiatribein*, to waste time on, 531,25
- *endidonai*, to implant, 479,20; 486,26; 488,5; 540,8
- energeia, activity, 486,20; 569,14; 571,20; 577,17.23; 607,10; energeia(i), kat' energeian, actually, in actuality, 475,12 and passim
- *energein*, to act, 487,10; to engage in an activity, 577,18.19; 614,5.6.9.10
- engennan, to produce in, 530,19
- *engignesthai*, to come to be in, 485,9; 486,12; 488,8; 492,20; 530,16; 543,27; to come to, 558,25; 625,13
- *engion*, nearly, 535,9; closer 535,11.12

enistenai, to object, 540,24; 620,12 enklêma, wrong (error or deficiency), 548,2

- enkosmios, cosmic, 603,27; 604,3
- ennoia, consideration, 489,1; conception 573,25; 636,12; thought 630,10; sense 637,9; 638,25
- *ennoein*, suppose, 523,19; understand 641,1; to reflect 644,23
- enstasis, objection, 489,8

entautha, here, 537,14; 573,22; 613,4.20; 627,22; present, 563,24; here in sense of sublunar world, sublunar, 524,8; 528,19; 'in this argument' 551,22; entautha ka'kai, 'in both cases', 557,26

- *entelesteron*, more thoroughly, 548,26
- *enteuthen*, therefore, because of this, 472,22; 646,1; from (all of) this, from this source, 523,7; 542,5; 548,2; 579,2; 597,9; 602,9; 624,9; in that, 574,18; from the following considerations, 575,5
- *entithenai*, to place in, 543,17; 553,13
- *entunkhanein*, *entunkhanontes*, readers, 531,26; 549,4; 594,9
- *enudron*, aquatic (animal), fish, 486,27.28; 487,22; 509,7; 516,27
- enulos, enmattered, 470,11
- *enuparkhein*, to exist in, 488,24; 571,22; to be inherent in, 530,17; to belong to, 595,11
- epagein, introduce, 528,8; 624,24
- *epanalambanein*, to take up again, 505,14
- epanalêpsis, taking up again, reiteration, 480,28; 610,13
- epanastrephein, to rotate, 578,14
- epangellein, to profess, 548,14
- epanorthôsis, restoration, 601,13
- *epeisagein*, to introduce, 512,12; 524,5; 529,24; 644,4
- epexergasia, elaboration, 635,20
- *ephaptesthai*, to lay hold of, 519,4; to touch 535,17

epharmozein, to coincide, 534,19; to fit, 535,27; to assimilate, 536,26; to apply to, 626,17

ephestêkuios, to be set over, 485,8

- *ephêkein*, to have come to, 486,18; 489,25
- *ephexês*, thereupon, after, then, next, 497,23; 510,24; 512,21; 516,23; 519,21; 524,3; 543,14.17; 624,20; and so on, in succession, 580,25; 581,5
- ephiesthai, to strive, 491,24
- *ephistanein*, to give attention to, 484,7
- *epidekhesthai*, to admit, to be receptive of, 474,6; 572,21; 600,22; 616,19
- *epideiknunai*, to show, 483,7; to exhibit, 625,19
- *epigenêtôs*, in a supervening manner, 595,7
- *epiginesthai*, to supervene, 544,1; to impose on them, 546,20; to come to additionally, 596,14; 626,10; 627,20; 628,24; to come to be, 595,25
- *epigraphein*, to entitle, 523,2; 626,1
- *epikheirêma*, argument, 477,7; 540,20.22; 541,7; 544,14; 545,3; 551,2; 586,12.13; 587,10; 591,13; 594,8.10; 613,17; 630,27; proof, 610,6
- *epikheirêsis*, attempt, 481,11; 581,9; argument, 483,20; 617,25; 637,20; attack, 484,17
- epikratein, to predominate, 485,20
- *epikrinein*, to side with, 526,6 *epikrupsis*, concealment,
- encryption, 484,4; 512,20 epiktêsis, ex epiktêseôs, by
- acquisition, 594,27; 595,3.5
- epiktêtos, acquired (as something additional to the essence), by acquisition, 548,7; 559,16; 591,20; 594,22; 596,13.14.19.24; 597,17; 598,8.26; 599,8; 627,19; 628,14; 630,14; epiktêtôs, by acquisition, 595,16.18; 596,16.25
- *epilambanesthai*, to take hold of, 518,25
- epilampein, to shine, 582,15
- epilanthanein, to forget, 524,15
- epilogos, epilogue, 611,25
- epiluein, to solve, 489,8; 557,3
- epimignusthai, to mix, 506,25
- *epimixia*, mixture, 506,23
- epinoein, to conceive, 485,9; 531,14;

537, 8; 629,7; to picture, 546,16; to imagine, 585,28; 601,12; to consider, 601,5; to think of, 629,18

- *epinoia*, thought, 540,19; thought experiment, 608,25; *epinoia(i)*, in thought, 540,14; 543,19; 544,1; *di'epinoias*, in thought, 627,10; *kat'epinoian*, theoretically, 576,18.23; 577,2.5.24.27; conceivably, 608,22.23; hypothetically, 595,9; 598,25; 623,5; notionally, 606,23.25; conceptually, 624,7; 629,12.16
- *epipedon*, plane, 513,18; 514,22; 532,1.8; 534,18; 535,10.15
- *epipherein*, to add, 521,12; 522,18; 553,14; to present, 549,4
- epipleos, over-abundantly, 537,13
- *episkepsesthai*, examine, 483,21; 553,6; 557,4
- episkepsis, examination, 523,2; 626,2; investigation, 566,4
- *episkeuastos*, restored, 494,10; 548,7; 556,2; 596,13; 598,8.26; 600,23; 638,13
- episkeuazesthai, to restore, 548,9; 598,21
- episkeuê, restoration, 595,24
- episkopein, to consider, 525,22
- episkotein, to throw darkness over, 523,20
- epistasia, attention, 623,11
- *epistasthai*, to keep in mind, 505,21; *epistêmonos*, educated, 534,5
- *epistatêteon*, one must oversee, 640,18
- *epistellein*, to write (a letter), 644,17.22
- epistolê, letter, 644,19.21; 645,1
- *epistêmê*, knowledge, 596,24; science, 599,25
- *episumbainein*, to supervene, 506,22
- *episunaptein*, to join together, 516,1; to add, 633,20; 635,10
- *epitêdeios*, suitable, 466,6.13; 467,16; 473,13; 474,16-476,6; 539,19; 540,8; 543,25; appropriate, 642,5
- *epithumia*, appetite, 612,6; 624,20; 632,8
- epitithenai, to impose, 476,2

- eponazein, to name, 509,13
- epônumôs, eponymously, 486,5
- *êremaion*, gentle, 526,16
- *êremia*, rest, 546,18
- ergazesthai, to produce, afford, 487,14; 507,2
- ergon, action, 632,5; 641,17
- *erion*, wool, 595,4
- *eris*, strife, 632,5; *pros erin*, eristically, contentious(ly), 522,24; 563,24; 569,23
- *erôs*, love, 632,8
- (e)thelein, to wish, 491,2; 562,26; 567,5; 568,11.14.18; 592,16
- *euergos*, serviceable, 466,18.20; 467,16; 474,12.19; 538,4.5.6.9.12.22; 539,10.15.17.18.20.21.24
- eukuklos, well-rounded, 517,3
- *eulogos*, reasonable, reasonably, 469,24; 484,3; 486,23; 492,18; 587,11; 597,13; 602,9; 603,24; rational, 561,27; one should, 484,13
- eumêkhanon, talented, 484,16
- *euolisthos*, unstable, instability, 534,17; 535,8.10.12
- *eusebein*, to speak in a reverent manner or with reverence, 608,12; 612,18
- eusebôs, reverently, 609,23
- eutaktos, well-ordered, 546,19
- euthugrammos, rectilinear, 532,1; 535,11
- euthunesthai, to be directed, 552,26
- euthuporeisthai, to move in a
- straight line, 477,23; 524,17
- *euthuphoreisthai*, to go straight, 484,22; 489,5; 490,2.3.10.12.22; 491,11
- *euthus*, immediately, at once, automatically, directly, promptly, 492,6; 497,21; 498,17.28; 499,28; 543,27.28; 545,14; 566,22; 567,1; 576,15; 578,5; 595,9.25; 600,14; 635,5; 642,1; *ep' euthu, ep' eutheias, kat' eutheian, eutheia(i),* in a straight line, 479,27; 480,7; 489,11.14.27,
 - 490,4.10,13.15.19.21.25.28.29; 491,17.18; 492,3.10.17; 645,7; *euthus en arkhê(i)*, right at the beginning, 612,9

exhaptein, burning, 519,1

- exairetos, singular, 530,9
- exakontizein, to launch, 491,9
- *exallagê*, variety, variation, 487,13; 503,28
- exarkein, to suffice, 513,20
- *exêgeisthai*, to expound, 521,26; 522,10; 546,7; to interpret, 599,10; 633,6
- *exêgêsis*, interpretation, 514,25; 533,16; 541,3; exegesis, 540,19; 551,2
- *exêgêtês*, exegete, 482,22; 520,25; 521,3; 524,14; 553,9; 631,19
- *exê(i)rêsthai*, to transcend, 477,23; 489,7; 524,17; 574,28; 575,26
- *exêllagmenos*, different, 530,22
- *exetasis*, scrutinizing, 587,10; examination, 634,14
- *exetazein*, to examine or consider (closely or carefully), 477,11; 483,15.22; 549,2; 557,5
- *existanai*, to displace, 490,20; 491,1.9.22.23.27
- exolisthainein, to slip, 598,21
- exomoioun, to make like, 608,9
- gamos, matrimony, 634,21
- $g\hat{e}$, earth, 478,1 and passim
- geêros, earthy, 486,3; 491,5
- genesis, generation, 467,16 and passim
- *genêtos*, generated, 466,2 and *passim*
- **gennan**, to beget, 500,21.22.28; 501,6; 553,16; 579,24; 633,7; to generate, 532,8
- *genos*, sort, kind, 478,19; 493,5; 508,8.25.27; 509,8; 510,19; 511,2.14.16.26; 512,1.2; 529,10.11.16; 530,7; 531,4; 533,26; class, 516,26; 620,3; race, 613,12; 630,25; 631,4.18.23; *ta panta genê*, the entire collection, 509,26
- *geôdês*, earthy, 489,18
- geômetria, geometry, 532,7
- *geômetrikôtatos*, quite skilled in geometry, 532,5
- geranos, crane, 581,18
- *gêras*, old age, 528,8
- *ginesthai*, to come to be, 467,1 and *passim*

glukus, sweet, 506,25

- gnôsis, knowledge, 563,18.23; 564,8; 568,21.24; 570,4.6.15.16.19; 573,5; 575,12; 580,10; 583,12.17.19.20.22; 584,5; 617,14
- *gnôstos*, object of knowledge, 570,19; 575,11
- *grammata*, letters, 474,25.26; 475,1.18.22
- *graphein*, to write, 474,26; 475,20.21.23; 641,10; document, 530,23
- grapheus, scribe, 474,25
- haima, blood, 503,20
- hairesis, school, 524,20
- halmuros, salty, 506,26
- hama, simultaneously, 473,23 and passim; together, 495,5 and passim; at the same time, 500,16 and passim
- *haphê*, touch, 520,14; 521,23.24; 525,21
- *haplôs*, absolutely, 468,11 and *passim*; *simpliciter*, 470,6; 567,26; really, 475,19; simply, 531,2 and *passim*; in short, 531,19; in general, 575,24; 583,24; 632,8; unconditionally, 577,28; in a simple manner, 597,6
- *haplous*, simple, 468,22 and *passim; haplousterous*, the more simple-minded, 505,27
- harma, wagon, 546,24
- *harmonia*, fitting-together, 475,8.27; harmony, 565,18
- *harmozein*, to fit together; 475,10.25.26; 591,8; 592,15; to be adapted to, 534,14; to suit one's need, 579,9
- *hêgoumenos*, to believe, 522,21; 611,15.17; to rule, 644,18
- hêdonê, pleasures, 612,6
- *hedra*, face (of a regular solid), 535,14; *eph' hedra(i)*, in its seat, 536,21
- hedraios, steady, 534,17
- heimarmenos, allotted, 624,20
- hekastos, kath' hekaston, particular, 570,12; 573,9
- *hêlios*, sun, 472,17; 486,5; 517,17; 525,8; 570,11; 578,15; 579,4;

580,2; 595,5.6.7.8; 633,19; 636,9.21

- hêliotropia, heliotropes, 486,6
- *henaios*, unitary, 563,17; 570,14; 584,1
- *heneka*, *to hou heneka*, that for the sake of which, 479,5
- *hêniokhein*, to drive, 546,25
- *henoeidês*, uniform, 568,20.22; 573,11; 574,8; uniformity, 584,20
- *henoeidôs*, in a uniform manner, 568,27; 571,6; 573,7.15; 617,17
- *henôsis*, union, 514,20; 515,8
- *henousthai*, to unite, 514,18; 515,14
- *hepesthai*, to follow from, to be consequent upon, 471,8 and *passim*
- *herpein*, to crawl, 487,23
- hesperos, Venus, 578,16
- *heterophuês*, of a different nature, 487,16
- *hexis*, capacity, 508,13.16; 614,4-616,14; state, 625,4.9
- *hikanos*, sufficient, to suffice, 466,11.17.19; 474,24; 497,26; 502,14; 519,20
- *hikanôs*, sufficiently, 469,2; 471,1; 473,28; 509,1; 529,13; 586,11; 599,17; enough, 633,21
- *hippos*, horse, 512,4; 620,4
- hiptasthai, to fly, 487,21
- *hodos*, path, 521,7
- *holotês*, ensemble, 480,26; 492,8.16.21; 493,20; 503,6.24.28; 504,6.7.9.19.20; 505,8; 507,8; 517,26; 595,20.26
- *homoeidês*, having the same form; 504,8; 506,16; 507,5; 528,18; 532,1
- *homoiomerês*, homoiomerous, 506,11.17
- *homoiôsis*, likeness, 551,4.7; 556,21; 559,8.10; 567,17; 610,15; 618,3.7.13.17
- *homoiotês*, likeness, 510,25; 557,26; 558,12; 568,12
- *homologein*, to agree, 491,15; 494,13; 496,22.28; 505,21; 541,10; 545,24; 577,22; to consent, 514,6; 527,20; to coalesce 516,16; admittedly, 530,14; to concede, 565,15; 575,7
- homologia, coalition, 514,20

homônumia, homonymy, 574,22; 594,17; 638,15 homônumôs, homonymously, 611,7; 637,5 homophuês, same in nature, 528,25 *homoulês*, having the same matter, 528, 18*horan*, to see, 473,23; 492,12; 518,20; 606,24; 607,15; horômenos, visible, 525,5; 529,9; 530,7; 531,3; 533,26; to consider, 555,2; to apprehend, 636,22 *hôras*, hour, 578,13 horasis, vision, 520,13; 521,23.24 *horatos*, visible, 510,20; 511,6.8.13.16; 512,9; 513,1.3; 514,3; 520,7.10.13.18; 521,22.23; 525,14; 541,19; 547,2.5.15; 586,25; 596,11;621,19; 622,11.14; 626,4; 633,22; 636,1; 638,22.28; 639,3.4.18 horismos, definition, 626,17.22 *horizesthai*, to define, 538,17; 622,9; to determine, 620,24; 622,14; *hôristai*, what is determinate, 623,7 horkos, oath, 632,7 *hormê*, impulse, 490,29; 491,10.17; 492,21; authaeretô(i) gnômês $horm\hat{e}(i)$, voluntary desire of the mind, 566,26 *horos*, definition, 538,21; 623,10 hugros, moist, 494,2; 497,8.9; 504,11.13; 515,8.22.25; 516,15 hugrotês, moistness, 516,17; 527,15 hudôr, water, 475,14; 482,9; 484,23; 485,24; 490,18; 491,4; 492,23; 497,3.7; 499,10; 502,16.27; 503,2; 504,10.11.12; 506,3.4.24; 507,1.2.22; 513,24-516,20; 520,14-521,19; 525,23.25; 527,25; 531,18; 532,10; 535,7.8; 536,8; 595,1.26.27 *huios*, son, 500,24; 632,25; 633,2; 634,18; 641,17; 642,18 hulê, matter, 466,2 and passim huparkhein, to exist, 473,25; 503,1; 507,5; 518,23; 614,17; 615,25; to be (constituted) of, 480,3; 490,3.23.26; 519,5; to belong to, 485,7.14; 490,1; 549,10; 595,2.17; 626,12; 638,7; to be, 489,13; 490,5.12.28; 491,26;

493,17; 495,11.16; 497,5.14; 500,8; 503,1; 507,10; 512,6; 516,7.13; 535,5; 598,14; 600,17; 639,2; to subsist as, 552,16; to be the case, 510,23; to have, 588,25; *toiouto huparkhein*, to go like this, 600,12; to apply, 608,25; to be derived, 624,11

huparxis, existence, 469,4.13; 471,10; 472,17; 569,14; 570,3; 572,21; 574,7; 576,2.5.7; 581,26; 639,26

hupekkauma (the sublunar region of fire bordering on the heavens), 489,15; 492,9.25; 517,27; 518,11

huperanabainein, to transcend, 493,13

huperbolê, excess, 482,16; 507,3; 518,6.7.21; 519,12; 531,10

huperekhein, huperekhein tôi megethei, to outsize, 517,13.16

huperekplêssein, to astonish, 531,10

huperokhê, superiority, 493,10; excess, to exceed, 517,22; 518,3

- *hupexê(i)rêsthai*, to be excluded, 569,10
- huphêgetês, teacher, 482,15
- *huphêgeisthai*, to guide, 512,10; to give, 618,23
- *huphistenai*, to come to exist, 468,1; 545,14.20; 576,24; to subsist, 614,11; to cause to exist, 538,3.7.12.14; 539,25.27; 544,2; 547,23; 566,7; 571,5; 572,26; 578,23; to exist, 471,6.26; 476,13; 543,16; 546,21; 558,1.8.11; 575,2; 608,11; 620,14; to be present, 508,20
- *hupnos*, sleep, 632,7
- hupodeiknunai, to show, 576,3
- *hupodokhê*, receiving, 474,25; receptacle, 538,17ff.; 541,25; 543,26
- *hupokeimenon*, substratum, 471,9.10; 538,6.8; underlying, what underlies, 485,15; 507,1; 535,17; 540,2; subject, 595,15
- *hupokeisthai*, to underlie, 493,6.16; to assume, 535,20; 578,24
- *hupokrinein*, *hupokrinomenos*, in the role of, 589,12

- *hupolambanein*, to assume, 635,24; 636,11
- *hupoleipein*, to leave (out, behind or over), 514,12; 528,1.3
- *hupolêpsis*, assumption, 526,5; 530,2; 618,22;
- *hupomnêmata*, commentary, 520,5; 521,26; 546,6
- *hupomnêmatizesthai*, to interpret, to commentate, 483,11; 519,21; 537,11
- *hupomnêsis*, reminder, 610,8; 613,20
- *huponoein*, to suppose, 486,23; 492,17; 493,27; 547,10; 637,11; 638,27; to conceive, 574,25
- *huponoia*, meaning, 635,23.25; 636,3; 639,13; 642,21.22.23
- *hupopeptôkenai*, to be subject to, 504,8
- hupopodos, footed, 487,2
- hupopteuein, to suspect, 636,18
- *hupostasis*, existence, 469,7;
- 569,12; 626,6; production, 539,11 *hupostathmê*, sediment, 526,24
- *hupostatikos*, capable of bringing into existence, 572,25
- hupothesis, hypothesis, 484,7; 499,14; 541,10.14; 544,17.24; 545,5.8.13.19.25; 564,24; 578,3; 596,5; 602,7.8.18.20; 622,8; 623,26; assumption, 525,9; 543,7; 552,26; 610,25; 629,2.23; supposition, 578,9; premise, 592,9; en hupothesei, kath' hupothesin, hypothetically, 563,26;564,14; 574,13; 586,16; 587,8.12; 611,19.20; 622,6; 625,12; 630,11; 645,19; 646,3.5.7; mekhri monês hupotheseôs, hypothetically, 643,16
- hupotithenai, to suppose, to assume, to make an assumption, 483,18.23; 484,3; 485,1; 487,20; 489,2; 492,7; 494,10; 496,19; 518,1; 533,23; 534,2; 541,12; 542,11; 545,23.26; 547,25; 548,23; 567,3; 579;11.14; 610,23; 612,22; 622,28; 628,19
- *idea*, form, 489,1; 493,13.16; 516,25; 517,1; 552,22; 637,22 *idikos*, specifically, 516,23

- *idios*, own, 474,16; 486,11; 495,21; 497,19; 499,14; 522,4.25; 524,15; 529,25; 544,4; 547,26; 553,3; 554,21; 567,11; 573,13; 577,3; 578,11.15.17; 580,13; 594,20; 595,13; 599,8.25; 611,4; 618,22; 623,16; 625,23; 628,22; 632,15; 635,3; 638,18; 640,15; 643,15; 644,5; respective, 504,9; 507,5.8; individually, 543,20; 575,18; proper, 569,12; characteristic, 575,11.21
- *idiotês*, property, 530,27; feature, 570,6
- *ikhnê*, trace, 539,3-540,15; 542,5-543,28; 544,9; 545,15.20; 546,5.8; 547,8-17
- *ilingian*, to be dizzied, 497,15
- *iskhus*, force, 545,1
- *iskhuros*, violent, 528,6.12; strong (evidence) 645,16
- *isodromein*, to keep pace with, 578,16
- *isodromos*, that keep pace with, 579,4
- isogônios, equiangular, 534,22
- *isoperimetros*, of equal perimeter, 535,16
- isopleuros, equilateral, 534,22
- *kakia*, evil, 469,4; 566,26; 567,3.12; 569,10; 630,25; 635,16
- *kakos*, evil, 560,5; 562,3.4.8.19; 566,15.19.21.27; 567,10; 569,12; 583,4; 586,7.10; 587,2-593,16; 603,25-604,8; 611,14
- *kakôs*, 565,21; 586,8; wrong, 628,15; poor, 641,8
- *kakomorphos*, poorly shaped, 585,26
- kakophônos, cacophonous, 585,26
- kakourgos, villainous, 597,1
- *karteros*, troublesome, 557,2
- *katakaiein*, to burn completely, 517,16
- *katalambanein*, (perfect tense) to occupy, to be settled, 489,17.23.24.28; 491,16
- katalampein, to illuminate, 472,18
- *kataleipein*, to leave (out), 528,14.23; 531,24; to be left (remaining), 637,13
- katalogos, rolls, 640,14

- katamênia, menses, 501,5.9
- katanoein, to observe, 509,21;
- 528,5; 600,10; 629,17; 636,24
- katapherein, to lower, 611,16 kataphlegein, to consume, 517,13; 518.13
- kataphora, attack, 640,10
- katapseudesthai, to give a false account of, 557,18; 621,25
- kataskeuazein, to establish, 473,11.17.18; 481,12; 522,16; 523,4; 524,4; 545,11; 618,4; 624,1; 631,19; fabricate, 555,5
- kataskeuê, conclusion, 594,6; meta *kataskeuês*, he reasons it out, 596.9
- katharôtatos, purest, 483,5; 489,21; 491,14; extremely pure, 518,19; as pure as possible, 519,11; 526,18; 530,11; kathôteros, purer, 493,11; 522,7
- katharotês, purity 527,17; 530,26
- katégoria, accusation, 640,16
- kathidrusthai, to be seated, 517,21
- katholou, en tô(i) katholou, universally, 474,9; entirely, 507,14; 581,20; 584,5; ta katholou, the universals, 570,21.24; 573,1; 582,24; generally, 597,19
- kaustikos, caustic, 518,8.12.24.26; 523, 12
- kenos, empty, 536,8
- kêros, wax, 474,24; 475,18.20
- *khara*, joy, 632,7
- kharaktêrizein, to characterize, 497,5; 504,1.7; 527,14; 528,17; 531,18.21; 534,8.9; 587,26
- kharizesthai, to grant, 515,8; to impart, 599,1; to welcome, 634,15
- *kheimôn*, winter, 581,19
- *kheir*, hand, 495,11.12; 519,3
- *khersaios*, land creature, 486,27; 487,2.23; 509,7; 516,28
- *khiôn*, snow, 518,6
- *khôra*, place, 491,16; space, 535,17; 536.8
- *khôrein*, to concede, 565,14
- *khôris*, without, 467,24; 468,1; 513,6; 635,25; separately or apart (from), 476,13.14; 485,8; 546,15; 565,4; 614,24; except, 543,18
- khôrismos, separation, 645,20

khôristos, separate, 576,8; 577,12 khôrizein, to separate, 500,26; 513,2; 543,20; 575,28; 576,5.6.7; 577, 1.5; 624, 8; 627, 6.11; 629,9.10.12.16; 645,19 *khôrion*, passage, 521,27; 522,10 khrêsimos, khrêsimon pragmateiôdes ouden ekhein, to have no serious use, 603,21 *khrêsis*, passage, 519,22 *khrôma*, colour, 520,13; 530,20 *khronikos*, temporal, 472,5.18.24 khronos, time, 466,22 and passim khrusos, gold, 493,8 kinein, to move, 478,6 and passim kinêsis, motion, movement, 477,14 and *passim* koinônein, to have in common, 506,21; 516,9; to own jointly, 515,6; to share (in), 621,2.16; 622,19; 630,21; 638,1 koinônia, joint ownership, 515, 4.14; 637, 13.14 *kolazesthai*, to be kept in check, 518,17; to punish, 642,2 kolobos, mutilated, 495,15 kompsôs, cleverly, 531,22 koruphê, peak, 489,15; 493,21; vertex, 534,25; 535,2.4.23.28 kosmein, to order, to establish cosmic order, 466,11 and passim 476.9*kosmopoiia*, the production of the cosmos, 544,11 kosmos, cosmos, 466 and passim kouphos, light, 478,2.4; 484,24; 485,10; 497,5; 536,6.7 kouphotês, lightness, 527,15 *krasis*, mixture, 530,13.19.27; 625.17kreittos, better, 479,3.5; 493,8.17; 564,18.20; 587,27; 588,14.17; 590,18.19.22; 602,3.4; 629,14; 630,7; mightier, 491,6; described, 530,18 krinesthai, to judge, 495,27;

587,17; 642,23; to determine, 506,14

- *kludôn*, rough water, 623,24; 625,21

- *kosmopoein*, to create the cosmos,
- 603, 6.8.9.11.13.14.18; 627, 14.19; 492,26; kreittos logou, cannot be

- *kubernein*, *kubernôn*, steersman, 546,24; who steers it, 624,24
- *kubernêtês*, steersman, 623,12; 624,17; 625,19
- *kubikos*, cubical, 532,9; 534,15
- *kubos*, cube, 482,1; 532,2; 534,17.18
- *kuklophoreisthai*, to be carried around in a circle, 492,27
- *kuklophorêtikos*, to move in a circle, 477,19; 520,21
- kuklos, circle, 578,11.15; 580,13.17; kuklô(i), in a circle, circular(ly), 477,16; 478,5; 479,16.28; 480,2.5.9; 483,16.24; 484,1.11.20.21; 485,6; 486,15.17.19.24; 487,18; 488,1.3.7; 489,3.10.14.24.25.28; 490,2.10.16; 492,5.9.13.16.21.24.27; 493,3.21.23.26; 517,5 kunidia, little dogs, 612,4
- kunos, dog, 493,9
- *kuôn*, dogstar, 496,4
- kuriôs, proper(ly), 502,20; 638,24
- *lambanein*, to admit, to accept, 467,20; 470,28; 546,3; 547,7; 555,3; to receive, to get, to take, 472,16.20; 500,4; 521,12; 533,17; 536,25; 540,8; 548,8; 569,14; 620,13; 642,24; to draw (on), to take (over), 495,8; 555,6; 566,2; 601,21; 631,26; to apprehend, 498,10; to derive, 521,22; to make (an assumption), 543,7; to assume, assumption, 544,5.16; 545,3; 554,25; 555,16; 557,16; 564,15; 586,16; 592,13.22; to have, 581,18; 639,27; to take (to understand), 594,17; 639,27
- *leipein*, to be missing, 495,14.17; to be left, 532,11; 546,23; to remain, 569,19

leptotatos, rarest, 489,20; 491,14

- *leptotês*, rarity, 527,17
- *leptomerês*, rare, 518,19.22; 519,22; 526,25; 530,12.26
- leukos, white, 594,24
- *lexis*, text, passage, 501,27; 508,21; 533,19; 591,22; 597,7; 633,21; 644,20; word(s), statement(s), 533,10; 613,1; 618,5; 624,13; 626,10; 628,25; *epi lexeôs*,

verbatim, precisely, in these words, in his own words, 502,12; 510,23; 522,1.13; 523,11; 532,24; 600,3; 624,17; 636,15; 640,17

- *litê*, prayer, 632,6
- *lithos*, stone, 474,18; 475,4.8.10.24.27; 476,1.3; 488,27; 495,29; 503,15.16; 512,5
- *logikos*, rational, 468,18.21; 566,10; 582,14
- *logismos*, reasoning, 528,9; 547,7; 557,13
- *logos*, argument, 466,1 and *passim*; chapter, 469,5 and *passim*; nature, 474,16; kata logon, reasonab(ly), according to reason, 480,2; 525,22; 582,15; 601,14; 621,6; thesis, 485,2; pros logon (tinos), in correspondence with (something), 487,4.5; by reference to (something), 493,10; view, 490,14; account, 502,14; 531,7; 533,6; 544,4; 549,3; 554,7; 569,10;575,4; 594,19; 595,10.13.18; 644,15; proof, 503,26; 596,18; definition, 506,24; ana ton auton *logon*, in the same proportion, 513,25; book, 523,1.11; 573,19.24; 575,9; treatise, 524,27; 600,1; 626,1; 627,22; 628,7.16; feature, 526,2; discussion, 527,10; logou kreitonnes, countless, 530,18; kata ton auton logon, in the same manner, 536,25; mêkunein ton *logon*, to speak, 537,14; 633,14; statement, 547,22; principle, 503,26; 594,21;595,21; 598,2.3; 600,13.14.21; 601,18; 610,16; case, 600,1; *tô(i) logô(i)*, in thought, 627,6; word, 639,14; 641,9;644,1
- *loipon*, then, 475,16; 476,4; 541,14; 545,22; 551,22; remaining, 491,10; now (in sense of 'next up'), 512,18; further, 516,23; the rest, 555,9; the remainder, 625,17
- *lusis*, refutation, 465,22 and *passim*; dissolution, 528,7; 548,12.20; 554,11.21; 576,17; 618,15

makhê, conflict, 484,7; clash, 625,26 *makhesthai*, to contradict, 480,4;

- 610,23; to be inconsistent, 483,22; to contend with, to be at odds with, to be in conflict with, 515,6.16; 516,9; 520,26; 539,12.13; 610,25; 625,24; to battle against, 642,7
- *makrobiôtatos*, most long-lived, 493,18
- *manousthai*, to become rarefied, 521,9
- *manthanein*, to ascertain, 488,10; learn, 508,25; 633,10.11; to understand, 523,25
- mantikôs, prophetically, 529,22
- *marturia*, testimony, 483,12; 512,22; 592,5; 599,22; supporting passage, 523,8; evidence, 527,2
- *mathêmatikos*, mathematical , 514,25
- *mathêtês*, student, 508,14; 527,4; 529,25; 644,13
- *megethos*, largeness, 495,26; *huperexein tô(i) megethei*, to outsize, 517,13.17
- *mêkhanasthai*, contrive, 532,16; 554,3; 555,24
- mêkhanê, machine, 491,5
- *mêkhanêma*, machine, 492,23.24; contrivance, 607,7
- *mêkunein*, *mêkunein ton logon*, to speak at length, 537,14; 633,14
- *mênuein*, to declare, 533,6
- *merikos*, particular, 470,3.6; 471,12; 506,18; 507,21.22; 538,10; 567,18.22; 571,11; 581,15; 582,26.27; 586,10; 603,27; 604,5; 607,2; 616,26; 617,1.8; 622,4; 628,1.4; 629,3.9.23; 630,3; component, 504,11
- *meristos*, dividedness, 568,25.27; divided in parts, 571,7; 573,3; 617,12.14.16
- *merizein*, to divide, 563,6; 564,19; 570,15.19
- meros, part, 468,4 and passim
- mesos, intermediate, 478,2; 536,5;
 dia mesou, by means of, 493,3; en mesô(i), kata to meson, in the middle, 513,7.24; 521,18; 529,8; 535,26; to meson, mean, 513,12-16; 515,7-516,10; 523,21; 524,19; 526,2; 605,15; middle, 645,7

- *mesotês*, intermediate, 513,20.23; 514,19.23.26; 516,20; 521,14.21
- metabainein, to move, 575,19
- *metaballein*, to change, 501,8.11; 506,3; 526,1; 606,14; 611,19; 613,15; 616,11
- metabasis, changing, 571,8
- *metabatikos*, discursive, 576,13; 577,8.11,15.22
- *metabolê*, change, 559,5; 606,25; 613,12.13; 614,11; 615,20; 617,27; 620,23; 621,3.21; 622,12.14.20; 624,4.8; 627,17; 628,21; 630,26; 631,4.20; 646,3; alteration, 614,21
- metapiptein, to revert, 606,15
- *metarrhein*, to move back and forth, 536,10
- *methistanai*, to shift, 486,2; to remove, 491,4
- methodos, method, 532,7; 544,13
- metriôs, sufficiently, 564,25
- *mimeisthai*, to imitate, 486,18.22; 509,5; 537,1
- mimêma, imitation, 608,6
- mimêsis, imitation, 486,19
- *mixis*, mixture, 518,17
- moira, degree, 579,17; lot, 601,2
- *monas*, unit, 619,8.16
- *monogenês*, the only member of its kind; one of a kind, 512,27; 534,10; 549,9.13.14; 552,1.5.9
- *morion*, piece, 478,18; 480,22; 494,23; 495,11; 498,7.18; 500,1-501,28; 503,20; 505,19.24; 506,7.10; 507,9.16.19.23.24; 511,2.14; 538,16; part, 576,10; portion, 595,27; 604,9; one, 629,26
- morphoun, to shape, 542,23
- *muthos*, story, 611,3.5.13; 632,16-633,17; 640,1-641,3; 643,9; 644,4.6;
- nauagion, steersman, 623,22
- naupégein, shipmaking, 508,15
- naupêgos, shipmaker, 508,15
- *naus*, ship, 496,1; 508,14; 623,22; 625,20
- nêkhesthai, swimming, 487,23
- *nemein*, to dispense, 583,5
- *neneukenai*, to stretch, 535,4; *sunneneukenai*, to converge, 534,24
- *noein*, to conceive, 535,19.24; to

- perceive, 542,24; to understand, 547,8; 627,12; to consider, 549,7; to regard, 553,15; 579,23; to think, 570,7.8; 611,21; 575,6.10.18.23; 576,13; 577,10.11; to mean, 610,10; *nooumenon*, object of thought, 511,6; *noêteon*, one must consider, 584,5 *noêma*, intellection, 575,19.20; thought, 582,23 *noeros*, intellective, 486,20; 488,16; 564,6; 570,6; 574,27; 575,3.12.14.25; 576,21.23.25;
- 577,6; 578,6.7; 583,26; 637,8.18.28 *noêsis*, apprehension, 569,9.15;
- understanding, to understand, 575,22; 576,13; 577,9.23; 621,6; thought, 580,5; 581,7; conception, 600,3.16
- *noêtos*, intelligible, 511,4.11.13.20.22.25; 539,7; 575,20; 608,15; 611,7.10; 622,10; 637,21; 638,3; 639,2.3.6.8.12.17.18.19.23
- *nous*, intellect, 477,16; 484,20; 486,16.18.22; 570,6; 575,5.9.12.15.21.23; 576,6.11.12; 577,9.12.13.21.22.26; *noun ekhein*, to have sense, 506,12; 547,22; 637,10; *ton noun prosekhein*, to keep in mind, 644,23
- *oikeios*, proper, 474,22; 477,15.17; 483,25; 484,19; 485,6; 486,20.24; 489,10-491,9; 561,4; 562,7.8.25; 564,18; 586,19; 587,3; respective, 478,22; 499,12; own, 502,1; 538,9; 557,12; 595,19; 597,4; 610,16; 629,4; 633,15; appropriate, 538,8.11; 543,10; one's own kin (or relatives), 634,5; 635,1; 642,12; 644,12
- oikeiôsis, association, 536,24
- oikeiotês, oikeiotêta ekhein, to be assimilated, 536,27
- oikeioun, to appropriate, 499,28
- *oikia*, house, building, 474,19.23; 475,1.4.9.10.11.12.25.26.28; 476,2.5; 488,26.27; 495,28.29; 500,20; 503,13.14; 601,9.13
- *oikodomos*, builder, 474,21; 476,2; 488,26; 500,21

- oikodomoun, to build, 616,5
- oikonomia, structure, 544,12
- okhlêsis, worry, 537,15
- oktahedron, octahedron, 482,1; 532,2.10.18
- olisthos, unstable, 535,18 (cf. euolisthos); the fall (of Man), 635,19
- opsis, sight, 525,20
- orektos, desirable, 562,26; 563,1
- orexis, desire, 563,1.2
- organikos, to organikon, the instrument, 616,6
- organon, instrument, 616,9.10
- ostoun, bone, 503,20; 612,5
- ouranios, celestial, 478,3 and passim
- ouranos, heaven(s), 477,19 and passim; universe, 479,8 and passim
- *ousia*, substance, 479,13; 480,5; 482,5.18; 483,17; 484,2; 487,9.13.14; 490,11; 492,17; 493,2; 500,20.22; 504,10; 506,20.23; 507,1; 508,10.12; 516,13.24; 527,16; 561,26; 564,6; 566,11; 568,25; 570,3; 574,27; 575,3.14.26; 576,8.21.24.25; 577,6.12; 578,6.8; 583,26; 594,25; 595,21; being, 554,5; *kat' ousian*, substantially, 565,22; 595,2.5.17
- ousiôdês, substantive, 559,16; 577,18.22
- ousiôsis, being, 472,15; 616,21
- pakhumerês, dense, 518,26; 519,10
- *panteles*, complete, 549,9.10.11.12; 552,1.2.7; 571,20; 586,2 (cf. *teleios*); *eis to panteles*, forever, 598,22
- *pantelôs*, at worst, 518,22; completely, 539,5; 542,10.14.17; 553,21; 562,8; 566,27; 643,3.6
- *pantokalôs*, at all well (not in LSJ), 541,1
- *pantôs*, absolutely, 467,4; 468,10; 535,16; 541,22; 546,18; 564,5; 567,14; 579,1; 586,7,28; 604,8; invariably, 468,8; 469,13; 470,26.28; 471,12.17; 472,2.7.13; 538,10; 574,26; 576,4; 578,5; 583,15.25; 584,3.21; 592,6; 598,3; 602,16; 608,22; by all means,

518,1; surely, 546,16; 585,12; in all ways, 551,23; *pantôs*, *hôs pephuken*, entirely as much as is natural for it, 568,10; entirely, 599,1; 601,15

papuros, papyrus, 519,1.7

paradeigma, paradigm, 488,26; 510,22; 511,10-25; 544,20.22; 549,8; 550,7-559,15; 579,25; 607,25; 610,14; 613,5.6; 618,2.6.9.13.17

paradeigmatikôs, as paradigms, 488,25

- paradramein, to exceed, 482,8
- *paragein*, to bring forth, to introduce, 468,20; 476,15; 562,23; 565,19-26; 569,1; 571,3; 573,17; 574,1; 585,18.19; 616,17.21; to attribute, 622,24; *paragomenos*, created, 571,6; 584,8
- paragôgê, introduction, 472,15
- *parakhôrêsis*, abandonment, 569,13
- *parakhrêma*, just now; 496,18; on the spot 497,19; immediately, 502,3
- *parakouein*, to misunderstand, 638,25
- *parakrouein*, to deceive, 505,26; 553,9; to mislead, 512,10; 638,25
- paraktikos, productive, 570,1
- *paralambanein*, to receive, 501,4; to take, 541,20; 547,3; 586,26
- *paralogismos*, fallacy, 554,26; 594,16
- paralogizesthai, to mislead; 557,19
- *paraplêsion*, like, 468,19; 492,12; 548,15; 551,11; 558,24; 559,1.2; 569,15; 568,12
- paraskeuazein, to prepare, 543,11
- *paratasis*, extension, extended period, 472,18.20; 550,2; 558,5; 619,2
- pareinai, to be present, 543,27; 549,13; 569,5; 572,1.2.9.11; 574,3; 584,10; 595,7.8.11.12; 596,21; 606,10.11; 607,17; 608,21.23.26; 609,2.4.13.15.17.18; 622,6; 627,12
- parekhein, to provide, 599,16
- parektikos, able to cause, 523,25
- *parepomenos*, consequence, 587,18; 588,1

- *parexêgêsis*, misinterpretation, 531,23
- parhodos, introduction, 472,21
- *paristanai*, to show; 492,11; 639,1; to support, 523,4
- pas, every, all, 466,2 and passim; to pan, the universe, 478,21 and passim; entire, 468,4 and passim
- *paskhein*, to be in a predicament, 466,8; to suffer, 504,26; 528,14.20;.21.22.24; to be affected, 530,5
- patêr, father, 500,22.23; 501,4; 642,19; (of the Creator), 553,16; 579,24
- *pathos*, incident, 492,11; affection, 632,5; suffering, 641,27
- *peithein*, to convince, 469,20; 482,26; to persuade, 640,20; 642,13; *peisteon*, one must believe, 634,1
- peithô, autarkê eis peithô, sufficient to convince, 527,8
- *pentagônon*, pentagon, 536,15-537,3
- *peperasmenos*, limited, 608,5; 619,10-620,19; 626,8; 627,2
- *pepoiôsthai*, to be qualified, 481,20; 497,27; 527,10; 544,3
- *periagesthai*, to come round, 498,15; to get turned around, 502,3; to get reduced, 599,11; to circle back, 646,1
- periaptein, to attach, 488,10
- *periekhein*, to contain, 478,21.22; 534,19; 535,7; to surround, 492,22; 517,26; 518,2; to encompass, 510,1.2; 511,12-27; 552,4
- perigraphein, to conclude, 549,3
- periistasthai, to surround, 528,6
- *perikopê*, section, 520,6; 569,26
- *perilambanein*, to embrace, 511,4.11; 636,2
- *perilêpton*, to be comprehended, 621,6
- *perimenein*, to put up with, 539,16.25
- periodos, circuit, 579,11
- *periphora*, revolution, 486,5; 578,12; 579,20.27; 580,10
- peripiptein, to fall (into

contradiction), 480,19; 496,19; 501,21; to fall (victim), 584,17 *pezos*, footed, 516,27

- pezos, 100teu, 510,27
- phainesthai, obvious(ly), clear(ly), evident(ly), 482,5; 484,10; 490,28; 525,17.22; 530,4.17; 544,7; 557,8; 587,11; 597,24; to appear, to seem, 484,1; 517,11; 553,3; 564,2; 565,10; 574,19; 636,18; 637,14; 646,6; ta phainomena, the appearances, 498,10; 499,5; seen or visible, 508,23; 633,18; 636,9; hôs emoi phainetai, if you ask me, 482,18; autô(i) tô(i) phainesthai, his fallacious ideas, 512,14; not translated (strengthens enargôs or phanerôs), 492,10; 512,16
- *phanerôs*, clearly, 512,16; 559,11; openly, 644,25
- phantazesthai, to appear, 478,20
- *phlauros*, bad, 541,18; 566,18.20; 586,24; 588,21
- phlegein, to burn up, 518,3
- *philoplatônes*, Plato enthusiasts, 484,8
- philosophia, philosophy, 482,14; 502,11; kata philosophian, philosophical, 599,26
- *philosophos*, philosopher (referring to Proclus), 467,22; 477,7; 483,12; 502,2; 565,3; 573,13; 586,14; 587,12; 594,4; 601,21; 603,24; 622,22; 625,22; 635,9; (referring to others), 512,22; 519,22; 597,1
- *phlox*, flame, 507,2; 518,5,21.27; 519,3.12; 526,12
- *phobos*, fear, 632,5
- phônê, statement, 490,8; 524,16; apheinai phônas, to voice opinions, 621,24; 627,23
- phora, movement, 485,24; 488,15
- Phorkus, Phorkus, 634,9
- *phôs*, light, 523,22.24; 595,4.6.9; 596,19.22; 640,9
- *photizein*, to bear light; 523,20.26; to illuminate, 595,12
- phronein, to be prudent, 482,18
- *phronêsis*, intelligence, 477,16; 484,20; 517,4; 643,8
- phrontizein, to care about, 643,15
- *phrontis*, *kinein phrontida*, to motivate, 544,26

- *phthartikos*, destructive, 497,4; 498,23; 504,1
- *phthartos*, destructible, 480,13 and *passim*
- *phtheirein*, to perish, to be destroyed, 478,10 and *passim*
- phthengesthai, to speak, 524,24
- phthinein, to perish, 528,8
- *phthora*, destruction, 478,6 and *passim*
- *phusikos*, natural, 471,11; 486,21; 488,6; 489,4; 491,23; 492,21; 497,9; 518,6.7.22; 528,25; 537,21; 546,17; physical, 514,26; 526,3; *ta phusika*, natural philosophy, 530,23; 532,6; *phusikôtatos*, foremost natural philosopher, 599,24; 618,26; *phusikôtata*, quite natural(ly), 610,18; 620,7
- phusikôs, naturally, 491,24
- *phusiologein*, to give a physical theory, 516,22; 555,19
- *phusis*, nature, 469,3 and *passim*; *kata phusin*, natural(ly), 477,6 and *passim*
- *phuton*, plant, 472,3; 481,4; 486,4; 507,21
- *pikros*, bitter, 506,26
- pilêsis, compression, 491,8
- *pisteuein*, to believe, 634,18.24; 635,4.8; 644,7; *pisteuteon*, one must believe, 634,6
- *pistis*, evidence, 483,13; assurance, 502,15; *eis pistin*, to confirm, 633,2; 640,11
- *pistos*, credible, 498,5; 544,25; 600,10; 610,3; 631,14
- *pistousthai*, to be true to, 527,3; to establish, 586,21; 618,5; 598,12; 645,15
- *pithanos*, plausible, 483,16; 485,1; 498,3; 544,25
- *plagia*, epi ta plagia, kata ta plagia, horizontal(ly), 485,16.20.25; 475,1; 536,4;536,10
- *planômenos*, wandering (star or sphere), 488,12; 537,6; 578,25; 579,16
- *plêmmelôs*, discordant(ly), 539,4; 541,2-543,12; 545,21-547,16; 560,3.21; 564,24; 565,16.20; 584,24; 585,25; 586,27; 602,26; 609,23.25
- plêsiazein, to bring near, 519,9
- *plêthunein*, to be multiplied, 563,20; 571,7; multiple, 573,11; 617,12.15.17
- *pleura*, side, 534,24; 535,21; 536,17.18
- ploion, ship, 546,24
- **pneuma**, breath, 491,7; wind, 496,21; 625,20; spirit, 635,18
- podiaios, foot long, 495,29; 496,2
- *poiein*, to make, 466,3 and *passim*; to affect, 486,3; to undergo, 492,21; to do, 512,18; 604,4-5; 629,15; execute, 578,17; to produce, 560,23 and *passim*; *poieisthai mnêmên*, to refresh one's memory, 530,24; *tous logous poieisthai*, to argue 569,23; to give an account, 644,15
- poiêtês, maker, 469,14; 471,23; 591,2; 645,3; poet, 611,1; 632,1.2.9.17; 634,19; 635,10.14.22.24; 640,11.14; 641,3; 642,17
- poiêtikos, efficient, 467,13; 468,8; 473,24; 476,26; 508,17; 623,12.19; 625,13; poetic, 611,3.13; 632,13.16.27; 633,16; 644,4; 645,10; poiêtikôs (ekhein), (to be) making, 605,10-13; 613,26
- poikilia, diversity, 568,25
- *poiotês*, quality, 481,18; 497,5.27; 498,23; 504,1.5.6.16.18; 506,22.25; 515,7.10; 521,11; 527,13; 528,15; 530,21; 531,20; 544,4
- *polemein*, to be at war with, 515,9.14; 642,6; to be at odds with, 628,26
- *polemios*, hostile, 516,12; *polemiôs*, hostile, 516,17
- *polemos*, war, 632,5
- *polugôniôteros*, with more angles, 535,13
- ponêria, evil, 635,18
- ponêros, wicked, 635,15; 644,2
- *poson*, quantity, 506,11.13.19
- *pote*, at some time, 466,4 and *passim; pote ... pote*, at one time
 - ... at another time, 466,16 and *passim; pote ... pote*, now ... now, 574,14ff.
- pragma, thing, 472,15; 479,26;

490,17; 525,8; 569,24; 584,23; (10,24; 616, 22; fact, 540, 1;

- 610,24; 616,22; fact, 549,1;
- 552,25; 573,24; 637,11; in reality, 638,2
- pragmateia, treatise, 600,2; 611,25
- *pragmateiôdês*, serious, 540,21; 541,8; 603,22
- praxis, action, 566,13; 643,10
- prepon, becoming, 526,16-17
- *proagein*, to present, 483,13; to precede, 543,22
- **proairesis**, ek proaireseôs hairoumenên, to choose freely, 567,7
- *proanairein*, to anticipate and refute, 529,22
- proballein, to introduce, 645,17
- problêma, problem, 534,5
- *prodromos*, precursor, 543,20; 543,11
- *proeisêgeisthai*, to anticipate and introduce, 530,1
- proêkein, to advance, 524,21
- *proekkeisthai*, to mention above, 521,27; 583,9
- *proektithenai*, to expound beforehand, 520,6
- prognôsis, foreknowledge, 569,5
- *progonos*, ancestor, 634,3.25; 635,3; 644,9
- *prokeisthai*, to be one's present intention or task, 549,2; 557,6; *prokeimenos*, present, in question, now before us, 477,7; 510,21; 520,5; 523,10; 524,15; 527,3; 533,15.18; 540,22; 541,7; 544,12.24; 545,2; 551,14; 553,11; 553,11; aforementioned, 522,18; to propose, 608,9
- *prolambanein*, to assume, 600,6; 646,8
- *pronoein*, to provide (for), 522,9; to foreknow, 568,23; 569,17; 573,10.18; 583,8; 617,11
- *pronoia*, foreknowledge, 563,18.20; 568,21.22; 569,27; 570,14; 573,9.19.23; 575,9; 583,7.12; 617,14
- *prooikonomein*, to pre-arrange, 487,11
- *proomologein*, to grant or concede beforehand, 497,25; 628,7; 631,1

propherein, to bring forward, 529,17; 531,6 prosdiorismos, condition, 567,2; qualification, 594,17.18; 597.8.15.16 proseikazein, to assimilate, 517,3 prosêkein, to be suitable or appropriate, to befit, 477,21; 513,21; 533,4; 546,22; 547,19.23; 553,13; 554,8; 562,5; 563,8; 565,26; 585,18; 586, 21; 587,7; 604,15.17.21; 605,6.19; 608,15; 609,21; 615,1; 620,26; 621,12;630,20; 631,25 *prosênôs*, mildly, 526,17 prosharmozein, to attach, 475,5 proskhêma, façade, 482,14; appearing, 512,10; pretext, 522,25 proslambanein, to get, 635,16 prosmarturein, to bear additional witness, 527,5; to confirm, 638,7 prosnemein, to assign, 535,19 prosoikeioun, to associate, 535,7; 537.12prosphoros, fitting, 486,25 *prostassein*, to order, 510,8; 643,4 prosthêkê, addition, 594,9 pros ti, relative, 469,8; 473,15; 477,9 *protasis*, premise, 541,9; 544,15; 592,22; assertion, 555,10 *prothumêteon*, one must proceed eagerly, 529,11 prouparkhein, to precede in existence, to exist beforehand or already, 476,19; 488,25; 542,4 proupomnêmatisamenoi, previous commentators, 533,17; 534,12 *proupotithenai*, to undertake, 522,26psukhê, soul, 468,25; 469,4.13; 478, 18. 19. 28; 485, 5-490, 1; 492, 20; 553,13; 566,25; 567,5.6; 570,7; 575,17; 576,10; 577,7; 586,3; 616,6; 633,14; hê logikê psukhê, rational soul, 468,18.21; *hê tou* pantos psukhê, World-Soul, 488,13.17 psukhikos, psychic, 486,12; 570,5; 575.12psukhros, cold, 475,15; 494,2;

497,7.8; 504,11.15; 515,5.9.12.19.25; 516,7.15; 518,7; 528,11; 531,18; coldness, 528,5 *psukhogonia*, psychogony, 488,8; 537,10

psuxis, coldness, 481,19; 527,14

ptênos, winged (creatures), 486,1.27.28; 487,22; 516,27

puknousthai, to become dense, 521,8

pur, fire, 478,1 and *passim*

puraktoun, to fire, 519,9; 595,1

- *puramis*, pyramid, 482,1; 532,2.10; 534,20.24; 535,1.4
- *puramoeidês*, pyramid-shaped, 535,5

purios, fiery, 481,12; 492,1; 517,12.24; 523,26; 524,11 *purôdês*, fiery, 491,7; 516,24

- *rhêsis*, phrase, 499,28; 522,18; passage, 582,3; 583,10; speech, 600,26
- *rhêtos*, words, 488,11; lines, 533,15; 575,8

rhopê, inclination, 485,13; 488,5

- sarx, flesh, 503,19
- *selênê*, moon, 578,14; 579,3; 580,2; 633,19; 636,9.21
- *selêniakos*, lunar, 596,18
- sêmeion, point, 534,24; 535,10.15.23; 536,1; 578,13.25; 579,10.18.28; 580,23; eis to auto sêmaion apokatastasis, complete revolution or return, 579,3; 580,27
- *sidêros*, iron, 493,8; 519,8; 595,1
- *skelos*, leg, 487,24
- skemma, subject, 557,6
- skhêma, figure, 479,21; 483,24; 486,24.25; 487,13.15; 532,2-536,23; 593,14
- *skhesis*, position, 536,4; 546,22; relation, 576,6.9.22; 577,4; 624,16; 629,5.8; 630,7.10.14 (cf. *suntaxis*)
- *skia*, shadow, 523,20
- skiagraphein, to sketch out, 542,21
- skiagraphia, sketch, 547,11
- *skotos*, darkness, 523,22.24; 596,19
- smikrotês, smallness, 495,27
- \hat{soma} , body, 477,15 and passim
- *sômatikos*, corporeal, 572,20; 575,28
- *sômatoeidês*, bodily in form, 513,1; 520,6.9; corporeal (element), 624,24; 625,9.17

- *sômatousthai*, to be corporealized, 547,14
- sophisma, sophism, 564,4
- sophistês, sophist, 484,12
- sophistikos, sophistical, 574,21
- *sophos*, wise, 498,9; 572,9; 629,33
- *sôstikos*, sustains, 570,2
- sô(i)zein, to preserve, 491,3.11.25; 503,19; 505,2; 557,25; 558,12.19; 560,11; 561,11; 610,13; 618,2.6.12.17
- *sperma*, sperm, 501,5.9
- speudein, to hasten, 489,12
- sphaira, sphere, 488,9; 517,21; 535,10.12.13; 537,1.2.6.7; 578,10; 580,24; 595,7, 596,19.22
- sphairikos, spherical, 483,24
- sphairoeidês, sphere-shaped,
- 477,15; 484,19
- stasimos, stability, 534,16
- *stasis*, static condition, 614,25; 615,3
- sterein, to deprive, 487,28; 546,25; 565,19; 575,28; 585,27; 586,3; 623,11; 624,23
- stereos, solid, 481,24; 513,3.22; 514,21; 525,15.17.22; 526,1; 532,2.4; 534,7.18.21; 535,6.25; 536,15; 537,2; stereôteros, more solid, 518,25; 519,5
- sterêsis, privation, 586,2
- *stoikheiôdos*, elemental, 492,15; 506,20; 507,3; 519,13; 526,15
- *stoikheion*, element, 468,5 and *passim*
- stokhasmos, guesswork, 484,5
- *strophê*, dodginess, 603,21
- *sukophantein*, to criticize, 483,7; to misrepresent, 598,13
- sullêbdên, to summarize, 570,1
- *sullogismos*, (deductive) argument, 510,16; 581,9; 587,16; 591,15; syllogism, 544,15; 593,14; 624,12; inference, 588,3
- *sullogizesthai*, to infer, to make an inference, to reach a conclusion, 541,13; 542,6; 543,14; 544,5.19.27; 545,1.8; 551,18; 565,4.8; 585,12; 591,24; 592,26; 596,12; 601,25; 602,9; 624,9; 637,17; to deduce, 557,18; 593,10; to reason, 557,23; *ta akoloutha*
 - sullogizesthai, to draw conclusions, 592,9

- sumbebêkos, accidental, 623,20.23
- sumbolikos, symbolic, 533,21; symbolically, 532,7; ton sumbolikon tropon, symbolically, 488,22; sumbolikôs, symbolically, 534,15
- summetria, balance, 530,27
- *summerizesthai*, to be divided, 570,19; 571,5; 573,10
- *sumparateinein*, to extend, 555,14; 556,5.10
- *sumpatheia*, corresponding affection, 530,19
- *sumperainein*, to complete, 496,24; to accomplish, 638,19
- *sumperiagesthai*, to be led around with, 492,22
- *sumperidineisthai*, to be whirled around, 492,24
- *sumperithein*, to revolve with, 486,5; 492,13
- *sumpheron*, advantage, 476,28; advantageous, 643,14
- *sumphônein*, harmonize with, 515,23; 644,11
- sumphônia, accord, 516,12; eis sumphônian agein, to bring in tune, 484,8
- *sumphônos*, consistent(ly), 524,24; 541,12; 553,8; 557,7; 592,1; 598,14; agreement, 571,17; 572,12
- *sumphônôs*, consistent, 479,25; 490,17; 523,9
- sumphutos, innate, 625,20
- *sumplekein*, to intertwine, 515,27; 516,7; 611,4
- *sumplêrôtikos*, to fill completely, 495,25; to fill out, 500,17.19.23; 507,6.8.9; to complete, 508,19
- *sumplêroun*, to fill completely, 495,21.23.24; to fill out, 500,21
- *sumplêthunein*, to multiply, 568,23; 584,7
- sumpnoia, union, 516,3
- *sumpodizein*, to entangle, 499,25
- sumpoikillesthai, to vary, 568,26
- *sunagein*, to infer, 477,10; 541,15; 544,8; 555,10; 564,12; 584,25; 591,26; 592,17; 593,3.21; 597,9.23; 611,9; to imply, 498,24; to lead together, 514,21; to prove, 532,16; to follow, 540,25; 541,4; to unite, 588,26

sunaidion, co-everlasting, 566,3 sunamphoteron, composite, 476,15; 550,14; both, 606,23 *sunanaireisthai*, to be destroyed together, 473,16; 576,24; 583,7; to be removed, 577,25 *sunaphistasthai*, to withdraw with, 595,10 *sunaptein*, to join to, 515,12.16.20; 521,17.21; 595,10; 627,9 (cf. episunaptein) sunarithmein, to add, 620,2 *sunarkhesthai*, to begin together with, 548,18; 557,14 *sunarmozein*, to fit together, 521,14 sundeein, to bind (together), 513,20; 514,20.22; 515,3.18; 516,8; 521,20; 560,8; 601,4 sundesma, something bound together, 522,15 *sundesmon*, bond, 516,4 sundetikos, binding together, 516.20*sundiairein*, to divide, 582,1 *sundiistanai*, to become divided, 568,26; 584,7; to be extended, 569,1; 574,8 sunêgorein, to declare, 524,13; sunêgoroumenos, client, 483,8 sunêgoros, advocate, 600,1 sunekheia, kata sunekheian, continually, 598,5 sunekhein, to keep or hold together, 478,23; 576,11; 599,1; to keep, 563,4 sunekhês, continuous, 500,25; continually, 595,23 sunelaunein, to force, 494,13; 565,11; to hammer together, 496,21 *sunenoun*, to unite, 500,24.26 sungeneia, kinship, 524,3 sungenes, (a)kin, kinship, 512,5; 524, 1.8; 642, 12 sungignôskein, recognize, 527,13; to allow, 531,24 sungnômê, it is excusable, 484,8 *sunistênai*, to be constituted, 481,8.15; 482,10; 483,2; 489,20; 494,1; 498,27; 504,3; 507,17; 512,9.21,24; 514,14.17; 517,8.10; 518,10.15; 519,20; 520,1; 522, 1.3. 19; 523, 7; 524, 23. 25;

526,7; 527,12; 529,19.21; 530,1.12.15; 531,17; 532,1; 533,23; 537,5.17; 546,11; to erect, 536,19; to compose, 554,2; 555,24 *sunkeisthai*, to be composed, 470,4.5; 479,23; 482,12; 483,14; 485,18; 487,9.15; 503,14; 505,1.3.8.16; 507,23; 508,1.3; 510,3; 520,25; 526,7; 531,6; 534,22; 535,26; 536,15; 537,3;

619,20 *sunkhein*, to confuse, 542,24; 585,28

- *sunkhôrein*, to conidse, 542,24, 565,2 *sunkhôrein*, to grant, concede, agree, 468,6; 469,12; 470,15; 471,27; 473,11; 476,8.18; 477,18; 479,26; 485,2; 487,26; 501,18.22; 525,6; 529,9,13.27; 530,6; 531,3.15; 533,25; 540,23; 541,9; 545,5.9; 552,22; 554,20; 563,26; 564,5; 565,23; 574,12; 576,25; 584,15; 587,13; 590,2; 600,21; 603,7; 610,26; 616,23; 630,15; 635,27; 646,4
- sunkinein, to move along with, to be in movement with, 570,26; 574,7
- sunkrama, compound, 483,6
- *sunkrasis*, composition, 624,25; 625,9
- sunkrima, combination, 518,9
- *sunneuein*, to converge, 534,24; 535,22; 536,1.20
- sunokhê, coherence, 522,9
- *sunônumôs*, synonymously, 611,8; 637,25
- *sunoran*, to see, 497,16
- sunousia, conversation, 529,26
- sunousioun, to join substantially, 594,25.26; 595,15
- *suntaxis*, ordering (cf. *skhesis*), 577,4; 624,12; 627,14.20; 628,24; 629,14; 630,6.9
- *suntelein*, to help complete, 508,10; to help, 587,7
- *sunthesis*, combining, 475,27; composition, 516,21
- *sunthetos*, composite, 481,5; 482,21; 485,3.19.21.23; 489,16; 493,6.9.12; 500,3; 505,25; 506,1; 507,17.18; 508,2.3.5; 518,10.17; 529,18; 530,19.26; 533,13; 537,19; 600,3; 604,10; composed, 531,13; composing, 528,17; 530,26

- *sunthlibein*, to squeeze together, 491,8
- *suntithenai*, to assemble, 475,5; 476,1.3; to compose, 482,25; 507,20; 521,21; 625,3.8; 641,4
- *suntomos*, brief, 591,18; 610,13; 613,19
- *suntomôs*, in a concise manner, 533,18
- *suntrophos*, congenital, 625,1.10.18; 631,8
- sunuparkhein, to co-exist, 544,21
- *sunuphistasthai*, to come into existence together, 473,16.24
- *suskiazein*, to make obscure, 484,15; to darken, 512,13
- *sustasis*, constitution, 514,10; 527,24; composition, 526,20; 520,8; formation, 532,24
- *sustatos*, composite, 528,5
- *tassein*, *to tetagmenon*, the ordered state, what is ordered, 539,12 and *passim*; to order, 543,18 and *passim*
- *tautotês*, sameness, 515,9; 637,27; identity, 623,10
- taxis, order, 539,26 and passim
- *têde*, sublunar, 477,22; 485,22; 523,5.27; 524,1.7.11.18; 525,12; 526,7; down here, 538,13
- $tekhn\hat{e}$, expertise, 474,15.22
- *tekhnitês*, craftsman, 538,2.10.11.13.18.25; 539,2; 543,9.10
- tektôn, carpenter, 500,27
- *teleios*, complete, 508,11.15; 509,1.14; 511,7; 527,9; 542,18.20; 543,2.3.5.24.28; 563,7.8; perfect, 586,18; 587,6; 614,4
- teleiôs, completely, 600,22
- *teleioun*, to complete, 508,15; to be used, 539,19
- telikos, final, 476,27
- $telos, end, 477,12; 537,22; 549,5; \\ 552,14.16.21; 554,24; 556,3; \\ 559,22; 585,15; 589,4; 596,21; \\ 604,12; 618,10.26; 633,23; 638,23; \\ 645,7$
- tetragônos, square, 534,18; 535,20
- *thanatos*, death, 594,21; 601,2; 640,8

- *thesis*, thesis, 494,19; 497,19; position, 536,3; place, 546,22
- theios, divine, 516,28; 538,11; 562,5; 563,19; 577,20; 630,23; 637,18; 638,6; theioteros, more divine, 562,11.14; 587,3.13.27; theiotatos, most divine, 604,15 and passim; to theion, divinity, 609,26
- *theologein*, to theorize about God, 573,19.25; 584,11; *ta proteron tetheologêmena*, the preceding statements about God, 584,4
- *theologia*, account of the gods, 634,23
- theologos, theorist of God, 583,1
- *theôrein*, to observe, 496,20; 498,22; 504,24.28; 615,13.23.26; 624,2.9; to consider, 543,21; 546,21; contemplation, 577,14.15
- theôrêma, consideration, 565,10; question, 599,26
- theôria, theory, 618,26
- theos, god, God, 468,3 and passim
- *thermainesthai*, to be heated, 475,15.16.17; 594,27
- $\begin{array}{l} \textit{thermos}, \, \mathrm{hot}, \, 475, 17; \, 494, 2; \\ 497, 6.8; \, 504, 12.14; \\ 515, 4.5.13.18.25; \, 516, 6.12.15; \\ 526, 17; \, 528, 5.11; \, 531, 17; \, 536, 3; \\ 594, 25.26; \, \mathrm{heat}, \, 518, 9; \, 519, 16; \\ 523, 13 \end{array}$
- *thermotês*, heat, 481,18; 515,20; 527,14
- *thesis*, thesis, 494,19; 497,19; position, 536,3; 546,22
- *thinganein*, to touch, 519,5.7; 575,20
- *thnêtos*, mortal, 508,8-510,15; 523,15; 538,16; 567,21; 596,7; 598,7
- thruallis, plantain, 519,6
- *thura*, door, 500,28; 506,14.15; 507,24.27
- tiktein, to assemble, 472,19
- *tithenai*, to assume, suppose, postulate, 498,17; 511,3; 525,10; 590,9; 609,11; to place, 517,3; 521,15.19; 524,6.20; to do, 582,17; stance, 597,2; to refer, 633,12; to agree, 635,21; to apply, 637,2
- *tithênê*, nurse, 538,18; 542,1
- *tmêma*, division, 582,1

- *tmêtikos*, cutting, 534,26; cuts, 535,2
- topikos, local, 487,20-488,19
- *topos*, place, 478,13; 489,10-491,27; 514,18; 579,7; topic, 520,17; passage, 541,3; *kata topon*, locally, 488,20
- trigônon, triangle, 534,21-535,7
- trophos, nurse, 640,21
- *tropos*, manner, way, 484,16; 504,15; 505,14; 535,20; 536,23; 548,25; 570,10; 580,22.26; 593,9; 594,15; 599,4; 635,25; (syllogistic) mode, 593,13.21; 594,4; spirit, 611,16; *ton sumbolikon tropon*, symbolically, 488,22; *panti tropô(i)*, to the utmost, 642,3
- *trugôdes*, thick, 526,23
- *tukhê*, chance, 467,25
- *tuphlos*, blind, 488,21; 502,3
- *tupos*, vague indication, 542,25; mark, 640,26
- *xeein*, to make smooth, 474,18; 475,4.24; 476,4
- xenos, alien, 483,1; 493,26;
- 512,7.11; 523,5; 524,5.9; 526,20
- *xêros*, dry, 494,2; 497,6.9;

504,14.15; dry,

- 515,2.9.14.15.24.26; 516,7.16.17
- *xêrotês*, dryness, 515,23; 516,10; 527,15
- *xulon*, wood, 475,27; 476,1; 496,1; 503,15.17; 506,16; 507,25.26.27; 519,1.8
- $z \hat{e} n$, to be alive, 523,15
- *zêtein*, to investigate, 602,17; 629,26; *zêtêteon*, one must search, 566,15
- *zêtêsis*, inquiry, 533,28
- *zôdion*, Zodiac(al), 578,26; 579,16
- zô(i)on, living thing, 479,16.19.20.21; 485,5-487,15; 505,16.23; 507,20; 510,18-512,2; 516,25; 519,15; 523,14; 525,12; 526,7.27; 528,2; 549,12; 552,7; 553,15.18.20; 558,14; 567,21; 579,23; 582,14; 608,10; 625,5.11; 631,9; 637,24.28; animal, 481,4; 486,27; 487,20; 489,28; 507,20; 508,8-510,15
- *zôopoios*, vitalizing, 519,15; 523,13
- *zôtikos*, vital, 518,7.12.22; 519,13; 526,15

This page intentionally left blank

Subject Index

Bold numbers indicate that the passage in question is a direct quotation from Proclus.

actuality, see potentiality and actuality all by itself (auto kath' hauto), defined, 622,8-11 Archytus, 522,21 Aristotle, 589,7; 590,8; 482,22, etc. Generation of Animals, 523,14 Meteorology, 517,9 De Anima, 576.10 Atticus, 519,22; 606,17; 608,11 blasphemy, 612,21-3; 631,10-23 capacity, see potentiality and actuality cause one cause of all things, 468,2; 471,24-6; 565,23-5; 570,1-2; 573,28-9; 639,15 nothing comes to be without a cause, 467,23-4 efficient cause precedes product in time, 473,24-5 final cause in generation, 475,1-2; 476,5-477,12; 566,8-28 final cause is what is natural for each thing, 477,6; 566, 9-10; 568,14-16; cf. 569,13-14; 574,9-11; 617,21-2 what exists in product as copy exists beforehand in cause as paradigm, 488,24-5 accidental causes, 623,12-25 intelligible gods generated in cause, 639,17 visible gods generated in time, 639.25-7celestial spheres number of spheres, 537,7-10

revolutions of, 578,10-581,10 sphere of fixed stars, 579,2 do not have light by their own natures, 595,4-13; 596,21-3 'the same' and 'the other', 488.11 - 13see also heaven, planets and stars change subsists in changed and not in changer, 614, 10-12 what is unreceptive to evil is unreceptive to change, 630,25-6 contraries generation and destruction belong to / caused by, 477.6-7; 494,3-5; 496,28-497,1; 498,11; 498,20-23; 503,28-504,2; 504,22-3contraries have contrary natural motions, 477,7-8; 497,2 one thing has one opposite, 477,8 cosmos / ordered state always exists / coming to be, **466,21-3**; 471,17-18; **477,23-5**; 540,11-17; 548,10-26; **550,19-24**; 551,14-553,5; 562,10-17; 569,19-21; 585,7-24; **589,19-590,10**; **591,1-11**; 592,14-15.23-4; 594,1-2; 597,23-5; 599,21-2; 603,4-5; 605,21-606,9; **607,16-608,2**; **608,16-609,18**; 611, 14-15.20-1; 614, 2-3;622,18-20; 628,9-11; 638,6-14; 645,8-15; 645,16-646,8 does not always exist, 469,6; 474,8; 497,18-19

subject to change, 620,20-621,23; 622,20-21; 624,4-5; 627,15-16 sphere shaped, 477,15-16 products versus parts, 478,16-23 ensembles always exist, 478,11ff. simultaneous with traces of forms, 540,11 image of paradigm, 511,10-512,1; 544,19-23; 549,7-550,24; 551,14-559,21; 608,2-11; 613, 4-9; 618, 1-11 most similar to paradigm, **550,8-9**; 557,25-559,21; 608,10-11 a god, 533,7; 608,16ff.; 613,9-11; 620,20-24; 630,27-632,14; 635, 25-636.3complete, 508,5-510,16; 528,1-4 considered in conceptual isolation from God, 629,18-630,18 generated in cause versus generated in time, 638,26-639,27 craftsman either creates matter or makes serviceable, 538,2ff. product and producer simultaneous, 561,6-9 Creator, see God Democritus, 534,1 Dionysius, 644,16-17 disordered state whether always exists, 550,15-18; 561,9-11; 585,1; 590,19-591,1; 601,21-603,5 whether better than ordered state, 590,21-2; 602,1-6 meaning of 'disordered' / not-being, 585,24-596,7 evil, 587,18 caused by material natures, 623.12-25see also motion, cosmos, traces of forms dodecahedron. see elements elements whether parts of cosmos, 495,7-496,16; 498,4-499,24; 505.20

495,7-496,16; 498,4-499,24; 505,20 are contrary, 497,10 whether ensembles are generated

and destructible, 478,14-16; 495,7-498,4; 498,6-8; 504,2-4; 505,11-506,10; 595,19-24 intermediate elements needed to join extremes, 514,19-516,20; 521,11-24; 526,1-3 and senses, 520,8-23 new properties and powers emerge from composites of, 530,13-531,1 celestial pinnacles characterized by contraries, 527,11-531,21 dodecahedron does not correspond to fifth, 532,11-537,21 see also motion, heavens, fire embryo, 501,2-12; 542,23 Empedocles, 611,22-3 Euripus, 496,20 everlastingness and eternity everlastingness image of eternity, 549,17-18; 554,16-557,19 all species everlasting, 549,17-18 whether everlastingness is infinite in both directions. 549,18ff.; 554,16-557,19; 558,19-21 eternity has no priority / posteriority, 550,1-3; 558,3-5 everlastingness's infinity comes to be, **550,3-4**; 557,25-559,21 exegetic principles revision is permitted only if there is contradiction, 484,8-14 'for pedagogical reasons' (didaskalias kharin), 547,24; 548.22evil has no existence per se, 569,12 is abandonment of natural activity, 569,13-14 being in evil state is worse than not being at all, 565,20-21; 586,7-9 destruction of ordered particulars not absolutely evil. 604.2-11 what is unreceptive to evil is unreceptive to change, 630.25-6what is receptive to evil cannot have a beginningless existence, 469,3-5

state Fall of Man, see soul fire flame excess of fire, 518,5-6; 518,21; 526,14 elemental, vital, natural, inborn fire, 518,7-10; 518,21-2; 519,13-17; 526,15 celestial (ethereal) fire is vital, not caustic, 518,11-12; 519,13-17; **523,11-18**; 526, 15-17extremely pure and rare, 518,18 see also heaven, elements form not self-substantial / requires matter, 471,5-7 relation to suitable matter, 475,3-477,12 generation of form, 475,28 form of house in builder's soul is cause and paradigm of house, 488,25-7there are forms of all things, 488,27-489,2 some forms better than others, 493.7-8forms of specific living things are parts of paradigm of genus living thing, 511,10-512,1 traces of, 541,7-549,4 necessary for visibility, 546,27-547,19 images need not exist simultaneously with form, 552,23-4 Galen, 599,23-601,20 generation definition of, 472,14-17 God absent from and present to cosmos, 606,9-607,17; **608,22-609,18**; 622,6-7.27; 625,11-21; 628,18 whether always making, 605,11-21; 607,9-10; 612,11-12; 613,24-614,2 always sufficient, 466,9-11; 473,13-14; defined 474,14-15 same and unchanging, 466,10-11;

see God, (final) cause, disordered

474,7-8; **604,17-605,11**; 607,4-5; 608,16-17; 609,6-7; **609,26-7**; 612,10-11; 613,2-4; 613, 12 - 13, 22 - 3; 621, 14 - 15;622,18; 630,19-20 makes (prime) matter, 468,3ff.; 476,12-17; 538,10ff.; 543,8-9 makes all things, 471,23-4; 472,28-473,1 caused traces of forms to be in matter. 539.3ff.: 543.6-549.4 desires order, 562,26-7 creates immortal things, 589,21-2 not evil, 591,1-2 among most divine things, 604,16-17; 612,23; 621,13 invoked in prayer, 483,20-21; 613.21organization of living things pre-arranged by nature of Demiurge, 487,6-12; 493,9-12 causes a thing to exist simultaneously with appropriate order, 547,22-4; 565,25-6; 585,17-19 makes all things like Himself, 558,23-559,8; 567,14-15 not responsible for evil or disorder, 566,19-28; 567,9-10; 623, 12-13God's unitary knowledge of particulars, 568,23-8; 569,17-18; **570,8-18**; 570,18-571,2; 572,25-573,9; 573, 15-18; 579, 18-580, 9;581,10ff.; 617,11-18 eternally present, 572,8-11; 574.2-3God's 'move' from not creating to creating is not a change, 615,25-616,13; 616,22-617,9 etymology of 'god', 635,26-637,11 see also will, providence good, see cause (final), will (of God) heaven circular motion natural, 477,18-19; 484,18ff.; 490,1-5 whether made of four sublunar elements, 478,1-2; 482,7; 491,12-13; 492,3-4; 493,25-9; 496,25-6; 497,14-15; 512,17-537,21

made of pinnacles of four sublunar elements, 483,5-6; 491,13-14; 493,9-16; 518,17-8; 522,6-7; **524,6-8**; 524,10-14; 526,17-527,1; 527,15-17; 530,8-531,1 (mostly) of fire, 482,12-13; 485,3-4; 489,19-20; 516,20-519,17; 522,5-6; 523,11-524,2; 525,16 whether ungenerated and indestructible, **478,10-11**; 494,5-7; 496,27-8 whether light or heavy, 478,2-4; 484,24ff. living thing / ensouled, 485,4; 486.13-14 circular motion by agency of soul, 486,14; 489,24-490,1; 492,18-20 body of heaven most long-lived and impassive as possible, 493.17 - 19'heaven' (ouranos) sometimes synonymous with 'cosmos', 509,9-14 see also motion, will of God, fire, celestial spheres Heraclitus, 525,7 Herodotus, 582,18-19 Homer, 582,20; 633,3 house, 475,1ff.; 488,25-7 hupekkauma, 489,15; 492,9.25; 517,27; 518,11 infinity actual infinity (of past time) cannot be traversed. 619.7-9 cannot be increased or multiplied, 619,25-620,6 what is limited does not have infinite power, 627,2-3 intellect / intellective substance connected to circular motion, **477,16-17**; 484,20-21; 486,16-17 many in being and thinking, 570.6-7 divine, creative intellect thinks non-discursively, 575,3-22; 577,21-2 particular intellective substances

/ intellects think discursively, 575,3-576,2; 577,7-23

beyond time, 576,11-12 can exist without bodies, 576,6-8.19-24 particular souls are intellective substances, 577,6-7 World-Soul is intellective, 488,16-17 divine nature is intellective and incorporeal, 637,19-20 intellective and incorporeal beings above motion, 637,7-9 Manicheans, 470,19 (prime) matter always suitable, 466,12ff.; 473,12-13; 474,15-477,12; 538.5-6 whether comes to be in time / not everlasting, 467, 19-20; 471,20ff.; 473,10-474,8; 545,4-18 inalterable, 466,14-15 Plato defines as receptacle and nurse of generation, 541,25-542,1; 538,16-18 per se immobile and without form, 539,5; 542,10-11 moves discordantly due to traces of forms, 539,3-4; 542,7-8 always possesses traces of forms, 540,10; 543,14-544,4 matter and generation are relative terms, 469,8-10; 477.8-9matter and form are relative terms, 473,13-14 is created without matter. 470,20-2; 471,2-12; 472,9-21 never existed separately from forms, 476, 12-17 see principles Menander, 583,3-5 motion motion natural to living thing not natural to its underlying body, 485,13-15; 486,10-13 relation to configuration of body, 486,23-487,20 elements naturally rest or move in circle in proper place, 489,3-490,5; 490,5-23; 490,24-492,4; 492,5-493,24

circular motion beyond nature, 492.24-8discordant and disorderly, 541,20-24, 542,25-543,6; 546, 3-549, 4without motion there is no time, 576,2-3 in bodies, 576,4 see also heavens Mount Olympus, 496,7-9 myth examples of Plato's own invention of myths, 632,20-23 examples of Plato's use of poets' myths, 632,23-633,14; 645,8-15 challenges Proclus to take myths entirely literally, 634, 12-636, 3 Plato pays lip-service to myths to avoid persecution, 640,1-8; 644,15-16; 644,16-645,1; 645,8-15 all myths useless and harmful, 643,3-6 myths are products of wicked daimons, 644,2-4 see also poets nature creates things according to form, 471.3-4nature of generated things prevents them from being completely everlasting, good,

etc., 473,26-474,8; 477,6; 559,6-8; 566,8-568,5; 568,14-20; 572,20-21; 574,9-11; 616,16-19; 617,21-2; 626,6-7; 629,4-5 principle of motion and rest, 546,17-18 makes bodies, 582,12 is ignorant, 582,12-13; 583,8-9 having a property substantially by nature *versus* superveniently by acquisition, 594,18-596,27; 622,24-6 having a property substantially by nature *versus* by relation / ordering, 624, 9-12, 14-16.

ordering, 624,9-12.14-16; 627,17-20; 628,12-17.21-4; 629,18-630,18 see also God, evil Orphics tradition of calling cosmos a god, 631, 25-6paradigm one of a kind, 549,9.12-14; 552.5-9eternal, 549,9; 552,9-21; 608,7-11 complete, 549,9-12; 552,2-5 see also form, cosmos parts and wholes whole better than parts, 478,25-479,5 if parts are destructible, whole is destructible, 494,12-495,6; 498,15-17; 502,6-505,10 a part of a part of the whole is a part of the whole, 495,9; 499,21-3; 506,10-508,4 what fills a whole are parts / pieces, 495,24-5; 500,17-18; 507, 6-10part *versus* product, **478,16-19**; 499,2-502,5; 505,11-508,4; 508,5ff. planets and stars, see also celestial spheres Venus (Hesperus), 578,16 Mercury, 578,16 Mars, 578,18; 579,5 Jupiter, 578,19; 579,5 Saturn, 578,19; 579,5-6 Moon, 579,3 dogstar, 496,4 Plato (the following lists only instances of dialogues mentioned by name), 472,3 etc. Cratylus, 636,7.14 Gorgias, 632,23 Laws, 633,12; 645,6 Minos, 632,24 Phaedo, 589,22-3 Phaedrus, 589,10 Philebus, 561,7 Protagoras, 478,9 Republic, 589,10; 640,13; 644,14-15 Statesman, 509,13; 548,23; 601,4-5; 604,16; 606,10.19; 611,18; 620,23; 622,6.9.23; 623,26; 624,7.13; 629,15; 645,18; 646,5.8

Timaeus, 508,22; 512,23; 527,18;

529,3; 532,24; 546,7; 548,21; 553,12; 567,20; 579,22; 600,25; 604,21; 606,10.17; 611,20; 621,4; 622,9; 628,20; 633,17;644.7Letters, 644, 16-17; 645, 1; 646, 1.6 Plotinus, 486,17; 524,19-527,1; 571,16; 574,2; 583,10; 584,10; 617,24 Plutarch, 519,23 poets call everything 'gods', 632,2-10 describe gods as being generated without being destroyed, 632, 10-14whether poets have covert meanings, 635,23-5 Plato's attack on, 640,8-17 see also myth, Orphics Porphyry, 521,25-522,23; 546,6ff. potentiality and actuality and the suitability of matter, 475.3-476.11 self-actualization of a capacity does not involve qualitative change, 614,3-615,25 capacity is like a static condition, 614.25-6 in God's case, capacity (power) and activity identical, 616,13ff. principles (and corollaries) everything that comes to be (at some time) requires matter, 466,2; 470,26-8 not everything that comes to be (at some time) requires matter, 467,20-468,22; 469,17-470,25; 471,12-472,13 not everything that comes to be comes to be from something that exists, 472,22-473,9 everything generated is destructible, 589,8-15; 592,13-14.23; 593,2-3.5-6; 597,2-3; 597,20; 598,14-15; 599.19-20everything ungenerated is indestructible, 589,9-15; 593, 1.7; 600, 8.14-15 everything destructible is generated, 589,16-18; 593,3-4.6.8-19; 602,9-10 everything indestructible is

ungenerated, 589,18-19; 593, 4.8. 19-26; 596, 1-27; 600,17-601,19 generation better than destruction, 590,17-18; 602,4 whole better than parts. 478,25-479,5 product and producer simultaneous, 561,6-9 only most divine things unchanging, 604,14-15; 609,26-7 what follows from impossibility is impossible, 609,8-9 what follows from possibility is possible, 609,10 Proclus An Examination of Aristotle's Criticisms of Plato's Timaeus, 482,22; 523,2-3; 626,2-3 On Ten Puzzles About Providence, 569,27; 573,18-19; 575,9 providence (of God) is unitary despite plurality of things, 568,22-3; 569,17-18; **570,8-18**; 573,9-13; 573,15-18; 583, 4-12; 617, 11-18 see also knowledge (under God) Ptolemy, 537,8 reason in command of nature, 582,14-16 relation, see nature

ship, 472,19; 496,1; 508,14; 546,24; 623,22-5; 625,19-21 [Theseus'] ship not numerically the same over time, 502,24-503,1; cf. 548,8-10; 598, 4-6; 601, 6-14 Socrates, 503,18; 512,4; 547,10-11; 567,24-6Sophroniscus, 567,24-6 soul rational soul, 468,18-22 no beginning to its existence, 468,25-6 beginning to its existence, 468ff. World-Soul, 488,17 does not itself move locally, 488,20-3and evil, 566,25-568,5

being motion, thinks with motion, 570,7-8 do not have knowledge by nature, 596.23-5Fall of soul, 635,17-19 see also intellect stereometric figures, 531,22-537,21 sun, 479,4 illumination of transparent body as analogy of instantaneous creation, 472,17 light exist substantially in, 595.4-5syllogistic modes Darii, 393,14 Taurus, 520,4-521,25 Theophrastus, 520,18.26; 521,2 time creation in versus instantaneous, 472,15-21 temporal 'always', 472,24-5 itself came to be / not infinite in both directions, 548,18-20; 554,16-557,19; 559,8-21; 576,16-17; 613,4-9; 619,1-25; 620,6-10 not all priority is temporal, 574,12-27; 577,21-578,6; 583,23ff. intellective substances are in time, 575,3-576,15 without motion there is no time, 576.2-3see also infinity, eternity traces, see forms

wax, 474,24; 475,18-23

will (of God) has two wills - one that disorder not exist and one that order exist, 560,2-8; 586,16-17 whether effective by very existence, 560,9-11; 560,20ff.; 571,2-3; 580,17-18; 616,7-8 product exists simultaneously with will, 564,27-568,5; 569,17-21; 572,17-573,13 both wills always in Him, 560,11ff. not temporal, 560,17-19; 568,6-569,21; 571,3-16; 571,14-15; 571,21ff.; 574,6; 580,9-581,10 whether will that disorder not exist more proper to God. **562,4-7**; 586,17-21; 587,27-588,1; 588,16-17 two wills are one because desire for order is one, 562,20ff.; 574,8-9; 586,12-589,3 is unitary, 568,20-1; 568,28-569,1; 571,3-16; 574,8-9; 584,3-6; 584,19-20; 616,19-20; 617,18-21 heavens / cosmos gain restored immortality by will of God, 494,9-11; 548,7-8; 559,16; 596,12-14; 598,7-599,9; 638.6-14is the Good, 584,6-7

Zodiac, 578,26 Aries, 578,26 Taurus, 579,16 This page intentionally left blank

Index of Passages

Numbers in bold type refer to the notes, those preceded by 'i' to the notes to the introduction.

AESCHYLUS *TrGF* 3 fr. 139: **372** ALCINOUS Didask. 15.2,2-3: i11, 399 ALEXANDER in An. Pr. 26,16-18: 392 in Metaph. 79,22-80,7: 64; 80,15: 273 in Top. 232,6-10: 467 [ALEXANDER] Aporiai kai luseis 18 (esp. 2,5-6 and 30,25-32,19): i11, 399 in Metaph. 599,31-4: 332; 711,35: 472 Problemata 1.87,40ff.: 501 ANAXIMANDER DK 12A15: 400 ARISTOTLE An. Post. 71b12: i20; 73a21-3: i20; 77a5-10: i20 Cael. 1.2: 177; 1.2-4: 50; 269a14: 39; 270a14ff.: i14, 81; 270a18-20: 39; 270a22: 39; 270b20: 150; 270b22-3: 433, 513; 276b1: 47; 279a15: 342; 279b32-280a2: 223; 285a29: 62; 286a29: 47; 286a33: 39; 292a20: 62 DA 406b26ff.: 63; 411b18-19: 343; 418a29-419b3: 28; 425a11-13: 141; 432b17-19: 59; 433a21: 294 EN 1.1-2: 294; 1177b26-1178a8: i19 GA 736b29-737a7: 134; 744b12-27: 176 GC 330b4: 141; 331a12-14: 107; 337a23: 340 Metaph. 999a24-b24: i20;

1003a13-15: i20; 5.25: 89; 1013b13-15: 467; 1051b24: 332, 338; 1055b30: 39; 1060b20-1: i20; 1072b18: i19; 1072b24: 332, 338; 1086b14-1087a25: i20 Meteor. 340a1: 131; 340b21-3: 133, 134, 173; 340b27-9: 141; 341b1ff.: 73; 341b21-2: 133, 173; 341b36-342a1: 68; 1.7: 73 MM 1212b39-1213a7: i19 PA 665b20-1: 176 Phys. 192a22: 39; 195a13-14: 467; 197a8ff.: 7; 203b6ff.: 400; 219a1ff.: 340; 261b16ff.: 39; 266a23ff.: 478, 482 Peri Ideôn see Alexander in Metaph. Sens. 437a22: 141; 446b27-447a3: 28 [ARISTOTLE] Mund. 391b11-12: i12; 392a5-9: 433; 392a8: 150, 513; 396a31: 400 Plant. 815b33: 151 ASCLEPIUS in Metaph. 21,1ff.: 366; 74,5-10: 366; 306,6-9: 467; 349,26ff.: 89 DAMASCIUS *in Phaed.* ii §132: **192** DEMOCRITUS Mund. 391b11-12: i12; 392a5-9: 433; 392a8: 150, 513; 396a31: 400 Plant. 815b33: 151 DK 68A40: 199 EMPEDOCLES DK 31A3: 495; DK 31B27: 502

GALEN Peri apodeixeôs: 403 HERACLITUS DK 22A1: 494, 495; DK 22B8: 495; DK 22B53: 494; DK 22B80: 494, 495 HERMIAS in Phaedr. 62,25: 472; 65,3: 472 HERODOTUS Hist. 1.47: 363 HESIOD Theogony 212: 500; 225f.: 495; 230: 498 Op. 16ff.: 495; 804: 499 Shield 144: 496; 195: 496 HOMER Iliad 4.440: 495, 496; 9.502: 497; 14.203: 500; 16.672: 500; 16.682: 500; 19.91ff.: 498 Odyssey 4.379: 364; 4.468: 364; 19.178-9: **505** IAMBLICHUS Myst. 8,3: 335 MENANDER *Epitrepontes* ll. 1084-6 (= fr. 174): 367 NEMESIUS Nat. Hom. 42: 366 NUMENIUS fr. 12: 472; fr. 20: 335; fr. 51: i2 OLYMPIODORUS in Alc. 43,28-44,2: 365; 120,22-3: 298 in Cat. 43,14-15: 22 ORIGEN Contra Celsum 5.23,22: i11, 399 De Principiis 3.6,6: i11, 399 PARMENIDES DK 28A13: 502 PHILOPONUS Contra Arist. fr. 121 (Wildberg): 329 in Cat. 20,9-14: 22 in DA 1-2: 13; 78,10ff.: 332; 79,21ff.: 332; 155,12: 344; 188,26-7: **365**; 260,23-4: **333**; 3.4-8: 13 in GC 145,22ff.: 185; 214,27: 201; 228,8-19: i2 in Phys. 12,19-21: 361; 276,31-277,4:7 PHOTIUS *Bibliotheca* 461b8-9: **i11**, **399**

PLATO Alcibiades 115D8-11: 298 Cratylus 397C4-D8: 515; 397C8-D6: 513; 397D2-4: 433; 410B5-7: 513 Gorgias 523E8-524A1: 503 Parmenides 134C10-D6: i19, i21; 134D1-E8: 366 Phaedo: 142; 88B: 400; 95B: 400; 106D2-4: 388; 108B-C: 141; 110B5-7: 204 Phaedrus 245D3-4: 386, 393; 246E-247A: 204 Philebus 26Eff.: 287; 26E2-4: 287; 26E6-8: 287; 27B1-2: 287 Laws 672B3-5: 507; 715E7-716A1: 536; 892B: i4; 896A: i27; 896E: i28; 903C-D: 44 Protagoras 332C: 39 Republic 377B11-378E3: 527; 379C5-7: 299; 420C6-7: 176; 523-5: 64; 530B2-3: 157; 546A2: 382; 596A6-7: 64; 597B5-7: i19; 617E4-5: 300 Sophist 265C8-9: 19 Statesman 269Cff.: 226; 269C4-5: 422; 269C4-279E1: i10; 269D5-6: 419, 493; 269D5-7: 456; 269D7-8; 114; 270A: 84, 225; 270A4: 268; 272Eff.: 420, 465; 272E3-6: 473; 272A3: 474; 273A6: 474; 273B4-C2: 475, 491; 273E1-2: 422 Symposium: 502 Timaeus 27D6-28A1: 419; 27D6-28A4: 460; 28A: 490; 28Aff.: 224; 28A4-6: 5; 28B2-4: 113; 28E5-29B1: i19; 29A5-6: 418; 29B3-D3: 167; 29E1-3: 277; 29E1-30A6: 291, 422; 29E3: 303; 30A2-3: 301, 381; 30A2-5: 220, 280, 296; 30A2-6: 210, 376; 30A3-5: i5, i26; 30A4-5: 279, 412; 30C2-31A1: 115; 31Aff.: 348; 31A8-B3: 241; 31Bff.: 47; 31B1: 230, 231; 31B1-32C8: 119; 31B3: 228; 31B4: 139; 31B4-8: 164; 31B4-32B8: i2; 31B8-32A7: 171, 172; 32B8-C1: 144, 146; 32B8-33B1: 184; 32Cff.: 84; 32C2-4: 268, 422; 33B: 52,

34A: 53; 34Aff.: i28; 34A1-2: 57; 34A2: 37, 55; 34A8: 421; 34B10ff.: 60; 36C: 61; 36C-D: 348; 37Cff.: 341; 37C6: 341; 37C6-D1: **354**; 37C6-38A1: 254; 37D1-2: 275; 37D3: 229; 37D5ff.: 305; 37D6-7: 234; 37E1-3: 266; 37E4: 285; 38B3-C3: 260; 38B6-7: 265; 38C1-3: 425, 452; 39E10-40A4: 166; 39E10-40A7: 130; 39E10-40B8: i3; 40A: 51, 69; 40D3-5: 520; 40D3-41C3: 511; 40D6-41C3: i43, i44; 40E5-6: 512; 41A-B: 224; 41A7-8; 268; 41B1-2: **391**; 41B2-3: **i8**, **396**, 401; 41B2-6: 282, 406; 41B4-6: i9; 41B6-C6: 112; 41B7: 109; 41C2-3: 387; 41C4-5: i33, i36, **304**; 41D: **336**; 42D2-4: **300**; 42E9-43A1: 43, 87, 101, 105, 205, 416; 49A6: 207, 211; 51A7: 221; 52B2: 221; 52E4: i30; 53A2-B5: i5; 53A8ff.: 212; 53B2: i29; 53B3-4: 421; 53D7-E8: 187; 54B-D: 107; 54D6: i2; 55C4-5: 191; 55C4-D6: 198; 57C3: i6; 58D2: 514; 69C: 336; 92C9: 228 [PLATO] Ep. 2, 313E1-2: 533; 13, 363B1-6: 532; 13, 363B5-6: i45 Minos 318D6-8: 504; 319B5-6: 505; 319C1-E5: 506 PLOTINUS Enneads 2.1: i11; 2.1.1: 399; 2.1.2,4-6: 156; 2.1.2,5-16: 162; 2.1.2,13: i15; 2.1.3,16-18: 71; 2.1.4,9-10: 176; 2.1.4,11-12: **174**; 2.1.4,12-13: **175**; 2.1.5,6ff.: 336; 2.1.6,2-16: 172; 2.1.6,21ff.: i2; 2.1.7: i16; 2.1.7,25-6: 175; 2.1.7,46-9; **399**; 2.2.1,1: **56**; 2.3.17,4-5: **361**; 2.3.17,6-9: **362**; 2.3.18,15: **335**; 3.3.4,8-9: **362**; 3.3.5,3-8: 176; 3.5 passim: 502; 4.4.10,1ff.: 335; 4.4.13,7-8: 361; 5.1.8,5: 335; 5.8.8,5ff.: **335**; 5.9.3,25-6: **335**; 6.1.27,28: **15**; 6.4.11,16: **333**; 6.7.1,45-57: 325; 6.7.35,21: 332

PLUTARCH On the Generation of the World according to Plato: 137 Moralia 390Aff.: 141; 1002E-1003B: 137; 1003C: **204**; 1007D: **137**; 1013D-1017C: 137; 1015E: i28 PORPHYRY in Tim. (Sodano) fr. 48: 143; fr. 49: 145, 222; fr. 50; 222; fr. 60: 148; 2 fr. 31: 419 VP 22,6-7: 363 PROCLUS An Examination of Aristotle's Criticisms of Plato's Timaeus: $\mathbf{48}$ ET §18: 43; §65: 43 in Alc. 144,4: 298 in Crat. §185: i11, 399 in Parm. 707,24-6: 233; 907,28-30: 233; 924,32-4: 332; 957,22: 366; 968,13ff.: 366 in Remp. 1.81,7: 472; 2.11,17ff.: 235 in Tim. 1.233,23-234,2: 10; 1.235,26-32: 422; 1.237,22-238,2: 161; 1.256,25-257,8: 419; 1.276,30f.: 137; 1.2777,24-7: 419; 1.438,28ff.: 332; 2.9,4-5: i2; 2.42,9-44,24: i16; 2.49,12ff.: 48; 2.49,29: 48, 192; 2.61,16-17: 332; 2.278,31ff.: 63; 3.37,13ff.: 363; 3.37,31-2: 341; 3.45,5ff.: 360; 3.112,19-133,10: i16; 3.113,14ff.: 48; 3.212,6ff.: i11, 399 Ten Puzzles (Isaac) 5,14-23: 310; 5,18-19: **334**; 5,30-3: **311** PTOLEMY Almagest 7.2: 203 SEXTUS EMPIRICUS PH 3.140: 341 SIMPLICIUS in Cael. 12,6-16: 161; 20,10-25,23: i13; 21,18-25: 75; 21,33ff.: 65; 35,33ff.: 73; 115,30-116,2: **161**; 306,25ff.: 472; 369,26-8: i11, 399; 462,12ff.: **203**; 640,24-671,20: **48**

in Phys. 207,34-5: 9; 319,10-11:

466; 706,34ff.: **341**; 1157,10-1158,29: **329**; 1334,25: **i11**, **399** SOPHONIAS *Paraphr. in DA* 128,5-6: **332** SUDA 'Taurus': **138**

SYRIANUS *in Metaph.* 3,1: **472**; 4,32: **332**, **338** THEMISTIUS *in Phys.* 144,23: **341** *Paraphr. in DA* 119,6-7: **294**