Proclus' Commentary on Plato's dialogue *Timaeus* is arguably the most important commentary on a text of Plato, offering unparalleled insights into eight centuries of Platonic interpretation. This edition offers the first new English translation of the work for nearly two centuries, building on significant recent advances in scholarship on Neoplatonic commentators. It provides an invaluable record of early interpretations of Plato's dialogue, while also presenting Proclus' own views on the meaning and significance of Platonic philosophy. The present volume, the third in the edition, offers a substantial introduction and notes designed to help readers unfamiliar with this author. It presents Proclus’ version of Plato’s account of the elements and the mathematical proportions which bind together the body of the world.

Dirk Baltzly is Senior Lecturer in the School of Philosophy and Bioethics, Monash University. He has published on topics in ancient Greek philosophy from the Presocratics to late antiquity, as well as in contemporary virtue ethics.
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In this translation we have sought to render Proclus’ text in a form that pays attention to contemporary ways of discussing and translating ancient philosophy, while trying to present the content as clearly as possible, and without misrepresenting what has been said or importing too much interpretation directly into the translation. We have not sought to reproduce Proclus’ sentence structure where this seemed to us to create a barrier to smooth reading, for which reason line and page numbers will involve a degree of imprecision. We have found the French translation by A. J. Festugi`ere an invaluable starting-point, and it is still a useful and largely faithful rendition of Proclus’ Greek. However, we consider it worthwhile to try to make the philosophical content and arguments of Proclus’ text as plain as possible. Something of our intentions can be deduced from the translation and commentary that Tarrant produced cooperatively with Robin Jackson and Kim Lycos on Olympiodorus’ Commentary on the Gorgias.

We believe that the philosophy of late antiquity now stands where Hellenistic philosophy did in the early 1970s. It is, at least for the Angloanalytic tradition in the history of philosophy, the new unexplored territory. The most impressive contribution to studies in this area in the past fifteen years has been the massive effort, coordinated by Richard Sorabji, to translate large portions of the Greek Commentators on Aristotle. R. M. van den Berg has provided us with Proclus’ Hymns, while John

1 Festugi`ere, (1966–8). We are enormously indebted to Festugi`ere's fine work, even if we have somewhat different aims and emphases. Our notes on the text are not intended to engage so regularly with the text of the Chaldean Oracles or the Orphic fragments, or the history of religion. We have preferred to comment on those features of Proclus' text that place it in the commentary tradition.

2 Jackson et al. (1998).

3 To be sure, some of the seminal texts for the study of Neoplatonism have been available for some time. These include: Dillon (1973), Dodds (1963), Morrow (1970), Morrow and Dillon (1987), O’Neill (1965). There are also the translations by Thomas Taylor (1758–1835). While these constitute a considerable achievement, given the manuscripts from which Taylor was working and the rate at which he completed them, they cannot compare well with modern scholarly editions.

4 The Ancient Commentators on Aristotle (Duckworth and Cornell University Press). The first volume in the series, Christian Wildberg's translation of Philoponus' Against Aristotle on the Eternity of the World, appeared in 1987. There are a projected 60 volumes including...
Note on the translation

Finamore and John Dillon have made Iamblichus’ *De Anima* available in English.\(^5\) Sorabji’s Commentators series now includes an English translation of Proclus’ essay on the existence of evil.\(^6\) There is also a new edition of Proclus’ eighteen arguments for the eternity of the world.\(^7\) We hope that our efforts will add something to this foundation for the study of late antiquity. If we have resolved ambiguities in Proclus’ text without consideration of all the possibilities, or failed to note the connections between a particular passage in the *Timaeus* commentary and another elsewhere, then we can only plead that our team is working to begin the conversation, not to provide the final word.

In all five volumes in this series, the text used is that of Diehl. His page numbers and line numbers are reproduced in the margins; the page numbers are in bold. Deviations from that text are recorded in the footnotes. On the whole, where there are not philological matters at issue, we have used transliterated forms of Greek words in order to make philosophical points available to an audience with limited or no knowledge of Greek.

Neoplatonism has a rich technical vocabulary that draws somewhat scholastic distinctions between, say, intelligible (*noêtos*) and intellectual (*noëros*) entities. To understand Neoplatonic philosophy it is necessary to have some grasp of these terms and their semantic associations, and there is no other way to do this than to observe how they are used. We mark some of the uses of these technical terms in the translation itself by giving the transliterated forms in parantheses. On the whole, we do this by giving the most common form of the word – that is, the nominative singular for nouns and the infinitive for verbs – even where in the corresponding Greek text the noun is in the dative or the verb a finite form. This allows the Greekless reader to recognize occurrences of the same term, regardless of the form used in the specific context at hand. We have deviated from this practice where it is a specific form of the word that constitutes the technical term – for example, the passive participle of *metechein* for ‘the participated’ (*to metechomenon*) or comparative forms such as ‘most complete’ (*teleōtaton*). We have also made exceptions for technical terms using prepositions (e.g. *kat’ aitian*, *kath’ hyparxin*) and for works from Alexander Aphrodisias, Themistius, Porphyry, Ammonius, Philoponus and Simplicius.

\(^5\) Van den Berg (2001), Finamore and Dillon (2002). Other important, but somewhat less recent, additions to editions and modern language translations of key Neoplatonic texts include: Segonds (1985–6) and the completion of the *Platonic Theology*, Saffrey and Westerink (1968–97).

\(^6\) Opsomer and Steel (2003).

Note on the translation

adverbs that are terms of art for the Neoplatonists (e.g. protōs, physikōs). This policy is sure to leave everyone a little unhappy. Readers of Greek will find it jarring to read ‘the soul’s vehicles (ochēma)’ where the plural ‘vehicles’ is followed by the singular form of the Greek noun. Equally, Greekless readers are liable to be puzzled by the differences between metechoin and metechomenon or between protōs and protos. But policies that leave all parties a bit unhappy are often the best compromises. In any event, all students of the Timaeus will remember that a generated object such as a book is always a compromise between Reason and Necessity.

We use a similar system of transliteration to that adopted by the Ancient Commentators on Aristotle series. The salient points may be summarized as follows. We use the diaeresis for internal breathing, so that ‘immaterial’ is rendered a¨ylos, not ahyllos. We also use the diaeresis to indicate where a second vowel represents a new vowel sound, e.g. a¨ıdios. Letters of the alphabet are much as one would expect. We use ‘y’ for v alone as in physis or hypostasis, but ‘u’ for v when it appears in diphthongs, e.g. oisia and enautba. We use ‘cb’ for χ, as in psychē. We use ‘rb’ for initial ρ as in rbetōr; ‘nk’ for γκ, as in anankē; and ‘ng’ for γγ, as in angelos. The long vowels and ω are, of course, represented by ê and ô, while iota subscripts are printed on the line immediately after the vowel as in òigenēs for φογενης. There is a Greek word index to each volume in the series. In order to enable readers with little or no Greek to use this word index, we have included an English–Greek glossary that matches our standard English translation for important terms, with its Greek correlate given both in transliterated form and in Greek. For example, ‘procession: pro¯odos, πρόοδος’.

The following abbreviations to other works of Proclus are used:

Proclus frequently mentions previous commentaries on the *Timaeus*, those of Porphyry and Iamblichus, for which the abbreviation in *Tim.* is again used. Relevant fragments are found in

R. Sodano, *Porphyrii in Platonis Timaeum Fragmenta*, (Naples: Istituto della Stampa, 1964) and


Proclus also frequently confirms his understanding of Plato’s text by reference to two theological sources: the ‘writings of Orpheus’ and the Chaldean Oracles. For these texts, the following abbreviations are used:


Majercik uses the same numeration of the fragments as E. des Places in his Budé edition of the text.

References to the text of Proclus’ *in Timaeum* (as also of *in Remp.* and *in Crat.*) are given by Teubner volume number, followed by page and line numbers, e.g. in *Tim.* II. 2.19. References to the *Platonic Theology* are given by Book, chapter, then page and line number in the Budé edition. References to the *Elements of Theology* are given by proposition number.

Proclus’ commentary is punctuated only by the quotations from Plato’s text upon which he comments: the lemmata. These quotations of Plato’s text and subsequent repetitions of them in the discussion that immediately follows that lemma are in bold. We have also followed Festugièrè’s practice of inserting section headings so as to reveal what we take to be the skeleton of Proclus’ commentary. These headings are given in centred text, in italics. Within the body of the translation itself, we have used square brackets to indicate words that need perhaps to be supplied in order to make the sense of the Greek clear. Where we suppose that Greek words ought to be added to the text received in the manuscripts, the supplements are marked by angle brackets.