comprehensive, including Greek words, but it would have been helpful to have subdivisions for the major entries.

Clare College, Cambridge CHARLES WEISS
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni259

PROCLUS ON THE *TIMAEUS*

A. LERNOULD: *Physique et théologie. Lecture du* Timée *de Platon par Proclus*. Pp. 405. Calais: Presses Universitaires de Septentrion, 2001. ISBN: 2-85939-644-6.

This monument of chalcenteric scholasticism, the reworking of a doctoral thesis submitted at the University of Lille in 1992, is devoted to a close analysis of the structure of Proclus' commentary on the *Timaeus* of Plato, with a view to demonstrating the elaborately 'dialectical' format of Proclus' treatment of the work. One's first reaction is to reflect that this serves Proclus right for putting out a 1133 (Teubner) page commentary on the first twenty-seven (Stephanus) pages of Plato's dialogue (up to 44d2); but that is not quite fair to L., who in fact provides a most useful analysis of the structure and rationale of Proclus' commentary as a whole, and then a most detailed account of the first part of it.

Proclus, after all, it must be admitted, is very much concerned to present Plato's work as an entirely logical construction, demonstrating the fundamental 'theological' principles behind the account of the nature of the physical cosmos. The *Timaeus* was for him, following as he did the schema of dialogues laid down first by Iamblichus, one of the two 'summits' of Platonic philosophy—its counterpart being the *Parmenides*, which set out the structure of the intelligible universe. It is essential to Proclus' vision that the 'physics' of the *Timaeus* be based firmly ('geometrically') on certain metaphysical first principles, and it is these that Lernould is concerned here to set before us.

His work is divided, after a brief introduction (pp. 11–24), into two parts. The first, and shorter, one (pp. 27–112), divided into five chapters, sets out, first, Proclus' account of the *skopos*, or subject matter, of the dialogue, and then an analysis of the commentary as a whole. This is followed (Chapter 3) by a close study of how Proclus divides up the *Timaeus* in his introduction (1.4.6–6.16 Diehl), and then a discussion of the divisions of the various levels of demiurgy in Books 2 and 3 of the *Commentary*. Here the important thing that emerges is the distinction of a primary from a secondary level of demiurgy, the primary being that conducted by the Demiurge, or demiurgic Intellect, himself, the secondary by the so-called 'young gods', instructed by the Demiurge in his address to them at *Tim.* 41a–d. The primary demiurgy is itself divided into three: the creation of the universe as a whole (*Tim.* 29d4–31b4); the creation of its chief parts, the cosmic body and soul (31b5–37c5), followed by the institution of time and its instruments (37c–41a)—and thirdly, L. would argue with some plausibility, the creation of the elements (47e–61c), though this comes after the secondary demiurgy.

This secondary demiurgy, in turn, covers the embodiment of the immortal part of the human soul, and the creation of the mortal part and then of the human body. There are further subdivisions of each of these, which we need not go into here. Suffice it to say that L.'s analysis is impressively thorough, and leaves not much to quibble with. His conclusion (Chapter 5) sums this all up, and raises the interesting

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni260 Published online by Cambridge University Press

issue of why, whereas Plato has fairly plainly divided his dialogue into three main sections (the workings of Reason (27d–47e), the workings of Necessity (47e–69a), and the cooperation of Reason and Necessity (69a–92c)), Proclus, in his account, seems to gloss over (L.'s term is 'escamotage') the workings of Necessity, and treats the third section as a mere appendix. L. is doubtless correct that this is due to Proclus' much more radical degree of monism, which makes him uncomfortable with the idea of Necessity as any sort of independent force resistant to the Demiurge. It is probably, he suggests, no accident that the surviving part of Proclus' commentary breaks off at 44d7 (though we have evidence that he covered the whole dialogue in some form, at least); it is likely that, after 47e, his comments became somewhat perfunctory and repetitive, since he made all his main points in the portion that survives to us.

The second, longer section of the work (pp. 115–354), entitled 'La dialectisation du *Timée*', is taken up with an exhaustive analysis of Proclus' exegesis of *Tim.* 27c–31b (covering Book 2 of his *Commentary*), which Proclus discerns as presenting, first, a series of hypotheses (a fundamental one, to the effect that the world is 'generated' [*genêtos*] only in the sense that it possesses its essence in Time, and thus can be said to come to be throughout the whole of time), followed by three pairs of hypotheses; and then four 'demonstrations' (*apodeixeis*). L. deals with the hypotheses in Chapters 6–12 (pp. 115–216), and the demonstrations in Chapters 13–17 (pp. 217–303). This gets him through *Tim.* 29d5.

The third section of the second part ('Le traité de la Démiurgie du Monde en son Tout comme troisième remontée dialectique vers les Causes divines du Monde') covers *Tim.* 29d6–31b4 and Proclus' *Commentary* 1.355.16–458.11 Diehl, and focuses on the final cause of the demiurgic creation, in the form of the 'goodness' of the Demiurge and his providential care for the world, including his assimilation of it to the Paradigm. This he covers in two chapters (18–19) and a conclusion. This, in turn, is followed by three appendices on particular points, a useful bibliography, and an 'Index des notions', confined to the main concepts discussed in the work.

As I remarked at the outset, this work is to a large extent a laborious analysis and formalization of Proclus' own formalization of the *Timaeus*, but in its way it is an admirable piece of scholarship, and a useful addition to our knowledge of Proclus' methods of work.

Trinity College, Dublin JOHN DILLON
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni260

A DEFENCE OF ORIGEN

M. J. EDWARDS: *Origen against Plato*. Pp. vi + 191. Aldershot and Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2002. Paper, £15.99 (Cased, £40). ISBN: 0-7546-0828-X (0-7546-1331-3 hbk).

As Lecturer in Patristics at Christ Church, Oxford, Mark Edwards sets out in this compact and erudite book to set the record straight on the controversial third century Christian theologian, Origen of Alexandria. The title summarizes the theme of the book, which is to restore Origen's philosophical doctrines as consciously constructed against the philosopher rather than being fatally tainted by extra-Christian opinions. To prove his case Edwards discusses the doctrine of Trinity with its traditional problems of hierarchy or subordination, the question of pre-existent souls, allegory as a hermeneutic for scripture, and eschatology. Each of

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni260 Published online by Cambridge University Press