*Classical Quarterly* **55.2** 447–454 (2005) *Printed in Great Britain*
doi:10.1093/cq/bmi042


# ARISTOTLE, PLOTINUS, AND SIMPLICIUS ON THE RELATION OF THE CHANGER TO THE CHANGED

## ARISTOTLE

The longest continuous discussion of change (κίνησις) in the Aristotelian corpus is book *Γ* of the *Physics*. There are, of course, many difficult issues raised in this book but, for the purposes of this examination, a summary of Aristotle's conclusions pertaining to the location of change suffices, and so we can keep our account brief.

Aristotle defines change as 'the actualization of the potential as such' (ἡ τοῦ δυνάμει ὄντος ἐντελέχεια, ᾗ τοιοῦτον, *Phys*. *Γ*1, 201a10–11), the meaning of which is best grasped through one of his own examples. A certain collection of boards and bricks is potentially a house in so far as they fulfil the material requirements of a house and can therefore receive the form of house.[1] To actualize this potential is to build a house out of these materials, and so we can say that in this case change is defined as the actualization of these materials' potential to be a house, that is, it is the process of being built into a house (*Phys*. *Γ*1, 201b5–15). One attractive feature of such an abstract definition of change is its broad applicability. The same definition can be used to account for human acts (κινήσεις). For example, when a man who knows how to build a house is himself in the process of building a house, this act can be described as the actualization of his potential (that is, his knowledge of how) to build houses. However, as economical as this definition might be, it raises a serious concern: what is the relationship between the change that takes place with respect to the builder—the act of building or the actualization of his potential to build a house—and the change that takes place with respect to the materials—the process of being built into a house or the actualization of their potential to become a house? Aristotle's response to this concern is too well known to warrant discussion here. It is enough for us to catalogue some of its significant features:

(1) The actualization of the man's potential to build is identical to the actualization of the materials' potential to become a house. In other words, there takes place only a single change, though this change can be described from two different perspectives—the builder's and the materials' (*Phys*. *Γ*3, 202a13–21).
(2) This single change takes place in the changed rather than in the changer. For example, the building of a house occurs in the boards and stones, and not in the builder himself (*Phys*. *Γ*3, 202a21ff.).
(3) Although the change is localized exclusively in the changed, it is 'not cut off' (οὐκ ἀποτετμημένη) from the changer (*Phys*. *Γ*3, 202b6–8).[2]

[1] For some general guidelines on fulfilling material requirements and so qualifying as potentially *x*, see *Metaphysics* H4-5 and Θ7.

[2] A completed house has the form of house as something cut off, but what is still in the process of being made into a house does not (cf. Simpl. *in Phys*. 445.34–446.5). The house being built and the student being taught are subjects—not of the forms of house and knowledge—but of the changes towards those forms, and these changes surely do not occur independently of their initiators, that is, the teacher and the builder.

*Classical Quarterly* 55.2 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/bmi042 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(4) Every change involves a transferral of form from the changer to the changed (*Phys.* *Γ*2, 202a9–13).[3]

In what follows I shall first show how selectively Plotinus draws from this list and then make some suggestions aimed at explaining this selectivity. I shall subsequently show that Simplicius' account of this in his commentary on the *Physics* is directly influenced by Plotinus, although he departs from Plotinus by not shying away from any of these four features. Finally, I shall propose a possible explanation of Simplicius' divergence from Plotinus in this regard.

## PLOTINUS

6.3.23 is one of the last chapters of Plotinus' critical examination of the doctrine of categories in 6.1–3 and forms part of his discussion of change (*κίνησις*) in 6.3.21–6. The guiding question of this chapter concerns the relationship between change and sensible things, and Plotinus' primary response to this question is that change is distinct from the sensible things that are changed, even though it is only through the perception of sensible things in change that we are able to perceive the change itself. This raises the question for him of what the change is in, which brings us to lines 13–20 (I shall explain the underlining shortly):

*ἐν τίνι οὖν ἡ κίνησις, ὅταν ἄλλο κινῇ, καὶ ὅταν δὲ ἐκ τῆς ἐνούσης δυνάμεως εἰς ἐνέργειαν ἴῃ; ἆρα ἐν τῷ κινοῦντι; καὶ πῶς τὸ κινούμενον καὶ πάσχον μεταλήψεται; ἀλλ' ἐν τῷ κινουμένῳ; διὰ τί οὖν ἐλθοῦσα οὐ μένει; ἢ δεῖ μήτε τοῦ ποιοῦντος ἀπηλλάχθαι μήτε ἐν αὐτῷ εἶναι ἀλλ' ἐξ αὐτοῦ μὲν καὶ εἰς ἐκεῖνο, οὐκ ἐν ἐκείνῳ δὲ ἀποτετμημένην εἶναι, ἀλλ' ἀπ' ἐκεῖνου εἰς ἐκεῖνο, οἷον πνοὴν εἰς ἄλλο.*

What, then, is the change in when it changes another thing, and when it goes *to actuality from an immanent potentiality*? Is it, then, in the changer? And how will what is passively changed participate in it? Or is it in the changed? But then why, having come, does it not remain? In fact change should *neither be separated from the efficient cause* (*τοῦ ποιοῦντος*) [i.e. the changer] *nor be in it; rather, it should come out of* the changer to the changed – *but it should not* be *in the changed as something cut-off* [i.e. from the changer], but [go] from the changer to the changed *just like a breath [breathed] into something else*.

Plotinus' examination of change in connection with sensible things has led him back to the question that Aristotle poses in *Phys*. *Γ*3, 202a13ff.: Is change in the changer or in the changed? Like Aristotle, Plotinus answers with (2) from the list above: change is in the changed—with two clarifications. Both are familiar from Plotinus' theory of causation, but each also corresponds to one of the four significant features of our summary of *Phys*. *Γ*2, 202a9–*Γ*3, 202b28. The first picks up on (3) from our list above, insisting that change is in the changed without being *cut off* from the changer (line 19).

The use of negated *ἀποτέμνειν* to express the continued dependence of a product on its cause is found frequently throughout the *Enneads* and in application to all levels of reality, for example, Intellect (5.3.12.39ff.), Soul and souls (1.1.2.9–13, 3.5.4.10–11, 4.3.12.3–4, 4.4.29.46–52, 4.9.5.6–7), Nature (6.2.22.31–4) and the sensible world

[3] 'The changer will always transmit some form, either a substantial form or a qualitative form or a quantitative form' (*εἶδος δὲ ἀεὶ οἴσεταί τι τὸ κινοῦν, ἤτοι τόδε ἢ τοιόνδε ἢ τοσόνδε*). When a builder builds a house, he is transferring the form of house from his soul to the potential house, that is, to the stones and boards, and for a teacher to teach a student is for the former to transmit some form of knowledge from his own soul to the latter's soul (cf. *DA* 417b12–16). In other words, a builder is building just in so far as he is in the process of transferring the form of house to the stones and boards, and a house is being built only in so far as it is in the process of receiving the form of house from the builder.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/bmi042 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(2.9.16.11–12, 4.3.9.29–31). Plotinus' favourite empirical examples of this point are light (1.7.1.24–5, 4.4.29.41–5, 5.3.12.39ff.) and the images in mirrors (6.2.22.31–4, 6.4.10.11–15). It is no doubt an interesting question to what extent (if any) this component of Plotinus' thought is ultimately due to Aristotle's utterance in *Phys*. *Γ*3, though it is one that will not be pursued here.[4]

The second clarification is that change involves transferring something 'from the changer to the changed just like a breath [breathed] into something else' (line 20), which nicely corresponds to (4) on our list. Here, too, we are dealing with a familiar feature of Plotinus' theory of causation, as the example of 'breath into something else' shows. This example—itself not found in *Phys*. *Γ*3—is disappointingly concise and in itself offers little illustrative help. Yet, despite being the only instance of *πνοή* in the *Enneads*, it is solidly Plotinian. In order to understand its Plotinian sense, we need to look at several passages where Plotinus uses breath metaphors *via* the Greek words *ἐμπνεῖν* and/or *ἀναπνοή* to illustrate his meaning. The most central of these passages is 3.2.4.12–16:

*ζωὴ γὰρ ἐνταῦθα κινουμένη, ἐκεῖ δὲ ἀκίνητος. Ἔδει δὲ κίνησιν ἐξ ἀκινησίας εἶναι καὶ ἐκ τῆς ἐν αὐτῇ ζωῆς τὴν ἐξ αὐτῆς γεγονέναι ἄλλην, οἷιν ἐμπνέουσαν καὶ οὐκ ἀτρεμοῦσαν ζωὴν ἀναπνοὴν τῆς ἠρεμούσης οὖσαν.*

For life here [i.e. in the sensible region] is in change, but there [i.e. in the intelligible] is unchanging. And so change must derive from changelessness, and from the life that is in changelessness comes another life that is from it – a life that, as it were, breathes (*ἐμπνέουσαν*) and stirs and is an exhalation (*ἀναπνοὴν*) of the life that rests.

The relevance of this passage to 6.3.23 should be clear: both passages concern one thing creating change in another while itself remaining unchanged. And here again the latter is likened to a breath proceeding from the former. But this time the metaphor has been placed in a more familiar background. Plotinus is thinking of ontological procession or emanation: to say that the life of change is a breath proceeding from the unchanging life is to say that the one emanates from the other.

If we reflect on Plotinus' doctrine of procession, we can see why he finds this breath metaphor so appealing. First, for those substances that do breathe, breathing is an essential activity. Indeed, it, like emanation, is an activity that proceeds without any planning or choice. Second, breathing suggests a kind of giving that does not entail any loss for the giver, just as is the case with emanation, in so far as the air exhaled is not an essential constituent of the exhaler's nature. Finally, an exhalation's existence is completely dependent on the continued activity of the exhaler, just as ontologically lower entities are dependent on the activities of the higher ones. Hence, this metaphor is particularly well suited to explain how one substance can come to be by emanating from an ontologically prior substance.[5]

[4] For one opinion, see A. C. Lloyd, 'Plotinus on the genesis of thought and existence', *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy* 5 (1987), 155–86: 'Plotinus regularly borrows the metaphor from the formula of the *Physics*: the product is not cut off from its origin' (168).

[5] For another use of the metaphor, see e.g. 5.1.2.2 where Plotinus describes the soul's demiurgic function of creating living things as 'breathing' life into them (*ἐμπνεύσασα αὐτοῖς ζωήν*). Likewise at 6.7.23.22–4 where the Good is said to 'breathe' intellect, life and being into all things (*ἐμπνέον νοῦν, ἐμπνέον ζωήν, εἰ δέ τι μὴ δύναται ζῆν, εἶναι*). Proclus uses it in a similar manner, e.g. at *In Tim*. 1.383.6–7, where he says that the bodies in the pre-cosmic state have motion 'because they have been breathed into by Nature' (*ὡς ὑπὸ φύσεως ἐμπνεόμενον*), and at 3.327.7–8, where we are told that 'the soul moves the body by breathing the power of change into it' (*φέρει μὲν γὰρ ἡ ψυχὴ τὸ σῶμα δύναμιν ἐμπνέουσα κινήσεως*).

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/bmi042 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Hence, Plotinus describes change as a process that transfers something from the changer to the changed, a process that takes place in the changed without being cut off from the changer. What, then, of the central insight of *Phys*. *Γ*3, namely (1) that the actuality (*ἐντελέχεια*) of the changer is identical to the actuality of the changed? Plotinus passes over it. This probably has little to do with Plotinus' systematic avoidance of Aristotle's term *ἐντελέχεια*, since he is quite capable of using *ἐνέργεια* as a substitute for it.[6] It likely has much more to do with the rest of his theory of causality and emanation, which describes the procession of one level of reality out of another in terms of two *ἐνέργειαι*, described most fully in 5.4.2.27–33:

*Ἐνέργεια ἡ μέν ἐστι τῆς οὐσίας, ἡ δ'ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας ἑκάστου· καὶ ἡ μὲν τῆς οὐσίας αὐτό ἐστιν ἐνέργεια ἕκαστον, ἡ δὲ ἀπ'ἐκείνης, ἣν δεῖ παντὶ ἕπεσθαι ἐξ ἀνάγκης ἑτέραν οὖσαν αὐτοῦ· οἷον καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ πυρὸς ἡ μέν τίς ἐστι συμπληροῦσα τὴν οὐσίαν θερμότης, ἡ δὲ ἀπ'ἐκείνης ἤδη γινομένη ἐνεργοῦντος ἐκείνου τὴν σύμφυτον τῇ οὐσίᾳ ἐν τῷ μένειν πῦρ. Οὕτω δὴ κἀκεῖ.*

The one kind of activity of each thing is *of* substance, the other is *from* substance. And the activity of substance is each thing itself, whereas the activity from substance is that which must necessarily follow everything, being different from it. For example, even in the case of fire, there is one heat that fills its substance, and another heat that immediately comes from that heat when the fire, in remaining fire, exercises the activity that is intrinsic to its substance. So, too, in the intelligible region.[7]

Each level of reality has its own internal activity which constitutes its substance and to this extent remains in it, but this activity automatically brings forth a second, external activity which passes on some derivative form of its substance to something else. Plotinus employs this distinction throughout the *Enneads*, albeit through a number of different expressions: what is called *ἡ τῆς οὐσίας* (*ἐνέργεια*) in the preceding quotation is also referred to as (*ἡ*) *ἐν ἑαυτῷ* or *αὐτῇ* (2.9.8.22–3, 3.7.12.7, 6.2.22.26) as well as *ἐντός* (4.5.7.16)—hence the designation 'internal[8]—*πρὸς αὐτὴν* (3.7.12.7) and *σύμφυτον τῇ οὐσίᾳ* (5.4.2.32). And *ἡ ἐκ* (or *ἀπὸ*) *τῆς οὐσίας* (*ἐνέργεια*) is also referred to as (*ἡ*) *ἐξ* or *παρ'αὐτοῦ* (6.2.22.26–7, 5.1.6.34, cf. 6.7.18.6), *εἰς ἄλλο* (2.9.8.23) or *εἰς τὸ πόρρω* (4.5.7.19, 21, 22), *πρὸς τὸ ἔξω* (4.5.7.34, 5.1.6.31–2) *ἐν ποιήσει καὶ γενέσει* (3.7.12.7–8) and *ἐνέργεια δευτέρα* (4.5.7.16), whereby its similarity and derivativeness is often underlined with terms such as *ὁμοίωμα* (4.5.7.18), *εἴδωλον* (4.5.7.44), *περίλαμψις* (5.1.6.28), *εἰκών* (5.1.6.33), *ἴχνος* (5.3.7.24).

Although sometimes it looks as though Plotinus means to *identify* an entity with its prior's external activity,[9] strictly speaking this is not quite right. The external activity that proceeds, for example, from the One is not *Νοῦς* itself but, as it were, a precursor to *Νοῦς* which Plotinus sometimes calls '(undefined) life'. This prior activity becomes

[6] Plotinus employs *ἐντελέχεια* only eleven times. Of these, ten are in 4.7.8[5] where Plotinus argues against Aristotle's definition of soul as the *ἐντελέχεια* of a potentially living body. The other (4.2.1.3) simply refers back to the discussion in 4.7.8[5]. However, Plotinus often substituted *ἐνέργεια* for *ἐντελέχεια* (see 2.5 *passim* and the use of *ἐνέργεια* in discussions of the nature of Intellect, e.g. 5.3.5), as did Aristotle himself on many occasions (cf. Bonitz, *Index Aristotelicus* [Berlin, 1870], 253b46ff.). According to Beutler and Theiler (*Plotins Schriften* 2b [Meiner, 1956–71], 430) one can already in Alexander begin to see the gradual replacement of *ἐντελέχεια* by *ἐνέργεια*.

[7] The double activity theory also comes up in 2.9.8.22–5, 3.7.12.6–8, 4.5.7.15ff., 5.1.6.28–39, 5.3.7.23–4, 5.9.8.13–15, 6.2.22.24–9, 6.7.18.5–6, 6.7.21.4–6, 6.7.40.21–4. And see C. Rutter, 'La doctrine des deux actes dans la philosophie de Plotin', *Revue philosophique* 146 (1956), 100–6.

[8] Cf. the frequent use of *μένειν* 4.5.7.19, 5.1.6.30ff., 5.4.2.33, and so on.

[9] E.g. 5.3.12.39–41 where the hypostasis *Νοῦς* is described as 'the activity that, as it were, flows from it [i.e. the One] like light from the sun' (*τὴν μὲν ἀπ'αὐτοῦ οἷον ῥυεῖσαν ἐνέργειαν ὡς ἀπὸ ἡλίου φῶς*).

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/bmi042 Published online by Cambridge University Press

*Νοῦς* when it turns back to its source, the One, and becomes defined.[10] This turning-back is the next internal activity in the series and is identical to *Νοῦς* itself. For this reason, the external activity can also be referred to as *ἡ πρὸς τὸ κάτω* (6.2.22.30), and the internal activity as *ἡ πρὸς τὸ ἄνω* (6.2.22.29–30).

This theory of double activity efficiently ties together (2)–(4) from our list above. (4) A prior substance, that is, the internal activity, sends out from itself an external activity. (3) This external activity is continuously dependent on its source, and so is not 'cut off' from it. Note that even Plotinus' favourite images for a thing's not being 'cut off' from its cause, light and images in mirrors, are also—along with the heat of fire[11]—his preferred examples for double activity: light (4.5.7.33–44, 5.1.6.29–30) and images in mirrors (4.5.7.44–50). Moreover, (2) the external activity, *qua* external, occurs *outside* of its source, or as Plotinus at one point says, *ἐν ἄλλῳ* (5.3.7.25). But (1) is incompatible with this theory in so far as the activity of the changer, that is, the internal activity, is not numerically identical to the activity of the changed, the external activity. Rather, the latter is only a *ὁμοίωμα* of the former.

## SIMPLICIUS

We have strong textual reasons for believing that Simplicius, in his commentary on Aristotle's *Physics*, is directly influenced by these lines of Plotinus. As part of his discussion of *Phys. Γ*3, 202a13–21, Simplicius writes:

*ἓν οὖν ἐστι τῷ ὑποκειμένῳ ἡ ἐνέργεια καὶ τὸ πάθος ἀρχομένη μὲν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐνεργοῦντος, καὶ ἐκεῖθεν τὸ εἶδος ἐπιφέρουσα, ἐνστηριζομένη δὲ τῷ πάσχοντι, καὶ διατιθεῖσα τοῦτο κατὰ τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ ποιοῦντος τοῦ εἴδους ἔνδοσιν οἷον πνοὴν εἰς ἄλλο, ὡς μήτε ἀπηλλάχθαι τοῦ ποιοῦντος μήτε ἐν αὐτῷ εἶναι, ἀλλ' ἐξ ἐκείνου μέν, ἐν ἐκείνῳ δὲ οὐκ ἀποτετμημένην. καὶ εἰ μὲν ἀπὸ τοῦ ποιοῦντος καὶ κινοῦντος ἀρχοίμεθα, ποιεῖν καὶ κινεῖν ἐστιν, εἰ δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ πάσχοντος καὶ κινουμένου, πάσχειν καὶ κινεῖσθαι. ἰστέον δὲ ὅτι ἐν τούτῳ τῷ χωρίῳ οἱ μὲν πολλοὶ σαφέστερον οὕτω γράφουσι ταύτην τὴν λέξιν. "ἐντελέχεια γάρ ἐστι τούτου ὑπὸ τοῦ κινητικου," ὁ δὲ Ἀνδρόνικος οὕτως· "ἐντελέχεια γάρ ἐστι τοῦ κινητοῦ καὶ ὑπὸ τούτου." καὶ ἐξηγεῖται ὅτι κἂν ἔξωθεν ᾖ τὸ κινοῦν, ἐκ τῆς ἐνούσης δυνάμεως εἰς ἐνέργειαν ἀγόμενον, ὑφ' ἑαυτοῦ κινεῖσθαι δοκεῖ τὸ κινούμενον.*
(*in Phys.* 440.5–17)

The agency then, is one in substrate with the patiency;[12] it begins from the agent and from here brings the form, but is implanted in the patient; and it manages this by imparting the form from the efficient cause, *just like a breath into something else*, so that *it is neither separated from the efficient cause nor in it—rather, it comes out* of the one, and is *in the other though not as something cut off* [i.e. from the changer].[13] And if we begin from the efficient cause and the changer, [change] is to act and to change, but if we start from the patient and the changed, [change] is to be acted on and to be changed. And one should know that in this spot most write this passage rather clearly as follows: 'For it is the actualization of this by the source of change.' But Andronicus writes it this way: 'For it is the actualization of the changed and by this.' And he takes this to mean that even when the changer is external, the changed seems to be changed by itself, since it is brought *to actuality from an immanent capacity*.

As the underlining illustrates, this passage has such remarkable philosophical and linguistic similarities to 6.3.23.13–20 that we can conclude that Simplicius is drawing directly on Plotinus here. This has gone unnoticed by both Henry and Schwyzer in

[10] 6.7.17.11–26. For a discussion of this passage and of this issue in general, see Lloyd, *op. cit.* especially 166 and 177.

[11] 5.1.6.34, 5.3.7.23–4, 5.4.2.30–3, 5.9.8.13–15, 6.7.8.15–16.

[12] Simplicius substitutes *ἐνέργεια* and *πάθος* for Aristotle's *ποίησις* and *πάθησις* at *Phys. Γ* 3,202a22ff.

[13] J. O. Urmson's recent translation (Simplicius, *On Aristotle Physics 3* [London, 2002], p. 58) of this line is not right: 'It is from the agent but not excised from being in it.'

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/bmi042 Published online by Cambridge University Press

their edition of Plotinus' *Enneads* and by Diels in his edition of Simplicius' commentary on the *Physics*. It is, of course, possible that Plotinus and Simplicius are both consulting some unknown third source. After all, it is well known that Plotinus frequently engages with the thought of his philosophical predecessors without explicitly mentioning them by name. This anonymity sometimes takes the form of a subjectless *φάσι* or *φήσι*,[14] but Plotinus often does not even show his readers this courtesy.[15] Further, this form of engagement is not limited to only polemical contexts. He might, for example, approvingly quote or paraphrase a line of Hesiod (4.3.14.7), Homer (1.6.8.16), or any number of philosophers (cf. 5.9.5.29–32)—again without the slightest indication that he is doing so. Hence, readers are constantly confronted with the problem of identifying not only Plotinus' philosophical opponents but also his philosophical debts, and they confront it in a particularly acute form when he is dealing with post-Hellenistic philosophers, since as a rule he does not refer by name to anyone after Epicurus (to whom he refers at 2.9.15.8). Moreover, it is well known that throughout Plotinus' examination of the Aristotelian categories in 6.1–3 he drew on the work of commentators such as Lucius and Nicostratus.[16] It might seem quite likely, then, that Plotinus, while pondering Aristotle's question, selectively helped himself to some of the ideas he found in a commentary. One might even suspect that Plotinus' source was Andronicus, since it is in connection with Andronicus that Simplicius uses the phrase 'to actuality from an immanent capacity'—a phrase that we find word for word in 6.3.23.13–20 as well.[17] Nevertheless, I believe the Plotinian character of the 'breath' metaphor that we established above gives us good reason to conclude that this is a case where Simplicius is simply drawing on Plotinus.

In this brief passage one can see that Simplicius acknowledges all four features listed above: (1) the actualization of the changer is identical to that of the changed (lines 5–6);[18] (4) change involves a transferal of a form from the changer to the changed (lines 7–8); and (2) it is localized in the changed (line 9), but (3) is not 'cut-off' from the changer (line 10). And so what we have in Simplicius is a Neoplatonist exegete of Aristotle who, on the one hand, incorporates some of Plotinus' insights into his interpretation of this passage, but who, on the other hand, is—unlike Plotinus—unbothered by the identification of the two actualizations. This, of course, raises the question of why this identification seems so objectionable to one Neoplatonist but not to the other, and I would like to venture an answer to this question.

[14] E.g. 2.1.6.25.

[15] E.g. 6.4.4.24–5.

[16] This allegation is likewise based on Simplicius' own commentary. To my knowledge, this is argued most extensively by K. Praechter in 'Nikostratos der Platoniker', *Hermes* 57 (1922) 481–517 at 512ff. Others who agree with Praechter's conclusion include S. Strange, 'Plotinus, Porphyry, and the Neoplatonic interpretation of the *Categories*' in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt* 2.36.2, 955–74, esp. 956 and 965; K. von Fritz 'Nikostratos' in *RE* XVII.1, 547.3–551.31, see 551.23–5; and W. Capelle 'Lukios' in *RE* XIII.2, 1791.6–1797.16, see 1792.36ff.

[17] Plotinus' discussion of other categories also bears strong resemblances to Andronicus': see Simpl. *in Cat*. 269.38–270.3 (cf. 6.1.11), 347.18–25 (cf. 6.1.13.10–13), 358.8–11 (cf. 6.1.14).

[18] A clearer statement of this identity is found just prior to this passage (439.26–9): *διὰ τί οὖν ἡ τοῦ κινητοῦ ἐνέργεια κίνησίς ἐστι καὶ μὴ μᾶλλον ἡ τοῦ κινοῦντος; ἢ οὐκ ἄλλη ἐστὶν ἡ τοῦ κινητικοῦ ἐνέργεια. ἔστι γὰρ κινητικὸν ἐνεργητικὸν τοῦ κινητοῦ.* "*Μία*" *οὖν* "*ἡ ἀμφοῖν ἐνέργεια*".'Why, then, is change the activity of the changeable and not rather the activity of the changer? Because the activity of the changer is not distinct. For a changer is an actualizer of the changeable. Thus, "the activity of both" is "one".'

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/bmi042 Published online by Cambridge University Press

As we have seen above, Plotinus' hesitation with respect to (1) probably derived from his theory of double activity, and so Simplicius' willingness to agree to (1) suggests that he did not adopt this theory. Indeed, I suspect this was the case. It is true that the structure of Neoplatonic metaphysics that one encounters in Simplicius bears many similarities to that of Plotinus, including much of the language of procession.[19] Both, for example, speak of lower substances 'proceeding (*προϊέναι*)[20] from' and 'enjoying' (*ἀπολαύνειν*) [21] 'radiation' (*ἔλλαμψις* or *περιλάμψις*) from their priors.[22] But nowhere, I claim, does Simplicius explain procession by means of Plotinus' theory of double activity. There is, of course, no great proof stone for such negative claims. Nevertheless, this claim can be partially verified by checking to see what Simplicius has to say about Plotinus' favourite examples of double activity—light, heat and the images in mirrors—as well as by searching the Simplician corpus[23] to see if he uses the designations for internal and external activity that Plotinus uses. Investigation shows that Simplicius does not make use of Plotinus' designations. The closest we get is a passage in his commentary on the *Physics* where he provides a long quotation of Damascius in which the theory seems to appear.[24] Otherwise we find only some discussion of the Aristotelian distinction between first and second actuality.[25] But Simplicius does not distinguish the activity *τῆς οὐσίας* from that *ἐκ* (or *ἀπὸ*) *τῆς οὐσίας*,[26] nor that *πρὸς τὸ ἄνω* from that *πρὸς τὸ κάτω*, nor that *ἐν ἑαυτῷ* (or *αὐτῇ*) from that *ἐξ* (or *παρ'*) *αὐτοῦ*.

Moreover, we can see that none of Plotinus' three examples is employed by Simplicius to explain double activity. Regarding the nature of light, Simplicius is even rather non-committal at times.[27] As for heat, even when Simplicius does draw

[19] For a description of procession that is characteristic of Simplicius' commentaries on Aristotle, see *in Cael.* 93.2ff. The metaphysics of his commentary on Epictetus seems to diverge from Plotinus' metaphysics in some respects. See K. Praechter, 'Simplikios,' *RE* IIIA,1, 204.8–213.9, especially 206.66ff. and 212.11ff.

[20] E.g. Simpl. *in Cael.* 93.13 and Plotinus 5.1.6.36, 5.3.9.12, 6.4.4.19.

[21] E.g. Simpl. *in Phys*. 630.15; Plotinus 5.1.6.37.

[22] E.g. Simpl. *in Phys*. 314.12–4 (cf. 965.29–30, 630.15 and *in Cael.* 303.22); Plotinus 5.1.6.28 and see J. H. Sleeman and G. Pollet, *Lexicon Plotinianum* (Brill, 1980), 361.40–54.

[23] I do not include the commentary on *De Anima* in the Simplician corpus on the grounds that it has long been held to be spurious. This verdict has recently been repeated and defended by J. Urmson in the introduction to his translation of *in De An.* 1.1–2.4 (Londo, 1995), 2–4 and by H. Blumenthal in his *Aristotle and Neoplatonism in Late Antiquity* (London, 1996), pp. 65–71. In his contribution to *Priscian On Theophrastus on Sense Perception with 'Simplicius' On Aristotle On the Soul 2.5–12* (Duckworth, 1997), C. Steel makes a more extensive case against Simplicius' authorship and argues that the author is in fact Priscian of Lydia (105–40).

[24] *In Phys*. 625.6–9: *καὶ τὴν κατ'ἐνέργειαν* [*viz*. *διάστασιν*] *διττήν, τὴν μὲν τῇ οὐσίᾳ σύμφυτον, καθ'ἣν ἐν συνεχεῖ ῥοῇ ἐστιν ἡ οὐσία, τὴν δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς οὐσίας προϊοῦσαν, καθ'ἣν ἄλλοτε ἄλλα ἐνεργεῖ παρατεταγμένας ἔχοντα καὶ οὐκ ἀθρόας τὰς ἐνεργείας*. Here much of Plotinus' vocabulary is found again.

[25] E.g. *in Phys*. 415.2ff.

[26] The distinction Simplicius makes at *in Phys*. 405.24–6.16 and 428.5–12 is *not* that of internal and external activity. Here he distinguishes between two kinds of change (*κίνησις*). On the one hand there is the kind of change that Aristotle is concerned with—ordinary sensible change that takes place in time. On the other hand there is intelligible change that Simplicius attributes to Plato and that 'is measured by eternity' (406.10–11). This latter change is described as *τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄντος πρώτην ἐξανάστασιν εἰς δυνάμεις τε καὶ ἐνεργείας ζωτικάς τε καὶ νοεράς...παντελῶς οὖσαν ἀμετάβλητον* (405.27–9) and *τὴν ἀπὸ τῆς οὐσίας ἐξανάστασιν τοῦ ἐνεργοῦντος* (428.6). The language is similar, but the distinction is obviously different, since both internal and external activity can take place both in time (as with fire's heat) and outside time (as with the procession of hypostases).

[27] See *in Cat*. 182.11–13: *τὸ γὰρ φῶς καὶ εἰ τοῦ ἡλίου ἐστὶν οὐ λέγεται πρὸς τὸν ἥλιον. ἄλλο γάρ τινός εἶναι ἢ γέννημα ἢ ἐνέργειαν ἢ πάθος ἢ κτῆμα, καὶ ἄλλο τὸ πρός τι εἶναι καὶ λέγεσθαι –*

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/bmi042 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the distinction between the heat that is proper to fire (that is, the internal activity) and the heat that fire produces in another thing (that is, the external activity), he does so without using the language of the double activity theory.[28] And Simplicius simply does not make much use of mirrors.[29] All of this, I believe, points to the conclusion that Simplicius does not employ Plotinus' distinction between internal and external activity. If this is right, it perhaps does not imply that Simplicius' views on the metaphysics of procession are all that different from Plotinus', but at the very least it would show that there is sometimes a considerable difference in the way he goes about describing those views.[30]

*Williams College* J. WILBERDING
jwilberd@williams.edu

'Light, even if it is of the sun, is not said to be relative to the sun. For it is one thing to be a product or activity or affection or possession of something, and another thing to be said and to exist relative to something.' Just before this he says only that light and heat are *συνυπάρχοντα* and *ἀχώριστα συμβεβηκότα* of fire and the sun (181.32ff.). He only comes close to the spirit of the double activity act at times, e.g. *in Cat*. 328.1: *ὁ ἥλιος τῷ εἶναι φωτίζει* – 'the sun produces light by its being.' Contrast this with the application of the double-activity theory to light in Ps.-Simpl. *in De An*. 131.17–23: *οὐ γάρ ἐστι τὸ φῶς, ὡς ἡ νόησις, ἐμμένουσα τῇ προαγούσῃ αὐτὴν οὐσίᾳ καὶ ἡ αὐτὴ οὖσα τῇ οὐσίᾳ ἀλλ' ἐνέργεια μὲν καὶ τὸ φῶς, οὔτε δὲ ἡ αὐτὴ τῷ ἐνεργοῦντι οὔτε μένουσα ἐν αὐτῷ, οὐ μὴν οὐδὲ ἀπεσπασμένη, ἀλλ' ἅμα τε τοῦ ⟨προόντος⟩ αὐτὴ ἐχομένη καὶ ἑτέρῳ ἐνδιδομένη* – 'For light is not like intellection, remaining in the substance that advanced it and being the same as that substance. But even light is an activity, though neither being the same as that which activates it nor remaining in it, but then again not being detached from it either, but rather it at once holds fast to what ⟨precedes⟩ it and is implanted in another.' This perhaps provides additional grounds for the spuriousness of *in De Anima*. (*προϊόντος* at 131.20 does not give the right sense. I read *προόντος*. Cf. C. Steel's [n. 23] proposal *προιέντος* [128 n. 74].)

[28] So at *in Cat*. 230.16–18 Simplicius distinguishes between the heat of fire, which is natural (*φυσικήν*), and the heat in hot water, which is a mere *διάθεσις* (cf. 226.29ff.). *In Cat*. 248.29–33 at best finds some resonance with the theory.

[29] *κάτοπτρον* occurs only three times in the corpus (*in Cael.* 384.4, 457.16, 21, 28).

[30] I would like to thank Ian Mueller, David Rehm, and an anonymous referee for valuable comments on an earlier version of this paper.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/bmi042 Published online by Cambridge University Press