

Part I: PHILOSOPHY OF THE COSMOS

What is the Passing Through (*Dierkhomai*) into *Alēthēs* (Unconcealed)?

Oleg Bazaluk

Doctor of Philosophical Sciences, Professor, Guangdong University of Petrochemical
Technology (Maoming, China)

E-mail: bazaluk@ukr.net

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1623-419X>

Bazaluk, Oleg (2023) What is the Passing Through (*Dierkhomai*) into *Alēthēs* (Unconcealed)? *Philosophy and Cosmology*, Volume 30, 4-23. <https://doi.org/10.29202/phil-cosm/30/1>

The author examines a basic ontological dichotomy stated in Plato's Timaeus. The goal is to harmonise it with the Big Bang Theory and the expansion of the Universe argumentation. Using Plato's Vocabulary helps to combine the modern understanding of fundamental physical phenomena with Platonic philosophy. Moreover, the use of Platonic philosophy as an authoritative beginning and Platonic philosophy as the way to follow (méthodos) exhibits a new quality of the Big Bang theory. Specifically, the ability to combine physical (primary) and existential (secondary) meanings to define critical phenomena "come to be," "cease to be," and "to be." The author considers the formulated questions "What is alētheia?", "What is there in alēthēs?", "What is the phúsis of the form as the dúnamis?" and "What is dianoia of the homin form?" as the sources of the "turning round of the psukhē" to the main question: "What is meaningful phúsis?" The issue inquiry guarantees humanity the fundamental competitive advantage in the expanding kósmos and being among the forms that come to be (gígnomai) and always is purely (ón).

Keywords: Platonic philosophy, ontological dichotomy, alētheia, come to be, cease to be, to be, the Big Bang theory, phúsis of the expanding kósmos, meaningful phúsis.

Received: 2 November 2022 / Accepted: 5 December 2022 / Published: 5 February 2023

Introduction¹

τί τὸ ὄν ἀεί, γένεσιν δὲ οὐκ ἔχον, καὶ τί τὸ γιγνόμενον μὲν (ἀεί), ὄν δὲ οὐδέποτε²
What is that which always is (όν) and has no *genesis*, and what is that which (always)
comes to be (*gígnomai*) and not ever (οὐδέποτε) is (όν)?³

The question posed by Socrates indicates the path of our exploratory ascent, *méthodos*.⁴ The summit and, accordingly, the target destination is the clarification of a basic ontological dichotomy formulated in Plato's *Timaeus*. The ascent beginning, *arkhē*, is the dialogues of Plato and their comprehension in the Platonic corpus.

The article does not aim at the victorious summit ascent and establishing a new dichotomy as a fait accompli. The author proposes a dialogue that focuses on purification of the sources of the upward path⁵ to a new formulation. The critical questions in the article are those that motivate "an ongoing, unending exploration of possibilities"⁶ of an ascent.

1. What is *alētheia*?

We will start the ascent to the dichotomy "What is that which always is (όν) and has no *genesis*, and what is that which (always) comes to be (*gígnomai*) and not ever (οὐδέποτε) is (όν)?" with the passing to the question "What is *alētheia*?" for "Of all the *agathón*, for gods and men alike, *alētheia* stands first."⁷

The meanings development of the term *alētheia* in the ancient philosophical tradition, with their subsequent rethinking in terms of *verum* ("reality/realness") and "truth," hid the main Platonic message that cannot be conveyed with the word "true". The *alētheia* and the *lēthē* have a standard beginning, in which the opposition between them is eliminated. Plato

¹ I am sincerely grateful to the organisers of the Perseus Digital Library (<http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/>) and the Center for Hellenic Studies (<https://chs.harvard.edu/>) for free access to the dialogues of Plato and selected studies of the Platonic corpus.

² (*Timaeus* 27d6-28a1). The Greek text is cited according to (Burnet, 1901; 1903; 1978; 1907; Duke et al., 1995). The author follows the translation (unless otherwise indicated) of *Plato in twelve volumes*, 1967-1979.

³ (Ademollo, 2018: 63) with modification. ἀεί (always) is in brackets due to its controversial use in Plato's original presentation (Ademollo, 2018: 63-66).

⁴ All Greek words are in italics and are compiled in the Glossary at the end of the article. The author uses Greek words as the technical terms and does not stick to a grammatical case except for direct quotations. The meanings of the words in the Glossary are based on Plato's dialogues, the Platonic corpus, and Liddell and Scott's Greek-English lexicon. However, in the text, the author rethinks them and puts his understanding into them. Plato's Vocabulary helps the author to establish an ancestral connection with Platonic philosophy and use it as an authoritative beginning.

⁵ The upward path (anō hodon), the ascent in Plato's dialogues, see (Carone, 2007: 221; Fierro, 2003; Gerson, 2007: 48-63; Gill, 2010: 172; Gonzalez, 2009: 151-152, 244-245; Hadot, 1999; McPherran, 2000: 105-106; McPherran, 2007: 92; Schur, 2015; Sheffield, 2007: 24).

⁶ (Schur, 2015).

⁷ ἀλήθεια δὴ πάντων μὲν ἀγαθῶν θεοῖς ἡγεῖται, πάντων δὲ ἀνθρώποις (*Laws* 5.730c1-2). Translated by R.G. Bury.

called it “unconditioned *arkhē*.”⁸

The author calls “unconditioned *arkhē*” the unity of *gígnomai* and *phtheirō*. The above Greek verbs and their inflection define two fundamental physical phenomena. The verb *gígnomai* represents the phenomenon of “come to be,” which is complete on its own. Namely, as Myles Fredric Burnyeat concludes: “to come to be is to come to be (predicatively) a being/something that is.”⁹ Hence, *gígnomai* conveys the essential idea of Burnyeat: “is that of a verb which is complete on its own, but which is further completable without change of meaning.”¹⁰ The verb *gígnomai* expresses the formula: “Everything that comes to be comes to be (i) by the agency of something and (ii) from something and (iii) something.”¹¹

The verb *phtheirō* defines the opposite physical phenomenon “cease to be.” The author also uses the *phtheirō* as a technical term. It allows us to extend Burnyeat’s idea to this verb as well.¹² Guided by the law of conservation of energy and Noether’s theorem, I state that the “cease to be” phenomenon is complete on its own, so “cease to be is cease to be (predicatively) a being/something that is.” The author allows the use of *phtheirō* as a formula: “Everything that ceases to be ceases to be (i) by the agency of something and (ii) from something and (iii) something.” Moreover, the author expands the use of the verb: (2a) “*x* cease to be,” (2b) “*x* cease to be *F*,” similar to (1a) “*x* come to be,” (1b) “*x* come to be *F*,” where *x* is a subject and *F* – some predicate.

A wide range of meanings of the adjective “true”¹³ is not suitable for describing the “unconditioned *arkhē*,” and the interactions between the “come to be” and “cease to be” physical phenomena. Both phenomena are the physical environment in which existential meaning is secondary.

Plato explored the “unconditioned *arkhē*” by “composing myths”¹⁴ and mathematics.¹⁵ According to Plato, a mortal could not gaze (θεωρέω)¹⁶ at it. However, if the opposite is

⁸ ἀρχὴν ἀνυπόθετον (*Republic* 6.510b6). The “unconditioned *arkhē*” is understood from Plato’s dialogues or (1) conceptually as the *agathou* idea (τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ ιδέα) (*Republic* 6.505a-6.509c; 6.510a-6.511d; 7.518a-7.518d; 7.532c-7.532c; 7.534c; 10.621c-d; *Timaetus* 29a), or (2) mathematically as one (one, εἷς) (*Republic* 7.524e-7.525a). “Some of the names for the principles – one, many, indefinite dyad – show that Plato frequently thought of the highest, immaterial world in numerical terms. This is no surprise because he treated the entire universe, not just its immaterial component, as a chain of numbers” (Kalvesmaki, 2013).

⁹ (Burnyeat, 2003: 23). Burnyeat relied on γενέσθαι ποτὲ ὄν (*Sophist* 245d1).

¹⁰ (Burnyeat, 2003: 10). Therefore, *gígnomai* “is used sometimes with, sometimes without a complement: (1a) “*x* γίγνεται,” (1b) “*x* γίγνεται *F*”” (Burnyeat, 2003: 9). γίγνεται is the third-person singular present mediopassive indicative of *gígnomai*.

¹¹ (Burnyeat, 2003: 18; 22- 23).

¹² In fact, “in ordinary Greek, you do not say ‘*X* φθείρεται *F*’ to mean ‘*X* ceases to be *F*’” (Ademollo, 2018: 63).

¹³ See Cambridge Dictionary (<https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/true>).

¹⁴ ποιεῖν μύθους (*Phaedo* 61b3). These are (*Gorgias* 522d-527b; *Phaedo* 107c-114c; *Republic* 10.614a-621b; *Phaedrus* 245c-249d). See the review by Alexey Losev (Plato, Volume 1, 1990: 810-813).

¹⁵ “Plato greatly advanced mathematics in general and geometry in particular because of his zeal for these studies.” Translated by Paul Kalligas and Voula Tsouna (Philodemus’ History, 2020: 283). According to Vlastos, “the most important point of disagreement between Plato and Aristotle” is that “Aristotle wants to provide an explanation of nature that is based on ordinary language, whereas Plato wants to leave such an explanation up to mathematics, which, in ever-changing sensible things, represents the traces of intelligible stability” (Vlastos, 2005: xviii). For mathematics in Plato’s dialogues, see (Kalvesmaki, 2013; Fierro, 2003; Philodemus’ History, 2020: 282-283).

Adverb from *alēthēs* (ἀληθής) +[-ως (-ōs)].

¹⁶ (*Phaedo* 109e).

assumed, then “he (mortal) would recognize that that one is (*eimí*) the *alēthōs*¹⁷ heaven and the *alēthinon* light and thus *hōs alēthōs* the earth.”¹⁸ From the “unconditioned *arkhē*,” the upward path began,¹⁹ “the path that is always underway from the underworld to the upper world, from concealment to unconcealment.”²⁰

Modern cosmology defines the “unconditioned *arkhē*” as “the initial singularity”, which has contained all the energy and spacetime of the Universe.²¹ It was followed by the “part of the Planck epoch,” or “the first second of the chronology of the universe.”²² According to the Big Bang theory, singularity is an active principle²³ that causes “the chronology of the Universe.”²⁴

The author will denote the symmetry breaking of the “unconditioned *arkhē*” and, accordingly, the first manifestations of the confrontation between the “come to be” and “cease to be” symmetries by the noun *genesis*.²⁵ This decision is due to the symmetry violation in favour of the “come to be” phenomenon.²⁶

Thus, *genesis* is the formation of apparent opposition between the phenomena “come to be” and “cease to be” and the apparent dominance of the first phenomenon over the second. The result of the confrontation between two physical phenomena²⁷ and the prevalence of “come to be” over “cease to be” is the formation of the third phenomenon – “to be.” The Greeks referred to it with the verb *eimí*, to be, exist and its inflections: participle *óntos* (ὄντος), participle and noun *ón* (ὄν), noun *ousiā* (οὐσίᾳ),²⁸ etc. The third physical phenomenon is a regulatory compromise between the “come to be” and “cease to be” phenomena. It exhibits, on the one hand, the “come to be” and “cease to be” phenomena in themselves, on the other hand, the rivalry between them. According to Burnyeat, “to be is to be (predicatively) a being/ something that is (εἶναι ὄν).”²⁹ That is why everything exhibited in the “to be” phenomenon cannot be “come to be”³⁰ and/or “cease to be” itself. The physical meaning of the “to be”

¹⁷ Adverb from *alēthēs* (ἀληθής) + {-ως (-ōs).

¹⁸ γῶναι ἂν ὅτι ἐκεῖνός ἐστιν ὁ ἀληθὺς οὐρανὸς καὶ τὸ ἀληθινὸν φῶς καὶ ἡ ὥς ἀληθὺς γῆ (*Phaedo* 109e5-110a1). Translated by Gwenda-lin Grewal.

¹⁹ The upward path (*Republic* 2.364d) and the path above (*Republic* 7.514b). See (Schur, 2015; Gill, 2010: 172; Gonzalez, 2009: 244-245).

²⁰ (Gonzalez, 2009: 244).

²¹ (Sagan, 2013).

²² The Lambda-CDM Cosmological Model currently represents this period’s most authoritative argument (Sagan, 2013).

²³ “dark energy, in the form of a cosmological constant, makes up 71.4% of the universe, causing the expansion rate of the universe to speed up” See <https://map.gsfc.nasa.gov/>

²⁴ <https://map.gsfc.nasa.gov/>

²⁵ *Génesis* is derived from the verb *gígnomai*. *Gígnomai* and *génesis*, as well as words derived from them, are used as key terms in the presenting cosmogony and cosmology in Plato’s *Timaeus*. According to A.F. Losev, “Only sometimes, instead of γίγνομαι, Plato uses the verb γεννάω, which means “to beget”, and in Greek, this term is primarily connected with the descent from the father (24d, 28b-c, 37c, 38c, 41a-b, 41d)” (Plato, V-3, 1994: 599).

²⁶ On the cosmology of Plato and Empedocles, which share a “fundamental structure of a symmetrical movement back and forth between opposed situations” (Coates, 2018: 422) see (Vlastos, 2005; Coates, 2018).

²⁷ φθορὰν καὶ γένεσιν (*Philebus* 55a).

²⁸ From ὄν, οὐσᾶ, ὄν (“being”), the present participle of *eimí* (“to be”), + -iā (-iā, abstract noun suffix).

²⁹ (Burnyeat, 2003: 23).

³⁰ See (*Phaedrus* 245d) and the discussion (Burnyeat, 2003: 23).

phenomenon is already something that is (εἶναι ὄν) in a specific combination between “come to be” and “cease to be.” From this combination, that is, from “something that is”, a return to the original physical state, namely the “come to be purely” physical phenomenon, and/or “cease to be purely” is impossible.

Thus, the physical meaning of the “to be” phenomenon is the *alēthēs* (not hidden, unconcealed) combination between “come to be” and “cease to be.” It is the exhibit of a compromise symmetry that allows a phenomenon to demonstrate a specific range of physical meanings that emphasise its (i) certain self-sufficiency (being something) and the contrast with the (ii) “come to be”³¹ and (iii) “cease to be” phenomena.³² The main feature of the newly formed symmetry is *alētheia*, or the exhibit of unity and opposition between three fundamental physical phenomena: “come to be”, “cease to be”, and “to be.”

It follows the definition of the *alētheia*. We refer to *alētheia* as the commensurability of three physical phenomena, which we designate with the verbs *gígnomai*, *phtheirō*, and *eimí*. This commensurability is the *alēthēs* (unconcealed) for itself, but the *lēthē* is for each phenomenon separately. The only way to the *alētheia* “passes through” the *lēthē* of the “to be” phenomenon towards *genesis*, where the phenomena and their meaningfulness are formed.

2. What is there in *alēthēs*?

The intuition guide to *genesis* through the *lēthē* of the “to be” phenomenon is the question, “What is there in *alēthēs*?” We will investigate the *kósmos* of the “to be” phenomenon with the help of the *Platone philosophandi ratio triplex*.³³

The phenomena “come to be” and “cease to be” are energy and spacetime, or *dúnamis*. The Romans translated *dúnamis* as *potentia*, which has formed the root of the English word “potential.” Hence, “to be” as a regulatory compromise between “come to be” and “cease to be” is the *dúnamis*, “it as the realm of the things that are ‘never in the same state.’”³⁴ “For I put (τίθεμαι) a boundary (ὄρος) which defines (ὀρίζω) being (όντα), that it is (*estin*) nothing else but *dúnamis*.”³⁵

The examining the “to be” phenomenon as the *dúnamis* defines it not as “a capability of merely being present-with, but rather a capability of acting and being-acted upon.”³⁶

³¹ Francesco Ademollo notes that Plato’s “contrast between ‘coming to be’ and ‘being’” (γένεσις and οὐσία: e.g. *Republic* 7.525b-c, 7.526e, 7.534a), sometimes as a contrast between “what comes into being” and “what is” (τὸ γιγνόμενον and τὸ ὄν: e.g. *Republic* 6.518c, 6.521d) and sometimes as a contrast between “what comes and goes” and “what always is” or simply “what is” (τὸ γιγνόμενον καὶ ἀπολλύμενον ὄν and just τὸ ὄν: e.g. *Republic* 6.508d, 7.521e, 7.527b).” (Ademollo, 2018: 59).

³² For “the contrast between the realm of being (*eimí*) and that of coming to be (*gígnomai*) and passing away (*phtheirō*)” in the *Republic*, see (Ademollo, 2018: 62-64).

³³ Fuit ergo iam accepta a Platone philosophandi ratio triplex, una de vita et moribus, altera de natura et rebus occultis, tertia de disserendo et quid verum quid falsum quid rectum in oratione pravumve quid consentiens quid repugnet iudicando. [p. 9] (Cicero, *Academica*: 1.19). O. Plasberg, Ed. (<http://data.perseus.org/citations/urn:cts:latinLit:phi0474.phi045.perseus-lat1:1.19>). “There already existed, then, a threefold scheme of philosophy inherited from Plato: one division dealt with conduct and morals, the second with the secrets of nature, the third with dialectic and with the judgement of truth and falsehood, correctness and incorrectness, consistency and inconsistency, in rhetorical discourse.” Translated by H. Rackham (1933). See also (Horky, 2020: 171-181).

³⁴ (Phaedo 78c6-8, 79a9-10, 79c6-7). For discussion, see (Ademollo, 2018: 36-40).

³⁵ τίθεμαι γὰρ ὄρον ὀρίζειν τὰ ὄντα ὥς ἔστιν οὐκ ἄλλο τι πλὴν δύναμις (*Sophist* 247e3). Translated by Harold N. Fowler with modification.

³⁶ (Gonzalez, 2009: 324; *Phaedrus* 247d-e).

The investigation of the *dúnamis* discovers the *phúsis*, which establishes the *kósmos*.³⁷ According to modern concepts, the *kósmos* of the “to be” phenomenon is based on the metric expansion or the FLRW metric.³⁸

Phúsis (not “nature”³⁹) causes the *kósmos* as the combination of *anankē* and *nóos*.⁴⁰ The noun *anankē* denotes force,⁴¹ concentrated in *dúnamis*. *Anankē* is represented by well-known fundamental forces,⁴² introducing constraint and necessity, or focus of interactions specified in the *kósmos*. In *anankē*, the superiority of the physical meaning of the “come to be” phenomenon over “cease to be” is exhibited. In turn, the noun *nóos* denotes the ability of self-organisation (self-assembly).⁴³ These are the limitations embedded in the *dúnamis* by the physical meaning of the “cease to be” phenomenon. In this physical meaning, the meanings of *nóos* are cognate with the meanings of νόμοι (laws),⁴⁴ in a way that *nóos* determines laws.

The *phúsis* of the *kósmos* is the *arkhē* of the “to be” phenomenon. Let us pay attention to the essential connotation of the noun *arkhē*, which is transmitted to it from the verb *árkhō* (ἄρχω).⁴⁵ This “beginning,” “origin,” leads, rules, governs and commands.⁴⁶ *Arkhē* is the *phúsis* of the *kósmos*, which obliges to “being something or other, being something definite. There is no concept of existence (εἶναι τι,⁴⁷ to exist) as such, for subjects of an indeterminate nature.”⁴⁸ “To be” something or whole (ὅλον) is an action that is always completed on its own, which corresponds to the formula: “Everything that exists,⁴⁹ exists (i) by the agency of something and (ii) from something and (iii) something.”⁵⁰ Moreover, it appears true: (3a) “x exists,” and (3b) “x is F.”⁵¹

³⁷ “That *physis* is even more basic than *kosmos* is evident from the fact that the discoverers of the *cosmos* came to be called *physiologoi*, not *kosmologoi*, and that “nature” occurs much more frequently in tides of their treatises than does “cosmos” (Vlastos, 2005: 18).

³⁸ The Friedmann–Lemaître–Robertson–Walker metric (the FLRW metric) underlies the Big Bang cosmology.

³⁹ “Christian interpreters (and not only they!) ought to remember that this Greek concept of nature is not identical with naturalism in our modern sense, but almost the opposite of it.” (Jaeger, 1961: 18).

⁴⁰ οὗν ἡ τοῦδε τοῦ κόσμου γένεσις ἐξ ἀνάγκης τε καὶ νοῦ συστάσεως ἐγεννήθη (*Timaeus* 48a1-2).

⁴¹ (Liddell & Scott, 1940).

⁴² There are four fundamental interactions, also known as fundamental interactions, also known as fundamental forces: the gravitational and electromagnetic interactions, and the strong and weak interactions.

⁴³ Examples of self-organisation are crystallisation, thermal convection of fluids, chemical oscillation, animal swarming, neural circuits, etc. In recent decades, related modelling- emergence – has been developed along with the self-organisation (self-assembly) models.

⁴⁴ “For the “law” which we recognise in the regularity of the celestial motions is, for Plato, a proof of their rationality (νόος and νόμος being akin).” (Bury, 1937: 315).

⁴⁵ *Arkhē* is derived from ἄρχω (*árkhō*, “to begin”) + -η (-ē, verbal noun suffix).

⁴⁶ (Liddell & Scott, 1940). See especially (*Statesman* 260e8-9; 275a3-6; 304b11-304c1) and discussion (Gill, 2010: 186).

⁴⁷ Present infinitive of *eimi*.

⁴⁸ (Burnyeat, 2003: 16).

⁴⁹ Pay attention that in English “to exist” was a late-comer, in 1602 (Burnyeat, 2003: 21).

⁵⁰ (Burnyeat, 2003: 18).

⁵¹ See (Burnyeat, 2003; Ademollo, 2018).

Thus, the investigation of the question “What is there in *alēthēs*?” leads us to the *phúsis* of the *kósmos* of the “to be” phenomenon. The *phúsis* of the *kósmos* is (3a) “*x* exists,”⁵² which exposes the combination between (1a) “*x* come to be” and (2a) “*x* cease to be,” where *x* is the subject or equals to something. The metric (3a) “*x* exists” is independent and does not correspond to the metrics (1a) and (2a) separately. The main difference of the metric (3a) “*x* exists,” is the meaningfulness of the physical characteristics of something that is (εἶναι ὄν). It is the meaningful *phúsis* of any “something that is” that is its defining characteristic, which allows it to be “what is purely (όντος)” and not “what is not (not óntos).”⁵³

Thus, the “passing through” the *lēthē* of the “to be” phenomenon towards the *genesis* has led us to define the critical dichotomy of the *phúsis* of the *kósmos*:

What is that which comes to be (*gígnomai*) and always is purely (όν) and what is that which comes to be (*gígnomai*) and not ever (οὐδέποτε) is (όν)?⁵⁴

3. What is the *phúsis* of a form as *dúnamis*?

The formulated dichotomy⁵⁵ is based on the Big Bang theory and the argumentation of the expansion of the Universe. A critical clarification follows from it. Namely, we examine the *phúsis*, which causes the expanding *kósmos* of the “to be” phenomenon.

The concept of “expanding *kósmos*” presents the physical environment of the “to be” phenomenon as a *paradigm* (*parádeigma*),⁵⁶ which compares (παράδεικνυμι) the *phúsis* of the *kósmos* with the *agōn*.⁵⁷ The forms “come into being and are generated”⁵⁸ in the *agon* (*agōn*).⁵⁹ The *agōn* selects and legitimises the competitive advantage of their *phúsis* in real-time. Each form is an image (εἰκών) of a *parádeigma*⁶⁰ and differs only by the characteristics of its *phúsis*.

Modern science has been clear about the expanding *kósmos* formed by non-material (dark energy) and material⁶¹ forms. All of them are formed by the combination of *anankē* and *nóos*.

⁵² According to Burnyeat, Frege’s logic, in particular, the logical notation (3x)(Fx A Gx), means “the way one language or another expresses (what we call) existence” (Burnyeat, 2003: 21).

⁵³ τε μὴ ὄντος καὶ τοῦ ὄντος εἰλικρινῶς (*Republic* 5.479d4). See discussion (Burnyeat, 2003: 12-16; Ademollo, 2018: 61-62).

⁵⁴ The author changed a basic ontological dichotomy to fit the Big Bang theory. See (*Timaeus* 27d6-28a1).

⁵⁵ “Dichotomous division plays a major role in Plato’s search for definitions in the late dialogues, but not the comprehensive role often attributed to it” (Gill, 2010: 197-198).

⁵⁶ The noun *parádeigma* is derived from the verb *παράδεικνυμι*, “to make comparisons, to exhibit.” A *parádeigma* “indicates how to go on, how to begin an enquiry or how to get beyond an impasse” (Gill, 2010: 176). The *parádeigma* facilitates the passage through the *lēthē* of the “to be” phenomenon in the direction of *genesis*. The modern meanings of the word “paradigm” differ from the meanings of the *parádeigma*.

⁵⁷ For the *agōn* and the agonistic tradition, see (Tell, 2011; Daqing, 2010).

⁵⁸ γιγνόμενα καὶ γεννητὰ (*Timaeus* 28c2).

⁵⁹ Plato imagined it as a *chōra* (χώρα), “an *eidos* invisible and unshaped, all-receptive” (*Timaeus* 51a). Translated by W.R.M. Lamb. See (Ademollo, 2018, Zeyl & Sattler, 2022).

⁶⁰ According to Plato, forms were the images (*eikōn*) for the demiurge (God), who created the *kalós kósmos*. (*Timaeus* 51a-52a; *Phaedo* 109a-111c; *Cratylus* 439c-440d; *Symposium* 211b; *Republic* 10.596a-10.598d).

⁶¹ “...completed a census of the universe and finds that dark matter (matter not made up of atoms) is 24.0%”, whereas “ordinary atoms (also called baryons) make up only 4.6% of the universe.” <https://map.gsfc.nasa.gov/>

This combination exposes each form as a potency (*dúnamis*) of the presence,⁶² capable of acting and being-acted upon. The forms which come to be, come to be always is pure. Hence, we need “to go through” the question:

What is the *phúsis* of a form as *dúnamis*?

The previously made conclusion facilitates investigation of the forms that potentially “come to be (*gignomai*) and always is purely (*ón*).” Namely, any form comes to be as an image of a *parádeigma*. It means that the basic structure of the forms is the same. Any form which comes to be consists of *arkhē*, *anankē* and *nóos*, where:

(1) *Arkhē* is a directive physical meaning of any (non-material and material) form formed by a particular combination of the “come to be” and “cease to be” phenomena. The *arkhē* of the forms is the image of the “unconditioned *arkhē*”, but it has a fundamental difference. Namely, it is based on the FLRW metric⁶³ and the magnitude of the appropriated energy. As a result, *arkhē* is the providential and directive beginning of any form. Moreover, it exhibits the physical characteristics of the form as a certain rightness (*dikaíosunē*).⁶⁴ Accordingly, the “comes to be” form is as *dikaíos* (righteous) *phúsis*, always focused on being pure. Thanks to the *arkhē*, the expanding *kósmos* is represented as a hierarchy of *dikaíos* forms or as the chronology of the Universe.

(2) *Anankē* is the force of the “come to be” phenomenon, which forms the constraints and necessity of each form. *Anankē* guarantees that the form will always be “an open system,”⁶⁵ but, at the same time, its existence will be a constraint and limited by the magnitude of the appropriated force. Thanks to *anankē*, the competing variety of forms in the *kósmos* have a common focus or *dikaíosunē* (rightness) of the interactions. *Anankē* represents the competition between forms as an opposition between *dikaíos* (righteous) and unrighteous (*ἄδικος*) interactions (forces).

(3) *Nóos* is the form’s ability of self-organisation (self-assembly). *Nóos* causes the ordering of the components that come to be into an organised structure – form. Moreover, it is the “intending and perceiving”⁶⁶ of “always to be purely,” by which the components that come to be are organised into the form without external direction. In this physical aspect, the meanings of *nóos* and laws (*vóμoι*) demonstrate their affinity. Coming to be components use innate, local interactions (*anankē*) for self-organisation (self-assembly) into a specific form (system) with certain physical characteristics. The defining ones are (i) magnitude of appropriated energy, (ii) order (structure) and (iii) ability to act, interact (function). *Nóos* exhibits the competition between the forms as the competition between *dikaíos* and unright (*ἄδικος*) self-organisation (self-assembly).

The combination of the three above basic characteristics forms the *phúsis* of the form as *dúnamis*. The form “comes to be” into *agōn* and competes for the reward of “always be purely” solely as a physical phenomenon or *phúsis*. The quality of *phúsis*, which guarantees the pass through the form into “to be” with the goal of “always be purely,” the author will denote by the verb *dierkhomai*. All forms that “come to be” into the *kósmos* of the “to be” phenomenon have a *phúsis* equivalent to *dierkhomai*.

⁶² The discussion of “the “δύναμις of presence” (or co-presence)” (Gonzalez, 2009: 325).

⁶³ It has been established that the FLRW metric itself changed over time.

⁶⁴ The author uses the connotation “right” rather than “justice” when translating the adjective δίκαιος and the nouns δίκη and δικαιοσύνη. He presents the argument in the text.

⁶⁵ Modern open systems models link the organismic, thermodynamics and evolutionary models.

⁶⁶ The author used the result of the discussion (Gonzalez, 2009: 29).

The quality of *dierkhomai* is the *phúsis* of the forms that “come to be (*gígnomai*) and always is purely (όν).” Moreover, the *phúsis* of forms, which “come to be (*gígnomai*) and not ever (οὐδέποτε) is (όν)” has this quality. Therefore, *dierkhomai* is a qualitative characteristic of the form, leading it into *agōn*. To win or lose in the *agōn*, that is, to come to be in the *agōn*, so that later “always is purely (όν) or not ever is (όν),”⁶⁷ is determined by a different quality of *phúsis*. Denote it by the noun *dianoia*. *Dianoia* are specific physical characteristics that allow the form to win *agōn* and always be purely (όν). It is the fundamental competitive advantage of the form, which guarantees its existence in the expanding *kósmos* as something that is (3a) “x exists” and (3b) “x is F.”

Analysis of *dianoia* is possible only on the example of a specific form. Therefore, an investigation of the question “What is the *dianoia* of the hominin form?”⁶⁸ will lead us to understand, “What is a meaningful *phúsis*?”

4. What is *dianoia* of the hominin form?

Modern man defines *arkhē* of the form as neuroevolution, which, approximately 7 million years ago, caused the formation of the phylogeny of hominin species.⁶⁹ That is, about seven million years ago, the hominin form won the *agōn* and was rewarded the opportunity to “always is purely (όν)” in the expanding *kósmos*. What competitive advantage does the *phúsis* of hominin form have?

The first investigations of the meaningful *physis* of the hominin form, which have come down to our times, are found in Plato’s *Meno*.⁷⁰ Beginning with *Meno*, Plato focused on three important problems that exhibit the fundamental competitive advantage of hominin.⁷¹ “The first concerns what counts as a good definition, the second what is to be defined, the third the variety of permissible definitions.”⁷² The study of these problems is turning round hominin to the question “What is x?” in (3a) “x exists”⁷³ and reveals the significance of this turning around. “For when he says that, he makes a statement about that which is (όντων⁷⁴) or is becoming (γιγνομένων⁷⁵) or has become (γεγονότων⁷⁶) or is to be (μελλόντων); he does not merely give names (ονομάζω), but he concludes by combining verbs with nouns.”⁷⁷

⁶⁷ *Agon* follows the “first-only rule”, i.e. one event, one winner. It corresponds to the famous saying at that time: “either the wreath or death”) (Daqing, 2010: 6806).

⁶⁸ What the author refers to as “the hominin form” in this dialogue is the current stage of the form that I refer to as the “Intelligent Matter.” The “Intelligent Matter” form is explored in the second dialogue. The question “What is the *dianoia* of the hominin form?” changes the focal length to a meaningful *phúsis* of the “Intelligent Matter” form and narrows the angle of view.

⁶⁹ See (McNulty, 2016).

⁷⁰ (*Meno* 72c).

⁷¹ Especially see *Definition in Greek Philosophy*. Edited by David Charles (2010).

⁷² (Charles, 2010: 3).

⁷³ “Socrates’ most significant philosophical innovation, in Aristotle’s view, was to focus on the search for definitions, raising and attempting to answer his famous ‘What is it?’ question” (*Metaphysics* 1078b22ff). (Charles, 2010: 1).

⁷⁴ Inflection of *eimi*.

⁷⁵ Inflection of *gígnomai*.

⁷⁶ Inflection of *gígnomai*.

⁷⁷ δηλοῖ γὰρ ἥδη που τότε περὶ τῶν ὄντων ἢ γιγνομένων ἢ γεγονότων ἢ μελλόντων, καὶ οὐκ ὀνομάζει μόνον ἀλλὰ τι περαίνει, συμπλέκων τὰ ῥήματα τοῖς ὀνόμασι (*Sophist* 262d4-6). Translated by Harold N. Fowler. For discussion, see (Burnyeat, 2010: 183-184).

The examination of the question “What is x ?” exposes the hominin essential ability. Namely, the hominin “comes to be and always are purely” *due to* and *through* the “turning round” to that “which comes to be and always is purely.” The quality of the *phūsīs* of the hominin form guarantees not only the passage into “to be”, i.e., the *dierkhomai*, but also the passage through the *lēthē* of the “to be” phenomenon towards *gēnesis*, i.e., *dianoia*. The hominin demonstrate the ability to examine x in (3a) “ x exists” and in founding it (1a) “ x come to be”, and (2a) “ x ceases to be”. As a result, they define and use x as F , where F is more than “some” predicate.⁷⁸ F is the result of *dianoia*. The hominin “use the *noūs*” as a physical characteristic and examine (3a) to reach balanced conclusions about it and its combination (1a) and (2a).⁷⁹

Thus, the ability to examine “What is x ?”⁸⁰ is a demonstration of the fundamental competitive advantage of the *phūsīs* of the hominin in the *agōn*, thanks to which they can define that one something in (3a) in which all cases of F are F .⁸¹ Hominin does not examine “What is there in *alēthēs*?” They grasp concrete x ,⁸² something, in all three phenomena, denoted by us by the verbs *gígnomai* *gígnomai*, *phtheirō* and *eimí*. The hominin form wins the *agōn* by being able to grasp the *phūsīs* of the *kósmos* as *alēthēs* (not hidden, unconcealed) F , which is subsequently used to multiply one’s *phūsīs*.

Understanding the ability to examine “What is x ?” is equivalent to understanding the hominin form’s meaningful *phūsīs*. The reflection compares and defines the three key characteristics of meaningful *phūsīs*. These characteristics provide the fundamental advantage of the hominin form in the *agōn* and guarantee victory. The author has labelled the identified attributes in related terms: the *agathós*, the *agathou dúnamis* and the *aretē*. Let us consider them.

(1) The adjective *agathós*⁸³ denotes the first and main characteristic.⁸⁴ According to Plato, the *kállistos* of all that has come into being (*gígnomai*) or *kósmos*)⁸⁵ is nothing but the

⁷⁸ The fact that a verb usually forms the predicate is explained by Aristotle (*Arist. Int. 16b6*) (Liddell & Scott, 1940).

⁷⁹ (*Timaeus* 52a-b). Especially see (Ademollo, 2018: 67-69; Zeyl & Sattler, 2022). “According to Plato, “there is, indeed, continuous change in the sensible world, but there is also some stability, and there are patterns and regularities in the change. He thinks that he is in a position to recognise these elements of stability because he, unlike his opponents, admits in his ontology the universal properties of the changing things, namely the forms, by participating in which the changing things are whatever they are” (Ademollo, 2018: 77-78).

⁸⁰ Moreover, as we will specify later, to examine precisely as a *dialégesthai* (διαλέγεσθαι) and a *dialégō* (διαλέγω), that is, in a particular way, in the meanings: “to practice dialectikē,” “to reveal results in discussion,” or “to think discursively.”

⁸¹ See (*Meno* 72c7ff.; Charles, 2010; Brown, 2010; Gill, 2010). “A good definition of F must give that one thing which is common to all and only F s, and which is that through which all the F s are F . A definition must give the ‘what it is’, the essence of F , i.e. that which explains why all the F s are F ” (Brown, 2010: 151-152).

⁸² ἡ ψυχὴ τῆς ἀληθείας ἄπτεται (“the *psukhē* grasp the *alētheia*”) (*Phaedo* 65b7). Translated by Gwenda-lin Grewal (2018).

⁸³ See (*Euthydemus* 278e-281e). In Ancient Greece, the term *agathós* concentrated in itself the whole set of concepts that have covered and still cover all man’s moral, intellectual and spiritual virtues. All of them are their derivatives. The whole hierarchy of being and knowledge is based on *agathós* (Hadot, 1999).

⁸⁴ Sometimes it is called the One. See (Plotinus, 1952).

⁸⁵ ὁ μὲν γὰρ κάλλιστος τῶν γεγόνότων (*Timaeus* 29a4).

agathou offspring,⁸⁶ which the *agathós* begot (γεννάω) in a proportion with itself.⁸⁷ *Agathós* hand over (παρέχω)⁸⁸ *alētheia* for (τοῖς) objects perceived (γινώσκομένοις) and give back (ἀποδίδωμι)⁸⁹ the *dúnamis* for perceivers (γινώσκοντι).⁹⁰ *Agathós* is the cause of epistēmē of the singular “to be” (οὔσαν) and singular *alētheia* (ἀληθείας).⁹¹ Plato identified three forms of the *agathón*:⁹² “*psūkhēi*,⁹³ the body, and external.”⁹⁴ They sequentially formed (i) the “rightness (*dikaíosunē*), phrónēsis, courage (*andreíā*), and *sōphrosúnē*”⁹⁵ into *psūkhēi*; (ii) the “beauty (*kállos*), wellness, health, and strength in the body”;⁹⁶ and (iii) “friends, the eudaimōnia of fatherland and wealth among the external.”⁹⁷

Agathós, as a characteristic of the meaningful *phúsis* of hominin, examines “What is *x*?” in such a way as to define (3a) “*x* exists” as (3b) “*x* is *F*”. In this case, *F* is one *F*, which the “to be” phenomenon represents as the *alēthēs* (unconcealed) combination between the “come to be” and “cease to be” phenomena. *Agathós* compares *x* in (1a), (2a) and (3a) and defines it as the one *F*, moreover, as a global something that is both (i) a whole and expanding *kósmos* and (ii) causes a meaningful *phúsis* of hominin and any other form.

Thanks to the *agathós*, the hominin perceive the *phúsis* of the expanding *kósmos* as an intelligible complexity. Each new intelligible account of this complexity advances the hominin towards *génesis*. As a result, hominin acquire the physical meanings that provide: (i) passing into *agōn* but losing, that is, the quality of *phúsis* equivalent to *dierkhomai*, and (ii) a fundamental competitive advantage that allows the forms to win *agōn* and “always to be purely.” The fundamental advantage of hominin is their ability to define the meaningful *phúsis* of the existing forms, grasp physical meanings and use them to win *agōn*.

The hominin form examines the “to be” phenomenon as the *agathós*, embracing it by the *lógos* and the *phrónēsis*.⁹⁸ At the same time, hominin recognise the limitations of their capabilities.⁹⁹ Therefore, they are examining “What is *x*?” in (3a)¹⁰⁰ in such a way as to define

⁸⁶ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ ἔκγονον (*Republic* 6.508b11).

⁸⁷ ὃν τὰγαθὸν ἐγέννησεν ἀνάλογον ἑαυτῷ (*Republic* 6.508b11-12).

⁸⁸ Properly, have close beside, i.e. give (offer) in a “up-close-and-personal” way. <https://biblehub.com/greek/3930.htm>

⁸⁹ Properly, give from, i.e. to return (especially as a payment), in relation to the source of the giving back. <https://biblehub.com/greek/591.htm>

⁹⁰ τὸ τὴν ἀλήθειαν παρέχον τοῖς γινώσκομένοις καὶ τῷ γινώσκοντι τὴν δύναμιν ἀποδιδόν (*Republic* 6.508e1-2).

⁹¹ αἰτίαν δ’ ἐπιστήμης οὔσαν καὶ ἀληθείας (*Republic* 6.508e2-3). “The good (*agathón*) makes beings manifest as beings, thereby at the same time letting them be. The good (*agathón*) is the cause of the beingknown of beings and of their being (509b). In other words, it provides the light of ἀλήθεια in which they can first come into presence and be” (Gonzalez, 2009: 312).

⁹² Masculine/feminine/neuter genitive plural of *agathós*.

⁹³ Dative singular of *psukhē*.

⁹⁴ Τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἄρα τρία εἶδη ἐστί: τὰ μὲν ἐν ψυχῇ, τὰ δὲ ἐν σώματι, τὰ δὲ ἐκτός (Diogenes Laertius, 3.1.81). Edited by Robert Hicks (1972).

⁹⁵ δικαιοσύνη καὶ ἡ φρόνησις καὶ ἡ ἀνδρεία καὶ ἡ σωφροσύνη (Diogenes Laertius, 3.1.80).

⁹⁶ τὸ δὲ κάλλος καὶ ἡ εὐεξία καὶ ἡ ὑγεία καὶ ἡ ἰσχὺς ἐν σώματι (Diogenes Laertius, 3.1.80).

⁹⁷ οἱ δὲ φίλοι καὶ ἡ τῆς πατρίδος εὐδαιμονία καὶ ὁ πλοῦτος ἐν τοῖς ἐκτός (Diogenes Laertius, 3.1.80).

⁹⁸ τὸ λόγῳ καὶ φρονήσει περιληπτὸν (*Timaeus* 29a5-6).

⁹⁹ Due to the varying quality of the *lógos* (*Sophist* 262e-264a) and the difficulty with the “to conceive and bring forth” the *phronesis* (*phrónēsis*) (*Symposium* 209a).

¹⁰⁰ (3a) “*x* exists.”

x not as *agathós* itself but as *F*, an *agathou* idea (τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ ιδέα)¹⁰¹ or, equivalently, an *agathou* form.¹⁰² The *agathós* is the ideal characteristic of the meaningful *phúsis*, while the *agathou* form is its accurate understanding and use. Hominin use the *agathou* form primarily for (i) imitation, where “imitation” (*mīmēsis*) is understood in two meanings: “identification” and “reproduction,”¹⁰³ (ii) and/or assimilation (*homoiōsis*) so far as this is possible.¹⁰⁴ *Mīmēsis* and/or *homoiōsis* convert the hominin form into image (3a) “*x* exists” and helps to win *agōn*.

(2) The phrase the *agathou dúnamis* denotes the second characteristic of the meaningful *phúsis* of hominin. The *agathou dúnamis* is that one something, which is always the answer to the question “What is to be Defined?”¹⁰⁵ What is to be Defined? It is always the *agathou dúnamis*, which [A] is that one something in (3b) “*x* is *F*,” which [B] is graspable without specialised knowledge; [C] is such that if one does not know it, one cannot know any other feature of *F*; and [D] is such that if one does know it, one will be able to distinguish on its basis any case of *F* from any case which is not *F*.¹⁰⁶

The *agathou dúnamis*, as a characteristic of the hominin’s meaningful *phúsis*, is exhibit by “the acts or actions of the agent.”¹⁰⁷ Moreover, this does not happen in any manner, for example, the “action for the sake of action,”¹⁰⁸ but with a specific focus and limits of collective and individual self-realisation: *agathós* and *aretē*, respectively.¹⁰⁹ The meanings of the *agathou dúnamis* are equivalent to the combination of the *anankē* and *nóos* meanings, which present the *phúsis* of hominin as the image of the *phúsis* of the expanding *kósmos*. In this sense, the *agathou dúnamis* defines the hominin form as a potency capable of acting and being acted upon. The hominin are compared (παράδεικνυμι) by actions (interactions) focused on procreation (τίκτειν) “in a biological and/or cultural sense”¹¹⁰ and self-organisation (self-assembly) into a technologically advanced space civilisation¹¹¹ based on the agonistic tradition.

¹⁰¹ See (*Republic* 6.505a–6.509c; 6.510a–6.511d; 7.518a–7.518d; 7.532a–7.532c; 7.534c; 10.621c–d; *Timaeus* 29a). For the “turning round” discussion towards the *agathou* idea, see (Capra, 2015; Fierro, 2003: 215–220; Gonzalez, 2009: 330–332).

¹⁰² For the synonymy of εἶδος and ιδέα to refer to forms in Plato’s dialogues and discussion, see (Gonzalez, 2009: 85–127).

¹⁰³ The author follows Plato. Discussion of *mīmēsis* see (Capra, 2015).

¹⁰⁴ (*Symposium* 207d; *Theaetetus* 176b; *Republic* 10.619a). Discussion see (Fierro, 2003; Torri, 2017).

¹⁰⁵ The author follows David Charles, “In the *Meno*, when Socrates seeks an account which will answer his ‘What is *F*?’ question, his target is described in the following terms:

[A] it is that one thing in virtue (*aretē*) of which all cases of *F* are *F* (72c7ff.);

[B] it is graspable without specialised knowledge by intelligent interlocutors (75d2–7);

[C] it is such that if one does not know it, one cannot know any other feature of *F* (71b3–7);

[D] it is such that if one does know it, one will be able to distinguish on its basis any case of *F* from any case which is not *F* (72c8–d1) (Charles, 2010: 5–6).

¹⁰⁶ See (Charles, 2010: 5–6).

¹⁰⁷ See (Wilson & Shpall, 2016).

¹⁰⁸ “Act! act! it is to that end we are here.” Johann Gottlieb Fichte formulated this imperative at the end of the 18th century. (The Christian Pioneer, 1842: 182).

¹⁰⁹ In the Middle Ages, the potency (*dynamis*), which gives the intention of collective and individual self-realisation, was denoted by the terms “God” and “soul” in modern history – “the Universe” and “mind.” The agreement between the meanings of *agathós* and *aretē* in Plato’s dialogues is primary and unprecedented. The author uses it as the basis of a new paradigm.

¹¹⁰ (Fierro, 2003: 67).

¹¹¹ See (Bazaluk, 2022).

A comparative analysis of the actions of the hominin allows us to distinguish three qualities of the meaningful *phúsis*. I define them as (i) *dierkhomai* or the ability to “pass through” the *lēthē* into the *alēthēs*; (ii) “turning round” towards *arkhē*, and (iii) the *dianoia* or the ability to examine *arkhē*. We shall run through them briefly.

(i) The quality of *dierkhomai* or the ability to “pass through” *lēthē* into *alēthēs* is a direct manifestation of the magnitude of the appropriated *agathou dúnamis*, which forms the active principle or the *arkhē* of the hominin form. On the one hand, *dierkhomai* has a providential and directive influence on the actions (interactions) of all hominins. On the other hand, this magnitude creates a contrast “between the things that merely *happen* to people – the events they undergo – and the various things they genuinely *do*.”¹¹²

(ii) The “turning round of the *psukhē*”¹¹³ towards the *aretē* and *agathós* is assumed but not ensured by the *agathou dúnamis*. The “turning round” does not mean “to turn or turn around” in its “passing through” the *lēthē* of the “to be” phenomenon towards *genesis*. The “turning round”¹¹⁴ to *arkhē* is “a fundamental change in orientation.”¹¹⁵ It is a new quality of deeds and actions involving complex preparation¹¹⁶ and inspiration to win the *agōn*.

The “turning round” is caused by understanding the *agathou dúnamis* as the physical characteristics of one’s form and the cause of the acts and actions. The “turning round of the *psukhē*” expands the individual nature possibilities at the expense of the intelligible external. The *psukhē* learns to examine its nature and, subsequently, the *phúsis* of its form and *kósmos* in order to discover the *agathou* form. Moreover, it learns to manage *dierkhomai* to independently “pass through” the *lēthē* into *alēthēs*, grasp *x* in (3a) as *alēthēs F*, and use all cases of *F* to expand the possibilities of self-propulsion. The ability to govern the *dierkhomai* is equivalent to the “What is *x*?” examination. The examination purifies the *psukhē* from the evil of ignorance¹¹⁷ and reveals to it new capacities to act in something that is (εἶναι ὄν).

(iii) The quality of *dianoia* or the ability to question *arkhē* is the independent “passage” of the *psukhē* from the “turning round” to the place of the unity of collective and individual actions. It is an examination of the *phúsis* of the hominin form, with the prospect of determining the *alēthēs phúsis* of the expanding *kósmos*. Following Plato, the results of *dianoia* we will call *sophiā* and *aretē* alithiní.¹¹⁸ The adjective *alithiní* (ἀληθινή) is translated as “agreeable to *alētheia*,” and the phrase “*aretē alithiní*” (ἀρετὴ ἀληθινή) means literally “*arete* that is agreeable to the *alētheia*. Hence, *dianoia* (the “guiding perspective”)¹¹⁹ is defined as the upward path¹²⁰ to the source of the significant presence, to the *agathós*, which can be used as *sophiā* and *aretē alithiní* to increase one’s meaningful *phúsis*. The quality of *dianoia* provides the “governance of one’s own actions,”¹²¹ and individual imitation (*mīmēsis*) and/or assimilation (*homoíōsis*) of the *alēthēs* (unconcealed) *F*, revealed by the examination of “What is *x*?” in (3a) “*x* exists.”

¹¹² (Wilson & Shpall, 2016).

¹¹³ ψυχῆς περιαγωγῇ (*Republic* 7.521c5).

¹¹⁴ “the metaphorical expression of “turning round” (περιστροφή and περιαγωγῇ, *Republic* 7.521c) the *psukhē* “upwards” (ἐπάνωδος)” (Fierro, 2003: 215).

¹¹⁵ (Gonzalez, 2009: 330).

¹¹⁶ “I must beware lest I might undergo (paskhein) the very thing which those undergo (paskhein) who behold (theōrein) and examine the sun during an eclipse” (*Phaedo* 99d). Translated by Gwendalin Grewal.

¹¹⁷ Plato called ignorance the worst of evils (*Gorgias* 527e).

¹¹⁸ ἡ μὲν γὰρ τούτου γνώσις σοφία καὶ ἀρετὴ ἀληθινή (*Theaetetus* 176c3-4).

¹¹⁹ (Gonzalez, 2009: 69, 73).

¹²⁰ See (Hadot, 1999; Schur, 2015; Gonzalez, 2009: 244-245)

¹²¹ See (Wilson & Shpall, 2016).

(3) The noun *aretē* denotes the third most significant feature of the meaningful *phúsis* of hominin. According to Plato, the *agathou dúnamis* manifested itself in *kalós* and *aretē*.¹²² The word *aretē* comes from the adjective *áristos*, the superlative degree of *agathós*. It means the personal quality of being *agathou*.¹²³ The *agathós* man¹²⁴ was the person who purified the *aretē* and guaranteed its unconcealment with the spells.¹²⁵ The *agathós* man was able to “give birth to the unconcealed *aretē* and to nurture it.”¹²⁶ As a result, he attained the quality of meaningful *phúsis*, allowing him to multiply the *phúsis* of hominin and contribute to the victory in the *agōn*.¹²⁷ The *agathós* man contemplates the *alēthēs* of the form in and by itself,¹²⁸ which is equivalent to using the *agathós dúnamis* “so far as this is possible.”

The *aretē* is the magnitude of the appropriated *agathou dúnamis*. The magnitude is always individual. The factor of hereditary transmission is essential but not decisive for hominin. Thanks to *aretē* and *mnēmē*,¹²⁹ each hominin “felt such a friendly affection for the *agathón*,”¹³⁰ and experiences “the reason to pursue an *aretē*.”¹³¹

Conclusions

Based on the foregoing, we can draw the following conclusion. The question “What is the *dianoia* of the hominin form?” helps us to define three qualities of the meaningful *phúsis* of hominin: the *agathós*, the *agathou dúnamis* and the *aretē*. We have called the ideal combination of these qualities the *agathós* man. The *agathós* man is a person who perfectly knows *anamimnēskō* (ἀναμνήσκω) and/or *dialégesthai* (διαλέγεσθαι),¹³² which allows to examine “What is *x*?” in a particular way. As a result, he singles out and defines that one something in (3a) in which all cases of *F* are *F*.

The *agathós* man grasps the *phúsis* of the *kósmos* as *alēthēs F* and fixes it as *sophiā* and *aretē* alithiní in the norms (νόμματα) about *kalón*, *dikaíon* and *agathón*.¹³³ The *agathós* man demonstrates how to correctly (*dikē*) use “the best and most excellent,”¹³⁴ the *agathón*,

¹²² (*Philebus* 64e).

¹²³ See (Robinson, 1995; Burnyeat, 2003). “(In Apology (Socrates# defence speech), Crito, and Gorgias) We have seen that virtue (*aretē*) is not just one good thing (*agathós*) for me to have, something that might be measured against other good things (*agathós*), such as wealth or security. Rather, virtue (*aretē*) is a “divine” good (*agathós*) – it is either the only unconditional good (*agathós*), or the only thing which is good (*agathós*) at all” (Annas, 2002: 55).

¹²⁴ ἀγαθὸς ἀνὴρ. See (*Laws* 2.660e). According to Plato, the *agathós* man is an example to *mīmēsis* (*Republic* 6.500c; 9.590e-9.591).

¹²⁵ For discussion, see (Annas, 2002; Capra, 2015; Fierro, 2003; Hadot, 1999).

¹²⁶ τεκόντι δὲ ἀρετὴν ἀληθῆ καὶ θρεψαμένῳ (*Symposium* 212a).

¹²⁷ “Thus *aretē* amounts to “success, supremacy, being better” than others (Griffith, 1990: 188).

¹²⁸ For the discussion on Plato’s vision on the possibility of considering the unconcealed form, see (Carone, 2007: 216-221; Fierro, 2003: 218-221; Hadot, 1999: 99-101; McPherran, 2007: 93-94; Sheffield, 2007: 37).

¹²⁹ *Mnēmē* is the collective memory of the *phúsis* of the form and its existence as a whole. Otherwise, these are the archetypes, the universal basic innate mental structures that form the content of the collective unconscious. See (Jung, 1981).

¹³⁰ (*Lysis* 220d).

¹³¹ ἀρετὴν δὲ διώκειν (*Theaetetus* 176b-c).

¹³² The meanings of the verbs “to recollect” and “to practice *dialektikē*” are understood by me as complimentary. The author is guided by (Capra, 2015).

¹³³ νόμματα καλῶν τε πέρι καὶ δικαίων καὶ ἀγαθῶν (*Republic* 6.484d2-3).

¹³⁴ τὸ ἄριστον καὶ τὸ βέλτιστον (*Phaedo* 97d3). See (Gonzalez, 2009: 328-330).

therefore it is his life that is called the *eudaimōn* life (βίον εὐδαιμόνα).¹³⁵ “If one is *agathōús* (ἀγαθοῦς),¹³⁶ one is at the same time necessarily *eudaimōnas* (εὐδαιμόνας).¹³⁷”¹³⁸

The definition of the *agathós* man specifies *dianoia* as the top quality of the form that comes to be (*gígnomai*) and always is purely (όν).

Glossary¹³⁹

Agathós (ἀγαθός, adjective); **Agathou** (ἀγαθοῦ, masculine/neuter genitive singular); **Agathón** (ἀγαθόν, neuter nominative/accusative/vocative singular), good. “In like manner, then, you are to say that the objects of knowledge not only receive from the presence of the *agathou* their being known, but their very existence and essence is derived to them from it, though the *agathou* itself is not essence but still transcends essence in dignity (πρεσβεία) and surpassing *dunámei* (δυνάμει).”¹⁴⁰

Agōn (ἄγών, noun, from verb ἄγω, I lead, bring (a person, or animal), guide), “means that many people assemble in some place to have a contest.”¹⁴¹ *Agōn* “was an unique creation of the Greeks in the ancient world. In the all kinds of *agōn* of Greece, they showed an unflinching spirit of antagonism, the Greeks made it legalization, rationalization and formalization. It is from this kind of spirit that the western thinking tradition of binary opposition was formed,”¹⁴² including *dialektikē*.

Alētheia (ἀλήθεια, noun), unconcealment, non-oblivion.¹⁴³ **Alēthēs** (ἀληθής, adjective) unconcealed; opposite *lēthē*.

Anankē (ἀνάγκη, noun), force, constraint, necessity.

Aretē (ἀρετή, noun), the personal quality of being *agathou*. “...but from *aretē* money and other things come to be *agathá*”¹⁴⁴ for human beings – yes, all other things, both in private and in public life [= in the *dēmos*].”¹⁴⁵ Plato considered *aretē* as the essence of *psukhē*,¹⁴⁶ “the flow of *agathes psychis*.”¹⁴⁷

Arkhē (ἀρχή, noun) beginning, origin.

Dianoia (διάνοια, noun, from διά, “thoroughly, from side-to-side,” which intensifies *noióō*, “to use the *noús*”), “movement from one side (of an issue) to the other to reach balanced-conclusions; full-orbed reasoning (= critical thinking), i.e., dialectical thinking that literally reaches “across to the other side” (of a matter).”¹⁴⁸

¹³⁵ (*Timaeus* 42b).

¹³⁶ Accusative plural masculine form of *agathós*.

¹³⁷ Literally “blessed with the *daimōn*,” happy.

¹³⁸ It is an interpretation σχεδόν μὲν γὰρ εὐδαιμόνας ἅμα καὶ ἀγαθοὺς ἀνάγκη γίγνεσθαι (*Laws* 5.742e4-5). “That *eudaimōnas* (happiness) and *agathōús* (goodness) should go together is well-nigh inevitable.” Translated by R.G. Bury.

¹³⁹ The author focuses on Plato’s dialogues, the Platonic corpus, and Liddell and Scott’s Greek-English lexicon.

¹⁴⁰ (*Republic* 6.509b). Translated by Paul Shorey.

¹⁴¹ (Daqing, 2010: 6805). For the meaning and features of the agonistic tradition, see (Daqing, 2010; Tell, 2011).

¹⁴² (Daqing, 2010: 6809).

¹⁴³ I distinguish between *alētheia* and truth, so I consciously avoid using the latter word.

¹⁴⁴ Feminine nominative/accusative/vocative dual of *agathós*.

¹⁴⁵ (*Apology* 30b). Translated by Myles Fredric Burnyeat (Burnyeat, 2003: 24).

¹⁴⁶ For example, (*Symposium* 209a).

¹⁴⁷ ῥοήν τῆς ἀγαθῆς ψυχῆς (*Cratylus* 415d).

¹⁴⁸ <https://biblehub.com/greek/1271.htm>

Dierkhomai (διέρχομαι, verb), to go through, pass through.¹⁴⁹

Dikaios (δίκαιος, adjective, derived from *dikē*), right, righteous; opposite *ádikos*

Dikē (δίκη, noun), custom, right (as self-evident), especially a judicial verdict which declares something that is approved or disapproved;¹⁵⁰ as a **Dikaiosúnē** (δικαιοσύνη, noun). From *δίκαιος* (*dikaios*) + *-σύνη* (*-súnē*), rightness, righteousness) it refers to a person; as an adverb. – duly, rightly.

Dúnamis (δύναμις, noun, from *dúnamai*), potency, i.e. a special ability to do a particular thing (a natural ability, *dúnamai*); the total amount that can be contained or produced (capacity). The Romans translated *dúnamis* as *potentia*, which has formed the root of the English word “potential.”

Eimí (εἰμί, verb), exist, be;¹⁵¹ ὢν (ὄν, participle, noun) the things which actually exist, the present, reality;¹⁵² opposite *gígnomai*¹⁵³ and *phtheirō*.¹⁵⁴

Génesis (γένεσις, noun) coming into being, production, generation. *Génesis* is a derivative of the verb *gígnomai*.

Gígnomai (γίγνομαι, verb) to come into being, namely, (i) to become, i.e. to come into existence, begin to be, receive being, and (ii) to become equivalent to come to pass, happen, of events;¹⁵⁵ opposite (i) *phtheirō*, “We should all agree that the opposite of *gígnesthai*¹⁵⁶ is *phtheiresthai*,¹⁵⁷ should we not?”¹⁵⁸ and (ii) *eimí*.¹⁵⁹

Homoíōsis (ὁμοίωσις, noun) and **Hómoios** (ὅμοιος, adjective), a being made like, assimilation, establishment of a resemblance.¹⁶⁰

¹⁴⁹ See (Schur, 2015; Gonzalez, 2009: 207-208; McPherran, 2007: 92).

¹⁵⁰ <https://biblehub.com/greek/1349.htm>

¹⁵¹ I follow Myles Fredric Burnyeat: ‘x ἐστὶ’ is, “uncontroversially, complete statements”; the pass from ‘x ἐστὶ’ to ‘x ἐστὶ *F*’ “is not to change the meaning of the verb, but to add a complement to a verb that was already complete, but further *completable*.” Where *x* is a subject and *F* is some predicate (Burnyeat, 2003: 9-10). “Platonic Greek for “X exists” is “X is something”, εἶναι τι.” For examples of this use of εἶναι τι see *Phd.* 74a9-12, 102b1, *Rep.* 9.583c 5, 584d3, *Tht.* 157a3 and 5, *Soph.* 246e5, 247a9, *Tim.* 51b7-8, *Phlb.* 37a2-9” (Burnyeat, 2003: 16).

¹⁵² (*Sophist* 263d; Liddell & Scott, 1940).

¹⁵³ See discussion (Burnyeat, 2003: 22-23; Ademollo, 2018).

¹⁵⁴ “that being (*ousiā*) which always is (*ousiā*) and does not wander under the influence of *genéseos* and *phthorās*” (ἐκείνης τῆς οὐσίας τῆς ἀεὶ οὐσης καὶ μὴ πλανωμένης ὑπὸ γενέσεως καὶ φθορᾶς) (*Republic* 6.485b). Translated by Myles Fredric Burnyeat with modification (Burnyeat, 2003: 22; Ademollo, 2018: 62-63).

¹⁵⁵ <https://biblehub.com/greek/1096.htm>. Also, I follow Burnyeat: “x γίγνεται” is, “uncontroversially, complete statements”; the pass from “x γίγνεται” to “x γίγνεται *F*” “is not to change the meaning of the verb, but to add a complement to a verb that was already complete, but further *completable*.” Where *x* is a subject and *F* is some predicate (Burnyeat, 2003: 9-10). Also, I follow the formula: “Everything that comes to be comes to be (i) by the agency of something (*Timaeus* 28a4-6) and (ii) from something (*Phaedo* 70c) and (iii) something” (Burnyeat, 2003: 18; 22-23) with modification.

¹⁵⁶ Present infinitive of *gígnomai*.

¹⁵⁷ Infinitive of *phtheirō*.

¹⁵⁸ (*Philebus* 55a). Translated by Harold N. Fowler. See discussion (Ademollo, 2018; Burnyeat, 2003; Gonzalez, 2009; Vlastos, 2005).

¹⁵⁹ (*Timaeus* 27d-28a; *Republic* 6.485a-b). See discussion (Burnyeat, 2003: 22-23; Ademollo, 2018: 59).

¹⁶⁰ “The verb ὁμοίω is an active verb, which denotes an active process performed by an active subject. For this reason, the related noun ὁμοίωσις must be translated as “assimilation,” or “establishment of a resemblance,” rather than simply as “likeness, resemblance”” (Torri, 2017: 10-11).

Kalós (καλός, adjective; neuter **Kalón**, καλόν), moral beauty, of fine quality; and **Kállos** (κάλλος, noun), beauty. According to Plato, the *kalós* meanings followed from the *agathós* meanings: “All that is *agathón* is *kalón* (ἀγαθὸν καλόν), and the *kalón* is not excessive (καλὸν οὐκ ἄμετρον).”¹⁶¹ Diogenes Laertius wrote, “He was the first to define the notion of *kāloû* (καλοῦ)”¹⁶² as that which is bound up with whatever is praiseworthy (ἐπαινετοῦ) and rational (λογικοῦ) and useful (χρησίμου) and proper (πρέποντος) and becoming (ἀρμόττοντος).”¹⁶³

Kósmos (κόσμος, noun), order.

Lēthē (λήθη, noun), concealment, oblivion, closedness; opposite *alētheia*.

Méthodos (μέθοδος, noun), path (hodos) of pursuit (meta-), to pursue one’s inquiry), or literally “the way to follow.”

Mīmēsis (μίμησις, noun), imitation, in the meanings of an identification and a reproduction.¹⁶⁴

Nóos (νόος, noun; contracted form: **Noûs**, νοῦς), mind (perception), an act of mind (thought)).

Parádeigma (παράδειγμα, noun), pattern (model) as a norm, or simply an example, or a combination of both.¹⁶⁵

Phtheirō (φθείρω, verb), to pass away, perish, be destroyed.¹⁶⁶ On the one hand, it was opposed to *gígnomai*;¹⁶⁷ on the other hand, it opposed to *eimí*.¹⁶⁸

Phúsís (φύσις, noun), the energy that causes the expansion of the *kósmos*.¹⁶⁹ “That *physis* is even more basic than *kósmos* is evident from the fact that the discoverers of the *kósmos* came to be called *physiologoi*, not *kosmologoi*, and that “nature” occurs much more frequently in tides of their treatises than does “cosmos.””¹⁷⁰

Psukhē (ψυχή, noun). Plato’s research was aimed at affirming the two main meanings of *psukhē*: (1) the *psukhē* is immortal,¹⁷¹ and its nature differs from the nature of the body.¹⁷² (2) *Epistēmē* is stored in the *psukhē*, therefore to seek for something (ζητεῖν ἄρα) and to know (τὸ μανθάνειν), in general, was called *anamimnēskō*.¹⁷³

¹⁶¹ πᾶν δὴ τὸ ἀγαθὸν καλόν, τὸ δὲ καλὸν οὐκ ἄμετρον (*Timaeus* 87c).

¹⁶² Masculine/neuter genitive singular of *kalós*.

¹⁶³ (Diogenes Laertius, 3.1.79). Edited by Robert Hicks (1972).

¹⁶⁴ See (Capra, 2015).

¹⁶⁵ See (*Meno* 77a9-77b1; *Sophist* 218d9; 235d7). “A *parádeigma* is not merely an example (or paradigmatic example) of some general concept... The search for the definition of the example reveals a procedure, which the enquirers can transfer to the harder case, independent of content. (...) A *parádeigma* indicates how to go on, how to begin an enquiry or how to get beyond an impasse” (Gill, 2010: 175-176).

¹⁶⁶ Unlike the verbs *gígnomai* and *eimí*, the verb *phtheirō* “can only be used without a complement”: “in ordinary Greek you do not say ‘X φθίρεται F’ to mean ‘X ceases to be F’” (Ademollo, 2018: 63).

¹⁶⁷ See (Ademollo, 2018: 62-63).

¹⁶⁸ See (Burnyeat, 2003).

¹⁶⁹ I follow Gregory Vlastos (2005: 4-19) and Werner Jaeger (1961), which indicate the difference between the meanings of *phúsís* and naturalism.

¹⁷⁰ (Vlastos, 2005: 18).

¹⁷¹ ἀθάνατος ἂν ἡ ψυχὴ εἴη (*Meno* 86b).

¹⁷² For example, (*Phaedo* 115c-116a; *Phaedrus* 245c-249d; *Timaeus* 34c).

¹⁷³ (*Meno* 81d).

 References

- Ademollo, Francesco (2018) On Plato's Conception of Change. *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy*, Volume 55, 35-84. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198836339.003.0002>
- Annas, Julia (2002) *Plato: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford University Press.
- Bazaluk, Oleg (2022) Philosophy of the Cosmos for a Discursive "Thinking Through" of the Chronology of the Universe. *Philosophy and Cosmology*, Volume 28, 5-21. <https://doi.org/10.29202/phil-cosm/28/1>
- Brown, Lesley (2010) Definition and Division in Plato's *Sophist*. *Definition in Greek Philosophy*. Edited by David Charles. Oxford University Press, 151-171.
- Burnet, John. (ed.) (1901) *Oxford Classical Texts: Platonis Opera*. Vol. 2: Tetralogia III-IV. Oxford University Press.
- Burnet, John. (ed.) (1903) *Oxford Classical Texts: Platonis Opera*. Vol. 3: Tetralogia V-VII. Oxford University Press.
- Burnet, John. (ed.) (1978) *Oxford Classical Texts: Platonis Opera*. Vol. 4: Tetralogia VIII. Oxford University Press.
- Burnet, John. (ed.) (1907) *Oxford Classical Texts: Platonis Opera*. Vol. 5: Tetralogia IX Definitiones et Spuria. Oxford University Press.
- Burnyeat, Myles Fredric (2003) *Apology* 30b 2-4: Socrates, money, and the grammar of γίγνεσθαι. *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 123, 1-25. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3246257>
- Bury, R.G. (1937) Theory of education in Plato's "Laws." *Revue des Études Grecques*, tome 50, fascicule 236-237, 304-320. <https://doi.org/10.3406/reg.1937.2825>
- Capra, Andrea (2015) *Plato's Four Muses: The Phaedrus and the Poetics of Philosophy*. Hellenic Studies Series 67. Washington, DC: Center for Hellenic Studies. Available online: http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:hul.ebook:CHS_CapraA.Platos_Four_Muses.2014
- Carone, Gabriela Roxana (2007) The Virtues of Platonic Love. *Plato's Symposium: Issues in Interpretation and Reception*. Edited by James Lesher, Debra Nails, and Frisbee Sheffield. Hellenic Studies Series 22. Washington, DC: Center for Hellenic Studies, 208-228.
- Charles, David (2010) Introduction. *Definition in Greek Philosophy*. Edited by David Charles. Oxford University Press, 1-30.
- Coates, Cameron F. (2018) Cosmic Democracy or Cosmic Monarchy? Empedocles in Plato's *Statesman*. *Polis, The Journal for Ancient Greek Political Thought*, 35, 418-446.
- Daqing, Wang (2010) On the Ancient Greek αἶσχος. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, Volume 2, Issue 5, 6805-6812. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.05.031>
- Diogenes Laertius (1972) *Lives of Eminent Philosophers*. Edited by Robert Hicks. Cambridge. Harvard University Press.
- Duke, E.A., Hicken, W.F., Nicoll, W.S.M., Robinson, D.B. & Strachan, J.C.G. (eds) (1995) *Oxford Classical Texts: Platonis Opera*, Vol. 1: Tetralogiae I–II. Oxford University Press.
- Fierro, Maria Angelica (2003) *Plato's theory of desire in the Symposium and the Republic*. Durham theses, Durham University.
- Gerson, Lloyd P. (2007) A Platonic Reading of Plato's *Symposium*. *Plato's Symposium: Issues in Interpretation and Reception*. Edited by James Lesher, Debra Nails, and Frisbee Sheffield. Hellenic Studies Series 22. Washington, DC: Center for Hellenic Studies, 47-70.
- Gill, Mary-Louise (2010) Method and Metaphysics in Plato's *Sophist* and *Statesman*. *Definition in Greek Philosophy*. Edited by David Charles. Oxford University Press, 172-199.

-
- Gonzalez, Francisco J. (2009) *Plato and Heidegger. A Question of Dialogue*. University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Griffith, Mark (1990) Contest and Contradiction in Early Greek Poetry. In *Cabinet of the Muses*, ed. M. Griffith and D. J. Mastronarde. Scholars Press, 185-207.
- Hadot, Pierre (1999) *What Is Ancient Philosophy?* Moscow: Publishing House of Humanities.
- Horky, Phillip Sidney (2020) Approaches to the Pythagorean *Acusmata* in the Early Academy. *Plato's Academy: Its Workings and its History*. Edited by Paul Kalligas, Chloe Balla, Effie Baziotopoulou-Valavani, and Vassilis Karasmanis. Cambridge University Press, 167-187.
- Jaeger, Werner (1961) *Early Christianity and Greek Paideia*. Cambridge, Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Jung, Carl Gustav (1981) *The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious*. Princeton University Press; 2nd edition.
- Kalvesmaki, Joel (2013) *The Theology of Arithmetic: Number Symbolism in Platonism and Early Christianity*. Hellenic Studies Series 59. Washington, DC: Center for Hellenic Studies.
- Liddell, Henry George and Robert Scott (1940) *A Greek-English Lexicon*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- McNulty, Kieran P. (2016) Hominin Taxonomy and Phylogeny: What's In a Name? *Nature Education Knowledge*, 7(1): 2.
- McPherran, Mark L. (2000) Does Piety Pay? Socrates and Plato on Prayer and Sacrifice. *Reason and Religion in Socratic Philosophy*. Edited by Nicholas D. Smith and Paul B. Woodruff. Oxford University Press, 89-114.
- McPherran, Mark L. (2007) Medicine, Magic, and Religion in Plato's *Symposium*. *Plato's Symposium: Issues in Interpretation and Reception*. Edited by James Leshner, Debra Nails, and Frisbee Sheffield. Hellenic Studies Series 22. Washington, DC: Center for Hellenic Studies, 71-95.
- Philodemus' *History of the Philosophers: Plato and the Academy* (PHerc. 1021 and 164) (2020) Translated with Introduction by Paul Kalligas and Voula Tsouna, and Notes by Myrto Hatzimichali. *Plato's Academy: Its Workings and its History*. Edited by Paul Kalligas, Chloe Balla, Effie Baziotopoulou-Valavani, and Vassilis Karasmanis. Cambridge University Press, 276-383.
- Plato. *Collected Works in 4 Volumes* (1990-1994) Ed. by A.F. Loseva and others; Auth. enters, articles by A.F. Losev; Note. A.A. Takho-Godi. Moscow: Mysl.
- Plotinus. 1952. *The Six Enneads*. Translated by Stephen MacKenna and B. S. Page. Chicago: Encyclopaedia Britannica. Available online: <http://www.sacred-texts.com/cla/plotenn/index.htm>
- Robinson, Thomas More (1995) *Plato's Psychology*. 2nd ed. University of Toronto Press.
- Sagan, Carl (2013) *Cosmos*. New York: Ballantine Books.
- Schur, David (2015) *Plato's Wayward Path: Literary Form and the Republic*. Hellenic Studies Series 66.
- Sheffield, Frisbee (2007) Two: The Role of the Earlier Speeches in the *Symposium*: Plato's Endoxic Method? *Plato's Symposium: Issues in Interpretation and Reception*. Edited by James Leshner, Debra Nails, and Frisbee Sheffield. Hellenic Studies Series 22. Washington, DC: Center for Hellenic Studies, 22-46.
- Tell, Hakan (2011) *Plato's Counterfeit Sophists*. Hellenic Studies Series 44. Washington, DC: Center for Hellenic Studies.
-

The Christian Pioneer (1842) Edited by George Harris. Volume 16. Edinburgh: R.R. Nelson.
Torri, Paolo (2017) *Homoiōsis Theōi. A Study of the Telos in Middle Platonism*. Università degli Studi di Milano.

Vlastos, Gregory (2005) *Plato's Universe*. With a new introduction by Luc Brisson. Parmenides Publishing.

Wilson, George and Samuel Shpall (2016) Action. *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, (Winter 2016 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.). Available online: <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2016/entries/action/>

Zeyl, Donald and Barbara Sattler (2022) Plato's Timaeus. *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, Summer 2022 Edition, Edward N. Zalta (ed.). Available online: <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/plato-timaeus/index.html#ref-32>