

THE COLLECTED WORKS
OF HERMAN DOOYEWEERD

Series A, Volume 5

GENERAL EDITOR: D.F.M. Strauss

*Reformation and
Scholasticism
in Philosophy*

VOLUME I

THE GREEK PRELUDE

Herman Dooyeweerd

The Edwin Mellen Press
Lewiston/Queenston/Lampeter

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Dooyeweerd, H.(Herman), 1884-1977.
Reformation and Scholasticism in Philosophy
Herman Dooyeweerd.
p. cm.
Includes bibliographical references and index
ISBN 0-7734-8736-0 [CWHD A5] (hard)

This is Series A, Volume 5 in the continuing series
The Collected Works of Herman Dooyeweerd
ISBN 0-7734-8736-0
CWHD Series ISBN 0-7734-8731-X

The Collected Works comprise a *Series A*, a *Series B*, and a *Series C*
(*Series A* contains multi-volume works by Dooyeweerd,
Series B contains smaller works and collections of essays,
Series C contains reflections on Dooyeweerd's philosophy
designated as: *Dooyeweerd's Living Legacy*)

A CIP catalog record for this book is available from the British Library.

Copyright 2003 The Dooyeweerd Centre for
Christian Philosophy
Redeemer College
Ancaster, Ontario
CANADA L9K 1J4

All rights reserved. For information contact:

The Edwin Mellen Press
Box 450
Lewiston, New York
USA 14092

The Edwin Mellen Press
Box 67
Queenston, Ontario
CANADA L0S 1L0

The Edwin Mellen Press, Ltd.
Lampeter, Ceredigion, Wales
UNITED KINGDOM SA48 8LT

Printed in the United States of America

Reformation and Scholasticism
in
Philosophy

by

Herman Dooyeweerd

Volume I
THE GREEK PRELUDE

Translated by
Ray Togtmann

Initial Editor the Late
Robert Knudsen

Final Editor
Daniël Strauss

Editing of All Greek Quotations by
Al Wolters

This is Volume I of a three-volume work. Volume I first appeared in 1949 under the title: *Reformatie en Scholastiek in de Wijsbegeerte* (T. Wever, Franeker – 496 pp.). Parts of Volumes II and III appeared in the Journal *Philosophia Reformata* between 1945 and 1950. Volume III was left uncompleted, but it does contain the main ideas of Dooyeweerd with regard to the theory of enkaptic interlacements and Dooyeweerd's anthropological theory of the complex bodily structure of the human being.

Volume II – Greek and Medieval Philosophy

Volume III – Nature Philosophy and Anthropology

The translation of this book is made possible by a grant from the Free University of Amsterdam, while the Kuyper Foundation of the Netherlands contributed substantially to its publication.

Contents

Preface

..... xix

I

INTRODUCTION

INITIAL SURVEY OF THE RELIGIOUS GROUND-MOTIVES AND THE CONFLICT THEY PRODUCE BETWEEN THE REFORMATIONAL AND SCHOLASTIC SPIRITS IN PHILOSOPHY

1. The Four Religious Ground-Motives Underlying the History of Western Philosophic Thought	1
<i>a. The Greek Form-Matter Motive</i>	4
<i>b. The Scriptural Ground-Motive of the Christian Religion: Creation, the Fall into Sin, and Redemption</i>	11
<i>c. The Romanistic Scholastic Synthesis Motive of Nature and Grace</i>	15
<i>d. The Modern Humanistic Ground-Motive of Nature and Freedom</i>	17
2. The Relationship between Religious and Theoretical Dialectic	20
<i>a. The Communal Character of the Religious Ground-Motives and the Use of the Critical Method in the Investigation of the History of Philosophy</i>	20
<i>b. The Religious Ground-Motives and the Modern Historicistic Pattern of Thought</i>	21
<i>c. The Fundamental Critical Problem in the Study of the History of Western Philosophy. The Intellectual Community of the West</i>	22
<i>d. The Scholastic Approach to This Problem. The Natural Community of Thought Based on the Autonomy of Natural Reason.</i>	23
<i>e. Dilthey's So-Called Hermeneutical Method with Respect to This Problem. The "Fundamental Religious Sense" of Humanity and "historisch freischwebende Intelligenz".</i>	24

Contents

f.	<i>The Absoluteness of the Religious Antithesis</i>	25
g.	<i>Is There in the West a Religious Intellectual Community of a Dialectical Kind? Hegel's Conception</i>	25
h.	<i>The Absence of Reciprocity in the Possibility of Religious Understanding between the Christian Starting Point and the Points of Departure against Which the Christian Religion Sets Itself in Radical Antithesis</i>	30
i.	<i>The Origin of the Religious Dialectic. Why the Religious Antithesis Permits No True Synthesis. The Polar Tendency in the Dialectical Ground-Motives</i>	31
j.	<i>The Device of Ascribing the Primacy to One of the Two Polar Motives Which Appear in the Dialectical Ground-Motive</i>	32
k.	<i>The Boundaries of Theoretical Dialectic and the Intrusion of Religious Dialectic into Theoretical Thought</i>	33
l.	<i>The Religious Dialectic of the Scholastic Synthesis Motive of Nature and Grace. Two Possible Points of Contact for This Presumed Synthesis</i>	34
m.	<i>The First Way: The Thomistic Synthesis and the Roman Catholic Standpoint</i>	34
n.	<i>The Law of Religious Dialectic: The Operation of the Polar Tendency in the Dialectical Ground Motive. The Dualism between Nature and Grace in Ockham and in Averroistic Nominalism</i>	36
o.	<i>The Second Way: Lutheranism and the Dialectic of Law and Gospel. Dialectical Theology</i>	37
p.	<i>The Dialectic of the Ground-Motive of Nature and Grace in Reformed Scholasticism</i>	38

II

DIORAMA OF THE DIALECTICAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE FORM-MATTER MOTIVE IN GREEK PHILOSOPHY UP TO AND INCLUDING PLATO

Part I

THE DIALECTICAL DEVELOPMENT UP TO PLATO

1.	The Dialectic of the Greek Ground-Motive under the Primacy of the Matter Motive in Pre-Socratic Philosophy up to Parmenides	41
a.	<i>The Conception of Physis (Nature) in the First Phase of Greek Nature Philosophy</i>	41
b.	<i>The Religious Primacy of the Matter Motive in Milesian Nature Philosophy. Anaximander's Dikē Motive</i>	42

c.	<i>The Rationalization of Anankē. Heraclitus' Conception of the Logos</i>	43
d.	<i>Cornford's View of the Religious Orientation of Greek Philosophy. Moira and the Dikē Motive</i>	46
e.	<i>Critique of Cornford's Conception</i>	47
f.	<i>The Motives of Moira and Dikē and Their Relation to Anankē.</i>	49
g.	<i>What Did Heraclitus Mean by "Polymathy?"</i>	52
2.	The Polar Antithesis between the Principles of Form and Matter in Parmenides' Ontology. The "Uranization" of the Form Motive	53
a.	<i>Parmenides' Conception of the Divine Form of Being as a Sphere</i>	56
b.	<i>The Orphic Religion and Its Influence on Parmenides' Conception of the Principle of Form</i>	57
c.	<i>The Rejection of the Orphic-Dionysian Conception of the Principle of Matter</i>	59
d.	<i>Xenophanes' and Parmenides' Ideas of God</i>	61
e.	<i>The Theoretical Metamorphosis of Anankē: Anankē as the Protectress of the Divine Form of Being and as Logical-Metaphysical Necessity.</i>	62
f.	<i>The Matter Principle as the Origin of the Form Principle in Heraclitus and the Milesians</i>	63
3.	The Formalization of the Matter Principle in the Older Pythagorean School	64
a.	<i>The Three Strata in the Original Religious Conception of the Pythagorean Community</i>	64
b.	<i>The Meaning of the Pythagorean Tetractys.</i>	68
c.	<i>The Pythagorean Attempt at Synthesis</i>	70
d.	<i>Ten as the Perfect Number</i>	71
e.	<i>The Astronomical Theory of Philolaus in the Light of the Religious Ground-Motive</i>	73
f.	<i>The Antinomy in Pythagoras' Conception of the Form Principle and Philolaus' Attempt at Synthesis</i>	74
g.	<i>The Petrification of the Pythagorean Motive of Form under the Influence of the Eleatic Critique.</i>	74
h.	<i>The Effects of the Dualistic Ground-Motive in the Anthropological Conception: The Dualism of Material Body and Thinking Soul, in Contrast to the Hylozoistic Conception</i>	75
i.	<i>The Threefold Homeric Conception of the Soul: Bloodsoul, Thumos, and Eidolon</i>	77
j.	<i>The Theoretical Antinomy in the Pythagorean Conception of the Soul. The Thinking Soul as Harmony</i>	78
4.	The Formalization of the Earthly Matter Principle in Empedocles' Theory of the Four Elements of <i>Physis</i> . The Persistence of the Orphic Dualism in the Principle of Matter	81

Contents

a.	<i>The Orphic Dualism in Empedocles' Καθαρμοί and the Role of Anankē</i>	81
b.	<i>Empedocles' Theory of Physis and Its Inner Connection with the Teaching of the Katharmoi</i>	83
c.	<i>Empedocles' Rejection of Parmenides' Conception of the Eternally Flowing Physis. The Four Elements of Physis as Static, Corporeal Forms of Being</i>	84
d.	<i>The Sphere in Empedocles' Poem on Physis</i>	86
e.	<i>Empedocles' Sphere Is No Longer a Static Form of Being</i>	87
f.	<i>The Four Elements Have No Spontaneous Power of Movement. Philia and Neikos as Spontaneously Moving Soul-Forces. The Dissociation from Each Other of the Form and Matter Principles</i>	87
g.	<i>Empedocles Transposes the Orphic Dualism into the Matter Principle Itself. Plato's Epinomis</i>	88
h.	<i>The Orphic Dualism Is Also Carried Through in Empedocles' Theory of the Elements</i>	89
i.	<i>The Relationship between Light and Fire in the Light-Metaphysics of Augustinian Scholasticism</i>	90
j.	<i>The Two Hemispheres of Day and Night</i>	90
k.	<i>Has Empedocles Also Formalized the Divine Matter Principle of Philia? The Role of Harmonia in Empedocles' System</i>	91
l.	<i>Blind Anankē Rules the Entire Earthbound Process of Becoming Which Gives Rise to Individual Beings</i>	93
m.	<i>The Problem with Respect to the Immortality of the Soul in Empedocles' Theory of Physis</i>	93
n.	<i>Cornford's Solution to This Problem Is in Conflict with the Clear Pronouncements of Empedocles</i>	94
o.	<i>The Most Likely Interpretation of Empedocles' Pronouncements on This Point. The Origin of the Thesis That "Like Is Known Only by Like"</i>	95
p.	<i>Empedocles' Individual Soul Is Not Human and Has Immortality Only in a Relative Sense</i>	96
q.	<i>The Antinomies in Empedocles' Theory of Physis</i>	97
5.	<i>The Primacy of the Form Principle of the Religion of Culture in Anaxagoras' Theory of Nous, and the Atomists' Reversion to the Naturalistic Form Principle</i>	98
a.	<i>The Nous as Divine Form-Giver (Demiurge) Remains Unmixed with Matter, Which It Controls by Its Form-Giving. The Form Motive of the Religion of Culture</i>	98
b.	<i>The De-Deification of the Matter Principle</i>	99
c.	<i>Anaxagoras' Conception of Matter as an In-Itself Fixed and Chaotic Meigma of the Seeds of All Things. The So-Called "Homoeomeries"</i>	99
d.	<i>Anaxagoras' Conception of Matter as the Precursor of the Aristotelean Conception. How It Basically Differs from the Latter. The Inner Antinomy in Anaxagoras' Conception of Hulē as a Reality Existing Apart from Form.</i>	101

e.	<i>Anaxagoras' Departure from the Notion That Like Is Known by Like. The Metaphysical Interpretation of the Gegenstand Relation and Its Influence on the Scholastic Theory of the Soul.</i>	104
f.	<i>The Relationship between Form of Being and Matter in the Atomists</i>	105
g.	<i>The Soul as a Complex of Indivisible Forms of Being (Atoms) That Are Spread throughout the Entire Body. Not the Soul but Only Its Constituent Atoms Have Immortality. The Special Character of the Latter by Virtue of Their Spherical Form</i>	108
h.	<i>The Atoms as the Exact Opposite of Anaxagoras' Spermata</i>	109
i.	<i>The Anankē of Atomism Is a Metaphysical Formal Necessity. It Is Neither Teleological nor Mechanistic.</i>	109
j.	<i>The "Atheism" of the Greek Atomists</i>	110
6.	Sophism and the Critical Turning Point in Greek Philosophy under the Primacy of the Form Principle of the Religion of Culture.	111
a.	<i>The Matter Principle Is Carried Through in Protagoras' Theory of Knowledge</i>	111
b.	<i>The Meaning of Protagoras' Homo Mensura Rule</i>	113
c.	<i>Protagoras' Nominalism in His Conception of the Form Principle of Culture</i>	115
d.	<i>The Contrast between Physis and Nomos</i>	116
e.	<i>Protagoras' Evolutionistic Philosophy of History.</i>	117
f.	<i>The Younger, Radical Wing of Sophism. Its View of the Natural Right of the Strong</i>	118
7.	The Form-Matter Motive as It Is Illuminated by Critical Self-Reflection and the Ethical-Religious Deepening of the Form Motive in Socratic Dialectic	118
a.	<i>The Central Role of the Maxim γνῶθί σεαυτόν ("Know Yourself") in Socratic Thinking</i>	118
b.	<i>The Continuance of Anaxagoras' Theory of Nous.</i>	120
c.	<i>The Socratic Method of Concept-Formation Is Religiously Concentrated on the Divine Formative Power in the Idea of the Kalokagathon. Socrates' Maieutic Method</i>	121
d.	<i>Socratic Irony</i>	122
e.	<i>Socratic Theōria as the Path to True Virtue and Piety. The Dynamic Character of the Socratic Concept in Its Directedness toward the Divine Idea of the Good and the Beautiful. Plato's Euthyphro</i>	123
f.	<i>The Socratic Daimonion and Its Significance for Post-Socratic Anthropology</i>	124
g.	<i>Socrates as the "Outstanding Citizen of the Athenian Polis." The Religious Foundation of Obedience to the Laws</i>	125

Part II

**THE DIALECTICAL DEVELOPMENT IN PLATO'S
THOUGHT UNDER THE PRIMACY OF THE FORM
MOTIVE OF THE RELIGION OF CULTURE**

Introduction

The Origin of Plato's Theory of Ideas

1. General Description of the Mutually Antagonistic Motives in Plato's Thought. The Socratic Form Motive in the Earliest Dialogues, as the Idea of the Good and the Beautiful 127
 - a. *The Socratic Idea in the Euthyphro* 132
 - b. *The Eidos as the Aretē of the Object of Knowledge* 134
2. The Rise of the Metaphysical Theory of the *Eidē* and the Dialectical Tension between the Static and the Dynamic Form Motive (*Eidos* and *Idea*). The Dialogues of the Transition Period 134
 - a. *The Origin of the Platonic Theory of Ideas Lies in the Conjunction of the Socratic Idea of the Kalokagathon with the Eidē or Static Ontic Forms of Things. The Pregnant Meaning of the Terms Eidos and Idea in the Platonic Theory of Ideas.* 134

Chapter One

**THE DIALECTIC OF THE THEORY OF IDEAS FROM
ITS INITIAL CONCEPTION TO ITS CULMINATION IN
THE *REPUBLIC***

1. The *Phaedo*. The Orphic Dualism of Soul and Body and the Static Theory of the *Eidē* in Its Polar Opposition to the Matter Motive. 147
 - a. *The Connection between the Theory of Ideas and the Theory Concerning the Immortality of the Thinking Soul* 147
 - b. *The So-Called Simplicity of the Thinking Soul as a Proof of Its Indestructibility. The Unreconciled Dualism between the Theōria of the Eidē and the Socratic Idea in the Phaedo* 149
 - c. *The Orientation of Epistemology to the Theory of the Eidē* 151
 - d. *The Main Proof for the Immortality of the Soul in the Phaedo* . . . 151
 - e. *The Parousia of the Eidē in Sense Objects and the Relationship of the Eidē to the Thinking Soul in the Phaedo* 152
 - f. *Form and Matter in the Eidē Conceived as Ideal Numbers in the Final Stage of Plato's Thought* 154
 - g. *The Phaedo's Depreciation of the Polis as the Vehicle of the Religion of Culture* 155

2.	The Re-emergence of the Socratic Form Motive in the <i>Phaedrus</i> and the <i>Symposium</i> , and the Revised Conception of the Soul	156
a.	<i>The Doctrine of the World-Soul. The Phaedo’s Static Conception of the Soul Is Abandoned. The Soul as the Principle of Self-Movement.</i>	156
b.	<i>The New Source of Difficulty in Plato’s Conception of the Soul. The Dualism of the Form and Matter Principles Is Introduced into the Soul Itself. The Doctrine of the Tripartite (Trichotomous) Soul</i>	157
c.	<i>The Myth of the Soul’s Astral Journey.</i>	159
d.	<i>The Transformation of the Uranic Motives of Orphic Pythagorean Thought in the Theory of Ideas. The Topos Hyperouranios of the Eidē</i>	160
e.	<i>The Orphic Dualism of Body and Soul Is Weakened in the Phaedrus</i>	160
f.	<i>The Aporia of the Origin of the Matter Principle in the Soul. The Theory of the Phaedrus, the Timaeus, the Laws, and the Epinomis, and the Influence of Empedocles on the Latter</i>	160
3.	The Reconciliation of the Static and the Dynamic Form Motive in the <i>Republic</i> (Books II-X). The Socratic Idea as the Origin of the <i>Eidē</i>	164
a.	<i>The Divine Idea of the Good Is Transcendent to the Realm of the Ontic Forms (Ousiai)</i>	168
b.	<i>Through Its Idea, the Divine Nous Is the Origin of the Eidē.</i>	169
c.	<i>The Conception of the Idea of the Good as the Highest Member of the Realm of the Eidē Is Incorrect.</i>	171
d.	<i>The Epistemological Significance of the Idea</i>	171
e.	<i>The Idea of the Good as the An-hypotheton of Dialectic. Dianoia and Epistēmē in Their Mutual Relation.</i>	171
f.	<i>The Allegory of the Cave.</i>	173
g.	<i>Plato’s Great Epistemological Discovery and Why Its Metaphysical Foundation Left It Unfruitful for Science</i>	175
h.	<i>The Conception of the Soul in the Republic</i>	177
i.	<i>The Dialectical Proof for the Tripartition of the Soul and the Path That Led Plato to This Conception</i>	177
j.	<i>The Unity of the Soul in This Trichotomistic Conception Is Sought in the Pythagorean Principle of Harmony. The Absence of a Metaphysical Foundation for the Latter.</i>	180
k.	<i>The Revision of the Trichotomistic Conception of the Phaedrus</i>	182
l.	<i>The Inner Antinomy in the Republic’s Conception of the Soul. Review of the Present State of the Theory of Ideas</i>	183

Chapter Two

THE DIALECTIC OF THE FORM-MATTER MOTIVE IN THE CRISIS OF THE THEORY OF IDEAS. THE THEAETETUS, THE PARMENIDES, THE SOPHIST, THE STATESMAN, AND THE DIALECTICAL PORTION OF THE PHAEDRUS

1. The Crisis of the Theory of Ideas and the Continuing Influence of the Religious Dialectic in the New, Dialectical Logic. The *Theaetetus* as a Preparation for the Eleatic Dialogues 185
 - a. *The Causes of the Crisis in Plato's Theory of Ideas. The Simplicity of the Eidē as Ideal Ontic Forms Constructed in A Priori Fashion, and the Composite Nature of Empirical Things.* 186
 - b. *Plato's Growing Interest in Empirical Phenomena Beginning with the Theaetetus. The Problem of Methexis Considered Logically.* 187
 - c. *The New, Dialectical Turn of Plato's Logic.* 188
 - d. *The Meaning of the Synopsis in the Original Conception of the Eidē. The Evasion of the Logical Contradictions in This Conception.* 189
 - e. *The Exaltation of the Principle of Motion in the Theaetetus. The Acquisition of Knowledge as κίνησις. Epistemological Analysis of Existential Judgments.* 190
 - f. *Being as the Copula in Existential Judgments and as the Presumed Metaphysical Synthesis between Mutually Opposed Eidē. The Metaphysical Tendency of Plato's New, Dialectical Logic.* 191
 - g. *The Continuing Influence of the Religious Dialectic in Plato's Dialectical Logic.* 192
2. The Dialectic of the Form-Matter Motive in the *Parmenides* and the New, Logical Function of the Idea. The Dynamization of the *Eidē* as Active Soul-Forces (*Parmenides* and *Sophist*) and the Eideticization of the Matter Principle 193
 - a. *The Three Aporias of the Doctrine of Methexis in the Parmenides.* 193
 - b. *The Use of the Terms εἶδος and ιδέα in This Section of the Dialogue. The Idea as a Dialectical Correlation of Opposed Eidē.* 199
 - c. *The First Path Taken by the Dialectical Argument: The One Conceived as Absolute Leads Logical Thought to the Absolute Negation of All Predicates.* 200
 - d. *In Making the Absolute Contrast between Unity and Plurality, Plato Is Adhering to the Primordial Dualism of His Religious Ground-Motive.* 202

e.	<i>The First, Negative Part of Parmenides' Dialectical Argument as a Negative Theology of the Divine Unitary Origin of All Form. The Second Path of the Dialectical Argument</i>	202
f.	<i>The Dialectical Derivation of Spatiality and Motion from the Real One</i>	205
g.	<i>The Metaphysical Interpretation of Logical Relations Leads to Plato's Deliberate Unearthing of the Theoretical Antinomies Contained in the Metaphysical Concepts of Unity and Being. The Origin of These Antinomies according to the General Theory of the Law Spheres.</i>	206
h.	<i>Plato's Dialectic in Contrast to the Dialectical Logic of Origin of the Marburg School of Neo-Kantianism. The Latter's Misconception of Plato's Position</i>	208
i.	<i>The Participation (μέθεξις) of Being in Time</i>	208
j.	<i>Zeno's Third Paralogism</i>	209
k.	<i>The Timeless Moment of Change</i>	210
l.	<i>Change as a Dialectical Idea</i>	211
m.	<i>Critical Analysis of the Dialectical Argumentation Uncovers Its Inward Emptiness. The Metaphysical Interpretation of the Logical Relation between Identity and Difference Lacks All Foundation.</i>	211
n.	<i>In Dynamizing the Eidē, Plato Conceives Them as Active Soul-Forces. The Statement about This in the Sophist.</i>	211
o.	<i>The Antinomy in the New Conception of the Eidē as Soul-Forces</i>	214
p.	<i>The Third Path of the Dialectical Argument. The Introduction of Three New Dialectical Ideaī (the Whole, Individuality, and Limit) That Are Contained in the Supreme Dialectical Idea of the One That Is</i>	216
q.	<i>The Fourth Path of the Dialectical Argument: The One and the Other as Absolute Metaphysical Opposites. The Negative Dialectic of Absolute Hulē as a Counterpart to the Negative Theology of the Absolute Formal Unity</i>	218
r.	<i>The Fifth Path of the Dialectical Argument</i>	219
s.	<i>The μὴ ὄν as a Relative Nothing. Relative Negation as a Form of Logical Determination</i>	219
t.	<i>The Sixth Path: The Second Contribution to the Negative Dialectic of Absolute Hulē</i>	221
u.	<i>The Elaboration of the Negative Dialectic in the Seventh Path. Plato's Critique of Anaxagoras' Conception of the Spermata. . . .</i>	221
v.	<i>The Eighth Path of the Dialectical Argument</i>	222
w.	<i>Summary of Our Analysis of the Parmenides</i>	223
3.	<i>The Temporary Suppression of the Socratic Form Motive in the Eleatic Dialogues and the Diairesis of the Eidē (the Sophist, the Statesman, and the Dialectical Portion of the Phaedrus)</i>	223
a.	<i>The Diairesis or Dichotomization of the Eidē in the Sophist, the Statesman, and the Phaedrus.</i>	223

Contents

b.	<i>The Atomon Eidos and the Individual Things of the Sense World</i>	226
c.	<i>Has All Relation between the New Dialectic and the Idea Tou Agathou Disappeared in the Eleatic Trilogy?</i>	226
d.	<i>The Temporary Suspension of the Transcendental Qualification of Being as Good and Beautiful.</i>	228
e.	<i>Diairesis as the λόγον διδόναι of Empirical Phenomena. Epistēmē as ἀληθῆς δόξα μετὰ λόγου.</i>	228
f.	<i>The Highest Eidē according to the Statesman and in the Sophist. Their Inability to be Represented as a Sensory Eidōlon</i>	229
g.	<i>The Idea of Otherness as the Ontic Form of the μὴ ὄν, the Hulē of the Sophists</i>	231
h.	<i>The Dialectical Ideai of Being and Non-Being Are for Plato Not Identical with the Absolute Ontic Form and Absolute Hulē. Plato's Own Statement on This in the Sophist</i>	232
i.	<i>The Idea of Otherness as the Principium Individuationis. Plato and Augustinian Scholasticism</i>	234
j.	<i>The Relationship between the Dialectical Idea of the Other (ιδέα τοῦ θατέρου) and the Idea of Change in the Parmenides.</i>	234
k.	<i>The Inner Antinomy in the Attempt of the Dialectic to Capture the Matter Principle Itself in an Eidos. The Crisis in the Theory of Ideas Can Only Be Overcome by Limiting the Scope of the New, Dialectical Logic</i>	235
l.	<i>Pure Eidē and Eidē Mixed with Matter. In Plato's Next Period, Only the Latter Can Be Retained as Genē Related to the Divine Idea as Origin</i>	235

Chapter Three

THE DIALECTIC OF THE FORM-MATTER MOTIVE IN THE PENULTIMATE STAGE OF DEVELOPMENT IN PLATO'S THOUGHT, AFTER THE CRISIS HAS BEEN SURMOUNTED

1.	<i>The Theory of Ideas in the Philebus and the Dialectical Theory of the Mixture of the Principles of Form and Matter</i>	237
a.	<i>The Dialectical Theory of the Mixture of the Principles of Form and Matter.</i>	237
b.	<i>The Number of Intermediate Links between the Unity of the Genus and the Apeiron.</i>	238
c.	<i>The Use of the Term Idea Is Again Perfectly Consistent with the Dialectical Logic.</i>	239
d.	<i>The Distinction between the Realm of Pure or Absolute Being and the Realm of Being That Is a Mixture of Peras and Apeiron. The Four Genē (Genera) of the Latter.</i>	241
e.	<i>The New Dialectical Idea of the Unlimited. The Influence of Heraclitus' Conception of the Matter Principle</i>	242

f.	<i>Plato's Dialectical Idea of the Unlimited and Aristotle's Conception of Matter as Potential Being (δυνάμει ὄν)</i>	243
g.	<i>The Pure Eidos of the Peras and the Dialectical Idea of the Peras Are Not Identical</i>	244
h.	<i>The Eidetic Numbers and the Mathematical Numbers. The Eidos Number as Indivisible and Incommensurable (ἄσύμβλητος)</i>	245
i.	<i>The Pure, Indivisible Peras Is Not a Genus of Mixed Being. Stenzel's Unsuccessful Attempt to Derive the Eidetic Numbers by the Method of Diairesis</i>	247
j.	<i>The Idea of Composite Being as a γένεσις εἰς οὐσίαν. The Teleological Element Is Once Again Introduced into the Definition of That Which Has Come into Being</i>	249
k.	<i>The New Dialectic's Physico-Teleological Proof for the Existence of God</i>	251
2.	<i>The New Conception of the Soul as a Mixture of Form and Matter (a Product of Becoming)</i>	251
a.	<i>The Human Anima Rationalis and the Rational World-Soul Are Restricted to the Realm of Generated or Mixed Being</i>	254
b.	<i>Causality as a Separate Genus</i>	258
c.	<i>According to the Philebus, Neither the Pure Eidē nor Hulē Originates in the Divine Nous as Efficient Cause. The Scholastic Accommodation of This Platonic Conception (Later Adopted by Aristotle) to the Christian Creation Motive</i>	258
d.	<i>The Nous Which Reigns over the Universe Is Not Identical to the Nous in the World-Soul</i>	259
e.	<i>The Philebus and the Timaeus Both Admit Only One Causality: That Which Originates in the Rational Soul</i>	259
f.	<i>Do the Philebus Genera Correspond to the Five Highest Eidē in the Sophist?</i>	260

Chapter Four

THE DIALECTIC OF THE FORM-MATTER MOTIVE IN THE *TIMAEUS*, THE *LAWS*, AND THE *EPINOMIS*, AND IN THE FINAL STAGE OF PLATO'S THOUGHT

1.	<i>The Polar Dualism in the Timaeus between the Eidos as Formal Model for the Visible Cosmos and Absolute Hulē</i>	263
a.	<i>Ideal Matter and Hulē in Its Original Meaning</i>	263
b.	<i>The Timaeus Breaks Through the Unity in the Concept of Causality. The New Problem for Plato's Dialectic</i>	263
c.	<i>The Conception of Eidetic or Ideal Matter Is Restricted, Not Abandoned. The Influence of This Conception on Augustinian Scholasticism</i>	264
d.	<i>The Relation between Belief and Truth</i>	265

Contents

e.	<i>The Timaeus and the Four Genera of the Philebus. The Eternal Eidos Is Again the Paradigma for the Visible Cosmos. The Republic and the Parmenides</i>	266
f.	<i>The Idea of the Good and Beautiful as the Origin of the Cosmos in the Timaeus. Did Plato Really Believe That the Cosmos Has Come into Being?</i>	267
2.	<i>The Formal Model of the Visible Cosmos and the Theory of Idea-Numbers in the Final Stage of Development of Plato's Thought</i>	269
a.	<i>The Eidos of the Living Being according to the Dialectical-Logical Conception of the Timaeus. The Conception of This as an Indivisible Unity in the Oral Lecture "On the Good."</i>	269
b.	<i>The Idea-Numbers and the Pythagorean Tetractys. The Living Being in Itself as an Eidetic Decad</i>	274
3.	<i>The Relationship between the Socratic Idea, the Eidos, and the Visible Form of the Cosmos in the Timaeus</i>	276
a.	<i>The Conception of the Visible Cosmos in the Timaeus and the Teleological Explanation of Genesis.</i>	276
b.	<i>The Elements as Primary, Mathematically Formed Bodies. The Mathematical Corporeal Form as the Condition for the Visibility and Tangibility of the Elements</i>	277
c.	<i>The Harmonic Mathematical Structure of the World-Body</i>	278
d.	<i>The Demiurge Uses the Celestial Deities as Intermediaries in the Composition of Perishable Beings. Plato's Influence on the Later Logos Theory and Scholasticism.</i>	281
e.	<i>Plato's and Empedocles' Descriptions of the Sphairos. For Plato the Body Has an Innate Mathematical Form, Independent of the Soul. The Influence of This Conception on Augustinian Scholasticism</i>	282
4.	<i>The Place of the Soul in the Intermediate Realm. Has Plato Reverted in the Timaeus to the Uncritical Position That Like Is Known by Like?</i>	282
a.	<i>According to Timaeus 35 a, the Being of the Rational Soul Has a Form Intermediate between the Eidetic Ontic Forms and Visible, Corporeal Forms</i>	282
b.	<i>Timaeus 35 A and the Dialectical Ideai of the Sophist</i>	284
c.	<i>The Theory of Mixture Is Worked Out Anew. The Testimony of Proclus</i>	285
d.	<i>Indivisible Being as Idea-Number? The Testimony of Xenocrates</i>	286
e.	<i>The Division of the World-Soul into Harmonic Intervals</i>	289
f.	<i>The Circular Motion of the Self-Identical and the Other in the World-Soul</i>	289
g.	<i>Has Plato Reverted in Timaeus 35 A ff. to the Position That Like Is Known by Like?.</i>	291
h.	<i>Timaeus 37 A-B Can Only Be Understood in Terms of the Old Platonic Problem of Methexis.</i>	293

i.	<i>How Aristotle and the Prevailing View Which Followed Him Came to the Wrong Interpretation of Plato's Conception</i>	293
j.	<i>The Homoiōsis of the Object of Knowledge to the Knowing Soul</i>	295
k.	<i>Time as a Circle in the Timaeus. The Conception of Time in the Timaeus and the Parmenides.</i>	296
l.	<i>The Anima Rationalis as the Immortal Part of the Human Soul Is Not Pure Nous, but Mixed in Nature.</i>	299
m.	<i>The Laws of Heimarmenē in the Combination of the Immortal with the Mortal.</i>	300
n.	<i>Heimarmenē and Anankē</i>	301
5.	<i>The Polar Dualism between the Form-Power of the Divine Nous and the Anankē of the Matter Principle in the Timaeus' Conception of the Soul</i>	301
a.	<i>The Condition of the Soul at the Birth of Human Beings</i>	301
b.	<i>The Two Mortal Parts of the Soul and Their Seats in the Body</i>	305
c.	<i>The Liver as the Seat of μαντεία (Divination). Theoria's Depreciation of Prophecy</i>	307
d.	<i>The Timaeus' Theory of the Soul Is More Fruitful for Empirical Science Than the Thomistic-Aristotelian Theory.</i>	308
e.	<i>The Timaeus's Theory of the Soul against the Background of the Homeric Conception</i>	309
f.	<i>The Maladies of the Soul under the Influence of Anankē</i>	309
6.	<i>Anankē as the "Errant Cause" and the Persuasive Power of the Divine Nous. The Conception of the Good and the Evil World-Soul in the Laws and the Epinomis</i>	310
a.	<i>Anankē as Blind Causality and the Modern Concept of Mechanical Causation</i>	310
b.	<i>Reason Is Not the Unique Source of Motion. Cornford's Incorrect View</i>	312
c.	<i>The Description of Chaos</i>	313
d.	<i>The Chōra as the Third Genus of That Which Comes into Being</i>	314
e.	<i>The Chōra Is Not Empty Space (Bäumker).</i>	315
f.	<i>The Chōra as Hulē</i>	317
g.	<i>The Inner Antinomies in the Conception of the Chōra. Plato and Anaxagoras</i>	319
h.	<i>The Chōra and the Aristotelian Conception of Prime or Absolute Matter</i>	319
i.	<i>The Divine Reason's Persuasion of Anankē in Aeschylus' Oresteia Tragedy.</i>	320
j.	<i>The Conception of the Good and Evil World-Souls in the Laws and the Epinomis</i>	322
 Commentary on the Text 		
1.	<i>Hesiod's Chaos.</i>	325
2.	<i>The Lutheran Dialectic between Law and Gospel.</i>	326

Contents

3.	<i>The Origin of the Word “Elements” (στοιχεῖα).</i>	328
4.	<i>The Meaning of Anaximander's Apeiron. Is This Apeiron Conceived as Ensouled?</i>	328
5.	<i>Anaximenes and Anaximander. Anaximenes' Statement Concerning the Human Soul and the Divine Pneuma</i>	331
6.	<i>Textual Correction on Page 46. The Meaning of the Word νόμος in the Fragment Quoted in Note 1</i>	332
7.	<i>The Dialectical Combination of the Rational World-Order and the Incalculable (Irrational) in Heraclitus' Thought</i>	334
8.	<i>The More Recent Interpretation of Heraclitus. Is the Theory of Eternal Flux Attributable to Heraclitus?</i>	334
9.	<i>The Interpretation of Parmenides, B. Fragm. 3</i>	338
10.	<i>The Religious Interpretation of Parmenides' Ontology</i>	338
11.	<i>The Orphic Myth of Dionysus Zagreus. The Pantheistic Tendency in the Ancient Orphic Cosmogonies</i>	341
12.	<i>The Third Path in the Second Part of Parmenides' Poem</i>	342
13.	<i>The Interpretation of Parmenides, B. Fragm. 8, 50 ff.</i>	342
14.	<i>Parmenides' Pythagorean-Orphic Conception of the Soul</i>	345
15.	<i>The Form Motive in Xenophanes' Idea of God</i>	346
16.	<i>Xenophanes' Theological Skepticism</i>	347
17.	<i>The Original Pythagorean Theory of Numbers</i>	347
18.	<i>Alcmaeon's Conception of Logical Thought as the Core of the Human Soul. His Great Physiological Discovery</i>	347
19.	<i>The Meaning of the Psychē in Homer and in the Branch of Greek Philosophy Influenced by Orphism</i>	348
20.	<i>The Relationship between Empedocles' Purifications and His Poem on Physis</i>	353
21.	<i>Anaxagoras' Theory of the Nous and the Spermata</i>	357
22.	<i>The Relationship between the Divine and the Human Nous in Anaxagoras</i>	359
23.	<i>The Relationship between Diogenes of Apollonia and Anaxagoras</i>	359
24.	<i>The Conception of the “Void” in Leucippus and Democritus</i>	360
25.	<i>Protagoras' and Democritus' Philosophy of History</i>	364
26.	<i>Self-Knowledge in Socrates and Heraclitus.</i>	365
27.	<i>The Chronological Problem in the Phaedrus' Theory of the Soul</i>	365
28.	<i>Plato's Oration On the Good</i>	366
29.	<i>Roman Catholic Objections to a Few Points in My Account of the Thomistic Doctrine of Creation</i>	366

Index of Subjects

.....	369
-------	-----

Index of Persons

.....	375
-------	-----

Preface

A few years before the outbreak of the Second World War, I received a request from the publisher T. Wever of Franeker to write a booklet on *Calvinism and Philosophy*. Their plan was to include it in a series *Calvinism and the Questions of our Time*. This request came to me at an inopportune moment. My energies were completely taken up with working out my philosophical anthropology. In addition, I was attempting to give my three-volume *Encyclopedia of the Science of Law* a definitive form.

I then conceived the plan of writing, concurrently with the latter work, a smaller book on *Reformation and Scholasticism in Philosophy*. I intended to devote this book in particular to elucidating the questions of anthropology in terms of the opposition between the ground-motive of the Reformation and that of the scholastic line of thought. This small work would then serve as an introduction to the positive elaboration of my anthropological insights.

I conceived this plan in the face of the deep-seated objections which had been raised immediately preceding the war in certain Reformed theological circles, particularly against the view of the human soul that had been presented in the Philosophy of the Law-Idea. These objections were rooted entirely in traditional scholastic ideas. In view of this fact, I was eager, first of all, to place them in their appropriate historical setting. By putting them in this light I hoped to provide an explanation as to why this philosophy had so decisively rejected the scholastic conceptions of the human soul.

Once the theme "Reformation and Scholasticism in Philosophy" had taken hold of me, however, I soon realized that it demanded a much broader treatment than I had originally intended. For the genius of scholastic thinking can be understood in its opposition to that of the Reformation only when the religious ground-motive of Greek thought has been traced in its radical opposition to the ground-motive of Scriptural revelation.

That there is indeed one common religious ground-motive at the foundation of Greek thought, which gives us the key to understanding the typical dialectical course of development of Greek philosophy, is, however, more easily claimed than actually demonstrated by way of a careful investigation of this development. Such a proof requires not only a thorough study of the religious notions of the Greeks but also a study in depth of the Greek philosophical texts. Every classicist knows that this places almost insurmountable obstacles in the way of a non-classicist. Because of the profound importance of the inquiry, however, I felt obliged to go ahead with it, undeterred by the difficulties. Now, after an involved and time-consuming preparatory study, I am sending forth the first volume of my *Reformation and Scholasticism in Philosophy*.

The introductory section of this work deals with the four religious ground-motives of Western philosophical thought and with the relationship between theoretical and religious dialectic. The major lines of thought of this section have already appeared in an article of mine in the journal *Philosophia Reformata*.¹

As my study of Greek philosophy broadened and deepened, I became more and more convinced of the accuracy of my original conviction that the background of the Aristotelian form-matter scheme is much broader and has deeper roots than is generally admitted. In fact, as I had suspected, it gives philosophical expression to the dialectical ground-motive which governed all of Greek thought from the beginning.

In this regard the attitude of Aristotle himself should have served as a warning. As one who lived in the Greek world of thought, he construed the entire preceding history of philosophy within this scheme. This of itself should have been enough to alert the modern investigator to the fact that what we have here is far more than a subjective thought-construct of the great Stagirite. Indeed, if this motive had been simply an invention of Aristotle, which did not truly apply to the philosophy before him, it would have been impossible for him to have forced the latter into its mold without provoking opposition. He would have distorted it so badly that the mutilation could not have gone unnoticed by his contemporaries. For it is the very foundations of Greek thought that are at stake here. In addition, the very fact that the form-matter motive so consistently maintained its position throughout later Greek thought and during the entire Scholastic period, controlling the very way in which the philosophical problems were framed, should have served as a second warning against the misconception that what we have here is merely a philosophical invention of Aristotle by which he arbitrarily measured all of his predecessors.

¹ "De vier religieuze grondthema's in den ontwikkelingsgang van het wijsgerig denken van het Avondland," *Philosophia Reformata*, VI (1941), 161-179.

If one penetrates behind the question of terminology, which of itself is insignificant, and concentrates on the actual meaning of Aristotle's form-matter scheme, a thoroughgoing study of Plato and of the so-called pre-Socratics will reveal that what is at issue here is indeed a dialectical ground-motive in which the entire Greek community of thought was rooted from the beginning. Once this has taken place, the only remaining task is to lay bare the religious meaning of this ground-motive. At this point, one cannot fail to see that what has been a continual subject of investigation since the Romantic period, the encounter between the pre-Homeric religion of nature and the later culture religion of the Olympic pantheon, is the origin of that deep religious conflict in the Greek consciousness which is embodied in the polar opposition between the form motive and the matter motive. Once one possesses this clue, the entire history of Greek philosophy is bathed in a surprising light. Much within it that had previously appeared inexplicable or internally contradictory is now made clear as it is placed against its proper background. Furthermore, the true meaning of Scholasticism, which tries to construct a bridge between the ground-motive of the Christian religion and the dialectical ground-motive of Greek thought, can now be made fully clear for the first time.

In this way the possibility arises of a true transcendental critique of both Greek and scholastic philosophy. By this critique, furthermore, the standard portrayal of the history of philosophy as a process of increasing emancipation from the fetters placed upon it by religion is revealed as a radical misconception.

This misconception was rooted in the a priori prejudice that philosophic thought, according to its very nature, is autonomous. Those making this judgment, however, glossed over the fact that in Greek philosophy this presumed autonomy had a completely different meaning from the one it had in Thomistic Scholasticism, and that in both of these its meaning was totally different from the one it has in modern humanistic thought. If fuller account had been taken of this incontrovertible fact, the critical question would have surfaced of its own accord: What is it that has determined the profound differences in the way that this autonomy has been conceived in the course of history? It would then have appeared, as a matter of course, that these differing conceptions were entirely dependent on the religious ground-motives which have undergirded Western thought in its whole development. Then the "axiom" of the autonomy of philosophy would have become a critical problem. Then, too, the philosophic dogmatism which elevated this autonomy to the position of a "dogma" would have had to make way for a transcendental, critical stance, for which philosophic thought itself had the status of a theoretical problem. For only a serious investigation of the inner structure of this thought can provide a truly critical answer to the question as to whether a religiously unprejudiced philosophy in the modern sense of the word is in fact possible.

I initially developed such a transcendental critique of philosophic thought in the first volume of my *Philosophy of the Law-Idea*.¹ There I applied it in a detailed analysis of the dialectical course of development of modern humanistic philosophy. Now the same method will be followed in an investigation of Greek philosophy. And, in conformity with the overall design of this work, it will be the questions of anthropology that stand in the foreground.

In order to help the reader draw his own conclusions as to whether and to what degree this method of approaching Greek philosophy in terms of its own ground-motive does greater justice to Greek thought than the standard one, I have throughout supported my analysis with extensive Greek quotations. Insofar as the sources permit, these are included in the context of the entire argument of the writers themselves. For the benefit of those who do not know the Greek language or who have an insufficient grasp of it, I have placed after each quotation a translation, in which I have attempted as far as possible to avoid prejudicing the philosophical interpretation. The fact that one can never fully succeed in this attempt is known to all who have learned from experience the problems encountered in translating.

By far the greater part of my exposition treats the development of Plato's thought. The justification for this will be found in the design and execution of my method of investigation itself. For, in the philosophy of Plato, all the strands of philosophy before him are gathered together, and it is in the development of his thought that the dialectic of the Greek ground-motive obtains its most representative and, at the same time, its most complicated expression.

At this point I shall make only a few brief comments about the two volumes that are to follow the present one. The second critically investigates the opposition between the Philosophy of the Law-Idea and scholastic philosophy, more particularly scholastic anthropology. This volume is now completely finished. It will appear in a short while, as soon as paper becomes available and as soon as there is opportunity to have it printed. This volume will also contain a detailed discussion of the relationship between philosophy and theology, the issue which appears to have been the pivotal one for Christian thought from the beginning. At the same time, by way of a transcendental critique of the Thomistic and Augustinian schools of scholastic thought, I shall resume my analysis of the dialectical development of Greek thought at the point that I temporarily left it after my analysis of Plato. The third volume, which for the greater part has also been brought to completion, will contain an extensive treatment of the problems of anthropology within the framework of the Philosophy of the

¹ *De Wijsbegeerte der Wetsidee* (Amsterdam: H. J. Paris, I [1935]).

Law-Idea. This final volume is intended to comprise an important addition to this philosophy, which will make it possible to gain a more precise insight into its overall design and outworking. It is my fervent hope that many misunderstandings which have persisted regarding my earlier published work will thereby be removed.

