



Timaeus

Plato , Donald J. Zeyl (Translator)

[Download now](#)

[Read Online](#) 

Timaeus

Plato , Donald J. Zeyl (Translator)

Timaeus Plato , Donald J. Zeyl (Translator)

First published in Plato: *Complete Works*, Donald J. Zeyl's masterful translation of *Timaeus* is presented along with his 75 page introductory essay, which discusses points of contemporary interest in the *Timaeus*, deals at length with long-standing and current issues of interpretation, and provides a consecutive commentary on the work as a whole. Includes an analytic table of contents and a select bibliography.

Timaeus Details

Date : Published 2000 by Hackett Publishing Company (first published -360)

ISBN : 9780872204461

Author : Plato , Donald J. Zeyl (Translator)

Format : Paperback 112 pages

Genre : Philosophy, Classics, Nonfiction

 [Download Timaeus ...pdf](#)

 [Read Online Timaeus ...pdf](#)

Download and Read Free Online Timaeus Plato , Donald J. Zeyl (Translator)

From Reader Review Timaeus for online ebook

Erik Graff says

The sources for the myth of Atlantis are two: Plato's dialogs Timaeus and Critias, primarily the latter. That's it. The rest is much more modern invention.

Cornford's Plato books are usually detailed and excellent, albeit perhaps too detailed and technical for some readers. In this edition he did the translation as well as an introduction and preface, apparently abstracted from his longer Plato's Cosmology. Since the Timaeus is primarily a geometricized cosmology, something pretty alien to modern thinking, the commentary is welcome.

Kerri F says

PERSONS OF THE DIALOGUE: Socrates, Critias, Timaeus, Hermocrates.

Atlantis...

Many great and wonderful deeds are recorded of your state in our histories. But one of them exceeds all the rest in greatness and valour. For these histories tell of a mighty power which unprovoked made an expedition against the whole of Europe and Asia, and to which your city put an end. This power came forth out of the Atlantic Ocean, for in those days the Atlantic was navigable; and there was an island situated in front of the straits which are by you called the Pillars of Heracles; the island was larger than Libya and Asia put together, and was the way to other islands, and from these you might pass to the whole of the opposite continent which surrounded the true ocean; for this sea which is within the Straits of Heracles is only a harbour, having a narrow entrance, but that other is a real sea, and the surrounding land may be most truly called a boundless continent. Now in this island of Atlantis there was a **great and wonderful empire** which had rule over the whole island and several others, and over parts of the continent, and, furthermore, the men of Atlantis had subjected the parts of Libya within the columns of Heracles as far as Egypt, and of Europe as far as Tyrrhenia. This vast power, gathered into one, endeavoured to subdue at a blow our country and yours and the whole of the region within the straits; and then, Solon, your country shone forth, in the excellence of her virtue and strength, among all mankind. She was **pre-eminent in courage and military skill**, and was the leader of the Hellenes. And when the rest fell off from her, being compelled to stand alone, after having undergone the very extremity of danger, she defeated and triumphed over the invaders, and preserved from slavery those who were not yet subjugated, and generously liberated all the rest of us who dwell within the pillars. **But afterwards there occurred violent earthquakes and floods; and in a single day and night of misfortune all your warlike men in a body sank into the earth, and the island of Atlantis in like manner disappeared in the depths of the sea. For which reason the sea in those parts is impassable and impenetrable, because there is a shoal of mud in the way; and this was caused by the subsidence of the island.**

Memories...

Truly, as is often said, the lessons of our childhood make a wonderful impression on our memories; for I am not sure that I could remember all the discourse of yesterday, but I should be much surprised if I forgot any of these things which I have heard very long ago. I listened at the time with childlike interest to the old man's narrative; he was very ready to teach me, and I asked him again and again to repeat his words, so that like an indelible picture they were branded into my mind. As soon as the day broke, I rehearsed them as he spoke

them to my companions, that they, as well as myself, might have something to say. And now, Socrates, to make an end of my preface, I am ready to tell you the whole tale. I will give you not only the general heads, but the particulars, as they were told to me.

Miniture Table of Contents...

CRITIAS: Let me proceed to explain to you, Socrates, the order in which we have arranged our entertainment. Our intention is, that Timaeus, who is the most of an astronomer amongst us, and has made the nature of the universe his special study, should speak first, beginning with the generation of the world and going down to the creation of man; next, I am to receive the men whom he has created

Cause...

Now everything that becomes or is created must of necessity be created by some cause, for without a cause nothing can be created. The work of the creator, whenever he looks to the unchangeable and fashions the form and nature of his work after an unchangeable pattern, must necessarily be made fair and perfect; but when he looks to the created only, and uses a created pattern, it is not fair or perfect.

With or Without Beginning?...

Was the heaven then or the world, whether called by this or by any other more appropriate name—assuming the name, I am asking a question which has to be asked at the beginning of an enquiry about anything—was the world, I say, always in existence and without beginning? or created, and had it a beginning? Created, I reply, being visible and tangible and having a body, and therefore sensible; and all sensible things are apprehended by opinion and sense and are in a process of creation and created. Now that which is created must, as we affirm, of necessity be created by a cause.

World of Generation...

Let me tell you then why the creator made this world of generation. He was good, and the good can never have any jealousy of anything. And being free from jealousy, he desired that all things should be as like himself as they could be. This is in the truest sense the origin of creation and of the world, as we shall do well in believing on the testimony of wise men: God desired that all things should be good and nothing bad, so far as this was attainable. Wherefore also finding the whole visible sphere not at rest, but moving in an irregular and disorderly fashion, out of disorder he brought order, considering that this was in every way better than the other. Now the deeds of the best could never be or have been other than the fairest; and the creator, reflecting on the things which are by nature visible, found that no unintelligent creature taken as a whole was fairer than the intelligent taken as a whole; and that intelligence could not be present in anything which was devoid of soul. For which reason, when he was framing the universe, he put intelligence in soul, and soul in body, that he might be the creator of a work which was by nature fairest and best. Wherefore, using the language of probability, we may say that the world became a living creature truly endowed with soul and intelligence by the providence of God.

This being supposed, let us proceed to the next stage: In the likeness of what animal did the Creator make the world?

Only One World and Heaven...

Are we right in saying that there is one world, or that they are many and infinite? There must be one only, if the created copy is to accord with the original. For that which includes all other intelligible creatures cannot have a second or companion; in that case there would be need of another living being which would include both, and of which they would be parts, and the likeness would be more truly said to resemble not them, but that other which included them. In order then that the world might be solitary, like the perfect animal, the creator made not two worlds or an infinite number of them; but there is and ever will be one only-begotten and created heaven.

Tangible Heaven...

If the universal frame had been created a surface only and having no depth, a single mean would have

sufficed to bind together itself and the other terms; but now, as the world must be solid, and solid bodies are always compacted not by one mean but by two, God placed water and air in the mean between fire and earth, and made them to have the same proportion so far as was possible (as fire is to air so is air to water, and as air is to water so is water to earth); and thus he bound and put together a visible and tangible heaven. And for these reasons, and out of such elements which are in number four, the body of the world was created, and it was harmonized by proportion, and therefore has the spirit of friendship; and having been reconciled to itself, it was indissoluble by the hand of any other than the framer.

Creation of Perfect World...

Now the creation took up the whole of each of the four elements; for the Creator compounded the world out of all the fire and all the water and all the air and all the earth, leaving no part of any of them nor any power of them outside. His intention was, in the first place, that the animal should be as far as possible a perfect whole and of perfect parts: secondly, that it should be one, leaving no remnants out of which another such world might be created: and also that it should be free from old age and unaffected by disease. Considering that if heat and cold and other powerful forces which unite bodies surround and attack them from without when they are unprepared, they decompose them, and by bringing diseases and old age upon them, make them waste away—for this cause and on these grounds he made the world one whole, having every part entire, and being therefore perfect and not liable to old age and disease. And he gave to the world the figure which was suitable and also natural.

Self-Sufficient Man...

Now to the animal which was to comprehend all animals, that figure was suitable which comprehends within itself all other figures. Wherefore he made the world in the form of a globe, round as from a lathe, having its extremes in every direction equidistant from the centre, the most perfect and the most like itself of all figures; for he considered that the like is infinitely fairer than the unlike. This he finished off, making the surface smooth all round for many reasons; in the first place, because the living being had no need of eyes when there was nothing remaining outside him to be seen; nor of ears when there was nothing to be heard; and there was no surrounding atmosphere to be breathed; nor would there have been any use of organs by the help of which he might receive his food or get rid of what he had already digested, since there was nothing which went from him or came into him: for there was nothing beside him. Of design he was created thus, his own waste providing his own food, and all that he did or suffered taking place in and by himself. For the Creator conceived that a being which was self-sufficient would be far more excellent than one which lacked anything; and, as he had no need to take anything or defend himself against any one, the Creator did not think it necessary to bestow upon him hands: nor had he any need of feet, nor of the whole apparatus of walking; but the movement suited to his spherical form was assigned to him, being of all the seven that which is most appropriate to mind and intelligence; and he was made to move in the same manner and on the same spot, within his own limits revolving in a circle. All the other six motions were taken away from him, and he was made not to partake of their deviations. And as this circular movement required no feet, the universe was created without legs and without feet.

Time & Heaven...

Time, then, and the heaven came into being at the same instant in order that, having been created together, if ever there was to be a dissolution of them, they might be dissolved together. It was framed after the pattern of the eternal nature, that it might resemble this as far as was possible; for the pattern exists from eternity, and the created heaven has been, and is, and will be, in all time. Such was the mind and thought of God in the creation of time. The sun and moon and five other stars, which are called the planets, were created by him in order to distinguish and preserve the numbers of time; and when he had made their several bodies, he placed them in the orbits in which the circle of the other was revolving,—in seven orbits seven stars.

Man...

And having made it, he divided the whole mixture into souls equal in number to the stars, and assigned each

soul to a star; and having there placed them as in a chariot, he showed them the nature of the universe, and declared to them the laws of destiny, according to which their first birth would be one and the same for all,—no one should suffer a disadvantage at his hands; they were to be sown in the instruments of time severally adapted to them, and to come forth the most religious of animals; and as human nature was of two kinds, the superior race would hereafter be called **man**.

Sleep/Eyes...

But when night comes on and the external and kindred fire departs, then the stream of vision is cut off; for going forth to an unlike element it is changed and extinguished, being no longer of one nature with the surrounding atmosphere which is now deprived of fire: and so the eye no longer sees, and we feel disposed to sleep. For when the eyelids, which the gods invented for the preservation of sight, are closed, they keep in the internal fire; and the power of the fire diffuses and equalizes the inward motions; when they are equalized, there is rest, and when the rest is profound, sleep comes over us scarce disturbed by dreams; but where the greater motions still remain, of whatever nature and in whatever locality, they engender corresponding visions in dreams, which are remembered by us when we are awake and in the external world.

Derivation of Philosophy...

But now the sight of day and night, and the months and the revolutions of the years, have created number, and have given us a conception of time, and the power of enquiring about the nature of the universe; and from this source **we have derived philosophy**, than which no greater good ever was or will be given by the gods to mortal man.

Regeneration/Cycle of Elements...

In the first place, we see that what we just now called water, by condensation, I suppose, becomes stone and earth; and this same element, when melted and dispersed, passes into vapour and air. Air, again, when inflamed, becomes fire; and again fire, when condensed and extinguished, passes once more into the form of air; and once more, air, when collected and condensed, produces cloud and mist; and from these, when still more compressed, comes flowing water, and from water comes earth and stones once more; and thus generation appears to be transmitted from one to the other in a circle. Thus, then, as the several elements never present themselves in the same form, **how can any one have the assurance to assert positively that any of them, whatever it may be, is one thing rather than another?** No one can. But much the safest plan is to speak of them as follows:—Anything which we see to be continually changing, as, for example, fire, we must not call 'this' or 'that,' but rather say that it is 'of such a nature'; nor let us speak of water as 'this'; but always as 'such'; nor must we imply that there is any stability in any of those things which we indicate by the use of the words 'this' and 'that,' supposing ourselves to signify something thereby; for they are too volatile to be detained in any such expressions as 'this,' or 'that,' or 'relative to this,' or any other mode of speaking which **represents them as permanent**.

David Sarkies says

Socrates and Science

15 December 2018 – Perth

This book is famous for all the wrong reasons, and it basically has something to do with a city that for some reason Jason Moma seems to have a very strong connection to. Yet, while this is generally known as the Atlantis dialogue, in reality it isn't, that accolade goes to the partner dialogue, the Critias. However, at the start, there is this discussion on this city named Atlantis, and how Critias came to learn of its existence, however, at this stage I'll leave it with Jason Moma and move on to what this text is actually about.

You could say that this is Plato's scientific text, namely it is the dialogue where he explores how things work, how the world was created, and why things are the way they are. To say that he is completely and utterly wrong is an understatement in and of itself, but the thing is that we are talking about some guy writing something like two and a half thousand years ago, so we can sort of give him a little bit of slack.

However, the problem I faced is that having read Lucretius, I just simply got this feeling that Plato, well, simply was not a scientist. Sure, when it comes to political and ethical theory, then he certainly excels in that department, but it seems that what he is doing is attempting to cram quite a lot of information, information that is expanded by the works of three people down the track – Ptolemy, Galen, and Lucretius – that the text itself really does seem to be a bit rushed.

Look, when I first read it, I thought it was amazing, and kept on raising the question that if the Greeks were this insightful, why is it that they didn't develop technology faster than it was actually developed? Well, it seems that the editor does try to answer that question, and no, it has something to do with the idea that a slave society had no need for tools and equipment to make their lives easier. Apparently, in the twilight of the Roman Empire, there were some experiments in developing a rudimentary assembly line, namely for producing bread. No, the suggestion was that there were a lot technologies that we have, such as cast iron and gunpowder among many others, that were simply not available to the Greeks.

Yet what about the scientific method. Well, that wasn't something that was necessarily developed until the era of Isaac Newton, but that didn't necessarily mean that Plato, nor the others, weren't going about inquiring as to the nature of the universe the wrong way. The thing is that what we are seeing here is the beginning of this idea that there are reasons that things happen in this world, and these things aren't happening because some randy God is throwing a tantrum because he didn't get his own way. What we are seeing is that people are beginning to observe things, starting to see patterns, and beginning to question the reasons behind these patterns.

However, one thing that does bug me is that I am not entirely sure if this is actually Plato. I'm not saying that Plato didn't necessarily write this dialogue, but rather my feeling is that Plato is espousing things that no doubt were handed down to him from other sources. There is a suggestion that Timeaus may never have existed, but just because we don't have any external references to him does not mean that he didn't exist. I should also note that Critias happens to be Plato's grandfather, so there is certainly a connection there (as well as there being a connection through Socrates).

In the end though, what the whole dialogue is about is that Plato is continuing to explore this idea of a perfect system of government, a dialogue that started back in the Republic. This is clear from the opening discussion at the beginning. Yet, for some reason, Plato then seems to diverge from this topic and delve into a scientific exploration of the origins of the universe. The editor suggested that Plato is simply laying the groundwork for his discussion on Atlantis in the next dialogue, but honestly, I'm not all that convinced.

????? ?????? ????? says

????? ?????? ?? ??????? ?? ?????.

Frank says

A very wide ranging speculation, presented as fact, covering everything from the origin of the universe, to medicine, ethics, prehistory and the physical sciences. Perhaps the most valuable reflections relate to chemistry, encompassing the notion that matter is made up of combinations of more elementary building blocks capable of recombination. Plato's signature argument for creation from eternal templates is given novel and trenchant presentation.

Bettie? says

'And therefore to you I turn, Timaeus, citizen of Locris, who are at once a philosopher and a statesman, and to you, Critias, whom all Athenians know to be similarly accomplished, and to Hermocrates, who is also fitted by nature and education to share in our discourse.'

Read here for free!

Back to skoolz for me and into the description and dimension of Atlantis, the existence of which creeps into credibility with every new push back on dating epic structures, and pondering the forerunners of sites such as the 1994 discovery of Göbekli Tepe.

Solon > Plato = aural tradition/rote

Manuel Alfonso says

The Timaeus is usually considered the platonic dialogue that deals with cosmology. However, although in a cosmological environment, it could be considered as a treatise on human physiology, explained in relation to the cosmos and making continual use of final causes to explain things.

The Timaeus is divided into three parts: the first explains the form and origin of the cosmos (including a proof that the multiverse cannot exist) and uses this information to explain the shape of the human head and the difference between the anterior and the posterior parts of the body.

The second explains the composition of the cosmos with a very curious theory, no doubt of Pythagorean origin, which considers that the basis of everything are two rectangular triangles: one isosceles and one scalene, the result of dividing in two an equilateral triangle. This theory is then used to explain human sensitivity.

The third part is devoted to explaining the various parts of the body, and the respiratory, circulatory and excretory functions, including a theory of health and disease. There is also a theory about prophetic dreams, largely superseded by Aristotle, who in a small treatise gives a surprisingly modern explanation.

Critias is an incomplete dialog where the legend of Atlantis first appeared, although there is a summary at the beginning of Timaeus.

El Timeo se considera usualmente el diálogo platónico que trata de cosmología. Sin embargo, aunque en un entorno cosmológico, podría considerarse como un tratado de fisiología humana que se explica en relación con el cosmos y haciendo uso continuamente de causas finales para explicar las cosas.

El Timeo se divide en tres partes: en la primera se explica la forma y el origen del cosmos (incluida una demostración de que no puede existir el multiverso), y se hace uso de esta información para explicar la forma de la cabeza humana y la diferencia entre la parte anterior y la posterior del cuerpo.

En la segunda se explica la composición del cosmos con una teoría curiosísima, sin duda de origen pitagórico, que considera que la base de todo son dos triángulos rectángulos: uno isósceles y otro escaleno,

When I arrived back home, the world of mundane matters once again seized the foreground of my mind and took centre stage.

Endless questions about new friends, work habits, and professors.

The real world never lets up, does it?

But if I had learned anything from Plato, it was this: inspiration.

That's it, you say?

Well, it was enough.

You see, the reading bug had taken over my system!

'Je suis Hanté.' I repeated to myself, mimicking Mallarme... haunted by old books.

And by the end of that semester I had won the University Prize for first-year English. A little insignificant dreamer like me... but dreams work miracles.

Four stars for the dynamite source material about Atlantis, scanty though it is, and the fascinating content.

But shy of Five, because you need to know geometry like Leibniz did to understand most of it!

Anders says

“And so far as it is at all possible for a man to become thoroughly mortal, he cannot help but fully succeed in this, seeing that he has cultivated his mortality all along. On the other hand, if a man has seriously devoted himself to the love of learning and to true wisdom, if he has exercised these aspects of himself above all, then there is absolutely no way that his thoughts can fail to be immortal and divine, should truth come within his grasp.”

*

On Plato:

Well it started out sort of interesting where the demiurge creates everything who is this single, perfect immortal being and so exerts perfect will and reason. But even that is really just caught up in Timaeus' astronomical leanings which, to me, are Plato's harmony by another name. Harmony is even mentioned explicitly at the end so I don't think I'm wrong in that. Then after that it devolves into a mathematical reasoning of the physical world and living beings and I'm sure there's some interesting stuff about the early development of biological thought but it was a bit lost on me. I'm curious as to the overlap with Hippocrates. And I also detected some influence on Lucretius? Maybe?

Overall this was a pretty boring dialogue. Although it did have its moments, it had little for me to grab onto and run with. Like so many dialogues that have really memorable passages, the Timaeus also fell victim to being merely about the demiurge and it's actually got a lot more to it. Just not a lot more that I can say much about.

On Donald J Zeyl:

I don't want to call him completely incompetent, but I found his footnotes asinine and his intro and explanations woefully inadequate. Sure, they gave a decent overview of past scholarship but they had absolutely no life or interpretative vigor to them. And to my sensibilities, they were way off the mark. He's perfectly happy to say Plato is advancing such and such a doctrine and even in this "late" dialogue I find that to be, at worst, patently false, at best, grievously errant—a product of calcified, uncritical Platonic scholarship. It's disappointing really, because normally Hackett has great Plato translations and commentaries, but for a more obscure dialogue like the *Timaeus*, I guess I shouldn't be so surprised.

To temper my disgust a bit, he does hit the main points. But I had to stop reading his footnotes to appreciate the dialogue and I had to skip around the commentary to retain my sanity which I hardly ever do.

Random other stuff:

Zeyl makes a huge point about the Greek verb *gigonen* and to be and coming to be and translations thereof. None of it is clear or helpful. To use another person's words "that's extremely cryptic and not at all helpful." Hmph.

One of the first big things is whether the creation story is literal or metaphorical. Ugh this is just exactly the sort of obsolete thing I'm talking about. But hey it's what all the big guys have talked about so it must be THE THING to talk about.

An interesting thing Zeyl seems not to realize the importance of: that the entire passage is called a "likely account." There's even a fun bit of reasoning *Timaeus* does that says hey well we don't have the absolute truth so we must accept the likeliest thing; here's what I think is the likeliest! Zeyl uses a bunch of big words to make it seem like this is just Plato doing lip service to the limits of the various disciplines he's combining to give an account of reality. But this brings up another really terrible aspect of Zeyl. He continuously refers to all of the arguments, all of *Timaeus'* arguments in his speech as Plato's. Sigh. Mistake number one buddy. Mouthpiece Shmouthpiece, let alone some wayward astronomer.

And actually now that I'm remember there is the cool story at the beginning about Atlantis and Egypt and Solon that has an odd touch of Euhemerism to it, if I can use that term not too anachronistically here.

There's also a neat bit about color that goes through what combinations of colors make other colors. Ancient colors, cool!

I really did like *Timaeus'* bit about likely accounts: "what being is to becoming, truth is to convincingness."

It's funny that this whole speech about the creation of the universe and such is supposed to be the introduction to a speech about talking about how cities will act in competition with others. *Timaeus* makes a stray comment like we don't have enough time to address x important topic, as is so often the case and I wonder whether that might pertain to his whole speech—that's it's a digression that suits him and not really the topic at hand. "Perhaps later on we could at our leisure give this subject the exposition it deserves." But the comment is about more PLANETS that the ASTRONOMER doesn't want to go on about.

"And what is more, we also say things like these: that what has come to be is what has come to be, that what is coming to be is what is coming to be, and also that what will come to be is what will come to be, and that what is not is what is not. None of these expressions of ours is accurate. But I don't suppose this is a good time right now to be too meticulous about these matters."

I suppose I got bogged down in the bulky end of *Timaeus'* speech where he's just describing things and there's not really much to say about it.

Zeyl: "It is a cardinal doctrine of Plato's metaphysics that nothing in the world of sense experience retains its character permanently." I hate this man SO MUCH.

Okay I'm not gonna lie I skipped over a lot of his serious engagement with the math and science of Timaeus otherworldly ramblings. I'm sure there is something to be gained by taking it seriously. But I just couldn't take this man seriously who continuously insisted on saying that Timaeus is spouting the honest-to-Zeus truth about what Plato's metaphysics is. So since I abhor this guy and his interpretation so much I'll just go ahead and reveal my secret: I don't believe that Plato EVER advances a positive metaphysics in any of his dialogues. Of course he had one and yes it was probably some form of realism like what he talks about in his dialogues. But I insist that it is an entirely vain enterprise to try to deduce Plato's metaphysics is from the dialogues-they are merely theories to be contemplated and made use of.

Well, my last crazy thought is that most of Plato's dialogues are trying to make someone look stupid and that person here is obviously Timaeus. Without Socrates as a dominant interlocutor its hard to know exactly in what way Timaeus is being stupid, but I have some theories and it's half mooning over astronomy and half being an expert medical man of science.

It's apparent enough that I don't buy any of this dialogue being a treatise on Plato's metpahysic, but since I held that opinion before I read the dialogue and even that sometimes isn't enough I would like to clearly state: After having read the Timaeus, I am not convinced that it indicates anything solid about Plato's metaphysics.

I guess I'm gonna have to read the Critias to see if that connects any of the dots here (as it's part of the alleged trilogy with the hypothesized and nonexistent Hermocrates).

Oh and of course, the last shoutout is to Judeo-Christian theology which plundered this dialogue for all sorts of fun theology that I'm not even going to approach except to mention it here with a flippant final flourish of fireworks flare! After all, in Raphael's School of Athens, is not Plato pointing upwards to the heavens (Heaven) and holding his best dialogue the Timaeus (Italian: Timeo) which features the number one deity, the demiurge (God)??!!

By Zeus, what have I done?!

MJD says

What I found best in terms of literary merits was the mythos of the the city of Atlantis early on in the book. The story of the ball people was also interesting.

Collier Brown says

True, the Timaeus is known for its fleeting references to Atlantis. But far more curious is the cosmography it describes: strange confluents, for instance, of mathematics, morality, and biology. Buried in that morass of ideas are some attitudes toward women that, in various ways, plague us still.

Ever heard of the "wandering womb"—the notion that the uterus ("hystera" in Greek) roams restlessly throughout the female body, desperate for sex? Yeah, that's Timaeus (read: Plato). The womb, according to Timaeus, punishes the mind with madness until it gets what it desires. And so begins centuries upon

centuries of pernicious stereotypes about "hysterical" women.

Here's a snippet: ". . . the same is the case with the so-called womb or matrix of women; the animal within them is desirous of procreating children, and when remaining unfruitful long beyond its proper time, gets discontented and angry, and wandering in every direction through the body, closes up the passages of the breath, and, by obstructing respiration, drives them to extremity, causing all varieties of disease, until at length the desire and love of the man and the woman, bringing them together and as it were plucking the fruit from the tree, sow in the womb, as in a field, animals unseen . . ."

I'll leave it that. Not exactly a "good" read. Historically revealing, that's how I'd put it.

Hussain Ali says

????? ??? ????? ????? ???????... ??? ?????? ??? ?????????? ??????!!

G.R. Reader says

Sleep-inducing New Age crap. But maybe Plato was just kidding.
