

- 9- Philo : Foundations of religious and philosophy,  
by H.A. Wolf son.
- 10- Plato : The Republic, translated with Introduction  
by F.M. Cornford, London, 1941, reprinted  
(1972).
- 11- Rose : " Aristotles , Fragments ", leipzig 1886  
(1966).
- 12- Ross,W.D. Aristotle's Metaphysics, oxford, 1970.
- 13- Sextus Empiricus " Adversus methematicos ( physicos ).
- 14- Guthrie " The Development of Aristotle's Theology "  
Classical Quarter, Vol 27. 1933.

THE REFERENCES

- 1- Aristotle Metaphysics, with an English translation by H. tradennick. London ( Loeb ), 1961-1969.
- 2- Aristotle the physics, English translation by P.H. Wicksteed, London ( Loeb ) 1968.
- 3- Aristotle on the heavens, English translation by W.K.C Guthrie, London ( Loeb ) 1971.
- 4- Bernays " Die dialoge des Aristotes in ihrem ver-  
haltnis zu seinen ubrigen werken, Berlin,  
1863.
- 5- Cicero, M.T, ciceronis, De natura deorum, Academica,  
with an English translation by H. Rackham,  
London ( Loeb ) 1933.
- 6- H. von Arnim, "Die entwicklung der Aristote " Gotte-  
lehre, Sitzungsber.d. Akad.d. wissin, phil-  
hist. Kl, book, 5 1931.
- 7- I. Bonitz, Index Aristotelicus, Graz, 1870.
- 8- Philo of Alexandria : De Aeternitate Mundi, ed.Fr.  
Cumont, Berlin, 1981.

creation that way which most of Islamic Philo-  
sophers followed , , - as Al-Kindi - and if  
philo believed that the way to know god must  
be through god himself, as being the first cause,  
this implies that god is a first cause for some-  
thing i.e something created. And also it is de-  
servable to notice here that for Aristotle there  
is no theory of ceartion at all but the unive-  
rse for him is eternal i.e ungenerated. So it  
is not god's handiwork or effect.

64- P.171. Chrous distinguishes in Aristotle between  
a knowledge of god which is grounded upon  $\nu\alpha\theta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$   
and a knowledge which is based on  $\mu\alpha\theta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$ .

65- Jaeger, p, 160.

66- Jaeger, p. 161.

67- See chroust, p. 162 - 163.

68- Fra. 14 Rose , 14 Walzer, 14 Ross.

69- Plato's laws XII 966 D.

- 61- Jaeger maintains that the first thing that we notice in this passage of Cicero is the complete dependence of it on Plato's cave in Republic (514 ff), but with a basic differences. First Aristotle's men have not lived in a cave, they are modern, cultivated. Aristotle teaches them to contemplate into a super natural world, but that which is visible to all instead of Plato's Ideas, he invites us to contemplate the real world the wonderful shapes and arrangements of the cosmos, a contemplation which leads up to the intuition of the divine director of it all " p. 164.
- 62- Aristotle fragments : 10 Rose, 12 a Walzer, 12 a Ross
- 63- Cf. Philo of Alexandria, legum. Allegoriarum libri Tercii III. 32.99. ( Frag.12 Rose, 13 Walzer, 13 Ross). Philo insisted that men who, like Aristotle, find the " way to god " through his handwork, still proceed in an " inferior way " because they know god through his " shadow ", that is through his handiwork. The proper way of knowing god, according to Philo, is through god himself. ( see Chroust p. 179). But we don't agree with Philo in his view because in fact this is the natural way for knowing god, i.e through his

who had always lived beneath the earth, in comfortable well-lit dwellings, decorated with statues and pictures and furnished with all luxuries enjoyed by persons thought to be supremely happy, and who though they had never come forth above the ground had learnt by report ... .. when they saw these things, surely they would think that the gods exist and that these mighty marvels are their handiwork". And in another passage which seems probably to come from Aristotle "on philosophy" (see Cicero II. 37.) Cicero relates: "In fact, there is nothing which is perfect" (see also J. Bernays "Die dialog des Aristoteles in ihrem Verhaltnis zu seinen ubrigen werken, Berlin, 1863.p. 106 ff". Where he reports that "the belief in god is based on man's perception of the sublime beauty and orderliness of the heavens and the heavenly bodies" see also Chroust p. 164.

60- See here Plato's "Laws" x 886 A where Plato refers to the earth, sun, the stars i.e. all the universe as an evidence of god's existence, so Aristotle was effected by Plato's cosmological argument.

- 55- Chroust, p. 191.
- 56- See, Rose fr. 16, Walzer, Ross 16. Also see philo of Alexandria : de praem . et poenis VII 40 ff - ( frag. 12 Rose, 13 Walzer, 13 Ross).
- 57- Jaeger, p. 158, Ross, p. 179 and chroust p. 159.
- 58- W. Jaeger maintains that Aristotle in his " Philosophy gave us the root of his notological argument which is bound with his teleological one" wherever there is a series of comparable things displaying gradual differences of value, there is also a most perfect thing or maximum ,.... In nature, which to Aristotle posses a form and purpose every lower thing is related to something higher and ruling. To him this teleological order is a law of nature. It follows that in the realm of existing things there is a most perfect thing , which naturally must also be a real Form, and which as the highest final cause , is principle of everything ... that the most perfect being would be identical with the divine " . p. 158.
- 59- Cicero, De Natura Deorum II 95 - 6 ( fr, 12 Rose, fr. 13 Walzer, fr. 13 Rose ) " IF there were being

- 46- Cod. Paris. Graec. 174, Fol. 46 a ( Fra. 17 Rose, Fra. 17 Walzer, Fra. 17 Ross).
- 47- Von Arnim : Die Entuirck ling der Aristotelischen 1931.
- 48- J. Pein (l'interpretation du " De philosophia " d'Aristotle d' apres que lques travaux recents "Revue des Etudes Grecques, vol. 77 nos, 366 8(1964) - p. 466 - 473) - in agreement with Arnim - has derived that Aristotle introduced the concept of the Un-moved Mover into his " on pholosophy " and also based his view on Cicero. (De Nat. II. 44.).
- 49- Aristotle : De Cael, Book 1,3, 270 a.
- 50- Fragment, 24 Rose.
- 51- W.C.K. Guthrie : The development of Aristotle's Theology. C.Q 1933.
- 52- Ibid, p. 164.
- 53- De Natura deorum II. 44.
- 54- Guthrie , C.Q 1933, p. 167.

- 42- Jaeger p. 133. J. Bernays ( Die Dialoge des Aristoteles in ihrem Verhältnis zueinander und zu den übrigen Werken - Berlin, 1863 . p.99 - 100 ) - in agreement with Jaeger - believes that there is unmistakable allusion to a " supreme god " in Aristotle's passage ( De Nat. Deor. I. 33 ) who is the Unmoved Mover of Aristotle's later work. ( See Chroust p. 180 ) W. Theiler ( Ein vergessenes Aristoteleszeugnis, Journal of Hellenic Studies, Vol. 77 (1957) p. 127 - likewise believes that Aristotle refers here to the Unmoved Mover and that Aristotle gave us a doctrine of two distinct gods which are not of equal rank, the divine universe conceived as " ether " and the divine Nous conceived as the governor of the divine universe. Also the view that the Unmoved Mover had a place in the early " exoteric " writing of Aristotle has more recently been upheld by E. Dignone ( L'Aristotele perduto e la formazione filosofica di Epicuro, II, 398 ff ). ( see Chroust p. 182 ).

43- Jaeger, p. 141 - 142.

44- Jaeger, p. 140 ff.

45- Plato's " laws " 898 E ff.

maintained that the universe is no better than the work of man's hands .... " Chroust, P. 180

34- Ibid V. 20 ( Fra. 19 Rose, Fra. 199 Walzer, Frag . 199 Ross).

35- See chroust , p. 179. also Jaeger, p. 141 when he maintains that the expression " visible god" is itself platonic and the comparisons of the heavens with a pantheon including all the particular gods, though the words may belong not to Aristotle but to philo, is Aristotleian in intention".

36- Aristotle " De Caelo ", 270b 11 ff.

37- Ibid 270 b 27.

38- Ibid 270 b11, b 20, 284 a 4.

39- Aristotle " On the heavens " book I.

40- P. 139.

41- Aristotle " On the heavens " 278 b11 where Aristotle gave us three different meanings of the word "ὄρανος".

31- According to Jaeger if god should be identified with the universe as well as with ether, this does not constitute a real contradiction. He supported his view saying that : by the term " Cosmos " Aristotle means the heavens or the celestial sphere and not the world of the changeable matter. Also chroust request whether or not the term " deus " should be translated as to θεῖον (divin) rather than ὁ θεός (god), see "De Caelo" 985a 27-31 . He also depending on philo of Alexandria, Cicero, and Sextus Empiricus believes that the visible god according to Aristotle is not identical with the " Supreme god ". on the contrary, it can be inferred that for Aristotle there exists a " Supreme god " who is the governor, maintainer and commander of the universe (P. 178 - 179).

32- De Aeternitate Mundi III 10 - 11 and Ibid V 20-24.

33- Philo of Alexandria III 10 - 11 ( Fra. 18 Rose , Fra. 18 Walzer, Fra. 18 Ross. " Aristotle was surely speaking piously and reverently when he insisted that the universe is uncreated and imperishable, divine and when he charged with serious ungodliness those people ( the Atomists) who

the plantes are dels-moving, yet he inisits on the existence of the best soul of the supreme controle soul.

22- De Natura Deorum, I. 13.33.

23- Cicero, De Natura Deorum I. 8.18

24- See chroust, p.176, Jaeger p. 139.

25- Guthrie CQ. p. 165 where he mentioned that Aristotle in the ( on philosophy ) " gave us hypothesis and did not stress on one of them concerning the concept of god ".

26- See chroust, p. 179.

27- Aristotle Metaphysics with an English translation by Hugh Tredennick, A. 1072b14-30.

28- Fra. 16 Rose, Fra. 10C Walzer, Fra. 10C Ross.

29- Fra. 16 Rose, Fra. 10C Walzer, Fra. 10C Ross.

30- See chroust p. 178.

in Aristotle's early thought. see also Plato's  
" laws " x .84u cff, also " Timaeus " ( 29 - 30 ,  
31 , 34 ).

19- Cicero , De Natura Deorum, II 42, 43.

20- De Natura Deorum II 44 " Aristotle is also to  
be commended for his view that the notion of  
all living bodies is due to one of three causes,  
nature, force , or will, now the sun and moon  
and all the stars are in motion, and bodies  
moved by nature travel either down wards owing  
to their weight or upwards owing to their ligh-  
tness, but neither is the case with the heavenly  
bodies, because their motion is revolution in a  
circle, nor yet can it be said that some stro-  
nger force compels the heavenly bodies to travel  
in a manner contrary to their nature, for what  
stronger force can there be ? it remains there-  
fore that the motion of the heavenly bodies is  
voluntary ".

21- Although plato in " laws " insists on : " that  
the outer - most sphere of the fixed stars and

- 11- Jaeger, 138.
- 12- Both of Jaeger and Guthrie are in agreement.
- 13- Philo of Alexandria " De Aeternitate Mundi, 3.10-11
- 14- Jaeger, p. 128.
- 15- De Natura Deorum I. 13.33, Fra. 26 Rose, Fra.  
26 Walzer, Fra. 26 Ross and the same work II.  
15. 42 - 44 ( Fra 23 - 24 Rose Fra. 21 Walzer, Fra .  
21 Ross).
- 16- Adversus Mathematicos ( physicos ) I x 20 - 23 ( Fra.  
10 Rose, Fra. 12 a Walzer, Fra. 12 a Ross).
- 17- De Aeternitate Mundi III 10-11 (Fra. 18 Rose, Fra.  
18 Walzer, Fra. 18 Ross, Ibid. V.2-4 ( Fra. 14 rose,  
Fra, 19 Walzer, Fra. 19a Ross, Ibid, VI 98 - VII 34  
( Fra, 20 Rose, Fra. 19b Walzer, Fra. 19b Ross, and  
Ibid VIII 39 - 43 ( Fra. 21 rose, Fra. 19c Walzer ,  
Fra. 19c Ross ).
- 18- Guthrie, C.Q. 1933. Both of Jaeger and Chroust are  
in agreement in seeing platonic traces of motion

Notes

- 1- W Jaeger, Aristotle, fundamental of the history of his development, London, 1967.
- 2- Von Arnim. Die Entstehung der Gotteslehre des Aristoteles, Berlin, 1931.
- 3- W.K.C. Guthrie : " The development of Aristotle's Theology " Classical Quarter. 1933, pp. 162-190. also the same author " introduction to Aristotle's "On the heavens ", pp. 11 - 35.
- 4- Jaeger, P. 125.
- 5- Jaeger, p. 138.
- 6- Plato's " laws " , books 10 - 12. also see Epinomis.
- 7) Cicero, M.T, ciceronis, De natura deorum, Academica, with an English translation by H. Rackham, London (Loeb) 1933. I. 13.33,
- 8) Jaeger, p 139.
- 9) Guthrie " The development of Aristotle's Theology C.Q, 1933, P. 169.
- 10) Jaeger, 125.

inner composure is the essence of all religious devotion<sup>(68)</sup>, Aristotle derives the subjective conviction of god's existence from two sources from man's experience of the inspired sight of the soul and from the sight of the stary heavens . This derivation is not to be understood historically. It is a frequent juxtaposition of the two great wonders that all the enlightenment of the enlightened cannot explaine. What Aristotle compresses here into a formules is simply the religious attitude of Plato's<sup>(69)</sup> circle towards universe ".

and most refined logical arguments can never achieve that irresistible force of inner conviction which arises out of the inspired presentiments of the soul. It was Aristotle who distinguishes sharply between feeling and understanding, between faith and reason. "those who are initiated are not required to grasp any thing with the understanding, (πιστεῖν), but to have a certain inner experience (παθεῖν), and so to be put into a particular frame of mind, presuming that they are capable of this frame of mind in the first place"(65). From Plato, and the Academy, Aristotle taught - Jaeger insists - that true religion is possible only in the form of personal experience and personal awe in the face of the sublime (66), that is through personal devotion.

I borrow here Jaeger's words as Chroust expressed them(67) "No one in the ancient world ever spoke more beautifully and more profoundly about the personal and emotional side of all religious life than Aristotle during the years when religion was the central problem in his mind. In the dialogue "on philosophy" he spoke of the feeling of awe in the presence of that which is higher than man. He recognized that

II. The Psychological argument :

In addition to the cosmological, teleological argument Aristotle refers to the personal and psychological feeling. For Aristotle, man's belief in God arouses from an innate spiritual strength and from the events which concern the soul. In the case of sleep the soul is inspired and is able to predict the future with prophetic eye. Also in the case of death when it gets rid of the body and its relation and becomes pure, it is in that case more nearer to the divine nature. For all these reasons he came to the conclusion that there exists something divine which is akin to the soul and which is above all the most intelligent. In brief - as Chroust mentioned<sup>(64)</sup> "Aristotle held that religious beliefs especially the belief in God and his existence, originated either from direct and personal "mystical revelation" or "inspiration" where man's soul is directly affected by a personal awareness that results in spontaneous certainty, or from a "derivative" or "inferential" realization or knowledge of the divine".

In his "or philosophy" - as Jaeger maintains, Aristotle indicates that even the most compelling

of the soul i.e the events which concern the soul, and of the celestial phenomena. As for the first source I shall explain it later on. As to the second source, men think that behind the character and regularity of the stars, there, exists a high divine power that means that wherever men stand face to face with the marvellous and orderly universe, they reach to the rational conclusion that all this beauty and orderliness must be caused by an ultimate principle i.e order. This means that men come to believe in god's existence through his effects. (63) So from the existence of the cosmos and from their sighting of natural phenomena, men inferred the existence of god.

in order to achieve the good of the whole. And everything is existed for the sake of another. And to support this point of view he refers here to a passage in Cicero<sup>(59)</sup> which is considered to be of Aristotle's (on philosophy) where Aristotle referred to some beings who lived beneath the earth and who only, by report, have learnt that there exist divine powers, then suddenly they were faced for the first time with the sight of earth, seas and sky, the sun with its powers the moon, the heavenly bodies, the stars with their regular changeless order, in a word when they saw both the earth, and the heavens with their marvels, they would be sure that all these phenomena are signs of a divine power and hence they would conceive the existence of god<sup>(60)</sup>, for all these works cannot be a handiwork of human being. We observe here that Aristotle used Plato's analogy of the cave with some differences as Jaeger points out<sup>(61)</sup>.

Again according to Sextus Empiricus (Adversus Mathe .. : x 20-3) Aristotle maintained in the on philosophy<sup>(62)</sup> that men's belief in god originated from two sources : personal experiences

Aristotle's proofs for the existence of the Unmoved Mover:

In his "on philosophy" Aristotle gave us his early proofs for the existence of god.

I. The ontological ( Teleological ) proof :

In a fragment referring to his third book of "on philosophy" (56) Aristotle gave us what can be called the ontological argument: "where there is a good, there is a better and where there is a better among existing things one is better than another, there is also something that is best which is at the same time the divine" (57). It seems as most of the scholars believed (58) that Aristotle's ontological argument is connected with his teleological one.

For if among the observed things we can compare or prefer some being to another that means that there exists a perfect being which is incomparable. And which is identical with the divine. This ontological argument is connected with the teleological one. For as Aristotle's doctrine requires, everything has existed for a certain purpose and to do a certain role and as he says: "god and nature do nothing in vain". everything is connected with the other

In this passage. Guthrie presents two important points :

- a) the circular motion is not yet considered as a natural one, while the motion up and down are natural.
- b) Aristotle admits here that there is no superior power to the power of the stars. The motion of the stars comes from the will which resides in them. So Guthrie came to conclusion that Aristotle abandoned the idea that motion of ether is not a natural motion. Circular motion is a natural one, ether moves in all directions.

Guthrie, it seems, is not completely against Jaeger's idea for he mentioned that " It is difficult to be dogmatic in the face of the general confusion of Cicero's passage ( De Mer) .I. 33) so he believes that the argument that insists on the existence of the Unmoved Mover rests on probabilities " (54). Chroust, on the other hand, for some reasons, upheld W. Jaeger's view that in the on philosophy Aristotle alluded to the transcendental Unmoved Mover. For the Supreme god being  $\nu\acute{o}\upsilon\varsigma$ , and a  $\acute{\alpha}\tau\eta\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$  moves without being moved (55).

heavenly bodies are moved by will or voluntarily and this excludes the exterior mover whose existence Jaeger proclaims. For the third view which takes an "intermediary" position between Jaeger<sup>(51)</sup> and von Arnim, it seems that Guthrie will represent it. He believes that Aristotle in his "on philosophy" does not commit himself to a final definition of the divine, he (Aristotle) "gave us four suppositions and did not stress on one of them", really he does not postulate openly an Unmoved Mover in the "on philosophy" although this notion can be touched in his dialogue, for the ultimate necessity of postulating such Unmoved Mover is compatible with the fundamental tenor of the "on philosophy" and Guthrie supports his view by mentioning that the passage from which the scholars understood that it contains the "Unmoved Mover" is put by Cicero into the mouth of an Epicurean critic whose object is to show that Aristotle's thoughts were muddled<sup>(52)</sup>. So Guthrie is in agreement with Arnim against Jaeger in seeing that the latter was not right in seeing the Unmoved Mover in this passage. On the contrary Guthrie gave us another passage<sup>(53)</sup> by which he disposes Jaeger's assumption of the presence of the Unmoved Mover.

" on Metrology " that are connected with the first work ), Aristotle presupposes in a general way the doctrine of the Unmoved Mover and so on, partly it appears in these texts as Arnim sees that in " De Caelo " the ethersphere is a mover which is by its own nature eternal with no beginning and no end, with circular motion. This theory is contrary to the supposition that ether sphere is moved by something different from it. But if we suppose that it is implied, how can we attach it to the theory that the ether-sphere is self-moved ? If we suppose an exterior mover in this state - he would be of use, but no Aristotle says that god and nature never do any thing in vain. Ether is corporeal, if there existed a non corporeal mover, this would have to be superior to Ether. And from "De Caelo we" know that Aristotle presents Ether as the supreme substance which represents the divine element in cosmos (49).

4. Arnim points out that there is another passage which contradicts Jaeger's interpretation of the existence of the Unmoved Mover, this passage is Cicero's De Nat. Deo. II. 44<sup>(50)</sup>, where Aristotle refers to three causes for motion and that the

Everything that is moved, is moved either naturally, or by force, or by will. The stars don't move as the four elements upwards and downwards, but in a circle, and since we can not admit that they are moved contrary to the nature, so we have to admit that they are moved by their will, that is by the ether, a spiritual substance, and mere, or material, of the soul. The ether has perception and mind.

2. The theory exposed in "De caelo" of the ether as *κικλοφορικόν* is based on the conception of the self-motion of the ethersphere. If Aristotle had already conceived the theory of god, as an Unmoved Mover who rules all the motions of the cosmos he had not to talk of ether as of *φύσει κίκλον*. In his "on philosophy and " On heavens ", the cosmos is endowed with a soul.

Ether is a body, a matter, even it is, and it remains at the same time *συνόμις*

3. Arnim tried to provide ( p.10 ) more evidence that Jaeger's thesis is without faith (this thesis is that in " De Caelo " and in the "parts of animal " and " De generation and Corruption " .

circular motion of the interior spheres which are moved by the force of themselves. They are self-moved and they are moved by the divinity which resides in them. So god in the dialogue "Περὶ φιλοσοφίας" is not the mover of the first motion, but of the interior and of the circular motions of these internal spheres (sun moon, ect). But the mover of the inner spheres is not the same as the mover of the exterior sphere, and this appeared in the theory expounded in Λ. In the first period the mover is of course the soul that lies in the interior spheres, in the later period it means the exterior mover, who moves the spheres.

In the "Περὶ φιλοσοφίας" Aristotile still bears the platonic influence and considers that the motion has its source in itself, that the world is moved by the soul and the things possessing soul. And in order to prove his point of view Arnim refers to some passages from Aristotle's own writings :

1. Arnim maintains that the motions of the sky in the "Περὶ φιλοσοφίας" are not ascribed to an Unmoved Mover, but to the stars which are made out of ethereal spiritual substance which involves its own motion within itself. Aristotle says :

concept of the Unmoved Mover from Plato's laws.

Those who see in the "on philosophy" the Unmoved Mover of Aristotle, in addition to their dependence on Cicero (De Natura Deorum, I. 33) depending also on the scholia in Prov. Salomonis<sup>(46)</sup> which refers to "something common that unites (the many) and this is the first principle".

The second point of view is represented by Von Arnim<sup>(47)</sup>. He does not find in the fragments of "Περὶ φιλοσοφίας" any indication which could permit us to say that it refers to the "Unmoved first Mover"<sup>(48)</sup>. And in order to support his explanation V. Arnim quotes the passage in Cicero (De Nat. Deo. I. 13, 33) - on which also relies Jaeger - where Epicure criticizes Aristotle's idea. Arnim does not agree with Jaeger seeing that his conviction of the existence of the Unmoved Mover in the (on philosophy) is false for Jaeger based his thesis on the translation of the sentence "replicatione quadam mundi motum regat dque tuateure" a sort of going back movement. Arnim points out that the word "rück- aufig" does not apply to the circular motion of the cosmos through the action of the Unmoved Mover, (Jaeger's hypothesis) but it applies solely to the

The concept of god mentioned by Cicero as "some other ruler over (the divine) universe, who moves the universe by means of reverse motion (aliquando (deum) proficit mundo eique vas partes tribuit ut replicatione quadam mundi motum regat atque tuateure), this concept has aroused many discussions and conflicting interpretations. We can sum them all in three attitudes or points of view. The first is represented by Jaeger<sup>(42)</sup>, who insists that the "on philosophy" of Aristotle contains the idea of the Unmoved Mover. Jaeger based his conviction on a passage of Cicero (De Nat. Deo, I. 33) and reached to the conclusion that Aristotle proclaims in the "on philosophy that the supreme "god" to whom the world is subordinated is the transcendental Unmoved Mover who guides the world as its final cause, by reason of the perfection of his pure thought". This, Jaeger assumes, is the core of Aristotle's early theology. "This immaterial pure intellect Unmoved Mover, separated from the world, since it is pure from, lies over all gods and in this Mover one can find the unity of the world"<sup>(43)</sup>. Also Jaeger holds<sup>(44)</sup> that the notion of a transcendent Unmoved Mover is Platonic in its spirit and is the third possibility mentioned in Plato's laws<sup>(45)</sup> and that Aristotle derives the

Also when Aristotle ascribes divinity to "ether" this does not contradict with the notion of postulating "supreme god". Aether for Aristotle is a different element from the other four traditional elements. It is the element of the heavenly bodies, it is also called "the primary body" with an unchangeable quality<sup>(36)</sup>. We read in "De Caelo": "Men give the highest place a name of its own, namely "ether", which is derived from the fact that "it runs<sup>(37)</sup> always "ἀεὶ θεῖν". This ether being immutable within the corporeal world<sup>(38)</sup>, and the element of the divine stars is divine in its nature. It is important here to notice that when Aristotle used the term divine or god, applying it for both of the universe (the heavens and the fixed stars) and the ether, he does not mean to identify between them and the "supreme god". By divine he means something which is pure unchangeable, ungenerated and indestructible, ageless and impossible something which is not the result of man's hand work. The universe, the heavens are divine in the sense that they are not subject to death and natural incidents of the terrestrial world<sup>(39)</sup>. Moreover when Aristotle called the world divine he did not mean the sublunary world of the changeable elements but he means-as Jaeger maintains - the heavens i.e. the fixed stars.

In his metaphysics Aristotle<sup>(27)</sup> identified between god and the nous, also from Aristotle's protrepticus<sup>(28)</sup>, we are informed that "mind alone is divine" and that since mind is "the divine dwelling in us .. mortal life possesses a certain element of the divine"<sup>(29)</sup>.

Man shares in divinity owing to the dwelling of mind in him. For mind is something divine, but in fact the supreme god is incomparable with the human mind. For god is the "Mind of Minds"<sup>(30)</sup>.

Also when Aristotle says that the universe is god, that does not mean the identification of the universe as "visible god" with the supreme invisible god<sup>(31)</sup>. This point of view is supported by two passages of Philo of Alexandria<sup>(32)</sup>, which are considered to be "fragments of Aristotle's "on philosophy". Philo of Alexandria in his work (De Aeternitate Mundi III 10-10) ascribes to Aristotle that the universe is uncreated and imperishable in short it is eternal and it could not be a work of man's hands<sup>(33)</sup>.

Also Philo<sup>(34)</sup> credits Aristotle with having called the universe the "immense visible god" who included the sun, the moon and the pantheon of the planets and the fixed stars<sup>(35)</sup>.

mind is something, divine, secondly that the universe itself is god thirdly : that there is a god above all the world, who rules and guides the movement of the universe by a sort of reverse motion ( replicatione quadam ). And fourthly that the aether is god.

This paragraph in Cicero was reported by Velleius<sup>(23)</sup>, one of the Epicureans who were out of sympathy with Aristotle<sup>(24)</sup>, and so Velleius mentioned that Aristotle gave us contradicting and confused notions about god<sup>(25)</sup>, each of which contrary to the other, for he ( Aristotle ) identified - from Velleius point of view - god or the supreme ( pure intellect ) with the universe and the other considering both of them as god. But in fact this contradiction, can be reduced to Velleius point of view rather than Aristotle himself.

For when Aristotle attributes divinity to the intellect or the pure Mind this does not contradict with the divinity of the universe or of the ether. For here, Aristotle referring to two different kinds of divinity the lesser divinity or the universe the visible god ( which is deathless, everlasting, over moving which transcends the limitations and imperfections of human existence ), and the " supreme divinity" the supreme good, the  $\text{N\acute{o}\upsilon\varsigma}$ , the True Theos (  $\text{\Theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma}$  )<sup>(26)</sup>.

stars move by their free will, i.e. voluntary.

From these two passages, it can be concluded that the stars are living beings possess purpose, and intelligence, and that their own element is the ether which contains in itself the principle of its motion, the stars move by their own free will, so we can come to the conclusion that they have soul which is the cause of their motion. So in this stage Aristotle adopted the doctrine of the star-soules<sup>(21)</sup>.  
The concept of god in "on philosophy":

According to a passage in cicero<sup>(22)</sup>, we are informed that Aristotle in the third book of his "on philosophy" has a great many confused notions not disagreeing with the doctrines of his master Plato at one moment he assigns divinity exclusively to the intellect, at another he says that the world is itself a god, then again he puts some other being over the world, and assigns to this being the role of regulating and sustaining the world-motion by means of a sort of inverse rotation, then he says that the celestial heat is god not realizing that the heavens are a part of that world which elsewhere he himself has entitled god.

It is clear from cicero's report, that Aristotle assigns divinity first : to the intellect, i.e. the pure

variation, . . . the stars move of their own free will and because of : their intelligence and divinity"(19).

That means that : In every element there are some living beings so it is absurd not to exist living beings in the fifth element, the ether, which is by its own nature pure. We know that ether is the element of the stars. So the stars are living beings. But the regularity and orderliness of their motion presupposes that they must be endowed with the highest intelligence and possess reason and purpose, and since this perfect order and regular circular motion cannot be the product of mechanical nature, it must be the result of a conscious intent and this means that their motion imply free will and inner design. From all these characters which Aristotle gave to the stars, it is easy to conclude with him that the stars have self-cause motion i.e. they are moved by immanent souls.

This result is confirmed by a passage in Cicero<sup>(20)</sup>, where Aristotle laid down three possible causes of motion, nature, force and free will. The motion of the bodies is either upwards or downwards but the motion of the heavenly bodies is circular and this motion cannot be explained by external force, for there is no force greater than the heavenly bodies so the

in the " on philosophy " .

In this first stage Aristotle adopted Plato's theology as it has been expounded in " laws " (18) .

Aristotle started with the notion that the heavenly bodies have souls because they move themselves . According to a passage in cicero Aristotle holds that : " since therefore some living creatures are born in the earth, others in the water and others in air , it is absurd, so Aristotle holds, to suppose that no living animal is born in that element which is most adapted for the generation of living things. But the stars occupy the region of ether, and this has a very rarified substance and it always in lively motion, it follows that the animal born in this region has the keenest senses and the swiftest power of movement, hence since the stars come into existence in the ether, it is reasonable to suppose that they possess sensation and intelligence. And from this it follows that the stars are to be reckoned as gods ... It is therefore likely that the stars possess surpassing intelligence. Again, the consciousness and intelligence of the stars is most clearly evidenced by their order and regularity for regular and rhythmical motion which is impossible without design, which contains no trace of causal or accidental

---

Book two is considered to contain a detailed criticism of Plato's separate Ideas.

Book three contains Aristotle's own view of the world, it was a cosmological and theological part which took the form of a throughout criticism of Plato, for the simple reason that it was depending on him in every step<sup>(11)</sup>. In its essential, Aristotle adopted the astral theology of Plato's later days<sup>(12)</sup>. Also in his dialogue Aristotle examined the doctrine of the eternity of the world, for he rejected the notion that the universe may have a beginning or an end. His own view is that the universe is ungenerated and imperishable<sup>(13)</sup>. Also in this part he examined the movements of the stars and gave his early proofs for the existence of god.

As for the date of its compositions it was suggested that "on philosophy" was written at the same time as the criticism of the forms in the first book of the Metaphysics or slightly later on after Plato's death<sup>(14)</sup>.

Although "on philosophy" is a lost work, yet depending on the fragments recorded by Cicero<sup>(15)</sup>, Sextus Empiricus<sup>(16)</sup>, and Philo Alexandria<sup>(17)</sup> it is possible to introduce a fairly clear picture of Aristotle's theological views as they have been expounded

expounded in "De Caelo," that the ether is the cause of circular motion of the cosmos, and the late theory that the Unmoved Mover is the cause of this motion, the same idea is exposed in physics I - IV when Aristotle maintains that the "Nature" in things is the final cause of motion. And in his physics VII, VIII there is an evolution in his theory which is found also in metaphysics. (A) and which has no connection with his earlier position. Aristotle wrote his book later on as second stage of his evolution, when he abandoned the theory of the soul fixed-stars, as a self-mover, i.e. when he abandoned his master's theory of the soul-cosmos. He wrote it after his cosmological writings had been completed in "De Caelo," "De generation and Corruption," "metreological" and when he had put the seed and origin for his theory of the Unmoved Mover in his physics specially in book H. and Θ.

Aristotle's "on philosophy" represents the first stage of Aristotle's evolution<sup>(10)</sup>. It is a lost work which is a signal part of a distinct period of intellectual transition when Aristotle was preparing himself to strike out a new philosophical attitude. "On philosophy" consists of three books.

Book one begins with an account to the historical development of philosophy.

The stars are "self-movers". As for the second stage it is a natural development for the first stage - as Guthrie believed - it starts when Aristotle begins to study the nature of the element of the heavenly bodies, which is the ether<sup>(9)</sup>. But what is its nature and properties. Here Guthrie transforms to the second stage, which is based on the fact that nature in things is the principle of movement. So ether moves in a circular naturally. But everything that moves is moved by something else, and this series of movers must be terminated in an Unmoved Mover. (Aristotle studies this subject in book H,  $\Delta$ , of his physics). And here Aristotle reached the last stage where he postulated the Unmoved Mover as the cause of the motion of the universe. Von Arnim believed that Aristotle's thought passed two stages, the early and the later views. The first stage for him begins when Aristotle thinks that the sphere of the ether, that which goes round, has the reason of its motion in its own self. In Aristotle's "De Caelo," the ether is presented as a self-mover power. Arnim insists that we cannot find hints of the idea of the Unmoved Mover in both of the "on philosophy" and "De Caelo". And he supported his view by saying that there is no connection between the theory

But, unlike plato, Aristotle is primarily concerned with the cosmological or visible side rather than the transcendental and invisible aspect of this dual world.

Now although most of the scholars accepted Aristotle's development yet they differ in their point of view. let us begin with Jaeger who, analysing or depending on an account of cicero<sup>(7)</sup>, came to the conclusion that in his ( on philosophy ) Aristotle proclaims that the supreme " god to whom the world is subordinated is the transcendental Unmoved Mover , who guides the world as its final cause, by reason of the perfection of his pure thought "<sup>(8)</sup>. This , Jaeger assumes, is the core of Aristotle early theology. And for this reason, it is Jaeger's own view that Aristotle's thought passed several consistent stages and that the idea of the Unmoved Mover, existed in Aristotle's doctrine from the beginning. Again concerning the theory of Aristotle's development, Guthrie, distinguishes, in Aristotle, three stages each of which is a leading step to the other and which in fact show no contradiction. Every stage for him has a specific character. As for the first stage Aristotle, adopted the theory of soul-stars, i.e the cause of motion is reduced to the existence of a soul. So