

PD11 - Alternate Translations

Post by “Cassius” of November 19, 2017 at 11:39 AM

Bailey: 11. If we were not troubled by our suspicions of the phenomena of the sky, and about death, fearing that it concerns us, and also by our failure to grasp the limits of pains and desires, we should have no need of natural science.

ΕΙ ΜΗΘΕΝ **ΗΜΑΣ ΑΙ ΤΩΝ ΜΕΤΕΩΡΩΝ ΥΠΟΨΙΑΙ ΗΝΩΧΛΟΥΝ**

ΚΑΙ ΑΙ ΠΕΡΙ ΘΑΝΑΤΟΥ **ΜΗ ΠΟΤΕ ΠΡΟΣ ΗΜΑΣ Η ΤΙ ΕΤΙ ΤΕ ΤΟ**

ΜΗ ΚΑΤΑΝΟΕΙΝ **ΤΟΥΣ ΟΡΟΥΣ ΤΩΝ ΑΛΓΗΔΟΝΩΝ ****ΚΑΙ ΤΩΝ**

ΕΠΙΘΥΜΙΩΝ **ΟΥΚ ΑΝ ΠΡΟΣΕΔΕΟΜΕΘΑ ΦΥΣΙΟΛΟΓΙΑΣ. **

“If apprehensions relating to the heavenly bodies did not disturb us, and if the terrors of death have no concern with us, and if we had the courage to contemplate the boundaries of pain and of the desires, we should have no need of physiological studies.” Yonge (1853)

“If we had never been molested by alarms at celestial and atmospheric phenomena, nor by the misgiving that death somehow affects us, nor by neglect of the proper limits of pains and desires, we should have had no need to study natural science.” Hicks (1910)

“If we were not troubled by our suspicions of the phenomena of the sky and about death, fearing that it concerns us, and also by our failure to grasp the limits of pains and desires, we should have no need of natural science.” Bailey (1926)

“If our dread of the phenomena above us, our fear lest death concern us, and our inability to discern the limits of pains and desires were not vexations to us, we would have no need of the natural sciences.” Geer (1964)

“Were we not upset by the worries that celestial phenomena and death might matter to us, and also by failure to appreciate the limits of pains and desires, we would have no need for natural philosophy.” Long, *The Hellenistic Philosophers* 155 (1987)

“If apprehensions about the heavens and our fear lest death concern us, as well as our failure to realize the limits of pains and desires, did not bother us, we would have no need of natural science.” O'Connor (1993)

“If our suspicions about heavenly phenomena and about death did not trouble us at all and were never anything to us, and, moreover, if not knowing the limits of pains and desires did not trouble us, then we would have no need of natural science.” Inwood & Gerson (1994)

“If we were never troubled by how phenomena in the sky or death might concern us, or by our failures to grasp the limits of pains and desires, we would have no need to study nature.” Anderson (2004)

“If we were never perturbed by frightful second-guessing of natural phenomena and death; if, adding to the above, we were never [beset by] failure to comprehend the proper limits of pains and pleasures: then, we would have no need of natural science.” Makridis (2005)

“If our suspicions about astronomical phenomena and about death were nothing to us and troubled us not at all, and if this were also the case regarding our ignorance about the limits of our pains and desires, then we would have no need for studying what is natural.” Saint-Andre (2008)

“We would have no need for natural science unless we were worried by apprehensiveness regarding the heavenly bodies, by anxiety about the meaning of death, and also by our failure to understand the limitations of pain and desire.” Strodach (2012)

“If we were not harassed by apprehensions caused by celestial phenomena and by the fear that death somehow affects us, and by our failure to comprehend the limits of pains and desires, we would have no need for natural science.” Mensch (2018)

“If no worries about celestial things troubled us at all, or any about death possibly mattering for us, or again if we did not understand the boundaries of pain and desire, we would have no more need for the study of nature.” White (2021)