

Demetrius Lacon - Main Biography

Post by "Don" of November 26, 2023 at 11:36 PM

[Quote from Bryan](#)

On one hand we have outlined the likely possibilities, and should probably suspend judgment.

But just for fun:

My sentiments exactly 😄 ...

[Quote from Bryan](#)

In this case we are looking for something specifically that is not perceptible "by the 5 senses" as the text says (οὐδὲν αἰσθητόν) but is perceptible by the mind.

I'm still not entirely sure/convinced of the syntax of that sentence, whether:

πάλιν τε οὐδὲν διφυῆς αἰσθητόν.

or

πάλιν τε οὐδὲν διαφανές αἰσθητόν.

I'm going to talk some of this out in real time, so I hope you all will indulge me.

διφυῆς and διαφανές are both neuter nominative/accusative singular adjectives.

διφυῆς is the "two natures; of double nature or form, generally, twofold, double"

διαφανές is translucent, transparent; but can also be metaphorically "manifest, distinct, distinctly seen, conspicuous"

[Henry George Liddell, Robert Scott, A Greek-English Lexicon, διαφαν-ής](#)

But we know adjectives can be used as substantives so one/both of these could be "that which is X"

αἰσθητόν "sensible, perceptible; able to be perceived by the senses" can also be nominative/accusative singular. Same here: Either an adjective or "a sensible/perceptible thing."

To get back to [Bryan](#) 's comment above:

[Quote from Bryan](#)

In this case we are looking for something specifically that is not perceptible "by the 5 senses" as the text says (οὐδὲν αἰσθητόν) but is perceptible by the mind. Although translucent things may not be visible by a focus of the senses (ἡ ἐπιβολή τῶν αἰσθήσεων) they must be visible by a focus with the mind (ἡ ἐπιβολή τῆς διανοίας) - because we can get a mental image of "a translucent object" whereas we cannot of "something simultaneously having both greater and lesser density within a defined space" - which is equivalent to imagining two atoms at the same point at the same time.

Why does the topic of the sentence have to be "perceptible by the mind"? Is the import of the sentence talking about things that are being ruled out as being imperceptible by *all* the senses (physical and mental)? Saying in effect, the gods cannot exist in this "two-natured" state, so Demetrius is ruling it out?

That pesky οὐδὲν "nothing" in there seems to be saying that "Once again, nothing (which is) X (διφυῆς/διαφανές) is able to be perceived by the senses (5 physical senses + the mind)" or to look at adverbially, "Once again, in no way is "an X-thing" (διφυῆς/διαφανές) able to be perceived by the senses (5 physical senses + the mind)."

And that pesky "once again" seems to be referring back to something previously discussed in the text. But what??