

# The Final Nails in the Coffin of Aristotle's Unmoved Mover of *Metaphysics* Lambda 6<sup>1</sup>

Gregory L. Scott  
[gls62@caa.columbia.edu](mailto:gls62@caa.columbia.edu)

## Abstract

My Aristotle's "Not to Fear" Proof for the Necessary Eternality of the Universe (2019) argues that the Northern Greek from Stagira dropped the Unmoved Mover ("UM"), typically identified with the "God" of Lambda 7-10, in favor of a proof guaranteeing the *necessary* eternity of the universe, whether or not the outer spheres have souls (required for desiring the UM and contingently moving in the heavenly circle). Subsequently, I published eight "digital extensions," which provide evidence that Aristotle evolved to the *aether qua* divine 5th element, a position that Sarah Broadie independently deemed stronger, even though she argued (in one of the digital extensions) that Aristotle kept both doctrines. The *aether*, however, moves eternally *in virtue of its own nature*, dispensing with the Stagirite's motivation for the UM. Today I provide new evidence based on Eudemus, *On the Cosmos* and the late assemblage of our "*Metaphysics*" to seal the coffin of Aristotle's youthful indiscretion, which he arguably sensibly buried himself.

For the accompanying full handout:

<https://epspress.com/NTF/Ottawa2024Handout.pdf>

For the subsequent arguments regarding why Guthrie is right regarding Aristotle's theological evolution from the first stage (in which Aristotle accepts Plato's view that the outer spheres have souls) to the second stage of *De Caelo* but wrong regarding the third stage of Lambda 6 (and the narcissistic god of Lambda 7-10), see the URLs at the very bottom, from the International Aristotelian Conference, University of Lisbon, July 2-4, 2025. -- GLS, July 6, 2025

---

<sup>1</sup> Available at <https://www.epspress.com/NTF/Ottawa2024.pdf>

First, I want to thank Mark Nyvlt and his colleagues for organizing the conference and the opportunity to not only present my views but to get feedback from any or all of you, especially given that this conference encouraged me to return to my old stomping grounds (I taught here in the Philosophy Department from 1993-95).

A crucial handout of a 10-step proof is available now—which should be circulating—and if you would take a photo of it with your phone and pass it on, I and the forests of Canada will be grateful. There are three URLs at the bottom with all the materials, namely, the 10-step proof; second, the presentation I’m now reading; and finally the 12 pages that have all the relevant textual passages, with translations by renowned specialists of the last 100 years. Given how dense my presentation is and how distracting the handout might be, I ask for your undivided attention until the Q&A, at which point we can address any issue with Greek words per se, which, again, have not been given my perhaps biased translation.

Let’s get started. Before covering the newest evidence for my position, let me first summarize why the modern view that *Metaphysics* Lambda is Aristotle’s best, or one and only, theology arose mistakenly from Alexander of Aphrodisias and Plotinus.

To begin with, an absolutely crucial distinction needs to be made: The Northern Greek from Stagira writes in *Physics* Book VIII Chapter 5 that the man who moves the hand which moves the stick that moves the rock is the first mover, and Aristotle indicates later in the chapter that in a certain sense the man is unmoved, which is to say, unmoved by anything else. **(Text 1 in the full handout.)**

Obviously, the rock-hitting man has matter and surely had moved in many ways before he grabbed a stick. How, then, is he first and unmoved? As I have explained in my book noted in the Abstract with citations from the corpus,<sup>2</sup> the rock-hitter must be first in knowledge or explanation, *not* in ontological kinetics. Keep this in mind, because it will allow us to make sense of the 47 or so prime movers of Lambda Ch 8 (1074a), which have posed perennial dilemmas for scholars trying to resolve how the UM of Lambda 6 can have multiple instantiations, considering that it has neither matter nor potentiality. This is because the Northern Greek says also in Chapter 8 that “all things which are many in number have matter (for one and the same

---

<sup>2</sup> Aristotle’s “Not to Fear” Proof, pp. 253 & 256-7. [Added after the conference, 11/26/24; *Metaphysics* V 1, 1013a16.]

definition applies to many individuals, e.g. that of "man"; but Socrates is *one*)” (trans. H. Tredennick; 1074a33-35).

Now let us recall some history. In my view, the immaterial Mover was part of Aristotle’s youthful attempt to deal with Platonic metaphysics, but was the third “Unmoved Mover” in the philosophical tradition, seemingly improving upon the second, namely, the *Nous of Anaxagoras*, whom Aristotle praises in *Physics* for causing motion only because it itself is unmoved. (**Text 2**)

Anaxagoras himself followed the first Unmoved Mover by Xenophanes. (**Text 3**) However, Robert Mayhew has beautifully shown<sup>3</sup> that the sun-god (*helios*) in Homer was the subject of an analysis by Aristotle because this sun-god oversees and overhears everything. In my view, this sun-god was the primary inspiration for Xenophanes. The Ionian thinker re-configures it to be unlike humans but still a body that is all-seeing and all-hearing. Later on, Anaxagoras removes most or all of the materiality so only *Nous* is considered to be the deity, and finally the youthful Ar removes all materiality *and* potentiality so that the Unmoved Mover is purely non-physical. Unless anyone can figure how to get *negative immateriality*, this seems to be the end of the progression.

Consider now what a seemingly brilliant insight, or better yet, hypothesis, the young Stagirite had. **If** the immaterial Mover exists, it could **never** cease to exist because it has no potential of any kind, including, most importantly, the potential to cease existing. Aristotle thereby seemingly accomplishes what no other previous thinker had done: He *guarantees* both eternal existence of a Platonic-type ontological entity *and*, as I will discuss soon, the resulting eternal motion of the physical universe. Remember, one problem with the Platonic Forms according to Lambda 10 (1075b27-28) is that the Forms, even if they existed, cannot cause motion.

However, I hold that the absurdities of the immaterial Mover were so obvious to the Stagirite’s colleagues in the Academy that shortly after sharing his thoughts, Ar simply dropped some of them. Here, I can only touch upon a few but they are already listed in my digital extension to the aforementioned book, whose URL is provided in the 12-page Handout. (**Text 4A**) Also, to emphasize, I say “Academy” and not “Lyceum” because there is evidence that parts of Lambda were early Aristotle. They were written long before the

---

<sup>3</sup> Robert Mayhew. "Aristotle on Helios' 'omniscience' in Iliad 3 and Odyssey 12: On Schol. b\* Iliad 3.277" in *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* Vol. 60 Iss. 1 (2020) p. 98 - 123 ISSN: 2159-3159.  
Available at: <http://works.bepress.com/robert-mayhew/197/>

Peripatos, even if other parts were kept to the end of his life, e.g. substance is primary.<sup>4</sup>

There are in addition a host of dilemmas in the related doctrine of the god, *ho theos*, of Lambda Chapters 7-10, which thinks of itself thinking, and the dilemmas are also presented at the URL you will have. One oddity is thinking without a brain and body. This is a position found in *De Anima* Book III Chapters 4-5 but is so ridiculous that I will never quit believing that at least some of these passages had to have been interpolated by a later editor or were equally clever but untenable ideas of the youthful Aristotle. As I have argued in my publications, *ho theos* in all other citations in his corpus was him speaking rhetorically or protecting himself politically, because those other invocations of a god never advance his *philosophical* arguments per se. In addition, Michael Bordt has argued persuasively in the article “Why Aristotle's God is Not the Unmoved Mover” in *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy* (2011)<sup>5</sup> that the Unmoved Mover of Lambda 6 cannot be the same as what I call the Narcissistic god, that is, the one which has a blessed life but which thinks of itself thinking for all eternity. If the entity were human, we would call this self-focus the paradigm of selfishness, like Narcissus.

Speaking of eternity, some of you may argue to the end of time that because of the extant texts, Ar must have held that thinking can be done with no brain. However, that issue is not my concern today—I readily grant that in his early 20s he tried to advance a Platonic metaphysics in which thinking *was* utterly immaterial. I claim, however, that his other theory, such as the divine 5th element, and the history after him for 500 years, shows absolutely no evidence of him maintaining such a bizarre psycho-theology as he matured. Moreover, the related doctrine of the immaterial Mover is completely negated by other texts, such as *De Caelo* Books I and II, all of which renders the UM completely unnecessary.

## 500 Years of Embarrassing Silence

Let us continue now with a few historical considerations. My publications have demonstrated that not one Peripatetic, or any other philosopher, for half a millennium accepted either the immaterial Mover **or** the Narcissistic god. This kind of god necessarily could not even be aware of the physical universe,

---

<sup>4</sup> The Stagirite need only drop a few claims, like, e.g., the notion of Pure Actuality as posited in Ch 6 and the end of Ch 8 1074a35, when he says “the primary essence has no matter, because it is complete reality (*entelecheia*).” (Trans. Tredennick).

<sup>5</sup> Michael Bordt, “Why Aristotle's God is Not the Unmoved Mover,” *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy*, Vol. XL, Summer (2011) 91-109.

and *a fortiori* could not be providential. The more telling consideration for me, however, is that no one after Theophrastus for five full centuries even cared to discuss the doctrines, much less accept them! Let me repeat: No one after Theophrastus even cared to discuss the doctrines,—until Alexander.

Theophrastus alludes to the immaterial Mover in passing in an *aporia*, a puzzle. However, he does not accept this doctrine and also complains about desire being the cause of motion, apparently referring to the desire of the outer spheres for the Unmoved Mover. However, the philosopher from Lesbos retorts that the desiring entities would likewise want to be at rest. Moreover, to my knowledge he never even discusses a Narcissistic god. Ultimately, in his own first philosophy, nature alone is sufficient to account for motion (10a6-17), a theory which is identical in essence, if not in exact details, with the 5th element.<sup>6</sup> (TEXT 4B)

The later Peripatetics for whom relevant texts survive include Eudemus of Rhodes; Strato, the third head of the Lyceum who like Theophrastus thought that nature in and of itself was sufficient to explain eternal motion; Critolaus, the head in the 2nd century BCE; and Xenarchus of Seleucia in the 1st century BCE. Even the anti-Aristotelian Platonizing Atticus of the 2nd century CE argued against Aristotle's divine 5th element, mentioning explicitly neither the immaterial Mover *nor* the Narcissistic god.

I have already discussed some of these thinkers' texts in print and I add more at the end today. They help demonstrate that Aristotle, rather than having one static theology for his whole life, evolved to the 5th element, dropping his seemingly brilliant idea of the immaterial Mover. Nevertheless, the Northern Greek always accepts the material first movers of the *Physics*, which allows the multiple ones of Lambda 8. The issue of the Narcissistic god is different in my view, but, to emphasize, "god" in the corpus, whether or not it means the same Narcissistic deity, merely is hortatory or provides political cover so that Ar would not be put to death for atheism (see Text 5 in **handout for the URLs**). If you think that this idea is far-fetched, then, even leaving aside Anaxagoras' fate, just reread Plato's *Laws* Book 10, which requires that atheists be executed or at least sentenced to jail for 5 years to determine whether they are corrigible; if not, they too are executed.

---

<sup>6</sup> Theophrastus seemingly was at the Academy with the Stagirite during a substantial period of the 350s and there is a good chance, which no one has explored to my knowledge, that, rather than vice-versa, he inspired Ar to accept the same general thesis, with the 5th element being sufficient in and of itself for Ar to account for the eternal motion of the universe.

## **How the Immaterial Mover fails to cause eternal physical motion**

Despite Aristotle's clever, youthful words, the immaterial Mover could not guarantee the motion of the universe, for reasons I have also already published at the URLs you'll have. **(TEXT 6a)** To save time now, I jump immediately to the worst problem for the outer spheres moving because of their desire for the Unmoved Mover. The problem is that these eternal entities *do not and cannot have souls*, given the accounts in *De Caelo* Books I and II, including the analogy of Ixion in Book II Chapter 1. Similarly to Prometheus, Ixion was punished for all time, in his case because of inappropriate advances towards Hera, and Aristotle indicates that eternal living bodies would have a miserable existence because they could not even have the benefit of sleep, which we have. Because desiring the UM requires souls on the part of the outer spheres, *if none of them can have a soul*, they cannot desire. If they cannot desire, they cannot move. Yet they cannot have souls in the *DC* because they are eternal bodies, of which more later when discussing Eudemus and in a few seconds when covering WKC Guthrie. *De Caelo* in my view proves, therefore, that Ar dropped his clever but unsustainable theory of Lambda 6. **(TEXT 6b)**

Regarding Guthrie, in his translation of *DC* from 1939, which was continually reprinted until at least 1986 and which is still available for purchase today, he agrees that Ar evolved *and that DC is utterly inconsistent with the immaterial Mover*. However, Guthrie holds that the Stagirite had a three-stage evolution. According to Guthrie, in *On Philosophy* Aristotle believed in ensouled outer spheres, following Plato, but then advanced to the theory of *DC*. However, for puzzling or poor reasons, Guthrie then claims that Aristotle subsequently returned to his earlier position, namely, that the outer spheres **do** have souls, with Ar *ultimately advocating the immaterial Mover*. Despite Guthrie's wonderfully lucid account of various precise relationships between Lambda and *DC*, his 3-stage evolution is riddled with problems. However, in the interest of time, I relegate a few crucial statements in the 12-page Handout. **(TEXT 6c)** The more sensible position in my view follows Philodemus, who, according to Guthrie himself, considered Lambda to be *early "exoteric" Aristotle*. This is completely consistent with the *exoteric On Philosophy* and supports, if inadvertently, my interpretation that only a second and final major stage of evolution occurred, to *DC*. Moreover and rather shockingly, in his notes to *DC* Book I Ch 8, Guthrie acknowledges Aristotle's explicit reference there to QUOTE "first philosophy" UNQUOTE and even interprets that reference as having implications for the immaterial

Mover, which hardly squares with his, Guthrie's, own opinion that Lambda was written *after DC*. If anything, this passage in *DC* is more evidence that Lambda was earlier.

In brief, as confirmed by *Meteorology* and seemingly also by *Peri Kosmou*, which I'll examine at the end today, the 5th element replaces the desiring outer spheres. (**TEXT 7**) This element was well discussed by later Peripatetics and by Atticus, so I note now only a few considerations pertaining to it. It was also called the "aether" or "always running," given its ancient etymology. The Stagirite calls it the first element in *DC*, not the fifth, because of its priority, with the other four elements—fire, air, earth, and water—rounding out the handful. Just as the four move in a straight line according to their natures, up or down, the 5th element moves eternally in a circle *because of its own nature*. This nature dispenses with any need to have a soul or an Unmoved Mover, just as the other four elements have no need of a soul of their own. Their natures or material causes are sufficient for their motions.

The Northern Greek also says that the 5th element is divine, and it can be unmoved or a prime mover, but he must mean this in the sense of the *Physics*. The 5th element is obviously physical because we see the heavens and its eternal spheres, and according to Ar, human records show the same movement for generation after generation.

It is only with Alexander and Plotinus that philosophers assume Lambda's immaterial Mover is the Northern Greek's theology, with all or almost all of you laboring under this same misconception, I venture to say. Yet, to my knowledge, and I would happily be corrected, neither Alexander nor Plotinus ever considered the 5th element, and Plotinus thereby, if unintentionally, sets up a straw man by only accounting for the weaker theory of the youthful Stagirite.

The 5th element has one potential flaw. What if the seemingly never changing circular motion of the spheres is off by even an inch in 1000 years? Then the human records that Ar knew about, which on different accounts range from about 8,000 to 630,000 or even 1.5 million years (**TEXT 8**), are no guarantee that the spheres won't change course, collide and ultimately go out of existence, even if a centillion years down the line (a centillion, in case you forgot, is 10 to the 600th power, which, to speak loosely, is still a minuscule fraction of infinity).

This is why my published "Not to Fear" Proof is arguably stronger and supplements any argument in *DC* for the universe being ungenerated and indestructible. The proof's name comes from the conclusion stated in

*Metaphysics* Theta 8, 1050b19-24, when Ar writes that we have no fear the sun and stars will ever stand still. The Proof, as I originally formulated it, is based on three of his indubitable principles: first, the infinite past; second, the so-called Principle of Plenitude and, third, an ontological meaning of three modal terms—possibility, impossibility, and necessity—in a triangular scheme that has also been called “two-sided possibility” in *Prior Analytics*. This is contrasted with “one-sided possibility” in which impossibility is the *only* opposite.

In the ontological sphere, necessity primarily means “that which always happens” (and “always” here means eternally); impossibility means “that which *never* happens throughout eternity,” and possibility means that which happens *at least once but finitely*. These meanings can be extracted from *DC* Book I and were introduced to me over 20 years ago in the analysis of Aristotle’s logic, ontology and the Principle of Plenitude by Jaakko Hintikka, Sarah Broadie, and Jeroen van Rijen.<sup>7</sup> However, what those scholars never emphasized, if they even acknowledged it, is that possibility is even more ambiguous and has three other meanings in the *Prior Analytics* Book I Ch 3, 25a37-39: as Ar says, “...possibility is said in several ways (*pollachōs legetai to endechesthai*), for we call the necessary, the not necessary, and the potential possible.” This ultimately means from one perspective that the eternal universe is *neither* possible *nor* potential, a claim that Aristotle emphasizes in Theta 8 and that many, if not most, scholars seemingly do not understand, with Stephen Makin being an arguable exception, because they have missed Aristotle’s triangular modal model in this chapter.<sup>8</sup>

Regarding now the Principle of Plenitude: It has been given various formulations throughout history, and thinkers like Leibniz and Jonathan Barnes have taken it to mean QUOTE “anything which can be thought is a possibility eventually actualized in an eternity,” UNQUOTE but I myself take

---

<sup>7</sup> The full bibliography is in my *Aristotle’s “Not to Fear” Proof*, but the primary works are: Jaakko Hintikka, *Time and Necessity: Studies in Aristotle’s Theory of Modality* (Oxford: Clarendon Press) 1973; Sarah (Waterlow) Broadie, *Passage and Possibility: A Study of Aristotle’s Modal Concepts* (Oxford: Clarendon Press) 1982; and Jeroen van Rijen, *Aspects of Aristotle’s Logic of Modalities* (Dordrecht/Boston/London: Kluwer Academic Publishers) 1989.

<sup>8</sup> Stephen Makin admirably recognizes the different modal model in Theta 8, but he does not draw out the ramifications relative to Lambda (*Aristotle Metaphysics Book Theta*, translated with an Introduction and Commentary, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2006). Two who have missed two-sided possibility in Theta 8 are Jonathan Beere (*Doing and Being: An Interpretation of Aristotle’s Metaphysics Theta*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009) and seemingly Marko Malink, who himself acknowledges Beere while missing Makin and who, relative to the *Metaphysics*, only cites one-sided possibility in Theta 4 ([https://as.nyu.edu/content/dam/nyu-as/philosophy/documents/faculty-documents/malink/Malink\\_Aristotle-Possibility.pdf](https://as.nyu.edu/content/dam/nyu-as/philosophy/documents/faculty-documents/malink/Malink_Aristotle-Possibility.pdf)). One might say Malink had no need to mention the two-sided meaning but he actually does have a reason, because he cites Gisela Striker writing that “it would seem absurd to say that what is necessary is not possible” and he states that Ar using the past tense reflects the Stagirite’s concern for two-sided possibility rather than one-sided possibility in the so-called organon. He does not consider that two-sided possibility instead has the meaning of occurring once in an infinity, as explained by Hintikka, Broadie and van Rijen. Nevertheless, apart from this issue, I recommend Malink’s article for providing a clear exposition of a dilemma regarding both one-sided and two-sided possibility in the *Analytics*.

the only critical formulation today to be from *Physics* Book III Ch 4:  
“Concerning that which is eternal, what may be, is.”<sup>9</sup>

The infinite past I hardly need to explain to this audience, and in my book, I offer a 12-step Not to Fear Proof to account for *finite* instantiations of eternal kinds, like humans, art, and what have you to correct the weaknesses that I thought were in the otherwise admirable scholarship of Hintikka and Broadie. However, since today I am concerned *only* with eternity or eternal substances for the Northern Greek, I provide a shorter 10-step proof in the handout, one that does not need the Principle of Plenitude. (TEXT 9)

Given the ontological primacy of the 5th element and its inclusion of the divine sun and stars, the conclusion of the 10-step proof obviously implies that Aristotle himself need not fear the heavens will stop. The conclusion also entails that he drops the “*logically possible*” eternal universe of Lambda, as alluded to above and explained in detail in a digital extension to my book. (TEXT 10). The universe is *necessary in the ontological sense*. Consequently, even apart from *DC* and the issue of whether eternal outer spheres have souls, the Northern Greek no longer needs the immaterial Mover.<sup>10</sup>

In short, the metaphysical “Not to Fear” Proof is different from, and does not rely in its premises on, the meteorological aspects of the 5th element such as human records. The Proof reveals why for Aristotle the physical universe has always existed and will always exist, and any rejection of its statements, leaving aside the belief that the aether is part of the universe and includes the sun and stars, seemingly implies greater absurdity than what one might impute to any part of the Proof. That is, even today in Ottawa I challenge anyone to find tenable reasons to reject statements 1-9.

### Three New Pieces of Evidence

Alas, I have almost run out of time, as my rehearsal suggested I might, so I only summarize the three new pieces. However, anticipating this, I provide in the 12-page handout the texts and fuller arguments, and we can discuss any of

---

<sup>9</sup> *Physics* III 4, 203b30; transl. by R.P. Hardie and R.K. Gaye, in J. Barnes, *The Complete Works of Aristotle*, *op. cit.*, as are other passages from the *Physics*. In the web version, they translate “For...eternal things, **what may be must be [my bolding]**.” (*Endechesthai gar ē einai ouden diapherei en tois aidiois.*) This Principle was either inspired by, or it inspired, Plato’s similar thoughts in *Timaeus* 37e. I should add that Plato and Aristotle are right in one fundamental manner: We say “2+2 **is** 4,” not “2+2 **will be** 4” or “2+2 **has been** 4,” even if all three statements are everlastingly true. For a brief account on the different formulations of the Principle of Plenitude, formulations that have led to arguments at cross-purposes across centuries, see:

<https://www.epspress.com/NTF/VariousVersionsOfThePrinciple.pdf>

<sup>10</sup> A further, practical ramification of all of this is that the Unmoved Mover *qua* God deserves only as much scholarly attention in the future as the Unmoved Movers of Xenophanes and Anaxagoras, and for the same reasons, despite Aristotle’s praise of Anaxagoras in this regard at *Physics* VIII 5, 256b25-28.

it in the Q&A. My email is also there, and I will gladly reply to any later feedback.

### Eudemus of Rhodes—See TEXT 11 for fuller treatment

Eudemus paraphrased Aristotle's *Physics* and is often known because of the *Eudemian Ethics*. Nothing that he says about prime movers, however, need apply to the non-physical version. Indeed, his statements are better applied to unmoved movers that have matter:

- First, he speaks of prime movers, plural, not a single prime mover, so he must be using the sense of *Physics* VIII and the approximately 47 movers of Lambda;
- Second, Simplicius reports Eudemus saying that QUOTE “**the heaven is not moved by something else but by itself,**” UNQUOTE which is consistent with the theory of the 5th element but not with Lambda 6;
- Third and last, Eudemus and Aristotle distinguish motion of substances in virtue of their own nature from self-motion: ***self-motion implies life as well as the ability to stop itself***; yet the five elements cannot stop their own motion voluntarily. They always move according to their nature, what we might call their material cause.

### ***Peri Kosmou* (On the Cosmos) aka De Mundo (“DM”)—See TEXT 12 for fuller treatment**

*DM* has no indication whatsoever of a Narcissistic god. The god that is described in the book, sometimes called Zeus, is utterly at odds with the Narcissistic one and seems inspired by Plato and folk religion.

As I noted, though, *DM* explicitly refers to the divine 5th element, and that theory is most consistent with 47 minimal prime movers, not an immaterial one.

### **The Creation of our *Metaphysics*: Lloyd Gerson, Jonathan Barnes, and Silvia Fazzo —See TEXT 13 for fuller treatment**

[Not read at the Conference because of time limitations: Gerson, whom you all probably know, gives the evidence that at first, second and even third glance “our” *Metaphysics* was QUOTE “pretty largely an academic failure,” UNQUOTE and that in the ancient tradition QUOTE “there exists not a single commentary by one hand on the entire work as preserved and edited by Andronicus of Rhodes.” UNQUOTE Barnes says that QUOTE “So far as I know, in none of these textual discussions [by the serious commentators like Alexander, Ammonius and Simplicius] is there any reference to a ‘canonical’ edition of the Aristotelian works, or any hint that one particular manuscript tradition might be better than another.” UNQUOTE Silvia Fazzo, an Italian professor of Ancient Greek philosophy and a specialist in palaeography and in the transmission of the manuscripts of the *Metaphysics* —who I was delighted to discover is presenting at this conference—provides evidence that the various books (*biblia*) as we have them were still being configured,

edited and assembled seemingly as late as the middle of the 4th century CE by the late Peripatetic scholars called μεταγενέστεροι and that at least one of the archetypes of the ultimate collection, the so-called “subject matter” (*pragmateia*), of the books was apparently created because of a commission by Constantius II for the imperial library in Constantinople in 352 CE.]

The work of these three modern scholars, *albeit unintentionally*, seems to support my claim that the books of our *Metaphysics* were not an organic unity by the Northern Greek, which I am not the first to claim. That is, our tome is an agglomeration of manuscripts and *we should not, therefore, assume that Aristotle’s final theological conclusions were necessarily in the twelfth book, Lambda*. Rather, it seems better to establish his more sophisticated, mature and sensible theory, with *De Caelo*, the divine 5th element and the ninth book of the *Metaphysics*, Theta, all being actually later and better.

Edits:

8 March 2025. The typo "esoteric" on p. 6 was corrected to "exoteric."

4 July 2025: URLs for follow-up conference at the University of Lisbon, July 2-4, 2025:

### **From the International Aristotelian Conference, University of Lisbon, July 2-4, 2025**

The crucial link for my presentation on Guthrie's mistakes for the 3-stage evolution (accepting his view on the first two stages); the Presentation includes the URL for the separate Handout:

<https://epspress.com/Lisbon2025/Presentation20minutes.pdf>

The URLs for Claudio Veloso’s own assets: His Reply and Handout:

<https://epspress.com/Lisbon2025/URLsForVeloso.pdf>

The URL for my Primary Responses to Veloso’s Reply:

<https://epspress.com/Lisbon2025/PrimaryCommentsOnCWVreply.pdf>

The URL for my Secondary Responses to Veloso’s Reply, very detailed rebuttals of 95% of his arguments, especially the disastrous view of Lindsay Judson regarding *De Caelo*:

<https://epspress.com/Lisbon2025/SecondaryCommentsOnCWVreply.pdf>

Finally, in the last footnote of the Secondary responses, there is a fourth link to an Appendix with passages that any serious scholar trying to argue for the “static” view of the corpus should handle, in my opinion, if they are to assert rigor.