

The aim of this book is to explain the shape of Greek mathematical thinking. It can be read on three levels: first as a description of the practices of Greek mathematics; second as a theory of the emergence of the deductive method; and third as a case-study for a general view on the history of science. The starting point for the enquiry is geometry and the lettered diagram. Reviel Netz exploits the mathematicians' practices in the construction and lettering of their diagrams, and the continuing interaction between text and diagram in their proofs, to illuminate the underlying cognitive processes. A close examination of the mathematical use of language follows, especially mathematicans' use of repeated formulae. Two crucial chapters set out to show how mathematical proofs are structured and explain why Greek mathematical practice manages to be so satisfactory. A final chapter looks into the broader historical setting of Greek mathematical practice.

REVIEL NETZ is a Research Fellow at Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge, and an Affiliated Lecturer in the Faculty of Classics.



IDEAS IN CONTEXT 51

## THE SHAPING OF DEDUCTION IN GREEK MATHEMATICS



#### IDEAS IN CONTEXT

Edited by Quentin Skinner (General Editor)
Lorraine Daston, Wolf Lepenies, J. B. Schneewind and James Tully

The books in this series will discuss the emergence of intellectual traditions and of related new disciplines. The procedures, aims and vocabularies that were generated will be set in the context of the alternatives available within the contemporary frameworks of ideas and institutions. Through detailed studies of the evolution of such traditions, and their modification by different audiences, it is hoped that a new picture will form of the development of ideas in their concrete contexts. By this means, artificial distinctions between the history of philosophy, of the various sciences, of society and politics, and of literature may be seen to dissolve.

The series is published with the support of the Exxon Foundation.

A list of books in the series will be found at the end of the volume.



# THE SHAPING OF DEDUCTION IN GREEK MATHEMATICS

A Study in Cognitive History

REVIEL NETZ





## PUBLISHED BY THE PRESS SYNDICATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE The Pitt Building, Trumpington Street, Cambridge, United Kingdom

#### CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 2RU, UK 40 West 20th Street, New York NY 10011–4211, USA 477 Williamstown Road, Port Melbourne, VIC 3207, Australia Ruiz de Alarcón 13, 28014 Madrid, Spain Dock House, The Waterfront, Cape Town 8001, South Africa

http://www.cambridge.org

© Reviel Netz 1999

This book is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 1999 First paperback edition 2003

Typeset in 11/12½pt Baskerville No. 2 [GC]

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress cataloguing in publication data

Netz, Reviel.

The shaping of deduction in Greek mathematics: a study in cognitive history / Reviel Netz.

p. cm. – (Ideas in context; 51)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 0 521 62279 4 (hardback)

1. Mathematics, Greek. 2. Logic. I. Title. II. Series.

QA27.G8N47 1999

510'.938-dc21 98-20463 CIP

ISBN 0 521 62279 4 hardback ISBN 0 521 54120 4 paperback

Transferred to digital printing 2003



To Maya



### **Contents**

Preface	page xi
List of abbreviations	xiii
The Greek alphabet	xvi
Note on the figures	xvii
Introduction	I
A specimen of Greek mathematics	9
I The lettered diagram	12
2 The pragmatics of letters	68
3 The mathematical lexicon	89
4 Formulae	127
5 The shaping of necessity	168
6 The shaping of generality	240
7 The historical setting	271
Appendix: The main Greek mathematicians cited in the book	313
Bibliography Index	316 323



## Preface

This book was conceived in Tel Aviv University and written in the University of Cambridge. I enjoyed the difference between the two, and am grateful to both.

The question one is most often asked about Greek mathematics is: 'Is there anything left to say?' Indeed, much has been written. In the late nineteenth century, great scholars did a stupendous work in editing the texts and setting up the basic historical and mathematical framework. But although the materials for a historical understanding were there, almost all the interpretations of Greek mathematics offered before about 1975 were either wildly speculative or ahistorical. In the last two decades or so, the material has finally come to life. A small but highly productive international community of scholars has set up new standards of precision. The study of Greek mathematics today can be rigorous as well as exciting. I will not name here the individual scholars to whom I am indebted. But I can – I hope – name this small community of scholars as a third institution to which I belong, just as I belong to Tel Aviv and to Cambridge. Again I can only express my gratitude.

So I have had many teachers. Some were mathematicians, most were not. I am not a mathematician, and this book demands no knowledge of mathematics (and only rarely does it demand some knowledge of Greek). Readers may feel I do not stress sufficiently the value of Greek mathematics in terms of mathematical content. I must apologise – I owe this apology to the Greek mathematicians themselves. I study form rather than content, partly because I see the study of form as a way into understanding the content. But this content – those discoveries and proofs made by Greek mathematicians – are both beautiful and seminal. If I say less about these achievements, it is because I have looked elsewhere, not because my appreciation of them is not as keen as it should be. I have stood on the shoulders of giants –



xii Preface

to get a good look, from close quarters, at the giants themselves. And if I saw some things which others before me did not see, this may be because I am more short-sighted.

I will soon plunge into the alphabetical list. Three names must stand out – and they happen to represent the three communities mentioned above. Sabetai Unguru first made me read and understand Greek mathematics. Geoffrey Lloyd, my Ph.D. supervisor, shaped my view of Greek intellectual life, indeed of intellectual life in general. David Fowler gave innumerable suggestions on the various drafts leading up to this book – as well as giving his inspiration.

A British Council Scholarship made it possible to reach Cambridge prior to my Ph.D., as a visiting member at Darwin College. Awards granted by the ORS, by the Lessing Institute for European History and Civilization, by AVI and, most crucially, by the Harold Hyam Wingate Foundation made it possible to complete graduate studies at Christ's College, Cambridge. The book is a much extended and revised version of the Ph.D. thesis, prepared while I was a Research Fellow at Gonville and Caius College. It is a fact, not just a platitude, that without the generosity of all these bodies this book would have been impossible. My three Cambridge colleges, in particular, offered much more than can be measured.

I owe a lot to Cambridge University Press. Here, as elsewhere, I find it difficult to disentangle 'form' from 'content'. The Press has contributed greatly to both, and I wish to thank, in particular, Pauline Hire and Margaret Deith for their perseverance and their patience.

The following is the list – probably incomplete – of those whose comments influenced directly the text you now read (besides the three mentioned already). My gratitude is extended to them, as well as to many others: R. E. Aschcroft, Z. Bechler, M. F. Burnyeat, K. Chemla, S. Cuomo, A. E. L. Davis, G. Deutscher, R. P. Duncan-Jones, P. E. Easterling, M. Finkelberg, G. Freudental, C. Goldstein, I. Grattan-Guinness, S. J. Harrison, A. Herreman, J. Hoyrup, E. Hussey, P. Lipton, I. Malkin, J. Mansfeld, I. Mueller, J. Ritter, K. Saito, J. Saxl, D. N. Sedley, B. Sharples, L. Taub, K. Tybjerg, B. Vitrac, L. Wischik.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> I have mentioned above the leap made in the study of Greek mathematics over the last two decades. This owes everything to the work of Wilbur Knorr, who died on 18 March 1997, at the age of 51. Sadly, he did not read this book – yet the book would have been impossible without him.



## Abbreviations

#### GREEK AUTHORS

Abbreviation	Work (standard title)	Author
de Aedific.	de Aedificiis	Procopius
Amat.	Amatores	[Plato]
APo.	Analytica Posteriora	Aristotle
APr.	Analytica Priora	Aristotle
Av.	Aves	Aristophanes
Cat.	Categoriae	Aristotle
CF	On Floating Bodies	Archimedes
CS	On Conoids and Spheroids	Archimedes
DC	Measurement of Circle	Archimedes
D.L.	Lives of Philosophers	Diogenes Laertius
EE	Ethica Eudemia	Aristotle
El. Harm.	Elementa Harmonica	Aristoxenus
de Eloc.	Demetrius on Style	Demetrius
EN	$Ethica \ {\it Nicomachea}$	Aristotle
Epin.	<i>Epinomis</i>	[Plato] (Plato?)
Euthd.	Euthydemus	Plato
Euthyph.	Euthyphro	Plato
Grg.	Gorgias	Plato
HA	Historia Animalium	Aristotle
Hip. Mai.	Hippias Maior	Plato
Hip. Min.	Hippias Minor	Plato
In de Cael.	In Aristotelis de Caelo	
	Commentaria	Simplicius
In Eucl.	In Euclidem	Proclus
In Phys.	In Aristotelis Physica	
	Commentaria	Simplicius

xiii



xiv	Abbreviations	
Abbreviation	Work (standard title)	Author
de Int.	de Interpretatione	Aristotle
In SC	In Archimedes' SC	Eutocius
In Theaetet.	Anonymi Commentarius	
	In Platonis Theaetetum	Anonymous
Lgs.	de Legibus	Plato
Mech.	Mechanica	[Aristotle]
Mem.	Memorabilia	Xenophon
Metaph.	Metaphysica	Aristotle
Meteor.	Meteorologica	Aristotle
Meth.	The Method	Archimedes
$\mathcal{N}u$ .	$\mathcal{N}ubes$	Aristophanes
Ort.	Risings and Settings	Autolycus
Parm.	Parmenides	Plato
de Part.	de Partibus Animalium	Aristotle
PE	Plane Equilibria	Archimedes
Phaedr.	Phaedrus	Plato
Phys.	Physica	Aristotle
QP	Quadrature of the Parabola	Archimedes
Rep.	Republica	Plato
SC	On Sphere and Cylinder	Archimedes
SE	Sophistici Elenchi	Aristotle
SL	Spiral Lines	Archimedes
Theaetet.	Theaetetus	Plato
Tim.	Timaeus	Plato
Vit. Alc.	Vita Alcibiadis	Plutarch
Vita Marc.	Aristotelis Vita	
	Marciana	Anonymous
Vita Pyth.	de Vita Pythagorica	Iamblichus

#### ROMAN AUTHORS

Abbreviation	Work (standard title)	Author
Ann.	Annales	Tacitus
Nat. Hist.	Naturalis Historia	Pliny the Elder
$\mathcal{N}\!D$	de Natura Deorum	Cicero
de Rep.	de Republica	Cicero
Tusc.	Tusculanae Disputationes	Cicero



#### Abbreviations

XV

#### DOCUMENTARY SOURCES

Abbreviation Standard title

BGU Berliner griechische Urkunden

FD Fouilles de Delphes
ID Inscriptions Délos
IG Inscriptionae Graecae

IGChEg. Inscriptionae Graecae (Christian Egypt)

Inschriften aus Kleinasien ΙK Ostraka (Strasburg) Ostras P. Berol. Berlin Papyri PCair.Zen. Zenon Papyri PFay. Fayum Papyri P. Herc. Herculaneum Papyri PHerm Landl. Landlisten aus Hermupolis POxy.Oxyrhynchus Papyri  $\gamma BC$ Yale Babylonian Collection

#### OTHER ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviation Reference (in bibliography)

CPF Corpus dei Papiri Filosofici

DK Diels-Kranz, Fragmente der Vorsokratiker KRS Kirk, Raven and Schofield (1983)

L&S Long and Sedley (1987)

LSJ Liddell, Scott and Jones (1968)

Lewis and Short Lewis and Short (1966)

TLG Thesaurus Linguae Graecae

Usener (1887)

#### NOTE ON GENDER

When an indefinite reference is made to ancient scholars – who were predominantly male – I use the masculine pronoun. The sexism was theirs, not mine.



## The Greek alphabet

Capital approximately the form used in ancient writing	Lower case a form used in modern texts	Name of letter
A B Γ Δ E Z H Θ I K Λ M N Ξ O Π P Σ T Y Φ X	α β γ δ ε ζ η θ ι κ λ μ ν ξ ο π ρ σ τ υ Ψ ν Ψ ν Ψ ν Ψ ν ν ν ν ν ν ν ν ν ν ν ν ν	Alpha Bēta Gamma Delta Epsilon Zēta Ēta Thēta Iōta Kappa Lambda Mu Nu Xi Omicron Pi Rhō Sigma Tau Upsilon Phi Chi
Ψ Ω	Ψ ω	Psi Ōmega

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> A modern form for the letter in final position.

xvi



## Note on the figures

As is explained in chapter I, most of the diagrams in Greek mathematical works have not yet been edited from manuscripts. The figures in modern editions are reconstructions made by modern editors, based on their modern understanding of what a diagram should look like. However, as will be argued below, such an understanding is culturally variable. It is therefore better to keep, as far as possible, to the diagrams as they are found in Greek manuscripts (that is, generally speaking, in Byzantine manuscripts). While no attempt has been made to prepare a critical edition of the Greek mathematical diagrams produced here, almost all the figures have been based upon an inspection of at least some early manuscripts in which their originals appear, and I have tried to keep as close as possible to the visual code of those early diagrams. In particular, the reader should forgo any assumptions about the lengths of lines or the sizes of angles: unequal lines and angles may appear equal in the diagrams and vice versa.

In addition to the ancient diagrams (which are labelled with the original Greek letters), a few illustrative diagrams have been prepared for this book. These are distinguished from the ancient diagrams by being labelled with Latin letters or with numerals.

While avoiding painterly effects, ancient diagrams possess considerable aesthetic value in their austere systems of interconnected, labelled lines. I wish to take this opportunity to thank Cambridge University Press for their beautiful execution of the diagrams.