

## Preface

Proclus' *Hypotyposis Astronomicarum Positionum* ranks among the mathematical treatises of Late Antiquity. Being an astronomical treatise composed by one of the most prolific Neoplatonic philosophers, it has been transmitted to us through Byzantine codices which usually record it among mathematical, philosophical or historical works. In the modern era, the *Hypotyposis* has attracted the interest of historians of Greek astronomy and scholars dealing with Proclean (and, generally, Neoplatonic) cosmology, and epistemological considerations about the discipline of astronomy. Nevertheless, apart from Karl Manitius' (1909) reliable edition of the Greek text with a German translation, a few interpretative notes and an edition of the ancient scholia, no systematic study of the *Hypotyposis* has been attempted so far. Passing references to the *Hypotyposis* scattered throughout modern literature propose divergent conceptions of its character and aims. While specific passages of the work have been quite popular, others – in fact, the greatest part of it – have been strikingly neglected. Quite often those passages are insufficiently contextualized and, thus, potentially misleading.

The present book offers a close reading of the entire *Hypotyposis* and an overall interpretation of its aim and scope within the framework of Greek mathematical treatises and Proclus' works. It re-examines individual topics already touched upon in the secondary literature and sheds light on aspects that have gone unnoticed. It includes a revised form of Manitius' Greek text, an English translation, and a full-scale philosophical and mathematical commentary, framed by an introduction and a study of the astronomical diagrams and illustrations that accompany the text of Byzantine manuscripts.

The *Hypotyposis* may be quite technical. My wish is to make it accessible to readers who are not necessarily specialists in Greek astronomy. To this end, several footnotes on the translation contain explanatory comments that anticipate elaboration in the commentary, while the commentary itself has the form of a continuous discourse that offers an interpretative reconstruction of the entire text. The commentary also contains lengthy discussions of particular issues in the form of parenthetical essays. The introduction is the fruit of the study of the *Hypotyposis* as a whole and prepares the reader for the approaches to be adopted in the commentary. The last section, a separate study of the diagrams and illustrations, offers justification for my relevant claims throughout this study and serves as a tool for further research.

