Parmenides' Arguments for What-Is

General Premise

Only that-which-is (or what-is) may be spoken of or conceived. That-which-is-not (or what-is-not) cannot be meaningfully spoken of; it is inconceivable.

Properties of What-Is

Uncreated: what-is never came into being
   1. Creation requires something other than what-is, out of which what-is comes into existence (otherwise this is not creation)
   2. Since this something is other than what-is, it must be what-is-not
   3. But then something that-is-not is being used in our explanation
   4. This is impossible since what-is-not cannot be thought
   5. Hence, creation for what-is is unthinkable

Indestructible: what-is can never go out of being
   1. Destruction requires something other than what-is, into which what-is passes away (otherwise this is not destruction)
   2. Since this something is other than what-is, it must be what-is-not
   3. But then something that-is-not is being used in our explanation
   4. This is impossible since what-is-not cannot be thought
   5. Hence, destruction for what-is is unthinkable

Whole: what-is is all alike
   1. If what-is was not all alike, then part of what-is is A and part of what-is is B, where A and B are distinct from each other
   2. In order for A and B to be distinct, then A must be not-B and B must be not-A
   3. To know A is to then know not-B, ditto for B and not-A
   4. But then something that-is-not (i.e., not-A and not-B) are being used in our explanation
   5. This is impossible since what-is-not cannot be thought
   6. Hence, what-is being not all alike is unthinkable

Homogenous: what-is is all (internally) alike
   1. Follows immediately from wholeness

Unique: what-is is all (externally) alike
   1. Follows immediately from wholeness

Not-of-Degrees: what-is is does not admit of degrees (i.e., what-is is not more or less in some respect)
1. Being of degrees requires different degrees that what-is could be
2. But this is impossible since what-is is whole and so all alike
3. Hence, what-is does not admit of degrees

Continuous: what-is cannot be separated
1. Separation requires something other than what-is, which would separate what-is
2. Since this something is other than what-is, it must be what-is-not
3. But then something that-is-not is being used in our explanation
4. This is impossible since what-is-not cannot be thought
5. Hence, separation for what-is is unthinkable

Complete or **_Perfect_**: what-is is not lacking in any respect
1. If what-is lacked anything, it would lack everything
    a. The only lack in what-is is lack of being what-is
    b. But what-is does not admit of degrees
    c. Lack of being what-is then implies a complete failure of being what-is
    d. Hence, if what-is lacked anything, it would lack everything
2. This implies that what-is would not be what-is, it would be what-is-not
3. This is impossible since what-is-not cannot be thought
4. Hence, what-is lacks nothing

Limited: what-is has a *peiras*
1. Follows immediately from completeness
    a. What-is complete implies that what-is has a "limit" (*peiras*, best translated here as "the mark of completion")
    b. Since what-is has a limit (or is complete), there is a constraint on what-is (just *as if* it had a physical boundary)

Motionless and **_Changeless_**: what-is cannot vary (in either space or time)
1. Change (in either position or form) of what-is requires that what-is is different from what it will be or what it was
2. This implies that what-is is incomplete, since there is something more to come (either movement or change in form)
3. But what-is complete
4. Hence, what-is is unmoved and unchanging

Timeless and ***Eternal***: what-is, is not subject to any temporal distinctions
1. What-is is neither created nor destroyed, hence it is eternal
2. What-is cannot change, hence it is timeless
    a. Time requires change in order to distinguish different times
    b. But what-is cannot change
    c. Hence, what-is is timeless