

opinion is, that the excess of this small foot above the English foot was even less than Mr. Greaves has made it. That writer rates the excess at about the 143rd part of a foot. My calculation makes this excess still less—the 658th part and a fraction of a foot. Now if the small stadium consisted of 330 small Greek feet of the dimensions which I have calculated, the result will be found very remarkable. The circumference of the earth is determined at 25,038 English miles, or at 132,200,640 English feet. If we reckon the small stadium at 330 small Greek feet, then 400,000 stadia will be equal 132,000,000 of these Greek feet. Were these Greek feet precisely of the same measure with as many English feet, the whole would amount to precisely 25,000 English miles; but I have stated this small Greek foot to be longer than the English by the 658th part and a fraction of a foot: This may appear a very trifling difference; and yet in the circumference of the earth it will amount to 200,640 English feet or 38 English miles; and thus will 132,000,000 of these Greek feet, be precisely equal 132,200,640 English feet; and 400,000 Chaldean stadia will be equal to 25,038 English miles, the exact measure of the earth's circumference. I now leave the subject for the present, and regret that I have detained my readers so long; though I have endeavoured to be as concise as possible.

*Paris, July 1817.*

*W. DRUMMOND.*

---

## REMARKS ON THE DÆMON OF SOCRATES.

---

As the dogmas of the ancient philosophers have been but little understood since the abolition of their schools, they have been for the most part grossly perverted, or ignorantly opposed. We have an egregious instance of this in what is transmitted to us by Plato and Xenophon respecting the celebrated dæmon of Socrates, of which the general opinion has been, that it was the prudence, foresight, or conscience of Socrates, unaccompanied with any supernatural agency. The following testimonies, however, from Plato will, I doubt not, convince the intelligent reader that Socrates firmly believed he was under the immediate protection of a power, superior to man, but inferior to God; that this power was a dæmon, or in modern language a guardian angel; and that it was not merely, as Mr. Nares asserts, *a voice*, but that it was *the voice of a dæmon*.

In the first place, it is requisite to observe of the adjective *δαιμόνιον*, that though it frequently signifies *divine*, yet its primary signification is *dæmoniacal*. Hence it is usual with all the disciples of Plato to call their master *θεῖος divine*, and Aristotle *δαιμόνιος*, taking occasion thus to denominate the latter from what Plato said of him, that he was *δαίμων φύσεως, the dæmon of nature*, from his uncommon knowledge in every branch of physiology.

In the second place, that every man has a dæmon who attends him while living, and conducts him to his judges when he dies, is expressly asserted by Socrates in the *Phædo*: λέγεται δὲ οὕτως, ὡς ἄρα τελευτήσαντα ἕκαστον, ὁ ἕκαστου δαίμων ὅπερ ζῶντα εἰλήχει, οὗτος ἄγειν ἐπιχειρεῖ εἰς δὴ τινα τόπον, κ. λ.

In the third place, *δαιμόσιον* in Plato, is not, as Mr. Nares supposes, always an adjective supported by *τι*, as is evident from the following instances from the *Theages* and *Theætetus*: ὅτι λέγοντός σου μεταξὺ γέγονέ μοι ἡ φωνή ἢ τοῦ δαιμονίου.—ἐνίοις μὲν τὸ γιγνόμενόν μοι δαιμόσιον ἀποκαλύει συνεῖναι, ἐνίοις δὲ ἑᾶ. From the former of these extracts also, it is evident that the *δαιμόνιον* of Socrates was not merely a voice, but the voice of a dæmon. For as there is a substantive *δαιμόνιον*, this word, when unaccompanied with *τι*, and particularly when preceded by the article *τὸ*, is doubtless to be considered as a substantive. But as Socrates also calls this *τὸ δαιμόνιον*, a God, in consequence of being, as Proclus observes, a dæmon of the highest order, it is indubitably certain that this word is used by him in the above passages as a substantive. He calls it a God, however, in the first *Alcibiades*: διὸ δὴ καὶ πάλαι οἰμαί με τὸν θεὸν οὐκ ἔἴην διαλέγεσθαι σοι, ὃν ἐγὼ περιεμένον ὀηνίκα ἔασσε. And also in the *Theætetus*: τὸ δὲ αἴτιον τούτου τόδε· μαιεύεσθαι με ὁ θεὸς ἀναγκάζει, γένναν δὲ ἀπεκάλυπεν.—τῆς μέντοι μαιείας ὁ θεὸς τε καὶ ἐγὼ αἴτιος.

It would be in vain to observe to Mr. Nares, that the greater part, and the best of the disciples of Plato, agree with Mr. Heber, that "Socrates was attended by one of those beings superior to man, whom, under the name of dæmon, they were accustomed from their infancy to fear, propitiate, and adore." For he says, "What others have made of *δαιμόνιον* is of no consequence." As if the opinion of men was of no consequence, with whom the Greek language was their native tongue; who made the study of

the philosophy of Plato the business of their lives; and who had books to consult, written by his immediate disciples, which since their time have been irrecoverably lost. Or as if the decision of Dr. Enfield, Dr. Hay, Bishop Horsley, Mr. Mitford, and Schweighæuser, on this subject, was of greater authority than that of Plutarch, Apuleius, and Proclus.

To other learned readers, indeed, it will most clearly appear from the Apology of Socrates, written by Plato, that Socrates was accused of impiety, and of making innovations in the religion of his country, for asserting that he was connected in a very transcendent degree with a presiding dæmon, to whose direction he confidently submitted the conduct of his life. For the accusation of Melitus, that he introduced other *novel dæmoniacal* natures, (*καινὰ δαιμόνια*), can admit of no other construction. This is evident from what is said by Xenophon, whose testimony on this point is no less weighty than decisive: "I have often wondered," says that historian and philosopher, "by what arguments the Athenians, who condemned Socrates, persuaded the city that he was worthy of death. For, in the first place, how could they prove that he did not believe in the Gods in which the city believed? since it was evident that he often sacrificed at home, and often on the common altars of the city. It was also not unapparent that he employed divination. For a report was circulated that signals were given to Socrates, according to his own assertion, by a dæmoniacal power; whence they especially appear to me to have accused him of introducing new dæmoniacal natures. He, however, introduced nothing new, nor any thing different from the opinion of those who, believing in divination, make use of auguries and oracles, symbols and sacrifices. For these do not apprehend that either birds, or things which occur, know what is advantageous to the diviners; but they are of opinion that the Gods thus signify to them what is beneficial; and he also thought the same." *Πολλάκις ἐθαύμασα, τίσι ποτὲ λόγοις Ἀθηναίους ἔπεισαν οἱ γραψάμενοι Σωκράτην, ὡς ἄξιός ἐστι θανάτου τῆ πόλει.—πρῶτον μὲν οὖν ὡς οὐκ ἐνόμιζεν οὐδὲ ἡ πόλις νομίζει θεοὺς, ποῶ ποτ' ἐχρήσαντο τεκμηρίω; θύων τε γὰρ φανερόν ἦν πολλάκις μὲν οἴκοι, πολλάκις δὲ ἐπὶ τῶν κοινῶν τῆς πόλεως βωμῶν· καὶ μαντικῇ χρώμενος οὐκ ἀφανὴς ἦν· διετεθρύλλητο γὰρ, ὡς φαίη Σωκράτης τὸ δαιμόνιον ἑαυτῷ σημαίνειν, ὅθεν δὴ καὶ μάλιστα*

μοι δοκοῦσιν αὐτὸν αἰτιάσασθαι, καινὰ δαιμόνια εἰσφέρειν· ὁ δ' οὐδὲν καινόμενον εἰσέφερε τῶν ἄλλων, ὅσοι μαντικὴν νομίζοντες, οἰωνοῖς τε χρῶνται, καὶ φήμαις, καὶ συμβόλοις, καὶ θυσίαις· οὗτοί τε γὰρ ὑπολαμβάνουσιν, οὐ τοὺς ὄρνιθας, οὐδὲ τοὺς ἀπαντῶντας, εἰδέναι τὰ συμφέροντα τοῖς μαντευομένοις, ἀλλὰ τοὺς θεοὺς διὰ τούτων αὐτὰ σημαίνειν· κάκεινος οὕτως ἐνόμιζεν. And in another place he observes, "That it was evident that Socrates worshipped the Gods the most of all men." Φανερός ἦν θεραπεύων τοὺς θεοὺς, μάλιστα τῶν ἄλλων ἀνθρώπων.

Conformably to this, in his *Apology* written by Plato, he clearly says, that the doctrine of Anaxagoras, which made the sun and moon to be no Gods, is *absurd*. And in another part of it: "I believe that there are Gods more than any one of my accusers." καὶ ἀτέχνως ἀπολογούμενος κατηγοροῖην ἂν ἑμαυτοῦ, ὡς θεοὺς οὐ νομίζω· ἀλλὰ πολλοῦ δεῖ οὕτως ἔχειν νομίζω τε γὰρ, ὡς ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, ὡς οὐδεὶς τῶν ἡμῶν κατηγορῶν.

If Socrates therefore was a believer in the religion of his country, as he most unquestionably was, he believed that he was attended by a friendly *dæmon*; and this being one of the most exalted kind, he not only calls it τὸ δαιμόνιον, but also θεός. For agreeably to the theology of the Greeks, as the summit of an inferior coalesces with the extremity of a proximately inferior order, the highest *dæmon* is κατὰ σχέσιν, through habitude or alliance, a God.

I had almost forgot to observe that this voice, which Socrates heard, is called by him in the *Apology* a *prophetic voice*, ἡ γὰρ εἰσθυῖά μοι μαντικὴ, ἢ τοῦ δαιμονίου. And prophecy, according to Plato, is under the *immediate* superintendence of *dæmons*, as is evident from the speech of Diotima in the *Banquet*.

After such unequivocal testimony, no other reason can be assigned for the position of the moderns, that Socrates ridiculed the religion of his country, than inattention to one of the most important tenets of ancient theology, and which may also be considered as ranking among the first of the most magnificent, scientific, and divine conceptions of the human mind. The tenet I allude to is, that the essential, which is the most perfect energy of deity, is deific; and that his first and immediate progeny must as necessarily be Gods, that is, beings transcendently similar to himself, and possessing those characteristics *secondarily* which he possesses *primarily*, as heat is the immediate offspring of fire,

164 *Stanleii Notæ quædam in Callimachum.*

and coldness of snow. Unacquainted with this mighty truth, which is coeval with the universe itself, modern theologians and sophists have defamed what they did not understand, and by offering violence to the pages of venerable antiquity, have made the great Socrates himself become the patron of their own distorted conceptions.

*Manor Place, Watworth.*

*THOMAS TAYLOR.*

---

STANLEII NOTÆ QUÆDAM IN  
CALLIMACHUM.

---

THESE Notes, it appears from some rudiments (greatly varied by corrections and interlineations) to have been the writer's intention to inscribe,

*Clarissimo*  
*ac*  
*Eruditissimo Viro,*  
JOHANNI MARSHAM,  
*Armigero, &c.*

They are much intermingled with additional remarks by Bowyer, into whose possession they seem to have passed; and here and there I have presumed, very slightly, to play the commentator myself. As, from my sequestered situation, I have no easy means of ascertaining whether or not the annotations of S. and B, have been already communicated, in some shape or other, to the public, I trust I shall be forgiven, even if I should appear to students more fortunately circumstanced in that particular, to have "found a mare's nest."

Yours very truly,

*Hunmanby, June 23, 1817.*

F. WRANGHAM.

N. B. I only insert occasionally the Bowyer additions, of which the Greek passages (I may add) are, contrary to those of Stanley, generally accented.